



## **Evaluation of Titanium-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr (Ti-5553) Alloy Against Fragment and Armor-Piercing Projectiles**

**by Shane D. Bartus**

**ARL-TR-4996**

**September 2009**

## **NOTICES**

### **Disclaimers**

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**

Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5069

---

**ARL-TR-4996****September 2009**

---

## **Evaluation of Titanium-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr (Ti-5553) Alloy Against Fragment and Armor-Piercing Projectiles**

**Shane D. Bartus**

**Weapons and Materials Research Directorate, ARL**

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this 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 information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 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 any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. <b>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</b>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) September 2009		2. REPORT TYPE Progress		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 8 January 2007–8 June 2009	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Evaluation of Titanium-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr (Ti-5553) Alloy against Fragment and Armor-Piercing Projectiles				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Shane D. Bartus				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Laboratory ATTN: RDRL-WMT-A Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER ARL-TR-4996	
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 Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT Ballistic tests were carried out on the relatively new titanium alloy Ti-5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr (Ti-5553), which was subjected to two heat treatment conditions. The two heat treatments provided high-strength plates which were solution treated and aged (STA) and high toughness plates that were beta-annealed, slow cooled and aged (BASCA). The ~13.9-mm-thick plates were evaluated for V <sub>50</sub> using 0.50-cal. FSP and 0.30-cal. AP M2 projectiles. The results were benchmarked against MIL-DTL-46077F and MIL-A-46077 D for weldable titanium alloy armor plate (Ti-6Al-4V). The BASCA plates exceeded the requirement for the 0.30-cal. AP M2 by 3.2% but fell short of the Ti-6Al-4V performance against the 0.50-cal. FSP projectiles by 11.3%. The STA plates exceeded the Ti-6Al-4V mil-spec requirement by 8.7% and 11.7% for the 0.30-cal. AP M2 and 0.50-cal. FSP projectiles, respectively.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS titanium, armor, Ti-5553					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT  UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES  42	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Shane D. Bartus
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) (410) 278-6012

---

## Contents

---

<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Background</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Materials</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. Test Projectiles</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5. Test Method</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6. Results</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7. References</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix. Additional Test Data</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Distribution List</b>	<b>26</b>

---

## List of Figures

---

Figure 1. Processing schedules for the Ti-5553 plates subjected to the STA and BASCA heat treatment schedules (not shown to scale).....	3
Figure 2. Details for the 0.50-cal. (13.9-mm) FSP and 0.30-cal. AP M2 projectile used in the study.....	4
Figure 3. $V_{50}$ minimum velocity requirements for a given thickness of Ti-6Al-4V armor plate against 0.30-cal. AP M2 (MIL-DTL-46077F) and 0.50-cal. FSP (MIL-A-46077D) projectiles.....	5
Figure 4. $V_{50}$ difference plot for the Boeing Ti-5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr high toughness and high strength (STA) 13.9-mm-thick plates subjected to 0.50-cal. FSP and 0.30-cal. AP M2 threats comparing the results vs. the Ti-6Al-4V requirement for equivalent thickness. ....	7
Figure 5. $V_{50}$ results for the Boeing Ti-5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr high toughness and high strength (STA) 13.9-mm-thick plates subjected to 0.30-cal. AP M2 and the comparison to the Ti-6Al-4V requirement velocities for equivalent thickness. ....	7
Figure 6. $V_{50}$ results for the Boeing Ti-5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr high toughness and high strength (STA) 13.9-mm-thick plates subjected to 0.50-cal. FSP and the comparison to the Ti-6Al-4V requirement velocities for equivalent thickness.....	8
Figure 7. Titanium 5553 high toughness plate after $V_{50}$ testing against the 0.50-cal. FSP threat showing the (a) strike face and (b) the distal side.....	9
Figure 8. Titanium 5553 high toughness plate after $V_{50}$ testing against the 0.30-cal. AP M2 threat showing the (a) strike face and (b) the distal side.....	10
Figure 9. Titanium 5553 high strength plate after $V_{50}$ testing against the 0.50-cal. FSP threat showing the (a) strike face and (b) the distal side. The red box indicates the area sectioned for examination. ....	11
Figure 10. Titanium 5553 high strength plate after $V_{50}$ testing against the 0.30-cal. AP M2 threat showing the (a) strike face and (b) the distal side. The red box indicates the area sectioned for examination. ....	12
Figure 11. Typical failure modes for titanium armor against FSPs showing (a) shear plugging, (b) spalling, and (c) diskingscabbings.....	13
Figure 12. Stress wave propagation showing the (a) incident compressive, (b) wave superposition, and (c) reflected tensile wave. The stress wave speed, $c$ , is given by $c = (E/\rho)^{1/2}$ . ....	14
Figure 13. Cross-section views of the BASCA plates impacted by the (a) 0.30-cal. AP M2 and (b) 0.50-cal. FSP and STA plates impacted by the (c) 0.30-cal. AP M2 and (d) 0.50-cal. showing a distinct difference in failure modes.....	15
Figure 14. Typical failure modes for titanium armor near the ballistic limit for a 0.30-cal. AP M2 showing (a) the AP core and copper jacket prior to impact, (b) beginning of core penetration into the target and deformation of the gilding, and (c) perforation of the target by the core and ejection of the jacket.....	17

---

## List of Tables

---

Table 1. Chemical composition of Ti-5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr.....	6
Table 2. $V_{50}$ ballistic limit results for Ti-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr (SI units). ....	6
Table 3. $V_{50}$ ballistic limit results for Ti-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr (SAE units). ....	6

---

## **Acknowledgments**

---

The author would like to thank Austin Standiford (U.S. Army Research Laboratory [ARL], Armor Mechanics Branch) for specimen sectioning, Dr. Jane Adams (ARL, Survivability Materials Branch) for specimen preparation, Vaughn Torbert (Dynamic Science, Inc.) for ballistic evaluation, Kevin Doherty (ARL, Survivability Materials Branch) for helping with microscopy, and Matthew Burkins (ARL, Armor Mechanics Branch) and Dr. Rob Carter (ARL, Ordinance Materials Branch) for providing technical reviews.



---

## 1. Introduction

---

Historically, the primary user of titanium alloys has been the aerospace industry. However, the drive to reduce military ground vehicle weight, coupled with issues related to the high cost and multiple impact requirements associated with composite/ceramic solutions, has made titanium alloys an attractive alternative for lightweight armor applications. Ti-6Al-4V is the typical alloy choice for armor applications and its ballistic performance is detailed in MIL-DTL-46077F (1998) and MIL-A-46077D (1978).

Burkins et al. evaluated the ballistic performance of Ti-6Al-4V with respect to annealing temperature (1997) and thermo-mechanical processing (2000). The  $V_{50}$  limit velocity was relatively insensitive to the annealing temperature below the beta transus temperature; however, the limit velocity decreased significantly above the beta transus temperature (Burkins et al., 1997). The resulting microstructure from the beta anneal changed the failure mode from that of bulging, delamination, shearing, and spalling to a low-energy failure mode of adiabatic-shear plugging (Burkins et al., 1997). Burkins et al. (2000) noted similar results for ELI Ti-6Al-4V plates annealed or rolled above the beta transus temperature.

The understanding of ballistic performance for Ti-6Al-4V under various processing conditions is relatively mature; however, literature on new titanium alloys is limited. Ballistic characterization of alternate alloy systems would provide armor designers with a means to reduce weight or increase protection if the said alloys performed better. One of the relatively new alloys is Ti-5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr (Ti-5553). This near-beta alloy was introduced by Titanium Metals Corporation (Zeng, 2006) and the beta-annealed, slow cooled, and aged (BASCA) heat treatment is currently patent pending by Boeing (Boeing Material Specification, 2006). This alloy has several manufacturing advantages, such as castability (allowing production of near-net shapes) and weldability so that practical structures can be fabricated. Ti-5553 has a reported tensile strength up to 1309 MPa with more than 10% elongation (Zeng, 2006) compared with the 827 MPa minimum tensile strength specified for class 1 ELI Ti-6Al-4V with similar elongation (MIL-DTL-46077F, 1998). In addition, Ti-5553 exhibits excellent hardenability (up to 6 in/15.24 cm thick sections) (Veeck et al., 2004), which is an issue for thick sections (>1 in/2.54 cm) of Ti-6Al-4V (Donachie, 2000).

However, mechanical properties often do not correlate to ballistic performance (Nesterenko et al., 2003). Therefore, ballistic protection offered by titanium alloys cannot be inferred from tensile strength, hardness, elongation, reduction in area, or charpy impact. For these same reasons, macro-mechanical numeric models, which are based on material properties, tend to have difficulty matching experimental results without being calibrated to experimental data. Thus, evaluation of ballistic response must be determined experimentally with a range of projectiles which encompass what a fielded component is likely to see in service.

---

## 2. Background

---

Titanium undergoes an allotropic transformation above the beta transus. Below the beta transus temperature (882 °C for pure titanium), it exists in the hexagonal-close-packed (HCP) crystal structure which is known as the alpha ( $\alpha$ ) phase. The alpha phase is not stable above the beta transus temperature and the crystal structure changes to body-centered-cubic (BCC); the beta ( $\beta$ ) phase, which is stable to melting point (Donachie, 2000). Commercially pure titanium has poor mechanical properties so it is often alloyed with additional elements to provide solid-solution-strengthening.

Alloying can drastically affect the allotropic transformation temperature. Additions of tin and zirconium provide solid-solution-strengthening without changing the beta transus temperature. Manganese, chromium and iron produce a eutectoid reaction, reducing the alpha-beta transition temperature and producing a two-phase microstructure at room temperature. Other alloying elements are referred to as alpha or beta stabilizers. Alpha stabilizers, aluminum, oxygen, hydrogen, etc., increase the temperature at which  $\alpha$  transforms to  $\beta$ . Vanadium, tantalum, molybdenum, and niobium lower the transition temperature and can result in metastable beta (or near-beta) structure at room temperature (Askeland, 1994).

Ti-5553 is a near-beta alloy because the large additions of V and Mo retain a high degree of beta structure at room temperature. Strengthening is obtained by the addition of solid-solution-strengthening elements and by aging the metastable beta structure to precipitate alpha. The alpha phase forms as finely dispersed particles within the retained beta (Donachie, 2000). There are several disadvantages of metastable beta alloys in contrast to alpha-beta alloys (e.g., Ti-6Al-4V), such as higher density and lower ductility (aged condition). In the Ti-5553 system, the BASCA heat treatment was developed to impart higher toughness while still maintaining a relatively high degree of strength. The STA heat treatment is employed to exploit strength. Beta annealing is carried out above the beta transus temperature where solution treating is done below the beta transus temperature, which is ~840 °C for the Ti-5553 system.

---

## 3. Materials

---

The chemical composition allowances for Ti-5553, outlined in the Boeing Material Specification, are shown in table 1. The four plates used in the present study were forged and rolled by Verkhnyaya Salda Metallurgical Production Association (VSMPO), Sverdlovsk Region, Russia and were heat treated by Boeing, Berkeley, MO. Two 30.5-cm  $\times$  30.5-cm  $\times$  ~13.90-mm-thick plates were subjected to solution treated and aged (STA) and two plates of the same size,

from the same heat, were subjected to BASCA. The heat treatments were carried out in accordance with the Boeing Material Specification (2006). The processing details are highlighted briefly.

A qualitative graphical representation of the STA and BASCA heat treatments is shown in figure 1. For the plates treated to BASCA, the beta anneal was held at 900 °C (11.1 °C/min ramp) for 90 min and then slow cooled 2.0 °C/min to ~607 °C. The plates were subsequently aged for 8 h and then furnace cooled. The solution treatment for the STA plates was performed at 827 °C (11.1 °C/min ramp), below the beta transus temperature, and held for 2 h before air cooling. Aging took place at 593 °C (11.1 °C/min ramp) for 8 h, then air cooled.




Figure 1. Processing schedules for the Ti-5553 plates subjected to the STA and BASCA heat treatment schedules (not shown to scale).

---

## 4. Test Projectiles

---

The 0.30-cal. (7.62-mm) armor-piercing (AP) M2 and 0.50-cal. (12.7-mm) fragment-simulating projectile (FSP) were selected for the study because they are listed as appropriate test projectiles in MIL-DTL-46077F and MIL-A-46077D, respectively, for the 13.9-mm plate thickness. The projectile details are shown in figure 2, and the required  $V_{50}$  test velocities for 0.30-cal. AP M2 and 0.50-cal. FSP projectiles are plotted as a function of ELI Ti-6Al-4V thickness in figure 3. The FSP represents high-velocity primary fragments from ordinance and is described in MIL-P-46593A (1964).




Figure 2. Details for the 0.50-cal. (13.9-mm) FSP and 0.30-cal. AP M2 projectile used in the study.

It is important to evaluate plate performance against both projectiles since it is possible for the penetration mechanisms to be different. In addition, previous work from Burkins et al. (2000) also indicated that FSPs were better at showing differences in plate performance due to microstructure changes than armor piercing penetrators.

