

**THE CALIBRATION OF A COLLECTION MEDIUM FOR
THE DETERMINATION OF PARTICLE VELOCITY**

PROJECT THOR TECHNICAL REPORT No. 50

JULY 1962

**Ballistic Analysis Laboratory
Institute for Cooperative Research
The Johns Hopkins University
3506 Greenway
Baltimore 18, Maryland**

**Contract DA-36-034-ORD-29RD
Philadelphia Ordnance District**

**Ordnance Research and Development Project No. TB3-0238
Department of the Army Project No. DA5B03-05-010**

**Ballistic Research Laboratories
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
Abstract	v
Introduction	1
The Collecting Medium.	5
Fragment Materials And Types	6
Empirical Relationships.	13
Fragment Deformation And Break-Up.	16
Results.	28
Summary.	41
Appendix I Characteristics Of Experimental Data	49
Appendix II Fragment Retardation In Air.	61
Distribution List.	71

LIST OF TABLES

Page No.

Table I	Other Ballistic Analysis Laboratory Reports On Studies Of The Perforation Of Target Materials By Fragments And Projectiles.	2
Table II	Characteristics Of Plastic Fragments.	8
Table III	Characteristics Of Magnesium Alloy Fragments.	9
Table IV	Characteristics Of Aluminum Alloy Fragments	10
Table V	Characteristics Of Steel Fragments.	11
Table VI	Characteristics Of Tungsten Alloy Fragments	12
Table VII	Observations Of Recovered Plastic Fragments After Penetration Of Maftex	18
Table VIII	Observations Of Recovered Magnesium Alloy Fragments After Penetration Of Maftex	19
Table IX	Observations Of Recovered Aluminum Alloy Fragments After Penetration Of Maftex	20
Table X	Observations Of Recovered Steel Fragments After Penetration Of Maftex	21
Table XI	Observations Of Recovered Tungsten Alloy Fragments After Penetration Of Maftex	22
Table XII	Goodness Of Fit Of The Master Estimating Equation . . .	43
Table XIII	Characteristics Of Experimental Data; Plastic Fragments	50
Table XIV	Characteristics Of Experimental Data; Magnesium Alloy Fragments	51
Table XV	Characteristics Of Experimental Data; Aluminum Alloy Fragments.	52-53
Table XVI	Characteristics Of Experimental Data; Steel Fragments	54-58
Table XVII	Characteristics Of Experimental Data; Tungsten Alloy Fragments.	59-60

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Page No.</u>
Figure 1 Percentage Of Weight Lost During Maftex Penetration; Plastic Fragments.	23
Figure 2 Percentage Of Weight Lost During Maftex Penetration; Magnesium Alloy Fragments	24
Figure 3 Percentage Of Weight Lost During Maftex Penetration; Aluminum Alloy Fragments.	25
Figure 4 Percentage Of Weight Lost During Maftex Penetration; Steel Fragments	26
Figure 5 Percentage Of Weight Lost During Maftex Penetration; Tungsten Alloy Fragments.	27
Figure 6 Variation Of f Values With Fragment Density	34
Figure 7 Steel Fragments vs Maftex, $\theta = 0^\circ$	35
Figure 8 Steel Fragments vs Maftex, $\theta = 30^\circ$	36
Figure 9 Steel Fragments vs Maftex, $\theta = 45^\circ$	37
Figure 10 Steel Fragments vs Maftex, $\theta = 60^\circ$	38
Figure 11 Steel Fragments vs Maftex, $\theta = 70^\circ$	39
Figure 12 Depth Of Penetration Into Maftex Along Line Of Travel vs $(mV^4)^{1/3}$	40
Figure 13 Variation Of Percent Error In Velocity Estimates For 1000 fps Intervals In Velocity; Plastic Fragments	44
Figure 14 Variation Of Percent Error In Velocity Estimates For 1000 fps Intervals In Velocity; Magnesium Alloy Fragments	45
Figure 15 Variation Of Percent Error In Velocity Estimates For 1000 fps Intervals In Velocity; Aluminum Alloy Fragments.	46
Figure 16 Variation Of Percent Error In Velocity Estimates For 1000 fps Intervals In Velocity; Steel Fragments	47
Figure 17 Variation Of Percent Error In Velocity Estimates For 1000 fps Intervals In Velocity; Tungsten Alloy Fragments.	48

LIST OF FIGURES (CONT)

	<u>Page No.</u>
Figure 18 Retardation For Plastic Fragments In Air	65
Figure 19 Retardation For Magnesium Alloy Fragments In Air	66
Figure 20 Retardation For Aluminum Alloy Fragments In Air	67
Figure 21 Retardation For Steel Fragments In Air	68
Figure 22 Retardation For Tungsten Alloy Fragments In Air	69

ABSTRACT

Previous investigations dealing with efforts to calibrate various media for the determination of particle velocity were usually restricted to steel particles impacting at normal obliquity with velocities up to 4000 feet per second. The present report provides a useful calibration of a medium for estimating particle velocities over a broad range of particle sizes, velocities, materials, and obliquities of strike.

Compact fragments of plastic, magnesium alloy, aluminum alloy, steel, and tungsten alloy have been used in single-fragment firings on a particular variety of fiberboard at the Ballistic Research Laboratories to produce the needed experimental data. A single empirical formula has been fitted to the data, relating striking velocity to the impact parameters of thickness of medium penetrated, angle of obliquity of strike, particle size, and presented area.

An effort has also been made to determine limiting impact conditions for each fragment material for which the fragment will remain essentially intact during the penetration. Whenever the fragment breaks up or deforms excessively during the penetration, the velocity estimates are no longer valid.

INTRODUCTION

For several years, this laboratory has been participating in programs sponsored by the Weapon Systems Laboratory, Ballistic Research Laboratories (BRL), to supply information for vulnerability analysts and weapons designers on the resistance of various materials to perforation by fragments and projectiles. The bulk of the experimental data has been provided by BRL. Several reports have been published on the analyses of such data; the identification of these reports is given in Table I.

The present report describes a method for estimating the velocity of a particle on the basis of the extent of its penetration into an appropriate collecting medium.

The velocity of an isolated particle can be measured satisfactorily by any of several conventional techniques. The situation is complicated when several particles are moving together at different velocities. Such a situation is encountered, for example, when a target material is hit by a fragment and large numbers of particles of target material and fragment material issue forth from the back surface of the target material. By collecting these particles in a soft medium, it becomes possible to describe the weight, velocity, and spatial patterns or distributions of the particles. A knowledge of such characteristics leads to a more complete resolution of the effects of the initial impact.

In low velocity impacts the main result of the impact, when perforation is achieved, is usually one large particle of fragment origin. Several small particles of target origin may also be formed but their low velocity combined with their low mass suggest a negligible damage potential.

High velocity impacts are characterized by some break-up of the

TABLE I

Other Ballistic Analysis Laboratory Reports on Studies of the Perforation
of Target Materials by Fragments and Projectiles

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Classification</u>
14	Sept. 1954	A Suggested Technique for Predicting the Performance of Armor-Piercing Projectiles Acting on Rolled Homogeneous Armor (U)	C
25	July 1956	A Comparison of Various Materials in Their Resistance to Perforation by Steel Fragments; Empirical Relationships (U)	C
36	April 1958	A Study of Residual Velocity Data for Steel Fragments Impacting on Four Materials; Empirical Relationships (U)	C
41	May 1959	A Comparison of the Performance of Fragments of Four Materials Impacting on Various Plates (U)	C
44	Jan. 1960	The Resistance of Two Nose-Cone Materials to Perforation by Steel Fragments; Empirical Relationships for Fragment Residual Velocity and Residual Weight (U)	S
47	April 1961	The Resistance of Various Metallic Materials to Perforation by Steel Fragments; Empirical Relationships for Fragment Residual Velocity and Residual Weight (U)	C

fragment on impact and the formation of many particles. Here, the damage potential of the particles formed from the impact can no longer be expressed in terms of the damage potential of a single particle. Furthermore, the particles are more numerous and several particles may have sufficient mass and velocity to warrant consideration as lethal agents.

Several materials have been tried out as collecting media. Some issues that are of importance in the choice of such materials are 1) availability, 2) cost, 3) quality control (product standardization), and 4) feasibility for experimental purpose. When a collecting medium stops a fast-moving particle, there is, inevitably, some abrasion, deformation, or even some disintegration of the particle. For laboratory purposes, the medium must offer sufficient resistance to the moving particle that it will stop the particle within a convenient thickness of the medium. Usually, the less dense the medium, the greater the thickness that is required to stop a given, moving particle. Some compromise is needed in the selection of the medium in regard to density and those characteristics of the medium which influence the effects on the particle during the penetration. Styrofoam, for example, is a low density material which appears to be capable of stopping particles with negligible effects on the particle shape and weight, but for particles of high velocity and/or large weight, the thickness required is prohibitive in many laboratory facilities for space reasons. On the other hand, soft metals like aluminum or magnesium might be considered, but even soft metals will punish the particle excessively during the "capture" of the particle.

Whenever the fragment deforms or breaks up appreciably during the penetration of the collecting medium, the fragment's performance deteriorates, i.e., the fragment does not penetrate the collecting medium as far as would

be expected on the basis of results of other impacts. The basic assumption in the determination of an empirical fit is that the faster a given particle, the deeper it will penetrate the collecting medium. To retain the validity of this assumption, it is therefore necessary to weed out from the data samples cases where the fragment has either deformed or broken up extensively.

THE COLLECTING MEDIUM

Maftex was chosen as the collecting medium to be calibrated. It is a type of insulation board manufactured by MacAndrews and Forbes Co., Camden, New Jersey. The dimensions of standard production sheets are 4 feet by 8 feet by 1/2 inch. Thinner sheets of 5/16 inch are also available.

The approximate composition of this material is 40 to 50% plant root fiber (such as specially processed and defibrated licorice root), 30 to 40% coniferous wood fiber, 20 to 30% refined wood pulp, and sufficient asphalt to offer water resistance and strength.

Some physical characteristics of this material are a) moisture, 4 to 8%, b) density, 15 to 17 lb/ft³, c) tensile strength, 200 to 300 lb/in², and d) absorption, 2 to 5% by volume.

Production sheets are cut into convenient sizes (usually 4 by 4 feet) and stacked for laboratory use. For a given impact condition, the pack is always thicker than necessary to halt the particle. After each firing, that portion of the pack which has not been damaged by the firing is removed for use in another pack.

Care should be exercised in the storage of Maftex so that the moisture content remains relatively constant.

FRAGMENT MATERIALS AND TYPES

Cylindrical and spherical pre-formed fragments of five materials have been used in single-shot firings at BRL to produce the experimental data. The fragment materials chosen for the experimental work are Lexan, a magnesium alloy designated AZ31 B, aluminum alloy 2024T-4, steel, and Mallory 3000.

Lexan is a polycarbonate manufactured by General Electric. It has a density of about 75 lb/ft³. Lexan is representative of several plastics which have been found useful for various Ordnance applications.

Magnesium alloy, aluminum alloy, and steel are typical structural materials in military targets. The densities are 113, 165, and 490 lb/ft³, respectively.

Mallory 3000 is a tungsten alloy containing 7% iron and 3% nickel. It has a hardness of 24 on the Rockwell C scale. Its density is approximately 1061 lb/ft³. High density materials are receiving much attention for certain military requirements.

When a structural material is struck by a fragment and the rear surface is damaged, particles of the target material emanate from the rear surface. These particles, in many cases, have a considerable capacity for damage in their own right.

These five fragment materials span a wide range in density. They represent several classes of materials which have some significance, directly or indirectly, for the consideration of military targets.

The weights, dimensions, and average presented areas (assuming random orientation in flight) of all fragments used in the experimental work are presented in Tables II-VI. A fragment shape factor, c , has been determined for each fragment material, by averaging the ratios of the average presented

area to the two-thirds power of the fragment weight for each fragment of that material. The constancy of the individual values of c within a target material is consistent with the comment, previously made, that the fragments were designed to be essentially homologous. Some fluctuation is expected since one must adapt the fragment designs to accommodate the gun facilities available.

Table II
Characteristics of Plastic Fragments

Weight m (grains)	Shape	Radius (inches)	Length (inches)	Average Presented area A (sq. in.)	$c = \frac{A}{\frac{2}{3}m}$
0.10	cylinder	.0375	.075	.00663	.03078
0.25	cylinder	.0500	.104	.01210	.03049
1	cylinder	.0800	.166	.03091	.03091
5	cylinder	.1495	.232	.09194	.03144
10	cylinder	.1995	.260	.14399	.03102
15	cylinder	.1995	.390	.18473	.03037
30	cylinder	.2495	.498	.29295	.03034
60	cylinder	.2940	.739	.47705	.03113
120	cylinder	.3440	1.054	.75541	.03105

Average value of shape factor, c , is 0.0308

Table III

Characteristics of Magnesium Alloy Fragments

Weight m (grains)	Shape	Radius (inches)	Length (inches)	Average Presented Area A (sq. in.)	$c = \frac{A}{\frac{2}{3}m}$
0.10	cylinder	.0325	.066	.00598	.02776
0.25	cylinder	.0450	.086	.01108	.02792
1	cylinder	.0750	.124	.02849	.02849
5	cylinder	.1165	.256	.08034	.02748
10	cylinder	.1495	.312	.12841	.02767
15	cylinder	.1995	.263	.18062	.02970
30	cylinder	.2495	.335	.28488	.02951
60	cylinder	.2740	.485	.39399	.02571
120	cylinder	.3445	.705	.67434	.02772
240	cylinder	.3445	1.410	1.05584	.02734

Average value of shape factor, c, is 0.0279

Table IV

Characteristics of Aluminum Alloy Fragments

Weight m (grains)	Shape	Radius (inches)	Length (inches)	Average Presented Area A (sq. in.)	$c = \frac{A}{\frac{2}{3}m}$
0.10	cylinder	.0315	.053	.00418	.01941
0.25	cylinder	.0390	.078	.00717	.01807
1.0	cylinder	.0625	.122	.01811	.01811
5	cylinder	.1165	.176	.05353	.01831
10	cylinder	.1165	.351	.08555	.01843
15	cylinder	.1495	.320	.11025	.01812
30	cylinder	.1995	.359	.17502	.01813
60	cylinder	.2495	.459	.27767	.01811
120	cylinder	.2935	.663	.44098	.01812
240	cylinder	.3445	.962	.70700	.01830

Average value of shape factor, c, is 0.0183

Table V
Characteristics of Steel Fragments

Weight m (grains)	Shape	Radius (inches)	Length (inches)	Average Presented Area A (sq. in.)	$c = \frac{A}{\frac{2}{3}m}$
.05	cylinder	.016	.032	.0012	.0088
.10	cylinder	.020	.040	.00186	.0086
.215	sphere	.031	----	.00302	.00841
.250	cylinder	.028	.054	.00352	.00887
0.825	sphere	.047	----	.00679	.00772
1.0	cylinder	.047	.075	.0090	.0090
2	sphere	.062	----	.01227	.00773
5	cylinder	.075	.145	.0257	.0088
6.75	sphere	.094	----	.02761	.00773
10	cylinder	.075	.290	.0427	.0092
15	cylinder	.117	.180	.0549	.0090
30	cylinder	.150	.213	.0852	.0088
60	cylinder	.200	.243	.1388	.0091
120	cylinder	.250	.313	.2206	.0091
240	cylinder	.294	.450	.3430	.0089
475	cylinder	.345	.659	.5433	.0087

Average value of shape factor, c, is 0.0088

Table VI
Characteristics of Tungsten Alloy Fragments

Weight m (grains)	Shape	Radius (inches)	Length (inches)	Average Presented Area A (sq. in.)	$c = \frac{A}{2/3 m}$
0.10	cylinder	.016	.029	.0011	.0051
0.25	cylinder	.021	.042	.0021	.0053
1.00	cylinder	.040	.051	.0057	.0057
5.00	cylinder	.063	.094	.0155	.0053
10	cylinder	.0745	.134	.0244	.00526
15	cylinder	.0745	.201	.0322	.0053
30	cylinder	.1165	.162	.0510	.00528
60	cylinder	.1495	.199	.0819	.00534
120	cylinder	.1995	.225	.1321	.00543
240	cylinder	.2495	.287	.2099	.00544

Average value of shape factor, c, is 0.0054

EMPIRICAL RELATIONSHIPS

A single empirical equation of the form

$$V = k e^{\alpha} m^{\beta} (\sec \theta)^{\gamma} A^{\lambda}$$

was selected to fit the experimental data for all the fragment materials.

In this equation,

V is the fragment striking velocity in fps,

e is the thickness in inches of Maftex penetrated, measured along the normal to the surface of the Maftex,

m is the weight of the fragment in grains,

θ is the angle between the trajectory of the fragment and the normal to the surface of the Maftex,

A is the average presented area of the fragment in square inches, and

k, α , β , γ and λ are constants determined for the equation by the Method of Least Squares,

The values of these constants which specify the equation are to be found in the Results Section.

The exponential form of this equation is simple, practical, and includes the vital impact parameters. The form has the additional merit of being convertible into a corresponding logarithmic form, useful for its linearity.

The goodness of fit of the estimating equation is given in terms of the values of b' and σ , defined below. If $(\Delta V)_i$ is the difference between the experimental result and the formula prediction (in that order) for the i-th set of N sets of experimental conditions, then

$$b = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (\Delta V)_i}{N}$$

and

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (\Delta V)_i^2}{N}$$

It is understood that the final selection of the set of constants for the estimating equation is made to correspond with the lowest obtainable value of σ . It is also desirable for the value of b associated with the estimating equation to be close to zero.

The following method is employed to obtain an empirical formula for estimating particle velocity on the basis of depth of penetration into Maftex. The basic formula is converted into the associated logarithmic form:

$$\log V = \mu + \alpha \log e + \beta \log m + \gamma \log \sec \theta + \lambda \log A .$$

With this linear form, the method of least squares is employed to determine a satisfactory set of values μ , α , β , γ , and λ which specify the logarithmic equation given above and the original, related equation as well.

Admittedly, this procedure minimizes S , defined below, rather than σ .

$$S^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (\log V_i^* - \log V_i)^2}{N} .$$

Note that V^* refers to the particle velocity as calculated by the formula, whereas V is the particle velocity determined experimentally for the same set of impact conditions.

The form of the estimating equation is but slightly different from the forms used in earlier reports.

The values of b and σ for each fragment material are given in Table XII of the Summary Section. That section also contains a series of graphs showing for each fragment material the variations with velocity of the percentage of error in the velocity estimates.

The characteristics of the experimental data are shown in Appendix I.

FRAGMENT DEFORMATION AND BREAK-UP

For each combination of fragment material and collecting medium, there seems to be a limit, probably expressible in terms of fragment velocity, below which the fragments remain essentially intact during the penetration of the medium. Above this limit, the fragment is likely to break up or deform to the extent that the fragment's performance becomes unpredictable.

To determine these limits, the fragments were recovered after impact on Maftex and examined for changes in shape and weight. A decision was given on the basis of a visual examination as to whether the fragment was essentially intact, moderately deformed, or seriously deformed. In addition, each recovered fragment was weighed to determine the loss in weight during the penetration of the medium. From these results it appears that a velocity can be established for each fragment material, under which the fragment (independent of its size) can be expected to penetrate Maftex with negligible effects on its shape and weight. These velocities are presented in the following chart.

<u>Fragment Material</u>	<u>Maximum Velocity</u>
Plastic	4200
Magnesium Alloy	5500
Aluminum Alloy	8500
Steel	10000
Tungsten Alloy	8000

Tables and graphs follow to sustain the selection of these velocities as cut-offs beyond which the velocity estimates as determined from the master estimating equation are probably unreliable since the collecting medium, Maftex, is expected to damage the fragment.

For higher velocities, the calibration of a softer collecting medium such as styrofoam might be useful. It is presumed that with any collecting medium, if the velocities are sufficiently high, the fragment will deform or break up during the penetration. Maftex appears to be a satisfactory medium for metallic fragment materials as long as the striking velocity is actually less than 5000 fps. For fragment materials of high tensile strength such as steel, it appears that velocities up to 10000 fps can be tolerated with this technique.

Table VII
Observations of Recovered Plastic Fragments After
Penetration of Maftex

<u>Striking Velocity (fps)</u>	<u>Fragment Essentially Intact</u>	<u>Fragment Moderately Deformed</u>	<u>Fragment Badly Deformed</u>
< 2000	ψ ψ ∂ ∂ ∂ *		
2000 to 3000	Δ Δ ∂ ∂		
3000 to 4000	ψ ∂ *	Δ ψ ψ ψ	∂
4000 to 5000	*	∂	ψ
5000 to 6000			Δ ∂ ∂ ∂ * *
6000 to 7000			*
7000 to 8000			∂
8000 to 9000			
9000 to 10000			
> 10000			

Code

∅: $.01 \leq m < .10$

Δ: $.10 \leq m < 1.0$

ψ: $1.0 \leq m < 10$

∂: $10 \leq m < 100$

*: $100 \leq m < 10000$

m: fragment weight
(grains)

Table VIII
Observations of Recovered Magnesium Alloy Fragments
After Penetration of Maftex

<u>Striking Velocity (fps)</u>	<u>Fragment Essentially Intact</u>	<u>Fragment Moderately Deformed</u>	<u>Fragment Badly Deformed</u>
< 2000	ψ ∂ ∂ *		
2000 to 3000	Δ ψ *		
3000 to 4000	Δ		
4000 to 5000	ψ ψ ∂ ∂ ∂	Δ	
5000 to 6000	* *	ψ ψ	
6000 to 7000	∂ ∂		
7000 to 8000		∂	∂
8000 to 9000			
9000 to 10000			
> 10000			

Code

∅: $.01 \leq m < .10$

Δ: $.10 \leq m < 1.0$

ψ: $1.0 \leq m < 10$

∂: $10 \leq m < 100$

*: $100 \leq m < 1000$

m: fragment weight
(grains)

Table IX
Observations of Recovered Aluminum Alloy Fragments
After Penetration of Maftex

<u>Striking Velocity (fps)</u>	<u>Fragment Essentially Intact</u>	<u>Fragment Moderately Deformed</u>	<u>Fragment Badly Deformed</u>
< 2000	Δ Δ Δ ψ ψ ψ ψ ∂		
2000 to 3000	Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ ψ ψ ψ ψ ∂		
3000 to 4000	Δ Δ ψ ∂ ∂ ∂		
4000 to 5000	∂ ∂ *	Δ	
5000 to 6000			
6000 to 7000	*		
7000 to 8000	*		∂
8000 to 9000			
9000 to 10000			∂
> 10000			∂

Code

∅: $.01 \leq m < .10$

Δ: $.10 \leq m < 1.0$

ψ: $1.0 \leq m < 10$

∂: $10 \leq m < 100$

*: $100 \leq m < 1000$

m: fragment weight
(grains)

Table X
Observations of Recovered Steel Fragments After
Penetration of Maftex

<u>Striking Velocity (fps)</u>	<u>Fragment Essentially Intact</u>	<u>Fragment Moderately Deformed</u>	<u>Fragment Badly Deformed</u>
< 2000	Δ Δ Δ Δ		
2000 to 3000	∅ Δ Δ Δ Δ		
3000 to 4000	∅ Δ Δ Δ Δ		
4000 to 5000	∅		
5000 to 6000	*		
6000 to 7000	Δ *		
7000 to 8000	Δ ∂		
8000 to 9000			
9000 to 10000	Δ	Δ Δ ∂	
> 10000	Δ Δ ∂ ∂		

Code

∅: $.01 \leq m < .10$

Δ: $.10 \leq m < 1.0$

ψ: $1.0 \leq m < 10$

∂: $10 \leq m < 100$

*: $100 \leq m < 1000$

m: fragment weight
(grains)

Table XI
Observations of Recovered Tungsten Alloy Fragments
After Penetration of Maftex

<u>Striking Velocity (fps)</u>	<u>Fragment Essentially Intact</u>	<u>Fragment Moderately Deformed</u>	<u>Fragment Badly Deformed</u>
< 2000	Δ ψ ψ ∂		
2000 to 3000	Δ Δ Δ ψ ψ ψ ∂ *		
3000 to 4000	Δ Δ Δ Δ ψ ψ		
4000 to 5000	Δ Δ ∂ * *		
5000 to 6000	ψ ψ		
6000 to 7000	Δ		
7000 to 8000	Δ		
8000 to 9000			
9000 to 10000	∂	∂ ∂	Δ
> 10000		∂ ψ ψ	ψ

Code

∅: $.01 \leq m < .10$

Δ: $.10 \leq m < 1.0$

ψ: $1.0 \leq m < 10$


∂: $10 \leq m < 100$

*: $100 \leq m < 1000$

m: fragment weight
(grains)

PERCENTAGE OF WEIGHT LOST DURING MAF TEX PENETRATION

Plastic Fragments




LEGEND		
+	m <	0.1
Δ	0.1 ≤ m <	1.0
O	1.0 ≤ m <	10.0
x	10.0 ≤ m <	100.0
∇	100.0 ≤ m	

m: fragment weight
(grains)

Fig. 1

PERCENTAGE OF WEIGHT LOST DURING MAFTEX PENETRATION

Magnesium Alloy Fragments



LEGEND		
+	m <	0.1
Δ	0.1 ≤ m <	1.0
O	1.0 ≤ m <	10.0
x	10.0 ≤ m <	100.0
▽	100.0 ≤ m	

m: fragment weight
(grains)

Fig. 2

PERCENTAGE OF WEIGHT LOST DURING MAFTEX PENETRATION

Steel Fragments




Fig. 4

PERCENTAGE OF WEIGHT LOST DURING MAF TEX PENETRATION

Tungsten Alloy Fragments




Fig. 5

RESULTS

The master estimating equation relating striking velocity to other impact parameters for all five fragment materials is

$$V = 26170 e^{0.736 m^{-0.681} (\sec \theta)^{0.711} A^{0.638}}$$

where symbols and units are defined in the section, EMPIRICAL RELATIONSHIPS.

For each fragment material, a set of pre-formed fragments was designed to be essentially homologous, i.e., the same shape. For each material, it is possible to relate the average presented area of the fragment to the fragment weight by means of the equation: $A = cm^{2/3}$. The average value of c for each fragment material is given below:

<u>Fragment Material</u>	<u>c</u>
Plastic	0.0308
Magnesium Alloy	0.0279
Aluminum Alloy	0.0183
Steel	0.0088
Tungsten Alloy	0.0054

Note that with this type of formula, it is assumed that the difference in performances on Maftex between two fragments of the same weight and shape but of different materials can be accounted for by their different average presented areas. With the weight and shape of fragment fixed, the denser the material, the smaller the average presented area.

By substituting for A, in the master estimating equation, the appropriate function of m for each fragment material, a set of equations is generated.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PLASTIC: } V &= 2838 e^{0.736} m^{-0.255} (\sec \theta)^{0.711} \\
 \text{MAGNESIUM ALLOY: } V &= 2664 e^{0.736} m^{-0.255} (\sec \theta)^{0.711} \\
 \text{ALUMINUM ALLOY: } V &= 2035 e^{0.736} m^{-0.255} (\sec \theta)^{0.711} \\
 \text{STEEL: } V &= 1276 e^{0.736} m^{-0.255} (\sec \theta)^{0.711} \\
 \text{TUNGSTEN ALLOY: } V &= 934 e^{0.736} m^{-0.255} (\sec \theta)^{0.711}
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that these equations vary only in the value of the coefficient. This suggests that the velocity estimate for each material can be given in terms of the velocity estimates for a selected material multiplied by some appropriate ratio or factor. If steel is selected as the standard, then the factor f_v , the ratio of the coefficient for the given material to that for steel, appears in the chart which follows.

By solving each equation in the previous set for e , another useful set of equations is generated.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PLASTIC: } e &= 0.00002044 m^{0.347} V^{1.358} (\cos \theta)^{0.966} \\
 \text{MAGNESIUM ALLOY: } e &= 0.00002228 m^{0.347} V^{1.358} (\cos \theta)^{0.966} \\
 \text{ALUMINUM ALLOY: } e &= 0.00003211 m^{0.347} V^{1.358} (\cos \theta)^{0.966} \\
 \text{STEEL: } e &= 0.00006058 m^{0.347} V^{1.358} (\cos \theta)^{0.966} \\
 \text{TUNGSTEN ALLOY: } e &= 0.00009250 m^{0.347} V^{1.358} (\cos \theta)^{0.966}
 \end{aligned}$$

Again, one notes that the equations in this set vary only in the value of the coefficient. This suggests that the thickness of Maftex that would be penetrated by any fragment material can be given in terms of the thickness of Maftex that would be penetrated by, say, a steel fragment of the same weight, shape, velocity, and angle of obliquity of strike, multiplied by some appropriate factor or ratio. Steel, again, has been selected as the standard, and the factors f_e appear (as well as those for f_v) in the chart below.

f_v	Fragment Material	f_e
2.23	Plastic	0.34
2.09	Magnesium Alloy	0.37
1.60	Aluminum Alloy	0.53
1.00	Steel	1.00
0.73	Tungsten Alloy	1.53

A set of five graphs follows, relating the impact parameters to each other. Each graph applies to a selected value of θ , the angle of obliquity, between 0° and 70° . Whereas these graphs are prepared for steel fragments, it will now be shown how they can be adapted for other fragment materials.

The graphs are useful for the solution of two types of problems. In the first problem, one is given e , m , θ , for a compact fragment of material X. To find the velocity corresponding to these conditions, one determines the velocity for a compact steel particle of the same weight; then this result is multiplied by the factor f_v corresponding to material X.

In the second problem, one is given V , m , θ , for a compact fragment of material X. To find the thickness of Maftex that would be penetrated by such a fragment, one determines the thickness of Maftex that would be penetrated by a compact steel fragment of the same weight; then this result is multiplied by the factor f_e corresponding to the material X.

The density range of the five fragment materials considered in the experimental work is so extensive that the master estimating equation can probably be useful in providing velocity estimates for other fragment materials as well. In Figure 6, the variation of the two sets of f values with fragment

density is shown. Accordingly, the reader can estimate the velocity of a particle of some material not actually under consideration in this report when the density of the material is known.

It should be remembered, however, that all the experimental work was executed with chunky fragments for which the ratio of maximum presented area to minimum presented area was never far removed from unity. Thus, the performance of fragments with the same characteristics do not fluctuate widely under the same firing conditions, providing the fragments are not breaking up or deforming while slowing down in the collecting medium.

In Figures 7-11 which follow, the inner rectangle delineates the conditions which represent the major effort of the experimental work. For example, few firings were made with fragments weighing less than 0.10 grains or with velocities in excess of 12,000 fps.

In using the equations or graphs to estimate particle velocity, the reader is cautioned that these results evolve from isolated or independent firings. One possible source of error is discussed. The user locates two particles in the same general region of the recovery medium, one large and one small. Not realizing that the smaller particle is a splinter particle of the larger one (and had therefore the same velocity on impact as the larger particle), the user might infer that the small particle had a velocity corresponding to that of a small particle which would independently penetrate that much of the collecting medium.

In the set of equations solved for e , the values of the exponents are remarkably close to $1/3$, $4/3$, and 1 respectively. This suggests that the equations might be adjusted to fit the form:

$$e \sec \theta = k' (mV^4)^{1/3}$$

where ($e \sec \theta$) would represent the distance of travel through the Maftex pack along the line of travel. Of course, if there is some particular merit to this alternate form of the equation, one could return to the Least Squares technique and compute a best k' compatible with this form for the experimental data for each fragment material.

For a quick result, a sampling of sets of parameters (e , θ , m , V) for steel fragments was made. The average value of k' where

$$k' = \frac{e \sec \theta}{(mV^4)^{1/3}}$$

corresponding to these sets was found to be 0.000080. If it is assumed that the same set of values for f_e holds for this new form of equation, then a new set of equations of the form

$$e \sec \theta = k' (mV^4)^{1/3}$$

is generated where the value of k' for each fragment material is given in the following chart.

<u>Fragment Material</u>	<u>k'</u>
Plastic	0.000027
Magnesium Alloy	0.000029
Aluminum Alloy	0.000042
Steel	0.000080
Tungsten Alloy	0.000122

One ready advantage of the preceding form of the equation is the linearity of ($e \sec \theta$) with $(mV^4)^{1/3}$. In Figure 12, a single graph displays the estimated variation of depth of Maftex penetration along the line of travel with this particular function of m and V . The ordinate has absorbed the obliquity factor.

The estimates of thickness of Maftex penetrated by a given fragment, as determined by this simplified equation and again as determined from the master estimating equation, are generally in excellent agreement.

For the reader's convenience, the principal set of graphs (Figures 7-11) shows two sets of units, grains and grams, on the abscissa axis and two sets of units, feet per second and meters per second, on the ordinate axis.

VARIATION OF f VALUES WITH FRAGMENT DENSITY

(Compact Fragments)




Fig. 6

STEEL FRAGMENTS vs MAFTEX $\theta = 0^\circ$

f_v	Material	f_e
2.23	Plastic	0.34
2.09	Mg Alloy	0.37
1.60	Al Alloy	0.53
1.00	Steel	1.00
0.73	Tungsten Alloy	1.53

To obtain V for a fragment material other than steel, determine V for a steel particle, and multiply by the value of f_v corresponding to the fragment material in question.

To obtain e for a fragment material other than steel, determine e for a steel particle, and multiply by the value of f_e corresponding to the fragment material in question.




Fig. 7

STEEL FRAGMENTS vs MAFTEX $\theta = 30^\circ$

f_y	Material	f_e
2.23	Plastic	0.34
2.09	Mg Alloy	0.37
1.60	Al Alloy	0.53
1.00	Steel	1.00
0.73	Tungsten Alloy	1.53

To obtain V for a fragment material other than steel, determine V for a steel particle, and multiply by the value of f_y corresponding to the fragment material in question.

To obtain e for a fragment material other than steel, determine e for a steel particle, and multiply by the value of f_e corresponding to the fragment material in question.




Fig. 8

STEEL FRAGMENTS vs MAFTEX

$\theta = 45^\circ$

f_v	Material	f_e
2.23	Plastic	0.34
2.09	Mg Alloy	0.37
1.60	Al Alloy	0.53
1.00	Steel	1.00
0.73	Tungsten Alloy	1.53

To obtain V for a fragment material other than steel, determine V for a steel particle, and multiply by the value of f_v corresponding to the fragment material in question.

To obtain e for a fragment material other than steel, determine e for a steel particle, and multiply by the value of f_e corresponding to the fragment material in question.




Fig. 9

STEEL FRAGMENTS vs MAFTEX

$\theta = 70^\circ$

f_v	Material	f_e
2.23	Plastic	0.34
2.09	Mg Alloy	0.37
1.60	Al Alloy	0.53
1.00	Steel	1.00
0.73	Tungsten Alloy	1.53

To obtain V for a fragment material other than steel, determine V for a steel particle, and multiply by the value of f_v corresponding to the fragment material in question.

To obtain e for a fragment material other than steel, determine e for a steel particle, and multiply by the value of f_e corresponding to the fragment material in question.




Fig. 11

Depth of Penetration into Maftex Along Line of Travel vs $(mV^4)^{1/3}$ (Compact Fragments)




Fig. 12

SUMMARY

A single formula covering several fragment materials has been established to determine particle velocity on the basis of the depth of penetration of the fragment into a variety of fiber board. This formula is:

$$v = 26170 e^{0.736 m^{-0.681}} (\sec \theta)^{0.711} A^{0.638}$$

where the symbols are defined in the section, EMPIRICAL RELATIONSHIPS. By replacing A with $cm^{2/3}$, where c depends on the fragment material, a set of equations is generated, one for each fragment material.

The velocity estimate for a material X can be obtained by multiplying the velocity estimate for steel by f_v , a constant for each material. The estimate of thickness of fiber board that will be penetrated by a fragment of material X can be obtained by multiplying the estimate of thickness of fiber board that will be penetrated by a steel fragment by f_e , a constant for each material.

The values for b and σ (see Empirical Relationships) which describe the goodness of fit of the equation to the experimental data are given below.

For each fragment material a maximum velocity has been established under which the fragment is expected to remain essentially intact upon penetration of the particular medium, Maftex. The equation provided for the estimates of velocity for a given fragment material may not produce reasonable estimates beyond this maximum velocity. Whenever the fragment deforms or breaks up appreciably while penetrating the collecting medium, the fragment does not penetrate as far as would be expected.

Whereas the magnitude of σ serves as an overall criterion for the goodness of fit of the formula to the entire body of data, the magnitude of the errors in the velocity estimates tends to increase with velocity.

The relative errors in the velocity estimates are highest at low velocity. One apparent reason for this is that the basic unit of thickness of Maftex for the experimental work was one sheet or one-half inch. A fragment found in the twentieth sheet of Maftex has penetrated between 9.5 and 10.0 inches of Maftex. No matter which figure is used, the relative error in this measurement will be small. However, a fragment found in the first (half-inch) sheet of Maftex has penetrated a thickness less than 0.5 inches of Maftex and the relative error in this measurement may be large. One technique which will permit better measurements of thickness penetrated is to use thinner pieces of Maftex for the first few sheets of the pack. In addition, an effort should be made to measure each depth of penetration to the nearest half or quarter sheet.

A series of graphs follows showing for each fragment material the variation with velocity of the percentage of error of the velocity estimates.


Table XII

Goodness of Fit of the Master Estimating Equation

<u>Fragment Material</u>	<u>Sample Size N</u>	<u>b (fps)</u>	<u>c (fps)</u>	<u>Maximum Velocity for Estimates (fps)</u>
Plastic	19	-36	678	4200
Magnesium Alloy	16	-231	704	5500
Aluminum Alloy	42	11	819	8500
Steel	136	112	564	10000
Tungsten Alloy	36	-70	814	8000
All	249	36	671	-----

VARIATION OF PERCENT ERROR IN VELOCITY ESTIMATES FOR 1000 FPS INTERVALS IN VELOCITY

Plastic Fragments




- Notes:
- 1) $\bigcirc$ = average percent error in interval
 - 2) $V_{max} = 4200$ fps

Fig. 13

VARIATION OF PERCENT ERROR IN VELOCITY ESTIMATES FOR 1000 FPS INTERVALS IN VELOCITY

Magnesium Alloy Fragments




Notes:

- 1) $\bigcirc$ = average percent error in interval
- 2) $V_{max} = 5500$ fps

Fig. 14

VARIATION OF PERCENT ERROR IN VELOCITY ESTIMATES FOR 1000 FPS INTERVALS IN VELOCITY

Aluminum Alloy Fragments




Notes:

- 1) $\bigcirc$ = average percent error in interval
- 2) $V_{max} = 8500$ fps

Fig. 15

VARIATION OF PERCENT ERROR IN VELOCITY ESTIMATES FOR 1000 FPS INTERVALS IN VELOCITY

Steel Fragments




- Notes:
- 1) $\bigcirc$ = average percent error in interval
 - 2) $V_{max} = 10,000$ fps

Fig. 16

VARIATION OF PERCENT ERROR IN VELOCITY ESTIMATES FOR 1000 FPS INTERVALS IN VELOCITY

Tungsten Alloy Fragments



- Notes:
- 1) $\odot$ = average percent error in interval
 - 2) $V_{max.} = 8000 \text{ fps}$

Fig. 17

APPENDIX I

CHARACTERISTICS OF EXPERIMENTAL DATA

TABLE XIII
Characteristics of Experimental Data

Plastic Fragments

Data No.	<u>m</u> (grains)	<u>θ</u> (degrees)	<u>V</u> (fps)	<u>e</u> (inches)
1	0.25	0	2600	0.75
2	0.25	70	2900	0.25
3*	0.93	60	5314	0.25
4	0.99	0	4105	1.25
5	1.0	0	1950	0.75
6	1.0	0	3000	1.25
7	1.0	70	3500	0.7
8*	1.0	0	4635	1.0
9	5.0	0	1350	1.5
10	5.0	0	3800	2.5
11	5.0	70	3400	1.0
12	15.0	0	1800	3.0
13	15.0	0	3750	3.0
14	15.0	70	2500	0.7
15	15.0	70	2500	1.0
16	15.0	70	3800	1.0
17*	15.0	0	5800	2.5
18*	15.35	0	5000	2.25
19*	15.5	0	7150	3.0
20	30.0	0	4200	4.0
21*	30.0	0	5460	4.0
22	30.0	70	1400	0.7
23*	60.0	70	4500	1.5
24	120.0	0	4000	8.0
25*	120.0	0	4545	7.0
26*	120.0	0	5840	6.5
27*	120.0	0	6600	6.5
28	120.0	70	3950	2.0
29*	122.0	0	5525	6.5
30	124.0	0	1000	2.5

* Data point not included in analytical fit because of excessive fragment deformation or break-up.

TABLE XIV

Characteristics of Experimental Data

Magnesium Alloy Fragments

<u>Data No.</u>	<u>m (grains)</u>	<u>θ (degrees)</u>	<u>V (fps)</u>	<u>e (inches)</u>
1	0.1	0	2500	0.5
2	0.12	0	4180	0.7
3	0.25	0	3300	1.1
4	1.0	0	1600	0.75
5	1.0	0	4850	2.5
6*	1.003	0	5925	2.25
7*	1.005	60	5693	0.75
8	5.0	0	2000	2.5
9	5.0	0	4300	3.5
10	15.0	0	1400	2.0
11	15.0	0	4200	5.0
12	15.0	70	4100	1.1
13*	15.35	0	7050	5.0
14	30.0	0	970	1.6
15*	30.0	0	6780	7.0
16*	60.0	0	6450	9.0
17*	60.0	0	7000	5.5
18	60.0	70	4400	2.0
19	120.0	0	850	2.1
20	120.0	0	5460	13.0
21	120.0	70	2030	2.1
22	120.0	70	5000	4.5

* Data point not included in analytical fit because of excessive fragment deformation or break-up.

TABLE XV

Characteristics of Experimental Data

Aluminum Alloy Fragments

Data No.	m (grains)	θ (degrees)	V (fps)	e (inches)
1	0.1	0	2975	0.75
2	0.1	60	2908	0.437
3	0.1	70	3223	0.25
4	0.108	0	2299	0.75
5	0.115	0	4842	1.0
6	0.24	60	2807	0.5
7	0.258	0	1153	0.5
8	0.258	70	3277	0.5
9	0.951	60	1798	0.75
10	0.951	70	2521	0.375
11	0.972	0	6420	3.5
12	1.0	0	5016	4.0
13	1.0	0	6430	4.0
14	1.03	0	1462	0.875
15	1.03	60	1934	0.75
16	1.03	70	2191	0.375
17	5.0	0	1612	2.5
18	5.0	0	2000	3.0
19	5.0	70	2516	1.0
20	5.25	60	1470	1.0
21	5.25	60	2244	1.5
22	5.45	60	2465	1.5
23	5.5	70	4010	1.5
24	5.5	70	4634	1.0
25	15.0	0	1734	3.5
26	15.0	0	2362	5.5
27	15.0	0	5323	6.5
28	15.0	0	6204	7.5
29	15.5	0	2090	4.5
30*	15.5	0	9375	5.75

* Data point not included in analytical fit because of excessive fragment deformation or break-up.

TABLE XV (CONT)
 Characteristics of Experimental Data
 Aluminum Alloy Fragments

<u>Data No.</u>	<u>m (grains)</u>	<u>θ (degrees)</u>	<u>V (fps)</u>	<u>e (inches)</u>
31	15.6	0	4485	5.75
32*	15.6	0	11200	-----
33	30.0	0	3600	8.5
34	31.0	0	5290	9.0
35	31.0	60	3391	3.0
36	31.0	70	4299	2.0
37	62.0	0	3912	10.0
38	62.0	60	3929	5.0
39	63.0	70	5520	5.0
40	120.0	0	7182	15.0
41	122.0	0	3933	14.0
42	122.0	60	4454	8.5
43	232.0	0	3948	18.5
44	240.0	0	6092	21.5
45	243.0	70	3777	7.0
46	244.0	60	3219	7.5

* Data point not included in analytical fit because of excessive deformation or break-up.

TABLE XVI
Characteristics of Experimental Data

Data No.	Steel Fragments			
	m (grains)	θ (degrees)	v (fps)	e (inches)
1	0.057	60	3700	0.75
2	0.059	0	2600	1.375
3	0.059	70	4150	0.625
4	0.112	0	6560	3.5
5	0.225	0	9103	7.0
6	0.225	0	9337	8.0
7*	0.225	0	11109	8.0
8	0.236	0	1015	1.0
9	0.236	0	2750	2.75
10	0.236	60	2100	1.563
11	0.236	70	3440	1.25
12	0.825	0	6767	9.0
13	0.825	0	7613	9.5
14*	0.825	0	12799	11.5
15	0.826	0	1210	1.25
16	0.826	0	2500	3.88
17	0.826	60	1540	1.125
18	0.826	60	1840	1.44
19	0.826	70	3000	1.568
20	0.826	70	3270	1.75
21*	0.84	0	12480	10.5
22	0.952	0	7050	7.0
23*	1.98	0	11100	15.5
24	2.5	0	900	0.39
25	2.5	0	1000	0.5
26	2.5	0	1400	1.11
27	5.0	0	600	0.59
28	5.0	0	800	0.67
29	5.0	0	1000	1.04
30	5.0	0	1100	1.35

* Data point not included in analytical fit because of excessive deformation or break-up.

TABLE XVI (CONT)

Characteristics of Experimental Data

Steel Fragments

Data No.	m (grains)	θ (degrees)	V (fps)	e (inches)
31	5.0	0	1200	1.8
32	5.0	0	1300	1.94
33	5.0	0	1400	1.94
34	5.0	0	1500	2.35
35*	6.75	0	15500	21.5
36	10.0	0	400	0.25
37	10.0	0	500	0.61
38	10.0	0	600	0.75
39	10.0	0	800	1.52
40	10.0	0	900	1.13
41	10.0	0	1000	2.16
42	10.0	0	1100	1.0
43	10.0	0	1200	2.08
44	15.0	0	400	1.08
45	15.0	0	500	0.25
46	15.0	0	600	1.25
47	15.0	0	700	1.25
48	15.0	0	800	1.92
49	15.0	0	900	1.88
50	15.0	0	1000	2.32
51	15.0	0	1100	2.31
52	15.0	0	1200	3.0
53	15.0	0	1300	2.75
54	15.0	0	1400	3.58
55	15.0	0	1500	3.25
56	15.0	0	1685	5.17
57	15.0	0	1960	5.17
58	15.0	0	2010	4.95
59	15.0	0	2075	5.0
60	15.0	0	2400	5.17

* Data point not included in analytical fit because of excessive fragment deformation or break-up.

TABLE XVI (CONT)

Characteristics of Experimental Data

Steel Fragments

Data No.	m (grains)	θ (degrees)	V (fps)	e (inches)
61	15.0	0	7925	18.75
62	15.0	0	9920	18.0
63*	29.2	0	10682	26.0
64	30.0	0	758	2.2
65	30.0	0	854	2.25
66	30.0	0	886	2.25
67	30.0	0	890	2.25
68	30.0	0	907	2.25
69	30.0	0	951	2.3
70	30.0	0	3413	10.4
71	30.0	0	3448	11.9
72	30.0	0	3484	10.3
73	30.0	0	4651	15.0
74	30.0	0	4739	15.0
75	30.0	0	4854	15.5
76	30.0	45	3939	11.5
77	30.0	45	5887	15.5
78	30.0	45	5887	15.5
79	30.0	60	3170	6.0
80	30.0	60	5957	10.0
81	30.0	70	4935	6.0
82	60.0	0	632	2.0
83	60.0	0	693	2.0
84	60.0	0	875	2.5
85	60.0	0	1155	5.0
86	60.0	0	1157	6.0
87	60.0	0	1460	6.0
88	60.0	0	1466	5.0
89	60.0	0	1848	7.5
90	60.0	0	1887	8.0

* Data point not included in analytical fit because of excessive fragment deformation or break-up.

TABLE XVI (CONT)

Characteristics of Experimental Data

Steel Fragments

Data No.	m (grains)	θ (degrees)	V (fps)	e (inches)
91	60.0	0	2130	8.0
92	60.0	0	2268	10.0
93	60.0	0	2315	10.0
94	60.0	0	2463	8.5
95	60.0	0	2725	10.0
96	60.0	0	2762	12.0
97	60.0	0	3125	13.5
98	60.0	0	3135	14.5
99	60.0	0	3584	15.0
100	60.0	0	3690	15.0
101	60.0	0	3788	15.0
102	60.0	0	4651	16.5
103	60.0	0	4673	15.5
104	60.0	0	4762	18.5
105	60.0	0	10600	24.5
106	60.0	45	2485	8.5
107	60.0	45	5191	16.0
108	60.0	60	3848	9.5
109	60.0	70	4098	5.5
110	120.0	45	2718	12.0
111	120.0	45	3147	13.0
112	120.0	45	3165	13.5
113	120.0	45	3203	14.0
114	120.0	45	3212	14.0
115	120.0	60	3040	10.0
116	120.0	70	5118	9.5
117	240.0	0	341	1.2
118	240.0	0	400	0.4
119	240.0	0	449	0.4
120	240.0	0	531	2.5

TABLE XVI (CONT)
Characteristics of Experimental Data

Steel Fragments

Data No.	m (grains)	θ (degrees)	V (fps)	e (inches)
121	240.0	0	809	4.3
122	240.0	0	988	7.0
123	240.0	0	1205	10.3
124	240.0	0	1299	12.0
125	240.0	0	1422	10.8
126	240.0	0	1502	11.0
127	240.0	0	1669	14.0
128	240.0	0	1745	12.2
129	240.0	0	2203	12.8
130	240.0	0	2882	20.5
131	240.0	0	3021	22.8
132	240.0	0	3115	24.5
133	240.0	0	3236	26.0
134	240.0	0	4115	24.0
135	240.0	0	4739	44.5
136	240.0	0	4831	34.3
137	240.0	0	4854	42.5
138	240.0	0	4878	36.5
139	240.0	0	5076	36.7
140	240.0	0	5076	38.8
141	240.0	0	6080	33.0
142	240.0	45	2271	15.0
143	240.0	45	2908	19.0
144	240.0	60	3129	13.0
145	240.0	60	3922	16.5
146	240.0	60	3922	16.5
147	240.0	70	5143	14.0
148	481.0	0	5225	52.5

TABLE XVII

Characteristics of Experimental Data

Tungsten Alloy Fragments

Data No.	m (grains)	θ (degrees)	v (fps)	e (inches)
1	0.112	0	3766	3.875
2	0.112	0	4871	4.125
3	0.114	0	6750	5.0
4	0.119	60	3782	1.75
5	0.119	70	4722	1.062
6	0.12	70	3446	1.125
7*	0.128	0	9575	3.75
8	0.25	0	2262	2.5
9	0.256	0	1142	0.875
10	0.256	60	2398	1.25
11	0.256	70	3741	1.25
12	0.982	60	7200	6.0
13*	1.0	0	9750	9.25
14*	1.008	0	10075	8.75
15	1.05	0	1962	3.875
16	1.05	0	2143	4.375
17	1.05	60	2263	2.0
18	1.05	70	3041	2.25
19*	1.1	0	16800	10.5
20	4.7	0	2393	5.5
21	4.95	70	5631	4.5
22	5.0	0	1478	5.5
23	5.0	0	5756	14.5
24*	5.0	0	16150	21.0
25	5.0	60	2073	5.0
26	5.0	60	3844	9.5
27	5.25	70	5298	8.0
28	12.8	0	1701	10.0
29	12.8	0	4457	22.5
30*	13.0	0	9070	28.25

* Data point not included in analytical fit because of excessive fragment deformation or break-up.

TABLE XVII (CONT)

Characteristics of Experimental Data

Tungsten Alloy Fragments

Data No.	m (grains)	θ (degrees)	V (fps)	e (inches)
31*	13.0	0	10225	26.25
32*	15.0	0	8260	31.0
33	29.2	0	3408	28.0
34*	29.2	0	9300	35.25
35	29.2	60	3574	13.0
36	29.25	0	2604	16.0
37*	29.3	0	9140	27.5
38	29.6	0	2995	18.0
39	31.0	70	3883	12.5
40	59.0	0	3603	35.0
41	59.0	70	5667	12.0
42*	59.3	0	9480	36.0
43	59.45	60	3779	13.0
44	59.6	0	3949	33.0
45*	60.1	0	9450	58.25
46	136.0	0	4103	54.0
47	136.0	60	4183	19.5
48	137.0	60	4306	23.0
49	238.0	60	2953	19.0
50	238.0	70	4400	16.5

* Data point not included in analytical fit because of excessive fragment deformation or break-up.

APPENDIX II
FRAGMENT RETARDATION IN AIR

FRAGMENT RETARDATION IN AIR

The fragment velocities recorded in the experimental work were measured at a short distance before the collecting medium. The effect of drag even for short distances is significant for small particles. Hence it was necessary to correct the instrumental velocities for the effect of drag in order to obtain the fragment velocity at impact on the collecting medium. Corrections were based on the substance of BRLM Report 915 entitled, "Air Drag Measurements of Fragments" (U). For the reader's convenience, a brief summary of this report is given below along with a set of graphs indicating how fragment slow-down varies with velocity and fragment size for each fragment material.

The experimental work for BRLM 915 amounted to firing individual fragments with velocities from 600 to 5000 fps through three successive wire velocity grids. The average velocity over measured distances was obtained; the loss in velocity for a known distance of travel led to an estimate of the drag coefficient, C_D , for the fragment shape under consideration. Cubes, right circular cylinders, parallelepipeds, and shell fragments were used in the experimental work. All the fragments were steel, — ranging in weight from about 0.7 grains to 555 grains.

The retardation equation is taken to be:

$$\frac{dV}{dR} = - C_D \frac{A^*}{m} \rho V.$$

In this equation

V is the fragment velocity in fps,

R is the distance of travel in inches,

C_D is the drag coefficient (~ 0.56 for cubical fragments with Mach numbers from 1 to 5 at sea level),

A^* is the average projected area, in square inches, of the moving fragment in a plane perpendicular to its trajectory,

m is the fragment weight, in grains, and

ρ is the air density in grains/(inch)³; $\rho = 0.327$ at sea level (standard conditions)

If the fragments are randomly oriented in flight, then $A^* = A$ where

$$A = cm^{2/3}$$

and c is a constant for any homologous class of regularly shaped fragments. A value of c for the set of fragments for each fragment material has been given earlier in this report, but will be shown again in a table which follows shortly.

Therefore,

$$\frac{dV}{dR} = - \frac{C_D c \rho V}{m^{1/3}}$$

Thus, with the initial value $V = V_0$ at $R = 0$, the differential equation has the solution

$$V = V_0 \exp (-C_D c \rho R/m^{1/3}).$$

Let R be 12 inches, and let ΔV be the loss in velocity sustained by the fragment in this one foot of travel at sea level (standard conditions); then

$$\Delta V = V_0 - V = V_0 \left[1 - \exp (-h/m^{1/3}) \right]$$

where

$$h = C_D c (.327) (12).$$

Appropriate values for c and h for each of the fragment materials under consideration are given in the following table.

Fragment Material	c	h
Plastic	0.0308	0.0677
Magnesium Alloy	0.0279	0.0613
Aluminum Alloy	0.0103	0.0402
Steel	0.0088	0.0193
Tungsten Alloy	0.0054	0.0119

A set of graphs follows, showing for each fragment material the estimated loss in fragment velocity for one foot of travel. The assumptions that are implicit for the construction of these graphs are:

- 1) the value of C_D is approximately 0.56 for all velocities, fragment weights, and fragment shapes under consideration,
- 2) the fragments are moving at, or near, sea-level (standard conditions),
- 3) the fragments move through air with no apparent stabilization regardless of the size, material, velocity, etc.

Retardation for Plastic Fragments in Air

Notes:

- a) Fragment has moved only one foot
- b) Fragment moving at standard, sea-level conditions
- c) $C_D \sim 0.56$





Fig. 18

Ref: BRLM 915

Retardation for Magnesium Alloy Fragments in Air

Notes:

- a) Fragment has moved only one foot
- b) Fragment moving at standard, sea-level conditions
- c) $C_D \sim 0.56$




Ref: BRLM 915

Fig. 19

Retardation for Aluminum Alloy Fragments in Air

Notes:

- a) Fragment has moved only one foot
- b) Fragment moving at standard, sea-level conditions
- c) $C_D \sim 0.56$




Ref: BRLM 915

Fig. 20

Retardation for Steel Fragments in Air

Notes:

- a) Fragment has moved only one foot
- b) Fragment moving at standard, sea-level conditions
- c) $C_D \sim 0.56$




Ref: BRLM 915

Fig. 21

Retardation for Tungsten Alloy Fragments in Air

Notes:

- a) Fragment has moved only one foot
- b) Fragment moving at standard, sea-level conditions
- c) $C_D \sim 0.56$



Ref: BRLM 915

Fig. 22

This page intentionally blank

DISTRIBUTION LIST

No. of Copies	Organization	No. of Copies	Organization
10	Commander Armed Services Technical Information Agency ATTN: TIPCR Arlington Hall Station Arlington 12, Virginia	1	Commanding Officer Diamond Ordnance Fuze Laboratories ATTN: Technical Information Office, Branch 012 Washington 25, D.C.
1	Commander Field Command Defense Atomic Support Agency ATTN: FCDR/4 Sandia Base P.O. Box 5100 Albuquerque, New Mexico	1	Commanding Officer Ordnance Material Research Office ATTN: Mr. B. Goldberg Watertown Arsenal Watertown 72, Massachusetts
6	Chief of Ordnance ATTN: ORDTB - Bal Sec Department of the Army Washington 25, D.C.	2	Commanding General Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: Mr. H. Spiro Mr. Charles Saulter 1501 Beard Street Detroit 9, Michigan
4	Commanding Officer Picatinny Arsenal ATTN: Mr. F. Saxe Mr. J. Killen Dr. N. Clarke Dover New Jersey	2	Commanding Officer Philadelphia Ordnance District ATTN: OD, R&D Branch 128 North Broad Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1	Commanding General Frankford Arsenal ATTN: Mr. H. Markus Philadelphia 37, Pennsylvania	1	Commanding Officer U.S. Army Chemical Center ATTN: Mr. George Stewart Army Chemical Center, Maryland
1	Commanding Officer Watertown Arsenal ATTN: Watertown Arsenal Lab Armor Section Watertown 72, Massachusetts	2	Commanding General Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command ATTN: Mr. A. Alessi Natick, Massachusetts
3	Commanding General U.S. Army Ordnance Missile Command ATTN: Mr. P. Mallowney Mr. C. Cockrell Library Section Redstone Arsenal, Alabama	1	Commandant U.S. Army Artillery & Missile School ATTN: Librarian O. Willard Hollaway Fort Sill, Oklahoma

DISTRIBUTION LIST

No. of Copies	Organization	No. of Copies	Organization
2	Commanding General Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland ATTN: Technical Information Branch	3	Commander U.S. Naval Weapons Laboratory ATTN: Dr. A.V. Hershey KBT-3S Code W4-1; Missile Safety Staff Dahlgren, Virginia
20	Director Ballistic Research Laboratories ATTN: Weapon Systems Lab (5) Terminal Ballistics Lab (5) Reports Dist Sec (10) Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland	2	Commander Air Proving Ground Center ATTN: PGRE PGTQM Eglin Air Force Base, Florida
1	Director Development & Proof Services ATTN: Mr. W.C. Pless Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland	1	Commander Foreign Technology Division Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Ohio
1	Commanding Officer U.S. Naval Air Development Center ATTN: WR-4 Johnsville, Pennsylvania	1	Commander Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico ATTN: AF Space Weapons Center
1	Commanding Officer Naval Ordnance Laboratory ATTN: Fuze Department Corona, California	3	Commanding Officer Naval Nuclear Ordnance Evaluation Unit ATTN: Code 40 Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico
1	Commander Naval Ordnance Laboratory White Oak Silver Spring 19, Maryland	2	Air Force Ballistic Missile Division ATTN: Capt Eibling (BSRVP) (1) A.F. Unit Post Office Los Angeles 45, California
2	Commanding Officer U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station ATTN: Code 12, Mr. Naufeld Code 4057, Mr. Zeitlin China Lake, California		Of Interest to: Space Technology Laboratories, Inc. ATTN: Dr. Morris Rosen (1) Box 95001 Los Angeles 45, California
10	Director U.S. Naval Research Laboratory ATTN: Mr. W.W. Atkins Washington 25, D.C.		

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Director, Marshall Space Flight Center ATTN: Library Section Redstone Arsenal, Alabama	1	University of Denver Industrial Research Institute ATTN: Mr. L.E. Smith Denver 10, Colorado
2	U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Sandia Corporation ATTN: W.F. Hartman, Div 126 F.J. Weibell, Div 1285 Sandia Base Albuquerque, New Mexico	1	University of Utah ATTN: Explosives Research Group Salt Lake City, Utah
2	Aerojet General Corporation ATTN: K.N. Krezenhagen Ann R. Chase, Libr at Downey, California Azusa, California	6	The Scientific Information Officer Defence Research Staff British Embassy 3100 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington 8, D.C.
1	Aircraft Armaments, Inc. P.O. Box 126 Cockeysville, Maryland	5	Defence Research Member Canadian Joint Staff 2450 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington 8, D.C.
1	Armour Research Foundation ATTN: Librarian of Documents 33rd & Dearborn Streets Chicago, Illinois		1 Copy of Interest to: ORDTP - Major D.R. Balfour Canadian Liaison Office
2	Boeing Airplane Company ATTN: Ray M. Elam Mail Stop 21-31 P.O. Box 3707 Seattle 24, Washington		
1	Institute for Cooperative Research The Johns Hopkins University ATTN: H.R. Warfield, Dir 34th & Charles Streets Baltimore 18, Maryland		