

**Product Evaluation  
PROGRAM**

**Peer Exchange  
for Southwestern States  
May 7 – 10, 2013**

**Report**

**Arizona Department of Transportation**  
Research Center  
206 South 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Mail Drop 075R  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007  
Telephone: (602) 712-6430

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Arizona Department of Transportation or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. Trade or manufacturer names which may appear herein are cited only because they are considered essential to the objectives of the report. The U.S. Government and the State of Arizona do not endorse products or manufacturers.

---

## CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....   | 1    |
| II. PEER EXCHANGE SESSIONS .....  | 3    |
| III. MOVING FORWARD .....   | 9    |
| IV. FUTURE COLLABORATION .....  | 11   |
| <br>APPENDIX A:<br>AGENDA   |      |
| <br>APPENDIX B:<br>CONTACT LIST   |      |
| <br>APPENDIX C:<br>PRODUCT EVALUATION INFORMATION EXCHANGE REQUEST FORM |      |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Figure 1. Peer Exchange Team ..... | 2 |
|------------------------------------|---|

## LIST OF TABLES

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Table 1. DOT Representatives.....                                      | 1 |
| Table 2. ADOT Staff .....  | 1 |
| Table 3. Proposed Product Collaborations .....                         | 4 |
| Table 4. Product Evaluation Programs.....                              | 5 |
| Table 5. Funding of Product Evaluation Programs .....                  | 5 |
| Table 6. Product Evaluation Lists .....                                | 6 |
| Table 7. Product Evaluation Lists' Purpose and Records Retention ..... | 6 |
| Table 8. Product Evaluation Application and Evaluation Processes.....  | 7 |
| Table 9. No Interest or Non-APL Responses .....                        | 8 |
| Table 10. Product Evaluation Recertification Requirements.....         | 8 |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| AASHTO | American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials |
| ADOT   | Arizona Department of Transportation                               |
| APEL   | AASHTO Product Evaluation List                                     |
| APL    | Approved Products List   |
| ASTM   | American Society for Testing and Materials                         |
| ASU    | Arizona State University   |
| AZ     | Arizona  |
| C&S    | Contracts & Specifications   |
| DOT    | Department of Transportation                                       |
| DWD    | Detectable Warning Device  |
| FGM    | Flexible Growth Medium   |
| FHWA   | Federal Highway Administration                                     |
| FY     | Fiscal Year  |
| FTP    | File Transfer Protocol   |
| MASH   | Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware                               |
| MatPEC | Materials Product Evaluation Committee                             |
| MSDS   | Material Safety Data Sheet   |
| MSE    | Mechanically Stabilized Earth                                      |
| MUTCD  | Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices                          |
| NCHRP  | National Cooperative Highway Research Program                      |
| NDOT   | Nevada Department of Transportation                                |
| NEMA   | National Electrical Manufacturers Association                      |
| NTPEP  | National Transportation Product Evaluation Program                 |
| NV     | Nevada   |
| NM     | New Mexico   |
| NMDOT  | New Mexico Department of Transportation                            |
| PCCP   | Portland Cement Concrete Pavement                                  |
| PE     | Product Evaluation; or title of Professional Engineer              |
| PEC    | Product Evaluation Committee                                       |
| QPL    | Qualified Products List  |
| RAP    | Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement   |
| SPR    | State Planning and Research Program                                |
| SW     | Southwest  |
| TCPEC  | Traffic Control Product Evaluation Committee                       |
| T.S.   | Traffic Standard Drawing   |
| TX     | Texas  |
| TxDOT  | Texas Department of Transportation                                 |
| SW     | Southwest  |
| TTI    | Texas Transportation Institute                                     |
| UDOT   | Utah Department of Transportation                                  |
| UT     | Utah   |
| UTC    | University Transportation Center                                   |



## I. INTRODUCTION

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Research Center's Product Evaluation Program hosted a Peer Exchange for southwestern states on May 7 – 10, 2013 in Phoenix, Arizona. A copy of the peer exchange agenda is included in Appendix A.

Department of Transportation (DOT) representatives who participated on the peer exchange panel are noted in Table 1. Contact information is included in Appendix B. ADOT staff, who were instrumental with the planning and execution of the peer exchange, are noted in Table 2.

