

AD-A152 296

RIA-85-U108

AD A152296

B
R
L

TECHNICAL REPORT BRL-TR-2638

TECHNICAL
LIBRARY.

FIBER REINFORCEMENT OF GUN PROPELLANT

Lawrence J. Vande Kieft
Warren W. Hillstrom

February 1985

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

US ARMY BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

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

Additional copies of this report may be obtained
from the National Technical Information Service,
U. S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia
22161.

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.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER TECHNICAL REPORT BRL-TR-2638	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) FIBER REINFORCEMENT OF GUN PROPELLANT		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) LAWRENCE J. VANDE KIEFT WARREN W. HILLSTROM		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: AMXBR-TBD Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 1L161101A91A
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: AMXBR-OD-ST Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066		12. REPORT DATE February 1985
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 43
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) Desensitization Fiber Reinforcement Sensitiveness to Fragment Impact Gun Propellants Grain Fracture Sensitiveness to Shaped Charge Jets		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The basis for this paper is the hypothesis that explosive reactions of gun propellant charges subjected to gross damage from attack by shaped charge (SC) or kinetic energy (KE) rounds are the result of catastrophic grain failures; i.e., that as a result of this type of event, the reactive surface area is increased by many orders of magnitude. Thus, given a propellant ignition by the impact of the SC or KE round, the gas generation rate will also be orders of magnitude greater than that for which the propellant was designed. To obviate this, it (continued)		

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

20. ABSTRACT (continued)

was proposed that propellant grains be made stronger through the addition of small percentages of high strength-to-weight-ratio materials; e.g., graphite fibers. It was anticipated that these reinforcing elements would assume the stress, and because of their extremely large elastic moduli would tend to limit the strain experienced by the propellant material. This in turn would tend to limit the damage, in particular the fracturing experienced by the propellant grains, and thus limit the gas generation rate. Representative fibers and propellants were selected, mixed, and tested for sensitiveness and mechanical properties. Response to standard sensitiveness tests was relatively unaffected by fiber addition; mechanical properties of a Low Vulnerability Ammunition (LOVA) propellant, CAB/RDX, were enhanced while those of a standard propellant, M-30, were degraded.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	5
LIST OF TABLES.	7
I. INTRODUCTION.	9
II. PROPELLANT SELECTION.	13
III. FIBER SELECTION	13
IV. PRELIMINARY HAND MIXES.	26
V. SMALL-SCALE MIXES	26
A. Mandatory Hand Mixes	26
B. CAB (LOVA) Procedure.	26
C. Extrusion	27
D. Examination of Finished Grains.	27
VI. TESTS	29
A. Safety.	29
B. Density	29
C. Dimensional Stability	29
D. Burning Rates	29
E. Drop Weight Mechanical Properties Tests	33
F. Compression Test Data	37
VII. SUMMARY	37
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	40
DISTRIBUTION LIST	41

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Typical Stress/Strain Curve.	9
2. Typical Stress/Strain Curve for a Single Graphite Fiber.	11
3. Effect of Graphite Fiber Addition on Gun Propellant Specific Impulse.	12
4. Tows of Various Fiber Types Dipped into TNT.	19
5. Scanning Electron Micrographs - Hercules AU Tow/TNT Interfaces. . .	20
6. SEM's of a Single Kevlar Fiber, Wetted by Dipping into Molten TNT .	21
7. SEM's of a Single Kevlar Fiber with a Droplet of TNT, Showing Contact Angles from Several Perspectives	22
8. Wetting Behavior of Celanese GY-70 Graphite Fiber with TNT	23
9. Examples of Fibers Used to Strengthen Propellants. Photomicrographs @ 50X.	24
10. Examples of Fibers Used to Strengthen Propellants. Photomicrographs @ 50X.	25
11. GY-70 Fibers in CAB/ATEC/RDX Propellant @ 50X.	28
12. Drop Weight Mechanical Properties Tester	34
13. Representative Stress/Strain Curves for Gun Propellant	35
14. Photos of Fiber-Containing Propellant Grains after Testing in the Drop Weight Mechanical Properties Tester	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Formulations for Gun Propellant M-30	14
2	Formulations for Gun Propellant CAB/ATEC/RDX	15
3	Most Commercially Available Carbon Fibers (as of 3/30/73).	16
4	Candidate Fibers	18
5	DTA Data of M-30 and LOVA Propellants.	27
6	Particle Sizes of Fibers	29
7	LOVA Propellants (Modified).	30
8	Fiber Study - CAB.	31
9	Fiber Study - M-30	32
10	Drop Weight Mechanical Properties Tests Results.	33
11	Compression Test Data.	38

I. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this work was to determine the feasibility of reducing the sensitiveness of propellant charges so that if they were subjected to hypervelocity impact, they would react mildly. The particular hypervelocity impact threats under consideration were shaped charge (SC) and kinetic energy (KE) projectiles. Other pertinent threats are projectile fragments and behind armor debris. Since the Army carries gun propellant into battle in armored vehicles, these are commonly experienced threats. Current gun propellants often react violently, exhibiting high order deflagration or, in extreme cases, detonation, when exposed to these threats.

One potential mechanism for these undesirably violent reactions, the mechanism that this research was intended to obviate or vitiate, is as follows: Explosive reactions of propellant charges subjected to gross damage from attack by SC or KE rounds grow rapidly as the result of catastrophic grain failures; i.e., as a result of this type of event, the reactive surface area is increased by many orders of magnitude. Since the gas generation rate varies directly as the surface area, this will also be orders of magnitude greater than that for which the propellant was designed. The purpose of this task is to obviate this mechanism and thus reduce the violence of gun propellant reactions initiated as described above.

The concept proposed for accomplishing this goal is that of enhancing the toughness of gun propellants through the addition of small amounts of high strength-to-weight-ratio materials in the form of fibers. Toughness in this context is defined as the integral of stress with respect to strain from zero to breaking strain:

$$T = \int_0^{\epsilon_b} \sigma(\epsilon) d\epsilon \quad (1)$$

T = Toughness

σ = Stress (Force/Area)

ϵ = Strain (Elongation/Length)

ϵ_b = Strain at Breaking Point

Figure 1 is a typical stress/strain curve, which serves to illustrate this concept.




Figure 1 - Typical Stress/Strain Curve

It was anticipated that these reinforcing elements, fibers, would assume the stress since they would be intimately bonded to the matrix of propellant and since their breaking strain is an order of magnitude greater than that of the propellant. Figure 2 is a stress/strain curve for a graphite fiber, Celanese GY-70. Previously measured physical characteristics of this fiber type include Young's Modulus (E) of $3.8 \cdot 10^7$ psi, and an ultimate tensile stress (σ) of $3 \cdot 10^5$ psi (reference 1). The changing slope at the toe of this curve, $\epsilon \sim 10^{-3}$, was caused by the straightening of the fiber as stress was applied. The following linear portion yielded Young's Modulus of $3.29 \cdot 10^7$ psi, relatively near to the value referenced earlier. The ultimate tensile stress, measured at the break point, of $1.29 \cdot 10^5$ psi fell far short of the referenced value. This was because the fiber pulled out of the epoxy used to hold it in the Instron chuck. This behavior indicates a potential problem — that of providing adequate bond strength between fibers and gun propellant so that applied stress can be transferred to the imbedded fibers.

Two values are indicated on the abscissa of Figure 2, the strains at which TNT and Composition-B fail. Since fiber strain at failure is approximately one order of magnitude greater, these fibers could hold these materials together for strains considerably greater than their normal failure strain. TNT and Composition-B are not the materials considered here, but were only used in a generic sense as being representative of organic, energetic materials.

Since propellant performance is likely to be slightly degraded by addition of fibers, the proportion used should be kept small. The Blake Code was used to aid in determining the fiber level to be included in the M-30 and CAB propellants. Typical theoretical data such as the graphite fiber level vs impetus for these two propellants are shown in Figure 3. At the 2% level, there appears to be about a 40 joules/gram loss for both propellants. To be effective, the fibers should be well dispersed throughout the propellant volume. To satisfy both of these requirements, the mean fiber length should be small. The optimum fiber length depends upon the bond strength between fibers and propellant. Fiber length for a given bond strength should be such as to ensure that fiber failure (fracture) and bond failure (pull-out) occur at approximately the same strain state.

In order to assess the validity of this concept, representative fiber and propellant types were selected. Wetting studies were performed on the fibers using TNT as a generic, organic, energetic simulant. Laboratory scale hand mixes were made to assess the processibility of these propellant blends. Small-scale hand mixes of propellant, 5 lb in a 2-1/4 gallon mixer, were made and tested for mechanical properties, safety, and sensitiveness. Results were analyzed and materials selected for large-scale formulation and testing. This large-scale work still remains to be done. The above described study will be discussed in detail, test results presented, comparisons made, and conclusions drawn.

¹ B. L. Butler, "Application of Engineering Data on Carbon Fibers to Carbon/Carbon Composites," Sandia Laboratories Report SLA-73-0385B, Sep 73.




Figure 2 - Typical Stress/Strain Curve for a Single Graphite Fiber.




Figure 3 - Effect of Graphite Fiber Addition on Gun Propellant Specific Impulse.

II. PROPELLANT SELECTION

The rationale for selecting gun propellants for use in this study was as follows: For the sake of cost and time required, the number was restricted to two. It seemed desirable to use one standard propellant and one novel propellant, one that would likely be used in the near future. The propellants chosen should be designed for use in tank guns since their exposure to the threats described earlier is greater than that for other propellants.

With these concepts in mind, the standard tank gun propellant, M-30, and the LOVA candidate, CAB/RDX, were selected. M-30 is a triple-base propellant, having the formulation shown in Table 1; the formulation of the LOVA (CAB) propellant is shown in Table 2.

III. FIBER SELECTION

In the context of this study, a fiber is defined as a material object having a large fineness (length-to-diameter) ratio and small diameter. The Celanese GY-70 fiber has a nominal diameter of 10 μm , so a 1 mm length of this fiber has a fineness ratio of 100:1, quite large for so short a fiber.

Carbon and graphite fibers are manufactured by drawing long filaments from polymerized hydrocarbons such as rayon or polyacrylonitrile. The fibers are chemically treated to stabilize their structure and then baked in an inert atmosphere. At baking temperatures below 1800°C, the fibers are characterized as carbon; above 2500°C, graphite crystal structures are formed. Carbon and graphite fibers are typically 0.004 to 0.020 millimeters in diameter and resemble extremely fine strands of black fiberglass. Because of their small diameters, the fiber filaments are packaged into tows or yarns containing several hundred to many thousand individual fiber filaments. The industrial importance of carbon and graphite fibers lies in their mechanical properties, their extremely high strength-to-weight-ratio.

There exists a plethora of fiber types with a wide variety of characteristics. A fairly complete list of those that were commercially available in 1973 is shown in Table 3 (reference 1). More have become available since then.

Desiderata for these fibers are as follows: They should be strong and tough, but not brittle. Their breaking strain should be greater than that for the propellant matrix. They should bond well to the matrix and be chemically compatible with it. They should also be relatively inexpensive and available.

The process of fiber selection was to compare the properties of available fibers against the list of desired properties, and to select a group that best fits the needs. Small-scale mixes with the associated mechanical properties and sensitiveness tests were used to further narrow the group, to two fiber types. Large-scale tests, yet to be performed, will be used to make the final selection.

TABLE 1

Formulations for Gun Propellant M-30

Ingredients	Baseline									
	Run 1170	Run 1171	Run 1172	Run 1173	Run 1174	Run 1175	Run 1176			
	wt %	wt %	wt %	wt %	wt %	wt %	wt %			
Nitrocellulose	28.0	27.44	27.44	27.44	27.44	27.44	27.44			
Ethyl Centralite	1.5	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47			
Cryolite	0.3	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29			
Nitroglycerin	22.5	22.05	22.05	22.05	22.05	22.05	22.05			
Nitroguanidine	47.7	46.75	46.75	46.75	46.75	46.75	46.75			
Nylon Flock		2.00	-	-	-	-	-			
Kevlar			2.00	-	-	-	-			
3004-S, Glass				2.00	-	-	-			
612-A4, Glass					2.00	-	-			
GN-70, Graphite Fiber						2.00	-			
Kynol							2.00			

TABLE 2

Formulations for Gun Propellant CAB/ATEC/RDX

Ingredients	Baseline						
	Run 1072/1082	Run 1073	Run 1078	Run 1079	Run 1080	Run 1081	Run 1084/1177
	wt %	wt %	wt %	wt %	wt %	wt %	wt %
Cellulose Acetate	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75	12.0
Butyrate (CAB)							
Acetyl Triethyl	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75	11.75	12.0
Citrate (ATEC)							
Potassium Sulfate	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
RDX	73.5	73.5	73.5	73.5	73.5	73.5	73.5
Kynol	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
GY-70		2.0	-	-	-	-	-
Nylon Flock			2.0	-	-	-	-
Kevlar				2.0	-	-	-
3004-S					2.0	-	-
612-A4						2.0	

TABLE 3

Most Commercially Available Carbon Fibers (as of 3/30/73)

Name	Manufacturer	Base Precursor	Fil. Diam (μm)	Density (g/cm^3)	E (10^6 psi)	σ (10^3 psi)
1. GY2-1	HITCO	Rayon	7.6	1.5	4	200
2. HMG 50	HITCO	Rayon	6.0	1.72	50	310
3. HMG 15	HITCO	Rayon	7.1	1.51	15	153
4. HITRON 401	HITCO	Rayon	6.2	1.67	40	300
5. VYB 105-1/3	UNION CARBIDE	Rayon	9.5	1.53	6	120
6. VYB 85-1/2	UNION CARBIDE	Rayon	9.5	1.53	6	120
7. WYB 125-1/5	UNION CARBIDE	Rayon	8.9	1.32	6	90
8. WYB 85-1/2	UNION CARBIDE	Rayon	8.9	1.32	6	90
9. TH 16	UNION CARBIDE	Rayon	8.3	1.33	14	170
10. TH 25	UNION CARBIDE	Rayon	7.1	1.42	27	180
11. TH 40	UNION CARBIDE	Rayon	6.7	1.56	40	250
12. TH 50 WYG 150-1/2	UNION CARBIDE	Rayon	6.5	1.67	57	315
13. TH 75 WY1 160-1/2	UNION CARBIDE	Rayon	5.6	1.82	79	380
14. CSCY2-__	CARBORUNDUM	Rayon	5.6	1.82	79	380
15. CYCY2-__	CARBORUNDUM	Rayon	10.2	1.50	4	140
16. CSCY2-5	CARBORUNDUM	Rayon	10.2	1.50	4	140
17. CSCY2-5	CARBORUNDUM	Rayon	10.2	1.50	4	140
18. CX-__	POLYCARBON	Rayon	9	1.45	6	175
19. CX-R-__	POLYCARBON	Rayon	9	1.45	6	175
20. CX-__	POLYCARBON	Rayon	9	1.50	6	120
21. CX-R-__	POLYCARBON	Rayon	9	1.50	6	120
22. A	HERCULES	PAN	7.9	1.76	31	300

TABLE 3 (continued)

Most Commercially Available Carbon Fibers (as of 3/30/73)

Name	Manufacturer	Base Precursor	Fil. Diam (μm)	Density (g/cm^3)	E (10^6psi)	σ (10^5psi)
23. HT	HERCULES	PAN	7.8	1.78	38	400
24. HM	HERCULES	PAN	7.5	1.96	55	290
25. FORTAFIL 3-T(L)	GREAT LAKES	PAN	(Orlon)	1.70	28	200
26. FORTAFIL 4-r	GREAT LAKES	PAN	(Orlon)	1.70	37	350
27. FORTAFIL 5-r	GREAT LAKES	PAN	(Orlon)	1.80	48	400
28. FORTAFIL 6-r	GREAT LAKES	PAN	(Orlon)	1.90	59	420
29. MODMOR I	MORGAN LTD. (Whittaker Dist)	PAN	7.5	1.74	40	400
30. MODMOR I	MORGAN LTD. (Whittaker Dist)	PAN	7.5	1.99	60	250
31. TH 400 WYM-60 1/0	UNION CARBIDE	PAN		1.78	30	425
32. HYFIL 2710	ROLLS ROYCE	PAN		1.75	28	348
33. CELION GY-70	CELANESE	PAN	(Orlon)	1.96	38	300
34. PANEX 30/A	STACKPOLE	PAN	7.5	1.78	30	460
35. PANEX 30/C	STACKPOLE	PAN	7.5	1.78	30	300
36. KCF-100	KUREHA	PITCH	10	1.60	6.5	150
37. KGF-200	KUREHA	PITCH	10	1.60	6.5	150
38. CMF-MONO-FILAMENT	GREAT LAKES	PITCH	33	1.65	6	100

A first step in this process was to determine wettability of fibers since wettability is related to bond strength. TNT was used as a generic, organic, energetic, simulant. Figure 4 shows a set of seven fibers that were dipped into molten TNT, held for a couple seconds, and withdrawn. Numbers under the tows correspond to those in the legend indicating the fiber types used. Scanning electron micrographs (SEM's) were then made of these tows at the interface between the fibers and the upper end of the frozen TNT. A representative set of SEM's is shown in Figure 5. The photo at 50X shows the entire meniscus; that at 350X, the left side; at 380X, the right side; and at 780X, the only part of the interface that shows any wetting is displayed with great magnification. In general, this fiber type shows almost no affinity for TNT, the meniscus even appears to indicate repulsion. Also, single fibers were dipped into molten TNT, with results shown in Figure 6. Kevlar was the fiber type used here. A periodic structure of globules resulted. One was selected and displayed at several magnifications. Again, wetting was very poor.

A third method of assessing wettability was used: A single fiber was suspended horizontally across a microscope slide mounted on the programmable hot stage of a Nikon optical microscope. Powdered TNT was sprinkled onto the fiber. The stage was slowly heated from ambient, through the melting point of TNT, and slowly cooled, while observations were made. Figure 7 depicts the results of one such experiment. Again, Kevlar was used. The droplet shown resulted from a TNT flake melting onto the fiber and then solidifying. The droplet is shown from several perspectives to display contact angles formed between the Kevlar and TNT. In this experiment, wetting appears good.

A slight modification of this method yielded the results shown in Figure 8. A small pile of powdered TNT was placed at one end of the single fiber suspended on the microscope hot stage as described above. The temperature was cycled as before and behavior observed. As the TNT melted, the meniscus was seen to form; surface tension drew the TNT far up the fiber, blending asymptotically with it. Wetting was very good. The fiber type here was Celanese GY-70, a high modulus graphite fiber.


Fibers were selected to cover a wide range of properties and materials (Table 4).

TABLE 4
CANDIDATE FIBERS

Fibers	Length	Comment
3004-S	<1 mm	Heat cleaned glass
612-A4	~1 mm	Producer's finish, glass
Kevlar	1.5 mm	Aromatic polyamide, DuPont Kevlar 29 Pulp Type 1979
Kynol	~.9 mm	Cross linked amorphous phenolic polymer, Harbison-carborundum
Nylon Flock	~1 mm	Claremont grade 572, natural color
GY-70	~1.5 mm 10 mm*	Lab chopped graphite fiber, Celanese

*10 mm for pilot plant mixes

The selection spans from high modulus, brittle graphite down to low strength nylon flock. Typical examples are shown in Figures 9 and 10.



LEGEND

<u>No.</u>	<u>Type</u>
1	THORNEL 300
2	AU
3	HMS
4	AS
5	KEVLAR
6	GY-70
7	TP4104-B

Figure 4 - Tows of Various Fiber Types Dipped into TNT.

(30 kV at -10° TILT)



50X



350X



380X




780X

Figure 5 - Scanning Electron Micrographs - Hercules AU Tow/TNT Interfaces.




250 X



1500 X



3500 X



5000 X

Figure 6 - SEM's of a Single Kevlar Fiber, Wetted by Dipping into Molten TNT. All photos were made at 30° tilt and 30 kv accelerating potential, in the secondary emission mode.








Figure 7 - SEM's of a Single Kevlar Fiber with a Droplet of TNT, Showing Contact Angles from Several Perspectives. Photos were taken at 50X, 30° tilt, 30 kV accelerating potential in the secondary emission mode.



Figure 8 - Wetting Behavior of Celanese GY-70 Graphite Fiber with TNT.



NYLON FLOCK (TYPE 572)



KEVLAR 29 PULP (TYPE 979)

Figure 9 - Examples of Fibers Used to Strengthen Propellants. Photomicrographs @ 50X.



MICROGLASS TYPE 3004-S
HEAT CLEANED ($L < 1\text{mm}$)



CELANESE GY-70
GRAPHITE FIBER

Figure 10 Examples of Fibers Used to Strengthen Propellants.
Photomicrographs @ 50X.

IV. PRELIMINARY HAND MIXES

Hand mixes were made at the Ballistic Research Laboratory (BRL) by incorporating fibers into previously cured gun propellants with the aid of solvents. This was done to provide preliminary data on dispersion and integrity of fibers during mixing as well as to obtain some safety properties. Since the fiber containing mixes were examined optically, the standard M-30 gun propellant presented some problems. In the processing of M-30, usually a graphite glaze is applied to the surface of the propellant, which opacifies the propellant during the redissolving step. In all future M-30 mixes, the graphite glaze will be eliminated to facilitate ease of optical examination of the modified propellants. Most of the hand mixes therefore were made utilizing CAB standard propellant. All fibers dispersed fairly well, considering that they were hand mixed. Most fibers, with the exception of GY-70, showed no dimensional change from mixing. GY-70 did break down to about .3 mm long.

Drop weight impact tests all were in excess of 500 mm, which is considered low sensitivity. Because of the limited capability to make gun propellant at BRL at this time, all of the propellant preparation beyond the preliminary hand mixes, and most of the testing were carried out by the Navy at NOS, Indian Head.

V. SMALL-SCALE MIXES

All of the small-scale mixes were mixed in a 2-1/2 gallon Baker-Perkins horizontal mixer. Five pounds of each composition (Tables 1 and 2) were prepared.

A. Mandatory Hand Mixes

Prior to making any propellant formulations in the pilot plant at Indian Head, it was mandatory from safety that small laboratory mixes be made with all of the same lots of raw materials that were to be used in the pilot plant compositions. Laboratory formulated propellants were prepared and samples were tested on the Differential Thermal Analyzer (DTA). The data, Table 5 for modified M-30 propellants, have a significantly lower peak exotherm ($\sim 188^{\circ}\text{C}$) compared to modified CAB propellants ($\sim 250^{\circ}\text{C}$), which would be expected based on the ingredients in each composition. However, within a given composition the exotherms vary very little, showing that the addition of any fiber to an M-30 or a CAB composition does not lower the modified propellant's exotherm. M-30 compositions had exotherms that ranged from 186°C to 193°C , with the exotherm of the control propellant being 188°C . The CAB propellants' exotherms ranged from 240°C to 250°C .

B. CAB (LOVA) Procedure

All CAB pilot plant mixes were mixed at 120°F , with blowdown (i.e., solvent removal) at 70°F . The propellant was removed from the mixer to the extruding operation area. The M-30 propellant mixes were started at 90°F and raised to 120°F ; after blowdown the propellant removal temperature was 70°F .

TABLE 5

DTA DATA OF M-30 AND LOVA PROPELLANTS

Sample Identity	Exotherm Peak °C	
	M-30	LOVA
Control	188	250
Kynol	188	242
Kevlar	187	247
GY-70	193	250
Nylon	186	240
3004-S	187	249
612-A4	186	250

C. Extrusion

All propellants were blocked under vacuum twice in the extruder, extruded through a 16 mesh screen at nominal 700 psig. Then the screened material was blocked again twice, and finally extruded as 7 perf gun propellant. The CAB propellants were extruded at a nominal starting pressure of 2000 psig and ambient temperature; the M-30 propellants were extruded at a nominal starting pressure of 1300 psig. The gun propellant was cut into pellets after a suitable drying time. The cut pellets are usually dried 1 day at ambient and 2 days at 140°F. Kevlar-containing pellets tended to have elliptical perforations if the cutting tool was not extremely sharp.

D. Examination of Finished Grains

At BRL, samples of all mixes were examined optically, after being cut parallel to the perfs. The fibers were evenly dispersed, and orientated parallel to the perfs. Only GY-70 and Kynol fibers broke up during processing of the propellant composition. GY-70, for example, initially was hand cut to 10 mm long. Kynol, as received, was a 0.9 mm long fiber. After processing the compositions through to the finished pellets, the GY-70 fibers were 0.3 mm long and the Kynol were 0.6 mm long. This was determined by dissolving the propellant, filtering and measuring the fibers. Weight % of fibers in the propellants was also confirmed to be at the 2% level. Figure 11 is a typical example of what was observed. Table 6 shows these results.



Figure 11 - GY-70 Fibers in CAB/ATEC/RDX Propellant @ 50X

TABLE 6

PARTICLE SIZES OF FIBERS

	Before Mix	After Mix
GY-70	10 mm	0.3 mm
Nylon Flock	0.9 mm	0.9 mm
612-A4	0.6 mm	0.6 mm
3004-S	0.5 mm	0.5 mm
Kevlar	1.5 mm	1.5 mm
Kynol	0.9 mm	0.6 mm

VI. TESTS

A. Safety

Results of the safety tests done at NOS, Indian Head (Table 7), were as expected. The addition of fibers to M-30 or CAB gun propellants did not increase their sensitivity to impact, friction or electrostatic discharge compared to the control propellants, those without fibers. It can be noted that M-30 had a medium sensitivity to the drop weight impact test while CAB propellant exhibited a low sensitivity.

B. Density

The densities obtained with the modified CAB propellants had a considerable scatter beyond that attributed to the fibers being incorporated into the propellant. Densities ranged from 1.55 g/cc to 1.645 g/cc. The modified M-30 propellants exhibited a much narrower density range, 1.626 g/cc to 1.658 g/cc.

C. Dimensional Stability

Ten pellets were randomly selected from each mix. Their dimensions were measured, averaged, and listed in Table 8 A for CAB and in Table 9 A for M-30. Both propellants were considered to show excessive scatter in physical dimensions.

Parameters such as density and physical dimensions (outer/inner web distance, for example) must be included in the closed bomb data analysis procedure to derive burning rate.

D. Burning Rates

The burning rates were obtained on the closed bomb at 5000 psig increments from 5 to 30 thousand psig. Tables 8 B and 9 B show the results. The fibers appear to have little effect on the burning rate, as was expected.

TABLE 7

Safety Tests

Sample	Mix Number	LOVA Propellants (Modified)				Electrostatic Discharge (Joules)
		Fiber Additive	Impact (mm)	Friction (lb)		
CAB/RDX	1072	Kynol	600 (L)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1073	GY-70	600 (L)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1078	Nylon Flock	600 (L)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1079	Kelvar	600 (L)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1080	3004-S	600 (L)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1081	612-A4	600 (L)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1084/1177	Control	600 (L)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1170	Control	250 (M)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
M-30	1171	Nylon Flock	250 (M)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1173	3004-S	150 (M)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1172	Kevlar	250 (M)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1174	612-A4	150 (M)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1175	GY-70	200 (M)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	
	1176	Kylon	250 (M)	>960 (L)	>12.5 (L)	

Relative Sensitivity

(L) Low (M) Medium (H) High

TABLE 8

Fiber Study - CAB

A	Mix No.	Fiber	Density g/cc	Length	Dimensions (Inches)					
					Outer Diameter	Outer Web	Inner Web	Outer Perf Diameter	Inner Perf Diameter	
	1084/1177	Control	1.545	.263	.188	.042	.033	.014	.014	
	1072	Kynol	1.562	.269	.190	.044	.035	.012	.013	
	1073	GV-70	1.645	.269	.190	.043	.033	.014	.012	
	1078	Nylon Flock	1.568	.276	.190	.045	.033	.012	.012	
	1079	Kevlar	1.603	.274	.186	.042	.037	.011	.012	
	1080	3004-S	1.552	.266	.191	.042	.032	.014	.015	
	1081	612-A4	1.593	.273	.189	.041	.033	.014	.014	
B	Mix No.	Fiber	5000	10000	Burn Rate (in/sec)		25000	30000	Coefficient	Exponent
					15000	20000				
	1084/1177	Control	.337	.716	1.165	1.645	2.150	2.676	1.674 E-5	1.16
	1072	Kynol	.331	.743	1.196	1.682	2.192	2.721	1.463 E-5	1.18
	1073	GV-70	.359	.831	1.347	1.849	2.312	2.779	2.108 E-5	1.15
	1078	Nylon Flock	.329	.778	1.244	1.735	2.245	2.772	1.372 E-5	1.19
	1079	Kevlar	.347	.760	1.175	1.655	2.158	2.681	2.139 E-5	1.14
	1080	3004-S	.368	.825	1.306	1.827	2.335	2.855	2.154 E-5	1.15
	1081	612-A4	.366	.789	1.255	1.733	2.249	2.782	2.351 E-5	1.13

TABLE 9

Fiber Study - M-30

A	Mix No.	Fiber	Density g/cc	Length	Outer Diameter	Dimensions (Inches)				Outer Perf Diameter	Inner Perf Diameter
						Outer Web	Inner Web	Outer Perf Diameter	Inner Perf Diameter		
	1170	Control	1.658	.256	.189	.042	.032	.014			
	1171	Nylon	1.632	.275	.172	.037	.072	.013			.013
	1172	Fevlar	1.626	.282	.169	.039	.028	.013			.013
	1173	3004-S	1.655	.278	.178	.042	.027	.014			.015
	1174	612-A4	1.657	.282	.175	.038	.030	.013			.013
	1175	GY-70	1.653	.278	.173	.040	.027	.014			.014
	1176	Kynol	1.641	.277	.171	.040	.027	.014			.014

E	Mix No.	Fiber	5000 psi	10000 psi	15000 psi	Burn Rate (in/sec)				30000 psi	Coefficient	Exponent
						20000 psi	25000 psi	30000 psi	Coefficient	Exponent		
	1170	Control	1.831	2.506	3.260	4.030	4.750	5.433	9.285 E-03	.64		
	1171	Nylon	1.735	2.387	3.053	3.772	4.432	5.037	1.037 E-02	.60		
	1172	Kelvar	1.752	2.543	3.455	4.276	5.044	5.772	5.418 E-03	.67		
	1173	3004-S	1.795	2.376	2.998	3.777	4.409	5.002	1.191 E-02	.58		
	1174	612-A4	1.774	2.415	3.159	3.938	4.673	5.374	8.660 E-03	.63		
	1175	GY-70	1.934	2.760	3.363	4.270	4.515	5.513	1.248 E-02	.59		
	1176	Kynol	1.683	2.236	2.955	3.768	4.487	5.176	6.723 E-03	.64		

E. Drop Weight Mechanical Properties Tests

This is a method by which the mechanical properties of a material can be evaluated under high strain rate, compressive loading. The device consists of a standard drop weight tester, normally used for impact sensitivity measurements, that has been modified by placing a force gage and an assembly that transmits the impact force from the falling weight cage to the sample, in place of the standard anvil (see reference 2). Figure 12 is a schematic diagram of this device. Results of this test are in the form of stress and strain vs time, and visual observation of damage. A typical set of stress/strain curves is shown in Figure 13, and post-test photos of fiber-containing grains in Figure 14.

The maximum stress before failure was measured and the relative amount of damage was noted. M-30 is stronger than CAB/RDX and required a drop height (DH) of 20 cm and a drop weight (DW) of 2 kg for fracture. CAB/RDX required a DH of 11 cm and DW of 1 kg. The results are shown in Table 10.

TABLE 10

DROP WEIGHT MECHANICAL PROPERTIES TESTS RESULTS

CAB/ATEC DH = 11 cm, DW = 1 kg

Lot No.	Fiber	Maximum Stress (MPa)	Relative Damage
1072	Kynol	33.6	0
1073	GY-70	37.1	-
1077	Control	33.3	0
1078	Nylon Flock	34.8	0
1079	Kevlar	39.7	-
1080	3004-S	33.1	0
1081	612-A4	37.9	-

M-30 DH = 20 cm, DW = 2 kg

1170	Control	105	0
1171	Nylon Flock	95.4	0
1172	Kevlar	89.8	0
1173	3004-S	91.6	0
1174	612-A4	106	+
1175	GY-70	103	+
1176	Kynol	93.3	+

Legend: 0 = Damage Level for Control Samples

- = Less Damage than Control

+ = More Damage than Control

²

R. Lieb, et al, "Impact Mechanical Properties Tester for Gun Propellants," 1981 JANNAF Structures and Mechanical Behavior Subcommittee Meeting, Vol 1, pp 155-162.




Figure 12 - Drop Weight Mechanical Properties Tester.





Figure 13 - Representative Stress/Strain Curves for Gun Propellant.
These data are for a brittle, highly fractured sample.




M-30 CONTROL

8.25 X
DW=2.0 kg
DH=20 cm



M-30/GY-70



LOVA CAB/RDX CONTROL

12.5 X
DW=1.0 kg
DH=10 cm



LOVA CAB/RDX/GY-70

Figure 14 - Photos of Fiber-Containing Propellant Grains after Testing in the Drop Weight Mechanical Properties Tester.

M-30 lots with fibers all showed more damage than the control lot. For some grains the damage difference was only slight, but the stress before failure in these cases was markedly lower. This indicates that the grains became more brittle upon the addition of the fibers, a condition that will cause more fracture upon failure. In the case of CAB/ATEC, the amount of damage done was either about the same or a little less than for the control lot. For some lots the average stress before failure was higher than for the control lot, but the scatter in the individual results reduces the significance of the higher average. The smaller amount of fracture indicates that some fibers may increase the strength of the grain on the order of 10%.

The main problem with fiber-containing M-30 propellant appears to be with the fiber/propellant bond; this is very weak. Instead of strengthening the propellant, the fibers weakened it, likely by forming void-like inclusions in the material. The proper choice of bonding agent may cause a great improvement in response to this test. Apparently, bonding between fibers and CAB is much better, since these tests exhibit improvement in mechanical properties.

F. Compression Test Data

This series of tests was performed on an Instron mechanical properties tester. The principal difference between these tests and those previously described, the Drop Weight Mechanical Properties Tests (DWMPT), is the strain rate used. For the DWMPT, the interval over which stress is applied is a few milliseconds, whereas for Instron tests, this interval is on the order of 1 minute. Data were taken for two temperatures, 20°F and 77°F, for both propellant types, with the control and the six fiber types. The data are shown in Table XI. High compressibility and large compressive force at yield are desired. Fibers did not improve the compressive force at yield for M-30; neither was there significant degradation except for nylon flock and Kevlar, for which there was about 20% degradation. Nylon flock improved the compressibility of M-30 by a small amount. Results were better for fiber addition to CAB/RDX. In almost all cases the compressive force at yield exceeded that for the control, by approximately 12% for nylon flock and Kevlar. Compressibility was also improved by two fiber types, both of glass, 3004-S and 612-A4, but only by about 4%. Unfortunately, the fiber type causing the greatest improvement in the one parameter was not the one causing the most improvement in the other parameter. However, glass fiber type 612-A4 caused a 3.7% improvement in compressibility and 6.2% improvement in compressive force at yield.

VII. SUMMARY

The objectives of this work were to attempt to reduce the sensitiveness of gun propellants to attack by shaped charge jets and long rod penetrators, as well as to all other forms of impact. The approach was to strengthen the propellant so that impact would produce less cracking and fragmentation than in the unmodified state and thus result in a lower gas generation rate. All combinations of two propellants and six fibers were made and tested in various ways. Fiber addition had little effect on any of the properties of M-30 propellant except for mechanical properties: compressive force at yield was reduced by ca. 20% for two fiber types. Fiber addition to CAB/RDX resulted in some improvement in mechanical properties for several fiber types.

TABLE 11

Compression Test Data

Test Temp		20°F		77°F		20°F		77°F	
Mix No.	Compress. Force (lb)	% Compress.	Compress. Force (lb)	% Compress.	Mix No.	Compress. Force (lb)	% Compress.	Compress. Force (lb)	% Compress.
1177 (Control)	585	2.9	405	4.8	1170	2372	3.3	1163	6.2
	584	3.1	408	4.5	(Control)	2446	3.6	1194	6.3
	738	2.2	400	6.3		2435	4.3	1252	7.5
1078	605	2.6	478	3.5	1171	2065	3.5	982	5.8
Nylon Flock	661	2.9	455	3.8	Nylon Flock	2060	3.5	993	6.3
	675	2.4	421	4.7		2088	3.4	1018	8.4
1079	679	2.4	467	2.4	1172	2060	2.5	965	5.1
Kevlar	707	2.3	438	3.8	Kevlar	2075	3.0	1023	4.2
	797	2.0	445	4.0		2035	3.1	1040	6.0
1080	563	2.5	393	4.9	1173	2203	4.0	1122	5.5
Glass 3004-S	598	4.4	369	6.0	Glass 3004-S	2170	3.9	1142	5.9
	548	2.8	378	5.2		2080	3.9	1146	6.4
1081	598	2.3	432	5.3	1174	2315	3.5	1176	4.7
Glass 612-A4	596	2.2	443	5.3	Glass 612-A4	2275	3.3	1196	4.6
	661	3.6	411	5.6		2346	3.6	1186	4.8
1072	638	2.1	413	4.3	1176	2153	3.1	1166	4.8
Kynol	596	2.3	413	3.8	Kynol	2205	3.1	1118	4.5
	623	2.5	407	4.2		2246	3.2	1120	5.0

TABLE 11 (continued)
Compression Test Data

Test Temp	20°F			77°F			20°F			77°F		
	Mix No.	Compress. Force (lb)	% Compress.	Compress. Force (lb)	% Compress.	Mix No.	Compress. Force (lb)	% Compress.	Compress. Force (lb)	% Compress.	Compress. Force (lb)	% Compress.
Graphite GY-70	1073	638	2.1	394	5.2	1175	2405	3.4	1190	4.6		
		604	2.2	400	4.9	Graphite	2295	3.7	1202	5.1		
		587	2.2	410	5.1	GY-70	2246	3.2	1174	5.1		

Sensitiveness was not tested except to insure compatibility of fibers with propellant, and safety in processing. These tests included drop weight impact, friction, and electrostatic discharge. Again, no significant changes were noted for the modified as compared with the unmodified propellants. The test which might have shown some effect, the drop weight impact test, was ineffective because the sample grains had to be powdered for this test while the whole purpose of adding fibers was to prevent fracturing of the grains.

The tests discussed earlier were intended as screening tests, to indicate research directions for further and larger scale testing. These indications are that there is some merit to the concept, but that further small-scale research is required before proceeding to larger scale testing. Wetting and bonding agents could be used to improve the fiber/propellant interface bond strength. This then should improve the mechanical properties of the propellant grains. If this work is continued, the shotgun test will be applied to the enhanced materials, as a final screening test. In this test, grains are impacted on a solid obstacle at various speeds. Resulting fragments are then ignited in a closed bomb, and the maximum rate of change of pressure (P_{max}) recorded. P_{max} vs impact speed is plotted and compared with that for the control materials. This test should provide a very sensitive discriminant for fiber desensitization of propellants to impact because it so closely parallels the tactical situation being addressed. Candidates which respond favorably to the shotgun test would then be subjected to shaped charge jets and possibly to fragment and long rod penetrator attack.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work reported here was an In-house Laboratory Initiated Research (ILIR) task performed jointly by the Terminal and Interior Ballistics Divisions, TBD and IBD. In IBD, the principal participants were Joseph Rocchio, Robert Lieb, and Sean Wise, as Team Leader and researcher on the drop weight mechanical properties tests, and consultant, respectively. The authors are also indebted to them for many helpful discussions and sound technical advice throughout the performance of this task.

As mentioned in the text of this report, the pilot plant mixing of propellants and fibers, as well as some of the sensitiveness testing, was performed by NOS Indian Head personnel. We wish to thank specifically David Brooks, Daniel LaFluer, Steven Mitchell, Anthony Dunay and Lawrence Torreyson for their kind cooperation. Richard Shuford, AMMRC, and Steven Petrie, University of Lowell, provided some of the fibers, processed to the required length.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
12	Administrator Defense Technical Info Center ATTN: DTIC-DDA Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	1	Commander Armament R&D Center US Army AMCCOM ATTN: SMCAR-LCN, Dr. P. Harris Dover, NJ 07801
1	Chairman DOD Explosives Safety Board ATTN: Dr. T. Zaker Room 856-C Hoffman Bldg 1 2461 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22331	1	Commander US Army Armament Materiel Readiness Command ATTN: SMCAR-ESP-L Rock Island, IL 61299
1	Commander US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCDRA-ST 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	1	Director Benet Weapons Laboratory US Army AMCCOM, ARDC ATTN: SMCAR-LCB-TL Watervliet, NY 12189
1	Commander Armament R&D Center US Army AMCCOM ATTN: SMCAR-TDC Dover, NJ 07801	1	Commander US Army Aviation Research and Development Command ATTN: AMSAV-E 4300 Goodfellow Boulevard St. Louis, MO 63120
1	Commander Armament R&D Center US Army AMCCOM ATTN: SMCAR-TSS Dover, NJ 07801	1	Director US Army Air Mobility Research and Development Laboratory Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035
1	Commander Armament R&D Center US Army AMCCOM ATTN: SMCAR-LCE, Dr. R. F. Walker Dover, NJ 07801	1	Commander US Army Communications- Electronics Command ATTN: AMSEL-ED Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703
1	Commander Armament R&D Center US Army AMCCOM ATTN: SMCAR-LCE, Dr. W. Slagg Dover, NJ 07801	1	Commander US Army Electronics Research and Development Command Technical Support Activity ATTN: DELSD-L Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703 -5301
1	HQDA DAMA-ART-M Washington, DC 20310	1	Commander US Army Development & Employment Agency ATTN: MODE-TED-SAB Fort Lewis, WA 98433

DISTRIBUTION LIST (continued)

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-R Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898	1	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command ATTN: Mr. R. Beauregard, SEA 64E Washington, DC 20362
1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-YDL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898	1	Commander Naval Explosive Ordnance Disposal Facility ATTN: Technical Library Code 604 Indian Head, MD 20640
1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSME-RK, Dr. R.G. Rhoades Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898	1	Commander Naval Research Lab ATTN: Code 6100 Washington, DC 20375
1	Commander US Army Tank Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-TSL Warren, MI 48090	1	Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: Code G13 Dahlgren, VA 22448
1	Director US Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: ATAA-SL White Sands Missile Range NM 88002	9	Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: Mr. L. Roslund, R122 Mr. M. Stosz, R121 Code X211, Lib E. Zimet, R13 R.R. Bernecker, R13 J.W. Forbes, R13 S.J. Jacobs, R10 K. Kim, R13 Dr. C. Dickinson Silver Spring, MD 20910
1	Commandant US Army Infantry School ATTN: ATSH-CD-CSO-OR Fort Benning, GA 31905	4	Commander Naval Weapons Center ATTN: Dr. L. Smith, Code 3205 Dr. A. Amster, Code 385 Dr. R. Reed, Jr., Code 388 Dr. K. J. Graham, Code 3835 China Lake, CA 93555
1	Commander US Army Research Office ATTN: Chemistry Division P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211	1	Air Force Armament Laboratory ATTN: AFATL/DLODL Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000
1	Commander Office of Naval Research ATTN: Dr. J. Enig, Code 200B 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217		

DISTRIBUTION LIST (continued)

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Commander Naval Weapons Station NEDED ATTN: Dr. Louis Rothstein, Code 50 Yorktown, VA 23691		<u>Aberdeen Proving Ground</u> Dir, USAMSAA ATTN: AMXSY-D AMXSY-MP, H. Cohen
1	Commander Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic ATTN: G-4 (NSAP) Norfolk, VA 23511		Cdr, USATECOM ATTN: AMSTE-TO-F Cdr, CRDC, AMCCOM ATTN: SMCCR-RSP-A SMCCR-MU SMCCR-SPS-IL
1	Commander AFRPL ATTN: Mr. R. Geisler, Code AFRPL MKPA Edwards AFB, CA 93523		
1	AFWL/SUL Kirtland AFB, NM 87117		
1	Commander Ballistic Missile Defense Advanced Technology Center ATTN: Dr. David C. Sayles P.O. Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807		
1	Director Lawrence Livermore National Lab University of California ATTN: Dr. M. Finger Livermore, CA 94550		
1	Director Los Alamos National Lab ATTN: John Ramsey P.O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, NM 87544		
1	Director Los Alamos National Lab ATTN: Irv Akst P.O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, NM 87544		
1	Director Sandia National Lab ATTN: Dr. J. Kennedy Albuquerque, NM 87115		

USER EVALUATION SHEET/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

This Laboratory undertakes a continuing effort to improve the quality of the reports it publishes. Your comments/answers to the items/questions below will aid us in our efforts.

1. BRL Report Number _____ Date of Report _____
2. Date Report Received _____
3. Does this report satisfy a need? (Comment on purpose, related project, or other area of interest for which the report will be used.) _____

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

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

6. General Comments. What do you think should be changed to improve future reports? (Indicate changes to organization, technical content, format, etc.) _____

CURRENT
ADDRESS

Name

Organization

Address

City, State, Zip

7. If indicating a Change of Address or Address Correction, please provide the New or Correct Address in Block 6 above and the Old or Incorrect address below.

OLD
ADDRESS

Name

Organization

Address

City, State, Zip

(Remove this sheet along the perforation, fold as indicated, staple or tape closed, and mail.)