

(12)  
D.S.

LEVEL III

AD-E 300 731

DNA 4806T-1

ADA 083451

## MEDIUM FREQUENCY PROPAGATION EXPERIMENT AT MISERS BLUFF

Roger S. Vickers  
SRI International  
333 Ravenswood Avenue  
Menlo Park, California 94025

15 November 1978

Topical Report for Period 15 July 1978—15 November 1978

CONTRACT No. DNA 001-77-C-0269

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;  
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

THIS WORK SPONSORED BY THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY  
UNDER RDT&E RMSS CODES B322078462 I25AAXHX68502 H2590D  
AND X322078469 Q93AAXHX68501 H2590D.

Prepared for  
Director  
DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY  
Washington, D. C. 20305

DTIC  
ELECTE  
S APR 23 1980 D  
B

80 3 13 011

FILE COPY

Destroy this report when it is no longer  
needed. Do not return to sender.

PLEASE NOTIFY THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY,  
ATTN: STTI, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20305, IF  
YOUR ADDRESS IS INCORRECT, IF YOU WISH TO  
BE DELETED FROM THE DISTRIBUTION LIST, OR  
IF THE ADDRESSEE IS NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY  
YOUR ORGANIZATION.



## UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE   |                                     | READ INSTRUCTIONS<br>BEFORE COMPLETING FORM   |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER<br>DNA 4806T-1   | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.<br>AD-A083451 | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER   |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle)<br>MEDIUM FREQUENCY PROPAGATION EXPERIMENT<br>AT MISERS BLUFF   |                                     | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED<br>Topical Report for Period<br>15 Jul 78—15 Nov 78                          |
| 7. AUTHOR(s)<br>Roger S. Vickers  |                                     | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER<br>SRI Project 6262  |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS<br>SRI International<br>333 Ravenswood Avenue<br>Menlo Park, California 95025   |                                     | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)<br>DNA 001-77-C-0269   |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS<br>Director<br>Defense Nuclear Agency<br>Washington, D.C. 20305   |                                     | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK<br>AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS<br>Subtasks I25AAXHX685-02<br>and Q93AAXHX685-01 |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)<br>USAF/SAMSO/MNNH<br>Norton AFB, California 92409  |                                     | 12. REPORT DATE<br>15 November 1978   |
|   |                                     | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES<br>34   |
|   |                                     | 15. SECURITY CLASS (of this report)<br>UNCLASSIFIED   |
|   |                                     | 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING<br>SCHEDULE   |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)<br>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.   |                                     |   |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)  |                                     |   |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES<br>This work sponsored by the Defense Nuclear Agency under RDT&E RMSS Codes<br>B322078462 I25AAXHX68502 H2590D and X322078469 Q93AAXHX68501 H2590D.   |                                     |   |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br>MISERS BLUFF                      Communications<br>Dust Effects                      High Explosive<br>Radio Propagation                Detonation<br>Medium Frequency   |                                     |   |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)<br>In an experiment conducted in conjunction with the MISERS BLUFF high-explosive detonation, the effects of the dust cloud on wave propagation at 3 MHz were assessed. The experiment used both vertical above-ground and horizontal buried antennas. The results indicate that the dust from this 720-ton ANFO detonation caused no appreciable propagation effects, as expected, although the shock wave perturbed communications for several seconds. |                                     |   |

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

## CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS. . . . .                | 2  |
| LIST OF TABLES . . . . .                      | 2  |
| I INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES . . . . .       | 3  |
| II APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM . . . . .          | 4  |
| A. Experimental Design. . . . .               | 4  |
| B. Antenna Design . . . . .                   | 7  |
| C. Electronics. . . . .                       | 9  |
| III THE EVENT . . . . .                       | 16 |
| IV DATA REDUCTION AND RESULTS. . . . .        | 20 |
| V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION . . . . .         | 24 |
| A. Questions That Have Been Answered. . . . . | 24 |
| B. Questions That Remain. . . . .             | 25 |
| REFERENCES . . . . .                          | 26 |

|                                 |               |                                     |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| ACCESSION for                   |               |                                     |
| NTIS                            | White Section | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| DDC                             | Buff Section  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| UNANNOUNCED                     |               | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| JUSTIFICATION _____             |               |                                     |
| BY _____                        |               |                                     |
| DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES |               |                                     |
| Dist                            | Avail. and/or | SPECIAL                             |
| A                               |               |                                     |

## ILLUSTRATIONS

| <u>Page</u> |  | <u>Number</u> |
|-------------|--|---------------|
| 1           | Experiment Configuration . . . . .                                   | 5             |
| 2           | Analysis Equipment in Shelter. . . . .                               | 8             |
| 3           | Transmitter Site Before the Shot . . . . .                           | 10            |
| 4           | Azimuthal Patterns of Subsurface Dipoles . . . . .                   | 11            |
| 5           | Equipment Block Diagram. . . . .                                     | 12            |
| 6           | Secondary Receiver Site. . . . .                                     | 13            |
| 7           | Primary Receiving Site . . . . .                                     | 14            |
| 8           | MISERS BLUFF II Detonation . . . . .                                 | 17            |
| 9           | MISERS BLUFF II Detonation . . . . .                                 | 18            |
| 10          | Dust Cloud Viewed from Equipment Shelter . . . . .                   | 19            |
| 11          | Relative Phase Data (unsmoothed) from Vertical<br>Antennas . . . . . | 21            |

