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## DISCLAIMER

This research was performed in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official view or policies of the FHWA or TxDOT. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation, and its contents are not intended for construction, bidding, or permit purposes. In addition, the above listed agencies assume no liability for its contents or use thereof. The United States Government and the State of Texas do not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the object of this report. The engineer in charge of the project was Roger P. Bligh, P.E. (Texas, \#78550).

## TTI PROVING GROUND DISCLAIMER

The results of the crash testing reported herein apply only to the article being tested.
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## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

This project was set up to provide Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) with a mechanism to quickly and effectively evaluate high priority issues related to roadside safety devices. Roadside safety devices shield motorists from roadside hazards such as non-traversable terrain and fixed objects. To maintain the desired level of safety for the motoring public, these safety devices must be designed to accommodate a variety of site conditions, placement locations, and a changing vehicle fleet. Periodically, there is a need to assess the compliance of existing safety devices with current vehicle testing criteria.

Under this project, roadside safety issues are identified and prioritized for investigation. Each roadside safety issue is addressed with a separate work plan, and the results are summarized in an individual test report.

### 1.2 BACKGROUND

Median barriers are commonly used to separate opposing lanes of traffic on divided highways. Concrete median barriers (CMBs) are often preferred on urban freeways with narrow medians. They are also used along heavily traveled highways to separate managed lanes from general purpose lanes. The rigid nature of concrete barriers results in little or no deflection and makes them relatively maintenance free. This reduces life-cycle cost, congestion due to lane closures, and exposure of maintenance personnel.

However, long, continuous runs of CMBs limit access of emergency and maintenance vehicles to the other side of the roadway or a managed lane. Periodic openings in the barrier can provide needed cross-median access. However, the exposed barrier ends resulting from openings in a concrete median barrier pose an impact hazard for traffic. Even if the exposed barrier ends are safety treated with crash attenuators, median protection is lost along the length of the opening. Implementation of crashworthy median barrier gates at these locations can maintain the desired level of median protection for motorists while offering improved cross-median access for emergency and/or maintenance vehicles.

A median barrier gate must be able to function as a median barrier to contain and redirect errant vehicles impacting along its length, be able to open and close, and be properly transitioned to the CMB on both ends. The Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) developed an emergency opening system (EOS) for the Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation (SDHPT) in the early 1980s (1). The system was comprised of two tubular steel beams mounted vertically on top of each other with a separation of 3 inches. A W-beam rail was attached to the face of the steel beams and terminated with W -beam end connectors to minimize snagging potential. The beams spanned 30 ft between free-standing CMB sections that were modified to transition from a New Jersey safety shape profile to a vertical face. Steel brackets with three 7/8-inch thick horizontal steel plates were anchored to the ends of the CMB sections using eight 1.5 -inch diameter anchor bolts. The steel box beams were pinned to the brackets using a
3.25-inch diameter pin at each end. A jack and caster mechanism was used to raise the beams off of the horizontal bracket plates to permit it to be pushed open.

Three full-scale crash tests were conducted to evaluate the impact performance of the system under NCHRP Report 230 (2). Two tests were performed to evaluate the transition of the steel beams to the CMB and the effects of vehicle snagging on the concrete barrier ends. One test involved an 1800-lb small passenger car impacting the EOS at a nominal speed of $60 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and a nominal angle of 15 degrees. The other transition test involved a $4500-\mathrm{lb}$ passenger sedan impacting the EOS at nominal speed of $60 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and a nominal angle of 25 degrees. The impact point for both tests was 6 ft upstream of the downstream end of the system.

Another test was conducted 6 ft upstream of the midpoint of the gate to evaluate the strength and maximum deflection of the steel beams. A 4500-lb passenger sedan impacted the EOS at nominal speed of $60 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and a nominal angle of 25 degrees. The crash tests were successful, and the design was implemented by the SDHPT on selected projects along Interstate 45 (1).

As traffic volumes have continued to increase, additional lanes have been added to increase capacity. This has resulted in narrower medians and the use of more concrete median barrier to separate traffic. The use of managed lanes has also increased significantly in recent years as another means of addressing growing congestion problems. Consequently, the need for median barrier gates to provide emergency and other authorized vehicles access to these lanes has also increased.

TTI conducted further testing of both the original and a modified version of the EOS for the TxDOT under research project 0-5210 (3). The objective of the testing was to determine if the EOS complies with the new Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (MASH) that was published by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) in October 2009 (4). MASH has superseded NCHRP Report 350 (5) as the recommended guidance for the safety performance evaluation of roadside safety features.

MASH test designation 3-10 was performed on the original EOS barrier design with some minor modifications incorporated to reduce the potential for vehicle snagging. The horizontal plates on the steel end bracket were tapered, and the curb protruding from the end of the concrete parapet was constructed with a straight taper rather than a rounded nose. Figure 1.1 shows the test installation. The test conditions were a 2420 lb vehicle (denoted 1100C) impacting the gate 3.6 ft upstream of the end of the concrete parapet at a nominal impact speed and angle of $62 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and 25 degrees, respectively.

The 1100 C test vehicle was contained and redirected. However, the gate failed to comply with MASH due to excessive occupant compartment deformation inside the vehicle (3).


Figure 1.1. Emergency Opening System (EOS).

Several modifications were made to the end of the EOS to help mitigate the severe vehicle snagging. These changes were developed with retrofit of the existing design as a goal. The horizontal steel plates on the end brackets were replaced with tapered sections of 2 inch $\times$ $1 / 4$-inch thick steel tubing. The ends of the tubular steel beams were cut off and tapered sections of tubing were added. These tubes tapered out 2 inches from the sides of the steel beams and then tapered back down to a width that was less than the width of the end of the concrete parapet to reduce snagging potential from a reverse direction impact. When assembled and installed, the tapered sections of tubing on the steel beams and end bracket overlapped each other to resemble
a finger joint. Other details of the median barrier gate, including the concrete parapet details, remained the same as in the previous tests.

MASH test 3-10 was performed on the modified design. Once again, the modified gate did not perform acceptably due to excessive occupant compartment deformation inside the vehicle (3). Further research was needed to develop a median barrier gate that satisfies MASH impact performance criteria.

### 1.3 OBJECTIVES/SCOPE OF RESEARCH

The objective of this research was to develop a median barrier gate that meets the Test Level 3 (TL-3) impact performance requirements of $M A S H$. TxDOT requested that the gate be designed to accommodate reversible traffic flow on both sides of the median and that the gate be operable in both directions on each end.

The research approach consisted of engineering analysis, finite element simulation, and full-scale crash testing. Three tests were performed to evaluate different aspects of the design. Test 3-11 evaluated the strength of the median barrier gate and its ability to function as a longitudinal barrier. Tests 3-20 and 3-21 assessed the transition of the median barrier gate to the adjacent concrete median barrier.

Reported herein are details of the design and analysis of the TxDOT median barrier gate, descriptions of the tests performed, assessment of the test results, and implementation recommendations.

## CHAPTER 2. MEDIAN BARRIER GATE DESIGN*

A median barrier gate must function as a median barrier. Adequate strength is necessary to maintain continuity of protection between the sections of concrete median barrier it spans. The gate must be capable of containing and redirecting errant vehicles that impact along its length. Additionally, the stiffness of the gate must be properly transitioned to the adjacent concrete median barrier to prevent excessive vehicle snagging or vehicle "pocketing" into the more flexible gate in advance of the rigid barrier end.

As the name implies, the median barrier gate must also function as a gate. It must be capable of being readily opened and closed from both directions on either end. The gate must be sufficiently light to permit manual operation and the components, including any wheels or casters must be durable and suitable for operation in a highway environment. Key design considerations that must be addressed include vehicle snagging on exposed CMB surfaces, structural adequacy to accommodate the increased impact severity of the design impact conditions prescribed by the AASHTO MASH, and stability of the pickup truck design test vehicle.

### 2.1 DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

### 2.1.1 Snagging

As discussed in Chapter 1, the original EOS failed to comply with MASH. Exposed surfaces on the CMB to which the gate was attached permitted severe vehicle snagging to occur. The snagging forces led to excessive occupant compartment deformation inside the vehicle.

Various design features were incorporated into the new median barrier gate to help mitigate snagging potential. The vertical spacing between the rail elements was eliminated. This not only reduced snagging, but also simplified fabrication. Stacking the two rails on top of one another eliminates the need for welded spacers. Thus, the rails can be individually galvanized and assembled with through bolts rather than being welded together with channel spacers and galvanized as a unit.

Additionally, the width of the tubular rail members was increased to match the width of the end of the concrete parapet to which it is attached. This decreases the ability of the vehicle to make direct contact with the end of the concrete parapet. When making this change, it was important to account for the tolerance in the pinned connection and any lateral shift that the connection permits in the rail members. Too much shift could expose the edge of the rail members and result in snagging in a reverse direction impact.

[^0]Finally, the gap between the ends of the tubular rails and the concrete parapet was minimized. Some offset was required to accommodate the travel arc of the rails as they are opened and closed.

### 2.1.2 Rail Member Selection

The selection of a rail member to serve as the beams in the median barrier gate involved consideration of several factors. The bending capacity of the rails had to be sufficient to contain and redirect a pickup truck impacting at the design test conditions specified in MASH. The EOS was connected to free-standing barrier ends when it was crash tested. The resulting lateral barrier deflection reduced the impact forces compared to a system connected to a rigid barrier. Furthermore, the heavier design test vehicle specified in MASH increased the impact severity by 13 percent compared to the nominal test conditions used to evaluate the EOS.

Geometry of the rails was an important consideration in addition to strength. As mentioned in the previous section, it was desirable that the width of the rail match the width of the end of the concrete parapet to which it was attached to reduce snagging potential. Further, several constraints existed on the depth of the rail members. The combined height of the two rail members had to provide sufficient rail height to maintain vehicle stability during redirection while maintaining a clear opening from the ground to the bottom of the lower rail of no more than 11 inches. An empirical relationship between clear opening and post setback distance is presented in Section 13 "Railings" of the 2004 AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications (G). This guidance, which was based on crash test performance, recommends that the clear opening beneath a rail be no more than 11 inches when the post setback distance is zero. In the case of the median barrier gate, the "post" is the end of the concrete parapet and the setback distance is zero (i.e., the edge of the concrete parapet is aligned with the face of the tubular steel rail elements).

Weight, cost, and availability were other important factors in the selection of a rail member for use in the median barrier gate. If the tubular steel rails were too heavy, it would make their use in a manually operated gate impractical. Some districts have found the cost of proprietary gate systems in the market to be prohibitive. One of the design objectives for the new median barrier gate was to keep its cost comparable to that of the existing EOS. The availability of tubular steel members in large sizes can be very limited. Selection of a rail size with very limited availability could adversely affect fabrication and delivery schedules. The researchers contacted several steel suppliers in Texas to obtain cost information and verify availability of the members being considered for use in the median barrier gate system.

Table 2.1 shows the weight, cost, and plastic section modulus for the 8 -inch $\times 8$-inch $\times$ $1 / 2$-inch steel tube used in the EOS and other sizes with possible application in the new median barrier gate. Tubular members with a width of 12 inches were selected to match the width of the concrete parapet needed to develop the strength of the barrier gate. The selection of member depth was a function of rail height. Stacked 12 -inch $\times 10$-inch steel tubes could provide a maximum height of 31 inches when constrained by a maximum clear opening of 11 inches. The 12 -inch $\times 12$-inch section could provide rail heights up to 35 inches.

Several thicknesses were available for these two sizes of steel tubes. The selection of a thickness is based on the required strength. Impact simulations were performed to aid in the selection of a rail height based on vehicle stability and a rail thickness based on strength.

Table 2.1. Comparison of Tubular Rail Properties.

| Material Costs (04/2010) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section | Thickness | Cost/Foot | Weight/Foot | Cost/lb | Zx |  |
|  | $1 / 4$ | $\$ 28.91$ | 39.4 | $\$ 0.73$ | 47.6 |  |
|  | $5 / 16$ | $\$ 33.42$ | 48.8 | $\$ 0.68$ | 58.6 |  |
|  | $3 / 8$ | $\$ 35.90$ | 58 | $\$ 0.62$ | 69.2 |  |
| 12 | $1 / 4$ | $\$ 38.80$ | 36 | $\$ 1.08$ | 42.1 |  |
|  | $5 / 16$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 44.6 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 51.7 |  |
|  | $3 \times 8$ | $1 / 2$ | $\$ 58.35$ | 52.9 | $\$ 1.10$ |  |
|  | $\$ 38.09$ | 48.1 |  |  |  |  |

### 2.2 FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS

Finite element models were developed for use in impact simulations to determine the optimal rail member size for the new median barrier gate. The objective was to meet strength and crashworthiness requirements while minimizing weight and cost. This was accomplished through a parametric study of the performance of different rail sizes and thicknesses.

The LS-DYNA finite element code was used for the simulations (7). LS-DYNA is a general purpose explicit finite element code capable of simulating complex nonlinear dynamic impact problems. LS-DYNA incorporates state-of-the-art contact algorithms that can be used to model vehicular collisions with roadside objects and is widely used within the roadside safety research community for analyzing the impact performance of roadside safety hardware.

The analyses were performed using the impact conditions of MASH test 3-11. This test involves a $5000-\mathrm{lb}$ pickup truck (denoted 2270P) impacting the barrier at a speed of $62 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and an angle of 25 degrees. The impact point was approximately 4 ft upstream of the midpoint of the gate. The vehicle model used in the simulations was a 2007 Chevrolet Silverado 1500, 2-wheel drive (2WD), crew cab, short box, pickup truck (8). This model was developed by the National Crash Analysis Center (NCAC) under sponsorship of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to represent the $M A S H$ design vehicle.

An initial simulation was performed on the EOS. This system incorporates two 8 -inch $\times$ 8 -inch $\times 1 / 2$-inch steel tubes vertically separated 3 inches and mounted at a height of 28.5 inches. The pickup truck exhibited a high roll angle as shown in Figure 2.1, and rollover was the predicted outcome. It was concluded from the results of this simulation that the rail height needed to be increased to improve stability of the pickup truck.


Figure 2.1. Mid-Span Impact of Pickup Truck into EOS: (a) Initial Impact Conditions and (b) High Vehicle Roll Angle.

Additional simulations were performed with the 12 -inch $\times 10$-inch and 12 -inch $\times 12$-inch steel tubes. The lightest sections (i.e., minimum thickness) available were selected for evaluation. The 12 -inch $\times 10$-inch $\times 1 / 4$-inch tube was evaluated at a height of 31 inches, which was the maximum height that could be achieved while maintaining a maximum clear opening of 11 inches below the rail. A 12 -inch $\times 12$-inch $\times 1 / 4$-inch steel tube was evaluated at heights of 34 inches and 36 inches. Figure 2.2 shows the pickup truck in relation to these rail configurations. As a consequence of these first findings, the barrier design process concentrated in investigating the impact response behavior of the device with alternative heights and sections. At first, various 12 -inch wide tube sections were evaluated with different rail heights, as it is shown in Figure 2.2.

(a)

$$
34 ":\left(12^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime} \times 1 / 4^{\prime \prime} \text { tubes }\right)
$$


(b)
$36 ":\left(12^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime} \times 1 / 4^{\prime \prime}\right.$ tubes)

(c)

Figure 2.2. Pickup Truck in Relation to Different Rail Geometries Chosen for Evaluation.

As shown in Figure 2.3, the maximum dynamic deflection and permanent deflection was similar for all three rail configurations. Some localized buckling was observed in the 12 -inch $\times$ 12 -inch $\times 1 / 4$-inch tube.

| Rail Height | Max. <br> Dynamic <br> Deflection | Max. <br> Statatic <br> Deflection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $31^{\prime \prime}$ <br> $\left(12^{\prime \prime} \times 10^{\prime \prime} \times 1 / 4^{\prime \prime}\right)$ | $12.25^{\prime \prime}$ | $9.5^{\prime \prime}$ |
| $34^{\prime \prime}$ <br> $\left(12^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime} \times 1 / 4^{\prime \prime}\right)$ | $11.75^{\prime \prime}$ | $9 \prime$ |
| $36^{\prime \prime}$ <br> $\left(12^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime} \times 1 / 4^{\prime \prime}\right)$ | $12^{\prime \prime}$ | $9^{\prime \prime}$ |



Figure 2.3. Rail Deformation and Deflection Results.

Figure 2.4 shows vehicle roll angle versus time. At time of termination of the simulation runs ( 0.55 seconds), the vehicle roll angle for the 31 inch rail height was 35 degrees and still increasing. Vehicle rollover for this configuration is likely. The vehicle was very stable in the impact with the 36 inch rail height, with a maximum roll angle of only 17 degrees. The vehicle was also successfully redirected in the simulation with the 34 inch rail height, but the vehicle had a higher roll angle of 27 degrees.

Results showed that a 12 -inch $\times 10$-inch tube section was not feasible as a rail member for the new median barrier gate. It was not capable of redirecting the pickup truck in a stable manner at its maximum height of 31 inches. Thus, further evaluation efforts focused on the 12 -inch $\times 12$-inch steel tube sections.

Two additional simulations were performed. One simulation evaluated vehicle stability associated with a 35 inch rail height. A 12 -inch $\times 12$-inch $\times-1 / 4$ inch tube was used in this simulation. The final simulation was performed with a thicker 12 -inch $\times 12$-inch $\times 5 / 16$-inch tube at a height of 34 inches. The purpose of this simulation was to evaluate if the local buckling phenomenon observed in the simulation of the thin-walled tube affected vehicle stability. In other words, would the reduced deformation of a thicker, stronger tube improve vehicle stability and enable a lower mounting height to be utilized.


Figure 2.4. Vehicle Roll Angle Results.

Figure 2.5 shows vehicle roll angle versus time for these additional simulations superimposed on the results from the previous simulations. Results from the two cases with different rail thickness (cases B and E) are similar in terms of vehicle roll angle, indicating that the increase in rail thickness did not affect vehicle stability. Consequently, there was no compelling reason to adopt a thicker, heavier, more costly rail section. It was concluded that the 12 -inch $\times 12$-inch $\times 1 / 4$-inch tube section was the optimal choice as a rail member for the new median barrier gate. Not only does it provide adequate strength to contain and redirect the pickup truck, it is a lighter and less expensive section than the 8 -inch $\times 8$-inch $\times 1 / 2$-inch tube section used in the EOS (refer to Table 2.1).

The rail height selected for the new median barrier gate was 35 inches. The pickup truck was stably redirected at this rail height as shown in Figure 2.5. Further, this is the maximum height that can be achieved with the stacked 12 -inch $\times 12$-inch $\times 1 / 4$-tubes when constrained by a maximum clear opening of 11 inches between the ground and bottom of the rail to reduce potential for vehicle snagging.

The impact forces derived from the simulation of the selected rail configuration were used to size the connection pins, design the steel anchor bracket, and engineer the reinforcement in the concrete parapet ends. The design recommendations were reviewed and approved by TxDOT. Full-scale crash tests were performed to verify the impact performance of the median barrier gate. Details of the median barrier gate and crash tests are described in the following sections of this report.


Figure 2.5. Predicted Vehicle Roll Outcomes for Different Rail Configurations.

## CHAPTER 3. MEDIAN BARRIER GATE DETAILS

### 3.1 TEST ARTICLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

The total length of the installation was $50 \mathrm{ft}-0$ inch and was comprised of two 10 ft cast-in-place concrete barrier sections with a 30 ft long median barrier gate spanning between them. The concrete parapets were cast in place on top of a 6 -inch thick reinforced concrete slab. They were tied to the slab using fourteen \#5 stirrups spaced at 8 inches, followed by three $\# 5$ stirrups spaced at 4 inches at the gate end of the parapet. The concrete parapets transitioned from a 32 -inch tall F-shape that was $91 / 2$ inches wide on top and 24 inches wide on bottom to a vertical wall that was $361 / 2$ inches tall and 12 inches wide over a distance of 5 ft . A $91 / 2$-inch tall curb protruded 16 inches out from the end of the concrete parapet to support the steel end bracket and steel connection pin.

Horizontal reinforcement in the F-shape portion of the concrete parapets consisted of four pairs of \#5 bars located 5 inches, 10 inches, 16 inches, and $301 / 2$ inches from the bottom of the parapet. These bars were symmetric about the vertical centerline of the parapet and followed its profile. In the transition section, the horizontal reinforcement included two pairs of \#5 bars located 5 inches and 10 inches from the bottom of the parapet, and three pairs of \#7 Richmond anchors located 14 inches, $201 / 2$ inches, and $25 \frac{1}{2}$ inches from the bottom of the parapet. Another set of \#7 Richmond anchors were bent to follow the vertical taper of the transition and terminated at a height of 31 inches from the bottom of the parapet. The Richmond anchors formed a rectangular bolt pattern to which the steel anchor brackets were attached.

The vertical reinforcement in the 5 - ft transition section of the parapet near the gate connection was comprised of pairs of \#5 U-bars that created closed stirrups spaced on 4-inch centers. This was followed by four more pairs of U-bars spaced at 8 inches. These U-bars were positioned between \#5 open stirrups that were bent to match the profile of the F-shape barrier and spaced on 8 -inch centers along the 5 -ft length of F-shape barrier.

A 16 -inch long, $91 / 2$-inch high curb was cast on the inside face of each concrete parapet. A $91 / 2$-inch long section of 3 -inch schedule 40 pipe that was cast inside the curb and reinforced with two \#5 U-bars that extended out of the end of the parapet. The steel end brackets rested on top of the curb, and the connecting pins extended into the embedded pipe section.

The median barrier gate itself was comprised of two 29 - ft long, 12 -inch $\times 12$-inch $\times$ $1 / 4$-inch A500 Grade B steel tubes. The tubes were stacked vertically on top of one another and bolted together using three $3 / 4$-inch diameter $\times 26$-inch long ASTM A325 or equivalent grade bolts spaced on 80 -inch centers. A $2 \frac{1}{2}-$-inch schedule 40 pipe section was welded inside the ends of the tubes for the connecting pins. The ends of the tubes were reinforced with a tubing support bracket fabricated from ASTM A36 steel plate. The tubing support bracket slides into the end of the tubes around the pipe inserts and is secured in place using two $3 / 4$-inch diameter $\times 26$-inch long ASTM A325 or equivalent grade bolts.

Steel end brackets were fabricated from ASTM A36 steel plate. The vertical plate of the end bracket that connected to the end of the concrete parapet was 12 inches wide and 2 inches thick. Two 1 -inch thick tapered horizontal steel plates were welded to the top and bottom of the end plate. A $2 \frac{1}{2}$-inch $\times 3$-inch slot was cut into each plate to accept the connecting pin.

The end brackets were bolted to the ends of the concrete parapets using eight 1-inch diameter $\times 33 / 4$-inch long ASTM A325 high-strength bolts. The bolts threaded into the Richmond anchors that were cast inside the concrete parapet.

The median barrier gate was connected to the end brackets using $2 \frac{1}{4}$-inch diameter $\times$ 32 -inch long ASTM A36 cold rolled steel pins. The pins passed through the horizontal plates in the end bracket, the pipe sections inside the tubular steel rails, and inserted into the pipe sleeve embedded in the parapet curb.

The median barrier was supported by a heavy duty 8 -inch diameter swivel caster wheel. The wheel provides a mounting height of 35 inches to the top of the upper steel tube. Figure 3.1, Figure 3.2, and Appendix A show details of the median barrier gate installation. Figure 3.3 presents photographs of the completed test installation.

### 3.2 MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS

Concrete used for parapet portion of the barrier was specified to have a 28-day unconfined compressive strength of 3600 psi. All reinforcing steel was grade 60.

The rails that comprised the gate were ASTM A500 Grade B steel tubes. The end bracket, tubing support bracket, and caster mounting plate were fabricated from ASTM A36 steel plate.

The bolts used to connect the end bracket to the concrete parapet, secure the tubing support bracket inside the tubes, connect the tubes together, and connect the swivel caster were all ASTM A325 or equivalent grade. The connecting pin was specified to be ASTM A36 cold rolled steel. The handle on the pin was fabricated from ASTM A36 steel rod. Appendix B presents materials certifications related to the materials used to construct the median barrier gate.

### 3.3 SOIL CONDITIONS

The test installation was installed on an existing concrete apron.


Figure 3.1. Details of the TxDOT Median Barrier Gate Installation.




Figure 3.3. TxDOT Median Barrier Gate Installation before Testing.

## CHAPTER 4. TEST REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

### 4.1 CRASH TEST MATRIX

Three full-scale crash tests were performed to evaluate the impact performance of the TxDOT median barrier gate and assess its compliance with MASH guidelines. The first test performed on the TxDOT median barrier gate was MASH test 3-20. This test involves a $2420-\mathrm{lb}$ passenger car (denoted 1100 C ) impacting the median barrier gate upstream of its connection to the rigid concrete parapet at a nominal speed of $62 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and an angle of 25 degrees. The intent of this test is to evaluate the transition of the median barrier gate to the concrete parapet and assesses the potential for vehicle snagging. The critical impact point (CIP) for this test was determined to be 3.6 ft upstream of the concrete parapet end.

The second test was MASH test 3-11. This test involves a 5000 lb pickup truck (denoted 2270P) impacting the CIP of the length of need (LON) of the median barrier at a nominal impact speed and angle of $62 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and 25 degrees, respectively. This is a strength test that verifies the structural adequacy of the median barrier gate for impacts involving light trucks and sport utility vehicles (SUVs). Vehicle stability is also a primary evaluation criterion for this test. The CIP for this test was selected to be 4.3 ft upstream of the midpoint of the median barrier gate.

The third test performed on the median barrier gate was MASH test 3-21. This test involves a 5000 lb pickup truck impacting the median barrier gate upstream of its connection to the rigid concrete parapet at a nominal speed of $62 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and angle 25 degrees. The purpose of this test is to evaluate the strength of the connection between the median barrier gate and concrete parapet as well as the potential for vehicle snagging in the transition section. The critical impact point (CIP) for this test was determined to be 4.3 ft upstream of the concrete parapet end.

The crash test and data analysis procedures followed for these tests were in accordance with guidelines presented in $M A S H$. Chapter 4 presents brief descriptions of these procedures.

### 4.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The crash tests were evaluated in accordance with the criteria presented in MASH. The performance of the TxDOT median barrier gate was judged on the basis of three factors: structural adequacy, occupant risk, and post impact vehicle trajectory. Structural adequacy criteria assess the median barrier gate's ability to contain and redirect the vehicle. Occupant risk criteria evaluate the potential risk of hazard to occupants in the impacting vehicle, and to some extent other traffic, pedestrians, or workers in construction zones, if applicable. Post impact vehicle trajectory is evaluated to determine potential for secondary impact with other vehicles or fixed objects that may create further risk of injury to occupants of the impacting vehicle and/or risk of injury to occupants in other vehicles. The appropriate safety evaluation criteria from table 5.1 of MASH were used to evaluate the crash tests reported herein. These criteria are described in further detail for each crash test.

## CHAPTER 5. CRASH TEST PROCEDURES

### 5.1 TEST FACILITY

The full-scale crash tests reported herein were performed at TTI Proving Ground. TTI Proving Ground is an International Standards Organization (ISO) 17025 accredited laboratory with American Association for Laboratory Accreditation (A2LA) Mechanical Testing certificate 2821.01. The full-scale crash tests were performed according to TTI Proving Ground quality procedures and according to the MASH guidelines and standards.

The Texas Transportation Institute Proving Ground is a 2000-acre complex of research and training facilities located 10 miles northwest of the main campus of Texas A\&M University. The site, formerly an Air Force base, has large expanses of concrete runways and parking aprons well suited for experimental research and testing. The site selected for construction and testing of the TxDOT median barrier gate evaluated under this project was on the surface of an out-ofservice concrete apron. The apron consists of unreinforced jointed-concrete pavement in $12.5-\mathrm{ft}$ by $15-\mathrm{ft}$ blocks nominally 8 to 12 inches deep. The apron is over 50 years old, and the joints have some displacement, but are otherwise flat and level.

### 5.2 VEHICLE TOW AND GUIDANCE PROCEDURES

The test vehicle was towed into the median barrier gate using a steel cable guidance and reverse tow system. A steel cable for guiding the test vehicle was tensioned along the path, anchored at each end, and threaded through an attachment to the front wheel of the test vehicle. An additional steel cable was connected to the test vehicle, passed around a pulley near the impact point, through a pulley on the tow vehicle, and then anchored to the ground such that the tow vehicle moved away from the test site. A two-to-one speed ratio between the test and tow vehicle existed with this system. Just prior to impact with the installation, the test vehicle was released to be free-wheeling and unrestrained. The vehicle remained free-wheeling, i.e., no steering or braking inputs, until the vehicle cleared the immediate area of the test site, at which time brakes on the vehicle were activated to bring it to a safe and controlled stop.

### 5.3 DATA ACQUISITION SYSTEMS

### 5.3.1 Vehicle Instrumentation and Data Processing

The test vehicle was instrumented with a self-contained, on-board data acquisition system. The signal conditioning and acquisition system is a 16 -channel, Tiny Data Acquisition System (TDAS) Pro produced by Diversified Technical Systems, Inc. The accelerometers, that measure the $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}$, and z axis of vehicle acceleration, are strain gauge type with linear millivolt output proportional to acceleration. Angular rate sensors, measuring vehicle roll, pitch, and yaw rates, are ultra small size, solid state units designs for crash test service. The TDAS Pro
hardware and software conform to the latest SAE J211, Instrumentation for Impact Test. Each of the 16 channels is capable of providing precision amplification, scaling, and filtering based on transducer specifications and calibrations. During the test, data are recorded from each channel at a rate of 10,000 values per second with a resolution of one part in 65,536 . Once recorded, the data are backed up inside the unit by internal batteries should the primary battery cable be severed. Initial contact of the pressure switch on the vehicle bumper provides a time zero mark as well as initiating the recording process. After each test, the data are downloaded from the TDAS Pro unit into a laptop computer at the test site. The raw data are then processed by the Test Risk Assessment Program (TRAP) software to produce detailed reports of the test results. Each of the TDAS Pro units is returned to the factory annually for complete recalibration. Accelerometers and rate transducers are also calibrated annually with traceability to the National Institute for Standards and Technology.

TRAP uses the data from the TDAS Pro to compute occupant/compartment impact velocities, time of occupant/compartment impact after vehicle impact, and the highest 10millisecond (ms) average ridedown acceleration. TRAP calculates change in vehicle velocity at the end of a given impulse period. In addition, maximum average accelerations over $50-\mathrm{ms}$ intervals in each of the three directions are computed. For reporting purposes, the data from the vehicle-mounted accelerometers are filtered with a $60-\mathrm{Hz}$ digital filter, and acceleration versus time curves for the longitudinal, lateral, and vertical directions are plotted using TRAP.

TRAP uses the data from the yaw, pitch, and roll rate transducers to compute angular displacement in degrees at 0.0001 -s intervals and then plots yaw, pitch, and roll versus time. These displacements are in reference to the vehicle-fixed coordinate system with the initial position and orientation of the vehicle-fixed coordinate systems being initial impact.

### 5.3.2 Anthropomorphic Dummy Instrumentation

An Alderson Research Laboratories Hybrid II, $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile male anthropomorphic dummy, restrained with lap and shoulder belts, was placed in the driver's position of the 1100C vehicle. The dummy was uninstrumented. Use of a dummy in the 2270 P vehicle is optional according to $M A S H$, and there was no dummy used in the tests with the 2270 P vehicle.

### 5.3.3 Photographic Instrumentation and Data Processing

Photographic coverage of the test included three high-speed cameras: one overhead with a field of view perpendicular to the ground and directly over the impact point; one placed behind the installation at an angle; and a third placed to have a field of view parallel to and aligned with the installation at the downstream end. A flashbulb activated by pressure-sensitive tape switches was positioned on the impacting vehicle to indicate the instant of contact with the installation and was visible from each camera. The footage from these high-speed cameras was analyzed on a computer-linked motion analyzer to observe phenomena occurring during the collision and to obtain time-event, displacement, and angular data. A mini-DV camera and still cameras recorded and documented conditions of the test vehicle and median barrier gate installation before and after the test.

## CHAPTER 6. CRASH TEST 420020-6 (MASH TEST 3-20)

### 6.1 TEST DESIGNATION AND ACTUAL IMPACT CONDITIONS

MASH test 3-20 involves an 1100 C vehicle weighing $2420 \mathrm{lb} \pm 55 \mathrm{lb}$ impacting the median barrier gate at a speed of $62.2 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h} \pm 2.5 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and an angle of 25 degrees $\pm 1.5$ degrees. The target impact point was 3.6 ft upstream of the end of the concrete parapet. The 2003 Kia Rio used in the test weighed 2424 lb and the actual impact speed and angle were $62.6 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and 24.6 degrees, respectively. The actual impact point was 4.1 ft upstream of the end of the concrete parapet.

### 6.2 TEST VEHICLE

A 2003 Kia Rio, shown in Figures 6.1 and 6.2, was used for the crash test. Test inertial weight of the vehicle was 2424 lb , and its gross static weight was 2592 lb . The height to the lower edge of the vehicle bumper was 8.50 inches, and it was 22.75 inches to the upper edge of the bumper. Figure C 1 in Appendix C gives additional dimensions and information on the vehicle. The vehicle was directed into the installation using the cable reverse tow and guidance system, and was released to be free-wheeling and unrestrained just prior to impact.

### 6.3 WEATHER CONDITIONS

The test was performed on the morning of July 15, 2010. Eight days prior to test date, a total of 0.17 inch of rainfall was recorded. Weather conditions at the time of testing were as follows: wind speed: $6 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$; wind direction: 184 degrees with respect to the vehicle (vehicle was traveling in a northerly direction); temperature: $88^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, relative humidity: 66 percent.


### 6.4 TEST DESCRIPTION

The 2003 Kia Rio, traveling at a speed of $62.6 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$, impacted the TxDOT median barrier gate 49 inches upstream of the end of the concrete parapet at an angle of 24.6 degrees. At approximately 0.009 s after impact, the left front tire of the vehicle contacted the downstream caster wheel of the gate, and at 0.026 s , the left front tire contacted the toe of the concrete barrier. The vehicle began to redirect 0.037 s after impact. At 0.167 s , the vehicle was traveling parallel with the median barrier gate and traveling at a speed of $45.6 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$. The rear of the vehicle contacted the barrier 0.199 s after impact. At 0.300 s , the vehicle lost contact with the barrier and was traveling at an exit speed and angle of $49.3 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and 11.6 degrees, respectively. Brakes on the vehicle were applied at 1.4 s after impact, and the vehicle subsequently came to rest 183 ft downstream of impact and 27 ft toward traffic lanes. Figures D1 and D2 in Appendix D show sequential photographs of the test period.


Figure 6.1. Vehicle/Barrier Geometrics for Test No. 420020-6.


Figure 6.2. Vehicle before Test No. 420020-6.

### 6.5 DAMAGE TO TEST INSTALLATION

Damage to the gate itself was only cosmetic and consisted of scuff marks as shown in Figures 6.3 and 6.4. The end of the upstream concrete parapet sustained two thin stress cracks on the field side. Minor concrete spalling was observed on the field side of the end of the downstream concrete parapet. No rebar was exposed and the spall was considered to be cosmetic in nature. The vehicle was in contact with the installation 10.2 ft . No measurable dynamic or permanent deflection was noted.

### 6.6 VEHICLE DAMAGE

As shown in Figure 6.5, the vehicle sustained damage to the front and left side. The left front strut, strut tower, and A-post were deformed. Also damaged were the front bumper, hood, grill, radiator and support, left front fender, left front tire and wheel rim, left front door and glass, the left rear door, and left rear quarter panel. The roof was deformed and the windshield sustained stress cracking. Maximum exterior crush to the vehicle was 12.0 inches in the side plane at the left front corner at bumper height. Maximum occupant compartment deformation was 3.0 inches in the firewall area near the toe pan on the driver side. Figure 6.6 shows photographs of the interior of the vehicle. Exterior crush and occupant compartment deformation measurements are provided in Appendix C, Tables C1 and C2.

### 6.7 OCCUPANT RISK FACTORS

Data from the accelerometer, located at the vehicle center of gravity, were digitized for evaluation of occupant risk. In the longitudinal direction, the occupant impact velocity was $26.6 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ at 0.078 s , the highest $0.010-\mathrm{s}$ occupant ridedown acceleration was -4.0 Gs from 0.221 to 0.231 s , and the maximum $0.050-\mathrm{s}$ average acceleration was -14.9 Gs between 0.032 and 0.082 s . In the lateral direction, the occupant impact velocity was $31.2 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ at 0.078 s , the highest $0.010-\mathrm{s}$ occupant ridedown acceleration was 6.4 Gs from 0.217 to 0.227 s , and the maximum 0.050 -s average acceleration was 17.6 Gs between 0.023 and 0.073 s . Theoretical Head Impact Velocity (THIV) was $43.1 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ or $12.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ at 0.076 s ; Post-Impact Head Decelerations (PHD) was 7.1 Gs between 0.218 and 0.228 s ; and Acceleration Severity Index (ASI) was 2.28 between 0.028 and 0.078 s . Figure 6.7 summarizes these data and other pertinent information from the test. Vehicle angular displacements and accelerations versus time traces are presented in Appendix E, Figures E1 through E7.


Figure 6.3. Vehicle/Barrier Positions after Test No. 420020-6.


Figure 6.4. TxDOT Median Barrier Gate after Test No. 420020-6.


Figure 6.5. Vehicle after Test No. 420020-6.


Before Test

After Test

Figure 6.6. Interior of Vehicle for Test No. 420020-6.


| General Information |  | Impact Conditions | Post-Impact Trajectory |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Test Agency......................... | Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) | Speed .............................. 62.6 mi/h | Stopping Distance ....................... 183 ft dwnstr |
| Test Standard Test No. ............ | MASH Test 3-20 | Angle ...............................24.6 degrees | 27 ft twd traffic |
| TTI Test No. | 420020-6 | Location/Orientation ...........4.1 ft upstrm of | Vehicle Stability |
| Date | 2010-07-15 | Exit Conditions parapet end | Maximum Yaw Angle....................-184 degrees |
| Test Article |  | Speed ............................... 49.3 mi/h | Maximum Pitch Angle................... 10 degrees |
| Type. | Median Barrier Gate | Angle ...............................11.6 degrees | Maximum Roll Angle .................... -12 degrees |
| Name | TxDOT Median Barrier Gate | Occupant Risk Values | Vehicle Snagging ........................ No |
| Installation Length | 50 ft | Impact Velocity | Vehicle Pocketing......................... No |
| Material or Key Elements ......... | 12 -inch $\times 12$-inch $\times 1 / 4$-inch steel tubes | Longitudinal....................26.6 ft/s | Test Article Deflections |
|  | connected to concrete parapets using | Lateral ...........................31.2 ft/s | Dynamic ..................................... Nil |
|  | 21/4-inch steel pins | Ridedown Accelerations | Permanent.................................. Nil |
| Soil Type and Condition............ | Anchored to existing concrete | Longitudinal....................-4.0 G | Working Width............................. Nil |
| Test Vehicle |  | Lateral ............................ 6.4 G | Vehicle Damage |
| Type/Designation..................... | 1100C | THIV ................................ $43.1 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | VDS .......................................... 11LFQ6 |
| Make and Model . | 2003 Kia Rio | PHD .................................7.1 G | CDC.......................................... 11FDEW4 |
| Curb . | 2357 lb | ASI..................................0.11 | Max. Exterior Deformation ............ 12.0 inches |
| Test Inertial. | 2424 lb | Max. 0.050-s Average | OCDI ......................................... LS1020120 |
| Dummy . | 168 lb | Longitudinal....................-14.9 G | Max. Occupant Compartment |
| Gross Static ........................... | 2592 lb | Lateral .......................... 17.6 G | Deformation ......................... 3.0 inches |
|  |  | Vertical ........................... -3.9 G |  |

Figure 6.7. Summary of Results for MASH Test 3-20 on the TxDOT Median Barrier Gate.

### 6.8 ASSESSMENT OF TEST RESULTS

An assessment of the test based on applicable $M A S H$ safety evaluation criteria is provided below.

### 6.8.1 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.

Results: The TxDOT median barrier gate contained and redirected the 1100C vehicle. The vehicle did not penetrate, underride, or over the installation. No measureable deformation was noted. (PASS)

### 6.8.2 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 an undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone.
Deformation of, or intrusions into, the occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.3 and Appendix E of MASH. (roof $\leq 102 \mathrm{~mm}$ (4.0 inches); windshield $=\leq 76 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 3.0 inches); side windows $=$ no shattering by test article structural member; wheel/foot well/toe pan $\leq 229 \mathrm{~mm}$ (9.0 inches); forward of A-pillar $\leq 305 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 12.0 inches); front side door area above seat $\leq 229 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 9.0 inches); front side door below seat $\leq 305 \mathrm{~mm}$ (12.0 inches); floor pan/transmission tunnel area $\leq 305 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 12.0 inches))

Results: No detached elements, fragments, or other debris was present to penetrate or to show potential for penetrating the 1100 C vehicle, nor to present hazard to others in the area. (PASS)
Maximum occupant compartment deformation was 3.0 inches in the firewall area near the toe pan on the driver side. (PASS)
F. The vehicle should remain upright during and after collision. The maximum roll and pitch angles are not to exceed 75 degrees.

Results: The 1100 C vehicle remained upright during and after the collision event. Maximum roll and pitch angles were -12 degrees and 10 degrees, respectively. (PASS)
H. Occupant impact velocities should satisfy the following: Longitudinal and Lateral Occupant Impact Velocity
$\frac{\text { Preferred }}{30 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}} \quad \frac{\text { Maximum }}{40 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}}$

Results: Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was $26.6 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$, and lateral occupant impact velocity was $31.2 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$. (PASS)
I. Occupant ridedown accelerations should satisfy the following: Longitudinal and Lateral Occupant Ridedown Accelerations
$\frac{\text { Preferred }}{15.0 \mathrm{Gs}} \quad \frac{\text { Maximum }}{20.49 \mathrm{Gs}}$

Results: Longitudinal ridedown acceleration was -4.0 G , and lateral ridedown acceleration was 6.4 G. (PASS)

### 6.8.3 Vehicle Trajectory

For redirective devices, the vehicle shall exit the barrier within the exit box.
Result: The vehicle exited within the exit box. (PASS)

## CHAPTER 7. CRASH TEST 420020-7 (MASH TEST 3-11)

### 7.1 TEST DESIGNATION AND ACTUAL IMPACT CONDITIONS

MASH test 3-11 involves a 2270P vehicle weighing $5000 \mathrm{lb} \pm 100 \mathrm{lb}$ impacting the TxDOT median barrier gate at a speed of $62.2 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h} \pm 2.5 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and an angle of 25 degrees $\pm 1.5$ degrees. The target impact point was 4.3 ft upstream of the mid-span of the gate. The 2003 Dodge Ram 1500 Quad-Cab pickup used in the test weighed 5015 lb and the actual impact speed and angle were $63.1 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and 24.7 degrees, respectively. The actual impact point was 4.8 ft upstream of the mid-span of the gate.

### 7.2 TEST VEHICLE

A 2003 Dodge Ram 1500 Quad-Cab pickup, shown in Figures 7.1 and 7.2, was used for the crash test. Test inertia weight of the vehicle was 5015 lb , and its gross static weight was 5015 lb . The height to the lower edge of the vehicle bumper was 13.5 inches, and it was 26.0 inches to the upper edge of the bumper. The vertical center of gravity (CG) height of the pickup truck was measured to be 28.12 inches. Figure C2 and Table C3 in Appendix C gives additional dimensions and information on the vehicle. The vehicle was directed into the installation using the cable reverse tow and guidance system, and was released to be freewheeling and unrestrained just prior to impact.

### 7.3 WEATHER CONDITIONS

The test was performed on the morning of July 19, 2010. No rainfall was recorded for the 10 days prior to the test date. Weather conditions at the time of testing were as follows: wind speed: $6 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$; wind direction: 218 degrees with respect to the vehicle (vehicle was traveling in a northerly direction); temperature: $87^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, relative humidity: 69 percent.

### 7.4 TEST DESCRIPTION

The 2003 Dodge Ram 1500 Quad-Cab pickup, traveling at a speed of $63.1 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$, impacted the TxDOT median barrier gate 4.8 ft upstream of the mid-span of the gate at an angle of 24.7 degrees. At approximately 0.021 s , the left front tire contacted the gate and the left front tire aired out. The gate began to deflect 0.025 s after impact, and the vehicle began to redirect at 0.042 s . At 0.169 s after impact, the vehicle was traveling parallel with the barrier at a speed of $55.1 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$. Maximum deflection of the barrier of 1.1 ft occurred 0.223 s after impact. At 0.311 s , the 2270 P vehicle lost contact with the barrier and was traveling at an exit speed and angle of $50.1 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and 12.2 degrees, respectively. Brakes on the vehicle were applied at 1.2 s after impact, and the vehicle subsequently came to rest 100 ft downstream of impact and 25 ft toward traffic lanes. Figures D3 and D4 in Appendix D show sequential photographs of the test period.


Figure 7.1. Vehicle/Gate Geometrics for Test No. 420020-7.


Figure 7.2. Vehicle before Test No. 420020-7.

### 7.5 DAMAGE TO TEST INSTALLATION

The steel barrier gate sustained moderate damage as shown in Figures 7.3 and 7.4. The traffic faces of the steel tubes were deformed inward and the tubular rails were buckled near midspan. There was no damage noted to the concrete parapets. The vehicle was in contact with the installation a distance of 14.9 ft . Working width was 1.1 ft . Maximum dynamic deflection of the median barrier gate during the test was 1.1 ft , and maximum permanent deformation was 0.8 ft .

### 7.6 VEHICLE DAMAGE

As shown in Figure 7.5, the majority of the damage sustained by the 2270P vehicle was to the left front corner and above the top wheel line along the left side. The left upper A-arm was deformed. Also damaged were the front bumper, grill, left front fender, left front tire and wheel rim, left front and rear doors, rear of the cab, left exterior bed, left rear wheel rim (no loss of air in the tire), rear bumper, and tailgate. Maximum exterior crush to the vehicle was 12.0 inches in the side plane in the left front corner at bumper height. Maximum occupant compartment deformation was 0.5 inches across the cab at hip level on the driver side. Figure 7.6 shows photographs of the interior of the vehicle. Exterior crush measurements and occupant compartment deformation are provided in Appendix C, Tables C4 and C5.

### 7.7 OCCUPANT RISK FACTORS

Data from the accelerometer, located at the vehicle center of gravity, were digitized for evaluation of occupant risk. In the longitudinal direction, the occupant impact velocity was $11.5 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ at 0.090 s , the highest $0.010-\mathrm{s}$ occupant ridedown acceleration was -7.4 Gs from 0.101 to 0.111 s , and the maximum $0.050-\mathrm{s}$ average acceleration was -5.0 Gs between 0.015 and 0.065 s . In the lateral direction, the occupant impact velocity was $27.2 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ at 0.090 s , the highest 0.010 -s occupant ridedown acceleration was 12.8 Gs from 0.104 to 0.114 s , and the maximum 0.050 -s average acceleration was 12.9 Gs between 0.032 and 0.082 s . THIV was $32.2 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ or $8.9 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ at 0.088 s ; PHD was 14.2 Gs between 0.103 and 0.113 s ; and ASI was 1.49 between 0.028 and 0.078 s . Figure 7.7 summarizes these data and other pertinent information from the test. Vehicle angular displacements and accelerations versus time traces are presented in Appendix E, Figures E8 through E14.


Figure 7.3. Vehicle/Gate Positions after Test No. 420020-7.


Figure 7.4. TxDOT Median Barrier Gate after Test No. 420020-7.

-


Figure 7.5. Vehicle after Test No. 420020-7.


Figure 7.6. Interior of Vehicle for Test No. 420020-7.

Figure 7.7. Summary of Results for MASH Test 3-11 on the TxDOT Median Barrier Gate.

### 7.8 ASSESSMENT OF TEST RESULTS

An assessment of the test based on the applicable MASH safety evaluation criteria is provided below.

### 7.8.1 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.

Results: The TxDOT median barrier gate contained and redirected the 2270P vehicle. The vehicle did not penetrate, underride, or override the installation. Maximum dynamic deflection during the test was 1.1 ft . (PASS)

### 7.8.2 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 an undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone.
Deformation of, or intrusions into, the occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.3 and Appendix E of MASH. (roof $\leq 102 \mathrm{~mm}$ (4.0 inches); windshield $=\leq 76 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 3.0 inches); side windows $=$ no shattering by test article structural member; wheel/foot well/toe pan $\leq 229 \mathrm{~mm}$ (9.0 inches); forward of A-pillar $\leq 305 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 12.0 inches); front side door area above seat $\leq 229 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 9.0 inches); front side door below seat $\leq 305 \mathrm{~mm}$ (12.0 inches); floor pan/transmission tunnel area $\leq 305 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 12.0 inches))

Results: No detached elements, fragments, or other debris was present to penetrate or to show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, nor to present undue hazard to others in the area. (PASS) Maximum occupant compartment deformation was 0.5 inches at the hip level on the driver side. (PASS)
F. The vehicle should remain upright during and after collision. The maximum roll and pitch angles are not to exceed 75 degrees.

Results: The 2270 P vehicle remained upright during and after the collision event. Maximum roll and pitch angles were -21 degrees and 6 degrees, respectively. (PASS)
H. Occupant impact velocities should satisfy the following: Longitudinal and Lateral Occupant Impact Velocity
$\frac{\text { Preferred }}{30 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}} \quad \frac{\text { Maximum }}{40 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}}$

Results: Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was $11.5 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$, and lateral occupant impact velocity was $27.2 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$. (PASS)
I. Occupant ridedown accelerations should satisfy the following: Longitudinal and Lateral Occupant Ridedown Accelerations $\frac{\text { Preferred }}{15.0 \mathrm{Gs}} \quad \frac{\text { Maximum }}{20.49 \mathrm{Gs}}$

Results: Longitudinal ridedown acceleration was -7.4 G , and lateral ridedown acceleration was 12.8 G . (PASS)

### 7.8.3 Vehicle Trajectory

For redirective devices, the vehicle shall exit the barrier within the exit box.
Result: The 2270P vehicle exited within the exit box. (PASS)

## CHAPTER 8. CRASH TEST 420020-8 (MASH TEST 3-21)

### 8.1 TEST DESIGNATION AND ACTUAL IMPACT CONDITIONS

MASH test 3-21 involves a 2270P vehicle weighing $5000 \mathrm{lb} \pm 100 \mathrm{lb}$ impacting the TxDOT median barrier gate at a speed of $62.2 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h} \pm 2.5 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and an angle of 25 degrees $\pm 1.5$ degrees. The target impact point was 4.3 ft upstream of the end of the concrete parapet. The 2003 Dodge Ram 1500 Quad-Cab pickup used in the test weighed 5008 lb and the actual impact speed and angle were $63.1 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and 25.5 degrees, respectively. The actual impact point was 3.9 ft upstream of the end of the concrete parapet.

### 8.2 TEST VEHICLE

A 2003 Dodge Ram 1500 Quad-Cab pickup, shown in Figures 8.1 and 8.2, was used for the crash test. Test inertia weight of the vehicle was 5008 lb , and its gross static weight was 5008 lb . The height to the lower edge of the vehicle bumper was 13.5 inches, and it was 26.0 inches to the upper edge of the bumper. The vertical CG height of the pickup truck was 28.25 inches. Figure C3 and Table C6 in Appendix C gives additional dimensions and information on the vehicle. The vehicle was directed into the installation using the cable reverse tow and guidance system, and was released to be free-wheeling and unrestrained just prior to impact.

### 8.3 WEATHER CONDITIONS

The test was performed on the morning of July 21, 2010. Three days prior to the test date 0.41 inch of rain was recorded. Weather conditions at the time of testing were as follows: Wind speed: $5 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$; wind direction: 88 degrees with respect to the vehicle (vehicle was traveling in a southwesterly direction); temperature: $90^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, relative humidity: 65 percent.

### 8.4 TEST DESCRIPTION



The 2003 Dodge Ram 1500 Quad-Cab pickup, traveling at a speed of $63.1 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$, impacted the TxDOT median barrier gate 3.9 ft upstream of the end of the concrete parapet at an angle of 25.5 degrees. At approximately 0.49 s after impact, the right front corner of the vehicle contacted the concrete parapet, and at 0.054 s , the vehicle began to redirect. The caster wheel under the gate separated from the gate at 0.059 s . At 0.184 s after impact, the vehicle was traveling parallel with the barrier at a speed of $49.4 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$. The rear of the vehicle contacted the gate at 0.199 s after impact, and then the concrete barrier at 0.263 s . At 0.344 s , the vehicle lost contact with the barrier and was traveling at an exit speed and angle of $46.3 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ and 6.6 degrees, respectively. Brakes on the vehicle were applied 1.2 s after impact, and the vehicle subsequently came to rest 190 ft downstream of impact with the rear toward the field side of the installation. Figures D5 and D6 in Appendix D show sequential photographs of the test period.


Figure 8.1. Vehicle/Gate Geometrics for Test No. 420020-8.


Figure 8.2. Vehicle before Test No. 420020-8.

### 8.5 DAMAGE TO TEST INSTALLATION

The lower toe and end of the concrete barrier sustained significant damage, as shown in Figures 8.3 and 8.4. The concrete was cracked and fell away from the reinforcement in the toe of the concrete barrier and also from the field side of the barrier. The concrete on the end of the traffic face of the barrier was cracked, but remained in place. The end bracket was pushed toward the field side 1.0 inch. Tire marks were present along the traffic face of the steel gate and traffic face of the concrete barrier for a distance of 11.75 ft . Working width, maximum dynamic deflection, and maximum permanent deformation were 1.25 inches.

### 8.6 VEHICLE DAMAGE

Figure 8.5 shows the damage to the vehicle, which was mostly in the right front quarter in the side plane. The right upper and lower ball joint, right tie rod end, right frame rail, right front upper and lower A-arms, drive shaft, rear axle, and rear U-bolts and springs were damaged. Also damaged were the front bumper, hood, grill, right front fender, right front tire and wheel rim, right front and rear doors, right rear cab, right rear exterior bed, right rear tire and wheel rim, rear bumper, and tailgate. The windshield sustained stress cracks. Maximum exterior crush to the vehicle was 19 inches in the side plane at the right front corner at bumper height. Maximum occupant compartment deformation was 5.25 inches in the right firewall area near the toe pan on the front passenger side. Figure 8.6 shows photographs of the interior of the vehicle. Exterior crush and occupant compartment deformation are provided in Appendix C, Tables C7 and C8.

### 8.7 OCCUPANT RISK FACTORS

Data from the accelerometer, located at the vehicle center of gravity, were digitized for evaluation of occupant risk. In the longitudinal direction, the occupant impact velocity was $22.6 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ at 0.091 s , the highest $0.010-\mathrm{s}$ occupant ridedown acceleration was -6.5 Gs from 0.103 to 0.113 s , and the maximum 0.050 -s average acceleration was -11.8 Gs between 0.0 .45 and 0.0 .95 s . In the lateral direction, the occupant impact velocity was $27.9 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ at 0.091 s , the highest $0.010-\mathrm{s}$ occupant ridedown acceleration was -9.4 Gs from 0.104 to 0.114 s , and the maximum $0.050-\mathrm{s}$ average acceleration was -14.9 Gs between 0.034 and 0.084 s . THIV was $38.8 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ or $10.8 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ at 0.0 .89 s ; PHD was 11.1 Gs between 0.104 and 0.114 s ; and ASI was 1.92 between 0.044 and 0.094 s . Figure 8.7 summarizes these data and other pertinent information from the test. Vehicle angular displacements and accelerations versus time traces are presented in Appendix E, Figures E15 through E21.


