## Development of a Testing Protocol for Quality Control/Quality Assurance of Hot Mix Asphalt

Dr. Walaa S. Mogawer, PI Dr. Rajib B. Mallick, Co PI Dr. William Crockford

Prepared for The New England Transportation Consortium February 5, 2004

NETCR 43

**NETC 01-2** 

This report, prepared in cooperation with the New England Transportation Consortium, does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. The contents of this report reflects the view of the authors who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the views of the New England Transportation Consortium or the Federal Highway Administration.

		<b>Technical Repor</b>	t Documentation Page		
1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No. N/A	3. Recepient's Catalog No.	N/A		
4. Title and Subtitle		5. Report Date			
Development of a Testing Protocol for (	Quality Control/Quality		XX/XX/XX		
Assurance of Hot Mix Asphalt	Quality Control Quality	<ol> <li>Performing Organization</li> </ol>	Code		
		ľ	N/A		
7. Author(s)		8. Performing Organization	Report No.		
Dr. Walaa S. Mogawer, PI		NETCR43 01-	-2		
Dr. Rajib B. Mallick, Co PI					
Dr. William Crockford					
9. Performing Organization Name and Address		10 Work Unit No. (TRAIS)			
Department of Civil and Environmental Eng	ineering	NI/A			
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth	incering				
285 Old Westport Road		11 Contract or Grant No			
North Dartmouth, MA 02747		N/A			
		13. Type of Report and Per	riod Covered		
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address					
170 Middle Turppike					
University of Connecticut U-5202					
Storrs. CT 06269-5202					
,		14. Sponsoring Agency Co	de		
		NETC 01-2 A study conducted in cooperation			
15 Sunnlementary Notes		with the U.S. DO	ľ		
N/A					
16. Abstract					
The objective of this research was to develop	a test protocol for the use of the rapid t	riaxial test method for use in	quality control of HMA		
production. The scope of this study consisted	of testing different mixes at two different	ent temperatures and frequenc	ies and evaluating the		
results. The equipment is rugged and portable	e, and the hardware and software are eas	sy to handle and do not requir	e extensive technician		
training. The results from this study show that	t modulus and phase angle values obtain f regults obtained from tests conducted	at 60°C and 1 Hz are low. To	to key mixture components		
showed good correlation of dynamic stiffness	parameters with rutting, and the stiffne	ess parameters were found to 1	be sensitive to dust to		
effective binder ratio. One significant advanta	ige of using this test procedure as a regi	ular quality control tool is that	t decisions can be taken on		
the basis of performance related parameters ra	ather than on the basis of volumetric pro-	operties only. Considering the	e desirable qualities, it		
seems that this test method can be considered	for regular use for quality control testin	ng. However, before it is used	, user agencies must test		
mixes using the suggested test protocol, and e	stablish target values and allowable val	lations.			
17. Key Words	18. Distribution Statement	t is available to the public.	through the		
	National Technical Information	t is available to the public	uniougn me		
		i service, springfield, vilg	5111a 22101.		
Unclassified	Unclassified	21. No. of Pages	22. Price		
	Depre duction of completed		1 1/ / 1		

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)

Reproduction of completed page authorized

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Introduction	4
1.1. Problem Statement	4
1.2. Objectives of Research:	4
1.3 Format of Report	. 4
Chapter 2: Background, Scope and Test Plan	6
Background	6
Scope	. 7
Test Plan	8
Chapter 3. Results and Analysis	13
Practical considerations, user friendliness and cost	13
Rate of loading1	14
Test temperature	14
Results and Analysis	14
Variability of Test Results and Effect of Mix Properties	14
Determination of phase angle values	17
Suggested use of the test procedure 1	17
Chapter 4. Conclusions and Recommendations	28
APPENDIX A	29
APPENDIX B	41

#### **Chapter 1. Introduction**

#### **1.1. Problem Statement**

In order to implement the Superpave design system for Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) mix design and construction, proper measures must be taken to ensure the quality of mixes produced in the HMA plant. Good quality can be maintained only through the use of sensitive, easy to use and repeatable quality control and quality assurance tests. The nature of quality control requires a system that is easily and rapidly implemented and routinely operated at the project level. Once a good test procedure is identified, there is a need to develop testing protocols for proper use.

For quality control and quality assurance (QC/QA), the Superpave gyratory compactor (SGC) and the rapid triaxial testing equipment have been recommended for use by the researchers of NCHRP 9-7: Field Procedures and Equipment to Implement SHRP Asphalt Specifications (1). The utility of the rapid triaxial test procedure for characterization of mixes has been presented in a number of reports (2, 3, 4). Since the recommended triaxial testing equipment is new, there is a need to evaluate the equipment, determine its sensitivity to key mixture properties and develop guidelines for using the equipment and the test results in an effective QC/QA system for HMA.

#### 1.2. Objectives of Research:

The objectives of the research reported in this paper are to evaluate the rapid triaxial test method for use in quality control of HMA production – its applicability, practicality and sensitivity to mix properties, and if possible, determine test conditions for obtaining reliable results.

#### **1.3 Format of Report**

This report presents the results of NETC 01-2, "Development of a Testing Protocol for Quality Control/Quality Assurance of Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) study, carried out by University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth and Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI). The rest of the report is divided in five chapters.

Chapter 2 provides the background, scope and test plan of the study. Chapter 3 presents details of test results and analysis.

Chapter 4 provides conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter 5 presents the list of references indicated in the different chapters.

Appendix A presents the suggested Standard Practice for Rapid Triaxial Test for Flexible Pavement QC/QA

Appendix B presents the raw data obtained during tests in this study.

#### **Chapter 2: Background, Scope and Test Plan**

#### Background

Researchers of NCHRP 9-7 realized that the measurement of gyratory properties such as slope of compaction or volumetric property such as density is not adequate for testing of materials for performance related properties. Accordingly, they proposed the use of two tests – field shear test and rapid triaxial testing. The field shear test is an expedited version of the SST, and the rapid triaxial test is an automated version of a triaxial testing system that has been used by Texas Department of Transportation (DOT) in the past. Preliminary studies indicated that the rapid triaxial test is better suited for adoption at this time, since it is based on the widely used concept of shear strength and triaxial testing of soils, and also because a significant amount of work needs to be done to evaluate the effects of different test parameters in the field shear device before it can be recommended for regular use. At this time, it also appears that the field shear device or the Superpave Simple Performance Testing. Accordingly, the objective of this proposed research project is to develop testing protocols for the rapid triaxial test.

The prototype rapid triaxial testing system was developed by Barry Tritt of Industrial Process Controls (IPC) based on conceptual designs by Dr. Crockford and theoretical considerations put forth by R.L. Lytton of Texas Transportation Institute as part of the NCHRP 9-7 research program (1). The basic philosophy behind the test is based on triaxial testing of construction and geomaterials, as conducted for many years by Texas DOT and CalTrans. The newly developed testing system is much easier to use than a conventional geotechnical cell triaxial system, and is fully automated and software controlled (Figure 1). Testing can be conducted using a wide range of stress, states of stress and confinement conditions.

The test applies a haversine loading to the specimen and engineering properties are determined from the response. The draft procedure outlined in Reference *1* includes information on loading, frequency, and pay factor style result analysis. Very little testing was used to support the pay factor table in project 9-7, so the table is heavily dependent on theoretical estimates. However, recent efforts in the Superpave Models and AASHTO 2002 projects have independently confirmed that there is some merit to the table published in Report 409.

For QC purposes, the 9-7 recommendations were testing at one confining pressure, using specimens taken straight out of gyratory mold, and for QA the recommendations were testing at multiple frequencies at desired temperature(s).

Results from tests with materials obtained from SPS 9 projects and Westrack have shown that the test procedure is sensitive to basic mixture components and can be used to identify changes in key mixture components (1, 2, 3).

#### Scope

The scope of this study consisted of testing of different mixes at two different temperatures and frequencies and evaluating the results. The tests were conducted to obtain two parameters – dynamic modulus and phase angle. The compression dynamic modulus is a measure of the stiffness of the mix and affects the deflection response of the pavement under load. The phase angle, which indicates the lag between stress and strain response, is a measure of the viscoelastic response of the mix.

The equipment used was a testing machine consisting of software controlled rapid triaxial testing system. The maximum load capacity of the equipment is 40kN, and load is applied through a pneumatic system. While going through the results and analysis sections, the reader should keep in mind that this equipment, unlike its bigger versions, which are hydraulically operated, works through a pneumatic system, and hence suffers from usual load variations common to all pneumatic powered testing equipment. However, the pneumatic powered system (can be used with a portable air compressor) makes it ideal for use in quality control operations in a plant or field laboratory.

In the first phase, two mixes, with different nominal maximum aggregate size, gradation and asphalt content, were tested. Next, samples compacted from the same mix, but with different air voids, were tested. In the third phase, mixes with design, design plus and design minus asphalt contents (AC) and percent passing the 0.075 mm sieve (P75) were tested. Observations made during the tests and analyses of results were used for evaluation of the test procedure. Data analysis was focused on evaluation of repeatability of test, comparison of desired and actual load at two different frequencies and sensitivity of test results to mix properties at different frequencies and temperature.

The testing required compaction of gyratory samples, and questions about dimensions and mass of sample, and number of gyrations were raised. For obtaining speed/economy, it was decided to use a 100 mm diameter sample, as tall as can be obtained. Regarding the question of sample mass and gyration, it was decided to use samples with a fixed amount of mix – 2,000 grams, and compact the mixes to design (N<sub>design</sub>) gyrations. It was realized that the samples would not end up with optimum air voids, and the plan was to treat the resultant air voids as covariates in the subsequent analysis.

Initially, it was decided to use samples taken straight out of the gyratory compactor for testing. The temperature of samples taken straight out of the gyratory compactor was found to be approximately 100°C. Also, to simulate pavement conditions under traffic traveling at highway speeds, a frequency of 5 Hz was selected. However, as work progressed, it was determined that practical considerations would necessitate the investigation of the use of this test at a lower temperature and a lower frequency. A lower temperature of 60°C and a lower frequency of 1 Hz were selected.

The tests were run in compression, using a sinusoidal wave, ranging from 10 kPa to 90 kPa, with the application of a range of  $\pm$ 40kPa about a 50kPa compressive stress. A confining pressure of 5 kPa was applied. Figure 1b shows a typical stress and strain plot from testing.

#### **Test Plan**

The test plan consisted of three different phases. In the first phase, two different mixes (different in nominal maximum aggregate size, asphalt content and gradation) were used for compacting samples and testing. These mixes, a 9.5 (known as Class 2) and a 12.5 mm (known as Class 1) mix, were obtained from a HMA plant in Connecticut. The samples were made by taking 2,000 gram mix, and using the required number of gyrations required to produce samples with 6 to 8 percent (construction) VTM. Since the 9.5 mm NMAS mix sample could not stand the seating load (20N) at the beginning of the dynamic modulus test (it fell apart) at 100°C, all tests were run at 60°C. Aggregate gradation and other relevant mix information are shown in Table 1.

In Phase 2, samples were made out of granite aggregate, using a coarse gradation and one asphalt content, and different numbers of gyration (to obtain specific heights), to produce samples with different voids in total mix (VTM). A PG 64-28 asphalt binder was used, at an

asphalt content of 5.3 %. Target VTM were 5, 7 and 9 percent. Aggregate and asphalt properties are shown in Table 1.

Next, to observe the sensitivity of the test procedure, at different conditions, to mix variables, tests were run with samples compacted with different asphalt contents and percent passing the 0.075 mm sieve (Phase 3, part 1). The asphalt content was increased and decreased by 0.5 % from the Phase 2 mixes, and the percent passing the 0.075 mm sieve (P75) was increased and decreased by 2 % from the Phase 2 mixes. The matrix for the samples is shown in Table 2. The same aggregate and gradations as used in Phase 2 were used. These samples were all compacted to 75 gyrations, using approximately 2,000 gram mix for each sample. The samples were tested at 60°C and 100°C, and using 1 Hz and 5 Hz loading rate. Three samples were made for each cell.

In Phase 3, part 2, another aggregate was used for preparing a fine graded mix, with different asphalt contents and percentage passing the 0.075 mm sieve. Relevant mix information is shown in Table 1. The sample matrix is shown in Table 2. Tests were conducted for the dark shaded cells only. Five samples were made for each cell. Next, a set of samples was made with mixes with design asphalt content and design, design -2 and design +2 percent P75. Unlike the other samples, these were compacted using 50 gyrations, to obtain higher air voids. The compacted samples were tested at 60°C, at 1 Hz and 5 Hz loading rate.

The test parameters and test results were then analyzed to determine whether the test procedure is practical and sensitive to key mix properties.

Note that these particular gradations (used in Phase 2) were selected on the basis of recommendation from New England Transportation Consortium (NETC) technical committee members. The coarse and fine gradations are commonly used gradations in mixes used by the New Hampshire and Maine department of transportation, respectively.



FIGURE 1 A Triaxial cell with sample, B Loading parameters.

### TABLE 1 Mix information

# Phase 1

1 11450 1		
Mix	Asphalt Content, %	Theoretical Maximum
		Density (Gmm)
Class 1, 12.5 mm NMAS	5.2	2.478
Class 2, 9.5 mm NMAS	6.0	2.447
Phase 2, Phase 3, part 1		
Material	Property	
Aggregate	Bulk specific gravity: 2.599	
Aggregate	Absorption: 0.85	
Asphalt, content	PG 64-28, 5.3 %	
Phase 3, part 2		
Material	Property	
Aggregate	Bulk specific gravity: 2.681	
Aggregate	Absorption: 0.57	
Asphalt	PG 64-28	

#### Gradation

	% Passing							
			Phase 2	Phase 3,				
Sieve	Phase 1	Phase 1	and Phase 3,	part 2				
Size, mm	12.5 mm mix	9.5 mm mix	part 1					
19	100		100	100				
12.5	96	100	100 98					
9.5	76	98	86	83				
4.75	56	63	46	64				
2.36	45	51	32	45				
1.18			24	28				
0.6	26	29	17	16				
0.3	14	14	11	10				
0.15			6	7				
0.075	4.6	3.5	3.1	100				

Note: In phase 1, samples of two mixes, a 9.5 mm and a 12.5 mm mix, with approximately 7 % VTM were tested. In phase 2, samples prepared with gradation shown above, and 5.3 % asphalt content, were compacted to 5, 7 and 9 % VTM, and tested.

# TABLE 2 Sample matrix

Phase 3, par	t 1		
Percent			
passing			
0.075 mm			
sieve		Asphalt Content, %	
	5.3 - 0.5 = 4.8	5.3	5.3 + 0.5 = 5.8
3.1 - 2 = 1.1	XXX	XXX	XXX
3.1	XXX	XXX	XXX
3.1 + 2 = 5.1	XXX	XXX	XXX

# Phase 3, part 2

Percent								
passing 0.075 mm								
sieve		Asphalt Content, %						
	5.7	6.2	6.7					
7 - 2 = 5	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX					
7	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX					
7 + 2 = 9	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX					

Note: Dark shaded cells – compaction to 75 gyrations, light shaded cells – compaction to 50 gyrations, 6.2 % asphalt content and 7 percent passing 0.075 mm sieve mix was used for both 50 and 75 gyrations, unshaded mixes were not prepared

## **Chapter 3. Results and Analysis**

#### Practical considerations, user friendliness and cost

The steps for setting up and testing samples and the approximate time needed are as follows.

- Run a tuning procedure with a representative sample at representative test conditions to obtain target test conditions. This process takes about ten minutes for an experienced operator. This step is needed only at the start of the test program and is not needed before testing each and every sample.
- 2. Input parameters to specific test template. This takes about two to five minutes, and is needed only at the start of the test program.
- 3. Select the specific template file for running the test. Input sample information and test conditions. This step takes less than a minute.
- 4. Take sample out from gyratory compactor/conditioning chamber and place it under the triaxial cell.
- 5. Use software to lower the rapid triaxial cell and run test. Running the test consists of checking the readings from LVDTS (linear variable differential transducers), applying required number of cycles of stress, saving the results, selecting data filtering options and viewing and printing results. This step, depending on the number of cycles, takes about three to five minutes.

The entire procedure, starting from placement of the sample under the cell and getting the results takes less than 10 minutes. The hardware and software are relatively easy to handle. *Portability of the equipment:* The loading equipment, along with the rapid triaxial cell, data acquisition and pneumatic filtration/regulation system is less than 300 kg in weight. The loading equipment is about 60 cm wide, 30 cm wide and 1.5 m in height. The equipment can easily be placed and towed in a trailer. It runs on standard 115V, single-phase electrical system. The equipment requires a system for providing filtered clean air at a minimum pressure of 800 kPa. The test procedure is fairly easy to understand, and a technician can be trained within a relatively short period of time. The equipment used in this study, along with an environmental chamber, costs about \$50,000. Note that the environmental chamber may not be necessary for running in quality control mode.

#### **Rate of loading**

One important concern was that of making sure that the applied load is the same as (or close to) the specified load. The software provides an estimate of "standard error" which is a measure of the difference between specified and applied load, as obtained from the load transducer. These errors, for a set of samples, as obtained at 1 Hz and 5 Hz (at 60°C), are shown in Table 3. Each set of three samples belongs to the same mix. As Table 3, shows, the average standard error at 5 Hz is more than 3 times the average standard error for the 1 Hz loads.

#### **Test temperature**

With time, the flexible membrane inside the triaxial cell gets coated with asphalt and very fine aggregates (on the inside). After conducting tests on approximately 50 samples at 100°C, the test could not be run, as the head could not move up and down. It seemed that because of tests ran at 100°C, a significant amount of asphalt had stuck to the inside of the membrane, and the build up was preventing the cell from moving up or down by getting caught in the loading head. Figure 2a shows the build up of asphalt inside the membrane. The moving cell actually tore the membrane (Figure 2b) and this caused a reduction in confining pressure. This could also have occurred because when the cell lifted up, the system did not pull enough vacuum on the membrane. At this time it is recommended that tests be conducted at temperatures lower than 100°C.

#### **Results and Analysis**

The results of this ongoing study are provided in several paragraphs.

#### Variability of Test Results and Effect of Mix Properties

The results of phase 1, which consisted of tests conducted on samples from two different mixes, are shown in Table 4. Average temperature of samples (average of temperatures measured on the specimen surface at the start and end of the test) are also shown. The dynamic modulus and phase angle values were analyzed to determine whether the values differed significantly or not. It can be seen that the dynamic modulus values of 12.5 mm mix are (mostly) greater than the dynamic modulus values of the 9.5 mm mix. The phase angle values for the 9.5 mm mix (which has a higher asphalt content) are (mostly) greater than the phase angle values of the 12.5 mm mix. Also, as expected, the modulus values for each mix at 5 Hz are greater than the modulus values at 1 Hz. The statistical analysis results are shown in Table 4. It shows that the dynamic modulus values obtained at both 1 and 5 Hz are significantly affected by mix type and temperature, whereas the phase angle values obtained at 1 Hz are significantly affected by mix

type only, and phase angle values obtained at 5 Hz do not show any significant effect of mix type or temperature. Note that quality control documents were obtained to verify the properties of these mixes, and theoretical maximum density tests for these two mixes were run as part of this study.

The results of tests conducted in phase 2, which consisted of tests on samples (of same mix) with different air voids, are shown in Table 5. As planned initially, these samples were tested at 5 Hz and 100°C. Only the dynamic modulus values are shown as the phase angles obtained in these tests were believed to be erroneous because of wrong software settings. The dynamic modulus values decrease with an increase in VTM, and the statistical analysis results, presented in Table 5, show significant effect of air voids on dynamic modulus values. In the model, the parameter estimate for temperature was not found to be significantly different from zero, most likely because of narrow range of temperature. However, the inclusion of temperature variable did improve the model.

Results of tests in phase 3, part 1, consisting of tests conducted at 60 and 100°C at 1 and 5 Hz, with granite aggregates and a coarse gradation, are shown in Table 6. The coefficients of variation (CV) are close to 10 in all cases except for the phase angles at 100°C and 5 Hz (which is abnormally high, around 23 percent). In comparison, the CVs are close to 5 percent for tests run at 60°C, except again for the phase angle results at 5 Hz (CV of 25 percent). It seems that the results are the least variable, and hence the test has the best repeatability when conducted at 60°C and 1 Hz.

The data was analyzed to determine whether the dynamic modulus and phase angle values are significantly affected by air voids, temperature, asphalt content and percent passing the 0.075 mm sieve. (Note that both asphalt content and P75 are present in the Witczak's equation, which relates dynamic modulus with mix properties, 4). Data were taken at nominal temperatures 60°C and 100°C (measured temperature was used as a covariate). Models were fit for each response, nominal temperature and covariate. Model selection was done from among a set of candidate regressors consisting of the four predictors, their squares and pairwise cross products. Promising models were selected using stepwise regression (p = 0.05), all possible regressions using the adjusted R<sup>2</sup> criterion, and all possible regression using the C(p) criterion. Baseline model with asphalt content, percent passing the 0.075 mm sieve, temperature and VTM as linear terms are also provided. The results of analysis are shown in Table 7.

