

**AASHTO/NSBA Steel Bridge Collaboration - Document Implementation**  
**Status as of May 1, 2005**

<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>UC</b>	<b>UG</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NE</b>
G1.1 Shop Detail Drawing Review/ Approval Guidelines	MA, ME(D2), NJ, VT	AL, IA, MN, PA(D), VA	AR, CA, DE, ID, IL(14), KS, KY, MI, MO(19), NC, ND, SD, TN(9), TX, VT (26), WI		FL(12), GA, MS, OH,
G1.2 Guidelines for Design Plan Presentation	ME(C), NJ(1)	AL, DE,IL, IA, MA, MD, MN, NC, NH,PA(D), TX, VA, VT	CA, ID, KS, KY, MD, ME(D3), MI, (NEC), NY(4), SD, TN(9), WI, WV		AR, FL, GA, MO(20), MS, ND, (NEF), OH
G1.3 Guidelines for Shop Detail Drawing Presentation	FL(13), MA, ME(C), NJ(1), TX	AL, IA, MD, MN, NH, PA(D), VA, VT	AR, CA, DE, GA(2), ID, IL(15), KS, KY, MD, ME(D3), MI, MO(21), (NEC), NC, ND, NY(5), SD, TN(9), WI, WV		MS
S2.1 Steel Bridge Fabrication QC/QA Guide Specification (6)	ME(27), NJ(1), TX	AL, DE, IL(16), IA,MA, MN, MO(22), NH, PA(C1),VT	AR, CA, FL(13), GA, ID(10), IL(16), KS, MD(3), MI, (NEC), (NEF), NC, ND, NY, SD, TN(9), VA, WI, WV		KY, MS, OH, PA(D)
S4.1 Steel Bridge Fabrication QC/QA Guide Specification	FL(13), ME(D3), NJ(1), PA(C), TX	AL, DE, IA, KY, MA, MN, MO(23), (NEF), NC, NH, VT	CA, FL, GA, ID, IL, KS, MD, MI, NY(7), TN(9), VA, W I, WV		AR, KY, MS, ND,(NEC), OH, PA(D), SD
S8.1 Guide Specification for Coating Systems with Inorganic Zinc-Rich Primer	DE, NJ(1), TX	AL, IL(17), IA,KY, MN, MO, (NEF), NH PA(C3), VA,VT	CA GA, ID, KS, ME(D3), MI, MO, NC, NY(8), SD, TN(9), WI, WV		AR, FL, KY, MA, MS, ND, (NEC), OH, PA(D)
G12.1 Guidelines for Design for Constructability	NJ(1)	DE, IA, MN, MO(24), MS, NH, NC, VA, VT	AR, CA, FL(13), GA, ID(11), KS, KY, MA, ME(D3), MI, SD, TN(9), WI, WV	NY(25)	IL(18), MD, MS, ND, (NEC), (NEF), OH, PA(D), TX

**Generic Survey Response Form Legend:**

A - Adopted

UC - Under Consideration

UG - Used as a Guide

NA - Not Acceptable

NE - Have Not Evaluated

**AASHTO/NSBA Steel Bridge Collaboration - Document Implementation**  
**Status as of May 1, 2005**

**Footnotes on DOT Responses**

- (C) Maine DOT Bureau of Construction
- (C1) PennDOT Bureau of Construction to decide this calendar year after fully evaluating.
- (C2) PennDOT Bureau of Construction hopes to adopt this calendar year. Need to evaluate effectiveness for all types of fabricated steel
- (C3) PennDOT Bureau of Construction to meet in April 2002 to review.
- (D) Maine DOT and PennDOT Bureau of Bridge Design units.
- (D1) Maine DOT includes Guide in all outgoing steel bridge/component projects in a Special Provision. MDOT is close to producing a new Standard Specification book which will permanently include the Guide. It reads: "...approved in accordance with the requirements of Section 100 and AASHTO/NSBA Shop Drawing Review/Approval Guidelines, G1.1"
- (D2) Maine DOT uses direct reference in specifications
- (D3) Maine DOT will list as a resource/reference in the written policies provided to all Department and consultant personnel involved in the bridge program
- (NEC) Northeastern Consultant
- (NEF) Northeastern Fabricator
- (1) The New Jersey DOT has approved, but not yet adopted, G1.2, G1.3, S2.1, S4.1 and S8.1. They have approved G12.1 with comment
- (2) The Georgia DOT has had 1 fabricator submit these guidelines as part of the shop drawings. GDOT notified the fabricator that the document was considered to be a guide only, and not contractual.
- (3) The Maryland SHA is using the SCEF QC/QA guideline but will also allow use of S4.1
- (4) NYSDOT bridge design sheets were used as a starting point.
- (5) Per NYSDOT, certain fabricators are refusing to conform.
- (6) NYSDOT uses own Steel Construction Manual.
- (7) NYSDOT looking at specifying minimum standards.
- (8) NYSDOT adopting Zn primer but has concerns about edge grinding.
- (9) TNDOT – for all Guides is in general agreement with 90% or more as to the contents, and the suggestions are already embedded in their Standard Operating Procedures.
- (10) Idaho DOT notes as good reference source
- (11) Idaho DOT notes as excellent reference source

**AASHTO/NSBA Steel Bridge Collaboration - Document Implementation**  
**Status as of May 1, 2005**

- (12) FLDOT notes that section 5 of their Standard Specifications already provides guidelines.
- (13) FLDOT notes that these guides have been used to prepare Section 460 of proposed specification for Structural Steel and Miscellaneous Metals Specifications.
- (14) ILDOT has distributed to all design consultants that review drawings; available to all in-house staff.
- (15) ILDOT has no objection to fabricators using.
- (16) ILDOT concerned with conflicts with their standard specifications, Bridge Welding Code, and S2.1 Fabrication Guide. Need to correct non-specification-type language and review priorities/mandates.
- (17) ILDOT going toward organic zinc, which will be included soon in S8.1.
- (18) ILDOT anticipates distributing final version in-house and to all consultant designers.
- (19) MoDOT process already follows most of the processes in this guide.
- (20) MoDOT does not see the need to define standard plan formats.
- (21) MoDOT does not have any set requirements for information shown in shop drawings or format.
- (22) MoDOT still reviewing for any differences with AWS and AASHTO Code requirements. Revising standard specifications from method to performance format, so anticipate adoption of this guide in some form.
- (23) MoDOT has several problems with language and requirements set forth for owner and inspector.
- (24) MoDOT notes as good reference document, providing flexibility to States to incorporate individual preferences.
- (25) NYSDOT notes too many differences of opinion exist
- (26) VAOT has been using this Guide for the last 2+ years.
- (27) Maine DOT will furnish to shop inspectors with instructions to use, except as required by specifications.