

Optimizing Laboratory Mixture Design as it Relates to Field Compaction in Order to Improve Hot Mix Asphalt Durability

SPR-3624

Rebecca McDaniel

John Haddock

APAI Board Meeting

October 20, 2011

Background

- ▶ Indiana pavements generally reach end of life because of durability issues
 - ▶ Typically cracking caused in part by oxidized binder
 - ▶ Rutting has been significantly reduced
- ▶ Reducing permeability (to air) decreases rate of binder aging
- ▶ Mixes designed at 4% air voids can be placed in the field at lower densities, in some cases with air voids > 9%
- ▶ Above 8% air voids, permeability increases dramatically

Concept

- ▶ Achieving lower air void contents in the field would improve durability by decreasing binder aging.
- ▶ Requires changing the mix design.
- ▶ If we target higher voids in mix design, the designed mix will be somewhat easier to compact in lab and field.
- ▶ Important to keep effective binder content the same for durability.
- ▶ Design at 5% and compact to 5% – then keep the voids at that level (reduce traffic densification).

Objective

- ▶ Optimize HMA lab mix design compaction as it relates to field compaction in order to increase in-place durability without sacrificing rutting resistance.
- ▶ Additional compaction equipment should not be needed in the field but roller patterns (including speed, frequency and number of passes) may vary.

Precedent

- ▶ Laboratoire Central des Ponts et Chaussées (LCPC)
 - ▶ Developed in 1960s-1970s
 - ▶ Design and construct to ultimate density; no post construction densification
 - ▶ Design compaction selected to match construction densities under pneumatic tired roller
 - ▶ Gyratory compaction similar to Superpave gyratory
 - ▶ Design effective binder content fixed for each mix type; select aggregate structure to provide desired air voids (range 4-8%)
 - ▶ Field density requirement = 95% (lifts generally thicker than US)
 - ▶ Little to no additional compaction under traffic

Precedent

- ▶ Ministère de Transports de Québec (MTQ)
 - ▶ Wanted to implement LCPC method but compactors were hard to get and \$\$\$
 - ▶ Merged LCPC with Superpave gyratory
 - ▶ Effective binder volume fixed as in LCPC
 - ▶ Field density requirement = 92% (similar lift thicknesses to US)

Approach

- ▶ Start with some example current mix designs
 - ▶ 9.5 and 19 mm
 - ▶ Category 3 and 4 (~50% of INDOT work)
 - ▶ Dolomite, limestone and blast furnace slag with PG 64-22
 - ▶ RAP and RAS included (to be realistic)
- ▶ Adjust gradation to achieve 5% voids at different gyrations
 - ▶ 100 gyration mixes will be adjusted and compacted at 70, 50 and 30 gyrations
 - ▶ Bailey method will be used to guide adjustments
 - ▶ Maintain air voids, VMA and binder content in 5% void mixes

Approach (continued)

- ▶ **Test mechanical properties of the mixes**
 - ▶ Want to achieve the same (or better) mechanical properties in the lower air void mixes as the original mix provided
 - ▶ Do not sacrifice rutting resistance for higher density
 - ▶ Tests will include flow number and dynamic modulus
 - ▶ Test 100 gyration mix at 7% and others at 5% air voids
 - ▶ Determine number of gyrations to achieve 5% air voids and similar (or better) mechanical properties

- ▶ **Field Validation**
 - ▶ Can we achieve higher densities with revised mix design?

Deliverables

- ▶ Revised lab compaction and mix design procedure
- ▶ Field validation plan
- ▶ Draft revised test methods
- ▶ Draft special provisions
- ▶ Training (for implementation phase)

Time Frame

- ▶ INDOT wants trial project ***next season***
- ▶ Need enough data to make recommendations before summer
 - ▶ Have materials and are “shaking rocks” now
- ▶ Final report will follow
- ▶ 18 month project (7/1/2011 – 12/31/2012)



Study Advisory Committee

- ▶ Gerry Huber
- ▶ Dave Andrews
- ▶ Michael Prather
- ▶ Kurt Sommer
- ▶ Tommy Nantung
- ▶ Tom Duncan

Advisors

- ▶ Gerry Huber
- ▶ Brad Crucea
- ▶ Bill Pine

- ▶ Meeting frequently to develop plans, choose mixes and materials, adjust designs, etc.

Anticipated Implementation

- ▶ Implementation first on several trial projects
- ▶ If favorable, wider implementation possible
- ▶ No new equipment or increases in testing/design time
- ▶ Minimal training needed
- ▶ Minimal costs for implementation

Anticipated Benefits

- ▶ Potential 2-3 years of increased service life
- ▶ Potential savings of \$20-30 million a year
 - ▶ Based on \$300 million HMA rehab budget and that 50% of the HMA pavements reaching end of life do so because of durability problems



Plug

- ▶ North Central Asphalt User Producer Group Technical Conference
- ▶ Downtown Indianapolis
- ▶ February 15-16 (1st choice) or February 22-23 (2nd choice)
- ▶ NCSC Steering Committee and NCAUPG Management Committee meetings on preceding afternoon

- ▶ Details will be on the web -- Link from NCSC page or <http://cobweb.ecn.purdue.edu/~spave/NCAUPG/Index.html>

NCAUPG Topics

- ▶ **Energy/Recycling/Sustainability**
 - ▶ RAP, RAS and WMA
- ▶ **Binders**
 - ▶ MSCR Test, Mixing and Compaction Temperatures
- ▶ **Plant Operations and Innovations**
 - ▶ Plant Innovations, QC, Continuous Plant Monitoring
- ▶ **Pavement Design and Performance**
 - ▶ MEPDG, Cold Temperature Study
- ▶ **Constructing Safe and Durable Pavements**
 - ▶ Intelligent Compaction and PavelR, Safety Edge, Centerline Corrugations, etc.

Questions?

Rebecca S. McDaniel

Technical Director

North Central Superpave Center

Purdue University

West Lafayette, IN

765/463-2317 ext 226

rsmcdani@purdue.edu

<https://engineering.purdue.edu/NCSC>

