

Errata to CAIB Report Volume II Appendix D.12
Impact Modeling
by James D. Walker

Errata introduced in putting Appendix D.12 in CAIB report format:

Equations

There were a number of errors introduced into equations. In particular,

Eq. (6), page 370. u_e was replaced by c_0 . The correct equation is

$$u_e = \frac{\sigma_{crush}}{\rho_0 c_0}$$

Eq. (8), page 370. An extraneous equals sign appeared in the denominator and a plus sign was changed to a minus sign there. The correct equation is

$$V_{crush} = u_{et} + u_{ef} + \frac{\sigma_{crush-t} - \sigma_{crush-f}}{\rho_{ef} (c_{1f} + u_{ef})}$$

Eq. (9), page 370. The equals sign was replaced by a minus sign. The correct equation is

$$V_y = V \sin(\theta)$$

Eq. (10), page 370. Again, an equals sign was replaced by a minus sign. Also, an extra V appeared in the denominator. The correct equation is

$$V = \frac{V_{crush}}{\sin(\theta)}$$

(continued next page)

Eq. (12), page 377. The second plus sign in the lower expression was replaced with a minus sign. The correct equation is

$$p = \begin{cases} \rho_{0f} c_{0f} (V - u_{RCC}) & V \leq u_{RCC} + u_{ef} \\ \sigma_{crush-f} + \rho_{ef} (c_{1f} + u_{ef})(V - u_{ef} - u_{RCC}) & V > u_{RCC} + u_{ef} \end{cases}$$

Figures

Somehow, the font was changed in the figure legends on many of the figures. This led to a minor problem – the legend no longer was within the box – and a more serious problem, the new font didn't have a θ . Thus, either nothing or a “q” appears in those figure legends. This font change lost the θ in Figures 14 (pg. 370), 15a-f (pg. 371), 16 (pg. 372), and 17 and 18 (pg. 373).

Figure captions: The caption to Figure 25 (pg. 380) is missing the α and β . The angles in the parenthetical remark should read the $\alpha = 5.5^\circ$, $\beta = 2.5^\circ$.

Tables

An extra row divider was placed in Table 8 (pg. 380), thus separating the last line “(Option #3 – test condition)” from the rest of the second row entry. The row divider (a horizontal line) should not be there since “(Option #3 – test condition)” is part of the second row entry.

Footnotes

There were two footnotes used in the report (pg. 364 and pg. 370). When the decision was made to place both footnotes at the end of the report instead of at the bottom of the page, the symbol used for one of them should have been changed. Right now, the same symbol (*) is used for both footnotes.