

SECURITY	CLASSIFICATION OF THIS	S PAGE

	ORT DOCUMENTA	TION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0183
IA. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION 1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS Unclassified		<u></u>			
A SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION	AVAILABILITY OF R	PORT	
D. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		Approved f	or public releas	e; distrib	ution unlimited.
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	<u>\$)</u>	5. MONITORING	ORGANIZATION REP	ORT NUMBE	R(S)
HDL-TR-2173					1
A NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Harry Diamond Laboratorics	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (# applicable) SLCHD-NW-EH	74. NAME OF MO	NITORING ORGANIZ	ATION	
c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	-	76. ADDRESS (C	ity, State, and ZIP Coo	<i>(e)</i>	
2800 Powder Mill Road Adelphi, MD 20783-1197				- - 	·
a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING	75 OFFICE STMBOL	9. PROCUREMEN	T INSTRUMENT IDE	NTIFICATION	NUMBER
TLS Army Laboratory Command	(# applicable) AMSLC			-	
c ADDRESS (City State and ZIP Code)	AMBLE	10. SOURCE OF FU	UNDIN'S NUMBERS		
2800 Powder Mill Road		PROGRAM	PROJECT	TASK	WORK UNIT
Adelphi, M.) 20783-1145		6 12 20A	XE79ES	NO.	AUCEDOCH NU.
1 TITLE Unchude Security CL . Mitalino'		0.12.2011		<u> </u>	
			Vahihang /Vahi	Lana Aaa	
Sames J. LORUS, VAIENE FRONCZAK (F Sa TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIME C Final FROM	Tarry Diamond Labora Overed 3/88to1/89	14. UATE OF REPOR February 19	Kohlberg (Kohl At <i>Yeer, Month, Driy</i> 90	berg Ass	15. PAGE COUNT 28
AMS code: 612120.H250011	tarry Diamond Labora Overed 3/88 to <u>1/89</u>	Iories), and Ira 14. UATE OF REPOI February 19	Kohlberg (Kohl At <i>Trear, Worth, Diry</i> 90	berg Ass	15. PAGE COUNT
AMS code: 612120.H250011	tarry Diamond Labora OVERED 3/88 to 1/89	Iorics), and Ira 14. Date of Repoi February 19	Kohlberg (Kohl htt://www.adoruth.Doily 90	berg Ass	15. PAGE COUNT 28
Sames J. LUILUS, VAICHE FRONCZAK (F Ja. TYPE OF REPORT Final S. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION AMS code: 612120.H250011 COSATI CODES TELD GROUP SUB-GROUP	La SUBJECT TERMS (C	Indiana (14. UATE OF REPOR February 19	Kohlberg (Kohl RT (Year, Month, Dig 90 Processes y and Koncity ator diffracted	by block nun	ociates, inc.) 15. PAGE COUNT 28 nber) fiction Fresnel dife
AMS code: 612120.H250011 7. COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP 09 03	In SUBJECT TERMS (C EMP scale modeli fraction: diffracted	Iories), and Ira 14. UATE OF REPOI February 19 continue concernent ing; EMP simula field measurer	Kohlberg (Kohl at rrear, booth, Driv 90 necessary and kontry ator, diffracted nents	by block num	nber) liction, Fresnel dif-
James J. Lottus, valence Pronczak (P Ja TYPE OF REPORT Final 13b. TIME (FROM) 6. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION AMS code: 612120.H250011 7. COSATI CODES TELD GROUP 09 03 20 14	Arry Diamond Labora OVERED 3/88 TO 1/89 10. SUBJECT TERMS (C EMP scale modeli fraction, diffracted	onlinue on some a la field measurer	Kohlberg (Kohl AT (Year, Morth, Dry 90 Peccessory and Identity ator, diffracted nents	by block nun field prec	nbor) liction, Fresnel dif-
James J. Lonus, valenc Pronczak (P James J. Lonus, valence P	tarry Diamond Labora OVERED 3/88 TO 1/89 10 SUBJECT TERMS (C EMP scale modeli fraction; diffracted dentify by block number)	Iories), and Ira 14. UATE OF REPOI February 19 continue concerned to ng; EMP simula field measurer	Kohlberg (Kohl AT (Year, Morth, Driv 90 Processery and Kork/y ator, diffracted nents, (), ()	by block num	noor) liction, Fresnel dif-
James J. LUILUS, VALETIC FRONCZAK (F Ja. TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIME (FROM	Laboral ENP scale modeli fraction, diffracted dentify by block number) rve and record the effect	Iories), and Ira 14. DATE OF REPOI February 19 continue on covernant ng; EMP simula field measurer cuiveness of a fe	Kohlberg (Kohl Treases and konchy 90 necessary and konchy ator, diffracted nents	by block num field prec	noeriates, Inc.) 15. PAGE COUNT 28 10007) liction, Fresnel dif- magnetic barrier to
James J. LOILUS, VALETIC FRONCZAK (F Ja. TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIME (Final 6. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION AMS code: 612120.H250011 17. COSATI CODES TIELD GROUP 20 14 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and if Experiments were conducted to obset the field emanating from a horizontal contraction	Laboral EMP scale modeli fraction; diffracted dently by block number) rve and record the effection	Information of a feature of a f	Kohlberg (Kohl AT (Year, Morth, Dr.) 90 Processory and Kor(Y) ator, diffracted nents, (), () (ence acting as a MP) sinulator.	by block num field prec	noeriates, Inc.) 15. PAGE COUNT 28 28 10007) liction, Fresnel dif- magnetic barrier to crimental results are
James J. LOITUS, VALETIC FRONCZAK (F B. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION AMS code: 612120.H250011 J. COSATI CODES TELD GROUP SUB-GROUP O9 O3 20 14 J. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse it necessary and it Experiments were conducted to obset the field emanating from a horizontal compared to a theoretical model white Fressel diffraction The comparison of the com	La SUBJECT TERMS (C EMP scale modeli fraction; diffracted dently by block number) rve and record the effect ly polarized electroma ch predicts the observe	Interior, and Ira 14. DATE OF REPOR February 19 continue on contract (ng; EMP simula field measurer ctiveness of a fe gnetic pulse (El r height and ran t with turning (Kohlberg (Kohl at rrear, adorut, Dri 90 reconcerny and identify ator, diffracted nents, / / / / cnce acting as a MP) sinulator. ige dependence incertainting bai	by block num field prec	actives, Inc.) 15. PAGE COUNT 28 28 26 26 28 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20
James J. LOITUS, VALETIC FRONCZAK (F James J. LOITUS, VALETIC FRONCZAK (F Ja. TYPE OF REPORT Jab. TIME (F Final Is. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION AMS code: 612120.H250011 IT. COSATI CODES TELD GROUP O9 03 20 14 IP. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and in the field emanating from a horizontal compared to a theoretical model which Fresnel diffraction. The comparison in t	Arry Diamond Labora OVERED 3/88 TO 1/89 Le SUBJECT TERMS (C EMP scale modeli fraction, diffracted dently by block number) rve and record the effer ly polarized electroma ch predicts the observe reveals good agreemen	ontinue of a feed february 19 continue of account of ng; EMP simula field measurer ctiveness of a fe gnetic pulse (El r height and ran t, with typical u	Kohlberg (Kohl Treases and Konch, Driv 90 necessary and Konchy ator, diffracted nents, <u>()</u> ence acting as a MP) sinulator. uge dependence incertaintics bei	by block num field prec	nagnetic barrier to erimental results are ectric field due to e order of 10 percent.
James J. Lottus, valenc ProncZak (P James J. Lottus, valenc ProncZak (P Ja. TYPE OF REPORT Jab. TIME (Final Supplementary NOTATION AMS code: 612120.H250011 In. COSATI CODES TIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP 09 03 20 14 Bastract (Continue on reverse if necessary and it Experiments were conducted to obset the field emanating from a horizontal compared to a theoretical model white Fresnel diffraction. The comparison of the transmission of the trans	La SUBJECT TERMS (C EMP scale modeli fraction; diffracted dently by block number) rve and record the effect ly polarized electroma ch predicts the observe reveals good agreemen	Interior, and Ira 14. DATE OF REPOR February 19 continue on contract ng; EMP simula field measurer ctiveness of a fe gnetic pulse (El r height and ran t, with typical u	Kohlberg (Kohl at rrear, adorut, Dr. 90 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	by block num field prec	actives, Inc.) 15. PAGE COUNT 28 28 2000 1000 15. PAGE COUNT 28 2000 100 1000 1
James J. Lottus, valenc Pronczak (P James J. Lottus, valence P J	Laboral ENP scale modeli fraction; diffracted dently by block number) rve and record the effect ly polarized electroma ch predicts the observe reveals good agreemen	Indiana (14) and Ira 14. DATE OF REPORT February 19 continue on contrast (1) ng; EMP simulat field measurer cuiveness of a fe gnetic pulse (El r height and ran t, with typical u	Kohlberg (Kohl Treases and konchy 90 recoses y and konchy ator, diffracted nents //// ence acting as a MP) simulator. the dependence incertaintics bei	by block num field prec	nociates, Inc.) 15. PAGE COUNT 28 28 1000) liction, Fresnel dif- magnetic barrier to rimental results are ectric field due to corder of 10 percent.
James J. Lottus, valenc Pronc2ak (F Ja. TYPE OF REPORT Jab. TIME OF REPORT Final Supplementary NOTATION AMS code: 612120.H250011 17. COSATI CODES TELD GROUP 09 03 20 14 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on revene if necessary and it Experiments were conducted to obset the field emanating from a horizontal compared to a theoretical model white Fresnel diffraction. The comparison of the field emanation of the comparison of the field emander of the comparison of the field emanation. The comparison of the field emanation of the comparison of the field emander of the comparison of the comparison of the field emanation. The comparison of the comparison	Arry Diamond Labora OVERED 3/88 TO 1/89 - 10. SUBJECT TERMS (C EMP scale modeli fraction; diffracted dently by block number) rve and record the effect ly polarized electroma ch predicts the observe reveals good agreemen	Indiana (1997), and Ira 14. DATE OF REPORT February 19 February 19	Kohlberg (Kohl Treases and Identify 90 Percent of the second in the second nents (1) (1) (1) ence acting as a MP) sinulator. Ige dependence incertaintics bei	by block num field prec	nagnetic barrier to erimental results are ectric field due to e order of 10 percent.
James J. Lottus, valenc Pronc2ak (F Ja. TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIME (Final Final 13b. TIME (FROM	Laboral ENP scale modeli fraction, diffracted dently by block number) rive and record the effect ly polarized electroma ch predicts the observe reveals good agreemen	Indiana (14) and Ira 14. DATE OF REPORT February 19 continue on community ng; EMP simulation field measurem ctiveness of a fe gnetic pulse (El r height and ran t, with typical u	Kohlberg (Kohl at rrear, adorut, Dr. 90 reconcerner, adorut, Dr. 90 reconcerner, and korrer ator, diffracted nents, / L. L. (ence acting as a MP) sinulator. 100 ge dependence incertaintics bei	by block num field prec	28 28 28 28 2000) liction, Fresnel dif- magnetic barrier to rimental results are ectric field due to e order of 10 percent.
James J. LUILUS, VALCHE FRONCZAK (F James J. LUILUS, VALLABILITY OF ABSTRACT	Arry Diamond Labora OVERED 3/88 TO 1/89 Le SUBJECT TERMS (C EMP scale modeli fraction, diffracted dently by block number) rve and record the effer ly polarized electroma ch predicts the observe reveals good agreemen	21. ABSTRACT S	Kohlberg (Kohl Treases and Konch, Driv 90 Percessory and Konchy ator, diffracted nents, <u>f</u> ence acting as a MP) sinulator. Ige dependence incertaintics being ECURITY CLASSIFIC	by block num field prec field prec of the expe of the ele ng on the	ber) 15. PAGE COUNT 28 100r) liction, Fresnel dif- magnetic barrier to erimental results are ectric field due to e order of 10 percent.
Sames J. LOILUS, VAICHE FRONCZAK (F Supplementation from a formation for the field compared to a theoretical model which fresheld iffraction. The comparison for the field comparison for the field for the field comparison for the field comparison for the field for the field comparison for the field comparison for the field for the field comparison for the	APT. DIAMOND Labora	Incise), and Ira 14. DATE OF REPOI February 19 continue on community ng; EMP simula field measurer ctiveness of a fe gnetic pulse (El r height and ran t, with typical u	Kohlberg (Kohl Trease and look to be possessivy and look to possessivy and	by block num field prec	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

