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#### Abstract

RCC Silos are used by a wide range of industries to store bulk solids in quantities ranging from a few tones to hundreds or thousands of tones. The term silo includes all forms of particulate solids storage structure that might otherwise be referred to as a bin, hopper, grain tank or bunker. Silos are very demanding in cement industries. Hence RCC silos are widely used for storage of granular materials as they are an ideal structural material for the building of permanent bulk-storage facilities for dry granular like fillings. Initially concrete storage units are economical in design and reasonable in cost. Concrete can offer the protection to the stored materials, requires little maintenance, is aesthetically pleasing, and is relatively free of certain structural hazards such as buckling or denting. In order to study the most economical configuration of silos to store a given volume of a material, twenty eight samples of silos have been designed by changing the ratio of height to diameter for storing a given material, namely, bituminous coal. In this investigation, for volume of $125 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, the diameter to height ratio is varied and has been designed and finally, the most economical size is found out. This method is carried out for volume of $125 \mathbf{m}^{3}$. All the designs have been based on the recommendations of I.S 4995-1974 (part 1\&2) "Criteria For Design Of Reinforced Concrete Bins For The Storage Of Granular And Powdery Materials" and I.S 456-2000 codes. Based on these designs, those dimensions of silos which will lead to least amount of concrete, steel and total cost to store a given amount of material have been found out. These findings will be useful for the designers of silos.


## I. INTRODUCTION

Silo has been used to store bulk solids (such as cement, coal, bitumen, etc) in industries. The quantity may range from few tones to over one hundred thousand tones. Shallow bins are usually called as bunkers and deep bins are usually called as silos. If the plane of rupture of material stored meets the top horizontal surface. The common name for silos is bins. The bins are used to store large quantities of materials like grains, coals etc. R.C.C. bins are preferred to steel bins, since maintenance cost of R.C.C. bins is less. The bunkers may be termed as shallow bins and silos as deep bins. Silos may be circular or rectangular in shape. The bins are always provided with hopper bottoms. The slope of hopper bottoms with horizontal is kept more than angle of friction between the grain stored and concrete so that when bottom door is opened the material starts rolling down on its own weight. The bins are supported on a number of columns spaced at regular intervals. The distance between two adjacent columns and the height of the columns should be sufficient for a truck to pass, so that they can be directly loaded with the material stored when hopper bottom is opened. The various part of the silos to be designed are vertical cylindrical walls, hopper bottom and edge beams.

## II. OBJECTIVES

A. To analyse, design and optimize a silo for storage of coal.
B. To carry out cost calculation and identify the optimised silo for construction.
C. To develop an excel program to optimize silos for storing coal.
$D$. The main objective is to identify the most economical size of silo to store for a given volume of material.

## III. METHODOLOGY

A formula sheet has been developed for the design of silo. All the designs have been based on the recommendations of I.S. 49951974 and I.S. 456-2000 codes. Estimation of cost of silos are done.

## IV. IS GUIDELINES \& PROBLEM DEFINITION

All the designs have been based on the recommendations of IS 4995-1974 (Part $1 \& 2$ ) "Criteria for design of reinforced concrete bins for the storage of granular and powdery materials" and IS 456-2000 code.
Various dimensions of silos are chosen as per volume requirement and are designed. Steel quantity is found out from "Bar bending schedule" and concrete quantity is also found out separately. The total cost is then calculated to obtain economical dimension.
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## v. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

Dimensions and layout of the bins, etc shall be so arrived as to effect optimum economies, the details of which are given below. In addition, the material handling facilities shall also be considered.
DIMENSIONS - Volume of each bin and height to diameter ratio shall be governed by its storage and functional requirements of materials. To achieve a reduction in lateral pressure over a larger height, it may be preferable to select a height/diameter ratio greater than or equal to two.

LAYOUT - Storage bins may be either free standing individual bins or arranged in the form of batteries of free standing bins or bins interconnected in one or both the directions.
A. Volume of Silos

Weight of coal considered $=\quad 100$ tonnes
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Density of coal } & = & 8 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{3} \\ \text { Volume of coal } & = & 125 \mathrm{~m}^{3}\end{array}$
TABLE 1
VOLUME OF SILOS

| Height of <br> cylindrical <br> portion $(\mathrm{m})$ | Top dia. <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ | Height of <br> Frustrum <br> cone $(\mathrm{m})$ | Bottom dia. <br> of hopper <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ | Volume of <br> cylindrical <br> portion $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Volume of <br> frustrum <br> cone $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Total volume <br> $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Structure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19.90 | 2.80 | 1.15 | 0.5 | 122.535 | 2.857 | 125.392 | SILO |
| 19.20 | 2.85 | 1.18 | 0.5 | 122.484 | 3.014 | 125.498 | SILO |
| 18.50 | 2.90 | 1.20 | 0.5 | 122.196 | 3.176 | 125.372 | SILO |
| 17.80 | 2.95 | 1.23 | 0.5 | 121.662 | 3.344 | 125.006 | SILO |
| 17.20 | 3.00 | 1.25 | 0.5 | 121.580 | 3.518 | 125.098 | SILO |
| 16.70 | 3.05 | 1.28 | 0.5 | 122.013 | 3.698 | 125.711 | SILO |
| 16.10 | 3.10 | 1.30 | 0.5 | 121.518 | 3.883 | 125.401 | SILO |
| 15.60 | 3.15 | 1.33 | 0.5 | 121.573 | 4.075 | 125.648 | SILO |
| 15.10 | 3.20 | 1.35 | 0.5 | 121.441 | 4.273 | 125.714 | SILO |
| 14.60 | 3.25 | 1.38 | 0.5 | 121.118 | 4.477 | 125.595 | SILO |
| 14.10 | 3.30 | 1.40 | 0.5 | 120.597 | 4.688 | 125.285 | SILO |
| 13.70 | 3.35 | 1.43 | 0.5 | 120.754 | 4.905 | 125.658 | SILO |
| 13.25 | 3.40 | 1.45 | 0.5 | 120.299 | 5.129 | 125.428 | SILO |
| 12.80 | 3.45 | 1.48 | 0.5 | 119.657 | 5.359 | 125.016 | SILO |
| 12.50 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 0.5 | 120.264 | 5.596 | 125.860 | SILO |
| 12.10 | 3.55 | 1.53 | 0.5 | 119.766 | 5.840 | 125.606 | SILO |
| 11.70 | 3.60 | 1.55 | 0.5 | 119.091 | 6.091 | 125.182 | SILO |
| 11.40 | 3.65 | 1.58 | 0.5 | 119.284 | 6.349 | 125.632 | SILO |
| 11.10 | 3.70 | 1.60 | 0.5 | 119.348 | 6.614 | 125.962 | SILO |
| 10.70 | 3.75 | 1.63 | 0.5 | 118.178 | 6.887 | 125.064 | SILO |
| 10.40 | 3.80 | 1.65 | 0.5 | 117.948 | 7.166 | 125.114 | SILO |
| 10.10 | 3.85 | 1.68 | 0.5 | 117.580 | 7.454 | 125.033 | SILO |
| 9.60 | 3.95 | 1.73 | 0.5 | 117.640 | 8.051 | 125.691 | SILO |
| 9.30 | 4.00 | 1.75 | 0.5 | 116.867 | 8.361 | 125.228 | SILO |
| 9.10 | 4.05 | 1.78 | 0.5 | 117.231 | 8.679 | 125.910 | SILO |


| 8.80 | 4.10 | 1.80 | 0.5 | 116.182 | 9.005 | 125.188 | SILO |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8.60 | 4.15 | 1.83 | 0.5 | 116.328 | 9.339 | 125.668 | SILO |
| 8.35 | 4.20 | 1.85 | 0.5 | 115.684 | 9.682 | 125.366 | SILO |

