Vehicle Restraint Systems

Eoin Doyle Arup

TII Standards Training 2022 19th May 2022

Bonneagar Iompair Éireann Transport Infrastructure Ireland



Agenda

• Dynamic Testing

- Importance of Ground Conditions
- Current Testing Approach
- Proposed Testing Approach
- Overview of Research
- Ongoing Work Packages
 - Embankment Height Research
 - Radius Barriers
 - SCD Ramped Terminals
 - DN-REQ-03034 Updates



Dynamic Testing



Importance of Ground Conditions

- Critical for safety barrier performance —
- Initial Type Testing (ITT) Conditions v Site Ground Conditions ____







Ground Conditions during VRS Certification





Importance of Ground Conditions

- Critical for safety barrier performance —
- Initial Type Testing (ITT) Conditions v Site Ground Conditions —







Importance of Ground Conditions

Reasons for Differing ground conditions on site and during impact tests:

- Site ground conditions may have lower relative strength/stiffness
- Less passive resistance behind posts on embankments
- The degree of compaction at the verge of an embankment may be less than elsewhere
- The top layer of an embankment slope/verge is a top soil layer that will have lesser strength properties than those of engineered fill





Plastic hinge develops at ground level or higher.



Plastic hinge may not develop at all or may occur at a lower level than required by the design.

Current Ground Testing Requirements for VRS Post Foundations

DN-REQ-03034

"All VRS rely on certain ground conditions in order to function satisfactorily. Testing, as described in the CC-SPW-00400, shall be undertaken to ensure that the system performs as intended"

CC-SPW-00400

- Test Procedure Push tests in accordance with BS 7669 Part 3 Annex B
- Test Requirements provided in the manufacturer's I.S. EN 1317-5 compliant installation manual
- Independent Chartered Engineer attends site to witness and certify the pre-installation site testing





Limitations of Current Approach







Limitations of Current Approach

- Post does not experience dynamic loads which occur during vehicle impact tests
- Generally a plastic hinge does not develop
- Historical test originally developed for pre-EN 1317 type VRS (specific post type)
- Deflection time of the post is not considered
- ✓ Relatively cheap
- ✓ Equipment is readily available
- ✓ Provides an indication of soil strength





- Tests the safety barrier post in a manner comparable to the impact test
- Impact mass and speed are controlled
- Height of the impact is controlled
- Considers energy dissipation, displacement, torsion, and plastic hinge – more representative of 'real' post-ground behaviour
 - Capacity of post/ soil system to absorb energy (C_{F}) is calculated







• Energy dissipating capacity (C_E)



Displacement vs. time curve derived from the dynamic test





C_E Reference – Test House



C_E Real – Site





- The test considers the dynamic behaviour of the soil
- Test load and impact load are more comparable
- Plastic hinge is more likely to develop
- Test can be applied to any post type and related back to the initial type test
 - Recognised standard?
 - Irish Soils?
 - Acceptable limits?





Dynamic Testing Research Stages

Phase	Title		Status
Phase 1	Literature Review	ARUP	Complete
Phase 2	Test House Testing	ARUP Service Alsico	Complete
Phase 3	FEM Analysis for Acceptability Limits	ARUP Solution Alsico	Complete
Phase 4	Site Testing in Irish Ground Conditions	ARUP Salsico CPS	Complete
Phase 5	Final Verification and Interim Technical Advice	ARUP Salsico CPS	Ongoing







Stage 1 - Literature Review

- Literature review of available test methods and their applicability to Irish road projects
 - Static push pull tests
 - Driving time test
 - > Dynamic Testing
- Manufacturer Consultation and Feedback
- Recommended Testing Schedule for Stage 2



Transport Infrastructure Ireland **Dynamic Testing of Vehicle Restraint Systems** Module 180.1 - Literary Review

236135-180-TPS-0002001-D02

Issue | 5 June 2018

This report takes into account the particula instructions and requirements of our client. It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party.

Job number 236135-00

Ove Arup & Partners Ireland Ltd

Arup 50 Ringsend Road Dublin 4 Ireland WWW.arup.com





Stage 2 – Test House

- Completion of a series of dynamic and static push pull tests at the Aisico test house facility
 - Post section
 - Earthworks materials
 - > Slope profile
 - Relative compaction of earthworks material
 - Post embedment length
 - Set-back distance from crest of embankment to post
 - Concrete foundations
- Compare results and determine acceptability limits for push-pull tests in various scenarios



Transport Infrastructure Ireland **Dynamic Testing of Vehicle Restraint Systems**

WP3.4A - Specification for VRS Testing

262866

Issue 1 | 5 October 2018

Transport Infrastructure Ireland

Dynamic Testing of Vehicle Restraint Systems

VRS Barrier Testing: Preliminary Interpretation

262866-GE-RP01

Issue 1 | 07 November 2019

This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party.

