STUDY OF DRY SILICA FUME ADMIXTURE ADDITION RATES AND BLENDED SILICA FUME CEMENT IN CONCRETE

REPORT 94-4 MAY 1994

REPORTING ON WORK PLAN 93-C-7

STATE OF VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION MATERIALS AND RESEARCH DIVISION

PATRICK J. GARAHAN, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION R. L. MERCHANT, DIRECTOR OF CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE R. F. CAULEY, MATERIALS & RESEARCH ENGINEER D. F. HALE, STRUCTURAL CONCRETE ENGINEER

Prepared by:

W. L. Meyer, Technician IV Structural Concrete Section

Reviewed By:

Cauly per

R. F. Cauley Materials & Research Engineer

10 may 1999 Date:__

The information contained in this report was compiled for the use of the Vermont Agency of Transportation. Conclusions and recommendations contained herein are based upon the research data obtained and the expertise of the researchers, and are not necessarily to be construed as Agency policy. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. The Vermont Agency of Transportation assumes no liability for its contents or the use thereof.

ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	2
Materials	4
Procedures	5
Results & Discussion	7
Conclusions & Recommendations	9
<pre>Appendix A Table 1, Concrete Mix Designs (US Customary Units) Table 1M, Concrete Mix Designs (SI Units) Appendix B (Two Reports) Section 704.01 & Section 704.02 Test Results, Laboratory Report Nos. G9300134, G9300141</pre>	10
Appendix C Table 2, Concrete Test Results (US Customary Units) Table 2M, Concrete Test Results (SI Units) Table 3, Average Concrete Test Results (US Customary Units) Table 3M, Average Concrete Test Results (SI Units) Figure 1, Average Compressive Strength vs Age (US Customary Units) Figure 1-M, Average Compressive Strength vs Age (SI Units) Figure 2, Resistance To Rapid Freezing and Thawing- Average Weight Loss Figure 3, Average Chloride Content After 90 Days Of Ponding	14
Appendix D Work Plan No. 93-C-7	22

<u>Note:</u> Values shown in the text are presented in SI (International System) units, with US customary units show in parentheses. Generally, SI units are direct conversions and should not be considered as the standard, in referenced specifications.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As the use of silica fume in concrete and related products grows, the need to gain more knowledge concerning use of this complex material has increased dramatically. Optimum addition rates, densified/compacted versus slurry silica fume products, blended silica fume cements, other admixtures, and batching, mixing and curing practices must all be understood, and proper procedures followed, if this relatively new and important construction tool is to perform as desired.

This evaluation was initiated to gain a better understanding of material performance for various silica fume addition rates and blended silica fume cement. Mixing and testing followed usual laboratory procedures, with less than desired results.

Information obtained subsequent to the mixing and testing portion of this program indicates the reduced performance of some concrete batches containing silica fume may have resulted from failure to use extended mixing periods when a densified/compacted silica fume product was introduced into the mixture.

Subsequently, few of the initial questions have been answered. Instead, new and more comprehensive questions have been raised. More study and research will be needed before procedures can be established to achieve the maximum benefits using silica fume concrete.

INTRODUCTION

The introduction of silica fume(microsilica), as an additive to portland cement concrete, has presented specifiers and users with many new challenges. Enhanced strength and durability, combined with reduced permeability, have prompted the use of silica fume concrete under the most severe environments.

The Vermont Agency of Transportation (AOT) currently specifies silica fume concrete for bridge curbing and some other structural components exposed to severe weather conditions and repeated applications of deicing chemicals. Silica fume, in dry densified form, or as a slurry, is added to the concrete mixture at the rate of 7.5% by weight of portland cement. One field test also specified silica fume be added to the concrete mixture at a 4% addition rate.

Shotcrete, incorporating silica fume as an admixture, was used in the rehabilitation of piers and pier caps on two recently completed AOT projects. Test specimens yielded excellent results and repairs were generally completed without difficulty. Silica fume quantities of 4% and 5% by weight of cement were used initially in shotcrete applications, with the majority of work performed using the 4% addition rate.

When all the positive aspects of silica fume concrete are examined, there are still many unanswered questions. Some of these questions focus on optimum addition rates that can be reasonably employed under field conditions, and minimum addition rates that will continue to provide improved performance.

Laboratory studies using silica fume quantities of 25% to 40% by weight of cement produced outstanding results. In actual field practice, the higher addition rates may produce concrete with reduced workability and increased shrinkage cracking, causing many concerns among specifiers and users. While some of these disadvantages are overcome with high range water reducing admixtures (HRWR), finishing aids and early application of moist curing, most users specify addition rates well below those examined in laboratory experiments.

To answer some of the questions regarding silica fume addition rates, a program was organized to study reduced quantities and their effect on various concrete properties. Addition rates of 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% were included in the study. This program also examined a blended cement containing 7.5% silica fume. Concrete containing silica fume was compared with an airentrained reference concrete and with concrete containing a high range water reducing admixture.

Further questions regarding use of silica fume in concrete deal with slurry versus densified (compacted) products, and more recently with blended silica fume cements. Silica fume particles are generally about 0.13 - 0.16 microns in size. Because of the extremely small particle size, silica fume is frequently dispensed as a slurry to reduce dust and facilitate handling. Slurries may be formulated to contain HRWR or other admixtures to enhance placing and finishing characteristics.

Densified (compacted) silica fume particles are agglomerations of individual particles varying in size from 10 microns to 0.1 mm or more. Densifying the particles helps reduce dust and facilitates handling of the material in bags and bulk shipping containers.

More recently, area cement producers are marketing a blended silica fume cement which is manufactured by grinding cement clinker with silica fume pellets. The pellets are formed by introducing humidified air into a revolving chamber of silica fume particles. Silica fume collects on the moisture droplets forming soft pellets with a maximum size of about 12.7 mm (1/2 inch). Silica fume, in this form, can be easily transported and stored, and later blended with cement clinker as it enters the grinding mill. Heat generated in the grinding mill drives the moisture out of the pellets, allowing the silica fume particles to return to their natural size. One area producer is supplying cement containing approximately 7.5% silica fume.

Data obtained subsequent to this investigation suggests normal concrete mixing practices may not be adequate to achieve total dispersion of densified (compacted) silica fume and pelletized silica fume (silica fume cement) throughout concrete mixtures. Without complete dispersion, many desired benefits of silica fume concrete may not be realized.

To insure total dispersion one supplier recommends extended mixing periods, with a minimum of 120 mixing revolutions, and reduced load size when their densified/compacted product is used in ready mixed concrete operations. For laboratory mixers, blending of the densified product with coarse aggregate and water, and mixing for five minutes prior to addition of the remaining ingredients is recommended to achieve dispersion. This recommendation is based on the reduced mixing energy of laboratory mixers as compared to transit or central mixers.

Failure to address this increased mixing effort may have contributed to reduced performance of mixtures containing densified silica fume in this program. While these mixtures were not severely affected, some of the anticipated benefits were not evident. The silica fume cement used in this evaluation did appear to provide many of the desired benefits. It is unknown, however, if maximum performance was achieved, and how other silica fume cements will perform under similar conditions. Additional research is essential, to establish optimum batching and mixing procedures that will provide maximum benefits from all silica fume products used in concrete.

MATERIALS

The materials selected for this program represent those used, or proposed for use, at the S. T. Griswold & Co. ready mixed concrete facility in Williston, Vermont. The materials are as follows:

Aggregates:

19.05 mm (3/4") Crushed Stone

F. W. Whitcomb Construction Corp. Colchester, Vermont

Fine Aggregate

Hinesburg Sand & Gravel Company, Inc. Hinesburg, Vermont

Cements:

Type II Cement

Lafarge Corporation, Northeast Cement St. Constant, Quebec

Blended Cement (Lafarge Silica Fume Cement)

Lafarge Corporation, Northeast Cement St. Constant, Quebec

Admixtures:

Air Entraining Admixture

Micro-Air Master Builders, Inc. Cleveland, Ohio

Water Reducing Admixture

WRDA with Hycol W. R. Grace & Company Cambridge, Massachusetts

High Range Water Reducing Admixture

WRDA-19 W. R. Grace & Company Cambridge, Massachusetts

Silica Fume (Microsilica) Admixture

Force 10,000 (Dry Densified) W. R. Grace & Company Cambridge, Massachusetts

PROCEDURES

AOT Class A concrete was selected as the reference material for this investigation. Class A mixtures are designed with a minimum cement content of 391.57 kg/m^3 (660 lbs/yd³) and a maximum .44 water/cement ratio. A water reducing, retarding, or water reducing and retarding admixture is specified. The required air content is 6 ± 1% and a maximum 76.2 mm (3 inch) slump is specified when this class of concrete is used in bridge decks. The minimum compressive strength requirement for Class A is 27.58 MPa (4,000 psi) at 28 days.

Silica fume concrete is currently detailed in project Special Provisions and must meet the requirements of Class A concrete with the following modifications:

- 1. Water/(Cement & Silica fume) ratio maximum 0.40
- 2. Slump 127 \pm 50.8 mm (5 \pm 2 inches) (after addition of super plasticizer)
- 3. Air content 7 + 2%
- 4. Seven day compressive strength no less than 31.03 MPa (4500 psi)

5. 28 day compressive strength no less than 34.48 MPa (5000 psi)

The silica fume shall be added to the concrete mixture at the rate of 7.5% by weight of portland cement or 29.37 kg/m^3 (49.5 lb/yd³) of silica fume. Use of a high range water reducing admixture will be required to produce a workable mix. At least three weeks prior to placement the Contractor shall submit to the Engineer the proposed silica fume concrete mix design for approval.

Aggregates were sampled and tested for compliance with the appropriate sections of AOT specifications. The aggregates were air-dried prior to the start of mixing operations.

Two reference batches were prepared which contained 391.57 kg/m^3 (660 lb/yd³) of cement, an air entraining admixture and a water reducing admixture. Two batches each were also prepared for the concrete containing a high range water reducing admixture and for the three addition rates (2.5%, 5% and 7.5%) of dry silica fume admixture. Four batches were prepared using the blended silica fume cement. Concrete was mixed in a Sears rotary drum mixer with a batch size of 0.05 m³ (1.8 ft³). Mix designs, including water and admixture quantities, are shown in Tables 1 and 1-M, in Appendix A.

Tests were performed on the fresh concrete to determine slump (AASHTO T 119-82), air content (AASHTO T 152-90), unit weight (AASHTO T 121-86), temperature (ASTM C 1064-86) and time of setting (AASHTO T 197-90).

Hardened concrete was tested for compressive strength (AASHTO T 22-90), resistance to rapid freezing and thawing (AASHTO T161-86) modified, and resistance to chloride ion penetration (AASHTO T 259-80) modified.

Compressive strength, using 152.4 x 304.8 mm (6 x 12") cylinders, was determined at one, three, seven and 28 days. Freeze thaw specimens, 76.2 x 76.2 x 406.4 mm (3 x 3 x 16") prisms, were moist cured for 14 days before being subjected to 300 cycles of rapid freezing and thawing in a 3% sodium chloride solution. Tests for resistance to chloride ion penetration were conducted using 304.8 x 304.8 x 127 mm (12 x 12 x 5") deep blocks with an 279.4 x 279.4 x 19.1 mm (11 x 11 x 3/4") deep reservoir cast into the surface.

The blocks were moist cured for 14 days, followed by 28 days of air drying. During the drying period, the blocks were sampled and tested for base chloride ion levels. At the conclusion of the drying period, the specimens received 90 days of continuous ponding with a 3% sodium chloride solution. Following ponding, the specimens were again sampled and tested for total chloride ion content at depths of 1.6 to 12.7 mm (0.0625 to 0.50"), 12.7 to 25.4 mm (0.50 to 1"), and 25.4 to 50.8 mm (1 to 2").

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

GENERAL

Results of tests conducted on the coarse and fine aggregates used in this investigation are shown on Laboratory Report Nos. G9300134 and G9300141, in Appendix B.

Test data for fresh and hardened concrete, for all batches, is outlined in Tables 2 and 2-M in Appendix C. Tables 3 and 3-M show average results for each combination of material examined. Average results for silica fume cement in Tables 3 and 3-M show Batches 1 and 2 combined, and Batches 3 and 4 combined. The data was presented in this manner to compare results when air contents varied approximately 3%.

COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH

1. Compressive strengths of the HRWR and silica fume cement mixtures were approximately equal at 28 days. These materials yielded strengths that were significantly higher at that age than the reference batches, and exceeded the strengths of batches containing compacted silica fume by a considerable margin. The 28 day strengths of HRWR and silica fume cement batches were 30% to 34% greater than reference batches, while the Force 10000 strengths ranged from 9% to 17% higher than reference strengths. Figures 1 and 1-M, in Appendix C, show the average strength gain characteristics of the various mixes.

2. Batch 1 of Force 10000 at the 7.5% addition rate, failed to achieve the currently specified seven day strength of 31.03 MPa (4500 psi). All other batches containing silica fume complied with both the seven day requirement, and with the 28 day minimum of 34.48 MPa (5000 psi).

RESISTANCE TO RAPID FREEZING AND THAWING

1. All batches examined in this program performed well in freezing and thawing tests. Results after 300 cycles of freezing and thawing showed weight losses ranging from 0.8% to 5.1%. The best overall performance was displayed by the reference concrete with an average durability factor of 101.9, and an average weight loss of 0.8%, after 300 cycles. Figure 2, in Appendix C, illustrates the average weight loss experienced in freeze/thaw testing.

2. The silica fume cement batches, with an average 8.8% air content performed somewhat better than their companion batches with an average air content of 6.1%. After 300 cycles of freezing and thawing, batches 1 & 2 (8.8% air content) showed 1.8% weight loss while batches 3 & 4 (6.1% air content) exhibited 5.1% weight loss.

3. The HRWR and Force 10000 silica fume batches showed average weight losses ranging from 3.0% to 4.1% after 300 cycles.

RESISTANCE TO CHLORIDE ION PENETRATION

1. Base level chloride tests, conducted prior to the start of ponding, yielded a broad range of results. The lowest reading obtained was 19 ppm and the greatest reading was 137 ppm, with an average of 63 ppm for 27 tests.

2. Chloride contents after 90 days, obtained with Force 10,000 at the 2.5% and 5% addition rates, were roughly equal to reference concrete results at all depths.

3. Force 10,000 concrete using the 7.5% addition rate had less chloride intrusion at the 1.6 - 12.7 mm (1/16 - 1/2") depth than the reference concrete, but exhibited similar performance at greater depths.

4. The batches containing silica fume cement demonstrated the best overall performance in resistance to chloride intrusion tests. After 90 days of ponding, the chloride contents at 1.6 - 12.7 mm (1/16 - 1/2") were equal to or less than the other concrete mixes. Depths greater than 12.7 mm (1/2") showed chloride levels similar to those obtained prior to the start of testing.

5. At the 1.6 - 12.7 mm (1/16 - 1/2") depth, considerable variation existed between batches of similar concrete. Several of the batches had chloride contents at that depth which were roughly half the chloride content of their counterparts.

6. At the 25.4 - 50.8 mm (1 - 2") depth, chloride contents of all batches, after 90 days of ponding, were comparable to results obtained prior to the start of testing.

7. Following 90 days of ponding, none of the materials had chloride contents below the 12.7 mm (1/2") depth that approached the corrosion threshold of 325 ppm. Average results of chloride ion penetration tests are displayed in Figure 3, in Appendix C.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Batches containing the Force 10,000 silica fume generally had earlier setting times than the other concretes. Conversely, batches containing silica fume cement exhibited later setting times. Difficulty controlling concrete temperatures and storage temperatures of time of set specimens may have had a greater influence on setting times than other variables in the testing program.

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Concrete containing silica fume cement performed well in all tests conducted in this evaluation. It is recommended that this material be approved for use in AOT projects when silica fume concrete is specified. Use of this material will be contingent upon the ready mixed concrete supplier providing adequate storage facilities for handling and dispensing the blended product. Provisions must also be made to insure strict adherence to specified ratios of portland cement and silica fume, i.e. additional cement and silica fume must be available for blending, when non-standard quantities are specified.

2. Due to the strengths experienced with silica fume cement, when compared to other mixtures, further examination of all silica fume products is recommended. Examinations should include, but not be limited to:

a. Compressive strength comparison of concretes or mortars containing "slurry" vs densified (compacted) silica fume products, and blended silica fume cements.

b. Development of laboratory tests to determine the necessity for extended mixing times to achieve full dispersion of densified/compacted silica fume and silica fume cements.

- 1) Use a constant energy mixer. (Laboratory mixer meeting requirements of AASHTO T 162.)
- 2) Combine cementitious materials with graded standard sand meeting requirements of ASTM C 778.
- 3) Blend materials for several prescribed mixing periods, ie. one, two, four, and six minutes.
- 4) Determine compressive strength, AASHTO T 106, at early ages, ie. one, two, and three days to establish an optimum test age.

3. Prior to completion of laboratory tests, require ready mixed concrete producers to adhere to the following procedures when silica fume concrete is used:

- a. Increase mixing periods to a minimum of 150 revolutions of the drum at mixing speed, when transit mixers are used.
- b. When central mixers are used, increase mixing times a minimum of 50%.
- c. Limit the maximum load size to 80% of rated mixing capacity.

These additional requirements may be waived if the producer elects to use a "slurry" silica fume product.

4. Until more conclusive information is obtained regarding use of silica fume at reduced addition rates, it is recommended the current 7 1/2% addition rate be retained when silica fume concrete is specified.

Appendix A

TABLE 1

CONCRETE MIX DESIGNS BATCH QUANTITIES

					Fo	rce 1	0,000	- Si	lica	Fune				
	Refe	rence	H	RWB	2.	5%	5	*	1.	5%	Sil	ica Fu	me Cem	ent
Material	B1	<u>R2</u>	HR1	HR2	1	2	1	2	<u> </u>	2		2	3	4
3/4" Stone, lbs/yd ³	1574	1574	1574	1574	1590	1590	1590	1590	1590	1590	1590	1590	1590	1590
Sand, 1bs/yd ³	1327	1327	1418	1418	1288	1288	1288	1288	1288	1288	1288	1288	1288	1288
Cement: Type II, 1bs/yd ³	660	660	660	660	660	660	660	660	660	660				
Silica Fume, lbs/yd ³											709.5	709.5	709.5	709.5
Force 10,000, lbs/yd ³					16.5	16.5	33.0	33.0	49.5	49.5	•		•	
Micro-Air, oz/yd ³	6.0	5.0	3.5	2.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	5.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
WRDA/Hycol, oz/cwt	3	3	- 3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	. 3
WRDA-19, oz/cwt			11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Net water, gal/yd ³	34.1	34.1	30.4	30.3	29.4	29.5	30.8	30.9	33.7	33.4	29.3	27.6	29.0	29.1
W/C & W/(C+SF)	0.43	0.43	0.38	0.38	0.36	0.36	0.37	0.37	0.40	0.39	0.34	0.32	0.34	0.34

TABLE 1-N

CONCRETE MIX DESIGNS BATCH QUANTITIES

						Force	10,000	- Sili	ca Fume			Α.,		
	Refe	rence	HR	/R	2	. 5%		5%	1	.5%	8	ilica Fu	ine Cen	ent
Material	<u>R1</u>	<u>R2</u>	HR1	HR2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	4
19.1 mm Stone, kg/m ³	933.83	933.83	933.83	933.83	943.32	943.32	943.32	943.32	943.32	943.32	943.32	943.32	943.32	943.32
Sand, kg/m ³	787.29	787.29	841.28	841.28	764.15	764.15	764.15	764.15	764.15	764.15	764.15	764.15	764.15	764.15
Cement: Type II, kg/m ³	391.57	391.57	391.57	391.57	391.57	391.57	391.57	391.57	391.57	391.57		•		
Silica Fume, kg/m ³		·									420.93	420.93	420.93	420.93
Force 10,000, kg/m ³		,			9.79	9.79	19.58	19.58	29.37	29.37				
Micro-Air, mL/m ³	232	193	135	11	135	135	135	135	135	135	193	155	11	11
WRDA/Hycol, mL/kg	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1,96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96
WRDA-19, mL/kg			7.17	7.17	1.11	7.17	7.17	7.17	7.17	7.17	7.17	7.17	7.17	1,11
Net water, L/m ³	168.83	168.83	150.51	150.02	145.56	146.06	152.49	152.99	166.85	165.37	145.07	136.65	143.58	144.08
W/C & W/(C+SF)	0.43	0.43	0.38	0.38	0.36	0.36	0.37	0.37	0.40	0.39	0.34	0.32	0.34	0.34

11

TA 419 Rev. 2.5 M 1-92

STATE OF VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION MATERIALS AND RESEARCH DIVISION

	REPORT	ON SAMPI	E OF STRU	JCTURAL CO	DNCRETE AGGREGATE Coへに	RETE
		020012			C.F.	·
Laboratory Numbe	er (j.	330013	4	Pay	Item 501	
Project Name For	S,BLE 1	TUTURE	USENO	K Project 1	Number 93-C-7	
Sampled By Ke	ELLY	D	ate Sample	5-5-9	Examined For 7:4.02	,
Source of Material	STOCKPIL	E I	Plant	GRISI	OUD WILLISTON	
Quantity Represen	ted	· Sa	mple Type	PRELIM	INARY	
Sample Compariso	n NO			Cross Refer	ence Number	
MATERIA	AL TESTED	314 4	2. STON	E FOR	CONCRETE	• .
SIEVE	WEIGHT	% RE1	AINED	% PASSING	AGGREGATE MOISTURE CONTEN	NT .1
SIZE	INDIV.	IND'V.	CUMUL.	CUMUL.		
PET					WET WEIGHT	
					DRY WEIGHT	
RET				100	MOISTURE CONTENT %	
RET	0.00	1	· ·			
RET	170	- 		-14	1 NOTE: MOISTURE CONTENT	(%) ==
RET 16	702	25		40	ww-wp	
RET -78	770	27		2	X 100	
RET	1.20	7			a ^w b	· · ·
RET 8	0.15	<u> </u>				
PAN	0.37	1				HT.
TOTAL	33.64	100			$\bigcup_{\mathbf{D}} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{W}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{R}$	HT
Fineness Mo	dulus					
Cumul	. Total Reta	ined/100.	•		21 181	Τ.
Organic Impu	rities: Cole	or		•	Tille	Lo Vo
<i>ጥጽ</i> -ፑ		-ha	% Thin	& Flongstod	Piacos	
Total Weight	- 20		70 IIIII	& Elongateu	Tieces A RELEIVLI	in H
Fractures	= 213	= 100	% Fract	ured Faces	MAY 07	1993 3
Total Weight	213				MATERIALS & R	ESEARCH A
	• •			40*	L-A DIVISIO	
Final Weight	$\frac{5000}{179}$	g	Grading Percent V	Vear 17	AASHTO TOR EVILLE	
1 min Wonght	4127			1 1 1 1		للمتسل
() Test resul	ts are in co	mpliance w	vith specific	ations.		
(🗸) Test resul	ts are outsi	de specifica	tions.			· ·
Comments:	5.3%1	that T	HIN CEL	ONGATEN	PIERES	
	MATERIA	th NOT	RETER	TED		
	N .			DA	DEHALE	
Tested By	Josoph	Zell	1	Reviewed B	y John H, Weaver, P.E.	4
Date Completed (5	-5-93	7	Date	5/7/73 4	ltials
	J				11	40

TA 419 Rev. 2.5 M 1-92

STATE OF VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION MATERIALS AND RESEARCH DIVISION

REPORT ON SAMPLE OF STRUCTURAL CONCRETE AGGREGATE CONCRETE C.F. G9300141 Pay Item Laboratory Number 50 Project Name Proc. -

ridject Name rossiple where use	Work plan Project Number 73-C-1	
Sampled By KEUN	Date Sampled 5-6-93 Examined For 704.01	21
Sampled From STOCKPILE	Plant GRISINOUD WILLSTON	
Source of Material HNESBUR	(3	
Quantity Represented	Sample Type PRELIMINARY	
Sample Comparison NO	Cross Reference Number	

MATERIAL TESTED FINE ALCORELOATE, FOR CONCRETE

SIEVE	WEIGHT	% REI	AINED	% PASSING	AGGREGATE MOISTURE CONTENT
SIZE	INDIV.	1140.4.	COMDE.	CONDE.	WET WEIGHT
RET 3101		,		ico	DRY WEIGHT
RET		7			MOISTURE CONTENT %
RET 4	15	6	<u> </u>	78	-
RET <u>B</u>	 	14	16	- 84	- 1 NOTE: MOISTURE CONTENT (%) =
RET	126	22	_38	62	- WW.
RET 30	_119_	20	58	42	X 100
RET SO		· 20	78	22	w _p
RET 100	_79_	14	92	8	
24 N	_45	8	100		$w_{w} = wet weight$
TOTAL	581	100			$W_{D} = DRY WEIGHT$
Fineness Mod Cumul Organic Impu <u>T&E</u> Total Weight <u>Fractures</u> Total Weight Original Weight (lulus . Total Reta rities: Col 	ined/100 or mpliance w	2.84 % Thin % Fract Grading Percent W	& Elongated ured Faces Vear ations.	Pieces Pieces AASHTO T96 ALL FOIL 15 AASHTO T96 ALL FOIL 15 ALL FO
() Test resul	ts are outsi	de specifica	tions.		
Comments:	- <u> </u>				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Tested By Date Completed	Acre	pl 24 5-6-9	lly 3	DA Reviewed B Date	AVID F. HAUE y John II, Weaver, P.E. <u>DIA</u> 5/7/93 Initials ADZ

Appendix C

TABLE 2

CONCRETE TEST RESULTS

	Force 10,000 - Silica Fune Silica Fune										Fune C	Cement		
	: Re	ference	е .	HRWR		2.5%		5%		7.5%	(7.5% Silica			Fune)
Test	<u>R1</u>	<u>R2</u>	HR	<u>1 HR2</u>	2 1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	4
Slump, in	; ; 3.00	3.00	6.50	6.50	5.25	5.00	4.25	4.75	5.50	5.50	7.00	7.25	7.25	7.25
Air content, %	7.6	7.6	8.2	6.8	6.9	6.8	6.5	6.8	6.2	6.5	8.6	9.0	6.0	6.1
Weight, 1b/ft ³	141.9	141.3	142.1	144.3	143.3	143.4	142.5	142.8	141.4	141.5	140.2	139.9	144.1	144.6
Temperature. ^O F	69	70	68	73	70	72	73	73	72	73	68	68	70	72
Time of setting:	1													
Initial, hr:min	8:10	1:55	10:00	10:00	8:00	8:00	6:30	6:50	7:10	7:20	11:20	10:30		
Final, hr:min	10:10	10:00	11:30	12:05	9:30	9:20	7:50	8:10	8:40	8:55	13:00	12:40		
Compressive	1													
strength, psi	1													
1 day	1839	2058	3031	3003	3318	3268	3172	3360	2787	2798	2660	2539	2748	2575
3 days	3141	2914	4372	4351	4145	4269	4060	4060	4043	4043	4464	4909	5125	5210
7 days	3540	3915	4844	5496	5189	5175	4732	4973	4266	4665	5397	6112	6087	6059
28 days	4973	4736	6248	6731	5578	5779	5709	5475	5217	5376	6321	6275	6519	6381
Freeze/thaw														
resistance:														
Weight loss, %				ц. н. 1										
50 cycles	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.5		* - *		0.3	0.4	1.0	1.2
100 cycles	0.2	0.3	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.7	1.3	0.6	0.6	1.7	2.0
150 cycles		0.3	1.8	1.4	/			1.0	0.9	3.0			2.1	3.1
200 cycles	0.3	0.5		· 1.8	2.5	2.2	2.1	1.5	1.3	4.1	1.2	1.3	3.6	4.0
250 cycles	0.3	0.7	2.7	2.3	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.1	1.9	5.2	1.5	1.5	4.2	4.8
300 cycles	0.5	1.0	3.3	2.7	3.4	3.2	3.3	2.7	2.1	6.0	1.8	1.8	4.9	5.3
Durability factor	1													
50 cycles	100.6	98.8		100.7	100.0	97.2	100.0	99.8	99.2	99.8	98.2	98.6	98.4	97.9
100 cycles	101.8	99.2	97.7	100.9	100.7	97.9	99.5	99.5	96.9	98.7	98.6	98.2	97.7	96.6
150 cycles	102.3	99.9	95.9	102.3	101.1	97.4	99,5	98.3	98.5	99.3	98.5	98.4	96.0	95.4
200 cycles	102.4	100.5	97.1	103.1	99.0	96.3	97.7	98.6	98.2	95.7	98.6	98.1	96.3	94.9
250 cycles	103.8	101.2	96.2	103.6	100.7	97.7	98.9	98.7	98.2	97.4	98.7	98.7	96.3	94.2
300 cycles	103.3	100.4	97.3	102.6	100.6	97.1	98.6	99.1	98.0	98.6	99.2	98.1	94.9	93.5
Total chloride ion:	1													
Base Level: ppm	1													
Sample depth,	1													
0.0625-0.5 in	46	19	33	60										
0.5 -1.0 in	; 52	26	50		82	64	84	86	84	101	19	66		
1.0 -2.0 in	; 24	54	50	34	67	68	64	66	79	132	137	57	•	
After 90 days: ppm	•													
Sample depth,	1													
0.0625-0.5 in	883	1422	840	561	815	1689	1524	827	697	1239	379	657	464	191
0.5 -1.0 in	118	199	163	83	84	134	69	118	94	174	26	66	53	51
1.0 -2.0 in	; 58	63	31	44	55	83	80	95	106	137	110	43	71	41

TABLE 2N

CONCERTE TEST RESULTS

	1	Force 10,000 - Silica Fume								Silica Fume Cement				
	¦ Re	ference	3	HRWB		2.5%		5%		7.5%	{	7.5% S	ilica	Fune)
Test	<u> B1</u>	<u>R2</u>	HR	<u>1 HR</u> 2	2 1	2	1	2	1	2	1_	2	3	4
Slunp, nn	76.2	76.2	165.1	165.1	133.4	127.0	108.0	120.7	139.7	139.7	177.8	184.2	184.2	184.2
Air content, %	1 7.6	7.6	8.2	6.8	6.9	6.8	6.5	6.8	6.2	6.5	8.6	9.0	6.0	6.1
Weight, kg/m ³	2273	2264	2276	2312	2296	2297	2283	2288	2265	2267	2246	2241	2308	2316
Temperature, ^O C	; 20.6	21.1	20.0	22.8	21.1	22.2	22.8	22.8	22.2	22.8	20.0	20.0	21.1	22.2
Time of setting:	1									•				
Initial, hr:min	; 8:10	7:55	10:00	10:00	8:00	8:00	6:30	6:50	7:10	7:20	11:20	10:30		
Final, hr:min	; 10:10	10:00	11:30	12:05	9:30	9:20	7:50	8:10	8:40	8:55	13:00	12:40		
Compressive														
strength, MPa	1													
1 day	12.68	14.19	20.90	20.71	22.88	22.53	21.87	23.17	19.22	19.29	18.34	17.51	18.95	17.75
3 days	21.66	20.09	30.14	30.00	28.58	29.43	27.99	27.99	27.88	27.88	30.78	33.85	35.34	35.92
7 days	24.41	26.99	33.40	37.89	35.78	35.68	32.63	34.29	29.41	32.17	37.21	42.14	41.97	41.78
28 days	34.29	32.65	43.08	46.41	38.46	39.85	39.36	37.75	35.97	37.07	43.58	43.27	44.95	44.00
Freeze/thaw	{													
resistance:														
Weight loss, %	1													
50 cycles	; 0.2	0.2	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.5				0.3	0.4	1.0	1.2
100 cycles	; 0.2	0.3	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.7	1.3	0.6	0.6	1.7	2.0
. 150 cycles	¦	0.3	1.8	1.4				1.0	0.9	3:0			2.7	3.1
200 cycles	0.3	0.5		1.8	2.5	2.2	2.1	1.5	1.3	4.1	1.2	1.3	3.6	4.0
250 cycles	0.3	0.7	2.7	2.3	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.1	1.9	5.2	1.5	1.5	4.2	4.8
300 cycles	0.5	1.0	3.3	2.7	3.4	3.2	3.3	2.7	2.1	6.0	1.8	1.8	4.9	5.3
Durability factor	{													
50 cycles	100.6	98,8		100.7	100.0	97.2	100.0	99.8	99.2	99.8	98.2	98.6	98.4	97.9
100 cycles	; 101.8	99.2	97.7	100.9	100.7	97.9	99.5	99.5	96.9	98.7	98.6	98.2	97.7	96.6
150 cycles	102.3	99.9	95.9	102.3	101.1	97.4	99,5	98.3	98.5	99.3	98.5	98.4	96.0	95.4
200 cycles	102.4	100.5	97.1	103.1	99.0	96.3	97.7	98.6	98.2	95.7	98.6	98.1	96.3	94.9
250 cycles	103.8	101.2	96.2	103.6	100.7	97.7	98.9	98.7	98.2	97.4	98.7	98.7	96.3	94.2
300 cycles	103.3	100.4	97.3	102.6	100.6	97.1	98.6	99.1	98.0	98.6	. 99.2	98.1	94.9	93.5
Total chloride ion:														
Base Level: ppm	1 ; 1													
Sample depth,	1								4					
1.6 - 12.7 mm	46	19	33	60										
12.7 - 25.4 mm	; 52	26	50		82	64	84	86	84	101	19	66		
25.4 - 50.8 mm	24	54	50	34	67	68	64	66	79	132	137	57		
After 90 days: ppm	¦													
Sample depth,	}													
1.6 - 12.7 mm	883	1422	840	561	815	1689	1524	827	697	1239	379	657	464	191
12.7 - 25.4 mm	118	199	163	83	84	134	. 69	118	94	174	26	66	53	51
25.4 - 50.8 mm	58	63	31	44	55	83	80	95	106	137	110	43	11	41

AVBRAGE CONCRETE TEST RESULTS

	1					Silica Fume Ceme		
	}		Force	10,000 - 8	lilica Fume	(7.5% Si	lica Fune)	
Test	Reference	HRWR	2.5%	5%	7.5%	1&2	3&4	
Slump. in	3.00	6.50	5.25	4.50	5.50	7.25	7.25	
Air content. %	1.6	7.5	6.9	6.7	6.4	8.8	6.1	
Weight 1h/ft	141.6	143.2	143.4	142.7	141.5	140.1	144.4	
Temperature OR	70	71	71	73	73	68	71	
Time of settind'	1 10							
Initial hrimin	1 . 8.02	10.00	8.00	6.40	7 • 15	10.55		
Rinal hrimin	1 10:05	11.47	0.00	8.00	8:47	12.50		
	1 10.00	11.41	3160	0.00	17.0	17,20		
atrendth noi	1							
strength, psi	1 1040	9019	220.2	2966	9709	9600	9669	
1 day	1 1545	JUIT 1969	1000	3400 1000	4049	4000	6160 6160	
3 days	1 3048	4004 6170	4401 5100	4000	4040	4001	0100 6070	
	1 1055	0110	0104 EC70	4000	4400	0100 6900	0013	
48 days	4800	6490	9019	9994	5291	0490	0490	
Freeze/thaw								
resistance:	1							
Weight loss, %								
50 cycles	0.2	0.7	0.7	U.5		0.4	1.1	
100 cycles	0.3	1,1	1.2	0.8	1.0	0.6	1.9	
150 cycles	0.3	1.6		1.0	2.0		2.9	
200 cycles	0.4	1.8	2.4	1.8	2.1	1.3	3.8	
250 cycles	0.5	2.5	2.8	2.4	3.6	1.5	4.6	
300 cycles	0.8	3.0	3.3	3.0	4.1	1.8	5.1	
Durability factor	1							
50 cycles	99.7	100.7	98.6	99.9	99.5	98.4	98.2	
100 cycles	100.5	99.3	99.3	99.5	97.8	98.4	97.2	
150 cycles	101.1	99.1	99.3	98.9	98.9	98.5	95.7	
200 cycles	101.5	100.1	97.7	98.2	97.0	98.4	95.6	
250 cycles	102.5	99.9	99.2	98.8	97.8	98.7	95.3	
300 cycles	101.9	100.0	98.9	98.9	98.3	98.7	94.2	
Total chloride ion	{							
Base Level: ppm								
Sample depth,								
0.0625-0.5 in	33	47						
0.5 -1.0 in	39	50	74	85	93	43	••	
1.0 -2.0 in	39	42	68	65	106	97		
After 90 days: ppm								
Sample depth.								
0.0625-0.5 in	1153	701	1252	1176	968	518	328	
0.5 -1.0 in	159	123	109	94	134	46	52	
1.0 -2.0 in	61	38	69	88	122	77	56	

T	Å	B	L	B	3	M

AVBRAGE CONCRETE TEST BESULTS

	}					Silica Fume Cement		
	1		Force	10,000 - S	Silica Fume	(7.5% Si	lica Fume)	
Test	Reference	HRWR	2.5%	5%	7.5%	1&2	3&4	
Slump, mm	76.2	165.1	133.4	114.3	139.7	184.2	184.2	
Air content, %	7.6	7.5	6.9	6.7	6.4	8.8	6.1	
Weight, kg/m ³	2268	2294	2297	2286	2267	2244	2313	
Temperature, ^O C	21.1	21.7	21.7	22.8	22.8	20.0	21.7	
Time of setting:								
Initial, hr:min	8:02	10:00	8:00	6:40	7:15	10:55		
Final, hr:min	10:05	11:47	9:25	8:00	8:47	12:50		
Compressive	1							
strength, MPa	1							
1 day	13.44	20.80	22.71	22.52	19.26	17.93	18.35	
3 days	20.88	30.08	29.01	27.99	27.88	32.32	35.63	
7 days	25.70	35.65	35.73	33.46	30.79	39.68	41.87	
28 days	33.48	44.75	39.16	38.56	36.52	43.42	44.47	
Freeze/thaw	1							
resistance:	1							
Weight loss, %								
50 cycles	0.2	0.7	0.7	0.5		0.4	1.1	
100 cycles	1 0.3	1.1	1.2	0.8	1.0	0:6	1.9	
150 cycles	; 0.3	1.6		1.0	2.0		2.9	
200 cycles	0.4	1.8	2.4	1.8	2.7	1.3	3.8	
250 cycles	0.5	2.5	2.8	2.4	3.6	1.5 .	4.6	
300 cycles	; 0.8	3.0	3.3	3.0	4,1	1.8	5.1	
Durability factor	1							
50 cycles	99.7	100.7	98.6	99.9	99.5	98.4	98.2	
100 cycles	; 100.5	99.3	99.3	99.5	97.8	98.4	97.2	
150 cycles	101.1	99.1	99.3	98.9	98.9	98.5	95.7	
200 cycles	101.5	100.1	97.7	98.2	97.0	98.4	95.6	
250 cycles	102.5	99.9	99.2	98.8	97.8	98.7	95.3	
300 cycles	; 101.9	100.0	98.9	98.9	98.3	98.7	94.2	
Total chloride ion	-							
Base Level: ppm	1							
Sample depth,	1.							
1.6 - 12.7 mm	33	47						
12.7 - 25.4 mm	39	50	74	85	93	43		
25.4 - 50.8 mm	39	42	68	65	106	97		
After 90 days: ppm	1			•				
Sample depth,	1							
1.6 - 12.7 mm	1153	701	1252	1176	968	518	328	
12.7 - 25.4 mm	159	123	109	94	134	46	52	
25.4 - 50.8 mm	; 61	38	69	88	122	77	56	

Average Compressive Strength vs Age Figure 1



. 18







Average Chloride Content After 90 Days of Ponding

TA 565 Rev. 4/79

STATE OF VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION MATERIALS & RESEARCH

RESEARCH INVESTIGATION

Work Plan No. 93-C -7

Subject Silica Fume Concrete (2½%, 5% and 7½% addition rates)

Investigation Requested By <u>Warren B. Tripp</u> Date <u>March 18, 1993</u> Structures Engineer Date Information Required ASAP

Purpose of Investigation To determine performance of silica fume concrete when

compared to reference concretes. Silica fume addition rates to be 21%, 5% and 71%.

Proposed Tests or Evaluation Procedure Two batches each of Class A concrete will be

Materials & Research Division Agency of Transportation Date Typed: