

Durability of Carbon Fibre Reinforced Polymer (CFRP) strand for use in high capacity permanent ground anchors

Matthew Sentry¹, Abdelmalek Bouazza², Riadh Al-Mahaidi³, Frank Collins⁴, Darren Loidl⁵, Chris Bluff⁶, Len Carrigan⁷

^{1, 2, 3, 4} Department of Civil Engineering, Monash University, Wellington Rd, Clayton, VIC, Australia
^{5, 6, 7} Geotechnical Engineering, 68 Springbank St, Tullamarine, Victoria, Australia

Abstract

High capacity ground anchors currently employ the well established steel strand system using stress relieved post tensioned strands. Although such systems provide rugged tendons with readily available hardware, they are vulnerable to corrosive attack from aggressive ground environments. Current permanent ground anchor standards require the use of double protection systems encapsulating the steel strands, to ensure a serviceable design life. Fibre Reinforced Polymer (FRP) is characterised by its superior resistance to aggressive environments, compared to steel. In recent years, where steel reinforcement use was restricted due to aggressive ground conditions, FRP reinforcement was successfully used as a durable construction alternative. Whilst carbon fibre (CFRP) strands have been researched and developed for use in prestressed concrete members such as bridge construction, minimal research has been devoted to developing FRP strands for use in high capacity ground anchors.

The paper summarises current research knowledge and best practices for use of CFRP strands in ground anchor systems. Research work reported in this paper involves investigation into CFRP strand performance in comparison to steel strands, when exposed to extreme aggressive environments. A series of six month long experiments are currently in progress studying these durability effects over a range of accelerated conditions including temperature and concentration levels, whilst specimens are in an unstressed and stressed state. This paper presents the interim results of unstressed CFRP specimens subjected to an alkaline and acidic based groundwater solution and a neutral solution tested under accelerated conditions (60°C and increased salt concentration) over three months of a six month period. Based on the results of tests, the levels of corrosion protection systems required for CFRP anchor systems are critically assessed. Early progressive research results, presented by the authors, in the field of CFRP durability indicated that there are minimal overall material property changes over time when specimens are exposed to various aggressive groundwater environments.

Keywords: Ground anchors; Fibre reinforced polymers; FRP; carbon fibre reinforced polymers; CFRP; Durability

1. Introduction and background

High capacity ground anchors currently employ the well established steel strand system using stress relieved post tensioned strands [10]. Although such systems provide rugged tendons with readily available hardware, they are vulnerable to corrosive attack from aggressive ground environments. Current permanent ground anchor standards require the use of double corrosion protection systems encapsulating the steel strands, to ensure a serviceable design life.

Technological advancements of fibre reinforced polymer (FRP) products for applications in civil construction has allowed new products such as glass fibre (GFRP), aramid fibre (AFRP) and carbon fibre (CFRP) to pave the way for research into further improvements to the currently favoured steel tendon ground anchor system.

FRP's are characterised by their superior resistance to aggressive environments, compared to steel. Where steel reinforcement has been restricted due to aggressive ground conditions, minimal alternatives have been available for

industry use until FRP reinforcement was developed and successfully used as a durable construction alternative. Extensive research has been conducted on FRP as a substitute for conventional steel reinforcement; however there is minimal knowledge on FRP limitations, especially its behaviour over prolonged exposure to aggressive ground environments whilst stressed.

2. Limitations of steel strand ground anchors

Corrosion in steel tendon ground anchors occurs as a consequence of in-homogeneities or impurities in the steel tendon or grout, or by the existence of salts, sulphates and other dissolved solids present in grout mixtures, soils or groundwater [6].

To eliminate risk of corrosion, international standards including EN1537, established a double corrosion protection system as a minimum level of protection required for permanent ground anchors (Figure 1). Double corrosion protection must be applied over the tendon bond length, tendon free length, the anchor head and the transition between the anchor head and the tendon free length [11].

Littlejohn [5] reported on 35 known cases of corrosion related failures to steel tendon ground anchors, concluding that free length corrosion comprised 60% of failures, 34% of failures occurred at the anchorage head and only 6% of failures occurred in the fixed anchor length. Catastrophic structural failures can occur as a direct result of ground anchor failure due to corrosion (Figure 2). Littlejohn emphasised that the small percentage of failures within the fixed anchor length was a result of inadequate grout placement.




Figure 1: (a) Schematic of double protection system for permanent ground anchor; (b) longitudinal section - double corrosion protection through the bond length of a ground anchor [8].

Steel tendon corrosion occurs locally where the tendon intersects a crack in the surrounding grout, or as a result of damage to the corrosion protective sheaths [15]. Grout cracks occur as a result of either shrinkage strains during curing or tensile loading of the anchor. Due to grout micro cracking, majority of standards do not permit grout to be considered as one of the two means for corrosion protection. Weerasinghe and Anson [16] and Mothersille [8] provided project examples where corrosion occurred above and below the anchor head, resulting in anchor strength reduction (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Failure of anchored quay wall (a) corroded barrels and wedges in anchor head (b) lack of corrosion protection behind anchor block [8]

Tendon material choice is limiting ground anchor development. The need to protect the ground anchor system from corrosion performs an integral element of a permanent ground anchor.

3. Advancements in corrosion resistant materials – FRP

Current complexities of double corrosion protection has shifted research into investigating the use of alternative materials to assist in minimising risk of anchor failure due to corrosion, including investigations into the use of fibre reinforced polymers (FRP).

3.1 Fibre reinforced polymer (FRP) materials

FRP consists of a group of materials containing aligned continuous organic (aramid or carbon fibre) or inorganic (glass fibre) filaments embedded in a polymer matrix and shaped into a product for use. Organic filaments are the primary choice for ground anchors [19]. North America is continuously developing and refining the use of inorganic filaments as a substitute for steel in concrete reinforced structures [12,13].

FRP filaments consist of various kinds of load bearing fibres of high tensile strength and high modulus of elasticity. Ultimate tensile strengths of carbon fibre reinforced polymer (CFRP) filaments range from 290 to 758GPa, aramid fibre reinforced polymer (AFRP) filaments ranges from 70 to 179GPa compared to prestressed steels tensile strength of 195GPa [17].

For all FRP materials, a polymeric matrix is used to bond the fibres, protect the fibres against environmental effects and assist in the equalization of fibre forces and load transfers in the transverse direction. Thermoplastic and thermoset polymers can be applied with FRP fibre filaments to form an FRP composite material. Thermoset polymers including epoxy, polyester and vinyl ester are preferred resins for FRP material in civil engineering applications [18].

3.2 Properties of FRP Composites

Composite products currently able to provide the industry with an environmentally resistant alternative product to steel tendons for ground anchor applications include glass fibre (GFRP), aramid fibre (AFRP) and carbon fibre (CFRP) reinforced polymers. FRP properties can vary depending on quality, manufacturer and manufacturing process (Table 1).

Table 1: Properties of FRP composites [after 18]

Property	GFRP	AFRP	CFRP
Minimum fibre volume ratio	0.55	0.6	0.63
Density (g/cm ³)	2.1	1.38	1.58
Longitudinal tensile strength (MPa)	1080	1280	2280
Transverse tensile strength (MPa)	39	30	57
Longitudinal modulus (GPa)	39	78	142
Transverse modulus (GPa)	8.6	5.5	10.3
In-plane shear strength (GPa)	89	49	71
In-plane shear modulus (GPa)	3.8	2.2	7.2
Major Poisson's ratio	0.28	0.34	0.27
Maximum longitudinal strain (%)	2.8	1.5	1.5
Maximum transverse strain (%)	0.5	0.5	0.6
Relaxation ratio (%)			2-3

FRP composites are known to have a brittle mode of failure compared to yielding failure of steel (Figure 3) [3]. Designers need to consider the brittle failure nature of FRP composites when designing.

Tensile strength is dependant on length of tendon, anchorage system being used and the loading rate. CFRP ranges between 13-18% higher tensile strength than steel [18]. Brittle nature of FRP composites result in the modulus of elasticity for CFRP composites to be in the order of 30% lower and AFRP composites to be 65% lower than prestressing steel [18]. Tensile strain of CFRP ranges between 1.3-1.6% and AFRP ranges between 2.0-3.7%, compared to prestressing steel which is at 6%.




Figure 3: Typical tensile stress-strain behaviour of various FRP products compared to steel strand [after 2]

FRP fibres are weak in transverse loading. FRP shear strength is a result of the matrix used to construct the composite, which is considerably lower than its tensile strength. Santoh (1993) compared AFRP, CFRP and prestressing steel showing lateral shear strength of 11% (CFRP), 15% (AFRP) and 47% (prestressing steel) of the materials tensile strength. FRP (CFRP and AFRP in particular) density is approximately 15-20% that of prestressing steel [2].

FRP creep rupture may be more prominent than in steel strand due to brittle failure of FRP tendons over time under sustained loading or under adverse conditions [2,18]. Under initial stress of $65\%f_{pu}$, creep strain of CFRP tendons is approximately 0.007% after 100 years [2]. Zhang et al. [18] reported that the relaxation for AFRP was 12% after 1000 hours (under load of $0.6f_{pu}$), while CFRP ranged between 0.48% and 0.96% ($0.5f_{pu} - 0.8f_{pu}$) when compared to prestressing steel relaxation rate of 1.02% to 7.35% ($0.5f_{pu} - 0.8f_{pu}$).

3.3 FRP composite ground anchorage design

FRP tendon ground anchors must consider the same design criterion and procedures as with conventional steel tendon ground anchors. Several quality standards are available to assist designing with FRP tendons. In addition to standards, government organisations have established rigorous guidelines complementing local and international standards. Adjustments to current standards and guidelines are required when replacing

steel tendons with FRP tendons. Current documentation relevant to ground anchorage construction and for application of FRP tendons in ground anchors include (but not limited to) are EN 1537:2002–Execution of special geotechnical works–Ground Anchors; BS 8081:1989–Ground Anchorages; ACI 440.4R-04–Prestressing Concrete Structures with FRP Tendons; CAN/CSA S806–Design and Construction of Building Components with Reinforced Polymers; ISIS Canada-Educational Modules No. 1– 8; Post Tensioning Institute (USA)-Recommendations for Prestressed Rock and Soil Anchors and RTA QA Specification B114 Ed 2/Rev 3 1999.

4. Durability of CFRP in aggressive ground environments

Ground anchors are commonly exposed to both acidic and alkaline ground conditions depending on ground mineral content, soil/rock type, age and groundwater flow path. It is essential to understand the limitations to ground anchorage materials especially when exposed to aggressive ground conditions whilst in a stressed state. Conventional ground anchors use multiple layers of HDPE sheaths or combined HDPE and steel sheaths to protect steel strand from external environments.

This paper reports on an ongoing experimental analysis investigating the durability of various CFRP strand materials exposed to two different aggressive groundwater conditions and a neutral condition at various temperatures under unstressed and stressed conditions. This investigation aims to establish what levels of corrosion protection, if at all, are required for high capacity ground anchorage systems.

4.1 Factors affecting CFRP durability

Steel is deemed isotropic and homogenous in comparison to anisotropic and heterogenous CFRP reinforcement. Behaviour of the bond between the steel and the cementitious product in conventional steel reinforced concrete is generally influenced by the concrete strength [9]. On the other hand, FRP bond behaviour in FRP reinforced concrete products is influenced by numerous factors as indicated by Nanni et al. [9] including; fibre type, matrix type, FRP geometry, and FRP manufacturing process.

Micelli and Nanni [7] performed experiments to investigate the durability of FRP reinforcement bars on concrete structures, indicating various damage mechanisms for FRP reinforcement which must be considered relevant to ground anchors including; fluid absorption and influence on physical/mechanical properties, creep and stress relaxation, fatigue and environmental fatigue damage and weathering. These mechanisms considered as a result of attack by external agents relevant to the ground anchor including moisture and aggressive solutions (within groundwater), alkaline

environment (within both the grout and groundwater), and fatigue loads (from superstructure).

Micelli and Nanni [7] suggests that the rate of degradation of polymer composites exposed to a fluid environment is related to the rate of sorption of the fluid, concluding that the absorption behaviour of a polymer composite depends on the type of fluid the composite it is exposed to, concentration levels of fluid that composite polymer is exposed to, temperature, damage status of composite polymer, applied stresses to composite polymer, and chemical structure of matrix and the fibre/matrix interface within the composite polymer.

As a result of the polymer composition, polymers are classified as a viscoelastic material and can exhibit creep and stress relaxation to greater extents than steel reinforcements.

4.2 Aggressive groundwater environments

Aggressive ground conditions generally relate to the aggressive nature of either the ground (soil/rock/contaminated or hazardous waste fill) or the groundwater by means of increased levels of minerals, ions or contaminants. Groundwater can be defined as the subsurface water located in soil pore spaces and in the fractures of geological formations. Due to the location of groundwater, the presence of contaminants due to soil/rock condition, mineralogy of the surrounding ground, environmental factors caused by human alterations to the environment (mining, industrial leakage, etc) all has a part in providing a certain quality to the groundwater. Aggressive groundwater is commonly understood as water which is either acidic or alkaline. The various ion levels present and the total dissolved solids (TDS) depends on the aggressiveness of the groundwater.

Aggressive groundwater in Australia is commonly measured by the concentration levels of Sulphate (SO_4^{2-}), Calcium (Ca^{2+}), Magnesium (Mg^{2+}), Sodium (Na^+) and Chloride (Cl^-) [14]. AS3600 exposure classification recommends that any soil with a $\text{pH} < 4.0$ or with groundwater $> 1000 \text{mg/L}$ of Sulphate shall be deemed aggressive. Walton [14] concluded that any groundwater environment can be deemed aggressive should the TDS exceed 1000mg/L where the TDS comprises of one or more of the above mentioned minerals.

Acidic aggressive groundwater is commonly located in soils with groundwater close to the surface or near coastal regions in Australia where Sulphate levels are excessive [4]. Sodium Hydrogen Sulphate (NaHSO_4) is a common solution found in highly acidic groundwater where Sulphate is present.

Although AS3600 and EN1537 do not refer to alkaline aggressive groundwater, it is essential that this study investigates these effects on FRP. Numerous studies on extreme alkaline concrete pore water tests have been carried

out on many forms of FRP products. No test to date has investigated the effects alkaline aggressive groundwater has on FRP products, in particular CFRP. Extreme alkaline groundwater's pH ranges between 8.0 – 10.0. It is the ion combination which can be present in Australia's aggressive groundwater that can have altering effects on steel properties compared with the effects of concrete pore water.

Common groundwater in Australia has a pH range between 5.0 and 8.0. Extreme alkaline groundwater is considered to have a $\text{pH} > 8.5$. These extreme alkaline groundwater conditions are associated with the inclusion of Sodium Bicarbonate (NaHCO_3) [14]. Groundwater with high concentrations of Hydrogen Carbonate (HCO_3^-) is commonly associated with moderate alkaline groundwater. Acidic groundwater is classified as having a $\text{pH} < 5.0$. Extreme acidic groundwater (pH less than 2.5) contains free acids. Groundwater with varying amounts of mineral acids from sulfide sources or within organic acids is considered to be moderately acidic [14].

4.3 CFRP absorption of aggressive groundwater solutions

A critical aspect of FRP durability is its absorption behaviour. Diffusivity and gravimetric measurements can be used to monitor this behaviour. Moisture can permeate into different FRP products to different extents, depending upon the number of molecular and microstructural aspects, polarity of the molecular structure, degree of cross-linking, degree of crystallinity, presence of residual monomers and the FRP's surface properties [7]. Micelli and Nanni [7] and ACI440.3R-04 method for analysing CFRP's rate of absorption (Equation 1) was used in this study

$$M_t (\%) = \frac{W - W_d}{W_d} \times 100 \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

Where: W = moist weight; W_d = dry weight at time $t=0$

5. Investigation into the durability of CFRP strand in aggressive ground environments

An ongoing investigation into the durability effects of CFRP strands in aggressive ground environments is being undertaken at Monash University. This research is determining what level of corrosion protection is required for CFRP strands when commercially used in high capacity permanent ground anchors if exposed to alkaline or acidic groundwater conditions.

This paper is a progress report for samples exposed to aggressive solutions at an elevated temperature of 60°C in an unstressed state over a one and three month period.

5.1 Experimental procedure

5.1.1 Tensile capacity assessment

The experiment studies what effect acidic and alkaline aggressive groundwater may have on the ultimate tensile performance of CFRP strands. Two CFRP based strands were used in this investigation, CFCC (Tokyo Rope – Japan) and HS25x2 (Sireg – Italy). Each specimen is fully immersed in different aggressive environments and placed into a temperature controlled curing tank. Curing of the specimens is over a one, three and six month period. Temperatures of 30°C and 60°C were chosen. The specimens endure these conditions under an unstressed and stressed state. This paper presents results only for a 60°C temperature over one and three months in an unstressed state.

Specimen curing is in accordance with ACI 440.3R-04. Method of assessment is in accordance with ASTM D3039M, ASTM D3916 and ACI440.3R-04. Method of determining elastic modulus of the cured specimens is in accordance with ACI440.3R-04. An elastic modulus range of between 1000 and 3000 microstrain is recommended for use. The accuracy of this investigation is calculated to two standard deviations at the 95% probability level. Ultimate tensile testing was conducted using the Baldwin testing machine, calibrated and serviced by Monash University.

All specimens are compared and an assessment of the materials ultimate tensile strength performance using Arrhenius modelling can be used to establish the levels of long term corrosion protection required for CFRP strands being used for permanent ground anchors.

5.1.2 Rate of absorption

CFRP absorption analysis is carried out on all specimens in line with Micelli and Nanni [7] method of analysis (Equation 1). Specimens were measured and weighed prior to curing and again post curing. Visual, weight and scanning electron microscope (SEM) are the methods used to assess rates of absorption and changes to materials.

SEM analysis is an excellent tool providing a detailed micro-view of how absorption can occur and what effects this might have on the specimens overall tensile performance.

5.2 Aggressive groundwater solutions

Two aggressive solutions and one neutral solution are used to replicate groundwater conditions in this investigation. All aggressive solutions had a minimum TDS concentration >1,000mg/L. The following solutions are being used:

Acidic groundwater ➔ $\text{NaHSO}_4 + \text{NaCl}^*$
 Alkaline groundwater ➔ $\text{NaHCO}_3 + \text{NaOH} + \text{NaCl}^*$

Neutral groundwater ➔ H_2O (distilled)

Note: * = added to increase salinity of solution to further accelerate aging of specimens

A pH of 9.5 (± 0.5) was maintained for the alkaline aggressive groundwater solution, while a pH of 1.0 (± 0.5) was maintained for the acidic groundwater solution. The neutral solution had a pH of 7.0 (± 0.5).

5.3 Material properties

Two different CFRP based strands are currently being adopted for this research investigation (Figure 4). Steel strand was used as a standard comparison. The manufactures material properties are as per Table 2



Figure 4: Materials being used in investigation

Table 2: Technical properties for CFRP test specimens being used in research project (Tokyo Rope, 2006., Sireg, 2006.) and stress relieved steel strand (One Steel)

Property	CFCC (Tokyo Rope)	HS 25x2 (Sireg)
Dimensions		
Width (mm)	-	25
Diameter (mm)	15.2	-
Nominal Thickness (mm)	-	2
Effective Cross Sectional Area (mm ²)	113.6	32
Linear Weight (g/m)	226	97
Carbon Fibre		
Minimum fibre volume ratio	0.62	0.64
Density (g/cm ³)	1.5	1.8
Tensile strength (MPa)	4200	4900
Elastic modulus (GPa)	240	78
Resin		
Type	modified epoxy	Vinylester
Density (g/cm ³)	1.6 - 2.0	1.15
Tensile strength (MPa)	80	>55
Product		
Tensile strength (MPa)	2200	2500
Elastic modulus (GPa)	141	140

5.4 Results and discussion

5.4.1 Absorption of aggressive solution

Specimen weights were analysed prior to immersion into aggressive groundwater solutions at various temperatures and then re-weighed post curing. The absorption rate was analysed using Equation 1. Figure 5 illustrates the rates of absorption over the testing time frame.

Figure 6 indicates the uniform corrosion of steel immersed in acidic solution, with some minor pitting. The bicarbonate deposits are evident on both the steel and CFCC strands when immersed in the alkaline solution. Minimal evidence of any aggressive solution attack was present on the CFRP products

immersed in all three solutions. This is reflected with the absorption increase over time of the CFRP products.

The results clearly show that CFRP absorbs solution over time. From the limited results it is evident that rates of absorption increase for CFRP materials when exposed to aggressive groundwater compared to exposure to a neutral solution. HS25x2 CFRP strand has the highest rate of absorption. Absorption trends for all solution types indicate an increase in absorption over time.

Steel strand, as expected showed levels of corrosion. These levels of corrosion vary depending on solution type. Corrosive trends for all solution types indicate an increase in corrosion over time. Corrosion of steel can be increased by implementing cyclic loading, however CFRP specimens require full long term saturation compared to cyclic assessment when studying corrosive effects due to absorption.

CFRP rates of absorption are of interest at these elevated temperatures as it may allow for deterioration of fibre strength over time. SEM analysis can provide a greater understanding to how aggressive solution can penetrate the strand and investigate if there is any deterioration of the composite matrix as a result of absorption.

Preliminary SEM analysis (Figure 7) indicates that although there is a complete epoxy coating around the perimeter of the CFCC strand (Figure 7 (a) left side of image), void cracks within the composite matrix may result in variations to material strength over time (Figure 7 (b)).

Figure 7 (c) are images of the CFRP material HS25x2. The uncured samples clearly show the longitudinal fibre filaments with the epoxy coating surrounding the filaments. Gaps within these filaments pose a potential threat to solution ingress and potential attack.




Figure 5: Absorption of specimens immersed in aggressive groundwater at elevated temperatures




Figure 6: Specimens after 3 months curing (a) alkaline solution (1–CFCC and 2–HS25x2); (b) acidic solution (3–CFCC and 4–HS25x2)

SEM analysis on cured samples can provide more detail of the methods of absorption by CFRP specimens and if there is any relationship between aggressive solution attack and ultimate tensile failure modes.

Further analysis over long time frames must be conducted prior to drawing sound conclusions on the effects of absorption has on the overall tensile strengths of CFRP strands. This research is currently being undertaken at Monash University.




Figure 7: SEM analysis on CFRP strand prior to immersion into aggressive groundwater solution (a) CFCC at 100x magnification (b) CFCC at 500x magnification (c) HS25x2 at 1000x magnification

5.4.2 Ultimate durability tensile capacity of Steel and CFRP strands

The results from CFRP (CFCC) specimens curing in acidic and alkaline groundwater and a neutral solution over 0, 1 and 3 months at an elevated temperature of 60°C in an unstressed state are reported in Figure 8 and Table 3.

Results for the CFRP product HS25x2 for periods of 0, 1 and 3 months are currently inconclusive due to ongoing gripping issues. Results have been achieved but verifications must be conducted prior to specimen analysis and discussion. Further publications will present these results and comparisons

It is evident that even from these initial stages of this durability assessment, the minimal tensile change when cured in the aggressive ground environments. It was observed that specimen strength initially increased within the first month,

possibly due to the additional curing of the composite matrix at the elevated temperature of 60°C.

Strength increases of 11.5%, 13.5% and 10.9% were observed for the neutral, alkaline and acidic solutions respectively. After three months, the specimen strength reduced, but still showed a strength increase from the control samples. An overall strength increase of 6.3%, 2.1% and 2.8% were observed for the neutral, alkaline and acidic solutions, after three months curing, respectively. Further assessments on six month curing can provide greater knowledge on the strength effects of the cured specimens.






Figure 8: Unstressed stress-strain relationships of steel and CFCC strand over 0, 1 and 3 months curing in various aggressive solutions at a curing temperature of 60°C (a) CFCC curing in alkaline groundwater, (b) CFCC curing in acidic groundwater and (c) CFCC curing in neutral solution.

CFRP specimens showed minimal changes to the materials brittle nature when the specimens were maintained in a saturated state at elevated temperatures over time. Acidic solutions showed a decrease in elastic modulus over the three months period of 12% (6% decrease after 1 month). Alkaline solution showed an increase 7% after one month, but reduced to an increase of 5% between the control specimens and the 3month trial specimens. This showed only a 2% elastic modulus decrease from specimens curing from one to three months. CFCC specimens immersed in a neutral solution initially showed a 16% increase in elastic modulus after one month, however the elastic modulus reduced after three months to fall below the control specimens by 3%. This was a 16% change from one month results to three month results.

Although these results showed changes in the materials elasticity over time, as visually indicated in Figure 8, there is minimal change over time between each series of specimens sampled over time.

Specimens immersed in the neutral solution had an increase in ultimate failure strain of 6.6% over a three month period, with a 1.3% increase in ultimate failure strain after just one month. Acidic groundwater specimens exhibited major ultimate failure strain increases, with a failure strain increase of 24.9% after just one month and a total of 29.4% after three months. Specimens affiliated with alkaline groundwater exhibited a failure strain increase of 11.2% after one month, but only displayed a total failure strain of 0.8% after three months. This equates to a decrease in failure strain of 10.4% from the one month to the three month tests.

Table 3: Ultimate Stress and corresponding failure strain for CFCC specimens immersed in alkaline groundwater, neutral solution and acidic groundwater solution over a total period of three months (of a 6 month experiment).

Solution	Curing Time (months)	Elastic Modulus (GPa)	Failure Strain (%)
Control	0	170	1.05%
Neutral	1	197	1.06%
	3	164	1.12%
Alkaline	1	182	1.17%
	3	178	1.06%
Acidic	1	160	1.31%
	3	150	1.36%

As indicated by Bakis et al., [1] and Benmokrane et al., [3] CFRP's tend to fail in a brittle manner. As such the composite matrix breaks down and exposes rough and jagged failure planes (Figure 9). Explosive failures were common for all types of CFCC strand. Strand failure generally occurred close to the proximal end of the bonded anchorage, but still within the test area.

These results in conjunction with the absorption of CFRP materials over time provides the authors an opportunity to further investigate whether a relationship between the absorption rates affect the strength, ductility and overall performance of CFRP strands once exposed to aggressive ground conditions in a passive state.



Figure 9: (a) & (b) CFCC (CFRP) strand, tensile tested to failure after 1 month exposure to acidic aggressive groundwater.

Although these results are interesting to analyse, it is important to be able to study and compare how these specimens are able to perform when exposed in the aggressive ground environments over the extended six month period, both in these unstressed conditions and in a stressed condition.

6. Future research works

This paper has primarily reported on one type of CFRP specimen in a range of CFRP materials currently under

investigation in this experiment in an unstressed state at one elevated temperature range.

As indicated, the results reported herein are part of a progressive report on the durability and absorption effects of CFRP materials when exposed to aggressive groundwater solutions under various conditions including, increased temperature and when specimens are exposed to these situations in a passive and a stressed state.

In addition to the durability assessment of CFRP materials for use as permanent ground anchorage systems with minimal corrosion protection, investigations is currently being undertaken on the bond effects of CFRP strands for use in high capacity ground anchors and finite element evaluation and modelling of CFRP stand, used as a high capacity ground anchors in rock. Full scale gunbarrel comparisons and model verifications are being investigated.

7. Conclusions

Although recent developments to conventional steel tendon ground anchors have improved corrosion protection, the implementation of FRP's into the construction industry provide a durable construction alternative.

This paper presented a progress report on a durability study, currently being conducted at Monash University, investigating effects of various aggressive groundwater solutions have on the tensile performance of numerous CFRP materials that can be utilised as a practical alternative to steel strands in ground anchorage systems. The completed investigation aims to be able to address the long term effects of corrosive solutions on CFRP materials and develop a means to establish what levels of protection is required when constructing CFRP based ground anchors.

8. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Monash University and the civil engineering laboratory and the project sponsor Geotechnical Engineering.

9. Reference

- [1] C.E. Bakis, T.E. Boothby, J. Jia, Fracture based analysis of bond durability of GFRP bars in concrete, in: B. Benmokrane, E. El-Salakawy (Eds.), Third international conference on durability and field applications of fibre reinforced polymer (FRP) composites for construction, Quebec City, Canada, 2007.
- [2] B. Benmokrane, H. Xu, I. Nishizaki, Aramid and carbon fibre-reinforced plastic prestressed ground anchors and their field applications, Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering 24 (6) (1997) 968.

- [3] B. Benmokrane, B. Zhang, K. Laoubi, B. Tighiouart, I. Lord, Mechanical and bond properties of new generation of carbon fibre reinforced polymer reinforcing bars for concrete structures, *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering* 29 (2) (2002) 338-343.
- [4] A. Carse, The design of Durable Concrete Structures for Aggressive Environments, in: Q.D.o.M.R.-S. Division (Ed.), 2004.
- [5] G.S. Littlejohn, Ground Anchorages: corrosion performance, *Proceedings - Institute of Civil Engineers Part 1* (82) (1987) 645-662.
- [6] G.S. Littlejohn, D.A. Bruce, *Rock Anchors - State of the Art*, Foundation Publications Ltd, Essex, England, 1977.
- [7] F. Micelli, A. Nanni, Durability of FRP rods for concrete structures, *Construction & building materials* 18 (7) (2004) 491-503.
- [8] D. Mothersille, ANCOLD Conference Presentation - Recent Development in Permanent Ground Anchor Technology, Geoserve Global Ltd & Geotech Pty Ltd, 2006, p. 54.
- [9] A. Nanni, C.E. Bakis, J.A. Mathew, Acceleration of FRP Bond Degradation, in: B. Benmokrane, H. Rahman (Eds.), *Proceedings from the First International Conference on Durability of Fibre Reinforced Polymer (FRP) Composites for Construction*, Sherbrooke, Canada, 1998.
- [10] M. Sentry, A. Bouazza, R. Al-Mahaidi, L. Carrigan, D. Loidl, *Developments in Ground Anchor Technology: Carbon Fibre Reinforced Polymer (CFRP)*, Common Ground - 10th Australia New Zealand Conference on Geomechanics, Brisbane, 2007.
- [11] M. Sentry, A. Bouazza, R. Al-Mahaidi, D. Loidl, C. Bluff, L. Carrigan, *Advancements in Ground Anchors: Carbon Fibre Reinforced Polymer (CFRP) Strands*, ICE International Conference on Ground Anchorages and Anchored Structures in Service 2007, London, 2007.
- [12] D. Tardif, K.W. Neale, M. Demers, A.R. Zaki, G. Tadros, Potential use of CFRP and GFRP in precast prestressed reinforced bridge deck system with extended service life, *Durability and field applications of fibre reinforced polymer (FRP) composites for construction*, Canada, 2007.
- [13] J.S. Van der Wal, M. Boulfiza, A step forward in characterizing the performance of GFRP rods in concrete, *Durability and field applications of fibre reinforced polymer (FRP) composites for construction*, Canada, 2007.
- [14] Walton, *Groundwater Resource Evaluation*, 1970.
- [15] D.R.B. Weerasinghe, M.D. Adams, *A Technical Review of Rock Anchorage Practice 1976-1996*, Ground Anchorages and Anchored Structures, Thomas Telford, London, 1997, pp. 481-491.
- [16] D.R.B. Weerasinghe, R.W.W. Anson, Investigation of long term performance and future behaviour of existing ground anchorages, *International Conference on Ground Anchorages and Anchored Structures*, Thomas Telford publications, London, 1997.
- [17] B. Zhang, B. Benmokrane, Design and evaluation of a new bond-type anchorage system for fibre reinforced polymer tendons, *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering* 31 (2004) 14-26.
- [18] B. Zhang, B. Benmokrane, Large model test of prestressed carbon fibre reinforced polymer ground anchors, *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering* 32 (6) (2005) 1064.
- [19] B. Zhang, B. Benmokrane, A. Chennouf, Prediction of Tensile Capacity of Bond Anchorages for FRP Tendons, *Journal of Composites for Construction* 4 (2) (2000) 39.