

SUSTAINABLE AND DURABLE BRIDGE DECKS

by

ANDREW JOSEPH SHEARRER

B.S., Kansas State University, 2012

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

**MASTER OF SCIENCE**

Department of Civil Engineering  
College of Engineering

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

2014

Approved by:

Major Professor  
Robert J. Peterman

# **Copyright**

ANDREW SHEARRER

2014

## Abstract

Epoxy polymer overlays have been used for decades on existing bridge decks to protect the deck and extend its service life. The polymer overlay's ability to seal a bridge deck is now being specified for new construction. Questions exist about the amount of drying time needed to achieve an acceptable concrete moisture content to ensure an adequate bond to the polymer overlay. Current Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) specifications for new bridge decks call a 14 day wet curing period followed by 21 days of drying (Kansas DOT, 2007) If not enough drying is provided, the moisture within the concrete can form water vapor pressure at the overlay interface and induce delamination. If too much drying time is provided projects are delayed, which can increase the total project cost or even delay overlay placement until the next spring.

A testing procedure was developed to simulate a bridge deck in order to test the concrete moisture content and bonding strength of the overlay. Concrete slabs were cast to test typical concrete and curing conditions for a new bridge deck. Three concrete mixtures were tested to see what effect the water –cement ratio and the addition of fly ash might have on the overlay bond strength. Wet curing occurred at 3 different temperatures (40°F, 73°F, and 100°F) to see if temperature played a part in the bond strength as well. The concrete was then allowed to dry for 3, 7, 14, or 21 days. Five epoxy-polymer overlay systems that had been preapproved by KDOT were each used in conjunction with the previously mentioned concrete and curing conditions.

After, the slabs were setup to perform pull-off tests to test the tensile rupture strength. The concrete slabs with the different epoxy overlays were heated to 122-125°F to replicate summer bridge deck temperatures. Half of the pull-off tests were performed when the slabs were heated and half were performed once the slabs had cooled back down to 73°±5°F.

Results from the pull-off tests as well as results from a moisture meter taken on the concrete prior to the overlay placement were compared and analyzed. Testing conditions were compared with each other to see which had a larger effect on the epoxy polymer overlay's bond strength.

# Table of Contents

List of Figures .....	vi
List of Tables .....	xi
Chapter 1 - Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 - Literature Review.....	2
Introduction.....	2
Bridge Deck Protection.....	2
Epoxy Polymer Overlay.....	3
Advantages.....	3
Preparation .....	3
Failure Mechanisms .....	4
Causes of Failure.....	4
Effects of Failure.....	5
Surveys.....	7
Survey on Polymer Overlay Usage.....	9
Previous Testing .....	10
KDOT Multi-Layer Polymer Concrete Overlay Specifications .....	12
Chapter 3 - Materials .....	15
Setup .....	15
Concrete Mixes .....	18
Concrete Materials .....	19
Epoxy-Polymer Overlay Systems .....	20
Chapter 4 - Testing Process .....	21
Casting Slabs.....	21
Curing the Slabs .....	24
Moisture Reading and Surface Preparation .....	28
Overlay Placement .....	32
Testing Procedure .....	34
Temperature Preparation.....	37



Pull-Off Tests.....	38
Chapter 5 - Results.....	43
Moisture Readings .....	43
Pull-off Tests.....	49
Pull-off Test Results Compared to Moisture Readings .....	57
Pull-off Failure Type Results.....	58
Concrete Compressive Strengths .....	61
Chapter 6 - Additional Testing .....	64
Moisture Readings Taken Over Full Drying Time.....	64
Moisture Meter Accuracy .....	65
Epoxy Tensile Test .....	70
Chapter 7 - Conclusions and Recommendations .....	73
Conclusions.....	73
Recommendations.....	76
Chapter 8 - Works Cited .....	77
Appendix A - Moisture Meter Results.....	79
Appendix B - Concrete Compressive Strengths .....	91
Appendix C - Pull-off Test Results.....	100
Appendix D - Pull-off Failure Types .....	115
Appendix E - Moisture Results for Slabs Dried 21 Days .....	125
Appendix F - Pull-off Test Result Figures.....	129

## List of Figures

Figure 1: Failures in the concrete.....	6
Figure 2: Testing matrix.....	16
Figure 3: Slab dimensions.....	17
Figure 4: Slab after wet curing.....	18
Figure 5: Forms built to accommodate the 12 x 18 x 6 inch slabs. ....	21
Figure 6: Thermocouple wire setup within slab forms .....	22
Figure 7: Mud Hog mixer used to batch concrete.....	23
Figure 8: Slab label cast into the concrete .....	24
Figure 9: Wet cure locations for 40°F refrigerator (left) and 73°F moist room (right) .....	25
Figure 10: Wet cure location for 100F oven.....	25
Figure 11: Slab placed inside a bin for wet curing .....	26
Figure 12: Slab after wet curing.....	27
Figure 13: Slab wrapped in plastic to dry .....	27
Figure 14: Drying location.....	27
Figure 15: Sand blaster .....	29
Figure 16: Before (left) and after (right) sand blasting a slab.....	29
Figure 17: Sand blasted surface with visible large aggregates .....	30
Figure 18: Close up of concrete surface after sand blasting .....	31
Figure 19: Tramex CMEXpert II instrument used to take moisture readings .....	32
Figure 20: Placement of course 1 of epoxy (left) and aggregate (right).....	33
Figure 21: Placement of course 2 of epoxy (left) and aggregate (right).....	33
Figure 22: Coring setup (left) and a core through the overlay into the concrete (right).....	34
Figure 23: Placement of silicone caulk to seal the cores .....	36
Figure 24: Application of adhesive epoxy to mount the aluminum caps .....	36
Figure 25: Slabs before and after placing pull-off caps.....	37
Figure 26: Slabs placed under heat lamps with shield protectors over the caps.....	38
Figure 27: Thermocouple as the slabs are heated .....	38
Figure 28: Pull-off tester.....	39

Figure 29: Pull-off cap ready to be tested .....	40
Figure 30: Failure type 1 (left) and failure type 2 (right) .....	41
Figure 31: Failure type 3 (left) and failure type 4 (right) .....	41
Figure 32: Failure type 5 (left) and a failure with both type 2 and type 3 (right).....	41
Figure 33: Overall average of moisture readings.....	44
Figure 34: Average moisture readings separated by concrete type .....	45
Figure 35: Moisture readings: pre and post sand blasting for fly ash concrete .....	46
Figure 36: Moisture Readings: Wet Cure Temperature.....	47
Figure 37: Moisture readings: pre-sand blasting for the fly ash concrete categorized by wet cure temperature .....	48
Figure 38: Pull-off test results overview.....	50
Figure 39: Average of hot pull-offs based on concrete type.....	51
Figure 40: Average of room temperature pull-offs based on concrete type .....	52
Figure 41: Average of hot pull-offs based on wet cure temperature .....	53
Figure 42: Average of room temperature pull-offs based on wet cure temperature .....	53
Figure 43: Average of hot pull-offs based on epoxy-polymer overlay system used .....	54
Figure 44: Average of room temperature pull-offs based on epoxy-polymer overlay system used .....	55
Figure 45: Hot pull-off test results for fly ash concrete slabs split by their wet cure temperature	56
Figure 46: Room temperature pull-off test results for fly ash concrete slabs split by their wet cure temperature .....	56
Figure 47: Hot Pull-offs vs Moisture Readings .....	57
Figure 48: Room Temperature Pull-offs vs Moisture Readings.....	58
Figure 49: Control concrete failure types .....	59
Figure 50: Low-cracking concrete failure types .....	60
Figure 51: Fly ash concrete failure types .....	60
Figure 52: Compressive strength of concrete by concrete type .....	62
Figure 53: Compressive strength of concrete by wet cure temperature.....	63
Figure 54: Time Progression of Moisture Readings for Selected Slabs .....	65
Figure 55: Test specimen cast to test moisture content .....	66
Figure 56: Specimen 1: dried (not wrapped) .....	67

Figure 57: Specimen 3: dried (wrapped) .....	68
Figure 58: Specimen 2: heat dried (not wrapped).....	69
Figure 59: Specimen 4: heat dried (wrapped).....	69
Figure 60: Moisture content of heat dried specimen .....	70
Figure 61: 2 aluminum pucks epoxied together.....	71
Figure 62: Epoxy tensile test setup .....	72
Figure 63: C-40-3-1 (left) and C-40-7-1 (right).....	129
Figure 64: C-40-14-1 (left) and C-40-21-1 (right).....	129
Figure 65: C-70-3-1 (left) and C-70-7-1 (right).....	130
Figure 66: C-70-14-1 (not pictured) and C-70-21-1 (right).....	130
Figure 67: C-100-3-1 (left) and C-100-7-1 (right).....	131
Figure 68: C-40-3-2 (left) and C-40-7-2 (not pictured) .....	132
Figure 69: C-70-3-2 (left) and C-70-7-2 (right).....	133
Figure 70: C-100-3-2 (left) and C-100-7-2 (not pictured) .....	134
Figure 71: C-100-14-2 (not pictured) and C-100-21-2 .....	134
Figure 72: C-40-3-3 (left) and C-40-7-3 (right).....	135
Figure 73: C-40-14-3 (left) and C-40-21-3 (right).....	135
Figure 74: C-70-3-3 (left) and C-70-7-3 (right).....	136
Figure 75: C-70-14-3 (not pictured) and C-70-21-3 (right).....	136
Figure 76: C-100-3-3 (left) and C-100-7-3 (right).....	137
Figure 77: C-100-14-3 (left) and C-100-21-3 (right).....	137
Figure 78: C-40-3-4 (left) and C-40-7-4 (right).....	138
Figure 79: C-40-14-4 (left) and C-40-21-4 (right).....	138
Figure 80: C-70-3-4 (left) and C-70-7-4 (right).....	139
Figure 81: C-70-14-4 (left) and C-70-21-4 (right).....	139
Figure 82: C-100-3-4 (left) and C-100-7-4 (right).....	140
Figure 83: C-100-14-4 (left) and C-100-21-4 (right).....	140
Figure 84: C-40-3-5 (left) and C-40-7-5 (right).....	141
Figure 85: C-40-14-5 (left) and C-40-21-5 (right).....	141
Figure 86: C-70-3-5 (left) and C-70-7-5 (right).....	142
Figure 87: C-70-14-5 (not pictured) and C-70-21-5 (right).....	142

Figure 88: C-100-3-5 (left) and C-100-7-5 (right).....	143
Figure 89: C-100-14-5 (left) and C-100-21-5 (right).....	143
Figure 90: L-40-3-1 (left) and L-40-7-1 (right) .....	144
Figure 91: L-40-14-1 (not pictured) and L-40-21-1 (right) .....	144
Figure 92: L-70-3-1 (left) and L-70-7-1 (right) .....	145
Figure 93: L-70-14-1 (left) and L-70-21-1 (right) .....	145
Figure 94: L-100-3-1 (left) and L-100-7-1 (right) .....	146
Figure 95: L-100-14-1 (left) and L-100-21-1 (right) .....	146
Figure 96: L-40-3-2 (left) and L-40-7-2 (right) .....	147
Figure 97: L-40-14-2 (left) and L-40-21-2 (not pictured) .....	147
Figure 98: L-70-3-2 (left) and L-70-7-2 (right) .....	148
Figure 99: L-70-14-2 (left) and L-70-21-2 (not pictured) .....	148
Figure 100: L-100-3-2 (left) and L-100-7-2 (right) .....	149
Figure 101: L-100-14-2 (not pictured) and L-100-21-2 (right) .....	149
Figure 102: L-40-3-3 (left) and L-40-7-3 (right) .....	150
Figure 103: L-40-14-3 (not pictured) and L-40-21-3 (right) .....	150
Figure 104: L-70-3-3 (left) and L-70-7-3 (right) .....	151
Figure 105: L-70-14-3 (not pictured) and L-70-21-3 (right) .....	151
Figure 106: L-100-3-3 (left) and L-100-7-3 (not pictured) .....	152
Figure 107: L-100-14-3 (left) and L-100-21-3 (right) .....	152
Figure 108: L-40-3-4 (left) and L-40-7-4 (right) .....	153
Figure 109: L-70-3-4 (left) and L-70-7-4 (right) .....	154
Figure 110: L-100-3-4 (left) and L-100-7-4 (not pictured) .....	155
Figure 111: L-100-14-4 (left) and L-100-21-4 (right) .....	155
Figure 112: L-40-3-5 (left) and L-40-7-5 (right) .....	156
Figure 113: L-40-14-5 (left) and L-40-21-5 (right) .....	156
Figure 114: L-70-3-5 (left) and L-70-7-5 (right) .....	157
Figure 115: L-70-14-5 (left) and L-70-21-5 (right) .....	157
Figure 116: L-100-3-5 (left) and L-100-7-5 (right) .....	158
Figure 117: L-100-14-5 (left) and L-100-21-5 (right) .....	158
Figure 118: F-40-3-1 (left) and F-40-7-1 (right).....	159

Figure 119: F-40-14-1 (left) and F-40-21-1 (right).....	159
Figure 120: F-70-3-1 (left) and F-70-7-1 (right).....	160
Figure 121: F-70-14-1 (left) and F-70-21-1 (right).....	160
Figure 122: F-100-3-1 (left) and F-100-7-1 (right).....	161
Figure 123: F-100-14-1 (left) and F-100-21-1 (right).....	161
Figure 124: F-40-3-2 (left) and F-40-7-2 (right).....	162
Figure 125: F-40-14-2 (left) and F-40-21-2 (right).....	162
Figure 126: F-70-3-2 (left) and F-70-7-2 (right).....	163
Figure 127: F-70-14-2 (left) and F-70-21-2 (right).....	163
Figure 128: F-100-3-2 (left) and F-100-7-2 (right).....	164
Figure 129: F-100-14-2 (left) and F-100-21-2 (right).....	164
Figure 130: F-40-3-3 (left) and F-40-7-3 (right).....	165
Figure 131: F-40-14-3 (left) and F-40-21-3 (right).....	165
Figure 132: F-70-3-3 (left) and F-70-7-3 (right).....	166
Figure 133: F-70-14-3 (left) and F-70-21-3 (right).....	166
Figure 134: F-100-3-3 (left) and F-100-7-3 (right).....	167
Figure 135: F-100-14-3 (left) and F-100-21-3 (right).....	167
Figure 136: F-40-3-4 (left) and F-40-7-4 (right).....	168
Figure 137: F-40-14-4 (left) and F-40-21-4 (right).....	168
Figure 138: F-70-3-4 (left) and F-70-7-4 (right).....	169
Figure 139: F-70-14-4 (left) and F-70-21-4 (right).....	169
Figure 140: F-100-3-4 (left) and F-100-7-4 (right).....	170
Figure 141: F-100-14-4 (left) and F-100-21-4 (right).....	170
Figure 142: F-40-3-5 (left) and F-40-7-5 (right).....	171
Figure 143: F-40-14-5 (left) and F-40-21-5 (right).....	171
Figure 144: F-70-3-5 (left) and F-70-7-5 (right).....	172
Figure 145: F-70-14-5 (left) and F-70-21-5 (right).....	172
Figure 146: F-100-3-5 (left) and F-100-7-5 (right).....	173
Figure 147: F-100-14-5 (left) and F-100-21-5 (right).....	173

## List of Tables

Table 1: Polymer Concrete Overlay Cure Times (adapted from KDOT section 729) .....	14
Table 2: Concrete mixes* .....	19
Table 3: Epoxy Overlay Properties.....	20
Table 4: Overall moisture percentages .....	43
Table 5: Pull-off test results overview .....	50
Table 6: Epoxy tensile test results .....	72
Table 7: Moisture meter readings for control concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2 .....	79
Table 8: Moisture meter readings for control concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4 .....	80
Table 9: Moisture meter readings for control concrete with Epoxy 5 .....	81
Table 10: Moisture meter readings for low-cracking concrete and Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2.....	82
Table 11: Moisture meter readings for low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4.....	83
Table 12: Moisture meter readings for low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 5 .....	84
Table 13: Moisture meter readings for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2.....	85
Table 14: Moisture meter readings for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4.....	86
Table 15: Moisture meter readings for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 5.....	87
Table 16: Moisture meter readings taken prior to sand blasting for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2.....	88
Table 17: Moisture meter readings taken prior to sand blasting for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4.....	89
Table 18: Moisture meter readings taken prior to sand blasting for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 5 .....	90
Table 19: Concrete cylinder strengths for control concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2 .....	91
Table 20: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for control concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4 .....	92
Table 21: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for control concrete with Epoxy 5 .....	93
Table 22: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2 .....	94

Table 23: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4 .....	95
Table 24: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 5 ....	96
Table 25: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2 .....	97
Table 26: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4 .....	98
Table 27: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 5 .....	99
Table 28: Pull-off test results from control concrete with Epoxy 1 overlay .....	100
Table 29: Pull-off test results from control concrete with Epoxy 2 overlay .....	101
Table 30: Pull-off test results from control concrete with Epoxy 3 overlay .....	102
Table 31: Pull-off test results from control concrete with Epoxy 4 overlay .....	103
Table 32: Pull-off test results from control concrete with Epoxy 5 overlay .....	104
Table 33: Pull-off test results from low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 1 overlay .....	105
Table 34: Pull-off test results from low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 2 overlay .....	106
Table 35: Pull-off test results from low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 3 overlay .....	107
Table 36: Pull-off test results from low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 4 overlay .....	108
Table 37: Pull-off test results from low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 5 overlay .....	109
Table 38: Pull-off test results from fly ash concrete with Epoxy 1 overlay .....	110
Table 39: Pull-off test results from fly ash concrete with Epoxy 2 overlay .....	111
Table 40: Pull-off test results for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 3 overlay .....	112
Table 41: Pull-off test results for fly ash slabs with Epoxy 4 overlay .....	113
Table 42: Pull-off test results for fly ash slabs with Epoxy 5 overlay .....	114
Table 43: Failure types for control slabs .....	115
Table 44: Failure types for low-cracking slabs .....	118
Table 45: Failure types for fly ash slabs .....	121
Table 46: 21 day moisture readings on slab F-100-21-2 .....	125
Table 47: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-70-21-2 .....	125
Table 48: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-40-21-2 .....	126
Table 49: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-100-21-3 .....	126
Table 50: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-70-21-3 .....	126



Table 51: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-40-21-3.....	127
Table 52: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-100-21-4.....	127
Table 53: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-70-21-4.....	127
Table 54: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-40-21-4.....	128

## **Chapter 1 - Introduction**

Epoxy-polymer overlays are used on concrete bridge decks to protect it and extend its service life. The epoxy consists of two components: a resin and a binder. Mixing these two components produces a thermosetting resin that is moisture tolerant (Potter, 1975). Combining the epoxy with a flint aggregate provides an overlay system that can seal and protect a bridge deck while creating a skid-resistant driving surface. Epoxy overlays are typically only 3/8 to 1/2 inch thick (Sika Corporation, 2011).

The Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) has been using epoxy-polymer overlays on existing bridge decks since 1999 with great success (Meggers, 2009). Because of this effectiveness when placed on existing bridge decks, KDOT is investigating placing the epoxy-polymer overlay on new bridge decks. Placing the epoxy overlay on a new bridge deck creates a question about the acceptable moisture content in the concrete to allow for an adequate bond to the bridge deck. If the overlay is placed too early, water vapor pressure can form at the overlay interface and induce delamination. Current KDOT specifications call for 14 days of wet cure followed by 21 days of drying before placing an epoxy overlay on a new bridge deck (Kansas DOT, 2007). Having too much drying time delays projects and increases costs. For bridges constructed towards the end of summer, overlay placement can be delayed until the next spring due to low temperatures. The bridge deck is then exposed to water and chlorides over its first winter cycle. Research is needed to determine acceptable moisture content and drying time of the bridge deck prior to placement of an epoxy overlay on new bridge decks.

Chapter 2 of this study is a literature review explaining more about epoxy-polymer overlays. The literature review contains information on using the epoxy overlay, failures that might occur in the overlay, current state DOT use, and previous testing on epoxy overlays.

Chapter 3 explains the testing setup and the materials used. Chapter 4 explains the testing process in detail from casting concrete slabs to performing moisture readings and pull-off tests. Chapter 5 shows the results produced from testing. Chapter 6 includes additional testing that was completed to answer questions that arose during the main testing process outlined in Chapter 4. Finally, Chapter 7 makes conclusions and recommendations for changing current specifications and for future research.

## **Chapter 2 - Literature Review**

### **Introduction**

Bridge decks comprised of concrete and reinforcing steel support traffic loads and provide driving surfaces. From the moment bridge decks are opened to traffic, they are exposed to traffic loads, water, chlorides, and abrasion, leading to cracking which allows water and chlorides to enter the deck and contacts the steel. Consequently, the steel corrodes and section area is lost decreasing the strength capacity of the bridge.

According to the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) National Bridge Inventory from 2012, 151,497 (24.9%) of the 607,380 total bridges in the United States (U.S.) were classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete (FHWA, 2012). Therefore, initial bridge deck protection is crucial in order to increase the life span of a bridge.

### ***Bridge Deck Protection***

All bridge decks eventually experience accelerated deterioration, leading to mandatory full deck replacement; placement of an overlay system, however, can postpone this costly procedure. Overlay systems, such as concrete overlays, polymer-modified asphaltic overlays, and thin polymer overlays, prevent chlorides from entering the bridge deck and provide an abrasive driving surface (Frosch, Kreger, & Strandquist, 2013). Concrete overlays utilize Portland cement as a base material, but additional materials, such as silica fume, latex, and short fibers, are added to provide desirable overlay characteristics, including higher compressive/tensile strength, lower permeability, or earlier strength development. Polymer modified asphaltic overlays combine polymer material with an asphalt binder in order to create a sealant layer. Thin polymer overlays consist of a polymer and an aggregate less than 1 inch thick (Frosch, Kreger, & Strandquist, 2013). Polymer overlay types include methyl methacrylate, polyester, and epoxy. Methyl methacrylate overlays are monomers that utilize the slurry method of placement in which the monomer and aggregate are mixed to create a slurry before being placed on the deck. Epoxy overlays comprise a multiple layer system that utilizes epoxy and an aggregate spread over each layer. Epoxy overlays are discussed in detail in this report.

## ***Epoxy Polymer Overlay***

Epoxy overlays are typically comprised of a resin and a binder; mixing these two parts produces thermosetting resin well-suited for protecting a bridge deck (Potter, 1975). Adhesive properties of hardened resin have adequate strength to typically out-perform the tensile strength of a concrete bridge deck ranging from 500-600 psi (Reagan, 1992). Materials can be added to the epoxy to specialize it to provide properties desirable for specific bridges or projects, such as increased compressive strength, hardness, or thermal conductivity (Guthrie, Nelsen, & Ross, 2005).

### ***Advantages***

Epoxy polymer overlays are advantageous for bridge deck protection. According to Frosch, epoxy allows for short installation time, proper bond to concrete, impermeability, crack bridging, good skid resistance, and little additional dead load (Frosch, Kreger, & Strandquist, 2013). Installation times for epoxy overlays are relatively short, with curing requiring only 1.5 hours for the first course and 3 hours for the second course (at 80-84°F) before opening to traffic (Dayton Superior, 2012). Epoxies can have excellent bond strengths that reach over 500 psi within 24 hours (Poly-Carb, Inc., 2011). Epoxies are moisture resistant before and after curing, resulting in a sealed bridge deck (Sika Corporation, 2011). Multiple epoxy layers prevent imperfections in one layer from breaking destroying the integrity of the whole overlay system, and waterproofing the bridge deck keeps all water and chlorides from entering thus preserving the internal reinforcement. Epoxy overlays are great at bridging cracks up to .04 inches wide due to their tensile strength and elongation properties, but should be filled with a resin prior to overlay placement for cracks wider than .04 inches (NCHRP, 2011). With the use of a hard aggregate, epoxy overlays provide a good skid-resistant driving surface for years. Epoxy overlays are also very thin, typically 3/8 inch to 1/2 inch thick, adding very little dead load to the structure (Sika Corporation, 2011). Because epoxy overlays are so thin, no modifications to roadway clearance or approach slabs are required, thereby simplifying installation.

### ***Preparation***

An epoxy overlay can protect a bridge deck up to 20 years if properly placed and maintained, so care should be taken to properly prepare a deck for an epoxy overlay (NCHRP, 2011). The concrete surface is critical because it directly bonds with the epoxy. The surface

should be free of moisture, roughened by shot-blasting, and free of solid or chemical debris. Dry, warm temperatures offer optimum curing conditions for the epoxy. Epoxy overlay application should be completed by an experienced crew supervised by the epoxy producer to ensure proper placement (NCHRP, 2011).

## **Failure Mechanisms**

### ***Causes of Failure***

If failures occur in the epoxy overlay system, they typically occur during overlay construction (NCHRP, 2011). The areas that lead to failure in the epoxy overlay most often occur during surface preparation, proportioning, mixing, curing, or overlay finishing. Concrete repair and surface preparation are crucial to the concrete-epoxy bond which is usually stronger than the concrete itself. Therefore, if the concrete is cracked or spalled then achieving a high bond strength to the deteriorated concrete does no good (Guthrie, Nelsen, & Ross, 2005). Similarly, if foreign materials are on or within the concrete, the bond is unable to reach its full potential. For example, if chloride content in the concrete is reaching levels that can corrode steel, then the corroding steel will crack the concrete, causing delaminations in the overlay (Babaei & Hawkins, 1987). In the cases that have deteriorated concrete in any way, the damaged concrete must be removed and replaced. Repairs made with portland cement should be wet cured to decrease the amount of shrinkage and furthermore from debonding the polymer overlay as a result of the shrinkage (NCHRP, 2011). The bridge deck surface is related to the overlay bond because the rougher the bridge deck surface, the more area and friction is able to resist shear or tensile forces. According to the National Cooperative Highway Research Program NCHRP, a surface roughness of 6-7 on the International Concrete Repair Institute (ICRI) roughness scale provides an adequate bonding surface (International Concrete Repair Institute).

Materials used for the overlay can directly cause or aid in delaminations. Concrete and epoxy mechanical properties must be similar in order to avoid additional stresses caused from shrinkage or thermal expansion. Epoxies with a similar coefficient of thermal expansion to the concrete bridge deck prohibit additional shear stresses from forming at the bond due to differential expansion (Guthrie, Nelsen, & Ross, 2005). Aggregate selected for the overlay must have good impact and abrasion resistance (Guthrie, Nelsen, & Ross, 2005). An aggregate that breaks apart will decrease overlay abrasiveness and allow the overlay to break apart earlier.

Clean aggregate is critical to keeping the aggregate from falling out of the overlay (Smith, 1991). Aggregate that has any dirt or foreign residues on it will be inhibited from bonding well to the overlay.

Many epoxy overlay systems use a 1:1 part A to part B ratio by volume for proportioning. Any variances from a 1:1 by volume ratio results in unused material, leading to soft spots and rutting in the overlay (Guthrie, Nelsen, & Ross, 2005). Inadequate mixing of the epoxy such as not fully blending the two parts or leaving unmixed epoxy on the sides of the mixing barrel will also results in the epoxy not having a perfect 1:1 ratio by volume. Epoxies, especially, larger batches, should be mixed mechanically to avoid human error (Guthrie, Nelsen, & Ross, 2005). Entraining air during mixing should be avoided since bubbles in the overlay allow direct access for chlorides through the overlay (NCHRP, 2011). A jiffy mixer or paddle attached to a low speed drill is recommended to keep entrained air to a minimum during mixing (Dayton Superior Corporation, 2012). Overlay application should be conducted as specified in the epoxy product data sheet. The time needed to completely cure the epoxy will change with temperature variances (Poly-Carb, Inc., 2011).

Moisture on the deck surface or within the bridge deck can decrease the bond. Areas near drains or low spots must be closely monitored because they often retain moisture. Moisture within the concrete can rise to the bond interface and be unable to escape because the overlay is impermeable. The trapped moisture, when heated, creates high pressure with the water vapor, leading to delaminations. (Guthrie, Nelsen, & Ross, 2005)

Long-term damage can also lead to premature overlay failure. Ultraviolet radiation (UV) from the sun bears down on the overlay surface, causing epoxy molecules to break apart into smaller molecular structures that are more susceptible to erosion (Chin, Martin, Karbhari, & Nguyer, 2001). However, the presence of aggregate protects the overlay from UV rays, and multiple layers prevent the damage from spreading too deep and ruining the water resistant seal on the bridge deck (15 Guthrie). Prolonged structural strains cause cracks and stresses that the overlay is unable to resist, resulting in overlay failure (Stenko, 2001).

### ***Effects of Failure***

Overlay failure types can be categorized into three groups: delamination of the overlay, increased porosity of the overlay, and loss of skid resistance (Guthrie, Nelsen, & Ross, 2005).

Delamination exposes the bridge deck, allowing chlorides to enter. Increased porosity creates cracks and holes by which chlorides can also penetrate the overlay. Loss of skid resistance eliminates friction required for adequate stopping distance for drivers, consequently increasing overlay hazards.

Delamination of the overlay from the bridge deck can result from inadequate overlay construction. A poorly roughened concrete surface is the primary contributing factor to delaminations (Nabar, 1997). As noted previously, incorrect termination of the overlay at joints or failure to mix or cure the overlay correctly increases the potential for delamination. In addition, moisture at the bond interface weakens the overlay bond, especially during high temperatures during summer when moisture becomes water vapor. Drastic differences in thermal expansion or mechanical properties between the overlay and concrete can also lead to increased possibility of delamination (Nabar, 1997). Delaminations also can repeatedly occur just below the concrete surface when the concrete is weaker than the bond. Figure 1 shows cores with concrete failures just below the concrete surface.



**Figure 1: Failures in the concrete**

Increased porosity of the polymer overlay can cause multiple types of overlay failures because water and chlorides are granted immediate access to the bridge deck. Cracks offer a direct path through the overlay. Most of the time, cracks in the concrete reflect up through the overlay (Nabar, 1997). Therefore, all cracks in the bridge deck must be repaired prior to overlay

placement. In a bridge study by Carter shown in NCHRP, a repaired bridge had 2,000 ft of flexural cracks and 20,000 ft of shrinkage cracks (Carter, 1993). Four years after overlay placement, approximately 325 ft of cracks were reflected up in the overlay. Another bridge with a lot of cracks prior to placing an overlay showed approximately 70% of the cracks reflecting up into the overlay (Carter, 1993).

Pitting is another type of porosity resulting from air bubbles entrained during mixing of the epoxy (Harper, 2007). Pits are pin size to quarter-inch holes in the overlay that are present during overlay placement or form due to the environment (Harper, 2007). Pits can span the entire depth of the overlay layer it is present in. During Harper's investigation, it was expected that pits would not line up between multiple layers of epoxy since the probability was too low. If the pits did line up though, they would provide a funnel by which water and chlorides could enter the deck and corrode the steel. In a study by the Missouri Department of Transportation, 62 out of 98 bridges inspected demonstrated pitting with pits lining up between layers (Harper, 2007). Harper also found that increased temperatures and an increased number of freeze/thaw cycles resulted in additional pitting (Harper, 2007).

The third overlay failure type occurs in the abrasive surface of the overlay (Nabar, 1997). A loss of skid resistance results in an unsafe driving surface. Incorrect aggregate types and gradation such as having aggregates that are too fine do not provide a sufficiently rough and durable surface for driving on. Aggregates can popout if they are not clean when placed in the overlay because dust and dirt prevent a good bond from establishing between the epoxy and aggregates. UV rays can also deteriorate the abrasive surface of the overlay over time.

## **Surveys**

In this study, a survey of state DOT's was conducted to determine polymer overlay usage on newly placed concrete bridge decks. If a polymer overlay had been placed prior to opening the deck to traffic, questions then pertained to specifications or procedure changes. Responses were collected from 18 state DOTs. The following questions were included in the survey.

1. Have you placed a polymer overlay on newly poured bridge deck before opening to traffic?



2. Were any additional procedures taken when pouring/curing the concrete to accommodate for the early placement of the polymer overlay and how were they established?
  - a. Specifically, what minimum wet curing and time is required?
  - b. How much drying time after removing the wet curing is required before the polymer overlay can be placed?
  - c. Is the bridge deck moisture content required to be checked before placement?  
If so, what method is used and what values were acceptable?
3. Were any additional procedures taken when placing the polymer overlay compared to placing the overlay on an existing bridge?
4. After placing the polymer overlay on the new bridge deck, what causes of failure were observed?
  - a. Can they be specifically attributed to the placement of the overlay on the new concrete?
  - b. If applicable, what life span of the overlay was observed?

Question 1 responses indicated only a few DOTs have placed a polymer overlay on a bridge deck prior to opening the deck to traffic. Illinois and Texas had used polymer overlays on new bridged decks, but not by design. These overlay placements are most likely due to construction problems that called for the bridge deck to be sealed early in its life. New York and Pennsylvania have used polymer overlays on new bridge decks after they have gone through one winter cycle, thereby allowing early cracking to occur. The overlay then placed after the winter would bridge over and fill the cracks. Utah and Wisconsin claimed to have used a polymer overlay prior to opening to traffic by design.

Responses to Questions 2 and 3 can be combined and summarized. Overall results indicated that polymer overlays are placed 28 days after bridge deck placement. Illinois uses seven days for wet cure and 28 days after casting the deck. New York specified the time was the same as the time required to reach required strength of the deck. Wisconsin uses 14 days for wet cure and 28 days after batching. Virginia allows 28 days after casting the deck and also applies a curing compound. If an earlier timeframe is necessary, a test patch can be constructed to see if an overlay would be plausible. If bond strength tests were over 250 psi and failed in the concrete,

the overlay would be allowed. Utah requires 14 days minimum, but the manufacturer recommends 28 days.

For DOTs that place a polymer overlay on new bridge decks, moisture in the concrete was commonly checked. Illinois, Wisconsin, and Missouri use ASTM D 4263 Standard Test Method of Indicating Moisture in Concrete by the Plastic Sheet Method to check moisture in the deck for a minimum of two hours. New York requires that no precipitation have fallen on the bridge deck during the previous 24 hours before the test and that a moisture meter read bridge deck moisture at less than 5%. Wisconsin requires that the moisture content be less than 4.5% when read by a moisture meter. No additional special provisions for new bridge decks were found.

No information has been obtained regarding failures on new bridge decks, but the Virginia DOT anticipates an epoxy overlay life span of 15-25 years, depending on traffic.

### ***Survey on Polymer Overlay Usage***

A questionnaire survey of state DOTs was conducted by Guthrie from Brigham Young University in 2005. The purpose of the survey was to determine polymer concrete usage on bridge decks in the U.S. The questionnaire received 20 responses from state DOTs.

Questionnaire results led to the following conclusions about polymer overlay usage as of 2005. A majority of state DOTs placed polymer overlays to provide a chloride barrier or a skid resistant wearing surface. Polymer overlays were placed on a bridge deck when significant cracking or deterioration occurred or when rehabilitation was scheduled. A few DOTs set schedule times for overlay usage ranging from two years for a deck seal in Wisconsin to 25 years in Idaho. Furthermore, when asked to distinguish the determining factor of when to apply a surface treatment, 10 DOTs claimed crack density, five claimed chloride concentration, 12 claimed bridge deck age, and four claimed skid resistance. A crack density that is too high can refer to 10% of deck cracked in New Mexico or if crack widths exceed .007 inch in South Carolina. Idaho, New Jersey, and Wisconsin claimed they place a deck seal when chloride concentration reaches 2-3 lbs. per cubic yard at the depth of the reinforcing steel. No information was gathered on bridge deck age or skid resistance factors. Primary surface treatments utilized by DOTs are as follows: 10 epoxy, 4 epoxy-urethane, 1 urethane, 7 methacrylate, 2 silicone, and

12 answers returned as other. Construction specifications to achieve good bond included the following:

- Substrate preparation
- Equipment
- Overlay thickness (Epoxy .250-.375 inch thick)
- Climatic factors
- Lane closure requirements
- Personnel expertise
- Manufacturer representation
- Compliance with laboratory tests
- Contractor demonstration of past performance and compatibility

Climatic factors refer to dry, warm bridge deck conditions, lack of moisture in the weather forecast, and utilization of the ASTM D 4263 Standard Test Method of Indicating Moisture in Concrete by the Plastic Sheet Method. The most common modes of failure for surface treatments were cracking (10 responses) and delamination (11 responses). Shrinkage cracking and lack of quality control were the primary causes for cracking, while poor quality concrete and inadequate surface preparation were the primary causes of delamination. Three DOTs reported zero responses for skid resistance failure and UV damage as failure causes. Most DOTs reported bi-annual inspections on bridges with polymer overlays. (Guthrie, Nelsen, & Ross, 2005)

### **Previous Testing**

In this section, previous research and testing from three studies related to polymer overlay usage and bond strength are presented. First, Gama performed experimental tests by saturating the concrete with water in an attempt to induce failure at the concrete/overlay interface due to water vapor pressure (Gama, 1999). Second, Young performed pull-off tests on two epoxy overlay systems on current bridges (Young, Durham, & Bindel, 2011). Lastly, Pantelides performed pull-off tests on precast slabs when the overlay was placed before and after the induction of initial cracking (Pantelides & Weber, 2011).

Gama performed a water vapor pressure test to determine whether pressures created by heating up the slab could delaminate a polymer overlay. Because polymer overlays are only .25-.5 inches thick, the assumption was made that only minimal pressure would be needed to induce delamination (Gama, 1999). For this experiment, Portland cement concrete slabs .5 m (19.7 in.) wide by .5 (19.7 in.) m long by .05 m (1.97 in.) deep were cast with a polymer overlay placed on the top surface of the slab. The slabs were then placed under water so that the concrete was under water but the overlay was above the water level. Insulation surrounded the slabs so water could not escape out of the sides of the slab thus ensuring that the slabs remained saturated and in a worse-case scenario. To induce water vapor pressure, the slabs were placed under ultraviolet heat lamps (250W, 120V) to replicate sunlight. The lamps were situated so that internal concrete temperatures reached 50°C (122°F) (Gama, 1999). Five samples were placed under heat lamps for two weeks, during which time surface temperatures reached 90°C (194°F) and overlay interface temperatures reached 48-73°C (118-163°F), depending on heat lamp exposure. Concrete temperatures reached 53°C (127°F) and the water reached 48°C (118°F) (Gama, 1999).

Gama calculated theoretical pressures that would be created by his research. Modeling a thermodynamic closed system, he theorized a water vapor pressure of 11.7 kPa (1.69 psi) when fully saturated at 50°C (122°F). Based on these calculations, the pressure did not seem strong enough to cause delamination. Neither ultrasonic tests nor visual inspection demonstrated any failures (Gama, 1999).

Pull-off tests were performed on both slabs heated while surrounded by water and on unheated control slabs also surrounded by water. Average pull-off tests for heated slabs ranged from 3.54-3.82 MPa, while average pull-offs for control slabs ranged from 3.40-3.73 MPa. Both pull-off sets were completed on room temperature slabs, and all pull-offs resulted in concrete failure. Water vapor pressure did not negatively affect bond strength of the polymer overlay (Gama, 1999).

In March 2011, Young performed pull-off tests on two bridges: one with a Safelane overlay and one with a Flexogrid overlay. The overlays were only one to two years old at the time of the tests, and each overlay system had two pull-offs at four locations along the bridge. Safelane averaged 370 psi with all failures located in the concrete. Flexogrid produced failures in the concrete, at the interface, and in the test adhesive. Failure in the test adhesive was the only test to not reach 250 psi. By leaving out the test adhesive failure, the pull-offs tests ranged from

340-520 psi. All tests were performed at night with low temperatures. (Young, Durham, & Bindel, 2011)

Pantelides performed pull-off tests after applying polymer overlay before and after initial cracks were induced on precast slabs. The first testing type (Type 1) used two precast concrete deck slabs sized 18 inch by 8 feet by 8.75 inch thick. These slabs were turned upside down to crack the specimens, similar to cracking that occurs during construction and early life of the structure. The two slabs were grouted together and an epoxy overlay was applied. The slabs were then cyclically loaded for five days while daily pull-off tests were performed (Pantelides & Weber, 2011). The second type of testing (Type 2) was similar to the first type, but in this set, overlay was placed on the precast panels prior to flipping and inducing cracks. After cracking, one additional layer of overlay was placed to splice together the two panels. Cyclic loading and testing then occurred in the same manner as in the Type 1 tests (Pantelides & Weber, 2011).

Five polymer overlay systems were tested, only one of which was an epoxy polymer overlay. Pull-off tests were conducted using a 2-inch core and drilling 3/8 inch into the concrete. A tensile force was applied until failure. Pull-offs from Type 1 tests resulted in average valid pull-off strength of 673 psi with five out of the six pull-off tests (83%) failing in the concrete. Type 2 tests resulted in an average valid pull-off strength of 530 psi with six out of eight (75%) failing in the concrete. Results indicate that cracking induced with the overlay already on the panels resulted in lower pull-off values than panels that were cracked prior to overlay placement (Pantelides & Weber, 2011).

### ***KDOT Multi-Layer Polymer Concrete Overlay Specifications***

The Standard Specifications for State Road & Bridge Construction-2007, section 729 contains KDOT's requirements for placing a multi-layer polymer concrete overlay. The specification includes information regarding the equipment needed, preparation of the concrete surface, placement of the overlay, and weather conditions that are acceptable.

The equipment required for hand application situations start with calibrated containers to portion out the epoxy accurately. The paddle used needs to be able to completely mix the epoxy resin and hardening agent. A notched squeegee should be used to spread out the epoxy evenly over the concrete surface. Any other additional tools needed to place the overlay according to the specifications should also be on hand. (Kansas DOT, 2007)

Surface Preparation is crucial to ensuring adequate overlay bond to the concrete. On existing structures, any deteriorated concrete should be removed and replaced. Portland cement concrete patches require a minimum of 28 days between the repairs and overlay placement. New structures receiving a polymer overlay should be wet cured for 14 days and then allowed to dry for 21 days. (Kansas DOT, Section 729)

Prior to placing the polymer overlay, the bridge deck needs to be properly prepared. The deck should be shot blasted or another approved form of blasting to provide a roughened surface and also to remove any contaminating materials. The roughened surface should meet the requirements for a surface preparation level of 6 to 7 on the ICRI roughness scale or meet ASTM E 965 Pavement Macrottexture Depth of .04 to .08 inches. Shot blasting the surface also removes any contamination or weak surface concrete. After shot blasting, the deck should be air blasted or vacuumed to remove all dirt, paint, oil, curing materials or foreign materials from the surface. (Kansas DOT, 2007)

Special care should be taken so the deck does not get contaminated after shot blasting. The shot blast equipment or any other equipment that would produce dust should not be emptied or cleaned closer than 50 feet from the bridge deck. Rain should not contact the surface between the surface preparation and the overlay placement. The reasons specifications do not allow for the surface to be rained on prior to the overlay placement is the rain could be carrying contaminants and the deck should not contain too much moisture. To check for moisture, tape a plastic sheet to the concrete surface for a minimum of 2 hours in accordance with ASTM D 4263 to see if moisture accumulates on the plastic sheet. The first course should be placed within 24 hours of shot blasting to minimize contaminants on the bridge deck. (Kansas DOT, 2007)

Overlay placements should be conducted according to contract documents and the epoxy manufacturer's specifications. A manufacturer representative is to be present upon placement of overlay to ensure proper placement. The overlay should be placed in 2 separate courses. The first course is to contain no less than .22 gal. /yd<sup>2</sup> of epoxy and at least 10 lbs. /yd<sup>2</sup> of aggregate. The second course should be no less than .45 gal. /sq. yd. of epoxy and a minimum of 14.5 lbs. /sq. yd. of aggregate. Enough aggregate should be spread on top of the epoxy so that no epoxy goes uncovered. The bridge deck, epoxy, and aggregate should all maintain a temperature above 60°F at all times. The epoxy should be spread evenly by the notched squeegee. Within 10 minutes, the dry aggregate should be cast onto the epoxy. Curing times for both the first and second courses

can be found in Table 1. Excess aggregate should be vacuumed or swept off the deck after the epoxy has hardened. The first course should never be opened to traffic. The second course will then be placed using the larger proportions and cured for a minimum of 8 hours. The overlay should be placed continuously and within the time limits. Any sections of the overlay that are not adequate are to be removed and replaced. (Kansas DOT, Section 729)

Weather limitations do not allow for polymer overlays to be placed prior to April 1<sup>st</sup> or after September 30<sup>th</sup>. The bridge deck temperature should never exceed 100°F during placement of the overlay and the air temperature should not fall below 55°F during curing. The overlay should also not be placed if at any time the temperature causes the gel time to be less than 10 minutes. (Kansas DOT, Section 729)

**Table 1: Polymer Concrete Overlay Cure Times (adapted from KDOT section 729)**

<b>Polymer Concrete Overlay Cure Times</b>							
Course	Average Temperature of Overlay Components °F						
	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-85	85+
	Minimum Cure Time (hours)						
1	5	4	3	2.5	2	1.5	1
2	6.5	6.5	5	4	3	3	3

## Chapter 3 - Materials

### Setup

As previously stated, placing an epoxy-polymer overlay on a newly placed concrete bridge deck makes the epoxy overlay susceptible to delamination caused by water vapor pressure. Moisture content within new concrete bridge decks is much higher than the moisture content of the concrete on existing bridge decks. Different concrete mixtures and curing conditions can have different effects on the moisture content within the concrete and furthermore, cause different bond strengths between the concrete and overlay. Several concrete mixes and curing conditions were selected to test their effects on the concrete moisture content and overlay bonding strength. The conditions to be tested include concrete mix, wet cure temperature, drying time, epoxy-polymer overlay system, and temperature at time of pull-off test.

Concrete mixes selected included a control mix, a low-cracking mix, and a mix containing fly ash. The control mixture contained a water-to-cementitious ratio (w/c) of .50, the low-cracking mix contained a w/c of .44, and the fly ash mix contained 25% class F fly ash and had a w/c ratio of .50.

Wet curing of the slabs occurred at 100% relative humidity for 14 days (Kansas DOT, 2007). To test wet cure temperature effects on moisture within concrete at testing, three wet cure temperatures spanning normal construction temperatures were selected: 40°F, 73°F, and 100°F.

