

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

REPORT NUMBER: FHWA-AZ88-202-I

# SMALL SIGN SUPPORT ANALYSIS

Phase I Crash Test Program

Prepared by: Hayes E. Ross, Jr. Dean L. Sicking Wanda L. Campise Richard A. Zimmer

Texas Transportation Institute Texas A&M University College Station, Texas 77843

August 1988

Prepared for: Arizona Department of Transportation 206 South 17th Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007 in cooperation with U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration 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 or policies of the Arizona Department of Transportation or the Federal Highways Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. Trade or manufacturer's names which may appear herein are cited only because they are considered essential to the objectives of the report. The U.S. Government and the State of Arizona do not endorse products or manufacturers.

		TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD TITLE PA
FHWA-AZ88-202-1	2. Government Accession No	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
L. Title and Subtitle		5 Report Dore
		August 1988
SMALL SIGN SUPPORT ANA PHASE I _ CRASH TEST P	LYSIS: ROGRAM	6 Performing Organization Code
Author s		8 Performing Organization Report No
Hayes E. Ross, Jr., De Wanda L. Campise, and	an L. Sicking, Richard A. Zimmer	Research Report 7024-1
Performing Organization Name and	Address	10 Work Unit No
Toyas Transportation I	nctituto	11. Commence Commence
Toyas ALM University	nstitute	HPP_PI_1(31) Itom 202
College Station, Texas	77843	13 Type of Report and Period Covered
2. Sponsoring Agency Name and Add	iress.	
Arizona Department of Highway Division	Transportation	Final Report - Phase I
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007		14 Sponsoring Agency Code
ADOT Contacts: Rudy K Larry Mumtaz	Kolaja Scofield z Sarsam	
15. Abstroct		
This report describ evaluate the impact Department of Transpor accordance with the m "Standard Specification Traffic Signals."	es a series of full-scale ve performance of small sign tation (ADOT). The tests recommendations of NCHRP R os for Structural Supports f	ehicular crash tests conducted to supports used by the Arizona were conducted and evaluated in eport 230 and the 1985 AASHTO for Highway Signs, Luminaires and

Based on the test program, it was concluded that the following systems are in compliance with recommended safety performance standards: (1) one Pl post; (2) one 3 lb/ft U-post; (3) one 4 lb/ft U-post; (4) two 3 lb/ft U-posts; and (5) a slipbase design having two S4 x 7.7 posts with a hinge at the midheight of the sign panel. It was concluded that the following systems are not in compliance with recommended safety performance standards: (1) two or more P2 posts within a 7 ft spacing; (2) three or more 3 lb/ft U-posts within a 7 ft spacing; and (3) two or more 4 lb/ft Uposts within a 7 ft spacing.

This is one of three reports prepared in the subject project. The other two are:

Small Sign Support Analysis:

Phase II - Static, Pendulum and Full-Scale Crash Test Programs (two volumes) Phase III - Benefit/Cost Analysis

17. Key Words		18. Distribution Statem	ent	
Sign, Support, Safety, Tes Small, Impact	t, Crash,			
19. Security Classif, (at this report)	20. Security Class	t, (of this page)	21- No. of Pages 233	22. Price

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-69)

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their sincere appreciation for the cooperation and guidance of Mumtaz Sarsam, Donald Cornelison, Larry Scofield, Rudy Kolaja, and Frank McCullagh of ADOT. Other ADOT personnel on the Project Advisory Committee who provided valuable input included Robert Conklin, John Hauskins, Jim Pyne, Roger Hatton, and Robert Cromley. The suggestions of Nate Banks of FHWA were also appreciated.

As usual, Non Cangelose and his associates did an excellent job in setting up and conducting the crash tests. Thanks also go to Sylvia Velasco and Patsy Astle for their help in preparing the report.

#### PREFACE

Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Project HPR-PL-1(31), Item 202, "Small Sign Support Analysis", was initiated by the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) October 1, 1984. Originally, the project consisted of 18 full-scale vehicular crash tests to evaluate ADOT small sign supports. Upon completion of one-half of the tests it became evident that additional tests would be needed. The project was modified May 31, 1985 to increase the number of tests to 23. Also, the modification included a benefit/cost (B/C) study to develop guidelines for upgrading existing ADOT small sign supports and for selection of new small sign supports. The project was again modified in August, 1986 to develop an improved small sign support system. The B/C study was also modified to include results of the improved support system.

A description of the 23 crash tests and results therefrom are presented herein.

A description of the study in which an improved sign support system was developed is presented in a report entitled "Small Sign Support Analysis: Phase II - Development of New Small Sign Support," (two volumes).

A description of the B/C study and results therefrom are presented in a report entitled "Small Sign Support Analysis: Phase III - Benefit/Cost Analysis."

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS PHASE I

age
1
2
2
6
8
8
- -
9
9
9
12
A-1
A-2
A-2
A-2
A-9
A_ 9
4-16
A-16
4-16
A-33
4-41) A-48
A-54
A-61
A-68
H-/D A-83

# TABLE OF CONTENTS PHASE I (continued)

	Page
A-3-9. Test 9 A-3-10. Test 10 A-3-11. Test 11 A-3-12. Test 12 A-3-13. Test 13 A-3-14. Test 14 A-3-15. Test 15 A-3-16. Test 16 A-3-17. Test 17 A-3-18. Test 18 A-3-19. Test 19 A-3-20. Test 20 A-3-21. Test 21 A-3-22. Test 22 A-3-23. Test 23	A-90 A-97 A-103 A-109 A-115 A-123 A-129 A-135 A-141 A-147 A-153 A-153 A-159 A-166 A-172 A-178
APPENDIX B. PROPERTIES OF SIGN POSTS	8-1
APPENDIX C. SOIL PROPERTIES AT TEST SITE	C-1
APPENDIX D. DATA ACOUISITION SYSTEMS	D-1
D-1. Deceleration Measurements	D-2
D-2. High-Speed Cine	D-2
APPENDIX E. REFERENCES	E-1

#### LIST OF FIGURES PHASE I

FIGURE NO.		PAGE
A-1	TEST VEHICLE PROPERTIES	A-3
A-2	SLIPBASE DESIGN, TESTS 1 AND 2	A-4
A-3	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 1	A-7
A-4	SQUARE STEEL TUBE, SINGLE POST, TESTS 3 AND 4	A-10
A-5	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 3	A-11
A-6	SQUARE STEEL TUBE, MULTIPLE POSTS, TESTS 5, 6, 19, AND 20	A-12
A-7	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 5	A-14
A-8	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 19	A-15
A-9	STEEL U-POST, SINGLE SUPPORT, TESTS 7, 8, AND 13	A-17
A-10	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 7	A-18
A-11	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 13	A-19
A-12	STEEL U-POST, THREE SUPPORTS, TESTS 9 AND 10	A-20
A-13	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 9	A-21
A-14	STEEL U-POST, TWO SUPPORTS, TESTS 11 AND 12	A-22
A-15	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 11	Å-23
A-16	STEEL U-POST, THREE SUPPORTS, TESTS 14, 15, 18, AND 21	A-24
A-17	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 14	A-25
A-18	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 18	A-26
A-19	STEEL U-POST, THREE SUPPORTS, TESTS 16 AND 17	A-27
A~20	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 16	A-28
A-21	STEEL U-POST, TWO SUPPORTS, TESTS 22 AND 23	A-29
A-22	SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 22	A-30

FIGURE NO.		PAGE
A-23	RELATIVE POSITIONS OF SIGN INSTALLATION AND TEST VEHICLE FOR TEST 1	A-34
A-24	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 1	A-35
A-25	BREAKAWAY BASE AFTER TEST 1	A-36
A-26	TEST VEHICLE BEFORE AND AFTER TEST 1	A-37
A-27	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 1	A- 38
A-28	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 1	A-39
A-29	TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 2	A-41
A-30	RELATIVE POSITIONS OF SIGN INSTALLATION AND TEST VEHICLE FOR TEST 2	A-42
A-31	BREAKAWAY BASE AFTER TEST 2	A-43
A-32	HINGE AFTER TEST 2	A-44
A-33	TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 2	A-45
A-34	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 2	A-46
A-35	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 2	A-47
A-36	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 3	A-49
A-37	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 3	A-50
A-38	TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 3	A-51
A-39	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 3	A-52
A-40	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 3	A-53
A-41	TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 4	A-55
A-42	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 4	A-56
A-43	TEST SITE AFTER TEST 4	A-57
A-44	SIGN POST AFTER TEST 4	A-58
A-45	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 4	A-59
A-46	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 4	A-60

#### LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO	•	PAGE
A-47	TEST VEHICLE REFORE TEST 5	A-62
A-48	RELATIVE POSITIONS OF THE TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 5	A-63
A-49	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 5	A-64
A-50	TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 5	A-65
A-51	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 5	A-66
A-52	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 5	A-67
A-53	TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 6	A-69
A-54	RELATIVE POSITIONS OF TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 6	A-70
A-55	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 6 (BASE)	A-71
A-56	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 6 (SUPPORTS AND SIGN PANEL)	A-72
A-57	TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 6	A-73
A- 58	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 6	A-74
A-59	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 6	A-75
A-60	TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 7	A-77
A-61	RELATIVE POSITIONS OF TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 7	A-78
A-62	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 7	A-79
A-63	TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 7	A-8D
A-64	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 7	A-81
A-65	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 7	A-82
A-66	TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 8	A-84
A-67	RELATIVE POSITIONS OF TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 8	A-85
A-68	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 8	A-86
A-69	TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 8	A~87

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.		PAGE
A-70	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 8	A-88
A-71	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 8	A-89
A-72	TEST VEHICLE BEFORF. TEST 9	A- 91
A-73	PELATIVE POSITIONS OF TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 9	A-92
A-74	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 9	A-93
A-75	TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 9	A-94
A-76	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 9	A-95
A-77	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 9	A-96
A-78	RELATIVE POSITIONS OF TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 10	A- 98
A-79	SIGN INSTALLATON AFTER TEST 10	A- 99
A-80	TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 10	A-100
A-81	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 10	A-101
A-82	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 10	A-102
A-83	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 11	A-104
A-84	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 11	A-105
A-85	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 11	A-106
A-86	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 11	A-107
A-87	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 11	A-108
A-88	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 12	A-110
A-89	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 12	A-111
A- 90	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 12	A-112
A-91	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 12	A-113
A-92	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 12	A-114
A-93	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 13	A-116

### LIST OF FIGURES

PHASE I (continued)

FIGURE NO.		PAGE
A-94	RELATIVE POSITIONS OF SIGN INSTALLATION AND TEST VEHICLE FOR TEST 13	A-117
A-95	TEST SITE AFTER TEST 13	A-118
A-96	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 13	A-119
A-97	TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 13	A-120
A-98	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 13	4-121
A-99	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 13	A-122
A-100	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 14	A-124
A-101	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 14	A-125
A-102	TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 14	A-126
A-103	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 14	A-127
A-104	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 14	A-128
A-105	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 15	4-130
A-106	TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 15	A-131
A-107	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 15	4-132
A-108	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 15	A-133
A-109	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 15	A-134
A-110	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 16	A-136
A-111	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 16	A-137
A-112	TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 16	A-138
A~113	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 16	A-139
A-114	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 16	A-140
A-115	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 17	A-142
A-116	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 17	A-143
A~117	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 17	A-144
A-118	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 17	A-145

LIST OF FIGURES PHASE I (continued)

FIGURE NO.		PAGE
A-119	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 17	A-146
A-120	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 18	A-148
A-121	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 18	A-149
A-122	TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 18	A-150
A-123	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 18	A-151
A-124	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 18	A-152
A-125	TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 19	A-154
A-126	TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 19	A-155
A-127	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 19	A-156
A-128	TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 19	A-157
A-129	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 19	A-158
A-130	TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 20	A-160
A-131	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 20	A-161
A-132	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 20	A-162
A-133	TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 20	A-164
A-134	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 20	A-165
A-135	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 21	A-167
A-136	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 21	A-168
A-137	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 21	A-169
A-138	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 21	A-170
A-139	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 21	A-171
A-140	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 22	A-173
A-141	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 22	A-174
A-142	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 22	A-175
A-143	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 22	A-176

#### LIST OF FIGURES PHASE I (continued)

FIGURE NO.		PAGE	
A-144	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 22	A-177	
A-145	VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 23	A-179	
A-146	SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 23	A-180	
A-147	SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 23	A-181	
A-148	VEHICLE AFTER TEST 23	A-182	
A-149	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 23	A-183	
C-1	AGGREGATE GRADATION, TEST SITE SOIL	C-3	
C-2	COMPACTED UNIT WEIGHT OF TEST SOIL	C-4	A.
D-1	CAMERA POSITIONS	D-3	

#### LIST OF TABLES PHASE I

TABLE NO.		PAGE
٦	CRASH TEST CONDITIONS FOR MINIMUM MATRIX	3
2	SAFETY EVALUATION GUIDELINES	4
3	RECOMMENDED OCCUPANT RISK VALUES	5
4	SUMMARY OF TESTS	7
5	MULTIPLE U-POST SIGN SUPPORT DETAILS	10
B-1	CHEMICAL AND MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF SIGN POSTS	B-3
B-2	IMPACT PROPERTIES OF SIGN POSTS	B-4
D-1	CAMERA DETAILS	D-4

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS PHASE II

<u>Sec</u>	<u>ction</u>		Page
		volume 1 (Report)	
1.	Introdu	ction and Background Information	. 1
2.	Splice	Configurations	. 3
	2.1. 2.2. 2.3. 2.4. 2.5. 2.6. 2.7.	Selection of Moment Arm Lengths. Assumptions and Calculations. Calibrated Bolts. Back to Back. Nested. Face to Face. Box.	. 3 . 4 . 6 . 7 . 8 . 9 . 10
3.	Test Pr	ocedures	. 11
	3.1. 3.2. 3.3.	Bending Torsion Combined Bending and Torsion	. 11 . 13 . 15
4.	Results	;	. 17
	4.1. 4.2. 4.3.	Bending Tests Torsion Tests Combined Bending and Torsion Tests	. 17 . 22 . 23
5.	Discuss	sion	. 28
	5.1. 5.2.	Critical and Non-critical Splice Configurations Predicted Load Transfer Mechanics for Bending	. 28 . 28
		5.2.1. Bolted Splices 5.2.2. Box Splices	. 28 . 38
	5.3.	Splice Performance in Bending	. 39
		<ul><li>5.3.1. Back to Back and Nested Splices</li><li>5.3.2. Face to Face Splices</li><li>5.3.3. Box Splices</li></ul>	. 39 . 40 . 44
	5.4.	Splice Performance in Torsion	. 46
		<ul><li>5.4.1. Back to Back Splices</li><li>5.4.2. Nested Splices</li><li>5.4.3. Comparison of Back to Back and Nested Splices</li></ul>	. 46 . 47 . 48
	5.5. 5.6. 5.7. 5.8. 5.9.	Splice Performance in Combined Bending and Torsion Effective Splice Length Nested Splice Configurations Superposition and Principal Base Stress Calculations Static Test Conclusions	48 51 58 59 61
6.	Pendul	um Tests	62
	6.1. 6.2. 6.3.	Purpose Appurtenance Description Pendulum Facility	. 62 . 62 . 62

TABLE OF CONTENTS PHASE II (continued)

<u>Section</u>		Page
6.4. 6.5. 6.6. 6.7.	Electronic Instrumentation Photographic Instrumentation Test Results Summary	64 64 65
7. Full Se	cale Crash Tests	67
7.1. 7.2. 7.3. 7.4.	Introduction Instrumentation and Data Analysis U-Post Test Installations Test Results	67 67 67 68
	7.4.1. Test 7024-24 7.4.2. Test 7024-25 7.4.3. Test 7024-26 7.4.4. Test 7024-27	68 73 78 83
7.5. 7.6.	Slip-Base Test Installations Slip-Base Test Results	. 88 . 88
	7.6.1. Test 7024-29 7.6.2. Test 7024-30	. 88 . 96
8. Conclu	sion	. 100
Reference	S	. 101
	Volume II (Appendices)	
Appendix	A: Preliminary 72" Bending Tests	. A-1
Fiel Mari Back Crit	d Bolt Summary Tables on 3 lb/ft 80 ksi Nominal Yield Stress to Back, Nested and Face to Face Splices ical and Non-critical Configurations	
Appendix	B: 17" Bending Tests	. B-1
Fiel Fran Mari Back Crit	d Bolt Summary Tables uklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi on 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi a to Back, Nested and Face to Face Splices cical and Non-critical Configurations	
Appendix	C: Final 71" Bending Tests	. C-1
Fiel Frar Mari Bacl Crit	ld Bolt Summary Tables hklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi ion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi < to Back and Nested Splices tical Configuration	

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

PHASE II (continued)

Page
ppendix D: Torsion Tests D-1
Field and Calibrated Bolt Summary Tables Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Post W/O Splice
ppendix E: 75" Combined Bending and Torsion Tests E-1
Field Bolt Summary Tables Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Critical Configuration
ppendix F: Preliminary 72" Bending Tests F-3
Calibrated Bolt Summary Tables Marion 3 lb/ft 80 ksi Nominal Yield Stress Back to Back, Nested and Face to Face Splices Critical and Non-critical Configurations
ppendix G: 17" Bending Tests G-:
Calibrated Bolt Summary Tables Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back, Nested, Face to Face and Box Splices Critical and Non-critical Configurations
Appendix H: Final 71" Bending Tests H-
Calibrated Bolt Summary Tables Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Critical Configuration
Appendix I: 75" Combined Bending and Torsion Tests
Calibrated Bolt Summary Tables Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Critical Configuration
Appendix J: Preliminary 72" Bending TestsJ-
Base Stress vs Tip Deflection (Field Bolts) Marion 3 lb/ft 80 ksi Nominal Yield Stress Back to Back, Nested and Face to Face Splices Critical and Non-critical Configurations

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### PHASE II (continued)

Page Section Appendix K: 17" Bending Tests..... K-1 Base Stress vs Deflection at Point of Load (Field Bolts) Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back, Nested, Face to Face and Box Splices Critical and Non-critical Configurations Appendix L: Final 71" Bending Tests.....L-1 Base Stress vs Tip Deflection (Field Bolts) Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Critical Configuration Appendix M: Torsion Tests..... M-1 Applied Torque vs Post Rotation (Field Bolts) Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Post W/O Splice Appendix N: 75" Combined Bending and Torsion Tests...... N-1 Base Stress vs Tip Rotation (Field Bolts) Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Critical Configuration Base Stress vs Relative Bolt Tension (Calibrated Bolts) Marion 3 lb/ft 80 ksi Nominal Yield Stress Back to Back, Nested and Face to Face Splices Critical and Non-critical Configurations Appendix P: 17" Bending Tests..... P-1 Base Stress vs Relative Bolt Tension (Calibrated Bolts) Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back, Nested, Face to Face and Box Splices Critical and Non-critical Configurations Appendix Q: Final 71" Bending Tests.....Q-1 Base Stress vs Relative Bolt Tension (Calibrated Bolts) Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Critical Configuration

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

PHASE II (continued)

<u>Section</u> Page Appendix R: Torsion Tests..... R-1 Applied Torque vs Relative Bolt Tension (Calibrated Bolts) Franklin 3 & 4 1b/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 1b/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Post W/O Splice Base Stress vs Relative Bolt Tension (Calibrated Bolts) Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Critical Configuration Appendix T: Final 71" Bending Tests With Predicted Bolt Tension Base Stress vs Relative Bolt Tension (Absolute) Franklin 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Back to Back and Nested Splices Critical Configuration Applied Tension vs Milli-Volts (From Wheatstone Bridge) 3/8 Inch Grade 9 Bolts 1-3/4 and 4-1/2 Inch Bolt Lengths TML Bolt Strain Gauges MM AE-10 and TML Epoxies Franklin 4 lb/ft Posts - 60 ksi Marion 3 & 4 lb/ft Posts - 80 ksi Appendix X: Results of Pullout Tests......X-1

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS PHASE 111

																													<u>Page</u>
	ACKN	OWLE	EDGM	ENTS	5		• •					•	•		•	•	•	•		•	•		•	•	•	•			ii
	PREF	FACE			•			•		•			•		•	•	•	•	•			•	•		•	•	•	•	iii
Ι.	INT	RODUC	CT10	N AN	ND (	OBJ	JEC	TI	VES	5							•					•		•	•				1
Π.	STU	DY AI	PPRO	ACH									•		•														2
III.	GUI	DELII	NES	FOR	UP	GR/	AD I	NG							•														5
	Α.	Exi	stin	a Si	vst	ems	s N	lot	iı	n (	Cor	np <sup>1</sup>	lia	anc	ce	W	i t ł	1 5	Saf	Fel	tγ	St	tar	nda	iro	1s			5
	B. C.	Upg B/C	radi Ana	ng / lysi	Alt is	err	nat	iv.	es	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	-	-	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	5 8
		1. 2.	U-P P2	ost: Post	s ts	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	-	•	•	•	•	•	•	10 13
	D.	Exa	mple	s.		•		•	•						•							-							17
		1. 2.	Exa Exa	mple mple	el e2		••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	17 21
	E.	Dis	cuss	ion	of	R	esı	ilt	s		•			•											-	-			21
IV.	GUI	DELI	NES	FOR	NE	¥.	INS	STA	LL	AT	IO	NS		•	•											•			28
۷.	CON	CLUS	IONS											•									-						33
	REF	EREN	CES										•																34
	APP	ENDI	CES																										
	A. B. C.	EST RET RET GUI	1MAT ROF1 ROF1 DE1	ING T GI T GI	TH UID UID FO	IE IEL IEL	SE\ INI INI NFI	/ER ES ES	IT FO FO	Y R R TA	1N U- P2	DE: PO: P( AT	X ( ST: OS <sup>-</sup>	DF S TS NS	SI	MA	LL	S	IG	N	SU -	PP( - -	OR	TS	-	•	•	•	36 50 65 94



37

°c

°c

METRIC CONVERSION FACTORS

\*1 in = 2.54 (exactly). For other exact conversions and more detailed tables, see NBS Misc. Publ. 286, Units of Weights and Measures, Price \$2.25, SD Catalog No. C13.10.285.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

This report describes a series of full-scale vehicular crash tests conducted to evaluate the impact performance of small sign supports used by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). The tests were conducted and evaluated in accordance with the recommendations of NCHRP Report 230  $(1)^*$  and AASHTO specifications (2).

Test articles, including sign posts, sign blanks, and fasteners, were supplied by ADOT. Installation of the test articles, testing, data acquisition, and data reduction were performed by Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) personnel at the Texas A&M Research and Extension Center.

High-speed film, still photos and slides, and video were used in documenting each test. ADOT has been provided a copy of all film, slides, and video of each test.

A summary of the test program is given in the main text. Details of each test are given in the appendix. Also given in the appendix are results of laboratory tests, conducted by a materials lab. to ascertain the physical and chemical properties of the various sign posts, a description of the soil at the test site, and data acquisition systems.

<sup>\*</sup>Underscored numbers in parentheses are references listed at the end of the report.

#### II. SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF TEST RESULTS

Presented in this chapter is a summary of the impact performance criteria for roadside signs and results of the 23 crash tests. Complete details and photographs of each test are presented in the appendices.

#### 11-A. Impact Performance Criteria

The sign supports were tested and evaluated in accordance with the guidelines of NCHRP Report 230 (1) and AASHTO specifications (2). A summary of the guidelines is presented here. Interested parties should refer to references 1 and 2 for complete details and a commentary on development of the criteria.

Shown in Table 1 are crash test conditions for various safety features per reference 1. Note that tests 60-63 pertain to roadside sign supports. Tests 60 and 61 are identical to tests 62 and 63, respectively, except the latter two tests are with an 1800 lb auto instead of a 2250 lb auto. While an agency may choose to use either car, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) urges use of the smaller car. Further, the soon-to-be-released revisions to the current AASHTO Specifications (2) will require that sign supports meet the 1800 lb car criteria. The 1800 lb car was used in the present study.

Shown in Table 2 are criteria used to evaluate crash tests of the various safety features per reference 1. Three basic factors are used: structural adequacy, occupant risk, and vehicle trajectory. Note that items B, D, E, F, H, and J pertain to sign testing. Further, note that item F, within "occupant risk", involves "acceptance factors" F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>2</sub>, F<sub>3</sub>, and F<sub>4</sub>. Recommended values for these factors as shown in Table 3 were adopted for the present study. For sign testing, the two factors of importance are F<sub>1</sub> and F<sub>3</sub> since the signs are impacted head-on, with the vehicle in a "tracking" mode. Thus, with F<sub>1</sub> equaling 2.67 and F<sub>3</sub> equaling 1.33, the recommended limit on "occupant impact velocity" is 15 ft/sec and the recommended limit on "occupant ridedown acceleration" is 15 g's (1 g = 32.2 ft/sec<sup>2</sup>).

According to AASHTO  $(\underline{2})$ , "Satisfactory dynamic performance is indicated when the maximum change in momentum for a standard 2250 lb vehicle, or its equivalent, striking a breakaway support at speeds from 20 mph to 60 mph does not exceed 1100 lb-sec, but desirably does not exceed 750 lb-sec."

Appurtenance	Test Designation	∀ehicle Type <sup>(d)</sup>	Im Speed (mph)	pact Angle(e) (deg)	Target Impact Severity <sup>(f)</sup> (fi-kips)	Impact Point <sup>(a)</sup>	Evaluation Criteria <sup>(h)</sup>
Longitudinal Barrier <sup>(a)</sup> Length-of-Need	10	4500S	60	250	97-9. + 17	For post and beam systems, midway between posts in span contianing railing splice	A,D,E,H,I
	- 11	22505	60	150)	18-2, + 3	For post and beam systems, vehicle should contact railing splice	A,D,E,F,(G),H,1
	12	18005	60	150	14-2, + 2	For post and beam system, vehicle should contact railing splice	A,D,E,F,(G),H,I
Transition		4500S	(0	2500	97-9. + 17	15 ft upstream from second system	A,D,E,H,1
Terminal	40	45005	60	2500	97-9. + 17	At beginning of lenth-of-need	A,D,E,H,I
1	41	4500S	60	0(1)	541-53.+94	Center nose of device	C,D,E,F,(G),H,J
	42	2250S	60	1500	38-2.+3	Midway between nose and lenth-of-	C,D,E,F,(G),H,I,J
	43	22505	60 <sup>(o)</sup>	00	270-34, + 47	need Offset 1.25 ft from center nose of device	C,D,E,F,(G),H,J
	44	18005	60	1500	14-2, + 2	Midway between nose and length-of- need	C,D,E,F,(G),H,I,J
	45	18005	<b>60</b> (a)	000	216-21, + 37	Offset 1.25 ft from center nose of device	C,D,E,F,(G),H,J
Crash Cushion <sup>(b)</sup>	50	4500S	60	001	541-53,+M	Center nose of device	C,D,E,F,(G),H,J
	51	22505	60101	00	270-24. + 47	Center nose of device	C,D,E,F,(G),H,J
	52	18005	60101	00	216-21.+37	Center nose of device	C, D, E, F, (G), H, J
	530	45005	60	200	63-4,+11	Alongside, midlength	C,D,E,H,I,J
	54	4500S	60	10-150	541-53, + M	0-3 ft offset from center of nose of device	C,D,E,F,(G),H,J
Breakaway or							
Yielding Support(c)	60	2250S	20	(k)	30-4, +4	Center of bumper(m,n)	B,D,E, F,(G),H,J
	61	22505	60	00	270-24.+47	Al quarter point of bumper <sup>(n)</sup>	B,D,E,F,(O),H,J
	62	18005	20	60	24-3,+3	Center of bumper <sup>(m,n)</sup>	B,D,E,F,(G),H,J
	63	1600S	60	(k)	216-21, + 37	At quarter point of bumper(=)	B,D,E,F,(G),H,J

#### TABLE 1. CRASH TEST CONDITIONS FOR MINIMUM MATRIX (1)

(a) Includes guardrail, bridgerail, median and construction barriers.

(b) Includes devices such as water cells, sand containers, steel drums, etc.

(c) Includes sign, luminaire, and signal box supports.

(d) See Table 2 for description.

(e) + 2 degrees

- (f) IS = 1/2 m (v sin  $\theta$ )<sup>2</sup> where m is vehicle test inertial mass, slugs: v is impact speed, fps: and  $\theta$  is impact angle for redirectional impacts or 90 deg for frontal impacts, deg.
- (g) Point on appurtenance where initial vehicle contact is made.
- (h) See Table 6 for performance evaluation factors; ( ) denotes supplementary status.
- (i) From centerline of highway.
- (j) From line of symmetry of device.
- (k) Test article shall be oriented with respect to the vehicle approach path to a position that will theoretically produce the maximum vehicle velocity change; the orientation shall be consistent with reasonably expected traffic situations.
- See Commentary, Chapter 4 Test Conditions for devices which are not intended to redirect vehicle when impacted on the side of the device.

(m) For base bending devices, the impact point should be at the quarter point of the bumper.

- (n) For multiple supports, align vehicle so that the maximum number of supports are contacted assuming the vehicle departs from the highway with an angle from 0 to 30 deg.
- (b) For devices that produce fairly constant or slowly varying vehicle accelerations; an additional test at 20 mph (32 kph) is recommended for staged devices, those devices that produce a sequence of individual vehicle deceleration pulses (i.e. "lumpy" device) and/or those devices comprised of massive components that are displaced during dynamic performance (see commentary).

## TABLE 2. SAFETY EVALUATION GUIDELINES (1)

Evaluation Factors	Evaluation Criteria	Applicable to Minimum Matrix Test Conditions (see Table 3)
		, `
Structural Adequacy	Test article shall smoothly redirect the vehicle; the vehicle shall not penetrate or go over the installation although con- trolled lateral deflection of the test article is acceptable.	10, 11, 12, 30, 40
	. The test article shall readily activate in a predictable man- ner by breaking away or yielding.	60, 61, 62, 63
	. Acceptable test article performance may be by redirection, controlled penetration, or controlled stopping of the vehicle.	41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54
	Detached elements, fragments or other debris from the test article shall not penetrate or show potential for penetrating the passenger compartment or present undue hazard to other traffic.	A11
Occupant Risk	The vehicle shall remain upright during and after collision although moderate roll, pitching and yawing are accept- able. Integrity of the passenger compartment must be maintained with essentially no deformation or intrusion.	Ali
	maintained with essentially no deformation of intrusion. Impact velocity of hypothetical front seat passenger against vehicle interior, calculated from vehicle accelerations and 24 in. (0.61m) forward and 12 in. (0.30m) lateral displace- ments, shall be less than: <u>Occupant Impact Velocity-fps</u> <u>Longitudinal</u> Lateral <u>40/F<sub>1</sub></u> <u>30/F<sub>2</sub></u> and vehicle highest 10 ms average accelerations subsequent to instant of hypothetical passenger impact should be less than: <u>Occupant Ridedown Accelerations-g's</u> <u>Longitudinal</u> Lateral <u>20/F<sub>3</sub></u> <u>20/F<sub>4</sub></u> where F <sub>1</sub> , F <sub>2</sub> , F <sub>3</sub> , and F <sub>4</sub> are appropriate acceptance factors (see Table 8, Chapter 4 for suggested values). G. (Supplementary) Anthropometric dummy responses should be less than those specified by FMVSS 208, i.e., resultant chest acceleration of 60g, Head Injury Criteria of 1000, and femur force of 2250 lb (10 kN) and by FMVSS 214, i.e. resultant chest acceleration of 60 g. Head Injury Criteri	11, 12, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, 51, 52, 54, 60, 61, 62, 63 11, 12, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, 51, 52, 54, 60, 61, 62, 63
Vehicle Trajectory	ria of 1000 and occupant lateral impact velocity of 30 fps (9.1 m/s). H. After collision, the vehicle trajectory and final stopping po-	Ali
Cincle trajectory	sition shall intrude a minimum distance, if at all, into adja- cent traffic lanes.	
	<ul> <li>In test where the vehicle is judged to be redirected into or stopped while in adjacent traffic lanes, vehicle speed change during test article collision should be less than 15 mph and the exit angle from the test article should be less than 60 percent of test impact angle, both measured at time of vehicle loss of contact with test device.</li> <li>J. Vehicle trajectory behind the test article is acceptable.</li> </ul>	10, 11, 12, 30, 40, 42, 44, 53 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, 51,
	<ul> <li>change during test article collision should be less than 15 mph and the exit angle from the test article should be less than 60 percent of test impact angle, both measured at time of vehicle loss of contact with test device.</li> <li>J. Vehicle trajectory behind the test article is acceptable.</li> </ul>	

Impact Direction <sup>(aa)</sup> and	Occupa Impac	nt/Compartm ct Velocity <sup>(b)</sup>	ent -	Occupant Ride	down Acceleratic (g's)	
Appurtenance Type	Flail Space Recom	mendation	TRC	Flail Space Recomme	ndation	TRC
	$(\Delta V)_{Limit}/F^{(c)}$	$(\Delta V)_{\text{Design}}$	191	(a) <sub>Limit</sub> /F <sup>(c)</sup>	(a) <sub>Design</sub>	191(e)
Longitudinal (X) Direction				-		
Breakaway/Yielding Sup-						
<ul> <li>Signs and luminaire</li> </ul>	40/2.67	ĩ <b>5</b>	11-160	20/1.33	15	
<ul> <li>Timber Utility Poles</li> </ul>	40/1.33	30	_	20/1.33	15	
Vehicle Deceleration Devices						
<ul> <li>Crash cushions and barrier terminals</li> </ul>	40/1.33	30	32-39(d)	20/1.33	15	
<b>Redirectional Barriers</b>						
<ul> <li>Longitudinal, transitions and crash cushion side impacts</li> </ul>	40/1.33	30	25-36 <sup>(d)</sup>	20/1.33	15	
Lateral (Y) Direction						
Redirectional Barriers						
<ul> <li>Longitudinal, transitions and crash cushion side impacts</li> </ul>	30/1.50	20	14-18 <sup>(d)</sup>	20/1.33	15	

#### TABLE 3. RECOMMENDED OCCUPANT RISK VALUES (1)

Notes:

(aa) With respect to vehicle axis.

(b) Occupant to windshield, dash or door impact velocity with occupant propelled by vehicle deceleration pulse through 2-ft forward or 1 ft lateral flail space; multiply fps by 0.305 to convert to m/s.

(c) F is acceptance factor to be established by highway agency.

(d) Values calculated from TRC 191 criteria assuming that the highest 50-ms acceleration limits of TRC 191 are constant for the duration of the event and shown here for reference.

(e) Flail space accelerations are highest 10 ms averages beginning with occupant impact to completion of pulse; TRC 191 accelerations are less severe, highest 50 ms averages or those averaged over vehicle stopping distance. These values are not comparable.

(f) From TRC 191.

As used in the Specification, "breakaway supports" is a generic term meant to include <u>all</u> types of sign supports whether the release mechanism is a slip plane, plastic hinges, fracture elements, or a combination of these. The Specification states that "Breakaway structures should also be designed to prevent the structure or its parts from penetrating the vehicle occupant compartment." The Specification also alludes to the unacceptability of vehicle rollover following impact with the test article.

Use of small cars has increased since the Specification was written (1975). Hence, the current guidelines (1) recommend that an 1800 lb vehicle be used to evaluate small signs. Nonetheless, the intent of the Specification was to limit a vehicle's velocity change during impact to values implicit in the "change in momentum" limits. The implied vehicle velocity change limits are 15.7 ft/sec (10.7 mph) for the 1100 lb-sec momentum change and 10.7 ft/sec (7.3 mph) for the 750 lb-sec momentum change. For an 1800 lb vehicle, the corresponding momentum change limits would be 878 lb-sec (for 15.7 ft/sec) and 598 lb-sec (for 10.7 ft/sec).

It should be noted that the NCHRP 230  $(\underline{1})$  "occupant/compartment impact velocity" limiting value of 15 ft/sec approximates the upper vehicle velocity change limit of 15.7 ft/sec in the Specification. For most sign impacts, the vehicle's change in velocity will approximately equal the occupant/ compartment impact velocity if the latter is computed according to the NCHRP 230 guidelines.

#### II-B. Test Results

Shown in Table 4 is a summary of the 23 crash tests. Reference should be made to Appendix A for a description of the test vehicles, design and installation details of the test articles, and a description of the details of each test.

Four parameters were used to quantify the test results, namely, occupant impact velocity, occupant ridedown acceleration, change in vehicle momentum, and change in vehicle velocity. Methods used to calculate these parameters are discussed in A-3 of Appendix A.

For some tests, "no contact" is listed under "occupant impact velocity" and "occupant ridedown acceleration". This means that an occupant, idealized as a free missile, did not travel a flail space distance of 2 ft during the "impulse period". In such cases, one can assume the occupant impact velocity

				]	RST RS	LTS		ADHERENCE ID EVALUATION GUIDELTHESA							
100	TEST ATION	in a	-		ant er	Casher In		STRU	TARAL AFELIACY		COLFANT ALS	r	VEDILE BALECTOPY		
10		POSTS HET	149ACT MELOCITY (mph)	Dipact (Cloceft (ft/sec)	REPEDONN RECELERATION (G's)	HDHIQE HDHIQE HDHENMUM (Ho-sec)	VELOCITY (ft/sec)	B. PROPER ACTIVATION?	B. PENCTRATION OF PASSENCER CONFARTMENT?	E, VBMQLE STABLE?	F. ACCEPTABLE Impact Velocityy	F. ACCEPTABLE RUSEDOM ACCELEVATION	H, RALECTORY ACCOPTABLE?		
1	Two SAx7.7 with S34pbase, Hinge at Michelgin, of Panel	l af 2	a, ei	No Cortact <sup>o</sup>	No Contact <sup>b</sup>	殿	۵٤	Tes	Ro	Tes	Tes	ites.	Ties		
2	Same as Test 1	l of 2	59.1	70 Contact <sup>0</sup>	ೆ. ಮುಸಿದಾರಿ	174	3.1	Tes	Ro	Tes	Tes	745	Tes		
	Che Squame Steel Tube (Unt- struct) JODT P1 Post Design	l of 1	<b>20.02</b>	No Contact <sup>6</sup>	No Contact <sup>b</sup>	1913	3,5	٦es	Ro	Tet	Tes	Tes	TG		
4	Same as Test 2	L of )	56.X	ND Contact <sup>b</sup>	No Contact <sup>b</sup>	428	8.5	Yes	No <sup>4</sup>	Yest	Tes	Tes.	Tes		
5	Prime Square Strel Tubes (Unistruc) 4007 92 Post Deslige	2 of 3	19.7	Q. 15	0,9	1150	2)	tes -	He .	Tes	llo	Pes	Tes		
6	Same as Test 5	3 af 3	59.1	8.8	1.1	1459	<b>a</b> .	Tes	ND <sup>C</sup>	Tes	No	Ta	1e.		
1	One 3 Bb/ft, High Certain, Billet Stael U-Post (100 ksF)	ì or' 1	60.5	llo Contact <sup>b</sup>	No Contact®	489	3.1	16	No	Tes	Tes	Tes	Tes		
	Same as Test 7	l of 1	19,9	No Contact <sup>b</sup>	No Contact <sup>b</sup>	139	6.0	Yeş	80	Tes	hes	Tes	Yes		
	Prime 3 1b/ft, Higo Carbon, Brillet Steel U-Posts (100 kst)	3 of 3	59.3	ol Estab	No Contact	990	10.6	Tes	Мо	Ϋ́es	Nes	Tes	765		
10	Same as Tass 9	3 0" 3	19.4	19.3	1,6	1335	29	Tes	- Ro	Tes	Ro	Tes -	Yes		
11	fwo 4 lb/ft, High Carbon, Billet Steel U-Posts (BD-ksi)	2 af 2	20.2	16.2	1.5	<i>6</i> 53	12.5	Tes	Partially <sup>b</sup>	1a	Teg	ía.	15		
12	Same as Test 11	2 of 2	60,9	10.1	0.5	589	10.3	<b>1</b> 44	ND ND	16	Tes	765	Yes		
13	One 4 Tbyft, High Sarbon, Billes Steel U-Post (100 ksi)	) of )	61,3	Ab Coreact	No Contact	152	6.3	Υœ	No	TES <sup>d</sup>	ła	*s	¥6		
<b>н</b>	Three 3 Horft, Eatl Steel U-Posts (Short Lap Splice)	3 of 3	20,3	26.9	F-4	1541	27 .6	Tes	No	THES	<b>R</b> b	Tes	Yes		
15	Seet as Test M	3 of 3	6.9	31.2	4.4	1927	34.5	ites.	Partiallyb	Tes	Hp -	Ta	16		
14	Paree 3 Byft, High Carbon, 81Tiet Steel U-Posts (90 ksl) Cong Lap Splice)	3 or 3	20,0	22.4	3.6	<b>1534</b>	27.9	Hes	H2	Tes	lin	Yes	Yes		
17	Same an Test 16	3 or 3	62,0	12.8	2.0	X058	18,9	Tes	No.	15	1m	Te	7		
38	Same as Test H6 Except Short	3 of 3	19,5	22.5	1.3	1394	21.5	Ites	llo	Tes	No.	nes	Tas		
19	Two Soware Steel Tubes (Uni- strut) 4001 P2 Design (40 in. Post Spacing)	2 of 2	18,9	34,1	Z.5	625	34,7	Tes	No	۲œ.	Hes.	Tes	76		
20	Same as Test 19	2 of 2	57.5	17.4	1.7	KOE	17,9	te .	₩r <sup>2</sup>	Text		, J			
21	Same as Tost 16 Except Short. Lep Splice	3 of 3	61.5	19.0	1.9	125	2.4	Tes	Partiallyb	īs,	No I	TE.	Tes		
22	Two 3 Tbift, High Carbon, Billet Steel U-Posts	2 04 2	20.0	10,1	1.9	10	9.4	Thes	Ro	1es	Tes	76	Tes		
23	Same as Test ZZ	2 of 2	62.8	11.8	0.8	668	11.7	he	ND.	Tes	Nes	Tes	Tes		
# Reco Occu Get 5 Set 5 Set 5 Set 5 Set 5 Set 5 Set 5 Set	Percurrented Harts are as follows:         Percurrented Harts are are as follows:         Percurrented Harts are														

THELE 4. SHOWING TESTS

will equal the vehicle's change in velocity, as given in Table 4. Further commentary on this matter is given in Section A-3 of Appendix A.

Each test was evaluated according to the criteria of Table 2. Following is a discussion of the results, categorized according to the type of sign support.

#### II-B-1. Slipbase Sign Support (Tests 1 and 2)

Details of this design are given in Section A-2-1 of Appendix A. It differs from the conventional slipbase sign support system in that the hinge is placed at the midheight of the sign panel rather than just below the sign panel. The purpose of this modification is to minimize improper hinge activation during strong winds or during snow removal operations (when snow is blown against a sign by snow blowers). The system met all safety criteria in both tests.

#### II-B-2. Square Steel Tube, Single Post (Tests 3 and 4)

Details of the design are given in Section A-2-2 of Appendix A. The system is considered to have met all safety criteria in both tests. However, in test 4 the panel separated from the post at impact, then struck and broke the windshield. Although it did not penetrate the windshield, the potential for doing so exists in such instances.

From Figure A-44 of Appendix A, it can be seen that the washer on the lower bolt cupped and pulled through the plywood panel. The 0.065 inch thick flat washer had an outside diameter of 1.25 inches. This problem could be remedied by increasing the washer's thickness, by increasing its yield strength, or by using additional bolts to attach the panel to the post. Further analysis and testing would be required to determine the best solution.

As noted in Table 4, the vehicle in test 4 rolled subsequent to impact with the test article. However, analysis of the test film showed that the rollover was not attributable to the impact. Rather it was due to vehicle yawing that resulted from unsymmetrical braking, leading to tire rutting and the tripping of the vehicle. While the rollover cannot be attributed to the impact, it does point out the relative instability of the 1800 lb vehicle. As shown, rollover of this vehicle can occur on relatively <u>flat</u>, traversable, grassy sod, quite similar to actual roadside conditions.

#### II-B-3. Square Steel Tube, Multiple Posts (Tests 5, 6, 19, and 20)

Details of the design evaluated in tests 5, 6, 19, and 20 are given in Section A-2-3 of Appendix A. Two of the three posts were impacted in test 5, and all three posts were hit in test 6. Neither test met the occupant risk criteria of reference 1 or the vehicle's velocity change criteria of reference 2. Also, in test 6, as the sign panel rotated down, it struck and partially penetrated the windshield.

Tests 19 and 20 involved a two-support system. Test 19 met all safety criteria, while test 20 did not. In test 20, the occupant risk criteria and the vehicle's velocity change criteria were not met. Also, in test 20, as the panel rotated down it struck and partially penetrated the windshield. The strength of the fasteners was increased to Grade 5 in tests 19 and 20 to determine if this would reduce the windshield impact problem seen in test 6. The fasteners in tests 5 and 6 were Grade 1 in strength. A close examination of the film of tests 6 and 20 shows that the panel remained attached to the posts in test 20 up to the time of windshield impact, while the posts detached from the panel prior to that time in test 6. However, the end result was essentially the same in that the windshield was partially penetrated in both cases.

#### II-B-4. Steel U-Post, Single Support (Tests 7, 8, and 13)

Details of this design are shown in Section A-2-4 of Appendix A. Tests 7 and 8 involved a 3 lb/ft post and test 13 involved a 4 lb/ft post. The posts were from billet steel having a minimum yield strength of approximately 100 ksi. All safety criteria were met in each test. It is noted that the vehicle rollover that occurred in test 13 was not attributed to the test article (see discussion at end of Section II-B-2).

#### II-B-5. Steel U-Post, Multiple Supports (Tests 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, and 23)

Details of the system tested are given in Section A-2-5 of Appendix A. Table 5 summarizes the basic details and differences of each of the various systems.

A review of the results shows that the systems in tests 9 and 10, 14 and 15, 16 and 17, and 18 and 21 did not satisfy either the occupant impact velocity criteria nor the change in the vehicle's velocity criteria. Also, in test 15, the panel detached from the posts, hit and broke the windshield, and dented the roof above the front passenger area. A similar event happened

TEST NO.	NO. OF POSTS	POST SIZE (1b/ft)	POST TYPE	MINIMUM YIELD STRENGTH (ksi)	SPLICE LENGTH (ft)	GRADE OF BOLTS <sup>a</sup>	WASHER SIZE (in.)	PANEL SIZE (ft)
9 & 10	3	3	Billet	100	1.0	1	3/8	5 x 6
11 & 12	2	4	Billet	80	1.0	5	1 1/4	5 x 6
14 & 15	3	3	Ra:1	60	1.0	5	1 1/4	5 x 6
16 & 17	3	3	Billet	80	3_0	5	1 1/4	5 x 8
18 & 21	3	3	Billet	80	1.0	5	1 1/4	5 x 8
22 & 23	2	3	Billet	80	2.0	5	1 1/4	4 x 7

TABLE 5. MULTIPLE U-POST SIGN SUPPORT DETAILS

as.A.E. Grades

in test 21, although the panel remained attached to the posts up to and during impact with the windshield and roof.

With one exception, the systems in tests 11 and 12 and tests 22 and 23 satisfied all safety criteria. Test 11 did not meet evaluation criteria "D" of NCHRP Report 230 (1). In this test, a broken post stub penetrated approximately 3 inches into the floor of the test vehicle. In all probability, such a penetration would not pose a significant hazard to an occupant. However, the potential may exist for these stubs to rupture the gas tank in a similar impact with an attendant fire risk.

A review and comparison of the multiple U-post tests indicates that the number of posts in an installation is more significant in terms of impact performance than any other variable investigated. With the exception of the partial penetration noted in test 11, both of the two-post systems passed, and all of the three-post systems failed. Other observations were:

- (1) While neither system passed, a comparison of the system in tests 14 and 15 with the system in tests 18 and 21 indicates the 80 ksi billet steel post had a better impact performance than the rail steel post.
- (2) A comparison of tests 16 and 17 with tests 18 and 21 indicates that the splice length had negligible effect on impact performance.
- (3) A comparison of test 9 with test 21 (see Figures A-76 and A-138) shows the 100 ksi post (test 9) performed much better for 60 mph impacts than did the 80 ksi post (test 21). It is interesting that there are no appreciable differences in the impact properties of the posts in test 9 with those in test 21 (see Table B-2 of Appendix B). At 20 mph both systems performed similarly (tests 10 and 18).
- (4) There was a tendency for the 0.065 inch thick, 1.25 inch diameter, flat washer to cup and pull through the plywood sign panels. This could be remedied by a thicker washer, a higher strength washer, additional post-to-panel fasteners, or a combination of these. Further analysis and testing is needed to determine the best solution.
- (5) The effect of a higher strength post-to-panel fastener and larger washer on impact performance could not be conclusively determined from the limited test results. However, it is the researchers' opinion that in most instances, impact performance of a small sign support system will be enhanced if the panel remains attached to the post(s) during the vehicle/sign impact phase.

#### III. CONCLUSIONS

A series of full-scale vehicular crash tests were conducted to evaluate the impact performance of small sign supports used by ADOT. The tests were conducted and evaluated in accordance with the recommendations of NCHRP Report No. 230 and the 1985 AASHTO "Standard Specifications for Structural Supports for Highway Signs, Luminaires and Traffic Signals." Based on the test results, some support systems were found to be in compliance with the recommended safety standards and some were not.

#### A. Systems in compliance

- A slipbase design having two S4 x 7.7 posts with a hinge at the midheight of the sign panel. Sign details are given in Figure A-2.
- (2) The ADOT P1 Single Post Design as described in Figure A-4. It is a square steel tube, telescoping post design.
- (3) A single 3 lb/ft billet steel U-post (100 ksi) as described in Figure A-9.
- (4) A two-post system with 3 lb/ft billet steel U-posts (80 ksi) as described in Figure A-21.

#### B. Systems not in compliance

- The ADOT P2 multiple post design as described in Figure A-6, for both two- and three-post systems. The system is composed of square steel telescoping tubes.
- (2) A two-post system with 4 lb/ft billet steel U-posts (80 ksi) as described in Figure A-14. This system was considered unacceptable since there was partial penetration of the occupant compartment by the fractured posts (see discussion in Section II-B-5).
- (3) A three-post system with 3 lb/ft billet steel U-posts (100 ksi) as described in Figure A-12.
- (4) A three-post system with 3 lb/ft rail steel U-posts (60 ksi) as described in Figure A-16.
- (5) A three-post system with 3 lb/ft billet steel U-post (8<sup>n</sup> ksi) as described in Figure A-19.
- (6) A three-post system with 3 lb/ft billet steel U-post (80 ksi) as described in Figure A-16.

Other conclusions and observations made as a result of the test program were as follows:

- C. There was a tendency for the 0.065 inch thick, 1.25 inch diameter, flat washer to cup and pull through the plywood sign panels. This could be remedied by a thicker washer, a higher strength washer, additional post-to-panel fasteners, or a combination of these. Further analysis and testing is needed to determine the best solution. (Note: This problem was investigated in Phase II of the study. See the Phase II report for suggested solutions.)
- D. The effect of a higher strength post-to-panel fastener and larger washer on impact performance could not be conclusively determined from the limited test results. However, it is the researchers' opinion that in most instances, impact performance of a small sign support system will be enhanced if the panel remains attached to the post(s) during the vehicle/sign impact phase.
- E. The number of supports in a U-post system is more significant than any other factor investigated. Both of the two-post systems passed the safety criteria (with one exception as noted in Section II-B-5), and all three-post systems failed.
- F. The 80 ksi billet steel U-post had a better impact performance than the rail steel U-post.
- G. The 100 ksi billet steel U-post had a better impact performance at 60 mph than did the 80 ksi billet steel U-post.
- H. The splice length in the U-post designs tested had a negligible effect on impact performance.
- I. The 1800 1b Honda Civic test vehicle rolled over in two different tests. The rollover was not attributed to impact with the test article. Rather, rollover occurred as a consequence of unsymmetrical braking that caused the vehicle to yaw, allowing the tires to plow into the grassy sod, which tripped the vehicle. While the rollover was not attributed to the impact, it underlines the relative instability of an 1800 lb vehicle. As demonstrated, rollover of this vehicle can occur on relatively flat, traversable, grassy sod.

## APPENDIX A. TEST DETAILS
## A. TEST DETAILS

This appendix contains a description of the test vehicle, design details of the test article, and installation details for each of the 23 tests. Also presented are results from accelerometer measurements and photographs of before, during, and after scenes of each test. Appendix B contains physical and chemical properties of the sign supports. Appendix C contains a description of the properties of the soil at the test site. Appendix D contains a description of the data acquisition systems.

# A-1. Test Vehicles

The test vehicles consisted of 1979-80 Honda Civics weighing approximately 1,800 lb. A 50th percentile male dummy weighing approximately 170 lb was placed in the driver position in each test vehicle in an unrestrained condition. The dummy was not instrumented. Design differences between the 1979 and 1980 models were very minor. Figure A-1 contains typical dimensions of the 1979-80 Hondas used in the crash tests. Photos of each test car are given in Section A-3 of Appendix A.

Damage to the vehicle after each test is given in subsequent sections of this appendix. In some cases the same vehicle was used in two tests. This was done only when the initial test caused minor damage to the vehicle.

# A-2. Design and Installation Details of Test Articles

This section describes the as-tested sign support systems. All of the supports were placed in soil per NCHRP 230 ( $\underline{1}$ ) recommendations. Properties of the soil are given in Appendix C.

#### A-2-1. Slipbase Sign Support (Tests 1 and 2)

Shown in Figure A-2 (3 sheets) are details of the system evaluated in tests 1 and 2. Photos of the installation for test 1 are given in Figure A-3 (2 sheets).

An 8 ft wide by 5 ft high extruded aluminum panel was mounted on the two S4 x 7.7 posts, with the lower edge of the panel approximately 7 ft above ground. The posts were spaced 5 ft apart. Note that the hinge was placed at the midheight of the panel as shown on the first sheet of Figure A-2, <u>not</u> as shown on the second sheet. It should also be noted that the hinge details differed from those shown on the second sheet. For the installations tested,



FIGURE A-1. TEST VEHICLE PROPERTIES



FIGURE A-2. SLIPBASE DESIGN, TESTS 1 AND 2

1



FIGURE A-2. SLIPBASE DESIGN, TESTS 1 AND 2 (continued)



FIGURE A-2. SLIPBASE DESIGN, TESTS 1 AND 2 (concluded)

1



FIGURE A-3. SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 1 (SAME AS TEST 2)





FIGURE A-3. (CONCLUDED)

the sign post was <u>not</u> cut completely into as shown. The flange adjacent to the sign panel and the web was cut but the back flange was not cut. The "friction fuse plate" was installed as shown but there was no need for the "back plate".

The panel was attached to the sign posts with six post clamps and lock nuts, per post, all of which were above the hinge. Details of the post clamps are given on the third sheet of Figure A-2.

#### A-2-2. Square Steel Tube, Single Post (Tests 3 and 4)

Shown in Figure A-4 are details of the system evaluated in tests 3 and 4. Photos of the installation for test 3 are shown in Figure A-5.

A 2 ft wide by 2 1/2 ft high by 5/8 inch thick plywood (MDO) panel was mounted on the 2 inch square sign post, with the lower edge of the panel approximately 5 ft above ground. Two fasteners were used to attach the panel to the post. Attachment hardware was as shown on the second sheet of Figure A-6.

# A-2-3. Square Steel Tube, Multiple Posts (Tests 5, 6, 19, and 20)

Shown in Figure A-6 (2 sheets) are details of the system evaluated in tests 5, 6, 19, and 20. Photos of the installation for test 5 are shown in Figure A-7. Photos of the installation for tests 19 are shown in Figure A-8.

In tests 5 and 6, a 6 ft wide by 5 ft high by 5/8 inch thick plywood (MDO) panel was mounted on three 1 3/4 inch square sign posts, with the lower edge of the panel approximately 5 ft above ground. Post spacing was 21 inches rather than the 25 inches called for the in the plans (first sheet, Figure A-6). The smaller spacing was used so that the test vehicle would strike all three posts (vehicle width was approximately 51 inches). Three fasteners were used to attach the panel to each of the three posts. Attachment hardware was as shown on the second sheet of Figure A-6. Hardware specifications are given in the notes of Figure A-4. It is noted that a bolt for this specification is equivalent to an SAE Grade 1 bolt.

In tests 19 and 20, a 6 ft wide by 4 ft high by 5/8 inch thick plywood (MDO) panel was mounted on two 1 3/4 inch square sign posts, with the lower edge of the panel approximately 5 ft above ground. Post spacing was 40 inches rather than the 43 inches called for in the plans (first sheet, Figure A-6). The smaller spacing was requested by ADOT. Two fasteners were used to attach the panel to each post. Attachment hardware was as shown on the second sheet of Figure A-6. In tests 19 and 20, the bolts were SAE Grade 5 and the nuts were Grade 8.







FIGURE A-5. SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 3 (SAME AS TEST 4)







FIGURE A-7. SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 5 (SAME AS TEST 6)



FIGURE A-8. SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 19 (SAME AS TEST 20)

# A-2-4. Steel U-Post, Single Support (Tests 7, 8, and 13)

Shown in Figure A-9 are details of the system evaluated in tests 7, 8, and 13. Photos of the installation for test 7 are shown in Figure A-10. Photos of the installation for test 13 are shown in Figure A-11.

Sign panel size and mounting details were as shown on Figure A-9. The lower 7 ft-6 inch post section was driven in the soil to the depth shown. A 3 lb/ft, high carbon, billet steel post was used in tests 7 and 8 and a 4 lb/ft, high carbon, billet steel post was used in test 13.

# A-2-5. Steel U-Post, Multiple Supports (Tests 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, and 23)

The system evaluated in tests 9 and 10 is shown in Figure A-12. Photos of the installation for test 9 are shown in Figure A-13. All posts were 3 lb/ft, high carbon, billet steel.

Details of the system evaluated in tests 11 and 12 are shown in Figure A-14. Photos of the installation for test 11 are shown in Figure A-15. The posts were 4 lb/ft, high carbon, billet steel.

The system evaluated in tests 14, 15, 18, and 21 is shown in Figure A-16. Photos of the installation for tests 14 and 18 are shown in Figures A-17 and A-18, respectively. Posts in tests 14 and 15 were 3 lb/ft rail steel. Posts in tests 18 and 21 were 3 lb/ft, high carbon, billet steel.

Details of the system evaluated in tests 16 and 17 are shown in Figure A-19. Photos of the installation for test 16 are shown in Figure A-20. The posts were 3 lb/ft, high carbon, billet steel.

The system evaluated in tests 22 and 23 is shown in Figure A-21. Photos of the installation for test 22 are shown in Figure A-22. Posts were 3 lb/ft, high carbon, billet steel.

# A-3. Test Results

Presented in this section is a description of the test results on a test-by-test basis. Reference should be made to Chapter II for a summary of the results in terms of current evaluation criteria.

Data acquisition and data reduction procedures were in accordance with recognized guidelines  $(\underline{1})$ . Test results consist of data derived from an accelerometer attached to the vehicle, photos of the impact phase, and photos of the damage to the sign installation and the vehicle. Details of data acquisition systems are given in Appendix D.



FIGURE A-9. STEEL U-POST, SINGLE SUPPORT, TESTS 7, 8, AND 13









FIGURE A-12. STEEL U-POST, THREE SUPPORTS, TESTS 9 AND 10



FIGURE A-13. SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 9 (SAME AS TEST 10)



FIGURE A-14. STEEL U-POST, TWO SUPPORTS, TESTS 11 AND 12





FIGURE A-15. SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 11 (SAME AS TEST 12)



FIGURE A-16. STEEL U-POST, THREE SUPPORTS, TESTS 14, 15, 18, AND 21





FIGURE A-17. SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 14 (SAME AS TEST 15)





FIGURE A-18. SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 18 (SAME AS TEST 21)



FIGURE A-19. STEEL U-POST, THREE SUPPORTS, TESTS 16 AND 17





FIGURE A-20. SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 16 (SAME AS TEST 17)



FIGURE A-21. STEEL U-POST, TWO SUPPORTS, TESTS 22 AND 23



FIGURE A-22. SIGN INSTALLATION, TEST 22 (SAME AS TEST 23)

Vehicle acceleration data were analyzed to obtain three parameters: (1) change in the vehicle's velocity (and hence change in the vehicle's momentum), (2) occupant impact velocity, and (3) occupant ridedown acceleration. Following is a discussion of the procedures used in the analysis.

Change in the vehicle's momentum was obtained by first integrating the vehicle's deceleration over a given time interval, which gives the change in the vehicle's velocity during the interval. Change in velocity is then multiplied by the vehicle's mass to obtain the change in momentum. Since change in momentum is time dependent, a time duration must be specified for its computation. Guidelines for determining this duration, presented in reference 3, are as follows:

For yielding supports (such as base-bending signs) change in vehicle momentum to be used in the acceptance criteria of this section shall be computed on the basis of time integration of the vehicle deceleration signal over a "duration of event". This duration shall be defined as the lesser of the following: (1) time between incipient contact and loss of contact between the vehicle and the yielding support, or (2) the time for a free missile to travel a distance of 24 in. starting from rest with the same magnitude of vehicle deceleration.

Free missile travel is explicitly determined from measured accelerometer data. "Time between incipient contact and loss of contact between the vehicle and the yielding support" is not so explicit. High-speed film would seem to be the logical means with which this time duration could be determined. However, it is often difficult to ascertain the time that "loss of contact" occurs with precision. In a low-speed impact, the vehicle may bend the post down and travel over it. "Apparent contact" can occur over a relatively large time period, although there may be no appreciable contact forces. In a high-speed impact, the post may wrap around and remain with the vehicle after it has fractured or pulled from the ground. Again, "apparent contact" is still being made with no appreciable contact forces. Compounding the problem is the fact that filtered accelerometer output causes slight phase shifts in the filtered data.

To overcome these difficulties with computation of "contact time" for change in momentum calculations, a simple procedure was adopted in which only the accelerometer data were used. Contact time, or "impulse period" as used herein, was defined as the duration between initial contact and the time at which the deceleration <u>essentially</u> returned to and remained at zero. Obviously, deceleration does not remain at zero unless the vehicle reaches a constant velocity or comes to a stop. However, in most tests, contact was followed by a period where wind drag and rolling resistance were the only forces on the vehicle. These forces decelerate the vehicle at a level which is small in comparison with that caused by contact forces. Subsequent to that period, the brakes were applied.

Computation of occupant impact velocity and occupant ridedown acceleration is more direct. Vehicle deceleration is double integrated with respect to time to find the time,  $T_0$ , for a free missile ("occupant") to travel 2 ft relative to the vehicle, with the missile having a constant velocity equal to the vehicle's velocity at impact. Occupant impact velocity equals the vehicle's <u>change</u> in velocity at time  $T_0$ . Occupant ridedown acceleration is computed from the vehicle's deceleration and equals the highest average deceleration computed over any continuous 10 millisecond period after  $T_0$ .

In some tests the "occupant" will not travel 2 ft relative to the vehicle during the "impulse period". If so, the results presented herein indicate "no contact" for the occupant. For these cases, one may assume the occupant impact velocity equals the vehicle's change in velocity that occurs during the impulse period. In other words, once an occupant is moving relative to the vehicle at a velocity,  $V_0$ , he will eventually strike the vehicle's interior at  $V_0$ , provided the vehicle does not accelerate or decelerate.

Damage to the vehicle was assessed in terms of two nationally recognized rating scales. These were the Vehicle Damage Scale published by the Traffic Accident Data Project (TAD) (4) and the Collision Deformation Classification recommended by the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) (5).

All tests were conducted with the vehicle impacting the sign installation in a head-on, tracking orientation. From the time of impact to the time of rest, the vehicle was in a free-steering mode (no steer input). In each test, the brakes were applied once the vehicle cleared the test area.

#### A-3-1. Test 1

A 1980 Honda Civic was directed into the sign installation at 19.6 mph. Test inertia mass of the test vehicle was 1,820 lb and its gross static mass was 1,985 lb. Impact point was 15 in. to the left of the vehicle centerline. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-23.

Approximately 0.020 sec after impact the breakaway base on the right support began to slip. At 0.035 sec the right support began to kick up and by 0.067 sec the support lost contact with the vehicle. At about 0.261 sec the vehicle regained contact with the support and at 0.348 sec the hinge activated. As the vehicle continued forward it lost contact with the support at 0.498 sec and subsequently came to rest 72 ft behind and 18 ft to the left of the impact point. The sign installation remained standing with the right support bent back about 4 ft as shown in Figure A-24.

Photographs of the sign installation after the test are shown in Figures A-24 and A-25. Damage to the vehicle was minimal as shown in Figure A-26. The left front quarter was deformed and was crushed 1.0 in. at bumper height. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-27.

A summary of test results is provided in Figure A-28. Change in the vehicle's velocity during the impulse period was 3.4 mph and change in momentum was 282 lb-sec. There was no occupant contact during the impulse period.





FIGURE A-23. RELATIVE POSITIONS OF SIGN INSTALLATION AND TEST VEHICLE FOR TEST 1.





FIGURE A-24. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 1.



FIGURE A-25. BREAKAWAY BASE AFTER TEST 1.





FIGURE A-26. TEST VEHICLE BEFORE AND AFTER TEST 1.


FIGURE A-27. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 1.



 Uccupant Ridedown Accelerations Longitudinal....N/A Lateral....N/A Maximum Vehicle Crush Bumper Height....1.0 in. (2.5 cm) Hood Height....None

FIGURE A-28. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 1.

# A-3-2. Test 2

A 1980 Honda Civic, pictured in Figure A-29, was directed into the sign installation at 59.3 mph. Test inertia mass of the test vehicle was 1,820 lb and its gross static mass was 1,985 lb. Impact point was 15 in. to the right of the vehicle centerline. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-30.

Approximately 0.005 sec after impact the breakaway base of the left support began to slip and by 0.025 sec the upper hinge activated. At 0.052 sec the support lost contact with the front of the vehicle and continued moving upward. After the vehicle exited the test area, the clamps attaching the sign panel to the left support began to release and at 1.160 sec the sign panel fell from the right support. The vehicle came to a relatively safe, stable stop approximately 240 ft behind and 24 ft to the left of the impact point.

Photographs of the sign after the test are shown in Figures A-31 and A-32. The vehicle received minimal damage as shown in Figure A-33. The right front quarter received 2.0 in. crush at bumper height and 2.0 in. at hood height. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-34.

A summary of test results is provided in Figure A-35. Change in the vehicle's velocity during the impulse period was 2.1 mph and change in momentum was 174 lb-sec. There was no occupant impact during the impulse period.





FIGURE A-29. TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 2.





FIGURE A-30. RELATIVE POSITIONS OF SIGN INSTALLATION AND TEST VEHICLE FOR TEST 2.



FIGURE A-31. BREAKAWAY BASE AFTER TEST 2.





FIGURE A-32. HINGE AFTER TEST 2.





FIGURE A-33. TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 2.



FIGURE A-34. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 2.



FIGURE A-35. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 2.

## A-3-3. Test 3

The 1979 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-36, was directed into the sign at 20.0 mph. The test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,770 lb and its gross static mass was 1,939 lb. Impact was such that the vehicle bumper contacted the support 15 in. to the right of the vehicle centerline.

Approximately 0.025 sec after impact the support fractured at bumper height. The vehicle lost contact with the sign installation at 0.110 sec. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-37. The support was fractured (but not completely separated) at the base and 16 in. above the ground as shown in Figure A-38. As shown in Figure A-39 the vehicle sustained minor scrapes to the bumper.

Results of the test are summarized in Figure A-40. Change in the vehicle's velocity was 2.4 mph and change in momentum was 193 lb-sec. There was no occupant impact during the impulse period.





FIGURE A-36. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 3.



0.000 sec



0.018 sec



0.070 sec



0.088 sec



0.035 sec



0.053 sec





0.135 sec

FIGURE A-37. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 3.



FIGURE A-38. TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 3.



# FIGURE A-39. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 3.



0.000 sec

0.035 sec

0.070 sec

0.110 sec



72 ft	IMPACT
Test No	<pre>Impact Speed 20.0 mph (32.2 kph) Change in Velocity 2.4 mph (3.9 kph) Change in Momentum 193 lb-sec Occupant Impact Velocity Longitudinal None Lateral None Occupant Ridedown Accelerations Longitudinal N/A Lateral N/A Maximum Vehicle Crush Bumper Height 0.0 in. (0.0 cm) Hood Height 0.0 in. (0.0 cm)</pre>

FIGURE A-40. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 3.

#### A-3-4. Test 4

The 1979 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-41, was directed toward the sign at 56.8 mph. The test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,770 lb and its gross static mass was 1,939 lb. Impact was such that the vehicle bumper contacted the support 15 in. to the left of vehicle centerline.

Approximately 0.010 sec after impact the sign panel split at the lower bolt connection and at 0.013 sec the support began to fracture at bumper height. At 0.035 sec the bottom of the sign panel hit the hood and shortly thereafter (0.043 sec) broke away from the support. The top of the sign panel then hit the windshield at 0.050 sec. Loss of contact occurred at 0.148 sec. As the vehicle left the test site the brakes were applied. The brakes locked up and the vehicle yawed in counterclockwise rotation. The wheels dug into the soft soil causing the vehicle to roll one and three-quarter revolutions. The vehicle subsequently came to rest on its right side. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-42.

The support broke away at the base and was deformed as shown in Figures A-43 and A-44. The vehicle sustained a maximum crush of 3.0 in. at bumper height and the hood was scraped and dented. The windshield was cracked but not penetrated when the sign panel hit it. All other damage was due to post-test rollover. Photos of the vehicle after the test are shown in Figure A-45.

Results of this test are summarized in Figure A-46. Change in the vehicle's velocity was 5.8 mph and change in momentum was 468 lb-sec. There was no occupant impact during the impulse period.

The vehicle remained upright and stable throughout the impact phase and up to the time of brake application. Rollover of the vehicle was considered to be totally due to unsymmetrical brake application in combination with soft soil and not induced by impact with the sign.





FIGURE A-41. TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 4.



0.000 sec



0.025 sec



0.050 sec



0.075 sec



0.100 sec



0.126 sec



0.151 sec





FIGURE A-42. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 4.



FIGURE A-43. TEST SITE AFTER TEST 4.



FIGURE A-44. SIGN POST AFTER TEST TEST 4.





FIGURE A-45. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 4.



0.000 sec

0.050 sec

0.100 sec

0.151 sec





ate	Change in Velocity
(Unistrut) P1 post	Longitudinal None
ehicle	Lateral None
Test Inertia 1,770 lb (804 kg)	Longitudinal N/A
Gross Static 1,939 lb (880 kg)	Lateral N/A
TAD	Bumper Height 3.0 in. (7.6 cm)

FIGURE A-46. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 4.

#### A-3-5. Test 5

A 1980 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-47, was directed into the sign installation at 19.7 mph. Test inertia mass of the test vehicle was 1,790 lb and its gross static mass was 1,952 lb. The test was designed so that the vehicle would impact all three supports. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-48.

Due to a malfunction in the cable release mechanism of the guidance system just moments before impact, the vehicle shifted to the left and impacted the center and left supports only. Approximately 0.027 sec after impact the center and left supports were bending. At 0.037 sec the dummy was moving forward and to the right and by 0.090 sec the dummy's head hit the mirror. As the vehicle moved forward it began to ride up the supports. At. 0.144 sec the dummy's head hit the dash and at 0.269 sec the back of the dummy's head hit the windshield. Shortly thereafter the connections on the sign panel began to fail and at 0.488 sec the sign panel released from the right support, fell on the hood of the test vehicle, and bounced away. Subsequently, the vehicle came to rest over the left and center supports as shown in Figures A-49 and A-50. The sign came to rest approximately 10 ft from the front of the vehicle. As shown in Figure A-49, the left and center supports were bent back at the base. The right support was scratched and bent back slightly.

The front of the vehicle was deformed as shown in Figure A-50. The right front quarter received 4.0 in. crush at bumper height. The center was crushed 2.0 in. at bumper height. The windshield was slightly cracked just below the mirror. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-51.

Test results are shown in Figure A-52. Change in the vehicle's velocity during the impulse period was 14.1 mph and change in momentum was 1,150 lb-sec. Occupant impact velocity in the longitudinal direction was 21.0 fps and the highest 0.010-second occupant ridedown acceleration was 0.9 g.





FIGURE A-47. TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 5.





FIGURE A-48. RELATIVE POSITIONS OF THE TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 5.



FIGURE A-49. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 5.





FIGURE A-50. TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 5.



0.000 sec



0.025 sec



0.062 sec



0.100 sec



0.162 sec



0.274 sec



0.386 sec



0.500 sec

FIGURE A-51. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 5.



FIGURE A-52. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 5.

A-67

## A-3-6. Test 6

A 1980 Honda Civic, pictured in Figure A-53, was directed into the sign installation at 59.3 mph. Test inertia mass of the test vehicle was 1,790 lb and its gross static mass was 1,952 lb. The test was designed so that the vehicle would impact all three supports. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-54.

Almost immediately after impact (0.002 sec), the supports began bending. At 0.022 sec the supports began to fracture and, as the vehicle continued forward, the supports deformed around the front of the vehicle. At 0.072 sec the sign panel hit the windshield knocking it loose from the upper molding. At 0.090 sec the dummy's head came through the opening between the windshield and the roof of the vehicle and by 0.162 sec the dummy's head was completely out of the vehicle. The vehicle exited the test area carrying the sign panel and parts of the supports. The vehicle came to rest approximately 156 ft behind and 18 ft to the right of the impact point.

As shown in Figure A-55, the left and right supports were bent back at the base. The center support broke at the base and was carried 90 ft with the vehicle. It was deformed and torn as shown in Figure A-56. The sign panel and fragments of the supports were scattered along the exit path of the vehicle.

The front of the vehicle was deformed and the windshield was broken as shown in Figure A-57. The right front quarter received 4.0 in. crush at bumper height. The center was crushed 1.0 in. at bumper height and 1.5 in. at hood height. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-58.

Test results are shown in Figure A-59. Change in vehicle's velocity during the impulse period was 17.9 mph and change in momentum was 1,459 lb-sec. Occupant impact velocity was 24.9 fps in the longitudinal direction. The highest 0.010-second occupant ridedown acceleration was 3.3 g.



(cracks in windshield from Test 5)



FIGURE A-53. TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 6.





FIGURE A-54. RELATIVE POSITIONS OF TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 6.



FIGURE A-55. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 6. (BASE)



FIGURE A-56. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 6. (SUPPORTS AND SIGN PANEL)



FIGURE A-57. TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 6.

A-73


0.000 sec



0.025 sec



0.050 sec



0.075 sec



0.100 sec



0.149 sec



0.199 sec



0.249 sec

FIGURE A-58. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 6.



FIGURE A-59. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 6.

A-75

### A-3-7. Test 7

A 1979 Honda Civic, pictured in Figure A-60, was directed into the sign installation at 60.5 mph. Test inertia mass of the test vehicle was 1,800 lb and its gross static mass was 1,965 lb. Impact point was 15 in. to the left of the vehicle centerline. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-61.

Approximately 0.015 sec after the impact the support began to fracture at bumper height. At 0.025 sec the support lost contact with the front of the vehicle and the sign and part of the support began rising upward. The sign panel then impacted the roof of the vehicle at 0.072 sec. The sign lost contact with the vehicle at 0.097 sec and subsequently came to rest 72 ft behind and 16 ft to the left of the impact point. The vehicle came to a stop approximately 228 ft behind and 60 ft to the left of the impact point.

The support was split from ground level to 14 in. above the ground. At this point the support was fractured as shown in Figure A-62. The vehicle received a maximum crush of 3.5 in. at bumper height and the left front corner of the bumper was bent forward. The roof was dented about 2 in. where the sign impacted. Photographs of the vehicle after the test are shown in Figure A-63 and sequentials of the crash are presented in Figure A-64.

Test results are given in Figure A-65. Change in the vehicle's velocity during the impulse period was 2.1 mph and change in momentum was 169 lb-sec. There was no occupant impact during the impulse period.



# FIGURE A-60. TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 7.





FIGURE A-61. RELATIVE POSITIONS OF TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 7.



FIGURE A-62. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 7.



FIGURE A-63. TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 7.



0.060 sec



0.075 sec



0.090 sec



0.105 sec

FIGURE A-64. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 7.

0.015 sec

0.000 sec

TEST 7024-7

6)

TEST 7024-7

11-6



0.030 sec



0.045 sec



FIGURE A-65. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 7.

A-82

### A-3-8. Test 8

A 1979 Honda Civic, pictured in Figure A-66, was directed into the sign installation at 19.9 mph. Test inertia mass of the test vehicle was 1,800 lb and its gress static mass was 1,965 lb. Impact point was 15 in. to the right of the vehicle centerline. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-67.

Approximately 0.015 sec after impact the support began to fracture at bumper height. At 0.095 sec the support lost contact with the front of the vehicle and the sign and a portion of the support began rising upward. As the vehicle continued forward the sign panel grazed the right front corner of the vehicle at roof height (just above and to the right of the windshield) and bounced away leaving no deformation. The sign panel and support subsequently came to rest 21 ft behind the impact point as shown in Figure A-68. The vehicle came to a stop approximately 60 ft directly behind the impact point.

The support was split from ground level to 16.5 in. above the ground. At this point the support was fractured as shown in Figure A-68. The vehicle received a minimal amount of damage. As shown in Figure A-69 there was a slight indentation in the bumper and the parking light was also broken. (Damage to the left side was due to the previous test.) Sequentials of the test are presented in Figure A-70.

Test results are given in Figure A-71. Change in the vehicle's velocity during the impulse period was 4.1 mph and change in momentum was 339 lb-sec. There was no occupant impact during the impulse period.

A-83



# FIGURE A-66. TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 8.





FIGURE A-67. RELATIVE POSITIONS OF TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 8.



FIGURE A-68. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 8.





FIGURE A-69. TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 8.







0.015 sec



0.055 sec



0.095 sec



0.163 sec



0.231 sec



0.296 sec



0.366 sec

FIGURE A-70. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 8.



FIGURE A-71. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 8.

A-89

#### A-3-9. Test 9

A 1979 Honda Civic, pictured in Figure A-72, was directed into the sign installation at 59.3 mph. Test inertia mass of the test vehicle was 1,800 lb and its gross static mass was 1,970 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle impacted all three supports of the installation. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-73.

Approximately 0.017 sec after impact the lower section of the left support began to fracture at bumper height and by 0.027 sec the remaining supports had fractured. At 0.055 sec the supports lost contact with the front of the vehicle and the sign panel and supports began rising upward. The sign subsequently came to rest 6 ft directly behind the impact point. The vehicle came to a stop approximately 270 ft behind and 30 ft to the left of the impact point.

The lower section of the left support was split longitudinally from ground level to 16.5 in. above the ground where it had fractured. The lower section of the center support was split from ground level to its fracture point of 12 in. As shown in Figure A-74 the right support split from ground level to 20 in. above the ground where only the right half fractured. The upper sections were relatively undamaged.

The front of the vehicle was deformed as shown in Figure A-75. The right front quarter received 12.0 in. crush at bumper height. The center was crushed 6.5 in. at bumper height and 1.5 in. at hood height. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-76.

Test results are given in Figure A-77. Change in the vehicle's velocity during the impulse period was 7.2 mph and change in momentum was 590 lb-sec. There was no occupant impact during the impulse period.



### FIGURE A-72. TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 9.





FIGURE A-73. RELATIVE POSITIONS OF TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 9.



FIGURE A-74. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 9.





FIGURE A-75. TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 9.



0.000 sec



0.012 sec



0.025 sec



0.037 sec



0.050 sec



0.087 sec





0.162 sec

FIGURE A-76. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 9.



FIGURE A-77. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 9.

### A-3-10. Test 10

A 1979 Honda Civic was directed into the sign installation at 19.4 mph. Test inertia mass of the test vehicle was 1,800 lb and its gross static mass was 1,970 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle impacted all three supports of the installation. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-78.

Approximately 0.013 sec after impact the lower sections of the supports between ground level and the upper connection were bending and causing bending deformations at the upper connection. By 0.028 sec the top bolts in the connection failed and by 0.038 sec the lower bolts also failed. At 0.108 sec the vehicle began to ride up on the supports. The dummy's head hit the windshield just below the visor at 0.170 sec and at 0.210 sec the vehicle impacted the sign panel which had remained connected to the upper sections of the supports. Subsequently, the vehicle tilted to the left and came to rest directly over the left and center supports as shown in Figure A-79. The sign came to rest about 6 ft in front of the vehicle.

The lower section of the left support was split longitudinally from just below ground level to 24.0 in. above the ground. The lower section of the center support was split from about 1.5 in. below ground level to 16.0 in. above. The right support was scratched and bent back slightly. The upper sections were relatively undamaged.

The front of the vehicle was deformed as shown in Figure A-80. The right front quarter received 6.0 in. crush at bumper height. The center was crushed 2.0 in. at bumper height. The windshield was slightly cracked just below the visor and the visor was bent. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-81.

A summary of the test results is given in Figure A-82. Change in the vehicle's velocity during the impulse period (0.600 sec) was 16.3 mph and change in momentum at 0.600 sec was 1,335 lb-sec. Occupant impact velocity in the longitudinal direction was 19.3 fps and the highest 0.010-second occupant ridedown acceleration was -1.6 g.





FIGURE A-78. RELATIVE POSITIONS OF TEST VEHICLE AND SIGN INSTALLATION FOR TEST 10.



FIGURE A-79. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 10.



# FIGURE A-80. TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 10.





0.113 sec

0.613 sec

FIGURE A-81. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 10.



FIGURE A-82. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 10.

1

### A-3-11. Test 11

The 1979 Honda, shown in Figure A-83, was directed into the sign installation at 20.2 mph. The test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,770 lb and its gross static mass was 1,940 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle bumper contacted both supports of the sign installation.

Approximately 0.029 sec after impact the right support fractured, and at 0.044 sec the left support fractured. The vehicle lost contact with the upper portion of the sign installation at 0.112 sec. However, the vehicle came to rest over the lower section of the sign installation. One of the lower sections penetrated the floorboard of the vehicle approximately 3 in. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-84.

The right support was fractured 19 in. above the ground and the left support was fractured 20 in. above the ground, as shown in Figure A-85. As shown in Figure A-86, the vehicle was elevated by the fractured supports. The front of the vehicle sustained minor scrapes and dents.

Results of the test are summarized in Figure A-87. Change in the vehicle's velocity at 0.500 sec was 8.1 mph and change in momentum was 653 lb-sec. Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was 14.2 fps and the maximum 0.010-second average occupant ridedown acceleration was -1.6 g.





FIGURE A-83. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 11.

A - 104





0.026 sec



0.052 sec



0.078 sec



0.104 sec



0.157 sec



0.209 sec



0.261 sec

FIGURE A-84. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 11.



FIGURE A-85. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 11.





FIGURE A-86. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 11.



FIGURE A-87. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 11.

### A-3-12. Test 12

A 1979 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-88, was directed into the sign at 60.9 mph. Test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,770 lb and its gross static mass was 1,940 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle bumper contacted both supports of the installation. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-88.

Approximately 0.010 sec after impact the supports began to fracture. At 0.039 sec the vehicle lost contact with the sign. Shortly thereafter the upper portion of the sign installation went up and over the vehicle and at 0.183 sec the sign panel struck the rear of the vehicle. Sequential photographs of the test are presented in Figure A-89.

The lower sections of the left and right supports fractured 17 in. above the ground. Damage to the sign supports is shown in Figure A-90. The front of the vehicle was deformed as shown in Figure A-91. The vehicle sustained minor dents. It remained upright and stable after impact.

Test results are shown in Figure A-92. Change in the vehicle's velocity was 7.3 mph and change in momentum was 589 lb-sec. Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was 10.5 fps and the maximum 0.010-second average ridedown acceleration was -0.5 g.




FIGURE A-88. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 12.



0.000 sec



0.080 sec



0.013 sec



0.120 sec



0.027 sec



0.160 sec



0.040 sec



0.200 sec

FIGURE A-89. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 12.

A-111



FIGURE A-90. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 12.





FIGURE A-91. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 12.



FIGURE A-92. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 12.

# A-3-13. Test 13

A 1979 Honda Civic, pictured in Figure A-93, was directed into the sign installation at 61.3 mph. Test inertia mass of the test vehicle was 1,795 lb and its gross static mass was 1,961 lb. Impact point was 15 in. to the left of the vehicle centerline. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-94.

Approximately 0.015 sec after impact the lower section of the support began to fracture at bumper height. At 0.040 sec the support lost contact with the front of the vehicle and the sign panel and part of the support began rising upward. The sign panel then impacted the left side of the roof of the vehicle at 0.077 sec. The sign lost contact with the vehicle at 0.125 sec and subsequently came to rest 90 ft behind and 30 ft to the left of the impact point. The vehicle left the test area in a stable mode yawing counterclockwise at 15 deg/sec (8 deg at 0.550 sec). Post-test brake application caused the vehicle to yaw violently in clockwise rotation and subsequently rolled one revolution.

The lower section of the support was fractured 18 in. above the ground as shown in Figures A-95 and A-96. The vehicle received a maximum crush of 6.0 in. at bumper height and 2 in. at hood height. Photographs of the vehicle after the test are shown in Figure A-97 and sequentials of the test are presented in Figure A-98.

Test results are shown in Figure A-99. Change in the vehicle's velocity during the impulse period was 4.3 mph and change in momentum was 352 lb-sec. There was no occupant impact during the impulse period.

The vehicle remained upright and stable throughout the initial test period. Post-test roll was attributed to unsymmetrical brake application and subsequent tipping of the vehicle when the tires rutted the grassy sod.

A- 115





FIGURE A-93. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 13.





FIGURE A-94. RELATIVE POSITIONS OF SIGN INSTALLATION AND TEST VEHICLE FOR TEST 13.



FIGURE A-95. TEST SITE AFTER TEST 13.



FIGURE A-96. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 13.



Post-test roll attributed to unsymmetrical brake application and soil condition.

FIGURE A-97. TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 13.







FIGURE A-98. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 13.



0.000 sec

3

0.040 sec

0.080 sec

0.120 sec





FIGURE A-99. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 13.

# A-3-14. Test 14

The 1980 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-100, was directed into the sign at 20.3 mph. The test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,800 lb and its gross static mass was 1,970 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle bumper contacted all three supports of the sign installation. Relative positions of the vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-100.

Approximately 0.123 sec after impact the vehicle began to ride up on the supports, and at 0.128 sec the dummy hit the windshield. The vehicle lost contact with the sign installation at 0.212 sec and began to rebound. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-101.

The sign installation was pushed back about 6.5 in. and was scratched and bent about 16 in. above the ground as shown in Figure A-102. As shown in Figure A-103, the vehicle sustained minor scrapes to the bumper with a maximum 1.5 in. crush at bumper height. Also the windshield was cracked.

The results of the test are summarized in Figure A-104. Change in the vehicle's velocity was 18.8 mph and change in momentum was 1,541 lb-sec. Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was 26.9 fps and the maximum 0.010-second average occupant ridedown acceleration was -1.6 g.





FIGURE A-100. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 14.



0.000 sec



0.040 sec



0.081 sec



0.121 sec







0.211 sec



0.335 sec





FIGURE A-101. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 14.







FIGURE A-102. TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 14.





FIGURE A-103. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 14?4-



FIGURE A-104. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 14.

A-128

### A-3-15. Test 15

A 1980 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-105, was directed into the sign at 62.0 mph. Test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,800 lb and its gross static mass was 1,970 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle bumper contacted all three supports of the installation. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-105.

Approximately 0.008 sec after impact the supports began to bend. At 0.060 sec the lower section of the left and right supports began to fracture. Shortly thereafter the dummy hit the windshield and the sign panel which had separated from the supports hit the hood and windshield. The sign panel rode with the vehicle which traveled 105 ft directly behind the impact point.

The lower sections of the left and right supports fractured 54 in. above the ground. The center support was pulled completely out of the ground. Damage to the sign supports is shown in Figure A-106.

The front of the vehicle was deformed as shown in Figure A-107. The right front quarter received 10.0 in. crush at bumper height. The center was crushed 3.0 in. at bumper height and 1.0 in. on the left side. The windshield was also broken. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-108.

Test results are given in Figure A-109. Change in the vehicle's velocity at 0.350 seconds was 23.5 mph and change in momentum was 1,927 lb-sec. Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was 31.2 fps and the maximum 0.010-second average ridedown acceleration was 4.6 g.

A-129





FIGURE A-105. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 15.



FIGURE A-106. TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 15.





FIGURE A-107. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 15.



0.000 sec



0.018 sec



0.035 sec



0.053 sec



0.073 sec



0.093 sec



0.131 sec



0.169 sec

FIGURE A-108. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 15.



FIGURE A-109. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 15.

A-134

# A-3-16. Test 16

The 1979 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-110, was directed into the sign at 20.0 mph. The test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,772 lb and its gross static mass was 1,955 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle bumper contacted all three supports of the sign installation. Relative positions of the vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-110.

Approximately 0.035 sec after impact the lower section of the right support fractured at bumper height and at 0.169 sec the dummy hit the visor. The vehicle lost contact with the sign installation at 0.538 sec. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-111.

The sign installation was pushed to the ground as shown in Figure A-112. The lower section of the right support was split longitudinally and was fractured 19 in. above the ground. The lower sections of the center and left supports were split longitudinally.

The vehicle received minor damage as shown in Figure A-113. There was a maximum vehicle crush of 4 in. at bumper height.

The results of the test are summarized in Figure A-114. Change in the vehicle's velocity was 19.0 mph and change in momentum was 1.534 lb-sec. Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was 22.4 fps and the maximum 0.010-second average occupant ridedown acceleration was -3.6 g.





FIGURE A-110. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 16.

A-136



0.000 sec



0.063 sec



0.126 sec



0.189 sec



0.251 sec



0.347 sec



0.443 sec



0.538 sec

FIGURE A-111. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 16.



FIGURE A-112. TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 16.



FIGURE A-113. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 16.



FIGURE A-114. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 16.

Ţ

## A-3-17. Test 17

A 1979 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-115, was directed into the sign at 62.0 mph. Test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,800 lb and its gross static mass was 1,965 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle bumper contacted all three supports of the installation. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-115.

Approximately 0.021 sec after impact, the lower section of the center and right supports began to fracture. Shortly thereafter the sign panel which had separated from the left support hit the roof. The left support pulled out of the ground and rode with the vehicle which traveled 207 ft directly behind the impact point. Sequential photographs of the test are presented in Figure A-116.

The lower section of the center support fractured at 17 in. and the right support fractured 33 in. above the ground. The left support was pulled completely out of the ground. Damage to the sign supports is shown in Figure A-117.

The front of the vehicle was deformed as shown in Figure A-118. The right front quarter received 5.0 in. crush at bumper height. The center was crushed 5.5 in. at bumper height, and 10.0 in. on the left side.

Test results are shown in Figure A-119. Change in the vehicle's velocity was 12.9 mph and change in momentum was 1,058 lb-sec. Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was 12.8 fps and the maximum 0.010-second average ridedown acceleration was -2.0 g.





FIGURE A-115. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 17.



0.000 sec



0.013 sec

-



0.078 sec





0.156 sec



0.196 sec

0.026 sec an were store

0.039 sec

FIGURE A-116. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 17.





FIGURE A-117. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 17.





FIGURE A-118. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 17.


FIGURE A-119. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 17.

### A-3-18. Test 18

A 1980 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-120, was directed into the sign at 19.5 mph. The test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,800 lb and its gross static mass was 1,970 lb. Impact was such that the vehicle bumper contacted all three supports of the installation.

Approximately 0.008 sec after impact the supports began to bend. The dummy hit the windshield at 0.123 sec and at 0.217 sec the left support fractured. The vehicle lost contact with the sign installation at 0.262 sec but snagged on the lower section of the broken support as it rolled back. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-121.

The left support was fractured 19.5 in. above the ground as shown in Figure A-122. The center and right supports were split longitudinally but did not fracture. As shown in Figure A-123, the vehicle sustained minor scrapes to the bumper and a broken windshield.

The results of the test are summarized in Figure A-124. Change in the vehicle's velocity was 17.0 mph and change in momentum was 1,394 lb-sec. Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was 22.5 fps and the maximum 0.010-second average ridedown acceleration was -1.3 g.



FIGURE A-120. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 18.



0.00 sec



0.043 sec



0.171 sec



0.217 sec



0.086 sec

17



0.129 sec



0.262 sec



0.313 sec

FIGURE A-121. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 18.





FIGURE A-122, TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 18.





FIGURE A-123. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 18.



FIGURE A-124. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 18.

### A-3-19. Test 19

A 1979 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-125, was directed into the sign at 18.9 mph. The test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,808 lb and its gross static mass was 1,980 lb. Impact was such that the vehicle bumper contacted both supports.

At approximately 0.015 sec after impact the left support of the installation began to bend. Shortly thereafter the right support began to bend and at 0.045 sec the left support fractured. At 0.171 sec the dummy hit and cracked the windshield. The vehicle continued to roll forward and subsequently came to rest over the sign as shown in Figure A-126. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-127.

As shown in Figure A-128, the supports were fractured at the base. The left support also had a slight fracture about 16.0 in. above the ground. The vehicle (see Figure A-126) received minor scrapes on the bumper with a maximum crush of 4.5 in. on the right side at bumper height. The windshield was also cracked.

The results of this test are summarized in Figure A-129. Change in the vehicle's velocity at 0.300 seconds was 10.0 mph and change in momentum was 825 lb-sec. Occupant impact velocity in the longitudinal direction was 14.1 fps and the highest 0.010-second longitudinal occupant ridedown acceleration was -2.5 g.





FIGURE A-125. TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 19.

A=154



FIGURE A-126. TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 19.



0.000 sec -



0.025 sec



0.101 sec



0.151 sec



0.050 sec



0.075 sec 0.252 sec FIGURE A-127. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 19.



0.201 sec





FIGURE A-128. TEST INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 19.



FIGURE A-129. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 19.

#### A-3-20. Test 20

A 1979 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-130, was directed into the sign at 57.5 mph. The test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,808 lb and its gross static mass was 1,980 lb. Impact was such that the vehicle bumper contacted both supports.

The left support of the sign installation fractured at bumper height approximately 0.010 sec after impact. Both supports then began to deform around the front of the vehicle and at 0.045 sec the right support fractured at hood height. At 0.056 sec the sign panel impacted the windshield. As the vehicle continued forward, it carried the whole installation with it. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-131.

As shown in Figure A-132 (two sheets), the left support separated about 10 in. above the ground and the right support separated at the base. The vehicle sustained a maximum crush of 3 in. at bumper height on the right side. The hood was scraped and dented, and the windshield was knocked out. Photographs of the vehicle after the test are shown in Figure A-133.

The results from this test are summarized in Figure A-134. The change in the vehicle's velocity was 12.2 mph and change in momentum was 1,005 lb-sec. Occupant impact velocity in the longitudinal direction was 17.4 fps and the highest 0.010-second longitudinal occupant ridedown acceleration was 1.7 g.





FIGURE A-130. TEST VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 20.

A-160



FIGURE A-131. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 20.



FIGURE A-132. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 20.



FIGURE A-132. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 20 (continued).



FIGURE A-133. TEST VEHICLE AFTER TEST 20.



FIGURE A-134. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 20.

## A-3-21. Test 21

A 1979 Honda Civic, shown in Figure A-135, was directed into the sign at 61.5 mph. Test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,772 lb and its gross static mass was 1,955 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle bumper contacted all three supports of the installation.

Shortly after impact the supports began to deform around the front of the vehicle and by 0.063 sec the front wheels left the ground. By 0.089 sec the supports had bent sufficiently to cause the sign panel to hit the hood and windshield. The whole sign installation pulled out of the ground and rode with the vehicle which traveled 175 ft directly behind the impact point.

The sign installation was pulled out of the ground. The supports were split and twisted. Damage to the sign supports is shown in Figure A-136.

The front of the vehicle was deformed as shown in Figure A-137. The left front quarter received 6.0 in. crush at bumper height. The center and right side was crushed 3.0 in. at bumper height. The windshield also was broken. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-138.

The results are shown in Figure A-139. Change in the vehicle's velocity at 0.300 seconds was 15.3 mph and change in momentum was 1,235 lb-sec. Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was 19.0 fps and the maximum 0.010-second ridedown acceleration was -1.9 g.



# FIGURE A-135. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 21.



FIGURE A-136. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 21.





FIGURE A-137. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 21.



FIGURE A-138. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST. 21.



FIGURE A-139. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 21.

## A-3-22. Test 22

A 1980 Honda, shown in Figure A-140, was directed into the sign at 20.0 mph. The test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,833 lb and its gross static mass was 2,003 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle bumper contacted both supports of the sign installation.

Approximately 0.054 sec after impact the right support fractured, and at 0.077 sec the left support fractured. The vehicle lost contact with the sign installation at 0.197 sec. Shortly thereafter the sign panel fell on the hood and slid to the ground. Sequential photographs of the test are shown in Figure A-141.

The right support was fractured 19 in. above the ground and the left support was fractured 20 in. above the ground as shown in Figure A-142. As shown in Figure A-143, the vehicle sustained minor scrapes to the bumper and hood.

The results of the test are summarized in Figure A-144. Change in the vehicle's velocity was 6.4 mph and change in momentum was 534 lb-sec. Longitudinal occupant impact velocity was 10.1 fps and the maximum 0.010-second average occupant ridedown acceleration was -1.9 g.



FIGURE A-140. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 22.



FIGURE A-141. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 22.





FIGURE A-142. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 22.





FIGURE A-143. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 22.



FIGURE A-144. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 22.

A-177

# A-3-23. Test 23

A 1980 Honda, shown in Figure A-145, was directed into the sign at 62.8 mph. Test inertia mass of the vehicle was 1,833 lb and its gross static mass was 2,003 lb. Impact point was such that the vehicle bumper contacted both supports of the installation. Relative positions of the test vehicle and sign installation are shown in Figure A-145.

Approximately 0.010 sec after impact the supports began to split longitudinally and the sign panel separated from the supports. At 0.045 sec the lower sections of the supports began to fracture. By 0.096 sec the panel was on the roof and the supports were riding horizontally on the hood of the vehicle as shown in Figure A-146. The vehicle continued to travel 198 ft before coming to a stop.

The lower section of the left support fractured 35 in. above the ground and the right support fractured 38 in. above the ground. The upper sections of the supports rode with the vehicle for approximately 145 ft. Damage to the sign installation is shown in Figure A-147.

The front of the vehicle was deformed as shown in Figure A-148. The right front quarter received 1.0 in. crush at bumper height and 5.0 in. on the left side. The roof was scratched from the sign panel.

The results of this test are summarized in Figure A-149. Change in the vehicle's velocity at 0.300 seconds was 8.0 mph and change in momentum was 668 lb-sec. Longitudinal occupant velocity was 11.8 fps and the maximum 0.010-second average ridedown acceleration was -0.8 g.





FIGURE A-145. VEHICLE BEFORE TEST 23.

A-179



FIGURE A-146. SEQUENTIAL PHOTOGRAPHS FOR TEST 23.



FIGURE A-147. SIGN INSTALLATION AFTER TEST 23.




FIGURE A-148. VEHICLE AFTER TEST 23.



FIGURE A-149. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR TEST 23.

A-183

# APPENDIX B. PROPERTIES OF SIGN POSTS

B-1

### 8. PROPERTIES OF SIGN POSTS

Tests were conducted by an independent materials laboratory in Houston, Texas to determine the chemical, physical, and impact properties of each of the base-bending sign supports, which included supports in tests 3 through 23. A specimen was taken from the above-ground portion of the support system for analysis. The specimen was taken from an undeformed section. For tests in which multiple supports were used, the specimen was taken at random from one of the posts. Chemical and physical properties are given in Table B-1 and impact properties are given in Table B-2.

Charpy tests were conducted at both the ambient temperature at the time of the full-scale crash test and at 150°F. The latter value was selected as an "upper temperature limit" for a post in the field. In general, the fracture energy of a metal post increases as its temperature increases. Hence, if the post exhibits brittle fracture at 150°F it follows that it would do so at lower temperatures.

For each post evaluated, four Charpy tests were conducted -- two at the ambient temperature and two at  $150^{\circ}$ F. The thickness of the specimen cross section was that of the post, and the depth of the cross section (at the notch) was held constant at 0.314 -0.000 in. Results of the Charpy tests were normalized in terms of fracture energy per square inch of cross section at the notch.

CRASH	POST TYPE				·	-	Cher (Perc	(ICAL / ENT BY	WEIG	(S П)						MECHANICA YIELD	L PROPERTIES	
NO.	SIZE	C	Hn	Ρ	S	Si	Ni	Cr	Мо	Cu	A	Ti	Zn	Sn	Mg	(psi)	(psi)	(%)
3	Square Steel Tube 2" x 2" x 0.105"	0,100	0,35	0.005	0,019	(a)	0.01	(a)	(a)	0,02	0,013	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	55,400	58,100	25
4	Same as Test 3	0.099	0.36	0,006	0.020	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.04	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	50,70L	57,600	25
5	Square Steel Tube 1 3/4" x 1 3/4" x 0,105	0,054	0.25	0.012	0.021	0,06	0.02	0.03	(a)	0,06	ea. 0	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	50,000	56,500	21
6	Same as Test 5	0,053	0,25	0.008	0.022	0.05	0.04	0,03	(a)	0,08	0.08	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	45,600	55,000	24
7	Billet Steel U-Post 3 lo/ft	0.75	0,94	0.020	0,023	0 <i>,2</i> 7	0.08	0.16	10,0	0,40	0.02	(a)	(a)	0,03	(a)	102,000	162,000	7
8	Same as Test 7	0.74	1.02	0.019	0.020	0.38	0,10	0.16	0,01	0.41	0.03	(a)	(a)	0.03	(a)	104,000	162,000	10
9	Same as Test 7	0.75	0.93	0.018	0.020	0,26	0.09	0.17	0.02	0.40	0.03	(a)	(6)	0.04	(a)	105,000	163,000	ю
10	Same as Test 7	0.74	0.95	0.022	0.030	0.20	0.11	0.15	0.03	0.36	0.02	(a)	(a)	0.02	(a)	100,000	159,000	9
п	Billet Steel U-Post 4 lb/ft	0.75	0.81	0.011	0,028	0.13	0.12	0.16	0.02	0,34	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.02	(a)	84,100	147 ,200	n
12	Same as Test 11	0.74	0,81	0.012	0.031	0.14	0.11	0.16	0.02	0.34	(a)	(a)	(a)	0,02	(a)	86,700	147,400	12
13	Same as Test 11	0.73	0.81	0.028	0,034	0.15	0.10	0.15	0.02	0.34	0.03	(a)	(a)	0.02	(a)	98,000	156,000	12
14	Rail Steel U-Post 3 lb/ft	0.69	0,84	0 <b>.03</b> 8	0_015	0.16	0.02	០.០	(a)	0,18	0,04	(a)	(a)		(a)	72,200	133,200	14
15	Same as Test 14	0.74	0.82	0.005	050.0	0.16	0.07	0.04	0.01	0.07	0.06	(a)	(a)	_	(a)	78,300	137 Ann	12
16	Same as Test 7	0.75	0.70	0.006	0.017	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.02	0.24	0.04	(a)	(a)	_	(a)	85.100	147 300	12
17	Same as Test 7	0.69	0,83	0.018	0.021	0.22	0.15	0.14	0.02	0.46	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.02	(a)	88,700	146 600	14
18	Same as Test 7	0.76	0.76	0.008	0.017	о.ю	0.10	0.10	0.02	0,31	0.04	(a)	(6)	_	(a)	84,700	146.700	12
19	Same as Test 5	0.098	0,41	0.006	0.015	(a)	្រា	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.05	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	41,500	49,200	44
20	Same as Test 5	0.097	0.42	0.013	0.017	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	0.05	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	39,200	49,200	43
21	Same as Test 7	0.74	0.70	0.010	0.020	0.08	0.11	0,10	0.03	0.2	0.06	(a)	(a)	-	(a)	87,900	149,100	10
22	Same as Test 7	0.75	0.73	0.010	0.022	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.02	0.24	0.06	(a)	(a)	-	(a)	81,300	139.800	10
23	Same as Test 7	0.75	0.71	0.009	0.020	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.03	0.2	0.06	(a)	(a)		(a)	86,200	147,400	12

## TABLE 8-1. CHEMICAL AND MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF SIGN POSTS

(a)Less than 0.01

## TABLE B-2. IMPACT PROPERTIES OF SIGN POSTS

CRASH	POST TYPE	CHARPY FRACTUR (in1b/in	ROCKWELL	
TEST NO.	AND SIZE	AMBIENT TEMP. (°F) <sup>a</sup>	AT 150°F	HARDNESS
3	Square Steel Tube 2" x 2" x 0.105"	6560 (85) 6560 (85)	6560 6950	74.7 <sup>b</sup> 76.1 <sup>b</sup> 76.5 <sup>b</sup>
4	Same as Test 3	6950 (85) 6560 (85)	6560 6180	76.4 <sup>b</sup> 72.6 <sup>b</sup> 74.6 <sup>b</sup>
5	Square Steel Tube 1 3/4" x 1 3/4" x 0.105"	6348 (57) 6732 (57)	6732 6348	N/A
6	Same as Test 5	6348 (72) 6540 (72)	6732 6348	N/A
7	Billet Steel U-Post 3 lb/ft	768 (65) 576 (65)	576 960	N/A
8	Same as Test 7	576 (73) 384 (73)	960 768	N/A
9	Same as Test 7	576 (79) 576 (79)	768 768	N/A
10	Same as Test 7	768 (77) 768 (77)	960 960	N/A
11	Billet Steel U-Post 4 lb/ft	293 (68) 586 (68)	732 732	29.3 <sup>c</sup> 30.3 <sup>c</sup> 30.0 <sup>c</sup>
12	Same as Test 11	290 (72) 140 (72)	436 581	30.5 <sup>c</sup> 30.5 <sup>c</sup> 30.5 <sup>c</sup>
13	Same as Test 11	432 (67) 288 (67)	432 576	N/A
14	Rail Steel U-Post 3 lb/ft	650 (92) 810 (92)	485 650	27.0 <sup>c</sup> 25.0 <sup>c</sup> 30.1 <sup>c</sup>
15	Same as Test 14	440 (94) 585 (94)	730 585	27.9 <sup>c</sup> 27.8 <sup>c</sup> 28.0 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Number in parenthesis is temperature in degrees Fahrenheit; <sup>b</sup>Hardness "B"; <sup>c</sup>Hardness "C"

CRASH TEST NO.	POST TYPE AND SIZE	CHARPY FRACTUR (in1b/ir AMBIENT TEMP, (°F)a	RE ENERGY	ROCKWELL HARDNESS
16	Same as Test 7	325 (73) 485 (73)	670 485	29.8 <sup>c</sup> 30.1 <sup>c</sup>
17	Same as Test 7	488 (59) 651 (59)	976 976	29.9° 30.2° 31.2° 31.3°
18	Same as Test 7	485 (102) 485 (102)	650 650	29.6 <sup>c</sup> 26.4 <sup>c</sup> 25.9 <sup>c</sup>
19	Same as Test 5	10040 (89) 9650 (89)	9650 10040	65.4 <sup>b</sup> 65.1 <sup>b</sup> 69.8 <sup>b</sup>
20	Same as Test 5	9650 (89) 9650 (89)	9260 9260	58.3 <sup>b</sup> 63.5 <sup>b</sup> 59.2 <sup>b</sup>
21	Same as Test 7	325 (84) 655 (84)	655 815	30.3 <sup>c</sup> 30.2 <sup>c</sup> 30.4 <sup>c</sup>
22	Same as Test 7	645 (72) 645 (72)	645 645	29.1 <sup>c</sup> 29.3 <sup>c</sup> 29.4 <sup>c</sup>
23	Same as Test 7	655 (85) 490 (85)	655 655	30.2 <sup>c</sup> 30.2 <sup>c</sup> 30.5 <sup>c</sup>

# TABLE B-2. IMPACT PROPERTIES OF SIGN POSTS (concluded)

<sup>a</sup>Number in parenthesis is temperature in degrees Fahrenheit; <sup>b</sup>Hardness "B"; <sup>c</sup>Hardness "C"

APPENDIX C. SOIL PROPERTIES AT TEST SITE

-

### C. SOIL PROPERTIES AT TEST SITE

With the exception of tests 1 and 2, all sign posts were embedded in a test pit composed of a crushed limestone base material. The pit was 6 ft deep, 12 ft long, and 15 ft wide. The 12 ft dimension was in a direction parallel to the direction of the test vehicle's travel at impact. The soil and test pit dimensions were in accordance with recommended criteria of NCHRP 230 (<u>1</u>). The pit was filled with the "strong soil (S-1)" described in NCHRP 230.

Gradation of the test site soil, determined from previous research  $(\underline{6})$ , is shown in Figure C-1 together with recommended limits. The soil was compacted and the density was determined by AASHTO T99-70, Method C. The maximum soil density was 142 lb/ft<sup>3</sup> at a moisture content of 7.8%. The moisture-density curve is shown in Figure C-2. The soil can be seen in photos presented in Section A-3; for example, see Figure A-38.





FIGURE C-2. COMPACTED UNIT WEIGHT OF TEST SOIL (6)

COMPACTED UNIT WEIGHT (Ib/ft3)

C-4

# APPENDIX D. DATA ACQUISITION SYSTEMS

### D. DATA ACQUISITION SYSTEMS

#### D-1. Deceleration Measurements

Vehicle acceleration measurements were made by means of two longitudinally and one transversely oriented strain gage linear accelerometers attached to the floor of the vehicle. Each accelerometer was placed near the vehicle's center of mass, as shown in Figure A-1. The vertical position of the accelerometers was approximately 13.5 in. above ground. These accelerometers incorporate a balanced, fully active strain gage bridge which features rugged construction, low response to transverse accelerations, and high overload capacity. The particular units used had a measurement range of  $\pm 50$  g's with a bandwidth of 0 to 250 Hz. The nonlinearity and hysteresis is less than  $\pm 1\%$  full scale with infinite resolution.

The accelerometers were physically calibrated by means of a Genisco 1074 precision centrifuge at various input levels. These calibration values were used to establish an 'R' cal value which was transmitted just prior to a test as required in final data reduction. Signals from the accelerometers were transmitted via a telemetry system to the base station for recording on analog tape.

### D.2. High-Speed Cine

Three high-speed, ground mounted cameras were used to record the impact behavior of the test article and the vehicle. A fourth movie camera was used for documentary purposes, including real-time behavior of test vehicle and pre an postimpact scenes. Details of these cameras are given in Figure D-1 and Table D-1. The tests were also recorded on videotape for quick examination.

D-2



FIGURE D-1. CAMERA POSITIONS

# TABLE D-1. CAMERA DETAILS

\_\_\_\_

CAMERA NO.	ТҮРЕ	TYPICAL SPEED (Frames/sec)	BOUNDARIES OF SCENE	LENS	
1 <sup>a</sup>	Redlakes Hycam	1000	12 ft before and after impact	74 mm Wollensak	
2 <sup>a</sup>	Redlakes Locam	500	10 ft before and 40 ft after impact	12-120 mm Zoom Angeneaux	
3 <sup>a</sup>	Photosonics 1P	500	15 ft before and after impact	12-120 mm Zoom Angeneaux	
4	Arriflex-M	24	Documentary	17-70 mm Zoom Angeneaux	

<sup>a</sup>See Figure D-1.

APPENDIX E. REFERENCES

### REFERENCES

- Michie, Jarvis D., "Recommended Procedures for the Safety Performance Evaluation of Highway Appurtenances," National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 230, March 1981.
- 2. "Standard Specifications for Structural Supports for Highway Signs, Luminaires, and Traffic Signals," American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 1975.
- 3. "Recommended Procedures for Vehicle Crash Testing of Highway Appurtenances," Transportation Research Circular No. 191, Transportation Research Board, February 1978.
- 4. "Vehicle Damage Scale for Traffic Accident Investigators," Traffic Accident Data Project Bulletin No. 1, National Safety Council, 1971.
- 5. "Collision Deformation Classification, Recommended Practice J224a," Society of Automotive Engineers, New York, 1973.
- Ross, H. E., Jr., et al., "Crash Tests of Small Highway Sign Supports," Report No. FHWA/RD-80/502, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C., May 1980.