Update on NAPA/FHWA HMA Workshops

Rebecca S. McDaniel NCAUPG January 28, 2005

Regional Workshops

► NAPA and FHWA sponsored

- Meetings held with Northeast, Southeast, North Central and Rocky Mountain User Producer Groups
 - Rocky Mountain scheduled for April 2005.

Purpose

- ▶ Learn the state of the art in hot mix asphalt.
- ▶ What can we do better?
- ▶ What changes have been made?
- ► How have problems been addressed?
- ► How is Superpave implementation going?
- ► Ultimately, produce a best practices document for HMA and Superpave

Participants

- One representative of each state DOT in the region
- ► Two representatives of industry in each state typically contractors, some execs
- ► Guests welcome to share in exchange
- Dale Decker, Kent Hansen, Rebecca McDaniel, Dave Newcomb, John Bukowski, John D'Angelo

What Participants Hope to Gain

- ► Learn from others in their region
- **▶** Discuss common problems
- ► Synergy among states
- ▶ Work towards convergence
- ► Examine regional and national issues
- Achieve consistency
- ► Make better mixes

Topics Covered

- ► Materials
 - Aggregates
 - Binder
- ► Production and Field Issues
 - Construction
 - Trucking
 - QC/QA
- ► Mix Design

Issues/Comments from Northeast

- ► Many current issues not new to Superpave; seeing more because of renewed focus
- Aggregate processing, availability, variability, quarry balancing
- Superpave as a mix quality system, not just mix design system
- More attention on aggregates and volumetrics

- ▶ Durability is a concern more binder
- ► Tending towards finer mixes
- ► Mix design some have lowered, others are considering lowering, design air voids to get more binder (3.5%)
- Some permeability issues and longitudinal joint problems
- ► Need simple performance test to resolve some issues

- ► Half allow grade bumping
- ► Generally not accepting of "blind" specs
 - many specify type of modifier or usePG plus
- Tender mixes and delayed set with some binder grades

- ▶ Learned how to deal with Tender Zone (temps, rollers, patterns)
- ► Lift thicknesses 3:1 or 4:1
- QC field tech should run the job
- ► Communication is more important
- Know more about their mixes than ever before

Issues/Comments from Southeast

- ► Still a lot of Marshall mixes in some states
- Some issues with flat and elongated and fine aggregate angularity
- ► Resource availability/use of marginal or local materials is a concern
- Aggregate variability, QC
- ► Aggregate degradation and dust problems

- ► Almost every state is PG+
- Use mixing and compactions temps from supplier, usually
- ► General agreement that agitated vertical tanks are best for modified binders
- Extensive use of lime and antistrips
- ▶ Need to pay more attention to detail

- ▶ Use of RAP varies widely some using half what they used to, others using a lot, some fractionating, some states do not allow
- ► States generally disregarding Nini except as info for contractors
- ► Moisture in mix

- ► Have learned from early density/ permeability problems
- ► Many tools to deal with compaction issues
- ► Lift thicknesses critical
- ► Tarping and MTV help keep temp
- ▶ Train the paving crew
- ► Trial batches help fine tune designs

- ► Also concerned that mixes are too dry
- ► Also tending towards finer mixes
 - Permeability, durability, smoothness issues
- ► Some changes in gyration levels
- Some states have minimum binder contents
- Rutting improved, some raveling and cracking
- ► Know the product much better than before

The North Central

- ► Still some Marshall mixes in use, but Superpave is "standard"
- Aggregate variability is a concern variation in specific gravity, absorption within and between ledges
 - Big impact on VMA
- ▶ Use of more angular sands
- Agg supply can be a challenge in some areas

More from the North Central

- ► Flat and elongated not a big problem
- ► Most states are not using restricted zone except as a reference
 - Some never adopted RZ (ex. WI)
 - Some still using in some way (ex. MI, IL)
- About half the states have certified agg producers

- ► Why can't we do with hot mix what the Combined State Binder Group has done with binder?
- ► Too many binder grades in use
 - Up to ten grades in a state
 - Multiple grades on a project (more than 2-3)
 - Educate designers on use of grades
- Mixing and compaction temps vary

- Contractors have added bins, vertical storage tanks for binder
- Use of Superpave by locals, commercial work is growing
- RAP use is growing in general back to near previous usage with some changes
 - Reduced use in some states

- Contractors have scenarios to deal with compaction issues
 - Need to adjust rollers and patterns
 - Pneumatics, vibratories, steel wheel and oscillatory all have uses
 - Lift thicknesses important, range generally from 3:1 to 4:1

- Some states have adopted "new" AASHTO compaction levels, others use old
- Starting to implement PWL

- Overall, performance is improved
 - Ride, cracking, rutting improved
 - Some concern in some areas with durability

Overall Impressions So Far

- ► More attention to detail
- ► Focus on mixes draws attention to preexisting conditions
- Concerns about durability, aggregate availability in some areas
- Have largely learned how to deal with compaction, density and permeability issues

Overall Impressions

- We know more about our mixes and what affects them than ever before
- ▶ We still have more to learn

- ▶ North Central region is leading
 - Much more experience
 - More positive attitude

Product of these Workshops

- Best Practices document to be prepared following final meeting in April 2005
- Report should be available by early summer

Training in 2005

- ► Binder course, March 2-3
- ► Mix Design for Experienced Designers, March 30-31
- ► Nebraska Binder and Mix Design Training, February 22-25
- Customized courses available on request

More info:

Rebecca S. McDaniel Technical Director North Central Superpave Center P. O. Box 2382 West Lafayette, IN 47906 765/463-2317 ext. 226 rsmcdani@purdue.edu http://bridge.ecn.purdue.edu/~spave/