


Development, optimization, and design for robustness of a novel FMVSS 201U energy absorber



David M. Fox
US Army RDECOM-TARDEC
COM: (586) 574-3844
DSN: 786-3844
Email: david.m.fox1@us.army.mil

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.


1. REPORT DATE 15 MAY 2006		2. REPORT TYPE Briefing Charts		3. DATES COVERED 08-01-2006 to 25-04-2006	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Development, optimization, and design for robustness of a novel FMVSS 201U energy absorber				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) David Fox				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army TARDEC, 6501 East Eleven Mile Rd, Warren, Mi, 48397-5000				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER #15848	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army TARDEC, 6501 East Eleven Mile Rd, Warren, Mi, 48397-5000				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) TARDEC	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) #15848	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES For 2006 LS-DYNA INTERNATIONAL USER'S CONFERENCE					
14. ABSTRACT briefing charts					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Public Release	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 33	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Introduction

- Significant opportunity to improve vehicle occupant safety
- Reduce impact severity between occupant heads and vehicle interiors
- Rigid body panels
- Used plastic deformation of mild steel fins and cover sheet to absorb impact energy

Absorber construction

- 0.5 inch wide mild steel fins
- Connected with a mild steel web
- Sandwiched between mild steel surface panel and rigid armor




LS-DYNA absorber model

- Connected fin / web assembly to cover sheet using spot welds
- Used SPC to anchor fins at interface between absorber and rigid panel
- Type 13 contacts between the various assembly components
- Nominal 3 mm mesh
- Steel was modeled using MAT24

Impact test simulation

- FMVSS 201U
- Component level, 10 inch X 10 inch surface
- FTSS v. 3.6 free motion headform
- 15 mph initial velocity
- 20° angle between velocity and surface




Optimization problem

- Minimize crush space subject to the constraint that $HIC(d) < 700$
- Independent variables:
 - crush space
 - spacing between fins
 - shell thickness of fin, web, and cover sheet

Head Injury Criterion (HIC)

$$HIC = \max_{t_1, t_2} \left\{ \left[\frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} a(\tau) d\tau}{(t_2 - t_1)} \right]^{2.5} (t_2 - t_1) \right\}$$

$$HIC(d) = 0.75446 (HIC) + 166.4$$



- HIC is used to estimate the severity of head impact events
- HIC(d) is a correlation between free motion headform HIC and HIC for a full 50th percentile dummy
- In the expression for HIC, $a(t)$ is defined as the resultant acceleration as a function of time, t_1 and t_2 are any two points in time during the impact separated by not more than 36 milliseconds.
- Lower HIC is better, FMVSS 201U requires that HIC(d) be less than 1000


Optimization technique

- Closely followed Stander and Craig (LS-OPT) successive response surface method
- Iterative sequence of linear least squares response surfaces
- Chose D-Optimal subsets of 3^3 full factorial basis designs
- D-Optimal subsets contained seven combinations of the three design factors
- 15 iterations of 7 runs each; 105 simulations overall


Convergence to optimum values

	Initial	Optimum
Crush space (inch)	0.875	0.8044
Fin spacing (inch)	0.875	0.9446
Fin / web / cover shell thickness (inch)	0.0285	0.02616
HIC(d)	737	699


Convergence – crush space and spacing




Convergence – shell thickness



Acceleration – time history for optimum design




Variability / robustness




- 2^3 full factorial about optimum
- Optimum design settings $\pm 5\%$

Initial design interaction




Crush space – thickness interaction




- Lower shell thickness increases propensity toward “bottoming out”
- Lower crush space tends to increase mean deceleration


HIC(d) = 688, first peak



HIC(d) = 688, second peak




Improve design




- ~5% increase in crush space should enable HIC(d) < 700
- Use 0.84 crush space face as starting point

Design improvement




- Used interpolation process keeping spacing and thickness fixed
- Found new crush space to ensure $HIC(d) < 700$ for nominal parameter settings $\pm 5\%$

Design improvement




Improve design




- ~5% increase in crush space should enable HIC(d) < 700
- Use 0.84 crush space face as starting point

Improved design



- New nominal design settings $\pm 5\%$
- Moderate (~ 0.1 inch) increase in nominal crush space yields HIC(d) < 700

Improved design interaction



Response surfaces for the improved design

- Sampled by means of uniform designs
- Developed response surfaces via Kriging
- Factorial simulation results were used to compare fidelity of Kriging response surfaces generated in various ways

Kriging

$$y_{krige} = \sum_{k=1}^p \beta_k f_k(\bar{x}) + Z(\bar{x})$$

$$R(x_i - x_j) = \exp[-\theta(x_i - x_j)^2]$$

Kriging models

- Compared results for surfaces generated with
 - constant
 - first order polynomial
 - quadratic polynomial
- Gaussian correlation function
- Three different sample sizes – 9, 17, and 30

Goodness-of-fit estimates

$$\textit{Maximum Error} \equiv \max \left| y_{krige,i} - y_{factorial,i} \right|$$

$$\textit{RMSE} \equiv \left[\sum_i \frac{(y_{krige,i} - y_{factorial,i})^2}{n} \right]^{1/2}$$


Comparison of maximum error

Sample size	Constant	First Order Polynomial	Quadratic Polynomial
9	42.70	29.52	-
17	125.28	37.44	34.92
30	53.39	30.08	18.66


Comparison of root mean square error (RMSE)

Sample size	Constant	First Order Polynomial	Quadratic Polynomial
9	24.36	18.36	-
17	60.50	16.00	19.02
30	23.95	15.04	10.67


Kriging model contours



Kriging model contours



Kriging model contours



Conclusions

- It's possible to very efficiently optimize an energy absorber design using
 - the LS-DYNA explicit finite element code
 - the successive response surface method algorithm
- Use of classic factorial techniques in combination with Kriging response surfaces can
 - guide improvement of product robustness
 - offer insight into the nature of a product and its performance variability
- An enlightened combination of these techniques enables, if nothing else, valuable and relatively inexpensive insight into the feasibility and behavior of various design concepts.