### **Specifiers Checklist for Flexible Pavement Design**

## Alternate/ "Or Equal" Performance Testing Evaluation for Flexible Pavements

Project Name: Engineer of Record:

Project Location: Original Specified Product(s):

Project Number: Alternate/"or Equal" Product Under Review:

Owner: Company Name/Person Proposing Alternate:

#### **Original Geogrid Design Parameters**

- 1. Traffic Capacity
- 2. Subgrade Strength
- 3. Currently Approved Geogrid
- 4. Asphalt Thickness
- 5. Asphalt Thickness Reduction (%)
- 6. Aggregate Thickness
- 7. Aggregate Thickness Reduction (%)
- 8. Increased Traffic Capacity
- 9. Cost Saving(%)
- 10. Material Savings(CY)
- 11. Time Savings(days)

#### Alternate/"Or Equal" Design Parameters

- 1. Traffic Capacity
- 2. Subgrade Strength
- 3. Alternate Geosynthetic
- 4. Asphalt Thickness
- 5. Asphalt Thickness Reduction (%)(APT Required)
- 6. Aggregate Thickness
- 7. Aggregate Thickness Reduction (%)(APT Required)
- 8. Increased Traffic Capacity
- 9. Cost Saving(%)
- 10. Material Savings(CY)
- 11. Time Savings(days)

# 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. 3rd Party testing conducted in the United States at an NCHRP accredited APT facility (see attached list)?
- 2. Specific proposed alternate product included in APT testing?
- 3. Environmentally controlled APT test chamber?
- 4. Standard highway moving wheel loads?
- 5. Thin asphalt concrete geogrid pavement section compared to thicker asphalt concrete control section?
- 6. Thinner aggregate base pavement section compassed to thicker aggregate base control section?
- 7. Pavement testing involved comparisons over soft (CBR <4) and firm (CBR >5) subgrade conditions?
- 8. Geogrid section trafficked more than 100,000 ESALs with rut depths less 1/2 inch.
- 9. Test data normalized for variances in AB/AC thicknesses and subgrade strength differences between test sections?
- 10. Quantifiable percent reduction of asphalt concrete and/or aggregate base assumed in original design?
- 11. Structural benefits outlined of the geogrid stabilized section?
- 12. Testing results published and/or independently reviewed?(optional)





Validat	ion:	n-groun	d performance testing in	_ to validate calibrated design in compliance with AASHTO R50.
YES	NO	on geo	grid stabilized aggregate base, where	ad tests conducted, in compliance with AASHTO T221- 90 (2012), the results confirmed that the undation were achieved for the product being recommended.
	<ul><li>2. Testing completed under the supervision of a licensed Engineer?</li><li>3. Testing completed over a range of subgrade strengths?</li><li>4. At a minimum, 2 of the tests must show results for 10,000 cycles and demons behavior?</li></ul>			e strengths?
Verific	atior	ı: Indepe	endent review and verification	of supporting research, data, design assumptions and
analyse	es. Na	me of in	dependent reviewer:	
YES	NO	<ul><li>2. Independent of the second of the</li></ul>	endent review of design assumptions (ate quality? endent review of design methodology (ndent verification of product-specific des	product performance, and range of subgrade conditions? and variations with AC and AB thickness, subgrade strength, and
Alterna	ate/"	Or Equa	al" Approval Status	
	Арр	roved	above. ("Yes" to all performance qu	erly calibrated, validated and independently reviewed as shown alifiers) or increased traffic capacity confirmed to meet the original
	Reje	ected	•	to evaluate product performance  properly calibrated, validated and independently reviewed as noreof the performance qualifiers)