This brochure is meant to provide homeowners with information about resources that can help determine if their concrete foundation is damaged, and help find potential options for repair.

The Connecticut Department of Consumer Protection and the Connecticut Insurance Department are among the resources homeowners can consult regarding foundation concerns.

While the Department of Consumer Protection gathers information from concerned consumers, the Insurance Department is helping potentially affected homeowners with any insurance related questions or complaints.

Residents are encouraged to email individual insurance related questions to cid.ca@ct.gov, or call the Insurance Department at 800-203-3447.
If the concrete in your basement walls has large cracks like ones pictured, your home's foundation may be damaged and **should be inspected.** An inspection can identify solutions to prevent long-term damage.

**What you need to know.**
- During your conversations with experts about potential damage to your foundation, make sure you reference cracks in your foundation walls and floor individually. This will help the experts provide you with an adequate recommendation for repair.
- Cracks such as those in the photos shown here may take ten or more years after the foundation is poured to develop. Many of the homes that show damage similar to that in these photos were built in the 1980s and 1990s.

**What you can do.**
- Talk with a professional engineer about testing the concrete in your home for damage, and their recommended next steps for repair.
- You can verify that your professional engineer is licensed, and your home improvement contractor is registered at [www.elicense.ct.gov](http://www.elicense.ct.gov).
- Contact the Connecticut Insurance Department to work through any insurance-related questions or complaints.
- If you have questions or need support, please contact the Department of Consumer Protection at [dcp.concrete@ct.gov](mailto:dcp.concrete@ct.gov).

**What to avoid.**
- There may not be a quick, or partial fix to the problem. Using a short-term fix or partial replacement may result in more repairs at a higher cost in the future.
- Be aware of scams, and make sure you're using a registered and reputable home improvement contractor (take a look at [www.elicense.ct.gov](http://www.elicense.ct.gov) to verify their registration).
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Re: Consumer Protection Investigation of Crumbling Concrete Home Foundations

Dear Governor Malloy and Commissioner Harris:

This letter is to provide a status report in response to your August 6, 2015, letter requesting that my office work in coordination with the Department of Consumer Protection ("DCP") to investigate crumbling concrete home foundations in northeastern Connecticut. Specifically, you asked my office to work with DCP to issue Civil Investigative Demands ("CIDs"), pursuant to Section 42-110d of the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act ("CUTPA"), to determine "whether consumer protection rules were violated, whether faulty concrete was knowingly poured and supplied to contractors, and whether there was any breach of a duty and consequent failure to notify homeowners and the State."

My office has since worked closely with DCP to issue CIDs to numerous parties believed to have knowledge about the crumbling concrete foundations. We have also retained a concrete expert from UConn to investigate the underlying cause of the crumbling concrete, and we have deposed and interviewed dozens of people involved in the industry.

Based on our efforts to date, which are ongoing, we do not anticipate that our investigation is likely to provide a sufficient basis to support viable and worthwhile claims for violations of Connecticut consumer protection laws. Thus, we caution you that sovereign CUTPA claims – that is, claims brought under CUTPA by the State on behalf of the public – should not be relied upon as a source of significant financial relief for the homeowners afflicted by crumbling foundations or otherwise as a solution to this pressing public problem.

Our concrete expert has not yet issued his final report on the complete cause of crumbling foundations – it is expected in September. The numerous interviews, depositions and documents my staff reviewed to date, in addition to our expert's review of the scientific literature associated with this problem, point to two likely and important conclu-
sions: (1) that the presence of pyrrhotite is a necessary causal factor in the concrete problems we have observed, but its use in concrete aggregate during the relevant time period does not provide a viable basis for a claim of unfair or deceptive business conduct and/or (2) even if one could advance a viable CUTPA claim in these circumstances, which is doubtful, we would not expect to recover financial relief in amounts adequate to provide meaningful relief relative to the scope of the harm.

I emphasize that we have not waived any claim against any potential defendant, and reserve full authority to assert such claims as are warranted by facts, law and circumstances. I am conveying this information and preliminary conclusions now for three reasons. First, while it is possible that further investigation will alter my office’s current views, it is not likely to yield different conclusions. Second, I am mindful that recently-enacted legislation, Public Act No. 16-45, requires Commissioner Harris to report on the potential cause or causes of failing concrete foundations no later than January 1, 2017. In light of his mandate and the limited time frame to meet it, he should be informed of relevant findings and information as early as possible. Third, and related, the problems suffered by affected homeowners in northeastern Connecticut are acute and potentially devastating to families and communities. Government officials and others should not place unrealistic hopes that consumer protection law promises the likelihood of significant remedies, and they should instead focus their attention without delay on identifying and pursuing more effective potential avenues for broad-based assistance.

I. Background

In this circumstance, the Attorney General’s investigatory and enforcement authority is limited to that which is available under CUTPA. CUTPA authorizes the Commissioner of Consumer Protection to investigate possible unfair or deceptive business practices. See General Statutes § 42-110d. In addition to the authority to issue CIDs – essentially, administrative subpoenas – CUTPA authorizes the Commissioner and his representatives to conduct depositions of those believed to have information relevant to his investigations. See General Statutes §§ 42-110j, 110n.

Whenever the Commissioner has reason to believe that any person has violated CUTPA, he may request that the Attorney General bring a sovereign enforcement action in Superior Court seeking an injunction and an order directing restitution or other equitable relief. See General Statutes § 42-110m. In a CUTPA enforcement action, the Attorney General may pursue civil penalties of up to five thousand dollars per willfully committed act or practice prohibited under the statute.

It is within the context of CUTPA’s statutory scheme that my office has been working with DCP to investigate the business practices relating to the crumbling concrete home foundations. (The statutory authority to undertake pre-suit CUTPA investigation is vested by statute with DCP. We undertake pre-suit CUTPA investigations in our role as legal counsel to DCP.) DCP has solicited consumer complaints and, to date, received 235 complaints from Connecticut homeowners whose foundations were poured largely from the mid-1980s through the early 2000s. On behalf of the Commissioner, we have issued 31
CIDs demanding information from homeowners' insurance carriers for information in their possession pertaining to the causes of crumbling concrete foundations.\textsuperscript{1} We also issued CID to a cement manufacturer and to the Joseph J. Mottes Company ("Mottes"), the company that produced the only concrete associated with the problem. In addition, we have

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1} There has been much public discussion about the refusal of insurance companies to provide coverage under homeowners' policies for damages to their foundations. Some homeowners have filed class action litigation against their insurers alleging violations of the Connecticut Unfair Insurance Practices Act ("CUIPA"), Conn. Gen. Stat. § 38a-815 et seq., breach of contract, and other claims based on coverage claim denials. We are aware also of anecdotal reports of some homeowners, whose coverage claims were initially denied, obtaining substantial settlements after initiating individual litigation against their carriers. Our understanding is that some of those homeowners and others have questioned the fairness and adequacy of disclosures made by some companies when coverage language was changed to erect barriers to these kinds of crumbling concrete claims. Those concerns are serious and warrant further review.

Our CUTPA CID to insurance carriers did not seek information concerning their coverage decisions or the propriety of those decisions or disclosures, and we have not determined if insurers are obligated to provide coverage for crumbling foundation damage or if any has engaged in unfair conduct in reviewing or denying coverage claims or in communicating with policy holders. Those determinations are beyond the scope of the Governor's referral, and, in any event, the authority to compel production of information to inform them would not derive from CUIPA but rather from the Connecticut Insurance Department's broad investigatory authority. CUIPA authorizes the Insurance Commissioner, upon reason to believe that an unfair insurance act has occurred to initiate a hearing if she believes it is in the public interest to do so. In the context of such a hearing, she may compel production of records and other information as she deems necessary. More broadly, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 38a-16 provides that the Insurance Department may, "as often as the Commissioner deems necessary, conduct investigations and hearings in aid of any investigation, on any matter under the provision of [Title 38, Insurance]." In the course of such an investigation, the Commissioner may issue subpoenas, compel testimony, and order production of documents. \textit{Id.} If the Insurance Department determines after investigation that an insurer has engaged in conduct constituting an unfair insurance practice it may order far-reaching relief, up to and including monetary fines and license revocation. See Conn Gen. Stat. § 38a-17.

The Insurance Department has not to my knowledge as of yet issued CUIPA or other subpoenas to gather information concerning insurers' coverage obligations, coverage denial conduct, or communications to their policy holders relating to crumbling foundation coverage. It has, however, recently issued data calls requesting some information concerning these topics. I applaud Commissioner Wade for taking this initial step and stand ready at her request to assist that and any further investigative efforts that may be warranted.
conducted over a hundred interviews and depositions, including of Mottes employees, past and present, and people involved in home construction and foundation installation in northeastern Connecticut over the past forty years.

We have retained Prof. Kay Wille, Ph.D., to conduct a scientific investigation into the underlying cause or causes of the crumbling concrete foundations. Professor Wille is an assistant professor of civil and environmental engineering at the University of Connecticut. His research focuses on concrete mixture design, and characterization of mechanical and durability properties, and he is the director of UConn’s Advanced Cementitious Materials and Composites (ACMC) laboratory. He is the 2015 recipient of the National Science Foundation CAREER award.

Professor Wille has conducted a review of all available literature relating to crumbling concrete foundations. He has inspected Becker's quarry, the source of the stone aggregate used in Mottes' concrete, and he has taken and analyzed samples of stone from the quarry. He and his assistant, Rui Zhong, Ph.D., have also now taken and analyzed core samples from a representative sampling of seven homes with Mottes concrete foundations, six of which are crumbling, and they have conducted visual inspections of an additional 15 home foundations.

II. Relevant Factual Findings

Professor Wille's review is ongoing and his final report is due in September. Nonetheless, he has conveyed to my office that his analysis of the stone aggregate from the quarry and from the core samples taken from home foundations, and his visual inspections, all suggest a likelihood that an iron sulfide mineral called pyrrhotite is the primary source of the problem.

Concrete used in home foundations is comprised of four main ingredients: cement, chemical admixtures, water, and stone aggregate. Since the early 1980s Mottes has used stone aggregate from Becker's quarry in its concrete. According to a geological map provided to us by the Connecticut State Geologist, Becker's quarry sits squarely in a vein of rusty weathering rock, containing significant amounts of pyrrhotite. Our investigation has not required us to examine other quarries in detail, but in light of the pattern of complaints presented, Becker's quarry appears likely to contain unusually high levels of pyrrhotite in its geological make up. It is certainly present at Becker's quarry in amounts greater than trace amounts. Pyrrhotite oxidizes in the presence of water and oxidant (oxygen or ferric ions). The oxidation leads to the formation of expansive mineral products, such as ferrihydrite, and the release of sulphate. The released sulphate promotes a reaction with tricalcium aluminate within the cement, resulting in deleterious secondary minerals such as ettringite. Further, at the presence of carbon, either from calcite in the aggregate or from carbon dioxide in the environment, another deleterious mineral, thaumasite, can be formed. Both of these secondary minerals (ettringite and thaumasite) are expansive and ultimately lead to the premature deterioration of the surrounding concrete foundations. More than
trace amounts of pyrrhotite are necessary to cause destructive expansive cracking and there may be other contributing factors necessary for the reaction to occur.

As part of their investigation, Professor Wille and Dr. Zhong conducted a literature review in an attempt to determine the state of knowledge about risks associated with pyrrhotite in concrete. Very significantly, although Professor Wille is confident in his conclusions about the necessary role of pyrrhotite in the present problems in northeastern Connecticut, he emphasizes that there has been insufficient study to yield a broadly recognized consensus on the role of pyrrhotite in concrete deterioration.

