

AD

AD-E403 369

Technical Report ARMET-TR-11031

## M119 HOWTIZER SADDLE GUN FIRE FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS

R. Terhune  
S. McDonald  
M. Kotliar

December 2011



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

Munitions Engineering Technology Center

Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

20111219057

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.

The citation in this report of the names of commercial firms or commercially available products or services does not constitute official endorsement by or approval of the U.S. Government.

Destroy this report when no longer needed by any method that will prevent disclosure of its contents or reconstruction of the document. Do not return to the originator.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-01-0188		
The 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 of 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. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) December 2001		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) December 2010 to May 2011	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE  M119 HOWITZER SADDLE GUN FIRE FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHORS  R. Terhune, S. McDonald, and M. Kotliar			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army ARDEC Fuze & Precision Armaments/Munitions Systems & Technology Directorate (RDAR-MEF-E/MEM-A) Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army ARDEC, ESIC Knowledge & Process Management (RDAR-EIK) Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Technical Report ARMET=TR-11031		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT  Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT  The M119 howitzer is the current fielded 105-mm artillery weapon. It is undergoing upgrades to the fire control system in which they will be adding new components and brackets to the existing system. Finite element analysis (FEA) was performed to determine the stress contours along the side of the saddle (a sub-system of the howitzer) in regions where holes will be added for fire control brackets. The FEA results were validated by strain gauge data from live fire test and provided the needed insight for verifying the hole locations.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS  M119      Howitzer      105 mm      Artillery      Finite element analysis (FEA)      Strain gauge Saddle      Fire control					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 19	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON R. Terhune
a. REPORT U	b. ABSTRACT U	c. THIS PAGE U			SAR

## CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Method	1
Geometry	1
Finite Element Mesh	2
Materials	2
Applied Constraints	3
Applied Loads and Boundary Conditions	4
Results	6
Conclusions	12
References	13
Distribution List	15

## FIGURES

1 Saddle geometry	1
2 Saddle finite element mesh	2
3 Tie constraints between various parts of the saddle	3
4 Ridge body constraint on the trail box (carriage) stimulant	4
5 Coupling of reference points to geometry and connectors between reference points	4
6 Trunnion force versus time plot	5
7 Force holding on the saddle	5
8 Acceleration versus time plot of the trail box	5
9 Acceleration boundary condition applied to a reference point couples to the trail box	6
10 Von Mises stress contour plots of the saddle at $t = 0.0224s$	6
11 Von Mises stress contour plot of the saddle at $t = 0.0704s$	7

**FIGURES**  
(continued)

	Page
12 Strain gauge locations 1 to 4 used to compare to live-fire testing	7
13 Strain gauge 1 comparison	8
14 Strain gauge 2 comparison	9
15 Strain gauge 3 comparison	9
16 Strain gauge 4 comparison	10
17 Strain gauge locations 17 to 18 used to compare to live-fire testing	10
18 Strain gauge 17 comparison	11
19 Strain gauge 18 comparison	11
20 Strain gauge 19 comparison	12

## INTRODUCTION

The M119 howitzer is the U.S. Army's currently fielded 105-mm artillery weapon system. The M119A3, which is in production, will entail an upgrade to the fire control system. With this upgrade, new assemblies, components, brackets, and holes will be added to the existing M119 gun system in various locations. The scope of this analysis remains on the saddle subsystem of the howitzer. The saddle is the main structural support for the cannon, recoil system, and cradle and remains seated on top of the trail box. The goal of this modeling and simulation effort was to determine if the proposed addition of holes in the saddle should be in regions that see high stress. In addition, the finite element analysis (FEA) results will be compared with strain gauge data from testing for validation in the model.



## METHOD

The stress contours and values in the M119 saddle were determined using modeling and simulation. The general purpose finite element program, ABAQUS Explicit 6.10.ef1 (ref. 1) was used. The models were non-linear and dynamic.

## GEOMETRY

Figure 1 shows the saddle geometry.




Figure 1  
Saddle geometry

## FINITE ELEMENT MESH

The finite element (FE) mesh is displayed in figure 2. All the sheet metal parts were modeled with 8-node continuum shell elements with five integration points through thickness. There are 111,065 elements in total in the model consisting of 42,839 8-node hexahedral elements, 66,926 8-node continuum shell hexahedral elements, and 1,300 10-node tetrahedral elements.




Figure 2  
Saddle finite element mesh

## MATERIALS

The model used linear elastic material properties. The M119 uses a British stainless steel, but for the purpose of this analysis, a 17-4 stainless steel was used since its material properties match well.

Part	Material	Modulus (psi)	Poisson Ratio	Density (lb <sup>f</sup> s <sup>2</sup> /in <sup>4</sup> )	Yield (psi)	Ultimate True Plastic Strain	Ultimate True Stress (psi)
Entire Assembly	17-4 S.S.	2.85E+7	0.27	.000732	125,000	0.11	163,850

## APPLIED CONSTRAINTS

General frictionless contact is applied to the entire model at all contacting surfaces. Tie constraints were used to simulate all the welds that connect each part of the saddle (fig. 3). Given this may artificially strengthen the saddle, it's a close approximation, and since the regions of concern were away from the weld, the overall stress contours should not be affected (figs. 4 and 5).




Figure 3  
Tie constraints between various parts of the saddle






Figure 4  
Rigid body constraint on the trail box (carriage) stimulant




Figure 5  
Coupling of reference points to geometry and connectors between reference points

### APPLIED LOADS AND BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

The force and acceleration loads for this FEA model were provided by a rigid body kinematics model of the M119 weapon system at a quadrant elevation (QE) of 1244 mil. The force from the trunnions can be seen in figure 6 and is applied to the saddle as seen in figure 7. Figure 8 displays the acceleration boundary condition that is applied to the trail box stimulant as seen in figure 9. This will drive the trail box and saddle motion as it's loaded with the trunnion force.




Figure 6  
Trunnion force versus time plot




Figure 7  
Force loading on the saddle

(Note: half the total load applied at each reference point and load applied with horizontal and vertical components)




Figure 8  
Acceleration versus time plot of the trail box




Figure 9  
Acceleration boundary condition applied to a reference point couples to the trail box

## RESULTS

The FE analysis converged to a solution and produced confident results. At the first peek in the force loading, the stress contour can be seen in figure 10. In figure 11, the stress contour of the saddle at the force maximum is seen. The regions of concern are circled in red. Overall, the regions where holes are being added see low stresses during gun fire.




Figure 10  
Von Mises stress contour plots of the saddle at t=0.0224s




Figure 11  
 Von Mises stress contour plot of the saddle at t=0.0704s

The Von Mises stress values at specific locations on the saddle were recorded in the analysis so they could be compared to strain gauge derived stress values. Figures 12 and 17 show the locations and element numbers that were chosen. Stress comparisons for gauges 1 to 4 are displayed in figures 13 through 16 and for gauges 17 to 19 in figures 18 through 20.




Figure 12  
 Strain gauge locations 1 to 4 used to compared to live fire testing




Figure 12  
(continued)




Figure 13  
Strain gauge 1 comparison




Figure 14  
Strain gauge 2 comparison




Figure 15  
Strain gauge 3 comparison




Figure 16  
Strain gauge 4 comparison




Figure 17  
Strain gauge locations 17 to 18 used to compare to live fire testing




Figure 18  
Strain gauge 17 comparison




Figure 19  
Strain gauge 18 comparison






Figure 20  
Strain gauge 19 comparison

### CONCLUSIONS

The model and simulation was able to capture the high rate gun fire event with confidence and proved to be an effective aid in the redesign to the weapon. Mesh refinement models were also run to verify that continuum shell elements produce accurate stress results as compared to typical three-dimensional hexahedral elements. Overall, the analysis results provided accurate stress contours over the saddle in the regions of concern. Validation and correlation was achieved as the finite element analysis stress values matched up well with live fire test strain gauge data at multiple locations on the saddle. With confidence in the model results, decisions can be made with regards to what locations would be appropriate for adding holes in the saddle for new components.

## REFERENCES

1. "ABAQUS User Manual V6.10.1," Dassault Systems 2004-2010.

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

U.S. Army ARDEC

ATTN: RDAR-EIK  
RDAR-GC  
RDAR-ME, J. Hedderich  
RDAR-MEF, W. Smith  
RDAR-MEF-E, R. Terhune (2)  
RDAR-MEF-E, D. Troast  
A. Totten  
RDAR-WSW-I, M. Kotliar  
S. McDonald

Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000

Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC)

ATTN: Accessions Division  
8725 John J. Kingman Road, Ste 0944  
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

Commander

Soldier and Biological/Chemical Command  
ATTN: AMSSB-CII, Library  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5423

Director

U.S. Army Research Laboratory  
ATTN: AMSRL-CI-LP, Technical Library  
Bldg. 4600  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066

Chief

Benet Weapons Laboratory, WSEC  
U.S. Army Research, Development and Engineering Command  
Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center  
ATTN: RDAR-WSB  
Watervliet, NY 12189-5000

Director

U.S. Army TRADOC Analysis Center-WSMR  
ATTN: ATRC-WSS-R  
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002

Chemical Propulsion Information Agency

ATTN: Accessions  
10630 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 202  
Columbia, MD 21044-3204

GIDEP Operations Center

P.O. Box 8000  
Corona, CA 91718-8000