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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This is a summary report of a study of motor vehicle accidents involving children between 0 and 4 years old. The study, sponsored by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and conducted fram September, 1981, to May, 1984, entailed in-depth investigation of selected crashes in Michigan by experienced, professional accident investigators.

The purpose of the study was to assess the effectiveness of child safety restraints in real-life crash situations and to determine how they are used and misused. Such careful observation of a select number of crashes involving young children may serve as the basis for recamendations to improve child safety in motor vehicle crashes.

A total of 60 child occupants were involved from 43 crashes which were investigated in-depth. Each investigation resulted in a separate clinical case report of the crash. Crashes selected for investigation came from more than 1,000 notifications of such crashes within Michigan provided by two insurance carriers. Crashes investigated included those in which restrained children were injured, restrained children were uninjured, unrestrained children were injured, and unrestrained children were uninjured.

Each accident investigation report addressed areas relevant to the child safety problem brought out by the investigation. Individual reports of each accident have been published separately. In addition to presenting summary conclusions, this document will serve as an index to the original reports.

### 2.0 BACKGROUND

Data regarding motor vehicle accidents and their consequences have become more camplete, more refined, and more accurate in recent years. These data have confirmed that children constitute a special problem in highway safety. Children up to and including age five account for about $2 \%$ of all fatalities in motor vehicle accidents.

The purpose of this project was to contribute to the knowledge of child safety through in-depth, clinical studies of selected crashes involving child occupants who were contained properly in child safety devices, or were improperly contained in child safety devices, as well as crashes where no child safety device was used.

The project was initially planned as a companion effort to a Ieague General Insurance Company program that provides free child safety seats to policyholders who have children under four years old. Leaque General has about 35,000 policyholders in Michigan. Through the cooperation of their policyholders who have children, League General screened incoming reports of accidents and alerted $\operatorname{UMIRI}$ to crashes involving young children.

One problem with the investigation of small-child injuries in past accident studies has been inadequate identification of the children involved. Also, projects such as the NHTSA-sponsored National Crash Severity Study (NCSS) and the National Accident Sampling System (NASS), which are based on a sampling of accidents from a specific regional accident population, yielded numbers too small to conduct any meaningful analysis. Sametimes multidisciplinary accident investigation teams would learn of the involvement of a child in an accident they were investigating, but the child would not have been adequately identified in the police report. Police reporting forms
often amit the presence of a child in an accident-involved vehicle unless the child is injured. Thus identifying young children in accidents has in the past been a special problem for accident researchers.

The number of crashes to be investigated in this study depended on the accident experience of policyholders of League General Insurance Company. When the project was begun, the number of crashes with young children in League General's accident population was found to be far smaller than had been initially estimated. Many crashes reported to the insurer-crashes involving young children-were reported as being more severe than they actually were. It became apparent that when the low-energy "fender bender" crashes were eliminated, accidents selectable for in-depth investigation would be too few to satisfy the needs of this project. To overcome this problem, a second insuring organization with wider accident experience involving young children was invited to participate in the project.

The second insurer was the Autamobile Club of Michigan (AAA), which has about 1.2 million policyholders in Michigan. The AAA cooperated by having its field offices report to its headquarters all crashes involving young children. AAA headquarters notified UMIRI of all such crashes, except for same that were low energy. This change in the project significantly increased the number of crashes available for investigation.

### 3.0 DESIGN OF THE ACCIDENT INESTIGATION PROGRAM

In-depth investigations of selected motor vehicle crashes search out, observe, measure, and record up to 700 discrete data elements relating to the precrash, crash, and postcrash phases of an accident. Since this accident investigation project was concerned primarily with young children and how they were affected in crashes, data elements were selected on the basis of their relevancy to the objectives of the project. Data selected were in four categories:
(1) Basic Crash Descriptors: crash time, date, location, number of vehicles involved, vehicle type(s), number of occupants involved, occupant age, sex, seated location, overall crash severity, overall injury severity.
(2) Vehicle Examination: damage characteristics, damage measurements, occupants' interior contacts, restraint use or non-use, change in vehicle velocity at impact (Delta-V*).
(3) Child Injuries: child physical characteristics, inventory of individual child injuries, movement of child within vehicle, child kinematics, specific interior areas and/or objects of vehicle contacted by child.
(4) Child Safety Restraints: restraint type, make, model, restraint performance, attachment security, where located, overall relevance, and performance in crash.

These data elements were organized to provide an efficient and complete protocol for the investigation of selected crashes, complete in those areas

[^0]of most interest and value as they relate to the safety of the child occupant. Various field data forms were desiọned to ensure that vital information was systematically collected and organized. These data forms also formed the major portion of each accident case report which was the resulting work-product of the entire effort. Data forms used in the study are included in Appendix B. In addition to the use of field data forms, photographs were taken of the vehicle and accident site, and where possible, with parental consent, of the actual child seated in the child restraint involved in the crash. In each case, these data were organized so as to protect the identity of all individuals. Completed case study reports were "sanitized" to eliminate all personal identifying information.

### 4.0 FIETD INVESTIGATION OF CRASHES

Alerting to crashes involving young children originated from either the League General Insurance Company main office, in Southfield, Michigan, or the Automobile Club of Michigan headquarters located in Dearborn, Michigan. Whenever a policyholder reported a crash in which children 0 to 4 years old were involved, the insuring organization would relay the information to UMTRI by telephone. Information initially received from each policyholder in this manner included the following, when available:

- Date and time of crash.
- Iocation of crash.
- Type of crash.
- Crash severity (general characterization).
- Number of child occupants 0-4 years.
- Child, or children, injured or noninjured.
- Age and sex of child occupants.
- Child restraint involved, or if used.
- Indication of cooperative attitude of the reporting person relative to further follow-up of the crash by UMIRI.
- Whether the crash-involved vehicle was driveable after the crash.
- Additional coments, when possible, their relationship (if any), and a general overview of the crash and damage involved.

This alerting information regarding crashes, from which in-depth investigations could be initiated, was recorded in the order that the calls were received. Based upon the information received, a decision was then made whether any additional information was needed before the crash could be considered for an in-depth investigation, or whether it should be disregarded
in favor of an alternate selection with desirable features more consistent with the objectives of the study. Crashes that were low-energy "fender benders" would typically be discarded at this point.

Where additional information was needed before a decision to proceed was made, the party who had reported to the insurer was called by phone and interviewed. A decision was then made whether to proceed with an in-depth investigation of that crash. When a crash was selected, arrangements were made through the same phone interview, or a follow-up call, to examine the child safety restraint (when involved) and the crash-involved vehicle (when in the possession of the reporting party).

Field investigation data forms also served as a gride for conducting the investigation. They were augmented by further questioning of the parents or guardians, when possible, during the examination of the vehicle and/or child restraint.

Report preparation followed, in which child injuries were coded, a diagram of the crash scene prepared, photograpis edited and indexed, a reconstruction of the crash enerav, or "Delta $V$," conpleted (where applicable), ano the case report assembled. Each report also included a narrative summary that included relevant findings.

### 5.0 DISCUSSION OF CASES

Summaries of the crashes investigated in this project are in Appendix A. No statistical analysis of injuries in those crashes would be meaningful, both because of the small number of cases and because they were not selected to constitute a representative sample of all such crashes occurring in Michigan. But the cases investigated do consitute a judgment sample of the various types of crashes involving young children. When organized in terms of child injuries and restraint use, they are represented by the tabulation in TABIE 5-1.

A few illustrative cases are summarized here in terms of their child protective and nonprotective features.

## TABLE 5-1

|  | Children | Children |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Case | Unre | Unre- |
| Reprained \& |  |  |
| Report | Uninjured | Injured |
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### 5.1 Crashes in Which Restrained Children Were Uninjured

The four cases sumarizei here are representative of crashes in which child protective devices performed as desired and provided a significant level of protection to the child. They might be viewed as "success stories" - collisions severe enough to result in moderate or greater injury to adult occupants, but with the properly. restrained child well protected.

## Case 141

This single-vehicle loss-of-control rollover accident involved an intermediate-size passenger car driven by a 36-year-old mother on a major four-lane divided highway just outside a large city. The driver lost control of her car when a stone thrown up fram the wheels of a tractor-trailer cambination ahead of her struck the car's windshield. Her car swerved off the roadway, into the median area, and rolled over. The unrestrained driver received moderate-to-serious injuries. Her two-year-old child, securely restrained in a child safety seat in the right front, was uninjured.

## Case 142

This crash involved a one-year-old female child riding in a sub-compact passenger car with her mother. The car became involved in a four-vehicle crash. The child was securely restrained in a child safety seat, and her mother, the 25 -year-old driver, was similarly restrained by the vehicle's lap and shoulder restraint. The vehicle was impacted frontally while they attempted to negotiate a left tum within an urban intersection. The driver received moderate-to-serious injuries, while the child was uninjured. Occupants in the other crash-involved vehicles received moderate-toserious injuries.

Case 855
This crasi involved two compact-size vehicles that collided in an angle impact within an urban intersection. One vehicle, containing four young children ages $1,2,3$, and 10 seated in the rear seat, was struck in the right side by the other vehicle, which enterei the intersection late on a caution signal. All occupants were restrained with the vehicle's belt restraints except the one-year-old child, who was contained in a child safety seat and was uninjured. The safety seat was partially secured to the vehicle,
with the child securely belted into the safety seat. The two frontseated and restrained adults received minor injuries, primarily because of excessive slack in their belt restraints. The four rear-seated and restrained children were uninjured.

Case 470
This crash, an intersection angle type impact between an intermediate size sports coupe and a pickup truck, involved a one-year-old child restrained in a child safety seat. The 27 -year-old driver of the sports coupe, and mother of the child, was unrestrained. The child was securely contained in a child safety seat located in the right front. The driver of the pickup truck failed to yield the right of way and impacted the right side of the passenger car in the area near where the child was seated.

At impact and during the subsequent rollover, the unrestrained driver contacted the lower instrument panel and windshield header, which resulted in loss-of-consciousness fram a concussion, accampanied by other injuries. The restrained child was uninjured and prevented from moving about the vehicle interior and contacting various interior surfaces and objects. Clothing worn by the child, consisting of blue jeans, gym shoes, a zipped-up winter jacket with hood up and tied, with a pacifier in the child's mouth, also prevented lacerations from flying glass fragments and other interior objects.

### 5.2 Crashes in Which Restrained Children Were Injured

Crashes summarized here resulted in injuries to a restrained child, but where the child was not properly secured within the protective device or the device not properly secured to the vehicle.

The injuries incurred could have been eliminated, or reduced in
severity, had the child and protective device been properly secured.
Case 406
This was a severe crash in which one adult occupant of an inter-mediate-size coupe was killed, and a two-year-old female child was injured. The vehicle containing the child was impacted in the left side by a stake truck whose driver failed to yield the righ of way in an urban intersection. The 27-year-old driver and mother of the child sustained fatal injuries. The child was located in the left rear, seated in a child safety seat. The safety seat was properly secured to the vehicle but the child was not secured within the safety seat.

Crash forces resulted in moving the child laterally across the rear seat and contacting the right side rear glass, where she
received a minor head laceration. The child safety seat was crushed where it was attached to the left rear seat of the vehicle from crash forces and intrusion into the left side of the interior.

The investigator believed that had the child been properly secured within the child safety seat, her injuries would have been significantly greater and possibly fatal. This case must be viewed as that rare exception where the usage of an occupant restraint, because of the circumstances of the crash, could adversely affect occupant safety.

## Case 479

This crash occurred on a major suburban arterial when the driver of an intermediate-size sedan, a 28 -year-old mother with her four-year-old child, had her view obstructed by a city bus turning within a major intersection. A collision resulted with an oncoming vehicle as she initiated her turn. The child was contained in a "booster" type child seat in the right front seat position. However, due to the lack of lap and shoulder belt restraints in the vehicle, it was not possible to attach the child and the child seat to the vehicle. The impact resulted in the child's moving into the right side interior of the vehicle, where he recieved a minor forehead contusion, and facial lacerations of moderate severity from shattered right-side glass fragments. The driver and mother of the child received a minor forehead contusion from contact with the instrument panel. Investigators believed that proper securing of the booster (and child) would have minimized the injuries sustained.

## Case 610

This crash resulted in the death of a two-year-old child while two other children ages one and four years received serious injuries. The vehicle with the children, an intemediate-size sports coupe, was struck in the right side by a pickup truck within a major suburban intersection. The crash occurred when the driver of the pickup truck entered the intersection without the right of wav, striking the right side of the sports coupe.

All five occupants in the sports coupe, which included the mother driving and the father in the right front seat, were injured. Principal crash forces were to the right side of the vehicle, which resulted in fatal injuries to the father, seated in the right front seat, and a two-year-old male child seated in the right rear seat. A one-year-old female child was contained in a safety seat, but was not secured within the seat, which was also not attached to the vehicle's belt system. The mother had placed the child and seat on the rear backglass convenience shelf. Impact forces caused the child and seat to move forward, resulting in serious injuries to the child. The free-floating child and child safety seat also struck the four-year-old male child in the left rear seat, inflicting severe injuries to the child, The one-year-old child was injured critically. Investigators believed that proper securing of seat and child would have lessened injuries to both the 1 and 4 year olds.

This crash, also an intersection angle type impact, involved an intermediate-size two-door sedan which was struck in the right side by a pickup truck whose driver initiated a turn movement to enter a ramp leading onto an Interstate highway. The crash resulted when the pickup driver pulled into the path of the sedan, whose driver was initiating a right tum on an entrance ramp. This resulted in a frontal impact to the sedan, which had four occupants.

The driver, a 2l-year-old female, was unrestrained, as was a 24 -year-old female right front passenger. A four-year-old female occupant was seated in the left rear, also unrestrained and lying face down on the seat. The fourth occupant, a 20 -month-old female, was restrained in a child safety seat in the center rear. The driver and right front adult passenger received serious and moderate injuries, with the unrestrained four-year-old child also receiving serious injuries. The 20 -month-old restrained child did receive a laceration on the forehead, bloody nose, and right-side mouth contusion and abrasion. The child did remain securely within the child safety seat.

### 5.3 Crashes in Which the Vehicle's Seat Belts Failed to Protect Young Children

Two crashes are summarized here in which children were restrained by the vehicle's belt system and sustained injuries. Use of an appropriate child protective device would have been more effective. Similarly, a properly secured child safety seat would most probably have avoided injury to the one small child.

Case 495
This crash involved two vehicles in an urban intersection angle-type crash. An intermediate-size station wagon, with a 35-year-old driver and mother of a four-year-old male child riding in the vehicle's right front seat, entered the intersection without yielding the right of way as required by traffic controls. The vehicle was struck on the left front by a smaller sub-compact vehicle making a left turn.

Both the mother and the four-year-old child were restrained with the vehicle's three-point belt restraints. Both moved violently to the right from the impact. The child contacted the interior right-side door armrest and sustained a minor head contusion. The restrained driver received a minor pelvic contusion from the lap belt portion of her restraint.

## Case 276

This crash involving two vehicles occurred on a residential intersection in a major city. A foreign-made compact sedan with two adults and two children, ages five and two years, was struck in the left side by a pickup truck whose driver failed to yield the right of way. Both front-seat occupants in the sedan, parents of the children, were unrestrained and were injured. The five-year-old male child was seated in the left rear and buckled-in with the lap belt for the seated position. The two-year-old female child was located in the left rear but secured within a child safety seat. However, the safety seat was improperly attached to the vehicle, permitting the child and seat to move about from crash forces. This resulted in a severe laceration to the head of the two-year-old from contacting the side window frame of the vehicle. The lap-belt-restrained five-year-old in the right rear was also injured from contacting the rear interior of the vehicle.

### 5.4 Crashes in Which an Unrestrained Occupant Injured a Restrained Child

Occupant-to-occupant contact in a crash can result in one occupant inflicting injury upon another. This is particularly true when one occupant is free to move as a result of crash forces while an adjacent occupant is restrained. Two cases are summarized here in which an unrestrained occupant, one an adult and another a three-year-old child, contacted and injured an effectively restrained child.

Case 391
This crash, which involved a mother and eight-month-old child, resulted in moderate-to-severe injuries to the child from the mother's movement within the vehicle during the crash. The mother was unrestrained. The crash involved a full-size sedan struck by a campact coupe in an intersection angle-type collision. The child was securely contained within a child safety seat in the front center seating area of the vehicle, but received a fractured femur from contact by her mother, who sustained minor injuries to her leg, back, and head.

In this crash two children, ages one and three, were injured. One child was restrained; the other child was unrestrained. The vehicle with the children, an intermediate-size two-door coupe, was struck in the right side by an errant vehicle of the same approximate size.

There were four occupants in the vehicle struck by the errant and out-of-control vehicle. These were a 35 -year-old unrestrained male driver, a 35 -year-old unrestrained female passenger in the right front seat, a three-year-old female unrestrained child in the right rear seat, and a one-year-old child restrained in a child safety seat in the center rear. The unrestrained child was forced against the restrained child, with both sustaining minor injuries. Both adult front-seated passengers similarly sustained minor injuries from striking interior portions of the vehicle.

### 5.5 A Severe Crash That Injured a Restrained Child

As with all safety features or devices associated with motor vehicles, the protection they offer occupants is often not sufficient in high-severity, catastrophic crashes involving penetration of occupant space and deformation of seats. These are crashes in which the design features of the vehicle, intended to contain and protect its occupants, are not cormensurate with the severity of the crash. Case 350

This crash resulted in serious injury to a nine-month-old child, even though the child was securely and properly contained within a child safety seat. The intermediate-size two-door sports coupe in which the child was a passenger was struck in the rear by a similar size vehicle, and then moved forward so as to contact a smaller vehicle ahead in a chain-type front-rear collision.

The child was located in the left rear seat and sustained a skull fracture from contact with the front seat as it deformed rearward from crash forces. A four-year-old male child was seated in front between two adults, restrained in a lap belt. The four-yearold received a minor injury from contact by the driver.

### 5.6 A Crash Involving Nonsecurement of the Child Seat

Here is a case in which the child occupant was injured because the mother failed to check to ensure that the vehicle's seat belt was buckled.

Case 716
In this crash a $91 / 2$-month-old female child was secured in a child safety seat, but the child seat moved forward upon impact and struck the windshield and instrument panel, resulting in facial contusions and lacerations. The vehicle, a full-size luxury sedan, struck a trailer in tow by a vehicle ahead.

The movement of the child in the crash, and her injuries, resulted from the child safety seat's separation from its attachment to the vehicle. The lap seat belt of the vehicle was attached as required through the child safety seat, but was not properly locked within the retractor mechanism assembly of the vehicle's seat belt system. The 3-point belt system provided with the vehicle contained an electro-mechanical retractor to allow the driver and/or passenger lap belts to freely move in and out on the retractor reel until the "D" ring, or latch plate, is fastened in the belt buckle.

### 6.0 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

An early finding in this study is that parents reporting a crash to the insurance carrier frequently overstated the crash severity and the danger to the child occupants. This was evident from the initial reports and followups. Often the crash was so minor that there was little potential for ham to the child. Key indicators such as injuries to other occupants, if any, and a description of damage to the vehicles involved, were used to screen incoming reports of crashes.

A second finding was that child restraints were often not used because parents found them to be inconvenient. In same instances neither the child nor safety seat was secured. This suggests that parents are not sufficiently motivated to make the effort involved in properly using a child safety seat. It suggests that on short trips, or travel where little danger is perceived, the parent and/or guardian may not feel the urgency of properly securing the child and safety seat.

Thirdly, the presence of nonrestrained passengers (children or adults) in a vehicle containing restrained young children poses a threat to the restrained children. This is because the unrestrained occupants can become "unguided missiles" in a crash and can inflict injury on those restrained.

The best location for securing a child in a child seat in a vehicle seems to be the center rear. This places the child away from the two sides of the vehicle and in an area surrounded by seat cushions and seat backsrelatively forgiving structures. Securing the child in a child safety seat restricts its movement within the vehicle during a collision. In case 406, summarized earlier here, the child seat secured in the left rear seat was crushed and the unsecured child was flung to the right. If the child seat
had been secured in the center of the rear seats, and the child secured in it, the child would probably have sustained no injuries or only a minor injury.

In general, this study has provided useful evidence that child safety devices offer young children significant protection, provided the devices are properly used.

## APPENDIX A

Summaries of the Cases Investigated

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline C.ASE NO. ACA- \& DESCRIPTOR \& AGE/SEX \& OCCUPANT DATA LOCÁtiṓ \& RESTRAINT \& InJURIES \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Max. } \\
\& \text { AlS } \\
\& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] \& 155 \& VEHICLE/CDC \& CRASH3 \& COMMENTS \\
\hline 101 RT \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Frontal \\
impact with deer
\end{tabular} \& \[
\begin{aligned}
30 \mathrm{Yr} . \& F \\
31 \mathrm{Yr} . \& M \\
8 \mathrm{Yr} . \& M \\
3 \mathrm{Yr} . \& M \\
5 \mathrm{Yr} . \& M
\end{aligned}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Driver \\
Riglit Front Left Rear Center Rear Right Rear
\end{tabular} \& None None None None None \& Uninjured Unin.jured Uninjured Uninjured Uninjured \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 0 \\
\& 0 \\
\& 0 \\
\& 0 \\
\& 0
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \mathbf{0} \\
\& \mathbf{0} \\
\& \mathbf{0} \\
\& \mathbf{0} \\
\& \mathbf{0}
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 1979 \text { Ford } \\
\& \text { franada } \\
\& 12-\text { FDMW-1 }
\end{aligned}
\] \& N.A. \& The 3-year-old child was not restrained and was uniniured. The effect of the lacl: of resstraint is minimal in this minor accident used as an introduction to the groject. \\
\hline 102 Ki \& Angle parking lot collision \& \[
27 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F}
\] \& Driver \& Lap : Shld \& Uninjured \& 0 \& 0 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
1977 Chevrolet \\
Vega 2-door
\end{tabular} \& No \& The effect of the child's lack of restraint was minimal in this minor accident. Since both veh- \\
\hline \& \& \[
\begin{array}{r}
33 \mathrm{Yr} . F \\
13 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\
3 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F}
\end{array}
\] \& Driver Right Front Center Rear \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Mone \\
None Century Trav-L Guard*
\end{tabular} \& Uninjured Uninjured Uninjured \& 0
0
0 \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 0 \\
\& 0 \\
\& 0
\end{aligned}
\] \& 1967 Volkswagen 2-door \& No \& icles were traveling about 5 mph, the potential for injury was small. \\
\hline 104 RI \& Front-to-rear collision with parked vehicle \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 27 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\
\& 31 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F} \\
\& 9 \mathrm{Mon} . \mathrm{F} \\
\& 3 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F} \\
\& 2 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\
\& \text { Adult F }
\end{aligned}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Driver \\
Right Front \\
Right Front in mother's arms Left Rear Center Rear Right Rear
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
None \\
Vone \\
None \\
None \\
None \\
None
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Fractured left arm Head, knee 8 back \\
Uninjured Concussion Uninjured Uninjured
\end{tabular} \& 2
1
0
1
0
0 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
0 \\
\hline \\
0 \\
0
\end{tabular} \& 1979 Chevrolet Monte Carlo 01-FDEW-5 \(\qquad\) 1930 Chevrolet Piekup Truck \& No

No \& The 9-month-old child was prevented from injury by the cushioning effect of his mother. Restraint use would have redused or prevented injury. The rear edge of the Monte Carlo's hood penetrated the windshield. <br>

\hline 140 Ril \& llead-on intersection collision \& \[
$$
\begin{gathered}
22 \mathrm{rr} . \mathrm{F} \\
1 \mathrm{rr} . \mathrm{F}
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& | Driver |
| :--- |
| Right Front | \& | None |
| :--- |
| Strolee child seat | \& | Contus. : Lac. all over. |
| :--- |
| Uninjured | \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& 0 \& 1978 Chevrolet Chevette \& No \& "Success story" - child seat prevented the child from being injured. <br>

\hline \& \& $18 \mathrm{rr} . \mathrm{F}$ \& Driver \& None \& Inn injured \& 0 \& 0 \& 1975 Pontiac Grand Prix \& No \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}



| CASE NO. IICA- | DESCRIPTOR | - AGE/SEX | $\frac{\text { OCCUPAYI DATA }}{\text { LOCATIOAT }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $144 \overline{\mathrm{R} 1}$ | Mechanical mal function, loss-of-control, head-on collision4 -vehicle crash | 25 rr . F | Driver |  |
|  |  | 3 rr . F | Right Front | Non |
|  |  | $5 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M}$ | Center Rear | Non |
|  |  | $34 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F}$ | Driver |  |
|  |  | $21 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M}$ | Driver |  |
|  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 19 \mathrm{Yr} . F \\ & 20 \mathrm{Yr} . \end{aligned}\right.$ | Center Front Right Front | None |
| 180 RIT |  |  | Oriver | Unk |
|  | Angle intersection collision | 35 Yr . F | Priver | None |
|  |  | 30 Yr. F <br> 11 month M | Oriver Right Front | Non |
| 204 RI | Loss-of- coltrol, left roadway rollover crash | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cl} 29 \mathrm{Yr} \cdot \mathrm{M} \\ 29 \mathrm{Yr} \cdot \mathrm{~F} \\ 5 \text { week } \mathrm{M} \end{array}\right.$ | Driver <br> Right Front Right Rear | None None Bobby |



| CASE NO. IICA- | DESCRIPTOR | ATSE/SEX | $\frac{\text { OCCUPANT DATA }}{\text { LOCATIOY }}$ | RESTRAINT ${ }^{-}$ | TİJURIES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAX } \\ & \text { AIS } \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{1} \overline{5} 5$ | VEHICLE/CDC | CRASII3 | COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 391 RI | Angle intersection crash | $\begin{array}{lll} 16 & \mathrm{Yr} & \mathrm{M} \\ 16 & \mathrm{Yr} & F \\ 16 & \mathrm{Yr} . & F \\ 16 & \mathrm{Yr} & M \end{array}$ | Driver <br> Right Front <br> Left Rear <br> Right Rear | None <br> None <br> None <br> None | Severe <br> Injured <br> Injured <br> Injured | Unk. <br> Unk. <br> Unk. <br> Unk. | Unk. Unk. Unk. Unk. | 1982 Ford Mustang II | No | The 8 -month-old child's injury was received as a result of being struck by the driver adjacent to her. The seat, which was in proper use, had no effect on the injury. |
|  |  | 27 Yr . F 8 month $F$ | Driver <br> Center Front | None <br> Bobby Mac child seat | Cont., lac <br> 8 concuss <br> Frac. femu | $2$ | 9 9 | $\begin{aligned} & 1980 \text { 01dsmobile } \\ & \text { Delta 88 } \\ & \text { 82-FREW-3 } \\ & \text { 03-RDEW-2 } \end{aligned}$ | 14.7 mph |  |
| 393 RI | Angle intersection collision | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F} \\ & 48 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\ & 21 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\ & 20 \mathrm{Yr} . M \end{aligned}$ | Driver Right Front Left Rear Right Rear | None <br> Restrained <br> None <br> None | Injured I injured Uninjured Injured | Unk. Unk. 0 Unk. | Unk. <br> Unk. <br> 0 <br> Unk. | 1974 Plymouth Duster | No | "Success story" - the child seats prevented the children from being injured. |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \text { Yr. F } \\ & 1 \text { Month M } \\ & 44 \text { Yr. F } \\ & 27 \text { Yr.M M } \\ & 4 \text { Yr.M } \end{aligned}$ | Driver <br> Center Front Right Front Center Rear Right Rear | None <br> Child seat <br> None <br> None <br> Kantwet <br> child seat | Lacerat. <br> Uninjured Contusions Back strn. <br> Uninjured | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 1972 Pontíac Catalina A-dr | 12.1 mph |  |
| 406 R*I | Stake truck struck passenger car | $25 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M}$ | Driver | None | Uninjured | 0 | 0 | 1978 Ford LN700 Stake Trck | No | *The driver of the Chevrolet was killed. The child was contained in the child seat, but was not |
|  | Angle <br> intersection <br> collision <br> Fatal | $\begin{aligned} & 27 \mathrm{Yr} . F \\ & 2 \mathrm{Yr} . F \end{aligned}$ | Driver Left Rear | None Contained in child seat* | Killed <br> Forehead lacer. | 6 1 | Unk 1 | 1978 Chevrolet Monte Carlo 09-LYAW-3 | 32.4 nph | secured in the seat. The crash forces caused the child to be thrown from the child seat to the right side of the vehicle, where she contacted the side window, resulting in a minor head laceration. In this instance, the child escaped serious injury as the seat was crushed by the damage after the child was thrown from it. |






| CASE NO. MCA- | DESCRIPIOR | AGE/SEX | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OCCUPAMT DATA } \\ & \text { LOCAIOV } \end{aligned}$ | RESTEAINT | TNJUURIES | $\operatorname{Max}_{\text {MIS }}$ | ISS | VEIIICLE/CDC | CRASII3 | COMMENIS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 716 Rī | Rear-end collision w/ boat \& trlr. Restraint failure | $27 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F}$ <br> 10 Month F | Driver <br> Right Front | Lap 8 shldr Lap \& shldr. belt which failed ${ }^{\star}$ | Uninjured Facial injuries | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 1977 Cadillac DeVille <br> 12-FDMN-1 <br> (Veh. repaired | N.A. | *The child's lap and shoulder belt retractor did not lock once the restraint was fastened, allowing the child and the child seat in which the child was |
|  |  | $26 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F}$ | Oriver | None | Uninjured | 0 | 0 | 1977 Ford Thunderbird towing boat 8 trailer | N.A. | secured to move forward, contac- <br> ting the dashboard and the windshield. |
| 761 RI | Loss-of control of vehicle tow--ing trailer. rollover crash | $49 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M}$ <br> 47 Yr. F <br> 21 Yr. F <br> 7 Mont/I M | Driver <br> Right Front <br> Right Rear <br> Left Rear | Lap \& shldr. Lap \& shldr. <br> Lap belt Bobby Mac child seat | Uninjured Torso cont from belt Uninjured Uninjured | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 1982 Dodge Ram Charger towing 22' travel trailer 12-RBES-1 00-TDDO-3 | $0.9 \mathrm{mph}$ <br> N.A. | "Success story" - all occupants were restrained, including the child, who was properly restrained in a child seat, and all were protected from severe injury by the restraints. The only injury was from the restraint webbing when the vehicle rolled onto its roof. |
| 762 RI | ```Angle intersection crash Run-off-road``` | $\begin{aligned} & 55 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\ & 56 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F} \end{aligned}$ | Driver Right Front | None None | Moderate Moderate | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 1982 Chevrolet Malibu Wagon 08-LDAW-4 12=FDEN=1 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.8 \mathrm{mph} \\ & 6.3 \mathrm{mph} \end{aligned}$ | *"Success story" - both children were contained in child seats which functioned properly and prevented serfous injury. The |
|  |  | $27 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F}$ 6 week F 18 Month F | Driver Center Front Right Front | None <br> GM Infant child seat Sears child seat | Uninjured <br> Uninjured Minor cont. from side of seat* | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 1975 Dodge Van 01-FYEW-2 | 9.6 mph | only injury was a minor bruise on the 18 -month-old from contact with the side of the child seat. |
| $\begin{gathered} 764 \mathrm{RI} \\ \& \mathrm{RI} \end{gathered}$ | Angle <br> collision | $18 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M}$ | Driver | None | Uninjured | 0 | 0 | 1972 Pontiac LeMans | No | The restrained child received his injury from contact with the |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 35 \mathrm{Yr} . & \mathrm{M} \\ 35 \mathrm{Yr} . & F \\ 1 \mathrm{Yr} . & M \end{array}$ | Driver Right Front Center Rear | None None Cosco OneStep child seat | Wrist sprn Knee cont. llead cont. from cont act with adj. occ. | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1980 \text { Buick } \\ & \text { Regal } \\ & 11-L D E W-2 \\ & 12-F R W N-3 \\ & 12-\text { FRWN-9 } \\ & \text { 12-FLWN-9 } \end{aligned}$ | 14.2 mph No No No | adjacent unrestrained child. The restraint had no effect on the child's injury; however, had the adjacent child been restrained, injury to both would probably have been prevented. |
|  |  | $3 \mathrm{Yr.F}$ | Right Rear | None | Head cont. | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |



| r.ASE NO. 14CA- | DESCRIPTOR | - AGE/SEX | $\begin{array}{r} \text { OCCUPAYT DATA } \\ \hline \\ \hline \end{array}$ | RESTRAINT | INJURIES | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Max} \\ & \text { AIS } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | : ISS | VEHICLE/CDC | CRASII3 | COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 879 Kı | Loss-of-control, contac with median barrier | $\begin{array}{r} 29 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\ 4 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F} \end{array}$ | Driver Center Front | None <br> None | Injured <br> Severe Injuries | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 1979 \text { Chevro- } \\ & \text { let Van } \\ & \text { o1-FZEW-2 } \\ & 01 \text { RPEW-1 } \end{aligned}$ | 9.0 mph <br> 3.3 mph | Child's injuries could have been prevented or reduced with restraint usage. |
| 901 Ril | Angle intersection collision 3-vehicle crash | $20 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F}$ | Driver | None | Severe | - | - | 1983 Chrys ler LeBaron 01-FZEW-2 | 16.0 mph | Child in the Chrysler Newport was braced by the adjacent right front occupant prior to the collision and was prevented from being injured. Other un restrained occupants in the vehicle were injured. |
|  |  | $24 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F}$ | Driver | None | Ininjured | 0 | 0 | 1978 Pontiac Bonneville |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}28 & \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\ 37 & \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F} \\ 4 & \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F} \\ 18 \\ 18 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F}\end{array}$ | Driver Right Front Center Front Right Rear | None None None None | Injured Injured Uninjured Injured | - | - <br> - | 1977 Chrysler Newport 70-LFEW-4 | 8.7 mph |  |
| 924 Rİ | Angle intersection crast Run-off-roadway, contact with concrete wall | $\begin{array}{r} 27 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F} \\ 3 \mathrm{rr} . \mathrm{M} \end{array}$ | Driver <br> Right Front | None ${ }^{\text {Lap \& shldr. }}$ | Head \& face injuries Uninjured | 2 | 7 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 1982 \text { Buick } \\ & \text { Regal } \\ & \text { OI-RYEW-3 } \\ & \text { II-FLEW-2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.8 \mathrm{mph} \\ 16.5 \mathrm{mph} \end{array}$ | "Success story". Child was restrained in lap-and-shoulder harnesses which prevented him from contacting objects in the vehicle and protected him from injury while the adjacent front seat occupant received severe injuries. |
|  |  | $30 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M}$ | Driver | Lap a shldr. | Minor | - | - | 1979 Piymoutí Horizon 10-FYEW-2 | 14.7 mph |  |
| 976 RI | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Angle collii- } \\ \text { sion } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{F} \\ & 10 \text { month F } \end{aligned}$ | Driver Center Front | None Century 200 child seat | Chest, fact <br> head \& back | $1$ | 1 | 1976 Chevy Pickup 07-L YAW-2 | N.A. | Child's injuries from contact with sides and back of child seat. The seat had little effect on the child's injuries. |
|  |  | $24 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M}$ | Oriver | None | Ininjured | 0 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 1979 \text { Inter- } \\ & \text { nationa 1 } \\ & \text { Tanker truck } \\ & \text { 12-FRES-3 } \end{aligned}$ | N.A. |  |


| CASE NO. ISCA- | DESCRIPIOR | AGE/SEX | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OCCUPAYT DATA } \\ & \text { LOCAIIOA } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | RESTRAINT | IMJURIES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAX. } \\ & \text { AIS } \end{aligned}$ | 155 | VEHICLE/CDC | CRASII 3 | COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 977 RI | Angle intersection crasl | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\ & 12 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\ & 13 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ | Driver <br> Right Front Right Rear | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { None } \\ & \text { None } \\ & \text { None } \end{aligned}\right.$ | Uninjured Uninjured Uninjured | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{0} \\ & \mathbf{0} \\ & \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1962 \text { Buick } \\ & \text { LeSabre } \\ & 12 \text {-FREE-1 } \\ & 10-F Y E W-1 \end{aligned}$ | 6.9 mph 6.4 mph | Children located in the cargo area in the rear of the Ford, which is not a seating area. Ho restraints were available, which, if used, would have prevented their injuries. |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{lll} 34 & \mathrm{Yr} . & \mathrm{M} \\ 32 \mathrm{Yr} . & F \\ 7 & \mathrm{Yr} & \mathrm{~F} \\ 5 & \mathrm{Yr} . & F \\ 3 \mathrm{Yr} . & F \end{array}$ | Driver <br> Riglit Front <br> Left Rear Center Rear Right Rear | None None None None None | Back-neck Contusions all over Head Face Skull fx. | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 13 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1982 \text { Ford EXP } \\ & 01-\text { RFE- } \\ & 03-\text { REEW-3 } \end{aligned}$ | 12.7 mph 11.7 mph |  |
| 1023 रII | Angle intersection crash | $64 \mathrm{Yr.F}$ | Oriver | None | Injured | - | - | 1979 Dodge St. Reg is 70-LFEW-4 09-LZEW-2 | 9.4 mph <br> 2.6 mph | The child moved forward and to the right, contacting the glove compartment, causing injury. Lap restraints were unavailable. |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \\ & 2 \mathrm{Yr} . \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ | Oriver <br> Center Front | None <br> None | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { lead, neck. } \\ & \text { 8 back } \\ & \text { Mouth lac. } \end{aligned}\right.$ | $1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1976 \text { Pontiac } \\ & \text { Ventura } \\ & \text { 01-RYEW-2 } \\ & \text { O2-RBEE-1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.0 \mathrm{mph} \\ 2.8 \mathrm{mph} \end{gathered}$ | Had they been utilized the child would have been uninjured. |
| 1031 RI | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Loss-of-con- } \\ & \text { trol, } \\ & \text { rollover } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \mathrm{Yr} . F \\ & 19 \mathrm{Yr} . F \\ & 18 \mathrm{Yr} . F \\ & 1 \mathrm{Yr} . F \end{aligned}$ | Driver <br> Right Front <br> Right Rear <br> left Rear | Mone None None None | Injured Injured Injured Injured | - | - | 1979 AMC Spirit |  | All occupants contacted the roof and other objects during the rollover and were severely in.jured. |

APPENDIX B
Data Forms Used in the Study
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## INCIDENT SUMMARY - Field Form

## Day \& Time of Day of incident:

$\qquad$
Origin-Destination of trip: $\qquad$
Vehicle Make/Model/Year: $\qquad$
VIN\#: $\qquad$
Overall Vehicle Condition (describe, include interior foreign objects and materials if present) $\qquad$

VEHICLE MOTION AT TIME OF INJURY:
__ TRAVELING DOWN ROADWAY ACCELERATING BRAKING SWERVING
__ OTHER, DESCRIBE

GOING OVER POTHOLE OR RUT GOING OVER BUMP
TRAVELING UP INCLINE
TRAVELING DOWN SLOPE

CHILD ACTIVITY WHEN INJURY RECEIVED:
__ SITTING QUIETLY
STANDING \& ACTIVE
SITTING, BENT OVER
KNEELING ON SEAT
OTHER, DESCRIBE $\qquad$
__ FACING ( ) front; ( ) REAR; () Side of VEHICLE __ RESTRAINED
COMMENTS $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## CHILD SAFETY SEAT SUPPLEMENT - FieLd Form <br> (To be completed if the child injuries are received While contained in a child safety seat)

INVESTIGATOR: $\qquad$ DATE: $\qquad$
A. PRE-ACCIDENT CONDITION

1. Was the child restraint systems harness used?

Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$
Were they tight? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$
Explanation: $\qquad$
2. Was the child restraint system fastened in the car with the car's belt system?

Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$
Was it tight? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$

Explanation: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
3. Was the child restraint system's back strap fastened to the car?

Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$
Was it tight? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$

Explanation: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
B. POST-ACCIDENT CONDITION

1. Look for traces of child restraint shell plastic on the adult lap belt and corresponding slippage marks on each side of the restraint system.

Observation: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
2. Look for child harness slippage marks on belts and restraint system.

Observation: $\qquad$
3. Look for whitening inside and outside.

Observation: $\qquad$
4. Look for belt slippage.

Observation: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
5. Look for deformation of back strap anchor hook. Observation: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
6. Look for deformation of back straps anchor mount or parcel shelf. Observation: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
7. Look for damage to all buckles and slides. Observation: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
8. Look for whitening inside and outside on both sides.

Observation: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
9. Look for any damage to restraint system not covered in specifics above.

Observation: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
10. Overall condition of restraint system: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

VEHICLE CRASH DATA - Field Form (to be completed if child inuury SUSTAINED IN MOTOR VEHICLE CRASH) Vehicle Make/Model/Year VIN\#

Transmission $\qquad$ Manual
_ Automatic
Odometer $\qquad$
MEASUREMENTS AND DAMAGE DESCRIPTION

C.D.C. (first impact) $\qquad$ C.D.C. (second impact)

LOCATE \& DESCRIBE INJURY SOURCES, CHILD OCCUPANT CONTACTS AND ASSOCIATED PHYSICAL EVIDENCE (DENTS, TISSUE, HAIR, ETC.)

Forward

## Left Side




USE THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS SHEET TO NOTE INFORMATION RELATING TO CHILD POSITION, MOVEMENT, CONTACT, RESTRAINT STATUS, AND FINAL REST

* Identify child pre-injury and post-injury location IN VEHICLE,
* Indicate seated position of child and all other occupants OF VEHICLE,
* Describe safety restraints available and used at each SEATED LOCATION.
* Describe restraint types available.
* Note all relevant information on child position, posture, MOVEMENT, AND RESTRAINT USE OR NON-USE,
* If ejected, NOTE EJECTION pORTAL,
* Note all after-market additions or changes to interior if RELEVANT TO INJURY PRODUCTION (I,E1, CB RADIO, STEREO, AIR CONDITIONER, ETC.),


## OCCUPANT CONTACT AREAS

Front of Passenger Compartment
WINDSHIELD
SUNVISOR, FITTING(s) \&/OR TOP MOULDING INSTRUMENT PANEL

ASH TRAY
GLOVE COMPARTMENT AREA, DOOR, HDWE
BENEATH INSTRUMENT PANEL
PARCEL TRAY
knee restraint
VERTICAL CONSOLE
FOOT CONTROLS
STEERING ASSEMBLY, WHEEL, COLUMN TRANSMISSION LEVER
INSTRUMENTS
IGNITION KEY
MIRROR
HEATER OR A/C DUCTS
A/C OR VENTILATION OUTLETS
RADIO
ADD-ON TAPE DECK, RADIO, A/C
Floor
Interior-General
FRONT SEAT-BACK(s)
FRONT SEAT CUSHION
REAR SEAT CUSHION \& BACK
HEAD RESTRAINT
ARMREST ON SEAT
UNDER SEAT BOTTOM
RESTRAINT SYSTEM HARDWARE
RESTRAINT SYSTEM WEBBING
KNEE RESTRAINT
HEAD RESTRAINT
INTERIOR LOOSE OBJECT
OTHER OCCUPANTS
INTERIOR FLYING GLASS (ANY SOURCE)
Sides
SURFACE OF SIDE INTERIOR
HDWE ON DOOR SIDE
ARMREST OF DOOR SIDE
COAT HOOK
WINDOW GLASS
WINDOW FRAME
ROOF SIDE RAIL
CONSOLE BETWEEN SEATS
A-PILLAR
TRANSMISSION LEVER ON FLOOR OR CONSOLE
B-PILLAR
C-PILLAR
D-PILLAR
Roof
ROOF OR CONVERTIBLE TOP SUNVISOR, FITTING(S)
\&/OR TOP MOLDING ROOF SIDE RAIL COAT HOOK
DOME LIGHT BACKLIGHT HEADER

ADMINISTRATIVE/ENYIRONYENTAL:-1


## ADMINISTRATIVE/ENVIRONMENTAL:-2

Eirst Hazmíul Event (cont.)
__ Bridge or overpass
(passing unde:)
Eridge oz overpass
(passing over)
Maner of Collision
(Based on First Earmful Event)
$\qquad$ Not collision with venicle
in rransport
Rear-end
Elead-0n
Rear-fo-rear
Angle
Sicestripe, same direction
Sideswipe, opposire direction
Relation 50 Roadway
_ On roadway
_-_O shoulder
In median
On roadside
Outside right-of-way
Off roadway-location unknown
In parking lane
Number of Travel Ianes
One
Two
Five
Six
Three
Sour or more
Seven
Unienown

Trafficway Division and Median Type Undivided
Divided (median with 2 to four feet) paved flush-peinted or unpainted (i.e., not curbed)

Curbed
Unpaved, uncurbed median (e.g., grass, Eravel, etc.) Median barrier Other median type:

Access Control
Fuil
Parcial
Oncontrolled
Direction of Travel Flow
One way
Two way

Snouliez Presence
$\qquad$ No shoulder
___ One shoulder
___ Two sinoulders
Roadway Aligament
___ Seraight Cusve
Roadwey Proíile

- Level
__ Grade
Gillerest
——Sas
Surface Iype
__ Concrete Bituminous Brick or block Slag, gravel, of stone Di=t Other: $\qquad$
Surface Condition
- DEY DEY
Wet Snow, siushy
Icy
Other (e.g., sand, dirt, oid):

Junction Traffic Controls No control Control not functioning
Conerol Functioned Traffic signal
Stop sign or jield sign Bailroad crossing control Othe: trafile control

Speed Immit
_m.p.t.
Ifght Conditions
Daylight
Dark
Dark, but lighted
Dawn
Dusk

## ADMINSTRATIVE/ENIRONMENTAL - 3

```
A=0mospaeric Condirions
    Nio:mal (no acverse atmospheric
    =elared driving conci=ions)
    Zま゙пing
    Sleeting
    5nor falliag
    E0g
    O_jez (e.g., smog, smoike,
    Ejowing senci o: dus%, esc.):
Ares Iype
        Eurai
        Drbag
Cless I=afificway
        Interscate
        Other limited access
        Ocher D.S. route
        Ociner stace rouce
        Orier major arrery
        CounEy y0ad
        Local road
        Ocher road:
R0aciway Section Type
        NOD-jumetion
        Three leg inrersection
        Four leg incersecrion
        More chan fowr leg incersection
        Incersection related
        Incerchange area
        Driveway, alley access, erc.
        Rsilroad grade crossiag
        Taknown
```


## RESTRAIIT USAGE/STATUS


 -availabi゙i=!
(I) Nione
(2) Lap belt anc
sioulider tzzness
(3) Lap $\overline{\text { BeIF }}$
(i) Shauide= ianness
(3) Eeinet
(o) Coilé sa=ery sea:
(i) Oこne: =estraine :
(9) Unienomi

- Indication of usage
(I) None (includes

(2) Lap belt and
sinoulder hamess
(3) Lap bele
(4) Smoulder hamess
(5) Eeimes
(6) Crild safery seaz - in proper use
(7) Orier sestraint used
(9) Unknown
?2ssive Ress=aint Passive Iest=ain: Sysะem Defeazed
(1) None

Available
(2) Aic beg-
deployed
(3) Ad: beg-
cid not de? loy
(4) Passive bel:
(5) OZher =es=تaine:
(9) Tniknow
(1) No (inciudes บாavaioabilasy
Fes
(2) ?assive beit noe woz:
(3) AL: bag discomected
(4) bi- bag not zeinstalied
(5) Ocher =est=aine
(9) Unknorin

[^1]

COLLISION DEFORMATION CLASSIFICATION by IMPACT SEQUENCE


Specific Specific Type o Horizontal Vertical Damage
Location Location Location Distribution

Deformation | Direction Deformation |
| :--- |
| of Force | 1

## OCCUPANTT

OCCJPANT
Driver Passenge:

Oce:pant's Age
Year (s)
Oceupars's Sex
Eale
Female
Occupare's Feigit
inches
Occupant's Height
pounds
Ireatment - Yortality
Fatal

## Nonfaral

- Eospitalization

Transported and released
Ireatment-other:
No Exerement

Occupant's Seat Position Fromt seat-leit side Front seat-middle Froat seat-right side Second seaz-left side Second seat-micidle Second seat-rigite side Third seat-left side Third seat-middie Third seat-right side Front seat-addieional passenger Second seat or beyondadditional passenger
$\qquad$ Other exciosed area:

If occupant is a child ( $0-4$ yrs) Sizeing height

Describe child's apparel
$\qquad$ $\longrightarrow$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

CETM ACIIVLIT WETAR DENUEY RECESTVED:
$\qquad$
FLCING ( ) FROMI; ( ) REAR; () SIDE OF VEPICIE RESTRATMED

## OCCUPANT IMURIES





## OCCIPANT INURY CLASSIFICATION

## OCCUPANT ( )

EIUTEY SOMARY DATA - MEDIESI FORM



MiUKI SETE®T SCOBE (ISS)
canneris $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
*Confidence Factor - Certainty of Injury Source:
1 = Definite
2 = Probable
3 = Possible

## EJECTION

## INDICATIONS OF EJECTION <br> not ejecied NOT applicable

NONE: If ejection is suspected -Open or reported, indicate the avenue. For multiple avenues numer them \& utilize the same numers consistently throughout. - Status unknown

EIECTION AREA
"indshicld
Left tront
Right front
Lef́ rear
Right rear
Rear
Roof́ (Convertible or Sun Roof)
Other area le.g., sidecar, back of pickup, etd)
Unknown.

EJECTION MEDIUM
—Door
Open roof structure
Fixed windows
Other medium type Unknown
OPERABLE WINDONS
—— Roll down type

- Hinged zype

Sliding type
— Other type window
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

ORAL INJURIES - Medical Form

## DECIDUOUS



## PERMANENT



Note tooth damage and/or loss on diagram. Describe oral injuries:
$\qquad$


[^0]:    *Delta-V, the abrupt change of vehicle velocity in a crash, is used as an indicator of crash severity.

[^1]:    * Specift the other ?osizion or Dxiv =eferenced:

