

AD-A237 041



20030214113

2

TECHNICAL REPORT BRL-TR-3237

BRL

EXPERIMENTAL DETERMINATION OF CRITICAL
PHYSICAL PARAMETERS AFFECTING
JA2 PROPELLANT GRAIN RESPONSE,
PHASE I: SCREENING DESIGN

GEORGE A. GAZONAS
DAVID A. HOPKINS
JAMES C. FORD

MAY 1991

DTIC
ELECTE
JUN 21 1991
S B D

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED.

U.S. ARMY LABORATORY COMMAND

BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

91 6 18 008

91-02419



NOTICES

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, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

The findings of 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

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE May 1991	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final, Aug 90 - Dec 90	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Experimental Determination of Critical Physical Parameters Affecting JA2 Propellant Grain Response, Phase I: Screening Design			5. FUNDING NUMBERS PR: 1L161102AH43	
6. AUTHOR(S) George A. Gazonas, David A. Hopkins, and James C. Ford				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: SLCBR-IB-P Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER BRL-TR-3237	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) Uniaxial compression tests are performed on single grain, seven-perforation JA2 propellant specimens using a statistically-based, 2 ⁴ (factorial) design strategy. A total of sixteen tests are performed and a mechanical response surface is generated over the range of continuous variables, strain rate (10 ⁻⁴ and 500 sec ⁻¹), temperature (0 and 60 degrees Celsius), and specimen aspect ratio (0.8 and 1.3), and discrete variable, specimen end lubrication ("yes" or "no"). It is found that specimen end lubrication reduces the variability of the mechanical response of JA2 but does not affect the magnitude of the mechanical response as characterized by the yield stress, yield strain, compressive modulus, and strain energy absorbed at yield. The specimen aspect ratio did not affect the mechanical response of JA2 because of the limited aspect ratio range investigated. The mechanical response of JA2 is well represented by a second degree polynomial model, since the RMS errors between data and model are only slightly greater than standard deviations in the mechanical response derived from prior replicate testing of JA2.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Mechanical Properties, Propellants, JA2, Compressive Testing, Statistical Design, Screening Design			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 44	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

UNCLASSIFIED

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18
298-102

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF FIGURES.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. EXPERIMENTAL METHOD.....	2
2.1 Apparatus, Data Acquisition and Data Reduction.....	2
2.2 Specimen Preparation.....	3
2.3 Experimental Design.....	4
3. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS.....	7
4. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	9
4.1 Specimen Aspect Ratio.....	11
4.2 End Lubrication.....	12
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	13
6. FUTURE WORK.....	14
7. REFERENCES.....	14
APPENDIX A: CUBE PLOTS, LEAST SQUARES COEFFICIENTS, AND INTERACTION PLOTS FOR RESPONSES.....	15
APPENDIX B: MODEL RESIDUALS FOR RESPONSES BY END LUBRICATION.....	29
8. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	35
DISTRIBUTION LIST.....	37



For	☒
	☐
	☐
on	

Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Servohydraulic Test Apparatus with Upper Bell and Impact Cone Piston Assembly.....	2
2. Experimental Reproducibility of the Mechanical Response of JA2 in Uniaxial Compression at Strain Rates of 10^{-2} and 200 sec^{-1}	3
3. Cube Plot with 2^3 Design Points.....	6
4. "Classical" Material Test Program for Strain Rate, Temperature, Aspect Ratio, and Specimen End Lubrication.....	6
5. Measured Mechanical Responses.....	7
6. Cube Plots of Stress at Yield Response With and Without End Lubrication.....	8
7. Absorbed Strain Energy Density at Maximum Stress at -30 degrees Celsius for JA2 and M30 Deformed at 100 sec^{-1} in Uniaxial Compression versus Specimen Aspect Ratio.....	12
A1. Cube Plots for Stress at Yield.....	17
A2. Least Squares Coefficients for Stress at Yield.....	18
A3. Strain Rate*Temperature Interaction Surface for Stress at Yield.....	19
A4. Cube Plots for Strain at Yield.....	20
A5. Least Squares Coefficients for Strain at Yield.....	21
A6. Strain Rate*Temperature Interaction Surface for Strain at Yield.....	22
A7. Cube Plots for Energy.....	23
A8. Least Squares Coefficients for Energy.....	24
A9. Strain Rate*Temperature Interaction Surface for Energy.....	25
A10. Cube Plots for Modulus.....	26
A11. Least Squares Coefficients for Modulus.....	27
A12.. Strain Rate*Temperature Interaction Surface for Modulus.....	28

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
B1. Model Residuals for Stress at Yield by End Lubrication.....	31
B2. Model Residuals for Strain at Yield by End Lubrication.....	32
B3. Model Residuals for Energy at Yield by End Lubrication.....	33
B4. Model Residuals for Modulus by End Lubrication.....	34

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Experimental Protocol with Random Run Number and Experimental Responses.....	5
2 Least Squares Regression Coefficients ($\alpha = 0.05$).....	10

1. INTRODUCTION

Constitutive models for deformable media are developed by performing material tests, preferably under environmental conditions which are identical to those in the service environment. The environmental conditions are implicitly assumed to be measurable and controllable independent variables such as temperature, pressure, and relative humidity. Complications arise in the development of constitutive models if the service environment conditions are harsh, unknown or impossible to exactly reproduce in laboratory testing.

The "classical" one-factor-at-a-time¹ material test program proceeds by testing the material over the operating range of a particular variable, while the other variables are held constant at a value within their respective ranges. The test program can become time consuming and costly if the effects of a number of variables are to be investigated. Furthermore, if nonlinear effects (interaction, curvature) are present among the variables, one-factor-at-a-time experimentation will not detect them. As an alternative, a statistically valid experimental design strategy can be used to minimize the total number of tests performed and to maximize the amount and quality of information that is obtained.

This report describes the implementation of a statistically based experimental design strategy for evaluating the relative importance of three independent continuous variables, i.e., temperature, strain rate, and specimen aspect ratio (L/D), and one independent discrete variable, specimen end lubrication, in predicting the uniaxial compressive mechanical response of JA2 gun propellant. The design strategy lends itself to the development of a mechanical response model whose prediction error is comparable to the standard deviation obtained in replicate testing. Since a hierarchy of importance in the independent variables will be established, the experiments will essentially form a screening design. JA2 gun propellant has been shown to be a rate-sensitive and temperature-sensitive material^{2,3}, and in a variety of materials, the specimen aspect ratio and degree of end lubrication affects the mechanical response by perturbing the homogeneous stress state in the specimen during uniaxial compression⁴. Although other variables, such as relative humidity and hydrostatic pressure, may affect the mechanical response of the propellant, these variables are not investigated since they are not directly controllable with the experimental apparatus.

2. EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

2.1 Apparatus, Data Acquisition and Data Reduction. The High Rate 810 MTS Material Test System (Figure 1) consists of a conventional two-pole press with a servohydraulically actuated ram that operates from quasistatic velocities to a maximum velocity of about 12 m/sec; the maximum velocity imparts a maximum strain rate of 1200 sec^{-1} on a 10 mm long specimen. A Thermotron oven/refrigerator




Figure 1. Servohydraulic Test Apparatus with Upper Bell and Impact Cone Piston Assembly.

environmental chamber surrounds the upper and lower piston which helps to maintain a constant test temperature. Gun propellant specimens are thermally conditioned within the chamber for at least one hour prior to testing at a given temperature. A more complete description of the servohydraulic test apparatus can be found in the initial report by Gazonas². Uniaxial compression tests are performed at constant strain rate by computer control of the piston velocity via feedback from an externally-mounted displacement transducer (LVDT). Force measurements are made with a 60 kN quartz force gage that is mounted on the upper moving piston. The raw force and displacement data are acquired, stored, and then analyzed with a Norland 3001 data acquisition system. The raw force and displacement data are reduced to engineering stress versus strain plots by normalizing to initial specimen area and length respectively,

and correcting for apparatus distortion as previously reported². The uniaxial compression test results for this material are highly reproducible and are illustrated by plotting the results for five replicate tests at strain rates of 10^{-2} and 200 sec^{-1} (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Experimental Reproducibility of the Mechanical Response of JA2 in Uniaxial Compression at Strain Rates of 10^{-2} and 200 sec^{-1} .

2.2 Specimen Preparation. Right circular cylinders of JA2 (lot # 81E001S110) propellant are cut from seven-perforation granular stock using an Isomet double-bladed diamond saw. A double-bladed saw is used to cut specimen ends parallel to each other and to help maintain coaxial deformation with the cylinder axis. Specimens with aspect ratios, length-to-diameter (L/D), of 0.8 and 1.3 are tested, with a limit on the upper L/D set by the initial length of the granular stock. The specimen diameters averaged 8.72 mm and the perforation diameters averaged 0.483 mm. Molybdenum disulfide, MoS_2 , is applied sparingly to the specimen ends in those tests that require end lubrication.

2.3 Experimental Design. A 2^4 (factorial) experimental design is utilized¹; the name of the design arises from having four independent, controllable, variables. We test these variables at two levels (low and high). The total possible number of low/high combinations is thus 2^4 , yielding sixteen experiments.

Recall that three of our independent variables (strain rate, aspect ratio, and temperature) are continuous throughout their respective ranges. The fourth variable is discrete, "yes" or "no", corresponding to whether lubrication is present or not present. A desirable feature of the family of factorial designs is the ability to accommodate both continuous and discrete variables.

The present design is orthogonal since there is no correlation (linear association) between the independent variables. The orthogonal design assumes that any estimate of a factor effect (e.g. specimen aspect ratio) is independent of the effects of all others, whether they are linear or nonlinear. In some cases, variables which were initially assumed to be independent, may in fact be dependent upon one another. For example, the coupling of thermodynamic and mechanical fields becomes important in media subjected to inertial loading⁵. Thermomechanical coupling is assumed to be negligible in our tests.

An experimenter often encounters a situation where one or more environmental factors are present which cannot be directly controlled in the experiment. An example might be a drifting ambient relative humidity in the laboratory. The tests are conducted in random order to minimize the confounding effects of environmental variables. In our case the sixteen experiments are performed in a statistically random order. Table 1. shows the experimental conditions (A=strain rate, B=temperature, C=aspect ratio, D=lubrication), the experimental responses (R1=yield stress, R2=yield strain, R3=absorbed energy, R4=compressive modulus), and the random order in which our sixteen experiments are executed. The standard order represents how the variables are permuted beginning at settings (low,low,low,low) and ending at settings (high,high,high,high). One can visualize the design endpoints in our 2^4 experimental design using a cube plot. Each vertex in the cube represents a "low" or "high" test condition for a particular experiment (Figure 3). Two cubes are needed to represent the sixteen experiments in our 2^4 design; one cube represents all lubricated experiments, and the second cube represents all unlubricated experiments.

In contrast, the experimenter would perform 80 tests using a "classical" test approach (Figure 4) to obtain mechanical responses at all sixteen experimental conditions addressed in this research; in this calculation, it is assumed that five tests are sufficient to ensure reproducibility at each experimental condition. However, this example (Figure 4) represents a five-fold replication of the factorial design (Figure 3). The hidden replication present in factorial designs removes the necessity of performing multiple tests at each test condition. The actual number of tests required at each experimental condition,

Table 1. Experimental Protocol with Random Run Number and Experimental Responses.
(DESIGN - EASE is a Trademark Name of a Product of STAT - EASE, Inc.)

TM

DESIGN-EASE ANALYSIS

		Run Order	1	2	3	4
		Block	1	1	1	1
		Standard Order	2	14	12	9
A - STRAIGHT	LOG		2.7	2.7	2.7	-4
B - TEMPERATURE DEGREES C			0	0	60	0
C - ASPECTRAT	L/D		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
D - LUBRICATE	DISCRETE		NONE	MOLYCOAT	MOLYCOAT	MOLYCOAT
R1 - STRESS	MPa		44.3000	34.9000	7.9700	4.3000
R2 - STRAIN	N/N		5.1000	2.3400	1.4800	3.9400
R3 - ENERGY	MPa		0.7800	0.5490	0.0370	0.1030
R4 - ENDUOLIN	MPa		1738.0000	1448.0000	667.0000	221.0000

DESIGN-EASE ANALYSIS

		Run Order	5	6	7	8
		Block	1	1	1	1
		Standard Order	13	8	3	5
A - STRAIGHT	LOG		-4	2.7	-4	-4
B - TEMPERATURE DEGREES C			60	60	60	0
C - ASPECTRAT	L/D		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
D - LUBRICATE	DISCRETE		NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
R1 - STRESS	MPa		1.2600	6.1900	0.9600	5.3300
R2 - STRAIN	N/N		4.9600	1.8000	3.7900	2.4900
R3 - ENERGY	MPa		0.0370	0.0400	0.0170	0.0490
R4 - ENDUOLIN	MPa		36.6000	564.0000	27.7000	314.0000

DESIGN-EASE ANALYSIS

		Run Order	9	10	11	12
		Block	2	2	2	2
		Standard Order	7	16	6	4
A - STRAIGHT	LOG		-4	2.7	2.7	2.7
B - TEMPERATURE DEGREES C			60	60	0	60
C - ASPECTRAT	L/D		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
D - LUBRICATE	DISCRETE		NONE	MOLYCOAT	NONE	NONE
R1 - STRESS	MPa		0.8360	5.7500	38.1000	6.0000
R2 - STRAIN	N/N		2.5400	1.8300	3.1400	0.8500
R3 - ENERGY	MPa		0.0090	0.0420	0.3700	0.0200
R4 - ENDUOLIN	MPa		37.2000	428.0000	3046.0000	977.0000

DESIGN-EASE ANALYSIS

		Run Order	13	14	15	16
		Block	2	2	2	2
		Standard Order	1	10	13	11
A - STRAIGHT	LOG		-4	2.7	-4	-4
B - TEMPERATURE DEGREES C			0	0	0	60
C - ASPECTRAT	L/D		1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
D - LUBRICATE	DISCRETE		NONE	MOLYCOAT	MOLYCOAT	MOLYCOAT
R1 - STRESS	MPa		4.0000	42.0000	6.2900	1.0900
R2 - STRAIN	N/N		1.7800	3.5200	2.8400	4.5600
R3 - ENERGY	MPa		0.0330	0.0140	0.0760	0.0180
R4 - ENDUOLIN	MPa		226.0000	1127.0000	273.0000	41.0000




Figure 3. Cube Plot with 2^3 Design Points.





Figure 4. "Classical" Material Test Program for Strain Rate, Temperature, Aspect Ratio, and Specimen End Lubrication.

using the "classical" test approach, is directly proportional to the variance of the measured quantity and inversely proportional to the required tolerance⁶.

The sixteen experiments in this phase of investigation serve as a screening function, rather than a basis for a predictive mathematical model. Specifically, we seek to determine which of the four independent, controllable variables have significant effects on the measured mechanical responses. In addition, we wish to determine the effect of the discrete variable, lubrication, on the mechanical response of the JA2 gun propellant.

3. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The mechanical response of the JA2 propellant is characterized by the compressive modulus, stress and strain at yield, and absorbed strain energy density at yield (Figure 5). These particular measures of the mechanical response are chosen so that a comparison can be made with previous one-factor-at-a-time experiments^{2,3}.




Figure 5. Measured Mechanical Responses.

The yield stress is defined as the stress level where the material most rapidly loses its ability to sustain load. The stress level is determined by finding the minimum in the second derivative of stress with respect to time². The mechanical response is measured at the following independent variable endpoints: strain rate (10^{-4} and 500 sec^{-1}), temperature (0 and 60 degrees Celsius), aspect ratio (0.8 and 1.3), and end lubrication (yes and no) (see Table 1). Cube plots which illustrate the stress at yield response of the JA2 propellant appear in Figure 6. The encircled numbers at the cube vertices include the yield stresses (in MPa) determined at the various experimental conditions (Table 1), and the random run numbers. The plots indicate that the yield stress increases as the strain rate increases, and decreases as the temperature is increased in both lubricated and unlubricated tests. In addition, there does not appear to be, by mere visual inspection of the plots, a yield stress dependence on specimen aspect ratio.




Figure 6. Cube Plots of Stress at Yield Response With and Without Specimen End Lubrication.

An inspection of the remaining cube plots (Appendix A, Figures A4, A7, and A10), indicates that in addition to the yield stress, the absorbed strain energy at the yield stress and the compressive modulus increase with an increase in strain rate, yet decrease with an increase in temperature. The strain at yield is independent of strain rate, temperature, and aspect ratio, yet increases if the specimen ends are lubricated.

4. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

A mechanical response surface is generated to determine the relative linear and nonlinear contributions of the independent variables. In this research, the empirical response surface, Y , is written as a second degree polynomial expansion of the four independent variables, (X_1 , X_2 , X_3 , and X_4) as:

$$Y = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_{12}X_1X_2 + b_{13}X_1X_3 + b_{14}X_1X_4 + b_{23}X_2X_3 + b_{24}X_2X_4 + b_{34}X_3X_4$$

or, more generally as:

$$Y = b_0 + \sum_{i=1}^q b_i X_i + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j \geq i}^q b_{ij} X_i X_j$$

where, $b_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n Y/n$ and q = the number of factors, n = total no. of experiments.

The b_i terms quantify the main effects of the independent, controllable variables. The b_{ij} terms describe the pairwise interaction effects of the independent variables. The intercept term, b_0 , is simply the arithmetic mean of all the recorded responses. The second degree polynomial model is the fit to the data using standard least squares regression techniques. First, however, the actual numerical values of the independent variables, X_i , are standardized (nondimensionalized) to range from +1 for "high" experimental conditions, and -1 for "low" experimental conditions. By nondimensionalizing the variables, and ranking the magnitudes of the coefficients determined by regression analysis, one can determine the relative contribution of each variable to the measured mechanical response.

The coefficients, (b_0 , b_i , and b_{ij}), of the linear and nonlinear terms in the second degree polynomial expansion with an alpha significance level of .05 or more are included in Table 2. A complete list of response coefficients appears in Appendix A (Figures A2, A5, A8, and A11). A positive coefficient for a particular variable, e.g., strain rate, indicates that the response, e.g., yield stress, increases if the

controlled variable increases. A negative coefficient for a particular variable indicates that the response decreases if the controlled variable increases. In addition, the yield stress, absorbed strain energy, and the natural log of the compressive modulus is predicted to a high degree of precision since the adjusted R-square values are all greater than 0.91. Recall, the R-square statistic is one of several goodness-of-fit measures¹. However, it is more difficult to predict the yield strain and compressive modulus as evidenced by the relatively low adjusted R-square values of 0.75, and 0.79 respectively (Table 2). An adjusted R-square of 0.91 implies 91% of the total variation in our system is explained by the second degree polynomial model that was fit to the data. The R-square value is adjusted by normalizing the R-square statistic by the number of coefficients to be estimated. In addition, the adjusted R-square value represents contributions from all eleven terms, some of which are not significant at the alpha=.05 confidence level.

Table 2. Least Squares Regression Coefficients (alpha = .05).

RESPONSE	Const	$\dot{\epsilon}$	T	A	L	$\dot{\epsilon}$ T	$\dot{\epsilon}$ A	$\dot{\epsilon}$ L	TA	TL	AL	R_{adj}^2	RMS ^{**}	s ^{***}
Stress @ Yield	13.34	10.1	-9.58			-7.36						0.990	1.625	1.418
Strain @ Yield	3.12				.436	-.996						0.752	0.707	0.656
Energy @ Yield	.189	.146	-.159			-.137						0.916	0.082	0.046
Modulus	698.2	551.2	-350.9			-239.5						0.799	367.2	112.78
Ln (Mod)	5.75	1.20	-.746			.245		.128	-.14			0.985	n/a	n/a

* Adjusted R-square statistic.