## TABLES

| <u>Page</u> |  | <u>Number</u> |
|-------------|--|---------------|
| 1           | Predicted Antenna Deflection at 5 psi Region . . . . .                   | 9             |
| 2           | Differential Phase Shift Between Primary and<br>Secondary Paths. . . . . | 21            |

## I INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

Experiments on the effects of dust clouds on the propagation of electromagnetic waves have been conducted for the last few years at frequencies from 400 MHz upwards.<sup>1\*</sup> There is a military interest in communications at 3 MHz and below through dust clouds. Until the time of experiment, designers of equipment at these frequencies have only speculated on the effects of dust clouds, based on extrapolation from the 400 MHz data and on predictions from scattering theory.

The purpose of the experiment described in this report is to provide experimental data to confirm the prediction that at frequencies below 3 MHz dust would have no appreciable effect on wave propagation. It is hoped that the data will permit a quantitative relationship to be established between dust density, attenuation, phase shift, and (to a lesser extent) the yield of the explosion.

This work was supported by the Defense Nuclear Agency and the U.S. Air Force Space and Missile Systems Organization under contracts DNA001-77-C-0269 and DNA001-79-C-0181. This experiment and results will also be described in Technical Report DNA 4801T-1, which is to be published in the near future.

74)

---

\* References are listed at the end of this report.

## II APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

### A. Experimental Design

The basic configuration of the experiment is shown in Figure 1, with a primary transmission path passing through ground zero (GZ) and a secondary path off at  $90^\circ$  for normalization purposes. We expected to experience some shock effects, and possible damage, at the two close-in sites, which would result in changes in the baseline level at the receivers. Since transmitter changes would also be detected at the secondary receiving site, we expected to be able to calibrate out any such phase and amplitude effects from the primary data. The antennas were vertical monopoles mounted on 8-m telephone poles with the lower 3 m buried. Ground currents were returned through copper screening wound around the buried section; the whole antenna was driven in an unbalanced mode. An antenna loading coil was wound onto the pole immediately above the feed point.

Because of the long wavelengths involved, diffraction effects were a possible source of errors; the antennas were positioned close to the detonation to ensure that the direct path would be completely filled with dust. This led to the question of whether the antennas could survive the blast. Consequently, a second set of buried antennas was installed with a common phase center to the primary antennas. We were, therefore, able to study the relative performance of the buried and exposed antennas during and after the shot.

Buried horizontal dipoles were colocated with each of the telephone pole antennas. The design and anticipated performance of these antennas were taken from studies published by RADC<sup>2</sup> and by the Boeing Corporation<sup>3</sup>. The depth of burial was just sufficient to ensure no damage from the shock wave, and electrically the antennas could be considered to be at the air/soil interface. The purpose of these secondary antennas was twofold: (1) to provide a backup in case the primary antennas




FIGURE 1 EXPERIMENT CONFIGURATION



failed on passage of the shock wave, and '2) to provide a basis for comparing the performance of the two types of antenna under "near miss" conditions.

A number of factors used in the interpretation of any observed effects bothered us in the early stages of experimental design. Our main concern, particularly since we were aiming for a system sensitivity of 0.1 dB and  $1^\circ$  in phase, was to make sure that we had a completely defensible experiment, even in the unlikely event that some major propagation effects were seen. The possibility of multipath propagation interfering with the data was minimized by placing the antennas very close to GZ, so that the dust cloud would completely envelope both the transmitter and the primary receiving sites. The cloud was also expected to fill the area between MISERS BLUFF and GZ, which constituted the most likely source of multipath interference. The antennas were placed 400 m on either side of the GZ on a radial oriented approximately parallel to the bluff. The over-pressure at the points was expected to be 5 psi. This was not our first choice for orientation but was largely dictated by such field considerations as already emplaced cable and other experiments competing for space.

A second source of concern was the length of the cable runs from the antennas to the instrumentation park, where the data analysis equipment was to be located. These cables would carry both the drive signals for the transmitters and the received signals from the antennas, and would be approximately 2500 m in length. We were concerned that if there was a poor ground at the transmitter or a mismatch at the cable ends, we could inadvertently radiate from the 2500-m cable rather than the 5-m vertical monopole. To remove any possibility of this, the cables were terminated 20 m from the antennas, and an optical link carried the signals from this point to and from the antenna amplifiers.

The signals were analyzed for phase shift and attenuation by a series of Hewlett-Packard 8407 Network Analyzers--one for each receiving antenna. The output of these instruments was to be recorded both on tape (Ampex FR 1300) and on paper (Honeywell Visicorder). We also

recorded the voice of Test Control with the countdown timing. The equipment is shown in Figure 2. The left rack contains the above-ground antenna instruments and the Ampex recorder, the right rack contains the subsurface-antenna analysis equipment. The gap in the rack was for the Honeywell Visicorder, which, unfortunately failed 48 hours before the event. Attempts to integrate a substitute recorder (flown in from SRI the evening before the shot) were unsuccessful. This, the only equipment failure during the experiment, resulted in data from the subsurface antenna at the secondary receiving site not being recorded. Since these data would be critical only if the colocated vertical antenna failed, we were not overly concerned. Phase data from both the buried and vertical antennas at the primary site were, therefore, ratioed against the signals from the vertical normalizing antenna.

#### B. Antenna Design

Because we desire to have the primary transmission path filled by the dust cloud, the antennas had to be placed close to GZ. Based on the results of the Phase I detonation, we decided that the transmitter and primary receiver sites should be 400 m on either side of the center of the explosives array. This meant that we could anticipate approximately 5 psi of over-pressure on each antenna. A dynamic analysis was done to predict the flexure and possible permanent deformation (or destruction) of the telephone poles used for the antenna support. The expected deflections are given in Table 1. As a result of the analysis, the 30-cm diameter pole was considered survivable, and was used in the experiment.

The impedance of the vertical antenna was estimated using a ground conductivity value of 10 mmho/m. Attempts to measure the conductivity in the field with standard geophysical equipment failed because of the high electrode resistance in the dry upper dust layers. Simple analyses at SRI indicated that a loading coil of some 40  $\mu$ H would be required for proper loading of the antenna. We planned to operate the antenna in an unbalanced mode, assuming that the buried portion of the pole would act more like a ground plane than a monopole. To aid in the return of ground currents, several hundred gallons of water were poured in the telephone




FIGURE 2 ANALYSIS EQUIPMENT IN SHELTER

Table 1  
PREDICTED ANTENNA DEFLECTION AT 5 psi REGION

| Pole Diameter              | 14 cm<br>(5.5 in.) | 30 cm<br>(12 in.) |
|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Maximum elastic deflection | 36.6 cm            | 6.6 cm            |
| Permanent deflection       | 0 cm               | 2.1 cm            |

pole during emplacement. This also helped the mechanical stability of the antenna by compacting the fill material. Figure 3 shows the vertical transmitter antenna with the transmitter enclosure still open. During the antenna emplacement, aluminum sheeting was used to sheath the antenna, secured by nails and steel bands. By these means, we both increased the strength of the configuration and made it less vulnerable to major damage by the cutting action of missiles resulting from the explosion.

The subsurface antennas were 6-m horizontal dipoles; the minimum in the antenna pattern was pointed toward MISERS BLUFF to reduce the contribution of reflected energy received. The antennas were fed by a suitable balanced network. The predicted antenna pattern is shown in Figure 4.

### C. Electronics

Figure 5 shows the configuration of the transmitter and receiver electronics, which was identical for both the vertical and subsurface antennas. Both antennas were driven by Class C amplifiers that were left on, but they could be turned into a nonradiating mode during the ANFO arming sequence by removing the transmitter drive at the equipment shelter. In the nondriven condition, battery power consumption was minimal and did not constrain the experiment. The optical links were used to isolate the cables and the antenna electronics, as previously mentioned. Figure 6 shows the vertical antenna at the secondary site before detonation, and Figure 7 the primary receiving station after detonation.



FIGURE 3 TRANSMITTER SITE BEFORE THE SHOT




FIGURE 4 AZIMUTHAL PATTERNS OF SUBSURFACE DIPOLES  
 (AFTER ENTZMINGER)




FIGURE 5 EQUIPMENT BLOCK DIAGRAM




FIGURE 6 SECONDARY RECEIVER SITE






FIGURE 7 PRIMARY RECEIVING SITE

For the day of the shot, the shelter was tied down, all circuit breakers were hard wired "on" and all windows were boarded over, since we were uncertain of the pressure levels to be expected at this site. The site was manned during the shot.


### III THE EVENT

During preparations on the day of the shot, we were hampered somewhat by unexpected restrictions on vehicle movement during the early hours of the morning (T - 4 hours). This prevented us from adequately checking the repairs on our primary receiving cables, which had been cut the day before. Fortunately, the repairs were good, and after turning all the equipment on, we had signals to and from all antennas at the equipment shelter. The countdown went normally, with a 45 min hold for weather. We began recording data at T - 15 min to establish any drift as the valley heated up after sunrise. Data recording continued through the shot until T + 30 min. Figures 8 and 9 show the dust cloud at various stages of development, viewed from 10 miles away; Figure 10 shows it as seen from the equipment shelter at approximately T + 30 s.

Apart from the high noise level, no adverse effects were noted as the shock wave passed through the equipment shelter. We did not see any loss of phase lock at any time on any of the recorded channels. After the shock wave passed, the amplitude of the vertical antenna signal at the primary site dropped approximately 10 dB and stayed there. Subsequent inspection showed no apparent damage, and the only expected change in performance was due to the 2.1 cm permanent deflection mentioned earlier. Since the other antennas provided normalizing signals, the 10 dB drop simply represented a shift in baseline.




