

State Discussion Topics – 2004

State: Nevada

Contact Person for Questions Concerning this Information: Darin Tedford

Phone: 775-888-7520

Email: dtedford@dot.state.nv.us

1. Have you adopted the Superpave aggregate consensus properties? **No.** Were any of these specifications more restrictive than your previous specifications? **N/A** If you did not adopt the Superpave aggregate standards have you made any significant changes to your aggregate specifications in the last 10 years. **No.**
2. Have aggregate producers had to modify practices and equipment to meet the new specifications? As an example: have you seen changes in crushing equipment, equipment to remove fine dust, and the number of stockpiles and cold feed bins used? **No significant changes.**
3. Do you have aggregate sources that were being used before the changes that no longer meet your specifications? Are aggregates or filler having to be hauled to some locations, in order to meet Superpave requirements, where local sources were being used before Superpave? **No sources have been eliminated.**
4. Do you require QC or QA testing of aggregates during aggregate production or only during the mixing process? **QA is required during both. Contractor may do his own QC during both, but is only required to do QC on the aggregate production.** Do you require the contractor to perform QC testing at required frequencies? Which properties must be checked? **On aggregate testing, the Contractor is required to check gradation and PI once per 1000 tons per size produced.**
5. For aggregate properties, excluding gradation, do you test or require testing at a specified frequency during production or do you only verify aggregate properties at the time of the mix design? For which properties and at what frequencies are the tests performed? **The Contractor is required to check PI on every 1000 tons per size produced.**
6. Please list the test specified and the limits for each of the properties shown below for an aggregate you would use for surface course on a high volume rural interstate.
 - A. Soundness – **Coarse Aggregate 12% max, Fine Aggregate 15% max**
 - B. Durability - **LAR 37% max loss**

- C. Course Aggregate Fracture – **80% minimum**
 - D. Fine Aggregate Fracture – **N/A**
 - E. Cleanliness (sand equivalent, PI, or other) **PI 10% max before marination**
 - F. Flat and Elongated **N/A**
 - G. Polish Resistance **N/A**
7. Has your state done any research with Micro Deval? **No.** Is Micro Deval testing performed on the coarse aggregate, fine aggregate, or a combined sample? **No.** Do you have any plans to replace your present specifications for aggregate soundness or durability with Micro Deval? **No.**
8. Is your state using any wheel tracking devices (Hamburg, APA, or Other) to test HMA? Do you use the devices to evaluate rutting, moisture damage, or fatigue? What are your testing parameters (number of cycles, temperature, rut depth, and such)? Do you have specification for HMA and if so please list? Does the state perform the testing or is the contractor required to perform the testing? **Nevada uses the APA to evaluate rutting potential. We test at 140°F for 8000 cycles. Currently we are collecting information only and have not implemented a specification. This testing is performed by the State.**