Army Research Laboratory



Shock and Vibration Profile for MEF IAS/TCAC PIP

by Stuart Young and Chris Winslow

ARL-TR-1445

December 1997

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19971230 129

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

Citation of manufacturer's or trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use thereof.

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

Army Research Laboratory

Adelphi, MD 20783-1197

ARL-TR-1445

December 1997

Shock and Vibration Profile for MEF IAS/TCAC PIP

Stuart Young and Chris Winslow Information Science and Technology Directorate

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Abstract

The Marine Expeditionary Force Intelligence Analysis System (MEF IAS) and the Technical Control and Analysis Center Product Improvement Program (TCAC PIP) are command, control, and intelligence systems developed by the Marine Corps Systems Command and built around a common core system. The development strategy behind the MEF IAS and TCAC PIP is to reduce the total cost of these systems. The major savings will be in life-cycle management costs, by fielding the two different systems to two different organizations within the Marine Corps that share (extensively) a common support structure. This common core system is an M-1097 high-mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV) (heavy variant) carrying a computer and communications system mounted in a standard integrated command post shelter (SICPS).

This report analyzes the results of tests performed during late 1994 and early 1995. These road tests, rail impact tests, and transit drop tests helped develop a general testing profile that can be applied to future upgrades of the MEF IAS and TCAC PIP. The same technique of using a common core system and individual component testing can be applied to the fielding of entirely new systems. The cost savings of such an approach are significant.

Contents

ntroduction	L
Procedure	2
Results	2
Conclusion	4
Bibliography	4
Distribution	3
Report Documentation Page	5

Appendices

A .	Plots of Shock Test Results	17
B.	Plots of Vibration Test Results	33

Figures

Shock response spectrum (SRS): vertical envelope	. 9
Shock response spectrum (SAC). Vertical entrelept	9
SKS. Tongitudinal envelope	10
SKS: transverse envelope	10
Vertical: MEF IAS—road data	11
Longitudinal: MEF IASroad data	11
Transverse: MEF IAS-road data	11
Vertical: TCAC PIP—road data	12
Longitudinal: TCAC PIP—road data	12
Transverse: TCAC PIP—road data	13
MIL-STD-810E: shock spectrum	13
MIL-STD-810E: vibration spectrum	14
MIL-STD-810E: vibration spectrum	14
MIL-STD-810E: vibration spectrum	15
	Shock response spectrum (SRS): vertical envelope SRS: longitudinal envelope SRS: transverse envelope Vertical: MEF IAS—road data Longitudinal: MEF IAS—road data Transverse: MEF IAS—road data Vertical: TCAC PIP—road data Longitudinal: TCAC PIP—road data MIL-STD-810E: shock spectrum MIL-STD-810E: vibration spectrum MIL-STD-810E: vibration spectrum MIL-STD-810E: vibration spectrum

Tables

L

1	Rail impact tests	5
1.	Static drop toots	5
Ζ.	Static drop lesis	6
3.	Channel locations for fail impact tests (ICAC FIF)	7
4.	Channel locations for static drop tests (TCAC PIP)	
5.	Munson road tests	1
6	Channel locations for road runs 1–9	8
7	Channel locations for road runs 12–19	8
1.		

Introduction

The Marine Expeditionary Force Intelligence Analysis System (MEF IAS) and the Technical Control and Analysis Center Product Improvement Program (TCAC PIP) are command, control, and intelligence (C²I) systems developed by the Marine Corps Systems Command and built around a common core system. This common core system is an M-1097 high-mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV) (heavy variant) carrying a computer and communications system mounted in a standard integrated command post shelter (SICPS). The core equipment mounted in the shelter includes computers and associated peripherals, modems, and encryption equipment. Supplied with each vehicle/shelter is a tent that is suitable for connection to the shelter, a number of workstations, and a set of support equipment consisting of tables, chairs, and lights.

The concept behind the development strategy of the MEF IAS and TCAC PIP is one that will reduce the total cost of these systems. While there are savings in design, development, and testing, the major savings will be in life cycle management costs. This savings is achieved by fielding the two different systems to two different organizations within the Marine Corps that share (extensively) a common support structure. This commonality can be found in areas ranging from training to spares inventory.

