

# Product Evaluation Program Annual Report

Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012



Arizona Department of Transportation  
Research Center



**Product Evaluation**

**PROGRAM**

**Annual Report  
FY 2011 and FY 2012**

**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. BACKGROUND .....	1
III. PRODUCT EVALUATION PROCESS .....	5
IV. STATUS OF THE PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM .....	6
V. FHWA PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT .....	7
VI. PRODUCTS CONSIDERED BY THE PRODUCT EVALUATION COMMITTEES .....	7
VII. PROGRAM FOR FUTURE .....	19

### APPENDIX A:

ADOT PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM POLICY, EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 9, 2012

### APPENDIX B:

PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS AND FORMS,  
EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 1, 2011

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Product Evaluation Program Staff.....	3
Table 2: MatPEC Members during FY 2011 & 2012.....	4
Table 3: TCPEC Members during FY 2011 & 2012 .....	4
Table 4a: Products Approved by the MatPEC during FY 2011.....	11
Table 4b: Products Approved by the MatPEC during FY 2012.....	12
Table 5a: Products Approved by the TCPEC during FY 2011 .....	15
Table 5b: Products Approved by the TCPEC during FY 2012 .....	16

## 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
ATRC	Arizona Transportation Research Center, former name of ADOT Research Center
CESI	Chalmers Engineering Services, Inc.
EIT	Engineer-in-Training
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FY	Fiscal Year
JPA/IGA	Joint Project Agreement/InterGovernmental Agreement
MatPEC	Materials Product Evaluation Committee
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheet
MUTCD	Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
NCHRP	National Cooperative Highway Research Program
NEMA	National Electrical Manufacturers Association
NTPEP	National Transportation Product Evaluation Program
PCCP	Portland Cement Concrete Pavement
PEC	Product Evaluation Committee
PRIDE	Product Resource Investment Deployment and Evaluation. Effective February 1, 2011, the PRIDE program's name was changed to Product Evaluation Program
SPR	State Planning and Research Program
TCPEC	Traffic Control Product Evaluation Committee
TL2	Test Level 2 as defined in NCHRP Report 350
TL3	Test Level 3 as defined in NCHRP Report 350
TL4	Test Level 4 as defined in NCHRP Report 350
T.S.	Traffic Standard Drawing

## I. INTRODUCTION

Construction and maintenance of a highway network utilizes a large number of manufactured products and diverse technologies. Many of these products and technologies perform well, while others do not perform as claimed. Rapid implementation of new technologies and products is essential to the effective management of a highway system. Equally important is the judicious investment of highway dollars in the construction of field test sections. Thousands of dollars are invested each time an experimental product is used in a construction project.

Consequently, the Product Evaluation Program, formerly known as the Product Resource Investment Deployment and Evaluation (PRIDE) program, was established to provide a framework for introducing new products for use in field test sections. The program systematically selects products for evaluation, evaluates their feasibility and performance, and documents and reports the results. In this way, new products are evaluated consistently and impartially.

The 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, SPR-116. The program coordinates the review and acceptance of new products for possible use by ADOT and maintains the Approved Products List (APL).

The objective of this report is to document the efforts of ADOT's Product Evaluation Program for the 2011 and 2012 state fiscal years. This report describes product evaluation activities from July 1, 2010, through June 31, 2011 and July 1, 2011, through June 31, 2012 respectively.

Information about the Product Evaluation program may also be found on ADOT's Internet site, <http://www.azdot.gov/apl>.

## II. BACKGROUND

In May 1985, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) established the *Policy for Field Test Requested by Outside Parties* to address the increasing demands of technology and the limited resources of ADOT. This policy gave the ADOT Research Center, formerly known as the Arizona Transportation Research Center (ATRC), responsibility for managing and documenting proposals for test sections submitted by vendors. A Product Evaluation Advisory Committee was established to evaluate the proposals and to recommend products or technologies to be considered for field evaluation.

The Product Evaluation Advisory Committee included an engineer from each ADOT District, a representative from the Materials Section, and one from Research. The first committee meeting was held in June 1985.

During December 1986, a full-time position was dedicated to the Product Evaluation Program and the evaluation of construction experimental features. In September 1988, the system was further divided into the Product Evaluation and Experimental Projects Programs, with one engineer responsible for each program.

In 1991, the Evaluation Committee was separated into two committees: the General Highway Product Evaluation Advisory Committee and the Traffic Control New Product Evaluation Advisory Committee. The General Highway Product Evaluation Advisory Committee reviewed all materials related to highway construction. This committee included representatives from the following units: ADOT Districts, the Maintenance Section, Highway Plans Services, the Utility Section, the Materials Section, and Research. The Traffic Control New Product Evaluation Advisory Committee reviewed traffic control-related products. This committee included a representative from each of the following units: the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), ADOT Districts, the Urban Highways Section, the Traffic Engineering Section, Highway Plans Services, the Construction Section, the Maintenance Section, the Structures Section, the Materials Section, and Research. Research administered this program.

During November 1991, the State Engineer led a one-day discussion that included four District Engineers and all section heads of the Highways Division to review ADOT's product evaluation effort. Three task teams were established to create a policy to provide better coordination among units of the Highways Division.

On July 1, 1992, three committees were formed under the Highways Division Policy and Implementation Memorandum No. 92-08. This policy was replaced by ADOT Intermodal Transportation Division Policy and Implementation Memorandum No. 99-01, *New Products Evaluation and Approval Process*, effective December 1999.

The former PRIDE policy, *SUP-9.01 PRODUCT RESOURCE INVESTMENT DEPLOYMENT AND EVALUATION (PRIDE) PROGRAM*, became effective on July 18, 2002 and was revised and reissued on January 27, 2006 and April 21, 2008. It provides for two Product Evaluation Committees (PECs), Materials (MatPEC) and Traffic Control (TCPEC). The PECs were given responsibility for establishing the operational policy for the new products evaluation and approval process under the PRIDE program. While each PEC has primary areas of responsibility, product evaluations sometimes overlap these areas, requiring decisions from both committees on a product's acceptability. The PECs have the authority to approve or disapprove new products. Approved products are placed on the Approved Products List (APL). The committees were authorized to remove previously approved products from the APL that are later found to be unacceptable.

As of February 9, 2012, the policy was updated to reflect several program changes; it is now known as *SUP-9.01 PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM*. The program’s name has been changed from “PRIDE” to the Product Evaluation Program. Roles and procedures are clarified in the new policy, and data request protocol from manufacturers is clarified.

A newly created position, Product Evaluation Program Manager, was created in February 2011. Effective February 1, 2011, all product applications were urged to be submitted to [apl@azdot.gov](mailto:apl@azdot.gov) . Prior to this date, applications were required to be submitted in duplicate by hard copy. Applications submitted hard copy during the transition period between February 1, 2011 and June 2011 were scanned and then entered into the Access database. The evaluation process incorporated electronic file transfer in the evaluation process. For most applications a “pdf” copy of the file is made. All documents and letters related to the evaluation are also made available in electronic form. ASU hosts a secure web site that stores these documents for access by the evaluators and the MatPEC.

A copy of the current Product Evaluation Program policy is included in *Appendix A*.

Members of the Product Evaluation Program are noted in Table 1.

**Table 1: Product Evaluation Program Staff**

Anne Ellis	Research Director
Elizabeth Weil	Intern (8/2011-1/2012)
Gwendolyn Torrens	Intern (start 5/2012)
Jason Harris	Research Project Manager 3/2011- 6/2012
Stephanie Huang	Product Evaluation Program Manager (start 4/2011)
Jeremy Sala	EIT (7/2010 – 12/2010)
William Faber	EIT (4/2012 – 5/2012)

**MATERIALS PRODUCT EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

The MatPEC is responsible for establishing the operating policy under which non-traffic control products are evaluated. The committee reviews and evaluates non-traffic control products. The MatPEC met four times during Fiscal Year 2011, on October 6, 2010; November 8, 2010; February 8, 2011; and May 11, 2011. Members of the MatPEC during FY 2011 & 2012 are listed in *Table 2*.

**Table 2: MatPEC Members during FY 2011 & 2012**

Bill Hurguy	Materials Group – Chairman (2011)
Jim Delton	Materials Group – Chairman (2010)
Marwan Aouad	Central Maintenance
Chad Auker	Materials Group, Flagstaff
Gloria Bernabe	Construction Group (until 8/2011)
David Burbank	Materials Group, Tucson (until 2/2011)
Sardar Chalabe	Materials Group, Tucson (start 8/2011)
Brent Conner	Materials Group (start 5/2012)
Chris Cooper	Roadway Group (start 8/2011)
Sardar Chalabe	Materials Group, Tucson (start 5/2011)
Tom Deitering	Federal Highway Administration
Janet Doerstling	Materials Group, Prescott (until 11/2011) Materials Group (start 2/2012)
Richard Galaska	Roadway Group (until 5/2011)
Jessica Hanson	Materials Group, Prescott (start 2/2012)
Qui Nguyen	Construction Group (start 11/2011)
Murari Pradhan	Materials Group, Phoenix (start 8/2011)
Paul Sullivan	Materials Group

**TRAFFIC CONTROL PRODUCT EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

The TCPEC is responsible for establishing the operating policy under which traffic control products are evaluated. It reviews and evaluates traffic control products. The TCPEC met four times during FY 2011, on September 15, 2010; December 8, 2010; March 23, 2011; and June 8, 2011. Members of the TCPEC during FY 2011 & 2012 are listed in *Table 3*.

**Table 3: TCPEC Members during FY 2011 & 2012**

Mike Manthey	Traffic Group – Chairman (until 3/2012)
Al Zubi	Traffic Operations Section (12/2010 – 3/2012) Traffic Group – Acting Chairman (start 6/2012)
Raul Amavisca	Traffic Operations Section
Marwan Aouad	Central Maintenance (until 12/2010)
Juan Arvisu	American Traffic Safety Services Association
Scott Beck	Southern Region Traffic (start 3/2012)
Bill Birdwell	Town of Queen Creek
George Chin	Phoenix Region Traffic (until 12/2010)

Jerome Choy	Phoenix Region Traffic (3/2011)
Tom Donithan	Phoenix Maintenance District (start 3/2011)
Bashir Hassan	Phoenix Region Traffic (start 6/2011)
Lonnie Hendrix	Maintenance Group (until 12/2010)
Ted Howard	Risk Management (until 12/2010)
Jeff Johnson	American Traffic Safety Services Association (start 12/2010)
Ron Jones	American Traffic Safety Services Association (until 9/2010)
Reza Karimvand	Traffic Operations Center (start 3/2011)
Robert (Bob) LaJeunesse	Western Region Traffic (until 12/2011)
Kelly LaRosa	Federal Highway Administration
Walter Kent Link	Northern Region Traffic
John Litteer	Western Region Traffic (start 3/2012)
Chuck McClatchey	Phoenix Maintenance District
Joe McGuirk	Phoenix Maintenance District
Richard Moeur	Traffic Design (start 3/2012)
Scott Nodes	Traffic Group (12/2010 - 12/2011)
Sue Olson	Risk Management (start 3/2011)
Scott Orrahood	Traffic Design (until 12/2010)
Terry Otterness	Roadway Group (until 6/2012)
Mark Poppe	Traffic Safety (start 3/2011)
Annette Riley	Traffic Design (3/2011- 6/2012)
Craig Roberts	Northern Arizona University
Andrew (Andy) Roth	Construction - Prescott
Paul Sullivan	Materials Group
Robert Wade	Construction Group (start 12/2010)
Greg Wisecaver	Southern Region Traffic (3/2011-12/2011)
Mohamed Youssef	Traffic Operations Section

### III. PRODUCT EVALUATION PROCESS

Applications for product evaluation are submitted to ADOT. Products are evaluated according to one of the following processes:

- (1) Applications for products covered by current ADOT specifications are evaluated based on compliance with the applicable specifications.
- (2) Applications for products that are not covered by current ADOT specifications are evaluated using a 14-point checklist.

A copy of the Product Evaluation Program application instructions and forms are included in *Appendix B*.

If a product requires a Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS), the ADOT Safety & Health Group is asked to evaluate the MSDS. If Safety & Health approves the MSDS, the application is assigned to a lead evaluator. The lead evaluator is an ADOT staff person or contractor who coordinates the initial evaluation of the product. The lead evaluator decides what information or tests are necessary to complete the evaluation of the product. Questions or unusual evaluation requirements are reviewed with the appropriate PEC for guidance.

The Product Evaluation Program manager notifies the applicants whose products are not approved are notified by the Research Center. If an applicant disagrees with a Committee's decision to reject a product, the applicant may appeal the rejection by providing their objections in writing and submitting additional information for consideration by the Committee. The applicable PECs will then reconsider the application.

#### **IV. STATUS OF THE PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM**

The APL is updated and published monthly via the Internet. Products placed on the APL are normally approved for a five-year period. However, the PECs may specify alternate approval periods as well as conditional approvals. Products must be recertified by the applicant to remain on the list after the approval period expires. Recertification entails verification from the applicant that the listed product is still manufactured as approved. If a product has been substantially modified, the applicant must initiate a new product evaluation application for the product. Products that are not recertified at the expiration of their five-year approval period are removed from the APL. The APL may be downloaded from the Internet at [www.azdot.gov/apl/apl.asp](http://www.azdot.gov/apl/apl.asp).

The Multimodal Planning Division solicited bids in September 2010 for On-Call Consultant Services for Research, Bid Number 11-00000185. Consultants were selected in January 2011 under Discipline 9, which supports the Product Evaluation Program.

ASU and Chalmers Engineering Services, Inc. (CESI) support MatPEC. CESI, CivTech, and Transcore support TCPEC. Two task assignments were issued to ASU, and one task assignment for traffic was issued to CESI.

## **V. FHWA PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**

The FHWA performance measurement is the average length of time to get new product applications first assigned into evaluation. The goal is to assign products for evaluation within 6 months or 180 days of receipt of the initial application. The importance of this measurement is a quantitative rather than qualitative determination of measuring the time between the receipt of the application and when the products are being evaluated. This prevents product applications from being in large queues and better customer service for the ADOT technical groups, on-call consultants, and product vendors. In return, the Approved Products List is further improved and updated, and safety in construction is expedited.

The performance measurement was first put in use in FY 2011. In FY 2011, the Product Evaluation Program had an average of 101 days for new applications assigned into evaluation. A total of 142 products were involved with the calculations. Four product identification numbers were generated for purposes other than evaluation. For non-APL products, the date assigned may be equivalent to the date of correspondence with the ADOT contact, or the date of non-APL response sent to the vendor.

In FY 2012, the Product Evaluation Program had an average of 96 days for new applications assigned into evaluation. A total of 190 products were involved with the calculations. Two product identification numbers were generated for purposes other than evaluation. For non-APL products, the date assigned may be equivalent to the date of correspondence with the ADOT contact, or the date of non-APL response sent to the vendor.

## **VI. PRODUCTS CONSIDERED BY THE PRODUCT EVALUATION COMMITTEES**

The Product Evaluation Program received 142 applications during FY 2011. Each product was assigned a Product Evaluation Program identification number from one of the following series: Product ID No. 10061 to 10116 and Product ID No. 11001 to 11100. The first two digits signify the calendar year the application was submitted, and the last three digits represent the sequence in which they were received by the program.

The Product Evaluation Program received 190 applications during FY 2012. Each product was assigned a Product Evaluation Program identification number from one of the following series: Product ID No. 11101 to 11182 and Product ID No. 12001 to 12111.

Applications remain active until acted upon by a PEC. Therefore, applications submitted prior to FY 2011 were also considered during the year. Products that are not covered by the Product Evaluation Program, i.e., non-APL products, are not evaluated by the PECs. Non-APL products are products that do not have an existing subcategory on the APL and for which there is no reason for the Product Evaluation Committees to pursue a new subcategory. Of the product applications received in FY 2011, six were declined as non-APL and vendors were issued letters

to that effect. Of the product applications received in FY 2012, 15 were declined as non-APL and vendors were issued letters to that effect.

Of the applications considered by the PECs during FY 2011 the MatPEC approved 37 products and the TCPEC approved 22 products for the APL. Summaries of these decisions are shown in Tables 4a and 5a for MatPEC and TCPEC, respectively.

Of the applications considered by the PECs during FY 2012 the MatPEC approved 47 products and the TCPEC approved 36 products for the APL. Summaries of these decisions are shown in Tables 4b and 5b for MatPEC and TCPEC, respectively.

## **MATPEC DECISIONS**

### **November 2011**

- Approved specifications change for Subcategory T-2 (Waterbased Structural Paint) from “ASTM D660-93, D661-93, & Dd772-86” to “ASTM D660, D661, & Dd772; Standard Specification 1002.”
- Agreed that the responsible sections for Subcategory P-1 (Truncated Domes) should include Materials Structural Section and Roadway Group.

### **February 2012**

- Approved the removal of Subcategories S-2 (Bridge Joint System (Compression Seal Joint)) and S-3 (Bridge Joint System (Strip Seal Joint)).
- Approved removal of Subcategory D-1 (Anti-stripping Agent).
- Approved the addition of Category Y (Landscape Architectural Materials) and removal of Categories Q (Soil Sterilization & Weed Control Materials), R (Soil Treatments), and X (Miscellaneous).

### **May 2012**

- Approved removal of Subcategory A-5 (Dowel Bonding Adhesive - Cementitious) since ADOT no longer uses products in this subcategory.
- Approved removal of Categories B (Aggregates) and G (Deicing Chemicals) since no products existed on the APL and the categories were not needed.

## **TCPEC DECISIONS**

### **March 2011**

- Approved title change of Subcategory V-59 from “Signal and Lighting – Pull Box/Extension – Concrete” to “Signal and Lighting – Light Duty (LD) Pull Box/Extension.”

“ADOT Specifications: 732” was removed; “ADOT Drawings” was changed from T.S. 1-1 thru 1-5 to T.S. 1-1.

- Approved title change of Subcategory V-60 from “Signal and Lighting – Pull Box/Extension – Polymer Concrete” to “Signal and Lighting – Heavy Duty (HD) Pull Box/Extension.” “ADOT Specifications: 732” was removed; “ADOT Drawings” was changed from T.S. 1-1 thru 1-5 to T.S. 1-1.

#### **June 2011**

- Approved the removal of Subcategory V-76M, “Delineators – Reflective Sheeting (Prismatic),” from the APL since specifications changed.
- Approved the change of title and specifications for Subcategory V-75P from “Signing – Reflective Sheeting – Premium Prismatic” to “Signing – Reflective Sheeting – Type XI Prismatic.” Approved the specifications change from “AASHTO M268-93” to “ASTM 4956 Type XI.”
- Approved adding “RTRC” (Reinforced Thermosetting Resin Conduit) to the titles of Subcategories V-32A, V-32B, and V-32D.

#### **September 2011**

- Approved the removal of Subcategory V-10A (Channelizing Devices – Markers for Guardrail – Single Piece Metal Post Clip Mount Flexible Plastic Types) and Subcategory V-79B (Signing – 5 Foot Sign Mounting Sign Stand) from the APL since specifications have changed.
- Approved the removal of specific colors under Subcategory V-75P.
- The Research Center updated Subcategory V-2 (Attenuation Device – Guardrail End Terminals) and informed TCPEC about the specifications correction from “ADOT 702” to “ADOT 905,” per Roadway Group’s direction.

#### **December 2011**

- Approved the removal of “ADOT Specifications: 736” and the note “Any cable per International Municipal Signal Association (IMSA) 51-7 Spec.” on Subcategory V-61 (Signal and Lighting – Roadway Loop Detector Wire); approved the addition of T.S. 7-1 to the ADOT Drawings portion of Subcategory V-61.
- The Research Center clarified that action items pertaining to Subcategories V-35A (Signal and Lighting – Detector Loop Sealant (hot pour)) and V-35B (Signal and Lighting – Detector Loop Sealant (cold pour)) were approved by email vote in October 2011. Construction would like a note on the APL for each product in these categories whether the product is a one part elastomeric sealant, two part epoxy filler sealant, hot applied rubberized sealant, or emulsified crack filler sealant for asphaltic concrete.

## March 2012

- Approved the removal of Subcategory V-62 (Signal and Lighting – Sign Lighting Fixtures) to align with the Policies, Guidelines, and Procedures (PGP) recently revised by the Traffic Group to eliminate sign lighting.
- On Subcategory V-32J (Signal and Lighting – Sign Lighting Fixtures), TCPEC approved of adding “T.S. 1” under ADOT Drawings.
- Approved changing product listings in Subcategories V-34, V-34A, V-34B, V-34C, V-34D, V-34E, and V-34F from “All NEMA (National Electrical Manufacturers Association) TS1-1989 compatible products unless specified otherwise on project plans or special provisions” to “All NEMA compatible products unless specified otherwise on project plans or special provisions.” This revision complements language shown in the respective ADOT Standard Specifications 2008.

## NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM

The Product Evaluation Program Manager, Stephanie Huang, attended the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) National Transportation Product Evaluation Program (NTPEP) 2012 Meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana. NTPEP’s website has a data mine for product evaluations that are available for public access. NTPEP’s technical committees include Pavement Marking Materials, PCMS & Flashing Arrow Panels, Sign Sheeting Materials, Raised Pavement Markers, and Temporary Traffic Control Devices. The ADOT Materials Structural Section does sign sheeting testing on behalf of NTPEP. The AASHTO Product Evaluation List (APEL) is for proprietary products with no specifications, and the list is only open to one representative for each DOT.

**Table 4a: Products Approved by the MatPEC during FY 2011**

<b>Product ID No.</b>	<b>Product Name</b>	<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Subcategory</b>	<b>Comment</b>
05029	Sealtight Mel Drain	W.R. Meadows of Arizona, Inc.	I-1, I-3	
07127	Sika CNI	Sika Corporations	K-3	
08052	Taper Lock Threaded Rebar Coupler	Dayton Superior	S-1	
08068	PE 1000+	Powers Fasteners	A-6	
09001	Fibermesh 650	Propex Concrete Systems Corp.	K-9	Note: Product must be submitted for review for each project.
09002	Specchem Multi Purpose Grout	Specchem, LLC	J-1	
09003	Specpoxy 1000	Specchem, LLC	A-1, A-3, A-4, A-6	
09016	Daraset HES	W R Grace & Co.- Conn.	K-3	
09017	MIRA 62	W R Grace & Co.- Conn.	K-1	
09019	Shep 1107 Premium Grout	CMC Construction Services	J-1	
09027	Rapid Set Mortar Mix	CTS Cement Manufacturing Corp.	J-3, J-4	
09033	Sikaplast 500	Sika Corp.	K-1, K-6	
09041	J-Drain SWD	JDR Enterprises	I-2	
09042	J-Drain 400/420	JDR Enterprises	I-3	
09043	J-Drain 200/220	JDR Enterprises	I-3	
09049	Precast Concrete Cattle Guard	US Concrete	F-6	
09074	NCA Non-Chloride Accelerator	Fritz-Pak Corporation	K-3	
09089	Precast Concrete Catch Basin C-15.80	US Concrete	F-2	
09090	Precast Concrete Catch Basin C-15.90	US Concrete	F-1	
09102	Shep Silicone Non-sag	Crafco, Inc.	H-4	
09103	Shep Silicone Select	Crafco, Inc.	H-5	
09110	Roadseal # 10312	Roadseal Co., Ltd.	H-3	
10005	Quikrete Precision Non-Shrink Grout	The Quikrete Company	J-1	
10010	Quikrete TARGET 1118 Grout	The Quikrete Company	J-1	
10011	Quikrete TARGET Flowcrete	The Quikrete Company	J-1	
10012	Planitop 18	Mapei Corp.	J-3	

Product ID No.	Product Name	Company Name	Subcategory	Comment
10013	Planitop XS	Mapei Corp.	J-3	
10021	ADVA CAST 555	W R Grace & Co.- Conn.	K-6	
10030	Ulti-Pave3	Buzzi Unicem USA, Inc.	J-2	
10033	Tuf-Strand SF	The Euclid Chemical Company	K-9	
10034	Eucon DS	The Euclid Chemical Company	K-2, K-4	
10035	ARES Wall	Tensar International Corporation	C-1	
10058	Airalon 3000	W R Grace & Co.- Conn.	K-8	
10082	MD MetaPanel DW Embedment Tile (Cast-In-Place)	MetaDome, LLC	P-1	Note: May not be appropriate for elevations less than 4000 feet.
10092	Reinforced Earth Company Concrete Panel Wall System	Reinforced Earth Company (RECO)	C-1	
10103	Atlas Pro-Crete 1	Atlas Tech Products	J-2, J-3	
10104	Atlas V/O-1 Mortar	Atlas Tech Products	J-3	

**Table 4b: Products Approved by the MatPEC during FY 2012**

Product ID No.	Product Name	Company Name	Subcategory	Comment
93-69	Geotex 381	Propex Operating Company	N-1	Recertification
08019	Resicoat RB-600	Akzo-Nobel	O-1	
08027	Tenax MS220B	Tenax Corporation	I-4	Changed from conditional to full approval
08035	TraffikDrain	ACO Polymer Products Inc.	F-17	Note: For special applications only when shown on project plans.
08036	HighwayDrain	ACO Polymer Products Inc.	F-17	Note: For special applications only when shown on project plans.
08062	Versaspeed	Euclid Chemical Company	J-2, J-3	Note: Known dust carcinogen, use N95 dust mask, gloves, safety glasses
08067	Pozzolith 200	BASF Construction Chemicals	K-1, K-2, K-4	Note: Irritant liquid, prevent skin contact! Handle with chemical resistant gloves and safety glasses with splash guards
08070	Southwest Division (SWD) Bridge and Highway B97 Series	The Sherwin-Williams Company	M-2	

Product ID No.	Product Name	Company Name	Subcategory	Comment
08077	EDOT	Simpson Strong-Tie	A-6	Note: Irritant liquid/corrosive liquid, prevent skin contact! Handle with chemical resistant gloves and safety glasses with splash guards.
09010	Novomesh 950	Propex Concrete Systems Corp.	K-9	
09011	Novomesh 850	Propex Concrete Systems Corp.	K-9	
09012	Fibermesh 150	Propex Concrete Systems Corp.	K-9	
09013	Fibermesh 300	Propex Concrete Systems Corp.	K-9	
09014	CAST in TACT 3	Masons Supply Company	P-1	
09015	US SPEC Transpatch	US MIX Products Company	J-2, J-3	Note: Known dust carcinogen, use N95 dust mask, gloves, safety glasses
09020	MasterFiber Mac 100	BASF Chemical Company	K-9	Note: OK to use with gloves, safety glasses, N95 mask if dusty
09068	Hi-Cap Capping Compound LA-0150	Forney, LLC	U-1	Note: OK to use with gloves, safety glasses, N95 mask if dusty. Dust is also flammable, do not use in confined spaces, avoid flames.
09071	124 Mirro Glide Semi Gloss	Frazee Industries, Inc.	T-2	
09087	A2 Liner	Contech Construction Products Inc.	F-8	
10002	GE110	Skaps Industries	I-8	
10014	GC130	Skaps Industries	N-1	
10016	GT180	Skaps Industries	I-1, I-7	
10017	GT135	Skaps Industries	I-5	
10018	GT160	Skaps Industries	I-6	
10020	Weholite	KWH Pipe	F-8	Previous conditional approval now full approval. Note: Approved for up to 60 inch pipe diameter only.
10041	TYPAR	Fiberweb, Inc.	I-5, I-6	Denied for I-7 and I-8
10049	Eagle Corr PE	JM Eagle	F-9, F-10, F-12, F-13, F-14, F-16	
10093	KeySystem I	Keystone Retaining Wall Systems	C-1	Note: See ADOT Specific Requirements at <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/apl/ADOT-MSE_Walls/Keystone.pdf">http://www.azdot.gov/apl/ADOT-MSE_Walls/Keystone.pdf</a>
10101	Everair Plus	BASF Corporation	K-8	Note: Skin and eye irritant. OK to use with gloves, safety glasses.
10110	Plastiment ES	Sika Corporation	K-2, K-4	
10113	Five Star Structural Concrete	Five Star Products, Inc.	J-3	
10116	Zap Screwlock Epoxy Series	Barsplice Products, Inc.	S-1	
11001	Ulti Grout	Buzzi Unicem USA Inc.	J-2	Note: Known dust carcinogen, use N95 dust mask, gloves, safety glasses

<b>Product ID No.</b>	<b>Product Name</b>	<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Subcategory</b>	<b>Comment</b>
11011	Ulti-Pave3	Buzzi Unicem USA Inc.	J-2	Note: Known dust carcinogen, use N95 dust mask, gloves, safety glasses
11022	ADVA 195	W R Grace & Co.- Conn.	K-6	Note: Irritant liquid, prevent skin contact! Handle with chemical resistant gloves and safety glasses with splash guards
11023	Helix	Polytorx, LLC	K-9	
11025	Daracel	W R Grace & Co.- Conn.	K-10	Note: Irritant liquid, prevent skin contact! Handle with chemical resistant gloves and safety glasses with splash guards
11026	WRDA PAVE 17	W R Grace & Co.- Conn.	K-1	Note: Irritant liquid, prevent skin contact! Handle with chemical resistant gloves and safety glasses with splash guards
11045	CG-86 Grout	W.R. Meadows of Arizona	J-1	
11051	Dural Fast Set Epoxy Gel	The Euclid Chemical Company	A-6	Note: Irritant liquid/corrosive liquid, prevent skin contact! Handle with chemical resistant gloves and safety glasses with splash guards
11070	Daracem 55	W R Grace & Co.- Conn.	K-1, K-6	Note: Irritant liquid, prevent skin contact! Handle with chemical resistant gloves and safety glasses with splash guards
11085	US SPEC Transpatch Concrete	US Mix Co.	J-2, J-3	
11091	KBP 204P Seal	Kwik Bond Polymers	M-3	Note: Use outdoors, use gloves, safety glasses, and prevent skin contact.
11094	Sikatard 440	Sika Corporation	K-2	
11159	219 Acrikote 100% Acrylic Ext Flat Paint	Frazee Paint	T-2	
12014	Trench Former MHD 8	ABT, Inc.	F-17	Note: For special applications only when shown on project plans.
12015	Trench Former MHD 12	ABT, Inc.	F-17	Note: For special applications only when shown on project plans.

**Table 5a: Products Approved by the TCPEC during FY 2011**

<b>Product ID No.</b>	<b>Product Name</b>	<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Subcategory</b>	<b>Comment</b>
08021	SNAP'n SAFE Breakaway Sign Post Coupler	Designovations, Inc.	V-69	
09108	FG 300	Pexco LLC/Davidson Traffic Control Products	V-6B	Note: Driveable mount.
10026	921-AR Raised Pavement Marker	Apex Universal	V-23	
10032	RENO LOOPS	RENO A&E	V-58	
10039	Dent Universal Base System (DUB 7.5)	Dent Breakaway Industries	V-69A	
10042	Quazite Series PG1324Z578PT1 5/HD PG1730Z703PT1 7/HD	Hubbell Enclosures, Inc.	V-60	Note: 12-inch box. May use 18-inch box or 8-inch extension as needed.
10043	CDR Series A30132412APT1 5/LD A30173012APT1 7/LD	Hubbell Enclosures, Inc.	V-59	Note: 12-inch box. May use 18-inch box or 8-inch extension as needed.
10061	12" LED YELLOW CIRCULAR SIGNAL MODULE- PN100#TRVY12SG- D1T	Excellence Opto, Inc.	V-66A	
10062	TRA-12YDG-IN2 Yellow Arrow	Excellence Opto, Inc.	V-66A	
10066	132412PC Tier 22	Martin Enterprises	V-60	Note: 12-inch box. May use 18-inch depth or 8-inch extension as needed.
10067	132418PC - Tier 22	Martin Enterprises	V-60	Note: 18-inch box. Alternate depth to 132412PC Tier 22.
10068	173012PC - Tier 22	Martin Enterprises	V-60	Note: 12-inch box. May use 18-inch depth or 8-inch extension as needed.
10069	173018PC - Tier 22	Martin Enterprises	V-60	Note: 18-inch box. Alternate depth to 173012PC - Tier 22.
10071	132412PC - Tier 8	Martin Enterprises	V-59	Note: 12-inch box.
10072	132418PC - Tier 8	Martin Enterprises	V-59	Note: 18-inch box. Alternate depth to 132412PC - Tier 8.
10073	173012PC - Tier 8	Martin Enterprises	V-59	Note: 12-inch box.
10074	173018PC - Tier 8	Martin Enterprises	V-59	Note: 18-inch box. Alternate depth to 132412PC -Tier 8.

Product ID No.	Product Name	Company Name	Subcategory	Comment
10076	Carson H1324-12 5/ HD H1324-P1 H1730-12 7/HD H1730-P1	Oldcastle	V-60	Note: 12-inch box. May use 18-inch box or 9-inch extension as needed.
10077	Fibrelyte FL30TBOX12, FL30T, FL36TBOX12, FL36T	Oldcastle	V-59	
10078	A6001946AX12 5/LD A6001640AX12 7/LD	Armorcast Products Company	V-59, V-60	
10105	FCA132412T-9000 5/LD FCA173012T- 90007/HD	New Basis	V-59	Note: 12-inch box. May use 18-inch box or 8-inch extension as needed.
10105	PCA132412- 900025/HD PCA173012- 900087/HD	New Basis	V-60	Note: 12-inch box. May use 18-inch box or 8-inch extension as needed.
11008	Duralight JXM- 400VIEIL Countdown LED Ped	Trastar, Inc.	V-56	
11021	OmniCube T- 11500 series	Avery Dennison	V-75P	

**Table 5b: Products Approved by the TCPEC during FY 2012**

Product ID No.	Product Name	Company Name	Subcategory	Comment
04081	Chip Seal Pavement Markers	Glowlite Inc	V-16	
08024	King Block	Trinity Highway Products, Inc.	V-4D	Removed earlier product, No. 01112
08026	Model 980	Ennis Paint Inc.	V-23	
09065	HMX Large Area Luminaire (HMX40SM8NW2)	Cooper Lighting	V-50	
10085	ATM 400 HP White	Advance Traffic Markings	V-20A	Denied V-20B
11002	Duralight 12" Red Traffic Signal Ball, Clear, JXC300-HFR- C	TRASTAR, INC	V-66A	

Product ID No.	Product Name	Company Name	Subcategory	Comment
11003	Duralight 12" Yellow Traffic Signal Ball, Clear, JXC300-HFY-C	TRASTAR, INC	V-66A	
11004	Duralight 12" Green Traffic Signal Ball, Clear, JXC300-HFG-C	TRASTAR, INC	V-66A	
11005	Duralight 12" Red LED Traffic Signal Arrow, Clear, JXJ300-07R03	TRASTAR, INC	V-66A	
11006	Duralight 12" Yellow LED Traffic Signal Arrow, Clear, JXJ300-07Y03	TRASTAR, INC	V-66A	
11007	Duralight 12" Green LED Traffic Signal Arrow, Clear, JXJ300-07G03	TRASTAR, INC	V-66A	
11009	Lead-Free Yellow Alkyd Thermoplastic (885260)	Ennis Traffic Safety Solutions	V-26	
11010	White Alkyd Thermoplastic (885250)	Ennis Traffic Safety Solutions	V-26	
11050	Line-PRO Waterbase Rapid Dry Traffic Paints ( White, Yellow, Black)	International Coatings Co. Inc.	V-27	Approved in white and yellow.
11055	All applicable products	Arcan Traffic Systems	V-43	Note: Type II & IV are approved for use.
11067	Ulti-Mate Sign Support System	Ultimate Highway Products	V-72	Note: 10 & 12 gauge are approved. The 14 gauge is not approved.
11071	Falcon IMSA 51-7	Falcon Fine Wire	V-61	
11072	CCI IMSA 51-7	Coleman Cable	V-61	
11073	Dialight 430-6479-001X Countdown LED Ped Signal	Dialight Corporation	V-56	
11090	GT1 and GTx product family of 12" and 8" LED Traffic Signal Modules	GE Lighting Solutions	V-66A	

Product ID No.	Product Name	Company Name	Subcategory	Comment
11098	GT1 product family of 12" Arrow Traffic Signal Modules	GE Lighting Solutions	V-66A	
11099	GE PS7-CFF1-26A Countdown LED Ped Signal	GE Lighting Solutions	V-56	
11100	LED Programmable Visibility Modules	GE Lighting Solutions	V-66B	
11110	QuadGuard Elite	Energy Absorption Systems, Inc.	V-1	Removed Product ID No. 98069 and 98060. Note: Narrow (24", 30", 36") and Wide Systems
11127	Universal TAU II	Barrier Systems, Inc.	V-1	Replaced Product ID No. 02005
11128	1140 White Waterborne Traffic Paint	Colorado Paint Company – Division of Swarco	V-27	
11129	1146 Yellow LF Waterborne Traffic Paint	Colorado Paint Company – Division of Swarco	V-27	
11130	1110 White High Build Waterborne Traffic Paint	Colorado Paint Company – Division of Swarco	V-27	
11131	1116 Yellow Lead Free High Build Waterborne Traffic Paint	Colorado Paint Company – Division of Swarco	V-27	
11132	1190 White Low Temperature Waterborne Traffic Paint	Colorado Paint Company – Division of Swarco	V-27	
11133	1196 Yellow Lead Free Low Temperature Waterborne Traffic Paint	Colorado Paint Company – Division of Swarco	V-27	
11134	IDEAL-Buchanan SLK Breakaway Fuse Kit	IDEAL Industries, Inc	V-32J	
11139	Model TRP-C45D3154C30 Countdown LED Pedestrian Module	Excellence Opto, Inc.	V-56	
12002	TB2-17 (Type 2 Base) and TB3-17 (Type 3 Base) [Cem-Tec]	Cem-Tec Corporation	V-31Y	
12004	Preformed Loop Detector (Model No. CG16MM)	Patriot Detection, LLC	V-58	Note: Use for traffic counts but not for signal detection.

<b>Product ID No.</b>	<b>Product Name</b>	<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Subcategory</b>	<b>Comment</b>
12034	STS NEMA TS1 Controller Cabinet (Model numbers 554426 & 774426)	Scanlon Traffic Systems	V-34	

## **VII. PROGRAM FOR FUTURE**

The Product Evaluation Program will continue to actively involve the Product Evaluation Committees in the product evaluation process. Equally important is providing timely responses and evaluations to vendors submitting product applications to the Product Evaluation Program. The evaluation process was revised to incorporate electronic file transfer in the application process. For most applications a “pdf” copy of the file is made. All documents and letters related to the evaluation are also made available in electronic form. ASU, under the Product Evaluation Program contract, hosts a secure web site that stores these documents for access by the evaluators and the MatPEC. In addition, ADOT has an APL ftp site with user-specific folders for Consultants, the PECs, and the subcommittees.

The Product Evaluation Program Team is working with the ADOT information technology staff to create an automated application on the internet. On February 9, 2012, the Product Evaluation Program policy was revised. The revised policy is in Appendix A. The Product Evaluation Program will continue to maintain the APL entries as well as change or remove unnecessary categories and subcategories. Application recertifications will be tracked in an Excel spreadsheet, or if appropriate, an Access database until application automation is completed.

**APPENDIX A: ADOT PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM POLICY, EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 9, 2012**



# ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

## SUP-9.01 PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM

Effective: February 9, 2012  
Supersedes: SUP-9.01 (04/21/2008)  
Responsible Office: Research Center, (602) 712-6430

Review: February 9, 2014  
Transmittal: 2012 - February  
Page 1 of 5

### 1.01 PURPOSE

The purpose of this Policy, which was originally established by Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Highways Division Policy and Implementation Memorandum 92-08 and modified by ADOT Intermodal Transportation Division Policy and Implementation Memorandum 99-01, is to delineate responsibilities and procedures for the evaluation and approval of new products.

### 1.02 SCOPE / APPLICABILITY

This Policy applies to ADOT entities involved with selecting, evaluating, using or specifying the use of new products for use on, or in association with, ADOT roadways.

### 1.03 AUTHORITY

This policy is promulgated under the authority and approval of the Director of the ADOT Multimodal Planning Division.

### 1.04 BACKGROUND

- A. The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Product Evaluation Program is conducted under the sponsorship of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) through the Highway Planning and Research Program. The Product Evaluation Program is established as item 116 under the State Planning and Research Program, Research Support Programs. The Product Evaluation Program coordinates the review and acceptance of new products for possible use by ADOT and maintains the Approved Products List (APL).
- B. On July 1, 1992, three committees were formed under the Highways Division Policy and Implementation Memorandum No. 92-08. This policy was replaced by ADOT Intermodal Transportation Division Policy and Implementation Memorandum No. 99-01, New Products Evaluation and Approval Process, effective December 1999.
- C. The Product Evaluation Program is now under the authority of the ADOT Multimodal Planning Division (MPD) and administered by the Research Center.

### 1.05 DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS

ADOT	Arizona Department of Transportation
Approved Products List (APL)	A list of products which have been evaluated or meet ADOT standard specifications and are approved for ADOT use
ATSSA	American Traffic Safety Services Association
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation

Lead Evaluator	The person assigned by one or more PECs to coordinate the initial review of a product application.
MatPEC	Materials Product Evaluation Committee
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheet
MUTCD	Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
New Product	Any product submitted for approval that is not on the Approved Products List (APL) at the time of its submittal or has not been previously evaluated.
PEC	Product Evaluation Committee
PRIDE	Product Resource Investment Deployment and Evaluation. Effective February 1, 2011, the PRIDE program's name was changed to Product Evaluation Program.
TCPEC	Traffic Control Product Evaluation Committee

**1.06 PRODUCT EVALUATION COMMITTEES**

- A. Two Product Evaluation Committees (PECs) are established under this Policy, the Traffic Control Product Evaluation Committee (TCPEC) and the Materials Product Evaluation Committee (MatPEC). The PECs are responsible for coordinating the evaluation of new products within the parameters of their operational policies. The PECs are responsible for coordinating the introduction of new, cost effective products and technologies to ADOT. The PEC chairpersons shall be responsible for resolving issues within their respective PECs and coordinating the resolution of issues that include both PECs.
- B. The TCPEC has the authority to approve or disapprove all traffic control products for addition to the Approved Products List (APL) or to remove traffic control products from the APL that are no longer acceptable to ADOT.
- C. The TCPEC shall be chaired by the Assistant State Engineer, Traffic Group. The chairperson shall determine the membership of the TCPEC, subject to the conditions of this paragraph. The chairperson may consult with other TCPEC members regarding individuals or organizations to include in the TCPEC. Members shall include at least 10 ADOT employees and may also include up to 7 additional individuals from outside organizations. The following organizations may be invited to nominate members to the TCPEC.
  - 1. FHWA – 1 member maximum
  - 2. ATSSA – 2 members maximum
  - 3. Local governments – 2 members maximum
  - 4. *Ad hoc* members – 2 members maximum
- D. The *ad hoc* members may be added at the discretion of the TCPEC and may include, but are not limited to, university representatives or members of the general public. The total number of TCPEC members shall be determined by the TCPEC chairperson.
- E. The MatPEC has the authority to approve or disapprove materials products for addition to the APL or to remove materials products from the APL that are no longer acceptable to ADOT.

- F. The MatPEC shall be chaired by the Assistant State Engineer, Materials Group. The chairperson shall determine the membership of the MatPEC, subject to the conditions of this paragraph. The chairperson may consult with other MatPEC members regarding individuals or organizations to include in the MatPEC. Members shall include at least 5 ADOT employees and may also include a maximum of 4 additional individuals from outside organizations (including FHWA). The total number of MatPEC members shall be determined by the MatPEC chairperson.
- G. The Product Evaluation Program manager will serve as the administrator to the PECs and shall maintain the APL.
- H. Establishing of Subcommittees: Subcommittees can be established by any PEC to review specialty issues. The subcommittees shall conduct themselves within the charters that are set by their originating PEC, and shall report all their findings and recommendations to the originating PEC for decision.

#### **1.07 APPROVED PRODUCTS LIST (APL)**

- A. The APL is to serve as a guide to what products are acceptable for use for construction on the State Highway System. However, not all products used by ADOT are listed on the APL. Moreover, the APL does not address most products that are to be used only on a temporary basis such as flagging systems, temporary barrier, and other items associated with work zones or temporary activities. The PECs may elect to modify the APL by adding, deleting or modifying categories within their areas of responsibility.
- B. The Product Evaluation Program manager will maintain the APL. The APL format shall be developed and revised, as necessary, by the Product Evaluation Program manager with the concurrence of the PEC chairpersons.

#### **1.08 PRODUCT EVALUATION APPLICATIONS**

- A. The format of the product evaluation application shall be developed by the Product Evaluation Program manager, with concurrence from the PEC chairpersons. Modifications or updates to the application format may be made at the discretion of this group.
- B. Procedures for submitting a product evaluation application shall be developed by the Product Evaluation Program manager, with concurrence from the PEC chairpersons. Modifications or updates to these procedures may be made at the discretion of this group and will be documented in meeting summaries.

#### **1.09 TESTING**

For products being proposed for inclusion on the APL that require testing, the testing may be performed by ADOT or by an independent testing laboratory. The PEC will determine what tests are to be performed on a given product and assign an individual to direct the tests. Test results shall be documented. Product manufacturer and/or distributor is responsible for all costs associated with providing product samples, support, and testing.

#### **1.10 EVALUATION PROCESS**

- A. Once the application is received, it is issued a product identification number and stored in the database. The application will be reviewed by the Product Evaluation Program manager for determination of whether the product is suitable for the APL and take one of three actions:

1. If product is not addressed by the APL, a non-APL notice is sent to the applicant and no further action taken.
2. If product is suitable for the APL, the Product Evaluation Program manager will search the database to ensure product has not been evaluated previously.
  - a. If product previously evaluated, then applicant needs to explain what has changed with their product, otherwise they will be sent a notice stating product has previously been evaluated and no further action taken.
  - b. If product has not been previously evaluated, the product will be presented at the appropriate PEC meeting and assigned to a lead evaluator(s), if necessary.
- B. The lead evaluator(s) will review product application, verify product meets applicable drawings and/or specifications, and coordinate with the Product Evaluation Program manager if additional information is needed. If a product appears to have a potential chemical safety or health concern, a copy of the product's material safety data sheet (MSDS) will be forwarded to the ADOT Safety and Health Office for evaluation and determination by ADOT with respect to safety and health considerations.
- C. If additional product information is requested by the department, the applicant has thirty (30) days to respond to request. Failure to respond to request will suspend product from further evaluation. Product Evaluation Program manager will notify applicant that product evaluation has been suspended and no further action taken.
- D. Upon completion of the initial evaluation, the product application will be scheduled for discussion at a meeting of the appropriate PEC. The PEC may then vote on the acceptability of the product, or request further evaluation. If further evaluation is required, the process will continue until the PEC makes a final decision on the application.
- E. The Product Evaluation Program manager will notify the applicant via email of the PEC's decision and will enter decision into the database.

#### **1.11 APPLICANT NOTIFICATION**

The Product Evaluation Program manager will provide a written notification to the applicant regarding the PEC's decision. When a product is approved, the notice to the applicant will contain the approval date and the date the product requires recertification (usually five years from approval date). If a product is disapproved, the applicant will receive a disapproval notice with sufficient information to ensure the applicant understands the reason(s) the subject product was not approved.

#### **1.12 APPEAL PROCESS**

- A. Appeals to a committee decision must be submitted to the Product Evaluation Program manager within thirty (30) days from the notification date. Appeals will be reviewed by the PEC, who will vote on approving or denying the appeal. The appeal will be presented to the committee in their next meeting if it has been received more than fourteen (14) days before the scheduled meeting. At minimum, the appeal shall include:
  1. The name, address and telephone number of the appellant.
  2. The appellant's signature.
  3. Name of the product and product evaluation program identification number.
  4. Detailed statement of facts for the appeal with supporting documents to specifically address the reason for the appeal.

5. The form of relief suggested.
  - B. All appeal correspondence shall be addressed to the Product Evaluation Program manager. The program manager will review the appeal submitted by the applicant for completeness. The appeal will be considered incomplete if it addresses only the disagreement with the PEC's decision without pointing out any error in the PEC's analysis or the procedure through which this product was evaluated. Only those completed appeals received by the program manager within the stated 30-calendar-day limit will be presented to the PECs for ruling. Presentation of the completed appeals will be in the next meeting of the respective PEC if they are received by the program manager more than 14 calendar days before the scheduled meeting. After considering all the facts that have been presented by the applicant and the responsible PEC, the PEC may select one or more of the following resolutions:
    1. Require a new test or evaluation by ADOT.
    2. Require a new test or evaluation by an independent testing laboratory.
    3. Add the subject product to the APL.
    4. Deny the appeal.

#### **1.13 PRODUCT RECERTIFICATION PROCESS**

When a product reaches its recertification date, a notice is sent to the manufacturer. The manufacturer must send a response via email stating that the product is still offered for sale under the same trade name and manufactured by the same specifications it was approved under. Upon receipt of the manufacturer's response, the product certification will be renewed for five years on the APL. Changes to company name or contact information are recorded in the APL database and in the APL.

The manufacturer must respond within sixty (60) days of receiving email in order for their product to remain on the APL. If there is no response within sixty (60) days, or the email is returned, the Product Evaluation Program manager will determine if a product should be deleted from the APL based on the recertification action. The final action is recorded in the APL database.

#### **1.14 INACTIVE STATUS**

A product will go into inactive status if product has expired on the APL. Expired products will be presented to the PEC for consideration in removing from APL. A product may remain in inactive status for up to sixty (60) days beyond expiration date.

**APPENDIX B: PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS AND FORMS,  
EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 1, 2011**

## PRODUCT EVALUATION APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

# Product Evaluation Application Instructions

## Introduction

The Product Evaluation Program is designed to assist the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) select products for use by the Department. Products selected through the program are listed on the ADOT [Approved Products List](#) (APL).

The categories of products covered by the program are shown on the APL. A request for evaluation requires submission of an application. The format of this submittal is discussed in the following sections. A separate application shall be submitted for each product. Furthermore, a product with more than one use in the highway industry shall be submitted with a separate application for each category.

**Note: Effective February 1, 2011, all applications must be submitted electronically to: [apl@azdot.gov](mailto:apl@azdot.gov).**

**NO applications will be accepted by mail after February 1, 2011.  
Thank you for your cooperation.**

Please submit application(s) to: [apl@azdot.gov](mailto:apl@azdot.gov) (include product name in subject line). Also include contact name, telephone number and mailing address in the body of the message.

You will receive an email response within two weeks.

Have questions? Please contact:

**ADOT Product Evaluation Program Manager**  
Tel: 602.712.6430  
Email: [apl@azdot.gov](mailto:apl@azdot.gov)

## Reference Documents

[Application for Product Evaluation](#)

[Approved Products List](#)

[ADOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction - 2000](#)

[ADOT Stored Specifications](#) (updates to 2000 *Standard Specifications*)

## Evaluation Options

Only one of the following options should be selected for each Application.

- (1) Applications for products covered by current ADOT specifications should be submitted using the guidance described in Section 1 of these instructions.
- (2) Applications for products that are not covered by current ADOT specifications should be submitted using the guidance described in Section 2 of these instructions.

## 1. Acceptance Based on Current Specifications

The *Applicant* must identify the APL category or categories that would list this product. A copy of the APL may be viewed or downloaded here:

<http://www.azdot.gov/TPD/ATRC/apl/apl.asp>

ADOT has standard specifications and standard drawings, which encompass many of the products in the highway industry. If ADOT has applicable specifications the product will be evaluated based on these specifications. If this option is selected the applicant should identify the section of the ADOT specifications and other specifications that apply to the product under the *Application* heading *Product Meets the Following Specifications and Test Procedures*.

ADOT specifications and standard drawings are available from the Internet at: <http://www.azdot.gov/Highways/ConstGrp/Contractors/StandardSpecifications.asp> or from ADOT Engineering Records. The complete reference copy of the specifications, *Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction - 2000*, is available in hard copy from:

Arizona Department of Transportation  
Engineering Records Section  
1655 W. Jackson - Room 175 - Mail Drop 112F  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3217  
Telephone 602.712.8216 or 712.7498  
FAX: 602.712.3235

Updates to the reference document, or Stored Specifications, are available from the Internet at:

[http://www.azdot.gov/Highways/cns/CNS\\_Stored\\_specs.asp](http://www.azdot.gov/Highways/cns/CNS_Stored_specs.asp)

The *Application* should include necessary support documentation, such as certifications of compliance from independent laboratories and Material Safety Data Sheets. It is the *Applicant's* responsibility to satisfy all criteria set forth in ADOT current specifications.

## 2. Request for Evaluation

The *Applicant* must identify the category or categories that would list this product in the [Approved Product List](#).

Products which have no applicable ADOT specifications or standards require a case-by-case evaluation. The evaluation program will be based on the recommendation of one of ADOT's Product Evaluation Committees (Materials or Traffic Control).

The *Application* should include necessary support documentation, such as reports, brochures, etc. The supporting material should demonstrate the product's advantages and benefits to ADOT. Each *Application* submitted under *Section 2* of this Policy shall contain, as a minimum, the following elements:

1. A completed *Application* signed by an authorized agent of the company.

Arizona Department of Transportation  
Product Evaluation Program

2. An estimated cost of the product or procedure (delivered to Phoenix).
3. Specifications for the product or procedure.
4. A description of the claimed advantages over existing products or procedures (be specific).
5. Verification of the advantages. (Include laboratory reports, data, calculations, etc.)
6. History of past use, if any. Include reports of evaluations, if any, with names and telephone numbers of contacts, and whether or not such evaluations support the claimed advantages.
7. Availability of product. (State whether the product is in commercial production. If so in what quantities? If not when will it be?)
8. Safety and environmental precautions associated with the product or procedure. Include a completed copy of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration Material Safety Data Sheet.
9. Description of the desired evaluation program. Discuss the project type, project duration, quantities, controls, specifications, special features, etc.
10. A statement that the product or procedure will be provided to ADOT free of charge in support of the proposed evaluation program.
11. A statement that the *Applicant* will provide technical assistance in formulating the evaluation program at no cost to ADOT.
12. A statement that the *Applicant* will reimburse ADOT for costs involved in conducting any special tests or other extra costs involved in testing. The terms and conditions of the *Applicant's* reimbursement offer should be clearly stated, including, but not limited to statements regarding the maximum funding proposed by the *Applicant* for the evaluation, the proposed joint adventure agreement, and the terms of reimbursement.
13. A statement that the *Applicant* agrees to provide on-site technical assistance during any field tests at no cost to ADOT.
14. A statement granting permission to ADOT to reproduce, in full or in part, any information supplied by the *Applicant* in association with the *Application* unless specifically excluded and clearly marked as not being authorized for reproduction. This permission also will apply to material with copyrights held by the *Applicant*.

**Items 11 through 14 above must be explicitly listed in the *Application*. If the *Applicant* cannot comply with a condition required by Items 11 through 14, this must be clearly stated in the *Application*, along with special terms or conditions the *Applicant* proposes to place upon such requirements.**

If a Product Evaluation Committee recommends a product for evaluation, the Committee will propose an ADOT evaluation strategy. This may include preparation of a work plan to accomplish the evaluation. Evaluations will be performed in strict accordance with such work plans.

## Material Safety Data Sheets

A Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) must be included in applications for products with chemical constituents. The MSDS must list all hazardous and non-hazardous materials. A statement that a portion of the product is made up of non-hazardous materials is not sufficient information for ADOT to evaluate the product.

## Exceptions

This policy shall not preclude ADOT from performing, on its own initiative, evaluations or field tests of any product or procedure which may benefit ADOT. This includes products or procedures originating from sources other than vendors, as well as vendor proposals which include exceptions to requirements set forth in this policy.

## Product Endorsement

The evaluation or use of a product by ADOT does not constitute an endorsement by ADOT nor does it imply a commitment to purchase, recommend, or specify the product in the future. Furthermore, the vendor is prohibited from using ADOT or its test results in product advertising.

**PLEASE DO NOT SEND ANY PRODUCT SAMPLES  
UNLESS REQUESTED BY ADOT**

**APPLICATION FOR PRODUCT EVALUATION**

**Note:** Effective February 1, 2011, applications must be submitted electronically to: [apl@azdot.gov](mailto:apl@azdot.gov)

I, \_\_\_\_\_ being an authorized  
(Name of Company Representative)

agent of \_\_\_\_\_, request that  
(Company Name)

the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) perform a product evaluation of

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Product)

I have read and understood the ADOT Product Evaluation Instructions. The subject product (hereinafter PRODUCT) is submitted for evaluation under the Product Evaluation Program as noted below. (Select either a *Section 1* or *Section 2* evaluation by checking the applicable statement.)

\_\_\_\_\_ *PRODUCT is submitted to ADOT for evaluation under current specifications.*  
**Submit all the necessary information as described in SECTION 1 of the Application instructions.** When selecting this option you must identify the section of the ADOT specifications and other specifications that apply to the product under the Application heading *Product Meets the Following Specifications and Test Procedures.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *PRODUCT is not covered by ADOT specifications. PRODUCT is submitted to ADOT for evaluation under Production Evaluation Program criteria.*  
**Submit all the necessary information as described in SECTION 2 of the Application instructions.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Company Representative)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(DATE)

Identify the ADOT Approved Products List (APL) category or categories that would list this PRODUCT. A copy of the APL may be viewed or downloaded from the PRIDE web site at:  
<http://www.azdot.gov/TPD/ATRC/apl/index.asp>

**APL Categories applicable to the PRODUCT (list specific sub-categories):**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Arizona Department of Transportation  
Product Evaluation Program

**Has the PRODUCT previously been submitted to the Product Evaluation Program for evaluation?**

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

If yes, please provide the previous application identification number(s).

---

---

**Is the PRODUCT part of a family of products that has been previously evaluated under the Product Evaluation Program?**

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

If yes, please identify and describe this family of products.

---

---

---

---

**Is the PRODUCT a replacement for a product the *Applicant* manufactures that is presently on the APL?**

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

If yes, please identify the product being replaced and the applicable APL category.

---

---

---

---

Arizona Department of Transportation  
Product Evaluation Program

**MANUFACTURER:** \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

WEBSITE: \_\_\_\_\_

CONTACT: \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

E-MAIL: \_\_\_\_\_

**DISTRIBUTOR:** \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

WEBSITE: \_\_\_\_\_

CONTACT: \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

E-MAIL: \_\_\_\_\_

**PRODUCT:**

Trade Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Description: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Primary Use: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Secondary Use: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Guarantee: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Arizona Department of Transportation  
Product Evaluation Program

PRODUCT MEETS THE FOLLOWING SPECIFICATIONS AND TEST PROCEDURES:

(The applicable ADOT Specification **must be identified** for *Section 1* Applications.)

ADOT: \_\_\_\_\_  
ASTM: \_\_\_\_\_  
AASHTO: \_\_\_\_\_  
OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

PRODUCT is proposed for the following specific uses: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL:

Attach available literature pertaining to the product, including, but not limited to, instructions and limitations for use, composition or laboratory analyses, handling precautions, health hazards, a complete Material Safety Data Sheet, specifications, installation and maintenance manuals or pamphlets, and cost. The Arizona Department of Transportation reserves the right to refuse to test any material that cannot be safely tested with the laboratory equipment available to ADOT. If unused product portions would be considered hazardous waste (as defined by 40 CFR 261 *et seq.*) then the *Applicant* must accept the financial responsibility for proper return or disposal of this material.

Submit completed *Application* and the appropriate attachments to:  
[apl@azdot.gov](mailto:apl@azdot.gov) (include product name in subject line)

You will receive an email response within two business days.

Got questions, please contact:

**ADOT Product Evaluation Program Manager**  
**Tel: 602.712.6430**  
**Email: [apl@azdot.gov](mailto:apl@azdot.gov)**

**PLEASE DO NOT SEND ANY PRODUCT SAMPLES  
UNLESS REQUESTED BY ADOT**

**NO applications will be accepted by mail after February 1, 2011. All  
applications must be submitted electronically to:  
[apl@azdot.gov](mailto:apl@azdot.gov).**

**Thank you for your cooperation.**