

ORACLE V5.2 “SURGICAL STRIKE” ABLATION ANALYSIS: HURRICANE HUGO (1989)

Comprehensive Technical Evaluation of V50 Gemini Tracking, V51 Wisdom Regulation, and Physical Fidelity in Pure Physics Mode

Project Oracle Technical Team

January 14, 2026

Abstract

This report presents a rigorous, forensic analysis of the “Project Oracle” simulation run documented in `console_v5.2_PURE_ADV3_SPG3_HUGO_1989.log`. The simulation utilizes the **V5.2 “Surgical Strike”** computational fluid dynamics (CFD) architecture to reconstruct the genesis and intensification of Hurricane Hugo (September 1989) under “**Pure Physics**” (**Test A**) conditions. This specific configuration—disabling external “Oracle” nudging—serves as a definitive ablation test, isolating the performance of the core Navier-Stokes solver, the **V50.3 Gemini StormTracker**, and the **V51 Wisdom Intensity Regulator** against the chaotic reality of historical meteorological records.

The analysis reveals a profound dichotomy between computational stability and historical chronology. While the V5.2 engine demonstrates exceptional numerical fidelity—maintaining kinetic energy conservation errors at the machine-precision level of $O(10^{-16})$ via the Cayley Transform [1]—the simulated vortex exhibits “hyper-efficiency,” intensifying from a tropical storm to a Category 5 system in less than 14 simulation hours, a process that historically spanned five days.[2] This report dissects the mechanisms behind this acceleration, identifying the **Gaussian Soft Start** initialization and the idealized, shear-free environment as the primary catalysts. Furthermore, the analysis confirms the critical efficacy of the **V51 Wisdom Regulator** in preventing physical divergence (“hypercanes”) by aggressively throttling surface fluxes when wind speeds exceed 155 knots [1], and documents the eventual navigational failure (**Corner Rejection**) caused by the decoupling of the static basin grid from the advecting storm system.[1]

1 Introduction: The V5.2 “Surgical Strike” Framework

The domain of Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) constantly grapples with the balance between physical parameterization and computational stability. Project Oracle’s V5.2 architecture represents a specific branch of this development, focusing on “Surgical Strike” ablation testing.[1] Unlike operational forecast models that continuously assimilate satellite and sonde data to correct errors, the V5.2 “Pure Physics” mode is designed to test the limits of the underlying equations of motion. By stripping away the corrective “Oracle” layer, the simulation exposes the raw behavior of the fluid dynamics solver, the turbulence closure schemes, and the tracking algorithms.

The target of this simulation, **Hurricane Hugo**, offers a uniquely challenging test case. Originating as a classic Cape Verde storm in September 1989, Hugo was characterized by a long, messy organization phase across the central Atlantic, followed by distinct periods of Rapid Intensification (RI) and eyewall replacement cycles.[2, 3] Simulating Hugo without data assimilation tests the model’s ability to handle genesis, RI, and peak intensity solely through internal thermodynamics and boundary forcings.

1.1 Computational Architecture and Grid Configuration

The simulation log `console_v5_2_PURE_ADV3_SPG3_HUGO_1989.log` confirms the initialization of a **Static North Atlantic Basin**.^[1] This choice of a static domain is pivotal to interpreting the later tracking failures.

- **Grid Dimensions:** The computational grid is defined as 900×600 points. While the precise spatial resolution (Δx) is not explicitly printed in the log, the domain physics rely on a “Characteristic Length” (L_{char}) of 2,000 km, implying a grid resolution sufficient to resolve the mesoscale vortex but potentially relying on sub-grid parameterizations for the eyewall processes.^[1]
- **Vertical Structure:** The physical domain extends to a height of 20 km (z_{depth}), capturing the full tropospheric depth required to model the hurricane’s outflow anticyclone and inflow layers.^[1]
- **Solver Timestep (dt):** The simulation employs a highly conservative timestep. The initialization log notes a “HOTFIX #6” which reduced the solver timestep (dt_{solver}) to 5×10^{-5} (dimensionless units). This reduction from the previous 1×10^{-4} standard is a critical stability measure, specifically implemented to prevent Courant–Friedrichs–Lowy (CFL) violations during the high-velocity regimes expected in “Pure Physics” testing.^[1]

1.2 “Pure Physics” Ablation Mode (Test A)

The log explicitly identifies the run configuration as “**TEST A: PURE PHYSICS (No Oracle)**”.^[1] This setting serves as the fundamental control variable for the analysis.

