## 58<sup>th</sup> Annual IAC







#### Maximizing Pavement Life – Part 2 Considerations for Construction Practice

MEERENCE

Mark D. Blow P.E. Sr. Regional Engineer Asphalt Institute Oct. 25, 2018 Moscow, Idaho



# Lift Thickness and Mix Type

**Design - Section 3** 

## Mix Type





https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/infrastructure/pavements/asphalt/HMA.pdf

## Recommended Lift Thickness



#### FIGURE 3: Recommended Mix Types for Surface, Intermediate and Base Courses



39





#### NMAS grading <u>is different</u> than older "Topsize" Grading

Old Rule of Thumb - Minimum lift thickness = 2x Topsize

NMAS - Minimum compacted thickness

- ✓ 4 times nominal aggregate size
- ✓ 3 times nominal aggregate size for fine graded mixtures
  - Thicker lifts are easier to compact
  - Cool slower providing longer compaction time

### Minimum -----NOT MAXIMUM !

## Mixtures can vary significantly



	Table 1					
Requirements	Class D		Class E		Class G	
	Type 1	Type 2	Type 1	Type 2	Type 1	Type 2
Sieve	Percent Passing					
1 inch	100		100		100	
3/4 inch	97-100	100	97-100	100	97-100	100
5/8 inch						
1/2 inch	75-95	97-100	75-95	97-100	75-95	97-100
3/8 inch						
#4	45-75	60-80	45-75	60-80	45-75	60-80
#8	30-55	40-60	30-55	40-60	30-55	40-60
#16	20-45	25-50	20-45	25-50	20-45	25-50
#40	10-30	15-35	10-30	15-35	10-30	15-35
#200	3.0-7.0	4.0-8.0	3.0-7.0	4.0-8.0	3.0-7.0	4.0-8.0

Table F - Gyratory Controlled QC/QA Gradation* <sup>1</sup>				
	Control Points (percent passing)			
Sieve Size	Min.	Max.		
3/4 inch	100			
1/2 inch	90	100		
3/8 inch		85		
#8	30	55		
#200	2.0	7.0		

## Lift Thickness





## NCAT Test Track 1<sup>st</sup> Cycle





Coarse, intermediate, and fine gradations. No differences in rutting performance!

Courtesy of NCAT

## Lift Thickness





## Construction



- 1. Tack Coat
- 2. Longitudinal Joints
- 3. Density









## Tack Coat

**Construction - Section 1** 



### **Consequences of Debonding**



## Proper Tack Coat



Surface Type	Residual Rate (gsy)	Appx. Bar Rate Undiluted <sup>*</sup> (gsy)	Appx. Bar Rate Diluted 1:1 <sup>*</sup> (gsy)
New Asphalt	0.020 - 0.045	0.030 - 0.065	0.060 - 0.130
Existing Asphalt	0.040 - 0.070	0.060 - 0.105	0.120 - 0.210
Milled Surface	0.040 - 0.080	0.060 - 0.120	0.120 - 0.240
Portland Cement Concrete	0.030 – 0.050	0.045 – 0.075	0.090 – 0.150





## Longitudinal Joints

**Construction - Section 2** 

## Longitudinal Joints





Core #2 (No Overlap)



Core #7 (No Overlap)



Core #9 (Overlap 1 ½")



Core #10 (Overlap 1 ½")

## Ski Best for Smoothness (reference is average over length of ski)



Versus Joint Matcher, which is best for joint (reference is exact location just in front of auger) Note: If underlying pavement already smooth, some contractors feel they can get good joint with ski, but must finish 1/10" high

## Destined for Failure

Likely that the hot side of joint was starved of material at these locations and bridging occurred.



## Density

**Construction - Section 3** 

### **Reference Densities**





# Density vs. Loss of Pavement Service Life



### In-Place Voids vs Fatigue Life



asphalt institute

#### Density vs. Lift Thickness





asphalt institute



#### Tensile Strength & Moisture Susceptibility vs. Air Voids AASHTO T 283



Sample Air Voids

Asphalt Institute Research

# FHWA Performance Based Mix Design

	Fatigue Cracking	Rutting
<b>Design Air Voids</b> For every 1% increase	40% increase	22% decrease
<b>Design VMA</b> For every 1% increase	73% decrease	32% increase
<b>Compaction Density</b> For every 1% lower in-place Air Voids (Increasing Density Improved Both!)	19% decrease	10% decrease



## Maintenance

Crack Sealing & Surface Treatments

### Think permeability .....

Photo: Wes McNett

## Crack Sealing





## Crack Sealing











### Surface Treatments





### Minnesota Research



 $( \mathbf{D} )$ 

#### Optimal Timing of Preventive Maintenance for Addressing Environmental Aging in Hot-Mix Asphalt Pavements

Minnesota Department of Transportation

RESEARCH SERVICES & LIBRARY

> Office of Transportation System Management

R. Michael Anderson, Principal Investigator Asphalt Institute, Inc. Lexington, KY

#### December 2014

Research Project Final Report 2014-45





The TH 56 test section confirmed the hypothesis, with mixture testing indicating that the subsections with chip seals applied more than two years after construction had essentially the same fracture energy properties as the unsealed control subsection. The findings from this test section imply that to mitigate damage from environmental aging, the initial treatment from a preservation standpoint should occur within the first two years of the pavement's life. After that, while some benefits may still be obtained from treatment, it appears that the damage from environmental aging may have already substantially occurred.



### New 2-day Workshop in 2019



## Thank you to our Members



## Thank you for your attention institute



## **Discussion/Questions?**