## **RESEARCH REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**

| 1. Report No.   | 2. Report Date                             | <ol> <li>Contract No.</li> <li>N/A</li> </ol>       |                           |                    | 4. Project No.     |
|---|--|---|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| UND06-02<br>5. Title and Subtitle   | May 2008                                   |   | 6. Report Type            |                    | 7. Project No.     |
| Evaluation of North Dakota's<br>Performance in Locally Prod   | Click on link to oper                      | n report  | 8. Project No.            |                    |                    |
| Aspahalt Pavement Analyzer  |  |   | Work Plan                 |                    | 9. Project No.     |
|   |  |   | Construction              |                    |                    |
|   |  |   | Evaluation<br>Final       |                    | 10. Project No.    |
| 11. Author(s)/Principle Investigator(s)   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| Dr. Nabil Suleiman, Principal Investigator         12. Performing Organization Name and Address         13. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| NDDOT M+R North Dakota DOT  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
|   | aterials and Research D                    | North Dakota DOT                                    |                           |                    |                    |
|   | 0 Airport Road                             | Materials and Research Division<br>300 Airport Road |                           |                    |                    |
| UND 🛛 Bit   | marck ND 58504-6005 Bismai                 |   | arck ND 5850              | irck ND 58504-6005 |                    |
| OTHER*  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| *see supplementary notes  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| 14. Supplementary Notes   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
|   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| 15. Abstract  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| Objective<br>The main objectives of this study are: (1) To examine the effects of specified fine aggregate angularities and binder grades on the  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| volumetric properties, rutting resistance and tensile strength of Superpave HMA mixes; and (2) To evaluate and compare the rutting  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| resistance of local Superpave HMA mixes of different combinations of aggregate blends and binder grades using the asphalt   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| pavement analyzer.  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| Scope   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| In this project, the appropriate laboratory tests and analysis were done on the HMA mixes to evaluate the effect of the fine aggregate  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| angularities and the binder grades on the HMA properties and performance. The performance of the various Superpave were evaluated based on their deformation under the wheel load of the asphalt pavement analyzer. A 0.276 inch (7.0 mm) deformation             |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| under the wheel load of the APA is considered the minimum criterion for rutting failure. The relative performance of the mixes was also   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| examined based on comparing their APA deformation values.   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| Summary   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| For the dry condition, the 45-70 mix design outperformed all other design cases followed by the rest of the FAA of 45 cases. The FAA  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| 43 mix cases had performed slightly better than the FAA 42 cases. But the 42-64 mix had a better result than the 43-58 mix indicating   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| that the positive influence of a higher binder grade overweighs the negative influence of a slightly lower FAA value. The rutting values  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| for both of the FAA 42 mix design cases were hovering around the 7.0 mm specification value. All of the mix design cases under dry condition passed the 7.0 mm specification except for the FAA 40 mix design cases.  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
|   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| For the wet condition, only the FAA 45 mix design cases have actually passed the specification. The FAA 43 and FAA 42 mix design  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| cases did fail the specification but the FAA 40 mix design cases triggered the maximum APA failure value of 14.0 mm.  |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| The 45-64 mix design case performed really well with a TSR value of 96%. The 45-58 mix design also did well with a TSR value of   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| 90%. Even though the TSR values for the FAA 42 mix cases were lower than the TSRs for the FAA 45 mix cases as expected, the 42-   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| 64 mix design case presented an anomaly. The 42-64 case not only performed inferior to the 42-58 mix design case but the dry and wet strengths were much higher than all the other design cases. The 42-64 mix design case was repeated and the same results were |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| obtained.   |  |   |                           |                    |                    |
| 16. Key Words   | 17. Distribution Statement                 |   |                           |                    | 18. No. of Pages   |
| Asphalt   | No restrictions. This                      | document is available                               | to the public from        | :                  | 26                 |
| Binder<br>Aggregate   | North Dak                                  | ota Department of                                   | Transportation            |                    | 19. File type/Size |
| Aggregate<br>Gradation  |  | rials and Research                                  | Division:                 |                    | PDF                |
|   | 300 Airport Road<br>Bismarck ND 58504-6005 |   |                           |                    |                    |
|   | Office: (701) 32                           |   | -0005<br>Fax: (701) 328-0 | 310                |                    |
|   |  |   | · /                       |                    |                    |