Specifiers Checklist for Subgrade Stabilisation			Alternate/ "Or Equal" Performance Testing Evaluation for Subgrade Stabilisation		
Pro	ject Name:		Original Specified Product(s):		
Project Location:			Alternate/ "or Equal" Product Under Review:		
Pro	Project Number:		Alternate Product Sample Received: YES	NO	
Owner:			Alternate Product Manufacturer and Location:		
Engineer of Record:			Company Name/ Person Proposing Alternate:		
Orig	ginal Design Para	meters	Alternate/ "Or Equal" Design Parameter		
1.	Loading Condition	n (Axle load & passes)	1. Loading Condition (Axle load & passes)		
2.	Subgrade Strength	h	2. Subgrade Strength		
3.	Subgrade Soil Typ	e	3. Subgrade Soil Type		
4.	Currently Approve	ed Geogrid	4. Alternate Geosynthetic		
5.	Aggregate Thickne	ess (mm)	5. Aggregate Thickness (mm)		
6.	Aggregate Thickne	ess 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.	9. Predicted Surface Rut Depth (mm)		9. Predicted Surface Rut Depth (mm)		
10.	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 (day	s)	14. Time Savings (days)		
15.	Environmental Sav	vings (kgCO2e)	15. Environmental Savings (kgCO ₂ e)		
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 a	nd/or plate load testing performed	I on the specific product(s) to evaluate performance?		
2.	Testing performed	d evaluated surface and subgrade r	uts within the range of design parameters?		
3.	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.	5. Designed 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 co	onfirmed to meet all intended design parameters, performance,	, and savin _f	gs
	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)				