The auto industry and government have known about the deadly consequences of vehicle roof crush since 1960s, yet have never upgraded the 1971 standard nor extended it to vehicles weighing more than 6,000 lbs.

**1971 ROOF STRENGTH STANDARD:**
33-Year Old Standard Does Not Provide Basic Rollover Crashworthiness Protections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 13, 1965</td>
<td>Both General Motors (GM) and Ford highlight the importance of roof strength in rollovers in testimony before Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 13, 1966</td>
<td>GM Engineering Staff memo describes the company’s plans to develop a dynamic roof strength drop test from 5 ½ feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 11, 1967</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration (FHA) of the National Traffic Safety Bureau (NTSB) issues an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) on 47 issues, including roof intrusion, seeking public comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 6, 1971</td>
<td>The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA, formerly NTSB), issues a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on roof intrusion protection for passenger cars that would statically test both front corners of the roof on passenger vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 1971</td>
<td>General Motors Corporation (GM) and the Automobile Manufacturers Association (which later became the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers) argue in comments to the docket that testing both sides of the roof is unnecessary. It was later revealed in litigation that GM had used NHTSA’s two-corner test on six of its production model vehicles and that only one vehicle tested had passed. GM nevertheless argued to NHTSA that only one side should be tested because the roof was “symmetrical,” in addition to pushing for other changes to weaken the test. Moreover, GM withheld its testing results from the agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 8, 1971</td>
<td>NHTSA issues final rule establishing a roof crush standard for passenger cars to take effect in 1973. This standard, which today is virtually the same as in 1973, measure the result of pressure to only one side of a vehicle’s roof.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mar. 22, 1973    The Center for Auto Safety petitions NHTSA to apply federal motor vehicle safety standards, including the roof crush standard, to light trucks and multipurpose passenger vehicles with gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of 10,000 pounds or less.

Sept. 1, 1973    Roof Crush Resistance standard, FMVSS No. 216, takes effect for passenger cars.

1974    NHTSA contracts with Minicars for development of a research safety vehicle that protects occupants in serious rollover crashes at 50 mph.

Apr. 30, 1976    Engineer killed during accidental rollover at GM proving grounds during a tire evaluation test. GM institutes a new policy requiring roll cages on all test vehicles and all test drivers and test occupants to wear helmets.

Apr. 17, 1991    NHTSA issues a final rule, effective Sept. 1, 1993, extending the application of FMVSS 216, the existing car roof crush resistance standard to light trucks, vans, buses and multipurpose passenger vehicles (MPVs) with GVWR of 6,000 lbs. or less, specifically declining to extend the standard to light trucks, vans, buses and MPVs with a GVWR of up to 10,000 lbs.

Dec. 18, 1991    Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) requires application of passenger car safety standards to light trucks, vans, buses and MPVs with GVWR of 6,000 lbs or less. ISTEA also requires issuance of a standard to improve head impact protection from interior components (roof rails, pillars, and front headers) of passenger cars. ISTEA additionally directs NHTSA to commence a rulemaking proceeding on a standard to prevent rollover crashes.

Jan. 3, 1992    NHTSA issues an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) to establish a rollover prevention standard, as required by ISTEA.

Sept. 23, 1992    NHTSA releases *Planning Document for Rollover Prevention and Injury Mitigation* listing alternative actions agency could take to address rollover problem, including research into improved roof crush resistance to prevent head and spinal injury.

Jan. 22, 1993    NHTSA delays by one year, until Sept. 1, 1994, effective date for application of FMVSS 216, the roof crush standard to light trucks, vans, buses and MPVs with gross vehicle weight rating of 6,000 lbs. or less.

June 23, 1994    NHTSA terminates rulemaking on rollover prevention and stability standard. In the notice of termination, the agency promises that it will instead address factors involved in preventing rollover casualties, including roof strength requirements.
May 6, 1996  R. Ben Hogan, Smith and Alspaugh, PC, a law firm, petitions NHTSA for rulemaking, and requests that the agency require “roll cages” as standard equipment on passenger cars.

Jan. 8, 1997  NHTSA grants petition requesting rulemaking to require “roll cages.”

Apr. 27, 1999  FMVSS 216, the roof crush standard procedure clarified for placement of the test device to accommodate certain vehicles that have raised and/or highly sloped roofs. This change in the standard does not address or upgrade underlying roof crush testing and strength requirements.

Sept. 2000  In wake of the exposé of Firestone tire/Ford Explorer rollover fatalities, NHTSA Administrator states that agency needs to improve roof crush safety standard for rollover protection in testimony before Congress.

Oct. 22, 2001  NHTSA publishes notice and request for comments on roof crush resistance, describing agency roof crush research and testing as a part of its rollover protection program over the past 30 years.

2002  Herbst, B., Forrest, S., Meyer, S., Hock, D. publish their “Alternative Roof Crush Resistance Testing with Production and Reinforced Roof Structures,”¹ that discusses the feasibility of a dynamic roof crush test, stating that “[t]he automotive industry and researchers have used drop testing for years to evaluate roof strength. In the late 1960’s, Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) developed a standardized procedure to perform full vehicle inverted drop testing. Many domestic and import auto manufacturers have utilized the inverted drop test technique as far back as the 1960s and 1970s to evaluate roof strength.

Apr. 2002  NHTSA publishes its report Characteristics of Fatal Rollover Crashes² and notes that rollover crashes are more likely to be fatal than other crashes.

Sept. 17, 2002  NHTSA Administrator Dr. Jeffrey Runge states that roof crush intrusion potentially contributes to serious or fatal injury in 26 percent of rollover crashes.³

Feb. 26, 2003  Senate Commerce Committee holds a hearing SUV safety where senators, auto industry representatives, the administrator of NHTSA and spokespeople from consumer safety groups speak about the problems of roof crush in SUV rollovers.

March 3, 2003  Detroit News series “Deadly Driving” highlights the failure of NHTSA to upgrade its roof strength standard and cites NHTSA data indicating that 1,400 deaths and 2,300 serious injuries could be prevented if the standard were more rigorous.
July 15, 2003  National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) concludes roof crush contributed to severity of driver injuries and diminished passenger survivable space in Henrietta, Texas crash of 15-passenger van that killed four occupants and seriously injured eight others.


July, 2003  NHTSA estimates that 1,339 serious or fatal injuries caused by roof crush intrusion are suffered by belted occupants each year. NHTSA lists a proposed rule to upgrade roof crush resistance as a possible 2004 action, and final rule as a possible 2005 action, in *Vehicle Safety Rulemaking Priorities and Supporting Research 2003-2006*, with little description of a rule’s possible contents. No proposal for rulemaking or an upgraded standard has yet been issued.

Nov. 25, 2003  S.1978 reported out of Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee containing a mandate for NHTSA to issue a dynamic roof crush standard and upgrade of rollover crashworthiness in vehicles up to 10,000 lbs.

2003 - Jan. 2004  Safety researchers at Xprts, Inc., conduct roof crush dynamic tests using the Jordan Rollover System (JRS) on Chevrolet Blazers, Chevrolet Suburbans and Ford Explorers. During the JRS tests, the roadway surface moves forward along a track, contacting the roof of the vehicle as it rotates on the spit. The test surface impacts both sides of the roof a single time, imitating the first roll of a vehicle in a rollover crash. The results show that while the current static test measures only the weakness of the roof, dynamic tests measure occupant injury, safety belt performance, window glazing, side impact air bags, seatback strength, and door locks and latches, as well as roof strength.

Feb. 12, 2003  Senate passes S.1072, the Highway Funding Bill, which includes safety provisions from S.1978 that would:
- Require NHTSA to issue a rollover crashworthiness standard by June 30, 2006, for passenger vehicles under 10,000 lbs. that will consider the prescription of a dynamic roof strength standard that realistically duplicates actual forces;
- Require NHTSA consideration of improved seat structure and safety belt design (including seat belt pretensioners), side impact head protection air bags and roof injury protection measures.
2 NCSA, Characteristics of Rollover Crashes, DOT HS 809 438, (Apr. 2002), at 14 and 20; See also "Registration Data for 1975-2001