This core system will be fielded in three variants. The MEF IAS is a twovehicle system. Each of the two MEF IAS variants contains a slightly different set of peripherals and will be issued with an M101A3 general cargo trailer. The TCAC PIP contains yet a slightly different set of computer peripherals and will be fielded with radios for both voice and data communication. These radios will be mounted in a rack that is a part of the core system. The TCAC PIP will also be fielded with an M101A3 general cargo trailer. The load out for this item will, however, be slightly different than that of the MEF IAS trailer. In each of these three variants, over 85 percent of the components are identical.

The Army Research Laboratory (ARL) has been involved in the design, engineering, and testing of these systems since 1992. During late 1994 and early 1995, a number of mechanical tests were run on the low-rate initial production (LRIP) version of the MEF IAS and TCAC PIP. The prime contractor, in accordance with a government-approved test plan, executed some of the tests at commercial facilities. The government executed some of the tests at the Aberdeen Test Center in Aberdeen, Maryland. Those tests included road tests, rail impact tests, and transit drop tests. All tests were performed in accordance with MIL-STD-810E.¹

In this report, we analyze the results of those tests to develop a general testing profile that can be applied to future upgrades of the MEF IAS and TCAC PIP. The profile to be developed will enable developers to perform component tests rather than full system tests when minor upgrades are

¹Military Standard, Environmental Test Methods and Engineering Guidelines, MIL-STD-810E (14 July 1989).

made to the fielded systems. The same technique of using a common core system and individual component testing can be applied to the fielding of entirely new systems. The cost savings of such an approach are significant.

Procedure

We needed to develop a profile that would be the worst case of the test data for the entire interior of the shelter. We developed this profile by calculating the power spectral density (PSD) of each time response for each accelerometer from the Munson road test data (random vibration) for each channel of each test. Next, we assembled the peak response of the interior by enveloping all of the responses for the interior of the shelter. Once the PSD was enveloped, we compared the resulting PSD with MIL-STD-810E and made the final component testing recommendations.

A similar approach was also taken for the shock data. From the time response of the static drop and rail impact tests, we calculated the shock response spectrum (SRS) for each location and then enveloped the responses to find the worst-case response within the shelter. The final SRS profile was then compared with MIL-STD-810E.

The assumption was made that any new components would be mounted to the existing system in such a way as not to further amplify the response of the components. It was also assumed that the components would be installed in the existing equipment racks.

Results

Shock

We investigated the shock test results first. The results from both the rail impact (table 1') and the static drop tests (table 2) were considered in the shock analysis. The SRS for each location inside the shelter was calculated and then assembled into a single matrix for each of the three orthogonal directions (vertical, longitudinal, and transverse). Only the locations inside the shelter were considered for the analysis. The locations consisted of channels 17 to 34 for the rail impact tests (table 3) and channels 11 to 28 for the static drop tests (table 4). The plots of the test results are shown in appendix A, figures A-1 through A-27. The maximum values are the solid lines, and the dotted lines represent the individual responses for each interior location. Following this analysis, we assembled the peak response and plotted the results as shown in figures 1 to 3. Figure 1 is the vertical orientation, figure 2 is the longitudinal orientation, and figure 3 is the transverse orientation.

^{*}Tables and figures appear at the end of the main body of text (pp. 5 ff).

The LRIP rail impact testing consisted of four tests conducted on the TCAC PIP variant at Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), Maryland. Combat Systems Test Activity (CSTA) performed the tests in November 1995. The four tests are detailed in table 1. The 30 channels that were instrumented during the rail impact testing are shown in table 3.

The LRIP static drop testing consisted of five tests conducted on the TCAC PIP variant at APG. CSTA performed the tests in November 1995. The five tests are detailed in table 2. Table 4 shows the 24 channels that were instrumented during the static drop testing.

Vibration

We next analyzed the vibration test results. The results from the Munsun road tests (table 5) were considered in this analysis. Both the MEF IAS and TCAC PIP variants were tested, and the results were analyzed separately for each variant. The PSD for each location inside the shelter was calculated and then assembled into a single matrix for each of the three orthogonal directions (vertical, longitudinal, and transverse). Only the locations inside the shelter were considered for the analysis. The locations consisted of channels 1 to 12 for road runs 1 through 9 (table 6), and channels 1 to 12 for road runs 12 through 19 (table 7). The plots of these test results are shown in appendix B, figures B-1 through B-33. The maximum values are the solid lines, and the dotted lines represent the individual responses for each interior location. Following this analysis, we assembled the peak responses for each variant and plotted the results as shown in figures 4 to 9. Figure 4 is the vertical orientation of the MEF IAS, figure 5 is the longitudinal orientation, and figure 6 is the transverse orientation. Similarly, figure 7 is the vertical orientation of the TCAC PIP, figure 8 is the longitudinal orientation, and figure 9 is the transverse orientation.

