TECHNICAL PROGRESS REPORT 413
NOTS TP 3910
COPY 53

HIGH EXPLOSIVE EQUIVALENCY TESTS OF ROCKET MOTORS

by

F. H. Weals
C. H. Wilson
Systems Development Department

ABSTRACT. From November 1964 to 19 March 1965 seven solid propellant motor hazard tests and two high explosive calibration tests were conducted at the U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California. The primary purpose of the tests was to assess the blast yield of two classes of solid propellant material, when subjected to severe explosive shock, and to compare the propellant blast yields to those produced by a standard explosive. The following yields, in percent of TNT equivalency by weight, were determined from overpressure and impulse data from a blast gage array: The highest yield of class 2 propellants tested alone approximated 40%; class 7 propellants tested alone produced well over 100%; and a combination of equal amounts of each class produced approximately 100%. The quantity and dispersion of fragments varied widely with the propellants used and with the test configuration.

Additional tests are planned using different motor configurations, different propellants, and varying explosive stimuli.

U.S. NAVAL ORDNANCE TEST STATION

China Lake, California

November 1965

U. S. NAVAL ORDNANCE TEST STATION

AN ACTIVITY OF THE BUREAU OF NAVAL WEAPONS

J. I. HARDY, CAPT., USN
Commander

WM. B. McLEAN, PH.D.
Technical Director

FOREWORD

This report documents results from the initial seven tests in a continuing series of experiments planned to investigate the blast yield of solid propellant motors. Blast yields from the seven motor tests are related to those produced by common explosives, TNT, and Composition B, to arrive at high explosive equivalency values for the propellants investigated.

The tests were conducted during the period November 1964 to March 1965 for the Armed Services Explosives Safety Board (ASESB). The primary funding was provided by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) under Work Request W-11543B-Am. 1 and Local Project Number 965.

Supplemental funding was provided through the Dividing Wall program, which is supported by funds from the three Military Departments and from the Defense Atomic Support Agency (DASA). The Dividing Wall program is currently identified as Task Assignment RMMO-62061/216-1/F008-11-05 and Local Project No. 556.

Released by
JAMES E. COLVARD, Head
Project Engineering Division
August 1965

Under authority of
WM. B. McLEAN
Technical Director

NOTS Technical Publication 3910
Technical Progress Report 413

Published by. . . . . .Systems Development Department
Manuscript 30/MS-751
Collation . . . . . Cover, 25 leaves, DD Form 1473, abstract cards
First printing . . . . . 135 numbered copies

SECURITY MARKING

The classified or limited status of this report applies to each page, unless otherwise marked.
Separate page printouts MUST be marked accordingly.

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE ESPIONAGE LAWS, TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTIONS 793 AND 794. THE TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW.

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

CONTENTS

Figures:

Tables:

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Constructive comments in test planning and report preparation have been received from members of the staff of ASESB. Will Filler of the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, has provided valuable suggestions relating to the technical aspects of the report.

INTRODUCTION

This report presents an interim summary of data presently available from a continuing series of solid propellant motor hazard tests. The tests are being conducted at the U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station (NOTS), China Lake, California, under the auspices of the Armed Services Explosives Safety Board (ASESB), with funds provided primarily by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). The motors tested were provided by the Bureau of Naval Weapons, Special Projects Office.

The seven motor tests and two calibration high-explosive tests described in this report were conducted from 5 November 1964 through 19 March 1965. The purpose of the tests was to assess the blast yield of two classes of solid propellant material, when subjected to severe explosive shock, and to compare the propellant blast yields to those produced by standard explosives.

DESCRIPTION OF TESTS

MOTOR TESTS

One class 2 motor was used in Test No. 1, and one class 7 motor was used in Test No. 2. A primary objective of the two tests was to determine the blast yield of large solid propellant motors when subjected to the severe stimulus of the detonation of a high explosive primer in intimate contact with the propellant grain. The priming explosive consisted of 96 lb of Composition C-4 placed in the grain perforation, with an electric detonator embedded in each end of the priming charge.

Two motors (one class 2 and one class 7) were used in each of the next three tests. Only the motor containing class 7 propellant was primed; the stimulus to the class 2 motor was provided by the explosion of the class 7 donor motor. Tests 3 and 4 were identical, with the motors placed side-by-side in a horizontal attitude; in Test 5, the class 7 motor was placed on top of the class 2 motor, with both motors in a vertical position.

The test setup for Test No. 6 was the same as for Tests 3 and 4, except that two class 2 motors (each primed with 96 lb of C-4) were used. The seventh test configuration was like that of Test 5; i.e., a class 7 motor was placed on top of the class 2 motor; however, the priming agent used in this test was a 100-lb spherical charge of cyclotol placed on top of the class 7 motor.

Figure 1 shows the test configurations used in each of the seven motor tests.

CALIBRATION FIRINGS WITH HIGH EXPLOSIVE

Calibration Test A

The common explosive, Composition B, was employed for this test. The Comp B was in cast form and contained in cubical metal cans. Each container and its contents weighed 47½ pounds. The cans were arranged in a configuration approximating that of two test motors, side-by-side, as in Tests 3 and 4. The explosive configuration measured 81 inches by 56 inches in plan form and was 36 inches high. Two cans were removed from the main group and stacked on top to make room for the two 40-lb booster charges that were inserted, one in either side of the stack. Each booster charge was equipped with two electric blasting caps, all four of which were fired simultaneously.

Calibration Test B

In this test, flaked TNT was placed in a braced wooden structure of octagonal cross section. The length-to-diameter ratio of the explosive charge approximated that of a single motor of the types employed in the motor tests. The main axis of the charge was horizontal, and the bottom of the charge was separated from the ground plane by the thickness of the container floor--about four inches. Priming was accomplished with 96 lb of C-4 contained in a 6x6-inch wooden box that extended from one end to the other at the main axis of the TNT package. The C-4 explosive was detonated by two electric detonators, one at each end of the priming charge. Because the flaked TNT was considerably less dense than were the propellants in the motors tested, and also because of the weight difference, the volume of the TNT charge was substantially greater than that of a single motor.

Test configurations used for the two calibration tests are shown in Fig. 2.

Test Motor in Place for Test 1.

Aft End of Motor Before Installation of Priming Charge, Test 2.



Configuration for Test 3 (Class 7 Donor Motor in Foreground).

Motors in Place for Test 4. Note absense of aft bulkhead on acceptor motor.



Motors Being Prepared for Test 5. Class 7 donor motor on top.



Two Class 2 Motors in Place for Test 6.



Test 7 Configuration Showing 100 lb Spherical Primer Charge on Top.

FIG. 1. Montage Showing Motors in Place for Tests 1 Through 7.



Comp B Stacked for Calibration A Test. Two cans were placed on top to make room for C-4 primers, placed one in either end of configuration. (Total explosive weight: 10,260 lb, total primer weight: 80 lb).

Wood Container Being Loaded With 10,650 lb of TNT and 96 lb of C-4 for Calibration B Firing

FIG. 2. Test Configurations Used in Calibration Firings A and B.

Test parameters for both the motor and calibration tests are summarized below:

Motor test number	Number of motors tested	Class 2 motors		Class 7 motors		Test date	NOTS Experiment Specification Number
		Number	Prop. wt.	Number	Prop. wt.		
1	1	1	7,250	0	0	5 Nov 64	4259
2	1	0	0	1	7,360	16 Nov 64	4260
3	2	1	7,250	1	7,360	18 Nov 64	4261-1
4	2	1	7,250	1	7,360	20 Nov 64	4261-2
5	2	1	7,250	1	7,360	8 Jan 65	5001
6	2	2	14,500	0	0	16 Mar 65	5058
7	2	1	7,250	1	7,360	17 Mar 65	5065

Calibration test	Explosives	Test date	NOTS ES number
A	10,260 lb Comp. B & 80 lb C-4	25 Nov 64	4262
B	10,650 lb TNT & 96 lb C-4	19 Mar 65	5064

TEST INSTRUMENTATION

Blast Gages

Three different types of blast gages were used to measure overpressure-time history: Ballistics Research Laboratory (BRL) mechanical PHS gages, BRL mechanical PNS gages, and Kistler piezoelectric gages. The blast-measuring instruments were deployed on two radial lines at right angles to each other, as shown in the diagram in Fig. 3. Because of the differences in response times, the Kistler gages were placed relatively close in, PNS gages were located at mid-positions, and PHS gages were used in the more distant locations. The table below lists the gages and their positions; however, all gages were not used in all tests.



FIG. 3. Overpressure Gage Layout for Motor Hazard Tests Using 1 or 2 Motors Per Test.

Nominal pressure region (psi)	R gage distance from center of mass (ft)	Gage type (1) and nominal pressure rating (2) for each gage line			
		Line North		Line East	
		Gage A	Gage B	Gage C	Gage D
64	80	K	None	K	None
32	110	K	P-50	K	None
16	150	K	P-25	K	None
8	210	P-10	B-15	P-10	B-15
4	340	B-5	B-5	P-5	B-15
2	520	B-5	B-5	B-5	B-5
1	880	B-1	B-5	P-2	B-5
0.5	1,400	B-0.5	B-1	B-0.5	B-1
0.3	2,000	B-0.5	None	B-0.5	None

NOTE: (1) B = Ballistics Research Lab, PHS type gage
P = Ballistics Research Lab, PNS type gage
K = Kistler piezoelectric gage

(2) Ballistics Research Lab gages yield reliable data to double their nominal pressure rating.

Optical Instrumentation

Both motion-picture and still cameras (ranging in size from 16mm to 4x5-inch and operating at various frame rates) were used to record fireball growth and fragment travel. The 4x5 cameras all used infrared film and long exposure times--from 15 to 20 seconds. The frame rates employed with the motion picture cameras ranged from 30 to 8000 frames per second. In general, photographic coverage was from two directions: one along a continuation of the test motor centerline and the other at right angles to the first.

Fragment Search Procedures

Prior to the first test, the test site was divided into search areas as shown in Fig. 4, and as propellant fragments were collected, they were identified with the area in which they were found. After the first three tests, however, it became apparent that an attempt to recover all fragments from a large area was extremely time-consuming and expensive. Therefore, for the remaining tests, small plots, considered to be

representative of larger areas in the same sector at the same distance from ground zero, were selected and marked off (Figs. 5 and 6) for detailed fragment search. (For detailed description of plots, see page 16.)

The data shown in Figs. 4, 5, and 6 are further discussed under Test 1, 4, and 5 results, pages 10 and 16.



FIG. 4. Fragment Distribution, Test No. 1.



FIG. 5. Propellant Fragment Dispersion on Preselected Plots, Test No. 4.



FIG. 6. Propellant Fragment Dispersion on Preselected Plots, Test No. 5.

TEST RESULTS

SUMMARY

The largest fragments were produced in the first test, in which one class 2 motor was primed and exploded. In all tests, a small number of fragments (possibly 10% of the total) were burning as they traveled through the air and continued to burn on the ground. In general, larger fragments traveled farther than smaller ones. In Tests 1, 3, and 4, in which the class 2 motors were placed on the ground in a horizontal position, most fragments were thrown out at right angles to the motor axis, while smaller and fewer fragments were thrown out at the ends--in the direction of the motor axis. Since very few inert fragments large enough to be a significant hazard were recovered from any of the tests, they were disregarded.

Summaries of conditions associated with each test are presented in the Appendix to this report.

Test No. 1

The single class 2 propellant motor, primed with 96 lb of C-4 for this test, exploded without much violence and produced a crater that measured 3 ft deep and 13 ft across. Fragments of motor propellant were thrown out to 3,000 ft on either side of the test motor and, to a lesser degree, into the two sectors at either end of the motor.

The area inside the 500-ft circle shown in Fig. 4 was saturated with numerous small fragments. Since this area was also subjected to severe blast pressure, these fragments were not considered as primary hazards and no attempt was made to plot the fragment densities in this region. Since primary concern was with the larger fragments, and with those that were thrown farthest, many small fragments (less than 1/2 pound) were ignored. As a result, the fragment density values shown in Fig. 4 are lower than the actual densities that were present--especially at close range, where the small fragments were most numerous.

It is reasonably certain that in the four 45-degree sectors searched, no large fragments at distances beyond 500 ft were overlooked, and distance values are considered accurate to ±50 feet. Figures 7-11 are views of the test site taken during and after the explosion.

FIG. 7. Aerial View of Test No. 1 at Time of Explosion.

FIG. 8. Aerial View of Test No. 1 Approximately 5 Seconds After the Explosion Showing Burning Fragments of Propellant in the Air.



LHL 099280

FIG. 9. Crater Formed by Test No. 1.



LHL 108913

FIG. 10. Test Site After Test No. 1. Unburned class 2 propellant is shown at upper left; impact position is shown at left center.

LHL 108914

FIG. 11. Residue of Class 2 Propellant
After Burning on Ground, Test No. 1.

Test No. 2

The second test also involved only one motor--a class 7--which produced a sharp explosion, with attendant high pressure readings, and carved out a crater 7 ft deep and 36 ft across. Essentially, all of the propellant contributed to the explosive effects. No propellant fragments were found, and only a few firebrands can be seen in the test pictures. Figures 12 and 13 show the test site after the explosion.

LHL 099678

FIG. 12. Crater Formed by Test No. 2.

LHL 099680

FIG. 13. Crack in Ground Surface
Near Crater Formed by Test No. 2.

Tests 3 and 4

These two test setups were identical, and the results were very similar. In each test, one class 7 motor and one class 2 motor were placed side-by-side on the ground. The class 7 (donor) motor, which was primed with 96 lb of C-4, exploded completely leaving no propellant fragments, while the class 2 (acceptor) motor produced both burning fragments and scraps of unburned propellant.

In each test, the fragments were smaller and less numerous than those observed in Test No. 1. Maximum fragment travel was only 1,650 feet. A 3-lb fragment was recovered at this distance after Test No. 3. None of the other fragments recovered after either test weighed over 3/4 pound. Each explosion produced a crater measuring about 10 ft deep and 52 ft across. Two views of the crater produced by Test No. 3 are shown in Figs. 14 and 15.

In Test No. 4, fragments were collected from small discrete plots (see Fig. 5). Each of the square plots encompassed 100 sq ft of area, while the rectangular plots contained 200 square feet. The cleared diagonal path was 12 ft wide, and the radial path on the centerline was 24 ft wide. In those areas where the fragments were larger and less numerous (beyond 1,000 ft), individual fragments were plotted. Fragment densities W_D (weight of recovered propellant per 1,000 sq ft of area) are listed for each individual plot and for several sections of the cleared paths.

The number of fragments recovered and the total weight of propellant recovered are also listed for each plot and for three sections of the cleared radial path.

This fragment collection scheme was used for the two $22\frac{1}{2}$-degree sectors on one side of the test motors only. Photographs taken during the two tests indicated that this region (i.e., on the open side of the class 2 motor) received the heaviest concentration of fragments.

Test No. 5

The fifth test also involved two motors--one class 7 and one class 2. However, for this test, the motors were in a vertical position, one on top of the other. The top motor was the class 7, which was primed with 96 lb of Comp C-4. Test results were similar to those obtained in Tests 3 and 4, although fewer and smaller fragments were recovered, probably because of the difference in placement of the motors.

Once again, fragments were collected only from the discrete plots shown in Fig. 6. The test configuration favored a symmetrical fragment dispersal and, as expected, the collection plots produced fewer fragments

LHL 099443

FIG. 14. Side View of Crater Formed by Test No. 3.

LHL 099442

FIG. 15. Top View of Crater Formed by Test No. 3.

than were recorded for either of the two previous tests. In general, the fragments were not thrown quite so far. The largest fragment of unburned propellant recovered was one pound, and the maximum distance traveled was 1,500 ft from ground zero.

The motor placement also accounted for the crater configuration--which was much shallower, but had a larger diameter than those produced by Tests 3 and 4. The crater was saucer-shaped with a small conical hole at the center. The deepest point at the bottom of the cone was five feet; average depth, exclusive of the cone, was two feet; and the diameter was 60 feet.

Test No. 6

Two class 2 motors, each primed with 96 lb of C-4, were placed side-by-side for this test. Unburned propellant fragments ranging up to eight pounds were found, and maximum fragment throw was 2,300 feet. The fragment recovered at this distance weighed $2\frac{1}{2}$ pounds. Average crater diameter was 20 feet, rim-to-rim.

Test No. 7

This test setup was identical to that for Test No. 5 except that the primer was a 100-lb spherical charge of cyclotol placed on top of the class 7 motor. Small fragments of propellant were thrown out to 1,500 ft, or more, in all directions. The average rim-to-rim crater diameter was 60 feet.

Calibration Test A

The 10,260 lb of Comp B used in this test was primed with 80 lb of C-4 and produced two distinct shockwaves. The explosion produced a crater that measured 9 ft deep and 52 ft across.

Calibration Test B

This test, in which 10,650 lb of TNT was placed in a wooden container and primed with a 96-lb charge of C-4, produced a large fireball and blackened the ground to a distance of 150 ft outward in all directions. The average crater diameter was 30 feet. Observers at 3,000 ft, and beyond, reported that the sound of the explosion was less 'sharp' than that produced by the Comp B calibration firing and the motor firings involving class 7 motors.

ANALYSIS OF BLAST GAGE DATA

The analytical approaches used to compute high explosive equivalency weight for the motor tests are described below; tabulations of blast gage data and derived blast parameters are presented in Tables 1-9.

COMPARISON WITH PUBLISHED DATA

BRL Memorandum Report No. 1518, Peak Overpressure Versus Scaled Distances for TNT Surface Bursts (April 1964), shows graphical and tabulated data covering results of overpressure measurement in connection with the surface firing of 20- and 100-ton hemispherical TNT charges. Using data from Report 1518 as a reference, yields for the seven motor tests were derived from peak pressure based on the following:

$$W = Wo \frac{p_z}{p_o} \left(\frac{R}{\lambda_1}\right)^3 \quad \text{(see footnote)}$$

where

W = yield in lb of TNT

Wo = 1 lb of TNT

p_z = ambient air pressure

p_o = standard sea level air pressure 1013 mb

R = distance from center of charge to gage

λ_1 = scaled distance determined by the ratio:

$$\frac{\text{recorded overpressure}}{\text{ambient pressure}} \quad \text{(as tabululated in Report 1518)}$$

In application, values of R/λ_1 were computed for each gage distance for each test, using averaged values of overpressures from all gages at that distance. Values of R/λ_1 are directly related to $W^{1/3}$ and should, therefore, be of similar magnitude at each gage distance, if the function of overpressure-versus-scaled distance parallels that derived by

---

* In making the computations, the ratio (ambient air pressure/standard sea level air pressure) was used in lieu of the more precise ratio ρ_z/ρ_o (ambient air density/air density at 1013 mb and 59°F) in order to conform to correction practices employed in BRL Report No. 1518.

BRL. Values of R/λ_1 were averaged for all gage distances and again for all distances exclusive of those at 80, 110, and 150 feet. The latter average was determined because of the evident tendency of close-in gage recordings from the high explosive calibration firings and motor Tests 3, 5, and 7 to register markedly higher than BRL data.

OVERPRESSURE COMPARISON WITH HIGH EXPLOSIVE CALIBRATION FIRINGS

In a second approach to computing high explosive equivalency from peak overpressure data, curves of peak overpressure versus scaled distance were prepared from the gage results of each of the calibration firings (Fig. 16). These curves were then used with the motor test overpressure data to determine the TNT and Comp B equivalencies. Thus, the average peak overpressure for each gage distance was used to determine the corresponding scaled distance λ_2 value, and this value was used to derive R/λ_2 values (see Tables 1-7). The R/λ_2 values were then averaged, and this value--which determines an average $W^{1/3}$--was cubed to arrive at the Comp B and TNT equivalencies (Tables 10 and 11). Because the atmospheric changes from test-to-test were small, no attempt was made to introduce an atmospheric correction.



FIG. 16. Overpressure Versus Scaled Distance Calibration Curves.

Comparison of motor test data with the derived calibration curves presented difficulties similar to some of those experienced in comparing the data with the BRL curve, in that the calibration curves do not appear to parallel the function of overpressure-versus-scaled-distance for some tests (notably Tests 1, 2, and 4) as demonstrated by lower-than-average R/λ_2 values at close-in gage stations for the motor tests. Additionally, there is some concern over the tendency for the blast records from the Calibration A firing to show double and well-separated peaks, particularly at intermediate and long ranges.

While it is not considered that the atypical separated peaks tend to diminish the peak pressure values below normal values (as discussed later in this report), it would be somewhat easier to place confidence in overpressure-time histories of more classical shape.

The Calibration B results agree reasonably well with data in BRL Report No. 1518 at intermediate and longer ranges, but the readings run higher than the BRL data at two close-in gage positions.

Although Calibration B data and the above described BRL data were alike in being derived from TNT explosions, there were differences in the following test parameters:

a. The charge shapes and means of priming
b. The physical condition and density of the TNT
c. Gage arrays, and some differences in gage types
d. Data reduction techniques
e. Terrain
f. Number of tests and variety of explosive weights involved

IMPULSE COMPARISON WITH HIGH EXPLOSIVE CALIBRATION FIRINGS

Scaled-impulse-versus-scaled-distance values were plotted for the two high explosive calibration firings (Fig. 17). Since these curves cannot be entered directly without first knowing the desired value W, a family of curves (Figs. 18 and 19) were derived relating impulse with $W^{2/3}$ for each gage distance. (The relationship of impulse versus $W^{2/3}$ approximates linearity for a specific gage distance.) The impulse versus $W^{2/3}$ curves were then entered with averaged impulse values for each gage distance. The extracted $W^{2/3}$ values were then averaged for all distances, and this average $W^{2/3}$ was converted to W--or high explosive equivalency.



FIG. 17. Scaled Impulse Versus Scaled Distance.



FIG. 18. Impulse Versus $W^{2/3}$ for R Values of 210, 340, 520, 880, 1,400, and 2,000 Feet (Calibration Tests A and B).

TABLE 1. Test #1 (ES-4259)

R gage distance (ft)	Gage position	Gage type N leg	Gage type E leg	Peak overpres. N leg (psi)	Peak overpres. E leg (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. amb. atmos.	λ_1 Scaled distance BRL 1518	R/λ_1	λ_2 Scaled distance overpres. calib. A	R/λ_2	Impulse N leg (psi-ms)	Impulse E leg (psi-ms)	Avg. impulse (psi-ms)	$W^{2/3}$ from impulse calib. A
80	1A	K(1)	K	23.61	28.23	25.92	1.898	5.99	13.3	6.9	11.6	168.86	174.50	171.68	175
110	2A	P(2)	K	18.01	11.03	13.41	0.982	8.17	13.4	8.5	12.9	93.42	123.79	107.69	165
	2B	K	**	11.20	**							105.86	**		
150	3A	P	K	8.63	5.71	6.27	0.459	12.14	12.3	12.4	12.1	67.38	79.37	75.25	150
	3B	K	**	4.47	**							79.02	**		
210	4A	P	P	*	5.98	4.47	0.327	14.77	14.2	15.3	14.7	*	74.10	58.14	145
	4B	B(3)	B	3.26	4.18							46.37	53.96		
340	5A	B	P	2.63	*	2.39	0.175	22.17	15.3	24.7	13.7	24.13	*	27.75	95
	5B	B	B	1.81	2.72							28.56	30.55		
520	6A	B	B	1.13	1.02	1.10	0.081	39.65	13.1	50.0	10.4	20.37	26.92	22.32	110
	6B	B	B	1.16	*							19.68	*		
880	7A	B	P	0.58	0.63	0.58	0.042	66.25	13.2	76.0	11.6	11.44	14.68	13.63	115
	7B	**	B	**	0.54							**	14.77		
1400	8A	B	B	0.32	0.32	0.29	0.021	106.6	13.1	115.0	12.2	6.54	7.47	7.37	100
	8B	B	B	0.24	0.28							7.16	8.29		
2000	9A	B	B	0.14	0.17	0.16	0.012	158.33	12.6			3.94	5.18	4.56	95
					Average for all gage distances				13.39		12.4				128
					Average excluding distances of 80', 110' and 150'				13.58		12.5				110

Note (1) K = Kistler Gage
(2) P = BRL-PNS Type Gage
(3) B = BRL-PHS Type Gage

** No gage.
* Gage failure.



FIG. 19. Impulse Versus $W^{2/3}$ for R Values of 80, 110, and 150 Feet (Calibration Tests A and B).

LIMITATIONS OF REFERENCE DATA

It should be noted that this is a progress report outlining initial results in a continuing series of tests. There are acknowledged limitations in the use of the BRL data as a standard for comparison, primarily because of differences in charge geometry. There are also acknowledged limitations in the use of the Calibration A and B firing data, for the obvious reason that each set of data is derived from a single test. It is probable that additional high explosive calibration firings will be conducted in the future, thus providing a firmer basis for comparison.

EXPLANATION OF TABLES 1 THROUGH 9

The purpose of the tables is to list blast gage records and to show the methods of computation used. Derived values of λ_1 and R/λ_1 are explained above. Derived values of λ_2, R/λ_2, and $W^{2/3}$ are based on Calibration A results; therefore, these values relate to Comp B. Identical procedures were used in relating the tests to Calibration B TNT test results; however, these computations are not shown.

TABLE 2. Test #2 (ES-4260)

R gage distance (ft)	Gage position	Gage type: N leg	Gage type: E leg	Peak overpres. N leg (psi)	Peak overpres. E leg (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. amb. atmos.	λ_1 Scaled distance BRL 1518	R/λ_1	λ_2 Scaled distance overpres. calib. A	R/λ_2	Impulse N leg (psi-ms)	Impulse E leg (psi-ms)	Avg. impulse (psi-ms)	$W^{2/3}$ from impulse calib. A
80	1A	K(1)	K	99.12	127.53	113.32	8.301	3.13	25.5	4.05	19.7	*	*	*	*
110	2A	P(2)	K	86.09	51.06	60.54	4.435	4.13	26.6	5.1	21.6	425.61	*	425.61	533
	2B	K	**	44.48	**							*	**		
150	3A	P	K	21.88	18.67	18.56	1.359	6.98	21.4	7.7	19.5	271.74	*	271.74	560
	3B	K	**	15.13	**							*	**		
210	4A	P	P	6.52	9.42	8.63	0.632	10.20	20.6	10.5	20.0	173.03	165.62	166.37	465
	4B	B(3)	B	6.99	11.60							167.93	158.91		
340	5A	B	P	6.15	4.85	5.32	0.389	13.45	25.3	13.6	25.0	128.77	129.84	122.36	530
	5B	B	B	4.92	5.36							116.09	114.75		
520	6A	B	B	2.26	2.36	2.34	0.171	22.50	23.1	25.2	20.6	59.59	85.65	70.78	398
	6B	B	B	2.37	2.37							62.51	75.37		
880	7A	B	P	1.29	1.62	1.32	0.096	34.70	25.4	43.0	20.5	37.89	46.86	43.51	365
	7B	**	B	**	1.05							**	45.79		
1400	8A	B	B	0.75	0.70	0.66	0.048	59.16	23.7	71.0	19.8	32.28	27.11	29.60	404
	8B	B	B	0.64	0.55							32.82	26.20		
2000	9A	B	B	0.46	0.32	0.39	0.028	88.00	22.7	98.0	20.7	20.69	18.27	19.48	395
					Average for all gage distances				23.81		20.8				456
					Average excluding distances of 80', 110' and 150'				23.46		21.1				426

Note (1) K = Kistler Gage
(2) P = BRL-PNS Type Gage
(3) B = BRL-PHS Type Gage

* Gage failure.
** No gage.

TABLE 3. Test #3 (ES-4261-1)

R gage distance (ft)	Gage position	Gage type N leg	Gage type E leg	Peak overpres. N leg (psi)	Peak overpres. E leg (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. amb. atmos.	λ_1 Scaled distance BRL 1518	R/λ_1	λ_2 Scaled distance overpres. calib. A	R/λ_2	Impulse N leg (psi-ms)	Impulse E leg (psi-ms)	Avg. impulse (psi-ms)	$W^{2/3}$ from impulse calib. A
80	1A	K(1)	K	230.84	188.53	209.68	15.361	2.37	33.7	3.2	25.0	982.66	1302.97	1142.81	690
110	2A	P(2)	K	92.03	(42.98)	108.14	7.922	3.24	33.9	4.1	26.9	456.36	*	519.65	610
	2B	K	**	124.25	**							582.95	**		
150	3A	P	K	30.85	34.23	34.25	2.509	5.31	28.2	6.4	23.5	323.36	246.53	312.40	625
	3B	K	**	37.69	**							367.32	**		
210	4A	P	P	10.74	12.28	13.14	0.962	8.27	25.4	8.6	24.4	239.30	251.12	237.17	625
	4B	B(3)	B	15.02	14.52							233.31	224.96		
340	5A	B	P	5.74	6.72	6.07	0.444	12.35	27.5	12.5	27.2	134.39	171.53	149.71	673
	5B	B	B	5.08	6.77							(59.95)	143.23		
520	6A	B	B	*	2.93	2.97	0.217	19.20	27.0	20.5	25.3	*	*	95.48	588
	6B	B	B	2.76	3.24							84.55	106.42		
880	7A	B	P	1.56	2.15	1.66	0.121	29.10	30.2	34.8	25.3	62.63	60.90	63.87	548
	7B	**	B	**	1.27							**	68.10		
1400	8A	B	B	0.87	0.88	0.81	0.059	50.70	27.6	62.0	22.6	41.09	45.78	44.45	600
	8B	B	B	0.81	0.70							56.40	34.56		
2000	9A	B	B	0.55	0.43	0.49	0.036	73.75	27.1	85.0	23.5	28.26	26.50	27.38	550
					Average for all gage distances				29.0		24.87				612
					Average excluding distances of 80', 110', and 150'				27.4		24.71				597

Note (1) K = Kistler Gage
(2) P = BRL-PNS Type Gage
(3) B = BRL-PHS Type Gage

( ) Measured value not used in computations.
* Gage failure.
** No gage.

TABLE 4. Test #4 (ES-4261-2)

R gage distance (ft)	Gage position	Gage type N leg	Gage type E leg	Peak overpres. N leg (psi)	Peak overpres. E leg (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. amb. atmos.	λ_1 Scaled distance BRL 1518	R/λ_1	λ_2 Scaled distance overpres. calib. A	R/λ_2	Impulse N leg (psi-ms)	Impulse E leg (psi-ms)	Avg. impulse (psi-ms)	$W^{2/3}$ from impulse calib. A
80	1A	K(1)	K	(109.35)	145.20	145.20	10.63	2.90	27.6	3.65	21.9	794.62	751.93	773.27	516
110	2A	P(2)	K	*	80.77	92.11	6.75	3.43	32.1	4.38	25.1	*	366.14	412.10	515
	2B	K	**	103.46	**							458.06	**		
150	3A	P	K	27.45	29.64	28.91	2.12	5.72	26.2	6.75	22.3	257.91	183.90	244.54	510
	3B	K	**	29.66	**							291.81	**		
210	4A	P	P	10.26	14.17	11.68	0.855	8.77	23.9	8.90	23.6	209.41	197.18	202.65	605
	4B	B(3)	B	10.76	11.55							201.52	202.49		
340	5A	B	P	5.93	6.25	5.95	0.436	12.5	27.2	12.8	26.5	145.16	153.81	147.45	660
	5B	B	B	5.68	*							143.38	*		
520	6A	B	B	2.75	2.77	2.64	0.193	20.8	25.0	22.6	23.0	86.06	99.12	87.10	505
	6B	B	B	2.51	2.56							96.38	66.86		
880	7A	B	P	1.62	2.08	1.67	0.122	28.9	30.4	34.8	25.3	66.73	66.30	65.32	560
	7B	**	B	**	1.33							**	62.95		
1400	8A	B	B	0.82	0.94	0.80	0.0586	52.6	26.6	62.0	22.6	35.67	43.14	38.27	515
	8B	B	B	0.73	0.74							37.28	37.00		
2000	9A	B	B	0.54	0.43	0.48	0.0352	75.5	26.5	87.0	23.0	25.72	26.50	26.11	520
					Average for all gage distances				27.3		23.7				548
					Average excluding distances of 80', 110', and 150'				26.6		24.0				561

Note (1) K = Kistler Gage
(2) P = BRL-PNS Type Gage
(3) B = BRL-PHS Type Gage

( ) Measured value not used in computations.
* Gage failure.
** No gage.

TABLE 5. Test #5 (ES-5001)

R gage distance (ft)	Gage position	Gage type N leg	Gage type E leg	Peak overpres. N leg (psi)	Peak overpres. E leg (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. amb. atmos.	λ_1 Scaled distance BRL 1518	R/λ_1	λ_2 Scaled distance overpres. calib. A	R/λ_2	Impulse N leg (psi-ms)	Impulse E leg (psi-ms)	Avg. impulse (psi-ms)	$W^{2/3}$ from impulse calib. A
80	1A	K(1)	K	*	252.40	252.40	18.490	2.17	36.8	2.97	26.9	*	738.94	738.94	492
110	2A	P(2)	K	76.60	150.92	113.76	8.334	3.12	35.3	4.05	27.2	393.11	556.80	474.95	575
	2B	K	**	*	**							*	**		
150	3A	P	K	31.39	55.01	43.20	3.164	4.79	31.3	5.80	25.9	420.00	244.00	332.00	660
	3B	K	**	*	**							*	**		
210	4A	P	P	*	*							*	*		
	4B	B(3)	B	*	13.22	13.22	0.968	8.24	25.5	8.60	24.5	*	219.74	219.74	662
340	5A	B	P	6.19	6.07	5.91	0.432	12.51	27.2	12.8	26.6	158.65	151.82	147.4	660
	5B	B	B	5.25	6.13							141.59	137.61		
520	6A	B	B	*	(0.71)	2.79	0.204	19.92	26.1	21.6	24.0	*	(19.13)	95.7	564
	6B	B	B	*	2.79							*	95.70		
880	7A	B	P	1.57	1.61	1.46	0.106	32.07	27.4	39.0	22.6	60.80	**	57.7	490
	7B	**	B	**	1.22							**	54.69		
1400	8A	B	B	0.86	0.84	0.76	0.055	53.55	26.1	65.0	21.6	40.80	29.57	35.1	475
	8B	B	B	0.71	0.66							37.76	32.35		
2000	9A	B	B	*	0.39	0.39	0.028	88.00	22.7	98.0	20.7	*	28.83	28.8	570
					Average for all gage distances				28.71		24.44				572
					Average excluding distances of 80', 110', and 150'				25.83		23.33				570

Note (1) K = Kistler Gage
(2) P = BRL-PNS Type Gage
(3) B = BRL-PHS Type Gage

( ) Measured value not used in computations.
* Gage failure.
** No gage.

TABLE 6. Test #6 (ES-5058)

R gage distance (ft)	Gage position	Gage type N leg	Gage type E leg	Peak overpres. N leg (psi)	Peak overpres. E leg (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. amb. atmos.	λ_1 Scaled distance BRL 1518	R/λ_1	λ_2 Scaled distance overpres. calib. A	R/λ_2	Impulse N leg (psi-ms)	Impulse E leg (psi-ms)	Avg. impulse (psi-ms)	$W^{2/3}$ from impulse calib. A
80	1A	K(1)	K	*	*							*	*		
110	2A	**	**	**	**							**	**		
	2B	*	*	*	*							*	*		
150	3A	P(2)	P	14.55	*	14.55	1.075	7.82	19.2	8.30	18.1	176.8	*	177	375
	3B	**	**	**	**							**	**		
210	4A	P	P	8.48	*	8.62	0.633	10.19	20.6	10.5	20.0	137.0	*	129	368
	4B	B(3)	B	8.87	8.50							120.37	*		
340	5A	B	P	3.88	(1.44)	3.27	0.240	17.95	19.0	19.0	17.9	70.20	(35.43)	64	250
	5B	B	B	2.90	3.03							55.62	66.27		
520	6A	B	B	1.74	1.59	1.74	0.128	27.86	18.7	33.0	15.8	41.01	48.00	45.6	240
	6B	B	B	1.81	1.82							43.26	50.02		
880	7A	B	P	0.96	0.82	0.89	0.0653	47.15	18.7	58.0	15.2	30.11	26.64	28.9	245
	7B	**	B	**	0.90							**	29.77		
1400	8A	B	B	0.62	0.46	0.52	0.0382	71.14	19.6	82.0	17.1	*	17.80	17.0	235
	8B	B	B	0.42	0.59							16.10	*		
2000	9A	B	B	0.24	0.27	0.25	0.0183	120.6	16.6	125.0	16.0	11.47	12.66	12.1	245
					Average for all gage distances				18.9		17.16				280
					Average excluding distances of 80', 110', and 150'				18.9		17.01				264

Note (1) K = Kistler Gage
(2) P = BRL-PNS Type Gage
(3) B = BRL-PHS Type Gage

( ) Measured value not used in computations.
* Gage failure.
** No gage.

TABLE 7. Test #7 (ES-5065)

R gage distance (ft)	Gage position	Gage type N leg	Gage type E leg	Peak overpres. N leg (psi)	Peak overpres. E leg (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. amb. atmos.	λ_1 Scaled distance BRL 1518	R/λ_1	λ_2 Scaled distance overpres. calib. A	R/λ_2	Impulse N leg (psi-ms)	Impulse E leg (psi-ms)	Avg. impulse (psi-ms)	$W^{2/3}$ from impulse calib. A
80	1A	K(1)	K	(*176.04)	281.77	281.77	20.8	2.05	39.0	2.85	28.0	(*432.61)	840.33	840	552
110	2A	**	**	**	**		10.4	2.83	38.9	3.70	29.7	**	**	454	555
	2B	K	K	187.56	95.37	141.46						470.98	438.02		
150	3A	P(2)	P	31.23	*	31.32	2.31	5.49	27.3	6.60	22.7	386.4	*	386	740
	3B	**	**	**	**							**	**		
210	4A	P	P	11.61	*	12.45	0.919	8.47	24.8	8.75	23.7	210.1	*	209	570
	4B	B(3)	B	13.66	12.08							207.13	*		
340	5A	B	P	5.88	5.97	5.68	0.419	12.80	26.6	13.2	25.8	144.82	(7.8)	133	583
	5B	B	B	4.66	6.21							119.79	135.83		
520	6A	B	B	2.78	2.62	2.69	0.198	20.39	25.5	22.3	23.3	90.70	92.00	91.6	535
	6B	B	B	*	2.68							*	92.12		
880	7A	B	P	1.59	1.35	1.41	0.104	32.66	26.9	40.0	22.0	64.77	61.94	58.8	500
	7B	**	B	**	1.28							**	50.71		
1400	8A	B	**	0.87	**	0.76	0.0561	53.07	26.4	65.0	21.6	37.49	**	34.0	460
	8B	B	B	0.71	0.71							33.37	31.15		
2000	9A		B	0.46	0.42	0.44	0.0325	79.84	25.1	91.0	22.0	22.65	22.76	22.70	455
					Average for all gage distances				29.0		24.3				561
					Average excluding distances of 80', 110', and 150'				25.9		23.1				517

Note (1) K = Kistler Gage
(2) P = BRL-PNS Type Gage
(3) B = BRL-PHS Type Gage

( ) Measured value not used in computations.
* Gage failure.
** No gage.

TABLE 8. Calibration Test "A" (ES-4262)

R gage distance (ft)	Gage position	Gage type N leg	Gage type E leg	Peak overpres. N leg (psi)	Peak overpres. E leg (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. amb. atmos.	λ_1 Scaled distance BRL 1518	R/λ_1	Impulse N leg (psi-ms)	Impulse E leg (psi-ms)	Avg. impulse (psi-ms)
80	1A	K(1)	K	131.73	158.36	145.04	10.63	2.95	27.1	773.16	635.10	704.13
110	2A	P(2)	K	61.02	64.21	62.61	4.59	4.06	27.1	326.16	427.73	347.19
	2B	K	**	(32.43)	**					287.70	**	
150	3A	P	K	38.52	34.57	32.79	2.40	5.32	28.2	343.83	158.17	229.68
	3B	K	**	25.30	**					187.05	**	
210	4A	P	P	9.30	9.94	10.06	0.73	9.50	22.1	132.10	195.82	151.11
	4B	B(3)	B	10.95	*					125.41	*	
340	5A	B	P	4.91	4.36	4.28	0.313	15.1	22.5	94.18	155.66	115.14
	5B	B	B	3.78	4.09					83.53	127.19	
520	6A	B	B	2.30	2.69	2.50	0.183	21.6	24.1	77.16	93.09	79.26
	6B	B	B	2.11	2.92					54.84	91.95	
880	7A	B	P	1.12	1.69	1.42	0.104	32.6	26.9	(17.47)	63.98	59.57
	7B	**	B	**	1.47					**	55.17	
1400	8A	B	B	0.69	1.05	0.78	0.057	52.5	26.6	37.71	30.21	34.55
	8B	B	B	0.57	0.81					35.88	34.42	
2000	9A	B	B	0.43	0.45	0.44	0.032	81.0	24.7	25.12	23.60	24.36
					Average for all gage distances				25.47			
					Average excluding distances of 80', 110', and 150'				24.48			

Note (1) K = Kistler Gage
(2) P = BRL-PNS Type Gage
(3) B = BRL-PHS Type Gage

( ) Measured value not used in computations.
** No gage.
* Gage failure.

TABLE 9. Calibration Test "B" (ES-5064)

R gage distance (ft)	Gage position	Gage type N leg	Gage type E leg	Peak overpres. N leg (psi)	Peak overpres. E leg (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. (psi)	Avg. peak overpres. amb. atmos.	λ_1 Scaled distance BRL 1518	R/λ_1	λ_2 Scaled distance overpres. calib. A	R/λ_2	Impulse N leg (psi-ms)	Impulse E leg (psi-ms)	Avg. impulse (psi-ms)	$W^{2/3}$ from impulse calib. A
80	1A	K(1)	K	*	308.25	308.25	22.6	1.97	40.6	2.90	27.5	*	764.43	764	517
110	2A	**	**	**	**		6.04	3.60	30.6	4.60	23.9	**	**		
	2B	K	K	*	82.35	82.35						*	397.96	398	505
150	3A	P(2)	P	*	21.84	21.84	1.61	6.47	23.2	7.25	20.7	*	286.1	286	580
	3B	**	**	**	**							**	**		
210	4A	P	P	*	*	10.20	0.748	9.37	22.4	9.60	21.9	*	*	163	485
	4B	B(3)	B	9.95	10.45							149.84	176.82		
340	5A	B	P	4.85	4.07	4.18	0.306	15.33	22.2	15.7	21.6	100.84	118.4	106	447
	5B	B	B	3.58	4.24							86.53	119.18		
520	6A	B	B	2.07	1.99	2.05	0.151	24.67	21.0	28.3	18.4	79.58	68.43	76.7	435
	6B	B	B	2.10	2.07							87.79	70.88		
880	7A	B	P	1.34	1.20	1.20	0.0880	37.18	23.6	46.2	19.0	46.49	48.4	44.8	375
	7B	**	B	**	1.06							**	39.28		
1400	8A	B	**	0.75	**	0.68	0.0499	58.07	24.1	70.0	20.0	35.42	**	33.2	450
	8B	B	B	0.60	0.70							31.05	*		
2000	9A	B	B	0.40	0.31	0.35	0.0257	94.74	21.1	105.0	19.1	20.54	19.12	19.83	400
					Average for all gage distances				25.3		21.33				466
					Average excluding distances of 80', 110', and 150'				22.4		20.0				432

Note (1) K = Kistler Gage
(2) P = BRL-PNS Type Gage
(3) B = BRL-PHS Type Gage

* Gage failure.
** No gage.

ANALYSIS OF BLAST YIELD COMPARISONS

COMPARISON WITH TNT

In Table 10, which summarizes TNT equivalent yields for the tests conducted, six different yield values are identified for each motor test, representing three different approaches to yield determination. It is not considered that all columns of values are equally valid; e.g., the W_{T1} column is believed to exaggerate the yield for some tests. However, the multiple listing of values does serve to illustrate the variation that can result with different choices of gage distance ranges and calibration standards, and when different blast characteristics, such as impulse versus overpressure, are used in yield determination.

The multiplicity of values also illustrates the difficulty of making an arbitrary choice of a single value of TNT equivalency for any of the tests. Some comments on the differences are presented below:

1. The differences between W_{T3} and W_{T4} and those between W_{T5} and W_{T6} simply suggest that the blast decay patterns of the propellants tested do not parallel those of TNT as tested in the Calibration B firing.

2. The differences between W_{T1} and W_{T2} also suggest nonparallel decay patterns; however, they also include differences in charge geometry and differences in test techniques, including gage recording and interpretation of data at close-in positions. The agreement between W_{T2} and W_{T4} is good, which suggests that the above described differences diminish in significance when close-in gage records are disregarded.

3. Differences between W_{T3} and W_{T5} and between W_{T4} and W_{T6} are considered acceptable, since it is not anticipated that equivalent yields based on impulse would be the same as those based on overpressure.

COMPARISON WITH COMPOSITION B

Table 11 summarizes Composition B equivalency yields for the tests conducted, based on overpressure and impulse comparisons of like values from the Calibration A Comp B firing.

As in Table 10, values are shown with all gages considered, and also with records of the three close-in positions omitted. Again, there are differences between values for an individual test in each of the four columns, but these are generally of less magnitude than the corresponding differences appearing in Table 10.

TABLE 10. Summary of TNT Equivalent Yield

Test number	Yield from overpressure calibration BRL Report 1518 all gages	Yield from overpressure calibration BRL Report 1518 excluding gages at 80, 110 & 150'	Yield from overpressure Calib. "B" all gages	Yield from overpressure from Calib. "B" excluding gages at 80, 110 & 150'	Yield from impulse Calib. "B" all gages	Yield from impulse from Calib. "B" excluding gages at 80, 110 & 150'
	W_{T1}	W_{T2}	W_{T3}	W_{T4}	W_{T5}	W_{T6}
1	2,250	2,360	2,330	2,570	1,660	1,500
2	12,700	12,200	10,600	12,300	10,900	10,900
3	22,900	19,400	17,000	19,600	16,000	16,800
4	18,400	17,700	15,500	18,400	13,500	15,200
5	22,200	16,300	15,600	16,500	14,300	15,300
6	6,350	6,350	6,530	6,530	5,200	5,330
7	22,600	16,100	15,500	16,000	13,700	13,800
Calib. A	15,400	13,700	12,500	14,100	11,100	12,300
B	15,000	10,400	----	----	----	----

TABLE 11. Summary in Terms of Composition "B" Equivalent Yield

Test number	Yield from overpressure Calib. "A" all gages	Yield from overpressure Calib. "A" excluding gages at 80, 110 & 150'	Yield from impulse Calib. "A" all gages	Yield from impulse Calib. "A" excluding gages at 80, 110 & 150'
	W_{C1}	W_{C2}	W_{C3}	W_{C4}
1	1,910	1,950	1,520	1,160
2	9,000	9,400	9,800	8,800
3	15,400	15,100	15,200	14,100
4	13,300	13,800	12,800	13,300
5	14,300	12,600	13,700	13,600
6	5,060	4,920	4,690	4,290
7	14,300	12,300	13,300	11,800
Calib. "B"	9,700	8,000	10,100	8,980

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING DERIVED YIELDS

Comparison of Tables 10 and 11 suggests that the propellants tested are behaving more like Comp B than like TNT. A comparison of the yields derived in the high explosive calibration firings is also of interest.

For example, when Comp B is expressed in TNT equivalency, using overpressure and the full range of gages (W_{T3}), the ratio value becomes (12,500 lb/10,340 lb) or 1.20, which compares to the commonly accepted value of 1.13. Using impulse and all gages (W_{T5}), the ratio value becomes (11,100/10,340) or 1.07, which is quite close to the commonly accepted 1.06 value. However, when records of close-in gages are omitted, these values change from 1.20 to 1.36 (14,100/10,340) when using W_{T4}, and from 1.07 to 1.19 (12,300/10,340) when using W_{T6}.

It should be noted that these changes with gage distances in TNT-versus-Composition B relationships are reflected in cross comparison of propellant values in Columns W_{T3} through W_{T6} of Table 10 with corresponding columns of Table 11.

If columns W_{T3} and W_{T5} of Table 10 and the corresponding columns, W_{C1} and W_{C3}, of Table 11 are arbitrarily selected for derivation of percentage equivalencies, the following values are obtained.

Test No.	TNT equiv. over-pressure	TNT equiv. impulse	Comp. "B" equiv. overpressure	Comp. "B" equiv. impulse	Test geometry*
1	32%	23%	26%	21%	
2	144%	148%	122%	133%	
3	116%	109%	105%	104%	
4	106%	92%	91%	88%	
5	107%	98%	98%	94%	
6	45%	36%	35%	32%	
7	106%	94%	98%	91%	

*The dot in the geometry configuration for each test shows the placement of the charge; the numbers 2 and 7 indicate the class of propellant.

In the above grouping, only two tests--3 and 4--were essentially identical; however, they did not produce identical results.

Tests 3, 4, 5, and 7 used identical motor combinations, but were different in motor attitude and method of priming. The results are similar despite the differences in test conditions.

Test 1 used only one class 2 motor, and test 6 used two class 2 motors involving twice as much propellant; however, there is a substantial increase in percentages between the two tests. This suggests that the added mass, or the distribution of mass and relative positioning of of priming charge, influenced the increase.

If Tests 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 are compared, and if it is assumed that the class 7 motor in Test 2 was producing near maximum yield, then it follows that the class 2 motors in Tests 3 and 4 were producing a higher yield than they were in Tests 1 or 6. Using TNT overpressure values (W_{T3}) and averaging results of Tests 3 and 4, the following defines average yield of the class 2 motor in Tests 3 and 4:

$$Y \text{ (class 2 yield)} = \frac{16,200 - 10,600}{7,250} = \frac{5,600}{7,250} = 0.77 \text{ or } 77\%$$

Using Comp B overpressure values (W_{C1}), the following applies:

$$Y = \frac{14,350 - 9,000}{7,250} = 0.74 \text{ or } 74\%$$

This indicates that the large application of externally applied energy from the exploding class 7 motor produced greater yield in the class 2 motor than the yield produced in a similar motor by the explosion of 96 lb of C-4 placed in the grain perforation.

CONCLUSIONS

The derived percentage values of high explosive equivalency are considered to represent a convenient expression of potential blast damage effects in terms of common explosives; however, it is acknowledged that there are differences in structure and rates of decay of blast waves produced by different explosives and propellants so that expressions of high explosive equivalency are limited to generalizations without specific identification of quantities, distances, and types of energy measured.

Additionally, it is emphasized that the measurements made and the analytical approaches used in this evaluation required the cubing of the derived $W^{1/3}$ values to arrive at the W values shown in Tables 10 and 11. Thus, errors in measurement (and the possible real anomalies in the blast wave itself) are amplified in the expression of W.

With the above qualifications in mind, the tests show that, under strong stimulus, motors of the class 7 type tested are capable of producing blast yields that exceed those of some common explosives. Motors of the class 2 type tested are also capable of producing significant blast yields, the magnitude of which tends to vary with the strength of the stimulus and with propellant mass, or the distribution of mass and relative positioning of the priming charge.

Fragment type, size, quantity, and distribution were considered to be consistent with the explosive effects noted with each test. In general, the estimated total weight of unburned propellant fragments varied inversely with the blast effectiveness, as might be expected.

No attempt has been made to correlate blast yield with crater size for two main reasons: (1) the craters tended to assume different shapes according to the configuration and orientation of the propellant and explosive charges, and (2) the same site was used for all tests in order to maintain consistent gage position; therefore, there was progressive pulverization and change of soil structure with each explosion and subsequent re-leveling operation.

Appendix

ARMED SERVICES EXPLOSIVES SAFETY BOARD
SOLID PROPELLANT MOTOR HAZARDS TESTS

Summaries of conditions associated with each test
are shown on the following pages.

Conducted by: US NOTS | Test No. 1 | E.S. No. E-4259

Funds: | Date 5 Nov 1964 | Test Site Victor "C"

PRIMED MOTOR

Number 1 | Type _____ | Serial No. _____

Propellant Class 2 | Propellant Weight 7250 lbs | Motor Case Mat. Steel

Position relative to ground In contact with: horizontal

Position of main motor axis Horizontal, head end NE

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) Four nozzles in aft bulkhead

PRIMING SYSTEM

Priming Explosive: Type C-4 | Amount 96 lbs | Position Grain perforation

Detonators: Type Engine Sp. | Number 2 | Position One fore; one aft

Remarks Some of the explosive was packed into the cavity where the nozzle chambers join the grain perforation at the aft end of the motor

ACCEPTOR MOTORS

Number None | Type _____ | Serial No. _____

Propellant Class _____ | Propellant Weight _____ | Motor Case Mat. _____

Position relative to primed motor _____

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) _____

WEATHER

Pressure mb 941.7 | Temperature °F 75 | Density Slugs _____

Humidity 18% | Wind Direction 095° | Wind Velocity, ft/sec 8

Conducted by: US NOTS | Test No. 2 | E.S. No. E-4260

Funds: | Date 16 Nov 1964 | Test Site Victor "C"

PRIMED MOTOR

Number 1 | Type | Serial No.

Propellant Class 7 | Propellant Weight 7358 | Motor Case Mat. Fiberglass

Position relative to ground On ground: horizontal

Position of main motor axis Horizontal; head end NE

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) There were no nozzles on this motor.

PRIMING SYSTEM

Priming Explosive: Type C-4 | Amount 96 lbs | Position Grain perforation

Detonators: Type Electric | Number 2 | Position One fore; one aft

Remarks Two electric blasting caps were fired simultaneously.

ACCEPTOR MOTORS

Number None | Type | Serial No.

Propellant Class | Propellant Weight | Motor Case Mat.

Position relative to primed motor

Remarks (including motor deficiencies)

WEATHER

Pressure mb 940.6 | Temperature °F 47 | Density Slugs

Humidity 40 | Wind Direction 080° | Wind Velocity, ft/sec 10

Conducted by: US NOTS | Test No. 3 | E.S. No. 4261-1

Funds: | Date 18 Nov 1964 | Test Site Victor "C"

PRIMED MOTOR

Number 1 | Type | Serial No.

Propellant Class 7 | Propellant Weight 7358 | Motor Case Mat. Fiberglass

Position relative to ground On ground: horizontal

Position of main motor axis Horizontal; head end NE

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) Rear bulkhead but no nozzles in this motor.

PRIMING SYSTEM

Priming Explosive: Type C-4 | Amount 96 lbs | Position Grain perforation

Detonators: Type Electric | Number 2 | Position One fore; one aft

Remarks

ACCEPTOR MOTORS

Number 1 | Type | Serial No.

Propellant Class 2 | Propellant Weight 7250 | Motor Case Mat. Steel

Position relative to primed motor Side by side: touching

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) Rear bulkhead complete with nozzle bosses (no nozzles) was on this motor.

WEATHER

Pressure mb 935.7 | Temperature °F 54 | Density Slugs

Humidity 12% | Wind Direction S | Wind Velocity, ft/sec 7

Conducted by: US NOTS | Test No. 4 | E.S. No. 4261-2

Funds: | Date 20 Nov 1964 | Test Site "C"

PRIMED MOTOR

Number 1 | Type | Serial No.

Propellant Class 7 | Propellant Weight 7358 | Motor Case Mat. Fiberglass

Position relative to ground On ground: horizontal

Position of main motor axis Horizontal; head end NE

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) No nozzles on this motor.

PRIMING SYSTEM

Priming Explosive: Type C-4 | Amount 96 lbs | Position In grain perforation

Detonators: Type Electric | Number 2 | Position One fore; one aft

Remarks

ACCEPTOR MOTORS

Number 1 | Type | Serial No.

Propellant Class 2 | Propellant Weight 7250 | Motor Case Mat. Steel

Position relative to primed motor Side by side: touching

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) No rear bulkhead in this motor.

WEATHER

Pressure mb 943.7 | Temperature °F 55 | Density Slugs

Humidity 22 | Wind Direction Calm | Wind Velocity, ft/sec --

Conducted by: US NOTS | Test No. 5 | E.S. No. 5001

Funds: | Date 8 Jan 1965 | Test Site Victor "C"

PRIMED MOTOR

Number 1 | Type _____ | Serial No. _____

Propellant Class 7 | Propellant Weight 7358 | Motor Case Mat. Fiberglass

Position relative to ground Above ground, resting on acceptor motor

Position of main motor axis Vertical, head end down

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) _____

PRIMING SYSTEM

Priming Explosive: Type C-4 | Amount 96 lbs | Position Grain perforation

Detonators: Type Electric | Number 2 | Position One fore; one aft

Remarks _____

ACCEPTOR MOTORS

Number 1 | Type _____ | Serial No. _____

Propellant Class 2 | Propellant Weight 7250 | Motor Case Mat. Steel

Position relative to primed motor On ground; vertical head end up

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) _____

WEATHER

Pressure mb 941.2 | Temperature °F 45 | Density Slugs _____

Humidity 30% | Wind Direction 100° | Wind Velocity, ft/sec 5

Conducted by: US NOTS | Test No. 6 | E.S. No. 5058

Funds: | Date 16 Mar 1965 | Test Site C

PRIMED MOTOR

Number 2 | Type | Serial No.

Propellant Class 2 | Propellant Weight 14,500 | Motor Case Mat. Steel

Position relative to ground On ground - horizontal - side-by-side

Position of main motor axis Horizontal - head ends NE

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) No nozzles on either motor.

PRIMING SYSTEM

Priming Explosive: Type C-4 | Amount 96#/motor | Position Grain perforation

Detonators: Type Electric | Number 2/motor | Position One fore; one aft

Remarks

ACCEPTOR MOTORS

Number | Type | Serial No.

Propellant Class | Propellant Weight | Motor Case Mat.

Position relative to primed motor

Remarks (including motor deficiencies)

WEATHER

Pressure mb 937.1 | Temperature °F 70.5 | Density Slugs 0.00215

Humidity 16% | Wind Direction Calm | Wind Velocity, ft/sec calm

Conducted by: US NOTS | Test No. 7 | E.S. No. 5065

Funds: | Date 17 Mar 1965 | Test Site C

PRIMED MOTOR

Number 1 | Type | Serial No.

Propellant Class 7 | Propellant Weight 7358 | Motor Case Mat. Fiberglass

Position relative to ground On top of acceptor - 6' above ground

Position of main motor axis Vertical

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) There were no nozzles on this motor.

PRIMING SYSTEM

Priming Explosive: Type Comp B | Amount 100# | Position On top of donor motor

Detonators: Type Electric | Number 2 | Position On top of primer charge

Remarks

ACCEPTOR MOTORS

Number 1 | Type | Serial No.

Propellant Class 2 | Propellant Weight 7250# | Motor Case Mat. Steel

Position relative to primed motor On ground directly under donor.

Remarks (including motor deficiencies)

WEATHER

Pressure mb 935.9 | Temperature °F 72.5 | Density Slugs 0.00215

Humidity 14% | Wind Direction 125° | Wind Velocity, ft/sec 10

Conducted by: US NOTS | Test No. Calibration-A | E.S. No. 4262

Funds: | Date 25 Nov 1964 | Test Site Victor "C"

PRIMED MOTOR

Number 216 cans | Type Reclaimed Comp. B | Serial No. _____

Propellant Class _____ | Propellant Weight 10,260 | Motor Case Mat. _____

Position relative to ground On pallets

Position of main motor axis _____

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) 216 metal cans 9x9x9 in. Stack was 9 cans x 6 cans x 4 cans high.

PRIMING SYSTEM

Priming Explosive: Type C-4 | Amount 80 lbs | Position Each side

Detonators: Type Electric | Number 4 | Position 2/each primer chg.

Remarks _____

ACCEPTOR MOTORS

Number _____ | Type _____ | Serial No. _____

Propellant Class ____ | Propellant Weight _____ | Motor Case Mat. _____

Position relative to primed motor _____

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) _____

WEATHER

Pressure mb 933.1 | Temperature °F 64 | Density Slugs _____

Humidity 18 | Wind Direction E | Wind Velocity, ft/sec 3.5

Conducted by: US NOTS | Test No. Calibration B | E.S. No. 5064

Funds: | Date 19 Mar 1965 | Test Site C

PRIMED MOTOR

Number 213 boxes | Type Flake TNT | Serial No. _____

Propellant Class _____ | Propellant Weight 10,650 | Motor Case Mat. _____

Position relative to ground Loose in one large wooden box

Position of main motor axis Box oriented NEXSW

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) 10 boxes, containing 500#, were stacked on top of the loose TNT.

PRIMING SYSTEM

Priming Explosive: Type C-4 | Amount 96# | Position E of box

Detonators: Type Electric | Number 2 | Position One fore; one aft

Remarks The 96# of priming explosive were contained in a 6-in. x 6-in. wooden box which extended from one end to the other at the exact center of the main explosive charge.

ACCEPTOR MOTORS

Number _____ | Type _____ | Serial No. _____

Propellant Class ____ | Propellant Weight _____ | Motor Case Mat. _____

Position relative to primed motor _____

Remarks (including motor deficiencies) _____

WEATHER

Pressure mb 940.0 | Temperature °F 65 | Density Slugs _____

Humidity 13% | Wind Direction 150° | Wind Velocity, ft/sec 3.4

Unclassified

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY *(Corporate author)*

U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station
China Lake, California 9355S

2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
Unclassified

2b. GROUP
--

3. REPORT TITLE

HIGH EXPLOSIVE EQUIVALENCY TESTS OF ROCKET MOTORS

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES *(Type of report and inclusive dates)*

Progress report on solid propellant motor hazard tests; S November 1964 through 19 March 196S.

5. AUTHOR(S) *(Last name, first name, initial)*

Weals, F. H.
Wilson, C. H.

6. REPORT DATE	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	7b. NO. OF REFS
November 196S		--

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)
Work Request W-11S43B-Am. 1	TPR 413
b. PROJECT NO. Local Project Number 96S	NOTS TP 3910
TA RMMO-62061/216-1/F008-11-0S	
c. Local Project Number 556	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) *(Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)*
d.	--

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES

All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through The Armed Services Explosives Safety Board, DOD, Washington, D. C. 2031S.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY
Ballistics Research Lab Memorandum Report 1S18, dated April 1964, used as comparison reference.	ASESB Department of Defnese, Washington, D. C. 2031S

13. ABSTRACT

ABSTRACT. From November 1964 to 19 March 196S seven solid propellant motor hazard tests and two high explosive calibration tests were conducted at the U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California. The primary purpose of the tests was to assess the blast yield of two classes of solid propellant material, when subjected to severe explosive shock, and to compare the propellant blast yields to those produced by a standard explosive. The following yields, in percent of TNT equivalency by weight, were determined from overpressure and impulse data from a blast gage array: The highest yield of class 2 propellants tested alone approximated 40%; class 7 propellants tested alone produced well over 100%; and a combination of equal amounts of each class produced approximately 100%. The quantity and dispersion of fragments varied widely with the propellants used and with the test configuration.

Additional tests are planned using different motor configurations, different propellants, and varying explosive stimuli.

DD FORM 1 JAN 64 1473 *0101-807-6800*

Unclassified

Security Classification

Unclassified

Security Classification

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Propellant hazard Explosive equivalency Rocket motor safety						

INSTRUCTIONS

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defenae activity or other organization *(corporata author)* iasuing the report.

2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulationa.

2b. GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, ahow that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital lettera. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be aelected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES: If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive datea when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, ahow rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an abaolute minimum requirement.

6. REPORT DATE: Enter the date of the report aa day, month, year; or month, year. If more than one date appeara on the report, uae date of publication.

7a. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Enter the total number of referencea cited in the report.

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER: If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. PROJECT NUMBER: Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, aubproject number, aystem numbera, task number, etc.

9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S): Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number muat be unique to this report.

9b. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S): If the report has been asaigned any other report numbera *(either by the originator or by tha sponsor)*, also enter thia number(a).

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES: Enter any limitations on further diaemination of the report, other than those impoaed by security classification, using standard atatements such as:

(1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."

(2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."

(3) "U. S. Government agenciea may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC usera shall request through

_____."

(4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of thia report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through

_____."

(5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through

_____."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring *(paying for)* the research and development. Include address.

13. ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as *(TS), (S), (C), or (U)*.

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.

Unclassified

Security Classification