From: Artimovich, Nick (FHWA)
To: "Piper, Dave L"
Subject: RE: ET Plus
Date: Thursday, October 11, 2012 3:33:31 PM
Attachments: CC_0094_Acceptance_Letter_09-02-2005.pdf

Dave,
Here is our reply to your inquiry regarding the ET-Plus terminals.

On February 14, 2012, Barry Stephens and Brian Smith of Trinity Highway Products (Trinity) stated the company's ET end terminal with the 4-inch wide guide channels was crash tested at the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) in May 2005. Roger Bligh of TTI confirmed this information on February 14, 2012. Trinity submitted documentation on various dates of changes made to its ET end terminals, which included changes from the ET-2000 to the ET-Plus. On February 14, 2012, the company reported the reduction in the width of the guide channels from 5 inches (in the year 2000) to 4 inches (in 2005) was a design detail omitted from the documentation submitted to the Agency on August 10, 2005. On March 15, 2012, Trinity submitted a letter to FHWA dated March 14, 2011 (sic), which stated its ET-Plus with the 4-inch guide channels was crash tested at TTI in May 2005. The Trinity ET-Plus end terminal with the 4-inch guide channels is eligible for reimbursement under the Federal-Aid Highway Program under FHWA letter CC-94 of September 2, 2005.

FHWA Letter CC-94 is attached.

Regards,

Nicholas Artimovich, II
Highway Engineer, Office of Safety Technologies
Federal Highway Administration HSST
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Room E71-322
Washington, DC 20590
email: nick.artimovich@dot.gov
phone: 202-366-1331
fax: 202-366-3222
web: http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov

From: Piper, Dave L [mailto:Dave.Piper@illinois.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 05, 2012 5:47 PM
To: Artimovich, Nick (FHWA)
Cc: Ho, Alan (FHWA); Tobias, Priscilla A
Subject: ET Plus

We have heard of changes to the ET Plus terminal that reduce the opening in the extruder head. Attached are photos from Illinois showing differing construction where the horizontal channels are welded to the inlet of the extruder. In one case, the older one on wood posts, the channels are butt welded. The other photo, showing an impact head that has been hit, the channels extend into the extruder head.

Our specifications require that guardrail terminals be accepted by FHWA, on the Department's list of approved devices and be according to manufacturer's specifications. We have been unable to confirm that this change to the insertion of the channels into the extruder head and apparent reduction of the opening was accepted by FHWA. Has FHWA accepted this modification?