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• Background of HWT
• Data trends (Texas)
• Specifications

• Special thanks to Dale Rand and TxDOT
Background

• Developed in Germany, used since the mid-1970’s
  – *Spurbildungsgerät, auf Deutsch*

• A loaded steel wheel tracks over the samples in a heated water bath, the deformation is observed vs. the number of loading passes

• Has mostly been used in North America as an mixture evaluation tool
• TxDOT uses specimens molded in the SGC or 6” cores cut from the pavement
  – 10” cores can also be used
• ~50 cycles per minute, < 7 hrs for 20,000 passes
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Specimen Configuration, TEX-242-F

- Lab-compacted specimens molded to 93% $G_{mm} \pm 1\%$
- Circular specimens sawed as shown in the figure

**Not drawn to scale

Top View of Test Specimen Configuration for the Hamburg Wheel-tracking Device.
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Colorado DOT Test Criteria: CPL 5112

- Test temperature based on PG high temperature grade
  - PG 52...40°C
  - PG 58...45°C
  - PG 64...50°C
  - PG 70...55°C

- Data reported include:
  - Number of passes
  - Maximum impression
  - Test temperature
  - Sample(s) air voids
  - Creep slope
  - Stripping slope
  - Stripping inflection point
TxDOT 2004 Specifications

• No longer use the Modified Lottman (TEX-531-C, AASHTO T283)
  – TxDOT still uses the boil test (TEX-520-C)
• All HMA items, except Items 292 (Plant mix, asphalt-treated base) and 342 (Permeable Friction Course) include HWT criteria
• Only the maximum rut depth (0.5 inches) is specified, the number of passes depends on the PG grade
  – Not using the other Hamburg parameters for mix design acceptance
HWT-TxDOT Materials & Tests Laboratory, Cedar Park

• TxDOT has seven HWT’s
• Four in their central laboratory (Cedar Park)
  – Three in MAT labs around the state
  – Three approved commercial labs
• Testing performed at 50C, for prescribed number of passes or until failure (1/2 inch deformation)
**TxDOT HWT Requirements**

**Mixture Design & Production**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Temperature Binder Grade</th>
<th>Test Method</th>
<th>Minimum # of Passes @ 0.5&quot; Rut Depth, Tested @122°F⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG 64 or lower</td>
<td>Tex-242-F</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG 70</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG 76 or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. May be decreased or waived when shown on the plans. Test not required for RBL.

Note: TxDOT also includes a maximum indirect tensile strength requirement to avoid brittle mixtures
HWT Testing Requirements

- Mixture design (for approval)
- Trial batch (Lot 1)
- Minimum on 1 HWT during the project
- Engineer may test as desired
  - Usually not done unless there are other indications of potential problems
- During production, failing test results result in suspension of operations and may require removal and replacement of material
Passing Result

- Dense-graded mixture
- PG 76-22
- 14% RAP
Contrasting results

- Failed @10,200 passes
- PG 76-22, Limestone

- Passed, 2.8 mm @ 20,000 passes
- Same aggregate, different binder source
General Trends

- HWT does a better job of identifying mixtures that are susceptible to premature failure than other laboratory tests (Lottman, Hveem stabilometer, Creep, etc).
- Stiffer asphalt binders (higher high temperature grades) do better.
- Adding liquid antistrip or lime usually improves the HWT results. Improvement with lime is usually more dramatic than with liquid.
- Harder aggregates do better (igneous - vs - limestone).
- Stone on stone mixes do better than dense mixes.
- There are no absolutes! ... Do not assume! ... Measure! (D. Rand)
Trends in the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PG 64-22</th>
<th>PG 70-22</th>
<th>PG 76-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count (Lime)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count (Liquid)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count (None)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are exceptions!!!

Hamburg Wheel Test Results (20,000 Passes)
Wichita Falls (12.5mm SFHMACP)
Limestone Aggregate with Koch PG 76-22

Spec Limit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Rut Depth (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Additive</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 % Lime</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 % Lime</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 % HP Plus (liquid)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caution!!!

- HWT favors stiff asphalt binders and mixtures
  - Good for thick pavements, bad for thin, deflecting pavement structures
- HWT does not identify mixtures that are susceptible to cracking
Other uses

• Forensic tool
  – In combination with distress survey, other sampling and testing, NDT
  – Not enough data (yet) to identify a test result limit that suggests failure

• Pavement evaluation tool
  – Test samples from existing pavement before deciding on rehabilitation or resurfacing strategy
    • Particularly where there is evidence of moisture trapped within the pavement, raveling, or a history of moisture damage with existing materials
Moisture Damage

- Note lateral deformation
- Ruts > 1 in. deep
- Moisture damage in underlying material

- This can be avoided!!!
In summary...

• HWT is used by TxDOT in lieu of stability and Lottman tests for design and project control
• Other agencies use HWT as a forensic tool
• HWT or other loaded wheel tests can and should be used for verifying designs and for evaluating existing materials
Thanks!