

UMTRI-86-26/III

Improving the Dynamic Performance of Multitrailer Vehicles: A Study of Innovative Dollies

Volume III

Executive Summary

C. B. Winkler
P. S. Fancher
O. Carsten
A. Mathew
P. Dill

July 1986

UMTRI The University of Michigan
Transportation Research Institute

1. Report No. FHWA/RD-86/162		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.										
4. Title and Subtitle IMPROVING THE DYNAMIC PERFORMANCE OF MULTITRAILER VEHICLES: A STUDY OF INNOVATIVE DOLLIES - Volume III Executive Summary				5. Report Date July 1986										
				6. Performing Organization Code										
7. Author(s) C.B. Winkler, P.S. Fancher, O. Carsten, A. Mathew, P. Dill				8. Performing Organization Report No. UMTRI-86-26/III										
9. Performing Organization Name and Address The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute 2901 Baxter Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS) 3104-112										
				11. Contract or Grant No. DTFH61-84-C-00026										
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Federal Highway Administration U.S. Department of Transportation Washington, D.C. 20590				13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final May 1984-July 1986										
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code										
15. Supplementary Notes Contracting Officer's Technical Representative: Mr. Martin Hargrave (HSR-20)														
16. Abstract <p>This study of the dynamic performance of multitrailer articulated vehicles has led to the development of guidelines for the design of innovative dollies that will improve the roll stability and trailing fidelity of doubles combinations. The major effort of this project involved identification, analysis, and further development of innovative dolly and trailer hitching hardware showing potential for the reduction of rearward amplification and prevention of rollover of the second trailer. Specifically, the project (1) reviewed the current state-of-the-art in innovative coupling mechanisms, (2) performed a parametric sensitivity study, based on computer simulation techniques, on combination vehicles using existing and proposed coupling mechanisms, and incorporating various combinations of 96- and 102-in-width hardware, (3) developed a new type of dolly believed to provide superior safety performance, (4) conducted full-scale tests of combination vehicles using various dollies, including a prototype of the new dolly, and (5) examined the potential safety and economic impacts of the use of innovative dolly hardware.</p> <p>This volume is the third in a series. The others in the series are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>FHWA No.</th> <th>Vol. No.</th> <th>Title</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>RD-86/162</td> <td>I</td> <td>Final Technical Report</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RD-86/162</td> <td>II</td> <td>Appendices</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						FHWA No.	Vol. No.	Title	RD-86/162	I	Final Technical Report	RD-86/162	II	Appendices
FHWA No.	Vol. No.	Title												
RD-86/162	I	Final Technical Report												
RD-86/162	II	Appendices												
17. Key Words Innovative dollies, Doubles, Roll stability Rearward amplification, Trailing fidelity, B-dollies			18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161											
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages 16	22. Price									

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I: FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
A REVIEW OF INNOVATIVE DOLLIES AND COUPLING MECHANISMS	5
1. Modified A-Dollies	8
2. B-Dollies	25
THE SIMULATION STUDY.....	32
1. The "Test" Vehicle	32
2. Findings with Respect to the Use of Innovative Coupling Mechanisms	33
3. Findings with Respect to the Use of Mixed-Width Axles	121
THE VEHICLE TEST PROGRAM	129
1. Test Dollies	133
2. Test Program Findings	149
OPERATIONAL IMPACTS	183
1. Accident Studies	183
2. Economic Analysis	204
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	228
1. Dolly Performance and Design Guidelines	228
2. Further Development of Innovative Dollies	232
REFERENCES.....	234

VOLUME II: APPENDICES

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX A: EXAMPLE LISTINGS OF SIMULATED VEHICLE PARAMETERS FOR THE YAW/ROLL SIMULATION.....	1
APPENDIX B: LISTINGS OF EQUATIONS AND VARIABLES USED IN THE FINANCIAL MODEL.....	39

VOLUME III: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
IMPACT AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESEARCH STUDY.....	1
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE RESEARCH RESULTS.....	3
APPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS.....	3

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Project flow chart	4
2. The A-dolly and B-dolly	9
3. The symmetric, trapezoidal dolly	11
4. A trapezoidal dolly and the equivalent, imaginary A-dolly	12
5. The asymmetric, trapezoidal dolly	14
6. The converter, trapezoidal dolly	15
7. The double-cross drawbar	16
8. The A-dolly with roller cam hitch	16
9a. Two European, force-steer dollies	18
9b. A Canadian forced-steer dolly	18
10. Linked articulation dolly with telescoping member	19
11. The skid-steer dolly	21
12. Two extending drawbar dollies	23
13. The locking A-dolly	24
14. A B-train is composed of a tractor towing two or more semitrailers. The towing trailers have an extended 5th wheel for attaching the next trailer made of a B-dolly and semitrailer	26
15a. Converter style B-dolly	27
15b. Turntable style B-dolly	27
16. Auto-steering B-dolly	29
17. Turntable-steering B-dolly	29
18. Three types of centering devices for the auto-steering axle	30
19. The baseline simulation test vehicle: the western double	34
20. Two modifications to the baseline vehicle	35
21. Characteristic parameters of three types of screening study dollies	40
a. The shifted IC dollies	40
b. The forced-steer dollies	41
c. The linked-articulation dolly	41
22. Steering resistance performance of the reference self-steering axle	42
23. Example path and acceleration data from a lane-change maneuver performed with the Yaw/Roll model	45
24. Rearward amplification in the frequency domain: the shifted IC dollies	46
25. Rearward amplification in the frequency domain: forced-steer dollies	47
26. Rearward amplification in the frequency domain: the roll-stiffened pintle hitches	48
27. Rearward amplification in the frequency domain: the linked-articulation dollies	49
28. Rearward amplification in the frequency domain: the skid-steer dollies	50
29. Rearward amplification in the frequency domain:	

	the roll-compliant B-dollies	51
30.	Rearward amplification in the frequency domain: the self-steering B-dollies	52
31.	Peak rearward amplification of all the screening study vehicles	56
32.	Schematic diagram illustrating the location of the steer point for forced-steer dollies	58
33.	Rearward amplification as a function of steer-point position	61
34.	Low-speed offtracking in a 50-ft (15.24-m) turn as a function of steer point position	62
35.	Dynamic rollover threshold in an emergency lane change: the shifted-steer-point dollies	65
36.	Dynamic rollover threshold in an emergency lane change: the roll-stiffened pintle hitches	66
37.	Dynamic rollover threshold in an emergency lane change: the linked-articulation dollies	67
38.	Dynamic rollover threshold in an emergency lane change: the skid-steer dollies	68
39.	Dynamic rollover threshold in an emergency lane change: the roll-compliant B-dollies	69
40.	Dynamic rollover threshold in an emergency lane change: the self-steering B-dollies	71
41.	Dynamic rollover threshold in an emergency lane change of all the screening study dollies	72
42.	Maximum offtracking performance of the screening study vehicles in a 50-ft- (15.24-m-) radius turn	74
43.	Offtracking behavior with the skid-steer dolly	75
44.	Ackerman steer geometry applied to the linked-articulation dolly	80
45.	Ackerman steer geometry applied to the controlled-steering dolly	83
46.	Comparison of the rearward amplification of the improved dollies under four loading conditions	85
	a. Trailer loading conditions: full/full	85
	b. Trailer loading conditions: full/empty	85
	c. Trailer loading conditions: empty/full	86
	d. Trailer loading conditions: empty/empty	86
47.	The influence of loading condition on the rearward amplification of the improved dollies	87
	a. The trapezoidal dolly, forward IC position	87
	b. The linked-articulation dolly, 0.44 system gain	87
	c. The self-steering B-dolly, full steering resistance	88
	d. The CSB-dolly, 0.30 steering gain	88
48.	Less favorable rearward amplification performance	89
	a. The trapezoidal dolly, rearward IC position	89
	b. The self-steering B-dolly, low steering resistance	89
49.	The influence of forward velocity on rearward amplification	90
	a. The A-train	90
	b. The trapezoidal dolly, forward IC position	90