The PSD results were verified using the following relationship:

$$\sigma^{2} = \left\langle x^{2}(t)_{rms} \right\rangle \equiv \int_{0}^{\infty} S(f)_{rms} df$$
$$\sim \sum_{\Delta f} S(f)_{rms} \Delta f$$

The LRIP Munsun road testing consisted of 19 tests (11 were analyzed) conducted on the TCAC PIP and MEF IAS variants at Hughes Road Test Facility, California. Honeywell performed the tests in October 1994. The 11 tests are detailed in table 5. Tables 6 and 7 show the 12 channels that were instrumented during the road testing.

Conclusion

A comparison of the test results from this analysis with the profiles from MIL-STD-810E shows that generally the profiles from MIL-STD-810E (fig. 10–13) are more rigorous than the test data. In some instances, however, the actual environment is more severe than the MIL-STD-810E profiles. It should be noted that MIL-STD-810E is suggested input if no data are available and that the profiles in MIL-STD-810E are for inputs to an entire system and not for individual components.

The SRS plots shown in figures 1 to 3 should be used to test any components that need to be installed in the MEF IAS or TCAC PIP. If the components pass these tests, then it is reasonable to assume that the components would survive within the system during a complete system test.

The PSD plots shown in figures 4 to 6 should be used to define tests for any components that may be installed in the MEF IAS. If the components pass these tests, then it is reasonable to assume that the components would survive within the system during a complete system test.

Finally, the PSD plots shown in figures 7 to 9 should be used to define tests for any components that may be installed in the TCAC PIP. If the components pass these tests, then it is reasonable to assume that the components would survive within the system during a complete system test.

Bibliography

- Alvarez, Diane M. (1994). Abbreviated Test Plan for the Environmental Test of the MEF IAS TCAC PIP. Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.
- Alvarez, Diane M. (1995). Final Report for the Support Test of the MEF IAS TCAC PIP. Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.
- Bendat, Julius S., and Allan G. Piersol (1986). Random Data, Analysis and Measurement Procedures. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Etter, D. M. (1993). Engineering Problem Solving with MATLAB. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Harris, Cyril M., and Charles E. Crede (1976). Shock and Vibration Handbook. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Inman, Daniel J. (1996). Engineering Vibration. Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Robson, J. D. (1964). An Introduction to Random Vibration. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, Scotland.
- Vitro Corporation (1995). Environmental Test Report for the MEF IAS TCAC PIP. Oxnard, CA.

Table 1. Rail impact tests.

Speed (mph)
4.0 forward
6.2 forward
8.2 forward
8.0 reverse

Table 2. Static drop tests.

Test	Orientation
1	Flat
2	Front
3	Rear
4	Curbside
5	Roadside

Channel	Orientation	Location	
5	Longitudinal	ECU	
5	Transverse	ECU	
0	Vortical	ECU	
0	Transmission	ECU	
0	Transverse	Shelter ECU frame	
9	Longitudinal	Shelter ECU frame	
10	Vertical	Shelter ECU frame	
11	Longitudinal	HMMWV frame	
12	Transverse	HMMWV frame	
13	Vertical	HMMWV frame	
14	Longitudinal	Floor outside	
15	Transverse	Floor outside	
16	Vertical	Floor outside	
17	Longitudinal	CS rear rack	
18	Transverse	CS rear rack	
19	Vertical	CS rear rack	
20	Longitudinal	CS front rack	
21	Transverse	CS front rack	
22	Vertical	CS front rack	
23	Transverse	BOT disk drive	
24	Longitudinal	BOT disk drive	
25	Vertical	BOT disk drive	
26	Longitudinal	Rack near keyboard	
27	Transverse	Rack near keyboard	
28	Vertical	Rack near keyboard	
29	Longitudinal	RS rack printer	
30	Transverse	RS rack printer	
31	Vertical	RS rack printer	
32	Longitudinal	LG printer base	
33	Transverse	LG printer base	
34	Vertical	LG printer base	

Table 3. Channel locations for rail impact tests (TCAC PIP).

ECU = environmental control unit

HMMWV = high-mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle CS = curbside

- BOT = bottom
- RS = roadside

LG = large

Channel	Orientation	Location	
5 Longitudinal		HMMWV frame	
6	Transverse	HMMWV frame	
7	Vertical	HMMWV frame	
8	Longitudinal	Floor outside	
9	Transverse	Floor outside	
10	Vertical	Floor outside	
11	Longitudinal	CS rear rack	
12	Transverse	CS rear rack	
13	Vertical	CS rear rack	
14	Longitudinal	CS front rack	
15	Transverse	CS front rack	
16	Vertical	CS front rack	
17	Transverse	BOT disk drive	
18	Longitudinal	BOT disk drive	
19	Vertical	BOT disk drive	
20	Longitudinal	Rack near keyboard	
21	Transverse	Rack near keyboard	
22	Vertical	Rack near keyboard	
23	Longitudinal	RS rack printer	
24	Transverse	e RS rack printer	
25	Vertical	RS rack printer	
26	Longitudinal	LG printer	
27	Transverse	LG printer	
28	Vertical	LG printer	

Table 4. Channel locations for static drop tests (TCAC PIP).

Table 5. Munson road tests.

_

Run	Description	Speed (mph)	Variant
1	Belgian block	20	MEF IAS
3	Spaced bumps	20	MEF IAS
5	Radial washboard	15	MEF IAS
7	Two-inch washboard	10	MEF IAS
9	Six-inch washboard	5	MEF IAS
12	Belgian block	20	TCAC PIP
13	Spaced bumps	20	TCAC PIP
15	Radial washboard	15	TCAC PIP
16	Two-inch washboard	10	TCAC PIP
18	Six-inch washboard	5	TCAC PIP
19	Pot holes	15	TCAC PIP

Channel Orientation		Location	
1	Vertical	Left rear corner	
2	Vertical	Center plotter	
3	Longitudinal	Left front corner	
4	Vertical	Center rack	
5	Transverse	Right front corner	
6	Vertical	Right rear rack	
7	Vertical	Right rear corner	
8 .	Vertical	Center under A/C	
9	Transverse	Center rack	
10	Longitudinal	Center rack	
11	Transverse	Right rear rack	
12	Longitudinal	Right rear rack	

Table 6. Channel locations for road runs 1–9.

 $\overline{A/C} = air \ conditioner$

Table 7. Channel locations for road runs 12–19.

Channel Orientation		Location	
1	Vertical	Left rear corner	
2	Longitudinal	A/C compressor top	
3	Longitudinal	Left front corner	
4	Vertical	Center rack	
5	Vertical	Generator engine mount	
6	Vertical	Right rear rack	
7	Vertical	Right rear corner	
8	Vertical	A/C compressor top	
9	Transverse	Center rack	
10	Longitudinal	Center rack	
11	Transverse	Right rear rack	
12	Longitudinal	Right rear rack	

ł





Natural frequency (Hz)







Figure 6. Transverse: MEF IAS—road data.



Frequency (Hz)





Figure 10. MIL-STD-810E: shock spectrum.



Test procedure	Peak acceleration (g)	T _E (ms)	Crossover frequency (Hz)
Functional test for flight equipment	20	6–9	45
Functional test for ground equipment	40	6–9	45
Crash hazard test for flight equipment	40	6–9	45
Crash hazard test for ground equipment	75	3.5–5	80



Note: If the test item is resonant below 10 Hz, extend the curve to the lowest resonant frequency.





Appendix A. Plots of Shock Test Results

These plots show the results of shock tests on the Marine Expeditionary Force Intelligence Analysis System (MEF IAS) and the Technical Control and Analysis Center Product Improvement Program (TCAC PIP) command, control, and intelligence (C²I) systems. The maximum values are the solid lines, and the dotted lines represent the individual responses for each interior location.







Natural frequency (Hz)







Natural frequency (Hz)





Natural frequency (Hz)





Natural frequency (Hz)



1 2 ()



Natural frequency (Hz)





Natural frequency (Hz)



Appendix B. Plots of Vibration Test Results

These plots show the results of vibration tests on the Marine Expeditionary Force Intelligence Analysis System (MEF IAS) and the Technical Control and Analysis Center Product Improvement Program (TCAC PIP) command, control, and intelligence (C²I) systems. The maximum values are the solid lines, and the dotted lines represent the individual responses for each interior location.



Frequency (Hz)



IAS-two-inch





Figure B-6. Vertical: TCAC—Belgian block at 20 mph (ROAD012).









Figure B-10. Vertical: TCAC—six-inch washboard at 5 mph (ROAD018).









.



Frequency (Hz)



.





Figure B-25. Transverse: IAS—radial washboard at 15 mph (ROAD005).

Figure B-26. Transverse:

IAS—two-inch washboard at 10 mph

(ROAD007).



Frequency (Hz)



Figure B-28. Transverse: TCAC— 10¹ Belgian block at **10**⁰ 20 mph (ROAD012). 10-1 10-2 PSD (g²/Hz) 10⁻³ 10-4 10⁻⁵ 3 ž 1. S.S. 10-6 10-7 50 100 250 150 200 300 350 400 450 500

Frequency (Hz)

1









Figure B-32. Transverse: TCAC—six-inch washboard at 5 mph (ROAD018).



ŧ

Distribution

Admnstr Defns Techl Info Ctr Attn DTIC-OCP 8725 John J Kingman Rd Ste 0944 FT Belvoir VA 22060-6218

Ofc of the Secy of Defns Attn ODDRE (R&AT) G Singley Attn ODDRE (R&AT) S Gontarek The Pentagon Washington DC 20301-3080

MARCORSYSCOM Attn CCR/IT Project Officer CPT T Sobey Attn Code CIS D M Hubbs Attn Code PSE-P G Pardo Attn Code PSE N Conde 2033 Barnett Ave, Ste 315 Quantico VA 22134-5010

US Army Train & Doctrine Cmd Battle Lab Integration & Techl Dirctrt Attn ATCD-B J A Klevecz FT Monroe VA 23651-5850

CECOM RDEC Electronic Systems Div Dir Attn J Niemela FT Monmouth NJ 07703

CECOM

Sp & Terrestrial Commetn Div Attn AMSEL-RD-ST-MC-M H Soicher FT Monmouth NJ 07703-5203

DARPA

ŧ

Attn B Kaspar Attn J Pennella Attn L Stotts 3701 N Fairfax Dr Arlington VA 22203-1714

Dpty Assist Scy for Rsrch & Techl Attn SARD-TT F Milton Rm 3EA79 The Pentagon Washington DC 20301-0103

DUSD Space Attn 1E765 J G McNeff 3900 Defense Pentagon Washington DC 20301-3900 Hdqtrs Dept of the Army Attn DAMO-FDQ D Schmidt 400 Army Pentagon Washington DC 20301-0460

MICOM RDEC Attn AMSMI-RD W C McCorkle Redstone Arsenal AL 35898-5240

OSD Attn OUSD(A&T)/ODDDR&E(R) J Lupo The Pentagon Washington DC 20301-7100

US Army Aviation Rsrch, Dev, & Engrg Ctr Attn T L House 4300 Goodfellow Blvd St Louis MO 63120-1798

US Army CECOM Rsrch, Dev, & Engrg Ctr Attn R F Giordano FT Monmouth NJ 07703-5201

US Army Edgewood Rsrch, Dev, & Engrg Ctr Attn SCBRD-TD J Vervier Aberdeen Proving Ground MD 21010-5423

US Army Info Sys Engrg Cmd Attn ASQB-OTD F Jenia FT Huachuca AZ 85613-5300

US Army Materiel Sys Analysis Agency Attn AMXSY-D J McCarthy Aberdeen Proving Ground MD 21005-5071

US Army Matl Cmnd Dpty CG for RDE Hdqtrs Attn AMCRD BG Beauchamp 5001 Eisenhower Ave Alexandria VA 22333-0001

US Army Matl Cmnd Prin Dpty for Acquisition Hdqrts Attn AMCDCG-A D Adams 5001 Eisenhower Ave Alexandria VA 22333-0001

Distribution (cont'd)

US Army Matl Cmnd Prin Dpty for Techlgy Hdqtrs Attn AMCDCG-T M Fisette 5001 Eisenhower Ave Alexandria VA 22333-0001

US Army Natick Rsrch, Dev, & Engrg Ctr Acting Techl Dir Attn SSCNC-T P Brandler Natick MA 01760-5002

US Army Rsrch Ofc Attn G Iafrate 4300 S Miami Blvd Research Triangle Park NC 27709

US Army Simulation, Train, & Instrmntn Cmd Attn J Stahl 12350 Research Parkway Orlando FL 32826-3726

US Army Tank-Automotive Cmd Rsrch, Dev, & Engrg Ctr Attn AMSTA-TA J Chapin Warren MI 48397-5000

US Army Tank-Automtv & Armaments Cmd Attn AMSTA-AR-TD C Spinelli Bldg 1 Picatinny Arsenal NJ 07806-5000

US Army Test & Eval Cmd Attn R G Pollard III Aberdeen Proving Ground MD 21005-5055

US Military Academy Dept of Mathematical Sci Attn MAJ D Engen West Point NY 10996

USAASA Attn MOAS-AI W Parron 9325 Gunston Rd Ste N319 FT Belvoir VA 22060-5582 GPS Joint Prog Ofc Dir Attn COL J Clay 2435 Vela Way Ste 1613 Los Angeles AFB CA 90245-5500

Ofc of the Dir Rsrch and Engrg Attn R Menz Pentagon Rm 3E1089 Washington DC 20301-3080

Special Assist to the Wing Cmndr Attn 50SW/CCX CAPT P H Bernstein 300 O'Malley Ave Ste 20 Falcon AFB CO 80912-3020

ARL Electromag Group Attn Campus Mail Code F0250 A Tucker University of Texas Austin TX 78712

Dir for MANPRINT Ofc of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel Attn J Hiller The Pentagon Rm 2C733 Washington DC 20301-0300

US Army Rsrch Lab Attn AMSRL-CI-LL Tech Lib (3 copies) Attn AMSRL-CS-AL-TA Mail & Records Mgmt Attn AMSRL-CS-AL-TP Techl Pub (3 copies) Attn AMSRL-IS-CI B Broome Attn AMSRL-IS-CI C Winslow (2 copies) Attn AMSRL-IS-CI S Young (2 copies) Attn AMSRL-IS-P L Tokarick Attn AMSRL-IS-P T Rose Attn AMSRL-IS-P R Gregory Attn AMSRL-IS-P J Locker Attn AMSRL-IS-P J Van Etten Attn AMSRL-IS-P S Bragonier Attn AMSRL-IS-CI T Mills Adelphi MD 20783-1197

54

٦.

)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
Public reporting burden for this collection of in gathering and maintaining the data needed, in collection of information including suggestion	nformation is estimated to average 1 hour per r and completing and reviewing the collection of i ns for reducing this burden, to Washington Hea	esponse, including the time for re- nformation. Send comments rega dquarters Services, Directorate fo	viewing instructions, searching existing data sources, rding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this r Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson
Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22	2202-4302, and to the Office of Management and 2 REPORT DATE	ad Budget, Paperwork Reduction 1	Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.
. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Diank)	December 1997	Final, Ap	ril 1997 to June 1997
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE			5. FUNDING NUMBERS
Shock and Vibration Profile for MEF IAS/TCAC PIP			PE: 62120A
5. AUTHOR(S)	<u></u>		
Stuart Young and Chris V	Vinslow		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
U.S. Army Research Laboratory			ARL-TR-1445
Attn: AMSKL-IS-CI (syoung@an.mii) 2800 Powder Mill Road			
Adelphi MD 20783-119	7		· .
SPONSORINGAMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING
			AGENCY REPORT NUMBER
2033 Barnett Ave. Ste 31	5		
Quantico, VA 22134-50	50		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		<u></u>	
AMS code: 622120H160	0		
ARL PR: 7FT330			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.			
,			
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The Marine Expeditionar and Analysis Center Proc gence systems developed system. The developmen these systems. The major systems to two different of support structure. This co vehicle (HMMWV) (heav standard integrated comm This report analyzes the rail impact tests, and tran future upgrades of the M and individual compone	y Force Intelligence Analys Juct Improvement Program d by the Marine Corps Syste t strategy behind the MEF I r savings will be in life-cycl organizations within the Ma ommon core system is an N ry variant) carrying a comp mand post shelter (SICPS). results of tests performed d nsit drop tests helped devel EF IAS and TCAC PIP. The nt testing can be applied to	is System (MEF IAS (TCAC PIP) are cor ems Command and AS and TCAC PIP i e management cos arine Corps that sha 4-1097 high-mobili uter and communic uring late 1994 and op a general testing same technique of o the fielding of enti) and the Technical Control nmand, control, and intelli- built around a common core s to reduce the total cost of ts, by fielding the two different are (extensively) a common ty multipurpose wheeled cations system mounted in a d early 1995. These road tests, g profile that can be applied to using a common core system irely new systems. The cost
savings of such an appro	ach are significant.	0	
			15. NUMBER OF PAGES
SICPS, LMS, shelter			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	19. SECURITY CLASSIFIC	CATION 20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
OF REPORT Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	UL

•

£