

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Nebraska Department of Transportation Research
Reports

Nebraska LTAP

9-2005

Investigating Binder Flushing of SP-2 Mixes

Magdy A. Abdelrahman

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ndor>



Part of the [Transportation Engineering Commons](#)

Abdelrahman, Magdy A., "Investigating Binder Flushing of SP-2 Mixes" (2005). *Nebraska Department of Transportation Research Reports*. 24.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ndor/24>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Nebraska LTAP at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Nebraska Department of Transportation Research Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Investigating Binder Flushing of SP-2 Mixes

Dr. Magdy A. Abdelrahman

National Bridge Research Organization (NaBRO)
(<http://www.NaBRO.unl.edu>)
Department of Civil Engineering
College of Engineering and Technology

W150 Nebraska Hall
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0531
Telephone (402) 472-5106
FAX (402) 472-6658

Sponsored By
Nebraska Department of Roads



September, 2005

UNIVERSITY OF
Nebraska
Lincoln

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	ii
List of Figures	iii
List of Tables	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
OBJECTIVES	1
SUPERPAVE FLUSHING CASES IN NEBRASKA	1
STUDY PLAN	3
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	5
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	11
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	12
REFERENCES	13
APPENDIX A	24
APPENDIX B	63
APPENDIX C	69

List of Figures

Figure 1-1: Map of Nebraska with Locations of Flushed Sections	20
Figure 1-2: Comparisons of Extracted Cores and Original Asphalt by WRI (5).....	20
Figure 1-3: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Temperature, Highway-56..	21
Figure 1-4: Comparisons of QA/QC Data with Field Cores for Highway-56.....	22
Figure 1-5: Effects of Traffic Loads on Flushing Severity.....	23

List of Tables

Table 1-1: Superpave Mix Level-2 in Nebraska.....	16
Table 1-2: Considered SP-2 Sections	16
Table 1-3: Summary of Thermal Analysis of the Highway-43 Samples.....	16
Table 1-4: Testing on Extracted Binders at 58 degrees C	17
Table 1-5: Testing on Extracted Binders at 19 degrees C	18
Table 1-6: Average Maximum Seven Day Pavement Temperature, Highway-56 ...	18
Table 1-7: Mix Design and Parameters for Flushed and Non-Flushed Sections....	19

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank the Nebraska Department of Roads for sponsoring this research. Special acknowledgement is to Mr. Mukunda Gopalakrishna in performing some tables and graphs required, and to Mr. Udit Molakatalla, to Mr. Larry Koves and to Mr. John Dageforde in performing the required testing.

Introduction

Mix bleeding, or binder flushing, is migration of the bitumen to the surface of the flexible pavement, with or without fines. Krishnan and Rao (1, 2) indicated that migration can happen by means of two mechanisms: first, by the diffusion of asphalt into the air voids when it is subjected to temperature exceeding its softening point and second by the movement of asphalt due to pressure gradient developed in asphalt. The development of this pressure gradient is due to the reduction of air voids under traffic loads. Both mechanisms can occur simultaneously and the contribution of each depends very much on the temperature-stiffness relationship of the binder, the air voids distribution in the mix and the traffic loads to which the pavement is subjected to. Literature (3, 4) lists mix segregation and binder contamination during the construction process as possible causes of binder flushing.

Objectives

The objective of this study is to analyze available data on early flushing sections of Superpave mixes in Nebraska and to have a better understanding of the possible causes.

Superpave Flushing Cases in Nebraska

Binder flushing was observed in pavement sections with Superpave level-2 mixes (SP-2) in Nebraska. The sections were constructed between 1999 and 2000 and flushing was observed from 2000 to 2002. At the time of construction, quality assurance (QA) data by the Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) and quality control (QC) data by the contractors showed compliance with the then current specifications of SP-2 mixes. Figure 1 shows a map of the State of Nebraska with the locations of flushed sec-

tions. The distribution shown indicates that flushing was not region specific. SP-2 is a county road mix with a majority of natural aggregate components. Table 1 shows current design criteria for SP-2 mixes. Values shown in the table may be slightly different from the specifications at the time the flushed sections were constructed. NDOR provided records of thirty five projects with SP-2 mixes. Eleven sections had PG58-28 binders. Five of the PG58-28 sections were flushed. Twenty four sections had PG 64-22 binders with only one case exhibiting low severity flushing in limited areas. Table 2 shows a list of the sections considered in this study. The flushed sections were reported to have an Average Daily Truck Traffic (ADTT) from 190 to 230, both ways.

The most rapid onset of flushing occurred within few weeks after construction. That was in the summer of 2000 on Highway-43. Because of the high severity of flushing, the surface was milled late 2000 with no further rehabilitation actions. Flushing was observed again in the same section in late summer 2002, but with a much lower severity. During the 2000 flushing case, field cores were obtained and analyzed by the Western Research Institute (WRI) for chemical and physical properties on the binder and by NDOR for mix parameters (5). Table 3 and Figure 2 from the report by WRI provide sample results of testing on the original and extracted binders. The study by WRI did not find any conclusive evidence as to the cause of the flushing problem on Highway-43 but the analysis showed very unusual chemical properties of the extracted asphalt that were significantly different from the original asphalt and most likely contributed to the problem. Results by WRI showed lower boiling point materials in the extracted cores that did not exist in the original binder. Extracted binders were substantially softer than the original binder. There were indications of low compatibility asphalt that may suffer separation and behave as an oily material. The original mix design called for 5% asphalt by weight while flushed cores showed higher asphalt content with an average value of 6.99% by weight. Non-

flushed cores showed an average value of 4.92% asphalt content. The report by WRI also indicated that similar problems were experienced in other states at about the same time.

