

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER

**AD818102**

LIMITATION CHANGES

TO:

**Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.**

FROM:

**Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Critical Technology; APR 1967. Other requests shall be referred to Rome Air Development Center, Griffiss AFB, NY 13440. This document contains export-controlled technical data.**

AUTHORITY

**RADC, USAF ltr, 17 Sep 1971**

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

**Best  
Available  
Copy**

AD818102

RADC-TR-67-162  
Final Report



## FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR A TACTICAL LORAN-D ANTENNA

I. E. Johnson

T. S. Cory

Collins Radio Company

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. RADC-TR-67-162

April 1967

This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments, foreign nationals or representatives thereof may be made only with prior approval of RADC (ZMLI), GAFB, N.Y. 13440

Rome Air Development Center  
Research and Technology Division  
Air Force Systems Command  
Griffiss Air Force Base, New York

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

Do not return this copy. Retain or destroy.

## **FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR A TACTICAL LORAN-D ANTENNA**

**I. E. Johnson**

**T. S. Cory**

**Collins Radio Company**

**This document is subject to special  
export controls and each transmittal  
to foreign governments, foreign na-  
tionals or representatives thereof may  
be made only with prior approval of  
RADC (EMLI), GAFB, N.Y. 13440**

## FOREWORD

This Final Technical Report encompasses all work performed under Contract AF33(615)-3339 from 29 November 1965 to September 1966. This manuscript was released for publication by the authors on January 31, 1967.

The program was accomplished by the Antenna Division of Collins Radio Company, Richardson, Texas under the technical direction of Mr. R. S. Jones/EMAEI, Rome Air Development Center.

The authors of this program were Mr. I. E. Johnson, Project Engineer and Mr. T. S. Cory. Those who contributed significant assistance in the preparation of this report were Messrs. R. H. Sliger, W. G. Jones, H. R. Wilson, and Dr. W. L. Weeks.

Release of subject report to the general public is prohibited by the Strategic Trade Control Program, Mutual Defense Assistance Control List (revised 6 January 1965), published by the Department of State.

The efforts described were carried out under Project 681A. This technical report has been reviewed and is approved.

Approved:

*Richard S. Jones*  
RICHARD S. JONES  
Project Engineer

Approved:

*Thomas S. Bond, Jr.*  
THOMAS S. BOND, JR.  
Colonel, USAF  
for Chief, Surveillance &  
Control Division

FOR THE COMMANDER:

FOR THE COMMANDER:

*Irving G. Belman*  
IRVING G. BELMAN

Chief, Advanced Studies Group

## ABSTRACT

The feasibility of a lightweight, tactical, Loran D antenna system is examined in this study. The existing Sperry system is used as a basis for comparison to achieve either an improved electrical performance utilizing the present mechanical characteristics, or retaining the present systems electrical parameters and achieving superior tactical and mechanical properties.

The program was accomplished by evaluating efficiency - bandwidth products for a variety of electrical configurations while a concurrent mechanical study was being made involving various structural designs, materials, and methods. Finally, the findings of the electrical and mechanical studies were combined, resulting in four recommended possible approaches.

The antenna recommended as a result of this study is a basic umbrella configuration. The support structure recommended is an optimized version of the snap-out tower presently employed. Optimization of the tower involved increased guy diameters to provide linear tower displacement, increasing the leg wall thickness from 0.095 to 0.125 inch, and decreasing the horizontal tower member spacing to 30 inches from 36 inches.

The specified erection time of 10 men - 8 hours for antenna installation was judged feasible due to past performance of the existing system. The system weight using one of the recommended configurations is estimated to be between 5500 to 6500 pounds.

Four basic systems recommended as a result of the study are as follows:

1. INCREASED  $\eta$  X BW OVER STANDARD ANTENNA

a. A tower height of 300 feet with 12 umbrella radiators result in a  $\eta$  X BW of 133. This system would weigh approximately 6,500 pounds and have a volume of approximately 550 cubic feet.

b. A 300-foot tower with an umbrella consisting of 12 radiators with a skirt wire provide a  $\eta$  X BW of 170. The estimated weight of this system is 6,500 pounds and the volume is estimated to be 550 cubic feet

2.  $\eta$  X BW = 100 OPTIONS

a. A tower 275 feet in height supporting a 12 radiator umbrella resulted in a  $\eta$  X BW of 100. The estimated weight is 6,100 pounds and the estimated volume is 540 cubic feet.

b. A 250-foot tower supporting an umbrella consisting of 12 radiators with a skirt wire provides a  $\eta$  X BW of 100. Estimated weight and volume of this system is 5,800 pounds and 530 cubic feet respectively.

## EVALUATION

1. The objective of this study is to determine the feasibility of a light-weight, tactical Loran-D Antenna System whose electrical performance and general mechanical characteristics are superior over the present antenna system.
2. The approach taken by the contractor was to conduct an electrical performance study by building a variety of antenna configurations on a scale model basis and evaluate their electrical characteristics. Concurrent with the electrical study a mechanical study was made whereby various available tower designs, anchors, conductor and materials, state-of-the-art erection techniques, and other properties are evaluated with tactical requirements in mind. Finally the results of the electrical and mechanical studies are combined and the basis for a development specification is given for one or more antenna systems optimized with respect to the tactical requirements.
3. The antenna system recommended is an optimized version of the snap-out tower presently employed.
4. Although no exotic antenna designs were uncovered, the study does provide design curves useful in evaluating various L.F. antenna configurations applicable to Loran-D. The study also provides detail information relative to various tower structures.

  
Richard S. Jones  
Project Engineer

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Section                                                   | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I INTRODUCTION . . . . .                                  | 1    |
| II SUMMARY . . . . .                                      | 3    |
| 1. General . . . . .                                      | 3    |
| 2. Ground Rules and Trade-offs . . . . .                  | 3    |
| a. Weighting Factors . . . . .                            | 3    |
| b. Trade-offs . . . . .                                   | 4    |
| 3. Results . . . . .                                      | 4    |
| 4. Recommendations . . . . .                              | 7    |
| III TECHNICAL APPROACH . . . . .                          | 11   |
| 1. General . . . . .                                      | 11   |
| 2. Electrical Considerations . . . . .                    | 11   |
| a. Mathematical Models . . . . .                          | 11   |
| 3. Empirical Technique . . . . .                          | 45   |
| a. General . . . . .                                      | 45   |
| b. Measurement $\gamma$ XBW Equation Derivation . . . . . | 46   |
| c. Description of Measurements . . . . .                  | 48   |
| d. Description of Test Facility . . . . .                 | 51   |
| 4. Full-Scale Considerations . . . . .                    | 52   |
| a. Power Limitations . . . . .                            | 52   |
| b. Insulator Design . . . . .                             | 57   |
| c. Ground Screen Requirements . . . . .                   | 59   |
| 5. Mechanical Considerations . . . . .                    | 62   |
| a. Support Structure . . . . .                            | 62   |
| b. Guys . . . . .                                         | 74   |
| c. Anchors . . . . .                                      | 75   |
| d. Ground Screen . . . . .                                | 75   |
| e. Radiating Elements . . . . .                           | 75   |
| f. Lighting System Considerations . . . . .               | 76   |
| IV DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS . . . . .               | 77   |
| 1. General . . . . .                                      | 77   |
| 2. Electrical Configuration . . . . .                     | 77   |
| a. Configurations Measured . . . . .                      | 77   |
| b. Analysis of Data . . . . .                             | 78   |
| 3. Design Recommendations . . . . .                       | 84   |
| 4. Mechanical Configurations . . . . .                    | 86   |
| a. Support Structures Investigated . . . . .              | 86   |
| b. Analysis and Recommendations . . . . .                 | 135  |
| 5. Radiating Conductors . . . . .                         | 137  |
| 6. Ground Screen . . . . .                                | 138  |
| a. Materials Considered . . . . .                         | 138  |
| b. Analysis . . . . .                                     | 138  |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont)

| Section                                                        | Page |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 7. Guys . . . . .                                              | 139  |
| a. General . . . . .                                           | 139  |
| b. Materials Considered . . . . .                              | 139  |
| c. Analysis . . . . .                                          | 143  |
| d. Associated Equipment . . . . .                              | 144  |
| 8. Anchors . . . . .                                           | 144  |
| a. General . . . . .                                           | 144  |
| b. Anchors Considered . . . . .                                | 148  |
| c. Anchor Installation Equipment . . . . .                     | 158  |
| d. Analysis . . . . .                                          | 159  |
| 9. Data Presentation and Analysis of Lighting System . . . . . | 160  |
| a. General . . . . .                                           | 160  |
| b. Systems Considered . . . . .                                | 160  |
| c. Power Supply Systems . . . . .                              | 162  |
| d. Analysis . . . . .                                          | 164  |
| List of References . . . . .                                   | 167  |

## APPENDICES

- I Design Requirements for Loran-D Antenna System
- II Sample Data from Tower Analysis Computer Run
- III Derivation of Structural Analysis and Equations  
Stress Analysis of TILT UP Erection Procedure
- IV Determination of Allowable Tower Stresses

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

| Figure                                                                                                                        | Page |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1 Geometry of the Biconical Antenna . . . . .                                                                                 | 16   |
| 2 Bandwidth of Monocone Antenna, Radius 200 Feet, at 100 KHz<br>Cone Angle as Parameter . . . . .                             | 18   |
| 3 Bandwidth of Biconical Antenna, Radius 250 Feet., Freq. 100 KHz,<br>as a Function of Cone Angle (Efficiency = 1) . . . . .  | 18   |
| 4 Bandwidth of Biconical Antenna of 300 ft. Radius at 100 Kilohertz<br>as a Function of Cone Angle (Efficiency = 1) . . . . . | 19   |
| 5 Bandwidth of Monocone Antennas as Function of Radius, or Height,<br>at 100 KHz. Cone Angle as Parameter . . . . .           | 20   |
| 6 Input Impedance of 250 ft. Monocone Antenna at 100 KHz, as a<br>Function of Cone Angle . . . . .                            | 21   |

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (Cont)

| Figure |                                                                                                                                                                                   | Page |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 7      | Geometry of Wire Cage Monocone . . . . .                                                                                                                                          | 24   |
| 8      | Equivalent Cone Angle vs. Monocage Angle for Various<br>Numbers of Wires . . . . .                                                                                                | 25   |
| 9      | Comparison of the $\eta$ XBW of a 250 ft. Monocone and a 250 ft.<br>Monocage at 100 KHz as a Function of Angle for 100% Efficiency . . . . .                                      | 28   |
| 10     | Comparison of Input Impedance Calculated for Monocage and<br>Extracted from Measured Data . . . . .                                                                               | 29   |
| 11     | $\eta$ XBW for Monocage as a Function of Number of Wires . . . . .                                                                                                                | 30   |
| 12     | $\eta$ XBW for 300 ft. Monocage Antenna vs. Top Cone Angle . . . . .                                                                                                              | 32   |
| 13     | Geometry of Wire Umbrella Antenna . . . . .                                                                                                                                       | 33   |
| 14     | Comparison of Efficiency Bandwidth Product for Twelve Wire,<br>49 Degree Umbrella for Various Literature Sources; Also<br>Calculated and Measured Values, This Contract . . . . . | 35   |
| 15     | Efficiency-Bandwidth Product @ 100 KHz for Wire Umbrella,<br>Mast $h/d = 96$ , Wire $l/d = 10,000$ , $\theta_r = 49$ Degrees<br>vs. Number of Wires . . . . .                     | 36   |
| 16     | Efficiency-Bandwidth Product @ 100 KHz for Wire Umbrella,<br>Mast $h/d = 96$ , Wire $l/d = 10,000$ , $\theta_r$ Adjusted for<br>Maximum vs. Number of Wires . . . . .             | 37   |
| 17     | Geometry of Disc Loaded Tower . . . . .                                                                                                                                           | 38   |
| 18     | Radiation Resistance of Disc-Loaded Tower vs.<br>Disc Radius @ 100 KHz . . . . .                                                                                                  | 40   |
| 19     | Efficiency-Bandwidth Product of Disc Loaded Tower<br>vs. Disc Radius @ 100 KHz . . . . .                                                                                          | 41   |
| 20     | Geometry of Ring Antenna . . . . .                                                                                                                                                | 42   |
| 21     | Efficiency-Bandwidth Product of Ring Antenna vs.<br>Conductor Diameter and Area @ 100 KHz . . . . .                                                                               | 44   |
| 22     | Single Tower Geometry to Support 250 Foot Disc . . . . .                                                                                                                          | 45   |
| 23     | Thevenin's Equivalent Circuit Representation of Test Antenna . . . . .                                                                                                            | 46   |
| 24     | Test Facility . . . . .                                                                                                                                                           | 51   |
| 25     | Ground Plane . . . . .                                                                                                                                                            | 52   |
| 26     | Impedance Measurement Setup . . . . .                                                                                                                                             | 53   |
| 27     | Incident Field Strength Measurement . . . . .                                                                                                                                     | 53   |
| 28     | Standard Whip Voltage Measurement . . . . .                                                                                                                                       | 54   |
| 29     | Model Antenna Voltage Measurement . . . . .                                                                                                                                       | 54   |
| 30     | Equivalent Circuit of Umbrella Antenna for Estimating<br>Maximum Voltage . . . . .                                                                                                | 55   |
| 31     | Pictorial Representation of Shaped Insulator . . . . .                                                                                                                            | 57   |
| 32     | Equivalent Circuit for Analysis of Base Insulator . . . . .                                                                                                                       | 58   |
| 33     | Ground Screen Resistance for Radial Ground Wire<br>System with Effective Height = .018 @ 100 KHz . . . . .                                                                        | 61   |
| 34     | Computer Program Flow Diagram . . . . .                                                                                                                                           | 63   |
| 35     | Wind Force Variation with Height . . . . .                                                                                                                                        | 66   |
| 36     | Definition of Variables . . . . .                                                                                                                                                 | 68   |
| 37     | Allowable Column Stress for Round Aluminum Tubing<br>(No Safety Factor Included) . . . . .                                                                                        | 72   |
| 38     | Snap-Out Tower . . . . .                                                                                                                                                          | 87   |
| 39     | Snap-Out Tower Erection . . . . .                                                                                                                                                 | 88   |

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS (Cont)

| Figure |                                                    | Page |
|--------|----------------------------------------------------|------|
| 40     | Computer Run #1 . . . . .                          | 93   |
| 41     | Computer Run #2 . . . . .                          | 94   |
| 42     | Computer Run #3 . . . . .                          | 95   |
| 43     | Computer Run #4 . . . . .                          | 96   |
| 44     | Computer Run #5 . . . . .                          | 97   |
| 45     | Computer Run #6 . . . . .                          | 98   |
| 46     | Computer Run #7 . . . . .                          | 99   |
| 47     | Computer Run #8 . . . . .                          | 100  |
| 48     | Computer Run #9 . . . . .                          | 101  |
| 49     | Computer Run #10 . . . . .                         | 102  |
| 50     | Computer Run #11 . . . . .                         | 107  |
| 51     | Computer Run #12 . . . . .                         | 108  |
| 52     | Computer Run #13 . . . . .                         | 109  |
| 53     | Computer Run #14 . . . . .                         | 110  |
| 54     | Computer Run #15 . . . . .                         | 111  |
| 55     | Computer Run #16 . . . . .                         | 113  |
| 56     | Computer Run #17 . . . . .                         | 114  |
| 57     | Computer Run #18 . . . . .                         | 116  |
| 58     | Computer Run #19 . . . . .                         | 117  |
| 59     | Computer Run #20 . . . . .                         | 119  |
| 60     | Computer Run #21 . . . . .                         | 120  |
| 61     | Computer Run #22 . . . . .                         | 121  |
| 62     | Computer Run #23 . . . . .                         | 122  |
| 63     | Packaged Tower . . . . .                           | 123  |
| 64     | Tilt-Up Tower, Ready for Erection . . . . .        | 124  |
| 65     | Erected Tilt-Up Tower . . . . .                    | 125  |
| 66     | 300 Ft. Configuration . . . . .                    | 128  |
| 67     | 150 Ft. Configuration . . . . .                    | 130  |
| 68     | Comparative Strengths of Ropes and Wires . . . . . | 141  |
| 69     | Guy Adjuster and Tensiometer . . . . .             | 145  |
| 70     | Soil Class . . . . .                               | 146  |
| 71     | Soil Class . . . . .                               | 147  |
| 72     | Expansion Anchor . . . . .                         | 148  |
| 73     | Anchor Installation - Power Tool . . . . .         | 150  |
| 74     | Dead Man Anchor . . . . .                          | 154  |
| 75     | Arrowhead Anchor . . . . .                         | 155  |
| 76     | Explosive Anchor . . . . .                         | 157  |
| 77     | Fixture Location to Meet FAA Specs . . . . .       | 161  |
| 78     | Fixture Location, Minimum Requirement . . . . .    | 163  |
| 79     | Lighting System Power Transmission . . . . .       | 166  |

# LIST OF TABLES

| Table |                                                                                                                                    | Page  |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| I     | Results of Optimization of Standard Antenna Support Structure. . .                                                                 | 6     |
| II    | Terminating Admittance and Input Impedance @ 100 KHz for<br>150 Foot Radius Bicones vs. Cone Angle . . . . .                       | 17    |
| III   | Terminating Admittance and Input Impedance @ 100 KHz for<br>200 Foot Radius Bicones vs. Cone Angle . . . . .                       | 17    |
| IV    | Terminating Admittance and Input Impedance @ 100 KHz for<br>250 Foot Radius Bicones vs. Cone Angle . . . . .                       | 22    |
| V     | Terminating Admittance and Input Impedance @ 100 KHz for<br>300 Foot Radius Bicones vs. Cone Angle . . . . .                       | 22    |
| VI    | Terminating Admittance and Input Impedance @ 100 KHz for<br>350 Foot Radius Bicones vs. Cone Angle . . . . .                       | 23    |
| VII   | Monocage Impedance Calculated Using the "Impedance Concept" for<br>250 Foot Radius; 24, 12, 6 Wires @ 100 KHz vs. Cage Angle . . . | 27'   |
| VIII  | Model Configurations . . . . .                                                                                                     | 79/80 |
| IX    | Tower Configuration . . . . .                                                                                                      | 89    |
| X     | Guy Configuration . . . . .                                                                                                        | 90    |
| XI    | Rope Properties . . . . .                                                                                                          | 91    |
| XII   | Tower Computer Investigation . . . . .                                                                                             | 105   |
| XIII  | Tower Computer Investigation . . . . .                                                                                             | 106   |
| XIV   | Guy Material Properties . . . . .                                                                                                  | 106   |
| XV    | Cost/Ft. Equivalent Rope Dia. . . . .                                                                                              | 140   |
| XVI   | Comparison of 16-1800 Lb Anchors for Class 7 Soils . . . . .                                                                       | 151   |
| XVII  | Anchor Weight Comparison 16-18,000 Lbs. Capacity. . . . .                                                                          | 152   |
| XVIII | Cost and Weight Comparison Lighting System. . . . .                                                                                | 165   |

### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|                  |                                                                                                                                        |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| $\eta$ .....     | efficiency                                                                                                                             |
| BW .....         | bandwidth                                                                                                                              |
| KHz .....        | kilohertz                                                                                                                              |
| $h_{1, 2}$ ..... | tower height                                                                                                                           |
| $f$ .....        | frequency                                                                                                                              |
| L .....          | leg, (tower)                                                                                                                           |
| D .....          | diagonal (tower)                                                                                                                       |
| H .....          | horizontal (tower)                                                                                                                     |
| $h$ .....        | height between tower horizontal members                                                                                                |
| psi .....        | pounds per square inch                                                                                                                 |
| F.S. ....        | factor of safety                                                                                                                       |
| $d$ .....        | distance between tower legs, in.                                                                                                       |
| Q .....          | reciprocal of percent bandwidth                                                                                                        |
| $\Delta f$ ..... | frequency increment between 3 db selectivity points of antenna under matched conditions of frequency $f$ as measured at antenna input. |
| $R_a$ .....      | input resistance                                                                                                                       |
| $Z_o$ .....      | input characteristic impedance                                                                                                         |
| $\eta_L$ .....   | loss efficiency                                                                                                                        |
| PTAM .....       | perfect actual matched antenna                                                                                                         |
| PMAM .....       | perfect short matched monopole                                                                                                         |
| $R_r$ .....      | input resistance                                                                                                                       |
| $\beta_l$ .....  | electrical length                                                                                                                      |
| C .....          | input capacitance                                                                                                                      |

|                              |                                            |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| $W_E$ .....                  | mean stored electric energy                |
| $W_H$ .....                  | mean stored magnetic energy                |
| $\lambda$ .....              | wavelength                                 |
| $K_a$ .....                  | radius of hemisphere in radians            |
| $K$ .....                    | characteristic impedance of bicone         |
| $P_n$ .....                  | Legendre polynomial of order $n$           |
| $\hat{H}_n(\beta R_0)$ ..... | spherical Bessel function of order $n$     |
| $H_n'(\beta R_0)$ .....      | derivative with respect to $n$             |
| $Z_{in}$ .....               | input impedance at apex of bicone          |
| $\Gamma_{hm}$ .....          | load reflection coefficient                |
| $Z_{OB}$ .....               | biconical line characteristic impedance    |
| $\theta_{eB}$ .....          | equivalent cone angle at biconical section |
| $R_a$ .....                  | input resistance                           |
| $X_a$ .....                  | input reactance                            |
| $\theta_B$ .....             | base cone angle                            |
| $X_L$ .....                  | Load reactance                             |
| $h_T$ .....                  | Total tower height, ft.                    |
| $h_m$ .....                  | unmasked tower height, ft.                 |
| $X_m$ .....                  | equivalent series inductive reactance      |
| $l_\mu$ .....                | umbrella wire length                       |
| $r$ .....                    | tower radius                               |
| $D_m$ .....                  | mast diameter                              |

|                                    |                                                        |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| $kh$ .....                         | mast height, radians                                   |
| $kr$ .....                         | radius, radians                                        |
| $H_0, H_1$ .....                   | Hankel functions                                       |
| $J_n (Kr), N_n (kr)$ ....          | Bessel functions                                       |
| $f_R$ .....                        | series resonant frequency                              |
| $W_R$ .....                        | received power                                         |
| $V_m$ .....                        | measured voltage                                       |
| $V_{oc}$ .....                     | open circuit voltage                                   |
| $E_{inc} (\theta_o, \phi_o)$ ..... | incident field strength impinging in desired direction |
| $A (\theta_o, \phi_o)$ .....       | antenna aperture in desired direction                  |
| $A_{PMM}$ .....                    | aperture of perfect short matched monopole             |
| $Z_{in}$ .....                     | impedance read at bridge                               |
| $Z_o$ .....                        | 50 ohm line impedance                                  |
| $Z_r$ .....                        | impedance rotated through transmission line            |
| $\tan \beta l$ .....               | tangent of electrical angle of rotation                |
| $X_{sc}$ .....                     | short circuit reactance reading                        |
| $Z_a$ .....                        | antenna impedance                                      |
| $R_a$ .....                        | antenna resistive component                            |
| $X_a$ .....                        | antenna reactive component                             |
| $X_b$ .....                        | base capacitance                                       |
| $f_o$ .....                        | operating frequency at band center                     |
| $V_m$ .....                        | voltage at antenna terminals                           |
| $\rho$ .....                       | wire radius in inches                                  |

|                     |                                                            |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| $h_w$ .....         | wire height in inches                                      |
| $p_r$ .....         | sphere radius in centimeters                               |
| $R_1$ .....         | shunt dielectric loss resistance                           |
| $X_1$ .....         | shunt capacitance of insulations                           |
| $X_{el}$ .....      | shunt terminal zone capacitance external to the dielectric |
| $R_{pa}$ .....      | shunt or parallel equivalent input resistance              |
| $\sigma$ .....      | insulator conductivity                                     |
| $\epsilon_r$ .....  | relative dielectric constant                               |
| $\epsilon_0$ .....  | air dielectric constant                                    |
| $\tan \delta$ ..... | loss tangent                                               |
| $C_1$ .....         | insulator capacitance                                      |
| $I$ .....           | moment of inertia, in <sup>4</sup>                         |
| $E$ .....           | modulus of elasticity, psi                                 |
| $t_{WL}$ .....      | tower leg wall thickness, in.                              |
| $D_L$ .....         | tower leg diameter, in.                                    |
| $AG$ .....          | shear stiffness                                            |
| $t_{WD}$ .....      | diagonal wall thickness, in.                               |
| $D_D$ .....         | diagonal diameter, in.                                     |
| $T_{WH}$ .....      | horizontal wall thickness, in.                             |
| $D_H$ .....         | horizontal diameter, in.                                   |
| $K$ .....           | spring rate lbs/in                                         |
| $AE$ .....          | stiffness of guy wires                                     |
| $S$ .....           | distance from tower base to guy anchor                     |

|                    |                                                |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| $l$ .....          | height from ground to tower guy point          |
| $W$ .....          | wind loading in lbs/ft                         |
| $C_D$ .....        | drag coefficient                               |
| $V$ .....          | wind velocity in mph                           |
| $t_{ice}$ .....    | ice thickness on member                        |
| $\alpha$ .....     | angle of incidence of member to wind direction |
| $\Delta l_i$ ..... | length of $i^{th}$ section of tower            |
| $f_i$ .....        | load forces on $i^{th}$ section of tower       |
| $F_j$ .....        | restraining forces on $j^{th}$ guy             |
| $m_o, f_o$ .....   | top loads on tower                             |
| $F_B$ .....        | base shear on tower                            |
| $F'_B L_B$ .....   | base mount on tower                            |
| MTBF .....         | mean time between failure                      |
| $L/r$ .....        | slenderness ratio of member                    |
| $L/D$ .....        | lift to drag ratio                             |

## SECTION I

### INTRODUCTION

The object of this study is to determine the feasibility of a light-weight, tactical Loran D antenna system. This objective is accomplished by effecting improvement over the existing Sperry 300-foot, 9-wire umbrella design. To achieve this improvement, the goal of the study is either to improve the electrical performance with a design having the same general mechanical characteristics as the Sperry antenna; or for nominal performance, comparable to the Sperry antenna, to provide a design with superior mechanical and tactical properties.

The program approach is as follows:

- a. An electrical performance study is made by building a variety of antenna configurations on a scale model basis and evaluating their electrical characteristics.
- b. Concurrent with the electrical study, a mechanical study is made whereby various available tower designs, anchors, conductor and guy materials, state-of-the-art erection techniques, and other properties are evaluated with tactical requirements in mind.
- c. Finally, the results of the electrical and mechanical studies are combined and the basis for a development specification is given for one or more antenna systems optimized with respect to the tactical requirements.

The measure for evaluating electrical performance is efficiency-bandwidth product (abbreviated  $\eta$ XBW). The criterion for this evaluation is maximum  $\eta$ XBW for minimum land area and tower height (300-foot hemisphere maximum volume allowed). Of primary importance to the mechanical study is a computer program which permits an iterative evaluation of structural members for a given configuration; the result is an optimally stressed mechanical design. The best electrical designs and the most suitable mechanical components are used with this program to yield a design that is truly optimum for the given tactical constraints.

The main body of the report begins with a technical approach section (Section III) where the characteristics of the electrical and mechanical configurations are determined analytically. Electrically, the possible configurations fall into three classes:

- a. Umbrella or top-loaded vertical types.
- b. Monocone-monocage types.
- c. Transmission line types.

These models are analyzed and conclusions are drawn on purely theoretical grounds. Mechanically, the considerations influencing the structural design are presented together with the analytical basis for the stress analysis computer program.

This section also contains the empirical technique for the electrical measurements; also a discussion of full scale limitations and the mathematical basis for their evaluation.

The second section of the main body (Section IV) presents the data gathered from the electrical study, the computer analysis of various supporting structures, and back-up data on structural components. This data is then compared with the considerations of Section III and qualitative analysis is given with respect to the tactical impact of the results. The result of this analysis is the basis for the developmental specification for optimum system(s).

The ground rules, trade offs and the results of this study are summarized in Section II.

## SECTION II

### SUMMARY

#### 1. GENERAL

The comparative analysis of antenna configurations, support structures, and associated equipment, has resulted in four basic configurations which satisfies the requirements of a lightweight, tactical, Loran D antenna system. The selected techniques and components are within the present state-of-the-art, and are capable of satisfying the mission requirements of the system.

As a basis for the study, the system specifications shown in Appendix 1 together with the additional ground rules in the following section were used. Also contained in the following section are the system trade-offs implemented in obtaining the following results and recommendations.

#### 2. GROUND RULES AND TRADE-OFFS

##### a. WEIGHTING FACTORS

To augment the imposed antenna system requirements of Appendix 1, additional weighting factors are required in order to more specifically establish system design goals. These weighting factors are:

(1) The standard for comparison is the Sperry system currently employed. The summarized characteristics of this antenna are:

Efficiency Bandwidth Product: ( $\eta$ XBW) = 116

No. of umbrella wires: 9

Umbrella angle: 45 degrees

Length of umbrella wires: 305 feet

Tower height: 303 feet

No. of ground radials: 9 @ 300 feet

Weight of system: 6000 pounds

Erection time: 10 men/8 hours

(2) One KHz bandwidth or greater is required. The system  $\eta$ XBW will be 100 or greater (assumed 10% efficiency).

(3) For a given  $\eta$ XBW, electrical configurations are evaluated in terms of land area required for a tower height of 300 ft.

(4) A sufficient number of ground radials of sufficient length to insure "impedance stability" with climatic changes are required.

(5) Wind and ice specifications (see appendix 1) are considered firm on all types of support structures. Effects of reduced environmental conditions on the guys are considered if loads become a critical factor.

(6) A factor of safety of 2 to 1 will be in effect for all structural members.

#### b. TRADE-OFFS

Trade-offs used in the comparative analyses of the antenna system are:

- (1) Increasing land area to improve  $\eta\text{XBW}$ .
- (2) Increase number of radiator wires to improve  $\eta\text{XBW}$ .
- (3) Addition of skirt wire to umbrella to improve  $\eta\text{XBW}$ .
- (4) Increase in weight and volume from additional equipment to facilitate assembly and erection.
- (5) If required, increase system cost to provide improved tactical capability.
- (6) Emphasis on reusable components as opposed to expendable items.
- (7) Emphasis on design, simplicity, and ruggedness resulting in increased system reliability as opposed to a more complex design with above average electrical performance.

### 3. RESULTS

The antenna recommended as a result of this study is a properly designed umbrella configuration. The support structure resulting from the study is an optimized configuration of the snap-out tower presently used.

Factors influencing the umbrella design are:

a. Fixing other parameters, the increase in efficiency-bandwidth product ( $\eta\text{XBW}$ ) for an increase in tower height from  $h_1$  to  $h_2$  is  $\left(\frac{h_2}{h_1}\right)^3$  times ( $\eta\text{XBW}$ ).

b. Fixing other parameters, the increase in  $\eta\text{XBW}$  for increase in frequency  $f_1$  to new frequency  $f_2$  is  $(f_2/f_1)^4$  ( $\eta\text{XBW}$ ).

c. The  $\eta$ XBW increases when the number of umbrella wires is increased. For instance, an umbrella with an optimum  $1/h_T$  and angle  $\phi_T$  of the order of 45 - 50 degrees, the following increases in  $\eta$ XBW may be achieved:

| <u>Umbrella Wires</u> | <u>% Increase</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 6 - 9                 | 24%               |
| 9 - 12                | 16%               |
| 12 - 24               | 20%               |
| 9 - 24                | 38%               |

d. The addition of a skirt wire of the same diameter as the radiator wires results in approximately a 30 percent increase in  $\eta$ XBW.

e. An increase in allowable land area will give an increase in  $\eta$ XBW. For the conditions of paragraph c preceding and using 12 radiators, an increase in land area of 33 percent resulting from a 10 percent increase in tower height, results in an  $\eta$ XBW increase of 33 percent for an initial  $\eta$ XBW of approximately 100.

f. For umbrella angles which are reasonable for Loran D (40 - 50 degrees) the umbrella wire length is approximately equal to the tower height for maximum  $\eta$ XBW.

g. No significant reduction in ground loss resistance is achieved when using an excess of 40 ground radials.

h. For power handling, the most critical component is the base insulator. The insulator should be 24 to 30 inches high with a minimum diameter. For normal dielectrics (porcelain or fiberglass resin) the dielectric loss is not critical if the insulator diameter is less than 10 inches.

The type of support structure recommended as a result of the study is an optimized version of the Up-Right Tower Company currently employed. Table 1 illustrates a comparison of the standard and the optimized versions of this tower. As shown in table 1, a small margin of safety exists in critical areas, notably the tower legs and guy ropes, in the present design.

Improvements resulting in optimization of the tower are:

- (1) Increase guy sizes with height to provide linear deflection of the tower, and resulting minimum of bending in tower.
- (2) Increase leg wall thickness from 0.095 to 0.125 inches.
- (3) Change spacing of horizontal members from 36 to 30 inches, thereby decreasing the  $1/r$  and increasing the allowable stress level.

TABLE 1. RESULTS OF OPTIMIZATION OF STANDARD ANTENNA SUPPORT STRUCTURE

| TOWER                       | MEMBER SIZE, INCHES |         |      | MAXIMUM STRESS, PSI |       |        | ALLOWABLE STRESS PSI, SAFETY FACTOR = 2 |        |        | MAX. TOWER DEFLECTION | MAX. GUY LOAD | ALLOW. GUY LOAD, PS = 2 | TOWER WT / FT | PARAMETERS, METERS, INCHES |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------|------|---------------------|-------|--------|-----------------------------------------|--------|--------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|
|                             | L                   | H       | D    | L                   | H     | D      | L                                       | H      | D      |                       |               |                         |               |                            |
| STANDARD UMBRELLA           | 2 X 035             | 2 X 036 | 3/16 | 31,235              | 6,042 | 36,414 | 19,000                                  | 17,500 | 40,800 | 9.378                 | 9,185         | 5,000                   | 9.3           | 36                         |
| OPTIMIZED STANDARD UMBRELLA | 2 X 125             | 2 X 038 | 3/16 | 25,991              | 6,986 | 39,000 | 26,000                                  | 17,500 | 40,800 | 4.443                 | 9,672         | 9,000                   | 10.0          | 30                         |

|                         |     |     |     |     |     |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1                       | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   |
| STANDARD UMBRELLA GUYS  |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3/8 DIA                 |     |     |     |     |     |
| LEG (L)                 |     |     |     |     |     |
| DIAGONAL (D)            |     |     |     |     |     |
| HORIZONTAL (H)          |     |     |     |     |     |
| GUY DIA IN              |     |     |     |     |     |
| 1                       | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   |
| 219                     | 500 | 438 | 375 | 312 | 312 |
| OPTIMIZED UMBRELLA GUYS |     |     |     |     |     |

#### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

##### a. Increased BW system (over Standard Antenna)

(1)  $\eta \times BW = 133$

|                                  |                                     |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Tower Height:                    | 300 feet                            |
| No. of Radiators:                | 12 (No Skirt Wire)                  |
| Radius of Antenna:               | 345 feet                            |
| Radiator - Tower Included Angle: | 49°                                 |
| Radiator Material:               | Aluminum Braid<br>Jacketed Glastran |

##### Guy Diameters (Glastran):

|                        |           |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Guy No. 1 (Radiators): | 3/16 inch |
| Guy No. 2:             | 1/2 inch  |
| Guy No. 3:             | 7/16 inch |
| Guy No. 4:             | 3/8 inch  |
| Guy No. 5:             | 5/16 inch |
| Guy No. 6:             | 5/16 inch |

##### Anchors, Class 6 & 7 Soils:

|            |                                |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| Radiators: | 10-inch screw anchors, 12 each |
| Guys:      | 13-inch screw anchors, 15 each |

##### Anchors, Class 3, 4 & 5 Soils:

|            |                               |
|------------|-------------------------------|
| Radiators: | 6 by 22-inch Deadman, 12 each |
| Guys:      | 6 by 22-inch Deadman, 15 each |

Estimated Volume: 550 cubic feet

Estimated Weight: 6500 pounds

Installation Time: 10 men, 8 hours

Ground Screen: 40 radials, 350-feet long # 13  
Aluminum Wire

(2)  $\eta \times BW = 170$

|                                     |                                     |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Tower Height:                       | 300 feet                            |
| No. of Radiators:                   | 12 (with skirt)                     |
| Radius of Antenna:                  | 345 feet                            |
| Radiator - Tower included<br>Angle: | 49°                                 |
| Radiator Material:                  | Aluminum Braid<br>Jacketed Glastran |

Guy Diameters (Glastran):

|                        |           |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Guy No. 1 (Radiators): | 3/16 inch |
| Guy No. 2              | 1/2 inch  |
| Guy No. 3              | 7/16 inch |
| Guy No. 4              | 3/8 inch  |
| Guy No. 5              | 5/16 inch |
| Guy No. 6              | 5/16 inch |

Anchors, Class 6 & 7 Soils:

|            |                               |
|------------|-------------------------------|
| Radiators: | 10-inch screw anchor, 12 each |
| Guys:      | 13-inch screw anchor, 12 each |

Anchors, Class 3, 4, 5 Soils:

|            |                               |
|------------|-------------------------------|
| Radiators: | 6 by 22 inch Deadman, 12 each |
| Guys:      | 6 by 22-inch Deadman, 12 each |

Estimated Volume: 550 cubic feet.

Estimated Weight: 6500 pounds

Installation Time: 10 men, 8 hours

Ground Screen: 40 radials, 350-feet long, #13  
Aluminum Wire

b.  $\eta \times BW = 100$  Options

(1)  $\eta \times BW = 100$  (no skirt)

|               |          |
|---------------|----------|
| Tower Height: | 275 feet |
|---------------|----------|

No. of Radiators: 12  
 Radius of Antenna: 300 feet  
 Radiator - Tower Included Angle: 47-1/2°  
 Radiator Material: Aluminum Braid Jacketed Glastran

**Guy Diameters (Glastran)**

Guy No. 1 (Radiators): 3/16 inch  
 Guy No. 2: 1/2 inch  
 Guy No. 3: 7/16 inch  
 Guy No. 4: 3/8 inch  
 Guy No. 5: 5/16 inch

**Anchors, Class 6 & 7 Soils:**

Radiators: 10-inch screw anchor, 12 each  
 Guys: 13-inch screw anchor, 12 each

**Anchors, Class 3, 4 & 5 Soils:**

Radiators: 6 by 22-inch Deadman, 12 each  
 Guys: 6 by 22-inch Deadman, 12 each

Estimated Volume: 540 cubic feet

Estimated Weight: 6100 pounds

Installation Time: 10 men, 8 hours

Ground Screen: 40 wires, 300 feet long #13  
 Aluminum wire

(2)  $\eta \times BW = 100$  (with skirt)

Tower Height: 250 feet  
 No. of Radials: 12, with skirt  
 Radius of Antenna: 300 feet  
 Radiator - Tower Included Angle: 50°

**Radiator Material:** Aluminum Braid  
Jacketed Glastran

**Guy Diameters (Glastran):**

**Guy No. 1 (Radiators):** 3/16 inch

**Guy No. 2:** 1/2 inch

**Guy No. 3:** 7/16 inch

**Guy No. 4:** 3/8 inch

**Guy No. 5:** 5/16 inch

**Anchors, Class 6 & 7 Soils:**

**Radiators:** 10-inch screw anchor, 12 each

**Guys:** 13-inch screw anchor, 12 each

**Anchors, Class 3, 4, & 5 Soils:**

**Radiators:** 6 by 22-inch Deadman, 12 each

**Guys:** 6 by 22-inch Deadman, 12 each

**Estimated Volume:** 530 cubic feet

**Estimated Weight:** 5800 pounds

**Installation Time:** 10 men, 8 hours

**Ground Screen:** 40 radials, 300-feet long  
#13 Aluminum Wire

## SECTION III

### TECHNICAL APPROACH

#### 1. GENERAL

The possible electrical configurations fall into three basic classifications: top-loaded vertical types or umbrella, moncone-monocage types, and transmission line types, which are defined in this section. Also, the efficiency-bandwidth product ( $\eta \times BW$ ) is quantitatively defined.

The test facility, with which the antenna scale models were tested and data obtained, is described.

Full-scale electrical considerations described include power limitations, corona minimization, insulator design, ground screen design, and lighting system design.

Mechanical considerations influencing the structural design are presented, as is the analytical background for the stress analysis computer program used on applicable types of support structures.

#### 2. ELECTRICAL CONSIDERATIONS

##### a. MATHEMATICAL MODELS

In the process of determining optimum antenna configurations, it is necessary to define efficiency-bandwidth product and to place theoretical and practical upper limits on its value for the volume containing the antenna. The size of this volume is defined in terms of electrical size. For the Loran-D requirements, it is approximately 0.03 wavelengths in radius. At a frequency of 100 KHz, this volume has a lineal radius of 300 feet. The antenna configurations studied are generally constrained to fit within this volume.

The percent bandwidth may be defined as the reciprocal of  $Q$  and is given by

$$\% BW = \frac{1}{Q} = \frac{\Delta f}{f} \times 100$$

where

$f$  is the frequency

$\Delta f$  is the frequency increment between the 3 db selectivity points of the antenna under matched conditions at frequency  $f$  as measured at the antenna input.

The bandwidth in cycles is then

$$BW = \Delta f = \frac{f}{Q} = \frac{f R_a}{Z_o}$$

where

$$Q = \frac{Z_o}{R_a}$$

and

$R_a$  is the input resistance

$Z_o$  is the input characteristic impedance.

Correspondingly, efficiency may be defined as

$$\eta = \frac{A_{\text{actual antenna when matched}}}{A_{\text{perfect short monopole when matched}}}$$

where

$A$  is the aperture

then,

$$\eta = \eta_L \frac{A_{\text{perfect actual matched antenna}}}{A_{\text{perfect short matched monopole}}}$$

where

$\eta_L$  = loss efficiency

$$= \eta_L \frac{A_{\text{PTAM}}}{A_{\text{PMAM}}}$$

therefore,

$$\eta_{XBW} = \eta_L \frac{A_{\text{PTAM}}}{A_{\text{PMAM}}} \frac{f R_a}{Z_o}$$

For electrically small antenna, assuming  $A_{\text{PTAM}} = A_{\text{PMAM}}$  in the direction of interest

$$\eta_{XBW} = \eta_L \frac{f R_a}{Z_o}$$

Now

$$\eta_L = \frac{R_r}{R_a}$$

where  $R_r$  is the component of the input impedance representing radiation.

Then,

$$\eta XBW = \frac{f R_r}{Z_o}$$

If  $R_r$  is the same as the input resistance for the case of no loss, then  $\eta XBW$  can be calculated for some antennas and  $\eta XBW$  is the same as the bandwidth of the perfect antenna. This means that there is a one for one tradeoff or efficiency for bandwidth. Efficiency, as used here, is also the gain for the surface wave of the test antenna undermatched conditions relative to a perfect short monopole under matched conditions.

For electrically small antennas\*

$$Z_o \approx \frac{Z_{oa}}{\beta l}$$

where  $Z_{oa}$  is the average characteristic impedance

$\beta l$  is the electrical length

and, as for the monopole, if the input reactance can be expressed as

$$-jX_a = -j Z_{oa} \cot \beta l$$

where for small angles

$$\cot \beta l \approx \frac{1}{\beta l}$$

then

$$X_a \approx \frac{Z_{oa}}{\beta l} = Z_o = \frac{1}{2\pi f C}$$

where  $C$  is the input capacitance.

Thus  $\eta XBW$  may be expressed as

$$\eta XBW = \frac{f R_r}{X_a}$$

A more exact definition of  $Q$  for a circuit is based on

$$Q = 2\pi \frac{\text{energy stored/cycle}}{\text{energy dissipated/cycle}}$$

---

\* for which an average characteristic impedance may be defined.

$$= 2 \pi f \frac{\frac{1}{4} i i^* \frac{\partial X_a}{\partial \omega}}{\text{energy dissipated/sec}}$$

where  $i$  is the current and

$$\frac{\partial X_a}{\partial \omega} = \frac{4 (W_H + W_E)}{i i^*}$$

where  $W_E$ ,  $W_H$  are the mean stored electric and magnetic energies.

$$\text{Energy dissipated/sec} = \frac{1}{2} i i^* R$$

such that

$$\text{The unloaded } Q = \frac{\omega}{2R} \frac{\partial X_a}{\partial \omega}$$

for the loaded  $Q$  of the circuit where  $X_T$  is the total circuit reactance

$$Q = \frac{f_o \left. \frac{dX_a}{df} \right|_{f_o} + X_a}{2R}$$

Considering electrically small antennas of the monopole type where the frequency dependence of the reactance is approximately  $1/f$

$$= f_o \left. \frac{dX_a}{df} \right|_{f_o} \approx X_a$$

which validates the previous definition of  $Q$ .

For two electrically small antennas which differ only in scale factor, the input resistance is given by

$$R_r = K \left( \frac{h}{\lambda} \right)^2$$

where

$K$  is a constant

$h$  is the height

$\lambda$  is the wavelength.

$$\eta \text{ XBW} = K_1 f^4 (h^3)$$

where  $K_1$  is a constant.

The prime motivation for this study from the Collins point of view is based on the work of Collin & Rothchild<sup>2</sup>, Schellkunoff<sup>3</sup>, Weeks<sup>4</sup>, and others indicating that if the lowest order spherical mode could be established in the volume, the efficiency bandwidth product could be as high as 690 at 100 KHz. For example, a 300-foot hemispherical antenna fed with a slice-generator at the base could excite this mode.

For a spherical antenna, the input impedance at this mode is given by

$$Z = -j 80\pi \left[ \frac{1}{k_a} - \frac{(j_{1/2}(k_a) - j N_{1/2}(k_a))}{(j_{3/2}(k_a) - j N_{3/2}(k_a))} \right]$$

$$\approx 80\pi \left[ \frac{(k_a)^2}{1 + (k_a)^2} \right] - j 80\pi \left[ \frac{1}{k_a [1 + (k_a)^2]} \right]$$

for small  $k_a$  where  $k_a$  is radius of hemisphere in radians. Using

$$\eta \text{ XBW} = \frac{f R_r}{X_a}$$

$$\eta \text{ XBW} = (k_a)^3 f = 690.$$

The excitation of the single spherical modes requires a minimum of stored energy.

Practical antenna configuration such as the bicone requires multiple modes to match the boundary conditions between the spherical cap and the biconical line section, thus reducing the maximum achievable  $\eta \text{ XBW}$ .

#### (1) Biconical Model.

There are few configurations which are amenable to near-exact analysis due to the inability to fit the conducting surfaces of many antennas to any coordinate system for which wave functions are known. The biconical antenna is one of these few. It most nearly fits the mathematical approach of Collin and Rothchild. It consists of a portion of a spherical antenna fed with a biconical transmission line. The geometry is shown in Figure 1. In the limiting case where  $\theta \rightarrow 90$  degrees, the antenna approaches the spherical model discussed previously. Unfortunately, for this case the impedance of the biconical line feeding the sphere becomes so low in value that the input resistance is greatly reduced.

To evaluate the  $\eta \text{ XBW}$  of monocones, the terminating admittances,  $Y_{T1}$ , pertaining to the bicone were calculated. The method used is that of Tai<sup>5</sup>. Examination of Tai's result shows that the zero order approximation is sufficiently accurate for small cones ( $\theta R_0 < .5$ ) when the angles are in the range of 40-80 degrees. The terminating admittance, for this case, is given by




Figure 1. Geometry of the Biconical Antenna

$$Y_T = -j \frac{120}{K^2} \sum_{n=1,2,\dots} \frac{(2n+1)}{n(n+1)} P_n^2 (\cos \theta) \frac{\hat{H}_n(\beta R_o)}{\hat{H}_n'(\beta R_o)}$$

where

$K = 120 \ln \left( \cot \frac{\theta}{2} \right)$ , the characteristic impedance of the bicone.

$P_n$  is the Legendre polynomial of order  $n$ .

$\hat{H}_n(\beta R_o)$  is the spherical Bessel function of order  $n$ .

$\hat{H}_n'(\beta R_o)$  is the derivative with respect to  $R_o$ .

The input impedance at the apex of the bicone,  $Z_{in} = R + jX$ , is calculated by means of the standard transformation equation

$$Z_{in} = K \left[ \frac{\cos \beta R_o + j K Y_T \sin \beta R_o}{K Y_T \cos \beta R_o + j \sin \beta R_o} \right]$$

The monocone impedances over perfect ground are then half those of the bicone, however, the  $\eta$  XBW is the same.  $\eta$  XBW was calculated by the formula

$$\eta \text{ XBW} = \frac{f R}{X}$$

The input impedances and bandwidth in Hertz of bicones of 150, 200, 250, 300, 350 feet in radius at 100 KHz, for cone angles ranging from 35-85 degrees are shown in figures 2 through 5 and tables II through VI.

The most interesting result of the above theoretical calculations is that the  $\eta \text{ XBW}$  increases with decreasing cone angle within the limits of the calculations made. It is obvious that for very small cone angles, the  $\eta \text{ XBW}$  must decrease and become that of a thin monopole. For the particular case of radius equal to 250 feet, the  $\eta \text{ XBW}$  based on thin bicone impedance data<sup>6</sup> was plotted and the two sets of data were joined. The results are shown as figure 6. Note that the resistance has a

TABLE II. TERMINATING ADMITTANCE AND INPUT IMPEDANCE @ 100 KHz FOR 150 FOOT RADIUS BICONES VS. CONE ANGLE

| $\theta$ | 150'                       |                            |                            |                          |
|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
|          | $Y_T \text{ Real}$         | $Y_T I_m$                  | $Z_{in} \text{ Real}$      | $Z_{in} I_m$             |
| 35       | $5.34 \text{ by } 10^{-7}$ | $6.21 \text{ by } 10^{-4}$ | $3.12 \text{ by } 10^{-1}$ | $-7.55 \text{ by } 10^2$ |
| 45       | $6.28 \text{ by } 10^{-7}$ | $7.99 \text{ by } 10^{-4}$ | $2.36 \text{ by } 10^{-1}$ | $-5.81 \text{ by } 10^2$ |
| 55       | $8.19 \text{ by } 10^{-7}$ | $9.98 \text{ by } 10^{-4}$ | $1.67 \text{ by } 10^{-1}$ | $-4.46 \text{ by } 10^2$ |
| 65       | $9.31 \text{ by } 10^{-7}$ | $1.24 \text{ by } 10^{-3}$ | $1.03 \text{ by } 10^{-1}$ | $-3.30 \text{ by } 10^2$ |
| 75       | $1.01 \text{ by } 10^{-6}$ | $1.36 \text{ by } 10^{-3}$ | $4.86 \text{ by } 10^{-2}$ | $-2.17 \text{ by } 10^2$ |
| 85       | $1.06 \text{ by } 10^{-6}$ | $2.17 \text{ by } 10^{-3}$ | $8.29 \text{ by } 10^{-3}$ | $-8.81 \text{ by } 10^1$ |

TABLE III. TERMINATING ADMITTANCE AND INPUT IMPEDANCE @ 100 KHz FOR 200 FOOT RADIUS BICONES VS. CONE ANGLE

| $\theta$ | 200'                       |                            |                            |                          |
|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
|          | $Y_T \text{ Real}$         | $Y_T I_m$                  | $Z_{in} \text{ Real}$      | $Z_{in} I_m$             |
| 35       | $1.70 \text{ by } 10^{-6}$ | $8.83 \text{ by } 10^{-4}$ | $5.38 \text{ by } 10^{-1}$ | $-5.60 \text{ by } 10^2$ |
| 45       | $2.17 \text{ by } 10^{-6}$ | $1.07 \text{ by } 10^{-3}$ | $4.23 \text{ by } 10^{-1}$ | $-4.31 \text{ by } 10^2$ |
| 55       | $2.61 \text{ by } 10^{-6}$ | $1.34 \text{ by } 10^{-3}$ | $2.98 \text{ by } 10^{-1}$ | $-3.31 \text{ by } 10^2$ |
| 65       | $2.97 \text{ by } 10^{-6}$ | $1.66 \text{ by } 10^{-3}$ | $1.88 \text{ by } 10^{-1}$ | $-2.45 \text{ by } 10^2$ |
| 75       | $3.22 \text{ by } 10^{-6}$ | $2.10 \text{ by } 10^{-3}$ | $8.70 \text{ by } 10^{-2}$ | $-1.62 \text{ by } 10^2$ |
| 85       | $3.36 \text{ by } 10^{-6}$ | $2.91 \text{ by } 10^{-3}$ | $1.49 \text{ by } 10^{-2}$ | $-6.57 \text{ by } 10^1$ |




Figure 2. Bandwidth of Monocone Antenna, Radius 200 Feet, at 100 KHz.  
Cone Angle as Parameter




Figure 3. Bandwidth of Biconical Antenna, Radius 250 ft., Freq. 100 KHz, as a  
Function of Cone Angle (Efficiency = 1)




Figure 4. Bandwidth of Biconical Antenna of 300 ft. Radius at 100 Kilohertz as a Function of Cone Angle (Efficiency = 1)




Figure 5. Bandwidth of Monocone Antennas as Function of Radius, or Height, at 100 KHz. Cone Angle as Parameter




Figure 6. Input Impedance of 250 ft. Monocone Antenna at 100 KHz, as a Function of Cone Angle

TABLE IV. TERMINATING ADMITTANCE AND INPUT IMPEDANCE @ 100 KHz FOR  
250 FOOT RADIUS BICONES VS. CONE ANGLE

| $\theta$ | 250'              |                   |                   |                 |
|----------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
|          | $Y_T$ Real        | $Y_T$ $I_m$       | $Z_{in}$ Real     | $Z_{in}$ $I_m$  |
| 35       | 4.19 by $10^{-6}$ | 1.05 by $10^{-3}$ | 8.78 by $10^{-1}$ | -4.41 by $10^2$ |
| 45       | 5.35 by $10^{-6}$ | 1.35 by $10^{-3}$ | 6.65 by $10^{-1}$ | -3.40 by $10^2$ |
| 55       | 6.42 by $10^{-6}$ | 1.69 by $10^{-3}$ | 4.70 by $10^{-1}$ | -2.61 by $10^2$ |
| 65       | 7.31 by $10^{-6}$ | 2.10 by $10^{-3}$ | 2.92 by $10^{-1}$ | -1.94 by $10^2$ |
| 75       | 7.94 by $10^{-6}$ | 2.64 by $10^{-3}$ | 1.37 by $10^{-1}$ | -1.28 by $10^2$ |
| 85       | 8.27 by $10^{-6}$ | 3.63 by $10^{-3}$ | 2.33 by $10^{-2}$ | -5.23 by $10^1$ |

TABLE V. TERMINATING ADMITTANCE AND INPUT IMPEDANCE @ 100 KHz FOR  
300 FOOT RADIUS BICONES VS. CONE ANGLE

| $\theta$ | 300               |                   |                   |                 |
|----------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
|          | $Y_T$ Real        | $Y_T$ $I_m$       | $Z_{in}$ Real     | $Z_{in}$ $I_m$  |
| 35       | 8.78 by $10^{-6}$ | 1.27 by $10^{-3}$ | 1.27              | -3.61 by $10^2$ |
| 45       | 1.12 by $10^{-5}$ | 1.64 by $10^{-3}$ | 9.65 by $10^{-1}$ | -2.78 by $10^2$ |
| 55       | 1.35 by $10^{-5}$ | 2.05 by $10^{-3}$ | 6.82 by $10^{-1}$ | -2.14 by $10^2$ |
| 65       | 1.33 by $10^{-5}$ | 2.34 by $10^{-3}$ | 4.24 by $10^{-1}$ | -1.59 by $10^2$ |
| 75       | 1.66 by $10^{-5}$ | 3.19 by $10^{-3}$ | 2.00 by $10^{-1}$ | -1.05 by $10^2$ |
| 85       | 1.73 by $10^{-5}$ | 4.42 by $10^{-3}$ | 3.43 by $10^{-2}$ | -4.33 by $10^1$ |

maximum value at about 28 degrees. Considering the biconical portion of the antenna as a monopole, the spherical cap provides capacitive loading to this monopole. As the cone angle increases from small values the loading increases but the effective height of the monopole portion decreases, thus providing the peak in the resistance curve.

Practical monocone structures consist of a cage of equally spaced wires on a conical surface. Also, the top or "cap" consists of an inverted cone composed of the same wires in lieu of a solid spherical cap. In general, the inverted cage has a different angle than that of the biconical section. Because of this top section, in particular, the impedance and hence the  $\eta$  XBW of the case will be different than that for the solid cones.

TABLE VI. TERMINATING ADMITTANCE AND INPUT IMPEDANCE @ 100 KHZ FOR  
350 FOOT RADIUS BICONES VS. CONE ANGLE

| $\theta$ | 350'              |                   |                   |                 |
|----------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
|          | $Y_T$ Real        | $Y_T I_m$         | $Z_{in}$ Real     | $Z_{in} I_m$    |
| 35       | 1.65 by $10^{-5}$ | 1.51 by $10^{-3}$ | 1.75              | -3.03 by $10^2$ |
| 45       | 2.10 by $10^{-5}$ | 1.94 by $10^{-3}$ | 1.33              | -2.33 by $10^2$ |
| 55       | 2.52 by $10^{-5}$ | 2.42 by $10^{-3}$ | 9.39 by $10^{-1}$ | -1.80 by $10^2$ |
| 65       | 2.87 by $10^{-5}$ | 2.99 by $10^{-3}$ | 5.84 by $10^{-1}$ | -1.34 by $10^2$ |
| 75       | 3.12 by $10^{-5}$ | 3.76 by $10^{-3}$ | 2.76 by $10^{-1}$ | -8.91 by $10^1$ |
| 85       | 3.25 by $10^{-5}$ | 5.19 by $10^{-3}$ | 4.74 by $10^{-2}$ | -3.68 by $10^1$ |

The cage of wires having angle  $\theta$  can be transformed into an equivalent cone having angle  $\theta_e$  according to Schelkunoff<sup>7</sup>. The relation is given by

$$\tan\left(\frac{1}{2}\theta_e\right) = \tan\left(\frac{1}{2}\theta\right) \left[ \frac{n \tan\left(\frac{1}{2}\theta_o\right)}{\tan\left(\frac{1}{2}\theta\right)} \right]^{\frac{1}{n}}$$

where

$\theta_o$  is the cone angle of the conical wire.

$n$  is the number of wires.

The geometry of a wire cage monocone is shown as figure 7. The relation between the cone and cage angles for  $n$  equal 6, 12, 24 and for  $\theta_o$  equal to  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  is shown as figure 8.

The cases to be considered are those where lengths of the monocone wires are equal to the height; that is

$$\frac{h_m}{\cos \theta_B} = h_T.$$

The model used is that of considering the top inverted cage to serve as a load on a section of biconical transmission line. The load reactance,  $Z_L$ , is given by

$$Z_L = -j Z_o \cos \beta Z$$




Figure 7. Geometry of Wire Cage Monocore

where  $Z_0$  is the average characteristic impedance of the inverted cone section.

$$Z_0 \approx \frac{60}{h} \int_0^h \ln \left[ \frac{2 Z dz}{(h-z) \sin \theta_{et}} \right] dz$$

$$= 60 \ln \left( \frac{2}{\sin \theta_{et}} \right)$$

where  $\theta_{et}$  is equivalent cone angle for the top inverted section. The current of the bi-conical line section projected onto the Z axis is given by

$$I(z) = I_z \left( e^{+j\beta(h_m - z)} - \rho_{hm} e^{-j\beta(h_m - z)} \right)$$

$$0 \leq z \leq h_m$$

with the phase referred to the load end.

where  $\rho_{hm}$  is the load reflection coefficient.

$$\rho_{hm} = \frac{Z_L - Z_{0B}}{Z_L + Z_{0B}} = 1 e^{j \arg \rho_{hm}}$$




Figure 8. Equivalent Cone Angle vs. Monocage Angle for Various Numbers of Wires

where

$$Z_{0B} = 60 \ln \left( \cot \frac{\theta_{eB}}{2} \right) \text{ the biconical line characteristic impedance}$$

$\theta_{eB}$  is equivalent cone angle at the biconical section.

$$I_z = \frac{1}{1 - \rho_{hm}}$$

Then

$$|I_z| = |I_2| \sqrt{2} \sqrt{1 - \cos [\arg \rho_{hm} - 2\beta (h_m - z)]}$$

The average current over this sector referred to the total height,  $h_T$ , is

$$I_{ave} = \frac{1}{\beta h_T} \int_0^{h_m} |I_z| d\beta z$$

$$= \frac{2 |I_2|}{\beta h_T} \left[ \cos \left( \frac{\arg \rho_{hm}}{2} + \beta h_m - \beta z \right) \right] \bigg|_0^{\beta h_m}$$

If the current projection of the top inverted cone on the Z axis is assumed to be linear, the average current on this sector is given simply by

$$I_{ave} = \frac{.5 (\beta h_T - \beta h_m)}{\beta h_T}$$

The assumption of a linear variation of current is not strictly correct as the current is really much larger near the base of the inverted cone than further out. The result is that the effective height of the monogage calculated is a little high, but this is significant only for large base cone angles. The effective height is given by

$$\frac{h_e}{h_T} = 2 |I_2| \left[ \cos \left( \frac{\arg \rho_{hm}}{2} + \beta h_m - \beta z \right) \right] \bigg|_0^{h_m} + \frac{.5 (\beta h_T - \beta h_m)}{|I_0| \beta h_T}$$

where

$$I_0 = |I_2| \sqrt{2} \sqrt{1 - \cos (\arg \rho_{hm} + 2\beta h_m)}.$$

The input resistance is then given by

$$R_a = 40 (\beta h_T)^2 \frac{h_e^2}{h_T}$$

Resistances were calculated for  $h_T$  equal 250 feet,  $n$  equal to 6, 12, 24 for angles  $\theta_B$  from 20-60 degrees. These resistance values are shown in Table VII. For the calculated impedance curves of figure 6 for the perfect solid bicone, the  $\eta$  XBW's vs. cone angle calculated and are shown in figure 9. Also plotted in this graph is the calculated  $\eta$  XBW using the same resistance values but reactance values corresponding to the equivalent cone angle for 12 wires and the measured monocage data for 12 wires. If the difference between the latter two sets of data is used to correct the resistance curve of figure 6, the corrected curve and the values calculated in Table VII for twelve wires correspond closely. This comparison is shown in figure 10.

The transmission line model used to compute effective height can also be used to compute reactance. As stated previously, the load reactance on the biconical line is given by

$$Z_L = -j 60 \cot \beta h \ln \left( \frac{2}{\sin \theta_{eT}} \right)$$

$$\approx -j \frac{60}{\beta h} \ln \left( \frac{2}{\sin \theta_{eT}} \right)$$

The input reactance is then given by

$$X_a = \frac{-j \frac{Z_L}{Z_{oB}} + j \beta h}{1 + \beta h \left( \frac{Z_L}{Z_{oB}} \right)}$$

TABLE VII. MONOCAGE IMPEDANCE CALCULATED USING THE "IMPEDANCE CONCEPT" FOR 250 FOOT RADIUS; 24, 12, 6 WIRES @ 100 KHz VS. CAGE ANGLE

| $\theta_o$ | 6 Wires |     | 12 Wires |     | 24 Wires |     |
|------------|---------|-----|----------|-----|----------|-----|
|            | R       | -jX | R        | -jX | R        | -jX |
| 20         | 0.282   | 820 | 0.295    | 726 | 0.297    | 631 |
| 30         | 0.287   | 770 | 0.289    | 542 | 0.306    | 462 |
| 40         | 0.277   | 625 | 0.253    | 437 | 0.296    | 349 |
| 50         | 0.262   | 529 | 0.241    | 348 | 0.256    | 272 |
| 60         | 0.257   | 449 | 0.205    | 284 | 0.217    | 211 |




Figure 9. Comparison of the  $\eta_{XBW}$  of a 250 ft Monocone and a 250 ft Monocage at 100 KHz as a Function of Angle for 100% Efficiency




Figure 10. Comparison of Input Impedance Calculated for Monocage and Extracted from Measured Data

These reactances were also calculated for  $h_T$  equal 250 feet,  $n$  equal to 6, 12, 24 for angles  $\theta_B$  from 20-60 degrees and are tabulated together with the previous resistance values in Table VII. From these resistances and reactances,  $\eta_{XBW}$  were calculated and are shown in figure 11. The case for 9 wires is also plotted in figure 11 as a comparison with the measured values.




Figure 11.  $\eta_{XBW}$  for Monocage as a Function of Number of Wires

Although the  $\eta_{XBW}$  is shown to increase for an increase in the base cone angle,  $\theta_B$ , the values must go through a maximum and then decrease. For low number of wires the maximum is nearly reached at  $\theta_B$  equals 60 degrees. For very large base cone angles, the method used to calculate the  $\eta_{XBW}$  becomes inaccurate due to not knowing the current distribution on the "inverted cone" portion of the antenna with accuracy. Using a value of  $h_e/h_T$  equals 0.42 determined from data calculated for 12 wire umbrella antennas<sup>8</sup>, the best estimate of  $\eta_{XBW}$  is about 50. With this value in mind, the  $\eta_{XBW}$  curves of figure 11 were extrapolated and replotted, in a form to facilitate comparison later in the report, in figure 12. Also plotted is the  $\eta_{XBW}$  for the perfect moncone, the data for which was established earlier in this section for large cone angles. The maximum  $\eta_{XBW}$  for the perfect moncone occurs for a different cone angle than for the wire cage structures because of the difference in the "end cap".

## (2) Umbrella Standard Model

There are several sources of wire umbrella data available for use in establishing the  $\eta_{XBW}$  to use as a standard of comparison. Unfortunately, most of the sources containing either measured or calculated data are either too sketchy or unsuited to the electrical size requirements for Loran-D. These sources of data are:

- (a) Space General Report SGCTM1A-1<sup>8</sup>
- (b) Smith-Johnson Paper<sup>9</sup>
- (c) Navy Report (unpublished at this time)<sup>10</sup>

The problem of establishing a reference level for  $\eta_{XBW}$  is further complicated by the fact that there is no way to calculate exactly the  $\eta_{XBW}$ ; and considering the methods used, there is a considerable spread between the results of these calculations and measured data. Calculations performed external to the present work are based upon static field analysis where the static charge distribution is calculated over the antenna conducting surface allowing the determination of static input capacitance and effective height based on this distribution of charge. This analysis considering the antenna to be infinitesimally electrically small, which is not exact. An alternate approximate method of analysis is based on the "impedance concept" employed in sub-section 1 preceding. In this case the resistance was estimated from an effective height calculation based on a transmission line model representing the projected vertical current distribution. A more accurate method of obtaining the resistance, which is beyond the scope of this work, would be the use of Schelkunoff's<sup>11</sup> "method of moments".

Using the impedance concept, the inverted wire cone (umbrella wires) and the "masked" portion of the tower are considered to load the unmasked portion of the tower. As before, the load reactance of the inverted cone section is given by

$$X_L \approx -j \frac{60}{\beta (h_T - h_m)} \ln \frac{2}{\sin \theta_e T}$$

where (as shown in figure 13)

$h_T$  is the total tower height




Figure 12.  $\eta_{XBW}$  for 300 ft. Monocage Antenna vs. Top Cone Angle




Figure 13. Geometry of Wire Umbrella Antenna

$h_m$  is the unmasked tower height.

In addition, the equivalent series inductive reactance represented by the masked portion of tower encased by the umbrella wires is given by

$$X_m \approx +j 30 \beta (h_T - h_m) \left[ \ln \left( \frac{l}{2r} \sin \theta_{eT} \right) + 1 \right]$$

where

$l$  is the umbrella wire length

$r$  is the tower radius.

In the same notation used in the previous section,

$$Z_L = X_L + X_m.$$

Instead of using the characteristic impedance of the biconical line for the line loaded by  $Z_L$ , the average characteristic impedance of the unmasked portion of mast is used which is given by

$$Z_o = 60 \left[ \ln \left( \frac{4 h_m}{D_m} \right) - 1 \right]$$

where

$D_m$  is the mast diameter.

Using the impedance concept,  $\eta$ XBW were calculated for  $\theta_T$  equals 49 degrees,  $h_T$  equals 300 feet,  $n = 12$  for varying  $l/h_T$ . The results are plotted in

figure 14. Figure 14 shows a comparison of  $\eta$ XBW for the above parameters using available calculated and measured data. Included on this graph are:

- (a)  $\eta$ XBW from impedance concept.
- (b)  $\eta$ XBW measured as part of this program.
- (c)  $\eta$ XBW using resistance from impedance concept and measured reactances.
- (d)  $\eta$ XBW from Space General report based on static computations.
- (e)  $\eta$ XBW from Navy report based on static computations.
- (f)  $\eta$ XBW from Smith Johnson scaled up from  $n$  equals 8 to  $n$  equals 12 using Navy computations as a basis.

The hybrid calculation of (c) above was made because the reactance values measured were in general agreement with those of the static's calculations of (d) and (e). In the range of  $l/h_T$  for maximum  $\eta$ XBW, there is a spread of about 20 percent in  $\eta$ XBW. The results of the Navy report were weighed quite heavily because the report contains detailed calculations of  $\eta$ XBW versus the various umbrella parameters.

The Navy report presents  $\eta$ XBW in normalized form with respect to the  $\eta$ XBW of the tower alone. For a tower with a length-to-diameter ratio of about 100- and 300-feet tall at 100 KHz, the resistance, reactance, and  $\eta$ XBW are respectively about .367 ohm, -j1600 ohm, 23.2. Regardless of whether or not the  $\eta$ XBW versus parameters from the Navy report are correct in an absolute sense, it is very reasonable that the relative variations are correct.  $\eta$ XBW versus  $l/h_T$  for various numbers of wires is given in figure 15.  $\eta$ XBW, optimized for  $l/h_T$ , are given versus umbrella angle,  $\theta_T$ , in figure 16. The data on these latter two figures were plotted relative to the Navy report with respect to a value of 136 chosen on the basis of the data of figure 14. The values of figure 16 are hereby chosen as being the standard of comparison for the remainder of the report.

### (3) Transmission Line Model

The transmission line model is of interest because a wide class of antenna types fit into this category. Also, the analysis differs sufficiently from that of the axially-symmetric conical antenna types, such as the umbrella and monocone, to provide a slightly different point of view. The transmission line antenna consists of a vertical mast loaded in some manner at the top with a transmission line. Generally this line lies in a plane parallel to the ground and at the height of the tower.

It is intuitively obvious that high  $\eta$ XBW can be achieved with transmission line antennas if the line is made sufficiently long. The problem is that of determining the  $\eta$ XBW (i.e., capacity of the line) which is practical to achieve within the land area limitations posed by the transportable Loran-D System.

The capacity achievable with any open-circuited line configuration at a fixed height above ground is greatest for the greatest conductor area which can be presented by the line. For this reason, and to place an upper bound on the  $\eta$ XBW for transmission line antennas, the case of an axially symmetric disc placed on top of a




Figure 14. Comparison of Efficiency Bandwidth Product for Twelve Wire, 49 Degree Umbrella for Various Literature Sources; Also Calculated and Measured Values, This Contract




Figure 15. Efficiency-Bandwidth Product @ 100 KHz for Wire Umbrella, Mast  $h/d = 96$ , Wire  $l/d = 10,000$ ,  $\theta_T = 49$  Degrees vs. Number of Wires




Figure 16. Efficiency-Bandwidth Product @ 100 KHz for Wire Umbrella, Mast  $h/d = 96$ , Wire  $l/d = 10,000$ ,  $l/h_T$  Adjusted for Maximum vs. Number of Wires

mast will first be considered. This disc forms a radial transmission line with respect to the tower and this line presents maximum conductor area for a fixed height above ground. The geometry of this antenna is shown in figure 17.

The load reactance presented to the mast by the disc is given by<sup>12</sup>

$$X_L = -j Z_{oi} \frac{\cos(\theta_i - \psi_L)}{\sin(\psi_i - \psi_L)} = \frac{h}{2\pi r} \frac{E_z}{H_\phi} \bigg|_1$$

with output of the radial line short circuited, where  $Z_{oi}$ ,  $\theta_i$ ,  $\psi_i$  are quantities evaluated at the input radius.  $\psi_L$  is a quantity evaluated at the disc radius.

$$Z_{oi} = 60 \frac{h}{r} \frac{|H_0(k_r)|}{|H_1(k_r)|} \bigg|_{\text{input radius}}$$

where

$h$  = mast height

$r$  = radius

$H_0$ ,  $H_1$ , are Hankel functions of first or second kinds of zero and first orders.

That is,

$$|H_0^{(1)}(k_r)| = |H_0^{(2)}(k_r)| = [J_0^2(k_r) + N_0^2(k_r)]^{1/2}$$

$$|H_1^{(1)}(k_r)| = |H_1^{(2)}(k_r)| = [J_1^2(k_r) + N_1^2(k_r)]^{1/2}$$




Figure 17. Geometry of Disc Loaded Tower

where  $J_n(k_r)$ ,  $N_n(k_r)$  are the usual Bessel functions of 1st and 2nd kinds. Also,

$$\theta(k_r) = \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{N_0(k_r)}{J_0(k_r)} \right]$$

$$\psi(k_r) = \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{J_1(k_r)}{-H_1(k_r)} \right]$$

For purposes of analysis, a mast of  $k_h = 0.128$ , (200 feet @ 100 KHz)  $k_r = 0.00064$  (2 feet @ 100 KHz) was chosen. For evaluation of  $Z_{oi}$ , small argument approximations apply for the Bessel Functions, and as a result

$$Z_{oi} \approx 60 k_h \ln \left( \frac{2}{1.781 k_r} \right).$$

Once the load reactance,  $X_L$ , is known, the input reactance,  $X_a$ , is given by the usual transmission line formula

$$X_a = Z_{oa} \frac{X_L \cos kh + j Z_{oa} \sin kh}{Z_o \cos kh + j Z_L \sin kh}$$

where  $Z_{oa}$  is the average characteristic impedance of the mast previously defined.

The radiation resistance of the mast is calculated by the method used in the preceding two subsections. Some radiation resistance is associated with the transmission line portion of the antenna, but this resistance is ignored because we are concerned only with the vertically polarized surface wave. The  $\eta_{XBW}$  is calculated by the simple formula

$$\eta_{XBW} = \frac{f R_r}{X_a}$$

The calculated radiation resistance is shown in figure 18 and the  $\eta_{XBW}$  vs.  $k_r$  is shown in figure 19.

For a simple, but general approach for  $\eta_{XBW}$  applicable to transmission line antennas, consider the bandwidth to be given by

$$BW = \Delta f = \frac{2 R_r f_o}{f_o \left. \frac{dX_a}{df} \right|_{f_o} + X_a}$$

If the reactance,  $X_a$ , is given by

$$X_a = -j Z_o \cot \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{f}{f_R} \right)$$




Figure 18. Radiation Resistance of Disc-Loaded Tower vs. Disc Radius @ 100 KHz

where

$Z_0$  is the characteristic impedance at the line

$f_R$  is the series resonant frequency,

then

$$\frac{dX_a}{d_f} = Z_0 \frac{\pi}{2f_R \sin^2 \left( \frac{\pi f}{2 f_R} \right)}$$




Figure 19. Efficiency-Bandwidth Product of Disc Loaded Tower vs. Disc Radius @ 100 KHz

and

$$\eta_{XBW} = \frac{2R_r f \sin^2 \left( \frac{\pi f}{2 f_R} \right)}{\frac{f Z_o}{2f_R} + \frac{Z_o}{2} \sin \left( \pi \frac{f}{f_R} \right)}$$

with

$$\frac{4l}{\lambda} = \frac{f}{f_R},$$

$l$  being the line length,

$$\eta_{XBW} = \frac{2R_r \sin^2 kf}{kf Z_o + \frac{Z_o}{2} \sin 2kf}.$$

For electrically short lines,

$$\eta_{XBW} = \frac{\pi f^2 R_r}{2 f_R Z_o} = \frac{kf f R_r}{Z_o}.$$

For lines near series resonance.

$$\eta_{XBW} = \frac{4 f R_r}{\pi Z_o}$$

As an example, consider a ring antenna as depicted in figure 20 using the same tower height and  $l/D$  as for the disc loaded antenna (200 feet,  $l/D = 100$ ). The ring radius was chosen at 300 feet and  $R_r$  was chosen as 0.65 ohms (near-uniformly loaded).




Figure 20. Geometry of Ring Antenna

$\eta$ XBW was calculated as a function of ring diameter and correspondingly the total conductor area contained in the ring given as

$$\text{Area} = 2\pi^2 d (300) \text{ in square ft.}$$

The results are plotted as figure 21. A ring with diameter  $d$  is equivalent to a flat strip with width twice the ring diameter.

#### (4) Summary of Analytical Work

In subsections (2) and (3) are illustrations summarizing the results of the  $\eta$ XBW calculations (figure 12 for monocones, figure 16 for umbrellas). These figures are plotted to the same scale so that they may be compared by inspection. These curves show that for a given tower height and top cone angle,  $\theta_T$ , for a given number of wires, the umbrella is always superior to the monocone. As the monocone is constrained to a 300-foot hemisphere, the only point for exact comparison is at an angle of 60 degrees, however, with the aid of figures 14 and 15, this result is verified for other values of  $\theta_T$  as well. The reason the umbrella is better is because its effective height and, hence, radiation resistance is greater. This is true even though the monocone has a lower input reactance. For example, at 60 degrees  $\eta$ XBW's are about 125 and 194 for the monocone (monocage) and umbrella respectively if  $n = 12$ . For those cases the resistances are about 0.295 and 0.652 ohms respectively. Because the monocage is a more complex antenna, it is hereby eliminated from further consideration as an optimum design.

Several interesting facts are apparent upon examining the results of the transmission line antenna model. First, the impracticability of constructing a suitable disc-loaded tower is demonstrated by considering figure 19. For a  $\eta$ XBW of 100 using a 200-foot tower, a disc with radius of 250 feet is required. To make the construction comparable with that of an umbrella, consider figure 22, where a 300 foot mast is used to guy off and support a disc at the 200-foot level. It is seen that a land area 625 feet in radius is required.

Consider a 300-foot disc loading a 200-foot tower. The area of this disc is 283,000 square feet. The corresponding  $\eta$ XBW is 150. From the curve of figure 22, the conductor area of a ring antenna to give a  $\eta$ XBW of 150 is 302,000 square feet and the ring diameter would have to be 51 feet. This example clearly demonstrates the effect of conductor area on the  $\eta$ XBW of a transmission line antenna. For the land area available, it is clear that the umbrella antenna, properly designed, will give superior performance over the transmission line antenna. If real estate were no problem, a transmission line antenna may well be the best choice.

The results of the electrical analysis indicate that the optimum antenna configuration is the umbrella. The goal of this section is then to adequately describe the factors influencing the umbrella design to permit the ultimate selection of one or more near-optimum designs on the basis of the mechanical analysis.

The following factors have been extracted from subsection (3) of this section.

(a) All other factors remaining the same, the increase in  $\eta$ XBW for increase in antenna height (scale factor),  $h_T$ , to new height  $h_T^1$  is  $(h_T^1/h_T)^3$  times the  $\eta$ XBW.




Figure 21. Efficiency-Bandwidth Product of Ring Antenna vs. Conductor Diameter and Area @ 100 KHz




Figure 22. Single Tower Geometry to Support 250 Foot Disc

(b) The  $\eta\text{XBW}$  is increased when the number of umbrella wires is increased. For an umbrella with optimum  $1/h_T$  and angle  $\theta_T$  of the order of 45-50 degrees increase from 6 to 9 wires give 24 percent  $\eta\text{XBW}$  increase, increase from 9 to 12 wires give 16 percent  $\eta\text{XBW}$  increase, increase from 12 to 24 wires give 20 percent  $\eta\text{XBW}$  increase, increase from 9 to 24 wires give 38.6 percent  $\eta\text{XBW}$  increase.

(c) An increase in allowable land area will give an increase in  $\eta\text{XBW}$ . For the conditions of (b) above and 12 wires, an increase in land area required by an increase in tower height gives: 10 percent increase in tower height increases the land area required by 33 percent and increases the  $\eta\text{XBW}$  by 33 percent when the initial  $\eta\text{XBW}$  is about 100.

(d) For umbrella cone angles which are reasonable for Loran-D (40-50 degrees) the umbrella wire length is approximately equal to the tower height for maximum  $\eta\text{XBW}$ .

(e) All other factors remaining the same, the increase in  $\eta\text{XBW}$  for increase in frequency  $f_1$  to new frequency  $f_2$  is  $(f_2/f_1)^4$  times the  $\eta\text{XBW}$ .

### 3. EMPIRICAL TECHNIQUE

#### a. GENERAL

The major problem in the empirical determination of  $\eta\text{XBW}$  is in obtaining efficiency. The measurement of bandwidth for electrically small antennas under matched input conditions is a function of the reactance and the slope of the reactance curve at the frequency of interest. The measurement of reactance is usually quite accurate. To obtain the antenna efficiency, it is necessary to measure the gain. Two techniques are more prominent than others for this measurement.

One technique involves transmitting from an antenna of calculable power input and gain, receiving a signal at the test antenna which can be referred to an open circuit voltage at the test antenna terminals, and comparing this voltage to one obtained by transferring the known radiated power from the transmitting antenna to a received voltage at the test antenna assuming 100 percent efficiency.

The second technique involves measuring the absolute incident field strength from an arbitrary transmitting antenna which is placed so as to illuminate the test antenna with a vertically polarized plane wave front. The received voltage at

the test antenna is also measured, as in the first technique, and this voltage is compared to that calculated from the known incident field strength and a perfect test antenna. The assumption made in each of these techniques is that the test antenna radiation pattern does not change when the test antenna is no longer perfect. This assumption is probably quite valid if the transmitting and test antennas are both mounted on a large ground screen.

The latter technique was used in this program because, if means are available to measure the field strength accurately, the gain measurement is not as much a function of the quality of the ground screen installation and the transmitting antenna. The incident field strength can be measured either by using a device available for this purpose such as Empire Device's NF-105 signal strength meter, or by using an electrically, very short vertical whip, and measuring the received voltage unit. In the latter case, the received voltage is transformed to an open circuit voltage, and the additional terminal zone shunt capacitance is mathematically removed.

#### b. MEASUREMENT $\eta$ XBW EQUATION DERIVATION

The voltage measured,  $V_m$ , of the test antenna is related to the open circuit voltage,  $V_{oc}$ , by the Thevenin's equivalent circuit shown as figure 23. For the case at hand, the load reactance,  $X_T$ , equals zero and the load resistance,  $R_T$ , equals 50 ohms. The received power,  $W_R$ , is given by<sup>13</sup>

$$W_R = \frac{E_{inc}^2 (\theta_o, \phi_o) A (\theta_o, \phi_o)}{120 \pi}$$

where  $E_{inc} (\theta_o, \phi_o)$  is the incident field strength impinging in the desired direction,  $A (\theta_o, \phi_o)$  is the antenna aperture in that direction. From the equivalent circuit with  $X_T = 0$  and  $R_T = 50$  ohms

$$\frac{V_m^2}{50} = \frac{V_{oc}^2 50}{(R_a + 50)^2 + (X_a + X_T)^2}$$




Figure 23. Thevenin's Equivalent Circuit Representation of Test Antenna

and the antenna aperture is given by

$$A = 120 \pi \frac{V_{oc}^2}{E_{inc}^2} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{R_a}{50} + 1\right)^2 + \left(\frac{X_a}{50}\right)^2} = \frac{120 \pi V_{oc}^2}{50 E_{inc}^2}$$

For electrically small antennas,  $\frac{R_a}{50} \ll 1$  and

$$A = \frac{120 \pi}{50} \frac{V_{oc}^2}{E_{inc}^2} \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{X_a}{50}\right)^2}$$

If the test antenna is matched, the

$$A_{TAM} = \frac{120 \pi V_{oc}^2}{4 R_a} = \frac{120 \pi V_m^2}{4 R_a} \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{X_a}{50}\right)^2}$$

and since

$$\eta = \frac{A_{TAM}}{A_{PMM}}$$

where  $A_{PMM}$  is the aperture of a perfect short matched monopole  $= 0.06 \lambda^2$ .

The efficiency is then given by

$$= 1.75 \times 10^{-2} f_{mc} \left(\frac{V_m}{E_{inc}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{R_a} \left[1 + \left(\frac{X_a}{50}\right)^2\right]$$

where  $f_{mc}$  is the frequency in MHz.

From section IIA

$$BW = \frac{f R_a}{Z_o}$$

where

$$Z_o = \frac{f_o \left(\frac{dX_a}{df}\right) \bigg|_{f_o} + X_a}{2}$$

so that

$$\eta_{XBW} = 1.75 \times 10^4 \frac{f_{mc}^2}{Z_0} \left( \frac{V_m}{E_{inc}} \right)^2 \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{X_a}{50} \right)^2 \right].$$

This latter equation was used in calculating the  $\eta_{XBW}$  for all the model measurements. The formula demonstrates the value of  $\eta_{XBW}$  as a figure of merit for electrically small antennas in that the measurement of radiation resistance or loss resistance need not be made.

### c. DESCRIPTION OF MEASUREMENTS

The test procedure for determining efficiency bandwidth was done in the following steps.

(1) Field strength measurement. Using the Empire Device's NF-105 with its calibrated loop antenna and 30-foot RG58U coax the incident field was measured at the ground plane center disc with a fixed input at the remote transmit antenna.

(2) The loop antenna was then replaced by the 2-meter whip. While maintaining the transmitted level, a reading was made on the E.D. NF105 meter. The coax was then removed from the base connector of the standard whip antenna and attached to the output jack of the signal generator. The signal generator level was then set to where the E.D. NF105 reading was repeated. The signal generator level was then read and this reading was taken to be a standard field strength level to be compared to the field strength level of step one above.

(3) Daily measurements were made with the standard whip during the course of the study and any deviation from the original standard whip measurement in step (2) was used to calculate the change in incident field strength by direct proportional calculation.

(4) Similar to the step (2) method of received voltage measurement, the received voltage level at the terminals of the model under study was determined by a substitution method. The same level of signal was fed to the remote transmit antenna as was used for determining field strength and received on the model under study. The gain setting of the E.D. NF105 was set to some meter reading. The coax was then removed from the terminals of the model under study and connected to the output jack of the signal generator. The generator level was then set to produce the same meter deflection on the E.D. NF105 and the generator output level recorded as the received voltage of the model under study.

(5) Impedances were measured at three frequencies for bandwidth determination. Ten megahertz was determined to be the test frequency to correspond to the 100 to 1 scaling factor of the models studied. Additional points, one above and one below 10 mc, were measured. Impedances were measured using the General Radio 1606 bridge. To minimize attenuation and rotation of the impedances measured, the bridge was located immediately under the ground screen and connected to

the model under study with a 10 inch piece of RG58U coax. Attenuation could then be neglected but rotation of the impedances read at the bridge were necessarily rotated to the antenna terminals. Rf voltage measurements were made through common pieces of coax to eliminate attenuation errors.

The efficiency bandwidth product of the models tested was calculated using the following methods:

(1) Impedances measured were rotated through a 10-inch length of coax used to connect the model to the impedance bridge. This corrected the impedances read at the bridge to the impedances that appeared at the antenna terminals. To accomplish this formula

$$Z_{in} = Z_0 \frac{Z_r + j Z_0 \tan \beta l}{Z_0 + j Z_r \tan \beta l}$$

where

$Z_{in}$  = impedance read at bridge

$Z_0$  = 50 ohm line impedance

$Z_r$  = impedance rotated through transmission line

$\tan \beta l$  = tan of electrical angle of rotation

was rearranged to determine the unknown,  $Z_r$ .  $\tan \beta l$  was determined by short readings taken on the line through which the impedances are to be rotated.

$$\tan \beta l = \frac{X_{sc}}{Z_0}$$

where  $X_{sc}$  = short circuit reactance reading.

(2) Base capacity of the model was eliminated from the antenna reactance readings by first measuring the base structure (less elements and mast) of the model for distributed capacity. This capacity was then removed by:  $X_A = X_t - X_B$

$$X_t = \frac{Z_a X_b}{X_a + X_b}$$

from which:

$$Z_a = \frac{R_a X_b X_a + R_a X_b (X_b - X_a) + j X_a X_b (X_b - X_a) - j R_a^2 X_b}{R_a^2 - (X_b - X_a)^2}$$

where

$Z_a$  = antenna impedance

$R_a$  = antenna resistive component

$X_a$  = antenna reactive component

$X_b$  = base capacitance

(3) The Q of the antenna is calculated by:

$$Q = \frac{f_o (\Delta X_a) + X_a}{2R_a}$$

where

$f_o$  = operating frequency at band center

$\Delta X_a$  = reactance of lowest frequency less reactance of highest frequency measured

(4) The bandwidth was determined by:

$$F = \frac{f_o}{Q \text{ (scale factor)}}$$

(5) Efficiency was determined by:

$$\eta = 1.78 F_o \left[ \left( \frac{V_m}{E_{inc}} \right)^2 \right] \left( \frac{1}{R_a} \right) \left[ \left( \frac{R_a}{Z_o} + 1 \right)^2 + \left( \frac{X_a}{Z_o} \right)^2 \right]$$

where

$V_m$  = voltage measured at antenna terminals

$E_{inc}$  = incident field strength

(6) Efficiency bandwidth product was determined by obtaining the product of steps (4) and (5) above.

d. DESCRIPTION OF TEST FACILITY

The test facility of the Loran-D study was composed basically, of a ground plane, the housing for test equipment located at the ground plane center, the test equipment, and the associated test antennas used for the antenna model study.

The ground plane was constructed with a 12-foot circular copper-covered disc as the center from which 90 soft drawn copper wires radiated at 4 degree increments to a diameter of 200 feet. Extensions of a 45 degree wedge to a diameter of 400 feet provided a ground plane surface complete between the plane center and a remote transmitting antenna. The ends of the wires contained in the 45 degree wedge were tied together with an additional wire. Figure 24 is a diagram of the test plane.

Located under the 12-foot disc at the ground plane center, a 6-foot diameter silo served as the testing facility for housing the test equipment and personnel. The test equipment included an impedance bridging setup, a field strength measurement setup and three test antennas not including the the models studied. The impedances were determined using a Hewlett-Packard 606A signal generator, a General Radio 1606 impedance bridge and an Empire Devices NF105 field strength meter used here as a null detecting receiver. See figure 26. Field strength measurements were made using the same Empire Devices NF105 and its calibrated LP105 loop antenna and coaxial cable. A 2-meter whip antenna was constructed for a reference receive




Figure 24. Test Facility

antenna and a cage monopole was constructed to serve as our remote transmitting antenna with an underground coaxial cable run back to the underground test silo. This remote transmitting antenna was located at the center of the 45 degree wedge and at the perimeter of the wedge as shown in figure 25.

#### 4. FULL-SCALE CONSIDERATIONS

##### a. POWER LIMITATIONS

As the electrical height of the Loran-D antennas is small compared to a quarter-wavelength antenna, the peak voltage appearing at any point on the structure will be only slightly larger than the peak input voltage. To obtain an estimate of the voltage increase to be expected, consider the equivalent circuit of figure 30. The capacitance, represented by reactance  $X_L$ , is the load reactance of the umbrella wires. The inductance, represented by reactance  $X_m$ , is that caused by the mast. This inductance (ref. "impedance concept" umbrella calculations of III 2 a 2 may be considered as two parts; that of the "unmasked" portion of the tower as a transmission line, and that of the coaxial shorted section represented by the "masked" portion of the mast placed coaxially inside of the top inverted cone formed by the umbrella wires. The




Figure 25. Ground Plane




Figure 26. Impedance Measurement Setup




Figure 27. Incident Field Strength Measurement




Figure 28. Standard Whip Voltage Measurement




Figure 29. Model Antenna Voltage Measurement

$$V_{\max} = \frac{X_L}{X_L - X_m} V_{in}$$




Figure 30. Equivalent Circuit of Umbrella Antenna for Estimating Maximum Voltage

input reactance is  $X_a$ . The maximum voltage on the structure is then given approximately by

$$V_{\max} \frac{X_L V_{in}}{X_a} = \frac{X_L}{X_L - X_m} V_{in}$$

where the peak input voltage has previously been defined as 50 kv. Calculations for the 49 degree 12 wire umbrella give  $X_L$  and  $X_a$  equal to 464.5 and 385 ohms respectively. The "voltage increase factor" is the 1.2; thus the maximum peak voltage on the structure is about 60 kv.

From a voltage breakdown standpoint, there are three major considerations. These are:

- (1) The maximum voltage which can exist on the elevated wires before voltage breakdown (corona and spark-over) occurs.
- (2) The maximum voltage which can exist on the terminations (ends and joints) of the elevated wires before voltage breakdown occurs.
- (3) The size at the base insulator required to prevent voltage breakdown due to the peak input voltage.

The mast or tower is large enough in diameter that the voltage between it and ground will not produce a voltage breakdown condition.

An estimate of the voltage breakdown condition of the elevated wires may be made by considering the maximum voltage on a wire parallel to the ground and at

the minimum height of the elevated wires. For an open-circuited parallel wire above perfect ground, the maximum voltage is given as<sup>14</sup>

$$V_m = 21.5 \left( 1 + \frac{.202}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \left[ 2p \ln \frac{2h_w}{p} \right], h \gg p$$

where  $V_m$  is in kilovolts under standard conditions (30 in Hg at 23 degrees centigrade)

$p$  is wire radius in inches

$h_w$  is height of wire in inches

Consider a 250-foot umbrella with a 49-degree angle and wire length equal to the height. The minimum wire height above ground is 86 feet. If the wire diameter is taken as 3/16 inches. Then  $V_m = 308$  kv; thus the first consideration presents no problem.

The second case is involved with the minimum radius of curvature which small protruding parts elevated above ground at the minimum wire height may be such that 70 kv will not produce voltage breakdown. This may be estimated by considering the maximum voltage which can be applied to a sphere at a given height above ground. For a sphere with height much greater than the sphere radius, this voltage is independent of height and is given by<sup>15</sup>

$$V_m = 54.5 p \left( 1 + \frac{0.54}{\sqrt{p}} \right), h \gg p_r$$

where  $V_m$  is in kilovolts under same conditions as before

$p_r$  is sphere radius in centimeters.

For a  $V_m$  of 70 kv, the minimum radius is 0.66 cm. This radius at curvature does not apply to parts which are more cylindrical than spherical and which are not isolated (protruding like a bolt, etc.). There will be no problems evolving from this second consideration.

The base insulator criteria are easy to estimate in that the voltage is a known value, and the insulator is located at a fixed height; but the criteria is also difficult in the sense that temperature, humidity, and contamination of the insulator material greatly affect the allowable voltage. For ordinary fluted insulators in dry air, the minimum height for about 18 cm diameter and 50 kv is about 20 cm, for air densities as low as 0.5. Similarly, and for the same conditions, a 30-cm high fluted insulator can stand 75 kv. The best type of insulator is one with one or more corona caps on it. These insulators are alternately called suspension insulators or shaped insulators. Such an insulator is shown pictorially in figure 31. The effect of the cap is to relieve the electrical stress on the dielectric portion of the insulator. Collins Radio Company has built insulators of this type whereby the cap or caps are shaped to correspond to an equipotential surface. This design places minimum electrical stress (voltage gradient) across the insulator surface. Peek<sup>16</sup> shows that a single 30-cm diameter cap with an insulator spacing of 16.5 cm for an air density at 0.5 cm can withstand 60 kv. For an air density of 1.0 this insulator can withstand 72 kv. The difficulty establishing base insulator requirements should not be underestimated. For example, saline environments can appreciably lower the corona and flash over voltage levels. Also,




Figure 31. Pictorial Representation of Shaped Insulator

because the 50 kv will be applied instantaneously, the problems of weird transient effects and surface anomalies causing premature breakdown become much greater.

#### b. INSULATOR DESIGN

As the base insulator is likely the most critical electrical component of the antenna, some analytical comments are due as well as comments on commercially available insulators and insulating materials. The rise time of the electrical pulse has been given as about 80 microseconds. This means that the maximum significant frequency components of the pulse are of the order of 100 KHz. This factor is important in evaluating the dielectric loss to be expected due to the insulator. Known requirements for this base insulator are:

- (1) Mechanical compressional load of greater than 40,000 pounds
- (2) Voltage breakdown (flashover point) greater than 100 kv (safety factor of 2 or greater) when wet
- (3) Minimum insulator capacitance

A typical commercial insulator to meet these requirements is the LOCKE<sup>17</sup> type 25048. This insulator is 30-inches high (dielectric portion) 22 1/2-inches wide at the top tapering down to about half that at the base. The recommended working load is 100,000 pounds, the quoted wet flashover point is 105 kv, the capacity of the dielectric is about 2 pf and it is made of porcelain. The loss tangent of porcelain at 100 KHz is about 0.01 and the relative dielectric constant is about 5.3. The effect of an insulator must be considered from an impedance point of view as well as from voltage breakdown and structural considerations. This effect may be estimated by considering the equivalent circuit at figure 32. In this circuit

$R_i$  is the shunt dielectric loss resistance

$X_i$  is the shunt capacitance of insulation

$X_{ei}$  is the shunt terminal zone capacitance external to the dielectric




Figure 32. Equivalent Circuit for Analysis of Base Insulator

$R_{pa}$  is the shunt or parallel equivalent input resistance

$X_a$  is the antenna input capacitance

Now,  $R_{pa} = Q_a^2 R_a$ , where  $Q_a = \frac{X_a}{R_a}$  and  $R_a$  is the input resistance

similarly  $Y_i = \frac{1}{R_i} + j \frac{1}{X_i}$

$$= \frac{\sigma}{\epsilon_r \epsilon_0} C_i + j \omega C_i$$

$$= \tan \delta \omega C_i + j \omega C_i$$

where  $\sigma$  is the insulator conductivity

$\epsilon_r$  is the relative dielectric constant

$\epsilon_0$  is the dielectric constant at air

$\tan \delta$  is the loss tangent equal to the dissipation factor

$C_i$  is the insulator capacitance

For the insulator specified above and for nominal umbrella input impedance

$$R_a \approx 0.5 \text{ ohm}$$

$$X_a \approx -j 400 \text{ ohm}$$

$$C_i \approx 2 \text{ pf}$$

$$\tan \delta \approx 0.01.$$

$$R_{pa} \text{ is then } \left( \frac{400}{0.5} \right)^2 0.5 = 32 \times 10^4 \text{ ohms}$$

$$R_i \text{ is } \frac{1}{0.01 (2\pi) 10^5 \times 2 \times 10^{12}} = 80 \times 10^6 \text{ ohms}$$

$$X_i \text{ is } \frac{1}{(2\pi) 10^5 2 \times 10^{-12}} = 80 \times 10^8 \text{ ohms}$$

as the efficiency of the equivalent circuit is

$$\eta_e = \frac{R_i}{R_{pa} + R_a},$$

and the reactance is so high, the above insulator will not degrade the antenna performance (the capacitance  $C_{ei}$  is presumed to be at the order of  $C_i$ , which is reasonable. If the insulator were fatter, the  $C_i$  would increase (as increase in insulator cross-sectional area) meaning that a greater portion of the "terminal zone" fields are contained within the dielectric. For the above insulator if the top diameters were increased to 38 inches from 22 1/2 inches,  $C_i$  increases from about 2 pf to 6 pf (this increase is not required for this insulator, but may be required for other insulators made of different material but with about the same dielectric constant and height). The  $R_i$  then drops to  $26.7 \times 10^6$  ohms, which is still acceptable. Suppose, now, that the loss tangent increases to 0.07, which is typical of good phenolic resins. Then  $R_i$  for the larger diameter reduces to  $38 \times 10^5$  ohms, which is still acceptable.

The conclusion is that for the particular input impedance parameters, at Loran-D umbrella antennas, the dielectric loss consideration is probably insignificant. Caution must be used in selecting insulators made of fiberglass due to the water absorption properties. The particular insulator chosen for analysis represents typically the characteristics required for this application.

The current carrying capacity of the umbrella wires is expected to be an insignificant consideration in power handling capability since for 50 kv at the antenna input terminals (current of 125 amperes) the peak pulse current in each of the umbrella wires will be less than 10 amperes with 3/16 to 1/4 inch diameter wires being typical.

Particular attention is required at the termination of the radial element wires. An exponential horn shaped corona shield should be attached at this point to minimize rf heating of the fiberglass insulator at the juncture of the insulating material and the conductive radiator.

### c. GROUND SCREEN REQUIREMENTS

The increase in input impedance due to a ground screen consisting of a finite number of wires of finite length has been considered by Wait,<sup>18</sup> Maley and King,<sup>19</sup> Brown and Lewis and Epstein<sup>20</sup> and others. Generally speaking, it is not correct to consider this change of impedance as a change with respect to that over perfect ground, because the current distribution on the radiating portion of the antenna is generally not the same as that found when perfect ground is used. This change, as a change over perfect ground, is valid for capacitively loaded vertical antennas, however, because the current distribution cannot change to any great extent. The problem is, in this case, to determine the effective height properly. The above references show that the change in reactance is only a small percentage of that over perfect ground, thus it cannot have a significant effect on the antenna performance. The change in resistance,

however, is at least as great as the radiation resistance, and thus its consideration is important from standpoints of efficiency and impedance stability.

To estimate the change in resistance, a computer program was written following the method of Wait referenced above and the change in resistance was computed for conductivity's,  $\sigma$ , of 0.01 and 0.001 mho/meter representing average and poor ground conditions respectively. These changes in resistance were computed also for a varying number of radials ranging between 4 and 100, and lengths between 150 and 600 feet. The effective height was chosen to be  $0.018 \lambda$ , consistent with the 300-foot umbrella nominal values. The data is presented in figure 33. Several interesting results may be observed from examination of this figure. They are:

- (1) An increase in the number of radials beyond 40 results in less than a 20 percent decrease in resistance for average ground and less than a 10 percent decrease for poor ground.
- (2) If the number of radials is at the order of 10, the length (within limits of 150-600 feet) is relatively unimportant.
- (3) Any increase in radial length beyond the 200-foot radius is relatively unimportant.

Perhaps the most reasonable design goal for ground resistance is to try and keep it less than 10 percent of the total input resistance. This is important from two aspects. The first is that climatic and environmental changes can cause a considerable fluctuation at this resistance. If the fluctuations are significant, they will produce instability of the input resistance causing a corresponding fluctuation in antenna efficiency and bandwidth, which also complicates impedance matching. The second is that of obtaining a positive control of efficiency. That is, it is probably most desirable to be able to lower the efficiency at will by adding series resistance to the antenna, than trying to provide the desired level of efficiency by designing-in inherent antenna system loss. From all of the above considerations and the curves of figure 33, the logical choice is about 40 radials of 300 feet in length.

The umbrella is, of course, an extended structure. That is, it is broad in terms of land area. This factor will probably change the effect of the assumed length of the radials slightly, but should not change the effect of the number of radials. Also, it should be possible to design the screen with radials at varying length. It is quite possible that the length of the radials not directly underneath the respective umbrella wires could be shorter than those directly underneath.

Because of the low frequency, the manner in which the radials are laid out (buried and grounding point effects) should not make much difference. Certainly, these effects cannot be counted on for improvement in a design where the antenna must be installed in a variety of locations with different soil conditions.

The size of the wire used is probably most important in terms of the ohmic loss involved, as the number of radials used (at about 40), using wire sizes varying from #6 to #12 copper weld, will handle the current. If #6 wire is used the resistance is about 1 ohm/1000 feet or 0.33 ohms per 300 feet. For 40 radials, the ohmic loss resistance of the wires at the antenna terminals assuming uniform current would be about 0.008 ohms. Correspondingly for #12 wire, the input resistance would be about 0.045 ohms. Probably about a number 9 or 10 wire ( $R_{in} \approx .025$  ohms) would be the




Figure 33. Ground Screen Resistance for Radial Ground Wire System with Effective Height = .018 @ 100 KHz

most reasonable choice, unless the resistance is unimportant because of the designed operating efficiency, in which case a small wire (about #12) would be best.

## 5. MECHANICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The primary requirements of the Loran-D antenna support structure are high strength-to-weight ratio, ease of assembly and disassembly, simplicity, ruggedness and personnel safety. Many types of structures are available or being developed which could satisfy the antenna system requirements to varying degrees. System trade-offs, taking into consideration the desirable and undesirable characteristics of the various types, were all used to aid in the selection of the recommended structure.

The major problem areas applying to a lightweight tactical antenna support structure are discussed in the following paragraphs:

### a. SUPPORT STRUCTURE

#### (1) Stress Analysis

An analysis of guyed towers involves the solution of a multiple redundant beam-column on spring supports further complicated by the catenary action of the guys. The solution is so complex that a hand solution would require a great number of simplifying assumptions reducing the accuracy considerably.

By using a digital computer program we cannot only avoid these inaccuracies but perform the analysis with much greater speed. This increased speed also allows the solution of a much greater number of cases.

Figure 34 shows a flow diagram of the computer program with the following pages describing the various steps.

#### (a) Input Data

The inputs which must be supplied to the computer program for each solution are listed below.

Wind Velocity

Temperature Differential

Ice Accumulation on Tower

Ice Accumulation on Guys

No. of Guys at each Guy Location

Height of each Guy tied to Tower

Stiffness (AE) of each Guy

Coefficient of Thermal Expansion of each Guy

Preload Tension for each Guy




Figure 34. Computer Program Flow Diagram

Weight of each Guy

Diameter of each Guy

Distance from Tower Base to Ground Anchor of each Guy

Tower Configuration

Tower Material, Modulus of Elasticity, Coefficient of Thermal Expansion, and Density

Diameter and Wall Thickness of Legs, Diagonals, and Horizontals

Diameter, Weight per Foot and Length/Height Ratio for non-structural Member

(b) Tower Bending & Shear Stiffness

The section properties of the tower are computed from the input data for the tower. For example, the bending stiffness (IE) is computed by the formula for a triangular tower

$$IE = \frac{\pi}{2} t_{WL} (D_L - t_{WL}) d^2 E \text{ (Refer to Appendix III)}$$

where

I = moment of inertia in in.<sup>4</sup>

E = modulus of elasticity in lb/in.<sup>2</sup>

$t_{WL}$  = wall thickness of leg in in.

$D_L$  = diameter of leg in in.

$d_1$  = distance between legs in in.

The shear stiffness is expressed as (AG) corresponding to a beam web stiffness. For a triangular X-brace configuration, the equation is:

$$AG = \frac{\pi h E}{(d_1^2 + h^2)^{1.5}} + \frac{.577 d_1}{t_{WH} (D_H - t_{WH})} \text{ (Refer to Appendix III)}$$
$$1.5 d_1^2 t_{WD} (D_D - t_{WD})$$

where

h = vertical height of diagonal in inches

$t_{WD}$  = wall thickness of diagonal in inches

$D_D$  = diameter of diagonal in inches

$t_{WH}$  = wall thickness of horizontal in inches

$D_H$  = diameter of horizontal in inches

other configurations are computed similarly.

(c) Guy Spring Stiffness

The tower redundant analysis assumes the guys act as horizontal springs resisting the side motion of the tower. The guy spring stiffness is computed by the following formula until the preload is relieved in the leeward guys.

$$K = \frac{\eta AE S^2}{2 (1^2 + S^2)^{1.5}} \quad (\text{Refer to Appendix III})$$

where

$K$  = spring rate in lb/ft

$\eta$  = number of symmetrically located guys

$AE$  = stiffness of guy wires

$S$  = distance from base of tower to guy ground anchor in ft.

$1$  = height from ground to guy tie to tower in. ft.

When the preload is relieved in the leeward guy, the spring rate drops 50%.

(d) Wind Forces on Tower and Guys

The wind drag on the tower assumes that each member is exposed to the wind with no influence from the other members. The wind force on a member is found by the formula

$$W = .000212 C_D V^2 (D + 2t_{ice}) \cos^3 \alpha$$

where

$W$  = wind loading in lb/ft

$C_D$  = drag coefficient f(member size, shape, wind v, temperature, and density)  $\approx 1.73$  for small round members

$V$  = wind velocity at altitude in mph

$D$  = diameter of member (in)

$t_{ice}$  = thickness of ice on member (in)

$\alpha$  = angle of incidence of member to wind direction



The wind velocity is varied with altitude as shown in figure 35 for coastal areas.




Figure 35. Wind Force Variation with Height

(e) Redundant Analysis of Tower

The general guyed tower represents a redundant mechanical system which nature solves by minimizing the total energy stored in the system in springs of the guys, and bending, and shear of the tower sections. There are of course the restraints that the external moments and shear be zero if the tower is to stand in one place.

The energy equation is (refer to figure 36 for definition of variables)

$$U = \sum_{i=1}^M \left( \frac{m_i^2 \Delta l_i}{2 EI_i} + \frac{v_i^2 \Delta l_i}{2 GA_i} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{F_j^2}{K_j}$$

where  $EI_i$  and  $GA_i$  are the effective bending and shear characteristics respectively of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  section and  $K_j$  is the effective spring rate of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  guy.

The moment in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  section is

$$m_i = m_o + f_o l_i + \sum_{j=1}^i f_j (l_i - l_j) = \sum_{k=1}^N F_k (l_i - L_k) \nabla_{ik}$$

$$\text{n. b. } \nabla_{ik} \doteq \begin{cases} 1, & l_i > L_k \\ 0, & l_i < L_k \end{cases}$$

while the shear in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  section is

$$v_i = f_o + \sum_{j=1}^i f_j - \sum_{k=1}^N F_k \nabla_{ik}$$

These equations can be reduced to

$$m_i = cm_i - \sum_{j=1}^N F_j \nabla_{ij} (l_i - L_j)$$

$$v_i = cv_i - \sum_{j=1}^N F_j \nabla_{ij}$$

by combining the known quantities.




Figure 36. Definition of Variables

The external moment and shear constraint equations are:

$$\theta_1 = \sum_{i=1}^N F_i (l_M - L_i) + F'_B L_B - c v_M = 0$$

$$\theta_2 = \sum_{i=1}^N F_i + F_B - c v_M = 0$$

Minimizing the energy function  $U$  subject to the constraints  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  can be shown to be equivalent to minimizing a new function  $U'$  defined as

$$U' = U + \lambda_1 \phi_1 + \lambda_2 \phi_2$$

where  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are called Lagrangian multipliers. To minimize  $U'$  we set the partial derivatives of  $U'$  with respect to  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_N, F_B, F'_B, \lambda_1, \lambda_2$  equal to zero.

$$\frac{\partial U'}{\partial F_k} = \sum_{i=1}^M -\Delta l_i \nabla_{ik} \left( \frac{Cm_i (l_i - L_k)}{EI_i} + \frac{CU_i}{GA_i} \right) \quad (1)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^N F_j \left( \Delta l_i \nabla_{ik} \nabla_{ij} \left( \frac{(l_i - L_k)(l_i - L_j)}{EI_i} + \frac{1}{GA_i} \right) + \frac{S_{jk}}{K_j} \right) + \lambda_1 (l_m - L_k) + \lambda_2 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial U'}{\partial F_B} = \lambda_2 = 0 \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\partial U'}{\partial F'_B} = \lambda_1 L_B = 0 \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{\partial U'}{\partial \lambda_1} = \sum_{i=1}^N F_i (l_m - L_i) + F'_B L_B - cm_M = 0 \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{\partial U'}{\partial \lambda_2} = \sum_{i=1}^N F_i + F_B - cv_M = 0 \quad (5)$$

Equation (2) shows  $\lambda_2 = 0$  always and can, therefore, be eliminated in all equations. Equation (3) shows  $\lambda_1$  to be indeterminate when  $L_B = 0$ . To correct this problem Equation (3) and  $F'_B$  are deleted when  $L_B = 0$ . The computer solves the remaining equations simultaneously.

#### (f) Tower Weight with Ice

The weight of the tower is computed by accumulating the computed weight of individual tower members. The ice weight is then added based on the ice forming a tube around the member with the wall thickness corresponding to the ice thickness and the inside diameter at the diameter of the member. The ice is computed at weighing 56 lb/cu ft.

(g) Vertical Force from Guy

The tower will feel a vertically applied load from the guys at the tie point between guy and tower.

First, the preload will exert a downward component to the tower. After the preload has been exceeded in the leeward guys, the windward guys will exert a downward force proportional to the guy tension.

Then, the weight of the guy and its accumulated ice will exert a downward force on the tower.

Finally, a change in temperature from the temperature at which the guy preload is set, will change the guy preload, thereby changing the vertical force. A drop in temperature will usually increase the guy preload.

(h) Effect of Vertically Applied Forces

The vertical forces are applied to the deflected shape of the tower and the redundant analysis rerun. This process is repeated until the change in deflection becomes small or the change in deflection becomes larger with each trial.

(i) Tower Member Stresses

The axial load on each member of the tower is computed from the bending moment, shear, and vertical force at the section.

The stress is computed by dividing this axial load by the area computed from the diameter and wall thickness of the member.

(j) Final Guy Tension

The guy tension is computed as a catenary under the combined tension force from the tower, temperature differential, preload tension, wind force on guy and weight of guy and ice.

(k) Tower Member Ratios

This is a computation of length/radius of gyration of the members to aid in the manual determination of allowable column buckling of the members. (See Appendix IV.)

(2) Environmental Conditions

(a) Wind Loading

The consideration of wind loading increasing with tower height<sup>21</sup> is of extreme importance in the design of a tall tower. In actuality, the wind increases with height from a standardized anemometer height of 30 foot. For coastal regions, the velocity is given as:

$$V_z = V_{30} \left[ \frac{Z}{30} \right]^x$$

where

$z$  = height

$x$  - exponent<sup>21</sup> depending on  $V_{30}$

For  $V_{30} = 70$  knots,  $x$  is approximately 0.25. As shown in figure 35, the relative wind force is over three times as great as the wind force resulting from an assumed constant velocity.

#### (b) Ice Accumulation

Specified ice accumulation is an important consideration in the support structure comparative analysis. The specified ice conditions of one inch of radial ice on the tower, occurring simultaneously with 70 knot winds, are severe but not beyond possible occurrence in tactical application.

The combined wind and ice conditions are considered to occur simultaneously at all times, with no assumptions that ice will be broken off and shed during occurrence of high winds. This assumption may be valid at certain conditions of wind and temperature, but has not been found as a common occurrence.

#### (3) Sizing of Guys

To minimize bending moments and the resulting stresses in the support structure, the tower supports must be designed and selected in such a manner to allow the structure to be displayed horizontally an amount increasing proportionally with height. Ideally, then, when under maximum environmental conditions, the tower remains linear.

The conducting elements that are also used as guys, and the guy materials, must possess elongation properties, or spring constant, which are compatible with one another.

#### (4) Tower Configuration Considerations

A transportable tower should be as lightweight as practical for ease of erection and handling. Aluminum, due to its high strength to weight ratio, has been found to be the lightest structural material for ordinary temperature applications by the aircraft industry. Therefore steel towers were not considered in this study.

A savings in weight can be realized by the use of a strong alloy such as 7075-T6 or 7178T-6 in preference to the more common 6061-T6 material. However, the cost of 7178T-6 of approximately \$1.27/lb and for 7075T-6 of approximately \$1.16/lb must be considered against the lesser cost of 6061T-6 of approximately \$.49/lb (for equivalent tubular member).

Towers will usually fail by instability of its column members. Figure 37 shows the allowable compression stress versus the slenderness ratio for 7075-T6, 7178T-6, and 6061-T6 aluminum. It can be seen that it is important to keep the slenderness ratio less than 44 with 7178T-6 aluminum. This is done by keeping the spacing between cross-lacing ties small in relation to the diameter of the leg.




Figure 37. Allowable Column Stress for Round Aluminum Tubing (No Safety Factor Included)

A tower with a fixed base has a high bending moment introduced at the base due to the restraint there. This high bending moment combined with the high vertical load at the base makes the lower members critical. The use of a pivoted base makes the base moment zero where the vertical loads are the highest and results in a lower weight design.

#### (5) Erectability

To maintain the maximum utilization of available manpower during erection, the structure must be of a basically simple design. This type of transportable equipment is subject to rough handling, and inherent ruggedness of the design is mandatory. Special erection equipment or tools must be kept to a minimum because of the possibility of being lost or damaged.

Site requirements must be considered for antenna erection, and the equipment must be as compatible as possible with various types of terrain. Any special terrain requirements for a particular type of structure must be carefully considered due to the man-hour requirements involved.

The utilization of the 10-man crew must be such that idle time encountered during erection is held to a minimum. Each man should be utilized at a particular task to optimize the erection time.

A prime consideration in the erectability of such a structure is the safety and minimization of risk to associated personnel. The hazards associated with each concept considered must be carefully considered in the comparative analysis.

#### (6) Transportability

To be classified transportable, the tower structure must be strong, lightweight, stored in a minimal volume, capable of rapid assembly and disassembly, have a minimum of loose pieces, and be of rugged and simple design to withstand operation under tactical situations.

Packaging requirements include the necessity that material to be used first is removed first, and conversely when the system is being taken down. Where possible, all materials are to be re-usable to minimize packaged volume and weight requirements.

The system must be packaged to be compatible with all types of tactical transportation by land, sea, and air in standard military vehicles, and adapt to a standard 463L "Rail" system pallet for aircraft so equipped.

#### (7) Maintainability Considerations

In determining the optimum configuration for the L F Tactical Antenna, maintainability features to be considered are as follows:

(a) Preventive Maintenance Requirements such as periodic tension checking of guy wires, cleaning requirements of the base plate, or lubricating any moving parts.

(b) Assembly and disassembly time for correction of any structural failures.

(c) Repair time and feasibility of connecting lighting failures on the antenna tower.

(d) Skill levels required to perform maintenance and assembly and disassembly actions.

(e) Special tools requirements for maintenance and installation.

(f) Safety of both installation and maintenance personnel.

(8) Reliability

The reliability evaluation will analyze the mission profile in three operational modes:

(a) Erection

(b) Operation on the site throughout the two years lifetime under all conditions called out in the specifications

(c) Retraction

The equipment design will be reviewed for reliable application of the individual parts, considering applied and rated stresses to insure that adequate safety margins are inherent in the design.

Optimization of the structure will be performed to insure that the design corresponds closely to the reliability required without unnecessary weight. The system effect then is a function of reliability and availability. The availability  $\left( \frac{MTBF}{MTBF + Downtime} \right)$  is a function of the mean time between failure and the mean down time (scheduled and unscheduled maintenance time plus erection time). All these parameters depend on the complexity of the system. The system with the least auxiliary equipment will have a definite advantage.

(9) Cost

The cost of the system is an important consideration not only in terms of initial investment but also in the logistical cost of maintaining the system. The cost is to be considered as a secondary factor, however, if a system evolves which is considered superior to a degree to warrant the additional cost.

b. GUYS

(1) Materials

The material used for guying the structure must not only possess the desired dielectric properties, but also satisfy necessary structural requirements, such as high strength, minimum elongation for maximum tower stability, flexibility for ease of handling, resistance to moisture absorption, minimum creep properties, a resistance to weathering and sunlight, and capability of operation under a wide range of temperature.

## (2) Tensioning and Take-up Devices

Basic functional requirements of a guy cable terminating device include strength capability equal to the guy cable, a take-up mechanism to adjust the length of the guy, and a read-out of guy cable tension. In addition, the device must be simple to operate, rugged, lightweight, and capable of operation in extreme environmental conditions.

### c. ANCHORS

Perhaps the most time consuming operation in the erection of the antenna system is the installation of the ground anchors. Important considerations in the selection of an anchor are holding power, weight, ease of installation, suitability to a wide range of soil conditions, and the requirements of special installation equipment. Expendable anchors should be compared against re-usable anchors, taking into account logistics problems, retraction effort and time, and packaging problems.

Also to be evaluated are various types of installation equipment to facilitate placement and removal of ground anchors. They will be considered on the basis of value in installation time requirement saved versus additional weight, volume, and power requirements.

### d. GROUND SCREEN

Important considerations of the ground screen in regards to mechanical requirements include weight, handling properties, corrosion resistance, and storage requirements.

The basic concepts of expandable and re-usable ground screens must be evaluated in terms of logistics requirements in addition to the above considerations.

### e. RADIATING ELEMENTS

The material to be used for radiating elements in the antenna system must satisfy the electrical considerations discussed in previously as well as possessing mechanical properties such as high strength to weight, compatible elongation properties, good handling qualities, and corrosion resistance.

The conductor diameter requirements include a minimum set by electrical considerations, as well as the tensile strength necessary to provide support to the top level of the support structure. A conductor having the required minimum diameter may possess strength in excess of the structural requirements, as well as excess weight.

The conductor material must have elongation properties or a spring constant (area x modulus of elasticity) which will allow the tower to be displaced horizontally under loading at the radiator support point an amount necessary for the tower to remain linear, thus minimizing stresses resulting from bonding.

Resistance to corrosion and ease of handling and storing must also be considered.

#### f. LIGHTING SYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

Of primary importance in considering any type of lighting system is the type of structure involved, the specifications to be met, and the power available at the site. Since the type of structure and the applicable specifications may vary, these areas will be discussed further. The primary power available in all instances will remain at a constant value, 220 volts ac, 3 phase, 400 cycles per second.

In considering the type of lighting fixtures used, several things must be dealt with, the most demanding of which is the amount of light required. If a Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) specification applies, a large flashing beacon is required at the top of the tower and smaller units required at half the tower height (assuming a 300-foot tower - FAA spec. A-2). If less rigid requirements exist, two pair of smaller light fixtures may be used, one flashing pair at the top of the tower and one steady pair at mid-point, or both pair steady. Each type system will be considered with regards to weight, cost, reliability, and ease of installation.

The tower base insulation requirements of the antenna system demand a method of transmitting power across the insulator from the primary power source to the lighting system. The insulation properties required of the insulator are also required of the power transmitting system, that is, 50 kv, 100 amperes at 100 kc. As with the lighting fixtures, each method of transmitting power will be considered with regards to weight, cost, reliability, and ease of operation.

## SECTION IV

### DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

#### 1. GENERAL

This section presents data gathered from the electrical study, the computer analysis of various support structures, and data gathered on various supporting equipment. This gathered data is then compared with the considerations of Section III, and a qualitative comparative analysis is made of all components and techniques. The basis for the recommended system(s) is the result of this analysis.

#### 2. ELECTRICAL CONFIGURATION

During the course of the study seven major configurations were studied. Included in the seven major configurations one hundred minor configurations are represented.

##### a. CONFIGURATIONS MEASURED

Listed below are model configurations that were measured. See Table VIII for more detailed specifications of the models.

| <u>Model No.</u> | <u>Nomenclature</u>                                                  | <u>Steps of Variables</u> |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1                | Standard Umbrella                                                    | 6                         |
| 2                | Two Foot Umbrella                                                    | 4                         |
| 3                | Skirted Umbrella                                                     | 4                         |
| 4                | Umbrella with tapered tower                                          | 4                         |
| 5                | Shunt fed umbrella                                                   | 2                         |
| 6                | Near optimum monopole height at 2 feet                               | 5                         |
| 7                | Inductive top loaded umbrella                                        | 30                        |
| 8                | Wound umbrella                                                       | 6                         |
| 9                | Near optimum monopole height at 3 feet<br>θ and radial length varied | 9                         |
| 10               | Near optimum monopole height at 2 feet<br>radial length varied       | 3                         |
| 11               | Optimum monopole                                                     | 1                         |

| <u>Model No.</u> | <u>Nomenclature</u>                      | <u>Steps of Variables</u> |
|------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 12               | Discone                                  | 4                         |
| 13               | Tee with no. 40 wire only                | 1                         |
| 14               | Tee with no. 40 wire only ends grounded  | 1                         |
| 15               | Near optimum monopole height at 2.5 feet | 6                         |
| 16               | Tee with tower ends & center simulated   | 1                         |
| 17               | Tee with tower center simulated          | 1                         |
| 18               | Tee with flat top                        | 1                         |
| 19               | Triangular monocone                      | 1                         |
| 20               | Square monocone                          | 2                         |

A model of the standard umbrella was constructed at a 100:1 scale using polystyrene sheet supporting material. This type construction was abandoned when the effects of the polystyrene sheet appeared to affect the data and a polystyrene foam construction was adopted. This type construction was subsequently followed throughout the remainder of the program. The elements of the models were constructed from No. 40 wire, which has a diameter of 0.0031 inches. Simulated tower supports were made of one quarter inch brass tube.

With the exception of Model 20, which was scaled to 125:1 because of the large side dimension, all other models were constructed at a 100:1 scale factor (see Table VIII). All models were investigated at 10.1 MHz as our operating frequency scaled to 100:1. This frequency was chosen to avoid the signals of WWV. Model 20 was investigated at 13 MHz, which represented the scaled frequency (see Table VIII).



During the last phases of the study some of the models were rebuilt using No. 34 wire, which is nominally twice the diameter of the No. 40 wire initially used to determine the effects of L/D of the elements. This change of wire size made no apparent difference to the data taken initially.

#### b. Analysis of Data

##### (1) Discussion of Measured Configurations

Presentation of the significant umbrella and monocone data was made in Section III together with qualitative comparisons based on the three types of mathematical models. The purpose of this subsection is, then, to comment qualitatively on the measured antenna configurations and reiterate and substantiate the conclusions of Section III.

A significant result of the measurements, which is not readily calculable, is the effect of adding a skirt to both the monocone and umbrella structures. Reference to table VIII shows that an approximate 30 percent increase

| MODEL                                                                                                                                               | HEIGHT<br>IN FT           | WIND<br>LENGTH | S       | ΔP      | WPGV  | W       | WGP<br>PRODUCT |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|-------|---------|----------------|
| <br>MODEL 1<br>UMBRELLA<br>4 FT<br>10 FT                           | 1'-0"                     | 919            | 10,400  | 180     | 220   | 39      |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 2'-0"                     | 919            | 16,400  | 180     | 117   | 117     |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 3'-0"                     | 919            | 15,300  | 180     | 60    | 55      |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 4'-0"                     | 919            | 12,800  | 100     | 102   | 95      |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 5'-0"                     | 919            | 12,800  | 111     | 100   | 93      |                |
| <br>MODEL 2<br>UMBRELLA<br>4 FT<br>10 FT                           | 1'-0"                     | 281            | 26,700  | 62      | 2,000 | 22.5    |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 2'-0"                     | 173            | 17,000  | 88      | 1,064 | 22.7    |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 3'-0"                     | 135            | 12,800  | 66      | 1,006 | 13.8    |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 4'-0"                     | 113            | 17,100  | 73      | 1,004 | 14.65   |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     |                           |                |         |         |       |         |                |
| <br>MODEL 3<br>UMBRELLA WITH 8 RIBS<br>4 FT<br>10 FT               | 1'-0"                     | 126.5          | 37,000  | 268     | 1,128 | 100     |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 2'-0"                     | 135            | 17,100  | 197     | 1,128 | 107.9   |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 3'-0"                     | 108.5          | 12,800  | 121     | 1,128 | 101     |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 4'-0"                     | 157            | 34,400  | 208     | 1,112 | 137     |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     |                           |                |         |         |       |         |                |
| <br>MODEL 4<br>UMBRELLA WITH 16 RIBS<br>4 FT<br>10 FT              | 1'-0"                     | 22.1           | 137,300 | 207     | 1,168 | 85.5    |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 2'-0"                     | 28.4           | 121,000 | 193     | 1,168 | 87      |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 3'-0"                     | 31.7           | 100,000 | 188     | 1,168 | 107.5   |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 4'-0"                     | 42.9           | 218,000 | 148     | 1,168 | 95.3    |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     |                           |                |         |         |       |         |                |
| <br>MODEL 5<br>UMBRELLA WITH 8 RIBS, METAL POLE<br>4 FT<br>10 FT  | METAL CENTER<br>POLE      |                | 51      | 120,000 | 182   | 1,004   | 84.5           |
|                                                                                                                                                     | COLLECTIVE<br>CENTER POLE |                | 11.45   | 110,000 | 130   | 1,001.5 | 76.25          |
| <br>MODEL 6<br>UMBRELLA WITH 8 RIBS, METAL POLE<br>4 FT<br>10 FT | 10"                       | 8              | 182,500 | 68      | 1,112 | 27.5    |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 12"                       | 8              | 181,500 | 66      | 1,100 | 27.3    |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 14"                       | 8              | 178,500 | 63      | 1,088 | 27.0    |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 16"                       | 8              | 182,500 | 104     | 1,021 | 65.4    |                |
|                                                                                                                                                     | 18"                       | 12             | 185,000 | 134     | 1,025 | 70      |                |











| MODEL                                                                                                                                    | HEIGHT<br>IN FT           | WIND<br>LENGTH | S       | ΔP      | WPGV  | W       | WGP<br>PRODUCT |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|-------|---------|----------------|
| <br>MODEL 7<br>UMBRELLA WITH 8 RIBS<br>4 FT<br>10 FT  | 1'-0"                     | 281            | 26,700  | 62      | 2,000 | 22.5    |                |
|                                                                                                                                          | 2'-0"                     | 173            | 17,000  | 88      | 1,064 | 22.7    |                |
|                                                                                                                                          | 3'-0"                     | 135            | 12,800  | 66      | 1,006 | 13.8    |                |
|                                                                                                                                          | 4'-0"                     | 113            | 17,100  | 73      | 1,004 | 14.65   |                |
|                                                                                                                                          |                           |                |         |         |       |         |                |
| <br>MODEL 8<br>UMBRELLA WITH 8 RIBS<br>4 FT<br>10 FT  | 1'-0"                     | 126.5          | 37,000  | 268     | 1,128 | 100     |                |
|                                                                                                                                          | 2'-0"                     | 135            | 17,100  | 197     | 1,128 | 107.9   |                |
|                                                                                                                                          | 3'-0"                     | 108.5          | 12,800  | 121     | 1,128 | 101     |                |
|                                                                                                                                          | 4'-0"                     | 157            | 34,400  | 208     | 1,112 | 137     |                |
|                                                                                                                                          |                           |                |         |         |       |         |                |
| <br>MODEL 9<br>UMBRELLA WITH 8 RIBS<br>4 FT<br>10 FT  | 1'-0"                     | 22.1           | 137,300 | 207     | 1,168 | 85.5    |                |
|                                                                                                                                          | 2'-0"                     | 28.4           | 121,000 | 193     | 1,168 | 87      |                |
|                                                                                                                                          | 3'-0"                     | 31.7           | 100,000 | 188     | 1,168 | 107.5   |                |
|                                                                                                                                          | 4'-0"                     | 42.9           | 218,000 | 148     | 1,168 | 95.3    |                |
|                                                                                                                                          |                           |                |         |         |       |         |                |
| <br>MODEL 10<br>UMBRELLA WITH 8 RIBS<br>4 FT<br>10 FT | METAL CENTER<br>POLE      |                | 51      | 120,000 | 182   | 1,004   | 84.5           |
|                                                                                                                                          | COLLECTIVE<br>CENTER POLE |                | 11.45   | 110,000 | 130   | 1,001.5 | 76.25          |
|                                                                                                                                          |                           |                |         |         |       |         |                |
|                                                                                                                                          |                           |                |         |         |       |         |                |
|                                                                                                                                          |                           |                |         |         |       |         |                |

TABLE VIII. MODEL CONFIGURATIONS

| Q     | $\Delta F$ | Vm $\mu$ V | $\eta$  | $\eta \Delta F$ PRODUCT | MODEL                                                                                                           | INDUCT. IN $\mu$ F | RADIAL LENGTH | Q     | $\Delta F$ | Vm $\mu$ V | $\eta$  | $\eta \Delta F$ PRODUCT |       |
|-------|------------|------------|---------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------|------------|------------|---------|-------------------------|-------|
| 970   | 10,400     | 180        | .950    | 99                      | A. UMBRELLA, TOP LOADED<br>    | 4.68               | 3'-0          | 130   | 77,700     | 985        | .143    | 111                     |       |
| 615   | 16,400     | 189        | .712    | 117                     |                                                                                                                 | 3.4                |               | 189   | 53,400     | 440        | .167    | 89.4                    |       |
| 652.5 | 15,500     | 196        | .690    | 107                     |                                                                                                                 | 2.51               |               | 227   | 44,500     | 340        | .169    | 69                      |       |
| 424   | 23,800     | 200        | .402    | 95.7                    |                                                                                                                 | 1.64               |               | 251   | 40,200     | 259        | .289    | 116                     |       |
| 424   | 23,800     | 211        | .386    | 92                      |                                                                                                                 | 0.7                |               | 343   | 29,400     | 213        | .420    | 123                     |       |
| 390   | 25,900     | 220        | .340    | 88.25                   |                                                                                                                 | 4.68               | 3'-2          | 129   | 79,000     | 1080       | .109    | 87                      |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 3.4                |               | 161   | 62,700     | 520        | .140    | 87.7                    |       |
| 261   | 38,700     | 62         | 0.0635  | 24.8                    |                                                                                                                 | 2.51               |               | 167.5 | 60,300     | 388        | .144    | 87                      |       |
| 273   | 37,000     | 69         | 0.064   | 23.7                    |                                                                                                                 | 1.64               |               | 251   | 40,250     | 280        | .287    | 115.5                   |       |
| 425   | 23,800     | 69         | 0.058   | 13.8                    |                                                                                                                 | 0.7                |               | 289   | 35,000     | 222        | .282    | 123.5                   |       |
| 272   | 37,100     | 72         | 0.0448  | 16.65                   |                                                                                                                 | 4.68               | 3'-4          | 109   | 93,000     | 1000       | .088    | 83                      |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 3.4                |               | 116   | 87,100     | 619        | .112    | 97.6                    |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 2.51               |               | 119   | 85,000     | 440        | .128    | 109                     |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 1.64               |               | 157   | 64,300     | 300        | .174    | 112                     |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 0.7                |               | 251   | 40,500     | 232        | .246    | 99                      |       |
| 108.5 | 93,000     | 268        | 0.159   | 149                     |                                                                                                                 | 4.68               | 3'-6          | 143.5 | 70,400     | 855        | .1395   | 98.2                    |       |
| 130   | 77,750     | 257        | 0.236   | 183.5                   |                                                                                                                 | 3.4                |               | 146.5 | 69,000     | 732        | .126    | 87                      |       |
| 109.5 | 92,200     | 231        | 0.153   | 141                     |                                                                                                                 | 2.51               |               | 108.5 | 92,250     | 500        | .145    | 124                     |       |
| 157   | 64,400     | 208        | 0.213   | 137                     |                                                                                                                 | 1.64               |               | 200   | 50,800     | 320        | .171    | 87                      |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 0.7                |               | 155   | 65,200     | 244.5      | .218    | 142.5                   |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 4.68               | 3'-9          | 153.5 | 65,750     | 561        | .08775  | 84.2                    |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 3.4                |               | 185   | 54,500     | 290        | .1175   | 84                      |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 2.51               |               | 153.5 | 63,800     | 523        | .138    | 88.4                    |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 1.64               |               | 151   | 66,900     | 310        | .160    | 107                     |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 0.7                |               | 159   | 63,500     | 229        | .191    | 121                     |       |
| 23.1  | 437,500    | 202        | .0184   | 80.5                    |                                                                                                                 | 4.68               | 4'-0          | 137   | 68,750     | 404        | .0915   | 62.8                    |       |
| 28.4  | 351,000    | 183        | .0265   | 93                      |                                                                                                                 | 3.4                |               | 133   | 76,000     | 882        | .114    | 86.7                    |       |
| 31.7  | 319,000    | 169        | .03365  | 107.5                   |                                                                                                                 | 2.58               |               | 136.5 | 73,950     | 641        | .117    | 86.65                   |       |
| 42.8  | 236,000    | 149        | .0405   | 95.5                    |                                                                                                                 | 1.64               |               | 137.5 | 73,500     | 341        | .132    | 97.2                    |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | 0.7                |               | 141.5 | 71,300     | 242        | .169    | 120.5                   |       |
| 11    | 920,000    | 252        | .0094   | 86.5                    | B. UMBRELLA, WOUND<br>       | WIRE END GROUND    | 38"           | 48.4  | 209,000    | 73.25      | .0097   | 20.2                    |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | WIRE END OPEN      | 38"           | 7.92  | 1,275,000  | 50         | .001212 | 26.9                    |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | WIRE END GROUND    | 36"           | 54    | 187,000    | 77.4       | .0188   | 35.2                    |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | WIRE END OPEN      | 36"           | 14.2  | 555,000    | 9.8        | .000126 | 74.1                    |       |
| 12.45 | 810,000    | 238        | .009175 | 74.25                   |                                                                                                                 | WIRE END GROUND    | 34"           | 53    | 190,500    | 72         | .0138   | 34.8                    |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 | WIRE END OPEN      | 34"           | 70    | 1,445,000  | 3.2        | .000404 | 58.4                    |       |
| 55    | 183,500    | 83         | .015    | 27.5                    | C. NEAR OPTIMUM MONOPOLE<br> | $\theta$           | 40°           | 3'-0  | 182        | 55,500     | 159     | .108                    | 60    |
| 62.5  | 161,500    | 96         | .0269   | 43.5                    |                                                                                                                 |                    | 2'-9          | 168   | 59,650     | 142        | .102    | 61                      |       |
| 72.8  | 138,500    | 93         | .0296   | 40.25                   |                                                                                                                 |                    | 2'-6          | 248   | 40,750     | 142        | .139    | 56.7                    |       |
| 35.7  | 283,000    | 104        | .0231   | 65.4                    |                                                                                                                 |                    | 49°           | 3'-0  | 123        | 82,900     | 216.5   | .1435                   | 117.5 |
| 61.2  | 165,000    | 124        | .0425   | 70                      |                                                                                                                 |                    | 2'-0          | 142   | 71,200     | 177        | .2195   | 158                     |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 |                    | 1'-5          | 183.5 | 55,000     | 129        | .151    | 83                      |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 |                    | 60°           | 3'-0  | 274        | 36,900     | 239     | .446                    | 164.5 |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 |                    | 2'-9          | 147.5 | 68,600     | 218        | .208    | 142.5                   |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 |                    | 2'-6          | 182.5 | 55,300     | 208        | .163    | 90                      |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 |                    |               |       |            |            |         |                         |       |
|       |            |            |         |                         |                                                                                                                 |                    |               |       |            |            |         |                         |       |

| MODEL                                                                                                            | INDUCT IN $\mu H$ | RADIAL LENGTH | Q     | $\Delta F$ | $V_m \mu V$ | $\eta$ | $\eta \Delta F$ PRODUCT |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------|------------|-------------|--------|-------------------------|
| 10. NEAR OPTIMUM MONOPOLE<br>   |                   | 2'-4          | 315   | 32,100     | 77          | 0.058  | 18.6                    |
|                                                                                                                  |                   | 2'-2          | 272   | 37,100     | 70.5        | 0.0466 | 17.3                    |
|                                                                                                                  |                   | 2'            | 286   | 35,300     | 70.0        | 0.057  | 20.15                   |
|                                                                                                                  |                   |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
| 11. OPTIMUM MONOPOLE<br>        |                   | 2'            | 221   | 45,750     | 156         | 0.174  | 79.5                    |
|                                                                                                                  |                   |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
|                                                                                                                  |                   |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
|                                                                                                                  |                   |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
| 12.                             | 0                 | 3'-0          | 48.1  | 210,000    | 138         | .0313  | 65.6                    |
|                                                                                                                  | 5                 | 2'-8          | 50.75 | 199,000    | 375         | .0286  | 56.8                    |
|                                                                                                                  | 5                 | 3'-0          | 42    | 241,000    | 580         | .0214  | 51.8                    |
|                                                                                                                  | 5                 | 3'-6          | 40    | 253,000    | 580         | .021   | 53.1                    |
| 13.                            |                   | 12'           | 44.85 | 225,000    | 289         | 0.105  | 236                     |
|                                                                                                                  |                   |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
|                                                                                                                  |                   |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
|                                                                                                                  |                   |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
| 14.                           |                   | 12'           | 38.2  | 258,000    | 82          | 0.0036 | 9.3                     |
|                                                                                                                  |                   |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
|                                                                                                                  |                   |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
|                                                                                                                  |                   |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
| 15. NEAR OPTIMUM MONOPOLE<br> | 0                 |               |       |            |             |        |                         |
|                                                                                                                  | 90°               |               | 64.8  | 156,000    | 180         | .064   | 84.4                    |
|                                                                                                                  | 50°               |               | 70    | 144,000    | 143         | .0529  | 80.5                    |
|                                                                                                                  | 40°               |               | 75.9  | 133,000    | 130         | .0496  | 66                      |
|                                                                                                                  | 30°               |               | 60.1  | 168,100    | 100         | .035   | 58.8                    |
|                                                                                                                  | 20°               |               | 55.75 | 181,000    | 92          | .0293  | 52                      |
|                                                                                                                  | 10°               |               | 45.4  | 222,500    | 64          | .0174  | 38.7                    |




TABLE VIII. MODEL CONFIGURATIONS (CONT.)

[illegible]

in  $\eta$ XBW is obtained with the skirt. Furthermore, the skirt need not be made of conductors of larger diameter than the umbrella or cone wires. The skirt apparently provides increased capacitive loading in the mast or the base cone.

The umbrella model was measured with and without a tapered mast section. The presence of this section seemed to insignificantly change the measured  $\eta$ XBW.

In certain cases the comparative efficiencies of some of the configurations of table VIII seem to be extraordinarily low and differ by an order of magnitude. This is because these lower efficiency (as measured) configurations were measured with a series 10-ohm resistor at the antenna terminals. The configurations include the square monocone, the shunt fed umbrella, and the umbrella with tapered mast.

A shunt fed umbrella configuration was tried to attempt to approximate feeding an antenna with a slice generator. The  $\eta$ XBW results were about 20 percent below the standard umbrella. If the antenna had been more ideally fed, such as with multiple generators spaced around the periphery at the skirt, the effect at the shunt skirt capacitance could probably have been minimized. As it was, the low skirt height required to feed the antenna appeared as a shunt capacitance directly across the single generator. Also, because of ohmic losses in the wires, it was not possible with a single generator to provide uniform circumferential excitation of the structure.

An umbrella model loaded near the top of the mast with a series inductance was measured (see Table VIII). The plan was to measure the electrical length in a region sufficiently up from the mast base to be in a region where appreciable current was flowing and to be able to take advantage of the effective impedances transformation of the mast. The data is somewhat scattered, but the results indicate that the  $\eta$ XBW is of the same order as that of the standard umbrella and is best with minimum inductance.

A "wound" umbrella configuration was measured where the umbrella portion was made of a continuous wound wire with 6 turns equally spaced radially in azimuth. The purpose of this configuration was to increase the overall electrical length in much the same manner as a helix. The  $\eta$ XBW results were poor, having values only 30 to 40 percent of the standard umbrella. The efficiencies are seen to be low. The configuration was measured with the wire end open and then grounded to the mast. The results indicate that the ohmic losses at the continuous wire are large enough to decrease the efficiency. One interesting feature of the data is that the measurement with the wire open indicated the lowest efficiency and the maximum  $\eta$ XBW. This indicates that the electrical length of the open-wire-end wound portion was greater (lower reactance) but the electrical length at the antenna in terms of effective height was probably less. Also, grounding the wire end may have effectively fed the wound portion of the antenna at both the base and the top, thus increasing the effective height somewhat.

Of all the configurations measured, the square monocone exhibited the greatest  $\eta$ XBW (373 at scale frequency of 13 MHz). This is to be expected considering the large land area it covers. There is no elementary means of analytically evaluating its performance. As a check, it was measured also at 10 MHz, which is the scale frequency for the other configurations. The fall-off at  $\eta$ XBW is twice as great as would be expected by  $(f/f_0)^4$ . Of course, it is not suitable for the Loran-D application because of its size.

Several "T" antenna configurations were measured. The "T" antenna without the folded ends has a measured value at  $\eta$  XBW at 134.5 (see Table VIII). Considering an effective height of about 0.35 of the physical height

$$R_a = 40 (\beta h)^2 (h_e/Kt)^2 = 0.33$$

The characteristic impedance,  $Z_0$ , of the strip (strip width - 2 times diameter at a circular conductor) is 260 ohms. Two strips in parallel give 130 ohms. Calculating  $\eta$  x BW by

$$\eta \text{ XBW} = \frac{Z_R f \sin^2 kl}{kl Z_0 + \frac{Z_0}{Z} \sin 2 kl}$$

when  $kl$  is 0.384 radians or 22 degrees,  $\eta$  x BW = 92.8

The above formula does not take into account the fringing fields off the ends of the strip, so a value of 134.5 measure seems reasonable. As inferred in Section III, the "T" antenna requires too much land area to be suitable for Loran-D. The "T" antenna with folded ends provide about a 5-6 percent increase in  $\eta$  XBW. The value of  $\eta$  XBW equals 236 measured for the "T" antenna with the wire mast made at No. 40 wire is not valid. This length of wire has an ohmic loss at about 4 ohms.

The monocone (monocage or near-optimum monopole) data has been discussed previously. There is close correspondence between calculated and measured data. The optimum monopole configuration, conceived as an optimum design from a statics point of view, proved to be inferior to the monocone due to the added shunt capacitance at the elevated portion of the ground plane.

No mathematical analysis was performed on the discone configuration of table VIII. This configuration proved to be inferior to the umbrella or monocone configurations by about 50 percent. This configuration seemed promising at its conception because the inverted conical base cone section looked as if it would support a more favorable current distribution than an umbrella, and that the proximity of the umbrella wires to those at the cone would increase the load capacity. The probable reason for its being inferior is due to the fact that the top-fed inverted-cone probably present a low impedance path to ground, whether or not the basis of the cone was grounded.

### 3. DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions of the analysis of the measured data are in agreement with those of Section III 2 a (4). The measured data for the most promising configurations for the Loran-D space requirements, namely the umbrella and monocone configurations, is in substantial agreement with calculations performed in this document and the referenced sources. The calculations were relied upon heavily for variation of characteristics with parameter change. The umbrella is chosen as the optimum configuration and the following optics are proposed from an electrical point of view and are based on the umbrella design factors summarized in Section III 2 a (4).

a. Increased  $\eta$ SBW options (over conventional 300-feet, 9-wire umbrella)

(1)  $\eta$  XBW 133

|                  |              |
|------------------|--------------|
| Tower height:    | 300 feet     |
| Number of wires: | 12 w/o skirt |
| Base radius:     | 345 feet     |
| Umbrella angle:  | 49 degrees   |

The land area increase over that of a 300-foot radius is 33%.

(2)  $\eta$  XBW 170

|                  |                                                   |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Tower height:    | 300 feet                                          |
| Number of wires: | 12 with skirt of same conductor diameter as wires |
| Base radius:     | 345 feet                                          |
| Umbrella angle:  | 49 degrees                                        |

b.  $\eta$  XBW 100 system options

(1)  $\eta$  XBW 100

|                  |              |
|------------------|--------------|
| Tower height:    | 275 feet     |
| Number of wires: | 12 w/o skirt |
| Base radius      | 300 feet     |
| Umbrella angle:  | 47.5 degrees |

(2)  $\eta$  XBW 100

|                  |                                                   |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Tower height:    | 250 feet                                          |
| Number of wires: | 12 with skirt at same conductor diameter as wires |
| Base radius:     | 300 feet                                          |
| Umbrella angle:  | 45 degrees                                        |

#### 4. MECHANICAL CONFIGURATIONS

Due to the fact that the umbrella antenna with modifications is the optimum electrical configuration, the mechanical configuration study is concentrated on satisfying the parameters of that array.

Comparative analysis of various techniques and concepts consider components which are practical, capable of satisfying the system specifications, and capable of adaptability to a tactical environment. The capability of rapid and reliable operation by military personnel in the field is a prime consideration.

##### a. SUPPORT STRUCTURES INVESTIGATED

The following types of support structures are compared as to their applicability to the requirements of the antenna system and compliance with the required specifications. Several types were given relatively limited consideration because of obvious limitations. Inflatable types which are proposed are compared using data supplied by reputable manufacturers as a basis for comparison. Detailed structural analysis of applicable types of structures was performed as a basis of comparison.

Types of structures investigated are discussed in the following paragraphs:

##### (1) Triangular Scaffold Type Structure

The triangular Snap-Out tower, manufactured by Up-Right Tower Co., is a development of portable scaffolding structures used in the present antenna system, which is the basis for comparison in this study.

The tower is comprised of 3-foot long interchangeable sections. Leg members are of 7178-T6 aluminum, with swing-bolt connections at each end. Horizontal members are of the same alloy and hinge at mid-span for compact storage as shown in figure 38. Diagonal members are stainless steel aircraft cable, which are tensioned when the horizontal members are extended and locked.

Tower erection is begun by assembly of a 30-foot portion of the tower on the ground. This portion of the tower is tilted to the vertical by hand and temporarily guyed. The remainder of the tower is assembled by hoisting 3 sections at a time with a light-weight davit assembly to a man at the top of the assembled tower as shown in figure 39. Guys are added at specified intervals during erection. Personnel on the ground pull the succeeding sections up to the high man by means of a tag line.

To critically evaluate the standard tower as it exists, a computer analysis was performed. A basic requirement of a safety factor of two with respect to failure by buckling (see Appendix IV) is assumed to be needed. Tower parameters inputted are shown in table IX, and guy parameters in tables X and XI. Computed tower data is shown in table XII, and computed guy data is in table XIII. A representative computer input data sheet and print-out (run #15) is shown in Appendix II.




Figure 38. Snap-Out Tower




Figure 39. Snap-Out Tower Erection

TABLE IX. TOWER CONFIGURATION

| TOWER<br>CONFIGURATION | SECTION<br>CODE | LEG MEMBERS |                   | DIAGONAL MEMBERS |                   | HORIZONTAL MEMBERS |                   |
|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                        |                 | DIA., IN.   | WALL<br>THK., IN. | DIA., IN.        | WALL<br>THK., IN. | DIA., IN.          | WALL<br>THK., IN. |
| I                      | 3               | 2           | .095              | .316             | .158              | 2                  | .058              |
| II                     | 3               | 2           | .125              | .316             | .158              | 2                  | .058              |
| III                    | 5               | 2.5         | .065              | 2.0              | .058              | 2                  | .058              |
| IV                     | 5               | 2.5         | .095              | 2.0              | .058              | 2                  | .058              |
| V                      | 5               | 2.5         | .083              | 2.0              | .058              | 2                  | .058              |
| VI                     | 5               | 2           | .125              | 2.0              | .058              | 2                  | .058              |
| VII                    | 5               | 2           | .095              | 1.25             | .058              | 1                  | .058              |

SECTION CODES




TABLE X. GUY CONFIGURATION

S = TOWER TO ANCHOR, FT.  
 AE = SPRING CONSTANT  
 T = PRETENSION, LBS.

| GUY<br>CONFIGUR-<br>ATION | GUY NUMBER |                      |                |     |                      |                |     |                      |                |     |                      |                |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------------|----------------|-----|----------------------|----------------|-----|----------------------|----------------|-----|----------------------|----------------|
|                           | 1          |                      |                | 2   |                      |                | 3   |                      |                | 4   |                      |                |
|                           | S          | AE(10 <sup>3</sup> ) | T <sub>1</sub> | S   | AE(10 <sup>3</sup> ) | T <sub>1</sub> | S   | AE(10 <sup>3</sup> ) | T <sub>1</sub> | S   | AE(10 <sup>3</sup> ) | T <sub>1</sub> |
| A                         | 308        | 111                  | 100            | 303 | 400                  | 2,000          | 301 | 400                  | 2,000          | 148 | 400                  | 2,000          |
| B                         | 305        | 322                  | 400            | 303 | 720                  | 3,000          | 301 | 720                  | 2,600          | 148 | 720                  | 2,200          |
| C                         | 306        | 322                  | 400            | 303 | 720                  | 3,000          | 301 | 720                  | 2,600          | 148 | 720                  | 2,200          |
| D                         | 305        | 485                  | 500            | 303 | 940                  | 3,000          | 301 | 940                  | 3,000          | 148 | 720                  | 2,500          |
| E                         | 300        | 485                  | 500            | 300 | 2,400                | 4,000          | 200 | 2,400                | 4,000          | 200 | 1930                 | 4,000          |
| F                         | 300        | 485                  | 500            | 300 | 940                  | 3,000          | 200 | 940                  | 3,000          | 200 | 720                  | 2,500          |
| G                         | 300        | 180                  | 450            | 300 | 720                  | 2,700          | 200 | 720                  | 2,700          | 200 | 520                  | 1,900          |
| H                         | 308        | 180                  | 450            | 303 | 720                  | 2,700          | 301 | 720                  | 2,700          | 148 | 520                  | 1,900          |
| K                         | 308        | 240                  | 600            | 303 | 940                  | 2,700          | 301 | 720                  | 2,700          | 148 | 520                  | 1,900          |
| L                         | 300        | 111                  | 200            | 300 | 400                  | 2,000          | 200 | 400                  | 2,000          | 200 | 400                  | 2,000          |
| M                         | 300        | 180                  | 450            | 280 | 940                  | 2,700          | 248 | 400                  | 2,000          | 100 | 400                  | 2,000          |
| N                         | 308        | 180                  | 450            | 303 | 940                  | 2,700          | 301 | 720                  | 2,700          | 148 | 520                  | 2,700          |
| O                         | 348        | 180                  | 450            | 348 | 940                  | 2,700          | 344 | 720                  | 2,700          | 148 | 520                  | 2,700          |
| P                         | 348        | 240                  | 600            | 348 | 940                  | 2,700          | 344 | 720                  | 2,700          | 148 | 520                  | 2,700          |

TABLE XI. ROPE PROPERTIES

| ROPE         | DIAMETER, INCHES | AE ( $10^3$ ) |
|--------------|------------------|---------------|
| GLASTRAN     | 7/32             | 240           |
| "            | 1/4              | 300           |
| "            | 5/16             | 400           |
| "            | 3/8              | 520           |
| "            | 7/16             | 720           |
| "            | 1/2              | 940           |
| "            | 9/16             | 1,120         |
| "            | 5/8              | 1,490         |
| "            | 11/16            | 1,590         |
| "            | 3/4              | 1,930         |
| "            | 13/16            | 2,400         |
| ALUMOWELD    | 3" 10            | 485           |
| PHOS. BRONZE | 1/8              | 111           |
| PHOS. BRONZE | 3/16             | 322           |

(a) Run No. 1

The standard antenna structure is comprised of tower configuration I and guy configuration A. A plot of tower displacement under load is shown in figure 40. As shown, the tower is displaced non-linearly with a maximum deflection of 8.8 feet at the top. Resulting leg stresses, shown in table XII, exceed the design stress (safety factor of two included) see Appendix III. Diagonal and horizontal tower members are within design stress limits. Also, the guys are overstressed above the desirable limits of one-half the breaking strength at the top four guy levels, as indicated in table XIII. The analysis of this computer run shows that the tower is of optimum configuration, and guy sizes are not of proper diameter to limit tower deflection under load. The high leg stresses result not only from the less than optimum tower configuration, but from the non-linear deflection of the tower. The standard configuration, as exists, provides a minimal margin of safety, therefore, the following computer runs were made in order to optimize the standard configuration to bring stress and loading values within acceptable limits.

(b) Runs 2, 3, and 4

These computer runs were made varying d' and h' as shown in table 9. Figures 41, 42, and 43 indicate no noticeable change in tower deflection, and leg member and guy stresses are still excessive.

(c) Runs 5, 6, and 7

Run 5, 6, and 7 were made with varying guy and tower configurations. Although guy loadings were brought generally within limits, leg stresses were still excessive and the tower deflection plots, shown in figures 44, 45, and 46, are non-linear, although total deflections are diminished to 2 to 3 feet maximum.

(d) Run No. 8

Run No. 8, using tower configuration I and guy configuration H, resulted in a more linear tower deflection as shown in figure 47. Guy loadings are close to specified limits, but tower leg stresses are still excessive.

(e) Run No. 9

Run No. 9, using tower configuration II and guy configuration H, resulted in tower leg stresses only slightly over the specified limit, and guy loadings nearly within limits. The deflection plot of the tower in figure 48 shows that the top of the tower deflected to 6 feet, which results in a somewhat non-linear tower deflection.

(f) Run No. 10

In Run No. 10, tower configuration II and guy configuration K combine to give a near optimum combination within specified design stresses and loadings with the exception of the 9 radials supporting the tower at the top, which have a safety factor of 1.6. The maximum tower deflection as shown in figure 49 is 4.4 feet, and the tower is in a nearly linear position under loading. Table shows a direct comparison of Run No. 1, the standard antenna, and Run No. 10, the optimized standard antenna.




Figure 40. Computer Run #1




Figure 41. Computer Run #2




Figure 42. Computer Run #3




Figure 43. Computer Run #4




Figure 44. Computer Run #5




Figure 45. Computer Run #6




Figure 46. Computer Run #7




Figure 47. Computer Run #8




Figure 48. Computer Run #9




Figure 49. Computer Run #10

The use of the optimized configuration of the standard antenna will result in a 157 pound weight increase due to larger guys, and a 210 pound increase due to tower configuration changes necessary to comply with specified requirements with a design safety factor of two.

(g) Run No. 11

In Run No. 11, guy configuration N and tower configuration I were used with 12 radial antenna wires at the top as opposed to 9 for the standard antenna. As shown in tables XII and XIII, tower stresses and guy loads are within acceptable limits. Figure 50 shows that the tower is displaced in a linear manner under load. The addition of three more antenna radiators does not exceed the capabilities of the tower.

(h) Run No. 12

Run No. 12 represents the standard antenna configuration with the exception that the angle between the radiators and the tower is  $49^\circ$  rather than  $45^\circ$ . Tower configuration II is used, as is guy configuration P. The tower remains relatively linear under loading as shown in figure 51, and tower member stress levels shown in table XII are at acceptable levels, as are the guy loads shown in table XIII.

(i) Run No. 13

Run No. 13 utilizes tower configuration II and guy configuration O. Twelve radiators are attached to the top of the tower at a  $49^\circ$  angle between the tower and radiators. As shown in tables XII and XIII, tower member stresses and guy loading are at acceptable levels, and figure 52 indicates that the tower deflects in a linear position.

(j) Run No. 14

In Run No. 14, 12 radial antenna wires are used, with a tower shortened to 275 feet. Tower configuration II is used with guy configuration M, which has five guy levels, as opposed to six for all previous runs. Tables XII and XIII show that tower member stress levels and guy loads are within acceptable limits. The tower deflects linearly as shown in figure 53.


(k) Run No. 15

In Run No. 15, the tower in configuration II is shortened to 250 feet and guy configuration M is used. Twelve radiator wires are used with a circumferential skirt wire located approximately  $3/4$  down from the top of the radiators. As shown in tables XII and XIII, tower stresses and guy loads are well within specified limits. Figure 54 shows that the tower deflects linearly to a maximum of only 3 feet under loading.

(l) Run No. 16

Run No. 16 uses tower configuration I and guy configuration H with the ice loading omitted. Tables XIII and XIV show that the tower stresses and guy loads are very low, with an overall safety factor in the order of four of one. This run was made for a comparison with inflatable types which cannot withstand the specified ice conditions. Although no further runs were made to lighten and optimize

TABLE XII. TOWER COMPUTER INVESTIGATION



| COMPUTER RUN NUMBER | CONFIGURATION |     | d' IN. | n' IN. | LEG MEMBER     |    |                   | DIAGONAL MEMBER |     |                   | HORIZONTAL MEMBER |     |                   |
|---------------------|---------------|-----|--------|--------|----------------|----|-------------------|-----------------|-----|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-------------------|
|                     | TOWER         | GUY |        |        | MAX STRESS PSI | L/ | DESIGN STRESS PSI | MAX STRESS PSI  | L/  | DESIGN STRESS PSI | MAX STRESS PSI    | L/  | DESIGN STRESS PSI |
| 1                   | I             | A   | 36     | 36     | 31,235         | 52 | 19,000            | 36,414          | --  | 40,800            | 5017              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 2                   | I             | A   | 36     | 42     | 30,121         | 61 | 13,750            | 37,843          | --  | 40,800            | 5749              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 3                   | I             | A   | 42     | 42     | 30,004         | 61 | 13,750            | 36,180          | --  | 40,800            | 5875              | 63  | 13,000            |
| 4                   | I             | A   | 30     | 36     | 30,790         | 52 | 19,000            | 34,895          | --  | 40,800            | 5212              | 45  | 25,000            |
| 5                   | I             | B   | 30     | 30     | 38,375         | 43 | 26,250            | 37,150          | --  | 40,800            | 6127              | 45  | 25,000            |
| 6                   | I             | C   | 36     | 36     | 33,126         | 52 | 19,000            | 36,330          | --  | 40,800            | 5990              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 7                   | I             | D   | 30     | 30     | 41,616         | 43 | 26,250            | 37,812          | --  | 40,800            | 6231              | 45  | 25,000            |
| 8                   | I             | H   | 36     | 30     | 33,432         | 43 | 26,250            | 33,521          | --  | 40,800            | 5998              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 9                   | II            | H   | 36     | 30     | 27,579         | 44 | 26,000            | 37,247          | --  | 40,800            | 6669              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 10                  | II            | K   | 36     | 30     | 25,591         | 44 | 26,000            | 39,004          | --  | 40,800            | 6968              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 11                  | II            | N   | 36     | 30     | 26,226         | 44 | 26,000            | 39,404          | --  | 40,800            | 7036              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 12                  | II            | P   | 36     | 30     | 25,637         | 44 | 26,000            | 39,154          | --  | 40,800            | 6993              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 13                  | II            | O   | 36     | 30     | 25,893         | 44 | 26,000            | 39,559          | --  | 40,800            | 7063              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 14                  | II            | M   | 36     | 30     | 26,207         | 44 | 26,000            | 38,071          | --  | 40,800            | 6798              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 15                  | II            | M   | 36     | 30     | 21,386         | 44 | 26,000            | 30,555          | --  | 40,800            | 5485              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 16                  | I             | H   | 36     | 36     | 13,179         | 43 | 26,250            | 17,878          | --  | 40,800            | 2951              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 17                  | I             | H   | 36     | 30     | 8,870          | 43 | 26,250            | 2,917           | --  | 40,800            | 509               | 54  | 17,500            |
| 18                  | III           | E   | 36     | 40     | 58,191         | 46 | 24,000            | 8,831           | 77  | 8,875             | 8256              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 19                  | IV            | F   | 36     | 40     | 29,758         | 46 | 24,000            | 7,881           | 77  | 8,875             | 5620              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 20                  | V             | G   | 36     | 30     | 32,930         | 35 | 28,850            | 6,147           | 67  | 11,500            | 5051              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 21                  | V             | G   | 36     | 40     | 31,427         | 46 | 24,000            | 3,182           | 77  | 8,875             | 5996              | 54  | 17,500            |
| 22                  | VII           | L   | 36     | 40     | 32,177         | 58 | 15,300            | 11,599          | 124 | 3,200             | 10300             | 107 | 4,250             |
| 23                  | VI            | G   | 36     | 30     | 27,560         | 44 | 26,000            | 7,890           | 67  | 11,500            | 6643              | 54  | 17,500            |

TABLE XIII. TOWER COMPUTER INVESTIGATION

| COMPUTER<br>RUN<br>NUMBER | GUY 1   |                              | GUY 2   |                              | GUY 3   |                              | GUY 4   |                              | GUY 5   |                              | GUY 6   |                              |
|---------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|
|                           | TENSION | BREAKING<br>STRENGTH<br>LBS. | TENSION | BREAKING<br>STRENGTH<br>LBS. | TENSION | BREAKING<br>STRENGTH<br>LBS. | TENSION | BREAKING<br>STRENGTH<br>LBS. | TENSION | BREAKING<br>STRENGTH<br>LBS. | TENSION | BREAKING<br>STRENGTH<br>LBS. |
| 1                         | 2082    | 1100                         | 8165    | 10000                        | 7047    | 10000                        | 6484    | 10000                        | 4917    | 10000                        | 3822    | 10000                        |
| 2                         | 2047    | 1100                         | 7933    | 10000                        | 6832    | 10000                        | 6298    | 10000                        | 4730    | 10000                        | 3835    | 10000                        |
| 3                         | 2080    | 1100                         | 8107    | 10000                        | 7048    | 10000                        | 6522    | 10000                        | 4941    | 10000                        | 3897    | 10000                        |
| 4                         | 1988    | 1100                         | 7554    | 10000                        | 6715    | 10000                        | 5875    | 10000                        | 4450    | 10000                        | 3807    | 10000                        |
| 5                         | 2779    | 4500                         | 9189    | 18000                        | 7804    | 18000                        | 6731    | 18000                        | 4754    | 18000                        | 4208    | 18000                        |
| 6                         | 2784    | 4500                         | 8900    | 18000                        | 8016    | 18000                        | 6711    | 13000                        | 4993    | 10000                        | 4154    | 10000                        |
| 7                         | 3036    | 4500                         | 9203    | 23500                        | 8327    | 23500                        | 7015    | 18000                        | 5413    | 13000                        | 4177    | 10000                        |
| 8                         | 2515    | 4500                         | 9073    | 18000                        | 8130    | 18000                        | 6632    | 13000                        | 5138    | 10000                        | 4228    | 10000                        |
| 9                         | 2603    | 4500                         | 9366    | 18000                        | 8207    | 18000                        | 6556    | 13000                        | 5134    | 10000                        | 4226    | 10000                        |
| 10                        | 2809    | 4500                         | 9672    | 18000                        | 7974    | 18000                        | 6730    | 13000                        | 5203    | 10000                        | 4211    | 10000                        |
| 11                        | 2399    | 4500                         | 9822    | 18000                        | 7885    | 18000                        | 6684    | 13000                        | 5210    | 10000                        | 4219    | 10000                        |
| 12                        | 2793    | 4500                         | 9442    | 18000                        | 7816    | 18000                        | 6778    | 13000                        | 5197    | 10000                        | 4200    | 10000                        |
| 13                        | 2390    | 4500                         | 9575    | 18000                        | 7835    | 18000                        | 6744    | 13000                        | 5203    | 10000                        | 4208    | 10000                        |
| 14                        | 2199    | 4500                         | 9570    | 18000                        | 7935    | 18000                        | 6841    | 13000                        | 4828    | 10000                        | ----    | -----                        |
| 15                        | 1965    | 4500                         | 8303    | 18000                        | 6504    | 18000                        | 5856    | 13000                        | 4182    | 10000                        | ----    | -----                        |
| 16                        | 792     | 4500                         | 4041    | 18000                        | 3715    | 18000                        | 2565    | 13000                        | 2801    | 10000                        | 1847    | 10000                        |
| 17                        | ----    | ----                         | 2281    | 18000                        | 1800    | 18000                        | 1394    | 13000                        | 1405    | 10000                        | 1061    | 10000                        |
| 18                        | 2832    | 4500                         | 11203   | 50000                        | 10013   | 50000                        | 8066    | 40000                        | 6431    | 36000                        | 7348    | 28000                        |
| 19                        | 3000    | 4500                         | 8847    | 23500                        | 9238    | 23500                        | 7401    | 18000                        | 6387    | 13000                        | 4697    | 10000                        |
| 20                        | 2284    | 4500                         | 8553    | 18000                        | 9058    | 18000                        | 6838    | 13000                        | 6840    | 13000                        | 4861    | 10000                        |
| 21                        | 1931    | 1100                         | 5196    | 10000                        | 4172    | 10000                        | 3822    | 10000                        | 3568    | 10000                        | 3116    | 10000                        |
| 22                        | 2553    | 4500                         | 9603    | 18000                        | 9307    | 18000                        | 6759    | 13000                        | 6841    | 13000                        | 4833    | 10000                        |
| 23                        | 2480    | 4500                         | 9076    | 18000                        | 8715    | 18000                        | 6382    | 13000                        | 6475    | 13000                        | 4459    | 10000                        |

TABLE XIV. GUY MATERIAL PROPERTIES

| GUY MATERIAL           | BREAK STRENGTH IN LBS. | DIAMETER | WEIGHT IN LBS PER 100 FT. | TENSILE PSI | BREAK LENGTH IN FT. | STRETCH 20% LOAD | SPECIFIC GRAVITY | MOISTURE ABSORPTION | FLEXIBILITY | WEATHERING (CORROSION) | CONDUCTING | RF BURNING |
|------------------------|------------------------|----------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------|------------|
| Manila                 | 11,000                 | 1 1/8    | 36                        | 9,000       | 30,600              | 6%               | 1.32             | 60%                 | Excel       | Poor                   | No         | Poor       |
| Nylon                  | 11,000                 | 5/8      | 10.5                      | 28,000      | 105,000             | 22%              | 1.14             | 25%                 | Excel       | Fair                   | No         | Poor       |
| Polypropylene          | 11,000                 | 7/8      | 15.4                      | 18,000      | 71,500              | 16%              | .90              | 20%                 | Excel       | Good                   | No         | Poor       |
| Dacron                 | 11,000                 | 5/8      | 13.5                      | 28,000      | 81,500              | 6%               | 1.38             | 25%                 | Excel       | Good                   | No         | Poor       |
| Mylar                  | 11,000                 | 3/4      | 16.7                      | 25,000      | 66,000              | 2%               | 1.35             | 12%                 | Excel       | Good                   | No         | Fair       |
| Galv. Steel 6 x 7 imp. | 11,000                 | 3/8      | 21                        | 100,000     | 52,500              | .5%              | 7.7              | <.1%                | Good        | Fair                   | Yes        | Na         |
| Stainless Steel 1 x 19 | 11,000                 | 5/16     | 21                        | 143,000     | 52,000              | .5%              | 7.8              | <.1%                | Good        | Good                   | Yes        | Na         |
| Alum Weld              | 11,000                 | 5/16     | 20.8                      | 143,000     | 53,000              | .5%              | 7.4              | <.1%                | Fair        | Good                   | Yes        | Na         |
| Glass Rod              | 11,000                 | 5/16     | 6.75                      | 143,000     | 163,000             | .60%             | 2.0              | <.1%                | Poor        | Good                   | No         | No         |
| Glastan                | 11,000                 | 5/16     | 5.7                       | 143,000     | 193,000             | .67%             | 1.9              | <.1%                | Good        | Good                   | No         | No         |
| Nolaro Dacron          | 12,000                 | 5/8      | 13.7                      | 30,500      | NA                  | 1.8              | 1.4              | <.1%                | Excel       | Good                   | No         | No         |




Figure 50. Computer Run #11




Figure 51. Computer Run #12




Figure 52. Computer Run #13




Figure 53. Computer Run #14




Figure 54. Computer Run #15

the scaffold tower, it is clear that it could be lightened considerably and still remain within acceptable stress levels at the special condition of 70 knot winds and no ice. Figure 55 indicates a minimum of deflection.

(m) Run No. 17

This run was made to determine the safety factors in the structure during erection, with a man positioned at the 300-foot level and the tower guyed up the 250-foot level, leaving the top section cantilevered. A 20-knot wind at 30 feet is assumed with no ice present. As shown in table XIII, the guys have safety factors in the order of five to one. The tower member stresses shown in table XII are at a level which provides a minimum safety factor of six to one. Figure 56 indicates that the man will be subjected to approximately 1.2 feet of horizontal tower displacement at this worst possible condition, and the deflection would be even less if 12 radiators were used instead of the 9 considered here. If normal safety precautions such as the use of a safety belt are employed, the person climbing the tower is relatively safe.

This support structure has been in operation with the standard antenna, and has shown capability of satisfying system requirements. The design principles have been proven through wide usage of similar commercial structures.

Changes recommended in this tower are as follows:

1. Use tower configuration II, table IX
2. Use guy configuration V, table X
3. Provide temporary hinge brackets at base insulator for pivoting lower 30 feet of assembled tower

(2) Tilt-up Tower

The tower shown in figure 63 is an adaptation of the AN/TSA-17 lightweight transportable tower. The AN/TSA-17 tower was designed to operate at a height of 70 feet and to support a transportable hf antenna array. It is erected by means of a falling A-frame 10 feet in height, connected to the 40-foot level of the tower by a lifting cable. By attaching a winch to the top of the A-frame, the tower is pulled into the vertical position and guyed.

To satisfy the present requirements, a similar but larger tower is considered. Like the AN/TSA-17 tower, it consists of 12-foot sections which are further sub-divided into three interchangeable leg assemblies. When stored, the leg assemblies are stacked as shown in figure 63. All fabrication of this tower, as with the scaffold-type tower, is accomplished by epoxy bonding, riveting, and bolting, rather than welding to eliminate localized annealing of the aluminum. 7178-T6 aluminum is the alloy to be used in the analysis because of its high strength properties.

The erection of this tower is accomplished as follows:

- (a) Assemble leg assemblies into sections as shown in figure 63.




Figure 55. Computer Run #16




Figure 56. Computer Run #17

(b) Completely assemble sections and guys on the ground, and attach lighting kit.

(c) Attach and tension side guys to their respective anchors.

(d) Attach rear guys to their respective anchors as shown in figure 64.

(e) Attach, starting from the top of the tower, guys 1, 3, and 5 to the top of the falling A-frame as shown in figure 64.

(f) Attach winch to top of A-frame as shown in figure 64.

(g) Winch to vertical position as shown in figure 65.

(h) Attach guys 2, 4, and 6 to their respective anchors, as shown in figure 65.

(i) Remove guys 1, 3, and 5 from A-frame, and attach to their respective anchors.

At all times during this procedure, the tower is stabilized by attached guys and the winch. This method of erection eliminates the requirement of climbing the tower during erection.

Requirements of accessory or additional equipment of this tower configuration include a winch, A-frame, and an additional set of guys for 4-way guying.

The following computer runs were made to optimize this tower configuration.

(a) Run No. 18

This run utilizes tower configuration III and guy configuration E, as shown in tables IX and X. Table XII indicates that the leg members are overstressed considerably for this run. The guys, shown in table XIII, are considerably understressed, with safety factors of five to one on the average. Figure 57 indicates a relatively linear tower displacement, with a maximum displacement of two feet.

(b) Run No. 19

Tower configuration IV and guy configuration F are implemented in this run. As shown in table XII, the leg members of the tower are overstressed, with horizontal and diagonal members within limits. Guy loads, as shown in figure 13, remain overly safe, but to a lesser degree than the previous run. Figure 58 indicates that the tower at the top section departs from a linear configuration.

(c) Run No. 20

Tower configuration V and guy configuration G are used in this run. Table XII indicates that the leg members remain somewhat overstressed,




Figure 57. Computer Run #18




Figure 58. Computer Run #19

with diagonal and horizontal members well within acceptable limits. The guys are loaded to near optimum values of a safety factor of two to one, as shown in table XIII. Figure 59 indicates a linear deflection plot of the tower under load.

(d) Run No. 21

Tower configuration V and guy configuration G are again used in this run, however with different values of  $h'$  and different guy sizes. Tables XII and XIII indicate that the leg members are overstressed, and that the top guy level is overloaded. Figure 60 indicates a relatively linear tower deflection with a maximum deflection of about 5.5 feet.

(e) Run No. 22

Tower configuration VII and guy configuration L result in tower members being overstressed, as shown in table XII. The guys, as shown in table XIII, are within load limits. Excessive tower deflection results from these configurations, as indicated in figure 61.

(f) Run No. 23

Tower configuration VI and guy configuration G are used in this run. It should be noted that this tower configuration is similar to that used in configuration II for the scaffold-type tower in run No. 10. Table XII indicates that the leg stresses are nearly optimum (safety factor of 1.9 to 1) with diagonal and horizontal members within acceptable limits. All guys are at values of safety factors nearly 2 to 1 as shown in table XIII. A maximum tower deflection of approximately 5.8 feet, together with linear tower displacement is shown in figure 62, indicating that minimum bending moments are being applied to the structure.

A brief analysis of erection stresses is shown in appendix III; the factor of safety during this operation is 2.4 to 1.

(3) Inflatable Tower, Goodyear Type

The following inflatable support structure is proposed by Goodyear Aerospace Corporation. They were consulted regarding this study, and their concept merits consideration for this application.

Goodyear Aerospace Corporation's concept of a 300-foot-high inflatable antenna mast features an automatically erectable inflatable tower consisting of a tapered tubular envelope of a high-strength rubberized fabric that is pressurized to achieve a rigid tower structure. Guy cables are used at appropriate levels, as with a conventional tower, to resist wind loads and prevent buckling or excessive deflection. The structural integrity of the tower is maintained by the pressurization system, which provides adequate material tension to offset compression loading due to the wind load moments, the vertical components of the guy cable loads, and the weight of the fabric and cable. Thus, buckling of the mast is prevented.

The erection of an actual 50-foot high automatically erectable tower takes less than 8 minutes. A 300-foot tower utilizing the same basic concept will be possible to erect or retract and repack efficiently in 2 to 5 hours, using not more than a 10-man crew.




Figure 59. Computer Run #20




Figure 60. Computer Run #21




Figure 61. Computer Run #22




Figure 62. Computer Run #23






Figure 63. Packaged Tower



**Figure 64. Tilt-Up Tower, Ready for Erection**




Figure 65. Erected Tilt-Up Tower

The most time consuming task during erection is the installation of ground anchors. This task can be expedited by additional sets of anchor installation equipment.

As the tower is inflated or deflated, it automatically extends upward or retracts into the support base, respectively. The tower will remain erect and rigid at all heights up to 300 feet as it is extended or retracted. The tower is automatically extended by the action of air pressure as it is raised or retracted by means of a reel in the base.

The guy cables, the upper ends of which are permanently attached externally on the tower, are also reeled in with the tower. Thus, when the tower is inflated, the guy cables are automatically deployed and it is merely necessary to attach the lower ends to ground anchors and pretension them. As each level of guy lines is exposed, the guys are attached to the ground anchors and tensioned. Thus each level of guy lines supports the tower as it is extended to its full height.

The top-loading antenna array can be deployed and retracted in the same manner as that for the guy lines. The erection and retraction are controlled by a relatively lightweight power pack, whose basic components consist of a blower, speed reducer, reel, brake, and motor or engine.

A preliminary structural analysis indicates that 12-guy levels would probably be optimum for a tower tapered from 5 to 2 feet in diameter. With an internal pressure of about 15 psi, this mast will be capable of surviving a 70-knot wind. Past analyses have been based on the assumption that radial ice does not occur simultaneously with the 70-knot wind, because lower velocity winds would crack and break the ice off before a 70-knot wind would occur.

In addition, the forming of ice on the inflatable mast itself may not occur. Exposure tests during the past winter on a 50-foot tower indicate that the fabric can be treated and the tower pressure varied so that the formation of ice can be prevented. A considerable weight penalty would result if the tower were designed to take the combination of ice and full wind loads.

This tower is designed for a midheight (150 foot) operation without modification. It would be erected in the usual manner. The top loading radiators would then extend 150 feet out from the top of the tower and form a somewhat larger angle with the vertical than it would when fully erected. A conductive ring would be used at midheight to protect the fabric from abrasion and to ensure electrical continuity from the tower into the top-loading conductors.

The tower can withstand a  $-65^{\circ}$  to  $+160^{\circ}$  F ambient temperature in the packed or erected state, but it cannot be deployed or retracted at  $-65^{\circ}$  F. The limiting erection and retraction temperature may be approximately  $-40^{\circ}$  F.

The other environmental conditions specified, such as humidity, barometric pressure, salt atmosphere, sand and dust, insects, and fungi, should present no problems in the use of an inflatable antenna tower.

Experience has indicated that with periodic maintenance procedures, an inflatable antenna tower of the concept suggested above will have a 2-year service life, including 15 to 20 erections and retractions during this period.

The requirement for packing size does not appear to be difficult to meet. However, the 3000 pound weight goal presents somewhat of a problem. Previous weight estimates for a 300-foot inflatable antenna tower indicate that the whole system will weigh approximately 4100 pounds. However, about 1500 pounds of this is auxiliary equipment. A 2-package transport system will weight about 2600 pounds. Spring steel tapes may be considered for reinforcement between plies to improve the strength-to-weight ratio.

To make the inflatable tower electrically conductive so that it can be used as a radiating element, at least four approaches are feasible:

- (a) Use a flexible silver loaded latex paint
- (b) Laminate aluminum foil to the tower fabric
- (c) Laminate fine mesh wire screen to the tower fabric
- (d) Incorporate a conductive wire in the tower.

The antenna array at the top of the tower will be connected electrically to the conductive surface of the tower.

For previous inflatable tower projects, tower lighting in accordance with FAA regulations has been considered, and does not appear to be a major problem.

#### (4) Inflatable Tower, Birdair Type

The inflatable tower developed by Birdair Structures differs in concept from the Goodyear tower. It differs in configuration, pressurization system, and method of erection.

The proposed tower support consists of a conical coated fabric envelope 3 feet in diameter at the top end, 22 feet diameter at the base, and 300 feet high, as shown in figure 66. Preliminary calculations indicate that the envelope material required for the tower would be a 2-ply neoprene coated Dacron fabric having a total weight of approximately 70 ounces per square yard and a strip tensile strength of 1000 pounds per inch in the warp and filling directions. The use of such a material would result in a completed tower weighing approximately 5000 pounds with a packaged volume of approximately 200 cubic feet. To improve the weathering and general abrasion resistance of the material it is anticipated that the exterior surface of the tower would be given two coats of Hypalon paint.

For normal everyday operations (winds under 45 knots), calculations indicate that an inflation pressure of 1.5 psi can be used. During initial erection, and for higher wind conditions, the pressure would be increased to 3 psi. The tower would be anchored to the ground at approximately 3-foot spacing around the base; 24 anchors would be required. The load per anchor at the base would be approximately 7000 pounds. For stability of the tower under wind loading, the tower would be guyed at 40-, 90-, 150-, and 200-foot positions from the top of the tower. The top cap of the tower would be guyed by the antenna radials. Except for the 10 top radials, all guy levels would consist of a 4-guy system with guys spaced 90° apart in azimuth.

Based on present known requirements, it is anticipated that a 3-blower pressurization package would be used. One low pressure, (5-6 inches  $H_2O$ ),




Figure 66. 300 Ft. Configuration

high volume blower would be used to initially fill the volume of the envelope with air. A second intermediate pressure (1.5 psi), lower volume compressor would be used to pressurize the tower for winds up to 45 K. A third high pressure (3 psi), low volume compressor would be used to provide sufficient pressure to erect the tower and to pressurize the tower for winds up to 70 K. All blowers would be provided with manual switches for operation as desired. In addition, the 1.5 psi and the 3 psi compressors could be automatically operated intermittently by pressure switch control to maintain the pressure in the tower between preset level limits. The blowers would each be arranged to discharge into a plenum through a check valve to prevent reverse flow of air through any blower that is not operating. The blower and control system would be contained in a weather tight housing and air would be ducted from the plenum to the tower envelope thru a flexible duct. To prevent overpressurization of the tower due to a sudden temperature buildup, a pressure relief valve would be located in the blower plenum. It is estimated that the maximum compressor power requirement would be 10 horsepower; the normal operational requirement would be approximately 2 HP. All blowers would be of the centrifugal compressor type.

For operation at a height of 150 feet, a set of auxiliary anchor attachment points would be located at mid height on the tower. The lower section of the tower envelope would be folded or rolled to the intermediate position and placed on the base position, as shown in figure 67. Twelve anchors on a 12-foot 6-inch base circle would be used to anchor the tower at the reduced height position.

The erection of the tower would be accomplished in the following sequence:

- (a) The base location and guy positions of the tower would be determined and anchors would be placed as required.
- (b) The tower envelope would be unrolled or unfolded with the base in position and the remainder of the tower placed in a radial line located downwind from the base position with respect to anticipated, existing, or prevailing wind.
- (c) Attach the base of the tower to the ground anchors with the pressure connection on the upwind side.
- (d) Locate the pressure package on the upwind side of the base and attach the duct to the tower envelope.

#### NOTE

The remainder of the installation should only be attempted under relatively calm wind conditions (under 15 mph).

- (e) Operate the low pressure blower to inflate the envelope while it is laying on the ground.
- (f) Turn on the high pressure blower (3 psi) and begin pressurizing the tower envelope. As the pressure builds up in the envelope, the tower will tend to raise itself using the base attachment as a pivot point. However, due to the long length and weight of the tower it will buckle midway along its length and erect itself in two stages. In the first stage the lower half will raise itself with the upper half folded down such that the top cap will be pointed toward the ground forming




Figure 67. 150 Ft. Configuration

a "knee" in the tower. Secure the lower and mid guy lines. In the second stage the upper half of the tower will raise itself pivoting about the "knee" in the tower envelope.

(g) After the tower is completely erected secure all remaining guy lines.

(h) Turn on the normal operating (1.5 psi) blower for automatic operation and turn off the high pressure blower.

To control the inflation to a greater extent, consideration would be given to compartmenting the tower along its length into numerous sections with spherical bulkheads so that a controlled sequential inflation along the length of the tower could be achieved.

Removal of the tower would be accomplished in the following (simplified) sequence.

(a) Remove the upper three sets of guy lines retaining the mid and lower sets.

(b) Gradually reduce the tower pressure letting the upper section of the tower fold down alongside the lower section reforming the "knee" at the mid height as in the erection.

(c) Gradually reduce the tower pressure further letting the remainder of the tower gradually settle to the ground.

(d) Evacuate all air from the tower envelope and refold or roll the envelope into its transport container.

For ease of handling and erection, consideration would be given to fabricating the tower in 2 to 6 sections. The sections would be joined in the field by quick connect coupling fasteners.

It is pointed out that during erection and removal of the tower all tower motion will be gradual and controllable, thus sudden motions or possible impacts are avoided. Further it would be unnecessary for personnel to climb the tower at any time during the installation or removal.

Specification comments on the Birdair inflatable tower are as follows:

(a) The tower in the guyed condition and pressurized to 3 psi would withstand steady winds of 70 knots.

(b) Preliminary calculations indicate that the tower would withstand the specified icing load if guyed and pressurized to 3 psi. Since the exterior of the tower is essentially smooth, ice would not tend to accumulate.

(c) The specified temperature range of -65° F to 160° F would necessitate the use of a specially compounded low temperature neoprene in the tower envelope material. All other equipment could be selected to meet this requirement. Installation of the tower at -65° F would be extremely difficult due to the stiffness of

the material, although no cracking or other damage would be anticipated. Further testing with the actual tower material would be required in order to evaluate the lowest practical temperature extreme for installation or removal of the tower.

(d) No adverse effect from 100 percent humidity, barometric pressure differential of 28.50 to 30.50 in. hg., salt atmosphere, sand and dust, and insects and fungi.

(e) With periodic maintenance, such as repainting at 2 year intervals, the tower should have a service life of 6 to 10 years with 50 to 100 erections.

(f) Preliminary calculations indicate that the weight of an inflatable tower would be approximately 5000 pounds.

(g) Calculations indicate a package volume of approximately 200 cu. ft. thus packaging into a 7- by 8- by 12-foot container should pose no particular problem.

(h) Ten men should be able to install the inflatable tower in 4 hours.

(i) No special skills would be required to install the inflatable tower and the necessity of climbing the structure would be eliminated.

(j) There would be essentially no maintenance procedures required while the tower is inflated.

(k) The top cap of the tower would contain sufficient rigid components to support the aircraft warning lights, antenna radials, guys and other required equipment.

#### (5) Telescoping Towers

Telescoping towers have been built and designed by various manufacturers for heights up to 200 feet. The commonly used method of construction in these towers is a series of nested triangular or rectangular sections that are stored within one another.

The conventional method of erection involves cranking by hand or motor-driven winch and cable assembly which raises the nested sections in sequence. The larger sections are extended first and mechanically locked in place when each successive section is locked in place. Guys are attached prior to erection, and are attached to anchors as the tower is erected.

A telescoping tower with an erected height of 300 feet has been developed by Andrew Tower Corporation of Ft. Worth, Texas. This tower has a rectangular cross section, and is constructed of 6061T-6 aluminum angle legs, and tubular bracing members. The overall length of this tower is approximately 44 feet, with a system weight of 12,100 pounds, including its transporting trailer, winch, and accessory equipment. A 5-kw generator is required to power the winch mechanism. This tower is obviously not suited to a highly tactical application, due to its size and weight. The weight of the tower structure portion of this system is about

5000 pounds. This concept is designed for commercial applications where the weight, size, and transportation facilities are available.

The high weight and large size requirements of the telescoping-type tower is due primarily to the overlap necessary between sections, and that the loading that dictates the minimum section properties results in the lower sections being oversized to accommodate the nesting feature.

From the above considerations, the telescoping-type tower was judged to be not applicable for this application.

#### (6) Launcher Type Towers

Several firms are at present manufacturing launcher towers, in heights ranging from 30 to 150 feet. This type of tower utilizes a base frame in which sections are placed and raised. When a section has been raised to the height of the launcher base, it is secured temporarily, and another section is inserted under the previous section. This process is repeated until the entire tower has been erected.

Many configurations of tower sections may be raised by this method; tubular, the scaffold snap-out tower, and the knock-down tower previously discussed in paragraph (2), to name a few.

The launcher frame would consist of a frame with guides to support the tower section being lifted, a winch and cable assembly to provide an axial lifting force on the tower section, and a locking mechanism to hold the hoisted tower into position. After the tower is completely erected, the frame would be detached and set aside. A desirable feature of the frame would be that it disassemble into a minimal volume for optimum storage purposes. A power tool used in installation of anchors could be adapted to drive the winch of the launcher frame.

This concept could be packaged within the limits of standard military vehicles, requiring only the additional weight and volume of the launching frame in addition to the standard antenna. Another advantage of this concept is that climbing the tower is not required.

A disadvantage of this concept, which becomes critical at the tower heights considered here, is paying out guy cables as each successive tower section is raised. Each guy must be slacked off enough to allow the tower to be raised the height of one section (12 feet) and with increased height, this becomes more difficult. Dielectric guy cables such as Glastran will not work successfully with guy adjuster devices as will aircraft cable guys. If any normal wind loading (up to 20 knots at 30 feet) is present, stability of the tower is marginal. Special devices such as slip clutches set at pre-determined tensions are costly, difficult to maintain, and not reliable. No adequate solution to this problem was discovered, therefore the launcher type tower could not be recommended for this application.

Another structural concept to which the above deficiency applies would be a STEM (Storable Tubular Extension Member) design similar to that used as space-boom antennas. Masts of this type have been experimented with at heights in the order of 40 feet. Other difficulties with this system would include excessive weight, high cost, reliability, and the attachment of guys and radiators. The STEM principle cannot be recommended as applicable to this antenna system.

## (7) Dynamic Lifting Balloons

Goodyear Aircraft Corporation was consulted regarding dynamic lifting balloon supported antennas and their Vee-Balloon concept is discussed.

In general, the Vee-Balloon antenna support concept offers a system for serious comparison with other antenna concepts. New high-strength, low-gas permeability fabrics, coupled with an improved aerodynamically designed balloon configuration, have resulted in an extremely stable, high lift balloon system ideally suited to support applications. The integration of this system into an air transportable operation could provide a very effective solution to the problem of substituting a wire antenna for a conventional tower-supported antenna.

The Vee-Balloon is probably one of the best dynamic lift balloons, since it develops a high L/D (lift-to-drag) ratio without stability problems. The Vee-Balloon obtains directional stability with small vertical tail surfaces and its lift and drag characteristics show values of over three. For equal volume, its diameter or height and length is less than that of other types of kite balloons, considerably easing handling and launching operations. The greater lateral width at the tail is well compensated for by improved handling and flying qualities.

A tri-tether guy system is a possible configuration together with the single-tethered system. The tri-tether system can be employed where a more stable antenna is required. A tri-tether on the balloon is used on a quarter-wave antenna to maintain the antenna as vertical as possible. This system is also required for a balloon supported antenna with less than a quarter-wave radiator to provide a top loading for the antenna. If a full quarter-wave antenna is not used, top loaded antenna heights of 1500 to 2000 feet with the top loading extending about 1000 feet to 500 feet, respectively, may be a reasonable estimate.

It is important to keep the antenna portion of the guy wires as taut as possible. To do so in a no-wind condition, a Vee-Balloon with excess lift is recommended. When under a wind load, the Vee-Balloon develops considerable lift; therefore, angles of attack of 6, 8, and 10 degrees have been examined for typical wind velocities. Tensions developed by the balloon range in the vicinity of the breaking strength of any individual tether cable, but since the resultant angle of the lift and drag of the Vee-Balloon remains inside the vertex of the tether cable juncture, all the cables share the load, but to different degrees.

Although the weight and wind loads on the guy cables cause them to sag, the high lift of the Vee-Balloon tends to hold the guy cable to ground angle to 45 degrees, as desired. A conventionally shaped balloon of the same size yields only about one-half this angle. Since the straighter or larger the angle maintained provides the more stationary or stable antenna, the Vee-Balloon is superior for the proposed application. This adds another advantage to the already mentioned stable flight characteristics of this vehicle and its simpler ground handling.

The Vee-Balloon configuration consists of two aerodynamically shaped bodies, intersecting at an angle of 40 degrees and joined at the nose. At the aft part, the two bodies are joined by an inflated horizontal tail surface that provides longitudinal stability. Two small inflated vertical surfaces located under each body provided directional stability.

The size of the balloon depends on the lifting capacity of the selected gas at the prescribed altitude and temperature conditions, on the weight that will be carried, and on the balloon's own weight. A cursory weight estimate on the complete balloon-supported antenna system shows that a quarter-wave radiator system can be provided within the specified weight limitations of 3000 lb.

Several items of ground equipment would be required as part of the transportable Vee-Balloon packages. These would include a winch, ground anchors, a ground cloth, and helium bottles or hydrogen generation equipment.

A significant problem of the Vee-Balloon concept is withstanding environmental conditions. In the temperature range of -65° to +160° F, considerable problems could arise. One inch of surface ice on the balloon could cause it to come down, at least until the lift and weight balance is achieved. The wind conditions specified would present additional severe problems. Lighting the balloon according to FAA specifications is another area of difficulty due to the fact that the balloon concept presents a definite aviation hazard. Also tactical vulnerability is a problem to be considered.

Logistic supply must be considered in terms of providing gas for the balloon. Helium, which would be required in large quantities, must be transported in pressure vessels which are heavy. Another gas supply could come from a hydrogen generator, but the hazards to personnel are considerable.

For this application, this concept is not considered the optimum, particularly in terms of down-time, system reliability, and logistical supply.

#### b. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The inflatable types of support structure, the Snap-Out scaffold type, and the collapsible tilt-up type all are capable, to varying degrees, of satisfying system requirements. As a basis for comparison, all are compared with a 300-foot umbrella antenna requirement.

On the basis of stage of development and availability, the structures are rated in order as follows:

- (1) Snap-Out towers are in production stage.
- (2) Collapsible tilt-up design is in production in smaller configuration, but not in production in size required here.
- (3) Goodyear inflatable towers have been built in relatively small configuration, not developed yet for 300-foot size.
- (4) Birdair inflatable towers are not yet designed or developed.

Considerable design effort, with corresponding stress analysis, has yet to be accomplished for inflatable types. Many design and production problems remain to be solved in regards to materials and methods.

In order of estimated initial cost, the support structures considered are as follows, least cost structures first:

- (1) Snap-Out scaffold tower (approximately \$30,000 per system)
- (2) Collapsible tilt-up tower (comparable to above configuration, but more guys and accessory equipment should require higher initial cost).
- (3) Birdair inflatable (budgetary estimate of \$110,000 quoted per system).
- (4) Goodyear inflatable (cost not known, but should be comparable to above).

The cost of maintaining the equipment during operation should also cause the structures above to be rated in the same order, assuming the higher initial cost reflects more sophisticated and complex equipment.

The specified environmental conditions of one inch of ice on the tower and one-half inch on the guys are particularly severe in the case of inflatable structure. For example, a 300-foot cylinder of five foot diameter, a surface area of 4700 ft<sup>2</sup> is involved. The weight of ice to be supported would be as follows:

$$(4700) \left( \frac{1}{12} \right) (56 \text{ lbs/ft}^3) = 22,000 \text{ lbs}$$

In addition, if more guys are required to provide column stiffness and to prevent buckling, additional ice loading will result. The wind loading is also much higher due to the large diameters involved for an inflatable structure.

An additional consideration is suitability to tactical environment. It is obvious that any 300-foot structure will not be difficult to be seen, but the much larger silhouette of the inflatable structure makes it more vulnerable to small arms fire. A continuous pressurization system could overcome the effects of a certain amount of leakage, but it would not withstand any significant amount of gunfire. The triangular aluminum tower would be less vulnerable to such conditions.

In terms of weight and volume, all systems considered would require two packages instead of the single specified package, thereby, doubling the weight and volume requirements. However, all packages would be capable of being transported in standard military vehicles. Each package would also be adapted to attachment to a standard 463L "rail" system pallet.

In general, the more rugged and simple design of the aluminum towers would require less training of personnel and better reliability and maintainability performance over the design lifetime of two years. Rough handling and abuse encountered in tactical situations is unavoidable, and a system which has the most rugged and simple design will have the least amount of down time. If a portion or section of an aluminum type tower is damaged in the field, the system may be still erected at a slightly lower height. However, an equivalent amount of damage to an inflatable tower would put the entire system out of operation.

In view of the aluminum construction towers having superior performance in terms of availability, reliability, maintainability, compliance to environmental condition specifications, and tactical capabilities, the inflatable concepts could not

be recommended as being the optimum support structure for this requirement. Of the two types of aluminum towers, the Snap-Out scaffold-type tower system would be considered more desirable for this application than the collapsible tilt-up tower because of the additional weight and volume required for the erection equipment, additional guys required (4-way guying instead of 3-way guying), and slightly higher weight of the tower (10 lbs/ft vs. 13.3 lbs/ft estimated). The results of computer run no. 17 show the safety of the tower when a man is on the tower. With proper safety precautions and training, the requirement for climbing the Snap-Out scaffold-type tower during erection is not considered objectionable to the extent that this concept should not be recommended.

It should be pointed out, however, if the high man concept is considered objectionable, the Snap-Out as well as the collapsible-type aluminum tower concepts are both suited to erection by the tilt-up procedure.

A comparison of weight differential of the "high-man" and the tilt-up techniques for the "snap-out" tower is as follows:

|                            | <u>high-man wt.</u><br><u>pounds</u> | <u>tilt-up wt.</u><br><u>pounds</u> |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| guys                       | 255                                  | 345                                 |
| anchors                    | 1500                                 | 1800                                |
| A-frame                    | ----                                 | 400                                 |
| misc. hdw.                 | ----                                 | <u>150</u>                          |
|                            | 1755                                 | 2695                                |
| differential-----→ 940 lbs |                                      |                                     |

## 5. RADIATING CONDUCTORS

Three materials were considered for use as radiators for the antenna umbrella: Alumoweld, phosphor bronze, and jacketed Glastran. A diameter of 3/16 inch was used as a standard of comparison due to the results of electrical considerations. The following chart compares the properties of the above materials.

| <u>MATERIAL</u>   | <u>WT/FT</u><br><u>lbs</u> | <u>CORROSION</u><br><u>RESISTANCE</u> | <u>HANDLING</u><br><u>EASE</u> | <u>E</u><br><u>psi</u> |
|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| Alumoweld (3# 12) | .044                       | Excellent                             | Fair                           | $23.5 \times 10^6$     |
| Phosphor Bronze   | .070                       | Excellent                             | Excellent                      | $10.5 \times 10^6$     |
| Jacketed Glastran | .034                       | Excellent                             | Good                           | $6.0 \times 10^6$      |

Alumoweld is a common material in use as antenna radiator material. It consists of a steel core covered with an aluminum jacket, combining strength with good conductivity. Alumoweld has the property of "self-healing". When the aluminum is nicked through to the steel core, the galvanic actions resulting from the exposure "heals" the damaged surface as opposed to copperweld wire, which has

the opposite reaction resulting in the sacrificing of the steel core. Alumoweld, however, is stiff and would be relatively difficult to handle during erection or striking of the antenna. In addition, the high modulus of elasticity (E) would tend to restrict the displacement of the top of the tower during loading, thereby creating excessive bending in the tower structure.

Phosphor bronze is widely used for antenna radiators where resistance to salt water and atmospheric corrosion is prevalent. It is very flexible and easy to handle during erection or striking of the antenna. Phosphor bronze is the heaviest material considered, weighing twice as much as the jacketed Glastran. In total weight for a 300-foot tower with 9 radiators, 250 pounds of phosphor bronze would be required. Phosphor bronze, like Alumoweld, has a relatively high modulus of elasticity, resulting in limitation of tower deflection under load, causing excessive bending stresses in the tower structure.

Jacketed Glastran radiators consist of a conventional Glastran rope with a hardened jacket of aluminum, in turn jacketed with 20 mil polyurethane to prevent handling damage and sunlight resistance. The jacketed Glastran has the lowest weight of the materials considered (125 pounds total), and the lowest modulus of elasticity. By using the smaller diameter Glastran radiators as compared to the Glastran guys at the other support levels of the tower, the tower deflects linearly with height, resulting in the minimum of stress in the tower structure. An added feature of the jacketed Glastran conductor is that the non-radiating portion of the umbrella (lower end which connects to ground anchors) is a continuance of the radiator with the aluminum braid eliminated. This results in elimination of special hardware for terminating the radiator, with the exception of corona rings.

Although some care in handling must be exercised to prevent sharp bends or kinks in the jacketed Glastran, it is considered to be the most suited for this application.

## 6. GROUND SCREEN

### a. MATERIALS CONSIDERED

It has been determined that a no. 12 conductor of 30 percent conductivity provides an adequate ground screen when arrayed in the form of 40 radials, each 300 feet in length. The following materials have equal or better conductivity, and were considered on the basis of mechanical properties.

| <u>Wire Material</u> | <u>ohms/1000 Ft.</u> | <u>wt./1000 Ft., lbs.</u> |
|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| #10 Copperweld       | 3.39                 | 28.81                     |
| #13 Aluminum         | 3.29                 | 4.76                      |
| #15 Copper           | 3.18                 | 9.86                      |
| #8 Alumoweld         | 3.09                 | 37.03                     |

### b. ANALYSIS

Copper materials have an advantage over aluminum when used in contact with the soil in that aluminum tends to corrode in contact with soil at a rate depending on the type of soil involved. In the case of this application, the aluminum wire, if

used, lays on top of the ground rather than buried, which would limit the corrosion process to a degree.

The total quantity of wire required for the ground screen is 12,000 feet. As shown in the above table, no. 13 aluminum wire is the lightest, resulting in a total system weight of wire of 57 pounds, as compared to 376 pounds of copper wire.

The aluminum wire would offer additional advantages of less cost, ease of handling, and a minimum of storage volume.

In view of the above considerations, it is felt that no. 13 aluminum wire would be most desirable for this application, although after an extended period of time it might have to be replaced due to corrosion.

In place of conventional copperweld ground rods used to periodically connect to the ground radials, it would prove beneficial in terms of weight to use a 2-inch arrowhead anchor together with a length of phosphor bronze cable to be used to connect to the ground wire, and to retrieve the small anchor. A bimetallic connector would be required for each grounding anchor. The per unit weight is approximately 0.3 pounds for the grounding anchor vs. 0.85 pounds for the ground rod.

## 7. GUYS

### a. GENERAL

Materials considered applicable for comparison included "Nolaro" Dacron, Dacron, Mylar, Polypropylene, Nylon, and Glastran ropes. Table XIV represents a comparison of physical properties, table XV a cost comparison, and figure 68 shows comparative strengths of various guy materials. An evaluation of guy materials follows.

### b. MATERIALS CONSIDERED

(1) Guy ropes of Dacron polyester fibers have been in use for several years. Dacron has a high strength to weight ratio, has good abrasion resistance, is very easy to handle, and has good weathering characteristics.


End fittings found suitable for Dacron ropes are compression sleeves such as made by National Telephone Supply Co., and conventional eyesplicing, which allow loads of 80 percent or greater of the breaking strength of the rope.

The elongation of a "broken in" Dacron rope (one preloaded to "set" fibers which removes un-recoverable elongation) is approximately 5 percent at a 20 percent breaking strength loading. This is at an acceptable level for structure of moderate height and environmental loading, but, at a height of 300 feet, excessive deflection would result in the tower structure.

### (2) Nolaro Dacron

The Nolaro term results from the construction of the rope which has no "lay" of the individual fibers. Any type of fiber may be used in a Nolaro construction, which consists of paralleled fibers thrown into a slack twisted yarn, after which a suitable number of yarns are paralleled under equal tension and held together in a bundle protected by an extruded plastic jacket. This type of construction reduces

TABLE XV. COST/FT. EQUIVALENT ROPE DIA.






Figure 68. Comparative Strengths of Ropes and Wires

abrasion between individual fibers and does not introduce elongation due to the lay of conventional rope. The breaking strength of the Nolaro Dacron rope is higher than the conventional Dacron rope due to the elimination of internal abrasion of fibers during loading.

Eyesplicing, while more difficult than with conventional lay ropes, can be accomplished on Nolaro Dacron rope. An alternate method which produces load capacities of 80 percent of the breaking strength is to remove a portion of the jacket, and socket the rope in a tapered end fitting with epoxy resin (small dia = rope dia + .010, and large dia = 1.5 to 2.5 rope dia, and length of cavity 2-5 times rope dia.)

The elongation of Nolaro Dacron rope is approximately 1.8 percent at 20 percent of the rope breaking strength. This is a considerable improvement over conventional lay Dacron rope, but is still approximately four times the spring rate of a steel guy cable. Through careful analysis a 300-foot tower could be guyed successfully with Nolaro Dacron.

(3) Nylon

Nylon is the strongest of the conventional synthetic ropes. However, due to its excessive elongation (22 percent at 20 percent of breaking strength) it would be unsuitable for this application.

(4) Mylar

Mylar is unique in construction, being made from 3/4-inch wide by 1/1000-inch thick Mylar film, which has been heated and stretched into a fine thread to remove all but about 5 percent of its elongation. These threads are then woven into a low twist lay rope to minimize load elongation. Mylar possesses all the attributes of Dacron rope, with a slightly lower breaking strength. However, it has an elongation of only 2 percent at 20 percent of breaking strength, which makes it suitable for guying a 300-foot tower.

(5) Polypropylene

Polypropylene like Nylon, has excessive elongation under load for a 300-foot tower application, approximately 16 percent at 20 percent rope breaking strength loading.

(6) Glastran

Glastran is a glass fiber rope, constructed of continuous filaments of high strength glass impregnated with epoxy resin. Filaments are stranded together, and the strands woven into a conventional rope lay.

To protect the rope from u-v radiation, and to provide abrasion protection, the rope is jacketed in extruded plastic, usually polyurethane.

The elongation of Glastran is very low, .67 percent at 20 percent breaking strength loading. As shown in table XIV, Glastran has nearly the same properties as stainless steel aircraft cable of the same diameter, with the exception that Glastran weighs 1/4th as much as the stainless steel cable.

Glastran may be terminated by means of a preformed dead end, such as supplied by Preformed Line Products Co. These have been tested to 100 percent of the breaking strength of the rope. To install a preformed dead end, the plastic jacketing of the Glastran must be removed under the area of contact with the dead-end. Tests were run using the preformed dead end directly over the jacketed Glastran, and failure occurred at approximately 80 percent of the rope breaking strength. The rope may also be terminated with epoxy resin in a socket-type end-fitting, with approximately 20 percent loss in load rating.

A problem exists with Glastran guying in that the rope strands may be broken under severe bending, such as being driven over by a vehicle. This, a partial break of the rope would not be readily visible due to the opaque black plastic jacketing. Care in handling of Glastran guys would be mandatory. Field repairs of Glastran can be made easily and quickly by cutting out the damaged section, removing necessary jacketing, and installing a preformed splicing sleeve, resulting in a joint that equals the rope breaking strength.

### c. ANALYSIS

Of the materials considered for guying Mylar, Nolaro Dacron, and Glastran are capable, to varying degrees, of meeting desired requirements. As a basis for comparison, a 300-foot guyed tower will be used, requiring approximately 4500 feet of guy rope. The system guy weight requirements are as follows:

|               |            |
|---------------|------------|
| Nolaro Dacron | 615 pounds |
| Mylar         | 750 pounds |
| Glastran      | 255 pounds |

Glastran offers a weight savings of 360 to 495 pounds over Nolaro Dacron and Mylar, which is a significant amount.

In terms of strength and elongation, Glastran has a significant advantage in that its elongation at 20 percent rope breaking strength is .67 percent, or 2.5 to 3 times less than Nolaro Dacron or Mylar. This is an extremely important property, in that the tower structure is subjected to a much less severe loading caused by deflection of guy supports. This deflection results in additional bending movements in the tower structure, necessitating a stronger tower. In addition, the tower is subjected to a lesser degree of fatigue loading.

An additional consideration in regards to tower loading effects caused by the guys is the diameter of the guy rope. A 5/16-inch diameter Glastran rope possesses strength equal to a 3/4-inch diameter Mylar rope and a 5/8-inch diameter Nolaro Dacron rope. The weight of accumulated ice increases with the square of the diameter, and the wind loading is directly proportional to the diameter. The advantage of Glastran is obvious in this case.

As shown in table XV, Glastran is approximately 1/2 as expensive as Mylar, and 34 cents per foot more than Nolaro Dacron. From a system cost basis, Glastran would cost approximately \$3,700 per system, while Nolaro Dacron guys would cost approximately \$2,150 per system.

In the event field damage occurs Nolaro Dacron and Mylar could be repaired by splicing. This necessitates that a crew member present be familiar with this process. Glastran is field repairable by application of a preformed splice joint, which must be supplied with the system. No particular skill is required for its application. Barring any unusual physical damage, any of the materials considered has a life expectancy far in excess of the specified two years.

The comparative analysis of guy rope materials above leads to the conclusion that Glastran guy rope is recommended for this application.

#### d. ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT

The device shown in figure 69 is a combined guy tensions and tensiometer produced by Up-Right Tower Company. A calibrated spring mechanism reads out guy tension at all times. A removable handle eliminates considerable weight, by being moved to each anchor during adjustment. This unit is ideally suited to this application.

### 8. ANCHORS

#### a. GENERAL

Anchors considered for comparative analysis include expansion anchors, screw-in type anchors, dead man type anchors, arrowhead anchors, and explosive installed anchors. Equipment and accessories used in installation of the various types of anchors are also considered. As an aid in determining the type and size of anchor best suited for a specific job, classification has been made of anchor holding strengths in different types of soil and under different moisture conditions (see figures 70 and 71). Classification of holding power on the basis of soil type alone has been found to be insufficient, not only from the standpoint of soil identification, but also because of variations experienced in the holding power values.

Numerous tests under different moisture conditions and in all types of soil have proven moisture content to be a greater factor than soil composition in determining soil-anchor holding power. The following soil classifications as developed by A. B. Chance Co., Centraillia, Mo., give consideration to both the type of soil and the moisture content, providing a more accurate and easily-recognized means of soil identification.

Class 1. Hard rock (solid)

Class 2. Shale, sandstone (solid or in adjacent layers).

Class 3. Hard, dry (hardpan). Usually found under a Class 4 strata, resembling soft rock.

Class 4. Crumbly, damp, (usually clay predominates. Insufficiently moist to pack into a ball when squeezing by hand. Particles crumble off).

Class 5. Firm, moist (usually clay predominates. Other soils commonly present. When squeezed by hand will form into a firm ball. Most solids in well drained areas will fall into this classification).




Figure 69. Guy Adjuster and Tensiometer




Figure 70. Soil Class




Figure 71. Soil Class

Class 6. Plastic Wet, (usually clay predominates as in Class 5. Due to unfavorable moisture conditions such as areas subjected seasonally to heavy rainfall, sufficient water is present to penetrate the soil to appreciable depth and though the area is fairly well drained, the soil during such seasons becomes plastic and when squeezed will readily assume any shape. The soil is not uncommon in fairly flat terrain).

Class 7. Loose, Dry (found in arid regions; usually sand and gravel predominates. Filled in or built up areas in dry regions fall into this class. As the term implies, there is very little bond to hold the particles together).

Loose, Wet (same as Loose, Dry, for holding power. High in sand, gravel, or loam content. Holding power at some seasons good, but during rainy seasons absorbs excessive moisture readily with resultant loss of holding power. Predominant in poorly drained areas. This Class also includes very soft wet clay).

Class 8. Swamps and Marshes (including areas that are marshes only seasonally).

#### b. ANCHORS CONSIDERED

##### (1) Expansion Anchors

A typical expansion anchor is shown in figure 72. These anchors are rugged, simple, and can be installed with a reasonable amount of effort provided hole boring equipment is available. The principle of operation of the expansion anchor involves insertion of the anchor and rod into a bored hole, filling and tamping the hole, and setting or expanding the anchor by exerting a force on the anchor rod. After expansion, the anchor exerts force into undisturbed earth, providing good holding power after installation.


As shown in Table XVI, the expansion anchor may be used in most soil types. Important in the holding power of this anchor is the hole size and back-fill practices. This anchor in type 6 and 7 soils would exhibit relatively greater creep if difficulty is encountered in back tamping soft or sticky soils. The anchor cannot be recovered after use. However, the rod may be removed for use at another site. As shown in Table XVII, the rod weight represents approximately 50 percent of each rod-anchor combination weight.

The hole required for installation may be made by a power driven auger, either electric, as shown in figure 76 or a conventional gasoline powered unit.

##### (2) Screw Anchors

Perhaps the most commonly used anchor for medium load requirements is the screw anchor. The type considered here is of all welded construction, rather than the type with threaded rod and head, due to the capability of the former to be retracted by turning in the opposite direction. The screw anchor may be installed by hand or machine. Figure 73 shows a screw anchor being driven by an electric

(I) EXPANSION ANCHOR INSTALLATION



(II) ANCHOR EXPANDED AND BACKFILLED




Figure 72. Expansion Anchor




Figure 73. Anchor Installation - Power Tool

TABLE XVI. COMPARISON OF 16-18000 LB ANCHORS FOR CLASS 7 SOILS

| ANCHOR TYPE | COMPARABLE INSTALLATION TIME (EST) | WT. LBS. | REUSABLE | SOIL CLASS USAGE | ACCESSORY EQUIPMENT REQUIRED                                  |
|-------------|------------------------------------|----------|----------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| SCREW       | 2 MEN -<br>5 MIN.                  | 58       | YES      | 6-7              | POWER TOOL                                                    |
| EXPANSION   | 2 MEN -<br>25 MIN.                 | 53       | ROD ONLY | ALL              | POWER TOOL<br>AUGER<br>TAMPING TOOL                           |
| DEADMAN     | 2 MEN -<br>30 MIN.                 | 57       | YES      | ALL              | POWER TOOL<br>AUGERS<br>WINCH FOR<br>RECOVERY<br>TAMPING TOOL |

TABLE XVII. ANCHOR WEIGHT COMPARISON 16-18, 000 LBS. CAPACITY

| ANCHOR TYPE |                | SOIL CLASS |     |      |      |      |
|-------------|----------------|------------|-----|------|------|------|
|             |                | 3          | 4   | 5    | 6    | 7    |
| EXPANSION   | ANCHOR WT.     | 5.2        | 9   | 9    | 19   | 33   |
|             | ROD WT.        | 7.4        | 7.4 | 10.8 | 20   | 19.7 |
|             | HOLE SIZE, IN. | 8          | 8   | 8    | 10   | 12   |
| DEAD-MAN    | ANCHOR WT.     | 5.5        | 5.5 | 10.6 | 16   | 34   |
|             | ROD WT.        | 7.4        | 7.4 | 12.2 | 12.2 | 22.5 |
|             | HOLE SIZE, IN. | 6          | 6   | 6    | 8    | 8    |
| SCREW       | ANCHOR WT.     |            |     | 44.9 | 48   | 57.8 |

power tool developed by Collins Radio Company. An 8-inch diameter screw anchor may be driven in 2 to 4 minutes by two men in average soil.

Due to a minimum of soil disturbance, screw anchors perform well in most soil classes. As the soil becomes harder, the maximum loads carried by dead man and expanding anchors exceed that of screw anchors. Also, installation of screw anchors in harder soil becomes more difficult, as evidenced in an evaluation at Fort Huachuca,<sup>23</sup> Arizona, in which screw anchors could not be driven successfully, and holes had to be dug with power tools and explosives in the hard, rocky soil at the site.

### (3) Dead-Man Anchors

The dead-man plate type anchors, illustrated in figure 74, are particularly suited for heavy guy loads. These anchors pull against solid, undisturbed earth, and are not dependent on the quality of a tamped backfill for holding power.

Installation of the dead-man anchors are illustrated in figure 74. A machine bored hole is required for installation of the anchor. Dependent on soil conditions, the rod may be either driven or inserted in a small diameter machine bored hole. After the rod is secured to the anchor and the anchor pulled against the undisturbed earth, the hole is filled, tamping not required or desirable.

To retrieve the anchor, the rod is detached and pulled out. Then by use of a winch, the plate anchor may be retrieved by pulling on the retrieving cable. This retrieval method is not used commercially, due to the fact that these anchors are not required to be removed in general use. Retrieving of the plate anchor will require a pull force depending on soil conditions and length of time since installation. Since tamping of the soil filling the anchor holes does not add to the pulling power of the anchor, it is desirable to leave this back fill loose to facilitate removal of the anchor.

As shown in Table XVII, the dead-man and the expansion anchor weigh approximately the same, but a smaller hole size is required for installation of the dead-man anchor.

### (4) Arrowhead Anchors

The arrowhead anchor, as produced by Laconia Malleable Iron Company, is Military approved and covered in 4-, 6-, and 8-inch sizes by MIL-A-3962A. These sizes are not of sufficient holding strength for this application, but a 16-inch version of the same anchor is rated as follows:

| Anchor Size | Area                | Guy Line Length | Weight | Holding Strength, lbs |        |         |
|-------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|---------|
|             |                     |                 |        | Sand                  | Clay   | Hardpan |
| 16"         | 128 in <sup>2</sup> | optional        | 20 lbs | 11,500                | 21,000 | 27,500  |

The weight above does not include the guy line and hardware, which would weigh approximately 5 pounds.




Figure 74. Dead Man Anchor

The operation of the arrowhead anchor is shown in figure 75. The anchor has a steel pin over which a driving rod is positioned. The anchor may be driven by sledge hammer, impact tool or by air or electric hammers, if available. For tactical application, the sledge is assumed to be used. When the anchor is driven to the length of the cable, the driving rod is removed. At this time, a preload must be applied to the anchor, which turns the anchor at right angles to the guy cable. During this operation, the anchor will rise 2 to 6 inches.

An example of the application of this anchor is the AN/TSA-17 antenna group,<sup>22</sup> a lightweight tactical hf antenna. During development of this antenna, 4- and 6-inch arrowhead anchors were evaluated by Collins Radio Company, in soil which would fall into class 5. It was found that the 4-inch anchor and 6-inch anchor developed approximately equal holding strength of about 2500 pounds immediately after being driven. Since a load requirement higher than 2500 pounds existed, two 4-inch anchors were bridled together to provide the desired holding strength. These anchors are equipped with a retrieving cable, attached to one corner of the anchor. To retrieve the anchor, a winch is attached to the retrieving cable, and tension on the corner of the anchor turns the anchor edgewise, and the anchor is pulled from the ground.

Field reports on the AN/TSA-17 have indicated that the 4-inch arrowhead anchors hold very well in average soil. The retrieving process is not 100 percent effective, in that considerable tension is required on occasion to pull out the anchor, occasionally breaking retrieving cables.




Figure 75. Arrowhead Anchor

An investigation conducted by Haley and Aldrich<sup>24</sup> reports on tests of holding power of arrowhead anchors. However, the tests conducted were in sand only, and results for the 16-inch anchor were not satisfactory. All other holding strengths used for the arrowhead anchors are based on theory. Interesting to note is the fact that their tests on 4 and 6 inch anchors substantiated Collins Radio Company's tests in that no increase in holding power was noted, in fact the 6-inch at 735 pounds did not equal the 800 pound pullout force of the 4-inch anchors.

On the basis of experience, field reports, and what test results are available at this time, arrowheads would be considered applicable to light, transportable structures. However, on large structures such as the subject of this study, it is recommended that these anchors not be used until the theoretical operation of the larger 16-inch arrowhead is proven by extensive testing.

#### (5) Explosive Ground Anchors

Two manufacturers of explosive anchors provided two distinct approaches to an anchor design utilizing an explosive to aid in its installation. The Seastaple produced by the National Water Lift Company, is a cartridge actuated device intended for use as a sea or mooring anchor.


Harvey Aluminum manufactures the Earth Rivet for use in general purpose anchoring requirements.

The Seastaple anchor is a forcibly embedded dead-man type anchor ideally suited for precision or hard bottom mooring. An electrically fired cartridge in the body of the anchor supplies the force needed to drive the anchor. The inverted cone or bell at the top of the housing provides recoil absorption through the column of water (10 feet minimum) above the cone. The anchor head fired into the earth then functions similarly to the arrowhead anchor previously discussed. The gun or body of the anchor is to be returned to the factory for inspection after firing 10 times.


The National Water Lift Company has no existing design for a surface anchor, and no present plans for its development.

The Harvey Earth Anchor, shown in figure 76, is a surface anchor as opposed to the Seastaple, which functions under water. Figure 76 also illustrates the steps involved in installation of the Harvey Earth Anchor. A 2-inch diameter, high strength steel tube is driven into the ground or inserted into a 2-inch diameter drilled hole, depending on soil conditions. After the tube is in the ground, detonation of a small explosive charge, approximately 1/10 of a pound of RDX explosive, forms the lower end of the tube into umbrella-like "tines." The explosive charge, which is detonated electrically, also opens a highly compacted cavity (camoflet) underground which is filled through the tube with a quick-setting grout to form a large anchor head. Then a suitable termination fitting is attached to the tube for guy attachment. As little as 30 minutes is required for setting or curing of the grout, after which the anchor is ready for operation.


① DRIVEN ANCHOR



② ANCHOR EXPANDED



③ GROUT BEING POURED



④ ANCHOR SECURED




Figure 76. Explosive Anchor

Specifications of the Harvey Earth Anchor are as follows:

| Anchor Size         | Anchor Holding Strength, Lbs |        |        |        |        |        |
|---------------------|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Dia for Emplacement | 3                            | 4      | 5      | 6      | 7      | 8      |
| 2"                  | 40,000                       | 40,000 | 38,000 | 30,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |

Anchor weight: approx. 50 pounds

Grout wt/anchor: approx. 125 pounds (1 cu. ft.)

The Harvey Earth Anchor is in use by the U. S. Navy, and is used in the SATS program to secure the arresting gear mechanism which brings the aircraft to a stop similar to the technique used on aircraft carriers. The Harvey Earth Anchor is not re-usable, and a new set of anchors and grout is required for each erection. The logistic advantage of this anchor is that of a single type anchor is suitable for all applications. A source of water is required for mixing of the grout. In view of the system weight requirements, the Harvey Anchor would not be applicable.

#### c. ANCHOR INSTALLATION EQUIPMENT

Two types of anchor driving tools are available, conventional gasoline engine portable power units, made by various manufacturers, and the 280B-1 Anchor Driver, built by Collins Radio Company. Both types are adaptable for driving screw anchors, and boring holes in the earth to facilitate installation of other types of anchors.

A representative list of gasoline power units is as follows:

| Auger Size Inches | Horsepower | Weight, Tool & Auger Pounds |
|-------------------|------------|-----------------------------|
| 2                 | 3/4        | 16                          |
| 8                 | 2-3/4      | 45                          |
| 12                | 4-3/4      | 82                          |
| 16                | 6 to 9     | 90                          |

These power tools are geared from 20:1 to 50:1 and have slip clutches to protect the operator and the equipment should an obstruction be hit.

An advantage of the gasoline powered unit is that it is free from the requirement of having a power cable required to reach all anchor points, in the case considered, 300 feet.

The 280B-1 anchor driver is an electrically powered, portable, hand-held unit designed for installing screw anchors. It can be adapted to drive a 5-ton winch, or can be adapted to drive an earth auger. It consists of a reversible, series-wound gearmotor, a baseplate, and two 4-foot handles. Specifications are as follows:

|                        |                                                             |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Direction of rotation: | reversible                                                  |
| Max output torque:     | 400 ft lb @ 40 rpm                                          |
| Input power:           | 115 vac @ 25 to 60 cps                                      |
| Current requirements:  | 5 amp - no load<br>16 amp - 120 ft-lb<br>35 amp - 400 ft-lb |
| Input connector:       | Std 3 prong                                                 |
| Weight:                | 50 pounds                                                   |
| Stored dimensions:     | 20x18x51 inches                                             |

A rectifier must be used if 220-volt 400-cps power is to be used.

The adapter required for driving anchors may be removed to permit the power tool to adapt directly with a standard winch to be used in antenna erection, or to a standard earth auger for hole boring. The maximum hole in average soil that could be augered is 8 inches in diameter.

#### d. ANALYSIS

For a comparative analysis of anchors, a 300-foot tower guyed at 50-foot intervals is considered, with 9 radial wires at the top, for a total of 9 radial anchors, and 15 guy anchors. For a safety factor of 2, the guy anchors should have a holding power of 16 to 18,000 lb, and the radial anchors a holding power of approximately 5,000 pounds.

The screw, dead-man, and expansion anchors are capable in varying degrees of compliance with the requirements. In terms of re-usability, installation time and effort, and simplicity, the screw anchor is superior to the expansion and dead-man anchor, except in the harder classes of soil where the use of the screw anchor is not possible. Table XVI shows a comparison of the above anchors.

The total anchor weight using nine 5,000-pound screw anchors and fifteen 16-18,000-pound anchors would be approximately 1,140 pounds for class 7 soils. The weight of the expansion and dead-man anchors would be approximately the same for class 7 soils. However, for class 5 soils, the weight of dead-man or expansion anchors is less, 360 pounds opposed to 747 lbs.

In view of the considerable man-hour requirement advantage of the screw anchor (approximately 4 man-hours of actual direct installation time versus approximately 20 man-hours required for the dead-man or expansion anchor), it is recommended that the screw type anchor be supplied with the antenna system for use in class 6 and 7; also recommended to be included with the antenna system is a set of dead-man anchors suitable for soil classes 5 to 3, where the installation of screw

anchors becomes very difficult. The expansion anchor is not recommended for the reason that the anchor head is not recoverable.

As a final comment on anchors, it should be noted that the Harvey Anchor would be ideal for instances where a semi-permanent installation of the antenna system could be used, at which time the necessary anchors and grout could be shipped separately. A possible future development of the Harvey Anchor principle in which no grout would be required, and the anchor would expand itself similar to an expansion anchor, would possibly result in this anchor as the optimum for large transportable structures of this type.

The requirement for the power tool to drive the anchors and augers recommended exceed the present capability of the 280B-1 power tool, and a gasoline powered tool of at least 4-3/4 hp is recommended. Although the reliability and maintainability of the gasoline powered tool is not equal to the 280B-1, it is more than sufficiently capable of meeting the requirements of 15 to 20 erections of the antenna with a minimum of maintenance.

## 9. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF LIGHTING SYSTEM

### a. GENERAL

An antenna structure of the size and type discussed in this test is considered a hazard to air navigation and will normally require some type of obstruction lighting system. When considering the type of lighting to be used, the prime considerations must be the amount of light desired, the mode of operation (flashing or steady), and the specifications to be conformed to, if any.

### b. SYSTEMS CONSIDERED

Three different light systems were considered and are presented herein:

- (1) A system which complies in all respects to FAA - Specification A-2 for towers up to 300 feet in overall height.
- (2) A system placing flashing lights at both top and midpoint of the tower.
- (3) A system placing steady lights at both top and midpoint of the tower.

#### (a) FAA System

The first system shown in figure 77 consists of a 300-MM code beacon which mounts at the top of the tower, two single lamp obstruction light fixtures mounted at the midpoint of the tower, a flasher unit located near the base insulator, a photoelectric control cell located directly below the flasher and all interconnecting conduit junction boxes and cabling.

The 300-MM code beacon is a large unit constructed of aluminum castings, and housing two 500, 620, or 700 watt lamps. It utilizes heat resistant color filters which can be supplied in red, green, yellow, or clear. The unit is ventilated to provide lower inside temperatures and increase lamp light.




Figure 77. Fixture Location to Meet FAA Specs.

The single lamp fixtures consist of cast aluminum fittings and have red, heat resistant lens. The fixture can be obtained with either a bottom or side entrance conduit fitting.

The flasher and photocell can be obtained in separate units or as a combination. In either case, they are housed in cast aluminum enclosures. Flasher units generally consist of motor driven, cam actuated mercury tilt switches which have proven to be highly reliable. Photo-electric control cells are adjusted to turn the system on when exposed to a northern sky light intensity of 35 foot-candles and off when exposed to 58 foot-candles.

(b) Flashing Light System

The second system is identical to the first with the exception that the 300-MM code beacon is replaced at the top of the tower with two single fixtures identical to those located at the tower midpoint. This system as shown in figure 78 also includes the flasher, photo-electric control cell and all interconnecting conduit junction boxes and cabling.

(c) Non-Flashing Light System

The third system is identical to the second with the added exception that the flasher unit is not used. This results in steady lights at the top and midpoints of the antenna.

c. POWER SUPPLY SYSTEMS

The problem of power transmission to the lighting system becomes a formidable one when a base insulator is utilized. It is necessary to transmit power across the base insulator, while at the same time maintaining the insulating properties required. Four different approaches were considered to arrive at the best solution to the problem.

(1) Battery Power

The possibility of utilizing battery power from a unit located above the insulator was considered with the conclusion that even with the less demanding of the three lighting systems a battery is not economically feasible which could operate for any length of time without recharging.

(2) Gasoline Driven Power Unit

A gasoline driven power unit was considered which would mount to the tower above the base insulator. This configuration requires the lifting and attaching of the power unit to the tower. Of all methods considered, the gasoline driven unit is the least costly and lightest, however, it has serious drawbacks in that it must be fueled often even with a special, larger fuel tank. The unit would be more difficult to transport due to oil spillage and would be more demanding from a maintenance standpoint. Reliability is considered good.

(3) Motor-Generator Combination

The third power transmitting system considered consisted of an electric motor-generator set with the motor mounted on the ground base plate and the




Figure 78. Fixture Location, Minimum Requirement

generator mounted directly above it to the tower above the base insulator. Both units are mounted with their shafts in a vertical plane and are connected by a dielectric shaft with the same insulating properties of the base insulator. This configuration is approximately 5 to 8 times as expensive as the gasoline power unit, and 3 to 5 times heavier. Installation requires alignment of the two units and also is hampered by the weight. Reliability of this system is higher than that of the gasoline power unit.

#### (4) Isolation Transformer

The fourth, and last, system considered is that of an isolation transformer consisting of two interlocking rings one of which is mounted to the base plate and the other is mounted to the tower above the base insulator. The isolation transformer provides a highly reliable means of supplying power across the base insulator. The two transformer rings are wrapped and insulated using fiber glass insulation and epoxy coatings which protect them during operation under even the most severe weather. Cost and weight of this type of system compare favorably to the other systems considered. The cost is approximately 2 to 3 times that of the gasoline power unit and the weight is 1-1/2 to 2 times that of the gasoline unit less fuel. These comparisons are based on the requirement of two isolation transformers required to operate the largest of the three lighting systems. If the small lighting system were used, the isolation transformer system would compare equally with the gasoline power unit.


#### d. ANALYSIS

A comparative analysis of the three methods or systems considered show that while all three are equally good in certain areas, the simpler the system, the more advantageous it is in terms of cost, weight, ease of installing and maintaining, and reliability. Table XVIII shows a comparison of cost and weight of the three systems based on current catalog information. Ease of installation is nearly proportional to weight since method of mounting will be similar in all systems. The absence of the heavy (78 pounds) code beacon in systems two and three reduces both the transported weight and the lifted weight during installation. Maintenance and reliability are somewhat altered as the code beacon and flasher units are eliminated in systems two and three, however, due to the high reliability of both of these units, neither maintenance or reliability will vary greatly.

After consideration of the above lighting systems and power transmitting devices, it is felt that unless a specific requirement must be met, the lesser of the three lighting systems is adequate to comply with the "tactical" classification of the antenna system. This being the case, an overall system including a single 750 watt isolation transformer is recommended to provide power thru an electric-control photo cell to two fixtures each located at the top of the tower and at the midpoint as shown in figure 78.

Under the requirements of FAA specifications A-2, the first lighting system must be utilized, see figure 77 along with a pair of 750 watt isolation transformers as shown in figure 79.

TABLE XVIII. COST AND WEIGHT COMPARISON LIGHTING SYSTEM






Figure 79. Lighting System Power Transmission

## LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Montgomery, Dicke & Purcell, "Principles of Microwave Circuits", MIT Radiation Lab Series, 1963, p. 230.
2. R. E. Collin & S. Rothchild, "Evaluation of Antenna Q", PGAP Vol. AP-12, (Jan. 1964), pp. 23-27.
3. S. A. Schelkunoff, "Electromagnetic Waves", D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc. (1943), p. 473.
4. W. L. Weeks, "Electromagnetic Theory for Engineering Applications", John Wiley & Sons, (1964), p. 546.
5. C. T. Tai, Journal of Applied Physics, Vol. 20, (Nov. 1949), pp. 1076-1084.
6. H. Jasik, "Antenna Engineering Handbook", McGraw-Hill Book Co. (1961), p. 3-10.
7. S. A. Schelkunoff & H. T. Friis, "Antennas, Theory and Practice," John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1952), p. 110.
8. A. F. Gangi, S. Sensiper, & G. R. Dunn, "The Characteristics of Electrically Short Umbrella Top-Loaded Antennas", SGC TM 1A-12, Space-General Corp., 9200 East Flair Drive, El Monte, California.
9. C. E. Smith & E. M. Johnson, "Performance of Short Antennas", Proceedings I.R.E., October 1947, pp. 1026-1038.
10. Navy Report (unpublished at this time).
11. Schelkunoff, op. cite. 7 page 155.
12. S. Ramo & J. R. Whinnery, "Fields and Waves in Modern Radio", John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1943), pp. 395-401.
13. J. D. Kraus, "Antennas", McGraw-Hill Book Company (1950), pp. 41-56.
14. E. A. LaPort, "Radio Antenna Engineering", McGraw-Hill Book Company (1952), p. 446.
15. F. W. Peek, Jr., "Dielectric Phenomena in High Voltage Engineering", McGraw-Hill Book Company (1929), pp. 30 & 73.
16. Peak, op. cite. p. 161.
17. "Radio Insulators", Locke Department, General Electric Company, Baltimore, Maryland, pp. 5-6.
18. J. R. Wait & W. A. Pope, "Input Resistance of L. F. Unipole Aerials," Wireless Engineer, Vol. 32 (1955), pp. 131-138.

19. S. W. Maley & R. J. King, "Impedance of a Monopole Antenna with a Radial-Wire Ground System on an Imperfectly Conduction Half-Space, Part II", Journal of Research, NBS, Vol. 68D No. 2, February 1964.
20. G. H. Brown, R. F. Lewis, & J. Spstein, "Ground Systems as a Factor in Antenna Efficiency", Proceedings I.R.E., Vol. 25 No. 6, June 1937.
21. Wind Forces on Structures, American Society of Civil Engineers, Paper No. 3269.
22. Uriniak, A. J. RADC "Test and Evaluation Report on Log-Periodic Antenna Group AN/TSA-17 ( )" June, 1964.
23. Report of USATECOM Project No. 6-32314-01, Engr./Service Test of Tower, Antenna AB-585( )/G, July, 1963.
24. Haley & Aldrich, Consulting Soil Engineers, Cambridge, Mass., "Investigation of Pullout Resistance of Universal Ground Anchors", December 1960.

**APPENDIX I**  
**Design Requirements for Loran-D**  
**Antenna System**

## DESIGN REQUIREMENTS FOR LORAN-D ANTENNA SYSTEM

### 1. BASIC REQUIREMENTS

The basic design requirements for a tactical, lightweight, low frequency antenna are as follows:

#### a. ENVIRONMENTAL

- (1) Wind velocity: 70 knots to be considered as a basic wind velocity measured 30 feet above the surface, and varied with height according to ASCE Transaction No. 3269.
- (2) Ice: 1/2 inch radial glazed ice on guys and 1 inch radial glazed ice on all other exposed surfaces with simultaneous 70 knot winds. 1 inch radial glazed ice on all members with simultaneous 25 knot winds.
- (3) Temperature: -65°F to 160°F storage  
-65°F to 120°F operating
- (4) Relative Humidity: Up to 100% including condensation due to temperature changes.
- (5) Barometric Pressure: 28.50 to 30.50 in hf
- (6) Salt Atmosphere: As encountered in coastal regions
- (7) Sand and Dust: As encountered in arid regions (0.0017 dia Particles)
- (8) Insects and fungi: As encountered in tropics
- (9) Service Life: 2 years, during which antenna is erected approximately 15 times.
- (10) Transportability: Shall be capable of transportation by water, land, and sea; compatible with 463L "Rail" System.

#### b. STRUCTURAL

- (1) Height: 300 feet with a 150-foot capability
- (2) Weight: A minimum weight is the objective with a design goal of less than 3000 pounds
- (3) Packaging: Antenna group to be transportable in 2-1/2 ton military vehicle. Maximum section length is 12 feet.
- (4) Erection Time: Maximum of 8 hrs by 10 man military crew, grade E5-E7 level.

(5) Deflection: So as not to impair electrical performance requirements

(6) Base Section: To support structure on 3000 psf soil.

c. ELECTRICAL

(1) Voltage handling: 50 kv peak  
40 kv rms

(2) Current handling: 100 ampere minimum

(3) Power handling: 3 kw peak  
400 watts average

(4) Pulse shape: fast rise leading edge (cosine @ 80 microseconds),  
log delay of trailing edge, 10% amplitude width of 200 microseconds

(5) Frequency: 100 kHz, 3 db Bw of 6 kHz (loaded system BW)

(6) Pulse spectrum: 99% of energy contained 90-100 kHz

**APPENDIX II.**  
**Sample Data from Tower Analysis**  
**Computer Run**

# ANTENNA TOWER STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS PROGRAM

| WIND VELOCITY<br>MPH            |                  | TEMP CHANGE<br>° F          |      | ICE THICK.<br>ON TOWER ~ IN.             |     | ICE THICK.<br>ON GUYS ~ IN.                |      |                             |    | GUY CODE<br>SECTION                                                                                             |       |                      |      |                          |  |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|------|------------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|----------------------|------|--------------------------|--|
| 8057                            |                  | 40                          |      | 1                                        |     | 5                                          |      |                             |    |  TRIANGULAR<br>01 SQUARE<br>02 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| MOM. AT TOP<br>OF TOWER ~ FT-LB |                  | VERT. FORCE<br>AT TOP ~ LB. |      | HORIZ. FORCE<br>AT TOP ~ LB.             |     | LENGTH OF<br>BASE ~ FT.                    |      |                             |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 0                               |                  | 750                         |      | 0                                        |     | 0                                          |      |                             |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| GUY<br>CODE                     | NO. OF<br>GUYS   | AE OF GUY WIRE              |      | COEFF. TH. EXP.<br>IN./IN./° F<br>OF GUY |     | COEFF. TH. EXP.<br>IN./IN./° F<br>OF TOWER |      | GUY PRELOAD<br>~ LB.        |    | WT. OF GUY<br>~ LB/FT                                                                                           |       | DIA. OF<br>GUY ~ IN. |      | DIST. TO<br>BR. AN ~ FT. |  |
| SECT.<br>CODE                   | NO. OF<br>SECTS. | E OF TOWER                  |      | HT. OF SECT. ~ FT.                       |     | d OF SECT ~ IN.                            |      | VERT. HT. OF<br>DIAG. ~ IN. |    | DENSITY<br>LB./CU. IN.                                                                                          |       | DIA. LEG<br>IN.      |      | TH. LEG<br>IN.           |  |
|                                 |                  | 5                           | 10   | 15                                       | 20  | 25                                         | 30   | 35                          | 40 | 45                                                                                                              | 50    |                      |      |                          |  |
| 3                               | 10               | 12                          | 1.8  | E+                                       | 57. | E-                                         | 61.3 | E-                          | 5  | 450                                                                                                             | 0.233 | 1.88                 | 3.0  | 1.25                     |  |
| 4                               | 3                | 16                          | 1.03 | E+                                       | 73. | E+                                         | 0.3  | 118                         | E+ | 1                                                                                                               | 30    | 1                    | 2    | 1.25                     |  |
| 5                               | 10               | 34                          | 4    | E+                                       | 57. | E-                                         | 61.3 | E-                          | 5  | 2700                                                                                                            | 1.49  | 5                    | 250  | 1.25                     |  |
| 6                               | 3                | 17                          | 1.03 | E+                                       | 73. | E+                                         | 0.3  | 118                         | E+ | 1                                                                                                               | 30    | 1                    | 2    | 1.25                     |  |
| 7                               | 10               | 37                          | 2    | E+                                       | 57. | E-                                         | 61.3 | E-                          | 5  | 2700                                                                                                            | 1.16  | 4.38                 | 2.48 | 1.25                     |  |
| 8                               | 3                | 17                          | 1.03 | E+                                       | 73. | E+                                         | 0.3  | 118                         | E+ | 1                                                                                                               | 30    | 1                    | 2    | 1.25                     |  |
| 9                               | 10               | 35                          | 2    | E+                                       | 57. | E-                                         | 61.3 | E-                          | 5  | 1900                                                                                                            | 0.86  | 3.75                 | 1.00 | 1.25                     |  |
| 10                              | 3                | 17                          | 1.03 | E+                                       | 72. | E+                                         | 0.3  | 118                         | E+ | 1                                                                                                               | 30    | 1                    | 2    | 1.25                     |  |
| 11                              | 10               | 34                          | 0    | E+                                       | 57. | E-                                         | 61.3 | E-                          | 5  | 1500                                                                                                            | 0.61  | 3.12                 | 0.8  | 1.25                     |  |
| 12                              | 3                | 16                          | 1.03 | E+                                       | 73. | E+                                         | 0.3  | 118                         | E+ | 1                                                                                                               | 30    | 1                    | 2    | 1.25                     |  |
| 13                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 14                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 15                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 16                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 17                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 18                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 19                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 20                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 21                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 22                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 23                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 24                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 25                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 26                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 27                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 28                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 29                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 30                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |
| 31                              |                  |                             |      | E                                        |     | E                                          |      | E                           |    |                                                                                                                 |       |                      |      |                          |  |

275482  
E.P. NO.

200' 1/4" DIA. W/ 1/4" - 2" 300  
DESCRIPTION

L. Johnson  
NAME

1

# ANTENNA TOWER STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS PROGRAM

[illegible]

12-3-20

1. John-4.4

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

/ OF /  
PAGE NO.

2

[illegible]

[illegible]

# ACC. VERTICAL FORCE

## DEFLECTION

## SHEAR

## MOMENT

## SECTION NO. FROM TOP

| SECTION NO. FROM TOP | MOMENT | SHEAR | DEFLECTION | ACC. VERTICAL FORCE |
|----------------------|--------|-------|------------|---------------------|
| TOP                  | 0      | -2013 | 2.9847     | 5615                |
| 1                    | -5559  | -1697 | 2.9841     | 5747                |
| 2                    | -10147 | -1381 | 2.9797     | 5880                |
| 3                    | -13758 | -1067 | 2.9705     | 6013                |
| 4                    | -16388 | -755  | 2.9554     | 6145                |
| 5                    | -18034 | -443  | 2.9338     | 6276                |
| 6                    | -18693 | -132  | 2.9052     | 6410                |
| 7                    | -18367 | 178   | 2.8695     | 6543                |
| 8                    | -17059 | 486   | 2.8288     | 6675                |
| 9                    | -14771 | 793   | 2.7775     | 6808                |
| 10                   | -11511 | 1099  | 2.7221     | 6940                |
| 11                   | -7288  | 1404  | 2.6616     | 7073                |
| 12                   | -2113  | 1708  | 2.5971     | 7206                |
| 13                   | 4001   | 2010  | 2.5299     | 7338                |
| 14                   | 11038  | 2311  | 2.4617     | 7471                |
| 15                   | 18978  | 2611  | 2.3943     | 7603                |
| 16                   | 27799  | 2910  | 2.3237     | 7736                |
| 17                   | 20517  | 2633  | 2.2504     | 7868                |
| 18                   | 13897  | 2137  | 2.1744     | 8000                |
| 19                   | 8141   | 1842  | 2.0964     | 8134                |
| 20                   | 3247   | 1549  | 2.0162     | 8266                |
| 21                   | -709   | 1257  | 1.9345     | 8399                |
| 22                   | -3777  | 947   | 1.8511     | 8531                |
| 23                   | -5927  | -678  | 1.7659     | 8664                |
| 24                   | -7154  | -391  | 1.6784     | 8796                |
| 25                   | -7458  | -105  | 1.5872     | 8929                |
| 26                   | -6842  | 180   | 1.4920     | 9061                |
| 27                   | -5310  | 443   | 1.3933     | 9194                |
| 28                   | -2875  | 744   | 1.2913     | 9326                |
| 29                   | 450    | 1024  | 1.1872     | 9459                |
| 30                   | 4646   | 1302  | 1.0811     | 9591                |
| 31                   | 9491   | 1578  | 0.9722     | 9724                |
| 32                   | 15546  | 1853  | 0.8614     | 9856                |
| 33                   | 22212  | 2126  | 0.7484     | 9989                |
| 34                   | 15199  | -2594 | 0.6331     | 10121               |
| 35                   | 8681   | -2322 | 0.5151     | 10254               |
| 36                   | 2961   | -2053 | 0.3945     | 10386               |
| 37                   | -1933  | -1785 | 0.2711     | 10519               |
| 38                   | -5081  | -1520 | 0.1459     | 10651               |
| 39                   | -9162  | -1256 | 0.0184     | 10784               |
| 40                   | -11464 | -994  | 0.0003     | 10916               |
| 41                   | -12878 | -734  | 1.7827     | 11049               |
| 42                   | -13402 | -476  | 1.7599     | 11181               |
| 43                   | -13039 | -220  | 1.7319     | 11314               |
| 44                   | -11799 | 33    | 1.6988     | 11446               |
| 45                   | -9694  | 284   | 1.6608     | 11579               |
| 46                   | -6744  | 533   | 1.6187     | 11711               |
| 47                   | -2975  | 779   | 1.5732     | 11844               |
| 48                   | 1386   | 1023  | 1.5253     | 11976               |
| 49                   | 6900   | 1265  | 1.4763     | 12109               |
| 50                   | 12929  | 1504  | 1.4259     | 12241               |
| 51                   | 7379   | -2242 | 1.3747     | 12374               |
| 52                   | 2227   | -2008 | 1.3208     | 12506               |
| 53                   |        | -1776 | 1.2653     | 12639               |

|    |        |       |        |       |
|----|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| 53 | -2204  | -1547 | 1.3709 | 27824 |
| 54 | -5889  | -1321 | 1.3494 | 27957 |
| 55 | -8809  | -1097 | 1.3248 | 28089 |
| 56 | -10950 | -877  | 1.2964 | 28222 |
| 57 | -12305 | -659  | 1.2637 | 28355 |
| 58 | -12872 | -445  | 1.2264 | 28487 |
| 59 | -12657 | -234  | 1.1843 | 28620 |
| 60 | -11671 | -26   | 1.1375 | 28752 |
| 61 | -9932  | 179   | 1.0865 | 28885 |
| 62 | -7463  | 380   | 1.0315 | 29017 |
| 63 | -4294  | 577   | 0.9734 | 29150 |
| 64 | -463   | 771   | 0.9130 | 29282 |
| 65 | 3990   | 961   | 0.8514 | 29415 |
| 66 | 9015   | 1147  | 0.7897 | 29548 |
| 67 | 14559  | 1328  | 0.7293 | 29680 |
| 68 | 9869   | -2062 | 0.7846 | 31936 |
| 69 | 5532   | -1885 | 0.6956 | 32069 |
| 70 | 1693   | -1713 | 0.6634 | 32201 |
| 71 | -1627  | -1547 | 0.6316 | 32334 |
| 72 | -4448  | -1388 | 0.5992 | 32466 |
| 73 | -6738  | -1236 | 0.5655 | 32599 |
| 74 | -8503  | -1090 | 0.5296 | 32732 |
| 75 | -9734  | -948  | 0.4911 | 32864 |
| 76 | -10418 | -806  | 0.4496 | 32997 |
| 77 | -10550 | -664  | 0.4046 | 33129 |
| 78 | -10127 | -522  | 0.3562 | 33262 |
| 79 | -9154  | -380  | 0.3041 | 33394 |
| 80 | -7639  | -238  | 0.2487 | 33527 |
| 81 | -5596  | -95   | 0.1900 | 33659 |
| 82 | -3041  | 47    | 0.1287 | 33792 |
| 83 | -0     | 189   | 0.0651 | 33925 |
|    |        | 331   | 0.0000 | 34057 |

| GUY NO. FROM TOP | TENSION ON GUY | TOTAL<br>HORIZONTAL REACTION | HORIZONTAL<br>REACTION ON GUY | VERTICAL<br>REACTION ON GUY |
|------------------|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1                | 1969           | 4896                         | 2883                          | 5615                        |
| 2                | 8303           | 6302                         | 863                           | 5940                        |
| 3                | 6904           | 5162                         | 442                           | 4948                        |
| 4                | 5855           | 4187                         | 204                           | 4297                        |
| 5                | 5162           | 3479                         | 89                            | 2256                        |

| SECTION NO. FROM TOP | LEG STRESS | DIAGONAL STRESS | HORIZONTAL STRESS |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1                    | 5847       | 20528           | 3198              |
| 2                    | 8305       | 17035           | 2604              |
| 3                    | 10253      | 13553           | 2012              |
| 4                    | 11687      | 10084           | 1422              |
| 5                    | 12607      | 6626            | 835               |
| 6                    | 13012      | 3181            | 249               |
| 7                    | 12902      | 252             | 335               |
| 8                    | 12278      | 3672            | 916               |
| 9                    | 11142      | 7079            | 1495              |
| 10                   | 9498       | 10473           | 2072              |
| 11                   | 7351       | 13354           | 2647              |
| 12                   | 4706       | 17222           | 3219              |
| 13                   | 5753       | 20576           | 3789              |
| 14                   | 9491       | 23916           | 4357              |
| 15                   | 13701      | 27243           | 4922              |
| 16                   | 16372      | 30555           | 5485              |
| 17                   | 17315      | 2640            | 5485              |
| 18                   | 13914      | 25290           | 4028              |
| 19                   | 10966      | 22022           | 3472              |
| 20                   | 8478       | 18769           | 2920              |
| 21                   | 7201       | 15531           | 2370              |
| 22                   | 8865       | 12310           | 1823              |
| 23                   | 10048      | 9104            | 1278              |
| 24                   | 10750      | 5914            | 736               |
| 25                   | 10969      | 2740            | 197               |
| 26                   | 10707      | 416             | 339               |
| 27                   | 9968       | 3556            | 872               |
| 28                   | 8753       | 6678            | 1402              |
| 29                   | 7546       | 9783            | 1930              |
| 30                   | 4799       | 12473           | 2454              |
| 31                   | 12496      | 15739           | 2975              |
| 32                   | 15672      | 18989           | 3493              |
| 33                   | 19160      | 22021           | 4007              |
| 34                   | 17795      | 1788            | 4378              |
| 35                   | 14448      | 24215           | 3870              |
| 36                   | 11518      | 21243           | 3365              |
| 37                   | 11341      | 18290           | 2864              |
| 38                   | 13217      | 15359           | 2367              |
| 39                   | 14939      | 12449           | 1873              |
| 40                   | 16202      | 9560            | 1383              |
| 41                   | 17002      | 6673            | 897               |
| 42                   | 17336      | 3849            | 414               |
| 43                   | 17206      | 1031            | 63                |
| 44                   | 16619      | 1758            | 536               |
| 45                   | 15578      | 4523            | 1005              |
| 46                   | 14096      | 7263            | 1469              |
| 47                   | 12185      | 9378            | 1929              |
| 48                   | 11519      | 12667           | 2385              |
| 49                   | 14357      | 15329           | 2836              |
| 50                   | 17568      | 17964           | 3282              |
| 51                   | 16673      | 1473            | 3784              |
| 52                   | 14940      | 20939           | 3347              |
| 53                   | 14088      | 18340           | 2916              |
| 54                   | 16074      | 15871           | 2489              |
| 55                   | 17560      | 13383           | 2068              |
| 56                   | 18839      | 10926           | 1653              |

|    |       |       |      |
|----|-------|-------|------|
| 57 | 19407 | 8502  | 1243 |
| 58 | 19964 | 6112  | 839  |
| 59 | 19912 | 3756  | 441  |
| 60 | 19456 | 1436  | 49   |
| 61 | 18607 | 847   | 337  |
| 62 | 17376 | 3092  | 716  |
| 63 | 15780 | 5298  | 1088 |
| 64 | 13838 | 7463  | 1453 |
| 65 | 15741 | 9586  | 1811 |
| 66 | 18428 | 11664 | 2161 |
| 67 | 21386 | 13697 | 2504 |
| 68 | 20016 | 3079  | 3552 |
| 69 | 17809 | 19910 | 3229 |
| 70 | 15862 | 18045 | 2917 |
| 71 | 15893 | 16248 | 2617 |
| 72 | 17422 | 14524 | 2329 |
| 73 | 18679 | 12673 | 2055 |
| 74 | 19662 | 11281 | 1787 |
| 75 | 20365 | 9708  | 1519 |
| 76 | 20783 | 8135  | 1251 |
| 77 | 20911 | 6562  | 983  |
| 78 | 20751 | 4989  | 716  |
| 79 | 20302 | 3416  | 448  |
| 80 | 19570 | 1843  | 180  |
| 81 | 18562 | 270   | 88   |
| 82 | 17287 | 1303  | 356  |
| 83 | 15757 | 2876  | 624  |

| SECTION NO. FROM TOP | LEG SLENDERNESS RATIO | DIAGONAL SLENDERNESS RATIO | HORIZONTAL SLENDERNESS RATIO |
|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1                    | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 2                    | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 3                    | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 4                    | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 5                    | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 6                    | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 7                    | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 8                    | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 9                    | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 10                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 11                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 12                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 13                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 14                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 15                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 16                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 17                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 18                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 19                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 20                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 21                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 22                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 23                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 24                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 25                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 26                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 27                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 28                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 29                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 30                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 31                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 32                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 33                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 34                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 35                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 36                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 37                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 38                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 39                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 40                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 41                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 42                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 43                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 44                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 45                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 46                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 47                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 48                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 49                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 50                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 51                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 52                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 53                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 54                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |
| 55                   | 44                    | 419                        | 54                           |



### **APPENDIX III.**

**Derivation of Structural Analysis and Equations  
Stress Analysis of TILT UP Erection Procedure**

## GUY STIFFNESS

Guys of guyed towers act as spring supports for the tower, and their spring rate must be computed in order to determine their contribution to the total elastic energy. The guys are assumed to be acting in a straight line from the tie at the tower to the ground anchor. The stiffness of a single guy from a force putting it into tension would be:


$K$  = stiffness (spring rate)

$P$  = guy tension

$$\Delta L = \frac{PL}{AE}$$

Find: Spring constant or stiffness in horizontal plane at guy attachment point

$$\Delta L = \frac{PL}{AE}$$



$$K_{\text{along guy}} = \frac{P}{\Delta L} = \frac{AE}{L}$$

$$\cos \theta = \frac{s}{L}$$

$$K_{\text{horizontal}} = \frac{P \cos \theta}{\Delta L} = \frac{AE}{L \cos \theta} \quad L = (s^2 + l_1^2)^{1/2}$$

$$= \frac{P}{\Delta L} = \frac{AE}{L \cos^2 \theta} = \frac{AE s^2}{(s^2 + l_1^2)^{1/2} (s^2 + l_1^2)^{1/2} (s^2 + l_1^2)^{1/2}}$$

$$= \frac{AE s^2}{(l_1^2 + s^2)^{1.5}}$$

For  $n$  guys,

$$K_{\text{horizontal}} = \frac{n AE s^2}{2(l_1^2 + s^2)^{1.5}}$$

# SHEAR STIFFNESS FOR TRIANGULAR X-BRACE TOWER


wind  $\perp$  to tower face

d = diagonal


H = horizontal

D = dia

$t_w$  = wall thickness



$$\delta = \sum \frac{P_P \Delta l}{AE} \quad (\text{Method of least work})$$



Consider diagonal and horizontal members only.

one face of tower

DIAGONALS. 2 Active in Height h

$$P = \frac{V}{\sqrt{3}} \left( \frac{\sqrt{1.33 d^2 + h^2}}{2d/\sqrt{3}} \right) = V \frac{\sqrt{1.33 d^2 + h^2}}{2d}$$

$$p = \frac{P}{V} = \frac{\sqrt{1.33 d^2 + h^2}}{2d} \quad \Delta l = \sqrt{1.33 d^2 + h^2}$$

HORIZONTALS. 2 Active in Height h

$$P = \frac{V}{\sqrt{3}} \quad p = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \quad \Delta l = d_1 = \frac{2d}{\sqrt{3}}$$

$$\delta_{\text{SHEAR}} = 2 \left[ \frac{V \sqrt{1.33 d^2 + h^2}}{2d} \right] \left[ \frac{\sqrt{1.33 d^2 + h^2}}{2d} \right] \frac{\sqrt{1.33 d^2 + h^2}}{A_D E}$$

$$+ 2 \left( \frac{V}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \frac{2d}{A_H E \sqrt{3}} = \frac{V(1.33 d^2 + h^2)}{2d^2 A_D E} + \frac{4d}{3\sqrt{3} A_H E}$$

$$AG = \frac{VL}{\delta} \quad L = h$$

$$AG = \frac{h E}{\frac{(1.33 d^1 + h^2)^{1.5}}{2d^2 Ad} + \frac{.77 d}{A_H}} \quad \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ d \\ \uparrow \end{array}$$

$d_1 = 1.33 d$

$$AG = \frac{h E}{\frac{(d_1^2 + h^2)^{1.5}}{1.5 d^2 Ad} + \frac{.577 d_1}{A_H}} = \frac{\pi h E}{\frac{(d_1^2 + h^2)^{1.5}}{1.5 d_1^2 t_{w_d} (D_d - t_{w_d})} + \frac{.577 d_1}{t_{w_H} (D_H - t_{w_H})}}$$

### BENDING STIFFNESS OF TOWER

$$= IE$$


$I$  = moment of inertia

$E$  = modulus of elasticity

$tw_L$  = wall thickness of leg

$D_L$  = dia of leg

$d_1$  = distance between legs



$$d_1 = 1.33 d$$

$$= \frac{2d}{\sqrt{3}}$$

$$A_{leg} = \frac{\pi}{4} \left[ D_L^2 - (D_L - 2 t_{w_L})^2 \right]$$

$$A_{leg} = \pi t_{w_L} \left[ D_L - t_{w_L} \right]$$


$$I = \frac{2}{3} A_L d^2 = \frac{2}{3} \pi t_{w_L} (D_L - t_{w_L}) d^2$$

$$I = .67 \pi t_{w_L} (D_L - t_{w_L}) d^2$$

$$I = \frac{\pi}{2} t_{wL} (D_L - t_{wL}) d_1^2$$

$$IE = \frac{\pi}{2} t_{wL} (D_L - t_{wL}) d_1^2 E$$

### CHECK TOWER FOR TILT-UP ERECTION



Let tower = continuous beam, equal spans on 4 supports

$$R_1, R_4 = (.4) (w) (l) = (.4) (10) (100) = 400 \text{ lbs}$$

$$R_2, R_3 = (1.1) (w) (l) = (1.1) (10) (100) = 1100 \text{ lbs}$$


$$M_{\max} = (.08) (w) (l^2) = (.08) (10) (100)^2 = 8000 \text{ ft. lbs}$$

Find compressive tower loads from lifting cables A, B, C

$$T_{AH} = \frac{300}{40} (400) = 3000 \text{ lbs}$$

$$T_{BH} = \frac{200}{40} (1100) = 5500 \text{ lbs}$$

$$T_{BH} = \frac{100}{40} (1100) = \frac{2750 \text{ lbs}}{11,250 \text{ lbs}} \quad \text{compression at base}$$



$$\frac{8000}{1.74} = 4600 \text{ lbs compression in leg from bending}$$

1/3 off section compressive load

$$= \frac{11250}{3} = 3750 \text{ lbs/leg}$$

Total compressive load in unsupported length of leg = 8350 lbs

$$K \frac{l}{r} \text{ Leg} = \frac{36}{.6748} = 53.3, K = 1$$

Allowable  $S_{cr} = 36.3$  (Alcoa)

$$S = \frac{P}{A} = \frac{8335}{5614} = 14,800 \text{ psi}$$


$$\text{F.S.} = \frac{36.3}{14.8} = 2.44$$

CHECK TOWER AS A BEAM

$$P = 11,250 \text{ lbs}$$

$$l = 1200 \text{ in}$$

$$E = 10 (10^6)$$



$$I_{sec} = \frac{3}{8} AD^2 = (.375) (.5614) (3.5) (3.5) \times 144 = 370.0 \text{ in}^4$$

$$\omega = \frac{10}{12} = .83 \text{ lbs/in}$$

$$\text{Max } M = M_1 = \omega l_j \left[ \frac{\tan U (\tan 1/2U - 1/2U)}{\tan U - U} \right]$$

$$j = \sqrt{\frac{EI}{P}} \quad U = \frac{l}{j}$$

$$j = \sqrt{\frac{10(10^6)(370.0)}{11,250}} = \sqrt{3.3 (10^5)} = 575$$

$$U = \frac{1200}{575} = 2.07 \text{ rad} = 119.5^\circ$$

$$\tan U = -1.77 \quad \tan \frac{U}{2} = +1.71$$

$$M_1 = (.83) (1200) (575) \left[ \frac{-1.77 (1.71 - 1.05)}{-1.77 - 2.09} \right]$$

$$= (5.73) (10^5) (.315)$$

$$= 1.81 (10^5) = 181,000 \text{ in/lbs}$$

$$S = \frac{Mc}{I} = \frac{(181,000) (1.74) (12)}{370} = 10,200 \text{ psi}$$

$$\frac{P}{A} = \frac{11,250}{(3) (.5614)} = 6650 \text{ psi}$$

$$\text{TOTAL } S = \underline{16,850 \text{ psi}}$$

## **APPENDIX IV**

### **Determination of Allowable Tower Stresses**

## DETERMINATION OF ALLOWABLE TOWER STRESSES

Column members used in this study are considered to fail by bending. The curves of Figure 37 are plotted using data from the Alcoa Structural Handbook, and represent ultimate column strength for various effective slenderness ratios.

The effective slenderness ratio includes an assumption of  $K = 1$  as used in this study. The leg members are assumed to have points of center-flexure mid-span between horizontal supports, and it was considered optimistic to use  $K < 1$  for the end fixity conditions presented here.

For a safety factor of two, the computed data must be  $<$  than one-half the ultimate column strengths of Figure 37.

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

| DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                          |
| 1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)<br>COLLINS RADIO COMPANY<br>ANTENNA DIVISION                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                               | 2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>UNCLASSIFIED<br>2b. GROUP<br>N/A                                                                                   |
| 3. REPORT TITLE<br>FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR A TACTICAL LORAN-D ANTENNA                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                          |
| 4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)<br>Final Report (9 November 1965 to September 1966)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                          |
| 5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial)<br>JOHNSON, I.E., CORY, T.S.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                          |
| 6. REPORT DATE<br>April 1967                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES<br>210                                                                                                                 | 7b. NO. OF REFS<br>24                                                                                                                                    |
| 8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.<br>AF33(615)-3339<br>b. PROJECT NO. 681A<br>c.<br>d.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)<br>UNKNOWN<br>9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)<br>RADC TR-67-162 |                                                                                                                                                          |
| 10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of RADC (EMLI), Griffiss AFB New York 13440.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                          |
| 11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                               | 12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY<br>Systems Engineering Group<br>Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio 45433<br>Rome Air Development Center<br>Griffiss AFB NY 13440 |
| 13. ABSTRACT<br>The feasibility of a lightweight, tactical, LORAN D Antenna system is examined in this study. The existing Sperry system is used as a basis for comparison to achieve either an improved electrical performance utilizing the present mechanical characteristics, or retaining the present systems electrical parameters and achieving superior tactical and mechanical properties.<br>The program was accomplished by evaluating efficiency-bandwidth products for a variety of electrical configurations while a concurrent mechanical study was being made involving various structural designs, materials, and methods. Finally, the findings of the electrical and mechanical studies were combined, resulting in four recommended possible approaches.<br>The antenna recommended as a result of this study is a basic umbrella configuration. The support structure recommended is an optimized version of the snap-out tower presently employed. Optimization of the tower involved increased guy diameters to provide linear tower displacement, increasing the leg wall thickness from 0.095 to 0.125 inch, and decreasing the horizontal tower member spacing to 30 inches from 36 inches.<br>The specified erection time of 10 men - 8 hours for antenna installations was judged feasible due to past performance of the existing system. The system weight using one of the recommended configurations is estimated to be between 5500 to 6500 pounds. |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                          |

DD FORM 1473  
1 JAN 64

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

UNCLASSIFIED

## Security Classification

| 14<br>KEY WORDS                   | LINK A |    | LINK B |    | LINK C |    |
|-----------------------------------|--------|----|--------|----|--------|----|
|                                   | ROLE   | WT | ROLE   | WT | ROLE   | WT |
| Antenna Low Frequency Towers      |        |    |        |    |        |    |
| Antenna Theory Tactical Equipment |        |    |        |    |        |    |
| Loran-D                           |        |    |        |    |        |    |

**INSTRUCTIONS**

1. **ORIGINATING ACTIVITY:** Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (corporate author) issuing the report.

2a. **REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:** Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. **GROUP:** Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. **REPORT TITLE:** Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. **DESCRIPTIVE NOTES:** If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. **AUTHOR(S):** Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. **REPORT DATE:** Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. **TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES:** The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. **NUMBER OF REFERENCES:** Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. **CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER:** If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, &c, & 8d. **PROJECT NUMBER:** Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. **ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S):** Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. **OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S):** If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (either by the originator or by the sponsor), also enter this number(s).

10. **AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES:** Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

- (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- (2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."
- (3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."
- (4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."
- (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. **SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:** Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. **SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY:** Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (paying for) the research and development. Include address.

13. **ABSTRACT:** Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as: (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. **KEY WORDS:** Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, rules, and weights is optional.

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification