# NEAR SURFACE MOUNTED TECHNIQUE FOR THE FLEXURAL AND SHEAR STRENGTHENING OF CONCRETE BEAMS



**Joaquim Barros** Associate Professor UM Guimarães, Portugal



Salvador Dias PhD Student UM Guimarães, Portugal



Adriano Fortes Auxiliary Professor CEFET-BA Salvador, Brazil

## ABSTRACT

The efficacies of the Near Surface Mounted and Externally Bonded Reinforcing techniques for the flexural and shear strengthening of reinforced concrete beams are compared. Both techniques are based on the use of carbon fiber reinforced polymer materials. In the present work the carried out tests are described and the main results are presented and analyzed.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

Near Surface Mounted (NSM) is a strengthening technique based on the use of laminate strips of carbon fiber reinforced polymer (CFRP) materials installed into precut slits opened on the concrete cover of the elements to strengthen [1]. This strengthening technique requires no surface preparation work and, after cutting the slit, requires minimal installation time compared to the Externally Bonded Reinforcing (EBR) technique. A further advantage associated with NSM is its ability to significantly reduce the probability of harm resulting from acts of vandalism, mechanical damages and aging effects.

In the present work the efficacies of the NSM and EBR techniques for the flexural and shear strengthening of reinforced concrete beams are compared. For the flexural strengthening, the influence of the longitudinal equivalent reinforcement ratio,  $\rho_{l,eq}$ , on the strengthening efficiency of both techniques is assessed. For the shear strengthening, the influences of the longitudinal steel reinforcement ratio,  $\rho_{sl}$ , and the beam depth on the strengthening efficacy of both techniques are evaluated. In this last experimental program, the influence of the inclination of the CFRP laminates in the NSM technique is also investigated. In the present paper the experimental program is described and the results are presented and analyzed.

## 2. STRENGTHENING TECHNIQUES

The NSM technique was made up of the following steps: 1) using a diamond cutter, slits of 4 to 5 mm width and 12 to 15 mm depth were cut on the concrete surface of the elements to strengthen; 2) slits were cleaned by compressed air; 3) CFRP laminates were cleaned by acetone; 4) epoxy adhesive was produced according to supplier recommendations; 5) slits were filled with the epoxy adhesive; 6) epoxy adhesive was applied on the faces of the laminate; and 7) laminates were introduced into the slits and epoxy adhesive in excess was removed.

To apply the wet lay-up strips of CFRP sheet by EBR technique, the following procedures were executed: 1) on the zones of the beam's surfaces where the strips of sheet would be glued, an emery was applied to remove the superficial cement paste (in the shear strengthening experimental program the beam edges were also rounded); 2) the residues were removed by compressed air; 3) a layer of primer was applied to regularize the concrete surface and to enhance the adherence capacity of the concrete substrate; and 4) strips of sheet were glued on the faces of the beam by epoxy resin.

# **3. MATERIALS**

#### 3.1 Concrete and steel bars

Table 1 includes the main properties of the concrete and steel bars used in the experimental program. The average values of the concrete compression strength at 28 days ( $f_{cm}$ ) and at the date of testing the beams ( $f_{cm,j}$ ) were evaluated from uniaxial compression tests (3 for each series, at least) with cylinders of 150 mm diameter and 300 mm height. Steel bars were tested and each result is the average of at least five tests.

	Cor	ncrete	Steel				
Element type	$f_{cm}$	$f_{cm,j}$	$\phi_s$	$f_{sym}$	$f_{sum}$		
	(MPa)	(MPa)	(mm)	(MPa)	(MPa)		
Flexural strengthening	11 2	52.2	5	620	700		
program	44.2	(70 days)	6.5	480	570		
	37.6 <sup>1</sup> 49.5 <sup>2</sup>	49.2 <sup>1</sup> (227 days) 56.2 <sup>2</sup> (105 days)	6 (stirrups)	540	694		
Shear strengthening			6 (long.)	$\begin{array}{c} 622 \\ 618 \\ 2 \end{array}^{1}$	702 <sup>1</sup> 691 <sup>2</sup>		
program			10	464	581		
			12	574 <sup>1</sup> 571 <sup>2</sup>	$\begin{array}{c} 672 \\ 673 \\ \end{array}^2$		

Table 1 - Properties of the concrete and steel bars

<sup>1</sup> A series; <sup>2</sup> B series

## 3.2 CFRP systems

Two CFRP systems were used on the present work: unidirectional wet lay-up sheets of 80 mm width and precured laminates of  $1.4 \times 9.6 \text{ mm}^2$  cross-section. These CFRP systems have the properties indicated in Table 2.

CFRP system				Main properties				
Туре		Material	Tensile strength (MPa)	Young's modulus (GPa)	Ultimate strain (%)	Thickness (mm)		
		Primer <sup>1</sup>	12	0.7	3.0	-		
S&P C-Sheet (wet lay-up sheet)		Epoxy <sup>1</sup>	54	3	2.5	-		
	Sheet	Flexural strengthening prog. C-Sheet 240	3700	240	1.5	0.111		
		Shear strengthening prog. C-Sheet 530	3000	390	0.8	0.167		
		Adhesive <sup>1</sup>	16-22	5	-	-		
(precured laminate)	<b>.</b>	Flexural strengthening prog. <sup>2</sup>	2740	158.8	1.7	1.4		
	Laminate	Shear strengthening prog. <sup>2</sup>	2286	166	1.3	1.4		
1		•						

Table 2 -	Properties	of the	CFRP	material	s
1 able 2 -	Troperties	or the	UTIM	material	.5

<sup>1</sup>According to the supplier; <sup>2</sup> Evaluated from experimental tests

### 4. FLEXURAL STRENGTHENING

Figure 1 represents the geometry of the beams, the reinforcement arrangement and the number and position of the CFRP. The load configuration and the support conditions are also schematized. The cross-section area of the CFRP systems was evaluated in order to be similar the  $A_f E_f / A_{sl} E_s$  ratio for the tested series, where  $A_f$  and  $E_f$  are the CFRP cross-section area and the Young's Modulus of the CFRP systems, and  $A_{sl}$  and  $E_s$  (200 GPa) are the cross-section area and the Young's Modulus of the longitudinal tensile steel bars. In this evaluation the distinct effective depth of the CFRP systems was not considered, but its influence is marginal. Shear reinforcement was selected to assure bending failure prior to shear failure for all beams. The beams were tested at the age of about 70 days [2].



Figure 1: Beam series for the flexural strengthening

The force-deflection relationships for the series of tested beams are depicted in Figure 2. The strengthening efficacy is evaluated in terms of the service  $(P_{serv})$  and the maximum  $(P_{max})$  load, see Table 3.  $P_{serv}(S)$  and  $P_{max}(S)$  are the service and maximum load of a strengthened beam, respectively, while  $P_{serv}(R)$  and  $P_{max}(R)$  are the service and maximum load of the reference

beam. In Table 3 the equivalent reinforcement ratio,  $\rho_{l,eq} = A_{sl}/(bd_s) + (A_f E_f/E_s)/(bd_f)$ , is also indicated, where b is the beam width and  $d_s$  and  $d_f$  are the effective depth of the longitudinal steel bars and CFRP systems, respectively. The influence of the  $\rho_{l,eq}$  on the strengthening efficacy index is graphically represented in Figure 3. In terms of the beam load carrying capacity the NSM technique was the most effective one. The effectiveness, however, decreases with the increasing of  $\rho_{l,eq}$ . In terms of service load, the EBR based on the use of wet lay-up CFRP sheets was the most efficient, since  $E_f$  and  $d_f$  were the largest ones. The beams strengthened by EBR laminates have failed by the premature debonding of the laminates. Two failure modes occurred in the beams strengthened by EBR sheets: in the beams strengthened by three layers, the beam concrete cover has detached, having been bonded to the CFRP sheet. This last failure mode was also occurred in the beams strengthened by the NSM technique, but the detached concrete layer had larger thickness [2].

(kN)	100 80 60	l de	Beam's signation	ρ <sub>l,eq</sub> (%)	P <sub>serv</sub> (kN)	$\frac{P_{ser}(S) - P_{ser}(R)}{P_{ser}(R)}$ (%)	P <sub>max</sub> (kN)	$\frac{P_{max}(S) - P_{max}(R)}{P_{max}(R)}$ (%)
Force	40 - EBR M EBR L		R	-	22.1	-	36.6	-
	20 - R	sries	NSM	0.28	37.5	70	79.9	118
	0 2 4 6 8 10 12	SI S	EBR_L	0.28	31.9	44	38.6	5
	Deflection at mid span (mm)		EBR_M	0.28	40.3	82	43.0	17
kN)	100 80 60 EBR_M	l de	Beam's signation	ρ <sub>l,eq</sub> (%)	P <sub>serv</sub> (kN)	$\frac{P_{ser}(S) - P_{ser}(R)}{P_{ser}(R)}$ (%)	P <sub>max</sub> (kN)	$\frac{P_{max}(S) - P_{max}(R)}{P_{max}(R)}$ (%)
Force (	40 - R		R	-	40.5	-	48.5	-
	20 -	sries	NSM	0.49	56.3	39	93.3	92
	0 2 4 6 8 10 12	S2 S6	EBR_L	0.48	57.6	42	83.5	72
	Deflection at mid span (mm)		EBR_M	0.48	59.5	47	79.5	64
kN)	100 80 60 EBR M EBR L	I ie:	Beam's signation	ρ <sub>l,eq</sub> (%)	P <sub>serv</sub> (kN)	$\frac{P_{ser}(S) - P_{ser}(R)}{P_{ser}(R)}$ (%)	P <sub>max</sub> (kN)	$\frac{P_{max}(S) - P_{max}(R)}{P_{max}(R)}$ (%)
Force (	40 - R		R	-	51.5	-	71.8	-
[	20 -	ries	NSM	0.73	71.5	39	96.6	35
	0 2 4 6 8 10 12	S3 S(	EBR_L	0.73	74.1	44	86.5	20
	Deflection at mid span (mm)		EBR_M	0.73	73.4	43	87.3	22

Figure 2: Force-deflection relationships of the flexural strengthening beams

Table 3 - Main results of the flexuralstrengthening beam series



Figure 3: Strengthening efficacy index vs longitudinal equivalent reinforcement ratio

### **5. SHEAR STRENGTHENING**

The experimental program was composed by four series of tests. The geometry, reinforcement arrangement and support conditions of the beams of these series are indicated in Figure 4. Each series was constituted by a beam without any shear reinforcement (R) and a beam for each of the following shear reinforcing systems: steel stirrups (S), strips of CFRP sheet (M), laminate strips of CFRP at 90° with the beam axis (VL), and laminate strips of CFRP at 45° with the beam axis (IL). The shear span, a, on the series of beams was two times the depth of the corresponding beams. The concrete clear cover for the top, bottom and lateral faces of the beams was 15 mm. The amount of shear reinforcement applied on the four reinforcing systems was evaluated in order to assure that all beams would fail in shear, at a similar load carrying capacity [3, 4]. Table 4 includes general information of the beams composing the four series. Further information can be found elsewhere [5]. The relationship between the force and the deflection at mid span of the tested beams is represented in Figure 5. Table 5 includes the main results obtained in the four series. Adopting the designation of  $F_{max,K}$  and  $F_{max,K}$  for referring the maximum load of a beam without shear reinforcement and a beam reinforced with steel stirrups, respectively, (K represents the series of tests) the ratios  $F_{max}/F_{max,K R}$  and  $F_{max,K S}$ were determined for assessing the efficacy of the shear strengthening techniques, in terms of increasing the beam load carrying capacity.

The unreinforced shear R beams have failed by the formation of one shear failure crack without the longitudinal tensile reinforcement has yielded. In the beams reinforced with steel stirrups (S beams) a shear failure crack has occurred. The sudden loss of the load carrying capacity in the S beams corresponds to the moment when a stirrup crossing the shear failure crack has ruptured. In general, beams M have failed by the formation of a shear crack and have pilled off. B12\_M beam had a distinct failure mode. This beam has failed by the formation of two "concrete lateral walls" that have separated from the interior concrete volume. A shear crack has formed in this interior concrete volume, and finally the "lateral walls" have ruptured. This complex type of failure has also occurred in B10\_VL, B10\_IL, B12\_VL and B12\_IL beams. In A10\_VL beam, after the longitudinal tensile reinforcement has yielded, a shear failure crack has formed. A12\_VL beam has failed in shear and the shorter bond length of the CFRP laminate strip crossing this crack has slid. Finally, A10\_IL and A12\_IL beams have ruptured by the formation of a flexural failure crack.



Beam's		eam's	Shear strengthening systems						
designation		gnation	Material	Quantity	Spacing (mm)	Angle (°)			
		A10_R	-	-	-	-			
	_	A10_S	Steel stirrups	6¢6 of two branches	300	90			
	A1(	A10_M	Strips of S&P C-Sheet 530	8×2 layers of 25 mm (U shape)	190	90			
s	7	A10_VL	S&P laminate strips of CFK 150/2000	16 CFRP laminates	200	90			
erie		A10_IL	S&P laminate strips of CFK 150/2000	12 CFRP laminates	300	45			
1 Se		A12_R	-	-	-	-			
1	~	A12_S	Steel stirrups	10\u00f666 of two branches	150	90			
	A1	A12_M	Strips of S&P C-Sheet 530	14×2 layers of 25 mm (U shape)	95	90			
		A12_VL	S&P laminate strips of CFK 150/2000	28 CFRP laminates	100	90			
		A12_IL	S&P laminate strips of CFK 150/2000	24 CFRP laminates	150	45			
		B10_R	-	-	-	-			
	_	B10_S	Steel stirrups	6¢6 of two branches	150	90			
	B1(	B10_M	Strips of S&P C-Sheet 530	10×2 layers of 25 mm (U shape)	80	90			
s		B10_VL	S&P laminate strips of CFK 150/2000	16 CFRP laminates	100	90			
erie		B10_IL	S&P laminate strips of CFK 150/2000	12 CFRP laminates	150	45			
3 se		B12_R	-	-	-	-			
щ	~	B12_S	Steel stirrups	10\u00f666 of two branches	75	90			
	B12	B12_M	Strips of S&P C-Sheet 530	16×2 layers of 25 mm (U shape)	40	90			
	_	B12_VL	S&P laminate strips of CFK 150/2000	28 CFRP laminates	50	90			
		B12_IL	S&P laminate strips of CFK 150/2000	24 CFRP laminates	75	45			

Table 4 - Beam	series fo	r the s	shear	streng	thening	ρ
----------------	-----------	---------	-------	--------	---------	---

-		-			
180 -	A10-S	Beams	$F_{max}$	F <sub>max</sub>	F <sub>max</sub>
160 · 140 ·	AIO-IL	Series A (\u00f610)	(kN)	$F_{max,A10_R}$	$F_{max,A10}$ _S
120 ·	A10-VL A10-M	A10-R	100.40	1.00	0.59
. 001 Force (k	AID R	A10-S	169.35	1.69	1.00
60 · 40 ·		A10-M	122.06	1.22	0.72
20 -		A10-VL	158.64	1.58	0.94
	0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 Deflection at mid span (mm)	A10-IL	157.90	1.57	0.93
280 -	A12-II	Beams	$F_{max}$	F <sub>max</sub>	F <sub>max</sub>
240 -	A12-VL	Series A (\$12)	(kN)	$F_{max,A12}_R$	$F_{max,A12}$ _S
200 - 2 160 -	AI2-N	A12-R	116.50	1.00	0.54
4) - 120 -	Al2-R	A12-S	215.04	1.85	1.00
80 -		A12-M	179.54	1.54	0.83
40 -		A12-VL	235.11	2.02	1.09
	0 5 10 15 20 25 Deflection at mid span (mm)	A12-IL	262.38	2.25	1.22
140	B10-VL	Beams	F <sub>max</sub>	F <sub>max</sub>	F <sub>max</sub>
120	BIO-S	Series B (\u00f610)	(kN)	$F_{max,B10_R}$	$\overline{F_{max,B10}}_{S}$
100 <u> <u> </u> </u>		B10-R	74.02	1.00	0.61
Force	BIO-M ABIO-M A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	B10-S	120.64	1.63	1.00
40 20	The second and the second seco	B10-M	111.14	1.50	0.92
0		B10-VL	131.22	1.77	1.09
	Deflection at mid span (mm)	B10-IL	120.44	1.63	1.00
<sup>180</sup>		Beams	$F_{max}$	F <sub>max</sub>	F <sub>max</sub>
140 -	B12-M	Series B (\u00f612)	(kN)	$F_{max,B12}R$	$F_{max,B12}S$
2 120	B12-IL	B12-R	75.7	1.00	0.48
- 08 Eore	DI2-VL	B12-S	159.1	2.10	1.00
40 -	B12-R	B12-M	143.0	1.89	0.90
20 - 0 -	<u> </u>	B12-VL	139.2	1.84	0.87
0	0 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 Deflection at mid span (mm)	B12-IL	148.5	1.96	0.93
Elan	no F. Forna deflection relationships of the	Table 6	Main	regulta of	44.0 01.000

Figure 5: Force-deflection relationships of the Table 5 - Main results of the shear strengthening beams strengthening beam series

From the results obtained, the following main conclusions can be pointed out:

- The CFRP shear strengthening systems applied in the present work increased significantly the shear resistance of concrete beams;
- The NSM shear strengthening technique was the most effective of the CFRP systems. This efficacy was not only in terms of the beam load carrying capacity, but also in terms of deformation capacity at beam failure. Using the load carrying capacity of the unreinforced beams for comparison purposes, the beams strengthened by EBS and NSM techniques showed an average increase of 54% and 83%, respectively;
- Increasing the beam depth, laminates at 45° became more effective than vertical laminates;
- $F_{max}$  of the beams reinforced with steel stirrups and  $F_{max}$  of the beams strengthened by NSM technique were almost similar;
- Failure modes of the beams strengthened by the NSM technique were not so fragile as the ones observed in the beams strengthened by the EBS technique.

#### 6. CONCLUSIONS

The effectiveness of the NSM and EBR techniques for the flexural and shear strengthening of RC beams was compared. For the flexural strengthening, the NSM technique was the most effective, but the difference between the efficacy of NSM and EBR techniques has decreased with the increase of the longitudinal equivalent reinforcement ratio. For the shear strengthening, the NSM was also the most effective technique, and was also the easiest and fastest to apply, and assured the lowest fragile failure modes.

# 7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of the present work wish to acknowledge the materials provided by the degussa<sup>®</sup> Portugal, S&P<sup>®</sup> and Unibetão (Braga). The study reported in this paper forms a part of the research program "CUTINSHEAR - Performance assessment of an innovative structural FRP strengthening technique using an integrated system based on optical fiber sensors" supported by FCT, POCTI/ECM/59033/2004.

#### 8. REFERENCES

- Barros, J.A.O., Sena-Cruz, J.M., Dias, S.J.E., Ferreira, D.R.S.M. and Fortes, A. S., 2004, "Near surface mounted CFRP-based technique for the strengthening of concrete structures", Workshop on R+D+I in Technology of Concrete Structures - tribute to Dr. Ravindra Gettu, Barcelona, Spain, October, pp. 205-217.
- [2] Fortes, A. S., 2004, "Estruturas de Concreto submetidas à flexão reforçadas com laminados de CFRP colados em entalhes (NSM for the flexural strengthening of RC structures)", PhD Thesis, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brasil, May, 213 pp.
- [3] CEB-FIP Model Code, Comite Euro-International du Beton, Bulletin d'Information nº 213/214, 1993.
- [4] ACI Committee 440, 2002, "Guide for the design and construction of externally bonded *FRP systems for strengthening concrete structures*", American Concrete Institute, 118 pp.
- [5] Barros, J.A.O. and Dias, S.J.E., 2003, "Shear strengthening of reinforced concrete beams with laminate strips of CFRP", Proceedings of the International Conference Composites in Constructions CCC2003, Italia, September, pp. 289-294.