

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

9 How would you rate the following elements of the Peer Exchange?

- Usefulness of overall experience

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Relevance of the peer presentations

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

10 How did you benefit from participating in the peer exchange?

11 Please add any additional comments or suggestions related to the event:

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

Mid-West States Bridge Load Rating Peer Exchange

Evaluation Form

Name (Optional): Debra Bradshaw

Agency (Optional): MoDOT

1 Was the purpose of the peer exchange clearly articulated?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

2 What aspects of this event did you find to be the **most** beneficial?

OSBW - permitting information

3 What aspects of this event did you find to be the **least** beneficial?

4 Did we accomplish the objectives and goals of the peer exchange?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

5 Name two specific practices you heard at the exchange that you plan to implement in your state?

research AAASH TOWare

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

9 How would you rate the following elements of the Peer Exchange?

- Usefulness of overall experience

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


- Relevance of the peer presentations

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

10 How did you benefit from participating in the peer exchange?

It was informational however, I'm in the
OSAW permitting office (the step before
it goes to Budget Dir)
So most was not
in my daily duties
however, it was
Very interesting.
Good job!

11 Please add any additional comments or suggestions related to the event:



Mid-West States Bridge Load Rating Peer Exchange

Evaluation Form

Name (Optional): AMJAD WAHZEED

Agency (Optional): OHIO DOT

1 Was the purpose of the peer exchange clearly articulated?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

2 What aspects of this event did you find to be the most beneficial?

Very beneficial and important for us. Lots of learning and exchange of ideas.

3 What aspects of this event did you find to be the least beneficial?

None

4 Did we accomplish the objectives and goals of the peer exchange?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

5 Name two specific practices you heard at the exchange that you plan to implement in your state?

1-Education of drivers @ Posting Signs.
2- QA/QC of local programs

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



Mid-West States Bridge Load Rating Peer Exchange

Evaluation Form

Name (Optional): Yihong Gao
Agency (Optional): MN

1 Was the purpose of the peer exchange clearly articulated?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

2 What aspects of this event did you find to be the most beneficial?

Culverts

3 What aspects of this event did you find to be the least beneficial?

none

4 Did we accomplish the objectives and goals of the peer exchange?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

5 Name two specific practices you heard at the exchange that you plan to implement in your state?

- develop standard sheet for bridge closure
- ~~some~~ Culvert procedure develop/revise

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 ~~5~~
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 ~~5~~
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 ~~5~~
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 ~~5~~
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 ~~4~~ 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 ~~4~~ 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 ~~5~~
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 ~~5~~
(low) (high)



Mid-West States Bridge Load Rating Peer Exchange

Evaluation Form

Name (Optional): Chris Cromwell

Agency (Optional): FHWA

1 Was the purpose of the peer exchange clearly articulated?

1 2 3 4 (5)
(low) (high)

2 What aspects of this event did you find to be the most beneficial?

- exchange of information by state DOTs
- Presentations on staffing needs, Rating SHVs, Posting, Metric 13 & 14

3 What aspects of this event did you find to be the least beneficial?

The load Testing presentation was a good presentation but should have been presented at the beginning of the day

4 Did we accomplish the objectives and goals of the peer exchange?

1 2 3 4 (5)
(low) (high)

5 Name two specific practices you heard at the exchange that you plan to implement in your state?

- Next Year would like FHWA Resource Center Review of Load Rating Staffing Needs
- Parametric study of Assigned Ratings

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



Mid-West States Bridge Load Rating Peer Exchange

Evaluation Form

Name (Optional): Raju. Iyer

Agency (Optional): INDOT

1 Was the purpose of the peer exchange clearly articulated?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

2 What aspects of this event did you find to be the most beneficial?

- Cross sharing State practices
- FHWA inputs.

3 What aspects of this event did you find to be the least beneficial?

- None -

4 Did we accomplish the objectives and goals of the peer exchange?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

5 Name two specific practices you heard at the exchange that you plan to implement in your state?

Ohio } Practices in Posting
WI } Bridge Automation - Rating tool (BrR)
MI } Bridge Databases

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a header or title, which is mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through.

Handwritten text in the middle section of the page, appearing as several lines of cursive script.

Handwritten text in the lower section of the page, consisting of several lines of cursive script.

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



Mid-West States Bridge Load Rating Peer Exchange

Evaluation Form

Name (Optional): Don Brydl
Agency (Optional): FHWA - IL

1 Was the purpose of the peer exchange clearly articulated?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

2 What aspects of this event did you find to be the most beneficial?

Quick "lightning" round discussion of specific issues - Their state practices.

3 What aspects of this event did you find to be the least beneficial?

Nothing not beneficial, but I suppose one way "technical" presentations? Need to focus on bottom lines & summaries.

4 Did we accomplish the objectives and goals of the peer exchange?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

5 Name two specific practices you heard at the exchange that you plan to implement in your state?

1) May not have to load rate for steel ??? unless everybody else does.

2) Need to look much closer at permitting process

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

9 How would you rate the following elements of the Peer Exchange?

- Usefulness of overall experience

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Relevance of the peer presentations

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


10 How did you benefit from participating in the peer exchange?

Most useful thing was to get
our new Load/Ruby Engr.
networking with neighbors.

11 Please add any additional comments or suggestions related to the event:

Need less one way presentations
Need to hear better (some
very difficult to hear)

FHWA note taking probably not
necessary - It was too
difficult. Everybody can
take their own notes



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- need more engagement/discussion

Mid-West States Bridge Load Rating Peer Exchange

Evaluation Form

Name (Optional): _____

Agency (Optional): FHWA

1 Was the purpose of the peer exchange clearly articulated?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

2 What aspects of this event did you find to be the most beneficial?

*Finding out what other states are doing on specific issues.
Research that has been done by other states.*

3 What aspects of this event did you find to be the least beneficial?

4 Did we accomplish the objectives and goals of the peer exchange?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

5 Name two specific practices you heard at the exchange that you plan to implement in your state?

Review of permitting process for truck routing.

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



Mid-West States Bridge Load Rating Peer Exchange

Evaluation Form

Name (Optional): Micah Wesch

Agency (Optional): FWA

1 Was the purpose of the peer exchange clearly articulated?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

2 What aspects of this event did you find to be the most beneficial?

Keeping the groups to small localized areas - Midwest State Engineers already knew their neighbors, and it kept the discussion manageable. Any larger and it may have been ineffective

3 What aspects of this event did you find to be the least beneficial?

There could have been more time allotted for free/open discussion - this was more useful than lecture-style presentations

4 Did we accomplish the objectives and goals of the peer exchange?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

5 Name two specific practices you heard at the exchange that you plan to implement in your state?

leave decision to IDOT

Will check into research on current load rating, rating for Ag Vehicles, Reduction in dynamic force effect for different entrance conditions

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

• Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

• Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

• Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

• Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

• Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

• Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

• Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

Mid-West States Bridge Load Rating Peer Exchange

Evaluation Form

Name (Optional): Jeremy Hunter

Agency (Optional): INDOT

1 Was the purpose of the peer exchange clearly articulated?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

2 What aspects of this event did you find to be the most beneficial?

Coordination w/ other States to learn about their Load Rating practices

3 What aspects of this event did you find to be the least beneficial?

N/A

4 Did we accomplish the objectives and goals of the peer exchange?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

5 Name two specific practices you heard at the exchange that you plan to implement in your state?

- Posting Policies (ODOT & others)
- Available Research Sharing
- Shear Analysis Options For Concrete Beams

6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

9 How would you rate the following elements of the Peer Exchange?

- Usefulness of overall experience

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


- Relevance of the peer presentations

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

10 How did you benefit from participating in the peer exchange?

11 Please add any additional comments or suggestions related to the event:

- More guidance on how to structure presentation (ie, fewer slides w/ list of questions at end)
- May not be possible, but it would be very beneficial to be able for everyone to be able to take turns sharing screens → visual aids are very useful to the discussion & clarify many times.



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)


8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)



6 Did the peer exchange meet your expectations?

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

7 Please rate the organization of the event:

- Importance of event to your state

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Logical arrangement of topics and sessions

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Networking opportunities

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Break frequency and duration

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Duration of event

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

8 Please rate the quality of facilitators:

- Ability to stay on time/on target with content

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

- Ability to keep participants engaged

1 2 3 4 5
(low) (high)

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a title or header.



Handwritten text located in the middle-right area of the page.

Handwritten text at the bottom of the page, appearing to be a signature or a set of initials.

Handwritten text at the bottom right of the page, possibly a date or a reference number.