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Webinar Procedure

• If you have questions for the presenters please type in the questions where indicated on your screen. Please refer to the slide number.

• At the end of the presentation the CP Tech Center will remove the mute for the participants to allow for open discussion.

• For questions regarding the webinar operations please contact Denise Wagner for assistance. dfwagner@iastate.edu; phone 515-294-5798.

• Thanks to FHWA for supporting the development of this material.
Introduction to Recycling Webinar

Learning Objectives

• To understand that recycled concrete aggregate (RCA) is an engineered material
• To understand the breadth of applications it can be used in and performance expectations
• To understand how RCA is produced
• To understand mixture design basics
• To understand the quality control aspects needed for using RCA
• To be able to identify the potential benefits of using RCA
Concrete Pavement Recycling

Mark B. Snyder, Ph.D., P.E.
Engineering Consultant to CP Tech Center

Tara Cavalline, Ph.D., P.E.
Assistant Professor, UNC – Charlotte
What is Concrete Recycling?

• Breaking, removing and crushing hardened concrete from an acceptable source.

• Old concrete pavements often are excellent sources of material for producing RCA.

• **Concrete pavements are 100% recyclable!**
Reasons for Concrete Recycling

- Dwindling landfill space/increasing disposal costs
  - 50,000 U.S. landfills accepting PCC in 1980
  - 5,000 U.S. landfills accepting PCC in 2000

- Rapidly increasing demand for aggregates with limited resources

- Sustainability
  - Conservation of materials
  - Potential reduced environmental impact due to reduced construction traffic, reduced landfill
  - Cost savings

- Potential for improved pavement performance

- A proven technology – it works!
Sustainability

• Landfill reduction
• Energy savings
• Conservation of resources

Reduction of greenhouse gases (GHGs).
Consider adding a slice on the Minnesota example with the key outcomes
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Example Cost Savings: TH 59 near Worthington, MN

- 16-mile two-lane D-cracked PCCP recycled in 1980
  - Coarse RCA for new 8-inch PCCP
  - Fine RCA for 1-in lift on subbase
- Estimated 27% total project cost savings and 150,000 gallons of fuel (MnDOT estimates)
Potential Pavement Performance Improvements

• Foundation stability; angular, rough texture and secondary cementing action.
• Concrete strength; partial substitution of RCA for virgin fine aggregate may increase concrete compressive strength.
Concrete Recycling: A Proven Technology!

41 of 50 states allow use of RCA in various applications (FHWA, 2004)
Uses of Recycled Concrete Aggregate

- PCC pavement
  - Single and Two-Lift
- HMA pavement
- Subbase
  - Unbound
  - Stabilized
- Fill material
- Filter material
- Drainage layer
Unstabilized Subbases/Backfill

• Most common application for RCA in U.S.
• Application used by 38 of 41 states using RCA in U.S. (FHWA 2004)
  – Some believe it outperforms virgin aggregate as an unstabilized subbase!
• Some level of contaminants is tolerable.
Cement-stabilized and Lean Concrete Subbases

• Stabilization helps to prevent migration of crusher fines, dissolution and transport of significant amounts of calcium hydroxide.

• Physical and mechanical properties of the RCA must be considered in the design and production of cement-stabilized subbases.
Concrete Mixtures

• RCA can be (and has been) incorporated as the primary or sole aggregate source in new concrete pavements.

• Used in the U.S. concrete mixtures since the 1940s
  – Roadway surfaces, shoulders, median barriers, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, building/bridge foundations and even structural concrete.

• Common in the lower lift of two-lift concrete pavements in Europe.
EC3

Mark, fyi the 2-lift in Kansas used normal project materials in the bottom layer. Their main goal was to examine the constructability using normal paving equipment instead of the paver that is common in Europe that places both lifts through one machine. The project was a success. As part of the trail, they constructed a number of sections to evaluate different materials and surface texture options.
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RCA in Two-Lift Construction

- Iowa US 75 Reconstruction (1976)
  - 60-40 RCA and RAP in 7-in lower lift; 23 ft wide
  - All virgin in 4-in top lift; 24 ft wide
  - Provided more than 40 years of service!

- Austrian Standard Practice since late 1980s
  - A-1 (Vienna-Salzburg): 19-cm (7.5-in) lower lift (RCA and RAP), 3-cm (1.5-in) upper lift (exposed virgin aggregate), fines to stabilize foundation (100 percent PCC recycled)
  - Overall project savings >10 percent
  - More than 75km (47 miles) between 1991 and 1994; two-lift construction using recycled materials is now standard
Concrete Mixtures (cont.)

• Batching, mixing, delivery, placement and finishing techniques can be similar to those used for virgin aggregate concrete mixtures.

• Concerns with water demand and premature stiffening:
  – Limiting or eliminate fine RCA
  – Presoak RCA
  – Chemical and mineral admixtures.

• Contaminants can lead to air entrainment problems.

• *Fresh and hardened properties of RCA PCC might be different from virgin aggregate PCC.*
Other Applications

• RCA is an economical and highly stable material that is well-suited for granular fill applications.

• Most states allow the use of RCA for erosion control (“rip-rap”) or slope stabilization.

• Soil stabilization, pipe bedding, landscape materials, railroad ballast, agricultural soil treatment, treatment of acidic lake waters, masonry blocks, artificial reefs, etc.
Performance of Pavements Constructed using RCA in PCC

There have been a few notable (and well-publicized) failures ....

- Deterioration of mid-panel cracks in JRCP
- Design issues (undoweled joints, panel length, foundation type, etc.)

.... but performance has generally been very good!

No structural problems have been reported with the use of RCA in foundation layers.
Texas Interstate 10

- 1995 Rehab Project in Houston, Texas
- I-10 between I-45 & Loop 610 West
- Project Length: 6 miles
- Existing CRCP: 1968 construction
- 10 Lanes + HOV

No Virgin Aggregates Used for New Concrete: 100% RCA (Coarse & Fine)

Original

- 8” CRCP
- 6” CSB

Reconstruct and Unbonded Overlay

- 14” CRCP
  - 3” ASB
  - 6” LTS
- 11” CRCP
  - 1” BB
### 2007 Photo of Texas I-10 (after 12 years of service)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>I-10 RCA concrete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28-Day compressive strength</td>
<td>4,615 psi (31.8 MPa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Day elastic modulus</td>
<td>2.58 x 10^6 psi (17.8 MPa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of thermal expansion and contraction (CTE)</td>
<td>4.7 to 5.3 με/°F (8.5 to 9.5 με/°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability (ASTM C1202/AASHTO T277)</td>
<td>466 coulombs (very low permeability)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
US 59 (Worthington, MN):

• 1st major recycling of “D-cracked” concrete into new concrete
• Reconstructed in 1980 (original 1955 construction)
  • 8-in slab, skewed joints (13, 17, 14, 19 ft panels)
  • 100% coarse RCA (3/4-in top size), edge drains
• No dowels
  • 3000+ vpd, ~8 percent heavy commercial

• Rehabilitated in 2000
  • Slab repairs, dowel bar retrofit, joint reseal
  • Diamond grinding

• PSR = 4.3 in 2006 (3.0 in 1994)
• Faulting = 0.01 inches in 2006 (0.25 inches in 1994)
• No recurring D-cracking
Interstate 80 (Pine Bluffs, Wyoming):

• Extensive alkali-aggregate (ASR) damage
• Much pre-design testing
Interstate 80 (Pine Bluffs, Wyoming):

- 1985: Original 8-in pavement recycled into new 10-in pavement surface
  - 65 percent coarse RCA, 22% fine RCA
  - Low-alkali (<0.5%) cement, 30% Class F flyash, w/c = 0.44
  - Skewed joints (14, 16, 13, 12 ft panels)
  - No dowels
  - 4400 ADT in 1985 (30 - 40% heavy)
- Rehabilitated in 2004
  - Dowel bar retrofit, diamond grinding, joint reseal
  - 2006 ADT: 8000 vpd (30-40% heavy)

- No significant evidence of recurring ASR until recently.
Performance Case Study: U.S. 52 – Zumbrota, MN (27-ft JRCP) after 22 years of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test and Value</th>
<th>MN 4-1 (Recycled)</th>
<th>MN 4-2 (Control)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transverse Joint Spalling, % Joints</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Faulting between Panels, in</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Joint Width, in</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Cracking, ft/mile</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse Cracking, % Slabs</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorated Transverse Cracks/mile</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transverse Cracks/mile</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI (in/mile)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile Strength, psi</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressive Strength, psi</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s Modulus, psi</td>
<td>4.4E6</td>
<td>6.3E6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average VSTR (cm³/cm²)</td>
<td>0.2902</td>
<td>0.3264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MN US 52 Observations:

• Foundation Stiffness (backcalculated) 30% lower for RCA section
• Aggregate Top Size
  • 1.0-in RCA
  • 1.5-in Control
• Mortar Content
  • 74% RCA (shrinkage cracks observed early)
  • 52% Control
• Similar Thermal Coefficients in 1994
  • 12.4/C° RCA
  • 11.9/C° Control
**Effect of Reclaimed Mortar Content**  
*(after FHWA, 1997)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>MN1</th>
<th>WY</th>
<th>MN4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ Mortar (%)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Length (ft)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Fault (in)a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ % Cracked Panels</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Deteriorated Cracks/Mile</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ PSR</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher reclaimed mortar content resulted in more panel cracking and crack deterioration for long (>25 ft) panels (but had no apparent effect on short [<16 ft] panels).*
This slide and the next 2 are kinda busy, I find myself needing to study. There may not be time. Consider some key findings added to the data or something.
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Effects of RCA, Panel Length on Cracking
(Section, L/ℓ, % Cracked Panels)
(from FHWA, 1997)

• Granular Base Sections
  – CT1-1, 16.6, 66%
  – CT1-2, 15.2, 93%
  – MN1-1, 7.3, 1%
  – MN1-2, 7.3, 0%
  – MN2-1, 8.2, 84%
  – MN4-1, 7.8, 88%
  – MN4-2, 8.2, 22%
  – WI1-1, 4.4, 8%
  – WI1-2, 4.6, 2%
  – WY1-1, 4.3, 0%
  – WY1-2, 4.3, 0%

• Stabilized Base Sections
  – KS1-1, 5.5, 0%
  – KS1-2, 5.5, 0%
  – MN3-1, 5.0, 2%

Long panels (L/ℓ > 6) with RCA generally experienced more cracking than when natural aggregate was used.
There was no apparent effect on shorter panels.
No Direct Influence of RCA on Development of Joint Faulting

- **Doweled Sections**
  - CT1-1, 0.01 in
  - CT1-2, 0.01 in
  - MN1-1, 0.02 in
  - MN1-2, 0.02 in
  - MN2-1, 0.03 in
  - MN4-1, 0.04 in
  - MN4-2, 0.03 in
  - WI1-2, 0.02 in

- **Undoweled Sections**
  - KS1-1, 0.09 in
  - KS1-2, 0.13 in
  - MN3-1, 0.24 in
  - WI1-1, 0.11 in
2006 Study Conclusions

• Recycled ASR concrete used successfully in Wyoming with mitigation measures
  • Isolated recurrent ASR
  • RCA performed better than control

• Recycled D-cracked concrete used successfully with mitigation measures
  • Reduced aggregate size
  • Reduced moisture exposure?
2006 Study Conclusions

• Need to treat RCA as “engineered material” and modify mix and structural designs accordingly
  • Reduce w/c
  • ASR mitigation
  • Reduced panel lengths
  • Other modifications as needed.

• Mortar contents are generally higher for RCA
  • Varied with aggregate type, crushing process
  • Higher mortar contents often had more distress – may need to control reclaimed mortar content
Production of RCA

• Typical steps:
  – Evaluation of source concrete.
  – Pavement preparation.
  – Pavement breaking and removal.
  – Removal of embedded steel.
  – Crushing and sizing.
  – Beneficiation.
  – Stockpiling.

• In-place concrete recycling

• Recycling of returned ready-mixed concrete.
Evaluation of Source Concrete

Known sources vs. unknown sources?
Potential Contaminants

- Reinforcing steel
- Dowel bars and baskets
- Chemical admixtures
- Deicing salts
- Oil
- Joint sealant
- Material from overlying and underlying layers
Pavement Preparation

• How will RCA be used? RCA for concrete mixtures might require more pavement preparation than for other uses.

• Removal of joint sealant:
  – Cutting tooth sealant plow
  – Other removal during production

• Asphalt patches/overlays/shoulders may or may not need to be removed;
  – Some European countries allow up to 30% RAP in new concrete paving mixtures (two-lift construction).
  – Remove deteriorated asphalt shoulders prior to breaking concrete on reconstruction projects.
Pavement Preparation
Pavement Breaking and Removal

- Main purpose is to size the material for ease of handling and transport to the crushing plant.
  - Broken into pieces about 18 to 24 in. max.
- Also should impart enough energy to maximize debonding of concrete to any reinforcing steel.
- The “impact breaker” is the most common breaking method.
Pavement Breaking and Removal

1,000+ yd²/hr
Pavement Breaking and Removal

- The first step in the removal process is to loosen the concrete pieces and separate any debonded reinforcing steel.
- Where steel mesh reinforcing or rebar are present and have not been broken or separated from the concrete, a “rhino horn” is used.
Notes: back hoe with rhino horn, wheel loader, or bulldozer....
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Pavement Breaking and Removal

- Use of front-end loaders and dump trucks for removal and transport to off-site processing (left)
  or
- On-site processing using back hoe and mobile crushing equipment (below).
Removal of Embedded Steel

- Typically accomplished during breaking and removal
Note goes with following slide.
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Removal of Embedded Steel

• Can also follow crushing operations
  – Electromagnets
  – Manual removal
Crushing and Sizing

• The same basic equipment used to processes virgin aggregates also can be used to crush, size and stockpile the RCA.

• Yield depends on many factors but loss of material can be as high as 10% and may approach 0%.

• Primary crusher reduces to 3” to 4”; material then screened and anything larger than 3/8” fed to secondary crusher, which breaks to the desired RCA top size.

• Three main types of crusher: jaw, cone, and impact.
  – Tell contractor what gradation/result is desired
  – Contractor should select crushing process based on desired gradation and material properties.
Crushing and Sizing

Jaw Crusher
- Broken concrete feed
- Jaw break plate
- Stationary jaw
- Jaw break plate
- Swing jaw
- Discharge

Cone Crusher
- Broken concrete feed
- Breaking plates
- Eccentric rotation
- Discharge
Crushing and Sizing

Vertical Shaft Impact Crusher
- Broken concrete feed
- Rotor/Impellers
- Impact break plate
- Rotation
- Crushed concrete discharge

Horizontal Shaft Impact Crusher
- Primary break plate
- Secondary break plate
- Broken concrete feed
- Discharge
- Rotor/blow bars
Effect of Crushing Process on RCA Particle Size Distribution

![Graph showing the effect of crushing process on RCA particle size distribution. The graph compares the percentage passing (% Passing) against particle size (Particle size, mm) for Jaw Crusher and Impact. The graph illustrates that Impact crushing results in a finer particle size distribution with a higher percentage of material passing through smaller particle sizes compared to Jaw Crusher.]
Correct note??
Ells Cackler, 3/16/2016

Yes -- I already modified the slide from German to English
markbsnyder, 4/4/2016
Effects of Crushing Technique and Natural Aggregate Type on RCA Reclamation Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Reclamation Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCA Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaw-Jaw-Roller</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaw-Cone</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact-Impact</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effect of Crushing Technique on Reclaimed Mortar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Average Reclaimed Mortar (%)</th>
<th>RCA Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaw-Jaw-Roller</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaw-Cone</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact-Impact</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Challenges from Crushing Concrete

- Silica dust (concrete)
- Asbestos (demolition debris – not paving PCC)

Dust suppression system at concrete crushing operation.
Beneficiation

• “The treatment of any raw material to improve its physical or chemical properties prior to further processing or use.”
  – Example: might need to remove accidentally included material (e.g., organic material, excessive dust, or other contaminants) from the RCA prior to use.

• Example beneficiation techniques:
  – Change crushing processes
  – Washing, wet or dry screening, etc.
  – Air blowing
  – Water floating or “heavy media separation” techniques.

• Degree of beneficiation required depends upon condition/composition of RCA and its intended use.
Stockpiling

• Coarse RCA can be stockpiled using the same techniques and equipment as are used with virgin coarse aggregate materials.
Stockpiling (cont.)

• Protect fine RCA stockpiles from moisture
  – Secondary cementing.

• RCA stockpile runoff is initially highly alkaline
  – Leaching of calcium hydroxide
  – Runoff alkalinity rapidly decreases
Not sure how stockpiles are protected from rain? Are you seeing this done? I can see controlling the runoff if needed.
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In-Place Concrete Recycling

- When RCA is to be used in a subbase layer of the roadway and/or shoulders, production can be accomplished using an in-place concrete recycling train.
Recycling Ready-Mixed Concrete

• Approximately 5% of the 445 million cubic yards of ready mixed concrete produced in the U.S. each year is returned to the concrete plant.

• Recycling this material, as with recycling any existing concrete material, presents sustainable benefits, including reduction of landfill use and virgin aggregate use.
## Properties of RCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Virgin Agg.</th>
<th>RCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shape and Texture</td>
<td>Well-rounded; smooth to</td>
<td>Angular with rough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>angular/rough</td>
<td>surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption Capacity</td>
<td>0.8% – 3.7%</td>
<td>3.7% – 8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Gravity</td>
<td>2.4 – 2.9</td>
<td>2.1 – 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A Abrasion</td>
<td>15% – 30%</td>
<td>20% – 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium Sulfate</td>
<td>7% – 21%</td>
<td>18% – 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium Sulfate</td>
<td>4% – 7%</td>
<td>1% – 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride Content</td>
<td>0 – 2 lb/yd³</td>
<td>1 – 12 lb/yd³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect of Particle Size on RCA Properties (after Fergus, 1980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve size</th>
<th>Percent retained</th>
<th>Bulk specific gravity</th>
<th>Percent Absorption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 in. (25 mm)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¾ in. (19 mm)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ in. (12.5 mm)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⅜ in. (9.5 mm)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4 (4.75 mm)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted average</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not sure what this slide is adding?
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Intended to show impact of particle size on mortar content ... smaller particles (fine aggregate) tend to be higher mortar content, so absorption goes up and specific gravity goes down. Explains need to treat coarse and fine RCA a bit differently, especially in PCC mixtures.
markbsnyder, 4/4/2016
Recycling Concrete Pavements

PROPERTIES OF CONCRETE WITH RCA
Properties of Concrete with RCA
(Hint: it’s all about the mortar ...)

MN 4-1 (Recycled)  

MN 4-2 (Control)
EC11  Might add a note for future presentators
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# Fresh (Plastic) Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Coarse RCA</th>
<th>Coarse and Fine RCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workability</td>
<td>Similar to slightly lower</td>
<td>Slightly to significantly lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishability</td>
<td>Similar to more difficult</td>
<td>More difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water bleeding</td>
<td>Slightly less</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water demand</td>
<td>Greater</td>
<td>Much greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air content</td>
<td>Slightly higher</td>
<td>Slightly higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Hardened Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Coarse RCA</th>
<th>Coarse and Fine RCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compressive strength</td>
<td>0% to 24% less</td>
<td>15% to 40% less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile strength</td>
<td>0% to 10% less</td>
<td>10% to 20% less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength variation</td>
<td>Slightly greater</td>
<td>Slightly greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulus of elasticity</td>
<td>10% to 33% less</td>
<td>25% to 40% less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>0% to 30% greater</td>
<td>0% to 30% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drying shrinkage</td>
<td>20% to 50% greater</td>
<td>70% to 100% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creep</td>
<td>30% to 60% greater</td>
<td>30% to 60% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability</td>
<td>0% to 500% greater</td>
<td>0% to 500% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific gravity</td>
<td>0% to 10% lower</td>
<td>5% to 15% lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hardened Properties

Compressive Strength of Various Aggregate Mixes

- Virgin Coarse Agg./Virgin Fine Agg.
- Virgin Coarse Agg./Fine RCA
- Coarse RCA/Virgin Fine Agg.
- Coarse RCA/Fine RCA

Compressive strength (MPa)

Age (days)
# Effects of RCA and Mix Design on Strength and Thermal Properties
*(after FHWA, 1997)*

Reducing w/cm and/or adding some RCA fines often resulted in RCA concrete mixtures with improved properties!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>MN1</th>
<th>WY</th>
<th>MN4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>RCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/cm</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Fine RCA:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f'c$ (psi)</td>
<td>5690</td>
<td>5130</td>
<td>7210</td>
<td>6340</td>
<td>6860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E ($10^6$ psi)</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$ ($10^{-6}/^\circ F$)</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Durability and other Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Coarse RCA</th>
<th>Coarse and Fine RCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeze-thaw durability</td>
<td>Depends on air voids</td>
<td>Depends on air voids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate resistance</td>
<td>Depends on mixture</td>
<td>Depends on mixture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASR</td>
<td>Less susceptible</td>
<td>Less susceptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonization</td>
<td>Up to 65% greater</td>
<td>Up to 65% greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrosion rate</td>
<td>May be faster</td>
<td>May be faster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS IN CONCRETE RECYCLING
Sustainability Benefits

Concrete recycling addresses sustainability “Triple Bottom Line”:

• **Environmental benefits**
  – Conservation of aggregates
  – Reduction of landfill use
  – Reduction of greenhouse gases, sequestration of carbon

• **Economic benefits**
  – Metals recovery
  – Fuel savings due to reduced haul distances
  – Reduced disposal costs
  – Extension of landfill life
  – Potential tax credits, other incentives

• **Societal benefits**
  – Reduced land use and reduced impact to landscape
Quantifying Sustainability Benefits

• **Environmental** and **societal** benefits of concrete recycling are well documented.

• **Economic** benefits are not as readily evident, or can be at equivalent cost.
  
  – Decisions made based on initial cost can eliminate options that include recycling.
  
  – **Quantification** of sustainability benefits (particularly **environmental** and **societal**) benefits support choice of recycling.

Projects should be approached in a manner that gives the contractor options so recycling opportunities can be incorporated into the bidding process.
Quantifying Sustainability Benefits

Measurement tools can be used to quantify sustainability benefits, weigh alternatives and facilitate decision-making.

• **Economic Analysis**
  – Life Cycle Cost Analysis, LCCA

• **Environmental Assessment**
  – Life Cycle Assessment, LCA

• **Rating Systems**
  – INVEST
  – Greenroads
  – Envision
  – Others

Incorporate recycling activities into these tools to quantify sustainability benefits.
Economic Analysis

• Lifecycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) quantifies economic cost over the lifetime of a project.
  – FHWA RealCost
  – Does NOT quantify environmental or societal benefits associated with recycling.

• Initial construction, future maintenance and rehabilitation, and end of life considered.

• Cost savings from recycling concrete can include:
  – Lower initial costs for recycled aggregates
  – Lower hauling costs
  – Reduced tipping fees
  – Salvage value of project, if recycled
    • Avoid double-counting
Environmental Assessment

- **Lifecycle Analysis (LCA)** quantifies impact of a product or process on the environment over the life cycle.

  ![Diagram of lifecycle analysis](from FHWA, Kendall 2012)

  - **Quantifies environmental impacts**
  - **Societal and economic impacts** quantified to some extent
Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)

• ISO 14140 and 14044
• LCA software programs include Athena, SimaPro, or TRACI
  – No generally accepted LCA framework for pavements
• Data to support LCA for highway projects is available
  – Life cycle inventory (LCI) and Environmental Product Declarations (EPD) for specific products
  – Federal agencies
• Level of detail required makes LCA project-specific
• Comparisons are only possible with equivalent bounding assumptions.
Concrete Recycling in LCA

• Concrete recycling can be considered in several LCA impact categories
  – Fuel consumption
  – Emissions
  – Non-renewable resource use
  – Fresh water use
  – Hazardous and non-hazardous waste

• Concrete must be defined as either a waste or a product
  – Avoid double-counting

• Use of pay items as primary input is one approach to provide consistency in analysis between projects (Harrell et al. 2015)
Rating Systems

• Facilitate rating based on environmental and social equity metrics
• Provide means of relative evaluation and differentiation of projects
• Also an avenue for recognition of stakeholders
Rating Systems

• Rating systems differ by grouping of:
  – Performance criteria
  – Delineation and computation of metrics
  – Thresholds for obtaining points and ratings status

• Certification methodology
  – INVEST and Envision are self-certification programs
  – Greenroads is a third-party certification system

• Credits or points for concrete recycling earned by:
  – Reuse of concrete materials
  – Recycling of concrete materials
  – Emissions reductions
  – Noise reductions
  – Planning initiatives
  – End-of-life considerations
Quantifying Sustainability

• Illinois Tollway
  – Move Illinois: 15-year, $12.1B program started 2011
  – Extensive use of recycled materials
  – LCCA used to identify $50M in savings (through 2014) by use of recycled concrete rather than virgin aggregate in pavement bases.
  – Modified version of INVEST rating system developed to adapt to Tollway needs, used to score (and compare) over 15 projects
  – Tools for LCA for pavements developed and are in proof-testing stages (early 2016)
  – Plans to integrate LCA with LCCA software and INVEST rating system (Gillen et al. 2015 and Gillen and Vavrik 2016)
Environmental Impacts

Recycling is inherently a beneficial practice, but must mitigate potential adverse environmental impacts

- Water quality
  - Contaminants in runoff and drainage
  - Alkalinity, chemical contaminants, other
  - Transported sediments

- Air quality
  - Equipment emissions
  - Fugitive dust

- Noise
  - Additional processing, handling

- Waste generation and disposition
  - Solids, wastewater, slurries, residuals

Often identified as key concern by state agencies
Traditional Environmental Controls
Water Quality

• Minimize jobsite footprint
• Stockpiles
  – Minimize fines
  – Select location to mitigate impact on surface waters
  – Erosion control
    • Berms, straw bales, filter channels
• Unbound bases
  – Minimize fines
  – Use of appropriate geotextile fabrics
• Compliance testing to meet regulatory guidelines
• Personnel training
Environmental Regulation and Compliance

• Regulatory policies differ by state
  – RCA is typically defined as an inert material

• Some regulations/categorizations of RCA can cause delays, expense, risk (perceived or real)
  – Decreases potential for recycling

• Policies can be modified for RCA
  – Both on-site and off-site activities
  – Increases potential for recycling
Environmental Regulation and Compliance

- Reducing regulatory burden can increase use of RCA
  - Legislation/compliance agreements related to waste definition(s) and practices
  - Guidance for allowable (and encouraged) recycling activities
  - Up-front guidance and “clear path” through regulation
    - Minimizes risk for contractor, can provide cost savings for Owner
  - Training of personnel
RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR USING RCA
RCA Production Considerations

• Consider RCA an “engineered material”; test thoroughly.
• Determine material properties and quality (before recycling, if possible)
• Consider product type/quality requirements
  – Gradation requirements will determine crushing equipment selection
  – Maximize reclamation?
  – Minimize reclaimed mortar?
• Give contractor options for determining the most cost-effective point for recycling
• Stockpile management plan (contamination, moisture)
Recommendations: Use in Subbases

• AASHTO M319

• Quality requirements (Saeed and Hammons, 2008)

• Grade according to subbase function
  – Free-draining
  – Dense-graded
  – See ACPA EB204P
Should the quality requirements (Saeed & Hammons) be summarized or at least the top few? Also as we produce our manual of practice, these would be good spec resources to include.

Ellis Cackler, 3/17/2016
# Test Criteria for RCA Unbound Subbase Applications

(after Saeed and Hammons, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests and Test Parameters</th>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Med.</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Med.</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moisture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freeze</td>
<td>Nonfreeze</td>
<td>Freeze</td>
<td>Nonfreeze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Deval Test (percent loss)</td>
<td>&lt; 5 percent</td>
<td>&lt; 15 percent</td>
<td>&lt; 30 percent</td>
<td>&lt; 45 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube Suction Test (dielectric constant)</td>
<td>≤ 7</td>
<td>≤ 10</td>
<td>≤ 15</td>
<td>≤ 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Triaxial Test (Max. Deviator Stress)</td>
<td>OMC, $\sigma_c = 5$ psi (35 kPA)</td>
<td>&gt; 100 psi (0.7 MPa)</td>
<td>&gt; 60 psi (0.4 MPa)</td>
<td>&gt; 25 psi (170 kPa)</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat., $\sigma_c = 15$ psi (103 kPA)</td>
<td>≥ 180 psi (1.2 MPa)</td>
<td>≥ 135 psi (0.9 MPa)</td>
<td>≥ 60 psi (410 kPa)</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated Load Test (Failure Deviator Stress)</td>
<td>OMC, $\sigma_c = 15$ psi (103 kPA)</td>
<td>≥ 180 psi (1.2 MPa)</td>
<td>≥ 160 psi (1.1 MPa)</td>
<td>≥ 90 psi (620 kPa)</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat., $\sigma_c = 15$ psi (103 kPA)</td>
<td>≥ 180 psi (1.2 MPa)</td>
<td>≥ 160 psi (1.1 MPa)</td>
<td>≥ 60 psi (410 kPa)</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiffness Test (Resilient Modulus)</td>
<td>≥ 60 ksi (0.4 MPa)</td>
<td>≥ 40 ksi (275 kPa)</td>
<td>≥ 25 ksi (170 MPa)</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Low traffic: < 100,000 ESALs/year; Medium traffic: 100,000 to 1,000,000 ESALs/year; High traffic: 1,000,000 ESALs/year.
Not clear here. Does this replace the 2008 recommendations of Saeed & Hammons? Source of recommendations?

