

AD-A133 432


ABRASION-EROSION RESISTANCE OF CONCRETE MADE WITH TWO
AGGREGATES STONEWALL (U) ARMY ENGINEER WATERWAYS
EXPERIMENT STATION VICKSBURG MS STRUC. T C HOLLAND
SEP 83 WES/MP/SL-83-15 CTIAC-66 F/G 11/2

1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A



US Army Corps
of Engineers

AD-A133 432


ABRASION-EROSION RESISTANCE OF CONCRETE MADE WITH TWO AGGREGATES, STONEWALL JACKSON DAM, WEST VIRGINIA

by

Terence C. Holland

Structures Laboratory


U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station
P. O. Box 631, Vicksburg, Miss. 39180



September 1983

Final Report

Approved For Public Release; Distribution Unlimited



DTIC FILE COPY

DTIC
OCT 12 1983
A

Prepared for U. S. Army Engineer District, Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222

83 10 12 168

Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not
return it to the originator.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an
official Department of the Army position unless so
designated by other authorized documents.

The contents of this report are not to be used for
advertising, publication, or promotional purposes.
Citation of trade names does not constitute an
official endorsement or approval of the use of such
commercial products.

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM	
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER	
Miscellaneous Paper SL-83-15	40-4133	432	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	
ABRASION-EROSION RESISTANCE OF CONCRETE MADE WITH TWO AGGREGATES, STONEWALL JACKSON DAM, WEST VIRGINIA		Final Report	
7. AUTHOR(s)		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
Terence C. Holland			
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station Structures Laboratory P. O. Box 631, Vicksburg, Miss. 39180			
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
U. S. Army Engineer District, Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222			
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE	
		September 1983	
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES	
		22	
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)	
		Unclassified	
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)			
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.			
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)			
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
Available from National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Va. 22161.			
This is CTIAC Report No. 66.			
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)			
Abrasion-erosion resistance (concrete) Concrete properties Stonewall Jackson Dam			
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)			
The resistance to abrasion-erosion of two concretes made with different coarse aggregates was evaluated. The aggregates used were selected as being representative of those that may be selected for use during construction of Stonewall Jackson Dam. The two coarse aggregates were limestones from different sources. All other concrete ingredients were identical for the two mixtures. Both concretes			

(Continued)

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

20. ABSTRACT (Continued)

showed very high abrasion-erosion losses when tested using the Corps of Engineers standard test method.

A recommendation was made that coarse aggregates with better wear-resistant properties be selected for use in areas of the structure that may be subjected to abrasion-erosion.

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

PREFACE

The investigation described in this report was conducted for the U. S. Army Engineer District, Pittsburgh, by the Concrete Technology Division (CTD) of the Structures Laboratory (SL), U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES). Authorization for this investigation was given by DA Form 2544, ORPED-83-34, dated 22 November 1982.

The investigation was performed under the general supervision of Mr. Bryant Mather, Chief, SL, and Mr. John M. Scanlon, Jr., Chief, CTD, and under the direct supervision of Dr. Terence C. Holland, who served as principal investigator. Mr. Steven A. Ragan prepared the concrete mixtures; Mr. Dale Glass, Mr. Frank W. Dorsey, and Mr. Roger Buttner conducted the abrasion-erosion tests. Mr. Stuart Long served as the point of contact at the Pittsburgh District. This report was prepared by Dr. Holland.

The information in this report was originally provided to the Pittsburgh District as an informal letter report (WESSC letter, "Abrasion-Erosion Resistance, Concrete Mixtures, Stonewall Jackson Dam," dated 10 February 1983).

Funds for publication of this report were provided from those made available for operation of the Concrete Technology Information Analysis Center (CTIAC). This is CTIAC Report No. 66.

Commander and Director of WES during this investigation and the preparation and publication of this report was COL Tilford C. Creel, CE. Technical Director was Mr. F. R. Brown.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Avail and/or	
Special	
Dist	
A	

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PREFACE	1
CONVERSION FACTORS, NON-SI TO SI (METRIC) UNITS OF MEASUREMENT	3
PART I: INTRODUCTION	4
Purpose	4
Scope	4
Authority	4
PART II: TEST METHOD, MATERIALS, AND CONCRETE MIXTURES	5
Test Method	5
Materials	5
Concrete Mixtures	7
PART III: TEST DATA AND DISCUSSION	8
Test Data	8
Discussion	8
PART IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	10
FIGURES 1-3	
TABLES 1-8	

CONVERSION FACTORS, NON-SI to SI (METRIC)
UNITS OF MEASUREMENT

Non-SI units of measurement used in this report can be converted to
SI (metric) units as follows:

<u>Multiply</u>	<u>By</u>	<u>To Obtain</u>
cubic feet	0.02831685	cubic metres
fluid ounces per cubic yard	38.6738	millilitres per cubic metre
fluid ounces per pound (mass)	65.1896	millilitres per kilogram
inches	25.4	millimetres
pounds (force) per square inch	0.006894757	megapascals
pounds (mass)	0.45359237	kilograms
pounds (mass) per cubic foot	16.01846	kilograms per cubic metre
pounds (mass) per cubic yard	0.5932764	kilograms per cubic metre

ABRASION-EROSION RESISTANCE OF CONCRETE MADE WITH
TWO AGGREGATES, STONEWALL JACKSON DAM,
WEST VIRGINIA

PART I: INTRODUCTION

Purpose

1. The purpose of this investigation was to evaluate two aggregates on the basis of resistance to abrasion-erosion of concrete made using them. These aggregates were selected by members of the Pittsburgh District staff as representative of aggregates that may be selected for use in construction of the Stonewall Jackson Dam.

Scope

2. This investigation was limited to testing concrete specimens made from mixtures containing the two subject aggregates. For purposes of comparison, data obtained during this study have been compared to that obtained during an abrasion-erosion study of concretes using various aggregates for a repair project at Kinzua Dam.*

Authority

3. The work described by this report was authorized by DA Form 2544, ORPED-83-34, dated 22 November 1982, from the Pittsburgh District.

* Holland, Terence C. 1983. "Abrasion-Erosion Evaluation of Concrete Mixtures for Stilling Basin Repairs, Kinzua Dam, Pennsylvania," Miscellaneous Paper SL-83-16, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES), Vicksburg, Miss.

PART II: TEST METHOD, MATERIALS, AND CONCRETE MIXTURES

Test Method

4. Abrasion-erosion testing was conducted in accordance with CRD-C 63-80,* "Test Method for Abrasion-Erosion Resistance of Concrete (Underwater Method)." This test procedure involves subjecting the concrete specimens to abrasion-erosion caused by the wear of steel grinding balls on the concrete surface. The steel grinding balls are propelled by water in the test chamber. The water is in turn propelled by a submerged mixer paddle. Test specimens are periodically removed from the apparatus to determine the amount of abrasion-erosion damage. The damage is quantified and reported as a percentage of original mass lost.

Materials

5. The primary materials involved in this investigation were the two coarse aggregates being evaluated. Except for the coarse aggregates, the materials used were the same as those used in the Kinzua test program. All materials used are described in the following paragraphs.

Fine aggregate

6. The fine aggregate, Structures Laboratory (SL) serial No. PITT-8 S-1, was from the Buffalo Slag Co., Franklinville, New York. This fine aggregate is classified as a glacial sand and is composed primarily of limestone and sandstone fragments. There was some clay present in the samples, but it was determined not to be a detrimental swelling clay. Test results for this aggregate (grading, specific gravity, and absorption) are given in Table 1.

7. This fine aggregate meets the grading requirements of ASTM C 33, "Standard Specification for Concrete Aggregates" (CRD-C 133),

* All CRD-C test methods are published in the Handbook for Concrete and Cement, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, 1949 (with quarterly supplements), Vicksburg, Miss.

as well as both alternates for fine aggregate for concrete of the Civil Works guide specification.*

Coarse aggregates

8. The first coarse aggregate was a limestone produced by the Greer Limestone Company, Greer, West Virginia. This aggregate is described in the Concrete Materials Design Memorandum** (Appendix 2B) as containing "several types of limestone, varying from slightly to highly argillaceous in nature." Test data for this aggregate are presented in Table 2.

9. The Greer coarse aggregate as supplied by the Pittsburgh District meets the requirements of size No. 4 of ASTM C 33 (CRD-C 133). The small amount of material finer than 3/4 in.† resulted in a somewhat harsh concrete mixture that would not be acceptable for normal applications. This aggregate was washed before use.

10. The second coarse aggregate was a limestone produced by the J. F. Allen Company, Elkins, West Virginia. This aggregate is described in the Concrete Materials Design Memorandum (Appendix 2F) as containing "calcareous and silty argillaceous sandstones, several types of limestone, the majority of which are slightly to moderately argillaceous, and calcareous, sandy silty dolomite." Test data for this aggregate are presented in Table 2.

11. The Allen coarse aggregate as supplied by the Pittsburgh District meets the requirements of size No. 4 of ASTM C 33 (CRD-C 133). The small amount of material finer than 3/4 in. resulted in a somewhat harsh mixture that would not be acceptable for normal applications. This aggregate was washed before use.

* Office of the Chief of Engineers. 1978. "Civil Works Construction Guide Specification: Concrete," CW-03305, Washington, D. C.

** U. S. Army Engineer District, Pittsburgh. 1982. "Stonewall Jackson Lake, West Fork River, West Virginia, Design Memorandum No. 11: Concrete Materials," Pittsburgh, Pa.

† A table of factors for converting non-SI units of measurement to SI (metric) units is presented on page 3.

Cement

12. The portland cement used, SL serial No. RC-888, was purchased from the Marquette Cement Co., Brandon, Mississippi. The cement meets the requirements of ASTM C 150 (CRD-C 201) for a Type I cement. The physical and chemical test results for the cement are presented in Table 3.

Admixtures

13. The air-entraining admixture used was Hunts Air-In, from laboratory stock. It is a neutralized vinsol resin produced by Hunt Process Corporation - Southern, Ridgeland, Mississippi.

Concrete Mixtures

14. Two concrete mixtures were proportioned for this investigation, one for each of the coarse aggregates. The mixtures were essentially the same as that used in the Kinzua investigation (Kinzua G1 mixture). The mixture proportions may be found in the table indicated:

- a. Greer limestone: Table 4.
- b. Allen limestone: Table 5.

PART III: TEST DATA AND DISCUSSION

Test Data

15. The properties for the fresh and hardened concretes are presented in Table 6. In addition to the data for the concretes containing the Greer and Allen aggregates, data from the Kinzua G1 concrete and from a chert aggregate concrete are included in the table for comparison.

16. The abrasion-erosion test data for the concretes containing the Greer and Allen coarse aggregates are presented in Tables 7 and 8, respectively. These data, along with that for the Kinzua G1 concrete and the chert aggregate concrete, are plotted in Figure 1.

17. Photographs of specimens, containing the Greer limestone, at the conclusion of testing are in Figure 2. Photographs of specimens, containing the Allen limestone, at the conclusion of testing are in Figure 3.

Discussion

18. Both aggregates tested showed relatively high abrasion-erosion losses. These results are in agreement with the results of earlier testing of limestone aggregates. As can be seen in Table 6, the two limestone aggregates tested did not perform as well as the chert aggregate, even though the compressive strength of the concrete containing the limestone aggregates was higher than that of the concrete containing the chert aggregate. This result is also in agreement with previous WES testing.

19. Both of the concretes containing the test aggregates showed apparently equal wear on the paste and aggregate portions. There is no evidence, for either type of aggregate, of aggregate particles being plucked from the matrix.

20. Of the two types of aggregate, the Greer limestone appears to be slightly more susceptible to abrasion-erosion loss.

21. Because of the gradings of the two coarse aggregates tested, the results of this testing may not be directly comparable to other work. No research has been accomplished to date on the effect of aggregate gradings on abrasion-erosion resistance. While grading may be assumed to have some influence on abrasion-erosion resistance, it is not likely to be a significant factor that would drastically change the results of the present abrasion-erosion test method. Specifically, had a greater percentage of material passing the 3/4-in. sieve been present for these two aggregates, it is doubtful that the results would have been significantly different.

PART IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

22. Neither the Allen nor the Greer coarse aggregate appears to be well suited for use in conventional concretes in areas that may be subjected to severe abrasion-erosion forces during the lifetime of the planned structure. Since these two aggregates were selected as being representative of those available for use in the structure, it is doubtful that any of the available local aggregates will be suitable for use in areas susceptible to severe abrasion-erosion.

23. The District is encouraged to explore the use of other more wear-resistant coarse aggregates for use in areas that may be subjected to abrasion-erosion.




Figure 1. Comparison of abrasion-erosion resistance of concretes tested during this test program and two concretes tested previously



Figure 2. Posttest photographs of concrete specimens containing Greer limestone (Sheet 1 of 2)



Figure 2. (Sheet 2 of 2)




Figure 3. Posttest photographs of concrete specimens containing Allen limestone (Sheet 1 of 2)



Figure 3. (Sheet 2 of 2)

Table 1. Fine Aggregate Data.

STATE NY	INDEX NO.:	AGGREGATE DATA SHEET	TESTED BY: USAEWES		
LAT	LONG		DATE 19 May 1982		
LAB SYMBOL NO. PITT-8 S-1		TYPE OF MATERIAL Fine Aggregate			
LOCATION Franklin, NY					
PRODUCER Buffalo Slag Co.					
SAMPLED BY: Pittsburgh District Personnel					
TESTED FOR Kinzua Dam					
USED AT					
PROCESSING BEFORE TESTING: None					
GEOLOGICAL FORMATION AND AGE:					
GRADING (CRD-C 103) (CUM. % PASSING):					
SIEVE	3-6"	1 1/2-3	3/4-1 1/2"	#4-2"	FINE AGG.
6 IN.					2.63
5 IN.					1.6
4 IN.					
3 IN.					
2 1/2 IN.					
2 IN.					
1 1/2 IN.					
1 IN.					
3/4 IN.					
3/8 IN.					
NO. 4					100
NO. 8					93
NO. 16					71
NO. 30					47
NO. 50					20
NO. 100					7
NO. 200					2
200#					0
F.V. 10'					2.62
TEST RESULTS					
BULK SP. GR., S.S.D. (CRD-C 107, 108)					
ABSORPTION, % (CRD-C 107, 108)					
ORGANIC IMPURITIES, FIG. NO. (CRD-C 121)					
SOFT PARTICLES, % (CRD-C 130)					
% LIGHTER THAN SP. GR. (CRD-C 122)					
% FLAT AND ELONGATED (CRD-C 119, 120)					
WT. AV. % LOSS, 5 CYC. $MgSO_4$ (CRD-C 115)					
L.A. ABRASION LOSS, % (CRD-C 117, 145) GRADING					
UNIT WT., LB./CU. FT. (CRD-C 106)					
FRIABLE PARTICLES, % (CRD-C 142)					
SPEC. HEAT, BTU/LB./DEG. F. (CRD-C 124)					
REACTIVITY WITH $NaOH$					
(CRD-C 128)					
MORTAR-MAKING PROPERTIES (CRD-C 118)					
TYPE _____ CEMENT, RATIO: _____ DAYS, _____ DAYS, _____					
LINEAR THERMAL EXPANSION MILLIONTHS./DEG. F. (CRD-C 125, 126)					
ROCK TYPE		PARALLEL	ACROSS	ON	AVERAGE
MORTAR:					
MORTAR-BAR EXPANSION AT 100F., % (CRD-C 123):		FINE AGGREGATE		COARSE AGGREGATE	
		2 MO.	6 MO.	9 MO.	12 MO.
LOW-ALK. CEMENT: % Na_2O EQUIVALENT:					
HIGH-ALK. CEMENT: % Na_2O EQUIVALENT:					
SOUNDNESS IN CONCRETE (CRD-C 40, 114):					
FINE AGG.		COARSE AGG.		DFE ₃₀₀	
FINE AGG.		COARSE AGG.		DFE ₃₀₀	
PETROGRAPHIC DATA (CRD-C 127):					

Table 2
Coarse Aggregate Data

<u>Sieve Size</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent Passing</u>		
	<u>CRD-C 133</u> <u>Size No. 4</u>	<u>Allen</u>	<u>Greer</u>
2 in.	100	100	100
1-1/2 in.	90-100	100	100
1 in.	20-55	37.6	33
3/4 in.	0-15	4.7	5.8
3/8 in.	0-5	0.8	0.3

	<u>Allen</u>		<u>Greer</u>	
	<u>ORDL*</u>	<u>WES</u>	<u>ORDL*</u>	<u>WES</u>
Specific Gravity CRD-C 107	2.67	2.68	2.70	2.70
Absorption CRD-C 107	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.4

* Data from Concrete Materials Design Memorandum.

Table 3. Cement Test Data.

TO: Structures Laboratory Research Group ATTN: Terry Holland		REPORT OF TESTS OF PORTLAND CEMENT RC-888		FROM: CORPS OF ENGINEERS U. S. ARMY Structures Laboratory Waterways Exp Station ATTN: Cem & Pozz Group P. O. Box 631 Vicksburg, MS 39180	
TEST REPORT NO. WES-188-82		BIN NO.		DATE: 25 May 82	
SPECIFICATION: ASTM C 150, Type I		CWT REPRESENTED:		DATE SAMPLED: 13 May 82	
COMPANY: Marquette Cement		LOCATION: Brandon, MS		BRAND:	
THIS CEMENT DOES ☒ MEET SPECIFICATION REQUIREMENTS					
SAMPLE NO.	1				
SiO ₂ , %	22.0				
Al ₂ O ₃ , %	3.7				
Fe ₂ O ₃ , %	2.9				
MgO, %	3.4				
SO ₃ , %	2.6				
LOSS ON IGNITION, %	1.0				
ALKALIES-TOTAL AS Na ₂ O, %	0.50				
Na ₂ O, %	0.07				
K ₂ O, %	0.66				
INSOLUBLE RESIDUE, %	0.16				
C+O, %	63.2				
C ₃ S, %	54				
C ₃ A, %	5				
C ₂ S, %	22				
C ₃ A + C ₃ S, %	59				
C ₄ AF, %	9				
C ₄ AF + 2 C ₃ A, %	19				
HEAT OF HYDRATION, 7D, CAL/G					
HEAT OF HYDRATION, 28D, CAL/G					
SURFACE AREA, SQ CM/G (A.P.)	3680				
AIR CONTENT, %	10.1				
COMP. STRENGTH, 3 D, PSI	3310				
COMP. STRENGTH, 7 D, PSI	4015				
COMP. STRENGTH, 28 D, PSI	5150				
FALSE SET-PEN. F.I., %					
SAMPLE NO.	1				
AUTOCLAVE EXP., %	0.04				
INITIAL SET, HR/MIN	3:15				
FINAL SET, HR/MIN	5:30				
SAMPLE NO.					
AUTOCLAVE EXP., %					
INITIAL SET, HR/MIN					
FINAL SET, HR/MIN					
REMARKS: Job Number 441-S778.12SC41					
CC: McDonald					

Table 4. Mixture Proportions, Greer Limestone

REPORT OF SELECTION OF CONCRETE MIXTURE PROPORTIONS (CRD-C 3)									
PROJECT NAME: Stonewall Jackson Abrasion Testing	SYMBOL: DATE: Dec 1982								
CONCRETE REQUIRED FOR:	MIXTURE NO.:								
MATERIALS									
PORTLAND CEMENT, SS-C-182. TYPE: I ADDITIONS: BRAND AND MILL: Marquette	POZZOLON OR OTHER CEMENT: TYPE: None SOURCE:								
AIR-ENT. ADMIXTURE: TYPE: Hunt Air-In³ AMOUNT: 2.3 fl oz/yd³									
FINE AGGREGATE	COARSE AGGREGATE								
TYPE: Glacier Sand SOURCE: Buffalo Slag Co. Franklinville, NY	TYPE: Limestone SIZE: SOURCE: Greer Limestone Co. Greer, WV								
MATERIALS	SAMPLE SERIAL NO.	SIZE RANGE	COARSE AGGR (%)	BULK SP GR (SSD)	ABSORP %				
PORTLAND CEMENT	RC-888								
FINE AGGREGATE	PITT-8 S-1	No. 4 - 200		2.63	1.6				
COARSE AGGREGATE (A)	--	No. 4 - 1-1/2 in.		2.70	0.4				
COARSE AGGREGATE (B)									
COARSE AGGREGATE (C)									
COARSE AGGREGATE (D)									
MIXTURE DATA			SPECIMEN DATA						
MATERIALS	MIX. BY WEIGHT	S. S. D. WEIGHTS ONE CU YD BATCH (LB)	SOLID VOL ONE CU YD (CU FT)	CYLINDERS			BEAMS		
PORTLAND CEMENT	1.00	534.4	2.719	SIZE:			SIZE:		
• ** WRA				NO.	AGE	PSI	NO.	AGE	PSI
FINE AGGREGATE		1189.6	7.249						
COARSE AGGREGATE (A)		1992.8	11.828						
COARSE AGGREGATE (B)									
COARSE AGGREGATE (C)									
COARSE AGGREGATE (D)									
WATER		238.6	3.854						
AIR 5%			1.350						
TOTAL		3955.1	27.000						
W/C (WT): 0.45				S/A, % VOLUME: 38					
SLUMP (IN.): 1-1/2				THEO. UNIT WT (LB/CU FT): 154.2					
BLEEDING (%):				ACTUAL UNIT WT (LB/CU FT):					
AIR CONTENT (%): 5.0				THEO. CEMENT FACT (LB/CU YD): 534.4					
AIR CONTENT (%):				ACTUAL CEMENT FACT (LB/CU YD):					
1 Calculated on the basis of: 2 Expressed as the percentage of mixing water separating from the concrete when tested by CRD-C 9. 3 In the entire batch as mixed. 4 In that portion of the concrete containing aggregate smaller than the 1-1/2-in. sieve. * For "other cement," pozzolan, second size of fine aggregate, as may be required.									
REMARKS: Condition of mix, workability, plasticity, bleeding, etc.									
** WRA: Hunt HPS-R, 26.72 fl oz/yd ³ (5.0 fl oz/100 lb cement).									

Table 5. Mixture Proportions, Allen Limestone

REPORT OF SELECTION OF CONCRETE MIXTURE PROPORTIONS (CRD-C 3)									
PROJECT NAME: Stonewall Jackson Abrasion Testing		SYMBOL: SERIAL NO.	DATE Dec 1982						
CONCRETE REQUIRED FOR:		MIXTURE NO.							
MATERIALS									
PORTLAND CEMENT, SS-C-192. TYPE: I ADDITIONS: BRAND AND MILL: Marquette		POZZOLON OR OTHER CEMENT. TYPE: None SOURCE:							
		AIR-ENT. ADMIXTURE TYPE Hunt Air-In ³ AMOUNT 2.3 fl oz/yd ³							
FINE AGGREGATE		COARSE AGGREGATE							
TYPE: Glacier Sand		TYPE: Limestone SIZE							
SOURCE: Buffalo Slag Co. Franklinville, NY		SOURCE: J. F. Allen Co. Elkins, WV							
MATERIALS	SAMPLE SERIAL NO.	SIZE RANGE	COARSE AGGR. (%)						
PORTLAND CEMENT	RC-888								
FINE AGGREGATE	PITT-8 S-1	No. 4 - 200							
COARSE AGGREGATE (A)	--	No. 4 - 1-1/2 in.							
COARSE AGGREGATE (B)									
COARSE AGGREGATE (C)									
COARSE AGGREGATE (D)									
MIXTURE DATA		SPECIMEN DATA							
MATERIALS	MIX. BY WEIGHT	S. S. D. WEIGHTS ONE CU YD BATCH (LB)	SOLID VOL ONE CU YD (CU FT)	CYLINDERS			BEAMS		
				SIZE:			SIZE:		
PORTLAND CEMENT	1.00	534.4	2.719	NO.	AGE	PSI	NO.	AGE	PSI
**WRA									
FINE AGGREGATE		1189.6	7.249						
COARSE AGGREGATE (A)		1978.0	11.828						
COARSE AGGREGATE (B)									
COARSE AGGREGATE (C)									
COARSE AGGREGATE (D)									
WATER		238.6	3.854						
AIR 5%			1.350						
TOTAL		3940.6	27.000						
W/C (WT): 0.45				S/A, % VOLUME: 38					
SLUMP (IN.) ⁴ : 2				THEO. UNIT WT (LB/CU FT): 153.6					
BLEEDING (%) ² :				ACTUAL UNIT WT (LB/CU FT):					
AIR CONTENT (%) ³ : 4.9				THEO. CEMENT FACT (LB/CU YD): 534.4					
AIR CONTENT (%) ⁴ :				ACTUAL CEMENT FACT (LB/CU YD):					
¹ Calculated on the basis of: ² Expressed as the percentage of mixing water separating from the concrete when tested by CRD-C 9. ³ In the entire batch as mixed. ⁴ In that portion of the concrete containing aggregate smaller than the 1-1/2-in. sieve. ⁵ For "other cement," pozzolan, second size of fine aggregate, as may be required.									
REMARKS: Condition of mix, workability, plasticity, bleeding, etc ** WRA: Hunt HPS-R, 26.72 fl oz/yd³ (5.0 fl oz/100 lb cement).									

Table 6

Properties of Fresh and Hardened Concrete Mixtures Tested

Mixture	W/C (by Mass)	Slump, in.	Air Content, %	Average	
				Compressive Strength psi	Abrasion-Erosion Loss, % by Mass @ 72 hr
Chert Reference	0.45	3-1/2	5.3	4740	4.1
Kinzua G-1	0.45	2	5.1	5710	6.9
Stonewall Jackson: Allen limestone	0.45	2	4.9	5730	7.3
Stonewall Jackson: Greer limestone	0.45	1-1/2	5.0	5130	8.9

NOTES: (1) Average of three 6- by 12-in. specimens.
(2) Average of three abrasion-erosion specimens.

Table 7
Abrasion-Erosion Test Data
Concrete Mixture: Greer Limestone Aggregate

Elapsed Test Time hours	Specimen						Average Percent Loss
	A		B		C		
	Wt, lb	Percent Loss	Wt, lb	Percent Loss	Wt, lb	Percent Loss	
0	38.00	0.0	38.15	0.0	38.15	0.0	0.0
12	37.45	1.4	37.60	1.4	37.70	1.2	1.3
24	36.95	2.8	37.05	2.9	36.95	3.1	2.9
36	36.15	4.9	36.50	4.3	36.40	4.6	4.6
48	35.75	5.9	35.90	5.9	35.80	6.2	6.0
60	35.35	7.0	35.30	7.5	35.20	7.7	7.4
72	34.80	8.4	34.80	8.9	34.55	9.4	8.9

Table 8
Abrasion-Erosion Test Data
Concrete Mixture: Allen Limestone Aggregate

Elapsed Test Time hours	Specimen						Average Percent Loss
	A		B		C		
	Wt, lb	Percent Loss	Wt, lb	Percent Loss	Wt, lb	Percent Loss	
0	38.05	0.0	38.00	0.0	37.90	0.0	0.0
12	37.70	0.9	37.65	0.9	37.35	1.5	1.1
24	37.20	2.2	37.15	2.2	37.00	2.4	2.3
36	36.70	3.5	36.75	3.3	36.45	3.8	3.5
48	36.25	4.7	36.15	4.9	36.00	5.0	4.9
60	35.35	7.1	35.80	5.8	35.35	6.7	6.5
72	35.05	7.9	35.35	7.0	35.20	7.1	7.3

END

FILMED

10-83

DTIC