

Note to reviewers:

This document is a **draft version** of the Roadside Design Manual and is being circulated for consultation on proposed technical and editorial revisions to the 2023 edition.

As the document is still under review, final formatting, editing, and quality assurance checks have not yet been completed. Additional revisions are anticipated as a result of the consultation process. Consequently, reviewers may encounter inconsistencies in figure and table numbering, page layout, spacing, cross-references, pagination, and other formatting elements.

While every effort has been made to ensure the draft is coherent and readable, reviewers are requested to focus their comments on the proposed technical content and editorial changes. A comprehensive formatting, editorial, and quality review will be undertaken prior to publication of the final document. Comments related solely to formatting, pagination, numbering, or document layout are generally not required at this stage, unless they affect the interpretation of the technical content.

Thank you for your feedback and participation in this consultation.

ROADSIDE DESIGN MANUAL

DRAFT - JULY 2026

DRAFT

HIGHWAY STANDARDS BRANCH
HIGHWAY DESIGN OFFICE

DRAFT

Record of Revisions

This version of the Roadside Design Manual dated July 2023 includes Edition #3 and supersedes the previous edition. Changes from the previous edition are summarized below.

All Chapters

- All references to freeways are replaced with “freeways and high-speed divided highways”

Chapter 1

- Figure 1-2 updated with 2023 data for fatal run-off-road collisions

Chapter 2

- Section 2.3.1 added clarification between the terms “clear zone” and “desirable clear zone”
- Revised desirable clear zone calculation to a relative-risk approach for design speeds 90 km/h and above based on NCHRP Report 1097. Approach introduces reduced desirable clear zones for intermittent and isolated obstacles. Existing deterministic approach retained for design speeds less than 90 km/h.
- Section 2.3.2 clarified wording related to traversable, non-recoverable foreslopes.
- Section 2.3.5 added a consideration for enhanced rock cut removal when winter shading causes operational concerns.
- Section 2.3.6 clarified wording on the function of a median barrier
- Section 2.3.6.1 replaced the methodology for median barrier selection based on NCHRP Report 996

Chapter 3

- Section 3.1.6 added clarification that shoulder widening to accommodate shy line values is not recommended
- Section 3.1.7.1 moved discussion on legacy barrier from evaluation procedure to earlier in Chapter 3
- Section 3.1.8.1 added new section on Legacy Approach End Terminals with a requirement to replaced eccentric loader terminals – guidance relocated from CDED chapter.
- Section 3.1.8.2 added new section on Legacy Leaving End Terminals including requirement to replace turned-down and unanchored “fishtail” leaving ends with a current system.

- Section 3.3.3.3 removed all references to cable guiderail in evaluation procedure. Added new evaluation procedure for existing high-tension cable guiderail
- **Section 3.3.3.4** added new section with evaluation procedure for existing steel beam energy attenuating terminals.

Chapter 4

- Section 4.1.2 added new subsection on Zone of Intrusion
- Section 4.2.1 added new TL-4 High Tension 4-Cable Guiderail
- Section 4.2.1 added language on designer flexibility to extend upstream end of high tension cable guiderail to accommodate grading requirements, similar to steel beam guidance.
- Section 4.2.2.1 added guidance on the use of deeper offset blocks to accommodate underground conflicts with guiderail posts.
- Section 4.2.2.1 added clarification that guiderail installations should not be located more than 4.0 m from edge of travelled way
- Section 4.2.2.1 added option for base plating to a buried concrete slab
- Table 4-1 added entry for Type M20 with half post spacing and continuous HSS tube offset
- Section 4.2.2.1 added guidance on exposure of unanchored SBGR ends to traffic during staged construction.
- Section 4.2.2.1 added Midwest thrie beam buttress connection to concrete parapet ends.
- Section 4.2.2.1.1 new subsection on N-Cap plastic post covers for Type M SBGR to protect pedestrians and cyclists from sharp edges on the posts
- Section 4.2.2.2 replaced ACP Sentry proprietary with Safe Direction RamShield
- Section 4.2.2.4 added subsection on Multifunctional Barrier System from NCHRP Report 1018
- Section 4.2.4 added guidance recommending the use of TL-4 thrie beam roadside barriers on freeways and high-speed divided highways where barriers are used to shield water hazards
- Section 4.3 removed ACP Sentry Median Guide Rail as a semi-rigid median barrier option.
- Section 4.3.1 added guidance on considerations on how to address ongoing maintenance requirements after a median cable guiderail is installed, including the need to consult with Maintenance section when scoping a new median barrier in capital contracts.
- Section 4.3.3 removed ACP Sentry median barrier, renumbered subsequent sections.

- Section 4.4.1.6 added new section on Next Generation Terminal SBEAT
- Section 4.4 removed guidance on the use of redirective, gating single-sided crash cushions and removed references to the BB-BEAT and QuadTrend
- Section 4.4.2.1 added clarification that two narrow crash cushions side by side are not an acceptable replacement for a wide crash cushion
- Section 4.4.2.4 updated QuadGuard M10 to include permanent wide variation
- Section 4.4.2.9 added section on TAU-XR crash cushion
- Section 4.5 rewritten guidance on posts and sign supports. New subsections describing small sign supports including wooden breakaway, Rib-Bak, Sqr-Loc, Franklin U-channel, Telespar breakaway, Ecoposte and U-Flange non-breakway sign supports
- Section 4.5.2 rewritten guidance on intermediate sign supports, including new subsection 4.5.2.2 for Highway Gator system.
- Section 4.6 added guidance on location of ramp closure gates

Chapter 5

- Section 5.1 added guidance on consideration of the implications of the use of anchors for temporary barriers.
- Section 5.1.2.4 added option for PVC sleeves in the 9 m Type X barrier
- Section 5.1.2.6 new section on Type H temporary concrete barrier
- Section 5.1.3.2 renamed section title to Concrete Reactive Tension Barrier. Added description on Variable Length Barrier segments and additional system details
- Section 5.2.1.4 new section on Tall42 Movable TCB
- Table 5-1 removed ACZ 350 crash cushion
- Section 5.2 added guidance on the use of High Exposure crash cushions
- Section 5.2.1.3 removed section on ACZ 350 crash cushion.
- Section 5.2.1.3 new section on Quash crash cushion

Appendix A

- No Changes

Appendix B

- Added definitions for Crashworthy and Desirable Clear Zone
- Other changes consistent with the Design Supplement updates

DRAFT

Table of Contents	Page
1. Introduction	1-1
1.1 Key Terms Used in Manual	1-4
1.2 The Importance of Roadside Design	1-6
1.3 Historical Perspective	1-8
1.4 Contents of the Manual	1-10
1.5 Safety Sensitive Design	1-11
1.6 Risk Mitigation and Treatment	1-13
1.7 Relationship to Other Design Documents	1-15
2. Roadside Design Policies, Standards and Guidelines.....	2-1
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Design Procedures and Roadside Safety Hardware	2-3
2.3 Roadside Design	2-4
2.3.1 Desirable Clear Zone	2-4
2.3.2 Slopes	2-8
2.3.3 Shoulder Rounding	2-15
2.3.4 Drainage Ditches	2-16
2.3.5 Rock Cuts	2-18
2.3.6 Freeway Medians	2-20
2.3.7 Freeway Median Crossovers and Openings	2-24
2.3.8 Ramp Bullnoses	2-26
2.3.9 Curbs	2-27
2.3.10 Water Bodies	2-28
2.3.11 Culvert Ends	2-29
2.3.12 Poles, Sign Support and Other Roadside Equipment	2-30
2.3.12.1 Luminaire Supports, Signal Poles and High Mast Poles	2-30
2.3.12.2 Sign Support	2-31
2.3.12.3 Utility Poles and Other Roadside Equipment	2-31
2.4 Roadside Safety Hardware	2-32
2.4.1 New Roadside Safety Hardware Installations	2-32
2.4.2 Existing Roadside Hardware Installations	2-37

2.4.3	Barrier System Length of Need	2-38
2.4.4	Barrier System Transitions and Connections	2-40
2.4.5	Barrier System Terminals and End Treatments	2-41
2.4.6	Leaving Ends of Barrier Systems	2-42
2.4.7	Barrier Systems on Overland Flow Routes and Flood Plains	2-43
2.4.8	Sign Support Systems	2-44
2.4.9	Anti-Glare Screen	2-46
2.5	Temporary Barrier Systems in Work Zones	2-47
2.5.1	Temporary Barrier Adjacent to Excavations and Roadway Protection Systems ..	2-47
2.5.2	Temporary Barriers Adjacent to Edge of Structures and Scaffolding	2-49
3.	Roadside Design Process	3-1
3.1	Introduction	3-1
3.1.1	Design Process	3-1
3.1.2	Desirable Clear Zone	3-2
3.1.3	Identifying Areas of Concern	3-7
3.1.4	Risk Mitigation Strategies	3-9
3.1.5	Shielding Obstacles with Roadside Hardware	3-10
3.1.6	Barrier System Length of Need	3-11
3.1.7	Barrier System Selection	3-16
3.1.8	End Terminal and Crash Cushion Selection	3-18
3.1.9	Desirable Clear Zone	3-22
3.2	Benefit Cost Evaluation	3-23
3.2.1	Encroachment Rate and Probability	3-24
3.2.2	Severity	3-25
3.2.3	Implementation Costs	3-26
3.2.4	Economic Factor Selection	3-27
3.3	Documentation Requirements	3-28
3.3.1	Clear Zone Documentation	3-28
3.3.2	Contract Drawings	3-28
3.3.3	Existing Guide Rail Evaluations and Guide Rail Evaluation Reports	3-29
3.3.3.1	Introduction	3-29
3.3.3.2	Legacy Systems	3-29

3.3.3.3	Evaluation Criteria	3-30
4.	Roadside Safety Hardware	4-1
4.1	Barrier Systems	4-2
4.1.1	Barrier Systems Types	4-4
4.1.2	Barrier Systems Performance	4-5
4.2	Roadside Barrier Systems	4-7
4.2.1	High Tension Three Cable Guide Rail	4-8
4.2.2	Steel Beam Guide Rail	4-14
4.2.2.1	Midwest Guardrail System	4-14
4.2.2.2	Australian Construction Products Sentry Barrier System	4-25
4.2.2.3	Ingall Civil Products Ezy-Guard 4 Guide Rail	4-28
4.2.3	Concrete Roadside Barrier	4-31
4.2.4	Thrie Beam Systems	4-35
4.2.4.1	Australian Construction Products TL-4 Barrier	4-36
4.2.4.2	Ezy Guard High Containment Barrier	4-37
4.3	Median Barrier Systems	4-39
4.3.1	High Tension Four Cable Median Guide Rail Systems	4-40
4.3.2	Type M Double Rail Steel Beam Guide Rail	4-45
4.3.3	Australian Construction Products Sentry Median Barrier W Beam System	4-47
4.3.4	Ingall Civil Products Ezy Guard 4 Median Barrier W Beam System	4-49
4.3.5	Guardian 5 Steel Beam Median Barrier	4-51
4.3.6	Concrete Median Barrier	4-54
4.3.6.1	Type TW Concrete Median Barrier	4-54
4.3.6.2	Type M and C Concrete Median Barrier	4-56
4.4	Barrier End Terminals and Crash Cushions	4-59
4.4.1	SBGR End Terminals	4-61
4.4.1.1	End Terminal Grading	4-61
4.4.1.2	MAX Tension Terminal System	4-63
4.4.1.3	SoftStop Terminal System	4-63
4.4.1.4	MASH Sequential Kinking Terminal System	4-64
4.4.1.5	SPIG Gating End Terminal	4-66
4.4.1.6	Max Tension Median Terminal	4-66

4.4.1.7	Median Attenuating Trend Terminal	4-67
4.4.1.8	Slotted Rail Terminal	4-68
4.4.1.9	MASH Flared Energy Attenuating Terminal	4-69
4.4.2	Crash Cushions	4-71
4.4.2.1	Summary of Crash Cushions	4-72
4.4.2.2	Box Beam Bursting Energy Absorbing Terminal	4-76
4.4.2.3	QuadTrend 350 End Treatment System	4-77
4.4.2.4	QuadGuard and QuadGuard M10 Systems	4-78
4.4.2.5	SMART Cushion	4-79
4.4.2.6	TAU-II and TAU-M Systems	4-80
4.4.2.7	SMA Hercules	4-81
4.4.2.8	Delta Crash Cushion	4-83
4.4.3	Barrier System Transitions and Connections	4-84
4.4.4	Existing In-Service Systems	4-85
4.5	Poles and Sign Support Systems	4-86
4.5.1	Small Sign Support Systems	4-88
4.5.2	Intermediate Sign Support Systems	4-93
4.5.3	Sign Supports on Concrete Median Barrier	4-95
4.6	Ramp Closure Gates	4-96
4.7	Culvert Ends	4-97
5.	Roadside Safety Hardware for Work Zones	5-1
5.1	Temporary Barrier System Performance	5-1
5.1.1	Temporary Construction Barrier Systems	5-3
5.1.1.1	Use of TCB's to Separate Opposing Traffic Flows	5-5
5.1.2	Temporary Concrete Barrier System	5-7
5.1.2.1	Type J Temporary Concrete Barrier	5-8
5.1.2.2	Type M Temporary Concrete Barrier	5-9
5.1.2.3	Type T Temporary Concrete Barrier	5-10
5.1.2.4	Type X Temporary Concrete Barrier	5-11
5.1.2.5	Type Z Temporary Concrete Barrier	5-13
5.1.3	Movable Temporary Concrete Barrier System	5-15
5.1.3.1	Quickchange Movable Barrier	5-15

5.1.3.2	Reactive Tension System	5-16
5.1.3.3	Flux Barrier	5-17
5.1.4	Temporary Steel Barrier Systems	5-17
5.1.4.1	BarrierGuard 800	5-16
5.1.4.2	ZoneGuard	5-20
5.1.4.3	Defender	5-21
5.1.4.4	Safezone	5-22
5.1.4.5	HV2	5-23
5.1.4.6	Highway Guard	5-24
5.1.5	Temporary Type M SBGR	5-26
5.2	Temporary Crash Cushions	5-27
5.2.1	Reduced Exposure Energy Attenuators	5-30
5.2.1.1	Absorb 350 Reduced Exposure Temporary Energy Attenuator System	5-30
5.2.1.2	ABSORB-M Reduced Exposure Temporary Energy Attenuator System	5-31
5.2.1.3	ACZ 350 Reduced Exposure Temporary Energy Attenuator System	5-31
5.2.1.4	SLED Reduced Exposure Temporary Energy Attenuator System	5-32
5.3	Transitions to Temporary Concrete Barrier	5-34
5.4	Temporary Work Zone Signs	5-36
5.4.1	Skid-Mounted Temporary Sign Supports	5-36
APPENDIX A – MTO Severity Index Tables		A
APPENDIX B – Glossary		B

List of Figures	Page
Figure 1-1 Provincial Highway Right-of-Way Components	1-1
Figure 1-2 Percent Distribution of Fatal Crashes by Obstacle Struck in US, 2023	1-7
Figure 1-3 GM Proving Ground Encroachment Relationship.....	1-8
Figure 1-4 Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators adapted from the 2009 WHO report on the Global Status on Road Safety	1-12
Figure 2-1 Desirable Grading Section for Medians Separating Low-Speed Interchange Ramps	2-13
Figure 2-2 Earth/Shale Fill Sections.....	2-13
Figure 2-3 Earth/Shale Cut Sections	2-15
Figure 2-4 Rock Fill Sections	2-17
Figure 2-5 Rock Cut Sections: 0.25H:1V Rock Face	2-18
Figure 2-6 Rock Cut Sections: Buried Backslope.....	2-18
Figure 2-7 Desirable Cross-Section for 'V' Ditches on High Speed Roads.....	2-21
Figure 2-8 Preferred Cross-Section for Trapezoid Ditches on High-Speed Roads Bottom Width of Ditch $\geq 1.2\text{m}$	2-21
Figure 2-9 Minimum Median Configuration	2-24
Figure 2-10 Desirable Median Configuration.....	2-24
Figure 2-11 Minimum Narrow Median Configuration	2-25
Figure 2-12 Independent Alignment Median Configuration	2-25
Figure 2-13 Guidelines for Median Barrier Need Determination and Material Selection	2-28
Figure 2-14 Clear Traversable Area Beyond Ramp Bullnose	2-33
Figure 2-15 Length of Need – Divided Highway	2-47
Figure 2-16 Length of Need – Undivided Highway	2-47
Figure 2-17 Legacy SBGR Connection to Rigid Barrier (OPSD 912.430).....	2-48
Figure 3-1 Roadside Design Process	3-3
Figure 3-2 DCZ Distance on Recoverable vs Non-Recoverable Slopes	3-5
Figure 3-3 DCZ Distance Transition with Spiral	3-6
Figure 3-4 DCZ Distance Transition without Spiral	3-6
Figure 3-5 Identifying Areas of Concern and Obstacles	3-8

Figure 3-6	Protection to Back or Bottom of Area of Concern.....	3-12
Figure 3-7	Mitigation Requirements at Exit Ramps.....	3-13
Figure 3-8	Selection of Appropriate Median Barrier Systems Active in CPS.....	3-18
Figure 3-9	Selection of Appropriate Roadside Barrier Systems Active in CPS	3-19
Figure 3-10	Selection of End Treatment for Steel Beam Guide Rails	3-21
Figure 3-11	Selection of End Treatment or Crash Cushion for Concrete Barriers	3-22
Figure 3-12	Selection of Crash Cushion for a Single Fixed Object in a Median, Gore or Roadside.....	3-23
Figure 3-13	Steel Beam Guide Rail Evaluation Process for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Projects on Low-Speed Roadways.....	3-38
Figure 3-14	High Tension Cable Guide Rail Evaluation Process for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Progress.....	3-44
Figure 4-1	Zone of Intrusion for TL-3, TL-4 and TL-5 Rigid Barriers.....	4-6
Figure 4-2	Safence HT3CGR Installation	4-9
Figure 4-3	Safence HT4CGR Installation.....	4-9
Figure 4-4	Safence HTCGRT Installation	4-12
Figure 4-5	Safence HT3CGR Shoulder Installation	4-14
Figure 4-6	Safence HT3CGR Slope Installation	4-15
Figure 4-7	Safence HTCGRT Shoulder Installation	4-15
Figure 4-8	Rail Splice Locations on Legacy SBGR vs Type M SBGR.....	4-17
Figure 4-9	Various Type M SBGR Installation Configurations	4-19
Figure 4-10	Long Span Treatment for Low Fill Culverts	4-21
Figure 4-11	Selection Process for SBGR Treatments.....	4-23
Figure 4-12	Type M20 and M30 SBGR Leaving End Treatment	4-25
Figure 4-13	Pedestrian Access Terminal (PAT) for Steel Beam Guide Rail	4-26
Figure 4-14	Legacy SBGR with Channel Connection to Concrete Parapet Wall	4-28
Figure 4-15	MASH TL-3 Long-Span Structure Connection (LSSC)	4-28
Figure 4-16	MASH TL-3 Thrie Beam Connection to a Buttressed Concrete Wall	4-28
Figure 4-17	MASH TL-2 SBGR Connection to Rigid Barrier on Low Speed Roads.....	4-29
Figure 4-18	N-Cap Steel Beam Guide Rail Post Covers	4-30
Figure 4-19	Safe Direction RamShield W-Beam Barrier System	4-31
Figure 4-20	Ingall Civil Ezy Guard 4 System	4-33

Figure 4-21	Traffic Side/Field Side of Multifunctional Barrier System	4-36
Figure 4-22	Traffic Side/Field Side of Multifunctional Barrier's Transition System	4-37
Figure 4-23	Concrete Roadside Barrier Installations	4-40
Figure 4-24	W-Beam and Thrie Beam Cross Section Comparison	4-42
Figure 4-25	ACP TL-4 Barrier	4-44
Figure 4-26	Ezy Guard High Containment Barrier	4-45
Figure 4-27	Typical HT4CMGR installation for rural median with 4H:1V slopes.....	4-49
Figure 4-28	Typical HT4CMGR installation for rural median with 6H:1V slopes.....	4-49
Figure 4-29	Ingal Civil Products Ezy Guard 4 W Beam Median Barrier	4-54
Figure 4-30	Guardian 5 Steel Beam Median Barrier System	4-58
Figure 4-31	Tall Wall Concrete Median Barrier installation	4-61
Figure 4-32	Desirable Grading for SBEAT Installations	4-67
Figure 4-33	MAX-Tension Terminal System.....	4-68
Figure 4-34	SoftStop Terminal System	4-69
Figure 4-35	MSKT Installation.....	4-70
Figure 4-36	Correct Orientation of Bearing Plate on Compression Based Terminals ...	4-70
Figure 4-37	SPIG Gating End Terminal Installation.....	4-71
Figure 4-38	NGT System	4-72
Figure 4-39	NGT System Installation	4-73
Figure 4-40	Max Tension Median Terminal Installation	4-74
Figure 4-41	Median Attenuating Trend Terminal.....	4-75
Figure 4-42	Slotted Rail Terminal	4-76
Figure 4-43	MASH Flared Energy Attenuating Terminal	4-77
Figure 4-44	QuadGuard M-10	4-83
Figure 4-45	SMART Unidirectional Crash Cushion.....	4-84
Figure 4-46	TAU-M Narrow System	4-85
Figure 4-47	SMA Hercules	4-86
Figure 4-48	Delta Crash Cushion	4-87
Figure 4-49	TAU-XR Narrow System.....	4-88
Figure 4-50	Sign Support System Types and Sign Areas	4-93

Figure 4-51	Small Breakaway Single Post System with 89 mm x 140 mm Drilled Wooden Post	4-95
Figure 4-52	Triple Post Assembly of Lap-Splice Rib-Bak Breakaway System.....	4-96
Figure 4-53	Double Post Assembly of SQR-LOC Perforated Steel Square Breakaway System	4-97
Figure 4-54	Triple Post Assembly of Franklin U-Channel Breakaway System.....	4-98
Figure 4-55	Single Post Assembly of Telespar Sign Support Breakaway System	4-99
Figure 4-56	Single Post Assembly of EcoPoste Collapsible Support Breakaway System	4-100
Figure 4-57	Single Post Assembly of U-Flange Non-Breakaway Sign Support System	4-101
Figure 4-58	Double Post Assembly of Slip-Safe Supreme Rib-Bak Breakaway System	4-103
Figure 4-59	Double Post Assembly of Highway Gator Sign Support Breakaway System	4-104
Figure 4-60	Sliding Base and Chute Median Sign Support System Installation	4-106
Figure 4-61	Breakaway Ramp Closure Gate Installed on Ramp Without Curb.....	4-107
Figure 4-62	Exposed Culvert End within Desirable Clear Zone.....	4-108
Figure 4-63	Culvert End with Safety Slope End Treatment	4-109
Figure 4-64	Culvert End with Headwall	4-109
Figure 5-1	Category IV Barrier Separating Staged Opposing Freeway Traffic	5-6
Figure 5-2	Type J Temporary Concrete Barrier.....	5-9
Figure 5-3	Type M Temporary Concrete Barrier.....	5-10
Figure 5-4	Type T Temporary Concrete Barrier	5-10
Figure 5-5	Type X Temporary Concrete Barrier	5-11
Figure 5-6	ReDD Insert for Type X Barrier.....	5-10
Figure 5-7	Type Z Temporary Concrete Barrier	5-13
Figure 5-8	Type H Temporary Concrete Barrier.....	5-14
Figure 5-9	Quickchange Moveable Barrier Transfer Machine Shifting QMB Barrier ..	5-15
Figure 5-10	Quickchange Movable Barrier System	5-16
Figure 5-11	Concrete Reactive Tension System Barrier	5-17
Figure 5-12	Reactive Tension System	5-17
Figure 5-13	FLUX Barrier.....	5-18
Figure 5-14	FLUX Barrier Dimensions	5-18

Figure 5-15	TALL42 Moveable Barrier Transfer Machine Shifting Barriers	5-19
Figure 5-16	TALL42 Moveable Barrier Dimensions.....	5-19
Figure 5-17	BarrierGuard 800 Temporary Steel Barrier	5-21
Figure 5-18	ZoneGuard Temporary Steel Barrier Installation	5-22
Figure 5-19	Defender Temporary Steel Barrier	5-23
Figure 5-20	Safezone Temporary Steel Barrier	5-24
Figure 5-21	HV2 Temporary Steel Barrier	5-25
Figure 5-22	Highway Guard Temporary Steel Barrier	5-26
Figure 5-23	Typical TCB Layout with Temporary Energy Attenuator	5-30
Figure 5-24	Typical TCB Layout with Temporary Reduced Exposure Energy Attenuator	5-30
Figure 5-25	ABSORB 350 Temporary Reduced Exposure Energy Attenuator	5-31
Figure 5-26	ABSORB-M Temporary Reduced Exposure Energy Attenuator	5-32
Figure 5-27	Quash Crash Cushion System.....	5-33
Figure 5-28	SLED Temporary Reduced Exposure Energy Attenuator	5-34
Figure 5-29	Transition from Existing SBGR to TCB	5-35
Figure 5-30	Transition from Permanent Concrete Barrier to Temporary Concrete Barrier	5-36
Figure 5-31	Skid-Mounted Temporary Sign Support	5-37

List of Tables	Page
Table 2-1 Category of Work.....	2-2
Table 2-2 Desirable Clear Zone Distances (Obstacle Spacing < 45m).....	2-7
Table 2-3 Desirable Clear Zone Distances (Obstacle Spacing 45-90m)	2-8
Table 2-4 Desirable Clear Zone Distances (Obstacle Spacing > 90m).....	2-9
Table 2-5 Desirable Clear Zone Values	2-10
Table 2-6 Horizontal Curve Adjustment Factors	2-11
Table 2-7 Desirable Earth and Shale Fill Foreslopes	2-14
Table 2-8 Desirable Earth and Shale Cut Slopes.....	2-15
Table 2-9 Desirable Rock Fill Foreslopes.....	2-16
Table 2-10 Desirable Rock Cut Foreslopes and Backslopes.....	2-17
Table 2-11 Desirable and Minimum Rounding Widths.....	2-19
Table 2-12 Desirable Rock Face Offsets.....	2-22
Table 2-13 Desirable Ditch Depth at Rock Cut	2-22
Table 2-14 Guidelines for Selection of Longitudinal Barrier Test Level	2-29
Table 2-15 Outcome Reduction of Fatal/Serious Injury Crashes – Cable Median Barriers	2-29
Table 2-16 Outcome Reduction of Fatal/Serious Injury Crashes – Metal Beam Median Barriers.....	2-30
Table 2-17 Outcome Reduction of Fatal/Serious Injury Crashes – Concrete Median Barriers.....	2-30
Table 2-18 Encroachment Length in Gores at Exits	2-33
Table 2-19 NCHRP Report 350 Test Level Matrix for Barrier Systems	2-42
Table 2-20 MASH Test Matrix for Barrier Systems.....	2-43
Table 2-21 MASH Implementation Schedules	2-44
Table 2-22 Runout Lengths.....	2-46
Table 3-1 Recommended Minimum Shy Line Offsets.....	3-15
Table 3-2 Recommended Maximum Barrier Flare Rates	3-15
Table 3-3 Acceptable Mounting Heights	3-34
Table 3-4 Acceptable HTCGR Mounting Heights	3-41
Table 4-1 Working Widths for Type M SBGR Installations.....	4-22
Table 4-2 Working Widths for Guardian 5 Steel Beam Median Barrier	4-57

Table 4-3 Permanent Energy Attenuators4-79

Table 5-1 Temporary Energy Attenuators5-28

DRAFT

1. Introduction

The purpose of the Roadside Design Manual (RDM) is to provide MTO staff and engineering consultants with updated cost beneficial policies, standards, and guidelines for design of the roadside environment adjacent to the roadway within provincial highway Right-of-Ways (ROW) as shown in Figure 1-1. A comprehensive literature review was carried out during the preparation of the RDM, relying extensively on the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Roadside Design Guide, United States Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Memoranda, National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Reports, Midwest States Pooled Fund Program Research Reports, Texas Transportation Institute Roadside Safety Pooled Fund Research Reports, and roadside safety hardware manufacturers, distributors and installers.




Figure 1-1 – Provincial Highway Right-of-Way Components

Although the RDM is issued primarily for the direction and guidance of MTO staff and engineering consultants for design of provincial highway projects, it may also be used as a design guideline by other road authorities in Ontario. On provincial highway projects, deviations from policies contained in Chapter 2 of the RDM shall be justified and documented in the applicable design report(s) for the project.

Desirable values are provided for various features within the roadside environment in the RDM, which should be used for design of new highways and expansion (widening) of existing provincial highways. For major capital rehabilitation or major capital reconstruction of existing highways, desirable values should be considered and explicitly evaluated during design to select cost beneficial treatments within the roadside environment that can be achieved with available funding and other constraints. In addition, as design guidelines, standards and best practices continue to evolve over time, existing highways that were originally constructed according to previous design policies, guidelines and standards, and have acceptable operational and collision histories, should not require reconfiguration or improvements based on desirable values in the RDM. This is further described in Chapter 2.

Designers should achieve a balance between competing objectives and constraints when determining how the roadside environment will be configured. In some cases, engineering judgement is required to assess trade-offs. The choices made to achieve this balance will be influenced by the:

- Functional classification;
- Design speed;
- Operating speed;
- Posted speed;
- Traffic volumes and composition;
- Drainage considerations;
- Pavement design considerations;
- Right-of-way (ROW) constraints (such as property limits, environmental);
- Other ROW user expectations (such as utility companies);
- Access requirements (such as entrances);
- Constructability considerations;
- Maintenance considerations;
- Funding considerations; and
- Other constraints (such as social, political, technological).

Common highway design objectives include:

- Maximizing road user throughput (the number of road users served for a given time period);
- Maximizing road user safety;
- Ensuring an appropriate level of access (Corridor Management Policies and Regulations);
- Minimizing impacts on the natural and socio-economic environments; and
- Minimizing the overall life cycle cost of the facility.

The RDM does not address:

- Drainage design;
- Geotechnical design;
- Maintenance;
- Property management and acquisition;
- Property access;
- Signage (other than sign-supports);
- Utilities (other than poles and boxes); and
- Shared use of ROW (Active Transportation Paths, Recreational Trails, etc.)

1.1 Key Terms Used in Manual

Roadside design, like other areas of highway design, uses many unique terms to define specific physical or operational aspects of the highway or the design process. While the Glossary presents many definitions, it is important for the designer to understand the following key terms:

Area of Concern: An obstacle or area within the roadside environment and within the desirable clear zone that has a higher severity index than a barrier system.

Barrier System: A system which provides a physical limitation through which an errant vehicle would not normally penetrate or vault over. It is intended to contain or redirect an errant design vehicle of a particular size range, at a given speed and angle of impact.

Clear Zone (CZ): The unobstructed, traversable area provided beyond the edge of the travelled way available for use by errant vehicles. The clear zone includes shoulders, bike lanes, and auxiliary lanes, except those auxiliary lanes that function like through lanes. The clear zone also includes recoverable slopes, and non-recoverable slopes with a clear run-out area. The selected clear zone width for a project is dependent upon traffic volumes and design speed, and roadside geometry.

Crash Cushion: An energy attenuating system which provides a physical limitation through which an errant vehicle would not normally penetrate. It is intended to contain or redirect or stop an errant design vehicle of a particular size range, at a given speed and angle of impact.

Desirable Value: The value at the top of a range of values in a design standard, or the discreet value when a range is not given in a design standard.

Dynamic Deflection: The maximum distance that the barrier system is expected to deflect laterally under a specified design impact, measured from the traffic face of the system.

Energy Attenuator: Has the same meaning as crash cushion.

Foreslope: A slope parallel to the roadway in a cut (frontslope) or fill (sideslope) section, between the edge of shoulder rounding and bottom of slope. It includes earth or rock, and granular base and sub-base.

Guide Rail: Has the same meaning as barrier system.

Highway: The entire right-of-way comprising of a common or public thoroughfare, including a highway, road, street, bridge, and any incidental thereto.

High Speed Roadways: Roadways with posted speeds of 70 km/h or higher.

Minimum Value: The value at the bottom of a range of values in a design standard.

Obstacle: Any non-breakaway and non-traversable feature within the roadside environment greater than 100mm in height that can increase the potential for personal injury and vehicle damage when struck by an errant vehicle leaving the roadway.

Right-of-Way (ROW): The area of land acquired for or designated to the provision of a highway.

Road: Has the same meaning as Highway.

Roadside Environment: The portion of the ROW beyond the roadway, including medians, not designed for vehicular use. The roadside environment may include a variety of surfaces, slopes, obstacles, and natural features (such as water bodies, vegetation, etc).

Roadway: The portion of the highway, including shoulders, designed for vehicular use.

Severity Index: A number from zero to ten used to categorize the potential severity of an encroachment or impact by an errant vehicle for a range of design speeds over a variety of surfaces and slopes, fixed objects and natural features within the roadside environment. The number is used for evaluating alternative safety treatments.

Shall: A mandatory obligation.

Should: A recommendation that is not a mandatory obligation

Terminal: A crashworthy end treatment or crashworthy anchor used at the end of a barrier system.

Working Width: Distance between the traffic face of a barrier system before a vehicular impact during a specified crash test, and the maximum lateral distance position of any major part of the system or vehicle after impact.



1.2 The Importance of Roadside Design

Collisions that occur within the roadside environment typically involve a vehicle departing the roadway and subsequently impacting an obstacle, or encountering a situation or feature that result in the rollover of the vehicle. These are referred to as run-off-the-road (RoR) collisions.

The 2011 AASHTO Roadside Design Guide indicates that in the United States “about thirty percent, or almost one in every three fatalities, are the result of a single vehicle run-off-the-road crash”. According to the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and Highway Loss Data Institute, in the United States “20 percent of motor vehicle crash deaths result from a vehicle leaving the roadway and hitting a fixed object alongside the road. Trees, utility poles, and traffic barriers are the most common objects struck. Almost half of the deaths in fixed object crashes occur at night. Alcohol is a frequent contributing factor. Motorists also run off the road because of excessive speeds, falling asleep, inattention or poor visibility. Efforts to reduce these driver errors are only somewhat effective, so it's important to remove fixed objects or avoid putting them along roads in the first place if feasible, especially on roads where vehicles are more likely to leave the pavement. Less preferred options include using breakaway objects, shielding objects and increasing the visibility of objects.”

The Ontario Road Safety Annual Report (ORSAR) published by MTO states that in 2019 there were 221,793 reportable collisions on all roads across the province. These reportable collisions for all roads in 2019 consisted of 545 fatal collisions, resulting in 584 persons killed, and there were 33,602 personal injury collisions and 187,646 property damage collisions. For provincial highways, the reportable collisions in 2019 consisted of 142 fatal collisions, 5,771 personal injury collisions, and 37,421 property damage collisions. ORSAR is updated and published annually by the ministry and is available on the ministry's web site at:
<http://www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/publications/ontario-road-safety-annual-report.shtml>

Although ORSAR does not specify how many of the collisions occurred within the roadside environment, it is likely that Ontario's experience with RoR collisions is similar to that experienced in the United States. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and Highway Loss Data Institute published a pie chart showing percentage distribution of fatal crashes by obstacle struck in the United States for the year 2015, which is reproduced in Figure 1-2.






Figure 1-2 – Percent Distribution of Fatal Crashes by Obstacle Struck in US, ~~2020~~2023 *

* Pie Chart from Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and Highway Loss Data Institute, Washington, DC, ~~2020~~2023: <https://www.iihs.org/research-areas/fatality-statistics/detail/collisions-with-fixed-objects-and-animals>
<http://www.iihs.org/iihs/topics/t/roadway-and-environment/fatalityfacts/fixed-object-crashes>

1.3 Historical Perspective

The emphasis on roadside safety design emerged in North America during the 1960s. Designers came to realize that some motorists, regardless of the improvements made, may run off the roadway. It also became clear that serious collisions within the roadside environment could be reduced if a traversable recovery area was provided.

Many studies have been done to gain a better understanding of the path and stability of errant vehicles when they encroach onto the roadside environment. The vehicle behaviour depends largely on the nature of the roadside, vehicle speed, the circumstances that caused the roadside encroachment, and the characteristics of the vehicle. On traversable roadside terrain, the driver may be able to regain some control of the vehicle after the vehicle has left the travelled way, and either bring the vehicle to a stop or return to the roadway.

Test track experience and full scale testing at the GM Proving Grounds in the 1950s established a basic understanding of encroachment distance relationship and geometry of the roadside. The standard cross-section implemented at the GM Proving Ground test tracks in 1958 included 3 m (10 foot) shoulders, 6H:1V or flatter foreslopes and backslopes, and a roadside clear of obstacles for a minimum distance of 30m (100 feet) on each side of the travelled way. Field studies conducted in the mid-1960s and 1970s enhanced the understanding of the encroachment distance relationship for RoR collisions. This encroachment distance relationship is illustrated in Figure 1-3. While this encroachment relationship was first established almost 60 years ago, it is still relevant today.




Figure 1-3 – GM Proving Ground Encroachment Relationship

As an example, Figure 1-3 indicates that on high speed roadways, a traversable, flat, obstacle free area adjacent to the travelled way results in about 80% of errant vehicles departing the travelled way to recover or stop before encroaching more than 9.1 m (30 feet) beyond the edge of travelled way. Conversely, about 20% of errant vehicles leaving the travelled way are expected to encroach more than 9.1 m (30 feet) from the travelled way. Where this area slopes downward away from the roadway, out of control vehicles will likely encroach further away from the travelled way. Conversely where this area slopes upward away from the roadway, encroachment distances should be less.

Roadside safety design treatments have also evolved over time. - Roadway embankments were initially constructed using similar principles to those used for construction of railway embankments. Steep foreslopes were used to minimize the amount of materials and grading required. -The steepness of the slope was typically governed by the loading requirements to support the roadway and to limit erosion. -Construction through rock necessitated almost vertical walls due to cost. -Early construction practices would usually result in very rough or jagged rock faces. -It is now understood that providing flatter wider areas adjacent to the roadway can reduce the lateral extent and severity of encroachments within the roadside environment.

1.4 Contents of the Manual

The RDM provides cost beneficial design guidelines, standards and policies for design of the roadside environment and features on provincial highway projects.

Chapter 1 provides an introduction, historical perspective, and the general philosophy and principles of design of the roadside environment. Key terms from the glossary that are used extensively throughout the RDM are also defined.

Chapter 2 provides the ministry's policies, standards, and guidelines for design of the roadside environment on provincial highway projects.

Chapter 3 provides design processes for selection of appropriate design treatments within the roadside environment on provincial highway projects. A set of decision charts is included to guide the designer through the design process toward the selection of the most appropriate and cost beneficial design treatment for the situation and feature under consideration.

Chapter 4 provides the performance characteristics and design details for new roadside safety hardware to be used on provincial highway projects including barrier systems, terminals, crash cushions and small signs.

Chapter 5 provides the performance characteristics and design details for roadside safety hardware to be used within work zones on provincial highway projects including temporary barrier systems and temporary crash cushions.

Appendix A provides the MTO Severity Index Tables for many roadside features for a range of design speeds from 50 km/h to 120 km/h including various foreslope and backslope configurations, drainage ditches, and various obstacles such as trees, poles, piers, barrier systems, terminals, and culvert treatments. These tables are to be used for explicit benefit cost evaluations of alternative safety treatments during design of provincial highway projects.

Appendix B provides a glossary of terms common to the RDM and the MTO Design Supplement for the TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads, June 2017.

1.5 Safety Sensitive Design

Significant improvements in safety are not automatic by-products of highway projects. In some cases, collision data may not be available or collision experience may not highlight the need to make a safety improvement, or to take advantage of a potential opportunity to improve safety. The designer should deliberately and systematically consider potential opportunities within each project to apply sound safety and traffic engineering principles.

At the beginning of the project the designer should assess the existing physical and operational conditions affecting safety by using collision data, site inspections and existing design and traffic characteristics. Consideration should be given to locations where the consequences of a collision may be severe.

Safe System Approach:

The Safe System Approach is designed with the human being at its centre, not only taking human fallibility and vulnerability into account, but accepting that even the most conscientious people make mistakes. The goal of the Safe System Approach is to ensure that these mistakes do not result in a collision; or, if a collision does occur, its effects are sufficiently mitigated so as to not cause death or life-changing injuries. It requires that all those involved directly and indirectly in the design, operation, maintenance and use of the system understand how various components of the system interact and strive to minimize human error or mitigate its consequences. In a Safe System Approach, one of the central components is safe roads. Safe roads are designed, operated and maintained to reduce the risk of collisions occurring and the severity of an injury, should they occur. While all road users must always try to interact with each other and the facility safely, the Safe System Approach emphasizes that the transportation system must be designed to accommodate human vulnerability and error. The safe system approach has been adopted and developed by several organizations such as TAC and FHWA and is increasingly informing highway engineering practises within MTO.




Figure 1-4 – Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators adapted from the 2009 WHO report on the Global Status on Road Safety

Adopting a Safe System approach necessarily means adopting a culture of safety consciousness, putting safety first and following Safe Systems principles in each of the engineering decisions made during design. In relationship to this manual, the central component of a Safe Systems Approach is accommodating human tolerance to physical force by reducing impact forces. This can be accomplished through reducing the angle and speed of impacts and improving roadside crashworthiness through a forgiving roadside with clear zones, breakaway hazards where possible and barriers to current standards where necessary. Designers must consider that vehicles will leave the roadway and interact with roadside hazards, then consider the appropriate level of protection based on the expected mix of users. These decisions must also be made considering the context of equity for all users recognizing that vulnerable users will be present along with a mix of transportation modes on our highways.

1.6 Risk Mitigation and Treatment

It is recognized that it is not practical or cost beneficial to incorporate all possible safety improvements into every major capital works project on the provincial highway system due to physical, environmental, and/or funding priorities and constraints. However, the designer is encouraged to be proactive in improving safety where practical and cost beneficial. The intent of providing a clear zone adjacent to the travelled way is to minimize the probability of collisions with obstacles in the roadside environment by errant vehicles departing the roadway.

Ideally, the designer should strive towards providing the widest clear zone that can be reasonably afforded, fully considering physical, environmental, and funding constraints. However, this is not always practical. In such circumstances, the roadside mitigation treatments listed below in order of preference, should be considered and evaluated to determine the appropriate cost beneficial design alternative treatment to reduce the probability and/or severity of collisions with a roadside obstacle or area of concern.

Roadside Mitigation Treatment in Order of Preference:

1. Remove the obstacle;
2. Relocate the obstacle to a location to reduce the probability of it being impacted;
3. Redesign the obstacle so that it can be safely traversed;
4. Reduce the impact severity of the obstacle by using an appropriate breakaway design;
5. Shield the obstacle with a barrier system or crash cushion;
6. Delineate the obstacle, if the above mitigation measures are not appropriate; and
- ~~7. Reduce the posted speed.~~

7.

As noted above, the most preferred treatment is to remove or relocate the obstacle, unless other considerations, such as cost and environmental impact, make its removal or relocation impractical. For example, trees pose a hazard to errant vehicles and should be removed from the clear zone. However, there may be situations where the removal of trees may cause adverse effects to the environment, or they may have heritage value. In these cases, the reason to justify keeping them should be documented in the project files (Design Criteria).

If the removal or relocation of an obstacle is not practical, the obstacle should be shielded (as in the trees example), or where possible, the severity (e.g. severity index) of the obstacle may be reduced by other means, such as making it traversable, using an appropriate breakaway design, flattening slopes, or utilizing traversable (safety) culvert end treatments. These treatments are preferable to shielding them with a barrier system or crash cushion.

Although barrier systems and crash cushions are designed and crash tested to minimize the severity of injuries to occupants in passenger vehicles from collisions with roadside obstacles dependent on the type of impact, significant vehicle damage can occur including injury to occupants under certain conditions. Once a barrier system or crash cushion comes into use, the crash is already in progress. The purpose of a barrier system or crash cushion is therefore not to prevent a crash, but rather to minimize the severity of the crash.

DRAFT

1.7 Relationship to Other Design Documents

The Roadside Design Manual should be used and read in conjunction with other guidelines, manuals, standards and codes such as:

- Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code (CHBDC);
- MTO Bikeway Design Manual
- MTO Contract Design Estimating and Documentation Manual (CDED);
- MTO Contract Preparation System (CPS);
- MTO Drainage Design Standards;
- MTO Drawings (MTOD);
- MTO Design Standards Section Drawings (DSSD);
- MTO Electrical Engineering Manual;
- MTO Design Supplement to the TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads;
- MTO Maintenance Manual;
- MTO Provincial Engineering Memorandums;
- MTO Sign Support Manual;
- MTO Standard Special Provisions;
- Ontario Provincial Standard Drawings (OPSD);
- Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications (OPSS),
- Ontario Traffic Manuals (OTM), and;
- TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads (as referenced in MTO Geometric Design Supplement to the TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads).