

of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration

# AUG 29 1996

400 Seventh St., S.W. Washington, D.C. 20590

Refer to: HNG-14

Charles E. Dougan, Ph.D., P.E. Manager of Research and Materials Bureau of Engineering and Highway Operations Connecticut Department of Transportation P.O. Box 317546 Newington, Connecticut 06131-7546

Dear Dr. Dougan:

Your August 21 letter to Mr. Gerald L. Eller, Director, Office of Engineering requested the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) acceptance of an aesthetic steel post supported timber guardrail developed for use on the Merritt Parkway in Connecticut. Included with your letter were plan sheets and specifications for the Merritt Parkway Guardrail (MPG), an April 1996 test report by Bullard, Menges, and Alberson of the Texas Transportation Institute entitled "Testing and Evaluation of the Merritt Parkway Guiderail," and a composite videotape showing each of the tests that were run.

The MPG consists of a 152-mm x 305-mm timber rail element backed by a steel strap and splice plates. This rail is supported by W150 x 22.5 steel posts at a 2896-mm spacing and set with the top of the rail at a height of 762 mm above the pavement surface. Wood blockouts measuring 100 mm x 200 mm x 280 mm separate the rail from the steel posts. Details of the design are shown in Enclosure 1. A transition design, shown in Enclosure 2 was also tested.

Enclosure 3 is a summary of the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 350 testing that was done. We note that the basic design was successfully tested with both the 820-kg car and the 2000-kg pickup truck (tests 3-10 and 3-11, respectively). Test 3-11 was also run on the basic design set 300 mm behind a slope-face, 100-mm high curb, and test 3-21 was run on the transition design. We concur that the pickup truck test is the critical one in these last two cases, and that tests 3-10 and 3-20 with the 820-kg car are not necessary. However, in the case of the transition design, a note should be added to the plan requiring that the granite transition curbing be backfilled to its top to minimize the likelihood of a small car's wheel becoming jammed between the back of this curb and the bottom of the timber rail element.

Based on our review of the test results, we find that the MPG meets the appropriate evaluation criteria for an NCHRP Report 350 Test Level 3(TL-3) traffic barrier and may be used on the National Highway System (NHS) when such use is requested by a highway agency. We understand that the MPG is a non-proprietary product and that interested agencies may contact the Connecticut Department of Transportation to obtain copies of specifications and full size drawings.

We note that you intend to conduct an in-service evaluation of the MPG as recommended in the NCHRP Report 350. Two items of particular interest, in addition to crash performance and repair costs, are the initial cost of the system and the long-term durability of the weathering steel used for the backing plates, splices, and posts.

You also asked our opinion on the possible effect on performance of horizontal grooves on the upper sloped face of an F-shape concrete safety barrier. Tests conducted several years ago have led some research engineers to conclude that a "rough" faced barrier allows an impacting vehicle to climb higher up the wall, possibly leading to a rollover in the case of shorter wheelbase, front-wheel drive vehicles. Horizontal grooves in the barrier could produce the same undesirable results in relatively shallowangle impacts. Thus, we recommend that this seemingly minor design modification be tested prior to use, or that a verticalfaced barrier be considered instead.

Sincerely yours,

James & Hatton h

Y Seppo I. Sillan, Acting Chief へ Federal-Aid and Design Division

3 Enclosures

Geometric and Safety Design Acceptance Letter B-38



Radius R	Ø /2	d	
(ft.)	(Degrees)	(In.)	
35 Min.	4.10	5/8	
40	3.58	9/16	
45	3.18	1/2	
50	2.86	7/16	
55	2.60	7/16	
60	2.40	3⁄8	
65	2.20	3⁄8	
70	2.05	5⁄16	
Over 70	Flat	0	



		REVISED: 04/05/05
	TOWN:	PROJECT NO.:
		DRAWING NO.:
PLOTTED	DRAWING JULE MISCELLANEOUS CONNECTICUT DETAIL MERRITT PARKWAY GUIDERAIL LEADING END ATTACHMENT AND SYSTEMS 2 & 3	SHEET NO.:

Maximum Design Deflection (ft) Area. Of Concern Plus 2 Posts (see sketch) SYSTEM 3 SYSTEM 2 Standard System W6x15 Posts W6x15 Posts W6x15 Posts Min. Length Needed Spaced at 2'- 6" Spaced at 5' Spaced at 10' System 3 10' 10' 50' 70' System 2 10' 60' 70' 4' Standard System 70

NOTES: 1. THIS DRAWING SHOWS LEADING END ATTACHMENT TO PROPOSED PARAPETS. AT EXISTING PARAPETS ATTACH GUIDERAIL USING D.O.T. APPROVED CHEMICAL ANCHORS.

### CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Division of Research August 1996

# Merritt Parkway Guiderail (MPG)

NCHRP Report 350, Test Level 3 Crash Tests

## Summary of Results

NCHRP Report 350	3-11	3-10	3-11	3-21
Test Designation	No Curb	No Curb	With Curb	Transition
Vehicle Mass (kg)	2000	896	2000	2000
<pre>Impact Velocity (km/h)</pre>	100.02	99.29	99.33	101.96
Impact Angle (degrees)	25.20	20.30	25.24	26.38
Impact Location	0 mm upstream from a post.	1800 mm upstream from a post.	0 mm upstream from a post.	1880 mm from end of rigid barrier.
Lateral Dynamic Deflection (mm)	1150	750	1020	150
Occupant Impact Velocity (m/s)		•		
Longitudinal (max. allowable=12)	8.09	5.99	6.96	9.22
<pre>Lateral (max. allowable=12)</pre>	4.25	5.27	4.78	7.91
Occupant Ridedown Acceleration (peak 10 ms avg g's)				
Longitudinal (max. allowable=20)	-9.58	-4.27	-10.12	-8.15
Lateral (max. allowable=20)	-10.13	8.23	-10.16	-10.38
Exit Angle (degrees)	0.50	8.80	12.53	9.20
Exit Velocity (km/h)	40.90	76.20	59.37	56.93
Assessment	Passed all requirements	Passed all requirements	Passed all requirements	Passed all requirements