Midwest States' Regional Pooled Fund Research Program Fiscal Year 1996-1997 (Year 7) NDOR Research Project Number SPR-3(017)

DYNAMIC TESTING OF WOODEN GUARDRAIL POSTS - WHITE AND RED PINE SPECIES EQUIVALENCY STUDY

Submitted by

John R. Rohde, Ph.D, P.E. Associate Professor

Jason A. Hascall, B.S.C.E., E.I.T. Graduate Research Assistant Karla A. Polivka, M.S.M.E., E.I.T. Research Associate Engineer

Ronald K. Faller, Ph.D., P.E. Research Assistant Professor Dean L. Sicking, Ph.D., P.E. Professor and MwRSF Director

MIDWEST ROADSIDE SAFETY FACILITY

University of Nebraska-Lincoln 527 Nebraska Hall Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0529 (402) 472-0965

Submitted to

MIDWEST STATES' REGIONAL POOLED FUND PROGRAM

Nebraska Department of Roads 1500 Nebraska Highway 2 Lincoln, Nebraska 68502

MwRSF Research Report No. TRP-03-154-04

September 21, 2004

TECHNICAL REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. Report No.	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
TRP-03-154-04		
4. Title and Subtitle		5. Report Date
Dynamic Testing of Wooden	Guardrail Posts - White	September 21, 2004
and Red Pine Species Equival	lency Study	6.
7. Author(s)		8. Performing Organization Report No.
Rohde, J.R., Hascall, J.A., Po and Sicking, D.L.	livka, K.A., Faller, R.K.,	TRP-03-154-04
9. Performing Organization Name and Addr	ess	10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.
Midwest Roadside Safety Fac	cility (MwRSF)	
University of Nebraska-Linco	bln	11. Contract © or Grant (G) No.
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-052	29	SPR-3(017)
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Add	iress	13. Type of Report and Period Covered
Midwest States' Regional Poo	oled Fund Program	Final Report 2001-2004
Nebraska Department of Road	ds	14. Sponsoring Agency Code
Lincoln, NE 68502		
		•

15. Supplementary Notes

Prepared in cooperation with U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.

16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words)

Dynamic impact testing of 152-mm (6-in.) x 203-mm (8-in.) Red, White, and Southern Yellow Pine posts was performed. Dynamic tensile strength of the posts was primarily dependent upon the species of the post, with variation within each species attributable to the inconsistency of wood as a material and defects such as knots in the posts.

The Southern Yellow Pine species tended to have the highest modulus of rupture with an average value of 37.23 MPa (5.40 ksi). White Pine yielded the lowest modulus of rupture, averaging 20.33 MPa (2.95 ksi). The modulus of rupture for Red Pine was 27.44 MPa (3.98 ksi).

Based on these results, it is recommended that the use of Red and White Pine posts as guardrail line posts should require a new cross-sectional depth that would provide equivalent performance to Southern Yellow Pine. The width should remain the same. These changes will provide equivalent performance from Red and White Pine guardrail posts, without changing the soil reaction properties. The suggested depth is 238 mm (9 3/8 in.) for Red Pine species and 264 mm (10 3/8 in.) for White Pine species.

17. Document Analysis/Descriptors		18. Availability Statement	
Highway Safety, Wooden Pos Southern Yellow Pine, Roads Crash Testing	sts, Red Pine, White Pine, ide Appurtenances, Bogie	No restrictions. Docu National Technical Ir Springfield, Virginia	ment available from: formation Services, 22161
19. Security Class (this report)	20. Security Class (this page)	21. No. of Pages	22. Price
Unclassified	Unclassified	91	

DISCLAIMER STATEMENT

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 views nor policies of the State Highway Departments participating in the Midwest States' Regional Pooled Fund Research Program nor the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge several sources that made a contribution to this project: (1) the Midwest States' Regional Pooled Fund Program funded by the Connecticut Department of Transportation, Illinois Department of Transportation, Iowa Department of Transportation, Kansas Department of Transportation, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Missouri Department of Transportation, Montana Department of Transportation, Nebraska Department of Roads, Ohio Department of Transportation, South Dakota Department of Transportation, Texas Department of Transportation, and Wisconsin Department of Transportation for sponsoring this project; (2) Robert D. Slagter from ANRO Timber Products, Inc. for donating the Red Pine and White Pine wood posts; and (3) MwRSF personnel for conducting the crash tests.

Acknowledgment is also given to the following individuals who made a contribution to the completion of this research project.

Midwest Roadside Safety Facility

J.C. Holloway, M.S.C.E., E.I.T., Research Associate Engineer A.T. Russell, Laboratory Mechanic II Undergraduate and Graduate Assistants

TABLE OF	CONTENTS
----------	----------

TECHNICAL REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	i
DISCLAIMER STATEMENT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
List of Figures	vi
List of Tables	viii
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Objective	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	2
2.1 Prior Post Testing Results	2
3 PHYSICAL TESTING	
3.1 Purpose	
3.2 Test Facility	
3.3 Scope	3
4 SYSTEM DETAILS	
4.1 Wood Post	
4.2 Equipment and Instrumentation	
4 2 1 Bogie	10
4.2.2 Accelerometer	
4.2.3 Pressure Tape Switches	
4.2.4 Photography Cameras	
4.3 Methodology of Testing	
4.4 End of Test Determination	
4.5 Data Processing	15
5 TEST RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	16
5 1 Results	
5 2 Force Discussion	23
5 2 1 Tests WP-1 through WP-30	23
5.2.2 Tests RP-1 through RP-30	
6 DISCUSSION ON POST SIZE	26

7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
8 REFERENCES	
Appendix A A.1 Test Summary Information	

List of Figures

Figure 1. Major Dimensions of the Wooden Guardrail Post	7
Figure 2. Rigid Frame Bogie	11
Figure 3. Impact Location.	
Figure 4. Bogie Positioned in the Guide Track Configuration	14
Figure 5. WP-4 Force- Deflection At Impact Location	
Figure 6. WP-4 Fracture	
Figure 7. RP-27 Force-Deflection At Impact Location	
Figure 8. RP-27 Fracture.	
Figure 9. Results of WP-1	
Figure 10. Results of WP-2	
Figure 11. Results of WP-3	
Figure 12. Results of WP-4	
Figure 13. Results of WP-5	
Figure 14. Results of WP-6	
Figure 15. Results of WP-7	
Figure 16. Results of WP-8	
Figure 17. Results of WP-9	40
Figure 18. Results of WP-10.	41
Figure 19. Results of WP-11	
Figure 20. Results of WP-12.	
Figure 21. Results of WP-13	44
Figure 22. Results of WP-14	
Figure 23. Results of WP-15	
Figure 24. Results of WP-16	
Figure 25. Results of WP-17	
Figure 26. Results of WP-18	
Figure 27. Results of WP-19	50
Figure 28. Results of WP-20	
Figure 29. Results of WP-21	52
Figure 30. Results of WP-22	53
Figure 31. Results of WP-23	
Figure 32. Results of WP-24	55
Figure 33. Results of WP-25	
Figure 34. Results of WP-26	57
Figure 35. Results of WP-27	
Figure 36. Results of WP-28	59
Figure 37. Results of WP-29	60
Figure 38. Results of WP-30	61
Figure 39. Results of RP-1	
Figure 40. Results of RP-2	
Figure 41. Results of RP-3	
Figure 42. Results of RP-4	
Figure 43. Results of RP-5	
Figure 44. Results of RP-6	67

Figure 45.	Results of RP-7	68
Figure 46.	Results of RP-8	69
Figure 47.	Results of RP-9	70
Figure 48.	Results of RP-10	71
Figure 49.	Results of RP-11	72
Figure 50.	Results of RP-12	73
Figure 51.	Results of RP-13	74
Figure 52.	Results of RP-14	75
Figure 53.	Results of RP-15	76
Figure 54.	Results of RP-16	77
Figure 55.	Results of RP-17	78
Figure 56.	Results of RP-18	79
Figure 57.	Results of RP-19	80
Figure 58.	Results of RP-20	81
Figure 59.	Results of RP-21	82
Figure 60.	Results of RP-22	83
Figure 61.	Results of RP-23	84
Figure 62.	Results of RP-24	85
Figure 63.	Results of RP-25	86
Figure 64.	Results of RP-26	87
Figure 65.	Results of RP-27	88
Figure 66.	Results of RP-28	89
Figure 67.	Results of RP-29	90
Figure 68.	Results of RP-30	91

List of Tables

. 4
. 5
. 8
. 9
13
18
19
20
20
21
21
22
28
29
31

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The performance of W-beam longitudinal barriers is significantly affected by the performance of the posts embedded in soil. Post rotation in soil, fracture of the post, bending of the post, twisting of the post, or a combination of failure modes radically affects how much energy is absorbed by a post in a guardrail system. If the post does not rotate sufficiently in the soil, but fractures or yields soon after impact, there is a significant chance that the barrier will not perform satisfactorily. In cases where wood posts are utilized, the posts must have sufficient structural capacity to displace founding soils and absorb energy. If wood posts that have insufficient bending strength are utilized, the bulk of the impacting vehicle's energy is absorbed by the W-beam element, potentially leading to failure of the rail element and subsequent penetration of the impacting vehicle.

1.2 Objective

The objective of the research project was to determine the properties of the Red and White Pine wood species when used as posts under impact loading conditions. The desired result of this research was to determine an acceptable size of Red and White Pine species in order to allow these species to serve as substitutes for the currently acceptable Southern Yellow Pine (SYP) species in guardrail post applications.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Prior Post Testing Results

In 1995, Rohde et al. (<u>1</u>) completed a study of the effects of grading variation on the performance of wooden posts. The study was requested by the Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) in response to the realization that an independent testing laboratory had inaccurately graded lumber installed as guardrail posts from 1989 to 1994.

The results of the study show that there is no significant difference in strength or energy absorption between the nationally accepted standard and the lower grade posts that were installed in Nebraska. These results were based on both the comparison of dynamic testing of Southern Pine Inspection Bureau (SPIB) graded posts and an analysis of BARRIER VII ($\underline{2}$) results considering how posts of significantly varying strength affected barrier performance.

3 PHYSICAL TESTING

3.1 Purpose

To assess the dynamic properties of the subject species, physical testing was undertaken to determine failure properties. Past work has shown that dynamic testing at appropriate loading rates is required to accurately assess wood properties.

3.2 Test Facility

Physical testing of 152-mm x 203-mm (6-in x 8-in.) Red, White, and Southern Yellow Pine guardrail posts was performed at the Midwest Roadside Safety Facility (MwRSF) outdoor testing facility located at the Lincoln Air-park on the northwest side of the Lincoln Municipal Airport.

3.3 Scope

Bogie impact tests on the sample posts were performed with the posts installed in a rigid steel sleeve embedded in concrete. The target impact condition for all of the crash tests was a speed of 32 km/h (20 mph) and an angle of 0.0 degrees (deep axis), which has been shown to reflect loading conditions experienced during a longitudinal barrier impact. The posts were impacted 550 mm (21.65 in.) above the ground line perpendicular to the narrow face. The scope of the physical testing is listed in Table 1 and Table 2 below.

Sixty crash tests, WP-1 through WP-30 and RP-1 through RP-30, were conducted, and the test results were analyzed and evaluated. For comparison purposes, fifty-seven previous dynamic bogie post tests were also used. These tests were completed as part of the 1995 NDOR study discussed previously (1).

Table 1. Scope of Physical Testing – White Pine

Test No.	Impact Speed km/h (mph)	Embedment Depth mm (in.)	Moisture Content (%)	X-Axis
WP-1	31.58 (19.62)	965 (38.0)	12.67	Strong
WP-2	31.30 (19.45)	965 (38.0)	10.00	Strong
WP-3	32.88 (20.43)	965 (38.0)	15.67	Strong
WP-4	31.17 (19.37)	965 (38.0)	18.00	Strong
WP-5	32.00 (19.88)	965 (38.0)	9.33	Strong
WP-6	32.14 (19.97)	965 (38.0)	11.67	Strong
WP-7	32.73 (20.34)	965 (38.0)	17.33	Strong
WP-8	31.72 (19.71)	965 (38.0)	12.33	Strong
WP-9	31.58 (19.62)	965 (38.0)	19.00	Strong
WP-10	30.38 (18.88)	965 (38.0)	12.33	Strong
WP-11	31.44 (19.54)	965 (38.0)	14.00	Strong
WP-12	33.96 (21.10)	965 (38.0)	18.00	Strong
WP-13	30.58 (19.0)	965 (38.0)	15.33	Strong
WP-14	39.56 (24.58)	965 (38.0)	10.33	Strong
WP-15	32.43 (20.15)	965 (38.0)	11.00	Strong
WP-16	31.58 (19.62)	965 (38.0)	12.67	Strong
WP-17	32.43 (20.15)	965 (38.0)	14.67	Strong
WP-18	32.00 (19.88)	965 (38.0)	10.67	Strong
WP-19	33.33 (20.71)	965 (38.0)	11.33	Strong
WP-20	34.62 (21.51)	965 (38.0)	16.00	Strong
WP-21	34.95 (21.72)	965 (38.0)	17.00	Strong
WP-22	30.90 (19.20)	965 (38.0)	17.33	Strong
WP-23	34.29 (21.30)	965 (38.0)	17.00	Strong
WP-24	35.29 (21.93)	965 (38.0)	17.67	Strong
WP-25	32.14 (19.97)	965 (38.0)	14.33	Strong
WP-26	30.42 (18.90)	965 (38.0)	16.67	Strong
WP-27	29.27 (18.19)	965 (38.0)	15.00	Strong
WP-28	33.80 (21.0)	965 (38.0)	19.33	Strong
WP-29	34.12 (21.20)	965 (38.0)	15.67	Strong
WP-30	32.43 (20.15)	965 (38.0)	18.33	Strong

Test No.	Impact Speed km/h (mph)	Embedment Depth mm (in.)	Moisture Content (%)	X-Axis
RP-1	29.29 (18.20)	965 (38.0)	17.33	Strong
RP-2	32.14 (19.97)	965 (38.0)	11.00	Strong
RP-3	31.72 (19.71)	965 (38.0)	11.00	Strong
RP-4	31.58 (19.62)	965 (38.0)	11.33	Strong
RP-5	30.13 (18.72)	965 (38.0)	14.33	Strong
RP-6	30.77 (19.12)	965 (38.0)	17.67	Strong
RP-7	32.29 (20.06)	965 (38.0)	17.33	Strong
RP-8	31.72 (19.71)	965 (38.0)	11.67	Strong
RP-9	32.14 (19.97)	965 (38.0)	11.67	Strong
RP-10	31.72 (19.71)	965 (38.0)	22.00	Strong
RP-11	32.29 (20.06)	965 (38.0)	18.67	Strong
RP-12	32.14 (19.97)	965 (38.0)	16.67	Strong
RP-13	32.14 (19.97)	965 (38.0)	8.00	Strong
RP-14	29.75 (18.49)	965 (38.0)	20.33	Strong
RP-15	30.25 (18.80)	965(38.0)	22.00	Strong
RP-16	33.96 (21.10)	965 (38.0)	21.33	Strong
RP-17	32.00 (19.88)	965 (38.0)	18.33	Strong
RP-18	31.30 (19.45)	965 (38.0)	19.67	Strong
RP-19	30.90 (19.20)	965 (38.0)	22.67	Strong
RP-20	31.72 (19.71)	965 (38.0)	18.00	Strong
RP-21	31.44 (19.54)	965 (38.0)	16.33	Strong
RP-22	30.64 (19.04)	965 (38.0)	22.67	Strong
RP-23	31.30 (19.45)	965 (38.0)	19.33	Strong
RP-24	30.90 (19.20)	965 (38.0)	18.67	Strong
RP-25	32.58 (20.24)	965 (38.0)	21.00	Strong
RP-26	32.43 (20.15)	965 (38.0)	20.00	Strong
RP-27	31.58 (19.62)	965 (38.0)	16.00	Strong
RP-28	31.58 (19.62)	965 (38.0)	18.33	Strong
RP-29	30.00 (18.64)	965 (38.0)	17.00	Strong
RP-30	37.50 (23.30)	965 (38.0)	16.67	Strong

Table 2. Scope of Physical Testing – Red Pine

4 SYSTEM DETAILS

4.1 Wood Post

The posts utilized in this study were cut from White and Red Pine native to Wisconsin. These posts were supplied by ANRO Timber Products, Inc. and selected randomly from a stockpile containing approximately 600 posts of each species. Each specimen was weighed and measured. Moisture contents were collected at three locations along the post (top, center, and bottom), and wane was documented.

Each post was a solid specimen with nominal dimensions of 152 mm x 203 mm x 1,829 mm (6 in. x 8 in. x 72 in.), as shown in Figure 1. Actual cross-sectional measurements were taken at three locations along the posts. Measurements, moisture contents, and weights for the White and Red Pine species are shown in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively.

To complete the test, each post was placed in a 965-mm (38-in.) deep steel sleeve embedded in concrete with 864 mm (34 in.) of the post above the ground. To hold the post in place, neoprene pads of varying dimensions were inserted between the non-impact side of the post and the steel sleeve.



Figure 1. Major Dimensions of the Wooden Guardrail Post

Table 3. Material Properties of White Pine Wooden Posts

Post #	t Weight kg (lbs) 34(74)	Top Width 152(6.000)	Cr Top Depth 197(7.750)	oss-Section Meas Center Width 152(6.000)	urements mm (i Center Depth 203 (8.000)	in.) Bottom Width 152(6.000)	Bottom Depth 203(8.000)	Top	Moisture Middle 22	Content (Bottom	%) Average 17
7	27(59)	152(6.000)	203(8.000)	152(6.000)	203(8.000)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	14	11	∞ ;	11
ω 4	28(62) 27(59)	152(6.000) 152(6.000)	197(7.750) 203(8.000)	152(6.000) 152(6.000)	203(8.000) 203(8.000)	152(6.000) 152(6.000)	203(8.000) 203(8.000)	10	12	11	= =
5	33(73)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	6	14	20	14
9	34(74)	159(6.250)	210(8.250)	159(6.250)	206(8.125)	159(6.250)	206(8.125)	12	20	21	18
5	34(76)	156(6.125)	206(8.125)	159(6.250)	210(8.250)	162 (6.375)	210(8.250)	12	20	20	17
∞	33(72)	156(6.125)	203(8.000)	152(6.000)	203(8.000)	156(6.125)	203 (8.000)	11	10	14	12
6	34(74)	149(5.875)	203 (8.000)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	11	12	12	12
10	29(65)	156(6.125)	210(8.250)	152(6.000)	208(8.188)	156(6.125)	206(8.125)	21	22	23	22
Ξ	33(73)	156(6.125)	203 (8.000)	152(6.000)	210(8.250)	156(6.125)	206(8.125)	21	20	15	19
12	26(57)	152(6.000)	203(8.000)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	156(6.125)	206(8.125)	15	16	19	17
13	29(63)	159(6.250)	203 (8.000)	156(6.125)	203 (8.000)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	8	8	8	8
14	33(72)	152(6.000)	210(8.250)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	24	20	17	20
15	30(67)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	23	22	21	22
16	34(74)	156(6.125)	203(8.000)	156(6.125)	225(8.875)	156(6.125)	203 (8.000)	22	23	19	21
17	28(61)	146(5.750)	203 (8.000)	149(5.875)	203 (8.000)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	17	20	18	18
18	33(72)	156(6.125)	206(8.125)	152(6.000)	203(8.000)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	19	21	19	20
19	33(72)	159(6.250)	203 (8.000)	159(6.250)	203 (8.000)	159(6.250)	203 (8.000)	22	24	22	23
20	34(75)	156(6.125)	206(8.125)	159(6.250)	206(8.125)	159(6.250)	210(8.250)	14	20	20	18
21	30(66)	156(6.125)	203 (8.000)	156(6.125)	203 (8.000)	159(6.250)	206(8.125)	23	11	15	16
22	29(63)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	24	21	23	23
23	31(69)	154(6.063)	203 (8.000)	156(6.125)	206(8.125)	156(6.125)	210(8.250)	22	13	23	19
24	31(69)	159(6.250)	206(8.125)	162(6.375)	206(8.125)	165(6.500)	210(8.250)	22	15	19	19
25	28(61)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	152(6.000)	206(8.125)	18	22	23	21
26	29(65)	152(6.000)	200(7.875)	152(6.000)	203(8.000)	156(6.125)	203 (8.000)	19	21	20	20
27	28(61)	149(5.875)	200(7.875)	156(6.125)	203 (8.000)	159(6.250)	203 (8.000)	14	18	16	16
28	28(61)	156(6.125)	189(7.438)	149(5.875)	222(8.750)	152(6.000)	197 (7.750)	13	20	22	18
29	30(67)	156(6.125)	200(7.875)	149(5.875)	200(7.875)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	14	20	17	17
30	35(78)	159(6.250)	206(8.125)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	152(6.000)	203 (8.000)	20	16	14	17

Posts
Vooden
Pine W
of Red
erties (
l Prop
Aateria
ole 4. N
Tal

4.2 Equipment and Instrumentation

A variety of equipment and instrumentation were used to record and collect data. It is important to gather correct data using affordable instrumentation in order to understand and derive meaningful conclusions of the physical tests. Equipment and instruments utilized in this testing included:

- Bogie
- Accelerometer
- Pressure Tape Switches
- Photography Camera
- Digital Video Camera

4.2.1 Bogie

A rigid-frame bogie was used to impact the posts. An impact head, made of a 203-mm (8-in.) diameter, 12.5-mm (0.5-in.) thick standard steel pipe, was mounted to the bogie with its horizontal centerline 550 mm (21.65 in.) above the ground. Neoprene belting, 19-mm (0.75-in.) thick, was attached to the steel pipe to minimize the local damage to the post from the impact. The bogie is shown in Figure 2.

The bogie weight was 611 kg (1,346 lbs). Calculations and computer simulations prior to testing indicate that this weight, in combination with a velocity of approximately 32 km/h (20 mph or 8.9 m/s) closely replicates the actual impact conditions that a post as part of a guardrail system would be subjected to in a 100 km/h (62.14 mph) and 25-degree impact with a 2,000-kg (4409-lb) test vehicle.



Figure 2. Rigid Frame Bogie

4.2.2 Accelerometer

One triaxial piezoresistive accelerometer system with a range of ±200 G's was used to measure the acceleration in the longitudinal, lateral, and vertical directions at a sample rate of 10,000 Hz. The environmental shock and vibration sensor/recorder system, Model EDR-4M6, was developed by Instrumented Sensor Technology (IST) of Okemos, Michigan and includes three differential channels as well as three single-ended channels. The EDR-4 was configured with 6 Mb of RAM memory and a 1,500 Hz lowpass filter. Computer software, "DynaMax 1 (DM-1)" and "DADiSP" were used to digitize, analyze, and plot the accelerometer data.

4.2.3 Pressure Tape Switches

Three pressure tape switches, spaced at 1-m (3.3-ft) intervals and placed near the end of the bogie track, were used to determine the speed of the bogie before the impact. As the front left tire of the bogie passed over each tape switch, a strobe light was fired sending an electronic timing signal to the data acquisition system. Test speeds were determined using the time between these signals from the data acquisition system and the known distance between the switches.

4.2.4 Photography Cameras

One high-speed Red Lake E/cam video camera, with an operating speed of 500 frames/sec, and one Canon digital video camera, with an operating speed of 29.97 frames/sec, were used to film a subset of the tests. The cameras were placed approximately 7.62 m (25 ft) away and perpendicular to the bogie's direction of travel. The high-speed footage was only used to confirm accelerometer measurements on a limited number of tests.

4.3 Methodology of Testing

A total of 60 tests, 30 White Pine and 30 Red Pine, were conducted. The posts were impacted along the strong axis of impact with a 965 mm (38.0 in.) embedment depth in a steel sleeve embedded in concrete. Strong axis impact occurs when the bogie head impacts one of the 152 mm (6 in.) faces. A graphical representation of the impact is shown in Figure 3, and the test parameters can be seen in Table 5.



Figure 3. Impact Location

Table 5. Test Parameters

Test Parameters
Test: Strong Axis Impact at 0 degrees
Accelerometer: EDR-4 Data
Bogie Weight: 611 kg (1,346 lbs)
Bumper Height: 550 mm (21.65 in.)
Posts: 152 mm x 203 mm (6 in. x 8 in.) Wooden
Post Length: 1,829 mm (72 in.)
Soil: N/A (Steel sleeve embedded in concrete)

The tests were conducted using a bogie guidance system developed at MwRSF. This system consists of steel pipe supported and anchored by stanchions placed in the concrete every 3.05 m (10 ft). The bogie vehicle is equipped with bearings at the front and back wheels. These bearings surround the pipe keeping the bogie traveling in the direction of the pipe. A pickup

truck with a cable system was used to tow the test vehicle, accelerating it to the required impact velocity, at which point the cable was released, allowing the bogie to roll free as it came off the guide track. The bogie positioned on the guide track can be seen in Figure 4.



Figure 4. Bogie Positioned in the Guide Track Configuration

The bearings guided the bogie into the posts to ensure the proper impact direction and position. A remote braking system was installed on the bogie to allow the bogie to be brought safely to a stop after the test. The accelerometer, located at the bogie's center of gravity, records lateral, horizontal and vertical acceleration data.

4.4 End of Test Determination

The end of the test was generally identified at the third time the acceleration data crossed the X-axis from positive to negative. Past this point, the post was considered to be broken. In some cases where the remaining data was clearly irrelevant, the test was ended when the acceleration data crossed the X-axis from positive to negative the first or second time.

4.5 Data Processing

Initially, the bulk of the data was filtered using a SAE Class 60 Butterworth filter conforming to the SAE J211/1 specifications. The pertinent acceleration signal was extracted from the bulk of the data. The processed acceleration data was then multiplied by the mass of the bogie to get the impact force using Newton's Second Law. Next, the acceleration trace was integrated to find the change in velocity. Initial velocity of the bogie, calculated using the data from the pressure tape switches, was then used to determine the bogie's velocity trace. The calculated bogie's velocity trace was then integrated to find the displacement. Subsequently, using the previous results, the force-deflection curve was plotted for each test. Finally, integration of the force-deflection curve provides the energy-displacement curve for each test.

5 TEST RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Accelerometer data was processed for each test in order to obtain acceleration, velocity, and displacement curves, as well as force-deflection curves. Individual test results are provided in Appendix A. A summary of all the tests is provided in Table 6 for the Wisconsin White Pine species, Table 7 for the Wisconsin Red Pine species, and Table 8 for the SYP posts. A summary of the tests for each of the different SYP post grades is provided in Table 9 for Grade 1 Dense posts, Table 10 for Grade 1 posts, Table 11 for Grade 2 Dense posts, and Table 12 for Grade 2 posts.

5.1 Results

The modulus of rupture (MOR) was calculated for each test and is shown in the mentioned tables. The MOR is the stress in the wood fibers at the front and back faces of the post at the point of rupture using an elastic relationship. It is calculated by dividing the bogie impact moment by the section modulus, creating a comparison between posts that is independent of the shape of the post and the speed of the bogie. Furthermore, the MOR values were adjusted to represent MOR values at saturation, 23% moisture content, in order to compensate for the varying strengths due to moisture content variation in the posts. To make this change, the Quadratic Surface Model (Quadratic) was used. This is an empirical adjustment method developed by the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Products Laboratory (<u>3</u>) that is more accurate, but more computationally intensive than the alternative method given in ASTM D-1990 (<u>4</u>).

After all of the adjustments were made, SYP post testing resulted in the highest MOR value of 28.1 MPa (4.07 ksi). Red Pine, with an average MOR of 22.7 MPa (3.30 ksi), had a

16

higher MOR than White Pine, but was still significantly lower than SYP. White Pine resulted in the lowest MOR value at 16.1 MPa (2.34 ksi).

Table 6. Dynamic White Pine Wood Post Test Results

moot	Velocity	m/s (mph)	8.8 (19.6)	8.7 (19.5)	9.1 (20.4)	8.7 (19.4)	8.9 (19.9)	8.9 (20.0)	9.1 (20.3)	8.6 (19.3)	8.8 (19.6)	8.4 (18.9)	8.7 (19.5)	9.4 (21.1)	8.5 (19.0)	11.0 (24.6)	9.0 (20.2)	8.8 (19.6)	9.0 (20.2)	8.9 (19.9)	9.3 (20.7)	9.6 (21.5)	9.7 (21.7)	8.6 (19.2)	9.5 (21.3)	9.8 (21.9)	8.9 (20.0)	8.4 (18.9)	8.1 (18.2)	9.4 (21.0)	9.5 (21.2)	9.0 (20.2)	9.0 (20.2)	0.6 (1.2)
Adjusted MOR	Quadratic)	Mpa (k/in.²)	15 (2.17)	18 (2.63)	17 (2.51)	17 (2.40)	18 (2.57)	14 (1.98)	16 (2.24)	16 (2.25)	23 (3.26)	20 (2.87)	23 (3.36)	16 (2.26)	16 (2.35)	22 (3.17)	15 (2.21)	14 (2.06)	14 (1.97)	15 (2.15)	7 (0.96)	18 (2.66)	16 (2.39)	15 (2.10)	15 (2.22)	14 (2.19)	15 (2.17)	16 (2.25)	13 (1.91)	16 (2.38)	15 (2.27)	15 (2.15)	16.1 (2.34)	3.1 (0.45)
Moieturo	Content	(%)	13	0	16	9	б	12	17	12	19	12	14	9	15	0	11	t	15	1	11	16	17	17	17	9	14	17	15	19	16	18	15	3
Modulus of	Rupture	Mpa (k/in.²)	17.2 (2.50)	20.5 (2.98)	21.0 (3.05)	19.5 (2.83)	19.2 (2.79)	15.1 (2.19)	18.2 (2.64)	17.9 (2.59)	27.1 (3.93)	24.2 (3.51)	30.0 (4.35)	18.1 (2.63)	19.4 (2.82)	26.2 (3.80)	17.0 (2.47)	16.2 (2.35)	15.5 (2.25)	16.5 (2.39)	6.8 (0.99)	22.6 (3.27)	19.6 (2.85)	16.8 (2.43)	18.0 (2.61)	16.4 (2.38)	17.5 (2.54)	18.3 (2.65)	14.8 (2.15)	18.9 (2.75)	17.9 (2.60)	17.1 (2.47)	18.8 (2.73)	4.2 (0.60)
	Energy	kJ (kip-in.)	3.14 (27.8)	4.06 (36.0)	3.98 (35.2)	3.22 (28.5)	2.61 (23.1)	1.63 (14.4)	2.25 (19.9)	2.57 (22.7)	5.50 (48.7)	3.77 (33.3)	4.52 (40.0)	3.56 (31.5)	2.94 (26.0)	7.57 (67.0)	1.96 (17.3)	1.82 (16.1)	1.98 (17.5)	1.79 (15.8)	1.08 (9.6)	3.01 (26.7)	2.53 (22.4)	4.30 (38.1)	2.44 (21.6)	1.80 (15.9)	3.45 (30.5)	2.74 (24.3)	1.78 (15.8)	4.00 (35.4)	2.06 (18.2)	2.68 (23.7)	3.02 (26.8)	1.33 (11.8)
Rupture	Deflection	mm (in.)	329 (13.0)	404 (15.9)	395 (15.5)	321 (12.6)	271 (10.7)	333 (13.1)	328 (12.9)	317 (13.0)	414 (16.3)	330 (13.0)	403 (15.9)	424 (16.7)	312 (12.3)	607 (23.9)	274 (10.8)	311 (12.3)	333 (13.1)	320 (12.6)	298 (11.7)	344 (13.5)	344 (13.6)	396 (15.6)	336 (13.2)	333 (13.1)	360 (14.2)	389 (15.3)	285 (11.2)	389 (15.3)	325 (12.8)	304 (12.0)	351 (13.8)	64 (2.5)
	Time	ms	39.3	49.8	45.7	39.1	31.7	38.1 38	37.3	41.8	51.3	41.8	49.6	47.1	38.5	60.2	31.3	36.5	89	37	32.7	37	36.7	49.6	36.4	34.8	42.4	48.1	g	43.7	35.2	35.2	40.7	6.8
	Energy	kJ (kip-in.)	0.75 (27.8)	0.91 (36.0)	1.07 (35.2)	0.90 (28.5)	1.03 (23.1)	0.65 (14.4)	0.82 (19.9)	0.79 (21.6)	2.42 (21.4)	2.44 (33.3)	2.80 (40.0)	0.89 (31.5)	0.84 (26.0)	1.50 (67.0)	0.77 (17.3)	0.66 (16.1)	0.70 (17.5)	0.71 (15.8)	0.28 (9.6)	1.09 (26.7)	0.99 (22.4)	2.33 (38.1)	0.85 (21.6)	0.81 (15.9)	0.86 (30.5)	0.76 (24.3)	0.63 (15.8)	2.47 (35.4)	0.86 (18.2)	0.78 (23.7)	1.11 (25.8)	0.66 (11.1)
ak Force	Deflection	mm (in.)	46 (1.8)	48 (1.9)	52 (2.0)	50 (2.0)	53 (2.1)	46 (1.8)	48 (1.9)	47 (3.2)	80 (3.2)	81 (3.2)	90 (3.5)	52 (2.0)	46 (1.8)	64 (2.5)	48 (1.9)	46 (1.8)	48 (1.9)	47 (1.8)	34 (1.3)	52 (2.0)	53 (2.1)	92 (3.6)	50 (2:0)	51 (2.0)	50 (2:0)	45 (1.8)	43 (1.7)	97 (3.8)	49 (1.9)	48 (1.9)	55 (2.2)	16 (0.6)
Pe	Force	kN (kips)	35.0 (7.9)	39.1 (8.8)	41.3 (9.3)	37.3 (8.4)	38.4 (8.6)	29.4 (6.6)	35.8 (8.1)	35.1 (7.9)	51.7 (11.6)	48.5 (10.9)	57.2 (12.9)	35.7 (8.0)	39.4 (8.9)	50.0 (11.2)	34.2 (7.7)	30.9 (7.0)	30.6 (6.9)	32.4 (7.3)	13.6 (3.1)	45.1 (10.1)	39.8 (8.9)	43.3 (9.7)	35.3 (7.9)	33.3 (7.5)	35.9 (8.1)	36.5 (8.2)	32.3 (7.3)	40.4 (9.1)	37.1 (8.3)	34.2 (7.7)	37.6 (8.5)	8.0 (1.8)
	Time	sm	5.3	5.6	5.7	5.8	ى	5.2	5.3	5.5	9.3	9.0	10.5	5.5	5.4	5.9	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.3	3.7	5.4	5.5	10.9	5.3	5.2	5.6	5.3	5.3	10.5	5.2	5.4	6.18	1.8814
	Post Test	No.	Ļ	2	m	4	ъ	9	7	ω	6	9	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	2	21	53	8	24	25	26	27	8	29	8	Avg.	St. Dev.
														s	əiə	əd	s ə	ui,	d ə	ìid	M													

18

Test Results
Post
Wood
Pine
Red
Dynamic
Table 7.

Table 8. Summary of 1995 NDOR Dynamic Southern Yellow Pine Wood Post Test Results

											Adjusted MOR
	Number		_	Peak Force			Rupture		Modulus of	Moisture	(23% MC
	of	Force	Time	Deflection	Energy	Time	Deflection	Energy	Rupture	Content	Quadratic)
Grade	Posts	kN (kips)	sm	mm (in)	kN-mm (kip-in)	sm	mm (in)	kN-mm (kip-in)	Mpa (k/in.²)	%	Mpa (k/in.²)
Grade 1D	16	49.59 (11.14)	8.16	78 (3.07)	2253 (19.94)	15.35	145 (5.70)	4184 (37.02)	28.68 (4.16)	31	28.51 (4.14)
Grade 1	თ	46.73 (10.50)	8.26	81 (3.21)	2141 (18.95)	15.54	151 (5.95)	4100 (36.27)	27.03 (3.92)	33	26.65 (3.87)
Grade 2D	16	51.77 (11.63)	8.55	83 (3.26)	2406 (21.28)	17.54	166 (6.55)	4725 (41.80)	30.81 (4.47)	Ж	30.81 (4.47)
Grade 2	16	44.58 (10.02)	9.10	88 (3.46)	2134 (18.88)	16.68	159 (6.25)	4007 (35.45)	26.25 (3.81)	34	26.18 (3.80)
	Average	48.17 (10.82)	8.52	83 (3.25)	2234 (19.76)	16.28	155 (6.11)	4254 (37.64)	28.19 (4.09)	32.98	28.04 (4.07)

Table 9. Grade 1 Dense 1995 NDOR Testing Results

		_	_		_		_				_		_		_		_		_
Adjusted MOR (23%	Quadratic)	MPa (k/in. ²)	38.9 (5.64)	40.5 (5.87)	20.4 (2.97)	34.9 (5.06)	39.4 (5.71)	21.6 (3.14)	31.1 (4.52)	28.4 (4.12)	23.5 (3.41)	29.4 (4.27)	27.0 (3.92)	22.4 (3.25)	26.7 (3.87)	30.5 (4.43)	21.5 (3.12)	19.9 (2.88)	28.5 (A.1.A)
Moisture	Content	(%)	∀/N	37	N/A	හ	53	24	N/A	48	N/A	33	N/A	N/A	23	N/A	53	26	Ue
Modulus of	Rupture	MPa (k/in.²)	38.9 (5.64)	40.5 (5.87)	20.4 (2.97)	34.9 (5.06)	41.2 (5.97)	21.6 (3.14)	31.1 (4.52)	28.4 (4.12)	23.5 (3.41)	29.4 (4.27)	27.0 (3.92)	22.4 (3.25)	26.7 (3.87)	30.5 (4.43)	22.4 (3.25)	19.9 (2.88)	28.7 (A 16)
Impact	Velocity	m/s (mph)	9.7 (21.8)	9.5 (21.3)	9.6 (21.5)	9.2 (20.6)	10.1 (22.7)	9.7 (21.8)	9.6 (21.5)	9.3 (20.8)	9.8 (22.0)	10.0 (22.4)	9.5 (21.3)	9.1 (20.4)	10.1 (22.6)	9.8 (22.0)	10.1 (22.6)	9.2 (20.6)	07 01 EV
re	Energy	kJ (kip-in.)	5.52 (48.8)	5.79 (51.2)	2.85 (25.2)	4.71 (41.6)	6.47 (57.3)	3.37 (29.8)	4.06 (35.9)	4.08 (36.1)	3.38 (29.9)	4.49 (39.7)	3.99 (35.3)	3.21 (28.4)	3.91 (34.6)	4.92 (43.5)	3.28 (29.0)	2.93 (25.9)	A 18 G7 M
Ruptu	Deflection	mm (in.)	145 (5.7)	147 (5.8)	139 (5.5)	140 (5.5)	153 (6.0)	146 (5.8)	141 (5.5)	145 (5.7)	142 (5.6)	153 (6.0)	144 (5.7)	131 (5.2)	158 (6.2)	144 (5.7)	143 (5.6)	150 (5.9)	145 (G 7)
	Time	(sm)	15.3	15.9	14.7	15.6	15.6	15.3	15.0	15.9	14.7	15.6	15.3	14.7	15.9	15.0	14.4	16.6	15.1
	Energy	kJ (kip-in.)	2.76 (24.4)	3.16 (28.0)	1.53 (13.5)	2.48 (21.9)	4.26 (37.7)	1.79 (15.8)	2.11 (18.7)	2.16 (19.2)	1.77 (15.7)	2.39 (21.2)	2.00 (17.7)	1.70 (15.1)	1.96 (17.3)	2.62 (23.2)	1.71 (15.2)	1.63 (14.4)	7 75 (19 G)
ak Force	Deflection	mm (in.)	75 (3.0)	79 (3.1)	75 (2.9)	77 (3.0)	85 (3.3)	79 (3.1)	74 (2.9)	81 (3.2)	76 (3.0)	84 (3.3)	74 (2.9)	71 (2.8)	78 (3.1)	79 (3.1)	75 (3.0)	86 (3.4)	78 G 11
Pe	Time	(ms)	7.8	8.4	7.8	8.4	8.4	<u>8</u>	7.8	80 00	7.8	8.4	7.8	7.8	7.8	0	7.8	9.4	α α
	Force	kN (kips)	65.0 (14.6)	68.5 (15.4)	35.1 (7.9)	57.8 (13.0)	73.6 (16.5)	39.2 (8.8)	49.4 (11.1)	48.5 (10.9)	40.2 (9.0)	51.2 (11.5)	48.5 (10.9)	41.3 (9.3)	43.3 (9.7)	59.2 (13.3)	38.8 (8.7)	33.8 (7.6)	10 G (11 1)
ade	Special		1D	0	10	0	1D	0	1	0	1D	0	10	0	10	0	10	1D	Average
Gra	SPIB		1D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Э	
Post	1 Number		ω	100	176	209	314	504	559	613	620	626	704	1128	1151	1222	1407	1419	
Year	Installed		1989	1992	1992	1994	1989	1992	1994	1989	1989	1990	1992	1994	1992	1994	1989	1989	

Results
Testing
NDOR
1 1995
Grade
Table 10.

Adjusted MOR (23%	Quadratic)	MPa (k/in.²)	27.1 (3.94)	27.8 (4.03)	22.3 (3.23)	17.8 (2.58)	30.1 (4.36)	22.1 (3.21)	39.3 (5.70)	26.6 (3.87)
Moisture	Content	(%)	R	ñ	41	2	33	25	39	32
Modulus of	Rupture	MPa (k/in. ²)	27.1 (3.94)	27.8 (4.03)	22.3 (3.23)	20.5 (2.97)	30.1 (4.36)	22.1 (3.21)	39.3 (5.70)	27.0 (3.92)
Impact	Velocity	m/s (mph)	10.1 (22.5)	10.1 (22.5)	9.7 (21.6)	9.7 (21.6)	10.5 (23.5)	9.5 (21.3)	10.1 (22.6)	9.9 (22.2)
re	Energy	kJ (kip-in.)	4.29 (37.9)	4.20 (37.2)	3.43 (30.3)	3.16 (27.9)	4.68 (41.4)	3.26 (28.9)	5.68 (50.3)	4.10 (36.3)
Ruptu	Deflection	mm (in.)	163 (6.4)	148 (5.8)	139 (5.5)	154 (6.1)	157 (6.2)	149 (5.9)	147 (5.8)	151 (5.9)
	Time	(ms)	16.6	15.0	14.7	16.3	15.3	15.9	15.0	15.5
	Energy	kJ (kip-in.)	2.20 (19.4)	2.25 (19.9)	1.86 (16.5)	1.69 (15.0)	2.38 (21.1)	1.68 (14.9)	2.92 (25.8)	2.14 (18.9)
ak Force	Deflection	mm (in.)	84 (3.3)	81 (3.2)	78 (3.1)	81 (3.2)	85 (3.3)	80 (3.1)	81 (3.2)	81 (3.2)
Pe	Time	(sm)	8.4		0. 1	8.4	<u>8</u> .1	8.4	8.1	8.3
	Force	kN (kips)	46.3 (10.4)	48.0 (10.8)	41.9 (9.4)	35.6 (8.0)	51.2 (11.5)	38.3 (8.6)	65.8 (14.8)	46.7 (10.5)
rade	Special		ł	-	. 	-	-	.	1	Average
9	SPIB									
Post	ed Number		14	9 657	1027	303	179	1773	1112	
Year	Instal		1989	1989	1989	1990	1992	1994	1994	

Table 11. Grade 2 Dense 1995 NDOR Testing Results

Adjusted MOR	(23% Quadratic)	MPa (k/in.²)	48.6 (7.04)	27.2 (3.94)	45.9 (6.65)	33.8 (4.90)	57.1 (8.29)	18.9 (2.75)	15.2 (2.21)	36.2 (5.25)	26.9 (3.91)	25.0 (3.63)	50.1 (7.26)	18.8 (2.73)	31.4 (4.55)		7.7 (1.12)	19.4 (2.81)	30.8 (4.47)
Moisture	Content	(%)	Æ	27	36	R	R	25	25	27	29	31	50	72	47		29	23	98
Modulus of	Rupture	MPa (k/in.²)	48.6 (7.04)	27.2 (3.94)	45.9 (6.65)	33.8 (4.90)	57.1 (8.29)	18.9 (2.75)	15.2 (2.21)	36.2 (5.25)	26.9 (3.91)	25.0 (3.63)	50.1 (7.26)	18.8 (2.73)	31.4 (4.55)		7.7 (1.12)	19.4 (2.81)	30.8 (4.47)
Impact	Velocity	m/s (mph)	9.6 (21.4)	9.8 (21.9)	9.1 (20.4)	9.8 (22.0)	10.3 (23.0)	9.6 (21.5)	9.6 (21.4)	10.0 (22.4)	9.1 (20.3)	9.8 (22.0)	9.9 (22.2)	9.7 (21.6)	9.8 (21.9)	9.8 (21.9)	10.0 (22.4)	10.1 (22.6)	Ч <i>Ц Ц Ц</i> В Г
8	Energy	kJ (kip-in.)	6.86 (60.7)	5.02 (44.4)	6.58 (58.2)	5.29 (46.8)	8.85 (78.3)	5.07 (44.8)	2.16 (19.1)	5.80 (51.3)	3.78 (33.5)	4.15 (36.7)	7.40 (65.5)	2.53 (22.4)	4.89 (43.3)	2.59 (23.0)	1.42 (12.6)	3.20 (28.3)	4 72 (41 8)
Rupturo	Deflection	mm (in.)	175 (5.7)	139 (6.2)	236 (5.5)	145 (6.3)	160 (6.9)	178 (13.5)	129 (5.6)	162 (6.1)	145 (5.3)	165 (6.3)	162 (6.0)	145 (5.3)	148 (6.1)	160 (6.2)	147 (7.5)	147 (6.5)	159 (G 5)
	Time	(ms)	15.6	16.6	15.9	16.9	17.8	36.9	15.0	15.9	15.3	16.6	15.9	14.1	16.3	16.3	19.1	16.6	17 5
	Energy	kJ (kip-in.)	3.69 (32.6)	2.56 (22.7)	3.54 (31.4)	2.84 (25.1)	4.43 (39.2)	1.41 (12.5)	1.10 (9.7)	3.10 (27.5)	1.95 (17.2)	2.25 (19.9)	3.90 (34.5)	1.37 (12.2)	2.56 (22.7)	1.33 (11.7)	0.69 (6.1)	1.75 (15.5)	241013
ak Force	Deflection	mm (in.)	80 (3.1)	88 (3.5)	79 (3.1)	88 (3.5)	92 (3.6)	78 (3.1)	74 (2.9)	84 (3.3)	73 (2.9)	91 (3.6)	83 (3.2)	72 (2.8)	82 (3.2)	79 (3.1)	91 (3.6)	91 (3.6)	83 13 31
Pe	Time	(ms)	8.4	9.1	8. 8	9.1	9.1	1	7.8	8.4	1	9.4	8.4	7.5	8.4	÷.	9.1	9.1	9 00
	Force	kN (kips)	81.6 (18.3)	54.9 (12.3)	81.5 (18.3)	57.3 (12.9)	90.4 (20.3)	31.8 (7.1)	26.1 (5.9)	64.0 (14.4)	47.9 (10.8)	45.3 (10.2)	84.8 (19.1)	31.7 (7.1)	55.0 (12.4)	29.1 (6.5)	13.6 (3.1)	33.3 (7.5)	518 (11 6)
ade	Special		2D	Average															
Gra	SPIB		2D	m	2D	m	2D	ш	2D	2D									
Post	Number		ភ	ۍ	111	156	207	305	321	501	510	518	576	803	619	670	1160	1423	
Year	nstalled		1989	1989	1992	1992	1994	1990	1990	1992	1992	1992	1994	1989	1989	1989	1992	1989	

Adjusted	MOR (23%	MPa (k/in. ²	28.6 (4.15)	23.5 (3.40)	19.1 (2.77)	17.0 (2.46)	24.0 (3.49)	18.8 (2.72)	27.5 (3.99)	25.1 (3.65)	39.4 (5.72)	35.8 (5.19)	20.4 (2.95)	27.4 (3.97)	34.7 (5.04)	35.7 (5.18)	24.1 (3.50)	17.8 (2.58)	26.2 (3.80)
Moisture	Content	(%)	24	26	23	<u>7</u> 9	R	Ю	45	55	64	8	24	26	34	27	26	22	34
Modulus of	Rupture	MPa (k/in. ²)	28.6 (4.15)	23.5 (3.40)	19.1 (2.77)	17.0 (2.46)	24.0 (3.49)	18.8 (2.72)	27.5 (3.99)	25.1 (3.65)	39.4 (5.72)	35.8 (5.19)	20.4 (2.95)	27.4 (3.97)	34.7 (5.04)	35.7 (5.18)	24.1 (3.50)	18.9 (2.74)	26.3 (3.81)
Impact	Velocity	m/s (mph)	9.9 (22.2)	9.7 (21.8)	10.6 (23.8)	9.6 (21.4)	9.7 (21.6)	9.8 (21.9)	8.8 (19.7)	9.8 (21.9)	9.4 (21.1)	9.6 (21.4)	10.3 (23.1)	9.7 (21.6)	9.4 (21.0)	9.4 (21.1)	9.8 (21.9)	10.0 (22.3)	9.7 (21.7)
e	Energy	kJ (kip-in.)	4.73 (41.9)	3.42 (30.2)	3.91 (34.6)	2.32 (20.5)	3.71 (32.8)	3.16 (28.0)	3.45 (30.5)	3.87 (34.3)	5.71 (50.5)	5.85 (51.7)	3.27 (28.9)	3.88 (34.3)	5.04 (44.6)	5.57 (49.2)	3.44 (30.5)	2.78 (24.6)	4.01 (35.5)
Ruptu	Deflection	mm (in.)	175 (6.9)	139 (5.5)	236 (9.3)	145 (5.7)	160 (6.3)	178 (7.0)	129 (5.1)	162 (6.4)	145 (5.7)	165 (6.5)	162 (6.4)	145 (5.7)	148 (5.8)	160 (6.3)	147 (5.8)	147 (5.8)	159 (6.3)
	Time	(sm)	18.1	14.7	22.5	15.3	16.9	18.4	15.0	16.9	15.9	17.8	15.9	15.3	16.3	17.5	15.3	15.0	16.7
	Energy	kJ (kip-in.)	2.35 (20.8)	1.86 (16.4)	2.08 (18.4)	1.26 (11.1)	1.99 (17.6)	1.73 (15.3)	1.80 (16.0)	2.00 (17.7)	3.07 (27.2)	3.10 (27.4)	1.77 (15.6)	1.96 (17.3)	2.83 (25.0)	3.04 (26.9)	1.82 (16.1)	1.50 (13.3)	2.13 (18.9)
ak Force	Deflection	mm (in.)	92 (3.6)	78 (3.1)	145 (5.7)	77 (3.0)	90 (3.5)	103 (4.1)	71 (2.8)	85 (3.3)	79 (3.1)	92 (3.6)	90 (3.5)	75 (2.9)	84 (3.3)	90 (3.6)	79 (3.1)	77 (3.0)	88 (3.5)
Pe	Time	(ms)	9.4	÷.	13.8	1	9.4	10.6	ω -	() () ()	8.4	9.7	00 00	7.8	9.1	9.7	1	7.8	9.1
	Force	kN (kips)	47.6 (10.7)	41.9 (9.4)	33.1 (7.4)	28.0 (6.3)	40.0 (9.0)	31.6 (7.1)	45.8 (10.3)	42.3 (9.5)	67.7 (15.2)	62.5 (14.0)	34.6 (7.8)	45.7 (10.3)	58.5 (13.1)	61.2 (13.8)	40.6 (9.1)	32.1 (7.2)	44.6 (10.0)
de	Special		2	2	2	m	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	Average
Gra	SPIB		m	2	2	m	2	2	2	2	2	2	m	m	2	m	m	2	
Post	Number		74	109	306	407	425	426	572	609	625	630	662	669	676	763	766	768	
Year	Installed		1989	1992	1990	ΝA	٩N	٩N	1994	1989	1989	1989	1989	1989	1989	1994	1994	1994	

Results.
Testing
NDOR
2 1995
Grade
Table 12.

ſ

5.2 Force Discussion

The ability for a guardrail post to rotate in soil is based on having a sufficient modulus of rupture to overcome soil resistance. Therefore, the key factor in determining the acceptability of an alternative wood species is based on a comparison between the peak capacities.

5.2.1 Tests WP-1 through WP-30

The average peak force for White Pine was considerably lower than that for the Southern Yellow Pine. A sample force-displacement graph is shown below in Figure 5. A photograph of the post fracture for test WP-4 is provided in Figure 6.

The average peak force for White Pine was 37.6 kN (8.5 kips), with a standard deviation of 8.0 kN (1.8 kips). The maximum peak force was 57.2 kN (12.9 kips) and the minimum peak force was 13.6 kN (3.1 kips). The average energy dissipated at rupture was 3.02 kJ (26.8 kipin.), with a standard deviation of 1.33 kJ (11.8 kip-in.). Deflection at rupture averaged 351 mm (13.8 in.), with a standard deviation of 64 mm (2.5 in.).



Figure 5. WP-4 Force- Deflection At Impact Location



Figure 6. WP-4 Fracture

5.2.2 Tests RP-1 through RP-30

The average peak force for the Red Pine posts was lower than that for Southern Yellow Pine. A sample force-displacement graph is shown below in Figure 7 along with a photograph of the fracture in Figure 8.

The average peak force for Red Pine was 53.9 kN (12.1 kips), with a standard deviation of 18.6 kN (4.2 kips). The maximum peak force was 95.3 kN (21.4 kips) and the minimum peak force was 31.2 kN (7.0 kips). The average energy dissipated at rupture was 4.75 kJ (42.0 kip-

in.), with a standard deviation of 1.83 kJ (16.2 kip-in.). Deflection at rupture averaged 360 mm (14.2 in.), with a standard deviation of 83 mm (3.3 in.).



Figure 7. RP-27 Force-Deflection At Impact Location



Figure 8. RP-27 Fracture

6 DISCUSSION ON POST SIZE

The performance of a W-beam longitudinal barrier is largely based on the rotation of the posts embedded in the soil. This energy absorption is critical for both limiting the tensile stress in the guardrail element and minimizing the chances for vehicle instability. To define acceptable performance for utilizing alternative wood species as posts in these systems, it is necessary that these alternatives have equivalent dynamic strength to assure that they will provide the same degree of energy absorption. Because the force required to rotate a post in soil is dependent on the width of the section, alternatives need to maintain this same width in order to eliminate the need for full-scale vehicle crash testing. This means changing the cross-sectional depth of the post is the only way to increase the energy absorption.

To calculate a suggested depth, the assumption was made that the Wisconsin posts should provide the same resisting moment as the Southern Yellow Pine posts. Knowing the MOR value and the section modulus for Southern Yellow Pine posts, it is possible to calculate the resisting moment created by the posts. From the resisting moment, the MOR value for the Wisconsin posts can be used to solve for an equivalent section modulus and using the equivalent section modulus, a new depth can be found. The formulas used to calculate the suggested depth are shown in Equations 1 through 6, where b is cross-sectional width, d is cross-sectional depth, and S is the section modulus for the post.

$$MOR_{SYP} \times S_{X-SYP} = MOR_n \times S_{X-n}$$
 (Equation 1)

$$S_{X-n} = \frac{MOR_{SYP} \times S_{X-SYP}}{MOR_{X-n}}$$
(Equation 2)

$$S_{X-n} = \frac{bd^2}{6} = \frac{(6in.)(d_n^2)}{6} = d_n^2$$
 (Equation 3)

$$S_{X-SYP} = \frac{(6in.)(8in.)^2}{6} = 64in.^3$$
 (Equation 4)

$$d^{2} = \frac{MOR_{SYP} \times 64 in.^{3}}{MOR_{X-n}}$$
 (Equation 5)

$$d = \sqrt{\frac{MOR_{SYP} \times 64 in.^3}{MOR_{X-n}}}$$
 (Equation 6)

To find the equivalent depth of the post, several comparisons could be used, all of which result in slightly different conclusions. For the purpose of this study, two methods were considered. The first method was to use the average moisture-adjusted MOR from dynamic bogie test data to compare Southern Yellow Pine to White and Red Pine. Although limited by the small sample size, the test results offer insight into the affects of defects on each species. Using this method, and the MOR values from Table 6, Table 7, and Table 8, the equivalent depth was found to be 226 mm (8.9 in.) for Red Pine and 257 mm (10.1 in.) for White Pine.

The second method compares average, tabulated, saturated MOR values given in the Wood Handbook ($\underline{5}$). These values are based on static test results of a much larger sample and should be considered more representative of the species as a whole. The downfall is that the given data is for clear specimen under static conditions rather than those with defects such as knots and splits under dynamic conditions. Using this method, the equivalent depth was found to be 239 mm (9.4 in.) for Red Pine and 262 mm (10.3 in.) for White Pine. The MOR values used for each species are displayed in Table 13.
Species	Varieties	MOR	Average MOR
		MPa (ksi)	MPa (ksi)
Red Pine	Red Pine	40.00 (5.8)	40.00 (5.800)
White Pine	Eastern White Pine	34.00 (4.9)	33.00 (4.800)
	Western White Pine	32.00 (4.7)	33.00 (4.000)
Southern Yellow Pine	Loblolly	50.00 (7.3)	
	Longleaf	59.00 (8.5)	55.00 (7.075)
	Shortleaf	51.00 (7.4)	55.00 (7.975)
	Slash	60.00 (8.7)	

 Table 13. Wood Handbook MOR Values Given for Green Specimen in Static Bending

7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results herein, it is recommended that guardrail posts produced using Red Pine and White Pine should have increased section depths to compensate for their lower MOR's. The suggested depth is 238 mm (nominally 9 3/8 in.) for the Red Pine species and 264 mm (nominally 10 3/8 in.) for White Pine species. These sections, as shown in Table 14, will provide equivalent performance from Red and White Pine guardrail posts, without changing the soil reaction properties.

Table 14. Nominal Size Recommendations for White Pine and Red Pine

	Recommended Nominal Size		
Species	Depth	Width	
	mm (in.)	mm (in.)	
Southern Yellow Pine	203 (8.000)	152 (6.000)	
Red Pine	238 (9.375)	152 (6.000)	
White Pine	264 (10.375)	152 (6.000)	

8 REFERENCES

- Rohde, J.R., Reid, J.D., and Sicking, D.L., *Evaluation of the Effect of Wood Quality on W-beam Guardrail Performance*, Transportation Research Report TRP-03-60-96, Midwest Roadside Safety Facility, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska, November 1995.
- 2. Powell, G.H., *BARRIER VII: A Computer Program For Evaluation of Automobile Barrier Systems*, Prepared for: Federal Highway Administration, Report No. FHWA RD-73-51, April 1973.
- Evans, J.W., Evans, J.K, and Green, D.W., Computer Programs for Adjusting the Mechanical Properties of 2-inch Dimension Lumber for Changes in Moisture Content, General Technical Report FPL-GTR-63, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wisconsin, February 1990.
- 4. Standard Practice for Establishing Allowable Properties for Visually-Graded Dimension Lumber from In-Grade Tests of Full-Size Specimens, ASTM Standard No. D1990-00(2002)e1, ASTM International, April 2000.
- 5. Dietenberger, M.A., et al. *Wood Handbook Wood as an Engineering Material*, Forest Products Laboratory, Forest Products Society, 1999.

Appendix A

A.1 Test Summary Information

A summary sheet for each test is provided in this section. Summary sheets include acceleration-time, velocity-time, displacement-time, force-deflection, and energy-deflection plots.

Table 15. Post Testing Summary

Test Parameters		
Test: Strong Axis Impact at 0 degrees		
Accelerometer: EDR-4 Data		
Bogie Weight: 611 kg (1,346 lbs)		
Bumper Height: 550 mm (21.65 in.)		
Posts: 152 x 203 mm (6 x 8 in.)		
Post Length: 1,829 mm (72 in.)		



Figure 9. Results of WP-1



Figure 10. Results of WP-2



Figure 11. Results of WP-3



Figure 12. Results of WP-4



Figure 13. Results of WP-5



Figure 14. Results of WP-6



Figure 15. Results of WP-7



Figure 16. Results of WP-8



Figure 17. Results of WP-9



Figure 18. Results of WP-10



Figure 19. Results of WP-11





Figure 20. Results of WP-12



Figure 21. Results of WP-13



Figure 22. Results of WP-14





Figure 23. Results of WP-15





Figure 24. Results of WP-16



Figure 25. Results of WP-17



Figure 26. Results of WP-18



Figure 27. Results of WP-19





Figure 28. Results of WP-20





Figure 29. Results of WP-21



Figure 30. Results of WP-22



Figure 31. Results of WP-23



Figure 32. Results of WP-24





Figure 33. Results of WP-25



Figure 34. Results of WP-26



Figure 35. Results of WP-27



Figure 36. Results of WP-28



Figure 37. Results of WP-29



Figure 38. Results of WP-30



Figure 39. Results of RP-1



Figure 40. Results of RP-2


Figure 41. Results of RP-3



Figure 42. Results of RP-4



Figure 43. Results of RP-5



Figure 44. Results of RP-6



Figure 45. Results of RP-7



Figure 46. Results of RP-8



Figure 47. Results of RP-9



Figure 48. Results of RP-10



Figure 49. Results of RP-11



Figure 50. Results of RP-12



Figure 51. Results of RP-13



Figure 52. Results of RP-14



Figure 53. Results of RP-15



Figure 54. Results of RP-16



Figure 55. Results of RP-17



Figure 56. Results of RP-18



Figure 57. Results of RP-19



Figure 58. Results of RP-20



Figure 59. Results of RP-21



Figure 60. Results of RP-22



Figure 61. Results of RP-23



Figure 62. Results of RP-24



Figure 63. Results of RP-25



Figure 64. Results of RP-26



Figure 65. Results of RP-27



Figure 66. Results of RP-28



Figure 67. Results of RP-29



Figure 68. Results of RP-30