

WSDOT Errata to FOP for AASHTO T 335

Determining the Percent Fracture in Coarse Aggregate

WAQTC FOP for AASHTO T 335 has been adopted by WSDOT with the following changes:

Sampling and Sample Preparation

4. Method 2 – Individual Sieve Fracture Determination – *Method not recognized by WSDOT.*

DETERMINING THE PERCENTAGE OF FRACTURE IN COARSE AGGREGATE FOP FOR AASHTO T 335

Scope

This procedure covers the determination of the percentage, by mass, of a coarse aggregate (CA) sample that consists of fractured particles meeting specified requirements in accordance with AASHTO T 335-09.

In this FOP, a sample of aggregate is screened on the sieve separating CA and fine aggregate (FA). This sieve will be identified in the agency's specifications but might be the 4.75 mm (No. 4) sieve. CA particles are visually evaluated to determine conformance to the specified fracture. The percentage of conforming particles, by mass, is calculated for comparison to the specifications.

Apparatus

- Balance or scale: Capacity sufficient for the principal sample mass, accurate to 0.1 percent of the sample mass or readable to 0.1 g and meeting the requirements of AASHTO M 231.
- Sieves: Meeting requirements of the FOP for AASHTO T 27/T 11.
- Splitter: Meeting the requirements of FOP for AASHTO R 76.

Terminology

1. Fractured Face: An angular, rough, or broken surface of an aggregate particle created by crushing or by other means. A face is considered a "fractured face" whenever one-half or more of the projected area, when viewed normal to that face, is fractured with sharp and well-defined edges. This excludes small nicks.
2. Fractured particle: A particle of aggregate having at least the minimum number of fractured faces specified. (This is usually one or two.)

Sampling and Sample Preparation

1. Sample and reduce the aggregate in accordance with the FOPs for AASHTO R 90 and R 76.
2. When the specifications list only a total fracture percentage, the sample shall be prepared in accordance with Method 1. When the specifications require that the fracture be counted and reported on each sieve, the sample shall be prepared in accordance with Method 2.
3. Method 1 - Combined Fracture Determination
 - a. Dry the sample sufficiently to obtain a clean separation of FA and CA material in the sieving operation.

- b. Sieve the sample in accordance with the FOP for AASHTO T 27/ T 11 over the 4.75 mm (No. 4) sieve, or the appropriate sieve listed in the agency's specifications for this material.

Note 1: Where necessary, wash the sample over the sieve designated for the determination of fractured particles to remove any remaining fine material, and dry to a constant mass in accordance with the FOP for AASHTO T 255.

- c. Reduce the sample using Method A – Mechanical Splitter, in accordance with the FOP for AASHTO R 76, to the appropriate test size. This test size should be slightly larger than shown in Table 1, to account for loss of fines through washing if necessary.

TABLE 1
Sample Size
Method 1 (Combined Sieve Fracture)

| Nominal Maximum Size* mm (in.) | Minimum Cumulative Sample Mass Retained on 4.75 mm (No. 4) Sieve g (lb) |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 37.5 (1 1/2) | 2500 (6) |
| 25.0 (1) | 1500 (3.5) |
| 19.0 (3/4) | 1000 (2.5) |
| 12.5 (1/2) | 700 (1.5) |
| 9.5 (3/8) | 400 (0.9) |
| 4.75 (No. 4) | 200 (0.4) |

* One sieve larger than the first sieve to retain more than 10 percent of the material using an agency specified set of sieves based on cumulative percent retained. Where large gaps in specification sieves exist, intermediate sieve(s) may be inserted to determine nominal maximum size.

4. Method 2 – Individual Sieve Fracture Determination

- a. Dry the sample sufficiently to obtain a clean separation of FA and CA material in the sieving operation. A washed sample from the gradation determination (the FOP for T 27/T 11) may be used.
- b. If not, sieve the sample in accordance with the FOP for AASHTO T 27 over the sieves listed in the specifications for this material.

Note 2: If overload (buffer) sieves are used the material from that sieve must be added to the next specification sieve.

- c. The size of test sample for each sieve shall meet the minimum size shown in Table 2. Utilize the total retained sieve mass or select a representative portion from each sieve mass by splitting or quartering in accordance with the FOP for AASHTO R 76.

Note 3: Where necessary, wash the sample over the sieves designated for the determination of fractured particles to remove any remaining fine material, and dry to a constant mass in accordance with the FOP for AASHTO T 255.

TABLE 2
Sample Size
Method 2 (Individual Sieve Fracture)

| Sieve Size mm (in.) | Minimum Sample Mass g (lb) |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 31.5 (1 1/4) | 1500 (3.5) |
| 25.0 (1) | 1000 (2.2) |
| 19.0 (3/4) | 700 (1.5) |
| 16.0 (5/8) | 500 (1.0) |
| 12.5 (1/2) | 300 (0.7) |
| 9.5 (3/8) | 200 (0.5) |
| 6.3 (1/4) | 100 (0.2) |
| 4.75 (No. 4) | 100 (0.2) |
| 2.36 (No. 8) | 25 (0.1) |
| 2.00 (No. 10) | 25 (0.1) |

Note 4: If fracture is determined on a sample obtained for gradation, use the mass retained on the individual sieves, even if it is less than the minimum listed in Table 2. If less than 5 percent of the total mass is retained on a single specification sieve, include that material on the next smaller specification sieve. If a smaller specification sieve does not exist, this material shall not be included in the fracture determination.

Procedure

1. After cooling, spread the dried sample on a clean, flat surface.
2. Examine each particle face and determine if the particle meets the fracture criteria.
3. Separate the sample into three categories:
 - Fractured particles meeting the criteria
 - Particles not meeting the criteria
 - Questionable or borderline particles
4. Determine the dry mass of particles in each category to the nearest 0.1 g.
5. Calculate the percent questionable particles to the nearest 1 percent.
6. Re-sort the questionable particles when more than 15 percent is present. Continue sorting until there is no more than 15 percent in the questionable category.
7. Calculate the percent fractured particles meeting criteria to nearest 0.1 percent. Report to 1 percent.

Calculation

Calculate the percent questionable particles to the nearest 1 percent using the following formula:

$$\%Q = \frac{Q}{F + Q + N} \times 100$$

Where:

- %Q = Percent of questionable particles
- F = Mass of fractured particles
- Q = Mass of questionable or borderline particles
- N = Mass of unfractured particles

Example:

$$\%Q = \frac{97.6 \text{ g}}{632.6 \text{ g} + 97.6 \text{ g} + 352.6 \text{ g}} \times 100 = 9\%$$

Given:

- F = 632.6 g
- Q = 97.6 g
- N = 352.6 g

Calculate the percent fractured particles to the nearest 0.1 percent using the following formula:

$$P = \frac{\frac{Q}{2} + F}{F + Q + N} \times 100$$

Where:

- P = Percent of fractured particles
- F = Mass of fractured particles
- Q = Mass of questionable particles
- N = Mass of unfractured particles

AGGREGATE

WAQTC

FOP AASHTO T 335 (21)

Example:

$$P = \frac{\frac{97.6 \text{ g}}{2} + 632.6 \text{ g}}{632.6 \text{ g} + 97.6 \text{ g} + 352.6 \text{ g}} \times 100 = 62.9\% \quad \text{Report 63\%}$$

Given:

$$F = 632.6 \text{ g}$$

$$Q = 97.6 \text{ g}$$

$$N = 352.6 \text{ g}$$

Report

- On forms approved by the agency
- Sample ID
- Fractured particles to the nearest 1 percent.

AGGREGATE

WAQTC

FOP AASHTO T 335 (21)

41_T335_short_21_errata

Aggregate 13-6

Pub. October 2021

AGGREGATE

WAQTC

FOP AASHTO T 335 (14)