In the second part of Phase 3 tests were conducted at 60°C only, at 1 and 5 Hz with fine gradation mixes, with different asphalt contents and percent passing the 0.075 mm sieve. The results are shown in Table 8. The CVs are less than 10 percent in all cases, and the CV for the phase angle results is the less for the 1 Hz than that at 5 Hz condition, whereas the CVs for the dynamic modulus at 1 Hz and 5 Hz are both approximately 6 percent. Hence, it seems that the test has better repeatability at 1 Hz than at 5 Hz.

Statistical analysis was conducted in a similar way as done for Phase 3, part 1 results, and the analysis results are shown in Table 9.

Results of analyses presented in Table 7 (for coarse gradation) show that dynamic modulus values at both 60°C and 100°C are significantly affected by asphalt content and P75. As expected, interaction factors also have significant effects. The best models for the phase angles, obtained at 1 Hz and 5 Hz at 60°C include AC and P75, and contains only P75 for the results of tests conducted at 1 Hz and 100°C. Regressions are stronger (higher R<sup>2</sup>) for tests results obtained at 60°C compared to regressions for test results obtained at 100°C.

Results of analyses presented in Table 9 (for fine gradation) show that better regressions are obtained for the phase angles compared to the regressions obtained for dynamic modulus, although the models for dynamic modulus are significant, as shown by Pr>F<0.05. However, it seems that the dynamic modulus values are not significantly affected by a change in asphalt content (AC). The best regression model obtained for the phase angle values obtained at 1 Hz does not include AC. The best regression model (with  $R^2=0.6$ ) for phase angle values obtained at 5 Hz includes AC and P75, as well as an interaction factor, AC\*P75. Considering all the results, it seems that the phase angle values are more sensitive to the mix variables in this fine graded mix, than the dynamic modulus values. However, it is quite possible that the range of variation (for example in asphalt content) in this study was not simply wide enough.

Results of tests conducted on the samples compacted to 50 gyrations are shown in Table 8. Results from the tests conducted at 1 Hz indicate a maximum modulus at design P75 (7 %) and lower modulus values at lower (5 %) and higher (9 %) P75. The phase angle values increase with an increase in P75. Results from tests conducted at 5 Hz show a decrease in modulus values between 7 and 9 % P75. Statistical analyses presented in Table 9 show that dynamic modulus values values obtained from tests conducted at 1 Hz are significantly different for mixes with different P75.

Samples compacted to 50 gyrations (as discussed above) were also tested for rutting with the Asphalt Pavement Analyzer. Note that all of these samples (shown in Table 8) have voids around 3 %. Rut tests were conducted at 60°C using 690 kPa pressure and 8,000 cycles. The results are plotted against dust to effective binder ratio in Figure 3a. A plot of dynamic modulus/sin  $\phi$  versus dust to effective binder ratio is also shown in the same Figure. The low dust to effective binder ratio (D/P<sub>be</sub>=0.9) corresponds to reduced dust, the medium D/P<sub>be</sub>=1.2 corresponds to the design dust content and the high D/P<sub>be</sub>=1.6 corresponds to increased dust. Note that the stiffness values peak at the design dust content, are lower in the case of reduced dust content, and lowest at the increased dust content. At the same time, the rut depths are lowest at the design dust content, high at the reduced dust content, and highest at the increased dust content. A plot of dynamic modulus/sin  $\phi$  versus rutting (Figure 3b) shows that the dynamic stiffness properties have good correlation with rutting.

#### **Determination of phase angle values**

Note that the phase angles can be calculated from the test data by using either the midpoint values or from the maximum and minimum (peak) values. Since the method using the "peak" values does not work well with imperfect wave shapes, it is recommended that the midpoint method be used. Note that the results (and statistical analysis result) improved significantly when the values from the midpoint method were used (instead of the values obtained from the peak picking method).

#### Suggested use of the test procedure

Note that this study was carried out to determine a suitable test that can be conducted as a regular quality control procedure. This study was to evaluate and (if proven to be possible) recommend the test procedure as a regular QC tool to identify changes in mix properties. To do this, tests were conducted under different conditions to select a set of conditions that can give reliable results, considering the sophistication level of this portable equipment. As shown from this research and from the statistical analysis of the test results, DOTs /user agencies can consider using this test as a QC tool for identifying changes in mix properties. DOTs intending to use the proposed test procedure should develop their own database of mix properties for building specifications, including target values and allowable variations for specific mixes.

It must be noted that the advantage of using a test procedure such as the one evaluated in this study, over existing methods (such as testing for volumetric properties only) is that the quality control decisions can be taken on the basis of *performance-related* properties (modulus and phase angle) rather than on the basis of indirectly related surrogate properties. In view of the fact that the stiffness parameter  $E^*/\sin \phi$  has been found to have the best statistical correlation with rutting (5, 6) it makes sense to consider the test (procedure) evaluated in this study as a regular QC tool, since it offers the option of getting reliable performance related parameters quickly and easily, with a portable testing equipment. Obviously, the parameters obtained from this test procedure have far greater significance – for example dynamic modulus has been proposed as design parameters by researchers of both NCHRP 9-19 (Superpave Support and Performance Models Management), and 1-37A (Development of the 2002 Guide for the Design of New and Rehabilitated Pavement Structures) projects. However, the test procedure(s) and conditions used and recommended in this study are not robust and sophisticated enough to yield performance or structural design parameters. It is also not the intent of the researchers to prove whether this test, as recommended in this study, can be used to predict mix or structural performance.

Sample	1Hz	5 Hz
1	1.9	5.2
2	3.2	6.9
3	2.1	5.9
4	2.7	8.6
5	2.5	8.0
6	2.4	7.4
7	3.0	9.5
8	2.5	8.0
9	2.4	6.7
10	2.0	6.9
11	1.8	6.0
12	1.9	6.7
13	3.0	8.9
14	2.7	8.5
15	2.9	8.7
16	2.2	7.4
17	1.9	7.4
18	2.0	6.9
19	2.0	6.6
20	2.1	7.5
21	2.1	7.0
22	2.3	7.0
23	2.3	7.1
24	1.8	6.1
25	1.5	4.8
26	1.9	5.9
27	2.2	6.9
Average	2.3	7.1
č		

TABLE 3 Standard error, load transducer (60°C)

Sample	NMAS	VTM	AC, %	Dynamic Modulus, MPa		Phase angle, degrees		Average Temperature, C
				1 Hz	5 Hz	1 Hz	5 Hz	. –
9.5-2	9.5	6.9	6	40.3	47.7	11.9	9.9	55
9.5-3	9.5	6.5	6	46.4	53.3	12.2	9.5	56.5
9.5-4	9.5	6.5	6	50.1	56.6	11.3	10.8	57.5
9.5-5	9.5	6.5	6	51.9	58.8	11.5	7.9	57
9.5-6	9.5	6.4	6	54.3	61.7	11.7	9.3	57.5
	Average		48.6	55.6	11.7	9.5		
Standa	ard Devia	ation		5.46	5.39	0.35	1.05	
12.5-1	12.5	7	5.2	54.8	61.6	10	7.8	57.5
12.5-2	12.5	7.4	5.2	53	60.1	10.6	10	57.5
12.5-3	12.5	6.9	5.2	55.5	61.5	10.3	8.5	57
12.5-4	12.5	7.4	5.2	56.5	61.9	10.6	8.3	57
12.5-5	12.5	7.1	5.2	53.8	60.6	10.6	8.6	57
12.5-6	12.5	7	5.2	57.4	62.9	10	8.6	56.5
Average		55.2	61.4	10.4	8.6			
Standa	ard Devia	ation		1.65	0.99	0.29	0.73	

# TABLE 4 Test results, Phase 1

Statistical analysis of Phase 1 (all tests conducted at 60°C) results

Variables	Parameters				
	Response - Dynamic Response – Phase angle,				
	Modulu	ıs, MPa	degrees		
	1 Hz	5 Hz	1 Hz	5 Hz	
Temperature, Mix type,	Pr > F = 0.0003	Pr > F = 0.0006	Pr>F=0.0015	Pr>F=0.58	
Temperature* Mix type	All parameter	All parameter	Parameter		
	estimates	estimates	estimate for		
	significantly	significantly	mix type		
	different from	different from	significantly		
	0	0	different from		
			0		

	1	1	1
Sample	VTM, %	Average	Dynamic Modulus, MPa
number		Temperature, C	
21	5	98.5	44.5
22	5	98	46.6
	Avera	age	45.5
5	6.8	95.5	39.9
14	7	96.5	39.3
17	7	99.5	36.6
23	7	97.5	33.0
24	7	97.5	35.3
	Avera	ige	36.8
25	9	98	29.4
26	9	97.5	38.9
4	8.8	92.5	38.3
13	8.5	95.5	36.8
	Avera	ige	35.8

TABLE 5 Results of tests with samples with different VTM, Phase 2

Statistical analysis of Phase 2 (all tests conducted at 100°C, 5 Hz) results

Variables	
	5 Hz
VTM, VTM <sup>2</sup> , Temperature	Pr > F = 0.02
	Parameter estimate for only VTM
	significantly different from 0

				Dynam	nic Modulus	Pha	se angle
	Asphalt	Percent					
Mix/condition	Content	passing	VTM		Coefficient		Coefficient
WIIX/Condition	%	sieve	v 1 ₩1, %	Average		Average	of variation
	18	3.1	74	101pa 12 7	22.48	13.8	5.88
Coarse graded	53	3.1	5.1	37	9.16	13.6	8 30
100C, 1 Hz	5.8	3.1	3.1	44.5	18.65	14.1	23 73
Phase 5, part 1	<u> </u>	11	7.2	43.3	9.15	17.1	8.92
	53	1.1	5.6	48.3	14 76	12.0	10.00
	5.8	1.1	3.8	35.6	8.62	12.9	7.40
	<u> </u>	5.1	17	<u> </u>	1.46	11.3	4 07
	53	5.1	1.7	46.6	5.97	12.7	13 33
	5.8	5.1	0.4	44.6	2 33	12.7	20.32
	5.0	5.1	Ave	rage	10.29	12.0	11.33
	48	3.1	74	52	22.31	12.3	6 34
G 1.1	5.3	3.1	5.1	46.3	7.00	12.3	18.60
Coarse graded,	5.8	3.1	3.8	51.9	16.05	13.1	52.58
Phase 3 part 1	4.8	11	7.2	51.2	10.03	11.0	30.13
r nuse s, pure r	53	11	5.6	56.4	16.38	12.4	31.32
	5.8	11	3.8	42.7	8 31	11.3	7 50
	4.8	5.1	1.7	56.6	1.59	9.9	9.55
	5.3	5.1	1.1	54.6	7.44	11.6	23.13
	5.8	5.1	0.4	52.9	2.12	11.0	30.39
			Ave	erage	10.22		23.28
	4.8	3.1	7.4	51.3	13.90	8.3	8.50
Coarse graded	5.3	3.1	5.1	50.7	4.04	7.0	5.80
60C, 1 Hz	5.8	3.1	3.8	48.7	8.25	7.5	5.00
Phase 3, part 1	4.8	1.1	7.2	57.5	7.36	8.1	2.59
	5.3	1.1	5.6	51.8	2.70	7.1	5.54
	5.8	1.1	3.8	53.8	4.46	7.5	6.34
	4.8	5.1	1.7	60.5	3.65	7.5	3.00
	5.3	5.1	1.1	56.8	2.31	6.8	1.52
	5.8	5.1	0.4	52.6	4.33	7.2	3.57
			Ave	erage	5.67		4.65
	4.8	3.1	7.4	59.1	13.16	7.9	5.90
Coarse graded	5.3	3.1	5.1	55.1	3.65	7.0	48.91
60C, 5 Hz	5.8	3.1	3.8	53.6	7.82	7.5	51.71
Phase 3, part 1	4.8	1.1	7.2	64.1	5.82	8.3	19.12
	5.3	1.1	5.6	56.5	2.28	6.1	25.36
	5.8	1.1	3.8	58.3	4.75	8.5	26.25
	4.8	5.1	1.7	65	5.29	8.2	24.41
	5.3	5.1	1.1	61.4	2.65	8.2	23.27
	5.8	5.1	0.4	58.2	5.60	7.8	3.88
			Ave	erage	5.67		25.42

# TABLE 6 Results of Phase 3, part 1

	Paran	neters		
Response - Dynamic Modulus, MPa		Response – Phase angle, degrees		
60°C				
1 Hz	5 Hz	1 Hz	5 Hz	
Variables: AC, P75, Temp Pr>F=0.001 R <sup>2</sup> =0.5 All parameter estimates, except for temperature, are significantly different from 0	Variable: AC, P75, Temp Pr>F=0.0046 R <sup>2</sup> =0.4 Parameter estimates for AC and VTM are significantly different from 0	Variable: AC, AC2, P75, Temp, VTM, Temp*VTM, AC*Temp, P75*Temp Pr>F<0.0001 $R^2 = 0.9$ All parameter estimates, except for AC, P75 and P75*Temp are significantly different from 0	Variables: AC, P75, VTM, Temp, AC*P75, AC*VTM, P75*Temp, P75*VTM, VTM*VTM, Temp*Temp Pr>F = 0.0464 $R^2$ = 0.6 Parameter estimates for AC, P75, VTM, AC*VTM are significantly different from 0	
	10/	200		
V 11 AC D75	100 N. 11 AC D75	$V^{\circ}C$	V. 11 T	
Variables: AC, P75, Temp, VTM Pr>F=0.28	Variables: AC, P75, Temp, VTM Pr>F=0.3	Variables: P75, Temp, VTM, Temp*VTM Pr>F=0.0057 R <sup>2</sup> =0.5 All parameter estimates are significantly different from 0	Variables: Temp, VTM, Temp*VTM Pr>F=0.0405 $R^2 = 0.3$ Parameter estimate of Temperature only significant	

# TABLE 7 Statistical analysis of phase 3, part 1 results Parameters

# TABLE 8 Results of Phase 3, part 2Samples compacted to 75 gyrations

Mix/condition			Dynamic		c Modulus	Phase A	ngle
	Asphalt Content %	Percent passing 0.075 mm sieve	VTM, %	Average Mpa	Coefficient of variation %	Average degrees	Coefficient of variation %
Fine graded, 60C, 1 Hz Phase 3, part 2	6.2	7	1.9	52.2	5.94	8.6	4.40
	6.7	7	0.8	52.5	6.48	9.9	5.15
	5.7	7	2.9	55.4	2.35	8.8	4.44
	5.7	9	2.7	46.8	8.76	11.0	6.36
	6.7	5	1.3	48.8	10.25	11.7	2.56
			Av	erage	6.75		4.58
Fine graded, 60C, 5 Hz Phase 3, part 2	6.2	7	1.9	57.7	6.24	9.1	7.06
	6.7	7	0.8	57.5	2.09	9.7	3.23
	5.7	7	2.9	60.5	3.47	8.9	12.66
	5.7	9	2.7	51.8	10.62	10.9	10.09
	6.7	5	1.3	55.4	10.29	10.9	8.11
			Av	erage	6.54		8.23
Samples compacted to 50 gyrations							

Dynamic Modulus Phase Angle Asphalt Percent Content passing Mix/condition passing 0.075 mm VTM, Average of variation Average Of variation % sieve % Mpa % Degrees % 3.0 7.39 9.3 6.2 7 87.3 7.68 Fine graded, 6.2 9 2.7 75.7 2.59 10.0 3.29 60C, 1 Hz Phase 3, part 2 6.2 5 3.6 82.0 2.60 10.2 5.72 4.19 Average 5.56 7 3.0 6.2 89.1 12.60 11.9 18.77 Fine graded, 9 2.7 2.09 6.2 83.4 11.8 5.41 60C, 5 Hz Phase 3, part 2 6.2 5 3.6 89.3 3.48 11.5 6.15 Average 6.06 10.11

	<u> </u>			
Parameters				
Response - Dynamic Modulus, MPa		Response – Phase angle, degrees		
60°C				
1 Hz	5 Hz	1 Hz	5 Hz	
Variables: P75, VTM,	Variables: P75,	Variables: AC, Temp,	Variables: AC, Temp,	
Temp, VTM*Temp,	Temp, P*Temp, P752	P75, VTM,	P75, VTM,	
P752	Pr>F=0.04	Temp*P75,	Temp*P75,	
Pr>F=0.01	$R^2 = 0.3$	AC*VTM, AC*P75	VTM*VTM, AC*P75	
$R^2 = 0.4$	Parameter estimates	Pr>F<0.0001	Pr > F = 0.0007	
Parameter estimates	for P75, P752 are	$R^2 = 0.9$	$R^2 = 0.8$	
for P75 and P752 are	significantly different	All parameter	Parameter for AC,	
significantly different	from 0	estimates except for	AC*P75 and	
from 0		Temp and Temp*Pass	VTM*VTM are	
		are significantly	significantly different	
		different from 0	from 0	

# TABLE 9 Statistical analysis of Phase 3, Part 2 results Samples compacted to 75 gyrations

Note: For coarse graded mix, VTM is present in best model for both dynamic modulus and phase angle. For fine graded mix, a better model ( $R^2=0.8$ ) is obtained at 1 Hz with P75 and VTM<sup>2</sup> (does not include AC) compared to the one ( $R^2=0.6$ ) which has AC and P75.

Samples compacted to 50 gyrations

Parameters				
Response - Dynamic Modulus, MPa		Response – Phase angle, degrees		
60°C				
1 Hz	5 Hz	1 Hz	5 Hz	
Variables: P75,	Variables: AC, P75,	Variables: Temp,	Variables: P75, VTM,	
Temp, VTM	Temp, VTM	Temp*Temp	Temp, P75*Temp,	
Pr > F = 0.04	Pr>F=0.17	Pr>F<0.0001	VTM*Temp,	
		$R^2 = 0.8$	P75*P75,	
		All parameter	Temp*Temp	
		estimates are	Pr > F = 0.0145	
		significantly different	$R^2 = 0.9$	
		from 0	All parameter except	
			for Temp and	
			Temp*Temp are	
			significantly different	
			from 0	



A



В

FIGURE 2 A Asphalt and fine particle build-up inside the membrane B. Torn membrane.



FIGURE 3a Plots of dust/effective binder ratio versus E\*/sin and APA rutting.



FIGURE 3b Plot of E\*/sin  $\phi$  versus rutting

#### **Chapter 4. Conclusions and Recommendations**

Based on the results of this study, the following conclusions and recommendations are made:

- 1. The rapid triaxial testing procedure offers a fundamental, practical, fast and economic procedure for obtaining mechanistic properties of HMA. The triaxial testing process allows proper simulation of in-place stress states, while fully automated and software controlled equipment allows the user to avoid lengthy sample and test preparation steps that are usually involved in a standard triaxial testing.
- 2. The results from this study and several others have shown that modulus and phase angle values obtained from testing are sensitive to key mixture components and properties, and that rankings of mixes based on results from this test are consistent with observed in-place rutting in HMA pavements.
- The coefficients of variation of results obtained from tests conducted at 60°C and 1 Hz are low (around 5 %) and hence the test has good repeatability.
- 4. The equipment is rugged and portable, and the hardware and software are easy to handle and do not require extensive technician training.
- 5. It should be noted that the equipment and software allow user definable stress, load frequencies and waveforms, and hence allow the user to conduct a wide range of standard and customized tests such as static and dynamic, uniaxial and triaxial, creep and resilient modulus. Also, the use of its environment chamber (which is typically not used for QC testing) allows the user to test mixes under a wide range of temperatures. The chamber for the equipment used in this study was found to be capable of maintaining temperatures between  $-10^{\circ}$ C to  $60^{\circ}$ C.
- 6. Considering the desirable qualities, it seems that this test method can be considered for regular use for QC testing. However, before it is used, each state DOT must test each of its mixes (produced under controlled conditions) using an adopted test protocol, and establish target parameter (modulus and phase angles) and allowable variations. For guidance, test temperature and frequency of 60°C and 1 Hz, respectively, are recommended.

# APPENDIX A

Standard Practice for Rapid Triaxial Test for Flexible Pavement QC/QA

#### Standard Practice for Rapid Triaxial Test for Flexible Pavement QC/QA

#### 1 Scope

1.1 This standard provides rapid laboratory test procedures for quality control, quality assurance (QC/QA) and engineering analysis of hot mix asphalt concrete mixtures. With suitably prepared specimens, the test may also be used for base course materials.

1.2 This standard is applicable to specimens prepared by gyratory compaction or cored from a laboratory scale slab compacted with a rolling wheel compactor or from a full scale pavement. The specimen diameter is 150mm with a minimum height to diameter ratio of approximately 1:1 (but not less than 0.97:1). The procedure is written assuming a 150 mm tall by 150 mm diameter specimen, a configuration that is readily produced in a gyratory compactor. While it is recognized that there is interest among various circles in testing specimens with reduced diameters and height to diameter ratios of 2:1, the intent of the proposed practice is to provide a rapid means of testing specimens that can be readily produced in a standard Superpave<sup>™</sup> gyratory compactor. The test does not require alteration to accommodate these other specimen sizes, but the triaxial cell dimensions must be altered to properly fit the specimen and specimens less than 69 mm in diameter will not be used. The standard is applicable to materials having maximum aggregate sizes up to 63.5 mm.

1.3 Two procedures are available in this test method.

Procedure A - Quality Control Testing

Procedure B - Quality Assurance and Mixture Evaluation Testing

1.4 This practice may involve hazardous materials, operations, and equipment. It does not purport to address all the safety problems associated with its use. It is the responsibility of whoever uses this practice to consult and establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to its use.

#### 2 Reference Documents

2.1 AASHTO Standards

Quality Assurance Guide Specification, AASHTO Joint Task Force report 09/22/95

- PP2 Practice for Short and Long Term Aging of Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA)
- PP3 Practice for Preparing Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) Specimens by Means of the Rolling Wheel Compactor

- T40 Sampling Bituminous Materials
- T168 Sampling Bituminous Paving Mixtures
- T 245 Resistance to Plastic Flow of Bituminous Mixtures Using Marshall Apparatus
- T283 Resistance of Compacted Bituminous Mixture to Moisture Induced Damage
- TP4 Method for Preparing and Determining the Density of Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) Specimens by Means of the SHRP Gyratory Compactor
- TP7 Method for Determining the Permanent Deformation and Fatigue Cracking
   Characteristics of Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) Using the Simple Shear Test (SST)
   Device
- 2.2 ASTM Standards
- D3387 Method for Compaction and Shear Properties of Bituminous Mixtures by Means of the U.S. Corps of Engineers Gyratory Testing Machine (GTM)
- D5361 Practice for Sampling Compacted Bituminous Mixtures for Laboratory Testing
- 2.3 Other Documents
- PPaa-96, Standard Practice for Design and Analysis of Large Stone (LSM) Bituminous Mixtures, NCHRP 4-18 Final Report, Appendix C.
- Superpave<sup>™</sup> Asphalt Mixture Design & Analysis, National Asphalt Training Center Demonstration Project 101
- Glossary of Highway Quality Assurance Terms, Transportation Research Circular 457, April 1996, TRB.
- AASHTO Quality Assurance Guide Specification, September 1995
- **3** Significance and Use

3.1 The triaxial approach to determining material properties is useful for a variety of reasons. One of the more important reasons for this utility is the ability to handle the characterization of different types of materials, including those materials in the pavement system that do not stick together very well (*e.g.* unbound base and subgrade materials and asphalt concrete at high temperature). The test procedure is written for asphalt concrete, but agencies may utilize the proposed practice for soils and base course materials with only slight modification. The apparatus specified in this procedure differs significantly from standard geotechnical type triaxial machines and the primary driving force for this

difference is the requirement to minimize the time between specimen preparation and testing.

3.2 The unconfined uniaxial testing conducted without radial measurements is known to be of limited utility when trying to relate lab performance to field performance with LSMs and SMAs in particular. The two key elements of this limitation are:

- If the test is both unconfined and conducted without radial measurements, there is (a) virtually no possibility of mobilizing the internal friction of the aggregate without the benefit of confinement similar to that which is present in a full scale pavement since the binder acts more as a lubricant than a binder at the relatively high temperatures used in tests related to rutting, and (b) if there is no radial measurement as well, there is very little possibility of quantifying the potential for mobilizing friction.
- If an attempt is made to relate lab and field performance using only one parameter out of a full time dependent elastic-plastic model (*e.g.* complex compliance, or slope of the creep response curve only), the relationship will likely be quite crude. However, individual parameters can often be used in process control (QC) and QA. It is in mix design/performance prediction that combinations of material properties are needed most.

This proposed practice addresses these two issues by requiring both confinement and measurement of Poisson's ratio.

3.3 "Poisson's ratio" in compression is expected to equal or exceed 0.5 for mixes with good stone-on-stone contact. High ratios should only be interpreted as identifying superior mixtures if other portions of the analysis indicate that long-term performance is acceptable (*i.e.*, impending failure and nonuniform strain fields can also be accompanied by high Poisson's ratios under certain circumstances).

3.4 If the analysis procedure indicates that the mixture will not perform adequately, the following suggestions are offered for correction of the problem. Remove any stockpile that prevents the stone skeleton from developing throughout the gradation curve. This problem often arises when a larger stone stockpile of material is not fully taken advantage of because a smaller stone stockpile has been used in too high a proportion and/or the average size of the smaller stockpile is large enough to reduce or eliminate any beneficial contribution the

largest stockpile might have on the performance of the mixture. If the problem is due to breakdown of a weak aggregate during mixing and/or compaction or is due to aggregate shape, surface texture or surface chemistry, a different parent material source for the aggregate should be selected.

### 4 Apparatus

## 4.1 General

4.1.1 Loading Device - The device shall have a minimum actuator load capacity of 5 kN on one axis (usually the vertical), and a minimum confining pressure capacity of 400 kPa. It is unlikely that mechanical (*e.g.* screw-driven) machines would be capable of meeting the intent of this practice. Servo-controlled hydraulic and pneumatic machines are recommended.

Note 1: Pneumatic and hydraulic machines machines manufactured by Industrial Process Controls Ltd. have been found to be suitable for this purpose. Nitrile or neoprene membranes for the triaxial cell manufactured by Karol-Warner have been found to be suitable for moderate temperature range applications. Extended temperature range membranes manufactured by TSL Services & Equipment have been found suitable for high temperature QC testing as well as low temperature QA/performance testing. Latex membranes are not suitable for use in this apparatus.

4.1.2 Control system - The loading device shall have two channels of feedback control and shall be capable of producing a sinusoidal waveshape at 15 Hz on the vertical axis while maintaining a constant confining pressure. The control system shall allow the user to change the frequency of the axial loading, the shape of the waveform, and the type of test. The feedback system shall dynamically control the amplitude of the axial waveform to within 0.5% of the command at the measurement point. Additionally, the control system shall be capable of ramping the vertical load and confining pressure simultaneously such that a condition of hydrostatic pressure is maintained throughout when this type of loading is required during the test.

4.1.3 Load Measuring Devices - The load measuring device shall consist of an electronic load cell with a resolution of 5 N or better, and a minimum capacity of 5 kN with 0.1% accuracy. An electronic pressure transducer with a 600 kPa range, 0.5 kPa resolution and 0.25% accuracy shall be used to measure confining pressure.

4.1.4 Specimen Deformation Measurement Devices - Axial and radial measurement devices shall have a range and resolution sufficient to measure the strains that occur during the test. The required range may be different for different temperatures and materials. Specimen Temperature Measurement Devices - A device to measure and 4.1.5 automatically record specimen temperature inside the triaxial cell during the test is recommended. However, measurement by external means (e.g. infrared thermometer) is allowed. If external means are used, temperature readings shall be taken within 30 seconds (a) before placing the specimen in the cell, and (b) within 30 seconds after removing the specimen from the cell, and both temperature readings shall be recorded on the report. 4.1.6 Environmental Chamber - An environmental chamber that is an integral part of the testing machine is optional, but if used shall maintain the desired test temperature to within  $\pm 1.0$  °C over the range of interest. The use of an integral environmental chamber is highly recommended for Procedure B. If a separate environmental chamber is used for Procedure B, the time limit between removal of the specimen from the conditioning system and placement in the testing machine shall be the same as the time limit specified in Procedure A for the time between removal from the compaction mold and placement in the machine. 4.1.7 Data Acquisition - The data acquisition system shall be capable of sampling at least 6 channels at a minimum rate of 200 Hz with a minimum of 12-bit analog to digital resolution.

#### 5 Hazards

5.1 Observe all safety precautions recommended by the manufacturer as well as standard laboratory safety precautions when operating testing equipment and preparing, testing, and disposing of HMA test specimens.

#### 6 Standardization

6.1 Testing systems shall be standardized prior to initial use and at least once every year thereafter.

6.1.1 Verify the calibration of all measurement components and verify the capability of the environmental and specimen conditioning systems to maintain temperatures and pressures within specified limits.

6.1.2 If any of the verifications yield data that does not comply with the accuracy specifications, correct the problem prior to testing. Appropriate action may include correction of menu entries, maintenance on system components, calibration of system components (using an independent calibration agency, or service by the manufacturer, or inhouse resources), or replacement of system components.

## 7 Test Requirements

7.1 Procedure A is used for process control of the plant production and laydown operation. Procedure B is used in conjuction with Procedure A for Quality Assurance purposes. Both procedures may also be used in the mix design and/or evaluation phases to estimate pavement performance.

# 7.2 Sampling, Specimen Preparation and Preliminary Determinations

7.3 Plant Mixed, Laboratory Compacted Specimens - Obtain hot mix asphalt sample(s) in accordance with T168. Compact specimens in accordance with PP3, TP4, or ASTM D3387. Specimens shall have a diameter of 150 mm and a height to diameter ratio of at least 0.97:1. The ratio of the smallest dimension of the specimen (i.e. the smaller of height or diameter) to the nominal maximum aggregate size shall not be less than 2.5:1. If equipment is unavailable to produce specimens with the dimensions recommended herein, the dimensions and actual ratios shall be entered in the report and the sentence "*Specimen dimensions do not meet the recommendations of the AASHTO standard*" shall be

prominently entered in boldface type on the report.

7.4 Roadway Specimens - Obtain specimens of the necessary diameter and height from the pavement in accordance with ASTM D5361.

# 8 Procedure A - QC Testing

# 8.1 Compute the frequency of loading.

Note 2: It is recommended that a frequency corresponding to the posted speed limit be used. The frequency should be computed assuming a tire contact radius, the posted speed limit, and a 1.8 m radius deflection basin. While testing at only one frequency is approved for use in this section of the proposed practice, it is not approved for Procedure B. Therefore, it is recommended that several frequencies be used in Procedure A as well, one of which should correspond closely with the posted speed limit. Then, the single frequency corresponding to the speed limit may be used for QC, and the entire frequency sweep data may be used in conjunction with the other testing for QA purposes. To provide a reasonably comprehensive range of

frequencies, 11 frequencies were used during the early research on frequency sweep testing, while later in the research, only 5 were used: 13.33, 10, 6.67, 5, and 4 Hz. While the 5 frequencies shown above are recommended, the following frequencies correspond approximately to the speed limits shown and should suffice for most applications.

Speed Limit (MPH)	Approximate Frequency (Hz)
40	4.89 (5)
55	6.72 (7)
70	8.56 (9)

Note that in the study reported in this document, a pneumatic equipment was used and a combination of 60°C and 1 Hz (as temperature and frequency) was found to be optimum for minimizing test data variability. This combination should be suitable for rapid quality control and assurance testing. However, as long as the standard errors and data variability are checked, the user can use any suitable frequency (from the above table) and temperature.

8.2 Sample, prepare, and test a minimum of three specimens per sublot of material in accordance with section 7 of this standard.

Note 3: It is recommended that QA samples be taken simultaneously with QC samples. Agency procedures should be developed for environmentally controlled storage of the QA samples for later testing if necessary. Two additional specimens may be prepared for optional strength testing of each sublot, at each stress state and environmental condition using the confining pressure for the stress state of interest and axial loading at a rate of 50.8 mm/min up to the point of (a) specimen failure, (b) the capacity of the load cell, or (c) 5% strain is reached, whichever comes first.

8.3 After compacting each specimen, immediately extrude the specimen from the mold. The specimen shall be placed in a hydrostatic confinement condition of at least 2 kPa and not more than 10% of the starting pressure selected in paragraph 8.4.1, within 60 seconds of extrusion from the mold.

8.4 Test the specimen.

8.4.1 Within 60 seconds of applying the initial 2 kPa hydrostatic pressure, simultaneously ramp both the vertical and confining pressures up to the selected starting pressure and begin the axial sinusoidal loading.

Note 4: 50 kPa hydrostatic pressure has been used successfully in this
procedure as the baseline starting pressure. An axial sinusoidal loading of  $\pm 40$  kPa is applied about the 50 kPa hydrostatic level, resulting in a cyclic load range in the axial direction of +10 to +90 kPa. Higher or lower stress levels may be indicated to meet local preferences.

#### 9 Procedure B - QA and Mixture Evaluation Testing

9.1 Determine the frequencies and environmental conditions to be used in the test.

Note 5: Except as allowed in paragraph 9.3.1, a minimum of three frequencies is required for this procedure. These frequencies should include testing at the same frequencies as used in Procedure A, as a minimum. Five frequencies are recommended (see note 2).

Note 6: In general, it is recommended that three temperatures are used, one of which should be the maximum 7-day temperature for the location. However, fewer or greater numbers of temperature conditions may be used. If moisture conditions are used as well, two should suffice and should be coupled with the temperature condition based on the local environment. Testing under moisture conditioning may be used to complement other moisture susceptibility tests such as T283. If no agency guidance has been issued, temperatures of 4, 25 and 40°C, and/or moisture conditioning of vacuum saturated versus dry are suggested.

9.2 Sample, prepare, and test a minimum of four specimens per sublot of material per temperature of interest in accordance with section 7 of this standard. It is the intent of this practice that QA tests may be used in place of QC tests, but QC tests may not be used in place of QA tests. Therefore, a full QC/QA testing program requires a minimum of four specimens per condition if Procedure B is used for both QC and QA. However, a minimum of seven specimens per condition is required if Procedure A is used for QC (3 specimens) and Procedure B is used for QA with additional stress states and/or environmental conditions over those used for QC (4 additional specimens).

9.3 Test the specimen.

9.3.1 If operating without an integral environmental chamber, within 60 seconds of removing the specimen from the chamber being used for conditioning, insert the specimen in the testing machine and bring to a 2 kPa hydrostatic pressure. Within 60 seconds of applying the hydrostatic pressure, simultaneously ramp both the vertical and confining pressures up to the selected starting pressure and begin the axial sinusoidal loading. A minimum of one stress state (*i.e.* that used for paragraph 8.4.1) and loading frequency is required. However, it is recommended that a frequency sweep is applied at

each of four stress states. If the starting hydrostatic stress state changes between two consecutive stress states, simultaneously ramp both the vertical and confining pressures up (or down) to the next stress state before starting the cyclic loading. The test must be completed within 10 minutes of removing the specimen from the chamber. Testing in accordance with this paragraph for purposes of mixture evaluation beyond the level of QC/QA work (e.g. for performance prediction models) is not allowed. For these more detailed studies, paragraph 9.3.2 must be used.

Note 7: 50 kPa hydrostatic pressure has been used successfully in this procedure as the baseline starting pressure for the first stress state. An axial sinusoidal loading of  $\pm$  40 kPa is applied about the 50 kPa hydrostatic level, resulting in a cyclic load range of +10 to +90 kPa. Higher or lower stress levels may be indicated to meet local preferences. Stress states corresponding to octahedral shear stresses of 310 kPa for a heavy truck and 138 kPa for a light truck may be used. However, these loads may cause premature specimen failure, especially if applied at elevated temperature. Although several stress magnitudes were used during the research, for temperatures between 4°C and 100°C the following stress states were found to be adequate for most of the mixtures tested.

Stress State	Starting Hydrostatic State (kPa)	Axial Deviation from Hydrostatic (kPa)
Extension/Compression	50	+40 / -40
Extension	50	+0 / -40
Compression	50	+50 / -0
Compression	100	+100 / -0

9.3.2 If operating with an integral environmental chamber, confirm that the environmental chamber and specimen are maintaining the specified test temperature  $\pm$  0.5°C and/or other environmental conditions as desired. Conduct testing in accordance with Note 7.

#### 10 Calculations

10.1 Procedures A and B

10.1.1 For the extension-compression stress state, it is necessary to separate the extension response from the compression response. Compute the dynamic modulus and Poisson's ratio in extension and in compression. Compute the phase angle between the axial stress and the axial strain. Recall that engineering strain is equal to the change in displacement divided by the gage length and that modulus is stress divided by strain. Compute the

Poisson's ratio as the radial strain divided by the axial strain. These calculations should be performed on a minimum of five cycles of data, usually starting at cycle 20. Compute the average response over the five cycles as well as the trend over the period.

Note 8: The extension-compression test is a full sinusoidal waveform that is intended to simulate the changing stress states during vehicle passage and to provide an indication of the possibility of permanent deformation in fully reversed loading. The extension portion of the waveform elicits response from the material that is similar to, but not necessarily equal to, tension loading. The reasons an extension test is used in place of a tension test are (a) the tension test requires time consuming attachment of the specimen to the loading platens by some means such as gluing which is inconsistent with the objective of a rapid test procedure, and (b) at elevated temperatures where the asphalt binder is playing a reduced role in the response, performing a direct tension test is virtually impossible.

10.1.2 If strength testing is performed, calculate the strength and Poisson's ratio at the termination point.

10.2 Procedure B

10.2.1 Compute the engineering properties listed in paragraph 10.1 for all additional stress states and environmental conditions.

### 11 Report

11.1 Procedures A and B

11.1.1 Report the results of the calculations given in paragraph 10 and its subparagraphs.

11.1.2 Plot both compression and extension modulus results versus environmental condition (e.g. temperature), and versus stress state (e.g. bulk stress).

11.1.3 For the extension-compression stress state, plot the axial and radial strain peak response as a function of cycle number. Plot the line delineating the change in response from extension to compression as a function of cycle number.

11.1.4 Using the data reported in paragraph 11.1.1, compute the percent within limits

(PWL) in accordance with the AASHTO Quality Assurance Guide Specification.

Determine composite pay factors using the guidance in QA-401.05 of the Guide

Specification and appropriate locally developed weighting factors for each parameter

selected for acceptance measurement. Pay factors are often based on measurements at one stress and environmental condition, while the results from the additional stress and moisture

conditions are usually applied to mixture evaluation and performance prediction in a continuous improvement program.

## 12 Precision and Bias

12.1 Precision - The research required to develop precision estimates for the procedures described in this standard has not been conducted.

12.2 Bias - The research required to establish the bias of this standard has not been conducted.

## 13 Key Words

Quality Control, Quality Assurance, triaxial, modulus, permanent deformation, rutting, dilation, Poisson's ratio, Mix design

# APPENDIX B

Test Data

## PHASE I Dynamic Modulus Test Outputs







#25 "have 1 E = 27.4 M/ VTAL = 9.0% (=) Timp: 102' - 94°C



















Specific Gra 2 34 2 329 2 345	2.376	2.37	2.386	2.401	2.392	2.354	2.335	2.321	2.352	2.363	2.384	2.386	2.386	2.421	2.417	2.420	2.428	2 425	2418	2.413	2.421	
ic Gravity, Gse Bulk 1 25 25	25	25	25	25	8	17	17	17	17		17	17	17	48	48 -	68 18		6	-8 48	48	48	
fective Specif 27 27	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	iÑ	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2 C C	2.7 2.7	2.7	2.7	2.6	26	ά Υ Υ	9 9 9	i c	s s i c	5 5 9	2.6	SUSPECT
/oids in Total Mix, % Ef 73 78 72	5.2	5.4	4.8	3.5		6.6	7.3	7.8	6.3	e e e	3.9	3.8	3.8	1.7	1.8	13 7 7	2 U	80	0.4	0.6	0.2	D AND RD SAMPLES;
ssing 0.075 mm sieve  \ 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	: <del>:</del> ;	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	5.1	5.1	ט.ם הו		5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1	
It Content, % Percent ps 4.8 4.8	5.3	5.3	5.3	5 3 2	5.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	53	5.00 2.00	5.8 5.8	5.8	5.8	4.8	4.8	4.0 5.3	5.3	5.3	5.8	5.8	5.8	Just content
ole Asphal						0	_	0	3	** 16			~	•	~	- ^			10	~	~	check c

.