c.	The trapezoidal dolly, rearward IC position	91
d.	The linked-articulation dolly, 0.44 system gain	91
e.	The self-steering B-dolly, full resistance steering	92
f.	The self-steering B-dolly, low resistance steering	92
g.	The CSB-dolly, 0.30 steering gain	93
50.	Dynamic rollover threshold of the improved dollies	95
51.	Low-speed offtracking performance of the selected dollies	96
52.	Lateral acceleration response to a steering pulse: the reference A-train	97
53.	Lateral acceleration response to a steering pulse: the linked- articulation dolly, 0.44 system gain	100
54.	Lateral acceleration response to a steering pulse: the CSB-dolly, 0.30 steering gain	101
55.	Lateral acceleration response to a steering pulse: the self-steering B-dolly, full steering resistance	102
56.	Lateral acceleration response to a steering pulse: the self-steering B-dolly, low steering resistance	104
57.	Lateral acceleration response to a steering pulse: the self-steering B-dolly, long drawbar, low steering resistance	105
58.	Lateral acceleration response to a steering pulse: the CSB-dolly, long drawbar, 0.30 steering gain	106
59.	Lateral acceleration response to a steering pulse: the CSB-dolly, long drawbar, 0.43 steering gain	107
60a.	The A-dolly hitch loads	109
60b.	The trapezoidal dolly hitch loads	109
60c.	Linked articulation dolly hitch loads	110
60d.	B-dolly hitch loads	110
61.	Straight-line braking (wet surface), deceleration at the occurrence of wheel lock, empty vehicles	113
62.	Straight-line braking (wet surface), deceleration at the occurrence of 10° articulation angles, empty vehicles	115
63.	Braking in a turn (wet surface), deceleration at the occurrence of wheel lock, empty vehicles	116
64.	Braking in a turn (wet surface), deceleration at the occurrence of 10° articulation angles, empty vehicles	117
65.	Braking in a turn (dry surface), deceleration at the occurrence of axle lock, loaded vehicles	118
66.	Braking in a turn (dry surface), deceleration at the occurrence of 10° articulation angles, loaded vehicles	119
67.	Straight-line braking (split surface), deceleration at the occurrence of wheel lock, loaded vehicles	120
68.	The geometry of the test vehicle	130
69.	The test vehicle	131
70.	Test vehicle loading	132
71.	The drawbar hitch load transducer	135
72.	The A-dolly	136

73.	The asymmetric trapezoidal dolly	137
74.	The linked-articulation dolly	138
75.	The auto-steering B-dolly	139
76.	The controlled-steering B-dolly	140
77.	The forward and rearward IC position of the trapezoidal dolly hitch	142
	a. The forward IC position	142
	b. The rearward IC position	142
78.	Castered steering system kingpin of the auto-steer-style dolly	143
79.	The centering mechanism of the self-steering B-dolly	144
80.	Schematic diagram of the CSB-dolly steering linkage	145
81.	Schematic diagram of the CSB-dolly steering connection with its trailer	146
82.	A top view of the CSB-dolly upper steering arm	147
83.	The CSB-dolly steering linkage	148
84.	Rearward amplification performance results for all of the test dollies	151
85.	Comparison of test and simulation rearward amplification performance measures	151
	a. A-train	151
	b. Linked-articulation dolly	152
	c. Trapezoidal dolly, forward position	152
	d. Self-steering B-dolly, full resistance steering	153
	e. Controlled steering B-dolly, 0.30 steering system gain	153
86.	Rollover threshold of the test vehicle equipped with the various test dollies	155
87.	Example pulse-steer time histories of steering and lateral acceleration response	156
88.	Example pulse-steer response for each test dolly	158
	a. The LA.8 dolly	158
	b. The TRAP.F dolly	158
	c. The TRAP.R dolly	159
	d. The SA.60 dolly	159
	e. The SA.0 dolly	160
	f. The CSB.30 dolly	160
89.	Low-speed offtracking in a 50-ft- (15.24-m-) radius turn	162
	a. 50-ft- (15.24-m-) radius, 90 degree arc	162
	b. 50-ft- (15.24-m-) radius, 180 degree arc	162
90.	High-speed offtracking in a 1000-ft- (304.8-m-) radius turn at 45 mi/h (72.42 km/h)	163
	a. Absolute outboard offtracking	163
	b. High-speed outboard offtracking component	163
91.	Brake pressure and longitudinal deceleration time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 443	165
92.	Articulation angle and steering wheel angle time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 443	166
93.	Articulation angle and steering wheel angle time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 442	167

94.	Articulation angle and steering wheel angle time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 460	169
95.	Articulation angle and steering wheel angle time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 466	170
96.	Articulation angle and steering wheel angle time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 465	171
97.	Articulation angle and steering wheel angle time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 437	172
98.	Articulation angle and steering wheel angle time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 447	173
99.	Articulation angle and steering wheel angle time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 450	174
100.	Articulation angle and steering wheel angle time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 131	176
101.	Articulation angle and steering wheel angle time histories during braking-in-a-turn: run number 132	177
102.	The curb-climbing test	178
103.	The severe steer test	180
104.	Operating cost sensitivities for a current small fleet (the more important variables)	216
105.	Operating cost sensitivities for a current small fleet (the less important variables)	217
106.	Operating cost sensitivities for a lighter B-dolly	226

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Innovative Dollies and Hitching Hardware Identified in Task A	6
2. The Screening Study Vehicles	38
3. Significant Dimensions of the Simulated Vehicle of Figures 31 and 32	60
4. Effective Damping Ratio of the Test Vehicle in a 55 mi/h (88.5 km/h) Pulse-Steer Maneuver, Equipped with the Improved Dollies and Under Differing Load Conditions	99
5. The Influence of Dolly Drawbar Length and Steering Properties on the Damping Ratio of Test Vehicle Equipped with the B-Dollies	103
6. Maximum Absolute Drawbar Hitch Loads in Emergency Lane-Change Maneuvers at the Rollover Threshold	111
7. Combinations of Axle Widths Simulated	123
8. Rollover Thresholds of A-Trains - Static Roll Model	124
9. Maximum Lateral Acceleration (in g's) Developed at the Tractor During a 2 Radian/Second Lane-Change Maneuver - A-Train: Yaw/Roll Model	125
10. Maximum Lateral Acceleration (in g's) Developed at the Tractor During a 2 Radian/Second Lane-Change Maneuver - B-Train: Yaw/Roll Model	126
11. Side Slope and Road Sinkage (25 ft (7.62 m) Distance Constant): Sinkage Constrained to the Right Side of the Vehicle - A-Trains with a Forward Velocity of 27.72 mi/h (44.60 km/h)	127
12. Test Vehicle Wheel Loads	134
13. Variables Transduced and Recorded During Testing	134
14. Test Dolly Weights	150
15. Constants Used in Correcting Rearward Amplification Measures for Variations of Test Velocity from 55 mi/h (88.5 km/h)	150
16. Damping Ratios Measured in the Vehicle Testing Program	157
17. Maximum Loadings	181
18. Tractor-Trailer Accident Involvements by Data Source and Number of Trailers	189
19. ICC-Authorized Tractor-Trailer Accident Involvements by Data Source and Number of Trailers	189
20. Tractor-Trailer Fatal Accident Involvement Rates by Data Source and Number of Trailers	192
21. Tractor-Trailer Injury (Incl. Fatal) Accident Involvement Rates by Data Source and Number of Trailers	192
22. TIFA 1980-82: Tractor-Trailer Fatal Accident Involvements by Road Class and Number of Trailers	194
23. BMCS 1984: ICC-Authorized Tractor-Trailer Accident Involvements by Road Class and Number of Trailers	194

