AD722403



MISCELLANEOUS PAPER S-71-6

FREE-FIELD CODE PREDICTIONS VERSUS FIELD MEASUREMENTS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOR THE PRAIRIE FLAT EVENT

by

J. S. Zelasko, G. Y. Baladi



March 1971

Sponsored by Defense Atomic Support Agency

Conducted by U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi

NATIONAL TECHNICAL

64

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited

	7/
Station In	THE STOTES
H	ANCE SECTION
M	
WAA MANERO	
HE HHYDRY !!	NA SEP PARAMETER
	and a state of the
	THE REAL PROPERTY AND INCOME.
CALIFY N	HIGH ANALISEN WITH GOUSS
1	NINEL MENT
1	
1	
10	
1U	

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

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.



MISCELLANEOUS PAPER S-71-6

FREE-FIELD CODE PREDICTIONS VERSUS FIELD MEASUREMENTS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOR THE PRAIRIE FLAT EVENT

Ьу

J. S. Zelasko, G. Y. Baladi



March 1971

Sponsored by Defense Atomic Support Agency Subtask SB209

Conducted by U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi

ARMY MRC FICKSBURG MISS

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited

ABSTRACT

This report documents the results of an airblast-induced groundshock calculation performed at the U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES) for the Operation Prairie Flat 500-ton highexplosive (HE) event. A WES-modified version of the 2D axisymmetric LAYER Code developed by the Paul Weidlinger firm was used for the investigation. Each layer of the soil profile was mathematically modeled with a nonlinear elastic-plastic-compacting type constitutive model that provided good fits to the available material property test data. Field airblast measurements were used to develop an airblast routine suitable for code input. The code results, carried to 300 msec of real time, showed good quantitative and qualitative agreement with the field ground-motion measurements in regions outside the crater zone.

The calculations reported herein represent initial efforts at WES to conduct comprehensive parametric studies of the effectiveness of contemporary mathematical constitutive models in predicting airblast-induced ground motions for several high-explosive field tests. The overall research program includes study of the influences of computational details such as boundary conditions, grid size, and time step and comparative analyses of the calculated ground motions and those recorded during the field test events.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK

PREFACE

This report was prepared for presentation at the Eric H. Wang Symposium on Protective Structures Technology held at the Air Force Weapons Laboratory, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, 21-23 July 1970.

The calculations and analyses reported herein were performed for the Defense Atomic Support Agency under Subtask SB209, "Propagation of Ground Shock Through Earth Media," by personnel of the Soils Division, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES). In addition to the authors, Dr. J. S. Zelasko and Dr. G. Y. Baladi, other engineers actively engaged in this study were Mr. J. G. Jackson, Jr., Dr. N. Rhadakrishnan, and PFC B. R. Phillips.

The work was accomplished under the general supervision of Messrs. J. P. Sale and R. G. Ahlvin, Chief and Assistant Chief, respectively, WES Soils Division, and Mr. R. W. Cunny, Chief, Soil Dynamics Branch.

Directors of the WES during the preparation and publication of this report were COL Levi A. Brown, CE, and COL Ernest D. Peixotto, CE. Technical Director was Mr. F. R. Brown.

CONTENTS

ABSTRAC	T	3
PREFACE		4
CONVERS	ION FACTORS, BRITISH TO METRIC UNITS OF MEASUREMENT	8
CHAPTER	1 INTRODUCTION	9
1.1 1.2	Background Purpose and Scope	9 10
CHAPTER	2 CONSTITUTIVE MODEL DESCRIPTION	11
2.1 2.2	Material Model Parameters Representative Soil Properties and Model Construction	11
2.3	Model Fits	14 15
CHAPTER	3 COMPUTATION DETAILS	37
3.1 3.2	Coded ProblemAir Overpressure Function	37 37
CHAPTER	4 RESULTS	43
4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4	General Preliminary Code Studies Vertical Motions Radial Motions	43 43 45 47
CHAPTER	5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	61
REFEREN	CES	62
TABLES		
2.1 1 3.1 1	Material Model Description Surface Overpressure Function Parameters	18 40
FIGURES		
2.1 2.2 2.3	Compacting hydrostat Yield condition Types of representative uniaxial strain material property	19 20
2.4	test data supplied for constitutive model analyses Comparison of representative dynamic uniaxial strain relations to 2,000 psi with model fit; Zone 1, Prairie	21
2.5 (FlatComparison of representative dynamic uniaxial strain relations to 500 psi with model fit; Zone 1, Prairie	22
J	Flat	23

2.0	Comparison of representative dynamic stress paths in uniaxial strain with model fit; unloading from vertical stress levels of 1,000 and 2,000 psi; Zone 1, Prairie	
2.7	Commarison of representative dynamic stress paths in	24
•	uniaxial strain with model fit; unloading from vertical	05
28	stress levels of 250 and 500 psi; Zone 1, Prairie Flat	25
	relations with model fit; Zone 2, Prairie Flat	26
2.)	Comparison of representative dynamic stress paths in	~-
2 10	uniaxial strain with model fit; Zone 2, Prairie Flat	27
ú. . 1 0	relations with model fit; Zone 3, Prairie Flat	28
2.11	Comparison of representative dynamic stress paths in	
	uniaxial strain with model fit; Zone 3, Prairie Flat	29
5.15	Comparison of representative dynamic uniaxial strain	30
2.13	Comparison of representative dynamic stress paths in	J¢
	uniaxial strain with model fit; Zone 4, Prairie Flat	31
2.14	Comparison of representative dynamic uniaxial strain	20
2 14	Contarison of representative dynamic stress paths in	32
· · 1 /	uniaxial strain with model fit; Zone 5, Prairie Flat	33
2.10	Comparison of representative dynamic stress paths in	
0 10	Uniaxial strain with model fit; Zone 6, Prairie Flat	34
• • •	depth: Prairie Flat	35
2.18	Comparison of representative dynamic shear strength	
	properties, Zones 1 through 6, Prairie Flat	36
·.1	Schematic representation of coded Prairie Flat boundary	Ъ
3.2	Comparison of mathematical fit with Prairie Flat air	41
	overpressure measurements at selected ground ranges	42
4.1	Results of grid-size parameter study at 800-psi contour	49
4.2	forms with field measurements: range 220 feet: Prairie	
	Flat	50
4.3	Comparison of computed vertical particle velocity wave-	
	forms with field measurements; range 330 feet; Prairie	51
4.4	Comparison of computed vertical displacement waveforms)1
	with field measurements; range 220 feet; Prairie Flat	52
4.5	Comparison of computed vertical displacement waveforms	F ^
4	With field measurements; range 330 feet; Prairie Flat	23
	cle velocity and lisplacement attenuations versus depth;	
	range 220 feet; Frairie Flat	54
	,	

4.7	Comparison of measured and computed peak vertical particle velocity and displacement attenuations versus depth: range 330 feet: Prairie Flat	55
4.8	Computed attenuations of peak stress; ranges 220 and 330 feet; Prairie Flat	56
4.9	Comparison of computed radial particle velocity wave- forms with field measurements; range 220 feet; Prairie	57
4.10	Comparison of computed radial particle velocity wave- forms with field measurements; range 330 feet; Prairie	58
4.11	Comparison of computed radial displacement waveforms	,0
	with field measurements; range 220 feet; Prairie Flat	59
4.12	Comparison of computed radial displacement waveforms	
	with field measurements; range 330 feet; Prairie Flat	60

.

CONVERSION FACTORS, BRITISH TO METRIC UNITS OF MEASUREMENT

British units of measurement used in this report can be converted to metric units as follows.

Multiply	Ву	To Obtain
inches	2.54	centimeters
reet	0.3048	meters
tons (2,000 pounds)	907.185	kilograms
pounds per square inch	0.070307	kilograms per square centimeter
kips per square inch	70 .307	kilograms per square centimeter
pounds per cubic foot	16 .018 5	kilograms per cubic meter

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The state-of-the-art in constitutive modeling of earth materials for free-field ground-shock calculation purposes is continually being upgraded to incorporate new developments both in theory and material property evaluation. As a consequence, each new major calculation project is usually performed with a supposedly improved model of the pertinent site materials. However, very little research effort has been devoted to an assessment of the degree of improvement, if any, that the newer models actually provide. This information gap is currently of concern to theoreticians and experimentalists alike, since a number of serious objections have recently been raised to the continued use of many contemporary models.

Under sponsorship of the Defense Atomic Support Agency (DASA), the U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES) has recently initiated a program to evaluate a variety of contemporary constitutive models by performing parametric code calculations against well-documented field test events. Operation Prairie Flat, a 500-ton¹ high-explosive (HE) event executed 9 August 1968 (Reference 1) at the Watching Hill Test Range, Suffield, Alberta, Canada, was the first event chosen for study in this research program.

Nonlinear elastic-plastic-compacting (NEPC) models have been the mainstay of the code community during the past few years. As implied by their name, these models exhibit behavior defined by elasticity and theory of perfect plasticity, as well as compaction behavior; the

¹ A table of factors for converting British units of measurement to metric units is presented on page 8.

latter mechanism predicts mechanical hysteresis during a cycle of virgin loading and unloading through subyield stress paths. In general, the NEPC models are prescribed by specification of a plastic yield criterion and flow rule, a nonlinear compacting hydrostat, and one other elastic parameter such as Poisson's ratio ν or shear modulus G. Both ν and G have recently seen wide service formulated either as functions of the first stress invariant or as constants. The first model chosen for the calculation study was a mixed constant ν constant G NEPC model. This model, called the hybrid ν -G, is a recent innovation resulting from WES collaboration with Applied Theory, fnc., on a Minuteman study sponsored by the Air Force Space and Missile Systems Organization.

To date, one large two-dimensional (2D) calculation, using the hybrid \vee -G model, has been carried out to a real time of 300 msec. A mathematic... 'dealization of the Prairie Flat surface overpressure history between the nominal 1500- and 40-psi contours (range = 84 and 560 feet, respectively) was developed at WES for this purpose. The code used for this effort was a WES-modified version of the Weidlinger axisymmetric LAYER Code (Reference 2) adapted for use on an accessible GE-635 computer.

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The primary purpose of this report is to document a code-based analysis of the Prairie Flat ground motions at intermediate ranges.

The material model and the mathematical fits to representative Prairie Flat soil properties for six idealized layers are described in Chapter 2. Details of the coded problem and the mathematical airblast routine are contained in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, the code results are compared with field measurements at selected intermediate ground ranges and an analysis of the event up to 300 msec from detonation is presented. Conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 2

CONSTITUTIVE MODEL DESCRIPTION

2.1 MATERIAL MODEL PARAMETERS

The material hydrostat is shown in Figure 2.1. Changes in dynamic mean normal stress P_{dyn} and volumetric strain ϵ_{kk} are defined by three polynomial functions:

$$P_{\ell} = P_{g} + \sum_{n=1}^{m} A_{n} (\epsilon_{max})^{n}$$
 (1)

$$P_{u} = P_{g} + \sum_{n=1}^{m} B_{n} (\epsilon_{kk} - \epsilon_{s})^{n} , \quad \epsilon_{s} < \epsilon_{kk} \le \epsilon_{max}$$
(2)

$$\epsilon_{s} = \sum_{n=1}^{m} c_{n} (\epsilon_{max})^{n}$$
(3)

where:

1

 P_g = static mean normal overburden stress¹

$$P_{g} = \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{\gamma_{i} [1 + 2\nu_{i} / (1 - \nu_{i})]}{3} dZ$$

where: γ_i = wet unit weight of ith layer.

 v_i = initial static Poisson's ratio of the ith layer (not necessarily = initial dynamic v). For the calculations reported herein v_i = 0.5 was assumed for each layer.

Z = depth coordinate.

$$\begin{split} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\max} &= \text{maximum volumetric strain achieved} \\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_s &= \text{permanent set relative to a closed cycle of} \\ & \text{dynamic mean normal stress change} \\ & \mathbb{A}_n, \, \mathbb{B}_n, \, \text{and} \, \mathbb{C}_n &= \text{material coefficients} \\ & \text{When } \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{kk} < \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_s \,, \, \mathbb{P}_u \quad \text{is computed from} \end{split}$$

$$P_{u} = P_{g} + B_{l}(\epsilon_{kk} - \epsilon_{s})$$
(4)

where: B₁ = slope of the unloading hydrostat at zero dynamic mean normal stress.

Equations 1, 2, and 4 determine the slopes of the hydrostat to be unique functions of mean normal stress. To avoid energy generation problems, at any given mean normal stress level

$$\frac{dP_{\ell}}{d\epsilon_{kk}} \le \frac{dP_{u}}{d\epsilon_{kk}}$$
(5)

The material is assumed to be fractured for stress states $P_u \leq 0$ (soils exhibit little or no tensile strength); when this occurs, P_u and each individual deviator stress are set equal to zero.

The hybrid v-G model is initially a constant Poisson's ratio NEPC model during virgin loading. Therefore, the loading shear modulus can be obtained from the slope of the loading hydrostat by

$$G_{\ell} = \frac{3(1 - 2\nu_{\ell})}{2(1 + \nu_{\ell})} \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{m} nA_{n}(\epsilon_{max})^{n-1}$$
(6)

where: v_{ρ} = loading Poisson's ratio.

However, the value of G computed from Equation 6 is constrained to have a definite upper limit G_{\max} . Thus, at a prescribed mean normal

stress level, virgin loading switches to a constant-G ($G_{\ell} = G_{max}$) NEPC model.

The unloading shear modulus is a constant for a given cycle of unloading-reloading, but the value of the constant is a function of the maximum mean normal stress, i.e.

$$G_{u} = f(P_{max}) \tag{7}$$

Therefore, the unloading shear modulus can be determined from

$$G_{u} = \frac{3(1 - 2v_{u})}{2(1 + v_{u})} \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{m} nB_{n}(\epsilon_{max} - \epsilon_{s})^{n-1}$$
(8)

where: $v_u =$ unloading Poisson's ratio (a constant). In general, $v_u \neq v_\ell$. The value of G computed from Equation 8 is also constrained by G_{max} . Thus, according to Equation 5, at any mean normal stress level,

$$G_{\ell} \leq G_{u} \leq G_{max}$$
 (9)

Equations 5 and 9 state that the material can exhibit hysteresis in shear as well as in compression for all virgin loading cycles. Equations 5, 6, 8, and 9 specify that the material cannot, under any circumstances, generate energy.

The material description is completed by specification of a failure, or yield, surface and a flow rule. In order to realistically match typical soil shear strength data, a modified form of the yield function proposed by Drucker and Prager (Reference 3) was adopted. This form, widely accepted in recent years by all major calculators, is written as a polynomial function of dynamic mean normal stress (Figure 2.2)

$$\sqrt{J_2'} = \sum_{n=1}^{m} D_n (P_{dyn})^{n-1}$$
 (10)

where: $J_2' = \text{second invariant of the stress deviator tensor.}$ At low stress levels the material exhibits Coulomb type yield behavior, but transitions into Von Mises behavior at higher stresses. Beyond the point at which the slope of Equation 10 becomes zero $(P_{dyn} > P_c$, Figure 2.2).

$$\sqrt{J_2'} = Constant$$
 (11)

The code calculations reported in this report utilized the Von Mises flow rule. Because the Prairie Flat soils above the groundwater table generally exhibit Coulomb yield behavior, this rule is nonassociative in these materials.

2.2 REPRESENTATIVE SOIL PROPERTIES AND MODEL CONSTRUCTION PROCEDURES

Laboratory material property tests and data analyses for Operation Prairie Flat were accomplished as a separate, though related, task under the DASA nuclear weapons effects research program at WES. The outcome of this task resulted in the division of the Prairie Flat profile into six idealized horizontal layers or zones. The density and depth to bottom of each zone are listed at the top of Table 2.1. For each zone, representative dynamic load-unload stress-strain and stress path relations for uniaxial strain (UX), Figure 2.3, and values of v_{ℓ} were made available for constitutive model analyses.

Construction of a constant Poisson's ratio NEPC model, well documented in Reference 4, is a relatively straightforward procedure.

This procedure was used, along with the representative UX stressstrain relations and v_a values, to construct loading and unloading hydrostats for each of the six zones, assuming the materials possessed nonassociated flow rules. Then, guided by the representative unloading UX stress paths, variations in $\,G_{max}^{}\,$ and $\,\nu_{u}^{}\,$ were parametrically studied for each zone. This effort, coordinated with the WES material property testing and data analysis group, eventually led to the selection of representative values of G_{max} and v_{u} . These values are listed along with all other pertinent model parameters for each zone in Table 2.1. NU in the table is v; PC = P_c; EFFK is the value of the constant in Equation 11; coefficients A , AM , AU , and AY define the polynomials for the loading hydrostat, the permanent set, the unloading hydrostat, and the yield condition, respectively; GZ and EMZ are the initial shear and constrained moduli, respectively; P-VEL and S-VEL are the initial elastic compression and shear wave speeds; EZ is the initial Young's modulus; and KMAX and EM are irrelevant to this report.

2.3 MODEL FITS

Figure 2.4 compares the representative Zone 1 UX stress-strain relations with the model fits; Figure 2.5 shows the low stress-level fits at an expanded scale. In Figures 2.6 and 2.7 the corresponding Zone 1 stress path comparisons are presented. As an aid to the identification of the stress paths, significant stress states have been labeled; point A defines the intersection of the representative loading path with the yield surface, point 1 defines the model loading path and yield surface intersection, points B and 2, respectively, define representative and model unloading departure states, and points C and 3, respectively, locate the states at which the representative and model unloading paths intersect the lower yield surface.

Figures 2.4 through 2.7 indicate that in Zone 1 good quality fits

were obtained for both types of UX data over the entire stress range considered (0 to 2000 psi); however, because the model incorporates strain-axis translation for the unloading hydrostat, the soft hooks at the bottoms of the UX unloading stress-strain curves could not be matched without creating energy-generation problems in the model.² Comparisons of the representative and modeled UX relations for Zones 2 through 6 are shown in Figures 2.8 through 2.16.

Material behavior within the first three zones is characterized by very low constrained moduli during virgin loading in uniaxial strain and large hysteretic strain energy loss upon unloading due to very high air void contents and low densities. The relation for Zone 4 is somewhat stiffer and less hysteretic due to increased density, increased geostatic overburden confinement, and decreased air void content. This trend continues very sharply into Zone 5 (which underlies the groundwater table³) and culminates in Zone 6 with a condition of full saturation and a constrained loading modulus approximately that of water. The stiffness variations between Zone 1 and 6 differ by almost two orders of magnitude as indicated in Figure 2.17 where the initial constrained modulus has been plotted versus depth.

Shear strength also varies significantly with depth as shown in Figure 2.18. The saturated and nearly saturated materials in the vicinity of the groundwater table exhibit little or no increase in strength with increasing mean normal stress, whereas the upper, high

² Use of an associated flow rule would provide improved agreement with the UX unloading hooks. This is one of the model parameters under consideration for future Prairie Flat calculations.

³ Just prior to the Prairie Flat test, piezometer readings determined a depth to groundwater of approximately 23 feet.

initial air void content materials show large increases in strength with increasing mean normal stress.

.

TABLE 2.1. MATERIAL MODEL DESCRIPTION

TIELD CUNDITION. SUJ2+AT(I)+SUM(AT(N+1)+P++N), N=1,2,3,....4 P+LT+PC S0 J2= fifk P.0T+PG PHESSUMF .GT+OF+E4+ ZERO FLUM RULG - MISES ITFE

PHESSURE - VOLUME RELATION INITIAL (UADING, PMAX(ERK)=SUM(A(N)=ERK==N) WHENE, N= 1,2,3....10 UNLUADING-RELDADING, P=SUM(AU(N)=DELERK==N) WHENE, N= 1,2,3....10 DELERR=ERN =EPS2(FKRMAX) EPS20SUM(AN(N)=FPSAAS UNLUADING DEVIATOR RELATION NU=CONST.FUN G LESS IMAN @MAX ELSE GL=GMAX UNLUADING DEVIATOR RELATION GUN=CONSTANT=MIN(GON(PMAX), GMAX)

LAYEH	1	2	ذ	4	5	•
UEFIN FE	0.844	12.008	18.048	24.080	13.000	
DENSIIT PCF	42.040	94.508	146.000	117.588	121.000	121.500
LUAD. NU	8 . 3 9 m 9	0.2000	0.3200	0.3800	8.4288	0.4/00
UNL. NO	1.30.0	8.2688		0.3880	4.4248	8.4/88
PL KST	2.0000	2.0900	2.0848	1.5000	1.2000	2.0440
1111 N.1	11.2425	6.7446	9.4047	4.1/32	0.0643	8-8346
ANAL ASI	59.50	14.1.00	150.04	144.00		
CHAI ASI	9	40 00	15.00	18.88	24.48	15.44
100m - 0.01	-u. Iniuus ou		-0.2.1.504	-8.476886-81	-8.128885 -01	
A(1) A.I	0 tanket	4.211986 01		4.684106 81	8.14114L 47	4.254885 Gt
	-0 11542		-4 142741 02	-0 A78765 A3	-1 148446 44	
	-0.119921 01	0.033NUE 01			1 714704E 04	
	-0.320/01 03	U.410746 U/			8.7.1.97YE 87	
		-0.009/36 0/				
4197 KS1	-4.103361 45	V .	-U./UU3VE 44	0.112046 0/	0.3/303E 0V	V •
ALD F ANE	0.134826 02		0.35758E US		-1.48/VZE 8V	
A(7) 451	-0.202308 07		-0.7/JUOE 07		0.00544F NO	
A(8) NUL	0.					
ALVE KSI	U .	¥.		••		
ACLUD ASI	· .	¥•	0.			
AMIL)	0.3720112 00	8.21384F BU	0.43776E 00	8.001525.01	4.8473/E-41	8-1000/E UV
ARCO	-0.34350L 01	-0.1H1V3E 02	• 8.22347E UZ	*0.1104/8 02	-0.03404F 08	
	-0.770512 02	-U.J7/78E U)	•0.01113E 03	8.2//JLE 84	0.710416 07	
APR 4 2	-0.304631 63	-0.40/40L U4	-0.14/301 03	0.211346 00	0.14/336 00	
AM(9)	-0.102110 04	-0.304778 07	-0.12272L 00	8+0/0/2E U/	0.2/3/4E 10	
4M(0)	-0.151/6E 04	-0.14/18E 00	-0.914071 00	8.18439E 89	0.1/042F 15	
AMC73	-0.434511 03	-0.50/008 00	-0.4414/1 0/	8.62865E 8Y	0.40585F J3	# •
AR(d)	U .	-0.54/988 86	-0.132411 00	U •	0.	••
●無じみ 3	0.	U .	-0.2/3986 88	••		••
AM(10)	0.	U .	-0.10313E UØ	••	•	¥•
AU(1) 451	0.031/46 01	W.35273E W1	0.398346 01	8+69287E 81	8.17982E 82	A.7000AE A7
AU121 ASL	-0.151346 #3	8.9149JE 83	0.41843E U4	#+15548E #J	0.40809E 04	
AUL31 K51	0.17338E 85	-U.133/4E UO	-0.13863E U7	-0.14835E 85	8.14888E U7	
AU(4) #51	+0.75H45E 06	U.16049E BH	0.51930F 08	8.94078E 87	-8.317296 18	.
AU(5) K'I	0.15320+ 07	-0.58/486 04	-*.138111 11	-0.10888E 10	0.13952E 13	1.
AULAS ASE	0.	0./3189E 10	0.3998AE 12	0.97921E 11	-0.13531E 15	
40(7) K 51	0.	0.205216 11	-0.435911 13	0.	¥.	
AUCH) KSI	ο.	U.	٥.	U .		U .
AUL91 #51	0.	υ.		θ.		
AU(10) KSE	0.	۷.	•.	4		
47(1) ASL	0.134476-01	0.125M7E-01	0.11716t-#1	0.896518-82	8.89140E-02	#.1J967E-#1
41(2)	0.317451 10	4.77450E 00	0.431316 00	0.23581E 00	0.11016E 00	W.26448E-81
AT432 +51-1	-0.187721 01	-0.3951AE 00	-0.15336E 00	-U.11689E 0D	-#.74371E-01	-#.12465E-01
AT(4) +51-2	0.252/31 01	U. #9433E-01	0.1#327E-01	0.224366-01	0.19141E-01	#.22218E-#2
AT(") +51-3	-0.184961 01	υ,	0.	V.		
AT(6) 851-4	0.6H358E UU	u.	υ.	ο.	0.	
ATL/J ASI-5	-0.919641-11	υ.	0.	0.	1.	
ATIAL ASI-6	0.	u.	0.	0.	0.	0.
ATIVE ASI-7	0.	U.,	0.	9 e	0.	
AVILUDESI-H	α.	0.		υ.	0.	
62 ASI	1.348	1.200	1.411	1.550	2.758	15.300
EM4 ASE	4.859	3.944	5.329	8.489	19.993	270.408
42 ASI	3.610	3.089	3.724	4.278	7.832	45.000
P-VFI PPS	494.7	440.0	4112.6	561.4	\$/4.9	3211.1
S- YFL Fra	264.4	243.2	248.3	247.2	324.9	764.0

18

ومعاللا منتقب منافعها فمتعادية فتلافئه كالبرسي كالأخاص والأقافة فالمتحد وليكرك والمتحد والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع











Figure 2.3 Types of representative uniaxial strain material property test data supplied for constitutive model analyses.



Figure 2.4 Comparison of representative dynamic uniaxial strain relations to 2,000 psi with model fit; Zone 1, Prairie Flat.







Figure 2.6 Comparison of representative dynamic stress paths in uniaxial strain with model fit; unloading from vertical stress levels of 1,000 and 2,000 psi; Zone 1, Prairie Flat.



ŧ.



25



Figure 2.8 Comparison of representative dynamic uniaxial strain relations with model fit; Zone 2, Prairie Flat.







Figure C.10 Comparison of representative dynamic uniaxial strain relations with model fit; Zone 3, Frairie Flat.



t





Figure 2.12 Comparison of representative dynamic uniaxial strain relations with model fit; Zone 4, Prairie Flat.











Figure 2.15 Comparison of representative dynamic stress paths in uniaxial strain with model fit; Zone 5, Prairie Flat.











Figure 2.18 Comparison of representative dynamic shear strongth properties, Zones 1 through 6, Prairie Flat.

·36

CHAPTER 3 COMPUTATION DETAILS

3.1 CODED PROBLEM

The coded problem is shown schematically in Figure 3.1. The region considered for the calculation extended horizontally from ground zero (GZ) to a range of 555 feet and vertically to a depth of 75 feet. The bottom boundary was specified to be rigid-fixed, the far boundary was set free of radial gradients of stress, and the symmetry axis was, of course, free of shear stress and able to move vertically only. A mathematical air overpressure routine developed at WES was used to prescribe the time-dependent surface boundary condition; discussed in detail in the next section, this routine smoothly describes the actual Prairie Flat overpressure history between the nominal 1,500- and 40-psi contours (range = 84 and 560 feet, respectively). Between ground zero and 84 feet, an artificial pulse was applied to the surface.

A 3-foot square grid size and a time step of 0.5 msec were used to carry the 2D finite-difference calculation to a real time (from detonation) of 300 msec. The problem required approximately 3 hours of computer processor time.

3.2 AIR OVERPRESSURE FUNCTION

Airblast measurements obtained during the Prairie Flat event (Reference 5) were utilized to develop a mathematical expression for overpressure as an exponential interpolation function of range and time. In constructing the function, measured arrival times, peak pressures, and impulses were preserved as closely as possible.

The functional form of the derived fit (valid for ranges between 84 and 560 feet) is patterned after that used in the Weidlinger calculation of Event Distant Plain 1A (Reference 2):

$$\sigma_{zz}(R,t) = A(R) \times \left(B \exp \left\{ -A_{1}(R) \times \left[t - t_{a}(R) - t_{r} \right] \right\} \right) \\ + C \exp \left\{ -A_{2}(R) \times \left[t - t_{a}(R) - t_{r} \right] \right\} \right) \times \left[1 - \frac{t - t_{a}(R) - t_{r}}{t_{d}(R)} \right] \\ \times U \left[t - t_{a}(R) \right] \times U \left[t_{a}(R) + t_{d}(R) + t_{r} - t \right]$$
(12)
where:
$$\sigma_{zz} = \text{surface pressure (tension considered positive), kips/in^{2}}$$

W

R = ground range, feett = time in milliseconds $U(\mathbf{x})$ = unit step functions $A_1(R)$ and $A_2(R)$ = functions related by

$$A_1(R) = 10A_2(R) = \frac{14.0}{t_d(R)}$$
 (13)

and B and C are constants:

The peak amplitude A(R) , the arrival time $t_a(R)$, and the positive duration $t_d(R)$ functions are determined from expressions of the form

$$f(R) = f_{i} + \frac{(f_{i+1} - f_{i})}{(R_{i+1} - R_{i})^{\alpha}} (R - R_{i})^{\alpha} \qquad R_{i} \le R \le R_{i+2}$$
(14)

where the exponent is given by

$$\alpha = \frac{ln \left[(f_{i+1} - f_i) / (f_{i+2} - f_i) \right]}{ln \left[(R_{i+1} - R_i) / (R_{i+2} - R_i) \right]}$$
(15)

Experimental values of arrival time, peak overpressure, and the adjusted positive durations used in the above equations are given in Table 3.1. A constant rise time $t_r = 0.25$ msec was appended to the overpressure function to provide agreement with the field airblast measurements.

In the region $0 \le R < 84$ feet, the artificial overpressure applied to the surface was $\sigma_{zz}(84, t)$ with

$$t_{a}(R) = t_{a}(84) \times \frac{R}{84}$$
 (16)

The quality of the airblast fit is depicted in Figure 3.2, where it is compared with field measurements at ground ranges of 84, 220, 330, and 560 feet.

Ground Range R	Arrival Time t _a (R)	Peak Overpressure -A(R)	Positive Duration $t_{\hat{d}}(R)$
feet	msec	kips/sq in	msec
84	5.3	1.5174	11.1
140	11.0	0.8103	13.9
220	22.2	0.495	25.0
240	25.4	0.3966	45.0
400	63.5	0.1063	110.0
475	89.7	0.0744	135.0
560	125.5	0.0378	250.0

TABLE 3.1 SURFACE OVERFRESSURE FUNCTION PARAMETERS



Figure 3.1 Schematic representation of coded Prairie Flat boundary value problem.

1 The main many transmission of the second statement of the second statement is a first forward with the second statement is



Figure 3.2 Comparison of mathematical fit with Prairie Flat air overpressure measurements at selected ground ranges.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

4.1 GENERAL

The field data utilized in this report were obtained from the Project Officer in charge of the WES ground-motion measurement experiment for Operation Prairie Flat. A description of the WES experiment and portions of the measured data have been published (Reference 6). The measurements are considered reliable; however, they are still subject to future modification.

The results of the 2D calculation are compared with the field measurements at two intermediate ground ranges, R = 220 feet (nominal 500-psi contour) and R = 330 feet (nominal 200-psi contour), where code output was least prone to artificial boundary influences. Computed waveforms at depths of 1.5, 4.5, 10.5, and 16.5 feet are compared with corresponding field data obtained at depths of 1.5, 5.0, 10.0, and 17.0 feet.

4.2 PRELIMINARY CODE STUDIES

Prior to the 2D calculation, a series of one-dimensional (1D) runs were made, using the nominal 800-psi contour overpressure pulse, to parametrically study the effect of grid size and time step. This study showed that time-step variations satisfying the Courant criterion (Reference 7) would have negligible effect on the computed vertical waveforms. However, it also showed that grid-size variations would significantly influence computed peak stresses and particle velocities in the immediate vicinity of the surface.

The results of the grid-size study are summarized in Figure 4.1 where the attenuations of computed peak vertical particle velocity are compared for grid dimensions of 0.75, 1.5, and 3.0 feet; field data obtained at this range (140 feet) and the results of the 2D calculation are included in the figure for completeness sake. As grid size increased, more and more of the high-frequency spike of the airblast front was lost in the 1D calculations; however, little impulse was lost as a result, and below a depth of about 5 feet, the calculated peaks converged (as did the remainder of the waveforms). This study indicated that a very fine grid is needed in the vicinity of the surface to minimize ground shock underprediction for HE tests conducted at the Watching Hill site.

The 2D calculation suffered an even greater loss of the highfrequency airblast spike due to horizontal as well as vertical gridsize effects. The surface node at this range did not experience its mathematically predicted peak overpressure (810 psi, Table 3.1) during the incremental sweep of the airblast function; it only saw a peak of 732 psi. This accounts for a portion of the 1D-2D discrepancy in Figure 4.1. This problem can be alleviated somewhat (if running time is not a problem) by reducing the time step.

Another series of one-dimensional runs were made using the overpressure pulses pertinent to the 800- and 200-psi contours in order to assess the influence of the rigid bottom boundary location on code output in this region. Rigid boundaries at depths of 75, 150, and 250 feet were considered (bedrock at the site is located in the vicinity of 250 feet). The results showed detectable quantitative, but not qualitative, differences in the vertical motions at later times. The differences were sufficiently minor to suggest running the first 2D calculation of the Prairie Flat constitutive model parameter study with the 75-foot-deep boundary. The influences of the bottom boundary location on the late-time computed horizontal motions will be assessed in future 2D calculations.

4.3 VERTICAL MOTIONS

Figures 4.2 and 4.3 show comparisons of the experimental and computed vertical particle-velocity waveforms at the 220- and 330-foot ranges, respectively. The correlations are quite favorable at all locations. The oscillations in the computed waveforms are partially due to the numerical techniques employed in the code and partially due to real stress-wave interactions in the multilayered profile; separation of these effects also awaits additional calculations.

As suggested by the grid-size effects study, the computed peaks at the 1.5-foot depth at both ranges are lower than the measured peaks by about a factor of two. The discrepancy in the peaks at depth 17 feet, range 330 feet, is partially attributable to the fact that the gage recorded an early-arriving outrunning signal well prior to the arrival of the local airblast energy.

Comparisons of the computed and measured vertical displacement waveforms at the 220- and 330-foot ranges are shown in Figures 4.4 and 4.5, respectively. The measurements represent integrated particle-velocity gage records. The agreements are generally good although the phasing of the computed waveforms appears to lag that of the measurements. The late-time measurement at depth 1.5 feet, range 220 feet, is suspect.

Ground shock attenuation with depth at the 220- and 330-foot ranges is summarized in Figures 4.6 and 4.7, respectively, where computed peak vertical particle velocities and displacements are compared with the measured peaks. The dashed portions of the computed curves are a reminder that the calculated peaks are questionable in the vicinity of the surface (see Figure 4.1).

The combined effects of the short duration of the Prairie Flat airblast pulse and the highly compressible and energy-absorbing nature of the materials in the upper mones of the profile resulted in an

initially extremely rapid attenuation of incident peak vertical velocity and stress with depth. As the groundwater table was approached, further reductions in incident peak velocity occurred while peak stresses were simultaneously enhanced due to reflection-refraction phenomena at the higher impedance interfaces. Figure 4.8 shows the computed attenuation of peak dynamic vertical, radial, and mean normal stresses versus depth for the 220- and 330-foot ranges.

The calculation revealed that the major upward-traveling reflected stress pulse generated when the incident wave impinged on the stiff materials in the vicinity of the groundwater table was a significant factor in arresting or reversing the downward momentum of the materials above the water table. In its subsequent refraction from the surface (which by then was free of positive overpressure), this pulse became a tensile rarefaction that imparted new or additional upward momentum to the near-surface soils, spalling or fracturing them as it passed (i.e., the tension cutoff, Chapter 2, was invoked). The spalled materials essentially behaved as groups of free particles acted upon only by gravity with each particle having an initial velocity vector. Eventually, after following ballistic trajectories, the particles came back into contact with one another to reconstitute the continuum. This phenomenon can be readily observed in the velocity waveforms shown in Figures 4.2 and 4.3. Near-surface spalling occurred in the time period 100 to 125 msec at range 220 feet and in the period 125 to 150 msec at range 330 feet. Both the calculation and the measurements indicate that the vertical velocities decrease at an approximately linear rate (≈32.2 ft/sec²) for periods ranging from 100 to 200 msec after spall inception. This free-fall effect was computed at all code output ranges.

4.4 RADIAL MOTIONS

Calculated radial velocity waveforms are compared with the field measurements at ground ranges of 220 and 330 feet in Figures 4.9 and 4.10, respectively. The peak radial velocities are smaller than the vertical peaks by approximately one order of magnitude; this indicates that a highly superseismic condition existed at these depths and ground ranges. The computed motions at early times generally agree in form and magnitude with the measurements. For example, first-arrival outward velocity peaks show lie e or no attenuation with depth and the consistently computed shear-wave-induced reversals immediately behind the first peaks have detectable counterparts in the data; however, as discussed in the previous section, the computed near-surface peaks are probably low because of grid-size effects. The individual oscillations beyond the first full cycle are partially due to realistic reflection-refraction phenomena and partially due to unrealistic numerical noise. Late-time correlations at range 220 feet could be improved by considering the higher energy inputs closer to ground zero. Further calculations are required to clarify these details.

The computed radial velocities at depth 1.5 feet at both ground ranges are constant at later times as a result of the near-surface spall; these are the horizontal components of the ballistic trajectories discussed previously.

The 10- and 17-foot-deep gages at range 330 feet, Figure 4.10, indicated that low-amplitude outrunning signals were the first arrivals at these locations; this correlates with the vertical record for the 17-foot station, Figure 4.3.

The radial displacement waveforms are compared in Figures 4.11 and 4.12 for the 220- and 330-foot ranges, respectively. The latetime computations are, of course, partially suspect since the degree of influence of the bottom artificial boundary has yet to be

established, but the calculation mirrors the continuous outward flow of material recorded by the field gages.

The overpressure impulse at the 200 psi contour was greater than that at the 500 psi contour by approximately 30 percent (Reference 5); in addition, the duration was much longer. Thus, peak stress attenuation was less severe at the further ground range. This resulted in higher peak stresses in Zones 5 and 6 at R = 330 feet (see Figure 4.8), which in turn resulted in more plastic flow occurring in Zone 5 at this range than at R = 220 feet. This effect, in combination with the extra impulse, resulted in larger computed radial displacement peaks at R = 330 feet than at R = 220 feet (larger by at least a factor of two).

The measured peak radial displacements shown at t = 300 msec in Figures 4.11 and 4.12 represent 50 percent or more of the total outward displacements recorded at these locations in the Prairie Flat event due to the direct and airblast-induced energy inputs. The results of this calculation indicate that a significant portion of the near-surface radial displacement maxima is attributable to airblast effects alone. Finally, it is worth noting that the measured maximum radial displacements at these locations are the same general order of magnitude as the measured vertical maxima.







Figure 4.2 Comparison of computed vertical particle velocity waveforms with field measurements; range 220 feet; Prairie Flat.







Figure 4.4 Comparison of computed vertical displacement waveforms with field measurements; range 220 feet; Prairie Flat.



Figure 4.5 Comparison of computed vertical displacement waveforms with field measurements; range 330 feet; Prairie Flat.



Figure 4.6 Comparison of measured and computed peak vertical particle velocity and displacement attenuations versus depth; range 220 feet; Prairie Flat.







Figure 4.8 Computed attenuations of peak stress; ranges 220 and 330 feet; Prairie Flat.



Figure 4.9 Comparison of computed radial particle velocity waveforms with field measurements; range 220 feet; Prairie Flat.



Figure 4.10 Comparison of computed radial particle velocity waveforms with field measurements; range 330 feet; Frairie Flat.

•



Figure 4.11 Comparison of computed radial displacement waveforms with field measurements; range 220 feet; Prairie Flat.



Figure 4.12 Comparison of computed radial displacement waveforms with field measurements; range 330 feet; Prairie Flat.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major conclusion derived from this Prairie Flat analysis is that gravity effects must be included in code calculations of HE field tests conducted at the Watching Hill test range, especially if late real time ground motion phenomena are to be correctly computed. In addition, refined zoning is required in the vicinity of the ground surface to realistically predict surface peak particle velocities. These requirements are, of course, strongly dictated by the geology of this particular site and the high-intensity, short-duration nature of the overpressure pulses produced by the conventional explosives used for Watching Hill tests; however, they should be considered factors for all major ground shock calculations.

It should be readily apparent that a great deal of both quantitative and qualitative information can be extracted from a single 2D code calculation. Yet, to answer the numerous questions that come to mind concerning the effects of calculation variables such as airblast simulation, boundary locations, grid size, layering, model coefficients, tension cutoff specifications, and gravity treatment, let alone the influences of different types of constitutive models, a large number of additional parametric calculations are required. These calculations will be performed at WES as part of the ongoing constitutive model parameter study of the Prairie Flat event. This report represents the first step in this direction.

REFERENCES

1. M. J. Dudash, ed.; "Operation PRAIRIE FLAT, Symposium Report"; DASA 2377-1 (DASIAC SR-92), Volume I, Part I, January 1970; Defense Atomic Support Agency Information and Analysis Center, General Electric, TEMPO, Santa Barbara, Calif.; Unclassified.

2. M. L. Baron, J. M. McCormick, and I. Nelson; "Investigation of Ground Shock Effects in Nonlinear Hysteretic Media"; Computational Approaches in Applied Mechanics, Preliminary Edition, ASME Computer Conference, 19-20 June 1969; Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill., Pages 165-190; Unclassified.

3. D. C. Drucker and W. Prager; "Soil Mechanics and Plastic Analysis or Limit Design"; Quarterly of Applied Mathematics, July 1952, Volume 10, No. 2, Pages 157-165; Unclassified.

4. J. G. Jackson, Jr.; "Analysis of Laboratory Test Data to Define Soil Constitutive Properties"; Miscellaneous Paper S-69-16, April 1969; U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.; Unclassified.

5. L. Giglio-Tos; "Project LN101--Fundamental Air Blast Measurements"; DASA 2377-1 (DASIAC SR-92), Volume 1, Part I, Pages 72-109, January 1970; Defense Atomic Support Agency Information and Analysis Center, General Electric, TEMPO, Santa Barbara, Calif.; Unclassified.

6. D. W. Murrell; "Project LN302--Earth Motion and Stress Measurements"; DASA 2377-1 (DASIAC SR-92), Volume I, Part I,

Pages 242-259, January 1970; Defense Atomic Support Agency Information and Analysis Center, General Electric, TEMPO, Santa Barbara, Calif.; Unclassified.

7. R. Courant, K. Friedrichs, and M. Lewy; "Uber die partiellen Differenzergleichungen der mathematischen Physik"; Math Ann., 1928, Volume 100, Pages 32-74; Unclassified.

Security Classification	NT CONTROL DATA		
(Security classification of title, body of abattact a	nd indexing annotation must be	entered when t	he overall report is classified)
U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Exper Vicksburg, Mississippi	iment Station	26. REPORT Uncla 26. GROUP	SECURITY CLASSIFICATION ASSIFIED
REPORT TITLE			
FREE-FIELD CODE PREDICTIONS VERSUS . THE PRAIRIE FLAT EVENT	FIELD MEASUREMENTS	: A COMP/	ARATIVE ANALYSIS FOR
OESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates Final report AUTHOR(3) (First name, middle initial, lest name)	•)		
Joseph S. Zelasko George Y. Baladi			
REPORT DATE	78. TOTAL NO.	OF PAGES	78. NO. OF REFS
March 1971	74		7
D. PROJECT NO.	Miscell	aneous Par	MDER(5) Der S-71-6
• Subtask SB209	Sb. OTHER REP this report)	DAT NO(S) (Any	other numbers that may be assigned
4			
unlimited. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Paper presented a S. Wang Symposium on Protective Stru Technology, Air Force Weapons Labora Kirtland AFB, N. Mex., 21-23 July 19	t Eric 12. SPONSORING ictures itory, Defense	Atomic Su	pport Agency
	washing	. D. C.	
This report documents the calculation performed at the U. S. A for the Operation Prairie Flat 500-t version of the 2D axisymmetric LAYER used for the investigation. Each la with a nonlinear elastic-plastic-com fits to the available material prope used to develop an airblast routine carried to 300 msec of real time, sh with the field ground-motion measure calculations reported herein represe parametric studies of the effectiven models in predicting airblast-induce tests. The overall research program details such as boundary conditions, of the calculated ground motions and	results of an airl Army Engineer Water ton high-explosive & Code developed by aver of the soil pr mpacting type const erty test data. Fi suitable for code nowed good quantits ments in regions of ent initial efforts tess of contemporar ed ground motions f i includes study of grid size, and the those recorded du	olast-indu ways Expe (HE) even v the Paul cofile was citutive m deld airbl input. T ative and butside th s at WES t y mathema 'or severa ' the infly me step a paring the	ced ground-shock riment Station (WES) t. A WES-modified Weidlinger firm was mathematically models odel that provided god ast measurements were he code results, qualitative agreement e crater zone. The o conduct comprehensive tical constitutive l high-explosive field uences of computations ad comparative analyse field test events.
This report documents the calculation performed at the U. S. A for the Operation Prairie Flat 500-t version of the 2D axisymmetric LAYER used for the investigation. Each la with a nonlinear elastic-plastic-com fits to the available material prope used to develop an airblast routine carried to 300 msec of real time, sh with the field ground-motion measure calculations reported herein represe parametric studies of the effectiven models in predicting airblast-induce tests. The overall research program letails such as boundary conditions, of the calculated ground motions and	results of an airl Army Engineer Water ton high-explosive & Code developed by aver of the soil pr mpacting type const erty test data. Fi suitable for code nowed good quantits ments in regions of ent initial efforts tess of contemporar ed ground motions f i includes study of grid size, and ti i those recorded du	Unclass last-indu rways Expe (HE) even r the Paul cofile was citutive m leld airbl input. T ative and putside th s at WES t ry mathema 'or severa ' the infly me step at rring the	ced ground-shock riment Station (WES) t. A WES-modified Weidlinger firm was mathematically model odel that provided god ast measurements were he code results, qualitative agreement e crater zone. The o conduct comprehensi- tical constitutive 1 high-explosive field uences of computation and comparative analyse field test events.

acturity classification							
KEY WORDS		LIN	K A	LIN		LIN	× c
							<u> </u>
Airblast waves							
Code predictions							1
Explosion effects							
Ground motion							
Ground shock							
Mathematical models							ł
Prairie Flat (Operation)							ł
						1	
				1 1			ĺ
	1						
	(
	1						
·	[
	1						
			I				
					3		
-	74		Uncl	assifie	d.		

.

.