



THE UNIVERSITY  
*of* ADELAIDE

**Crash avoidance by Electronic  
Stability Control on Australian high  
speed rural roads: an analysis of  
braking interventions**

**James Richard Ryder Mackenzie**

University of Adelaide  
Centre for Automotive Safety Research

February 2015



# CONTENTS

<i>Contents</i> . . . . .	i
<i>List of Figures</i> . . . . .	viii
<i>List of Tables</i> . . . . .	xix
<i>Abstract</i> . . . . .	xxv
<i>Statement of originality</i> . . . . .	xxix
<i>1. Introduction</i> . . . . .	1
<i>2. Background</i> . . . . .	9
2.1 Vehicle dynamics . . . . .	9
2.1.1 Longitudinal wheel forces . . . . .	10
2.1.2 Lateral wheel forces . . . . .	12
2.1.3 Traction circle . . . . .	14
2.1.4 Vehicle body kinematics . . . . .	16
2.2 Origin of ESC . . . . .	23
2.3 ESC operation . . . . .	24
2.3.1 Interventions . . . . .	28
2.3.2 Understeer . . . . .	30

2.3.3	Oversteer . . . . .	32
2.3.4	Split Mu . . . . .	34
3.	<i>Literature review</i> . . . . .	39
3.1	Individual evaluations and estimates of ESC effectiveness . . .	39
3.2	Statistical evaluations of ESC effectiveness . . . . .	41
3.2.1	Methods of evaluation and confounding factors . . . . .	42
3.2.2	Effect on all crash types . . . . .	49
3.2.3	Effect on single vehicle crashes . . . . .	51
3.2.4	Effect on rollover crashes . . . . .	52
3.2.5	Effect on loss of control crashes . . . . .	54
3.2.6	Effect on multiple vehicle crashes . . . . .	55
3.2.7	Effect in Australia . . . . .	56
3.2.8	Reviews of effectiveness . . . . .	56
3.2.9	Effect in combination with other technologies . . . . .	57
3.3	Assessment of ESC performance . . . . .	71
3.4	Discussion of literature . . . . .	75
4.	<i>High speed rural road crashes</i> . . . . .	81
4.1	Method . . . . .	81
4.1.1	TARS database . . . . .	82
4.2	Results: Categorical variables . . . . .	84
4.2.1	Overview . . . . .	84
4.2.2	Crash characteristics . . . . .	85
4.2.3	Road characteristics . . . . .	88
4.2.4	Vehicle characteristics . . . . .	91

---

4.2.5	Driver characteristics . . . . .	92
4.3	Results: Logistic regression . . . . .	94
4.4	Discussion . . . . .	98
4.4.1	Univariate categorical variable analysis . . . . .	98
4.4.2	Multi-variate logistic regression analysis . . . . .	103
5.	<i>Loss of control crashes on Australian rural roads</i> . . . . .	107
5.1	Method . . . . .	107
5.1.1	In-depth database . . . . .	109
5.2	Model development . . . . .	111
5.3	Results: Loss of control crash characteristics . . . . .	115
5.3.1	Crash characteristics . . . . .	116
5.3.2	Road characteristics . . . . .	119
5.4	Discussion . . . . .	121
6.	<i>Simulating loss of control scenarios</i> . . . . .	123
6.1	Simulation software . . . . .	125
6.2	Validation of vehicle and ESC models . . . . .	127
6.2.1	Sine with dwell test and minimum ESC effectiveness criteria . . . . .	129
6.2.2	Validating the Bosch vehicle models without ESC . . .	131
6.2.3	Validating the Bosch vehicle models with ESC . . . . .	141
6.3	Development of loss of control scenarios . . . . .	144
6.3.1	Scenario 1 . . . . .	146
6.3.2	Scenario 2 . . . . .	149
6.3.3	Scenario 3 . . . . .	152

6.3.4	Scenario 4 . . . . .	155
6.3.5	Scenario 5 . . . . .	158
6.3.6	Scenario 6 . . . . .	161
6.3.7	Scenario 7 . . . . .	164
6.3.8	Scenario 8 . . . . .	167
6.3.9	Scenario 9 . . . . .	170
6.3.10	Scenario 10 . . . . .	173
6.4	Simulation of the environment . . . . .	176
6.4.1	Roadway model . . . . .	176
6.4.2	Coefficient of friction . . . . .	177
6.5	Simulation of the loss of control trajectory . . . . .	179
6.5.1	Braking . . . . .	182
6.5.2	Steering . . . . .	183
6.5.3	Aquaplaning . . . . .	195
6.6	Optimisation of simulation parameters . . . . .	196
6.6.1	Selecting an optimisation technique . . . . .	197
6.6.2	Quantifying an error term for optimisation . . . . .	199
6.6.3	Selecting an optimisation termination criteria . . . . .	201
6.6.4	Selecting which parameters to optimise . . . . .	203
6.6.5	Selecting the best set of optimised parameter values . . . . .	205
6.7	Summary . . . . .	206
7.	<i>Investigating the effects of ESC braking interventions</i> . . . . .	211
7.1	Identifying representative value sets . . . . .	212
7.2	Comparing loss of control scenarios with and without ESC . . . . .	229

---

7.2.1	Scenario 1 . . . . .	231
7.2.2	Scenario 2 . . . . .	237
7.2.3	Scenario 3 . . . . .	239
7.2.4	Scenario 4 . . . . .	241
7.2.5	Scenario 5 . . . . .	244
7.2.6	Scenario 6 . . . . .	248
7.2.7	Scenario 7 . . . . .	250
7.2.8	Scenario 8 . . . . .	252
7.2.9	Scenario 9 . . . . .	255
7.2.10	Scenario 10 . . . . .	257
7.2.11	Summary of effects of ESC . . . . .	259
7.3	Interaction between ESC and other rural road safety measures	268
8.	<i>Investigating the interventions made by ESC during loss of control scenarios</i> . . . . .	271
8.1	Summary of major ESC interventions . . . . .	271
8.2	Analysis of major interventions . . . . .	276
8.2.1	Major interventions during loss of control scenario simulations . . . . .	276
8.2.2	Major interventions during the sine with dwell test manoeuvre . . . . .	277
8.2.3	Characteristics of initial major interventions . . . . .	278
8.2.4	Effect of speed on initial major interventions . . . . .	281
8.2.5	Summary . . . . .	284

---

9. Discussion . . . . .	287
9.1 Summary . . . . .	287
9.2 Findings . . . . .	293
9.2.1 Identifying ESC interventions during loss of control scenarios . . . . .	293
9.2.2 Effect of rural road safety measures on braking inter- ventions . . . . .	297
9.2.3 Suitability of ESC effectiveness criteria . . . . .	299
9.3 Future work . . . . .	302
 Appendix . . . . .	 305
A. Lateral stability equations . . . . .	307
A.1 Nominal yaw . . . . .	307
A.2 Side slip angle rate of change . . . . .	310
B. Identifying representative value sets . . . . .	313
C. Effects of ESC in combination with other rural road safety measures	333
C.1 Scenario 1 . . . . .	335
C.2 Scenario 2 . . . . .	344
C.3 Scenario 3 . . . . .	347
C.4 Scenario 4 . . . . .	350
C.5 Scenario 5 . . . . .	355
C.6 Scenario 6 . . . . .	360
C.7 Scenario 7 . . . . .	363



---

C.8 Scenario 8 . . . . .	366
C.9 Scenario 9 . . . . .	371
C.10 Scenario 10 . . . . .	374



## LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	Difference between wheel and vehicle forward velocity . . . . .	11
2.2	Brake force vs wheel slip [adapted from Gillespie (1992)] . . . . .	11
2.3	Wheel slip angle . . . . .	13
2.4	Traction circle . . . . .	14
2.5	Example of a set of traction circles . . . . .	16
2.6	Vehicle body kinematics . . . . .	19
2.7	Bicycle model . . . . .	20
2.8	Dynamic lateral response [adapted from van Zanten et al. (1999)] . . . . .	26
2.9	Wheel force manipulation through braking intervention . . . . .	29
2.10	Understeer example . . . . .	31
2.11	Example of understeer and ESC response . . . . .	32
2.12	Oversteer example . . . . .	33
2.13	Example of oversteer and ESC response . . . . .	34
2.14	Split mu example . . . . .	35
2.15	Example of split mu and ESC response . . . . .	37
5.1	Proportion of high speed, rural road injury crashes that were due to a loss of control by hour of day, 1998 - 2007 . . . . .	118
6.1	Illustration of data flow during simulation . . . . .	127

6.2	Shape of the sine with dwell steering input . . . . .	129
6.3	Steering response for all vehicle models . . . . .	132
6.4	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for CarSim A-Class Hatch model . . . . .	135
6.5	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for CarSim B-Class Hatch model . . . . .	135
6.6	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for CarSim C-Class Hatch model . . . . .	136
6.7	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for CarSim D-Class Sedan model . . . . .	136
6.8	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for CarSim D-Class SUV model . . . . .	137
6.9	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for CarSim D-Class Mini- van model . . . . .	137
6.10	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for CarSim E-Class Sedan model . . . . .	138
6.11	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for CarSim E-Class SUV model . . . . .	138
6.12	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for CarSim F-Class Sedan model . . . . .	139
6.13	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for Bosch rear wheel drive model (without ESC) . . . . .	139
6.14	Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for Bosch front wheel drive model (without ESC) . . . . .	140

---

6.15 Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for Bosch rear wheel drive model (with ESC) . . . . .	142
6.16 Yaw rate during sine with dwell test for Bosch front wheel drive model (with ESC) . . . . .	142
6.17 Sine with dwell test for the 2013 Hyundai Genesis [reproduced from Lenkeit & Kebschull (2013)] . . . . .	143
6.18 The roadway, roadside shoulder, and Stobie pole (far right) involved in scenario 1 . . . . .	147
6.19 The damaged to the utility involved in scenario 1 . . . . .	147
6.20 Site diagram for scenario 1 . . . . .	148
6.21 The unsealed roadway involved in scenario 2 (note the crest in the road) . . . . .	150
6.22 The damage to the car involved in scenario 2 . . . . .	150
6.23 Site diagram for scenario 2 . . . . .	151
6.24 The roadway involved in scenario 3 . . . . .	153
6.25 The damage to the vehicle involved in scenario 3 . . . . .	153
6.26 Site diagram for scenario 3 . . . . .	154
6.27 The roadway and roadside shoulder involved in scenario 4 . . .	156
6.28 The damage to the van involved in scenario 4 . . . . .	156
6.29 Site diagram for scenario 4 . . . . .	157
6.30 The impacted tree and site of the final position for the 4WD involved in scenario 5 . . . . .	159
6.31 The damage to the 4WD involved in scenario 5 . . . . .	159
6.32 Site diagram for scenario 5 . . . . .	160
6.33 The roadway involved in scenario 6 . . . . .	162

6.34	The impacted tree and the damage to the car involved in scenario 6 . . . . .	162
6.35	Site diagram for scenario 6 . . . . .	163
6.36	The roadway and roadside shoulder involved in scenario 7 . . .	165
6.37	The damage to the car involved in scenario 7 . . . . .	165
6.38	Site diagram for scenario 7 . . . . .	166
6.39	The roadway and roadside shoulder involved in scenario 8 . . .	168
6.40	The damage to the car involved in scenario 8 . . . . .	168
6.41	Site diagram for scenario 8 . . . . .	169
6.42	The roadway and roadside shoulder involved in scenario 9 . . .	171
6.43	The damage to the car involved in scenario 9 . . . . .	171
6.44	Site diagram for scenario 9 . . . . .	172
6.45	The roadway and roadside shoulder involved in scenario 10 . .	174
6.46	The impacted tree involved in scenario 10 . . . . .	174
6.47	Site diagram for scenario 10 . . . . .	175
6.48	Example of using a dimensionally accurate vehicle template overlay to determine the scenario trajectory (a) and the resulting lateral displacement and yaw vs longitudinal distance data (b) . . . . .	180
6.49	UMTRI driver model flow [adapted from MacAdam (2003)] . .	185
6.50	Driver model parameter regions during critical driving [adapted from MacAdam (2003)] . . . . .	189
6.51	Standard driver model path . . . . .	195

---

6.52	Example of trajectory error calculation with the scenario trajectory shown in black and the simulated trajectory shown in red . . . . .	200
6.53	Average error by number of optimisation iterations . . . . .	203
6.54	Comparison of two optimised trajectories that have a similar error value . . . . .	206
7.1	Roadway layout, coefficient of friction values, and initial driver paths (Scenario 1) . . . . .	215
7.2	Roadway layout, coefficient of friction values, and initial driver path (Scenario 2) . . . . .	216
7.3	Roadway layout, coefficient of friction values, and initial driver path (Scenario 3) . . . . .	217
7.4	Roadway layout, coefficient of friction values, initial position of low friction patch, and initial driver path (Scenario 4) . . .	218
7.5	Roadway layout, coefficient of friction values, and initial driver path (Scenario 5) . . . . .	219
7.6	Roadway layout, coefficient of friction values, and initial driver path (Scenario 6) . . . . .	220
7.7	Roadway layout, coefficient of friction values, and initial driver path (Scenario 7) . . . . .	221
7.8	Roadway layout, coefficient of friction values, and initial driver path (Scenario 8) . . . . .	222
7.9	Roadway layout, coefficient of friction values, and initial driver path (Scenario 9) . . . . .	223

---

7.10 Roadway layout, coefficient of friction values, and initial driver path (Scenario 10) . . . . .	224
7.11 Effect of ESC (representative value set 1, scenario 1) . . . . .	233
7.12 Effect of ESC (representative value set 2, scenario 1) . . . . .	234
7.13 Effect of ESC (representative value set 3, scenario 1) . . . . .	235
7.14 Effect of ESC (representative value set 4, scenario 1) . . . . .	236
7.15 Effect of ESC (scenario 2) . . . . .	238
7.16 Effect of ESC (scenario 3) . . . . .	240
7.17 Effect of ESC (representative value set 1, scenario 4) . . . . .	242
7.18 Effect of ESC (representative value set 2, scenario 4) . . . . .	243
7.19 Effect of ESC (representative value set 1, scenario 5) . . . . .	246
7.20 Effect of ESC (representative value set 2, scenario 5) . . . . .	247
7.21 Effect of ESC (scenario 6) . . . . .	249
7.22 Effect of ESC (scenario 7) . . . . .	251
7.23 Effect of ESC (representative value set 1, scenario 8) . . . . .	253
7.24 Effect of ESC (representative value set 2, scenario 8) . . . . .	254
7.25 Effect of ESC (scenario 9) . . . . .	256
7.26 Effect of ESC (scenario 10) . . . . .	258
7.27 Relationship between maximum sideslip for simulations with and without ESC . . . . .	265
7.28 Relationship between maximum lateral offset for simulations with and without ESC . . . . .	265
7.29 Relationship between maximum yaw for simulations with and without ESC . . . . .	266



---

7.30	Maximum sideslip at various initial speeds both without and with ESC . . . . .	266
7.31	Maximum lateral offset at various initial speeds both without and with ESC . . . . .	267
7.32	Maximum yaw at various initial speeds both without and with ESC . . . . .	267
8.1	Characteristics of initial major braking interventions . . . . .	279
8.2	Characteristics of initial major braking interventions for simulations that showed obvious signs of understeer . . . . .	280
8.3	Major braking intervention peak slip relative to initial speed for simulations that showed obvious signs of understeer . . . . .	283
8.4	Major braking intervention duration relative to initial speed for simulations that showed obvious signs of understeer . . . . .	283
A.1	Bicycle model . . . . .	309
B.1	Example of the output generated from the optimisation of a group of initial value sets . . . . .	315
B.2	Optimised trajectories for set 1 (scenario 1) . . . . .	316
B.3	Optimised trajectories for set 2 (scenario 1) . . . . .	317
B.4	Optimised trajectories for set 3 (scenario 1) . . . . .	318
B.5	Optimised trajectories for set 4 (scenario 1) . . . . .	319
B.6	Optimised trajectories (scenario 2) . . . . .	320
B.7	Optimised trajectories for scenario 3 . . . . .	321
B.8	Optimised trajectories for set 1 (scenario 4) . . . . .	322

B.9 Optimised trajectories for set 2 (scenario 4) . . . . .	323
B.10 Optimised trajectories for set 1 (scenario 5) . . . . .	324
B.11 Optimised trajectories for set 2 (scenario 5) . . . . .	325
B.12 Optimised trajectories for scenario 6 . . . . .	326
B.13 Optimised trajectories for scenario 7 . . . . .	327
B.14 Optimised trajectories for set 1 (scenario 8) . . . . .	328
B.15 Optimised trajectories for set 2 (scenario 8) . . . . .	329
B.16 Optimised trajectories for scenario 9 . . . . .	330
B.17 Optimised trajectories for scenario 10 . . . . .	331
C.1 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (representa- tive value set 1, scenario 1) . . . . .	336
C.2 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (representative value set 1, scenario 1) . . . . .	337
C.3 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (representa- tive value set 2, scenario 1) . . . . .	338
C.4 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (representative value set 2, scenario 1) . . . . .	339
C.5 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (representa- tive value set 3, scenario 1) . . . . .	340
C.6 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (representative value set 3, scenario 1) . . . . .	341
C.7 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (representa- tive value set 4, scenario 1) . . . . .	342

---

C.8 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (representative value set 4, scenario 1) . . . . .	343
C.9 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (scenario 2) .	345
C.10 Effect of ESC with a sealed road (scenario 2) . . . . .	346
C.11 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (scenario 3) .	348
C.12 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (scenario 3) . . . . .	349
C.13 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (representative value set 1, scenario 4) . . . . .	351
C.14 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (representative value set 1, scenario 4) . . . . .	352
C.15 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (representative value set 2, scenario 4) . . . . .	353
C.16 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (representative value set 2, scenario 4) . . . . .	354
C.17 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (representative value set 1, scenario 5) . . . . .	356
C.18 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (representative value set 1, scenario 5) . . . . .	357
C.19 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (representative value set 2, scenario 5) . . . . .	358
C.20 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (representative value set 2, scenario 5) . . . . .	359
C.21 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (scenario 6) .	361
C.22 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (scenario 6) . . . . .	362
C.23 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (scenario 7) .	364

C.24 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (scenario 7) . . . . .	365
C.25 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (representative value set 1, scenario 8) . . . . .	367
C.26 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (representative value set 1, scenario 8) . . . . .	368
C.27 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (representative value set 2, scenario 8) . . . . .	369
C.28 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (representative value set 2, scenario 8) . . . . .	370
C.29 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (scenario 9) .	372
C.30 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (scenario 9) . . . . .	373
C.31 Effect of ESC with an initial speed 5 km/h lower (scenario 10)	375
C.32 Effect of ESC with a sealed shoulder (scenario 10) . . . . .	376

## LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Major components of the ESC system . . . . .	25
3.1	Summary of ESC effectiveness studies . . . . .	59
4.1	Categories of Injury Severity . . . . .	82
4.2	Number of ‘rural road’ crashes per year by severity category, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	84
4.3	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by type of crash, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	86
4.4	Proportion of casualty crashes involving a collision with an object that were high injury severity by type of object hit, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	87
4.5	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by day of week during daylight, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	88
4.6	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by day of week during darkness or low light, 2008 - 2012 (pre 5 am crashes attributed to previous day) . . . . .	88
4.7	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by speed zone, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	89

4.8	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by road surface type, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	89
4.9	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by road wetness, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	89
4.10	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by road alignment, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	90
4.11	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by road feature, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	90
4.12	Proportion of involvement in high injury severity crashes by type of vehicle involved, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	91
4.13	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by age of vehicle (car and derivatives), 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	92
4.14	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by licence type of driver, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	93
4.15	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by age of driver involved, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	93
4.16	Proportion of casualty crashes that were high injury severity by sex of driver involved, 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	94
4.17	Logistic regression analysis of single vehicle crashes involving cars and car derivatives predicting probability of high injury severity crash (N = 2,348), 2008 - 2012 . . . . .	97
4.18	Change in mean speed and percentage of vehicles exceeding the speed limit for 100 km/h and 110 km/h rural roads, 2008 - 2012 [Kloeden & Woolley (2014)] . . . . .	105

---

5.1	Crash type for high speed rural road crashes . . . . .	112
5.2	Appearance of unique word in crash description by loss of control classification . . . . .	114
5.3	Unique words in the crash description associated with the ten highest Chi squared values . . . . .	114
5.4	Loss of control prediction model . . . . .	115
5.5	Proportion of high speed, rural road injury crashes that were due to a loss of control by year, 1998 - 2007 . . . . .	117
5.6	Proportion of high speed, rural road injury crashes that were due to a loss of control by injury severity, 1998 - 2007 . . . . .	117
5.7	Proportion of high speed, rural road injury crashes that were due to a loss of control by day of week, 1998 - 2007 . . . . .	118
5.8	Proportion of high speed, rural road injury crashes that were due to a loss of control by speed zone, 1998 - 2007 . . . . .	119
5.9	Proportion of high speed, rural road injury crashes that were due to a loss of control by surface type, 1998 - 2007 . . . . .	119
5.10	Proportion of high speed, rural road injury crashes that were due to a loss of control by surface wetness, 1998 - 2007 . . . . .	120
5.11	Proportion of high speed, rural road injury crashes that were due to a loss of control by road alignment, 1998 - 2007 . . . . .	120
5.12	Proportion of high speed, rural road injury crashes that were due to a loss of control by road feature, 1998 - 2007 . . . . .	120
6.1	Description of the generic vehicle models pre-defined in CarSim131	

6.2	Steering wheel angle required by each vehicle model to achieve a lateral acceleration of 0.3 g . . . . .	133
6.3	Environmental conditions prevalent in scenario 1 . . . . .	146
6.4	Environmental conditions prevalent in scenario 2 . . . . .	149
6.5	Environmental conditions prevalent in scenario 3 . . . . .	152
6.6	Environmental conditions prevalent in scenario 4 . . . . .	155
6.7	Environmental conditions prevalent in scenario 5 . . . . .	158
6.8	Environmental conditions prevalent in scenario 6 . . . . .	161
6.9	Environmental conditions prevalent in scenario 7 . . . . .	164
6.10	Environmental conditions prevalent in scenario 8 . . . . .	167
6.11	Environmental conditions prevalent in scenario 9 . . . . .	170
6.12	Environmental conditions prevalent in scenario 10 . . . . .	173
6.13	Nominal values for the coefficient of friction on various surface types (Rivers, 1981) . . . . .	177
6.14	Coefficients of friction for various surface types used for simulations in this investigation . . . . .	179
6.15	The 36 driver preview time and lag time value pairs that span the likely solution space (P, l) . . . . .	193
7.1	Initial value sets (part 1) . . . . .	225
7.2	Initial value sets (part 2) . . . . .	226
7.3	Representative value sets (part 1) . . . . .	227
7.4	Representative value sets (part 2) . . . . .	228



---

7.5	Summary of the effects of ESC during the simulation of the representative value sets associated with each loss of control scenario . . . . .	264
7.6	Variables altered for emulation of various road safety features	268
8.1	Major ESC interventions for RWD vehicle model during loss of control scenario simulations (part 1) . . . . .	273
8.2	Major ESC interventions for RWD vehicle model during loss of control scenario simulations (part 2) . . . . .	274
8.3	Major ESC interventions for RWD vehicle model during sine with dwell test at various maximum steering wheel amplitudes	275



## ABSTRACT

International and Australian research has found that there are significant benefits to road safety associated with the addition of Electronic Stability Control (ESC) to passenger vehicles. The greatest benefit to Australia is for crashes on high speed rural roads that occur due to a loss of control.

An investigation of what variables in the South Australian statewide crash database are associated with high injury severity for vehicle occupants during crashes on high speed rural roads was conducted. For specifically single vehicle crashes on high speed rural roads, a higher speed limit, the hours of darkness, and an earlier crash year were found to be the major indicators of a high injury severity outcome.

A complementary investigation of high speed rural road crashes that were a result of a loss of control was also conducted. This required the development of a method for identifying loss of control crashes using available variables from the South Australian statewide crash database. It was estimated that, per year in South Australia, 561 injury crashes on high speed rural roads are the result of a loss of control including 33 fatal crashes and 208 crashes resulting in injuries requiring hospital admission.

While literature from ESC manufacturers clearly explains the theory behind how ESC operates, no research has directly investigated what braking

interventions are made by ESC during real world situations where a vehicle not equipped with ESC would have crashed. More specifically, no research has investigated how braking interventions affect vehicle trajectory and enable a collision to be avoided. Also of interest is how the effect of interventions are altered when combined with other rural road safety features such as lower travelling speeds, sealed roadside shoulders, and sealed roads.

Crash scenarios, developed based on high speed rural road crashes, were simulated using a vehicle model (with a corresponding ESC model) supplied by Bosch Australia. The simulation method included processes such as dynamic testing of the vehicle model, use of a driver model, and trajectory matching through optimisation. Each crash scenario was simulated using the vehicle model without ESC active and then again using the vehicle model with ESC active. The differences in vehicle trajectory and the braking interventions responsible for those differences were then analysed. The crash scenario simulations were also altered to represent the presence of specific rural road safety measures in order to investigate how ESC braking interventions were affected. However, this process was found to render the results unreliable and no analysis of how ESC was affected by the rural road safety measures was possible.

The results of simulating each crash scenario were presented in figures that show when braking interventions are made and how they affect vehicle trajectory. Vehicle trajectory was analysed by investigating how ESC affected vehicle sideslip, lateral offset, and yaw. The strength and duration of individual braking interventions were then analysed which included an investigation of how they were affected by travelling speed and how they compare

to braking interventions elicited during ESC effectiveness tests.



## STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution to James Mackenzie and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Signed:

Date:





## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would firstly like to thank my supervisors Robert Anderson and Paul Hutchinson for their assistance and encouragement throughout the journey that this thesis represents. Their ideas, feedback, and sustained enthusiasm were greatly appreciated and contributed considerably to my persistence to finish.

Special thanks are also owed to the following people for assistance with various parts of this thesis:

- Bosch Australia - in particular Walter My, John Nicolopoulos, Ken Humphreys, Mark Jackman, and Chris Woods - for their provision of the driver and ESC models as well as their hospitality during a fortnight long visit where I was shown how to operate the models and able to experience the effectiveness of ESC firsthand on a test track.
- David Kuchenmeister from the South Australia Police Major Crash unit for providing a catalogue of results from friction tests performed around South Australia.
- Tony Porcaro from the South Australian Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure for providing data and assisting with estimating a general friction coefficient for South Australian roads.

- Nigel Bean from the School of Mathematical Sciences at the University of Adelaide for providing advice on the selection of a suitable optimisation method and assistance with applying the method to my specific circumstances.
- Rick Morgan of the United States National Highway Transport Safety Administration for providing access to results of ESC minimum effectiveness tests.
- Jaime Royals from the Centre for Automotive Safety Research for assistance with identifying, and then tracking down, many pieces of (sometimes obscure) literature.

Finally I would like to thank all the staff and students at the Centre for Automotive Safety Research, my family, and my friends for all their encouragement (even the sarcastic bits) and patience through all the years I have been working on this thesis. I'm sure you'll all be as glad as me to hear that it is done!

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CASR	Centre for Automotive Safety Research
ESC	Electronic Stability Control
FWD	Front wheel drive
LOC	Loss of control
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Authority
RWD	Rear wheel drive
SAPOL	South Australian Police
TARS	Traffic Accident Reporting System