



2

TECHNICAL REPORT BRL-TR-3384

BRL

A SIMULATION OF BARRIER MOTION
INDUCED BY THE EXPLOSION OF
AN AMMUNITION STACK IN A MAGAZINE

WILLIAM LAWRENCE
JOHN STARKENBERG



AUGUST 1992

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED.

U.S. ARMY LABORATORY COMMAND

BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

92 9 04 025

92-24757

92-24757



4288

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.

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 August 1992	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final, 1 Jan 91-31 Dec 91	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A Simulation of Barrier Motion Induced by the Explosion of an Ammunition Stack in a Magazine			5. FUNDING NUMBERS PR: IMFZ9W9X1698	
6. AUTHOR(S) William Lawrence and John Starckenberg				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			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-3384	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) In an effort to increase magazine storage limits, it has been suggested that the maximum credible event in an accident scenario may be significantly reduced if the munitions store is divided into two or more stacks of ammunition separated by barriers. Consideration must be given to the fact that the moving barrier may cause sufficient damage to the munitions in the acceptor stack to initiate the explosive they contain, thus defeating its intended purpose. A combined analytical and experimental investigation was proposed to assess this hazard and to determine whether such barriers can successfully be designed. The analytical study included numerical simulations of the magazine environment for use in developing the experimental configuration. It was determined that thin fast-moving barriers have the potential to do greater damage to ammunition in an acceptor stack than thick slow-moving barriers, that blast scaling laws might be useful as predictive tools and that barrier venting was ineffective in mitigating the hazard.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS magazines (ordnance), explosions, ammunition stack, sand barrier, hull code			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 36	
			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 SAR	

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF FIGURES	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. DESCRIPTION OF THE MAGAZINE AND AMMUNITION STACKS	2
3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED EXPERIMENT	2
4. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE HULL CODE	5
5. DESCRIPTION OF THE MAGAZINE SIMULATION	5
6. RESULTS OF THE MAGAZINE SIMULATION	7
7. DESCRIPTION AND RESULTS OF THE TEST SIMULATION	18
8. DESCRIPTION AND RESULTS OF THE ACCEPTOR RESPONSE SIMULATION	23
9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	23
10. REFERENCES	27
DISTRIBUTION LIST	29

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes*	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. End Elevation and Plan Views of a Typical Magazine Showing a Proposed Stacking Arrangement	3
2. Side Elevation and Plan Views of the Proposed Experimental Arrangement ...	4
3. Magazine Configuration Simulation	6
4. Locations of the Lagrangian Stations in and Near the Barrier	8
5a. Pressure and Density Contour Plots for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation, 0.0 ms	9
5b. Pressure and Density Contour Plots for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation, 2 ms	10
5c. Pressure and Density Contour Plots for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation, 4 ms	11
5d. Pressure and Density Contour Plots for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation, 10.0 ms	12
5e. Pressure and Density Contour Plots for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation, 20.0 ms	13
6. Velocity Histories at Several Lagrangian Stations for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation	14
7a. Average Terminal Velocity as a Function of Barrier Thickness for a Charge Center to Barrier Center Separation Distance of 5.0 m	16
7b. Average Terminal Velocity as a Function of Separation Distance	17
8. Approximate Terminal Momentum and Kinetic Energy as Functions of Barrier Thickness for a Charge Center to Barrier Center Separation Distance of 5.0 m.	19
9. Approximate Terminal Momentum as a Function of Scale Distance for All Computations	20
10. Experiment Simulation Configuration Showing the Locations of the Lagrangian Stations	21
11. Velocity Histories at Several Lagrangian Stations for a Representative Test Simulation Computation	22

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
12. Munition Response Simulation Configuration Showing the Locations of the Lagrangian Stations	24
13. Pressure Histories at the Lagrangian Stations for the Munition Response Simulation Computation	25

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Summary of Magazine Computations	15
2. Summary of Test Simulation Computations	23

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Project Manager for Ammunition Logistics, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ. Mr. O. Lyman of the U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, who was responsible for the experimental study, was instrumental in providing guidance on the magazine design and munitions stack arrangements which were used in this study.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

1. INTRODUCTION

Large quantities of explosives, frequently exceeding 100,000 lb, in different types of munitions may be stored in a single magazine. The storage of ammunition has always presented safety problems, and various regulations have been developed over the years to ensure safe storage practices (DOD 6055.9 STD 1984; AR 385-64 1987). The situation is further complicated in areas where increased population density and reassessment of hazards have reduced the applicable explosive limits for existing magazines (Lyman 1983). To reduce the total land requirements for magazine facilities, it is desirable to limit the size of the maximum credible event to about 50,000 lb (further reductions don't reduce the safe inhabited building distance).

It has been suggested that the maximum credible event in an accident scenario may be significantly reduced if the munitions store is divided into two or more stacks of ammunition separated by barriers designed to prevent propagation of an explosion from one stack to another caused by fragments from the donor stack. For typical stacks of ammunition, this may require a wall of sandbags about 1 m thick. When using such a barrier to intercept fragments, the problem of the effect of its impact on the acceptor stack arises. While the fragment hazard may be eliminated, the moving barrier may cause sufficient damage to the munitions in the acceptor stack to initiate the explosive they contain, thus defeating its intended purpose.

A combined analytical and experimental investigation was proposed to assess this hazard and to determine whether such barriers can successfully be designed. The analytical study, which has been completed, included three numerical simulations using the HULL code. The first simulation was used to determine the velocity of the barrier on impact with the acceptor stack in the magazine environment in order to design meaningful experiments. In addition, several barrier design issues were addressed analytically. The second simulation was used to determine the experimental configuration required to produce the desired barrier velocity. The final simulation was used to assess the loading on typical acceptor ammunition that might be anticipated, in order to determine instrumentation requirements.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE MAGAZINE AND AMMUNITION STACKS

Munitions must be stored such that they can be easily accessed, inspected, and inventoried. Dissimilar items are stored together, and each type must be available for removal without disturbing other stored munitions. Much of the munitions stockpile is stored in standard magazines. Elevation and plan views of such a structure including a proposed stack arrangement are shown in Figure 1.

The magazine is constructed with reinforced concrete walls, roof, and floor and is covered with earth. The interior of the magazine is semicylindrical, 24.38 m long and 8.00 m in diameter. A steel door, 1.22 m (4 ft) wide by 2.44 m (8 ft) high, is located in the middle of one of the end walls. The door is used for access in order to store or remove ammunition and also serves as a vent in case of an explosion inside the magazine.

Using palletized M107 155-mm projectiles, it is possible to store 506 pallets in a stack 3.35 m deep, reaching to the roof of the magazine. The high explosive weight per pallet is approximately 55.9 kg (123 lb), which gives 28,290 kg (62,238 lb) per stack. Up to four such stacks could be stored in a magazine, while still leaving room for barriers up to 1 m thick and 1 m of access space on each side of each stack.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED EXPERIMENT

It is clearly impractical to conduct full-scale tests of candidate magazine configurations in order to find an arrangement which produces the desired results. As an alternative, tests in which a barrier segment is launched at a representative velocity toward an acceptor stack segment have been proposed. In these tests, the barrier thickness remains full-scale, but its lateral extent is limited.

The test setup is illustrated schematically in Figure 2. In order to account for the lateral confinement provided by the full magazine environment, the tests are conducted in a trench 2 m deep, 3 m wide, and about 10 m long with a 2-m-thick earth overburden. The configuration is symmetrical, allowing two barriers to be launched toward two acceptor stacks




Figure 1. End Elevation and Plan Views of a Typical Magazine Showing a Proposed Stacking Arrangement.




Figure 2. Side Elevation and Plan Views of the Proposed Experimental Arrangement.

by a central ammonium nitrate - fuel oil (ANFO) charge. The acceptor stacks include both live and inert 155-mm ammunition.

4. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE HULL CODE


We used the HULL code to conduct the analytical study. The HULL system consists of programs for generating and solving two- and three-dimensional dynamic continuum mechanics problems in Eulerian and/or Lagrangian frameworks plus many peripheral programs required to provide graphical renditions of the results. Numerous constitutive models are included, and material parameters are provided in the HULL library. Detonation is treated by the programmed burn method. We used the two-dimensional Eulerian finite-difference capability (without heat conduction or viscosity) for our simulation and the graphics routines to obtain pressure and density contour plots as well as history plots (Hull User's Class).

5. DESCRIPTION OF THE MAGAZINE SIMULATION

In order to keep the size of the simulation manageable, we used a two-dimensional axisymmetric representation of the magazine as illustrated in Figure 3. The simulated magazine is thus a complete cylindrical shell structure having twice the interior volume of the actual semicylindrical magazine. Because of the absence of any angular motion component, a plane of symmetry exists at the magazine floor (or any similar plane), effectively providing a perfectly rigid surface.

