Cyclic Response of Reinforced Concrete Moment Resisting Beams Repaired with Epoxy Injection
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ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of a quasi-static cyclic test carried out on a reinforced concrete special moment resisting beam in the Earthquake Engineering Center of UET Peshawar to study the efficiency of traditional repair techniques in restoring the strength and stiffness capacity of damaged RC beams. The beam was tested in a cantilever mode and was subjected to a standard loading protocol with increasing amplitude of displacement cycles. The final damage state of the beam consisted of severe cracking and spalling of the cover concrete. The cracks were repaired with low-viscosity injection epoxy and the spalled concrete was repaired with early-strength grout. The repaired specimen was subjected to the same loading protocol as the original specimen to study the efficiency of the repair technique employed. It was observed that epoxy injection is not effective in restoring the stiffness of beams due to bar slip and inelastic extension of longitudinal bars at the support end.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Modern seismic design codes [1-3] design buildings with the objective to avoid collapse and save human lives. Structures are designed for seismic forces that are considerably smaller than the design-level forces, and therefore they are prone to damage during design-basis earthquake [4]. Reinforced concrete special moment resisting frames are designed according to the principles of capacity design; which states that damage should be concentrated at fixed locations in beams, often called plastic hinges. The plastic hinges are located at the ends of beams and should be proportioned and detailed to respond primarily in flexure mode rather than brittle modes of response such as shear. This philosophy forms the basis of almost all the modern seismic design codes [1-3]. However, the subject of reparability of damaged reinforced concrete structures, after being subjected to an earthquake, has been addressed rarely. The performance of reinforced concrete moment resisting frames, designed to modern codes, in the recent earthquake of Christchurch (2011) was satisfactory but raised the issue of reparability of reinforced concrete structural components [5-6]. A large number of damaged reinforced concrete frames had to be demolished due to the lack of sufficient experimental evidence to justify the use of traditional repair techniques in restoring the capacity of damaged reinforced concrete structural elements.

This paper addresses the issue of reparability of reinforced concrete structural elements through an experimental program. Since there has been a rampant increase in the construction of reinforced concrete frames around the world, therefore, it is considered necessary to bring the issue of reparability of reinforced concrete beams to the knowledge of concerned authorities and structural design engineers. To achieve this task, it was necessary to conduct an experimental program to study the efficiency of repair techniques and highlight the associated problems with different repair techniques, used locally in Pakistan for the past many years. Quasi-static cyclic testing, as proposed by Ahmad et al., (2016) for testing beams, is conducted on a special moment resisting beam to study the efficiency of epoxy injection and grout patching in restoring the strength and stiffness of a damaged beam. Epoxy injection repair technique was studied herein due to its ease of application and its widespread adaptation in local industry in Pakistan within the context of rehabilitation.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Popov et al. (1975) tested three full-scale short cantilever reinforced concrete beams and one half-scaled interior beam-column joint representative of third floor framing of a 20 story RC moment resisting frame. Two repair schemes were investigated i.e. repair with a rapidly setting epoxy resin and concrete depending on the damage state of the beam. It was observed that the performance of beams repaired using epoxy resin was satisfactory but exhibited some loss of stiffness due to bond. Additionally, replacing severely damaged concrete using fresh concrete was found to be a satisfactory solution.

Corazao and Durrani (1989) carried out a detailed experimental investigation on repair of reinforced concrete sub-assemblages subjected to quasi-static cyclic loading. A total of eleven sub-assemblages were tested, which consisted of five exterior beam-column connections and six two bay frames. Different repair techniques were studied depending on the type and extent of damage. It was found that epoxy injection is suitable for repairing cracks in beams and slabs and its effectiveness in beam-column joints depends on the quality of work. In case of severe damage, such as damage to core concrete, the strength can be effectively restored by replacing the damaged concrete. Reinforcement jacketing and addition of external rolled steel elements were found to be reliable ways of restoring strength and stiffness.
III. EXPERIMENTAL WORK

The cross sectional dimensions of the beam are 12in. x 18 in. with a length of 96 in. The beam had 3-#8 bars in the top and bottom layer giving a longitudinal reinforcement ratio of 1.26%. The transverse reinforcement was provided according to the confinement requirements of ACI-318 for beams.

3.1 Materials

3.1.1 Steel

The longitudinal and stirrup reinforcement consisted of ASTM-A615 grade-60 bars. Steel coupons were tested in tension for the #8 and #3 bars to test their yield strengths. The details of tests are given in the Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Nominal Dia</th>
<th>Yield Strength (Psi)</th>
<th>Ultimate Strength (Psi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>66140</td>
<td>91846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>69387</td>
<td>95056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>64612</td>
<td>89985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>77939</td>
<td>107313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>67006</td>
<td>92291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>71171</td>
<td>99639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Concrete

Normal weight concrete with a specified strength of 3000 psi was used for all the beams. The concrete mix design ratio used was 1:2.13:3.61 with a water-to-cement ratio of 0.57. Standard cylinders of 12 in. height and 6 in. diameter were tested under compression loading to validate the mix design. The results of compression tests on the cylinders are given below in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen ID</th>
<th>Age of Concrete (days)</th>
<th>Concrete Compressive Strength, fc’ (psi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28-1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3282.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3204.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3492.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. SPECIMEN CONSTRUCTION AND SETUP

The specimen was cast using plywood formwork and was cured for a total of fourteen days. The beams cantilevered out of an anchorage block which was anchored to the strong floor of the laboratory using bolts Fig. 3. The lateral load was applied at some distance from the free end of the beam using a manual-controlled hydraulic actuator. The actuator was attached to the beam using a hinge assembly to allow the rotation of the actuator Fig. 3.

V. LOADING HISTORY

The loading protocol used consisted of a series of increasing displacement cycles with three cycles per each displacement increment. The control point for the displacement amplitude was the point of application of load by the actuator.
VI. TEST RESULTS

6.1 Damage Description and Hysteretic Response

The specimen was loaded with an initial displacement of 0.375 in. Full depth flexural crack formed at the northern face of the beam at a distance of 18 in. from the face of the block, whereas a flexural crack at a distance of about 16 in. formed on the southern face. Cracking was not observed on the eastern and western faces at this displacement demand. At displacement amplitude of 0.75 in., no new cracks formed on any face of the beam. With further increase in displacement demand to 1.5 in., new flexural cracks formed at 8 in., 13in. 26 in. and 34 in. from the support on the southern face. A flexure crack formed at northern face at a distance of 27 in., whereas slight diagonal cracking occurred on the western face. A wide distribution of cracks took place during the displacement cycles of 2.5 in., with cracks on the northern and southern faces as high as 54 in. Full depth inclined cracks were observed on the eastern and western faces of the beam which increased in number at displacement demand of 3.5in. Minimal new cracks were observed further till the conclusion of test at 5.5 in.

Spalling of the concrete cover started on the northern and southern faces at a displacement of 4.5 in., which escalated at final the displacement cycles of 5.5 in exposing the reinforcing bars on the southern face. The specimen could not be displaced further because the maximum stroke of the hydraulic jack was 6 in. The hysteretic response was marked by a strong pinching due to the slip of longitudinal bars. No strength drop was observed in the hysteretic response due to the fact that the specimen was not tested till failure as shown in Fig. 6.

VII. REPAIR OF DAMAGES

The main objective of conducting this test was to study the reparability of reinforced concrete beams damaged by seismic loading. Since the specimen did not sustain damage beyond spalling of cover concrete, therefore, the repair techniques chosen were epoxy injection into cracks and patching of spalled concrete. The epoxy used was a low viscosity injection epoxy. The patching of spalled concrete was done using non-shrink and early-strength grout.

Figure 4: Loading Protocol for Testing, adopted from Ahmad et al. (2016)

Figure 5: Specimen Damage Patterns

Figure 6: Hysteretic Response

Figure 7: Epoxy Injection and Patching of Spalled Concrete
VIII. DAMAGE DESCRIPTION AND Hysteric RESPONSE

The response of the repaired specimen was unsatisfactory. The beam showed a considerable drop in the strength and a severe pinched hysteretic response due to loss of stiffness Fig. 8.

The reason behind this performance is the fixed end rotation at the interface between the beam and the anchorage block. The interface opening was injected with epoxy but based on the results it can be said that the merely filling the interface opening with epoxy will not restore the original stiffness of the beams which will render the beam unable to achieve its original strength. The efficiency of the epoxy injection in treating the cracks could not be studied due to the fact that the beams did not sustain the original loads, which caused those cracks.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

i. The damage of the test specimen consisted of cracking, spalling and fixed-end rotation due to slip and inelastic extension of longitudinal bars. The cracks of the plastic hinge region and the interface crack (due to fixed-end rotation) were both injected with low viscosity epoxy to restore the capacity of the beam. It was, however, observed that the strength and stiffness of the beam were not regained.

ii. Therefore, it is concluded that the repair of reinforced concrete beams, with fixed-end rotation, will be ineffective by mere filling of interface crack with epoxy. The significant loss of strength and stiffness due to fixed-end rotation also renders the repair of the rest of the damaged beam useless.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

i. The epoxy injection repair technique should be coupled also with other technique(s) e.g. reinforcement jacketing, fibre reinforced polymer sheets, etc., that can increase the stiffness and strength of the beam.
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