

**Chapter 1 Evaluating the defense expert witness**

Doing your homework..... 11  
 Training, experience, and expertise..... 11  
 Attacks on the investigation and evidence..... 12  
 Educating the jury to reject the defense theory..... 13  
 Use of an evidence checklist..... 16  
 Defense expert has a favorite tactic..... 17

**Chapter 2: Speed from braking evidence**

**Braking evidence, tire marks**

Contamination – traffic through the scene..... 19  
 Tire marks not matched to defendant’s vehicle..... 19  
 Tire marks indicate a brake problem..... 19  
 Tire marks are different lengths..... 20  
 Fewer than four tire marks..... 20  
 Average skid distance is incorrect..... 21  
 No at-scene inspection of tires..... 22

**Road friction and drag factor**

ABS lower drag factor..... 22  
 Skid test is inaccurate..... 23  
 Drag factor outside a published range..... 24  
 Drag factor is velocity dependent..... 24  
 Wrong drag factor for tumbling vehicle ..... 26  
 Overlapping tire marks analyzed incorrectly..... 27  
 Chemical testing of tire mark residue..... 28  
 drag factor..... 29  
 Drag sled measurement of drag factor ..... 29  
 not corroborated..... 30  
 Drag sled was incorrectly used ..... 30  
 There is no video of the drag sled test..... 31  
 Drag sled scale calibration not checked..... 32  
 Accelerometer used to measure drag factor..... 33  
 Exemplar vehicle invalidates the measurement..... 33  
 Accelerometer was not recently calibrated..... 34  
 Cross exam attacks on LE witness..... 34  
 Drag factor test not done in a timely manner..... 35  
 “Digital accuracy” makes accelerometer better..... 35  
  
 Accelerometer is a “Black Box”..... 36  
 Expert criticizes the LE use of the accelerometer..... 37  
 Measurement is much lower than LE..... 37

Expert uses significantly lower

Sled measurement was

**Brake percentage, brake efficiency**

Motorcycle weight distribution was taken from a chart.... 38  
 Defense expert uses wrong brake percentage..... 40  
 Wrong brake efficiency - inoperable brakes..... 41  
 Wrong brake efficiency weight distribution chart..... 41

### **Speed from skid equation**

Weight is not in the equation, the equation is invalid.....	42
“Road & Track” defense.....	43
Calculations are sensitive to uncertainties.....	43
Uncertainties simply add together.....	44
Speed calculation was rounded down.....	45
Unequal tire pressures affect calculations.....	46

## **Chapter 3: Single vehicle collisions**

What is a critical speed yaw (CSY)? .....	47
---	----

### **General defenses**

Operator ID is the defense.....	47
Passenger caused the crash.....	49
Road design/defect caused the crash.....	49
Mechanical failure caused the crash.....	50

### **Attacks on the investigation and measurements**

State did not secure the vehicle.....	52
A single tire mark is not a CSY.....	53
Tire marks are ABS pre-impact braking.....	54
Curved tire marks are rear emergency braking.....	54
No visible crossover – not a CSY.....	54
No visible striations in the yaw marks.....	55
Expert criticizes measurements.....	56
Measurements made too late in the yaw.....	57
Length of yaw was not measured.....	57
Approach to the impact not documented.....	57

### **Calculations using the CSY equation**

Yaw marks are not truly circular.....	58
Only one measurement was made.....	59
Prior curve is inconsistent with calculated speed.....	59
Yaw was post-impact.....	60
Braking during yaw invalidates CSY equation .....	60
CSY analysis is invalid - vehicle has ESC.....	62
Publication claims the CSY is invalid.....	62
Drag factor used in the CSY measured incorrectly.....	63
Yaw starts on two surfaces – cannot use the CSY.....	63
The radius not adjusted for vehicle CM.....	64
CSY after an airborne motion.....	65
CSY calculation after an impact.....	65
Measurement uncertainties affect the calculation.....	66

### **Conservation of energy**

Defense attacks the knowledge of the State’s expert.....	68
--	----

## **Chapter 4: Pedestrian collisions**

### **General attacks or challenges**

Evidence was moved.....	71
To scale drawing was not verified.....	71
Investigator did not have specialized training.....	71
Minimizing the witness’ experience.....	71

Concession in a hit-and-run case.....	72
No vehicle debris at the scene.....	72
Expert uses a published evidence list.....	72
Concession - not a human factors expert.....	73
Vehicle has been released.....	73
Published chart used.....	74
Police used an assumption.....	74
Non deployment of an air bag.....	75
Speed from lamp examination.....	76
<b>Attacks on the investigation</b>	
Witness position was not documented .....	78
Witness view was obstructed.....	78
Pedestrian was moved .....	79
Bumper height was not documented .....	79
No leg injury .....	79
Location of a leg injury .....	80
A hat as evidence of the POI .....	81
Shoes as proof of the POI .....	81
POI from crash debris .....	82
<b>Estimates of vehicle speed</b>	
Speed from braking evidence .....	83
Speed from slide of pedestrian's body .....	83
Expert uses incorrect drag factor .....	84
<b>Pedestrian throw equations</b>	
POI/FRP of body is uncertain .....	86
Incorrect drag factor used in throw equation .....	86
Searle calculation is irrelevant .....	86
Landing point unknown .....	87
Searle equation misapplied .....	87
Searle was misapplied .....	88
Defense expert uses commercial software .....	88
Throw of pedestrian's shoe .....	88
Searle equation overestimates speed .....	89
Did not measure the actual drag factor .....	90
Expert uses head strike chart .....	90
Expert applies head strike chart incorrectly .....	91
Expert applies chart incorrectly .....	92
<b>Collision avoidance and human factors</b>	
Head strike chart used incorrectly.....	92
Human factors experts .....	92
Walking speed .....	94
"accepted" value as an assumption .....	95
Expert assumes a single value .....	97
Defense expert attacks State's assumptions .....	97
<b>Visibility issues</b>	
Different vision than the defendant .....	99
Pedestrian's clothing limits visibility.....	99
Glare from oncoming headlights .....	100

Acute field of vision .....	100
State's visibility test is invalid .....	101
Headlight illumination distance .....	102

**Operator perception-reaction time**

The defense expert assigns a value of 1.5 seconds .....	104
PRT value outside Olson range .....	105
Expert uses only data for sober operators.....	105
Expert uses a published chart .....	106
Expert makes assumptions .....	107
Low BAC would not affect the ability to operate .....	107
“Blame the pedestrian” defense .....	108

**Chapter 5 Other cases**

**Intersection crashes**

Expert uses PRT to calculate a speed .....	111
Incorrect acceleration into an intersection calculated .....	112
Expert uses wrong drag factor in calculation.....	113
Defense attacks the evidence in the momentum.....	113

**Head on and rear end crashes**

Momentum used in a near head-on collision.....	114
Defense expert does Monte Carlo analysis.....	115
Defense claims discovery or Brady violation.....	116
Point of impact in a crossing the center line case .....	116
Gouge in roadway incorrectly as the POI .....	117
Other vehicle crossed over into my lane .....	118
Mechanical failure as cause .....	118
The passenger caused the collision .....	119
Momentum used for vehicles of different weight .....	119
Expert intentionally misuses momentum .....	119
Expert calculates with wrong weight .....	120
State did not actually weigh the car .....	121

**Attacks on EDR evidence**

Data is not from this crash .....	122
Times in the EDR report are not prior to impact .....	122
Most recent version of software was not used .....	123
The State's witness is not certified .....	123
Investigators did not have a warrant .....	123
EDR speeds are higher than reconstructed speeds .....	124
Spoilation - removal of the EDR damaged the vehicle ....	124
Vehicle has been released – cannot image the EDR .....	124

**EDR opinions by defense expert**

EDR speeds are incorrect .....	125
EDR image has not been corroborated .....	125
The EDR report has been altered .....	126
A power interruption caused incomplete data .....	126
Expert's opinion is based on incomplete data .....	126
Not necessarily true speeds of the car .....	127
EDR module not from the defendant's vehicle .....	128
EDR data is inaccurate .....	128

<b>Operator ID</b>	
Operator ID issues .....	128
Operator ID incompletely investigated .....	130
Forensic evidence was not photographed .....	130
Air bag evidence was misinterpreted .....	130
<b>APPENDIX</b> .....	131