** Root-Mean-Square error of data and model in this report.

*** Standard Deviation from Gazonas²

$\dot{\epsilon}$ = strain rate

T = temperature

A = aspect ratio

L = lubrication

$$0 \leq R_{adj}^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_i (\alpha_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2 / (n - p - 1)}{\sum_i (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2 / (n - 1)} \leq 1$$

where n = no. of tests, p = no. of coefficients

$\bar{Y}$ = mean response, $\hat{Y}_i$ = estimated response

$$RMS = \sqrt{\sum_i (\alpha_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2 / (n - p - 1)}$$

The variability in our estimates of the mechanical response is also quantified using the root-mean-square, RMS, error which agrees well with the error estimated from replicate tests² on JA2 gun propellant (Table 2). The RMS error includes contributions from both data-model mismatch and test variability.

The results of this sixteen-test study are corroborated by previous one-factor-at-a-time experiments^{2,3} insofar as the JA2 compressive modulus, yield stress, and absorbed strain energy are found to increase with an increase in strain rate and decrease with an increase in temperature. The previous work² also corroborates the observation (Table 2.) that the yield strain is insensitive to strain rate. Some of the dominant nonlinear effects include a decrease in the yield stress, yield strain, and absorbed strain energy, and an increase in the compressive modulus, as both strain rate and temperature are simultaneously increased. Tests where the specimen ends are lubricated have less variability than tests where specimen ends are not lubricated. A comparison of the degree of variability between lubricated and unlubricated test results is illustrated by plotting the difference (residual) between the model prediction and the observed data for each measure of mechanical response as a function of whether or not lubrication is used (Appendix B). A higher degree of variability in the mechanical response is present in the unlubricated specimens even though they are relatively insensitive (all except strain at yield) to lubrication (Table 2). Some of the interesting coupled nonlinear effects include a decrease in the stress and strain at yield, and absorbed energy at yield, as both strain rate and temperature are simultaneously increased. The interaction of strain rate and temperature can be visualized with interaction surface plots (Appendix A, Figures A3, A6, A9, and A12). Additional linear and nonlinear responses are present (Table 2) but they are not significant at the $\alpha=0.05$ confidence level. The effects of aspect ratio and lubrication are discussed in more detail in the remainder of this section.

4.1 Specimen Aspect Ratio. The screening design indicates that the specimen aspect ratio does not significantly affect the mechanical response of JA2. However, we expect that aspect ratio should affect the mechanical response of materials deformed in uniaxial compression. Specimens with large aspect ratios become unstable due to bending under uniaxial compression and therefore have lower strengths than specimens with small aspect ratios which have higher strengths⁴. A series of constant strain rate (100 sec^{-1}), uniaxial compression tests performed on JA2 and M30 gun propellants at -30 degrees Celsius reveal that, for specimens that deform by macroscopic fracture, the absorbed strain energy density per unit volume at maximum stress decreases as the specimen aspect ratio is increased from 1.5

to 3 (Figure 7). The observation that aspect ratio did not affect the mechanical response of JA2 in this study is a result of the limited range in the aspect ratios of the tested specimens (0.8 to 1.3); the upper bound on the aspect ratio is limited due to the length of the initial granular JA2 propellant stock.




Figure 7. Absorbed Strain Energy Density at Maximum Stress and -30 degrees Celsius for JA2 and M30 Deformed at 100 sec⁻¹ in Uniaxial Compression versus Specimen Aspect Ratio.

One obtains a much better fit to the polynomial model if the natural log of the compressive modulus ($R^2_{adj} = 0.985$) rather than the compressive modulus ($R^2_{adj} = 0.799$) is used as a measure of the mechanical response (Table 2). The logarithmic transformation provides a superior fit to the polynomial model, yet it is difficult to explain or rationalize why specimen aspect ratio and end lubrication become significant (Table 2) when the compressive modulus is transformed. Furthermore, it is observed that the strain rate and aspect ratio interaction is not significant, yet the temperature and aspect ratio interaction is significant when the transformed compressive modulus is used to characterize the mechanical response.

4.2 End Lubrication. End lubrication did not significantly affect the mechanical response of the JA2 gun propellant in uniaxial compression. However, the degree of variability in the mechanical response was minimized by using lubrication (Appendix B). Since lubrication alters the boundary conditions at the specimen-piston interface, the increase in yield strain in lubricated specimens could be attributed to an increase in the size of the nonlinear "toe" (Figure 5), rather than an intrinsic material response.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1) The use of a well designed testing approach maximizes the information obtainable concerning the sensitivity of the mechanical response of JA2 gun propellant to the effects of strain rate, temperature, specimen aspect ratio, and lubrication, while simultaneously minimizing the number of tests required. The 2⁴ statistical design used in the present research is particularly useful for determining a subset of important variables (screened variables) from a larger set of potentially important variables.

2) Experimental design methods provide an empirically derived material model for quantifying factor effects within the test range. The empirical model can then be used to validate micro- or macro-phenomenological constitutive models for JA2.

3) JA2 is sensitive to changes in strain rate and temperature. Therefore, JA2 constitutive models should incorporate rate and temperature dependent effects.

4) The effect of specimen lubrication is to increase the strain at yield and reduce the variability in the measured mechanical responses (i.e., stress and strain at yield, absorbed strain energy density at yield, and compressive modulus). The use of lubrication is recommended for future compression tests on JA2.

5) The effect of specimen aspect ratio in the limited test range is not detectable with the available experimental equipment. Replicate compression tests on JA2 and M30 gun propellant at strain rates of 100 sec⁻¹, and -30 degrees Celsius indicate that the absorbed energy decreases as specimen aspect ratio increases from 1.5 to 3.0. Additional testing is required to quantify the effects of aspect ratio on the mechanical response of the gun propellant.

6) The measured mechanical response of JA2 is well represented by a second degree polynomial model, since the RMS errors in the mechanical response are only slightly greater than the standard deviations in the mechanical response derived from prior one-factor-at-a-time replicate tests on JA2.

6. FUTURE WORK

This report describes a screening design performed on perforated JA2 gun propellant. The next phase of this research is to use the data collected from an expanded test matrix to determine if effects arising from the presence of perforations can be detected. This can be done using a face-centered cube (FCC) design with perforations being considered as a discrete variable. The other independent variables, (i.e. strain rate, temperature, and specimen aspect ratio), will be identical to those used in this report, with the exception that lubrication will be used in all tests. The FCC design will serve two purposes: 1) to provide the ability to measure the effects of perforations, and 2) to provide the ability to detect the presence of second-order nonlinear effects, curvature and quantification of these effects.

7. REFERENCES

1. G.E.P. Box, W.G. Hunter, and J.S. Hunter, Statistics for Experimenters, New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons Publishing Co., 1978.
2. G.A. Gazonas, "The Mechanical Response of M30, XM39, and JA2 Propellants at Strain Rates from 10^{-2} to 250 1/s", BRL-TR-3181, U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, December, 1990.
3. R.J. Lieb, "The Mechanical Response of M30, JA2, and XM39 Gun Propellant to High Rate Deformation", BRL-TR-3023, U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, August, 1989.
4. V.S. Vutukuri, R.D. Lama, and S.S. Saluja, Handbook on Mechanical Properties of Rocks. Series on Rock and Soil Mechanics, Vol. 2, No. 1, Trans Tech Publications, 1974.
5. L.E. Malvern, Introduction to the Mechanics of a Continuous Medium, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1969.
6. W. Mendenhall, Introduction to Probability and Statistics, 4th edition, Duxbury Press, North Scituate, Massachusetts, 1975.

APPENDIX A:

**CUBE PLOTS, LEAST SQUARE COEFFICIENTS, AND
INTERACTION PLOTS FOR THE RESPONSES**

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.





Figure A1. Cube Plots for Stress at Yield

STRESS_COEFF 19R x 5C

Least Squares Coefficients, Response ST, Mode


0 Term	1 Coeff.	2 Std. Error	3 T-value	4 Signif.
1 1	13.342250	0.406284	32.84	0.0001
2 -S	10.084000	0.406284	24.82	0.0001
3 -T	-9.585250	0.406284	-23.59	0.0001
4 -A	-0.760250	0.406284	-1.87	0.1202
5 L<1df>				0.8104
6 NO	-0.102750	0.406284	-0.25	0.8104
7 YES	0.102750	0.406284	0.25	0.8104
8 -S*T	-7.363500	0.406284	-18.12	0.0001
9 -S*A	-0.931000	0.406284	-2.29	0.0705
10 -S*L<1df>				0.3995
11 NO	0.374000	0.406284	0.92	0.3995
12 YES	-0.374000	0.406284	-0.92	0.3995
13 -T*A	0.512250	0.406284	1.26	0.2630
14 -T*L<1df>				0.7138
15 NO	-0.157750	0.406284	-0.39	0.7138
16 YES	0.157750	0.406284	0.39	0.7138
17 -A*L<1df>				0.7536
18 NO	0.134750	0.406284	0.33	0.7536
19 YES	-0.134750	0.406284	-0.33	0.7536

No. cases = 16 R-sq. = 0.9967 RMS Error = 1.625
 Resid. df = 5 R-sq-adj. = 0.9901 Cond. No. = 1
 - indicates factors are transformed.

Figure A2. Least Squares Coefficients for Stress at Yield.

STRESS_3D4

STRESS
ASPECT_RATIO = 1.05, LUBRICANT = YES



STRONG STRAIN_RATE*TEMPERATURE INTERACTION

Figure A3. Strain Rate*Temperature Interaction Surface for Stress at Yield.





Figure A4. Cube Plots for Strain at Yield.

STRAIN_COEFF 12R x 5C

Least Squares Coefficients, Response STR, Mode:

0 Term 1 Coeff. 2 Std. Error 3 T-value 4 Signif.


1	1	3.122500	0.176674	17.67	0.0001
2	-S	-0.240000	0.176674	-1.36	0.2114
3	-T	-0.396250	0.176674	-2.24	0.0552
4	-A	-0.255000	0.176674	-1.44	0.1869
5	L<1df>				0.0388
6	NO	-0.436250	0.176674	-2.47	0.0388
7	YES	0.436250	0.176674	2.47	0.0388
8	-S*T	-0.996250	0.176674	-5.64	0.0005
9	-S*L<1df>				0.1565
10	NO	0.276250	0.176674	1.56	0.1565
11	YES	-0.276250	0.176674	-1.56	0.1565
12	-T*A	0.311250	0.176674	1.76	0.1161

No. cases = 16 R-sq. = 0.8676 RMS Error = 0.7067
 Resid. df = 8 R-sq-adj. = 0.7517 Cond. No. = 1
 ~ indicates factors are transformed.

Figure A5. Least Squares Coefficients for Strain at Yield.

STRAIN_3D3

STRAIN
ASPECT_RATIO = 1.05, LUBRICANT = YES



STRONG STRAIN_RATE*TEMPERATURE INTERACTION

Figure A6. Strain Rate*Temperature Interaction Surface for Strain at Yield.





Figure A7. Cube Plots for Energy.

ENERGY_COEFF 19R x 5C

Least Squares Coefficients, Response E, Model


0 Term	1 Coeff.	2 Std. Error	3 T-value	4 Signif.
1 1	0.189375	0.020378	9.29	0.0002
2 -S	0.146625	0.020378	7.20	0.0008
3 -T	-0.159375	0.020378	-7.82	0.0005
4 -A	-0.041875	0.020378	-2.05	0.0950
5 L<1df>				0.3174
6 NO	-0.022625	0.020378	-1.11	0.3174
7 YES	0.022625	0.020378	1.11	0.3174
8 -S*T	-0.136875	0.020378	-6.72	0.0011
9 -S*A	-0.041875	0.020378	-2.05	0.0950
10 -S*L<1df>				0.7495
11 NO	-0.006875	0.020378	-0.34	0.7495
12 YES	0.006875	0.020378	0.34	0.7495
13 -T*A	0.043875	0.020378	2.15	0.0839
14 -T*L<1df>				0.5191
15 NO	0.014125	0.020378	0.69	0.5191
16 YES	-0.014125	0.020378	-0.69	0.5191
17 -A*L<1df>				0.7847
18 NO	-0.005875	0.020378	-0.29	0.7847
19 YES	0.005875	0.020378	0.29	0.7847

No. cases = 16 R-sq. = 0.9719 RMS Error = 0.08151
 Resid. df = 5 R-sq-adj. = 0.9158 Cond. No. = 1
 - indicates factors are transformed.

Figure A8. Least Squares Coefficients for Energy.

ENERGY_304

ENERGY
ASPECT_RATIO = 1.05, LUBRICANT = YES



STRONG STRAIN_RATE*TEMPERATURE INTERACTION

Figure A9. Strain Rate*Temperature Interaction Surface for Energy.





