

AD-A060 871

ARMY MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS ACTIVITY ABERDEEN PROV--ETC 170 0000  
PARAMETRIC ANALYSIS OF MAIN BATTLE TANK MOBILITY IN KOREAN TERR--ETC(U)  
OCT 78 W A NIEMEYER, R C THIBODEAU  
AMSAA-TR-237


UNCLASSIFIED

NL

| of |  
AD  
A060 871



END  
DATE  
FILMED  
1-79  
DDC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

**DDC** FILE COPY

AD A060871

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER TR-237 ✓	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER 9
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Parametric Analysis of Main Battle Tank Mobility in Korean Terrain.	5. DATE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final rept.	
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
7. AUTHOR(s) William A. Niemeyer Robert C. Thibodeau	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) 16 LR765706M541	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS DA Project No 1R76506M541	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Commander US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	12. REPORT DATE 11 October 1978	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 59
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) AMSAA-TR-237	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE UNCLASSIFIED
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release, distribution unlimited. 126 pp.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Combat Vehicles                      Mobility Modeling Main Battle Tanks                      Automotive Performance Mobility                                      Korean Terrain		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report evaluates, through parametric component variation, the mobility potential of a series of main battle tank configurations operating in Korean terrain. Four principal design areas are varied, including the power train, suspension, weight and hull geometry. The speed potential of each vehicle configuration is determined throughout the terrain spectrum, and non-negotiable terrain is identified. Diagnostic analysis indicates the factors causing speed limitation as well as the reasons when the terrain is impassable. Some detail is provided on the soft soil mobility of the various configurations and the significance of differences on the basis of Korean seasonal soil strength.		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 68 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

403910

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

78 11 01 070

LB

# LEVEL II

12

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
List of Figures . . . . .	iii
List of Tables. . . . .	v
1. Introduction. . . . .	1
2. Model Description . . . . .	1
3. Terrain Description . . . . .	4
4. Vehicle Configurations - Parametric Variations. . . . .	7
5. Modeling Results. . . . .	7
6. Soft Soil Mobility Considerations . . . . .	21
7. Conclusions . . . . .	25
Appendix A: Terrain Factor Distributions . . . . .	29
Appendix B: Vehicle Cone Index Equations . . . . .	55
Distribution List . . . . .	59

APPROVED BY	
RTD	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Diff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
Dist. AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL	
A	

DDC  
RECEIVED  
NOV 6 1978  
RECEIVED  
D

Next page is blank

LIST OF FIGURES

	PAGE
1. AMC Mobility Model (Areal Mobility Prediction) . . . . .	2
2. Study Terrain Map Sheets. . . . .	5
3. Map Sheet Locations . . . . .	6
4. Parametric Vehicles in Korean Terrain (Actual Speeds, M60 Geometry & Suspension). . . . .	10
5. Parametric Vehicles in Korean Terrain (Actual Speeds, SOTA Geometry & Suspension) . . . . .	11
6. Parametric Vehicles in Korean Terrain (Actual Speeds, M60 Geometry-SOTA Suspension) . . . . .	12
7. Parametric Vehicles in Korean Terrain (Actual Speeds, SOTA Geometry - M60 Suspension) . . . . .	13
8. Parametric Vehicles in Korean Terrain (Average Speeds, M60 Geometry & Suspension) . . . . .	14
9. Parametric Vehicles in Korean Terrain (Average Speeds, SOTA Geometry & Suspension). . . . .	15
10. Parametric Vehicles in Korean Terrain (Average Speeds, M60 Geometry-SOTA Suspension). . . . .	16
11. Parametric Vehicles in Korean Terrain (Average Speeds, SOTA Geometry-M60 Suspension). . . . .	17
12. Gross Relationship Between Vehicle Ground Pressure and Soil Strength Required for Mobility. . . . .	23
13. Soft Soil Limitations in Korean Terrain . . . . .	24
14. Mobility Enhancement Provided by Configuration Changes . . . . .	26
A.1 thru A.23 Terrain Factor Distributions. . . . .	29

Next page is blank

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
1. Terrain Classification System . . . . .	3
2. Vehicle Configuration Matrix. . . . .	8
3. Summarized Cross Country Speed Performance. . . . .	18
4. Average Performance Improvements Obtained from Vehicle Component Variation. . . . .	19
5. Frequency of Limiting Factor Occurrence . . . . .	20
6. Marginal Soft Soil Mobility Factors . . . . .	22

Next page is blank

## PARAMETRIC ANALYSIS OF MAIN BATTLE TANK MOBILITY IN KOREAN TERRAIN

### 1. INTRODUCTION

This report evaluates, through parametric component variation, the mobility potential of a series of main battle tank configurations operating in Korean terrain. Four principal design areas are varied, including the power train, suspension, weight and hull geometry. The Korean terrain as characterized by the Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi, is statistically described, and the methodology for modeling vehicle performance is summarized.

The speed potential of each vehicle configuration is determined throughout the terrain spectrum, and non-negotiable terrain is identified. Diagnostic analysis indicates the factors causing speed limitation as well as the reasons when the terrain is impassable. Some detail is provided on the soft soil mobility of the various configurations and the significance of differences on the basis of Korean seasonal soil strength.

### 2. MODEL DESCRIPTION

The computer simulation used to evaluate the vehicle/terrain interaction and predict mobility performance is the Army Mobility Model (AMM). This model considers vehicle performance in both areal and linear type terrain features. The areal mobility prediction part of the model (which is the only portion used in this evaluation) is shown schematically in Figure 1. The fundamental operation of this model is as follows. Detailed areal terrain data are collected from existing terrain data sources such as topographical maps, air photos, terrain studies, agricultural data and soil maps. Where possible these data sources are supplemented by actual field surveys. All these data sources are then used to develop a series of individual maps of the area being considered for each of the terrain factors shown in Figure 1.

The terrain input processor accepts these maps and overlays them to define areas in which the terrain is homogeneous with respect to all of the terrain factors simultaneously. The result of this process is an areal terrain unit map as shown, where unit number 98 might reflect an area where the slopes are uniformly between 5 and 10 percent and the soil strength in the wet season is uniformly between 40 and 60 cone index, etc. Associated with each map unit number is a range of values for each of 14 terrain factors. The factor categories are shown in Table 1.

The model requires a total of 76 vehicle characteristic inputs. These range from vehicle size and weight to details of its power train and suspension components. With these data the various mathematical submodels of the overall model predict vehicle performance in the terrain factor values established for each map unit.




Figure 1. AMC Mobility Model (Areal Mobility Prediction)

TABLE 1 - TERRAIN CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

TERRAIN FACTORS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Surface Type	Plan Sectional Number	Control Number	Number	CF										
Surface strength (CI or RCI) Class range	201-200	221-200	161-220	101-160	61-100	41-60	31-40	26-32	17-26	11-16	4-10			
Slope (%) Class range	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-20	21-40	41-60	61-70	70-90						
Steepest approach angle (deg) Class range														
Steepest vertical way (in) Class range	170	181	176-178	162-164	171-173	166-169	159-170	191-202	140-150	202-211	136-140	212-225	98-126	228-270
Steepest base width (in) Class range	3-6	7-10	11-14	15-18	19-24	25-33	33-45	46-60						
Steepest length (ft) Class range	48-100	36-47	24-35	13-24	6-12									
Steepest spacing (ft) Class range	1	2-5	4-6	7-10	11-20	21-40	41-100							
Steepest spacing type	100	66-107	37-46	26-36	18-25	13-18	9-12	2-8						
Steepest spacing type	Number	Control Number												
Surface roughness x 10 (100 in.)	1	2-4	5-6	7-8	9-12	13-16	17-22	23-32	33-40					
Stem diameter (in.) Factor value	0	1	> 2.4	> 3.0	> 3.3	> 7.0	> 8.7	> 9.8						
Stem spacing (ft)	328	64-327	36-64	26-35	18-25	13-17	9-12	1-7						
Stability (ft) Class range	148-200	77-144	39-76	30-38	20-29	16-19	10-15	6-9	1-5					
Urban Code	Village	Town	City	Suburb										

Submodels consider vehicle performance in the following manner:

<u>Terrain Factors Considered</u>	<u>Vehicle Performance Predicted</u>
Soil Type	Tractive and resistance forces throughout speed range.
Soil strength	
Slope	
Terrain roughness	Ride limited speed
Obstacles	Hangup, traction, dynamic loading, acceleration and braking between obstacles.
Vegetation	Traction for overriding, and vehicle size for maneuvering between trees. Driver visibility.

For a given map unit the speed results of each of these submodels are compared for uphill, downhill, and level slope conditions; the limiting value is selected for each condition, and the three limiting values are averaged to provide the vehicle's estimated best speed in that map unit. In considering the vegetation factor the model examines various strategies of maneuvering around certain size trees and overriding others to obtain the best vehicle speed. Some terrain factors such as soil strength and slope naturally interact with others, so are considered simultaneously. For example, a vehicle on a soft soil slope will have less tractive force available to climb an obstacle or override a tree than it would on a level hard surface because some of its tractive force capability is used in overcoming the soft soil motion resistance and the grade resistance. The basic speed output of the model can be used to develop a speed map as shown in Figure 1.

### 3. TERRAIN DESCRIPTION

The terrain used in this analysis is an area approximately 12 kilometers wide and 46 kilometers long on the northeast coast, between 41° and 42° latitude. The terrain was characterized, in accordance with Table 1, by the US Army Corp of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station. It is the only Korean terrain that has been so characterized, and it is not known to what degree it can be considered representative of that in South Korea. This terrain was originally chosen for characterization simply because there was a complete set of topographic maps available for this area and it appeared to be reasonably representative of an area in which vehicle negotiation would be practical. The subject area is shown schematically in Figure 2 and the map sheet locations are shown in Figure 3.

The area has been divided into approximately 2,000 discrete terrain units, but several of the non-contiguous units have identical




Figure 2. Study Terrain Map Sheets.




Figure 3. Map Sheet Locations.

characteristics, so that there are 1617 unique combinations of terrain factors, i.e., there are 1617 different types of terrain units that occur. Appendix A contains frequency distributions (as represented by percent area rather than number of terrain units) for the most significant factors of the terrain characterization. The area is shown to be very hilly with steep slopes, but at the same time there is a significant portion of the terrain with soil too soft to support repeated traffic of an M60. There is also a significant portion of the terrain with high surface roughness. In virtually all respects, the Korean terrain analyzed herein is more severe than the West German terrain typically used to represent European operations.

#### 4. VEHICLE CONFIGURATIONS - PARAMETRIC VARIATIONS

There are four principal design areas that are addressed parametrically in this report. These are the power train, suspension, gross weight, and general hull configuration including both geometric and inertial characteristics. Each of these factors are evaluated at two different levels with the exception of the power train which is addressed at three performance levels. The base level in all cases represents the current M60 series design. The upper level represents the practical "state of the art" in main battle tank design and will be referred to as the "SOTA" level. The third power train level is intermediate to the upper and lower levels and is believed to represent the performance available by product improvement of the M60 engine without a transmission change.

The result of providing the variation discussed above is a matrix yielding 24 vehicle configurations. These are identified in Table 2. It may be noted that the weight levels selected are not entirely consistent with the M60/SOTA spectrum of vehicle characteristics. The lower weight level is especially artificial, but was nonetheless selected after discussions with visitors from the Republic of Korea and TARADCOM in April 1977.

#### 5. MODELING RESULTS

The mobility model described in Section II was utilized to predict the performance of each vehicle configuration across the 1617 terrain unit types identified in the Korean terrain. The results of these analyses are presented in the form of mobility profiles in Figures 4 through 11. The profiles in Figures 5 through 7 are generated by ordering the terrain units along the horizontal axis with those providing best vehicle performance considered first (furthest to the left on this axis). The vehicle speed in each individual terrain unit is then plotted as a function of the terrain unit position on the area axis (which, as stated, is determined by trafficability). Thus the actual vehicle speed which can be obtained in, for example, the 75th percentile terrain, is depicted. Figures 8 through 11 use the same technique for arranging the terrain units, but rather than plot the actual speed in each unit, the cumulative average speed over all terrain units to the left of each point

TABLE 2 . VEHICLE CONFIGURATION MATRIX

Configuration Number	Power Train (HP)	Suspension	Weight (TONS)	Hull Configuration
1	750	M60	45	M60
2	750	M60	55	M60
3	900	M60	45	M60
4	900	M60	55	M60
5	1500	M60	45	M60
6	1500	M60	55	M60
7	750	SOTA	45	SOTA
8	750	SOTA	55	SOTA
9	900	SOTA	45	SOTA
10	900	SOTA	55	SOTA
11	1500	SOTA	45	SOTA
12	1500	SOTA	55	SOTA
13	750	SOTA	45	M60
14	750	SOTA	55	M60
15	900	SOTA	45	M60
16	900	SOTA	55	M60
17	1500	SOTA	45	M60
18	1500	SOTA	55	M60
19	750	M60	45	SOTA
20	750	M60	55	SOTA
21	900	M60	45	SOTA
22	900	M60	55	SOTA
23	1500	M60	45	SOTA
24	1500	M60	55	SOTA

on the horizontal axis is plotted. Thus from these curves one can determine the average speed of the vehicle if it is driven in, for example, the most trafficable 75 percent of the terrain, with the most severe 25 percent avoided. One further note on computational techniques - when the model determines a terrain unit to be impassable, it nevertheless assigns a vehicle speed of 0.1 mph to that unit as a computational expediency. Thus on the cumulative average speed curves, the 0.1 mph is averaged with all prior unit speeds and a finite average speed is predicted even over impassable terrain. However, reference to the actual speed curves will indicate the point at which this artificiality occurs.

In order to summarize the results shown in preceding mobility profiles, Table 3 has been included. In this table, the average speed attainable with each configuration is shown, first when operating in the most trafficable 50% of the terrain ( $V_{50}$ ), and also when in the most trafficable 80% of the terrain ( $V_{80}$ ). The  $V_{50}$  performance might be representative of movement potential where the unit has not been forced to tactical deployment and route selection is not restricted. The  $V_{80}$  performance might then be taken as an indicator of movement potential under tactical deployment where route selection is more restricted. These are admittedly arbitrary measures, but nevertheless are believed to provide a reasonable basis for quantifying the effects of the parametric variation of vehicle components. The final quantification of these effects is obtained by determining the average contribution across all configurations, afforded by variation of a single vehicle parameter. This is accomplished by computing the average percentage improvement in  $V_{50}$  and  $V_{80}$  when a single vehicle variable is changed from its lower performance level to the higher level (e.g. from M60 level to SOTA level, or from 55T to 45T). The results are shown in Table 4.

The addition to the speed profiles discussed above, one further product of the mobility modeling is a determination of the factor for each terrain unit that either causes the unit to be impassable, or provides the ultimate speed constraint.

Factor categories 1-4 below indicate impassability; categories 5-10 are speed constraints.


1. Soil strength insufficient
2. Available traction less than soil and slope resistance
3. Obstacle interference
4. Available traction less than total resistance (including vegetation and obstacle override).
5. Ride dynamics
6. Soil and slope resistance

**HORSEPOWER-WEIGHT GUIDE**

750 HP	-	45 Tons
750 HP	-	55 Tons
900 HP	-	45 Tons
900 HP	-	55 Tons
1500 HP	-	45 Tons
1500 HP	-	55 Tons

M60 Geometry, M60 Suspension

**Figure 4:**  
**PARAMETRIC VEHICLES IN**  
**KOREAN TERRAIN**




**HORSEPOWER-WEIGHT GUIDE**

750 HP	-	45 Tons
750 HP	-	55 Tons
900 HP	-	45 Tons
900 HP	-	55 Tons
1500 HP	-	45 Tons
1500 HP	-	55 Tons

SOTA Geometry, SOTA Suspension

Figure 5:

PARAMETRIC VEHICLES IN  
KOREAN TERRAIN




**HORSEPOWER-WEIGHT GUIDE**

- 750 HP - 45 Tons
- 750 HP - 55 Tons
- 900 HP - 45 Tons
- 900 HP - 55 Tons
- 1500 HP - 45 Tons
- 1500 HP - 55 Tons
- M60 Geometry, SOTA Suspension

Figure 6:

**PARAMETRIC VEHICLES IN  
KOREAN TERRAIN**




**HORSEPOWER-WEIGHT GUIDE**

750 HP	-	45 Tons
750 HP	-	55 Tons
900 HP	-	45 Tons
900 HP	-	55 Tons
1500 HP	-	45 Tons
1500 HP	-	55 Tons

SOTA Geometry, M60 Suspension


**Figure 7:  
PARAMETRIC VEHICLES IN  
KOREAN TERRAIN**




**HORSEPOWER-WEIGHT GUIDE**

- 750 HP - 45 Tons
- 750 HP - 55 Tons
- 900 HP - 45 Tons
- 900 HP - 55 Tons
- 1500 HP - 45 Tons
- 1500 HP - 55 Tons

M60 Geometry, M60 Suspension








Figure 11:

PARAMETRIC VEHICLES IN  
KOREAN TERRAIN

HORSEPOWER-WEIGHT GUIDE

750 HP	- 45 Tons
750 HP	- 55 Tons
900 HP	- 45 Tons
900 HP	- 55 Tons
1500 HP	- 45 Tons
1500 HP	- 55 Tons

SOTA Geometry, M60 Suspension




TABLE 3. SUMMARIZED CROSS COUNTRY SPEED PERFORMANCE

Conf. (GEOM-SUSP-PWR-WT) No.	Cumulative Average Speed (MPH)	
	V <sub>50</sub>	V <sub>80</sub>
1 (M60-M60-750-45)	11.7	9.2
2 (M60-M60-750-55)	9.9	7.5
3 (M60-M60-900-45)	14.5	11.1
4 (M60-M60-900-55)	12.5	9.0
5 (M60-M60-1500-45)	17.9	12.9
6 (M60-M60-1500-55)	16.0	11.9
7 (SOTA-SOTA-750-45)	12.8	10.2
8 (SOTA-SOTA-750-55)	10.6	8.1
9 (SOTA-SOTA-900-45)	16.6	12.8
10 (SOTA-SOTA-900-55)	13.8	11.0
11 (SOTA-SOTA-1500-45)	21.7	15.6
12 (SOTA-SOTA-1500-55)	18.6	14.1
13 (M60-SOTA-750-45)	12.9	10.3
14 (M60-SOTA-750-55)	10.7	8.5
15 (M60-SOTA-900-45)	16.4	12.8
16 (M60-SOTA-900-55)	13.8	11.1
17 (M60-SOTA-1500-45)	21.2	15.4
18 (M60-SOTA-1500-55)	18.4	13.8
19 (SOTA-M60-750-45)	11.7	9.1
20 (SOTA-M60-750-55)	9.8	7.4
21 (SOTA-M60-900-45)	14.6	11.1
22 (SOTA-M60-900-55)	12.5	9.7
23 (SOTA-M60-1500-45)	18.3	13.0
24 (SOTA-M60-1500-55)	16.2	12.0

**TABLE 4. AVERAGE PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS OBTAINED FROM VEHICLE COMPONENT VARIATION**

Component	Variation	Improvement	
		V <sub>50</sub>	V <sub>80</sub>
● Suspension	M60 → SOTA	12.5%	14.7%
● Power Train	750 HP → 900 HP	27.3%	27.6%
	900 HP → 1500 HP	29.3%	21.6%
● Hull Geometry	M60 → SOTA	0.5%	-0.4%
● Weight	55T → 45T	17.3%	15.9%

TABLE 5 Frequency of Limiting Factor Occurrence

CONF NO. (GEOM-SUSP-PWR-WT)	LIMITING FACTOR NUMBER									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 (M60- M60- 750-45)	2.7	0.4	1.0	2.9	17.7	9.1	3.1	15.7	24.9	22.5
2 (M60- M60- 750-55)	4.5	0.1	0.8	3.0	15.8	9.9	2.7	15.3	27.4	20.7
3 (M60- M60- 900-45)	2.7	0.4	1.0	2.9	16.8	9.3	8.0	15.9	18.9	24.1
4 (M60- M60- 900-55)	4.5	0.1	1.0	2.9	15.8	9.4	6.6	15.8	21.7	22.2
5 (M60- M60-1500-45)	2.7	0.4	0.6	2.9	20.3	5.6	12.2	18.1	12.0	25.3
6 (M60- M60-1500-55)	4.5	0.1	0.6	3.0	19.2	7.1	10.0	16.9	15.2	23.7
7 (SOTA-SOTA-750-45)	3.1	0.1	2.2	2.9	8.6	13.6	3.1	16.9	34.9	14.7
8 (SOTA-SOTA-750-55)	4.6	0.0	2.8	2.9	7.9	14.4	2.5	16.1	36.0	12.9
9 (SOTA-SOTA-900-45)	3.1	0.1	1.7	2.9	11.2	11.1	10.0	17.2	26.5	16.3
10 (SOTA-SOTA-900-55)	4.6	0.0	2.2	2.9	9.9	11.3	8.1	16.6	29.9	14.7
11 (SOTA-SOTA-1500-45)	3.1	0.1	1.2	2.9	16.1	8.5	14.0	17.5	19.0	17.7
12 (SOTA-SOTA-1500-55)	4.6	0.0	1.3	2.9	14.7	9.0	11.8	17.8	20.9	17.1
13 (M60- SOTA-750-45)	2.7	0.4	0.8	2.9	8.4	12.4	5.4	13.7	34.3	19.1
14 (M60- SOTA-750-55)	4.5	0.1	0.8	3.0	7.8	12.9	4.6	12.5	36.1	17.8
15 (M60- SOTA-900-45)	2.7	0.4	0.7	2.9	10.7	9.7	13.4	14.0	25.2	20.3
16 (M60- SOTA-900-55)	4.5	0.1	0.8	2.9	9.6	9.8	10.9	13.7	28.8	19.1
17 (M60- SOTA-1500-45)	2.7	0.4	0.4	2.9	14.1	6.4	19.3	15.0	15.9	23.0
18 (M60- SOTA-1500-55)	4.5	0.1	0.4	3.0	13.3	7.6	16.0	14.9	19.2	21.2
19 (SOTA-M60- 750-45)	3.1	0.1	2.4	2.9	18.6	9.2	1.8	17.9	25.0	19.0
20 (SOTA-M60- 750-55)	4.6	0.0	2.8	2.9	16.6	10.4	1.3	17.5	27.2	16.8
21 (SOTA-M60- 900-45)	3.1	0.1	2.0	2.9	17.1	10.5	5.9	17.9	20.7	20.0
22 (SOTA-M60- 900-55)	4.6	0.0	2.4	2.9	15.9	10.8	4.9	17.4	22.2	19.0
23 (SOTA-M60-1500-45)	3.1	0.1	1.4	2.9	21.8	7.5	8.2	20.0	13.6	21.5
24 (SOYA-M60-1500-55)	4.6	0.0	1.5	2.9	20.2	8.4	6.8	18.9	16.1	20.5

NOTE: Table values are percent of total area for which factor constrains mobility

7. Visibility
8. Maneuvering (through vegetation and obstacles)
9. Total resistance to movement (including vegetation and obstacle override).
10. Acceleration and deceleration between obstacles.

Table 5 indicates the percentage of the total terrain area for which each of the 10 factors was the operative constraint, for each vehicle configuration. For example, if one were interested in power train effects on speed, configurations 8 and 12 might be compared. Speed limiting factors numbered 6 and 9 deal with power train constraints, and by summing these frequencies together we see that an increase from 750 HP to 1500 HP decreases the area in which we are power train limited from 50.4% of the total area to 29.9%. (Power effects are present in some of the other limiting factors, but 6 and 9 are the key factors.) It should be noted that this table only indicates the frequency with which the various factors are constraining, but not the performance level at which the constraint occurs.

#### 6. SOFT SOIL MOBILITY CONSIDERATIONS

In addition to the comprehensive analysis of cross-country mobility provided in the previous section, there is also an issue of vehicle performance in marginal soft soil to be addressed. The primary design parameters involved in marginal soft soil performance are the length and width of the track, the contact area of the track shoe, and the weight of the vehicle. Again the analysis was conducted with a high and a lower level assigned to each of these factors so that the relative contribution of each might be identified. Table 6 identifies the levels selected for analysis of the track variables. It also shows the nominal ground pressure associated with each combination of variables at the two previously selected gross vehicle weights. Finally, the table shows a VCI, and VCI<sub>50</sub> entry for each configuration. This is the minimum soil strength as measured by cone penetrometer readings which will permit one and fifty passes respectively, of the vehicle through the soil. The equations for calculating vehicle cone index (VCI) numbers have been empirically derived and are shown in Appendix B.

There is no direct relationship between vehicle cone index and ground pressure. However, over the relatively small variation in track parameters considered here, reasonably linear relationships can be established, as shown in Figure 12. The data points are those from Table 6. These trend lines provide a gross estimate of the soil strength required to support a vehicle with a given ground pressure.

In order to assess the significance of differences in ground pressure over the range analyzed (from about 9 psi to about 14 psi) it is necessary

Table 6 MARGINAL SOFT SOIL MOBILITY FACTORS

TRACK LENGTH (IN.)	TRACK WIDTH (IN.)	SHOE AREA (IN.) <sup>2</sup>	45 TONS		55 TONS			
			NOM. GRD PRESS. (PSI)	VCI <sub>1</sub>	VCI <sub>50</sub>	NOM. GRD PRESS. (PSI)	VCI <sub>1</sub>	VCI <sub>50</sub>
160	24	160	11.7	20.7	48.3	14.3	28.9	66.1
160	24	180	11.7	20.6	48.0	14.3	28.8	65.8
160	28	160	10.0	17.0	40.0	12.2	23.1	53.5
160	28	180	10.0	16.8	39.8	12.2	23.0	53.2
180	24	160	10.4	19.2	44.9	12.7	26.5	60.8
180	24	180	10.4	19.1	44.6	12.7	26.4	60.5
180	28	160	8.9	15.8	37.4	10.9	21.3	49.6
180	28	180	8.9	15.7	37.2	10.9	21.2	49.3




Figure 12. Gross Relationship Between Vehicle Ground Pressure and Soil Strength Required for Mobility




Figure 13. Soft Soil Limitation in Korean Terrain.

to determine the frequency with which soil strengths in the Korean terrain are sufficiently low as to influence vehicle passage. Figure 13 shows the cumulative frequency distributions of soil strengths for various seasons. The wet season and dry season distributions are obtained by referring to yearly average rainfall data and selecting the wettest and driest 30 day periods for analysis. The average season reflects soil conditions over the remaining 305 days. The fourth distribution (referred to as "NWET") is an estimate of conditions in severe periods of rainfall. It reflects the soil strength conditions over the 10 wettest days of the year but with the yearly averages for those days increased by 50 percent, as might be experienced in a particularly wet year.

Superimposed on the distribution curves in Figure 13 are the soil strengths required for both one and 50 vehicle passes at 9 and 14 PSI ground pressure. It may be observed that the significance of ground pressure is minimal insofar as the probability of completing one vehicle pass through Korean soft soil is concerned under any seasonal condition. However, the probability that the soil will support repeated traffic is very much affected by ground pressure. For example, in the wet season, about eight percent of the terrain will not support 50 passes of vehicles with 9 PSI ground pressure while 40% of the terrain will not support 50 passes if the vehicle ground pressure is 14 PSI.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

Keeping in mind that the results of the preceding section have been derived from analysis in the sample Korean terrain only, and assuming the parameter ranges used represent the feasible alternatives, the following conclusions are offered:

- o Power train selection has the most critical impact on mobility potential. However, it is a case of diminishing returns. A relatively small increase from 750 HP to 900 HP produces about the same percentage improvement as does the much larger step in going from 900 HP to 1500 HP. (In both cases the absolute improvement in  $V_{80}$  is about 2.4 MPH.)

- o The next best place to look for improved mobility is probably the suspension. Over the ranges considered the weight has a slightly greater effect, but weight reduction may mean a tradeoff in protection level. A suspension improvement produces about the same effect on mobility, but is more readily achieved.

- o Movement rate is shown to be insensitive to hull geometry, however, lack of attention to this design factor can result in serious obstacle interference problems.

- o Based on the above conclusions and using  $V_{80}$  as an index of mobility performance, Figure 14 shows the incremental improvements afforded by component changes ordered according to their payoff.




Figure 14. Mobility Enhancement Provided by Configuration Changes.

o Finally, with regard to soft soil mobility, it appears that the criticality of the track configuration is very dependent on gross vehicle weight. A 45-ton vehicle will have few trafficability problems with most of the track configurations. For areas of repeated traffic, it is desirable to maintain a ground pressure of 11 PSI or less. For a 55-ton vehicle the acceptable track configurations are thus narrowed considerably.

APPENDIX A

TERRAIN FACTOR DISTRIBUTIONS

FIGURE A.1

**KOREAN SURFACE TYPE**




FIGURE A.2  
**KOREAN SURFACE STRENGTH-DRY (RCI)**





FIGURE A.3

KOREAN SURFACE STRENGTH-AVERAGE (RCI)



PERCENT OF TOTAL AREA

FIGURE A.4  
**KOREAN SURFACE STRENGTH-WET (RCI)**




FIGURE A-5

KOREAN SURFACE STRENGTH-WETMET (RCI)





FIGURE A-6

KOREAN SLOPE (PERCENT)



PERCENT OF TOTAL AREA

FIGURE A-7  
**KOREAN OBSTACLE APPROACH ANGLES (DEGREES)**




FIGURE A-8

KOREAN OBSTACLE VERTICAL MAGNITUDE (INCHES)




FIGURE A-9


KOREAN OBSTACLE BASE WIDTHS (INCHES)



PERCENT OF TOTAL AREA

FIGURE A-10


KOREAN OBSTACLE LENGTHS (FEET)



PERCENT OF TOTAL AREA

FIGURE A-11


KOREAN OBSTACLE SPACINGS (FEET)



PERCENT OF TOTAL AREA

FIGURE A-12

### KOREAN OBSTACLE SPACING TYPE



CONT.  
RANDOM

FIGURE A-13

KOREAN SURFACE ROUGHNESS (RMS X 10)




FIGURE A-14  
**KOREAN STEM SPACINGS > CLASS I (FEET)**  
 (STEM DIA > 0 IN)




FIGURE A-15

**KOREAN STEM SPACINGS > CLASS II (FEET)**

(STEM DIA > 1.0 IN)





FIGURE A-16

**KOREAN STEM SPACINGS > CLASS III (FEET)**

(STEM DIA > 2.4 IN)



MEAN TOTAL AREA

FIGURE A-17

KOREAN STEM SPACINGS > CLASS IV (FEET)




FIGURE A-18

KOREAN STEM SPACINGS > CLASS V (FEET)





FIGURE A-19

**KOREAN STEM SPACINGS > CLASS VI (FEET)**

(STEM DIA > 7.0 IN)



BARLOWZT OL TOLAJ ARUK

FIGURE A-20

**KOREAN STEM SPACINGS > CLASS VII (FEET)**

(STEM DIA > 8.7 IN)





FIGURE A-21

**KOREAN STEM SPACINGS > CLASS VIII (FEET)**

(STEM DIA > 9.8 IN)



NUMBER OF TOTAL STEMS

FIGURE A-22





FIGURE A-23

KOREAN URBAN CODE



APPENDIX B

VEHICLE CONE INDEX EQUATIONS

Next page is blank

MOBILITY INDEX FOR SELF-PROPELLED TRACKED VEHICLES  
IN FINE-GRAINED SOILS

Vehicle \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_

Track Description \_\_\_\_\_

$$\text{Mobility Index} = \left[ \frac{(1) \times (2)}{(3) \times (4)} + (5) - (6) \right] \times (7) \times (8)$$

- (1) Contact Pressure Factor =  $\frac{\text{Gross weight, lb}}{\text{Area of tracks in contact with ground, sq in.}}$  = \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_ (1)
- (2) Weight Factor :   
 <50,000 lb = 1.0  
 50,000 to 69,999 lb = 1.2  
 70,000 to 99,999 lb = 1.4  
 100,000 lb or > = 1.8  
 = \_\_\_\_\_ (2)
- (3) Track Factor =  $\frac{\text{Track width, in.}}{100}$  = \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_ (3)
- (4) Grouser Factor :   
 <1.5 in. high = 1.0  
 >1.5 in. high = 1.1  
 = \_\_\_\_\_ (4)
- (5) Bogie Factor =  $\frac{\text{Gross wt} \div 10}{\text{Total no. bogies in contact with ground} \times \text{area of 1 track shoe}}$  = \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_ (5)
- (6) Clearance Factor =  $\frac{\text{Clearance, in.}}{10}$  = \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_ (6)
- (7) Engine Factor :   
 >10 hp/ton = 1.00  
 <10 hp/ton = 1.05  
 = \_\_\_\_\_ (7)
- (8) Transmission Factor =   
 Hydraulic = 1.00  
 Mechanical = 1.05  
 = \_\_\_\_\_ (8)

$$\text{Mobility Index (MI)} = \left[ \frac{x}{x} + - \right] \times \times = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$$

$$\text{VCI}_{50} = 19.27 + .43 \text{ MI} - \left[ \frac{125.79}{\text{MI} + 7.08} \right]$$

$$\text{VCI}_{50} = 19.27 + \quad - \quad = \boxed{\hspace{2cm}}$$

$$\text{VCI}_1 = 7.0 + .2 \text{ MI} - \left[ \frac{39.2}{\text{MI} + 5.6} \right]$$

$$= 7.0 + \quad - \quad = \boxed{\hspace{2cm}}$$

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>NO OF COPIES</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>NO OF COPIES</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
12	Commander Defense Documentation Center ATTN: TCA Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	2	Commander US Army Tank Automotive Research & Development Command ATTN: DRDTA-UL (Tech Lib) DRDTA-V Warren, MI 48090
1	Commander US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command ATTN: DRCDE-F 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	2	Chief Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange US Army Logistics Management Center ATTN: DRXMC-D Fort Lee, VA 23801
1	Commander US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command ATTN: DRCBSI-L 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	1	Commander US Army Concepts Analysis Agency 8120 Woodmont Avenue Bethesda, MD 20014
1	Commander US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command ATTN: DRCPA-S 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333		<u>Aberdeen Proving Ground</u>  Cdr, USATECOM ATTN: DRSTE DRSTE-CS-A Bldg 314
1	Commander US Army Waterways Experiment Station ATTN: WESFM Vicksburg, MS 39180		Dir, BRL, ATTN: STINFO Br, Bldg 305 Dir, BRL, Bldg 328 Dir, HEL, Bldg 520
2	Director US Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: ATAA-SA ATAA-T White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002		