

#### NETC 18-2: Framework of Asphalt Balanced Mix Design (BMD) for New England Transportation Agencies

Technical Memorandum

Task 1: Identify Typical Pavement Distresses in Each of The New England States

Prepared By:

Walaa S. Mogawer, Ph.D., P.E., F.ASCE & Thomas Bennert, Ph.D.

Prepared For:

New England Transportation Consortium (NETC) Project 18-2 Technical Committee

#### I. Background

The main objective of this research project was to synthesize existing information and to develop recommendations for a rational Balanced Mixture Design (BMD) approach for use by New England transportation agencies.

The first action item for this project was to develop a survey to administer to the NETC state agencies asking for information related to pavement distress. Prior to the adoption of any asphalt mixture performance testing program, whether this is simple index testing (tests with pass/fail criteria) or more complicated Balanced Mixture Design (fundamental properties measured to predict performance), it is critical that the selected performance test simulates the observed pavement distress in the area of question. For example, low temperature thermal cracking tests are not appropriate when observed pavement distresses are rutting and alligator cracking.

#### II. Internet Survey

A list of questions was developed and submitted to the project technical committee for approval prior to the solicitation of responses. Once the list of questions was approved, the internet based survey was developed in Google forms as shown in Appendix A and is available online at <u>https://forms.gle/iRjWUJCgR2kYSf3G8</u>.

The primary goal of the survey was to identify the predominate distresses observed in New England and how they occur regionally. Additionally, the survey was developed to gather more information about:

- Time period to distress initiation
- How distress measurements are collected and developed into indices
- Weighting of distress indices
- How mixtures are differentiated in reference to distress measurements and inclusion into a pavement management system
- Performance test used in an attempt to mitigate distress
- Percentage of asphalt surface mixtures by type (i.e. Nominal Maximum Aggregate Size)
- Recycled Asphalt Shingle (RAS) usage and practices
- Asphalt binder grades used
- Highly absorptive aggregates

The survey was distributed to the New England state transportation agencies (CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT) in May 2019 for responses. The last response was received in September 2019. In total seven response were received. Each New England state transportation agency responded to the survey with Vermont responding twice.

#### **III. Internet Survey Findings**

The survey results were reviewed, compiled and analyzed. As shown in Figure 1, the survey indicated the predominate pavement distress noted in New England were:



#### Figure 1: Predominate Distresses Noted by New England State Transportation Agencies

The highest noted distresses at 28.6% (2 responses each) were thermal cracking and fatigue cracking. A combination of rutting, raveling and moisture damage; all distresses, and all distresses except moisture damage all received one response (14.3%). A majority of respondents (71.4%) stated that certain distresses are more commonly observed in different regions of their state with thermal and fatigue cracking being the most commonly observed. Based on these distresses noted in the survey, candidate performance test will be selected in Task 2 of the project.

Other noteworthy findings of the survey were:

- □ There was no consensus among respondents about the time period when certain distresses initiate
- D Pavement distress data is measured by automated, manual and both methods
- □ A majority of respondents use a combined index for pavement treatment selection
- Respondents were split or unsure on if certain distress get weighed more heavily than others
- □ All respondents indicated that condition index data is available to the research team
- □ A majority of respondents stated that their pavement management system did not differentiate between mixture types (i.e. all mixture grouped as one pavement type)
- □ Most respondents are utilizing performance tests during the mixture design phase in an attempt to mitigate the occurrence of specific distresses
- □ In the New England region, 9.5 mm and 12.5 mm dense graded mixtures comprise a majority of the asphalt pavement surfaces being constructed
- □ Most respondents do not allow RAS use
- □ Anywhere from between one to four asphalt binders are specified in an individual state, with two asphalt binders being the most specified
- □ Most states do not require a different low temperature grade asphalt binder for different regions within the state
- □ No respondents stated that they deal with highly absorptive aggregates

A detailed copy of the survey results and analysis is available in Appendix B.

#### Appendix A

#### **Internet Survey**

#### NETC 18-2 "Framework of Asphalt Balanced Mix Design (BMD) for New England Transportation Agencies"

The New England Transportation Consortium is sponsoring this research study. The scope is to synthesize existing information and to develop recommendations for a rational BMD approach for use by New England transportation agencies. Caps in testing and performance data will be identified through this project and an experimental plan for required future work will be developed.

This survey is developed to obtain distress information from each of the New England States. All survey responses will be kept anonymous. The survey encompasses a maximum of 9 short questions and will require no more than 5 minutes to complete.

Thank you for your time and effort.

NEXT

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google. Report Abuse - Terms of Service

Google Forms

| Demographics  |
|---|
| Name *  |
| Your answer   |
| ⊤itle *   |
| Your answer   |
| Agency *  |
| Your answer   |
| Email *   |
| Your answer   |
| Phone Number *  |
| Your answer   |
| Can we contact you by phone? *                            |
| O Yes   |
| O No  |
| BACK NEXT<br>Never submit passwords through Google Forms. |
|   |

| Question 1  |
|---|
| What are the predominant pavement distresses witnessed in<br>your state?                                  |
| Rutting   |
| Fatigue Cracking  |
| Thermal Cracking  |
| Reflective Cracking   |
| Moisture Damage   |
| Raveling  |
| Other:  |
| BACK NEXT   |
| Never submit passwords through Google Forms.  |
|   |
| Question 2  |
| Are certain pavement distresses more commonly observed in<br>different regions of your state?             |
| Ves   |
| O No  |
| If Yes, which specific pavement distresses are more commonly observed in different regions of your state. |
| Rutting   |
| Fatigue Cracking  |
| Thermal Cracking  |
| Reflective Cracking   |
| Moisture Damage   |
| Raveling  |
| O Other:  |
|   |
| BACK NEXT   |
| Never submit passwords through Google Forms.  |

|   | 3   |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| What is the general time period when the observed pavement distresses initiate? |   |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Under 1<br>year   | 1 to less<br>than 3<br>years                       | 3 to less<br>than 5<br>years   | 5 to less<br>than 10<br>years | 10 to less<br>than 15<br>years | 15 to 20<br>years | Over 20<br>years |  |  |  |  |
| Rutting   | 0   | 0  | 0                              | $\circ$                       | 0                              | 0                 | 0                |  |  |  |  |
| Fatigue<br>Cracking   | 0   | 0  | 0                              | 0                             | 0                              | 0                 | 0                |  |  |  |  |
| Thermal<br>Cracking   | 0   | 0  | 0                              | 0                             | 0                              | 0                 | 0                |  |  |  |  |
| Reflective<br>Cracking  | 0   | 0  | 0                              | 0                             | 0                              | 0                 | 0                |  |  |  |  |
| Moisture<br>Damage  | 0   | 0  | 0                              | 0                             | 0                              | 0                 | 0                |  |  |  |  |
| Raveling  | 0   | 0  | 0                              | 0                             | 0                              | 0                 | 0                |  |  |  |  |
| Other   | 0   | 0  | 0                              | 0                             | 0                              | 0                 | 0                |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| BACK  | NEX   | т  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| Never submit p  | asswords the  | rough Google                                       | e Forms.                       |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| Questior  | 14  |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| How are   | your pa   | /ement   | distress                       | measu                         | rements                        | being co          | ollected         |  |  |  |  |
| and anal  | -   |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| Manua   |   |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>Autom</li> </ul>   | ated  |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| O Both  |   |  |                                | O Both                        |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| O 0ther:  |   |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| BACK  | NĐ  |  |                                |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| BACK<br>Never submit  |   |  | le Forms.                      |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| Never submit  | passwords th  |  | le Forms.                      |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
|   | passwords th  |  | le Forms.                      |                               |                                |                   |                  |  |  |  |  |
| Never submit  | passwords th<br>n 5<br>nt tilize ind<br>nt treatm             | rough Googi<br>lividual d                          | distress                       |                               |                                |                   | index            |  |  |  |  |
| Never submit  | passwords th<br>n 5<br>Itilize ind<br>nt treatn<br>Cl, etc.)? | irough Googi<br>lividual d<br>nent sel             | distress<br>ection c           |                               |                                |                   | index            |  |  |  |  |
| Never submit<br>Question<br>Do you u<br>paveme<br>(i.e. – PO                    | n 5<br>ntilize ind<br>nt treatn<br>Cl, etc.)?                 | lividual d<br>nent sel                             | distress<br>ection c<br>ements |                               |                                |                   | lindex           |  |  |  |  |
| Question<br>Do you u<br>paveme<br>(i.e. – PC<br>O Individ                       | n 5<br>ntilize ind<br>nt treatn<br>Cl, etc.)?                 | lividual a<br>nent sel<br>s measura<br>(PCI, etc.) | distress<br>ection c<br>ements |                               |                                |                   | index            |  |  |  |  |

