

AD A091978

DNA 5153F

# CALCULATION OF MULTIPLE BURST INTERACTIONS FOR SIX SIMULTANEOUS EXPLOSIONS OF 120 TON ANFO CHARGES

Kaman AviDyne  
83 Second Avenue  
Burlington, Massachusetts 01803

15 December 1979

Final Report for Period 1 March 1979-15 December 1979

CONTRACT No. DNA 001-79-C-0224

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;  
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

DTIC  
ELECTE  
NOV 24 1980

THIS WORK SPONSORED BY THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY  
UNDER RDT&E RMSS CODE B344079464 Y99QAXSG67704 H2590D.

Prepared for  
Director  
DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY  
Washington, D. C. 20305

DDC FILE COPY

80 11 21 055

Destroy this report when it is no longer  
needed. Do not return to sender.

PLEASE NOTIFY THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY,  
ATTN: STTI, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20305, IF  
YOUR ADDRESS IS INCORRECT, IF YOU WISH TO  
BE DELETED FROM THE DISTRIBUTION LIST, OR  
IF THE ADDRESSEE IS NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY  
YOUR ORGANIZATION.



UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

| 19 REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                     | READ INSTRUCTIONS<br>BEFORE COMPLETING FORM                                          |  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER<br>DNA 5155F                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.<br>AD-A091978 | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER                                                        |  |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle)<br>CALCULATION OF MULTIPLE BURST INTERACTIONS FOR SIX SIMULTANEOUS EXPLOSIONS OF 12 TON ANFO CHARGES.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                     | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED<br>Final Report for Period 1 Mar 77 - 15 Dec 79   |  |
| 6. AUTHOR<br>J. R. Ruetenik<br>Norman P. Hobbs<br>Robert F. Smiley                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                     | 7. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER<br>KA-TR-176                                        |  |
| 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Kaman Avidyne<br>83 Second Avenue<br>Burlington, Massachusetts 01803                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                     | 9. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)<br>DNA001-79-C-0224                                   |  |
| 10. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Director<br>Defense Nuclear Agency<br>Washington, DC 20305                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                     | 11. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS<br>Subtask Y99QAXSG677-04 |  |
| 12. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)<br>G-6111                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                     | 13. REPORT DATE<br>15 December 1979                                                  |  |
| 14. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)<br>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                     | 15. NUMBER OF PAGES<br>60                                                            |  |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                     | 17. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)<br>UNCLASSIFIED                                 |  |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES<br>This work sponsored by the Defense Nuclear Agency under RDT&E RMSS Code B344079464 Y99QAXSG67704 H2590D.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                     | 19. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE                                            |  |
| 20. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br>Blast<br>Computer Studies<br>Pressure<br>Shock                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                     |                                                                                      |  |
| 21. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br>The REFLECT code was modified for calculation of the interaction of six equal blast waves from simultaneously detonated charges in a hexagonal pattern. The objective has been to determine whether the REFLECT code, if further modified, would have the potential for accurate calculation of the interaction of six blast waves. In its present form the code is called REFLECT-3. → next page |                                     |                                                                                      |  |

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

194970

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

## 20. ABSTRACT (Continued)

A calculation was performed for the conditions of the MISERS BLUFF II-2 test, six 120-T ANFO charges separated by 100 m. Comparisons with overpressure and shock arrival time measurements show good agreement, within the data uncertainty, until the incident shock is within about 7 m (20 feet) of the array center. The peak overpressure predicted for the main reflected wave, which contains the highest pressures, agrees well with test results near the array center. Improvement would require reducing the cell sizes and applying the "sharp" (Rankine-Hugoniot) shock modelling not just to the initial shock but to two later shocks as well.

|                    |                                     |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Accession For      |                                     |
| NTIS GRA&I         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ERIC TAB           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Unannounced        | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Justification      |                                     |
| Distribution/      |                                     |
| Availability Codes |                                     |
| Avail. to user     |                                     |
| Dist               | Special                             |
| A                  |                                     |

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

**Conversion factors for U.S. customary  
to metric (SI) units of measurement.**

| To Convert From                                  | To                                                 | Multiply By                  |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| angstrom                                         | meter (m)                                          | $1.000\ 000 \times 10^{-10}$ |
| atmosphere (normal)                              | kilo pascal (kPa)                                  | $1.013\ 25 \times 10^5$      |
| bar                                              | kilo pascal (kPa)                                  | $1.000\ 000 \times 10^5$     |
| barn                                             | meter <sup>2</sup> (m <sup>2</sup> )               | $1.000\ 000 \times 10^{-28}$ |
| British thermal unit (thermochemical)            | joule (J)                                          | $1.054\ 350 \times 10^3$     |
| calorie (thermochemical)                         | joule (J)                                          | 4.184 000                    |
| cal (thermochemical)/cm <sup>2</sup>             | mega joule/m <sup>2</sup> (MJ/m <sup>2</sup> )     | $4.184\ 000 \times 10^{-2}$  |
| curie                                            | giga becquerel (GBq)**                             | $3.700\ 000 \times 10^4$     |
| degree (angle)                                   | radian (rad)                                       | $1.745\ 329 \times 10^{-2}$  |
| degree Fahrenheit                                | degree kelvin (K)                                  | $T_K = (T_F + 459.67)/1.8$   |
| electron volt                                    | joule (J)                                          | $1.602\ 19 \times 10^{-19}$  |
| erg                                              | joule (J)                                          | $1.000\ 000 \times 10^{-7}$  |
| erg/second                                       | watt (W)                                           | $1.000\ 000 \times 10^{-7}$  |
| foot                                             | meter (m)                                          | $3.048\ 000 \times 10^{-1}$  |
| foot-pound-force                                 | joule (J)                                          | 1.355 818                    |
| gallon (U.S. liquid)                             | meter <sup>3</sup> (m <sup>3</sup> )               | $3.785\ 412 \times 10^{-3}$  |
| inch                                             | meter (m)                                          | $2.540\ 000 \times 10^{-2}$  |
| jerk                                             | joule (J)                                          | $1.000\ 000 \times 10^{-9}$  |
| joule/kilogram (J/kg) (radiation dose absorbed)  | Gray (Gy)**                                        | 1.000 000                    |
| kiloton                                          | terajoules                                         | 4.184                        |
| kip (1000 lbf)                                   | newton (N)                                         | $4.448\ 222 \times 10^3$     |
| kip/inch <sup>2</sup> (ksi)                      | kilo pascal (kPa)                                  | $6.894\ 757 \times 10^5$     |
| knap                                             | newton-second/m <sup>2</sup> (N-s/m <sup>2</sup> ) | $1.000\ 000 \times 10^{-2}$  |
| micron                                           | meter (m)                                          | $1.000\ 000 \times 10^{-6}$  |
| mil                                              | meter (m)                                          | $2.540\ 000 \times 10^{-5}$  |
| mile (international)                             | meter (m)                                          | $1.609\ 344 \times 10^3$     |
| ounce                                            | kilogram (kg)                                      | $2.834\ 952 \times 10^{-2}$  |
| pound-force (lbf avoirdupois)                    | newton (N)                                         | 4.448 222                    |
| pound-force inch                                 | newton meter (N-m)                                 | $1.129\ 848 \times 10^{-1}$  |
| pound-force/inch                                 | newton/meter (N/m)                                 | $1.751\ 268 \times 10^2$     |
| pound-force/foot <sup>2</sup>                    | kilo pascal (kPa)                                  | $4.788\ 026 \times 10^2$     |
| pound-force/inch <sup>2</sup> (psi)              | kilo pascal (kPa)                                  | 6.894 757                    |
| pound-mass (lbm avoirdupois)                     | kilogram (kg)                                      | $4.535\ 924 \times 10^{-1}$  |
| pound-mass-foot <sup>2</sup> (moment of inertia) | kilogram-meter <sup>2</sup> (kg-m <sup>2</sup> )   | $4.215\ 011 \times 10^{-2}$  |
| pound-mass/foot <sup>3</sup>                     | kilogram/meter <sup>3</sup> (kg/m <sup>3</sup> )   | $1.601\ 846 \times 10^4$     |
| rad (radiation dose absorbed)                    | Gray (Gy)**                                        | $1.000\ 000 \times 10^{-2}$  |
| roentgen                                         | coulomb/kilogram (C/kg)                            | $2.579\ 760 \times 10^{-4}$  |
| shake                                            | second (s)                                         | $1.000\ 000 \times 10^{-8}$  |
| slug                                             | kilogram (kg)                                      | $1.459\ 390 \times 10^3$     |
| torr (mm Hg, 0° C)                               | kilo pascal (kPa)                                  | $1.333\ 22 \times 10^{-1}$   |

\*The becquerel (Bq) is the SI unit of radioactivity; 1 Bq = 1 event/s.

\*\*The Gray (Gy) is the SI unit of absorbed radiation.

A more complete listing of conversions may be found in "Metric Practice Guide E 380-7/," American Society for Testing and Materials.

## PREFACE

The work described here was performed by the Avidyne Division of the Kaman Sciences Corporation for the Defense Nuclear Agency under Contract DNA001-79-C-0224. Dr. George W. Ullrich of the DNA Shock Physics Directorate was the technical monitor.

Dr. J. Ray Ruetenik of Kaman Avidyne was the project leader under Dr. Norman P. Hobbs, Technical Director of KA. Dr. Hobbs and Mr. Robert F. Smiley carried out the computer code work assisted by Messrs. Thomas A. Dalton and Michael A. Tomayko.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Ullrich for his interest and technical interchange during the progress of the work. Particular appreciation is extended to Dr. Allen L. Kuhl, R&D Associates, for his comments during the course of this work.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>Section</u>                                                        | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| CONVERSION TABLE - - - - -                                            | 1           |
| PREFACE- - - - -                                                      | 2           |
| LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS- - - - -                                        | 4           |
| 1 INTRODUCTION - - - - -                                              | 5           |
| 2 REFLECT-3 HYDROCODE- - - - -                                        | 7           |
| 2-1 REFLECT-1 MODEL FOR TWO-BURST INTERACTION - - - -                 | 7           |
| 2-2 SIX-BURST INTERACTION - - - - -                                   | 11          |
| 3 RESULTS- - - - -                                                    | 17          |
| 3-1 BLAST-WAVE MODEL- - - - -                                         | 17          |
| 3-1.1 Shock Overpressure - - - - -                                    | 17          |
| 3-1.2 Overpressure Wave Form - - - - -                                | 36          |
| 3-1.3 Selection of Scaled AFWL 1-KT-STD (REV)<br>Blast Model- - - - - | 37          |
| 3-2 $R_1$ - $M_1$ WAVES - - - - -                                     | 37          |
| 3-3 $R_1$ - $R_2$ WAVES - - - - -                                     | 39          |
| 3-4 $R_2$ - $R_3$ WAVE- - - - -                                       | 40          |
| 3-5 M-R WAVE- - - - -                                                 | 40          |
| 3-6 ARRAY CENTER- - - - -                                             | 41          |
| 3-7 INCIDENT SHOCK OVERPRESSURES- - - - -                             | 41          |
| 3-8 MAIN REFLECTED SHOCK OVERPRESSURES- - - - -                       | 43          |
| 3-9 SHOCK FRONT TRAJECTORIES- - - - -                                 | 43          |
| 4 DISCUSSION - - - - -                                                | 45          |
| 5 CONCLUSIONS- - - - -                                                | 48          |
| REFERENCES - - - - -                                                  | 49          |
| APPENDIX - - - - -                                                    | 51          |

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

| <u>Figure</u> |                                                                                                                                                                      | <u>Page</u> |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1             | Blast pattern shortly following simultaneous burst<br>of a hexagonal array of charges - - - - -                                                                      | 8           |
| 2             | REFLECT-1 model of two-burst blast interaction- - - - -                                                                                                              | 9           |
| 3             | REFLECT-3 cell layout after $R_1$ wave intercepts charge<br>radial- - - - -                                                                                          | 10          |
| 4             | Sketches illustrating development of shock pattern- - -                                                                                                              | 13          |
| 5             | Comparison of predicted and measured shock over-<br>pressures for individual ANFO blast waves - - - - -                                                              | 18          |
| 6             | Comparison of overpressure predictions with MISERS<br>BLUFF II-2 test data for charge locations - - - - -                                                            | 19          |
| 7             | Comparison of overpressure predictions with MISERS<br>BLUFF II-2 test data for charge bisector locations- - -                                                        | 22          |
| 8             | Comparison of incident shock overpressure predictions<br>with MISERS BLUFF II-2 test data near the array center<br>along charge radials and bisectors- - - - -       | 31          |
| 9             | Comparison of peak overpressure predictions for the<br>main reflected wave with MISERS BLUFF II-2 test data<br>near the array center along charge radials- - - - -   | 32          |
| 10            | Comparison of peak overpressure predictions for the<br>main reflected wave with MISERS BLUFF II-2 test data<br>near the array center along charge bisectors- - - - - | 33          |
| 11            | Comparison of shock trajectory predictions with MISERS<br>BLUFF II-2 test data near the array center along<br>charge radials- - - - -                                | 34          |
| 12            | Comparison of shock trajectory predictions with MISERS<br>BLUFF II-2 test data near the array center along<br>charge bisectors- - - - -                              | 35          |
| 13            | Sketch illustrating the PFAB model- - - - -                                                                                                                          | 52          |

## SECTION 1

### INTRODUCTION

The interaction of blast waves from two or more simultaneous explosions can lead to much higher pressures than would be found from the individual blast waves. This phenomenon has been called cumulation by Kuhl (Reference 1) in a thorough analysis of the interaction for a six-burst situation described below.

A field test designated MISERS BLUFF II-2 (MB II-2) was conducted by the Defense Nuclear Agency at the Planet Ranch test site near Lake Havasu, Arizona, 30 August 1978, for measuring the interaction of six blast waves from the simultaneous detonation of six 120-ton ANFO charges arranged in a hexagonal pattern with 100-meter separation.

Reference 1 presents a comprehensive analysis of the basic interactions involved in this six-burst blast interaction. Reference 1 also develops a semi-empirical method for prediction of the peak shock overpressures and makes comparisons with the measured data from the MB II-2 test. The need for a hydrocode to be used in prediction of the interaction, particularly to obtain overpressure-time waveforms, is noted in Reference 1.

The objective of the present investigation has been to determine whether the REFLECT hydrocode would have the potential, if modified, for computing the interaction of blast waves from multiple nuclear bursts simultaneously detonated at ground level and to indicate the modifications needed.

A principal feature of the REFLECT code is the representation of the refracted (reflected) shock waves in a two-burst interaction as "sharp" shocks using the Rankine-Hugoniot (R-H) equations. If blast waves from additional bursts interact with these blast waves, as for the six-burst array being studied, it is expected that the additional shock waves might also have to be represented in such a calculation by the R-H equations in order to obtain satisfactory accuracy.

The approach taken has been to make a limited modification to the REFLECT code so that a preliminary comparison could be made of the code results with the MB II-2 test data. Only the two shock waves that are currently modelled in the code as R-H shocks, the first refracted shock and the first Mach shock, would be modelled. The shock waves appearing later would then be smeared shocks in these calculations. This comparison would enable an assessment to be made of the potential of the REFLECT code were one or more of the additional shock waves to be modelled as R-H shocks.

Sharp R-H shock representation is expected to be very important to accurate calculation of blast wave interaction from multiple bursts. Without R-H shock modelling, the shocks become smeared as compressions over a number of cells introducing strong numerical viscous effects into the computed interaction. Several other improvements to the REFLECT code should also be considered for the calculations, and they will be discussed and summarized below.

## SECTION 2

### REFLECT-3 HYDROCODE

#### 2-1 REFLECT-1 MODEL FOR TWO-BURST INTERACTION.

The blast wave pattern for six charges in a hexagonal pattern is shown in Figure 1 for a time shortly after the waves begin to interact. The blast waves all first interact at the charge bisector. Because the charges are equally spaced and equidistant from the array center, the wave pattern is symmetrical on the two sides of each of the six charge bisectors.

The REFLECT-1 code (Reference 2) computes the flow field within the shaded region for a plane of symmetry which is in this case the charge bisector plane. The solution is axisymmetric about the line joining the two charges. A sketch illustrating the REFLECT-1 solution and its relationship to the six-burst problem is shown in Figure 2. The code computes the flow field between the refracted blast shock and the charge bisector plane until the time that the refracted shock intercepts the plane of the charge radial.

The REFLECT code employs the Godunov differencing scheme (Reference 3) with an expanding cell system. The cell system, Figure 2, is axisymmetric about the axis passing through two adjacent burst centers. Each cell is a torus centered about the axis. The cells are arranged in columns with the generators for each column emanating from a common point on the axis on the opposite side of the charge bisector plane.

The refracted blast shock  $R_1$  is one boundary of the cell system. The charge bisector plane is the second boundary of the cell system. After the Mach shock  $M_1$  forms between the intersection of the shocks  $I_1$  and  $R_1$  and the bisector, it becomes the third boundary of the cell system. Further description of the cell system is given in Reference 2.

The Godunov method conserves mass, momentum and energy in each cell. The equation of state for air is taken from Brode (Reference 4).

The REFLECT-1 code then computes the flow within the region in Figure 2 bounded by the refracted shock  $R_1$ , the charge bisector plane and the Mach shock  $M_1$  after it forms, Figure 3. The boundary conditions for the calculation are the following. At the shock  $R_1$  the properties and flow velocities of the blast wave immediately outside of the shock provide the boundary conditions. At the bisector plane the impermeable surface conditions apply. At the Mach shock  $M_1$ , when it forms, the atmospheric conditions apply at the boundary.

The cell layout used in the present calculations is the same layout employed in Reference 2. There are 24 columns of cells between the axis and the triangular corner cell at the juncture of the  $R_1$  wave




Figure 1. Blast pattern shortly following simultaneous burst of a hexagonal array of charges.




Figure 2. REFLECT-1 model of two-burst blast interaction.




Figure 3. REFLECT-3 cell layout after  $R_1$  wave intercepts charge radial.

with the charge bisector. The number of cells in a column decreases stepwise from the axis to the corner cell. Also, the number of cells within a column increases with time as the cell system expands. The maximum number of cells in a column is limited to 16.

After the Mach shock  $M_1$  is formed the triangular corner cell is replaced by one or more four-sided cells. This cell array is called the outer mesh system in Reference 2. The maximum number of cells reached in the outer mesh system in the present calculations was 16 in a 4 x 4 array.

The number of cells used in the present calculations was limited to the capability of the REFLECT code developed in Reference 2. A recommended improvement to be emphasized below would be to increase the number of cells significantly.

## 2-2 SIX-BURST INTERACTION.

Up to the point in the calculation where the shock  $R_1$  reaches the charge radial the REFLECT-3 code is the same as the REFLECT-1 code of Reference 2, with the exception of improvements made to the code regarding iteration methods, tolerances and other associated techniques.

When the  $R_1$  shock reaches the charge radial the changes made for the REFLECT-3 code apply. The cell layout for this period is shown in Figure 3, where each cell shown in the sketch represents four cells in the calculation.

The adaptation made to the REFLECT-1 code for this problem has been to limit the expansion of the cell system to the boundary provided by the charge radial. Therefore each column of cell cross-sections shown in Figure 2 expands until it reaches the charge radial, as shown in Figure 3. In the inner nine columns shown in the sketch the cells are bounded by the charge radial. The outer four columns are bounded by the reflected shock  $R_1$  and the Mach shock  $M_1$ . As the incident shock  $I_1$  moves closer to the array center, the remaining columns one by one reach the charge radial. During the whole period, of course, the width of the columns increases.

When the cells reach the charge radial, a pressure wave reflects back towards the charge bisector. This is the refracted shock wave from the next clockwise burst, 90 degrees from the bisector.

The sequence of waves from the time the blast waves first interact is shown in Figure 4. The waves are sketched in this figure essentially in the shape obtained in the REFLECT-3 results. The shock waves that are computed correctly as R-H shocks are identified by double lines and the other shocks by single lines.

Adjacent blast waves first interact on the charge bisectors at 284.1 feet from the array center, Figure 4a. The shock pattern after the initial interaction is shown in Figure 4b. Up to this point all the shock waves are computed by the REFLECT-3 code as R-H shocks.

The pattern after the Mach shock  $M_1$  forms is shown in Figure 4c. The refracted shock  $R_2$  is not represented as an R-H shock in the REFLECT-3 code, so it smears over several cells. The results of the REFLECT-3 calculations indicate the triple point  $I_1-R_1-M_1$  intercepts the charge radial at 24.5 feet from the array center. This compares well with the 24 feet given by the method of Kuhl (Reference 1).

After the triple point  $I_1-R_1-M_1$  intercepts the charge radial, the Mach shock  $M_2$  is formed with the triple point  $M_1-R_2-M_2$ . Because the shock  $R_2$  is smeared in the present form of the REFLECT-3 code, the triple point becomes spread out along the incident shock  $M_1-M_2$ . The smeared triple point therefore would be expected to reach the charge bisector ahead of the time it would if instead it were formed by an  $R_2$  shock that is sharp.


The arrival of the principal part of the smeared triple point was identified from the REFLECT-1 results by the abrupt rise in pressure behind the  $M_1$  shock as being at 9 feet. This compares well with the arrival of the triple point given by Reference 1 as 8 feet.

The shock  $R_2$  refracts across the charge bisector as the  $R_3$  wave shown in Figure 4e and the Mach shock  $M_3$  is formed. The shock  $R_3$  is smeared in the REFLECT-3 calculations, but the front of the imploding wave continues to be formed by the R-H shock in the code. This imploding shock has the triple point  $M_2-R_3-M_3$  according to the model of Reference 1.


The triple point  $M_2-R_3-M_3$  is smeared in the calculations because the shock  $R_3$  is smeared. The arrival of the leading edge of the smeared zone at the charge radial is indicated in the computed results by a marked rise in pressure behind shock  $M_2$  at the radial at 3 feet from the array center. From there inward the results indicated that the pressure on the radial behind the incident shock increased to essentially equal the pressure at the bisector.

The REFLECT-3 calculations were continued until the incident shock on the bisector reached within 0.43 feet of the array center. At that point the cell system was frozen. From then on the waves moved through the mesh with all the waves being smeared. At this point the cell system had four cells along the imploding shock between the charge bisector and charge radial. Each cell had a 0.056-ft front on the imploding shock and a length in the radial direction of 0.20 feet.

The calculations were continued until 0.073 seconds after the scaled AFWL 1-KT-STD(REV) burst. This corresponds to about 0.080 seconds for the 120-ton ANFO bursts.




a. At two-burst intercept.




b. During two-burst regular shock interaction.

Figure 4. Sketches illustrating development of shock patterns.




c. Before triple point  $I_1-R_1-M_1$  reaches charge radial.



d. Triple point  $M_1-R_2-M_2$  between charge radial and bisector.

Figure 4. (Continued)



e. Triple point  $M_2$ - $R_3$ - $M_3$  between charge bisector and radial.

Figure 4. (Concluded)

The PFAB code has been developed for computing the shock wave that radiates from the array center after the imploding wave reaches the center. (This wave is called the main reflected wave in Reference 1). This code is described in the Appendix. The code computes the region inside of the outward-facing shock and the sector bounded by the charge bisector and radial. The boundary conditions for this zone are the conditions ahead of the outward-facing shock, given by the REFLECT-3 calculations, and the impermeable surface conditions at the charge bisector and radial. The PFAB code for computing this region has been prepared and debugged.

A computer routine is required to input the necessary data from the REFLECT-3 code into the PFAB code. The REFRA mating code was developed for use with the REFLECT-1 code output, and minor modifications are required for its use with the REFLECT-3 output.

There is a point concerning the three-dimensionality of the REFLECT-3 model that should be noted. The vertical plane from the ground along the charge radial is represented in the REFLECT-3 code as a slightly curved surface. This is due to the fact that the cell geometry of the REFLECT-3 code is axisymmetric about the axis joining the charges. In the code the boundary for the charge radial is a conical surface having its apex at the charge. The charge radial on the ground is a generatrix of the cone. The included angle of the cone is 120 degrees, so the radius of curvature normal to the surface is very large compared with the distance from the radial to the bisector, and the ratio of the two becomes infinite approaching the array center. Because the radius of curvature becomes increasingly large relative to the distance between the charge radial and charge bisector as the incident shock approaches the charge center, calculations have indicated that the curvature is not expected to have a significant influence on the results, particularly approaching the array center.

## SECTION 3

### RESULTS

The test results of the MISERS ELUFF II-2 test are presented in Figures 5 to 12. These results have been photocopied from Reference 1.

The free-air blast data are an input to the REFLECT-3 code. Two blast models are compared with the test data in Figures 5 and 6.

The records of the overpressures measured in the MB II-2 test are presented in Figures 6 and 7 for stations along the charge radials and bisectors, respectively. The records have been reproduced from Reference 1. The stations are identified by the radial distance from the array center in meters and angle from one of the charge bisectors in degrees; e.g., Station 25-30 is 25 meters from the array center and 30 degrees from the baseline charge bisector.

The output of the REFLECT-3 calculations is compared with the test results in Figures 6 and 7 for the charge radials and bisectors, respectively. The times for the REFLECT-3 results presented in these two figures have been adjusted to match the measured arrival of the first shock of each pressure record. The incident shock pressure-range results are compared with the test data in Figure 8. The pressure-range results for the main reflected wave are compared with the test data in Figures 9 and 10. The shock positions as a function of time are compared with the test results in Figures 11 and 12.

#### 3-1 BLAST-WAVE MODEL.

##### 3-1.1 Shock Overpressure.

The REFLECT code uses the data from the undisturbed blast wave from a single burst as input to the code calculations. The calculations are as accurate as this input.

The incident shock overpressure,  $\Delta p_n$ , given by two methods is compared in Figure 5 with data from the MB II-2 test results. The MB II-2 data used here for comparisons have been obtained from Reference 1. The abscissa is the distance from the center of the 6-burst array.

The crosses in Figure 5 represent the ANFO calculation by APWL for the MB II-2 test as given in Reference 5. The shock overpressure presented here for these data was determined by the current method recommended by Reference 6 wherein the shock overpressure is taken as the peak computed pressure and the location of the shock is taken as the point where the computed pressure is one-half of the peak pressure. Previously Reference 7 had recommended a 4-point extrapolation of the pressures to obtain the shock overpressure. That method generally gives a shock overpressure about 2 to 4 percent higher than for the curve shown. At the 82-ft station the ANFO calculation gives a shock overpressure that is 10 percent higher than a mean of the data. For the 41-ft station the ANFO calculation shows good agreement with the test data.






Figure 5. Comparison of predicted and measured shock overpressures for individual ANFO blast waves.

6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 M811-2 5-23 2307  
 25-30-AB-  
 100000.HZ 11217R  
 523. 8774




6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 M811-2 7-5 2316  
 25-210-AB-  
 100000.HZ 112179  
 705. 9301




a. 82 feet from array center.

Figure 6. Comparison of overpressure predictions with MISERS BLUFF II-2 test data for charge locations. Traces represent test data.

6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MS11-2 5-22 2306  
 12.5-30-AB-  
 100000.HZ 102078  
 522. 9774



6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MS11-2 7-15 2342  
 12.5-150-AB-  
 100000.HZ 102078  
 715. 9301



b. 41 feet from array center.

Figure 6. (Continued)

6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH

M911-2 7-1 2314


5-210-AB-

100000.HZ

102078

701.

9301



6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH

M911-2 7-20 2352


6-270-AB-

100000.HZ

102078

720.

9754



c. 20 feet from array center.

Figure 6. (Concluded)

6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH


M911-2 4-25 2312

96.6-50-AB-

100000.HZ 102078

425.

9774



6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH


M911-2 7-2 2325

86.6-240-AB-

100000.HZ 102078

702.


9351



a. 284 feet from array center.

Figure 7. Comparison of overpressure predictions with MISERS BLUFF II-2 test data for charge bisector locations. Traces represent test data.


6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MS11-2 7-11 2325  
 SQ-240-45-  
 100000.HZ 1020"9  
 711. 9301




b. 164 feet from array center.

Figure 7. (Continued)

6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MS11-2 5-21 0303  
 25-0-AB  
 100000.HZ 112.73  
 501. 9774




6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MS11-2 7-10 2324  
 25-240-AB-  
 100000.HZ 102078  
 710. 9301



c. 82 feet from array center.

Figure 7. (Continued)


5 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MS11-2 4-22 2323  
 15.9-240-AB-  
 100000.HZ 102079  
 422. 8774




d. 52 feet from array center.

Figure 7. (Continued)

6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MS11-2 7-24 2304  
 12.5-0-AB-  
 100000.HZ 100079  
 724. 9754



6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MS11-2 4-21 2322  
 12.5-0-AB-  
 100000.HZ 100079  
 421. 9774



e. 41 feet from array center.

Figure 7. (Continued)

6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH

MB11-2 7-4 2345


5-190-48-

100000.HZ

102078

704.

2301



6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH

MB11-2 7-3 2321


8-210-48-

100000.HZ

102078

703.

2301



f. 20 feet from array center.

Figure 7. (Continued)

5 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH

MB11-2 7-15 2344


3.05-180-RB-

100000.HZ

102079

716.

9301



6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH

MB11-2 7-15 2340


3.05-240-RB-

100000.HZ

102079

715.


9754




g. 10 feet from array center.

Figure 7. (Continued)

9 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MB11-2 7-27 2343  
 1.22-130-48-  
 100000.HZ 102079 9784  
 727.




6 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MB11-2 7-27 2348  
 1.22-240-40-  
 100000.HZ 102078 9784  
 727.




h. 4 feet from array center.

Figure 7. (Continued)

9 CHARGES - 120 TONS EACH  
 MB11-2 7-23 2303  
 3-0-48-  
 100000.HZ 102078 9754  
 723.



8 CHARGES 120 TONS EACH  
 MB11-2 7-22 2702  
 3-0-48-  
 100000.HZ 102079 9754  
 722.



1. At array center.

Figure 7. (Concluded)




Figure 8. Comparison of incident shock overpressure predictions with NISER Bluff II-2 test data near the array center along charge radials and bisectors.




Figure 9. Comparison of peak overpressure predictions for the main reflected wave with MISERS BLUP, II-2 test data near the array center along charge radials. (Arrows indicate shock wave direction; numbers indicate second, third or fourth peak.)




Figure 10. Comparison of peak overpressure predictions for the main reflected wave with MISERS BLUFF II-2 test data near the array center along charge bisectors. (Numbers indicate second, third or fourth peak.)




Figure 11. Comparison of shock trajectory predictions with MISERS BLUFF II-2 test data near the array center along charge radials. (Number indicates first, second, third or fourth peak. REFLECT-3 symbols  $\blacksquare$   $+$   $\bullet$ )




Figure 12. Comparison of shock trajectory predictions with MISERS BLUFF II-2 test data near the array center along charge bisectors. (Numbers indicate first, second, third or fourth peak.)

The second blast model was obtained from scaling the AFWL 1-KT-STD(REV) of Reference 8 for a free-air yield of 0.67 KT for the ambient conditions of the MB II-2 test. The shock overpressure for this model is also compared in Figure 5 with the MB II-2 test results. The agreement with the test data is very good at both the 82 and 41-ft stations.

### 3-1.2 Overpressure Wave Form.

At test stations on the radials at a distance of 82 feet from the array center, Figure 6a, the overpressure during approximately the first 0.025 seconds following the arrival of the  $I_1$  shock is produced by the blast wave from the charge located on the radial. For this period the overpressure wave forms for the ANFO calculations and the scaled 1-KT-STD(REV) models can be compared against the test data. Two records have been used in the comparison: from Stations 25-30 (30° radial) and 25-210 (210° radial). For Station 25-30 the ANFO computed values, using at the shock the 4-point extrapolation, are about 10 percent higher (as a fraction of the shock overpressure) than the test data during about the first 10 milliseconds, they essentially agree with the test data during the middle of the period and fall about 5 percent below toward the end. The scaled 1-KT-STD(REV) values are in good agreement for the whole period.

For Station 25-210 the ANFO calculations agree fairly well with the test data. The scaled 1-KT-STD(REV) values are about 10 percent lower than the test data at early times and about 10 percent higher when the period ends (with the arrival of the  $R_1$  wave). It is concluded from these comparisons that the waveform measurements at 82 feet from the array center support the ANFO and 1-KT-STD(REV) blast models about equally well.

Two stations were located on charge radials at 41 feet from the array center: Stations 12.5-30 and 12.5-150. The records are shown in Figure 6b. The  $I_1$  waveform lasts only about 0.005 and 0.003 seconds, respectively, at the two stations. The record for Station 12.5-150 indicates the  $I_1$  waveform is terminated by a double peak. Except for that the scaled 1-KT-STD(REV) values agree well with these waveform data to within the resolution of the graphs (about 0.2 to 0.4-in. amplitudes).

These comparisons on the radials provide an evaluation of the modelling of single ANFO blast waves at the ground level. From these comparisons it is concluded that the scaled 1-KT-STD(REV) blast model agrees with the test data within the data scatter at 82 and 41 feet of the array center until 0.06 seconds. There are no single-burst blast data nearer to the array center than the 41-ft station or later than about 0.06 seconds, because of the blast interactions from the other charges.

### 3-1.3 Selection of Scaled AFWL 1-KT-STD(REV) Blast Model.

Because of the differences in shock overpressure at the 82-ft station, it is concluded that the scaled AFWL 1-KT-STD(REV) blast model is in some what better agreement with the test data than is the ANFO calculational results. As far as the overpressure wave form comparisons, however, the two models agree about equally well with the test results.

There is another problem with using the ANFO calculational results. The properties in the region of the smeared shock must be defined and that would require some exploratory work.

Therefore the decision was made to use the scaled AFWL 1-KT-STD(REV) blast model with a free-air yield of 0.67 KT as the input to the RMPLECT-3 calculations to represent the 120-ton ANFO charges used in the MB II-2 test. It is concluded that the ANFO calculational results support this blast model for use in this inner 100-ft region of the blast array within about 10 percent in shock overpressure.

### 3-2 $R_1$ - $M_1$ WAVES.

The initial interaction of the blast waves occurs along the bisectors. The  $R_1$  waves are produced by this interaction. A record for this interaction is shown in Figure 7a for Stations 86.6-60 and 86.6-240.

The initial shock overpressure for an 86.6-m bisector station can be calculated directly from the properties of the incident shocks by using the R-H equations. This is essentially an exact calculation, dependent upon the strength of the incident shocks. Because the two blast models (ANFO computed and scaled 1-KT-STD(REV)) were shown to agree within about 10 percent with the measurements of the  $I_1$  shock overpressure and overpressure waveform, this calculation might be considered for use as an evaluation of the test simulation. The ANFO calculated blast wave gives an initial shock overpressure that is 7 percent higher than the scaled 1-KT-STD(REV) value at the 86.6-m station.

The test data from Station 86.6-60 has a shock overpressure that is 25 percent below the scaled 1-KT-STD(REV) value and the test data of Station 86.6-240-AB has a shock overpressure that is 36 percent below that value. Therefore it is concluded that the shock overpressures measured at initial blast intercept appear to be low by about 25 percent or more.

These differences cannot be used as a definite evaluation of the experiment because of questions regarding use of the blast models at the 164-ft (50-m) blast range. The comparisons made in Figure 5 are

for 246-ft and 287-ft blast ranges, respectively, for the 82-ft and 41-ft stations. The ANFO calculation showed a shock overpressure that tends to be high at the lower blast radius (82-ft station). The scaled AFWL 1-KT-STD(REV) shock overpressures, although they agreed at the 246 and 287-ft blast ranges, are much larger in the proximity of the burst center than for a high explosive. Therefore a definite conclusion cannot be reached at this point on the test accuracy. But the comparison does point up the possibility that the test overpressure might be low by as much as 25 percent or more compared with an ideal test.

The predicted overpressure waveform for Station 86.6-60 from the REFLECT-3 calculation are shown in Figure 7a to be within 10 percent of the test data by one millisecond after shock arrival. The differences with the test data for the 86.6-240 Station are much greater until about five milliseconds after the intercept.

The record for the 164-ft station on the charge bisector, Figure 7b, appears to indicate that one blast shock arrives about 1 1/2 milliseconds ahead of the other, tending to reduce the peak pressure. The REFLECT-3 shock value is 29 percent higher than the measured peak.

At the 82-ft stations on the charge bisector, Figure 7c, Station 25-0 has a large shock jump at 0.0448 seconds followed by a second jump about 0.003 seconds later. Station 25-240 shows a similar sequence, although the overpressure in the later case falls off about 15 percent before the second jump. The REFLECT-3 prediction essentially fails through the test data of Station 25-0 for about 0.013 seconds after the arrival of the  $M_1$  wave. The second jump in the overpressure may be due to an irregular type of Mach reflection. Irregular Mach reflection results in a compressive peak following the Mach shock due to the interaction of a slipline with the (virtual) reflecting surface.

At about 0.058 seconds the REFLECT-3 overpressures in Figure 7c begin to climb above the test values. This departure is attributed to the early arrival of the leading edge of the smeared  $R_2$  shock. The  $R_3$  wave arrives early as a result. It is expected that this effect could be eliminated by making the  $R_2$  shock a sharp R-H shock in the REFLECT-3 code, as are the  $R_1$  and  $M_1$  shocks. In general, however, the predictions shown in Figure 7c are in fair agreement with the test record.

For the 52-ft station on the charge bisector, Figure 7d, the REFLECT-3 prediction agrees well with the first peak of the trace. The measured pressure trace has a slight dip until about 0.06 seconds, but the agreement with the REFLECT-3 prediction otherwise is good. Beginning at 0.06 seconds the predictions again show the effect of the early arrival of the smeared  $R_2$  shock followed immediately by the  $R_3$  wave.

At 41 feet on the charge bisector, Figure 7e, the REFLECT-3 prediction agrees well with the first peak measured value for the  $M_1$  wave for Station 12.5-240 shown in the lower trace. However, the measured peak for Station 12.5-0 is about 20 percent lower and has a flat waveform for about 3 milliseconds, followed by a sudden dip, instead of the more

classical wave form of Station 12.5-240. At about 0.060 seconds the overpressure predicted by the REFLECT-3 code rises above the measured values for both the 0-deg and 240-deg stations due to the smeared  $R_2$ - $R_3$  wave.

The comparison for the 20-ft stations on the 240-deg bisector is shown in Figure 7f. The REFLECT-3 predictions for the  $M_1$  wave are 25 to 50 percent higher than the measured values for Station 6-240. However the predicted values fall below the measurements of Station 6-180 by up to 25 percent. So the REFLECT-3 prediction falls between the measurements. Several factors make it appear that the calibration of the record for Station 6-180 may be in error; this will be discussed in Section 3-5. The predicted overpressures begin to rise at about 0.065 seconds due to the early arrival of the smeared  $R_2$ - $R_3$  wave.

### 3-3 $R_1$ - $R_2$ WAVES.

The  $R_1$  wave in the REFLECT-3 code reaches the radial as a sharp shock as shown in Figure 4c. It refracts across the radial as the smeared  $R_2$  wave in the present form of the code. The  $R_1$  shock appears to refract at the radial as a regular shock reflection. The  $R_2$  wave following the intercept of the  $R_1$  shock is indicated on the traces in Figure 6.

In Figure 6a the  $R_2$  wave comparisons are shown for 82 feet from the array center. The arrival time of the  $R_1$ - $R_2$  wave for the REFLECT-3 prediction is within 0.0008 seconds of the measured arrival time for Station 25-30 (note: the measured variation in arrival time between the 30 and 210-deg test stations is 0.0004 seconds). This is good agreement. A second shock arrives 0.00085 and 0.0021 seconds after the first  $R_1$  shock at the two 82-ft radial stations. The REFLECT-3 results also show a rise following the shock arrival to a second peak about 0.004 seconds later. In fact both of the test traces show a third peak a few milliseconds behind the second. The second peak may indicate a delayed arrival of one of the  $R_1$  waves at each of the stations, and the third peak may indicate an irregular type of interaction of the shocks.

The REFLECT-3 results in Figure 6a again fair through the test data for the  $R_2$  wave fairly well up to about 0.056 seconds. At that point the REFLECT-3 values become higher, which is attributed again to early arrival of later waves due to shock smearing. Resolution of the sharply peaked  $R_2$  shock wave shown in Figure 6a would also require reduction in the size of the cells for the REFLECT-3 code.

Figure 6b shows the comparison at the 41-ft distance. For Station 12.5-30 the predicted arrival of the  $R_2$ - $R_1$  wave is 0.0010 seconds after the measured arrival, which is within the 0.00125-s difference measured between the arrivals for the two stations. Again the REFLECT-3 results fair through the test results until 0.067 seconds. The predictions then rise, which is again attributed to the wave smearing by the code, in this case by the smeared main reflected (M-R) wave.

The predictions again do not show the sharp peak of the test data, but that would require the smaller cells. The predictions do not agree quite as well with the test data for Station 12.5-150 but that station has an anomalous waveform with the two smaller waves preceding the apparent  $R_1$ - $R_2$  wave giving a significantly different overall waveform than for Station 12.5-30.

At the 20-ft stations on the charge radials, Figure 6c, the REFLECT-3 overpressure predictions have a waveform somewhat similar to that of Station 6-210 for about 0.004 seconds after arrival of the shock  $M_2$ . At Station 6-270 the  $M_2$  shock is preceded by a weaker shock, whereas at the 150 (not shown) and 210-deg radials the  $M_2$  shock arrives first. The level of the predictions is about 25 to 50 percent higher than the measured values, but there are differences of  $\pm 20$  percent between the measured  $R_2$  overpressure wave forms for the three stations at this range, so it is not clear that the measured interactions at this distance from the array center are accurate enough for much better resolution. But it does appear that the trend of the predicted values is higher than for the test data at this range.

At about 0.066 seconds the REFLECT-3 predictions in Figure 6c begin to rise significantly above the test values. This follows the trend at the more outward stations attributed to the effects of shock smearing and cell size.

#### 3-4 $R_2$ - $R_3$ WAVE.

The  $R_2$  wave intercepts the charge bisector and reflects (regular) as an  $R_3$  shock, as shown in Figure 4e. Both shocks are smeared in the REFLECT-3 code. The  $R_3$  wave appears at the 82-ft stations shown in Figure 7c, but it occurs too late for complete comparison with the test data. Comparison of the REFLECT-3 results with the  $R_3$  wave form in Figures 7d to g show that the REFLECT-3 wave is smeared and would need a sharp  $R_2$  shock and smaller cells to reproduce the relatively sharp peak of the  $R_3$  wave.

Figure 4e shows that stations on charge bisectors within 9 feet of the array center would be expected to have the Mach shock  $M_3$  arrive first. Careful inspection of the trace for Station 1.22-180 shows a steep initial shock jump very nearly equal to the REFLECT-3 shock jump indicated by the first point. The REFLECT-3 values continue to climb as do the test data, but the REFLECT-3 values continue to climb due to the early arrival of the smeared M-R wave. The initial shock jump is not quite as distinct for the trace of Station 1.22-240, but the REFLECT-3 results compare similarly.

#### 3-5 M-R WAVE.

The blast waves from charges that are located more than 90 degrees away around the hexagon produce the wave identified here as the M-R wave, taken again from the terminology in Reference 1 where it is called the main reflected wave. For points on the radials, as shown in Figure 6, the M-R wave is produced by three charges. For points on the bisectors, as shown in Figure 7, it is produced by two charges.

At the stations within 20 feet of the array center the M-R wave arrives early enough to allow comparisons of the REFLECT-3 results. These comparisons are shown in Figures 6c and 7f to i.

The M-R wave predicted by the REFLECT-3 code is of course smeared, but, with one exception, the magnitude of the peak overpressures generally agrees fairly well with the test results. The exception is for Station 6-180 which is believed to have an erroneous calibration, which is supported by several other features (the rapid decrease in the overpressure of the  $M_1$  shock along the 240-deg charge bisector that would result between 20 and 10 feet of the array center and by comparison of results with those for Station 6-240).

### 3-6 ARRAY CENTER.

The comparison for near the center of the array is shown in Figure 7i. The REFLECT-3 results are for a point on the bisector 0.43 from the array center. The  $M_1$  shock jump predicted by the REFLECT-3 code is 570 psi (3.93 megapascals). It compares well with the shock jump measured at the two stations, as indicated by the first sharp rise.

The peak overpressure predicted by the REFLECT-3 code at 0.43 feet is 1615 psi (11.1 megapascals), which is 71 percent of the peak of about 2260 psi (15.6 megapascals) measured from the records of the two stations in Figure 7i at the array center. This is very good agreement in view of the relatively large size of the cells employed in the REFLECT-code and the smearing of the  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  shock waves. The wave form of the REFLECT-3 overpressure is relatively similar to the measured wave form of the M-R wave except for the greater width and reduced peak. The comparison is very encouraging for the potential of the code.

### 3-7 INCIDENT SHOCK OVERPRESSURES.

The shock overpressures for the incident shock at points on radials and bisectors within 100 feet of the array center are plotted in Figure 8 reproduced from Reference 1. The REFLECT-3 values are plotted for comparison.

The REFLECT-3 radial values from 100 feet inward to 26 feet are the scaled 1-KT-STD(REV) input values to the code, so they do not provide a comparison for code evaluation. On the bisector at 82 feet the REFLECT-3 values are about 10 to 25 percent higher than given for the test data. However the test data, Figure 7e, have a second peak occurring only about 0.003 seconds after the incident shock, and the REFLECT-3 value is only 7 percent higher than the second-peak value for Station 25-0-AB.

At 52 feet on the bisector the REFLECT-3 values agree with the test peak value. At 41 feet on the bisector the REFLECT-3 shock overpressure agrees with the test value for the 240-deg station. The shock value for the 0-deg station is lower by 16 percent, but this record, Figure 7e, has a peculiar waveform, so the value is questioned.

At 20 feet on the bisector the predicted value of 140 psi falls between the measured values of 93-107 psi and 188-210 psi for the 240 and 180-deg bisectors, respectively. However, the calibration of the latter record appears questionable, as discussed in Section 3-5, so the prediction may be slightly high. The REFLECT-3 curve for the bisector in Figure 8 has a small rise between the 22 and 18-ft stations. This rise is attributed to the advance arrival of the smeared  $M_1$ - $R_2$ - $M_2$  triple point. At 10 feet on the bisector the predicted values are shown in Figure 6 to be about 30 percent higher than the measured peak values from the 180 and 240-deg bisectors.

At a distance of about 9 feet from the array center the REFLECT-3 incident shock overpressure on the bisector begins to climb. This corresponds with the presence of the  $M_3$  wave shown in Figure 4c. Because the  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  waves are not modeled in REFLECT-3 at this time as R-H shocks, the predicted incident shock overpressure increases smoothly instead of with the shock jump that would be expected in the actual case. At 4 feet from the array center the predicted incident shock overpressure is about two-thirds of the values reported in Reference 1. However, the record for Station 1.22-190 has a steep initial rise that corresponds well with the REFLECT-3 value, and this rise may be the actual  $M_3$  shock, and the value reported in Reference 1 may be that of a peak after the  $M_3$  shock arrival.

The REFLECT-3 shock overpressure on the radial for the incident shock reaches 593 psi when the shock is 0.49 feet from the array center. At that point the cell system was frozen. On the bisector the incident shock was within 0.43 feet of the array center with an overpressure given by the REFLECT-3 code of 570 psi.

It is concluded that the incident shock strengths on the bisectors are predicted well into 41 feet. From 20 to 10 feet the predictions appear to run somewhat high by as much as about 30 percent, which may be due to early arrival of the  $R_2$  wave due to smearing. At 4 feet the REFLECT-3 results appears to agree well with the data. The same agreement also exists near the array center. So, the REFLECT-3 results for the incident shock overpressure on the radial appears to agree well with what are believed to be the best data, except where smearing of the  $R_2$  wave appears to produce higher predicted overpressures.

Along the radial the REFLECT-3 incident shock overpressure is seen in Figure 8 to increase at about the 24-ft station where the  $M_2$  wave shown indicates a jump. Again, the incident shock in the REFLECT-3 model is a R-H shock but the reflected  $R_2$  wave is diffuse, so the rise would be expected to be not as sudden as in the test. At 22 1/2 feet the REFLECT-3 value agrees with the shock interaction analysis prediction of Reference 1. At the 20-ft station the REFLECT-3 incident shock overpressure is about 25 to 50 percent higher than the measured peak values. However, as mentioned in Section 3-3 there are significant

differences in the waveforms measured on the three radials (150, 210 and 270 degrees, Figure 6c). In fact, the waveform for the 210-deg radial continues to climb after shock arrival reaching a peak only 0.0018 seconds after shock arrival that agrees well with the predicted shock overpressure. On the 270-deg radial it appears the  $R_2$  wave has not overtaken the incident shock at the 20-ft station.

The REFLECT-3 predicted incident shock overpressure on the radial, Figure 8, continues to increase gradually to about the 3-ft station. At the 10-ft and 4-ft stations it is about 50 to 115 percent higher than the measured peak values, but comparisons with the test waveforms have not been made. At 4 feet the measured shock overpressures range from 102 to 522 psi (Reference 1) and the REFLECT-3 value is 305 psi. At the 3-ft station the REFLECT-3 value reaches essentially the same value as on the bisector and remains nearly the same inward to 0.49 feet from the array center where the mesh was stopped.

It is concluded that the incident shock strength is predicted well where the  $M_2$  shock first forms at about the 24-ft station. The REFLECT-3 value continues to climb whereas the test values decrease inward to the 10-ft station, but the differences are unresolved. From 4 feet inward the predictions are supported by some of the test results, but the test results differ significantly.

### 3-8 MAIN REFLECTED SHOCK OVERPRESSURES.

Shock overpressures predicted for the main reflected wave by the REFLECT-3 code are compared with the MB 11-2 data in Figures 9 and 10. For the charge radial there is one point for comparison which is at 20 feet. The agreement with the test results is excellent.

For the charge bisector, Figure 10, there are predictions for three locations to 10 feet. The agreement at 10 and 4 feet is excellent. At 0.43 feet the prediction is about 23 percent low. It is believed that a smaller cell size would improve the prediction, particularly because of the steepness of the peak (Figure 71).

### 3-9 SHOCK FRONT TRAJECTORIES.

The predicted trajectory of the incident shock along a charge radial is compared with the test data in Figure 11. Inward to the 23-ft station the velocity is that given by the scaled 1-KT-STD(REV) model. The shock velocity agrees with the test data in this range, which serves essentially as a consistency check because the predicted overpressures were found to agree there with the test data. The shock arrival time for the scaled 1-KT-STD(REV) model is about 6.6 milliseconds less than measured, which is expected as it is a nuclear blast wave model.

Between the 24.5-ft station and the array center the predicted shock velocity along the radial increases because of the greater strength of the  $M_2$  shock that forms at 24.5 feet. The REFLECT-3  $M_2$

shock is generally stronger than measured, but by the time the incident shock is near the array center the separation in arrival time between the predicted shock and the test data has decreased by about 0.6 milliseconds.

The shock front trajectories along the bisectors are compared in Figure 12. At the 82-ft station the REFLECT-3 shock arrives ahead of the test shocks by about 6.2 milliseconds. The separation decreases slightly, to about 6.0 milliseconds at about the 50-ft station, and it remains essentially constant from there on inward to the array center. It is noteworthy that the predicted speed of the incident shock increases in the final few feet from the center roughly similar to the speedup shown by the test data.

## SECTION 4

### DISCUSSION

The overpressure measurements from the MIGHTY MACH II-2 (MB II-2) six-burst test have been employed here as the basis for evaluation of the REFLECT-3 code results. Before reviewing the comparison, a few comments are noted regarding the use of the test results.

The detonation of six large high-explosive charges to produce blast waves sufficiently identical in space and time to converge at the array center with the accuracy that might occur for nuclear explosions is a difficult technical task. Evidence of the problem can be seen in the differences obtained in the overpressure histories measured on different bisectors for the interaction of simply two blast waves, Figure 7a. The shock overpressure for the pair intercepting on the 240-deg bisector is 36 percent lower than for the pair intercepting on the 60-deg bisector, and the latter is 25 and 30 percent below the two values computed from the blast models (Section 3-2).

The overpressure test records are presented in Figures 6 and 7 grouped in pairs by similar locations for comparison purposes. The differences between traces for any one pair is readily apparent. The differences are in arrival time, waveform and magnitude.

Many of the differences that could be expected between the blast waves themselves -- such as time of arrival, sphericity, etc. -- would generally be expected to tend to lower the interaction overpressures. A hydrocode calculation, on the other hand, having identical blast waves and that employed accurate hydrodynamic modelling -- such as "sharp" Rankine-Hugoniot shock waves, sufficiently small cell or mesh sizes, etc. -- would be expected to give overpressures that would occur under ideal burst and atmospheric conditions. A good hydrocode calculation is expected to serve in defining the upper limit of overpressures that could be expected for blast wave interactions, in particular for nuclear bursts.

The REFLECT-3 code in its present form is expected to be most accurate prior to interaction of the refracted  $R_1$  waves at the charge radials. This period terminates with the interception of the triple point  $I_1$ - $R_1$ - $M_1$  and the charge radial, Figure 4c, which is predicted to occur on radials at 24.5 feet from the array center. During this period the shock overpressures predicted along a charge bisector for the incident shock  $M_1$  are found to agree well with the maximum overpressures measured from 82 feet inward to 41 feet in the MB II-2 tests, Figure 8. The 24.5-ft intercept of the triple point and the charge radial is in good agreement with the 24 feet predicted by Kuhl (Reference 1) and the test results. Definite conclusions regarding the overpressure wave forms predicted for this period cannot be made because of some anomalies in the test data for points on the charge bisectors, Figures 7a-e.

However there is good agreement between the predicted wave form and one test record, for the point of first intercept at 284 feet on the 60-deg charge bisector, Figure 7a, starting at one millisecond after shock arrival, and there is supportive agreement with other records.

The REFLECT-3 prediction of the  $R_1$ -shock arrival time for points on the charge radial is in good agreement with the test results for the 82 and 41-ft stations, Figures 6a-b. The REFLECT-3 prediction has the shock jump at the beginning of the  $R_2$  wave, because it employs the sharp  $R_1$  shock. The test records show a very sharp pressure spike for this  $R_2$  wave following the shock and the predicted results essentially fair through these wave forms. Resolution of the overpressure peak would require some reduction in the cell sizes used in the code.

The  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  shocks (Figure 4c) have not been modelled in the present form of the REFLECT-3 code as sharp Rankine-Hugoniot shocks, so these shocks become smeared over several cells in the results. This smearing causes the pressures ahead of these shocks to rise early. For example, the rise of the incident  $M_1$  shock overpressure predicted along a charge bisector, Figure 8, commencing at the 22-ft station and amounting to about 10 percent is attributed to this  $R_2$ -shock smearing effect. The predicted incident shock overpressure is found to be higher than measured by up to 30 percent from 18 1/2 feet inward to 10 feet which is attributed in part to the smeared  $R_2$  shock. The marked climb in the  $M_1$  shock overpressure commencing at the 9-ft station is associated with the arrival of the bulk of the smeared  $R_2$  shock.

The  $R_2$  shocks intercepting at a charge bisector form the  $R_3$  waves. The early arrival of the leading edge of the smeared  $R_2$  waves appears to affect the predicted overpressure wave forms at stations on the bisector from 82 feet inward to 10 feet, Figure 7c-g. From 82 feet inward to 42 feet it appears to cause a pressure rise about 0.01 to 0.02 seconds early, beginning at about 0.06 seconds. At 20 and 10 feet the overpredictions beginning immediately with the arrival of the incident  $M_1$  shock are attributed to it.

After the predicted formation of the incident  $M_2$  shock (at 24.5 feet) on the radial and the incident  $M_3$  shock (at 9 feet) on the bisector, the incident shock overpressure predicted by the REFLECT-3 code climbs monotonically along both the radial and the bisector inward to the array center, Figure 8. This result is in contrast to the trend given by the shock interaction analysis of Reference 1 of decreasing shock overpressures.

Relative to this question the test results show the following. The predicted incident shock overpressure at 22.5 feet on the radial agrees well with the prediction of Reference 1 and the test results at 20 feet, Figure 8. Comparisons of predicted wave forms and test records have not been made for the radial inside of 20 feet, so an evaluation cannot be given. At 10 feet on the bisector the advance arrival of the

smeared  $R_3$  shock affects the comparison. But by 4 feet this effect would be expected to be essentially over, and at 4 feet and 0 feet the predicted incident shock overpressure agrees well with the test results, Figure 7h-1. It is concluded from this comparison that the strength of the incident shock increases after the  $M_2$  and  $M_3$  shocks are formed, but the conclusion is tentative, dependent upon calculations with sharp  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  shocks and smaller cells.

The main reflected (M-R) wave formed from the implosion of all six blast waves at the array center is of primary concern as it results in the highest overpressures observed, Figures 9 and 10. At 0.43 feet from the center the peak overpressure predicted for the M-R wave by the REFLECT-3 code is about 23 percent lower than measured, Figure 10. At 4 feet on the bisector the predicted value falls slightly below the data and at 10 and 20 feet on the bisector and radial, respectively, it lies somewhat above. There is therefore a trend for the predicted peak overpressure of the M-R wave to decrease more slowly than for the test results and to be higher at the further distances than measured in the test.

The test records indicate a rather sharp peak for the M-R wave, particularly for the array center. The predicted M-R wave forms are stretched out more in time. This stretch-out is expected to affect the peak value predicted. The stretch-out is attributed to the finite cell size, and it is expected to have a greater effect on the comparison close to the array center where the cell dimension becomes more important and the test record indicates the most rapid decay timewise.

A reduction in the cell size used in the REFLECT-3 code would tend to raise the peak pressures predicted in the M-R wave. the increase could well result in raising the peak pressures of the M-R wave at all distances from the center. In fact, the predictions might well then all fall well above the measured peak overpressures. Without further information on the characteristics of the imploding shock segments in a multiple-burst event relative to the effects of non-uniformity in blast detonations, atmospheric and terrain effects, etc., it is reasonable to speculate that perhaps higher peak overpressures might be attainable. This possibility is supported by the rapid decay indicated in the measured overpressure in Figures 9 and 10, a factor of two in a distance of only 4 to 6 feet, Figures 9 and 10, which might imply stringent time-of-arrival requirements.

In general it is concluded that the potential of the REFLECT-3 code has been well demonstrated in these comparisons with the MISERS BLUFF II-2 data. The two improvements to the code that have been indicated throughout are (1) to represent the reflected shocks  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  as sharp Rankine-Hugoniot shocks, as are the  $R_1$  reflected shock and the three incident Mach shocks,  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$  and  $M_3$ , in the present REFLECT-3 code, and (2) to reduce the cell sizes for better wave form definition.

## SECTION 5

### CONCLUSIONS

The REFLECT-3 code has been developed by making limited modifications to the original REFLECT code (DNA Report No. 3470F). The objective has been to determine from comparisons with the test results of the MISERS BLUFF II-2 event the potential of the code, if modified, for computing the interaction of multiple nuclear blast waves from ground-level detonations. The MISERS BLUFF II-2 test consisted of the simultaneous detonation of six 120-ton ANFO charges placed in a hexagonal array with 100-ft separations. The following conclusions were reached from the comparisons.

1. Between 100 and 41 feet of the array center the predicted incident shock overpressures for the charge bisector agree well with the maximum values measured.
2. Within about 22 feet of the array center the smearing of the  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  refracted shocks affects the predictions of the incident shock overpressure. Overpredictions relative to the test results of up to 30 percent are observed. Within 4 feet of the array center, where the smearing effect may be less, the predictions agree well with the incident shock overpressures measured.
3. The peak overpressure predicted for the main reflected wave is 1615 psi at 0.43 feet from the array center (the closest point from the center computed), which is only about 23 percent below the test result. At 4, 10 and 20 feet from the center the agreement is very good. Based on considerations concerning the code calculations and test factors, it is possible that higher overpressures might be obtainable than measured; it is expected that they could be adequately predicted following code improvements indicated below.
4. The two improvements to the code that have been indicated throughout are (i) to represent the two reflected shocks  $R_2$  and  $R_3$  as sharp Rankine-Hugoniot shocks and (ii) to reduce the sizes of the cells.

## REFERENCES

1. Kuhl, A.L., Airblast Cumulation near the Center of Symmetry for Six ANFO Charges, RDA Report RDA-TR-110006-003, April 1979.
2. Ruetenik, J.R., Thompson, J.H., Dalton, T.A., and Lee, W.N., REFLECT Computer Code for Ground-Reflected Blast Waves, Kaman Avidyne Report TR-96, Defense Nuclear Agency Report No. 3470F, 21 April 1975.
3. Godunov, S.K., A Difference Method for Numerical Calculation of Discontinuous Solutions of the Equations of Hydrodynamics, Mat. Sb. 47, p. 271-306, 1959.
4. Brode, H.L., Theoretical Descriptions of the Fireball, Blast and Thermal Radiation from a Nuclear Explosion at 60,000 ft., The RAND Corp., August 1965, Unpublished.
5. Air Force Weapons Laboratory MISERS BLUFF Tape No. IE2.
6. Private communication from C.E. Needham, Air Force Weapons Laboratory, to J.R. Ruetenik, 18 October 1979.
7. Private communication from C.E. Needham, Air Force Weapons Laboratory, to J.R. Ruetenik, 12 June 1979.
8. Needham, C.E., Havens, M.L., and Knauth, C.S., Nuclear Blast Standard (1 KT), Air Force Weapons Laboratory, Report AFWL-TR-73-55 (Rev). April 1975.
9. Smiley, R.F., Ruetenik, J.R., and Tomayko, M.A., FAB-2D Computations of Nuclear Free-Air Blast Waves in a Horizontally Stratified Standard Atmosphere, Kaman Avidyne Report TR-166, Prepared for the Defense Nuclear Agency.
10. Zartarian, G., and Lee, W.N., Program REFRA - Blast Routine Based on REFLECT Code, Kaman Avidyne Report TR-102, DNA Report 3596F, 2 May 1975.

## APPENDIX

### THE PFAB CODE

#### GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF CODE.

The PFAB computer code was developed as a modification of the FAB-2D code of Reference 9 for computing the main reflected wave in the six-burst problem. The method employed is to solve the planar two-dimensional transient fluid-flow problem of the reflection of an initially prescribed blast flow from the corner of a wedge-shaped boundary, as indicated in Figure 13.

The flow field outside of the computational cell system shown in Figure 13 is a prescribed time dependent flow, which is in the present application given by the REFLECT-3 code. While the REFLECT-3 code does compute this same problem as part of its late time solution, the PFAB code is more realistic in that the main reflected blast wave is represented as a sharp Rankine-Hugoniot shock front (which is smeared in the REFLECT-3 code) and the PFAB geometric cell layout is better adapted to the features of the main reflected wave.

The code computes the flow in a moving cell coordinate system similar to the one shown in Figure 13. The cell system consists of an arbitrary number of "sectors",\* three are indicated in Figure 13 (designated  $J=1$  to 3) each of which is subdivided into an arbitrary number of cells, as illustrated in the figure for sector 2 ( $J=2$ ) for a 5 radial cell configuration ( $I=1$  to 5). Cell dimensions and distances are expressed in terms of the radial distance  $r$  and the polar angle  $\theta$ , with the origin of coordinates being taken at the corner of the wedge-shaped space.

The outer boundary of the cell system represents the outer limit of the calculated flow region, which is initially specified and moves radially thereafter for each sector according to the speed of the shock wave at the outer boundary of the outermost cell of the sector and the local outer prescribed flow region. The inner and outer boundaries of all cells, such as  $aa'$ ,  $bb'$  in Figure 13, are taken to move outward similarly, at speeds proportional to the ratio of their initial radial distances from the origin of coordinates to the initial shock front radius for the same polar angle.

Within each sector the radius from the origin of coordinates to the curved circumferential cell boundaries ( $aa'$ , etc) is taken to vary linearly with the polar angle between the values at the two rays designating the sector boundaries.

---

\* These shapes are not precisely true sectors in that their outer boundaries deviate slightly from circular arcs.




Figure 13. Sketch illustrating the PFAB model.

The pressure, density and velocity components in each cell (abbreviated, etc.), as expressed in polar coordinates, are taken to be constant throughout the cell.

The flow between adjacent cells in the moving coordinate system is computed using the Godunov technique in the same manner as for the REFLECT-1 code (Reference 2). More specifically, in the interior of the disturbed region, the flux conditions at cell boundaries are computed as locally isentropic shock-expansion phenomena for large pressure and velocity differences between cells, using an isentropic exponent ( $\gamma_e = (d \ln(p) / d \ln(\rho))_s$ ) which is the average of the values for the two

adjacent cells; for small pressure and velocity differences between adjacent cells a linearized approximation is used. For the outermost cell boundary of the disturbed region, the shock front velocity and associated fluxes are calculated on the basis of the exact Hugoniot relationships for air.

The code assumes a real air medium with thermodynamic equation-of-state properties given by Brode's 1965 analytical representation (Reference 4).

Input to the code consists of the specification of the pressure, density and velocity in the entire disturbed fluid field at a time shortly before the incident blast wave strikes the corner and also the time dependent incident blast flow conditions outside of the computed flow region for all later times. These required initial and time dependent flow conditions would be obtained from the results of a REFLECT-3 run. The conditions would be inputted to the PFAB code by an interpolation code designated REFRA (Reference 10). The REFRA mating code was developed for use with the REFLECT-1 code. Minor changes are required for its use with the REFLECT-3 code.

Program output consists of tables of pressure, density and velocity and configuration geometry printouts for selected times.

The PFAB code has been set up on a CDC CYBER 176 computer. The code has a core requirement of 164K octal SCM and 376K octal LCM for a 5000 cell configuration.

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Assistant to the Secretary of Defense  
Atomic Energy  
ATTN: Executive Assistant

Defense Advanced Rsch Proj Agency  
ATTN: TIO

Defense Intelligence Agency  
ATTN: RDS-3A

Defense Nuclear Agency  
ATTN: SPSS, J. Galloway  
2 cy ATTN: SFSS, G. Ullrich  
4 cy ATTN: TITL

Defense Technical Information Center  
12 cy ATTN: DD

Field Command  
Defense Nuclear Agency  
ATTN: FCTMD  
ATTN: FCR

Field Command  
Defense Nuclear Agency  
Livermore Division  
ATTN: FCPRL

Joint Strat Tg Planning Staff  
ATTN: NRI, STINFO Library  
ATTN: XPFS

Undersecretary of Def for Rsch & Engrg  
ATTN: Strategic & Space Systems (OS)

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

BMD Advanced Technology Center  
Department of the Army  
ATTN: ATC-T

BMD Systems Command  
Department of the Army  
ATTN: BMDSC-HW

Chief of Engineers  
Department of the Army  
ATTN: DAEN-ASI-L  
ATTN: DAEN-RDL  
ATTN: DAEN-MPE-T, D. Reynolds

Harry Diamond Laboratories  
Department of the Army  
ATTN: DELHD-N-P  
ATTN: DELHD-I-TL

U.S. Army Ballistic Research Labs  
ATTN: DRDAR-BLT, J. Keefer  
ATTN: DRDAR-TSB-S

U.S. Army Cold Region Res Engr Lab  
ATTN: Library

U.S. Army Construction Engrg Res Lab  
ATTN: Library

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (Continued)

U.S. Army Engineer Center  
ATTN: Technical Library

U.S. Army Engr Waterways Exper Station  
ATTN: WESSA, W. Flathau  
ATTN: WESSD, J. Jackson  
ATTN: J. Zelasko  
ATTN: Library

U.S. Army Material & Mechanics Rsch Ctr  
ATTN: Technical Library

U.S. Army Materiel Dev & Readiness Cmd  
ATTN: DRXAM-TL

U.S. Army Nuclear & Chemical Agency  
ATTN: Library  
ATTN: J. Simms

## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Naval Construction Battalion Center  
ATTN: Code L08A  
ATTN: Code L51, J. Crawford  
ATTN: Code L53, J. Forrest

Naval Postgraduate School  
ATTN: Code 0142, Library  
ATTN: G. Lindsay

Naval Research Laboratory  
ATTN: Code 2627

Naval Surface Weapons Center  
ATTN: Code F31  
ATTN: Code X211

Naval Surface Weapons Center  
ATTN: Tech Lib & Info Svc Br

Office of Naval Research  
ATTN: Code 715

## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Air Force Institute of Technology  
ATTN: Library

Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: DLWM

Air Force Weapons Laboratory  
Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: NTE, M. Plamondon  
ATTN: SUL  
ATTN: NTV, D. Payton  
ATTN: NTE-D  
ATTN: NTE-A  
ATTN: DEY  
ATTN: NTE-S  
ATTN: NTE-G  
ATTN: NTEO

Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: IN

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE (Continued)

Assistant Secretary of the AF  
Rsch, Dev & Logistics  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: SAFALR/DEP for Strat & Space Sys

Ballistic Missile Office  
Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: MNNX, W. Crabtree  
ATTN: MNNXH, M. Delvecchio  
ATTN: MNNXH, D. Gage

Strategic Air Command  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: J. McKinney

Deputy Chief of Staff  
Rsch, Dev, & Acq  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: AFRDQI, N. Alexandrow  
ATTN: AFRDPN  
ATTN: AFRDQA  
ATTN: AFRDQI

Strategic Air Command  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: XPFS  
ATTN: NRI, STINFO Library

VELA Seismology Center  
ATTN: G. Ullrich

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CONTRACTORS

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
ATTN: D. Glenn

Los Alamos National Scientific Laboratory  
ATTN: R. Sanford  
ATTN: C. Keller

Sandia National Laboratories  
ATTN: A. Chabai  
ATTN: Org 1250, W. Brown

OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCY

Central Intelligence Agency  
ATTN: OSWR/NED

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

Acurex Corp  
ATTN: J. Stockton  
ATTN: K. Triebes  
ATTN: C. Wolf

Aerospace Corp  
ATTN: H. Mirels  
ATTN: Technical Information Services

Agabian Associates  
ATTN: M. Agabian

Applied Theory, Inc  
2 cy ATTN: J. Trulio

ARTEC Associates, Inc  
ATTN: S. Gill

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS (Continued)

Boeing Co  
ATTN: Aerospace Library  
ATTN: S. Strack

California Research & Technology, Inc  
ATTN: M. Rosenblatt  
ATTN: Library

Civil Systems, Inc  
ATTN: G. Melzer

University of Denver  
ATTN: J. Wistoski

Eric H. Wang  
Civil Engineering Rsch Fac  
University of New Mexico  
ATTN: J. Kovarna  
ATTN: P. Lodde  
ATTN: J. Lamb

General Electric Company—TEMPO  
ATTN: DASIAC

H-Tech Labs, Inc  
ATTN: B. Hartenbaum

Higgins, Auld & Associates  
ATTN: J. Bratton  
ATTN: N. Higgins  
ATTN: H. Auld

IIT Research Institute  
ATTN: Documents Library

J. H. Wiggins Co, Inc  
ATTN: J. Collins

Kaman Avidyne  
ATTN: R. Ruetenik

Merritt CASES, Inc  
ATTN: Library

Mission Research Corp  
ATTN: G. McCartor  
ATTN: C. Longmire

Nathan M. Newmark Consult Eng Svcs  
ATTN: N. Newmark  
ATTN: W. Hall

Pacific-Sierra Research Corp  
ATTN: H. Brode

Pacifica Technology  
ATTN: Tech Library

Physics International Co  
ATTN: J. Thomsen  
ATTN: Technical Library  
ATTN: F. Sauer

Science Applications, Inc  
ATTN: R. Schlaug  
ATTN: H. Wilson  
ATTN: Technical Library

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS (Continued)

R & D Associates  
ATTN: R. Port  
ATTN: J. Carpenter  
ATTN: P. Haas  
ATTN: A. Kuhl  
ATTN: J. Lewis  
ATTN: Technical Info Center  
ATTN: C. MacDonald

Science Applications, Inc  
ATTN: D. Hove

Science Applications, Inc  
ATTN: B. Chambers III  
ATTN: W. Layson

SRI International  
ATTN: J. Colton  
ATTN: D. Johnson  
ATTN: G. Abrahamson  
ATTN: Library

Systems, Science & Software, Inc  
ATTN: K. Pyatt  
ATTN: C. Dismukes  
ATTN: Library  
ATTN: J. Barthel

Systems, Science & Software, Inc  
ATTN: C. Needham

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS (Continued)

Systems, Science & Software, Inc  
ATTN: J. Murphy

Systems, Science & Software, Inc  
ATTN: C. Hastings

Terra Tek, Inc  
ATTN: A. Abou-Sayed  
ATTN: Library

TRW Defense & Space Sys Group  
ATTN: Technical Information Center  
ATTN: N. Lipner  
ATTN: T. Mazzola

TRW Defense & Space Sys Group  
ATTN: P. Dai  
ATTN: E. Wong  
ATTN: G. Hulcher

Weidinger Assoc, Consulting Engineers  
ATTN: I. Sandler

Weidinger Assoc, Consulting Engineers  
ATTN: J. Isenberg