Figure 8.3. Position of Vehicle/Gate after Test No. 420020-8.
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Figure 8.4. Installation after Test No. 420020-8.


Figure 8.5. Vehicle after Test No. 420020-8.


Figure 8.6. Interior of Vehicle for Test No. 420020-8.

Figure 8.7. Summary of Results for MASH Test 3-21 on the TxDOT Median Barrier Gate.

### 8.8 ASSESSMENT OF TEST RESULTS

An assessment of the test based on the applicable MASH safety evaluation criteria is provided below.

### 8.8.1 Structural Adequacy

B. 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.

Results: The TxDOT median barrier gate contained and redirected the 2270P vehicle. The vehicle did not penetrate, underride, or override the installation. Maximum dynamic deflection during the test was 1.25 inches. (PASS)

### 8.8.2 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 an undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone.
Deformation of, or intrusions into, the occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.3 and Appendix E of MASH. (roof $\leq 102 \mathrm{~mm}$ (4.0 inches); windshield $=\leq 76 \mathrm{~mm}$ (3.0 inches); side windows $=$ no shattering by test article structural member; wheel/foot well/toe pan $\leq 229 \mathrm{~mm}$ (9.0 inches); forward of A-pillar $\leq 305 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 12.0 inches); front side door area above seat $\leq 229 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 9.0 inches); front side door below seat $\leq 305 \mathrm{~mm}$ (12.0 inches); floor pan/transmission tunnel area $\leq 305 \mathrm{~mm}$ ( 12.0 inches))

Results: The toe and end of the concrete parapet cracked and pieces of concrete fell off in small pieces. This debris did not penetrate or show potential to penetrate the occupant compartment, nor to present undue hazard to others in the area. (PASS)
Maximum occupant compartment deformation was 5.25 inches in the firewall area near the toe pan on the front passenger side. (PASS)
F. The vehicle should remain upright during and after collision. The maximum roll and pitch angles are not to exceed 75 degrees.

Results: The 2270 P vehicle remained upright during and after the collision event. Maximum roll and pitch angles were 20 degrees and -8 degrees, respectively. (PASS)
H. Occupant impact velocities should satisfy the following: Longitudinal and Lateral Occupant Impact Velocity
$\frac{\text { Preferred }}{9.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}(30 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})} \quad \frac{\text { Maximum }}{12.2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}(40 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})}$

Results: Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was $22.6 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$, and lateral occupant impact velocity was $27.9 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$. (PASS)
I. Occupant ridedown accelerations should satisfy the following: Longitudinal and Lateral Occupant Ridedown Accelerations
$\frac{\text { Preferred }}{15.0 \mathrm{Gs}} \quad \frac{\text { Maximum }}{20.49 \mathrm{Gs}}$

Results: Longitudinal ridedown acceleration was -6.5 G , and lateral ridedown acceleration was -9.4 G. (PASS)

### 8.8.3 Vehicle Trajectory

For redirective devices, the vehicle shall exit the barrier within the exit box.
Result: The vehicle exited within the exit box. (PASS)

## CHAPTER 9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Concrete median barrier is commonly used to separate opposing lanes of traffic on highspeed, urban freeways with high average daily traffic (ADT) and narrow medians. The resulting long, continuous runs of CMBs limit access of emergency and maintenance vehicles to the other side of the roadway or managed lane. Periodic implementation of crashworthy median barrier gates can maintain the desired level of median protection for motorists while offering improved cross-median access for authorized vehicles.

TxDOT has been using an Emergency Opening System developed in the early 1980s to satisfy this need. The EOS was recently crash tested in accordance with the latest guidelines for the impact performance of roadside safety features contained in the AASHTO Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware. The gate failed to comply with MASH due to excessive occupant compartment deformation inside the vehicle.

A new crashworthy median barrier gate was developed to replace the EOS and meet the continuing needs of TxDOT. Three crash tests were performed to evaluate the impact performance of different aspects of the median barrier gate. Test 3-11 evaluated the strength of the median barrier gate and its ability to function as a longitudinal barrier. Tests 3-20 and 3-21 assessed the transition of the median barrier gate to the adjacent concrete median barrier. As summarized in Table 9.1 through Table 9.3, the new median barrier gate passed all of the required evaluation criteria for each test and meets the Test Level 3 (TL-3) impact performance requirements of $M A S H$.
Table 9.1. Performance Evaluation Summary for MASH Test 3-20 on the TxDOT Median Barrier Gate.

| Test Agency: Texas Transportation Institute | Test No.: 420020-5 | Test Date: 2010-07-15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MASH Test 3-10 Evaluation Criteria | Test Results | Assessment |
| Structural Adequacy <br> 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 | The TxDOT median barrier gate contained and redirected the 1100 C vehicle. The vehicle did not penetrate, underride, or over the installation. No measureable deformation was noted. | Pass |
| Occupant Risk <br> D. Detached elements, fragments, or other debris from the test article should not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, or present an undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone. | No detached elements, fragments, or other debris was present to penetrate or to show potential for penetrating the 1100 C vehicle, nor to present hazard to others in the area. | Pass |
| Deformations of, or intrusions into, the occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.3 and Appendix E of MASH. | Maximum occupant compartment deformation was 3.0 inches in the firewall area near the toe pan on the driver side. | Pass |
| $F$. The vehicle should remain upright during and after collision. The maximum roll and pitch angles are not to exceed 75 degrees. | The 1100 C vehicle remained upright during and after the collision event. Maximum roll and pitch angles were -12 degrees and 10 degrees, respectively. | Pass |
| H. Longitudinal and lateral occupant impact velocities should fall below the preferred value of $30 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$, or at least below the maximum allowable value of $40 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$. | Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was $26.6 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$, and lateral occupant impact velocity was $31.2 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$. | Pass |
| I. Longitudinal and lateral occupant ridedown accelerations should fall below the preferred value of 15.0 Gs, or at least below the maximum allowable value of 20.49 Gs. | Maximum longitudinal ridedown acceleration was -4.0 G , and maximum lateral ridedown acceleration was 6.4 G . | Pass |
| Vehicle Trajectory |  |  |
| For redirective devices, the vehicle shall exit the barrier within the exit box. | The vehicle exited within the exit box. | Pass |

Table 9.2. Performance Evaluation Summary for MASH Test 3-11 on the TxDOT Median Barrier Gate.

| Test Agency: Texas Transportation Institute | Test No.: 420020-7 | Test Date: 2010-07-19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MASH Test 3-11 Evaluation Criteria | Test Results | Assessment |
| Structural Adequacy <br> 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 | The TxDOT median barrier gate contained and redirected the 2270P vehicle. The vehicle did not penetrate, underride, or override the installation. Maximum dynamic deflection during the test was 1.1 ft . | Pass |
| Occupant Risk <br> D. Detached elements, fragments, or other debris from the test article should not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, or present an undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone. | No detached elements, fragments, or other debris was present to penetrate or to show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, nor to present undue hazard to others in the area. | Pass |
| Deformations of, or intrusions into, the occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.3 and Appendix E of MASH. | Maximum occupant compartment deformation was 0.5 inches at the hip level on the driver side. | Pass |
| $F$. The vehicle should remain upright during and after collision. The maximum roll and pitch angles are not to exceed 75 degrees. | The 2270 P vehicle remained upright during and after the collision event. Maximum roll and pitch angles were -21 degrees and 6 degrees, respectively. | Pass |
| H. Longitudinal and lateral occupant impact velocities should fall below the preferred value of $30 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$, or at least below the maximum allowable value of $40 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$. | Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was $11.5 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$, and lateral occupant impact velocity was $27.2 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$. | Pass |
| I. Longitudinal and lateral occupant ridedown accelerations should fall below the preferred value of 15.0 Gs, or at least below the maximum allowable value of 20.49 Gs . | Longitudinal ridedown acceleration was -7.4 G , and lateral ridedown acceleration was 12.8 G . | Pass |
| Vehicle Trajectory |  |  |
| For redirective devices, the vehicle shall exit the barrier within the exit box. | The 2270P vehicle exited within the exit box. | Pass |

Table 9.3. Performance Evaluation Summary for MASH Test 3-21 on the TxDOT Median Barrier Gate.

| Test Agency: Texas Transportation Institute | Test No.: 420020-8 T | Test Date: 2010-07-21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MASH Test 3-21 Evaluation Criteria | Test Results | Assessment |
| Structural Adequacy <br> 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 | The TxDOT median barrier gate contained and redirected the 2270 P vehicle. The vehicle did not penetrate, underride, or override the installation. Maximum dynamic deflection during the test was 1.25 inches. | Pass |
| Occupant Risk <br> D. Detached elements, fragments, or other debris from the test article should not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the occupant compartment, or present an undue hazard to other traffic, pedestrians, or personnel in a work zone. | The toe and end of the concrete parapet cracked and pieces of concrete fell off in small pieces. This debris did not penetrate or show potential to penetrate the occupant compartment, nor to present undue hazard to others in the area. | Pass |
| Deformations of, or intrusions into, the occupant compartment should not exceed limits set forth in Section 5.3 and Appendix E of MASH. | Maximum occupant compartment deformation was 5.25 inches in the firewall area near the toe pan on the front passenger side. | Pass |
| $F$. The vehicle should remain upright during and after collision. The maximum roll and pitch angles are not to exceed 75 degrees. | The 2270P vehicle remained upright during and after the collision event. Maximum roll and pitch angles were 20 degrees and -8 degrees, respectively. | Pass |
| H. Longitudinal and lateral occupant impact velocities should fall below the preferred value of $30 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$, or at least below the maximum allowable value of $40 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$. | Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was $22.6 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$, and lateral occupant impact velocity was $27.9 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$. | Pass |
| I. Longitudinal and lateral occupant ridedown accelerations should fall below the preferred value of 15.0 Gs, or at least below the maximum allowable value of 20.49 Gs. | Longitudinal ridedown acceleration was -6.5 G , and lateral ridedown acceleration was -9.4 G . | Pass |
| Vehicle Trajectory |  |  |
| For redirective devices, the vehicle shall exit the barrier within the exit box. | The vehicle exited within the exit box. | Pass |

## CHAPTER 10. IMPLEMENTATION STATEMENT ${ }^{\dagger}$

A new median barrier gate was developed and crash tested. The gate spans a $30-\mathrm{ft}$ opening in a concrete median barrier. The gate consists of two vertically stacked 12 -inch $\times$ 12 -inch $\times 1 / 4$-inch steel tubes connected to steel and brackets with $21 / 4$-inch diameter steel pins.

The 35-inch rail height dramatically improves vehicle stability during impacts along the length of the gate. The 12 -inch width of the tubular steel rails matches the width of the concrete parapet to which the gate is attached. This significantly reduces snagging potential on the end of the rigid concrete parapet.

The weight and material cost of the tubular steel rails are less than those used in the existing EOS. Thus, it will be more economical to deploy and easier to operate. Testing with a prototype built for the full-scale crash test program demonstrated that the gate can be readily operated by one person. Bolted connections are used to reduce welding and decrease fabrication cost. It also permits the rail members and components to be individually galvanized and assembled rather than as a complete unit.

The gate is designed to accommodate reversible traffic flow on both sides of the median and be operable in both directions on each end. This versatility enables the gate to be used in the median of a divided highway or as a means of separating main lanes from managed lanes with changing traffic direction. The heavy duty swivel caster wheels support the weight of the gate and eliminate the need for a jack to raise and lower the gate as part of the operation sequence. This will expedite operations for authorized vehicles requiring access through the gate.

The median barrier gate satisfies MASH Test Level 3 (TL-3) impact performance criteria and is suitable for immediate implementation on Texas highways where cross-median access is desired. Statewide implementation can be achieved through the development and issuance of a standard detail sheet by the Design Division.

A few design changes and options are recommended for consideration. It is recommended to increase the height of the fabricated steel end bracket by 1 inch. This modification will provide an additional $1 / 2$-inch tolerance between the upper and lower horizontal plates and the tubular steel rail members for gate operation.

A design option is the use of a fabricated steel curb rather than a concrete curb beneath the fabricated steel end bracket. Steel plates can be welded to the bottom of the lower horizontal plate of the end bracket to form a curb. If this option is used, the end bracket can be attached to the Richmond anchors and used as an end form for the concrete parapet. It eliminates the need to separately form, reinforce and cast a concrete curb, and eliminates the need for the pipe sleeve in the curb.

[^1]Finally, an optional pry bar can be included in the design. During installation and operation, it is possible for the rails to shift longitudinally against the connecting pins. The resulting bearing pressure can make it difficult to extract the pin to operate the gate. A pry bar can be used between the end plate and the tubular steel rails to shift the rail and release the bearing pressure on the pin. This can be easily accomplished by a single person if necessary. The pry bar design option calls for the incorporation of a pry bar in the system that will be available to the gate operator if needed. The pry bar is stowed by inserting it vertically into prefabricated holes in the steel rails. Appendix F provides these recommended design changes and options.
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## APPENDIX A. DETAILS OF THE TXDOT MEDIAN BARRIER GATE





















## APPENDIX B. CERTIFICATION DOCUMENTATION

| MATERIAL USED |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TEST NUMBER | 420020-7 | 420020-6 | 420020-8 |  |
| DATE | 2010-07-15 | 2010-07-19 | 2010-07-21 |  |
| DATE RECEIVED | ITEM NUMBER | DESCRIPTION | SUPPLIER | HEAT \# |
| 2010-06-08 | Rebar 05-10 | $5 / 8{ }^{\prime \prime} \times 20^{\prime}$ grd 60 | CMC-Sheplers | 3016376 |
| 2010-06-08 | Rich Anchor-1 | \#7 x 99" Richmond Anchor | CMC-Sheplers |  |
| 2010-07-07 | Parts-7 | Median Barrier Gate Parts | Brazos Industries | see file |



THIS MATERIAL IS FULLY KILLED, 100\% MELTED AND MANUFACTURED IN THE USA, WITH NO WELD REPAIR OR MERCURY CONTAMINATION IN THE PROCESS. REMARKS :

05/28/2010 04:16:11
Page 1 OF 1

PO \# 6271114



```
10.fun1014533 TEST CERTIFICATE NO:HO 175340
    Sald Ey:
    CARGIL.I. STEEL SEFVICE CENTERS
    DEPARTMENT OF CARGILL, INCQRPORATED
    $007 LIEERTY RD
    HOUSTON TX 770ZE-5730
    Twl: 713-672-4200 Fax: 713 672-4292
    gald To: (20847)
    NAMASCO
    ATTN: A/P
    SUTTE .500
    500 COLONIAL CENTER PKWY
    ROSWEILL GA SOOTG
    Tel: 678-259-9800 Fax: Gás 598-1572
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & CERTIFICATE Of ANALYETS And TESTS & Cert. Nos HO & \begin{tabular}{l}
1.75340 \\
10Jin10
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Part No} \\
\hline HR PLATE SHEET & ASTMA-36/ASME SA-36 & Fcs & Wgit \\
\hline \(1 / 2 \times 40.0000^{\prime \prime}\) & X 76.0000" & 30 & 19,604 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Heat Number
\[
101515
\]} & Tag No & Pes & Not \\
\hline & 152703 & 15 & 9,802 \\
\hline & YIELD=47.42-47.56/TENS=6S.17 VESSL=《UP24ZEOS〉/CNTRY \(=\langle M E X T C\) & \(G=45 \sim 4 \dot{\prime}\) MILL & (AHMSA> \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{101815} & 152704 & 15 & 9,802 \\
\hline & YIELD \(=4.7,42-47.56 /\) TENS \(=66.17-\) VESSL \(=\langle U P 242 Z O S\rangle / C N T R Y=\langle M E X I C\) & \[
G G=45-46 / M I L i=
\] & <AHMSA> \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

```
Hest Number ##** Chemical fnalysis ***
```

Hest Number \#\#** Chemical fnalysis ***
101815

```
101815
```




```
A1=0.0290 Ti=0.0030 V=0.0040 Nb=0.0020 Ma=0.0070 Cr=0.0230
```

A1=0.0290 Ti=0.0030 V=0.0040 Nb=0.0020 Ma=0.0070 Cr=0.0230
Ni=0.0240
Ni=0.0240
El.EMENTS MOT L.ISTED TESY EELOW DETEGTAERE LEVELS AILL ASTM PLATE PRDDUCTS ARE PRDDUCED FRLIM COIL GENTER TESTE AVATLABLE AT GARGILL
THIS IS TD CERTIFV THAT THE PRODUCT DESCRIEED HEREIN WAS SAMPLED AND TESTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SPECIFTCATION, TO QUR KNDWLEDGE. AND FULFILLS REQUIREMENTS IN SUCH RESPECT.

```
```
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Tel: 678-259-8845 Fax: 571 323-0613
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THEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE FIGURES ARE CORRECT AS CONTANED WTHE RCOORUS OF THE CORPORATION

\footnotetext{

}

\title{
APPENDIX C. TEST VEHICLE PROPERTIES AND INFORMATION
}

- Denotes accelerometer location.

NOTES: \(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
Engine Type: 4 cylinder
Engine CID: 1.6 Liter
ACCELEROMETER


Transmission Type:


Dummy Data:
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Type: & \(50^{\text {th }}\) percentile male \\
Mass: & 168 lb \\
Seat Position: & Frt Passenger Seat \\
\cline { 2 - 3 } &
\end{tabular}

Geometry: inches
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline A & 62.50 & F & 32.00 & K & 12.00 & P & 3.25 & U & 15.50 \\
\hline B & 56.12 & G & & L & 24.25 & Q & 22.50 & V & 20.00 \\
\hline C & 164.25 & H & 36.27 & M & 56.50 & R & 15.50 & W & 39.50 \\
\hline D & 37.00 & 1 & 8.50 & N & 57.00 & S & 8.62 & X & 103.25 \\
\hline E & 95.25 & J & 22.75 & O & 28.00 & T & 63.00 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Wheel Center Ht Front} & 10.75 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Wheel Center Ht Rear} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{11.12} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{Mass Distribution:}
lb
LF: 780
RF: \(\quad 721\)
LR: \(\qquad\)
RR: \(\qquad\)

Figure C1. Vehicle Properties for Test No. 420020-6.

Table C1. Exterior Crush Measurements for Test No. 420020-6.
\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
Date: & 2010-07-15 & Test No.: & 420020-5 & VIN No.: & KNADC125736268923 \\
Year: & Make: & Kia & Model: & Rio \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

VEHICLE CRUSH MEASUREMENT SHEET \({ }^{1}\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ Complete When Applicable } \\
\hline End Damage & Side Damage \\
\hline Undeformed end width \\
Corner shift: A1 & Bowing: B1 \\
A2 & B2 \\
End shift at frame (CDC) \\
(check one) \\
\(<4\) inches \\
\(\geq 4\) inches & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note: Measure \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) to \(\mathrm{C}_{6}\) from Driver to Passenger Side in Front or Rear Impacts - Rear to Front in Side Impacts.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Specific Impact \\
Number
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Plane* of C-Measurements} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Direct Damage} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Field L**} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{1}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{2}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{3}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{4}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{5}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{6}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\pm\) D} \\
\hline & & \begin{tabular}{l}
Width** \\
(CDC)
\end{tabular} & Max***
Crush & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 1 & Front plane at bumper ht & & 8 & 34 & 8 & 6 & 5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 0 \\
\hline 2 & Side plane at bumper ht & 2 & 12 & 45 & 1.75 & 4.5 & 6.75 & 9.5 & 10.5 & 12 & +50 \\
\hline \multicolumn{12}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \multicolumn{12}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \multicolumn{12}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Measurements recorded} \\
\hline \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{in inches} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{1}\) Table taken from National Accident Sampling System (NASS).
*Identify the plane at which the C-measurements are taken (e.g., at bumper, above bumper, at sill, above sill, at beltline, etc.) or label adjustments (e.g., free space).

Free space value is defined as the distance between the baseline and the original body contour taken at the individual C locations. This may include the following: bumper lead, bumper taper, side protrusion, side taper, etc. Record the value for each C-measurement and maximum crush.
**Measure and document on the vehicle diagram the beginning or end of the direct damage width and field L (e.g., side damage with respect to undamaged axle).
***Measure and document on the vehicle diagram the location of the maximum crush.
Note: Use as many lines/columns as necessary to describe each damage profile.

Table C2. Occupant Compartment Measurements for Test No. 420020-6.

*Lateral area across the cab from
driver's side kickpanel to passenger's side kickpanel.

Date: 2010-07-19 \(\qquad\) VIN No.: 1D7HA18N43525276
Year: 2003
Make: Dodge
Model: Ram 1500 Quad-Cab
Tire Size: \(\quad 245 / 70 R 17\) \(\qquad\) Tire Inflation Pressure: 35 psi

Tread Type: Highway
Odometer: 147224
Note any damage to the vehicle prior to test:
- Denotes accelerometer location.

NOTES: \(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
\\
Engine Type: & \\
V8 \\
Engine CID: & 4.7 Liter
\end{tabular}


Transmission Type:


Optional Equipment:


Geometry: inches


RANGE LIMIT: A=78 \(\pm 2\) inches; \(\mathrm{C}=237 \pm 13\) inches; \(\mathrm{E}=148 \pm 12\) inches; \(\mathrm{F}=39 \pm 3\) inches; \(\mathrm{G}=>28\) inches; \(\mathrm{H}=63 \pm 4\) inches; \(\mathrm{O}=43 \pm 4\) inches; \(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{N} / 2=67 \pm 1.5\) inches
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
& \\
GVWR Ratings: \\
Front & 3650 \\
\hline Back & 3900 \\
\hline Total & 6650 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Mass: lb
\(M_{\text {front }}\)
\(M_{\text {rear }}\)
\(M_{\text {Total }}\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Curb & \[
\frac{\text { Test }}{\text { Inertial }}
\] & \\
\hline 2750 & 2758 & Allowable \\
\hline 1949 & 2257 & Range \\
\hline 4699 & 5015 & \(5000 \pm 110 \mathrm{lb}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Gross}

Static


Mass Distribution:
lb
LF: 1380
RF: 1378
LR: 1110
RR: \(\qquad\) 1147

Figure C2. Vehicle Properties for Test No. 420020-7.

Table C3. Vehicle Parametric Measurements for Vertical CG for Test No. 420020-7.

Date: 2010-07-19 Test No.: 420020-7 VIN: 1D7HA18N43525276

Year: 2003 \(\qquad\) Model: Ra, 1500
Body Style: Quad Cab
Mileage: 147224
Engine: 4.7 liter
Transmission: Automatic \(\qquad\)
Fuel Level: \(\qquad\) Ballast:
\(235+418 \mathrm{lb}\) at front of bed (440 lb max)

Tire Pressure: Front: 35 psi

Rear: \(\qquad\) psi

Size: 245/70R17
Measured Vehicle Weights:
(lb)
LF: \(\quad 1400\)
LR: \(\qquad\)
RF: \(\qquad\) Front Axle: \(\quad 2734\)
Rear Axle: \(\qquad\)
Left: \(\qquad\) Right: \(\qquad\)
Total: \(\qquad\) \(5000 \pm 110 \mathrm{lb}\) allowed

Wheel Base: \(\frac{140.5}{148 \pm 12 \text { inches allowed }} \quad\) Track: \(F: \frac{68.25}{\text { Track }=(F+R) / 2=67 \pm 1.5 \text { inches allowed }} \frac{67.25}{}\) inches
Center of Gravity, SAE J874 Suspension Method
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline X: & 63.21 in & Rear & nt Axle ( \(63 \pm 4\) inches allow & & \\
\hline Y: & -0.40 in & Left & Right + of Vehicle Ce & & \\
\hline & 28.125 in & Above & und (minumum 28.0 inc & & \\
\hline Hood Height: & 44.75 & inches & Front Bumper Height: & 26.0 & inches \\
\hline & \(43 \pm 4\) inches allowed & & & & \\
\hline Front Overhang: & 39.0 & inches & Rear Bumper Height: & 28.75 & inches \\
\hline & \(39 \pm 3\) inches allowed & & & & \\
\hline Overall Length: & 227.0 & inches & & & \\
\hline & \(237 \pm 13\) inches allowe & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table C4. Exterior Crush Measurements for Test No. 420020-7.


Note: Measure \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) to \(\mathrm{C}_{6}\) from Driver to Passenger side in Front or Rear impacts - Rear to Front in Side Impacts.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Specific \\
Impact \\
Number
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Plane* of \\
C-Measurements
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Direct Damage} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Field \\
L**
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{1}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{2}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{3}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{4}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{5}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{6}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\pm\) D} \\
\hline & & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Width** } \\
\text { (CDC) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Max*** \\
Crush
\end{tabular} & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 1 & Front plane at bumper ht & 15 & 9 & 25 & 9 & 8.5 & 6 & 3 & 2 & 0 & -12.5 \\
\hline 2 & Side plane at bumper ht & 23 & 12 & 82 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 9.25 & 11 & 12 & +71 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & Measurements recorded & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & in inches mm & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{1}\) Table taken from National Accident Sampling System (NASS).
*Identify the plane at which the C-measurements are taken (e.g., at bumper, above bumper, at sill, above sill, at beltline, etc.) or label adjustments (e.g., free space).

Free space value is defined as the distance between the baseline and the original body contour taken at the individual C locations. This may include the following: bumper lead, bumper taper, side protrusion, side taper, etc.
Record the value for each C-measurement and maximum crush.
**Measure and document on the vehicle diagram the beginning or end of the direct damage width and field L (e.g., side damage with respect to undamaged axle).
***Measure and document on the vehicle diagram the location of the maximum crush.
Note: Use as many lines/columns as necessary to describe each damage profile.

Table C5. Occupant Compartment Measurements for Test No. 420020-7.


Date: \(\underline{\text { 2010-07-21 }}\) \(\qquad\) VIN No.: 1D7HA18N235509534
Year: 2003
Make: Dodge
Model: Ram 1500 Quad-Cab
Tire Size: \(\quad 245 / 70 R 17\) \(\qquad\) Tire Inflation Pressure: 35 psi

Odometer: 153319
Tread Type: Highway \(\qquad\)
Note any damage to the vehicle prior to test:
- Denotes accelerometer location.

NOTES: \(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
& \\
Engine Type: & V8 \\
Engine CID: & 4.7 Liter \\
\end{tabular}


Transmission Type:


Optional Equipment:


Geometry: inches


RANGE LIMIT: A=78 \(\pm 2\) inches; \(\mathrm{C}=237 \pm 13\) inches; \(\mathrm{E}=148 \pm 12\) inches; \(\mathrm{F}=39 \pm 3\) inches; \(\mathrm{G}=>28\) inches; \(\mathrm{H}=63 \pm 4\) inches; \(\mathrm{O}=43 \pm 4\) inches; \(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{N} / 2=67 \pm 1.5\) inches
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
& \\
GVWR Ratings: \\
Front & 3650 \\
\hline Back & 3900 \\
\hline Total & 6650 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Mass: lb
\(M_{\text {front }}\)
\(M_{\text {rear }}\)
\(M_{\text {Total }}\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Curb & Test Inertial & \\
\hline 2769 & 2786 & Allowable \\
\hline 1994 & 2222 & Range \\
\hline 4763 & 5008 & \(5000 \pm 110 \mathrm{lb}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Gross}

Static


Mass Distribution:
lb
LF: 1420
RF: 1366
LR: 1110
RR: 1112
Figure C3. Vehicle Properties for Test No. 420020-8.

Table C6. Vehicle Parametric Measurements for Vertical CG for Test No. 420020-7.
Date: 2010-07-21 Test No.: 420020-8
VIN: 1D7HA18N235509534
Year: 2003 \(\qquad\) Model: Ram 1500
Body Style: Quad Cab
Mileage: 153319
Engine: 4.7 liter
Transmission: Automatic
Ballast: \(\quad 255+315 \mathrm{lb}\) at front of bed
(440 lb max)
Fuel Level: Empty psi Rear: \(\qquad\) psi Size: \(\qquad\)
Tire Pressure: Front: \(\qquad\)
Measured Vehicle Weights:
(lb)

LF: 1408
LR: \(\quad 1132\)
RR: \(\qquad\)
Front Axle: \(\qquad\)
Rear Axle: \(\qquad\)
Left: 2540
Right: \(\qquad\) Total: \(\quad 5040\) \(5000 \pm 110 \mathrm{lb}\) allowed

Center of Gravity, SAE J874 Suspension Method

X: \(\qquad\) Rear of Front Axle ( \(63 \pm 4\) inches allowed)
\(\mathrm{Y}: \quad-\quad-0.27\) in
Z: \(\quad 28.25\) in
\(\square\)
Hood Height:


Above Ground (minumum 28.0 inches allowed)

Front Overhang:
\(\frac{39.0}{39 \pm 3 \text { inches allowed }}\) inches

Rear Bumper Height: \(\qquad\) 28.75 inches

Overall Length: \(\qquad\) inches
\(237 \pm 13\) inches allowed

Table C7. Exterior Crush Measurements for Test No. 420020-8.


Note: Measure \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) to \(\mathrm{C}_{6}\) from Driver to Passenger side in Front or Rear impacts - Rear to Front in Side Impacts.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Specific \\
Impact \\
Number
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Plane* of \\
C-Measurements
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Direct Damage} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Field} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{1}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{2}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{3}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{4}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{5}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\mathrm{C}_{6}\)} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\pm\) D} \\
\hline & & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Width** } \\
\text { (CDC) } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Max*** \\
Crush
\end{tabular} & & & & & & & & \\
\hline 1 & Front plane at bumper ht & 20 & 18 & 27 & 0 & 1 & 3.5 & 7 & 12 & 18 & +13.5 \\
\hline 2 & Side plane at bumper ht & 20 & 19 & 67 & 0 & 5 & 9 & 13 & 15 & 19 & +56 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & Measurements recorded & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & in inches mm & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{1}\) Table taken from National Accident Sampling System (NASS).
*Identify the plane at which the C-measurements are taken (e.g., at bumper, above bumper, at sill, above sill, at beltline, etc.) or label adjustments (e.g., free space).

Free space value is defined as the distance between the baseline and the original body contour taken at the individual C locations. This may include the following: bumper lead, bumper taper, side protrusion, side taper, etc.
Record the value for each C-measurement and maximum crush.
**Measure and document on the vehicle diagram the beginning or end of the direct damage width and field L (e.g., side damage with respect to undamaged axle).
***Measure and document on the vehicle diagram the location of the maximum crush.
Note: Use as many lines/columns as necessary to describe each damage profile.

Table C8. Occupant Compartment Measurements for Test No. 420020-8.


APPENDIX D. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS


Figure D1. Sequential Photographs for Test No. 420020-6 (Overhead and Frontal Views).


Figure D1. Sequential Photographs for Test No. 420020-6 (Overhead and Frontal Views) (Continued).


Figure D2. Sequential Photographs for Test No. 420020-6 (Rear View).


Figure D3. Sequential Photographs for Test No. 420020-7 (Overhead and Frontal Views).


Figure D3. Sequential Photographs for Test No. 420020-7 (Overhead and Frontal Views) (Continued).


Figure D4. Sequential Photographs for Test No. 420020-7
(Rear View).


Figure D5. Sequential Photographs for Test No. 420020-8 (Overhead and Frontal Views).


Figure D5. Sequential Photographs for Test No. 420020-8 (Overhead and Frontal Views) (Continued).


Figure D6. Sequential Photographs for Test No. 420020-8
(Rear View).

\section*{APPENDIX E. VEHICLE ANGULAR DISPLACEMENTS AND ACCELERATIONS}
Roll, Pitch, and Yaw Angles

Figure E1. Vehicle Angular Displacements for Test No. 420020-6.
X Acceleration at CG

Y Acceleration at CG

Z Acceleration at CG

Figure E4. Vehicle Vertical Accelerometer Trace for Test No. 420020-6 (Accelerometer Located at Center of Gravity).

Y Acceleration over Rear Axle
 60 Filter \(\quad-\quad 50-\mathrm{msec}\) average
Figure E6. Vehicle Lateral Accelerometer Trace for Test No. 420020-6
(Accelerometer Located over Rear Axle).
(э) ио!̣еләәәээヲ า

Figure E7. Vehicle Vertical Accelerometer Trace for Test No. 420020-6 (Accelerometer Located over Rear Axle).
Roll, Pitch, and Yaw Angles

X Acceleration at CG

Y Acceleration at CG

Z Acceleration at CG

(๑) ио!ұеләәэээ ןеэ!иәл

Y Acceleration over Rear Axle

Z Acceleration over Rear Axle

Time (s)
Figure E14. Vehicle Vertical Accelerometer Trace for Test No. 420020-7 (Accelerometer Located over Rear Axle).

X Acceleration at CG

Y Acceleration at CG

Z Acceleration at CG


Figure E19. Vehicle Longitudinal Accelerometer Trace for Test No. 420020-8 (Accelerometer Located over Rear Axle).
Y Acceleration over Rear Axle
 Figure E20. Vehicle Lateral Accelerometer Trace for Test No. 420020-8 (Accelerometer Located over Rear Axle).
Z Acceleration over Rear Axle
 s 60 Filter \(\quad-\quad 50-\mathrm{msec}\) average
Figure E21. Vehicle Vertical Accelerometer Trace for Test No. 420020-8
(Accelerometer Located over Rear Axle).
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\section*{APPENDIX F. RECOMMENDED MEDIAN BARRIER GATE DETAILS}
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[^0]:    * The opinions/interpretations expressed in this section are outside the scope of TTI Proving Ground's A2LA accreditation.

[^1]:    ${ }^{\dagger}$ The opinions/interpretations expressed in this section are outside the scope of TTI Proving Ground's A2LA accreditation.

