

UNCLASSIFIED

AD 405 889

DEFENSE DOCUMENTATION CENTER

FOR

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

CAMERON STATION, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA



UNCLASSIFIED

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

63-35

405889

BRL

405 889

MEMORANDUM REPORT NO. 1464
APRIL 1963

A SECOND TEST OF AN
UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM

Spence T. Marks
Eugene D. Boyer

DDC
RECEIVED
JUN 8 1963
TISIA B

RDT & E Project Nos. 1A011001B021 and 1M010501A005
BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORIES

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

ASTIA AVAILABILITY NOTICE

Qualified requestors may obtain copies of this report from ASTIA.

The findings in this report are not to be construed
as an official Department of the Army position.

B A L L I S T I C R E S E A R C H L A B O R A T O R I E S

MEMORANDUM REPORT NO. 1464

APRIL 1963

A SECOND TEST OF AN
UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM

Spence T. Marks*
Eugene D. Boyer**

*Ballistic Measurements Laboratory
**Exterior Ballistics Laboratory

RDT & E Project Nos. 1A011001B021 and 1M010501A005

A B E R D E E N P R O V I N G G R O U N D , M A R Y L A N D



FRONTISPIECE - EXTENDED GUN ON CARRIAGE

B A L L I S T I C R E S E A R C H L A B O R A T O R I E S

MEMORANDUM REPORT NO. 1464

STMarks/EDBoyer/cet
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.
April 1963

A SECOND TEST OF AN
UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM

ABSTRACT

The second phase of a high altitude gun probe project is presented. The project objectives, the design considerations, the proof tests, the vertical tests and the dispersion of the system are discussed. An altitude capability of at least 240,000 ft. and an impact circle requirement of one-mile radius has been demonstrated in two series of firings on the Edgewood peninsula of the Aberdeen Proving Ground. Although the performance of this fin-stabilized, five-inch projectile has been proved, the tests indicate the need for further development of data packages and fuzes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	7
II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES.	9
III. DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	9
IV. PROOF TESTS	19
V. VERTICAL TESTS.	25
VI. DISPERSION OF SYSTEM.	29
VII. SUMMARY	33
VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY.	35

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Frontispiece - Extended Gun on Carriage	2
1. Altitude Profiles as a Function of Ballistic Coefficient and Muzzle Velocity.	11
2. Photograph of Second Generation Gun Probe	12
3. Sectional View of Second Generation Gun Probe	13
4. Photograph of New Ejection Fuze	14
5. Sectional View of New Ejection Fuze	15
6. Photograph of Chaff, Meteor, and "On-Board" Telemetry Packages. . .	17
7. Circuit of Telemetry Packages	18
8. Mosaic Shadowgraph of Second Generation Gun Probe	20
9. Zero-Yaw Drag Coefficients vs Mach Number	23
10. Predicted Altitude vs Muzzle Velocity and $\frac{W}{C_D A}$	24
11. Round Impact Area, June 1962 Firings.	30
12. Round Impact Area, December 1962 Firings.	31
13. Dispersion for December 1962 Firings.	32

LIST OF TABLES

I. Physical and Aerodynamic Properties of Probe.	21
II. Vertical Firing Data, June and December 1962.	26
III. Vertical Firing Data, June and December 1962.	27

I. INTRODUCTION

While interest in gun fired probes dates back at least half a century, it was not until recently that serious consideration has been given to gun fired probes for making high altitude measurements. Two feasibility studies of high altitude gun probes for the purpose were conducted late in 1959, and early in 1960. One study, conducted at the Canadian Armament Research and Development Establishment, contemplated the use of a spinning probe from a 3.3-inch gun;¹ while a similar study at the Ballistic Research Laboratories resulted in a proposal that a non-spinning probe be employed from a smoothbore 5-inch gun.²

A feasibility test^{3,4,5} of the proposed 5-inch gun probe system was conducted by the BRL at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, during 1961. A smoothbore T123 tank gun, and probes constructed from T144 projectile parts were used during the test. These probes were lighter and weaker than desired, and their drag was high. As a result, some of the probes suffered structural failure during the test, and the maximum altitude reached was only 130,000 ft.

The report which described the 1961 feasibility test recommended that an improved 5-inch gun probe system be developed.⁵ Such a system would employ a suitable gun with a barrel extension and a heavier probe of greater strength and lower drag.

The present report describes the results obtained from tests of a redesigned 5-inch gun probe system which were conducted by the BRL at Aberdeen Proving Ground during 1962 with the partial support of the Defense Atomic Support Agency under WEB No. 07013.

Design of a 7-inch system is presently in progress. This increased scale will retain the mobility of the 5-inch system but will possess a 300,000-ft. altitude capability with over three times the payload volume. In addition to these developments at the BRL, the Army is supporting development of a 16-inch gun probe system,⁶ on the island of Barbados, W. I. F., under contract with the McGill University of Montreal, Canada. Although this size of gun clearly lacks the mobility of the smaller gun, it can put payloads of 300 lbs. to altitudes in excess of 300,000 ft. For seeding experiments,⁷ this approach is economically very attractive.

II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

A. Primary

The primary objective of the gun probe project during 1962 was the development of an advanced 5-inch gun probe system with an altitude capability of 200,000 - 250,000 ft.

This objective was to be accomplished by fitting a suitable gun with a barrel extension and designing a heavier probe of greater strength and lower drag for use with the gun.

The altitude capability of the system was to be determined by employing the elapsed time of flight method,⁸ and such other altitude determination methods as could be devised for the purpose.

B. Secondary

The secondary objective of the gun probe project during 1962 was the continued development of payload packages for use with the gun probe system.

This work was to include: (1) additional development and testing of inert packages, examples being chaff and artificial meteor experiments, and (2) a beginning on the development and testing of active packages, an example being a telemetry package for high altitude temperature measurements.

III. DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

A. Gun and Probe

The principal parameters which determine the capability of a gun system to propel a probe to a given altitude are (1) the muzzle velocity, and (2) the ballistic properties of the probe.² The parameter $\frac{W}{C_{D_0} A}$ has been adopted to represent the latter. To establish performance requirements, the equation

$$z = \left(\frac{\rho V^2}{2} \right) \left(\frac{C_{D_0} A}{W} \right) - g$$

was integrated on a digital computer, where z = height (ft), g = acceleration of gravity (ft/sec²), ρ = air density (lb/ft³), V = velocity (ft/sec), C_{D_0} = zero-yaw drag coefficient, A = cross sectional area (ft²), and W = weight (lb).

In performing the integration the variation of C_{D_0} with Mach number was taken into account,* gravity was constant, and the standard ballistic variation of density with altitude was assumed. The results are given in Fig. 1.

The chaff probe tested in 1961 was fired from a 24-foot gun tube and at most attained a muzzle velocity of 5250 ft/sec. C_{D_0} was about 0.30 at Mach 4.4. This drag with a 16.6-pound probe gave a $\frac{W}{C_{D_0} A}$ value of 1900 lb/ft². Thus, reference to Fig. 1 shows that this probe only had the capability to reach an altitude of 130,000 ft.

The solution to the problem of redesigning the 5-inch gun probe system to reach an altitude of 200,000 ft. or higher required an increase in the muzzle velocity of the probe and an increase in its $W/C_{D_0} A$ value (Fig. 1).

It was estimated that a barrel extension of 20 calibers would provide an additional 300 ft/sec muzzle velocity, and hence, a 10-ft. extension was added to the T123 tank gun for the 1962 test (Frontispiece).

The weight of the probe was increased from 16.6 lbs. to approximately 19.5 lbs. for the 1962 test, and more streamlined nose and fin units were employed to reduce drag (Figs. 2 and 3).

The increased weight of the probe, of course, required that more powder be employed to propel the probe, with a resultant increase of the erosion effect in the gun. This effect was off-set to a considerable extent by employing a colder powder and an improved primer.

With improved muzzle velocities up to 5500 ft/sec and an increased $W/C_{D_0} A$ as large as 3100 lb/ft² (depending upon the package carried) reference to Fig. 1 indicated that the redesigned probe should easily reach the desired 200,000 ft. altitude and indeed exceed it by as much as 50,000 ft.

B. Payload Packages

The payload compartment of the redesigned gun probe was located in the forward body of the probe (Fig. 3). This compartment measured 6.5" in length by 1.8" in diameter with a total volume of 16.5 cubic inches.

* The Mach number variation used is that shown in Fig. 9.




FIG. 1 - ALTITUDE PROFILES AS A FUNCTION OF BALLISTIC COEFFICIENT AND MUZZLE VELOCITY





FIG. 2 PHOTOGRAPH OF SECOND GENERATION GUN PROBE



- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|------|-----------------|
| 1 - | FIN | 6 - | EJECTION FUZE |
| 2 - | TAIL STUD | 7 - | EJECTION CHARGE |
| 3 - | TAIL BOOM | 8 - | FORWARD PAYLOAD |
| 4 - | TAIL VENT | 9 - | PAYLOAD |
| 5 - | SABOT | 10 - | NOSE SECTION |

FIG. 3 - SECTIONAL VIEW OF SECOND GENERATION GUN PROBE



FIG. 4 PHOTOGRAPH OF NEW EJECTION FUZE




FIG. 5 - SECTIONAL VIEW OF NEW EJECTION FUZE

The ejection fuze was moved from the rear of the payload compartment to a location in the forward part of the tailboom (Fig. 3). This change required a repackaging of the pyrotechnic fuze* which had functioned satisfactorily during the 1961 tests. The original fuze was short and thick (2.15" by 1.8" diameter) while the new design was required to be long and thin (9" by 1" diameter). Except for this change, it was expected that the two fuzes would be the same in material and principle of operation. One feature did appear to be more critical than that of the earlier model; the new design required the coiling of the fuze cord at minimum radius, and there was a question as to whether this could be done without damaging the powder train. However, tests by the manufacturer** indicated that the fuze cord could be ignited and would burn reliably after the tight winding. Initially, the new design employed the starters used in the 1961 fuze, but following some failures these units were replaced by a firing pin shear wire arrangement designed to function on a launch setback of 20,000 g's. The fuze terminated in a DuPont C58 blasting cap (Figs. 4 and 5).

No change was made in the chaff package for the 1962 test, it being essentially the same as the chaff package which was successfully ejected and tracked at 100,000 ft. during the 1961 test. It was desired, however, to secure more experimental data with this package by ejecting and tracking it at an altitude of 200,000 ft.

The chaff package contained aluminized nylon filaments 1.5 centimeters in length (1/2 wavelength for X-band radar). Only one diameter of chaff was used during the 1962 test, i.e., 0.0035", because it was more suitable for use at the higher altitude. The chaff was enclosed in a steel case (Fig. 6) designed to open upon ejection of the case from the forward end of the probe. Ejection was to be accomplished by igniting a powder charge at the base of the package. Total weight of the chaff and case was 1.8 lbs.

