

# UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER
AD871892
NEW LIMITATION CHANGE
TO Approved for public release, distribution unlimited
FROM Distribution authorized to DoD only; Administrative/Operational Use; MAR 1970. Other requests shall be referred to Naval Ordnance Lab., Air/Ground Explosion Div., Explosions Research Dept., White Oak, Silver Spring, MD.
AUTHORITY
US Naval Ordnance Lab ltr dtd 12 Dec 1972

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

AD 871892

NOLTR 70-32

BLAST CHARACTERISTICS OF 20 and 100 TON  
HEMISPHERICAL AN/FO CHARGES, NOL  
DATA REPORT

By  
L. D. Sadwin  
M. M. Swisdak, Jr.

NOL

17 MARCH 1970

UNITED STATES NAVAL ORDNANCE LABORATORY, WHITE OAK, MARYLAND

ATTENTION

Each transmittal of this document outside the Department of Defense must have prior approval of NOL.

Without authorization of the Director, NOLTR is not to be distributed outside the Department of Defense (DDO-9152)

BLAST CHARACTERISTICS OF 20 and 100 TON HEMISPHERICAL  
AN/FO CHARGES, NOL DATA REPORT

Prepared by:  
L. D. Sadwin  
M. M. Swisdar, Jr.

ABSTRACT: Two twenty-ton and one 100-ton hemispherical AN/FO (ammonium nitrate/fuel oil) charges were detonated on the surface at the Defence Research Establishment Suffield, Ralston, Alberta, Canada. The tests were conducted during August 1969 as a cooperative U.S./Canadian effort.

The major results were:

1. AN/FO has been demonstrated to be a highly suitable explosion source for nuclear airblast simulation.
2. Over the 1-200 psi region, there was no significant difference in the pressure-distance characteristics between AN/FO and TNT.
3. The impulse characteristics of the AN/FO system were found to be slightly lower than those of TNT.
4. No self heating of AN/FO was observed.
5. Conventional cube root scaling applies for AN/FO over a  $10^3$  range in explosive weight, once a charge weight of 200 pounds is exceeded.

AIR/GROUND EXPLOSIONS DIVISION  
EXPLOSIONS RESEARCH DEPARTMENT  
U. S. NAVAL ORDNANCE LABORATORY  
White Oak, Silver Spring, Maryland

NOLTR 70-32

17 March 1970

Blast Characteristics of 20 and 100 Ton Hemispherical AN/FO Charges, NOL Data Report


This is a data report which presents the results of the Naval Ordnance Laboratory (NOL) blast measurements on the recently completed AN/FO tests. AN/FO is an explosive mixture of ammonium nitrate and fuel oil. It is being developed as a TNT replacement for large scale nuclear airblast simulation.

The tests were conducted in cooperation with the Defence Research Establishment Suffield, at Ralston, Alberta, Canada, during August 1969. Several other U. S. agencies also participated in this program.

This effort was funded by the Defense Atomic Support Agency through the Naval Ships Engineering Center of the Naval Ship Systems Command. The work was performed under DASA Subtask NA 007-04, Task NOL-194.

The use of company names throughout this report is for technical information purposes only. No endorsement or criticism is intended.

GEORGE G. EALL  
Captain, USN  
Commander

  
J. PINES  
By direction

## NOMENCLATURE

A, B, C, D, E	= coefficients of gage calibration fit (Equation (B-1))
$\Delta f$	= frequency deviation, (Hz)
I	= positive impulse, (psi-msec)
$P_o$	= atmospheric pressure, (psi)
P	= peak side-on overpressure, (psi)
p	= instantaneous overpressure, (psi)
R	= distance, (feet)
$T_o$	= atmospheric temperature, ( $^{\circ}$ R)
t	= instantaneous time, (msec)
TOA	= shock time of arrival, (msec)
W	= charge weight, (pounds)
$\beta$	= time decay coefficient, (Equation (B-2))
$\alpha$	= pressure decay coefficient (Equation (B-3))
$\lambda$	= scaled distance, (feet/pound <sup>1/3</sup> )
$\tau$	= positive duration, (msec)

## SUBSCRIPTS AND SUPERSSCRIPTS

0	= atmospheric conditions
1	= standard conditions, (14.7 psi, 519 $^{\circ}$ R)
2	= test site conditions
'	= parameter cube root scaled
m	= extrapolated parameter
ss	= secondary shock

## CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Objective	1
1.3 Experimental Program	2
2. EXPERIMENT AND PROCEDURES	3
2.1 Test Site and Field Arrangement	3
2.2 Explosives and Charge Construction	4
2.2.1 AN/FO Main Charge	4
2.2.2 Booster and Primacord Initiation Method	6
2.3 NOL Instrumentation	6
2.4 Data Analysis Procedures	6
3. AIRBLAST RESULTS	7
3.1 The Data and Scaling Procedures	7
3.2 Secondary Shock Measurements	8
3.3 Temperature Measurements in the AN/FO	9
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	9
4.1 General	9
4.2 Equivalent Weight of AN/FO	10
4.3 Thermal Stability	11
4.4 Concluding Statement	11
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	12
REFERENCES	13
APPENDIX A, NOL INSTRUMENTATION	A-1
APPENDIX B, DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES	B-1
APPENDIX C, PRESSURE-TIME CURVES	C-1

TABLES

Table	Title
1	AN/FO charge characteristics
2	NOL airblast measurements, Event I, unscaled data
3	NOL airblast measurements, Event II, unscaled data
4	NOL airblast measurements, Event III, unscaled data
5	Ambient conditions and scaling factors for AN/FO trials at DRES, August 1969
6	NOL scaled airblast measurements, AN/FO Event I
7	NOL scaled airblast measurements, AN/FO Event II
8	NOL scaled airblast measurements, AN/FO Event III

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Title
1	The Defence Research Establishment, Suffield, Ralston, Alberta, Canada
2	AN/FO Trials layout
3	Airblast gage mounts
4	AN/FO mixing and bagging operation for Event I
5	Sequence of constructing 20 ton hemisphere of bagged AN/FO
6	Tanker truck on left feeding AN into AN/FO mixer truck. AN/FO entering container for Event III
7	Completed charge for Event II, AN/FO weight: 18.8 tons
8	Completed charge for Event III, AN/FO weight: 200 tons
9	Schematic arrangement of the AN/FO charges of Events II and III
10	Peak pressure versus scaled distance for AN/FO at DRES. Scaled to sea level conditions
11	Scaled positive duration versus scaled distance for AN/FO at DRES. Scaled to sea level conditions
12	Scaled impulse versus scaled distance for AN/FO at DRES. Scaled to sea level conditions
13	Scaled times of arrival versus scaled distance for AN/FO at DRES. Scaled to sea level conditions
14	Peak secondary shock pressure versus scaled distance. AN/FO trials, DRES, August 1969
15	Temperature-time history in AN/FO, Event I
16	Temperature-time history in AN/FO, Event II
17	Temperature-time history in AN/FO, Event III
18	Event I, 20 tons of bagged AN/FO. Time = 42.9 milliseconds after detonation. (DRES photograph)
19	Peak pressure and impulse equivalent weight versus pressure for AN/FO at DRES, August 1969

## I. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

There is a continuing requirement for the development of a large scale field source for generating an airblast environment that simulates that of a nuclear explosion. The need arises from programs designed to test the vulnerability and blast hardness of military hardware and strategic structures. For example, as part of its ship blast-hardening program the Navy has exposed special structures e.g., radar masts, deck houses, and fully operational ships to particular blast environments.

Large scale simulation techniques with charge weights up to 500 tons, usually involve the use of chemical explosives. The explosive for such a source should be inexpensive, easily handled, and safe to use. In the past, multiton simulant charges have been constructed from cast TNT blocks. Some work has been done using balloons filled with detonable gases (ref. (1)).

During 1967, NOL proposed the use of ammonium nitrate/fuel oil (AN/FO), a commercial blasting agent, as a replacement for the TNT used in large blast trials. Among the expected advantages of the AN/FO system were:

1. Increased economy. AN/FO costs about seven cents per pound in place at ground zero compared to about 11¢ to \$1.00 per pound for TNT in place--depending upon whether reclaimed or new TNT is used.
2. The availability of AN/FO in large quantities and at convenient locations; the TNT supply is limited and is greatly affected by munitions requirements.
3. Fewer blast anomalies (e.g., jetting and asymmetrical blast fronts) would be expected from a homogeneous charge in contrast to the block-built TNT charges.
4. Improved safety. The ammonium nitrate and fuel oil are non-explosive until mixed. Fully mechanized mixing and delivery systems are already developed for charge preparation at ground zero.

After a pioneering effort conducted by NOL in Nevada during 1968 which established the detonability of unconfined AN/FO and which determined its airblast characteristics (ref. (2)), the way was paved for a larger scale study. In the fall of 1968 NOL proposed a program which culminated in these AN/FO trials of August 1969.

### 1.2 Objectives

The general objective of this program was to demonstrate the feasibility of using AN/FO as the explosion source in the Department of Defense's nuclear airblast-vulnerability and hardening program. This objective was an outgrowth of



the original intent to satisfy the more limited blast requirements for the Navy's airblast-ship hardening program.