## 5. Test Method

The  $V_{50}$  for the Ti-5553 plates with dimensions  $30.48 \times 30.48 \text{ cm}^2$  (~13.9-mm-thick) was determined against the 0.30-cal. AP M2 (MIL-DTL-46077F) and 0.50-cal. FSP (MIL-A-46077D), in the both STA and BASCA heat treatments (four targets total). Projectile velocities were measured using Oehler Model 57 infrared screens and Oehler Model 35 chronograph. The screens were placed normal to the barrel, spaced 61 cm apart. A proof channel was placed in between (30.5 cm away) as a check for erroneous measurements. The projectile velocity measured by the chronograph was checked against an orthogonal flash x-ray system, described in Burkins et al. (2000). A correction of  $0.994 \times (\text{Measured Velocity})$  was applied to all chronograph measurements. Pitch and yaw were also initially measured and both were found to be less than  $2^\circ$ .




Figure 3.  $V_{50}$  minimum velocity requirements for a given thickness of Ti-6Al-4V armor plate against 0.30-cal. AP M2 (MIL-DTL-46077F) and 0.50-cal. FSP (MIL-A-46077D) projectiles.

All impacts were normal to the target which was placed 4.67 m from the barrel. The  $V_{50}$  was evaluated in an “up-down” manner in which the amount of propellant used was adjusted until a complete penetration (CP) occurred. The amount of propellant was then decreased until a partial penetration (PP) occurred and so forth. PPs and CPs were determined by placing a 0.508-mm-thick 2024-T3 aluminum witness plate 15.24 cm behind the target. If the projectile or ejected target material perforated the witness plate such that light could be seen through it when held to a 60-W light bulb, the impact was determined a CP. If light was not visible then the impact was deemed a PP. This procedure was continued until the  $V_{50}$  was determined in accordance with the U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Test Operations Procedure (TOP) 2-2-710 (1993). The values used in the calculation of the  $V_{50}$  are highlighted in grey in the tables contained in the appendix.

## 6. Results

The results given in the tables in the appendix are summarized in tables 2 (SI units) and 3 (SAE units) in this section.  $V_{50}$  limits were obtained for all the targets tested. From the test results, the only plate which did not meet the ELI Ti-6Al-4V requirement (MIL-A-46077D) was the

Table 1. Chemical composition of Ti-5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr.

Aluminum	4.4–5.7
Vanadium	4.0–5.5
Iron	0.30–0.50
Molybdenum	4.0–5.5
Chromium	2.5–3.5
Oxygen	0.18 maximum
Carbon	0.10 maximum
Nitrogen	0.05 maximum
Zirconium	0.30 maximum
Hydrogen	0.015 maximum
Silicon	0.15 maximum
Yttrium	0.005 maximum
Other	0.30 maximum
Titanium	Balance

Table 2.  $V_{50}$  ballistic limit results for Ti-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr (SI units).

Heat Treatment	Threat	Thickness (mm)	Tested $V_{50}$ (m·s <sup>-1</sup> )	Standard Deviation (m·s <sup>-1</sup> )	Required $V_{50}$ (m·s <sup>-1</sup> )
STA	0.30 cal. AP M2	13.86	729	7.6	671.2
BASCA	0.30 cal. AP M2	14.02	697.7	4.4	675.7
STA	0.50 cal. FSP	13.86	916.5	14.7	820.5
BASCA	0.50 cal. FSP	13.82	719.9 <sup>a</sup>	7.1	811.7

Notes: STA = solution treated and aged; BASCA = beta annealed, slow cooled, and aged.

<sup>a</sup>Did not meet the  $V_{50}$  requirement.

Table 3.  $V_{50}$  ballistic limit results for Ti-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr (SAE units).

Heat Treatment	Threat	Thickness (in)	Tested $V_{50}$ (ft·s <sup>-1</sup> )	Standard Deviation (ft·s <sup>-1</sup> )	Required $V_{50}$ (ft·s <sup>-1</sup> )
STA	0.30 cal. AP M2	0.546	2393	24.9	2202
BASCA	0.30 cal. AP M2	0.552	2289	14.5	2217
STA	0.50 cal. FSP	0.546	3007	48.3	2692
BASCA	0.50 cal. FSP	0.544	2362 <sup>a</sup>	23.4	2663

Notes: STA = solution treated and aged; BASCA = beta annealed, slow cooled and aged.

<sup>a</sup>Did not meet the  $V_{50}$  requirement.

BASCA plate against the 0.50-cal. FSP. The difference between the limit velocity and the specification velocity is the  $V_{50}$  difference velocity:

$$V_{50} \text{ Difference} = \text{Test } V_{50} - \text{Required } V_{50}. \quad (1)$$

The  $V_{50}$  difference plots are shown in figures 4–6. The BASCA plates had lower limit velocities than the STA plates regardless of the penetrator. The BASCA plate exhibited marginal improvement in performance over Ti-6Al-4V with a 21.9 m·s<sup>-1</sup> (72 ft·s<sup>-1</sup>) or 3.2% increase in the




Figure 4.  $V_{50}$  difference plot for the Boeing Ti-5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr high toughness and high strength (STA) 13.9-mm-thick plates subjected to 0.50-cal. FSP and 0.30-cal. AP M2 threats comparing the results vs. the Ti-6Al-4V requirement for equivalent thickness.




Figure 5.  $V_{50}$  results for the Boeing Ti-5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr high toughness and high strength (STA) 13.9-mm-thick plates subjected to 0.30-cal. AP M2 and the comparison to the Ti-6Al-4V requirement velocities for equivalent thickness.




Figure 6.  $V_{50}$  results for the Boeing Ti-5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr high toughness and high strength (STA) 13.9-mm-thick plates subjected to 0.50-cal. FSP and the comparison to the Ti-6Al-4V requirement velocities for equivalent thickness.

$V_{50}$  against the 0.30-cal. AP M2, while the STA plate improved by  $58.2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  ( $191 \text{ ft s}^{-1}$ ), an 8.7% increase. The difference in performance for the two heat treatments against the 0.50-cal. FSP was more dramatic. The  $V_{50}$  for the BASCA plate dropped 11.3% or  $91.7 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  ( $301 \text{ ft s}^{-1}$ ) below the required velocity while it increased 11.7%,  $96.2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  ( $315 \text{ ft s}^{-1}$ ), over the  $V_{50}$  requirement with the STA heat treated plate, as can be seen in figure 6. The strike and distal sides of the impacted specimens are shown in figures 7 and 8 for the BASCA plate and figures 9 and 10 for the STA plate.









Figure 8. Titanium 5553 high toughness plate after V<sub>50</sub> testing against the 0.30-cal. AP M2 threat showing the (a) strike face and (b) the distal side.






Figure 9. Titanium 5553 high strength plate after V<sub>50</sub> testing against the 0.50-cal. FSP threat showing the (a) strike face and (b) the distal side. The red box indicates the area sectioned for examination.



Figure 10. Titanium 5553 high strength plate after V<sub>50</sub> testing against the 0.30-cal. AP M2 threat showing the (a) strike face and (b) the distal side. The red box indicates the area sectioned for examination.

The difference in performance is most likely due to changes in the resulting microstructure from the STA and BASCA heat treatments. Under high strain-rate loading, microstructural effects may increase the propensity for adiabatic shear band formation and growth (Nesterenko et al., 2003). Shear band formation is a low energy failure mode resulting in a decrease in ballistic performance (Meyer et al., 1997; Burkins et al., 1997). The three predominate failure modes typically noted in ballistic impact of titanium are shown in figure 11. The shear localization /plugging and spalling failure modes shown in figure 11a and b are low energy failure modes which adversely affect ballistic performance. The disking failure mode (a form of spalling), figure 11c, is desirable because it incorporates a greater amount of fracture surface without the brittle failure noted in figure 11b.




Figure 11. Typical failure modes for titanium armor against FSPs showing (a) shear plugging, (b) spalling, and (c) disking/scabbing.

Spall formation (figure 12b and c) is a common occurrence in high-velocity/hypervelocity impact. Hopkinson was the first to document the phenomenon of spall formation in 1914 (Rinehart, 1975). Spalling results from high-intensity compressive stress wave reflects off a targets free surface as a tensile wave. The tensile wave is never as high in magnitude because the compressive wave, being geometric in shape (e.g., square, triangular, etc.), interacts with the first part of the tensile wave reflecting off the free surface (figure 12). Its magnitude can be determined from the principle of superposition; see figure 12b (Rinehart, 1975).




Figure 12. Stress wave propagation showing the (a) incident compressive, (b) wave superposition, and (c) reflected tensile wave. The stress wave speed,  $c$ , is given by  $c = (E/\rho)^{1/2}$ .

Factors that determine whether spalling occurs include the resistance of the material to fracture, magnitude of the stress wave, and the shape of the stress wave. The shape of the stress wave determines the location in which the superimposed stress wave becomes tensile in nature. This is to say, waves with flat top portions will become tensile further from the free surface because the flat compressive portion will cancel out the tensile wave until they move past one another (Bartus, 2006).

Figure 13b and d shows the cross section of the impact regions of the BASCA and STA plates after a non-perforating impact by a 0.50-cal. FSP. The section locations are indicated with red dashed lines in figures 7 and 9. Against the 0.50-cal. FSP, the BASCA targets failed by shear plugging while delamination and dinking were observed in the STA targets. Adiabatic shear bands were noted in the impact region of both heat treatments but were far more pronounced in the BASCA heat treated plates. This is likely to have caused the dinking fracture in the STA plates with a volume of approximately three projectile diameters  $\times$  4.5 mm deep into the distal side of the plate.




Figure 13. Cross-section views of the BASCA plates impacted by the (a) 0.30-cal. AP M2 and (b) 0.50-cal. FSP and STA plates impacted by the (c) 0.30-cal. AP M2 and (d) 0.50-cal. showing a distinct difference in failure modes.



Similar failure modes were seen in the plates impacted by the 0.30-cal. AP M2 projectiles, figure 13a and c, but were not nearly as pronounced as was the case against 0.50-cal. FSP. One difference was the formation of an impact crater on the strike face,  $\sim 1/2$  to  $3/4$  projectile diameters. This resulted from the separation of the copper jacket from the AP core during the penetration process. The penetration process and core separation is shown schematically in figure 14. The copper gilding first begins to mushroom upon contact with the target, figure 14b. As the gilding begins to lose momentum, it forms a crater as it continues to deform and the hard penetrator advances into the target through ductile hole opening and plug formation. The jacket eventually breaks away from the core and ricochets off the strike side of the plate. If the jacket is energetic enough, it may also contribute to hole opening (Me-Bar and Rosenberg, 1997). All tests performed in the present work were close to the ballistic limit and perforation of the plate was by the AP core by itself.

This program demonstrated potential gains in performance for Ti-5553 armor systems over MIL-SPEC Ti-6Al-4V provided a STA heat treatment was used. The potential benefits for U.S. Army applications of the Ti-5553 alloy for armor protection are increased ballistic performance, higher strength, ability to heat treat thick-sections, and near-net shape castability.






Figure 14. Typical failure modes for titanium armor near the ballistic limit for a 0.30-cal. AP M2 showing (a) the AP core and copper jacket prior to impact, (b) beginning of core penetration into the target and deformation of the gilding, and (c) perforation of the target by the core and ejection of the jacket.

---

## 7. References

---

- Askeland, D. R. *The Science and Engineering of Materials*; 3rd ed.; PWS Publishing Co.: Boston, MA, 1994.
- Backman, M. E. Terminal Ballistics. Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, CA, 1976.
- Bartus, S. D. Simultaneous and Sequential Multi-Site Impact Response of Composite Laminates. A dissertation, The University of Alabama at Birmingham, 2006.
- Boeing Material Specification. Titanium 5Al-5V-5Mo-3Cr Die Forgings and Bars, 28 August 2006.
- Burkins, M. S.; Love, W. W.; Wood, J. R. *Effect of Annealing Temperature on the Ballistic Limit Velocity of Ti-6Al-4V ELI*; ARL-MR-359; U.S. Army Research Laboratory: Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, August 1997.
- Burkins, M. S.; Hansen, J. S.; Paige, J. I.; Turner, P. C. *Effect of Thermo-Mechanical Processing on the Ballistic Limit Velocity of Extra Low Interstitial Titanium Alloy Ti-6Al-4V*; ARL-MR-486; U.S. Army Research Laboratory: Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, July 2000.
- Donachie, M. J., Jr. *Titanium: A Technical Guide*; 2nd ed.; ASM International, Materials Park, OH, 2000.
- Me-Bar, Y.; Rosenberg, Z. On the Correlation between the Ballistic Behavior and Dynamic Properties of Titanium-Alloy Plates. *Int. J Impact Eng.* **1997**, 19 (4), 311–318.
- Meyer, L. W.; Krueger, L.; Gooch, W.; Burkins M. Analysis of Shear Band Effects in Titanium Relative to High Strain-Rate Laboratory/Ballistic Impact Tests. *J. Phys. IV France* **1997**, 7, 415–422.
- MIL-DTL-46077F. *Detail Specification, Armor Plate, Titanium Alloy, Weldable* **1998**.
- MIL-A-46077D. *Detail Specification, Armor Plate, Titanium Alloy, Weldable* **1978**.
- MIL-P-46593A. *Projectile, Calibers .22, .30, .50, and 20-mm Fragment Simulating* **1964**.
- Nesterenko, V. F.; Goldsmith, W.; Indrakanti, S. S.; Gu, YaBei. Response of Hot Isostatically Pressed Ti-6Al-4V Targets to Normal Impact by Conical and Blunt Projectiles. *Int. J. of Impact Eng.* **2003**, 28, 137–160.
- Rinehart J. S. Stress Transients in Solids. *Hyperdynamics*, **1975**, 58, 203, 207, 210–212.

U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command, Ballistic Tests of Armor Materials. TOP-2-2-710 (AD A137873), Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, 8 July 1993.

Veeck, S.; Lee, D.; Boyer, R.; Briggs, R. The Castability of Ti-5553 Alloy. *Advanced Materials & Processes* **2004**, 47–49.

Zeng, L. High-Strength Titanium Fasteners. *Advanced Materials & Processes* **2006**, 164 (12), 34.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

---

## **Appendix. Additional Test Data**

---

---

This appendix appears in its original form, without editorial change.

Date:	1/24/2007				
Target:	Boeing Ti-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr (high toughness)				
Penetrator:	0.50 caliber FSP				
Requirement:	2663 ft s <sup>-1</sup> (MIL-DTL-46077F)				
Shot #	Propellant Wt. (gr.)	Velocity (ft s <sup>-1</sup> )	Velocity (m s <sup>-1</sup> )	Result	Projectile mass (g)
5145	115	2329	709.9	PP	13.4
5146	125	2513	766.0	CP	13.34
5147	120	2384	726.6	PP	13.39
5148	123	2409	734.3	CP	13.41
5149	121.5	2390	728.5	CP	13.43
5150	119	2369	722.1	CP	13.38
5151	116	2367	721.5	CP	13.4
<div> <div>BHN = 387</div> <div>Ave thickness = 0.544 in.</div> <div>Lowest complete = 2367 ft s<sup>-1</sup></div> <div>High partial = 2384 ft s<sup>-1</sup></div> <div>Velocity spread = 55 ft s<sup>-1</sup></div> <div>ZMR = 17 ft s<sup>-1</sup></div> <div>V<sub>50</sub> = 2362 ft s<sup>-1</sup> (2 &amp; 2)</div> <div>= 719.9 m s<sup>-1</sup></div> <div>Standard deviation = 23.4 ft s<sup>-1</sup></div> <div>= 7.1 m s<sup>-1</sup></div> <div>Requirement = 2663 ft s<sup>-1</sup></div> <div>V<sub>50</sub> Difference = -301 ft s<sup>-1</sup></div> </div>					

Date:	2/22/2007			
Target:	Boeing Ti-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr (high toughness)			
Penetrator:	0.30 caliber AP M2			
Requirement:	2217 ft s <sup>-1</sup> (MIL-DTL-46077F)			
Shot #	Propellant Wt. (gr.)	Velocity (ft s <sup>-1</sup> )	Velocity (m s <sup>-1</sup> )	Result
5280	33.5	2352	716.9	CP
5281	31.5	2210	673.6	PP
5282	32.5	2239	682.4	PP
5283	33	2284	696.2	PP
5284	33.2	2301	701.3	CP
5285	33.1	2309	703.8	CP
5286	32.7	2299	700.7	CP
5287	32.3	2270	691.9	PP
<p>BHN = 387</p> <p>Ave thickness = 0.552 in.</p> <p>Lowest complete = 2299 ft s<sup>-1</sup></p> <p>High partial = 2284 ft s<sup>-1</sup></p> <p>Velocity spread = 31 ft s<sup>-1</sup></p> <p>ZMR = 0 ft s<sup>-1</sup></p> <p>V<sub>50</sub> = 2289 ft s<sup>-1</sup> (2 &amp; 2)</p> <p>= 697.7 m s<sup>-1</sup></p> <p>Standard deviation = 14.5 ft s<sup>-1</sup></p> <p>= 4.4 m s<sup>-1</sup></p> <p>Requirement = 2217 ft s<sup>-1</sup></p> <p>V<sub>50</sub> Difference = 72 ft s<sup>-1</sup></p>				

Date:	1/25/2007				
Target:	Boeing Ti-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr STA (high strength)				
Penetrator:	0.50 caliber FSP				
Requirement:	2692 ft s <sup>-1</sup> (MIL-DTL-46077F)				
Shot #	Propellant Wt. (gr.)	Velocity (ft s <sup>-1</sup> )	Velocity (m s <sup>-1</sup> )	Result	Projectile mass (g)
5152	116	2294	699.2	PP	13.42
5153	121	2388	727.9	PP	13.38
5154	135	2633	802.5	PP	13.41
5155	145	2837	864.7	PP	13.41
5156	150	2842	866.2	PP	13.38
5157	165	3163	964.1	CP	13.39
5158	157	3060	932.7	PP	13.41
5159	161	3095	943.4	CP	13.40
5160	159	3120	951.0	CP	13.42
5161	157	3102	945.5	CP	13.38
5162	154	3016	919.3	CP	13.40
5163	154	3064	933.9	CP	13.41
5164	151	2991	911.7	PP	13.38
5165	152.5	2950	899.2	PP	13.39
5166	153	2962	902.8	CP	13.41
5167	150	2889	880.6	PP	13.39
5168	151	2880	877.8	PP	13.41
<p> BHN = 375  Ave thickness = 0.546 in.  Lowest complete = 2962 ft s<sup>-1</sup>  High partial = 3060 ft s<sup>-1</sup>  Velocity spread = 114 ft s<sup>-1</sup>  ZMR = 98 ft s<sup>-1</sup>  V<sub>50</sub> = 3007 ft s<sup>-1</sup> (3 &amp; 3)  = 916.5 m s<sup>-1</sup>  Standard Deviation = 48.3 ft s<sup>-1</sup>  = 14.7 m s<sup>-1</sup>  Requirement = 2692 ft s<sup>-1</sup>  V<sub>50</sub> Difference = 315 ft s<sup>-1</sup> </p>					



Date:	2/22/2007			
Target:	Boeing Ti-5Al-5Mo-5V-3Cr STA (high strength)			
Penetrator:	0.30 caliber AP M2			
Requirement:	2202 ft·s <sup>-1</sup> (MIL-DTL-46077F)			
Shot #	Propellant Wt. (gr.)	Velocity (ft·s <sup>-1</sup> )	Velocity (m·s <sup>-1</sup> )	Result
5288	31.4	2215	675.1	PP
5289	32.1	2252	686.4	PP
5290	33.1	2300	701.0	CP
5291	32.6	2267	691.0	PP
5292	33.0	2280	694.9	PP
5293	33.5	2324	708.4	CP
<p> BHN = 364  Ave thickness = 0.546 in.  Lowest complete = 2300 ft·s<sup>-1</sup>  High partial = 2280 ft·s<sup>-1</sup>  Velocity spread = 57 ft·s<sup>-1</sup>  ZMR = 0 ft·s<sup>-1</sup>  V<sub>50</sub> = 2393 ft·s<sup>-1</sup> (2 &amp; 2)  = 729.4 m·s<sup>-1</sup>  Standard Deviation = 24.9 ft·s<sup>-1</sup>  7.6 m·s<sup>-1</sup>  Requirement = 2202 ft·s<sup>-1</sup>  V<sub>50</sub> Difference = 191 ft·s<sup>-1</sup> </p>				

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 DEFENSE TECHNICAL  
 (PDF INFORMATION CTR  
 only) DTIC OCA  
 8725 JOHN J KINGMAN RD  
 STE 0944  
 FORT BELVOIR VA 22060-6218

1 DIRECTOR  
 US ARMY RESEARCH LAB  
 IMNE ALC HRR  
 2800 POWDER MILL RD  
 ADELPHI MD 20783-1197

1 DIRECTOR  
 US ARMY RESEARCH LAB  
 RDRL CIM L  
 2800 POWDER MILL RD  
 ADELPHI MD 20783-1197

1 DIRECTOR  
 US ARMY RESEARCH LAB  
 RDRL CIM P  
 2800 POWDER MILL RD  
 ADELPHI MD 20783-1197

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND

1 DIR USARL  
 RDRL CIM G (BLDG 4600)

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

3 CDR US ARMY TACOM  
AMSTA TR S  
T FURMANIAK  
L FRANKS  
D TEMPLETON  
MS 263  
WARREN MI 48397-5000

1 CDR US ARMY TACOM  
AMSTA TR R  
D HANSEN  
WARREN MI 48397-5000

1 PM  
SFAE GCSS HBCTS  
J ROWE  
MS 325  
WARREN MI 48397-5000

2 US ARMY RSRCH DEV & ENGRG CTR  
AMSRD NSC IPD B  
P CUNNIFF  
J WARD  
KANSAS ST  
NATICK MA 01760-5019

5 NATL GROUND INTLLGNC CTR  
D EPPERLY  
T SHAVER  
T WATERBURY  
W GSTATTENBAUER  
D DOBROWLSKI  
2055 BOULDERS RD  
CHARLOTTESVILLE VA 22091-5391

2 PM MRAP  
J PEREZ (JPO)  
E BARSHAW  
SFAE CSS MRE MS 298  
6501 E 11 MILE RD  
BLDG 229  
WAREN MI 48397-5000

1 PM BFVS  
ATTN SFAE GCSS W BV S  
M KING  
WARREN MI 48397-5000

1 SANDIA NATL LAB  
D CRAWFORD MS 0836 9116  
PO BOX 5800  
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87185-0307

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 NVL SURFC WARFARE CTR  
NSWC CARDEROCK DIV  
R PETERSON  
CODE 2810  
9500 MACARTHUR BLVD  
WEST BETHESDA MD 20817-5700

2 LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATL LAB  
R LANDINGHAM L372  
J REAUGH L282  
PO BOX 808  
LIVERMORE CA 94550

2 LOS ALAMOS NATL LAB  
F ADDESSIO  
M BURKETT  
PO BOX 1663  
LOS ALAMOS NM 87545

1 THE AIR FORCE RSRCH LAB  
AFRL/MLLMP  
T TURNER  
BLDG 655 RM 115  
2230 TENTH ST  
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH  
45433-7817

1 AIR FORCE ARMAMENT LAB  
AFATL DLJW  
W COOK  
EGLIN AFB FL 32542

4 UNIV OF TEXAS  
INST FOR ADVNCD TECH  
S BLESS  
H FAIR  
J HODGE  
R SUBRAMANIAN  
3925 W BRAKER LN  
AUSTIN TX 78759-5316

1 UNIV OF DAYTON RSRCH INST  
N BRAR KLA 14  
300 COLLEGE PARK  
DAYTON OH 45469-0182

2 SOUTHWEST RSRCH INST  
C ANDERSON  
J WALKER  
6220 CULEBRA RD  
SAN ANTONIO TX 78238

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

3 US DEPT OF ENERGY  
NETL  
J HANSEN  
P TURNER  
P KING  
1450 QUEEN AVE SW  
ALBANY OR 97321-2198

1 ALCAN ROLLED PRODUCTS  
J OFFER  
39111 W SIX MILE RD  
STE 173  
LIVONIA MI 48152

1 ALCOA  
R KANE  
4879 STATE ST  
PO BOX 8025  
BETTENDORF IA 52722-8025

1 ALCOA DEFENSE  
R HEIPLE  
100 TECHNICAL DR  
ALCOA CENTER PA 15069-0001

2 ALLVAC OREMET FACLTY  
J KOSIN  
B MAHONEY  
530 34TH AVE SW  
PO BOX 460  
ALBANY OR 97321

2 AM GENERAL  
S GRATE  
J RITTER  
12200 HUBBARD RD  
PO BOX3330  
LIVONIA MI 48151-3330

1 ARMORWORKS  
W PERCIBALLI  
305 N 54TH ST  
CHANDLER AZ 85226

2 ARCELOR MITTAL STEEL USA  
T DEAN  
J BABICH  
139 MODENA RD  
PO BOX 3001  
COATESVILLE PA 19320-0911

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

2 ATI ALLEGHENY LUDLUM  
R BAILEY  
G SWIATEK  
500 GREEN ST  
WASHINGTON PA 15301

1 ATI DEFENSE  
A NICHOLS  
500 GREEN ST  
WASHINGTON PA 15301

1 ATI DEFENSE  
L MARTIN  
1600 OLD SALEM RD NE  
ALBANY OR 97321-0460

1 ALLEGHENY TECHNOLOGIES  
J OGILVY  
20370 HOLLYWOOD  
HARPER WOODS MI 48225

1 BROWN UNIV  
DIV OF ENGRG  
R CLIFTON  
PROVIDENCE RI 02912

3 BAE LAND COMBAT SYS  
B KARIYA  
M MIDDIONE  
D SCHADE  
1205 COLEMAN AVE  
SANTA CLARA CA 95050

4 BAE SECURITY AND SURVIVABILITY  
M REYNOLDS  
M BOCZAK  
T RUSSELL  
M BERNING  
9113 LE SAINT DR  
FAIRFIELD OH 45014

2 BAE ADVANCED CERAMICS  
R PALICKA  
G NELSON  
991 PARK CTR DR  
VISTA CA 92083-7933

1 BAE SYSTEMS STEEL PRODUCTS  
J DORSCH  
2101 W 10TH ST  
ANNISTON AL 36201

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

2 BAE LAND COMBAT SYSTEMS  
E BRADY  
R JENKINS  
1100 BAIRS RD  
YORK PA 17405-1512

1 UNITED DEFNS LIMITED  
PARTNERS GROUND SYS DIV  
K STRITTMATTER  
PO BOX 15512  
YORK PA 17405-1512

2 BAE SECURITY AND SURVIVABILITY  
R MONKS  
V KELSEY  
7822 S 46TH ST  
PHOENIX ARIZONA 85044

1 CARPENTERSTEEL  
P THOMPSON  
PO BOX 14662  
READING PA 19612-4662

2 CERADYNE INC  
M KING  
M NORMANDIA  
3169 RED HILL AVE  
COSTA MESA CA 92626

1 CLIFTON STEEL COMPANY  
J SOMOGYI  
16500 ROCKSIDE RD  
MAPLE HTS OH 44137

1 COMMERCIAL METALS CORP  
G BREVADA  
6565 N MACARTHUR BLVD  
IRVING TX 75039

1 CONCURRENT TECHNOLOGIES  
J PICKENS  
100 CTC DR  
JOHNSTOWN PA 15904-1935

1 CYPRESS INTERNATIONAL  
R ASOKLIS  
47345 FEATHERED CT  
SHELBY TOWNSHIP MI 48315

1 DAMILER TRUCKS NA LLC  
R ENGEL  
2477 DEERFIELD DR  
FORT MILL SC 29715

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 DYNACORP  
W SNOWDEN  
4001 FAIRFAX DR  
ARLINGTON VA 22203-1615

1 HARDWIRE LLC  
G TUNIS  
1000 QUINN AVE  
POCOMOKE CITY MD 21851

1 INTERNATL RSRCH ASSN  
D ORPHAL  
4450 BLACK AVE  
PLEASANTON CA 94566

1 IDEAL INNOVATIONS INC  
R KOCHER  
4601 N FAIRFAX ST  
STE 1130  
ARLINGTON VA 22203

4 GDLS  
W BURKE MZ436 21 24  
G CAMPBELL MZ436 30 44  
J ERIDON MZ436 21 24  
W HERMAN MZ435 01 24  
38500 MOUND RD  
STERLING HTS MI 48310-3200

1 KAIROS PARTNERS INC  
D AKERS  
PO BOX 3629  
CHESTER VA 23831-3629

1 KAISER ALUMINUM  
J SANDERSON  
27422 PORTOLA PKWY  
STE 350  
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610-0892

1 MAGNESIUM ELEKTRON NA  
R DELORME  
1001 COLLEGE ST  
PO BOX 258  
MADISON IL 62060

1 INDUSTEEL USA LLC  
B HOLCOME  
1631 SENDWAY  
LUTZ FL 33549

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 INDUSTEEL USA LLC  
R GARVIN  
139 MODERNA RD  
COATESVILLE PA 19320

1 FORCE PROTECTION INDUST INC  
V JOYNT  
9801 HWY 78  
LADSON SC 29456

1 MISTRAL  
E BANAI  
7910 WOODMONT AVE  
STE 820  
BETHESDA MD 20814

1 NEW LENOX ORDNANCE  
A SENIW  
1200 E MAZON AVE  
BOX 188  
DWIGHT IL 60420

1 EVRAZ OREGON STEEL  
J ROSMUS  
14400 N RIVERGATE BLVD  
PORTLAND OR 97203

2 OSHKOSH DEFENSE  
D PELCO  
M IVEY  
370 W WAUKAU  
PO BOX 2566  
OSHKOSH WI 54903-2566

1 FOSTER-MILLER  
R SYKES  
195 BEAR HILL RD  
WALTHAM MA 02451

1 RMI TITANIUM CO  
W PALLANTE  
PO BOX 269  
1000 WARREN AVE  
NILES OH 44446

2 SOUTHWEST RSRCH INST  
T HOLMQUIST  
G JOHNSON  
5353 WAYZATA BLVD STE 607  
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55416

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

1 STEEL WAREHOUSE  
G AUBUCHON  
2722 W TUCKER DR  
SOUTH BEND IN 46619

1 STEEL WAREHOUSE  
J CLARK  
4066 SR 500  
PAYNE OH 45880

2 TENCATE ADVANCED COMPOSITES  
D PUCKETT  
E SIEFFERT  
18410 BUTTERFIELD RD  
MORGAN HILL CA 95037

2 TIMET  
J FANNING  
S FOX  
PO BOX 2128  
HENDERSON NV 89009

1 TIMET  
M GUSTIN  
224 VALLEY CREEK BLVD  
EXTON PA 19341

2 UNIV OF CA SAN DIEGO  
DEPT OF APPL MECH & ENGR  
SVC RO11  
S NEMAT NASSER  
M MEYERS  
LA JOLLA CA 92093-0411

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND

1 DIR USAMSAA  
AMSRD AMS D  
BLDG 392

1 CDR USATEC  
STEAC LI LV  
E SANDERSON  
BLDG 400

1 CDR US ARMY DTC  
CSTE DTC TT T  
M SIMON  
RYAN BLDG

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

77 DIR USARL  
RDRL SL  
R COATES  
RDRL SLB  
BOWEN  
RDRL WM  
J MCCAULEY  
RDRL WMB  
J NEWILL  
RDRL WMM B  
R BANTON  
R GUPTA  
R CARTER  
L KECSKES  
S MATHAUDHU  
D SNOHA  
RDRL WMM  
R DOWDING  
J BEATTY  
RDRL WMM C  
R SQUILLACIOTI  
W ROY  
RDRL WMM D  
E CHIN  
B CHEESEMAN  
J CHINELLA  
K CHO  
G GAZONAS  
J LASALVIA  
P PATEL  
J MONTGOMERY  
J SANDS  
S WALSH  
RDRL WMM S  
T JONES  
RDRL WMT  
C HOPPEL  
RDRL WMT A  
A BARD  
P BARTKOWSKI  
S BARTUS (5 CPS)  
M BURKINS  
R DONEY  
M DUFFY  
D GALLARDY  
W GOOCH  
D HACKBARTH  
T HAVEL  
V HERNANDEZ  
E HORWATH  
S HUG

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

M KEELE  
D KLEPONIS  
C KRAUTHAUSER  
B LEAVY  
M LOVE  
H MEYER  
J RUNYEON  
B SCOTT  
D SHOWALTER  
K STOFFEL  
S SCHOENFELD  
RDRL WMT C  
T BJERKE  
T FARRAND  
K KIMSEY  
L MAGNESS  
S SEGLETES  
D SCHEFFLER  
S SCHRAML  
R SUMMERS  
W WALTERS  
RDRL WMT D  
S BILYK  
D CASEM  
J CLAYTON  
D DANDEKAR  
N GNIAZDOWSKI  
M GREENFIELD  
Y HUANG  
B LOVE  
M RAFTENBERG  
E RAPACKI  
M SCHEIDLER  
T WEERASOORIYA  
RDRL WMT E  
C HUMMER  
B RINGERS

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

- 1 ALCOA EUROPE  
G BEVAN  
PO BOX 383  
KITTS GREEN RD KITTS GREEN  
BIRMINGHAM B33 9QR  
UNITED KINGDOM
- 1 ALCOA EUROPE  
A ARMIGLIATO  
ALCOA TRASFROMAZIONI  
VIA DELL'ELETTRONICA 31  
30030 FUSINA (VENEZIA)  
ITALY
- 3 ARCELOR MITTAL  
INDUSTEEL CREUSOT  
E DERASSAT  
S CORRE  
D HERITIER  
56 RUE CLEMENCEAU  
BP 19  
71201 LE CREUSOT CEDEX  
FRANCE
- 2 ARMOR AUSTRALIA  
A FAIRBAIRN  
H OLDFIELD  
2/461 THE BOULEVARDE  
KIRRAWEE NSW 2232  
AUSTRALIA
- 3 BAE SYSTEMS HÄGGLUNDS AB  
T GUSTAFSSON  
L PETTERSSON  
A BERGKVIST  
SE-891 82 ÖRNSKÖLDSVIK  
SWEDEN
- 2 BISALLOYS STEELS PTY LTD  
W PANG  
R BARNETT  
18 RESOLUTION DR  
PO BOX 1246  
UNANDERRA NSW 2526 AUSTRALIA
- 1 BLUESCOPE STEEL LTD  
J DRYDEN  
PO BOX 1854  
WOLLONGONG NSW 2500  
AUSTRALIA

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

- 1 CARLOS III UNIV OF MADRID  
C NAVARRO  
ESCUELA POLTEENICA SUPERIOR  
C/BUTARQUE 15  
28911 LEGANES MADRID  
SPAIN
- 1 CONDAT PROJEKT GMBH  
J KIERMEIR  
MAXIMILIANSTR 28  
SCHEYERN 85298  
GERMANY
- 2 DSTO  
MARITIME PLATFORMS DIV  
S CIMPOERU  
S ALKEMADE  
506 LORIMER ST  
FISHERMANS BEND  
VIC 3207 AUSTRALIA
- 2 DSTO  
WEAPONS SYSTEMS DIV  
N BURMAN  
J ANDERSON  
PO BOX 1500  
EDINBURGH SA 5111  
AUSTRALIA
- 2 DEFENSE RESEARCH AGENCY  
B JAMES  
B SHRUBSALL  
PORTON DOWN  
SALISBURY WTTTS SP04 OJQ  
UNITED KINGDOM
- 1 DEFENCE RESEARCH AND  
DEVELOPMENT-VALCARTIER  
R DELAGRAVE  
2459 PIE XI NORTH  
VAL-BELAIR QC G3J 1X5  
CANADA
- 1 DEUTSCH FRANZOSISCHES  
FORSCHUNGSINSTITUT ST LOUIS  
CEDEX 5 RUE DU  
GENERAL CASSAGNOU  
F 68301 SAINT LOUIS  
FRANCE



NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

2 ETBS DGA  
P BARNIER  
M SALLES  
ROUTE DE GUERAY  
BOITE POSTALE 712  
18015 BOURGES CEDEX  
FRANCE

3 FRANHOFER INSTITUT FUR  
KURZZEITDYNAMIK  
ERNST MACH INSTITUT  
E STRASSBURGER  
K THOMA  
M WICKERT  
ECKERSTRASSE 4  
D 79 104 FREIBURG  
GERMANY

2 GD LAND SYSTEMS CANADA  
P GALLAGHER  
K BENARD  
PO BOX 7003  
LONDON ONTARIO N5Y 6L8  
CANADA

1 INDUSTRIE BITOSSII  
R ROVAI  
VAI PIETRAMARINA 53  
I-50053 SOVIGLIANA-VINCI  
ITALY

1 INGENIEURBURO DEISENROTH  
F DEISENROTH  
AUF DE HARDT 33 35  
D 5204 LOHMAR 1  
GERMANY

3 INST FOR PROBLEMS IN MATLS SCI  
B GALANOV  
V KARTUZOV  
Y MILMAN  
3 KRHYZHANOVSKY STR  
252142 KIEV 142  
UKRAINE

1 MOFET ETZION  
M COHEN  
KFAR ETZION  
MP NORTH JEDEA 90912  
ISRAEL

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

2 NORDMETALL GBR  
L MEYERS  
S ABDEL-MALEK  
EIBENBERG  
EINSIEDLER STGR 18H  
D 09235 BURKHARDSDORF  
GERMANY

1 NATL DEFENCE HDQRTS  
PMO LAV A HODAK  
OTTOWA ONTARIO KIA OK2  
CANADA

1 RAFAEL  
D YAZIV  
PO BOX 2250  
HAIFA 31021  
ISRAEL

1 ROYAL NETHERLANDS ARMY  
JHOENEVELD  
V D BURCHLAAN 31  
PO BOX 90822  
2509 LS THE HAGUE  
NETHERLANDS

1 RIMAT  
M RAVID  
8B SIMTAT HAYEREK  
HOD HASHARON 45264  
ISRAEL

2 RUKKI  
V-M MANNER  
J ASUNMAA  
RAUTARUUKINTIE 155  
PO BOX 93  
FI 92101 FAAHE  
FINLAND

2 DEFENCE MATERIEL ADMIN  
WEAPONS DIRECTORATE  
A BERG  
R LINSTRÖM  
S 11588 STOCKHOLM  
SWEDEN

1 SECRA  
B JANZON  
PO BOX 97  
SE-147 22 TUMBA  
SWEDEN

NO. OF  
COPIES ORGANIZATION

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | SSAB SWEDISH STEEL LTD<br>C NASH<br>DE SALIS CT DE SAILS DR<br>HAMPTON LOVETT DROITWICH<br>WORCESTERSHIRE WR9 OQE<br>UNITED KINGDOM    |
| 1 | SSAB OXELÖSUND AB<br>ARMOR PLATE MANAGER<br>SE-613 80 OXELÖSUND<br>SWEDEN  |
| 4 | SWEDISH FOI<br>P LUNDBERG<br>J OTTOSSON<br>E LIDEN<br>L WESTERLING<br>SE-147 25 TUMBA<br>SWEDEN  |
| 2 | THYSSENKRUPP STEEL<br>H-J KAISER<br>S SCHARF<br>MANNESMANNSTRASSE GATE 9<br>47259 DUISBURG<br>GERMANY                                  |
| 2 | TNO DEFENCE SECURITY & SAFETY<br>A DIEDEREN<br>F T M VAN WEGEN<br>LANGE KLEIWEG 137<br>PO BOX45<br>2280 AA RIJSWIJK<br>THE NETHERLANDS |
| 1 | TDW EADS<br>M HELD<br>PO BOX 1340<br>SCHROBENHAUSEN D 86523<br>GERMANY   |