Superpave Durability NJ Task Force Evaluation Approach

October 22, 2004

Why The Evaluation After The 2003 Paving Season

Suppliers And Paving Contractors

Complained About

Superpave Mixtures

COMPLAINTS • COLD

• WEATHER

• PAVING

• Dry Looking Mixes

Mixture Segregation

• Raveling of The Mixes

Low Binder Contents

THIS MIX IS TOO HOT

Mari Jai 192

Phase #1

- Develop A Survey
- Objective, Find The Scope of The Problems
 - Submit Survey To Suppliers and Pavers

• NO RESPONCES

Phase #2

• NJDOT Thinks Survey Is A Good Idea!

• Submits Survey To DOT Field Engineers

• Responses To Date

• Superpave Is Doing Very Well

SURVEYS NOT VERY SUCCESFUL

Phase #3

• Our First Superpave Projects

• Are Now about 7 or 8 Years Old

• We will Develop A Review Team

• And Evaluate These Early Projects

NJDOT Has Followed The **Superpave Specifications** With Only Slight Changes To Thickness Ratio 12.5mm & 19mm Now 4:1

NJDOT Believes The Superpave System Has Worked Well To Date But Some Changes are Being

Considered

Change The Name From Superpave То HMA

Discontinue The Use of

Traffic Level "V" (Very Heavy Traffic) **Mix is Too Dry**

Plan To Use H Mixes (Heavy Traffic Level) With Binder Grades PG 64 -22 or PG 76 - 22 Increases % Binder

Discontinue Use of 19mm Mix For Surface Course Mixes Less Hand Work Less Raveling

Use 12.5mm Mix Traffic Level M Surface Course Mix With Binder Grades PG 64 – 22 or PG 76 – 22 Increases % Binder & Skid #

Use 19mm Mix Traffic Level M As Standard Base Mix Increases % Binder

Use 9.5mm Mix Traffic Level M For Driveways, Leveling

Introduce 4.75mm Mix For Very Thin Applications

Percent Passing #8 Sieve Specifications Changed to

Make Mixes Finer

• Limit 25mm Mix to

Base Courses (Without Traffic ?)

Because It

Segregates and Lose Aggregates

Cause Broken Windshields





















