



# A Look at CO<sub>2</sub> Reduction for Ternary Cementitious Combinations

Tyson D. Rupnow, Ph.D., P.E.

Anna Maria Workshop X

November 4 – 6, 2009

**LTRC**

<http://www.ltrc.lsu.edu>



# Outline

- Background
- Objectives
- Work plan
- Test Factorial
- Cost Savings
- CO<sub>2</sub> Emission Comparisons
- Discussion



# Background

- Benefits of ternary mixtures
  - Increased durability and strength
  - Reduced permeability, cost, and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions
- Drawbacks of ternary mixtures
  - Increased chance for incompatibilities
  - Early stiffening or delayed set times



# Background

- Wanted to write a specification
- Was told NO
  - Have to complete research on “our” materials
- Was then I learned the first lesson of government work

# First Lesson of Government Work





# Objectives

- Characterize fresh characteristics of ternary mixtures
- Characterize the hardened characteristics of ternary mixtures
- Determine maximum acceptable substitution limits for ternary applications



# Work Plan

- Concrete testing
  - 1 source of each class C and F fly ash, grades 100 and 120 slag, and type I portland cement
  - Slump, unit weight, temperature, air content, compressive and flexural strength, MOE, length change, freeze-thaw durability, and chloride permeability
  - 70°F for mixtures



# Work Plan

- 500 lbs cement / yd<sup>3</sup>
  - Coarse aggregate will be limestone
    - 60/40 ratio of coarse to fine aggregate
    - #57 Stone
  - water/cementitious material ratio: 0.45
  - Use of admixtures
    - air entrainment and water reducers to achieve air content and slump within specifications



# Test Factorial

Mixture ID	Type I PC	Class C FA	Class F FA	G100S	G120S
100TI*	100				
80TI-20C*	80	20			
80TI-20F*	80		20		
50TI-50G100S*	50			50	
50TI-50G120S*	50				50
50TI-30G120S-20C	50	20			30
40TI-30G120S-30C	40	30			30
30TI-30G120S-40C	30	40			30
30TI-50G120S-20C	30	20			50
20TI-50G120S-30C	20	30			50
10TI-50G120S-40C	10	40			50
50TI-30G100S-20C	50	20		30	
40TI-30G100S-30C	40	30		30	
30TI-30G100S-40C	30	40		30	
30TI-50G100S-20C	30	20		50	
20TI-50G100S-30C	20	30		50	
10TI-50G100S-40C	10	40		50	
50TI-30G120S-20F	50		20		30
40TI-30G120S-30F	40		30		30
30TI-30G120S-40F	30		40		30
30TI-50G120S-20F	30		20		50
20TI-50G120S-30F	20		30		50
10TI-50G120S-40F	10		40		50
50TI-30G100S-20F	50		20	30	
40TI-30G100S-30F	40		30	30	
30TI-30G100S-40F	30		40	30	
30TI-50G100S-20F	30		20	50	
20TI-50G100S-30F	20		30	50	
10TI-50G100S-40F	10		40	50	
60TI-20C-20F	60	20	20		
40TI-30C-30F	40	30	30		
20TI-40C-40F	20	40	40		

**LTRC**

<http://www.ltrc.lsu.edu>



# Cost Savings

- 26 foot wide top
- 10 inches in thickness
- One mile length
  - 475 lbs cementitious/yd<sup>3</sup>
- Approximately 1000 tons of binder per mile length of roadway



# Cost Savings

Binder	\$/Ton
Cement	\$120
Class C FA	\$40
Class F FA	\$50
G100S	\$90
G120S	\$100



# Cost Savings

Mixture ID	PCC Binder Cost / Mile (\$)	Potential Savings
100TI*	\$120,755	--
80TI-20C*	\$104,654	13.3
80TI-20F*	\$106,666	11.7
50TI-50G100S*	\$105,660	12.5
50TI-50G120S*	\$110,692	8.3
50TI-30G120S-20C	\$98,616	18.3
40TI-30G120S-30C	\$90,566	25.0
30TI-30G120S-40C	\$82,516	31.7
30TI-50G120S-20C	\$94,591	21.7
20TI-50G120S-30C	\$86,541	28.3
10TI-50G120S-40C	\$78,490	35.0
50TI-30G100S-20C	\$95,597	20.8
40TI-30G100S-30C	\$87,547	27.5
30TI-30G100S-40C	\$79,497	34.2
30TI-50G100S-20C	\$89,560	25.8
20TI-50G100S-30C	\$81,509	32.5
10TI-50G100S-40C	\$73,459	39.2
50TI-30G120S-20F	\$100,629	16.7
40TI-30G120S-30F	\$93,585	22.5
30TI-30G120S-40F	\$86,541	28.3
30TI-50G120S-20F	\$96,604	20.0
20TI-50G120S-30F	\$89,560	25.8
10TI-50G120S-40F	\$82,516	31.7
50TI-30G100S-20F	\$97,610	19.2
40TI-30G100S-30F	\$90,566	25.0
30TI-30G100S-40F	\$83,522	30.8
30TI-50G100S-20F	\$91,572	24.2
20TI-50G100S-30F	\$84,528	30.0
10TI-50G100S-40F	\$77,484	35.8
60TI-20C-20F	\$90,566	25.0
40TI-30C-30F	\$75,472	37.5
20TI-40C-40F	\$60,377	50.0

**LTRC**

<http://www.ltrc.lsu.edu>



# Cost Savings for LA Projects

- Assumptions same as before
- Approximately 192 two lane roadway miles bid in 2007 and 2008 construction seasons



# Cost Savings for LA Projects

Mix #	Mixture Design	Estimated cementitious material cost 2007-2008 bid years (2 years)	Savings / mix A (\$)	Savings / mix B (\$)	Savings / mix C (\$)
A	100TI	\$30,900,951	--	--	--
B	80TI20C	\$26,368,811	\$4,532,139	--	--
C	50TI50G120S	\$25,750,792	\$5,150,158	\$618,019	--
1	50TI20C30G120S	\$23,278,716	\$7,622,235	\$3,090,095	\$2,472,076
2	40TI30C30G120S	\$21,012,647	\$9,888,304	\$5,356,165	\$4,738,146
3	10TI50G120S40F	\$17,510,539	\$13,390,412	\$8,858,273	\$8,240,254



# CO<sub>2</sub> Reductions

- Portland cement = 0.92 tons / ton cement
- Grade 100 slag = 0.15 tons / ton slag
- Grade 120 slag = 0.20 tons / ton slag
- Class C fly ash = 0 tons / ton ash
- Class F fly ash = 0 tons / ton ash



# CO<sub>2</sub> Reductions

Mixture ID	CO2 (tons)	CO2 Savings (tons)	CO2 Savings (%)
100TI*	926		
80TI-20C*	741	185	20.0
80TI-20F*	741	185	20.0
50TI-50G100S*	538	387	41.8
50TI-50G120S*	564	362	39.1
50TI-30G120S-20C	523	403	43.5
40TI-30G120S-30C	431	495	53.5
30TI-30G120S-40C	338	588	63.5
30TI-50G120S-20C	378	547	59.1
20TI-50G120S-30C	286	640	69.1
10TI-50G120S-40C	193	733	79.1
50TI-30G100S-20C	508	418	45.1
40TI-30G100S-30C	416	510	55.1
30TI-30G100S-40C	323	603	65.1
30TI-50G100S-20C	353	573	61.8
20TI-50G100S-30C	261	665	71.8
10TI-50G100S-40C	168	758	81.8
50TI-30G120S-20F	523	403	43.5
40TI-30G120S-30F	431	495	53.5
30TI-30G120S-40F	338	588	63.5
30TI-50G120S-20F	378	547	59.1
20TI-50G120S-30F	286	640	69.1
10TI-50G120S-40F	193	733	79.1
50TI-30G100S-20F	508	418	45.1
40TI-30G100S-30F	416	510	55.1
30TI-30G100S-40F	323	603	65.1
30TI-50G100S-20F	353	573	61.8
20TI-50G100S-30F	261	665	71.8
10TI-50G100S-40F	168	758	81.8
60TI-20C-20F	555	370	40.0
40TI-30C-30F	370	555	60.0
20TI-40C-40F	185	741	80.0

LTRC

<http://www.ltrc.lsu.edu>



# CO<sub>2</sub> Reductions

- 26 foot wide top
- 10 inches in thickness
- One mile length
  - 475 lbs cementitious/yd<sup>3</sup>
- Approximately 1000 tons of binder per mile length of roadway



# CO<sub>2</sub> Reductions

- Assumptions same as before
- Approximately 192 two lane roadway miles bid in 2007 and 2008 construction seasons



# Potential CO<sub>2</sub> Reductions in LA

Mix #	Mixture Design	Estimated tons of CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions 2007-2008 bid years (2 years)	CO <sub>2</sub> Savings / mix A (tons)	CO <sub>2</sub> Savings / mix B (tons)	CO <sub>2</sub> Savings / mix C (tons)
A	100TI	176959	--	--	--
B	80TI20C	141605	35354	--	--
C	50TI50G120S	107781	69178	33825	--
1	50TI20C30G120S	97079	79880	44526	10702
2	40TI30C30G120S	79498	97461	62108	28283
3	10TI50G120S40F	36882	140077	104723	70898



# Conclusions

- CO<sub>2</sub> reduction can be achieved using ternary cementitious systems
- Great cost savings are also realized in the process
- Better quality more durable concrete



# Questions