Job number 262866

Ove Arup & Partners Ireland

Arup 50 Ringsend Road Dublin 4 Ireland www.arup.com

ARUP

Stage 2 – Test House



- > No consistent relationship between static and dynamic tests
- Base data set for further simulation work









- Development of fully calibrated numerical models (FEM) of the dynamic tests undertaken in Phase 2
- Undertake 2no. full-scale TB32 crash tests in scenarios considered in Phase 2
- Development of fully calibrated numerical models of the TB32 crash tests using soil conditions modelled in dynamic tests
- Undertake additional TB32 FEM with varying soil stiffness to determine the 'ok/fail' limits
- Develop a draft Dynamic Testing Standard including the initial 'acceptable CE' values



Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII)

WP 3.4i FEM Analysis and **Calibration of VRS Testing**

FEM Factual Report

26418569-WP3.4i-GE-RP01

Issue 1 | 31 August 2020

This report takes into account the particul nstructions and requirements of our clie It is not intended for and should not be relied pon by any third party and no responsibilit undertaken to any third party

Job number 264185-00

Ove Arup & Partners Ireland Ltd

Arup One Albert Quay Cork T12 X8N6 Ireland www.arup.com



Calibration, Verification and Validation







Identification of the acceptable CE tolerance limit







Identification of the acceptable CE tolerance limit



- Soil stiffness gradually reduced in FEM for full scale TB32 crash test
- 'Ok/ fail' limit established
- Soil stiffness at failure applied to FEM of dynamic tests to establish the corresponding C_{F} value
- C_F acceptable tolerance limit established

Stage 4 – Site Testing

- Site testing on Irish VRS installation projects with a view to assessing and verifying the appropriateness of the CE tolerance limit
 - > N4 Collooney to Castlebaldwin (new construction)
 - ➢ N4, N15, N60/61 and N25 (legacy network)
- 4 No. reference tests undertaken in test facility
- 89 No. tests undertaken in various configurations







Stage 5 – Final Validation and ITA

- Analysis of site testing results
- Recommend approach for final validation of acceptable tolerance limits
- Update the Draft Dynamic Testing Standard as required for issue as an Interim Technical Advice Note
- Pilot on selected Call-off Contracts under the TII VRS Installation framework
- Consider publication of final Standard and implementation via CC-SPW-00400







Figura 21: TH613 - Post impact configuration

Dynamic Testing - Other Research Applications



Verge Construction





Concrete Foundation Standard Detail

Ongoing Work Packages Embankment Height Research Radius Barriers SCD Ramped Terminals DN-REQ-03034 Updates



Embankment Height Research

- Pre 2014 embankment slopes between 1:2 and 1:3 and less than 2m high were not considered a hazard
- Research to understand the level of risk associated with embankments with 1 in 3 slope that is 0.5m, 1m, 1.5m or 2m high
- Virtual testing of vehicles running off the embankments at different heights and slopes
- Selection of full scale tests to calibrate/ validate the models
- Comparison of whole life cost of protecting these slopes versus the risk presented







Radius Barriers

- Review of the use of higher containment barriers on curves
- International review of the testing, design and installation of curved barriers
- Develop and undertake matrix of appropriate numerical simulations of radius barriers of varying configurations
- Make recommendation for standard construction detail







SCD Ramped Terminals

- Ramped down terminals only permitted downstream
- "Ramping the barrier down to ground level and anchoring the safety barrier as it was anchored during the Initial Type Test (System Anchorage)"
- International review of the use of ramped down terminals
- Develop a Standard Construction Detail for ramped down terminals (downstream only)
 - Ramp rate
 - Anchorage





DN-REQ-03034 Updates

- **Review of Departures received**
- Review of queries received
- VRS Design in wide medians
- Impending issue of TRs and TS in relation to Terminals, **Transitions and Removable Barrier Sections**
- Outcome of ongoing research





TII Publications PE DN CC OP AM RE GE

The Design of Road Restraint Systems (Vehicle and Pedestrian) for Roads and Bridges

DN-REQ-03034 May 2019



Standards

Questions and Answers