Concrete deterioration cases specifically associated with pyrrhotite have been reported in Oslo, Norway, in 1959, and in a dam in Spain in 2014. Cases associated with the oxidation of pyrrhotite or another iron sulfide mineral, pyrite, have been reported in Canada. Those cases apparently did not receive much attention until affected homes in the Montreal area were reported in the 1990s. Although the cases were investigated and a symposium on harmful pyritic rock fills was held in 1997 by the Montreal section of the Association of Engineering Geologists, the relevant scientific literature is sparse. There has yet to develop a broad or well understood consensus among scientists or building professionals about the risks associated with pyrite or pyrrhotite in concrete. No known regulatory body in the United States has restricted the amount of pyrrhotite in home foundation concrete.

Further, based on CID responses and depositions and interviews that my office and DCP conducted, we have insufficient evidence to support a finding that either Mottes or others in the concrete production or home construction industries had specific awareness of the deterioration risks associated with pyrrhotite at the time they provided concrete or aggregate for the now-crumbling foundations. Some witnesses have alleged instances of certain practices by Mottes and/or foundation installers – primarily practices involving introduction of excessive water into concrete mix – as potentially causing or contributing to concrete failures occurring many years later. While such practices may indeed have ultimately contributed to a subsequent pyrrhotite reaction in individual cases, it cannot be proved that any person knew or should have known at the time that their conduct could result in the pyrrhotite damage now being experienced. Simply put, the science relating to pyrrhotite was not sufficiently established at the time of the conduct, if it occurred, to support such a finding.

III. Legal Analysis

As discussed below, CUTPA may be violated by conduct in trade or commerce that is deceptive or unfair, within the meaning of the statute. See General Statutes § 42-110b. Under these circumstances, as explained below, we do not anticipate that the State is likely to have a viable cause of action under either of these CUTPA theories against any party involved in the production or installation of the affected concrete home foundations.

For purposes of unfairness claims, "in determining whether a practice violates CUTPA [the courts] have adopted the criteria set out in the 'cigarette rule' by the federal trade commission for determining when a practice is unfair: (1) whether the practice, with-
out necessarily having been previously considered unlawful, offends public policy as it has been established by statutes, the common law, or otherwise — whether, in other words, it is within at least the penumbra of some common law, statutory, or other established concept of unfairness; (2) whether it is immoral, unethical, oppressive, or unscrupulous; (3) whether it causes substantial injury to consumers (competitors or other businessmen)." Cheshire Mortgage Serv, Inc. v. Montes, 223 Conn. 80, 105-6 (1992). “All three criteria do not need to be satisfied to support a finding of unfairness." Id. "A practice may be unfair because of the degree to which it meets one of the criteria or because to a lesser extent it meets all three." Id.

Here, the investigation has not developed reliable evidence supporting a CUTPA unfairness claim based on the first two criteria: that any party involved in the production or installation of concrete home foundations committed any act or practice that offended an established public policy or that could be fairly characterized as immoral, unethical, oppressive or unscrupulous.

For a finding of unfairness based solely on consumer harm resulting from a business practice, the harm "...must be substantial; it must not be outweighed by any countervailing benefits to consumers or competition that the practice produces; and it must be an injury that consumers themselves could not reasonably have avoided," Ulbrich v. Groth, 310 Conn. 375, 474-75 (2013). Further, and critically, a showing of consumer harm must be accompanied by improper conduct by the defendants. See, e.g., Genworth Fin. Wealth Mgmt., Inc. v. McMullan, No. 3:09-CV-1521 JCH, 2012 WL 1078011, at *12 (D. Conn. Mar. 30, 2012) ("[S]ubstantial harm to [plaintiff], unaccompanied by any improper conduct by the Principal Defendants, cannot support CUTPA liability.").

Here, although homeowners could not have reasonably avoided the substantial injury they have suffered from crumbling concrete foundations, a legal showing of improper conduct by any party is undermined by the absence of scientific consensus or regulatory restriction addressing the dangers of pyrrhhotite in concrete.

Nor, for similar reasons, has our investigation developed evidence supporting a deception-based CUTPA claim against any party involved in manufacturing or installing the concrete at issue. To prevail on a claim for deception against a party, the State would need to demonstrate that (1) the party made a representation or omission or engaged in another practice likely to mislead consumers, (2) consumers interpreted the message reasonably under the circumstances, and (3) the misleading representation, omission, or practice was material (i.e., likely to affect consumer decisions or conduct). See Caldor, Inc. v. Heslin, 215 Conn. 590, 597 (1990).

Here, the State lacks evidence that any party made any representations, omitted information or engaged in any other practice likely to mislead consumers who, interpreting the message reasonably under the circumstances, made decisions based thereon to purchase the affected concrete for their home foundations. As noted above, it does not appear that those involved in the production and installation of concrete home foundations knew or should have known of the risks of pyrrhhotite in concrete, and thus it cannot be proved that they misled consumers about such risks.
The precise manner that pyrrhotite in aggregate can cause or contribute to damage in concrete is not yet completely understood. Numerous homes built on concrete from Mottes using Becker's stone are completely unaffected. Yet to be fully determined is the amount of pyrrhotite necessary to cause a reaction (although it appears clear that more than trace amounts are necessary to cause a problem), what other factors are necessary contributors to the problem, and how such factors must interact to create damage. The only concrete producer of which we are aware that has produced home foundation concrete with stone aggregate containing pyrrhotite is Mottes, and the only quarry of which we are aware that has produced stone aggregate containing high levels of pyrrhotite for home foundation concrete is Becker's quarry. On May 9, 2016, Commissioner Harris and I accepted an assurance of voluntary compliance from both businesses. Under the terms of the assurance, neither business will sell any product containing stone aggregate from Becker's quarry for use in home concrete foundations in Connecticut until June 30, 2017. This date gives the General Assembly an opportunity to react to the final report of Dr. Wille and the conclusions of Commissioner Harris by passing protective legislation. Neither business admits to any wrongdoing or liability under any cause of action, however, and the assurance itself is not evidence of a CUTPA violation.

My investigation has been focused primarily on the legal viability of CUTPA claims. I should also point out, however, the substantial limits to the practical utility of bringing sovereign CUTPA claims for monetary relief, even if legally viable, against concrete producers or aggregate suppliers. Most significantly, the likeliest defendants would almost certainly lack sufficient assets to allow meaningful financial recovery relative to the dramatic scope of the damages collectively faced by affected homeowners. The assets necessary to address the problem are likely to be in the millions of dollars. The individuals working for corporations cannot be held personally responsible for the actions of the corporation without evidence necessary to pierce the corporate veil or evidence to support a responsible corporate officer doctrine claim – both of which theories require the establishment of detailed facts about specific individual actions that occurred decades ago, and which we have no basis at present to pursue.

I note that although the State has no apparent basis to pursue a claim under CUTPA against any party involved in the production or installation of concrete home foundations affected by pyrrhotite, individual homeowners may have private claims under, for example, tort, contract or CUTPA theories. Such claims could be supported by evidence, not developed through the State's investigation, that individual installers were negligent in their installation practices. Mottes, for one, contends that installers added too much water to their concrete at installation sites to facilitate the flow of the concrete down the chutes from the trucks into the ground, contributing to (if not causing) the subsequent deterioration. To the extent that any such circumstances exist, however, they would vary too widely from home to home to support a sovereign enforcement action.

Lastly, I note that some evidence exists, albeit conflicted and subject to challenge, that Mottes employees themselves may in some instances have caused excessive water content in concrete (e.g., through the practice of "hot-loading", that is adding excessive water to remnants of previous concrete loads to permit their reuse). To the extent that
foundation failures are attributable in part to excessive water content or other construction or materials defects, the circumstances would vary too widely from home to home and be subject to other proof problems such that a sovereign enforcement action is not practicable. Those problems include the lack of available information about specific practices at specific homes by identifiable businesses and individuals, wide variations in circumstances among affected homes, contradictions among witness statements, hearsay obstacles, diminished recollections over long time periods, and witness bias or self-interest. We express no opinion about whether such problems would exist or be surmountable in private lawsuits involving individual homes.

IV. Conclusions/Recommendations

The investigation that my office has conducted in coordination with DCP has not to date resulted — and will not likely in the future result — in evidence supporting a sovereign enforcement action under CUTPA against any party involved with the production or installation of the concrete home foundations now crumbling. In short, the risks of pyrrhotite in home foundation concrete were not sufficiently known at the time that the concrete was produced and poured, undermining any unfairness or deception claim that could be brought under CUTPA.

In light of the above, strong consideration should be given to enacting through statute or regulation building standards limiting the presence of destructive expansive iron sulfide minerals (like pyrrhotite and pyrite) in home foundation concrete. The absence of such governmental standards, and the public policies embodied therein, inhibit the State's capacity to pursue claims, including CUTPA unfairness claims, against businesses that sell concrete containing the deleterious minerals. As noted, the assurance of voluntary compliance from Mottes and Becker Construction Company expires on June 30, 2017. This date was chosen so that the Legislature could have an opportunity in its next session to enact appropriate building standards legislation informed by our investigation before the agreement with the companies expires. The failure to do so would hamper any legal effort to protect consumers from future use of residential concrete containing dangerous levels of destructive minerals.

Finally, as has been publicly reported, informal discussions my office has had with some major insurers lead me to believe that at least some insurers, while maintaining a denial of coverage responsibility, may be willing to engage in a voluntary program to provide meaningful financial relief to affected homeowners. A majority of the market participants have not as of yet indicated any willingness to join such a program, but further outreach by government officials could be instrumental in gaining insurer participation in a voluntary

---

2 It is vital to emphasize that not every foundation in northeastern Connecticut that has exhibited cracking suffers from a pyrrhotite-related problem. Based on the investigation, crumbling caused by excessive pyrrhotite presents certain characteristics in foundation walls, such as multiple cracks within inches of each other that intersect and that are present in random directions, including horizontal cracks. This "map cracking" is generally recognizable to home inspectors and structural engineers upon visual inspection.
relief program. Exploring this option is particularly important in light of the failure to this point to identify other monetary sources for homeowner relief, such as federal emergency or other public funds. In addition, as discussed above, consideration of further appropriate investigation into insurers' conduct and coverage responsibility as it relates to foundation failures is warranted, and may aid in informing or advancing the availability of relief from insurance companies. My office remains available to assist in any such efforts.

If you have any questions or concerns about any of the foregoing, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours,

George Jepsen
INVESTIGATING THE DETERIORATION OF
BASEMENT WALLS MADE OF CONCRETE IN CT

by
Kay Wille$^1$ and Rui Zhong$^2$

$^1$ Associate Professor and PI of the project, $^2$ Postdoctoral Researcher

August, 31st 2016

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Advanced Cementitious Materials and Composites (ACMC) Laboratory
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269

This report was produced for the
Attorney General of the State of Connecticut.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................................. 1  
   1.1 BACKGROUND ............................................................................................................. 1  
   1.2 OBJECTIVE .................................................................................................................. 1  
   1.3 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RESEARCH APPROACH ................................................. 2  
   1.4 OUTLINE OF REPORT ................................................................................................. 5  

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ......................................................................................... 6  
   2.1 SULFATE ATTACK ....................................................................................................... 6  
      2.1.1 INVESTIGATION OF THE DETERIORATION OF CONCRETE STRUCTURE  
      DERIVED FROM SULFATE ATTACK ........................................................................... 6  
      2.1.2 MECHANISMS OF SULFATE ATTACK ................................................................ 10  
   2.2 DETERIORATION MECHANISMS OF CONCRETE DUE TO SECONDARY  
      MINERAL FORMATION .................................................................................................. 13  
      2.2.1 OXIDATION OF SULFIDE-BEARING AGGREGATE AND PRIMARY  
      EXPANSION .............................................................................................................. 14  
      2.2.2 INTERNAL SULFATE ATTACK AND SECONDARY EXPANSION .................... 15  
   2.3 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATION .................................................................................... 16  
   2.4 STANDARDS OF IRON SULFIDES IN AGGREGATE FOR CONCRETE ................. 17  

3. ON SITE SURVEY ............................................................................................................... 18  

4. COMPREHENSIVE STRENGTH ......................................................................................... 20  
   4.1 SAMPLE COLLECTION ................................................................................................. 20
4.2 SPECIMEN PREPARATION AND COMPRESSION TESTING .............................................. 21
4.3 TESTING RESULTS ................................................................................................. 22

5. ASSESSMENT OF THE QUARRY AGGREGATE .................................................. 26

5.1 XRD EXAMINATION ............................................................................................ 26
5.1.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION AND TEST SET UP ................................................. 26
5.1.2 TEST RESULTS ............................................................................................... 29

5.2 XRF ...................................................................................................................... 30
5.2.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION AND TEST SET UP ................................................. 30
5.2.2 TEST RESULTS ............................................................................................... 31

5.3 ION CHROMATOGRAPHY .................................................................................. 31

5.4 SEM-EDX ........................................................................................................... 33
5.4.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION ............................................................................... 34
5.4.2 TEST RESULTS ............................................................................................... 35

6. MINERALOGICAL ASSESSMENT: AGGREGATES FROM CRUSHED
    CONCRETE AND FORMATION AT THE VICINITY OF CRACKING SURFACE ...... 37

6.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION ..................................................................................... 37

6.2 AGGREGATE FROM CRUSHED CONCRETE ..................................................... 38

6.3 WHITISH FORMATION AT THE VICINITY OF CRACKING SURFACE ............ 40

7. MICROSTRUCTURAL INVESTIGATION OF DETERIORATED CONCRETE .... 42

7.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION ..................................................................................... 42
7.2 MATRIX EXAMINATION ...................................................................................... 42
7.3 PYRRHOTITE-BEARING AGGREGATE OXIDIZATION ...................................... 43

III
LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1.1 Research Approach ................................................................. 4
Fig. 3.1 Geographical distribution of candidate housing ................................ 18
Fig. 3.2 Typical symptoms of deteriorated foundation .................................. 19
Fig. 4.1 Coring process carried out by a third party contractor .................... 20
Fig. 4.2 Specimen preparation procedure ............................................... 21
Fig. 4.3 Specimen preparation and test equipment .................................... 21
Fig. 4.4 Completely disintegrated core sample of concrete foundation wall – house 1 .................................................. 22
Fig. 5.1 Sample preparation for XRD testing ........................................... 27
Fig. 5.2 Bruker D2 phaser X-ray diffractometer ....................................... 28
Fig. 5.3 Normalized XRD pattern at different scanning time ..................... 29
Fig. 5.4 Relative difference plot for different scanning time ....................... 29
Fig. 5.5 Typical XRD pattern of the coarse quarry aggregate ................... 30
Fig. 5.6 Sample preparation and test set up for XRF test .......................... 31
Fig. 5.7 DIONEX ICS-1100 ion chromatography ..................................... 32
Fig. 5.8 Comparison of IC signal .......................................................... 32
Fig. 5.9 Time history of the normalized concentration of released sulfate ...... 33
Fig. 5.10 SEM sample preparation ......................................................... 34
Fig. 5.11 Tenon field emission SEM ....................................................... 34
Fig. 5.12 SEM images of the brown aggregate samples .............................. 35
Fig. 5.13 Interface zone between two different phases ............................... 35
Fig. 5.14 EDX mapping elementary analysis for the interface zone - Sample 1 .......................................................... 36
Fig. 5.15 EDX spectrum for point 1 to 4 .................................................. 37
Fig. 6.1 Sample preparation for XRD testing ........................................... 37
Fig. 6.2 XRD pattern of aggregate indicating the existence of pyrrhotite ...... 38
Fig. 6.3 XRD pattern of aggregate showing the oxidization product of ferrihydrate .......... 39
Fig. 6.4 XRD pattern of aggregate showing the oxidization product of sulfur .......... 39
Fig. 6.5 XRD pattern of aggregate showing the oxidization product of goethite .......... 40
Fig. 6.6 Typical XRD pattern of whitish formation - housing 1 ......................... 41
Fig. 6.7 Typical XRD pattern of whitish formation – housing 7 ......................... 41
Fig. 7.1 Porous micro structure of matrix .................................................. 42
Fig. 7.2 Micro structure of the investigated ITZ ........................................... 43
Fig. 7.3 EDX spectrum – point 1 .............................................................. 44
Fig. 7.4 EDS spectrum – point 2 .............................................................. 44
Fig. 7.5 EDS spectrum – point 3 .............................................................. 45
Fig. 7.6 EDS lineal analysis – Line AB from A to B in Fig. 7.2 ....................... 45
Fig. 7.7 EDS mapping analysis – Rectangular area in Fig. 7.2 ...................... 46
Fig. 7.8 Secondary minerals in the ITZ .................................................... 47
Fig. 7.9 EDS spectrum – aggregate ....................................................... 48
Fig. 7.10 EDS spectrum of matrix .......................................................... 48
Fig. 7.11 EDS spectrum of secondary mineral - ettringite ....................... 48
Fig. 7.12 EDS spectrum of point 6 - thaumasite ....................................... 49
Fig. 7.13 Distribution of secondary minerals ............................................ 50
Fig. 7.14 EDX result for aggregate ........................................................ 50
Fig. 7.15 Secondary minerals deposited in the large voids of matrix .......... 50
Fig. 7.16 EDX result for the minerals in void A ....................................... 51
LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1 Primary expansion induced by the oxidation of pyrite and pyrrhotite in aqueous systems and their associated volume changes. Pyrrhotite reactions balanced for \( x=0.125 \), after [49] ................................................................. 15

Table 2-2 Secondary expansion reactions due to delayed formation of ettringite and their associated volume changes, after [49] ........................................................................................................ 16

Table 4-1 Summary of compressive strength test result ................................................................................. 23

Table 5-1 XRF test result for the brown and reference quarry aggregate ....................................................... 31
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

On August 6, 2015, the Attorney General and Commissioner of Consumer Protection of the State of Connecticut were asked by Governor Dannel P. Malloy to investigate whether Connecticut's consumer protection laws were violated in connection with the construction of homes in Eastern Connecticut experiencing deterioration of their concrete foundations. Pursuant to that investigation, the Attorney General and Commissioner of Consumer Protection retained the authors to assist in understanding the likely causes of the deterioration.

Early deterioration of concrete home foundations located in an area of Eastern Connecticut has caused alarm to homeowners, and thus to state agencies, affected communities and others. Many homeowners face significant financial and other burdens relating to the deterioration of their concrete home foundations. In some cases, the deterioration is severe. In light of these circumstances, it is of great public interest, and academic value, to understand what may have caused the deterioration.

Through site inspections and the rigorous testing and analysis of samples of deteriorating home foundation concrete and concrete aggregate, this report seeks to bridge an existing knowledge gap concerning why some home foundations in Eastern Connecticut are prematurely deteriorating.

While the potential methods of repair, as well as the full scope of the problems in terms of the number of potentially affected structures, are beyond the scope of the Governor's referral and of this report, the information contained herein represents a significant advancement of the scientific understanding of the basic causal factors underlying this problem.

1.2 OBJECTIVE

The objective of the proposed research is to investigate the deterioration of concrete foundation in an area of Eastern Connecticut and thereby gain a better understanding of what could have caused
the premature deterioration. Special emphasis will be placed on answering the following questions:

1) What are the symptoms and characteristics of the deterioration?

2) What is the strength loss of the material?

3) Is the concrete mixture (i.e., choice of aggregate and cement, mixture design) linked to the deterioration?

4) Did environmental conditions, including soil conditions, impact the deterioration?

5) Was knowledge about the deterioration potential of concrete constituents available at the time that the affected concrete was produced and the home foundations were installed?

1.3 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RESEARCH APPROACH

Based on the investigators’ experience in concrete technology, material design and characterization, the following research steps were undertaken:

1) **Site Visits and Sampling:** Selecting houses for potential inspection and investigation based on their construction date, degree of deterioration and geographical distribution. Documenting the symptoms of deterioration, such as crack pattern, crack opening, discoloring and spatial distribution of deposition at the vicinity of cracking surface. Collecting material samples at the cracking surface and drilling core samples out of concrete foundation walls and slabs both at damaged and intact areas.

2) **Concrete Strength:** Testing of the residual compressive strength and analyzing the failure pattern of deteriorated concrete.

3) **Mineral Characterization:** Emphasis of this characterization is placed on the detection of iron sulfide such as pyrite (FeS₂) and pyrrhotite (Fe₉S₈ (x=0 to 0.125)). Aggregates of the obtained core samples and aggregates of the supplying quarry were examined and in their mineral phases analyzed. Additionally, the mineral phases of the depositions at the vicinity of the cracking surface were characterized. X-ray diffraction
(XRD) and X-ray fluorescence (XRF) technologies were used for analysis purpose. Supplementary scanning electron microscopy (SEM) coupled with energy dispersive X-ray (EDX) test was also conducted for the investigation of quarry aggregate to overcome the limits of the XRD technology and confirm the XRF results.

4) **Investigation of Sulfate Based Reaction Products:** Emphasis was placed on investigating the micro structure of the interfacial transition zone (ITZ) between aggregate and cement matrix, as well as the matrix itself, using SEM coupled with EDX. Point analysis was conducted to confirm the existence of minerals such as ettringite and thaumasite and their delayed formation. Mapping analysis was used to validate the oxidation of the pyrrhotite-bearing aggregates.

**Fig. 1.1** schematically summarizes the research approach, in which visible macroscopic properties are linked to scientific microstructural parameters.
Fig. 1.1 Research Approach

Based on visual inspection typical deterioration symptoms can be identified, such as map cracking, whitish formation of minerals at the vicinity of the cracking surface and reddish-brownish discoloring. After experimental testing and microstructural investigation the results were analyzed and correlated to the deterioration symptoms of the visual inspection. Based on the
obtained results the investigators conclude that the oxidation of pyrrhotite-containing aggregates and the associated secondary formation of expansive minerals are the primary cause of the early deterioration of these concrete wall foundations. It is worth noting that the presence of pyrrhotite-containing aggregates alone does not necessarily lead to its oxidation and concrete deterioration.

1.4 OUTLINE OF REPORT

This final report is divided into seven chapters. The first chapter is an introduction to the research project, its objectives and research approach. Chapter two provides background information such as deterioration of concrete derived from sulfate attack and secondary mineral formation, historical investigation and existing standards related to concrete deterioration induced by sulfide-bearing aggregate. Chapter three presents detailed onsite survey results of candidate houses. Chapter four provides information regarding the compressive strength investigation. Chapters five and six cover mineralogical assessment of the quarry aggregate, aggregate from the crushed core samples and mineral formations at the vicinity of cracking surface. Chapter seven presents the microstructural investigation of deteriorated concrete. Chapter eight summarizes the principal findings and conclusions.
2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Based on the reported typical symptoms of deterioration, it is hypothesized that the damage is caused by the oxidation of sulfide-bearing aggregate that leads to expansive secondary mineral formation such as iron hydroxide, gypsum, ettringite, and thaumasite. Therefore research emphasis is placed on the mechanisms of such deterioration.

2.1 SULFATE ATTACK

2.1.1 INVESTIGATION OF THE DETERIORATION OF CONCRETE STRUCTURE DERIVED FROM SULFATE ATTACK

Normal Portland cement concrete is known to undergo an increase in volume and subsequently cracking under long exposure to sulfate enriched solutions. This phenomenon is called sulfate attack. It results from the chemical reaction between the products of cement hydration and the sulfates. The problem of sulfate attack raised concerns around 1890 due to failures on a railway in southern France. In 1900 and 1902 further problems due to sulfate attack by gypsum, magnesium and sodium sulfate were found in tunnels in France and in structures in southern Algeria [1]. Lea and Desch point out that clays and soils are found containing considerable amount of mineral sulfates in many parts of Great Britain and in many extensive regions outside of England [2]. Sulfate-bearing soils are also present in France and other parts of Europe, as well as across large areas of the United States and Canada. The problems associated with sulfate attack are therefore of widespread interest across North America and Europe.

In the early 1990s, the National Bureau of Standards (NBS), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Portland Cement Association (PCA) in the United States, as well as the Engineering Institute and the National Research Council in Canada conducted extensive research on the deterioration of concrete due to sulfate attack. The field and laboratory studies conducted and conclusions drawn by these organizations are reviewed in the following sections.
The NBS initiated a study in 1910 to investigate the resistance of concrete exposed to seawater [3]. However, this program eventually developed into a study of the deterioration of concrete by sulfate-containing water. Hollow mortar cylinders with varying cement-sand ratios were filled with salt solutions in the preliminary study. One conclusion from this study was:

*Portland cement mortar or concrete if porous enough can be disintegrated by the mechanical forces exerted by the crystallization of almost any salt in its pores, if a sufficient amount of it is permitted to accumulate and a rapid formation of crystals is brought about by drying. Porous stone, brick and other structural materials are disintegrated in the same manner. Therefore, in alkali regions where a concentration of salts is possible, a dense nonporous surface is essential.*

This preliminary study was followed by a cooperative investigation in 1914 involving the USDA, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the American Portland Cement Manufacturers Association [4]. Drain tile made with Portland cement was exposed to alkali soils in South Dakota, Colorado, Washington, New Mexico, Arizona, Minnesota, Missouri and Iowa. The experiments were extended to include concrete blocks containing reinforcing steel. Progress reports on this work were prepared in 1917, 1922 and 1926 [4-6]. Some of the conclusions were as follows:

1) *Disintegration may be manifested in sulfate water by physical disruption by expansion resulting from crystallization of salts in pores, but it is primarily due to chemical reaction between salts in solution and the constituents in cement.*

2) *The use of tile in soils containing alkali salts of the sulfate type in considerable quantities is hazardous, since some specimens of the best quality have been disintegrated during an exposure of less than 6 years.*

In the spring of 1919, a number of failures of drain tile in the ground in southwestern Minnesota drew attention of the USDA. Consequently, a laboratory at the University of Minnesota was established for the purpose of investigating the issues associated with the deterioration of concrete. An extensive study was conducted under the direction of Dalton G. Miller [7-9]. The
chemical analysis from the U.S. Bureau of Soils on 1062 water samples and 150 soil samples revealed that the failures were closely associated with the presence of sodium and magnesium sulfates. The performance of specimens made by 122 cements stored in tap water, Medicine Lake and solutions of Na₂SO₄ and MgSO₄ were evaluated. Based on the strength ratio between the samples stored in Medicine Lake and tap water and the number of months required to reach an expansion for 0.01%, Miller and Manson concluded that there was a definite correlation between sulfate resistance of Portland cement and the quantity of C₃A as calculated. The extensive research at the University of Minnesota established that normal cured concrete of low permeability had good resistance to sulfates when the calculated C₃A in cement is no more than 5.5%.

In 1921 a Committee on the Deterioration of Concrete in Alkali Soils was established by the Council of the Engineering Institute of Canada [10] and financially supported by the Research Council of Canada, the Canada Cement Company, the Canadian Pacific Railroad and the three Prairie Provinces of Canada [11]. After the inspection of field exposed specimens in 1927 [12], it was stated that:

*The results obtained from the field exposure tests are quite in accord with those obtained in other field investigations. The main effort should be centered upon research in the chemical laboratory was the original decision of the Committee, and this has proven sound. Few new data or ideas have been brought by the field, but the chemical research has greatly extended our knowledge of the behaviors of cements when exposed to sulfate solutions.*

The chemical investigation was conducted under the direction of Dr. Thorvaldson from the University of Saskatchewan [10]. The reaction of the principal minerals in Portland cement clinkers (C₃S, C₂S and C₃A) with water and sulfate solutions were studied. Strength and length change, extraction and microscopical studies were conducted for dilute suspensions of each mineral after exposure in water and salt solutions for different periods of time. The results of these studies with the pure compounds indicated that improved sulfate resistance can be achieved
either by decreasing the alumina content of kiln feed or adding some ferric oxide to it, either of which should decrease the C₃A content of the clinker.

The Portland Cement Association started a large-scale program in 1921 [13]. Approximately 2,000 10 in. by 24 in. concrete cylinders were made in the laboratory and were transported to the field and stored in sulfate soils and waters at Montrose, Colorado and Medicine Lake, South Dakota after two to three months of curing. Laboratory tests using 4 in. by 8 in. cylinders were also carried out under different storage conditions such as water and salt solutions. In short periods of time, serious deterioration of the concrete was observed which are similar to those of the studies conducted by NBS and the University of Minnesota. Over 400 cements with controlled composition were prepared using laboratory kiln and mills [14]. Glass contents were controlled by different cooling and quenching methods. Clinkers with different ratios of C₃S to C₂S, varying free CaO and free MgO contents, low to high C₃A contents with varying C₄AF contents were designed. The performance of specimens exposed to water and 2% solutions of sodium and magnesium sulfates were evaluated. Principal findings with respect to sulfate attack resistance were as follows:

1) Changes in the ratio of C₃S to C₂S lead to little observable effect on expansion in water or sulfate solutions.

2) Expansions of specimens in 2% sodium and magnesium sulfate solutions increase rapidly with increase in C₃A concentration.

3) The effect of C₄AF on the sulfate resistance is usually masked by a much greater effect of C₃A but becomes apparent once the C₃A is controlled at constant concentration. Increases in C₄AF to high values (20–27%) may result in marked acceleration in the length increase rate of specimens.

4) Crystalline C₃A is less resistant to sulfate attack than glass C₃A. In contrary, crystalline C₄AF is more resistant to sulfate attack than glass C₄AF.
2.1.2 MECHANISMS OF SULFATE ATTACK

While the formation of ettringite in regular Portland cement concrete is well established as the cause of deterioration during sulfate attack, the precise mechanism by which ettringite causes expansion is still an open question. The following theories have been formulated for possible explanations.

FORMATION OF ETTRINGITE

The most widely accepted mechanism of sulfate attack ascribes the expansion to the formation of AFt phase (ettringite) within cement paste through a topochemical reaction [15-23]. The alumina-bearing phase reacts with the sulfate ions to form ettringite which occupies a larger volume than the solid which participates in its formation. A local expansion occurred as the ettringite forms, which pushes the surroundings outward.

DOUBLE DECOMPOSITION BETWEEN THE SULFATE AND CALCIUM HYDROXIDE

One sewer constructed in 1890 was so severely deteriorated after a relatively short time in service that portions of it had to be rebuilt [24]. The remaining portions of the sewer were disintegrated in many locations and occasionally portions of the pipe were gone. These observations led to an investigation of chemical reactions involved in the deterioration under the direction of Burke and Pinckney [25]. Based on the chemical analysis results, a hypothesis explaining the deleterious effect of sulfate was proposed as follows:

The chemical reaction of alkali that is destructive to cement work is double decomposition between the various alkali salts and calcium hydroxide, which is an unavoidable constituent, and probably the binding constituent, of all set cement, whether the cement is classed as Portland, natural or slag. This reaction removes greater or lesser amounts of the calcium hydroxide and deposits in its place, in most cases, a molecular equivalent amount of other compounds, which have good cementing properties but occupy more space than calcium hydroxide. This increase in space occupied disrupts the cement, causing it to bulge, crack and crumble.
Typical double decomposition reactions can be represented as follows:

$$Ca(OH)_2 + MgSO_4 + 2H_2O = CaSO_4 \cdot 2H_2O + Mg(OH)_2$$

$$Ca(OH)_2 + Na_2SO_4 + 2H_2O = CaSO_4 \cdot 2H_2O + NaOH$$

Burke and Pinkey found that there is an increase of volume between the reactant and the reaction products. Based on the assumptions that these reaction products tended to be deposited in the space originally occupied by the calcium hydroxide and that these reactions are solid-liquid type as discussed by Hansen [26], they concluded that the volume change of the decomposition cause the cement to expand.

**Adsorbed Water By Gel System**

No volume increase was found after careful calculation of the volume of the reactants and reaction products. It seems impossible for a through-solution double decomposition to form solid reaction products, in a capillary pocket, that occupy a greater volume than the pocket plus the volume of the solid calcium hydroxide taking part in the reaction. Therefore the mechanism involving the water adsorption by the gel system was formulated. A colloidal product is surrounded by a shell of adsorbed water due to its surface energy [1]. Precipitation of colloidal solid in the gel pore resulted from the reaction between calcium hydroxide and sulfate disrupted the equilibrium of the water in the pore with the surface energy. The equilibrium can be restored by additional water entering the pore from the surrounding solution to furnish the newly formed solid particles with their shells of adsorbed water. This entrance of water causes the gel system to expand.

**Uptake of Water and Swelling of Colloidal Ettringite**

Experimental work demonstrated that the expansion associated with ettringite formation itself was insignificant compared to the expansion when ettringite was exposed to excessive water [27]. Scanning microscopy test by Mehta indicated that the ettringite formed at the presence of lime is colloidal but not lath-like crystals [28]. The colloidal ettringite is characterized by high specific
surface and peculiar structure with a negative net charge as proposed by Moor and Taylor [29]. It was proposed that this colloidal form of ettringite is probably responsible for attracting a large quantity of surrounding water molecules and the cause of interparticle repulsion which eventually result in an overall expansion of the system.

**Reduction of the Stiffness of C-S-H Due to the Adsorption of Sulfate Ions**

Since not all the physical manifestation (expansion, cracking, loss of strength and stiffness, and disintegration) of sulfate attack can be adequately explained by the chemical phenomenon of ettringite formation as a result of reaction between sulfate water and hydration product of Portland cement, another less widely accepted theory was forwarded to explain the deterioration associated with sulfate attack [30]. It is speculated that sulfate adsorption on C-S-H surfaces reduces their adhesive ability. Therefore expansion in a system suffered from a loss of stiffness can easily result in large dilatations of the paste and cracking.

**Solid State Conversion of C₄AH₁₃ to Monosulfate**

During the study of the paste hydration of C₃A-gypsum system with and without Ca(OH)$_2$, Chatterji and Grudemo observed that the pastes containing Ca(OH)$_2$ cracked before three months while those without Ca(OH)$_2$ remained intact. X-ray diffraction and electron-optical examination revealed that the initial sulfate-bearing compound was ettringite but the final one was calcium aluminate monosulfate (C$_3$A · CaSO$_4$ · xH$_2$O). The expansion seems to be connected with the formation of monosulfate at the expense of ettringite. Based on these observations, they proposed that the sulfate explanation is resulted from the solid state conversion of C$_4$AH$_{13}$ to monosulfate [31].

$$C_4AH_{13} + SO_4^{2-} + aq = C_3A · CaSO_4 · H_{12} + 2OH^- + aq$$

There is a net volume increase of about 14% during the solid state conversion. In the case of C₃A-gypsum system, part of the C₄AH₁₃ crystal will dissolve and diffuse out to other part of the matrix.
and will be precipitated. The increase in volume will be accommodated by this dissolution-diffusion-precipitation process. However, the concentration of lime is high for the case of C₃A-gypsum-Ca(OH)₂ mixtures. The solubility of C₆AH₁₃ is depressed thus the accommodative process is inoperative. Consequently there will be a disruptive expansion.

**Osmotic Forces**

After discussing theories of sulfate resistance, Thorvaldson made the following statement [32]:

*Many observations such as these suggest that volume changes in mortars are controlled by osmotic forces concerned with the swelling of gels, that the chemical reactions condition the gel system and destroy cementing substances while the formation of crystalline material is incidental to these chemical reactions, and that the increased resistance to volume changes with increased richness of mix may not be primarily due to decreased permeability but rather to the more prolonged maintenance of conditions within the mortar unfavorable to the swelling of the gels.*

### 2.2 Deterioration Mechanisms of Concrete Due to Secondary Mineral Formation

A significant problem associated with concrete deterioration is the formation of secondary minerals such as ettringite and thaumasite long after the concrete has hardened [33]. The formation of those minerals leads to significant expansion resulting in cracking when the stress in the concrete matrix exceeds its tensile strength. The secondary minerals must be differentiated from the primary minerals normally formed in the first days of cement hydration. For instance, primary ettringite is formed by the reaction between gypsum and the alumina phase of the cement (tricalcium aluminate 3CaO·Al₂O₃ abbreviated as C₃A). It turns into monosulfoaluminate (3CaO·Al₂O₃·CaSO₄·12H₂O) which is a more stable form of sulfoaluminate, and finally into hydrogarnet (C₄AH₁₃) [34]. The remaining sulfate ions are trapped in the structure of the C-S-H gel. Secondary ettringite can be expansive and its volume is three to eight times larger than that of the original solid [35]. Though the mechanisms involved remain controversial, the delayed
formation of these minerals is believed by many researchers to cause the expansion and premature deterioration of concrete [36-43].

2.2.1 OXIDATION OF SULFIDE-BEARING AGGREGATE AND PRIMARY EXPANSION

Secondary mineral formation is strongly dependent on the availability of sulfate which can be supplied either from internal or external sources. External sources include natural or polluted ground water, moisture in soils and sulfate-rich acid rain [44-45]. Sulfur dioxide from the combustion of motor fuels and the sulfate impurities of deicing salt are also potential external sources [46]. Internal sources are primarily sulfate or sulfide rich components of concrete, such as cement and aggregate. SO$_3$ content in cement is usually within the range of 2.5 to 4.0 wt.% which is considered safe to avoid delayed ettringite formation [47]. Therefore aggregates rich in sulfide become critical internal sources of sulfur for delayed mineral formation. Pyrite (FeS$_2$) and pyrrhotite (Fe$_{1-x}$S) are the most common iron sulfide in nature and are common minerals disseminated in various rock types. Oxidation of these sulfides at the presence of water and oxidant (oxygen or ferric ion) leads to series of chemical reactions and to the formation of products with larger volume than the initial reactant [48].

Table 2-1 summarizes the expansive oxidation reactions of these sulfides which have been referred as “primary expansion” [49]. It is worth noting that volume changes listed in Table 2-1 represent maximum expansion at complete reaction thus it overestimates the potential volume expansion. From the thermodynamic stability point of view, ferricydrite (Fe(OH)$_3$) is the predominant sulfide oxidation product under the alkaline conditions that are representative for concrete [50].
Table 2-1 Primary expansion induced by the oxidation of pyrite and pyrrhotite in aqueous systems and their associated volume changes. Pyrrhotite reactions balanced for \( x=0.125 \), after [49]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>( \Delta V_{solids} ) (cm(^3)/mole of sulfide)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 8F_{1-x}S + \frac{31}{2}O_2 + 8H_2O \rightarrow 7(FeSO_4 \cdot H_2O) + SO_4^{2-} + 2H^+ )</td>
<td>209.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhotite</td>
<td>( 8F_{1-x}S + 21O_2 + 11H_2O \rightarrow 7Fe(OH)_3 + 8SO_4^{2-} + 6H^+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 8F_{1-x}S + \frac{67}{4}O_2 + \frac{25}{2}H_2O \rightarrow 7FeOOH + 8SO_4^{2-} + 16H^+ )</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrite</td>
<td>( FS_2 + \frac{9}{2}O_2 + 2H_2O \rightarrow FeSO_4 \cdot H_2O + SO_4^{2-} + 2H^+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( FS_2 + \frac{18}{4}O_2 + 2H_2O \rightarrow Fe(OH)_3 + 2SO_4^{2-} + 6H^+ )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 INTERNAL SULFATE ATTACK AND SECONDARY EXPANSION

It can be seen from Table 2-1 that sulfate and hydrogen ions are released during oxidation. In hardened concrete, hydrogen ions attack the matrix and react with portlandite (Ca(OH)_2), a hydration product of Portland cement, to gypsum (CaSO_4\cdot2H_2O). Gypsum then reacts with the alumina phase in cement (tricalcium aluminate 3CaO\cdotAl_2O_3) resulting in the formation of monosulfoaluminate \( (C_4AS\bar{S}H_{12}) \) and, eventually, ettringite \( (C_6AS_3H_{32}) \). The expansions of these secondary minerals have been referred as “secondary expansion” [50]. Table 2-2 lists these secondary expansion reactions in increasing order of volume expansion. The predominance of one or another reaction is controlled by pH and the availability of sulfate ions. Formation of gypsum is preferable at pH<10.5. Due to the strong alkalinity of concrete it is unlikely that gypsum is a principle contributor to secondary expansion.

It is worth pointing out that under alkaline conditions in concrete, ferricydrite is the most stable product of sulfide oxidation. Its volume increase (Table 2-1) is small compared to that of
monosulfate or ettringite (Table 2-2) resulting from the reaction of sulfate ions with portlandite and tricalcium aluminate, respectively.

Table 2-2 Secondary expansion reactions due to delayed formation of ettringite and their associated volume changes, after [49]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$\Delta V_{\text{solids}}$ (cm$^3$/mole of sulfide)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$CH + S + 2H^+ \rightarrow C\bar{S}H_3$ (gypsum)</td>
<td>41.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CH + C_3A + S + 11H \rightarrow C_4ASH_{12}$ (monosulfoaluminate)</td>
<td>182.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3CH + C_3A + 3S + 29H \rightarrow C_6AS_3H_{32}$ (ettringite)</td>
<td>172.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATION

Scientific knowledge of deteriorating concrete home foundations due to internal sulfate attack and secondary expansion is limited, as evidenced by the scarcity of written work, and there remains no broadly recognized scientific consensus about the problem. Most published literatures of concrete deterioration associated with the expansion of pyritic rocks are linked to external causes, usually cracking and uprising of concrete buildings lying on swelling rock foundation or on a swelling rock fill. In very few cases concrete deterioration is caused by internal conditions, such as the expansion of sulfide rich aggregates as a result of the oxidation of pyrite or pyrrhotite [51-53].

To the best knowledge of the authors, the first internal sulfate attack induced by sulfide containing aggregate was reported in the Oslo region of Norway, 1959 [54]. Numerous cases of concrete deterioration due to sulfide containing rocks have been reported in Canada. The first deterioration cases associated with heaving of rock founations due to pyrite oxidation were published during the 1970s [55-56]. In the providence of Quebec, deterioration related to pyrite oxidation was first found in the region of Quebec City in 1983 and Matane in
1984 [57]. The cases in the Montreal area were officially reported in the 1990s [58-59]. The first symposium concerning harmful pyritic rock fills was held in May 1997 by the Montreal section of the Association of Engineering Geologists (AEG). More recently, premature deterioration of concrete foundations two to four years after construction in the Trois-Rivières area (Québec, Canada) were reported [60]. Rodrigues et al. investigated the importance of thaumasite formation on the reaction mechanism of concrete damage resulted from the oxidation of sulfide containing aggregates [61].

Although sulfide containing aggregates induced premature deterioration of concrete, only a limited number of scientists were aware of this problem before 1998. However, increasing interests arise as more and more damage is reported worldwide. Lee et al. investigated Iowa (USA) highway concrete deterioration in 2005 [62]. Oliveira et al. reported the downstream face and galleries damage of the Graus Dam (Spain) in 2014 [63].

2.4 STANDARDS OF IRON SULFIDES IN AGGREGATE FOR CONCRETE

In Europe, there are different standards regulating the content of iron sulfides in aggregates for concrete. Spanish Regulations of Structural Concrete (EHE), in force between 1999 and July 2008, prohibits the use of aggregates containing oxidizable sulfur compounds (Article No. 28). It is clarified in the comments section that “oxidizable sulfurs (e.g. pyrrhotite, marcasite, and some forms of pyrite), even in small quantities are very damaging to concrete since, as through oxidation and hydration, they form sulfuric acid and iron oxide/hydroxide minerals”. Similar requirements are stated in ASTM C294-05 (Section No. 13): “marcasite and certain forms of pyrite and pyrrhotite are reactive in mortar and concrete, producing a brown stain accompanied by an increase in volume that has been reported as a source of popouts in concrete”. It is worth noting that no obligatory European standard was in place in 1998. Recent European standard EN 12620:2008 (Section 6.3.2) makes the following statement: “should the presence of oxidizable iron sulfides in the form of pyrrhotite be detected, the sulfur content provided by them, expressed
in S, will be lower than 0.1%". This is the same requirement as that in the updated Spanish Regulations of Structural Concrete EHE-08 (Section 28.7.3). Notably, American regulators have not responded to either scientific findings or incidents of sulfur attacks by enacting regulations in building codes or statutes that limit the amount of iron sulfides in concrete.

3. ON SITE SURVEY

A list of candidate residences had been preselected to conduct onsite inspection and collect core samples based on their construction date, degree of deterioration and geographical distribution. The distribution of these homes is illustrated in Fig. 3.1. In this report seven homes (marked as 1 through 7 in Fig. 3.1) from the preliminary list were chosen for further investigation. Typical deterioration symptoms are summarized as follows:

- map cracking with wide opening and/or significant deformation of the wall
- whitish formation of minerals at the vicinity of cracking surface
- reddish - brown discoloring

Fig. 3.1 Geographical distribution of candidate housing
Fig. 3.2 Typical symptoms of deteriorated foundation
Since the inspected houses where core samples were taken show similar symptoms, only visual inspection was conducted for additional 14 houses. Soil samples were also taken and examined in the soil laboratory at the University of Connecticut.

4.  COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH

4.1  SAMPLE COLLECTION

Cylinder cores with a diameter of 3 inch and a minimum length of 6 inch were drilled out of the walls both at relatively intact and deteriorated areas for compressive strength test. The lengths of the cores drilled out of slabs were restrained by the actual thickness of the slab and ranged from 3 to 4 inches. An experienced third party contractor was hired to carry out the coring process (Fig. 4.1). In general, at least 9 concrete samples were cored from the foundation wall of each house.

Fig. 4.1 Coring process carried out by a third party contractor
4.2 SPECIMEN PREPARATION AND COMPRESSION TESTING

The collected samples were cut to 6 inch in length using a diamond saw. Special emphasis was placed in achieving high quality of the load face ends in terms of planeness and perpendicularity. After cutting the load faces were ground (Fig. 4.2b) and capped with sulfur (Fig. 4.2c). The capping process was conducted following ASTM C617. The cutting and grinding/polishing equipment are shown in Fig. 4.3a and b (MetLab Corporation – Metpol 300-1V) respectively.

![Specimen preparation procedure](image)

(a) originally collected  (b) after cutting  (c) after sulfur capping

**Fig. 4.2 Specimen preparation procedure**

![Specimen preparation and test equipment](image)

(a) Cutting saw  (b) Rotary grinding and polishing machine  (c) Load frame

**Fig. 4.3 Specimen preparation and test equipment**
Once the preparation procedure had been completed the specimens were placed and carefully aligned between the load platens of a hydraulic compression load frame (Fig. 4.3c) with a capacity of 400,000 pounds (1780 kN) of force. The machine displacement was set to a rate of 0.5 mm/min. Failure usually occurred within 1-2 minutes. Compressive strength was determined in accordance to ASTM C39.

4.3 TESTING RESULTS

The compressive strength of individual specimens is summarized in Table 4-1 along with the average (AVG), standard deviation (STD) and coefficient of variation (CV). It can be seen that most of the CV for intact (IT) zone is smaller than 9% as required by ASTM C42. The CV for severely deteriorated (SD) area is significantly higher than 9% while the CV for moderately deteriorated (MD) zone lies in between. It is worth noting that due to the severe deterioration of the concrete foundation wall, some of the collected core samples are just a group of pieces of disintegrated aggregates with attached matrix (Fig. 4.4) thus the compressive strength of such samples are 0 MPa and the compressive strength reduction is considered as 100%. As summarized in Table 4-1, the compressive strength reduction of concrete foundation wall ranges from 27% to 100%.

![Image](image_url)

Fig. 4.4 Completely disintegrated core sample of concrete foundation wall– house 1
Table 4-1 Summary of compressive strength test result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>Wall/Slab</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Individual (MPa)</th>
<th>AVG (MPa)</th>
<th>STD (MPa)</th>
<th>CV (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>IT-R</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT-R</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT-R</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>25.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A strength correction factor was applied due to the smaller than 1 length to diameter ratio (L/d) in accordance with ASTM C42/C42 M.

** This higher than standard allowed (9%) coefficient of variation (CV) may be attributable to the inhomogeneity of concrete or disturbance of the bond between the mortar and coarse aggregate during the coring process.
5. ASSESSMENT OF THE QUARRY AGGREGATE

5.1 XRD EXAMINATION

5.1.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION AND TEST SET UP

Aggregate with a brown color, indicating signs of oxidation, were selected for this investigation (Fig. 5.1a). Brown parts were separated from the original coarse quarry aggregate (Fig. 5.1b), ground in a mortar (Fig. 5.1c) and sieved (Fig. 5.1d) through a series of sieves. Powder smaller than 45 μm were collected [34]. Prior to the XRD analysis, samples were set down and compacted on the rough surface of a plastic block to be randomly disoriented (Fig. 5.1e). Prepared sample was mounted (Fig. 5.1f) and tested in a Bruker D2 Phaser X-ray diffractometer as shown in Fig. 5.2. Cu Kα radiation (λ=1.5418Å) generated at 10 mA and 30 kV is used in this research. The mineralogical phase of aggregate is analyzed by a commercial package Jade®.
Fig. 5.1 Sample preparation for XRD testing
Fig. 5.2 Bruker D2 phaser X-ray diffractometer

All specimens were step-scanned as random powder mounts from $11^\circ$ to $80^\circ$ at 0.02$^\circ$ 2θ steps integrated at 1s step$^1$. This step size and scanning time was selected based on the consideration of both detailed spectrum and appropriate testing time. Three scanning times (0.1s, 1s and 10s) were initially selected. For the purpose of comparison, the XRD patterns are normalized with respect to their peak intensity. Fig. 5.3 compares the normalized XRD patterns at different scanning time. It can be seen that the 0.1s scanning time is too short and the background noise level is high. Increased scanning time (1s and 10s) leads to lower noise level and smoother XRD pattern. Increase of scanning time from 1s to 10s does not result in profound further improvement of the XRD pattern. The effect of scanning time on the XRD pattern can be seen more apparently once the relative difference is compared (Fig. 5.4). The relative difference is defined as the ratio of the difference between the XRD pattern of interest and the XRD pattern with 10s scanning time to the normalized XRD pattern with 10s scanning time. It is observed that the relative difference for the XRD pattern with 0.1s scanning time is at the level of 30% and can be as high as 75%. In contrast, the relative difference for the XRD pattern with 1s scanning time is at a low level of
10%. Therefore 1s scanning time is selected for all the XRD testing in this research. It is worth noting that it is based on the assumption that the XRD pattern with 10s scanning time represents the real XRD pattern.

![Normalized XRD pattern at different scanning time](image1)

**Fig. 5.3** Normalized XRD pattern at different scanning time

![Relative difference plot for different scanning time](image2)

**Fig. 5.4** Relative difference plot for different scanning time

### 5.1.2 TEST RESULTS

Typical XRD pattern for the coarse quarry aggregate is illustrated in **Fig. 5.5**. It can be seen that no pyrrhotite was detected. This is attributable to the limitation of the XRD test that phases with a
concentration below 5% is not detectable. Therefore supplementary XRF and SEM-EDX tests were carried out.

Fig. 5.5 Typical XRD pattern of the coarse quarry aggregate

5.2 XRF

To overcome the limit of XRD test, elemental analysis using XRF technology was conducted for both the quarry aggregate showing signs of pyrrhotite and the reference aggregate. Emphasis was laid on iron and sulfur elements which iron sulfides consists of. The following sections present detailed information on the sample preparation and test results.

5.2.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION AND TEST SET UP

The coarse aggregate was processed for XRF test following the procedures described in section 5.1.1. The prepared powder was put in a plastic cell with a diameter of 31mm and covered with a special thin film 6µ in thickness designed for XRF test (Fig. 5.6). The covered cell was then mounted on a INNOV-X Systems analyzer for XRF test.
5.2.2 TEST RESULTS

The XRF test results are listed in Table 5-1. It can be seen that a significant amount of sulfur (2.542% on average) was detected in the quarry aggregate with brown color while no sulfur was detected for the reference aggregate. Iron was detected in both types of aggregate. However, the amount in the brown aggregate is several orders of magnitude higher than that in the reference aggregate. The higher level of sulfur and iron in the brown aggregate than the reference aggregate suggests the existence of iron sulfide in the quarry aggregate.

Table 5-1 XRF test result for the brown and reference quarry aggregate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarry aggregate samples with brown color</th>
<th>Reference quarry aggregate samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>2.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>6.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 ION CHROMATOGRAPHY

The inclusion of pyrrhotite in and the release of sulfate from quarry aggregate was confirmed by an accelerated oxidation test designed for this investigation. Due to the extremely slow natural oxidation process, quarry aggregate samples were submerged in 40% hydrogen peroxide solution to accelerate the oxidation process. The hydrogen peroxide solution was swapped out and tested
for sulfate concentration using a DIONEX ICS-1100 ion chromatography (Fig. 5.7). The use of hydrogen peroxide matrix instead of deionized water delays the retention time and blurs the signal for sulfate (Fig. 5.8). To overcome these disadvantages, all samples were diluted ten times using deionized water. The signal for sulfate becomes apparent once the samples were diluted. It is worth noting that the signal for the diluted sample was adjusted by a ratio of the peak signal between original and diluted samples for comparison purpose.

Fig. 5.7 DIONEX ICS-1100 ion chromatography

![Graph showing comparison of IC signal](image)

Fig. 5.8 Comparison of IC signal
Increment of the released sulfate due to aggregate oxidation was measured twice a week at predetermined intervals and ceased once the increment is smaller than 5% compared to previous measurement. They were summed up to obtain the accumulated amount of released sulfate. It is worth pointing out that the concentration was normalized by the sample aggregate weight to eliminate the influence of the size of aggregate. The development of concentration of the released sulfate is illustrated in Fig. 5.9. It can be seen that the sulfate released by the control sample remains negligible up to the end of the test. In comparison, the normalized sulfate released by the pyrrhotite bearing aggregate increased significantly during the test period. The amount of higher than control aggregate released sulfate through the accelerated aggregate oxidation is a direct evidence of the existence of pyrrhotite in the quarry aggregate.

![Graph](image.png)

**Fig. 5.9 Time history of the normalized concentration of released sulfate**

5.4 SEM-EDX

SEM coupled with energy dispersive X-ray test was also conducted to validate the existence of pyrrhotite in the quarry aggregate. SEM-EDX test results confirmed the finding of XRF test results.
5.4.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION

Sub-samples were separated from the coarse quarry aggregate and then dried and impregnated with low viscosity resin (Fig. 5.10a) which facilitates the grinding and polishing process. The resin impregnated sample was then ground and polished. To avoid damage to concrete during grinding and polishing, water was used as lubricant and excessive heating was avoided. The polished resin impregnated sample was dried at environmental temperature for 24 hours. To increase the conductivity, the surface of samples was sputter coated with a thin layer of gold/palladium (Au/Pd) alloy (Fig. 5.10b and c) prior to SEM micro structural examination and EDX elementary analysis. Fig. 5.11 shows the Teno Field Emission SEM used in this research. Operating conditions were set at 10–15 kV under secondary electron mode.

Fig. 5.10 SEM sample preparation

Fig. 5.11 Teno field emission SEM
5.4.2 TEST RESULTS

The SEM image (Fig. 5.12) shows two different phases: the dark grey and the light grey phase. Therefore point and area mapping EDX analysis were used to access their elementary composition.

The interface zone between the light grey and dark grey phase, as shown in Fig. 5.13, is selected for further analysis. Fig. 5.14 illustrates the EDX mapping analysis result within the targeted zone (Fig. 5.13b) for sulfur (S) and iron (Fe). It can be seen that the light grey phase is rich in sulfur and iron which are the elements for pyrrhotite. In contrast, the dark phase does not demonstrate the existence of any of these elements. Therefore it is hypothesized that this light grey phase is the combination of pyrrhotite. In fact, later XRD analysis of the aggregate from crushed concrete validates this hypothesis. More detailed information can be found in the next chapter.
Fig. 5.14 EDX mapping elementary analysis for the interface zone - Sample 1

Four random points (Fig. 5.14) in the light grey phase were selected for the EDX point analysis. The results are illustrated in Fig. 5.15. Two of the four points demonstrate solely sulfur and iron. It is attributable to the iron sulfides inclusions in the coarse quarry aggregate. The other two points indicates the existence of oxygen along with sulfur and iron. The oxidization of iron sulfide may be the source of oxygen. Similar results were obtained for the other samples. Detailed information can be found in APPENDIX B.
6. MINERALOGICAL ASSESSMENT: AGGREGATES FROM CRUSHED CONCRETE AND FORMATION AT THE VICINITY OF CRACKING SURFACE

6.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION

Brown aggregate, which is a sign of iron sulfide oxidation, were selected for this investigation. Aggregates were separated from cement matrix (Fig. 6.1a). Similar procedures described in section 5.1.1 were followed. The whitish formation was scratched off the surface of the deteriorated concrete foundation for XRD testing (Fig. 6.1b). All specimens were step-scanned as random powder from 11° to 80° at 0.02° 2θ steps integrated at 1s step⁻¹.

![Separated Aggregate and Scratched Whitish Powder](image)

a) separated aggregate  
b) scratched whitish powder

Fig. 6.1 Sample preparation for XRD testing
6.2 AGGREGATE FROM CRUSHED CONCRETE

Fig. 6.2 through Fig. 6.5 illustrates the typical XRD pattern of crushed aggregates collected from different houses. As it can be seen from these patterns, most of the aggregates contain pyrrhotite (Fig. 6.2-Fig. 6.4). A variety of minerals such as quartz and calcite (Fig. 6.2) are also detected. These minerals are common for concrete aggregate. Another important common characteristic is the presence of different pyrrhotite oxidization products, such as ferrihydrite (Fig. 6.3), sulfur (Fig. 6.4) and goethite (Fig. 6.5). It is worth noting that the predominant sulfide oxidation product ferrihydrite [50] under alkaline condition which is typical for concrete is detected (Fig. 6.3). This is a strong evidence of pyrrhotite oxidation. The presence of pyrrhotite is potentially oxidized at the presence of water and oxidant (oxygen or ferric ion) forming primary expansion products. More importantly the corresponding release of sulfate can lead to delayed formation of secondary expansive minerals such as ettringite and thaumasite. Both of the primary and secondary expansion products contribute to and ultimately result in the early deterioration of concrete foundation walls. The XRD patterns for the crushed aggregate from different houses are similar and are summarized in APPENDIX C.

![XRD pattern of aggregate indicating the existence of pyrrhotite](image)

Fig. 6.2 XRD pattern of aggregate indicating the existence of pyrrhotite
Fig. 6.3 XRD pattern of aggregate showing the oxidization product of ferrihydrite

Fig. 6.4 XRD pattern of aggregate showing the oxidization product of sulfur
6.3 WHITISH FORMATION AT THE VICINITY OF CRACKING SURFACE

Typical XRD patterns of the whitish formation at the vicinity of cracking surface are present in Fig. 6.6 and Fig. 6.7. It can be seen that quartz (Q) and calcite (C) are detected. This is attributable to remains of aggregate particles mixed with the whitish formation during sample preparation (Fig. 6.1b). In addition, gypsum is also observed. This is attributable to the remains of cement matrix during the scratching process of sample preparation. Therefore sulfate rich thenardite (T) and aphthitalite (L) are considered as the primary mineral phases in this whitish powder. The source of sulfate in thenardite and aphthitalite is potentially the released sulfate during the oxidization process of pyrrhotite. It is worth noting that three samples from each inspected houses were tested if enough whitish formation was obtained. Most of the samples demonstrated the existence of sulfate rich minerals such as thenardite (T) or aphthitalite (L) or both. This finding suggests the oxidization of pyrrhotite-bearing aggregate and the potentially delayed formation of minerals such as ettringite and thaumasite.
Fig. 6.6 Typical XRD pattern of whitish formation - housing 1

Fig. 6.7 Typical XRD pattern of whitish formation - housing 7
7. MICROSTRUCTURAL INVESTIGATION OF DETERIORATED CONCRETE

Scanning electron microscope (SEM) coupled with energy dispersive X-ray spectrometer (EDXS) is used for the microstructural examination and elementary analysis of deteriorated concrete.

7.1 SAMPLE PREPARATION

Sub-samples were cut out of collected samples and then dried and impregnated with low viscosity resin which serves to restrain against shrinkage cracking and enhances contrast among pores and hydration product. The sample preparation procedures described in section 5.4.1 were followed.

7.2 MATRIX EXAMINATION

Fig. 7.1 presents the microstructure of deteriorated concrete sample at a relatively low magnification of 150. In general, it can be seen that the matrix is very porous. The condition in the interfacial transition zone (ITZ) is the worst with higher than average porosity (the highlighted areas in Fig. 7.1). It is hypothesized that a higher amount of oxidation products might be found in the ITZ. Therefore investigating the ITZ might contribute formulating an understanding of the deterioration mechanism of concrete foundation.

![Fig. 7.1 Porous micro structure of matrix](image-url)
7.3  PYRRHOTITE-BEARING AGGREGATE OXIDIZATION

Sulfate is required for the delayed formation of expansive and thus detrimental secondary minerals. A potential source is the release of sulfate upon oxidation of pyrrhotite contained in aggregate. Previous examination on aggregate has proven the existence of pyrrhotite. In this section, a micro structural assessment of the aggregate was conducted to confirm the oxidation of aggregate. **Fig. 7.2** shows the microstructure of an interfacial transition zone (ITZ) between aggregate and cement paste. Point, linear and mapping EDXS elementary analysis were conducted.

![Fig. 7.2 Micro structure of the investigated ITZ](image)

Three random points in the zone of aggregate (point 1), ITZ (point 2) and cement matrix (point 3) were selected and the EDS spectrums of point analysis are illustrated in **Fig. 7.3** through **Fig. 7.5**. It can be seen that at point 1 (**Fig. 7.3**), elemental composition of quartz (SiO₂) is detected with silicon (Si) and oxygen (O). This confirms that the primary mineral of aggregate is quartz. Iron is observed at point 2 (**Fig. 7.4**). This confirms the XRD analysis of aggregate and implies potential pyrrhotite oxidization. Therefore further analysis, such as linear and mapping EDXS, is
performed. It is worth pointing out that no signs of ettringite was found in the cement matrix as demonstrated by the EDS spectrum of point 3 in Fig. 7.5.

Fig. 7.3 EDX spectrum – point 1

Fig. 7.4 EDS spectrum – point 2
Fig. 7.5 EDS spectrum – point 3

A line at the vicinity of point 2 was picked up for the linear EDXS elementary analysis and the EDS spectrum is shown in Fig. 7.6. A decreasing trend of both iron and sulfur elements are detected. The reduction of sulfur is attributable to the release of sulfate after oxidization while the decrease of iron may be explained by the precipitation of ferrihydrite (Fe(OH)₃) which is a predominant sulfide oxidation product under the alkaline conditions in concrete [50]. Therefore oxidation of pyrrhotite is validated.

Fig. 7.6 EDS lineal analysis – Line AB from A to B in Fig. 7.2

A zone encompassing point 2 and line AB was chosen for the mapping EDXS elementary analysis to further confirm the occurrence of pyrrhotite oxidation. The result is shown in Fig. 7.7. It is observed that iron and sulfur elements are rich at the ITZ between aggregate and cement.
This again confirms the existence of pyrrhotite. Furthermore, the decreasing intensity of iron and sulfur element confirms the oxidation of pyrrhotite.

![Fig. 7.7 EDS mapping analysis – Rectangular area in Fig. 7.2](image)

7.4 DELAYED FORMATION OF SECONDARY MINERALS

7.4.1 INTERFACIAL TRANSITION ZONE (ITZ)

The microstructure within the ITZ is examined at a high magnification by SEM as shown in Fig. 7.8. Large deposits of needle like crystalline material were observed in the ITZ (Fig. 7.8b). A point on the aggregate away from the ITZ and one point at the edge of the aggregate are selected as two representative points for EDX elementary analysis of aggregate. Two random points were also selected for the EDX elementary analysis of matrix. Three random points in the ITZ are selected to assess the minerals within the ITZ. The EDX spectrum for aggregate is displayed in Fig. 7.9. Elemental composition of quartz (SiO$_2$) is detected with silicon (Si) and oxygen (O). This confirms that the primary mineral of aggregate is quartz. Composition of iron
and sulfur are detected at the edge of aggregate (Fig. 7.9b) confirms the existence of pyrrhotite as validated by the XRD test in section 7.3.

Fig. 7.11 present the XRD spectrum of the selected points within the ITZ. The EDS spectrums indicate the elemental composition of ettringite, with calcium (Ca), sulfur (S), aluminum (Al) and oxygen (O). It is deleterious to concrete when it is formed after the hardening of concrete due to its expansive nature during formation. Another detrimental mineral found is thaumasite as illustrated in Fig. 7.12. Elemental composition of calcium (Ca), silicon (Si), carbon (C), sulfur (S) and oxygen (O) are detected. The carbon may have been supplied by one or a combination of the following (i) calcite present in veins and disseminated through the aggregate (Fig. 6.2), (ii) CO₂ trapped in the carbonated surface of the concrete. It must be pointed out that the used EDX spectrometer does not enable analysis of hydrogen (H). The presence of these minerals (ettringite and thaumasite) in the ITZ indicates the delayed formation of these minerals. These secondary minerals may lead to the deterioration of concrete due to the expansive nature upon reaction.

(a) micro structure of the ITZ
(b) close up view of the secondary minerals

Fig. 7.8 Secondary minerals in the ITZ
Fig. 7.9 EDS spectrum – aggregate

(a) point 1

(b) point 2

Fig. 7.10 EDS spectrum of matrix

(a) point 3

(b) point 4

Fig. 7.11 EDS spectrum of secondary mineral - ettringite

(a) point 5

(b) point 6
7.4.2 LARGE VOIDS IN MATRIX

Needle like secondary minerals were observed filling the large voids in the matrix as shown in Fig. 7.13. The dark grey phase is quartz aggregate as proven by the EDX analysis of two representative points (Fig. 7.14). Filling voids by secondary minerals is often associated with cracking (Fig. 7.15a). These cracks are either radially oriented micro cracks or propagate into the cement matrix. EDX analysis indicates that these secondary minerals are a mix of ettringite and thaumasite. The source of sulfate required for the formation of these minerals may be due to the oxidation of pyrrhotite included in the aggregate. More ettringite is observed in the voids of matrix near aggregates that contain pyrrhotite inclusions than occurs near aggregate without pyrrhotite (APPENDIX G). Pyrrhotite in aggregate adjacent to open spaces, such as voids in matrix or the porous ITZ, have easier access to oxygen and water thus higher change of oxidization leading to higher concentration of secondary minerals in these areas.
Fig. 7.13 Distribution of secondary minerals

Fig. 7.14 EDX result for aggregate

Fig. 7.15 Secondary minerals deposited in the large voids of matrix
Fig. 7.16 EDX result for the minerals in void A

(a) thaumasite

(b) ettringite
8. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE EFFORTS

8.1 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on the mechanical, mineralogical, microstructural and chemical tests on the core samples taken from 7 houses and the visual inspection of 14 additional houses, the primary findings are summarized as follows:

- Aggregates are rich in pyrrhotite (Fe₁₋₃S) and in their oxidization product such as goethite (FeO(OH)), ferrihydrite (Fe(OH)₃) and sulfur (S).
- The whitish deposits at the vicinity of cracking surface is primarily sulfate containing minerals such as thenardite (Na₂SO₄) and aphphtitalite ((K,Na)₃Na(SO₄)₂).
- The matrix is porous with a large quantity of voids and the ITZ is porous. Abundance of secondary minerals such as ettringite (Ca₆Al₂(SO₄)₃(OH)₁₂·26H₂O) and thaumasite (Ca₈Si(OH)₆(CO₃)(SO₄)·12H₂O) are present in these open spaces. Cracking is often associated with these open spaces and either within the voids or propagates into cement matrix.

A hypothesis is established: pyrrhotite in the aggregate oxidizes at the presence of water and oxidant (oxygen or ferric ions) which lead to the formation of expansive secondary mineral product such as ferrihydrite and the release of sulfate. The released sulfate promotes the reaction with aluminum containing phases in the cement (tricalcium aluminate (3CaO·Al₂O₃)) and results in the formation of expansive and thus deleterious secondary minerals such as ettringite. Furthermore, at the presence of carbon, either from the calcite in aggregate or from CO₂ from environment, another deleterious mineral thaumasite can be formed. Both of these secondary minerals are expansive and might ultimately lead to the premature deterioration of the concrete foundation investigated in this research. The hypothesis is validated by the chemical, mineralogical and microstructural investigation on the pyrrhotite-bearing aggregate, sulfate
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containing whitish deposits found at the vicinity of the cracking surface along with the spatial association of secondary minerals with microcracks in the cement matrix.

8.2 FUTURE EFFORTS

Understanding the cause of the early deterioration of concrete foundation walls facilitates future efforts to address some potential concerns as follows:

- What percentage of pyrrhotite contained in concrete aggregate can cause premature deterioration?
  This will require reproducing deterioration processes under isolated conditions in the laboratory, tailoring laboratory experiments and test protocols, and coupling of macro- and micro-analysis.

- What methods and investigations are suggested to determine the stage of deterioration?
  This will require finding effective test methods and providing recommendations for homeowners and contractors.

- What solutions can be found to reduce and mitigate the pyrrhotite-based deterioration of concrete?
  This will require finding mechanical or chemical solutions or a combination of both to address the stage-dependent deterioration.

- Can solutions be found to allow the use of pyrrhotite containing aggregates in concrete mixes for particular purposes?
  This will require isolated investigation of mixture design parameters.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: PHOTOS OF THE DETERIORATION OF THE INSPECTED HOUSES

(a) whitish powder  (b) brown trace

(c) map cracking

(d) wide crack opening  (e) large deformation

Fig. A- 1 House 1
(a) whitish powder

(b) brown trace

(c) wide crack opening

Fig. A-2 House 2
(a) whitish powder

(b) brown trace

(c) map cracking

(d) wide crack opening

Fig. A-3 House 3
(a) whitish powder

(b) brown trace

(c) map cracking

(d) wide crack opening

Fig. A- 4 House 4
Fig. A-5 House 5
Fig. A-6 House 6
(a) whitish powder  
(b) map cracking

Fig. A- 7 House 7
APPENDIX B: SEM-EDX TEST FOR QUARRY AGGREGATE

Fig. B-1 SEM images of the coarse quarry aggregate – Sample 2

Fig. B-2 EDX mapping elementary analysis for the interface zone – sample 2
Fig. B- 3 SEM images of the coarse quarry aggregate – Sample 3

Fig. B- 4 EDX mapping elementary analysis for the interface zone – sample 3
APPENDIX C: XRD TEST FOR AGGREGATES FROM

DETERIORATED CORE SAMPLES

![XRD Spectra](image)

- **P**: Pyrrhotite (Fe_{1-x}S)
- **Q**: Quartz (SiO_{2})
- **A**: Albite (NaAlSi_{3}O_{8})

Fig. C-1 House 1 Sample 1

![XRD Spectra](image)

- **P**: Pyrrhotite (Fe_{1-x}S)
- **Q**: Quartz (SiO_{2})

Fig. C-2 House 1 Sample 2
Fig. C-3 House 2 Sample 1

P: Pyrrhotite (Fe_{1-δ}S)
F: Ferrihydrite (Fe(OH)_3)
I: Iron Phosphorous Sulfide (Fe_2P_2S_6)

Fig. C-4 House 2 Sample 2

P: Pyrrhotite (Fe_{1-δ}S)
Q: Quartz (SiO_2)
C: Calcite (CaCO_3)
Fig. C-5 House 3 Sample 1

Fig. C-6 House 3 Sample 2
Fig. C- 7 House 3 Sample 3

Fig. C- 8 House 4 Sample 1
Fig. C-9 House 4 Sample 2

P: Pyrrhotite (Fe\(_{1-x}\)S)
L: Lepidocrocite (FeO(OH))

Fig. C-10 House 4 Sample 3

P: Pyrrhotite (Fe\(_{1-x}\)S)
Q: Quartz (SiO\(_2\))
Fig. C-11 House 5 Sample 1

Fig. C-12 House 5 Sample 2

P: Pyrrhotite (Fe_{1-x}S)
K: Krohnkite (Na_2Cu(SO_4)_2·H_2O)
G: Goethite (FeO(OH))
Q: Quartz (SiO_2)
P: Pyrrhotite (Fe$_{1-x}$S)

Fig. C-13 House 5 Sample 3

M: Maganese trichloride tetramethyl trichloro cuprate
(C$_6$H$_{12}$Cl$_3$Cu$_{0.5}$Mn$_{0.5}$N)

Fig. C-14 House 6 Sample 1
Fig. C-15 House 6 Sample 2

P: Pyrrhotite (Fe_{1-x}S)
I: Indite (FeInO_S4)
L: Lead Tin Fluoride (PbSnF4)

Fig. C-16 House 7 Sample 1

P: Ferritungstite ((W,Fe)(O,OH)8)
P: Pyrrhotite (Fe$_{1-x}$S)
C: Graphite (C)
Cs: Chromium Sulfide (Cr$_2$S$_3$)

Fig. C-17 House 7 Sample 2

P: Pyrrhotite (Fe$_{1-x}$S)
Q: Quartz (SiO$_2$)
A: Albite (Na$_{0.84}$Ca$_{0.16}$Al$_{1.16}$Si$_{2.84}$O$_8$)

Fig. C-18 House 7 Sample 3
APPENDIX D: XRD TEST FOR WHITISH POWDER

Fig. D- 1 House 1 Sample 1

Fig. D- 2 House 1 Sample 2

T: Thenardite (NaSO₄)
Q: Quartz (SiO₂)
C: Calcite (CaCO₃)
**Fig. D-3 House 1 Sample 3**

- T: Thenardite (Na₂SO₄)
- Q: Quartz (SiO₂)
- C: Calcite (CaCO₃)
- P: Gypsum (CaSO₄·2H₂O)

**Fig. D-4 House 2 Sample 1**

- T: Thenardite (Na₂SO₄)
- Q: Quartz (SiO₂)
- C: Calcite (CaCO₃)
- P: Gypsum (CaSO₄·2H₂O)
- D: Gismondine (Ca₆Al₂Si₂O₈·4H₂O)
Fig. D-5 House 2 Sample 2

Fig. D-6 House 2 Sample 3

T: Thenardite (NaSO₄)
P: Gypsum (CaSO₄·2H₂O)
S: CaSO₄·0.15H₂O
M: Mirabilite (NaSO₄·10H₂O)

Fig. D- 7 House 3 Sample 1

T: Thenardite (NaSO₄)
L: Natrite (Na₂CO₃)

Fig. D- 8 House 4 Sample 1
Fig. D-9 House 5 Sample 1

T: Thenardite (NaSO₄)
L: Aphthitalite ((K,Na)₃Na(SO₄)₂)

Fig. D-10 House 5 Sample 2

T: Thenardite (NaSO₄)
Q: Quartz (SiO₂)
C: Calcite (CaCO₃)
L: Aphthitalite ((K,Na)₃Na(SO₄)₂)
Fig. D-11 House 5 Sample 3

Fig. D-12 House 7 Sample 1
Fig. D-13 House 7 Sample 2

Fig. D-14 House 3 Sample 3
APPENDIX E: PYRRHOTITE-BEARING AGGREGATE OXIDIZATION

Fig. E-1 Pyrrhotite-bearing aggregate

Fig. E-2 DEX spectrum – point 1
Fig. E-3 DEX spectrum – point 2

Fig. E-4 EDS mapping analysis – Rectangular area in Fig. E-1
APPENDIX F: SECONDARY MINERALS IN ITZ

Fig. F-1 Secondary minerals in the ITZ

Fig. F-2 EDS spectrum of point 1 – quartz aggregate
Fig. F- 3 EDS spectrum of point 2 – ettringite

Fig. F- 4 EDS spectrum of point 3 matrix

Fig. F- 5 EDS spectrum of point 4 – ettringite
Fig. F- 6 EDS spectrum of point 5 – ettringite

Fig. F- 7 EDS spectrum of point 6 - ettringite
APPENDIX G: SECONDARY MINERALS IN LARGE VOIDS OF MATRIX

Fig. G-1 House 1

Fig. G-2 House 2
Fig. G-5 House 5
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STATE OF CONNECTICUT
BEFORE THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL
AND THE
COMMISSIONER OF CONSUMER PROTECTION

In the Matter of
The Joseph J. Mottes Company and Becker Construction Company

ASSURANCE OF VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE

This Assurance of Voluntary Compliance is provided to George Jepsen, Attorney General, and Jonathan A. Harris, Commissioner of the Department of Consumer Protection of the State of Connecticut (together, the "State"), by the Respondents The Joseph J. Mottes Company, 10 Meadow Lane, Stafford Springs, CT 06076 ("Mottes") and Becker Construction Company, P.O. Box 535, Willington, CT, 06279 ("Becker") (together, "Respondents"), pursuant to the provisions of Connecticut General Statutes § 42-110j.

Whereas, the State has an ongoing investigation into the cause of residential foundation deterioration within the State of Connecticut;

Whereas, the State has not yet reached a conclusion as to the cause of residential foundation deterioration within the State of Connecticut;

Whereas, Mottes disputes that the ready mix concrete that it manufactured and sold was defective or otherwise a cause of deteriorating residential foundations within the State of Connecticut;
Whereas, Mottes represents that it has not and does not install residential foundations;

Whereas, Mottes has expressed an intention to cease operations and sell or lease its real estate and batch plants to third parties;

Whereas, Becker and Mottes have cooperated with the State's investigation and wish to provide assurances to the State that, for a certain period of time as set forth herein, they will not sell stone aggregate for use in residential foundations, or concrete made with aggregate containing pyrrhotite to be used in residential foundations;

Now, therefore:

1.) Mottes represents itself as a company incorporated in Connecticut. Mottes is in the business of manufacturing and selling ready mix concrete, septic products and masonry supplies to customers, including customers in Connecticut.

2.) Becker represents itself as a business in Connecticut. Becker is in the business of providing crushed stone, stone aggregate, and other earth products to Connecticut customers, which crushed stone and stone aggregate Becker excavates from quarry sites in Willington, Connecticut ("Becker's Quarry"). Becker owns and operates Becker's Quarry. Stone aggregate excavated by Becker from Becker's Quarry has been used in Mottes concrete sold within the State of Connecticut.

3.) As of the date of the signing of this Assurance of Voluntary Compliance, and continuing until its expiration: (a) Mottes agrees to forbear from selling any material or product containing aggregate from Becker's Quarry for use in residential concrete foundations within the State of Connecticut; and (b) Becker agrees to forbear from selling
any material or product containing aggregate from Becker's Quarry for use in residential concrete foundations within the State of Connecticut.

4.) Becker will provide to its customers a notice, identical to the form attached hereto. Such notice shall be posted in all prominent places at Becker's business locations where it can be viewed by all customers. Becker shall also provide such notice to all customers that purchase stone aggregate.

5.) Mottes will provide a copy of this Assurance of Voluntary Compliance to any third party that leases or purchases its real estate and batch plants for the purpose of manufacturing and selling concrete.

6.) Becker shall provide notice to the Attorney General and the Commissioner, through their designees, in the event that it sells Becker's Quarry at any time during the term of this Assurance of Voluntary Compliance, within three (3) days of the date of the sale, at the following addresses:

Office of the Attorney General
Jeremy Pearlman, Assistant Attorney General
110 Sherman St.
Hartford, CT 06105
Jeremy.pearlman@ct.gov

Department of Consumer Protection
Julianne Avallone, Legal Director
165 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106-1630
Julianne.avallone@ct.gov

7.) Respondents are entering into this Assurance of Voluntary Compliance solely for purposes of settlement. This Assurance of Voluntary Compliance shall not be
considered an admission of liability or a violation of law or as evidence supporting any allegations raised by the State.

8.) Respondents agree that notwithstanding the foregoing, if either Respondent violates the terms of this Assurance of Voluntary Compliance, this matter may be reopened for further proceedings in the public interest, including, but not limited to, an action seeking appropriate relief as provided by law.

9.) This Assurance of Voluntary Compliance shall not become part of the official record unless and until it is accepted by the Attorney General and the Commissioner.

10.) This Assurance of Voluntary Compliance shall be binding on the Respondents, their successors and assigns.

11.) This Assurance of Voluntary Compliance shall become effective upon acceptance and approval by the Attorney General and the Commissioner without further notice to the Respondents.

12.) The acceptance of this Assurance of Voluntary Compliance shall not be deemed in any way to waive the right of the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Consumer Protection to take any and all appropriate action pursuant to their powers under the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act, Chapter 735a of the Connecticut General Statutes.
13.) This Assurance of Voluntary Compliance shall expire on June 30, 2017.

For the Respondent
The Joseph J. Mottles Company

Dated: 5/15/16
By: Dianel Becker
Name: Dianel Becker
Title: President

For the Respondent
Becker Construction Company

Dated: 5/15/16
By: Dianel Becker
Name: Dianel Becker
Title: General Manager

Duly Authorized

Accepted and approved this 9th day of May, 2016

Jonathan A. Harris
Commissioner

George Jepsen
Attorney General
WARNING

The State of Connecticut advises that until at least June 30, 2017, aggregate from Becker's Quarry should not be used in concrete for residential foundations.

Becker Construction Company has agreed to forbear from selling any material or product containing aggregate from Becker's Quarry for use in residential concrete foundations within the State of Connecticut.