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ABSTRACT - According to various research papers, it has been found that replacement of natural sand and aggregate by using artificial sand and recycled aggregate at various proportion (5%, 10% etc.). In this paper the study of compressive and flexural strength of concrete by partial Replacement of artificial sand and recycled aggregate by using of crumb and shredded rubber.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Demolition of old and deteriorated building and traffic infrastructure and their substitution with new ones, is a frequent phenomenon today in most of the part of world. The main reason for this situation are changes of purpose, structural deterioration, rearrangement of city, expansion of traffic directions and increase of traffic load, natural disasters like earthquake, flood fire etc. As per Times of India, Dec 6, 2010 states that according to JNNURM report India generates 10-12 million tons of C&D waste annually. And 50% of it is Concrete and Masonry which is not recycled in India. The most common methods of disposing this material are land filling. In these way large amounts of construction waste is generated, consequently becoming a problem a special problem of human environment. For this similar reason in developing countries, laws have been bought into practice to restrict this waste in the form of prohibitions or special taxes existing for creating waste areas. To take care of the C&D waste in India Ministry of Environment and forests has mandated environmental clearance for all large construction projects. The figure 1.1 and figure 1.2 below shows the C&D Waste and Concrete Rebar which are the main source for recycled concrete aggregates.

Limitations: Hard to have permit, Lack of specification or guideline, Properties of Recycled aggregate.

1.2 SHREDDED RUBBER AND CRUMB RUBBER:

Crumb rubbers are obtained by grinding. Crumb rubber- 30 mesh is produced by passing rubber tires through a screen
with 30 holes per inch resulting in rubber granulate that is slightly less than 1/30th of an inch.

1.2.2 Shredded Rubber:

This fine grade reclaim rubber product is manufactured from whole tyre scrap. These are the used tires from passenger car used tyres, primary shred size of pieces from 30cm and below, the shred is the primary cut of used tires produced by elden primary chopper, container 40 ft load with 25 tons

Recycled waste tire rubber has been used in this study to replace the fine and coarse aggregate by weight using different percentages. The results of this paper shows that although, there was a significant reduction in the compressive strength of concrete utilizing waste tire rubber than normal concrete, concrete utilizing waste tire rubber demonstrated a ductile, plastic failure rather than brittle failure.

2.2 Malek K. batayneh, Iqbal marie, and Ibrahim Asi, ‘PROMOTING THE USE OF CRUMB RUBBER CONCRETE IN DEVELOPING COUNTRY’ Waste management, 28 (2008) 2171-2176/ www.sciencedirect.com The main objectives of this research were to provide more scientific evidence to support the use of legislation or incentive-based schemes to promote the reuse of accumulated waste tires. This research focused on using crumb tires as a replacement for a percentage of the local fine aggregates used in the concrete mixes in Jordan. Ravindra k.dhir & Kevin A. Paine ‘VALUE ADDED SUSTAINABLE USE OF RECYCLED & SECONDARY AGGREGATE INCONCRETE’, The Indian Concrete Journal, March 2010. This research is helping to create a gradual acceptance of recycled and secondary aggregate for their sustainable use in concrete and concrete product. There is significant potential for growth of recycled and secondary aggregate as an appropriate and green solution to the anticipated increased world-wide construction activity and with it the demand for RSA.

2.3 Gintautas SKRIPKIUNAS, Audrius GRINYS, Benjminas CERNIUS, ‘DEFORMATION PROPERTIES OF CONCRETE WITH RUBBER WASTE ADITIVES’ ISSN 1392-1320 Material Science (medziagotyra), vol. 13, No. 3, 2007 The aim of investigation was to study the deformation properties of Portland cement concrete with rubber waste additive. Concrete mixtures with the same compressive strength as concrete without this additive were tested. Used tires rubber wastes were crumbed into fraction 0/1. The rubber additive was used as fine aggregate replacement in concrete mixtures by 3.2 % of aggregates mass.

2.4 A. Mohd Mustafa Al Bakri, S. A. Syed Nuzul Fadli, M. D. Abu Bakar and K. W Leong, ‘COMPARISON OF RUBBER AS AGGREGATE AND AS FILLER IN CONCRETE’, 1st International Conference on Sustainable Material 2007, lCosM 2007, 9-11 June 2007, Penang. An experiment will carry out to determine the strength of early age concrete with rubber waste coarse aggregate to compare with the rubber waste as filler in concrete (with crushed stone coarse aggregate and sand fine aggregate).This research will carry out 2 difference
type of concrete which are rubberized concrete and rubber filler in concrete. In rubberized concrete, rubbers were used to replace coarse aggregates and river sand as fine aggregate. Furthermore, in rubber filler in concrete, crushed stone was used as coarse aggregate and river sand as fine aggregate. Coarse aggregate usually gravel or crushed stone and shredded rubber as filler in concrete.

2.5 F. A. Aisien, F.K. Hymore and R.O. Ebewele, ‘APPLICATION OF GROUND SCRAP TYRE RUBBER IN ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT’, Indian journal of engineering and material sciences, vol.-13, August 2006, appl. 333-338. A laboratory scale evaluation of the feasibility of using ground rubber from scrap tyres in dry process hot-mix asphalt concrete used for road pavement was investigated. The result from the study show that the rubberized asphalt concrete mix has much better mechanical properties that the conventional one. The mechanical properties of rubberized specimens cured in air and those soaked in water were not significantly different.

III. METHODOLOGY.
The methodology for the project work depends on the objectives. This project work which has an objective of achieving M25 grade of concrete with maximum utilization of tyre rubber as aggregate and artificial sand in concrete contains extensive experimental work.

3.1 WORKING METHODOLOGY
THE PROJECT WORK WAS CARRIED OUT IN FOLLOWING PHASES

3.1.1 PHASE I:-Determination of basic properties of available materials
To know the basic properties of available materials. (This exercise was done to have a base to compare the respective properties of conventional materials, and alternative materials.) Establishing all the Physical and Mechanical properties of Artificial Sand or Machine made sand Shredded rubber.

Various tests carried out:-
To determine the Physical Properties of Aggregates & Rubber The following tests were carried on materials
i. Specific Gravity of Aggregate
ii. Determination of bulk density.
iii. Fineness modulus and particle size analysis of Aggregate
iv. Surface moisture content in fine aggregate
v. Specific gravity and water absorption of Aggregate.

3.1.2 PHASE II:-Actual Experimentation with mix design & casting
With reference to the above properties various mixes mentioned below were designed with an aim in achieving M25 grade concrete, Tests performed on concrete:

1. Fresh Concrete:
   i. Slump test for workability.
2. Hardened Concrete:
   i. Compressive Strength of blocks
   ii. Flexural strength

Concrete Mixes:
Mix design will be done using IS 10262:2009, with M25 grade of concrete. (Assumptions of suitable w/c ratio have to be done.)

1) Mix 1: M25 grade of concrete with recycled aggregate-Control mix
2) Mix 2: M25 grade of concrete with 2% replacement of artificial sand with crumb rubber.
3) Mix 3: M25 grade of concrete with 4% replacement of artificial sand with crumb rubber.
4) Mix 4: M25 grade of concrete with 6% replacement of artificial sand with crumb rubber.
5) Mix 5: M25 grade of concrete with 8% replacement of artificial sand with crumb rubber.
6) Mix 6: M25 grade of concrete with 10% replacement of artificial sand with crumb rubber.
7) Mix 7: M25 grade of concrete with 2% replacement of coarse aggregate with shredded rubber.
8) Mix 8: M25 grade of concrete with 4% replacement of coarse aggregate with shredded rubber.
9) Mix 9: M25 grade of concrete with 6% replacement of coarse aggregate with shredded rubber.
10) Mix 10: M25 grade of concrete with 8% replacement of coarse aggregate with shredded rubber.
11) Mix 11: M25 grade of concrete with 10% replacement of coarse aggregate with shredded rubber.

COMPARISON

- Compare densities of all the mixes i.e. Mix 1 to 10 with Mix ‘A’
- Calculate increase or decrease in weight.
- Check behavior of failure i.e. brittle or ductile
- Compare compressive and flexural strengths of all mixes i.e. Mix 1 to 10 with Mix ‘A’
3.1.3 PHASE III:

To compare the results of each mix stated in Phase III and to determine the optimum percentage of replacement of Crumb Rubber and Shredded Rubber.

Casting of Cubes:

Size of each cube is 15x15x15cm³
Then Volume of each cube (3375cm³)
Considering 3 each set for 28 days respectively.
1. Concrete cubes with artificial sand and Recycled Aggregate
2. Concrete cubes with artificial sand and Shredded rubber,

Approximate no of blocks: - 33

Casting of Beams:

Each beam of size (10x10x50) cm³. With volume (5000cm³)
1. With recycled aggregates
2. with relevant replacement
3. with relevant replacement

Approximate no of beams – 33

TOTAL:

Total No. of cubes: 33
Total No. of Beams: 33

IV. CONCRETE MIX DESIGN:


DATA for MIX DESIGN:

1. Grade of concrete: M25
2. Cement: OPC 53 grade
3. Maximum size of aggregate: 20mm
4. Minimum cement content: 300 kg/m³
5. Maximum w/c ratio: 0.5
6. Workability of concrete: 75mm slump
7. Admixture: super plasticizer
8. Specific gravity of cement: 3.15
9. Specific gravity of conventional coarse aggregate: 2.89
10. Specific gravity of artificial sand: 2.89

STEP I - TARGET STRENGTH

\[ f_t = f_{ak} + k \cdot s \]
\[ = 25 + 1.65 \times 4 = 31.6 \text{ N/mm}^2 \]

Where, \( f_t \) = target mean compressive strength at 28 days,

\( f_{ak} \) = Characteristic compressive strength of concrete at 28 days,

\( k \) = usually 1.65 as per IS456-2000

\( s \) = standard deviation

STEP II - SELECTION OF WATER/CEMENT RATIO

Max. Water content = 186 liter for 25 to 50mm slump
for 20mm aggt. Water content for 100mm slump
\[ = 186 \left(\frac{6}{100}\right)186 = 197 \text{lit.} \]

STEP III - CEMENT CONTENT

\[ \frac{W}{C} \text{ ratio} = 0.55 \]
\[ \text{Cement content} = (197/0.55) = 358.18 \text{ Kg/m}^3 \]

\( \geq 300 \text{ Kg/m}^3 \quad \text{(O.K.)} \)

STEP IV - PROPORTION OF VOLUME OF CRUSHED AGGRT. AND FINE AGGRT

Volume of crushed aggt. = 0.60
For \( \frac{W}{C} \) ratio = 0.50

Therefore, for 0.55 \( \frac{W}{C} \) ratio volume of crushed aggt. = 0.59

Volume of fine aggt. = 1 - 0.59 = 0.41

STEP V - MIX CALCULATIONS

a) Volume of concrete = 1 m³
b) Volume of cement = \( \left(\frac{358.18}{3.15}\right) \times \left(\frac{1}{1000}\right) = 0.113 \text{ m}^3 \)
c) Volume of water = \( \left(\frac{197}{1}\right) \times \left(\frac{1}{1000}\right) = 0.197 \text{ m}^3 \)
d) Volume of all in aggt. = 1 - (0.197 + 0.113) = 0.690 m³

e) Mass of fine aggt.
\[ = 0.690 \times 0.41 \times 2.95 \times 1000 = 834.56 \text{ Kg/m}^3 \]
f) Mass of coarse aggt. = 0.690 x 0.59 x 2.22 x 1000 = 903.76 Kg/m³
4.2 MIX PROPORTIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER (Lit.)</th>
<th>CEMENT (Kg)</th>
<th>ARTIFICIAL SAND (Kg)</th>
<th>CRUSHED AGGREGATE (Kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>358.18</td>
<td>834.56</td>
<td>903.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. RESULT

Table and graph: FLEXURAL STRENGTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR.NO</th>
<th>% of replacement</th>
<th>Crumb rubber</th>
<th>Shredded rubber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Control mix</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table and chart: COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR.NO</th>
<th>% of replacement</th>
<th>Crumb rubber</th>
<th>Shredded rubber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Control mix</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>32.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. CONCLUSIONS

1. The test results show that the use of rubber aggregate in concrete mixes produces a significant reduction in concrete compressive strength which increases with increasing rubber aggregate content. However, if the amount of rubber in the concrete is limited (2% in the project), a normal strength concrete can still be produced.

2. Properties of shredded rubber as compared to the artificial fine aggregate or conventional coarse aggregate are not very encouraging. However an attempt to use them in concrete as percentage replacement can be done.

3. In the present study, slump is not obtained for the mix. A trend of buckling can also be viewed. However as contrast to the specifications given by IS 10262:2009, all the mixes were easy to work with. It was found that rubberized concrete mixes did not pose any difficulties in term of finishing, casting, or placement, and that a good quality finish can be achieved although additional effort is required to smooth the finish surface. However, increasing the rubber aggregate content reduces the workability of the mix.

4. A typical pattern of failure was also observed in blocks and beams wherein two separate halves were not seen as expected. The interlocking fibers of rubber could held the halves together & avoid flexural cracking. The results also showed an enhancement of concrete flexural strength which could be beneficial in some applications.

5. As seen in table and figures 6.6.1 to 6.6.4 increase in crumb rubber and shredded rubber content in the mix resulted in decrease in unit weight of mixtures. However despite in the decrease in the unit weight of the mix due to lower unit weight of the rubber, the unit weight remained within the acceptable range for the total aggregate volume.

6. The cost analysis shows that with 2 percentage replacements by crumb rubber increases the cost of concrete with 3.10% and by shredded rubber the percentage increase in cost is about 3.25%. From present study it is not feasible to go with such small percentage of replacement as it results in increment in cost of concrete. In future there may be wide scope for study with some chemicals and if possibly increase in strength will reduce the cost by higher percentage
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