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Alkali-Aggregate Reaction
What Our Current Approach Tells Us and What is Doesn’t
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What Current Guidance Does Do

- Major Improvements:
  - Identification of reactive materials
  - Identification of reasonable mitigation procedures
  - Development of reasonably comprehensive concrete specifications

Purpose of Presentation

One Facility
Owner’s Perspective
A Little History on Guidance

Historical - ASR: Before 1940
- ASR in Major Civil Works Projects
- Parker Dam 1938
- Copper Basin Dam – 1938
- Coolidge Dam – 1928
- Stewart Mtn Dam – 1930
- American Falls Dam – 1927
- Owyhee Dam – 1932
- Also Transportation Structures

Historical - ASR: 1940 – early 1980’s
- Identification
  - 1940 – first publications
  - Importance of cement alkalis
- Low-alkali cement
  - ≤0.60%
- Test methods
  - C 289 quick chemical
  - C 227 – mortar bar
  - C 441 – mod. C 227

Historical - ASR: Late 1980’s – Present
- Problems in guidance
  - Test methods - detection errors
  - Specifications – insufficiently protective
- New TM’s and Spec’s
  - C 1260
  - C 1293 – reference condition
  - C 1567
- Field Service Record
- Comprehensive Concrete Specification
  - FWHA, ASTM

New Reference Condition?

Commonly Used Scheme
- Mitigation
  - SCM’s - primary
  - alkali’s – deemphasized
- Specifications (ΔL%) (C 1293)
  - 0.10% mortar
  - 0.04% concrete
Historical - ACR

- Identification & Early Work
  - 1950’s – 60’s
  - Screening – chemistry, microscopy
  - C 586 – rock prism
  - C 1105 – concrete prism

- Sporadic work on mechanism
- Renewed interest

What Current Guidance Doesn’t Tell Us

Field Service Record

- C 33
- Rarely useful in practice
  - Variable conditions
  - Variable materials
  - Sufficient age (10 y)
  - Lack of records

Some Materials Not Covered

- Blended cements
- C 1157 cements
- Lithium
- Specialty cements

Alkali Content of Materials

- Performance methods do not account for
  - Alkali-content of cements
- Alkali loading ~2 – 4 kg Na₂O/ m³
  - Based only cement alkalis
  - Low alkali cement
  - Alkalis in SCM’s

Service Conditions: Alkali Redistribution

- Alkali Content of Mortar, Total as Na₂O

Depth from surface, cm
Service Conditions: Ambient Temperatures

\[ \Delta T = 15 \, ^\circ C \]

Different temperature activation among aggregates?

Lab Tests & Long-Term Projections

- Assumptions on Performance Tests
  - Alkali content simulates highest cement alkali condition
  - Test time-temperature simulate very long service conditions
- Translation: Lab - Field
  - Ottawa: 10 – 25 y ???
  - Texas: 5 – 10 y ???

Specificity of Test Methods: ASR vs ACR

- Assumption: Methods are specific either to ASR or ACR
  - C 1260 is specific to ASR
  - C 586 is specific to ACR
  - C 1105 is specific to ACR

Combined CA – FA Testing

- Mortar Bar
  - Fine Aggr: \[ \Delta L = 0.10\% \]
  - Concrete Prism: \[ \Delta L = 0.04\% \]
- Coarse Aggr: \[ \Delta L = 0.10\% \]
- Coarse & Fine Aggr: \[ \Delta L = 0.08\% \]

Details of Interpretation – e.g. C 1293

What Do We Need to Do?

- Maybe better record keeping and monitoring
- Develop better test methods
  - Alkali contents of materials
  - Non-standard materials
- Develop information on aggregate activation E