A concrete shell and end walls enclose the air-filled interior of the magazine, and a sand layer simulates the earth overburden. Air also fills the region surrounding the magazine. No attempt was made to represent the doors.

The donor ammunition stack is simulated by a cylinder of bare TNT representing (in the baseline case) 56.5 Mg (about 124,000 lb) or twice the actual mass (corresponding to the doubling of the interior volume). The initial position of the donor charge and its mass was varied in different computations. In each case, it was initiated on the axis at the center of the charge.



ALL MEASUREMENTS: m

Figure 3. Magazine Configuration Simulation.

A sand barrier is placed near the center of the magazine. Sand wall thicknesses varying from 1 m to 3 m were modeled in different computations. In a few computations, vents (or open spaces) were left in the barriers to facilitate pressure equilibration across them. The vents were placed 1.0, 2.2, and 3.4 m above the floor. The size of the vents ranged from 0.20 to 0.60 m. Several stations in and near the sand barrier were chosen for monitoring velocity, pressure, and impulse histories. These are shown in Figure 4.

The computational region was discretized into 350 zones covering 28 m in the axial direction and 75 zones covering 6 m in the radial direction.

Equations of state for air, concrete, sand, and TNT products (Jones-Wilkins-Lee [JWL]) were taken from the materials library of the HULL code.

6. RESULTS OF THE MAGAZINE SIMULATION

Figures 5a through 5e shows a series of pressure and density contour plots for a typical computation. Pressure contours are shown on the left side of the axis and density on the right. After the TNT detonated, it took about 3 to 4 ms for the *blast wave to arrive at the sand barrier*. Acceleration of the wall took place over a considerably longer period of time. Each computation was allowed to run for 30 to 40 ms. This was more than enough time to produce a steady wall velocity. The contour plots show increasing diffusion of the material boundaries at late time. Corresponding plots of velocity history at several of the stations are shown in Figure 6. Somewhat different steady-state values are produced at the different stations. A total of 18 computations were completed. The steady-state velocities computed at stations 7, 8, and 9 (near the leading edge of the barrier) are summarized in Table 1 along with the average velocity at all the stations in the barrier. Some variation in the velocity from station to station is evident, but the general trends remain clear.

As the barrier thickness is increased while retaining a separation of 5.0 m between the center of the charge and the center of the barrier with a 28.2-Mg charge, the resulting terminal velocity decreases. Average terminal velocity is plotted as a function of barrier thickness in Figure 7a. As the separation distance is increased, the terminal velocity decreases as shown in Figure 7b. Approximate representations of the barrier momentum and kinetic energy per unit area may be obtained by multiplying the initial barrier mass per unit area by the velocity




Figure 4. Locations of the Lagrangian Stations In and Near the Barrier.




Figure 5a. Pressure and Density Contour Plots for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation, 0 ms.




Figure 5b. Pressure and Density Contour Plots for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation, 2 ms.




Figure 5c. Pressure and Density Contour Plots for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation, 4 ms.




Figure 5d. Pressure and Density Contour Plots for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation, 10.0 ms.




Figure 5e. Pressure and Density Contour Plots for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation, 20.0 ms.






Figure 6. Velocity Histories at Several Lagrangian Stations for a Representative Magazine Simulation Computation.

Table 1. Summary of Magazine Computations

Charge Mass (Mg)	Barrier Thickness (m)	Center-to-Center Separation (m)	Terminal Velocity at Station			Average Terminal Velocity (m/s)
			7 (m/s)	8 (m/s)	9 (m/s)	
19.5	2.0	5.0	200	200	170	208
28.2	0.5	5.0	900	900	800	867
28.2	1.0	5.0	500	560	460	514
28.2	1.0	10.0	440	385	510	437
28.2	1.0 ^a	10.0	420	400	500	443
28.2	1.0	11.0	450	400	530	415
28.2	2.0	5.0	320	290	255	290
28.2	2.0	5.5	300	280	235	282
28.2	2.0	7.5	225	230	190	224
28.2	2.0	10.5	240	240	230	210
28.2	2.0 ^a	10.5	220	240	210	206
28.2	3.0	5.0	200	200	160	195
28.2	3.0	6.0	180	180	140	172
28.2	3.0	8.0	150	150	100	158
28.2	3.0	11.0	120	140	115	142
28.2	3.0 ^a	11.0	120	120	140	128
32.4	2.0	5.0	360	360	320	328
37.0	2.0	5.0	400	400	400	380

^avented barrier




Figure 7a. Average Terminal Velocity as a Function of Barrier Thickness for a Charge Center to Barrier Center Separation Distance of 5.0 m.




