Concrete Slab Bridges

As with most modern bridge forms, the slab bridge hearkens back to precursors from the remote past. In the case of the slab, the origins are found in prehistory, as in the ancient "clapper" bridges of Dartmoor and Dartmeet, England (Whitney 1983:52). The form was subsequently abandoned at an early period because separate stones rarely have the tensile strength needed for this type of construction (Whitney 1983:213). Nonreinforced concrete suffers from the same weakness, but the advent of reinforced concrete with its increased tensile capabilities allowed the reintroduction of the slab span around the turn of the twentieth century.

The reinforced concrete slab soon became one of the most popular and expedient types of small highway bridges (Figure 18). Bridge engineering treatises such as H. Grattan Tyrrell's 1909 *Concrete Bridges and Culverts for Both Railroads and Highways* (Tyrrell 1909) and J.A.L. Waddell's 1916 *Bridge Engineering* described the versatile usefulness of reinforced concrete slabs for single spans as well as multiple spans (Waddell 1916). In his 1916 text *Concrete Construction for Rural Communities*, Roy Seaton listed the slab span as one of the principal types of small bridges and recommended slab usage for spans up to 20 feet (Seaton 1916:207). Popular trade journals such as *Public Works* found that "spans up to 20 or 30 feet, or sometimes even longer, may be made with. . . .concrete floor slabs" (*Public Works* 1916:353). By 1924, the standard text *Reinforced Concrete and Masonry Structures* noted that slab bridges could be built in multiple spans as concrete pile trestles, pier trestles, and trestles with framed bents (Hool and Kinne 1924).

At an early stage, slab spans became subject to a variation that was essentially a through girder design, in which the slab was reinforced by the use of parapets functioning as girders. Houghton's 1912 *Concrete Bridges, Culverts and Sewers* observed that "where the parapet and railings are reinforced by side girders, connected with ample reinforcement in the square pilasters, at each end of the bridge, a large portion of the loading is carried to the abutment by these girders; which serve a double purpose, as reinforcement and also as a parapet" (Houghton 1912:45-46). By 1924, Walter S. Todd, in George Hool and W.S. Kinne's text *Reinforced Concrete and Masonry Structures*, included a diagram for a 24-foot reinforced concrete slab bridge, but also observed that a through girder type bridge, in which "the loads from the roadway are carried to the abutments," was satisfactory for spans "from about 30 to 60 ft." (Hool and Kinne 1924:399, 407).

This type of through girder structure with a solid slab continued to be illustrated in design texts well into the 1930s (Figure 19). The 1939 text *Reinforced-Concrete Bridges* noted that "the simplest design of floor construction for a through bridge consists of a slab spanning between the main girders."

Observing that "such arrangement is economical only for narrow bridges" because "the dead load would be excessive" in wider crossings, the text's authors included diagrams for a typical "slab spanning between girders" (Taylor et al. 1939:94).

A variation of the slab design that was developed in the 1930s was the continuous slab bridge, in which a single slab extends over several spans. By 1939, structures with spans of slab up to 70 feet had been designed. Although the design has some advantages, including simpler arrangement of reinforcement and better distribution of lateral and longitudinal loading, the greater cost of materials and larger dead loads reduced its advantages over the simply supported multiple-span slab bridge (Taylor et al. 1939:35).

In both its simple and continuous span forms, the reinforced concrete slab span has continued to be used for highway bridges.



Typical Flat Slab Concrete Bridge FIGURE 18:

SOURCE: Maryland State Roads Commission 1924

3d¹0¹ Clear Readway 15.11 34/3223 3414 15:0' 19-01 Nore: No construction joint allowed between gliders & slob Sleb is to E -61 the pound with the schedules on a monostificial mass. Concrete vessing artises to be pound integrally with slob. If the area. Alternate bers beel up. Round conter to -1 - International 1 Filler Danin y -2:91 5.12 512 1103* 1612 26-0" Class' spon 117 slob including 14" I'radiua CROWN BIAGRAM Thefter. b-bara-2"+4" key full length of balastrade. monetifies wearing 读 AN FROM Rootway sest S. 18 ... +-bors -1111 ŝ net mid-mi Drak a-bers Same 21 164" widow ward Chart 60* 2 Cark or Rubbor Laponalog jaint terwyen face of girder 11 346 11 Beck Reinforcent terrs før all girder one layer of tor placer unde and only SECTION A-A 3-15 pinded on expe & ebutment at all wine 6-5" 511 al 1 613" teals management Symm. obt & racelway 3:3 for depth of readway seal HALF PLAN Samanan Pa Acres 1 CROSS SECTION OF ROADWAY Scole: MAR. Exercises for Course of Perturnet An BRIDGE RESTRIENTS, Divig CAS -30 Seals. A blorg PP-1 rikher gigt p!4* 22 30 15 20 6 \$ spa. \$10% 7%6" 5 710 617 9 spa 8 10% 7"-6" 9 Spo 810'- 7'6' 242 16 前小雨 1' Cart of Eulise Y Carle or Refter Y Carls or Robber Report Seint 22 Longth Talal Length ant 11 Telal Weight lork No Sint Defall Flore Nore: Top surface of elab to be finished & cured as described in behast S.R.C. Specifications for finishing and caring "One Course Main Cerneric Concrete Revenant" 60 ₹¥ . 33-3' 1995-0 1.52 3032 Straight Bolustrate, salylocing avily F and with the state of the state is shown in elevation . 20 14 33-9 ·01216" 56.1 18:30 ÷, 20 20-8 \$93.4" .86 510 c Straight Provide standard eye built for wise rape . Churt E 421 - 201 - 101 d 12 12.4 33-11" 407:0" guard fance where directed by the Engineer u ban 5.97 2180 See STANDARD EVE BOLT DETALD! ---where A-300 . 12 the. 33-11 407-0" 5.37 2186 - The bors - Flace one lower of int poper under backwalt & off geners D'- 2. Symmetrical about & bors --£ 24 11 35-4 800'0" 5.37 47.96 on experision and only 26'0' sen anders. \$4 8 426 713 3055'6" .68 2100 Sheaks . Ff a half a ha LA I vebers atter. 1-1-bac 1. h 2 3410 68-0* .56 58 Straight SECTION & ELEVATION 42 ÷ 4:7" 102:6" k -86 166 Straight Scale: mert note. Per sections and call franct calustrians details use "Standards Ballistrade Betaile" Drawing Childs 32 14 8-10 m 90-6* .66 78 Straight 68 1. 1:2" 275-0 237 . .\$6 Straight GENERAL NOTES STATE OF MARYLAND STATE ROADS COMMISSION ٠ 4 1 27:6 110-0" 36 95 Straight Securications: Lotest S.R.C. Operitications & A.A.S.M.O. Stand. Specifications: Lozenna : H20, with double (L.L.: impact) Unit Stratages: Fo: 1200% — Fo: 24,000% -BALTIMORE, MD. 1. 856 8914" 8 60 P 36 Stroight Concentra: All concrete in superstructure to be "Class A" 2 57 8-4" 16-8" 35 14 Straight STANDARD 28'0" CONCRETE GIRDER BRIDGE 1 Concerter: All concerte in superstructure to be "Class A" Reunnoneum: All reinforming to be different of lot to the source. Revenues: All reinforming to be different of lot os directed Economics: Johns' Cast of all material in superstructure expension joints Suplicing of some to be included in the confract will price for "Class A Concrete and Constructure for "Class A Concrete." Revenues (Cast of Economics Repeated and the contract will price for "Class A Concrete." Revenues 254 SUPERSTRUCTURE DETAILS 3 . 6.4 74-5 36 64 Straight + 12 10 28.4 \$40'0' .38 129 Straight CALE: AS NOTED MARCH, 1933 550 20 34 5-10 116'8" 152 44 177 Winek B: REVISIONS ADE BYA JON. . . w 16 14 8-9 140-0* 1.52 213 20 2 00 Revised April (234 TRACES BY JON. Januar F 37 × 8 32-3 2560 .36 222 Aromennesse Queermets to Surgestrictures: (for prefinitory solitoir only) 64.20 Cu yd: "Class A Concentr" actualing balustrades 05.53 Cu yd: "Class A Concente" in beluetrades 13.516 Lb. Deformad Sheel Bars. meres or ALG Straight 5719.1933 CONSECT. 30 ŧ. 26 75-0" 80 65 Straight y Tora long 17,518 5/8/73 CC-28-33

FIGURE 19: Typical Concrete Girder Bridge

SOURCE: Maryland State Roads Commission 1933