Development of MASH Computer Simulated Steel Bridge Rail and Transition Details



Road Safe LLC



Project: NETC 18-1

Chuck A. Plaxico, Ph.D. Roadsafe LLC

NETC Webinar July 16, 2020









Background and Project Motivation

- The current policy for roadside hardware installed on federal-aid projects requires upgrading non-conforming systems to MASH acceptance level for situations involving full system replacements, certain structural rehabilitations (e.g., deck replacements), or repairing a critically damaged bridge rail system.
- The predominate bridge rail and approach guardrail transition (AGT) systems used in the New England states, include details for 2-bar, 3bar and 4-bar designs, which were developed and tested under prior crash testing and evaluation standards.
- It was of interest to the New England Transportation Agencies to determine if these existing NETC designs meet the strength and safety criteria of the current test standard (i.e., MASH), which involve higher impact severities than the previous crash testing standards.

Objectives

- Review of NETC style bridge rail and AGT designs to:
 - 1) Determine preliminary MASH compliance/equivalency:
 - AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications
 - Procedures outlined in NCHRP Project 20-07 (395)
 - 2) Determine the least conservative designs for further evaluation using FEA crash simulation.
- Evaluate the crash performance of these systems using finite element analysis (FEA) computer simulation using *MASH* test conditions and criteria:
 - Structural capacity
 - Risk of occupant injury
 - Vehicle stability













Slight variations in design details depending on State

Three design details were evaluated:

- 1. NETC curb-mounted 2-Bar Rail (TL3)
- 2. NETC curb-mounted 3-Bar Rail (TL4)
- 3. NETC sidewalk-mounted 4-Bar Rail (TL4)













Comparing Impact Severity (Report 350 and MASH)







MASH Equivalency Assessment

LRFD Assessments

	NETC 2-Bar (TL3)		
	Rail	Rail	
	Height	Geometrics	Strength
Required	29	(see Table 5)	71 k
Actual	34	(see rable 5)	109 k
Assessment	S	S	S ⁽¹⁾

NS - Not Satisfactory

M - Marginal

S - Satisfactory

S⁽¹⁾ - Satisfactory Rating for TL-3 Only

S⁽²⁾ - Satisfactory when 9" curb is used

* - Differs from 20-07(395) report

- Rail geometrics are used to assess potential for vehicle snag on posts and considers:

- post-offset distance
- Max vertical clear opening between rails
- Contact surface w.r.t. overall barrier height









Research Approach for FEA Crash Simulations

- Develop finite element models of existing hardware.
- Validate the models using the procedures outlined in NCHRP Web Document 179 by comparing results to existing full-scale crash tests on the system.
- Update models to include MASH vehicle types and impact conditions
- Then use FEA to simulate MASH tests and evaluate the system's performance.



NETC 4-Bar

Validation

- Test No. NETC-3 on the bridge rail was performed by SwRI on 12/18/1997.
- Total length of bridge rail was 108 feet.
- Impact conditions:
 - Mass = 17,875 lb (8,108 kg)
 - Speed = 49.8 mph (80.1 km/hr)
 - Angle = 15 deg.
 - Impact point = 2 ft (0.61 m) upstream of Post 6.



NETC 4-Bar

Validation



MASH TL-3 for NETC 2-Bar Bridge Rail

Test 3-10

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 3.6 ft upstream from critical Post

<u>Test 3-11</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 4.3 ft upstream from critical Post

FEA of MASH Test 3-11 on NETC 2-Bar (curb) Time = 0.004999







Lateral <u>Dynamic</u> Deflection

Test 3-10



Test 3-11





Slide 16

Assessment of Potential Vehicle Contact with Post

- The front fender made slight contact with the post.
- The contact between the front tire and post was moderate.
 - Tire deflation was not included in the model, so an accurate assessment on the potential for wheel rim snag on the post could not be made; however, a moderate snag is possible.