## VI. DESIGN EXAMPLE

A. Data

Diameter of $\operatorname{silo(D)}=4.2 \mathrm{~m}$
Height of cylindrical portion $=8.35 \mathrm{~m}$
Depth of hopper bottom $=1.85 \mathrm{~m}$
Diameter of opening $=0.5 \mathrm{~m}$
Density of coal $(\mathrm{w})=8 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$
Density of RCC $\left(D_{c}\right)=25 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$
The ratio of horizontal to vertical pressure intensity $\left(\mu^{\prime}\right)=0.6$
Angle of repose ( $\varnothing$ ) $=35^{\circ}$
Typical of reinforcement $=415$ HYSD bars
Grade of concrete $=$ M20
Wall thickness provided $=120 \mathrm{~mm}$
B. Characteristic strength
$\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{ck}}=20 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$
fy $=415 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}$
$\mathrm{m}=$ modular ratio $=13$

## C. Design of cylindrical walls

Using Janssen's Theory:
Horizontal Pressure $\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)=\frac{w R}{\mu^{i}} \times\left(1-\exp { }^{\left(\frac{-\mu^{\prime} n \mathrm{R}}{R}\right)}\right)$
Where,
$\mathrm{n}=0.271$
$\mathrm{R}=1.050$

| Depth from top, $\mathrm{h}(\mathrm{m})$ | Horizontal pressure, $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{h}}\left(\mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 7.546 |
| 8.35 | 10.159 |
| 10.2 | 11.116 |

Hoop tension in cylindrical wall per mtr height $\left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)=0.5 \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{D}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =0.5 \times 11.116 \times 4.2 \\
& =23.343 \mathrm{KN}
\end{aligned}
$$

Design ultimate hoop tension $=1.5 \times \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1.5 \times 23.343 \\
& =35.015 \mathrm{KN}
\end{aligned}
$$

Area of hoop reinforcement $\left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}\right)=\frac{\mathrm{Ft} x 1000}{0.87 x f_{y}}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{23.343 \times 1000}{0.37 \times 415} \\
& =96.98 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$
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But,
$\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}$ minimum $=0.12 \% \mathrm{bD}$

$$
=\frac{0.12 \times 1000 \times 0.12}{100}=144 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}
$$

Use 8 mm hoops at 300 mm centre to centre $\left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}=\mathrm{A}_{\text {st }}\right.$ minimum $)$

$$
\text { Thus, } \begin{aligned}
\mathrm{A}_{\text {st }} \text { provided } & =\frac{a_{\text {st }} x 1000}{\text { Spacing }} \\
& =\frac{50.26 x 1000}{300} \\
& =167.552 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Assuming 120 mm thick cylindrical walls, the tensile stresses developed in concrete under working hoop tension should be limited to the values specified in clause: B- 2.1.1 of I.S. 456-2000.
Tensile stress in concrete $=\frac{F_{t}}{A_{c}+m x A_{s t}}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{23.343}{(120 \times 1000)+13 \times 167.552} \\
& =0.191<\sigma_{\mathrm{cbc}}=2.8 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{mm}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Design of vertical reinforcement:
$\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}$ minimum $=0.12 \% \mathrm{bD}$

$$
=\frac{0.12 \times 1000 \times 0.12}{100}=144 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}
$$

Use 8 mm hoops at 300 mm centre to centre $\left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}=\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}\right.$ minimum $)$
D. Design of hopper bottom

Provide a sloping slab of 120 mm thick with 30 mm lining.
Total thickness $=120+30$

$$
=150 \mathrm{~mm}
$$

Surcahrge load on hopper bottom per meter $=\left[\right.$ wh- $\left.\frac{A P h \mu^{*}}{D}\right]$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\left[8 x 8.35-\frac{4 \times 10.159 \times 0.6}{4.2}\right] \\
& =60.995 \mathrm{KN}
\end{aligned}
$$

Weight of sloping bottom
$=\left(\pi x \frac{\left(D_{1}+D_{2}\right)}{2}+\right.$ total wall thickness $\left.x \sqrt{2}\right)$ xtotal wall thickness $x \sqrt{2} x D_{c}$
$=\left(3.1415 x \frac{(4.2+0.5)}{2}+0.15 x \sqrt{2}\right) \times 0.15 \times \sqrt{2} \times 25$
$=42.68 \mathrm{KN}$
Total load $=60.995+42.680$

$$
=103.675 \mathrm{KN}
$$

Factored load $=1.5 \times 130.675$

$$
=155.513 \mathrm{KN}
$$

Mean diameter at centre of sloping slab $=\frac{\left(D_{1}+D_{2}\right)}{2}$

$$
=\frac{(4.2+0 . \mathrm{E})}{2}=2.35 \mathrm{~m}
$$

$\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{u}}=$ Ultimate tension per meter run $=\frac{1.5 \times 103.675}{\pi x 2.35} x \operatorname{Cosec} 45^{\circ}=19.857 \mathrm{KN}$
Reinforcement for direct tension $=\frac{\operatorname{Fr} x 1000}{0 . e 7 x f_{y}}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{19.857 \times 1000}{0.87 \times 415} \\
& =54.997 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$
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$\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}$ minimum $=0.12 \% \mathrm{bD}$

$$
=\frac{0.12 \times 1000 \times 0.12}{100}=144 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}
$$

Use 8 mm hoops at 300 mm centre to centre $\left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}=\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}\right.$ minimum $)$

Surcharge pressure on hopper bottom $=\frac{5 u r c h a r g e ~ l o a d ~ o n ~ h o p p e r ~ b o t t o m ~}{\pi x D^{2}}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{60.995}{3.1415 x 4.2^{2}} \\
& =1.101 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Maximum horizontal pressure $\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)=11.11 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$
Normal pressure intensity, $\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)=1.35 \times \operatorname{Cos}^{2} \theta+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{h}} \operatorname{Sin}^{2} \theta$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1.35 \times \operatorname{Cos}^{2} 45^{\circ}+11.116 \times \operatorname{Sin}^{2} 45^{\circ} \\
& =6.108 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Normal Component due to self weight of sloping slab $=$ total wall thickness $\times D_{c} \times \operatorname{Cos} \theta$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =0.15 \times 25 \times \operatorname{Cos} 45^{\circ} \\
& =2.651 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Total normal Pressure $(P)=P_{n}+$ total wall thickness $\times D_{c} \times \operatorname{Cos} \theta$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =6.108+2.651 \\
& =8.760 \mathrm{KN} / \mathrm{m}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Mean dia. of sloping slab $=\frac{\left(D_{2}+D_{2}\right)}{2}+$ total wall thickreess $x \sqrt{2}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{(4.2+0.5)}{2}+1.5 \times \sqrt{2} \\
& =2.562 \mathrm{~m}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hoop tension per meter $=0.5 \times P \times$ Mean dia .

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =0.5 \times 8.760 \times 2.562 \\
& =11.221 \mathrm{KN}
\end{aligned}
$$

Ultimate hoop tension per meter $=1.5 \times 11.221$

$$
=16.832 \mathrm{KN}
$$

Area of hoop reinforcement $\left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}\right)=\frac{16.032 \times 1000}{0.87 \times f_{y}}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{16.332 \times 1000}{0.87 \times 415} \\
& =46.620 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mathrm{A}_{\text {st }}$ minimum $=0.12 \% \mathrm{bD}$

$$
=\frac{0.12 \times 1000 \times 0.12}{100}=144 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}
$$

Use 8 mm hoops at 300 mm centre to centre $\left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}=\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{st}}\right.$ minimum $)$

## E. Edge Beam

At the junction of cylindrical wall and hopper bottom at the top of silo, edge beam of size $\mathbf{3 0 0} \mathbf{m m} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{3 0 0} \mathbf{m m}$ with 4 bars of 12 mm diameter are provided to increase the rigidity of the structure.
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F. Bar Bending Schedule

TABLE 2
BAR BENDING SCHEDULE

| Bar Mark | Shape of bar | No. of <br> Bars <br> (No's) | Dia. of <br> Bar <br> $(\mathrm{mm})$ | Length of <br> bar <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ | Unit weight of bar <br> $(\mathrm{Kg} / \mathrm{m})$ | Total <br> Weight <br> $(\mathrm{Kg})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Vertical | 46 | 8 | 8.300 | 0.395 | 150.835 |
| B | Circular | 29 | 8 | 13.934 | 0.395 | 159.640 |
| EB | Circular | 4 | 12 | 14.437 | 0.889 | 102.661 |
| C | Sloping | 48 | 8 | 2.666 | 0.395 | 50.561 |
| D1 | Sloping <br> circular | 1 | 8 | 14.123 | 0.395 | 5.579 |
| D2 | " | 1 | 8 | 11.810 | 0.395 | 4.666 |
| D3 | " | 1 | 8 | 9.925 | 0.395 | 3.921 |
| D4 | $"$ | 1 | 8 | 8.040 | 0.395 | 3.176 |
| D5 | " | 1 | 8 | 6.155 | 0.395 | 2.432 |
| D6 | " | 1 | 8 | 4.270 | 0.395 | 1.687 |
| D7 | " | 1 | 8 | 2.385 | 0.395 | 0.942 |
| E | Circular | 4 | 12 | 2.513 | 0.889 | 8.936 |
| Stirrups in EB | Square | 46 | 10 | 1.600 | 0.617 | 45.432 |
| Stirrups in E | Square | 7 | 10 | 1.600 | 0.617 | 6.914 |
| Total |  |  |  | 98.558 |  | 592.814 |
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Fig. 2 Cross section of RCC silo
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G. Cost comparison of R.C.C. Silo with various H/D ratio

TABLE 3
ABSTRACT SHEET WITH H/D RATIO

| Height of Cylindrical Portion (m) | Top dia. of Cylindrical Portion (m) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D} \\ & \text { ratio } \end{aligned}$ | Volume of concrete $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Rate <br> per <br> Unit | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ (\text { INR }) \end{gathered}$ | Weight of Steel (Kg) | Rate <br> per <br> unit | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost } \\ & \text { (INR) } \end{aligned}$ | Total Cost (INR) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19.90 | 2.80 | 7.11 | 22.756 | 6000 | 136536.00 | 680.689 | 40 | 27227.56 | 163763.56 |
| 19.20 | 2.85 | 6.74 | 22.378 | 6000 | 134268.00 | 676.288 | 40 | 27051.52 | 161319.52 |
| 18.50 | 2.90 | 6.38 | 21.974 | 6000 | 131844.00 | 668.305 | 40 | 26732.20 | 158576.20 |
| 17.80 | 2.95 | 6.03 | 21.544 | 6000 | 129264.00 | 664.435 | 40 | 26577.40 | 155841.40 |
| 17.20 | 3.00 | 5.73 | 21.206 | 6000 | 127236.00 | 657.025 | 40 | 26281.00 | 153517.00 |
| 16.70 | 3.05 | 5.48 | 20.965 | 6000 | 125790.00 | 655.300 | 40 | 26212.00 | 152002.00 |
| 16.10 | 3.10 | 5.19 | 20.585 | 6000 | 123510.00 | 646.466 | 40 | 25858.64 | 149368.64 |
| 15.60 | 3.15 | 4.95 | 20.305 | 6000 | 121830.00 | 643.655 | 40 | 25746.20 | 147576.20 |
| 15.10 | 3.20 | 4.72 | 20.008 | 6000 | 120048.00 | 639.748 | 40 | 25589.92 | 145637.92 |
| 14.60 | 3.25 | 4.49 | 19.691 | 6000 | 118146.00 | 635.952 | 40 | 25438.08 | 143584.08 |
| 14.10 | 3.30 | 4.27 | 19.357 | 6000 | 116142.00 | 627.163 | 40 | 25086.52 | 141228.52 |
| 13.70 | 3.35 | 4.09 | 19.135 | 6000 | 114810.00 | 610.175 | 40 | 24407.00 | 139217.00 |
| 13.25 | 3.40 | 3.90 | 18.832 | 6000 | 112992.00 | 624.068 | 40 | 24962.72 | 137954.72 |
| 12.80 | 3.45 | 3.71 | 18.513 | 6000 | 111078.00 | 619.123 | 40 | 24764.92 | 135842.92 |
| 12.50 | 3.50 | 3.57 | 18.382 | 6000 | 110292.00 | 616.799 | 40 | 24671.96 | 134963.96 |
| 12.10 | 3.55 | 3.41 | 18.102 | 6000 | 108612.00 | 616.507 | 40 | 24660.28 | 133272.28 |
| 11.70 | 3.60 | 3.25 | 17.807 | 6000 | 106842.00 | 607.529 | 40 | 24301.16 | 131143.16 |
| 11.40 | 3.65 | 3.12 | 17.64 | 6000 | 105840.00 | 608.074 | 40 | 24322.96 | 130162.96 |
| 11.10 | 3.70 | 3.00 | 17.462 | 6000 | 104772.00 | 604.983 | 40 | 24199.32 | 128971.32 |
| 10.70 | 3.75 | 2.85 | 17.127 | 6000 | 102762.00 | 603.347 | 40 | 24133.88 | 126895.88 |
| 10.40 | 3.80 | 2.74 | 16.926 | 6000 | 101556.00 | 603.991 | 40 | 24159.64 | 125715.64 |
| 10.10 | 3.85 | 2.62 | 16.714 | 6000 | 100284.00 | 599.284 | 40 | 23971.36 | 124255.36 |
| 9.60 | 3.95 | 2.43 | 16.41 | 6000 | 98460.00 | 597.982 | 40 | 23919.28 | 122379.28 |
| 9.30 | 4.00 | 2.33 | 16.167 | 6000 | 97002.00 | 595.511 | 40 | 23820.44 | 120822.44 |
| 9.10 | 4.05 | 2.25 | 16.071 | 6000 | 96426.00 | 599.187 | 40 | 23967.48 | 120393.48 |
| 8.80 | 4.10 | 2.15 | 15.808 | 6000 | 94848.00 | 597.253 | 40 | 23890.12 | 118738.12 |
| 8.60 | 4.15 | 2.07 | 15.696 | 6000 | 94176.00 | 594.361 | 40 | 23774.44 | 117950.44 |
| 8.35 | 4.20 | 1.99 | 15.495 | 6000 | 92970.00 | 592.812 | 40 | 23712.48 | 116682.48 |
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X-axis: H/D ratio
Y-axis: Total cost in INR
Fig. 1 Cost comparison of R.C.C. Silo with various H/D ratio
In the above graph, $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ ratio and Total cost in INR are taken in x and y axis respectively. The most economical silo has been found to the dimension of height: 8.35 m . and diameter: 4.2 m . The total cost required for economical silo is Rs. 116682.48 and for uneconomical one is Rs. 163763.56. It is found that the requirement of cost for construction of silo is directly proportional to height and inversely proportional to that of diameter.

## VII.CONCLUSION

From the above graph it is concluded that for storing bituminous coal for $100 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ volume, the $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ ratio of 1.99 is found to be most economical. As the ratio of $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ increases the total cost of construction of the storage structure also increases. It is concluded that, increasing diameter facilitates the high cost and vice versa and increasing the height of silo, the cost can be reduced.
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