

Client: DIAMOND GRID

Attention: Ben Kirkup

Your Reference: Purchase Order COD

Date: 3 September 2015

REPORT NO: 42151157-REV0

DIAMOND GRID SYSTEM – COMPRESSIVE STRENGHT ASSESSMENT OF THE SUPPLIED CONCRETE FILLED SAMPLE

 \mathcal{N}

Rebecca Newby *Civil Engineer*

Corporate Signatory

Assisting: Andrew Tamulevicius Engineering Technician

Supervising Consultant: Robert Bell Principal Civil Engineer

All work is subject to our standard terms and conditions, available on our ALS Global website via the following link; terms and conditions link.

ADDRESS 7 Brisbane Road (PO Box 6062), Riverview QLD 4303 Australia | PHONE +61 7 3816 5500 | FAX +61 7 3282 0118 ALS INDUSTRIAL PTY LTD ABN 21 006 353 046 Part of the ALS Laboratory Group An ALS Limited Company



Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Conclusions	4
3	Procedure	5
	3.1 Compressive Strength Testing	5
4	Results	8
2	1.1 Compressive Strength Testing	8
5	Discussion	9



1 INTRODUCTION

ALS was engaged by Ben Kirkup from Diamond Grid to undertake compressive strength testing on the supplied composite concrete and polypropylene surface stabiliser.

The trafficable composite area is used for various applications with various grid fill options. The supplied sample consists of an infill concrete matrix.

Various testing configurations were adopted during the testing process to understand the behaviour of the supplied material. The testing configurations consisted of the following:

- A single cell with polypropylene on each of the four sides, refer Error! Reference source not found.
- A sample with concrete exposed on all four sides, refer Figure 3
- Samples consisting of 4 cells with polypropylene on each of the four sides, refer Figure 4

This report shall detail the result from each of the compressive tests undertaken on the supplied sample.

The samples as supplied to ALS are provided below in Figure 1



Figure 1: Sheeting before infill is applied. Sheeting after concrete infill is applied (as supplied to ALS)

2 CONCLUSIONS

A summary of the testing results is provided below

- SAMPLE GROUP B: In the situation where the sample was cut so that the polypropylene was removed from the exterior testing surface, an average strength of the 16.38 MPa was recorded. <u>Refer</u> Figure 3
- SAMPLE GROUP A: A single cell with the polypropylene on all four edges recorded an average strength of 19.84 MPa. <u>Refer</u> Figure 2
- SAMPLE GROUP C: A configuration of 4 cells with polypropylene on all four edges recorded an average strength of 24.23 MPa. <u>Refer</u> Figure 4

The tests indicate that the larger configuration of the product with the concrete infill yielded the highest compressive strength. This is sample group C as may be seen in Figure 4

It is held that the most realistic in-situ representation of the DIAMOND GRID system is sample C which yielded an average of 24.23MPa.



3 **PROCEDURE**

3.1 Compressive Strength Testing

Two samples were supplied to the ALS office in form of 2 sheets of 0.4m by 0.6m. These were in filled with concrete as may be seen in Figure 1. The sheets were cut into sections to allow for compressive strength testing to be undertaken. Various configurations were tested during the process, these include:

- Single cell with polypropylene around the 4 edges sample reference group A
- Multi-cell cut so concrete was exposed on the edges sample reference group B
- Multi-cell (4) with polypropylene around the 4 edges sample reference group C

A total of three samples of each configuration were prepared to gain a measure as to the consistency of performance of the material under the varying configurations.

The configurations were chosen as it was not practically possible to test a full panel. The most realistic in-situ configuration is taken as where 4 cells are tested as shown in Figure 4.

The three sample configurations are shown below in **Error! Reference source not found.** to Figure 4



Figure 2: Testing configuration A – a single cell of the grid was extracted and the compression stress of the unit assessed.





Figure 3: Testing configuration B – The compression of an alternate configuration was cut from the sheet to encompass four cells not constrained about the perimeter.



Figure 4: Testing configuration c – The compression of an alternate configuration was cut from the sheet to encompass four cells that are constrained about the perimeter.



The samples were capped with sulphur to allow for uniform compression during crushing as shown in Figure 5 below.



Figure 5: Sulphur capped sample

The samples are then crushed in accordance with procedure as laid down AS1012.9:2014 to point of fracture with their fracture strength recorded. AS the samples were not to the dimensions and geometry as required in the standard, these should be read as nonstandard tests. The fracture point is converted into a compressive strength for the each of the specific samples. The results are presented within the results section of this report.



4 RESULTS

4.1 Compressive Strength Testing

The compressive strength test results have been provided in Table 1

Table 1: Determined compressive strengths (MPa)

Sample Reference	Sample description	Compressive strength (MPa)
A1	Single cell	17.03
A2	Single cell	17.62
A3	Single cell	24.88
B1	Sample without plastic on edges	18.87
B2	Sample without plastic on edges	15.17
B3	Sample without plastic on edges	15.10
C1	4 cells with plastic on edges	26.87
C2	4 cells with plastic on edges	24.10
С3	4 cells with plastic on edges	19.71
C4	4 cells with plastic on edges	26.24



5 DISCUSSION

The above results demonstrate a variable result based on the testing configuration.

In the testing scenario where the sample was cut so that the polypropylene was removed from the exterior testing surface (sample group B), an average strength of the 16.38 MPa was recorded.

A single cell with the polypropylene on all four edges (sample A) recorded an average strength of 19.84 MPa

A configuration of 4 cells with polypropylene on all four edges (sample C) recorded an average strength of 24.23 MPa.

The results indicate that it would be likely that an increased strength would be obtained if more cells were tested in a single configuration. It also indicates that when the polypropylene plastic remained about the perimeter of the sample as would be the case in-situ, the resultant strength increased.

Testing scenario B involved the removal of the polypropylene so that the concrete surfaces were exposed. This testing scenario is not realistic of the in-situ conditions for which the product would be used. This test allows for the developed understanding of the stress-strain relationship between the concrete and polypropylene interaction. The edges of the plastic confine the concrete allowing for a greater strength to be achieved than when the edges are unrestrained from movement. This tests also allows for the exclusion of the strength occurring simply from the concrete as this particular test group resulted in the lowest average compressive strength.



t: ond Grid ox 34 desert QLD 4285 desert QLD 4285 ils; of the samples s ampled : t purchase order: onditioning : :ct description : :ct description :	upplied to the . Supplied Di unknown COD none Diamond Gi (mm) 48.7 48.7	ALS offices amond Gi rid paveme Breadth (mm) 48.7 48.5	ant wearing mensions (mm) 44.3	g course 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	onfined (109/2015 kg/m ³ n/a	Compres: Notes: Condition Time days n/a	sion Stre 1. Density 2. Cap type 3. Compre: 5. Commer 6. NATA te 6. NATA te 7. Cap Type Type Type Type	ingth Test to AS 1012.12 R-rubber / C ssive strength t on factor to AS thy exception st undertaken) st undertaken Test Date 2/09/2015 2/09/2015	1 5-grind / P 0 AS 1012.14 for ALS by for ALS by for ALS by for ALS by for ALS by	-plaster / S-sulp -9 Cement Austra Uncorrected Strength MPa (note3) n/a	thur Lia Correction Factor (note 4)	ALS In 7 Brisba P.O.Box P.O.Box P.O.Box P.O.Box Telepho Fax: (07 Fax: (07 MPa (note4) 17.03 17.62	dustrial Ine Road, Riverview, QLD, 4303 6062, Riverview, QLD, 4303 Ine : (07) 3816 5500) 3282 0118) 3282 0118 Comments
ned on behalf of Al	48.8 77.1 58.8 94.5 94.6 94.6 94.6 14.6 94.6 ivil engineer &	49.4 58.0 94.7 94.5 84.3 84.3 team lead	45.1 44.8 46.5 46.5 46.4 46.4	n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a	л л а л л а л л а л л а л л а л л а	л/а л/а л/а л/а л/а л/а	νννννν	2/09/2015 2/09/2015 2/09/2015 2/09/2015 2/09/2015 2/09/2015 2/09/2015	n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a	л/а л/а л/а л/а л/а	n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a	24.88 15.17 15.10 26.87 26.24 26.24	