A number of specific objectives were investigated by NOL and other participating agencies during the course of this effort. The major objective was to determine the airblast characteristics of AN/FO. Since some test structures were available from earlier tests at the site, a secondary objective was to measure their blast response.

The primary objectives were:

1. To verify the detonability, scaling, and reproducibility of AN/FO for charge weights up to 100 tons.
2. To extend existing AN/FO airblast pressure-time-distance data by including measurements from close to the charge surface out to the 1 psi level.
3. To study fireball growth and observe blast anomalies.
4. To study the engineering aspects of preparing and firing bagged and bulk AN/FO charges.
5. To compare the airblast performance of AN/FO with TNT.
6. To compare the blast characteristics of bagged and bulk 20 ton AN/FO hemispheres.
7. To determine the temperature stability of the AN/FO explosive prior to firing for charge weights up to 100 tons.
8. To study the cratering of 20 and 100 ton AN/FO hemispheres.

The secondary objectives were:

1. To blast load a full scale frame house at the 1.5 psi level from the 100 ton AN/FO test (Event III).
2. To blast load an underground model silo and buried rock inclusions on Event III.

This report deals with NOL's efforts on primary objectives 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7. The other agencies participating on these trials will report their project results separately.

### 1.3 Experimental Program

The experimental phase of this program was carried out with the cooperation of the Defence Research Establishment Suffield (DRES), at Ralston, Alberta, Canada (ref. (3)). In addition to the field support they provided, DRES made shock time-of-arrival and crater measurements as well as high speed photographic observations on all three AN/FO tests. These data already have been reported in reference (4) and will be included in a comprehensive DASA report to be prepared by NOL covering all aspects of these AN/FO trials.

Other U. S. Agencies participating in these trials included the Ballistic Research Laboratories (BRL), Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory (NCEL), Naval Weapons Center (NWC) and the U. S. Geological Survey (USGS). BRL provided pressure measurements in the predicted 3000 to 30 psi overpressure range. NCEL made studies of the response of rock inclusions and made body motion observations of a model silo exposed to the blast loading of the 100 ton AN/FO test. NWC made observations on a two story frame house exposed at the 1.5 psi level from the 100 ton AN/FO test. The Geological Survey and DRES made crater studies. NOL was responsible for the explosives phase of these trials and made pressure measurements from 200 down to 1 psi.

The three tests conducted during the AN/FO trials at DRES during August 1969 were as follows:

- EVENT I - 20 ton AN/FO hemisphere, bagged. Detonated 14 Aug 1969.
- EVENT II - 20 ton AN/FO hemisphere, bulk in fiberglass shell.  
Detonated 21 Aug 1969.
- EVENT III - 100 ton AN/FO hemisphere, bulk in fiberglass shell.  
Detonated 23 Aug 1969.

## 2. Experiment and Procedures

### 2.1 Test Site and Field Arrangement

The trials described in this report were conducted at the Watching Hill Blast Range of the Defence Research Establishment, Suffield, at Ralston, Alberta, Canada. Figure 1 shows the range area of DRES.

This site was selected for reasons of logistics and because it enabled direct comparisons to be made with the earlier work on detonations of multiton TNT hemispheres (ref. (5) and (6)). The physical characteristics of this site have been fully described in the Operation Prairie Flat Operations Plan (ref. (7)).

The general layout of the ground zeroes, NOL cable lines, bunkers and camera positions for all 3 events is illustrated in Figure 2. In order to accommodate the secondary objectives of these trials, the ground zero for Event III (100 tons of AN/FO) was selected so that the model silo, instrumented on an earlier WEST test, could be blast loaded again. The frame house 1700 feet northeast of GZ III was therefore exposed at the 1.5 psi level. This house was repaired after being exposed at the 1 psi level on Operation Prairie Flat. The ground zero for Events I and II were placed along a NE-SW line with GZ I 300 feet from GZ III, and GZ's I and II being 160 feet apart.

NOL had 3 gage stations on each event, with 2 pressure gages at each station. (This instrumentation is described in Appendix A of this report). For Events I and II

the NOL gage line was perpendicular to the line between ground zeroes. This arrangement permitted an easy reorientation of the gages at each station without establishing new stations. The 200, 100, 50 and 20 psi gage stations were baffled flush with the ground. The 10, 5, 2 and 1 psi gage stations were above the surface and used disc type baffles. Photos of both types of gage stations are presented in Figure 3.

All gage cables were placed in a trench 12-18 inches deep. The cable trenches connected each gage station to a common NOL cable trench which ran to the NOL instrumentation trailer some 3000 feet distant.

Most of the ammonium nitrate for the AN/FO was delivered to the Suffield, Alberta, Canadian Pacific Railroad (CPR) siding in a 70 ton hopper car. The siding was about 35 miles from the test site. The remainder of the AN was trucked directly to the range in 22 ton capacity TRIMAC tanker trucks from the supplier in Calgary, Alberta.<sup>1</sup> Further details on charge construction are provided in Section 2.2 of this report.

## 2.2 Explosives and Charge Construction

### 2.2.1 AN/FO Main Charge

The main charge for these trials was a 94/6 by weight AN/FO mixture [94% ammonium nitrate and 6% fuel oil]. The AN itself was a commercial fertilizer and was basically the same type of prills<sup>2</sup> used in our 1968 Nevada tests (ref. (2)). The FO was summer grade No. 2 diesel fuel. A red dye was added to the fuel oil to permit a ready visual check on the AN/FO mixing proportions.

The 20 tons of bagged AN/FO for Event I were prepared at the GZ area. The AN was transported from the 70 ton hopper car at the Suffield CPR siding by the AN/FO mixing truck. The truck had a capacity of about 7 tons of mixed product (AN/FO). Thus, three loads were required per 20 ton event. A bagging unit<sup>3</sup> was

<sup>1</sup>The explosives contractor to NOL was Ace Explosives Ltd of Calgary, Alberta. The AN used was manufactured by Cominco Ltd also of Calgary, Alberta.

<sup>2</sup>Prills are porous, spherical particles. They are formed by dropping molten AN in a prilling tower and are much like lead shot in size and shape. They have a density of about 1.4 gm/cc compared to the crystal density of AN which is 1.725 gm/cc.

<sup>3</sup>The bagging unit was designed and built by Mr. G. R. Rintoul of Ace Explosives, Ltd.

located at the site during Event I charge placement. The arrangement of the mixer truck and bagging unit at the GZ location is shown in Figure 4.

A total of 800-50 pound bags was prepared for this first 20 ton charge. Six hundred and fifty 50-lb bags were used in the layered arrangement illustrated in Figure Loose AN/FO from 150 of the bags was poured into the spaces between bags to form a charge with uniform density, i. e., no airspaces. The bag dimensions were 21 x 13.5 x 5.8 inches.

The AN/FO mixer truck used a system of augers to feed the AN from the bins to the fuel metering point. At this point the red-dyed fuel oil was mixed with the AN. The mixed AN/FO was then fed through a vertical auger and out a swinging horizontal auger to place the AN/FO where it was needed, i.e., into the bagging unit for Event I and into the charge cases for Events II and III.

Changes in the fuel oil content of the AN/FO were detected very quickly by visual means because of the red-dyed fuel oil used. The fuel oil content was also monitored quantitatively throughout the explosives placement operation by chemical analysis (ref. (9)). Table 1 contains data on AN/FO charge dimensions, weight, density and fuel content for all three events.

Events II and III were charges of bulk AN/FO placed into thin walled fiberglass / polyester resin containers. The fiberglass/polyester resin shell<sup>1</sup> was made of section having full compound spherical curvature.

The 20 ton size container for Event II was 14.0 feet in base diameter and was made of 11 sections each 3/10 inch thick<sup>2</sup>. The 100 ton size container was 24.2 feet in base diameter and had 22 sections, each 1/4 inch thick. The sections were joined together by nylon bolts and epoxy resin adhesive.

To fill the fiberglass shells the mixer truck was backed up to the container for AN/FO placement. The time required for each mixing and placement cycle (i.e., each 7 tons of AN/FO) was about three hours. To reduce the loading time on the 100 ton AN/FO charge most of the AN was trucked from the Cominco fertilizer plant in Calgary to the GZ via 22 ton capacity TRIMAC tanker trucks. The AN was

<sup>1</sup> The sections for the two containers were manufactured by Rogay Models of Bethesda, Maryland.

<sup>2</sup> Before the field operation, we conducted high speed camera tests on samples of the shell material to determine their behavior when in contact with detonating explosives. The high speed photographs indicated break-up of the fiberglass within a few inches of the charge.

fed into the mixer truck and the AN/FO into the container in a continuous operation. Using this loading system, about 23 tons of AN/FO were mixed and placed in a four hour period. A photograph illustrating the arrangement of the TRIMAC tanker and AN/FO mixer trucks at the 100 ton GZ is presented in Figure 6. The completed 20 ton and 100 ton bulk AN/FO charges are shown in Figures 7 and 8.

### 2.2.2 Booster and Primacord Initiation Method

The hemispherical boosters used for all three events were prepared by the U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada (ref. (8)). The boosters were a nominal 250 pounds each total weight and consisted of a 16 pound hemispherical 50/50 pentolite primer with about 23<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> pounds of TNT cast over it.

NOL developed a primacord initiation method (ref. (2)) which was used for each event. In this method a strand of 100 grains per foot primacord is placed in a shallow, radial trench beneath the charge, leading from the GZ to beyond the outer edge of the AN/FO charge. The GZ end of the primacord is fed through a radial hole in the booster and a small knot is tied at the top to secure it. This method greatly simplified the arming procedure, as the electric detonator is simply attached to the other end of the primacord still exposed after the charge has been completed. The explosive train is: electric detonator → primacord → pentolite primer → TNT booster → main charge (AN/FO). This is all illustrated schematically in Figure 9.

### 2.3 NOL Instrumentation

Airblast pressure histories were measured with variable reluctance transducers and recorded on magnetic tape recorders. The temperature within the AN/FO charge was monitored with thermistors on each event. The instrumentation system is described in detail in Appendix A.

Before each event, both the pressure gages and the thermistors were statically calibrated. The calibration of the thermistor took into account the resistance of the cable between ground zero and the instrumentation trailer.

### 2.4 Data Analysis Procedures

The pressure-time records were digitized and then analyzed using techniques which are described in detail in Appendix B. The parameters computed include peak pressure, positive duration and positive impulse. Extrapolations to peak pressure and positive duration were made using techniques described by Ethridge (ref. (10)). These extrapolation techniques were used to take into account both the finite rise-time of the observed signal incurred because of instrumentation

system limitations and also any early-time gage malfunctions. Gage malfunctions were noted on several signals from each event--namely, at those stations in the 50 psi region and above. These malfunctions were manifested by a loss of FM carrier amplitude for several milliseconds upon the arrival of the airblast wave. This loss of carrier exhibited itself as spurious peaks on the discriminated signal. To handle this, only that portion of the record that occurred after the gage resumed normal operation was used in the computations.

A comparison between the procedure described in Appendix B for determining impulse and a direct measurement with a planimeter on several pressure-time records showed excellent agreement (within a few percent).

Time of arrival data were measured directly from the tape recordings, using an electronic counter operating in the time interval mode.

### 3. Airblast Results

#### 3.1 The Data and Scaling Procedures

The unscaled data obtained on all three events are presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4. The data presented in these tables are for the ambient conditions at DRES as shown in Table 5. To make for a useful comparison with previously published TNT data (ref. (5) and (6)), the AN/FO data were cube root and Sachs' Scaled (ref. (11)) to standard sea-level conditions of pressure and temperature. To do this scaling, the following equations were used:

$$\text{For Pressure:} \quad P_1 = P_2 \left( \frac{P_{01}}{P_{02}} \right), \quad (1)$$

$$\text{For Distance:} \quad \lambda = \frac{R}{W^{1/3} \left( \frac{P_{01}}{P_{02}} \right)^{1/3}}, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{For Times:} \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{TOA}_1' \\ \text{or} \\ \tau_1' \end{array} \right\} = \frac{\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{TOA}_2 \\ \text{or} \\ \tau_2 \end{array} \right\}}{W^{1/3} \left( \frac{P_{01}}{P_{02}} \right)^{1/3} \left( \frac{T_{01}}{T_{02}} \right)^{1/2}}, \quad (3)$$

And for Impulse:

$$I_1' = \frac{I_2}{W^{1/3} \left( \frac{P_{02}}{P_{01}} \right)^{2/3} \left( \frac{T_{01}}{T_{02}} \right)^{1/2}} \quad (4)$$

The scaling factors for all three events are presented in Table 5.

The data for each station of Tables 2, 3 and 4 were averaged and the scaling equations (Equations 1 through 4) were applied. The resulting scaled averaged data are presented in Tables 6, 7 and 8 for Events I, II and III respectively. All tabulated data are given to three significant figures.

The peak pressure versus scaled distance data ( $P_{1m}$  vs  $\lambda$ ) for all three events are shown graphically in Figure 10. The TNT standard curve (ref. (5)) is also plotted in this figure to enable the making of direct comparisons between AN/FO and TNT.

A 5th degree polynomial was fitted to a composite of all of the pressure ( $P_{1m}$ )-scaled distance ( $\lambda$ ) data of Tables 6, 7 and 8. The form of the equation was:

$$\ln P_{1m} = 10.4781 - 9.01448 (\ln \lambda) + 5.55124 (\ln \lambda)^2 - 2.33879 (\ln \lambda)^3 + .514723 (\ln \lambda)^4 - .0447655 (\ln \lambda)^5 \quad (5)$$

This equation is valid over the 1 to 200 psi region and is represented by the solid line in Figure 10.

Figure 11 is a plot of the scaled positive duration and scaled distance ( $\tau_{1m}'$  vs  $\lambda$ ) data. The scaled positive impulse -- scaled distance data ( $I_1'$  vs  $\lambda$ ) are plotted in Figure 12. A TNT standard curve from ref. (6) is also plotted in Fig. 12.

### 3.2 Secondary Shock Measurements

A late secondary shock wave was measured on the 20 psi and below pressure records on all three events. This distinct secondary shock occurred during the negative phase portion of the pressure-time curves (see Appendix C).

Information on the secondary shock is seldom reported, although a review of earlier work reveals its presence on a majority of the data records (e.g., ref. (12)). Because of its hydrodynamic interest and its possible significance for response test applications, secondary shock information is included in this report. The wave shapes can be observed on the records reproduced in Appendix C. The secondary shock amplitudes and times of arrival with respect to the detonation zero pulse are presented in Tables 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8. Figure 13 is a plot of all the

time of arrival data (main shock and secondary shock) as a function of scaled distance. The scaled peak secondary shock pressure is plotted versus scaled distance for all 3 events in Figure 14.

### 3.3 Temperature Measurements in the AN/FO

The temperature within the AN/FO explosive was monitored with a thermistor. For each event, the thermistor was placed at the center of mass of the hemisphere. It was felt that this location would be warmest if any self heating was to take place in the AN/FO. For the 20 ton charges the thermistor was located 3 feet above the base of the hemisphere. Similarly, for the 100 ton charge the thermistor was located at 5 feet above the base of the hemisphere. In addition, as a second check, another thermistor was placed at the top of the booster on Event III.

The temperature change in the AN/FO mass was of negligible magnitude. The temperature-time data are plotted in Figures 15, 16 and 17 for Events I, II and III respectively. Note the cooling down of the explosive at times. At no time did the recorded temperatures exceed 87°F. The initial temperature of the AN in the hopper car and in the tanker trucks was about 88°F. The ambient air temperature reached a maximum of 105°F during the loading of the 100 ton AN/FO charge for Event III.

## 4. Discussion and Conclusions

### 4.1 General

All three charges detonated properly and high order. This is evidenced by the following observations:

- a. The pressure-time records show the familiar and classical wave shapes (see Appendix C).
- b. The results of the 20 ton shots scale well with the 100 ton data (see Figures 10-12). The extent of data scatter is of the same order as for TNT fired under the same conditions and is attributed to a large extent to the accuracy of the instrumentation and to vagaries of field operation.
- c. The results of these large scale tests scale well with the earlier 260 lb to 4000 lb AN/FO results (ref. (2)).

From these observations it can be deduced that:

- a. Over the pressure range measured by this project, there is no significant difference between the tagged and bulk-loaded AN/FO charges.



b. The fuel-oil does not settle out of the AN/FO mixture; if this had occurred, it could be expected that the two 20 ton shots would have given different results and would not have scaled to the 100 ton and small size charge results. (Indeed, visual observation during charge preparations and prior to firing time did not show any evidence of oil seepage.)

c. From Figures 10-12, it is evident that there is no significant difference between the pressure-distance characteristics of AN/FO and TNT.

A single frame from one of the Canadian high speed camera films on Event 1 is shown in Figure 18. This photograph shows the smoothness and symmetry of the shock wave (at 42.9 milliseconds after detonation) produced by the 20 ton bagged AN/FO hemisphere.

Forzel (ref. (15)) and Lehto (ref. (16)) have independently made calculations of the pressure-distance characteristics of the AN/FO system. Both sets of analyses show good agreement with our experimental results in the 1-200 psi region.

The secondary shock (described in Section 3.2) which occurs near the minimum of the negative phase in large explosion trials deserves further attention. For structural elements exposed at low pressures, the secondary shock could be very important. This is because, as the main shock propagates and decays, the ratio of its amplitude to the secondary shock amplitude tends to approach a value of one.

#### 4.2 Equivalent Weight of AN/FO

Long standard NOJ procedures for evaluating the peak pressure and impulse TNT equivalent weights ( $EW_p$  and  $EW_I$ ) (ref. (13) and (14)) were used on the present data. A composite of the data presented in Tables 6, 7 and 8 was used in this analysis.

The pressure and impulse versus distance curves for any set of test and standard explosives are seldom parallel. Thus, the single value of average equivalent weight usually given for a test explosive may be misleading because it cannot indicate how it varies as a function of side-on overpressure. To illustrate this functional variation, the  $EW_p$  and  $EW_I$  for AN/FO are plotted as a function of pressure in Figure 19.

It is interesting to note that although  $EW_p$  varies from 0.77 to 1.17, this magnitude of variation in yield is hardly suspected when viewing the pressure-distance curves of Figure 10. Figure 10 shows a scatter of data around either the TNT or AN/FO curves no greater than that usually observed on large scale field trials.

Equivalent weight determinations are an exceedingly sensitive measure of the merits of one explosive compared to another; for some applications it may be too sensitive and hence of little practical significance. And of even lesser practical significance may be the averaged, single-value equivalent weight -- particularly if the average is taken over a large pressure range. The concept of averaged, single-valued equivalent weights is so rooted in the explosives field, however, that although it is with trepidation, we present these values. The user must observe the pressure range over which the averages are taken and be aware of the limitations of these average values.

The average  $EW_p$  for AN/FO over the 1 to 200 psi range is  $0.94 \pm .06^1$  relative to TNT using a logarithmic weighting method.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, the average  $EW_I$  for AN/FO is  $0.71 \pm .05$ . Using logarithmic averaging over the 1-30 psi range (the data range of earlier AN/FO work (ref. (2))), the average  $EW_p$  is  $0.86 \pm .03$ . In reference (2) we used a linear weighting method when we averaged the equivalent weights and arrived at a figure of 0.82 for the  $EW_p$ . The linear weighting gives greater emphasis to the  $EW_p$  at the higher pressure levels. Using the present logarithmic method on the Phase I AN/FO Data of reference (2), an average  $EW_p$  of 0.87 is obtained over the 1-30 psi range.

#### 4.3 Thermal Stability

The AN/FO temperature data, as presented in Figures 15, 16 and 17, indicate that massive AN/FO has good thermal stability. In the Event I data there is a definite cooling trend. In the case of the Event II and III data there is some evidence of a very slight general warming trend among the cooling and warming cycles. It is on the order of about  $1F^{\circ}$  per day (the measurements are accurate to within  $\pm 1F^{\circ}$ ). At this point it would appear to be not self heating of the AN/FO but rather external heating from the sun. During the loading of the Event III charge the outside temperature reached about  $105^{\circ}F$ . AN/FO is a good insulator. The initial temperature of the AN was about  $88^{\circ}F$ .

It can be concluded that the AN/FO did not exhibit any self heating. No self heating is expected for 500 ton AN/FO charges.

#### 4.4 Concluding Statement.

The results of these AN/FO trials in conjunction with NOL's earlier work on AN/FO have built up a now formidable portfolio of data on the airblast performance

<sup>1</sup> The standard deviation of the mean.

<sup>2</sup> Averaging the values of equivalent weight at logarithmic pressure intervals (i.e., 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100 and 200 psi).

of this explosive. AN/FO offers advantages of economy, safety, ease of handling, availability and reproducibility over TNT, slurried explosives, or any other system presently in use for large scale simulation of nuclear air blast.

With these advantages, AN/FO can be seriously considered as a candidate explosive for future large chemical explosive trials.

#### Acknowledgements

The success of this program could not have been achieved without the excellent cooperation between all the U. S. and Canadian agencies who participated in the AN/FO trials during August 1969. Particular recognition is given to all the DRES personnel who participated unselfishly in the field program. Special thanks are due Fred Davies, Skip Meyers and Ashton Patterson for their superior efforts during the trials.

The authors acknowledge the efforts of Francis B. Porzel and Delbert L. Lehto of NOI on their post-field calculations.

We also take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the personnel from all participating U. S. Agencies and to Ace Explosives Ltd of Calgary, Alberta for their excellent cooperation and performance.

We are grateful to all NOL personnel who contributed to the AN/FO program and to the following individuals who participated in the field program: Maurice Brooks, Roy W. Huff, Christopher Johnson, Richard L. Knodle, Gruver H. Martin, Edwin G. Nacke and Joseph Petes.

Finally, we thank Joseph Petes for his suggestions throughout the program and his comprehensive review of this report.

## REFERENCES

1. Balcerzak, M. J., "Detonable Gas Explosion," in Operation Distant Plain Symposium, DASA 1947-1, September 1967, UNCLASSIFIED.
2. Sadwin, L. D. and Pittman, J. F., "Airblast Characteristics of AN/FO, Phase I," NOLTR 69-82, 30 April 1969, (AD 692 074), UNCLASSIFIED.
3. Patterson, A. M., "Outline of U. S. and Canadian Programme for the Ammonium Nitrate/Fuel Oil Trials to be Carried Out at DRES," Suffield Memorandum No. 81/69, August 1969, UNCLASSIFIED.
4. Anderson, J. H. B. et al, "Ammonium Nitrate/Fuel Oil Trials Carried out at DRES," Suffield TN 268, January 1970, UNCLASSIFIED.
5. Kingery, C. N. and Pannill, B. F., "Peak Overpressure vs Scaled Distance for TNT Surface Bursts, (Hemispherical Charges)" BRL Memorandum Report No. 1518, April 1964, (AD 443 102), UNCLASSIFIED.
6. Kingery, C. N., "Air Blast Parameters vs Distance for Hemispherical TNT Surface Bursts," BRL Report No. 1344, Sept 1966, (AD 811 673), UNCLASSIFIED.
7. Keefer, J. H., Sauer, F. M. and Canthen, L. J., "Technical and Administrative Information for Operation Prairie Flat," DASIAC Special Report 69, 15 May 1968.
8. "Mold and Shipping Container for 250 Pound Hemispherical Charge," U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada, Ordnance Dept Drawings D 69-91, 92, May 1969.
9. Rintoul, G. R., "Test Method to Determine Amount Of No. 2 Fuel Oil in AN/FO Mixture," Ace Explosives, Ltd. August 1969.
10. Ethridge, N. H., "A Procedure for Reading and Smoothing Pressure-Time Data from H. E. and Nuclear Explosions," BRL MR 1691, September 1965, UNCLASSIFIED.
11. Sachs, R. G., "The Dependence of Blast on Ambient Pressure and Temperature," BRL 466, May 1944, UNCLASSIFIED.
12. Muirhead, J. C. and Palmer, W. O., "Canadian Participation in Distant Plain, Air Blast Pressure Gauge Measurements," Suffield Technical Note No. 177, 13 July 1967, UNCLASSIFIED.
13. Maserjian, J. and Fisher E. M., "Determination of Average Equivalent Weight and Average Equivalent Volume and their Precision Indexes for Comparison of Explosives in Air," NAVORD Report 2264, 2 Nov 1951, UNCLASSIFIED.
14. Swisdak, M. M., "Equivalent Weight Calculations Using the CEIR On-Site Computer," NOLTN 8123, 13 Aug 1968, UNCLASSIFIED.
15. Porzel, F. B., NOL Personal Communication, Prompt Energy Method.
16. Lehto, D. L., NOL Personal Communication, Wundy Method.




FIG. 1 THE DEFENCE RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENT, SUFFIELD RALSTON, ALBERTA, CANADA





FIG. 2 AN/FO TRIALS LAYOUT



(a) FLUSH BAFFLE. NOL GAGE ON LEFT,  
BRL GAGE ON RIGHT.



(b) STANDOFF BAFFLE

FIG. 3 AIRBLAST GAGE MOUNTS




FIG. 4 AN/FO MIXING AND BAGGING OPERATION FOR EVENT 1. MIXING TRUCK IS ON RIGHT; BAGGING UNIT IS ON LEFT.






(b) SECOND LAYER



(d) COMPLETED CHARGE FOR EVENT I



(c) 250 POUND TNT BOOSTER



(e) THIRD LAYER



FIG. 6 TANKER TRUCK ON LEFT FEEDING AN INTO AN/FO MIXER TRUCK. AN/FO ENTERING CONTAINER FOR EVENT III




FIG. 7 COMPLETED CHARGE FOR EVENT II. AN/FO WEIGHT: 18.8 TONS




FIG. 8 COMPLETED CHARGE FOR EVENT III. AN/FO WEIGHT: 200 TONS




FIG. 9 SCHEMATIC ARRANGEMENT OF THE AN/FO CHARGES OF EVENTS II AND III




FIG. 10 PEAK PRESSURE VERSUS SCALED DISTANCE FOR AN/FO AT DRES. SCALED TO SEA LEVEL CONDITIONS.




FIG. 11 SCALED POSITIVE DURATION VERSUS SCALED DISTANCE FOR AN/FO AT DRES. SCALED TO SEA LEVEL CONDITIONS.




FIG. 12 SCALED IMPULSE VERSUS SCALED DISTANCE FOR AN/FO AT DRES. SCALED TO SEA LEVEL CONDITIONS.




FIG. 13 SCALED TIMES OF ARRIVAL VERSUS SCALED DISTANCE FOR AN/FO AT DRES. SCALED TO SEA LEVEL CONDITIONS.






FIG. 14 PEAK SECONDARY SHOCK PRESSURE VERSUS SCALED DISTANCE. AN/FO TRIALS, DRES, AUGUST 1969




FIG. 15 TEMPERATURE-TIME HISTORY IN AN/FO, EVENT I




FIG. 16 TEMPERATURE-TIME HISTORY IN AN/FO, EVENT II




FIG. 17 TEMPERATURE-TIME HISTORY IN AN/FO, EVENT III



FIG. 18 EVENT I, 20 TONS OF BAGGED AN/FO. TIME = 42.9 MILLISECONDS AFTER DETONATION. (DRES PHOTOGRAPH)




FIG. 19 PEAK PRESSURE AND IMPULSE EQUIVALENT WEIGHT VERSUS PRESSURE.  
AN/FO AT DRES, AUGUST 1969

TABLE 1

AN/FO CHARGE CHARACTERISTICS, AN/FO TRIALS,  
DRES, AUGUST 1969

	EVENT I	EVENT II	EVENT III
BASE DIAMETER-FT	14	14	24.2
WEIGHT OF AN/FO -POUNDS	39,920	37,350	200,650
WEIGHT OF BOOSTER -POUNDS	250	250	250
EFFECTIVE WEIGHT- W-POUNDS	40,170	37,600	200,900
AN/FO DENSITY- GM/CC	0.882	0.839	0.865
FUEL OIL - % <sup>1</sup>	5.85	5.90	5.95

1. METHOD OF REFERENCE 9

2. NOL ESTIMATE, TOTAL VOLUME NOT CONTROLLABLE

TABLE 2

NOL AIRBLAST MEASUREMENTS, EVENT I, UNSCALED DATA  
W = 40,170 LBS

R FEET	TOA MSEC	P <sub>m</sub> PSI	T <sub>m</sub> MSEC	I PSI-MSEC	TOA' <sub>ss</sub> MSEC	P <sub>ss</sub> PSI
80.1	12.5	381	9.22	831		
80.1	12.6	225	17.4	967		
107	19.7	154	20.0	700		
107	19.8	147	20.7	752		
146	33.8	53.2	18.6	334		
146	33.8	51.5	29.8	433		
221	72.2	19.1	45.5	330	205	2.50
221	72.3	20.4	45.8	334	207	2.71
317	135	9.97	63.0	222	289	1.83
317	135	9.14	63.3	229	303	1.88
464	241	5.98	67.7	173	414	1.00
464	241	5.02	74.7	155	415	1.18
772	486	2.34	84.4	106	703	0.69
772	486	2.46	92.7	97.4	690	0.74
1340	959	1.28	117.5	94.2	1210	0.61
1340	960	1.16	117.8	61.7	1210	0.96

TABLE 3

NOL AIRBLAST MEASUREMENTS, EVENT II, UNSCALED DATA  
W = 37,600 LBS

R FEET	TOA MSEC	P <sub>m</sub> PSI	T <sub>m</sub> MSEC	I PSI-MSEC	TOA <sub>ss</sub> MSEC	P <sub>ss</sub> PSI
80.0	12.5	280	9.29	724		
80.0	12.6	290	17.8	1120		
109*	-	-	-	-		
109	20.5	99.9	27.1	603		
145	34.1	57.9	31.9	458		
145	34.1	58.8	27.5	404		
221	71.3	19.9	45.0	278	189	3.66
221	71.4	19.9	48.1	327	195	3.56
317	134	9.40	62.3	235	286	1.83
317	134	9.68	65.2	235	288	1.55
464	241	4.78	79.2	174	404	1.12
464	241	5.14	77.0	164	413	1.19
772	485	2.27	98.2	101	693	0.49
772*	-	-	-	-	-	-
1340	956	1.00	116	49.9	1190	0.22
1340*	-	-	-	-	-	-

\* NO SIGNALS RECORDED

TABLE 4

NOL AIRBLAST MEASUREMENTS, EVENT III, UNSCALED DATA  
W = 200,900 LBS

R FEET	TOA MSEC	P <sub>m</sub> PSI	T <sub>m</sub> MSEC	I PSI-MSEC	TOA <sub>ss</sub> MSEC	P <sub>ss</sub> PSI
136	20.4	326	9.86	842		
136	20.4	197	-Δ	1190Δ		
184	33.6	83.8	44.9	914		
184*	33.8	-	-	-		
249	58.7	42.8	55.0	763		
249	58.8	39.2	55.6	702		
378	128	19.5	90.7	547	362	2.20
378	128	20.4	87.4	585	365	3.06
542	238	9.16	124	410	514	1.54
542	239	9.34	122	428	509	1.58
794	432	4.85	152	294	749	0.80
794	432	4.70	149	301	763	0.84
1490	1020	1.86	205	174	1420	0.36
1490	1020	2.02	152	139	1420	0.41
2460	1870	0.96	219	98.7	2300	0.22
2460	1870	0.96	225	110.0	2350	0.20

\* NO SIGNALS RECORDED AFTER SHOCK ARRIVAL

Δ SIGNAL DID NOT CROSS BASELINE; IMPULSE WAS ESTIMATED



TABLE 5

 AMBIENT CONDITIONS AND SCALING FACTORS<sup>1</sup> FOR AN/FO TRIALS  
 AT DRES, AUGUST 1969

EVENT	W LBS	P <sub>o2</sub> PSI	T <sub>o2</sub> °R	SCALING FACTORS		
				PRESSURE	DISTANCE	TIME
I	40,170	13.58	544.5	1.0825	35.165	34.322
II	37,600	13.565	552.5	1.0837	34.411	33.342
III	200,900	13.533	525.2	1.0862	60.205	59.832
						IMPULSE
						31.713
						30.768
						55.081

<sup>1</sup> TO SEA LEVEL CONDITIONS: P<sub>o1</sub> = 14.7 PSI AND T<sub>o1</sub> = 519°R

TABLE 7

 NOL SCALED AIRBLAST MEASUREMENTS, AN/FO EVENT II,  
 W = 37,600 LBS

$\lambda$	TOA <sup>1</sup> MSEC/ LB <sup>1/3</sup>	P' <sub>m</sub> PSI	T' <sub>m</sub> MSEC/ LB <sup>1/3</sup>	I' <sup>1</sup> PSI- MSEC/LB <sup>2/3</sup>	TOA <sub>ss</sub> MSEC/ LB <sup>1/3</sup>	P' <sub>ss</sub> PSI
2.32	0.376	309	0.279	30.0		
3.16	0.615	108	0.813	19.6		
4.22	1.02	63.2	0.890	14.0		
6.42	2.14	21.6	1.39	9.83	5.76	3.91
9.22	4.03	10.3	1.91	7.64	9.61	1.83
13.5	7.24	5.38	2.34	5.50	12.1	1.25
22.4	14.5	2.46	2.94	3.28	20.8	0.53
39.0	28.7	1.08	3.48	1.62	35.7	0.24

TABLE 6

 NOL SCALED AIRBLAST MEASUREMENTS, AN/FO EVENT I,  
 W = 40,170 LBS

$\lambda$	TOA <sup>1</sup> MSEC/ LB <sup>1/3</sup>	P' <sub>m</sub> PSI	T' <sub>m</sub> MSEC/ LB <sup>1/3</sup>	I' <sup>1</sup> PSI- MSEC/LB <sup>2/3</sup>	TOA <sub>ss</sub> MSEC/ LB <sup>1/3</sup>	P' <sub>ss</sub> PSI
2.28	0.366	328	0.269	26.2		
3.05	0.575	163	0.593	22.9		
4.16	0.96	56.7	0.869	13.6		
6.29	2.11	21.4	1.33	10.5	6.00	2.81
9.02	3.92	10.4	1.84	7.11	8.58	2.00
13.2	7.03	5.95	2.07	5.17	12.1	1.18
21.9	14.1	2.60	2.56	3.21	20.3	0.78
38.2	28.0	1.32	3.43	2.46	35.3	0.84

TABLE 8

 NOL SCALED AIRBLAST MEASUREMENTS, AN/FO EVENT III,  
 W = 200,900 LBS

$\lambda$	TOA <sup>1</sup> MSEC/ LB <sup>1/3</sup>	P' <sub>m</sub> PSI	T' <sub>m</sub> MSEC/ LB <sup>1/3</sup>	I' <sup>1</sup> PSI- MSEC/LB <sup>2/3</sup>	TOA <sub>ss</sub> MSEC/ LB <sup>1/3</sup>	P' <sub>ss</sub> PSI
2.26	0.341	284	0.165	18.4		
3.05	0.563	91.0	0.750	16.6		
4.14	0.982	44.5	0.925	13.3		
6.28	2.14	21.7	1.49	10.2	6.08	2.86
9.00	3.99	10.1	2.05	7.61	8.55	1.69
13.2	7.22	5.19	2.52	5.41	12.6	0.89
24.7	17.0	2.11	2.98	2.85	23.7	0.42
40.9	31.2	1.04	3.71	1.89	38.9	0.23

## APPENDIX A

## NOL INSTRUMENTATION

The pressure gages used in these tests were variable reluctance transducers manufactured by Consolidated Controls Corporation. These are frequency modulated (FM) gages which operate in the standard IRIG 13 and IRIG 14 frequency bands, 14.5 kHz and 22.0 kHz respectively.

The gage signals were transmitted to the instrumentation trailer, some 3000 feet from the G. Z.'s, over WDL/TT field telephone wire. The signal cables were terminated by United Transformer company model UTC A-12 transformers and the signals then recorded on magnetic tape recorders. Three 14-track recorders were used: 1) Ampex FR 1800L, 2) Consolidated Electrodynamics Corporation VR 3300, and 3) Sangamo 4700. The FM signals were all recorded in the direct record (amplitude modulated) mode.

Pressures were measured at eight distances on each event, with two pressure transducers at each distance. A time zero pulse, provided by the DRES control bunker, was also recorded on each shot. Thus, 17 channels of information were recorded on each event. The incoming signals were divided in such a way that any two of the three recorders contained a complete set of records.

On playback, the signals were played through a tunable discriminator manufactured by Electro-Mechanical Research Corporation and recorded on a Midwestern oscillograph. The oscillograph records of pressure versus time were digitized using the NOL Telereader system.

The system frequency response was flat from D.C. to 1 kHz, the gages being the response-limiting element. This relatively low upper frequency response was sufficient for the long duration signals expected and observed on these trials. This low upper frequency response manifests itself as a finite rise-time and a reduction in the apparent peak amplitude of the observed gage signals. Using the extrapolation techniques described in Appendix B, the observed signals are extrapolated back to zero time (shock arrival). This procedure corrects for the upper frequency limitations of the system.

The temperature of the explosive in each charge was monitored by thermistors. A General Radio Type 1650-A Impedance Bridge was used to read the thermistor resistance. The accuracy of this measuring system was  $\pm 1^\circ$ .

## APPENDIX B

## DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

A least squares fit of the form

$$P = A(\Delta t) + B(\Delta t)^2 + C(\Delta t)^3 + D(\Delta t)^4 + E(\Delta t)^5, \quad (B-1)$$

was made to the calibration data for each gage for each event. A 3rd, 4th or 5th degree polynomial was chosen for each set of calibration data. The smallest degree of fit for optimum accuracy was selected for each set of calibration data.

The digitized data for each P-t record, along with the coefficients of the gage calibration data (Equation (B-1)) was analyzed using the IBM 7090/7094 computer. The calculational methods used and a listing of the computer program are presented herewith on pages B-3 to B-6.

Extrapolated positive duration was determined by fitting an equation of the form:

$$t = \tau_{2m} e^{\beta p}, \quad (B-2)$$

to the pressure-time data in the last quarter of the apparent positive phase. The value of  $\tau_{2m}$  is the extrapolated positive duration.

Extrapolated peak pressure was determined by fitting an equation of the form:

$$p = P_{2m} e^{\alpha t} \quad (\alpha < 0), \quad (B-3)$$

to the pressure-time data in the first half of the apparent positive phase. The value of  $P_{2m}$  is the extrapolated peak pressure.

Positive Impulse is defined by the equation:

$$I_2 = \int_0^{\tau_2} p(t) dt. \quad (B-4A)$$

In these calculations, the impulse was determined in two parts. Over most of the positive phase, after some initial time interval  $\Delta t$ , the impulse was determined by the equation.

$$I = \int_{\Delta t}^{\tau_2} p(t) dt, \quad (B-4B)$$

where  $\Delta t$  is a small value of time, which accounts for both the rise-time of the observed signal and any observed early-time gage malfunctions. Over this range ( $\Delta t$  to  $\tau_2$ ), the impulse was determined by the use of the trapezoid rule -- that is, a numerical integration of the pressure-time data.

The impulse in the time increment ( $\Delta t$ ) between shock arrival and the first pressure point was determined in the following way.

$$p = P_{2m} e^{-\alpha t}, \quad (B-3)$$

$$\Delta I = \int_0^{\Delta t} p(t) dt, \quad (B-4C)$$

$$\Delta I = P_{2m} \int_0^{\Delta t} e^{-\alpha t} dt, \quad (B-4D)$$

$$\Delta I = \frac{P_{2m}}{\alpha} \left( e^{-\alpha \Delta t} - 1 \right). \quad (B-4E)$$

This impulse increment (Equation (B-4E)) was then added to the impulse determined for the remainder of the positive phase to arrive at the total positive impulse (that is  $I_2 = I + \Delta I$ ).

```

COMMON      X(4,500),A(10),P(500),LL(50),TL(500),PT(500),TPLOT(500)
1PL(500),DUMMY(50),IX(2,500),T(500),U(500),TITLE(24),D1,G(500)

C
C      JCASE IS THE NUMBER OF RECORDS BEING PROCESSED
      READ(5,5000)JCASE
      DO 999 KIK=1,JCASE
      READ(5,5100)(TITLE(I),I=1,4)
      WRITE(6,5110)(TITLE(I),I=1,4)
C      IDEG IS THE DEGREE OF THE POLYNOMIAL USED TO FIT THE CALIBRATION
C      DATA FOR THAT GAGE AND SHOT
      READ(5,5000)IDEG
C      XCAL AND YCAL ARE THE SIZE OF THE X AND Y CALIBRATION STEPS.
      READ(5,5140)XCAL,YCAL
C      XCAL IS IN MILLISECS AND YCAL IS IN HERTZ.
C      IXSCA AND IYSCA ARE TELEREAD EX CALIBRATIONS
      READ(5,5130)IXSCA,IYSCA
      XSCA=IXSCA
      YSCA=IYSCA
C      ITOA IS THE SHOCK TIME OF ARRIVAL OBTAINED FROM THE RECORD
C      IDUM IS A DUMMY VARIABLE
      READ(5,5130)ITOA,IDUM
      TOA=ITOA
      DUMMY=IDUM
C      THE A(J) ARE THE COEFFICIENTS OF THE CALIBRATION CURVE FIT
      DO 10 J=1,IDEG
10      READ(5,5150)A(J)
      M=0
C      IX(1,L) AND IX(2,L) ARE THE POINTS PUNCHED BY THE TELEREADER
C      SYSTEM
      DO 20 L=1,500
      READ(5,5130)IX(1,L),IX(2,L)
      X(1,L)=IX(1,L)
      X(2,L)=IX(2,L)
      IF(X(1,L).EQ.999999.)GO TO 25
      M=M+1
20      CONTINUE
25      MM=M

C
      WRITE(6,5200)MM
      XS1=ABS(XSCA)
      XS2=ABS(XCAL)
      YS1=ABS(YSCA)
      YS2=ABS(YCAL)

C
      DO 40 JJ=1,MM
C      X(3,JJ) IS THE TIME CALCULATED FOR EACH POINT
      X(3,JJ)=(X(1,JJ)/XS1)*XS2
C      X(4,JJ) IS THE FREQUENCY DEVIATION CALCULATED FOR EACH POINT
      X(4,JJ)=(X(2,JJ)/YS1)*YS2
      T(JJ)=X(3,JJ)
      U(JJ)=X(4,JJ)
40      CONTINUE

C
      WRITE(6,5210)
      DO 80 K=1,MM
C      P(K) IS THE OVERPRESSURE CALCULATED FROM EACH FREQUENCY DEVIATION
      P(K)=0.
      DO 80 KK=1,IDEG
      P(K)=P(K)+A(KK)*X(4,K)**KK
80      CONTINUE

```

```

C 90 CONTINUE
C   G(1)=0.
   NNN=MM-1
C   THIS SECTION CALCULATES IMPULSE BY THE TRAPEZOID RULE
   DO 200 LK=1,MM
   IN=LK-1
   DELT=ABS(T(LK+1)-T(LK))
   IF(P(LK).EQ.0.)GO TO 150
   GO TO 155
150 G(LK)=0.
   GO TO 160
155 G(LK)=G(IN)+.5*(P(LK)+P(LK+1))*DELT
160 WRITE(6,5220)T(LK),P(LK),G(LK)
200 CONTINUE

C   CALL DURAT(T,U,P,MM)
C   DURAT DETERMINES BOTH THE ACTUAL CROSSING TIME OF THE SIGNAL AND
C   ALSO THE EXTRAPOLATED DURATION
C
C   CALL PRES1(D1,T,P,MM)
C   PRES1 CALCULATES THE EXTRAPOLATED PEAK PRESSURE
C
999 CONTINUE
5000 FORMAT(1I5)
5100 FORMAT(4A6)
5110 FORMAT(1H1,4A6)
5130 FORMAT(1I7,1I10)
5140 FORMAT(2E10.4)
5150 FORMAT(E14.5)
5200 FORMAT(1H0,2HM=,1I5)
5210 FORMAT(1H0,44HTIME(MSEC) PRESSURE(PSI) IMPULSE(PSI-MSEC),/)
5220 FORMAT(3F10.4)
   STOP
   END

$1BFTC SDURA
SUBROUTINE DURAT(T,U,P,MM)
COMMON X(4,500),A(10),P(500),LL(50),TL(500),PT(500),TPlot(500),
1PL(500),DUMMY(50),IX(2,500),T(500),U(500),TITLE(24),D1,G(500)
DO 30 NN=1,50
LL(NN)=0
30 CONTINUE
K=1
KI=0
DO 430 I=1,MM
IF(U(I))430,420,430
420 LL(K)=I
X=K+1
KI=KI+1
430 CONTINUE
IF(LL(2)-KI)500,440,440
440 LZ2=LL(2)
T2=T(LZ2)
445 IF(LL(3)-KI)510,450,450
450 LZ3=LL(3)
T3=T(LZ3)
455 IF(LL(4)-KI)520,460,460
460 LZ4=LL(4)
T4=T(LZ4)
465 IF(LL(5)-KI)530,470,470

```

```

470 LZ5=LL(5)
    T5=T(LZ5)
475 IF(LL(6)-K1)540,480,480
480 LZ6=LL(6)
    T6=T(LZ6)
    GO TO 600
500 T2=1.E4
    GO TO 445
510 T3=1.E4
    GO TO 455
520 T4=1.E4
    GO TO 465
530 T5=1.E4
    GO TO 475
540 T6=1.E4
600 D1=AMIN1(T2,T3,T4,T5,T6)
    D2=.75*D1
    KK=0
    TX=0.
    PT=0.
    TX2=0.
    TXPT=0.
    P2=0.
    DO 700 N=1,500
        IF(D2-T(N))620,620,700
620 IF(D1-T(N))700,630,630
630 TL(N)=ALOG(T(N))
    TX=TX+TL(N)
    PT=PT+P(N)
    P2=P2+P(N)**2
    TXPT=TXPT+TL(N)*P(N)
    KK=KK+1
700 CONTINUE
    XKK=KK
    BD=(XKK*TXPT-TX*PT)/(XKK*P2-PT**2)
    AD=(TX-BD*PT)/XKK
710 D3=EXP(AD)
    D6=6.*D1
    WRITE(6,2220) D1
    WRITE(6,2230) D3
2220 FORMAT(1H0,10X,33HAPPARENT POSITIVE DURATION(MSEC)=,1F10.4//)
2230 FORMAT(10X,37HETRAPOLATED POSITIVE DURATION(MSEC)=,1F10.4)
    RETURN
    END
$IBFTC SPRES
    SUBROUTINE PRES1(D1,T,P,MM)
    COMMON X(4,500),A(10),P(500),LL(500),TL(500),PT(500),TPLOT(500)
    IPL(500),DUMMY(500),IX(2,500),T(500),U(500),TITLE(24),D1,G(500)
    DP=.5*D1
    M1=0
    XT=0.
    YP=0.
    XT2=0.
    CROS=0.
    DO 700 NN=2,MM
        IF(T(NN).GT.DP)GO TO 700
        PL(NN)=ALOG(P(NN))
        XT=XT+T(NN)
        YP=YP+PL(NN)
        XT2=XT2+T(NN)**2





```




```
CROS=CROS+T(NN)*PL(NN)
MI=MI+1
700 CONTINUE
XMI=XMI
BP=(XMI*CROS-XT*YP)/(XMI*XT2-XT**2)
AP=(YP-BP*XT)/XMI
WRITE(6,2980)XMI,BP,AP
PME=EXP(AP)
WRITE(6,3000)PME
2980 FORMAT(1H0,10HXMI,BP,AP=,3F10.4)
3000 FORMAT(1H0,10X,32HEXTRAPOLATED PEAK PRESSURE(PSI)=,1F10.4)
RETURN
END
SDATA
```

APPENDIX C


The Pressure-Time Curves




EVENT 1  
R = 146 FT




EVENT 1  
R = 221 FT











EVENT 1  
R = 146 FT






EVENT 1  
R = 221 FT












EVENT II  
R = 145 FT




EVENT II  
R = 221 FT







EVENT II  
R = 145 FT





EVENT II  
R = 221 FT












EVENT III  
R = 136 FT





EVENT III  
R = 136 FT




EVENT III  
R = 184 FT







EVENT III  
R = 378




EVENT III  
R = 542 FT




EVENT III  
R = 378




EVENT III  
R = 542 FT




EVENT III  
R = 794 FT




EVENT III  
R = 1490 FT





EVENT III  
R = 794 FT



EVENT III  
R = 1490 FT





DISTRIBUTION

Copies

NAVY

Commander  
Naval Ordnance Systems Command  
Washington, D. C. 20360

Attn: NORD-9132  
NORD-0332  
NORD-034  
NORD-082  
NORD-035  
NORD-05411  
NORD-033

*1 dia. 10/10/70  
8-25-70*

7

Commander  
Naval Air Systems Command  
Washington, D. C. 20360

Attn: NAIR-604  
NAIR-350  
NAIR-52023  
NAIR-53233

4

Commander  
Naval Ship Systems Command  
Washington, D. C. 20360

Attn: NSHP-2021  
NSHP-6423  
NSHP-0331  
NSHP-0342  
NSHP-0412

5

Officer-in-Charge  
U. S. Naval School  
Civil Engineering Corps Officers  
Naval Construction Battalion  
Port Hueneme, California 93041

Commander  
Naval Ship Engineering Center  
Prince Georges Center  
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

Attn: NSEC-6105

4

Commanding Officer and Director  
Naval Ship Research and Development Center  
Washington, D. C. 20007

Attn: Library, E. Habib, H. Rich, F. Weinberger

5



Chief of Naval Research, ND

Washington, D. C. 20390

Attn: Code 811

Code 493, Code 418, Code 104

2  
3

Headquarters

Naval Material Command

Washington, D. C. 20360

Attn: 03L

Commanding Officer

Nuclear Weapons Training Center, Atlantic

Naval Base

Norfolk, Virginia 23500

Attn: Nuclear Warfare Department

Commanding Officer

Nuclear Weapons Training Center, Pacific

Naval Station

North Island

San Diego, California 92100

2

Commanding Officer

U. S. Naval Damage Control Training Center

Naval Base

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19100

Attn: ABC Defense Course

Commander

Naval Weapons Center

China Lake, California 93555

Attn: Library, R. E. Boyer, Dr. Mallory, Dr. J. Pearson

4

Commanding Officer and Director

U. S. Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory

Port Hueneme, California 93041

Attn: Code L31, R. J. Odello (Code L51)

2

Chief of Naval Operations, ND

Washington, D. C. 20350

Attn: OP-75

OP-03E0

2

Director of Naval Intelligence, ND

Washington, D. C. 20350

Attn: OP-922V

Commander

U. S. Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility

Kirtland AFB, New Mexico 87117

Attn: Library, (WEVS)

2

Commanding Officer  
U. S. Naval Ordnance Station  
Indian Head, Maryland 20640  
Attn: Library

Commander  
U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory  
Dahlgren, Virginia 22448  
Attn: Terminal Ballistics Department  
Technical Library

1  
2

Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Headquarters  
Washington, D. C. 20390  
Attn: Code 03

Superintendent  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, California 93940

Underwater Explosions Research Division  
Naval Ship Research and Development Center  
Portsmouth, Virginia 23709

# ARMY

Commanding General  
USA Missile Command  
Huntsville, Alabama 35801

Commanding General  
White Sands Missile Range  
White Sands, New Mexico 88002  
Attn: STEWS-AMTED-2

Chief of Engineers, D/A  
Washington, D. C. 20310  
Attn: ENG CW-NE, ENGTE-E, ENQMC-E

3

Commanding General  
U. S. Army Materiel Command  
Washington, D. C. 20310  
Attn: AMCRD-DE-N

2

Commanding Officer  
U. S. Army Combat Developments Command  
Institute of Nuclear Studies  
Ft. Bliss, Texas 79916

Commanding Officer  
Aberdeen Proving Ground  
Aberdeen, Maryland 21005

Attn: BRL for Director, J. J. Meszaros  
W. J. Taylor, R. E. Shear  
C. N. Kingery, J. H. Keefer, R. E. Reisler

6

Commanding General  
The Engineer Center  
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia 22060

Attn: Asst. Commandant, Engineer School

Commanding Officer  
Picatinny Arsenal  
Dover, N. J. 07801

Attn: SMUPA-G, -W, -VL, -VE, -VC, -DD  
-DR, -DR4, -DW, -TX, -TW, -V

6  
6

Director  
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Waterways Experiment Station  
Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180  
Attn: Library, John Strange, G. Arbuthnot

3

Commanding Officer  
U. S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development  
Center

Ft. Belvoir, Virginia 22060  
Attn: Technical Document Center

3

Commandant  
Army War College  
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013  
Attn: Library

Commanding Officer  
Army Engineer Nuclear Cratering Group  
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory  
Livermore, California 94550  
Attn: Document Control, CAPT Johnson

2

Commanding General  
Army Safeguard System Command  
P.O. Box 1500  
Huntsville, Alabama 35807  
Attn: SAFSC-DB, Ltc. W. Alfante

Commanding Officer  
Army Safeguard System Evaluation Agency  
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico 88002  
Attn: LT. R. M. Walker

Commandant  
Army Command & General Staff College  
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027  
Attn: Acquisitions, Library Division

Commanding Officer  
Frankford Arsenal  
Bridge and Tacony Streets  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19137

Chief of Research and Development, D/A  
Washington, D. C. 20310  
Attn: Atomic Division

AIR FORCE

AFWL  
Kirtland AFB, New Mexico 87117  
Attn: WLRPH, CAPT W. Whitaker

Headquarters  
Air Force Systems Command  
Andrews AFB, Washington, D. C. 20331  
Attn: SCPSL, Technical Library

AF Cambridge Research Laboratories, OAR  
L. G. Hanscom Field  
Bedford, Massachusetts 01730  
Attn: CRMXLR, Research Library, Stop 29

AF Institute of Technology, Au  
Wright-Fatterson AFB, Ohio 45433  
Attn: Technical Library

Air Force Special Weapons Center, AFSC  
Kirtland AFB, New Mexico 87117  
Attn: R. Bunker

Air University Library, Au  
Maxwell AFB, Alabama 36112  
Attn: Documents Section

Rome Air Development Center, AFSC  
Griffiss AFB, New York 13440  
Attn: Documents Library EMLAL-1

Space & Missile Systems Organization, AFSC  
Norton AFB, California 92409  
Attn: SMQN

DOD Activities

Defense Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D. C. 20301  
Attn: DIAAP-8B

Director of Defense Research and Engineering  
Washington, D. C. 20330  
Attn: Tech Library, R. D. Geckler

2

Commander  
Test Command, Defense Atomic Support Agency  
Sandia Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87115  
Attn: FCWT, PCTG

2

Director  
Defense Atomic Support Agency  
Washington, D. C. 20305  
Attn: SPLN, SPAS, SPSS

10

Civil Defense Research Project  
Oak Ridge National Lab  
P. O. Box X  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830  
Attn: Dr. Carsten Haaland

Director  
Advanced Research Projects Agency  
Washington, D. C. 20301  
Attn: NMR Nuclear Monitoring Res. Office

Commandant  
Industrial College of the Armed Forces  
Ft. McNair, Washington, D. C. 20315  
Attn: Document Control

Commandant  
National War College  
Fort Lesley J. McNair  
Washington, D. C. 20315  
Attn: Class Rec. Library

Assistant to the Secretary of Defense  
Atomic Energy  
Washington, D. C. 20301  
Attn: Document Control

Director of Defense Research & Engineering  
Washington, D. C. 20301  
Attn: Assistant Director Nuclear Programs

Director  
Weapons Systems Evaluation Group  
Washington, D. C. 20305  
Attn: Library

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Asst. General Manager for Military Application  
Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20543  
Attn: Document Control for R&D Branch

Atomic Energy Commission  
Albuquerque Operations Office  
P. O. Box 5400 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87116  
Attn: Technical Library

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory  
P. O. Box 1663  
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544  
Attn: LASL Library, Serials Librarian

OTHER ACTIVITIES

National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
Goddard Space Flight Center  
Greenbelt, Maryland 20771  
Attn: Technical Library

President  
Sandia Corporation, Sandia Base  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87115  
Attn: Dr. M. L. Merritt  
W. B. Bendick  
J. Roberts  
J. W. Reed  
Dr. C. Broyles

5

Director  
U. S. Bureau of Mines  
Division of Explosive Technology  
4800 Forbes Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213  
Attn: Dr. Robert W. Van Dolah  
Dr. R. W. Watson

2

Chairman  
Armed Services Explosives Safety Board  
NASSIF Bldg., 5616 Columbia Pike  
Washington, D. C. 20315  
Attn: Mr. R. G. Perkins

Department of Physics  
Stanford Research Institute  
Menlo Park, California 94025  
Attn: Library

Physics International  
2700 Merced Street  
San Leandro, California 94577  
Attn: Fred M. Sauer

Lockheed Missiles and Space Co.  
Palo Alto, California 94300  
Attn: Dr. R. E. Meyerott, Dr. Eugene Terry

2

Southwest Research Institute  
8500 Culebra Road  
San Antonio, Texas 78206  
Attn: Dr. Robert C. Dehart, Dr. W. Baker

2

Space Technology Laboratories, Inc.  
5500 West El Segundo Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90000  
Attn: Dr. Leon, Dr. Benjamin Sussholz  
Via: BSD, Norton AFB, California 94209

2

GE-TEMPO  
816 State Street  
Santa Barbara, California 93102  
Attn: DASA Information and Analysis Center  
Mr. Warren W. Chan  
Dr. C. M. Schindler

3

President  
Kaman Nuclear  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80900  
Attn: Dr. Frank Shelton

IIT Research Institute  
Illinois Institute of Technology  
10 West 35th Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60616

Denver Research Institute  
Mechanics Division, University of Denver  
Denver, Colorado 80210  
Attn: Dr. Rodney F. Recht

2

DDC  
Cameron Station  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Attn: TISIA-21

20

Falcon Research and Development  
1441 Ogden Street  
Denver, Colorado 80218  
Attn: Mr. D. K. Parks

URS Corporation  
1700 S. El Camino Real  
San Mateo, California 94401  
Attn: Mr. Kenneth Kaplan, Mr. C. Wilton

2

U. S. Geological Survey  
Center of Astrogeology  
601 East Cedar Avenue  
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001  
Attn: Dr. D. J. Roddy

Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc.  
Whippany Road  
Whippany, New Jersey 07981  
Attn: M. F. Stevens

The Boeing Company  
P. O. Box 3707  
Seattle, Washington 98124  
Attn: W. Crist

Engineering Physics Company  
12721 Twinbrook Parkway  
Rockville, Maryland 20852  
Attn: Mr. Vincent J. Cushing

General American Transportation Corporation  
General American Research Division  
7449 North Natchez Avenue  
Niles, Illinois 60648  
Attn: Dr. M. J. Balcerzak

Kaman Avidyne Division of Kaman Sciences Corporation  
83 2nd Avenue Northwest Industrial Park  
Burlington, Massachusetts 01803  
Attn: N. P. Hobbs

The Rand Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica, California 90406  
Attn: Technical Library/Dr. R. LeLevier

TRW Systems Group  
One Space Park  
Redondo Beach, California 90278  
Attn: H. J. Carpenter



ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION

Commanding Officer  
U. S. Naval Construction Battalion Center  
Port Hueneme, California 93041  
Attn: Civ Engr Corps Ofc

Director  
U. S. Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D. C. 20390

Commanding Officer & Director  
U. S. Naval Electronics Lab  
San Diego, California 92152

Director  
U. S. Naval Training Aids Center  
Building 62, Treasure Island  
San Francisco, California 94130

President  
U. S. Naval War College  
Newport, Rhode Island 02840

Commandant  
U. S. Marine Corps  
Washington, D. C. 20380  
Attn: Code A03H

AFATL (ATB, PGOW, PGEPS)  
Eglin AFB, Florida 32542

3

Commandant  
Armed Forces Staff College  
Norfolk, Virginia 23511  
Attn: Library

Commanding Officer  
Harry Diamond Laboratories  
Washington, D. C. 20438  
Attn: AMXDO-TD/002

Director  
Army Aeronautical Research Laboratory  
Moffett Naval Air Station  
California 94035

Director of Civil Defense  
Department of the Army  
Washington, D. C. 20310  
Attn: RADIMON

Commanding Officer  
U. S. Army Aviation Materiel Laboratories  
Fort Eustis, Virginia 23604  
Attn: SAVFE-SO, Tech Library Branch

Commanding Officer  
U. S. Army Edgewood Arsenal  
Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland 21010  
Attn: SMUEA-W

Commanding Officer  
U. S. Army Materials and Mechanics  
Research Center  
Watertown, Massachusetts 02172

Commanding Officer  
U. S. Army Cold Regions Research and  
Engineering Laboratories  
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755  
Attn: Mr. R. Frost, Mr. H. Smith

2

Commanding General  
U. S. Army Natick Laboratories  
Natick, Massachusetts 01762  
Attn: AMXRE, Dr. Dale H. Sieling

Office of Project Manager  
NIKE-X  
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama 35809  
Attn: Mr. H. Solomonson

Director  
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory  
University of California  
P. O. Box 808  
Livermore, California 94550  
Attn: Tech Information Division

Director  
Institute for Defense Analysis  
400 Army-Navy Drive  
Arlington, Virginia 22202

Lovelace Foundation  
4800 Gibson Blvd., S. E.  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87100 Attn: Dr. D. Richmond

University of Illinois  
Talbot Laboratory, Rm. 207  
Urbana, Illinois 61803  
Attn: Dr. N. Newmark

University of Michigan  
Institute of Science and Technology  
P. O. Box 618  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104  
Attn: Mr. G. Frantti

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139  
Attn: Dr. R. Hansen

St. Louis University  
221 North Grand  
St. Louis, Missouri 63100  
Attn: Dr. C. Kisslinger

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

## DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&amp;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) Commander U. S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory White Oak, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION <u>Unclassified</u>	
		2b. GROUP	
3. REPORT TITLE Blast Characteristics of 20- and 100-ton Hemispherical AN/FO Charges, NOL Data Report			
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)			
5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial) Sadwin, Lippe D. Swisdak, Michael M., Jr.			
6. REPORT DATE 17 March 1970	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 54	7b. NO. OF REFS 16	
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. DASA Subtask NAO07-04, Task NOL-194	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) NOLTR 70-32		
c. d.	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)		
10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES Each transmittal of this document outside the Department of Defense must have prior approval of NOL.			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Defense Atomic Support Agency Washington, D. C. 20305	
13. ABSTRACT Two twenty-ton and one 100-ton hemispherical AN/FO (ammonium nitrate/fuel oil) charges were detonated on the surface at the Defence Research Establishment, Suffield, Ralston, Alberta, Canada. The tests were conducted during August 1969 as a cooperative U. S./Canadian effort.  The major results were: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. AN/FO has been demonstrated to be a highly suitable explosion source for nuclear airblast simulation.</li> <li>2. Over the 1-200 psi region, there was no significant difference in the pressure-distance characteristics between AN/FO and TNT.</li> <li>3. The impulse characteristics of the AN/FO system were found to be slightly lower than those of TNT.</li> <li>4. No self heating of AN FO was observed.</li> <li>5. Conventional cube root scaling applies for AN/FO over a <math>10^3</math> range in explosive weight, once a charge weight of 200 pounds is exceeded.</li> </ol>			

DD FORM 1 JAN 64 1473

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Airblast Explosive Ammonium Nitrate/Fuel Oil Thermal Stability Secondary Shock Instrumentation Hemispherical Charges						

#### 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 parentheses 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, 8c, & 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 content. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.