# UNCLASSIFIED

# AD NUMBER

## AD801306

# **CLASSIFICATION CHANGES**

TO:

## unclassified

FROM:

secret

## LIMITATION CHANGES

TO:

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

## FROM:

Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Administrative/Operational Use; JUL 1952. Other requests shall be referred to Defense Nuclear Agency, Washington DC.

# AUTHORITY

DNA ltr, 10 Aug 1984; DNA ltr, 10 Aug 1984

# THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

AD 80/306 AUTHORITY: DNA Itr. 10 Aug 84







This report consists of 11k plug 4 pages (counting preliminary pages)

No.360of 373 copies, Series A



### **BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

ENGINEER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORIES









#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared under the administrative supervision of Mr. Arthur W. Van Heuckeroth. The author acknowledges the encouragement and assistance of Mr. George W. Howard and Mr. Neil Dickenson who offered valuable assistance in the planning and preparation of this project. Much credit is due to Capt. W. G. Kratz, and the other members of the Special Projects Branch, for help in the actual accomplishment of the work both at ERDL and at the test site. Credit is also extended to NRDL and NML for data and other information used in this report.

The testing and evaluation of the plastic samples returned to ERDL as well as the preparation of these samples was done by Mr. George Farmer, and the work on the coated fabrics by Mr. Clifford M. Brown. The assistance of Mr. J. D. Chapman in testing and evaluating the paint samples returned to ERDL is also appreciated.

111 Security Information





## CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGE	EMENT	s.	•	•	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	•	<u>ii</u> i
ABSTRACT.	• •	٠	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	٠	•	ix
CHAPTER 1	INTR	ODUC	TION	• •	•	٠	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	1
	1.1 1.2	Obj His	ectiv	ves.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1
	1.3	The	oreti	ical	Con	sid	era	.tio	ns	•	٠	•	٠	2
CHAPTER 2	EXPE	RIME	NTAL.	• •	•	٠	٠	٠	٠	•	•	•	•	4
	2.1	Pre	parat	tion	of	Sam	ple	s f	'ar	Lab	ora	tor	У	,
	2,2	Pre:	Dara:	tion a	at N of	san. San	ple	s f	or	Fie	ld	Exc	• ເວສນ	re 4
	2.3	Con	struc	ctia	n of	Te	st	Rac	ks	•	•	•	•	<del>-</del> 4
	2.4	Exp	erime	onta	1 PL	an	for	Fi	ela	l E	pos	ure	8.	5
	2.5	ERD	L Eva	lua	tion	of	Ex	pos	ed	Pan	els	٠	٠	6
CHAPTER 3	RESU	LTS (	OF DI	FFE	RENT	EX	POS	URE	S	•	•	•	•	7
	3.1	NML	Labo	orat	ory	Fxp	osu	ro	Tes	sts	•	•	•	7
	3.2	Fie.	ld 01	ser	vati	o <b>ns</b>	٠	•	٠	٠	•	•	•	7
	3.3	EHD	L Lat	ora	tary	Ev	alu	ati	on	Tes	ts	٠	٠	10
CHAPTER 4	DISC	USSI	ON OF	r rea	SULT	s.	•	;	•	•	٠	•	٠	12
	4.1	NML	Expo	sur	e Re	sul	ts	•	•	•	•		•	12
	4.2	Fie	ld 🗹	rpos	ure	Res	ult	s.	•	•	•	٠	•	13
	4.3	ERD	L Eva	lua	tion	•	٠		•	•	٠	٠	•	15
	4.4	Com	paris	on	of L	abo	rat	ory	· F]	lux	and			
		Fie	ld E	cpos	ure	Tes	<b>ک</b> ڼ	•	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	21
CHAPTER 5	CONC	LIGI	ons <i>i</i>	ND	RECO	MD.E	NDA	ma	NS	•	•	٠	٠	23
	5.1	Con	clus:	ions				•	•	•	•	•	•	23
	5.2	Rec	omer	ndat	ions	•		•	•	•	•	•	٠	24
BTRLTOGRA P	HY.										-	_	•	26



RESTRICTED DATA

\*\*\*\*



and a new providence of the second second

1 A 2 1 1

APPENDIX A . 27 A.1 Preparation of Samples for NML Laboratory A.2 Preparation of Samples for Field Exposure Tests, . . . . . . . . • 32 A.3 Construction of Racks for Field Tests . 35 APPENDIX B . . . 38 B.1 Method of Evaluating Damage to Samples NML . . . . . . • 38 • • • B.2 ERDL Laboratory Evaluation Tests . • 39 B.3 Method of Evaluating Damage to Samples ERDL. . 41 • • . . . APPENDIX C . . 43 Laboratory and Field Test Data • 43

#### **TLLUS TRATIONS**

#### CHAPTER 2 EXPERIMENTAL

CHAPTER 3 RESULTS OF DIFFERENT EXPOSURES

- 3.1 Paint systems after Field Exposure at Different Intensity Levels. . . . . 8
- 3.2 Plastics and Coated Fabrics Samples After Exposure at Different Intensity levels

#### CHAPTER 4 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.1 Typical Group of Panels After Exposure to Thermal Flux at NML.
4.2 Effect of Thermal Flux on Outside White Paint and a Fire Retardant Paint.
4.3 Fire Retardancy Test After Exposure to Thermal Flux





Searchy in "sealing



APPENDIX A

A.l	Consti	ruction	cf	the	Racks	Used	For	
	Field	Exposur	е.	•		•		• 3

APPENDIX C

- C.1 The Effect of Thermal Flux on an Alkyd Lusterless Enamel.
- C.2 The Effect of Thermal Flux on Certain Fibers.
- C.3 The Effect of Thermal Flux on Cer'ain Coated Fabrics.

#### TABLES

#### APPENDIX A

- A.1 Coding of Paint Samples Prepared for NML Testing
- A.2 Coding of Plastics, Coated Fabrics and Packaging Materials for NML Testing
- A.3 Coding of Paint Samples for Field Exposure
- A.4 Coding of Plastic and Coated Fabrics Samples for Field Exposure

#### APPENDIX C

· · · · ·

- C.] Results of Exposure to Laboratory Thermal Flux on Certain Materials
- C.2 Thermal and Blast Data (Field Exposures)
- C.3 Thermal Exposure Effects, BAKER Shot
- C.4 'Inermal Exposure Effects, DOG Shot 2000 ft.
- C.5 Thermal Exposure Effects, DOG Shot
- C.6 Effect of Thermal Flux on Resistance to Salt Spray.
- C.7 Effect of Thermal Flux on Resistance to Accelerated Weathering
- C.8 Effect of Thermal Flux on Resistance to High Humidity
- C.9 Effect of High Humidity on Painted Panels Expose to a Thernal Energy of 85 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>
- C.10 Effect of Thermal Flux on Overall Flexibility

LESTRICTED DATA

C.11 Effect of Thermal Flux on Overall Abrasion Resistance





- C.12 Effect of Thermal Flux on Overall Shear Hardness
- C.13 Effect of Thermal Flux on the properties of Fire Retardant Paint
- C.14 Effect of Thermal Flux on Rigid Plastics C.15 Effect of Thermal Flux on Plastic Filme C.16 Effect of Thermal Flux on Plastic and

- Cotton Fibers
- C.17 Effect of Thermal Flux on the Breaking Strength of Rubber Coated Fabrics
- C.18 Effect of Thermal Flux on the Elongation of Coated Fabrics

1

C.19 Comparison of the Thermal Effects of Laboratory Flux vs Field Exposure



viii -Scaulty Informatio



#### **ABS TRACT**

The object of this project was to determine the effect of thermal flux and other atomic blast phenomena on the service life and use characteristics of selected paint systems, plastics and coated fabrics currently used or proposed for use by the Corps of Engineers. Little or no work has been done previously on evaluating the effect of atom weapon phenomina on these properties. Selected materials were exposed to a laboratory source of thermal flux using Navy searchlight method, with the object of establishing a correlation between laboratory and field test results. Representative paint systems, plastics and coated fabrics were exposed to BAKER and DOG shots at thermal energies ranging from 1.6 cal./ to 85 cal./cm. The samples were given a visual inspection in the field and feturned to ERDL for laboratory comparison with samples retained at ERDL, to determine the effect of the exposures on the physical properties of the materials.

Cq Cm The main conclusions were:

1. That visual inspection does not always give a true picture and that subsequent laboratory testing of the exposed samples is necessary for accurate, effective evaluation of the damage done and the condition of the material.

2. That certain paint systems showed different degrees of damage when painted on different kinds of mutal surfaces, and that the effect of the kind of metal surface on the damage to one coating system cannot be used to predict its effect on other coating systems.

3. That paint systems applied to metal surfaces although completely destroyed by high intensities of thermal flux will impart improved rust and corrosion resistance to these surfaces even under high humidity conditions.

4. Wood panels coated with a developed fire retardant paint showed a critical energy for wood charring of seven times that of the unpainted wood and twice that of ordinary house paint.

5. That the fire retardant paint even though completely destroyed by high thermal intensity and blast damage gave the underlying wood good protection against burning that was not found in the other paint systems.

ir -

RESTRICTED DATA

39 CM



6. That the rigid plastics showed little damage below 18  $cal_o/cr^2$  while most of the plastic films and fibers had a critical energy in a range of from 10 to 18 cal\_/cm<sup>2</sup>.

7. Subsequent laboratory tests show that the damage to coated fabrics at intensities up to 10 cal./cm<sup>2</sup> is a surface effect that does not affect the fabric itself, but that intensities of 18 cal./cm<sup>2</sup> will severely damage the fabric.

8. Comparison of laboratory thermal data (searchlight source) with field results thows only fair correlation. Occasional contradiction is evidenced.

It is recommended that:

1. Critical wood structures subject to atomic blast exposure, te coated with an adequate fire retardant paint.

2. Epoxy resin type finishes be considered for use on metal equipment subject to these conditions.

3. That the polyester-fiberglas type of plastic be used where there is a need for a rigid type plastic with a high resistance to thermal flux.

4. That coated fabrics be flame-proofed before coating.

5. That additional data (for use in formulating better coatings and materials for specific military requirements) be obtained on:

a. The damage done to the different coatings when painted on magnesium surfaces. This is important due to the increasing use of magnesium in the construction of airborne equipment.

b. The effect of these phenomena on fire retardant paint formulated to an O.D. or camouflage color.

c. The damage to plastic film and fibers in the critical range of 10 to 18 cal./cm<sup>2</sup>.







## UNCLASSIELED

#### CHAPTER 1

#### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 OBJETTIVES

In the Engineer Research and Development Laboratories thermal project, conducted in conjunction with operation BUSTER, certain specific paint systems, plastics and coated fabrics, currently used, or proposed for use, by the Corps of Engineers, were exposed to the thermal effects and accompanying phenomena of an atom bomb blast. This was done in order to study and evaluate, by scientific tests, the effect of these exposures on the expected service life of the different paint systems, plastics and coated fabrics and the ability of the coating systems to protect the underlying surfaces from the thermal and sandolast effects of the explosion. It is important to know to what degree these coatings will continue to protect the equipment from normal weathering conditions after exposure to these phenomena. This will determine the necessity and/or desirability of removing the exposed material and replacing it with new material. It will also indicate any need for better, more resistant coatings or materials.

#### 1.2 HISTORICAL

The total energy in cal/cm<sup>2</sup> and delivery time, as well as intensities in cal/cm<sup>2</sup>/sec delivered at various distances are the quantities on which thermal effects depend. Such a small number of measurements have been made thus far, as evidenced by the reports on SANDS TONE and GREENHOUSE, that only general conclusions and predictions can be drawn from previous tests.

A large amount of work by various members of the protective coatings industry has been done on the evaluation of the different paint systems, plastics and coated fabrics for ordinary usage. Mattiello gives a very good discussion of the various laboratory tests and their correlation with field tests results. F. F. LaQue<sup>2</sup> of the International Nickel Company is doing extensive work on the corrosion of metals and metal protective systems. Considerable work has been done by Miller<sup>3</sup> at ERDL in the development of fire retardant paints and paint systems. Isano oil was found to be effective in one formulation. A study of literature, however, fails to reveal significant information on the



effect of thermal flux or other atomic weapon phenomena on these materials. No evaluation of the effects of these phenomena on the service life or use characteristics was found. When operation BUSTER was proposed, it was suggested by the Office, Chief of Engineers that a project be set up to secure information on these thermal effects. The inswers to the following questions were desired:

(a) What is the expected service life of these coatings and other materials after exposure to the effects?

(b) To what degree are their protective properties and/or use characteristics impaired?

(c) In what specific characteristics do the materials fail?

(d) Can an improved coating or other material be developed that will overcome these failings?

(e) Will the c. ting give adequate protection to the underlying surface under forsecable conditions?

Work has been done by other laboratories in this and previous operations in exposing various materials to atomic phenomena and studying these effects, but little has been done in evaluating the effect of these phenomena on the service life of paint systems and other materials used specifically by the Corps of Engineers.

#### 1.3 THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

•

An important difference between an atomic and a conventional explosion is that the energy liberated per unit mass is much greater and the temperature attained is much higher in the former case, with the result that a larger proportion of the energy is liberated as thermal radiations.

The characteristics of the thermal radiations from an atomic explosion as derived from theoretical considerations are discussed in some detail in the "Effects of Atomic Weapons<sup>4</sup>. According to theory, approximately one third of the total energy released is emitted as thermal radiation. At about 0.1 millisecond after the detonation, the fire ball consists of an isothermal sphere of about 50 feet radius and having a temperature of about 300,000 ° K. From theoretical considerations, it may be assumed that the fire ball emits essentially black-body radiation.



- 2 -

SECRET



Before the characteristics of the thermal energy received at any distance from the fire ball can be estimated, it is necessary to correct for atmospheric attenuation both by the undisturbed atmosphere present at a distance from point zero, and by the abnormal atmosphere produced around point zero by the detonation itself. At the present time, it must be said that sufficient uncertainties still exist on theoretical grounds, to render of limited value, quantitative calculations of the characteristics of thermal energy received at any distance from point zero. Physical measurements in actual field operations are needed to correlate and check the theoretical calculations. These measurements are made with calorimeters and passive indicators. The calorimeters measure the total integrated energy while passive indicators, such as certain textiles, plastics and other materials, measure only the effective flux, that is, the flux that will initiate and sustain damage.

The intense ultraviolet radiations emitted in the first millisecond of the detonation is only a small fraction of the total energy released and will not in itself produce visible damage; however, it may set up photochemical or other reactions that could affect the service life of the materials. To evaluate this condition and the other thermal effects, as well as the other phenomena, identical unexposed panels were concurrently evaluated at ERDL. This service evaluation of identical exposed and unexposed samples show the differences which are attributable to the effect of atomic weapon phenomena.

- 3 -

RESTRICTED DATA

ENERGY ACT

SECRET

CHAPTER 2

#### EXPERIMENTAL

#### 2.1 NAVAL MATERIALS LABORATORY EVALUATION TESTS

A series of paint systems, plastics, coated fabrics, and packaging meterials were prepared for exposure to the NEL laboratory source of thermal flux.

Tables A.1 and A.2, Appendix A, lists the samples submitted. A description of the method of preparation of these samples is also included. These samples were subjected to exposure to thermal flux by the laboratory searchlight method as described in NAL BUSTER report No. WT311. In this method the beam of a 24 inch Navy coarchlight is directed to a receiving mirror which concentrates the energy at a focal point. The sample is made to pass through this focal point at a constant acceleration or deceleration, with the total energy nd time of exposure determining the amount of thermal flux at any point. The energy level is determined by placing calibration strips along the side of the sample and converting the speed of travel into thermal energy in calories per square centimeter. Photograph 2.1 shows typical samples prepared for this exposure.

#### 2.2 PREPARATION OF SAMPLES FOR FIELD EXPOSUAE

Selected paint systems including alkyds, phenolics, epons, vinyls and a recently developed fire retardant paint, were applied to steel, aluminum and wood surfaces. Representative samples of plastics and coated fabrics were also included. Tables A.3 and A.4 listing these materials as well as a description of the method of preparation are included in Appendix A.

#### 2.7 CONSTRUCTION OF TEST RACKS

The test racks were designed and built, at ENDL, for these tests. They are inexpensive, light, but sturdy racks anchored by steel stakes and require only 6 to 8 man hours to erect in the field. The racks have detachable panel sections that assure quick easy removal of the samples to an uncontaminated area where they may be examined at leisure. A photograph and detailed description of the rack are contained in Appendix A.

- 4 -

RESTRICTED DATA

Secret-



Ę.





#### 2.4 EXPERIMENTAL PLAN FOR FIELD EXPOSURES

A series of paint systems, plastics and coated fabrics were prepared as described in paragraph 2.2 for exposure at four stations for both Baker and Dog Shots, with an extra rack for DOS Shot. The test panels were attached to the rack sections in the camp laboratories where they were sheltered from the weather until the afternoon before the shot. The racks were set up at the various stations, adjacent to the Thermal Line and on a radius from ground zero, with the face of the rack oriented to receive maximum thermal energy. The stations were located at the following distances from expected ground zero.

1



RESTRUCTED DATA

2.4.1 Eaker Shot

Station	1	-	2000	feet
Station	2	-	4000	feet
Station	3	-	5000	feet
Station	4	-	7000	feet

2.4.2 Dog Shot

Station 1 - 5000 feet Station 2 - 7000 feet Station 3 - 9000 feet Station 4 - 12000 feet Station 5 - 2000 feet

(1 rack of paint panels)

After each exposure, the test panels were monitored for possible contamination and given a visual inspection for damage, then returned to the camp laboratory for a more careful inspection. To acquire information on the structural behavior of these light racks, a rack with the face completely covered by two 3' x 5' plywood panels was set at 9000 feet on DOG Shot with the stakes just driven into the ground.

#### 2.5 ERDL EVALUATION OF EXPOSED PANELS

The sample panels exposed in 2.4 were returned to ERDL for laboratory evaluation with duplicate panels retained at the laboratories. The paint samples were subjected to salt spray, accelerated weathering and high humidity and then evaluated for flexibility, abrasion resistance and shear hardness. Any differences between the two sets of panels was attributed to the field exposure. The panels coated with fire retardant and ordinary house paint were given standard conditioning, and evaluated for fire retardant properties as specified in Federal Specification TT-P-26.

The plastics and coated fabrics were evaluated for damage, by the usual laboratory tests of flexual and breaking strength, elongation, surface hardness, and light transmission. A detailed description of the test procedures are given in Appendix B.

ATOMIC DIERGY ACT 1944

- 6 -SECRET CHAPTER 3

SECRET

#### RESULTS OF DIFFERENT EXPOSURES

#### 3.1 RESULTS OF NML LABORATORY EXPOSIME TESTS

The results of this exposure test are shown in Table C.l, "The Effect of Exposure to Laboratory Thermal Flux on Certain Materials."

#### 3.2 FIELD EXPOSURE TEOTS

Samples of paints, plastics, and coated fabrics were exposed to the BAKER and DOG Shots, at four different stations, yielding intensity levels varying from 1.6 to 85 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>. Figures 3.1 and 3.2 show typical damage to these materials at selected intensity levels. It should be noted that this damage is caused by both thermal and blast effects. Considerable thought was given to methods of distinguishing between thermal and blast damage. The use of quartz windows or electronically operated shutters were not considered practical because of the number and size of the samples to be exposed made their use excessive in cost. While this was primarily a thermal effects project, the Engineers were also interested in the actual damage, (thermal and blast), to the materials. In every case possible, the blast damage has been allowed for in the evaluation of the thermal damage to the sample. Table C.2, showing the thermal flux and blast pressures, as well as Tables C.3, C.4, and C.5, giving the results of the field exposure, are included in Appendix C. A selective summary of these data follows:

At 85 calories all of the paint systems were completely destroved. The panels with the epoxy type finish appeared to have small bits of paint left on the surface, while the panels with the vinyl type finish had a greyish mat finish. The panels coated with house paint and with fire retardant paint showed complete destruction of the paint film and excessive sand erosion. No plastics or coated fabrics were exposed at this station.

At 18 calories most of the paint systems showed charring and blistering. The coated pine panels showed blistering with a red color in the rosin grain. The coated poplar panels showed charring but no blistering. The rigid plastics showed little damage, while the plastic films and fibers were destroyed. Some of the coated fabrics were completely destroyed, others were melted and charred.

> - 7 -SECRET



SECRET



.

RESTRICTED DATA



RESTRICTED DATA

#### SECRET Intervention

At 9.8 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> the paint systems on metal panels showed some gravel damage with the aluminum panels showing a few blisters. The coatings on pine wood panels showed blistering and charring. The poplar panels coated with house paint showed some blistering while the fire retardant paint showed none. The rigid plastic films and fibers, and the coated fabrics did show some damage.

At energies below 5.7  $cal/cm^2$  the paints on metal panels showed occasional fine blisters with the aluminum panels showing slightly more damage than the steel. The pine panels showed blistering and some light charring. The vinyl and saran films and the saran fiber showed some damage. Some of the coated fabrics showed some surface damage.

#### 3.3 ERDL EVALUATION TESTS

#### 3.3.1 Evaluation of Paint Systems on Metals

The alkyd, phenolic, vinyl and epoxy systems coated on steel and aluminum were exposed to salt spray, accelerated weather and high humidity and then evaluated for flexibility, abrasion resistance and shear hardness. The results of these evaluations are included in Appendix C in the following tables.

- Table C.6Effect of Thermal Flux on Resistance to<br/>Salt Spray Exposure
- Table C.7
   Effect of Thermal Flux on Resistance to Accelerated Weathering Exposure
- Table C.8 Effect of Thermal Flux on Resistance to High Humidity
- Table C.9 Effect of High Humidity on Painted Panels Exposed to a Thermal Energy of 85 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>
- Table C.10 Effect of Thermal Flux on Flexibility
- Table C.11 Effect of Thermal Flux on Abrasion Resistance
- Table C.12 Effect of Thermal Flux on Shear Hardness

#### 3.3.2 EVALUATION OF FIRE RETARDANT PAINTS

Test panels of outside white paint and fire retardant paint were evaluated for fire retardancy under Fed. Spec. TT-P-26.

- 10 -

RESTRICTED DATA

Table C.13, Appendix C, shows the effect of thermal flux on the fire retardant properties of these two paints.

SECRET

3.3.3 Evaluation of Plastics and Coated Fabrics

The rigid plastics, plastic films and fibers and coated fabrics were evaluated for the effect of thermal flux on their physical properties. The results of these evaluations are shown in the following tables in Appendix C.

Table C.14 Effect of Thermal Flux on Rigid Plastics

- Table C.15 Effect of Thermal flux on Plastic Films
- Table C.16 Effect of Thermal Flux on Plastic and Cotton Fibers
- Table C.17 Effect of Thermal Flux on the Breaking Strength of Coated Fabrics
- Table C.18 Effect of Thermal Flux on the Ultimate Elongation of Coated Fabrics
- 3.3.4 Comparison of Laboratory Flux and Field Exposure

Field exposure results on fourteen paint systems were compared with the results obtained from exposure to laboratory flux on the same systems The results of this comparison are shown in Table C.19, Appendix C.

> - 11 -SECRET





#### CHAPTER 4

#### DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

#### 4.1 NHL EXPOSURE TESTS

An examination of Table C.1, Appendix C, will show the effect of these exposures. An examination of these results will show that the alkyd and phenolic paint systems had a higher critical energy when coated on aluminum than on steel or magnesium, while the critical energy of the epoxy resin system was higher on steel and magnesium than it was on aluminum. In the case of the alkyd and phenolic systems, this might be accounted for by the different heat conductance of the different metals. The results of the epoxy resin system, however, show that this reasoning cannot be applied indiscriminately in predicting the damage to other paint systems on these metals.

It can also be seen from these results that a good fire retardant paint should have a critical energy that is eight times that of unpainted wood and twice that of ordinary paint.

The values reported for the fibers do not reflect the true damage from thermal flux. It was noted, from close inspection, that damage to the fibers was caused more by the ignition of the wood than by thermal radiation falling on the fiber itself.

The rigid plastics were run at high calorie ranges. The early charring of the wood in some cases, was accounted for by the transparency of such samples as cellulose acetate and acrylic resin (plexiglass). The cellulose acetate showed marked effect from the incident radiation i.e. melting, as well as from the burning of the plywood backing. The acrylic resin however, was destroyed totally by the plywood backing, complicating the evaluation. The polyester-fiberglass material offered good protection to the underlying wood even though the specimens were run to a high range  $(427 to 853 cal/cm^2)$ . At low intensities the thickness of the coated fabrics acted as a thermal barrier protecting the underlying surface. It is seen from this table that the nitrile rubber coated fabric had the highest critical energy while the neoprene and styrene rubbers had the lowest.

Difficulty was experienced in the evaluation of some of the packaging materials. The surface, both front and back of several

- 12 -

RESTRICTED DATA

SECRET Security Information

#### SECRET Succerity Information

of the materials were stencilled in black print and the black print absorbed more of the energy than the adjacent areas. Some of the materials stuck to each other or to the wrapping paper altering the surface appearance of the material. Typical damage caused by this exposure is shown in Figure 4.1.

#### 4.2 FIELD EXPOSURE TESTS

A study of the samples at the various stations for both shots reveals a reasonably good correlation between the energy received and the amount of damage. It is also significant to note that there was no radioactive contamination found on any of the samples even though the surrounding areas did show some contamination. This is possibly due to the fact that the samples were in a nearly vertical position and thus missed any fall out of radioactive particles.

As would be expected, all of the paint systems were destroyed at the 85 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> level. One paint, the epoxy resin system, appeared to have small flecks of the paint left on the panel. This raises the question "were the paints burnt off by thermal effects or was the damage caused by the blast effects"? This could be determined at a future test using shielded and unshielded samples.

It was also significant to note that the poplar panels coated with fire retardant paint and ordinary house paint had the paint completely destroyed and the panels deeply sandblasted. A visual evaluation shows the two panels to be identical.

At the 18 calorie station it was noted that the alkyd lusterless enamel showed better resistance, when coated on steel, that it did on aluminum. It was thought that this could be accounted for by the higher specific conductivity of steel over aluminum, however, the phenolic system showed the reverse effects with the phenolic system showing less damage over the aluminum. It was seen that the pine panels were covered with red blisters grading to black in the charred areas. This red coloration is probably due to the rosin content of the wood or a combination of the rosin and some constituent of the paint. This reasoning is further borne out by the fact that the poplar panels showed no blistering or red color. It would seem from these results that it would be desirable to have all critical buildings constructed of non-resincus wood or to determine whether the fire retardant paint would eliminate the blistering of the pine wood. A further study of this data reveals that the exterior fire retardant paint shows less deterioration and gives better protection than the outside white paint.

- 13 -

SECRET Security Internetio





SECRET Security Information

8

•

.

.

•

i

ł

ł

RESTRICTED DATA ATOMIC ENERGY ACT 1948

Security Informati

i

SECRET Security Information

An evaluation of the plastics and coated fabrics reveal that the rigid type plastics show very little damage, the phenol-formaldehyde and the polyvinyl chloride samples show a little heat scorching. The absence of the blast damage is probably due to the thickness of the sample. The plastic films and fibers were completely gone with the exception of the vinyl covered glass fiber, in which case, the glass fibers remained. It is difficult to determine whether this damage was caused by thermal or blast effects. The coated fabrics showed surface melting, charring, and the imbedding of a layer of sand and fine gravel. The untreated duck sample and the material coated with a laboratory batch of neoprene rubber were completely destroyed, but again it is impossible to say to which effect this was due. Again, at the 9.6 cal station we find the alkyd system showing slightly less damage on steel than it does on aluminum. The phenolic system fails to show any differentiation at this level. It is to be noted that the house paint is blistered at intensities of this level while the fire retardant paint shows no damage. It is also noted that the plastic films, fibers, and the coated fabrics continue to show no damage. It is also noted that the plastic films, fibers, and the coated fabrics continue to show some damage. It is noted that some of the plastic materials particularly saran and vinyl films were completely destroyed at intensities of 5.6 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> and below. This is probably due to thermal flux rather than blast damage since NML laboratory results show these materials to have low critical energies. It is also seen that some of the coated fabrics showed surface damage even at these low calories levels, but the extent of damage could not be determined by visual inspection. It is particularly interesting to note that the pine panels continued to blister even at these low intensities. It would be of value to find out whether the fire retardant paint would eliminate the blistering of these paint panels.

4

It had been originally planned to include magnesium in the surfaces to be tested, but it was eliminated due to program restructions. In view of the expanding use of magnesium as a replacement for heavier materials in the construction of airborne and other equipment, and the inability to predict the behavior of paint systems applied to different metals, it becomes increasingly desirable to obtain data on the effect of these phenomina on paint systems coated on magnesium surfaces.

#### 4.3 ERDL EVALUATION TESTS

In the evaluation of the test data of this project is is immediately seen that a larger number of samples would have given more definite results, and that the results obtained do show trends from which valuable conclusions may be drawn.

> SECRET Security Information

RESTRICTED DATA

2

- 15 -

SECRET

#### 4.3.1 Paint Systems

Tables C.6, C.7, and C.8 Appendix C, show the effect of varying intensities of thermal flux on the resistance of these coatings to salt air, high humidity and accelerated weathering. It is shown that, in general, the exposed panels have poorer flexibility abrasion resistance and shear hardness than the unexposed panels, with the amount of damage increasing with the increase in thermal flux. This table shows that the alkyd system shows less damage over steel while the phenolic system is best over aluminum; with the epoxy resin system showing no particular differentiation. This shows that the effect on one coating system cannot be used to predict the damage that will be done to another. The vinyl paint was exposed on steel alone, therefore no comparison can be made of its characteristics on steel and aluminum. It is noted, however, that it suffered less damage than the other paint systems. This is attributed to its higher reflectivity. It was a white paint while the others were O.D. in color.

A study of Tables C.10, C.11 and C.12 shows that the overall flexibility of the different systems is not particularly affected by low intensities but that a thermal flux of 10 to 18 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> causes a small improvement in this property. This may be attributed to a heat polymerization of the paint, resulting in a tougher film. It is also noted that the overall abrasion resistance shear hardness show decreasing resistance with increase in thermal flux. An exception to this trend is the shear hardness of the vinyl system. These panels have very good shear hardness at energies up to 10 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> but have a sharp breakdown at 18 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>. This indicates a critical energy at some point within this range.

Table C.4 Appendix C, shows the effect of exposing alkyd, phenolic epoxy and vinyl systems to a thermal flux of 85 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>. It is noted that the paint is completely destroyed on all of the panels and most of them show severe sand erosion. In order to determine whether there was any surface effect not readily noticeable, these panels were placed in a high humidity cabinet along with a simular uncoated metal panel. The results of this exposure are shown in Table C.9, Appendix C. It is seen from this table that the exposed panels had improved resistance to rust and corrosion. It is believed that some of the paint pigments, such as the lead, zinc or chromate were reduced and fused into the surface of the panel making it more resistant.

RESTRICTED DATA

- 16 -SECRET

SECRET Security Information

Table C.13 shows the effect of different intensities of thermal flux on the fire retardant properties of ordinary house paint and fire retardant paint developed by ERDL. Based on the results obtained from this test, it can be seen that exposure to low intensities of thermal flux tends to improve the fire retardant properties of the paint. This can be accounted for by the heat polymerization of the oils and resins, making them harder and less combustible under laboratory test. It is also shown that the different levels of exposure do not significantly affect the weight loss of either paint. A difference is noted, however, in the char volume (amount of char on underlying wood panel) of the two paints. Up to a thermal level of 10 calories, the house paint shows an increase in char volume with an increase in thermal intensity while the fire retardant paint shows a decrease. This would indicate that the house paint is progressively breaking down to permit more and more destruction of the underlying wood while the fire retardant paint is developing more and more of a protective barrier that permits less and less destruction. It is also interesting to note that after exposure of  $85 \text{ cal/cm}^2$ , the poplar panels had all of the paint either burnt off, or worn off from sand abrasion. Under visual inspection both panels appeared to be identical in serviceability, however, an examination of Table C.13 shows that the panels coated with ordinary house paint were completely destroyed while the ones with the fire retardant paint suffered a moderately severe char but remained intact. This indicates that structures conted with ordinary paint would have burned down while those coated with fire retardant paint would have received a bad char but would remain standing and intact. Figures 4.2 and 4.3 show the effect of thermal flux on these two paints and their resistance to burning.

#### 4.3.2 Plastics and Coated Fabrics

An examination of Table C.14 Appendix C, shows that, in general, thermal flux intensities up to 18 cal/cal have only a slight effect on the flexural strength, modulus of elasticity, and surface hardness of the rigid plastics. The percent of light transmittance was determined to evaluate the use of these materials for windows, skylights, etc. It is to be seen that no great amount of damage was done at levels up to 9.6 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> but that a sharp drop occurred around 18 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> indicating a critical energy value in this range. A visual examination of the cellulose acetate, polyester resin, and polyvinyl chloride show that these samples were not uniformly damaged, indicating an unequal exposure to the effects.

- 17 -

ESTRUCTED DATA



i



Ĭ

i

and the second second

1

SECRET

It can be concluded from these results that, with the exception of the light transmittance properties, thermal flux up to 18 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> will not seriously affect the use of these rigid plastics. The fact that fiberglass reinforcing material made a good showing in both the rigid plastic and fiber uses indicates a desirability of further testing this material. Table C.15 Appendix C show the effect of thermal flux on the physical properties of certain plastic films. It is to be noted that the films in general showed poor resistance to even moderate levels of thermal flux. It is quite probable that this poor showing is a result of the combination of blast and thermal damage. Teflon showed destruction around 10 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> in the field test and a critical energy of 55 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> under the NML tests. It is also seen that the saran film showed a marked increase in Specific Gravity (density). This can be accounted for by the loss of plasticizer and other volatile constituents.

Table C.16 and Figure C.2 Appendix C, shows the effect of thermal flux on the physical properties of certain plastic and cotton fibers. The breaking strength was determined on both the straight and knotted strands since a large requirement for these materials is in the manufacture of camouflage netting. It has been shown by previous experience that knotting has a definate effect on the tensile strength of the fiber. The straight strand fibers show little change in breaking strength up to 9.6 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> with destruction of 18 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>. The vinyl covered fiberglass is an exception to this trend showing little loss of strength at any lev.l. The saran fiber, on the other hand, was destroyed at 5.6 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>. The tensile strength of the knotted strands, while less than that of the straight fibers showed the same general trend. On the basis of these results, it can be concluded that the vinyl covered fiberglass should be usable after exposure to 18 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> of thermal flux, in orlon, cotton, and Nylon FM 3606 up to an intensity of 8 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>, and the Dynel and untreated nylon to 5 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>. Saran will be damaged at 3 cal.

Tables C.17 and C.18 and Figure C.3 Appendix C, show the effect of lifferent levels of thermal flux on the physical properties of certain coated fabrics. It is shown that low intensities cause little or no damage to the tensile strength and elongation with some of the samples even showing a slight improvement; while 18 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> will completely destroy or severely damage the fabric. It is to be noted from the table that the untreated duck shows destruction above 9.6 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> and the laboratory coated sample of neoprene above 5.6 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>. It is significant to note that all of

RESTRICTED DATA

- 20 -

SECRET

the coated fabric samples except the neoprene sample had been flame proofed before coating. This at least, in part, accounts for their higher critical energies.

An examination of Fig. C.3 shows that there was varying amounts of visual damage to the different samples. The test results in the above tables show that at intensities up to 9.6 calories, the damage is largely a surface damage which has not hurt the fabric itself but that thermal levels in the range of 18 calories will destroy or seriously damage the fabric itself. This is another example of the need of subsequent testing of physical properties in correctly evaluating the effect of these phenominee on the service life and use characteristics of the various materials.

Additional, more detailed, test data and photographs not included in this report are on file in the Materials Laboratory, ERDL and are available for inspection by any interested persons.

#### 4.4 COMPARISON OF LABORATORY FLUX AND FIELD EXPOSURE TESTS

The object of establishing a correlation between laboratory flux and field exposure effects is to establish a method of screening the different materials in order to pick the most promising ones for field exposure. A study of Table C.19 reveals that, in general, the field exposure was more severe than the laboratory flux. Two exceptions to this are: 1. The phenolic system on steel, which showed slightly more damage in the laboratory, at the lower calorie intensities and about the same at the higher intensities. 2. The phenolic system on wood, which consistently showed more damage from the laboratory flux. It is also interesting to note that there was moderate to deep char of the resinous grain of the wood panels, subjected to field exposure, while the non-resinous grain showed little if any char. This condition was not noted in the laboratory samples possibly due to the size of the sample and smallness of the exposed area. It is believed that these test data show a fair correlation with the field exposure. The following factors make a comparison more difficult:

a. The small number of samples of each system exposed. Where visual conclusions are drawn from a small number of samples or from a small area on a panel, the probability of error is increased because there is no chance for small differences in apnel preparation or exposure conditions to be averaged.

b. The difference in the sizes of the exposed areas. The field samples had an area of 04 sq. in. as compared to 0.02 sq. in. (10 sq.mm.) for the laboratory samples.

- 21 -







;

c. While the laboratory samples were subjected to thermal flux alone the field samples were exposed to both thermal flux and blast damage with the blast damage possibly obscuring any light surface char.

d. The apparent non-uniformity of thermal damage by increasing intensities of laboratory thermal flux.



- 22 -





#### CHAPTER 5

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1 CONCLUSIONS

It is concluded that:

1. Visual inspection alone, does not give a true picture of the damage done and that subsequent laboratory testing of the physical properties is necessary for the accurate effective evaluation of the damage done to exposed materials.

2. Certain paint systems sustain different degrees of damage when coated over different metal surfaces, and that the effect of the metal surface on the damage to one coating system was not in direct correlation with the effect on other types of coating systems.

7. That paint systems applied to metal surfaces, although completely destroyed by exposure to high interatives of thermal flux, will impart improved rust and corrosion resistance to these surfaces, even under high humidity conditions.

4. Wood panels coated with an adequate fire retardant paint have a critical energy for wood charring seven times that of the unpainted wood and twice that of normally used house paint.

5. The fire retardant paint, even though completely destroyed by high thermal intensity and blast damage, imparted to the underlying wood a good resistance to burning not found in a simular wood panel coated with house paint.

6. The rigid plastics show little damage at intensities below  $18 \text{ cal/cm}^2$  with light transmittance being the only property showing any appreciable change and that plastic films and fibers in general, are destroyed at critical energies in the range of from 8 to 12 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>.

7. Laboratory tests show that the damage to the coated fabrics at intensities up to 10 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> is a surface effect that does not injure the fabric itself but that intensities of 18 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> will severely damage the fabric.

23 -

8. Flame proofing of the coated fabrics prior to coating will decrease the damage caused by exposure to these phenomena.

9. The epoxy resin system is equally good when coated on steel or aluminum while the alkyd system suffered less damage when coated over steel, and the pherolic system less damage when coated over aluminum.

10. Resinous type wood (pine) will blister even at low thermal intensities irrespective of the coating system used.

11. Laboratory exposure tests show that materials having high transparency or reflectivity show high critical energies.

12. Materials having high reflectivity or absorption characteristics offer better protection to the underlying material than those with high transparency.

13. Of the rigid plastics exposed to laboratory flux the polyester-fiberglas type offers the best protection to the underlying material even at high thermal ranges.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. Critical wood structures, subject to atomic blast exposure, be coated with an adequate fire retardant paint.

2. Epoxy resin type finishes be considered for use on metal equipment subject to these conditions.

3. The polyester-fiberglas type of plastic be used where there is a need for a non-transparent rigid plastic with a high resistance to thermal flux.

4. All coated fabrics be flame proofed before conting.

5. Further study be made on fire retardant paints to determine whether such paints formulated to an O.D. or camouflage color would have the same protective properties as the paint evaluated in this program.

6. A study be made, at some future test, to determine the effect of these phenomina on coatings applied to magnesium surfaces.

RESTRICTED DATA

- 24 -

SECRE

Sacurity Information

SECRET Security Information

This data will be of increasing value due to the expanding use of magnetium in air-borne and other equipment.

7. Further work be done to evaluate the effect of thermal flux on single and multiple coat systems to determine whether the damage is a surface effect or whether it sets up thermochemical reactions in the undercoats affecting their service life.

8. Additional work be done "oven fibers of the camouflage net and garnishment type to deter ... the effect of these phenomena on the camouflaging properties as well as the physical characteristics of these fibers.

9. Further exposures be made on the plastics and coated fabrics in the range of 10 to 20 cal/cm<sup>2</sup>. This was shown to be a critical range for a number of the samples.

- 25 -

SECRET Security Information

RESTRICTED DATA

ACT

Same and the second second



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1. Protoctive and Decorative Coatings J. J. Mattiello - John Wiley and Sons
- 2. F. J. LeQue International Nickel Company New York, New York
- 3. ERDL Report #1226, Fire Retardant Paints and Paint Systems Harvey Miller

ł.

Ì

4. Effects of Atomic Weapons Government Printing Office



SECRET
#### SECRET Security Information

#### APPENDIX A

### PREPARATION OF TEST SAMPLES

## A.1 PREPARATION OF SAMPLES FOR MAL EXPOSURE

## A.1.1 Preparation of Paint Samples

#### TABLE A.1

System No.	Type Panel	Primer Coat	Finish Coat
1	Steel	MTL-P-15328 <sup>1</sup>	
		TT-E-485	TT-E-485
2	Aluminum	n	H H
3	Magnesium	н	n
4	Wood	TT-P-636	3-174
5	Steel	MIL-P-15328	
		TT-E-485	3-173
6	Aluminum	n	Ħ
7	Magnesium	n	Ħ
8	Wood	TT-P-636	
		3-174	11
9	Steel	MIL-P-15328	
		TT-E-485	TT-E-489
10	Aluminum	n	n
11	Magnesium	n	n
12	Wood	TT-P-636	Π
13	Steel	MIL-P-15328	
		3-193, Type I	3-194
14	Aluminum	11	n
15	Magnesium	n	Ħ
16	Wood	3-193, Type II	n
17	Steel	MIL-P-15323	3-194
		3-193, Type I	3-173
18	Aluminum	n	n
19	Magnesium	H	n
20	Wood	3-193, Type II	n
21	Steel	MIL-P-15328	TT-E-485
22	Aluminum	n	<b>N</b>
23	Magnesium	n	
24	Wood	TT-P-636	
25	Steel	MIL-P-15328	
		TT-E-485	3-173
			1

Coding of Paint Samples Prepared for NML Testing

- 27 -

SECRET



#### TABLE A.1

System No.	Type Panel	Primer Coat	Finish Coat
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 33 34 35 36	Alvminum Magnesium Wood Steel Aluminum Magnesium Wood Steel Aluminum Magnesium Wood	TT-E-485 " TT-P-636 Pigmented Epon <sup>2</sup> " " " " NIL-P-15328 Pigmentea Devran " " TT-P-636	3-173 " Pigmented Epon " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "
37 38	Poplar Wood Poplar Wood	TT-P-25 "	TT-P-40 Fire Retardant Paint, TT-P-26 (Int.)

#### Coding of Paint Samples Prepared for NML Testing (conti)

Under painted panels, the primer and finish refer to Government specifications.

<sup>2</sup> The "Pigmented Epon" is an Epon-resin vehicle pigmented similar to TT-E-485b. It was prepared by Devoe Raynolds Company, Louisville, Kentucky.

Specific paint systems as shown in the above table were prepared by brush coating them on  $1" \times 8" \times 1/8"$  panels of wood, steel, aluminum and magnesium, and allowing the paint to air dry 20 to 24 hours after each coat. The paint systems on metal were cut to approximately one inch length and the eight pieces mounted on a glass melamine holder with an air space less than 1'16" between each section to eliminate heat conduction between the sections. The systems on wood were mounted in one piece and held in place by insulated retaining strips.

In the preparation and testing of these samples, it became obvious that brush coating of the samples was not a satisfactory

RESTRICTED DATA

SECRET

SECRET Security Informatica

method of application due to the requirements and limitations of the test method. It was seen that small differences that averaged in normal practice on larger surfaces and on the field panels appeared to be intensified in the small surfaces. Future panels should be prepared either by spraying to a specified dry film thickness or by use of the doctor blade techniques. If apparatus for controlled film thickness is available it should be the quickest most efficient method.

#### A.1.2 Preparation of Plastic and Coated Fabric Samples

#### TABLE A.2

System	Materials Description
<pre> 1. Plastics 39 40 41 42 43 43 44 45 46 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 </pre>	Polystyrene Polyester, reinforced with fiberglas mat Cellulose Acetate Acrylic (Plexiglass) Teflon Saran Sheet Polyethylene Vinyl Sheet Vinyl Sheet Vinyl Covered Glass Fiber Nylon Fiber Dynel Fiber Saran Fiber Nylon Monofilm (FM 3606) Orlon Fiber Vinyon (NOHU)
2. Coated Fabrics 47 48 49 50 51 52 53	Nitrile Rubber (GR-A) Natural Rubber Vinyl Chloride-Acetate Co-polymer Isobutylene-Isoprene Co-polymer, (GR-I) Neoprene Rubber (GR-M) Uncoated Treated Duck Butadiene-Styrene Co-polymer (GR-S)

Coding of Plastics, Coated Fabrics and Packaging Materials for NAL Testing

- 29 -

SECRET



# SECRET

**.** 

TABLE A.2

(conti)

System	Materials Description		
3. Packaging Mate	rials		
121-115	JAN-B-121, Grade C, Type I, Class 1, Greaseproof Barrier-Material, coated with JAN-P-115, Dipcoat Sealing Compound.		
121-A-II-1	JAN-B-121, Grade A, 'Nype II, Class 1, Greaseproof Barrier-Material.		
121-0-1-1	JAN-B-121, Grade C, Type I, Class 1, Greaseproof Barrier-Material.		
131 <b>4-</b> 1-A	MIL-B-131A, Class A, Flexible Water- Vaporproof Barrier-Material.		
117-8-I-C	JAN-P-117, Grade B, Type I, Class C, Non- heat Sealable Greaseproof, Waterproof Bag.		
149 <b>-11-</b> 1	JAN-C-149, Type I, Protective Strippable Compound Ethylcellulose.		
149 <b>-11-</b> II	JAN-C-149, Type II, Protective Strippable Compound Acetate Butyrate.		
HITH 1756 <sup>3</sup>	AXS 1756 Strippable (Sprayable) Protective Compound.		
G <b>E-</b> 5249 <sup>4</sup>	50-5249 by P. M. Hollingshead Corporation No Government specification covering.		
	AXS-673 Hard Drying, Thin Film Preservative coated on $1^{\mu} \ge 12^{\mu} \ge 1/8^{\mu}$ mild carbon steel.		
<sup>3</sup> Army Cocoon by R. M. Hollingshead Corp., Camden, N. J. Specification No. 4939 Army Cocoon conforms to AXS 1756. Film formed by			
1 coat webbing mixed to Hollingshead Specification.			
1 0	(approx. 5 mils ea) mixed with 2 os yellow dye.		
l coat cocoon consisting of 3 applications (approx, 5 mils ea) mixed with 1 lb aluminum			
paste per gallon cocom.			

RESTRICTED DATA

з.

- 30 -

#### SECRET Socurity Information

<sup>4</sup>G. E. Cocoon by R. M. Hollingshead Corporation, Camden, N. J. Specification No. 50-5249 No Government Specification covering formulated expressly for General Electric Co., Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Schenectady, N. Y. Approved for use in all AEC establishment by USAEC, Washington, D. C. and Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee. (For use indoors only). Film formed by

- 1 coat webbing solution as formulated by R. M. Hollingshead Corporation, Camden, N. J.
- 2 coats cocoon each consisting of 3 applications (Each application approx. 5 mils thick).

The plastics and coated fabrics as shown in Table A.2 above, were prepared in the following manner.

#### A.1.2.1 Costed Fabrics and Plastic Film

The coated fabrics and plastic film specimens were cut into 1" x 8" strips and mounted on a glass melamine holder grooved to provide an air background. A glass silicone laminate fire guard, employed to prevent the propagation of a flame, was mounted over the specimen and held in place by an insulated strip.

#### A.1.2.2 Plastic Fibers

The plastic fibers were wrapped widthwise around plywood holders (1 x 8 inches) and held in place by insulated strips. Side notches were utilized to prevent slipping.

#### A.1.2.3 Packaging Materials

The packaging materials were cut to approximately 1" x 8" and mounted on plywood or glass melamine holders depending on the material. A glass silicone laminate fire guard was utilized on all samples except the ethyl cellulose and the acetate butyrate strippable compounds.

#### A.1.2.4 Rigid Plastic Material

The rigid plastic material was cut to approximately  $l^{n} \times 4^{n}$  size and mounted on a  $l^{n} \times 8^{n}$  plywood strip and held by insulated strips. A small space less than  $1/16^{n}$  was kept between the strips to eliminate heat conduction.

- 31 -

SELIKEI incenty internetio



ł



#### A.1.2.5 Different Method of Mounting Samples

Some further thought should be given to a different method of mounting these samples. In several instances more damage was caused from the burning of the backup than from incident rudiation. This made it very difficult to evaluate the samples. Improper packaging also caused loss of some samples. Paper and other packaging meterial stuck to the test face thus altering its surface characteristics. It was noted also that several of the packaging materials had identifying stencil marks on the face of the sample that made their evaluation more difficult. A clearer more detailed knowledge of the requirements and limitations of the method would have eliminated this difficulty

#### A.2 PREPARATION OF SAMPLES FOR FIELD EXPOSURE

A.2.1 Preparation of Paint Samples

#### TABLE A.3

Code System	Type Panel	Prime Coat	Finish Coat
C-1	Steel	Wash primer	TT-E-4851
		MIL-P-15328	(2 coats)
6-2	Aluminum	Wash primer	TT-E-485
		MIL-P-15328	(2 coats)
C-4	Wood	T'I-P-635	3-174
c-s	Steel	MIL-P-15328	3-173
-		TT-E-485	55
C-6	Steel	MIL-P-15328	TT-E-489
			(2 coats)
C-7	Steel	MIL-P-15328	3-194
		TT-E-485	
C-8	Aluminum	MIL-P-15328	3-194
		3-193-TvI	
C-10	booW	3-193-TV II	5-194
C-11	Wood	TT-P-636	T7-E-485
C-12	Steal	Pigmented Epon <sup>4</sup>	Pigmented Epon
C-13	Aluminum	<b>.</b> .	N
C-15	Wood	11 N	<b>n</b> n
C-16	Steel	MIL-P-15328	n n
		Pigmented Epon	

Ooding of Paint Samples For Field Exposure

- 32 -



SECRET

SECRET Security Information

#### TABLE A.3 (conti)

Code System	Type Panel	Prime Coat	Finish Coat
C-17	Poplar Wood	TT-P-25	TT-P-40
C-18	Poplar Wood	TT-P-25	(2  coats) VV-Ext $20^2$
C20	Stoel	Vinyl Paint <sup>3</sup> Prime Coat (l coat)	(2 coats) Vinyl Paint Body Coat (2 coats)

<sup>1</sup> The primer and finish coats refer to Government specifications.
<sup>2</sup>VV Ext 20 is an experimental fire retardant paint developed under research contract by Vita Var Corp., Newark, N. J.

<sup>3</sup>The vinyl paint is Amercoat 23, a commercial coating produced by Amercoat Corp., Los Angeles, California

<sup>4</sup>Epon resin paint is an Epon type vehicle pigmented similar to TT-E-485b and was manufactured by Devoe Raynolds Co., Louisville, Kentucky.

Representative paint systems as shown in Table A-3 were prepared as follows.

#### A.2.1.1 Cold Rolled Steel Panels

 $7^n \ge 12^n$  SAE 1J20 cold rolled steel panels were sand blasted, solvent cleaned and coated as shown in the above table.

#### A.2.1.2 Aluminum Alloy Panels

 $7^{\mu} \ge 12^{\mu} \ge 0.04^{\mu} = 24ST3$  aluminum alloy panels were solvent clammed and coated in accordance with the above table.

#### A.2.1.3 Southern Yellow Pine Wood Panels

 $6^{n} \times 12^{n} \times 3/8^{n}$  southern yellow pine wood panels were samied smooth and free from dirt, and coated in accordance with the above table.

A.2.1.4 Poplar Wood Panels

Poplar wood panels conforming to the requirements of Fed. Spec. IT-P-26 were coated as shown in the above table.

- 33 -





7

1. S. .....



All coatings were sprayed to give a total dry film thickness of 3.5 to 4.0 mils. All systems except C.12, C.13, and C.16 were air dried. These systems were baked for 15 minutes at  $250^{\circ}$  F. A steel backup plate 7" x 12" x 1/16" was used on all of the samples to minimize destortion from blast effects.

In future tests it would be desirable to investigate the use of standard gauge panels and to use a controlled film thickness spray apparatus for coating the panels.

#### A.2.2 Preparation of Plastic and Coated Fabric Samples

The following table lists the samples subjected to field exposure.

#### TABLE A.4

#### Coding System for Plastics and Coated Fabrics for Field Exposure

System	Material Description
1. Rigid Plastics	
P-1	Plexiglass
P-2	Cellulose Acetate
P-3	Polyester Resin (Glass Mat)
P-4	Phenol-Formaldehyde (Asbestos)
P-5	Polyvinyl Chloride
P-6	Polyethylene
P-7	Teflon
P-8	Vinyl Sheet
P-9	Saran
P-10	Dynel
P-11	Orlon
P-12	Cotton
P-13	Vinyl Covered Glass
P-14	Nylon
P-15	Saran
P-16	Nylon Monofilm (FM-3606)

RESTRICTED DATA

- 34 -SECRET

Security Information



TABLE A.4 (conti)

	Sys tem	Material Description
2. Coated	Fabri cs	
	CF-1 CF-2 CF-3 CF-4 CF-5 CF-6 CF-7 CF-8	Butadiene-Styrene Copol. (GH-S) Isobutylene-Isoprene Copol. (GR-I) Neoprene GN Uncoated Treated Duck Nitrile Rubber GR-A Natural Rubber Vinyl Chloride-Acetate Copol. Neoprene Pubber Lab. batch

All of the samples were mounted on 1/4" plywood panels, 15" by 13", built up on the ends to permit a 1" air space between the sample and the backup panel. The fibers were strung in parallel strands running the length of the panel. The rigid plastic samples had mail holes drilled into each end of the sample so that the mails used for fastening the samples would not cause any localized stresses in the material. All of the coated fabric samples were commercial products except the meopreme coated fabric which was coated in the laboratory at ENDL.

In future tests thought should be given to the replacement of the wood backup panels with a non-flammable non-conductive type. This would eliminate damage from panel burn and simplify the evaluations.

#### A.3 CONSTRUCTION OF HACKS FOR FIELD TESTS

A.3.1 Construction of the Test Licks

The test racks, Fig. A.1 were constructed of 3/8" angle iron with two removeable pinel holding sections, and hinged back braces that permitted the face of the rack to be set **ab** any angle from 90° to 180°, and were bolted to steel stakes set into the ground. To determine the best method of setting the stakes, they were set in three different ways.

a. Set in concrete (6" thick, 18" diameter)

b. Set in the ground with an 18" baffle plate affixed near the bettom of the stake and the dirt backfilled over it.

- 35





, ni Li k



c. The stake merely driven into the ground.



Fig. A.1 Construction Of Racks Used For Field Exposure

The rack, itself, was 5' x 10' with two 3' x 5' panel sections that were 2' off of the ground. The rack and panel sections were so constilled that they reinforced each other. The panel sections were secured to the rack frace by three bolts, thus permitting quick easy removal of the samples to an uncontaminated area where a careful eximination of the panels could be mide and a fresh series prepared for the next shot.

A 3/4 ton power truck was used to transport the samples to and from the test site. A rack was built on the back of the truck in order to stand the panel soctions or edge and space them so that none of the samples would be damaged in transit,

In a study of the results of the exposures on this project it becomes apparent that it would be desirable to be able to differentiate between the Samare caused by theseal flux and that

- 36 -

SECRET

Security Information

RESTRICTED DATA

caused by thermal flux and blast damage together. This could be accomplished by either of three modifications of the presently used exposure racks.

a. The use of quartz or "Pyrex Vycer" windows.

SECRET Security Information

b. An electromically operated shield, or one with a fusible metal link, that would drop down and cover the samples, after exposure to the thermal effects and before the arrival of the blast wave.

c. Have the rack so hinged that it would lay back on the ground, with a shield covering the panels, on the arrival of the blast wave.

Quartz windows are commonly used but because of the size and number of samples, the cost would be too great. "Pyrex Vycer" is a glass manufactured by Corning Glass Works, with properties simular to quartz. It is comparatively cheaper than quartz and can be manufactured in desired sizes and shapes. It would warrent further investigation. "Lethod c would have one advantage in that the racks would not have to be built to withstand the pressures required under a or b.

An improvement of the present rack would be a quicker method of fastening the sample panels to the panel sections. At present there are four bolts to each panel and thirty-two paint panels to a rack. However, these can be put on at leisure and kept covered until ready for exposure.

Security Information

STRICTED D

WIC ENERGY



#### APPENDIX B

#### METHOD OF EVALUATION OF TEST RESULTS

#### B.1 METHOD OF EVALUATION OF NML SAMPLES

The samples prepared as described in Appendix A were subjected to a laboratory source of thermal flux using the searchlight method as described in NML BUSTER report No. WT311. In this method, the beam of a 24 inch Navy searchlight is directed towards a receiving mirror which concentrates the energy at a focal point. The sample is made to pass through this point at a constant acceleration or deceleration, with the total flux and the time of exposure determining the amount of flux at any point. The energy level is determined by placing calibration strips along the side of the sample and converting the speed of travel into thermal energy in cal/cm<sup>2</sup>.

B.1.1 Method of Evaluating Damage

The general method of evaluating the damage to the specimens was as follows.

#### B.1.1.1 Evaluating Exposed Paint Systems On Metal

The exposed paint systems on metal were evaluated for initial effects, and the flaming and complete destruction of the paint. Flaming was observed directly during exposure. Complete destruction was the minimum energy at which the charred paint lost its cohesiveness and could be readily flaked off down to the metal surface by lightly scraping with a razor blade.

#### B.1.1.2 Evaluating Paint Systems On Wood

The paint systems on wood were evaluated for initial effects, paint char, and wood char. The initial effect was primarily the discoloration of the topcoat.

#### B.1.1.3 Evaluating Exposed Coated Fabrics and Plastic Films

The exposed coated fabrics and plastic films were evaluated for initial effects, charring and destruction. In several cases only one critical point could be recorded, the destruction of the material. The energy corresponding to destruction was taken as the minimum energy at which the charred material lost its cohesiveness and readily fell apart at a light touch.

- 38 -

SECRET

Security Information





#### B.1.1.4 Evaluation Of Plastic Fibers

Plastic fibers were evaluated as to destruction only. Destruction was that point at which the fibers parted.

#### B.1.1.5 Evaluation of Rigid Plastics

Rigid plastics were evaluated as to the critical points particular to each.

#### B.1.1.6 Evaluation Of Packaging Material

The packaging material evaluation consisted of determining the energies corresponding to initial effect, charring or melting and destruction.

B.2 ERDL LABORATORY EVALUATION TESTS

B.2.1 Discussion of Test Methods

#### B.2.1.1 Paint Test Methods

The following exposure and evaluating tests were chosen to show what effect the field exposures had on the service life and use characteristics of the different paint systems. A more detailed discussion of them will be found in Fed. Spec. TT-P-141.

The Salt Spray Cabinet Test is one in which the samples are exposed to a fog of 20% salt solution at  $90^{\circ}$  F and was used to evaluate the porosity of the film and its ability to prevent corrosion of the underlying surface.

The Accelerated Weathering Test is one in which the samples are subjected to cycles of ultra-violet light (carbon arc) and water spray. It was used to evaluate the service life left in the film, that is, how well it would continue to stand up in outside use.

The Humidity Cabinet Test is one in which the sample is subjected to conditions of high humidity  $(90^{\circ} \text{ F and } 95\% \text{ R.H.})$  and was used to evaluate the porosity of the film and its ability to protect against rusting in high humidity (tropical) conditions.

Flexibility, abrasion resistance and shear hardness were used to evaluate the effect of the above exposure tests. Flexibility indicates adhesion of the film to the surface and resistance to thermal shock. It is determined on the Navy conical mandrel and is calculated to per cent elongation of the film by the following



Security Informati

RESTRICTED DATA

#### SECRET contry information

formula:  $\% = 100_{2r} \frac{T}{r}$ 

where T = average thickness of the panel (inches) r = radius of incipient cracking.

Abrasion resistance indicates the resistance of the film to abrasive wear. It is determined as weight loss on the Tabor Abrader and calculated to volume loss of the paint film.

Shear hardness indicates the adhesion and cohesion of the paint film and its resistance to gouging and mechanical shock. It is determined on the Tabor Abrader and is reported as the average width of scratch, in  $10^{-3}$  inches, made with a 600 gram load.

#### B.2.1.2 Plastics and Coated Fabrics

The non-volatile (ash) content of the reinforced plastics was determined by ashing at  $1050^{\circ}$  F. An increase in non-volatile would indicate the loss of plastic binder.

The surface hardness was determined on the "M" scale of the Rockwell Hardness Tester in accordance with Method 1081. Fed Spec. L-P-406a. A change in hardness indicates an increase in the polymerization of the material or a loss of plasticizer.

The specific gravity was determined on a Jolly Balance, in accordance with Method 5011, Fed. Spec. L-P-406a. An increase in specific gravity is an indication of the loss of some of the volatile constituents.

The breaking strength of the fibers and coated fabrics was determined on the Scott Tensile Tester in accordance with Method 5102, Fed. Spec. CCC-T-1916. Both the "strand strength" and "knot strength" were determined on the fibers since it has been shown that knotting has a variable effect on the strength of the fibers which is significant when the fibers are used in camouflage materials.

The flexual properties and modulus of elasticity of the rigid plastics were determined in accordance with Method 1031 Fed. Spec. L-P-406a. This test indicates the ability of the rigid plastic to resist breaking under bending stresses.

The percent light transmittance was determined on the G. E. Recording Spectrophotometer in accordance with Method 425.1 Fed. Spec. TT-P-141b. This test indicates any loss in translucency or the ability of the material to transmit light.

- 40 -

RESTRICTED DATA

SECRET Security Information

#### SECRET Security Information

B.3 METHOD OF EVALUATING DAMAGE TO SAMPLES, ERDL

B.3.1 Paint Samples

#### B.3.1.1 Exposure of Metal Panels

The metal panels were cut to  $4^{m} \ge 4^{m}$  and  $3^{m} \ge 5^{m}$  sizes, properly edged and subjected to the following exposure tests.

150 hours - Salt Spray Cabinet

300 hours - Accelerated Weathering

30 days - High Humidity

These panels were then evaluated for flexibility, abrasion resistance and shear hardness.

B.3.1.2 Exposure of Paint Systems

The panels on which paint systems were exposed to 85 cal/cm<sup>2</sup> and apparently suffered total destruction, were subjected to 30 days in the humidity cabinet.

#### B.3.1.3 Exposure of Fire Retardant Panels

The fire retardant panels, C.17 and C.18 were conditioned and burned by the Cabinet Test Method as specified in Fed. Spec. TT-P-26.

B.3.2 Plastics and Coated Fabrics

B.3.2.1 Rigid Plastics

The rigid plastics were subjected to the following laboratory tests.

Flexual strength and modulus of elasticity

Specific Gravity

Rockwell Hardness

Light Transmittance

Percent Inert

- 41 -

SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA

X

# SECRET

### B.3.2.2 Plastic Film and Coated Fabrics

Plastic films and coated fabrics were subjected to the following laboraty tests.

Breaking Strength

Percent elongation

#### B.3.2.3. Fibers

Fibers were subjected to the following lab-

oratory tests.

Breaking strength, strand and knot

Percent elongation, strand and knot

RESTRICTED DATA

- 42 -SECRET

Searly interaction

#### APPENDIX C

### TABLE C-1

### The Effect of Laboratory Thermal Flux on Certain Materials

System	Material	Description of Effect on Material	Critical Energy Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>
1	Alkyd lusterless an- amel (2 coats) on	Dulling and darkening of surface.	7.9
	Steel .	Surface breaks into non propagating flame.	16
2	Alkyd lusterless en- emel (2 coats) on	Dulling and darkening of surface.	19
		non propagating flame.	38
3	Alkyd lusterless en- amel (2 costs) on	Dulling and darkening of surface.	6.3
	Margine at the	non propagating flame. Paint Carbonises exceeding	16
		metal on light scraping.	30
4	Alkyd Semi-gloss en- amel on wood.	Blistering of topcoat. Discoloration of topcoat.	1.4 1.8
		Topcoat Chars.	5.5
		Undercost (nars.	13
		Wood Chars.	17
5	Alkyd Semi-gloss en- smel on steel.	Paint turns rusty red color.	19
6	Alkyd Sami-gloss en- amel on aluminum.	Paint turns rusty red color.	15
7	Alkyd Somi-gloss en- smel on magnesium.	Paint turns rusty red color.	10
		propagating flame. Paint carbonises and	זע
		flakes off exposing me- tal on light scraping.	19

i .

ŧ

- 43 -

SECRET

## RESTRICTED DATA

¥¥

----

1

işa J

.

## SECRET

## TABLE C-1 (Cont.)

System	Material	Description of Effect on Material	Critical Energy Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>
8	Alkyd Semi-gloss en- emel on wood .	Discoloration of top- coat. Topcoat Chars. Undercoat Chars. Wood Chars.	1.5 2.7 7.0 13.0
9	Alkyd Gloss ensmel on steel.	Paint turns rusty red color.	19
10	Alkyd gloss enamel on aluminum.	Paint turns rusty red color.	28
ц	Alkyd gloss ensuel on megnesium.	Paint turns rusty red color. Busface breaks into non propagating flams. Paint carbonises and flakes off exposing metal on light scraping.	6.7 16 33
12	Alkyd Gloss enamel on wood.	Blistering of topcoat along grain line. Miscoloration of top- coat, Topcoat Chars. Undercoat Chars. Wood Chars.	1.0 1.2 2.7 4.6 12
13	Phenolic Paint on atoel.	Paint blackens.	7.2
1),	Phenolic Paint on aluminum.	No effect.	53

RESTRICTED DATA

- 44 -

SECRET

SECRET Security Information

TABLE	C-1 (	(Cont.)	l.
-------	-------	---------	----

	r		1
System	Material	Description of Effect on Material	Critical Energy Cal/cm <sup>2</sup>
15	Phenolic Paint on magnesium.	Paint turns rusty red color. Surface breaks into non propagating flame. Paint carbonises and flakes off exposing metal on light scraping.	7.9 13 29
16	Phenolic Paint on wood.	Discoloration of top- coat. Topcoat Chars. Undercoat Chars. Wood Chars.	1.8 3.7 8.7 14
17	Alkyd Semi-gloss over Phenolic sys- tem on steel.	Paint blackens.	Ъц
18	Alkyd Semi-gloss over Phenolic sys- tem on eluminum.	Paint turns a rusty red color.	7.3
19	Alkyd Sami-gloss over Phenolic sys- tem on magnesium.	Paint turns a rusty red color. Surface breaks into non propagating flame. Paint carbonises and flakes off exposing metal on light scraping.	10 14 15
20	Alkyd Semi-glose over Phenolic sys- tem on wood.	Discoloration of top- coat. Topcost Chars. Undercoat Chars. Wood Chars.	2.3 8.2 15 22
21	Alkyd lusterless en- amel (1 coat) on steel.	Paint blackens.	8.8

1

- 45 -

SECRET Security internation

RESTRICTED DATA

SECRET Secrety Internet

System	Material	Description of Effect on Material	Critical Energy Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>
22	Alkyd lusterless en- amel (1 coat) on aluminum.	Paint blackens.	43
23	Alkyd lusterless en- amel (1 cost) on magnesium.	Small blisters on surf- ace. Paint blackens. Surface breaks into non propagating flams. Paint carbonises and flakes off exposing metal on light scraping.	8.8 16 27 33
<b>24</b>	Alkyd lusterless en- amel on wood.	Blistering of topooat. Topcoat Chars. Undercoat Chars. Wood Chars.	1.4 2.3 8.1 10
ి	Alkyd Sami-gloss on steel.	Paint turns a rusig red color.	7.9
26	Alkyd Semi-gloss en- anal on aluminum.	Paint turns a rusty red color.	7.2
27	Alkyd Sami-gloss en- apel on magnesium.	Paint turns a rusty red color. Surface breaks into non propagating flame. Paint carbonises and flakes off exposing metal on light scraping.	10 16 33
28	Alkyd Sund-gloss en- sael on wood.	Blistering of topcost. Discoloration of topcost. Topcost Chars. Undercost Chars. Wood Chars.	1.5 2.4 3.8 14 23
29	Epon resin paint (2 costs) on steel.	Paint blackens.	8.9

ŧ



RESTRICTED DATA

SECRET

arity informati 1 



## TABLE C-1 (Cont.)

System	Material	Description of Effect on Material	Critical Energy Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>
30	Epon resin paint (2 coats) on Alumin.	Paint blackens. Surface breaks into	6.7 15
31	Epon resin paint (2 coats) on magne-	Paint blackens. Paint forms brittle	9.2
	Slum.	off exposing metal.	<b>1</b> 4
32	Epon resin paint (2 coats) on wood.	Discoloration of top- coat. Topcoat Chars. Wood Chars.	2.0 3.7 16
33	Epon resin paint over washprimer on steel.	Paint blackens.	10
5 <b>4</b>	Epon resin paint over washprimer on aluminum.	Paint blackens.	7.9
35	Epon resin paint	Paint blackens.	14
	over wishprimer on magnesium.	non propagating flame. Paint Carbonises and	16
		flakes off exposing metal on light screping.	24
36	Spon resin paint over woodprimer on wood.	Discoloration of top- coat. Topcoat Chars. Undercoat Chars. Wood Chars.	0.93 2.7 5.7 18

þ

- 47 -

SECRET



- Handlin in



A Carl Street in the series

ŝ.

TABLE	C-1	(Cont.	)
-------	-----	--------	---

K

System	Material	Description of Effect on Material	Critical Energy Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>
37	Outside barracks paint on poplar wood.	Elistering of topcoat. Discoloration of top- coat. Topcoat Chars. Wood Chars.	10 14 18 34
38	Fire retardant paint on poplar wood.	Blistering and discolor- ation of topcoat. Sporatic charring of topcoat. Topcoat Chars. Wood Chars. Undercoat Chars.	10 76-21 21 66 81
	Douglas Fir, Uncoated.	Slight charring. First grain Char. Second grain Char.	4.5 8.3 10
	Poplar wood, Uncoated.	Slight charring. Wood Chars.	5.7 8.9
39	Polystyrene.	Not run.	
ն	Polyester reinforced with fiberglass mat.	Charring begins, no effect on wood.	28
μı	Celluloss Acetate.	Wood Chars. Slight melting. Destruction.	7.2 63 135
Jµ2	Plexiglass.	Wood Chars. No other apparent critical points.	6,5
43	Teflon.	Destruction.	55
μh	Saran Sheet.	Destruction.	7.6
45	Polyethylene.	Destruction.	30

- 48 -

SECRET

Security Information

RESTRICTED DATA

### SECRET Security Information

## TABLE C-1 (Cont.)

System	Material	Description of Effect on Material	Critical Energy Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>
46	Vinyl Sheet.	Charring begins.	2.3
47	GR-A Rubter.	Slight discoloration. Slight Blackening. Grey discoloration. Charring begins. Destruction.	3.4 4.8 8.4 9.4
48	Natural Rubber.	Slight discoloration. Brown discoloration. Grey discoloration. Charring begins.	0 <b>.81</b> 2.8 4 8.3
49	Vinyl rubber.	Slight discoloration. Sporatic charring. Charring.	1.1 2.8 4.5
50	GR-I rubber.	Slight discoloration. Grey discoloration Dk. green discoloration. Charring begins.	0.45 0.73 2.9 4.5
51	GR-M rubber.	Slight discoloration. Grey discoloration. Brown discoloration. Charring begins.	0.45 0.74 1.9 2.5
52	Uncoated Duck.	Slight discoloration Destruction	1 27
53	GR-S rubber	Slight discoloration. Charring begins.	0.81 2.2
54	Vinyl covered glass fiber.	Charring begins. Destruction begins.	7 58
55	Nylon fiber	Melting begins Destruction begins	7 21

L

- 49 -

SECRET

Security Info

RESTRICTED DATA

「「「「「「「」」」」という

Same and a second second

での読録をあるのです。

Contraction of the local division of the loc

1



## TABLE C-1 (Cont.)

System	Material	Description of Effect on Material	Critical Energy Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>
56	Dynel fiber	Charring begins. Destruction.	5 9
57	Saran fiber	Charring begins. Destruction.	2.8 5.5
58	Nylon monofilm FM 3606	Destruction	8
59	Orlon	Destruction.	32
60	Vinyon (NOHU)	Destruction.	8.4
121-115	Barrier Material	Slight discoloration. Melting begins.	6.3 8.1
121+C-I-I	Barrier Material	Slight discoloration Charring begins.	4.8 9.4
121 <b>-A-</b> II-I	Barrier Material	Slight discoloration. Charring begins Destruction	3 5.8 9.4
131 <b>4-</b> I-A	Barrier Lterial	Melting begins Charring of underlayer Destruction	3.2 7 14
117 <b>8-</b> I-C	Waterproof bag	Slight discoloration. Charring begins. Discoloration of underlayer. Destruction top layer. Destruction of underlayer.	2.8 5.9 11 14 27
149-I	Ethylcellulose	Melting begins	5 (approx.)
149-2	Acetate-Butyrate	Melting begins	5 (approx.)

RESTRICTED DATA

3

- 50 -

SECRET

ly informal

SECRET Security information

System	Material	Description of Effect	Critical Energy Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>
RWH 1756	Army Cocoon	Slight discoloration Charring begins	2.4 10
GE 5249	G.E. Cocoon	Melting begins Charring begins	5 19
AXS-673	Packaging material	No apparent critical points.	

1 ....

ł

,

TABLE C-1 (Cont.)

- 51 -

SECRET Security Information





#### TABLE C-2

## Thermal and Blast Data (Field Exposures)

Stations		BAKER			DOG	
(Nom. ft.)	Slant Distence	Thermal Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>	Blast psi	Slant Distance	Thermal Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>	Blast psi
2000	2414	17.5	5.7	2480	85	9.5
4000	4283	5.0	2.6			
5000	5260	3.2	2.0	5249	18,5	3.8
7000	7230	1.6	1.4	7200	9.8	2.9
9000				9175	5.7	2.7*
12000			·	<b>1213</b> 0	3.3	1.5*

÷

١

#### \* Estimated values

Slant distance in feet

Blast measurements by Sandia Corporation on Contract to LASE Thermal measurements by MRDL and MAL

BAKER Shot	DOG Shot
Height 1118 ft	Beight 1417 ft
140 ft N	56 IL N
13 ft W	36 <b>ft B</b>
Size 3.47 KT	Size 20.9 KT

RESTRICTED DATA

e



s#j

c	5	
ß	9	
0	9	
£	-	

i

.

_	L	
<b>_</b>	L	
	E	1
_	r	1
_	L	1
	L	J
	r	J.
		1
		l
	Ľ	J
_		1
	F.	1
	L	ł
	r	2
_	Ŀ	ł
		1
	L	1
	L	i
	L	J
-	L	1
	F.	ł
_		
	r.	1
_	Ľ	
_	L	l
-	L	ų
	L	
_		1
~		ſ
	Г	N
<b>x</b>	r.	1
	L	J
_	L	1
	E	1
	L	
	L	ł
	L	
	L	1
- 1	r	ł
- 1	L	
- 1		i
· 14	L	1
_	L	1
	L	3
1	L.	4
	L.	ł
	L	
<b>_</b>	F	1
	R	1
		1
	I.	J
_		ų
-	L	ł
-	r	1
	L	1
- 1		
- 1	L	1
		5

•			BAKER Shot		
<b>.</b>	Katerial	2000 Ct. Station	4000 ft. Station	5000 ft. Station	7000 ft. Station
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	C-1	Small blisters evenly over the surface. Blisters proken to show pitting. Scattered bits of dirt embedded in the surface.	No apparent change in color of sheen. Some surface erosion and gravel damage. A few fine blistars. Some embedded dust.	No apparent damage. A few scattered bits of gravel embedded in the surface.	Some Smoke dam- age one panel.
- 53 -	C-2	Surface coat charred and blistered. Thin undercoat possibly vash primer is 0.K. fvo top coats gone.	A small amount of sur- face erosion and gravel damage. A few fine blisters. Some embedded dust.	Some of the blisters flaked away exposing panel.	llo apperent danago.
<b>.</b>	* 5	Reddish in appearance. Resincus grain shows deep char. Non-resin- ous grain no char. Coating completely gone.	Panels show small, medium, and large blisters. Resinous grain is red in color with black blisters. Large blisters flaked off and showing some sand erosion of the panel.	Souttered blisters, small to large.	No apparent damage.

SECRET

rity inte

RESTRICTED DATA

SECRET Security Information TABLE C-3 (Cont.)

1	T .			
700 ft Station	No apparent damage.	Slight warpage on one panel. A group of what might be blisters on the other panel.	No apperent damage.	No apparent damage.
5000 ft Station	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.
4000 ft Station	Some surface erosion and an occasional blister. No appredi- able amount of em- bedded dirt.	Very slight darkening in color. No particu- lar surface erosion. Occasional blister. Some embedded dirt.	No visual damage.	No change in color. Some gravel damage. Some embedded dirt.
2000 ft Statign	Charring, blistering and flaking. Some damage from flying gravel.	Whole surface charred and blistered. The left side shows the most blast damage.	Surface coat shows mottled appearance of brown, red, yellow, and green with large flakes of blistered material.	Conting charred, fine pitting to show pri- mer, some pitting down to metal.
Material	с У	C-6	C	ထ ၂ ပ

SECRET Security Informat

RESTRICTED DATA

ŝ

SECRET inter.

۰.

Ī	cl	• •	<b>6</b> 80	<b>.</b>	
	atio	dame.	dama	dama	deme deme
	<b>ft</b> St	urent	rent	rent	rent
	2000	add a	aqqa	appe	bla
		r No	0 몇.	No	N N
	g	Ling of the second seco	ine and ters rain.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• କ୍ଷେ
	tat1	dden: se. ( se. ( other spots	th fr Tain bila Bila Bila	it dau	t de
	む	ed re urfec s ahc ere, red a	ed mi ers j ered ered	paret	per er
	5000	Spott the s place blat just	Cover blist resin scatt in th	No ap	d <b>s</b> o <sub>N</sub>
		ab red.	re brid	- -	
ort.	5	rll, ge floug eddi chari chari	11 gh Sur- Sur- Lth su Lge.	transition bed contro bed contro	entri entri entri entri
-3 (0	Stat1	w sm id lai Lar( Lar( Lar( Lar) Lar( Lar) Lar( Lar) Lar)	Resir Resir red. dem		11ght Considering Considering Considering
BLE	との	s sho m, ar ers h howir ng ur dan	slig lor. char cover blast	Burfe t dar . Son	
A T	707	Panel mediu blist blist blist blist coff resin Grave	Panel 1n co grain face Some	Some Sligh color dirt.	Show in co able disin top f bedde
			E * %		, <b>,</b> , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	tion	urce Coat Bone Uchar Uchar	nce c Ma ring ely howir	1ster	liga urfac age to
	t Ste	peers esinc ting. tely ing v	pears esinc s cha mplet ots s wood.	nd bi Fils Bg	nd al the a l dam ppear
	8	ed ap ce. R char char ehor	ed ep cos R cos R bow the cu	ing a f the pitti	ing a cf a c
	ন্দ	Mottl Bruffa Bruffa Bpots Food.	sorti surfa grain Soati Sone : sone :	Charr. Lng o: Jome ]	Charr: Corini Somo ( Die si Murnt
	-1	A U W YI U P			0 4 0 0 A
	teria	<b>c-1</b> 0	c-11	c1-5	c-13
[]	R				

SECRET

Security Information

ł.

RESTRICTED DATA

<u>.</u>

ł

SECRET Security Information

	7000 ft Statics	No apparent damage.	No aprarent dan- age.	No apperent das- age.
TABLE C-3 (Cont.)	5000 Ct Station	Covered with fine to modium blisters. Some cracking and peeling.	No apparent demago.	No apparent damage.
	4000 ft Station	Fine to large blisters ground the edges. Fine blisters over rest of panel. Large blisters flaked cff showing charring of wood under- neath. Small amount of embedded dirt.	Mo change in color. Few somttered blisters. Some embedded dirt.	No apparent damage
والمتعادية المتعادية المتالية المتالية المنافعة من المتعادية والمتعادية في خصارهم والمرية المتعاولية والانتهامية في معاني	2000 CL Btatica	Surface charred. Paint completely gone. Wood charred in resincue grain. Deep char in upper right corner.	Surface charring over entire surface. Severe charring down oenter of one panel. Some gravel damage. Some gravel and dirt embedded in the sur- face.	Surface is covered with a coating of sand and dirt. Coating charred in spots. Appears to be gone on majority of panel.
	<b>Materiale</b>	C-15	c-16	C-17

SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA

- 55 -SECRET

a hai

-	~
	٠
- 4	2
1	9
- (	D
C	с,
~	-
C	n
	1
Ľ	31
	â
	3
- 24	21
	1
- 2	5
F	• 1

-

÷

ŝ

-

.

	ton	a maria	б На на с	Bund		- Stan
	7000 ft Stat:	No apparent d	No apparent de	No apparent de	No apparent de	No apparent de
	5000 ft Station	No apparait dare 39.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damago.
(*******	4000 ft Station	No apperent danage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	Some smoking. No apparent damage.
	2000 Ct Station	Black surface char. No appreciable embedded dirt. Some gravel dam- age.	Surface alligatoring. Coating appears to have fibers or needle crystals. Coating shot on one edge of one panel.	Cracked on one edge. Slight bow. Some gravel damage. Back- ing Funel socrahed.	Some scorching. 911ght bow. Gravel embedded in one edge. Backing panel scorched.	One edge smoked up. Slight char on back wy panel on the unsmoked side. Slight bow. Some gravel damage.
	Materials	C18	<b>C-3</b> 0	P-1	<b>7-</b> 2	C - d

SECRET

in inte

SECRET Security Information

ATOMC ENDINY ACT NM

\$

4 • N

7000 ft Station No apparent dan-No apparent dam-No apparent dam-No apparents dem-Torn. Probably due to blast Completely damage. gone. **a**g**e**. age. **...** 8ge. No apparent damage. No apparent damage. No apparent damage. No apparent damage. 5000 ft Station Scorching on back up panel Partially burned. Completely gone. Completely destroyed. Scorching on back up TABLE C-3 (Cont.) Material melted and No apperent damage. No apparent damage. One edge damaged (crumpled). Could Could 4000 ft Station practically gone. Strip torn. Coul be blast damage. have been either blast or thermal effects. panel. edge. Some gravel dam-Some bow. No charring Heat scorched on one and surface erosion. Completely gone. Back up panel shows Back up panel shows age. Backing panel Some gravel damage 2000 ft Station of back up panel. Completely gone. Back up panel scorched. Completely gone. Back up penel scorched. Completely gone. edge scorching. good scorching. scorched. laterials P-9 P-5 **P-6** P-8 P-4 P-7 - 58 -

SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA

teres a

\*\*\*\*\*

SECRET

	7000 ft Station	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.
	5000 ft Station	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	Melted and frayed.	No apparent damage.
IABLE U-7 (CORT.)	4000 ft Station	No apparent damage.	No apperent damag	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	Completely gone.	No apparent damage.
	2000 ft Station	Completely gone. Back up panel shows good scorching.	Completely gone. Back up panel shows good scorching.	Completely gone. Back up panel shows good scorching.	Coating burnt off glass fiber, Fiber remains. Back up board was charred.	Completely gone. Back up panel charred.	Completely gone. Back up panel charred.	Completely gone. Back up panel charred.
	Material	<b>P-</b> 10	11-4	P-12	P-13	P-14	P-15	<b>P-1</b> 6

SECRET Security Internation

FARES C=3 (Cont.

1

•

right, I

SECRET Security information

RESTRICTED DATA

nt

والمرجرة بالمحمد

7000 AL Station	No apperent dan- age.	Nu apparent damege.	No apperent damage.	No apperent demage.	No apparent damage.
5000 ft Station	Some whitening . Some surface erosion.	Some whitening. Some surface erosion.	Some whitening. Some surface erosion	Some surface erosion.	No apparent úamage
4000 ft Station	Some whitening of the surface.	Some surface ero- sion. Some embedded dirt.	Some whitening of the surface. Some surface erosion.	Some surface erusion. Some emuoaded dirt.	Some smuking. Some whitening.
2000 ft Station	Completely gone. Possibly due to blast darage. Slight charr- ing under sample. Good charring between samples.	Some charring of sur- face. Gravel and dirt embedded in surface. Slight charring under sample.	Blackened surfacs. White surface deposit. Slight cuarring under sample.	Completely gous. Blight char on back up panel.	Completely gone. Probably due to blast damage. Slight charr- ing of back up panel.
Material	CF-1	CF-2	<b>6</b> -3	CF-4	CF-5

- 60 -

SECRET

ite inferme

TABLE C-3 (Cont.

RESTRICTED DATA ATOMIC ENGADY ACT 1945 SECRET Security Information TABLE C-3 (Cont.

Π				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	7000 ft Station	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No aprarent damage.
	5000 ft Station	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.
	400) ft Station	Some smoking. Some whitening.	Some melting and blackening. Some gravel and dust embedded in the surface.	Some dirt embedded in the surface. No other apparent damage.
	2000 ft Station	Completely gone. Probably due to blast damage. Slight charr- ing of back up panel.	Surface blackened. Gravel and dirt embed- ded in the surface. Very slight charring of back up panel.	Completely gome. Back up panel shows slight charring.
	Material	CF-6	CF−7	5 <b>7-</b> 30
	Material	<b>CF-</b> 6	- 61 -	<b>8-1</b> 2

SECRET

ecurity laters

SECRET Security Information

RESTRICTED DATA

30F

1

# SECRET

## TABLE C-4

## Thermal Exposure Effects

	DOG Shot at 2000 Ft.			
Neterial	Description of Effects			
C-1	Paint completely gone. Panel shows heat blueing and excessive sandblasting.			
C-2	Paint completely gone. Panel shows excessive sand- blasting. One panel half gone.			
C-5	Paint completely gone. Panel shows heat blueing, excessive sandblasting, and gravel damage.			
<b>C-6</b>	Paint completely gone. Panel shows heat blueing, excessive sandblasting, and gravel lamage.			
C-7	Paint completely gone. Panel shows heat blueing. excessive sandblasting, and gravel damage.			
C-8	Paint completely gone. One panel completely gone. Second panel shows excessive sand erosion and gravel.			
C-12	Paint completely gone. Panels show heat blueing and excessive sandblasting and gravel damage.			
C-13	Small specks of what appears to be paint remains. The rest of the panel shows sandblast effects.			
C-16	Paint completely gone. Panels show heat blueing, excessive sandblasting, and gravel damage.			
C-17	Paint completely gone. Surface shows excessive sandblasting and gravel damage.			
C-18	Paint completely gone. Surface shows excessive sandblasting and gravel damage.			
C-20	Paint completely gone. Surface has a gray mat appearance.			



- 62 -SECRET

tite Inde
TABLE C-5

ł

E

Thermal Exposure Effects

ł

SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA

SECRET Security Informa

RESTRICTED DATA

;

SECRET te M

15

64

TABLE C-5 (Cont.)

• • •

Katerial	5000 ft Station	7000 ft Station	9000 fi Station	12000 ft Station
S-5	Blistering and flaking with exposure of panel. Some charring on the edges.	Some gravel damage. Some embedded dirt.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.
9	Both penels badly cimarred. One panel shows bad pitting pro- bably due to gravel damage.	Coating completely gone.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.
c-2	Paint completely gone. Large blisters flaked off. Red and green spots on the panel.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.
89 	Top coat gone. Primer apparently intact. Panel has yellow spots and large blisters with red color on edges.	Some gravel damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.

SECRET

t,

1

1

)

•

		SE	CRET y Information	
	12000 ft Station.	A few red spots on the restnous grain. Probably incipient blist- ers.	Covered with fine blisters on the resinous grown.	l'o apparent dem- age.
	9000 ft Station	Small to large red blisters. A number of large blisters have flaked off leav- ing the wood exposed. The ex- posed wood has a red deposit on it.	Charring in the resincus portion with very fine blisters over the surface.	No apparent d <b>am-</b> age.
TABLE C-5 (Cont.)	7000 ft Station	Surface covered with fine to large blisters. Considerable flaking and charring.	Excessive charring and blistering. Some flaking of blisters. Pitting of top coat.	Some gravel damage.
	5000 ft Station	Coating completely gone on one panel. Practically gone on the other one. Deep charring in the resincus grain.	Coating completely gone on one panel and partially left on other. Deep char in resinous grain on both panels.	Surface covered with fine blisters and pitting. Some large blisters on one end exposing the panel.
	<b>Material</b>	<b>C-1</b> 0	11-J	C-12

SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA ATOMIC ENERGY ACT 1946

の事ない

£.

T

3

¥

	12000 ft Station	No apparent dam- age	Covered with blisters on the resinous grain.	No apparent dam- age
	3000 ft Station	No apparent dam- age	Fire to large blisters over the surface of the panel. Some blist- ers have flaked off exposing the panel to charring.	No apparent damige
TABLE C-5 (Cont.)	7000 ft Station	Considerable blist- ering and flaking of top cost. Blist- ers red in color	Excessive surface charring especially in the resinous grain. Resinous grain red in color.	One panel shows a few smail blisters along one edge. Other panel shows small to large blisters along one edge and small blisters along the other edge.
وبوغ مقاماتها والاختبار والمادي الأولال والاستان والاختار والاختار والاختار والانتقار والانتقار والانتقار والم	5000 ft Station	Surface charred and alligatoring. Coat- ing gone in spots leaving a black sur- face deposit.	Coating gome. Lep cher in resinous grain. Less char in nonresinous grain.	Surface shows scorching, checking, and alligs- toring. Contains very fine blisters.
	Material	C-13	C-15	C-16

- 66 -

RESTRICTED DATA

......

B. ....



Security Internet

SECRET Soundly Information .

e suis a suis a

<b>Material</b>	5000 ft Stetion	7000 ft Station	9000 ft Station	12000 ft Station
C-17	One panel surface blackened in spots and covered with a costing of frit and dirt. The other panel is blistered, charred, and covered with rit and dirt.	Some blistering and smoke smudging	No apparent damage	No apparent damage
C-18	Surface covered with black char.	No apparent demage	No apparent damage	No apparent damage
c-20	Coating melted and fused onto the panels. Alligatoring and em- bedding of dust on the edges.	A small amount of gravel damage and smoke smudging.	No apparent damage	No apparent damage
I-4	Some gravel damage. Slight bow in panel. Back up panel charred.	Back up panel scorched. Some embedded dirt.	No apparent damage	No apparent damage
P-2	Some gravel damage. Slight bow in panel. Bask up panel charred.	Back up panel scorched,	No apparent danage	No apperent damage

TABLE C-5 (Cont.)

Post and

ł

- 67 -SECRET Security Information

RESTRICTED DATA

Ţ

-----

SECRET Security Information

31.4

TABLE C-5 (Cont.)

a	8,	<b>\$</b> 0	8,	<b>e</b> 80	3
12000 Ct Statis	No apparent dans	Ko apparent dam	No apparent dama	No apparent dama	Torn, probably d to blast damge
2000 At Station	No apparent da <b>me</b> r	No apparent damge	No apparent damge	No sparent damge	Completely gone
7000 ft Station	No apparent damage. Back up panel not scorched.	No apparent damage. Back up panel not scorched.	No apparent damage. Incipient scorohing in the nonresincus grain of the back up panel.	Sample was werped and shrunk. Con- tains embedded dirt. Back up panel scorched.	Warped and stretch- ed. Milky in color. Rack up panel scorched.
5000 21 Station	No apparent damage. Spotted scorching of back up panel.	Some scorching and blackening. Some bowing of panel. No scorching of back up panel.	Scorching and charr- ing of part of panel. Scorching of back up panel. Some bowing of panel.	Completely gone. Back up panel scorched.	Completely gone. Back up panel scorched.
<b>Material</b>	P-3	P-4	2-5 2-5	Ф -	P-7

i

. \$

SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA

\$

1

SECRET

-		A						
	12000 ft Stat1on	Completely gone.	Warped and wrinkled. Pertially pulled away from frame.	No apparent damage.	No apperent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent d <b>amage.</b>	io apparent damage.
	9000 ft Station	Completely gone.	Completely gone.	No apparant damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.	No apparent damage.
TABLE C-5 (Cont.)	7000 ft Station	Completely gone. Some scorching on back up panel.	Completely gone. Back up panel scorched.	Melted into near the end. Back up panel scorched.	No apparent damage. Back up panel scorched.	No apparent damage. Back up panel scorched.	Scorched but still present. Back up panel scorched.	Completely gone. Back up parel scorched
	5000 ft Station	Completely gone. Slight scorching.	Completely gone. Back up panel charred.	Completely gone. Back up panel char- red.	Completely gone. Back ur panel charred.	Completely gone. Back up panel charred.	Coating gone. Glass fiber left. Back up panel charred.	Completely gone. Back up panel charred.
	Material	9-8	6-9	0 <b>1-4</b>	P-11	P-12	P-13	71-4

- 69 -

SECRET

Scority Informat

SECRET Security Informati

Concernation of the second

i

۱.

-

RESTRICTED DATA

No apparent damage. No apperent damage. No apparant derage No apperent damage 12000 At Stetlan Slightly melted and frayed. No apparent damage. No apparent damage No apparent damage No apparent damage 9000 At Statica Completely gone. panel between suits und gravel. Back up panel scorched. Blackened in color. No embedded áîrt. Back up panel scorched. Scorched. Darkened in color. Back up darkened in color. Some embedded dirt up panel scorched. frizzled up. Back Melted through at Completelly gone. Back up panel scorched. 7000 ft Station Sporched and one and and scorched. Completely gone. Back up panel char-5000 ft Station Surface charred. Contains embedded Contains embedded dirt. Back up panel charred be-Contains embedded dirt. Back up panel charred in dirt. Back up panel charred in Completely gone. Back up penel Surface charred. Surface charred. between strips. between strips. tween strips. charred. red. Material P-15 P-16 CF-1 CF-2 CF-3

70 -

ority information

SECRET

ŕ

SECRET

TABLE C-5 (Cont.)

RESTRICTED DATA ATOMIC ENERGY ACT 1946

<del>ව</del> විටි	•			
dam	damag	damage	damage	damage
apparent	apparent	apparent	apparent	apparent
No	No	No	No	No
No apparent damage	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	Some surface melt- ing gravel and dirt embedded in surface.	No apparent damage.
Blackened in color. No embedded áirt. Back up penel scorched.	Smoke smudging. No other apparent damage.	Slight char. No embedded dirt.	Melted surface. Some surface char. Some embedded dirt.	Completely gone. Back up panel charred.
Completely gone.	Curface char. Back up panel charred between strips.	Surface char. Some embedded dirt.	Panel showed surface char and embedded dirt and gravel	Completely gome.
CF-4	CF-5	<b>cr-</b> 6	cr-7	CF-8
	CF-4 Completely gone. Blackened in color. No apparent damage No apparent No embedded dirt. Back up penel scorched.	CF-4 Completely gone. Blackened in color. No apparent damage No apparent damage No apparent damage   No embedded dirt. Back up penel No apparent damage No apparent damage No apparent   CF-5 Eurface char. Back Smoke smudging. No No apparent damage No apparent   L Up panel charred other apparent No apparent damage No apparent	CF-4Completely gone.Blackened in color.No apparent damegeNo apparent damegeNo embedded dirt.No embedded dirt.No apparent damegeNo apparent damegeNo embedded.Scorched.No apparent damegeNo apparent damegeNo panel charredother apparentNo apparent damegeNo apparent damegeNo for some strips.damege.No apparent damegeNo apparent damege	CT-4Completely gone.Blackened in color.No apparent damageNo apparent damageNo embedded dirt.No embedded dirt.No apparent damageNo apparent damageNo embedded introScorched.No apparent damageNo apparent damageNo panel charredSmoke smudging. NoNo apparent damageNo apparent damageNo panel charredother apparentNo apparent damageNo apparent damageNoSurface char. SomeSlight char. NoNo apparent damageNo apparentNoSurface char. SomeSlight char. NoNo apparent damageNo apparentNoT-7Panel showed surfaceMelted surface.Some surface melt-No apparentCT-7Panel showed surfaceSome surface.Some surface that.No apparentdirt and gravelSome surface.Some surface.Some surfaceNo apparent

MM.



3

SECRET Security Information

# SECRET

#### Table C-6

### Effect of Thermal Flux on Resistance to Salt Spray

	THIT	Cl	C2	05	<b>t</b> 6	C7	<b>c</b> 8	C12	C13	C16	C20
	Flexibility-	12.1	<b>∢3.9</b> 2	5.97	9.53	9.53	10.5	₹3.92	<b>43.9</b> 2	5.0	4.76
17.5	Abresion	316.1	281.0	443.0	138.8	378.0	84.0	108.5	212.8	208.0	96.6
	Sheer Bartness	96.3	105.0	102.0	88.2	85.2	91.2	80.0	101.5	101.5	92.0
-	Flexibility	8.0	<b>∢3.9</b> 2	<b>4</b> 3.92	>28.6	8.0	5.26	<b>∢</b> 3.92	₹3.92	6.78	12.10
5	Algreeton	153.6	165.9	78.5	116.5	111.8	97.8	78.8	81.0	75.2	25.6
Call	Shear Jardness	71.2	37.5	49.5	83.2	62.0	50.0	78.8	59.2	59.5	*
	Flexibility	<b>&lt;3.9</b>	<b>∢</b> 3.92	8.6	>28.6	4.8	<b>∢</b> 3.92	<b>4</b> 3.92	<b>43.9</b> 2	5.97	12.1
3.2	Abresion	122.0	197.0	125.4	100.4	101.2	108.6	86.5	63.5	89.2	83.0
	Sheer Mardness	49.5	56.8	37.2	66.2	53.0	51.8	58.0	50.5	55.5	•
~	Flexibility	12.1	<b>&lt;</b> 3.9	5.97	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	6.35	5.55	₹3.92	<b>∢</b> 3.92	<b>∢</b> 3.92	8.6
1.6	Abresian	<b>95.</b> 4	<b>99</b> .5	87.2	94.7	102.8	87.4	37.0	88.3	69.6	68.4
	Shear Martness	51.2	46.2	50.5	58.0	55.0	54.2	<u>3</u> 4.8	58.2	60.5	•
	Flexibility	5.26	<b>4</b> 3.92	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	16.0	₹3.92	6.35	7.27	<b>∢</b> 3.92	3.6	5.0
18.5	Abrasiou	107.5	453.0	130.5	164.0	410.0	234.0	235.0	194.0	71.0	53.5
	Shear Mardness	66.8	112.5	68.2	123.2	61.2	95.0	101.5	81.2	80.2	107.2
	Flexibility	5.97	∢3.92	5.26	>28.6	9.53	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	∢3.92	<b>∢</b> 3.92	7.27	>28.6
9.8	Abresion	136.4	101.0	98.7	43.0	63.6	89.0	50.5	82.8	76.4	66.5
	Shear Bardness	53.0	46.5	49.5	69.0	51.2	55.0	67.8	83.2	74.5	•
<b>70</b>	Flexibility	5.0	∢3.92	5.97	>28.6	5.55	4.76	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	∢3.92	1.27	10.5
5.7	Abresion	140.8	126.1	136.5	119.7	119.0	96.8	47.8	65.1	54.8	46.4
	Sheer Bardness	49.5	46.2	42.8	58.8	51.0	53.0	<b>69</b> .2	58.2	55.0	
<b>N</b> 19	Flexibility	<b>∢3.9</b> 2	<u>∢3.9</u> 2	5.26	>28.6	9.53	8.0	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	<b>∢</b> 3.92	<b>4</b> 3.92	12.1
3.3	Abresion	84.6	92.5	131.3	<b>99</b> .5	ມາ.0	110.5	69.6	87.7	51.6	85.5
	Shear Bardness	55.8	42.0	47.2	62.8	51.5	52.5	64.8	61.5	¥6.2	•
	Flexibility	12.1	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	12.1	>28.6	12.1	₹3.92	<b>43.9</b> 2	<b>∢3.%</b>	5.97	12.1
180-	Ahresion	101.0	84.3	132.7	72.4	75.6	100.0	71.7	49.8	58.0	84.4
	Sheer Berdress	19.2	43.8	14.5	54.0	50.2	54.2	62.8	55.2	56.0	

flazibility: \$ elongation

Abresion: film loss (10<sup>-1</sup> HL)

\* Barely Discornible

i

1

Show Burdness: 10<sup>-3</sup> in.





#### Table C-7

SHOT	TEST	Cl	C2	C5	C6	C7	<b>0</b> 8	C12	C13	C16	C20
100	Flexibility	12.1	5.97	9.53	>28.6	<b>∢</b> 3.92	9.5	\$ \$3.9	₹ 3.92	5.5	4.76
17,5	Abrasion	250.0	361.0	338.0	174.2	220.8	229.0	88.4	218.0	175.5	87.9
	Shear Bardness	55.8	69.5	69.5	62.8	80.2	78.0	72,5	66.8	86.5	90.0
	Flexibility	10.5	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	5.97	>28.6	5.26	<b>43.9</b>	< 3.90	× 3.90	13.00	13.00
3	Abrasion	142.0	145.0	108.1	102.6	112.6	108.9	108.3	64.0	66.0	4,1
Cal	Shear Hardness	47.2	43.5	43.8	46.2	46.5	43.8	59.2	60 A	52.5	00.5
	Flexibility	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	8.0	>28.6	12.1	¢ 3.92	43.90	43.00	/3.00	43.00
3.2	Abras ion	84.0	134.1	106.8	111.2	112.0	110.0	77.9	71.4	80.3	a), je 01 0
	Shear Hardness	35.2	39.5	43.8	55.0	47.8	50.8	59.2	47.5	47.8	
197	Flexibility	9.53	<b>∢</b> 3.92	9.53	>28.6	<b>\$3.92</b>	₹3.92	₹3.92	<b>43.9</b>	æ 3.90	13.00
1.6	Abresion	74.5	105.4	92.6	108.0	94.4	90.0	48.5	47.8	36.6	106.2
CHI .	Shear Hardness	43.8	45.8	51.0	39.0	51.5	48.2	65.5	55.8	NA.2	
N	Flexibility	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	<b>(</b> 3.92	< 3.92	8.0	< 3.92	₹3.92	<b>∢</b> 3.92	< 3.92	43.00	13.00
18.5	Abrasion	109.0	254.0	252.0	251.5	254.0	305.0	97.5	95.5	94.6	An A
Call	Shear Bardnees	58.0	58.5	58.2	62.2	59.8	82.0	75.8	89.2	79.2	78.0
	Flexibility	12.1	∢3.92	5.97	∢3.92	∢3.92	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	∢ 3.92	<b>4</b> 3. 99	5.26	43.00
9.8	Abras ion	<b>%6.</b> 2	83.5	81.0	81.5	82.7	107.7	62.4	67.1	61.0	67.8
Cal	Shear Hardness	32.2	29.0	43.8	55.2	43.8	40.5	\$7.5	56.5	68.0	01.0
~	Flexibility	10.5	₹3.92	∢3.92	>28.6	<b>4</b> 3.92	43.98	< 3.92	43.92	5.26	
5.7	Abrasion	117.0	100.0	83.2	111.5	<b>95.1</b>	99.3	55.7	58.4	67.5	78 4
Cal	Shear Hardness	44.5	44.5	46.0	54.0	41.8	42.2	48.2	38.5		
	Flexibility	12.1	∢3.92	<b>().%</b>	>28.6	<b>4</b> 3.92	< 3.92	<b>∢3.9</b> 2	43.90	43.00	( 3.00
3.3	Abrasion	84.0	79.5	72.0	66.0	72.5	76.2	52.0	57.1	41.4	60 3
	Shear Hardness	45.8	34.8	42.0	41.5	51.0	47.0	60.0	49.0	56.5	68.2
	Flexibility	9.55	<b>().92</b>	5.97	<b>≽28</b> .6	5.26	<b>43.9</b>	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	< 3.9e	(3.90	(3.00
<u>u</u> n-	Abrasion	86.8	86.4	86.4	79.2	85.5	83.8	52.7	44.7	52.5	83.8
	Shear Hardness	41.0	31.5	>0.0	51.0	51.2	48.2	62.8	49.0	51.8	

Effect of Thermal Flux on Resistance to Accelerated Weathering

Flexibility: \$ elongation

i

T

Abresion: film loss (10<sup>-1</sup> ml.)

\* Burely Discornible

hear Eardness 10<sup>-3</sup> in.

- 73 -SECRET Secontly Information





#### Table C-8

## Effect of Thermal Flux on Resistance to High Humidity

	Type	Cl	<b>Ç</b> 2	C5	<b>C6</b>	C7	<b>c</b> 8	C12	<b>C</b> 13	C16	<b>C</b> 20
	Flexibility	12.1	43.92	10.5	≽28.6	<b>\$</b> 3.92	12.1	<b>43</b> .92	4.76	8.0	8.0
17.5	Abresion	289.0	466.0	362.0	182.0	394.0	205.0	100.0	176.0	167.4	133.6
Ce)	Spour Bardness	84.5	110.8	106.5	61.0	82.8	70.8	61.0	83.8	91.0	90.0
_	Flexibility	12.1	<b>\$3.9</b> 2	3.97	<b>≽28.</b> 6	43.92	<b>4</b> 3.92	<b>4</b> 3.92	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	<b>43.9</b> 2	10.5
3	Abresion	138.9	253.5	171.0	101.1	96.7	90.6	60.5	82.9	51.9	70.4
Oal	Shear Hardness	43.5	32.5	59.0	51.8	46.0	39.0	58.8	87.5	65.5	*
	Flexibility	9.53	<b>∢</b> 3.92	6.78	>28.6	43.92	<b>4</b> 3.92	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	₹3.92	<b>∢3.</b> %	12.1
35 3.6	Abrasion	158.0	231.0	175.0	135.0	138.0	169.2	40.7	65.0	66.0	89.8
Cal	Shear Bardness	30.8	113.0	32.0	k3.2	40.0	43.8	63.2	55.2	51.5	
	Flexibility	<b>43.</b> %	<b>∢</b> 3.92	6.78	<b>∢</b> 3.92	<b>∢</b> 3.92	₹3.92	<b>4</b> 3.92	<b>4</b> 3.92	<b>4</b> 3.92	16.0
1.6	Abrasion	150.5	114.3	116.0	107.0	84.8	78.1	46:0	41.2	50.6	61.3
Cel	Sheer Bardness	30.8	31.8	32.0	63.2	38.8	37.0	51.8	54.0	55.0	•
	Flexibility	6.78	<b>∢</b> 3.92	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	>28.6	₹3.92	₹ 3.92	₹3.92	≼ 3.92	4.76	9.55
18,5	Abresion	٥.ملا	300.0	416.0	176.7	333.0	343.0	68.0	103.2	125.9	105.7
Cal	Sheer Burdness	84.0	72.2	72.2	64.5	69.5	74.5	72.5	<b>68.</b> 0	75.2	91.2
	Flexibility	6.78	∢3.92	4.76	<b>≯2</b> 8.6	<b>∢</b> 3.92	<b>4</b> 3.92	43.9	<b>4</b> 3.92	43.92	28.6
2.8	Abres ion	162.5	175.0	133.8	113.5	85.4	81.4	47.8	72.2	63.5	82.2
Cal	Sheer Jardness	57.0	89.8	31.2	53.8	36.0	42.8	52.8	77.2	76.2	•
	Flatibility	4.76	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	<b>∢</b> 3.92	>28.6	₹3.92	<b>4</b> 3.7	<b>&lt;</b> 3.9	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	₹3.92	16.0
5.7	Abresion	127.0	191.0	120.8	121.5	<b>95.3</b>	87.4	42.6	51.5	58.7	72.9
Cal	Sheer Inrénese	50.2	34.0	<b>52.8</b>	43.8	30.0	34.2	52.8	51.5	57.2	
	Flecibility	12.1	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	3.97	≽28.6	<b>\$</b> 3.%	43.99	<b>4</b> 3.9	<b>د</b> ي.9	5.91	>28.6
3.3	Aleresion	101.0	116.0	201.4	82.9	82.3	84.9	52.4	80.0	62.8	99.3
ONL	Shoer Bardness	27.2	29.5	57.8	42.2	¥0.8	33.8	62.0	55.8	52.0	•
	Flexibility	12.1	<b>&lt;</b> 3.%	5.26	>28.6	<b>\$3.92</b>	<b>4</b> 3.9	<b>&lt;</b> 3.9	<b>4</b> 3.92	<b>&lt;</b> 3.92	12.1
0 188-	Almosion	192.8	206.0	192.0	205.6	126.3	125.0	87.9	54.9	59.6	100.0
= yosed	Sheer Bardpass	<b>34.</b> 8	27.0	10.2	63.5	39.8	44.2	66.2	61.0	51.8	•

Flexibility: \$ elongation

Abresion: film lose (10<sup>-1</sup> ml)

· Barely Discernible

1

Shear Bardness 10<sup>-5</sup> in.

SECRET





#### TABLE C-9

#### Effect of High Humidity on Painted Panels Exposed to a Thermal Energy of 85 Cal/Cm<sup>2</sup>

System	Surface Condition
Unexposed Bare Panel	Entire surface covered uniformly with medium to heavy rusting.
Cl	Light blue in color. Coating gone. Light rust spots covering about 40% of panel.
C5	Blue in color. Coating gone. Light rusting over about 20% of panel.
<b>C</b> 6	Burned appearance to metal. Coating gone. Rust on several drip streaks.
C7	Mettalic blue color. Costing gone. Light rusting over entire surface.
C12	About 10% of coating still intact. Light rusting on bare spots. Rust on drip streaks.
C13	About 5% of coating still intact. Only slight signs of white corrosion. Considerable abrasion damage.
C16	Light rusting on blued portions. Coating gune. Medium rusting on unburned metal.
<b>C</b> 20	Coating gone. Brownish-gray color surface. Light rust- ing over entire surface.

Ł

.





يتو يد

.

i

#### TABLE C-10

#### Effect of Thermal Flux on Overall Flexibility (% Elongation)

Critical Energy Level				Coa	ting Sy	rstems				
Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>	Cl	C2	C5	C6	C7	C8	C12	C13	C16	C20
17.5	12.1	4.6	8.7	22.2	5.8	10.7	3.9	4.2	6.2	5.8
18.5	5.3	3.9	3.9	14.2	3.9	4.4	5.0	3.9	5.8	7.2
9 <b>.</b> 6	5.3	3.9	5.3	20.4	5.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	5.5	20.4
5.6	10.2	3.9	5.0	<b>28.</b> 6	5.7	4.4	3.9	3.9	4•9	8.8
5.0	6.8	3.9	4.6	<b>28.</b> 6	4.5	4.2	3.9	3.9	5.5	10.1
3.2	5.1	3.9	7.8	<b>28</b> .6	6.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.6	9.4
3.7	9•3	3 <b>.9</b>	5.1	28.6	5.8	5.3	3.9	3.9	4.6	14.9
1.7	8.5	3.9	7.4	12,1	4.7	4.5	3.9	3.9	3.9	9.5
0	11.2	3.9	7.8	28.6	7.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.6	9.3

RESTRICTED DATA

- 76 -SECRET

- -----

i

#### TABLE C-11

#### Effect of Thermal Flux on Abrasion Over-all Resistance (Film loss in 10-411)

Critical Energy Level				Co	sting S	System	5			
$Cal/Cm^2$	Cl	<b>C</b> 2	C5	C6	C7	C8	C12	C13	C16	C20
17.5	217	369	381	165	331	173	9 <b>9</b>	202	184	106
18.5	178	336	266	198	332	294	134	131	97	82
9.6	132	120	104	80	77	93	54	74	67	73
5.6	132	188	119	107	107	99	83	76	64	54
5.2	128	139	1 <b>1</b> 0	118	103	94	49	58	61	66
3.2	121	187	136	115	117	129	68	67	78	88
3.7	90	96	101	83	88	91	58	68	52	81
1.7	106	106	99	103	94	85	44	59	56	79
0	128	<b>12</b> 6	1.37	119	96	103	71	50	57	89

1



RESTRICTED DATA

Security information



.....

#### TABLE C-12

		(	Width	of Scr	atch i	n 10-3	in.)			
Critical Energy Level				Co	ating	System	8			
Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>	Cl	C2	C5	C6	C7	C8	C12	C13	C16	C20
17.5	78.9	95.1	92.7	70.7	82.8	80.0	71.2	84.0	93.0	90.7
18.5	69.6	81.1	66.2	83.3	63.5	13.8	83.2	86.2	78.2	
9.6	40 <b>.8</b>	55.1	41.5	59.3	43.7	46.1	56.0	72.3	72.9	\$
5.6	54.0	37.8	50.8	60.4	51.5	44.2	65.9	72.2	59.2	due
5.0	41.4	41.6	40.5	52.0	40.9	43.2	56 <b>.8</b>	49•4	50 <b>•8</b>	lble color
3.2	38.5	69.8	37.7	54.8	46.9	48.8	60.2	51.1	51.6	cerni lte d
3.7	42.2	35.4	42.3	48.8	47.8	44.4	62.2	55.4	51.6	dis. Wh:
1.7	41.9	41.2	44.5	53.4	48.4	46.5	64.0	56.0	54.6	rely
0	41.7	34.1	44.9	56.8	47.1	48.9	63 <b>.9</b>	55.1	53.2	Bau

#### Effect of Thermal Flux on Shear Over-all Hardness (Width of Scratch in 10-3 in.)

RESTRICTED DATA

. . - 78 -SECRET

### TABLE C-13

Thermal	House Paint	(TT-P-40)	Fire Retardan	t Paint (VV#20)
Exposure Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup>	Weight Loss Grams	Char Volume Cubic Inch	Weight Loss Grams	Char Volume Cubic Inch
Unexposed	14.8	5.84	11.7	5.45
1.7	10.8	3.98	9.4	3.92
3.7	12.0	4.81	10.8	4.39
3.2	12.4	3.95	9.4	3.88
5.0	12.6	4.67	10.1	3.44
5.6	11.7	5.0	9.2	3.05
9.6	11.9	5.0	9.0	2,83
13.5	11.2	7.29	16.7	6.91
17.5	12.5	5.01	14.3	5.79
85	116.0	Burned up completely	49.83	12.45

Effect of Thermal Exposure on the Properties of Fire Retardant Paint

- 79 -SECRET

į

1

ATOMIC EMERGY ACT IN

3

愛

TABLE C-14

A. 4

Effect of Thermal Flux on Eighd Plastics

				Ther	and Lee		(2 <b>2</b> )		
Material D	pesodaed	1.6	3.7	3.2	2	5•6	9*6	18•5	27.5
Methyl Ketheary-									
Planual Birangth	ריית	24.3	13.1	15.1	<b>16.3</b>	16.7	15.6	<b>U.</b> 3	6.44
Nod of Elasticity	397	322	oti	325	म्र	475	л Д	<b>1</b> /60	294
Bpectfic Gravity 60/60 7	71.1	<b>81.1</b>	1.1B	<b>1.1</b> 8	91.1	1.18	٥١،1	1.18	71.1
Bockmall Rardness m scale Tisht Transmittanna	97.5	97.5	96.0	96.0	0°1ć	83.0	98.0	91.0	95.0
×	92.2	\$1.9*	92.6	92.7	92.5	92.5	89.2	51.6	47.2
Cellulose Acetate Flexial Strength	9.2	6.9	8,1	9.6	10.2	9.6	<b>20.3</b>	8.5	*10.3A
Mod of Electicity	206	गुरु	240	384	171	176	દક્ષ	245	9.0B 259A
Specific Gravity 62/60 F	1.30	1.31	1+30	1.31	1.2	1.31	1.30	1.30	1.318 1.318
E scale	83.5	82.0	79°0	81.0	79•0	8 <b>1.</b> 0	79.0	81.8	78.0A 76.0B

í

ł

SECRET

- 80 -

SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA

4

1					Th	ernal En	argy (C	1/Cm2)		
- 1	Material	Unexposed	1.6	3.7	3.2	~	5.6	9•6	18.5	17.5
	Light Transdittance	0•68	89•5	88.9	88.7#	88.6	89.5	87.8	1.61	60.1A 87.71
	Polyester Resin Reinforced with									
	Veruel Strength	28.5	23.1	24.64	20.3#	2.14	30.3	29.2	29.2	23.2A
	Mode of Election	1,375	3,230	1,130	1,130	1,170	86	7530	1,290	NO/OL
	Specific Gravity	1.14	1.35	1.40	1.35	1.38A	1.42	1,36	1.41	1.38 1.38
	Bockwell Hardness	Ħ	2.111	1.601	106.3	105.01	<b>3.601</b>	<b>%</b> Ш.9	Ħ	109.3
	Light Transditance	32.1	32.1	26.7	25.6	25.64	34.5	25.9	1.61	31.24
• 1	Inert Materials \$	28.6#	24.6*	33.2*	29.2#	28 .L+	28.6	29 <b>.6</b> #	35+2+	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	Phenol-Pormal dehyde Keein Rainforced with Asbestos Plerual Strength 1000 ped	ъ.6	6• <b>ग</b> т	11.8 1	1.9Ľ	9.21	1.51	າາ	12.6	ग॰गर
-		_		-	-	-	1			-

TABLE C-14 (Cont.) Effect of Thermal Flux on Rigid Flastics

ł

a a tanka anata a

A DESCRIPTION OF A DESC

s,

1

ł.

ł

.

-

SECRET Security information

SECRET Security Information

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT 1948

<u>.</u>~

1.199

\*

				Ther	Tail Ener	rey (Cal	/œ2)		
Material	Unexposed	1.6	3.7	3.2	5	3 <b>.</b> 6	9.6	16.5	17.5
Mod of Klasticity	1,375	1,085	1,342	מנו,נ	1,005	1,830	1,460	1,270	1,375
Bpecific Gravity	1.59	1,61	1.63	1.63	1.62	1.59	1.58	1.59	1.61
00/03 F Rockwell Hardness	2.011	99.2	94.9	98•4	98	107.5	יוםננ	102.5	93
m scale Inert Material \$	37	39.3	39.7	39.2	39•6	38.2	37.2	37.6	1-11
Polyvinyl Chloride Floxuel Strength	15.4	<b><sup>ф.</sup>9</b> Г	15.6	16.2	1.71	17.3	15.6	15.7A	16.7A
Mod. of Elasticity	475	סדין	Lto7	174	184	1406	hoh	236	
Specific Gravity	1.37	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.28	1-36A	1.35A
00/00 F Rockwell Hardness	84.1	83.1	84.0	84.0	84.0	82•0	85•0	87.18 86.18	
m scale Light Transmittance	75•5	1.27	75.5	75.4	75.2	75.6	75.6	26.4A	61.2A 34.8B
6(B) refers to 6 cal A in the table refe B in the table refer * indicates an avera	loric level in rs to section rs to section sec of less th	n BAKKR SHC of sample of sample of sample han 5 and n	T. with lea with most	6(D) r st visual t visual 2 testa	efers t L damag damage	o 6 calo	rie leve	1 in D06	SHOT.

.

•

į.

.

.

•

.

TABLE C-14 (Cont.)

A York

RESTRICTED DATA

SECRET curity information

Č,

82 -

-

6(B) refers to 6 calories on BAKER Sort. 6(D) refers to 6 calories on DOG Shot. 17.5 1 18.5 ł 1 8 1 t t 1 1 1640 0.99 1660 1.74 1,600 ĥ 200/ 8 9.6 I Thermal Energy (Cal/Cm2) 3.2 5 5 5.6 1690 2002 0.84 I I ł t t ŝ 051L 0.96 भूष 5330 7002 1.77 185 s 1 10,500 **081** 99 규 **1.**78 2002 0.34 2.6 દા 33 001,01 0.83 **1.7**8 7002 <u></u> 20 20 63**.**lt 2.6 3.7 215 0.0042 in. 0.0026 in. 0.0021 in. 7690 0.92 **8**977 8300 . З. З. 7002 1.84 36.7 1.6 215 Polyethylene Unexposed 1570 2210 1.93 8000 1.69 7007 0.87 ጜ 215 Teflon Saren Teflon Breating Strength Polyethylene Breaking Strength Seran Breating Strength Film Thicknesses: Specific Gravity 60/60 F Specific Gravity 60/60 F Specific Gravity 60/60 F Elongation, \$ Elongation, X Elungetion, S tad. þed Material

TABLE C-15

際の必要

Effect of Thermal Flux on Plastic Films

RESTRICTED DATA

**F**\*

No.

SECRET

- 83 -

SECRET Security Information TABLE C-16

Effect of Thermal Flux on Plastic and Cotton Pibers

				The	Tan'i Edu	and (Cal	L/(Cm <sup>2</sup> )		
Katerial	Unexposed	1.6	3.7	3.2	2	5.6	9•6	18.5	17.5
Denel Stratcht Strand	Ĵ5•9	36.6	36.5	34.2	36.5	36.0	IS	B	I
Broaking Strength De Ultiaate Elongation	8	्र	ß	53	53	148	ጽ	*	8
Inotted Strand Breaking Strangth	50	17	કા	7.61	19.7	21.8	36	I	ſ
Ultimate Elongation %	37	R	33	×	37	0 <del>1</del>	ţt6	I	•
Orlon Straight Strand Breaking Strength	50.3	48.1	1.14	48.8	45.6	50.7	46.9	<b>I</b> .	I
lbs Ultimate Elongation \$	t	37	न	ন্ম	77	33	45	1	I
Enotted Strand Breaking Strength	24 <b>.</b> 6	22.4	24.2	22.7	22.5	24.4	23.1	ı	I
Ultimate Flongation X	Ť	20	52	8	21	23	22	t	I

i

SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA



84

				The	mal Ener	rgy (Cell	(cm <sup>2</sup> )		
Material	Unexposed	1.5	3.7	3•2	2	5.6	9.6	18.5	17.5
Cotton Jtraight Strand Breaking Strangth	29.3	29.9	27.4	31.2	30.k	27.7	29.7	I	1
Ibs Ultimate Flongation	81	11.7	1.11	μ.7	12.8	12.6	ন	I	I
Ebotted Strand Breaking Strength	24.9	20.5	21.5	23.2	22.7	21.8	21.4	1	1
Ultimate Elongation	20.4	6•ग	1.11	17.8	প	71	17	I	I
Viryl Covered Fiberglass Atra-ont Strand									
Breaking Strength 1be	37.1	2.14	1	37	38.7	39.5	42.7	37	38.3
Ultimate Flongation	2	35	1	I	1	t	1	I	1
Breaking Strength	22	18.2	20.2	<b>18.7</b>	21.7	18.7	21.2	18.7	97
Ultimete Flongation	28	20	15	25	33	8	25	25	17

TABLE C-16 (Cont.)

1

E

.

- 85 -SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA

R

TAELE C-16 (Cont.)

R

į.

1

							SI Succi	ECRET	ation				
	17.5			3	1		ł	ł		I	1	ł	ł
	18.5			1	۱		1	I		l	I	ł	I
(c2)	9.6			19.1	ß		15.4	2H		1	ŧ	1	ł
(Cal)	5.6		•	2.2	1		27.7	8		1	l	1	1
Ind Las	5		(	13.2	1		29.8	88		ł	1	I	ł
Ther	3.2			19-41	1		28.7	69.7		7.7	t	7.7	I
	3.7		1	55.4	I		28.7	89		ส	1	8.2	9
	1.6			149	ł		31.5	I		35•5	18	29	ર્શ
	Unexposed		(	149	1		32.7	75		42.2	31	27.2	21.3
	Tel	Untreated	ng Strength		pur strand ite Elongation	sd Strand	ng Strength	1be ite Elongation g		ng Strength	ite Elongation	od Strand .ng Strength	tte Elongetion
	Mater	Nylon	Bread			Knotte	Break	Ultim	Seren Seren	Real	Uttm	Knotte Breakd	Ultime
							- 8	- 36					

٠

1

RESTRICTED DATA

10

SECRET

TABLE C-16 (Cent.)

L,

-

.

MaterialUnexposed1.63.73.255.69.61Nylon Fr 3006Straight StrandUnexposed1.63.73.255.69.61Straight StrandL2.332.4i.0.4U.1U.136.5436.5Breaking StrengthL2.332.4i.0.4U.1U.136.54Breaking StrengthL2.332.4i.0.4U.114.5U.136.5Breaking StrengthL2.327.626.326.627.827Breaking Strength1.327.626.326.627.827Ditimate Elongation95Breaking Strength1.626.326.627.82777Ditimate Elongation-60.851561777											
MaterialUnexposed1.63.73.255.69.61Nylon FN 3006Straight StrandStraight StrandBreaking StrangthLbDifferenceLaStraight StrandBreaking StrangthLaStraight StrandDifferenceBreaking StrangthJaStraight StrandDifferenceStraight StrandDifferenceStraight StrandBreaking StrangthJ1.327.626.326.45410Ditimate Elongetion-60.85455L777						Th	ermal. E	nerry (C	(21) له		
Wylom FM 3606Straight StrandBreaking StrangthLastend StrandLastend StrandLastend StrandLastend StrandLastend StrandStraight StrandLastend StrandStraight StrangthJ1.3Straight StrangthJ1.3Straight StrangthStraight Strangth	*	Materlal	Unexposed	1.6	3.7	3.2	20	5.6	9.6	78.5	17.5
Breaking Strength 12.3 32.4 10.4 14 14. 14.5 14 36.5 Intimate Elongetion		Wilon FM 3606									
Ultimate Elongation95Knotted StrendStrendth31.327.626.326.627.825.227Breaking Strength31.327.626.326.627.825.227Ultimate Elongation-60.854554777		Breaking Strength	42.3	32.4	40.4	77	44.5	177	36•5	ł	1
Knotted Strand   31.3   27.6   26.3   26.6   27.8   25.2   27     Breaking Strength   31.3   27.6   26.3   26.6   27.8   25.2   27     Ultimate Elongetion   -   60.8   54   55   47   77		Ultimate Flongation	1	8	ſ	ł	1	I	x	t	I
Ultimate Elongation - 60.8 54 58 55 47 77		Enotted Strand Breaking Strangth	31.3	27.6	26.3	26.6	27.8	25.2	27	8	ł
		Ultimate Elongation	. 1	60.8	ন্থ	ጜ	55	47	4	ł	1

SECRET

Security into

SECRET Socurity Infermition

RESTRICTED DATA

SECRET

#### TABLE C-17

#### Effect of Thermal Flux on the Breaking Strength of Rubber Coated Fabrics

			Therm	1 71	ux (C	al/C=	2)		
Natorial	Unexposed	1.6	3.6	3.2	5B	5.6	9.6	18.5	17.5
Natural	122	131	135	132	135	132	65.5	132	None
Neoprene GN	121	119	110	115	115	114	118	<b>98</b>	83
GR-I	130	131	124	129	129	141	135	123	87
GR-5	122	105	115	123	119	115	117	32	None
GR-A	109	105	119	216	116	121	112	114	None
Vinyl	130	138	136	119	140	135	103	105	78
Uncoated Duck	148	128	132	129	149	132	75	None	None
Neoprene (Lab. Batch)	68	67	65	67	63	48	None	None	None

Breaking strength in 1bs/in



ł

**810** 

ł

- 88 -

•

.



N. -

#### TABLE C-18

	T								
	Thermal Flux (Cal/Cm <sup>2</sup> )								
Material	Unexposed	1.6	3.6	3.2	5	5.6	9.6	18.5	17.5
Natural	11	13	13	12	п	10	4	11	None
Neoprene GN	12	15	13	12	12	14	11	7	7
GR-I	12	13	12.5	11	п	13	12	13	8
GR-S	9	9	10.5	n	ш	10	10	9	None
GR-A	12	13	14	14	13	12	11	11	None
Vinyl	12	14	15	14	13	12	8	8	5
Untreated Duck	12	14	13	12	12	14	7	None	None
Neoprene (Lab. Batch)	19	19	18	18	15	15	None	None	None

### Effect of Thermal Flux on the Ultimate Elongation of Rubber Coated Fabrics

Ultimate elongation in \$

S. Martin Content

t

-

the offer strategies and the state of the state of the strategies of the state of the state of the state of the

The second state of the second s

- 89 -SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA ATO COR GY ACT

126

# SECRET

#### Table C-19

#### Comparison of Thermal Effects Laboratory Flux vs. Field Exposure control systems

Oritical	Bye ten Cl		System C2		
Cal. /08.2	Laboratory	Field	Laboratory	Field	
1.6	No test	Some smoke Demage on one panel	No test	No apparent damage	
3.2	No test	No apparent damage. A few costlared bits of gravel imbedded in the surface	No test	Some of the blisters flaked away exposing panel	
3.3	No test	No apparent damage	lo tet	No apparent damage	
5.8	No apparent damage	No apparent change in color of shean. Some erosion and gravel damage. A few fine blisters	No apparent damage	A few fine blisters. Some surface erosion and gravel damage. Some imbedded dust.	
5.2	No apparent damage	No apparent demage	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	
9.8	Blight charring of surface	Some gravel damage. Small enount of imbedded dirt	Incipient cherring. No blistering	One or two incipi- ent blisters. Some gravel damage and imbedded dirt	
13.5	Definite charring of film - film present but no life	Fine blisters. Some pitting of blisters. Some imbedded dirt	Light surface char	Charring on both panels. One panel showe fine blisters and pitting, the other blistering and flaking	
17.5	Film charred, life gome out of film	Small blisters evenly over the surface. Silsters broken to show pitting. Some im- bedded dirt	Light surface than	Surface coat charred and blistered. Thin undercoat is o.k. Two top coats gono	
Critical	Bye Le	. Cà	Bysten C)		
Cal./Ca	Laboratory	<b>F1014</b>	Laboratory	Field	
<b>1</b> .5	Scattered blisters	No apparent damage	No test	No apparent damage	
3.2	Soattered blisters red in color	Stattured blisters small to large	No tent	No apparent damage	
3.3	Scattered blistere red in solor - some charred	Small to large. Reddish blistere in the resinces grain	Bo test	Bo apparent damage	
3.8	Top most pitted, some charring	Small to large blisters in resinces grain. Grain red. Blisters block	Bo apparent damage	Some surface erosion and an occasional blister. He appre- ciable encent of imbedded dirt	

i

RESTRICTED BATA

18<sup>76</sup>





Í.

#### SECRET Security Internation

#### Table C-19 (cont.)

#### Comparison of Thermal Effects Laboratory Flux vs. Field Exposure

.

.

COATING SYSTEMS

Critical	System C4		System C>		
Cal./Cm.2	Laboratory	Field	Laboratory	Field	
5.2	Top coat pitted and charred, undercoat intact	Small to large blisters. Blisters red and black	No apparent demage	No apparent damage	
9.8	Top coat gons, undercoat intact	Charring and blistering in the resinous grain	No apparent damage	Some gravel damage. Some imbedded dirt	
18.5	Coating gone, browning of wood	Coating gone, resincus grain charred	Some redening. No blisters	Blistering and flak- ing with exposurs of panel. Some charring on the edges	
17.5	Coating gone, browning of wood	Coating gone, rouincum grain shows deep char	Some redening. No blisters. Some charring	Charring, blister- ing and flaking	
Critical	Sys tor		System C8		
Cal./Cm <sup>2</sup>	Laboratory	Field	Laboratory	Field	
1.6	No test	No apparent damage	No test	No apparent damage	
3.2	No test	No apparent damage	No test	No apparent demage	
3.3	No test	No apparent damage	No test	No apparent damage	
5.8	Some blistering incipient, redening	No visual damage	No apparent damage	No change in color. Some gravel damage. Some imbedded dirt	
5.2	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	No apparant damage	No apparent damage	
9.8	Hair line cracks with reddning and charring in cracks	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	Some gravel damage	
18.5	Blistering, pitting and charring - no metal asposed	Paint completely gone. Large bliet- are flaked off. Wed and green spots on the panel	Small redish spote starting to form. No other apparent damage	Top coat gons. Primer apparently intact. Panel hus yellow spots and large blisters	
17.5	Sayare charring and flaking with panel exposed in spots	Surface cost shows mottled appearance - of brown, red, yellow, green, with large flakes	Righ spots of film show algos of red to black coloring. No other apparent damage	Coating charred, fine pitting to show primar. Some pitting down to motal	

- 91 -

SECRET



1

## Table C-19 (cont.)

### Comparison of Thermal Effects Laboratory Flux vs. Field Exposure

#### COATING SYSTING

Oritical	Systan Cl0		System Cll		
01./01.2	Laboratory	Field	Laboratory	Field	
1.6	Ro apparent éstinge	No apparent desage	No apparent damage	No apparent demage	
3.2	Fine to medium blisters. Redning of the film	Bpottet rei spots. Some rei blistere	Blight surface char, no blistering	Covered with fine blisters in resin- ous grain. Scat- tered blisters in other grain	
3.3	Fine to medium blistere, some sherring. Redning of the film	A few red spots on the resincus grain	Slight surface char, no blistering	Cover 1 with fine blisters on resin- ous grain	
5.8	Top film charted, undercost intes:	Small to large blisters. Resincus grain observed	Coating charred. No charring of wood	Slight fading of color. Reginous grain charred	
5.2	Top film charred but intest - covered with blisters	Small to large blisters. No charring of wood	Coating gons. No charring of wood	Fine blisters, charring of re- sinous wood	
9.8	Coating gons. Ho charring of wool	Burface covered with fine to large blisters. Consid- erable flaking and obsering	Coating gone, very slight surface char	Excessive charring and blistering. Pitting of coating	
18.5	Coating gone, slight surface charring	Coating gone, deep charring in resin- ous grain	Coating gone, surface char of wood	Coating gons, deep char in resincus grain	
17.5	Coating gone. Sgrface charring	Coating gone in spots showing un- aharred wood. Resinces grain aharred	Costing gons, surface obsr of wood	Reaircous grain charred, other grain not charred	
Critical	ST# ter	C12	Syntem C13		
01./02	Laboratory	Field	Laboratory	Field	
1.6	No taot	so apparent damage	No tent	No apparent demage	
3.2	Bo test	No apparent damage	No tent	So apparent damage	
3.3	Bo test	So apparent damage	No test	No apparent damage	
3.8	Bo apparent demage	Some everface erosion. Slight derkening in culor. Some imbedded dirt	Bo apparent damage	Some lightening in color. Consider- able blistering and disintegration of top film. Some imbedded dirt	



RESTRICTED DATA

SECRET

### Table C-19 (cont.)

#### Comparison of Thermal Effects Laboratory Flux vs. Field Exposure

**8** 1

i

. .

.

#### COATING SYSTEMS

Critical	System C12		System C13		
Cal./Cm.2	Laboratory	Field	Laboratory	Field	
5.2	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	
9.5	Blackening of film surface. No other apparent damage	Some gravel damage	No apparent damage	Considerable blistering and flaking of top coat. Blisters red in color	
18.5	Blackening of film surface. No other apparent damage	Surface covered with fine blisters and pitting. Some large blisters ex- posing the panel	Surface charring coating still intact	Surface charred and alligatoring. Coating gone in spots leaving black surface deposits	
17.5	No apparent damage (28 cal. shows large black surface de- posits. Film intact)	Charring and blistering of film. Some pitting	Severe blackening of surface with film still intact. No blisters	Charring and alli- gatoring of the surface. One side appears to be burnt off. Some gravel damage	
Critical	Syster	C15	System C16		
$Cal./Cm.^2$	Laboratory	Field	Laboratory	Field	
1.6	No apparent damage Some surface char	Nu apparent damage	No test	No apparent damage	
3.2		medium blisters. Some cracking and peeling			
3.3	Some surface char	Covered with blisters on the resincus grain	No test	No apparent damage	
5.8	Surface char. No char on wood	Fine to large blisters. Large blisters flaked off showing wood char- ring undermeath	No apparent dannge	No color change. Few scattered blisters. Sume imbedded dirt	
5.2	Surface char	Fine to large blisters. Charring under blisters	Bo apparent durage	Bo apparent damage	
9.5	Coaling charred, light charring of wood	Excessive surface charring especially in resincus grafa	Very slight darken- ing of film. No other apparent damige	Small to large blisters along edges of panels	
18.5	Coaling gone, surface charring of wood	Coating gone, d.ep char in resinous grain, some char in other grain	Slight blackening of surface. Film intact	Bearching, check- ing and allightar- ing. Contains very fine blaters	

- 93 -

SECRET

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT IDA:

*;*, \*\*\*

ţ

ŧ

拍

¥رونیم روا د. د.

g

.

-

.

\_

1

## Table C-19 (cont.)

# Comparison of Thermal Effects Laboratory Flux vs. Field Exposure

#### COATING SYSTEMF

Critical	8 <b>ys</b> to	a C15	System C16		
Cal./Ca.2	Leboratory Field		Laboratory	Field	
17.5	Coating gome, deep oharring of wood	Coating gons, wood oharred in resin- ous grain	Slight blackening of surface. Film intact	Surface entirely obarred; extreme in spots. Some gravel demage	
Critical	System	. 017	System C18		
Cal./Cm <sup>2</sup>	Laboratory	Field	Laboratory	Field	
1.6	No cest	No apparent damage	No test	No apparent damage	
3.2	No test	No apparent damage	No test	No apparent damage	
3.3	No test	No apparent damage	No test	No apparent damage	
5.8	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	
5.2	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	No apparent damage	No apparent dwaage	
9.8	Fine blister	Sors bliatering and smoke smudging	No apperent damage	No apparent damage	
18.5	Surface coating charred	One panel charred, other panel blist- ered and charred	Incipient surface, charring and blistering of coat- ing, no char on wood	Surface char	
17.5	Coating gone, some swrface char	Coating gone, charring in spots	Coating charred, surface char - wood	Coating charred	
	L	J	B		

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT 1946

- 94 -

SECRET Security Information



SECRET

RESTRICTED DATA

R

SECRET

iesently teler







 $17.5 \text{ cal/cm}^2$ CF-8



Standard (Unexposed)



CF6 Natural Rubber CF7 Vinyl Chloride-Acetate Cupol. CF8 Neoprene (Lab. Batch.)

**RESTRICTED DATA** 

ENERGY ACT 1946

£.\*\*

1

REPORT HAS BEEN DELIMITED - CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE - R DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.20 AND - ESTRICTIONS ARE IMPOSED JPON - SE AND DISCLOSURE.

THEBUTION STATEMENT A

PRIBUTION UNLIMITED.