



**A Comparison of Structural Analysis Techniques for the
Excalibur 155-mm Artillery Shell's
Canard Actuation System**

by James M. Bender and Lyonel E. Reinhardt

ARL-TR-3409

March 2005

NOTICES

Disclaimers

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.

Citation of manufacturer's or trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use thereof.

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

Army Research Laboratory

Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5069

ARL-TR-3409**March 2005**

A Comparison of Structural Analysis Techniques for the Excalibur 155-mm Artillery Shell's Canard Actuation System

James M. Bender

Weapons and Materials Research Directorate, ARL

Lyonel E. Reinhardt

U.S. Army Armament Research and Development Command

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 information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) March 2005		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 1 January 2004 to 1 October 2004	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A Comparison of Structural Analysis Techniques for the Excalibur 155-mm Artillery Shell's Canard Actuation System			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) James M. Bender (ARL) and Lyonel E. Reinhardt (ARDEC)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER 627168.H80		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Laboratory Weapons and Materials Research Directorate Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5069			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER ARL-TR-3409		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT A structural finite element analysis of the four-axis canard actuation system (CAS) of the Excalibur 155-mm artillery projectile is presented. This is an improved version of an earlier two-axis design that will increase its maneuverability and accuracy. CAS receives control signals from the global positioning system guidance module of the Excalibur, thus enabling mid-course trajectory corrections. CAS is being analyzed to assess the structural robustness of the design to ensure that it can sustain the severe launch environment of high-performance 155-mm howitzers and can function as designed.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS artillery; canard actuation system; Excalibur; 155-mm artillery					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 20	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON James M. Bender
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 410-306-0839

Contents

List of Figures	iv
List of Tables	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. Structural Analyses	1
2.1 Analysis by ARL	2
2.2 Finite Element Analysis Results.....	4
2.3 Analysis by Picatinny Arsenal	8
2.4 Finite Element Results for Picatinny Analysis.....	9
3. Conclusions	11
Distribution List	12

List of Figures

Figure 1. Excalibur 155-mm artillery projectile with payload variations.....	1
Figure 2. Solid model of the CAS module.....	3
Figure 3. Finite element model of CAS (exploded view).....	3
Figure 4. Internal components that comprise the stack.....	4
Figure 5. Finite element model with boundary conditions	5
Figure 6. Prototype CAS ready for testing.....	5
Figure 7. Prototype CAS location of strain gauges.....	5
Figure 8. Overall compression measurement.....	6
Figure 9. ABAQUS half-symmetry model employed by Picatinny.	8
Figure 10. Boundary conditions for the half-symmetry ABAQUS model.	9
Figure 11. ABAQUS finite element model.....	10

List of Tables

Table 1. Comparison of ARL predictions to actual strain gauge readings, PMP + 5% (μ strains).	7
Table 2. Comparison of Picatinny predictions to actual strain gauge readings, PMP + 5% (μ strains)	10

1. Introduction

The Excalibur projectile (see figure 1) is a 155-mm cargo carrier that can be launched from towed and self-propelled howitzers. This developmental projectile contains state-of-the-art guidance and control devices that are capable of providing mid-course trajectory corrections based on global positioning system satellite information. The canard actuation system (CAS) is a sub-unit of the projectile that is situated forward of the payload bay and aft of the guidance module that contains the inertial measuring unit (IMU) and guidance signal processing. At apogee, CAS deploys canards for steering control. The four-axis CAS differs from the previous version in that it is not roll controlled (course correction during rotation). All four canards can operate independently for maximum control. As in the previous two-axis model, the unit must sustain the severe gun-launch environment design load of 19,000 g's (which includes a 1.25 safety factor) while supporting the mass of the guidance unit, fuze, and expulsion charge above it.




Figure 1. Excalibur 155-mm artillery projectile with payload variations.

