





AD

AD-E401 850

#### TECHNICAL REPORT ARAED-TR-88018

## HAZARD CLASSIFICATION OF LIQUID PROPELLANTS

WILLIAM HERRERA SOUTHWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE

CHESTER GRELECKI GEORGE PETINO, JR. HAZARD RESEARCH CORPORATION

> WILLIAM O. SEALS ARDEC



SEPTEMBER 1988



U. S. ARMY ARMAMENT RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND ENGINEERING CENTER

ARMAMENT ENGINEERING DIRECTORATE

PICATINNY ARSENAL, NEW JERSEY

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.



UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

•

•

۲

#### REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION		1b. RESTRICTION	16. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
28. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTIO	N/AVAILABILITY	OF REPORT	
UNCLASSIFIED					
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCH	EDULE	Approve	d for public rel	ease: dist	ribution unlimited.
20. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCREDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NU	MBER	5. MONITORING	ORGANIZATION	REPORT NU	MBER
Techncial Report ARAED-TR-880	)18				
68. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL	7a. NAME OF M	ONITORING ORG	ANIZATION	
ARDEC, AED	SMCAR-AEE-BI	R			
6c. ADDRESS (CITY, STATE, AND ZIP CODE)		76. ADDRESS (	75. ADDRESS (CITY, STATE, AND ZIP CODE)		
Energetics and Warheads Div					
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-500	)0 (cont)	[			
88. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL	9. PROCUREME	INT INSTRUMENT	IDENTIFICA	TION NUMBER
ORGANIZATION ARDEC, IMD	SMCARJIML				
STINFO Br	SINCAR-IIVII-I				
8c. ADDRESS (CITY, STATE, AND ZIP CODE)		10. SOUNCE OF	FUNDING NUMBE	EHS	
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ, 07806-500	00	ELEMENT NO.	PROJECTINO.	TASK NO.	ACCESSION NO
	. •				
11 TITLE (INCLUDE SECURITY CLASSIFICATI	ON)			1	
HAZARD CLASSIFICATION C	OF LIQUID PROP	PELLANTS			
12 REPRONAL AUTHORIS) William Horror	A SwPL Chaster	Gralacki and Gas	rao Potino H	azard Boo	oarab Corp. and
William Seals,	ARDEC		луе - ешю, на 		
Final FROM	VERED TO	14. DATE OF REPOR	nt (Year, month nber 1988	1, DAY) 15. F	AGE COUNT 31
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION	fin Sonvinen Arron	mont issued by P	attelle Besse	woh Triana	ala Radi Offica 200
Park was periorned under a Scienti	The Services Ayree		allene, nesea	псп тпанс	gie Park Office, 200
17. COSATI CODES	CI TIALIQUE FAIN, I				
FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP	Hazard classificati		t nronellants		IF I BI BLOCK NUMBER)
	Rulletin TR 700-9		les of ignition	····· • m	athoninian
				<u>• 12 ()</u>	
19. ABSTRACT (CONTINUE ON REVERSE IF NECESSARY AND IDENTIFY BY BLOCK NUMBER)					
The hazard classification of liquid pr	opellants needs to	be addressed be	ecause proced	lures for cl	lassification have not
been established in the Department of Defense Hazard Classification Bulletin TB 700-2. This bulletin clearly states					
that it applies to ammunition and exp	plosives other than	liquids. Howeve	er, the bulletin	has been	used as a guide in
the hazard classification of liquid propellants.					
Incident reports on explosions or detonations, identify the major modes of ignition as friction, impact, thermal,					
adiabatic compression, electrostatics, and impingement. In providing an accurate classification, the subject material					
must be exposed to the same stimuli as experienced in its environmental state. Often small-scale tests do not					
simulate the actual conditions, and full-scale tests must be performed to account for the critical mass. This report					
addresses the methodology and tests required to established the hazard classification of liquid propellants.					
I. HAZNEDARI		(201) 72	ne (include are 24-3316	A CODE)	SMCAR-IMI-I

DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR

UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

6a. Name of Performing Organization: (cont)

Southwest Research Institute 6220 Culebra Road San Antonio, TX 78238

Hazard Research Corporation 200 East Main St. Rcckaway, NJ 07866

•

•

•

### CONTENTS

Page

13

14

14

14

Introduction	1
Literature Search and Surveys Methodology Screening Tests Conduct Screening Tests	2 3 0 5
Conclusions and Recommendations	7
References	21
Distribution List	23

### Figures

1	Hazard classification methodology	13
2	Explosive reaction methodology	13

i

- 3 No-go reaction methodology
- 4 Card cap test configuration
- 5 Liquid sample holder

•

•

•

6 Thermal stability bomb assembly



DTIC

#### INTRODUCTION

The hazards classification of solid propellants and explosives was conducted in accordance with the requirements stipulated in accepted manuals such as the DOD Manual TB 700-2. The classification of liquid propellants, however, poses a major problem due to the lack of a formal test procedure or protocol for liquid propellants. The safety community has an interim classification of liquid propellants as Class B. Being designated a liquid propellant, it was automatically classified as an explosive. As such, the DOD Manual TB 700-2 was used in establishing this classification. The manual explicitly states that it applies only to ammunition and explosives other than liquids. Therefore, the hazard classification of these liquid propellants is based on results of tests that were designed strictly for solid propellants.

It is critical that any tests designed for liquid propellants be based on the size of the actual system, the confinement encountered, and the potential modes of ignition that can exist. Many of the tests used in the past for evaluating liquid propellants dealt with quantities too small in size to accurately evaluate the sensitivity of a material to an external stimuli. Liquids, under shock loading generate hydraulic pressures, and these pressures are contingent upon the critical mass, the degree of confinement, and the density of the material. Too often, tests were selected in the evaluation of materials that did not simulate the modes of ignition that were encountered in manufacture, transportation, storage, and field use. As a remedy for this problem, this program was conducted to develop a hazards classification protocol for liquid propellants used in gun applications.

The objective of this program was to evaluate presently used or available test methods and to develop test procedures for the establishment of the sensitivity of liquids. In accomplishing this objective, Southwest Research Institute (SwRI) conducted the following specific tasks:

(1) SwRI conducted a literature survey to establish the different modes of ignition that could occur during the various stages of manufacture, transportation, operational use, and storage of HAN-based propellants. As part of this task, SwRI interfaced with safety community personnel from the Department of Defense Explosives Safety Board, Alexandria, VA; the Department of Transportation, Washington, DC; the Ballistics Research Laboratory, Aberdeen, MD; the Army Research, Development and Engineering Center, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ; and the AMC Field Safety Activity, Charleston, IN, to discuss and obtain available data on the hazards classification of liquid propellants.

(2) SwRI developed a methodology for establishing a hazards classification procedure.

(3) A series of screening tests were selected and recommended for possible use in the classification of liquid propellants.

(4) A series of screening tests were conducted on liquid propellants, LGP 1846.

#### Literature Search and Surveys

To develop a set of viable test procedures for liquid propellants, SwRI conducted an in-depth literature search and review and also attended several meetings with the safety community personnel. A number of reports identifying test procedures were evaluated (ref 1 through 5) and a table listing these key test procedures was developed (table 1). Test procedures are identified for both the solid and the liquid propellants. In addition to the review, SwRI evaluated the NATO AOP-7 706 manual (ref 6) to evaluate if the characteristics and qualification tests identified in the manual were applicable for the hazards classification of liquid propellants.

NATO AOP-7 cites a scheme for the classification of liquids, qualification tests for determining the hazards classification of liquid propellants and the characterization requirements essential for each liquid propellant for acceptance (ref 6). The qualification tests for the hazard classification of liquid propellants are:

Unconfined burning (Bonfire tests) Impact tests Card gap test Minimum pressure for vapor phase ignition Flash point test Adiabatic compression Detonation velocity

All of these tests with the exception of minimum pressure for vapor phase ignition test and the flash point test were considered viable tests for qualifying the present liquid propellants. These two tests were eliminated from consideration in establishing a hazards classification of the hydroxyammonium nitrate (HAN) based liquid propellants because the carrier system is water. Where volatile organic solvents are used, these tests should be considered.

The tests identified in table 1 and those listed above were evaluated for applicability and the following series of qualification tests were selected:

Card gap test Impact test Thermal stability test Electrostatic test

•

4

4

#### Methodology

The use of full-scale tests are normally preferred over laboratory-scale tests; however, full-sale tests can be costly. To make an assessment of the explosive potential of a liquid propellant, small-scale laboratory tests can provide reliable information if the environmental modes of ignition are addressed. The modes of ignition considered critical for evaluating liquid propellants on a laboratory scale are thermal, compression ignition, impact, and electrostatic. Critical mass and diameter are parameters that must be obtained by the use of full-scale test methods. As shown in figure 1, once a liquid propellant demonstrates a positive explosive reaction in one of the laboratory screening tests, further testing will be continued to determine if the material is a Class A or B explosive (fig. 2). If the liquid propellant does not produce explosive reactions in all the screening tests (fig. 3), then the materials are subjected to the full-scale critical mass and diameter tests.

#### **Screening Tests**

A series of screening tests were selected for the classification of liquid propellants. These screening tests include: card gap test, impact test, thermal stability test, and electrostatic test.

#### **Card Gap Test**

The card gap test is the standard DOD TB 700-2 test designed to determine the sensitivity of a material to the shock from a detonation. A typical card gap tester is shown in figure 4. The test apparatus consists of a one-piece 4.75-cm outside diameter by 14-cm long (1.875 in. O.D. by 5.5 in. long) mild steel tube, two pentolite pellets (each weighing approximately 60 grams), a J-2 blasting cap, a 15 by 15 by 1 cm (6 in. by 6 in. by 0.375 in.) mild steel witness plate, cellulose acetate (or equivalent) cards 5 cm in diarneter by 0.025 cm thick (2 in. diameter by 0.01 in. thick). Four small pieces of piastic 0.16 cm by 1.27 cm (0.0625 in. by 0.5 in.) are used to support the tube and to maintain a 0.158 cm (0.0625 in.) air gap between the test sample and the witness plate. The arrangement of the components is similar to that shown in figure 4 with the exception that the cellulose cards and the cardboard tube are omitted in the first test. Detonation is indicated when a clean hole is cut in the witness plate. Should no detonation occur in the first test, it will be repeated two times for a total of three tests. If detonation does occur, then a series of tests using the acetate cards will be conducted. The acetate cards are placed between the liquid propellant tube and the pentolite boosters (fig. 4). The first test is performed using eight cards, and if a detonation occurs, then the number of cards is doubled for the second test. If not detonation occurs, then the number of cards is halved. Doubling the number of cards will be continued until no detonation occurs. When the number of cards is reached that prevents detonation, the next test is performed with the number of cards reduced by half the preceding increment of increased (i.e., if detonation occurs at 32 cards but not at 64 cards, then the next test

is run with 48 cards). If detonation occurs at the reduced number of cards (48 cards in the example given) then the number of cards will be increased by one-half the preceding increment (i.e., from 48 cards to 56 cards). This test procedure will be continued until the point of 50% probability of detonation is obtained. Normally, a maximum of 12 tests is required to determine the 50% value.

Detonation is indicated when a clean hole is cut in the witness plate. The measure of charge sensitivity is the length of the attenuation (gap length) at which there is a 50% probability that detonation will occur as detailed in the above procedure.

#### Impact Test

The drop weight test is the standard JANNAF test designed primarily to determine the sensitivity of a material to impact. A typical impact test apparatus is shown in figure 5. The liquid test sample (0.03 ml) is enclosed in a cavity formed by a steel cup, an elastic ring, and a steel diaphragm. A piston rests on the diaphragm and carries a vent hole which is blocked by the steel diaphragm. A 2-kg weight is dropped onto the piston. A positive result is indicated by puncture of the steel diaphragm accompanied by a loud report or by severe deformation of the diaphragm and evidence that the sample was completely consumed. Data are reported as the height which yields a 50% probability of initiation.

#### JANNAF Thermal Stability Test

The JANNAF thermal stability study is the standard test designed by the ICRPG for testing the thermal sensitivity of propellants. The test fixture is a stainlesssteel cylinder 0.56 cm in diameter by 3.81 cm long (0.22 in. diameter by 1.5 in. long) closed at the bottom with a shielded thermocouple and a compression fitting (fig. 6). The fixture is charged with 0.5 cm<sup>3</sup> of sample and closed at the top with a stainlesssteel diaphragm, 7.6 mm (0.003 in.) thick. The assembly is then placed in a bath which is heated at a constant rate of 10°C/min A second thermocouple and an X-Y recorder are connected with the sample thermocouple so as to yield a plot of differential temperature (sample temperature minus bath temperature) versus bath temperature. Exothermic reactions appear as positive peaks; endothermic reactions appear as negative peaks. Results are reported in terms of the temperatures at which significant thermal activity is observed, and the temperature at which the burst disk yields.

#### **Electrostatic Test**

Electrostatic energy stored in a charged capacitor is discharged to the sample material being tested to determine whether an electrostatic discharge will cause the sample to decompose, flash, burn, ele. The cample is placed on a special holder which assures that the discharge will pass through the sample. The capacitor is charged with a 5000 volt potential; the discharge needle is lowered until a spark is drawn through the

sample (the sample being about 20 mg in size). The standard test interval ranges from 0.0001 microfarads ( $\mu$ f) and 0.00125 J (at 5kV) to 1  $\mu$ f and 12.5 J (at 5 kV). The test is begun at the 12.5 J (1  $\mu$ f) level. If results are negative, testing is continued until 20 consecutive negatives are reported at that level. If the result is positive, such as a flash, spark, burn, odor, or noise other than instrument noise, then the next lower test interval is tried until 20 consecutive negative results are reported. The test is normally conducted at a voltage of 5 kV DC or less. An ambient temperature of 18 to 32°C (65 to 90°F) and relative humidity not exceeding 40% are maintained.

#### **Conduct Screening Tests**

#### **Card Gap Tests**

•

łđ

.

A series of tests were conducted by SwRI on LGP 1846. The results of these tests are presented in table 2. Four tests were conducted using the LGP 1846 (one test was conducted with a longer mild steel tube having an L/D of 3 times the standard mild steel tube, i.e., 42 cm). A series of tests were conducted on LGP 1845 by Hazards Research Corporation in 1981 and have been included for comparison purposes with the result of the tests on the LGP 1846.

The test by SwRI on the LGP 1846 were conducted in accordance with the test procedure described earlier with two exceptions: (1) a polyethylene liner was used to isolate the LGP from the mild steel test tube, thereby precluding any contamination of the LGP, (2) the pentolite disks each weighed approximately 90 grams instead of 60 grams. The test tube with the polyethylene liner prior to being filled with the LGP is shown in figure 7, the liner full of liquid propellant in the mild steel tube in figure 8. On the tests conducted on the LGP 1845, there were no detonations since the witness plates were dished but not punched with a hole. Similarly, the tests involving the LGP 1946 resulted in the witness plates being dished but no holes being cut into the plates. The witness plates for the three tests conducted with the standard mild steel tube are shown in figures 9 through 10. These plates are severely deformed, but no holes have been punched. A test to confirm that the liquid propellant was becoming involved by the detonation of the pentolite and that the damage to the plate was not strictly due to the pentolite charges was conducted. In order to determine what contribution the LP was making, the confirmation was conducted with water instead of liquid propellant. The results of this test (fig. 12) show that the damage to the plate is much less without the LGP. The test conducted with the longer mild steel tube (fig. 13) shows that the witness plate is even less damaged than the plates in the previous tests with the smaller tube, indicating that the detonation is not being propagated through the liquid propellant but instead, is being attenuated.

The tests conducted by Hazards Research on the LGP 1845, however, were conducted using a smaller 10 cm by 10 cm (4 in. by 4 in.) witness plate and did result in reactions at the lower levels. Tests were conducted using larger quantities of attenuation cards up to a maximum of 70 cards with no reaction occurring at the 70-card level. Tests were conducted using the larger 15 cm by 15 cm (6 in. by 6 in.) witness plate and with 70 cards with no reaction. According to the DOD TB 700-2 classification scheme, the criteria for distinguishing between military class 7 (DOT class A) and military class 2 (DOT class B) is the sensitivity value of 70 cards. If the card value for the propelant is greater than 70 cards, then the classification is military class 7. If the card value is less than 70 cards or there is no reaction at 0 cards, then the classification is considered military class 2. According to this criteria, the LGP 1845 and the LGP 1846 are classed as explosives military class 2. This classification protocol does not allow for an accurate hazard assessment for a material when no reaction occurs at zero cards as is the case with the LGP 1846. A material should exhibit an explosive reaction before it is classified as an explosive. To follow the procedure of classification as outlined in the TB 700-2 is inconsistent with the concept of an explosive material.

#### Impact Tests

A series of impact tests were conducted on LGP 1845 and 1846. The results of these tests are presented in table 3. The drop height value for LGP 1845 and LGP 1846 that resulted in a 50% probability of initiation was 76 cm (30 in.). The impact value reported for nitromethane is 50 cm (20 in.). According to ICC regulations, nitromethane is shipped as a flammable liquid. By comparison, the liquid propellants cited are iess sensitive to impact than nitromethane yet are classed as a class B explosive.

#### **Thermal Stability**

The thermal stability, under confinement, demonstrates the temperature at which significant thermal activity is observed and the temperature at which a rupture disk yields. The results of the LGP materials (table 4) indicate that the LGP materials produce high gas pressures under conditions of confinement. This is consistent with the normal functions of a gun propellant.

#### **Electrostatic Tests**

A series of electrostatic tests were conducted by SwRI in accordance with the test protocol outlined earlier. The test apparatus used for the tests is shown in figure 14; and the sample holder which consists of a brass metal 0.001-in. brass shim stock which was bonded to a 0.10 cm (0.0625 in.) thick high voltage phenolic dielectric material in figure 15. The brass metal was connected to the ground lead of the spark generator. A 0.64 cm (0.25 in.) hole was cut into the insulator exposing the metal plate. The sample liquid material was then placed in the small cylindrical cavity created in the

insulator. The upper electrode was then lowered near the bottom plate (the sample holder), and the charge was then allowed to arc through the liquid sample. Tests were conducted at energy levels of 180 mJ with no reaction. Twenty repeat tests were conducted with no reactions.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the literature search and the screening tests performed on the LGP 1846, a number of conclusions and recommendations have been formulated.

According to the hazards classification stipulated in TB 700-2 for the card gap test procedure, if the card value necessary to prevent detonation is less than 70 cards or if there is no reaction at 0 cards, then the classification is considered military class 2. This classification protocol does not allow for an accurate hazard assessment for a material when no reaction occurs at zero cards as was the case with the LGP 1846 tests conducted at SwRI. It is recommended that a material be classification tests. To follow the procedure of classification as outlined in the TB 700-2 is inconsistent with the concept of an explosive material.

Since the earlier card gap tests conducted by Hazards Research Corp. on the LGP 1845 propellant using the larger 15.2 cm by 15.2 cm (6 in. by 6 in.) witness plate were run only with 70 cards, it is recommended that a series of tests be performed using the larger witness plate and with no attenuation cards. If a reaction occurs, then the normal progression of increasing the attenuation cards until no reaction occurs or 70 cards is reached should be performed.

It is recommended that small scale tests be performed on liquid propellants before performing any of the full scale tests. Small scale tests such as the impact test, the electrostatic test, and the thermal stability tests performed by SwRI and by Hazards Research demonstrated the feasibility of the use of small scale tests.

Small scale tests such as the card gap test have been demonstrated effectively on certain liquid propellants such as the LGP 1845 tests performed by Hazards Research Corp. However, these tests may need to be modified for other materials such as the LGP 1846 in order to better determine how the material is responding to an external stimuli. The use of a longer tube than the 14 cm (5.5 in.) tube currently used in the card gap test is one of the modifications that needs to be further explored.

Tests	Hazardous liquids	Hazardous solids
Impact tests		
Dread unsight (rate $1, 2, 2$ )	*	*
Adiabatic compression (ref 2)	*	*
Compression-ignition sensitivity (ref 2)	*	
Low amplitude compression (ref 2)	*	
Thermal tests		
Ignition temperature (ref 2)	*	*
Flash point (refs 1, 2)	*	*
Differential thermal analysis (ref 2) Thermal surge (ref 2)	*	
Thermal stability (refs 1, 2, 3) (10°C/min)	*a	
Thermal stability scan (ref 1) (2°C/min)	*	
Long term thermal stability (ref 1) (100°C for 48 hr)	*	*
Thermal explosion scan (ref 4)	*	*
Autoignition temperature (ref 1)	*	*
Shock energy input tests		
Card gap (refs 1, 2, 3)	*	*
Impedance mirror (ref 2)	*	
Shock confinement tests (ref 2)	*	
Storage hazards tests		
Single package test (ref 3)		*
Stack test (ref 3)		*
External fire stack test (refs 1, 3)	*p	*
Blast test (ref 3)		*
Fragment hazard test (ref 3)		*
Thermal effects test		
Thermal radiation field (ref 3)		*
Firebrands (ref 3)		*

# Table 1. Applicable safety testing criteria

Tests	Hazardous liquids	Hazardous solids
Other		
Friction (refs 4, 5)	*	*
Electrostatic discharge (refs 4, 5)	*	*
Dust explosibility (ref 4)	N/A	*
Detonation test (ref 3)		*
Detenation velocity (ref 1)	*	
Deflagration potential (ref 1)		*
Ignition and unconfined burning (ref 3)		*
Trauzi block (refs 1, 5)	*	*
Can sensitivity (ref 5)	*	
Bullet Impact (ref 5)	*	*

Table 1. (cont)

<sup>a</sup>Thermal stability tests should also be performed with the sample under pressure to determine the effects of pressure on sensitivity.

.

<sup>b</sup>Limited bonfire and unconfined burning tests have been performed on liquid propellants using 1-gal aluminum cans. Stack test, however, have not been performed.

# Table 2. Card gap test

Test no.	Material type	No. of cards	Results
1	LGP 1846	0	Witness plate severely deformed, no hole punched in plate.
2	LGP 1846	0	Witness plate severely deformed, no hole punched in plate.
3	LGP 1846	0	Witness plate severely deformed, no hole punched in plate
4	Water	0	Witness plate slightly deformed.
5	LGP 1846	0	Witness plate slightly deformed, no hole punched in plate.
1	LGP 1845	70	Witness plate dished but not punched with a hole.
2	LGP 1845	70	Witness plate dished but not punched with a hole.

## Table 3. Impact tests

Sample	Drop height (in.)			
identification	0%	50%	100%	
1. LGP 1845	28	30.0	31	
2. LGP 1946	29	30.5	33	

•

۲

## Table 4. JANNAF thermal stability

Sample identification	Temperature of major exotherm onset (°C)	Remarks
1. LGP 1845	135	Very sharp and rapid exotherm, burst disk
2. LGP 1846	120	Very sharp and rapid exotherm, burst disk







Figure 2. Explosive reaction methodology



Figure 3. No-go reaction methodology







Figure 5. Liquid sample holder

į

)

١.





14



Figure 7. Mild steel tube and liner



Figure 8. Tube with liner full of LGP 1846



Figure 9. Witness plate, test no. 1



Figure 10. Witness plate, test no. 2



Figure 11. Witness plate, test no. 3



Figure 12. Witness plate, test no. 4 conducted with water instead of LGP 1846



Figure 13. Test conducted with LGP 1846 with longer tube



Figure 14. Electrostatic test apparatus





#### REFERENCES

- 1. Cruise, W.J., "Classification of Liquid Gun Propellants and Raw Materials for Transportation and Storage," U.S. Army Armament Research and Development Command, May 1981, ARBRL-CR-00454.
- 2. Havens, J.A., "A Review of Hazard Assessment Procedures for Liquid Gun Propellants," U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, November 1984, BRL-CR-537.
- 3. TB 700-2, "Department of Defense Explosives Hazard Classification Procedures," September 1982.
- 4. Napadensky, H.S., et. al., "Development of Hazards Classification Data on Propellants and Explosives," U.S. Army Research and Development Command, November 1978, ARLD-CR-78035.
- 5. AMCP 706-177.
- 6. NATO AOP-7 706 Manual, "Manual of Tests for the Qualification of Explosive Materials for Military Use."

#### **DISTRIBUTION LIST**

Commander Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center U.S. Army Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command ATTN: SMCAR-IMI-I (5) SMCAR-TDC SMCAR-AEE-BR, D. Downs SMCAR-AEE, A. Beardel! N. Slagg A. Bracuti J. Lannon SMCAR-FSS-A, C. Daiy L. Frauen SMCAR-FSA-S, H. Liberman SMCAR-CCS-C, T. Hung Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000

Commander U.S. Army Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command ATTN: AMSMC-GCL(D) Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000

Commander Defense Technical Information Center ATTN: Accessions Division (2) Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304-6145

Director Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency ATTN: H. Fair 1400 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209

HQDA ATTN: DAMA-ART-M Washington, DC 20310

Commander U.S. Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCDRA-ST 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-0001 Director Benet Weapons Laboratory Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center U.S. Army Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-TL E. Conroy

A. Graham Watervliet, NY 12189-5000

Commander

U.S. Army Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command ATTN: SMCAR-ESP-L Rock Island, IL 61299-6000

Commander

U.S. Army Aviation Research and Development Command ATTN: AMSAV-E 4300 Goodfellow Boulevard St. Louis, MO 63120

Commander

U.S. Army Materiels Technology Laboratory ATTN: SLCMT-MCM-SB M. Levy Watertown, MA 02172-0001

Director U.S. Army Air Mobility Research and Development Laboratory Ames Research Center Moffett Field CA 94035

Commander U.S. Army Communications Electronics Command ATTN: AMSEL-ED Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703

Commander ERADCOM Technical Library ATTN: STET-L Ft. Monmouth, NJ 07703-5301 Commander

U.S. Army Harry Diamond Laboratories ATTN: DELHD-TA-L 2800 Powder Mill Road Adelphi, MD 20783

Commander

U.S. Army Missile Command Research, Development and Engineering Center ATTN: AMSMI-RD Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898

Commander

U.S. Army Missile and Space Intelligence Center ATTN: AIAMS-YDL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5500

Commander

U.S Army Belvoir Research and Development Center ATTN: STRBE-WC Techical Library (Vault), B-315 Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5606

Commander U.S. Army Tank Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-TSL Warren, MI 48397-5000

Commander U.S. Army Research Office ATTN: Technical Library P.O. Box 122<sup>1</sup>1 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211

Director U.S. Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: ATAA-SL White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002

Commander U.S. Army Infantry School ATTN: ATSH-CD-CSO-OR Fort Benning, GA 31905 Commandant U.S. Army Field Artillery School ATTN: ATSE-CMW ATSF-TSM-CN Ft. Sill, OK 73503-5600

Commandant U.S. Army Armor Center ATTN: ATSB-CD-MLD Ft. Knox, KY 40121

Commander U.S. Army Development and Employment Agency ATTN: MODE-TED-SAB Fort Lewis, WA 98433

Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: D.A. Wilson, Code G31 Code G33, J. East Dahlgreen, VA 22448-5000

1

4

4

4

(

Commander U.S. Naval Surface Weapons Center ATTN: O. Dengel K. Thorsted Silver Spring, MD 20902-5000

Commander Naval Weapons Center China Lake, CA 93555-6001

Commander Naval Ordnance Station ATTN: C. Dale Code 5251 Indian Head, MD 20640

Superintendent Naval Postgraduate School Department of Mechanical Engineering ATTN: Code 1424, Library Monterey, CA 93943 AFWL/SUL Kirtland AFB, NM 87117

Air Force Arthament Laboratory ATTN: AFATL/DLODL Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000

AFOSR/NA ATTN: L. Caveny, B-410 Bolling AFB, FL 32542-5000

U.S. Bureau of Mines ATTN: R.A. Watson 4800 Forbes Street Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Director Jet Propulsion Laboratory ATTN: Technical Library 4800 Oak Grove Drive Pasadena, CA 91109

Director

National Aeronautics and Space Administration ATTN: MS-603, Technical Library MS-86, Dr. Povinelli 21000 Brookpark Road Lewis Research Center Cleveland, OH 44135

Director National Aeronautics and Space Administration Manned Spacecraft Center Houston, TX 77058

Central Intelligence Agency Office of Centeral Reference Dissemination Branch Room GE-47 HQS (10) Washington, DC 20502 Central Intelligence Agency ATTN: Joseph E. Backofen HQ Room 5F22 Washington, DC 20505

Bell Aerospace Textron ATTN: F. Boorady A.J. Friona J. Rockenfeller P.O. Box 1 Buffalo, NY 14240

Calspan Corporation ATTN: Technical Library P.O. Box 400 Buffalo, NY 14225

General Electric Ordnance System Depot ATTN: J. Mandzy, OP43-220 R.E. Mayer H. West M. Bulman R. Pate I. Magoon J. Scudiere 100 Plastics Avenue Pittsfield, MA 01201-3698

General Electric Company Armament Systems Department ATTN: D. Maher Burlington, VT 05401

#### IITRI

.

0

ATTN: Library 10 West 35th Street Chicago, IL 60616

Olin Chemicals Research ATTN: D. Gavin P.O. Box 586 Chesire, CT 06410-0586 Olin Corporation ATTN: V.A. Corso Dr. R. L. Dotson P.O. Box 30-9644 New Haven, CT 06536

Morton Thiokol, Inc. Elkton Division ATTN: R. Biddle P.O. Box 214 Elkton, MD 21921-0241

Paul Gough Associates ATTN: P. Gough P.O. Box 1614 Portsmouth, NH 03801

4

Safety Consulting Engineering ATTN: C.J. Dahn 5240 Pearl Street Rosemont, IL 60018

Science Applications, Inc. ATTN: R. Edelman 23146 Cumorah Crest Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Sunstrand Aviation Operations ATTN: Dr. O. Briles P.O. Box 7002 Rockford, IL 61125

Veritay Technology, Inc. ATTN: E.B. Fisher 4845 Millersport Highway P.O. Box 305 East Amherst, NY 14051-0305

Director Applied Physics Laboratory The Johns Hopkins University Johns Hopkins Road Laurel, MD 20707 Director Chemical Propulsion Information Agency The Johns Hopkins University ATTN: T. Christian Technical Library Johns Hopkins Road Laurel, MD 20707

University of Delaware Department of Chemistry ATTN: Mr. J. Cronin Professor T. Brill Newark, DE 19711

University of Illinois at Chicago ATTN: Professor S. Murad Department of Chemical Engineering Box 4348 Chicago, IL 60680

University of Maryland at College Park ATTN: Professor F. Kasler Department of Chemistry College Park, MD 20742

University of Missouri at Columbia ATTN: Professor R. Thompson Department of Chemistry Columbia, MO 65211

University of Michigan ATTN: Professor G.M. Faeth Department of Aerospace Engineering Ann Arbor, MI 48109-3796

University of Missouri at Kansas City Department of Physics ATTN: Professor R.D. Murphy 1110 East 48th Street Kansas City, MO 64110-2499 Pennsylvania State University Department of Mechnical Engineering ATTN: K. Kujo University Park, PA 16802

Princeton Combustion Research Laboratories, Inc. ATTN: N.A. Messina M. Summerfield 475 U.S. Highway One North Monmouth Junction, NJ 08852

University of Arkansas Department of Chemical Engineering ATTN: J. Havens 227 Engineering Building Fayetteville, AR 72701

Director U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: AMXSY-D AMXSY-MP, H. Cohen Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5066

Commander U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command ATTN: AMSTE-TO-F Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066

Commander Chemical Research, Development and Engineering Center ATTN: SMCCR-RSP-A SMCCR-MU SMCCR-MSI Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5423

Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: SLCBR-IB-B, C. Leveritt J. Knapton W.F. Morrison AMXBR-OD-ST Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066

Í