The artificial meteor package for the 1962 test was modified to provide for the ejection of a more visible material to aid in demonstrating experiment feasibility. The same basic configuration was employed for the meteor ejection device as was used previously (Fig. 6); however, a cylindrical liner

*Manufactured by Harry Diamond Laboratories
**Ordnance Products Co., North East, Maryland




FIG. 6 PHOTOGRAPH OF CHAFF, METEOR AND TELEMETRY PACKAGES




FIG. 7 - CIRCUIT OF TELEMETRY PACKAGE

weighing 1.2 oz. was used with a Baratol charge weighing 1.5 lb. This device, known as the BRL Jet-pellet accelerator,⁹ was designed to eject a single 0.01-oz. aluminum pellet, rod-like in shape, from the nose tip of the probe vehicle at a velocity of 26 to 30 kft/sec.

A telemetry package with a radiated output of 20 mw at a frequency of 70 mc was developed by the Harry Diamond Laboratories for the first test of a telemetry unit on the gun probe (Figs. 6 and 7). The telemetry unit was plotted in the forward body of the gun probe for the first test, with the probe body and nose section serving as a dipole antenna. A later test is to be conducted with an ejectable telemetry package/parachute combination.

A flash package* consisting of 5 ozs. of 60% barium nitrate and 40% aluminum and magnesium powder, contained in an aluminum container, was used in the June 1962 firings for altitude determination purposes. There was some doubt as to the light output of this package at high altitude,¹⁰ and Picatinny Arsenal supplied a new flash unit for the December 1962 firings. The latter unit contained 5 ozs. of 40% aluminum, 30% potassium perchlorate and 30% barium nitrate. This mixture was also carried in an aluminum container with a total weight of 1.3 lbs.

IV. PROOF TESTS

A. Gun Probe

An extensive series of horizontal firings was conducted as a part of the 1962 test. The program included the firing of ten slugs and ten redesigned gun probes from an extended T123 tank gun.

Unexpected yawing effects were encountered when the first group of redesigned gun probes were fired horizontally, but this difficulty was overcome by modifying the fins of the newly designed probe to provide more riding surface area.

The second generation probe was then fired through the Transonic Range at Aberdeen Proving Ground to obtain drag data, and the mosaic shadowgraph of Fig. 8 was made. The physical and aerodynamic properties of the probe are given in Table I. The test results indicated that the drag coefficient, C_{D_0} ,

* built by Development and Proof Services, Aberdeen Proving Ground




FIG. 3 HOLOGRAPHIC SHADOWGRAPH OF SECOND GENERATION GUN PROBE

TABLE I

PHYSICAL AND AERODYNAMIC PROPERTIES OF PROBE

W	20.35	Weight (lbs.)
I_y	1947.4	Transverse moment. of inertia (lb.-in. ²)
CM	24.86	Center of mass (in. from base)
d	2.629	Diameter (in.)
M	4.4	Mach number
$\sqrt{\delta^2}$	3.3	Mean-squared yaw (degrees)
C_D	0.194	Drag coefficient
C_{M_α}	- 6.1	Static moment coefficient
C_{N_α}	4.4	Normal force coefficient
CP _N	21.22	Center of pressure (in. from base)
$C_{M_q} + C_{M_\alpha}$	- 450	Damping moment coefficient
V_p	16.5	Package volume (in. ³)
V_f	7.1	Fuze volume (in. ³)
	1500	Distance for initial angle to damp to half amplitude (ft.)

of the new probe was 0.17 at a Mach number of 4.4 (Fig. 9). This value is quite superior to that of 0.30 for the first generation probe at the same Mach number. With this drag coefficient, weights of 18.5 to 20.5 lbs. ($W/C_D A$ at $M = 4.4$ in the 2900 to 3200 lb/ft² class) and the higher muzzle velocity of 5500 ft/sec (made possible by an extension on the gun), trajectory calculations indicated that the second generation probe should be capable of reaching altitudes in excess of 200,000 ft. (Fig. 10).

B. Fuze and Package

After the June 1962 tests (results given in the next section) in which the projectiles had attained good altitudes and no functions were observed, a reinvestigation of the new fuze design (described in Section III) was carried out by the BRL. To simulate the gun launching loads, the fuze was placed in a carrier and fired backward, at low velocities (approx. 300 fps), into a lead block. This impact in the lead block simulated the direction, rise-time, and peak acceleration of a normal probe launch.

These tests indicated that for load levels above 40,000 g's, the two ball detents employed in the starter would become jammed (rise time to peak pressure was too fast) and would not permit the match stick to drop onto the anvil, thereby lighting the fuze cord.* To overcome this unlocking problem, the detent was changed to a shear pin mechanism which proved to be more reliable. Other deficiencies appeared in further tests but were of a nature that should be cured by adequate manufacturing control.

The final lot of fuzes for the December 1962 tests was produced and five of the lot were tested by firing into lead. Four of the five operated acceptably, one prematured by functioning on impact. Although the premature type of failure is the most unacceptable, the "80%" success of the final lot seemed to give reasonable assurance of success.

A horizontal test of the full scale telemetry package (20 mw) was made at the Transonic Range prior to the December 1962 firing and gave good transmission after launch, indicating that it withstood the g loading.

* Actually at above 50,000 g's, the striker could override the detent even if it jammed and would function anyway.




FIG. 9 ZERO-YAW DRAG COEFFICIENTS
VS
MACH NUMBER




FIG. 10 - PREDICTED ALTITUDE VS

MUZZLE VELOCITY AND $\frac{W}{C_{D_0} A}$ (LBS./FT.²)
 VS
 $\frac{W}{C_{D_0} A}$ M = 4.4

The Picatinny flash package (described in Section III) was tested* in an altitude chamber at a pressure altitude of 100,000 ft. and yielded 375,000 ft. candle seconds. The flash unit was also fired into lead blocks at BRI, and was found to withstand 65,000 g's.

V. VERTICAL TESTS

The extended T123 tank gun was mounted on a 155mm M2 field carriage for the vertical phase of the 1962 test, and the gun carriage was again placed on an incline to increase the elevation angle to 90°.

The recorded data for the firings are given in Tables I and II. The first vertical test series, conducted in June 1962, was fired for altitude determination purposes. The firing sequence for this series included the firing of three spotting rounds, with impact charges, for programmed altitudes of 100,000, 150,000, and 200,000 ft. and these rounds were followed by the firing of three rounds with flash units to programmed altitudes of 230,000, 220,000, and 200,000 ft., respectively. The flash units were to be activated by ejection fuzes, and it was believed that photography would make altitude determinations possible.

The wind shields of the spotting rounds were weaker than those of the other rounds and were lost on those rounds programmed for 150,000 and 200,000 ft. Two of the flash rounds reached altitudes between 240,000 and 250,000 ft., according to estimates based on elapsed time of flight, but no functions were observed. The third flash round had a very short time of flight and it seems probable that it functioned on launch.

The second vertical test series, conducted in December 1962, was fired both for altitude determination and instrument package tests. The firing sequence for this series began with the firing of a spotting round for a programmed altitude of 90,000 ft. This round was followed by the firing of two rounds with "on-board" telemetry packages for initially programmed altitudes of 135,000 and 145,000 ft., and these rounds were followed by a chaff round, a telemeter round and another chaff round to altitudes of 225,000, 175,000, and 230,000 ft. Three flash rounds were then fired for programmed altitudes of 195,000, 200,000, and 200,000 ft., respectively.

* at Picatinny Arsenal

TABLE II

VERTICAL FIRING DATA

Type Round	Time of Firing	Sabot Diameter (inches)	*Flight Weight (lbs)	Chamber Pressure psi (true)	**Muzzle Velocity (ft/sec)	Programmed Altitude (ft)	***Attained Altitude (ft)
<u>7-8 June 1962</u>							
1	Spotter	5.107	18.6	24,600	4,000	100,000	65,000
2	Spotter	5.107	18.6	46,300	5,200	150,000	(a) 40,000
3	Spotter	5.107	18.6	63,600	5,600	200,000	(b) 40,000
4	Flash	5.107	19.5	59,200	5,400	230,000	(c) 250,000
5	Flash	5.107	19.5	57,500	5,350	220,000	240,000
6	Flash	5.108	19.5	59,600	5,400	200,000	(d) 40,000
<u>3-4 December 1962</u>							
1	Spotter	5.116	18.6	21,600	3,800	90,000	95,000
2	Telemetry	5.116	19.2	38,600	4,450	135,000	155,000
3	Telemetry	5.116	19.2	40,200	4,550	145,000	120,000
4	Chaff	5.117	19.8	60,000	5,300	225,000	215,000
5	Telemetry	5.118	19.2	47,300	4,900	175,000	150,000
6	Chaff	5.120	19.8	58,800	5,400	250,000	210,000
7	Flash	5.120	19.4	51,100	5,100	195,000	190,000
8	Flash	5.120	19.4	52,800	5,150	200,000	(e) 50,000
9	Flash	5.121	19.4	53,000	5,150	200,000	140,000

* Add 5.20 lbs. sabot weight for launch.

** Determined from pressure measurements.

*** Determined from flight times.

(a) Spotting nose failed during launch.

(b) Spotting nose failed during launch.

(c) Altitude is in excess of 250,000 ft. Due to abnormal flight time some observers had given up on

round, and quoted times are from only two observers.

(d) Premature function of ejection system.

(e) Premature function of ejection system.

TABLE III
VERTICAL FIRING DATA
Flight times (seconds) observed by sound

Type Round	W/C _D ₀ (lb/ft ²)	Approximate Flight Time	Gun Position	Range Central	Iego Point	Worton Point	I Field
<u>7-8 June 1962</u>							
1	2,900	126	--	--	128	--	128
2	2,900	90	93	--	--	--	90
3	2,900	267	288	266	--	257	90
4	3,040	246	264	--	255	--	283
5	3,040	90	--	--	--	--	265
6	3,040	90	--	--	--	--	90
<u>3-4 December 1962</u>							
1	2,900	155	167	174	166	156	174
2	3,000	199	220	222	215	197	224
3	3,000	174	194	193	183	180	194
4	3,090	233	246	244	227	271	248
5	3,000	195	206	207	197	207	215
6	3,000	229	240	242	243	239	238
7	3,090	220	228	235	231	238	217
8	3,030	105	111	--	111	111	111
9	3,030	186	191	--	191	201	192

During the firing program, all rounds except the next to last flash round appeared to behave normally with respect to making altitude. The next to last flash round behaved in a manner that indicates it functioned on launch. The highest powered telemetry model and two meteorite rounds were not fired; the former because it could not be turned on just prior to loading, the latter two because there seemed to be fuze functioning difficulties in the test series up to that point.

The 20-mw telemetry probe tested in the horizontal firings was just barely adequate for the vertical tests, particularly since the power level could not be determined before assembly and had ranged from 10-20 mw. After the horizontal tests, minor revisions permitted the battery power to be increased, yielding up to 100 mw of output on initial tests. These higher power units, however, exhibited a very undesirable characteristic. For some unknown reason, the emitted power decayed with time after potting and, even worse, the rate of decay was not constant but increased sharply with time. As a result, although a few days before the firing it was anticipated that power levels of 40 mw would be obtained, in actuality, all units showed very low power during pre-launch check-out tests (7 mw, 10 mw, and 10 mw, respectively). In fact, the telemetry unit which performed successfully at the Transonic Range had twice the power of the units available for the vertical test. Since the probe antennas were essentially dipoles with a deep null off the tail, it was necessary to locate the receiving station some distance from the launch site so that the receiver did not look at the antenna null. The receiving station, therefore, was located at Spesutie Island fourteen miles from the launch site. This station was not able to confirm reception of signals from any of the firings. A receiver was located at the gun for the last firing, however, and did receive a signal.

The two flash rounds which reached altitude were not observed to function. The Nike radar units were not available for tracking during the December 1962 firings and, therefore, an M33 radar, operated by Development and Proof Services, was employed for the two chaff rounds. Although the probes reached programmed altitudes, there was no sighting of chaff. Four possibilities exist; the chaff was not ejected, the chaff ejected properly but was missed by the tracking station, the chaff ejected but failed to spread, or the chaff

was expelled so far from the programmed time that it was missed in the search. Since the elapsed flight times indicated that the probes reached the programmed altitudes, it can be presumed that at least they did not function early in flight. An early function would cause an increase in drag and, hence, a short time of flight.

VI. DISPERSION OF SYSTEM

The major results of the probe firings are demonstrated in the accuracy and altitude capabilities of the gun probe system. Altitudes of about 250,000 feet were achieved and all intact rounds were contained within a circle of 1600 yards radius.

In the June firings, the desired point of impact was about 4000 yards from Lego point along a bearing of 285° (clockwise from south) (Fig. 11). The desired impact was not changed during the firings and therefore the impact points can be plotted directly. In these firings, three of the probes were damaged at launch. These rounds impacted approximately 3000 yards from the launch point. The three intact probes impacted within a 3000-yard radius circle of the target point. From these results, it is seen that the danger area is roughly shaped like an ice cream cone. It is necessary, however, to add a 2000-yard radius circle around the gun, for sabot and gas seal parts which are released at launch. It can be seen that even with damaged projectiles (and wind allowances of over 1000 yards) the rounds impacted in a well defined area.

During the December firings, the proof officer had to exercise a very positive control over the impact point, in order to be permitted to continue firing. The firings were started on December 3 with a desired impact point on an azimuth of 285° and mid-way between the ship channel and Lego point. Based on wind data taken from a balloon flight six hours before firing, a 1200-yard wind allowance was made for the first round and it impacted on water short of the target point (Fig. 12). To get a better feeling for wind conditions aloft, round 2 was deliberately fired long. This proved to be a desirable impact area and round 3 was dropped near by. After round 3, a low fog settled in the danger area and made it impossible to identify boats in the ship channel. This situation necessitated dropping the rounds into an inner target area or a cease fire. As a result, the proof officer attempted to




FIG. 11 - ROUND IMPACT AREA, JUNE 1962 FIRINGS




FIG. 12 - ROUND IMPACT AREA, DECEMBER 1962 FIRINGS




FIG. 13 - DISPERSION FOR DECEMBER 1962 FIRINGS

place round 4 in the mouth of Bush River. This was done and as the fog conditions worsened, the rounds were dropped toward the shore of Lego point. Except for round 8, which functioned early, all rounds fell quite close to the point predicted by the proof officer prior to launch. Since major changes in the desired point of impact were made several times, the plotted impacts of Figure 12 cannot be directly used to construct a dispersion pattern.

Predicted impact points were computed for each round,¹¹ except round 8, and the dispersion pattern with respect to these points is given in Fig. 13. A circle of 1600 yards radius encompasses all the rounds. All impact locations were sound ranged only, since no actual impacts were sighted by the observers. The ability to maintain control and have adequate "observation" of the impact, from the safety point of view, under adverse conditions, seemed better than would have been hoped for.

It might be noted that this impact circle of 1600 yards radius is achieved after a total flight of 100 miles. This result roughly corresponds to placing all rounds into Central Park, New York, when launching from Philadelphia.

VII. SUMMARY

1. As a result of two series of firings in 1962, the capability of a 5-inch gun to launch a fin-stabilized, low drag probe to altitudes of at least 240,000 ft. has been demonstrated.

2. Dispersion of probes which did not structurally fail was less than one mile in radius. The total ground impact area required for sabot fragments, shorts and good rounds was a rectangle with sides of four and ten miles.

3. The performance of payload packages was disappointing; however, there is no reason to believe that successful performance of the chaff, telemetry and flash packages cannot be obtained during the next firing series.

4. The highly mobile 5-inch gun probe system has demonstrated excellent capability to reach high into the upper atmosphere. The low dispersion of the system makes upper atmosphere measurements possible in many parts of the United States for which rocket firings are not feasible; although, some care is required to avoid the possibility of blast damage due to focusing effects.^{12,13}

Spence T. Marks
SPENCE T. MARKS

Eugene D. Boyer
EUGENE D. BOYER

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Cheers, B. Ultraviolet Detector Tests at High Altitudes Using Gun Fired Projectiles CARDE Internal Memo No. 0101-02, December 1959.
2. MacAllister, L. C. and Bradley, J. W. Comments on the Use of Guns to Launch High Altitude Probes BRL Memo Report No. 1252, March 1960.
3. Whiteford, J. Feasibility Test of Vertical Probe D&PS Firing Record No. P-66048, August 1961.
4. Whiteford, J. Feasibility Test of Vertical Probe D&PS Firing Record No. P-66051, September 1961.
5. Marks, S. T.; MacAllister, L. C.; Gehring, J. W.; Vitagliano, H. Douglas; and Bentley, B. T. Feasibility Test of an Upper Atmosphere Gun Probe System BRL Memo Report No. 1368, October 1961.
6. Staff, Dept. of Mechanical Engineers, Project HARP, Description and Status, Report 62-5, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, October 1962.
7. Marmo, F. F. Modifying the Upper Atmosphere Industrial Research, Vol. 4, pp. 38-42, November 1962.
8. Force, Charles T. Estimate of Sounding Rocket Trajectories from Total Time of Flight American Rocket Society Journal 32, 7, 1095-1097, July 1962.
9. Kronman, S. and Kineke, J. Explosive Devices for Projecting Hypervelocity Pellets up to 21.0 km/sec Proc. Fifth Symposium on Hypervelocity Impact Denver, Colorado, Vol. II, 21-37, April 1962.
10. Lopatin, S. Sea-Level and High-Altitude Performance of Experimental Photoflash Composition Picatinny Arsenal Technical Report FRL-TR-29, October 1961.
11. Kent, R. H. The Technique of Firing Vertically for Recovery BRL Report No. 293, July 1942.
12. Perkins, B.; Lorrain, P. H.; and Townsend, W. H. Forecasting the Focus of Air Blasts Due to Meteorological Conditions in the Lower Atmosphere, BRL Report 1118, October 1960.
13. Berning, W. W. Investigation of the Propagation of Blast Waves over Relatively Large Distances and the Damaging Possibilities of Such Propagation BRL Report 675, November 1948.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Research and Engineering), The Pentagon ATTN: Technical Library, Room 3E1065 Washington 25, D. C.	1	Hqs., U. S. Continental Army Command ATTN: ATINT-P&O Fort Monroe, Virginia
10	Commander Armed Services Technical Information Agency Arlington Hall Station ATTN: TIPCR Arlington 12, Virginia	2	Hqs., U. S. Army Electronics Command Research Division ATTN: AMSEL-RE-C Fort Monmouth, New Jersey
1	Commanding General U. S. Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCRD-RS-PE-Bal Mr. Stetson Research and Development Directorate Washington 25, D. C.	2	Hqs., U. S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-RPA Redstone Arsenal, Alabama
1	Hqs., U. S. Army Materiel Command Research Division ATTN: AMCRD-RS-ES-A Washington 25, D. C.	2	Hqs., U. S. Army Munitions Command ATTN: AMSMU-RC Dover, New Jersey
1	Hqs., U. S. Army Materiel Command Development Division ATTN: AMCRD-DE-MI Washington 25, D. C.	2	Hqs., U. S. Army Mobility Command ATTN: Research Division Centerline, Michigan
1	Commanding Officer Harry Diamond Laboratories ATTN: Technical Information Office, Branch 012 Washington 25, D. C.	2	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Cold Regions Research & Engineering Lab. ATTN: Environmental Research Branch Hanover, New Hampshire
1	Hqs., U. S. Army Combat Development Command ATTN: CDCMR-E Fort Belvoir, Virginia	2	Commanding General U. S. Army NATICK Laboratory ATTN: Earth Sciences Division Natick, Massachusetts
		1	Director U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station ATTN: WESSR Vicksburg, Mississippi

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
2	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Electronics R&D Agency ATTN: Meteorology Division, Surveillance Dept. Fort Monmouth, New Jersey	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Dugway Proving Ground ATTN: Meteorological Division Dugway, Utah
2	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Electronics R&D Activity ATTN: Meteorological Dept. Fort Huachuca, Arizona	1	President U. S. Army Artillery Board Fort Sill, Oklahoma
2	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Electronics R&D Activity ATTN: Missile Meteorology Division White Sands Missile Range New Mexico	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Communications - Electronics Combat Developments Agency Fort Huachuca, Arizona
1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Biological Labs. ATTN: Program Coordination Office Fort Detrick, Maryland	1	Commandant U. S. Army Artillery & Missile School ATTN: Target Acquisition Dept. Fort Sill, Oklahoma
1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Frankford Arsenal ATTN: MEIE Division Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Biological Labs. ATTN: CB Cloud Research Office Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland
1	Commanding Officer Picatinny Arsenal ATTN: Special Weapons Group Dover, New Jersey	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Biological Labs. ATTN: Technical Library, SMUFD-12 TI Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland
1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Engineering R&D Lab. Fort Belvoir, Virginia	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army CBR Operations Research Group Army Chemical Center, Maryland
1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Transportation Research Command Fort Eustis, Virginia	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Chemical Research & Development Laboratories ATTN: Director of Development Support Army Chemical Center, Maryland

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Commanding General Deseret Test Center Fort Douglas, Utah	2	Army Research Office ATTN: Mrs. Frances Whedon Dr. Hoyt Lemons 3045 Columbia Pike Arlington, Virginia
1	President U. S. Army Arctic Test Board Fort Greely, Alaska	1	Chief of Research and Development (OCRD) ATTN: Director/Special Weapons Missile and Space Div. Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C.
1	Hqs., U. S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-RB Redstone Arsenal, Alabama	1	Special Assistant to ASA Office, Secretary of the Army ATTN: Mr. C. L. Poor The Pentagon, Room 3E385 Washington 25, D. C.
1	Hqs., U. S. Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-RR Redstone Arsenal, Alabama	1	Commanding General U. S. Army Missile Command ATTN: Mr. P. E. Mallowney Redstone Arsenal, Alabama
1	Commanding Officer Watervliet Arsenal ATTN: Mr. Paul Netzer Watervliet, New York	2	Office of Chief of Research & Development Department of the Army ATTN: CRD/M Washington 25, D. C.
2	Commanding General U. S. Army Special Weapons Ammunition Command ATTN: ORDSW-I Technical Library Picatinny Arsenal Dover, New Jersey	1	Office of the Chief Signal Officer Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C.
1	Commanding Officer White Sands Missile Range Electronics R&D Activity Mr. Willis L. Webb New Mexico	3	Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons ATTN: DIS-33 Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.
1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Research Office (Durham) ATTN: Mr. Joseph Lane Box CM, Duke Station Durham, North Carolina	1	Chief, Bureau of Ships ATTN: R&D Division Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Commander Naval Ordnance Laboratory ATTN: Mr. M. J. Parker Dr. Paul Thurston White Oak Silver Spring 19, Maryland	2	Commander Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories ATTN: CRXL, Laurence G. Hanscom Field Bedford, Massachusetts
2	Commander U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory ATTN: Dr. Kemper Mr. David Sloan Dahlgren, Virginia	1	Director Atmospheric Sciences Programs National Science Foundation Washington 25, D. C.
1	Chief of Naval Research ATTN: CODE 427 Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	1	Director Bureau of Research & Development Federal Aviation Agency Washington 25, D. C.
1	Office of U. S. Naval Weather Service U. S. Naval Air Station Washington 25, D. C.	1	Director Bureau of Research & Development Federal Aviation Agency National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center ATTN: Technical Library, Bldg. 3 Atlantic City, New Jersey
1	Officer-in-Charge U. S. Naval Weather Research Facility U. S. Naval Air Station, Bldg. R 28 Norfolk 11, Virginia	1	Chief, Fallout Studies Branch Division of Biology and Medicine Atomic Energy Commission Washington 25, D. C.
2	APGC (PGAPI, PGW) Eglin Air Force Base Florida	2	Chief, U. S. Weather Bureau ATTN: Librarian Washington 25, D. C.
1	AFSWC (SWRP) Kirtland Air Force Base New Mexico	1	Director of Meteorological Systems Office of Applications (FM) National Aeronautics & Space Administration Washington 25, D. C.
1	Commander Air Weather Service (MATS) U. S. Air Force ATTN: AWSSS/TIPD Scott Air Force Base, Illinois	1	NASA Facility ATTN: Mr. Robert L. Kreiger Wallops Island Temperanceville, Virginia

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	NASA Goddard Space Flight Center ATTN: Mr. Karl Medrow Space Science Division Greenbelt, Maryland	1	Mr. Larry Brace Goddard Space Flight Center Greenbelt, Maryland
1	Office of Aerospace Research ATTN: RR OS-1 T-D Building Washington 25, D. C.	1	Mr. Thomas N. Gautier Assistant Chief Ionospheric Research and Propagation Laboratory National Bureau of Standards Boulder, Colorado
1	Meteorological Development Lab. ATTN: Mr. Norman Sissenwine 1065 Main Street Waltham, Massachusetts	1	Dr. Phillip Mange Astrophysics and Atmosphere Division Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D. C.
1	The Rand Corporation ATTN: Dr. W. W. Kellogg Dr. Richard Holbrook 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	1	Major J. E. Mock Defense Atomic Support Agency ATTN: DASARA-2 Washington 25, D. C.
1	Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center Public Health Service 4676 Columbia Parkway Cincinnati 26, Ohio	1	Dr. Wolfgang Pfister CRZL-GRD Air Force Cambridge Research Lab. L. G. Hanscom Field Bedford, Massachusetts
1	Harvard College Observatory ATTN: Mr. R. E. McCrosky Cambridge 38, Massachusetts	1	Dr. Henry L. Richter, Jr. Electro-Optical Systems, Inc. 300 N. Halstead Street Pasadena, California
1	Dr. G. V. Bull McGill University Montreal, Quebec, Canada	1	Dr. Gian Carlo Rumi School of Electrical Engineering Cornell University Ithaca, New York
1	Dr. Sidney Bowhill Department of Electrical Engineering University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois	1	Professor A. H. Waynick Ionospheric Research Laboratory University Park, Pennsylvania
1	Mr. Robert E. Bourdeau Space Sciences Division Goddard Space Flight Center Greenbelt, Maryland	1	Mr. Palmer Dyal Air Force Special Weapons Center Kirtland Air Force Base Albuquerque, New Mexico

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Mr. Gil Moore Astro-Meteorological Systems Group Thiokol Corporation 3340 Airport Road Ogden, Utah
1	Mr. John Nicolaidis NASA Headquarters Washington 25, D. C.
10	The Scientific Information Officer Defence Research Staff British Embassy 3100 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W. Washington 8, D. C.
4	Defence Research Member Canadian Joint Staff 2450 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W. Washington 8, D. C.

Of Interest to:

CARDE

Mr. B. Cheers

Mr. E. Greenwood

<p>AD Ballistic Research Laboratories, AFG A SECOND TEST OF AN UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM Spence T. Marks and Eugene D. Boyer</p> <p>ERL Memorandum Report No. 1464 April 1963</p> <p>RDT & E Project Nos. LA011001B021 and LM010501A005 UNCLASSIFIED Report</p>	<p>UNCLASSIFIED</p> <p>Accession No.</p> <p>Upper atmosphere - Instrumentation Gun probe - Upper atmosphere</p>
<p>AD Ballistic Research Laboratories, AFG A SECOND TEST OF AN UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM Spence T. Marks and Eugene D. Boyer</p> <p>ERL Memorandum Report No. 1464 April 1963</p> <p>RDT & E Project Nos. LA011001B021 and LM010501A005 UNCLASSIFIED Report</p> <p>The second phase of a high altitude gun probe project is presented. The project objectives, the design considerations, the proof tests, the vertical tests and the dispersion of the system are discussed. An altitude capability of at least 240,000 ft. and an impact circle requirement of one-mile radius has been demonstrated in two series of firings on the Edgewood peninsula of the Aberdeen Proving Ground. Although the performance of this fin-stabilized, five-inch projectile has been proved, the tests indicate the need for further development of data packages and fuzes.</p>	<p>UNCLASSIFIED</p> <p>Accession No.</p> <p>Upper atmosphere - Instrumentation Gun probe - Upper atmosphere</p>
<p>AD Ballistic Research Laboratories, AFG A SECOND TEST OF AN UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM Spence T. Marks and Eugene D. Boyer</p> <p>ERL Memorandum Report No. 1464 April 1963</p> <p>RDT & E Project Nos. LA011001B021 and LM010501A005 UNCLASSIFIED Report</p>	<p>UNCLASSIFIED</p> <p>Accession No.</p> <p>Upper atmosphere - Instrumentation Gun probe - Upper atmosphere</p>
<p>AD Ballistic Research Laboratories, AFG A SECOND TEST OF AN UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM Spence T. Marks and Eugene D. Boyer</p> <p>ERL Memorandum Report No. 1464 April 1963</p> <p>RDT & E Project Nos. LA011001B021 and LM010501A005 UNCLASSIFIED Report</p> <p>The second phase of a high altitude gun probe project is presented. The project objectives, the design considerations, the proof tests, the vertical tests and the dispersion of the system are discussed. An altitude capability of at least 240,000 ft. and an impact circle requirement of one-mile radius has been demonstrated in two series of firings on the Edgewood peninsula of the Aberdeen Proving Ground. Although the performance of this fin-stabilized, five-inch projectile has been proved, the tests indicate the need for further development of data packages and fuzes.</p>	<p>UNCLASSIFIED</p> <p>Accession No.</p> <p>Upper atmosphere - Instrumentation Gun probe - Upper atmosphere</p>

AD Accession No. UNCLASSIFIED
Ballistic Research Laboratories, AFG
A SECOND TEST OF AN UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM
Spence T. Marks and Eugene D. Boyer
ERL Memorandum Report No. 1464 April 1963
RDT & E Project Nos. LA011001B021 and LM010501A005
UNCLASSIFIED Report

The second phase of a high altitude gun probe project is presented. The project objectives, the design considerations, the proof tests, the vertical tests and the dispersion of the system are discussed. An altitude capability of at least 240,000 ft. and an impact circle requirement of one-mile radius has been demonstrated in two series of firings on the Edgewood peninsula of the Aberdeen Proving Ground. Although the performance of this fin-stabilized, five-inch projectile has been proved, the tests indicate the need for further development of data packages and fuzes.

AD Accession No. UNCLASSIFIED
Ballistic Research Laboratories, AFG
A SECOND TEST OF AN UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM
Spence T. Marks and Eugene D. Boyer
ERL Memorandum Report No. 1464 April 1963
RDT & E Project Nos. LA011001B021 and LM010501A005
UNCLASSIFIED Report

The second phase of a high altitude gun probe project is presented. The project objectives, the design considerations, the proof tests, the vertical tests and the dispersion of the system are discussed. An altitude capability of at least 240,000 ft. and an impact circle requirement of one-mile radius has been demonstrated in two series of firings on the Edgewood peninsula of the Aberdeen Proving Ground. Although the performance of this fin-stabilized, five-inch projectile has been proved, the tests indicate the need for further development of data packages and fuzes.

AD Accession No. UNCLASSIFIED
Ballistic Research Laboratories, AFG
A SECOND TEST OF AN UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM
Spence T. Marks and Eugene D. Boyer
ERL Memorandum Report No. 1464 April 1963
RDT & E Project Nos. LA011001B021 and LM010501A005
UNCLASSIFIED Report

The second phase of a high altitude gun probe project is presented. The project objectives, the design considerations, the proof tests, the vertical tests and the dispersion of the system are discussed. An altitude capability of at least 240,000 ft. and an impact circle requirement of one-mile radius has been demonstrated in two series of firings on the Edgewood peninsula of the Aberdeen Proving Ground. Although the performance of this fin-stabilized, five-inch projectile has been proved, the tests indicate the need for further development of data packages and fuzes.

AD Accession No. UNCLASSIFIED
Ballistic Research Laboratories, AFG
A SECOND TEST OF AN UPPER ATMOSPHERE GUN PROBE SYSTEM
Spence T. Marks and Eugene D. Boyer
ERL Memorandum Report No. 1464 April 1963
RDT & E Project Nos. LA011001B021 and LM010501A005
UNCLASSIFIED Report

The second phase of a high altitude gun probe project is presented. The project objectives, the design considerations, the proof tests, the vertical tests and the dispersion of the system are discussed. An altitude capability of at least 240,000 ft. and an impact circle requirement of one-mile radius has been demonstrated in two series of firings on the Edgewood peninsula of the Aberdeen Proving Ground. Although the performance of this fin-stabilized, five-inch projectile has been proved, the tests indicate the need for further development of data packages and fuzes.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED