Specifiers Checklist for Subgrade Stabilisation

Alternate/ "Or Equal" Performance Testing Evaluation for Subgrade Stabilisation

Project Name:		Original Specified Product(s):	
Project Location:		Alternate/ "or Equal" Product Under Review:	
Project Number:		Alternate Product Sample Received:	YES ☐ NO ☐
Owner:		Alternate Product Manufacturer and Location:	
Engineer of Record:		Company Name/ Person Proposing Alternate:	

Original Design Parameters		Alternate/ "Or Equal" Design Parameter	
1. Loading Condition (Axle load & passes)		1. Loading Condition (Axle load & passes)	
2. Subgrade Strength		2. Subgrade Strength	
3. Subgrade Soil Type		3. Subgrade Soil Type	
4. Currently Approved Geogrid		4. Alternate Geosynthetic	
5. Aggregate Thickness (mm)		5. Aggregate Thickness (mm)	
6. Aggregate Thickness Reduction (%)		6. Aggregate Thickness Reduction (%)	
7. Predicted Mr on top of aggregate (if applicable)		7. Predicted Mr on top of aggregate (if applicable)	
8. Predicted Service Life (if applicable)		8. Predicted Service Life (if applicable)	
9. Predicted Surface Rut Depth (mm)		9. Predicted Surface Rut Depth (mm)	
10. Predicted Subgrade Rut Depth (mm)		10. Predicted Subgrade Rut Depth (mm)	
11. Predicted Elastic Deformation (mm) (if applicable)		11. Predicted Elastic Deformation (mm) (if applicable)	
12. Cost Saving (%)		12. Cost Saving (%)	
13. Materials Savings (m^3 or ton)		13. Materials Savings (m^3 or ton)	
14. Time Savings (days)		14. Time Savings (days)	
15. Environmental Savings ($kgCO_2e$)		15. Environmental Savings ($kgCO_2e$)	

Alternate/"Or Equal" Performance Evaluation *(Calibration, Validation, and Verification Required)*

Calibration: Accelerated Pavement Testing (APT) in compliance with NCHRP Report 512 and Synthesis 325

	YES	NO
1. Full-scale wheel and/or plate load testing performed on the specific product(s) to evaluate performance?	☐	☐
2. Testing performed evaluated surface and subgrade ruts within the range of design parameters?	☐	☐
3. Five case histories provided, on the specific product being supplied, that demonstrate product holds up under normal construction activities?	☐	☐
4. Peer-reviewed and published design methodology?	☐	☐
5. Design method utilised: Third party report or letter from authors of the methodology verifying that this product has gone through proper calibration and validation to the method?	☐	☐





Alternate/ "Or Equal" Approval Status

☐ Approved

- ☐ 1. Alternate product has been properly calibrated, validated and independently reviewed as shown above. ("Yes" to all performance qualifiers)
- ☐ 2. Alternate product design confirmed to meet all intended design parameters, performance, and savings

☐ Rejected

- ☐ 1. Insufficient information provided to evaluate product performance
- ☐ 2. Alternate product has **NOT** been properly calibrated, validated and independently reviewed as shown above. ("No" to one or more performance qualifiers)