| Question 6   |  |
|--|--|
| If you use a combined index, are the individual distress<br>measurements and magnitudes available (for the current year<br>and previous years)?  |  |
| ⊖ Yes  |  |
| O No   |  |
| O Other:   |  |
| BACK NEXT  |  |
| Never submit passwords through Google Forms.   |  |
| Question 7   |  |
| If you use a combined index, do different distresses get<br>"weighed" more heavily than others?  |  |
| ⊖ Yes  |  |
| O No   |  |
| O Other:   |  |
| If you use a combined index, which ones get "weighed" more   |  |
| heavily?<br>Your answer  |  |
|  |  |
| Are the individual and/or combined index values available to the<br>Research ⊤eam for the current year and multiple years prior?   |  |
|  |  |
| O No   |  |
|  |  |
| BACK NEXT  |  |
| Never submit passwords through Google Forms.   |  |
|  |  |
| Question 8   |  |
| Does your Pavement Management System (PMS) differentiate<br>different asphalt mixture types (i.e. – different nominal<br>aggregate size, polymer vs neat, dense-grade vs SMA, etc.) in<br>the pavement performance curves or is all asphalt mixtures<br>grouped as one material pavement type (i.e. – asphalt, PCC,<br>composite)? |  |
| O Differentiated by nominal aggregate size   |  |
| O Differentiated by binder type (polymer vs neat)  |  |
| O Differentiated by mixture type (dense graded vs SMA)   |  |
| Grouped as one pavement type   |  |
| O 0ther:   |  |
|  |  |
| BACK NEXT  |  |
| Never submit passwords through Google Forms.   |  |
|  |  |

| Question 9  |
|---|
| Does your state currently utilize any performance tests during<br>the mixture design phase in an attempt to mitigate the<br>occurrence of specific distresses observed? |
| O Yes   |
| O No  |
| If Yes, please list which ones.   |
| Your answer   |
| BACK NEXT Never submit passwords through Google Forms.  |
| Question 10   |
| Regarding performance testing, how does your state intend to<br>conduct the testing? If uncertain, best guess at the moment.  |
| O Central laboratory in the state   |
| Regional laboratories in the state  |
|   |
| Combination of state and consultants/universities   |
| Combination of state and consultants/universities     Consultant/universities only  |
|   |
|   |

|   | Question 11  |
|---|--|
|   | What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state<br>contain 9.5mm NMAS dense graded mixes?  |
|   | Your answer  |
|   | What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state<br>contain 12.5mm NMAS dense graded mixes? |
|   | Your answer  |
|   | What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state<br>contain 19mm NMAS dense graded mixes?   |
|   | Your answer  |
|   | What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state contain 9.5mm NMAS SMA?                    |
|   | Your answer  |
|   | What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state<br>contain 12.5mm NMAS SMA?                |
|   | Your answer  |
|   | What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state<br>contain OGFC?                           |
| E | Your answer  |
|   | BACK NEXT  |
|   | Never submit passwords through Google Forms.   |
|   |  |
|   | Question 12  |
|   | Does your state allow RAS?   |
|   |  |
|   | If Yes, how much?  |
|   | Your answer  |
|   |  |
|   | BACK NEXT  |
|   | Never submit passwords through Google Forms.   |

| Quest   | ion 13   |  |
|---|--|--|
| In reg<br>amou                                  | ards to RAP/RAS mixtures, what are the maximum<br>nts of RAP and/or RAS allowed?   |  |
| Your an   | swer   |  |
| ls a re   | juvenator required?  |  |
| O Yes   | 3  |  |
| O No  |  |  |
| ls the<br>in VM                                 | mixture containing RAP/RAS required to have an increase<br>A or asphalt content?   |  |
| O Yes   | 3  |  |
| O No  |  |  |
| BAC   | K NEXT   |  |
| Never sut                                       | omit passwords through Google Forms.   |  |
|   |  |  |
|   |  |  |
| Quest   | ion 14   |  |
|   | ion 14<br>nany different binder grades are typically used in your  |  |
| How r   | ion 14<br>many different binder grades are typically used in your  |  |
| How r<br>state?<br>Your an<br>Does              | ion 14<br>many different binder grades are typically used in your  |  |
| How r<br>state?<br>Your an                      | ion 14<br>many different binder grades are typically used in your<br>swer<br>your state require different low temperature grades for<br>ent regions of your state? |  |
| How r<br>state?<br>Your an<br>Does y<br>differe | ion 14<br>many different binder grades are typically used in your<br>swer<br>your state require different low temperature grades for<br>ent regions of your state? |  |
| How r<br>state?<br>Your an<br>Does y<br>differe | ion 14<br>many different binder grades are typically used in your<br>swer<br>your state require different low temperature grades for<br>ent regions of your state? |  |

| Question 15   |
|---|
| What is your minimum VMA for your typical surface course mixes?                 |
| Your answer   |
| Does your state deal with high absorptive aggregates (> 1.5% water absorption)? |
| ⊖ Yes   |
| O No  |
| If so, do you handle conditioning differently with these aggregates?            |
| O Yes   |
| O No  |
| O 0ther:  |
| BACK SUBMIT   |
| Never submit passwords through Google Forms.                                    |

#### **End of Survey**

#### Appendix **B**

#### **Detailed Survey Results**

# What are the predominant pavement distresses witnessed in your state?





# Are certain pavement distresses more commonly observed in different regions of your state?



If Yes, which specific pavement distresses are more commonly observed in different regions of your state.

6 responses





# What is the general time period when the observed pavement distresses initiate?



# How are your pavement distress measurements being collected and analyzed?





Do you utilize individual distress measurements for your pavement treatment selection or do you use a combined index (i.e. – PCI, etc.)?



Individual distress measurements
 Combined index (PCI, etc.)

If you use a combined index, are the individual distress measurements and magnitudes available (for the current year and previous years)?





If you use a combined index, do different distresses get "weighed" more heavily than others?



## If you use a combined index, do different distresses get "weighed" more heavily than others?

If you use a combined index, which ones get "weighed" more heavily?

4 responses

Disintergration, Index Cracking

NA

IRI, Patching

Response by Pavement Management Engineer

Are the individual and/or combined index values available to the Research Team for the current year and multiple years prior?

7 responses



Does your Pavement Management System (PMS) differentiate different asphalt mixture types (i.e. – different nominal aggregate size, polymer vs neat, dense-grade vs SMA, etc.) in the pavement performance curves or is all asphalt mixtures grouped as one material pavement type (i.e. – asphalt, PCC, composite)?



- Differentiated by nominal aggregate size
- Differentiated by binder type (polymer vs neat)
- Differentiated by mixture type (dense graded vs SMA)
- Grouped as one pavement type
- Unsure; I believe they're grouped as one pavement type altogether
- Response by Pavement Managem...

Does your state currently utilize any performance tests during the mixture design phase in an attempt to mitigate the occurrence of specific distresses observed?



#### If Yes, please list which ones.

4 responses

Currently piloting a BMD specification with pass/fail criteria using the Hamburg and I-FIT tests; will soon require that test results (regardless of whether they pass or fail) be provided for informational purposes across-the-board.

HWT on certain projects

NA

Response by Pavement Management Engineer/Research and Materials Engineer

Regarding performance testing, how does your state intend to conduct the testing? If uncertain, best guess at the moment.



- Central laboratory in the state
   Regional laboratories in the state
   Combination of state and consultants/universities
  - Consultant/universities only

What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state contain 9.5mm NMAS dense graded mixes?

| Unsure, at least 80% |
|----------------------|
| 48%                  |
| 75%                  |
| -                    |
| 18%                  |
| 15%                  |
|                      |

What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state contain 12.5mm NMAS dense graded mixes?

| Unsure |
|--------|
| 50%    |
| 25%    |
| -      |
| 81%    |
| 55%    |
| -      |

What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state contain 19mm NMAS dense graded mixes?



## What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state contain 9.5mmNMAS SMA?0% (Exploring use of SMA on Project in 2020)

0% 0% -0% 5% -

What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state contain 12.5mm NMAS SMA?

| 0% |  |
|----|--|
| 0% |  |
| 0% |  |
| -  |  |
| 0% |  |
| 0% |  |
| -  |  |

What percent of the asphalt pavement surfaces in your state contain OGFC?



## **Does your state allow RAS?**



#### If Yes, how much?

5 responses

No more than 3.0% by mass of total aggregate weight

Only 3% in maintenance/sand mxies that are not designe dper superpave

max 3% only asphalt base layers

NA

5% max in intermediate & base courses

## In regards to RAP/RAS mixtures, what are the maximum amounts of RAP and/or RAS allowed?

50% RAP, 3% RAS; when combined as RAM, 1.2% total binder replacement 20% 3% RAS asphalt base 20% RAP in any layer 0% RAS and 18 to 28% RAP

RAP - 10% Asphalt Rubber Surface 15% intermediate 40% intermediate & base crs

## In regards to RAP/RAS mixtures

#### Is a rejuvenator required?

6 responses



Is the mixture containing RAP/RAS required to have an increase in VMA or asphalt content?

6 responses



How many different binder grades are typically used in your state?



**Does your state require different low temperature grades for different regions of your state?** 



## What is your minimum VMA for your typical surface course mixes?

| 16.5    |  |  |  |
|---------|--|--|--|
| 16      |  |  |  |
| 14      |  |  |  |
| 14      |  |  |  |
| 15516.5 |  |  |  |

## Does your state deal with high absorptive aggregates (> 1.5% water absorption)?



#### If so, do you handle conditioning differently with these aggregates?

6 responses