Dry curing of the slabs occurred at 73°F and 50% relative humidity for all slabs. Drying times were set at 3, 7, 14, and 21 days after wet curing, thus providing total curing times of 17, 21, 28, and 35 days after concrete casting to overlay placement.


Overlay systems were selected from the five pre-approved epoxy overlay systems currently accepted by KDOT: E-Bond 526 (E-Bond Epoxies), Pro-Poxy Type III DOT (Unitex Chemicals), Flexolith (Euclid Chemical Co.), Sikadur 22 Lo Mod (Sika Corporation), and Mark 154 (Poly-Carb, Inc.).

Temperatures at the time of pull-off testing were established as room temperature (73° ± 5°F) and a hot temperature (122°-125°F 1 inch below concrete surface). The room temperature



replicates temperatures during early morning summer hours, while the hot temperature replicates temperatures experienced in the bridge deck during the heat of a summer day.


A test matrix can be obtained with a combination of these conditions. A slab matrix of 180 slabs are required with three concrete types, three wet cure temperatures, four drying times, and five overlay systems Figure 2 shows this test matrix.



**Figure 2: Testing matrix**

In order to produce each of the 180 possible testing conditions and test for both the moisture present and overlay bond strength, a slab thickness of 6 inches was selected. A 6 inch deep slab would provide enough depth, but also reduce the weight of the slabs. The top surface of the slab had to provide enough area to accommodate both hot and room temperature pull-off tests. KDOT's KT-70 document states that four pull-off tests must be conducted for each test patch and the three highest values should be used to calculate tensile rupture strength. Therefore, eight pull-off tests were performed on each slab; four at a hot temperature and four at room temperature. Four of each pull-off tests at each temperature allowed for one pull-off in each

temperature set to fail. Three successful pull-off tests are enough to still calculate an accurate average. KDOTs KT-70 document also states that a test patch size of 1.5 feet by 3 feet must be selected (KDOT). A slab of that size and weight would create problems due to storage restrictions within both the wet and dry curing locations. Instead, a more modest size of 12 inches by 18 inches was selected as shown in Figure 3. This size fit much easier within the curing locations and only weighed approximately 110 lbs. instead of 330 lbs.



**Figure 3: Slab dimensions**



**Figure 4: Slab after wet curing**

The labeling system that was implemented simplified each of the conditions the slab was to undergo, for example C-40-7-1. The first value refers to the concrete mixture: C for control, L for low-cracking, or F for fly ash. The second value is the wet cure temperature at which the slab was cured at: 40 for 40°F, 70 for 73°F, and 100 for 100°F. The third value is the duration of drying: 3, 7, 14, or 21 days. The fourth value refers to the epoxy overlay system to be placed on the slab: E-Bond 526, Pro-Poxy Type III DOT, Flexolith, Sikadur 22 Lo Mod, or Mark-154. Each overlay system was given a label 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5.

To test concrete strengths for each curing method, concrete cylinders were made and tested to find compressive strength of the concrete. The concrete compressive strengths would need to be tested when the pull-off tests are to be conducted. Many tests result in concrete failures and knowing the concrete strength would be beneficial. The determination was made that two concrete cylinders be tested for each slab upon completion of wet curing and two additional cylinders be tested when pull-off tests are conducted. When the slabs finish wet curing, compressive tests would provide a vantage point to discern wet cure temperature effects on the compressive strength of the concrete.

### **Concrete Mixes**

A summary of concrete mixes used when batching the slabs is presented in Table 2. The mix for the low-cracking concrete mix was obtained from Midwest Concrete Materials (MCM) for a typical low-cracking bridge deck mix design. This mix contained 550 lbs. cement, a w/c = .44, 40% coarse aggregates, and 60% fine aggregates. Batches of this concrete mix were made to

test this mix design. The test batches resulted in a very dry mix that had a lot of voids. The coarse aggregate was switched to 60% and the fine aggregate switched to 40%. The updated mix design eliminated those initial problems and provided concrete with a slump between 2-4 inches with great workability. The control was determined to have the same mix design, but with a .5 water to cement ratio. The fly ash would have a w/c = .5, but also have 25% of the cement (maximum allowed) swapped out for class F fly ash. Water reducer amounts were determined based on the production of trial batches of concrete that achieved a slump between 2-4 inches.

**Table 2: Concrete mixes\***

	Control	Low-Cracking	Fly Ash
Water/Cementitious Ratio	0.5	0.44	0.5
Cement	550	550	412.5
Fly Ash	0	0	137.5
Coarse Aggregate	1,837	1,858	1,884
Fine Aggregate	1,250	1,264	1,282
Air Content (assumed)	2%	2%	2%
Water Reducer (mL/kg-cementitious material)	600	800	0

\*All units are lbs. / yd<sup>3</sup> unless otherwise noted

## Concrete Materials

In this study, only materials that met KDOT’s Standard Specifications for State Road & Bridge Construction – 2007 were used in the concrete mixes. Ash Grove Portland cement type I/II, a prequalified Portland cement (Kansas DOT, 2013), was used as the cement in the concrete. A fly ash from Ash Grove called Durapoz F was used in the concrete mixture. The fine aggregate used in the concrete mixtures was a concrete sand from Midwest Concrete Materials and met both ASTM C33 FA and KDOT’s FA-A size requirements. The requirements are located in section 1102 revision (Kansas DOT, 2014). CA-5 crushed limestone was used as the mixture’s coarse aggregate, meeting KDOT’s CA-5 specifications in section 1102 revision (Kansas DOT, 2014). The water reducer selected was Daracem 65. It is manufactured by W. R. Grace & Company and is a mid-range water-reducing admixture that had been prequalified by KDOT (Kansas DOT, 2014).

## Epoxy-Polymer Overlay Systems

The epoxy-polymer overlay systems that were selected were all prequalified epoxy-resin-base bonding systems for KDOT: E-Bond 526, Pro-Poxy Type III DOT, Flexolith, Sikadur 22 Lo Mod, and Mark-154 (Kansas DOT, 2011). The epoxy properties for each of the five overlay systems are shown in Table 3. KDOT has its own specifications that must be abided by when applying any type of multi-layer polymer concrete overlay.

**Table 3: Epoxy Overlay Properties**

		Epoxy 1		Epoxy 2		Epoxy 3		Epoxy 4		Epoxy 5	
Compressive Modulus		690,000 psi	14 days	80,000 psi		120,000 psi		125,000 psi	7 day		
								166,000 psi	28 day		
Compressive Strength		1,000 psi	3 hrs					2,100 psi	16 hrs	8,500 psi	8 hrs
		5,000 psi	24 hrs			5,000 psi		3,400 psi	1 day		
		6,500 psi	7 day					6,500 psi	3 days	10,500 psi	48 hrs
Tensile Strength		2,500-5,000 psi	7 days	3,000 psi		2,700 psi		5,900 psi	14 days	2,500 psi	
Bond Strength		1,600 psi	2 days	3,200 psi	14 days	2,100 psi	2 days	1,600 psi	14 days	500 psi	24 hrs
Absorbtion		0.40%	7 days	0.20%		<.5%		0.23%	24 hour	Max 1.0%	
Elongation		30-80%		50%		30-60%		30%		45-55%	
Gel Time		15-30 minutes		15 min	60 gm @ 73F	>30 min		30 minutes	200 gram mass	20 minutes	at 75° ±2°F
Coverage	Course 1	Epoxy	2.5 gal/100 sq ft	1 gal./40 sf		40-45 sq ft/gal		-		35 sf/gal	
		Aggregate	10 lbs/sq yd	10 lbs./ sq yd		1.0-1.5 sq ft/gal		-		15 lbs/sq yd	
	Course 2	Epoxy	5 gal/100 sq ft	1 gal./20 sf		22-25 sq ft/gal		-		15 sf/gal	
		Aggregate	14 lbs/sq yd	14 lbs./ sq yd		1.5-2.0 sq ft/gal		-		15 lbs/sq yd	
All information in this table comes from data sheets for each of the five epoxy overlay systems. (E-Bond Epoxies, Inc), (Dayton Superior Corporation, 2012), (The Euclid Chemical Company), (Sike Corporation), and (Poly-Carb, Inc)											

## Chapter 4 - Testing Process

The process for testing both the moisture contents and overlay bond process was conceived to address all project needs while utilizing available equipment. The amount of slabs that could be cast at a time was limited to the available space in the curing locations. After examining all aspects of the process and resolving test slab complications, the process was completed as described in the following sections.

### Casting Slabs

Casting concrete slabs for the epoxy polymer overlay to be placed was the first step. Reusable, transportable forms were built to accommodate 12 by 18 by 6 inches deep slabs as shown in Figure 5. Limited space in the wet and dry curing locations allowed for only limited number of slabs to be cast per batch. Many casting days and various sets of forms were required to accommodate the 180 slabs to be cast. The forms had dimensional restraints too since they had to be placed within the wet cure locations.



**Figure 5: Forms built to accommodate the 12 x 18 x 6 inch slabs.**

An additional piece of wood was placed along the ends of the 12 inch length inside each form allowing for handles in the slabs once the forms were stripped away. The handles provided a place to lift and transport the slabs without affecting slab depth function. Space for the handles is shown in Figure 5. All corners of the forms were sealed with a waterproof silicone caulk to seal cracks.

A length of twine, acting as a guide wire for a thermocouple, spanned the form at 1 inch below the top of the forms as shown in Figure 6. The thermocouple is required to measure internal temperature of the concrete slabs later in the testing process. The thermocouples were set 1 inch below the concrete surface. To achieve this depth, holes were drilled on the form sides at a depth of 1 inch and twine was strung from side to side. The twine was drawn taut and taped to the sides of the forms. Thermocouple wire was then placed through the hole on one side of the form until the end of the wire reached the center of the form. The thermocouple wire was taped to the twine. Both holes in the forms were sealed with caulk.



**Figure 6: Thermocouple wire setup within slab forms**

Materials to create the concrete were placed inside the day before mixing, thereby equalizing the temperature of all the materials. After weighing out proportions, the concrete was mixed with a 12 ft<sup>3</sup> Mud Hog mixer. The mixing was performed as follows:

1. Admixture was poured into batch water.
2. One-third of coarse and fine aggregates were placed into the mixer.
3. One-half of total batch water was added, ensuring all admixtures was added.
4. Aggregates and water were mixed for 1 minute to thoroughly wet the aggregates.



5. A maximum of 50 lbs. of cement and an adequate amount of batch water were added to keep the mix wet. Mix for 30 seconds. (If using fly ash, add the fly ash in this step prior to the cement.)
6. Step 5 was repeated until all cement was in the mixer.
7. Coarse and fine aggregate were alternately added to the mix until all aggregate was in the mixer (3-5 minutes). The remaining batch water was added as needed.
8. Mixing continued for 2 minutes.



**Figure 7: Mud Hog mixer used to batch concrete.**

Upon completion of mixing, a slump test was conducted with a target slump between 2-4 inches. The slabs were then cast and the slab surface was smoothed. A small aluminum plate with a slab label was placed in the bottom right corner of the slab as seen in Figure 8. Dampened burlap was laid over the concrete to begin wet curing and a sheet of plastic was taped over the burlap to seal in the moisture. The forms and newly cast concrete slabs were immediately transported to the wet cure location so all curing would occur at the designated temperature.



At this same time, 4 inch by 8 inch concrete cylinders were cast. The cylinders were covered with a lid and sealed with tape. Labels were placed on the cylinders to keep track of which slab they corresponded to. After this point, the cylinders did not leave the slabs they were cast with. They went to the same wet cure location and then to the drying location.



**Figure 8: Slab label cast into the concrete**

### **Curing the Slabs**

As soon as the slabs had been sealed in plastic, they were moved to one of three prescribed wet cure locations: a refrigerated room, a moist cure room, and an oven. The three locations are shown in Figure 9 and Figure 10. The slabs cured in their locations for one day before the forms were removed. Slabs located in the 73°F wet cure room were allowed to remain, while the 40°F and 100°F slabs were placed in plastic totes, as shown in Figure 11. Wet burlap was placed within the bin with the slab and the tote was sealed with duct tape. The slabs inside the totes were checked on regularly to ensure that the burlap remained wet. The slabs were wet cured for 14 days after casting before they were to begin drying.



**Figure 9: Wet cure locations for 40°F refrigerator (left) and 73°F moist room (right)**



**Figure 10: Wet cure location for 100F oven**



**Figure 11: Slab placed inside a bin for wet curing**

Upon completion of wet curing, the slabs were taken out of their bins and allowed to dry enough so that no moisture was present on the sides of the slabs. For a bridge deck, the bottom and sides of an area 12 by 18 inch would be encapsulated in concrete. To simulate this condition, the slabs were completely wrapped in plastic with the exception of the top surface to prevent moisture from escaping and causing excess drying not typical in a larger slab. Gorilla tape was used to secure the plastic to the slab. Figure 12 and Figure 13 show a slab before and after wrapping in plastic. All slabs, no matter the wet cure temperature, were placed in a room at 73°F and 50% relative humidity for the prescribed 3, 7, 14, or 21 days.

At this time, all of the cylinders were broken out of their forms. The cylinders had to remain in their forms for the whole wet cure time in order to seal the cylinders and allow for wet curing. Two concrete cylinders were tested for each group of slabs being removed from their respective wet cure locations. In some cases, three or more slabs were all wet curing for the same time period and also in the same wet cure location, so instead of testing 2 cylinders for each slab, 2 cylinders were tested for all of them. Cylinders were tested at a maximum rate of 450 lb. /s. The resulting strengths were labeled as wet cure strengths.





**Figure 12: Slab after wet curing**



**Figure 13: Slab wrapped in plastic to dry**



**Figure 14: Drying location**

## **Moisture Reading and Surface Preparation**

Once the slabs reached their prescribed drying time, they were removed and prepared for overlay installation. A steel wire brush was used to roughen and clean the slab surface of debris such as single fibers of burlap that adhered to the slab during curing. The surface was then sand blasted to a surface roughness of 3-5 on the ICRI roughness scale with the sand blaster shown in Figure 15. A before and after photo of the sand blasting is shown in Figure 16. The achieved roughness of 3-5 provided a worst-case scenario for surface roughness, and thereby making the findings from this study conservative. The surface of a roughened slab is shown in Figure 17 and a close up is shown in Figure 18. KDOT specifications call for an ICRI roughness of 6-7 (Kansas DOT, Section 729).

Moisture in the top surface of the concrete was read by a Tramex CMEXpert II concrete moisture meter shown in Figure 19. The moisture meter reads the moisture content by reading the electrical impedance measured across multiple electrodes on the meter. The electrodes create a low frequency alternating electrical field. The CMEXpert II readings can vary, so only the highest readings should be recorded. Six zones were created on top of the slab and a moisture reading was taken in each zone a minimum of three times. The highest reading within each zone was recorded, and the overall slab moisture average was found from these six readings. Moisture readings were taken after sand blasting on all slabs. After looking at the results of the after sand blasting moisture readings, it was determined that the compressed air and sand being blown onto the concrete slab surfaces might be drying them out. Moisture readings were taken both prior to sand blasting and after sand blasting on the fly ash slabs to see how much sand blasting is drying out the slab surfaces.



**Figure 15: Sand blaster**



**Figure 16: Before (left) and after (right) sand blasting a slab.**





**Figure 17: Sand blasted surface with visible large aggregates**



**Figure 18: Close up of concrete surface after sand blasting**





**Figure 19: Tramex CMEXpert II instrument used to take moisture readings**

## **Overlay Placement**

After roughening and moisture reading, the slabs were ready for their overlay. Amounts of both epoxy components were portioned out at a ratio of 1:1 by volume by using a tablespoon measuring spoon.

Because of the intention to make all overlay systems uniform, the epoxy proportions would be 2.5 fl. Oz. per component for the first course and 5.0 fl. Oz. per component for the second course. These proportions were equivalent to a coverage rate of 40 ft<sup>2</sup>/gal. for the first course and 20 ft<sup>2</sup>/gal. for the second course. These coverage rates for each course either fell within the recommended range or close to the recommended amounts previously mentioned in Chapter 3 - Materials. Parts A and B were then mixed together vigorously for 3 minutes by hand because the mixed amounts were too small to mix mechanically as recommended. If the small quantities of epoxy had been mechanically mixed, air would become entrained causing a loss of bonding surface and other complications.

Epoxy was poured evenly over the slab surface and allowed to spread out for a few minutes. The epoxy was then manually dispersed evenly over the entire surface. Ten minutes

after initial mixing, aggregate was spread over the surface by hand. The aggregate rate used for all systems was .55 lbs. per slab for the first coating and .88 lbs. per slab for the second coating. The aggregate application rates are equivalent to 10 lbs. /yd<sup>2</sup> and 16 lbs. /yd<sup>2</sup> for the first and second courses respectively. Similar to the epoxy amounts, these were set within the recommended range or close to the recommended amount. Figure 20 and Figure 21 show the first and second courses of the epoxy and aggregate layers.



**Figure 20: Placement of course 1 of epoxy (left) and aggregate (right)**



**Figure 21: Placement of course 2 of epoxy (left) and aggregate (right)**



All overlay systems were placed in 70-75°F temperature with a curing time of 2.5 hours between the first and second courses. The second coarse cured overnight.

### Testing Procedure

After curing overnight for at least 15 hours, the overlay was ready to be cored. The testing procedure conducted was similar to KDOT's KT-70 and ACI 503R, Appendix A of the ACI Manual of Concrete Practice. Applied changes include sealing the cores with silicone caulk and heating the slabs to 122-125°F. Both changes increased potential water vapor pressure at the interface between the concrete and overlay. Caulk sealed in the moisture to replicate the overlay prior to being cored.

A diamond tipped concrete core drill bit with an interior diameter of 2 inches was used to drill through the polymer overlay to a depth of .5 inches into the concrete as shown in Figure 22. Water was not used when coring to avoid adding moisture not already present within the concrete. Dust from the cores was blown out using compressed air.



**Figure 22: Coring setup (left) and a core through the overlay into the concrete (right).**

The cores were filled with silicone caulk directly after coring as shown in Figure 23. The caulk was allowed to harden and dry for a couple hours to avoid interference with mounting the pull-off caps. Aggregate on the surface of the overlay created a surface with sharp rocks sticking

out. Pull-off cap placement directly on a core would misalign the cap with the axis of the core; therefore any aggregates that aided in misaligning the cap from the axis of the core were chipped off with a hammer and chisel. Once enough aggregates were chipped away to provide a surface on which the cap can sit level, the caps were ready to be mounted. Occasionally a small part of the overlay at the edge of the core would chip off, but otherwise there were no ill effects from chipping the aggregates. Once the caps sat level on the cores, they were ready to be mounted. The pull-off caps were 2-inch diameter aluminum pucks with a flat bottom and a hole on top in which to screw the pull-off equipment. Prior to placing, the caps were soaked in acetone and scraped to remove existing epoxy from prior use of the caps. The caps were sand blasted to create a clean, roughened surface for the adhesive to bond to. After cleaning, the caps could effectively provide a stronger bond to the adhesive than either the overlay's bond to the concrete or the strength of the concrete tensile strength. The same epoxy used for the overlay was used for the adhesive to mount the pull-off caps. No failures due to the pull-off cap delaminating from the overlay were recorded when the procedure was correctly followed. The epoxy was measured and mixed in the same manner as described in the section under Overlay Placement. . After mixing was complete, the epoxy was spread over the core and pull-off cap to ensure complete coverage as shown in Figure 24 and Figure 25. Caps were placed on the core and kept level while curing. Any epoxy that spilled onto the silicone caulk or onto the rest of the overlay was not considered to cause misleading results. When performing the pull-off, the caulking added minimal strength to the final pull-off result; when the epoxy had to "bridge" over the caulk, that epoxy was placed under shear stress. The shear strength of the epoxy did not substantially add to the pull-off strength. The epoxy used as adhesive was allowed to cure for a minimum of 2 hours prior to placing the slabs under heat lamps.



**Figure 23: Placement of silicone caulk to seal the cores**



**Figure 24: Application of adhesive epoxy to mount the aluminum caps**







**Figure 25: Slabs before and after placing pull-off caps.**

### **Temperature Preparation**

The slabs were placed under heat lamps to replicate the sun's heat during summer on the bridge deck. The heat lamps were rectangular with 120V lamps to provide even distribution of heat to the whole surface of the slab. The lamps were placed 10.5 inches (from the bottom of the rectangular lampshade) above the slab surface, producing an internal temperature of 122-125°F 1 inch below the concrete surface after 12-18 hours. Thermocouple wires cast into the concrete were connected to a computer to read temperatures. In order to protect the aluminum caps from heating up more quickly than the overlay, heat shields comprised of halved plastic cups protected the caps from direct exposure to the heat. Heat allowed directly to the aluminum caps produced thermal stresses because of differential heating which produced a low strength bond between the aluminum cap and epoxy adhesive. The heating setup is shown in Figure 26 and the thermocouple connected to the computer is shown in Figure 27.



**Figure 26: Slabs placed under heat lamps with shield protectors over the caps**



**Figure 27: Thermocouple as the slabs are heated**

### **Pull-Off Tests**

Pull-off tests were performed using a DYNA Pull-Off Tester with Digital Manometer which utilized a hydraulic crank to pull attached pull-off caps in tension. Tensile force was measured digitally in pounds per square inch. The pull-off tester is shown in Figure 28.



**Figure 28: Pull-off tester.**

Pull-off testing was performed on four cores per slab immediately after a slab reached 122-125°F and was removed from under the heat lamps. The remaining four cores were tested the following day, approximately 24 hours after initial tests were completed. This testing procedure provided four measurements for pull-off strength when the slabs are in a “worst-case scenario” and four measurements when the slab has undergone a “worst-case scenario” and returned to temperatures likely to produce strengths higher than the first four measurements.

A connecting screw was used to connect the pull-off cap to the pull-off tester. The screw was screwed into the cap while the other end attached to the pull-off tester by a ball-bearing system, allowing the tester to account for small eccentricities that are too small to correct. Figure 29 shows the screw attached to a cap ready for the tester.





**Figure 29: Pull-off cap ready to be tested**

The pull-off tester did not have an automated system with which to control the testing by force or displacement. KDOT's KT-70 document states a tensile load should be applied at  $100 \pm 10$  pounds every 5 seconds. In order to decrease variability, a testing procedure based on rotation of the crank was utilized: one full crank rotation for every 1 second. A metronome set at 60 beats per minute was used to match 1 rotation with 1 second. The test became displacement controlled by controlling the rotation of the crank.

After completion of a test, the pull-off strength in psi and failure type were recorded and the coverage area for each failure was recorded for each pull-off. In many instances, there were both failure in concrete and failure at the bond interface as shown in Figure 32. According to KDOT's KT-70, five failure types are possible for each pull-off. Each failure type is shown in Figure 30, Figure 31, and Figure 32. The 5 types of failure are the following:

- Type 1: Failure in the concrete at a depth greater than or equal to .25 inches over more than 50% of the test area.
- Type 2: Failure in the concrete at a depth less than .25 inches over more than 50% of the test area.
- Type 3: Separation of the polymer overlay from the concrete surface.
- Type 4: Failure within the polymer overlay.
- Type 5: Failure of the test adhesive.



**Figure 30: Failure type 1 (left) and failure type 2 (right)**



**Figure 31: Failure type 3 (left) and failure type 4 (right)**



**Figure 32: Failure type 5 (left) and a failure with both type 2 and type 3 (right)**

Average pull-off strengths for each slab were found based on the average of Type 1, 2, and 3 failures. Type 4 failures were not used in calculation because it means the overlay was either not mixed, placed, or cured correctly. Similarly, type 5 failures meant the adhesive was either not mixed, placed, or cured properly and the results were not used in calculation. When the pull-off cap failed during testing the failures were denoted as type 6. Type 6 failures were very rare and only occurred twice. A properly prepared concrete surface and applied polymer overlay should result in a type 1 failure (KDOT). Type 1 failures less than 250 psi result from weak concrete rather than a poor overlay bond; therefore they should not be used in calculations (KDOT). Each slab for hot and room temperature pull-offs required a minimum of three pull-offs tests to be an acceptable failure type. If less than 3 pull-off tests were acceptable, the entire slab was deemed unacceptable and was recast and retested.

Concrete cylinders were tested the same day the pull-off tests were conducted. Two cylinders were tested for each slab using the same procedure as the tests that were conducted after wet curing.

## Chapter 5 - Results


### Moisture Readings

As described in the Moisture Reading and Surface Preparation section, a TRAMEX CMEXpert concrete moisture meter was used to measure moisture present in the top layer of a concrete slab. Readings were taken after sand blasting the slabs but prior to placing the polymer overlay. Multiple readings were taken within the six zones on the slab surface, the maximum value from each zone was recorded, and the average was found for each slab. Figure 33 plots the average moisture percentage in the concrete with how many days the slabs were dried. Moisture percentages shown are the average of all slabs with the only difference coming from the number of drying days. Results indicate slight decreases in moisture readings as drying time increases. As shown in Table 4, the moisture percentage in the concrete decreases by .04-.46% per day of dry curing. Drying occurred three to ten times faster during the first 14 days than during the last seven days. Drying was expected to occur faster initially since more moisture was available to be lost. To see the effect the concrete type and wet cure temperature had on the moisture content in the slabs, each condition was examined more in-depth.

**Table 4: Overall moisture percentages**

Overall Moisture Percentages				
Drying Time (Days)	Overall Moisture %	Percentage Decrease from Previous	Percentage Decrease from Previous (Per Day)	Percentage Decrease from 3 Day
3	3.576			
7	3.556	-0.55%	-0.14%	-0.55%
14	3.441	-3.22%	-0.46%	-3.76%
21	3.433	-0.25%	-0.04%	-3.99%

## Overall Moisture Readings Average




**Figure 33: Overall average of moisture readings**

Concrete type could potentially affect moisture content in the concrete while drying due to the concrete's makeup. The control and fly ash concretes were batched with a .50 w/c, while the low-cracking contained a .44 w/c. As shown in Figure 34, the low-cracking mixture consistently provided higher moisture contents than the other two types of concrete. The fly ash consistently produced the lowest moisture contents. The largest difference in moisture content between the three types of concrete occurs at the 7-day drying time. The low-cracking slabs contain an average of 3.79% moisture, while the control and fly ash concretes contain an average of 3.49% and 3.39% moisture, respectively. The pore structure within .50 w/c ratio concretes has more voids and could allow for quick evaporation.


Moisture contents remain similar after categorizing them into various concrete types. Results showed that sand blasting the concrete surface lowered the moisture content of the slab and showed all readings to be similar. On the fly ash concrete slabs, moisture readings were taken prior to sand blasting and after sandblasting. The same process of collecting moisture readings from the slabs after sandblasting was used prior to sandblasting. Figure 35 shows the difference between taking moisture readings before and after sand blasting the slabs. Moisture

readings were much higher prior to sand blasting. After 3-days of drying, moisture prior to sand blasting averaged 4.21%, while after sand blasting, moisture in the same slab averaged 3.37%. Standard deviation bars also show consistent averages: Averages after sand blasting had standard deviations between .167 and .222, and standard deviations from averages before sand blasting were 1.363 (3-day), .917 (7-day), .307 (14-day), and .295 (21-day). Large standard deviations from the 3- and 7-day drying indicate that a portion of the slabs dried more quickly, while others demonstrated wet spots. After 14 days of drying, the standard deviation decreased. The conclusion can be made that between seven and 14 days of drying, the slabs dried enough to have consistent moisture contents with each other.



**Figure 34: Average moisture readings separated by concrete type**

## Moisture Readings: Pre and Post Sand Blasting for Fly Ash Concrete




**Figure 35: Moisture readings: pre and post sand blasting for fly ash concrete**

The temperature at which wet curing occurs could also affect moisture content of the slabs. In the same format as Figure 34, average moisture readings are categorized by wet cure temperature in Figure 36. The moisture readings are consistent from 3 days to 21 days, similar to Figure 34. The largest variance was observed for the 73°F wet cure slabs which ranged from 3.76% moisture to 3.38% moisture at 3 and 21 days, respectively. Neither the 40°F nor the 100°F varied more than .1% from 3- to 21-days of drying. Like previously stated, sand blasting the surface could have produced more uniform results.

Results shown in Figure 35 for the fly ash concrete moisture readings prior to sand blasting can be split between the three wet cure temperatures, as shown in Figure 37. The graph shows averages from the 40°F and 100°F wet cure temperatures varying slightly from Day 3 to Day 21 with a limited range of 3.72% to 3.44% for the 40°F and 3.49% to 3.38% for the 100°F. Conversely, the 73°F wet curing produced much higher moisture readings for three and seven days of dry curing, with an average moisture reading of 5.82% and 4.97%, respectively.

Moisture readings for the 73°F slabs remained only slightly higher than the 40°F and 100°F slabs at 14- and 21-days of drying.


The difference in moisture readings could be due to several causes, including the wet cure environment. The 73°F slabs were wet cured in a moist room with a constant spray of mist. The 40°F and 100°F slabs were cured and sealed within a small bin with moist burlap because no moist room was available at 40°F or 100°F. A second cause for differences in moisture readings is temperature difference. The 40°F and 100°F slabs were forced to undergo a temperature change when placed in the 73°F drying location. The temperature change could have increased evaporation or bleeding from the slabs. The 73°F slabs did not undergo a temperature change and were allowed to dry under ideal circumstances.



**Figure 36: Moisture Readings: Wet Cure Temperature**



## Moisture Readings: Pre Sand Blasting for the Fly Ash Concrete Categorized by Wet Cure Temperature



**Figure 37: Moisture readings: pre-sand blasting for the fly ash concrete categorized by wet cure temperature**

Additional tests were conducted to more thoroughly understand how moisture affects the curing process of concrete. A few slabs dried for 21 days were tested periodically for moisture content throughout the dry curing time, thus offering insight as to how individual slabs dry.


Another test was performed to discern the correlation between moisture meter readings and actual moisture content within concrete. This test was conducted by casting concrete specimen that were smaller than the slabs. After wet curing, these specimens were placed allowed to dry at 73°F and 50% RH or into an oven to dry out completely. Using the moisture meter, the specimen were continuously tested for moisture readings and weight to determine actual moisture content in the concrete. The full process and results are presented in Chapter 6 - Additional Testing.

## Pull-off Tests

Pull-off tests using the previously described procedure were conducted for all 180 slabs. Eight pull-off tests were conducted per slab with four tested at the hot temperature (122-125°F) and four tested at room temperature (73° ±5°F). Results indicated that average strengths occurred in the concrete or at the bond interface. All failures in the overlay or test adhesive used to mount the aluminum pucks were viewed as inadequate. Strength in the concrete or bond interface could be stronger, but an early failure in the epoxy would show a lower pull-off test result than what the overlay bond is capable of. To demonstrate the range of pull-off tests and the average, standard deviation bars were added to all bar graphs.

An overview of all pull-off test results was compiled and is presented in Figure 38. The graph plots pull-off strength against the number of days the slabs were dried. In addition, hot and room temperature pull-off tests were split and are shown in separate bars due to their large difference in their average pull-off tests. Each bar in Figure 38 consists of 180 individual pull-off tests from 45 slabs. As indicated in the figure, pull-off tests at room temperature performed nearly twice as strong as the tests conducted at the hot temperature. Pull-off tests conducted at the hot temperatures averaged less than 250 psi, but room temperature pull-off tests averaged over 350 psi. In addition, pull-off tests gained strength with increased cure time. Table 5 shows the values depicted in Figure 38 and the percentage increase for each drying time. Using the 3-day drying time results as a base, hot temperature pull-off strengths increased by 13.8% after four additional days of drying and up to 40% after 11 additional days of drying. Room temperature pull-off tests showed a slight decrease in pull-off strength after four additional days, but gained over 9% after the entire 21 days of drying. For hot and room temperature tests, the largest increase in pull-off strength was noted from 7-days of drying to 14-days. Hot temperature pull-off tests gained 23.1%, while room temperature tests gained 6.6%. These results indicate that the hot temperature pull-offs have more potential to increase the pull-off strength when given more time to dry.

## Pull-offs Test Results



**Figure 38: Pull-off test results overview**


**Table 5: Pull-off test results overview**

Drying Time (Days)	Hot Temperature			Room Temperature		
	Pull-off (psi)	Percentage increase from previous	Percentage increase from 3 days	Pull-off (psi)	Percentage increase from previous	Percentage increase from 3 days
3	165			389		
7	187	13.8%	13.8%	380	-2.2%	-2.2%
14	231	23.1%	40.0%	405	6.6%	4.2%
21	235	1.8%	42.5%	424	4.7%	9.1%

The following graphs show pull-off test results as above, but the results are shown based on the concrete type. The three concrete mixes were control (.5 w/c), low-cracking (.444 w/c), and fly ash (.5 w/c and 25% fly ash). Figure 39 shows pull-off results with respect to drying time. Drying times are further dissected between the three concrete types. Hot and room temperature pull-off results are separated into Figure 39 and Figure 40, respectively.


In Figure 39, pull-off strengths generally increase with time. The low-cracking and fly ash concretes continually increase with time, while the control concrete peaked at 14 days. The fly ash concrete consistently produced the highest or second highest average pull-off strengths.

The low-cracking concrete surprisingly demonstrated the worst performance even though it had the lowest water-to-cement ratio. Figure 40 shows results for room temperature pull-off tests for each concrete type. Again, room temperature tests result in higher pull-off strengths. The fly ash concrete also produced the highest pull-off test results out of the three concrete types. Each bar in Figure 39 and Figure 40 represents 15 slabs or 60 pull-off tests.



**Figure 39: Average of hot pull-offs based on concrete type**

## Room Temperature Pull-offs: Concrete Type



**Figure 40: Average of room temperature pull-offs based on concrete type**

Instead of separating the results by concrete type, Figure 41 and Figure 42 categorize the results by the temperature at which the slabs were wet cured: 40°F, 73°F, and 100°F. Different temperatures during initial hardening of the concrete result in different crystalline structures within the concrete. Moisture within these concretes also can vary depending on the wet cure temperature. In Figure 41, the 100°F wet cured slabs produced the highest pull-off strengths and consistently had lower moisture readings than the 40°F or the 73°F cured slabs. Moisture could be affecting these results, especially at the 3 or 7 day drying times when moisture readings are highest. Figure 42 shows room temperature pull-off tests for the various wet cure temperatures. These results are more consistent across the drying times, but the 73°F slabs generally produced lower pull-off results. Moisture readings from the 73°F slabs were consistently higher than the 40°F or 100°F slabs. Lower pull-off test results could be the result of increased water vapor pressure forming at the bond interface. Each bar in Figure 41 and Figure 42 represent 15 slabs or 60 pull-off tests.

### Hot Pull-offs: Wet Cure Temperature




Figure 41: Average of hot pull-offs based on wet cure temperature

### Room Temperature: Wet Cure Temperature





Figure 42: Average of room temperature pull-offs based on wet cure temperature


Pull-off test results can also be separated by the epoxy-polymer overlay system used. Similar to Figure 41, Figure 43 shows all test results with respect to the number of drying time. The drying time results are then split between the epoxy-polymer overlay systems. Each bar in both Figure 43 and Figure 44 is the average of nine slabs or 36 pull-off tests. As seen previously in other pull-off test figures, results generally increase as the length of drying increases. By day 21, four out of five epoxies averaged approximately 250 psi. Only Epoxy 1 fell below 200 psi on day 21 and Epoxy 1's results show the lowest pull-off tests for all four dry curing times. In the room temperature pull-offs, Epoxy 1 again produces the lowest pull-offs for both the 3 and 7 days before eventually producing the highest average at 21 days. Epoxy 4 consistently had one of the highest pull-off averages in both the hot and room temperature pull-offs for all four drying times.

Full results on pull-off tests can be found in Appendix C.



**Figure 43: Average of hot pull-offs based on epoxy-polymer overlay system used**

## Room Temperature Pull-offs: Epoxy-Polymer Overlay




**Figure 44: Average of room temperature pull-offs based on epoxy-polymer overlay system used**

After looking into both the moisture meter results and the pull-off test results, both results can be compared directly. Figure 37 showed the moisture meter results for fly ash concrete slabs prior to sand-blasting the surface. The results showed much higher moisture contents in the 73°F slabs for both the 3 and 7 day tests than in the 40°F and 100°F slabs. It would be expected that higher moisture readings would result in lower pull-off test results. To see the if this would be true, the results of the pull-off tests corresponding to those same slabs shown in Figure 37 are shown in Figure 45 for the pull-offs conducted at the hot temperature and Figure 46 for the pull-off tests conducted at room temperature. The results for both the hot and room temperature pull-off tests do not show the 73°F pull-off results any lower than either the 40°F or 100°F results for the 3 and 7 day times. The 73°F fly ash slabs had an average moisture reading of 5.82% yet still has a higher average pull-off strength than the 40°F fly ash slabs that average a 3.44% moisture reading. To further investigate these findings, further testing was set up and can be found in Chapter 6 - Additional Testing. Smaller concrete specimen were cast to test the difference between the moisture meter readings and the actual moisture content within the concrete.




## Hot Pull-offs: Wet Cure Temperature for Fly Ash Concrete



**Figure 45: Hot pull-off test results for fly ash concrete slabs split by their wet cure temperature**


## Room Temperature Pull-offs: Wet Cure Temperature for Fly Ash Concrete



**Figure 46: Room temperature pull-off test results for fly ash concrete slabs split by their wet cure temperature**


### ***Pull-off Test Results Compared to Moisture Readings***

Increased moisture content in the concrete slabs should result in lower pull-off test results. In an attempt to show this relationship, scatter plots were made as shown in Figure 47 and Figure 48. Figure 47 plots the pull-off test results conducted at 122°F against the average moisture readings while Figure 48 plots the pull-off test results performed at 73°F against the average moisture readings. No correlation can be seen as the data points are all clumped together. The moisture readings mostly read between 3.0-4.0% with the pull-off test results varying by over 200 psi. The surface moisture readings do not provide a good representation of the moisture content within the slab and thus the relationship between the pull-off tests and moisture readings don't correlate.



**Figure 47: Hot Pull-offs vs Moisture Readings**

## Room Temperature Pull-offs vs Moisture Readings




**Figure 48: Room Temperature Pull-offs vs Moisture Readings**


### *Pull-off Failure Type Results*

Failure type for each pull-off test was recorded. Failure location is defined as the weakest point between the concrete and overlay. A majority of failures were Types 1, 2, or 3. A Type 1 failure occurs deeper than .25 inches in the concrete and a failure at this location at a strength less than 250 psi is seen as weak concrete (KDOT). A failure greater than 250 psi is expected when other failure types do not occur. Tensile strength in concrete ranges from 450-600 psi. As long as other failure types do not occur, the concrete will break here. A Type 2 failure also occurs in the concrete but at a depth less than .25 inches. A shallow failure in the concrete is caused by a weak top layer of concrete. Failure Type 3 indicates a bond failure at the concrete/overlay interface resulting from poor surface preparation or a buildup of water vapor pressure underneath the overlay. Type 4 and 5 failures are rare as long as the overlay and epoxy adhesive are mixed, placed, and cured correctly. Additional information on all failure types is located in Testing Process. (KDOT)


The occurrence of each failure type was graphed and the graphs were divided between the three concrete types. Figure 49 through Figure 51 show results for the failure type analysis. The failure type corresponds well to average pull-off strength for hot pull-off tests. The low-cracking concrete had the most Type 3 failures and the lowest average pull-off tests, as shown in Figure 39. The fly ash concrete contained the least amount of Type 3 failures and produced the highest average pull-off tests, also demonstrated in Figure 39. Results indicate that Type 3 failures produce weaker pull-off tests than failure Types 1 or 2. The new concrete could potentially cause weaker bond strength.



**Figure 49: Control concrete failure types**



**Figure 50: Low-cracking concrete failure types**



**Figure 51: Fly ash concrete failure types**


Further analysis of failure types confirms that Type 3 failures produce weaker pull-off strengths. Analysis performed showing the failure types corresponding to the different wet cure temperatures further show that type 3 failures produce weaker pull-off strengths. On average, the

100°F slabs produced less Type 3 failures, more Type 1 and 2 failures, and higher pull-off tests than the 40°F and 73°F tests. All data and figures for this analysis are presented in Appendix D.

### **Concrete Compressive Strengths**

Concrete compressive strengths were found for the slabs upon completion of wet curing and when the pull-off tests were performed. The compressive strengths at the time of the pull-off test did show some correlation to the pull-off tests conducted at room temperature. This can be attributed to the failure types. The vast majority of failures for the room temperature pull-off tests were in the concrete. If the concrete has more strength, then the pull-off test should reach a higher strength.

Figure 52 shows the compressive strengths of the concrete as the pull-off tests were being conducted. The results are split by the amount of days the cylinders were allowed to dry and the type of concrete they consisted of. For the most part, not much strength was gained from the 3 day (17 days after batching) to the 21 day (35 days after batching) tests. What can be deciphered from this figure is the relationship between the cylinder strength and the pull-off test. Comparing Figure 52 with the pull-off tests performed at the hot temperature (Figure 39), almost no correlation can be found. This is due to the majority of pull-offs occurring as a type 3 or at the bond interface. The concrete strength has no impact on the results of pull-off tests that fail at the bond interface. If Figure 52 is compared with the results from the pull-off tests conducted at room temperature (Figure 40), then a few observations can be made. First, the fly ash concrete compressive strengths are the highest for each time period. The fly ash slab pull-off results are consistently the highest too. On the other side, the control concrete slabs are at the bottom of both the compressive strengths and pull-off test results.




**Figure 52: Compressive strength of concrete by concrete type**

Looking at the compressive strengths divided by their wet cure temperature instead of their concrete type, we can again see some correlation. Figure 53 shows the compressive strengths split by the time allowed to dry and the temperature of their wet cure location. A comparison of these results to the pull-off results taken at the hot temperature (Figure 41) shows no correlation because many of the results were at the bond interface. Instead compare it to the pull-off tests conducted at room temperature and split between wet cure temperatures (Figure 42). To find correlation, each temperature must be looked at separately. The 40°F compressive strengths consistently gain each time period. The pull-off results show this consistent gain between the 7 and 21 day times, but the 3 day results are higher than expected. The 73°F compressive strengths actually decrease slightly from 3 to 7 days before gaining strength through the 14 and 21 days. This trend is reflected in the pull-off results. The pull-off results decrease from the 3 day to the 7 day results before gaining strength. Finally, the 100°F pull-off results seen in Figure 42 show the 14 day pull-off results as being the highest and the 21 day results dipping a little. The compressive strengths for the 100°F cylinders reflect this behavior. The 14 day results are higher than the 21 day results.



The differing wet cure temperatures do not show that a higher compressive strength will result in a higher pull-off test when compared relative to each other. The 100°F compressive strengths were the lowest between the wet cure temperatures by a significant amount for each drying time, but sometimes had the highest pull-off test results. This could be the result of the wet cure temperature's effect on the concrete's mechanical properties. Differing wet cure temperatures can result in a different tensile strength relative to its compressive strength.

All compressive strength results can be found in Appendix B - .



**Figure 53: Compressive strength of concrete by wet cure temperature**


## **Chapter 6 - Additional Testing**

Questions arose during the slab testing that required special attention. The moisture meter consistently provided varying moisture readings, but is variation expected and to what degree? Were the readings accurate? A large difference of at least 150 psi between the hot and room temperature pull-off tests was also noted. Either water vapor pressure caused the difference or the epoxy softened when heated. Tests were developed for this study to answer these concerns and questions.

### **Moisture Readings Taken Over Full Drying Time**

Moisture readings during the main testing procedure were conducted on slabs only after the slabs had finished dry curing and these readings provided only single data points on a timeline progression. Moisture readings could indicate lower moisture content in a 3-day dried slab but higher moisture content on a similar 7-day dried slab. In order to see time progression of the moisture content from start to finish, a few slabs were selected to have moisture readings taken periodically throughout their drying time. The selected slabs included several sets of 21-day dried slabs containing fly ash. Results of this test are shown in Figure 54. Complete results containing individual moisture meter readings are presented in Appendix E.

## Time Progression of Moisture Readings for Selected Slabs



**Figure 54: Time Progression of Moisture Readings for Selected Slabs**

As demonstrated in Figure 54 the 40°F and 73°F sets of slabs emerged from their wet cure at or near the 6.9% maximum moisture reading. The 100°F slabs gave moisture readings near 4.0%. All slabs converged to an average moisture reading near 4.0% after 10 days.

### Moisture Meter Accuracy

During testing, speculation arose as to whether the moisture meter was providing accurate results because many results collected within the same zone gave varying results. Maximum moisture content within each zone was the recorded value in an effort to produce consistent results.

Test specimens were developed and sized to test their moisture content by using the moisture meter or oven for drying. Specimen sizes were 4 inches x 16 inches x 3 inches deep, as shown in Figure 55. Surface area of the specimens represented the size of a zone used when measuring moisture in the slabs in the main testing for this study. Three readings were taken on each specimen: one on each end and a third in the center.

Specimens were cast for two conditions. The first variable included dry curing at 73°F and 50% RH or heat dried in an oven at 200°F so that all moisture escaped the slab. The second variable tested the effectiveness of wrapping the specimen in plastic. All slabs to be overlaid had


their bottom and sides wrapped in plastic between wet and dry curing, as described in Chapter 4 - Curing the Slabs. The primary goal was to simulate slab encasement in a larger slab so that moisture was unable to escape from the sides and bottom of the slab. For the moisture to escape from within the concrete, it would be forced to travel up through the surface. In this test, half of the specimen was wrapped in plastic in the same manner as the slabs and the other half of the specimen was not wrapped. As drying occurred, the specimens were tested for moisture content using the moisture meter and weighed to determine the weight of moisture lost. Four bars were made for this test. Bar 1 was dried and not wrapped. Bar 2 was heat dried and not wrapped. Bar 3 was dried and wrapped. Bar 4 was heat dried and wrapped.



**Figure 55: Test specimen cast to test moisture content**


Moisture readings for each of the four slabs are presented in Figure 56 through Figure 59. The 3 different series in each graph show moisture readings for three locations from which a reading was taken on each specimen. Each graph shows moisture readings through 150 hours (Day 7) after wet cure. After this point, all moisture readings from each specimen converged. Specimen 1 and 3 were dried, but Specimen 3 was wrapped in plastic while Specimen 1 was not wrapped. Moisture readings for Specimen 1 showed two out of three readings converged to approximately 4.0% after only 20 hours. The third reading took approximately 100 hours to converge to 4.0%. Specimen 3 demonstrated variability in readings because 100 hours were required for two out of three readings to converge to 4.0% and approximately 160 hours for all three readings. The additional time required for Specimen 3 could be a result of the plastic wrap

on the bottom and sides of the concrete which prevented moisture from evaporating. Moisture could only escape through the surface. These results show that the plastic wrap performed as expected in its simulation of the specimen being a part of a much larger slab. Inconsistency in some moisture reading progressions was also observed for specimens 1 and 3. Some moisture reading progressions demonstrated an increase from one reading to the next, specifically in the first 40 hours of dry curing as seen in Figure 56. The conclusion was made that the moisture meter is not consistently able to provide the maximum value of moisture in each section with only one reading; multiple readings must be taken and the maximum reading should be recorded to ensure consistency. Some moisture readings from the slabs to be overlaid demonstrated lower than the actual moisture because insufficient readings were taken.



**Figure 56: Specimen 1: dried (not wrapped)**

### Specimen 3: Dry Cured (Wrapped)



**Figure 57: Specimen 3: dried (wrapped)**

Specimen 2 and 4 were heat dried. Directly after wet curing, one specimen was similarly wrapped in plastic as Specimen 3 and the other specimen was not wrapped. Both specimens were placed in an oven at 200°F for 160 hours until they were completely dry. The moisture content was tested by measuring the weight of each specimen. When the weight of the specimen no longer decreased, then all moisture had been extracted. Results indicate that wrapping Specimen 4 in plastic had no effect on the drying process because both specimens demonstrated similar drying patterns. The specimens dried quickly within the first 10 hours before a slower rate of moisture loss was established. Moisture readings show that this initial moisture loss declined from 6.9% (moisture meter maximum reading) to 3.0-3.5% and then only minimal moisture loss occurred until approximately 50-60 hours. A probable cause of this stagnation could be that internal moisture of the specimen slowly reached the surface and replenished surface moisture at the same rate of evaporation. After approximately 60 hours, the specimens continued to dry at an increased rate until moisture readings were less than 1.0%. Figure 58 and Figure 59 show results of Specimen 2 and 4 respectively.

## Specimen 2: Heat Dried (Not Wrapped)




Figure 58: Specimen 2: heat dried (not wrapped)

## Specimen 4: Heat Dried (Wrapped)





Figure 59: Specimen 4: heat dried (wrapped)

Differences in moisture content of moisture meter readings and moisture percentage calculated by specimen weight are shown in Figure 60. Average moisture meter readings for specimens 2 and 4 from Figure 58 and Figure 59 and the moisture percentage in the entire specimen based on the weight loss of the specimen while heat drying are included. The moisture readings leveled out between 10 and 60 hours of drying, similar to Figure 58 and Figure 59. The moisture percentage based on weight continued to decrease during this same timespan because the moisture percentage accounts for the entire specimen while the moisture meter only measures the surface of each specimen. This also indicates that as the specimen dries out, moisture from

within the specimen escapes through the surface. The surface, therefore, has higher moisture content than the overall moisture within the slab for the first 100 hours of drying.



**Figure 60: Moisture content of heat dried specimen**

### Epoxy Tensile Test

Based on pull-off test results, tests conducted at room temperature performed much better than tests performed directly after heating the slabs to 122-125°F. Two potential causes were identified. The first cause could have been that the increased temperature on an epoxy polymer overlay on new concrete caused water vapor pressure, consequently encouraging overlay delamination. Overlay delamination due to water vapor pressure was a main focus for this study because water vapor pressure is a major concern with new concrete. The other potential cause could have been the loss of tensile and bond strength in the polymer overlay system as temperature increased. Increased temperature increases the epoxy’s plasticity, causing the epoxy to lose strength. A direct tensile test was set up to determine if temperature increase caused the lower bond strengths.

A direct tensile test was developed to remove the potential for failure due to water vapor pressure or weak concrete. Two aluminum pucks were epoxied together using a slurry with flint aggregate. This allowed failure to occur in the epoxy or at the interface between the epoxy and aluminum puck. Figure 61 shows the two epoxied pucks. The bottom puck was wrapped in Gorilla tape to fill voids in the forms so epoxy would not ooze out between the pucks. The epoxy hardened for 24 hours and then half of the epoxied pucks (5) were placed in an oven at 122°F



and half the epoxied pucks (5) were kept at room temperature (~73°F). The epoxied pucks were allowed to heat up and maintain heat for an additional 24 hours.



**Figure 61: 2 aluminum pucks epoxied together**

The testing setup for direct tension is shown in Figure 62. A metal loop was screwed into both pucks and the connections created a pinned connection, allowing the test to be in straight tension. Utilization of a fixed connection would have produced an eccentricity since the pucks never came out perfectly aligned the two pucks were separated at a rate of 60 lbf per second or approximately 20 psi/second. Results for both pucks kept at room temperature and pucks kept at 122°F are presented in Table 6. Temperatures for the heated pucks were recorded. The pucks were between 121-122°F when removed from the oven. By the time they were mounted in the testing apparatus, they had fallen to a temperature between 105-110°F and remained in that range for the duration of the test. After removing results that full coverage of the epoxy on the puck was not achieved, the 73°F tests averaged a force of 2,948 lbf (938 psi), while the 105-110°F tests averaged 2,827 lbf (900 psi). With bond strengths to the aluminum pucks reaching over 900 psi for both the 73°F and the 105-110°F, the epoxy clearly bonds better than the pull-off tests show. It can be concluded that it is not the epoxy weakening at the higher temperature that is causing the approximately 200 psi average differences between the hot and room temperature

pull-off test results. Instead, it is the water vapor pressure forming at the bond interface that is decreasing the pull-off strengths for the 122°F pull-off tests.



**Figure 62: Epoxy tensile test setup**

**Table 6: Epoxy tensile test results**

	Tensile Force			
	73°F		122°F	
	Force (lbf)	Comments	Force (lbf)	Comments
Test 1	3240		3127	
Test 2	2678		1644	Not full coverage
Test 3	2685	Not full coverage	2940	
Test 4	2855		2415	
Test 5	3018		-	Broke prior to testing
Average of all tests	2895		2532	
Average of tests with full coverage	2948		2827	

## Chapter 7 - Conclusions and Recommendations

### Conclusions

Six conclusions can be made based off of the results of the moisture meter readings from both the slabs and the additional tests for the smaller concrete specimen.

1. Moisture readings from the concrete slabs did decrease with more drying time, but not by much for the moisture readings taken after sand-blasting the surface. This is likely due to the sand blasting since dry-compressed air was sprayed over the concrete surfaces which dried them out. The greatest average moisture reading decrease occurred between 7 and 14 days of drying as shown in Table 4.
2. The low-cracking concrete (only concrete with .44 w/c ratio) and the 73°F both recorded slightly higher moisture contents than the other conditions for moisture readings taken after sand blasting.
3. Taking moisture readings prior to sand blasting proved to show a greater discrepancy between curing conditions and moisture content. For the fly ash concrete cured at 73°F, the moisture readings were far above both the 40°F and the 100°F cured slab's moisture readings for both the 3 and 7 day drying times. By the 14 day drying time, the 73°F had converged with both 40°F and 100°F slabs. The 40°F and 100°F slab's surface dried out much quicker than the 73°F slabs. The difference in moisture contents can be attributed to two causes. First, the 73°F slabs were wet cured in a room with mist being sprayed constantly while the 40°F and 100°F slabs were both wet cured with burlap. The 73°F slabs were wet cured ideally, but the 40°F and the 100°F slabs may be more representative of curing an actual bridge deck. Second, both the 40°F and 100°F slabs experienced a temperature change. Upon completion of wet curing, they were moved to dry at 73°F. This temperature difference increased evaporation from the slabs.
4. Readings taken on slabs periodically throughout their drying time of 21 days showed that both the 40°F and 73°F slabs began at or near the moisture meter's maximum reading of 6.9%. Between day 7 and 14, both the 40°F and 73°F slabs had converged to a moisture reading between 4.0-4.5%. The 100°F slabs on the

other hand stayed relatively constant throughout the entire 21 day drying period. They began near 4.0% moisture and remained around 4.0% until dropping to 3.5% on day 20.

5. Moisture readings taken on the smaller heat dried specimen showed the difference between the surface moisture readings and the moisture content of the entire specimen. The moisture readings from these specimen lost a lot of moisture quickly before leveling out between 10-60 hours. The rate of moisture loss then sped up after 60 hours. The moisture content of the entire slab continued to drop at a faster rate than the surface moisture readings. This can be attributed to the internal moisture in the concrete. The surface readings show that the surface moisture is being replenished by the internal moisture, while the overall moisture content of the specimen decreases.
6. Also seen from the smaller specimen moisture tests are the effect plastic wrapping had on the concrete drying. The moisture readings were a bit more varied for the specimen wrapped in plastic when compared to the moisture readings for the specimen not wrapped. This shows the internal moisture was forced to escape through the top surface of the concrete for the wrapped specimen which causes the increased variability.

Four conclusions from the pull-off test results are shown below.

1. Pull-off tests performed at 122°F resulted in nearly half the pull-off strength of the tests performed at room temperature or 73°±5°. The room temperature pull-off test results were relatively consistent across the drying times. The drying time did not seem to affect the room temperature pull-off tests much. The hot pull-off tests were affected by the drying time though. The results showed an increase in the hot pull-off test results when given more drying time. Maximum strength increase occurred between 7 and 14 days. The research suggests that the difference between the 122°F and 73°F pull-off tests may be due to vapor pressure at the bond interface. Additional testing showed that epoxy retained adhesion in excess of 900 psi while at an elevated temperature which is much larger than the pull-off test results.

2. The fly ash concrete performed the best for both the hot and room temperature pull-off tests. Also, the 100°F wet cured slabs produced the highest pull-off results at the hot temperature.
3. The moisture meter readings for the fly ash concrete slabs showed the 73°F slabs to have much higher moisture readings than either the 40°F or the 100°F slabs. The resulting pull-off tests for those same fly ash concrete slabs at 73°F were not lower as expected. With the results from the additional testing, it can be determined that the surface moisture readings are a bad indicator for the moisture within the slab. Moisture from within the slab slowly seeps to the surface to replenish the surface moisture which aids in a lower pull-off strength.
4. Even though surface moisture readings for some slabs were very similar between slabs dried for 3 and 21 days, once the overlay was placed and heated to 122°F, more internal moisture was available to the 3 day slabs. The higher moisture content from within the slabs dried 3 days caused lower pull-off test results than the slabs dried for 21 days.

Three conclusions from the pull-off failure type results are shown below.

1. The majority of the hot pull-off tests were type 3 while the majority of the room temperature pull-off tests were either type 1 or type 2.
2. Type 3 pull-offs failures made up the majority of all pull-off tests for both the control and low-cracking concretes at both the 40°F and 73°F wet cure temperatures. Type 2 pull-off failures were the majority in the fly ash concrete types and for the 100°F wet cure temperatures.
3. Higher pull-off strengths were recorded for both the fly ash concrete slabs and all the slabs wet cured at 100°F. This goes to show that pull-off failure types 1 and 2 produce higher pull-off strengths than type 3 failures.

Two conclusions were made based on the results of the cylinder compressive strengths.

1. The fly ash concrete produced the highest cylinder compressive strengths and also the highest pull-off test results for both the hot and room temperature pull-off tests.

2. Comparing the compressive strengths between the different wet cure temperatures, a higher compressive strength doesn't always translate to a higher pull-off result. The different wet cure temperatures produce different tensile strengths relative to their compressive strength. The correlation that can be seen is between one wet cure temperature at a time. A higher compressive strength will result in a slightly higher pull-off result when compared to other tests from the same wet cure temperature.

### **Recommendations**

From the previous conclusions, recommendations can be made for future placement of an epoxy-polymer overlay on a new bridge deck.

1. The time of overlay placement after wet cure could be reduced to 14 days and possibly to 10 days from the 21 days currently in place based on moisture content data shown in Figure 37 and Figure 54.
2. Surface moisture readings did not always give an accurate depiction of what the pull-off strength would do. A moisture test or moisture meter that can accurately measure moisture content of the slab deeper than just at the surface should be used.
3. Future testing should be conducted to test the effect internal moisture contents have on the pull-off strengths. Moisture readings should be taken for different depths in the concrete to see their effects on vapor pressure and overlay bond.

## Chapter 8 - Works Cited

- Babaei, K., & Hawkins, N. (1987). *Evaluation of Bridge Deck Protection Strategies*. TRB, National Research Council. Washington D.C.: National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 297.
- Carter, P. (1993). Thin Polymer Wearing Surfaces for Preventive Maintenance of Bridge Decks. *Polymer Concrete*(137), pp. 29-48.
- Chin, J., Martin, J., Karbhari, V., & Nguyer, T. (2001). *Gap Analysis for Durability of Fiber Reinforced Polymer Composites in Civil Infrastructure*. Reston, VA: American Society of Civil Engineers.
- Dayton Superior Corporation. (2012). *Pro-Poxy Type III D.O.T*. Miamisburg, OH: Dayton Superior Corporation.
- E-Bond Epoxies, Inc. (n.d.). *Product Data Sheet for E-Bond 526*. E-Bond Epoxies, Inc.
- FHWA. (2012). Federal Highway Administration's National Bridge Inventory.
- Frosch, R. J., Kreger, M. E., & Strandquist, B. V. (2013). *Implementation of Performance-Based Bridge Deck Protective Systems*. Purdue University. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Department of Transportation.
- Gama, N. (1999). *Durability of Epoxy Polymer Concrete Overlays for Bridge Decks*. Montreal, Canada: McGill University.
- Guthrie, W. S., Nelsen, T., & Ross, L. A. (2005). *Performance of Concrete Bridge Deck Surface Treatments*. Brigham Young University. Salt Lake City: Utah Department of Transportation.
- Harper, J. (2007, Nov.). Investigations of Failures of Epoxy Polymer Overlays in Missouri.
- International Concrete Repair Institute. (n.d.). Retrieved 2013, from [www.icri.org](http://www.icri.org)
- Kansas DOT. (2011, 12 01). List of Prequalified Epoxy-Resin-Base Bonding Systems for Concrete--Type III Overlay.
- Kansas DOT. (2013, 05 24). List of Prequalified Fly Ash for Use in Concrete.
- Kansas DOT. (2013, 08 23). List of Prequalified Portland Cement & Blended Hydraulic Cement.
- Kansas DOT. (2014, 03 24). List of Prequalified Chemical Admixtures for Concrete.
- Kansas DOT. (2014, April 14). Standard Specifications for State Road & Bridge Construction - 2007, Section 1102 Aggregate for Concrete. Topeka, KS.

- Kansas DOT. (n.d.). Multi-Layer Polymer Concrete Overlay, Section 729. (*Section 729*).
- Kansas DOT. (n.d.). Special Provision to the Standard Specifications. *Section 729, Multi-Layer Polymer Concrete Overlay(Revision 1), Edition 2007*.
- KDOT. (n.d.). KT-70. *Test Method for Testing Polymer Overlays for Surface Preparation and Adhesion*.
- Meggers, D. (2009). The Kansas Experience with Polymer Concrete Bridge Deck Overlays. *Mid-Continent Transportation Research Symposium*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University.
- NCHRP. (2011). *Long-Term Performance of Polymer Concrete for Bridge Decks*. Washington, D.C.: Transportation Research Board.
- Pantelides, C. P., & Weber, E. D. (2011). *Evaluation of Bridge Deck Seal Treatment for Accelerated Bridge Deck Construction (ABC) Bridge Decks Using Precast Panels*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah.
- Poly-Carb, Inc. (2011.). *Mark-154 Bridge Deck Thin Polymer Overlay*. Cleveland, OH: Poly-Carb, Inc.
- Potter, W. (1975). *Uses of Epoxy Resins*. Newnes-Butterworths, London, UK.
- Reagan, F. (1992, June). Performance Characteristics of Traffic Deck Membranes. *Concrete International*, 14(6), pp. 48-51.
- Sika Corporation. (2011). *Sikadur 22, Lo-Mod*. Lyndhurst, NJ: Sika Corporation.
- Smith, A. (1991, April). Overlaying Concrete Bridge Decks with Polymer Concrete. *Concrete Construction*, 13(4), pp. 325-332.
- Stenko, M. a. (2001). Thin Polysulfide Epoxy Bridge Deck Overlays. *Transportation Research Record 1749*, pp. 64-67.
- The Euclid Chemical Company. (n.d.). *Flexolith Data Sheet*.
- Young, L. M., Durham, S. A., & Bindel, M. K. (2011). *Thin Bonded Epoxy Overlays on Concrete Bridge Deck Surfaces*. Denver, Co: University of Colorado Denver.



## Appendix A - Moisture Meter Results

**Table 7: Moisture meter readings for control concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
After Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
C-40-3-1	31-Jan	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.6	3.1	3.25
C-40-7-1	9-Jan	2.5	2.9	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.5	2.5	3.13
C-40-14-1	16-Jan	2.9	2.6	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.3	2.6	2.90
C-40-21-1	23-Jan	2.7	2.9	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.2	2.7	2.98
C-70-3-1	31-Jan	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.52
C-70-7-1	4-Feb	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.12
C-70-14-1	7-May	3.8	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.1	3.43
C-70-21-1	23-Jan	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.25
C-100-3-1	30-May	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.47
C-100-7-1	4-Feb	2.7	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.5	2.7	3.08
C-100-14-1	8-May	2.3	2.8	3.7	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.7	2.3	3.00
C-100-21-1	missed							#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
C-40-3-2	7-Oct	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.0	2.9	3.47
C-40-7-2	7-May	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.0	3.8	3.0	3.57
C-40-14-2	14-May	3.3	3.4	3.9	3.7	3.3	3.4	3.9	3.3	3.50
C-40-21-2	missed							#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
C-70-3-2	7-Oct	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.7	4.0	3.2	3.88
C-70-7-2	24-Sep	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.3	5.3	4.2	3.52
C-70-14-2	14-May	3.9	3.4	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.4	3.88
C-70-21-2	missed							#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
C-100-3-2	30-May	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.7	3.4	3.0	3.7	3.0	3.35
C-100-7-2	7-May	3.0	3.1	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.3	4.0	3.0	3.47
C-100-14-2	14-May	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.4	4.0	3.4	3.73
C-100-21-2	8-Oct	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.05

**Table 8: Moisture meter readings for control concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
After Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
C-40-3-3	7-Oct	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.2	4.2	2.7	3.37
C-40-7-3	24-Sep	3.2	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.6	2.8	3.45
C-40-14-3	1-Oct	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.1	3.52
C-40-21-3	8-Oct	3.7	3.1	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.30
C-70-3-3	7-Oct	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7	6.8	4.0	3.62
C-70-7-3	11-Jun	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.50
C-70-14-3	18-Jun	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.2	3.43
C-70-21-3	8-Oct	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.0	3.4	2.9	3.32
C-100-3-3	7-Oct	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.1	3.58
C-100-7-3	23-Sep	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.1	3.42
C-100-14-3	16-Jan	2.6	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.0	2.7	3.3	2.6	2.95
C-100-21-3	8-Oct	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.40
C-40-3-4	29-Aug	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.4	4.0	4.0	3.4	3.72
C-40-7-4	5-Aug	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.63
C-40-14-4	missed							#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
C-40-21-4	19-Aug	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.8	3.2	3.8	3.2	3.42
C-70-3-4	29-Aug	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.6	3.97
C-70-7-4	6-Aug	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.9	4.5	4.3	4.5	3.9	4.20
C-70-14-4	13-Aug	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.32
C-70-21-4	20-Aug	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.75
C-100-3-4	29-Aug	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.78
C-100-7-4	5-Aug	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.45
C-100-14-4	12-Aug	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.43
C-100-21-4	19-Aug	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.42

**Table 9: Moisture meter readings for control concrete with Epoxy 5**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
After Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
C-40-3-5	29-Aug	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.72
C-40-7-5	13-Aug	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.50
C-40-14-5	20-Aug	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.9	3.9	3.2	3.45
C-40-21-5	27-Aug	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.40
C-70-3-5	29-Aug	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.97
C-70-7-5	12-Aug	3.6	4.0	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.7	4.0	3.4	3.65
C-70-14-5	19-Aug	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.4	3.67
C-70-21-5	26-Aug	3.2	3.6	3.5	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.0	3.35
C-100-3-5	29-Aug	3.2	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.2	3.55
C-100-7-5	12-Aug	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.60
C-100-14-5	19-Aug	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.50
C-100-21-5	26-Aug	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.43

**Table 10: Moisture meter readings for low-cracking concrete and Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
After Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
L-40-3-1	26-Jul	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.58
L-40-7-1	9-Jan	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.2	3.48
L-40-14-1	31-Jul	2.9	3.3	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.3	2.9	3.12
L-40-21-1	23-Jan	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.52
L-70-3-1	26-Jul	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.8	4.0	3.6	3.75
L-70-7-1	17-Jul	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.9	3.9	3.4	3.9	3.4	3.65
L-70-14-1	16-Jan	2.6	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.0	2.7	3.3	2.6	2.95
L-70-21-1	23-Jan	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.2	3.45
L-100-3-1	25-Jul	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.53
L-100-7-1	missed							#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
L-100-14-1	1-Jul	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.37
L-100-21-1	8-Jul	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.2	3.48
L-40-3-2	26-Jul	3.7	3.6	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.7	4.0	3.6	3.82
L-40-7-2	16-Jul	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.7	4.0	3.7	4.0	3.3	3.68
L-40-14-2	23-Jul	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.78
L-40-21-2	30-Jul	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.70
L-70-3-2	26-Jul	4.1	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.97
L-70-7-2	16-Jul	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.78
L-70-14-2	3-Jan	3.4	3.7	3.8	4.1	3.8	0.0	4.1	3.4	3.76
L-70-21-2	30-Jul	3.4	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.4	3.67
L-100-3-2	25-Jul	3.3	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.62
L-100-7-2	15-Jul	3.4	3.5	3.7	4.0	3.5	3.7	4.0	3.4	3.63
L-100-14-2	22-Jul	3.6	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.6	3.88
L-100-21-2	29-Jul	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.50

**Table 11: Moisture meter readings for low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
After Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
L-40-3-3	26-Jul	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.7	4.1	3.7	3.97
L-40-7-3	23-Jul	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.57
L-40-14-3	missed							#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
L-40-21-3	6-Aug	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.5	3.60
L-70-3-3	26-Jul	3.8	4.1	4.1	3.6	3.6	4.1	4.1	3.6	3.88
L-70-7-3	23-Jul	3.9	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.90
L-70-14-3	missed							#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
L-70-21-3	6-Aug	3.4	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.62
L-100-3-3	25-Jul	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.5	3.75
L-100-7-3	22-Jul	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.08
L-100-14-3	29-Jul	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.8	3.4	3.62
L-100-21-3	5-Aug	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.90
L-40-3-4	6-Sep	3.4	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.4	3.50
L-40-7-4	6-Aug	3.4	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.4	3.60
L-40-14-4	13-Aug	3.2	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.2	3.57
L-40-21-4	20-Aug	3.3	3.6	4.0	3.5	3.4	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.55
L-70-3-4	6-Sep	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.1	3.6	4.0	4.2	3.6	3.98
L-70-7-4	7-Aug	3.9	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.88
L-70-14-4	13-Aug	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.67
L-70-21-4	21-Aug	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.65
L-100-3-4	5-Sep	3.6	3.5	3.9	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.9	3.4	3.60
L-100-7-4	19-Aug	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.68
L-100-14-4	26-Aug	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.42
L-100-21-4	2-Sep	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.42

**Table 12: Moisture meter readings for low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 5**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
After Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
L-40-3-5	6-Sep	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.50
L-40-7-5	27-Aug	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.98
L-40-14-5	3-Sep	3.6	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.6	3.72
L-40-21-5	10-Sep	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.88
L-70-3-5	6-Sep	4.0	4.2	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.7	4.2	3.7	3.92
L-70-7-5	27-Aug	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	3.8	4.8	3.8	4.52
L-70-14-5	3-Sep	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.72
L-70-21-5	23-Jan	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.45
L-100-3-5	5-Sep	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.9	3.7	4.0	3.5	3.82
L-100-7-5	26-Aug	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.63
L-100-14-5	2-Sep	3.7	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.68
L-100-21-5	9-Sep	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.6	3.77

**Table 13: Moisture meter readings for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
After Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
F-40-3-1	30-Jan	3.4	3.5	2.9	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.5	2.9	3.23
F-40-7-1	7-Jan	3.3	3.6	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.40
F-40-14-1	16-Jan	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.43
F-40-21-1	21-Jan	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.37
F-70-3-1	27-Jan	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.2	3.57
F-70-7-1	7-Jan	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.50
F-70-14-1	16-Jan	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.42
F-70-21-1	21-Jan	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.58
F-100-3-1	27-Jan	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.4	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.30
F-100-7-1	7-Jan	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.20
F-100-14-1	16-Jan	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.42
F-100-21-1	21-Jan	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.32
F-40-3-2	30-Jan	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.8	2.7	3.1	3.1	2.7	2.97
F-40-7-2	26-Nov	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.33
F-40-14-2	4-Dec	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.3	3.50
F-40-21-2	10-Dec	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.5	2.9	3.23
F-70-3-2	14-Dec	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.72
F-70-7-2	25-Nov	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.63
F-70-14-2	2-Dec	3.0	3.1	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.0	3.33
F-70-21-2	9-Dec	3.5	3.1	3.2	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.32
F-100-3-2	14-Dec	3.4	3.2	3.9	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.9	3.1	3.33
F-100-7-2	25-Nov	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.6	3.1	2.6	2.92
F-100-14-2	2-Dec	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.53
F-100-21-2	9-Dec	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.1	3.42

**Table 14: Moisture meter readings for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
After Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
F-40-3-3	30-Jan	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.1	2.7	3.1	3.5	2.7	3.15
F-40-7-3	27-Nov	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.8	3.4	3.52
F-40-14-3	5-Dec	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.12
F-40-21-3	12-Dec	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.6	3.2	3.47
F-70-3-3	14-Dec	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.57
F-70-7-3	26-Nov	3.4	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.4	4.1	3.4	3.70
F-70-14-3	4-Dec	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.38
F-70-21-3	10-Dec	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.53
F-100-3-3	14-Dec	3.2	3.4	3.9	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.9	3.2	3.50
F-100-7-3	27-Nov	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.68
F-100-14-3	5-Dec	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.37
F-100-21-3	12-Dec	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.70
F-40-3-4	30-Jan	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.43
F-40-7-4	4-Dec	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.1	3.40
F-40-14-4	10-Dec	3.2	3.1	2.8	2.7	3.1	3.1	3.2	2.7	3.00
F-40-21-4	17-Dec	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.0	2.9	3.4	2.9	3.12
F-70-3-4	14-Dec	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.55
F-70-7-4	2-Dec	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.40
F-70-14-4	9-Dec	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.23
F-70-21-4	17-Dec	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.22
F-100-3-4	27-Jan	3.4	3.2	3.5	3.0	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.33
F-100-7-4	2-Dec	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.28
F-100-14-4	9-Dec	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.48
F-100-21-4	17-Dec	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.52



**Table 15: Moisture meter readings for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 5**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
After Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
F-40-3-5	30-Jan	2.9	3.1	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.4	2.9	3.20
F-40-7-5	5-Dec	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.0	3.18
F-40-14-5	12-Dec	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.53
F-40-21-5	17-Dec	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.47
F-70-3-5	27-Jan	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.1	3.50
F-70-7-5	4-Dec	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.58
F-70-14-5	10-Dec	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.27
F-70-21-5	17-Dec	3.2	3.1	2.8	2.6	3.1	2.7	3.2	2.6	2.92
F-100-3-5	27-Jan	3.0	3.1	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.18
F-100-7-5	5-Dec	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.13
F-100-14-5	12-Dec	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.37
F-100-21-5	17-Dec	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.3	2.7	3.3	2.7	3.08

**Table 16: Moisture meter readings taken prior to sand blasting for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
Before Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
F-40-3-1	30-Jan	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.4	4.0	3.4	3.65
F-40-7-1	7-Jan	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.4	4.4	4.02
F-40-14-1	16-Jan	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.68
F-40-21-1	21-Jan	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.77
F-70-3-1	27-Jan	5.5	5.3	4.0	3.7	3.5	3.9	5.5	3.5	4.32
F-70-7-1	7-Jan	6.9	6.8	6.4	6.9	5.2	4.5	6.9	4.5	6.12
F-70-14-1	16-Jan	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.1	4.1	3.7	3.85
F-70-21-1	21-Jan	3.6	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.3	3.9	4.3	3.6	3.90
F-100-3-1	27-Jan	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.48
F-100-7-1	7-Jan	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.32
F-100-14-1	16-Jan	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.52
F-100-21-1	21-Jan	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.30
F-40-3-2	30-Jan	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.70
F-40-7-2	26-Nov	4.1	3.7	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.3	3.7	4.05
F-40-14-2	4-Dec	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.17
F-40-21-2	10-Dec	4.0	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.77
F-70-3-2	14-Dec	5.3	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	5.3	6.63
F-70-7-2	25-Nov	4.1	5.1	5.9	6.9	6.6	5.4	6.9	4.1	5.67
F-70-14-2	2-Dec	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.6	3.5	4.1	3.5	3.80
F-70-21-2	9-Dec	4.0	3.8	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.93
F-100-3-2	14-Dec	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.53
F-100-7-2	25-Nov	3.3	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.3	2.9	3.08
F-100-14-2	2-Dec	3.9	3.9	2.3	1.4	3.3	3.5	3.9	1.4	3.05
F-100-21-2	9-Dec	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.73

**Table 17: Moisture meter readings taken prior to sand blasting for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
Before Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
F-40-3-3	30-Jan	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.5	3.0	3.22
F-40-7-3	27-Nov	3.4	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.65
F-40-14-3	5-Dec	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.58
F-40-21-3	12-Dec	3.2	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.52
F-70-3-3	14-Dec	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	5.7	6.9	5.7	6.70
F-70-7-3	26-Nov	5.5	6.2	6.4	5.3	4.3	4.1	6.4	4.1	5.30
F-70-14-3	4-Dec	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.7	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.7	3.90
F-70-21-3	10-Dec	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.73
F-100-3-3	14-Dec	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.0	3.30
F-100-7-3	27-Nov	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.55
F-100-14-3	5-Dec	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.9	3.4	3.65
F-100-21-3	12-Dec	3.5	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.2	4.0	3.2	3.63
F-40-3-4	30-Jan	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.27
F-40-7-4	4-Dec	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.8	3.5	3.45
F-40-14-4	10-Dec	3.6	3.0	2.7	3.4	2.8	3.0	3.6	2.7	3.08
F-40-21-4	17-Dec	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.0	2.6	3.3	2.6	3.05
F-70-3-4	14-Dec	6.8	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.8	6.88
F-70-7-4	2-Dec	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.67
F-70-14-4	9-Dec	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.8	4.1	4.1	3.4	3.75
F-70-21-4	17-Dec	3.5	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.85
F-100-3-4	27-Jan	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.33
F-100-7-4	2-Dec	3.7	3.9	3.4	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.9	3.4	3.65
F-100-14-4	9-Dec	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.77
F-100-21-4	17-Dec	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.48

**Table 18: Moisture meter readings taken prior to sand blasting for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 5**

Moisture Meter Readings (%)										
Before Sand Blasting										
Slab	Date	Zone						Max	Min	Avg
		1	2	3	4	5	6			
F-40-3-5	30-Jan	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.6	3.2	3.38
F-40-7-5	5-Dec	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.7	3.1	3.45
F-40-14-5	12-Dec	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.50
F-40-21-5	17-Dec	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.33
F-70-3-5	27-Jan	5.4	5.1	4.0	3.8	3.8	5.3	5.4	3.8	4.57
F-70-7-5	4-Dec	3.9	4.1	3.8	4.2	4.5	4.1	4.5	3.8	4.10
F-70-14-5	10-Dec	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.27
F-70-21-5	17-Dec	2.8	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.3	2.8	3.03
F-100-3-5	27-Jan	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.25
F-100-7-5	5-Dec	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.40
F-100-14-5	12-Dec	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.1	3.7	3.1	3.38
F-100-21-5	17-Dec	3.4	3.0	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.30

## Appendix B - Concrete Compressive Strengths

**Table 19: Concrete cylinder strengths for control concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2**

Slab Label	Compressive Force (lbs.)				Average after Wet Cure		Average at Pull-off		Days after Batching
	Wet Cure		At Pull-Off		Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	
	1	2	1	2					
C-40-3-1	57,280	40,405	76,360	79,535	48,843	3,887	77,948	6,203	21
C-40-7-1	50,800	54,170	77,545	66,105	52,485	4,177	71,825	5,716	23
C-40-14-1	50,800	54,170			52,485	4,177	#N/A	#N/A	30
C-40-21-1	50,800	54,170	83,630	76,680	52,485	4,177	80,155	6,379	47
C-70-3-1	62,605	50,785	78,900	71,895	56,695	4,512	75,398	6,000	21
C-70-7-1	62,605	50,785	81,150	65,735	46,993	3,740	73,443	5,844	24
C-70-14-1	40,645	53,340	68,430	69,100	#N/A	#N/A	68,765	5,472	30
C-70-21-1	61,225	62,790	81,085	80,975	62,008	4,934	81,030	6,448	47
C-100-3-1	61,045	61,350	72,880	73,810	61,198	4,870	73,345	5,837	19
C-100-7-1	51,790	60,475	70,955	72,045	49,400	3,931	71,500	5,690	24
C-100-14-1	50,990	47,810			#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	30
C-100-21-1	50,990	47,810	56,545	68,705	49,400	3,931	62,625	4,984	37
C-40-3-2	55,080	61,415			58,248	4,635	#N/A	#N/A	19
C-40-7-2	71,265	56,815	83,250	86,635	64,040	5,096	84,943	6,760	23
C-40-14-2	71,265	56,815			64,040	5,096	#N/A	#N/A	30
C-40-21-2	71,265	56,815			64,040	5,096	#N/A	#N/A	37
C-70-3-2	54,790	59,090			56,940	4,531	#N/A	#N/A	19
C-70-7-2	55,695	52,850	57,305	72,680	54,273	4,319	64,993	5,172	23
C-70-14-2	43,270	47,335			45,303	3,605	#N/A	#N/A	30
C-70-21-2	43,270	47,335			45,303	3,605	#N/A	#N/A	37
C-100-3-2	61,045	61,350	72,880	73,810	61,198	4,870	73,345	5,837	19
C-100-7-2	58,080	59,655	78,620	72,605	58,868	4,685	75,613	6,017	23
C-100-14-2	58,080	59,655			58,868	4,685	#N/A	#N/A	30
C-100-21-2	45,035	50,455			47,745	3,799	#N/A	#N/A	37

**Table 20: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for control concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4**

Slab Label	Compressive Force (lbs.)				Average after Wet Cure		Average at Pull-off		Days after Batching
	Wet Cure		At Pull-Off		Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	
	1	2	1	2					
C-40-3-3	55,080	61,415			58,248	4,635	#N/A	#N/A	19
C-40-7-3	44,135	54,245	75,385	71,400	49,190	3,914	73,393	5,840	23
C-40-14-3	44,135	54,245	69,620	84,720	49,190	3,914	77,170	6,141	30
C-40-21-3	44,135	54,245			49,190	3,914	#N/A	#N/A	37
C-70-3-3	54,790	59,090			56,940	4,531	#N/A	#N/A	19
C-70-7-3	59,970	58,840	81,365	82,725	59,405	4,727	82,045	6,529	23
C-70-14-3	59,970	58,840	75,410	80,405	59,405	4,727	77,908	6,200	30
C-70-21-3	55,695	52,850			54,273	4,319	#N/A	#N/A	37
C-100-3-3	48,635	55,965			52,300	4,162	#N/A	#N/A	19
C-100-7-3	45,035	50,455	55,120	61,330	47,745	3,799	58,225	4,633	23
C-100-14-3	58,495	67,475	75,260	72,100	62,985	5,012	73,680	5,863	47
C-100-21-3	45,035	50,455			47,745	3,799	#N/A	#N/A	37
C-40-3-4	66,785	63,470	67,565	76,805	65,128	5,183	72,185	5,744	19
C-40-7-4	58,220	63,265	77,385	81,480	60,743	4,834	79,433	6,321	23
C-40-14-4	58,220	63,265	85,530	80,890	60,743	4,834	83,210	6,622	30
C-40-21-4	58,220	63,265	82,805	88,710	60,743	4,834	85,758	6,824	37
C-70-3-4	54,690	56,165	73,450	74,300	55,428	4,411	73,875	5,879	19
C-70-7-4	56,580	61,145	66,230	71,405	58,863	4,684	68,818	5,476	23
C-70-14-4	56,580	61,145	73,725	82,405	58,863	4,684	78,065	6,212	30
C-70-21-4	56,580	61,145	73,985	74,090	58,863	4,684	74,038	5,892	37
C-100-3-4	55,610	54,605	67,280	69,415	55,108	4,385	68,348	5,439	19
C-100-7-4	50,980	54,395	57,300	60,155	52,688	4,193	58,728	4,673	23
C-100-14-4	50,980	54,395	71,125	60,200	52,688	4,193	65,663	5,225	30
C-100-21-4	50,980	54,395	77,715	70,285	52,688	4,193	74,000	5,889	37

**Table 21: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for control concrete with Epoxy 5**

Slab Label	Compressive Force (lbs.)				Average after Wet Cure		Average at Pull-off		Days after Batching
	Wet Cure		At Pull-Off		Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	
	1	2	1	2					
C-40-3-5	66,785	63,470	67,565	76,805	65,128	5,183	72,185	5,744	19
C-40-7-5	62,695	58,390	80,395	88,100	60,543	4,818	84,248	6,704	23
C-40-14-5	62,695	58,390	82,460	90,550	60,543	4,818	86,505	6,884	30
C-40-21-5	62,695	58,390	87,725	90,555	60,543	4,818	89,140	7,094	37
C-70-3-5	54,690	56,165	73,450	74,300	55,428	4,411	73,875	5,879	19
C-70-7-5	57,140	55,730	71,340	73,125	56,435	4,491	72,233	5,748	23
C-70-14-5	57,140	55,730	80,445	80,570	56,435	4,491	80,508	6,407	30
C-70-21-5	57,140	55,730	74,210	80,010	56,435	4,491	77,110	6,136	37
C-100-3-5	55,610	54,605	67,280	69,415	55,108	4,385	68,348	5,439	19
C-100-7-5	39,675	53,520	67,205	64,605	46,598	3,708	65,905	5,245	23
C-100-14-5	39,675	53,520	65,750	67,865	46,598	3,708	66,808	5,316	30
C-100-21-5	39,675	53,520	64,650	70,745	46,598	3,708	67,698	5,387	37

**Table 22: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2**

Slab Label	Compressive Force (lbs.)				Average after Wet Cure		Average at Pull-off		Days after Batching
	Wet Cure		At Pull-Off		Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	
	1	2	1	2					
L-40-3-1	63,645	67,060	82,985	77,930	65,353	5,201	80,458	6,403	19
L-40-7-1	65,090	69,990	90,050	89,900	67,540	5,375	89,975	7,160	23
L-40-14-1	66,020	68,155	88,335	86,695	67,088	5,339	87,515	6,964	30
L-40-21-1	65,090	69,990	93,065	85,200	67,540	5,375	89,133	7,093	37
L-70-3-1	48,815	61,785	83,165	78,580	55,300	4,401	80,873	6,436	19
L-70-7-1	62,170	62,215	78,350	84,235	62,193	4,949	81,293	6,469	23
L-70-14-1	69,810	64,140	85,250	88,835	66,975	5,330	87,043	6,927	30
L-70-21-1	69,810	64,140	86,250	70,450	66,975	5,330	78,350	6,235	47
L-100-3-1	62,355	60,795	75,500	74,320	61,575	4,900	74,910	5,961	19
L-100-7-1			82,150	90,545	#N/A	#N/A	86,348	6,871	23
L-100-14-1			90,220	94,360	#N/A	#N/A	92,290	7,344	30
L-100-21-1			88,535	88,860	#N/A	#N/A	88,698	7,058	37
L-40-3-2	63,645	67,060	82,985	77,930	65,353	5,201	80,458	6,403	19
L-40-7-2	68,440	64,330	92,325	94,965	66,385	5,283	93,645	7,452	23
L-40-14-2	68,440	64,330	86,340	104,170	66,385	5,283	95,255	7,580	30
L-40-21-2	68,440	64,330	102,405	96,360	66,385	5,283	99,383	7,909	37
L-70-3-2	48,815	61,785	83,165	78,580	55,300	4,401	80,873	6,436	19
L-70-7-2	71,550	58,170	90,065	83,695	64,860	5,161	86,880	6,914	23
L-70-14-2	71,550	58,170	96,400	89,885	64,860	5,161	93,143	7,412	30
L-70-21-2	71,550	58,170	43,150	90,945	64,860	5,161	67,048	5,335	37
L-100-3-2	62,355	60,795	75,500	74,320	61,575	4,900	74,910	5,961	19
L-100-7-2	62,790	61,335	77,780	75,340	62,063	4,939	76,560	6,092	23
L-100-14-2	62,790	61,335	81,645	77,340	62,063	4,939	79,493	6,326	30
L-100-21-2	62,790	61,335	75,230	76,450	62,063	4,939	75,840	6,035	37



**Table 23: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4**

Slab Label	Compressive Force (lbs.)				Average after Wet Cure		Average at Pull-off		Days after Batching
	Wet Cure		At Pull-Off		Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	
	1	2	1	2					
L-40-3-3	66,605	68,980	82,985	77,930	67,793	5,395	80,458	6,403	19
L-40-7-3	72,895	72,120	92,170	91,165	72,508	5,770	91,668	7,295	23
L-40-14-3	72,895	72,120	92,515	97,855	72,508	5,770	95,185	7,575	30
L-40-21-3	72,895	72,120	95,115	98,280	72,508	5,770	96,698	7,695	37
L-70-3-3	67,125	66,115	83,165	78,580	66,620	5,301	80,873	6,436	19
L-70-7-3	63,355	64,445	84,585	68,255	63,900	5,085	76,420	6,081	23
L-70-14-3	63,355	64,445	81,645	88,535	63,900	5,085	85,090	6,771	30
L-70-21-3	63,355	64,445	84,360	89,840	63,900	5,085	87,100	6,931	37
L-100-3-3	62,355	60,795	75,500	74,320	61,575	4,900	74,910	5,961	19
L-100-7-3	68,070	67,140	87,130	75,705	67,605	5,380	81,418	6,479	23
L-100-14-3	68,070	67,140	91,075	90,340	67,605	5,380	90,708	7,218	30
L-100-21-3	68,070	67,140	88,205	82,205	67,605	5,380	85,205	6,780	37
L-40-3-4	63,280	62,950	57,405	78,580	63,115	5,023	67,993	5,411	19
L-40-7-4	61,355	65,885	90,505	85,925	63,620	5,063	88,215	7,020	23
L-40-14-4	61,355	65,885	91,130	87,700	63,620	5,063	89,415	7,115	30
L-40-21-4	61,355	65,885	85,105	86,430	63,620	5,063	85,768	6,825	37
L-70-3-4	64,905	61,145	74,825	75,340	63,025	5,015	75,083	5,975	19
L-70-7-4	62,260	61,520	79,910	80,110	61,890	4,925	80,010	6,367	23
L-70-14-4	62,260	61,520	79,305	84,605	61,890	4,925	81,955	6,522	30
L-70-21-4	62,260	61,520	85,105	86,430	61,890	4,925	85,768	6,825	37
L-100-3-4	61,890	64,280	78,920	77,165	63,085	5,020	78,043	6,210	19
L-100-7-4	54,545	59,805	69,860	74,250	57,175	4,550	72,055	5,734	23
L-100-14-4	54,545	59,805	74,115	75,865	57,175	4,550	74,990	5,968	30
L-100-21-4	54,545	59,805	79,230	73,405	57,175	4,550	76,318	6,073	37

**Table 24: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 5**

Slab Label	Compressive Force (lbs.)				Average after Wet Cure		Average at Pull-off		Days after Batching
	Wet Cure		At Pull-Off		Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	
	1	2	1	2					
L-40-3-5	63,280	62,950	57,405	78,580	63,115	5,023	67,993	5,411	19
L-40-7-5	72,855	74,030	84,395	91,315	73,443	5,844	87,855	6,991	23
L-40-14-5	72,855	74,030			73,443	5,844	#N/A	#N/A	30
L-40-21-5	72,855	74,030	102,475	88,390	73,443	5,844	95,433	7,594	37
L-70-3-5	64,905	61,145	74,825	75,340	63,025	5,015	75,083	5,975	19
L-70-7-5	69,245	63,140	92,420	87,570	66,193	5,267	89,995	7,162	23
L-70-14-5	69,245	63,140			66,193	5,267	#N/A	#N/A	30
L-70-21-5	69,810	64,140	86,250	70,450	66,975	5,330	78,350	6,235	47
L-100-3-5	61,890	64,280	78,920	77,165	63,085	5,020	78,043	6,210	19
L-100-7-5	55,345	55,365	73,430	67,380	55,355	4,405	70,405	5,603	23
L-100-14-5	55,345	55,365	69,500	76,210	55,355	4,405	72,855	5,798	30
L-100-21-5	55,345	55,365	69,005	75,015	55,355	4,405	72,010	5,730	37

**Table 25: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 1 or Epoxy 2**

Slab Label	Compressive Force (lbs.)				Average after Wet Cure		Average at Pull-off		Days after Batching
	Wet Cure		At Pull-Off		Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	
	1	2	1	2					
F-40-3-1	51,770	50,055	89,430	86,005	50,913	4,051	87,718	6,980	22
F-40-7-1	60,350	59,340	93,570	79,480	59,845	4,762	86,525	6,885	23
F-40-14-1	60,350	59,340	97,350	96,555	59,845	4,762	96,953	7,715	35
F-40-21-1	60,350	59,340	94,480	96,120	59,845	4,762	95,300	7,584	38
F-70-3-1	57,740	56,850	90,170	96,825	57,295	4,559	93,498	7,440	24
F-70-7-1	61,045	62,910	87,600	88,645	61,978	4,932	88,123	7,013	23
F-70-14-1	61,045	62,910	95,390	89,215	61,978	4,932	92,303	7,345	35
F-70-21-1	61,045	62,910	94,510	94,105	61,978	4,932	94,308	7,505	38
F-100-3-1	77,170	74,590	86,400	82,980	75,880	6,038	84,690	6,739	24
F-100-7-1	77,085	73,245	81,475	71,325	75,165	5,981	76,400	6,080	23
F-100-14-1	77,085	73,245	85,415	88,810	75,165	5,981	87,113	6,932	35
F-100-21-1	77,085	73,245	88,045	83,455	75,165	5,981	85,750	6,824	38
F-40-3-2	51,770	50,055	89,430	86,005	50,913	4,051	87,718	6,980	22
F-40-7-2	58,265	48,140	78,070	90,500	53,203	4,234	84,285	6,707	23
F-40-14-2	58,265	48,140	96,000	93,080	53,203	4,234	94,540	7,523	30
F-40-21-2	58,265	48,140	102,050	94,495	53,203	4,234	98,273	7,820	37
F-70-3-2	71,790	68,495	95,520	89,775	70,143	5,582	92,648	7,373	19
F-70-7-2	56,615	56,030	79,685	80,450	56,323	4,482	80,068	6,372	23
F-70-14-2	56,615	56,030	81,292	80,100	56,323	4,482	80,696	6,422	30
F-70-21-2	56,615	56,030	75,410	80,275	56,323	4,482	77,843	6,195	37
F-100-3-2	77,780	75,015	78,995	78,990	76,398	6,080	78,993	6,286	19
F-100-7-2	80,950	61,395	78,775	88,475	71,173	5,664	83,625	6,655	23
F-100-14-2	80,950	61,395	75,920	74,715	71,173	5,664	75,318	5,994	30
F-100-21-2	80,950	61,395	84,830	81,865	71,173	5,664	83,348	6,633	37

**Table 26: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 3 or Epoxy 4**

Slab Label	Compressive Force (lbs.)				Average after Wet Cure		Average at Pull-off		Days after Batching
	Wet Cure		At Pull-Off		Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	
	1	2	1	2					
F-40-3-3	51,770	50,055	89,430	86,005	50,913	4,051	87,718	6,980	22
F-40-7-3	55,625	63,075	87,290	85,700	59,350	4,723	86,495	6,883	23
F-40-14-3	55,625	63,075	75,320	89,185	59,350	4,723	82,253	6,545	30
F-40-21-3	55,625	63,075	88,925	100,565	59,350	4,723	94,745	7,540	37
F-70-3-3	71,790	68,495	95,520	89,775	70,143	5,582	92,648	7,373	19
F-70-7-3	60,030	49,385	82,760	64,390	54,708	4,353	73,575	5,855	23
F-70-14-3	60,030	49,385	75,320	89,185	54,708	4,353	82,253	6,545	30
F-70-21-3	60,030	49,385	98,170	98,175	54,708	4,353	98,173	7,812	37
F-100-3-3	77,780	75,015	78,995	78,990	76,398	6,080	78,993	6,286	19
F-100-7-3	66,480	72,795	71,055	81,375	69,638	5,542	76,215	6,065	23
F-100-14-3	66,480	72,795	65,970	89,550	69,638	5,542	77,760	6,188	30
F-100-21-3	66,480	72,795	89,770	83,480	69,638	5,542	86,625	6,893	37
F-40-3-4	51,770	50,055	89,430	86,005	50,913	4,051	87,718	6,980	22
F-40-7-4	60,425	63,400	101,180	95,905	61,913	4,927	98,543	7,842	23
F-40-14-4	60,425	63,400	93,975	99,000	61,913	4,927	96,488	7,678	30
F-40-21-4	60,425	63,400	99,350	92,405	61,913	4,927	95,878	7,630	37
F-70-3-4	71,790	68,495	95,520	89,775	70,143	5,582	92,648	7,373	19
F-70-7-4	63,205	69,050	72,775	95,310	66,128	5,262	84,043	6,688	23
F-70-14-4	63,205	69,050	101,395	97,155	66,128	5,262	99,275	7,900	30
F-70-21-4	63,205	69,050	96,090	86,975	66,128	5,262	91,533	7,284	37
F-100-3-4	77,170	74,590	86,400	82,980	75,880	6,038	84,690	6,739	24
F-100-7-4	80,420	81,055	93,730	94,825	80,738	6,425	94,278	7,502	23
F-100-14-4	80,420	81,055	93,680	91,875	80,738	6,425	92,778	7,383	30
F-100-21-4	80,420	81,055	96,140	96,550	80,738	6,425	96,345	7,667	37

**Table 27: Concrete cylinder compressive strengths for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 5**

Slab Label	Compressive Force (lbs.)				Average after Wet Cure		Average at Pull-off		Days after Batching
	Wet Cure		At Pull-Off		Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	Force (lbs.)	Stress (psi)	
	1	2	1	2					
F-40-3-5	51,770	50,055	89,430	86,005	50,913	4,051	87,718	6,980	22
F-40-7-5	55,210	53,585	88,600	85,335	54,398	4,329	86,968	6,921	23
F-40-14-5	55,210	53,585	92,495	95,060	54,398	4,329	93,778	7,463	30
F-40-21-5	55,210	53,585	97,480	76,260	54,398	4,329	86,870	6,913	37
F-70-3-5	57,740	56,850	90,170	96,825	57,295	4,559	93,498	7,440	24
F-70-7-5	67,010	71,340	97,475	85,980	69,175	5,505	91,728	7,299	23
F-70-14-5	67,010	71,340	93,990	97,085	69,175	5,505	95,538	7,603	30
F-70-21-5	67,010	71,340	91,970	98,505	69,175	5,505	95,238	7,579	37
F-100-3-5	77,170	74,590	86,400	82,980	75,880	6,038	84,690	6,739	24
F-100-7-5	78,395	65,840	90,790	92,620	72,118	5,739	91,705	7,298	23
F-100-14-5	78,395	65,840	80,250	77,810	72,118	5,739	79,030	6,289	30
F-100-21-5	78,395	65,840	99,570	68,070	72,118	5,739	83,820	6,670	37

## Appendix C - Pull-off Test Results

**Table 28: Pull-off test results from control concrete with Epoxy 1 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
c-40-3-1	4-Feb	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	83	87	111	104	520	399	416	512
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2
c-70-3-1	4-Feb	123.7	Pull-off (psi)	102	58	34	83	318	265	269	280
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
c-100-3-1	1-Jun	123	Pull-off (psi)	111	90	132	92	209	399	296	365
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	4	3	2	2
c-40-7-1	11-Jan	123	Pull-off (psi)	111	70	60	105	358	309	341	409
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2
c-70-7-1	7-Feb	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	160	92	119	90	377	328	346	427
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2
c-100-7-1	7-Feb	123.9	Pull-off (psi)	132	87	79	107	388	326	277	331
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3
c-40-14-1	18-Jan	122.9	Pull-off (psi)	73	102	107	79	384	292	303	348
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2
c-70-14-1	0-Jan	121-125	Pull-off (psi)	446	299	360	318	243	444	390	386
			Failure Type	3	3	2	5	3	1	5	3
c-100-14-1	0-Jan	0	Pull-off (psi)	250	273	218	328	354	337	290	318
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	5
c-40-21-1	28-Jan	122.5	Pull-off (psi)	143	113	104	102	418	392	322	435
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
c-70-21-1	28-Jan	122.6	Pull-off (psi)	124	124	136	128	405	478	427	435
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
c-100-21-1	0-Jan	0	Pull-off (psi)	123	282	243	335	277	290	265	328
			Failure Type	3	2	3	2	2	2	5	2

**Table 29: Pull-off test results from control concrete with Epoxy 2 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
c-40-3-2	9-Oct	124	Pull-off (psi)	105	92	152	188	463	390	533	375
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	1	2	2	1
c-70-3-2	9-Oct	124.5	Pull-off (psi)	250	104	115	215	414	410	484	354
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1
c-100-3-2	1-Jun	131.8	Pull-off (psi)	201	88	119	233	348	318	392	269
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
c-40-7-2	0-Jan	121-125	Pull-off (psi)	333	149	196	282	222	218	478	360
			Failure Type	3	3	3	6	3	3	2	5
c-70-7-2	27-Sep	122.7	Pull-off (psi)	250	218	168	307	488	367	441	337
			Failure Type	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	2
c-100-7-2	0-Jan	121-125	Pull-off (psi)	343	258	290	252	344	457	388	454
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
c-40-14-2	0-Jan	121.2	Pull-off (psi)	277	232	326	262	344	262	378	473
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
c-70-14-2	0-Jan	121.2	Pull-off (psi)	290	207	245	278	363	248	222	371
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
c-100-14-2	0-Jan	121.2	Pull-off (psi)	237	152	211	124	433	395	416	433
			Failure Type	2	2	3	5	2	2	2	2
c-40-21-2	24-May	0	Pull-off (psi)	158	190	264	218	474	286	441	388
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2
c-70-21-2	24-May	0	Pull-off (psi)	183	173	186	132	486	280	318	354
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
c-100-21-2	10-Oct	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	205	173	224	262	277	177	303	375
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1

**Table 30: Pull-off test results from control concrete with Epoxy 3 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
c-40-3-3	9-Oct	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	152	109	143	205	420	369	442	393
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	1
c-70-3-3	9-Oct	122.6	Pull-off (psi)	290	162	124	282	307	420	331	386
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
c-100-3-3	9-Oct	122.6	Pull-off (psi)	228	232	190	264	459	373	446	358
			Failure Type	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	1
c-40-7-3	27-Sep	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	324	160	233	232	446	363	452	418
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	1	2	1	1
c-70-7-3	13-Jun	152.2	Pull-off (psi)	85	85	70	109	267	269	232	228
			Failure Type	3	4	3	3	2	2	3	3
c-100-7-3	26-Sep	124.2	Pull-off (psi)	222	275	250	286	354	311	365	369
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
c-40-14-3	3-Oct	122	Pull-off (psi)	344	292	277	384	433	280	414	424
			Failure Type	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	2
c-70-14-3	20-Jun	126.9	Pull-off (psi)	318	243	213	216	269	422	386	431
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2
c-100-14-3	18-Jan	124.1	Pull-off (psi)	237	158	175	290	344	493	405	354
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1
c-40-21-3	10-Oct	122.4	Pull-off (psi)	224	128	137	352	499	467	369	441
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	2
c-70-21-3	10-Oct	122.3	Pull-off (psi)	333	226	215	296	474	480	363	352
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	2
c-100-21-3	10-Oct	124.2	Pull-off (psi)	341	280	262	213	292	166	333	456
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	2	1	1



**Table 31: Pull-off test results from control concrete with Epoxy 4 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
c-40-3-4	1-Sep	123.4	Pull-off (psi)	328	230	186	311	424	414	450	373
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	1
c-70-3-4	1-Sep	125	Pull-off (psi)	222	151	107	175	401	326	273	305
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
c-100-3-4	1-Sep	124.7	Pull-off (psi)	107	152	173	226	409	360	346	365
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	1	1	1
c-40-7-4	7-Aug	123.5	Pull-off (psi)	297	207	162	250	481	371	350	431
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	2
c-70-7-4	8-Aug	126.2	Pull-off (psi)	209	162	130	256	348	371	354	433
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2
c-100-7-4	7-Aug	122	Pull-off (psi)	256	151	184	301	183	409	395	401
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	1
c-40-14-4	14-Aug	123.8	Pull-off (psi)	356	232	198	341	407	456	403	456
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	1
c-70-14-4	15-Aug	124.9	Pull-off (psi)	299	239	203	222	465	425	358	437
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	1	1	1
c-100-14-4	14-Aug	124.4	Pull-off (psi)	269	296	224	361	401	424	354	390
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
c-40-21-4	21-Aug	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	296	256	247	209	533	499	373	414
			Failure Type	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1
c-70-21-4	22-Aug	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	328	237	239	344	399	416	388	452
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
c-100-21-4	21-Aug	123.9	Pull-off (psi)	250	169	192	284	256	367	311	358
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1

**Table 32: Pull-off test results from control concrete with Epoxy 5 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
c-40-3-5	1-Sep	124.5	Pull-off (psi)	115	107	66	166	352	316	280	380
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
c-70-3-5	1-Sep	123.6	Pull-off (psi)	87	75	113	98	307	265	169	294
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
c-100-3-5	1-Sep	122.7	Pull-off (psi)	173	145	160	235	397	375	348	265
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	2
c-40-7-5	15-Aug	125.9	Pull-off (psi)	211	190	169	275	405	457	473	467
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
c-70-7-5	14-Aug	122.8	Pull-off (psi)	245	102	98	264	265	305	348	416
			Failure Type	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	2
c-100-7-5	14-Aug		Pull-off (psi)	273	243	224	405	427	354	386	459
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
c-40-14-5	22-Aug	123.7	Pull-off (psi)	267	188	200	331	409	392	420	378
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	2
c-70-14-5	21-Aug	124.9	Pull-off (psi)	311	254	215	280	488	407	446	433
			Failure Type	1	3	3	2	2	1	1	1
c-100-14-5	21-Aug	123.4	Pull-off (psi)	369	226	297	326	395	467	224	437
			Failure Type	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
c-40-21-5	30-Aug	122	Pull-off (psi)	220	117	143	239	433	333	393	433
			Failure Type	3	4	3	3	1	2	2	2
c-70-21-5	28-Aug	124.5	Pull-off (psi)	273	247	220	275	457	441	405	407
			Failure Type	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
c-100-21-5	28-Aug	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	316	262	358	230	388	442	309	429
			Failure Type	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1

**Table 33: Pull-off test results from low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 1 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
L-40-3-1	28-Jul	125.2	Pull-off (psi)	102	75	62	100	277	258	247	314
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
L-70-3-1	28-Jul	124.3	Pull-off (psi)	92	100	83	113	433	392	378	356
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2
L-100-3-1	27-Jul	119.1	Pull-off (psi)	173	105	79	119	303	354	322	328
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
L-40-7-1	11-Jan	122.8	Pull-off (psi)	132	83	49	96	331	324	296	339
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
L-70-7-1	19-Jul		Pull-off (psi)	141	73	105	137	326	307	241	186
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
L-100-7-1	26-Jun	125.8	Pull-off (psi)	175	115	118	194	213	290	267	264
			Failure Type	5	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
L-40-14-1	2-Aug	121.1	Pull-off (psi)	122	104	137	119	363	390	352	388
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
L-70-14-1	18-Jan	123	Pull-off (psi)	128	77	90	128	405	282	301	367
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2
L-100-14-1	3-Jul	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	307	322	296	175	454	473	414	546
			Failure Type	3	3	3	5	5	2	1	1
L-40-21-1	28-Jan	122.6	Pull-off (psi)	139	102	109	113	506	520	444	538
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	1	2	2
L-70-21-1	28-Jan	122.7	Pull-off (psi)	207	126	152	184	516	454	489	533
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
L-100-21-1	10-Jul	120	Pull-off (psi)	284	211	215	288	410	516	474	457
			Failure Type	3	3	5	2	3	2	4	1

**Table 34: Pull-off test results from low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 2 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
L-40-3-2	28-Jul	120.3	Pull-off (psi)	113	126	156	151	409	373	377	373
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	1
L-70-3-2	28-Jul	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	260	147	198	280	482	482	499	484
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	1
L-100-3-2	27-Jul	127.9	Pull-off (psi)	177	126	213	152	448	363	386	388
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	2
L-40-7-2	18-Jul	127.5	Pull-off (psi)	264	147	98	211	469	450	393	312
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
L-70-7-2	18-Jul	126.2	Pull-off (psi)	177	77	134	120	156	403	326	393
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
L-100-7-2	18-Jul	121.8	Pull-off (psi)	294	203	175	301	427	418	307	439
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	1	2	2
L-40-14-2	26-Jul	121.5	Pull-off (psi)	100	94	96	181	222	279	279	358
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
L-70-14-2	26-Jul	122.5	Pull-off (psi)	130	113	72	175	346	320	288	420
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
L-100-14-2	24-Jul	119.5	Pull-off (psi)	247	184	100	335	437	386	348	425
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
L-40-21-2	1-Aug	127.7	Pull-off (psi)	222	328	322	337	506	531	527	552
			Failure Type	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2
L-70-21-2	1-Aug	124.9	Pull-off (psi)	375	237	188	226	499	422	537	407
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	2
L-100-21-2	31-Jul	121.9	Pull-off (psi)	245	254	273	311	425	373	392	446
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

**Table 35: Pull-off test results from low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 3 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
L-40-3-3	28-Jul	125.8	Pull-off (psi)	235	139	109	248	473	446	456	435
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	2
L-70-3-3	28-Jul	121.3	Pull-off (psi)	160	120	70	68	371	407	465	0
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	0
L-100-3-3	27-Jul	127.8	Pull-off (psi)	149	96	98	235	418	343	348	303
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2
L-40-7-3	26-Jul	121.8	Pull-off (psi)	209	134	143	141	280	393	0	433
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	0	2
L-70-7-3	25-Jul	122.6	Pull-off (psi)	164	79	66	85	363	307	299	318
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
L-100-7-3	24-Jul	124.2	Pull-off (psi)	192	218	184	301	318	401	247	350
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
L-40-14-3	1-Aug	124.2	Pull-off (psi)	177	130	104	224	414	471	420	350
			Failure Type	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	2
L-70-14-3	1-Aug	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	224	149	169	211	495	299	365	465
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
L-100-14-3	31-Jul	125	Pull-off (psi)	230	130	188	256	431	414	501	365
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	1
L-40-21-3	8-Aug	123.6	Pull-off (psi)	344	201	177	294	480	486	474	444
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	1
L-70-21-3	8-Aug	123.5	Pull-off (psi)	316	158	124	333	361	361	439	489
			Failure Type	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	2
L-100-21-3	7-Aug	123.9	Pull-off (psi)	220	179	87	248	471	418	395	433
			Failure Type	3	3	4	3	2	1	2	2

**Table 36: Pull-off test results from low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 4 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
L-40-3-4	8-Sep	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	207	166	198	230	350	363	314	418
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	1
L-70-3-4	8-Sep	122.4	Pull-off (psi)	126	68	73	166	344	0	250	386
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	5	3	3
L-100-3-4	7-Sep	122	Pull-off (psi)	230	156	132	201	422	377	365	344
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
L-40-7-4	8-Aug	122.3	Pull-off (psi)	267	184	226	260	433	410	471	452
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	2
L-70-7-4	9-Aug	122.4	Pull-off (psi)	222	132	279	284	463	427	444	425
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	1	2	1
L-100-7-4	21-Aug	124.4	Pull-off (psi)	245	141	124	260	392	395	474	486
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1
L-40-14-4	15-Aug	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	209	156	152	354	442	401	448	390
			Failure Type	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	2
L-70-14-4	16-Aug	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	348	188	218	339	480	512	482	450
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
L-100-14-4	28-Aug	122.4	Pull-off (psi)	356	216	284	305	395	412	471	501
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
L-40-21-4	22-Aug	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	247	177	124	326	491	437	435	457
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	2
L-70-21-4	23-Aug	123.3	Pull-off (psi)	292	141	194	348	448	461	384	493
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2
L-100-21-4	4-Sep	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	331	200	215	356	405	329	378	422
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	2

**Table 37: Pull-off test results from low-cracking concrete with Epoxy 5 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
L-40-3-5	8-Sep	125	Pull-off (psi)	299	177	104	224	424	375	407	441
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	2
L-70-3-5	8-Sep	122	Pull-off (psi)	100	92	137	98	399	277	299	228
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	2
L-100-3-5	7-Sep	122.5	Pull-off (psi)	213	136	119	213	297	348	352	333
			Failure Type	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	2
L-40-7-5	30-Aug	123.5	Pull-off (psi)	156	139	122	130	388	361	435	439
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
L-70-7-5	30-Aug	122.3	Pull-off (psi)	124	104	88	126	344	280	307	324
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
L-100-7-5	28-Aug	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	339	154	177	388	433	437	467	392
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	1	2	1
L-40-14-5	5-Sep	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	247	239	235	365	444	344	467	388
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
L-70-14-5	5-Sep	123	Pull-off (psi)	130	104	90	192	209	241	258	207
			Failure Type	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
L-100-14-5	4-Sep	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	294	154	154	230	365	239	328	216
			Failure Type	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
L-40-21-5	12-Sep	122.9	Pull-off (psi)	282	277	288	395	499	465	433	264
			Failure Type	1	3	3	2	2	1	2	6
L-70-21-5	28-Jan	122.7	Pull-off (psi)	267	130	96	226	435	467	452	450
			Failure Type	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	2
L-100-21-5	12-Sep	122	Pull-off (psi)	277	168	136	279	457	331	416	441
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2

**Table 38: Pull-off test results from fly ash concrete with Epoxy 1 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
F-40-3-1	1-Feb	123	Pull-off (psi)	136	90	85	173	373	371	410	337
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
F-70-3-1	30-Jan	122	Pull-off (psi)	271	122	117	378	324	457	433	518
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	1
F-100-3-1	30-Jan	122.3	Pull-off (psi)	149	117	184	288	503	431	399	399
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2
F-40-7-1	9-Jan	123.8	Pull-off (psi)	192	102	104	115	446	361	363	397
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
F-70-7-1	9-Jan	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	160	87	109	196	388	405	0	471
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	2	6	2
F-100-7-1	9-Jan	124.3	Pull-off (psi)	209	109	98	168	463	314	433	429
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
F-40-14-1	18-Jan	123.2	Pull-off (psi)	113	128	109	198	510	414	437	484
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
F-70-14-1	18-Jan	122.4	Pull-off (psi)	230	124	119	264	424	388	390	435
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
F-100-14-1	18-Jan	123.4	Pull-off (psi)	390	143	154	320	407	465	508	439
			Failure Type	2	3	3	3	1	1	2	2
F-40-21-1	24-Jan	122.4	Pull-off (psi)	194	122	92	209	542	508	499	407
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	1
F-70-21-1	24-Jan	123.6	Pull-off (psi)	279	258	218	369	520	435	471	548
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1
F-100-21-1	24-Jan	123.4	Pull-off (psi)	288	156	158	288	501	454	473	442
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	1



**Table 39: Pull-off test results from fly ash concrete with Epoxy 2 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
F-40-3-2	1-Feb	122	Pull-off (psi)	294	175	262	256	523	420	463	491
			Failure Type	2	3	2	2	1	1	1	1
F-70-3-2	17-Dec	123.4	Pull-off (psi)	220	111	117	149	469	390	378	448
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
F-100-3-2	17-Dec	122.5	Pull-off (psi)	198	117	107	194	412	418	427	343
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	2
F-40-7-2	28-Nov	124.2	Pull-off (psi)	316	164	196	329	435	446	403	424
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2
F-70-7-2	28-Nov	123.1	Pull-off (psi)	94	188	186	203	416	378	326	358
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
F-100-7-2	28-Nov	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	280	186	169	211	316	356	424	456
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	2
F-40-14-2	7-Dec	122.6	Pull-off (psi)	258	265	226	269	497	418	480	418
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2
F-70-14-2	5-Dec	123	Pull-off (psi)	260	186	196	235	431	393	343	414
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	2
F-100-14-2	5-Dec	124.3	Pull-off (psi)	232	186	137	280	442	448	433	435
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1
F-40-21-2	13-Dec	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	333	158	162	224	211	316	365	473
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	2
F-70-21-2	12-Dec	122	Pull-off (psi)	335	264	248	354	427	506	454	478
			Failure Type	2	2	3	2	2	1	1	2
F-100-21-2	12-Dec	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	296	290	230	309	427	540	369	497
			Failure Type	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	2

**Table 40: Pull-off test results for fly ash concrete with Epoxy 3 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
F-40-3-3	1-Feb	123.6	Pull-off (psi)	211	160	120	341	382	437	474	422
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	1
F-70-3-3	17-Dec	123.4	Pull-off (psi)	200	98	109	284	441	393	424	373
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
F-100-3-3	17-Dec	123.2	Pull-off (psi)	262	224	194	307	350	478	473	322
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	1
F-40-7-3	30-Nov	124	Pull-off (psi)	233	152	213	184	439	429	337	407
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
F-70-7-3	28-Nov	122.3	Pull-off (psi)	245	181	160	285	384	326	375	377
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
F-100-7-3	30-Nov	122	Pull-off (psi)	149	177	271	252	503	375	459	427
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	1
F-40-14-3	8-Dec	123.3	Pull-off (psi)	250	260	179	358	476	439	506	384
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
F-70-14-3	7-Dec	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	203	164	147	224	367	373	403	407
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
F-100-14-3	8-Dec	122.9	Pull-off (psi)	254	273	273	311	459	501	399	495
			Failure Type	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
F-40-21-3	14-Dec	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	318	305	284	250	506	412	200	384
			Failure Type	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	2
F-70-21-3	13-Dec	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	243	207	224	216	441	441	224	250
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
F-100-21-3	14-Dec	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	279	188	279	279	478	457	410	420
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	1	1	1	1

**Table 41: Pull-off test results for fly ash slabs with Epoxy 4 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
F-40-3-4	1-Feb	122.7	Pull-off (psi)	316	117	62	282	459	501	471	497
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	2
F-70-3-4	17-Dec	122.6	Pull-off (psi)	337	194	109	233	533	478	489	371
			Failure Type	2	3	3	3	2	1	1	2
F-100-3-4	30-Jan	122.3	Pull-off (psi)	173	205	243	186	465	542	452	546
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	1	2	1	2
F-40-7-4	7-Dec	122.6	Pull-off (psi)	269	162	192	292	467	405	437	516
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	2
F-70-7-4	5-Dec	123.5	Pull-off (psi)	262	128	119	264	441	333	467	471
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
F-100-7-4	5-Dec	122.4	Pull-off (psi)	243	156	183	267	442	461	450	506
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
F-40-14-4	13-Dec	122.3	Pull-off (psi)	388	258	273	331	505	497	427	469
			Failure Type	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	2
F-70-14-4	12-Dec	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	280	200	188	318	527	527	521	409
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
F-100-14-4	12-Dec	122	Pull-off (psi)	316	284	309	378	497	422	518	467
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1
F-40-21-4	20-Dec	124.1	Pull-off (psi)	262	215	160	331	420	416	352	442
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	1
F-70-21-4	20-Dec	123.2	Pull-off (psi)	312	196	267	186	452	501	521	422
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
F-100-21-4	20-Dec	122.8	Pull-off (psi)	224	277	248	262	425	395	360	531
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1

**Table 42: Pull-off test results for fly ash slabs with Epoxy 5 overlay**

Pull-off Test Results											
Slab Label	Date	Temperature (°F)		Pull-off Tests at 122°F				Pull-off Tests at 73°F			
				Pull-off Location				Pull-off Location			
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
F-40-3-5	1-Feb	122	Pull-off (psi)	141	119	102	130	412	312	369	378
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
F-70-3-5	30-Jan	122.7	Pull-off (psi)	239	181	181	279	503	395	446	450
			Failure Type	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
F-100-3-5	30-Jan	122.4	Pull-off (psi)	326	145	111	286	510	514	531	395
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	1
F-40-7-5	8-Dec	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	143	92	73	151	350	316	322	367
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
F-70-7-5	7-Dec	123.6	Pull-off (psi)	384	218	203	384	463	489	335	435
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
F-100-7-5	8-Dec	123.6	Pull-off (psi)	166	190	233	314	446	478	508	478
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	1
F-40-14-5	14-Dec	122.1	Pull-off (psi)	151	111	122	188	393	441	290	505
			Failure Type	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	1
F-70-14-5	13-Dec	123	Pull-off (psi)	307	228	196	360	505	457	467	478
			Failure Type	2	3	3	2	1	1	2	1
F-100-14-5	14-Dec	122.5	Pull-off (psi)	248	243	324	331	535	514	418	552
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
F-40-21-5	20-Dec	122.7	Pull-off (psi)	264	160	128	254	463	361	503	544
			Failure Type	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
F-70-21-5	20-Dec	122.2	Pull-off (psi)	377	105	222	211	523	439	425	369
			Failure Type	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	2
F-100-21-5	20-Dec	123.4	Pull-off (psi)	262	294	348	318	360	388	489	535
			Failure Type	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2

## Appendix D - Pull-off Failure Types

**Table 43: Failure types for control slabs**

Failure Types for Control Slabs								
Wet Cure Temp	Drying Time	Pull-off Temp	Epoxy System	Failure Type				
				1	2	3	4	5
40 F Wet Cure	3 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 2	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	2	1	1	0	0
			Epoxy 4	4	0	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
	7 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	3	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	2	2	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	1	2	0	1
			Epoxy 3	3	1	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
	14 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	1	2	1	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	2	2	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	2	2	0	0
Epoxy 3			2	2	0	0	0	
Epoxy 4			2	2	0	0	0	
Epoxy 5			1	3	0	0	0	

	21 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 4	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	3	1	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 3	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	3	1	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	1	3	0	0	0
70 F Wet Cure	3 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
	7 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	1	1	2	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	3	1	0
			Epoxy 4	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 5	1	1	2	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
14 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	1	2	0	1	
		Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0	
		Epoxy 3	0	1	3	0	0	
		Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0	
		Epoxy 5	1	1	2	0	0	
	Room Temp	Epoxy 1	1	0	2	0	1	
		Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0	
		Epoxy 3	0	2	2	0	0	
		Epoxy 4	3	1	0	0	0	
		Epoxy 5	3	1	0	0	0	
21	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0	

	Days		Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
100 F Wet Cure	3 Days	Hot	Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 1	0	2	1	1	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	4	0	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	3	1	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
	7 Days	Hot	Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 1	0	2	2	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 2	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	3	1	0	0	0
			Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
14 Days	Hot	Epoxy 2	0	2	1	0	1	
		Epoxy 3	0	1	3	0	0	
		Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0	
		Epoxy 5	1	3	0	0	0	
		Epoxy 1	0	2	1	0	1	
	Room Temp	Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0	
		Epoxy 3	3	1	0	0	0	
		Epoxy 4	4	0	0	0	0	
		Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0	
		Epoxy 1	0	2	2	0	0	
21 Days	Hot	Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0	

			Epoxy 3	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	1	3	0	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	3	0	0	1
			Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	3	1	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	3	1	0	0	0

**Table 44: Failure types for low-cracking slabs**

Failure Types for Low-Cracking Slabs								
Wet Cure Temp	Drying Time	Pull-off Temp	Epoxy System	Failure Type				
				1	2	3	4	5
40 F Wet Cure	3 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	1	2	1	0	0
			Epoxy 4	2	0	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	2	1	1	0	0
	7 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
	14 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
Epoxy 2			0	0	4	0	0	
Epoxy 3			0	0	3	1	0	



		Room Temp	Epoxy 4	1	0	3	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	3	1	0	0	0
	21 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 5	1	1	2	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	1	3	0	0	0
70 F Wet Cure	3 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 2	2	0	2	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	2	1	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	0	3	0	1
			Epoxy 5	1	1	2	0	0
	7 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
Room Temp		Epoxy 1	0	2	2	0	0	
		Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0	
		Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0	
		Epoxy 4	3	1	0	0	0	
		Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0	
14 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0	
		Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0	
		Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0	
		Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0	

		Room Temp	Epoxy 5	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 1	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	2	2	0	0	0
	Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0		
	21 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	3	1	0
			Epoxy 4	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	1	3	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	1	3	0	0	0
Epoxy 5			1	3	0	0	0	
100 F Wet Cure	3 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	1	3	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	1	3	0	0	0
	7 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	1	2	0	1
			Epoxy 2	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	2	2	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	4	0	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	3	1	0	0	0
14 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	3	0	1	
		Epoxy 2	0	2	2	0	0	
		Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0	
		Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0	
		Epoxy 5	0	3	1	0	0	

		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	2	1	0	0	1
			Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
	21 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	1	2	0	1
			Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	3	1	0
			Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	1	1	1	1	0
			Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0

**Table 45: Failure types for fly ash slabs**

Failure Types for Fly Ash Slabs								
Wet Cure Temp	Drying Time	Pull-off Temp	Epoxy System	Failure Type				
				1	2	3	4	5
40 F Wet Cure	3 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	4	0	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
	7 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
Room Temp		Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0	
Epoxy 2	2	2	0	0	0			

			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	3	1	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	1	3	0	0
	14 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	3	1	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	1	3	0	0	0
	21 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	1	3	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	3	1	0	0	0
Epoxy 4			2	2	0	0	0	
Epoxy 5			0	4	0	0	0	
70 F Wet Cure	3 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	1	3	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 4	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
	7 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	2	1	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0

	14 Days	Hot	Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 1	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	2	2	0	0
		Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0	
		Epoxy 5	0	2	2	0	0	
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
	Epoxy 4		0	4	0	0	0	
	Epoxy 5		3	1	0	0	0	
	21 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	3	1	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	3	1	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0
Epoxy 5			1	3	0	0	0	
100 F Wet Cure	3 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	2	2	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	4	0	0	0	0
			Epoxy 4	2	2	0	0	0
			Epoxy 5	3	1	0	0	0
	7 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 2	0	0	4	0	0
			Epoxy 3	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 4	0	1	3	0	0
			Epoxy 5	0	0	4	0	0
		Room Temp	Epoxy 1	0	4	0	0	0
			Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
			Epoxy 3	1	3	0	0	0
Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0			

		Epoxy 5	3	1	0	0	0
14 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	1	3	0	0
		Epoxy 2	0	2	2	0	0
		Epoxy 3	0	3	1	0	0
		Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0
		Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
	Room Temp	Epoxy 1	2	2	0	0	0
		Epoxy 2	2	2	0	0	0
		Epoxy 3	0	4	0	0	0
		Epoxy 4	3	1	0	0	0
		Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
21 Days	Hot	Epoxy 1	0	1	3	0	0
		Epoxy 2	0	3	1	0	0
		Epoxy 3	0	1	3	0	0
		Epoxy 4	0	4	0	0	0
		Epoxy 5	0	4	0	0	0
	Room Temp	Epoxy 1	2	2	0	0	0
		Epoxy 2	1	3	0	0	0
		Epoxy 3	4	0	0	0	0
		Epoxy 4	1	3	0	0	0
		Epoxy 5	3	1	0	0	0

## Appendix E - Moisture Results for Slabs Dried 21 Days

**Table 46: 21 day moisture readings on slab F-100-21-2**

F-100-21-2							
Days Dried	Moisture Readings						
	Zone 1 (%)	Zone 2 (%)	Zone 3 (%)	Zone 4 (%)	Zone 5 (%)	Zone 6 (%)	Average of Zones (%)
0							
2	4	4	4	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.92
3	4.1	4.1	4.1	4	4.1	4	4.07
7	4.1	4.3	4.3	4	3.9	4	4.10
10	4	3.7	3.9	3.9	4	4.3	3.97
17	4.1	4	4.2	4.1	4	4.2	4.10
21	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.73

**Table 47: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-70-21-2**

F-70-21-2							
Days Dried	Moisture Readings						
	Zone 1 (%)	Zone 2 (%)	Zone 3 (%)	Zone 4 (%)	Zone 5 (%)	Zone 6 (%)	Average of Zones (%)
0	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.90
2	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.7	6.9	6.2	6.75
3	6.9	6.9	6.3	6.2	6.9	6.9	6.68
7	4.7	6.9	5.2	6.4	6.7	5.6	5.92
10	4.2	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.45
17	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.18
21	4	3.8	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.93

**Table 48: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-40-21-2**

F-40-21-2							
Days Dried	Moisture Readings						
	Zone 1 (%)	Zone 2 (%)	Zone 3 (%)	Zone 4 (%)	Zone 5 (%)	Zone 6 (%)	Average of Zones (%)
0	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.90
1	5.5	5.9	5.7	6.6	6.3	6.3	6.05
2	5.4	5.1	5.6	5.5	5.2	5.7	5.42
6	4.9	4.5	3.9	4.5	4.5	5	4.55
16	4.3	4.1	4.6	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.30
20	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	4	4.1	4.18
21	4	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.77

**Table 49: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-100-21-3**

F-100-21-3							
Days Dried	Moisture Readings						
	Zone 1 (%)	Zone 2 (%)	Zone 3 (%)	Zone 4 (%)	Zone 5 (%)	Zone 6 (%)	Average of Zones (%)
0	4.2	4	4.1	4.1	3.9	4	4.05
1	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.27
5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.32
8	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.28
15	4.3	4.4	3.7	4.1	4.1	4	4.10
19	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.10
21	3.5	4	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.2	3.63

**Table 50: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-70-21-3**

F-70-21-3							
Days Dried	Moisture Readings						
	Zone 1 (%)	Zone 2 (%)	Zone 3 (%)	Zone 4 (%)	Zone 5 (%)	Zone 6 (%)	Average of Zones (%)
0	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.7	6	6.72
1	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.6	6.3	5.1	6.45
2	6.9	6.9	6.2	6.9	5.8	5	6.28
6	5	4.9	5.7	5.1	4.5	4	4.87
9	4.2	4.7	4.5	4.1	4.5	3.8	4.30
16	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.1	3.9	4	4.12
20	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.3	3.8	3.9	4.02
21	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.73



**Table 51: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-40-21-3**

F-40-21-3							
Days Dried	Moisture Readings						
	Zone 1 (%)	Zone 2 (%)	Zone 3 (%)	Zone 4 (%)	Zone 5 (%)	Zone 6 (%)	Average of Zones (%)
0	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.90
1	6	6.4	6.6	5.9	5.9	6	6.13
5	5.8	4.3	4.6	4.2	4	4	4.48
8	4	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.7	4.08
15	3.7	4.5	4.1	3.9	4	3.7	3.98
19	4	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.95
21	3.2	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.52

**Table 52: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-100-21-4**

F-100-21-4							
Days Dried	Moisture Readings						
	Zone 1 (%)	Zone 2 (%)	Zone 3 (%)	Zone 4 (%)	Zone 5 (%)	Zone 6 (%)	Average of Zones (%)
0	3.8	4.1	4.1	4.2	3.8	4.6	4.10
3	3.4	4	3.8	3.7	4.3	3.8	3.83
14	3.4	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.9	4	3.78
18	3.6	4	3.7	3.8	4.1	3.9	3.85
21	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.48


**Table 53: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-70-21-4**

F-70-21-4							
Days Dried	Moisture Readings						
	Zone 1 (%)	Zone 2 (%)	Zone 3 (%)	Zone 4 (%)	Zone 5 (%)	Zone 6 (%)	Average of Zones (%)
0	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.90
3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.6	5.2	5.9	4.83
14	4.1	4	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.22
18	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.25
21	3.5	3.9	3.8	3.9	4	4	3.85

**Table 54: 21 day moisture readings for slab F-40-21-4**

F-40-21-4							
Days Dried	Moisture Readings						
	Zone 1 (%)	Zone 2 (%)	Zone 3 (%)	Zone 4 (%)	Zone 5 (%)	Zone 6 (%)	Average of Zones (%)
0							
2	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.7	4.33
9	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.72
13	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.4	3	3.52
21	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.3	3	2.6	3.05

## Appendix F - Pull-off Test Result Figures



**Figure 63: C-40-3-1 (left) and C-40-7-1 (right)**



**Figure 64: C-40-14-1 (left) and C-40-21-1 (right)**





**Figure 65: C-70-3-1 (left) and C-70-7-1 (right)**



**Figure 66: C-70-14-1 (not pictured) and C-70-21-1 (right)**



**Figure 67: C-100-3-1 (left) and C-100-7-1 (right)**

Not pictured: C-100-14-1 and C-100-21-1





**Figure 68: C-40-3-2 (left) and C-40-7-2 (not pictured)**

Also not pictured: C-40-14-2 and C-40-21-2



**Figure 69: C-70-3-2 (left) and C-70-7-2 (right)**

Not pictured: C-70-14-2 and C-70-21-2



**Figure 70: C-100-3-2 (left) and C-100-7-2 (not pictured)**



**Figure 71: C-100-14-2 (not pictured) and C-100-21-2**





**Figure 72: C-40-3-3 (left) and C-40-7-3 (right)**



**Figure 73: C-40-14-3 (left) and C-40-21-3 (right)**





**Figure 74: C-70-3-3 (left) and C-70-7-3 (right)**



**Figure 75: C-70-14-3 (not pictured) and C-70-21-3 (right)**





**Figure 76: C-100-3-3 (left) and C-100-7-3 (right)**




**Figure 77: C-100-14-3 (left) and C-100-21-3 (right)**





**Figure 78: C-40-3-4 (left) and C-40-7-4 (right)**



**Figure 79: C-40-14-4 (left) and C-40-21-4 (right)**





**Figure 80: C-70-3-4 (left) and C-70-7-4 (right)**



**Figure 81: C-70-14-4 (left) and C-70-21-4 (right)**





**Figure 82: C-100-3-4 (left) and C-100-7-4 (right)**



**Figure 83: C-100-14-4 (left) and C-100-21-4 (right)**






**Figure 84: C-40-3-5 (left) and C-40-7-5 (right)**



**Figure 85: C-40-14-5 (left) and C-40-21-5 (right)**






**Figure 86: C-70-3-5 (left) and C-70-7-5 (right)**



**Figure 87: C-70-14-5 (not pictured) and C-70-21-5 (right)**






**Figure 88: C-100-3-5 (left) and C-100-7-5 (right)**



**Figure 89: C-100-14-5 (left) and C-100-21-5 (right)**





**Figure 90: L-40-3-1 (left) and L-40-7-1 (right)**



**Figure 91: L-40-14-1 (not pictured) and L-40-21-1 (right)**





**Figure 92: L-70-3-1 (left) and L-70-7-1 (right)**




**Figure 93: L-70-14-1 (left) and L-70-21-1 (right)**





**Figure 94: L-100-3-1 (left) and L-100-7-1 (right)**



**Figure 95: L-100-14-1 (left) and L-100-21-1 (right)**





**Figure 96: L-40-3-2 (left) and L-40-7-2 (right)**



**Figure 97: L-40-14-2 (left) and L-40-21-2 (not pictured)**





**Figure 98: L-70-3-2 (left) and L-70-7-2 (right)**



**Figure 99: L-70-14-2 (left) and L-70-21-2 (not pictured)**





**Figure 100: L-100-3-2 (left) and L-100-7-2 (right)**



**Figure 101: L-100-14-2 (not pictured) and L-100-21-2 (right)**





**Figure 102: L-40-3-3 (left) and L-40-7-3 (right)**



**Figure 103: L-40-14-3 (not pictured) and L-40-21-3 (right)**



**Figure 104: L-70-3-3 (left) and L-70-7-3 (right)**



**Figure 105: L-70-14-3 (not pictured) and L-70-21-3 (right)**





**Figure 106: L-100-3-3 (left) and L-100-7-3 (not pictured)**



**Figure 107: L-100-14-3 (left) and L-100-21-3 (right)**



**Figure 108: L-40-3-4 (left) and L-40-7-4 (right)**

Not pictured: L-40-14-4 and L-40-21-4





**Figure 109: L-70-3-4 (left) and L-70-7-4 (right)**

Not pictured: L-70-14-4 and L-70-21-4



**Figure 110: L-100-3-4 (left) and L-100-7-4 (not pictured)**



**Figure 111: L-100-14-4 (left) and L-100-21-4 (right)**





**Figure 112: L-40-3-5 (left) and L-40-7-5 (right)**




**Figure 113: L-40-14-5 (left) and L-40-21-5 (right)**





**Figure 114: L-70-3-5 (left) and L-70-7-5 (right)**



**Figure 115: L-70-14-5 (left) and L-70-21-5 (right)**





**Figure 116: L-100-3-5 (left) and L-100-7-5 (right)**



**Figure 117: L-100-14-5 (left) and L-100-21-5 (right)**





**Figure 118: F-40-3-1 (left) and F-40-7-1 (right)**



**Figure 119: F-40-14-1 (left) and F-40-21-1 (right)**





**Figure 120: F-70-3-1 (left) and F-70-7-1 (right)**



**Figure 121: F-70-14-1 (left) and F-70-21-1 (right)**





**Figure 122: F-100-3-1 (left) and F-100-7-1 (right)**



**Figure 123: F-100-14-1 (left) and F-100-21-1 (right)**





**Figure 124: F-40-3-2 (left) and F-40-7-2 (right)**



**Figure 125: F-40-14-2 (left) and F-40-21-2 (right)**





**Figure 126: F-70-3-2 (left) and F-70-7-2 (right)**



**Figure 127: F-70-14-2 (left) and F-70-21-2 (right)**





**Figure 128: F-100-3-2 (left) and F-100-7-2 (right)**



**Figure 129: F-100-14-2 (left) and F-100-21-2 (right)**





**Figure 130: F-40-3-3 (left) and F-40-7-3 (right)**




**Figure 131: F-40-14-3 (left) and F-40-21-3 (right)**





**Figure 132: F-70-3-3 (left) and F-70-7-3 (right)**



**Figure 133: F-70-14-3 (left) and F-70-21-3 (right)**





**Figure 134: F-100-3-3 (left) and F-100-7-3 (right)**



**Figure 135: F-100-14-3 (left) and F-100-21-3 (right)**





**Figure 136: F-40-3-4 (left) and F-40-7-4 (right)**



**Figure 137: F-40-14-4 (left) and F-40-21-4 (right)**





**Figure 138: F-70-3-4 (left) and F-70-7-4 (right)**



**Figure 139: F-70-14-4 (left) and F-70-21-4 (right)**





**Figure 140: F-100-3-4 (left) and F-100-7-4 (right)**





**Figure 141: F-100-14-4 (left) and F-100-21-4 (right)**





**Figure 142: F-40-3-5 (left) and F-40-7-5 (right)**



**Figure 143: F-40-14-5 (left) and F-40-21-5 (right)**





**Figure 144: F-70-3-5 (left) and F-70-7-5 (right)**




**Figure 145: F-70-14-5 (left) and F-70-21-5 (right)**





**Figure 146: F-100-3-5 (left) and F-100-7-5 (right)**



**Figure 147: F-100-14-5 (left) and F-100-21-5 (right)**