24.	TIFA 1980-82: Tractor-Trailer Involvements by Number of Vehicles Involved and Number of Trailers	196
25.	BMCS 1984: ICC-Authorized Tractor-Trailer Accident Involvements by Number of Vehicles Involved and Number of Trailers	196
26.	TIFA 1980-82: Tractor-Trailer Involvements by First Harmful Event and Number of Trailers	197
27.	TIFA 1980-82: Tractor-Trailer Involvements by Most Harmful Event and Number of Trailers	197
28.	TIFA 1980-82: Tractor-Trailer Involvements by Rollover and Number of Trailers	198
29.	TIFA 1980-82: Tractor-Trailer Involvements by Jackknife and Number of Trailers	198
30.	BMCS 1984: ICC-Authorized Tractor-Trailer Accident Involvements by Non-Collision Type and Number of Trailers	199
31.	BMCS 1984: ICC-Authorized Tractor-Trailer Property-Damage Accident Involvements by Non-Collision Type and Number of Trailers	199
32.	NASS 1981-84: Maximum AIS (MAIS) for Injury-Level Tractor-Trailer Involvements by Number of Trailers	201
33.	The Variables Used in the Financial Model	211
34.	The Reference Condition, Results Correspond to the Purchase of Six B-Dollies	212
35.	Variations Used in Sensitivity Analysis	215
36.	The Hypothetical Situation	219
37.	Values of the Variables Used in the Hypothetical Situation	221
38.	Another Reference Condition: Lighter B-Dolly	222
39.	Lighter B-Dolly Results	223
40.	Variations Used in Sensitivity Analysis: Lighter B-Dolly	225
41.	Worst-Case Loading Values	231

VOLUME II: APPENDICES

42.	Yaw/Roll Simulation Data Echo for the Fully Loaded Double Equipped with the A-Dolly	2
43.	Yaw/Roll Simulation Data Echo for the Fully Loaded Double Equipped with the Asymmetric Trapezoidal Dolly in the Forward IC Condition	9
44.	Yaw/Roll Simulation Data Echo for the Fully Loaded Double Equipped with the Linked-Articulation Dolly with 0.44 System Gain	16
45.	Yaw/Roll Simulation Data Echo for the Fully Loaded Double Equipped with the Self-Steering B-Dolly with Full Resistance Steering	23
46.	Yaw/Roll Simulation Data Echo for the Fully Loaded Double Equipped with the Controlled-Steering B-Dolly with 0.30 Steering Gain	31
47.	Variables Used in the Operational Impacts Study	41
48.	Key to the Variables Used in the Operational Impacts Study	42
49.	Economic Issues Considered in the Operational Impacts Study	43
50.	Equations Used for the Year Zero in the Operational Impacts Study	44

51.	Equations Used for Years One, Five and Nine in the Operational Impacts Study	45
52.	Equations Used for Years Two, Four, Six and Eight in the Operational Impacts Study	46
53.	Equations Used for Years Three and Seven in the Operational Impacts Study	47

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The success of this project is the result of the cooperation of a number of individuals and organizations, too numerous to allow a complete listing here. Special thanks are due, however, to the following: Mr. Norman Gallatin of the Trapezoid Corporation; Mr. William Feight Sr. of Truck Safety Systems; Mr. N. Royce Curry (formerly of ASTL) and Mr. Mike Krymski of Auto Steering Trailers Limited; Mr. Adrian Hulverson and Mr. Phil Pierce of the Fruehauf Corporation; Mr. Norman Burns of Highways and Transportation of the Province of Saskatchewan; Mr. Jack Baynes of the Department of Transportation of the Province of Alberta; Mr. Wayne Kaldestead and Mr. Fred Kearns of TRIMAC Transportation Services; Mr. Roy Margenau and Mr. Elmer Kiel of Chrysler Proving Grounds; and Mr. Martin Hargrave who served as the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative for FHWA.

The authors wish to thank John Koch, Tom Dixon, Michael Hagan, Michael Campbell, Jeannette Leveille, Kathy Richards, and David Toepler of the UMTRI staff for their efforts in this project.

IMPACT AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESEARCH STUDY

The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 allows the use of doubles combination vehicles nationwide on the interstate highway system. It also allows for the increase of commercial vehicle widths from 96 inches to 102 inches. This Act is generally expected to result in a major increase in the number of multi-trailer commercial vehicles in use throughout the U.S. At the same time, pressure for allowing the use of triples is increasing. In light of the fact that multi-trailer vehicles are known to suffer from special dynamic characteristics that can limit their stability and emergency maneuverability characteristics, vis-a-vis the tractor-semitrailer, these developments have led to concern over the potential for degradation of the safety quality of the U.S. commercial vehicle fleet. The primary purpose of this research study was to obtain (and disseminate) information on developments in heavy-vehicle technology which might provide improvement in the dynamic performance of multi-trailer vehicles, while this envisioned transition from singles to doubles vehicles was in progress. The purpose of the project was addressed through two specific goals, viz. (1) to develop safer, practical coupling mechanisms for multi-trailer combinations, and (2) to determine the safety effects of various width combinations possible under the 102-in-width limitation.

For purposes of this study, the goal of "improving the dynamic performance" of multi-trailer vehicles implied that the conventional tractor-semitrailer combination vehicle be taken as the reference. It is well established in the literature that maneuvering quality of the tractor-semitrailer portion of an A-train doubles combination vehicle is virtually unaffected by the presence of the full trailer, but that, in emergency maneuvers, the second trailer of the doubles suffers from a "crack-the-whip" phenomenon in which the second trailer substantially exaggerates, or amplifies, the motions of the tractor. The major safety consequence of this "rearward amplification" is the premature rollover of the second trailer. Rearward amplification and the resulting propensity toward rollover of the second trailer is generally recognized as the property of the double which distinguishes (and degrades) its dynamic performance capability from that of the tractor-semitrailer combination vehicle.

The major effort of this project, then, involved identification, analysis, and further development of innovative dolly and trailer hitching hardware showing potential for the reduction of rearward amplification and prevention of rollover of the second trailer. Specifically, the project (1) reviewed the current state-of-the-art in innovative coupling mechanisms, (2) performed a parametric sensitivity study, based on computer simulation techniques, on combination vehicles using existing and proposed coupling mechanisms, and incorporating various combinations of 96-

and 102-in-width hardware, (3) developed a new type of dolly believed to provide superior safety performance, (4) conducted full-scale tests of combination vehicles using various dollies, including a prototype of the new dolly, and (5) examined the potential operational impact of the use of innovative dolly hardware.

The major motivation for the use of multiply articulated trains by commercial trucking interests is to obtain a vehicle with high cargo volume which retains the practical benefit of good, low-speed maneuverability. Within the constraints of vehicle height and width laws, more cargo volume is attained by lengthening the vehicle. Generally, as vehicle length increases, so do maneuvering problems, since the magnitude of low-speed offtracking is directly related to vehicle length. However, the offtracking of a vehicle of a given length is generally reduced by the introduction of additional yaw articulation joints. By virtue of these facts, the so-called A-train doubles combination has become a popular commercial vehicle.

An A-train consists of a tractor-semitrailer pulling one or more conventional full trailers, where a conventional full trailer consists of a semitrailer whose forward end is supported by a dolly which (1) articulates in yaw relative to the semitrailer, (2) is connected to the towing unit by a single pintle hitch, and (3) has one or more axles which are non-steering relative to the dolly frame. While the A-train meets the primary need of providing a large-volume vehicle which can be maneuvered relatively easily at low speed, it is also known to be less stable at highway speeds than is the conventional tractor-semitrailer.

The dynamic stability of the A-train suffers from the phenomenon known as rearward amplification, wherein, in steering maneuvers of relatively high frequency content, trailing units in the train will tend to experience higher lateral accelerations than their towing unit. Thus lateral acceleration "amplifies" as one moves rearward along the train, and the rearmost trailer may experience accelerations much larger than those experienced by the driver in the tractor. The most serious safety consequence of the phenomenon is the resulting rollover of the rear trailer. Further, the addition of yaw articulation joints tends to reduce the yaw damping of the vehicle, and the reduction of low-speed offtracking tends to aggravate high-speed offtracking.

In recent years, the safety-degrading influence of additional articulation joints has become broadly recognized. Nonetheless, the economic motivations for the use of multi-trailer trains is so compelling that the use of such vehicles does and will continue to grow. In an attempt to improve the safety quality of these vehicles, however, a number of innovative dollies and hitching mechanisms have been developed. This project was intended to examine these developments and further the process of improving the dynamic performance capability of multi-trailer commercial vehicles.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE RESEARCH RESULTS

The computer simulations and vehicle tests showed that innovative dolly arrangements can provide significant improvements in the dynamic performance of multi-trailer combination vehicles. At least four different types of dollies with double drawbars (B-dollies) or special steering arrangements for the dolly wheels exhibited better performance than the conventional double with wagon-tongue steering and a single pintle connection to the first semitrailer. The prototype dolly, that was designed and developed in this project, demonstrated less rearward amplification of the motion of the tractor, more roll stability of the rear trailer, and no more offtracking than a conventional double.

With regard to increases in wheel and spring spacings due to the allowance of 102-in widths, the results show that an increase in width at any axle will be beneficial to roll stability. The greatest improvement in roll stability is attained by increasing the track widths of as many wheel and spring sets as possible.

The accident studies showed that singles and doubles have comparable fatal-accident rates. Doubles have a greater tendency to roll over than singles. By reducing the rollover tendency of doubles to that of singles, a safety benefit with an economic value of 0.84 cents per mile was estimated.

The economic analysis indicated that the dollar value of reduced accident costs was not large enough to provide a profit motive for the use of heavier and more complex dollies. Additional incentives such as weight allowances or less restricted access to pick up and delivery sites would be required to provide a profit motive for using B-dollies.

APPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

The findings of this research investigation suggest that it is both reasonable and practical to develop commercial vehicle dollies which can significantly improve the dynamic performance of the multi-trailer combination vehicle. Accordingly, a set of reasonable performance and design "guidelines" have been enumerated to provide goals in the development of innovative commercial vehicle dollies. The guidelines set forth in the final technical report apply specifically to the vehicle configuration commonly known as the Western Double in the fully loaded 80,000-lb GVW condition with both trailers having sprung mass c.g. heights of 80 in (typical of "medium density" freight). Performance expectations would be different for other configurations. In that regard, current understanding suggests that caution should be exercised in applying B-dollies in long-drawbar configurations.

The guidelines provide goals with respect to (a) vehicle dynamics performance properties, (b) dolly mechanical properties, and (c) the ability to withstand worst-case levels of structural loads.

With regard to future development of innovative dollies, the findings of this study indicate that B-dollies are dynamically superior to A-dollies and other types of innovative dollies because of (a) the roll coupling between the leading semitrailer and the dolly, and (b) the possibility of steering the dolly wheels to achieve good trailing fidelity of the last trailer. However, as long as productivity is the ruling force, there is not much economic incentive to use heavier B-dollies in place of lighter, simpler A-dollies.

The permit system that exists in the western Provinces of Canada encourages the use of B-dollies there. Weight allowances and the right to operate on secondary roads are strong economic incentives that promote the use of B-dollies in Canada. The ability to back up and make local deliveries means that the operation of doubles with B-dollies can be very attractive and profitable in certain types of service. In order for B-dollies to become popular in the United States, economic incentives may need to be developed. These incentives might come from (a) reduction, through design or special permission, of the weight penalty associated with B-dollies, (b) extraordinarily unfavorable changes in insurance rates and/or increases in settlements from lawsuits, thereby increasing the economic importance of safety, or (c) allowance to travel off of the interstate and primary highway system to make deliveries and pick ups.

The findings of this study are positive enough with respect to B-dollies to support a recommendation that combinations with new types of dollies be tested and evaluated in practical service in the United States. This evaluation effort would be in addition to a field trial of the prototype dolly that is currently underway in Canada.