PRIDE

Product Resource Investment Deployment and Evaluation

PROGRAM

Annual Report
2004

Arizona Department of Transportation
Arizona Transportation Research Center

Arizona Department of Transportation
Arizona Transportation Research Center
2739 East Washington Street
Mail Drop 075R
Phoenix, Arizona 85034-1422
tel: (602) 712-3134

PREFACE

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Product Resource Investment Deployment and Evaluation (PRIDE) Program is conducted under the sponsorship of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) through the Highway Planning and Research Program. The PRIDE program is partially funded by Project Number SPR-116 under the State Planning and Research Program, Research Support Programs. The PRIDE program coordinates the review and acceptance of new products for possible use by ADOT and maintains the Approved Products List (APL).

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.

Under the 99-01 Policy, three Product Evaluation Committees (PECs) are created – the Maintenance PEC, Materials PEC, and the Traffic Control PEC. The PECs are responsible for establishing the operational policy for the new products evaluation and approval process under the PRIDE program.

On July 18, 2002, a new ADOT PRIDE policy (*SUP-9.01 PRODUCT RESOURCE INVESTMENT DEPLOYMENT AND EVALUATION (PRIDE) PROGRAM*) was adopted. Under this policy the Maintenance PEC was eliminated with maintenance groups being represented on each of the two remaining PECs. Unlike previous policies, this policy was adopted as an ADOT, agency-wide policy.

Mr. Frank T. Darmiento of the Arizona Transportation Research Center (ATRC) administers the PRIDE program. He is assisted by Mr. Nick Samuelson of ATRC.

The objective of this report is to document the efforts of ADOT's PRIDE program for the 2004 calendar year. This report describes product evaluation activities from January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2004.

Information about the PRIDE program may also be found on ADOT's Internet site, **www.azdot.gov/TPD/ATRC/index.asp** Information on the PRIDE program may be accessed by selecting ***Pride Program.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

APPENDICES

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. However, 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 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.

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 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 ATRC. 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 of 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 highway construction-related materials. This committee included representatives from the following units: ADOT Districts, the Maintenance Section, Highway Plans Services, the Utility Section, the Materials Section, and ATRC. 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 ATRC. ATRC 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 current PRIDE policy, *SUP-9.01 PRODUCT RESOURCE INVESTMENT DEPLOYMENT AND EVALUATION (PRIDE) PROGRAM*, became effective on July 18, 2002. It provides for two Product Evaluation Committees (PECs), Materials (MatPEC) and Traffic Control (TCPEC). The PECs are responsible 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 often 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 have the authority to remove previously approved products from the APL that are later found to be unacceptable.

A copy of the current PRIDE program policy is included in *Appendix A*. During 2004, the PRIDE program was administered by Mr. Frank T. Darmiento.

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 2004, on February 26, May 11, August 25 and November 15. Members of the MatPEC during 2004 are listed in *Table 1*.

TABLE 1
MATERIALS PRODUCT EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS DURING 2004

Jim Delton	Materials Group – Chairman
Chad Auker	Materials Group, Flagstaff
Phil Bleyl	Federal Highway Administration
David Burbank	Regional Materials Engineer, Tucson District
Ken Cooper	Roadway Support
Frank Darmiento	Arizona Transportation Research Center
Lonnie Hendrix	Asst. State Maintenance Engineer
John Ivanov	Materials Group
Oscar Mousavi	Structural Material Testing Engineer, Materials Group
Perry Powell	District Engineer, Phoenix Construction District
Allan Samuels	Construction Operations
Scott Weinland	Engineer, Regional Materials

Pipe Subcommittee

In order to properly review pipe products, MatPEC established a Pipe Subcommittee. The subcommittee is chaired by Ken Cooper of Roadway Design Section. The subcommittee reviews and reports its recommendations to the MatPEC. The MatPEC makes the final decisions on Pipe Subcommittee recommendations.

The Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe Association (CPPA) Division of the Plastic Pipe Institute (PPI) developed a third party certification program for plastic pipe manufacturers. The PPI is the major

trade association representing all segments of the plastic pipe industry including pipe manufacturers, resin manufacturers, and other interested groups. This third party certification program was established by CPPA in the fall of 2001. Third party certification is a process by which a manufacturer states that a product meets or exceeds the requirements of a standard. The third party program evaluates whether or not the manufacturer's product meets or exceeds the applicable AASHTO standards through independent testing and inspection. The PPI pipe certification program tests for the material, dimensional, and physical performance properties specified in the AASHTO standard (M294) for pipe diameters from 12 to 60-inches and AASHTO standard M252 for pipe diameter from 4 to 10 inches. In addition, certified manufacturers of both pipe and resin are subject to random plant audits by TRI Environmental, Inc., a consultant employed by PPI under this program. The Pipe Subcommittee met on October 1, 2002 to discuss the approach to ensure these companies are in compliance with the new certification requirements. The committee decided to require both the third party PPI certification as well as joint-test certification of all pipe vendors.

During 2004, two manufacturers with active PRIDE applications participated in the PPI third party certification program. These included Hancor Inc. and Advanced Drainage Systems (ADS). Sizes up to 48 inches in diameter were approved for the APL. A decision on larger diameter pipes was deferred, pending a revision of the ADOT drainage pipe special provisions.

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 2004, on March 25, June 17, September 16, and December 2. Members of the TCPEC during 2004 are listed in *Table 2*.

TABLE 2
TRAFFIC CONTROL PRODUCT EVALUATION COMMITTEE
MEMBERS DURING 2004

Mike Manthey	Assistant State Engineer – Traffic Group – Chairman
George Chin	Regional Traffic Engineer – Phoenix Region
Mark Clark	Maricopa County Department of Transportation
Ken Cooper	Roadway Support
Craig Cornwell	Phoenix Maintenance District
Frank Darmiento	Arizona Transportation Research Center
David Duffy	Traffic Design Manager – Traffic Group
Jim Elliott	Pavement Marking, Inc.
Chuck Gillick	Regional Traffic Engineer – Flagstaff District
Tom Goodman	Traffic Operations
Lonnie Hendrix	Assistant State Maintenance Engineer - Maintenance Group
Roger Hopt	Western Region Traffic
Paul Hurst	Team Leader – Construction Operation
Jeff Johnson	Trafficade Service, Inc.
Reza Karimvand	Regional Traffic Engineer – Baja Region
Joe McGuirk	Phoenix Maintenance District
Oscar Mousavi	Material Testing Engineer – Materials Group
Steve Puzas	Safford District Maintenance
Dr. Craig Roberts	Northern Arizona University
Andy Roth	Resident Engineer-Prescott District
Tony Voyles	Transportation Technology Group
George Wendt	Manager - Risk Management

PRODUCT EVALUATION PROCESS

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

(1) Products that are covered by an existing ADOT specification or drawing are evaluated based on the appropriate specifications or drawings.
(2) Products that have no applicable ADOT specifications or drawings are submitted to one or more of the Product Evaluation Committee for evaluation.

A copy of the PRIDE application instructions is included in *Appendix B*. A copy of the PRIDE application form is found in *Appendix C*.

Each PRIDE application is assigned to an ADOT staff person, consultant or PEC member to coordinate the initial evaluation of the product. In some cases the evaluation includes testing by the ADOT Materials Testing Laboratory. For products evaluated by the Materials Section, including the Materials Testing Laboratory, a Product Evaluation Report is prepared by the Materials Section. This report is incorporated into the evaluation of the subject product application.

For product applications that are not appropriate for evaluation by the Materials Section the review process consists of canvassing affected sections, other state agencies and research organizations to verify the information provided in the proposals. A Product Summary report is

then published by ATRC and submitted to the appropriate Product Evaluation Committees for a decision.

For product applications reviewed by the TCPEC the review process consists of canvassing affected sections, other state agencies and research organizations to verify the information provided in the proposals. Field tests are conducted as directed by the TCPEC.

Vendors of unsuccessful requests are notified by ATRC. If a vendor disagrees with a Committee's decision to reject a product, the vendor 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.

STATUS OF THE PRODUCT EVALUATION PROGRAM

The APL is updated and published monthly *via* the Internet and ADOT's Intranet. 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 re-certified by the vendor to remain on the list after the approval period expires. Re-certification entails verification from the vendor that the listed product is still manufactured as approved. If a product has been substantially modified the vendor must initiate a new PRIDE evaluation for the product. Products that are not re-certified at the expiration of their five-year approval period are removed from the APL. The ADOT web page address is **www.azdot.gov/TPD/ATRC/index.asp** Information on the PRIDE program may be accessed by selecting ***Pride Program.***

A contract was awarded to Western Technologies, Inc. (WTI) and their subcontractor, Arizona State University (ASU) in February 2004 to support the PRIDE program. The focus of the WTI/ASU contract during 2004 was to support the Materials Product Evaluation Committee and provide an engineering student to support the PRIDE program administrative and evaluation tasks.

Chalmers Engineering Services, Inc., under contract to the ADOT Traffic Group, is used also to evaluate PRIDE applications. The focus of the Chalmers work is to support the Traffic Control Product Evaluation Committee.

PRODUCTS CONSIDERED BY THE PRODUCT EVALUATION COMMITTEES

The PRIDE program received 89 applications during 2004. The MatPEC approved seventeen products for the APL. The TCPEC approved fourteen products for the APL. Summaries of these decisions are shown in Tables 3-4.

TABLE 3
PRODUCTS APPROVED BY THE
MATERIALS PRODUCT EVALUATION COMMITTEE DURING 2004

Pride ID No.	Product Name	Company Name	Action
99044	42” Dia. CHDEPP	Hancor	Approved for APL
99075	Quilite Noise Barrier	Quilite International	Approved for APL
01010/ 00041	12” Sure-Lok F477	Hancor	Approved for APL
01011/ 00042	15” Sure-Lok F477	Hancor	Approved for APL
01012/ 00043	18” Sure-Lok F477	Hancor	Approved for APL
01013/ 00044	24” Sure-Lok F477	Hancor	Approved for APL
01014/ 00045	30” Sure-Lok F477	Hancor.	Approved for APL
01021	48” Sure-Lok F477	Hancor	Approved for APL
01070	36” Blue Seal	Hancor	Approved for APL
01071	42” Blue Seal	Hancor	Approved for APL
01072	48” Blue Seal	Hancor	Approved for APL
01120	N-12 (12”-60” dia) and N-12 Pro-Link (4”-36” dia.)	ADS.	Approved for APL
03042	Mira 85	W.R. Grace & Co.	Approved for APL
03108	EcoBerm and EcoBlanket Compost Material	WindSwept Organix, Inc.	Approved for APL
04044	ADATILE	ADA Solutions, Inc.	Approved for APL
04048	Armor-Tile Tactile Systems	Engineered Plastics	Approved for APL
04050	Skotchkote 413	3M	Reinstated on APL
04054	EZ-Set Ceramic Composite Panels	Detectable Warning Systems Inc.	Approved for APL

TABLE 4
PRODUCTS APPROVED BY THE
TRAFFIC CONTROL PRODUCT EVALUATION COMMITTEE DURING 2004

PRIDE ID No.	Product Name	Company Name	Action
96028/ 01080	Dent Breakaway Bolt	Dent Breakaway Industries/ Trinity Industries	Approved for APL with note
01010	SCI 100GM	SCI Products	Approved for APL
01026	Uretech HPS-4 Modified Urethane Pavement Markings	Innovative Performance Systems (IPS)	Approved for APL
02016	EZ Drive Marker	Flexstake Inc.	Approved for APL
02109	TD 9100 Guardflex	Three D Traffic Works	Approved for APL
02111	TD 5000	Three D Traffic Works	Approved for APL
02112	TD 5100 Ringtop	Three D Traffic Works	Approved for APL
02116	TD 6000 Vertical	Three D Traffic Works	Approved for APL
02133	T-5500A Series High Intensity Sign Sheeting	Avery Dennison	Approved for APL
03002	TM8212/TM8214 Hotline Epoxy Traffic Marking Paint (Traffic White)	Sherwin Williams	Approved for APL with note.
03060	9400 Series Sign Sheeting	Nippon Carbide	Approved for APL with note.
03112	3M Scotchlite Seties 3980 Wide Angle Prismatic Fluorescent	3M Company	Approved for APL
04007	Inductive Cold Pour Loop Sealant	Brewer Cote of Arizona	Approved for APL
04040	Series 3930 Sign Sheeting	3M Company	Approved for APL with note.

PROGRAM FOR 2005

The PRIDE program in 2005 will continue to actively involve the Product Evaluation Committees in the PRIDE process. Equally important is providing timely responses and evaluations to vendors submitting product applications to the PRIDE program. Objectives for 2004 include continuing quarterly application status reports from evaluators. These updates will then be used to compile a PRIDE program status update for the committees. The PRIDE program will continue to use Western Technologies, Inc. and Arizona State University, as well as Chalmers Engineering Services, Inc. to help with performing product evaluations.

The PRIDE policy was scheduled for review during 2004. A working group with representatives from both Product Evaluation Committees will be convened during 2005 to complete this review.

APPENDIX A

ADOT PRODUCT EVALUATION POLICY

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SUP-9.01 PRODUCT RESOURCE INVESTMENT DEPLOYMENT AND EVALUATION (PRIDE) PROGRAM

Effective: July 18, 2002 Review: July 18, 2004
Supersedes: None Transmittal: 2002 – July
Responsible Office: Arizona Transportation Research Center, (602) 712-3134

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 redefine, reaffirm, and 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 Transportation Planning Division.

1.04 BACKGROUND

a. The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Product Resource Investment Deployment and Evaluation (PRIDE) Program is conducted under the sponsorship of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) through the Highway Planning and Research Program. The PRIDE program is established as item 116 under the State Planning and Research Program, Research Support Programs. The PRIDE 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 PRIDE program is now under the authority of the ADOT Transportation Planning Division (TPD) in the Arizona Transportation Research Center (ATRC).

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

ATRC	Arizona Transportation Research Center
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 which has not previously been evaluated or does not meet a current ADOT specification or standard drawing. Any new materials, equipment, or methods to be used on a federal-aid project which may be included and evaluated in experimental construction (in accordance with Vol. 6, Chap 4, Sec 2, Subsec. 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Program Manual).
PEC	Product Evaluation Committee
PRIDE	Product Resource Investment Deployment and Evaluation Program
TCPEC	Traffic Control Product Evaluation Committee
Traffic Control Products	Various types of materials and equipment necessary to carry out the requirements of the ADOT, MUTCD or FHWA Safety Standards, which shall include but not be limited to signing materials, pavement marking materials, energy attenuators, temporary barrier systems, flexible and non-flexible delineators and those items which are used in traffic signal systems, highway lighting systems and overhead sign lighting systems

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 establishing the operational policy for the new products evaluation and approval process through the PRIDE Program. 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 is responsible for establishing the operating policy under which all traffic control products are evaluated. 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.

- FHWA – 1 member maximum
- ATSSA –2 members maximum
- Local governments – 2 members maximum
- *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 PRIDE program administrator shall be a non-voting member of the TCPEC. The total number of TCPEC members shall be determined by the TCPEC chairperson.

e. The MatPEC is responsible for establishing the operating policy under which all materials-related products are evaluated. 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 PRIDE program administrator shall be a non-voting member of the MatPEC. The total number of MatPEC members shall be determined by the MatPEC chairperson.

g. The Arizona Transportation Research Center (ATRC) through the PRIDE program, is assigned the responsibility of serving as the clearinghouse for all new products. The PRIDE program administrator will serve as the Administrative Secretary to the PECs and shall maintain the APL.

h. Establishing of Sub-committees: Sub-committees can be established by any PEC to review specialty issues. The sub-committees 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 and maintenance by ADOT. Products listed on the APL are to be used unless otherwise specified in contract documents. Not all products used by ADOT are listed on the APL. If an APL category does not exist for a product, approval through the PRIDE program is not needed to use the product. However, the PECs may elect to modify the APL by adding, deleting or modifying APL categories within their areas of responsibility.

b. The PRIDE program administrator will maintain the APL. The APL format shall be developed and revised, as necessary, by the PRIDE program administrator with the concurrence of the PEC chairpersons.

1.08 PRIDE APPLICATIONS

a. The format of the PRIDE application shall be developed by the PRIDE program administrator, 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 PRIDE application shall be developed by the PRIDE program administrator, 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 can be done by ADOT or by an independent testing laboratory. The TCPEC or MatPEC 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 by written reports.

1.10 EVALUATION PROCESS

a. The PRIDE program administrator will evaluate the completeness of all new product applications submitted under the PRIDE program. Those submittals not meeting program requirements will not be forwarded to a PEC for consideration. If an application is submitted for a product that is clearly not addressed by the APL, the PRIDE program administrator will notify the applicant that no action will be taken to either approve or disapprove of the product with respect to the APL.
b. If an application is submitted for a product that the PRIDE program administrator believes may be of interest to a PEC the product information will be presented at the appropriate PEC meeting. A PEC may create or modify an APL category to accommodate a product if the PEC believes there is a need for such an action.

c. Each complete application will be logged into a database maintained by the PRIDE program administrator and assigned a unique identification (ID) number. After an application is logged in the PRIDE program administrator will coordinate identification of lead evaluators for the product with the PEC chairpersons. If a product appears to have a potential chemical safety or health concern a copy of the material safety data sheet (MSDS) for the product will be forwarded to the ADOT Safety and Health unit for evaluation. Further consideration of such products will be subject to a written response from the ADOT Safety and Health unit confirming their acceptability to ADOT with respect to safety and health considerations.

d. After applicable safety and health approvals (if any) are obtained the PRIDE program administrator will forward a copy of the application to the lead evaluators. The lead evaluators will then be responsible for reviewing the applicant's submittal determining whether additional information from the vendor is needed and how to implement tests specified by the PECs, if any, or other tests that may be necessary.

e. Upon completion of the initial evaluation the product application will be scheduled for discussion at a meeting of the appropriate PEC. The applicable PECs may then vote on the

acceptability of the product, or request further evaluation. If further evaluation is required, the process will continue until the applicable PECs make a final decision on the application.

1.11 APPLICANT NOTIFICATION

If a product is approved for listing on the APL, the PRIDE program administrator will provide a written notification to the applicant regarding this approval. If a product is disapproved the applicant will be notified of this decision and a copy of applicable documentation will be sent to the applicant. The disapproval notice will contain sufficient information to ensure the applicant can understand the reasons the subject product was not approved. (See Section 1.12.) When a product is approved, the notice to the applicant will contain the approval date and the date the product requires re-certification.

1.12 APPEAL PROCESS

a. If a product receives an unfavorable decision from a PEC after the committee has reviewed the applicant's proposal and all relevant information, the applicant will be notified. The applicant may file an appeal with the PRIDE program administrator. The appeal must be received by ADOT within 30 days after the vendor receives notification from the PRIDE program administrator. The appeal shall be in writing and shall include the following information as a minimum:

   (1) The name, address and telephone number of the appellant.
   (2) The appellant's signature.
   (3) Name of the product and PRIDE program identification number.
   (4) A detailed statement of the factual grounds for the appeal with supporting documents to specifically address the shortcomings of the PEC analysis.
   (5) The form of relief suggested.

b. All appeal correspondence shall be addressed to the PRIDE program. The PRIDE program administrator 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 PRIDE program 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 PRIDE program administrator 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.

APPENDIX B

PRIDE APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

PRODUCT EVALUATION APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) strives to develop and maintain the State highway system in a cost-effective manner. The materials and products used to accomplish this are an important element in achieving this goal. Before accepting new products or materials for use on the State highway system ADOT thoroughly evaluates the item's performance, reliability, cost, and safety though its Product Resource Investment Deployment and Evaluation (PRIDE) program.

Product evaluations are often requested by outside parties (*Applicants*) as a means of demonstrating claimed advantages of a product or procedure. These evaluations require commitments of time and resources by ADOT. To help expedite these evaluations, it is the *Applicant's* responsibility to comply with the policy stated herein. Deviations from this policy may cause delay or rejection of such requests.

A request for evaluation requires submission of a complete Application for Product Evaluation (*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 use.

All requests must be submitted to ADOT with the appropriate forms and the required information.

Two complete copies of each application (including attachments) must be submitted.

The submittal address is:

PRIDE Program
Arizona Department of Transportation
2739 East Washington Street, Mail Drop 075R
Phoenix, Arizona 85034-1422

Tel: (602) 712-3134

The Approved Products List and these forms are available *via* the Internet at:

www.azdot.gov
Select: Planning/Research Center/PRIDE Program
Download the Approved Products List

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

B. Acceptance Based on Current Specifications

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/CNS/CNS_Stored_specs.asp

or from:

ADOT Engineering Records
1655 W. Jackson St., Mail Drop 112F
Phoenix AZ 85007
(602) 712-7498

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

C. Request for Evaluation

Products which have no applicable ADOT specifications require a case-by-case evaluation. The evaluation program will be based on the recommendation of one of ADOT's Product Evaluation Committees (Materials and 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 C* of this Policy shall contain, as a minimum, the following elements:

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

D. 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.

E. 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 UNTIL THEY ARE REQUESTED BY ADOT

APPENDIX C

PRIDE APPLICATION FORM

Application for Product Evaluation

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 Policy. I recommend that the following course of action be taken: (**<u>one action per request</u>**)

_____ Submit the product to ADOT for acceptance under current specifications **(Submit all the necessary information as described in *Section B* of ADOT's Product Evaluation Policy.)**

_____ Submit the product for evaluation by ADOT **(Submit all the necessary information as described in *Section C* of ADOT's Product Evaluation Policy.)**

REQUEST FOR PRODUCT ACCEPTANCE
UNDER CURRENT ADOT SPECIFICATIONS

DATE_____

MANUFACTURER:_____

ADDRESS:_____

_____

CONTACT:_____

TELEPHONE:_____

FAX:_____

DISTRIBUTOR:_____

ADDRESS:_____

_____

CONTACT:_____

TELEPHONE:_____

FAX:_____

PRODUCT:

Trade Name:_____

Description:_____

_____

_____

_____

Primary Use:_____

_____

_____

Secondary Use:_____

_____

_____

Guarantee:_____

_____

PRODUCT MEETS THE FOLLOWING SPECIFICATIONS AND TEST PROCEDURES:

ADOT: _____

ASTM: _____

AASHTO: _____

OTHER: _____

Product is proposed for the following uses: _____

_____

_____

_____

GENERAL:

Attach available literature pertaining to the product, including, but limited to, instructions and limitations for use, composition or laboratory analyses, handling precautions, health hazards, a complete Material Safety Data Sheet, specifications, 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.

_____

(Signature of Company Representative)

Return the completed *Application* and the appropriate attachments to:

PRIDE Program
Arizona Department of Transportation
2739 East Washington Street, Mail Drop 075R
Phoenix, Arizona 85034-1422

Tel: (602) 712-3134