

Innovation and International Best Practice on Road Restraint Systems

Martin Page Convenor CEN TC 226/WG 1 Road Restraint Systems









In the beginning ...

Road restraint system design & development by individual national governments







Common basis for determining product category agreed on by European national road authorities and industry





Performance based standard

- **Common test method** 1.
- 2.



Encourages more product development by manufacturers

Increased use of computer simulation in support of physical crash testing

- Single certification
- Access to multiple markets 3.











Common basis for determining product category agreed on by European national road authorities and industry

Performance based standard



Encourages more product development by manufacturers



Increased use of computer simulation in support of physical crash testing









Common basis for determining product category agreed on by European national road authorities and industry



Performance based standard

Encourages more product development by manufacturers



Increased use of computer simulation in support of physical crash testing









Common basis for determining product category agreed on by European national road authorities and industry

Performance based standard



Encourages more product development by manufacturers



Use of computer simulation <u>in</u> <u>support</u> of physical crash testing facilitates optimization & development. In addition to certification crash tests:

- Development of modified products
- Proving of different installations
- Checking alternative impact configurations



Certification always on basis of physical crash tests !





EN 1317-2 (Barriers)

Containment levels

(barrier restraining capability):

T1-T3, N1-N2, H1-H4(L1-L4)





Containment test (Heavy vehicle):

- Vehicule contained? Stiffness / "Working Width"?
- Acceptable vehicle behaviour (e.g. no rollover)?
- Working Width (WN): W1 W8

Severity test (Occupant risk – small car):

- Passenger compartment intrusion
- Acceptable vehicle behaviour?
- Severity level: A, B, C



- Benchmark for comparison of different products!
- > Balance containment capacity impact severity operating space available





Concrete Barriers for Every Application

- Each barrier type no longer restricted to particular applications
- Driven by market demand and higher safety levels – facilitated by a common, performance-based testing standard

Precast:

- Lightweight: low cost, easy handling
- Heavy: maximum restraint
- Thin: minimal footprint
- Rigid (anchored/embedded): high restraint
 low operating space
- Flexible (free-standing/anchored): low impact severity – more operating space required

Cast-in-place:

- Various dimensions
- Improvements in durability





Case Study: Increasing Use & Availability of Special Products - Terminals



Untreated barrier end = hazard _ e.g. spearing, snagging or hard impact





Case Study: Increasing Use & Availability of Special Products - Terminals





Case Study: Increasing Use & Availability of Special Products - Terminals

Sloped end: widespread solution removes system end hazard, although no control of vehicle exit trajectory Energy-absorbing terminals: controlled vehicle deceleration





Energy absorption – EN 1317 test







Case Study: Increased Use & Availability of Special Products - Transitions

- Abrupt barrier change can lead to hazardous change in stiffness
- Connect ends of barriers to avoid weak zones at ends of installations
- Transition = mitigated risk of increased impact severity or system breakage due to ubrupt change of barrier

Numerous barrier combinations

 \succ European standards \rightarrow Europe-wide solutions \rightarrow fewer combinations needed







Case Study: Bridge Parapet Development

- National, generic bridge parapet: although effective in vehicle restraint, often:
- high material usage,
- complex manufacturing,
- stiff post snagging risk,







Case Study: Bridge Parapet Development

... often:

- Up to H2 containment only (13 tonne coach) not designed to restrain heaviest trucks!
- frangible barrier anchorages to protect bridge deck structure











Case Study: Bridge Parapet Development



Innovation through EN 1317:

- Optimisation of design
- Concrete designs eliminate stiff post impact risk
- Highest containment levels -H4/L4 (38T truck)
- Unanchored lower impact severity and no damage to bridge deck from transferred impact loads









Case Study: Cast-in-Place Concrete Barriers

 Cast-in-place durability limited due to shrinkage cracks allowing corrosion of reinforcement.

• Quality control and durability requirements drive on-site quality checks and development of solutions to improve cast-inplace durability.

Rigid precast barrier solutions are also now available for traditional cast-in-place applications. Infiltration of water and chloride



Coated reinforcement strand







rigid and semi-rigide precast options





The Road Ahead

Future further development of the European standard will push continued product development and maintain wide portfolio of products.

Reduction of carbon footprint will be an important part of the next revision of EN 1317 and this will influence the future evolution of products.



To sum up ...

European standard EN 1317 and the associated CE marking for road restraint systems have been driving innovation in Europe and around the world by encouraging development that could not been achieved by national governments alone.

The use of a common evaluation basis allows comparison of a wide variety of restraint systems leading to greater choice for each application. The constant market-driven development leads to a widening range of systems that are also available outside of the European Union wherever EN 1317 is recognised.



