## Development of AASHTO Emulsion Performance Grading Standards

AASHTO TSP ETF Meeting May 22-23, 2017 Denver, CO

## **Chip Seal Performance Specifications**

#### **Objectives for 2017:**

- Residue Testing Guidelines: Draft 1A....
- On-going Research & Method Development
- In-service Evaluation of Test Methods
- Identify Funding Sources
- Validation Plan

## Chip Seal Emulsion Residue Testing Guidelines: Draft 1A

#### **Objective:** Evaluate/Merge SPG/EPG and ?

- Identify high temperature test
  - MSCR vs G\* x sin δ
- Identify low temperature test
  - 4 mm DSR vs 8 mm DSR vs BBR
- Determine need for PAV long-term aging
- Characterize polymer modification: PG+??
- Climate zones (67-19): Grades per zone (2 or 3)
- Not yet addressed:
  - Hi-float (yield stress); strength test
  - Curing rate sweep; water loss

#### **Central Lab to Manage Testing Program**

**Possible Contract Laboratories** 

- Mathy Hanz
- Purdue Superpave Center McDaniel
- Asphalt Institute Anderson
- UNR Sebally, Hajj
- TTI, NCS

#### **Need Funding**

#### **On-going Research & Method Development**

- Paragon study Baumgardner
- Research in UK/Europe Rowe
  - Need for Strength Test at G\* ~ 20 MPa
- DSR to Specify Hi-Float Emulsion Residues
  - Yield stress; Shear-rate dependence
  - Fundamental climate-based parameter or a pass/fail equivalent @ 6o C?
  - Addressed by ETF subcommittee: chaired by Kadrmas
- Method Development: 4 mm DSR
  - Issues with temperature control methods

## Summer 2016 Sampling Program

- Collect 20-25 chip seal emulsion samples from selected agency projects for roundrobin testing
  - Varied climates
  - Range of emulsion types

#### In-service Evaluation of Test Methods

Are the Proposed Test Methods Implementable for AASHTO Specifications?

- Agency: Maintenance & Materials support
- Industry: Guarantee reliable supply chain

AASHTO Test Method Validation: How to enlist Agencies/University/Industry lab to participate in round robin testing to validate proposed test methods, set specification limits, and collect ruggedness, reproducibility data

Validation & Implementation Plans

• to include UPGs & RPPs, Industry/AEMA

### Chip Seal Performance Specifications: Lead States Program

Identify agencies/universities that:

- have buy-in from preservation, materials, and local academia
- can collect and at-least partially test emulsion residues from ongoing chip seal projects using Draft Testing Guidelines
- will support further implementation and training within all five User-Producer Groups and four regional PP partnerships
- have interest in further supporting ETF

# Lead States Program Potential Partners

- Southeast: Texas & North Carolina
  - Contacts: Hazlett, Epps-Martin, Kim
- Pacific Coast Nevada
  - Contacts: Sebaaly, Hajj, Bush, Morian
- Rocky Mountain Utah
  - Contacts: Anderson, Van Frank, Romero
- North Central Indiana
  - Shields, McDaniel
- Northeast ?Ontario, New York?
- China JSTI Group

# Funding Options for Development of Standards

- Ask Lead-State Agencies to fund local universities
- NCHRP RFP submitted in October
- Preservation Partnerships funding requested
  - Likely not a large sum. ~\$15,000
- User-Producer Groups to fund regional labs
- Pooled Fund
  - Could be difficult due to the prevalence of pooled fund studies and competition for funding (FHWA)
- Leveraging / assisting with China study
- Apply for Federal Lands CTIP funding
- Leverage industry support: AEMA, FP2, AI

## **Development of Standards**

Reality: develop standards on low budget Options:

- Leverage research and data from previous studies
- Reduce scope of field validation effort
- Leverage pro bono testing from industry and/or State DOTs
- Move forward with provisional standards using current best knowledge and expertise

## **Prioritize Other Applications**

- Micro/Slurry
- NCSU EPG recommendations
- Tack Coat
- Emphasis on Trackless Tack from FHWA Innovation
- Northern States have performance problems
- Tack needs climate-based performance specs

# Input on Specification Approach

- Review strawman from Dec Meeting
- Develop consensus path forward
- Open discussion on specification development
  - What are the top concerns from industry
  - What are the top concerns from agencies
  - Input from academia
  - What applications deserve priority?