Ellis Cackler, 3/17/2016
Recommendations: Use in Subbases Preventing Drainage Structure Clogging

• All RCA is capable of producing precipitate and insoluble residue ("crusher dust")
  – Potential increases with surface area (smaller particles)
• Usually no problem below drains or in undrained layers
• In drained layers, you could get infill of drain pipes and/or clogging of rodent screens.
Effects of Ca(CO$_3$)$_2$ and Crusher Dust on Drainage Systems

Photo credits: Iowa DOT and PennDOT
Preventing Drainage Structure Clogging

- Minimize use of RCA fines.
- Crush to eliminate reclaimed mortar.
- Blend RCA and virgin materials.
- Use largest practical RCA particle sizes.
- Consider washing RCA to reduce insoluble residue (crusher dust) deposits.
- Use high-permittivity fabric.
- Wrap trench, not pipe.
- Consider daylighted subbase.
What are ISR deposits? Maybe “consider washing”? The washing has the potential to really limit base applications and on site recycling which has been done successfully for a long time. We should discuss as a team, this is a major issue with unbound bases.
Ellis Cackler, 3/17/2016
Recommendations: Pavement Structural Design

• RCA Subbase:
  – Consider possible stiffening of RCA subbase and adjust panel length, thickness as required

• RCA Slab:
  – Consider CTE and shrinkage
    • Adjust panel length
    • Adjust sealant reservoir dimensions and sealant materials
    • Higher reinforcing quantities (CRCP, JRCP)?
  – Reduced aggregate interlock potential
    • LTE may require dowels
  – Evaluate abrasion resistance (surface friction and wear)
Recommendations:
RCA in Mixture Design

• AASHTO MP16-13

• Quality Requirements and Properties
  – Generally the same as for PCC with virgin aggregate
  – Exception: sulfate soundness (unreliable for RCA)

• Materials-Related Distress
  – Alkali-silica reactivity
    • Lithium
    • Class F fly ash and/or slag cement
    • Limit RCA fines
    • Reduce water access (joint sealing, drains, etc.)
  – D-cracking
    • Reduce coarse aggregate top size
    • Reduce moisture exposure
  – Test effectiveness of all treatments before construction!
Recommendations:
RCA in Mixture Design Proportioning

- Consider Specific Gravity and Absorption Capacity
- Consider higher strength variability
- To maintain workability, add 5 – 15% water
  OR
- Use admixtures (chemical and/or mineral)
- Verify air content requirements (adjust for air in reclaimed mortar)
- Trial mixtures are essential
Summary

• Recycling is becoming an increasingly cost-effective alternative due to scarcity of virgin aggregate
• Requires adjustment to mix design and pavement design
• Good performance has been reported
• No specialized techniques or equipment
Resources: ACPA EB043P

- Production of RCA
- Properties and Characteristics of RCA
- Uses of RCA
- Properties of Concrete Containing RCA
- Performance of Concrete Pavements Constructed Using RCA
- Recommendations for Using RCA
- Appendices:
  - Guidelines for Removing and Crushing Existing Concrete Pavement
  - Guidelines for Using RCA in Unstabilized (Granular) Subbases
  - Guidelines for Using RCA in Concrete Paving Mixtures
  - Relevant AASHTO/ASTM Standards
  - Glossary of Terms and Index
Resources: CP Tech Center Deployment Plan

- Use of RCA in concrete mixtures is not common, but implementation efforts are underway.
- Report outlines barriers to implementation (perceptions, lack of experience, risk, etc.) and recommends approaches to overcoming them.

- Also: FHWA Technical Advisory TT 5040.37: Use of Recycled Concrete Pavement as Aggregate in Hydraulic-Cement Concrete Pavement
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Questions?
# Concrete Pavement Recycling Webinar Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Regions 1 &amp; 2 Webinar</th>
<th>Region 3 Webinar</th>
<th>Region 4 Webinar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pavement Recycling</td>
<td>April 20, 2016</td>
<td>May 4, 2016</td>
<td>May 18, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Map showing regions 1, 2, 3, and 4]