2. Structural Analyses

Two independent structural analyses were performed. The first analysis was performed by the U.S. Army Research Laboratory (ARL) acting as an independent agency. ARL used the ANSYS¹ structural analysis code. The other analysis was performed by the sponsoring agency,

¹ANSYS, which is not an acronym, is a registered trademark of ANSYS, Inc.

the Fire Support Armaments Center at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey. They performed an analysis using (ABAQUS)² and took advantage of the near half-symmetry of the structure and eliminated small features deemed structurally insignificant. ARL analyzed the full model. The comparison of the two analyses will give decision makers a certain level of confidence in the modeling techniques and will allow them to make a judicial decision that balances expediency and accuracy. It is envisioned that a simpler, defeatured model would allow faster turn-around of parametric analyses where the highly detailed model will boost confidence in the structural integrity of the final design.

2.1 Analysis by ARL

The ANSYS finite element analysis (FEA) program was employed to structurally analyze the four-axis CAS unit and compare results to a crush test of the unit in a laboratory testing environment. The crush test subjects the unit to compressive loading similar to that during gun-launch conditions with an added 5% safety factor (analysis with the required 25% safety factor will be performed at another time). Strain data from that test were compared to the strains predicted by the ANSYS model as a means of validating the finite element model. Drawings and electronic renderings (e-Drawings³, initial graphics exchange specification [IGES] files) were received from Raytheon Missile Systems, Inc, the contractor for the CAS (figure 2). They were read into SolidWorks⁴ virtual prototyping software, to prepare them for input into ANSYS. The assembly shown consists of a stack of two thick aluminum plates, which houses the control mechanisms. They are housed in an aluminum aeroshell with attachment clamp rings on the top and bottom. This section sits atop the payload compartment and below the ogive. The unit receives signals from the guidance section above (not shown) for in-flight navigation. The canards are stowed until the projectile achieves apogee, at which point, they are deployed by squibs (i.e., small explosive caps), lock in position, and commence control. The aeroshell and clamp rings hold the plates together in a compressive pre-load. The plates are bolted together as well.

The IGES files were imported into SolidWorks for refinement before being read into ANSYS. There, the solid model components were meshed into a structural finite element model as shown in figure 3. All mating interfaces were meshed with contact elements, thus allowing the two parts to meet, slide, or separate, depending on the state of stress between them. The two internal sections are shown in figure 4. The aluminum housing contains these parts and the stack is secured by a snug ring as shown, which pre-stresses them in compression. The two internal components are also held together by four bolts.

²ABAQUS, which is not an acronym, is a registered trademark of ABAQUS, Inc.

³e-Drawings is a registered trademark of Geometric Software Solutions Co., Ltd.

⁴SolidWorks is a registered trademark of Solid Works Corporation.




Figure 2. Solid model of the CAS module.




Figure 3. Finite element model of CAS (exploded view).




Figure 4. Internal components that comprise the stack.

The boundary conditions consistent with those from the physical test were applied to the finite element model of the CAS. Two tooling parts were modeled and affixed to the top and bottom of the assembly as shown in figure 5. These parts model the constraints that the actual projectile would impose on the CAS. Figure 6 shows the CAS prototype in the load machine ready for the test. Fifty-six strain gauges were affixed to the unit as well as a displacement transducer to measure overall axial deflection and a load transducer to track the applied load. These readings will be presented later for comparison to the FEA model.

2.2 Finite Element Analysis Results

The first result examined was the overall response of the structure to axial compression displacement. These data indicate whether the global stiffness of the test specimen agrees with the FEA model (see figure 7). Furthermore, it indicates whether all ten contact surfaces are behaving as specified according to the individual contact stiffnesses. Most of the strain data comparisons are discussed later, but the overall structural stiffness is assessed in figure 8 so that the global boundary conditions and response can be validated before we proceed to each measurement location. The global compression value modeled as -0.039 compares favorably with the measured response of -0.040 inch.




Figure 5. Finite element model with boundary conditions.




Figure 6. Prototype CAS ready for testing.

20% gauges: Numbers 7, 11, 21, 25, 29, 31
All others 5% gauges




Figure 7. Prototype CAS location of strain gauges.




Figure 8. Overall compression measurement.

For the present test, we achieved the maximum load of 131,512 lb incrementally by increasing the load at a rate of 5,000 lb/sec. Strain gauge readings were taken every 1/8 second. All data were written to a database file. The readings at maximum load were extracted and are listed in table 1 where they are compared to the ANSYS predictions.

Possible sources of error between the strain gauge readings and the ANSYS prediction include

1. Grid coarseness: The strain patches will occupy an area with a varying number of finite element nodes underneath it. Ideally, a large number of nodes would yield an accurate modeling of the strain in the area, e.g., 6 to 8 nodes under a patch. However, central processing unit time and memory resources might be challenged with a large amount of nodes throughout the structure. A judicious selection of a quantity of nodes will give acceptable results without straining computer resources.
2. The drawings of the CAS specify an amount of pre-load on the internal stack to assure that they are tightly packed. The resulting tension on the outer casing would quantify this pre-load but was not measured. Although the strain would be small (<3% of expected total strain), it does contribute to the combined error.

Table 1. Comparison of ARL predictions to actual strain gauge readings, PMP + 5% (μ strains).

(Actual gauge reading/ANSYS estimate)				
gauge_1	gauge_2	gauge_3	gauge_4	gauge_5
-918/-879	673	-1470/-1719	553/528	-1930/-1757
4.2%	*	-16.9%	4.5%	8.9%
gauge_6	gauge_7	gauge_8	gauge_9	gauge_10
432/319	-1630/-1344	-192/-175	629/585	-1690/-2100
26.1%	17.5%	-8.8%	6.9%	24.2%
gauge_11	gauge_12	gauge_13	gauge_14	gauge_15
-2070/-1897	590/485	-1700/-1596	-197	686/785
8.3%	17.8%	6.1%	*	-14.4%
gauge_16	gauge_17	gauge_18	gauge_19	gauge_20
-1470/-1428	-1740/-1771	496/535	-2080/-1537	299/319
2.8%	-1.8%	7.8%	26.1%	-6.7%
gauge_21	gauge_22	gauge_23	gauge_24	gauge_25
-2160/-1319	-54	636/641	-1840/-1763	-1930/-1853
38.9%	*	-0.8%	4.2%	4.0%
gauge_26	gauge_27	gauge_28	gauge_29	gauge_30
509/316	-1780/-1806	-37	-1580/-1293	210
37.9%	-1.5%	*	18.2%	*
gauge_31	gauge_32	gauge_33	gauge_34	gauge_35
-2500/-1605	553/335	-2360/-2332	-1360	
35.8%	39.4%	1.2%	Not modeled	Not modeled
gauge_36	gauge_37	gauge_38	gauge_39	gauge_40
			60400*	
Not modeled	Not modeled	Not modeled	Gauge failure	Not modeled
gauge_41	gauge_42	gauge_43	gauge_44	gauge_45
21400*	-9830*	60400*	-1080/-906	-931/-435
Gauge failure	Suspicious	Gauge failure	16.1%	53.3%
gauge_46	gauge_47	gauge_48	gauge_49	gauge_50
		-60400*	118	-208
Not modeled	Not modeled	Gauge failure	*	*
gauge_51	gauge_54	gauge_55	gauge_56	gauge_57
-382/-485	588/589	1040/686		
26.9%	0.2%	34.0%	Not modeled	Not modeled
gauge_58	gauge_59	load lbs	disp in	
		-131,512	-0.0400/0.0394	
Not modeled	Not modeled		1.5%	

*Finite element grid too coarse in the area for accurate comparison.

- No material samples were cut from the structure to measure their structural properties. MIL-HBK-5⁵ was the sole source of material properties. It is assumed that they met the specification, but it is a pass/fail criterion. Should the yield point exceed the specification by 15% (for example), it is accepted but would have an impact on the FEA.
- Tolerance stacking: The drawings and IGES (universal electronic solid model) files were used to construct the ANSYS model. In actuality, tolerances do exist and the

⁵Military Handbook 5, Air Force Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, July 2000.

combination of such tolerances may affect the load sharing and pre-stress conditions of the structure.

5. Strain gauge accuracy: The strain gauges used have a guaranteed accuracy of within 3%.

2.3 Analysis by Picatinny Arsenal

The purpose of the Picatinny model was to provide results quickly with a simpler CAS model, with the ARL model providing more detailed results at a later date. Therefore, most of the structurally insignificant features were removed from the Picatinny CAS model and half symmetry was assumed.

The model was built from step files generated via ProENGINEER (ProE)⁶. The ProE files were provided by Raytheon Missile Systems, Inc., the contractor for CAS. All the threaded faces were tied together—the equivalent of gluing or welding the faces together. Contact was defined on all the other mating interfaces simulating the interaction between touching bodies. Since this model assumed half symmetry, an additional symmetry boundary condition (figure 9) was applied.




Figure 9. ABAQUS half-symmetry model employed by Picatinny.

Pre-loads were applied to the model, as shown in the exploded diagram (figure 10). Two bolts, the top clamp and the two internal plates were preloaded to match the load applied during assembly of the CAS.

⁶ProENGINEER is a registered trademark of Parametric Technology Corporation.

To improve the accuracy of the strain readings, the areas of interest were coated with low modulus membrane elements. This places the integration points of the membrane elements on the surface of the part eliminating the extrapolation error with nodal values.




Figure 10. Boundary conditions for the half-symmetry ABAQUS model.

2.4 Finite Element Results for Picatinny Analysis

The reaction force and displacement of the case were measured. The displacements are portrayed graphically in figure 11. The reaction force was 65,775 pounds force (lbf); this matches well with the applied load of 65,806 lbf. The maximum displacement was 0.02575 inch. This is significantly less than the 0.039 inch from the crush test. This may be attributable to part defeaturing and removal of a gap between the outer shell and load ring stiffening the structure.




Figure 11. ABAQUS finite element model.

Table 2. Comparison of Picatinny predictions to actual strain gauge readings, PMP + 5% (μ strains)

(actual gauge reading/ABAQUS estimate, error percent below. Because of the half-symmetry of this model, not all gauges were analyzed - "NA")				
gauge_1	gauge_2	gauge_3	gauge_4	gauge_5
NA	673/612	NA	NA	NA
	9.1%			
gauge_6	gauge_7	gauge_8	gauge_9	gauge_10
432/423	NA	-192/-25	629/620	-1690/-1537
2.1%		87.0% (note 1)	1.4%	9.5%
gauge_11	gauge_12	gauge_13	gauge_14	gauge_15
-2070/-1937	590/722	-1700/-1722	-197/-488	NA
6.4%	-22.4% (note 2)	-1.3	-147.7% (note 1)	
gauge_16	gauge_17	gauge_18	gauge_19	gauge_20
-1470/-783	-1740/-1493	496/463	-208/-1835	299/445
46.7% (note 1)	14.2%	6.7%	11.8%	-48.8 (note 2)
gauge_21	gauge_22	gauge_23	gauge_24	gauge_25
NA	-54/30	NA	NA	NA
	43.9% (note 2)			
gauge_26	gauge_27	gauge_28	gauge_29	gauge_30
NA	NA	NA	-1580/-1420	-2360/2472
			10.1% (note 3)	-13%
gauge_31	gauge_32	gauge_33	gauge_34	gauge_35
NA	NA	-2360/-2472	NA	NA
		-4.7%		
gauge_58	gauge_59	load lbs	disp in	
NA	NA	-131,512	-0.0400	

1. Error may be attributable to tied constraints, course mesh.

2. High gradient; refined mesh would reduce error.

3. High gradient, location of gauge unclear

3. Conclusions

The Picatinny model being half-symmetry will provide approximately half the number of locations for which to compare strain results with the ARL model. The investigators from each activity have provided these analyses for the purpose of aiding the decision-making process and to reinforce each other's assessment of structural integrity of the Excalibur CAS. When half symmetry exists, it is expedient to choose this analytical option to reduce computation time and conserve computing and human resources. However, for state-of-the-art guided artillery projectiles, this is true for a limited number of parts of the round. It would be recommended to employ this technique as much as possible and to use the full-featured model when necessary.

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

* ADMINISTRATOR
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFO CTR
ATTN DTIC OCA
8725 JOHN J KINGMAN RD STE 0944
FT BELVOIR VA 22060-6218
*pdf file only

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN IMNE AD IM DR MAIL & REC MGMT
2800 POWDER MILL RD
ADELPHI MD 20783-1197

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL CI OK TECH LIB
2800 POWDER MILL RD
ADELPHI MD 20783-1197

3 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL SE RM E BURKE
G GOLDMAN
AMSRD ARL SE DC A GOLDBERG
2800 POWDER MILL RD
ADELPHI MD 20783-1197

1 DIRECTOR CIA
ATTN D MOORE
WASHINGTON DC 20505-0001

3 PM ABRAMS TANK SYSTEM
ATTN SFAE GCS AB COL KOTCHMAN
P LEITHEISER H PETERSON
WARREN MI 48397-5000

1 PM M1A2
ATTN SFAE GCS AB LTC R LOVETT
WARREN MI 48397-5000

1 PM M1A1
ATTN SFAE GCS AB LTC L C MILLER JR
WARREN MI 48397-5000

1 PEO-GCS
BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLES
ATTN M KING
WARREN MI 48397-5000

1 PM BFVS
ATTN ATZB BV COL C BETEK
FORT BENNING GA 31905

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 PM M2/M3 BFVS
ATTN SFAE GCS BV LTC J MCGUINESS
WARREN MI 48397-5000

3 PM BCT
ATTN SFAE GCS BCT COL R D OGG JR
J GERLACH T DEAN
WARREN MI 48397-5000

1 PM IAV
ATTN SFAE GCS BCT LTC J PARKER
WARREN MI 48397-5000

1 PM NIGHT VISION/RSTA
ATTN SFAE IEW&S NV COL BOWMAN
10221 BURBECK RD
FT BELVOIR VA 22060-5806

1 NIGHT VISION & ELEC SENSORS DIR
ATTN DR A F MILTON
10221 BURBECK RD SUITE 430
FT BELVOIR VA 22060-5806

2 CDR US ARMY TRADOC
ATTN ATINZA R REUSS
ATIN I C GREEN
BLDG 133
FT MONROE VA 23651

1 OFC OF THE SECY OF DEFENSE
CTR FOR COUNTERMEASURES
ATTN M A SCHUCK
WSMR NM 88002-5519

1 US SOCOM
ATTN SOIO JA F J GOODE
7701 TAMPA POINT BLVD BLDG 501
MCDILL AFB FL 33621-5323

1 CDR US ARMY ARMOR CTR & FT KNOX
TSM/ABRAMS
ATTN COL D SZYDLOSKI
FT KNOX KY 40121

1 CDR US AMBL
ATTN COL J JUGHES
FT KNOX KY 40121

1 DIR OF COMBAT DEVELOPMENT
ATTN ATZK FD W MEINSHAUSEN
BLDG 1002 ROOM 326
1ST CAVALRY DIV RD
FT KNOX KY 40121-9142

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

- 1 COMMANDING OFFICER
MARINE CORPS INTEL ACTIVITY
ATTN COL WILLIAM BARTH
3300 RUSSELL ROAD SUITE 250
QUANTICO VA 22134-5011
- 4 CDR US TACOM-ARDEC
ATTN AMSTA AR TD M DEVINE
 M FISETTE
 AMSTA AR FSA M J FENECK
 AMSTA AR FSA P D PASCUA
PICATINNY ARSENAL NJ 07806-5000
- 4 CDR US TACOM-ARDEC
ATTN AMSTA AR FSA S R KOPMANN
 H KERWIEN K JONES
 A FRANCHINO
PICATINNY ARSENAL NJ 07806-5000
- 4 CDR US TACOM-ARDEC
ATTN AMSTA AR FSA T A LAGASCA
 AMSTA AR FSP D LADD
 M CILLI M BORTAK
PICATINNY ARSENAL NJ 07806-5000
- 3 CDR US TACOM-ARDEC
ATTN AMSTA AR FSP G A PEZZANO
 R SHORR
 AMSTA AR FSP I R COLLETT
PICATINNY ARSENAL NJ 07806-5000
- 7 CDR US TACOM-ARDEC
ATTN AMSTA AR CCH A M PALTHINGAL
 A VELLA E LOGSDON
 R CARR M MICOLICH
 M YOUNG A MOLINA
PICATINNY ARSENAL NJ 07806-5000
- 3 CDR US TACOM-ARDEC
ATTN AMSTA AR QAC R SCHUBERT
 AMSTA AR WE C R FONG S TANG
PICATINNY ARSENAL NJ 07806-5000
- 1 SAIC
ATTN K A JAMISON
PO BOX 4216
FT WALTON BEACH FL 32549
- 4 PEO-GCS
ATTN SFAE GCS C GAGNON
 SFAE GCS W A PUZZUOLI
 SFAE GCS BV J PHILLIPS
 SFAE GCS LAV COL T LYTLE
WARREN MI 48397-5000

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

- 4 PEO-GCS
ATTN SFAE GCS AB SW DR PATTISON
 SFAE GCS AB LF LTC PAULSON
 SFAE GCS LAV M T KLER
 SFAE GCS LAV FCS MR ASOKLIS
WARREN MI 48397-5000
- 3 CDR US ARMY TACOM
ATTN AMSTA TR DR R MCCLELLAND
 MR BAGWELL
 AMSTA TA J CHAPIN
WARREN MI 48397-5000
- 12 CDR US ARMY TACOM
ATTN AMSTA TR R DR J PARKS C ACIR
 S SCHEHR D THOMAS J SOLTESZ
 S CAITO K LIM J REVELLO
 B BEAUDOIN B RATHGEB
 M CHAIT S BARSHAW
WARREN MI 48397-5000
- 8 CDR US ARMY TACOM
ATTN AMSTA CM XSF R DRITLEIN
 MR HENDERSON MR HUTCHINSON
 MR SCHWARZ S PATHAK
 R HALLE J ARKAS G SIMON
WARREN MI 48397-5000
- 5 PEO PM MORTAR SYSTEMS
ATTN SFAE AMO CAS IFM L BICKLEY
 M SERBAN K SLIVOVSKY
 SFAE GCS TMA R KOWALSKI
 SFAE GCS TMA PA E KOPACZ
PICATINNY ARSENAL NJ 07860-5000
- 3 MIT LINCOLN LABORATORY
ATTN J HERD G TITI D ENGREN
244 WOOD STREET
LEXINGTON MA 02420-9108
- 2 THE UNIV OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
INST FOR ADVANCED TECH
ATTN I MCNAB S BLESS
PO BOX 20797
AUSTIN TX 78720-2797
- 1 INNOVATIVE SURVIVABILITY TECH
ATTN J STEEN
PO BOX 1989
GOLETA CA 93116

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 SUNY BUFFALO
ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING DEPT
ATTN J SARJEANT
PO BOX 601900
BUFFALO NY 14260-1900

1 GENERAL DYNAMICS LAND SYSTEMS
ATTN D GERSDORFF
PO BOX 2074
WARREN MI 49090-2074

1 CDR US ARMY CECOM
ATTN W DEVILBISS
BLDG 600
FT MONMOUTH NJ 07703-5206

1 MARCORSYSCOM/CBG
ATTN CPT J DOUGLAS
QUANTICO VA 22134-5010

2 CDR USAIC
ATTN ATZB CDF MAJ J LANE
D HANCOCK
FT BENNING GA 31905

2 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL SL EA R CUNDIFF
AMSRD ARL SL EM J THOMPSON
WSMR NM 88001-5513

4 UNITED DEFENSE ADV DEV CTR
ATTN K GROVES J FAUL T WINANT
V HORVATICH
328 BROKAW ROAD
SANTA CLARA CA 95050

2 NORTHROP GRUMMAN CORP
ATTN A SHREKENHAMER D EWART
1100 W HOLLYVALE STREET
AAUSA CA 91702

1 CDR US ARMY AMCOM
ATTN AMSAM RD ST WF D LOVELACE
REDSTONE ARSENAL AL 35898-5247

1 HICKS & ASSOC INC
ATTN G SINGLEY III
1710 GOODRICH DR STE 1300
MCLEAN VA 22102

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 US MILITARY ACADEMY
MATH SCIENCES CTR OF EXCELLENCE
DEPT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES
ATTN MADN-MATH LTC T RUGENSTEIN
THAYER HALL
WEST POINT NY 10996-1786

1 DIR US ARMY WATERWAYS EXPER STN
ATTN R AHLVIN
3909 HALLS FERRY ROAD
VICKSBURG MS 39180-6199

1 NATL INST STAN AND TECH
ATTN K MURPHY
100 BUREAU DRIVE
GAITHERSBURG MD 20899

1 CDR US ARMY MMBL
ATTN MAJ J BURNS
BLDG 2021
BLACKHORSE REGIMENT DRIVE
FT KNOX KY 40121

1 DIRECTOR
AMCOM MRDEC
ATTN AMSMI RD W C MCCORKLE
REDSTONE ARSENAL AL 35898-5240

1 COMMANDER
US ARMY INFO SYS ENGRG CMD
ATTN AMSEL-IE-TD F JENIA
FT HUACHUCA AZ 85613-5300

1 COMMANDER
US ARMY NATICK RDEC
ACTING TECHNICAL DIR
ATTN SBNC-TP P BRANDLER
NATICK MA 01760-5002

1 COMMANDER
ARMY RESEARCH OFC
4300 S MIAMI BLVD
RSCH TRIANGLE PARK NC 27709

1 COMMANDER
US ARMY STRICOM
ATTN J STAHL
12350 RSCH PARKWAY
ORLANDO FL 32826-3726

1 COMMANDER
US ARMY TRADOC
BATTLE LAB INTEGRATION 7 TECH DIR
ATTN ATCD B J A KLEVECZ
FT MONROE VA 23651-5850

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 DARPA
3701 N FAIRFAX DRIVE
ARLINGTON VA 22203-1714

1 COMMANDER
US ARMY AVIATION & MISSILE CMD
ATTN AMSAM-RD-SS-EG A KISSELL
BLDG 5400
REDSTONE ARSENAL AL 35898

1 OFC OF THE PROJECT MGR
MANEUVER AMMUNITION SYSTEMS
ATTN S BARRIERES
BLDG 354
PICATINNY ARSENAL NJ 07806-5000

1 COMMANDER
US ARMY TRADOC ANALYSIS CTR
ATTN ATRC-WBA J GALLOWAY
WSMR NM 88002-5502

1 FASTTRACK TECH INC
ATTN J K GARRETT
540 CEDAR DRIVE
RADCLIFF KY 40160

1 DIR USARMY TACOM
6501 E ELEVEN MILE RD
WARREN MI 48397-5000

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL CI OK (TECH LIB)
BLDG 4600

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL HR SC
BLDG 459

2 CDR US ARMY TECOM
ATTN AMSTE CD B SIMMONS
AMSTE CD M R COZBY
RYAN BLDG

4 DIR US AMSAA
ATTN AMXSY D M MCCARTHY
P TOPPER
AMXSY CA G DRAKE S FRANKLIN
BLDG 367

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

7 CDR US ATC
ATTN CSTE AEC COL ELLIS
CSTE AEC TD J FASIG
CSTE AEC TE H CUNNINGHAM
CSTE AEC RM C A MOORE
CSTE AEC TE F P OXENBERG
A SCRAMLIN
CSTE AEC CCE W P CRISE
BLDG 400

1 PM ODS
ATTN SFAE CBD COL B WELCH
BLDG 4475
APG EA

5 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL WM J SMITH
E SCHMIDT B RINGER
T ROSENBERGER
B BURNS
BLDG 4600

3 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL WM
C SHOEMAKER
J BORNSTEIN
AMSRD ARL WM BF J WALL
BLDG 1121

1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL WM B W CIEPIELLA
BLDG 4600

3 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL WM BA D LYONS
AMSRD ARL WM BC P PLOSTINS
AMSRD ARL WM BD B FORCH
BLDG 4600

2 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL WM MB L BURTON
BLDG 4600

7 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL WM BF T HAUG
P FAZIO R PEARSON
M FIELDS G HAAS
W OBERLE J WALD
BLDG 390

NO. OF
COPIES ORGANIZATION

- 6 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL WM TE
 G THOMSON T KOTTKE
 M MCNEIR P BERNING
 J POWELL C HUMMER
BLDG 1116A
- 1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL WM TC R COATES
BLDG 309
- 1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL SL BG M ENDERLEIN
BLDG 247
- 1 DIRECTOR
US ARMY RSCH LABORATORY
ATTN AMSRD ARL SL EM C GARRETT
BLDG 390A