

CASE STUDY ON A EXISTING STRUCTURE BY USING NDT TECHNIQUES

K.Rohini^{*,a} and K. Sai Abhinav^a

^aDepartment of Civil Engineering, Annamacharya Institute of Technology and Sciences, Tirupati,

Abstract - Damage assessment of structures is one of the most important and emerging fields in Civil Engineering. Damage to structures may occur as a result of normal operations, accidents, deterioration or severe natural events such as earthquakes and storms. Most often the extent and location of damage may be determined through visual inspection. However, in some cases this may not be feasible. Non destructive testing is conducted on the main structural and relatively more affected column and beam members in various buildings. In the present work, a case study of the Reinforced Concrete (RC) buildings is carried out with special reference for the further usage of the structures. NDT are conducted to assess the real strength gained by the RC elements like columns, beams and slabs. Initially visual inspection is conducted on the building which is selected for case study. All the damages present in the building are identified in visual inspection. Non destructive tests are conducted at all the damaged areas. Rebound hammer test is conducted at many points on & near by the damages and the readings are noted. UPV test is also conducted at different places near damages in three different methods such as direct-direct, semi direct and indirect and the quality of the concrete in the building is determined. From the result analysis it is concluded that the structure requires immediate attention for strengthening the existing structures by adopting suitable rehabilitation techniques.

Key Words: NDT; REBOUND HAMMER, ULTRA SONIC PULSE VELOCITY, CARBONATION DEPTH

1. INTRODUCTION

Concrete is a composite material produced from the combination of cement, fine aggregate, coarse aggregate and water in their relative proportion. It is a ubiquitous building material because its constituents are relatively cheap, and readily available. In addition to that, concrete in its fresh state has the ability to be moulded into any desired shape and size. The strength of concrete is its most important property (especially when needed for structural purposes) alongside its durability. Deterioration or damage of reinforced concrete may be caused due to several reasons and is nowadays commonly observed because of improper construction techniques. Deterioration of concrete has significant effect on the performance and serviceability of structures. Many factors can contribute to the deterioration of concrete structures such as; poor construction, overloading, aging, corrosion of steel, chemical reactions, natural disasters, etc. Unfortunately, damage propagation is a time dependent process with serious effect on structural capacity and durability. Deterioration signs can be visible such as concrete cracking or excessive deflections which can be detected with visual inspection. In these cases, the concrete member has probably reached significant level of damage. Early detection of damage minimizes the repair costs and preserves the service-life of the structure.

Non destructive testing (NDT) methods are used to inspect or measure the materials or structures without destroying their surface texture, product integrity and future usefulness. The field of NDT is a very broad, interdisciplinary field that plays a critical role in inspecting that structural component and systems perform their function in a reliable fashion. Certain standards has been also implemented to assure the reliability of the NDT tests and prevent certain errors due to either the fault in the equipment used, the miss-application of the methods or the skill and the knowledge of the inspectors. Successful NDT tests allow locating and characterizing material conditions and flaws that might otherwise cause planes to crash, reactors to fail, trains to derail, pipelines to burst, and variety of less visible, but equally troubling events. However, these techniques generally require considerable operator skill and interpreting test results accurately may be difficult because the results can be subjective. These methods can be performed on metals, plastics, ceramics, composites, cermets, and coatings in order to detect cracks, internal voids.

Compressive strength of the hardened concrete can be determined using the non-destructive testing (NDT) methods. The rebound (Schmitz) hammer and ultra sonic pulse velocity test are some of the most popular non destructive testing (NDT) methods used to test the strength and homogeneity of concrete. Concrete is susceptible to a variety of environmental degrading factors which tend to limit its service life. This therefore has brought about the need for (NDT) test methods to measure the inplace properties of concrete for quality assurance and for evaluation of existing conditions. Since such test are expected not to impair the function of the structure and allow for re-testing at the same location to evaluate the changes in property at some other point in time, these methods should be non destructive. Non destructive tests as applied to concrete are those tests that

do not alter the concrete quality. Non - Destructive Testing (NDT) as the name implies refers to a test that does not impair the intended performance of the element, member or structure under investigation.

NDT of concrete is of great scientific and practical importance especially the need for quality characterization of damaged constructions made of concrete. Its importance can also be seen in the desire for a proposed change of usage or extension of a structure, acceptability of a structure for purchase or insurance, assessment of the quality or integrity of the repairs, monitoring of strength development in relation to formwork stripping, curing, pre-stressing or load application. This research is to assess the condition of existing reinforced concrete structure by non destructive testing and recommend rehabilitation procedures.

2. EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

In the present study, existing structure is considered.

- 1. Methodology includes identifying the structural damage by Visual inspection.
- 2. Identifying various Non-Destructive Test Methods to be carried out on the structure/building.
- 3. Identification of the possible causes leading to the damage of the structure.

Assessing the amount of damage caused and to determine its suitability for future use

2.1 REBOUND HAMMER

OBJECT AND PRINCIPLE OF TEST

The rebound hammer method could be used for:

i) Assessing the likely compressive strength of concrete with the help of suitable correlations between rebound index and compressive strength

ii) Assessing the uniformity of concrete,

iii) Assessing the quality of the concrete in relation to standard requirements, and

iv) Assessing the quality of one element of concrete in relation to another.

NOTE- The rebound hammer method can be used with greater confidence for differentiating between the questionable and acceptable parts of a structure or for relative comparison between two different structures.

Principle

When the plunger of rebound hammer is pressed against the surface of the concrete, the spring controlled mass rebounds and the extent of such rebound depends upon the surface hardness of concrete. The surface hardness and therefore the rebound is taken to be related to the compressive strength of the concrete. The rebound is read off along a graduated scale and is designated as the rebound number or rebound index.



Table 2.1 : Rebound Number v/s Quality of concrete surface				
Average Rebound Number	Quality Of Concrete Surface			
> 40	Very good hard layer			
30 to 40	Good layer			
20 to 30	Fair			
< 20	Poor concrete			
0	Delaminated			

Fig 2.1 Rebound hammer

2.2 ULTRA SONIC PULSE VELOCITY:

UPV testing is a wave propagation test. It transmits electro acoustic pulses through the concrete medium from one side, receiving the signal from other side and measuring the transit time. The path length between the transmitting and receiving point is measured and the pulses velocity is calculated by dividing the path length by the transit time.

Pulse velocity is influenced by the properties of concrete which determines its elastic stiffness and mechanical strength. There is a reduction in the pulse velocity if the concrete under the test has low compaction, voids or damaged material. The pulse velocity increases or decreases as the concrete matures or deteriorates or changes with time. This method is considered to be a valuable and reliable method of examining the interior of concrete in a non-destructive way. The pulse velocity measurements may be used to establish

- The homogeneity of the concrete
- The presence of cracks, voids and other imperfections
- Changes in the structure of the concrete which occur with time
- Quality of one element of concrete in relation to another
- The values of elastic modulii of concrete



Fig2.2 U.P.V apparatus

Table 2.2: UPV velocity v/s	s concrete quality
Velocity(km/sec)	Concrete Quality
>4.0	Very good to excellent
3.5-4.0	Good to very good, slight porosity may exist
3.0-3.5	Satisfactory but loss of integrity is suspected
<3.0	Poor and loss of integrity exists

2.3 CARBONATION TEST:

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE

Carbonation of concrete occurs when the carbon dioxide, in the atmosphere in the presence of moisture, reacts with hydrated cement minerals to produce carbonates, e.g.calcium carbonate.

The carbonation process is also called- as depassivation. Co_2 penetrates below the exposed surface of concrete medium, if the entire concrete cover over the reinforcing steel is carbonated, corrosion of the steel would occur.

GENERAL PROCEDURE

1% phenolphthalein solution is made by dissolving 1gm of phenolphthalein in 90 cc of ethanol. The solution is then made up to 100 cc by adding distilled water. On freshly extracted cores, the surface is sprayed with phenolphthalein solution, the depth of the uncoloured layer (the carbonated layer) from the external surface is measured at 4 - 8 points, and the average is taken. If the test is to be done in a drilled hole, the dust is first removed from the hole using an air brush and again the depth of the uncoloured layer is measured at 4 - 8 points and the average is taken. If the concrete still retains its alkaline characteristic, colour of the concrete will change to purple..



Fig 2.3: Carbonation Effect on Concrete



3. Results and Discussion

Proposed	Proposed testing methods to determine damage identification							
			Informati	on gained				
Test location	Test type	Test method	colour change	lateral extent of damage	Depth of damage	Compressive strength	Corrosion percentage of reinforcement	
		visual Inspection						
	Non- Destructive	Rebound Hammer						
On site		Ultra sonic pulse velocity						
On site		Half cell						
		potential method						
		carbonation						
		depth			r			
		measurment			\checkmark			

Table 3.1 proposed test methods



Fig.3.1 damages on a existing structure

3.1 Visual inspection:

From the external appearance of structure pealing, cracking status, corrosion and the like can be surveyed. The corresponds to the daily and periodic inspections performed for ordinary structure. It also conducted as needed before performing a detailed inspection. Preliminary qualitative data is obtained through this type of survey. It would be most effective if this data could be reflected in performance evaluations of the structure as shown below table

		surface appearance of concrete		Structural condition				
Class of damage	Element	Condition of finishing	Colour	Crazing	spallation	Exposure and condition of main reinforcement	Cracks	Deflection/Distortion
0	Column	slightly some places	No	Normal	None	No exposure	Normal	No

Table 3.2 Visual inspection / each floor



International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET) e-IS

T	Volume:	07	Issue:	09	Sep	2020	
---	---------	----	--------	----	-----	------	--

www.irjet.net

Slab Good No Mnor None happened None No Beam places No atjoints Located in exposed and atjoints Courned in toilets Severe No Column Good No Minor None No exposure Sightly No Column Good No Minor None None None None None Slab Good No Minor None None None None None Slab Good No Minor None None None None None Ream Good No Minor None No Minor None No Minor None No							correction		
Beam Instance Major cacks appers Located in bathrooms Upto 15% of reinforcement bathrooms Instance No 1 Beam Golumn Good No Minor None No exposure Slightly No 1 Column Good No Minor None No exposure Slightly No 1 Slab Good No None None <t< td=""><td></td><td>Slab</td><td>Good</td><td>No</td><td>Minor</td><td>None</td><td>happened</td><td>None</td><td>No</td></t<>		Slab	Good	No	Minor	None	happened	None	No
Beam slightly some No Aligon cacks appers Located in bathrooms reinforcement exposed and correted in Severe No Column Good No Minor None Noesposure Slightly No No 1 Golumn Good No Minor None None Slightly No No 1 Slab Good No Minor None None None None Slab Good No Minor None None None None None Beam Good No Minor None No Substantial No Substantial None Normal Correction Normal Increated and correted in Normal Increated and correted in No No Increated and correted in No No							Upto 15% of		
Sightly some Beam Sightly places Cacks appers at joints Locateum bathrows at joints Perposed and corrected in toilets Severe No Column Good No Minor None No exposure inforcement exposed and corrected in Sightly No Slab Good No None None None None Beam Good No Minor None None None Beam Good No Minor None None None Beam Good No Minor None None None None Beam Good No Minor None No exposure Sightly No Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Sightly No Slab Good No Minor None No exposure Sightly No Beam Good No Minor None No exposure Sightly No Slab					Major	Leastedin	reinforcement		
Beam places No at joints corted in toilets Severe No Column Good No Minor None No exposure Slightly No Image: Some severe No Minor None No exposure Slightly No Image: Some severe No None None None Upto 10% of reinforcement No Slab Good No None None toilets None No Beam Good No Minor None None happened Minor No Beam Good No Minor None No exposure Slightly No Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No Slab Good No Minor None None No No Slab Good No Minor None correction happened Minor No Slab			slightly		cacks	Located In	exposed and		
Beam places No at joints to loites Severe No Column Good No Minor None No exposure Slightly No 1 Siab Good No None None topto 10% of reinforcement exposed and correction None No Slab Good No None None happend Minor No Beam Good No Minor None happend Minor No Beam Good No Minor None No No No Beam Good No Majority of crack appers apt C- Block No Upto 15% of reinforcement No No No Slab Good No Minor None No exposure Slightly No Slab Good No Minor None happened Minor No Slab Good No Minor None correction reinforcement			some		appers	Datinoonis	correted in		
Column Good No Minor None No exposure Slightly No 1 Slab Good No None None Teinforcement exposed and correction None No Beam Good No Minor None None None No Beam Good No Minor None happened Minor No 2 Column Good No Minor None happened Minor No 2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 3 Good No Minor None No exposure Slightly No 3 Good No Minor None No Slightly No 3 Slab Good No Minor None babtrooms None Slab Good No Minor None columns No circ		Beam	places	No	at joints		toilets	Severe	No
1 Image: Stabe Good No None No None No None No Signtly Signtly Signtly		Column	Good	No	Minor	None	No exposure	Slightly	No
Image: state							Upto 10% of		
1 Slab Good No None None correction toilets None None Beam Good No Minor None correction happened Minor No Beam Good No Majority of crack appers No Minor No No 2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 3 Good No Minor None No exposure Slightly No 3 Good No Minor None babtrooms None 3 Substantial loss to circular No Major None correction happened Minor No 4 Good No Major None correction happened Minor No 5lab Good No Major None correction happe							reinforcement		
Slab Good No None None correction None No Beam Good No Minor None happened Minor No Beam Good No Majority of crack appers at C- Block No Minor No No 2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 3 Slab Good No Minor None correction reinforcement exposed and correction No No Beam Good No Slightly None happened Minor No Slab Good No Slightly No No Minor No Goud No Minor None correction happened No No Good No Major None correction happened to correction	1						exposed and		
Stab Good No None toilets None None No Beam Good No Minor None happened Minor No Beam Good No Minor None happened Minor No A Majority of crack appers at C- Block A A A A A Beam Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No Slab Good No Minor None bathrooms None No Beam Good No Minor None correction correction No No Beam Good No Major None correction correction No No Column varandas No Major None correction circular No steps Minor No							correted in		
Beam Good No Minor None happened Minor No 2 Image: Seam Good No Majority of crack appers Image: Seam Image: Seam<		Slab	Good	No	None	None	toilets	None	No
Beam Good No Minor None Inappended Minor No 2 Column Good No Minor No Minor No 2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 3 Good No Minor None None None No 3 Good No Minor None None No No 3 Good No Minor None None No No 3 Good No Minor None Correction No No 3 Good No Major None correction No No 3 Good No Major None columns Normal Correction No Slab		Deam	Cood	No	Minor	None	correction	Minor	No
2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 3 Slab Good No Minor None None None None No Beam Good No Minor None happened Minor No Beam Good No Minor None happened Minor No Golumns in Instructure Instructure Instructure Instructure Instructure Instructure Instructure No Goud No Major None correction Instructure Instrucure Instrucure Instrucure <td></td> <td>веат</td> <td>6000</td> <td>NO</td> <td>Minor</td> <td>None</td> <td>nappened</td> <td>Minor</td> <td>NO</td>		веат	6000	NO	Minor	None	nappened	Minor	NO
Column Good No Depts at C- Block None No exposure Up to 15% of reinforcement exposed and correted in Slightly No Slab Good No Minor None Up to 15% of reinforcement exposed and correted in No Beam Good No Minor None bathrooms No Beam Good No Slightly None happened Minor No Column Variandas No Slightly None happened Minor No Beam Good No Major None correction happened to circular columns in variandas No Major None columna columna Normal Column variandas No Minor None columna columna Normal Slab Good No Minor None Steps Minor No Slab Good No Minor None Steps Minor No Beam places places					of crack				
2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 3 Good No Minor None Dept. Column No No Slab Good No Minor None Dathrooms None No Beam Good No Silghtly None Correction No No Beam Good No Silghtly None Correction No No Column varandas No Major None correction No No Column varandas No Major None columns Normal Column varandas No Minor None columns No Slab Good No Minor None steps Minor No Slab Good No Minor None steps Minor No Slab Good No Minor None At joints No No Beam places places Minor					anners				
2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 3 Slab Good No Minor None None None No 3 Slab Good No Minor None bathrooms None No Beam Good No Silghtly None happened Minor No Substantial loss to correction happened to correction happened to Column varandas No Major None Outmas Normal Column varandas No Major None Substantial varandas Slab Good No Minor None Submas No Slab Good No Minor None steps Minor Slab Good No Minor None steps Minor Beam places places Minor None At joints Minor Substantial loss to cracks racks racks rack					appers				
Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 2 Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 3 Slab Good No Minor None bathrooms No 8 Good No Minor None bathrooms No 8 Good No Minor None happened Minor 8 Good No Silghtly None happened Minor 1 Ioss to circular correction happened to circular Nome correction happened to circular Nome Column varandas No Major None correction happened to circular Nome Slab Good No Major None Outoms Nome Slab Good No Minor None staps Minor Slab Good No Minor None At joints <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Block</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					Block				
2 Column Good No Dept. None No exposure Slightly No 1					ECE				
2 Image: state in the st		Column	Good	No	Dept.	None	No exposure	Slightly	No
3 Slab Good No Minor None correction bathrooms None None Beam Good No Silghtly None happened Minor No Beam Good No Silghtly None happened Minor No Column Substantial loss to circular correction circular Korrection Korrection Korrection Korrection Column varandas No Major None columns Normal Slab Good No Major None columns Normal Slab Good No Major None columns Normal Slab Good No Minor None steps Minor No Slab Good No Minor None steps Minor No Beam places places Minor None At joints Minor No Slab Good<	2				•		Upto 15% of		
Slab Good No Minor None exposed and correction None None Beam Good No Silghtly None Correction Minor No Beam Good No Silghtly None Correction Minor No Image: Column sine Substantial Image: Column sine Image: Col							reinforcement		
Slab Good No Minor None correted in bathrooms None None Beam Good No Silghtly None happened Minor No Beam Good No Silghtly None happened Minor No Substantial loss to circular Iss to circular Iss to columns in Iss to columns No Major None correction happened to circular Iss to circular Column varandas No Major None columns Normal Slab Good No Major None columns Normal Slab Good No Minor None steps Minor No Slab Good No Minor None steps Minor No Beam places places Minor None At joints Minor No Slab Good No major cracks mappears in							exposed and		
Slab Good No Minor None bathrooms None None Beam Good No Silghtly None happened Minor No Beam Good No Silghtly None happened Minor No Substantial Ioss to circular Ioss to circular Ioss to Correction Ios Ios Column varandas No Major None columns Normal Column varandas No Major None columns Normal Good No Major None Columns Normal Ios Slab Good No Major None Columns Normal Ios Slab Good No Minor None Steps Minor No Slab Good No Minor None At joints Minor No Slab Good No Minor							correted in		
Beam Good No Silghtly None happened Minor No Beam Good No Silghtly None happened Minor No Substantial loss to columns in Column Ioss to circular Correction (crcular Correction happened to circular No Major None Columns Normal Column varandas No Major None Columns Normal Column varandas No Major None Upto 10% of reinforcement exposed and correted in toilets and No Slab Good No Minor None Steps Minor No Beam Japsty Some Some None At joints Minor No Slab Good No Minor None At joints Minor No Beam places places Minor None At joints Minor No Columns in Some Columns in Some So		Slab	Good	No	Minor	None	bathrooms	None	No
BeamGoodNoSilghtlyNonehappenedMinorNoSubstantial loss to circularIsos to circularIsos to correction happened to columns inIsos to circularIsos to circularIsos to circularIsos to circularIsos to circularColumnvarandasNoMajorNoneColumnsNormalColumnvarandasNoMajorNoneOrmalIsos to circularSlabGoodNoMinorNoneStepsMinorNoSlabGoodNoMinorNoneAt jointsNoMinorBeamplacesplacesMinorNoneAt jointsMinorNoImage: Source Columns inSomeSomeCracksImage appearsImage appearsColumnvarandasplacesDept.noneNo exposureNormalno4Image appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appears4Image appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appears4Image appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appearsImage appears4Image appearsImage appears							correction		
3 Substantial loss to circular columns in Column No Major None correction happened to circular 3 Column varandas No Major None columns Normal 3 Column varandas No Major None columns Normal 4 Column varandas No Major None columns Normal 3 Slab Good No Minor None steps Minor No 3 Slab Good No Minor None steps Minor No Beam places places Minor None At joints Minor No 4 Column varandas places Dept. none No exposure Normal no		Beam	Good	No	Silghtly	None	happened	Minor	No
3 Ioss to circular columns in No Major None correction happened to circular Ioss to circular 3 Column varandas No Major None columns Normal 3 Column varandas No Major None columns Normal 3 Image: Solution of the second of the			Substantial						
3Columns in columns in varandasNoMajorNoneColumnsNormal3ColumnvarandasNoMajorNonecolumnsNormal3ColumnvarandasNoMajorNoneColumnsNormal3ColumnFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance3FranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance3FranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance4GoodNoMinorNoneStepsMinorNo5SomeFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance6BeamplacesplacesMinorNoneAt jointsMinorNo7SubstantialFranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance6Columns inSomeFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance4FranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance4FranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance4FranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance7FranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance7FranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFrance7FranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFranceFranc			loss to				correction		
ColumnvarandasNoMajorNoneColumnsNormal3ColumnvarandasNoMajorNoneColumnsNormal3Image: Second Secon			circular				happened to		
3ColumnVariandasNoMajorNoneColumnsNormal3		Column	varandas	No	Major	Nono	columns	Normal	
33Image: Solution of the form of		Column	varanuas	NU	Мајот	None	Unto 10% of	NUTINAL	
3 Image: Second control of the second contrel of the second contex and the second control of the second cont							reinforcement		
All of the second sec	3						exposed and		
SlabGoodNoMinorNonetoilets and stepsMinorNoSlabGoodNoMinorNonestepsMinorNosomeSomeSomeImage: SomeSomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeBeamplacesplacesMinorNoneAt jointsMinorNoImage: SubstantialImage: SubstantialImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SubstantialImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SubstantialImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SubstantialImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SubstantialImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SubstantialImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SubstantialImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SubstantialImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: SomeImage: Some							correted in		
SlabGoodNoMinorNonestepsMinorNoslightly someSomeSomeImage: SomeImage:							toilets and		
slightly someSomeSomeInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationBeamplacesDacesMinorNoneAt jointsMinorNoInterpretationSubstantial loss toInterpretationMajorInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationSubstantial loss toInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationSomeInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationColumnSomeInterpretation<		Slab	Good	No	Minor	None	steps	Minor	No
some Beamsome placesSome placesMinorNoneAt jointsMinorNoImage: Substantial loss to circular columns in ColumnImage: Substantial cracksImage: Substantial substantial cracksImage: Substantial cracksImage: Substantial substantial cracksImage: Substantial substantial cracksImage: Substantial su			slightly						
BeamplacesplacesMinorNoneAt jointsMinorNoSubstantialSubstantialMajorCracksImage: SubstantialImage: SubstantialIma			some	Some					
SubstantialMajorMajorImage: CracksMajorImage: CracksImage: Cra		Beam	places	places	Minor	None	At joints	Minor	No
4 loss to circular columns in varandas cracks appears in MBA loss to appears in MBA loss to circular in MBA loss to appears in MBA 4 Column varandas places Dept. none No exposure Normal no			Substantial		Major				
4 circular columns in varandas appears in MBA places in MBA Dept. none No exposure Normal no			loss to		cracks				
Columns in Columns in Varandas Some In MBA No exposure Normal no 4 Column varandas places Dept. none No exposure Normal no			circular	G	appears				
4 4 Upto 14% of reinforcement		Column	columns in	Some	IN MBA	nona	No ornograd	Normal	no
reinforcement	Λ	Column	varandas	places	Dept.	none	Into exposure	inormal	110
Temorement	4						Upi0 14% 01		
evnosed and							exposed and		
correted in							correted in		
some plces Some toilets and			some plces	Some			toilets and		
Slab in C-Block places Major C-Blocks steps Major no		Slab	in C-Block	places	Major	C-Blocks	steps	Major	no

International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET)

e-ISSN: 2395-0056 p-ISSN: 2395-0072

1		Substantial						
		loss to						
		circular						
		columns in	Some					
	Beam	varandas	places	Major	None	No exposure	Major	no

www.irjet.net

3.2 REBOUND HAMMER

Volume: 07 Issue: 09 | Sep 2020

Rebound Hammer test is conducted on the column faces using an N type Schmidt hammer test for concrete. The test covered critical column, Slab and beam locations in the building. The test is conducted as per the procedure mentioned in IS 13311: Part II. For each column, six readings are taken ensuring a minimum distance of 20mm between two successive points. Finally, average of these readings is taken as the representative rebound number for the concrete. The following tabular column is respective rebound numbers at the damage spots with respective to notations choosen

Notations

IRJET

A BLOCK	C 1,2n -COLUMN
B BLOCK	B 1,2n-BEAM
C BLOCK	

	Rebound number	r	
s.no	Structure	Near the damage	Quality
1	A C1	15	Poor concrete
2	AC2	12	Poor concrete
3	B C1	5	Poor concrete
4	B C2	28	Fair concrete
5	B C3	31	Good layer
6	C SLAB	16	Poor concrete
7	B B1	15	Poor concrete
3	B C4	21	Fair concrete
Ð	C B1	14	Poor concrete
10	CB2	19	Poor concrete
1	C B3	18	Poor concrete
12	C B4	22	Fair concrete
13	TEERACE 1	16	Poor concrete
.4	TEERACE C1	27	Fair concrete
15	TERRACE C2	20	Fair concrete



Fig 3.2 Conducting rebound hammer test

From Table it shows less than that of rebound number 20 quality of concrete for column beams and slab gives very poor and loss of integrity exists

3.3 ULTRASONIC PULSE VELOCITY:

Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity test is conducted on critical column and beam locations in the building. The test is conducted as per the procedure mentioned in IS 133111: Part I. Before measuring the pulse velocity using the transducers, a thin layer of grease is applied to testing members so as to act as acoustic coupling between the transducers and the concrete surface.

	Table 3.4 UPV test results					
s.no	Structure	Near the damage m/s	Quality			
1	A C1	3506	Good			
2	AC2	3412	Medium			
3	BC1	3096	Medium			
4	B C2	3727	Medium			
5	BC3	3309	Medium			
6	C SLAB	-	Doubtfull			
7	B B1	-	Doubtfull			
8	BC4	3672	Good			
9	C B1	3121	Medium			
10	CB2	3362	Medium			
11	C B3	3347	Medium			
12	C B4	3527	Good			
13	TEERACE 1	3477	Medium			
14	TEERACE C1	-	Good			
15	TERRACE C2	-	Medium			



Fig 3.3 Conducting UPV test

3.4 CARBONATION DEPTH

The phenapthalene indicator test and pH test is also conducted at the places where reinforcement is exposed. The CO₂ penetration level can be identified by doing phenapthelene test as shown table below. Actually pH of concrete is equal to 13 but carbonated concrete pH value after testing is equal to between 7 to 8.



I		1 at	Jie 3.5 CO2 Penetration	
	S.NO	structure	Size	Near the damage
	1	C B1	230mm	55mm
	2	C B2	200mm	28mm
	3	C B3	230mm	21mm
	4	C B4	230mm	10mm
	5	Terrace C2	300mm	47mm



Fig 3.4 Applied phenapthelene indicator on a exposed reinforcement

The results suggest that some structures has been subjected to carbonation

Based on the results and discussion we can identify and rectify the damages by using this following table

		•
Class of Damage	Repair Classification	Repair Requirements
0	Decoration	Redecoration if required
1	Superficial	Superficial repair of slight damage not needing fabric reinforcement
2	General repair	Non-structural or minor structural repair restoring cover to reinforcement where this has been partly lost.
3	Principal repair	Strengthening repair reinforced in accordance with the load-carrying requirement of the member. Concrete and reinforcement strength may be significantly reduced requiring check by design procedure.
4	Major repair	Major strengthening repair with original concrete and reinforcement written down to zero strength, or demolition and recasting.

Table 3.6 Rehabilitation techniques

4.CONCLUSIONS:

In the present case study from results we can conclude that

- 1. The damages are identified through visual inspection. NDT tests were conducted to assess the cause of crack.
- 2. During this investigation, quality of concrete has been determined using rebound hammer and UPV tests.
- Carbonation depth has been identified using phenapthalene indicator .It is observed that the areas which are 3. not affected by carbonation are in pink colour and the affected areas are colourless
- 4. Class of damage has been determined and recommendations for the repair work have been identified.



International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET)e-ISSN: 2395-0056Volume: 07 Issue: 09 | Sep 2020www.irjet.netp-ISSN: 2395-0072

REFERENCES

- Taekeun Oh, P.E, Seong-Hoon Kee, Ralf W. Arndt, John S. Popovics, P.E and Jinying Zhu (2013) "Comparison of NDT Methods for Assessment of a Concrete Bridge Deck", Journal of Engineering Mechanics, Vol. 139, No. 3, ASCE, ISSN 0733-9399
- 2. S. Bhaskar, P. Srinivasan and A. Chellappan (2006) "National Seminar on Non- Destructive Evaluation", proceedings of Indian Society of Non-Destructive Testing.
- 3. Jochen H. Kurz, Christian Bollerand Gerd Dobmann (2013) "Condition Assessment of Civil Infrastructure in Europe: Recent Developments and What Might Be Ahead", Journal of Engineering Mechanics, Vol. 139, No. 6, ASCE, ISSN 0733-9399
- 4. Jochen H. KURZ, Markus STOPPEL, Alexander TAFFE and Christian BOLLER (2012) "Condition assessment of reinforced concrete structures using automated multi-sensor systems", 18th World Conference on Nondestructive Testing, 16-20 April 2012, Durban, South Africa.
- 5. Waleed F. Tawhed and Sarah L. Gassman(2002) "Damage Assessment of Concrete Bridge Decks using Impact-Echo Method", ACI Materials Journal, V. 99, No. 3, May-June 2002.
- Ufuk Dilekand Michael L. Leming (2007) "Comparison of Pulse Velocity and Impact-Echo Findings to Properties of Thin Disks from a Fire Damaged Slab", Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities, Vol. 21, No. 1, ASCE, ISSN 0887-3828

BIOGRAPHIES



Ms. K.Rohini is pursuing postgraduate studies at AITS, Tirupati. He is keen in conducting research in the area of concrete technology and use of green materials in the construction."



Mr K. SAI ABHINAV has been working as Assistant Professor in the Dept. of Civil Engineering at AITS, Tirupati. He has been conducting research in the areas of Special concrete, Reinforced concrete structures and Soil Mechanics