More flushing cases were observed between 2000 and 2002. The condition ranged from medium to severe. Flushing usually started with a few spots of asphalt on the pavement surface. The number of asphalt spots continued to increase during the hot summer days. The spots gathered to form a distressed area and the size of the affected areas continued to increase during the summer time. All sections had scattered flushed areas, up to 200 feet long with one, or both, wheel paths flushed. None of the affected sections were fully flushed. No significant rutting was reported in any of the flushed sections and surface conditions were very good with no indication of any defects. Cores taken from the flushed areas showed no signs of moisture-related distresses.

Study Plan

A study plan was developed that included comparisons with selected non-flushed sections, analysis of QA/QC data for both flushed and non-flushed sections and randomly drilling cores in and adjacent to the flushed sections and in the non-flushed sections. A few hypotheses on the interaction of the aggregate sources with the asphalt sources were considered at the beginning of the research program. To examine these hypotheses, specific non-flushed sections were selected by NDOR for comparisons based on similarity of asphalt sources, principle contractors of both flushed and non-flushed sections, year of construction and aggregate sources. The comparisons helped examine specific factors in the design and construction of SP-2 mixes. The selected sections are listed in Table 2. As shown in the table, all severely flushed sections were associated with PG58-28 binders that were supplied by different suppliers. Only a single case with PG64-22 in Highway-23 had low severity flushing. Visits to each of the flushed

sections revealed that the flushing of Highway-23 was insignificant as compared to the other flushed sections. It was also clear there is no evidence that natural gravel contributes to the flushing problem. The non-flushed sections contain higher percentages of natural gravel than the flushed sections. The same applied to the RAP content. More non-flushed sections, than flushed sections, had RAP. Only one flushed section was found with a 15% RAP content. Possibilities of moisture-related causes were also minimized. QA/QC data indicated that tensile strength ratio (TSR) on flushed sections were passing specification requirements. Anti-strip additives were used in some of the flushed sections. None of the drilled cores in flushed sections showed any moisture-related damage due to the adhesion between asphalt and aggregate. To examine the possibility of moisture damage due to failure in the cohesion of the asphalt paste, attention was paid to the binder extraction process (ASTM D 1856-95a). None of the binder extraction cases of the flushed sections reported the existence of water in the solvent-asphalt solutions.

More than eighty cores were drilled from both flushed and non-flushed sections. Selected cores were tested as needed. Testing included binder physical properties and mix design parameters. Overlays were one lift of 2.0 in. for all sections except for Highway-56 that has two lifts, each with 2.0 in. thickness. Cores were obtained with 6.0 in. depth. The most recent top 2.0 in. overlays were split into two 1.0 in. layers. Mix parameters were determined for each 1.0 in. layer. Average values were used in the analysis of mix parameters as no significant differences were found between the two 1.0 in. thick halves. Binder physical properties did not include extracted material from the top 1.0 in. half because it was subjected to further oxidation, contamination and other causes of aging that prevented an accurate estimation of true binder properties. Binder content was based on the average of the two 1.0 in. halves. For Highway-56 the bottom 2.0 in. layer was treated separately from the upper layer and was not further separated into

two parts. It was recognized that each of the original 2.0 in. layers belonged to a different construction lot as they were not constructed at the same time. As will be presented in a next section, testing on cores, QA/QC data and calculations of pavement temperature indicated that flushing occurred in the upper 2.0 in. layer.

Results and Discussion

Considering the report by WRI, inspecting the flushed locations, reviewing QA/QC data on mix components, the study was focused on few main aspects: the binder nature and physical properties, the mix design parameters including the use of local materials and the suitability of SP-2 mix for traffic conditions, mix variability and in-situ mix quality. Summary and examples of the testing results are listed in this report. A complete list of all testing results including binder and mix parameters are listed in the attached appendices. Appendix A presents plots illustrating the variability of the binder and mix parameters within and between construction lots. Appendix B lists testing results on the extracted binders from field samples. Appendix C presents an analysis of the pavement surface temperatures as a potential factor, combined with the asphalt PG grade, affecting binder flushing.

Analysis of Binder Properties

Table 4 and Table 5 show the properties of extracted binders from field cores as compared to QA/QC data on original binders. The listed values were verified through additional extraction and testing. Flushed sections were three to four years in service. Original materials were PG58-28 with testing at 58 °C for RTFOT and at 19 °C for PAV parameters. One would expect extracted binders to be stiffer than RTFOT but may be softer than PAV materials. Results showed extracted binders vary in stiffness but are all softer than RTFOT materials and significantly softer than PAV materials. In two cases, extracted binders were softer than the original, un-aged,

material. Similar results were obtained by WRI in the 2000 Highway-43 flushing problem. The chemical analysis by WRI on the Highway-43 samples indicated compatibility concerns with the extracted binders. Thermal analysis showed a lower molecular weight material than the original asphalt in the extracted binder. It is known that asphalt compatibility progresses with aging and may lead to phase separation producing a solid, asphaltene-like material, dispersed in a relatively fluid medium. The separated solid material may not be extracted with solvents. Hence, the soft extracted binder might not include the separated solid part. The analysis on binder separation minimized the possibility of contamination as a cause of softer extracted binders. It is to be noted that NDOR does not apply any QA testing on binder separation. QA testing on binder separation is not common in HMA construction. PG binders are purchased with a certification from the suppliers.

$G^* \sin d @ 19^\circ\text{C}$ and $G^*/\sin d @ 58^\circ\text{C}$ values as obtained from QA/QC records were based on average testing results at the time of construction. It was not possible to refer cores data to exact construction lots due to data availability. All QA/QC data showed compliance with the then current specifications on binder grade. Recovered binders from drilled cores showed significant variability in properties that were not present in the QA/QC data. That variability could be attributed to the construction process including possible segregation of mix components. It is believed that additional QA measures are needed to ensure more consistent SP-2 mix quality.

The selection of asphalt grade for SP-2 mixes in Nebraska was questioned. All sections with significant flushing had PG58-28 binders. Only one section with PG64-22 showed insignificant flushing, Highway-23. Reports by district engineers indicated that flushing was associated with high summer temperature times. An analysis of pavement temperature for the past four years was conducted for all flushed locations. The objective was not to examine the current PG grade system in Nebraska but rather to study if

exceptional pavement temperature was a factor in the flushing problem. Flushing occurs when pavement temperature is high enough to cause softening of the binder so that it can flow under the effect of traffic loads. The analysis of pavement temperature can help determine the depth of pavement to consider as a source of flushed binder. SHRP procedures for Superpave specifications (6) were applied to the temperature analysis. Data on maximum daily air temperature and section longitude and latitude was collected from local sources. All basic assumptions that were documented in the original SHRP reference were applied in this study. One of the critical assumptions in the SHRP procedures was the maximum temperature difference between the surface and a 2.0 in. (50.0 mm) depth during hot summer days. That was assumed in the SHRP report between 10 °F and 20 °F. Table 6 presents the average maximum seven days pavement temperature, 20.0 mm below surface, for Highway-56 over the past four years. The table presents two cases; the first case is for a difference of 15 °F, $d(0-50) = 8.3$ °C. The second case is for a difference of 10 °F, $d(0-50) = 5.6$ °C. In both cases; pavement temperature was higher than what was expected for a PG58 grade mix with the second case being more critical. Figure 3 presents a frequency, in days, of maximum daily temperature based on the assumption of $d(0-50) = 5.6$ °C for Highway-56. The figure shows that pavement temperature, 20.0 mm below surface, was higher than 58 °C for about sixty days in each of the past three years. The presented data shows that a PG64 binder would be a better choice for the Highway-56 location. Same conclusions were reached for the locations of the other flushed sections. It is to be noted that NDOR stopped using PG58 grade binders in Superpave mixes since the 2001 construction season. While the pavement maximum temperature was higher than what was assumed for all flushed sections, it was concluded that temperature at the 4.0 in. depth was not sufficient to soften the existing binder enough to flow. Testing on extracted materials confirmed this finding. The above discussion on binder quality suggests that an adhesion problem that may have been caused by binder separation

has contributed to the flushing problem. The damage due to asphalt-aggregate adhesion is accelerated in mixes with softer binders.

Effects of Mix Parameters

Having air voids in an asphalt mix is unavoidable but it is necessary to engineer specific related parameters. About 4% voids in the total compacted mix at optimum asphalt content is acceptable. This void content must be achieved in the field during construction through compacting effort and not by adding asphalt cement to fill up the voids. Besides, a balanced amount of dust, material passing the #200 sieve, is required to regulate the function of the binder in the mix. Low dust to binder ratio (D/B) results in excessive binder content and can lead to softening of the mix and/or flushing of the binder. But high D/B may lead to fatigue cracking. The parameters related to the voids in asphalt mix are; asphalt content, D/B ratio, total voids and voids filled with asphalt (VFA). Table 7 presents average values of these parameters as obtained from the records of the original mix design, QA/QC testing, and testing on flushed and non-flushed cores. Flushed sections had high asphalt contents (AC). In some cases the AC was higher than what was originally determined in the mix design. In the case of Highway-56, mix design was based on 5.0% AC but flushed cores were showing an average of 5.9%. In the case of Highway-43 the mix design was based on 5.0% AC but flushed cores were showing an average of 5.7% AC, with some values as high as 7.0%. In other cases the original mix designs were based on high AC. In the case of Highway-15 the original design called for 5.7% AC and Highway-26 specified 5.7% AC. On the other hand, all mix designs of non-flushed sections were based on an AC of 4.7% to 5.2%. Cores and QA/QC records of non-flushed sections showed 4.4% to 5.1% AC. Table 7 shows that D/B ratios of flushed sections were significantly lower than those of non-flushed sections. All flushed sections were originally designed with D/B of 0.5 to 0.6. Values from QA/QC records and from flushed cores showed a slightly higher value of (0.8) for both Highway-56

and Highway-15 and a lower values of 0.3 for Highway-43 and 0.4 for Highway-26. Non-flushed sections had D/B ratios as high as 1.2 with no signs of fatigue cracking after three to four years of service. It is clear that the high AC coupled with the low D/B ratio were factors in this flushing problem. The earliest two sections to flush after construction, Highway-43 in few weeks and Highway-26 in few months, had the lowest D/B ratios.

Theoretically, binder flushes if VFA reaches unity (1, 2). The VFA value depends on the volume of air voids and the effective binder content in the mix. It can be seen that most of the cores had higher VFA values as compared to the mix design or the QA/QC values but none of the flushed sections had a VFA close to unity. Depending on how the air voids are structured and connected, the voids can be effective in containing the binder when flowing and flushing may be avoided. The numbers from Table 7 show that air voids values for both flushed and non-flushed sections remain close to 4.0% so that a conclusion on the effect of the volume of air voids on this flushing problem can not be reached. This argument supports the literature on the effectiveness of the structure, or distribution, of air voids in preventing binder flushing.

No meaning conclusions on the causes of the flushing problem can be reached without considering the aggregate effects. But aggregate contribution to the flushing cases is tied to the binder content. Testing shows the binder contents of few flushed sections are on the low side but even more so the passing sieve #200 materials. VFA values were all on the low side for the traffic levels using the researched sections. As shown in Appendix A, contents of aggregate sizes passing sieve #30 were relatively low, may be because of the restricted-zone rule applied to the SP-2 mix designs. This significantly decreases the surface area of fine aggregate and allows extra binder contents to exist in the matrix and hence flushing occurs when other conditions including high pavement temperature and softer, or

lighter, binder quality exist. Again, the use of natural gravel was not a main cause of the flushing distress as researched in this study.

