

# NUMERICAL MODELING OF THE RESPONSES OF A WATER BARRICADE AND AN ACCEPTOR STACK TO THE DETONATION OF A DONOR MUNITIONS STACK

Richard E. Lottero  
U.S. Army Research Laboratory  
Weapons and Materials Research Directorate  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD

28th DDESB Explosives Safety Seminar  
Orlando, Florida  
August 18-20 1998

## ABSTRACT

This paper documents the numerical modeling of the detonation of a simplified munitions stack, referred to as the "donor" stack, in a temporary storage area and the subsequent effects on the immediate surroundings of the stack. A plausible configuration of a donor munitions stack, a water barricade, and an "acceptor" munitions stack was modeled in a two-dimensional (2-D) Cartesian hydrocode computation using the CTH hydrodynamics computer code. The donor stack was modeled as an uncased, condensed high-explosive charge with a rectangular cross section. The water barricade has a trapezoidal cross section, and the acceptor stack is a solid rectangle. The loading on and pressures within the barricade were computed, as was the whole-body motion of the barricade. A separate, uncoupled computation was then run with the water barricade, reconstituted into its original shape and translating at the late-time velocity from the first computation, interacting with the acceptor stack. These computations were performed as part of a U.S. Army Research Laboratory (ARL) study titled "Munitions Survivability Technology," sponsored by the U.S. Army Defense Ammunition Logistics (Ammolog) Activity.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

When military units are involved in rapid deployment or rapid movement situations, it is not always possible to store needed munitions using standard safe-distance guidelines. At times such as these, it is sometimes considered necessary by commanders in the field to store munitions in closely spaced stacks in the open with no protective barricades between them. The primary purpose of protective barricades is to prevent a direct, line-of-sight path for either blast or fragments from existing between munitions stacks in proximity to one another. One example of extremely close spacing of munitions stacks occurred in the buildup of ammunition stocks at the port of Al Jubayl, Saudia Arabia, before the opening of hostilities in the Gulf War. A photograph of the port is shown in Figure 1. At one point, the stocks were estimated to have a net explosive weight (NEW) of 30,000 short

# Report Documentation Page

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE <b>AUG 1998</b>		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-1998 to 00-00-1998</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Numerical Modeling of the Responses of a Water Barricade and an Acceptor Stack to the Detonation of a Donor Munitions Stack</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Weapons and Materials Research Directorate, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, 21005-5066</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES <b>See also ADM001002. Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth DoD Explosives Safety Seminar Held in Orlando, FL on 18-20 August 1998.</b>					
14. ABSTRACT <b>see report</b>					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>Same as Report (SAR)</b>	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>22</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

tons. This stockpile, along with much of the port itself, could have been destroyed with one direct hit or other initiating incident. Fortunately, none occurred. Later, there was a similar situation involving munition stockpiles after the end of hostilities at Doha, Kuwait, in 1991. The munitions storage area also included nearby military vehicles, many of which contained combat loads. A fire in one vehicle started a chain reaction, which resulted in the loss of a large amount of munitions and equipment. Figure 2 shows a photograph taken after the event at Doha had ended but before cleanup operations had begun. It shows a row of armored vehicles (some damaged) at what appears to be a border of the fire and explosion event.

The U.S. Army Defense Ammunition Logistics (Ammolog) Activity has a program designed to improve the chances of stopping the chain reaction propagation from stack to stack after a munitions stack has been initiated. Ideally, the goal is to confine the event to just the single, initial munitions stack. The U.S. Army Research Laboratory (ARL) has been sponsored by Ammolog to contribute to that program. ARL's focus is on characterizing the nature of the reaction(s) within a donor stack; the propagation of fragments, firebrands, and blast; the protection provided to potential acceptor stacks by barricades of various designs (provided by others within the program); the effects on the barricades themselves; and the possible or probable reactions by the acceptor stack. This paper documents one part of a larger computational study, focusing on the complete, high-order detonation of a postulated donor stack and the subsequent effects on an acceptor stack protected by a candidate water-filled barricade. The results presented here are fully documented in an ARL technical report. [1]

## 2. COMPUTATIONAL APPROACH AND GEOMETRY

### 2.1. General Comments on the Hydrocode Model

The computations that are reported here were performed using the June, 1996, version of the CTH [2] hydrocode developed at Sandia National Laboratories. CTH solves the inviscid Euler equations using a second-order accurate, explicit time-stepping method. It has a Lagrangian first phase and a second phase that uses a mesh remapping to bring the distorted mesh back to the stationary Eulerian mesh and thereby perform a second-order accurate fluxing of materials between cells. The conservation equations are replaced by finite-volume approximations to maximize the code's ability to conserve mass, momentum, and energy. The computational grid cells have rectangular cross sections in two-dimensional (2-D) Cartesian coordinates with a presumed unit depth (1.0 cm). This unit depth represents an infinite depth with no wave interactions or fluxing in that direction. The computational grid cells in three-dimensional (3-D) Cartesian coordinates are rectangular parallelepipeds and therefore have rectangular cross sections in any planes parallel to any pair of axes. The computational grid cells in 2-D cylindrical coordinates are toroidal rings with rectangular cross sections. All axes are orthogonal. The reader is referred to the appropriate users' manuals for practical information about the structure

and use of the CTHGEN [3] grid generation code, the CTH [4] hydrocode, and their supporting utilities.

Ideally, a meaningful subsection of a postulated munitions storage area should be modeled in a 3-D Cartesian computational grid. Individual munitions stacks surrounded by barricades would be modeled, with one of the stacks designated as the donor stack. With such a grid design, most of the first-order physics of the system could be modeled. However, at this early stage of the computational study, that level of detail is not warranted. There are no firm definitions yet of the most likely munitions stack dimensions, the specific munitions, and the recommended maximum NEW of the stacks. The barricade geometric design and materials are not yet final, nor are the recommended standoff distances. Hopefully, the successful pursuit of this overall program will produce much of that information.

After much discussion, it was decided that these early computations would be performed using relatively simple physical approximations to provide initial estimates of simple blast loads and responses. These estimates could then be used as input to increasingly refined computational and experimental efforts. The first decision was to model the donor stack in the first computation discussed herein, designated as Computation 970908, as an uncased charge with no packing materials. This reduced the analysis to one of blast loading only, with no production of fragments or other debris. The second decision was to represent the explosive mass in Computation 970908 as a single, condensed charge rather than as a distributed set of smaller condensed charges. Preliminary computations with a single condensed charge versus distributed condensed charges of the same total mass showed comparable loading on and response of a simple barricade shape. More detailed comparisons of different configurations may be made later in another part of this study. The third decision was to model the flow field in 2-D Cartesian coordinates for this computation and for the second discussed herein, which is designated as Computation 971001. This provided a worst case blast loading for the simplified, uncased charge of condensed high explosives by eliminating the possibility of having any compression or expansion waves in the direction of depth of the munitions stacks and barricade. (Depth is a measure parallel to both the ground and the side walls of the munitions stack.) In effect, the donor and acceptor stacks and the barricade have an infinite depth in that coordinate system. In the CTH hydrocode model, which uses the cgs (centimeter-gram-second) units system, this implies a unit depth of 1.0 cm.

## 2.2. The Donor Munitions Stack

A previous ARL report on fragment propagation probabilities by Starckenberg et al. [5] used palletized and single M107 155-mm projectiles as fragment donors to analyze the threat to palletized TOW-2A missiles as acceptor munitions. That report was used as a guide from which to select the dimensions of a representative munitions stack. The donor munitions stack for the current study was assumed be of the same size as one consisting of 72 pallets of M107 155-mm projectiles, stacked three pallets high by four wide by six deep. Each pallet contains eight rounds. The dimensions of this particular stack are 2.44

m high by 2.94 m wide by 2.19 m deep (8.00 ft by 9.63 ft by 7.20 ft). Other stacking configurations and dimensions for the same number of pallets of M107 munitions are also possible but are not discussed here. According to Starkenberg et al., [5] "Storage regulations applicable to basic load ammunition holding areas in theaters of operations limit the explosive quantity in any stack to 4,000 kg. ... (See Army Regulation 385-64.)" A single M107 round can contain either 6.62 kg (14.6 lbm, where "lbm" denotes pounds mass, avoirdupois) of TNT or 6.98 kg (15.4 lbm) of Comp-B. A pallet contains eight rounds. The total mass of a pallet, including packaging, is 362 kg (797 lbm). [6] Thus, a presumed stack of M107 munitions would contain 576 rounds, having a total mass of 4,024 kg (8,870 lbm) of Comp-B. For simplicity, the nominal explosive mass of Comp-B for this computational study was taken as 4,000 kg (8,818 lbm) of Comp-B for the donor stack. The total mass of an actual stack containing 72 pallets of M107 rounds is 26,029 kg (57,384 lbm), including all packaging materials. This equates to a mass of 118.61 kg/cm depth for the actual stack with all materials. The acceptor stack was assumed to have the same physical dimensions and total mass as the donor stack.

As stated previously, it was decided to model the donor stack in Computation 970908 as an uncased explosive charge. The explosive modeled was Comp-B, taken at its reference density of 1.72 g/cm<sup>3</sup> in its undetonated state, and modeled [7] within the Sesame [8] equation-of-state package. The Sandia National Laboratories' Sesame equation-of-state package includes tabular data for high explosives and separate implementations of data for the Mie-Gruneisen, Jones-Wilkins-Lee (JWL), and ideal-gas equations of state. The explosive charge was placed within the computational flow field with its center coincident with that of the M107 donor stack described before. After assigning the donor stack the nominal explosive mass of 4,000 kg and using the actual stack depth of 2.19 m, this equated to an explosive charge mass of approximately 18.227 kg/cm depth of the stack to be modeled in the unit-depth 2-D Cartesian coordinates flow field in CTH. This mass of Comp-B was modeled as a rectangle whose width and height are in direct proportion to those for the donor stack. Specifically, the explosive charge is 93.91 cm high and 113.04 cm wide (i.e., the full width, and not one-half width for symmetry), located with its center of mass 121.92 cm above the ground plane. The ground plane was designated as a perfectly reflective boundary.

A small central section of the explosive charge served as a computational "booster" charge. It was detonated using the programmed burn model [3] using a constant detonation velocity of 7.98 km/s for reference-density Comp-B. [9] This model simulates the complete detonation of any part of an explosive that is passed by the expanding theoretical detonation front moving at that constant velocity. The remainder of the detonation was modeled using the "history variable reaction burn" (HVRB) model. [8] The HVRB model evaluates the thermodynamic state of a mass of undetonated explosive in a given computational flow field cells to determine if that material should be detonated in that time step. The detonation initiation point was located at the center of the explosive charge at the (X, Y) point (0.0, 121.92 cm).

### 2.3. The Barricade

The barricade shape chosen for Computations 970908 and 971001 is similar to that proposed by a Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) contractor. [10] That design consists of a pyramidal stacking of a number of identical, cylindrical, water-filled tubes. For simplicity in these computations, it is assumed that the stacking results in a shape that has a continuous sloping side with an inside angle at the top that is equal to 30 degrees when measured from a line perpendicular to the ground plane. An idealized trapezoidal cross section that has no internal air spaces and consists only of water is assumed. The materials that comprise the tubes' walls are ignored. The height of the barricade is 243.84 cm (8.0 ft) as stated in the contract. The width of the barricade at the flat top is assumed for the purposes of this computational study as 1.0 m (3.28 ft). The width of the barricade at the base is 381.56 cm (12.52 ft) for this geometry. The mass of water for the barricade is 58.71 kg/cm depth. The water in the barricade was modeled using the CTH Sesame equation-of-state data for water. [11] The bottom corner of the barricade closest to the donor stack was placed at a standoff distance of 3.048 m (10 ft) from nearest side of the donor stack. The standoff distance here is measured from the face of what would have been the side of the munitions stack, not the condensed explosive charge representing the stack.

### 2.4. The Acceptor Munitions Stack

The acceptor munitions stack was modeled in Computation 970908 as a simple, relatively inert mass of iron [12], with the same height and width (2.44 m high by 2.94 m wide) as the reference M107 munitions stack. The acceptor stack was located at a standoff distance of 3.048 m between its nearest face and the bottom corner of the barricade farthest from the donor stack. The purpose in modeling the acceptor stack in Computation 970908 as a full-sized mass of iron was for the convenience of having an object with the correct physical dimensions in order to observe wave interactions on the surface and providing surface blast loading data through the use of CTH's massless "tracer" particles placed in the air near the surfaces. Tracer particles are massless points that are specified at desired locations by the user at grid generation time. They may be fixed in computational space or be free to move along one or more of the principal axes in the grid. A relatively full complement of data describing the thermodynamic state and other physical parameters at the location of each tracer is recorded for later processing by the user. The use of iron was a simple convenience to provide a massive, relatively non-responding object. The acceptor stack was also modeled as iron in Computation 971001, with the height being the same but having the width adjusted to 61.96 cm so that the mass of the acceptor stack per centimeter depth in the computation was equal to that of the actual M107 stack described previously.

### 3. THE HYDROCODE COMPUTATIONS

#### 3.1. Donor Stack Detonation and Barricade Loading and Response

The first of the two computations, Computation 970908, was focused on modeling the detonation of the donor stack and the blast loading on the water barricade and acceptor stack; the coupled response of the barricade was computed during this blast loading. Both the whole-body response and the internal dynamics of the barricade were of interest, as was studying how the barricade shape might redirect the blast away from the acceptor stack. The second computation, numbered 971001, then used the barricade, reconstituted into its original shape and traveling toward the acceptor stack at its final X-direction velocity from Computation 970908, as an impactor striking the acceptor stack. Figure 3 shows the computational flow field at the start of Computation 970908 at the instant of the initiation of the detonation at time equal to zero. The "Y" axis at the left of the figure represents the height measured from the ground plane. In this simple 2-D Cartesian coordinate system, the left boundary at the Y axis is designated as a perfectly reflective plane of symmetry. The "X" axis represents the measure of width in the system and coincides with the perfectly reflective ground plane. The Y axis at the X = 0.0 location is also a vertical bisector of the donor stack. The air in the flow field, modeled with data from Graboske [13] within the Sesame [8] equation-of-state package, is shown with the color yellow. The top and right transmissive boundaries are marked by the top and right edges of that yellow region. The explosive charge representing the donor stack is shown as the red (one-half) rectangle on the left symmetry boundary, the water barricade is shown as the blue trapezoid, and the acceptor stack is shown as the black rectangle (the object closest to the right transmissive boundary).

Figure 4 shows the computational flow field at 5.00 ms after initiation. The barricade is now significantly distorted and traveling at close to its maximum velocity in the X direction. The air shock has almost fully engulfed the acceptor stack. The explosive products and associated air blast are being directed primarily upward and away from the acceptor stack. The computation was stopped at 8.0 ms, at which time the barricade had essentially reached a steady final velocity, the determination of which was the primary goal of Computation 970908.

One of the several useful features of the CTH hydrocode is its ability to extract the bulk momentum along a given axis for a material. From that bulk momentum, many useful parameters can be derived to describe the motion of, and forces on, an object comprised of a uniquely defined material. The barricade constitutes the only water in the computational flow field, and its motion in the X direction toward the acceptor stack is of interest here. Figure 5 shows the bulk momentum of the water barricade in the X direction, with positive momentum in the direction of increasing values of X, moving toward the acceptor stack. Hereinafter, any use of the term "momentum" or the other variables derived from it should be construed as referring to the bulk value in the X direction per centimeter depth, unless specifically stated otherwise. The momentum has

reached a nearly constant value of 10.18 Mg-m/s by 8.0 ms, the ending time of the computation, implying a nearly steady X-direction velocity. As may be seen in Figure 5, the momentum versus time curve is relatively smooth and well behaved, making it easier to extract other data from it. The X-direction velocity of the water barricade toward the acceptor stack is shown in Figure 6. This was computed by dividing the time-dependent momentum of the barricade by its mass, 58.71 kg/cm depth. The X-direction velocity of the barricade at 8.0 ms was steady at 173.4 m/s. One way to measure the forces on and within the barricade is to determine the acceleration rate of the barricade and view it in terms of multiples of the standard acceleration of gravity at the Earth's surface, designated here by the symbol "G," where  $G = 9.80665 \text{ m/s}^2$ . The velocity shown in Figure 6 was piecewise differentiated with respect to time, using the difference values of velocity and time in the data file. The acceleration data were then divided by the value for G. The acceleration versus time for the barricade is shown in Figure 7, in which the ordinate is labeled "Earth G's" for clarity. The acceleration has a double peak, with the first and larger peak of 12,770 G's occurring at 1.00 ms, and the second peak of 12,350 G's occurring at 1.38 ms. Finally, the velocity data are used to compute the bulk translation of the barricade versus time, which is shown in Figure 8. By the ending time of 8.0 ms, the barricade has moved 101.8 cm and is traveling at its final, maximum velocity of 173.4 m/s toward the acceptor stack.

In addition to determining the bulk reaction of the water barricade, it is also necessary to study the loading and motion at various locations on and within the barricade. The CTH hydrocode allows the user to distribute tracer particles, described earlier, at locations within the computational grid where detailed data are desired. The first set of tracers that will be discussed was placed just inside the sloping left surface of the barricade that faces the donor stack. Twenty tracers were evenly distributed, from top to bottom, about 1.0 cm below the surface, measured along a line perpendicular to the surface. Figure 9 shows an unweighted average of the overpressure versus time for those 20 tracers. The peak average overpressure of 293.7 MPa (42,600 psi, where "psi" is pounds force per square inch [lbf/inch<sup>2</sup>]) occurred at 1.35 ms. These early-time data should be considered reliable because the tracers are still in essentially water-filled computational flow field cells. The later data, probably after 2.0 ms, are not as reliable an indicator of the average overpressure specific to the left surface of the water. This is because of the distortion of the barricade with time; the mixing of air, explosive products, and water; and the freedom given to the tracer particles to move in both the X and Y directions in response to the blast loading. Pressures computed in mixed-material cells are not as reliable or as rigorously determined as are those in single-material cells. Also, some of the tracers may no longer be located just under the increasingly distorted left surface of the barricade, and they may have moved enough that the original even spacing assumed for the averaging may no longer exist. Figure 10 shows the average X-direction velocity for that same set of tracers. The final X-direction velocity of 490.6 m/s at 8.0 ms for these tracers is nearly three times the final bulk X-direction velocity of 173.4 m/s for the entire mass of water that constitutes the barricade. This indicates that there is also a large Y-direction velocity for the tracers, mostly occurring from about 2.0 ms onward. A significant part of the late-time velocities may be attributable to tracers from this set being swept up in what may be

largely a flow of air and explosive products mixed with water. This is consistent with the upward flow of explosive products seen clearly in Figure 4 and the large shear forces that must also exist at the left surface of the barricade.

Among other sets, a set of 30 evenly spaced tracers was placed along the left surface of the acceptor stack that faced the barricade and the donor stack beyond it. Specifically, they were placed in the first column of air-filled cells immediately in front of the iron block used to represent the acceptor stack. The unweighted average overpressure versus time for those tracers is shown in Figure 11. The average overpressure on the front surface of the acceptor stack reached a peak value of 3.61 MPa (524 psi) at 3.55 ms and had declined to 187 kPa (27.2 psi) by 8.0 ms. An analysis of Computation 970908 showed that this was caused only by the air blast. No explosive products of any consequence were computed to have reached the acceptor stack during this time.

The approximate bulk X-direction velocity versus time of the acceptor stack that was caused by the blast loading before the arrival of the water barricade is shown in Figure 12. This is shown primarily to document that the water barricade provides relatively good protection against direct blast loading for a simple high-order detonation event. Computation 970908 used a full-sized cross section for the acceptor stack and modeled it with iron, so the acceptor stack as modeled was much more massive than the actual stack. The velocity computed for Figure 12 used a corrected mass value, 118.61 kg/cm of depth, to produce the corrected velocity. This corrected velocity has a very minor intrinsic error in that the true movement of the stack during the loading time would reduce the loading but only by an extremely small amount in this case. The final velocity of the acceptor stack was relatively low at 1.58 m/s by 8.0 ms and essentially constant by that time. Differentiating that velocity with respect to time produces the acceleration versus time of the acceptor stack, which is shown in Figure 13. A peak acceleration of 79.5 G's is reached at 3.48 ms. It is highly unlikely that this in itself could be a threat to initiate the munitions in the stack.

An estimate can be made of the expected arrival time of the main body of the barricade at the acceptor stack front surface. By 8.0 ms, the barricade had moved 101.8 cm and was traveling in the X direction at a velocity of 173.4 m/s. The initial standoff of the acceptor stack from the barricade was 3.048 m. The time required to travel the remaining distance of 2.03 m at that velocity is 11.7 ms, so the estimated arrival time of the barricade at the acceptor front surface is 19.7 ms after initiation. This estimate does not include a correction for the distortion of the barricade during the loading event.

### 3.2. Barricade Translation and Acceptor Stack Loading and Response

As stated previously, Computation 971001 was set up to model the impact of the barricade against the acceptor stack. The barricade was reconstituted into its original mass and trapezoidal shape and assigned an initial X-direction velocity of 173.4 m/s, the final velocity from Computation 970908. The Y-direction (vertical) velocity from 970908, which was judged not to be of first-order importance, was set to zero for this

computation. As stated previously, the acceptor stack was modeled in 971001 as being made of iron, having the correct height but having the width adjusted so that its mass per unit depth was correct at 118.61 kg/cm depth. Its relatively low, final X-direction velocity of 1.58 m/s at 8.0 ms in Computation 970908 was ignored. The translating barricade was placed in the CTH computational flow field with its right-most bottom corner ready to impact the bottom-left surface of the acceptor stack. For convenience in Computation 971001, the time at the start of this computation was set to zero. Adding 19.7 ms to the time in this computation would give a reasonably good reference back to the time of the event, relative to the initiation of the donor stack. Figure 14 shows the computational flow field at the start of Computation 971001, with the rear surface of the translating water barricade ready to impact the acceptor stack. The air is shown in the yellow region, the borders of which also define the limits of the computational flow field. The water barricade is shown as the blue trapezoid and the acceptor stack as the black rectangle. Figure 15 shows that by 5.00 ms, the front surface of the acceptor stack has been fully engaged by the water barricade, and a small amount of water is jetting upward above the top of the acceptor stack. The computation ran until it failed at 7.81 ms, when the degree of scattering and mixing of water, air, and possibly iron seems to have exceeded the capacity of the modeling of this particular problem within this version of CTH to produce thermodynamically consistent results. That flow field is shown in Figure 16. Because the acceptor stack had reached a nearly steady-state velocity by that time, there was no attempt to stabilize the computation and continue progressing in time.

Figure 17 shows the velocity versus time for the barricade as it interacts with the acceptor stack. As momentum is transferred to the acceptor stack, the velocity of the barricade decreases, reaching a nearly steady value of 92.5 m/s by 7.81 ms, a decrease of 46.7 percent from its initial value of 173.4 m/s. Figure 18 shows the acceleration versus time of the water barricade as it interacts with the acceptor stack. Negative values indicate deceleration, with a peak deceleration of 2,127 G's for the barricade occurring at 3.47 ms.

Figure 19 shows the velocity versus time for the acceptor stack in response to the impact and momentum transfer from the barricade. At the ending time of the computation at 7.81 ms, the acceptor stack has reached a nearly steady velocity of 40.0 m/s, or approximately 41.6 m/s if the 1.6 m/s ending velocity from Computation 970908 is added under a linear superposition assumption. Figure 20 shows the acceleration versus time of the acceptor stack. It has a relatively small peak acceleration of 1,053 G's at 3.62 ms. Finally, Figure 21 shows the distance that the acceptor stack is moved during the time simulated in Computation 971001. The displacement of the acceptor stack is 17.0 cm at the ending time of 7.81 ms.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The computations discussed herein provide an estimate of the blast loading from a simplified, uncased explosive charge representing a nominal munitions stack of 4,000 kg

of Comp-B undergoing a complete, high-order detonation. No munitions casing (and their resulting fragments) or packing materials were included. Because the computation was performed in a 2-D Cartesian coordinates system, this provided a worst case estimate of the blast loading because of the elimination of 3-D divergence effects. In an actual detonation event, a munitions stack would not behave as the simple, monolithic charge modeled here. There would be a series of detonation events for the individual munitions, spreading outward from the first item that detonated in a pattern based on combinations of fragment impacts and sympathetic detonations.

The loading on, and response of, a water barricade having a trapezoidal cross section were computed. The water barricade was effective in deflecting most of the blast and nearly all of the explosive products upward and away from the acceptor stack. By 8.0 ms, the water barricade had accelerated to a nearly steady bulk velocity of 173.4 m/s toward the acceptor stack and had undergone significant distortion. That distortion indicated that large shearing forces occurred on and within the barricade but that this simplified shape maintained enough integrity during the loading event to be effective. An actual water barricade would have voids, shells and/or bladders, and various reinforcements and attachments that would greatly affect its strength and disintegration under blast and fragment loading. The amount of water required for this assumed shape may be impractical in field operations in which water supplies are not plentiful. No analysis of how practical such a water barricade would be to erect and maintain was performed.

The blast loading on the acceptor stack in this assumed configuration was minimal, as was the resulting acceleration, or G-loading, of the acceptor stack. The impact of the mathematically reconstituted water barricade at the 173.4-m/s velocity produced only moderate loading on and acceleration of the acceptor stack. No threat of causing a sympathetic detonation of the acceptor stack was indicated. The same comments concerning the donor stack also apply to the acceptor stack. An actual donor munitions stack would not respond as does a monolithic block such as the one modeled here. Even a relatively modest blast load would disrupt and scatter the munitions, with random events causing a possibly significant distribution of velocities and impacts for individual munitions.

At present, fully coupled computations that model the detonation of the donor stack; the loading, acceleration, and translation of the barricade; and the impact of the distorted barricade against the acceptor stack within a single computation are being performed with the latest version of CTH [14]. Additional computational studies in this part of the overall effort will be performed to evaluate other barricade shapes (e.g., rectangles of different thicknesses) and materials (e.g., sand) to determine their effectiveness. Computational studies of the impact of various barricade materials and their equivalents on simulated munitions will also be performed.

## 5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The technical consultation of Drs. Robert Frey and John Starkenberg of ARL and the technical support from Robert Rossi and Duane Scarborough of the U.S. Army Defense Ammunition Logistics Activity are gratefully acknowledged.

## 6. REFERENCES

1. R.E. Lottero, "Responses of a Water Barricade and an Acceptor Stack to the Detonation of a Donor Munitions Stack," ARL-TR-1600, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, APG, MD, March 1998.
2. J.M. McGlaun, S.L. Thompson, L.N. Kmetck, and M.G. Elrick, "A Brief Description of the Three-Dimensional Shock Wave Physics Code CTH," SAND 89-0607, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, July 1990.
3. R.L. Bell, M.R. Baer, R.M. Brannon, M.G. Elrick, A.V. Farnsworth, E.S. Hertel, S.V. Petney, S.A. Silling, and P.A. Taylor, "CTHGEN User's Manual and Input Instructions, Version 3.00," CTH Development Project, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, 18 July 1996.
4. R.L. Bell, M.R. Baer, R.M. Brannon, M.G. Elrick, A.V. Farnsworth, E.S. Hertel, S.V. Petney, S.A. Silling, and P.A. Taylor, "CTH User's Manual and Input Instructions, Version 3.00," CTH Development Project, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, 18 July 1996.
5. J. Starkenberg, K.J. Benjamin, R.B. Frey, "Predicting Fragmentation Propagation Probabilities for Ammunition Stacks," ARL-TR-949, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, APG, MD, January 1996.
6. "Technical Manual. Army Ammunition Data Sheets. Artillery Ammunition. Guns, Howitzers, Mortars, Recoilless Rifles, Grenade Launchers, and Artillery Fuzes." TM-43-0001-28, Headquarters, Department of the Army, April 1977.
7. G.I. Kerley and T.L. Christian Frear, "Composition B-3 Detonation Products," SAND93-2131, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, 1993.
8. G.I. Kerley, "CTH Reference Manual: The Equation of State Package," SAND91-0344, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, 24 May 1991.
9. B.M. Dobratz and P.C. Crawford, "LLNL Explosives Handbook, Properties of Chemical Explosives and Explosive Simulants," UCRL-52997, Change 2, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, 31 January 1985.

10. Federal-Fabrics-Fibers, Inc., "Rapid Ammunition Barricade Technology Development," Small Business Innovative Research Contract DAAE30-97-C-1023, 10 March 1997.
11. F.H. Ree, "Equation of State for Water," UCRL-52190, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, December 1976.
12. G.I. Kerley, "Multiphase Equation of State for Iron, SAND93-0227, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, 1993.
13. H.C. Graboske, UCID-16901, data for dry air, December 1981, modified March 1992.
14. R.L. Bell, M.R. Baer, R.M. Brannon, M.G. Elrick, E.S. Hertel, S.A. Silling, and P.A. Taylor, "CTH User's Manual and Input Instructions, Version 4.00," CTH Development Project, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, 13 March 1998.



Figure 1. Munitions Being Off-Loaded at Al Jubayl, Saudia Arabia, 1991 (courtesy of D. Scarborough, U.S. Army Defense Ammunition Logistics Activity).



Figure 2. Doha, Kuwait, 1991, Destroyed Munitions With Nearby Armored Vehicles (courtesy of D. Scarborough, U.S. Army Defense Ammunition Logistics Activity).




Figure 3. Flow Field at Time = 0.0 for Computation 970908.




Figure 4. Flow Field at Time = 5.00 ms for Computation 970908.




Figure 5. Water Barricade Bulk X-Direction Momentum Toward the Acceptor Stack, Computation 970908.




Figure 6. Water Barricade X-Direction Velocity Toward the Acceptor Stack, Computation 970908.




Figure 7. Water Barricade X-Direction Acceleration Toward the Acceptor Stack, Computation 970908.




Figure 8. Water Barricade X-Direction Distance Moved Toward the Acceptor Stack, Computation 970908.




Figure 9. Average Overpressure Inside the Left Surface of the Water Barricade, Computation 970908.




Figure 10. Average X-Direction Velocity Inside the Left Surface of the Water Barricade, Computation 970908.




Figure 11. Average Overpressure Along the Front Surface of the Acceptor Stack, Computation 970908.




Figure 12. Acceptor Stack X-Direction Velocity Attributable to Blast Loading, Computation 970908.




Figure 13. Acceptor Stack X-Direction Acceleration Due to Blast Loading, Computation 970908.




Figure 14. Flow Field at Time = 0.00 for Computation 971001.




Figure 15. Flow Field at Time = 5.00 ms for Computation 971001.




Figure 16. Flow Field at Time = 7.81 ms for Computation 971001.




Figure 17. Barricade X-Direction Velocity for Computation 971001.




Figure 18. Barricade X-Direction Acceleration for Computation 971001.




Figure 19. Acceptor Stack X-Direction Velocity for Computation 971001.




Figure 20. Acceptor Stack X-Direction Acceleration for Computation 971001.




Figure 21. Acceptor Stack X-Direction Distance Moved for Computation 971001.