Abstract

Although reinforced concrete structures are designed as per codes / standards but enough care is not always taken during construction process. As a result, the structures start showing signs of distress, some times less than 10 years of service life, requiring early repair and rehabilitation work. In this paper, a case study of 3 no. (G+8) multi-storeyed buildings badly damaged due to corrosion and Bhuj (India) earthquake of 2001, rehabilitated in 2003 has been presented. Repair strategy involved removal of delaminated carbonated concrete cover, application of rust remover, anti-corrosion coating, polymer bond coat, polymer modified mortar, injection of low viscosity epoxy grout to beam-column junctions and cracks, repair of masonry cracks with polymer modified mortar & grouting with SBR modified cement grout and jacketing of columns at the ground floor. Extensive material testing was carried out and specifications for acrylic and SBR polymer modified mortar were selected for durable repairs. Strict quality control and assurance both in material and workmanship was adopted. After nine years of successful rehabilitation and functioning, some signs of distress in the form of cracks and spalls due to rebar corrosion have been noted at some locations, requiring rehabilitation again. Some recommendations /conclusions have been given for durable concrete constructions and rehabilitation work.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Concrete is the most versatile man made building material of the recent past because of its ability to take any shape but it has certain limitations like lower flexural, tensile strength, poor bond between old and hardened concrete to new and fresh concrete, poor resistance to chemicals, porosity and permeability, shrinkage etc. Due to these limitations the concrete structures starts showing distresses in the form of cracks, spalls, delaminations and ultimate complete collapse as a result of carbonation of concrete, corrosion of reinforcement due to moisture penetration, chloride attack, and alkali-aggregate reactions etc. Ingress of dissolved substance from the external environment may cause various forms of chemically induced deterioration by reaction with cement paste aggregate constitutions. The resistance of concrete to chemical attack is in general directly influenced by its porosity, the cement composition used in the concrete and condition under which cement paste hardened. In such circumstances, proper evaluation of damage by visual and non-destructive tests followed by repair and rehabilitation using construction chemicals which are superior to ordinary
study of three no. (G+8) multi-storeyed residential buildings, badly damaged due to corrosion and Bhuj (India) earthquake of 2001, repaired and rehabilitated in 2003 has been presented.

In Ahmedabad Asset of ONGC, three no. multi-storeyed (G+8) buildings viz. Heera (C3), Panna (B5) and Ratna (B6) each having 68 quarters with half G.F as parking were constructed in year 1989-1990. These buildings were already sick due to severe reinforcement corrosion as evident from so many spalls, delaminations on column corners located at different heights, beam/ fin soffits, slab soffits, leached plaster on parapets corroded and leaking drainage pipes, water supply lines and stagnated water on terraces due to improper gradient etc. These were further damaged by the Bhuj earthquake on 26th Jan, 2001 in the form of separation cracks at beam-column junctions, RCC-masonry wall interfaces (Fig 6), cracks in masonry in-fills(Fig 5); even complete crumbling at some places, heavy de-bonding and dismantling of plaster at both exterior and interior surfaces etc. Due to fast deterioration, it was decided to rehabilitate these buildings at the earliest.

2. PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION

Visual inspection of the buildings indicated heavy rebar corrosion as a result of carbonation due to environmental attacks. At certain locations of beams, columns, fins and slabs concrete cover had got spalled (Fig 3) and some shear stirrups were totally eaten up by corrosion (Fig1). Beam - column junctions were badly cracked (Fig 2). Some masonry walls at GF level were totally cracked due to earthquake. A number of columns had continuous vertical cracks along the line of concrete cover thickness (Fig 4). The visual inspection necessitated the need for detailed evaluation for design of the rehabilitation design.

3. DETAILED INVESTIGATION

3.1 REBOUND HAMMER TEST: Rebound hammer test was carried out at different points to access the strength of the structural elements. Rebound numbers were determined after exposing the concrete surface by removing plaster and removing slurry and by taking at least five readings at a point and
averaging them the results showed that compressive strength in columns and beams varied from 11.2 N/mm² to 32.6 N/mm².

3.2 CORE TEST: Three no. core Tests were also carried out one in each building (Table 1). The results obtained were –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Core dia</th>
<th>Area (KN)</th>
<th>Load (KN)</th>
<th>Comp. strength (N/mm²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heera bldg</td>
<td>68mm</td>
<td>3629.89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>26.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panna bldg</td>
<td>68mm</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratna bldg</td>
<td>68mm</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 ULTRA SOUND PULSE VELOCITY TEST

The USPV Test was carried out on 34 nos of columns and 6 nos beams and the results obtained are -

3.3.1 COLUMNS

In general, the tests on columns showed good quality of concrete. Out of 34 columns, 28 columns (about 82%) mean observation showed good quality of concrete, 3 (about 9%) showed doubtful quality and 3 no. columns showed fair quality of concrete. In all columns including those of good quality category, the quality of concrete either near the junction with the beams or near the floor or both had spots of relatively lower value of USPV.

The test results showed that consistency of inferred quality was low. Observations in 7 columns of 28 good quality columns were having high (more than 10%) value of coefficient of variation (CV). In fair and doubtful quality columns, the inconsistency was poorer. This means that the quality of concrete was erratic in general. Only 25% of columns showed consistent quality (CV < 5%). This means that barring those columns with CV < 5%, rest columns have patches of variable quality of concrete in general. The range of Pulse velocity ranges from low value of 2320 m/sec. in col.C21 in B6 Panna Block to high value of 4333 m/s for columns C-230 in the same block. In Block B5 Ratna, the variation range from 3757 m/s to 4112 m/sec. with all having doubtful junction. Heera building had more columns with doubtful and fair quality. Panna building had one columns of doubtful quality of concrete.

A sample of 5 columns and 6 beams were taken up for combined UPV and RH test. The probable estimated strength of concrete varied from 10 N/mm² for columns C14 of C3 block to 24 N/mm² for col. C-26 of block C-3. This is indicative of large variation on quality.

3.3.2 BEAMS

Six beams were tested, 3 each in B6 (Panna) building and B5 (Ratna) building. The beam in B6 showed good quality consistently. In Block B5 Ratna building, two beams showed fair quality of concrete with high value of coefficient of variation (CV) and one beam with good quality. On the whole USPV values in beams were on lower end of good quality range.

From the USPV tests of beams and columns, it was concluded that-

i. Quality of concrete varied significantly.
ii. Weak patches are observed either near the junction of beam or at bottom near the floor or at both.
iii. The quality variation is reflected in probable estimated strength. The probable variation is from 10 N/mm² to 24 N/mm². Generally the values found were between 14-16 N/mm² in sample
columns. The values of estimated possible strengths of concrete in beam varied from 13 N/mm² to 23 N/mm² in sample beams. In B5 block, these were from 19 N/mm², 22 N/mm² and 23 N/mm². Those in sample beams in B6 were 13, 14, 22 N/mm².

The buildings were constructed with cement concrete (cement:1.5 fine aggregate:3 coarse aggregate) with minimum cube strength of 20 N/mm², but the NDT showed that compressive strength was found less than minimum strength required at many locations. Some members showed compressive strength even less than 10 N/mm² indicating poor quality of concrete in all the three buildings.

3.4 CARBONATION TEST

Test for carbonation of concrete was carried out at site as per standard practice and found that depth of carbonation was found 78mm for columns and 35 mm for beam soffits. It means that carbonation had already penetrated deeply beyond the clear cover of 40 mm of columns and 25 mm of beams resulting in to severe corrosion of the rebars and hence delamination and spalls in the structure.

3.5 TEST FOR CHLORIDES

Spalls of concrete were collected from the site for chloride content and got tested from the laboratory. As per lab test, the water soluble chloride content was found to be 1.84, 1.85 and 1.06 gms / kg of concrete weight in Heera, Panna and Ratna buildings resp. As per IS 456-2000, the permissible values of total acid soluble chloride in concrete at the time of placing are 0.6 Kg/ cubic meter i.e 0.25 gm / Kg of concrete which means that chloride content in concrete is beyond the permissible limits. The higher the chloride content during the construction stage or if subsequently exposed to warm and moist conditions, the greater is the risk of corrosion of reinforcement. Due to carbonation of concrete, excess chloride in concrete and poor workmanship in providing effective concrete covers especially at beam column junction has led to spalling and delamination of concrete covers exposing the reinforcement steel badly affecting the structural integrity of the multi-storeyed buildings.

4. DAMAGE BY BHUJ EARTH QUAKE OF JAN’ 2001

On 26th Jan, 2001, an earth quake of magnitude 7.9 on Richter scale struck Gujarat and other parts of India. The epicentre of the quake was Dhoria Village, 20KM off Bhuj. Many buildings were destroyed and some buildings developed cracks and other structural defects due to inadequate design and poor quality of material and workmanship in construction. These buildings safely resisted the earthquake loads but masonry walls were badly cracked while acting as shear walls for resisting lateral loads due to earthquake. There was lot of diagonal shear cracks observed in GF quarters (Fig 5). Due to earth quake vibration, there were separation cracks between masonry walls and beams at top and also between walls and columns (Fig 6). Plaster of walls simply got dismantled of its area due to shaking. The same thing happened with plaster on columns and beams. Some cracks in beam-column junctions were also observed.

Fig. 5- Diagonal shear cracks at GF
Fig. 6- Separation cracks at GF quarter
5. REPAIR STRATEGY - The following strategy was adopted for rehabilitation of buildings [2]

i. Removal of damaged plaster / concrete.
ii. Removal of corrosion on steel reinforcement by mechanical and chemical action and further application of corrosion inhibitor.
iii. Application of bond coat of polymer - cement mix to join old concrete with new mortar.
iv. Repair of RCC columns, beams, slabs by polymer modified mortar.
v. Jacketing of some columns with concrete.
vi. Epoxy grouting in RCC columns, beams to repair cracks.
vii. Crack sealing in masonry walls with polymer modified mortar.
viii. Polymer modified non-shrinkage grouting in cracks of masonry walls.
ix. Concrete grading on terraces
x. Replacement of damaged cast iron drainage pipes and water supply GI lines.
xi. Sealing of drainage pipe joints with PMM.

6. REPAIR METHODOLOGY - The repair of structural members were carried out as follows-

6.1 REMOVAL OF DAMAGED CONCRETE

At the location, where concrete cover had already spalled eg. Columns corners, soffit of beams, slabs and fins, loose concrete was removed 25cm more than the length of spall. For other areas which were not spalled, hammer sounding method was used to locate delaminated concrete and marked with paint. Surface repair boundary with 5mm groove using concrete saw cutter with minimum edge length was prepared. The beams, slabs were supported with props before removal of damaged concrete. After it was ensured that the surface to which cement based polymer modified mortar was to be bonded was sound, it was cleaned off all loose and foreign materials by means of stiff wire brushing. All dust and loose particles resulting from such pre-treatments was removed by washing with water under pressure[1].

6.2 REINFORCEMENT CLEANING AND ANTI CORROSIVE COATING

All concrete sticking to the rebars was removed by light hammering and manual chipping. Wire brush was used to remove unwanted oxide from steel surface completely. One coat of rust remover was applied all round the steel rebars. The coverage rate of rust clear coating on the steel bars came out to be about 3.86 sq. m per litre only much lesser than the claim in the technical brochures. Care was taken that the backside of the bars also gets coated with the rust remover. The rust remover was allowed to act for 24 hrs and then steel bars were rubbed with wire brush to remove the rust followed
with washing with water jet to completely remove the rust. If the rust was not removed effectively than another coat of rust remover was applied, waited for 10 minutes and then again rubbed with wire brush[1].

Anti corrosive zinc primer was coated on freshly cleaned and dry reinforcing steel on complete periphery as per manufacturer’s specifications and allowed the primer to dry for 4 hrs (Fig 7). The second coat of zinc primer after 4hrs of the application of first coat was also applied. Care was taken to cover all the steel without leaving even the smallest part of steel uncovered. The coverage rate of zinc based anti –corrosion coating on the steel bars came out to be about 2.4 sq. m per litre of the chemical which was much lesser than the claims in the technical brochures. The bars having more than 20% of the reinforcement steel bar cross sectional area corroded were replaced with the additional reinforcement by welding with existing bars or by drilling holes in to concrete and inserting the steel bars with epoxy mortar. There was severe corrosion of shear stirrups in beams resulting in decrease in diameter by more than 25%, so these were also replaced with new U- shape stirrups.

6.3 APPLICATION OF BONDING COAT TO SUBSTRATE

All concrete surfaces prior to application of bond coat was thoroughly inspected and made free from any deleterious materials such as oil, dust, dirt etc. The surface was kept wet for 24hrs ensuring that they are well saturated but free of surfaces water after natural drying. A bonding slurry of cement and Acrylic polymer in the ration 1:1 (1 cement: 1 acrylic polymer) by volume with required quantity of water was prepared to a lump free creamy consistency. The coverage rate was found to be 0.8-1.1 sq.m of the concrete substrate. The bonding slurry was worked well into surface of the parent body using a stiff brush ensuring that no pin holes are visible. If a second coat was felt necessary, the same was applied at right angle to first coat to ensure complete coverage after the first coat was touch dry. The bonding slurry was applied to prepared concrete substrate after tying in new reinforcement where ever specified. Care was taken that cement based polymer modified mortar was applied as soon as possible after application of bonding coat, but always during the open time of adhesive [1].

6.4 APPLICATION OF POLYMER MODIFIED MORTAR

There are no codes/standards available for preparation of polymer modified mortar for rehabilitation of concrete structures, so extensive testing was carried out for different polymer samples from different manufacturers yielding different strengths [2]. The buildings were originally constructed with concrete mix (1 cement: 1.5 sand: 3 coarse aggregates) with minimum strength requirement of 20 N/mm² min., so it was decided that the polymer modified repair mortar must have compressive strength of 25 N/mm². Based on the polymer test reports, concrete mix used in the construction of these buildings, extent of damage and technical guidance from CBRI, Roorkee, the following specifications for polymer modified mortar preparation were designed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid Content</td>
<td>46% mini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressive strength</td>
<td>25 N/mm² min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile strength</td>
<td>3.5 N/mm² mini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexural strength</td>
<td>8.5 N/mm² mini.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct shear bond strength</td>
<td>2 N/mm² mini.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Polymer modified mortar mix was prepared in the proportion Cement (OPC) 50 kg : sand (graded Zone II) 150 kg : Acrylic polymer @ 20-25% of cement content by weight and water cement ratio was kept below 0.4 (by weight). With this mix, the laboratory test reports of one batch of acrylic polymer yielded following strengths-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid Content</td>
<td>51.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressive strength</td>
<td>42.13 N/ sqmm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensile strength</td>
<td>4.01 N/sqmm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexural strength</td>
<td>-14.25 N/sqmm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct shear bond strength</td>
<td>2.77 N/sqmm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These strengths satisfied our specifications and hence rehabilitation of structural members was
carried out with this mortar mix. The test cubes of size 7.06 cm x 7.06 cm of the PMM prepared at site for concrete repair were also got tested from the laboratory as quality assurance measure which showed compressive strengths between 26 to 32.40 N/mm² meeting the specifications.

6.5 COLUMN JACKETING

Some of the columns were badly cracked throughout their height in the parking area and some had deep spalls at corners due to rebar corrosion. Some columns were badly damaged at floor level. These columns were jacketed with new rebars and jacketing concrete by 75mm thickness all-round to increase its strength and stiffness and to protect its reinforcement from further corrosion (Fig 9). The ready to use jacketing concrete in which coarse aggregate of 6-10 mm down size was to be added as per recommendation of the manufacturer was used. The Jacketing concrete was of following properties with water powder ratio of 0.21 at 30°C and with 100% aggregates:

- Compressive strength- 30N/sqmm mini at 30days,
- Flexural strength -3.0N/sqmm mini at 30days,
- Young’s Modulus- 22 KN/sqmm.

6.6 CRACK REPAIR

6.6.1 MASONARY CRACKS

The plasticized expanding grout admixtures along with Styrene Butadiene Rubber (SBR) polymer was used for sealing of masonry wall cracks. The SBR polymer with the same specifications as that for acrylic polymer was added to grout admixture for enhancing its bonding with cracked masonry inside. The laboratory test of one of the batch of SBR polymer used in the work had following properties:
Total solid content - 51.1%, Compressive Strength - 42.80 N/sq mm, Tensile strength - 4.91 N/sq mm, Flexural strength - 11.86 N/sq mm, Bond strength - 3.06 N/sq mm.

6.6.2 RCC CRACKS

Cracks in RCC members especially beam-column joints were grouted with epoxy grout of the following composition specially formulated to meet the required specifications (100 gms GY257+21 gm Aradur 21 + 4 gms Aradur 2958) from Araldite and the grout was of the following properties:

- Viscosity at 25°C max: 2 N/sq m
- Minimum Gel time: 30 minutes
- 14 days bond strength at 25°C - 3.5 N/sq mm
- Compressive yield strength at 7 days: 60 N/sq mm
- Tensile strength at 7 days: 45 N/sq mm
- Elongation at break min: 1%

![Fig.10- Epoxy injection in beam-column junctions](image)

7. QUALITY CONTROL AND ASSURANCE

All the construction materials were prior tested from reputed laboratories like Ahmedabad Textiles Industrial Research Association (ATIRA), Nirma University, Ahmedabad & IIT-Mumbai to check conformity to standards. Construction chemicals from reputed companies like STP, Roffe, Fosroc, Sunanda, Ventico performance polymers were used for this work. The non-destructive testing was carried out by M/s. KCT Consultancy Services and M/s. KBM Engineering Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad.

8. POST REHABILITATION CONDITION OF BUILDINGS

The buildings rehabilitation was completed in 2003. All visible cracks, spalls and de-laminations of concrete in beams, columns, fins and slabs were rehabilitated as per standard procedures, best quality workmanship and strict supervision at site. Extensive material testing of every polymer stock received at site was tested before use at site. The work was completed in 18 months as per desired quality standards. After structural rehabilitation, the building exterior was painted with acrylic paint.

![Fig.11- Cracked column at the parking level](image)

![Fig.12- Damaged slab below the toilet due to rebar corrosion](image)
“Apex” from Asian paints. After 9 years of successful performance of these buildings, some cracks, spalls have been noticed mostly in parking level columns (Fig 11), beam / slab soffits under the toilet area, roofs (Fig 12) and fins due to reinforcement corrosion requiring some structural rehabilitation work to avoid further deterioration due to corrosion of rebars.

CONCLUSIONS

The detailed investigation of the buildings with rebound hammer test, ultrasound pulse velocity test and core tests, carbonation test and chloride tests have indicated that there is lot of variation in the compressive strengths of concrete in beams as well as columns. At certain locations, the strengths were found around 10 N/mm² only indicated poor quality of concrete practices adopted in the original construction. Lower value of compressive strengths also indicates higher permeability of the concrete leading to ingress of harmful agents like carbon dioxide gas, chlorides etc from the environment resulting in corrosion of steel bars and disintegration of concrete covers. From this case study, following recommendations / conclusions are drawn for durable concrete constructions requiring minimum structural rehabilitation at later stages of life.

[1] There is no substitute for good quality concrete construction practices for durability of reinforced concrete structures. The quality control of materials and workmanship viz. water-cement ratio, concrete cover, compaction and curing etc. which are prerequisites for good quality construction are very important parameters and must be strictly observed at site. Poor quality concrete construction done cannot be rectified at a later date except repeated costly repairs to keep the structure functional.

[2] To achieve the quality at site, the role of manpower is very significant. The engineers and workers responsible for construction should be well experienced, quality conscious and must be fully aware of the repercussions of poor quality work. Also sufficient technical staff should be deputed for achievement of quality construction with full support and encouragement from top management.

[3] The early deterioration of concrete structure is also due to poor maintenance practices. The water supply and drainage system should be kept intact so that there is no leakage/ seepage on the walls and no stagnated water on roofs due to overflow of water tanks or rains which acts as an enemy to the structural integrity of the buildings.

[4] The repair/ rehabilitation of damaged structure should be carried out urgently to avoid further deterioration with time so that the life of the structure and the occupants is not jeopardized.

[5] The design for structural rehabilitation should be carried out after laboratory testing of the repair materials because the claimed strengths in the brochures from the manufacturers may not always be achievable.

[6] Structural rehabilitation is more challenging then new concrete construction. It requires special considerations for evaluation of damage, selection of suitable material, technical specifications, and techniques for repair and quality control of material and workmanship. Therefore sufficient time and cost allocations should be made for durable rehabilitation work.
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