QA/QC Considerations

The figures presented in Appendix A suggest that a primary cause of the flushing distress is the variation of properties of the plant produced mix. Temperature within a pavement section that flushed should not be different from the temperature within a pavement section that did not flush. Temperature, alone, is not a cause of flushing unless something else is contributing the problem. The nature of this flushing problem as non-continuous distressed areas can be attributed to the variability in mix parameters and binder properties. As shown for extracted binder properties, mix parameters varied in both QA/QC records and in core testing. Figure 4 presents an example of a lot-by-lot binder content and D/B ratio for Highway-56. As can be seen in the figure, significant variability existed within a lot and between lots. Recovered binder samples were almost 2.0% higher than the design binder content and in cases softer than the original binders. As discussed earlier, softer field binders can be attributed to a separation problem. However, QA testing on binder separation is not common in HMA construction. PG binders are purchased with a certification from the suppliers. Records do not confirm if a tack coat was used on the flushed sections? If so, that might account for some of the bleeding.

Effect of Traffic

Figure 5 illustrates an example of the effect of traffic on the severity of flushing. The figure shows one coring location of the intersection of Highway-15 with Highway-32. Note the extension of Highway-32 as a farmer-market unpaved road to the right. Highway-15 is a two-lane road. In this location, cores 1 and 2 were drilled in the right-turn lane to the low-volume-road with low or no heavy traffic. Cores 3 and 4 were drilled in the through

north-bound heavy traffic lane. Cores 5, 6 and 12 were drilled in the left-turn lane to Highway-32 with heavy traffic. Cores 7, 8 and 11 were drilled in the south-bound lane with heavy traffic. Cores 9 and 10 were drilled in the right-turn from Highway-32 into Highway-15 with a lower heavy traffic volume than that of a through traffic lane. AC and D/B parameters were not significantly different between flushed and non-flushed cores in this location. Binder properties were even softer for low flushing severity than for high severity flushing. This case shows that flushing severity can be related to traffic volumes.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

This study presents cases of Superpave mix bleeding caused by the combined effects of both asphalt properties and mix design parameters. Binder flushing, or mix bleeding, depends very much on the temperature-stiffness relationship of the asphalt used, air voids distribution in the pavement and traffic loads to which the pavement is subjected to. Extracted binder samples from flushed sections varied in their physical and chemical properties but were all significantly softer than what would be expected. It is believed that problems in the asphalt source, mostly related to compatibility, caused the separation of the light fractions of the binder in the top pavement layers. High pavement temperatures and heavy traffic accelerated the flushing process. It was also noted that flushed sections had a softer asphalt grade than non-flushed sections. This indicates that a stiffer binder would have been less likely to flush. All flushed sections had excessive binder content and insufficient dust. The above discussion on binder quality suggests that an adhesion problem that may have been caused by binder separation has contributed to the flushing problem.

Additional measures in the QA process are needed to ensure more consistency in the construction process. That need was demonstrated by the vari-

ability in the properties of extracted binders and in the mix parameters from field cores and QA/QC records.

Flushing occurred in spite of the fact that an acceptable percentage of air voids was present. Voids in the mix were mostly filled with high asphalt content in the asphalt-dust paste. An appropriate D/B ratio is critical to balance the mix performance between mix softening or binder flushing on one hand and fatigue cracking on the other hand. It is critical to further study the role of air voids in the mechanism of mix bleeding, or binder flushing. Two aspects are to be considered; first is the nature, structure and/or distribution, of air voids in an asphalt mix as related to binder flushing. Second is examining that nature during the mix design process.

References

- [1] Krishnan, J. M. and Rao, C. L. Permeability and Bleeding of Asphalt Concrete Using Mixture Theory. *International Journal of Engineering Science* 39 (2001) 611-627.
- [2] Krishnan, J. M. and Rao, C. L. Mechanics of Air Voids Reduction of Asphalt Concrete Using Mixture Theory. *International Journal of Engineering Science* 38 (2000) 1331-1354.
- [3] Brown, R. E., Cross, S. A. and J. K. Gehler. Evaluation of Pavement Bleeding on I-55 in Illinois. In *Transportation Research Record 1300*, TRB, National Research Council, Washington D.C., 1991, pp. 56-62.
- [4] Christensen, W. L. and Powers, D. B. 1999 Premature Flushing Study. Ohio Department of Transportation, 1999.
- [5] Western Research Institute, Special Study for the Nebraska Department of Roads, May 2001.
- [6] Solaimanian, M. and Kennedy, T. W. Predicting Maximum Pavement Surface Temperature Using Air Temperature and Hourly Solar Radiation. In *Transportation Research Record 1417*, TRB, National Research Council, Washington D.C., 1994, pp. 5-10.

Additional References

- "Effects of Material Properties, specimen Geometry, and Specimen Preparation Variables on Asphalt Concrete Tests for Rutting", John Harvey, Irwin Guada, Fenella Long, *Journal of the Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists*, Volume 69, 2000.
- Martin McCann and Peter E. Sebaaly, "Evaluation of Moisture Sensitivity and Performance of Lime in Hot-Mix Asphalt", *Transportation Research Record* 1832.
- "Comparison of Fundamental and Simulative Test Methods for evaluating Pavement Deformation of Hot-Mix Asphalt"

-
- "Mixture Testing, Analysis and Field performance of the Pilot Superpave Projects: The 1999 SPS-9 Mixtures", R. Michael Anderson, Gerald A. Huber, Dwight E. Walker, Xishun Zhang, Journal of Asphalt Association of Pavement Technologists.
 - "Evaluation of Pavement Bleeding on I-55 in Illinois" Brown, E.R., S.A., Cross, and J.G., Gehler. Transportation Research Record.
 - "Estimating Permeability of Asphalt-Treated Bases.", Lindly, J.K., and Ashraff, S.E., Transportation Research Record 1504.
 - "Do 'Tender' Bitumens Really Exist?", Oliver, J., Roger, J., Walter, H, Proceedings of 17th ARRB Conference, Part 3.
 - "Influence of Voids in the Mineral Aggregate (VMA) on the Mechanical Properties of Coarse and Fine Asphalt Mixtures", R. Michael Anderson and Ross Bentsen. Journal of the Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, Volume 70, 2001
 - "Issues Pertaining to the Permeability Characteristics of Coarse-Graded Superpave Mixtures", L. Allen Cooley Jr., Brian D. Prowell and E. Ray Brown, Journal of the Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, Volume 71, 2002.
 - "Sensitivity of Superpave Mixture Tests to Changes in Mixture Components", Anderson, R.M., Ronald, J.C., Brian, M., Killingsworth, Journal of the Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, Volume 67, 1998
 - "Critical review of voids in mineral aggregate requirement in superpave", P.S. Kandhal, K.Y. Foo, R.B. Mallick, Transportation Research Record 1609, , 1999
 - "Evaluation of VMA and Other Volumetric Properties as Criteria for the Design and Acceptance of Superpave Mixtures", Bensa Nukuya, Reynaldo Roque, Mang Tia and Bjorn Birgisson, Journal of the Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, Volume 70, 2001
 - "Performance Review of a Quality Control/ Quality Assurance Specification for Asphalt Concrete", Benson, P.E Transportation Research Record # 1654
 - "Sensitivity of Mixture Performance Properties to Changes in Laboratory Compaction Using the Superpave Gyratory Compactor", Robert Anderson, Robert McGennis, Weng Tam and Thomas Kennedy, Journal of the Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, Volume 69, 2000

-
- "Effect of Test Variability on Mixture Volumetric and Mix Design Verification", Adam J. Hand and Amy L. Epps, Journal of the Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists, Volume 69, 2000
 - "Coarse Superpave Mixture Sensitivity", Epps, A.L., and Adam, J., Transportation Research Record # 1712, Washington D.C
 - "Use of RAP in Superpave HMA Applications", M. Stroup-Gardiner and Chris Wagner, Transportation Research Record 1681, Paper no 99-0110
 - "Suitability of Asphalt Pavement Analyzer for Predicting Pavement rutting", Bouzid Chouane, Gale C. Page, and James A. Musselman, TRR 1723, Paper no 00-1252, Page 107
 - "Evaluation of Pavement Analyzer for HMA Mix Design", Prithvi S. Kandhal, and Rajib B. Mallick, NCAT Report No. 99-4, June 1999
 - "Evaluation of Anti-Stripping Agents using the Asphalt Pavement Analyzer", Cross Stephen A., and Michael D. Voth, University of Kansas Report No. K-TRAN: KU-99-3, Lawrence, Kansas, June, 2001
 - "Performance Testing Hot Mix Asphalt", Brown, E. Ray, P.S. Kandhal, and Jingna Zhang, NCAT Report No. 01-05A, 2001
 - "Gradation Effects on HMA Performance" Adam J. Hand, James L. Stiady, Kleinfelder, Thomas D. White
 - "Effect of Aggregate Gradation on the Rutting Potential of Superpave Mixes", El-Basyouny, Mamlouk
 - "Evaluation of Rutting/Fatigue Cracking Devices" Thomas Bennert, Leslie A. Walker, Dr. Ali Maher, Final Report, April 2001
 - "Effect of Mix Gradation on Rutting Potential of Dense- Graded Asphalt Mixtures" Prithvi S. Kandhal and Rajib B. Mallick, Transportation Research Record 1767, paper No. 01-2051
 - "Superpave Laboratory Compaction versus Field Compaction", Robert L. Peterson, Kamyar C. Mahboub, R. Michael Anderson, Eyad Masad and Laith Tashman, TRB Paper 03-3117

Gyratory Level	(N _{des} 76)
FAA	(N _{max} 117) Min. 43
VMA	Min. 13
VFA	65-78
Use Natural Aggregate	

Table 1-1: Superpave Mix Level-2 in Nebraska

Pavement Sections	Binder Grade	Condition	Year of Construction	Year of Flushing Observed	Natural Gravel	Crushed Gravel	Crushed Rock	RAP
HWY-56	PG58-28	Flushed	1999	2002	47.0%	15.0%	22.0%	None
HWY-43	PG58-28	Flushed	2000	2000/ 2002	42.0%	20.0%	19.0%	None
HWY-23	PG64-22	Slightly Flushed	2002	2002	34.0%	48.0%	18.0%	None
HWY-15	PG58-28	Flushed	2000	2002	41.0%	25.0%	20.0%	15.0%
HWY-26	PG58-28	Flushed	2000	2000/ 2002	43.0%	50.0%	10.0%	None
HWY-66	PG58-28	Non-Flushed	2000	NA	13.0%	55.0%	15.0%	15.0%
HWY-92	PG58-22	Non-Flushed	1999	NA	46.0%	10.0%	19.0%	15.0%
HWY-75	PG64-22	Non-Flushed	2000	NA	50.0%	13.0%	12.0%	25.0%
HWY-74	PG64-22	Non-Flushed	2000	NA	30.0%	50.0%	20.0%	None

Table 1-2: Considered SP-2 Sections

Sample	Glass Temperature, T_g, °C	Crystalline Content, mass %
Original PG 58-28	-25.3	2.4
Extracted Good Core Top	-26.3	2.6
Extracted Bad Core Top	-29.4	2.0
Extracted Bad Core Bottom	-27.2	2.3

Table 1-3: Summary of Thermal Analysis of the Highway-43 Samples

			$G^*/\sin \delta$, KPa	G^* , KPa	δ , Deg
HWY-56 (Flushed Section)	Core No.	18	1.651	1.645	85.14
		19	1.647	1.642	85.29
		21	1.601	1.596	85.48
		22	0.9387	0.936	86.17
	Un-aged, Original		1.15		
	RTFOT, Original		2.65		
HWY-15 (Flushed Section)	Core No.	1 (No-Flushing)	2.859	2.842	83.81
		3	1.97	1.965	85.95
		5	1.535	1.532	86.05
		7	1.714	1.71	85.88
		9	0.7933	0.7923	87.07
	Un-aged, Original		1.28	1.278	87.13
	RTFOT, Original		2.886	2.872	84.27
HWY-66 (Non- Flushed Section)	Core No.	2	6.322	6.238	80.62
		4	6.184	6.101	80.59
	Un-aged, Original		1.18		
	RTFOT, Original		2.98		

Table 1-4: Testing on Extracted Binders at 58 degrees C

			$G^* \sin \delta$, KPa	G^* , KPa	δ , Deg
HWY-56 (Flushed Section)	Core No.	18	1039	1187	61.13
		19	1041	1195	60.64
		21	1056	1208	60.90
		22	628.4	706.1	62.86
	PAV, Original		3730		
HWY-15 (Flushed Section)	Core No.	1 (No-Flushing)	1925	2331	55.68
		3	2774	3342	56.11
		5	1435	1648	60.57
		7	1386	1603	59.86
		9	585.4	642.9	65.58
	PAV, Original		4096	5931	43.68
HWY-66 (Non- Flushed Section)	Core No.	2	2698	3517	50.1
		4	2773	3633	49.74
	PAV, Original		4056		

Table 1-5: Testing on Extracted Binders at 19 degrees C

Year	$d_{(0-50)} = 8.3^\circ\text{C}$	$d_{(0-50)} = 5.6^\circ\text{C}$
1999	57.24	63.43
2000	58.08	64.48
2001	58.45	65.01
2002	59.44	65.01
Mean	58.30	64.48
Std Dev.	0.91	0.75

Table 1-6: Average Maximum Seven Day Pavement Temperature, Highway-56

		% Binder	Dust/ Binder	Air Voids	VMA	VFA	FAA	%Pass #200
HWY -56	Mix Design	5.0	0.5	3.8	14.5	73.8	40.0	2.5
	QA/QC	5.2	0.9	4.1	15.2	73.3	41.0	4.8
	Flushed Cores	5.9	0.8	3.7	15.3	75.8	40.3	4.7
	Non-Flushed Cores	5.3	0.8	2.9	14.1	79.2	40.6	4.2
HWY -15	Mix Design	5.7	0.6	5.5	17.9	69.2	41.1	3.7
	QA/QC	5.7	0.7	4.1	16.5	75.2	41.0	4.2
	Flushed Cores	5.5	0.8	5.8	16.6	65.4	41.0	4.6
	Non-Flushed Cores	5.6	0.8	3.0	15.21	80.1	40.4	4.8
HWY -43	Mix Design	5.0	0.6	6.0	16.8	64.4	43.5	3.4
	QA/QC	5.1	0.8	3.6	14.4	75.3	42.1	4.0
	Flushed Cores	5.7	0.3	3.9	14.3	72.2	41.5	4.4
HWY -26	Mix Design	5.7	0.5	4.2	15.5	72.7	43.0	2.8
	QA/QC	5.3	0.4	3.7	14.0	75.8	43.2	4.5
HWY -23	Mix Design	5.5	0.5	5.4	15.8	65.8	43.6	2.5
	QA/QC	5.5	0.5	3.6	15.1	70.1	42.6	2.9
HWY -66	Mix Design	4.7	1.1	4.2	14.0	69.9	41.2	5.4
	QA/QC	4.7	1.0	4.0	14.0	71.7	42.6	4.6
	Non-Flush Cores	4.4	1.2	3.7	14.0	73.7	41.7	5.4
HWY -92	Mix Design	5.0	0.8	6.1	15.0	58.0	42.4	3.9
	QA/QC	4.6	0.9	4.9	14.2	65.6	40.3	3.9
HWY -74	Mix Design	5.2	0.7	4.5	16.2	72.2	40.5	3.7
	QA/QC	4.9	0.7	3.8	14.9	75.5	NA	3.7
HWY -75	Mix Design	5.2	1.2	3.7	14.6	74.3	41.2	5.3
	QA/QC	5.1	1.0	3.9	14.0	72.3	41.0	5.0

Table 1-7: Mix Design and Parameters for Flushed and Non-Flushed Sections




Figure 1-1: Map of Nebraska with Locations of Flushed Sections




Figure 1-2: Comparisons of Extracted Cores and Original Asphalt by WRI (5)




Figure 1-3: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Temperature, Highway-56




Figure 1-4: Comparisons of QA/QC Data with Field Cores for Highway-56




Figure 1-5: Effects of Traffic Loads on Flushing Severity

Appendix

Variability of SP-2 Mix Parameters

A




Figure A-1: Hwy 15 - %Binder Content vs. Lot Number




Figure A-2: Hwy 15 - % Air Void vs. Lot Number




Figure A-3: Hwy 15 - % VFA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-4: Hwy 15 - % VMA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-5: Hwy 15 - % Passing # 30 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-6: Hwy 15 - % Passing #200 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-7: Hwy 15 - Dust/Binder Ratio vs. Lot Number




Figure A-8: Hwy 15 - CAA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-9: Hwy 15 - % FAA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-10: Hwy 23 - Binder Content vs. Lot Number




Figure A-11: Hwy 23 - % Air Void vs. Lot Number




Figure A-12: Hwy 23 - % VFA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-13: Hwy 23 - % VMA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-14: Hwy 23 - % Passing # 30 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-15: HwY 23 - % Passing # 200 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-16: HwY 23 - Dust/Binder Ratio vs. Lot Number




Figure A-17: Hwy 26 - % Binder Content vs. Lot Number




Figure A-18: Hwy 26 - % Air Void vs. Lot Number




Figure A-19: Hwy 26 - % VFA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-20: Hwy 26 - % VMA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-21: Hwy 26 - % Passing #30 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-22: Hwy 26 - % #200 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-23: Hwy 26 -Dust/Binder Ratio vs. Lot Number




Figure A-24: Hwy 26 -CAA vs. Lot Number, Data Not Available




Figure A-25: Hwy 26 - FAA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-26: Hwy 43 - % Binder Content vs. Lot Number




Figure A-27: Hwy 43 - % Air Void vs. Lot Number




Figure A-28: Hwy 43 - % VFA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-29: Hwy 43 - % VMA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-30: Hwy 43 - % Passing #30 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-31: Hwy 43 - % Passing #200 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-32: Hwy 43 - Dust/Binder Ratio vs. Lot Number




Figure A-33: Hwy 43 - CAA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-34: Hwy 43 - FAA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-35: Hwy 56 - % Binder Content vs. Lot Number




Figure A-36: Hwy 56 - % Air Void vs. Lot Number




Figure A-37: Hwy 56 - % VFA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-38: Hwy 56 - % VMA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-39: Hwy 56 - % Passing # 30 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-40: Hwy 56 - % Passing # 200 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-41: Hwy 56- Dust/Binder Ratio vs. Lot Number




Figure A-42: Hwy 56 - CAA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-43: Hwy 56 - FAA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-44: Hwy 66 - % Binder Content vs. Lot Number




Figure A-45: Hwy 66 - % Air Void vs. Lot Number




Figure A-46: Hwy 66 - % VFA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-47: Hwy 66 - % VMA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-48: Hwy 66 - % Passing #30 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-49: Hwy 66 - % Passing #200 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-50: Hwy 66 - Dust/Binder Ratio vs. Lot Number




Figure A-51: Hwy 66 - CAA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-52: Hwy 66 - FAA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-53: Hwy 74 - % Binder Content vs. Lot Number




Figure A-54: Hwy 74- % Air Void vs. Lot Number




Figure A-55: Hwy 74 - % VFA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-56: Hwy 74 - % VMA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-57: Hwy 74 - % Passing #30 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-58: Hwy 74 - % Passing #200 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-59: Hwy 74 - Dust/Binder Ratio vs. Lot Number




Figure A-60: Hwy 74 - FAA vs. Lot Number Data not Available




Figure A-61: Hwy 75 - % Binder Content vs. Lot Number




Figure A-62: Hwy 75 - % Air Void vs. Lot Number




Figure A-63: Hwy 75 - % VFA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-64: Hwy 75 - % VMA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-65: Hwy 75 - % Passing #30 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-66: Hwy 75 - % Passing #200 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-67: Hwy 75 - Dust/Binder Ratio vs. Lot Number




Figure A-68: Hwy 75 - FAA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-69: Hwy 92 - % Binder Content vs. Lot Number




Figure A-70: Hwy 92 - % Air Void vs. Lot Number




Figure A-71: HwY 92 - % VFA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-72: HwY 92 - % VMA vs. Lot Number




Figure A-73: Hwy 92 - % Passing #30 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-74: Hwy 92 - % Passing #200 vs. Lot Number




Figure A-75: Hwy 92 - Dust/Binder Ratio vs. Lot Number

Appendix

Extracted Binder Testing

B

B.1 TESTING ON EXTRACTED BINDERS @ 58 DEGREES C

** Indicates flushed cores

* Indicates slightly flushed cores. The rest of the cores were non-flushed

			G*/Sin δ , KPa	G*, KPa	δ , Deg
Highway - 15 (Flushed Section)	Core No	1	2.859	2.842	83.81
		2	3.657	3.621	81.97
		** 3	1.97	1.965	85.95
		** 4	5.031	4.977	81.61
		** 5	1.535	1.532	86.05
		** 6	20.33	18.980	69.02
		** 7	1.714	1.71	85.88
		** 8	4.152	4.107	81.61
		* 9	0.7933	0.7923	87.07
		** 11	33.99	30.980	65.92
		* 13	2.155	2.135	82.25
		Un-aged, Original	1.28	1.278	87.13
		RTFOT, Original	2.886	2.872	84.27

Table B-1: Binder Testing for Highway 15 @ 58 Degrees C

			G*/Sin δ , KPa	G*, KPa	δ , Deg
Highway - 23 (Flushed Section)	Core No. Phase II)	** 3	7.308	6.990	73.02
		** 8	1.903	1.882	81.51
		** 4	7.153	6.882	74.18

Table B-2: Binder Testing for Highway 23 @ 58 Degrees C

			G*/Sin δ , KPa	G*, KPa	δ , Deg
Highway - 56 (Flushed Section)	Core Number	**			
		3	2.28	2.272	84.36
		5	1.186	1.184	86.12
		6	12.73	12.26	74.41
		8	10.9	10.47	73.85
		9	2.953	2.934	83.41
		11	12.83	12.4	75.21
		12	27.69	25.7	68.17
		13	4.5	4.452	81.59
		14	4.188	4.148	82.11
		*			
		17	9.927	9.596	75.16
		**			
		18	1.67	1.67	85.17
		**			
		19	1.643	1.637	85.26
		**			
		21	1.585	1.58	85.5
		**			
		22	0.965	0.963	86.31
		**			
		23	2.946	2.922	82.7
		24	13.3	12.81	74.47
		26	10.61	10.27	75.49
		27	4.192	4.13	80.14
		**			
		29	1.981	1.974	84.88
		31	12.68	12.23	74.7
		*			
		32	2.531	2.515	83.44
		34	1.942	1.932	84.18
	Un-aged, Original		1.15		
	RTFOT, Original		2.65		

Table B-3: Binder Testing for Highway 56 @ 58 Degrees C

			G*/Sin δ , KPa	G*, KPa	δ , Deg
Highway - 66 (Flushed Section)	Core No. (Phase I)	2	6.322	6.238	80.62
		2-2	6.683	6.575	79.7
		3	68.98	59.07	58.91
		4	6.184	6.101	80.59
		5	149.9	121.40	54.13
		6	8.599	8.435	78.79
	Un-aged, Original		1.18		
	RTFOT, Original		2.98		

Table B-4: Binder Testing for Highway 66 @ 58 Degrees C

DSR @ 58C				Softening Point
Sample ID	G*/sin delta	G*	Phase Angle	Degrees F
14TOP A	9.904	9.673	77.6	122
14TOP B	3.929	3.896	82.57	113
** 18TOP A	2.218	2.204	83.57	109.9
** 18TOP B	1.651	1.645	85.14	108.5
** 19TOP A	3.569	3.538	82.48	117.1
** 19TOP B	1.647	1.642	85.29	107.6
** 21TOP A	4.491	4.4	81.34	109.85
** 21TOP B	1.601	1.596	85.48	103.55
** 22 TOP A	0.8	0.79	85.69	96.4
** 22 TOP B	0.9387	0.936	86.17	97.7

Table B-5: Binder Testing for Highway 56 @ 58 Degrees C

DSR @ 58C				Softening Point
Sample ID	G*/sin delta	G*	Phase Angle	Degrees F
2A	8.165	8.032	79.63	125.6
2B	6.49	6.402	80.56	122.5
4A	7.603	7.491	80.14	124.3
4B	6.32	6.234	80.54	125.2

Table B-6: Binder Testing for Highway 66 @ 58 Degrees C

DSR @ 58C				Softening Point
Sample ID	G*/sin delta	G*	Phase Angle	Degrees F
1A	3.1	3.082	83.78	115.25
1B	3.002	2.983	83.67	114.4
** 3A	2.39	2.378	84.28	111.2
** 3B	2.01	2.005	85.87	109.9
** 5A	2.507	2.494	84.18	111.7
** 5B	1.67	1.666	86.03	107.6
** 7A	2.333	2.323	84.68	112.6
** 7B	1.748	1.744	85.86	109
* 9A	2.878	2.861	83.72	113
* 9B	0.7506	0.7498	87.3	93.7

Table B-7: Binder Testing for Highway 15 @ 58 Degrees C

B.2 TESTING ON EXTRACTED BINDERS @ 19 DEGREES C

			$G^* \sin \delta$, KPa	G^* , KPa	δ , Deg
HWY-56 (Flushed Section)	Core No.	18	1039	1187	61.13
		19	1041	1195	60.64
		21	1056	1208	60.90
		22	628.4	706.1	62.86
	PAV, Original		3730		
HWY-15 (Flushed Section)	Core No.	1 (No-Flushing)	1925	2331	55.68
		3	2774	3342	56.11
		5	1435	1648	60.57
		7	1386	1603	59.86
		9	585.4	642.9	65.58
	PAV, Original		4096	5931	43.68
HWY-66 (Non-Flushed Section)	Core No.	2	2698	3517	50.1
		4	2773	3633	49.74
	PAV, Original		4056		

Table B-8: Binder Testing @ 19 Degrees C

Appendix

Analysis of Pavement Surface Temperature

C




Table C-1: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature for Highway 15, May-September 2002




Table C-2: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature @ 2.0" Below the Surface for Highway 15, May-September 2002




Table C-3: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature for Highway 26, May-September 2002




Table C-4: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature @ 2.0" Below the Surface for Highway 26, May-September 2002




Table C-5: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature @ 4.0" Below the Surface for Highway 26, May-September 2002




Table C-6: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature for Highway 56, May-September 2002




Table C-7: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature @ 2.0" Below the Surface for Highway 56, May-September 2002




Table C-8: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature @ 4.0" Below the Surface for Highway 56, May-September 2002




Table C-9: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature for Highway 66, May-September 2002




Table C-10: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature @ 2.0" Below the Surface for Highway 66, May-September 2002




Table C-11: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature for Highway 92, May-September 2002




Table C-12: Frequency of Maximum Daily Pavement Surface Temperature @ 2.0" Below the Surface for Highway 92, May-September 2002




Table C-13: Maximum Daily Temperature vs. Pavement Temperature at Various Depths @ Td = 15 degrees F for Highway 15




Table C-14: Maximum Daily Temperature vs. Pavement Temperature at Various Depths @ Td = 15 degrees F for Highway 26




Table C-15: Maximum Daily Temperature vs. Pavement Temperature at Various Depths @ Td = 15 degrees F for Highway 56




Table C-16: Maximum Daily Temperature vs. Pavement Temperature at Various Depths @ Td = 15 degrees F for Highway 66




Table C-17: Maximum Daily Temperature vs. Pavement Temperature at Various Depths @ $T_d = 15$ degrees F for Highway 92