Figure 7b. Average Terminal Velocity as a Function of Separation Distance.

and half the square of the velocity, respectively. These are plotted as functions of barrier thickness in Figure 8. The results are most consistent with constant momentum and show decreasing kinetic energy with increasing thickness.

Venting of the barriers left their terminal velocities virtually unchanged as is evident in Table 1.

The distances between the barrier and the donor charge and the mass of the donor charge were also varied in different computations. Blast scaling laws suggest that the impulse delivered, and, hence, the terminal momentum of the barrier, is a function of the scale distance defined by dividing the physical distance by the cube root of the charge mass. The variations in approximate terminal momentum as a function of scale distance are shown in Figure 9. The results indicate that this relationship is reasonably well followed especially at larger scale distances.

7. DESCRIPTION AND RESULTS OF THE TEST SIMULATION

A simulation of the experimental configuration, as illustrated in Figure 10, was also made. Axisymmetry was deemed the best way to represent the lateral confinement in a two-dimensional simulation. Additional symmetry is afforded by the experimental setup in which identical sand-filled barriers are arranged on either side of a TNT or ANFO charge which fills the space between them. The computational region thus extends from the center of the charge (where a reflective plane is placed) to a point 2 m beyond the end of the trench. The thickness of the barrier was maintained at 1 m in all the computations, but the thickness of the charge was varied from 0.30 to 0.40 m in different computations. The velocity of the wall was monitored at three locations ($r=0.50$, 1.00, and 1.50 m) along the radial axis, as shown in Figure 10.

Representative velocity histories are shown in Figure 11. Because the driving explosive is initially in contact with the barrier, the barrier does not quite reach terminal velocity before striking the end of the trench. The maximum velocities determined in four computations are summarized in Table 2.





Figure 8. Approximate Terminal Momentum and Kinetic Energy as Functions of Barrier Thickness for a Charge Center to Barrier Center Separation Distance of 5.0 m.





Figure 9. Approximate Terminal Momentum as a Function of Scale for All Computation.



ALL MEASUREMENTS: m

Figure 10. Experiment Simulation Configuration Showing the Locations of the Lagrangian Stations.




Figure 11. Velocity Histories at Several Lagrangian Stations for a Representative Test Simulation Computation.

Table 2. Summary of Test Simulation Computations

Charge Explosive	Thickness (m)	Maximum Velocity at Station			Average Velocity (m/s)
		1 (m/s)	2 (m/s)	3 (m/s)	
TNT	0.20	270	280	320	290
TNT	0.30	450	450	480	460
ANFO	0.30	320	320	350	330
ANFO	0.40	400	400	450	417

8. DESCRIPTION AND RESULTS OF THE ACCEPTOR RESPONSE SIMULATION


A final calculation was made to determine the pressure that might be expected inside a 155-mm M107 artillery round subjected to barrier impact at 500 m/s. The problem configuration including the locations of the pressure monitoring stations is shown in Figure 12. The computed pressure histories are shown in Figure 13. The pressures observed were generally lower than 0.35 GPa.

9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The fact that the kinetic energy imparted to a barrier decreases with its thickness indicates that thin fast-moving barriers have the potential to do greater damage to ammunition in an acceptor stack than thick slow-moving barriers. Barriers must be designed thick enough to prevent fragment penetration. Additional thickness, where possible, is also desirable.

The terminal momentum of the barriers was found to be roughly constant for a given charge mass and location. The application of blast scaling laws showed that these might be useful as predictive tools when the distance between stack and barrier is not too small.

Terminal velocities were not significantly reduced when vents were placed in the barriers. Thus, these computations provide little support for this technique as a method for mitigating the hazard posed by moving barriers.



ALL MEASUREMENTS: m

NOT TO SCALE

Figure 12. Munition Response Simulation Configuration Showing the Locations of the Lagrangian Stations.






Figure 13. Pressure Histories at the Lagrangian Stations for the Munition Response Simulation.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

10. REFERENCES

AR 385-64. Ammunition and Explosive Standards. May 1987.

DOD 6055.9 STD. DOD Ammunition and Explosive Safety Standards. July 1984.

"HULL User's Class." Orlando Technology, Inc., Shalimar, FL, August 1988.

Lyman, Ona R. "Advantages from Mixed Storage of Ammunition." BRL-TR-02506,
U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, July 1983.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>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 Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: ASQNC-TAC-DIT (Technical Information Center) Warren, MI 48397-5000
1	Commander U.S. Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCAM 5001 Eisenhower Ave. 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 Rd. 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	WL/MNOI Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000 <u>Aberdeen Proving Ground</u>
(Unclass. only)1	Commander U.S. Army Rock Island Arsenal ATTN: SMCRI-TL/Technical Library Rock Island, IL 61299-5000	2	Dir, USAMSAA ATTN: AMXSU-D AMXSU-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-TC
1	Commander U.S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-RD-CS-R (DOC) Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5010	3	Cdr, CRDEC, AMCCOM ATTN: SMCCR-RSP-A SMCCR-MU SMCCR-MSI
		1	Dir, VLAMO ATTN: AMSLC-VL-D
		10	Dir, USABRL ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
4	Chairman Department of Defense Explosives Safety Board ATTN: DDESB-KT, CPT D. Wallace COL R. Fahl Dr. J. Ward Dr. C. Canada 2461 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22331-0600	2	Commander U.S. Army Armament Munitions and Chemical Command ATTN: AMSMC-CG AMSMC-RT, Mr. R. Radkiewicz Rock Island, IL 61299-6000
1	Chairman DOD Explosives Safety Board ATTN: Dr. Jerry Ward Room 856-C Hoffman Bldg 1 2461 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22331-0600	1	Commander U.S. Army South ATTN: SOGA-PCS/COOP-A APO Miami, 34004-5000
1	Commander Headquarters, Department of the Army The Pentagon ATTN: DACO-St, Mr. R. Fatz Washington, D.C. 20310-0100	2	Commander U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command ATTN: ATOS-ER ATBO-HSS Fort Monroe, VA 23651-5000
1	Department of the Army Deputy Chief-of-Staff for Logistics ATTN: DALO-SMA, Mr. V. Hess Washington, DC 20310-0100	3	Commander U.S. Army Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center ATTN: SMCAR-AEE-W, Dr. N. Slagg Mike Joyce Richard Graybush Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
2	Commander U.S. Army Materiel Command Deputy Chief-of-Staff for Ammunition ATTN: AMCAM-LG, Mr. R. Fahy AMCCE-QP, Mr. E. Seard 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-0001	2	Commander U.S. Army Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center ATTN: SMCAR-AEE, Dr. Jack Alster Dr. J. Lannon Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000
1	Commander U.S. Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCSF 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-0001	1	Commander U.S. Army Armament Munitions and Chemical Command ATTN: AMSMC-IMP-L Rock Island, IL 61299-7300
1	Commander Eighth U.S. Army ATTN: FKSF APO San Francisco 96301-0009	1	Commander, USACECOM R&D Technical Library ATTN: ASQNC-ELC-IS-L-R, Myer Center Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703-5301

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Director U.S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSME-RK, Dr. R. G. Rhoades Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898
1	Director U.S. Army TRAC-WSMR ATTN: ATOR-TSL White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002-5502
1	Commandant USAFAS ATTN: ATSF-TSM-CN Fort Sill, OK 73503-5600
1	Commander U.S. Army Research Office ATTN: Chemistry Division P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211
1	Commander U.S. Army Pacific ATTN: APLG-MU Fort Shafter, HI 96858-5100
1	Commander U.S. Army Japan ATTN: AJGA-PM-S APO San Francisco, CA 96343-0054
1	Commander U.S. Army Special Operation Command ATTN: AOPE-SA Fort Bragg, NC 28307-5200
2	Commander U.S. Army Armament Research Development and Engineering Center ATTN: SMCAR-AEM, Mr. P. Serao Mr. B. Williamson Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
4	Commander U.S. Army Waterways Experiment Station ATTN: CEWES-SE, Mr. K. Davis Mr. M. Ford CEWEW-GS-S, Mr. M. Meyer Dr. J. Fowler 3909 Halls Ferry Road Vicksburg, MI 39180-6199
2	Commander U.S Army Corps of Engineers Huntsville Division ATTN: CEHND-ED-CS, Mr. P. LaHoud Mr. A. Farsoun P.O. Box 1600 Huntsville, AL 35807-4301
1	Commandant USAOMMCS ATTN: ATSK-CME, Mr. Steven J. Herman Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-6500
3	Commandant U.S. Army Ordnance Missile and Munitions Center and School ATTN: ATSK-CMT-Z, Mr. C. Doub ATSK-CMM, Mr. W. Brooks ATSK-CCU, CW4 J. Dunn Redstone Arsenal, AL 35897-6000
2	Commandant U.S. Army Engineer School ATTN: ATSE-DI-CE, MAJ J. Davis CPT J. Dawkins Fort Leonardwood, MO 65473-5620
1	Director U.S. Army Technical Center for Explosives Safety ATTN: SMCAC-ESL, Mr. C. Doyle Savanna, IL 61074-9639

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
3	Commander U.S. Army Belvoir RD&E Center ATTN: STRBE-N, Dr. D. Heberlein STRBE-NA, Dr. H. Spitzer SBRBE-NAN, Ms. P. Jacobs Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5606
1	Director Missile and Space Intelligence Center ATTN: AIAMS-YDL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000
1	C.I.A. OIR/DB/Standard GE47 HQ Washington, DC 20505
2	Office of Naval Research ATTN: Dr. A. Faulstick, Code 23 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217
1	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command ATTN: Dr. R. Bowen, SEA 061 Washington, DC 20362
1	Commander Naval Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technology Center ATTN: Technical Library, Code 604 Indian Head, MD 20640
1	Commander Naval Research Laboratory ATTN: Code 6100 Washington, DC 20375
1	Commander Naval Surface Warfare Center ATTN: Code G13 Dahlgren, VA 22448-5000
1	Commander Naval Weapons Station NEDED ATTN: Dr. L. Rothstein, Code 50 Yorktown, VA 23691

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
9	Commander Naval Surface Warfare Center ATTN: Dr. K. Mueller, Code R-10 L. Roslund, R10C M. Stosz, R10B R. R. Bernecker, R13 J. W. Forbes, R13 S. J. Jacobs, R10 J. Short, R12 C. Gotzmer Code X211, Library Silver Spring, MD 20902-5000
7	Commander Naval Air Weapons Center ATTN: Dr. L. Smith, Code 326 Dr. R. Atkins, Code 385 Dr. R. Reed, Jr., Code 388 Dr. K. J. Graham, Code 3891 Dr. M. Chan, Code 3891 Dr. R. Cramer Dr. G. Lindsay China Lake, CA 93555
2	Commander Naval Civil Engineering Lab ATTN: Code L51, Mr. J. Tancreto Mr. W. Keenan Port Hueneme, CA 93043
1	Commander Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic ATTN: G-4 (NSAP) Norfolk, VA 23511
1	Commander Air Force Rocket Propulsion Laboratory ATTN: R. Geisler, Code AFRPL MKPA Edwards AFB, CA 93523
3	Air Force Armament Laboratory ATTN: Dr. M. Patrick AFATL, Gary Parsons Thomas Floyd Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000

**No. of
Copies Organization**

- 1 Commander
Eglin Air Force Base
ATTN: ASD/YQI
Eglin, FL 32542
- 1 Commander
Ballistic Missile Defense
Advanced Technology Center
ATTN: Dr. D. C. Sayles
P.O. Box 1500
Huntsville, AL 35807
- 4 Director
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
ATTN: Dr. M. Finger
K. Scribner
L. Frahm
Dr. R. McGuire
P.O. Box 808
Livermore, CA 94550
- 3 Director
Los Alamos National Laboratory
ATTN: Dr. H. Cady
Mr. J. Ramsey
M. Stinecipher
P.O. Box 1663
Los Alamos, NM 87545
- 1 Director
Sandia National Laboratories
ATTN: Dr. E. Mitchell, Supervisor
Division 2513
P.O. Box 5800
Albuquerque, NM 87185
- 1 Director
Sandia National Laboratories
ATTN: Dr. R. Carling
Livermore, CA 94557-0096
- 1 Director
White Oak Laboratory
Naval Surface Weapons Center
ATTN: Mr. M. Swisdak
10901 New Hampshire Ave.
Silver Spring, MD 20903

**No. of
Copies Organization**

- 1 Director
Los Alamos National Laboratory
M Division
ATTN: MILSTOP P915, Dr. P. Howe
P.O. Box 1663
Los Alamos, NM 87545
- 1 Director
Idos Corporation
ATTN: Irving B. Akst
P.O. Box 285
Pampa, TX 79065

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

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 BRL-TR-3384 Date of Report August 1992

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. Specifically, how 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 Code

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 Code

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

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

