

February 22, 2021

1200 New Jersey Ave., SE Washington, D.C. 20590

In Reply Refer To: HSST-1/CC-165

Mr. John Annison Valmont Highway International Pty Ltd 57 – 65 Airds Road, Minto, NSW, 2566 Australia

Dear Mr. Annison:

This letter is in response to your September 10, 2020 request for the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to review a roadside safety device, hardware, or system for eligibility for reimbursement under the Federal-aid highway program. This FHWA letter of eligibility is assigned FHWA control number CC-165 and is valid until a subsequent letter is issued by FHWA that expressly references this device.

Decision

The following device is eligible within the length-of-need, with details provided in the form which is attached as an integral part of this letter:

• ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment

Scope of this Letter

To be found eligible for Federal-aid funding, new roadside safety devices should meet the crash test and evaluation criteria contained in the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials'(AASHTO) Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (MASH). However, the FHWA, the Department of Transportation, and the United States Government do not regulate the manufacture of roadside safety devices. Eligibility for reimbursement under the Federal-aid highway program does not establish approval, certification or endorsement of the device for any particular purpose or use.

This letter is not a determination by the FHWA, the Department of Transportation, or the United States Government that a vehicle crash involving the device will result in any particular outcome, nor is it a guarantee of the in-service performance of this device. Proper manufacturing, installation, and maintenance are required in order for this device to function as tested.

This finding of eligibility is limited to the crashworthiness of the system and does not cover other structural features, nor conformity with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

Eligibility for Reimbursement

Based solely on a review of crash test results and certifications submitted by the manufacturer, and the crash test laboratory, FHWA agrees that the device described herein meets the crash test and evaluation criteria of the AASHTO's MASH. Therefore, the device is eligible for reimbursement under the Federal-aid highway program if installed under the range of tested conditions.

 Name of system: ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment Type of system: Crash Cushion Test Level: Test Level 2 Testing conducted by: Karco Engineering Date of request: September 10, 2020

FHWA concurs with the recommendation of the accredited crash testing laboratory on the attached form.

Full Description of the Eligible Device

The device and supporting documentation, including reports of the crash tests or other testing done, videos of any crash testing, and/or drawings of the device, are described in the attached form.

<u>Notice</u>

This eligibility letter is issued for the subject device as tested. Modifications made to the device are not covered by this letter. Any modifications to this device should be submitted to the user (i.e., state DOT) as per their requirements.

You are expected to supply potential users with sufficient information on design, installation and maintenance requirements to ensure proper performance.

You are expected to certify to potential users that the hardware furnished has the same chemistry, mechanical properties, and geometry as that submitted for review, and that it will meet the test and evaluation criteria of AASHTO's MASH.

Issuance of this letter does not convey property rights of any sort or any exclusive privilege. This letter is based on the premise that information and reports submitted by you are accurate and correct. We reserve the right to modify or revoke this letter if: (1) there are any inaccuracies in the information submitted in support of your request for this letter, (2) the qualification testing was flawed, (3) in-service performance or other information reveals safety problems, (4) the system is significantly different from the version that was crash tested, or (5) any other information indicates that the letter was issued in error or otherwise does not reflect full and complete information about the crashworthiness of the system.

Standard Provisions

- To prevent misunderstanding by others, this letter of eligibility designated as FHWA control number CC-165 shall not be reproduced except in full. This letter and the test documentation upon which it is based are public information. All such letters and documentation may be reviewed upon request.
- This letter shall not be construed as authorization or consent by the FHWA to use, manufacture, or sell any patented system for which the applicant is not the patent holder.
- This FHWA eligibility letter is not an expression of any Agency view, position, or determination of validity, scope, or ownership of any intellectual property rights to a specific device or design. Further, this letter does not impute any distribution or licensing rights to the requester. This FHWA eligibility letter determination is made based solely on the crash-testing information submitted by the requester. The FHWA reserves the right to review and revoke an earlier eligibility determination after receipt of subsequent information related to crash testing.

Sincerely,

Michael & Juffith

Michael S. Griffith Director, Office of Safety Technologies Office of Safety

Enclosures

!-!-!

Request for Federal Aid Reimbursement Eligibility of Highway Safety Hardware

	Date of Request:	September 10, 2020	New	
Name: John Annison		John Annison		
Company: Valmont Highway International Pty Ltd		Ł		
jū	Address:	57 – 65 Airds Road, Minto, NSW, 2566		
Country: Australia				
To: Michael S. Griffith, Director FHWA, Office of Safety Technologies				

I request the following devices be considered eligible for reimbursement under the Federal-aid highway program.

Device & Testing	Criterion - Enter fr	om right to left	starting with Test Level

System Type	Submission Type	Device Name / Variant	Testing Criterion	Test Level
'CC': Crash Cushions, Attenuators, & Terminals	 Physical Crash Testing Engineering Analysis 	ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment	AASHTO MASH	TL2

By submitting this request for review and evaluation by the Federal Highway Administration, I certify that the product(s) was (were) tested in conformity with the AASHTO Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware and that the evaluation results meet the appropriate evaluation criteria in the MASH.

Individual or Organization responsible for the product:

Contact Name:	John Annison	Same as Submitter 🔀		
Company Name: Valmont Highway International Pty Ltd Same as Submitter 🔀				
Address:	57 – 65 Airds Road, Minto, NSW, 2566	Same as Submitter 🔀		
Country: Australia Same as Submitter 🔀				
Enter below all disclosures of financial interests as required by the FHWA `Federal-Aid Reimbursement Eligibility Process for Safety Hardware Devices' document.				
Valmont Highway International Pty Ltd and Karco LLC share no financial interests between the two organisations. This includes no shared financial interest but not limited to: 1. Compensation including wages, salaries, commissions, professional fees, or fees for business referrals. 2. Research funding or other forms of research support. 3. Patents, convrights, licenses, and other intellectual property interests.				

4. Business ownership and investment interests.

Version 10.0 (05/16) Page 2 of 9

PRODUCT DESCRIPTION

New Hardware or Significant Modification C Modification to **Existing Hardware**

The ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment is a gating, non-redirective End Treatment designed to protect the end of ArmorZone MASH TL2 temporary longitudinal water filled safety barriers from errant vehicles. The ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment is free standing and does not require anchoring to the road surface. It can be installed on concrete road surfaces (as tested) and also asphalt, gravel and dirt road surfaces. The ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment comprises of one yellow HDPE ArmorZone module which has had holes cut into its sides to prevent filling with water, and it also has had slots cut into the barrier sides and connector to initiate crumpling when impacted. The steel connector bar (which is present in the ArmorZone MASH TL2 longitude barriers) has been removed.

The dimensions of the ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment are the same as the ArmorZone MASH TL2 longitudinal barrier sections. Width 17.7 inches (450mm), Length 85 inches (2,160mm) Height 33.9 inches (860mm) and a weight of 56kg.

The connection between the ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment and the ArmorZone MASH TL2 temporary water filled longitudinal barrier is the same as what is used to connect each section of the ArmorZone MASH TL2 longitudinal barrier. It comprises of three HDPE lugs protruding from the end of the yellow module that interlinks with the three protruding lugs on the last barrier in the run. A steel twin pin connector is then inserted down through holes in each of the nested lugs, thus locking the ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment to the last ArmorZone barrier in the run.

For the TL2 tests conducted, the ArmorZone MASH TL2 end treatment was connected to a minimum of 21 units of the Armorzone MASH TL2 barrier for a total length of 154.0 ft. (48.4 m). All barrier units were filled with water to capacity via the fill hole at the top of each barrier. Each barrier weighed 124.0 lbs (56.2 kg) when empty and 1,030 lbs (467.2 kg) when filled to capacity. All units had a drain plug.

The ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment was tested to and passed MASH TL2 2-40, 2-41, 2-42, 2-43 and 2-44.

CRASH TESTING

By signature below, the Engineer affiliated with the testing laboratory, agrees in support of this submission that all of the critical and relevant crash tests for this device listed above were conducted to meet the MASH test criteria. The Engineer has determined that no other crash tests are necessary to determine the device meets the MASH criteria.

Engineer Name:	Steven Matsusaka Steven Matsusaka Digitally signed by Steven Matsusaka Digitally signed by Steven Matsusaka Disicre-Steven Matsusaka Disicre-Steven Matsusaka Disicre-Steven Matsusaka Disicre-Steven Matsusaka Disicre-Steven Matsusaka Disicre-Steven Matsusaka Disicre-Steven Matsusaka		
Engineer Signature:			
Address:	9270 Holly Rd, Adelanto, CA 92301	Same as Submitter 📋	
Country:	United States of America	Same as Submitter 🗌	
A hrief description of ea	ch crash test and its result:		

brief description of each crash test and its result:

Required Test Number	Narrative Description	Evaluation Results
2-30 (1100C)	Test for redirective crash cushions, not applicable to non-redirective crash cushions.	Non-Relevant Test, not conducted
2-31 (2270P)	Test for redirective crash cushions, not applicable to non-redirective crash cushions.	Non-Relevant Test, not conducted
2-32 (1100C)	Test for redirective crash cushions, not applicable to non-redirective crash cushions.	Non-Relevant Test, not conducted

Version 10.0 (05/16) Page 3 of 9

Required Test Number	Narrative Description	Evaluation Results
2-33 (2270P)	Test for redirective crash cushions, not applicable to non-redirective crash cushions.	Non-Relevant Test, not conducted
2-34 (1100C)	Test for redirective crash cushions, not applicable to non-redirective crash cushions.	Non-Relevant Test, not conducted
2-35 (2270P)	Test for redirective crash cushions, not applicable to non-redirective crash cushions.	Non-Relevant Test, not conducted
2-36 (2270P)	Test for redirective crash cushions, not applicable to non-redirective crash cushions.	Non-Relevant Test, not conducted
2-37 (2270P)	Test for redirective crash cushions, not applicable to non-redirective crash cushions.	Non-Relevant Test, not conducted
2-38 (1500A)	Test for redirective crash cushions, not applicable to non-redirective crash cushions.	Non-Relevant Test, not conducted

	The test article was aligned at a nominal		٦
	angle of 0 degrees, with the crash cushion		
	offset one quarter the vehicle's overall		
	width. The test was conducted using a		
	commercially available 2009 Kia Rio 4-door		
	sedan with a test inertial mass of 2,412.9 lbs.		
	(1,094.5 kg). The test was conducted with		
	the crash cushion and the longitudinal		
	barrier resting on a concrete surface.		
	Upon vehicle engagement with the end		
	treatment, the end treatment began to		
	crush. The end treatment was completely		
	crushed by approximately 0.144 s, at which		
	point the vehicle velocity was 27.1 mph		
	(43.6 km/h). As the end treatment was		
	crushing the entire Armorzone MASH TL2		
	longitudinal barrier was shifting rearward		
	and the first unit immediately behind the		
	end treatment began to deform. The		j
	barriers started to shift at approximately		
	0.016 s and the first unit began to lift		
	slightly off the ground and deform at about		
	The vehicle's yaw rotation rate increased		
	after the end treatment was crushed due to		
7 40 (11000)	the interaction with the neavier reinforced		
2-40 (1100C)	baling the and treatment defermed	PASS	
	bening the end treatment deformed		
	in the opposite direction. The vehicle last		
	contact with the unit at 0.49.7 s after which		
	the vehicle continued its you retation and		
	the installation continued to extend		
	towards the left (driver) side until it reached		
	a maximum dynamic deflection and		
	working width of 13.6 ft (4.1 m) and 15.0 ft		
	(4.6 m) respectively. The vehicle came to a		
	stop 31.6 ft (9.6 m) right and 13.1 ft (4.0 m)		
	downstream from the initial point of		
	contact.		
	The end treatment's performance was		
	deemed as acceptable to the MASH		
	standard based on the 2-40 test conducted.		
	The test device was penetrated in a		
	controlled fashion and without excessive		
	deceleration before coming to a controlled		
	stop. The vehicle was not penetrated and		
	there was not potential for article		
	penetration into the occupant		
	compartment. It is therefore recommended		
	that the performance of the Armorzone		ļ
	MASH TL2 End Treatment be considered as		
	satisfactory to test level 2 test 40.		

2-41 (2270P) The test article was aligned at a nominal angle of 0 degrees, with the centreline of the vehicle aligned with the longitudinal centreline of the end treatment. The test was conducted using a commercially available 2013 RAM 1500 4-door pickup truck with a test inertial mass of 4,980.2 lbs. (2,259.0 kg). The test vehicle impacted the system at a velocity of 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h) and an impact angle of 0.3°. The vehicle initial point of contact with the system was 1.0 in. (25 mm) from the intended impact point. The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The second unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approximately 0.20 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
 angle of 0 degrees, with the centreline of the vehicle aligned with the longitudinal centreline of the end treatment. The test was conducted using a commercially available 2013 RAM 1500 4-door pickup truck with a test inertial mass of 4,980.2 lbs. (2,259.0 kg). The test vehicle impacted the system at a velocity of 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h) and an impact angle of 0.3°. The vehicle initial point of contact with the system was 1.0 in. (25 mm) from the intended impact point. The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The system velocity 0.120 s. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approached the second unit's midpoint the front end began to pitch upward. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) the vehicle aligned with the longitudinal centreline of the end treatment. The test was conducted using a commercially available 2013 RAM 1500 4-door pickup truck with a test inertial mass of 4,980.2 lbs. (2,259.0 kg). The test vehicle impacted the system at a velocity of 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h) and an impact angle of 0.3°. The vehicle initial point of contact with the system was 1.0 in. (25 mm) from the intended impact point. The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approached the second unit's midpoint the front end began to lose its water at approximately 0.202 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) centreline of the end treatment. The test was conducted using a commercially available 2013 RAM 1500 4-door pickup truck with a test inertial mass of 4,980.2 lbs. (2,259.0 kg). The test vehicle impacted the system at a velocity of 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h) and an impact angle of 0.3°. The vehicle initial point of contact with the system was 1.0 in. (25 mm) from the intended impact point. The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The second unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) was conducted using a commercially available 2013 RAM 1500 4-door pickup truck with a test inertial mass of 4,980.2 lbs. (2,259.0 kg). The test vehicle impacted the system at a velocity of 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h) and an impact angle of 0.3°. The vehicle initial point of contact with the system was 1.0 in. (25 mm) from the intended impact point. The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The second unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approached the system began to defient unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.20 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
 available 2013 RAM 1500 4-door pickup truck with a test inertial mass of 4,980.2 lbs. (2,259.0 kg). The test vehicle impacted the system at a velocity of 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h) and an impact angle of 0.3°. The vehicle initial point of contact with the system was 1.0 in. (25 mm) from the intended impact point. The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The second unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approached the second unit's midpoint the front end began to pitch upward. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
 truck with a test inertial mass of 4,980.2 lbs. (2,259.0 kg). The test vehicle impacted the system at a velocity of 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h) and an impact angle of 0.3°. The vehicle initial point of contact with the system was 1.0 in. (25 mm) from the intended impact point. The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The second unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approached the second unit's midpoint the front end began to pitch upward. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
 (2,259.0 kg). The test vehicle impacted the system at a velocity of 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h) and an impact angle of 0.3°. The vehicle initial point of contact with the system was 1.0 in. (25 mm) from the intended impact point. The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The second unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approached the second unit's midpoint the front end began to pitch upward. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
2-41 (2270P) The test vehicle impacted the system at a velocity of 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h) and an impact angle of 0.3°. The vehicle initial point of contact with the system was 1.0 in. (25 mm) from the intended impact point. The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The second unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approached the second unit's midpoint the front end began to pitch upward. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) velocity of 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h) and an impact angle of 0.3°. The vehicle initial point of contact with the system was 1.0 in. (25 mm) from the intended impact point. The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The second unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approached the second unit's midpoint the front end began to pitch upward. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) approximately 0.220 sand the system began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 4 (2270P) 4 (2270P) 4 (2270P) 5 (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)
2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 3 (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)
2-41 (2270P) The vehicle's front bumper began to deform upon impact. The vehicle crushed the first unit and reached the second unit at approximately 0.120 s. The second unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approached the second unit's midpoint the front end began to pitch upward. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P)
2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P)
2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) (2-41 (2270P) (2-41 (2270P)) (2-41 (2270P) (2-41 (2270P)) (2-41 (2270P))
2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 4 (2270P
2-41 (2270P) began to lose its water at approximately (0.171 s. As the vehicle's front end approached the second unit's midpoint the front end began to pitch upward. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 2-41 (2270P) 4 approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
2-41 (2270P) approached the second unit's midpoint the front end began to pitch upward. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
2-41 (2270P) tront end began to pitch upward. The third unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
2-41 (2270P) unit began to lose its water at approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
approximately 0.220 sand the system began to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
to deflect to the right side. The vehicle continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
continued forward and reached a maximum pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
pitch angle of 12.5°. The first unit was underneath the vehicle when the front end
underneath the vehicle when the front end
returned to the ground. The vehicle came to
rest 25.2 ft. (7.7 m) downstream and 8.0 ft.
(2.4 m) left from its initial point of contact
with the system.
The Armorzone MASH TL2 End Treatment's
performance was deemed as acceptable to
the MASH standard based on the 2-41 test
conducted. The test device was penetrated
in a controlled fashion and without
excessive deceleration before coming to a
controlled stop. The vehicle was not
penetrated and there was not potential for
article penetration into the occupant
compartment. It is therefore recommended
that the performance of the Armorzone
MASH TL2 End Treatment be considered as
satisfactory to test level 2 test 41.

			rage 0 019
2-42 (1100C)	The test article was aligned at a nominal angle of 5 degrees, with the centreline of the vehicle aligned with the nose of the crash cushion. The test was conducted using a commercially available 2008 Kia Rio 4-door sedan with a test inertial mass of 2,410.7 lbs. (1,093.5 kg). The vehicle impacted the end treatment at an angle of 4.8° and a speed of 44.14 mph (71.04 km/h). Upon impact the empty module began to crush. The end treatment was completely crushed by approximately 0.126 s, at which point the vehicle's velocity was reduced to 29.43 mph (47.36 km/h). The vehicle remained relatively in its initial trajectory until the end treatment bottomed out and the first unit of the Armorzone began to deflect at about 0.140 s. The front of unit 1 was folded towards the field side at 0.275 s, which guided the vehicle towards the field side as it remained in contact with the end treatment. The vehicle continued forward and separated from the installation at 1.650 s. The vehicle came to a stop 25.9 ft. (7.9 m) right and 43.6 ft. (13.3 m) downstream from the initial point of contact. The Armorzone MASH TL2 End Treatment's performance was deemed as acceptable to the MASH standard based on the 2-42 test conducted. The test device was penetrated in a controlled fashion and without excessive deceleration before coming to a controlled stop. The vehicle was not penetrated and there was not potential for article penetration into the occupant compartment. It is therefore recommended that the end treatment be considered as satisfactory to test level 2 test 42.	PASS	

		i uge v	01.9
2-43 (2270P)	The test article was aligned at a nominal angle of 5 degrees, with the centreline of the vehicle aligned with the nose of the crash cushion. The test was conducted using a commercially available 2012 Ram 1500 pickup truck with a test inertial mass of 4,992.3 lbs. (2,264.5 kg). The vehicle impacted the end treatment at an angle of 5.4° and a speed of 44.59 mph (71 .76 km/h). Upon impact the empty unit began to crush. The end treatment was completely crushed by approximately 0.128 s, at which point the vehicle's velocity was reduced to 34.87 mph (56.12 km/h). As the end treatment was crushing the Armorzone barriers began to shift rearward. After the end treatment was completely crushed, unit 1 of the Armorzone barrier began to deform. Unit 1 was significantly deformed and released its water before the subsequent unit (Unit 2) began to deform at 0.202 s. Units 1 and 2 began their deformation in a similar manner as a crease was created at the top of both upstream ends of the units, which caused the upstream end to bend upwards. This motion caused the vehicle to pitch nose up as it continued forward, which prevented any other Armorzone units from crushing. The vehicle reached a maximum pitch and roll angle of 34 .7° (at 0.952 s) and 10.7° (at 0.563 s), respectively, before coming to a stop. The vehicle came to a stop 2.2 ft. (0.7 m) right and 2.6 ft. (0.8 m) downstream from the initial point of contact. The Armorzone MASH TL2 End Treatment's performance was deemed as acceptable to the MASH standard based on the 2-43 test conducted. The test device was penetrated in a controlled fashion and without excessive deceleration before coming to a controlled fashion and without	PASS	
	conducted. The test device was penetrated		
	in a controlled fashion and without		
	controlled stop. The vehicle was not		
	penetrated and there was not potential for		
	article penetration into the occupant		
	compartment. It is therefore recommended		
	that the end treatment be considered as		
	satisfactory to test level 2 test 43.		

2-44 (2270P)	The test article was aligned at a nominal angle of 20 degrees, with the centre of the vehicle aligned to the corner to the backup structure which in this case was the Armorzone MASH TL2 longitudinal barrier. The test was conducted using a commercially available 2012 RAM 1500 pickup truck with a test inertial mass of 4,992.3 lbs. (2,264.5 kg). The test was conducted with twenty-one (21) Armorzone units behind the end treatment, the first eight (8) units behind the end treatment were on concrete and the remaining rested on compacted soil. The intended impact point for this test was established by having the centre of the vehicle aligned with the field side front corner of the first Armorzone unit. This resulted in first contact occurring between the respective corners of the vehicle's bumper and the end treatment. The test vehicle impacted the end treatment at a velocity of 46.42 mph (7 4.71 km/h) and an impact angle of 20.5°. The impact forced the end treatment and Armorzone units to rotate towards the field side and rearwards about the original tangent installation. All units remained attached to one another and the vehicle separated from the article at 0.605 s. The vehicle's exit speed and angle upon exit were 23.63 mph (38.03 km/h) and 17.2°, respectively. The vehicle gated through the system in a stable manner. The end treatment's performance was deemed as acceptable to the MASH standard based on the 2-44 test conducted. The test vehicle came to a controlled stop and remained upright. The test vehicle was not penetrated and the occupant compartment deformation limits were not exceeded. This test is primarily intended to evaluate	PASS
2-45 (1500A)	the performance of a staged terminal or crash cushion. The ArmorZone MASH TL2 End Treatment is not a staging device and therefore this test was not conducted.	Non-Relevant Test, not conducted

Full Scale Crash Testing was done in compliance with MASH by the following accredited crash test laboratory (cite the laboratory's accreditation status as noted in the crash test reports.):

Version 10.0 (05/16)

Laboratory Name:	Applus IDIADA KARCO Engineering, LLC	
Laboratory Signature:	Steven Matsusaka	Digitally signed by Steven Matsusaka DN: cn=Steven Matsusaka, email=steven matsusaka⊛idiada com, c=US Date: 2020.09.10 19:04:55 -07'00'
Address:	9270 Holly Rd, Adelanto, CA 92301	Same as Submitter
Country:	United States of America	Same as Submitter 🗌
Accreditation Certificate Number and Dates of current Accreditation period :	TL-371, July 15, 2020 - July 15, 2022	

Submitter Signature*:

0 [17 Sept 2020

Submit Form

ATTACHMENTS

Attach to this form:

1) Additional disclosures of related financial interest as indicated above.

- 2) A copy of the full test report, video, and a Test Data Summary Sheet for each test conducted in support of this request.
- 3) A drawing or drawings of the device(s) that conform to the Task Force-13 Drawing Specifications [Hardware Guide Drawing Standards]. For proprietary products, a single isometric line drawing is usually acceptable to illustrate the product, with detailed specifications, intended use, and contact information provided on the reverse. Additional drawings (not in TF-13 format) showing details that are relevant to understanding the dimensions and performance of the device should also be submitted to facilitate our review.

FHWA Official Business Only:

Eligibil	ity Letter	
Number	Date	Key Words

MASH Test 2-40 Summary







-31.6 ft. [9.6 m]

General Information

Test Agency KARCO Test No	KARCO Engineering, LLC. P38213-01
Test Designation	
Test Date	

Test Article

	Name / Model	Armorzone MASH TL2 End Treatment
	Туре	Crash Cushion
	Installation Length	144.6 ft. (44.1 m)
	Terminal Length	End Treatment & Pin
	Road Surface	Concrete
_		

Test Vehicle

Type / Designation	. 1100C
Year, Make, and Model	2009 Kia Rio
Curb Mass	2,407.4 lbs (1,092.0 kg)
Test Inertial Mass	2,412.9 lbs (1,094.5 kg)
Gross Static Mass	2,577.2 lbs (1,169.0 kg)

Figure 8 Summary of Test 2-40

Impact Conditions	
Impact Velocity	44.26 mph (71.23 km/h)
Impact Angle	0.0°
Location / Orientation	1/4 Offset
Kinetic Energy	158.0 kip-ft (214.2 kJ)

Exit Conditions

Exit Velocity	N/A
Exit Angle	N/A
Final Vehicle Position	31.6 ft. (9.6 m) downstream
	13.1 ft. (4.0 m) Right
Exit Box Criteria Met	N/A
Vehicle Snagging	None
Vehicle Pocketing	None
Vehicle Stability	Satisfactory
Maximum Roll Angle	-9.3 °
Maximum Pitch Angle	8.9 °
Maximum Yaw Angle	127.9 °

Occupant Risk

0.425 s

Longitudinal OIV	28.9 ft/s (8.8 m/s)
Lateral OIV	1.3 ft/s (0.4 m/s)
Longitudinal RA	-7.4 g
Lateral RA	-4.4 g
THIV	28.9 ft/s (8.8 m/s)
PHD	. 7.7 g
ASI	.0.69

1.300 s

Test Article Deflections

Static	13.6 ft. (4.1 m)
Dynamic	13.6 ft. (4.1 m)
Working Width	15.0 ft (4.6 m)
Debris Field	N/A

Vehicle Damage

Vehicle Damage Scale	. 12-FD-3
CDC	12FDEW2
Maximum Intrusion	0.2 in. (5 mm)

MASH Test 2-41 Summary





0.100 s

0.350 s

0.850 s



2.000 s



GENERAL INFORMATION	Impact Conditions	Occupant Risk
Test Agency KARCO Engineering, LLC.	Impact Velocity 43.98 mph (70.78 km/h)	Longitudinal OIV 23.3 ft/s (7.1 m/s)
KARCO Test No P38214-01	Impact Angle 0.3°	Lateral OIV 0.0
Test Designation 2-41	Location / Orientation 1.0 in. (25 mm) left	Longitudinal RA4.2 g
Test Date	Kinetic 322.0 kip-ft (436.6 kJ)	Lateral RA 1.6 g
		THIV 23.3 ft/s (7.1 m/s)
TEST ARTICLE	Exit Conditions	PHD
Name / Model ArmorZone TL2 End Treatment	Exit VelocityN/A	ASI
Type Crash Cushion	Exit Angle N/A	
Installation Length 155.8 ft. (47.5 m)	Final Vehicle Position 25.2 ft. (7.7 m) Downstream	Test Article Deflections
Terminal Length 7.1 ft. (2.2 m)	8.0 ft. (2.4 m) Right	Static
Road Surface Concrete	Exit Box Criteria Met N/A	Dynamic
	Vehicle Snagging None	Working Width 11.3 ft. (3.4 m)
TEST VEHICLE	Vehicle PocketingNone	Debris Field N/A
Type / Designation 2270P	Vehicle Stability Satisfactory	
Year, Make, and Model 2013 RAM 1500	Maximum Roll Angle 14.2 °	Vehicle Damage
Curb Mass 4,877.6 lbs (2,212.5 kg)	Maximum Pitch Angle12.5 °	Vehicle Damage Scale 12-FC-5
Test Inertial Mass 4,980.2 lbs (2,259.0 kg)	Maximum Yaw Angle19.2 °	CDC 12FCEW3
Gross Static Mass 4,980.2 lbs (2,259.0 kg)		Maximum Intrusion0.3 in. (8 mm)

Figure 11 Summary of Test 2-41

MASH Test 2-44 Summary



0.000 s



0.150 s





0.550 s



0.950 s



0.350 s

General Information

Test Agency KARCO Test No Test Designation	. KARCO Engineering, LLC. . P38227-01 2-44
Test Article Name / Model Type	Armorzone MASH TL2 End Treatment
Installation Length	144.6 ft. (44.1 m) End Treatment unit and pin
Road Surface	Concrete

Type / Designation	. 2270P
Year, Make, and Model	. 2012 Ram 1500
Curb Mass	. 4,943.8 lbs (2,242.5 kg)
Test Inertial Mass	4,992.3 lbs (2,264.5 kg)
Gross Static Mass	. 4,992.3 lbs (2,264.5 kg)

Figure 14 Summary of Test 2-44

Impact Conditions	
Impact Velocity	46.42 mph (74.71 km/h)
Impact Angle	. 20.5°
Location / Orientation	Vehicle CL to LON CIP
Kinetic Energy	. 359.6 kip-ft (487.6 kJ)

Exit Conditions

Exit Velocity	23.63 mph (38.03 km/h)
Exit Angle	17.2°
Final Vehicle Position	82.3 ft. (25.1 m) dw
	48.1 ft. (14.7 m) Right
Vehicle Snagging	N/A
Vehicle Pocketing	None
Vehicle Stability	None
Maximum Roll Angle	Satisfactory
Maximum Pitch Angle	-1.6 °
Maximum Yaw Angle	-5.4 °
Maximum Yaw Angle	-20.9

Occupant Risk	
Longitudinal OIV	29.9 ft/s (9.1 m/s)
Lateral OIV	2.0 ft/s (0.6 m/s)
Longitudinal RA	3.9 g
Lateral RA	1.5 g
THIV	29.9 ft/s (9.1 m/s)
PHD	3.9 g
ASI	0.96
Static	14.3 ft. (4.4 m)
	13.7 II. (4.0 III)
Vahiala Damana	
Vehicle Damage	
<u>Vehicle Damage</u> Vehicle Damage Scale	12-FD-3
<u>Vehicle Damage</u> Vehicle Damage Scale CDC	12-FD-3 12FDEW2

MASH Test 2-42 Summary



0.000 s

0.150 s



0.550 s





General Information

Test Agency	KARCO Engineering, LLC.
KARCO Test No	P38215-01
Test Designation	2-42
Test Date	
Test Article	
Name / Model	Armorzone MASH TL2 End Treatmer
Туре	Crash Cushion
Installation Length	144.6 ft. (44.1 m)
Terminal Length	End Treatment unit and pin
Road Surface	Concrete
Test Vehicle	
Type / Designation.	1100C
Year, Make, and Mo	odel 2008 Kia Rio
Curb Mass	
Test Inertial Mass	

Gross Static Mass......2,576.1 lbs (1,168.5 kg)

Figure 17 Summary of Test 2-42

mpact Conditions	
Impact Velocity	44.14 mph (71.04 km/h)
Impact Angle	. 4.8°
Location / Orientation	Vehicle CL to nose of system
Kinetic Energy	. 157.0 kip-ft (212.9 kJ)

Exit Conditions

Exit Velocity	. 7.43 mph (11.96 km/h)
Exit Angle	28.5°
Final Vehicle Position	. 43.6 ft. (13.3 m) dw
	25.9 ft. (7.9 m) Right
Vehicle Snagging	None
Vehicle Pocketing	. None
Vehicle Stability	. Satisfactory
Maximum Roll Angle	4.8 °
Maximum Pitch Angle	. 4.3 °
Maximum Yaw Angle	23.5 °

Occupant Risk

Longitudinal OIV	30.8 ft/s (9.4 m/s)
Lateral OIV	4.6 ft/s (1.4 m/s)
Longitudinal RA	8.1 g
Lateral RA	3.8 g
THIV	31.2 ft/s (9.5 m/s)
PHD	8.3 g
ASI	0.84

Test Article Deflections

Static	2.3 ft. (0.7 m)
Dynamic	4.9 ft. (1.5 m)
Working Width	6.3 ft (1.9 m)

Vehicle Damage

Vehicle Damage Scale	12-FD-3
CDC	12FDEW2
Maximum Intrusion	0.6 in. (15 mm)

MASH Test 2-43 Summary



0.000 s

0.050 s

0.300 s

0.800 s





General Information	Impact Conditions	Occupa
Test Agency KARCO Engineering, LLC.	Impact Velocity 44.59 mph (71.76 km/h)	Longit
KARCO Test No P38216-01	Impact Angle5.4°	Latera
Test Designation 2-43	Location / Orientation Vehicle CL to nose of system	n Longit
Test Date	Kinetic Energy 331.8 kip-ft (449.9 kJ)	Latera
		THIV.
Test Article	Exit Conditions	PHD
Name / Model Armorzone MASH TL2 End Treatment	Exit Box Criteria Met N/A	ASI
TypeCrash Cushion	Exit Velocity N/A	
Installation Length 144.6 ft. (44.1 m)	Exit Angle 2.6 ft. (0.8 m) Up	Test Art
Terminal Length End Treatment unit and pin	Final Vehicle Position2.2 ft. (0.7 m) Right	Static
Road Surface Concrete	N/A	Dynar
	Vehicle Snagging Satisfactory	Worki
Test Vehicle	Vehicle Pocketing Satisfactory	
Type / Designation 2270P	Vehicle Stability Satisfactory	Vehicle
Year, Make, and Model 2012 RAM 1500	Maximum Roll Angle9.3 °	Vehic
Curb Mass 5,054.0 lbs (2,292.5 kg)	Maximum Pitch Angle 8.9 °	CDC.
Test Inertial Mass4,992.3 lbs (2,264.5 kg)	Maximum Yaw Angle 127.9 °	Maxim

Occupant Risk	
Longitudinal OIV	28.9 ft/s (8.8 m/s)
Lateral OIV	1.3 ft/s (0.4 m/s)
Longitudinal RA	-7.4 g
Lateral RA	-4.4 g
THIV	28.9 ft/s (8.8 m/s)
PHD	. 7.7 g
ASI	. 0.69
Test Article Deflections	
Static	. 1.9 ft. (1.4 m)
Dynamic	. 4.6 ft. (1.4 m)
Working Width	. 13.6 ft (4.1 m)
Vehicle Damage	
Tornolo Bullugo	

<u>venicie Danage</u>			
	Vehicle Damage Scale	12-FC-5	
	CDC	12FDEW2	
	Maximum Intrusion	0.3 in. (7 mm)	

Figure 20 Summary of Test 2-43

Gross Static Mass...... 4,992.3 lbs (2,264.5 kg)

