Technical Report Documentation Page

1. REPORT No.
M&R No. 24038

2. GOVERNMENT ACCESSION No.

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG No.

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Development of a Proportional, Rotary-Type Fine Aggregate Splitter

5. REPORT DATE
February 1965

6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION

7. AUTHOR(S)
John L. Beaton

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT No.
M&R Project No. 24038

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS
State of California
Highway Transportation Agency
Department of Public Works
Division of Highways

10. WORK UNIT No.

11. CONTRACT OR GRANT No.

12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS

13. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
Final Report

14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE

15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

16. ABSTRACT

In 1952, under the direction of Mr. F.N. Hveem, work was started on the development of a rotary-type fine aggregate splitter. This splitter was designed to separate a predetermined portion of a sample into four separate representative specimens in one operation.

On April 13, 1953, a report was submitted by H.R. Richard on the calibration and operational characteristics of the unit. A report dated July 2, 1953 was submitted by Mr. Richard covering the results of a series of trials using the Hveem Mechanical Quartering Machine on various types of materials. Comparisons of the relative performance of this unit and other splitting methods were reported by Mr. Richard on October 22, 1953. Research Authorization Number 2030 (later changed to 24030) was issued on February 9, 1954 to "Design and Construct a Sample Splitter" suitable for the preparation of R-value test specimens.

After making minor changes to reduce the objectionable noise caused by operating the unit, the splitter was sent to the Dist. 06 Materials Department. The District 06 Materials Department felt, after seven months in-use experience with the revolving splitter, that the unit was very reliable and had many advantages over conventional methods of splitting. (See letter, E.O. Hoakanson, Acting District Materials Engineer, to F.N. Hveem, Attention of A.W. Root dated March 15, 1957.)

Early in 1963, the revolving splitter was temporarily returned to Sacramento for preparation of "as-built" drawings. Using the first unit as a basis, rotary splitter No. 2 was designed incorporating several new features. Initial construction of the revised rotary splitter was completed and delivered to the R-value unit during the summer of 1964.

17. KEYWORDS
M&R Project No. 24038

18. No. OF PAGES:
9

19. DRI WEBSITE LINK
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/research/researchreports/1964-1965/65-40.pdf

20. FILE NAME
65-40.pdf

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS

FINAL REPORT

on the

65-40

February, 1965

State of California — Highway Transportation Agency

Memorandum

To : Mr. George A. Hill
Asst. State Highway Engineer - Planning

Date: February 24, 1965

File :

From : Department of Public Works—Division of Highways
Materials and Research Department

Subject: Final Report on Materials and Research Project No. 24038

Attached for your consideration and approval are three copies of the Final Report dated February 19, 1965, on our Project Authorization No. 24030-R, "Development of a Proportional, Rotary-type Fine Aggregate Splitter."

Original Signed
JOHN L. BEATON

JOHN L. BEATON
Materials and Research Engineer

CAF:ml
Attach

Approval Recommended

3/10/65

Orig Signed L. R. Gillis

L. R. Gillis
Asst. State Highway Engineer

FORM WH-38 REV.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: John L. Beaton February 19, 1965

FROM: Travis Smith

SUBJECT: Final Report on Project Authorization 24030-R, Development of a Proportional, Rotary-type Fine Aggregate Splitter.

INTRODUCTION

In 1952, under the direction of Mr. F. N. Hveem, work was started on the development of a rotary-type fine aggregate splitter. This splitter was designed to separate a predetermined portion of a sample into four separate representative specimens in one operation.

On April 13, 1953, a report was submitted by H. R. Richard on the calibration and operational characteristics of the unit. A report dated July 2, 1953 was submitted by Mr. Richard covering the results of a series of trials using the Hveem Mechanical Quartering Machine on various types of materials. Comparisons of the relative performance of this unit and other splitting methods were reported by Mr. Richard on October 22, 1953. Research Authorization Number 2030 (later changed to 24030) was issued on February 9, 1954 to "Design and Construct a Sample Splitter" suitable for the preparation of R-value test specimens.

After making minor changes to reduce the objectionable noise caused by operating the unit, the splitter was sent to the Dist. 06 Materials Department. The District 06 Materials Department felt, after seven months in-use experience with the revolving splitter, that the unit was very reliable and had many advantages over conventional methods of splitting. (See letter, E. O. Hoakanson, Acting District Materials Engineer, to F. N. Hveem, Attention of A. W. Root dated March 15, 1957.)

Early in 1963, the revolving splitter was temporarily returned to Sacramento for preparation of "as-built" drawings. Using the first unit as a basis, rotary splitter No. 2 was designed incorporating several new features. Initial construction of the revised rotary splitter was completed and delivered to the R-value unit during the summer of 1964.

The development and operation of rotary splitter number 2 and a performance evaluation made in 1963 on the unit used by District 06 is submitted in this report.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Results of the 1963 performance evaluation made on the first rotary splitter disclosed several operational deficiencies. Although some of these deficiencies could be corrected, correction of some characteristics of the unit would require a change in design.

2. Experience gained in the use of rotary splitter number 2 indicated that it possibly could be developed into a very satisfactory laboratory tool. The advantages of this rotary splitter over the conventional riffle unit are small, however. This is especially true when viewed in the light of the substantially greater cost and size of the rotary splitter.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION TAKEN

1. Permission was given to District 06 to dispose of the rotary splitter loaned to them. Although no reason was given for their change in opinion on the usefulness of the unit, we were informed that it has been idle for several months and they had no further need for it.

2. It is recommended that this project be terminated at this time for the following reasons:

   a. Tests performed after each series of modifications to the unit indicate that further modifications are necessary. Continuing this cycle of events is not only costly but appears to be unrewarding.

   b. Although a rotary splitter of this type would have certain advantages over the Jones type riffle splitter, the substantially greater cost and size of a rotary unit would limit its acceptance and use.

   c. If a rotary splitter were adopted as a standard item of laboratory equipment for the district laboratories, city and county laboratories might feel compelled to obtain this item to comply with test requirements. The cost of a rotary splitter would be burdensome to them.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION-ROTARY SPLITTER NUMBER 1

A series of tests was performed on this unit during the month of March, 1963. Four samples, each weighing 13,000 grams or more were split in this rotary splitter with the adjustment lever set to obtain 1000-gram portions in each of four pans. Two additional passes through the splitter were made with each sample using the material caught in the waste pan from the previous pass, (a slight adjustment was made to the weight of sample 1 before the third trial). All of these samples had 100 % passing No. 4 sieve material and the following:

Sample	1	2	3	4
% pass #30 sieve	43	38	48	47
% pass #200 sieve	4	11	21	23

In addition to the above, two samples of P.C.C. Sand, each weighing 10,000 grams, were split once with the adjustment lever set to obtain four 1000-gram portions.

The test data obtained from this series of tests is attached. Note that, although the adjustment lever was set to obtain 4000 grams total on each trial, the total weight in the four pans varied from 2644 grams to 4432 grams. The adjustment scale used to set the desired weight of material was in poor condition and settings were very critical. It was extremely difficult to set the adjustment to obtain an average weight in each pan to the nearest $\pm$ 100 grams or 10%.

Not all of the material being split was recovered after passing through this unit. The 0.5% to 3.0% shown as loss on the attached tabulation represents the amount of material spilled onto the floor and the shelf provided for the "waste" pan. Apparently none of the material intended to be caught by the sample pans was lost.

Considerable variation in weights of material caught by each pan were noted. As can be seen in the attached tabulation, the percentage deviation from the average weights are not constant for each pan but vary according to the total weight of sample being split. The average deviations for each pan are as follows:

Total Weight of Sample-grams	Avg. % Deviation from Avg. Weight Pan No.			
	1	2	3	4
5,001 - 7,500	+0.1	-1.3	+1.0	+0.3
7,501 - 10,000	-2.5	-0.8	+3.1	+0.2
10,001 - 12,500	-6.9	+0.5	+6.7	-0.4
12,501 - 15,000	-7.6	+0.5	+8.0	-0.9

Although grading analyses were performed on a portion of one sample obtained after each pass through the unit, the data was inconclusive. In general, gradings checked within $\pm$ 4 percentage points on the coarser screen sizes with one 6 point and one 8 point deviation. The greatest variances in grading analyses were noted on the Nos. 8 and 16 sieves with no greater than $\pm$ 2 points on the No. 200 sieve. No assurance can be given that these variances were caused by the revolving splitter since the test sample was subsequently reduced using a riffle splitter before performing the grading analysis.

DEVELOPMENT OF ROTARY SPLITTER NUMBER 2

The Rotary Splitter under discussion was of quite a different design from the earlier unit which is now in use at District 06, because the rotating table proportional feeder for the incoming sample was eliminated in favor of a Syntron vibrating feeder. In addition, six V-shaped hoppers were positioned in a six-pointed star arrangement in lieu of four to reduce the incoming 40 or 50 pound samples down to six 1,000 gram lots,-- and on two of these V-hoppers, two additional sub-splitters were arranged to take the 1,000 gram lots on down to 250 grams each.

After initial trials, the entire unit was raised to make the split sample removal more accessible. The Syntron was replaced with a hopper feed as the Syntron was found to seggregate the coarser fractions from the fine materials. This hopper was mounted on a pneumatic lift which eliminated the need of the operator lifting the initial samples.

Other improvements were made or suggested on lesser details as noted below, but the unit was never particularly popular with the operators as they could see no specific advantage of using it. It represented no space saving or time saving advantage over the standard riffle splitters.

The following features were added to this unit during the developmental stages:

1. Installed over-ride clutch on splitter drive to permit hand rotation for inspection and removal of samples.

2. Added sample lift for feed hopper to prevent lifting of sample.

3. Epoxy 60° corners to proportioning splitter hoppers to give radius to prevent dust hold up or bridging.

4. Dump reject directly into waste bag.

OPERATION-REVOLVING SPLITTER NUMBER 2

Trial tests, performed while the splitter was still in the machine shop, indicated some problems in clogging of the openings. This was partially corrected before the unit was delivered to the R-value batch room in the summer of 1964.

The following items were noted by the R-value unit during the trial period using this splitter:

1. Clogging necessitated removal of the two secondary units. These units were intended to split two of the six 1,000-gram portions into four 250-gram units each.

2. An accurate calibrated scale for adjusting the splitter is needed. The present method of adjustment is too critical to obtain portions of predetermined weight within acceptable limits.

3. The present feed hopper does not permit uniform flow of damp material into the rotary assembly.

4. Uniformity in size of test samples is poor. Because of this final adjustment using a riffle splitter is frequently necessary.

Additional improvements considered but not provided were as follows:

1. Enclosure of entire unit to restrict airborne dust.

2. Seal chain drive to rotary assembly from dust.

3. Investigate anti-static plastic coatings to eliminate dust retention on chutes.

4. Use of standard stock pans to receive split samples.

5. Add sequence timer for automatic operation.

Travis Smith

Travis Smith
Assistant Materials and
Research Engineer - Foundation

CAF:jf:ic
cc:E Zube
S McCloy

Attach.

TEST DATA-REVOLVING SPLITTER NO. 1

Sample	Trial	Total Wt.	Grams Retained Pans	Grams Retained Waste	Loss	% Loss	Avg. wt. Pans	% Deviation from Avg. Pan No. 1	Pan No. 2	Pan No. 3	Pan No. 4
1	A	13,000	3642	8,965	393	3.0	910	-6.9	+0.9	+7.1	-1.1
	B	8,965	4432	4,428	105	1.2	1108	-0.9	+0.9	+2.3	-0.5
	C	5,005	4273	699	33	0.7	1068	+0.3	-0.2	+0.5	-0.6
2	A	13,390	2893	10,329	168	1.3	723	-8.6	0.0	+8.9	-0.3
	B	10,329	3307	6,917	105	1.0	827	-6.9	+0.6	+6.6	-0.3
	C	6,917	3837	3,014	66	1.0	959	+0.1	-3.3	+1.9	+1.3
3	A	14,320	2930	11,220	170	1.2	732	-8.1	+1.0	+8.3	-1.2
	B	11,220	2644	8,488	88	0.8	661	-7.6	+0.5	+7.3	-0.2
	C	8,488	4231	4,216	41	0.5	1058	-0.5	-1.3	+1.6	+0.2
4	A	13,980	3317	10,521	142	1.0	829	-6.8	0.0	+7.8	-1.0
	B	10,521	3431	7,002	88	0.8	858	-6.1	+0.5	+6.2	-0.6
	C	7,002	3796	3,171	35	0.5	949	-0.2	-0.5	+0.6	+0.1
5		10,000	3858	6,085	61	0.6	964	-4.7	-0.6	+4.2	+1.1
6		10,000	3801	6,072	127	1.3	950	-4.0	-0.2	+4.4	-0.2