

1 **EVALUATION OF A CHEMICAL HARDENING PROCESS TO INHIBIT**  
2 **AGGREGATE ABRASION AND POLISHING**

3

4 **Liam Cumberpatch\*\***

5 University of Oklahoma

6 College of Engineering

7 202 West Boyd Street, Room 107

8 Norman, Oklahoma 73019

9 405-476-8491

10 \*\*Corresponding Author

11

12 **Dominique M. Pittenger, PhD, AC**

13 University of Oklahoma

14 College of Engineering

15 202 West Boyd Street, Room 107

16 Norman, Oklahoma 73019

17 405-573-3767

18

19 **Musharraf Zaman, PhD, PE**

20 University of Oklahoma

21 Associate Dean of Engineering

22 202 West Boyd Street, Room 107

23 Norman, Oklahoma 73019

24 zaman@ou.edu

25 405-

26

27 Submission Date:

28 Word Count = X

29 Figures and Tables = 5 @ 250 = 1,250

30 Total Word Count = X

31

32 **Paper# 15-0378**

## 1 ABSTRACT

2 Aggregate polishing and degradation is a pavement management problem for state highway  
3 agencies. It creates a safety issue by reducing skid resistance and shortening pavement service  
4 life. An underutilized pavement preservation tool, *Silicon Reactive Lithium Densifier and*  
5 *Shotblasting*, can harden new and existing pavement and bridge deck surfaces to inhibit  
6 polishing and abrasion and retain skid resistance. Research to determine the efficacy of this  
7 treatment is limited because of its relatively recent emergence in highway applications.  
8 Therefore, the objective of this paper is to evaluate densifier-treated limestone aggregate  
9 characteristics in the laboratory that relate to highway performance in terms of abrasion  
10 resistance, skid resistance and aggregate polishing using a Micro Deval and *aggregate image*  
11 *analysis* testing methodology. The results demonstrate that chemically treating soft aggregate  
12 improves the hardness and durability of the aggregate. Additionally, the angularity of the  
13 treated aggregate after polish-wear treatment trended closer to the new aggregate which  
14 received no abrasion process at all, indicating that the chemical application does indeed  
15 enhance aggregate abrasion resistance. The paper concludes that there is potential benefit to  
16 adopting lithium-based treatments as a pavement preservation tool to enhance the ability of  
17 pavement engineers to maintain safe surface friction levels, inhibit polishing and *keep good*  
18 *roads good*.

19

## 20 INTRODUCTION

21 According to the American Society of Civil Engineers US 2013 Infrastructure Report Card,  
22 32% of America's major roads are currently in poor or mediocre condition (1). These  
23 conditions are a significant factor in approximately one third of all US traffic fatalities (1).  
24 Unfortunately for pavement managers, the budget woes that have plagued their agencies and  
25 created these conditions are not expected to ease (2). *Pavement preservation* is a solution for  
26 addressing pavement system needs by "keeping good roads good" (3). Pavement preservation  
27 treatments are applied to extend the functional service life of the underlying pavement,  
28 deferring costly rehabilitation/ reconstruction. "A pavement preservation program aims at  
29 preserving investment in the pavement network, extending pavement life, enhancing  
30 pavement performance, ensuring cost effectiveness, and reducing user delays" (3).  
31 "Considering the annual magnitude of highway investments, the potential savings from  
32 following a cost-effective approach to meeting an agency's performance objectives for  
33 pavements are significant" (4), thus, allowing agencies to stretch the budget to address safety  
34 needs in infrastructure and enhance stewardship.

35 Polished aggregate in a pavement surface is considered to be a surface defect that  
36 must be mitigated by pavement engineers to ensure safety (5). Aggregate quality directly  
37 impacts the frequency (cost) of that maintenance. Mineral aggregates with high resistance to  
38 abrasion are considered to be of high quality because they provide sufficient microtexture for  
39 skid resistance and decrease the likelihood of polishing (6). According to the US DOT, there  
40 are roughly 8.6 million lane miles of pavement in the nation. Most of those pavement miles  
41 were constructed with natural aggregates originating from the most economical (closest)  
42 locations. Considering the distribution of aggregate quality in the US, 21 states have areas  
43 where the aggregates are either soft or medium soft, and are commonly limestone (7). In  
44 these regions where high quality aggregate is scarce, transportation costs make it hard to  
45 justify importing better aggregates. Even in areas that have higher quality aggregate, like  
46 California, accelerated surface deterioration still occurs due to frequent exposure to studded  
47 tires and snowplows (8).

48 There is a promising new pavement preservation treatment that aims to enhance the  
49 quality of surface aggregate by hardening it through chemical and mechanical processes  
50 referred to as *Silicon Reactive Lithium Densifier and Shotblasting* (9). Research to determine  
51 the efficacy of this treatment is limited because of its relatively recent emergence in highway  
52 applications. Therefore, the objective of this paper is to evaluate densifier-treated aggregate  
53 durability and characteristics, specifically abrasion resistance and gradient angularity, which  
54 relate to highway performance in terms of skid resistance and aggregate polishing tendencies.

1 The study uses a Micro Deval and aggregate image analysis (i.e. AIMS) testing methodology  
2 (10, 11, and 12).

3

#### 4 **BACKGROUND**

##### 5 **Skid Resistance and Aggregate Quality**

6 Pavement skid resistance is one of “the most important engineering components of the road  
7 from a safety standpoint” (13, 14). Therefore, a common indicator used to assess pavement  
8 skid resistance is *microtexture* (15). Essentially, microtexture is the quantitative measure of  
9 aggregate surface friction properties that contribute to skid resistance (16). Pavement  
10 managers assess pavement safety and surface performance (service life) by monitoring the  
11 microtexture deterioration rate until the surface reaches a certain threshold value that triggers  
12 the need for remedial action.

13 Pavement surfaces are continuously exposed to conditions related to traffic (i.e.  
14 volume, loads, turning motions, decelerating/ accelerating motions) and weather (i.e. freeze-  
15 thaw, wet-dry cycles) that cause aggregate polishing and degradation. Pavement microtexture  
16 is significantly affected by the characteristics of the aggregate contained within the pavement,  
17 such as angularity (12). Aggregate polishing and degradation have an adverse impact on these  
18 characteristics and result in accelerating the surface deterioration and increasing remediation  
19 frequency (10, 11, and 12). Essentially, aggregate less prone to texture loss and abrasion will  
20 predictively have better skid resistance in the field (6).

21 Limestone has been the most commonly used aggregate type in US road construction  
22 (17). However, this is problematic for pavement managers because limestone is generally  
23 more prone to polishing than other aggregate types, and therefore, yields poorer long-term  
24 skid performance and must be remediated more frequently (17, 18, 19, and 11). National  
25 Cooperative Highway Research Program (19) Report 634 found that surfaces with high  
26 quality aggregates retain their microtexture, and hence their skid resistance, for as long as 10  
27 years under heavy traffic (19). The same study reported that skid resistance on concrete and  
28 asphalt test sections containing limestone deteriorated at a much more rapid rate, needing to  
29 be retextured in as little as 3 years under the same traffic loads (19). Essentially, harder and  
30 more durable aggregates retain higher friction values longer, contributing to adequate  
31 pavement safety and longer service life (18, 19).

32

##### 33 **Silicon Reactive Lithium Densifier and Shotblasting**

34 *Silicon Reactive Lithium Densifier and Shotblasting* (or generally, densifier over shotblasting,  
35 DOS) is a pavement preservation treatment used to harden pavement surface against abrasion  
36 to retain microtexture and inhibit rutting and polishing, whereby extending the pavement’s  
37 service life (9). The treatment consists of a mechanical process (shotblasting - high velocity  
38 impact method (HVIM)) and a chemical application (Silicon Reactive Lithium Densifier).  
39 Shotblasting has been shown to be a cost effective method for restoring surface friction (20).  
40 In the DOS application, shotblasting also increases the surface porosity to facilitate the  
41 penetration of the densifier, resulting in a deeper hardened surface that is more resistant to  
42 wear from abrasion due to traffic and snow plows (21, 22). Therefore, the chemical  
43 application works to retain the surface texture and profile that the shotblasting restores. The  
44 treatment application is shown in Figure 1.



1  
2 **Figure 1. DOS -Treated Pavement: Shotblasting (Left), Densifier Application (Right)**  
3

4 Recent studies have evaluated the performance, cost effectiveness and sustainability of this  
5 pavement preservation treatment and demonstrate the value in its ability to lengthen a  
6 pavement's service life (9). Field studies and sustainability analyses have investigated the  
7 treatment application on PCCP highway projects. Results support the conclusions that DOS  
8 inhibits the rate of deterioration due to abrasion and polishing (8, 23, 21 and 9).

9 A recent Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) study demonstrated the  
10 treatment's ability to inhibit loss of skid resistance due to aggregate polishing. It evaluated  
11 DOS application on existing PCCP test sections on State Highway 77 (average daily traffic =  
12 14,000 vehicles per day). Results from the three-year project showed that DOS-treated test  
13 sections outperformed the control section in terms of skid resistance and cost effectiveness  
14 (21). The project included application of DOS to existing pavement, as well as shotblasted  
15 sections with no chemical application (SB). Monthly measurements were used to develop  
16 deterioration models that estimate PCCP preservation treatment service lives (21). The SB  
17 section showed friction loss of 11% over the testing period compared to 6.25% for the DOS  
18 section.

19 Another field study, sponsored by the California DOT (Caltrans), concluded that  
20 using DOS reduced pavement surface wear by more than 50% (8, 9). It evaluated DOS applied  
21 to new PCCP. The study measured surface wear over 12 months on a test section on Interstate  
22 Highway 80 (I-80) over Donner Pass in the Sierra Mountains. The test site was subjected to  
23 abrasion due to snow plowing and snow chains/studded tires (23). In addition to measuring  
24 change in wheel path rut depth, it also measured test section skid numbers.

25 The Delaware DOT conducted a field study that sought to determine the efficacy of  
26 diamond grinding and shotblasting for enhancing the penetration of the lithium silicate  
27 densifier (9). Two of the PCCP test sections received DOS, two received densifier  
28 application only, two received SB only, and one received diamond grinding with densifier.  
29 Core samples were extracted from each test section approximately 6 months after treatments  
30 were applied to measure densifier penetration. The results showed that DOS provides the  
31 deepest penetration of the three surface preparation methods, supporting the benefit accrued  
32 for DOS sections, which were inferred from the data to have a deeper hardened surface than  
33 the other options (9).

34 Other studies have concluded that DOS is a technically and sustainably viable PCCP  
35 preservation treatment that inhibits polishing. A life cycle cost analysis (LCCA) was used to  
36 compare DOS-treated PCCP pavement with non-treated pavement (do nothing case) (9). The  
37 data from the three field studies mentioned in the preceding paragraphs were used to provide  
38 DOS input. The study also used untreated test sections in a Washington State DOT study as a  
39 baseline measure. The LCCA revealed that the DOS-treated sections provided for lower life  
40 cycle cost due to the pavement service life extension, offsetting the marginally higher initial  
41 construction costs. The study also conducted a life cycle inventory (LCI) to compare the  
42 environmental impact of two pavement preservation treatments used for addressing pavement  
43 abrasion/rutting: DOS and microsurfacing (a bituminous-based seal). The LCI revealed that

1 the DOS application process for inhibiting rutting requires less energy and creates fewer  
2 emissions than using microsurfacing to fill ruts.

3 A carbon footprint cost index (CFCI) was developed for the purpose of comparing  
4 pavement preservation treatment alternatives on a basis of enhanced sustainability (Mosier  
5 2013). It was demonstrated on an airport case study using six treatment alternatives. Although  
6 the analysis methodology is the core of the study, the case study revealed that the DOS  
7 treatment had the lower CFCI and would have been the preferred treatment to restore surface  
8 friction and slow underlying pavement deterioration.

9 Beyond these studies, there was nothing found in literature with regard to the effect  
10 of the hardening agent on aggregate shape characteristics and durability. Therefore, the  
11 objective of this paper is to evaluate densifier-treated limestone aggregate characteristics that  
12 relate to highway performance in terms of abrasion resistance, skid resistance and aggregate  
13 polishing.

