UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER

ADB020480

NEW LIMITATION CHANGE

TO

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

FROM

Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies only; Test and Evaluation; JUN 1977. Other requests shall be referred to U.S. Army Armament Research and Development Command, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010.

AUTHORITY

EA D/A ltr, 18 Apr 1978

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED



AD

NIG 10 191

CONTRACTOR REPORT

ARCSL-CR-77020

INVESTIGATION OF METHODS FOR DETECTION AND CONTROL

OF PYROTECHNIC DUST FIRES AND EXPLOSIONS

by

W. R. Nestle G. L. McKown R. B. Belmonte

June 1977

NASA NATIONAL SPACE TECHNOLOGY LABORATORIES GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY RANGE AND TEST SERVICES BAY ST. LOUIS, MISSISSIPPI 39529

Contract No. NAS8-27750



COPY

US ARMY ARMAMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND Chemical Systems Laboratory Abardeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21010

Distribution limited to US Government agencies only because of test and evaluation; June 1977. Other requests for this document must be referred to Director, Chemical Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-I/Technical Releases, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21010.

Disclaimer

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.

츐

ł

Disposition

Destroy this report when no longe1 needed. Do not return to originator.

(/ REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1 REPORT NUMBER 2. GOVT ACCESSION I	NO. 3 RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
ARCS1-CR-77020	191
4. TITLE (and Subtilie)	STAPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERE
INVESTIGATION OF METHODS FOR DETECTION	Contractor Report,
AND CONTROL OF PYROTECHNIC DUST FIRES	Nov 1975 - Nov 1976
AND EXPLOSIONS .	S.PTERFORMING CRG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(*)	B CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(.)
W. R. Nestle,	151 NAS8-27756
G. L./McKown	MIDE 8166104601-F4W5
R. B. Belmonte PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT TASK
NASA National Space Technology Laboratories	AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
General Electric Company	PEMA-4932
NSTL Station, MS 39529	Project 5761313
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Director Chemical Systems Laboratory	12. REPORT DATE
Attn. DRDAR-CI J-I/Technica' Releases	June 1977 /
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESSIT different from Controlling Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
Attn: DRDAR-CLN-S	LINCI ASSIFIED
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21019	
(CPO-R. Belmonte, 671-3402)	150. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (at this Report)	
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CI.J-I/Technical	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Releases, Aberdeen Proving
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-L/Technical Ground, MD 21010.	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CI.J-I/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CI.J-I/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Releases, Aberdeen Proving
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CI.J-I/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CI.J-I/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving from Report
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. OthCr requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-L/Technical Ground, MD 21010.	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Releases, Aberdeen Proving
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. OthCr requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-L/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Ultraviolet detector	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving from Report)
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CI.J-I/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Uitraviolet detector Dust explesion Suppression	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving from Report from Report Sulfur dust
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CI.J-L/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Ultraviolet detector Dust explesion Suppression Runup reaction Quenching	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Releases, Aberdeen Proving from Report)
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. OthCr requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CI.J-L/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Ultraviolet detector Dust explosion Suppression Runup reaction Quenching Hazard evaluation Flame control	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving from Report to the state of the st
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-I/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Ultraviolet detector Dust explesion Suppression Runup reaction Quenching Hazard evaluation Flame control 14. ABSTRACT (Continue on personal of the N messare and identify by block numb	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Releases, Aberdeen Proving from Report)
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. OthCr requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CI.J-I/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Ultraviolet detector Dust explosion Suppression Runup reaction Quenching Hazard evaluation Flame control 18. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pharacteristics of sulfur dust fires and a method f	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Releases, Aberdeen Proving from Report Sulfur dust
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CI.J-L/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on referee side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Ultraviolet detector Dust explesion Suppression Runup reaction Quenching Hazard evaluation Flame control 14. AMETRACT (Continue on severee side 11 necessary and identify by block numb The characteristics of sulfur dust fires and a method f and high-pressure suppression were investigated. Sul	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving from Report Sulfur dust
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-L/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Ultraviolet detector Dust explesion Suppression Runup reaction Quenching Hazard evaluation Flame control 14. ABTRACT (Contant on reverse of the Necessary and identify by block numb The characteristics of sulfur dust fires and a method f and high-pressure suppression were investigated. Sul to be subject to low-order detonations, accompanied by	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Releases, Aberdeen Proving from Report Sulfur dust Sulfur dust
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-L/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Ultraviolet detector Dust explesion Suppression Runup reaction Quenching Hazard evaluation Flame control 14. ABTRACT (Continue on reverse of the investigated. Sul The characteristics of sulfur dust fires and a method f and high-pressure suppression were investigated. Sul to be subject to low-order detonations, accompanied by fronts. A high-pressure quency system, with a burst	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving from Report Sulfur dust
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. OthCr requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-I/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Ultraviolet detector Dust explosion Suppression Runup reaction Quenching Hazard evaluation Flame control 14. ABSTRACT (Continue on severate of M measuremy and identify by block numb The characteristics of sulfur dust fires and a method f and high-pressure suppression were investigated. Sul to be subject to low-order detonations, accompanied by fronts. A high-pressure quency system, with a burst ultraviolet sensor, was found to control these reaction for the local of the sensor of the se	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving from Report Sulfur dust
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. OthCr requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-I/Technical Ground, MD 21010. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, 11 different 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessary and identify by block numb Pyrotechnic Ultraviolet detector Dust explosion Suppression Runup reaction Quenching Hazard evaluation Flame control 14. ABSTRACT (Continue on severe side 11 necessary and identify by block numb The characteristics of sulfur dust fires and a method f and high-pressure suppression were investigated. Sul to be subject to low-order detonations, accompanied by fronts. A high-pressure quency system, with a burst ultraviolet sensor, was found to control these reaction found to be less efficient as a suppressant than haloger	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Releases, Aberdeen Proving from Report Sulfur dust
Distribution limited to US Government agencies only b June 1977. Other requests for this document must be Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-L/Technical Ground, MD 21010. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, 11 different DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstreet entered in Block 20, 11 different SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SupplementAry NOTES NET WORDS (Continue on reverse side 11 necessery and identify by block numb Py rotechnic Ultraviolet detector Dust explesion Suppression Runup reaction Quenching Hazard evaluation Flame control ABETRACT (Continue on reverse side N measurery and identify by block numb The characteristics of sulfur dust fires and a method f and high-pressure suppression were investigated. Sul to be subject to low-order detonations, accompanied by fronts. A high-pressure quency system, with a burst ultraviolet sensor, was found to control these reaction found to be less efficient as a suppressant than haloger	ecause of test and evaluation; referred to Director Chemical Peleases, Aberdeen Proving from Report Sulfur dust

2

<u>i</u> (

ž

PREFACE

The investigation described in this report was authorized under PEMA 49.32, Project 5761313, and MIPR 8166104601F4W5. It was performed at the NASA National Space Technology Laboratories (NSTL) for the Edgewood Arsenal Resident Laboratory (EARL) and NASA-NSTL by the General Electric Company under Contract No. NAS8-27750. Activity was initiated November 1975 and completed November 1976.

Reproduction of this document in whole or in part is prohibited except with permission of the Director, Chemical Systems Laboratory, Attn: DRDAR-CLJ-I/Technical Releases, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21010; however, DDC is authorized to reproduce the document for United States Government purposes.

The use of trade names in this report does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial hardware or software. This report may not be cited for purposes of advertisement.

The information in this document has not been cleared for release to the general public.

Acknowledgement

The technical assistance of test support personnel of the NSTL Kellar Road Test Range is gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Paragraph		Page
1.0	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	Objective	5
1.2	Authority	5
1.3	Background	5
2.0	EQUIPMENT AND APPARATUS	ő
2.1	General Approach	6
2.2	Extended Tube Hartmann Apparatus	6
2.3	10.36 Meter Test Chamber	11
2.4	Suppression System	22
2.5	Ultraviolet Detector and Controller	/ 22
3.0	EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES	22
3.1	Sample Preparation	22
3.2	Glass Tube Hartmann Apparatus	25
3.3	Steel Tube Hartmann Modification	25
3.4	Dust Gallery and Suppression System	26
4.0	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	26
4.1	Glass Tube Hartmann Appa. atus	26
4.2	Steel Tube Hartmann Apparatus	26
4.3	Dust Gallery and Suppression System	27
5.0	CONCLUSIONS	32
5.1	Characteristics of Flame Propagation	32
5.2	Suppression System	32
6.0	REFERENCES	33
APPENDIX	- DATA SHEETS	34
DISTRIBUTI	ON LIST	37
	LIST OF TABLES	

Table No. Title

1

鰄

;

. 화 같.

いたませ

長が地震は

,

ł

Pressure and Optical Sensor Data, Hartmann Apparatus

3

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont⁴d)

¥٤

dare und

and a second second

Table No.	Title	Page
2	Reaction Propagation Velocities, Hartmann Apparatus	28
3	Summary of Fire Suppression Test Data	32
	LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	
Figure No.	Title	Page
1	Glass Tube Extension to Hartmann Apparatus	7
2	Steel Tube Extension to Hartmanr. Apparatus	8
3	Extended Tube Hartmann Apparatus	9
-1	Hartmann Apparatus Pneumatic System	10
5	Hartmann Apparatus Instrumentation System	12
6	Hartmann Apparatus Electrica) Control	13
7	Plan Layout of Dust Gallery	14
8	Dust Gallery, Front View	15
9	Interior View of Dust Gallery	16
10	Dust Holder/Distribution Nozzle	17
11	Dust Gallery Suppression System	18
12	Extinguisher Nozzle	19
13	Sensor Locations in 1.0.36 Meter Test Chamber	20
14	Halon Loading System	20
15	Gas Manifold Hook Up	21
16	Burst Diaphragm Assembly	23
17	Detonator Assembly	24
18	Extinguisher Tank Deluge Valve Control	24
19	Electrical System Block Diagram	25
20	Test No. 40-5-01 Halon Suppressant	29
21	Test No. 41-5-01 Halon Suppressant	29
22	Test No. 47-5-01 Halon Suppressant	30
23	Test No. 48-5-01 Water Suppressant	30
24	Test No. 49-5-01 Water Suppressant	31
25	Test No. 49-5-02 Water Suppressant	31

INVESTIGATION OF METHODS FOR DETECTION AND

CONTROL OF PYROTECHNIC DUST FIRES AND EXPLOSIONS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 <u>Objective.</u> The objectives of this study were (a) to investigate the nature of dust deflagrations that can occur in pyrotechnic manufacturing facilities, and (b) to evaluate a detector/suppression system for control of such reactions.

1.2 <u>Authority.</u> The work described in this report was authorized by MIPR 8166104601 F4W5 from Edgewood Arsenal to the National Space Technology Laboratories.

Background. Previous results of the Edgewood Arsenal Pyrotechnic Hazards Evalua-1.3 tion Program have shown that fire is the most often encountered and most destructive hazard during production of pyrotechnic materials (1-5). In the usual plant environment, accidents that initiate from a small ignition source may propagate as a high-velocity fire storm through the production facility. When ignition occurs by dissipation of mechanical or electrical energy in a localized area below the surface of a bulk pyrotechnic mix, a transient pressure buildup may be occasioned by confinement of the reaction products within the body of material. As a result, extensive blowout of the mix can occur. Classic examples of this effect have been observed during recent simulated mixing operations using Jet Airmix or double cone blenders (3, 4). The flame front will then propagate through the dispersed material, ofttimes increasing velocity as the volume of burning material increases. As a result, the reaction may approach or exceed sonic velocity. This phenomenon is known as reaction runup, and has been investigated extensively by the Bureau of Mines for mine shaft scenarios (6, 7). Depending on the reaction velocity, normal sprinkler systems may not be effective unless the problem is detected early and unless the fireball can be confined to specific areas.

The potential effect of dust fires and explosions in U.S. Army munition plants has recently received increased emphasis due to the introduction of new material-handling techniques that involve automated-transfer equipment and, concomitantly, much larger quantities of material. Pneumatic conveying, large-scale blenders and continuous flow processing are being installed to replace conventional small-batch preparation of pyrotechnics. These new methods will reduce exposure of personnel to the hazards involved and through automated control can produce higher quality products at greatly increased output. However, the potential risk of damage to equipment and facilities must be determined, and measures for prevention of catastrophic accidents must be devised. Specifically, it is necessary to develop a system for early detection of a dust fire/explosion which simultaneously initiates some suppressive action that will minimize the hazard.

In reviewing available data on dust fires/explosions, it was obvious that all the conditions of environment and stimuli under which these problems occur in a factory are rarely known and difficult to simulate for repeatable laboratory studies. This project, therefore, was designed to move through a succession of steps to develop instrumentation, test methods, and experimental apparatus in which an actual dust fire/explosion could be initiated, propagated, measured, and suppressed. The basic requirement was to develop a working chamber which could sustain a propagating dust fire/explosion of sufficient duration to allow measurements to be made of the reaction characteristics and to permit evaluation of the detection and suppression system.

2.0 EQUIPMENT AND APPARATUS

General Approach. Preliminary design criteria were obtained using a micro-scale 2.1 dust gallery, consisting of a glass tube extension on a standard Hartmann apparatus This dust dispersion system was used to determine the ability of the pneumatic system to disperse and sustain a dust column of sufficient length to make the apparatus useful in developing instrumentation and design data for a larger chamber. On the basis of the information gathered in these tests a second modification was made to the Hartmann apparatus, consisting of a steel tube chamber extension equipped with instrumentation outlets to measure the pressure wave and flame front characteristics of a sulfur dust fire/explosion. Sulfur was chosen as the fuel to be used for the test program because it is the most energetic fuel component in standard pyrotechnic smoke compositions. For this laboratory study, it was imperative to have a fuel which could be expected to react positively in repeated tests. From the preliminary test data, design criteria were developed for a full scale dust gallery and the reaction time requirement was established for a suppression system. During the design and fabrication of the larger gallery, a survey and evaluation were made of existing commercial extinguishing systems with specifications that would meet the reaction time requirements and would suppress a dust fire/explosion. A combination of two commercial systems was selected and used in this study. The system chosen used an ultraviolet flame sensor coupled with a pressurized deluge system. Two extinguishing agents were tested, a halogenated hydrocarbon and water. The apparatus and peripheral equipment used in this program thus consists of three major systems; (a) an extended tube Hartmann apparatus and a 10.4-meter dust gallery, (b) a fire detection and suppression system, and (c) the instrumentation and control system.

2.2 Extended Tube Hartmann Apparatus. The Hartmann apparatus was developed by the Bureau of Mines to evaluate dust hazard characteristics. In its original configuration, the chamber consisted of a 7-cm diameter steel tube 30.5 cm long that is mounted vertically on a dispersion cup and stand assembly, and connected to a pneumatic system for dust dispersal. The interior of the base assembly consists of the following:

- (a) A dispersion cup receives the sample material.
- (b) An <u>adjustable compressed air deflector</u> directs compressed air onto the sample to disperse the material in the chamber.
- (c) An ignitor wire ignites the dust cloud when heated electrically.

The original apparatus was modified into two configurations for this program. Figure 1 shows the original base and pneumatic control system fitted with a 7.81-cm I. D., 1.52-meter long glass tube extension that was used to determine the ability of the system to form and sustain a dust column. Figures 2 and 3 show the steel tube extension added to the original chamber. Optical and pressure sensors were installed as shown to evaluate reaction characteristics prior to larger scale tests. Tests were conducted to determine the optimum air/ sulfur density and ignition method which would produce the most repeatable propagating dust fire/explosion to establish design criteria for the full scale dust gallery.



Figure 1. Glass Tube Extension to Hartmann Apparatus



Figure 2. Steel Tube Extension to Hartmann Apparatus

٠,

,

i



Figure 3. Extended Tube Hartmann Apparatus

In the second modification, an upper section consisting of a 7-cm I. D. steel tube 1.73 meters long was added to the original chamber. The appratus contained the following instrumentation:

- (a) Three Susquehanna Instruments Model ST-2 pressure sensors were mounted 0.76 meters apart to evaluate pressure wave propagation.
- (b) Three Monsanto Model MT-2 photo cells were mounted 0.76 meters apart to evaluate optical flame front propagation.
- (c) Three iron-constantan thermocouple <u>temperature probes</u> were mounted 0.76 meters apart to measure arrival and temperature of the propagating flame front.

The pneumatic system outlined in figure 4 consisted of the following:

朝

- "Missile grade" compressed air (dew point 75°F, particulate contaminants less than 50 microns) was supplied from a standard gas cylinder.
- (b) A standard two stage pressure regulator was installed on the air cylinder.
- (c) A spring-loaded toggle valve was utilized to relieve pressure on the system by venting to the atmosphere.
- (d) A 50 cm³ reservoir was used to provide a single shot charge of compressed air.
- (e) A full ported solenoid valve was utilized to release the compressed air charge to the chamber.
- (f) A check valve connected downstream of the solenoid valve was used to prevent pressure relief and escape of combustion products back through the system.



Figure 4. Hartmann Apparatus Pneumatic System

Ignition of the dust cloud was accomplished by one of the following electrical-power system:

V Million

ł

- (a) A continuous spark discharge unit, consisting of a capacitive discharge ignition system and an automotive ignition coil, was connected to spark gap electrodes. The pulse rate was 550 hertz, producing an average power of approximately 24 watts and spark energy of 23 millijoules.
- (b) A 120-volt AC power source was connected to a short length of 0.10-cm-diamet stainless steel wire.

The instrumentation and control equipment used for the extended tube Hartmann test is show in figures 5 and 6. The following is a list of the test equipment utilized:

ITEM	MANUFACTURER	MODEL
Power supply	Trygon	R.S. 4010
Pulse generator	Hewlett Packard	214A
Solenoid power supply	S.O.S. Photo-Cine Optics	BH
Control and capacitive discharge ignition	Custom built	
AC hot-wire ignition control	Custom built	

2.3 10.36 Meter Test Chamber. A schematic representation of the test chamber, dust dispersion system and the suppression system is shown in figure 7. Figures 8 through 15 show additional views of the systems and components. The test chamber is a rectangular box, 10.36 meters (34 feet) long by 0.46 meters (1.5 feet) in cross section, of plywood and Plexiglas construction. It is closed on one end, top, bottom and back with 1.9-cm plywood which is lined on the interior with galvanized sheet metal. The top was hinged in 1.2-mete sections to allow access to the dust nozzles and instrumentation sensors. Except for one plywood panel at the fire ignition end, the front was closed with 0.64-cm-thick Plexiglas sheet to facilitate observation of the reaction using high speed photography. The end throug which the extinguisher nozzle protrudes is enclosed with 0.13-mm plastic sheet. The chan ber is equipped with 17 combination dust-holder-distribution nozzles. The nozzles protrud through the bottom of the chamber to a height of 15.2 cm and are spaced 0.61 meters apart along the center line of the chamber. The nozzles are constructed of 2.54-cm schedule-40 pipe 12.7 cm long with an inverted cone mounted above the nozzle exit to aid in dispersal of the dust. The base of each nozzle was equipped with a plastic ring which held a tissue paper diaphragm to retain the dust prior to dispersal. Each nozzle has a capacity of 50 grams of sulfur, providing a total capacity of 850 grams used in each test.

The dust distribution nozzles, except for the one located in the center of the chamber, are connected in pairs to a 10.1-cm schedule-40 steel pipe manifold 9.75-meters long. Or end has a 1.27-cm valve which isolates the manifold from an auxiliary air supply bottle. Compressed air at a manifold pressure of 758 kPa (110 psi) is used for forced distribution of the sulfur dust from the holder distribution nozzles into the chamber. Control of gas flo to each pair of nozzles is accomplished by use of a 2.54-cm full-ported solenoid valve and



;:

er

'n

h

i-?

e

w.

a

ŝ

3

-

Figure 5. Hartmann Apparatus Instrumentation System.



- ,

醫

.....

1

<u>م</u>

14.45

ระ จะเราะการ และ การสินให้เรื่อง

n yan aren ya shi a shi ta shi ta

V.

19

Figure 6. Hartmann Apparatus Electrical Control





Fimme 8. Dust Gallery. Front View



• • • • • • • • •

2001

r igule o.

人の中国大学校と日本語の世大学

A REAL FOR

Figure 9. Interior View of Dust Gallery









翰

- 20

¥ 12

ţ



Figure 15. Gas Manifold Hook Up

value to prevent back flow of pressure from the chamber during firing. The control for the nine air distribution values is through an electrical-switching apparatus located near the chamber. Each value can be controlled individually from this control box for checkout, and a sequencer triggers all the values simultaneously during tests. This control system also contains a delay relay to provide a 2-second delay in value activation after initiation of the igniter.

日花殿

1001

The test chamber is instrumented to measure the pressure wave and flame front velocity by use of transducers mounted on the back vertical face of the chamber, as shown in figure 13. The sensors were shifted among the locations noted for some tests to provide better coverage in the area where fire suppression was anticipated. The pressure and optical sensors used were identical to those described above. In addition, ion probes were used to measure the flame front arrival time at each location. The ion probes were developed locally and consisted of two bare wire electrodes spaced 0.1 mm apart with an impressed voltage of 200 volts. The probes are designed to discharge when the flame front produces an ionized atmosphere between the electrodes. During some tests, passive sensors (cotton balls) were installed along the gallery to indicate the limit of flame propagation. Photographic coverage for each test was provided by a Hulcher Model-40 70-mm sequencing camera operated at 20 pictures per second, and by a Hycam Model-41.004 16-mm unit operated at 1500 frames per second.

In all tests conducted with the suppression system, a single 40-mm M-43A1 red signal flare was used as the ignition source. The flare was removed from the shell casing and mounted in a trough made of 2.54-cm angle iron. The flare was installed 0.305 meters from one end of the test chamber and was ignited with an electric match attached to the fuse. The flare produced a fireball 0.61 meters in diameter and lasted for approximately 9 seconds. Time zero (t_0) was established by ignition of the flare, and the dust dispersion system was triggered at $t_0 + 2$ seconds. A breakwire installed across one dust nozzle indicated arrival of dust in the chamber and a breakwire across the extinguisher nozzle indicated injection of the suppressive agent into the chamber.

2.4 <u>Suppression System</u>. The extinguisher tank is a 76-liter stainless steel cylinder with a working pressure of 13790 kPa (2000 psi), and contains the agents being evaluated for the suppression of dust fires/explosions in the test chamber. It is equipped with an extinguisher agent loading system, a pressurization system, and a system for expelling the contents of the tank into the test chamber. The tank is mounted at the end of the dust gallery opposite from the ignition source with the extinguisher nozzle protruding 0.305 meters into the chamber, see figure 1?. The tank was insulated with aluminum backed fiberglass to facilitate cooling of the tank prior to loading. Figure 14 shows a schematic of the suppression system and the method used for loading and pressurizing the system.

A 114 liter liquid nitrogen (LN_2) dewar is used to precool the extinguisher tank prior to loading the Halon 1301 extinguishing agent. It is a standard LN_2 dewar with both liquid and gaseous phase control valves. Two pressurized bottles containing gaseous nitrogen (GN₂) at 13,790 kPa (2000 psig) are equipped with regulators and are used in conjunction with the suppression system. One is used to pressurize the LN_2 dewar during the tank precool operation, and the other was used to pressurize the extinguisher tank prior to testing. In addition, a standard compressed air bottle equipped with a regulator is used to pressurize the dust distribution manifold, as shown in figure 15.

The extinguisher tank deluge valve is a Fike Model A-10 explosive burst diaphragm device, see figures 16 and 17. The valve is mounted on the outlet side of the tank and is composed of a split flange assembly for holding the rupture disc and the detonator assembly. The detonator is actuated by a signal from the UV controller. The detonator ignites the explosive train which breaks the rupture disc along prescored lines allowing the tank media to flow into the chamber. Tests were performed with the detonator in both downstream and upstream positions.

2.5 <u>Ultraviolet Detector and Controller</u>. The ultraviolet sensor and controller employed were Detector Electronics Corporation Models DE-C7050A and DE-R7300A. The controller is in modular form and consists of electronic circuitry for processing the detector signal plus several switching relays. The detector uses a Geiger-Mueller type tube designed to detect radiation in wavelengths from 185 to 245 nanometers. The tube is insensitive to UV radiation from the sun (at the earth's surface) or from artificial lighting. When the detector tube senses radiation of proper wavelength, a voltage pulse is transmitted to the controller which then energizes the deluge valve detonator. Power is supplied to the detector and associated circuitry by the Fike Metal Products Model IN40-004 24 volt DC power supply.

The electrical system wiring connection diagram and a block diagram showing interconnection of the units described in the above paragraphs are shown in Figures 18 and 19.

3.0 EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

- Carlor

ł

ł

100

nunuit lakaladi

unterentum estentization "I "I print a service un province of a restrict the Above and Contractions

3.1 <u>Sample Preparation</u>. The following sample preparation procedure was used for all tests conducted with the Hartmann apparatus and with the large dust gallery:



嚹

ì

1. all 10

and the second s

大学がないます

Figure 16. Burst Diaphragm Assembly









A CONTRACT OF A CONTRACT OF



Figure 19. Electrical System Block Diagram

- (a) All sample material was sieved through a No. 200 (U.S. Standard series) screen prior to drying and testing, to minimize particle size variation.
- (b) The sample material was dried in an oven for 24 hours at 75° C.
- (c) The sample material, after drying, was kept in a desiccator until needed.
- (d) Samples were weighed to within ± 0.5 mg on a precision analytical balance before placement in the chamber or in the dust gallery dispersion tubes.

3.2 <u>Glass Tube Hartmann Apparatus</u>. A weighed quantity of material was placed in the dust dispersion cup. The pressure regulator was set to the desired pressure to allow charging of the accumulator for pulsed air discharge, or continuous flow from the pressure regulator through the accumulator was used during some of the tests. The sample was dispersed by opening the solenoid valve. Since these tests were only used to determine operating conditions required for the modified apparatus, visual observation could be used to determine the system performance level. A well dispersed cloud that completely filled the tube in one to two seconds was considered a satisfactory test. The gas dispersal pressure, height of dust in the tube, and the time required for maximum height were recorded.

3.3 <u>Steel Tube Hartmann Modification</u>. A selected, weighed quantity of material was placed in the dust dispersion cup, then the steel tube was connected to the base. The ignition source leads were connected to the spark gap or hot wire electrodes. The pressure

regulator was adjusted to the desired pressure and the control valve was opened. Power was applied to the ignition system, with simultaneous opening of the solenoid valve to disperse the dust. Evidence of propagation was determined by visual observation with a mirror mounted above the steel tube chamber exit. Timing of events was made relative to the application of power to the igniter. Measurements were recorded of the arrival time and magnitude of the pressure wave at each pressure transducer, time of arrival of the flame at each optical sensor, and time of arrival of the flame at each thermocouple sensor.

3.4 <u>Dust Gallery and Suppression System</u>. The 10.36-meter test chamber was used initially, prior to installation of the suppression system, to determine methods of initiation, firing procedures, dust/air ratios, instrument locations, and recording methods. After establishing these basic requirements and completing modifications to the chamber and systems to assure repeatable test criteria, the suppression system was installed. Six tests were conducted using the suppression system to suppress the dust fire/explosion, three using Halon 1301 and three using water as the suppressing agent.

The extinguishing agent was loaded first for all tests in which the suppression system was used. The explosive burst disc and holder were assembled and installed, and the tank was loaded with extinguishing fluid (6.8 kg of Halon 131 or 57 liters of water). The gallery dust nozzles were removed and paper diaphragms were installed in the base. Each nozzle was loaded with 50 grams of sulfur and then reinstalled in the chamber. The M43 flare ignitor was prepared and mounted, then the gallery was closed and sealed. The gas manifold was pressurized to 758 kilopascals (kPa) (110 psi) with compressed air and the extinguisher tank was pressurized to 4140 kPa (for Halon) or 2070 kPa (for water) with nitrogen. The initiator for the burst disc valve and the flare ignitor were then connected.

The flare was ignited by the range sequencer, and two seconds later the air valves opened so that dust was injected into the chamber. Action of the UV sensor and burst disc valve then followed automatically.

Visual evidence of propagation was provided by posttest inspection and by observing the motion pictures. The limit of flame advance from passive sensors, timing of ignitor, dust injection time, extinguisher injection time, pressure traces, photocell outputs and the UV sensor signal were recorded.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

ALCOMPT ALL

4.1 <u>Glass Tube Hartmann Apparatus</u>. Using sulfur as the sample material, good dispersion of the dust in the tube was obtained during 8 of 12 tests. Tests run with a continuous flow of air at 103-140 kPa (15-20 psi) using 0.15 gm of sulfur resulted in even dust cloud distribution throughout the tube in 2-3 seconds. The average density of sulfur in the tube under these conditions was about 0.02 gm/liter.

4.2 <u>Steel Tube Hartmann Apparatus.</u> Observations made using the mirror clearly showed the progress of the fireball up the tube. The dust initially produced a haze above the fireball, and was plown out the end of the tube as the fireball approached the exit. Matches placed along the tube interior failed to ignite, but after each test small molten globules of sulfur coated the tube walls. Flame propagation throughout the length of the tube resulted for charge weights of 3-6 grams at an air pressure of 520-1040 kPa (75-150 psi). Improved dust distribution was noted at the higher pressures. The fireball appears as a donut-shaped bright ring on one 500 frame per second movie that was made of the propagation. Timing information as indicated by the pressure, optical and temperature sensors are given in table 1. In all cases, the top pressure sensor either did not show a pressure trace or the signals were so erratic as to be unusable. The general form of the pressure traces showed an initial spike followed by a slow pressure rise.

舒

. . . .

Į

s de la

4 2

1.00

	Time Between Sensors (ms)											
Trial Pressure Number 1-2		Optical 1-2	Optical 2-3	Temperature 1-2	Temperature 2-3							
1	13.0	9.6	7.2	15.6	28.1							
2	9.1	9.0	6.7	8.8	24.5							
3	10.1	8.2	6.0	11.8	33.1							
4	3.5*	9.4	5.1	9.0	13.3							
5	1.6*	10.7	4.5	no data	19.8							
6	11.8	12.4	5.1	9.1	21.8							
7	2.8*	11.9	7.5	no data	19.2							
8	4.3*	14.2	no data	no data	19.4							
Average	11.0 <u>+</u> 1.7	10.7 <u>+</u> 2.0	6.0 <u>+</u> 1.2	11 <u>+</u> 3	22+6							
Interage	*(3.0+1)											

TABLE 1. PRESSURE AND OPTICAL SENSOR DATA, HARTMANN APPARATUS

The time of arrival data was used to calculate average velocities of the pressure wave and flame front during propagation up the tube, results of which are given in table 2. In four of the eight tests a pressure wave velocity of approximately 250 m/sec was observed, compared to an average of 70 m/sec for the remaining trials. This is probably indicative of a low order detonation in the former case, compared to a low velocity burn during the latter runs; apparently the conditions for detonation were marginal during these tests. If the low-order pressure data is used, the correlation of velocities between sensor positions 1 and 2 (0.762 meters apart) is remarkable. On the other hand, between positions 2 and 3 the optical data shows an increasing front velocity whereas the thermal data shows a decrease. It is possible that the optical sensors triggered early due to reflections or other effects, or perhaps the thermocouples with inherent heat capacity may have taken longer to respond at position 3 as the fleeting flame front passed. The general indications from these experiments were that flame front propagation within the tube occurs with relative low velocity, accompanied or sometimes outrun by the pressure wave.

4.3 <u>Dust Gallery and Suppression System.</u> Visual examination of the gallery after successful test runs without the suppression system showed only small traces of unburned sulfur on the floor, with small globules of sulfur covering the walls and clouding the plexiglas face. In tests where propagation was incomplete, a definite demarcation between clouded and clear surfaces could be observed. The cotton ball passive sensors also clearly marked the limit

	Average	Average Velocity, m/sec									
Sensor Position	Pressure	Optical	Thermal								
1-2	69+9 (250 <u>+</u> 70)	71 <u>+</u> 10	69 <u>+</u> 15								
2-3	no data	127 <u>+</u> 20	35+8								
1-3	no data	91 <u>+</u> 15	46+10								

TABLE 2. REACTION PROPAGATION VELOCITIES, HARTMANN APPARATUS

of flame advance. Examination of the Hulcher and high speed motion pictures showed initiation within about 0.1 seconds after injection of the dust in the chamber. The dust as it is discharged from each nozzle forms an overlapping circular pattern which shortly after ignition can be observed being swept toward the chamber exit under force of the compression wave built up ahead of the flame front. The flame, clearly visible at ignition, becomes obscure due to dust and smoke buildup, and is visible only in flashes as propagation occurs. Continuous burning is visible again at the exit of the chamber.

Data sheets containing measurements of pressure, ionization and optical data obtained during the tests with the suppression system in place are contained in Appendix A. Each pressure trace showed an initial peak due to the compression wave from the reaction, followed by a relatively slow rise during the time that the optical sensors and ion probes indicated presence of flame. Subsequently, each pressure trace showed a sharp peak which is attributed to passage of the suppressant along the transducer array. The photocell data was extremely erratic, and little conclusive information could be obtained from the traces. Apparently these units responded to the initial dust injection, the movements of the dust cloud as the pressure wave passed, and the passage of the suppressant fluid in addition to the flame front. The photocell data was disregarded during final analysis, and an average flame front velocity was obtained primarily from the reaction of the UV sensor. This was corroborated by the ion probe data that was obtained during four tests.

The timing versus distance curves in figures 20 through 25 provide a display of all significant events during these experiments. From the point of ignition (0.61 meters from the left end), a compression wave travels down the gallery at near sound velocity. This is followed by the much slower flame front which triggers the UV sensor. After an inherent delay of about 30 milliseconds, the suppressant is released from the right end and propagates back through the gallery at or above sound velocity. Intersection of the flame front with the suppressant propagation curve indicates the point where the fire would be extinguished if the system were 100 percent effective. Comparison of this point with the passive sensor indicators then provides an indication of the suppression effectiveness.

A summary of the data from the dust gallery tests is given in table 3. The reaction of the ultraviolet sensor and deluge value to the flame front was remarkably consistent. Discounting one test, the total reaction time from detection to initiation of the deluge system was 28 ± 2 msec. For the Halon tests, figures 20 through 22, it is apparent that the suppression occurs with essentially no delay; the flame was extinguished within 0.5 meters and within 10 msec after the suppressant arrived. For the water tests, however, the suppressive action as well as the measurement system performed less satisfactorily. The flame appeared to



Ť

1

10-1 00

ł

ጥ / · · · · · · › አለቁ s. መብዙ , ዲስስ (ዲስቲ ስምስትስካቶ ሲካቶ, ቅጣስ/ትጠት ጎንድ ግስትንቸი ብሎተው ዘኛዊ



-

•

1.1.1

ţ

an 1 h to

dist.



.

Test No. and Fluid	Flame Arrival Time at U V Sensor Location 4.27m (ms)	Suppressant Injection in Chamber Time From Dust Nozzle Breakwire (ms)	System Reaction Time U V Sensor to Suppressant Injection (ms)	Flame Velocity Ion Probe Parameters (m/sec)	Fire Extinguish Point, Passive Sensor Location (m)	Max. Flame Static Ртовяцге РSIG	Leading Edge Pressure Wave Velocity (m/sec)	COMMENTS
40-5-01 Halon	200	225	26.0		5.8	0.9	240	
41-5-01 Halon	182	210	24.0		6.4	0.8	190	
47-5-01 Halon	216.2	242.5	29.3	41	6.4	0.8	280	
48-5-01 Water	230, 9	257.3	26.4	48	7.0	0.6	335	
49-5-01 Water	220. 3	267.1	46.8	44	9.4	1.1	182	All the leaves on the burst disc sheared off and passed through the suppressant nozzle. Probably plugged nozzle initially.
49-5-02 Water	274	303, 5	29.5		7.9	1.2	120	Suppressant no r/le plugged with pieces of burst disc approximately 80 percent restriction.

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF FIRE SUPPRESSION TEST DATA

advance 2-3 meters beyond the suppressant-flame interaction, which translates into 60-80 ms in time. In all cases the flame was extinguished prior to exiting the gallery, but the superiority of the Halon 1301 as a suppressant was clearly established. However, the additional expense and environmental problems associated with the use of halogenated hydrocarbons may offset the enhanced performance.

In summary, the results of this test series indicate that a UV detector/high-pressure suppression system can be highly effective in controlling the extent of damage due to flame propagation within a pyrotechnic manufacturing facility. Depending on the application, a fire can either be extinguished at the source or confined to a limited area such as the cubicle in which an operation takes place.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

e. :

5.1 <u>Characteristics of Flame Propagetion</u>. Sulfur dispersions in air are subject to loworder detonation when ignited by a hot source. A compression wave propagates outward with near sonic velocity, followed by a much lower velocity flame front.

5.2 <u>Suppression System</u>. An ultraviolet-detector/high-pressure quench system with a burst deluge valve is sufficiently fast in action to detect and extinguish a sulfur dust deflagration within 20-100 milliseconds. Using similar systems, Halon 1301 is a better suppressant than water.

6.0 REFERENCES

氎

1. McIntyre, F. L., Incident/Accident Su.vey (1950 through 197;), Edgewood Arsenal Contractor Report EM-CR-76011, December 1975.

2. McKown, G. L., Pyrotechnic Hazards Evaluation Program, Minutes of the Seventeenth Explosives Safety Seminar, pages 1473-1485, September 1976.

3. McIntyre, F. L., Evaluation of Violet Smoke Initiation Under Dynamic Conditions in the Jet Airmix Blender, Edgewood Arsenal Contractor Report EM-CR-77008, November 1976.

4. McIntyre, F. L., and W. R. Wilcox, Identification and Fvaluation of Hazards Associated with Blending of Violet Smoke Mix by Double Cone Process, Edgewood Arsenal Contractor Report EA-27R1, April 1977.

5. Nestle, W. R., Formulation of Hazard Evaluation Indices for Pyrotechnic Processes, Edgewood Arsenal Contractor Report EM-CR-74052, March 1975.

6. Nagy, John, <u>et al.</u>, Explosion Development in Closed Vessels, Bureau of Mines Report Number 7507, April 1971.

7. Liebmann, I. and J. K. Richmond, Suppression of Coal-Dust Explosions by Passive Water Barriers in a Single-Entry Mine, Bureau of Mines Report Number 7815, 1974.

APPENDIX

DATA SHEETS

DATA SHEET, TEST NO. 40-5-01

FUEL: Sulfur

- ×_2

\$

;

SUPPRESSANT: Halon

PARAMETER IDENTIFE ATION	INSTRUMENT LOCATION IN METERS FROM IGNITION END OF CHAMBER								
(TIMES 'N ms)	2.03	4.27	5.18	6.09	6.71	7.32	7.92	8.53	COMMENTS
Ion Probe Signal Time			181	187	195			20.8	Passive sensors showed burning
First Compression			101	101	100			200	5.79 meters from ignition end of
Wave Arrival Time			124	128	132	134		140	chamber
First Compression Wa'e Max Lum Pressure, psig			.40	. 40	.90	.75			
Suppressant Pres- sure Front Arrival Time			239	238	235	234		230	
U.V. Sensor Indica- tion of Flame Arrival		200							

DATA SHEET, TEST NO. 41-5-01

FUEL: Sulfur

SUPPRESSANT: Halon

PARAMETER IDENTIFICATION	INSTRUMENT LOCATION IN METERS FROM IGNITION END OF CHAMBER								
(TIMES IN ms)	3.05	4.27	5.18	6.09	5.71	7.32	7.92	8.53	COMMENTS
Ion Probe Signal Time Photocell Signal Time First Compression Wave Arrival Time			170 134	138		140	163	182 142	Passive sensors showed burning 6.40 meters from ignition end of chamber
First Compression Wave Maximum Pressure, psig			. 5	.4		• 9			
Suppressant Pres- sure Front Arrival Time			224	222		21 8	nanoverske st Antonio statu	206	
U.V. Sensor Indica- tion of Flame Arrival		182							

DATA SHEET, TEST NO. 47-5-01

FUEL: Sulfur

ッ

......

SUPPRESSANT: Halon

PARAMETER IDENTIFICATION		INSTRUMENT LOCATION IN METERS FROM IGNITION END OF CHAMBER								
(TIMES IN ms)	3.05	4.27	5.18	6.09	6.71	7.32	7.92	8.53	COMMENTS	
Ion Probe Signal Time	188	222	242	282		384	343	353	Passive sensors	
Photocell Signal Time	192		240	261			258	259	showed burning 6,40 meters from	
First Compression Wave Arrival Time		129	129	132		140			ignition end of chamber	
First Compression Wave Maximum Pressure, psig		.60	. 80	.40		. 55				
Suppressant Pres- sure Front Arrival Time		258	256	254	252	251				
UV Sensor Indica- tion of Flame Arrival		216.2								

DATA SHEET, TEST NO. 48-5-01

FUEL: Sulfur

SUPPRESSANT: Water

PARAMETER IDENTIFICATION		INSTRUMENT LOCATION IN METERS FROM IGNITION END OF CHAMBER									
(TIMES IN ms)	3.05	4.27	5,18	6.09	6.71	7.32	7.9 2	8.53	COMMENTS		
Ion Probe Signal Time First Compression Wave Arrival First Compression Wave Pressure	202.4	235.4 181 0.6 psi	251 184 0.5 psi	260.1 187 0.5 psi	274.6	298.2 191 0.6 psi	380	345.8	All the leaves of the burst disc sheared off and passed the bugh the nozzle. Probable initial plugging ac- counts for long delay in nozzle breakwire		

NOTE: Time reference lost on photo cell data and on pressure traces at 4.27 and 7.32 meter locations.

Start time reference for pressure curves at these locations estimated from curve through start time of pressure sensors located at 4.27 and 5.18 meter locations.

DATA SHEET, TEST NO. 49-5-01

FUEL Sulfur

P

.....

÷.

1

SUPPRESSANT: Water

PARAMETER IDENTIFICATION		INSTRUMENT LOCATION IN METERS FROM IGNITION END OF CHAMBER									
(TIMES IN ms)	3.05	4.27	5.18	6.09	6.71	7.32	7.92	8, 53	COMMENTS		
Ion Probe Signal Time	201	237	240	267	269	297	314	.332	Suppressant nozzle		
Photocell Signal Time		236	250	266	270	2 7 9	290	320	was 80 percent plugged with pieces		
First Compression Wave Arrival Time		148	154	158	no data	163			of burst disc Passive sensors showed burning		
First Compression Wave Maximum Pressure, psig		1.1	0. 85	0.7	no data	0.8			9.45 meters from ignition end of chamoer		
U.V. Sensor Indica- tion of Flame Arrival											

DATA SHEET, TEST NO. 49-5-02

FUEL: Sulfur

SUPPRESSANT: Water

PARAMETER IDENTIFICATION	INSTRUMENT LOCATION IN METERS FROM IGNITION END OF CHAMBER									
(TIMES IN ms)	3.05	4.27	5.18	6.09	6.71	7,32	7.92	8.53	COMMENTS	
Ion Probe Signal Time	238	288	325	343					Passive sensors	
Photocell Signal Time	282		322	359	399				showed burning 9.45 meters from ignition	
First Compression Wave Arrival Time		181	185	195		188.5			end of chamber	
First Compression Wave Maximum Pres- sure, psig		.25	.75	. 44		1.1				
Suppressant Pres- sure Front Arrival Time		320	317	314	31.2	310				
U.V. Sensor Indica- tion of Tlame Arrival		274		-						

DISTRIBUTION LIST

~~~<u>~</u>~

静

, S

ed 2004 -

South Strange

)))

|                                                                                                                                 | No. of Copies |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Commander<br>US Army Armament Research and<br>Development Command<br>Attn: DRDAR-LCM<br>Dover, NJ 07801                         | 1             |
| Commander<br>Pine Bluff Arsenal<br>Attn: Safety Office<br>Engineering and Technology<br>Pine Bluff, AR 71601                    | 1<br>1        |
| Commander<br>Frankford Arsenal<br>Attn: Safety Office<br>Bridge and Tacony Streets<br>Philadelphia, PA 19137                    | 1             |
| Commander<br>Rocky Mountain Arsenal<br>Attn: Safety Office<br>Denver, CO 80240                                                  | 1             |
| Director<br>National Aeronautics and Space Administration<br>Attn: Safety Office<br>Washington, DC 20546                        | 1             |
| Director<br>NASA National Space Technology Laboratories<br>Attn: Safety Office<br>NSTL Station, MS 39529                        | 1             |
| Chairman<br>Department of Defense<br>Explosives Safety Board<br>Forrestal Building, GB-270<br>Washington, DC 20314              | 1             |
| Commander<br>US Army Departments and Readiness Command<br>Attn: Safety Office<br>5001 Esienhower Avenue<br>Alexandria, VA 22333 | 2             |

| Project Manager, Munitions Production Base |   |
|--------------------------------------------|---|
| Attn. DRCPM-DRM-F/Mr. Dybacki              | 1 |
| USA Developments and Readiness Command     | 1 |
| Dover, NJ 07801                            |   |
| Director                                   |   |
| US Army Ballistics Research Laboratories   |   |
| Attn: Safety Office                        | 1 |
| Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005          |   |
| Director                                   |   |
| Defense Research & Engineering             | 1 |
| Pentagon                                   |   |
| Washington, DC 20310                       |   |
| Administrator                              |   |
| Defense Documentation Center               |   |
| Attn: Accessions Division                  | 2 |
| Cameron Station                            |   |
| Alexandria, VA 22314                       |   |
| Commander                                  |   |
| Chemical Systems Laboratory                |   |
| Attn: LRDAR-CLF                            | 1 |
| DRDAR-CLN                                  | 3 |
| Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010          |   |
| Commander                                  |   |
| Aberdeen Proving Ground                    |   |
| Attn: STEAP-AD-R/RHA                       | 1 |
| DRSAR-MAS-C                                | 5 |
| Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010          |   |

é

.....

A an

1

and a second second