

**CENTRE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE  
PERFORMANCE AND RELIABILITY**

**RESEARCH REPORT**

---

**Reinforcement Corrosion Initiation  
and Activation Times In Concrete  
Structures Exposed To Severe  
Marine Environments**

***R.E. Melchers and C.Q. Li***

**Research Report No. 269.11.08**

**ISBN No. 9780 9805 03 54 8**

---



**THE UNIVERSITY OF  
NEWCASTLE**  
AUSTRALIA



# Reinforcement corrosion initiation and activation times in concrete structures exposed to severe marine environments

RE Melchers\* (1) and CQ Li (2)

(1) Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability, School of Engineering, The University of Newcastle, Australia

(2) Department of Civil Engineering, The University of Greenwich, England

\* Corresponding author: rob.melchers@newcastle.edu.au

**Abstract** The corrosion of steel reinforcement bars in reinforced concrete structures exposed to severe marine environments usually is attributed to the aggressive nature of chloride ions. In some cases in practice corrosion has been observed to commence already within a few years of exposure even with considerable concrete cover to the reinforcement and apparently high quality concretes. However, there are a number of other cases in practice for which corrosion initiation took much longer, even in cases with quite modest concrete cover and modest concrete quality. Many of these structures show satisfactory long-term structural performance, despite having high levels of localized chloride concentrations at the reinforcement. This disparity was noted already more than 50 years ago, but appears still not fully explained. This paper presents a systematic overview of cases reported in the engineering and corrosion literature and considers possible reasons for these differences. Consistent with observations by others, the data show that concretes made from blast furnace cements have better corrosion durability properties. The data also strongly suggest that concretes made with limestone or non-reactive dolomite aggregates or sufficiently high levels of other forms of calcium carbonates have favourable reinforcement corrosion properties. Both corrosion initiation and the onset of significant damage are delayed. Some possible reasons for this are explored briefly.

**Keywords:** C: Corrosion, C: Long-Term Performance, D: Chloride, D: Reinforcement.

## Introduction

The early occurrence and high rate of corrosion of reinforcement in concrete structures exposed to marine environments or to repeated applications of de-icing salts is a problem that has been of interest for many decades [1,2,3]. That the problem is still not resolved is evident in the search for remediation measures, in the uncertainty in the criteria and guidelines for the durability design of reinforced concrete structures and in the continued exploration of alternative measures and materials [4]. However, specialist treatments and new materials may not be the key to the problem since already some 50 years ago Wakeman et al. [2] posed the question ‘Why do some concrete structures seem to last indefinitely in seawater while others deteriorate within a comparatively short time?’ Similarly, some 30 years later, Burkowsky and Englot [5] note that for New York and New

Jersey road bridges a wide variation in durability performance was observed, even for major bridges that are essentially similar in design and construction. While some have required extensive maintenance, others are ‘... standing up well - even after 60 years of service. Why the difference?’

Wakeman et al. [2] proposed some answers that have been echoed many times since, based both on experience and on research. They advocated ‘dense, impervious, relatively nonabsorbent concrete’, a minimum concrete cover of 3 inches (75mm), sufficiently high cement content, a low water/cement ratio, non-reactive aggregates and good compaction and curing. These are consistent with what currently is still considered good practice. These desiderata are based on the accepted notion that in marine environments chloride ions are aggressive to the passive layer assumed to exist on the exterior of steel reinforcement and that breakdown of this layer causes localized corrosion [6,7,8]. However, there are structures in practice exposed to extremely aggressive marine environments for which one or more of the desiderata have been violated, yet the structures have lasted many years with little or no signs of corrosion. For example, Burkowsky and Englot [5] note that none of the conventional predictive tools, including polarization resistance and pH measurements and chloride contents produced ‘...test results for the good decks (that) could not be separated easily from those for the problem decks...’ and ‘...so-called “indicator tests” were contradicted by ... actual deck performance.’ They found that very high chloride contents, in excess of 1 lb per cu. yd of concrete (approx 0.2% by cement), were common without a corresponding history of reinforcement corrosion. Similarly, Borgard et al. [9] note the occurrence of high levels of chloride adjacent to reinforcement that has not corroded and reinforcing steel ‘removed from concrete after many years with no indication that it has ever been exposed to a wet environment’.

One of the difficulties with these various comparisons is that usually different structures of different complexities at different locations with different micro-climates and built to differing design and construction standards are being compared. Moreover, there usually are also differences in detail design and considerable variability in construction and workmanship practices. Usually these factors taken together make comparison of the performance of reinforced concrete structures problematic. However, this is not always the case.

Recently, Melchers and Li [10] reported the very considerable difference in durability performance of some 1000 very simple and almost identical reinforced concrete elements all exposed to the same aggressive marine environment of the North Sea at Arbroath, Scotland. This means that differences due to location and micro-climate and in structural form and hence exposure are negligible and that only differences in materials are of interest. It is therefore noteworthy that over 90% of the elements constructed in 1943 had survived to 2006 with almost no evidence of corrosion initiation despite their being of apparent lower quality concrete than subsequent elements.

These were constructed in 1968 and 1993 and show severe reinforcement corrosion and longitudinal cracking of the elements. Tests showed that concrete permeability for the three concretes was generally similar and chloride concentrations at the reinforcement was as high for the 1943 elements as for the 1993 elements but much higher than that for the badly corroded 1968 elements. While only limited pH readings could be taken on the few cross-sections available to the investigators, they did not suggest much difference in concrete alkalinity between the three concretes even though the concretes are of very different ages. Detailed examination showed that unlike the subsequent elements, the 1943 elements were all constructed with seashells in the concrete mix. Seashells are predominantly aragonite, one of the polymorphs of calcium carbonate. Because construction records are no longer available, it is uncertain whether the seashells were rinsed with fresh water prior to use and whether seawater was used in the 1943 concrete.

The aim of the present paper is to investigate whether there are other cases reported in the literature for which there is correlation between reinforcement durability, elevated levels of calcium carbonate in the concrete matrix and concentration of chlorides at the level of the reinforcement. Of particular interest are observations and data for actual reinforced concrete structures under marine exposure conditions or subject to de-icing salts. Unfortunately, and for obvious reasons, there are almost no systematic observations directly of reinforcement bars in actual structures and how that reinforcement corrodes as a function of exposure time for realistic exposure conditions. Mostly what is available are data for observations of the external surfaces of concrete structures. Such observations are used herein, using data extracted from the open literature, both for in-situ observations and for some laboratory tests.

## **Background**

Corrosion of reinforcement usually is considered to initiate when chlorides from the external environment (or added during mixing) have penetrated sufficiently far into the concrete matrix to reach the reinforcement in concentrations high enough to break down the passive layer on surface of the reinforcement [6]. Chlorides can arise from seawater or salt-spray particles or de-icing salts where these are used on road bridges.

One role for the concrete surrounding the reinforcement is to provide physical protection against the migration of aggressive chloride ions. The other role of the concrete is that it provides an alkaline environment around the bars. The alkalinity of the concrete soon after casting typically is high and this develops a passive layer on the surface of the reinforcement. For mild and low alloy reinforcing steels this usually inhibits the initiation of the corrosion process. The high alkalinity is the result of the presence of highly alkaline calcium, sodium and potassium hydroxide ions. It has

been observed, however, that the hydroxide ions can leach out of the concrete slowly with time [11,12,13,14]. Perhaps in combination with concrete carbonation, this will contribute to the gradual lowering of the alkalinity surrounding the reinforcement bars and the observed lower pH value of older concretes. Eventually this leads to the initiation of corrosion of the reinforcement.

There are numerous observations that corrosion initiates at voids, air-pockets or pores in the concrete immediately adjacent to the reinforcement, that is, at locations where there is no immediate presence of alkalies [15,16] and there is a small local pocket or limited supply of oxygen. As a result, initial corrosion typically occurs as localized corrosion (sometimes called pitting corrosion).

While the process of corrosion initiation is controlled by the pH of the concrete and hence by the availability of a sufficiently high level of hydroxides, influenced in marine conditions by the presence of aggressive chloride ions, the process of subsequent continued corrosion is through oxidation of the reinforcement. As for bare steel in the atmosphere and under immersion conditions, the rate of oxidation is controlled primarily by the rate of supply of oxygen to the reinforcement impeded by the concrete cover [17,18].

It is conventional in many practical applications to use a simplified model to represent the changing pattern of corrosion loss with time. The most common approach does not deal directly with the corrosion of the reinforcing steel at all, but with its consequences, such as cracking, spalling and rust staining of the concrete, measured through the index 'damage' [19,20] even though this is obviously a parameter that can be defined only imprecisely. The usual assumption is that zero damage (and by implication insignificant corrosion) occurs prior to the reaching of some threshold time  $t_i$  sometimes known as the 'corrosion initiation time' (Figure 1a). Since the relationship in Figure 1a is in terms of damage, a more correct interpretation of  $t_i$  in this context is that it indicates the commencement of damage and in turn that this means the commencement of significant corrosion. In this model damage usually is assumed to increase linearly with time after  $t_i$ . This model is the well-known bi-linear 'damage' model. It has a considerable history and is widely advocated [8,21].




Figure 1(a) Bi-linear ‘damage’ model showing the threshold time  $t_t$  prior to which no damage is assumed to occur and subsequent to which linear damage accumulation is assumed, (b) more sophisticated model in terms of corrosion of the reinforcement showing the time  $t_i$  at which corrosion initiation occurs and the time  $t_{ac}$  at which long-term corrosion is activated [22].

In applications of the bi-linear damage model it is customary (and conservative) to assume that the cessation of adequate structural performance occurs at the onset of significant damage, that is, at time  $t_t$  (Figure 1a). This threshold of unacceptable damage is linked to a threshold chloride level, or, in other treatments, to a threshold ratio of the concentrations of chlorides to hydroxides at the reinforcement. The implication is that low levels of chlorides would not initiate corrosion. However, there have been many reports of reinforcement corrosion having initiated much earlier, as evident by rust stains and minor surface cracking sometimes with rust stains but with little or no evidence of further corrosion until much later (e.g. [23]). For this reason it is appropriate to add an earlier threshold, that of corrosion initiation, at time  $t_i$  and to distinguish this from active corrosion that occurs at a subsequent time  $t_{ac}$  (Figure 1b) [22].

Because of the importance conventionally attached to chlorides in the corrosion of reinforcement there has been much research attempting to define the threshold limit below which the action of chloride ions is considered to be of little importance [6,8]. Attention has been given also to the role of bound chlorides and much less attention to the leaching of hydroxide ions. Most research effort has been devoted to understanding the transportation of chlorides from the external environment into the concrete towards the reinforcement, often simplified by assuming Fickian (i.e. so-called ‘linear’) diffusion controls the process, whereas the reality is more complex. This has led to adaptations of the simple theory to meet field observations, with the diffusivity described by an equivalent system with an ‘apparent’ diffusivity coefficient [7]. Despite these extensive efforts, both the critical chloride (or the chloride/hydroxide) threshold level and the transportation mechanisms are still not well defined or understood [16].

As noted, there are actual field observations reported in the literature that suggests that very considerable levels of chloride can be tolerated at the reinforcement without apparent occurrence of corrosion initiation and hence with little or no obvious adverse structural or serviceability

consequences (e.g. [5,10,24,25]). Mostly these observations have been ignored in the development of theories for the initiation (and to a lesser extent the progression) of reinforcement corrosion. The following provides a summary of several examples described in the literature.

## Observations

Table 1 summarizes cases extracted from the corrosion and engineering literature for which sufficient information was available (or could be deduced) about the initiation and/or the progression with time of reinforcement corrosion. Table 1 shows the reported chloride concentrations at the reinforcement, converted where possible to percentages of cement content. In some cases estimates of the chloride content were made. Table 1 also shows information about cement type and about aggregates where this was available or could be reasonably deduced.

Two indicators of durability were extracted or estimated from the reported information for each case. The first is the time from first exposure to when rusting of the reinforcing bars commences, that is the ‘initiation’ time  $t_i$ . The second is the time  $t_{ac}$  from first exposure to active reinforcement corrosion, estimated as occurring at about the time significant damage such as cracking and spalling was observed. Where the data had to be interpreted to provide estimates of chloride content,  $t_i$  or  $t_{ac}$  the figures in Table 1 are shown in square brackets.

Wiebenga [26] and Bijen [27] both report the excellent performance of coastal structures in the Netherlands, many constructed using blast furnace slag cement. Concretes made with this type of cement have been noted to show better durability properties in marine environments than do concretes made using normal cements (and without additives such as fly-ash). In-situ chloride measurements showed low chloride concentrations next to the reinforcement. This was attributed to the blast furnace slag cement producing a less permeable concrete. Laboratory observations support this conclusion [28]. The initiation times for these data have been estimated since there is little in the documentation to provide firm information. Lea and Watkins [29] report on the effect of blast furnace cements as well as OPC and other cements on cracking due to reinforcement corrosion in experimental piles but provide little other information, including on chloride concentrations.

The papers by Cavalier and Vassie [30,31] mention the cases shown in Table 1 although again details of initiation time and longer-term behaviour are scanty. Importantly, all these structures showed corrosion within 18 years after construction, even though they were constructed in the mid-to-late 1950’s. This means that changes in the making of OPC (ordinary Portland cement) [32] are unlikely to be directly responsible for what is sometimes claimed to be the poorer durability performance of concrete made using modern cements [33].



The reinforcement corrosion performance of various Norwegian coastal structures is described by Gjorv [34] and Gjorv and Kashino [35]. Details such as cover are not given and only indicative information is provided about chloride concentrations. Gjorv and Kashino [35] observed that the rate of chloride diffusion for the Oslo Harbor piling was only about half that observed after 40 years of exposure for the piling of the old San Mateo-Hayward Bridge in the USA [36] and suggests that this is a result of ‘a difference in concrete quality between the two structures’. The Oslo Harbor pier was subject to severe frost damage and this led to several repair phases. However, most of these did not appear to be related to damage caused by reinforcement corrosion, despite the original concrete in the structure being rated, after demolition, as of ‘low quality and ...not air entrained’ [35]. As dolomites are quarried extensively in Norway for construction purposes, it is reasonable to assume that the concretes all contained dolomite aggregates. As there are no reports of alkali-aggregate reaction causing extensive concrete cracking, it may be assumed that the dolomites were non-reactive.

Lukas [24] was one of the first to note that heavy use of de-icing salts and hence high levels of chlorides could be tolerated in road bridges without apparent ill-effect and with corrosion of the reinforcement only rarely being detected. The bridges were located in Austria and, although not mentioned, it is likely that the Austrian aggregates were (non-reactive) dolomites. Lukas also notes that some earlier UK road bridges showed no evidence of reinforcement corrosion despite the use of de-icing salts. This may be contrasted with other UK bridges [37] that showed significant reinforcement corrosion problems within a few years of construction.

Cramer et al. [4] report on the severity of the reinforcement corrosion problem in the US and give examples of two road bridges in Oregon on the west coast of the US. These were demolished after about 40 years service during which extensive maintenance was required. The failure of a variety of preventative and corrosion inhibition measures was noted. The authors do not report details of the concrete mix design, the cement type or the aggregate used. US Geological Survey information shows that aggregate sources in Oregon are predominantly ‘traprock’, a local name for what is an igneous rock.

Lambert et al. [38] measured corrosion currents for laboratory slab tests specimens exposed to static seawater. After an initial period of about 2 weeks of active corrosion, the corrosion current dropped to very low values and only later increased again. This is consistent with the model of Figure 1(b). The increase in corrosion current generally was delayed for greater concrete cover and was found to depend on the ratio of wet time to dry time. Both are as expected. However, the authors did not comment on the result in the paper that showed specimens with limestone aggregate

having initiation times significantly longer than those for specimens with quartzite aggregate. The same cement (OPC) was used throughout.

The data reported by Polder and Hug [39] for the corrosion of reinforcement of a footbridge requires some interpretation. The greatest deterioration occurred for a part of the bridge initially protected with an epoxy coating but when this became permeable it also retained moisture inside the concrete, thereby artificially increasing the 'time of wetness' to much higher levels than for the adjacent parapets. However, these were subjected to much lower levels of application of de-icing salts. The frequency of de-icing salt application was considered to be modest given the relatively mild winters in The Netherlands. The net result is that the time to active corrosion is over-estimated for the parapets compared with that for the epoxy-coated part of the bridge once the coating lost its protective cover, estimated as between 10-15 years.

Castel et al. [40,41] found no correlation between longer-term corrosion and chloride content for reinforced concrete beams exposed for 17 years in the laboratory to a saline fog environment. Although the chloride content was well above the usual thresholds there was little evidence of reinforcement corrosion. It was suggested that corrosion occurred only where there was a lack of intimate contact between the reinforcement and the surrounding concrete. This accords with the recognized notion that air pockets at the interface layer are correlated with local corrosion [15].

For the Hathaway Bridge located in coastal southern Florida, Lau et al. [25] noted that even after 42 years in-service the 76 support piles showed little sign of corrosion initiation. Exposure of the reinforcing bars revealed only a dull to lustrous grey mill scale but no discernable rust. Similarly, for the Pensacola Bridge, there was only minor corrosion after 43 years exposure. Fewer than 2% of the 908 bridge piles examined showed rust stains greater than 100cm<sup>2</sup>. Smaller rust stains were noted on about 25% of the piles. The Brooks Bridge, only slightly younger at 39 years, showed only some superficial rust staining. The initiation times shown in Table 1 were estimated conservatively using the published information. In view of the predominant limestone geology of southern Florida, it is likely that the aggregate noted as 'river rock' is limestone or dolomite.

Sagues [42] also dealt with bridges in Florida. These ranged in age from 18 to about 30 years and were exposed to aggressive marine conditions. In general, polarization resistance measurements indicated negligible corrosion, consistent with visual observations of low incidence of reinforcement corrosion and rust staining. This was the case also for the Florida Keys bridges that were noted as having substantial deviations from the nominal cover. It was not uncommon for the cover to be 'as little as 25mm' and 'some instances of no cover were encountered'. The first concrete spalls were noted after only 6-9 years in service. Since these are likely to be associated

with low cover, they are not typical and the initiation time for areas of the bridges complying with design cover requirements is likely to be significantly longer.

Pronounced differences in reinforcement durability for road bridges subject to de-icing salts in New York and New Jersey led to detailed field and laboratory investigations of five selected bridges [5]. These were very similar in many critical design aspects. Details relevant to the present paper are given in Table 1. Reference to US Geological Survey reports shows that historically around 75-85% of crushed stone used for construction purposes in Pennsylvania State and New York State is limestone and dolomite. Overall aggregate production in the other neighbouring states was much lower and was predominantly igneous rock. Thus, although the source of aggregate used in each bridge cannot now be established from the available published information, it is likely that limestone or dolomite or both were used as concrete aggregate for most of the bridges.

Melchers and Li [10] observed that over 90% of simple pre-cast reinforced concrete handrails constructed at Arbroath, Scotland, in 1943 showed little or no sign of corrosion initiation even after more than 63 years of exposure to the North Sea. Some handrails were replaced in 1968 and others in 1993 for reasons that cannot now be traced, although it may be assumed that they showed signs of reinforcement corrosion. When inspected in 2003 the majority of the 1968 and 1993 replacements were found to be badly cracked longitudinally as a result of significant reinforcement corrosion. The 1943 handrails all contain seashells as part of the concrete mix. Both the 1968 and the 1993 concretes contain only igneous aggregates.

## Analysis

Table 1 shows estimates for  $t_i$  and  $t_{ac}$ . Where possible information reported in the literature is given, in other cases the Authors interpreted the available information. Parameters  $t_i$  and  $t_{ac}$  are plotted in Figures 2 and 3 respectively as a function of the reported or interpreted chloride content at the reinforcing bars. Evidently, there is a significant level of uncertainty in much of this information, largely due to its scant reporting in the original sources. For this reason all information is represented by the *range* of the information available, represented by a rounded or open rectangle. The upper and lower edges denote the range in initiation or active corrosion time, with the lower edge in all cases being a conservative estimate for the value reported in the literature, usually corresponding to the length of the observation period since first construction. In Figure 3 where the upper edge is not shown an arrow indicates that the upper boundary is undefined, i.e. there is continuing good performance and little or no evidence of active corrosion. The left and right edges denote the range in chloride content. Evidently a large bounded rectangle denotes greater overall

uncertainty compared with a smaller rectangle. Size is not, in this case, a measure of importance but rather a measure of uncertainty.

The dark shaded rectangles denote concretes made with blast furnace slag cements. The light grey rectangles denote concretes made with (non-reactive) dolomite or limestone aggregates or both or with seashells. The open rectangles are the remaining cases. Also shown is a typical nominal chloride threshold for corrosion damage, taken as 0.6% by weight of cement.




Figure 2 - Time  $t_i$  to corrosion initiation as a function of chloride content estimated at the level of the reinforcement for the cases shown in Table 1 for which information is available. Cases J and K, not shown, lie towards the bottom of the plot. Cover is 25mm unless shown otherwise (in brackets, mm).




Figure 3 - Time  $t_{ac}$  to active corrosion as a function of chloride content estimated at the level of the reinforcement for the cases shown in Table 1 for which information is available.

Figure 2 shows that the time to corrosion initiation for ordinary concretes in many cases is quite short - within the first 5 years or so of exposure irrespective of the precise chloride content around the reinforcing bars, although for low levels of chlorides the initiation time appears to be generally somewhat longer - perhaps up to about 10 years. However, for the concretes containing limestone or (non-reactive) dolomite aggregate (or seashells (W1)) or blast furnace cement (A1 and A2), the times to initiation of corrosion are longer, and in some cases very much longer. Again lower levels of chlorides around the reinforcement appear to extend the time to initiation.

The data plotted in Figure 2 has not discriminated for matters such as concrete cover and concrete permeability that could be expected to have some influence on initiation time. Unfortunately information on concrete permeability was available for only a few cases - insufficient to build a comprehensive picture of its influence. The nominal concrete cover for all data is 25mm except where shown otherwise (in brackets, mm) in Figure 2. Evidently, those cases with cover

much greater than 25mm tend to show lower chloride contents and longer initiation times, as expected. The fact that this is not always the case may simply reflect the uncertainty in some of the data relative to the initiation times of interest.

For the time  $t_{ac}$  to active corrosion, Figure 3 shows a clear distinction between the structures constructed from ordinary concrete and those in which the aggregates contained limestone, dolomite or other forms of calcium carbonate. The ordinary concretes all led to active corrosion occurring within about 20 years of exposure, somewhat longer when the chloride content was lower. For the concretes containing limestone, dolomite, seashells or blast furnace cements the time to active corrosion was at least 15 years after first exposure (case L) and in most cases very considerably longer, with some cases showing no sign of active corrosion even after 60 years exposure.

Figure 3 does not discriminate for concrete cover. This is unlikely to have much influence on activation time since in most cases the reinforcement can be expected to be fully exposed to high levels of chloride (and moisture) in the surrounding concrete after 20 years or so.

## Discussion

Figure 2 shows clearly that in general the initiation time  $t_i$  was quite short, typically occurring within a few years of first exposure. However, there are also a number of cases for which the initiation time was considerably greater. Commonly such differences have been dismissed and attributed to differences in concrete composition, in concrete quality and in cover to the reinforcement. Undoubtedly these factors will have influences on long-term corrosion behaviour of reinforcement. However, their influence is not consistent, with some structures with poor quality concrete or minimal cover displaying better corrosion resistance than others with high quality concretes and greater concrete cover. This inconsistency has been noted before [9,23].

Within the limitations of the available information, the present analysis shows that with  $t_i$  and  $t_{ac}$  as defined herein (Figure 1b) all of the longer  $t_i$  appear to be associated with the use of blast furnace slag cement or with some form of calcareous material for aggregates, such as seashells, limestone or (non-reactive) dolomite aggregates in the concrete. Similarly, the time  $t_{ac}$  to active corrosion is seen generally to be much longer for the concretes made with calcareous material or blast furnace slag cement. Moreover, the interval between  $t_i$  and  $t_{ac}$  is greater, typically, for the latter. These observations appear not to have been made previously.

From a scientific perspective the interesting question that arises is how the observed differences in  $t_i$  and  $t_{ac}$  between the various reinforced concrete structures might arise. Clearly, one possible reason for this may be the effect of the constituents of the concretes on chloride diffusion

rates. Concretes made with blast furnace cements usually are considered to have greater resistance to inward chloride diffusion as a result of this cement reducing the diffusion coefficient. This was deduced from extensive field observations of their long-term performance compared with the performance of concrete structures made from ordinary Portland cement (OPC) [27]. Accelerated laboratory tests on various concrete specimens support this conclusion. For example, Arskog et al. [43] noted that the chloride diffusion coefficients all reduced significantly in the first 30-40 days after exposure and appeared to converge in value. Unfortunately the short 180-day test regime does not permit a conclusion whether this convergence is likely to continue for longer exposure periods. It obviously is a matter for further investigation. The tests did show that significant changes occur within the concrete matrix during the early exposure period, and possibly longer. The manner in which these changes differ from those observed for chloride diffusivity in OPC concretes appears to be unclear at this time.

One known mechanism that has an effect on the transport of chlorides into the concrete from the external marine environment is the deposition of aragonite (a form of calcium carbonate) and brucite (a form of magnesium carbonate) on the exterior surfaces of concrete continuously immersed in seawater [44]. Whether this effect extends also to tidal and atmospheric exposure conditions and whether it is somehow influenced by the presence of limestone or dolomite aggregates in the concrete mix or the use of blast furnace slag cement remains a matter for investigation. However, this mechanism may be the reason for the observation that the chloride profile does not appear to change much with time after some initial period (perhaps some years). For example, Cusson and Qian [23] found that ‘the corrosion products at the steel surface did not progress significantly,’ even over a period of 10 years. This may be related to the observed decrease in diffusion coefficient with time (see above). Again, there appears to be no comparable test information for the effects of limestone or dolomite aggregates. In this respect the earlier test data reported by Matthews [45]) is too short and sparse to draw conclusions. There are clearly a number of related matters here for further investigation.

Despite the considerable developments in the theory of chloride diffusion and refinements beyond the simple application of Fick’s law of diffusion, including allowance for the so-called ‘skin effect’ and chloride transport by absorption mechanisms [7], current theory is not always consistent with field observations (e.g. [9]). This may be illustrated by the predictions of Amey et al. (1998) for the service life of concrete structures in the tidal and splash zones in Florida (compare with cases U in Table 1). Using an assumed 65 mm concrete cover, optimistic concrete properties and chloride penetration as the critical condition for time to initiation  $t_i$ , Amey et al. [46] estimated  $t_i = 9$  years. Assuming that the time interval to significant damage ranges from 3-6 years depending on

concrete resistivity and temperature, they estimated a service life of 16 years, extending to 27 and 33 years respective for a high quality concrete and concrete with 8% silica fume. However, the actual cover as reported by Lau et al. [25] for case U in Table 1 is only half of the 65mm assumed. With the usual assumption that chloride penetration varies exponentially with depth it is easily deduced that the time to initiation for 30mm cover would be about 4 years and the expected service life 9-10 years. Evidently, these estimates are very seriously less than the in-situ observations.

Since corrosion of reinforcement in concrete requires the presence of moisture, one potentially important variable not considered in the above analysis is ‘time of wetness’. This is known to be important in atmospheric corrosion and could be expected to have a similar role in reinforcement corrosion. However, as moisture from the outside penetrates the concrete cover it tends to be retained and external fluctuations of wetness and, with increasing depth, are less internally. This is likely to be the case for most of the structures in Table 1, particularly for structures in tidal regions, bridges, etc. exposed to coastal spray and wave action and bridges in wet climates such as the UK, or where de-icing salts are used for a significant part of the year. One example that does not fit this pattern is the inland footbridge described by Polder and Hug [39] for which de-icing salts were applied rather infrequently. In this case the time  $t_{ac}$  (as defined in Figure 1b) is probably over-estimated compared to the average structure in Table 1. In contrast, the part of the bridge with the deteriorated coating probably retained moisture more than would have been the case under natural conditions, such that the value of  $t_{ac}$  probably is under-estimated. It follows that a more detailed analysis should consider ‘time of wetness’ as a parameter. However, this is likely to be difficult since, unlike corrosion studies for bare steel in marine environments, this parameter has almost never been reported for reinforced concrete structures.

Changes in cement making practice are sometimes proposed as responsible for the lower durability of reinforcement in modern concretes. The information in Table 1 and Figures 2 and 3 does not bear this out. Changes in cement making (higher clinkering temperatures and finer grind) did not come about until the 1960’s in most countries [32], yet concern about variability in reinforcement durability was documented already much earlier. What may well be the case is that with higher early strength cements the need arose to use stronger aggregates and thus a trend to use igneous rock rather than limestone and, perhaps, (non-reactive) dolomite. If this is the case, the durability issue obviously is superficially but falsely correlated with changes in cement making.

In the analysis given in Table 1 and Figures 2 and 3 it was necessary in many cases to make assumptions about the stone aggregates used in the concretes, as this was only seldom reported in the literature. Nevertheless it was reported in some cases and in others there can be little doubt about the most likely source(s) of concrete aggregates. Even though this may add a further



dimension of uncertainty, the predominance of the trends in Figures 2 and 3 suggests that this is not a major source of error. Further, since concrete mix data is only seldom reported, it has not been possible to perform an analysis of calcium carbonate content versus structural performance such as measured through  $t_i$  and  $t_{ac}$ . Such analysis will only be possible once these matters start being reported in the literature or when specifically designed experimental programs are put in place. In both cases it is clear that practical results will take a long time to become available. For this reason the historical approach adopted herein was considered the only practical way forward as well as highlighting a potential variable that, to date, appears to have been entirely ignored within the usual assumption that the aggregates are 'inert'.

Despite the information in Table 1 and Figures 2 and 3 being subject to considerable uncertainty, as noted above, collectively it points to a consistent trend, namely that elevated levels of calcareous material in the concrete mix may be linked to enhanced durability of reinforcement against corrosion. The information used in Table 1 (and the trends in Figures 2 and 3) suggests this inference but cannot validate it and this difficult task remains. Controlled long-term experiments with a range of concrete aggregates and identical exposure conditions were commenced (at Newcastle) three years ago in an attempt to provide further insight and independent confirmation but clearly longer-term information may not be available for several decades.

## **Conclusion**

For reinforcement in concrete structures exposed to marine environments or to de-icing salts the information presented herein shows that the time to corrosion initiation does not depend strongly on the reported concentration of chlorides at the reinforcement. For many structures this was less than 5 years. However, it was considerably greater for reinforced concrete structures constructed from limestone or (non-reactive) dolomite aggregates or with blast furnace cement. For these the initiation period was at least 10 years and in most cases greater than 15 years, with some much greater still.

Similarly, the time period to the commencement of active corrosion was found to be not strongly related to chloride content. For most structures it was less than about 20 years, consistent with anecdotal observations for many modern reinforced concrete structures. However, for reinforced concrete structures constructed from limestone or (non-reactive) dolomite aggregates or with blast furnace cement, it was considerably longer, ranging from about 17 years and in most cases to more than 30 years, with some extending to 60+ years. The precise exposure conditions appear to have only a secondary influence.

These observations have clear implications for the practical achievement of concretes with favourable long-term resistance to reinforcement corrosion. However, they need to be verified by controlled experiments or other detailed investigations.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors acknowledge the financial support provided by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (Grant No. EP/E00444X/01) and the Australian Research Council (Grant DP0451308). The extensive and excellent service provided by the Inter-library Loans section of the Auchmuty Library at The University of Newcastle is appreciated and much facilitated the preparation of this manuscript.

Table 1 - Observed or estimated values for  $t_i$  and  $t_{ac}$  for various cases of long-term reinforcement corrosion reported in the literature.

| Code                 | Ref.      | Structure                                                                                             | Age (years)     | Cover (mm)                        | Total chloride concentration (by weight of cement) | Initiation Time $t_i$ (years) | Time to active corrosion $t_{ac}$ (years) | Cement/ concrete/ aggregate              | Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A1                   | 26        | Coastal structures (NL)                                                                               | 16-49           | Varies<br>50 typical              | Generally less than threshold.                     | [< 20]                        | [> 30]                                    | Many blast furnace slag cements.         | 88% of 64 structures showed no corrosion.<br>No visible corrosion if <30 years old.<br>"No correlation with cement content."                                                                                                                                |
| A2                   | 27        | Coastal structures (NL)                                                                               | 30+             | 50 (25-75)                        | ~ 0.14%                                            | [20-25]                       | > 30                                      | Ditto                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| A3                   | 1         | Coastal structures (South Africa)                                                                     |                 |                                   |                                                    | << 4                          | < 4                                       | Granites, gneiss aggregates              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| A4                   | 29        | Sheerness (UK) (1929)<br>Experimental tidal piles (144)                                               | 10              | 25<br>50<br>25<br>50              | ?<br>?                                             | < 2<br>~ 6<br>~ 8<br>> 10     |                                           | OPC, Rapid hardening<br>Blast furnace PC | First occurrence of cracking<br>High alumina cements > 10 years                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| B1                   | 30        | Haddiscoe Bridge deck (UK) (1960)                                                                     | 18              | 25                                | 0.9%                                               | [<15]                         | < 18                                      | OPC                                      | De-icing salts<br>Localized pitting corrosion                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| B2                   | 31        | Bridge over Great Ouse River (UK) (1964)                                                              | 18              | 38 specified, 25 and less         | 0.8%                                               | [<15]                         | < 18                                      | OPC                                      | De-icing salts<br>Localized pitting corrosion                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| B3                   | 31        | Jetty at Hout Bay (ZA) (1968)                                                                         | 14              |                                   |                                                    | [<10]                         | < 14                                      |                                          | Marine splash zone<br>Localized pitting corrosion                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| C1<br>C2<br>C3       | 34        | Harbour structures (219) (N)<br>- immersed<br>- tidal zone<br>- splash                                | 50-60           |                                   | [high ?]<br>[high ?]<br>[high ?]                   | < 5                           | [~ 50-60]<br>[~ 30-40]<br>[~ 30-40]       | Norway aggregates                        | Little corrosion evident<br>Approx < 20% steel loss<br>Beams corroded more than slabs                                                                                                                                                                       |
| C4<br>C5             | 34        | Coastal Bridges (320) (N)<br>pre 1970<br>post 1970                                                    | > 24<br>< 24    | Varies<br>50 typical              | High                                               | << 10                         | < 25<br>~ 10                              | Norway aggregates                        | Approx 25% have 'serious' corrosion<br>Lower cement content                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| C6                   | 34        | Offshore structures (several) (N)                                                                     | approx 10 years |                                   | High                                               | << 10                         |                                           | Norway aggregates                        | 'very good' condition (implies some evidence of rusting)                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| D1<br>D2<br>D3<br>D4 | 34,<br>35 | Pier (Oslo Harbor) (N) (~1922)<br>demolished 1982<br>- deck<br>- deck beams<br>- tidal<br>- immersion | 60              | < 30<br>< 50<br>25-50<br>50-120** | 0.35-0.7%<br>1.0-1.8%<br>1.5-1.8%<br>2.2-2.5%      | 20<br>10<br>< 14              | [< 54]<br>[< 54]<br>[< 60]<br>[< 60]      | Norway aggregates                        | Overall 'very good condition' <25% of reinforcement corroded, <10% steel loss.<br>Extensive spalling by 1976 (54 years)<br>Several repairs, invariably not effective<br>Pitting <1mm, surface cracking<br>Pitting < 0.2mm, some 0.5mm, little rust staining |

|    |    |                                                                      |      |                      |                                                                   |                            |        |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
|----|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| E1 | 36 | Road Bridge piles (USA)                                              | 37   | 45 - 55              | 0.8 - 1 %                                                         | < 1                        | << 37  |                                           | No evidence of reinforcement corrosion for some high chloride levels.                                                                                                          |
| E2 | 24 | Road bridges (Austria)                                               | 20   | 25 - 30              | > 1.8%                                                            | > 20                       | > 20   | Dolomite aggregates                       | Corrosion rarely detected even in high chloride regions.                                                                                                                       |
| E3 | 5  | Road bridges (New York)                                              |      |                      |                                                                   |                            |        | Limestones and dolomite aggregates likely | Overall repairs mainly to asphalt<br>Ditto plus minor patching in 1982<br>Ditto plus minor patching in 1976<br>Almost no patching required<br>Low-level maintenance throughout |
|    |    | Goethals Bridge (1928)                                               | 60   | 50 +                 | 0.36                                                              | < 54                       | > 60   |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| E4 |    | GB Parallel (1964)                                                   | 24   | 40                   | 0.95                                                              | < 18                       | > 24   |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| E5 |    | G. Washington HR1 (1959)                                             | 29   | 55                   | 1.3                                                               | < 17                       | > 29   |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| E6 |    | G. Washington PIP (1953)                                             | 35   | 62                   | 0.6                                                               | < 35                       | > 35   |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| E7 |    | Outerbridge Crossing (1922)                                          | 60   | 25 (6-125)           | > 0.3                                                             | [< 10]                     | [< 20] |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| E8 | 4  | Rocky Pt viaduct (1954)                                              | 40   | 28 - 67              | ~ 2.2                                                             | << 13                      | < 15   |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| E9 |    | Brush Creek Bridge (1954)<br>Oregon (USA)                            | 44   | 25 - 100             | ~ 1.1                                                             | ~ 4                        | 7-14   |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| F  | 47 | Test specimens, tidal and marine spray cycles at Aberdeen Beach (UK) |      | 0 upward             | >> threshold ([Cl <sup>-</sup> ]/[OH <sup>-</sup> ] 320 >> 0.61)  | > 3.3                      |        |                                           | Randomly distributed steel fibres in concrete. Extensive corrosion only of very outside fibre segments after 3 months (i.e. zero cover)                                        |
| G1 | 48 | Prisms (UK) atmosphere                                               | 10   |                      | ?                                                                 |                            |        |                                           | t <sub>i</sub> measured by first appearance of pitting on reinforcement surface. CaCl added to mixes.                                                                          |
| G2 |    | high strength rusty steel                                            |      | 10 & 20              |                                                                   | 1-2                        |        |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| G3 |    | ditto - grit-blasted                                                 |      | 10                   |                                                                   | 1-2                        |        |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| H  | 38 | Test specimens (slabs)                                               |      | 10 → 40              | >> threshold ([Cl <sup>-</sup> ]/[OH <sup>-</sup> ] 3-20 >> 0.61) | ~ 1 → 2                    |        |                                           | Artificial salt exposure conditions.                                                                                                                                           |
| I  | 49 | Jetty piles (Singapore) splash zone                                  | 24   | 70                   | ~ 1.4%                                                            | [5-10]                     | [~ 20] | OPC                                       | Rust stains, cracks, delamination ~ 30%                                                                                                                                        |
| J  | 50 | Test specimens Tokyo Bay                                             | 5    | 25                   |                                                                   | << 5                       |        |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| K  | 20 | Sample beams from bridge decks - undefined locations (USA).          | 40 ? | 27.2<br>47.5<br>69.5 |                                                                   | < 0.72<br>< 1.84<br>< 3.54 |        |                                           | Beam # 18512.0<br># 2859.6<br># 3859.6                                                                                                                                         |
| L  | 51 | Bridge piles (tidal) (MX)                                            | 15   | ?                    | 0.4-2.9%                                                          | < 5                        | [>15]  | [Limestone aggregates likely]             |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| M  | 52 | Test specimens (MX)                                                  | 2    | 32                   | ~ 1.2-3.6%                                                        | 0.5-0.8                    |        |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                |
| N  | 53 | Long Key Bridge (FL) piles (1980)                                    | 17   | 100                  | ~ 0.4-2.4%                                                        | < 6                        | [> 17] | [Limestone aggregates likely]             | Epoxy coated reinforcement                                                                                                                                                     |
| O  | 54 | Laboratory specimens<br>Range of salinities                          |      | 20                   | < 0.05 - 2.5%                                                     | < 4                        | [~ 10] |                                           | Irrespective of chloride levels (including zero) obtained 'unacceptable average corrosion rates'                                                                               |
| P  | 55 | Test beams under load                                                |      | 25                   | ~ 1.5%                                                            | 1-1.5                      |        |                                           | Averages from a number of tests                                                                                                                                                |

|          |    |                                                         |                        |                           |                           |                     |                |                                     |                                                                                                   |
|----------|----|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Q1       | 42 | Escambia Bay bridges (FL) (1966)<br>Piles in tidal zone | ~ 30                   | 26.4 - 2.84 (ave.)        | ~ 1.2%                    | < 30                | > 30           | [Limestone aggregates likely]       | No significant corrosion. PR measurements - 'negligible corrosion' Very low chloride diffusivity. |
| Q2       | 42 | Florida Keys bridges (5) (1980-2) splash zone (FL)      | 18-20                  | 76 nominal (see comments) | ~ 2.4-4% at 50-76mm depth | < 6                 | 6 - 9 +        | Limestone coarse aggregate          |                                                                                                   |
| R1       | 28 | Test specimens (immersed                                | 30                     | 20, 40, 70                | > threshold               | [15-25]             | > 30           |                                     | Slag cement and alumina cement concretes                                                          |
| R2       |    | in natural seawater)                                    |                        |                           | >> threshold              | [< 15]              | < 30           |                                     | OPC and high early strength, moderate heat concretes.                                             |
| S        | 56 | Offshore platform - Brent B (N)                         | ~ 20                   | 75                        | ~ 0.07%                   | ~ 20                | >> 20          | OPC + additives [Norway aggregates] | No external evidence of rebar corrosion                                                           |
| T1<br>T2 | 41 | Experimental beams in laboratory                        | 17                     | 10 min<br>40 max          | 1.8-2.2%<br>1.3-1.9%      | 4-6<br>8-12         | > 17<br>> 17   | OPC + some limestone aggregate      | B2CL2 -<br>A1CL1 -                                                                                |
| U1       | 25 | Hathaway Bridge piles (76)                              | 42                     | 31 (mainly)-50            | low                       | [~ < 35]            | [< 40]         | River rock, OPC                     | Rust stains on ~ 10%, minor delamination < 3%                                                     |
| U2       |    | Pensacola Bridge piles (908)                            | 43                     | 23.3                      | ~ 0.4-2%                  | [~ < 35]            | [< 40]         | River rock, OPC                     | Rust stains on ~ 10%, minor delamination < 3%                                                     |
| U3       |    | Brooks Bridge (30)                                      | 39                     | 29                        | low                       | [~ < 30]            |                | undefined, OPC                      | Superficial rust staining                                                                         |
| U4       |    | St George Island Bridge (15)<br>All in FL(USA)          | 1                      | 72-89                     | negl.                     | < 1                 |                | 22% FA, 8% microsilica + limestone  | Superficial rust staining<br>Note: River rock likely to be limestone.                             |
| V1<br>V2 | 57 | Test specimens (Cabo Raso (P) and La Voz (V))           | 2                      | 15-30mm                   | 0.42%<br>0.89%            | 0.8-0.9<br>1.8-1.9  |                | OPC or similar                      | Coastal atmospheric exposure                                                                      |
| W1       | 10 | Arbroath, North Sea, UK<br>balustrade (1000 samples)    | 63 (1943)              | 25                        | ~ 1.9%                    | ~ 20-63             | [> 30]         | Seashells in mix                    | <10% replaced, rest no significant corrosion (2006)                                               |
| W2<br>W3 |    |                                                         | 49 (1968)<br>14 (1993) | 25<br>25                  | ~ 0.5%<br>~ 1.8%          | [5 - 15]<br>[<< 10] | [< 25]<br>< 10 |                                     | All badly corroded and severely cracked<br>Most badly corroded and severely cracked               |

The column for cement/concrete aggregate is grey where ever there was use of blast furnace slag cement or limestone or dolomite aggregates.

## References

- 1 Lewis DA and Copenhagen WJ (1959) The corrosion of reinforcing steel in concrete in marine atmospheres, *Corrosion (NACE)* 15(7) 382t-388t.
- 2 Wakeman CM, Dockweiler EV, Stover HE and Whiteneck LL (1958) Use of concrete in marine environments, *Proc ACI* 54(4) 841-856.
- 3 Beaton JL and Stratfull RF (1963) Environmental influence on corrosion of reinforcing in concrete bridge substructures, *Highway research record*, 14: 60-78.
- 4 Cramer SD, Covino Jr BS, Bullard SJ, Holcomb GR, Russell JH, Nelson FJ, Laylor HM and Soltesz SM (2002) Corrosion prevention and remediation strategies for reinforced concrete coastal bridges, *Cement & Concrete Composites*, 24(1) 101-117.
- 5 Burkowsky B and Englot J (1988) Analyzing good deck performance on Port Authority bridges, *Concrete International*, 10(11) 25-33.
- 6 Bentur A, Diamond S and Berke N (1997) *Steel Corrosion in Concrete: Fundamental and Civil Engineering Practice*, E&FN Spon, London.
- 7 Richardson MG (2002) *Fundamentals of durable reinforced concrete*, SponPress, London.
- 8 Bertolini L, Elsener B, Pedeferri P and Polder R (2004) *Corrosion of steel in concrete*, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim.
- 9 Borgard B, Warren C, Somayaji S and Heidersbach R (1990) Mechanisms of corrosion of steel in concrete, (In) *Corrosion rates of Steel in Concrete*, ASTM STP 1065, (Ed) Berke NS, Chaker V and Whiting D, American Society for Testing and Materials, Philadelphia, 174-188.
- 10 Melchers RE and Li CQ (2008) Observations and crack width statistics for a 63-year old reinforced concrete promenade railing exposed to the North Sea (to appear).
- 11 Gjorv OE (1970) Thin underwater concrete structures, *J. of the Construction Divn, ASCE*, 96(CO1) 9-17.
- 12 Page CL and Treadaway KW (1982) Aspects of the electrochemistry of steel in concrete, *Nature* 297, May, 109-115.
- 13 Sergi G, Yu SW and Page CL (1992) Diffusion of chloride and hydroxyl ions in cementitious materials exposed to a saline environment, *Magazine Concrete Research*, 44(158) 63-69.
- 14 Sagues AA, Moreno EI and Andrada C (1997) Evolution of pH during in-situ leaching in small concrete cavities, *Cement and Concrete Research*, 27(11) 1747-1759.
- 15 Yonezawa T, Ashworth V & Procter RPM (1988) Pore solution composition and chloride effects on the corrosion of steel in concrete, *Corrosion*, 44(7) 489-499.
- 16 Glass GK and Buenfeld NR (2000) Chloride induced corrosion of steel in concrete, *Prog. Struct. Engng Mater.* 2(4) 448-458.
- 17 Bazant ZP (1979) Physical model for steel corrosion in concrete sea structures - Theory, *J. of the Structural Divn. ASCE*, 105 (ST6) 1137-1153.
- 18 Huet B, L'Hostis V, Santarini G, Feron D and Idrissi H (2007) Steel corrosion in concrete: Determinist modeling of cathodic reaction as a function of water saturation degree, *Corrosion Science*, 49: 1918-1932.
- 19 Tuuti K (1982) *Corrosion of steel in concrete*, Research Report No 4, Swedish Cement and Concrete Research Institute, Stockholm, 17-21.
- 20 Weyers RE (1997) Corrosion service life model concrete structures, (In) *Repair and rehabilitation of reinforced concrete structures: The State of the Art*, (Ed) WF Silva-Araya, OT De Rincon and LP O'Neill, ASCE, Reston, VA, 105-119.
- 21 Polder RB & de Rooij MR (2005) Durability of marine concrete structures - field investigations and modelling, *Heron* 50(3) 133-153.
- 22 Melchers RE and Li CQ (2006) Phenomenological modelling of corrosion loss of steel reinforcement in marine environments, *ACI Materials Journal*, 103(1) 25-32.
- 23 Cusson D & Qian S (2007) Corrosion inhibiting systems for concrete bridges - 10 years of field performance evaluation, (In) *Proc. CONSEC'07, Concrete under Severe Conditions*, (Ed) F

- Toutlemonde, et al., Laboratoire Central des Ponts et Chaussées, Paris, ISSN 1626-4704, pp 463-472.
- 24 Lukas W (1985) Relationship between chloride content in concrete and corrosion in untensioned reinforcement on Austrian bridges and concrete road surfacings, *Betonwerk und Fertigteil-Technik*, 51(11) 730-734.
  - 25 Lau K, Sagues AA, Yao L and Powers RG (2007) Corrosion performance of concrete cylinder piles, *Corrosion*, 63(4) 366-378.
  - 26 Wiebenga JG (1980) Durability of concrete structures along the North Sea coast of the Netherlands, *American Concrete Institute*, SP65, 437-452.
  - 27 Bijen J (1996) Blast Furnace Slag Cement of Durable Marine Structures, VNC/Beton Prisma, 's-Hertogenbosch, the Netherlands.
  - 28 Mohammed TU, Hamada H and Yamaji T (2004) Concrete after 30 years of exposure - Part 11: Chloride ingress and corrosion of steel bars, *ACI Materials Journal*, 101(1) 13-18.
  - 29 Lea FM and Watkins CM (1960) The Durability of Reinforced Concrete in Seawater (Twentieth Report of the Sea Action Committee of the Institution of Civil Engineers), Research Paper No. 30, National Building Studies, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (Building Research Station), HMSO, London.
  - 30 Cavalier PG and Vassie PR (1981) Investigation and repair of reinforcement corrosion in a bridge deck, *Proc Instn Civ Engrs*, Part 1, 70: 461-480.
  - 31 Cavalier PG, Vassie PR, et al. (1982) Discussion: Investigation and repair of reinforcement corrosion in a bridge deck, *Proc Instn Civ Engrs*, Part 1, 72: 401-419.
  - 32 Corish AT and Jackson PJ (1982) Portland cement properties - past and present, *Concrete*, 16(7) 16-18.
  - 33 Nixon PJ and Spooner DC (1993) Concrete proof for British cement, *Concrete* 27(5) 41-44.
  - 34 Gjorv OD (1994) Steel corrosion in concrete structures exposed to Norwegian marine environment, *Concrete International*, 16(4) 35-39.
  - 35 Gjorv OD and Kashino N (1986) Durability of a 60-year-old reinforced concrete pier in Oslo harbor, *Materials Performance*, 25(2) 18-26.
  - 36 Beaton JL, Spellman DL and Stratfull RF (1967) Corrosion of steel in continuously submerged reinforced concrete piling, *Highway Research Record*, 204: 11-21.
  - 37 Roberts MB, Atkins C, Hogg V and Middleton C (2000) A proposed empirical corrosion model for reinforced concrete, *Proc. Inst. Civil Engrs, Structures and Buildings*, 140(1) 1-11.
  - 38 Lambert P, Page CL and Vassie PRW (1991) Investigations of reinforcement corrosion. 2. Electrochemical monitoring of steel in chloride-contaminated concrete, *Materials and Structures*, 24: 351-358.
  - 39 Polder RB and Hug A (2000) Penetration of chloride from de-icing salt into concrete from a 30 year old bridge, *Heron* 45(2) 109-124.
  - 40 Castel A, Vidal T, Francois R and Arliguie G (2003) Influence of steel - concrete interface quality on reinforcement corrosion induced by chlorides, *Magazine of Concrete Research*, 55(2) 151-159.
  - 41 Castel A, Vidal T, Zhang R, Francois R and Sirivivananon V (2007) Initiation and propagation phase in reinforced concrete corrosion due to long term exposure in saline environment, (In) *Proc. CONSEC'07, Concrete under Severe Conditions*, (Ed) F Toutlemonde, et al., Laboratoire Central des Ponts et Chaussées, Paris, ISSN 1626-4704, pp 307-314.
  - 42 Sagues AA (2003) Modeling the effects of corrosion on the lifetime of extended reinforced concrete structures, *Corrosion*, 59(10) 854-866.
  - 43 Arskog V, Ferreira M, Liu G and Gjorv OE (2007) Effect of cement type on the resistance of concrete against chloride penetration, (In) *Proc. CONSEC'07, Concrete under Severe Conditions*, (Ed) F Toutlemonde, et al., Laboratoire Central des Ponts et Chaussées, Paris, ISSN 1626-4704, pp 367-374.

- 44 Buenfeld NR and Newman JB (1984) The permeability of concrete in a marine environment, Magazine of Concrete Research, 36(127) 67-80.
- 45 Matthews JD (1994) Performance of limestone filler cement concrete, (In) Euro-cement: Impact of ENV207 on concrete construction, (Ed) RK Dhir and MR Jones, E&F Spon, London, 113-147.
- 46 Amey SL, Johnson DA, Mittenberger MA and Farzam H (1998) Predicting the service life of concrete marine structures: An environmental methodology, ACI Materials Journal 95(2) 205-214.
- 47 Mangat PS and Gurusamy K (1988) Corrosion resistance of steel fibres in concrete under marine exposure, Cement and Concrete Research, 18: 44-54.
- 48 Treadaway KWJ, Cox RN and Brown BL (1989) Durability of corrosion resisting steel in concrete, Proc. Instn Civ. Engrs, Part 1, 86: 305-331.
- 49 Liam KC, Roy SK and Northwood DO (1992) Chloride ingress measurements and corrosion potential mapping study of a 24-year-old reinforced concrete jetty structure in a tropical marine environment, Mag. Conc. Res. 44(160) 205-215.
- 50 Suda K, Misra S and Motohashi K (1993) Corrosion products of reinforcing bars embedded in concrete, Corrosion Science, 35(5-8) 1543-1549.
- 51 Carpio JJ, Perez-Lopez T, Genesca J and Martinez L (1997) Rehabilitation of a damaged reinforced concrete bridge in a marine environment, (In) Repair and rehabilitation of reinforced concrete structures: The State of the Art, (Ed) WF Silva-Araya, OT De Rincon and LP O'Neill, ASCE, Reston, VA, 43-59.
- 52 Castro P, Veleza L & Balancan M (1997) Corrosion of reinforced concrete in tropical marine environment and in accelerated tests, Construction and Building Materials, 11(2) 75-81.
- 53 Hartt WH, Lee SK and Costa JE (1997) Condition assessment and deterioration rate projection for chloride contaminated reinforced concrete structures (In) Repair and rehabilitation of reinforced concrete structures: The State of the Art, (Ed) WF Silva-Araya, OT De Rincon and LP O'Neill, ASCE, Reston, VA, 82-104.
- 54 Novak P, Mala R and Joska L (2001) Influence of pre-rusting on steel corrosion in concrete, Cement and Concrete Research 31: 589-593.
- 55 Li CQ (2002) Initiation of chloride-induced reinforcement corrosion in concrete structural members - Prediction, ACI Structural J. 99(2) 133-141.
- 56 Sengul O & Gjorv OE (2007) Chloride penetration into a 20 year old North Sea concrete platform, (In) Proc. CONSEC'07, Concrete under Severe Conditions, (Ed) F Toutlemonde, et al., Laboratoire central des ponts et chaussées, Paris, ISSN 1626-4704, pp 107-116.
- 57 Trocónis de Rincon O and 30 others (2007) Effect of the marine environment on reinforced concrete durability in Iberoamerican countries: DURACON project/CYTED, Corrosion Science 49: 2832-2843.



**THE UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE**  
**SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING**  
**CIVIL, SURVEYING AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING**  
**RESEARCH REPORTS**

This report is one of a continuing series of Research Reports published by Civil, Surveying and Environmental Engineering at the University of Newcastle. An abridged list of recently published titles in this series is provided below. Requests for a more detailed list and/or copies of other reports should be addressed to:

The Secretary  
Civil, Surveying and Environmental Engineering  
The University of Newcastle  
University Drive  
CALLAGHAN NSW 2308

Telephone: (02) 4921 6058  
Facsimile : (02) 4921 6991

| REPORT NO.  | ISBN NO.          | TITLE AND AUTHOR                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 264.02.2008 | 9781 9207 01 94 9 | A Variational Theory Of Plasticity For Frictional Materials<br>K. Krabbenhoft                                                                                     |
| 265.04.2008 | 9781 9207 01 96 3 | Assessing The Costs And Benefits Of United States Homeland Security Spending<br>M.G. Stewart and J. Mueller                                                       |
| 266.04.2008 | 9781 9207 01 97 0 | Assessing The Risks, Costs And Benefits Of Australian Aviation Security Measures<br>M.G. Stewart and J. Mueller                                                   |
| 267.04.2008 | 9781 9207 01 98 7 | Assessing The Risks, Costs And Benefits Of United States Aviation Security Measures<br>M.G. Stewart and J. Mueller                                                |
| 268.08.2008 | 9781 9207 01 99 4 | Structural Reliability Analysis Of Reinforced Grouted Concrete Block Masonry Walls In Compression Designed To Chinese Code GB 50003<br>X.M. Zhai and M.G. Stewart |
| 269.11.2008 | 9780 9805 0354 8  | Reinforcement Corrosion Initiation and Activation Times In Concrete Structures Exposed To Severe Marine Environments<br>R.E. Melchers and C.Q. Li                 |

