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1. The proprietary devices are testing to 31 inch not 27-3/4 inch. Why test to anything less? Moving forward no 27-3/4 inch systems will be tested.
2. 36 inch high MGS is available
3. Everyone is going to 31 inch high guardrail…someday.
4. Both 8 and 12 inch blockouts are used by the member States. Performance is very similar and acknowledged to be so according to FHWA. It is agreed by the States, the default blockout depth for testing purposes is 8 inches unless an exception is identified. The objective is to get eligibility for both 8 and 12 inch depths.
5. Further discussion on Wednesday regarding weak post guardrail system. PDOT about the only state using it. We can probably get an eligibility letter on
6. it. Only 3 states wished to pursue.
7. Short radius guardrail
8. Derwood (Florida) is funding three tests independent of the group: 1) 31 inch MGS GR w/ rubrail, 2) anchored base plated post for use at obstructions, and 3) combination pedestrian bridge rail -36 single slope with handrail to make it 42 inches tall
9. How to handle different wood post types? Roger described that historically Southern Yellow Pine and Douglass Fir have been considered equivalents and FHWA concurs. Eric Emerson (Wisconsin) sponsored White Pine post testing. Revisit this issue per Carlos Torres at a point in the future. MWRSF believe the post types are comparable in the MGS.
10. MGS on 8:1 slope; Need it = 1; The rest of the group were - it would be nice to have.
11. Non-blocked out MGS half post spacing & other special conditions; Need it = 2; 13 no. Roger said MWRSF Pooled Fund is funding this effort through NDOR.
12. MGS different flare rate tests; Need it=2
13. MGS with curb and missing a post; Programmed for testing through the MWRSF Pooled Fund
14. W-beam (8” bo) 12’-6” steel post spacing on curb (TL-2); Need it =5
15. MGS w/reduced post spacing (nested and not); Need it=15
16. GR systems in mow strips/leave outs; Need it=13
17. Steel posts vs. wood post discussion by Bligh; Nick said MGS has been tested with both in the LON. Nick suggested additional analyses of the MGS tests to come to a conclusion. Nick said both steel and wood posts are required for proprietary terminals. Will suggested contacting MWRSF to see if the analyses were already performed.
18. Do we need to run the 1100C on the modified G2(weak post W-beam 12-6 spacing). Eric and Roger both think it does not need to be tested. Need it=3
19. \*\*\*\*\*CONCRETE SECTION DISCUSSION\*\*\*\*\*
20. Need AASHTO’s buy in based on structural analysis that Jersey shape is most critical and that if a bridge rail section is tested then a median version is acceptable or vice versa if LRFD strength calculations are used to support foundation details are sufficient…albeit over designed? Need to look at embedment/anchoring for median version vs. bridge rail/deck version. Will noted they are very much two different animals. Contact AASHTO TCRS Task Force chair – Keith Kota per Nick.
21. New Jersey barrier does not need to be included going forwarded. Will be deleted.
22. Nick asked is there any support for a concrete barrier lower than 36 inches tall? The group agreed there is not. The need is to address TL-4 only. Derwood noted in the future there is a desire for a low-profile barrier.
23. TL-3 median barrier use = 11
24. MASSDOT does not use cast-in-place barriers…only pre-cast.
25. Is additional research needed for permanent installation concrete median barriers? Need=17
26. How many states use what shape of barriers?
    1. F-shape =8
    2. Single Slope=12
27. Roger said we do not have any MASH tests on the F-shape barrier. Do we need to perform at least one test (go beyond just getting an eligibility letter)? Need=0
28. Roger thinks we have all the geometric shapes covered for testing purposes. We need to concentrate on the foundation types and options for testing to evaluate anchorage. One option is keying the barrier in; place on concrete and key in with asphalt. Another option is to leave some starter bars sticking above grade to tie to. Evaluate TL4 loading and apply results to other shapes with similar height. Members that use single slope barriers =10. 36 inch minimum height agreed to. Design foundation for a 42 inch barrier. All states agreed we are going to proceed with this effort
29. SCORE CARD 2
30. MGS Buried in Back Slope Terminal – 10 members use it
31. MGS Bullnose – Dick Albin noted the MWRSF pooled fund would like to investigate this pooled fund doing some of the testing. States that use the Bullnose system=10. States that want to pursue=11.
32. Group wants an eligibility letter on the TXDOT DAT (if TXDOT approves)
33. Low-tension 3-cable system is only used by 2 or 3 States. We will not invest in cable systems this year.
34. High Tension 3 cable generic system – No desire to do anything.
35. NCIAS – No desire to do anything
36. Fund TTI working on and maintaining the score card and developing score card 3. All States in favor.