

March 2022

## **Development of Cost-Effective High-Modulus Asphalt Concrete (HMAC) Mixtures Using Crumb Rubber and Local Construction Materials in Louisiana.**

Ibrahim A.I.E Elnaml

*Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_theses](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses)



Part of the [Other Materials Science and Engineering Commons](#), and the [Transportation Engineering Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Elnaml, Ibrahim A.I.E, "Development of Cost-Effective High-Modulus Asphalt Concrete (HMAC) Mixtures Using Crumb Rubber and Local Construction Materials in Louisiana." (2022). *LSU Master's Theses*. 5490. [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_theses/5490](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/5490)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [gradetd@lsu.edu](mailto:gradetd@lsu.edu).

**DEVELOPMENT OF COST-EFFECTIVE HIGH-MODULUS  
ASPHALT CONCRETE (HMAC) MIXTURES USING CRUMB  
RUBBER AND LOCAL CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS IN  
LOUISIANA.**

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Louisiana State University and  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science

in

Department of Construction Management

by  
Ibrahim Elnaml  
B.A., Mansoura University, 2016  
May 2022

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

As a fervent Muslim, the author would first like to express his gratitude to his Lord (Allah), who gave him strength, courage, wisdom, and love throughout this investigation. Furthermore, the author would like to express his gratitude and admiration to his parents (Fatma and Ali) and sisters (Rania, Reda, and Amira) for having been his driving force during this time. The author is grateful to his advisor Professor. Marwa Hassan, for the opportunity she provided him in conducting this research. In addition, her enthusiasm, encouragement, and guidance were essential for the development of this study. Furthermore, the author is grateful to Dr. Momen Mousa, whose advice, patience, friendship, and support were essential at every stage of this journey. Moreover, the author wants to express his gratitude to Professor Louay Mohammad for his support and good disposition, and to Dr. Hany Hassan for his contribution to the committee members and his kind welcome and motivation. The author wants to thank his colleague Ipshit Idris for his help in the Lab work.

A special thanks to Mr. Jeremy Icenogle and Ms. Hannah Boggs, members of the Louisiana Transportation Research Center (LTRC) Asphalt laboratory, for their assistance in this work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
LIST OF FIGURES .....	vi
ABSTRACT .....	viii
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	3
3. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE .....	4
4. BACKGROUND .....	5
4.1. French Mix Design Method.....	5
4.2. Performance of HMAC Mixes Based on Previous Studies .....	10
4.3. Advancements based on previous research .....	13
5. MATERIALS USED.....	14
6. MIXTURE DESIGN.....	15
6.1. Experimental Design.....	15
6.2. Sample Preparation .....	16
7. PERFORMANCE TESTS .....	17
7.1. Volumetric Properties .....	17
7.2. Permanent Deformation .....	20
7.3. Dynamic Modulus.....	24
7.4. Semi-Circular Bending (SCB) Test .....	29
7.5. Overall Performance Evaluation.....	31
8. COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF HMAC MIXTURES .....	32
8.1. Predicted Field Performance.....	32
8.4. Results of Approach 1 .....	34
8.5. Results of Approach 2 .....	36
8.6. Associated Material Costs .....	38
8.7. Cost-Effectiveness .....	39

9. CONCLUSION.....	40
10. STUDY LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK.....	41
LIST OF REFERENCES .....	42
VITA .....	44

## LIST OF TABLES

1. HMAC Classes.....	5
2. HMAC Mixtures - Aggregates Specifications Requirements.....	5
3. HMAC Mixtures- Binder Specifications Requirements .....	6
4. HMAC Mixtures - Aggregates' Grading Curves and Envelopes .....	7
5. HMAC Performance Tests' Criteria.....	12
6. Asphalt Mixtures' Details .....	15
7. Job Mix Formula for the Control Mixture SP.....	18
8. HMAC-Rutting Test (T-Test Results). .....	22
9. Dynamic Modulus Test - t-test .....	25
10. AASHTOWare Input Data.....	34
11. Total Material costs for the three mixtures .....	39

## LIST OF FIGURES

1. HMAC Components .....	1
2. Research Methodology .....	3
3. French Mix Design Procedure (6).....	9
4. Aggregate Gradation for the Stockpiles Used in This Study .....	14
5. Aggregate Gradation for Blend 1 And Blend 2 .....	16
6. Degree of Compaction of the HMAC Mixtures .....	19
7. HSD - Hmac Workability Test .....	19
8. LWT Test .....	20
9. LWT Point-Sensors on Paired Specimens .....	21
10. LWT Results .....	23
11. HSD - LWT Test.....	23
12. Dynamic Test .....	24
13. Dynamic Modulus Test- HSD Analysis 4.4°C .....	26
14. Dynamic Modulus Test- HSD Analysis 25°C .....	26

15. Dynamic Modulus Test- HSD Analysis 37°C .....	27
16. Dynamic Modulus Test- HSD Analysis 54°C .....	27
17. Dynamic Modulus Test- HSD Analysis at 10Hz and 15°C Reference Temperature. ....	28
18. Average Dynamic Modulus for Mixtures Versus Temperature at 10Hz Frequency. ....	29
19. SCB Specimens' Preparation and Testing.....	29
20. SCB Test Results for the Five Mixtures .....	30
21. LA 1077 Pavement Structure.....	32
22. Total Permanent Deformation for the Three Mixtures Under Different Initial AADTT Levels.....	36
23. Bottom-Up Fatigue Cracking for the Three Mixtures Under Different Initial AADTT Levels.....	36
24. Pavement Structure Using HMAC Mixture.....	37
25. Pavement Structure Using Superpave Mixture (Low Traffic Volume).....	37
26. Pavement Structure Using Superpave Mixture (High Traffic Volume) .....	38



## **ABSTRACT**

One of the emerging solutions to enhance the durability of asphalt pavements is the use of a French asphalt mix known as “High-Modulus Asphalt Concrete (HMAC).” This mix uses a hard asphalt binder, high binder content (about 6%), and low air voids content as compared to Superpave mixtures. The key objective of this study was to develop a cost-effective HMAC mixture using crumb rubber and local materials in Louisiana. To achieve this objective, four HMAC mixtures were prepared using two asphalt binders (PG 82-22 and PG 76-22 plus 10% crumb rubber) and two Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement (RAP) contents (20% and 40%); additionally, a conventional Superpave mixture in Louisiana was prepared as a control mixture. The laboratory performance of these five mixtures was evaluated in terms of workability, dynamic modulus, rutting resistance, and cracking resistance. The AASHTOWare Pavement Mechanical Empirical (AASHTOWare Pavement ME) Design software was also used to estimate the long-term field performance of these mixtures. Results indicated that the HMAC mixture prepared with 10% crumb rubber and 20% RAP successfully met the French mix design specifications for HMAC and Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LaDOTD) specifications. This HMAC mix was better than the control Superpave mix in terms of dynamic modulus, rutting resistance, and cracking resistance. Additionally, this HMAC mixture can reduce the required asphalt thickness by 1.5 or 2 inches based on the traffic level. The cost-effectiveness analysis indicated that this HMAC mixture was more cost-effective than conventional Superpave mixtures in Louisiana. In addition, this mixture is environmentally-friendly since it can reduce the disposal of scrap tires in landfills.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Asphalt concrete mixtures are primarily designed using the Superpave mix design procedure where the proportioning of asphalt mix components is primarily based on volumetric properties (1). Early Superpave implementation mainly focused on rutting resistance. Mixture designs for moderate and high traffic pavements were designed for improved rutting resistance by specifying a higher grade of asphalt binder and higher quality aggregates as indicated in Figure 1. Most highway agencies now report that rutting problems have been virtually eliminated. However, there have been growing concerns that the primary mode of distress for asphalt pavements is cracking of some form or another (1-2).




Figure 1. HMAC Components

One of the emerging solutions to enhance the durability of asphalt pavements is the use of a French asphalt mix known as “High-Modulus Asphalt Concrete (HMAC)” or “Enrobé à Module Élevé (EME)” mix. This mix was developed in France in the 1980s using hard asphalt binders (typically PG 88 or higher for critical high-temperature properties), relatively high binder content (about 6%), and relatively low air voids (close structure) as compared to conventional Superpave asphalt mixtures (1). As such, HMAC mixes have high modulus/stiffness, high durability, superior rutting performance, and reasonable fatigue resistance (3). For these reasons, HMAC mixes are considered as an excellent option to be used in the binder course in the pavement structure, which is subjected to the highest levels of tensile and compressive stresses (4). HMAC mixes have been successfully adopted by many other countries such as the United Kingdom, Poland, Switzerland, South Africa, and Australia (5, 6).

Generally, HMAC mixtures offer several advantages over conventional Superpave mixtures including reducing the required pavement thickness with improved service life as well as reducing the consumption of raw materials (3). Yet, using HMAC mixes with high stiffness may raise some concerns related to fatigue cracking especially in cold climatic conditions. These concerns may be addressed by enhancing the elastic recovery (flexibility) of the utilized hard binder using some modifiers such as crumb rubber that enhances the fatigue cracking resistance of the binder (7). Previous studies (8) indicated that adding 10% crumb rubber by weight of the binder can increase the binder elastic recovery from 20% to 70%. As such, in this study, crumb rubber was incorporated in HMAC mixtures to enhance their cracking resistance.

Some issues such as hot and humid climate, traffic, properties of available local construction materials, construction methods, and standards are specific to Louisiana. Therefore, the development of a suitable HMAC mix design in Louisiana cannot be a duplicate copy of the French method or any other designs used in another country or jurisdiction. As such, this study aimed to develop a cost-effective HMAC mixture considering the needs and specificities of Louisiana while preserving the authenticity of the concept and the advantages of the original technology.

## 2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY




Figure 2. Research Methodology

The research methodology was chronologically ordered into specific steps to serve the goal and scope of the study as shown in Figure 2. A literature review about HMAC mixtures, history, specifications, and purposes was conducted in parallel with the previous studies conducted globally regarding the HMAC industry and its application. Therefore, research gaps were targeted to be covered in this research considered as research advancements. Briefly, a description of HMAC mixture design steps and required performance tests were explained. However, not all European performance tests and measuring scales were able to be identically performed in the SI system due to the differences between them. Therefore, some correlations had to be considered starting from the sieves' sizes to rutting and cracking testing devices.

In addition, state standards and specifications have to be met using the common testing systems and procedures available in Louisiana. Therefore, one conventional Superpave mixture was prepared as a control mixture and four HMAC mixtures with different binder types and RAP contents were prepared and compared to each other and compared to the control mixture. Specimens were fabricated for each mixture and tested using local procedures and laboratory performance tests which brought the research to the third step. Rutting resistance (LWT), cracking resistance (SCB), and dynamic modulus tests were conducted considering the state standard criteria in LWT and SCB, and considering the French criteria in the dynamic modulus test.

Not only the laboratory evaluation was considered a final judgment, but finite element modeling using AASHTOWare pavement ME software was utilized to validate and support the laboratory results. After acknowledging similar trends between the laboratory and FEM results, previous studies' results were compared to this study's findings, and similar trends were proved. Lastly, a cost analysis was conducted between conventional Superpave mixture used in Louisiana and HMAC mixtures investigated in this study considering the material costs per one ton (9).

### **3. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE**

The main objective of this study was to develop a cost-effective HMAC mixture using crumb rubber and local construction materials in Louisiana. To achieve this objective, the following tasks were accomplished:

- Develop four HMAC mixtures and compare their laboratory performance (workability, dynamic modulus, rutting resistance, and cracking resistance) against a conventional Louisiana Superpave mixture.
- Predict the long-term field performance of HMAC mixtures as compared to a conventional Louisiana Superpave mixture using AASHTOWare pavement ME software.
- Assess the cost-effectiveness of HMAC mixtures as compared to a conventional Louisiana Superpave mixture.

## 4. BACKGROUND

### 4.1. French Mix Design Method

Unlike the Superpave mix design procedure, the French mix design approach is not driven by volumetric properties as much as it is driven by trying to meet performance-based specifications (1). In general, two classes of HMAC mixes exist, Class 1 and Class 2 as shown in

Table 1. Class 2 has excellent fatigue and rutting resistance, while Class 1 is a “low-cost” mixture with lower binder content, thus having similar stiffness and rutting resistance to Class 2 but with a relatively lower fatigue resistance (3).

Table 1. HMAC Classes

Category	Class 1	Class 2
Binder Content	Lower	Higher
Air voids	Higher	Lower
Stiffness	Similar	Similar
Rutting resistance	Similar	Similar
Fatigue resistance	Lower	Higher
Cost	Lower	Higher

#### 4.1.1. Select components

HMAC components are selected based on achieving required specifications for aggregates and binders as per Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

Table 2. HMAC Mixtures - Aggregates Specifications Requirements

Property	Test	Criteria
<b>Hardness</b>	Fines aggregate crushing test: 10% FACT	$\geq 160$ kN
	Aggregate crushing value ACV	$\leq 25\%$
<b>Water Absorption</b>	Coarse aggregate ( $>4,75$ mm)	$\leq 1.0\%$
	Fine aggregate	$\leq 1.5\%$
<b>Cleanliness</b>	Sand equivalency test	$>50$
<b>Particle shape and texture</b>	Percentage of fully crushed coarse aggregate ( $> 5$ mm)	100%
	Flakiness index test	$\leq 25$
	Particle index test	$>15$

It is worth mentioning that some previous studies proved to achieve HMAC mixture criteria using low-quality aggregates with a high amount of hard binder (12).

Table 3. HMAC Mixtures- Binder Specifications Requirements

			<b>Binder for EME</b>	
Characteristic	Test Method	Unit	10/20 pen	15/25 pen
<b>Penetration at 25°c</b>	EN 1426	0.1 mm	10-20	15-25
<b>Softening Point</b>	EN 1427	°C	63-73	60-70
<b>Pen. Index</b>	EN 13924	-	$\approx 0.7$	$\approx 0.7$
<b>Viscosity at 135°c</b>	EN 12595	Mm <sup>3</sup> /s	1100	900
<b>Flash Point, mini</b>	EN 2592	°C	245	245
<b>Solubility, mini</b>	EN 12592	%m/m	99	99
<b>RTFO</b>				
<b>Mass change</b>		%	0.5	0.5
<b>Retain pen 25°c</b>	EN 1426	%	65	65

#### 4.1.2. Design the Mix Gradation

Similar to the Superpave mix design procedure, the French mix design has specified particle size limits (grading envelopes) for HMAC mixes, which depend on the maximum sieve size of the mix (D). In general, there are three HMAC gradation categories based on D as follows:

- 0/10 gradation for D of 10 mm
- 0/14 gradation for D of 14 mm
- 0/20 gradation for D of 20 mm

The grading curves and envelopes for these three categories are shown in Table 4 (6):

Table 4. HMAC Mixtures - Aggregates' Grading Curves and Envelopes

Percent Passing Sieve Size	D=10 mm			D=14 mm			D=20 mm		
	Min	Target	Max	Min	Target	Max	Min	Target	Max
6.7 mm	47	56	68	52	54	72	46	54	66
6.3 mm	45	55	65	50	53	70	45	53	65
4.75 mm	-	53	-	43	49	63	42	49	62
4.0 mm	-	52	-	40	47	60	40	47	60
2.36 mm	32	36	44	28	26	42	28	36	42
2.0 mm	28	33	38	25	33	38	25	33	38
0.075 mm	6.4	6.9	7.4	5.5	6.9	7.9	5.5	6.7	7.9
0.063 mm	6.3	6.7	7.2	5.4	6.7	7.7	5.4	5.7	7.7

In addition to the above criteria mentioned for each NMA, 100% of aggregates should pass the 2D sieve, from 98% to 100% should pass sieve 1.4D, and from 85% to 98% should pass sieve D. The target line or the maximum density line is desired to get the mixture denser that have a lower percentage of air voids without compromising on increasing the binder content to achieve the richness factor specifications as described in the binder content step.



#### 4.1.3. Binder Grade

Typically, hard binders (10/25 or 15/25 pen binders) have been used in HMAC mixes (6). Since hard binders are not readily available in all locations, previous studies have used recycled materials in HMAC mixes (10).

#### 4.1.4. Binder Content

In the French mix design, the binder content is calculated not through volumetric properties like in the Superpave mix design, but through computing a minimum richness factor (k), which is an indicator of the minimum required asphalt film thickness. To determine the minimum required binder content, the specific surface area of the aggregate ( $\Sigma$ ) should be first calculated as follows:

$$100\Sigma = 0.25G + 2.3S + 12s + 150f \quad (1)$$

where,

G = proportion of aggregate retained on and above the 6.3 mm sieve;

S = proportion of aggregate retained between the 0.25 mm and 6.3 mm sieves;

s = proportion of aggregate retained between the 0.063- and 0.25-mm sieves; and

f = percent passing the 0.063 mm sieve.

Then the minimum binder content can be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Minimum binder content} = k\alpha\sqrt[5]{\Sigma} \quad (2)$$

where,

k = minimum richness factor (3.4 for Class 2 HMAC mixtures)

$$\alpha = 2.65/G_{se}$$

$G_{se}$  = aggregate effective specific gravity

Figure 3 shows a flowchart of the steps in the French mix design procedure. The following subsections will briefly explain the key steps in the flowchart.




Figure 3. French Mix Design Procedure (6)

#### 4.1.5. Performance Tests

Once the binder content is calculated, the final step in the mixture design is to conduct five performance tests to ensure that the mixture will be durable in the field. These tests include (1, 3):

1. **Gyratory Shear Compactor:** this test evaluates the compaction aptitude of the HMAC mixture using the French Gyratory Shear Compactor (called PCG). For HMAC Class 2 mixes, 0/14 mm gradation category, the air voids percentage after 100 gyrations in the PCG should be less than 6%.
2. **Duriez test:** this test evaluates the resistance of the HMAC mixture to moisture damage and is similar to the modified Lottman test conducted in the Superpave mix design procedure. For HMAC Class 2 mixes, the tensile strength ratio (TSR) should be greater than or equal to 0.75.

3. **Dynamic modulus test:** For HMAC Class 2 mixes, the dynamic modulus at 15°C and 10 Hz should exceed 14 GPa.
4. **Rutting test:** EN 12697-22 is the standard in Europe for assessing the rutting resistance of HMAC mixes using the French LCPC rutting tester. Other countries use their standard rutting tests such as the Superpave Shear Tester (SST) and the Repeated Simple Shear Test at a Constant Height.
5. **Fatigue test:** EN 12697-24 is the standard in Europe for assessing the fatigue resistance of HMAC mixes using the two-point bending test. Other countries use their standard fatigue tests such as the four-point bending test.

#### 4.2. Performance of HMAC Mixes Based on Previous Studies

In 2010, Sybilski et al. evaluated the applicability of limestone aggregate for HMAC mixes in Poland (11). Three HMAC mixtures were prepared in the laboratory using 20/30 grade bitumen obtained from Polish refineries. Two of the HMAC mixtures encompassed basalt aggregate and had binder contents of 4.6 and 5.1%, while the third HMAC mixture included limestone aggregate and had a binder content of 5.5%. Several laboratory tests were carried out to determine the dynamic modulus, resistance to moisture damage, fatigue resistance, and rutting resistance for the three HMAC mixtures. In terms of dynamic modulus and resistance to moisture damage, all three HMAC mixtures passed the requirements. On the other hand, only the limestone mixture with 5.5% binder passed the rutting resistance and fatigue resistance requirements. Therefore, it was concluded that limestone aggregate may be used in HMAC mixtures in Poland for base and binder courses. Similarly in Latvia (12), Latvian dolomite aggregate was successfully incorporated into HMAC mixtures when used with polymer-modified binders.

In 2011, a research study was conducted to develop a new HMAC Class 2 mixture using local materials in Indiana (13). In this study, HMAC mixture was developed using Indiana aggregates (crushed stone, dolomite, stone sand, and coarse RAP) and PG 64-22 asphalt binder mixed with 65% post-consumer shingles. The dynamic modulus of the HMAC mixture was measured in the laboratory and was compared to the dynamic modulus of a conventional Superpave mix in Indiana. Results indicated that the HMAC and Superpave mixtures had dynamic moduli (at 15°C and 10 Hz) of 15.1 and 11.5 GPa, respectively. The major limitation of this study was the fact that the fatigue resistance and rutting resistance of the proposed HMAC mixture was not experimentally evaluated providing an incomplete assessment of this mixture.

In 2017, Villacorta et al. conducted a research study in Auburn, AL. to evaluate the laboratory performance of HMAC mixtures for use as a base course (1). The experimental plan included a French mixture with a stiff binder (PG 88-16), two mixtures containing 35% reclaimed asphalt pavement (RAP) both with polymer-modified binders, one with high polymer content (HiMA), another mixture containing 25% RAP, and 5% reclaimed asphalt shingles (RAS) with a polymer-modified binder and finally, a 50% RAP mixture with a polymer-modified binder. For these five mixtures, the dynamic modulus, fatigue resistance, and rutting

resistance were evaluated. Results indicated that all the mixes had dynamic modulus (at 15°C and 10 Hz) that exceeded 14 GPa. Results also indicated that the 35% RAP HiMA mixture showed the highest resistance to permanent deformation followed by the 25%-5% RAS mixture based on the flow number test. In terms of fatigue resistance, the 35% RAP HiMA mixture was the most fatigue-resistant mixture based on the uniaxial tension fatigue test (S-VECD). Accordingly, it was concluded that the rutting and fatigue properties were improved for the high polymer-modified mixtures and decreased for the French mixture, which had a stiffer virgin binder (PG 88-16).

In 2018, Moghaddam (3) performed a research study in Ontario, Canada to develop a new approach for HMAC mix design that would achieve adequate performance at high, medium, and low temperatures. Two different mix types based on the NMAAS were considered. In addition, three types of modified asphalt binders were used in this study, namely: PG 88-28, PG 82-28, and PG 58-28 plus 10% elastomer additives. Thermo-mechanical tests were conducted to evaluate the performance of HMAC mixes in terms of stiffness, rutting resistance, and fatigue-cracking resistance. Results showed that the developed mixes had an acceptable performance at all levels and that the mixes could satisfactorily perform at low temperatures in Ontario.

The performance criteria for HMAC mixtures can be changed from one country to another depending on their needs and specifications as shown in Table 5 (3).

Table 5. HMAC Performance Tests' Criteria

Country	Test	Standard Method	EME Performance Requirements	
			Class 1	Class 2
France	Gyratory compactor, air voids after 100 gyrations	EN 12697-31	$\leq 10\%$	$\leq 6\%$
	Moisture sensitivity, Duriez	EN 12697-12	$\geq 0.7$	$\geq 0.7$
	Rutting, Wheel tracking (large device) at 60°C and 30,000 cycles	EN 12697-22	$\leq 7.5\%$ strain	$\leq 7.5\%$ strain
	Stiffness, two point bending flexural modulus 15°C, 10 Hz	EN 12697-26	$\geq 14$ GPa	$\geq 14$ GPa
	Fatigue, two point bending 10°C, 25 Hz to 50% stiffness reduction	EN 12697-24	$\epsilon_6 \geq 100\mu\epsilon$	$\epsilon_6 \geq 130\mu\epsilon$
The United Kingdom	Gyratory compactor, air voids after 100 gyrations (0/14 mix)	EN 12697-31	N/A	$\leq 6\%$
	Moisture sensitivity, Duriez	Based on NF P 98 251-1	N/A	$\geq 0.75$
	Rutting, Wheel tracking (large device) at 60°C and 30,000 cycles	EN 12697-22	N/A	$\leq 7.5\%$ strain
	Stiffness, Indirect Tensile Stiffness Modulus	DD 213: BSI 1996	N/A	5.5 GPa
	Fatigue, Two-point bending 10°C, 25 Hz to 50% stiffness reduction	NF P 98-261-1	N/A	$\epsilon_6 \geq 130\mu\epsilon$
South Africa	Gyratory compactor, air voids after 45 gyrations	ASTM D6926	$\leq 10\%$	$\leq 6\%$
	Moisture sensitivity, Modified Lottman (including freeze-thaw)	ASTM D4867	$\geq 0.8$	$\geq 0.8$
	Rutting, RSST-CH, 55°C, 5,000 repetitions	AASHTO T320-03	$\leq 1.1\%$ strain	$\leq 1.1\%$ strain
	Stiffness, Dynamic modulus test at 15°C, 10 Hz	AASHTO TP 79	$\geq 16$ GPa	$\geq 16$ GPa
	Fatigue, Four point bending at 10 Hz, 10°C, to 50% stiffness reduction	AASHTO T 321	$\epsilon_6 \geq 210\mu\epsilon$	$\epsilon_6 \geq 260\mu\epsilon$
Australia	Gyratory compactor, air voids after 100 gyrations	Based on EN 12697-31	N/A	$\leq 6\%$
	Water sensitivity, Modified Lottman (including freeze-thaw)	AGPT T232	N/A	$\geq 0.8$
	Rutting, Wheel tracking (small device) at 60°C and 30,000 cycles	AGPT T231	N/A	$\leq 4.0$ mm
	Stiffness, Four-point bending flexural modulus 15°C, 10 Hz	AGPT/T274	N/A	$\geq 14$ GPa
	Fatigue, Four-point bending at 20°C, 10 Hz to 50% stiffness reduction	AGPT/T274	N/A	$\epsilon_6 \geq 150\mu\epsilon$

### **4.3. Advancements based on previous research**

Based on the reviewed literature, there is a general agreement that HMAC mixtures are better than conventional mixtures in terms of mechanical properties. Yet, this study is expected to address several shortcomings in previous studies as follows:

- Most of the previous studies conducted in the United States were conducted in the Northern States with cold climates since the main challenge with HMAC mixes is low-temperature cracking in cold climatic conditions. Yet, surface cracking is a major concern in hot and wet climates such as Louisiana. Therefore, this study developed HMAC mixtures using available local construction materials in Louisiana and considering the needs and standards of the state while preserving the advantages of the original technology.
- Few previous studies incorporated crumb rubber in HMAC mixtures. The use of crumb rubber as an additive in asphalt pavement construction is of interest to the paving industry due to its economic and environmental benefits such as resource recovery by creating a use for recycled waste tires. Therefore, this study developed HMAC mixtures using crumb rubber enhancing pavement sustainability.
- Most of the previous studies emphasized the superior performance of HMAC mixtures without considering the cost-effectiveness of this technology. It is well recognized that using harder binders with higher binder contents will increase construction costs. As such, this study evaluated the cost-effectiveness of HMAC mixtures as compared to conventional Superpave mixtures.

## 5. MATERIALS USED

In this study, one RAP stockpile (binder content of 4.9%), one fine sand stockpile, and three limestone aggregate stockpiles; #89, #11, and #78 were collected from a contractor located in Lafayette, Louisiana. Figure 4 illustrates the aggregate gradation for these stockpiles. Three asphalt binders were used in this study as follows:

1. Styrene-Butadiene-Styrene (SBS)-modified PG 76-22 binder
2. Styrene-Butadiene-Styrene (SBS)-modified PG 82-22 binder
3. Styrene-Butadiene-Styrene (SBS)-modified PG 76-22 binder mixed with 10% (by mass of asphalt binder) 30 mesh crumb rubber (CR). The mixing was conducted through the wet process where the crumb rubber was mixed with the liquid binder for 45 minutes at 180°C and resulted in a binder with PG 94-16.




Figure 4. Aggregate Gradation for the Stockpiles.

## 6. MIXTURE DESIGN

### 6.1. Experimental Design

In this study, four HMAC mixtures (Class 2 and 0/14 gradation) were prepared in addition to a conventional Superpave mix in Louisiana (NMAS of 12.5 mm) to be used as a control mix. Table 6 summarizes the details of these asphalt mixtures. As shown in Table 6, two design aggregate gradations were developed for mixtures with 20% RAP and 40% RAP (by aggregate mass) to meet both the requirements of the Superpave and French mix design procedures, see Figure 5. These two mixtures were defined in this study as Blend 1 and Blend 2, respectively. The Superpave mix design procedure was performed to select the optimum binder content for the control Superpave mix, while the minimum richness factor (k) specified in the French mix design procedure (k=3.4) was used to compute the required binder content for the HMAC mixes.

Table 6. Asphalt Mixtures' Details

Mixture Code	Mixture Type	Number of Specimens	Asphalt Binder	Aggregate Blend	Total Binder content
SP	Superpave	13 specimens (8 for volumetric properties [optimum Ac content and $G_{mm}$ ]; 4 for rutting testing; 2 for dynamic modulus test; and 3 for cracking evaluation)	PG 76-22	Blend 1 (RAP 20%)	5.7%
H 1	HMAC	For each HMAC mixture, 13 specimens were prepared (2 for volumetric properties [ $G_{mm}$ ]; 2 for workability; 4 for rutting testing; 2 for dynamic modulus test; and 3 for cracking evaluation)	PG 82-22	Blend 1 (RAP 20%)	6%
H 2	HMAC		PG 94-16 (PG 76-22+10% CR)	Blend 1 (RAP 20%)	6%
H 3	HMAC		PG 82-22	Blend 2 (RAP 40%)	6%
H 4	HMAC		PG 94-16 (PG 76-22+10% CR)	Blend 2 (RAP 40%)	6%






Figure 5. Aggregate Gradation for Blend 1 and Blend 2

## 6.2. Sample Preparation

Given that all the samples in this study included RAP, the mixing procedure was based on the recommendations of a study conducted in Louisiana (14) to ensure 100% of the available recycle binder is utilized within the asphalt mixture. Mixture blending and compacting steps are summarized below:

1. 5% of moisture content was added to the RAP.
2. Virgin aggregates were superheated to a minimum temperature of 383°F (195°C) for 3 hours, while the mixing tools were heated to 325°F (163°C).
3. Moisture-laden RAP was placed at the bottom of the heated mixing bucket and the superheated virgin aggregates were placed on the top of the RAP. Superheated virgin aggregates and RAP were mixed resulting in steaming. Mixing was continued until steam seized.
4. Blended aggregate and RAP were placed into 325°F (163°C) oven till the blended aggregate reached the suitable temperature for mixing with asphalt binder.
5. Heated asphalt binder and blended aggregate were mixed in a heated mixing bucket. After mixing, the mixture was spread in a pan and short-term oven-aged for 2 hours at 275°F (135°C).
6. Compacted cylindrical specimens were then prepared using the Superpave gyratory compactor (SGC) to the specified dimensions for each particular test procedure.

## 7. PERFORMANCE TESTS

### 7.1. Volumetric Properties

Eight specimens were prepared to determine the optimum asphalt content and the volumetric properties of mixture SP. Table 7 presents the final job mix formula for mixture SP. As shown in this table, mixture SP satisfied the volumetric criteria under the Louisiana Standard Specifications for Roads and Bridges (15). For 12.5 mm NMAAS asphalt concrete mixtures, these criteria are as follows:

- Air voids percentage (AV%) should be in the range of 2.5 to 4.5%;
- Voids in mineral aggregate (VMA) should be greater than 13.5%;
- Voids filled with asphalt (VFA) should be between 69 and 80%.

As previously mentioned, the French mix design approach is not driven by volumetric properties as much as it is driven by trying to meet performance-based specifications. In the French mix design, the performance-based specification that governs the mixture volumetric properties is the PCG test that evaluates the mixture workability. This specification requires HMAC Class 2 mixes, 0/14 mm gradation category, to have an air voids percentage less than 6% after 100 gyrations in the French Gyratory Shear Compactor (called PCG). Previous studies (14) indicated that 80 gyrations in the Superpave gyratory compactor (SCG) produced similar compaction as 100 gyrations in the French compactor.

In this study, the workability of the four HMAC mixtures (H1 to H4) was evaluated by measuring the degree of compaction of eight specimens (2 specimens for each mixture). The evaluation was conducted using the SGC in which the air voids percentage was measured after 80 gyrations, Figure 6. As shown in Figure 6, the percentages of air voids after 80 gyrations were 1.3%, 2.0%, 2.9%, and 3.8% for mixtures H1, H2, H3, and H4, respectively. Since all the HMAC mixes had percentage air voids less than 6% after 80 gyrations, it can be concluded that the workability requirement of the HMAC mixes was achieved.

Tuckey Honest Significant Difference (HSD) test that was conducted at a significance level of 0.05 between the air voids percentages values of each HMAC mixture as per sample set (samples sharing at least one letter are statistically similar) as shown in Figure 7. The results showed that there is a significant difference among mixtures considering the H4 mixture has the highest air voids and H1 has the lowest (the densest mixture).

Table 7. Job Mix Formula for the Control Mixture SP

<b>Mix code</b>		SP
<b>NMAS (mm)</b>		12.5
<b>Aggregate Blend</b>		20 % #89 LS 36% #11 LS 10% #78 LS 14% FS 20% RAP
<b>Binder type</b>		PG 76-22
<b>Number of gyrations in SGC</b>	N <sub>i</sub>	7
	N <sub>d</sub>	65
	N <sub>f</sub>	105
<b>Design volumetric properties</b>	G <sub>mm</sub> , N <sub>d</sub>	2.456
	%AC	5.7
	% air voids	4.0
	%VMA	14.8
	%VFA	73
<b>Gradation, (%passing)</b>	25.0mm - 1"	100
	19.0mm - 3/4"	100
	12.5mm - 1/2"	96.8
	9.5mm - 3/8"	84.3
	4.75mm - No. 4	58.9
	2.36mm - No. 8	37.6
	1.18mm - No. 16	25.6
	0.600mm - No. 30	18.1
	0.300mm - No. 50	12.1
	0.150mm - No. 100	8.7
	0.075mm - No. 200	5.5




Figure 6. Degree of Compaction of the HMAC Mixtures




Figure 7. HSD - HMAC Workability Test

## 7.2. Permanent Deformation

Since the test procedure to evaluate the rutting resistance in Louisiana is not the same as the French method (which uses the French LCPC rutting tester), the currently-used performance testing procedure and standards in Louisiana were adopted in this study. As such, the ability of the five asphalt mixtures to resist permanent deformation was evaluated using the Loaded Wheel Tracking (LWT) test in accordance with AASHTO T324-17 (16) as shown in Figure 8.



Figure 8. LWT Test

The Hamburg Double Wheel Tracker was used in this study. In this test, the prepared mixtures were short-term oven-aged as per AASHTO R30 (17). After that, the mixtures were compacted using SGC to  $60 \pm 1$  mm. The average percentage of air voids for mixture SP was 6.5% to meet the requirements of the Superpave which specifies a range of allowable air voids of  $7 \pm 1\%$  for all performance tests. The average percentages of air voids for mixtures H1, H2, H3, and H4 was 4.7%, 5.6%, 4.3%, and 5.5%, respectively, to meet the requirements of the French mix design procedure, which specifies a range of allowable air voids between 3 and 6% for all performance tests.

For each of the five mixtures, four specimens were prepared and tested (a pair for each LWT test). Specimens were conditioned in a 122°F (50°C) water bath for 45 minutes before running the test for 20,000 passes (52 passes/min), per AASHTO T324 standard procedure (16) and Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LaDOTD) specification (15). Based on LaDOTD specifications, the maximum allowable rut-depth value at 20,000 passes is 6 mm or 10 mm based on the design traffic level (15).

To analyze the results, each mixture contains four specimens in the device (left front, left-back, right front, and right back). Each pair contains 11 point-sensors at which the rutting depths are recorded as shown in Figure 9. The wheel of LWT device moves back and forth from point 1 to 11 till it reaches 20,000 passes or the rutting depth exceeds the maximum allowable rutting

depth's record which is 20mm. At point 1 and 11, the wheel reaches zero speed and moves back quickly which affect differently on the deformation from other in-between points. Therefore point 1 and 11 are excluded from the analysis. In addition, point 6 is located at which every two specimens are trimmed to be paired in the mold. The cutting edges of both specimens may not accurately present the rutting depth, therefore point 6 is excluded. As a result, four points (from 2 to 5) are analyzed to represent specimen one which is the front specimen, and four points (from 7 to 10) are analyzed to represent specimen two which is the rear specimen.




Figure 9. LWT Point-Sensors on Paired Specimens

Each pair should not have a significant difference between their two specimens' results. To ensure that, a t-test was conducted for each pair of specimens. As the analysis includes five mixtures each of which has two pairs, ten t-tests (with a significance level of 0.05) were conducted as per

Table 8. Most of the results did not have a significant difference except H2 left and H3 right with a little higher significance level which did not exceed 7.5%.

To conduct the statistical analysis for all mixtures and categorize the results, the HSD test was conducted at a significance level of 0.05 between the rutting depth values of each mixture-pair set (mixtures-pairs sharing at least one letter are statistically similar). Figure 11 shows average rutting depths versus the mixture-pair after 20,000 passes (at the end of the test).

Table 8. HMAC-Rutting Test (T-Test Results).

Mixture code-Wheel Position	T-Test results
SP - Left	2.08%
SP - Right	1.91%
H1 - Left	0.70%
H1 - Right	4.77%
H2 - Left	7.13%
H2 - Right	1.90%
H3 - Left	3.79%
H3 - Right	7.35%
H4 - Left	0.32%
H4 - Right	0.69%

.Figure 10 presents the LWT output (number of passes versus average rut depth of the right and left wheel paths) for the five mixtures. Based on Figure 10, the following findings were observed:

- The average rutting depth after 20,000 cycles was 5.0, 3.6, 3.3, 2.9, 1.7 mm, and the coefficient of variation was 3.8%, 17.7%, 2.0%, 17.3%, and 2.0% for mixtures SP, H1, H2, H3, and H4, respectively.
- While the control mix had the least rutting resistance, all the five mixtures met LaDOTD rutting requirements by experiencing an average rut depth less than 6 mm after 20,000 passes. Mixture H4 exhibited the highest rutting resistance (lowest average rut depth).
- To evaluate the impact of adding RAP on the rutting resistance of HMAC mixtures, mixture H1 was compared versus mixture H3, and mixture H2 was compared versus mixture H4. As expected, and as reported by previous studies (18), increasing the RAP content in the asphalt mixture enhanced the rutting resistance.






Figure 10. LWT Results




Figure 11. HSD - LWT Test

### 7.3. Dynamic Modulus

For the dynamic modulus test, two specimens were prepared for each of the five mixtures. The specimens were aged at 135°C (short-term oven aging) for four hours before SGC compaction to a height of 170 mm and diameter of 150 mm. The samples were then cored using a portable core drilling machine and trimmed from each end using a grinding machine to have a height of 150 mm and a diameter of 100 mm. The average percentages of air voids were 7.1%, 5.7%, 5.9%, 4.1%, and 5.2% for mixtures SP, H1, H2, H3, and H4, respectively to meet the Superpave and French specifications. The dynamic modulus test was then conducted in accordance with AASHTO Provisional Standard T 378 (equivalent to EN 12697-26 in the European standards) using a Universal Testing Machine. During the test, a sinusoidal axial compressive stress with different loading frequencies (0.1, 0.5, 1, 5, 10, and 25 Hz) was applied to the sample at specific temperatures (4.4, 25, 37, and 54°C) as shown in Figure 12. The applied stress and the resulting strain response of the specimen were measured continuously during the test using a data acquisition system. The dynamic complex modulus values were then calculated as follows:

$$|E^*| = \frac{\sigma_o}{\varepsilon_o} \quad (3)$$

where,

$|E^*|$  = absolute value of the dynamic complex modulus;

$\sigma_o$  = peak dynamic stress amplitude; and

$\varepsilon_o$  = Peak recoverable strain amplitude.

For every mixture, a t-test was conducted between every two specimens recordings that were prepared for each mixture at each testing temperature (each isotherm). For each testing



Figure 12. Dynamic Test

temperature, the t-test was conducted for the 6 frequencies as per Table 9. The results showed that there is no significant difference between specimens as the level of significance did not exceed 0.05 except for limited points that have a little significance level increase which did not exceed 0.06.

Table 9. Dynamic Modulus Test - t-test

Mix code-Temperature	SP – 4.4°C	SP – 25°C	SP – 37 °C	SP – 54°C
T – tests results	3.5%	3.7%	2.8%	1.6%
Mix code-Temperature	H1 – 4.4°C	H1– 25°C	H1– 37 °C	H1– 54°C
T – tests results	5.2%	3.3%	0.6%	0.3%
Mix code-Temperature	H2 – 4.4°C	H2– 25°C	H2– 37 °C	H2– 54°C
T – tests results	2.9%	3.8%	4.4%	4.3%
Mix code-Temperature	H3 – 4.4°C	H3– 25°C	H3– 37 °C	H3– 54°C
T – tests results	1.9%	4.8%	4.0%	2.0%
Mix code-Temperature	H4 – 4.4°C	H4– 25°C	H4– 37 °C	H4– 54°C
T – tests results	5.2%	5.5%	3.8%	5.7%

To conduct the statistical analysis for all mixtures and categorize the results, the HSD test was conducted at a significance level of 0.05 between the dynamic modulus values of isotherms for each mixture set (isotherms sharing at least one letter are statistically similar). Figure 13, Figure 14, Figure 15, and Figure 16 Present isotherms at 4.4, 25, 37, and 54°C, respectively.

For isotherm 4.4°C, mixture H4 was categorized to be in class A, mixtures H2 and H3 were in between classes A and B, and mixtures SP and H1 were categorized to be in class B. These results showed that SP and H1 were the softest mixtures and H4 was the stiffest one.




Figure 13. Dynamic Modulus Test- HSD Analysis 4.4°C

For isotherm 25°C, all mixtures were categorized to be in class A except the SP mixture as it was categorized in class B and counted as the softest mixture compared to other HMAC mixtures.




Figure 14. Dynamic Modulus Test- HSD Analysis 25°C

For isotherm 37°C, mixtures H2, H3, and H4 were categorized to be in class A, however, H1 was in between classes A and B. Mixture SP again was the softest mixture that was categorized in class B.




Figure 15. Dynamic Modulus Test- HSD Analysis 37°C

For isotherm 54°C, all mixtures were categorized to be in class A except the SP mixture as it was categorized in class B and counted as the softest mixture compared to other HMAC mixtures.




Figure 16. Dynamic Modulus Test- HSD Analysis 54°C

As of comparing all results at 10Hz frequency and 15°C reference temperature as per the French specifications criteria, the HSD test was conducted as per Figure 17. The results showed that mixture H2, H3, and H4 were categorized to be in class A, however, mixture H1 and SP were softer than other HMAC mixtures. Mixture SP was the softest mixture compared to all mixtures.




Figure 17. Dynamic Modulus Test- HSD Analysis at 10Hz and 15°C Reference Temperature.

Figure 18 illustrates the average dynamic modulus for all the mixtures versus temperature at a 10 Hz frequency. Based on the obtained results, the following was observed:

- The average dynamic modulus was 10.5, 13.5, 15.6, 14.8, and 17.7 GPa, and the coefficient of variation was 16.8%, 1.0%, 10.2%, 12.5%, and 8.0% for mixtures SP, H1, H2, H3, and H4, respectively.
- Mixtures SP and H1 did not meet the minimum stiffness HMA requirement of 14.0 GPa at 15°C and under 10 Hz loading.
- Mixture H4 had the highest dynamic modulus (17.6 GPa) at 15°C and under 10 Hz loading, which could be attributed to the use of 40% RAP in addition to using a stiff binder with 10% crumb rubber. Previous studies indicated that including RAP (19) and crumb rubber (20) in the asphalt mix increase its dynamic modulus.




Figure 18. Average Dynamic Modulus for Mixtures Versus Temperature at 10Hz Frequency.

#### 7.4. Semi-Circular Bending (SCB) Test

Since the test procedure to evaluate the fatigue cracking resistance in Louisiana is not the same as the French method (which uses the two-point bending test), the currently used performance testing procedure and standards in Louisiana were adopted in this study. As such, the ability of the five asphalt mixtures to resist cracking at intermediate temperature was evaluated using the Semi-circular Bending (SCB) test in accordance with the ASTM D8044 (21). In this test, the samples were short-term oven-aged as per AASHTO R30 (16). Afterward, the samples were compacted using SGC to a height of 57 mm and 150 mm diameter, and 7.1% air voids for mixture SP and 4.2%, 4.7%, 3.1%, and 5.9% air voids for H1, H2, H3, and H4 mixtures, respectively. The compacted samples were then long-term oven-aged for  $120 \text{ h} \pm 0.5$



Figure 19. SCB Specimens' Preparation and Testing

hr. at a temperature of  $85 \pm 3^{\circ}\text{C}$  before testing. For this test, two sets of samples with two different notch depths (25.4 and 38.1 mm) were prepared for each mixture. Each set included three semi-circular samples, resulting in a total of six semi-circular notched samples for each mixture as shown in Figure 19. Using a three-point bending set-up, the semi-circular samples were loaded monotonically at a loading rate of 0.5 mm/min at  $25 \pm 0.3^{\circ}\text{C}$  to measure the critical strain energy release rate, also called the critical value of J-integral ( $J_c$ ). According to LaDOTD specifications, a minimum  $J_c$  value of  $0.6 \text{ kJ/m}^2$  is recommended for adequate cracking performance (15).

To conduct the statistical analysis for all mixtures and categorize the results, the HSD test was conducted at a significance level of 0.05 between the  $J_c$  values of each mixture set (mixtures sharing at least one letter are statistically similar). HSD test showed that there is a significant difference between each mixture and others, as each mixture was categorized with a separate result as per Figure 20.

Figure 20 presents the  $J_c$  values for each mixture. Based on Figure 7, the following was observed:

- Mixtures SP, H2, and H4 met LaDOTD cracking requirements, while mixtures H1 and H3 failed to meet LaDOTD cracking requirements because of the hard binder (PG 82-22) combined with RAP (20 or 40%).
- To evaluate the impact of adding RAP on the cracking resistance of HMAC mixtures, mixture H1 was compared versus mixture H3, and mixture H2 was compared versus mixture H4. As expected, and as reported by previous studies (22), increasing the RAP content in the asphalt mixture reduced the cracking resistance.




Figure 20. SCB Test Results for the Five Mixtures



## **7.5. Overall Performance Evaluation**

Based on the aforementioned results of the performance tests, mixtures H2 and H4 met the French mix design specifications as well as LaDOTD specifications. Therefore, only these two HMAC mixtures (H2 and H4), as well as the control mix (SP), were considered in the following analysis. It is worth noting that mixture H4 had higher RAP content (40%) than mixture H2 (20%), and therefore had higher dynamic modulus and rutting resistance but lower cracking resistance. Given the fact that LaDOTD allows only 20% of RAP in asphalt mixtures with an NMAS of 12.5 mm, mixture H2 would be preferable and recommended to LaDOTD.

## 8. COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF HMAC MIXTURES

To assess the cost-effectiveness of HMAC mixtures as compared to conventional Superpave mixtures, it is important to evaluate the predicted field performance of each type of mixture while considering the associated costs. In this study, the field performance was predicted using the AASHTOWare Pavement ME Design software, while the associated costs were obtained from local sources.

### 8.1. Predicted Field Performance

A pavement structure that was constructed on route LA 1077 (control section 852-13) in Louisiana was selected in the analysis to predict the field performance of mixtures SP, H2, and H4. Pertinent design information for this route was obtained from a previous study in Louisiana (23). The pavement structure of this control section consisted of 50.8 mm (2 in.) wearing course (PG 76-22), 50.8 mm (2 in.) binder course (PG 70-22), 304.8 mm (12 in.) cement-treated base, and a subgrade as shown in Figure 21.



Figure 21. LA 1077 Pavement Structure

The pavement was subjected to an initial Average Annual Daily Truck Traffic (AADTT) of 405 trucks per day (TPD) with a growth rate of 2.1% and 1.48 million ESALs. In this study, two analysis approaches were conducted as follows:

1. **Approach 1 (constant thickness):** three simulation runs were conducted where mixtures SP, H2, and H4 were incorporated into the 50.8-mm (2-in.) binder course to evaluate the impact of using HMAC mixes on reducing rutting and fatigue distresses.
2. **Approach 2 (constant distresses):** four simulation runs were conducted where mixture SP was incorporated into the binder course having four different thicknesses (76.2 mm [3 in.], 88.9 mm [3.5 in.], 101.6 mm [4 in.], and 114.3 mm [4.5 in.]) to estimate the thickness equivalent (constant distress) to using 50.8-mm (2-in.) binder course including H2 and H4 mixtures. This would allow predicting the effect of using HMAC mixes on the required asphalt thickness.

To consider the impact of traffic loading, approaches 1 and 2 were conducted at two different traffic levels (initial AADTT of 405 and 7000 TPD (1.48 and 25.6 million ESALs)) resulting in a total of 14 runs (6 runs for approach 1 and 8 runs for approach 2). For each of the 14 simulation runs, the total permanent deformation (in.) and AC bottom-up fatigue cracking (% lane area) were predicted. Table 10 presents the constant and variable inputs used within the 14 simulation runs.

Table 10. AASHTOWare Input Data

<b>Input</b>	<b>Variation within the 14 Runs</b>	<b>Input in the MEPDG</b>
Wearing course T*	Constant for all the runs	50.8 mm (2 in.)
Binder course T	Approach 1: constant	Approach 1: 50.8 mm (2 in.)
	Approach 2: variable	Approach 2: 76.2 mm [3 in.], 88.9 mm [3.5 in.], 101.6 mm [4 in.], and 114.3 mm [4.5 in.]
Base course T	Constant for all the runs	50.8 mm (2 in.)
Wearing course MP**	Constant for all the runs	Input level 3 through defining binder type and mixture gradation
Binder course MP	Variable in approach 1 and constant in approach 2	Input level 1 through defining the corresponding master curve
Base course MP	Constant for all the runs	Input level 3 through defining a resilient modulus of 80,000 psi
Subgrade MP	Constant for all the runs	Input level 3 through defining a resilient modulus of 18,000 psi
Initial ADTT	Variable	Two levels (405 and 7,000 TPD)
Climate File	Constant for all the runs	A station was selected in Louisiana having the following location (latitude of 30.5 ft., longitude of -91.875 ft., and elevation of 16 ft.)
Analysis Period	Constant	20 years

\*: Thickness    \*\*: Material properties

#### 8.4. Results of Approach 1

Due to the low difference in the mixtures' results when the low traffic volume was assigned, only the high level of traffic was considered in the analysis. To conduct the statistical analysis for the three mixtures and categorize the results, the HSD test was conducted at a significance level of 0.05 between the total permanent deformation values of mixtures. HSD test showed that there is a significant difference between HMAC mixtures and SP mixture; as H2 and H4 were categorized to be in class A, however, SP mixture was classified to be in class B. Similarly, HSD was conducted for the bottom-up fatigue cracking (percentage of lane area

covered with cracks). HSD results showed that H2 mixture has a higher resistance to cracking than H4 than SP as shown in Figure 22 and Figure 23.

Figure 22 and Figure 23 present the results of the 6 simulation runs conducted in approach 1. Based on these figures, the following was observed:

- As expected, for all the runs, the permanent deformation and bottom-up cracking at the end of the analysis period were higher for higher traffic.
- For low initial AADTT (1.48 million ESALs), all the mixtures had almost the same permanent deformation and bottom-up cracking at the end of the analysis period.
- For higher initial AADTT (25.6 million ESALs), mixtures H2 and H4 had relatively lower permanent deformation at the end of the analysis period when compared to mixture SP. Yet, all the three mixtures had permanent deformation at the end of the analysis period below the threshold (0.5 in.). This agrees with the experimental results of this study which indicated that mixtures SP, H2, and H4 met LaDOTD rutting requirement with mixture SP showing the least rutting resistance while mixture H4 showing the highest rutting resistance.
- For higher initial AADTT, mixtures H2 and H4 had relatively lower bottom-up fatigue cracking at the end of the analysis period when compared to mixture SP. Yet, all the three mixtures had bottom-up fatigue cracking at the end of the analysis period below the threshold (25% of the lane area).
- Comparing mixtures H2 and H4 for the high initial AADTT level, both mixtures had similar permanent deformation at the end of the analysis period. Yet, mixture H2 (20% RAP) had lower bottom-up cracking at the end of the analysis period, due to the lower RAP content used in mixture H2. This supports the laboratory results presented in Figure 20, and validates that mixture H2 may be an alternative for state agencies.




Figure 22. Total Permanent Deformation for the Three Mixtures Under Different Initial AADTT Levels




Figure 23. Bottom-Up Fatigue Cracking for the Three Mixtures Under Different Initial AADTT Levels

### 8.5. Results of Approach 2

The runs of approach 2 resulted in equivalent thicknesses of 88.9 mm (3.5 in.) and 101.6 mm (4 in.) for 1.48 and 25.6 design million ESALs (405 and 7000TPD), respectively as shown in Figure 24, Figure 25, and Figure 26. This means that for the higher traffic level, a 101.6-mm (4-

in.) binder course including mixture SP will have almost the same structural capacity as a 50.8-mm (2-in.) binder course including mixture H2 or H4 (reduction in asphalt thickness by 50.8 mm [2 in.]). This is comparable to a previous study (13) that reported a reduction in asphalt thickness by 63.5 mm (2.5 in.) when HMAC mixtures were used instead of a conventional Indiana Superpave asphalt mixture subjected to an initial AADTT of 18,454 TPD and a growth rate of 1.7%.




Figure 24. Pavement Structure Using HMAC Mixture



Figure 25. Pavement Structure Using Superpave Mixture (Low Traffic Volume)



Figure 26. Pavement Structure Using Superpave Mixture (High Traffic Volume)

### 8.6. Associated Material Costs

The material costs for the three mixtures SP, H2, and H4 were estimated. To do so, the following estimates were obtained as per average materials' prices used locally in Louisiana:

- Cost of virgin aggregates: \$45/ton
- Cost of PG 76-22: \$720/ton
- Cost of RAP: \$35/ton
- Cost of crumb rubber: \$270/ton

Using these estimates, the material cost of H4 (\$/ton) was calculated as follows:

- Cost of virgin aggregates =  $60\% \times 94\% \times 45 = \$25.38/\text{ton}$
- Cost of RAP =  $40\% \times 94\% \times 35 = \$13.16/\text{ton}$
- Cost of virgin binder (PG 76-22) =  $90\% \times 6\% \times 720 = \$38.88/\text{ton}$
- Cost of crumb rubber =  $10\% \times 6\% \times 270 = \$1.62/\text{ton}$
- Total cost =  $25.38 + 13.16 + 38.88 + 1.62 = \$79.04/\text{ton}$

Similarly, the material cost of mixtures SP and H2 were computed, see Table 4.



Table 11. Total Material Costs for the three mixtures.

Mixture Code	SP	H2	H4
Cost of virgin aggregates (\$/ton)	33.948	33.84	25.38
Cost of RAP (\$/ton)	6.601	6.58	13.16
Cost of virgin binder (\$/ton)	41.04	38.88	38.88
Cost of crumb rubber (\$/ton)	0	1.62	1.62
Total material cost (\$/ton)	81.589	80.92	79.04

### 8.7. Cost-Effectiveness

The previous section indicated that mixtures H2 and H4 had relatively lower materials costs and higher benefits (reduction in asphalt thickness by 1.5 or 2 in. based on the traffic level). Additionally, comparing mixtures H2 and H4 to mixture SP, the use of crumb rubber in mixtures H2 and H4 are expected to offer additional disposal cost savings (as of 2020, the cost for the Central Landfill to dispose of tires was about \$150/ton). As such, it can be concluded that the HMAC mixtures proposed in this study using crumb rubber and local construction materials in Louisiana were more cost-effective than conventional Louisiana Superpave mixtures. In addition, they are more environmentally friendly since they reduce the disposal of scrap tires in landfills.

## 9. CONCLUSION

This study developed a cost-effective HMAC mixture using crumb rubber and local construction materials in Louisiana. Based on the experimental results and structural analysis, the following conclusions and recommendations were drawn:

- Two HMAC mixtures (mixtures H2 and H4) were successfully developed using crumb rubber and local materials in Louisiana. These two mixtures met the French mix design specifications as well as LaDOTD specifications.
- Mixture H2 was better than the conventional Superpave mix in Louisiana (mixture SP) in terms of dynamic modulus, rutting resistance, and cracking resistance.
- Mixture H4 had higher dynamic modulus and rutting resistance, but lower cracking resistance than mixture SP. Yet, mixture H4 successfully met LaDOTD cracking requirements.
- Mixture H4 had higher RAP content (40%) than mixture H2 (20%), and therefore had higher dynamic modulus and rutting resistance but lower cracking resistance. This conclusion was validated using the AASHTOWare Pavement ME Design software. Given the fact that LaDOTD allows only 20% of RAP in asphalt mixtures with an NMAS of 12.5 mm, mixture H2 may be an alternative for LaDOTD.
- For 25.6 million ESALs (initial AADTT of 7000 TPD), a 101.6-mm (4-in.) binder course including mixture SP is expected to have almost the same structural capacity as a 50.8-mm (2-in.) binder course including mixture H2 or H4 (reduction in asphalt thickness by 50.8 mm [2 in.]).
- For 1.48 million ESALs (initial AADTT of 405 TPD), an 88.9-mm (3.5-in.) binder course including mixture SP is expected to have almost the same structural capacity as a 50.8-mm (2-in.) binder course including mixture H2 or H4 (reduction in asphalt thickness by 38.1 mm [1.5 in.]).
- HMAC mixtures proposed in this study using crumb rubber and local materials in Louisiana were more cost-effective than conventional Louisiana Superpave mixtures. In addition, they are more environmentally friendly since they reduce scrap tires in landfills.

While the results of the AASHTOWare Pavement ME Design software support the laboratory results, it should be noted that the Pavement ME only considers the mixture stiffness ( $E^*$ ), not its flexibility, ductility, or brittleness. As such, it is essential to support the results of this study through field testing.

## **10. STUDY LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK**

The study has some limitations that can be considered in future research such as:

- Evaluating HMAC mixtures against moisture damage resistance using modified Lottman test and low temperature cracking resistance using Thermal Stress Restrained Specimen Test.
- Evaluating the binder grading continuity means that a binder with PG 94-16 could be ranged from PG 94-16 to just before PG 100-22. This wide range of grading could make a difference in the results which should be investigated. In addition, binder chemical and rheological tests should be investigated.
- Preparing the required number of specimens for each test; dynamic modulus test requires 3 specimens at least not only two, in addition, the SCB test also requires four halves at each notch depth not only three halves and three notches not only two as conducted in this study due to the limited available time.
- SCB test evaluates the cracking propagation and many previous studies considered it to present cracking resistance, however, pure fatigue cracking resistance tests such as four-point bending beam test or SVECD (Direct tension) test should be conducted and analyzed.
- Reconducting the control mixture using PG 76-22 mixed with crumb rubber to accurately be able to compare the performance of HMAC mixtures and the Superpave mixture.
- Investigating complete cost analysis for HMAC mixtures considering the extension of pavement service life and the pavement thickness reduction, not only the material costs per ton as analyzed in this study.
- Incorporating warm mix additives into HMAC mixing and compaction to decrease the required high mixing and compacting's temperatures in HMAC mixtures. This will lead to energy-saving during mixing in the field plant and compacting in the field.
- Evaluating the actual field performance of HMAC mixtures.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Leiva-Villacorta, Fabricio, Adam Taylor, and Richard Willis. "High-modulus asphalt concrete (HMAC) mixtures for use as base course." *National Center for Asphalt Technology Report* (2017): 17-04.
2. Mousa, Momen, Mostafa A. Elseifi, and Ahmed Abdel-Khalek. "Development of tree-based algorithm for prediction of field performance of asphalt concrete overlays." *Journal of Transportation Engineering, Part B: Pavements* 145.2 (2019): 04019011.
3. Moghaddam, Taher Baghaee. Development of High Modulus Asphalt Concrete Mix Design Technology for Use on Ontario's Highways. Diss. University of Waterloo, 2019.
4. Montanelli, Eng Filippo. "Fiber/polymeric compound for high modulus polymer modified asphalt (PMA)." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 104 (2013): 39-48.
5. Petho, L., Beecroft, A., Griffin, J., & Denneman, E. High modulus high fatigue resistance asphalt (EME2) technology transfer. No. AP-T283/14. 2014.
6. Denneman, Erik, Nkgapele, M., Anochie-Boateng, J., & Maina, J. W. "Transfer of High Modulus Asphalt Technology to South Africa." *CSIR Built Enviroment, Po Box* 395 (2011).
7. Moreno-Navarro F., Sol-Sánchez, M., Rubio-Gámez, M. C., & Segarra-Martínez, M. 2014. The Use of Additives for the Improvement of the Mechanical Behavior of High Modulus Asphalt Mixes. *Construction and Building Materials*. 70: 65-70
8. Mashaan, Nuha, Asim Ali, Mohamed Karim, and Mahrez Abdelaziz. "Effect of blending time and crumb rubber content on properties of crumb rubber modified asphalt binder." *International Journal of Physical Sciences* 6.9 (2011): 2189-2193.
9. Elnaml, Ibrahim, M. Mousa, M. Hassan, I. Idris & L. Mohammad. "Development of Cost-Effective High-Modulus Asphalt Concrete Mixtures Using Crumb Rubber and Local Construction Materials in Louisiana." *Transportation Research Record* (2022): 03611981221074377.
10. Moghaddam, Taher Baghaee, Mohamed Rehan Karim, and Tamalkhani Syammaun. "Dynamic properties of stone mastic asphalt mixtures containing waste plastic bottles." *Construction and Building Materials* 34 (2012): 236-242.
11. Sybilski, Dariusz, Wojciech Bańkowski, and Marek Krajewski. "High Modulus Asphalt Concrete with Limestone Aggregate." *International Journal of Pavement Research & Technology* 3.2 (2010): 96-101.

12. Haritonovs, Viktors, Janis Tihonovs, and Juris Smirnovs. "High modulus asphalt concrete with dolomite aggregates." *Transportation Research Procedia* 14 (2016): 3485-3492. doi:10.1016/j.trpro.2016.05.314.
13. Wielinski, Jason C., and Gerry A. Huber. "Evaluation of French high modulus asphalt (EME) in pavement structural design (MEPDG)." *Journal of the Association of Asphalt Paving Technologists* 80 (2011).
14. Cooper, S. B. *Sustainable Materials for Pavement Infrastructure : Design and Performance of Asphalt Mixtures Containing Recycled Asphalt Shingles*. May 2015.
15. LaDOTD. *Louisiana Standard Specifications for Roads and Bridges*, 2018.
16. AASHTO (The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials). 2008. AASHTO T324: Standard Method of Test for Hamburg Wheel-Track Testing of Compacted Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA).
17. AASHTO (The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials). 2012. AASHTO R30: Mixture Conditioning of Hot Mix Asphalt.
18. Xiao, Feipeng, Serji Amirkhanian, and C. Hsein Juang. "Rutting resistance of rubberized asphalt concrete pavements containing reclaimed asphalt pavement mixtures." *Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering* 19.6 (2007): 475-483.
19. Zhu, J., Ma, T., Fan, J., Fang, Z., Chen, T., & Zhou, Y. "Experimental study of high modulus asphalt mixture containing reclaimed asphalt pavement." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 263 (2020): 121447.
20. Dong, Yuming, Yiqiu Tan, and Liying Yang. "Evaluation of performance on crumb-rubber-modified asphalt mixture." *Journal of Testing and Evaluation* 40.7 (2012): 1089-1093.
21. ASTM (American Society for Testing and Materials). 2016. ASTM D8044: Standard Test Method for Evaluation of Asphalt Mixture Cracking Resistance using the Semi-Circular Bend Test (SCB) at Intermediate Temperatures.
22. Shu, Xiang, Baoshan Huang, and Dragon Vukosavljevic. "Evaluation of cracking resistance of recycled asphalt mixture using semi-circular bending test." *Paving materials and pavement analysis*. 2010. 58-65.
23. Wu, Zhong, and Danny X. Xiao. *Development of DARWin-ME Design Guideline for Louisiana Pavement Design*. No. FHWA/LA. 11/551. Louisiana Transportation Research Center, 2016.

## **VITA**

Ibrahim A. Elnaml was born in Dakahliya, Egypt. In 2016, he finished his B.Sc. in Civil Engineering from Mansoura University, Egypt. From 2016 to 2020, he had opportunities to work as a teaching assistant in the Civil Engineering department and as an industrial engineer for many construction infrastructure and building projects in Cairo, Egypt, and Dubai, UAE. In 2020, he moved to Baton Rouge, Louisiana, to pursue his master's degree in Construction Management in conjunction with doing his doctoral studies. He plans to receive his Masters in science in May 2022. His research interest includes pavement management systems, pavement marking, sustainable construction materials, asphalt materials, pavement material characterization, pavement sustainability, pavement recycling, and asphalt reclaimed pavement. Upon completion of his master's degree, he will begin work on his doctorate.