### 14 **Aggregate Testing in Relation to Overall Project**

15 The main hypothesis to be tested by this two-phase study is that frictional characteristics of  
16 different aggregate types and pavement surfaces can be improved using the DOS process and  
17 enhance the surface friction performance of pavements. Laboratory and field tests will be  
18 conducted to get a more comprehensive assessment of DOS efficacy. Asphalt and concrete  
19 mix designs commonly used in Oklahoma pavements will be molded in the laboratory and  
20 DOS will be applied. Polishing tests will be conducted via the British Pendulum Skid Tester  
21 and the National Center for Asphalt Technology (NCAT) Three-Wheel Polishing Device  
22 (TWPD). The second phase of the study includes field tests: DOS-treating asphalt and  
23 concrete pavements and bridge decks. It will evaluate treatment performance by measuring  
24 the pavement surface for microtexture, macrotexture, rutting and polishing. The project is  
25 currently in its first phase, which involves applying the lithium silicate densifier directly to  
26 the aggregate to evaluate the difference between treated and untreated samples. Preliminary  
27 results are presented in this paper, which evaluates the efficacy of treating soft aggregate with  
28 *Silicon Reactive Lithium Densifier*. Treatment will potentially enhance the aggregate's  
29 durability, hardness and ability to maintain a sufficient level of microtexture whereby  
30 inhibiting degradation and polishing.

### 31 **Oklahoma Aggregate**

32 Most of the state of Oklahoma is comprised of soft aggregates (7, 25). Of the six commonly-  
33 used aggregate sources identified by ODOT to be evaluated in this study, four are limestone  
34 quarries, one is a rhyolite quarry and one is a granite quarry. Table 1 shows statewide  
35 aggregate quality for Oklahoma, classified with polished stone value (PSV) based upon  
36 Neaylon's (18) definitions of aggregate quality. Aggregate PSVs of 55 or above are  
37 associated with high resistance to polishing and PSVs less than 45 indicate low resistance to  
38 polishing. Good aggregate is available in the geologic strata of Oklahoma (25). However,  
39 there is no indication of the accessibility of that stone (property ownership) or if it can be  
40 economically mined. Table 1 shows that most of the state's aggregate (almost 65%) is prone  
41 to polishing (25).  
42  
43  
44

45 **TABLE 1 Oklahoma Aggregate Geology Based on Average PSV (after Gransberg NJ)**

Aggregate Quality Description	Oklahoma Aggregate Quality (%)
Good (Average PSV > 55, Minimum PSV > 45)	21.20%
Marginal (Average PSV < 55, Minimum PSV > 45)	15.17%
Poor (Average PSV < 45)	63.63%

## 1 **METHODOLOGY**

### 2 **General Testing Procedure**

3 The aggregate characteristics of shape, angularity, and texture significantly affect  
4 microtexture and can be used to predict pavement performance (26, 12). Therefore, there  
5 have been recent efforts to develop testing methodologies that evaluate these characteristics in  
6 relation to polishing and degradation. One such methodology includes the use of aggregate  
7 image analysis systems (i.e. AIMS - AASHTO Provisional Specification) to quantify  
8 aggregate shape/texture property changes resulting from exposure to standard Micro Deval  
9 testing (AASHTO T-327) , which simulates field polishing and abrasion of aggregate (27, 10,  
10 11 and 12). This laboratory testing methodology is being used in this paper to investigate the  
11 effect of lithium silicate densifier (no shotblasting) on selected Oklahoma aggregates.  
12

### 13 **Micro Deval (AASHTO T-327)**

14 Micro Deval provides insight regarding the ability of the densifier application to harden  
15 limestone aggregate, as the test output directly relates to aggregate hardness (11). The Micro-  
16 Deval test measures the abrasion resistance and durability of coarse aggregate. The testing is  
17 carried out in accordance with the American Association of State Highway and  
18 Transportation Officials (AASHTO) T-327 “Standard Test Method for Resistance of Coarse  
19 Aggregate to Degradation by Abrasion in the Micro-Deval Apparatus”.  
20

### 21 **Aggregate Imaging System (AIMS - AASHTO Provisional Specification)**

22 The [first-generation] aggregate imaging system (AIMS), an aggregate image analysis  
23 system, was developed to capture images and analyze aggregate shape and texture  
24 characteristics. AIMS setup consists of one camera and two different types of lighting  
25 schemes to capture images of aggregates at different resolutions, from which aggregate shape  
26 properties are measured (26). Coarse aggregate particles are placed on the sample tray with  
27 marked grid points. AIMS describes aggregate angularity by measuring the irregularity of a  
28 particle’s surface using the radius and gradient methods (angularity index). The gradient  
29 method is based on the principle that at sharp corners of the image, the direction of the  
30 gradient vector changes rapidly, whereas it changes slowly along the outline of rounded  
31 particles. The angularity is calculated based on the values of angle of orientation of the edge  
32 points and the magnitude of difference of these values. The sum of angularity values for all  
33 the boundary points are accumulated around the edge to get the angularity index for each  
34 particle. An analysis of variance was used to determine the significance in the angularity  
35 indices between the treated and non-treated samples.  
36


### 37 **Treatment Procedure**

38 Three replicates of non-treated limestone aggregates and densifier-treated aggregates were  
39 subjected to Micro-Deval and AIMS testing to determine if the chemical treatment enhances  
40 aggregate abrasion resistance, hardness and durability. The Micro Deval test provided weight  
41 loss measurements. Both pre- and post- Micro Deval aggregate particles were collected and  
42 analyzed for angularity using AIMS.

43 Direct treatment of aggregate using a lithium silicate densifier is a new procedure, so  
44 there are no documented standards or standard protocol regarding treatment methodology in  
45 literature. Therefore, aggregate was treated per the manufacturers’ specifications. Aggregate  
46 samples were washed and oven dried to a constant temperature, then submerged into the  
47 lithium-based densifier and agitated for 60 seconds to ensure as much uniformity in  
48 application as possible. The samples were then removed from the densifier and left to air dry  
49 for 24-48 hours. Testing was then initiated.


1 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

2 The preliminary Micro Deval results, as shown in Figure 2, reveal that the aggregate samples  
 3 with directly-applied lithium silicate densifier (triangle designation) had less weight loss than  
 4 the non-treated samples (diamond designation). Good friction performance has been  
 5 correlated with aggregates that exhibit Micro Deval weight loss values of 12% or less (11).  
 6 Therefore, the results indicate that the treated aggregate would facilitate good pavement  
 7 surface friction and better performance than the non-treated aggregate. Due to the nature of  
 8 Micro-Deval testing and the nature of the shotblasting process, shotblasting the aggregate  
 9 prior to densifier application was not possible. However, one could infer that if shotblasting  
 10 had been applied to deepen densifier penetration, the weight loss would be even less (9).  
 11



12 **FIGURE 2 Micro Deval results for DOS-treated and non-treated aggregate.**


13 Preliminary AIMS results show that applying the lithium silicate densifier directly to the  
 14 aggregate also enhances the aggregate's ability to retain angularity. Figure 3 shows the  
 15 angularity results (gradient method) from the 5/8-inch (16mm) limestone particle testing. In  
 16 general, an angularity value of 4000 or above indicates an angular particle, whereas a value  
 17 below 2100 indicates a rounded particle (28). Figure 3 shows the angularity values for the (a)  
 18 pre-Micro Deval particles (dashed line), (b) densifier-treated particles, post Micro Deval  
 19 (solid line), and (c) non-treated particles, post Micro Deval (hashed line).  
 20  
 21



1  
2 **FIGURE 3 AIMS results: gradient angularity for DOS-treated and non-treated samples.**

3  
4 The results show that the angularity of the untreated limestone aggregate is greatly reduced  
5 after exposure to Micro Deval, as one would expect. Only about 20% of pre-Micro Deval  
6 particles were considered rounded. However, the impact of abrasion is apparent in the  
7 untreated, post- Micro Deval particles, as most of the particles lost angularity. In contrast, the  
8 densifier-treated aggregate trends more closely with the aggregate that received no Micro  
9 Deval treatment at all, indicating that the chemical application does indeed enhance aggregate  
10 abrasion resistance, and by extension, skid resistance. The nature of AIMS testing is also not  
11 conducive with shotblasting, but one could infer that deeper densifier penetration would  
12 increase angularity (9).

13  
14 Figure 4 shows the descriptive statistics and distributions for the AIMS angularity data for  
15 treated (dashed lines) and untreated (solid line) particles. The analysis of variance showed  
16 that there was a statistically significant difference ( $p = 0.009$ ) between the treated aggregate  
17 (more angular) and the untreated aggregate (more rounded) based upon a 95% confidence  
18 interval (Tukey's Method). Additionally, there was no difference between treated samples.  
19



20  
21 **FIGURE 4 AIMS ANOVA results: gradient angularity for aggregate samples.**



1 There is a correlation between abrasion resistance and polishing resistance, especially for  
2 aggregate that is highly susceptible to abrasion like limestone (6). Essentially, when aggregate  
3 angularity is reduced, the aggregate becomes more susceptible to polishing. These results  
4 show that lithium silicate densifier application hardens the aggregate and, therefore, enhances  
5 the likelihood of inhibiting polishing.

## 6 7 **CONCLUSIONS**

8 This study demonstrates the value of hardening aggregate through lithium silicate densifier  
9 application. Laboratory results show that applying the densifier directly to the Oklahoma  
10 limestone aggregate improves its abrasive resistance, hardness and durability. It also shows  
11 that the treatment helps the aggregate retain its angularity under polish-wear conditions,  
12 which will enhance skid resistance and inhibit polishing. The potential viability and  
13 sustainability of this pavement preservation treatment has been demonstrated in recent  
14 research. *Silicon Reactive Lithium Densifier and Shotblasting* provides another tool for the  
15 pavement preservation toolbox that can contribute to stretching the budget by extending  
16 pavement service life. It will also enhance the ability of pavement engineers to maintain safe  
17 surface friction levels, inhibit polishing and *keep good roads good*.

## 18 19 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

20 The authors wish to thank the Oklahoma Department of Transportation for the sponsorship of  
21 this research.

## 22 23 **REFERENCES**

- 24  
25 1. (ASCE), 2013. "2013 Report Card for Americas Infrastructure," accessed July 16, 2014  
26 from: <http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/a/#p/roads/conditions-and-capacity>
- 27 2. (FHWA) 2014. Press Release: "U.S. Department of Transportation Outlines Steps for  
28 Managing Impending Highway Trust Fund Shortfall," July 1, 2014, US Department of  
29 Transportation, Federal Highway Administration Press Office, Washington DC.  
30 <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/pressroom/dot1459.cfm>
- 31 3. Galehouse, L., Moulthrop, J.S., Hicks, R.G. Principles for Pavement Preservation:  
32 Definitons, Benefits, Issues and Barriers. TR News, Transportation Resarch Board , pp.  
33 4-9. Washington DC, 2003
- 34 4. Peshkin, D.G., T.E. Hoerner and K.A. Zimmerman. National Cooperative Highway  
35 Research Program, NCHRP, Report 523 Optimal Timing of Pavement Preventive  
36 Maintenance Treatment Applications. Transportation Research Board, TRB, National  
37 Research Council, Washington, DC, 2004.
- 38 5. (FHWA) 2003. "Distress Identification Manual for The LTPP (Fourth Revised Edition)",  
39 Publication Number: FHWA-RD-03-031, Date: JUNE 2003, Department of  
40 Transportation, Federal Highway Administration  
41 [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/infrastructure/pavements/ltp/reports/030](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/infrastructure/pavements/ltp/reports/03031/01.cfm)  
42 [31/01.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/infrastructure/pavements/ltp/reports/03031/01.cfm)
- 43 6. Lancieri, F., M. Losa and A. Marradi, 2005. "Resistance to polishing and mechanical  
44 properties of aggregates for asphalt concrete wearing courses," Italian Society for Road  
45 Infrastructures (SIIV), SSD ICAR 04, <http://siiv.scelta.com/bari2005/162.pdf>
- 46 7. NSP, 2010. "Aggregate Classification Map of the United States," accessed July 16, 2014  
47 from:  
48 [http://nationalequipment.com/assets/documents/National\\_Aggregate\\_Hardness\\_US.pdf](http://nationalequipment.com/assets/documents/National_Aggregate_Hardness_US.pdf)
- 49 8. Komars, T. 2011. "Advanced Surface Preparation and Preservation Treatments for  
50 Concrete Pavements," CP<sup>2</sup> Center News, Newsletter of the California Pavement  
51 Preservation Center, No. 20, December.
- 52 9. Gransberg, D.D. and D. M. Pittenger, 2012. "Quantifying the Whole Life Benefit of  
53 Preserving Concrete Pavements using Silicon Reactive Lithium Densifier and  
54 Shotblasting – A Promising New Technology. Research, Development, and Practice in  
55 Structural Engineering and Construction." Vimonsatit, V., Singh, A., Yazdani, S. (eds.)

- 1 ASEA-SEC-1, Perth, RPS Publishers, Singapore, doi: 10.3850/978-981-08-7920-4\_I-4-  
2 0093 <http://rpsonline.com.sg/proceedings/9789810736781/html/I-4-0093.xml>
- 3 10. Rezaei, A., E. Masad, A. Chowdhury and P. Harris, 2009. "Predicting Asphalt Mixture  
4 Skid Resistance by Aggregate Characteristics and Gradation," Transportation Research  
5 Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2104, Transportation  
6 Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2009, pp. 24–33.
- 7 11. Fowler, D.W. and M. M. Rached, 2012. "Polish Resistance of Fine Aggregates in  
8 Portland Cement Concrete Pavements," Transportation Research Record: Journal of the  
9 Transportation Research Board, No. 2267, Transportation Research Board of the National  
10 Academies, Washington, D.C., 2012, pp. 29–36.
- 11 12. Moaveni (2014). Evaluation of Aggregate Resistance to Breakage, Abrasion, and  
12 Polishing Using Advanced Aggregate Imaging Systems. Transportation Research Board,  
13 Washington, D.C., January 2014
- 14 13. Gee, K.W., "Preservation and Rehabilitation," Proceedings, AEMA-ARRA-ISSA Joint  
15 Meeting, Bonita Springs Florida, p. 8, 2007.
- 16 14. (NCHRP). Evolution and Benefits of Preventative Maintenance Strategies, Synthesis of  
17 Highway Practice No. 153, National Cooperative Highway Research Program,  
18 Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1989.
- 19 15. Roque, R., D. Anderson, and M. Thompson. "Effect of Material, Design, and  
20 Construction Variables on Seal-Coat Performance," Transportation Research  
21 Record 1300, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, pp.  
22 108–115, Washington, DC, 1991.
- 23 16. Abdul-Malak, M.-A.U., D.W. Fowler, and A.H. Meyer. "Major Factors  
24 Explaining Performance Variability of Seal Coat Pavement Rehabilitation  
25 Overlays," Transportation Research Record 1338, Transportation Research  
26 Board, National Research Council, pp. 140–149, Washington, DC, 1993.
- 27 17. Csathy, T.I., W.C. Burnett, and M.D. Armstrong, 1968. "State-of-the-Art of Skid  
28 Resistance Research." Highway Research Board Special Report 95, Highway Research  
29 Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1968.
- 30 18. Neaylon, K. 2009. "The PAFV Test and Road Friction," AAPA 13th International  
31 Flexible Pavements Conference, 2009.
- 32 19. Smith, K.L., J.W. Hall and P. Littleton, 2009. "NCHRP Report 634: Texturing of  
33 Concrete Pavements," Transportation Research Board, National Cooperative Highway  
34 Research Program, Washington DC.
- 35 20. Cutts, R. and N.T. Moore, 2013. "Evaluation of Surface Abrasion," Final Report,  
36 Maryland Department of Transportation, State Highway Administration, Office of  
37 Materials Technology, Hanover, MD.
- 38 21. Riemer, C., D.M. Pittenger and D.D. Gransberg, 2012. "Preservation of Concrete  
39 Pavement Using a Modified Silicon Reactive Lithium Surface Densifier Over  
40 Shotblasting: A Life Cycle Cost Analysis," Paper 12-0531, Transportation Research  
41 Board, Washington. D.C.
- 42 22. Nasvik, J. "Lithium Silicate Densifiers," Concrete Construction, December 2008, pp. 1-5.  
43 On-line, Available: [http://www.concreteconstruction.net/concrete-construction/lithium-  
44 silicate-densifiers.aspx](http://www.concreteconstruction.net/concrete-construction/lithium-silicate-densifiers.aspx). [July 16, 2014].
- 45 23. Haworth, M. "Interstate 80 Donner Summit Shotblasting and Transil Application,"  
46 Testing Report, Blastrac, Inc. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 2011, pp. 1-4.
- 47 **24. MOSIER 2013**
- 48 25. Gransberg, N.J., (2012). "Correlating Geologic Strata to Polished Stone Values: A  
49 Nationwide Anaysis," Master's Report, Missouri School of Science and Technology,  
50 Rolla, Missouri.
- 51 26. Masad, E.A. Aggregate Imaging System (AIMS) Basics and Applications. Report No.  
52 FHWA/TX-05/5-1707-01-1. Texas Transportation Institute, The Texas A&M University  
53 System College Station, Texas, 2005.

- 1 27. Mahmoud, E. and E. Masad, 2007. "Experimental Methods for the Evaluation of  
2 Aggregate Resistance to Polishing, Abrasion, and Breakage," Journal of Materials in  
3 Civil Engineering, Vol. 19, No. 11, November 2007.
- 4 28. (FHWA) 2006. Gudimettla, J., L.A. Myers and C. Paugh, 2006. "AIMS: The Future in  
5 Rapid, Automated Aggregate Shape and Texture Measurement," US Department of  
6 Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC.