















3. Anchor damage or disengagement would require replacement. For the end shoe bracket, it may only require installation of new mounting bolts if the bracket is undamaged. The blockout mounting bracket could be replaced using the two unused anchor holes if one of the anchors is damaged or becomes disengaged.

## 12.5 Integration with Other Barrier Systems

The guardrail to PCB transition system developed herein focused on the MGS guardrail system and the 12.5-ft (3.81-m) long, F-shape PCBs that were developed through the Midwest States Pooled Fund Program. While the transition was designed specifically for these two barrier systems, there may be a desire to integrate this transition using other barrier systems, including existing G4(1C) W-beam guardrail or alternative PCB designs.

Because a majority of the guardrail currently on the highway system consists of the G4(1S) guardrail, there will likely be a need to attach the G4(1C) guardrail to a PCB transition. Two issues must be addressed to transition the G4(1S) system to the MGS guardrail. They related to differences in rail height and splice location. Previous guidance has been given to raise rail height from the G4(1S) to the MGS over a distance of 25 ft to 50 ft (7.62 m to 15.21 m). Several options exist to reposition the rail splices from the posts to the mid span locations by including omitting a post or use of  $\frac{1}{2}$  post spacing. Three layout options are proposed, but each requires a slightly different layout depending on the preferred splice repositioning method. In addition, each guardrail to PCB transition option requires a slightly different connection point to the nested MGS guardrail to provide a short length of standard MGS prior to the beginning of the guardrail to PCB transition. The three recommended G4(1S) to MGS transitions are detailed below.

 Omitted Post Option – The transition between the rail splice locations for the G4(1S) to MGS transition can be accomplished through omission of a post after the rail height transition is completed, as shown in Figure 107. Recent research has shown that the omission of a single post in the MGS and creation of a 12.5 ft (3.81 m) unsupported span is acceptable under MASH TL-3 impact conditions [15]. As such, it is recommended that the splice repositioning can occur following the rail height transition through omission of the post at the first splice following the height transition. This option creates a 9 ft –  $4\frac{1}{2}$  in. (2.86 m) span between G4(1S) spacing and MGS spacing. MGS attachment to the nested MGS may begin at the first splice following the splice repositioning.

- 2. Half-Post Spacing in MGS Option A second option for transitioning from G4(1S) to MGS consists of adding an additional post following the rail height transition, as shown in Figure 108. For this transition, a post at ½-post spacing is added after the second post following the rail height repositioning, and standard MGS begins after that point. Attachment of the MGS to the nested rail that begins the guardrail to PCB transition may begin after one 12.5-ft (3.81-m) long section of standard MGS following the splice repositioning.
- 3. Half-Post Spacing in G4(1S) Option A third option for transitioning from G4(1S) to MGS consists of adding an additional post prior to the rail height repositioning, as shown in Figure 109. For this transition, a post at ½-post spacing is added after the final post in the G4(1S) prior to the rail height repositioning, and standard MGS post spacing begins after that point. Attachment of the MGS to the nested rail that begins the guardrail to PCB transition may begin after one 12.5-ft (3.81-m) long section of standard MGS following the rail height repositioning.

The blockout depth may be converted from the 8-in. deep G4(1S) blockouts to the 12-in. deep MGS blockouts at whatever point is convenient.

Finally, the guardrail to PCB transition that was tested and evaluated herein used a common 12.5-ft (3.81-m) long, F-shape PCB that is used by a majority of the Pooled Fund states in the

Midwest. However, there may be potential to use this transition system with alternative PCBs if some basic criteria are met.

- 1. The reinforcement in alternative PCB designs would need to provide equal or greater barrier capacity to that provided by the PCBs used in this research.
- 2. Alternative PCB segment connections must have comparable or greater structural capacity and torsional rigidity about the longitudinal barrier axis when compared to the as-tested PCB.
- 3. Alternative barrier geometry may affect the performance of the system. As such, barrier height should be maintained at 32 in. (813 mm) to maintain a similar or less risk for wheel snag. Differences the barrier face geometry, such as New Jersey and single-slope barriers, may be acceptable, but they are not recommended at this time without further study. There are concerns that the difference in face geometry may affect vehicle interaction with the PCB in the overlapped barrier region. Thus, it may require revised connection hardware for the W-beam end shoe and blockouts.
- The PCB segments with alternative lengths could potentially be used but are not recommended without further study due to concerns for potential differences in the PCB deflection and stiffness.
- 5. Any alternative PCB should have similar mass per unit length to the as-tested PCB system to provide similar inertial resistance, stiffness, and dynamic deflections.
- 6. Finally, it is recommended that any alternative PCB should meet MASH TL-3. It is also recommended that any alternative PCB have similar MASH TL-3 dynamic deflections to the as-tested PCB. Significantly increased or decreased dynamic deflections may adversely affect the performance of the guardrail to PCB transition system.









Option





Option