

**DETERMINING ASPHALT CONTENT  
FOR RECYCLED ASPHALT PAVEMENT  
(RAP) MATERIALS**

**Final Report**

**PROJECT 304-221**



**DETERMINING ASPHALT CONTENT FOR RECYCLED  
ASPHALT PAVEMENT (RAP) MATERIALS**

**Final Report**

**PROJECT 304-221**

by

Gary Thompson  
Asphalt Pavement Association of Oregon  
5240 Gaffin Rd. SE  
Salem, OR 97301

for

Oregon Department of Transportation  
Research Unit  
200 Hawthorne SE, Suite B-240  
Salem OR 97301-5192

and

Federal Highway Administration  
Washington, D.C.

**July 2003**



1. Report No. FHWA-OR-DF-04-02		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Determining Asphalt Content for Recycled Asphalt Pavement (RAP) Materials Final Report				5. Report Date July 2003	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Gary Thompson				8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Asphalt Pavement Association of Oregon Asphalt Research Program 5240 Gaffin Rd. SE Salem, Oregon 97301				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. 304-221	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Oregon Department of Transportation Research Unit and Federal Highway Administration 200 Hawthorne SE, Suite B-240 Washington, D.C. Salem, Oregon 97301-5192				13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes					
16. Abstract  The State of Oregon uses significant amounts of Recycled Asphalt Pavement (RAP) in dense-graded mixes on State highways. The design process for these mixes relies on accurately knowing the amount of asphalt cement in the RAP materials being used. Beginning in 1997 ODOT began using ignition furnaces to determine RAP asphalt contents and gradations.  Asphalt contents are determined by measuring the change in mass between the original dry RAP sample and the mass of the final residue aggregate sample after the asphalt is burned off in the ignition furnace. One shortcoming of the process is that a small portion of the aggregate is usually lost in the burning process. The amount of aggregate lost is on the order of 0.5% which may be considered significant for most RAP mixtures.  This research attempted to use volumetric equations to solve for the RAP asphalt content by exploiting the constant nature of the Effective Specific Gravity of Aggregates, $G_{se}$ . A solution is presented using a simplified equation which ignores the difference in Specific Gravity of Asphalt, $G_b$ , between the RAP asphalt and the new added asphalt. This solution proved to be unstable and diverged significantly with only small changes in assumed $G_b$ .  A second more exact equation was derived to better account for the difference in $G_b$ between the RAP asphalt and the new added asphalt. However, it's analytic solution collapsed to zero due to the dependent nature of the volumetric equation being used. Attempts to derive a second linearly independent equation failed; however, future research may lead to a complete solution to this equation.					
17. Key Words Recycled asphalt pavement, asphalt content,			18. Distribution Statement Copies available from NTIS, and online at <a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/tddresearch">http://www.odot.state.or.us/tddresearch</a>		
19. Security Classification (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classification (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages 30	22. Price

# SI\* (MODERN METRIC) CONVERSION FACTORS

APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS TO SI UNITS				APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS FROM SI UNITS			
Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find	Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find
<b><u>LENGTH</u></b>							
in	inches	25.4	millimeters	mm	millimeters	0.039	inches
ft	feet	0.305	meters	m	meters	3.28	feet
yd	yards	0.914	meters	m	meters	1.09	yards
mi	miles	1.61	kilometers	km	kilometers	0.621	miles
<b><u>AREA</u></b>							
in <sup>2</sup>	square inches	645.2	millimeters squared	mm <sup>2</sup>	millimeters squared	0.0016	square inches
ft <sup>2</sup>	square feet	0.093	meters squared	m <sup>2</sup>	meters squared	10.764	square feet
yd <sup>2</sup>	square yards	0.836	meters squared	m <sup>2</sup>	meters squared	1.196	square yards
ac	acres	0.405	hectares	ha	hectares	2.47	acres
mi <sup>2</sup>	square miles	2.59	kilometers squared	km <sup>2</sup>	kilometers squared	0.386	square miles
<b><u>VOLUME</u></b>							
fl oz	fluid ounces	29.57	milliliters	ml	milliliters	0.034	fluid ounces
gal	gallons	3.785	liters	L	liters	0.264	gallons
ft <sup>3</sup>	cubic feet	0.028	meters cubed	m <sup>3</sup>	meters cubed	35.315	cubic feet
yd <sup>3</sup>	cubic yards	0.765	meters cubed	m <sup>3</sup>	meters cubed	1.308	cubic yards
NOTE: Volumes greater than 1000 L shall be shown in m <sup>3</sup> .							
<b><u>MASS</u></b>							
oz	ounces	28.35	grams	g	grams	0.035	ounces
lb	pounds	0.454	kilograms	kg	kilograms	2.205	pounds
T	short tons (2000 lb)	0.907	megagrams	Mg	megagrams	1.102	short tons (2000 lb)
<b><u>TEMPERATURE (exact)</u></b>							
°F	Fahrenheit	(F-32)/1.8	Celsius	°C	Celsius	1.8C+32	Fahrenheit
<b><u>TEMPERATURE (exact)</u></b>							

\*SI is the symbol for the International System of Measurement

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The author thanks Mike Remily, ODOT Pavement Quality Engineer, and the ODOT Bituminous Crew for sampling and testing the various RAP materials used in this study.

## **DISCLAIMER**

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Oregon Department of Transportation and the United States Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The State of Oregon and the United States Government assume no liability of its contents or use thereof.

The contents of this report reflect the view of the authors who are solely responsible for the facts and accuracy of the material presented. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Oregon Department of Transportation or the United States Department of Transportation.

The State of Oregon and the United States Government do not endorse products of manufacturers. Trademarks or manufacturers' names appear herein only because they are considered essential to the object of this document.

This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.





# DETERMINING ASPHALT CONTENT FOR RECYCLED ASPHALT PAVEMENT (RAP) MATERIALS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	PROBLEM STATEMENT .....	1
1.2	PROPOSED METHODOLOGY .....	2
<b>2.0</b>	<b>SIMPLIFIED EQUATION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	BACKGROUND.....	5
2.2	SIMPLIFIED EQUATION .....	5
2.3	VALIDATION OF ANALYTIC SOLUTION .....	5
<b>3.0</b>	<b>EXACT EQUATION.....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	BACKGROUND.....	7
3.2	EXACT EQUATION .....	7
3.3	VALIDATION OF EXACT EQUATION .....	8
<b>4.0</b>	<b>LABORATORY TESTING.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1	SIMPLIFIED EQUATION .....	11
5.2	EXACT EQUATION .....	11

APPENDIX A: Validation of Simplified Equation

APPENDIX B: Field Test Results

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Known test inputs based on virgin mix design .....	5
Table 3.1: Known test inputs using 1000 g of RAP.....	8



# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) eliminated solvent extractions for measuring asphalt cement content ( $P_b$ ) of hot mixed asphalt concrete (HMAC) in 1997 due to worker health concerns. In lieu of chlorinated solvents, ODOT began using the Ignition Method (AASHTO T 308) to establish asphalt cement contents for HMAC and recycled asphalt pavement (RAP) materials (*AASHTO 2001*).

The ignition method involves burning an asphalt mixture (or RAP) sample of known dry mass in an ignition furnace. The temperature in the ignition furnace is such that the flammable asphalt cement material is ignited and consumed leaving only the inert aggregate material as residue. The exact asphalt cement content can be calculated based on the before and after mass of this burning process if two conditions are met. The first condition is that all of the asphalt cement is consumed during the ignition process. The second condition is that all of the aggregate material remains as the unburned residue.

During the process, however, some small loss of aggregate material generally occurs during the burn. This results in a larger mass change during the process than just the mass of the asphalt cement that is consumed. To correctly calculate the asphalt cement content, a correction factor must be applied to account for this small aggregate loss.

For new materials, the correction factor may be determined by combining known masses of aggregate and asphalt cement. These known masses are then burned in the ignition furnace. The asphalt cement content determined from the final residue is compared to asphalt cement content from the initial known masses. The difference in these two asphalt cement contents becomes the correction factor.

RAP materials are problematic however, because we usually do not have their original asphalt cement and aggregate as separate constituents. Therefore, the correction factor development process described above cannot be performed for RAP materials. To overcome this problem ODOT has elected to assume a 0.50% aggregate correction factor for all RAP materials used in the state. This practice is consistent with most other states in the U.S.

Experience in Oregon shows that correction factors vary widely when using virgin materials. Therefore, it can be reasonably assumed that RAP produced from Oregon mixes would also exhibit a similar variation.

Accurate RAP asphalt cement contents are a critical element in the design and construction of HMAC mixtures. Asphalt cement content is also used as the basis for determining the quantity of asphalt cement for contract payment purposes. If the actual RAP asphalt cement content is substantially different than that determined using the standard 0.50% correction factor, then it

may result in substantial over- or under-payment for RAP asphalt cement contents. This problem becomes more important as mix designs start to approach the specification limits of 30% RAP materials.

There is a need to develop a more accurate means of determining the asphalt cement contents of RAP materials for use in Oregon mixtures.

## 1.2 PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

Conventional means of measuring asphalt cement contents as a percentage involve physically determining the mass of the asphalt cement. An alternate strategy is to solve for the asphalt cement content using standard volumetric equations for HMAC.

The effective specific gravity of aggregate ( $G_{se}$ ) for an HMAC mixture remains constant over a range of asphalt contents. The same should hold true for RAP materials.  $G_{se}$  is calculated as follows:

$$G_{se} = \left[ \frac{100 - P_b}{\left(\frac{100}{G_{mm}}\right) - \left(\frac{P_b}{G_b}\right)} \right] \quad (1-1)$$

where  $G_{mm}$  = maximum specific gravity of the mixture,  
 $G_b$  = specific gravity of the asphalt cement, and  
 $P_b$  = asphalt cement content as a percentage of total mixture.

Within the normal range of asphalt cement contents encountered in conventional mixtures,  $G_{se}$  should be constant. Mathematically this would be:

$$G_{se,m} = G_{se,n} \quad (1-2)$$

where  $G_{se,m}$  and  $G_{se,n}$  = effective specific aggregate gravity of aggregate at any two different asphalt contents  $P_{b,m}$  and  $P_{b,n}$ .

Substituting Equation 1-1 into Equation 1-2:

$$\left[ \frac{100 - P_{b,m}}{\left(\frac{100}{G_{mm,m}}\right) - \left(\frac{P_{b,m}}{G_b}\right)} \right] = \left[ \frac{100 - P_{b,n}}{\left(\frac{100}{G_{mm,n}}\right) - \left(\frac{P_{b,n}}{G_b}\right)} \right] \quad (1-3)$$

Note that Equation 1-3 uses the same specific gravity of asphalt ( $G_b$ ) for both samples.

The proposed methodology for RAP materials is to artificially create RAP samples of different asphalt cement contents by mixing known amounts of new asphalt cement with the RAP. This would produce the following:

$$P_b m = P_{br} + \%m \quad (1-4a)$$

$$P_b n = P_{br} + \%n \quad (1-4b)$$

where  $P_{br}$  = unknown RAP asphalt content, and  
 $\%m$  and  $\%n$  = different known percentages of new asphalt cement.

Substituting Equations 1-4a and 1-4b into Equation 1-3:

$$\left[ \frac{100 - (P_{br} + \%m)}{\left(\frac{100}{G_{mm}m}\right) - \left(\frac{P_{br} + \%m}{G_b}\right)} \right] = \left[ \frac{100 - (P_{br} + \%n)}{\left(\frac{100}{G_{mm}n}\right) - \left(\frac{P_{br} + \%n}{G_b}\right)} \right] \quad (1-5)$$

The maximum specific gravities ( $G_{mm}$ ) of these mixtures are then measured in the laboratory. Using a reasonable assumption for  $G_b$  the only remaining unknown  $P_{br}$  can then be solved.



## 2.0 SIMPLIFIED EQUATION

### 2.1 BACKGROUND

Equation 1-5 has two unknowns; the RAP asphalt content ( $P_{br}$ ) and the specific gravity of the combined RAP and new added asphalt cements ( $G_b$ ). It is not possible to solve Equation 1-5 with two unknowns, so a reasonable assumption must be made for  $G_b$ . Typical neat asphalt cements in Oregon have a specific gravities ranging from 1.020 to 1.030. For this research a value of  $G_b = 1.025$  will be used.

### 2.2 SIMPLIFIED EQUATION

Solving Equation 1-5 for  $P_{br}$  gives the following:

$$P_{br} = 100\% + \%m \left[ \frac{G_{mm}m(G_{mm}n - G_b)}{G_b(G_{mm}m - G_{mm}n)} \right] - \%n \left[ \frac{G_{mm}n(G_{mm}m - G_b)}{G_b(G_{mm}m - G_{mm}n)} \right] \quad (2-1)$$

### 2.3 VALIDATION OF ANALYTIC SOLUTION

To validate the analytic solution given in Equation 2-1, a set of test data was taken from a virgin mix design. In the mix design process, samples are prepared over a range of known asphalt contents,  $P_b$ . The mix designer selected  $P_b$ 's of 5.0%, 5.5%, 6.0% and 6.5%, with an asphalt cement of known specific gravity,  $G_b = 1.028$ .

To test the analytic solution, it was assumed that this was an equivalent RAP mixture with an unknown RAP asphalt content,  $P_{br} = 3.0\%$ . The remaining asphalt cement above 3.0% was considered the new added oil for each increment. Therefore, the corresponding added oil increments were 2.0%, 2.5%, 3.0% and 3.5% (i.e., a  $P_{br}$  of 3.0% plus added oil of 2.0% would equate to the original known mix design increment of 5.0%, etc.).

The  $G_{se}$  was calculated for the mix design and Rice gravities back-calculated to five decimal places for each known increment. The Rice gravities are given in Table 2.1:

**Table 2.1: Known test inputs based on virgin mix design**

% Added Oil	2.0%	2.5%	3.0%	3.5%
$G_{mm}$	2.48719	2.46874	2.45057	2.43266

If the analytic model is correct, then Equation 2-1 should correctly predict the asphalt content of the RAP as 3.0% across any two sets of asphalt contents given in Table 2.1. The results of

Equation 2-1 are provided in Appendix A for all combinations of new added oil listed above. The predicted RAP oil contents ranged from 2.99 to 3.03% depending on the two increments chosen as inputs. This would seem to indicate the solution is a reasonable predictor of the unknown increment of RAP asphalt.

In actual practice the specific gravity of the RAP asphalt would be unknown and therefore would need to be assumed. In most volumetric equations the solutions are relatively insensitive to the specific gravity of the asphalt,  $G_b$ . It was decided in the absence of a known value  $G_b = 1.025$  would be assumed.

When the same analysis was run on the inputs from Table 2.1 using  $G_b = 1.025$ , the results were less successful. The predicted RAP asphalt contents dropped significantly and ranged from 2.52 to 2.56%. The error from the true value of 3.0% is of the same magnitude as the assumed 0.50% correction factor currently in use.

It is apparent that the analytic solution is not insensitive to the specific gravity of asphalt as assumed. The solution would only be practical if the actual specific gravity of the combined RAP asphalt and new added asphalt is accurately known. In general, there is currently no easy way to determine this unknown specific gravity in the field.



### 3.0 EXACT EQUATION

#### 3.1 BACKGROUND

The sensitivity of Equation 2-1 to the value of the specific gravity of the asphalt ( $G_b$ ) demonstrates the need for a more exact equation for  $G_b$  in Equation 1-5. An equation will be derived which exactly accounts for the specific gravity of the RAP asphalt cement and the new added asphalt cement. The specific gravity of the new added asphalt will be known and only the RAP asphalt specific gravity will need to be assumed.

#### 3.2 EXACT EQUATION

An exact representation of the  $G_{se}$  equation must recognize the separate contribution of the RAP asphalt and the new added asphalt. In all probability each will have its own unique specific gravity. By definition:

$$Total P_b = \left[ \frac{\left( \frac{P_{br}}{100} \right) Mass_{RAP} + Mass_{NEW OIL}}{Mass_{RAP} + Mass_{NEW OIL}} \right] \times 100\% \quad (3-1)$$

where  $Mass_{RAP}$  = dry mass of RAP sample, and  
 $Mass_{NEW OIL}$  = mass of added new oil,

define the following:

$$A_m = \frac{Mass_{RAP}}{Mass_{RAP} + Mass_{NEW OIL} m} \quad (3-2a)$$

$$B_m = \frac{100 Mass_{NEW OIL} m}{Mass_{RAP} + Mass_{NEW OIL} m} \quad (3-2b)$$

where  $Mass_{NEW OIL} m$  = mass of added new oil to produce a %m increase.

Substituting Equations 3-2a and 3-2b into Equation 3-1 the total asphalt content for any added asphalt cement increment  $m$  is as follows:

$$Total P_{bm} = P_{br} A_m + B_m \quad (3-3)$$

A more exact equation for the Specific Gravity of the Combined Asphalt Cements may now be written as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Total } P_{bm}}{\text{Total } G_b} = \frac{P_{br} A_m}{G_{br}} + \frac{B_m}{G_b} \quad (3-4)$$

where  $\text{Total } G_b$  = combined specific gravity of the RAP oil and new oil,  
 $G_{br}$  = specific gravity of the RAP oil, and  
 $G_b$  = specific gravity of the new oil

Substituting Equation 3-4 into Equation 1-3 and solving for  $P_{br}$  gives the following:

$$P_{br} = G_{br} \left\{ \frac{\left( \frac{G_b}{G_{mm}n} \right) (100 - B_m) - \left( \frac{G_b}{G_{mm}n} \right) (100 - B_n) + (B_m - B_n)}{A_m \left[ \left( \frac{B_n}{100} \right) (G_b - G_{br}) - G_b \right] + A_n \left[ \left( \frac{B_m}{100} \right) (G_{br} - G_b) + G_b \right] + G_{br} \left[ A_m \left( \frac{G_b}{G_{mm}n} \right) - A_n \left( \frac{G_b}{G_{mm}n} \right) \right]} \right\} \quad (3-5)$$

### 3.3 VALIDATION OF EXACT EQUATION

To validate the analytic solution given in Equation 3-5, a set of data was constructed based on 1000 g of RAP with an unknown  $P_{br} = 5.0\%$  and an unknown  $G_{br} = 1.024$ . The effective specific gravity of the aggregate was arbitrarily chosen as 2.73361 and the resulting Rice gravities were back-calculated as shown in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1: Known test inputs using 1000 g of RAP**

Mass of Added Oil	0.0g	10.0g	20.0g	30.0 g
$G_{mm}$	2.52300	2.48736	2.45338	2.42096

If the analytic model is correct, Equation 3-5 should correctly predict the asphalt content of the RAP as 5.0% across any two sets of added oil. However, when the inputs were entered into Equation 3-5, the solution across all sets of added oil came out to zero.

Upon closer examination it was determined that in every case it was the numerator of Equation 3-5 that was collapsing to zero, as Equation 3-6 shows.

$$\left( \frac{G_b}{G_{mm}n} \right) (100 - B_m) - \left( \frac{G_b}{G_{mm}n} \right) (100 - B_n) + (B_m - B_n) = 0 \quad (3-6)$$

## **4.0 LABORATORY TESTING**

Representative RAP materials were gathered from ten different sources around the state. Samples of these materials were mixed with 1%, 2%, 3% and 4% increments of added new oil. Rice gravities were performed on the different increments per AASHTO T 209 (2001). The results are contained in Appendix B.

This testing was performed concurrently with the development of the two equations used in this research effort. Had a successful solution been found to either equation, this data would have been used to test the validity of the equations. However, because a stable solution was not found for either equation, trials were not made. This data is presented as an archive for future research.



## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 SIMPLIFIED EQUATION

The simplified equation showed early promise and was tested with a set of known values including the actual Specific Gravity of the RAP asphalt ( $G_b = 1.028$ ). Under these circumstances the equation did a reasonable job of predicting the RAP asphalt content.

However, when the Specific Gravity of Asphalt was *assumed* to be  $G_b = 1.025$ , the solution diverged significantly from the true answer (i.e. – the known RAP asphalt content of 3.0% was predicted to be 2.52%). Hence, a relatively minor three thousandths error in assuming a specific gravity resulted in a 0.48% error in asphalt content. This is the same magnitude as the assumed standard ignition oven burn loss of 0.5%.

It was concluded that the simplified equation was not practical for field use.

### 5.2 EXACT EQUATION

In lieu of the simplified equation a more exact equation was attempted to try to reduce the sensitivity to  $G_b$ . The resulting equation was mathematically correct in its derivation, however, the numerator of the final equation collapses to zero when the test set of known values is entered into the equation.

The exact equation also now contains the unknown variable  $G_{br}$ . Attempts made to solve this equation numerically failed when the author was unable to find a second linearly independent equation to account for the additional unknown variable  $G_{br}$ .

Because the exact equation collapses to zero, it was concluded that it also was not practical for field use.



## **6.0 REFERENCES**

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). “Standard Specifications for Transportation Materials and Methods of Sampling and Testing, Part 2 – Tests”. Washington, D.C. 2001.

Asphalt Institute. “Manual Series No. 2 (MS-2)”, Sixth Edition. 1993.





## **APPENDIX A**

### **VALIDATION OF SIMPLIFIED EQUATION**



**RAP Asphalt Content Study - 2002**

**RAP Source:** Example

**Simplified Linear Analytic Solution**

**Inputs:**

**Gb:** 1.025

**New Oil:**

<b>Pb1</b>	<b>Pb2</b>	<b>Pb3</b>	<b>Pb4</b>
2.00	2.50	3.00	3.50

<b>Gmm1</b>	<b>Gmm2</b>	<b>Gmm3</b>	<b>Gmm4</b>
2.48719	2.46874	2.45057	2.43266

**Coefficients A:**

	<b>Gmm2</b>	<b>Gmm3</b>	<b>Gmm4</b>
<b>Gmm1</b>	6.140225	6.095033	6.050488
<b>Gmm2</b>		6.049820	6.005605
<b>Gmm3</b>			5.961404

**Coefficients B & C:**

<b>Gmm1</b>	<b>Gmm2</b>	<b>Gmm3</b>	<b>Gmm4</b>
2.549370	2.530459	2.511834	2.493477

**Coefficients A-B:**

	<b>Pb2</b>	<b>Pb3</b>	<b>Pb4</b>
<b>Pb1</b>	3.590856	3.545663	3.501118
<b>Pb2</b>		3.519362	3.475147
<b>Pb3</b>			3.449569

**Coefficients A-C:**

	<b>Pb2</b>	<b>Pb3</b>	<b>Pb4</b>
<b>Pb1</b>	3.609767	3.583199	3.557011
<b>Pb2</b>		3.537986	3.512129
<b>Pb3</b>			3.467927

**Coefficients B-C:**

	<b>Pb2</b>	<b>Pb3</b>	<b>Pb4</b>
<b>Pb1</b>	0.018911	0.037536	0.055893
<b>Pb2</b>		0.018624	0.036982
<b>Pb3</b>			0.018358

**Calculated RAP Asphalt Content:**

	<b>Pb2</b>	<b>Pb3</b>	<b>Pb4</b>
<b>Pb1</b>	2.560329	2.538398	2.540947
<b>Pb2</b>		2.516687	2.531406
<b>Pb3</b>			2.545965

**RAP Asphalt Content Study - 2002**

**RAP Source:** Example

**Simplified Linear Analytic Solution**

**Inputs:**

**Gb:** 1.028

**New Oil:**

<b>Pb1</b>	<b>Pb2</b>	<b>Pb3</b>	<b>Pb4</b>
2.00	2.50	3.00	3.50

<b>Gmm1</b>	<b>Gmm2</b>	<b>Gmm3</b>	<b>Gmm4</b>
2.48719	2.46874	2.45057	2.43266

**Coefficients A:**

	<b>Gmm2</b>	<b>Gmm3</b>	<b>Gmm4</b>
<b>Gmm1</b>	6.140225	6.095033	6.050488
<b>Gmm2</b>		6.049820	6.005605
<b>Gmm3</b>			5.961404

**Coefficients B & C:**

<b>Gmm1</b>	<b>Gmm2</b>	<b>Gmm3</b>	<b>Gmm4</b>
2.556831	2.537865	2.519186	2.500774

**Coefficients A-B:**

	<b>Pb2</b>	<b>Pb3</b>	<b>Pb4</b>
<b>Pb1</b>	3.583394	3.538202	3.493656
<b>Pb2</b>		3.511955	3.467740
<b>Pb3</b>			3.442218

**Coefficients A-C:**

	<b>Pb2</b>	<b>Pb3</b>	<b>Pb4</b>
<b>Pb1</b>	3.602361	3.575847	3.549713
<b>Pb2</b>		3.530634	3.504831
<b>Pb3</b>			3.460629

**Coefficients B-C:**

	<b>Pb2</b>	<b>Pb3</b>	<b>Pb4</b>
<b>Pb1</b>	0.018967	0.037645	0.056057
<b>Pb2</b>		0.018679	0.037090
<b>Pb3</b>			0.018411

**Calculated RAP Asphalt Content:**

	<b>Pb2</b>	<b>Pb3</b>	<b>Pb4</b>
<b>Pb1</b>	3.034094	3.012271	3.014808
<b>Pb2</b>		2.990669	3.005314
<b>Pb3</b>			3.019800

**APPENDIX B**

**FIELD TEST RESULTS**



**Added Binder: Albina PF64-22 Gb(25/25) = 1.023**

RAP Source		Mass Pyc+Lid +Mix	Mass Pyc+Lid	Dry Sample Mass	SSD Sample Mass	Mass Pyc+Lid+ Water	Mass Pyc+Lid +Water +Mix	Water Temp (F)	Gmm	Gmm ssd	Change in Gmm
Porter Yett	Pbr+1%	5156.7	2972.4	2184.3	2191.8	7370.4	8661.0	75.0	2.44411	2.42377	
Porter Yett	Pbr+2%	5158.6	2977.8	2180.8	2187.0	7375.8	8655.0	74.4	2.41881	2.40229	0.02530
Porter Yett	Pbr+3%	4992.3	2813.6	2178.7	2188.0	7217.6	8477.4	74.6	2.37099	2.34496	0.04782
Porter Yett	Pbr+4%	5131.9	2958.9	2172.0	2180.9	7357.9	8606.9	74.4	2.35320	2.33072	0.01779
MBI-Eugene	Pbr+1%	5150.5	2972.4	2178.1	2186.5	7370.4	8659.3	77.0	2.44951	2.42658	
MBI-Eugene	Pbr+2%	5155.5	2977.8	2177.7	2180.6	7375.8	8656.2	77.3	2.42695	2.41913	0.02256
MBI-Eugene	Pbr+3%	4984.0	2813.6	2170.4	2174.8	7217.6	8475.0	77.0	2.37722	2.36582	0.04973
MBI-Eugene	Pbr+4%	5123.5	2959.9	2163.6	2167.2	7357.9	8600.9	77.0	2.35021	2.34105	0.02701
Riverbend	Pbr+1%	5162.0	2972.4	2189.6	2195.3	7370.4	8668.0	78.4	2.45471	2.43912	
Riverbend	Pbr+2%	5162.4	2977.8	2184.6	2188.0	7375.8	8661.0	78.6	2.42895	2.41981	0.02576
Riverbend	Pbr+3%	4997.2	2813.6	2183.6	2186.9	7217.6	8488.6	78.6	2.39272	2.38410	0.03623
Riverbend	Pbr+4%	5137.1	2959.9	2177.2	2179.8	7357.9	8613.8	78.6	2.36318	2.35653	0.02954
MBI-Corvallis	Pbr+1%	5158.4	2972.4	2186.0	2191.7	7370.4	8654.1	77.3	2.42270	2.40749	
MBI-Corvallis	Pbr+2%	5156.3	2977.8	2178.5	2182.9	7375.8	8640.8	78.0	2.38478	2.37335	0.03791
MBI-Corvallis	Pbr+3%	4993.4	2813.6	2179.8	2189.9	7217.6	8468.6	77.5	2.34690	2.32165	0.03788
MBI-Corvallis	Pbr+4%	5126.4	2959.9	2166.5	2175.3	7357.9	8590.7	77.9	2.32034	2.29867	0.02656
Island City Strip	Pbr+1%	5149.7	2972.4	2177.3	2185.6	7370.4	8661.4	77.7	2.45662	2.43383	
Island City Strip	Pbr+2%	5144.8	2977.8	2167.0	2178.7	7375.8	8651.0	77.5	2.42992	2.39845	0.02670
Island City Strip	Pbr+3%	4981.8	2813.6	2168.2	2178.6	7217.6	8479.2	77.5	2.39157	2.36445	0.03834
Island City Strip	Pbr+4%	5122.7	2959.9	2162.8	2170.2	7357.9	8607.9	77.3	2.36941	2.35036	0.02216
Lakeside	Pbr+1%	5163.2	2972.4	2190.8	2191.1	7370.4	8690.4	76.8	2.51585	2.51498	
Lakeside	Pbr+2%	5162.9	2977.8	2185.1	2195.9	7375.8	8679.9	76.8	2.48025	2.45021	0.03560
Lakeside	Pbr+3%	5002.1	2813.6	2188.5	2194.3	7217.6	8508.5	76.2	2.43817	2.42251	0.04208
Lakeside	Pbr+4%	5134.9	2959.9	2175.0	2180.2	7357.9	8628.9	76.4	2.40597	2.39221	0.03219
Roseburg Paving	Pbr+1%	5166.9	2972.4	2194.5	2199.4	7370.4	8690.9	76.2	2.51087	2.49687	
Roseburg Paving	Pbr+2%	5172.2	2977.8	2194.4	2200.7	7375.8	8682.3	75.9	2.47145	2.45404	0.03942
Roseburg Paving	Pbr+3%	5005.0	2813.6	2191.4	2197	7217.6	8506.7	75.7	2.42868	2.4137	0.04277
Roseburg Paving	Pbr+4%	5149.7	2959.9	2189.8	2191.8	7357.9	8632.5	75.7	2.3927	2.38748	0.03598

Sand Creek (US 97)	Pbr+1%	5155.8	2972.4	2183.4	2186.6	7370.4	8641.0	76.2	2.39198	2.38362	0.03229
Sand Creek (US 97)	Pbr+2%	5135.5	2977.8	2157.7	2160.3	7375.8	8619.1	76.4	2.35969	2.35300	0.03643
Sand Creek (US 97)	Pbr+3%	4951.0	2813.6	2137.4	2139.3	7217.6	8435.0	76.6	2.32326	2.31847	0.00995
Sand Creek (US 97)	Pbr+4%	5143.2	2959.9	2183.3	2185.4	7357.9	8597.4	76.6	2.31331	2.30817	

Bowery Ln (US 97 Bend)	Pbr+1%	5162.9	2972.4	2190.5	2192.3	7370.4	8659.5	77.5	2.43011	2.42527	0.03701
Bowery Ln (US 97 Bend)	Pbr+2%	5163.9	2977.8	2186.1	2190.1	7375.8	8648.4	77.3	2.3931	2.38267	0.03920
Bowery Ln (US 97 Bend)	Pbr+3%	4991.2	2813.6	2177.6	2180.3	7217.6	8470.1	77.5	2.35391	2.34706	0.03131
Bowery Ln (US 97 Bend)	Pbr+4%	5129.9	2959.9	2170	2173.6	7357.9	8593.6	77.5	2.32259	2.31368	

Celilo-Rufus (I-84)	Pbr+1%	5152.7	2972.4	2180.3	2185.5	7370.4	8695.7	77.3	2.55006	2.53464	0.04784
Celilo-Rufus (I-84)	Pbr+2%	5208.8	2977.8	2230.2	2235.4	7375.8	8714.7	77.3	2.50219	2.48767	0.05656
Celilo-Rufus (I-84)	Pbr+3%	5062.6	2813.6	2249.0	2255.3	7217.6	8547.0	77.0	2.44563	2.42899	0.01466
Celilo-Rufus (I-84)	Pbr+4%	5046.4	2959.9	2086.5	2090.2	7357.9	8586.1	76.8	2.43097	2.42053	