.

Contents

:

		Page
1.	SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF INVESTIGATION	5
2.	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF AESOP	6
3.	ELECTROMAGNETIC SCALE MODEL EXPERIMENT	7
	3.1 Background	7
	3.2 Experimental Approach	8
	3.3 Experimental Data	10
	3.4 Supplemental Data	12
4.	COMPARISONS BETWEEN THEORETICAL MODEL AND EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS	14
5.	CONCLUSIONS	21
6.	References	22
A	PPENDIX.—EXPERIMENTAL ERROR	23
D	ISTRIBUTION	25

Figures

I. Simulator, fence, and observer	2
2. AESOP pulser	7
3. Side and top view of AESOP and test area	7
4. Normalized AESOP pulse shape	7
5. Scale-model test area setup	9
6. Physical relationship between dipole and sensor	10
7. Physical relationship between dipole, metal sheet, and sensor	11
8. Sensor response to dipole, 10-ns data window	11
9. Sensor response to dipole, 2-ns data window	11
10. Sensor response to dipole field interrupted by a metal sheet	12
11. Leading-edge waveform of step-function generator	13
12. Sensor response to dipole step-function field	13
13. Sensor response to dipole step-function field with model fence in position	14
14. Sensor response to dipole step function field without model fence in position	14
15. Comparison between experimental and theoretical waveforms	16
16. Electric field in absence of fence for observer height = 7.5 m	17
17. Electric field in absence of fence for observer height = 15.0 m	17
18. Electric field in absence of fence for observer height = 22.5 m	17
19. Electric field in absence of fence for observer height = 30.0 m	17
20. Electric field in absence of fence for observer height = 37.5 m	17
21. Electric field in absence of fence for observer height = 45.0 m	17

Figures (cont'd)

22. Comparison of E_{ij} and \overline{E}_{ij} in absence of fence	18
23. Electric field with fence for observer height = 7.5 m	19
24. Electric field with fence for observer height = 15.0 m	19
25. Electric field with fence for observer height = 22.5 m	19
26. Electric field with fence for observer height = 30.0 m.	19
27. Electric field with fence for observer height = 37.5 m	19
28. Electric field with fence for observer height = 45.0 m	19
29. Comparison between $E_{\rm F}$ and $\overline{E}_{\rm F}$ with fence	20
30. Comparison between electric-field ratios	20
31. Electric field in absence of fence, with 13.7-ns risetime and observer height = 22.5 m	20
32. Electric field with fence, with 13.7-ns risetime and observer height = 22.5 m	20

Tables

1. Scale Model Facility instrumentation	8
2. Peak fields versus elevation, 3.5 m from dipole, with and without fence	13
3. Peak fields versus elevation, 7.0 m from dipole, with and without fence	13
4. Normalized experimental peak fields, with and without fence	15
5. Theoretical peak-field and ground time delay as a function of observer height	
in absence of fence	16
6. Theoretical peak field and ground delay as a function of observer height with fence	20
7. Comparison between experimental and theoretical electric-field ratios	20

1.10 UOPY

Accession Fo	1.
NTIS CLARI	X
DTIC 196	
Unannais d	
Justifies diff	
By	
Diservices. T	
$E_{\rm T} = 10^{-12}$	054264
······	$f \oplus r^*$
Dist 1 1.1	162
i i	
i 🔺 👔	1
A-1	ł

Page

1. Summary and Purpose of Investigation

The Woodbridge Research Facility (WRF) of the U.S. Army's Harry Diamond Laboratories (HDL) conducts research and development of electromagnetic (EMP) simulators, and evaluates the effect of the simulated EMP on Army electronic and communications systems and subsystems [1].* These simulated nuclear-generated pulses are characterized by risetimes on the order of nanoseconds, with decay times ranging from tenths to hundredths of nanoseconds. The energy is thus contained within a broad spectrum of frequencies.

The largest of the simulators at WRF is AESOP (Army EMP Simulator Operations), which can produce incident horizontal polarized peak fields of 50 kV/m at a ground range of 50 m from the simulator (see sect. 2). When the incident pulse is reflected by the ground, there will be constructive or destructive interference, the degree of which depends on range, observer height, ground conductivity, and ground dielectric constant. It is found that at large ranges, where the reflection coefficient is negative, there is an observer height regime where the time of arrival of the reflected field is less than the time to peak of the incident field. Under these conditions there is destructive interference and the peak of the incident field is not reached; this condition is defined as clipping. The degree of clipping depends on ground range, observer height, reflection coefficient, and waveform [2].

There is considerable interest in developing methods of reducing the peak electric field of AESOP (and thus for other simulators) that radiate beyond the boundary of the facility. One method under consideration is that of using an "EMP fence" made out of standard chain link. For example, if the chain link is bonded at every

*References are listed at the end of the text.

aperture crosspoint, it has been shown that for the AESOP waveform the peak value of the electric field which penetrates through the fence is only 3 percent of the incident peak field [3]. Thus the fields which extend beyond the fence are due to diffraction over the fence. It is therefore of interest to determine these fields.

Such a fence could be located along the existing security fence line which is roughly parallel to, and approximately 175 m from, the AESOP antenna. The fence would be, by necessity, limited to a practical height of 20 to 25 m. Figure 1 shows a sketch of such an arrangement.

Although the fence appears to produce adequate field suppression on the outside by shielding, the field at distances greater than several hundred meters from the fence is determined by diffraction. The theory for predicting the time



Figure 1. Simulator, fence, and observer: (a) top and (b) side.

behavior of the net field, including ground reflection, has been developed by one of us (I.K.) and is discussed elsewhere [3], as is the related computer program [4].

In this report we describe a scale-model experiment which was designed and conducted to test the concept of using a perfectly reflecting fence to suppress the AESOP far fields by diffraction. Because of the inherent difficulty of generating an accurate scaling of the shape of the AESOP waveform (see fig. 4) within the time constraints of setting up this experiment, we performed most of our testing with a scale model of AESOP but with a scaled time to peak, t_p , which is twice that of AESOP. Specifically, we have used a 1/50 scale model for the geometric dimensions of AESOP and the environment, and a scaled t_{i} of 0.400 ns. Strictly speaking the scaling law requires a value of t_p of 0.200 ns (which is the AESOP value, 10 ns, divided by 50). In the latter phases of the experiment we could however configure the pulser to achieve a real-world equivalent time to peak of 13.7 ns, which is close to the AESOP value of 10 ns. The details of the experimental setup and measurements are presented in section 3, while the corresponding comparison with theory is rendered in section 4. However, the major conclusions can be summarized as follows:

First, there was generally very good agreement between the theory and experiment, despite the differences in the shape of the experimental scaled waveform and the double-exponential scaled shape used in the theoretical model. This suggests that perhaps the peak fields are more sensitive to the time to peak rather than to the detailed structure of the early-time part of the waveform. This observation, however, must be tempered by the limited scope of the investigation.

For the conditions of the experiment, in which the fence is as high as the dipole source, we will achieve no more than a 50-percent reduction in the peak fields compared to the situation without the fence (the reasons for this are discussed in sect. 4). From a theoretical point of view, it would be possible to achieve a greater than 50-percent reduction in peak field strength by making the fence higher than the centerline of the simulator, but this would not appear to be practical. On the other hand, lowering AESOP would degrade its performance as a simulator. In summary, the scale-model experiment has established a quantitative assessment of the utility of a perfectly reflecting fence in reducing the far fields of **AESOP-like** simulators.

2. Brief Description of AESOP

The AESOP EMP simulator consists of a 300m horizontally polarized dipole antenna and a 7-MV pulse generator. A 120- Ω biconic structure is used to launch the electromagnetic pulse. Figure 2 shows the AESOP pulser and bionic section. AESOP uses dual Marx generators, erected at opposite polarities to yield the net maximum of 7 MV of output.

Figure 3 shows the top and side view of the entire simulator and its relationship to the test region. For normal operations, the simulator is raised to a height of 20 m.

The incident horizontally polarized electric free field (also called the incident field) is adjustable to a maximum of 50 kV/m at a ground range of 50 m along the centerline at the AESOP elevation of 20 m. The centerline is that plane which is normal to the axis of the antenna, at the center of the pulser. Figure 4 shows the normalized AESOP pulse shape, f(t). The pulse has a risetime of 10 ns, with the first zero crossing at 800 ns.

pulser.



Ground



Test region

Side view

Electromagnetic scale modeling is possible because of the linearity of Maxwell's equations that describe the fields in any electromagnetic system. Sinclair [6] demonstrated that with the elimination of nonlinear media, it is theoretically possible to construct a model to simulate a fullscale system. This concept has been applied in many experimental studies, including coupling studies for Army electronic systems [7,8] at the HDL EMP Electromagnetic Scale Model Facility (SMF).

As stated, the AESOP simulator radiates a pulsed electric field with a risetime of 10 ns. The SMF can radiate a repetitive pulsed horizontal electric field with a risetime of 0.20 ns, which is approximately 1/50 that of AESOP. Models of military systems have been immersed in this field, and the recorded responses of their complex interconnecting external receptors have predicted with fair to good accuracy the corresponding full-scale system's responses when deployed at the AESOP simulator. Scale modeling of the proposed electromagnetic fence for AESOP was therefore a reasonable choice.

3.2 Experimental Approach

The instrumentation for these experiments is listed in table 1. A typical test setup at the model facility is shown in figure 5.

As a prelude to the detailed study to determine the peak field behavior as a function of observer height with and without a fence, we conducted a preliminary or "proof-of-principle" experiment to check out the salient features of the theory. It was desirable to ensure that our experimental design was consistent with the theory.

The theory [3] predicts that if a pulse-driven horizontal dipole radiator and a compatible electromagnetic sensor are arranged as shown in figure 6, the output of the sensor will decrease by approximately a factor of two if an interdicting sharp-edged metal body is placed between them, as presented in figure 7. A dipole antenna was attached to a repetitive pulse source, and an asymptotic monopole (D-dot) sensor was placed as shown in figure 6. The sensor was coupled to the recording instrumentation within the shielded enclosure through a high-quality coaxial cable. The pulsed field emanating from the dipole was recorded, as seen in figure 8. The data shown are from a 10-ns window which shows the computerintegrated sensor response converted to read as volts per meter versus time. The waveform was

Table 1. Scale Model Facility Instrumentation

Instrument	Comments
Sensors	D-dot, HDL, risetime < 0.15 ns B-dot, EG&G, risetime < 0.15 ns
rf cables	Andrews heliax cable
Pulse generators	Omni-Wave R-100, 1 kV into 50 Ω , pulse width = 0.15 ns
	HDL Step 1, 1 kV into 50 Ω, risetime = 0.10 ns, length variable
Signal processor	Tektronix WP-1221, including Digital processing oscilloscope, model 7704A Time-domain sampler, model 7612 Sampling head, model S-6 Trigger recognizer, model S-53
	PDP-11 computer
	Display terminal
	Floppy disk unit
	Hard copy unit

*Signal processor system bandwidth = 0.045 ns (10 to 90 percent)

intentionally recorded with a baseline, or zero sensor output, for the first nanosecond, at which time the leading edge of the wavefront is seen.

The radiated pulse from the dipole rises very quickly to about 38 V/m and has almost decreased to zero at T = 3 ns, at which time the field may be observed to reverse polarity. This is the arrival of the ground reflection, that field which radiated from the dipole to the testbed sand to the sensor. The field was partially reflected and reversed in polarity by the conductive sand, as seen in the data. The calculated arrival time of this reflection is approximately 1.94 ns after the initial wavefront, or 2.94 ns in the data record. A calculation of the arrival time of the dipole "end effect," when the current on the dipole will reverse itself at the open ends, yielded an elapsed time value of 6 ns. In figure 8, the waveform reversal may be seen to occur about 6 ns from the baseline departure or when T = 7 ns in the data window.





The ground reflection and dipole "end-effect" arrival times have significance only in that the data demonstrate our ability to recognize where in time they should occur and may be observed. Figure 9 is a repeat of the measurement, recorded in a 2-ns data window for better definition. The peak of the field is clearly defined, and the effect of placing the metal sheet between the dipole and the sensor might now be observed.

The sensor output was again recorded after a sheet of metal was placed halfway between the dipole and the sensor, as seen in figure 7. The sensor height had been adjusted to that of the sheet metal (0.84 m). The resulting data are presented in figure 10. The peak value of this waveform is approximately half that of the data recorded without the metal sheet in place (21/38 V/m). This ratio is consistent with the theory. The change in slant range between the dipole and the sensor for these recordings was insignificant, and since the ground reflection and end effects of the dipole may be ruled out, the metal sheet has caused the field to halve. As previously stated, this comparison of field measurements with and without a metal barrier was continued, using a scaled size metal sheet to represent the proposed fence, and scaled



Figure 6. Physical relationship between dipole and sensor.

positions for the model elements which were 1/50 those of the AESOP test volume.

3.3 Experimental Data

The stated objective of the experiment was to observe and record the peak amplitude of a horizontally polarized pulsed field with and without a metal barrier, or fence, between the source dipole and a sensor. In this experiment, the spatial relationships of the elements of the model were hypothesized to be 1/50 of a real-world simulator such as AESOP. That is, where the AESOP simulator is normally positioned 20 m above the ground, the SMF dipole was 0.4 m above the testbed sand. Since the real-world distance between AESOP and the proposed fence would be approximately 175 m, the constructed model fence-to-dipole distance was 3.5 m. The dipole was not a true model of AESOP, which is a somewhat complex structure composed of two opposite-polarity Marx generators, peaking capacitors, and a bicone/dipole radiator that is resistively terminated to the earth to minimize end reflections. AESOP radiates a pulsed field which approximates a double-exponential shape, but the concern of this experiment was solely with peak field values as affected by the fence. Field contributions from the model dipole ends, while inevitable, were of no concern.

The conductivity of the earth-simulating SMF testbed, which is composed of salt-treated sand, was adjusted to a value approximately 50 times that of the AESOP test area. The permittivity (and permeability) of the sand is approximately that of the earth, which is as required for modeling. A sheet of metal, with approximately 1/50 the dimensions of the proposed fence, was constructed

Figure 7. Physical relationship between dipole, metal sheet, and sensor.

.



11



Figure 10. Sensor response to dipole field interrupted by a metal sheet.

for use with the previously fabricated dipole. The model fence was 7.3 m long and 0.46 m high, which corresponds to a real-world fence 365 m long and 23 m high.

The fields from the dipole were measured at ground-range distances of 3.5 and 7.0 m, with sensor-height variations from about 0.15 to 0.90 m, in 0.15-m increments. This corresponds to real-world ranges of 175 and 350 m, and height variations from 7.5 to 45 m. The 175-m position (referred to as position 1) corresponds to the property boundary behind AESOP, and the 350-m position (referred to as position 2) represents a location 175 m beyond that boundary. The measurements at position 1, when the sensor elevations were less than the fence height, were intended to determine the direct electromagnetic shielding achieved by the fence; in this zone, diffraction effects are minimal. The 350-m scaled position measurements were intended to evaluate the fields diffracted by the fence and are used for comparison to Kohlberg's theory [3].

The recorded peak fields for the resulting sensor responses at positions 1 and 2 may be seen in tables 2 and 3, respectively. These tables include the ratios of the "with fence" field values to the "no-fence" field values (see the appendix for a discussion of experimental error).

A comparison of these ratios and those produced by the FENCE program [4] may be found in table 7, with a graphic presentation in figure 30 (see p 20). The time (to peak) of the field waveform in the FENCE program was 20 ns. This value was input to the program because although the scale-model radiated field measures to be approximately 0.20 ns, 10 to 90 percent, it is approximately 0.40 ns, zero to peak. In other words, we made the theoretical value used in the computer program equal to 50 times the experimental value. As may be seen from table 7, the ratios compare rather well, with the worst case (18 percent) being closest to the ground. This is reasonable, since the signal-to-noise ratio of the data decreases, as does the field, near the ground.

3.4 Supplemental Data

Our experience dictates that the more often one confirms theoretical predictions with physical measurements, the better. We decided to go further, and conduct a supplemental experiment to more closely model the original results as predicted by Kohlberg [3], where the time to peak of the theoretical pulse was 10 ns. This required a model pulse generator with a faster risetime.

A step-function generator was fabricated by HDL and substituted for the original pulse generator that drove the dipole. For several reasons, this pulse source could not be used at the inception of the experiments. The leading edge of this step function, as recorded through the cable that couples the generator to the dipole, may be seen in figure 11. The 10 to 90 percent measured risetime is ~0.150 ns, while the zero-to-peak time is ~0.273 ns. In scale, this corresponds to a zero-to-peak real-world time of 13.7 ns. While this is not exact, it is considerably faster than the original model pulse, which scaled to a 20-ns time to peak. With this pulse applied to the dipole radiator, we repeated several measurements to observe the effect. The dipole height was raised to that of the fence.

 Table 2. Peak fields versus

 elevation, 3.5 m from dipole,

 with and without fence

		Peak fields (V/m)			
Sensor	height	Scaled height	With fence	No fence	WF/NF
(in.)	(m)	(m)	(WF)	(NF)	
~6	0.15	7.5	3.6*	~28	~0.13
12	0.30	15.0	3.8*	~33	~0.12
18	0.45	22.5	18.8	~38	0.5
24	0.60	30.0	38.5	~38	~1
30	0.75	37.5	37.9	~38	~1
36	0.90	45.0	36.9	~38	~1

*Questionable data validity due to poor signal-to-noise ratio.

			Peak field	ls (V/m)	
Sensor (in.)	hcight (m)	Scaled height (m)	With fence (WF)	No fence (NF)	WF/NF
6	0.15	7.5	5.6	6.8	0.82
12	0.30	15.0	7.6	10.4	0.73
18	0.45	22.5	8.8	13.3	0.66
24	0.60	30.0	10.6	15.9	0.66
30	0.75	37.5	12.2	17.2	0.71
36	0.90	45.0	13.5	18.8	0.72
	Scnsor (in.) 6 12 18 24 30 36	Sensor height (in.) (m) -6 0.15 12 0.30 18 0.45 24 0.60 30 0.75 36 0.90	Sensor height (in.) Scaled height (m) -6 0.15 7.5 12 0.30 15.0 18 0.45 22.5 24 0.60 30.0 30 0.75 37.5 36 0.90 45.0	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$



Figure 11. Leading-edge waveform of step-function generator.

The dipole field was measured as before, at a 7-m distance, with and without the fence present. Figure 12 shows the sensor response at a height of 36 in. (0.9 m) with the fence present. This figure includes two time windows, 2 and 10 ns. The calculated arrival time for the ground reflection is ~0.345 ns, and the 2-ns window data show clipping to occur at approximately this time. The end of the dipole field reversal may still be observed at ~6 ns in the 10-ns window data.

Figures 13 and 14 show the sensor response at an elevation of 0.45 m, with and without the fence. With the fence in place, the dipole, sensor, and top of the fence were all the same height above



Figure 12. Sensor response to dipole step-function field.

ground.

The ratio of the peak of the fields for "with fence" to "no fence" is $\sim 5/8.9$ or 0.562. The ratio obtained with the computer program using a 13.7-



Figure 13. Sensor response to dipole step-function field with model fence in position.

ns risetime is 0.52. This can be compared with the earlier part of the experiment, in which the risetime was 400 ps (20 ns real world). At the same sensor height, the ratio obtained in the experiment was 0.66 (table 3), and the computer result was 0.61. The effectiveness of the fence is more evident with the faster risetime.

4. Comparisons Between Theoretical Model and Experimental Results

This section compares the results of table 3 with theoretical predictions. Specifically, the following issues are addressed:

(a) Dependence of peak field in absence of fence, E_{n} , as a function of sensor height.

(b) Dependence of peak field with fence, E_F , as a function of sensor height.

(c) Dependence of E_F/E_N as a function of sen-



Figure 14. Sensor response to dipole step function field without model fence in position.

sor height.

(d) Extrapolation of this particular experiment, in which the sensor was 3.5 in from the fence, to cases where the sensor is much further from the fence.

To facilitate the comparison between theory and experiment, it is desirable to recast the experimental data of table 3 in an appropriately normalized form. The reason for this is that the absolute levels of the fields in the experiment are arbitrarily established by the input power to the dipole, while the absolute values of the fields calculated by the computer programs can also be arbitrarily set.

The normalization of the experimental data is calculated by dividing all the peak field-intensity measurements by the value of the no-fence case at the scaled height of 45 m. This value is 18.8 V/m (see table 3). Table 4 is a recasting of table 3 in normalized form (all dimensions are in real-world units).

Table 4. Normalized experimental peak fields, with and without fence

Height	Experimental peak fields		E,/E,
(m)	Ε,	E _N	
7.5	0.30	0.36	0.82
15.0	0.40	0.55	0.73
22.5	0.47	0.71	0.66
30.0	0.56	0.85	0.66
37.5	0.65	0.91	0.71
45.0	0.72	1.00	0.72

The normalized values of fields E_F , E_N are the values shown in table 3 divided by 18.8; that is,

$$E_F = \frac{(WF \text{ value})}{18.8} .$$

$$E_N = \frac{(NF \text{ value})}{18.8} .$$
(1)

As observed, the ratio

$$\frac{(WF \text{ value})}{(NF \text{ value})} = \frac{E_F}{E_N}$$
(2)

remains unchanged.

It is also more convenient to present the discussion in terms of the real-world dimensions rather than the experimental dimensions. For example, the model sensor height at 0.90 m will be regarded as the real-world dimension of 45.0 m. Likewise, the 0.40-ns zero-to-peak waveform used in the experiment should be interpreted as a 20-ns zero-to-peak waveform.

From a computational viewpoint it is not easy to express the actual experimental waveform in terms of a simple analytical expression which can be used in the FENCE [4] and REFLPROP [5] computer programs. These programs calculate the fields without and with the fence, respectively, and are constrained to use analytical expressions for the Fourier transforms of the input waveforms.

If we restrict our attention to the time domain before and including the peak of the experimental waveform, it is possible to provide an analytical approximation to the experimental waveform using a mathematically generated double-exponential waveform. The normalized expression for the time behavior of the incident electric field is given by

$$E_o(t) = 1.05[\exp(-Bt) - \exp(-At)],$$
 (3)

where t is in seconds and E_o will have a peak value of 1 V/m. The values B and A are the slow and fast time constants, respectively. The time for $E_o(t)$ to reach its peak value of unity is given by

$$t_p = \frac{1}{A-B} \ln \frac{A}{B} . \tag{4}$$

Using the values of

$$A = 86.0 \times 10^{6} \text{ s}^{-1} ,$$

$$B = 25.8 \times 10^{6} \text{ s}^{-1} .$$

gives

$$i_{n} = 20 \text{ ns}$$

Figure 15 compares the normalized doubleexponential expression of equation (3) and the normalized model waveform. It is evident that the double-exponential waveform does not provide a very good approximation to the shape of the experimental waveform, other than in the agreement between the times to peak. Nevertheless, as we shall see in the comparison between theory and experiment, t_p appears to be perhaps the most important parameter in determining the peak value of the observed field.

Let us initially consider the comparisons between the behavior of E_N as a function of observer height and its theoretical counterpart, which we designate as \overline{E}_N . The height dependence of \overline{E}_N is determined from the computer program REFLPROP [8] using the normalized double-exponential waveform of equation (3). The calculated waveform is given by

$$\overline{E}_{N}(\Delta) = E_{o}(\Delta) + E_{o}(\Delta - T_{L}) \quad , \tag{5}$$

where $E_{o}(\Delta)$ is given by equation (3) with t replaced by the retarded time, Δ ; E_{s} is the groundreflected contribution; and T_{L} is the time delay between the incident and ground reflected waves. The ground response is defined for $\Delta \geq T_{L}$. The retarded time, Δ , is given by

$$\Delta = t - \frac{R_o}{c} \tag{6}$$

where

$$R_o = \left[L^2 + (H_d - H_o)^2 \right]^{1/2} , \qquad (7)$$

Lis the ground range between source and observer, H_d is the dipole (AESOP) height, H_o is the height of the observer, and c is the velocity of light. R_o is the line-of-sight distance between the source and observer. If the ground range is considerably greater than the sum of the heights, then the time delay, T_d , is given by

$$\overline{\iota}_L = \frac{2H_d H_o}{c_L} \quad . \tag{8}$$

For the conditions of the experiment, the ground reflection coefficient is approximately -1, and $E_{e}(\Delta - T_{L})$ is given by

$$E_g(\Delta - T_L) = -E_o(\Delta - T_L) \quad . \tag{9}$$

When equation (9) applies and the reflection time delay is less than the time to peak of the incident wave, the net peak field occurs at the onset of the reflected wave and is given by

$$\overline{E}_N = E_o(T_L) \quad . \tag{10}$$

Table 5 gives values of E_N and T_L for the realworld conditions of the experiment, as determined from REFLPROP. Figures 16 to 21 show the waveforms corresponding to the conditions of table 5. In all cases there is clipping of the direct



Figure 15. Comparison between experimental and theoretical waveforms.

Table 5. Theoretical peak-	Height (m)	Ē	T _L (ns)
field and ground	7.5	0.33	2.9
time delay as a	15.0	0.60	5.7
function of	22.5	0.78	8.6
observer height in	30.0	0.88	11.4
absence of fence	37.5	0.96	14.3
	45.0	1.00	17.0

field since the time of reflection arrival is always less than t_{r} . As observed, the peak field, \vec{E}_{N} , occurs at the onset of ground reflection and is consistent with equation (8). This clipping effect is an important consideration in field reduction at large distances and at low observer heights, as can be seen from equation (10).

Figure 22 compares the normalized experimental and theoretical values of peak field. These curves are obtained from the values of E_N and $\overline{E_N}$ given in tables 4 and 5, respectively. There appears to be good agreement between the curves.

We now turn our attention to the fence case. From a theoretical point of view, we once again begin with the normalized waveform. That is, we retain the same incident field levels as in the nofence case; this is consistent with the way it was done in the experiment. The theoretical value of the field, designated by \overline{E}_p , is calculated from the FENCE computer program.



Figure 16. Electric field in absence of fence for observer height = 7.5 m.





observer height = 15.0 m.





Figure 20. Electric field in absence of fence f observer height = 37.5 m.





The resulting waveform in this case is given by

$$\overline{E}_{F}(\overline{\Delta}) = I_{d}(\overline{\Delta}) + I_{i}(\overline{\Delta}) \quad , \tag{11}$$

where $I_{a}(\overline{\Delta})$ and $I_{i}(\overline{\Delta})$ are the contributions from the direct diffracted ray and the external diffracted reflected ray (image), respectively. The direct diffracted ray is from the source to the fence top to the observer. The external diffracted reflected ray is from source to fence top to ground to observer. The time behavior of the field at the selected point is calculated in terms of the ground delay time $\overline{\Delta}$, given by

$$\bar{\Delta} = \frac{t - L}{c} , \qquad (12)$$

where, as before, L is the ground range between source and observer.

The retarded time, Δ , is introduced for computational convenience. It should be noted that except for the special case in which both the source and the observer are at the same height, and both are higher than the fence, the onset of the field will begin at $\overline{\Delta} > 0$.

Figures 23 to 28 show the waveforms with the fence present, as computed from the FENCE program. As in the no-fence case of figures 16 to 21, the net peak fields occur at the onset of the image (ground reflected) contribution. There is also a time delay between the direct and image waves, T'_{t} , which is approximately given by

$$T'_{L} \cong \frac{2H_s H_o}{cL_o} \tag{13}$$

where H_s is the height of the fence and L_s is the distance between the fence and observer.

Table 6 shows the theoretical peak field (E_F) corresponding to figures 23 to 28 and the corresponding ground time delay (T'_L) at the measured heights when the fence is present.

Figure 29 compares E_F (table 4) and \overline{E}_F (table 6) in the presence of the fence. As ob-



Figure 22. Comparison of E_N and E_N in absence of fence.

served, there appears to be relatively good agreement between the curves. It would appear that the differences between the curves are within the experimental uncertainties (see app A).

Of particular importance in evaluating the utility of the fence is the ratio E_F/E_N as a function of observer height. Table 7 and figure 30 show this ratio along with the theoretical value $\overline{E}_F/\overline{E}_N$. Here again, the comparison falls within the uncertainties of the experiment. Although the results of figures 22, 29, and 30 support the theoretical model, the numerical values of $\overline{E}_F/\overline{E}_N$ indicate that the fence does not greatly reduce the field intensity for the conditions of the experiment. The reason for this is that the no-fence case permits relatively more clipping of the incident field than does the fence case.

When the relative effect of clipping is reduced, which occurs when t_p is reduced, the fence has a relatively more beneficial effect. Using the 13.7-ns waveform previously discussed with $H_d =$ $H_o = 22.5$, it is found that $E_F/E_N = 0.56$, while the theoretical value is 0.52. Figures 31 and 32 show the no-fence and fence cases, respectively, corresponding to the 13.7-ns waveform.

Theoretical estimates of the benefits of a fence are presented elsewhere [3], where it is noted that over a large range of observer distance and height, the ratios of $\overline{E}_{F}/\overline{E}_{N}$ fall in the range of 0.45 to 0.55





Figure 23. Electric field with fence for observer height = 7.5 m.

Electric field





Figure 24. Electric field with fence for observer height Figure 27. Electric field with fence for observer height = 15.0 m.



= 22.5 m.

= 37.5 m.



Figure 25. Electric field with fence for observer height Figure 28. Electric field with fence for observer height = 45.0 m.



Figure 29. Comparison between E_s and \overline{E}_s with fence.



Figure 30. Comparison between electric-field ratios.

Table 7. Comparison between experimental and theoretical electric-field ratios

Height (m)	E _F /E _N	\vec{E}_F / \vec{E}_N	% difference*
7.5	0.82	0.67	18
15.0	0.73	0.65	11
22.5	0.66	0.61	8
30.0	0.66	0.60	9
37.5	0.71	0.60	15
45.0	0.72	0.64	11

*% difference =
$$\frac{E_F/E_N - \overline{E}_F/\overline{E}_N}{E_F/E_N}$$



Figure 31. Electric field in absence of fence, with 13.7ns risetime and observer height = 22.5 m.



Figure 32. Electric field with fence, with 13.7-ns risetime and observer height = 22.5 m.

`\

for waveforms of the AESOP regime. For shorter risetimes, with the same geometry, the improvement will reduce the ratio $\overline{E}_F/\overline{E}_N$ to the 0.3 to 0.4 range.

In summary, the experimental results are in good agreement with Kohlberg's theoretical model [3].

5. Conclusions

The results of this scale model experiment allow us to assess the reduction of the fields of EMP simulators of the AESOP type that can be achieved with a totally reflecting fence placed around the perimeter of the test volume. The measured peak field, as a function of observer height, was found to be in good agreement with the theory. Typically, there was a 10-percent difference between the theoretical and experimental results. The largest variation was 18 percent. We assume that closer agreement might have been achieved by more accurately matching the waveshapes and risetimes. This might be accomplished either in the scale-model pulse source, or by providing a variable waveshape input to the theoretical model.

It was shown that the fence did provide a reduction of the field in the region of interest, but the reduction was not especially large: around 50 percent.

The utility of using an EMP fence can be predicted by using the program FENCE. This program is executable on a PC in a few minutes. The waveshape, simulator-to-fence distance, fenceto-observer distance, and observer height are all used as variable inputs to the program. The effectiveness of a fence for many possible configurations can then be predicted.

References

- E. Patrick, PREMPT Fort Huachuca Test Report, Harry Diamond Laboratories, HDL-SR-76-2 (September 1976).
- 2. E. Patrick and S. Soo Hoo, Transportable Electromagnetic (TEMPS) Preliminary Field Mapping Report, Harry Diamond Laboratories, HDL-TM-74-15 (October 1974).
- Ira Kohlberg, Diffraction of Far Fields Produced by EMP Simulators due to a Wire Mesh Fence, Kohlberg Associates, Inc., report KAITN003-88, contract DAAL02-87-C-0052 (July 1988).
- I. Kohlberg and P. Elliot, FENCE: A Computer Program for Determining the Diffracted Far Fields of EMP Simulators due to a Wire Mesh Fence, Kohlberg Associates, Inc., report KAITN05-88, contract DAAL02-87-0052 (August 1988).

- 5. I. Kohlberg and P. Elliot, REFLPROP: A Computer Program for Calculating the Time Behavior of an Electromagnetic Pulse Reflected from the Earth's Surface, Kohlberg Associates, Inc., report KAITN004-88, contract DAAL02-87-0052 (July 1988).
- 6. G. Sinclair, Theory of Models of Electromagnetic Systems, Proc. IRE (November 1984), 1364-1370.
- 7. A. Cuneo and J. Loftus, Scale Modeling for the Patriot Electromagnetic Pulse Test, Harry Diamond Laboratories, HDL-TM-81-16 (May 1981).
- 8. A. Cuneo and J. Loftus, Measurement of Scaled-Down High Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (HEMP) Waveforms, Harry Diamond Laboratories, HDL-TM-81-6 (March 1981).

Appendix.—Experimental Error

The more simple the experiment, the lower the probability of error. The experiment described in the body of the report was simplified by using a substitution method for ot serving the effect of the fence on the horizontal electric field. The radiating dipole remained at a fixed position, while the recording field sensor was moved vertically at either of two fixed horizontal ranges. With the fields at each height recorded, the fonce was immediately placed between the dipole and sensor and the measurements were repeated.

There is systematic error here, in that some changes will occur in the field strength and/or the measurement system between these two sets of measurements. We previously observed the measurement-system and/or field-strength variations by repeating the recording of the field at a given position several times. There was no more than a ±5-percent change in the peak of the recorded fields, with no significant change observed in the temporal distribution. This small deviation may be attributed to the measurement system's signalaveraging capability. Although it requires almost three minutes for the measurement system to average this signal 100 times, the number of pulsed fields which occurred during the acquisition is greater than 10,000. The averaging results in a signal-to-noise ratio increase of 10 and a significantly decreased importance in pulse-source shot-to-shot amplitude variation.

The computer-controlled aspect of the measurement system helps to minimize human errors, such as assigning a transfer function to a captured waveform. The data-collection program was

)

modified for this experiment so that the proper transfer function for the sensor was applied to the waveform by the computer each time data were collected. These data were observed for consistency of response on the CRT of the digital processing oscilloscope while the sampling and averaging was in process.

Other sources of error are the physical placement of the fence, elevation changes of the sensor, and the sensor alignment. The fence-placement error is considered to be ± 3 in., while the sensorelevation error is placed at about ± 0.5 in. The effects of the fence-placement and elevation errors are quite small, in that they cause very little change to the slant range from the sensor to the dipole or from the sensor to the top of the fence (when the fence was present). The error introduced by sensor misalignment is also small, in that a 10° error would decrease the peak output by less than 3 percent. These physical placement (human) errors are assigned a value ± 5 percent.

We arbitrarily assign a random error of ± 10 percent because of undetected aspects such as measurement system gain fluctuation, variation in the electromagnetic environment, etc.

The experimental error for the data is approximated by the square root of the sum of the squares of the measurement-system/field-level estimation (± 5 percent), the physical placement estimation (± 5 percent), and the random error (± 10 percent):

> $(5^2 + 5^2 + 10^2)^{1/2}$ = ±13 percent.

> > 23

DISTRIBUTION

ADMINISTRATOR DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER CAMERON STATION, BUILDING 5 ATTN DTIC-DDA (2 COPIES) ALEXANDRIA, VA 22304-6145 ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ATOMIC ENERGY ATTN EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT WASHINGTON, DC 20301 DIRECTOR DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY ATTN CODE 8410 ATTN CODE B430 WASHINGTON, DC 20305 DIRECTOR COMMAND. CONTROL. & ENGINEERING CENTER ATTN C-660 ATTN G-630 WASHINGTON, DC 20306 DIRECTOR DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS ENGINEERING CENTER ATTN CODE R400 ATTN CODE R123, TECH LIB ATTN CODE R111 **1860 WIEHLE AVENUE** RESTON, VA 22090 ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INFORMATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND SYSTEMS INTEGRATION OFFICE ATTN DAMO-C42 THE PENTAGON WASHINGTON, DC 20301 DIRECTOR DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ATTN DB-4C2, D. SPOHN WASHINGTON, DC 20301 CHAIRMAN JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF ATTN J-3 ATTN C3S WASHINGTON, DC 20301 NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM DEPARTMENT DEFENSE OFFICE OF THE MANAGER ATTN NCS-TS, D. BODSON WASHINGTON, DC 20305 DIRECTOR DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY ATTN RAEV

ATTN DDST

DIRECTOR DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY (cont'd) ATTN RAEE ATTN TITL WASHINGTON, DC 20305 OFFICE OF UNDERSECRETARY OF DEFENSE RESEARCH & ENGINEERING DMSSO 2 SKYLINE PLACE **SUITE 1403** 5203 LEESBURG PIKE FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041 UNDER SECY OF DEF FOR RSCH & ENGG DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ATTN STRATEGIC & SPACE SYS 90S0 RM 3E129 ATTN STRAT & THEATER NUC FORCES WASHINGTON, DC 20301 DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR THEATRE/ TACTICAL C3 SYSTEMS JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON, DC 20301 CAMMANDER-IN-CHIEF US FORCES, EUROPE ATTN ECC3S APO, NY 09128 ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR AUTOMATION & COMMUNICATIONS ATTN DAMO-C4T ATTN DAMO-C4S DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY WASHINGTON, DC 20360 US ARMY BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY. ATTN SLCBR-DD-T (STINFO) ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD 21005 COMMANDER US ARMY INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND ATTN CC-OPS-WR, O.P. CONNELL/ R. NELSON FT HUACHUCA, AZ 85613 US ARMY COMBAT SURVEILLANCE & TARGET ACQUISITION LABORATORY ATTN DELET-DD FT MONMOUTH, NJ 07703 COMMANDER US ARMY ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS ENGINEERING INSTALLATION AGENCY ATTN ASBH-SET-S FT HUACHUCA, AZ 85613

DISTRIBUTION (cont'd)

COMMAND US ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND ATTN DRCRE ATTN DRCDE 5001 EISENHOWER AVE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333-0001 DIRECTOR US ARMY MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS ACTIVITY ATTN DRXSY-MP, LIBRARY ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD 21005 DIRECTOR US ARMY MISSILE LABORATORY USAMICOM ATTN DRSMI-RPR, REDSTONE SCIENTIFIC INFO CENTER ATTN DRSMI-RPT, TECHNICAL INFORMATION DIV ATTN DRSMI-RN, CHIEF, TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION OFFICE REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35809 COMMANDER US ARMY NUCLEAR & CHEMICAL AGENCY ATTN MONA-WE 7500 BACKLICK ROAD SPRINGFIELD, VA 22150 DEPT CH OF STAFF FOR RSCH, DEV. & ACQ DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY ATTN DAMA-CSS-N WASHINGTON, DC 20310 CHIEF US ARMY SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY ATTN DRCPM-SC FT MONMOUTH, NJ 07703 COMMANDANT US ARMY WAR COLLAGE ATTN LIBRARY CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013 COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF ATLANTIC ATTN J6 NORFOLK, VA 23511 COMMANDER NAVAL ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS COMMAND ATTN PME 110-241D WASHINGTON, DC 20360 CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIEL THEATER NUCLEAR WARFAR PROJECT OFFICE ATTN PM-23 WASHINGTON, DC 20360

COMMANDING OFFICER NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY ATTN CODE 4720, J. DAVIS WASHINGTON, DC 20375 COMMANDER NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER ATTN TECH LIBRARY DAHLGREN, VA 22448 COMMANDER NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER ATTN TECHNICAL LIBRARY WHITE OAK LABORATORY SILVER SPRING MD 20910 AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND ATTN EPPD SCOTT AFB, IL 62225 AIR FORCE WEAPONS LABORATORY/DYC ATTN TECH. LIBRARY KIRTLAND AFB. NM 87117 LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL LIB ATTN TECHNICAL INFO DEPT LIBRARY PO BOX 808 LIVERMORE, CA 94550 DIRECTOR NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY ATTN R15 9800 SAVAGE ROAD FT MEADE, MD 20755 BDM CORP ATTN CORPORATE LIBRARY 7915 JONES BRANCH DRIVE McLEAN, VA 22102 BOEING CO ATTN TECH. LIBRARY PO BOX 3707 SEATTLE, WA 98124 ENGINEERING SOCIETIES LIBRARY ATTN ACQUISITIONS DEPT 345 E. 47TH ST NEW YORK. NY 10017 ENSCO, INC ATTN R. GRAY 540 PORT ROYAL RD SPRINGFIELD, VA 22151 **IIT RESEARCH INSTITUTE** ATTN TECH. LIBRARY 10 W 35TH STREET CHICAGO, IL 60616

DISTRIBUTION (cont'd)

INTERNATIONAL TEL & TELEGRAPH CORP ATTN TECHNICAL LIBRARY 500 WASHINGTON AVENUE NUTLEY, NJ 07110

MARTIN MARIETTA CORPORATION ATTN DR. C. WHITESCARVER PO BOX 5837 ORLANDO, FL 32805

MISSION RESEARCH CORP ATTN DR. W. STARK 4935 N 30TH STREET COLORADO SPRINGS, CO80933

MISSION RESEARCH CORP ATTN J. DANDO ATTN DR. H. ROBERTS 3103 FOX DEN LANE OAKTON, VA 22124

MISSION RESEARCH CORP EM SYSTEM APPLICATIONS DIVISION ATTN TECHNICAL LIBRARY 1720 RANDOLF ROAD, SE ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87106

ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL CORP ATTN D/24-068, 031-CA31 PO BOX 3105 ANAHEIM, CA 92803

SRI INTERNATIONAL ATTN TECH. LIBRARY 333 RAVENSWOOD AVENUE MENLO PARK, CA 94025

TRW DEFENSE & SPACE SYSTEMS GROUP ATTN J. PENAR GNE SPACE PARK REDONDO BEACH, CA 92078

TRW, INC COMMAND & CONTROL & COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM DIV ATTN N. STAMMER 5203 LEESBURG PIKE SUITE 310 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041

US ARMY LABORATORY COMMAND ATTN TECHNICAL DIRECTOR, AMSLC-TD INSTALLATION SUPPORT ACTIVITY ATTN LEGAL OFFICE, SLCIS-CC USAISC ATTN RECORD COPY, AMSLC-IM-TS ATTN TECHNICAL REPORTS BRANCH, AMSLC-IM-TR (3 COPIES) HARRY DIAMOND LABORATORIES ATTN D/DIVISION DIRECTORS ATTN LIBRARY, SLCHD-TL (3 COPIES) ATTN LIBRARY, SLCHD-TL (WOODBRIDGE) ATTN CHIEF SCIENTIST, SLCHD-CS ATTN DEPUTY DIRECTOR, SLCHD-NW-E ATTN SPECIAL PROJECTS OFFICER, SLCHD-NW-E ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-NW-EP ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-NW-EP (15 COPIES) ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-NW-ES ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-NW-TN ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-NW-CS ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-NW-RP ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-NW-TU ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-NW-RS ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-NW-P ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-TT ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-TA ATTN CHIEF, SLCHD-TL ATTN W. L. VAULT, SLCHD-NW ATTN M. BUMBAUGH, SLCHD-NW-RS ATTN Z. G. SZTANKAY, SLCHD-ST-SP ATTN J. LOFTUS, SLCHD-NW-EH (30 COPIES)