Figure A10. Cube Plots for Modulus.

EMODULUS_COEFF 19R x 5C

Least Squares Coefficients, Response EM, Model

0 Term 1 Coeff. 2 Std. Error 3 T-value 4 Signif.


1	1	698.218750	91.811305	7.60	0.0006
2	-S	551.156250	91.811305	6.00	0.0018
3	-T	-350.906250	91.811305	-3.82	0.0123
4	-A	70.131250	91.811305	0.76	0.4794
5	L<1df>				0.1268
6	NO	168.018750	91.811305	1.83	0.1268
7	YES	-168.018750	91.811305	-1.83	0.1268
8	-S*T	-239.468750	91.811305	-2.61	0.0478
9	-S*A	51.993750	91.811305	0.57	0.5957
10	-S*L<1df>				0.1344
11	NO	163.856250	91.811305	1.78	0.1344
12	YES	-163.856250	91.811305	-1.78	0.1344
13	-T*A	-150.993750	91.811305	-1.64	0.1610
14	-T*L<1df>				0.2700
15	NO	-113.856250	91.811305	-1.24	0.2700
16	YES	113.856250	91.811305	1.24	0.2700
17	-A*L<1df>				0.5824
18	NO	53.931250	91.811305	0.59	0.5824
19	YES	-53.931250	91.811305	-0.59	0.5824

No. cases = 16 R-sq. = 0.9329 RMS Error = 367.2
 Resid. df = 5 R-sq-adj. = 0.7986 Cond. No. = 1
 - indicates factors are transformed.

Figure A11. Least Squares Coefficients for Modulus.

EMODULUS_3D1

EMODULUS
ASPECT_RATIO = 1.03, LUBRICANT = YES



STRONG STRAIN_RATE*TEMPERATURE INTERACTION

Figure A12. Strain Rate*Temperature Interaction Surface for Modulus.

APPENDIX B:

MODEL RESIDUALS FOR RESPONSES BY END LUBRICATION.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

STRESS_RES_L

Data from model DESIGN of malreg JAL_EXP04MULREG




Figure B1. Model Residuals for Stress at Yield by End Lubrication.

STRAIN_RES_L

Data from model JA2_STR2 of mulreg JA2_EXP@MULREG




Figure B2. Model Residuals for Strain at Yield by End Lubrication.

ENERGY_RES_L

ata from model JAJ_ENERGY of mulreg JAJ_EXP@MULREG




Figure B3. Model Residuals for Energy at Yield by End Lubrication.

EMODULUS_RES_LUBE

Data from model DESIGN of mulreg JA2_EXP@MULREG




Figure B4. Model Residuals for Modulus by End Lubrication.

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

G.E.P. Box and N.R. Draper, Empirical Model-Building and Response Surfaces, New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons Publishing Co., 1987.

N.R. Draper and H. Smith Jr., Applied Regression Analysis, New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons Publishing Co., 1981.

E.I. Dupont de Nemours and Co. (Inc.), Strategy of Experimentation: Planning and Analyzing Efficient Experiments, Quality Management and Technology Center, Linden Park, Newark, Delaware, 19714-6091, 1988.

J.E. Freund and F.J. Williams, Dictionary/Outline of Basic Statistics, New York, N.Y., McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., 1966.

J.O. Rawlings, Applied Regression Analysis: A Research Tool, Pacific Grove, CA, Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1988.

STAT - EASE, (Inc.), DESIGN - EASE, version 1.22, Minneapolis, Minn., 1988.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
2	Administrator Defense Technical Info Center ATTN: DTIC-DDA Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304-6145	1	Commander U.S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-RD-CS-R (DOC) Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5010
1	HQDA (SARD-TR) WASH DC 20310-0001	1	Commander U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: ASQNC-TAC-DIT (Technical Information Center) Warren, MI 48397-5000
1	Commander U.S. Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCDRA-ST 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-0001	1	Director U.S. Army TRADOC Analysis Command ATTN: ATRC-WSR White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002-5502
1	Commander U.S. Army Laboratory Command ATTN: AMSLC-DL 2800 Powder Mill Road Adelphi, MD 20783-1145	1	Commandant U.S. Army Field Artillery School ATTN: ATSF-CSI Ft Sill, OK 73503-5000
2	Commander U.S. Army Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center ATTN: SMCAR-IMI-I Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000	(Class. only) 1	Commandant U.S. Army Infantry School ATTN: ATSH-CD (Security Mgr.) Fort Benning, GA 31905-5660
2	Commander U.S. Army Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center ATTN: SMCAR-TDC Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000	(Unclass. only) 1	Commandant U.S. Army Infantry School ATTN: ATSH-CD-CSO-OR Fort Benning, GA 31905-5660
1	Director Benet Weapons Laboratory U.S. Army Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-TL Watervliet, NY 12189-4050	1	Air Force Armament Laboratory ATTN: WL/MNOI Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000 <u>Aberdeen Proving Ground</u>
(Unclass. only) 1	Commander U.S. Army Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command ATTN: AMSMC-IMF-L Rock Island, IL 61299-5000	2	Dir, USAMSAA ATTN: AMXSY-D AMXSY-MP, H. Cohen
1	Director U.S. Army Aviation Research and Technology Activity ATTN: SAVRT-R (Library) M/S 219-3 Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000	1	Cdr, USATECOM ATTN: AMSTE-TD
		3	Cdr, CRDEC, AMCCOM ATTN: SMCCR-RSP-A SMCCR-MU SMCCR-MSI
		1	Dir, VLAMO ATTN: AMSLC-VL-D
		10	Dir, BRL ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	HQDA (SARDA) WASH DC 20310-2500
1	Commander U.S. Army TSARCOM 4300 Goodfellow Boulevard St. Louis, MO 63120-1702
1	Commander U.S. Army Missile and Space Intelligence Center ATTN: AIAMS-YDL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5500
1	Commander U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-CG Warren, MI 48090
1	Commander U.S. Army TRAC-Ft. Lee Defense Logistics Studies Fort Lee, VA 23801-6140
1	Commander USA Concepts Analysis Agency ATTN: D. Hardison 8120 Woodmont Avenue Bethesda, MD 20014-2797
10	Central Intelligence Agency Office of Central Reference Dissemination Branch Room GE-47 HQS Washington, DC 20505
1	U.S. Army Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command Advanced Technology Center P.O. Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807-3801

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Chairman DoD Explosives Safety Board Room 856-C Hoffman Bldg. 1 2461 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22331-0600
1	Commander U.S. Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCDE-DW 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5001
1	Commander U.S. Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCICP-AD, Michael F. Fisette 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5001
2	PEO-Armaments Project Manager Autonomous Precision-Guided Munition (APGM) U.S. Army Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center ATTN: AMCPM-CWA, H. Hassmann AMCPM-CWW, F. Menke Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
1	Department of the Army Office of the Product Manager 155mm Howitzer, M109A6, Paladin ATTN: SFAE-AR-HIP, IP, Mr. R. De Kleine Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
1	Project Manager Production Base Modernization Agency ATTN: AMSMC-PBM-E, L. Laibson Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
3	PEO-Armaments Project Manager Tank Main Armament Systems ATTN: AMCPM-TMA, K. Russell AMCPM-TMA-105 AMCPM-TMA-120 Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000

No. of
Copies Organization

- 8 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-AEE-B,
A. Beardell
B. Brodman
D. Downs
S. Einstein
S. Westley
S. Bernstein
C. Roller
J. Rutkowski
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-AES, S. Kaplowitz, Bldg. 321
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 3 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-HFM,
E. Barrires
R. Davitt
SMCAR-CCH-V, C. Mandala
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Armament Research,
Development, and Engineering Center
ATTN: SMCAR-FSA-T, M. Salisbury
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
- 1 Commander, USACECOM
R&D Technical Library
ATTN: ASQNC-ELC-IS-L-R, Myer Center
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703-5000
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Harry Diamond Laboratories
ATTN: SLCHD-TA-L
2800 Powder Mill Rd
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Commandant
U.S. Army Aviation School
ATTN: Aviation Agency
Fort Rucker, AL 36360
- 2 Program Manager
U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command
ATTN: SFAE-ASM-SS-T, T. Dean
Warren, MI 48092-2498
- 1 Project Manager
U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command
Fighting Vehicle Systems
ATTN: AMCPM-BFVS
Warren, MI 48092-2498
- 1 President
U.S. Army Armor and Engineer Board
ATTN: ATZK-AD-S
Fort Knox, KY 40121-5200
- 1 Project Manager
U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command
ATTN: AMCPM-ABMS
Warren, MI 48092-2498
- 1 Director
HQ, TRAC RPD
ATTN: ATRC-MA, MAJ Williams
Fort Monroe, VA 23651-5143
- 2 Director
U.S. Army Materials Technology Laboratory
ATTN: SLCMT-ATL
Watertown, MA 02172-0001
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Research Office
ATTN: Technical Library
P. O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211
- 1 Commander
U.S. Army Belvoir Research and
Development Center
ATTN: STRBE-WC
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5006

No. of
Copies Organization

1 Director
U.S. Army TRAC-Ft Lee
ATTN: ATRC-L, Mr. Cameron
Fort Lee, VA 23801-6140

1 President
U.S. Army Artillery Board
Fl Sill, OK 73503-5000

1 Commandant
U.S. Army Special Warfare School
ATTN: Rev and Tng Lit Div
Fort Bragg, NC 28307

3 Commander
Radford Army Ammunition Plant
ATTN: SMCAR-QA/HI LIB
Radford, VA 24141-0298

1 Commander
U.S. Army Foreign Science and
Technology Center
ATTN: AMXST-MC-3
220 Seventh Street, NE
Charlottesville, VA 22901-5396

2 Commander
Naval Sea Systems Command
ATTN: SEA 62R
SEA 64
Washington, DC 20362-5101

1 Commander
Naval Air Systems Command
ATTN: AIR-954-Technical Library
Washington, DC 20360

1 Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(R, E, and S)
ATTN: R. Reichenbach
Room 5E787
Pentagon Bldg
Washington, DC 20375

No. of
Copies Organization

1 Naval Research Laboratory
Technical Library
Washington, DC 20375

1 Commandant
U.S. Army Command and General
Staff College
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027

2 Commandant
U.S. Army Field Artillery Center
and School
ATTN: ATSF-CO-MW, B. Willis
Fl Sill, OK 73503-5600

1 Office of Naval Research
ATTN: Code 473, R. S. Miller
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-9999

3 Commandant
U.S. Army Armor School
ATTN: ATZK-CD-MS, M. Falkovitch
Armor Agency
Fort Knox, KY 40121-5215

2 Commander
U.S. Naval Surface Warfare Center
ATTN: J. P. Consaga
C. Gotzmer
Indian Head, MD 20640-5000

4 Commander
Naval Surface Warfare Center
ATTN: Code 240, S. Jacobs
Code 730
Code R-13, K. Kim
Code R-10, R. Bernecker
Silver Spring, MD 20903-5000

2 Commanding Officer
Naval Underwater Systems Center
ATTN: Code 5B331, R. S. Lazar
Technical Library
Newport, RI 02840

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
5	Commander Naval Surface Warfare Center ATTN: Code G33, J. L. East W. Burrell J. Johndrow Code G23, D. McClure Code DX-21, Technical Library Dahlgren, VA 22448-5000
3	Commander Naval Weapons Center ATTN: Code 388, C. F. Price Code 3895, T. Parr Information Science Division China Lake, CA 93555-6001
1	AL/TSTL (Technical Library) ATTN: J. Lamb Edwards AFB, CA 93523-5000
1	AFATL/DLYV Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000
1	AFATL/DLXP Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000
1	AFATL/DLJE Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000
1	NASA/Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center ATTN: NHS-22, Library Section Houston, TX 77054
1	AFELM, The Rand Corporation ATTN: Library D 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, CA 90401-3297
1	Hercules Incorporated ATTN: R. V. Cartwright Howard Boulevard Kenvil, NJ 07847
1	Scientific Research Assoc., Inc. ATTN: H. McDonald P.O. Box 498 Glastonbury, CT 06033-0498

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	United Technologies Corporation Chemical Systems Division ATTN: Tech Library P.O. Box 49028 San Jose, CA 95161-9028
1	AAI Corporation ATTN: J. Frankle P. O. Box 126 Hunt Valley, MD 21030-0126
1	Aerojet General Corporation ATTN: D. Thatcher P.O. Box 296 Azusa, CA 91702
1	Aerojet Solid Propulsion Company ATTN: P. Micheli Sacramento, CA 96813
1	Atlantic Research Corporation ATTN: M. King 5390 Cherokee Avenue Alexandria, VA 22312-2302
3	AL/LSCF ATTN: J. Levine L. Quinn T. Edwards Edwards AFB, CA 93523-5000
1	AVCO Everett Research Laboratory ATTN: D. Stickler 2385 Revere Beach Parkway Everett, MA 02149-5936
2	Calspan Corporation ATTN: C. Murphy P. O. Box 400 Buffalo, NY 14225-0400
1	IITRI ATTN: M. J. Klein 10 W. 35th Street Chicago, IL 60616-3799

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Hercules, Inc.
Allegheny Ballistics Laboratory
ATTN: William B. Walkup
P. O. Box 210
Rocket Center, WV 26726

- 1 Hercules, Inc.
Radford Army Ammunition Plant
ATTN: J. Pierce
Radford, VA 24141-0299

- 3 Lawrence Livermore National
Laboratory
ATTN: L-355,
A. Buckingham
M. Finger
L-324, M. Constantino
P. O. Box 808
Livermore, CA 94550-0622

- 1 Olin Corporation
Badger Army Ammunition Plant
ATTN: F. E. Wolf
Baraboo, WI 53913

- 1 Olin Ordnance
ATTN: V. McDonald, Library
P. O. Box 222
St. Marks, FL 32355-0222

- 1 Paul Gough Associates, Inc.
ATTN: Dr. Paul S. Gough
1048 South Street
Portsmouth, NH 03801

- 1 Physics International Company
ATTN: Library, H. Wayne Wampler
2700 Merced Street
San Leandro, CA 94577-5602

- 1 Princeton Combustion Research
Laboratory, Inc.
ATTN: M. Summerfield
475 U.S. Highway One
Monmouth Junction, NJ 08852-9650

No. of
Copies Organization

- 2 Rockwell International
Rocketdyne Division
ATTN: BA08,
J. E. Flanagan
J. Gray
6633 Canoga Avenue
Canoga Park, CA 91303-2703

- 1 Thiokol Corporation
Huntsville Division
ATTN: Technical Library
Huntsville, AL 35807

- 1 Sverdrup Technology
ATTN: Dr. John Dear
2001 Aerospace Parkway
Brook Park, OH 44142

- 2 Thiokol Corporation
Elkton Division
ATTN: R. Biddle
Technical Library
P. O. Box 241
Elkton, MD 21921-0241

- 1 Veritay Technology, Inc.
ATTN: E. Fisher
4845 Millersport Highway
East Amherst, NY 14501-0305

- 1 Universal Propulsion Company
ATTN: H. J. McSpadden
Black Canyon Stage 1
Box 1140
Phoenix, AZ 84029

- 1 Battelle
ATTN: TACTEC Library, J. N. Huggins
505 King Ave.
Columbus, OH 43201-2693

- 1 Brigham Young University
Department of Chemical Engineering
ATTN: M. Beckstead
Provo, UT 84601

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Vanderbilt University
 Mechanical Engineering
 ATTN: A. M. Mellor
 Box 6019, Station B
 Nashville, TN 37235

- 1 California Institute of Technology
 204 Karman Laboratory
 Main Stop 301-46
 ATTN: F.E.C. Culick
 1201 E. California Street
 Pasadena, CA 91109

- 1 California Institute of Technology
 Jet Propulsion Laboratory
 ATTN: L. D. Strand, MS 512/102
 4800 Oak Grove Drive
 Pasadena, CA 91109-8099

- 1 University of Illinois
 Department of Mechanical/Industrial
 Engineering
 ATTN: H. Krier
 144 MEB; 1206 N. Green Street
 Urbana, IL 61801-2978

- 1 University of Massachusetts
 Department of Mechanical Engineering
 ATTN: K. Jakus
 Amherst, MA 01002-0014

- 1 University of Minnesota
 Department of Mechanical Engineering
 ATTN: E. Fletcher
 Minneapolis, MN 55414-3368

- 3 Georgia Institute of Technology
 School of Aerospace Engineering
 ATTN: B.T. Zinn
 E. Price
 W.C. Strahle
 Atlanta, GA 30332

- 1 Institute of Gas Technology
 ATTN: D. Gidaspow
 3424 S. State Street
 Chicago, IL 60616-3896

No. of
Copies Organization

- 1 Johns Hopkins University
 Applied Physics Laboratory
 Chemical Propulsion
 Information Agency
 ATTN: T. Christian
 Johns Hopkins Road
 Laurel, MD 20707-0690

- 1 Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 Department of Mechanical Engineering
 ATTN: T. Toong
 77 Massachusetts Avenue
 Cambridge, MA 02139-4307

- 1 Pennsylvania State University
 Applied Research Laboratory
 ATTN: G.M. Faeth
 University Park, PA 16802-7501

- 1 Pennsylvania State University
 Department of Mechanical Engineering
 ATTN: K. Kuo
 University Park, PA 16802-7501

- 1 Purdue University
 School of Mechanical Engineering
 ATTN: J. R. Osborn
 TSPC Chaffee Hall
 West Lafayette, IN 47907-1199

- 1 SRI International
 Propulsion Sciences Division
 ATTN: Technical Library
 333 Ravenwood Avenue
 Menlo Park, CA 94025-3493

- 1 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
 Department of Mathematics
 Troy, NY 12181

- 1 Stevens Institute of Technology
 Davidson Laboratory
 ATTN: R. McAlevy, III
 Castle Point Station
 Hoboken, NJ 07030-5907

**No. of
Copies Organization**

- 1 Rutgers University
 Department of Mechanical and
 Aerospace Engineering
 ATTN: S. Temkin
 University Heights Campus
 New Brunswick, NJ 08903
- 1 University of Southern California
 Mechanical Engineering Department
 ATTN: OHE200, M. Gerstein
 Los Angeles, CA 90089-5199
- 2 University of Utah
 Department of Chemical Engineering
 ATTN: A. Baer
 G. Flandro
 Salt Lake City, UT 84112-1194
- 1 Washington State University
 Department of Mechanical Engineering
 ATTN: C. T. Crowe
 Pullman, WA 99163-5201
- 1 Alliant Techsystems, Inc.
 ATTN: R. E. Tompkins
 MN38-3300
 10400 Yellow Circle Drive
 Minnetonka, MN 55343
- 1 Science Applications, Inc.
 ATTN: R. B. Edelman
 23146 Cumorah Crest Drive
 Woodland Hills, CA 91364-3710

Aberdeen Proving Ground

Dir, USAMSAA
ATTN: AMXSY-GI, CPT Klimack

USER EVALUATION SHEET/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

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

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

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

- 3. 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.**

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

BRL Report Number BRL-TR-3237 Division Symbol

Check here if desire to be removed from distribution list.

Check here for address change. _____

Current address: **Organization** _____
 Address _____

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
Director
U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory
ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

**BUSINESS REPLY MAIL**

FIRST CLASS PERMIT No 0001, APG, MD

Postage will be paid by addressee.

**Director
U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory
ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066**

**NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES**