- **Mechanism:** In standard Oracle operations, the system uses “nudging”—a four-dimensional data assimilation technique that injects historical reanalysis data (wind, pressure, temperature) into the simulation grid to correct the vortex’s path and intensity.
- **Ablation:** In Test A, this assimilation is disabled. The thermodynamic driver switches from a hybrid “Surface + Oracle” mode to “**Surface Fluxes ONLY**”.^[1]
- **Implication:** The simulated storm is energetically isolated. Its only energy source is the extraction of enthalpy (heat and moisture) from the sea surface via **Bulk Aerodynamic** formulas. Its only steering mechanism is the background environmental flow provided by the ERA5 boundary conditions. This mode demands that the **Core Solver** be perfectly balanced; any numerical error in the advection or pressure projection steps would accumulate rapidly without the Oracle’s corrective hand, leading to immediate dissipation or explosion.

1.3 Environmental Boundary Conditions

To provide a realistic playground for this physics test, the simulation ingests **ERA5 Historical Data**.

- **Steering Flow:** The `DataInterface` fetches pressure-level winds from the ERA5 archive. The log records successful fetches at 2-hour intervals (e.g., 1989-09-10 12:00, 14:00, 16:00).^[1] These winds provide the large-scale synoptic environment—specifically the Bermuda High and the upper-level lows—that steer the hurricane.
- **Land-Sea Mask:** The log confirms “0.0% land coverage” for the processed area at the genesis point (13.20°N, 20.00°W).^[1] This confirms the storm is initiating over the open ocean, removing land interaction friction from the early equation.

- **Sea Surface Temperatures (SST):** The basin is initialized with a climatological SST range of 10.0°C to 29.0°C.[1] The upper bound of 29°C is thermodynamically significant; it exceeds the 26.5°C threshold for cyclogenesis and provides massive potential energy (CAPE) for the storm. Crucially, because the basin is **static** and lacks a coupled ocean model, this 29°C represents an infinite heat reservoir—the simulation does not account for the “cold wake” or upwelling that typically acts as a negative feedback loop on slow-moving storms.

2 V50.3 Gemini StormTracker: Architecture and Performance

The navigational brain of the V5.2 system is the **StormTracker V50.3**, colloquially named “**OPUS’S COOLDOWN FIX**”.[1] Tracking a vortex on a discrete grid is non-trivial; noise in the vorticity field, broad pressure minima, and transient convection can all “distract” a simple tracking algorithm. The V50.3 system employs a sophisticated **Dual Lock Architecture** to separate structural integrity from navigational precision.

2.1 The “Dual Lock” Philosophy

The log provides continuous telemetry for two distinct tracking metrics, a significant evolution from single-score systems.

2.1.1 Lock_Struct: Chimera Coherence

- **Definition:** This metric measures the **Structural Health** of the vortex. It is not based on a single variable but on a weighted ensemble known as the “**Chimera Field**”.[1]
- **Composition:** The Chimera field aggregates three distinct meteorological signals:
 1. **Vorticity (35%):** Captures the rotational spin of the eyewall.
 2. **Pressure (35%):** Serves as a “Structural Anchor” because the pressure field is naturally smoother and less noisy than the wind field.[1]
 3. **Warm Core (30%):** Tracks the thermodynamic anomaly in the upper troposphere, a hallmark of a healthy tropical cyclone.[1]
- **Performance:** Throughout the simulation, the `lock_struct` score remains remarkably high, averaging between **0.78 and 0.88**.[1] Even during the chaotic “Stage Transition” phases (e.g., Frame 0, Frame 3700), the coherence never drops below 0.72.
- **Analysis:** This stability confirms the efficacy of the **Gaussian Soft Start**. By seeding the grid with a mathematically consistent Rankine vortex (where pressure and wind fields are in gradient balance), the simulation provides the Chimera algorithm with a clear, unambiguous target from Frame 0. The tracker recognizes this structure as “healthy” immediately.

2.1.2 Lock_Track: Navigation Accuracy

- **Definition:** This metric assesses how well the tracker can pinpoint the center of the grid relative to the storm center. It is calculated using a **Sigmoid function** of the tracking offset (distance in grid cells).[1]
- **Tuning:** The log notes that V50.1 Patch 3 “relaxed” the sigmoid slope ($k = 0.15$).[1] This adjustment prevents the score from fluctuating wildly due to minor pixel-level jitters, providing a smoother “confidence” curve for the adaptive mesh refinement (AMR) systems.

- **Performance:** The log shows a clear degradation of this score over time, correlating with the storm’s drift.
 - **Frame 0:** Lock 0.81 (Offset 0.5 cells).
 - **Frame 5000:** Lock 0.75 (Offset 2.9 cells).
 - **Frame 10000:** Lock 0.35 (Offset 14.5 cells).
 - **Frame 20000:** Lock 0.04 (Offset 28.5 cells).
- **Interpretation:** This declining score is not a failure of the tracker, but a precise measurement of the **Static Basin Limitation**. The tracker accurately reports that the storm is moving away from the camera center. In a dynamic simulation, a low `lock_track` score would trigger a “Camera Shift”.^[1] Since camera shifts are zero in this run [1], the metric correctly reflects the growing navigational error.

2.2 The “Cold Start Paradox” and The Cooldown Fix

The initialization log explicitly credits “Opus” for the **V50.3 Patch 5: Cooldown** fix, which “forces anchor to center”.^[1] This patch addresses a specific numerical singularity known as the “Cold Start Paradox”.^[1]

- **The Problem:** At the exact moment of initialization (Frame 0), a synthetic Gaussian vortex is perfectly circular. The divergence of the velocity field ($\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$) is effectively zero. The Poisson pressure solver, which relies on divergence ($\nabla^2 p = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$), consequently returns a pressure field that is near-zero or spatially uniform.^[1]
- **The Failure Mode:** Previous versions of the tracker (e.g., V43 “Bullseye”) sought the minimum pressure. In a uniform field, the numerical minimum often defaults to the array index —the corner of the grid. This caused the tracker to “panic,” reporting an offset of ~ 80 cells and initiating emergency re-centering routines that destabilized the vortex.^[1]
- **The Solution:** The “Cooldown” logic acts as a temporal damper. For the first few frames, it artificially weights the center of the grid in the search algorithm, effectively telling the tracker: “Ignore the noise at the edges; the storm is in the middle.”
- **Verification:** The log for Frame 0 shows **Offset = 0.5**. This proves the fix functioned correctly. Instead of snapping to the corner, the tracker stayed locked on the initialized vortex, allowing the simulation to proceed past the critical genesis phase.

2.3 Boundary Failure: Corner-Safe Rejection

As the simulation extends beyond Frame 24,000, the storm’s drift carries it into the “Forbidden Zone” of the grid.

- **The Logic:** V50.1 Patch 2 introduced “**Corner-Safe Rejection**” with an **Edge Margin** of $nx/3$.^[1] This logic assumes that any vortex center detected within the outer third of the grid is likely a numerical artifact (a “ghost” vortex reflected by the boundary conditions) rather than the true storm.
- **The Event:** At **Frame 24600**, the log records `CORNER REJECTION #1: Using previous (103.5, 58.1)`.^[1]
- **Analysis:** This confirms that the storm center physically advected into the margin. The tracker correctly identified the position as invalid and rejected it, reverting to the last known good coordinate. The log shows a sequence of rejections (#1 through #9) extending to Frame 25500.

- **Hysteresis:** The log notes V50.2 Patch 4 implemented “Hysteresis” to “break persistent edge lock”.[1] This logic prevents the tracker from oscillating between valid and invalid states, forcing it to commit to the rejection. This behavior is crucial for stability; if the tracker were to accept the boundary coordinates, the “camera” (in a dynamic run) might slam into the wall, crashing the simulation.

3 V51 Wisdom Regulator: Physics of the “Kill-Switch”

The **V51 Wisdom Intensity Regulator** is perhaps the most significant physics component analyzed in this ablation test. It acts as a thermodynamic “Governor” or “Safety Net,” preventing the simulation from spiraling into a “runaway feedback loop” where infinite moisture supply leads to unphysical wind speeds (Hypercanes).

3.1 The Global Kill-Switch Mechanics

Unlike local viscosity or drag coefficients, the Wisdom Regulator operates on a global scale. It monitors the **single maximum wind speed** (V_{max}) anywhere in the 3D domain.[1] This authority ensures that if *any* part of the eyewall breaches physical limits, the energy supply for the *entire* system is throttled.

- **Thresholds:**
 - **Braking Threshold** (T_{start}): 80.0 m/s (~155 kts).
 - **Hard Cap** (T_{cap}): 95.0 m/s (~185 kts).[1]
- **The Dampening Formula:** The regulator calculates a scalar dampening factor D using linear interpolation: This factor D is then clipped to the range [0.0, 1.0] and applied multiplicatively to the surface flux arrays:

3.2 Chronological Analysis of Regulator Activation

The log provides a frame-by-frame account of this regulator in action, demonstrating a textbook negative feedback loop.

Frame	Wind (kts)	Wind (m/s)	Dampening (D)	Flux Cut	Status
13000	153.9	~79.1	1.00	0%	Inactive
13100	158.0	~81.2	0.92	8%	ACTIVATED
13500	163.1	~83.9	0.74	26%	Throttling
14000	166.8	~85.8	0.58	42%	Heavy Braking
18200	170.1	~87.5	0.50	50%	Equilibrium

- **Analysis:**
 - **Activation Point:** The regulator engages exactly between Frame 13000 and 13100, as the wind speed crosses the 155 kt (~ 80 m/s) threshold. This validates the code logic.
 - **Equilibrium State:** From Frame 18000 onwards, the storm settles into a steady intensity of **169–170 kts**. At this speed (~ 87.5 m/s), the dampening factor is exactly **0.50**.
 - **Physical Interpretation:** The storm has reached a state where the energy input (throttled to 50% of potential) exactly matches the frictional dissipation of a 170-knot vortex. Without this regulator, the “Pure Physics” mode—feeding on 29°C water with no shear—would have continued to intensify the storm well beyond 200 kts, likely violating the CFL condition and crashing the solver.

3.3 The “Hypercane” Prevention

The log clearly demonstrates the necessity of the V51 patch. In “Pure Physics” mode, the environment assumes an infinite ocean heat content (OHC). Real hurricanes degrade their own fuel supply by churning up cold water (upwelling). The static basin in V5.2 cannot model upwelling. Therefore, the Wisdom Regulator acts as a **synthetic upwelling parameterization**, artificially reducing the enthalpy flux at high wind speeds to mimic the self-limiting nature of real-world hurricanes. The stabilization at 170 kts—while high—is physically plausible for a “Maximum Potential Intensity” (MPI) event, proving the regulator successfully enforces physical realism in an idealized environment.

4 Physical Fidelity vs. Historical Reality

A central objective of this report is to contrast the simulation’s “Pure Physics” evolution with the documented history of Hurricane Hugo. This comparison reveals a stark divergence: the simulation models the *physics* of a hurricane correctly, but fails to capture the *meteorological timeline* of the specific 1989 event.

4.1 Genesis: The “Gaussian” Shortcut

- **Historical Record:** Hugo originated as a messy cluster of thunderstorms (a tropical wave) off the coast of Africa on September 9th. It struggled against dry air and shear, taking **two full days** (until Sept 11) to become a Tropical Storm and **four days** (until Sept 13) to become a Hurricane.[2, 3]
- **Simulation Data:** The log shows the storm initializing at **48.3 kts** (Tropical Storm strength) at Frame 0.
- **Analysis:** The “Gaussian Soft Start” initialization [1] bypasses the genesis struggle. By injecting a pre-formed, mathematically coherent vortex, the simulation skips the complex process of “axisymmetrization” (organizing scattered convection into a ring). This creates a “turbocharged” start, placing the simulated storm days ahead of its historical counterpart in terms of structure.

4.2 Intensification: The Time Compression

The discrepancy in intensification rates is profound.

Table 1: Historical vs. Simulated Intensification

Milestone	Historical (UTC)	Duration	Sim Frame	Sim Time	Discrepancy
Genesis	Sept 10, 12:00	0 hrs	Frame 0	0 hrs	Exact Match
TS Strength	Sept 11, 18:00	+30 hrs	Frame 0	0 hrs	Instant
Cat 1 (64kt)	Sept 13, 12:00	+72 hrs	Frame 6100	~3.4 hrs	+68 hrs Fast
Cat 3 (96kt)	Sept 14, 18:00	+102 hrs	Frame 8600	~4.8 hrs	+97 hrs Fast
Cat 5 (137kt)	Sept 15, 18:00	+126 hrs	Frame 11100	~6.2 hrs	+120 hrs Fast

- **Analysis:** The simulation compresses **5 days** of real-world intensification into roughly **6 hours** of simulation time.
- **Causes:**

- Pure Physics Mode:** By disabling the Oracle, the simulation removes the **environmental inhibitors** (wind shear, Saharan Air Layer, dry air intrusion) that slowed Hugo's real-world growth.
- Idealized Thermodynamics:** The simulation feeds on pristine 29°C SSTs from the start [1], whereas the real Hugo traversed gradients of ocean heat content.
- No Eyewall Cycles:** Real storms undergo Eyewall Replacement Cycles (ERC) that temporarily halt intensification. The simulated vortex, being mathematically ideal, likely maintains a single, tightening eyewall without interruption.

4.3 Peak Intensity: The “Defiant Core”

- **Historical Peak:** 140 kts (160 mph) sustained winds, 918 mb pressure, achieved on Sept 15 east of the Leeward Islands.[4, 5]
- **Simulation Peak: 170.1 kts** (Frame 18100).[1]
- **Comparison:** The simulation overshoots the historical peak by \sim 30 knots.
- **Interpretation:** This overshoot is consistent with “Maximum Potential Intensity” (MPI) theory. The real Hugo was limited by environmental interactions. The simulated Hugo represents the “Platonic Ideal” of the storm—the maximum intensity thermodynamically possible given the Sea Surface Temperatures and atmospheric profile. The “Defiant Core” logic [1] keeps this structure intact even as it drifts, demonstrating that the fluid dynamics solver is capable of sustaining extreme gradients that real-world friction often erodes.

5 Core Solver Analysis: Numerical Stability

The log provides crucial insights into the stability of the numerical methods underpinning the V5.2 engine.

5.1 Cayley Coriolis Transform

The simulation employs the **Cayley Transform** for the Coriolis terms ($f \times \mathbf{u}$) in the momentum equation.

- **The Problem:** Standard time-integration schemes (like Leapfrog or Forward Euler) often introduce “energy drift” when handling rotational forces, causing the system to artificially gain or lose kinetic energy over thousands of steps.[6]
- **The Solution:** The Cayley Transform maps the skew-symmetric Coriolis matrix to an orthogonal rotation matrix, ensuring that the rotation vector preserves magnitude exactly ($|\mathbf{u}_{t+1}| = |\mathbf{u}_t|$).
- **Evidence:** The log consistently reports: [INFO] Cayley Coriolis: KE conservation error = 0.00e+00.[1] This zero-error metric at Frame 1900 confirms the solver is **perfectly energy-conserving** regarding planetary rotation. This is a critical validation for long-duration climate modeling.

5.2 Smagorinsky Turbulence Closure

The log tracks the **Smagorinsky Viscosity** statistics.

- **Range:** min=1.15e-20 to max=4.42e-02.[1]

- **Analysis:** This massive dynamic range (spanning 18 orders of magnitude) indicates a highly responsive turbulence model.
 - **Low Viscosity** (10^{-20}): In the laminar flow regions (far from the storm), the viscosity is effectively zero, minimizing numerical diffusion and preserving the large-scale steering flow.
 - **High Viscosity** (10^{-2}): In the eyewall, where shear gradients ($|S|$) are extreme, the viscosity spikes to dissipate energy at the grid scale.[1]
- **Conclusion:** The solver successfully balances stability and accuracy, applying dissipation only where physically required by the turbulence cascade.

5.3 Cubic Advection (ADV3)

The filename PURE_ADV3 indicates the use of **Order 3 (Cubic) Advection**.

- **Significance:** Lower-order advection (Order 1 Linear) acts like a low-pass filter, blurring sharp gradients. This would artificially weaken the eyewall.[1]
- **Observation:** The ability of the simulation to maintain a 170-knot peak intensity suggests that the cubic interpolation successfully preserved the sharp velocity gradients of the eyewall without “smearing” the vortex core.

6 Log Anomalies and Failure Modes

While the physics held, the simulation eventually degraded due to boundary conditions.

6.1 Soft Beach Energy Leak

The log tracks **Soft Beach: Edge KE**.

- **Progression:**
 - Frame 0: $1.70\text{e-}09$ (Negligible).
 - Frame 13900: $9.21\text{e-}04$.
 - Frame 24900: $5.11\text{e-}03$ (Significant Rise).
- **Analysis:** This metric measures the kinetic energy hitting the “Sponge Layer” at the domain boundaries. The exponential rise confirms that the storm, steered by the ERA5 winds, physically migrated across the static basin. By Frame 24900, the outer circulation was impinging on the boundary, forcing the sponge to absorb energy to prevent wave reflection.

6.2 The Track/Structure Divergence

The most telling anomaly is the divergence between **lock_track** and **lock_struct** in the final 5,000 frames.

- **Insight:** The **lock_struct** score never collapses. It stays near 0.80 even as the navigation score hits 0.01. This proves the “**Defiant Core**” phenomenon: the simulated hurricane remained physically intact and structurally coherent even as it drifted into the “Corner Rejection” zone. The failure was not in the *storm’s* physics, but in the *simulation’s* inability to move the camera (Nest Advection) to keep up with it.

Table 2: Tracking Metric Divergence

Frame	Lock Track (Nav)	Lock Struct (Coh)	Interpretation
5000	0.75	0.82	Healthy & Centered
15000	0.02	0.80	Healthy but Drifting
24600	0.01	0.78	Healthy but Rejected

7 Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 Synthesis

The **Oracle V5.2 Hugo Simulation** is a technical triumph of **fluid dynamics** but a representation of **potential** rather than **history**.

1. **Tracker Robustness:** The **V50 Gemini Tracker** proved exceptionally robust. The “Cooldown” fix [1] successfully navigated the “Cold Start Paradox,” and the “Dual Lock” architecture allowed the system to distinguish between a healthy storm and a navigational error.
2. **Regulator Efficacy:** The **V51 Wisdom Regulator** performed exactly as designed.[1] It identified a “Hypercane” event (155+ kts) and successfully clamped the intensity at a physical ceiling (170 kts) by throttling fluxes, preventing numerical runaway.
3. **Timeline Failure:** The simulation failed to replicate the historical timeline of Hurricane Hugo. The “Gaussian Soft Start” and “Pure Physics” mode combined to create a “perfect storm” scenario that intensified 10x faster than reality.

7.2 Recommendations for V5.3

To bridge the gap between this “Surgical Strike” physics test and a realistic historical reconstruction:

1. **Enable Adaptive Mesh Refinement (AMR):** The **AMRHandler** must be active even in “Pure Physics” mode to allow the nest to follow the storm. This will prevent the “Corner Rejection” and “Soft Beach” energy leaks observed after Frame 20000.
2. **Environmental Drag Injection:** The initialization must include realistic vertical wind shear or dry air layers. The current “vacuum” environment allows for unrealistic intensification rates.
3. **Cold Start Tuning:** The “Gaussian Soft Start” is too efficient. A “noisier” initialization—perhaps seeding random vorticity perturbations rather than a coherent ring—would force the model to undergo a realistic “axisymmetrization” period, better matching the 2-day genesis delay observed in 1989.

8 Appendix: Simulation Data Tables

8.1 V51 Wisdom Regulator Activation Profile

Data extracted from console log `console_v5_2_PURE_ADV3_SPG3_HUGO_1989.log`.

Frame	Wind (kts)	Dampening	Flux Cut %	Saffir-Simpson
13,000	153.9	1.00	0%	Category 4

13,100	158.0	0.92	8%	Category 5
13,300	160.5	0.83	17%	Category 5
13,500	163.1	0.74	26%	Category 5
14,000	166.8	0.58	42%	Category 5
18,100	170.1	0.50	50%	Category 5
25,500	162.7	0.74	26%	Category 5

8.2 Tracking Stability Metrics

Comparing Tracking Lock (Navigation) vs. Structural Coherence (Integrity).

Frame	Phase	Lock Track	Lock Struct	Offset (Cells)	Note
0	Genesis	0.81	0.78	0.5	Excellent Cold Start
5,000	Intensification	0.75	0.82	2.8	Stable
10,000	RI	0.35	0.88	14.5	Drift Begins
15,000	Peak	0.02	0.80	32.6	Lock Failing
24,000	Drift	0.01	0.81	39.5	Critical Drift
24,600	Boundary	0.01	0.78	40.0	CORNER REJECTION