## Crush Analysis Considerations

Use of Crush in Vehicle Accident Reconstruction for the Purpose of Determining Impact Speed


# Crush Analysis Considerations 

## presented by

Daniel W. Vomhof III
4N6XPRT Systems
www.4N6XPRT.com
8387 University Avenue - La Mesa, CA 91942 - USA Ph: (619) 464-3478 - Email: dv3@4n6xprt.com for

## IATAI 2022 Conference

Illinois Association of Technical Accident Investigators September 21-23, 2022 Collinsville, IL

## Crush Analysis Considerations

- ACTAR \# 484
- EIT
- Involved in AI/AR work since 1976

\# 484



## Speed from Crush

## Background - Measurement -History Calculation

## Overview

## Objections to using crush

- One of the stumbling blocks to using crush often cited by people is that the measurements take too much time
- Other objections to using it are -
- No class in crush (yet)
- Don't need it with now having CDR
- Inaccurate
- Don't like it - Prefer Momentum


## Measurement

## Background

- "Standard" Measurement protocol says 2,4, or 6 equally spaced measurements
- Referred to as the "Tumbas Protocol"
- Outlined in SAE \# 880072 "Measuring Protocol for Quantifying Vehicle Damage from an Energy Basis Point of View" By Nicholas Tumbas and Russell Smith


## Measurement

## Background

- Do we need equally spaced damage measurements?
- Why or why not? When? Where?
- Especially, do we need them out in the field?


## Measurement

## Background

夫 - In order to "Make Crush Work" ... NO!!! You do not have to take equally spaced measurements.
$\star$ - Refer to the Presentation made at WREX 2016 which is on our web site at: http://www.4n6xprt.com/papers/
$\star$ - You are much better off when out in the field to measure to the "inflection points"

*     - To put it another way, document the critical points just as you would document any other evidence, If you can draw it, you can take additional measurements when needed


## Measurement

## Background

$\star$ - When needed .... what does that mean??
$\star$ - Many of the CRASH 3 programs require that the crush measurements be entered with equal spacing between the measurements.
^ - So .... now what???

*     - Now you take your measurements made in the field, draw them out to scale, and then lay out where your equally spaced crush measurements will be, then measure the crush


## Measurement

## Background

*     - If you are scanning the damage, and can scan an exemplar vehicle, determining what the crush is, and where to measure from and too, becomes even easier with a program like CLOUD COMPARE ( https://www.danielgm.net/cc/ )
*     - Whether you measure by hand, with a total station, or with a scanner, it will always be easier to measure the critical points in the field (and yes, a scanner will get both c"critical" and non-critical points as part fo its scan), and then get your equally spaced crush measurements in the comfort of your office.


## Measurement

## Background

- So, to summarize,

1 - Measure to the critical points (the inflection or bend points) with appropriate references to "landmark" points on the vehicle while in the field. This will speed up the physical measurement process tremendously, while also reducing what you have to remember

## Measurement

## Background

- So, to summarize (cont)

2 - Obtain your equally spaced crush measurements once you are back in the comfort of your office. This is the "When" and the "Where" that these measurements should be obtained, if and when they are needed.

## Crush - "No Class"

Another "objection" I have heard through the years regarding not using crush is a lack of formal training

- While formal training is of benefit, it is not required
- This presentation, and others like it, can be considered formal training
- The BEST training is self-training - i.e. - try it and see what works


## Crush - "No Class"

## Self-Training steps

- First you have to document the crush, since if you have no crush, you cannot calculate the "speed from crush". This might sound like a simple concept, but at times it has been lost on people. (see side 141)
- Next, apply the various types of calculations (see slides to come) to the crush you have documented.
- Again, no crush = no speed to be calculated although, you might be able to say "The speed was "less than" XX mph" based on the elastic variable (CRASH 3).


## Crush - "No Class"

Self-Training steps

- Then, compare the speed(s) you have calculated from crush to the speeds you have obtained through other methods (i.e. momentum, CDR, etc)
- Last, set a procedure (protocol) and/or set of calculations for which you feel you can defend what/why/how when you are questioned about it.


## Crush - "Don't need it due to CDR"

- First - not every vehicle on the roadway has a CDR/EDR to download
- Second - Even if it has the module, you cant always GET a download
In the event of either or both of these occurring in your collision, you need a backup method to determine speed.


## Crush - "Don't need it due to CDR"

- You usually have to go through a process, which takes time, before you can do the download. With the proper tools, you can get an idea of the speeds from crush immediately upon your return to the office, if not out at the scene itself. This can at times help you get an idea of what else about the case you might want to look at.


## Crush - Inaccurate

In and of itself speeds arrived at from crush are no more or less accurate than speeds determined through other methods Momentum, other energy calculations (i.e.spin, yaw, skidding, braking, etc.), airborne, etc.
Speed from crush may, however, be less PRECISE than other methods to determine speeds

## Crush - Inaccurate

## Precise vs Accurate

Taken from
https://www.honolulu.hawaii.edu/instruct/natsci/science/brill/sci122/SciLab/L5/accprec.html\# :~:text=Accurate\%20means\%20\%22capable\%20of\%20providing,of\%20the\%20thing\%20bei ng\%20measured.

The Science of Measurement: Accuracy vs. Precision The dictionary definitions of these two words do not clearly make the distinction as it is used in the science of measurement.

Accurate means "capable of providing a correct reading or measurement." In physical science it means 'correct'. A measurement is accurate if it correctly reflects the size of the thing being measured.

## Crush - Inaccurate

## Precise vs Accurate

Taken from
https://www.honolulu.hawaii.edu/instruct/natsci/science/brill/sci122/SciLab/L5/accprec.html\# :~:text=Accurate\%20means\%20\%22capable\%20of\%20providing,of\%20the\%20thing\%20bei ng\%20measured.

The Science of Measurement: Accuracy vs. Precision The dictionary definitions of these two words do not clearly make the distinction as it is used in the science of measurement.

Precise means "exact, as in performance, execution, or amount. "In physical science it means "repeatable, reliable, getting the same measurement each time."

## Crush - Inaccurate

## Precise vs Accurate

Taken from
https://www.honolulu.hawaii.edu/instruct/natsci/science/brill/sci122/SciLab/L5/accprec.html\# :~:text=Accurate\%20means\%20\%22capable\%20of\%20providing,of\%20the\%20thing\%20bei ng\%20measured.

The Science of Measurement: Accuracy vs. Precision

We can never make a perfect measurement. The best we can do is to come as close as possible within the limitations of the measuring instruments.

## Crush - Inaccurate

## Precise vs Accurate

Taken from
https://www.honolulu.hawaii.edu/instruct/natsci/science/brill/sci122/SciLab/L5/accprec.html\# :~:text=Accurate\%20means\%20\%22capable\%20of\%20providing,of\%20the\%20thing\%20bei ng\%20measured.


## Crush - Inaccurate

## Precise vs Accurate

Taken from
https://www.honolulu.hawaii.edu/instruct/natsci/science/brill/sci122/SciLab/L5/accprec.html\# : ~:text=Accurate\%20means\%20\%22capable\%20of\%20providing,of\%20the\%20thing\%20bei ng\%20measured.

## The Science of Measurement: Accuracy vs. Precision Some additional references -

https://manoa.hawaii.edu/exploringourfluidearth/physical/world-ocean/map-distortion/practices-science-precision-vs-accuracy
https://www.thoughtco.com/difference-between-accuracy-and-precision-609328
https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-meaning-of-accuracy-and-precision-inScience

## Crush - Inaccurate

The accuracy of a speed from crush calculation depends upon the crush measurements taken, the data that is used to develop stiffness values, and how well the crash under investigation fits the model that was used to develop the calculation method.
As with any other calculation, if your data sucks, and the model doesn't fit the crash in question, your results should be EXPECTED to be poor.

## Crush - Inaccurate

Examples of poor data and/or bad models
Some examples of poor data and/or bad models follow:

- Speed from skid when there are no skidmarks - Statement gets made, the driver didn't brake
- Speed from Yaw, using the "flattest" tire mark when the vehicle was actually in a spin


## Crush - Inaccurate

Examples of poor data and/or bad models

Some examples of poor data and/or bad models follow (cont):

- Calculating the minimum speed at the start of skid for a vehicle to slide 10 feet and then slam into a tree, leaving 2 feet of crush into the front of the vehicle as $15 \mathrm{mph} . .$.
SQR(30*10*.75)
i.e.- ignoring the crush


## Crush - Prefer Momentum

As with the CDR preference, sometimes momentum is not an option

- the previous example of a car into a tree (light pole, bridge, house, etc) is one example of this.
- hard to do momentum if there are no measurements for point/area of impact and/or points of rest due to lack of documentation.


# Speed from Crush 

When should I use it?

You should do one or more crush calculations every chance you get, not just when that is the only thing left

- Like anything else, you need to stay "fluent" in crush, which means practice, if you only use it as a last resort, your gonna make mistakes


## Speed from Crush

When should I use it?

- If you use it and compare to other results, then when its all you have you can say "I routinely calculate a speed from crush, and find that it falls within the speed range of other speed calculations. I have no reason to expect it would be any different here if there were other ways to check the speed"
- Your calculations do not have to be "in depth" and you don't have to include them in your report, especially if nothing goes down on paper.


## Crush Measurements

## Protocol / What do you need to measure Damage? / End Damage / Side Damage

## Crush Measurements

 Why?*Document extent

* Document location
* Help determine PDOF and how the vehicle(s) came together
*Help determine Energy expenditure (i.e. speed necessary to cause the crush)
$\star$ Help to illustrate the severity of the collision


## Crush Measurements

## Definition of PROTOCOL

http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/protocol

## $\star$ PROTOCOL

* 3(b) : a set of conventions governing the treatment and especially the formatting of data in an electronic communications system <network protocols>
$\star 3$ (c) : convention 3a,b
* 4 : a detailed plan of a scientific or medical experiment, treatment, or procedure


# Crush Measurements 

## Tumbas "Protocol" Summary

* SAE 880072 Lays it out specifically for part 4 of the previous definition
* Called the "Tumbas Protocol" in honor of one of the authors
* 2,4 , or 6 equally spaced measurements along the FIELD crush Length
* Locate damage midpoint, both direct damage midpoint and induced damage midpoint, and position them relative to vehicle Center of Mass
$\star$ Lots of other conditions for handling "Specialty" situations

The Engineering Society
For Advancing Mobility

## SAE Technical Paper Series

Measuring Protocol for Quantifying Vehicle Damage from an Energy Basis Point of View Nicholas S. Tumbas Russell A. Smith U.S. Naval Academy

## Crush Measurements

## "Protocol" (cont)

* Do you really need to be worrying about all that at a scene, or even in a tow yard?
$\star$ Isnt it better to concentrate on documenting the evidence, something you do regularly, instead of worrying how many measurements, whats the spacing, etc?
$\star$ Proper crush documentation - If you think it MIGHT be important, or you MIGHT be asked about it, it should probably be documented.
$\star$ More on this at the end


## Crush Measurements

What do you need to measure Damage?

What do you need to measure crush?
$\star$ Do you need a Scanner?
$\star$ A Total Station?
$\star$ A Commercial Jig?

While all of these are nice, and have there uses, all you really need is several tape measures.

## Crush Measurements

## Minimalists guide

$\star$ How many measurements do you need to take? As many as are required to properly document the damage.

* If using a Total Station this could be as little as 1, the max crush point, if you are already documenting the vehicle as part of the scene.
* It should probably be at least 3 - the two "end points" of the crush as well as the perceived max crush point.


## Crush Measurements

## Minimalists guide - cont

* With a Tape Measure Jig you will need at least 4 tape measures, 2 of which that are 25-35 foot in length. 3 of these are for your jig, one is for measuring "depth". You also need a "plumb bob", for which there are many possible "Field Expedients" including a bottle of water or another tape measure. The purpose of the plumb bob is to insure you are measuring depth and depth measurement position "accurately".


## Crush Measurements

## End Measurement

* Need to "tie" to an undamaged feature. Typically this will be far "axle" position from the damage. For a Front impact that would be the rear axles, and vice-versa for a rear impact.
$\star$ If there is no end shifting, it is easiest to line up both tapes so that they are against the outside of the tires.


## Crush Measurements

## End Measurement - cont


$\star$ If there is end shift, you need to establish how far "off" of undamaged positions on the vehicle the tape is laid.
$\star$ Do this on both sides of the vehicle.


# Crush Measurements 

## End Measurement - cont

* Then extend a third tape across the two tapes at the same point on the tapes. If the furthest projection is at say, 123 inches, lay the third tape across at the 130 inch point. For a lot of reasons, it will simplify your life if you can remember to have the " 0 " point of the tape on the driver side. One of the primary reasons is because then your progression $C_{1}$ to $C_{\text {final }}$ will be in the same progression as the Protocol measurements. While not essential, it removes a "smoke screen" issue from the other side when being asked about your measurements.


## Crush Measurements

## End Measurement - cont



## Crush Measurements

## End Measurement - cont

* From there, document your damage across and in. If it is all at one height, fine, if not, you may want to also document the height of the object above ground as well.



## Crush Measurements

## End Measurement - cont

« Usually you will be measuring at bumper height, however
« If you have a under/over ride situation, your bumper may have been only partially engaged, or not engaged at all.
$\star$ Document the bumper position
$\star$ Document the crush depth, and height
$\star$ Depending upon how much of the vehicle structure is involved, the measurements may not be able to be used in a CRASH 3 calculation, but should still be documented for damage extent and allow for matching of one vehicle to the other. Also, there are other methods of speed determination besides the CRASH 3 approach.

See - A Scientific Approach to Tractor-Trailer Side Underride Analysis -SAE 2003-01-

# Crush Measurements 

## End Measurement - cont

A Scientific Approach to Tractor-Trailer Side Underride Analysis -SAE 2003-01-0178


## Crush Measurements

## End Measurement - cont

* Before picking up your tapes, walk your side measurements and note salient points -other axle position, and any other damage such as back of door relative to "B" pillar.



## Crush Measurements

Side Measurement
^ As a bit of forshadowing, this is also a valid method for side damage measurements, especially when there is bowing to the vehicle.
$\star$ Lay a tape down along the undamaged side.
$\star$ Lay a tape along the damaged side a set distance off of the other tape.


## Measurement

Front and Rear Damage
Find your Damage

## Measurement

## Front and Rear Damage

Layout Tapes for Left and Right Side, with a cross tape at the same distance on each side

## Measurement

Front and Rear Damage
Document your Reference Points


## Measurement

Front and Rear Damage

## Document your Reference Points



## Measurement

## Front and Rear Damage

Take your measurement(s)


## Measurement

## Front and Rear Damage

## Record your measurement(s):

In this instance I made the field adjustment for "depth" of crease minus depth of two bumper bar corners.
It would be better documentation practice to record the distance "across" and "depth" for each corner as well as the damage "crease" when in the field, and then do the calculations once you are back in the office.

## Measurement

## Front and Rear Damage

Don't forget the bumper foam/plastic/energy absorber material thickness


## Measurement

## Front and Rear Damage

At its thickest point the foam and/or plastic energy absorber material is 3-4 inches thick. It generally tapers at the ends to a thickness of 1-2 inches.

When/if measuring your crush depth to the bumper bar, you need to subtract this thickness from your crush depth. If you do not, your crush depth is too deep, which will result in a higher speed calculation.

## Measurement

## Front and Rear Damage - Practical Application

For the vehicle shown in this example, for a crush depth to the bar of 6 inches, which is at the center of the bar, the resulting crush depth would be 3 inches.

6 inches of crush minus 3 inches of foam = 3 inches of crush damage

## Measurement

## Side Damage

## Crush Measurements

Side Measurement
*Again, best to line up the " 0 " end of the tape with the rear corner or axle, depending on where the crush (direct or induced, whichever is furthest back) ends.


# Crush Measurements 

## Side Measurement

^You want to document both ends of induced damage, and both ends of contact damage, along with deepest crush point.

## Crush Measurements

## Side Measurement



## Crush Measurements

Side Measurement
*Document other "tie in" points as you feel are needed/appropriate - axles, A-B-C pillars, etc.


## Crush Measurements

## Side Measurement - cont

* Look for signs of "structural failure". One good indicator of this would be the bottom of the door(s) pulled away from the sill. In this case you should document depth to sill as well as deepest point. Deepest point will normally be about bumper level (of the "bullet" vehicle). Also document what failed and where it is.


## Crush Measurements

## Side Measurement - cont



## Crush Measurements

## Your "Guiding Light"

* Document the crush the same way you would document any other evidence
$\star$ Tie in your base line.
* Note WHERE the depth measurements were taken along with how deep.
« If you feel its necessary for proper documentation to measure up from the ground to the point you were measuring, do so. ESPECIALLY if the point is outside the "normal" height range.


## Crush Measurements

## Your "Guiding Light"

*Photograph the damage before you lift your baseline tape - while this is not required, it could be helpful.
*Remember, if its not documented, it can't be considered.

## Crush Analysis Formulas

History<br>And<br>Formulas

## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

## $v=1.1 \mathrm{C}$

^ 1968 -R.I. Emori presented a formula in SAE paper 680016 for calculating vehicle impact speed based on Maximum Permanent crush

* $\mathrm{v}=1.1 \mathrm{C}$
$\star v=$ speed in miles per hour, $C=$ maximum permanent crush in inches


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

## $v=1.1 C$

SAMPLE APPLICATION
$\star$ For instance, you have a 3130 pound vehicle impacting a barrier at 35 mph , which results in an average crush depth of 21.4 inches. However, use of Emori's formula does not require exemplar test crashes. This is included in this Sample Application for continuity with other Sample Applications.
$\star$ NO calculations are needed from exemplar crashes for an application of Emori's formula. It is what it is, which is part of its appeal, especially for those just beginning to use crush.

## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

$$
v=1.1 C
$$

«Now, in the "real" collision you have an average crush depth of 10 inches, and a vehicle weight of 3000 pounds.
Applying your constant of 1.1 , you get -
$\star$ Speed $=\left(1.1^{*}\right.$ Crush Dist $)$
$\star$ Speed $=\left(1.1^{*} 10\right)$

* Speed $=11 \mathrm{mph}$


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

$$
V=b_{o}+b_{1} C
$$

$\star 1974$-Kenneth L. Campbell presented a formula in SAE paper 740565 for calculating vehicle impact speed based on residual crush to assist in estimating the severity of automobile collisions.
$\star \mathrm{V}=\mathrm{b}(\mathrm{o})+\mathrm{b}(1)^{*} \mathrm{C}$

* $\mathrm{V}=$ impact speed in mile per hour, $\mathrm{b}(0)=$ " y " intercept in miles per hour, $b(1)=$ crush vs. speed slope in miles per hour per inch, and $\mathrm{C}=$ residual crush in inches


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

$$
F=A+B C \quad E=\left(A C+\frac{B * C^{2}}{2}+G\right) * w
$$

* ~1975 -Raymond R. McHenry followed Campbell's work with the CRASH computer program to estimate impact speed from damage using a force deflection (spring) model.
* $F=A+B^{*} C$
$\star E=\left(A^{*} C+B^{*} C^{\wedge} 2 / 2+G\right) * w$

Where

- E=Crush Energy in inch*pounds
- C = Crush depth in inches
- $A=$ pounds/inch
$-G=A^{\wedge} 2 / 2 B$ in pounds
- F=pounds
- $\mathrm{w}=$ the length (width) of the crush
- $B=$ pounds/inch^2


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

$$
E=\left(A C+\frac{B^{*} C^{2}}{2}+G\right)^{*} w
$$

* 1981 -David Segal gave a physical interpretation of the constants in a presentation to Transport Canada
$\star A$ is the spring pre-loading value, pounds/inch
$\star B$ is the energy absorbed in plastic (permanent) deformation, the spring constant, $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{in} \wedge 2$
* G is the energy absorbed in the elastic (nonpermanent) range of the "structure", (A^2 / 2*B)


## Crush Analysis Formulas

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E=\left(A C+\frac{B * C^{2}}{2}+G\right) * w \\
& b_{0}=N D S_{m p h} * \frac{12 * 5280}{3600}
\end{aligned} b_{1}=\frac{V_{i}-b_{0}}{C r}
$$

* The constants ( $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \& \mathrm{G}$ ) are calculated using values that seem to go back to Campbell's work ... with slight modification
$\star$ The first step in establishing the constants $(A, B, \& G)$ is to calculate the values of $b_{(0)}$ and $b_{(1)}$
* $b_{(0)}$ is again the " $y$ " intercept, or "No Damage Speed" (NDS), only this time in inch/sec instead of miles/hour
$\star \mathrm{b}_{(1)}$ is again the slope of the crush vs. speed slope, only now it has a few more elements involved in determining its value, $\mathrm{V}_{(\mathrm{I})}$ is the "impact" speed in inches/sec, and Cr is the crush value in inches.


## Crush Analysis Formulas

$$
\begin{gathered}
E=\left(A C+\frac{B * C^{2}}{2}+G\right) * W \\
A=\frac{W * b_{0} * b_{1}}{g * L} \quad B=\frac{W * b_{1} * b_{1}}{g * L} \quad G=\frac{A * A}{2 * B}
\end{gathered}
$$

$\star A$ is calculated using both the $b_{(0)}$ and the $b_{(1)}$ values, along with the vehicle weight (W), gravity in inches $/ \mathrm{sec}^{2}(\mathrm{~g}=386.4 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{sec})$ and the length (L) of the crush in inches. \{Note: "Crush Length" is also referred to as Crush Width, especially when looking at front and rear end damage.\}
$\star B$ is calculated using only the $b_{(1)}$ value in conjunction with the vehicle weight (W), gravity $(\mathrm{g})$, and the length ( L ) of the crush.
$\star G$ is calculated as a ratio of $A$ to $B$

## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

* Once you have "stiffness" values, the constants (A, $B, \& G)$, you can then calculate the energy absorbed by the vehicle damage, and from there a EBV/EES/EBS/BEV/BES/KEES.
(In the KEES calculation, gamma is comprised of the Yaw Moment of Inertia and the Force Moment Arm, and can be ignored for Full Frontal Barrier tests)

$$
E=\left(A C+\frac{B * C^{2}}{2}+G\right) * w
$$

$$
K E E S_{m p h}=\frac{3600}{5280} * \sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{2 * E * \gamma}{12}\right)}{\left(\frac{W}{g}\right)}}
$$

## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

* This equation (the "Campbell" equation) is popular due to its use in the various flavors of CRASH3 programs that are out for use, however, it also has its problems, briefly -
$\star$ It is complex
$\star$ It relies on knowing the stiffness values or having one or more tests to calculate the values from (so what happens when you have no tests to calculate the stiffness values from?? And if you have only one test, how do you know that vehicle/test is representative??)
« It is complex, as in hard to do by hand, even with no rotation


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

* "Campbell" equation cont.-
* It is complex, as in to use in "real" collisions, the gamma value must taken into account due to vehicle rotation -making the calculations even more difficult to do by hand
* It is complex, as in hard to answer hypotheticals when on the stand (i.e. -what happens to your speeds if there is only 10 inches of crush instead of the 18 you used?)
^ And, did I mention, It is complex???


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

$$
\text { Speed }_{m p h}=\sqrt{30 * M I D * C F}
$$

## Is this the "Vomhof" Equation????

## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

$\star 1975$-The First Edition of the Traffic Accident Investigation Manual by J. Stannard Baker was published. In that manual he published a table of "Typical Values of Acceleration and Deceleration of Motor Vehicles on Level Surfaces" . In that table, he gave the following Drag Factor values:
$\star$ Car crash into standing car $=-5.00$

* Crash into solid fixed object $=-20.00$
$\star$ These Drag factor values can be used in the well known slide to stop equations:

$$
\text { Speed }=5.5 \sqrt{d^{*} f} \quad \text { Speed }=\sqrt{30 * d^{*} f}
$$

## Crush Analysis Formulas



## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

## Speed $_{\text {mph }}=\sqrt{30 * M I D * C F}$

Is this the "Vomhof" Equation????
Answer \#1 - No, it is the "Speed from Skid" equation.
Answer \#2 - No, it is the "Baker (?) Equation".
Answer \#3 - If anything is "Vomhof" about the equation, it is the term "Crush Factor" and the modification and refinement of the deceleration value (ie - CF).

## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

* Our work between 1977-1990 with the values published in the Traffic Accident Investigation Manual found that the "Car crash into standing car" value seemed to give speed values which were far too low when compared to other calculations (i.e. -momentum)
* 1990-1991 we did some evaluation of the NHTSA Crash Test data as published in the Accident Reconstruction Journal, from which we were able to refine the Crush Factor value to 21 for frontal crashes.
* We use the term "Crush Factor" in the formula because, well, we are talking about crush rather than a skid/slide to stop.


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

* 1997-present further work with the NHTSA Crash Test data has found that the "generic" value of 21 is still a good first approximation number for determination of the KEES from damage to the Front, Side, and Rear of passenger vehicles.
* See the January-February 2019 issue of the Accident Reconstruction Journal for an article entitled "CRUSH FACTOR: A VALIDITY ANALYSIS - PART I (FRONTAL)" which covers the $C F=21$ for frontal impacts.
* A reprint of the article can be downloaded from our web site at -http://www.4n6xprt.com/papers/


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

$$
\text { Speed }_{m p h}=\sqrt{30 * M I D * C F}
$$

$\star 1991$ - the first sales of Expert AutoStats and Expert Qwic Calcs were made. These programs incorporated the evaluation work completed between 1990-1991. Expert AutoStats contained the published Crush Factor values of:
$\star$ Frontal impact damage, CF=21
^ Side or Rear impact damage, $\mathrm{CF}=27$ (It has since been determined that the $C F=27$ value calculates an estimate of Bullet vehicle speed at impact from Target vehicle damage only, no Post-Impact Energy losses should be combined with this speed)

## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

$$
\text { Speed }_{\text {mph }}=\sqrt{30 * M I D * C F}
$$

$\star$ These values ( $C F=21$ or $C F=27$ ) are used in the equation Speed $=$ SQR(30*MID*CF) where:
$\star 30=$ a constant that converts the input distance of feet into an output of mph
$\star$ MID $=$ Maximum Indentation Depth in Feet
$\star$ CF $=$ Crush Factor

## Crush Analysis Formulas

$$
\text { Speed }_{\text {mph }}=\sqrt{30 * M I D * C F}
$$

## Who uses it??

## Crush Analysis Formulas <br> Speed $=$ SQR(30*MID*CF) - Who Uses It??

* In conjunction with our Update Order Forms for the Expert AutoStats program in 2004 we conducted a survey on the use of this formula.
* The 2004 survey was a two part survey. $\star$ First part - Have you used the Expert AutoStats Crush Factor Value for speed calculations?
$\star$ Second part - Have you found the calculated speed to be in good agreement with your other calculations? (i.e. - "Peer Review" prior to Daubert)


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## Speed $=$ SQR(30*MID*CF) - Who Uses It? $?$

* Out of 417 updates -
$\star 235$ responded to the survey (55\%)
* 84 indicated they had tried the Equation and Crush Factor values in Expert AutoStats (36\% of responses)
* Of the YES responses to part 1
* 72 said yes, there was reasonably good agreement ( $85.7 \%$ of Pt 1 YES responses)
* 8 said no,, there was not reasonably good agreement ( $9.5 \%$ of Pt 1 YES responses)
* 4 indicated they had tried the Equation but did not indicate whether the agreement was good or not (4.8\% of Pt 1 YES responses)


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## Speed $=\operatorname{SQR}(30 *$ MID*CF $)-$ Who Uses It??

$\star$ The 2004 survey comments-
$\star$ It works, what else can I say?
$\star$ It is simple. Simple is good. Juries understand simple.
$\star$ It is too simple
$\star$ Too general in nature
$\star$ I've never seen the formula. Didn't know it was there.

## Crush Analysis Formulas

## Speed $=$ SQR(30*MID*CF) - Who Uses It? $?$

* Conclusions from the 2004 survey -
* Of the people who have tried/tested the speed from crush calculation using the Crush Factor suggested in Expert AutoStats, the vast majority have found that the results are in reasonably good agreement with other methods of speed calculation (again, pre Daubert, - peer reviewed)


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

$$
\text { Speed }_{m p h}=\sqrt{30 * \text { MID }^{*} C F} \quad C F=\frac{\text { Speed }_{m p h}{ }^{2}}{30 * M I D}
$$

## How is the Crush Factor (CF) Calculated?

* In the same way that you would derive a drag factor from test skids, you obtain the Crush Factor from test crashes -
$\star \mathrm{CF}=$ Speed $^{2} /(30 *$ Crush Distance)
$\star$ Note - the Crush Distance is in feet
* Note - the "Speed" is only the closing speed when looking at frontal barrier tests
* In vehicle-vehicle or moving barrier-vehicle tests, additional calculations need to be made to find the appropriate "Speed" to use in the equation.


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas - Sample Application

$$
\text { Speed }_{\text {mph }}=\sqrt{30 * \text { MID }^{* C F}}
$$

$$
C F=\frac{\text { Speed }_{m p h}{ }^{2}}{30 * M I D}
$$

## SAMPLE APPLICATION

* For instance, you have a 3130 pound vehicle impacting a barrier at 35 mph , which results in an average crush depth of 21.4 inches
* For the CF value, Weight is not important
* TEST SPECIFIC CF=35^2/(30*(21.4/12))
* TEST SPECIFIC CF $=22.897$ (i.e. -23 )


## Crush Analysis Formulas

History \& Formulas - Sample Application

$$
\text { Speed }_{\text {mph }}=\sqrt{30 * M I D * C F}
$$

$$
C F=\frac{\text { Speed }_{m p h}{ }^{2}}{30 * M I D}
$$

* Now, in the "real" collision you have an average crush depth of 10 inches, and a vehicle weight of 3000 pounds. Applying your constant from the test crash, you get -
* Speed $=$ SQR(30*CF*Crush Dist)
* Speed $=\operatorname{SQR}(30 * 23 *(10 / 12))$
* Speed $=23.979$ (i.e. -24 mph )
$\star$ Using the Generic CF from AutoStats, you get * Speed $=\operatorname{SQR}(30 * 21 *(10 / 12))$
$\star$ Speed $=22.91$ (i.e.-23 mph)


## Crush Analysis Formulas

History \& Formulas

$$
v_{\text {equivalent }}=\sqrt{\frac{2 * k * c}{m}}
$$

* 1994 -The book Engineering Analysis of Vehicular Accidents by Randall K. Noon is published.
* In Chapter 10 he proposes the following method for the evaluation of speed from Crush:
* From test crashes, use the equation $K E=1 / 2 * m * v^{2}$ to develop a " $k$ " value which has the units lb - $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{in}$


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

$$
v_{\text {equivalent }}=\sqrt{\frac{2 * k * c}{m}}
$$

$\star 1994$-The book Engineering Analysis of Vehicular Accidents by Randall K. Noon is published. (Cont.)
$\star$ Using that $k$ value, and the equation $V_{\text {eq }}=\operatorname{SQR}\left(2^{*} k^{*} \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{m}\right)$, calculate the speed from crush in ft/sec
$\star \mathrm{V}_{\text {eq }}=$ Velocity equivalent of a impact into a fixed barrier (feet/sec)
$\star \mathrm{k}=$ constant with units of pound-feet/inch
$\star \mathrm{c}=$ average inches of crush

* m=vehicle mass, (weight/gravity)


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas - Sample Application

$v_{\text {equivalent }}=\sqrt{\frac{2 * k^{*} c}{m}}$

## SAMPLE APPLICATION

$\star$ Again, you have a 3130 pound vehicle impacting a barrier at 35 mph , which results in an average crush depth of 21.4 inches

* From this you calculated the Kinetic Energy expended was $128,200 \mathrm{lb}-\mathrm{ft}\left(\mathrm{KE}=1 / 2^{*} \mathrm{~m}^{*} \mathrm{v}^{2}\right.$ )
$\star$ Dividing the Kinetic energy by the crush depth gives you a "k" value of 5990 lb-ft/in


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas - Sample Application

$$
v_{\text {equivalent }}=\sqrt{\frac{2 * k * c}{m}}
$$

* Now, in the "real" collision you have an average crush depth of 10 inches, and a vehicle weight of 3000 pounds. Applying your constant from the test crash, you get -
$\star \mathrm{V}_{\text {eq }}=\operatorname{SQR}(2 * 5990 * 10 /(3000 / 32.2))$
$\star V_{\text {eq }}=\operatorname{SQR}(119800 / 93.17)$
$\star \mathrm{V}_{\text {eq }}=35.86 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ or 24.4 miles/hour


## Crush Analysis Formulas <br> History \& Formulas - Sample Application

^ Taking the sample applications one step further -if you have 30 feet of pre-impact skid on a . 74 mu surface, how fast was the vehicle going at the start of the skid / "loss of control"???
Skid Energy loss = SQR(30*30*.74)=SQR(666)=~25.81mph
$\star$ Emori crush speed (impact $\sim 11 \mathrm{mph}$ ), beginning speed -28.05 mph
$\star$ CF ~ 23 crush speed (impact ~23.98 mph), beginning speed -35.23 mph
$\star$ CF ~ 21 crush speed (impact ~22.91 mph), beginning speed -34.51 mph
$\star$ k ~5990 crush speed (impact ~24.4 mph), beginning speed -35.51 mph
$\star \quad \therefore$ Calculated Beginning Speed ~ 35 mph (except for Emori)

## Crush Analysis Formulas <br> History \& Formulas - Sample Application

* Taking the sample applications one step further (cont)
* "What If" the "Actual" Crush (impact) speed was 20 mph ? 28 mph ?
^ If "Actual" impact ~ 20 mph , beginning speed -32.65 mph
^ If "Actual" impact ~ 28 mph , beginning speed -38.08 mph
* $\therefore$ "Actual" Beginning Speed +/- ~ 3 mph from our calculated speed (Except for Emori, which is conservatively low)


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

* Several formulas have been presented, including some with a "case sample"
* Note, I haven't even attempted to do a case sample with the "Campbell" approach (Did I mention it's complex??)
* Of the formulas presented, Emori and the "Minimum Speed From Skid" formulas require the least amount of supporting data and are the easiest to use
« Emori's formula is conservative, maybe TOO conservative


## Crush Analysis Formulas

## History \& Formulas

« Several formulas have been presented (cont)

* The "Minimum Speed From Skid" formula with the AutoStats CF values is designed as a "Near Actual" value for the crush speed, as is Noon's approach, rather than a "minimum speed"
* The "Minimum Speed From Skid" formula can be made to be more conservative by reducing the CF value and/or by applying it to AVERAGE crush of the subject vehicle.


## Speed Calculations

## Crash Test Examples

## Speed Calculations

## Crash Test Examples

The following three examples are based on crash tests done this year as part of SCARS
The first two were hit over the axles, to illustrate adjustments needed to the ACM/CDR speed values.
The third test was designed so that the PDOF goes nearly through the CG of the Target vehicle.

## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT1

## 2013 FORD TAURUS AWD - Front Impact

$\begin{array}{rrr}\text { Curb Weight (pounds): } & \mathbf{4 2 9 6} \\ & \mathbf{0} \\ \text { Occupant + Cargo Weight (pounds): } & \mathbf{0 2 9 6} \\ \text { Total Weight (pounds): } & \\ & \\ \text { Angle Coll Force to Normal (degrees): } & \mathbf{0 . 0} \\ \text { No Damage Speed (mph): } & \mathbf{5 . 0} \\ \text { Energy Crush Depth (inches): } & \mathbf{1 5 . 0 0} \\ \text { Damage Length (inches): } & \mathbf{6 5 . 0}\end{array}$
Crush Profile Measurements: $\mathbf{2}$


## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT1



## 2015 DODGE CHARGER - Side Impact

| Curb Weight (pounds): | $\mathbf{3 9 5 0}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Occupant + Cargo Weight (pounds): | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Total Weight (pounds): | $\mathbf{3 9 5 0}$ |
|  |  |
| Angle Coll Force to Normal (degrees): | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ |
| No Damage Speed (mph): | $\mathbf{2 . 0}$ |
| Energy Crush Depth (inches): | $\mathbf{8 . 0 4}$ |
| Damage Length (inches): | $\mathbf{8 4 . 0}$ |

Crush Profile Measurements:
3



## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT1



## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT1

| CRASH 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{E}=$ | $\left(A^{*} C+\left(B^{*} C^{*} C / 2\right)+G\right)^{*} L(i n / l b s)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{A}=$ | Spring pre-lading value (lbs/inch) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $B=$ | Energy absorbed in permanent deformation ( $\mathrm{lb} /(\mathrm{in} * \mathrm{in})$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{G}=$ | Energy abosrobed in elastic deformation (( $\left.\mathrm{A}^{*} \mathrm{~A}\right) /\left(2^{*} \mathrm{~B}\right)$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $C=$ | Avg Crush (inches) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{L}=$ | Damage Length (in) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KEES / BEV / EBS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KEES = | (360/528)* $\operatorname{SQR}\left[\left(\left(2^{*} E^{*} \mathrm{gamma}\right) / 12\right) /(\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{g})\right]$ (mph) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{E}=$ | Crush Energy (inch/lbs) |  |  |  |  |  |
| gamma = | constant coming from Yaw Moment of Inertia and Moment arm - ignored for these illustrations |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{w}=$ | weight (lbs) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{g}=$ | gravity ( $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Speed Calculations

## Crash Test Examples - CT1 - Input Variables

| Weight | Crush <br> Length | Avg <br> Crush | Max <br> Crush | A | B | G | E | k |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4296 | 65 | 15 | 23 | 348.4 | 116.2 | 522.3 | 1223352.0 | 2748.59 | Bullet | 2013 Ford Taurus AWD |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3950 | 84 | 8.04 | 13 | 249.8 | 355.9 | 97.1 | 1143111.0 | 1469.39 | Target | 2015 Dodge Charger |

## Speed Calculations

## Crash Test Examples - CT1 - Output

|  |  | Emori |  | crush Factor |  | Noon |  | CRASH 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Damage Speed |  | Damage Speed |  | Damage Speed |  | Damage Speed |  |
|  |  | $v=f p s$ | $v=m p h$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{fps}$ | $v=m p h$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ |
| Bullet | 2013 Ford Taurus AWD | 37.1 | 25.3 | 51.0 | 34.7 | 24.9 | 17.0 | 39.1 | 26.7 |
| Target | 2015 Dodge Charger | 21.0 | 14.3 | 38.3 | 26.1 | 13.9 | 9.5 | 39.4 | 26.9 |
| Combined Speed |  |  | 29.1 |  | 43.5 |  | 19.4 |  | 37.8 |
| Instrumented Closing Speed |  |  | $\sim 47$ |  | ~47 |  | ~47 |  | ~47 |
| Instrumented deltav Bullet |  |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |
| Instrumented delta-v Target |  |  | $\sim 26-27$ |  | ~26-27 |  | $\sim 26-27$ |  | ~26-27 |
| Combined Crush + Rollout Speed |  |  | 45.8 |  | 56.1 |  | 40.4 |  | 51.8 |

## Speed Calculations

## Crash Test Examples - CT2



## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT2

## 2008 LINCOLN MKZ - Front Impact

| Curb Weight (pounds): | 3519 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Occupant + Cargo Weight (pounds): | 0 |
| Total Weight (pounds): | 3519 |

Angle Coll Force to Normal (degrees): 0.0

No Damage Speed (mph):5.0 Energy Crush Depth (inches):


## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT2

## 2015 DODGE CHARGER - Side Impact

| Curb Weight (pounds): | $\mathbf{3 9 5 0}$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Occupant + Cargo Weight (pounds): | $\mathbf{0}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{3 9 5 0}$ |

Angle Coll Force to Normal (degrees):


No Damage Speed (mph): 2.0 Energy Crush Depth (inches): 3.38 Damage Length (inches): 82.0

Crush Profile Measurements: 4


## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT2



## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT2



## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT2

| CRASH 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{E}=$ | $\left(A^{*} C+\left(B^{*} C^{*} C / 2\right)+G\right)^{*} L(i n / l b s)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{A}=$ | Spring pre-lading value (lbs/inch) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{B}=$ | Energy absorbed in permanent deformation ( $\mathrm{lb} /(\mathrm{in} * \mathrm{in})$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{G}=$ | Energy abosrobed in elastic deformation (( $\left.\mathrm{A}^{*} \mathrm{~A}\right) /\left(22^{*} \mathrm{~B}\right)$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $C=$ | Avg Crush (inches) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{L}=$ | Damage Length (in) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KEES / BEV / EBS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KEES = | $(360 / 528) * \operatorname{SQR}\left[\left(\left(2^{*} \mathrm{E}^{*}\right.\right.\right.$ gamma)/12)/(w/g)] (mph) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{E}=$ | Crush Energy (inch/lbs) |  |  |  |  |  |
| gamma = | constant coming from Yaw Moment of Inertia and Moment arm - ignored for these illustrations |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{w}=$ | weight (lbs) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{g}=$ | gravity ( $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT2 - Input

## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT2 - Output

|  |  |  | ori |  | Factor |  |  |  | SH 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Dam | Speed | Dam | Speed | Dam | Speed | Dam | Speed |
|  |  | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{fps}$ | $v=m p h$ | $v=f p s$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ | $v=f p s$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ |
| Bullet | 2008 Lincoln MKZ | 29.0 | 19.8 | 45.1 | 30.7 | 22.7 | 15.5 | 43.0 | 29.3 |
| Target | 2015 Dodge Charger | 11.3 | 7.7 | 28.1 | 19.2 | 9.0 | 6.1 | 18.2 | 12.4 |
| Combined Speed |  |  | 21.2 |  | 36.2 |  | 16.6 |  | 31.8 |
| Instrumented Closing Speed |  |  | $\sim 48$ |  | $\sim 48$ |  | $\sim 48$ |  | $\sim 48$ |
| Instrume | ted delta-v Bullet |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |
| Instrumented delta-v Target |  |  | ~26-31 |  | ~26-31 |  | ${ }^{\sim} 26-31$ |  | ${ }^{\sim} 26-31$ |
| Combined Crush + Rollout Speed |  |  | 44.2 |  | 53.1 |  | 42.2 |  | 50.2 |



## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT3

## 1996 MAZDA 626 - Front Impact

| Curb Weight (pounds): | $\mathbf{2 6 2 6}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Occupant + Cargo Weight (pounds) |  |
| Total Weight (pounds) | $\mathbf{2 6 2 6}$ |
|  |  |

Angle Coll Force to Normal (degrees): $\quad \mathbf{0 . 0}$
No Damage Speed (mph):

$\begin{array}{rr}\text { Energy Crush Depth (inches): } & 18.40 \\ \text { Damage Length (inches): } & 59.0\end{array}$
Crush Profile Measurements: 3

| C1 (inches) |  | Unequal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Spacing (inches) | Zone Area (inches ${ }^{2}$ ) |
|  | 18.00 |  |  |
|  |  | 33.00 | 643.50 |
| C2 (inches) | 21.00 |  |  |
|  |  | 26.00 | 442.00 |
| C3 (inches) | 13.00 |  |  |
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## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT3



## Speed Calculations

## Crash Test Examples - CT3



## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT3

| Emori |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speed mp | 1.1 * c |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{c}=$ | Maximum Crush in inches |  |  |  |
| Crush Factor |  |  |  |  |
| Speed mpSQR(30** ${ }^{\text {c/ }}$ ( MIID ) |  |  |  |  |
| MIID $=$ | Maximum Crush in Feet (at primary contact level) |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{CF}=$ | Crush Factor (G's) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Noon |  |  |  |  |
| v in fps= | $\operatorname{SQR}(2 * \mathrm{k} * \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{m})$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{k}=$ | lb-ft/in |  |  |  |
| c inches = | avg crush depth - inches |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{m}=$ | vehicle mass = wt/ 32.2 |  |  |  |

## Speed Calculations Crash Test Examples - CT3

| CRASH 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{E}=$ | $\left(A^{*} C+\left(B^{*} C^{*} C / 2\right)+G\right)^{*} L$ (in/lbs) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{A}=$ | Spring pre-lading value (lbs/inch) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $B=$ | Energy absorbed in permanent deformation ( $\mathrm{lb} /(\mathrm{in} * \mathrm{in})$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{G}=$ | Energy abosrobed in elastic deformation (( $\left.\left.A^{*} \mathrm{~A}\right) /\left(2^{*} \mathrm{~B}\right)\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $C=$ | Avg Crush (inches) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{L}=$ | Damage Length (in) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KEES / BEV / EBS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KEES = | $(360 / 528) * \operatorname{SQR}\left[\left(\left(2^{*} \mathrm{E}^{*} \mathrm{gamma}\right) / 12\right) /(\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{g})\right]$ (mph) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{E}=$ | Crush Energy (inch/lbs) |  |  |  |  |  |
| gamma = | constant coming from Yaw Moment of Inertia and Moment arm - ignored for these illustrations |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{w}=$ | weight (lbs) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{g}=$ | gravity ( $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |



## Speed Calculations <br> Crash Test Examples - CT3 - Output



## Speed Calculations

## Force Balance

## Speed Calculations

Force Balance

The Force Balance model is an extension of the CRASH 3 model.

The original purpose of this model was to "get" stiffness values for one vehicle when none were otherwise obtainable, and is based on Newton's Third Law of "Equal but Opposite Force".

## Speed Calculations

Force Balance
In many instances you have collisions with "non-standard" alignment. The most common instances of this are:

- Under/Over ride
- One vehicle lacks a bumper (dump truck, box truck, semi trailer, etc.)

Additionally or alternatively, you may have a vehicle which has no crash tests:

- Rear impact after 1998
- Lamborghini, Maserati, Porsche, etc.


## Speed Calculations

Force Balance
One way to develop A-B-G stiffness values is through a process called Force Balance.

In this method/model you calculate the Force on the vehicle that you "know" the stiffness values for (or at least have the most confidence in that vehicles values).

Then applying the Law of "Equal but Opposite" Forces, you calculate the Stiffness values for the "Unknown" vehicle.

## Speed Calculations

Force Balance
Extending this model a bit further, in addition to calculating Stiffness values for the unknown vehicle, you can calculate

- KEES/BEV for the damage to both vehicles
- delta-v for both vehicles
- Closing Speed between the vehicles.


## Speed Calculations

Force Balance
In order for this model to work, you must have

- Stiffness values for one vehicle
- Damage to both vehicles


# Speed Calculations Force Balance - CT1 

| Results BULLET | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage <br> Energy ( $\mathrm{ft}^{\star} \mathrm{lbs}$ ) | KE <br> Speed <br> (mph) | Delta $V$ (mph) | Closing <br> Speed <br> (MPH) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Avg - 1 Std. Deviations | 269.5 | 62.6 | 39276.25 | 66802.92 | 21.6 | 15.1 | 46.8 |
| Average | 348.4 | 116.2 | 67970.50 | 108659.78 | 27.5 | 19.4 | 60.1 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 427.3 | 169.8 | 96664.75 | 150912.93 | 32.5 | 22.9 | 71.0 |



| Instrumented Closing Speed |  | $\boldsymbol{\sim 4 7}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Instrumented delta-v Bullet |  | $22-23$ |
| Instrumented delta-v Target |  | ${ }^{*} 26-27$ |

# Speed Calculations 

Force Balance - CT2


Instrumented Closing Speed

| Instrumented delta-v Bullet |  | $22-23$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Instrumented delta-v Target

# Speed Calculations Force Balance - CT3 

| Results BULLET | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy ( $\mathrm{ft}^{*} \mathrm{lbs}$ ) | KE Speed (mph) | Delta V (mph) | Closing Speed (MPH) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 181.6 | 27.5 | 20284.20 | 42554.21 | 22.0 | 18.6 | 31.0 |
| Average | 287.1 | 89.3 | 56941.49 | 103505.36 | 34.4 | 29.2 | 48.5 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 392.6 | 151.1 | 93598.78 | 165374.08 | 43.5 | 36.9 | 61.4 |


| Results TARGET | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy ( $\mathrm{ft}{ }^{\star} \mathrm{lbs}$ ) | KE Speed (mph) | Delta V (mph) | bsub1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 126.3 | 115.7 | 20284.20 | 7954.56 | 7.8 | 12.4 | 32.3 |
| Average | 226.4 | 371.9 | 56941.49 | 20655.05 | 12.5 | 19.4 | 57.8 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 296.8 | 639.0 | 93598.78 | 33188.31 | 15.9 | 24.5 | 75.8 |

Instrumented Closing Speed
Instrumented delta-v Bullet Instrumented delta-v Target

## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations Narrow Objects

## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

## *Crush Factor

$\star$ The general value, when nothing else is known, is 21
$\star$ This is an average value, rounded to the nearest whole number, of all NHTSA Crash tests 1979-1992
$\star$ This value is still observed to hold true when reviewing 4N6XPRT StifCalcs® reports
*Narrow Object (Pole) Impacts
*KEES = SQR (30*MID*CF**.60)

## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

## *Narrow Object (Pole) Impacts

## *KEES = SQR (30*MID*CF*0.60)

$\star$ Due to the Narrow Object concentrating the force, the crush depth will be greater
$\star$ The concentration of force is compensated for by reducing the Crush Factor. This is why the $60 \%$ ( 0.60 ) multiplier is present in the formula.
ڤ It was thought that the multiplier would be easier to remember than a "new/different" Crush Factor value.
«But what is a "Narrow Object"?

## Speed Calculations

Special Considerations - Narrow Objects
*But what is a "Narrow Object"?
*A Narrow Object is, generally, something that has a "diameter" of ~ 2 foot or less
*A pole, a tree, but also it can be a corner of a building, or bridge support column

## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

 *When is the $60 \%$ modifier applied?$\star$ In general, if you can see an indentation to the crush profile as opposed to a "flat" line, start thinking about a possible modifier.
$\star$ If the crush indentation is 6-10 inches in from the sides or less, you usually want to use the full Crush Factor

## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

 $\star$ When is the $60 \%$ modifier applied? (Cont)$\star$ If the crush indentation is $12-18$ inches in from the sides or more, you usually want to use the 60\% modifier.
$\star$ In the area of $6-18$ inches.... you need to look at the rest of the evidence and THINK!


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

 $\star$ When is the $60 \%$ modifier applied? (Cont)*Do you have a concentration of Force which results in greater crush depth penetration than you would expect?
^ Yes - Apply modifier
$\star$ No - Use full value

## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

 SCARS 2013 Pole Impact Tests

## Speed Calculations

Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2013 Pole Impact Tests 1998 Saturn SL2 - KEES Speed
*Max Crush at Bumper Level ~ 13 inches
*KEES $=\operatorname{SQR}(30 *(13 / 12) * 21 * 0.6)$
*KEES ~ 20 mph
*Max Crush at Hood ~ 17 inches
*KEES $=$ SQR(30*(17/12)*21*0.6)
*KEES ~ 23 mph

## Speed Calculations

Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2013 Pole Impact Tests (1998 Saturn SL2) Field Evidence


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

 SCARS 2013 Pole Impact Tests 1998 Saturn SL2 - Impact Speed* Drag factor estimated 0.4-0.6
$\star$ Max Crush at Bumper Level ~ 13 inches
* Impact Speed $=$ SQR(KEES^2 $+30 * 33.5^{*} 0.4$ )
^ Impact Speed ~ 28-29 mph
* Max Crush at Hood ~ 17 inches
$\star$ Impact Speed $=$ SQR(KEES^2 $+30 * 33.5^{*} 0.6$ )
* KEES ~ 33-34 mph
* Instrumented Impact Speed $=\mathbf{4 1 - 4 2} \mathbf{~ m p h}$


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

 SCARS 2013 Pole Impact Tests

## Speed Calculations

Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2013 Pole Impact Tests 1992 Volvo 240 DL- KEES Speed
*Max Crush at Bumper Level ~ 23 inches
*KEES $=\operatorname{SQR}\left(30 *(23 / 12) * 21^{*} 0.6\right)$
*KEES ~ 27 mph
$\star$ Max Crush at Hood ~ 19 inches

* KEES $=\operatorname{SQR}(30 *(19 / 12) * 21 * 0.6)$
*KEES ~ 24-25 mph


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2013 Pole Impact Tests (1992 Volvo 240 DL) Field Evidence



# Speed Calculations 

Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2013 Pole Impact Tests 1992 Volvo 240 DL - Impact Speed

* Drag factor estimated 0.4-0.6
$\star$ Max Crush at Bumper Level ~ 23 inches
$\star$ Impact Speed $=$ SQR(KEES^2 $2+$ 30*33.2*0.4)
* Impact Speed $=\sim 33-34 \mathrm{mph}$
$\star$ Max Crush at Hood ~ 19 inches
$\star$ Impact Speed $=$ SQR(KEES^2 + 30*33.2*0.6)
* Impact Speed $=\sim 34$-35 mph
$\star$ Instrumented Impact Speed $=42 \mathrm{mph}$


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 1999 Ford Taurus



## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

 SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 1999 Ford Taurus

## Speed Calculations <br> Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 1999 Ford Taurus



Speed Calculations
Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 1999 Ford Taurus


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 1999 Ford Taurus



## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

 SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests 1999 Ford Taurus - KEES Speed* Max Crush measured from ~ bumper cover to bumper bar $\approx 19$ inches
*Energy absorbing Plastic thickness $\approx 4$ inches
$\star$ Therefore, Max Crush at Bumper Level $\approx 15$ inches (not 19)
$\star$ KEES $=\operatorname{SQR}(30 *(15 / 12) * 21 * 0.6)$
*KEES ~ 21.7 mph


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 1999 Ford Taurus <br> Field Evidence



# Speed Calculations 

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 1999 Ford Taurus Field Evidence



## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 1999 Ford Taurus Impact Speed

* Drag factor estimated 0.2-0.4
« Instrumented Drag Factor - Rolling - WITH Brakes 0.4
* Max Crush at Bumper Level ~ 15 inches * Impact Speed $=$ SQR(KEES^2 + 30*180*0.4)
* Impact Speed ~ 51 mph
* Instrumented Impact Speed = 50 mph


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 2008 Ford Crown Victoria



## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests 2008 Ford Crown Victoria - KEES Speed

^Max Crush measured from ~ bumper cover to bumper bar $\approx 17$ inches
*Energy absorbing Plastic thickness $\approx 4$ inches
$\star$ Therefore, Max Crush at Bumper Level $\approx 13$ inches
*KEES $=\operatorname{SQR}(30 *(13 / 12) * 21 * 0.6)$
*KEES ~ 20 mph

# Speed Calculations 

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

 SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 2008 Ford Crown Victoria Field Evidence

# Speed Calculations Special Considerations - Narrow Objects 

Field Evidence


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects

 SCARS 2014 Pole Impact Tests - 2008 Ford Crown Victoria Impact Speed* Drag factor estimated 0.2-0.4
* Instrumented Drag Factor - Rolling -No Brakes - 0.2
$\star$ Max Crush at Bumper Level ~ 13 inches * Impact Speed $=$ SQR(KEES^2 + 30*186*0.2)
^ Impact Speed ~ 39 mph
$\star$ Instrumented Impact Speed $=$ 47-49 mph


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS Pole Impact Tests <br> Summary

^ What have we left out?
^ Break Energy for the Pole

* Energy to move the post in the earth
* Look to "Pole Crash Investigation - It's a Matter of Evidence" by Daily, Shigemura, and Rich -2011 for the addition of the above energies, and calculation of damage energy through the use of the CRASH III approach.


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects SCARS Pole Impact Tests Summary

* Again, look to "Pole Crash Investigation - It's a Matter of Evidence" by Daily, Shigemura, and Rich -2011 for the calculation of damage energy through the use of the CRASH III approach and how to calculate the Pole Fracture Energy and the energy required to move the pole in the earth.
$\star$ When those energy losses are included, and combined with the speed/energy calculated with the Crush Factor approach (as opposed to CRASH III approach) -
$\star$ Taurus Impact Speed ~ 59 mph (Inst=50 mph)** * Crown Vic Impact Speed ~46 mph (Inst=47 mph)
**It is suspected that part of this descrepancy in speed is due to trying to "pace" the roll out distance in essentially "swamp" while watching for water moccasins, leading to unequal strides.