T + 6 sec




T + 11 sec

(Courtesy of W. G. Chesnut)

FIGURE 8 MISERS BLUFF II DETONATION



(Courtesy of W. G. Chesnut) T + 2 min



T + 1 min

FIGURE 9 MISERS BLUFF II DETONATION



FIGURE 10 DUST CLOUD VIEWED FROM EQUIPMENT SHELTER

#### IV DATA REDUCTION AND RESULTS

Reduction of the MF data has included stripping out the data and calibrations on paper, and plotting the amplitude and phase deviations as a function of time. No reliable data on the dust density of the cloud are now available. Therefore, a first-order estimate has been made using the observed size of the craters and the photographs of the cloud size. No attempt has been made to analyze the first 3 s or so of data because of time and cost constraints, and because of the difficulty in separating real propagation effects from those due to antenna motion.

Figure 11 shows a section of the output from the phase channels from the vertical antennas as a function of time. The detonation time and blast effects are clearly seen. The impact of the shock waves on the equipment shelter is seen at the  $T + 5$  s. Both channels eventually return to a new baseline, which means that the shock wave caused individual permanent changes to each of the two close-in antennas. Because of the greatly increased distance to the second receiver site, we are assuming that any change in antenna performance at this second site is minimal compared with that of the two close-in antennas. Table 2 shows the differential phase shift between the two receivers as a function of time for the first 25 s. The phase information used in deriving this table was with reference to the post-shock baseline value. The records before the detonation show that the short-term drift in phase was not sufficient to be of concern. After the shot, however, both receivers showed a phase drift for about 15 min. During this period, the two vertical and the primary buried receiving antennas tracked perfectly in phase, indicating that the drift originated in the transmitter/antenna site; thus it was easy to calibrate out of the data.

The amplitude records show no measurable attenuation of the signal in either the vertical or the horizontal (buried) antenna channels. This important result confirms what had been previously only been assumed by




FIGURE 11 RELATIVE PHASE DATA (unsmoothed) FROM VERTICAL ANTENNAS

Table 2

DIFFERENTIAL PHASE SHIFT BETWEEN PRIMARY  
AND SECONDARY PATHS

| Time<br>(seconds) | $\delta\phi$<br>(degrees) |
|-------------------|---------------------------|
| T + 5             | 0.1                       |
| T + 10            | 0.2                       |
| T + 15            | 0.3                       |
| T + 20            | 0.1                       |
| T + 25            | 0.0                       |



extrapolating from much higher frequencies. With smoothing, the data were readable to 0.1 dB, and no noticeable deviation was observed. The phase data showed a maximum departure of 0.3°.

The phase shift due to the dust cloud can be crudely calculated from measurements of the crater volume if we assume that for typical alluvium, such as that found in the area around GZ, the dielectric constant,  $E_r$ , is 6 and the soil density,  $\rho$ , is 2 g/cc. We were given,<sup>4</sup> that the six crater volumes were

75,000 ft<sup>3</sup>  
 55,000 ft<sup>3</sup>  
 45,000 ft<sup>3</sup>  
 38,000 ft<sup>3</sup>  
 66,000 ft<sup>3</sup>  
 80,000 ft<sup>3</sup>.

The total volume, therefore, was 359,000 ft<sup>3</sup>. Assuming that approximately 50% of this was lofted by the explosion, the mass lofted was:

$$m = 1/2 \times 359,000 \times 28.3 \times 2 \text{ kg} \div 10^7 \text{ kg}$$

Similar estimates, given at a recent symposium on the preliminary findings at MISERS BLUFF,<sup>5</sup> ranged from 1 to 5 x 10<sup>6</sup> kg.

Sequential photographs of the dust cloud during its development were taken from a distant site, as shown in Figures 7 and 8. From photographs in this series it can be calculated that the cloud reached a maximum diameter of a little over 600 m at ground level at around T + 10 s.

Thus, if we assume uniform distribution of the lofted mass, the density  $\rho_c$  is given by

$$\rho_c = \frac{M}{V} \frac{10^7}{1/2 \times 4/3 \pi (300)^3} \text{ kg/m}^3 \div 0.18 \text{ kg/m}^3,$$

or 180 g/m<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, with the assumptions mentioned and a total mass of lofted material somewhere between 10<sup>6</sup> and 10<sup>7</sup> kg, the average density

ranges from 18 to 180 g/m<sup>3</sup>. The phase shift that this should produce is given by

$$\delta\varphi = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{\frac{E_r - 1}{E_r + 2}}{\rho_d} \int S \rho_c ds ,$$

where

$\delta\varphi$  = Phase shift

$E_r$  = Relative permittivity

$\rho_d$  = Specific gravity of the alluvium

$S$  = Distance through the cloud

$\rho_c$  = Density of the cloud.

Putting the following values:

$$S = 600 \text{ m}$$

$$\lambda = 100 \text{ m}$$

$$E_r = 6$$

$$\rho_c = 180 \text{ g/m}^3$$

$$\rho_d = 2$$

in the equation, we get  $\delta\varphi = 3.1 \times 10^{-3}$  radians, or 0.18° at 3 MHz. The observed values of 0.3° (max) at T + 15 s are therefore reasonable.

The phase records can be read individually to about  $\pm 0.1^\circ$  if they are smoothed. Since the phase deviation is the result of operating on four such readings, the random errors must be at least  $\pm 0.2$ . Other, lesser errors are due to the tape recording process and to amplification and processing before tape recording. Thus we cannot relate cloud density to observed phase shift with confidence, since the total shift is only slightly greater than the error bars.

## V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The experiment to confirm theoretical predictions on the effects of dust clouds on MF propagation was successfully concluded. The present estimates are that between one and five million kilograms of alluvium were lofted into the air by the Phase II explosion. The electrical properties of the near surface materials indicate that its conductivity, even in bulk form, was very low; therefore one would expect little attenuation at 3 MHz. The only cloud-induced effects noted were in phase, and the maximum phase shift measured corresponds to a dust density of  $300 \text{ g/m}^3$ . These observations are in accordance with expectation. The essentially zero imaginary component of the dust permittivity should cause no absorption effects, and the losses from scattering processes at 100 m wavelengths should also be close to zero. It should be borne in mind that the detonation was only equivalent to half a kiloton of TNT. If one were to scale this up to a megaton or more, the dust effects could be much more serious and long-lived.

Although we have not spent much effort analyzing the first 3 s of data, deviations of  $10^\circ$  or more in phase and 3 dB in amplitude did occur in this time period. The major results of the experiment are as follows.

### A. Questions That Have Been Answered

The measured attenuation was less than 0.1 dB at 3 MHz after  $T + 3 \text{ s}$ . The phase maximum shift was  $0.3^\circ$  at approximately 15 s, compared with the calculated value of  $0.18^\circ$  assuming a cloud density of  $180 \text{ g/m}^3$ . The experiment thus succeeded in its first objective, which was to verify that dust clouds from small detonations, such as MISERS BLUFF, have little effect on propagation at 3 MHz.

4  
B. Questions That Remain

The passage of the shock wave caused large and permanent performance variations in the vertical antennas and, to a lesser extent, in the buried primary receiver antenna. We feel that it is important to extrapolate the effects of the 0.5 kT blast to larger yields (MT or more) to eliminate the possible ground motion effects on buried antennas. These effects can be estimated by a mixture of analytical procedures and experimental data from larger detonations (possibly below-ground nuclear events).

The passage of the shock wave caused phase and amplitude excursions of over  $10^\circ$  and 3 dB which lasted about 3 s. Again, how does this scale to larger blasts? If the period during which the phase and amplitude were experiencing perturbations, due to ground motion and shock effects, were to increase to tens of seconds or even more, then the confidence level of communications links operating with buried antennas is reduced. Once the effects are characterized, it should be possible to devise signal handling schemes that would process out such variations.

In summary, we observed some relatively minor effects from a 0.5 kT detonation in Arizona. These effects may give rise to important system reliability questions when (a) scaled up to larger explosions, and (b) situated in different soils, temperature and humidity conditions, as in North Dakota. It is equally possible that with the current design of communication systems for use in silo communications, the shock and ground motion effects will not be critical. To resolve this ambiguity one would have to look at the design of the antennas, the anticipated ground motion at a variety of locations, and the sensitivity of the signals being transmitted to phase and amplitude noise. One logical way of answering many of these questions would be to take a series of antennas manufactured to the current design, subject them to shock, and monitor the response function using signal frequencies close to those used in actual operation.

This would answer the ground motion questions. The effects of larger dust clouds would have to be derived by extrapolating from the MISERS BLUFF data.

#### REFERENCES

1. Bollen, R. L., W. G. Chesnut, V. E. Hatfield, and G. Smith, "Predictions of Effects Produced by the Dice Throw Detonation on Experimental Microwave Links," DNA 4183T, Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, California (September 1976).
2. Entzminger, J. N., Jr., T. M. Treadway, and S. H. Talbot, "Measured Performance of HF Subsurface Dipoles," Technical Reports, RADC-TR-69-221, Rome Air Development Center, Air Force Systems Command, Griffiss Air Force Base, New York (June 1969).
3. "Underground Antenna Systems--Design Handbook," Boeing Report, Defense Documentation Center, Defense Supply Agency, Alexandria, Virginia, AD454041 (20 June 1962).
4. Davis, R. J., private communication (October 1978).
5. "DNA Nuclear Dust Environment Symposium," Lectures presented at SRI International, Menlo Park, California, 17-18 October 1978, unpublished.

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Assistant Secretary of Defense  
Comm., Cmd., Cont. & Intell.  
ATTN: Dir. of Intell. Sys., J. Babcock  
ATTN: C3IST&CCS, M. Epstein

Assistant to the Secretary of Defense  
Atomic Energy  
ATTN: Executive Assistant

Command & Control Technical Center  
ATTN: C-312, R. Mason  
ATTN: C-650, G. Jones  
3 cy ATTN: C-650, W. Heidig

Defense Advanced Rsch. Proj. Agency  
ATTN: TIO

Defense Communications Agency  
ATTN: Code 480, F. Dieter  
ATTN: Code R1033, M. Raffensperger  
ATTN: Code 205  
ATTN: Code 480  
ATTN: Code 810, J. Barna  
ATTN: Code 101B

Defense Communications Engineer Center  
ATTN: Code R410, J. McLean  
ATTN: Code R720, J. Worthington  
ATTN: Code R410, R. Craighill  
ATTN: Code R123

Defense Intelligence Agency  
ATTN: DC-7D, W. Wittig  
ATTN: HQ-TR, J. Stewart  
ATTN: DT-5  
ATTN: DB-4C, E. O'Farrell  
ATTN: DB, A. Wise  
ATTN: DT-1B

Defense Nuclear Agency  
ATTN: DDST  
ATTN: STVL  
3 cy ATTN: RAAE  
4 cy ATTN: TITL

Defense Technical Information Center  
12 cy ATTN: DD

Field Command  
Defense Nuclear Agency  
ATTN: FCPR

Field Command  
Defense Nuclear Agency  
Livermore Division  
ATTN: FCPRL

Interservice Nuclear Weapons School  
ATTN: TTV

Joint Chiefs of Staff  
ATTN: C3S  
ATTN: C3S Evaluation Office

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (Continued)

Joint Strat. Tgt. Planning Staff  
ATTN: JLTW-2  
ATTN: JPST, G. Goetz

National Security Agency  
ATTN: B-3, F. Leonard  
ATTN: W-32, O. Bartlett  
ATTN: R-52, J. Skillman

Undersecretary of Def. for Rsch. & Engrg.  
ATTN: Strategic & Space Systems (OS)

WMCCS System Engineering Org.  
ATTN: R. Crawford

### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Asst. Chief of Staff for Automation & Comm.  
Department of the Army  
ATTN: DAAC-ZT, P. Kenny

Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory  
U.S. Army Electronics R&D Command  
ATTN: DELAS-EO, F. Niles

BMD Advanced Technology Center  
Department of the Army  
ATTN: ATC-O, W. Davies  
ATTN: ATC-T, M. Capps  
ATTN: ATC-R, D. Russ

BMD Systems Command  
Department of the Army  
2 cy ATTN: BMDSC-HW

Deputy Chief of Staff for Ops. & Plans  
Department of the Army  
ATTN: DAMO-RQC

Electronics Tech. & Devices Lab.  
U.S. Army Electronics R&D Command  
ATTN: DELET-ER, H. Bomke

Harry Diamond Laboratories  
Department of the Army  
ATTN: DELHD-N-RB, R. Williams  
ATTN: DELHD-N-P, F. Wimenitz  
ATTN: DELHD-I-TL, M. Weiner  
ATTN: DELHD-N-P

U.S. Army Comm-Elec. Engrg. Instal. Agency  
ATTN: CCC-CED-CCO, W. Neuendorf  
ATTN: CCC-EMEO-PED, G. Lane  
ATTN: CCC-EMEO, W. Nair

U.S. Army Communications Command  
ATTN: CC-OPS-W  
ATTN: CC-OPS-WR, H. Wilson

U.S. Army Communications R&D Command  
ATTN: DRDCO-COM-RY, W. Kesselman

U.S. Army Foreign Science & Tech. Ctr.  
ATTN: DRXST-SD

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (Continued)

U.S. Army Materiel Dev. & Readiness Cmd.  
ATTN: DRCLDC, J. Bender

U.S. Army Missile Intelligence Agency  
ATTN: J. Gamble

U.S. Army Nuclear & Chemical Agency  
ATTN: Library

U.S. Army Satellite Comm. Agency  
ATTN: Document Control

U.S. Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity  
ATTN: ATAA-TDC  
ATTN: ATAA-PL  
ATTN: ATAA-TCC, F. Payan, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Joint Cruise Missile Project Office  
Department of the Navy  
ATTN: JCM-G-70

Naval Air Development Center  
ATTN: Code 6091, M. Setz

Naval Air Systems Command  
ATTN: PMA 271

Naval Electronic Systems Command  
ATTN: Code 501A  
ATTN: Code 3101, T. Hughes  
ATTN: PME 117-20  
ATTN: PME 106-4, S. Kearney  
ATTN: PME 117-211, B. Kruger  
ATTN: PME 106-13, T. Griffin  
ATTN: PME-117-2013, G. Burnhart

Naval Intelligence Support Ctr.  
ATTN: NISC-50

Naval Ocean Systems Center  
ATTN: Code 5:2, J. Bickel  
ATTN: Code 5:22, M. Paulson  
3 cy ATTN: Code 53:4, W. Moler

Naval Research Laboratory  
ATTN: Code 7500, B. Wald  
ATTN: Code 6700, T. Coffey  
ATTN: Code 6780, S. Ossakow  
ATTN: Code 7550, J. Davis

Naval Space Surveillance System  
ATTN: J. Burton

Naval Surface Weapons Center  
ATTN: Code F31

Naval Surface Weapons Center  
ATTN: Code F-14, R. Butler

Naval Telecommunications Command  
ATTN: Code 341

Office of Naval Research  
ATTN: Code 465  
ATTN: Code 421  
ATTN: Code 420

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (Continued)

Office of the Chief of Naval Operations  
ATTN: OP 604C  
ATTN: OP 981N  
ATTN: OP 941D

Strategic Systems Project Office  
Department of the Navy  
ATTN: NSP-43  
ATTN: NSP-2141  
ATTN: NSP-2722, F. Wimberly

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Aerospace Defense Command  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: DC, T. Long

Air Force Avionics Laboratory  
ATTN: AAD, W. Hunt  
ATTN: AAD, A. Johnson

Air Force Geophysics Laboratory  
ATTN: OPR-1, J. Ulwick  
ATTN: PHP, J. Aarons  
ATTN: LKB, K. Champion  
ATTN: OPR, A. Stair  
ATTN: OPR, H. Gardiner  
ATTN: PHI, J. Buchau  
ATTN: PHP, J. Mullen

Air Force Weapons Laboratory  
Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: SUL  
ATTN: DYC

Air Logistics Command  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: OO-ALC/MM, R. Blackburn

Assistant Chief of Staff  
Intelligence  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: INED

Assistant Chief of Staff  
Studies & Analyses  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: AF/SASC, W. Adams  
ATTN: AF/SASC, G. Zank

Ballistic Missile Office  
Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: MNH, M. Baran  
ATTN: MNH, S. Kennedy  
ATTN: MNH

Deputy Chief of Staff  
Operations Plans and Readiness  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: AFXOKT  
ATTN: AFXOKCD  
ATTN: AFXOXFD  
ATTN: AFXOKS

Electronic Systems Division  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: DCKC, J. Clark

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE (Continued)

Deputy Chief of Staff  
Research, Development, & Acq.  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: AFRDQ  
ATTN: AFRDSP  
ATTN: AFRDSS  
ATTN: AFRDS

Electronic Systems Division  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: XRW, J. Deas

Electronic Systems Division  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: YSM, J. Kobelski  
ATTN: YSEA

Foreign Technology Division  
Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: SDEC, A. Oakes  
ATTN: NIIS, Library  
ATTN: TQTD, B. Ballard

Headquarters Space Division  
Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: SKA, M. Clavin  
ATTN: SKA, C. Rightmyer

Headquarters Space Division  
Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: SZJ, W. Mercer  
ATTN: SZJ, L. Doan  
ATTN: SZJ

Rome Air Development Center  
Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: OCS, V. Coyne  
ATTN: TSLD

Rome Air Development Center  
Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: EEP

Strategic Air Command  
Department of the Air Force  
ATTN: DCX  
ATTN: XPES  
ATTN: OOKSN  
ATTN: DCXT  
ATTN: DCXF  
ATTN: NRT  
ATTN: DCXT, T. Jorgensen

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CONTRACTORS

Lawrence Livermore Laboratory  
ATTN: Document Control for L-389, R. Ott  
ATTN: Document Control for L-31, R. Hager  
ATTN: Document Control for Tech. Info. Dept. Lib.

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory  
ATTN: Document Control for MS 664, J. Zinn  
ATTN: Document Control for R. Taschek  
ATTN: Document Control for P. Keaton  
ATTN: Document Control for D. Simons  
ATTN: Document Control for E. Jones  
ATTN: Document Control for D. Westervelt

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CONTRACTORS (Continued)

Sandia Laboratories  
ATTN: Document Control for Space Project Div.  
ATTN: Document Control for Org. 1250, W. Brown  
ATTN: Document Control for 3141  
ATTN: Document Control for D. Dahlgren  
ATTN: Document Control for Org. 424, T. Wright  
ATTN: Document Control for D. Thornbrough

Sandia Laboratories  
Livermore Laboratory  
ATTN: Document Control for B. Murphey  
ATTN: Document Control for T. Cook

EG&G, Inc.  
ATTN: Document Control for J. Colvin  
ATTN: Document Control for D. Wright

OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Central Intelligence Agency  
ATTN: OSI/PSTD

Department of Commerce  
National Bureau of Standards  
ATTN: Sec. Officer for R. Moore

Department of Commerce  
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin.  
ATTN: R. Grubb

Institute for Telecommunications Sciences  
National Telecommunications & Info. Admin.  
ATTN: W. Utlaut  
ATTN: L. Berry  
ATTN: A. Jean  
ATTN: D. Crombie

U.S. Coast Guard  
Department of Transportation  
ATTN: G-DOE-3/TP54, B. Romine

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

Aerospace Corp.  
ATTN: N. Stockwell  
ATTN: V. Josephson  
ATTN: D. Olsen  
ATTN: I. Garfunkel  
ATTN: T. Salmi  
ATTN: S. Bower  
ATTN: F. Morse  
ATTN: R. Slaughter

University of Alaska  
ATTN: T. Davis  
ATTN: N. Brown  
ATTN: Technical Library

Analytical Systems Engineering Corp.  
ATTN: Radio Sciences

Analytical Systems Engineering Corp.  
ATTN: Security

Barry Research Communications  
ATTN: J. McLaughlin



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS (Continued)

BDM Corp.  
ATTN: T. Neighbors  
ATTN: L. Jacobs

Berkeley Research Associates, Inc.  
ATTN: J. Workman

Boeing Co.  
ATTN: J. Kenney  
ATTN: D. Murray  
ATTN: G. Hall  
ATTN: S. Tashird

University of California at San Diego  
ATTN: H. Booker

Charles Stark Draper Lab., Inc.  
ATTN: D. Cox  
ATTN: J. Gilmore

Computer Sciences Corp.  
ATTN: H. Blank

Comsat Labs.  
ATTN: G. Hyde  
ATTN: R. Taur

Cornell University  
ATTN: D. Farley, Jr.

Electrospace Systems, Inc.  
ATTN: H. Logston

ESL, Inc.  
ATTN: J. Marshall  
ATTN: C. Prettie  
ATTN: J. Roberts

Ford Aerospace & Communications Corp.  
ATTN: J. Mattingley

General Electric Co.  
ATTN: M. Bortner

General Electric Co.  
ATTN: A. Steinmayer  
ATTN: S. Lipson  
ATTN: C. Zierdt

General Electric Co.  
ATTN: F. Reibert

General Electric Co.—TEMPO  
ATTN: W. Knapp  
ATTN: T. Stevens  
ATTN: W. McNamara  
ATTN: M. Stanton  
ATTN: DASIAC  
ATTN: D. Chandler

General Electric Tech Services Co., Inc.  
ATTN: G. Millman

General Research Corp.  
ATTN: J. Garbarino  
ATTN: J. Ise, Jr.

GTE Sylvania, Inc.  
ATTN: M. Cross

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS (Continued)

HSS, Inc.  
ATTN: D. Hansen

IBM Corp.  
ATTN: F. Ricci

University of Illinois  
ATTN: Security Supervisor for K. Yeh

Institute for Defense Analyses  
ATTN: J. Bengston  
ATTN: H. Wolfhard  
ATTN: E. Bauer  
ATTN: J. Aein

International Tel. & Telegraph Corp.  
ATTN: G. Wetmore  
ATTN: Technical Library

JAYCOR  
ATTN: S. Goldman

JAYCOR  
ATTN: D. Carlos

Johns Hopkins University  
ATTN: T. Potemra  
ATTN: P. Komiske  
ATTN: Document Librarian  
ATTN: T. Evans  
ATTN: J. Newland  
ATTN: B. Wise

Kaman Sciences Corp.  
ATTN: T. Meagher

Linkabit Corp.  
ATTN: I. Jacobs

Litton Systems, Inc.  
ATTN: R. Grasty

Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Inc.  
ATTN: W. Imhof  
ATTN: M. Walt  
ATTN: R. Johnson

Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Inc.  
ATTN: D. Churchill  
ATTN: Dept. 60-12

M.I.T. Lincoln Lab.  
ATTN: L. Loughlin  
ATTN: D. Towle

Martin Marietta Corp.  
ATTN: R. Heffner

McDonnell Douglas Corp.  
ATTN: N. Harris  
ATTN: R. Halprin  
ATTN: J. Moule  
ATTN: G. Mroz  
ATTN: W. Olson

Meteor Communications Consultants  
ATTN: R. Latter

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS (Continued)

Mission Research Corp.  
ATTN: S. Gutsche  
ATTN: R. Hendrick  
ATTN: D. Sowle  
ATTN: F. Fajen  
ATTN: R. Bogusch  
ATTN: R. Kilb  
ATTN: D. Sappenfield

Mitre Corp.  
ATTN: C. Callahan  
ATTN: B. Adams  
ATTN: A. Kymmel  
ATTN: G. Harding

Mitre Corp.  
ATTN: M. Horrocks  
ATTN: W. Foster  
ATTN: W. Hall  
ATTN: J. Wheeler

Pacific-Sierra Research Corp.  
ATTN: E. Field, Jr.

Pennsylvania State University  
ATTN: Ionospheric Research Lab.

PhotoMetrics, Inc.  
ATTN: I. Kofsky

Physical Dynamics, Inc.  
ATTN: A. Thompson

Physical Dynamics, Inc.  
ATTN: E. Fremouw

R&D Associates  
ATTN: H. Ory  
ATTN: B. Gabbard  
ATTN: W. Wright, Jr.  
ATTN: M. Gantsweg  
ATTN: R. Lelevier  
ATTN: C. MacDonald  
ATTN: C. Greifinger  
ATTN: R. Turco  
ATTN: F. Gilmore  
ATTN: W. Karzas

R&D Associates  
ATTN: B. Yoon  
ATTN: L. Delaney

Rand Corp.  
ATTN: C. Crain  
ATTN: E. Bedrozian

Riverside Research Institute  
ATTN: V. Trapani

Rockwell International Corp.  
ATTN: J. Kristof

Santa Fe Corp.  
ATTN: E. Ortlieb

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS (Continued)

Science Applications, Inc.  
ATTN: J. McDougall  
ATTN: D. Hamlin  
ATTN: C. Smith  
ATTN: D. Sachs  
ATTN: L. Linson  
ATTN: E. Straker

Science Applications, Inc.  
ATTN: D. Divis

Science Applications, Inc.  
ATTN: SZ

Science Applications, Inc.  
ATTN: J. Cockayne

SRI International  
ATTN: R. Leadabrand  
ATTN: M. Baron  
ATTN: R. Livingston  
ATTN: W. Chesnut  
ATTN: C. Rino  
ATTN: G. Price  
ATTN: W. Jaye  
ATTN: D. Neilson  
ATTN: A. Burns  
ATTN: G. Smith  
ATTN: R. Vickers

Technology International Corp.  
ATTN: W. Boquist

Teledyne Brown Engineering  
ATTN: K. Deliberis

TRI-COM, Inc.  
ATTN: D. Murray

TRW Defense & Space Sys. Group  
ATTN: S. Altschuler  
ATTN: D. Dee  
ATTN: R. Plebuch

Utah State University  
ATTN: L. Jensen  
ATTN: K. Baker

Visidyne, Inc.  
ATTN: C. Humphrey  
ATTN: J. Carpenter