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|  | **Do you have a documented policy for determination and documentation of crashworthiness of roadside safety hardware being used?** |
| **Alaska** | Alaska does not yet have a documented policy or process for determining MASH compliance. We have discussed our approach with the DO. The plan is to use something similar to Jeff’s excellent “Team Principles.” But we haven’t written them down in any detail.   My expectation is to develop a hierarchy of considerations that logically support a determination. An FHWA eligibility letter would be of the highest order, followed by other successful crash tested results (critical tests maybe, but not full suite), then application of research specifically related to a device or modification, review and opinion of qualified professionals, etc. similar to those described the Team Principles.   An example is how we justified our determination of our wood post 31” w-beam as MASH compliant in December. MwRSF successfully crash tested wood post MGS with at least two species of wood post. Of course they used a 12” blockout and we want to use 8”. We felt we should justify that 8” block-outs and Alaska’s specification for wood posts are not impediments to MASH compliance. It goes something like this:  We used the eligibility letters for White Pine and Southern Yellow Pine posts (Eligibility Letters B-230 and B-230A, respectively) as the starting place. We referenced the TTI study Synthesis of System/Vehicle Interaction Similarities/Dissimilarities with 12-inch vs 8-Inch Blockouts with 31-Inch Mounting Height, Mid-Span Splices, quoting the finding that “there is no significant difference between use of 12-inch and 8-inch blockouts in terms of vehicle stability, occupant risk, rail system deflection, and interaction between vehicle and guardrail system.” As validation of that research, we referenced TxDOT’s successful crash test and eligibility letter B-240 for the (steel post) 31-inch W-Beam Guardrail with 8-inch Offset Block. Finally, we showed that our statewide standard specification for wood posts is essentially the same as the national standards for wood guardrail posts (PDE 01-08 Timber Guardrail Posts) published in A Standardized Guide to Barrier Hardware.   Based on that small blizzard of related information, we determined our W31 wood post system meets MASH TL3.   All we have to do is write up a meaningful process or policy document using this sort of reasoning. |
| **Connecticut** | Connecticut DOT does not have a formal documented process or procedure policy in determining the crashworthiness of roadside safety hardware at this time.   A) The non-proprietary hardware is shown on the Department’s Highway Design Standard Drawings, which are reviewed and approved by the local FHWA office for use on Construction Projects. For MASH implementation, they requested a reference document per standard sheet be provided listing the crash testing reports, research, etc used to create the standard sheet to be included with our request.  B) Proprietary items are handled by the Department’s Qualified Product List – QPL, which has the following preapproval criteria: **PREAPPROVAL CRITERIA:** *Written approval from FHWA for use on National Highway System roads and Crash Tested in accordance with “National Cooperative Highway Research (NCHRP) Report 350 – Recommended Procedures for the Safety Performance Evaluation of Highway Features” Test Level 3 criteria; or, Crash tested in accordance with “AASHTO Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (MASH)” Test Level 3 criteria.  Comments: For all attenuators, see the ConnDOT Highway Design Manual for guidance.* |
| **Idaho** | The Idaho Transportation Department has no formal policy for determining and documenting the crashworthiness of roadside safety hardware.  We still rely on federal-aid eligibility letters from FHWA and require that devices meet the new MASH testing standards as the implementation deadlines arrive. |
| **Illinois** | No. We are currently working to put together a documented process for determination of crashworthiness. |
| **Louisiana** | No.  Louisiana DOTD does not currently have a written policy for determining the crashworthiness of roadside safety system.  We were waiting on guidance from FHWA (ie. the recent April 9th memo) before developing our own policy. |
| **Massachusetts** | MassDOT does not have a documented policy, but now that FHWA has issued that memo we intend to draft one. It would be of great benefit to us if you could share any of the other policies that you receive. |
| **Oregon** | No – but we are meeting with our FHWA division office on May 8 to discuss this topic & move forward with developing a policy. |
| **Texas** | A Memo that is being finalized during this time. More information will be available when the Memo will be completed.  Roadside safety hardware can be approved for use on TxDOT projects in any one of the following ways:  • It has been successfully crash tested in accordance with current criteria. Further evaluation by Division of Record may be required before approval can be given. • It has been approved for specific uses by FHWA after evaluation of results from successful crash testing..  • It has been evaluated by TxDOT and identified as similar in strength and geometry to another rail that has been successfully crash tested in accordance with current criteria.  The Division of Record for specific roadside safety hardware maintains records of the basis of acceptance that can be made available to FHWA upon request. The Division of Record for various roadside safety hardware is as follows: • Bridge Division – bridge rails  o http://www.dot.state.tx.us/insdtdot/orgchart/cmd/cserve/standard/bridge-e.htm#RAILINGSTANDARDS • Design Division – precast and cast-in-place concrete barrier; metal barriers; metal beam guard fence, transitions, and terminals; and crash cushions.  o http://www.dot.state.tx.us/insdtdot/orgchart/cmd/cserve/standard/rdwylse.htm • Maintenance Division – mailboxes  o https://www.txdot.gov/insdtdot/orgchart/cmd/cserve/standard/maintcad.htm • Traffic Division – sign supports (permanent and temporary) and all other breakaway hardware  o https://www.dot.state.tx.us/insdtdot/orgchart/cmd/cserve/standard/toc.htm |
| **Washington State** | Although we don’t have a documented policy we do have an established procedure. For every generic (non-proprietary) system we use, we complete a MASH compliance evaluation form. The results of these evaluations inform policy revisions. We also meet monthly with FHWA division representation to keep them appraised of our process and our progress. Our MASH compliance documentation form relies heavily on many of the principles adopted at last year’s pooled fund meeting (you will even see them listed on the form.)  For any systems that we are uncomfortable completing the form ourselves, WSDOT is in the process of contracting with TTI for support, to get an independent expert opinion. |
| **West Virginia** | Two separate drafts have been prepared.  They need merged into one and submitted. As soon as the document is signed, I will forward for it to be shared. |
| **Wisconsin** | No formal written policy.  It is a one man show.  I know what information I ask for.  I document what I can. |