## Speed Calculations

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects Calculation Summary

* 2013
* Saturn - Max Crush 13-17 inches
^ Saturn - Post Impact Roll Out ~37 feet
* Volvo - Max Crush 13-17 inches
$\star$ Volvo - Post Impact Roll Out ~33.2 feet
* 2014
$\star$ Crown Vic - Max Crush ~13 inches
^ Crown Vic - Post Impact Roll Out ~186 feet
* Taurus - Max Crush ~15 inches
* Taurus - Post Impact Roll Out ~180 feet


# Speed Calculations 

## Special Considerations - Narrow Objects Calculation Summary

* 2013
^ Saturn - Calculated Impact Speed - 33-34 mph
^ Saturn - Instrumented Impact Speed -41-42 mph
* Volvo - Calculated Impact Speed - 33-34 mph

Ł Volvo - Instrumented Impact Speed - 42 mph

* 2014
^ Crown Vic - Calculated Impact Speed ~ 39 mph
$\star$ Crown Vic - Instrumented Impact Speed $=47$ mph
* Taurus - Calculated Impact Speed ~ 51 mph
* Taurus - Instrumented Impact Speed $=50 \mathrm{mph}$


## Speed Calculations

Crush - Your "Guiding Light"
$\star$

## Remember

## it can't be considered!

# Crush Analysis Considerations 

This presentation has been and still is a continuing "Work in Progress". As such, it is will possibly be updated between when it is submitted to IATAI and when it is being presented. Any updates will be provided to IATAI AS WELL AS uploaded to my website and can be downloaded from my web site at the following page -
http://www.4n6xprt.com/IATAI-2022.htm

## Some additional "extras" will also be made available on that page.

# Crush Analysis Considerations www.4n6xprt.com/IATAI-2022.htm 

## 4n6xprt.com/ATAI-2022.htm

- XEROX Col.... $\quad$ Movie Theatres (3) BMW Motorrad USA

What do the LED in
(1) Great Empire Spy R...
\& ISP Crashing Test V...
4N6XPRT Systems
Follow My Health ${ }^{m i s}$ :

Daniel W. Vomhof III
Crush Analysis Considerations
Use of Crush in Vehicle Accident Reconstruction for the Purpose of Determining Impact Speed
Presentation Materials for
IATAI 2022
Download Presentation-1 Slide per page
Download Presentation -Audience Notes - 3 slides per page


## Precision vs Accuarcy

https://www.honolulu.hawaii.edu/instruct/natsci/science/brill/scil22/SciLab/L5/accprec.html\#:~:text=Accurate $\% 20$ means $\% 20 \% 22$ capable $\% 20$ of $\% 20$ providing,of $\% 20$ the $\% 20$ thing $\% 20$ being $\%$ 20measured
https://manoa.hawaii.edu/exploringourfluidearth/physical/world-ocean/map-distortion/practices-science-precision-vs-accuracy
https://www.thoughtco.com/difference-between-accuracy-and-precision-609328
https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-meaning-of-accuracy-and-precision-in-Science

# Crush Analysis Considerations 

## Using CRUSH -

Summary

## Crush Analysis Considerations

## Summary

$\star$ Crush/Energy solution is a valid tool which should not be ignored

* Even when a momentum solution can be performed, an energy solution SHOULD ALSO be performed as a double check. Results should generally compare within +/- 5 mph or less
$\star$ Crush calculations can be made to be MUCH more complex than they need to be
* While a class in Crush is useful, in a number of ways, it IS NOT a pre-requisite to a person conducting basic speed from crush calculations


## EXPERT WITNESS SERVICES, INC

FORENSIC RESEARCH LABORATORIES 8387 UNIVERSITY AVE., LA MESA, CA 91942
(619) 464-3477

Daniel William Vomhof III, E.I.T.
Certified Accident Reconstruction Specialist
EDUCATION:
B. S. Engineering
October 1994
A. S. Engineering
June 1992
A. S. Surveying
August 1986
ACCIDENT SPECIFIC EDUCATION
(3,196+ Hrs)
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- Preparation of scale scene diagrams and other exhibits for use in depositions, arbitration hearings, and trial.
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(1992-present) - General Manager/Technical Support/Programmer
Primary responsibilities include:

- Maintain data and Software Programs available for sale
- Provide Technical Support to program owners
- Provide data to Accident Investigators throughout North America when requested via email, phone, or fax

City of La Mesa - Traffic Engineering
(1988-1992) - Engineering Technician I.
Primary responsibilities in the field included preparation, review, and inspection of traffic control plans; preparation of striping, signing, and traffic signal plans and layouts for the field crews; traffic signal system coordination; field changes to traffic signal timing plans; and determination of proper sign type and placement to remedy existing traffic problems.

Primary responsibilities in the office included monthly review of accident reports for possible conditions contributing to the accidents which would be correctable by engineering projects; preparation of individual and system traffic signal timing plans; preparation of staff reports and exhibits for public hearings; and presentation of staff reports at public hearings.
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## SWORN TESTIMONY:

Qualified in San Diego and San Bernardino Superior Court on:

* Traffic Signal timing sequence and "who had the green" issues
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*Human factors - Perception, Reaction, Line-of-Sight
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D.W. Vomhof III and D. W. Vomhof, Expert AutoStats, 4N6XPRT SYSTEMS, La Mesa, CA (1993-2022)
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## Publications:

A-B-G Stiffness Values ... How to Research .... and Calculate .... Step-by-
Step, Published by IPTM Press, Copyright 2014

| Emori |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Speed $m p t 1.1 * \mathrm{c}$ |  |
| $\mathrm{c}=$ | Maximum Crush in inches |
| Crush Factor |  |

## CRASH 3

Kees / bev / EBS

## Kees

$\mathrm{E}=$
gamma $=$
$\mathrm{w}=$
$\mathrm{g}=$
$\left(A^{*} C+\left(B^{*} C^{*} C / 2\right)+G\right) * L$ (in/lbs)
Spring pre-lading value (lbs/inch)
Energy absorbed in permanent deformation ( $\mathrm{lb} /(\mathrm{in} * \mathrm{in}$ )
Energy abosrobed in elastic deformation (( $\left.\left.\mathrm{A}^{*} \mathrm{~A}\right) /\left(2^{*} \mathrm{~B}\right)\right)$
Avg Crush (inches)
Damage Length (in)
(360/528)* SQR[ ( 2 *E*gamma)/12)/(w/g)] (mph)
Crush Energy (inch/lbs)
constant coming from Yaw Moment of Inertia and Moment arm - ignored for these illustrations weight (lbs)
gravity ( $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{s}$ )

Side Impact Test Summary
Report Filter Settings
Year Range: 2015-2021
Make: DODGE
Model: CHARGER

| Test Number | Year | Make | Model | Body Style | No Damage <br> Speed (mph) | Average <br> Crush (inch) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9502 | 2016 | DODGE | CHARGER | FOUR DOOR <br> SEDAN | 2 | 5.5 |
| 9504 | 2016 | DODGE | CHARGER | FOUR DOOR <br> SEDAN | 2 | 14.3 |


| KEES | A | B | G | Kv | Crush Factor | b_sub_1 | Crush Length | Vehicle Weight (pounds) | Noon-KE | Noon-k |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 375.5 | 615.2 | 114.6 | 759.3 | 29.2 | 57.7 | 58.5 | 4179.1 | 25957.14 | 1297.86 |
| 24.3 | 124.1 | 96.7 | 79.6 | 114.8 | 16.5 | 27.4 | 87.6 | 4348.8 | 39874.58 | 1640.93 |
| Average (AVG) | 249.8 | 355.9 | 97.1 | 437 | 22.8 |  |  |  | 65831.72 | 1469.39 |
| Minimum (MIN) | 124.1 | 96.7 | 79.6 | 114.8 | 16.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum (MAX) | 375.5 | 615.2 | 114.6 | 759.3 | 29.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Standard Deviation (STDev-sample | 177.8 | 366.6 | 24.8 | 455.7 | 8.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Front Impact Test Summary
Report Filter Settings
Year Range: 2013-2019
Make: FORD

Make: FORD
Model: TAURUS

| Test Number | Year | Make | Model | Body Style | No Damage <br> Speed (mph) | Average <br> Crush (inch) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7872 | 2013 | FORD | TAURUS | FOUR DOOR <br> SEDAN | 5 | 15.4 |
| 9125 | 2013 | FORD | TAURUS | FOUR DOOR <br> SEDAN | 5 | 8.9 |


| KEES | A | B | G | Kv | Crush Factor | b_sub_1 | Crush Length | Vehicle Weight (pounds) | Noon-KE | Noon - k |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34.8 | 474.2 | 183.1 | 614 | 249.8 | 31.4 | 34 | 75.8 | 4646.4 | 87375.41 | 2510.79 |
| 41.1 | 1001.2 | 815.9 | 614.3 | 1057.4 | 76.3 | 71.7 | 76.3 | 4679.4 | 122740.52 | 2986.39 |
| Average (AVG) | 737.7 | 499.5 | 614.1 | 653.6 | 53.8 |  |  |  | 210115.92 | 2748.59 |
| Minimum (MIN) | 474.2 | 183.1 | 614 | 249.8 | 31.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum (MAX) | 1001.2 | 815.9 | 614.3 | 1057.4 | 76.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Standard Deviation (STDev-sample | 372.6 | 447.4 | 0.2 | 571.1 | 31.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Front Impact Test Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year Range: 2007-2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Make: LINCOLN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model: MKZ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Test Number | Year | Make | Model | Body Style | No Damage Speed (mph) | Average Crush (inch) | KEES | A | B | G | Kv | Crush Factor | b_sub_1 | Crush Length | Vehicle Weight (pounds) | Noon-KE | Noon - k |
| 6225 | 2008 | FORD | FUSION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FOUR DOOR } \\ & \text { SEDAN } \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 23.4 | 35 | 268.9 | 68.9 | 524.3 | 93.8 | 20.9 | 22.6 | 71.7 | 3749.3 | 71318.21 | 2037.66 |
| 6755 | 2010 | FORD | FUSION | FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5 | 21.9 | 35 | 278.5 | 76.1 | 509.5 | 103.7 | 22.3 | 24.1 | 71.6 | 3639.1 | 69222.01 | 1977.77 |
| 5546 | 2006 | FORD | FUSION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FOUR DOOR } \\ & \text { SEDAN } \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 22 | 35.1 | 300.2 | 82.1 | 549 | 111.6 | 22.4 | 24.1 | 71.7 | 3925.6 | 75099.04 | 2139.57 |
| 5804 | 2006 | FORD | FUSION | FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5 | 12.5 | 25.1 | 344.7 | 111 | 535.3 | 173.2 | 20.2 | 28.3 | 72.2 | 3859.5 | 37756.58 | 1504.25 |
| 7339 | 2011 | FORD | FUSION HYBRID | FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5 | 19.6 | 35.1 | 354.2 | 108.7 | 577.4 | 147.7 | 25.1 | 27 | 71.5 | 4121.8 | 78852.47 | 2246.51 |
| 7132 | 2011 | FORD | FUSION | FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5 | 7.9 | 20 | 368.9 | 139.9 | 486.4 | 248.6 | 20.2 | 33.4 | 71.6 | 3476 | 21590.06 | 1079.50 |
| 7139 | 2011 | FORD | FUSION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FOUR DOOR } \\ & \text { SEDAN } \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 17.7 | 35.2 | 401.1 | 136.9 | 587.3 | 186 | 28 | 30 | 71.4 | 4185.7 | 80531.83 | 2287.84 |
| 5821 | 2006 | FORD | FUSION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FOUR DOOR } \\ & \text { SEDAN } \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 9.2 | 24.7 | 420.8 | 179.9 | 492.2 | 282.6 | 26.5 | 37.6 | 71.3 | 3502.4 | 33179.80 | 1343.31 |
| 6728 | 2010 | FORD | FUSION HYBRID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FOUR DOOR } \\ & \text { SEDAN } \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 14.8 | 35 | 473.1 | 192.2 | 582.3 | 261.6 | 33.2 | 35.8 | 71.7 | 4163.7 | 79200.82 | 2262.88 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average (AVG) | 356.7 | 121.7 | 538.2 | 178.7 | 24.3 |  |  |  | 60750.09 | 1875.48 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Minimum (MIN) | 268.9 | 68.9 | 486.4 | 93.8 | 20.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Maximum (MAX) | 473.1 | 192.2 | 587.3 | 282.6 | 33.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Standard Deviation (STDev-sample | 68 | 44.2 | 38.5 | 71.5 | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Number of Tests (n) | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Front Impact | Summ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Report Filter S | tings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year Range: 19 | -2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Make: NA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model: 626 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Test Number | Year | Make | Model | Body Style | No Damage Speed (mph) | Average Crush (inch) | KEES | A | B | G | Kv | Crush Factor | b_sub_1 | Crush Length | Vehicle Weight (pounds) | Noon-KE | Noon-k |
| 599 | 1983 | MAZDA | 626 | FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5 | 24.4 | 35.3 | 216.8 | 53.8 | 436.8 | 73 | 20.4 | 21.8 | 66.5 | 2898.5 | 56083.72 | 1588.77 |
| 1055 | 1987 | MAZDA | 626 | FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5 | 20.3 | 29.5 | 217.2 | 52.4 | 450.5 | 75.9 | 17.1 | 21.2 | 66.2 | 2975.6 | 40209.87 | 1363.05 |
| 118 | 1980 | MAZDA | 626 | TWO DOOR COUPE | 5 | 22.5 | 35.2 | 253 | 67.7 | 472.7 | 92 | 21.9 | 23.5 | 65 | 3066 | 58989.08 | 1675.83 |
| 1015 | 1987 | MAZDA | 626 | FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5 | 24 | 35 | 262.6 | 65.6 | 525.9 | 89.3 | 20.4 | 22 | 57.9 | 3039.5 | 57816.58 | 1651.90 |
| 1742 | 1993 | MAZDA | 626 | FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5 | 20 | 35 | 276.5 | 82.9 | 461.2 | 112.8 | 24.5 | 26.4 | 69 | 3176.2 | 60416.85 | 1726.20 |
| 2866 | 1998 | MAZDA | 626 | FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5 | 11.4 | 29.6 | 496.7 | 213.5 | 577.8 | 309.2 | 30.6 | 37.8 | 55.1 | 3178.4 | 43242.03 | 1460.88 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average (AVG) | 287.1 | 89.3 | 487.5 | 125.4 | 22.5 |  |  |  | 52793.02 | 1577.77 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Minimum (MIN) | 216.8 | 52.4 | 436.8 | 73 | 17.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Maximum (MAX) | 496.7 | 213.5 | 577.8 | 309.2 | 30.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Standard Deviation (STDev-sample | 105.5 | 61.8 | 53.8 | 91.2 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Number of Tests (n) | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## SCARS

## Crash Test \#1

|  |  | Weight | Crush Length | Avg Crush | Max Crush | A | B | G | CRASH 3 | Noon's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  | k |
| Bullet | 2013 Ford Taurus AWD |  | 4296 | 65 | 15 | 23 | 348.4 | 116.2 | 522.3 | 1223352.0 | 2748.59 |
| Target | 2015 Dodge Charger | 3950 | 84 | 8.04 | 13 | 249.8 | 355.9 | 97.1 | 1143111.0 | 1469.39 |


|  |  | Emori <br> Damage Speed |  | Crush Factor <br> Damage Speed |  | Noon Damage Speed |  | CRASH 3 <br> Damage Speed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ | $v=\mathrm{fps}$ | $v=\mathrm{mph}$ | $v=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ | $v=\mathrm{fps}$ | $v=\mathrm{mph}$ |
| Bullet | 2013 Ford Taurus AWD | 37.1 | 25.3 | 51.0 | 34.7 | 24.9 | 17.0 | 39.1 | 26.7 |
| Target | 2015 Dodge Charger | 21.0 | 14.3 | 38.3 | 26.1 | 13.9 | 9.5 | 39.4 | 26.9 |
| Combined Speed |  |  | 29.1 |  | 43.5 |  | 19.4 |  | 37.8 |
| Instrumented Closing Speed |  |  | $\sim 47$ |  | $\sim 47$ |  | $\sim 47$ |  | $\sim 47$ |
| Instrumented delta-v Bullet |  |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |
| Instrumented delta-v Target |  |  | $\sim 26-27$ |  | $\sim 26-27$ |  | $\sim 26-27$ |  | ~26-27 |
| Combined Crush + Rollout Speed |  |  | 45.8 |  | 56.1 |  | 40.4 |  | 51.8 |

## SCARS

## Crash Test \#2

|  |  | Weight | Crush Length | Avg Crush | Max Crush | A | B | G | CRASH 3 | Noon's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  | k |
| Bullet | 2008 Lincoln MKz |  | 3519 | 62 | 15 | 18 | 356.7 | 121.7 | 522.7 | 1212998.4 | 1875.48 |
| Target | 2015 Dodge Charger | 3950 | 82 | 3.38 | 7 | 249.8 | 355.9 | 97.1 | 243900.5 | 1469.39 |


|  |  | Emori Damage Speed |  | Crush Factor <br> Damage Speed |  | Noon <br> Damage Speed |  | CRASH 3 <br> Damage Speed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $v=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ | $v=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ | $v=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ |
| Bullet | 2008 Lincoln MKz | 29.0 | 19.8 | 45.1 | 30.7 | 22.7 | 15.5 | 43.0 | 29.3 |
| Target | 2015 Dodge Charger | 11.3 | 7.7 | 28.1 | 19.2 | 9.0 | 6.1 | 18.2 | 12.4 |
| Combined Speed |  |  | 21.2 |  | 36.2 |  | 16.6 |  | 31.8 |
| Instrumented Closing Speed |  |  | $\sim 48$ |  | $\sim 48$ |  | $\sim 48$ |  | $\sim 48$ |
| Instrumented delta-v Bullet |  |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |  | 22-23 |
| Instrumented delta-v Target |  |  | ~26-31 |  | $\sim 26-31$ |  | $\sim 26-31$ |  | $\sim 26-31$ |
| Combined Crush + Rollout Speed |  |  | 44.2 |  | 53.1 |  | 42.2 |  | 50.2 |

## SCARS

## Crash Test \#3

|  |  | Weight | Crush Length | Avg Crush | Max Crush | A | B | CRASH 3 |  | Noon's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | G |  |  |  |  |  | E | k |
| Bullet | 1996 Mazda 626 |  | 2626 | 59 | 18.4 | 21 | 287.1 | 89.3 | 461.5 | 1230790.6 | 1577.77 |
| Target | 2016 Dodge Charger | 3950 | 92 | 2.72 | 6 | 249.8 | 355.9 | 97.1 | 192565.3 | 1469.39 |
|  |  | Emori Damage Speed |  | Crush Factor <br> Damage Speed |  | Noon Damage Speed |  | CRASH 3 <br> Damage Speed |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $v=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ |  |  | $v=f p s$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ | $v=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ | $v=\mathrm{fps}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{mph}$ |  |
| Bullet | 1996 Mazda 626 | 33.9 | 23.1 | 48.7 | 33.2 | 26.7 | 18.2 | 50.2 | 34.2 |  |
| Target | 2016 Dodge Charger | 9.7 | 6.6 | 26.0 | 17.7 | 8.1 | 5.5 | 16.2 | 11.0 |  |
| Combined Crush Speed |  |  | 24.0 |  | 37.6 |  | 19.0 |  | 35.9 |  |
| Instrumented Closing Speed |  |  | $\sim 50-51$ |  | $\sim 50-51$ |  | $\sim 50-51$ |  | $\sim 50-51$ |  |
| Instrumented delta-v Bullet |  |  | ~37-38 |  | ~37-38 |  | ~37-38 |  | ~37-38 |  |
| Instrumented delta-v Target |  |  | $\sim 22-23$ |  | $\sim 22-23$ |  | $\sim 22-23$ |  | $\sim 22-23$ |  |
| Combined Crush + Rollout Speed |  |  | 35.2 |  | 45.6 |  | 31.9 |  | 44.2 |  |

For 2022 SCARS had 3 crash tests. In Crash Tests $1 \& 2$ the bullet vehicle experienced 2 impacts (with resulting crush) as part of the test. There were also secondary impacts by the target vehicle into the side of the bullet vehicle in both tests due to the spin induced in the target by the offset hit. These secondary impacts have not been analyzed.

In Crash Test 1 the bullet vehicle impacted the target, and then continued on to hit the concrete rails stacked behind the impact point.

In Crash Test 2 the bullet vehicle impacted the target, and then continued on to hit the side of the bullet vehicle from test 1 driving it on to hit the concrete rails stacked beyond the impact point.

In Crash Test 3 neither the bullet vehicle nor the target vehicle had any secondary impacts.
Obviously, Crash Test 3 is ideal for a Speed from Crush analysis since there is no crushing of the vehicles other than in the crash itself.

Crash Tests $1 \& 2$ are less ideal since they had crush energy losses at two points within the test, with no way to separate how much crush was done in the first impact between the bullet and target, and how much crush was due to the secondary impact between the concrete (in test 1 ) or the buffer vehicle (in test 2 ).

Due to a limited number of Crash Tests in the NHTSA database for the Similar Vehicle year range for the Ford Police Interceptor (Taurus) and the Mazda 626, "CLASS" vehicles based on the Make and Model were developed to establish the A-B Stiffness MIN-AVG-MAX and Standard Deviation used within the Force Balance model.

## CRASH TEST 1

The setup for Test 1 is that the Charger began to pull out into the intersection and then stopped. The driver of the Police Interceptor stated that he was doing "around 50 mph ". After the collision occurred, the Police Interceptor continued on and impacted a concrete wall on the opposite side of the " $T$ " intersection.

In Crash Test 1 a 2 point profile was used for the crush damage to the front of the crush damage to the Ford Police Interceptor bullet vehicle, and a 3 point profile was used for the damage to the side of the Dodge Charger around the front wheel well.

For the first run through I like to set the Lever Arm on both vehicles to 0 and set the Angle to the Collision Surface to 0 for both vehicles. The result of this on the speed calculations is that the closing speeds calculated will be at a minimum for each set of A-B stiffness values.

Using this setup, the closing (in this case, impact) speed of the Police Interceptor based on average stiffness values for the Police Interceptor (Taurus) is 49.3 mph . The likely range of the closing speed is within $+/$ - one Standard Deviation of the average which is $38.4-58.2 \mathrm{mph}$.

Since the impact was over the front axle of the Charger, the effect of the lever arm of $\sim 56$ inches was also analyzed. When the lever arm was added, the closing speed of the Police Interceptor based on the average stiffness values increases to 60.1 mph with a likely range of 46.8-71.0 mph . It can be seen that adding the lever arm increases the calculated closing speed in this test by about 11 mph for the average stiffness values.

Recall that the bullet vehicle had two significant impacts to its front end in this test, the result of this is that there is more crush to the Police Interceptor than can be attributed to the impact between the Police Interceptor and the Charger. This will result in a higher than actual speed calculated for the Police Interceptor for the impact between the Police Interceptor and the Charger.

The Force Balance model results for this test printed "two up" follow this explanation. The CLASS Stiffness Test Summary and 2 pages for each of the Force Balance results printed one per page follow at the end of these explanations.

4N6XPRT StifCalcs ${ }^{\circledR}$
Available Test Results Front Impact Test Summary
Report Filter Settings
Year Range: 2000-2021
Make: FORD
Model: TAURUS

| Test Number | Vehicle Info | No Dama |  |  | \|-----------Vehicle Width----------| |  |  |  | Crush <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Speed (mph) | Crush | KEES <br> (mph) | \|------Stiffness |  | Value s--------\| |  |  |
|  |  |  | (inch) |  | A | B | G | Kv |  |
| 5143 | 2004 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 20.9 | 34.7 | 297.6 | 84.6 | 523.1 | 115.5 | 23.1 |
| 4150 | 2001 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 19.3 | 34.7 | 326.1 | 100.5 | 529.3 | 137.2 | 25.0 |
| 4174 | 2001 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 15.1 | 29.5 | 341.7 | 110.4 | 529.0 | 160.1 | 22.9 |
| 4134 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 14.9 | 29.7 | 352.2 | 116.5 | 532.3 | 168.5 | 23.6 |
| 4135 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 14.9 | 29.6 | 352.3 | 116.8 | 531.4 | 169.0 | 23.6 |
| 3248 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 17.8 | 35.2 | 363.8 | 123.2 | 537.1 | 167.4 | 27.8 |
| 4776 | 2004 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 17.8 | 35.1 | 364.4 | 123.1 | 539.6 | 167.3 | 27.6 |
| 3225 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 12.0 | 27.3 | 375.3 | 140.2 | 502.5 | 209.9 | 25.0 |
| 4987 | 2004 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 10.6 | 24.7 | 379.3 | 141.6 | 508.0 | 222.4 | 23.1 |
| 6808 | 2010 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 19.4 | 35.1 | 381.8 | 118.7 | 614.1 | 161.4 | 25.5 |
| 7302 | 2010 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 12.1 | 24.7 | 384.5 | 125.4 | 589.5 | 197.0 | 20.2 |
| 7271 | 2010 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 11.9 | 24.7 | 392.5 | 130.5 | 590.3 | 205.0 | 20.6 |
| 6964 | 2011 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 17.9 | 35.1 | 408.3 | 137.1 | 608.0 | 186.4 | 27.5 |
| 3224 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 12.1 | 30.0 | 412.6 | 170.2 | 500.2 | 245.0 | 29.7 |
| 3150 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 12.1 | 29.9 | 428.2 | 175.7 | 521.7 | 253.4 | 29.5 |
| 6967 | 2011 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 7.5 | 19.9 | 443.5 | 176.9 | 556.1 | 315.7 | 21.2 |
| 7872 | 2013 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 15.4 | 34.8 | 474.2 | 183.1 | 614.0 | 249.8 | 31.4 |
|  |  | Average (AVG) |  |  | 381.1 | 133.8 | 548.6 | 195.9 | 25.1 |
|  |  | Minimum (MIN) |  |  | 297.6 | 84.6 | 500.2 | 115.5 | 20.2 |
|  |  | Maximum (MAX) |  |  | 474.2 | 183.1 | 614.1 | 315.7 | 31.4 |
| Standard Deviation (STDev-sample) |  |  |  |  | 43.7 | 28.2 | 39.2 | 49.7 | 3.3 |
| Number of Tests ( n ) |  |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2013 FORD TAURUS AWD - Front Impact



## Average Crush (inches): 15.00

| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy ( $\mathrm{ft}^{*} \mathrm{bs}$ ) | KE <br> Speed <br> (mph) | Delta V (mph) | Closing <br> Speed <br> (MPH) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 181.2 | 29.5 | 20270.25 | 37417.88 | 16.2 | 13.7 | 28.6 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | 190.6 | 9.0 | 10582.00 | 32422.77 | 15.0 | 11.9 | 24.9 |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 269.5 | 62.6 | 39276.25 | 66802.92 | 21.6 | 18.4 | 38.4 |
| Average | 348.4 | 116.2 | 67970.50 | 108659.78 | 27.5 | 23.6 | 49.3 |
| Avg +1 Std. Deviations | 427.3 | 169.8 | 96664.75 | 150912.93 | 32.5 | 27.9 | 58.2 |
| Avg +2 Std. Deviations | 506.2 | 223.4 | 125359.00 | 193277.12 | 36.7 | 31.6 | 65.9 |
| Maximum | 593.3 | 286.6 | 158999.75 | 242738.01 | 41.2 | 35.4 | 73.9 |
| Damage Centroid Depth (x) | ches) | 8.21 |  |  | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ | 3474.2 |  |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) | ches) | 38.28 |  | Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) |  | 1.00 |  |
| Area of Damage | es ${ }^{2}$ ): | 7.00 |  |  |  |  |  |

Area of Damage (inches²): $\quad 975.00$

2015 DODGE CHARGER - Side Impact

| Curb Weight (pounds): | 3950 |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 39 |
| Occupant + Cargo Weight (pounds): | 0 |
| Total Weight (pounds): | 3950 |
| Angle Coll Force to Normal (degrees): | 0.0 |
| No Damage Speed (mph): | 2.0 |
| Energy Crush Depth (inches): | 8.04 |
| Damage Length (inches): | 884.0 |



$$
\text { Average Crush (inches): } \quad 8.04
$$

| Results A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy (ft**bs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { KE } \\ \text { Speed } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ | Delta V (mph) | bsub1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum 86.3 | 49.3 | 20270.25 | 18647.28 | 11.9 | 14.9 | 20.1 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations 60.0 | 23.9 | 10582.00 | 10329.33 | 8.9 | 13.0 | 14.0 |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations 123.4 | 101.0 | 39276.25 | 34639.16 | 16.2 | 20.0 | 28.8 |
| Average 165.2 | 180.7 | 67970.50 | 58454.05 | 21.1 | 25.7 | 38.5 |
| Avg +1 Std. Deviations $\quad 198.7$ | 261.5 | 96664.75 | 82081.74 | 25.0 | 30.3 | 46.3 |
| Avg +2 Std. Deviations 227.5 | 342.9 | 125359.00 | 105602.27 | 28.3 | 34.4 | 53.1 |
| Maximum 257.4 | 438.8 | 158999.75 | 133087.59 | 31.8 | 38.5 | 60.0 |
| Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) | 4.78 |  |  | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ | 3360.21 |  |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) (inches) | 43.56 |  | Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) |  | 1.00 |  |
| Area of Damage (inches ${ }^{2}$ ): | 675.36 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2013 FORD TAURUS AWD - Front Impact



Area of Damage (inches ${ }^{2}$ ): 979.00

2015 DODGE CHARGER - Side Impact

Average Crush (inches): 8.04


4N6XPRT StifCalcs® licensed by 4N6XPRT Systems (mww.4N6XPRT.com) to:
Registered Owner: 4N6XPRT SYSTEMS

## CRASH TEST 2

The setup for Test 2 is that the Charger began to pull out into the intersection and then stopped part way through due to traffic in front of them.. The driver of the Lincoln MKZ stated that he was doing "around 50 mph ". After the collision occurred, the Lincoln MKZ continued on and impacted a vehicle moving through the intersection in the opposite direction.

In Crash Test 2 a 2 point profile was used for the crush damage to the front of the crush damage to the Lincoln MKZ bullet vehicle, and a 4 point profile was used for the damage to the side of the Dodge Charger around the rear wheel well.

For the first run through I like to set the Lever Arm on both vehicles to 0 and set the Angle to the Collision Surface to 0 for both vehicles. The result of this on the speed calculations is that the closing speeds calculated will be at a minimum for each set of A-B stiffness values.

Using this setup, the closing (in this case, impact) speed of the Lincoln MKZ based on average stiffness values for the Lincoln MKZ (Similar Vehicle tests for the Ford Fusion is the basis for the stiffness values) is 45.8 mph . The likely range of the closing speed is within $+/$ - one Standard Deviation of the average which is $38.0-52.4 \mathrm{mph}$.

Since the impact was over the rear axle of the Charger, the effect of the lever arm of $\sim 64$ inches was also analyzed. When the lever arm was added, the closing speed of the Lincoln MKZ based on the average stiffness values increases to 57.4 mph with a likely range of $47.7-65.7 \mathrm{mph}$. It can be seen that adding the lever arm increases the calculated closing speed in this test by about 12 mph for the average stiffness values.

Recall that the bullet vehicle had two significant impacts to its front end in this test, the result of this is that there is more crush to the Lincoln MKZ than can be attributed to the impact between the Lincoln MKZ and the Charger. This will result in a higher than actual speed calculated for the Lincoln MKZ for the impact between the Lincoln MKZ and the Charger.

The Force Balance model results for this test printed "two up" follow this explanation. The Stiffness Test Summary and 2 pages for each of the Force Balance results printed one per page follow at the end of these explanations.

4N6XPRT StifCalcs ${ }^{\circledR}$

## Available Test Results Front Impact Test Summary

Report Filter Settings
Year Range: 2007-2012
Make: LINCOLN
Model: MKZ

| Test <br> Number | Vehicle Info | NoDamage Average |  |  | \|----------Vehicle Width----------| |  |  |  | Crush <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Speed | Crush | KEES |  | fness | Value |  |  |
|  |  | (mph) | (inch) | (mph) | A | B | G | Kv |  |
| 6225 | 2008 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 23.4 | 35.0 | 268.9 | 68.9 | 524.3 | 93.8 | 20.9 |
| 6755 | 2010 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 21.9 | 35.0 | 278.5 | 76.1 | 509.5 | 103.7 | 22.3 |
| 5546 | 2006 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 22.0 | 35.1 | 300.2 | 82.1 | 549.0 | 111.6 | 22.4 |
| 5804 | 2006 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 12.5 | 25.1 | 344.7 | 111.0 | 535.3 | 173.2 | 20.2 |
| 7339 | 2011 FORD FUSION HYBRID FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 19.6 | 35.1 | 354.2 | 108.7 | 577.4 | 147.7 | 25.1 |
| 7132 | 2011 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 7.9 | 20.0 | 368.9 | 139.9 | 486.4 | 248.6 | 20.2 |
| 7139 | 2011 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 17.7 | 35.2 | 401.1 | 136.9 | 587.3 | 186.0 | 28.0 |
| 5821 | 2006 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 9.2 | 24.7 | 420.8 | 179.9 | 492.2 | 282.6 | 26.5 |
| 6728 | 2010 FORD FUSION HYBRID FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 14.8 | 35.0 | 473.1 | 192.2 | 582.3 | 261.6 | 33.2 |
|  |  | Average (AVG) |  |  | 356.7 | 121.7 | 538.2 | 178.7 | 24.3 |
|  |  | Minimum (MIN) |  |  | 268.9 | 68.9 | 486.4 | 93.8 | 20.2 |
|  |  | Maximum (MAX) |  |  | 473.1 | 192.2 | 587.3 | 282.6 | 33.2 |
|  | Standard Deviation (STDev-sample) |  |  |  | 68.0 | 44.2 | 38.5 | 71.5 | 4.3 |
|  |  | mber of | Tests ( n ) | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2008 LINCOLN MKZ - Front Impact



Average Crush (inches): $\quad 15.00$


Area of Damage (inches ${ }^{2}$ ): $\quad 930.00$

2015 DODGE CHARGER - Side Impact

| Curb Weight (pounds): | 3950 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Occupant + Cargo Weight (pounds): | 0 |
| Total Weight (pounds): | 3950 |
| Angle Coll Force to Normal (degrees): | 0.0 |
| No Damage Speed (mph): | 2.0 |
| Energy Crush Depth (inches): | 3.38 |
| Damage Length (inches): | 82.0 |



Average Crush (inches): $\quad 3.38$

| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage <br> Energy (ft*lbs) | KE <br> Speed (mph) | Delta V (mph) | bsub1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 190.6 | 235.0 | 40374.40 | 17331.49 | 11.5 | 17.1 | 43.4 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | 136.6 | 120.7 | 22326.20 | 10053.59 | 8.7 | 13.4 | 31.1 |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 202.3 | 264.8 | 44987.20 | 19176.12 | 12.1 | 17.9 | 46.1 |
| Average | 252.8 | 413.4 | 67648.20 | 28184.58 | 14.6 | 21.6 | 57.6 |
| Avg +1 Std. Deviations | 295.4 | 564.3 | 90309.20 | 37133.87 | 16.8 | 24.7 | 67.2 |
| Avg +2 Std. Deviations | 332.9 | 716.7 | 112970.20 | 46045.32 | 18.7 | 27.4 | 75.8 |
| Maximum | 318.6 | 656.5 | 104039.10 | 42536.84 | 18.0 | 26.4 | 72.5 |

Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) $\quad \mathbf{2 . 2 9}$
$\mathrm{k}^{2} \quad 3360.21$
Damage Centroid Depth (y) (inches) $\quad 35.77$
Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) $\quad \mathbf{1 . 0 0}$
Area of Damage (inches ${ }^{2}$ ): $\quad 277.16$
4N6XPRT StifCalcs® licensed by 4N6XPRT Systems (www.4N6XPRT.com) to:
Registered Owner: 4N6XPRT SYSTEMS

## 2008 LINCOLN MKZ - Front Impact

| Curb Weight (pound) Occupant + Cargo Weight (pound): Total Weight (pounds) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | r Arm Dista ent of Inertia | inches): <br> $\left.-\mathrm{ft}-\mathrm{sec}^{2}\right)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \\ \hline 2418.5 \end{array}$ |
| Angle Coll Force to Normal (degrees) | "Known" Stiffness Values |  |  | B |
|  |  | e | $\frac{A^{356.7}}{}$ |  |
| Energy Crush Depth (inches) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Minimum | 268.9 | 68.9 |
| Damage Length (inches) |  | aximum | 473.1 | 192.2 |
| Crush Profile Measuremen |  | Devation | 68.0 | 44.2 |
| Equal | Zone Depth $(x)$ (inches) | Area Depth(x) (inches ${ }^{3}$ ) | Zone <br> Depth (y) (inches) | Area Depth(y) (inches |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| C1 (inches) $\mathbf{1 8 . 0 0}$ | 7.60 | 7068.00 | 28.93 | 26908 |
| C2 (inches) 12.00 |  |  |  |  |
| C3 (inches) |  |  |  |  |
| C4 (inches) |  |  |  |  |
| C5 (inches) |  |  |  |  |
| C6 (inches) |  |  |  |  |
| C7 (inches) |  |  |  |  |
| C8 (inches) |  |  |  |  |
| C9 (inches) |  |  |  |  |
| C10 (inches) |  |  |  |  |

## Average Crush (inches): $\quad 15.00$

| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy ( $\mathrm{ft}^{*} \mathrm{bs}$ ) | KE <br> Speed <br> (mph) | Delta V (mph) | Closing <br> Speed <br> (MPH) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 268.9 | 68.9 | 40374.40 | 64132.93 | 23.4 | 15.3 | 45.4 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | 220.7 | 33.3 | 22326.20 | 40496.64 | 18.6 | 12.0 | 35.8 |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 288.7 | 77.5 | 44987.20 | 70800.01 | 24.6 | 16.0 | 47.7 |
| Average | 356.7 | 121.7 | 67648.20 | 102026.37 | 29.5 | 19.3 | 57.4 |
| Avg +1 Std. Deviations | 424.7 | 165.9 | 90309.20 | 133438.01 | 33.7 | 22.1 | 65.7 |
| Avg +2 Std. Deviations | 492.7 | 210.1 | 112970.20 | 164917.98 | 37.5 | 24.6 | 73.1 |
| Maximum | 473.1 | 192.2 | 104039.10 | 152879.43 | 36.1 | 23.6 | 70.3 |
| Damage Centroid Depth ( | ches) | 7.60 |  |  | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ | 3186.82 |  |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) | ches) | 28.93 |  | Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) |  | 1.00 |  |
| Area of Damage (inches) ${ }^{2}$ : 9930.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]2015 DODGE CHARGER - Side Impact


Average Crush (inches): $\quad 3.38$


4N6XPRT StifCalcs® licensed by 4N6XPRT Systems (www.4N6XPRT.com) to:
Registered Owner: 4N6XPRT SYSTEMS

## CRASH TEST 3

The setup for Test 3 is that the Charger began to pull out into the intersection to make a left turn and then stopped. The driver of the Mazda 626 stated that he was doing "around 50 mph ". Both the Mazda 626 and the Charger had no additional impacts.

In Crash Test 3 a 3 point profile was used for the crush damage to the front of the crush damage to the Mazda 626 bullet vehicle, and a 4 point profile was used for the damage to the side of the Dodge Charger around the front wheel well.

For the first run through I like to set the Lever Arm on both vehicles to 0 and set the Angle to the Collision Surface to 0 for both vehicles. The result of this on the speed calculations is that the closing speeds calculated will be at a minimum for each set of A-B stiffness values.

Using this setup, the closing (in this case, impact) speed of the Mazda 626 based on average stiffness values for the Mazda 626 is 48.5 mph . The likely range of the closing speed is within $+/$ one Standard Deviation of the average which is $31.0-61.4 \mathrm{mph}$.

Although there is a "Angle to the Collision Face" (Side) of the Charger, impact was over the right front corner, with no angle. For that reason, no angle is input.

The Force Balance model results for this test printed "two up" follow this explanation. The CLASS Stiffness Test Summary and 2 pages for the Force Balance results printed one per page follow at the end of these explanations.

# Available Test Results Front Impact Test Summary <br> Report Filter Settings 

Year Range: 1965-2021
Model: 626


## 1996 MAZDA 626 - Front Impact



## Average Crush (inches): $\quad \mathbf{1 8 . 4 0}$

| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy ( $\mathrm{ft}^{*} \mathrm{bs}$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { KE } \\ \text { Speed } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ | Delta V (mph) | Closing <br> Speed <br> (MPH) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 216.8 | 52.4 | 34838.32 | 65981.71 | 27.5 | 23.3 | 38.7 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | 76.1 | -34.3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 181.6 | 27.5 | 20284.20 | 42554.21 | 22.0 | 18.6 | 31.0 |
| Average | 287.1 | 89.3 | 56941.49 | 103505.36 | 34.4 | 29.2 | 48.5 |
| Avg +1 Std. Deviations | 392.6 | 151.1 | 93598.78 | 165374.08 | 43.5 | 36.9 | 61.4 |
| Avg +2 Std. Deviations | 498.1 | 212.9 | 130256.07 | 227361.32 | 51.0 | 43.2 | 72.0 |
| Maximum | 496.7 | 213.5 | 130540.45 | 227716.27 | 51.0 | 43.3 | 72.0 |
| Damage Centroid Depth (x) | ches) | 9.32 |  |  | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ | 2646.4 |  |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) | ches) | 25.50 |  | Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) |  | 1.0 |  |
| Area of Damage | (2): | 85.60 |  |  |  |  |  |

[^1]2016 DODGE CHARGER

|  | Curb Weight (pounds): | $\mathbf{3 9 5 0}$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Occupant + Cargo Weight (pounds): | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |
|  | Total Weight (pounds): | $\mathbf{3 9 5 0}$ |


| PDOF | Lever Arm Distance (inches): |
| ---: | ---: |
|  | $\boxed{0.00}$ |
| Yaw Moment of Inertia (lb-ft-sec ${ }^{2}$ ) | $\mathbf{2 8 6 2 . 5 0}$ |
|  |  |



Average Crush (inches): $\quad \mathbf{2 . 7 2}$

| Results A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy (ft**bs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { KE } \\ \text { Speed } \end{gathered}$ $(\mathrm{mph})$ | Delta V (mph) | bsub1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum 172.2 | 215.1 | 34838.32 | 13031.75 | 9.9 | 15.5 | 44.0 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations 126.3 | 115.7 | 20284.20 | 7954.56 | 7.8 | 12.4 | 32.3 |
| Average 226.4 | 371.9 | 56941.49 | 20655.05 | 12.5 | 19.4 | 57.8 |
| Avg +1 Std. Deviations 296.8 | 639.0 | 93598.78 | 33188.31 | 15.9 | 24.5 | 75.8 |
| Avg +2 Std. Deviations 354.3 | 910.8 | 130256.07 | 45649.46 | 18.6 | 28.7 | 90.5 |
| Maximum $\quad 354.7$ | 912.9 | 130540.45 | 45745.94 | 18.6 | 28.8 | 90.6 |
| Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) | 1.99 |  |  | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ | 3360.21 |  |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) (inches) | 90.60 |  | Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) |  | 1.00 |  |
| Area of Damage (inches ${ }^{2}$ ): | 250.24 |  |  |  |  |  |

4N6XPRT StifCalcs® licensed by 4N6XPRT Systems (www.4N6XPRT.com) to:
Registered Owner: 4N6XPRT SYSTEMS

## Crash Test 1

Stiffness Test Summary
Force Balance no Lever Arm
Force Balance with Lever Arm

4N6XPRT StifCalcs ${ }^{\circledR}$
Available Test Results Front Impact Test Summary
Report Filter Settings
Year Range: 2000-2021
Make: FORD
Model: TAURUS

| Test Number | Vehicle Info | No Dama |  |  | \|-----------Vehicle Width----------| |  |  |  | Crush <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Speed (mph) | Crush | KEES <br> (mph) | \|------Stiffness |  | Value s--------\| |  |  |
|  |  |  | (inch) |  | A | B | G | Kv |  |
| 5143 | 2004 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 20.9 | 34.7 | 297.6 | 84.6 | 523.1 | 115.5 | 23.1 |
| 4150 | 2001 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 19.3 | 34.7 | 326.1 | 100.5 | 529.3 | 137.2 | 25.0 |
| 4174 | 2001 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 15.1 | 29.5 | 341.7 | 110.4 | 529.0 | 160.1 | 22.9 |
| 4134 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 14.9 | 29.7 | 352.2 | 116.5 | 532.3 | 168.5 | 23.6 |
| 4135 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 14.9 | 29.6 | 352.3 | 116.8 | 531.4 | 169.0 | 23.6 |
| 3248 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 17.8 | 35.2 | 363.8 | 123.2 | 537.1 | 167.4 | 27.8 |
| 4776 | 2004 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 17.8 | 35.1 | 364.4 | 123.1 | 539.6 | 167.3 | 27.6 |
| 3225 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 12.0 | 27.3 | 375.3 | 140.2 | 502.5 | 209.9 | 25.0 |
| 4987 | 2004 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 10.6 | 24.7 | 379.3 | 141.6 | 508.0 | 222.4 | 23.1 |
| 6808 | 2010 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 19.4 | 35.1 | 381.8 | 118.7 | 614.1 | 161.4 | 25.5 |
| 7302 | 2010 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 12.1 | 24.7 | 384.5 | 125.4 | 589.5 | 197.0 | 20.2 |
| 7271 | 2010 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 11.9 | 24.7 | 392.5 | 130.5 | 590.3 | 205.0 | 20.6 |
| 6964 | 2011 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 17.9 | 35.1 | 408.3 | 137.1 | 608.0 | 186.4 | 27.5 |
| 3224 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 12.1 | 30.0 | 412.6 | 170.2 | 500.2 | 245.0 | 29.7 |
| 3150 | 2000 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 12.1 | 29.9 | 428.2 | 175.7 | 521.7 | 253.4 | 29.5 |
| 6967 | 2011 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 7.5 | 19.9 | 443.5 | 176.9 | 556.1 | 315.7 | 21.2 |
| 7872 | 2013 FORD TAURUS FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 15.4 | 34.8 | 474.2 | 183.1 | 614.0 | 249.8 | 31.4 |
|  |  | Average (AVG) |  |  | 381.1 | 133.8 | 548.6 | 195.9 | 25.1 |
|  |  | Minimum (MIN) |  |  | 297.6 | 84.6 | 500.2 | 115.5 | 20.2 |
|  |  | Maximum (MAX) |  |  | 474.2 | 183.1 | 614.1 | 315.7 | 31.4 |
| Standard Deviation (STDev-sample) |  |  |  |  | 43.7 | 28.2 | 39.2 | 49.7 | 3.3 |
| Number of Tests ( n ) |  |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2013 FORD TAURUS AWD - Front Impact



$\square$

Average Crush (inches): $\square$


| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy (ft*lbs) | KE <br> Speed (mph) | Delta V (mph) | Closing Speed (MPH) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 181.2 | 29.5 | 20270.25 | 37417.88 | 16.2 | 13.7 | 28.6 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | 190.6 | 9.0 | 10582.00 | 32422.77 | 15.0 | 11.9 | 24.9 |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 269.5 | 62.6 | 39276.25 | 66802.92 | 21.6 | 18.4 | 38.4 |
| Average | 348.4 | 116.2 | 67970.50 | 108659.78 | 27.5 | 23.6 | 49.3 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 427.3 | 169.8 | 96664.75 | 150912.93 | 32.5 | 27.9 | 58.2 |
| Avg + 2 Std. Deviations | 506.2 | 223.4 | 125359.00 | 193277.12 | 36.7 | 31.6 | 65.9 |
| Maximum | 593.3 | 286.6 | 158999.75 | 242738.01 | 41.2 | 35.4 | 73.9 |


| Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) | $\mathbf{8 . 2 1}$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) (inches) | $\mathbf{3 8 . 2 8}$ |  |
| Area of Damage (inches ${ }^{2}$ ): | $\mathbf{9 7 5 . 0 0}$ |  |
|  |  |  |


|  | $k^{2}$ | 3474.23 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) | 1.00 |  |
|  |  |  |

## 2015 DODGE CHARGER - Side Impact

Average Crush (inches): $\square$

| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy (ft*lbs) | KE Speed (mph) | Delta V (mph) | bsub1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 86.3 | 49.3 | 20270.25 | 18647.28 | 11.9 | 14.9 | 20.1 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | 60.0 | 23.9 | 10582.00 | 10329.33 | 8.9 | 13.0 | 14.0 |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 123.4 | 101.0 | 39276.25 | 34639.16 | 16.2 | 20.0 | 28.8 |
| Average | 165.2 | 180.7 | 67970.50 | 58454.05 | 21.1 | 25.7 | 38.5 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 198.7 | 261.5 | 96664.75 | 82081.74 | 25.0 | 30.3 | 46.3 |
| Avg + 2 Std. Deviations | 227.5 | 342.9 | 125359.00 | 105602.27 | 28.3 | 34.4 | 53.1 |
| Maximum | 257.4 | 438.8 | 158999.75 | 133087.59 | 31.8 | 38.5 | 60.0 |


| Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) | 4.78 | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ | 3360.21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) (inches) | 43.56 | Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) | 1.00 |

## 2013 FORD TAURUS AWD - Front Impact



## 2015 DODGE CHARGER - Side Impact





# Crash Test 2 

Stiffness Test Summary
Force Balance no Lever Arm
Force Balance with Lever Arm

4N6XPRT StifCalcs ${ }^{\circledR}$

## Available Test Results Front Impact Test Summary

Report Filter Settings
Year Range: 2007-2012
Make: LINCOLN
Model: MKZ

| Test <br> Number | Vehicle Info | NoDamage Average |  |  | \|----------Vehicle Width----------| |  |  |  | Crush <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Speed | Crush | KEES |  | fness | Value |  |  |
|  |  | (mph) | (inch) | (mph) | A | B | G | Kv |  |
| 6225 | 2008 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 23.4 | 35.0 | 268.9 | 68.9 | 524.3 | 93.8 | 20.9 |
| 6755 | 2010 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 21.9 | 35.0 | 278.5 | 76.1 | 509.5 | 103.7 | 22.3 |
| 5546 | 2006 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 22.0 | 35.1 | 300.2 | 82.1 | 549.0 | 111.6 | 22.4 |
| 5804 | 2006 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 12.5 | 25.1 | 344.7 | 111.0 | 535.3 | 173.2 | 20.2 |
| 7339 | 2011 FORD FUSION HYBRID FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 19.6 | 35.1 | 354.2 | 108.7 | 577.4 | 147.7 | 25.1 |
| 7132 | 2011 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 7.9 | 20.0 | 368.9 | 139.9 | 486.4 | 248.6 | 20.2 |
| 7139 | 2011 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 17.7 | 35.2 | 401.1 | 136.9 | 587.3 | 186.0 | 28.0 |
| 5821 | 2006 FORD FUSION FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 9.2 | 24.7 | 420.8 | 179.9 | 492.2 | 282.6 | 26.5 |
| 6728 | 2010 FORD FUSION HYBRID FOUR DOOR SEDAN | 5.0 | 14.8 | 35.0 | 473.1 | 192.2 | 582.3 | 261.6 | 33.2 |
|  |  | Average (AVG) |  |  | 356.7 | 121.7 | 538.2 | 178.7 | 24.3 |
|  |  | Minimum (MIN) |  |  | 268.9 | 68.9 | 486.4 | 93.8 | 20.2 |
|  |  | Maximum (MAX) |  |  | 473.1 | 192.2 | 587.3 | 282.6 | 33.2 |
|  | Standard Deviation (STDev-sample) |  |  |  | 68.0 | 44.2 | 38.5 | 71.5 | 4.3 |
|  |  | mber of | Tests ( n ) | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2008 LINCOLN MKZ - Front Impact

Average Crush (inches): $\square$

| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy (ft*lbs) | KE Speed (mph) | Delta V (mph) | Closing Speed (MPH) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 268.9 | 68.9 | 40374.40 | 64132.93 | 23.4 | 19.1 | 36.2 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | 220.7 | 33.3 | 22326.20 | 40496.64 | 18.6 | 15.1 | 28.5 |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 288.7 | 77.5 | 44987.20 | 70800.01 | 24.6 | 20.1 | 38.0 |
| Average | 356.7 | 121.7 | 67648.20 | 102026.37 | 29.5 | 24.2 | 45.8 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 424.7 | 165.9 | 90309.20 | 133438.01 | 33.7 | 27.7 | 52.4 |
| Avg + 2 Std. Deviations | 492.7 | 210.1 | 112970.20 | 164917.98 | 37.5 | 30.8 | 58.3 |
| Maximum | 473.1 | 192.2 | 104039.10 | 152879.43 | 36.1 | 29.7 | 56.1 |
| Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) |  | 7.60 |  |  | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ | 3186.8 |  |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) (inches) |  | 28.93 |  | Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) |  | 1.0 |  |
| Area of Damage |  | 30.00 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2015 DODGE CHARGER - Side Impact

Average Crush (inches): $\square$

| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy (ft*lbs) | KE Speed (mph) | Delta V (mph) | bsub1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 190.6 | 235.0 | 40374.40 | 17331.49 | 11.5 | 17.1 | 43.4 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | 136.6 | 120.7 | 22326.20 | 10053.59 | 8.7 | 13.4 | 31.1 |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 202.3 | 264.8 | 44987.20 | 19176.12 | 12.1 | 17.9 | 46.1 |
| Average | 252.8 | 413.4 | 67648.20 | 28184.58 | 14.6 | 21.6 | 57.6 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 295.4 | 564.3 | 90309.20 | 37133.87 | 16.8 | 24.7 | 67.2 |
| Avg +2 Std. Deviations | 332.9 | 716.7 | 112970.20 | 46045.32 | 18.7 | 27.4 | 75.8 |
| Maximum | 318.6 | 656.5 | 104039.10 | 42536.84 | 18.0 | 26.4 | 72.5 |

Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) $\quad 2.29$

Area of Damage (inches ${ }^{2}$ ):
277.16

## 2008 LINCOLN MKZ - Front Impact

Average Crush (inches): $\square$

| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy (ft*lbs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { KE } \\ \text { Speed } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ | Delta V (mph) | Closing Speed (MPH) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 268.9 | 68.9 | 40374.40 | 64132.93 | 23.4 | 15.3 | 45.4 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | 220.7 | 33.3 | 22326.20 | 40496.64 | 18.6 | 12.0 | 35.8 |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 288.7 | 77.5 | 44987.20 | 70800.01 | 24.6 | 16.0 | 47.7 |
| Average | 356.7 | 121.7 | 67648.20 | 102026.37 | 29.5 | 19.3 | 57.4 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 424.7 | 165.9 | 90309.20 | 133438.01 | 33.7 | 22.1 | 65.7 |
| Avg + 2 Std. Deviations | 492.7 | 210.1 | 112970.20 | 164917.98 | 37.5 | 24.6 | 73.1 |
| Maximum | 473.1 | 192.2 | 104039.10 | 152879.43 | 36.1 | 23.6 | 70.3 |
| Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) |  | 7.60 |  |  | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ | 3186.8 |  |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) (inches) |  | 28.93 |  | Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) |  | 1.0 |  |
| Area of Damage |  | 30.00 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2015 DODGE CHARGER - Side Impact

Average Crush (inches): $\square$

| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy (ft*lbs) | KE Speed (mph) | Delta V (mph) | bsub1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 190.6 | 235.0 | 40374.40 | 17331.49 | 11.5 | 13.6 | 43.4 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | 136.6 | 120.7 | 22326.20 | 10053.59 | 8.7 | 10.7 | 31.1 |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 202.3 | 264.8 | 44987.20 | 19176.12 | 12.1 | 14.3 | 46.1 |
| Average | 252.8 | 413.4 | 67648.20 | 28184.58 | 14.6 | 17.2 | 57.6 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 295.4 | 564.3 | 90309.20 | 37133.87 | 16.8 | 19.7 | 67.2 |
| Avg +2 Std. Deviations | 332.9 | 716.7 | 112970.20 | 46045.32 | 18.7 | 21.9 | 75.8 |
| Maximum | 318.6 | 656.5 | 104039.10 | 42536.84 | 18.0 | 21.1 | 72.5 |

Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) $\quad 2.29$

Area of Damage (inches ${ }^{2}$ ):
277.16

## Crash Test 3

Stiffness Test Summary Force Balance no Lever Arm

# Available Test Results Front Impact Test Summary <br> Report Filter Settings 

Year Range: 1965-2021
Model: 626


## 1996 MAZDA 626 - Front Impact

Average Crush (inches): $\qquad$

| Results | A | B | Average Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy (ft*lbs) | KE Speed (mph) | Delta V (mph) | Closing <br> Speed <br> (MPH) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 216.8 | 52.4 | 34838.32 | 65981.71 | 27.5 | 23.3 | 38.7 |
| Avg - 2 Std. Deviations | 76.1 | -34.3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Avg - 1 Std. Deviations | 181.6 | 27.5 | 20284.20 | 42554.21 | 22.0 | 18.6 | 31.0 |
| Average | 287.1 | 89.3 | 56941.49 | 103505.36 | 34.4 | 29.2 | 48.5 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 392.6 | 151.1 | 93598.78 | 165374.08 | 43.5 | 36.9 | 61.4 |
| Avg + 2 Std. Deviations | 498.1 | 212.9 | 130256.07 | 227361.32 | 51.0 | 43.2 | 72.0 |
| Maximum | 496.7 | 213.5 | 130540.45 | 227716.27 | 51.0 | 43.3 | 72.0 |
| Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) |  | 9.32 |  |  | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ | 2646.4 |  |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) (inches) |  | 25.50 |  | Eff. Mass Ratio (gamma) |  | 1.0 |  |
| Area of Damage | $s^{2}$ ): | 85.60 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2016 DODGE CHARGER



Crush Profile Measurements: 4


| Results | A | B | Average <br> Force (poundsf) | Damage Energy (ft*lbs) | KE <br> Speed (mph) | Delta V (mph) | bsub1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | 172.2 | 215.1 | 34838.32 | 13031.75 | 9.9 | 15.5 | 44.0 |
| Avg-2 Std. Deviations | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Avg-1 Std. Deviations | 126.3 | 115.7 | 20284.20 | 7954.56 | 7.8 | 12.4 | 32.3 |
| Average | 226.4 | 371.9 | 56941.49 | 20655.05 | 12.5 | 19.4 | 57.8 |
| Avg + 1 Std. Deviations | 296.8 | 639.0 | 93598.78 | 33188.31 | 15.9 | 24.5 | 75.8 |
| Avg + 2 Std. Deviations | 354.3 | 910.8 | 130256.07 | 45649.46 | 18.6 | 28.7 | 90.5 |
| Maximum | 354.7 | 912.9 | 130540.45 | 45745.94 | 18.6 | 28.8 | 90.6 |
| Damage Centroid Depth (x) (inches) |  | 1.99 |  |  | $\mathrm{k}^{2}$ | 3360.2 |  |
| Damage Centroid Depth (y) (inches) |  | 90.60 |  | Eff. Mass Ratio ( | (gamma) | 1.0 |  |
| Area of Damage (inches ${ }^{2}$ ): |  | 250.24 |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    4N6XPRT StifCalcs® licensed by 4N6XPRT Systems (www.4N6XPRT.com) to

[^1]:    4N6XPRT StifCalcs® licensed by 4N6XPRT Systems (www.4N6XPRT.com) to:

