

CONTRACT REPORT ARBRL-CR-00471

MUZZLE FLOW IN THE PRESENCE OF AN
ANTI-RECOIL PLATE: EXPLORATORY STUDY

Prepared by

G. M. A. F., Incorporation
514 S. Long Beach Avenue
Freeport, NY 11520

TECHNICAL
LIBRARY

October 1981



US ARMY ARMAMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND
BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

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

Secondary distribution of this report by originating
or sponsoring activity is prohibited.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained
from the National Technical Information Service,
U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia
22151.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as
an official Department of the Army position, unless
so designated by other authorized documents.

*The use of trade names or manufacturers' names in this report
does not constitute indorsement of any commercial product.*

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER CONTRACT REPORT ARBRL-CR- 00471	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Muzzle Flow in the Presence of an Anti-Recoil Plate: Exploratory Study		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER TM 81/1
7. AUTHOR(s) Gino Moretti and Michael T. Di Piano		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DAAK 11-80-Q-0124
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS G.M.A.F., Incorporation 514 S. Long Beach Avenue Freeport, N.Y., 11520		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Armament Research & Development Command US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory (DRDAR-BL) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005		12. REPORT DATE OCTOBER 1981
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 33
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
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) Muzzle Blast Muzzle Brake Numerical Gasdynamics Hydrocode		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Numerical analysis is attempted on the gasdynamics associated with flow over an anti-recoil plate. The blast field is analyzed under the assumptions that the presence of the precursor flow and projectile may be neglected. An existing shock-fitting code is used in order to determine its capability when computing impingement flowfields. While the code provided good prediction of the exhaust flow from the muzzle of the gun up until shock impingement, problems were encountered in treating the flow following this event. It is clearly demon-		

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

strated that a major reshaping of the code has to be undertaken in order to provide efficient computational grids.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	5
I. INTRODUCTION.	7
II. FIRST ATTEMPT	7
III. SECOND ATTEMPT.	9
IV. THIRD ATTEMPT	11
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	12
VI. REFERENCES.	13
DISTRIBUTION LIST	29

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Initial Mapping Grid.	14
2.	Grid Distortion - Early Time.	15
3.	Grid Distortion - Median Time	16
4.	Grid Distortion - Late Time	17
5.	Successive Transformations.	18
6.	Second Grid Distortion - Early Time	19
7.	Second Grid Distortion.	20
8.	Shock Structure Predicted with Third Grid	21
9.	$\theta = \text{Constant}$ Coordinate Lines, Third Grid	22
10.	Precursor Image in ξ - Plane.	23
11.	Third Grid.	24
12.	Isobars Computed Using Third Grid	25
13.	Proposed Double Grid Scheme	26
14.	Grid Lines.	27

MUZZLE FLOW IN THE PRESENCE OF AN ANTI-RECOIL PLATE

Exploratory study

I. Introduction

We have explored the possibility of determining the effect of an anti-recoil plate on the muzzle blast flow, by a numerical analysis. To reduce the problem to its essential elements, we assumed that the blast was produced by a piston moving inside the gun, as it is in the precursor flow, and we did not consider the presence of the projectile and of hot gases in its back. The anti-recoil plate was considered as a rigid, unpierced wall, extending to infinity and normal to the gun axis. Initial conditions were taken as in our previous calculations of precursor flows (Ref. 1). We assume that the reader is familiar with Ref. 1 and we use the same nomenclature used therein.

The analysis, as detailed below, intended to examine whether it would be possible to use the existing code for the calculation of precursor flows, with some minor modifications.

II. First attempt

A first attempt was made using the original code for the numerical analysis of the precursor flow in the absence of the projectile, with just one minor modification.

The original program computes the flow between the gun and the precursor wave, considered as the outer boundary of the region to be computed. Boundary conditions on the precursor wave are the Rankine-Hugoniot conditions for a shock proceeding into a gas at rest. The region external to the gun barrel is mapped

onto the region external to the unit circle in an auxiliary plane. The mapping is conformal; points in the physical plane are defined by a complex variable, $z = x + iy$, and points in the auxiliary plane are defined by a complex variable, $\zeta = \rho e^{i\theta}$. The two complex variables are related by the analytic transformation:

$$z = (r_0/\pi)[(z_1^2 - 1/z_1^2)/2 - \log z_1^2 - i\pi] \quad (1)$$

$$z_1 + 1/z_1 = 2B(\zeta + 1/\zeta)$$

where r_0 is the outer radius of the barrel, and B is determined to assure correspondence between $\zeta=1$ and $z=-i$. Lines of constant ρ and constant θ are mapped onto the grid shown in Fig. 1. The image of the precursor wave on the ζ -plane is defined by a function, $\rho=c(\theta,t)$ and it turns out to be an almost perfect circle. Nevertheless, a normalization of coordinates along each $\theta = \text{constant}$ line is necessary, in order to maintain evenly spaced mesh points along such lines in the computational space. In practice, thus, the grid in the physical plane is not perfectly orthogonal, although its departure from orthogonality is not conspicuous. Anytime a non-orthogonal mesh is used, additional terms appear in the equations of motion, which impair the accuracy of the calculation. In the precursor flow analysis, however, such effects are minimal. Inserting a plate, normal to the gun axis, at a given distance from the muzzle, simply means that all points on the outer boundary in the ζ -plane which fall behind the image of the plate must be replaced by boundary points on the image of the plate itself, corresponding to the same values of θ . At such points, not the Rankine-Hugoniot conditions but the well-known boundary conditions on a rigid wall will be applied. In principle, no other modifications to the code are necessary, since the distribution of interior points follows automatically as a consequence of normalizing the computational coordinate X between the muzzle and the outer boundary, whichever is.

In practice, one finds that the grid, so defined, is not suited for the calculation and will generate catastrophic inaccuracies.

Our statement is supported and clarified by Figs. 2, 3 and 4, which show the computational grid in the physical space at three successive instants of time. The progressive degeneration

of the grid, produced by the different normalization between precursor wave points and wall points, is evident. While at most of the points the grid is almost orthogonal, the departure from orthogonality is too strong to be acceptable along at least three $Y=\text{constant}$ lines. There, the calculation rapidly degenerates and stops.

Nevertheless, the code shows its capacity to describe the flow, once a proper grid is adopted. In fact, one can see in Fig. 4 two lines representing two imbedded shocks which result as a consequence of the impact of the precursor flow on the plate. The fact that the shock appears to be divided in two pieces is a consequence of the assumption, implicit in the code, that the imbedded shocks are always in the general direction of $\rho=\text{constant}$ lines; whenever a portion of a shock tends to lie along $\theta=\text{constant}$ lines, as it would occur between the two shocks of Fig. 4 if one joined them, that portion is automatically cut off.

From the experiments described above, we concluded:

- 1) A more efficient method of grid generation is needed, and
- 2) A more general analysis of imbedded shocks is needed.

III. Second attempt

A second attempt was then made, after modifying the computational grid. The computational region corresponding to the original grid is a rectangle, limited by the lines: $X=0$ (barrel mouth), $X=1$ (precursor wave), $Y=0$ (barrel wall), and $Y=\pi/2$ (centerline). In this attempt, the centerline of the flow (the axis of the gun) and the plate are taken as two parts of the same boundary line in the (X,Y) -plane (the $Y=\pi/2$ line). To this effect, the mapping of the z -plane onto the ζ -plane is modified as follows. The variable z of Eqs. (22) of Ref. 1 (repeated here as Eqs. (1)) is renamed z_3 ; to obtain z , the following additional sequence of transformations is used:

Second attempt

$$z_4 = - \frac{z_3(r_0^2 + 4x_w^2)}{z_3 - \kappa} + x_w^2$$

$$z_5 = (z_4)^{1/2}, \quad z = x_w - z_5$$

where x_w is the distance between the muzzle and the plate, and κ is a constant, determined in such a way that the imaginary part of the complex coordinate of the inner lip of the muzzle in the z_3 -plane is $-i$. The successive transformations are described by Fig. 5.

The scope of the transformation between the z -plane and the z_4 -plane is to align the plate (AB) with the centerline (FA). Consequently, the FD line and the DE line become parabolas. Assuming that the arc FCD on the z_4 -plane can be considered as a circular arc, the bilinear transformation between the z_4 -plane and the z_3 -plane straightens up the FCD line again, without changing the shape of the FAB straight line. Finally, the original transformation between the z_3 -plane and the ζ -plane produces a computational region in the ζ -plane which is very similar to the circular sector of Ref. 1, except that the CDE line is no longer a straight line. Consequently, a more complicated definition of stretching functions has to be used, since the value of θ on the CDE boundary is now, for each point, a function of ρ and t ; note, indeed, that the computational region expands as the precursor shock moves out, so that the points to be evaluated on the CDE boundary move in time along such line.

Recoding of a part of the program was then necessary since now both X and Y are functions of ρ , θ and t , whereas in (49), Ref. 1, Y was a function of θ alone.

In the first phase of the evolution, the grid so obtained looks promising and efficient (Fig. 6). Not the same can be said of the shock pattern. In fact, the most important shock, the one which originates as a consequence of the impact of the flow on the plate, runs now in the general direction of $\theta = \text{constant}$ lines. The program, as originally written, is unable to fit it, as we can see from Fig. 7, drawn at a further stage.

IV. Third attempt

The code was then modified, reversing the role played by the coordinates in the calculation of the shock; this, of course, entails more than a simple switch of symbols, since the dimensions of ρ and θ are different, and the stretching functions for X and Y are different too. In Fig. 8, we see that the shock reflected by the wall does now appear, while the other shocks are replaced by sharp transitions.

Unfortunately a new problem arises, as shown in Fig. 9. The lines here are $\theta = \text{constant}$ coordinate lines. They tend to cluster around a point on the plate, with two catastrophic effects: the reduction of the time step size to vanishingly small values, and a loss of resolution in the upper part of the figure (which, as is evident in Fig. 9, may even cause overlapping of mesh lines).

The reason for it is that the point at infinity in the z_4 -plane maps on the point $z_3 = K$ (denoted by K in Fig. 5) in the z_3 -plane. The semi-infinite line issuing from D , which is the outer wall of the gun, is then mapped onto the circular arc, DK . When the precursor shock moves out with a quasi-circular shape in the physical plane, its image in the ζ -plane is, instead, quasi-rectangular (Fig. 10). This is due to the fact that, regardless of the motion of the shock alongside the barrel, its image cannot move any farther than point K in the ζ -plane.

A brief, but formally complicated, attempt was made to correct the defect mentioned above, by using different values of θ for different values of X , on any $Y = \text{constant}$ line. An example of the grid is given in Fig. 11, and a plot of isobars appears in Fig. 12, definitively one of the best obtained so far. We intended to use it in order to advance, at least, to a stage where the reflected shock had moved towards the side of the barrel, although we do not approve of such a choice of stretching. Indeed, it defies the purpose of using conformal mappings as much as possible; conformal mappings should be used to provide the

basic relations between pairs of coordinates, whereas stretchings should be limited to functions of a single variable, essentially. In addition, such a definition of stretching is very complicated, in contradiction with the principle that most of the complications should be kept in the conformal mappings.

In any event, even the new correction did not serve the purpose, because soon the determination of values in the vicinity of K exceeded the limits of accuracy of the computer. The computation, which had started with promising results, had to be interrupted shortly after the stage shown in Fig. 12.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

It is clear that the gasdynamical portion of our codes is working well, and that such codes can provide reliable results. Comparisons of our computed flow patterns with shadowgraphs of actual experiments, provided by BRL, are very satisfactory.

It is also clear, however, that a major reshaping of the code has to be undertaken, in order to provide efficient computational grids.

We propose to examine the possibility of using two grids for two different regions, with a seam as shown in Fig. 13. The upper grid, for the analysis of region ABCD, is the same as the one described in the second attempt. As soon as the precursor shock has crossed the BC line completely (at time $t=t_0$, say), the perturbed flow field below BC would be redefined on the lower grid.

The latter can be generated by the following mapping function:

$$z = t + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1-t}{1+t} \quad , \quad t = [(A\zeta+B)/(\zeta+A)]^{1/2}$$

with A and B properly defined. Typical grid lines for this map-

Conclusions and recommendations

ping are shown in Fig. 14.

We would also perform the calculation with an improved treatment of shock waves, to account for shocks lying in any direction with respect to the mesh. Finally, we would speed up the calculation by eliminating most of the viscous code, according to our current computational philosophy.

VI. References

1. Moretti, G., A numerical analysis of muzzle blast precursor flow, POLY M/AE Rep. No. 80-10, 1980.




Figure 1. Initial Mapping Grid




Figure 2. Grid Distortion - Early Time




Figure 3. Grid Distortion - Median Time




Figure 4. Grid Distortion - Late Time




Figure 5. Successive Transformations




Figure 6. Second Grid Distortion - Early Time




Figure 7. Second Grid Distortion




Figure 8. Shock Structure Predicted with Third Grid




Figure 9. $\theta = \text{Constant}$ Coordinate Lines, Third Grid




Figure 10. Precursor Image in ξ - Plane




Figure 11. Third Grid




Figure 12. Isobars Computed Using Third Grid




Figure 13. Proposed Double Grid Scheme




Figure 14. Grid Lines

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
12	Commander Defense Technical Info Center ATTN: DDC-DDA Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	6	Commander US Army Armament Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDAR-LCV, Mr. Reisman DRDAR-SCN, Mr. Kahn DRDAR-LC, Dr. Frasier DRDAR-SCW, Mr. Townsend DRDAR-SC, Dr. T. Hung PM, 30mm Ammo, LTC Logan Dover, NJ 07801
2	HQDA (DAMA-WSA, MAJ Csoka; DAMA-CSM, LTC Germann) Washington, DC 20310		
1	Commander US Army Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command Huntsville, AL 35804	6	Director US Army ARRADCOM Benet Weapons Laboratory ATTN: DRDAR-LCB-TL Mr. W. Dock Dr. G. Carofano Dr. C. Andrade DRDAR-LCB, Mr. T. Allen Mr. R. Billington Watervliet, NY 12189
1	ODCSI, USAREUR & 7A ATTN: AEAGB-PDN(S&E) APO, New York 09403		
1	Commander US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command ATTN: DRCMDM-ST 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	2	Commander US Army Armament Materiel Readiness Command ATTN: DRSAR-LEP-L, Tech Lib Rock Island, IL 61299
2	Commander US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command ATTN: DRCDL DRCDE-R, Mr. Lockert 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	3	Commander US Army Aviation Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDAV-E DRCPM-AAH Product Manager, AH-1 4300 Goodfellow Boulevard St. Louis, MO 63120
9	Commander US Army Armament Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDAR-TSS (2 cys) DRDAR-TDS, Mr. Lindner DRDAR-TDA, Mr. Blick DRDAR-LC-F, Mr. A. Loeb DRDAR-SCA, Mr. N. Ford DRDAR-LCW, Mr. M. Salsbury DRDAR-LCE, Dr. H. Fair DRDAR-SEM, W. Bielauskas Dover, NJ 07801	1	Director US Army Air Mobility Research and Development Laboratory Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035
		1	Commander US Army Communications Rsch and Development Command ATTN: DRDCO-PPA-SA Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Commander US Army Electronics Research and Development Command Technical Support Activity ATTN: DELSD-L Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703	1	Commander US Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center ATTN: DRXMR-ATL Watertown, MA 02172
1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: DRSMI-R Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809	1	Commander US Army Research Office ATTN: CRD-AA-EH P. O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park NC 27709
1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: DRSMI-RBL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809	2	Director US Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: ATAA-SL White Sands Missile Range NM 88002
1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: DRSMI-TLH (Ricks) Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809	1	Commander US Army ARB ATTN: SGRD-UAH-AH, Dr. Patterson P. O. Box 577 Fort Rucker, AL 36362
1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: DRSMI-RDK Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809	3	Commander Naval Air Systems Command ATTN: AIR-604 Washington, DC 20360
1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: DRSMI-YDL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35809	2	Commander and Director David W. Taylor Naval Ship Research & Development Cmd ATTN: Lib Div, Code 522 Aerodynamic Lab Bethesda, MD 20084
1	Commander US Army Natick Research and Development Command ATTN: DRXRE, Dr. D. Sieling Natick, MA 01762	3	Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: Code 6X Mr. F. H. Maille Dr. J. Yagla Dr. G. Moore Dahlgren, VA 22448
1	Commander US Army Tank Automotive Rsch and Development Command ATTN: DRDTA-UL Warren, MI 48090		
1	Commander US Army Jefferson Proving Ground ATTN: STEJP-TD-D Madison, IN 47250		

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: Code 730, Tech Lib Silver Spring, MD 20910	1	Director NASA Scientific & Technical Information Facility ATTN: SAK/DL P. O. Box 8757 Baltimore/Washington International Airport, MD 21240
1	Commander Naval Weapons Center ATTN: Code 553, Tech Lib China Lake, CA 93555	1	AAI Corporation ATTN: Dr. T. Stastny Cockeysville, MD 21030
1	Commander Naval Research Laboratory ATTN: Tech Info Div Washington, DC 20375	1	Advanced Technology Labs ATTN: Mr. J. Erdos Merrick & Steward Avenues Westbury, NY 11590
1	Commander Naval Ordnance Station ATTN: Code FS13A, P. Sewell Indian Head, MD 20640	1	Aerospace Corporation ATTN: Dr. G. Widhopf P. O. Box 92957 Los Angeles, CA 90009
1	AFRPL/LKCC, C. D. Penn Edwards AFB, CA 93523	1	ARO, Inc. ATTN: Tech Lib Arnold AFS, TN 37389
2	AFATL (DLRA, D. Davis; Tech Lib) Eglin AFB, FL 32542	2	ARO, Inc. Von Karman Gasdynamics Facility ATTN: Dr. J. Lewis Mr. W. D. Williams Arnold AFS, TN 37389
1	AFWL/DEV Kirtland AFB, NM 87117	1	ARTEC Associates, Inc. ATTN: Dr. S. Gill 26046 Eden Landing Road Hayward, CA 94545
1	ASD/XRA (Stinfo) Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1	AVCO Systems Division ATTN: Dr. D. Siegelman 201 Lowell Street Wilmington, MA 01887
1	Director National Aeronautics and Space Administration George C. Marshall Space Flight Center ATTN: MS-I, Lib Huntsville, AL 38512	1	Battelle Columbus Laboratories ATTN: J. E. Backofen, Jr. 505 King Avenue Columbus, OH 43201
1	Director Jet Propulsion Laboratory ATTN: Tech Lib 2800 Oak Grove Drive Pasadena, CA 91103		

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Technical Director Colt Firearms Corporation 150 Huyshope Avenue Hartford, CT 14061	1	Franklin Institute ATTN: Tech Lib Race & 20th Streets Philadelphia, PA 19103
1	General Electric Corporation Armaments Division ATTN: Mr. R. Whyte Lakeside Avenue Burlington, VT 05401	1	Director Applied Physics Laboratory The Johns Hopkins University Johns Hopkins Road Laurel, MD 20810
1	Honeywell, Inc. ATTN: Mail Station MN 112190 (G. Stilley) 600 Second Street, North Hopkins, MN 55343	1	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Dept of Aeronautics and Astronautics ATTN: Tech Lib 77 Massachusetts Avenue Cambridge, MA 02139
3	Hughes Helicopter Company Bldg. 2, MST22B ATTN: Mr. R. Forker Mr. M. Kane Mr. R. Flood Centinella and Teel Streets Culver City, CA 90230	1	Ohio State University Dept of Aeronautics and Astronautical Engineering ATTN: Tech Lib Columbus, OH 43210
1	Kaman Tempo ATTN: Mr. J. Hindes 715 Shamrock Road, Suite UL-1 Bel Air, MD 21014	3	Polytechnic Institute of New York Graduate Center ATTN: Tech Lib Prof. S. Lederman Dr. G. Moretti Route 110 Farmingdale, NY 11735
1	Martin Marietta Aerospace ATTN: Mr. A. J. Culotta P. O. Box 5387 Orlando, FL 32805		
1	Winchester-Western Division Olin Corporation New Haven, CT 06504	1	Director Forrestal Research Center Princeton University Princeton, NJ 08540
1	Sandia Laboratories ATTN: Aerodynamics Dept Org 5620, R. Maydew Albuquerque, NM 87115	1	Southwest Research Institute ATTN: Mr. Peter S. Westine P. O. Drawer 28510 8500 Culebra Road San Antonio, TX 78228
1	Guggenheim Aeronautical Lab California Institute of Tech ATTN: Tech Lib Pasadena, CA 91104		

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Aberdeen Proving Ground

Dir, USAMSAA

ATTN: DRXSY-D

DRXSY-MP, H. Cohen

Cdr, USATECOM

ATTN: DRSTE-TO-F

Dir, USAHEL

ATTN: Dr. Weisz

Dr. Cummings

Dir, USAMTD

ATTN: Mr. S. Walton

Cdr, USACSL, Bldg. E3516, EA

ATTN: DRDAR-CLB-PA

USER EVALUATION OF REPORT

Please take a few minutes to answer the questions below; tear out this sheet, fold as indicated, staple or tape closed, and place in the mail. Your comments will provide us with information for improving future reports.

1. BRL Report Number _____

2. Does this report satisfy a need? (Comment on purpose, related project, or other area of interest for which report will be used.)

3. How, specifically, is the report being used? (Information source, design data or procedure, management procedure, source of ideas, etc.) _____

4. Has the information in this report led to any quantitative savings as far as man-hours/contract dollars saved, operating costs avoided, efficiencies achieved, etc.? If so, please elaborate.

5. General Comments (Indicate what you think should be changed to make this report and future reports of this type more responsive to your needs, more usable, improve readability, etc.) _____

6. If you would like to be contacted by the personnel who prepared this report to raise specific questions or discuss the topic, please fill in the following information.

Name: _____

Telephone Number: _____

Organization Address: _____