د ، کی MPa Phase Anale, dearee	2,40C* 7.4 7.88	92	7.6	3.9	10.9	8.7	10.1	6.2	10.6	12.6	14.2	12.8	25.2	104	6.5	9.7	13.3	<del>1</del>	11.7	13.3	13.7	11.6	14.2	9.7	12	11.4	30
デルト ゴー デルト ゴー Dvnamic Modulus.	42.6 <b>5 H1</b> 40.1	40.2	47.7	49.6	49.2	48	33.9	48.8	55.8	56.5	55.3	111.3	41.3	38.4	37.7	29.5	32.3	37.6	50.7	53.9	47.8	52.3	36.3	36	37.7	37.2	45
Loadino stress, kPa	82.9 81.9	61.8	79.6	81.5	82.6	81.7	81.3	83.5	82.3	81.5	81.9	81.2	80.3	82.7	81.4	81.9	81.3	80.8	82.2	81.4	81.9	82	81.6	82.3	81.6	80.7	
Voids filled with Asphalt. %	60.00060323 58.14231024	60.16728926	70.16389853	69.38265954	71.89864606	79.41212024	76.12003205	78.04916309	62.32667776	59.85650097	58.23361082	67.26211871	68.8182723	69 65231062	77.51553243	78.00412452	78.00412452	86 88375562	86.26461028	88 26407602	87.94125999	94.68401188	93.97368608	97 13918389	95.76268022	98 55858994	
Mineral Aggregate, %	5027523 3456881	07559633	42855046	.63706422	.08102752	7.00029358	7.5879633	7.31141284	7.51902834	8.18476261	8.67530364	8.02193596	7 63853515	7.46426205	7.34530732	7.27596614	7.27596614	2.96102719	3.10463384	2.78126888	4.09765861	3.16782477	3.27511329	3.98202417	4.15989426	3.87530211	
l ul spic	18.5 18.6	18.	17.	17	17	•	Ŧ	÷	-	<del>,</del>	<del>~</del>	•	Ŧ	•••	*	-	-	***	Ŧ		1	-	-	÷	ŧ	¥	

dد ask for gı

||+ %, | 190'L

Permanent axial strain 1615 1843	1567	2039	2034	2125	1481	1969	2237	1594	2101	2167	2132	2474	1817	3044	2326	1994	1452	1579	1128	1871	1560	2584	1986	2790	1807	:
Average Temp, CI 91 04	55 55	92	92	93.5	95.5	33	94.5	<b>99.5</b>	100	100.5	93	85	95	94	97	97.5	98	98.5	100	99.5	96.5	66	98	98	98	
C Out Temp, C 86 41	87	89	06	91	92	89	91	97	67	<b>8</b> 6	91	2	92	92	94	94	94	95	86	97	92	96	95	95	95	
In Temp, 96 87	56	95	94	96	66	97	<b>3</b> 8	102	103	103	95	<b>66</b>	<b>38</b>	96	100	101	102	102	102	102	101	102	101	101	101	
Mod/sin(phase angle) 330.7566495 292.4898284	251.4367111	360.6631022	729.2477841	260.1860691	317.3326703	193.3091913	451.8545475	303.3410726	259.0041279	225.4314512	502.373075	96.9986113	212.7198195	333.0294145	175.0852195	140.4044203	197.0556992	250.0156625	234.2971596	201.8255961	260.0981734	147.9776072	213.6633187	194.0954304	188.2044954	6
Sample 1 3	M	4	5	9	7	œ	თ	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	<b>6</b>	8	2	22	23	24	25	8	27	-

ل de ask for gı

final cycle

## PHASE II Dynamic Modulus Test Results




























































Reran Phase II Samples at 1 Hz and 5 Hz at 100°C

	Dynamic Modulus, Mpa				Phase Angle, °		
Sample	mple 1 Hz		5 Hz		1 Hz	5 Hz	Temp.
1	48.3	(2.3)	59.3	(7.9)	14.4	9.4	98-91
2	49.3	(2.5)	58.1	(9.1)	13.7	10.6	97-91
3	31.6	(1.9)	38.7	(6.1)	12.8	10.4	98-91
4	36.4	(2.8)	46.9	(8.4)	13.5	8.4	99-92
5	33.5	(2.6)	42.8	(9.3)	13.2	8.2	99-92
6	40.6	(2.3)	49.2	(7.7)	14.7	11.3	100-93
7	58.5	(2.1)	45.5	(8.0)	14.4	11.9	103-96
8	41.1	(2.4)	48.8	(8.4)	15.9	12.4	102-95
9	54.0	(2.2)	61.3	(8.1)	9.8	3.7	10-96
10	38.7	(2.6)	44.9	(8.9)	11.9	5.9	96-99
11	45.4	(2.7)	53.4	(8.8)	12.8	6.8	100-93
12	45.7	(2.4)	55.2	(8.4)	14.2	10.3	101-95
13	58.6	(2.3)	60.4	(8.4)	14.3	10.2	96-90
14	54.0	(2.2)	62.9	(7.9)	12.91	5.47	96-90
15	40.3	(2.2)	45.8	(5.6)	11.7	7.2	97-91
16	32.1	(2.2)	38.6	(7.7)	11.3	8.2	97-90
17	37.7	(2.6)	44.8	(8.0)	12.4	8.7	98-93
18	37.1	(2.7)	44.7	(8.4)	13.1	9.5	
19	48.6	(1.8)	57.6	(6.1)	11.2	8.6	91-87
20	50.0	(2.1)	56.1	(7.5)	10.9	8.3	91-87
21	47.6	(2.1)	56	(7.0)	11.8	9.9	93-87
22	49.8	(2.3)	58.5	(6.7)	11.9	8.1	93-87
23	44.6	(2.3)	50.4	(7.4)	10.9	9.2	98-89
24	45.5	(2.0)	54.8	(6.5)	14.1	12.5	98-93
25	44.9	(2.1)	51.9	(6.1)	9.7	7.1	96-93
26	45.4	(1.7)	54.1	(5.1)	12.8	10.2	97-91
27	43.4	(2.1)	52.6	(7.0)	14.7	13.3	98-93









































FileName: C:\UTM\UTM\_38\Tests\NETC\_01-02\_QCQA\Phase 2\NETC\_01-02\_P2b\_#09.B38


















































Time (sec)

¥

Dynamic Stress (R) — Dynamic Stress (C) — Dynamic Stress (P)

¥

¥

31

## Sweep 2 (5Hz)

30

20-

10-0 -10--20--30 -40

Test Date and Time: Monday, May 13, 2002, at 2:50 PM Data Filtering: Spencers 15 Point

4

Curve fitting: Applied to 41 data points

Phase angle: Calculated from max and min values

Temperature (Deg.C): 0.0

Strain (Microstrain)

0

Confining Pressure (kPa): 5.2

Axial Gauge Length (mm): 101

Radial Gauge Length (mm): 50

	Cycle #151	Cycle #152	Cycle #153	Cycle #154	Cycle #155	Average
Loading stress (kPa)	82.7	84.6	85.0	84.4	84.6	84 3
Recoverable axial micro-strain	1495.8	1504.2	1507.0	1506.9	1500.6	1502 0
Permanent axial micro-strain	298	303	301	297	288	1002.5
Dynamic modulus (MPa)	55.3	56.3	56.4	56.0	56.3	56 1
Phase angle (Deg)	7.04	7.12	7.30	10.91	9 13	8 30
Dyn.Modulus/sine(phase angle)	900.5	906.3	885.7	589.4	708.0	798.0
Poisson's ratio					100.0	130.0
Recoverable radial micro-strain						
Permanent radial micro-strain				ĺ	1	
Dynamic load (kN)	0.649	0.665	0.668	0.663	0.664	0.660
Maximum load (kN)	0.775 (30.046s)	0.778 (30.246s)	0 779 (30 446s)	0.778 (30.646c)	0.004	0.002
Minimum load (kN)	0.125 (30.148s)	0.113 (30.346s)	0.112(30.547s)	0.115(30.746s)	0.110 (30.0405)	0.116
Maximum averaged axial (mm)	0.121 (30.050s)	0.121 (30.250s)	0 122 (30 450s)	0.112 (30.652c)	0.114 (30.9465)	0.116
Minimum averaged axial (mm)	-0.030 (30.151s)	-0.031 (30.351s)	-0.030 (30.552s)	-0.030(30.751c)	0.020 (20.0515)	0.122
Maximum axial #1 (mm)	0.114 (30.050s)	0.115 (30 251s)	0 115 (30 451s)	0.116 (20 6520)	-0.029 (30.951S)	-0.030
Minimum axial #1 (mm)	-0.034 (30.152s)	-0.034 (30.351s)	-0 036 (30 553c)	-0.033(30.7500)	0.110 (30.8525)	0.115
Maximum axial #2 (mm)	0.128 (30.050s)	0.128 (30 249s)	0 128 (30 450s)	0.000 (00.7008)	-0.032 (30.9528)	-0.034
Minimum axial #2 (mm)	-0.026 (30.150s)	-0.027 (30.350s)	-0.027 (30.551c)	-0.027(30.0515)	0.129 (30.8505)	0.128
Operator: Jonethen C			0.027 (00.0013)	-0.027 (30.7515)	-0.026 (30.9515)	-0.027
Operation: Jonatinan S. Gould - NETTCP #503						
Notes/comments: QC/QA of HMA - Dynamic Modulus Testing						
NETC 01-02 - Phase 2						
1hz & 5hz @	100'C					
Specimen Information						
Identification: NETC 01-02 (QC/QA)						
Dimensions (mm) Point 1 Point 2	Point 3 Point 4	Boint 5 Deint C		Core/Sample	Number: P2_#20	
Diameter (mm) 100	1 0111 0 1 0111 4	FUILS FUILO	Average Std Dev	<u>.</u>		
Height (mm) 101			100	Cross-Sectional Area: 7853.982		
			101		Volume: 793252.1	
Comments/Properties: Initial Temp: 91 'C						
Final Temp: 👩 🖚 'C						
	י י <u>י</u>					

¥




























Phase II Samples run at 60°C at 1 and 5 Hz



































































FileName: C:\UTM\UTM\_38\Tests\NETC\_01-02\_QCQA\Phase 2\NETC\_01-02\_P2c\_#17.B38


















































	Modulus, Mpa				Phase Angle, °		
Sample	1 Hz		5 Hz		1 Hz	5 Hz	Temp.
1	47.4	(1.9)	57.2	(5.2)	8.8	8.3	59-55
2	46.9	(3.2)	52.5	(6.9)	7.8	7.5	60-56
3	53.5	(2.1)	67.7	(5.9)	7.5	7.5	58-55
4	48.3	(2.7)	53.0	(8.6)	7.1	6.8	58-55
5	51.9	(2.5)	57.0	(8.0)	7.1	2.3	58-56
6	51.8	(2.4)	55.4	(7.4)	6.4	4.6	59-56
7	44.3	(3.0)	49.1	(9.5)	6.8	-0.3	58-56
8	49.5	(2.5)	54.3	(8.0)	7.4	2.6	59-56
9	52.2	(2.4)	57.4	(6.7)	6.8	5.6	60-57
10	53.0	(2.0)	60.1	(6.9)	8.3	5.3	59-56
11	58.0	(1.8)	64.6	(6.0)	7.9	7.6	59-56
12	61.4	(1.9)	67.5	(6.7)	8.2	7.5	59-56
13	50.5	(3.0)	55.4	(8.9)	6.2	6.9	58-55
14	51.7	(2.7)	56.1	(8.5)	6.9	4.1	59-56
15	53.3	(2.9)	57.9	(8.7)	6.4	5.9	58-55
16	51.1	(2.2)	55.2	(7.4)	7.1	4.6	58-56
17	55.7	(1.9)	60.6	(7.4)	6.6	3.6	58-56
18	54.6	(2.0)	59.0	(6.9)	7.5	6.1	59-56
19	60.8	(2.0)	65.9	(6.6)	6.8	5.3	58-56
20	58.2	(2.1)	61.2	(7.5)	7.2	8.6	58-56
21	62.6	(2.1)	67.9	(7.0)	6.9	6.6	58-56
22	55.3	(2.3)	59.6	(7.0)	6.7	6.3	58-55
23	57.7	(2.3)	61.7	(7.1)	6.6	5.3	59-56
24	57.4	(1.8)	62.8	(6.1)	6.5	3.9	59-57
25	53.9	(1.5)	60.9	(4.8)	7.0	6.8	58-56
26	54.0	(1.9)	59.2	(5.9)	7.2	6.9	59-57
27	50.0	(2.2)	54.6	(6.9)	6.7	6.4	57-54

Phase 3 Two Mixes, 9.5/12.5 APA Testing














































- 4

ASPHALT PAVEMENT ANALYZER

## **Rutting Test Data Sheet**

4" diameter Samples.

Project No. : <u>NETC_01-02_</u> P3	Test No.: R0520-0	Temperature : 60 (deg. C)
Mix ID No. : <u>9.5</u>	Test Date: 05/20/02	Wheel Load : 100 (lbs)
Mix Type: HIIStates	Data File : R0520_0.ptd	Hose Pressure : ///// (psi)
Operator: 15G, #503	Run Status : Complete	Run Time 2:16:19 (hh:mm:ss)

1	Ale Material			7		v	Buik & Gravil	B		le ID	Left Samp
			% Alt Vol	640	n (mm) 0	Causa Daadla	1 Denth	95#1	erature	Tempe	Stroke
Percent	APA-DAS Average	Net Man Deflection	Average	5 4 2	<u>4</u>		2	1	С	F	Count
	0.000	0.000		}							0
	0.000	0.000		[							500
	3.758			ł	·						1,000
31.2	4.929			ļ							1 500
12.5	5.547			l							2,000
83	6.009										2,000
97	6 560			{							3,000
	7 305										4,000
11.2	1.285									1	5,000
5.0	7.660		marine and the								6 000
4.0	7.968										7 000
3.3	8.234	T.									7,000
1.6	8.368										0,000
	8.368								I	l	0,000

Middle Sam	ple ID			Bulk S Gr	avity		7				
Stroke	Tom		00		avay		I	% Air Vo	d		
Count		eraiure	7.5	₹ <u>3</u> Dep	th Gauge Readin	g (mm) 9	5#4	Manual	Net Man	APA-DAS	Percent
			1	2	2	4	5	Average	Deflection	Average	Change
0							1		0.000	0.000	
500							1		0,000	0.000	
1,000				1			t	-		2.620	
1.500	·····						· [			3.597	37.9
2,000			······································							4.305	19,7
3,000					_	······				4.911	14.1
4,000										5.965	21.5
										8.737	12.9
5,000				<b> </b>						7.327	8.8
0,000										7 947	
7,000										1.01/	5./
8,000										8.088	3.5
8.000				+				and the particular		8.403	3.9
										8,403	0.0

<b>Right Sam</b>	ple ID			Butte S Gray	ihy		7				r
Stroke	Toma	OPOTA INT	04	In an o orar	Ry			% Air Vo	d		
Count	remp		7,5#	-> Depth	Gauge Readin	g (mm) 9.	5#6	Manual	Net Man	APA-DAS	Percent
0	r F	C C	1	2	$\geq$	4	5	Average	Deflection	Average	Change
500	· · ·			<u> </u>	+				0.000	0.000	
1,000		†		<u> </u>						3.593	
1,500					ł	······································				5.237	45.8
2,000				{	<u> </u>					6,309	20.5
3,000				<u> </u>	<u> </u>					7.062	11.9
4,000					<u> </u>		·			8.198	16.1
5,000					╂	· <u> </u>	·		All and a second second	8.771	7.0
6,000							·			9.181	4.7
7,000					╂─────┤					9.540	3.9
8,000					╉─────╉		<u> </u>			9.818	2.9
8,000					<u> </u>	······	<u> </u>			10,093	2.8
							L	Sec. Sec.		10.093	0.0







4

1

.

ASPHALT PAVEMENT ANALYZER

## **Rutting Test Data Sheet**

4" diameter Samples.

Project No. : <u>NETC_01-02</u> Mix ID No. : <u>12.5</u> Mix Type : <u>Allstates</u> Operator : <u>JSG.</u> #50		01.02_ PS	P3	Test No. : Test Date: Data File : Run Status :	R0521-0 05/21/02 R0521_0.p Complete	otd	Ter Wi Hose	nperature : heel Load : Pressure : Run Time	60 /00 /00 2:19:37	(deg. C) (lbs) (psi) (hh:mm:ss)	
Left Samp	le ID			Bulk S Gri	avity	ļ	I	% Air Vol	d		1
Stroke	Temp	erature	12.57	1 Dep	th Gauge Readir	g (mm) 12	.5#2	Manual	Net Man	APA DAR	Destant
Count	F F	C I	1	2		4	5	Average	Deflection	Average	Change
500	<del> </del>	<u> </u> ]							0.000	0.000	
1 000	[									7.890	
1 500						L				8.732	13.5
2.000		┨────┨								9.232	5.7
3,000						L	L			9.714	5.2
4,000										10.266	5.7
5,000				······		······································	·			10.618	3.4
6,000										10.984	3.4
7,000									1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -	11.194	1.9
8,000										11.461	2.4
8,000										11.688	2.0
										11.888	0.0
<i>liddle</i> Sam	ple ID		<b>[</b>	Bulk S Gra	vity	·····		M. Ale 14-1-		Francisco de la constante de la	
Stroke Count	Tempe	rature	12.5#3	Dept	h Gauge Readin	(mm) <i>i</i> 2.5	*4	78 All Voic Manual	Net Man	APA-DAS	Patrent

Count F C	12.3#3	JAJ UPPIN Gauge Reading (mm) 12.5 #4					Not Man	ADA.DAS	Bassant		
	r	C		2		4	5	Average	Deflection	Average	Change
500									0.000	0.000	
1,000					<b> </b>			-		6.862	
1,500					<b></b>					7.573	10.4
2,000										7.987	5.5
3,000					l		~			8.416	5.4
4,000										9.061	7.7
5,000					łl	· · · · ·				9.469	4.5
6,000								1		9.782	3.3
7,000					I					10.164	3.9
8,000										10.356	1.9
8,000										10.7 3	3.5
							•			10.713	0.0

rugnt Sample ID		В	ilk S Gravity		ר	94 Air 16	14	<del> </del>	1
Stroke	Temperature	12.5#5	Depth Gauge Read	line (mana)	1 m 11 11 11	70 PHT VC			
Count	FC	1	2 2		24 #6	Manual	Net Man	APA-DAS	Percent
0		T				Average	Denection	Average	Change
500							0.000	0.000	
1,000				+				7.435	
1,500					·			8.657	16.
2,000				+	·	<u> </u>		9.274	7.
3,000				+	+			9.767	5.
4,000				+		ļ		10.469	7.3
5,000					<u> </u>			10.976	4.1
6,000		1				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		11.390	3.1
7,000				+	<b> </b>			11.757	3.2
8,000		1		<u> </u>				12.007	2.1
8,000				<b> </b>	l			12.249	2.0
				1	I			12.249	0.0





Phase 4 Belfast Aggregate (shaken out)





Comments/Properties: Initial Temp: 56 'C Final Temp: 53 'C







## QC/QA of HMA (NETC 01-02) - Dynamic Modulus Report

FileName: C:\UTM\UTM\_38\Tests\NETC\_01-02\_QCQA\Phase 4\NETC\_01-02\_P4\_#04.B38


























































## QC/QA of HMA (NETC 01-02) - Dynamic Modulus Report







0.760 (32.245s) 0.761 (33.246s) 0.761 (34.245s) 0.761 Minimum load (kN) 0.122 (30.744s) 0.126 (31.745s) 0.130 (32.742s) 0.123 (33.743s) 0.124 (34.746s) 0.125 Maximum averaged axial (mm) 0.250 (30.271s) 0.252 (32.273s) 0.083 (32.769s) 0.250 (31.274s) 0.255 (33.274s) 0.256 (34.276s) 0.253 Minimum averaged axial (mm) 0.077 (30.766s) 0.079 (31.770s) 0.082 (33.764s) 0.085 (34.771s) 0.081 Maximum axial #1 (mm) 0.253 (30.271s) 0.253 (31.274s) 0.255 (32.272s) 0.257 (33.273s) 0.259 (34.275s) 0.255 Minimum axial #1 (mm) 0.077 (30.765s) 0.079 (31.770s) 0.082 (32.762s) 0.082 (33.763s) 0.084 (34.771s) 0.081 Maximum axial #2 (mm) 0.246 (30.273s) 0.247 (31.275s) 0.250 (32.274s) 0.252 (33.274s) 0.254 (34.278s) 0.250 Minimum axial #2 (mm) 0.077 (30.766s) 0.080 (31.770s) 0.083 (32.769s) 0.083 (33.763s) 0.085 (34.771s) 0.082

Operator: Jonathan S. Gould - NETTCP #503

Notes/comments: **Specimen Information** 

Identification: NETC 01-02 (QC/QA) Core/Sample Number: P4\_#11 Dimensions (mm) | Point 1 | Point 2 | Point 3 | Point 4 | Point 5 | Point 6 | Average | Std Dev. Diameter (mm) 100 100 Cross-Sectional Area: 7853.982 Height (mm) 113.5 113.5 Volume: 891426.9 Comments/Properties: Initial Temp: 57 'C 55 °C Final Temp:















## QC/QA of HMA (NETC 01-02) - Dynamic Modulus Report








