**Table 1. DOT Representatives.**

| <b>State</b> | <b>Name</b>     | <b>Position</b>                           | <b>Product Coordinator</b> |
|--------------|-----------------|---|----------------------------|
| AZ           | Stephanie Huang | Product Evaluation Program Manager        | Yes                        |
| NM           | Robert McCoy    | Research Implementation Engineer          | No, Danielle Romero        |
| NV           | John Eiche      | Senior Road Designer, Standards & Manuals | No, Heather Manzo          |
| TX           | Sandra Kaderka  | Contract Administrator                    | Acting (Position vacant)   |
| UT           | Bin Shi         | Implementation Engineer                   | No, Barry Sharp            |

**Table 2. ADOT Staff.**

| <b>Name</b>       | <b>Role</b>                       |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Bonita Opie       | Facilitator                       |
| Mackenzie Kirby   | Assistant Facilitator             |
| Jennifer Catapano | Research Business Manager         |
| Carolyn Harmon    | Research Administrative Assistant |



**Figure 1. Peer Exchange Team.**

Left to right: Bin Shi, Sandra Kaderka, John Eiche, Stephanie Huang, Mackenzie Kirby, Bonita Opie, Jennifer Catapano, Robert McCoy

The ADOT Product Evaluation Program is conducted under the sponsorship of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and is funded through the State Planning and Research (SPR) Program. The program coordinates the review and acceptance of new products for possible use by ADOT and maintains the Approved Products List (APL). Construction contractors, ADOT construction inspectors, and local municipalities refer to the APL to save time and resources in the field. Time is paramount in the field as contractors may be penalized for not completing construction work within deadlines shown on the project plans. The peer exchange sessions strived to determine if the southwestern states may share resources, create efficient processes, and collaborate on the evaluation of highway products; in turn, this collaboration would save time and resources for ADOT and fellow state agencies.



## II. PEER EXCHANGE SESSIONS

### WELCOME RECEPTION

On Tuesday evening, May 7, the ADOT Research Center hosted a welcome reception. DOT representatives, ADOT management, Traffic Control Product Evaluation Committee, and Materials Product Evaluation Committee were invited. Refreshments were provided to facilitate team building and partnering, as well as promote trust, commitment, active listening, and cooperation in the days ahead.

### OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the peer exchange were the following:

- Create networks and open lines of communication.
- Develop an understanding of product evaluation programs in other states.
- Seek commonalities in research being done and challenges faced.
- Identify opportunities for collaboration and data sharing in regard to product evaluation.

### DOT PRESENTATIONS

On Wednesday, May 8, each DOT representative presented potential products for collaboration. The representatives were asked to present their top three products, yet some states had more than three products that were of interest. Table 3 lists the products presented for collaboration.

ADOT and Nevada DOT (NDOT) both expressed interest in collaborating with the design of Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) walls. ADOT and NDOT exchanged their specifications for MSE walls. NDOT requested other DOT specifications for geogrid used with MSE walls. NDOT does not use metal straps on their MSE walls as they have found that these corrode prematurely.

In general, many of the products listed for collaboration were research-oriented. Many of the DOT representatives would need to ask their respective research groups and technical areas for the status of the research of these highway products.

New Mexico DOT (NMDOT) included a piece of equipment (tow plow) as a product for collaboration even though equipment is not listed on their product evaluation lists. None of the DOTs have equipment on their product lists except for Texas DOT (TxDOT).

**Table 3. Proposed Product Collaborations.**

| <b>DOT</b> | <b>Products of Interest</b>  |
|------------|--|
| AZ         | MSE wall design, DWD, Pipe (culvert and drainage)  |
| NM         | Warm mix asphalt, polycarb bridge overlay, ultra high performance concrete, tow plow, inverted pavements, high% RAP, plasphalt, foamed asphalt |
| NV         | MSE wall backfill, bridge deck overlay, pavement markings  |
| TX         | Road Quake 2 temporary rumble strip, Flexterra FGM, geogrid for pavement   |
| UT         | Dust palliative, flexible concrete spall repair, asphalt antistripping, cold-in-place recycle  |

### **CHALLENGES AND SIMILARITIES AMONG PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAMS**

The common challenges are the following:

- Minimal staff is dedicated to the programs.
- Technical product evaluators are not under the direct supervision of the product coordinator.
- Many of the programs lack funding.
- Each DOT has different specifications, drawings, and methodologies.
- Each DOT has different purposes, procedures, and policies.

The common similarities are the following:

- No product evaluation programs charge application fees.
- Some product evaluations have a field testing component.
- Each product evaluation program uses DOT, American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) specifications.

TxDOT has the most extensive program with 30 published product lists. Utah DOT (UDOT) has the least extensive program with a product list that is an internal database.

### **STAFFING AND FUNDING**

Table 4 lists the product evaluation program names, as well as the staffing. The program names are similar for three out of the five states. ADOT has a formal policy which governs the purpose, scope, authority, committees, processes, and APL of its product evaluation program. All DOTs except for TxDOT have policies that govern their product evaluation programs. Staff support range from 1/3 to 1-1/2 people per program.

**Table 4. Product Evaluation Programs.**

| State | Program Name                  | No. Staff Support | DOT policy govern? |
|-------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| AZ    | Product Evaluation Program    | 1-1/2             | Yes                |
| NM    | Product Evaluation Program    | 1-1/2             | Yes                |
| NV    | Product Evaluation Program    | 1                 | Yes                |
| TX    | TX Product Evaluation Program | 1/3               | No                 |
| UT    | New Products Evaluation Panel | 1                 | Yes                |

Table 5 lists the department where product evaluation programs and funding reside. All programs are housed in their respective research groups, except for NMDOT and UDOT, which are housed in Maintenance and Materials respectively. ADOT has consultants assist with product evaluations. None of the other DOTs have consultants except TxDOT, which utilizes the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) for evaluation of erosion control products. Product evaluation is primarily federally funded except for UDOT, which is state funded. NMDOT, NDOT, and TxDOT may receive federal funding for product evaluations if these become research projects. Three DOTs have vendors pay for product field testing; whereas, ADOT and TxDOT usually pay for their own product field testing.

**Table 5. Funding of Product Evaluation Programs.**

| State | Department  | Work Done by Consultant            | Federal Funding Available?       | Field Testing                                    |
|-------|-------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| AZ    | Research    | Research                           | Yes                              | DOT pays if desired.                             |
| NM    | Maintenance | No                                 | Yes, if becomes research project | Vendor pays for non-standard product evaluation. |
| NV    | Research    | No                                 | Yes                              | Vendor pays.                                     |
| TX    | Research    | No, except TTI for erosion control | Yes, if becomes research project | DOT pays if desired.                             |
| UT    | Materials   | No                                 | No                               | Vendor pays.                                     |

## PRODUCT EVALUATION PROCESSES

Table 6 lists the names of the product evaluation lists, the quantity, the update frequency, and the ability to be found on the Internet. NDOT has a Qualified Products List (QPL). Most of the lists are updated once per month or quarter. As mentioned earlier, TxDOT has the most extensive program with 30 product lists. ADOT, NMDOT, and UDOT have APLs. TxDOT's program is so rigorous that once a product is accepted, it is placed on a product list permanently unless the product changes. All of the lists are published on the Internet, except for UDOT's, which will be published in 2015.

**Table 6. Product Evaluation Lists.**

| State | No. Lists | List Names   | Update Frequency | Online |
|-------|-----------|--|------------------|--------|
| AZ    | 1         | APL  | Monthly          | Y      |
| NM    | 3         | APL, APL w/restrictions, Products under Field Evaluation | Quarterly        | Y      |
| NV    | 1         | QPL  | Quarterly        | Y      |
| TX    | 30        | Product Categories                                       | No timeframe     | Y      |
| UT    | 1         | APL  | Monthly          | N      |

Table 7 lists the product evaluation lists' purpose and records retention. The lists for ADOT and UDOT are tools for contractors; however, the lists for the other three DOTs are mandatory for contractors' use. ADOT does not have a records retention policy specifically for product evaluation. TxDOT and UDOT have a three-year records retention policy where product files are purged.

**Table 7. Product Evaluation Lists' Purpose and Records Retention.**

| State | Dept. Home  | List Purpose | Product has to be on list to be used? | Records Retention    |
|-------|-------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| AZ    | Research    | Tool         | No                                    | None                 |
| NM    | Maintenance | Mandatory    | Yes for certain products              | Yes                  |
| NV    | Research    | Mandatory    | Yes for certain products              | Not sure             |
| TX    | Research    | Mandatory    | Yes for certain products              | 3 years + current FY |
| UT    | Materials   | Tool         | No                                    | 3 years              |

Table 8 lists the DOT’s product evaluation application and evaluation processes. TxDOT accepts any method of application submission including e-mail and hard copy. Most DOTs have the application sent to the lead evaluator by e-mail, except for NMDOT, which still handles hard copy applications. A Product Evaluation Committee (PEC) or panel reviews lead evaluator product recommendations in ADOT and UDOT. NDOT has a PEC that reviews vendor presentations or applications. NMDOT and TxDOT forward the application information to the appropriate technical division for evaluation. TxDOT does not use a PEC or panel but utilizes lead evaluators to make the final determination of whether a product is approved.

**Table 8. Product Evaluation Application and Evaluation Processes.**

| <b>State</b> | <b>Application</b>                | <b>Sent to Lead Evaluator/Panel</b> | <b>Evaluation Process</b>               | <b>Product Approval</b>                |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| AZ           | E-mail                            | E-mail, FTP                         | Lead evaluator presentation             | PEC                                    |
| NM           | E-mail<br>Hard Copy               | Hard Copy                           | Appropriate technical division          | PEC, spec committee,<br>Lead evaluator |
| NV           | Hard Copy<br>Online               | E-mail                              | Vendor presentation or application info | PEC                                    |
| TX           | E-mail<br>Hard Copy               | E-mail, Sharepoint                  | Appropriate technical division          | Lead Evaluator                         |
| UT           | E-mail, Hard copy, online by 2015 | E-mail                              | Lead evaluator presentation             | PE Panel                               |

Table 9 lists the No Interest or Non-APL responses for the DOTs. If a product is submitted to a DOT for inclusion on the product evaluation list and there is no interest in continuation of evaluation, the product vendor is sent a no-interest letter by TxDOT and NMDOT. ADOT’s APL is category/subcategory specific, and if there is no category on the APL and no interest in the creation of a category, a product vendor is given a non-APL letter. ADOT’s APL is not all inclusive for all specifications or drawings used by ADOT.

**Table 9. No-Interest or Non-APL Responses.**

| <b>State</b> | <b>Program Name</b>           | <b>Evaluation</b>                       | <b>No interest or non-APL response</b> |
|--------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| AZ           | Product Evaluation Program    | Requests input from technical evaluator | Yes                                    |
| NM           | Product Evaluation Program    | Requests input from technical evaluator | Yes                                    |
| NV           | Product Evaluation Program    | Requests input from technical evaluator | Yes, case-by-case basis                |
| TX           | TX Product Evaluation Program | Requests input from technical evaluator | Yes                                    |
| UT           | New Products Evaluation Panel | Requests input from technical evaluator | Yes                                    |

Table 10 lists the recertification procedures of the DOTs. Recertification implies that product approval on a product list is not indefinite, and a recertification is necessary for a product to remain on the product list. NDOT and TxDOT do not have recertification for their products. Once their products have been approved, they stay on their product lists permanently unless the product changes. UDOT has product vendors reapply every three years. ADOT and NMDOT have recertification processes every five years. For ADOT, recertification ensures that the products are manufactured and offered under the same trade names and under the same specifications they were approved under. Also, manufacturer contact information is verified.

**Table 10. Product Evaluation Recertification Requirements.**

| <b>State</b> | <b>Recertification Requirement</b> | <b>Product Expiration?</b>                                    |
|--------------|------------------------------------|---|
| AZ           | Yes                                | Renewal every 5 years or removal.                             |
| NM           | Yes                                | Renewal every 5 years or removal.                             |
| NV           | No                                 | None. Annual verification letter for product & vendor status. |
| TX           | No (only if product changes)       | None.   |
| UT           | N/A                                | Removed from APL unless vendor reapplies at 3 years.          |

### **III. MOVING FORWARD**

Since each state has different specifications and approaches to their QPL/APL, there was no decision made on a particular product to collaborate on. Instead the DOT representatives created a basis for collaboration and created a starting model for a future collaboration if deemed appropriate.

#### **PRODUCT EVALUATION SOUTHWESTERN STATES WEBSITE**

The ADOT Product Evaluation Program, in conjunction with the ADOT Communications and Partnering teams, intends to create a webpage with hyperlinks to the southwestern states product evaluation programs. Having access to each state's programs information would benefit both DOT representatives and product vendors.

#### **PRODUCT EVALUATION INFORMATION EXCHANGE REQUEST FORM**

The Peer Exchange team decided to create a product evaluation information exchange request form (Appendix C). The purpose of this form is to share product information among the states. The states have agreed to begin the process by sharing information on the products identified during the peer exchange. In the future, this form may also be e-mailed to participating states as a request for other product information.

The DOT's product evaluation coordinator would send the form to the respective DOT's technical expert. Then, the coordinator would distribute the forms to the southwestern states' e-mail list to request information for collaboration.

#### **MODEL FOR PRODUCT EVALUATION COLLABORATION**

Any state may request a collaboration planning meeting, which would be held by webinar or teleconference, to discuss the evaluation process for a specific product. The product evaluation coordinator and technical expert from each state would participate. The collaboration planning group would determine if it was realistic to collaborate or not based on the data provided during that meeting.

Prior to this meeting, the requesting state would complete a review as follows:

- Check with internal technical staff.
- Obtain information from product vendor.
- Check other states' APLs and QPLs.
- Check standards and drawings.
- E-mail Ohio DOT Brad Young (Brad.Young2@dot.state.oh.us) to be added to national product evaluation coordinator e-mail list serve.
- Request a literature review from the research library if the DOT has one.

The requesting state would then send a meeting request and a product evaluation information exchange request form to the participants. Invited participants would need to be prepared for a discussion and do research on the product within their DOT.

The participants would determine how each of the areas listed below would be handled for the product being evaluated. Typical standards or processes are listed below for reference.

- Evaluation Standards (AASHTO, ASTM, DOT, MASH, etc.)
- Specification Review (current, being developed, gap, etc.)
- Technical Review (lead evaluator, AASHTO, technical expert, etc.)
- Evaluation Methodology (how to compare standards with specifications)
- Testing Methodology (number of samples, placement, weather conditions, duration, elevation, etc.)
- Funding Options for Evaluation and Testing (pooled fund, NTPEP, TTI, UTC, other university, etc.)



#### **IV. FUTURE COLLABORATION**

Discussion of a pooled fund was made, but consensus among DOTs with product evaluation would need to be further determined. Each DOT representative was asked to consult with its product coordinator and technical lead on their products for collaboration.

The development of the Product Evaluation Southwestern States website will facilitate communication among the states. The product evaluation information exchange request form would also facilitate communication among the DOTs as well as identify the information needs for each DOT. ADOT called each individual DOT in late June 2013 and discussed comments on the draft report. NDOT will be hosting a follow-up web meeting or teleconference in September 2013. The next peer exchange for product evaluation may be hosted by another DOT within three years.

**AGENDA**  
**ADOT Research Center**  
**Product Evaluation Program**  
**Peer Exchange for Southwestern States**  
**May 7-10, 2013**  
**ADOT Research Center, 206 S. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85007**

**OBJECTIVES**

- Create networks and open lines of communication
- Develop an understanding of Product Evaluation Programs in other states
- Seek commonalities in research being done and challenges we face
- Identify opportunities for collaboration and data sharing in regard to product evaluation

**Tuesday, May 7, 2013**

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| <b>2:00 to 5:00 pm</b> | <b>Check-in at hotel</b>  |
| <b>5:00 to 7:00 pm</b> | <b>Welcome reception</b><br><i>ADOT Research Center</i><br><i>206 S. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 198</i><br><i>Phoenix AZ 85007</i><br><i>602-712-4052</i> |

**Wednesday, May 8, 2013**

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>8:30 to 9:00 am</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions / Ice Breaker <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What are your expectations?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Review of objectives</li> <li>• Agenda review</li> </ul>   |
| <b>9:00 to 10:00 am</b>    | <p>Overview from each State (Nevada, Utah):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ What are the top 3 products you identified in the survey as potential candidates for collaboration?</li> <li>✓ Why did you select these products?</li> </ul>                         |
| <b>10:00 to 10:15 am</b>   | <b>Break</b>  |
| <b>10:15 to 11:15 am</b>   | <p>Overview from each State continued (Texas, Arizona, New Mexico):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ What are the top 3 products you identified in the survey as potential candidates for collaboration?</li> <li>✓ Why did you select these products?</li> </ul> |
| <b>11:15 to 11:45 am</b>   | <p>Roundtable discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Seek commonalities in top 3 products</li> </ul>   |
| <b>11:45 am to 1:00 pm</b> | Lunch (delivered) – Jason’s Deli - and networking   |
| <b>1:00 to 3:00 pm</b>     | Summary of the Survey and Discussion: What is the process used by each DOT in regard to product evaluation?   |

**APPENDIX A: AGENDA**

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>3:00 to 3:15 pm</b>       | Break   |
| <b>3:15 to 4:30 pm</b>       | Continue discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Identify the commonalities, differences and challenges in evaluation processes among the states for the top products identified</li> </ul>  |
| <b>4:30 to 5:30 pm</b>       | Break   |
| <b>5:30 pm</b>               | Dinner – Old Spaghetti Factory  |
|                              |   |
| <b>Thursday, May 9, 2013</b> |   |
| <b>8:30 to 8:45 am</b>       | Agenda review   |
| <b>8:45 to 10:30 am</b>      | Discussion about collaborating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Is there a desire to collaborate?</li> <li>✓ What product will we recommend for the initial collaboration?</li> <li>✓ What will the model be that we recommend? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evaluation standards</li> <li>○ Specification review</li> <li>○ Technical review</li> <li>○ Methodology</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>10:30 to 10:45 am</b>     | Break   |
| <b>10:45 to 11:30 am</b>     | Continued discussion about collaboration  |
| <b>11:30 am to 12:30 pm</b>  | Lunch (delivered) – Zoe’s   |
| <b>12:30 to 2:00 pm</b>      | What resources do we need and how will we recommend that this be accomplished? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Pooled fund – how will we recommend that it be managed</li> <li>✓ How will we recommend that it be administered</li> </ul>  |
| <b>2:00 to 2:30 pm</b>       | Break   |
| <b>2:30 to 4:30 pm</b>       | Team review of collaboration details and discussion<br>Did we meet our objectives   |
| <b>4:30 to 6:00 pm</b>       | Break   |
| <b>6:00 pm</b>               | Dinner – Alice Cooperstown  |
|                              |   |
| <b>Friday, May 10, 2013</b>  |   |
| <b>8:30 to 11:00 am</b>      | Draft Report and Summary Presentation   |
| <b>11:00 am</b>              | Administrative paperwork for travel   |
| <b>11:30 am</b>              | Box Lunch - Cancelled   |
|                              | Adjourn   |

| Worksheet for Peer Exchange |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Commonalities</b>        |  |
| <b>Differences</b>          |  |
| <b>Challenges</b>           |  |

**APPENDIX B: CONTACT LIST**

| <b>State</b> | <b>Name</b>     | <b>E-mail Address</b>              | <b>Phone</b> |
|--------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| AZ           | Stephanie Huang | shuang@azdot.gov,<br>apl@azdot.gov | 602.712.6430 |
| NM           | Robert McCoy    | robert.mccoy@state.nm.us           | 505.798.6741 |
| NV           | John Eiche      | jeiche@dot.state.nv.us             | 775.888.7598 |
| TX           | Sandra Kaderka  | sandra.kaderka@txdot.gov           | 512.416.4742 |
| UT           | Bin Shi         | bshi@utah.gov                      | 801.965.4303 |

## Southwestern States Product Evaluation Peer Exchange Product Evaluation Information Exchange / Request

This form is intended for use by the five states that participated in the Southwestern States Peer Exchange that was hosted by the Arizona Department of Transportation on May 7 through May 10, 2013. Along with Arizona, those states are Nevada, New Mexico, Texas and Utah. The purpose of this form is to share product information among the states. The states have agreed to begin the process by sharing information on the products identified during the peer exchange. In the future this form can also be sent out to participating states as a request for information for other products.

Please include any information that you feel is relevant to this particular product. The text boxes will expand to accommodate as much text as needed.

Each state will provide the information they have back to the requestor. The requestor will compile all information received and return to all states.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Product name</b>   |  |
| <b>Manufacturer name and point of contact</b>                                   |  |
| <b>Vendor name and point of contact</b>   |  |
| <b>Description of use</b>   |  |
| <b>DOT Technical Expert: Name, email and phone number</b>                       |  |
| <b>Manufacturer web link</b>  |  |
| <b>Criteria for acceptance (AASHTO, State Statute, ASTM, etc.)</b>              |  |
| <b>Web links to research or general information</b>                             |  |
| <b>Any existing specifications (include date)</b>                               |  |
| <b>Are you developing a specification for this product? What is the status?</b> |  |
| <b>General category (i.e. materials, traffic, bridge, geotech, pavement)</b>    |  |
| <b>Has your DOT used the product before?</b>                                    |  |
| <b>Is the product currently on your APL?</b>                                    |  |
| <b>Does the product have an MSDS?</b>   |  |
| <b>Is a sample required?</b>  |  |
| <b>Comments</b>   |  |