Occupant Risk Test 3-10





Slide 18

Assessment of Potential Vehicle Snag

- The front fender and bumper made slight contact with the post, but the contact force was negligible.
- The front wheel and the front edge of the passenger door snagged on the rail tube at the splice but resulting accelerations did not exceed occupant risk criteria.





Occupant Risk Test 3-11

Slide 20





Conclusions for the NETC 2-BAR Bridge Rail

Evaluation Factors		Evaluation Criteria	Results
Structural Adequacy	A	Test article should contain and redirect the vehicle or bring the vehicle to a controlled stop; the vehicle should not penetrate, underride, or override the installation although controlled lateral deflection of the test article is acceptable.	Pass
- Occupant Risk -	D	Detached elements, fragments, or other debris from the test article should not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, or present undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone. Deformations of, or intrusions into, to occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.2.2 and Appendix E.	Pass
	F	The vehicle should remain upright during and after collision. The maximum roll and pitch angles are not to exceed 75 degrees.	Pass
	Н	The longitudinal and lateral occupant impact velocity (OIV) shall not exceed 40 ft/s (12.2 m/s), with a preferred limit of 30 ft/s (9.1 m/s)	Pass
	I	The longitudinal and lateral occupant ridedown acceleration (ORA) shall not exceed 20.49 G, with a preferred limit of 15.0 G	Pass



MASH TL-4 for NETC 3-Bar Bridge Rail

<u>Test 4-10</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 3.6 ft upstream from critical Post

<u>Test 4-11</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 4.3 ft upstream from critical Post

Time = 0.004999





Lateral <u>Dynamic</u> Deflection

Test 4-10

Test 4-11





Movies



Slide 26

Assessment of Potential Vehicle Snag

- The tire rim snagged on the splice
- Tires did not contact post.







Occupant Risk













Test 4-11





Slide 28

Conclusions on Test 4-10 and 4-11 on the NETC 3-Bar

Evaluation Factors		Evaluation Criteria	Results
Structural Adequacy	A	Test article should contain and redirect the vehicle or bring the vehicle to a controlled stop; the vehicle should not penetrate, underride, or override the installation although controlled lateral deflection of the test article is acceptable.	Pass
- Occupant Risk -	D	Detached elements, fragments, or other debris from the test article should not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, or present undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone. Deformations of, or intrusions into, to occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.2.2 and Appendix E.	Pass
	F	The vehicle should remain upright during and after collision. The maximum roll and pitch angles are not to exceed 75 degrees.	Pass
	Н	The longitudinal and lateral occupant impact velocity (OIV) shall not exceed 40 ft/s (12.2 m/s), with a preferred limit of 30 ft/s (9.1 m/s)	Pass
	I	The longitudinal and lateral occupant ridedown acceleration (ORA) shall not exceed 20.49 G, with a preferred limit of 15.0 G	Pass



MASH Test 4-12 for NETC 3-Bar Bridge Rail

Test 4-12 (Case 1)

- Impact Speed = 56 mph
- Impact Angle = 15 degrees
- Impact Point = 5.0 ft upstream from critical Post
- Bed Height = 47.5" (e.g., Ford F800)

NETC 3-Bar BR (MASH Test 4-12) Time = 0.004999



Test 4-12 (Case 2)

- Impact Speed = 56 mph
- Impact Angle = 15 degrees
- Impact Point = 5.0 ft upstream from critical Post
- Bed Height = 50" (e.g., GMC)

NETC 3-Bar BR (MASH Test 4-12 w/ Raised Truck) Time = 0.004999



Bed Height = 47.5 inches



Bed Height = 50 inches



Lateral <u>Dynamic</u> Deflection



Fransportation Engineering and Research

Conclusions on Test 4-12 on the NETC 3-Bar

			Results
Evaluation Factors		Evaluation Criteria – MASH Test 4-12	Case 1/ Case 2
Structural Adequacy	A	Test article should contain and redirect the vehicle or bring the vehicle to a controlled stop; the vehicle should not penetrate, underride, or override the installation although controlled lateral deflection of the test article is acceptable.	Pass/Pass
Occupant Risk	D	Detached elements, fragments, or other debris from the test article should not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, or present undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone. Deformations of, or intrusions into, to occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.2.2 and Appendix E.	Pass/Pass
	G	It is preferable, although not essential, that the vehicle remain upright during and after collision.	Pass/Fail



MASH TL-4 for NETC 4-Bar Bridge Rail

<u>Test 4-10</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 3.6 ft upstream from critical Post

<u>Test 4-11</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 4.3 ft upstream from critical Post

FEA of MASH Test 4-11 on NETC 4-Bar (sidewalk) Time = 0.004999



Assessment of Potential Vehicle Snag

- The top of the front fender made slight contact with the post, but the contact force was negligible.
- The tire rim snagged on the splice at the lower-middle tube rail, which resulted in peak longitudinal acceleration of 21.6 G and Peak lateral acceleration of 25.8 G.
- Tires did <u>not</u> contact post.







Occupant Risk Test 4-20



Assessment of Potential Vehicle Snag

- The front fender and bumper made slight contact with the post, but the contact force was negligible.
- The rear wheel tire and rim snagged on the rail tube at the splice, resulting in maximum ORA.





Rear Tire



Occupant Risk Test 4-21





Lateral <u>Dynamic</u> Deflection

Test 4-10



Test 4-11





Conclusions for Test 4-10 and 4-11 on the NETC 4-BAR

Evaluation Factor	S	Evaluation Criteria	Results
Structural Adequacy	A	Test article should contain and redirect the vehicle or bring the vehicle to a controlled stop; the vehicle should not penetrate, underride, or override the installation although controlled lateral deflection of the test article is acceptable.	Pass
— Occupant Risk —	D	Detached elements, fragments, or other debris from the test article should not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, or present undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone. Deformations of, or intrusions into, to occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.2.2 and Appendix E.	Pass
	F	The vehicle should remain upright during and after collision. The maximum roll and pitch angles are not to exceed 75 degrees.	Pass
	Н	The longitudinal and lateral occupant impact velocity (OIV) shall not exceed 40 ft/s (12.2 m/s), with a preferred limit of 30 ft/s (9.1 m/s)	Pass
	I	The longitudinal and lateral occupant ridedown acceleration (ORA) shall not exceed 20.49 G, with a preferred limit of 15.0 G	Pass


MASH Test 4-12 Simulation

NETC 4-Bar BR (MASH Test 4-12) Time = 0.004999

- Impact Conditions
 - Mass = 22,061 lb
 - Impact Speed = 56 mph (90 km/hr)
 - Impact Angle = 15 degrees
 - Target Impact Point = 5.0 ft upstream of Post 7



NETC 4-Bar BR (MASH Test 4-12) Time = 0.004999



Lateral <u>Dynamic</u> Deflection





Barrier Damage

- Analysis indicated probable crack opening in concrete at front anchor bolts at maximum dynamic deflection.
 - Max dynamic 1st Prin. Strain = 0.079
 - Final 1st Prin. Strain = 0.054

O



Dynamic at time = 0.515 seconds

Final Static

Conclusions on Test 4-12 on the NETC 4-Bar

Evaluation Factors		Evaluation Criteria – MASH Test 4-12	Results
Structural Adequacy	A	Test article should contain and redirect the vehicle or bring the vehicle to a controlled stop; the vehicle should not penetrate, underride, or override the installation although controlled lateral deflection of the test article is acceptable.	Pass
Occupant Risk	D	Detached elements, fragments, or other debris from the test article should not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, or present undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone. Deformations of, or intrusions into, to occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.2.2 and Appendix E.	Pass
	G	It is preferable, although not essential, that the vehicle remain upright during and after collision.	Pass



Summary for NETC Bridge Rail Designs

• NETC 2-Bar:

- Meets MASH TL3 criteria with only moderate barrier damages.
- Concrete curb damage was likely for Test 3-11.

NETC 3-Bar and 4-Bar:

• The barrier system <u>meets MASH TL4 criteria; however, relatively high barrier</u> <u>damages are likely under these conditions</u>.



NETC Transition Systems

- Three design options were evaluated:
 - 1. NETC Style 2-Bar Rail and Thrie Beam (TL3) (NHDOT steel rail transition)
 - NETC Style 3-Bar Rail and Thrie Beam (TL4) (NHDOT steel rail transition)
 - 3. Concrete Transition Barrier and Thrie Beam (TL4) (MaineDOT standard detail)





- Single taper on top
- No face taper



NETC 2-Bar Transition

The transition system for the 2-Bar bridge rail was modeled based on the detailed drawing from NHDOT





Slide 49

NETC 2-Bar to Thrie-Beam AGT

Report 350 Test Level 3

	401181-1	
Test Designation	Test 3-21	
Test Vehicle	2000 Chevrolet 2500	
Gross Vehicle Weight (lb)	4,706	
Impact Speed (mph)	63.6	
Impact Angle (deg)	24.9	
Exit Speed (mph)	52.9	Preferred
Exit Angle (deg)	11.7	Limits
Occupant Impact Velocity		
Longitudinal (ft/s)	17.1	< 30 ft/s
Lateral (ft/s)	24.6	
Ridedown Accel		
Longitudinal (g's)	8.3	< 15 G
Lateral (g's)	10	
Maximum 50 msec Avg Accel		2
Longitudinal (g's)	8.1	
Lateral (g's)	13.5	
Max Deflection (in)	7.87	
Vehicle Trajectory		
Maximum YawAngle (deg)	56	Ъ
Maximum Roll Angle (deg)	14	- < 75°
Maximum Pitch Angle (deg)	19	
NCHRP Report 350 Evaluation		-
Structural Adequacy	Pass	
Ocupant Risk	Pass	
Vehicle Trajectory	Pass	







NETC 2-Bar to Thrie-Beam AGT

Validation

		MASH T	est 3-11	Er	ror	W179 Criteria		
Occupant Risk Facto	ors	Test 401181-1	FEA					
		(0 - 1.0 seconds)	(0 - 1.0 seconds)	%	Absolute	Criteria	Pass	
Occupant Impact Velocity	x-direction	17.06 19.68		15.4%	2.62	<20% or < 6.6 f/s	Y	
(ft/s)	y-direction	-24.61	-24.93	1.3%	-0.33	<20% or < 6.6 f/s	Y	
	at time	at 0.0948 seconds on left side of interior	at 0.1005 seconds on left side of interior					
THIV		29.9	31.5	5.5%	1.64	<20% or < 6.6 f/s	Y	
(m/s)		at 0.0948 seconds on left side of interior	at 0.0986 seconds on left side of interior					
Ridedown Acceleration	x-direction	-8.3	-8.3	0.0%	0.00	<20% or < 4G	Y	
(g's)	x-unection	(0.1153 - 0.1253 seconds)	(0.1018 - 0.1118 seconds)					
	v-direction	10	7.5	25.0%	-2.50	<20% or < 4G	Y	
	y-unection	(0.1182 - 0.1282 seconds)	(0.1388 - 0.1488 seconds)					
PHD		11.9	9.1	23.5%	-2.80	<20% or < 4G	Y	
(g's)		(0.1180 - 0.1280 seconds)	(0.1344 - 0.1444 seconds)					
ASI		1.74	1.48	14.9%	-0.26	<20% or < 0.2	Y	
A31		(0.0216 - 0.0716 seconds)	(0.0355 - 0.0855 seconds)					
Max 50-ms moving avg. acc.	x-direction	-8.1	-9.6	18.5%	-1.50	<20% or < 4G	Y	
(g's)		(0.0334 - 0.0834 seconds)	(0.0342 - 0.0842 seconds)					
	v-direction	13.5	11	18.5%	-2.50	<20% or < 4G	Y	
	y-unection	(0.0216 - 0.0716 seconds)	(0.0448 - 0.0948 seconds)					
	z-direction	-7.6	-3.8	50.0%	3.80	<20% or < 4G	Y	
	z-airection	(0.0209 - 0.0709 seconds)	(0.0359 - 0.0859 seconds)					
Maximum Angular Disp.	Yaw	55.6	48.2	13.3%	-7.40	<20% or < 5 deg	Y	
(deg)	Taw	(1.0000 seconds)	(0.9426 seconds)					
	Roll	-19.4	-17	12.4%	2.40	<20% or < 5 deg	Y	
	KUII	(0.5914 seconds)	(0.4713 seconds)					
	Pitch	-13.7	-16.5	20.4%	-2.80	<20% or < 5 deg	Y	
	PILCH	(0.6647 seconds)	(0.5674 seconds)					



FEA of NCHRP Test 3-21 (IP 5.36 ft)





MASH TL-4 for NETC 2-Bar Transition

<u>Test 4-20</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 6.5 ft upstream from critical Post

<u>Test 4-21</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 9 ft upstream from end of tube rail

FEA of MASH Test 3-21 on AGT 2-Bar (IP 9.0 ft) Time = 0.004999



MASH TL-4 for NETC <mark>3-Bar</mark> Transition

<u>Test 4-20</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 5.5 ft upstream from critical Post

FEA of MASH Test 4-11 on AGT 3-Bar (IP 5.5 ft) Time = 0

<u>Test 4-21</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 6.2 ft upstream from end of tube rail

FEA of MASH Test 4-21 on AGT 3-Bar (IP 6.2 ft) Time = 0.004999





MASH TL-4 for NETC <mark>3-Bar</mark> Transition

<u>Test 4-20</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 5.5 ft upstream from critical Post

<u>Test 4-21</u>

- Impact Speed = 62.1 mph
- Impact Angle = 25 degrees
- Impact Point = 6.2 ft upstream from end of tube rail



Conclusions on Tests 3-20 and 3-21 on 2-Bar and 3-Bar Transition

Evaluation Factor	rs	Evaluation Criteria	Results
Structural Adequacy	A	Test article should contain and redirect the vehicle or bring the vehicle to a controlled stop; the vehicle should not penetrate, underride, or override the installation although controlled lateral deflection of the test article is acceptable.	Pass
Occupant Risk	D	Detached elements, fragments, or other debris from the test article should not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, or present undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone. Deformations of, or intrusions into, to occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.2.2 and Appendix E.	Pass
	F	The vehicle should remain upright during and after collision. The maximum roll and pitch angles are not to exceed 75 degrees.	Pass
	Н	The longitudinal and lateral occupant impact velocity (OIV) shall not exceed 40 ft/s (12.2 m/s), with a preferred limit of 30 ft/s (9.1 m/s)	Pass
	I	The longitudinal and lateral occupant ridedown acceleration (ORA) shall not exceed 20.49 G, with a preferred limit of 15.0 G	Pass



MASH Test 4-22 Simulation

• Impact Conditions

Slide

- Mass = 22,061 lb
- Impact Speed = 56 mph (90 km/hr)
- Impact Angle = 15 degrees
- Impact Point = 9 ft upstream of Bridge Rail tube ends

Ford 800 Surrogate





MASH Test 4-22 Simulation

• Impact Conditions

- Mass = 22,061 lb
- Impact Speed = 56 mph (90 km/hr)
- Impact Angle = 15 degrees
- Impact Point = 9 ft upstream of Bridge Rail tube ends



Barrier Damage

- Plastic deformations of the steel components were primarily to the top of Post 1 of the transition and to all three (3) bridge rail posts.
- There was some plastic deformation of the transition rail elements.
- The damage to the posts were due to the bottom of the cargo-box snagging on the top of the posts. This caused torque rotation and longitudinal deformation of the posts.
- The vehicle was in contact with the barrier from the point of contact until the truck box slid off the end of the bridge rail at 0.55 seconds.
- The maximum working width prior to exiting the barrier was 3.9 ft resulting from the top of the cargo box extending over the bridge rail.



Working width



Case 2 – ¾" Splice Gap and Tapered Post (5.5 ft)



Slide 60

Conclusions on Test 4-22 on the 3-Bar Trans

Evaluation Factors		Evaluation Criteria – MASH Test 4-12	Results
Structural Adequacy	A	Test article should contain and redirect the vehicle or bring the vehicle to a controlled stop; the vehicle should not penetrate, underride, or override the installation although controlled lateral deflection of the test article is acceptable.	Pass
Occupant Risk	D	Detached elements, fragments, or other debris from the test article should not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, or present undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone. Deformations of, or intrusions into, to occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.2.2 and Appendix E.	Pass
	G	It is preferable, although not essential, that the vehicle remain upright during and after collision.	Pass



Overall Project Conclusions

The results of this study showed that for:

• NETC Bridge Rail Designs

- 2-bar curb-mounted system meets MASH TL3
- 3-bar curb-mounted system meets MASH TL4
- 4-bar sidewalk-mounted system meets MASH TL4
- However, the 3-bar and 4-bar design resulted in considerable damage to the system, particularly in the SUT test.

NETC AGT Designs

- 2-bar to thrie-beam AGT meets MASH TL3
- 3-bar to thrie-beam AGT meets MASH TL4
- The <u>concrete buttress to thrie-beam did not meet</u> <u>MASH</u> requirements due to snag and high decelerations for small car test

Road Safe LLC

Overall Project Conclusions

- Redesign of the bridge rail system was not a focus of this study; however, general recommendations were provided to further improve crash performance, including:
 - <u>Revising the splice design to minimize</u> lateral movement in the splice connections.
 - <u>Increasing the size of the HSS rails</u> to improve geometric attributes and strength.
 - <u>Tapering the tops of the posts</u> to mitigate snagging on the top of the posts when parts of a vehicle (e.g., cargo-box on single-unit trucks) overhang the top rail.
- Final Report is posted on the NETC website at: <u>https://www.newenglandtransportationconso</u> <u>rtium.org/research/netc-research-</u> <u>projects/netc-18-1/</u>

Road Safe LLC

			Imp	act Condit	ions	RESULTS										
						Structural	Structural Adequacy Occupant Risk Metrics						Vehicle	Stability		
System		MASH Test		Angle	CIP	1	Max. Disp.	OCI		OIV _x	OIVy	ORA _x	ORAy	Roll	Pitch	Overall
Туре	System	No.	(mph)	(deg)	ft	Contain	(in)	Location	(in)	(ft/s)	(ft/s)	(g)	(g)	(deg)	(deg)	Result
	NETC 2-Bar	Test 3-10	62	25	3.6	Pass	3.6	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	3.3	26.2	33.1	5.5 ⁽¹⁾	6.4	7	5.4	Pass
		Test 3-11	62	25	4.3	Pass	2.7	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	2.8	20.7	26.9	4.6	15.4 ⁽²⁾	9	10.1	Pass
		Test 4-10	62	25	3.6	Pass	3.4	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	2.8	25.6	32.5	6.7 ⁽¹⁾	6	7.3	5.2	Pass
	NETC 3-Bar	Test 4-11	62	25	4.3	Pass	4.2	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	3.3	22	26.6	4.7	15.4 ⁽²⁾	9.9	7.5	Pass
	NETC 5-Dat	Test 4-12 ⁽³⁾	56	15	5	Pass	7.6	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	1	2	14.8	7	5.3	20.8	7.8	Pass
Bridge Rail		Test 4-12 ⁽⁴⁾	56	15	5	Pass	8.1	Wheel Well / lower edge of door	3.3	3	14.1	5.7	5.9	90 [*]	6.9	Pass
	$Mod 3-Bar^{\dagger}$	Test 4-10	62	25	3.6	Pass	2.3	-	-	24.3	32.5	3.5 ⁽¹⁾	7.7	-	-	Pass
	NETC 4-Bar	Test 4-10	62	25	3.6	Pass	2.8	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	3.4	24	31.5	7.1 ⁽¹⁾	10.3	10.9	6.5	Pass
		Test 4-11	62	25	4.3	Pass	5.4	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	2.2	17.7	26.6	13.8	18 ⁽²⁾	7.2	8.3	Pass
		Test 4-12 ⁽³⁾	56	15	5	Pass	8.2	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	1	3.9	16.7	4.3	6.7	18.8	5.6	Pass
	Mod 4-Bar [‡]	Test 4-12 ⁽³⁾	56	15	5	Pass	8.2	Not Evaluated	1	3.9	16.7	4.3	6.7	18.8	5.6	Pass
	2-Bar (Tube Rails)	Test 3-20	62	25	6.5	Pass	6.3	Wheel weel / Toe Pan	1.4	25.3	28.2	7.9 ⁽¹⁾	4.8	6.7	3.6	Pass
		Test 3-21	62	25	9	Pass	11.8	negligible	-	17.4	23.3	4.8	17.2 ⁽²⁾	9.3	5.5	Pass
		Test 4-20	62	25	5.5	Pass	5.8	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	1	24.3	25.9	4.2 ⁽¹⁾	7.4	6.2	3.9	Pass
	3-Bar (Tube Rails)	Test 4-21	62	25	5.5	Pass	8	negligible	-	17.7	24.6	5.2	15.1 ⁽²⁾	8.1	3.7	Pass
	(1000 1000)	Test 4-22	56	15	9	Pass	7.6	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	1	2.3	14.8	8.9	5.5	90 [*]	11.9	Pass ^{**}
AGT	4-Bar	Test 4-20	62	25	5.5	Pass	6.9	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	3.4	29.2	32.8	26	7.9 ⁽²⁾	5.4	6.8	Fail
AGI	(Concrete	Test 4-21	62	25	6.5	Pass	8.3	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	1	21	28.2	9.4	17.3	15.4	9.6	Pass
	Butress)	Test 4-22	56	15	12	Pass	17.0	Wheel Well/ Toe Pan	5.5	8.9	14.4	13.9	8.7	8.7	12	Pass***
	3-Bar	Test 4-20 [§]	62	25	4	Pass	3.25	-	-	25.3	33.1	4.9	2.9 ⁽²⁾	-	-	Pass
	з-ваг (Tube Rails)	Test 4-20 ^{§§}	62	25	4	Pass	2.65	-	-	23.6	32.8	3.7	7.9 ⁽²⁾	4.4	5.1	Pass
	w/ 5.5-ft Post	Test 4-21 [§]	62	25	6	Pass	-	-	-	22.6	27.9	5.8	≈18-19	-	-	Pass
	Space	Test 4-22 ^t	56	15	9	Pass	5.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pass**

* The vehicle was still upright when the analysis was terminated, but 90-degree roll was expected.

** Resulted in significant snagging on and damage to bridge rail posts.

*** The analysis showed that the barrier contained and redirected the 10,000S vehicle, but with significant damage to the transition and bridge rail elements.

⁽¹⁾ Maximum ORA occurred on tail-end of a major acceleration pulse. Would have been higher if OIV had occured slightly sooner.

 $^{(2)}$ Vehicle model tends to over-predict lateral accelerations associated with "tail-slap".

⁽³⁾ Cargo-box Bed Height = 47.5 ".

⁽⁴⁾ Cargo-box Bed Height = 50 ".

+ NETC 3-bar with HSS 5x4x5/16 lower rail

‡ NETC 4-bar with W8x28 posts

§ 3-bar AGT with original components

§§ 3-bar AGT with HSS5x4x5/16 lower rail

£ 3-bar AGT with 2-inch splice gap and top of posts tapered

Acknowledgements

The following are the members of the Technical Committee that developed the scope of work for the project and provided technical oversight throughout the course of the research:

- Project Manager Kirsten Seeber, CTC & Associates
- Chair Jeff Folsom, Maine DOT
- Dale Peabody, Maine DOT
- David Kilpatrick, Connecticut DOT
- Alex Bardow, Massachusetts DOT
- Robert Landry, New Hampshire DOT
- Michael Savella, Rhode Island DOT
- Jim Lacroix, Vermont Agency of Transportation



