

# Variation of Methods in Small-Scale Safety and Thermal Testing of Improvised Explosives

Mary M. Sandstrom,<sup>[a]</sup> Geoffrey W. Brown,<sup>[a]</sup> Daniel N. Preston,<sup>[a]</sup> Colin J. Pollard,<sup>[a]</sup> Kirstin F. Warner,<sup>[b]</sup> Daniel N. Sorensen,<sup>[b]</sup> Daniel L. Remmers,<sup>[b]</sup> Jason J. Phillips,<sup>[c]</sup> Timothy J. Shelley,<sup>[d]</sup> Jose A. Reyes,<sup>[e]</sup> Peter C. Hsu,<sup>[f]</sup> and John G. Reynolds<sup>\*[f]</sup>

**Abstract:** One of the first steps in establishing safe handling procedures for explosives is small-scale safety and thermal (SSST) testing. To better understand the response of homemade or improvised explosives (HMEs) to SSST testing, 16 HME materials were compared to three standard military explosives in a proficiency-type round robin study among five laboratories, two U.S. Department of Defense and three U.S. Department of Energy, sponsored by the Department of Homeland Security, Science & Technology Directorate, Explosives Division. The testing included impact, friction, electrostatic discharge (ESD) and thermal. The testing matrix was designed to address problems encountered with improvised materials: powder mixtures, liquid suspensions, partially wetted solids, immiscible liquids, and reactive materials. All testing materials and/or precursors came from the same batch distributed to each of the participants and were handled, pretreated, and mixed by standardized procedures. For this proficiency test, the participants had

similar equipment, usually differing by vintage. This allowed for a direct comparison of the results from each participant to the average of the results from all the participants. Some general trends observed for each series of tests were: (1) Drop hammer – LLNL usually found the materials less sensitive than the average with materials that have high sensitivity to impact and LANL usually found the materials less sensitive than the average with materials that have high sensitivity to impact; (2) friction – LLNL found the materials less sensitive than the average; (3) and ESD – IHD usually found the materials less sensitive than the average. In this report, the proficiency test data from all the participants is compared and contrasted for impact, selected friction, and ESD testing. Other friction and thermal data will be addressed elsewhere as well as the statistical analysis of several repeated measurements on the proficiency test standards.

**Keywords:** Small-scale safety testing · Homemade explosives · Improvised explosives · Impact · Friction · Electrostatic discharge

## 1 Introduction

Small-Scale Safety and Thermal (SSST) testing is one of the first steps in developing safe handling practices for energetic materials [1,2]. These tests are designed to determine sensitivity of energetic materials to handling and storage conditions – drop hammer for impact sensitivity, friction for shear force sensitivity, electrostatic discharge (ESD) for spark or static sensitivity, differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) for thermal stability, and many others tests for specific types of reactivity.

SSST testing methods were developed for primarily safe handling of military and mining explosives. With the increased interest in understanding improvised or homemade explosives (HMEs), SSST testing methods have been applied to various mixtures and pure materials that make up this class of energetic materials.

Performance evaluation of HMEs has been on the rise in recent years [3]. With this activity comes the need to apply SSST methods to develop safe handling protocols for HMEs. Often, HMEs are formed by mixing oxidizer and fuel

[a] M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, D. N. Preston, C. J. Pollard  
Los Alamos National Laboratory  
Los Alamos, New Mexico, USA

[b] K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers  
Naval Surface Warfare Center  
Indian Head Division  
Indian Head, Maryland, USA

[c] J. J. Phillips  
Sandia National Laboratories  
Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA

[d] T. J. Shelley  
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms  
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, USA

[e] J. A. Reyes  
Applied Research Associates  
Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, USA

[f] P. C. Hsu, J. G. Reynolds  
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
Livermore, California, USA  
\*e-mail: reynolds3@llnl.gov

precursor materials, and typically, the mixture precursors are combined shortly before use. The challenges to produce a standardized inter-laboratory sample are primarily associated with mixing and sampling. For solid-solid mixtures, the challenges primarily revolve around adequately mixing two powders on a small scale, producing a mixture of uniform composition – particle size and dryness often being a factor. For liquid-liquid mixtures, the challenges revolve around miscibility of the oxidizer with the fuel causing the possibility of multiphase liquid systems. For liquid-solid mixtures, the challenges revolve around the ability of the solid phase to mix completely with the liquid phase, as well as minimizing the formation of intractable or ill-defined slurry-type products. For all these mixtures, taking a representative sample is a barrier to adequate testing.

The Integrated Data Collection Analysis Program (IDCA), a Department of Homeland Security, Explosives Division funded effort, has been conducting SSST testing on a series of HME or improvised explosives, utilizing standard SSST testing practices as applied to military explosives [4]. The testing has been by a round-robin or proficiency test, where 19 HMEs and military explosives have been tested by three U.S. Department of Energy and two U.S. Department of Defense Laboratories – Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Sandia National Laboratories (SNL), Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head (IHD), and Air Force Research Laboratory, Tyndall Air Force Base (AFRL). This paper compares the testing results from these laboratories for impact (Type 12 or modified Type 12), friction (BAM), and electrostatic discharge (ABL and custom built). Comparison of BAM and ABL friction results, thermal results and issues, and statistical analyses of the proficiency test will be reported elsewhere. Preliminary results have been reported previously [5].

## 2 Results

The objectives of the IDCA effort are to accumulate SSST testing data on several HMEs, compare data from several laboratories taken on the same materials, and potentially derive statistical significance of the findings for both inter- and intra-laboratory performance. In order to achieve this, as many variables as possible in the testing were eliminated. Each component material was distributed to all the performers and the mixtures (when appropriate), were prepared, pretreated, and stored according to strict standardized procedures [6]. Test methods at the individual laboratories were modified to some extent, but each laboratory was allowed to use their own standard operating procedures when testing. In addition, no additional environmental controls were applied, so parameters, such as temperature and humidity, of testing varied throughout the testing and location. Data reduction methods selected were a modified Bruceton up-down method and Neyer D-Opti-

mal method for impact testing [7,8], modified Bruceton and Threshold Initiation Level (TIL) for friction [7,9], and TIL for ESD [9]. Each laboratory had a choice how to perform these analyses, so there were minor variations. For the modified Bruceton method, the variations were the choice of linear or log spacing. For TIL, the variation was the number of testing attempts. Detection methods for positive or negative reactions varied among the participants, although all participants used at least operator input in addition to other methods. For impact testing, all used sound and visible detection by the operator. In addition, LLNL and LANL employed microphones linked to a sound meter. For friction, all used sound and visual detection by the operator. For ESD, all used sound and visual detection by the operator while LLNL and SNL also used gas detection meters.

Due to the massive amount of data accumulated, only summary figures and tables are presented herein. A full listing of the data can be found in the Supporting Information available separately from the corresponding author [10].

### 2.1 Materials

Table 1 lists the materials used in the proficiency test, along with the abbreviations used throughout the text and the form of the material upon mixing.

The materials listed in Table 1 span a wide range of compositions and physical forms, some not encountered in normal SSST testing. Examples are: (1)  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ /fuel mixtures, due to the reactivity of the peroxide, can form intractable pastes that continually change (and are dangerous); (2)

**Table 1.** IDCA mixtures and pure materials formulations.

| Material <sup>a)</sup>                                | ID                                | Form <sup>b)</sup> |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{Al}$                             | $\text{KClO}_4/\text{Al}$         | Dry powder         |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{C}^{\text{c)}$                   | $\text{KClO}_4/\text{C}$          | Dry powder         |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{dodecane}$                       | $\text{KClO}_4/\text{D}$          | Wet powder         |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{dodecane}$                       | $\text{KClO}_3/\text{D}$          | Wet powder         |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{sugar}^{\text{d)}$               | $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$ 100     | Dry powder         |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{sugar}^{\text{e)}$               | $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$ AR      | Dry powder         |
| $\text{NaClO}_3/\text{sugar}^{\text{d)}$              | $\text{NaClO}_3/\text{Sg}$        | Dry powder         |
| $\text{AN}^{\text{f)}$                                | AN                                | White powder       |
| Bullseye® gunpowder                                   | GP                                | Black powder       |
| AN/Bullseye® gunpowder                                | AN/GP                             | Gray powder        |
| UNi/Al <sup>g)</sup>                                  | UNi/Al                            | Dry powder         |
| UNi/Al/S  | UNi/Al/S <sub>8</sub>             | Dry powder         |
| $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{cumin}^{\text{h)}$        | $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{Cmn}$ | Viscous paste      |
| $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{nitromethane}^{\text{j)}$ | $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{NM}$  | Miscible liquid    |
| $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{flour}^{\text{h,k)}$      | $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{Fl}$  | Sticky paste       |
| $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{glycerol}^{\text{h)}$     | $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{Gl}$  | Miscible liquid    |
| HMX Grade B   | HMX                               | Powder             |
| RDX Type II Class 5 <sup>l)</sup>                     | RDX                               | Powder             |
| PETN Class 4 <sup>l)</sup>                            | PETN                              | Powder             |

a) Mixture or pure material. b) Observed physical form. c) Activated charcoal (Darco). d) Icing sugar + −0.149 mm fraction  $\text{KClO}_3$ . e) Icing sugar + as received  $\text{KClO}_3$ . f) Ammonium nitrate. g) Urea nitrate. h)  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  (70%). i) *Cuminum cyminum*. j)  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  (90%). k) Chapati. l) Standard.

solid-solid mixtures can be composed of mismatched particle sizes where localized oxidizer to fuel ratios are significantly different than the bulk; (3) liquid-solid mixtures have volatile components that evaporate during the analysis changing the oxidizer to fuel mole ratio. All these are problematic and complicate obtaining representative and reproducible samples.

## 2.2 Impact Testing Results


Impact testing is used to evaluate the sensitivity of the energetic material to non-shock initiated reactions caused by dropping or having something dropped on it. The test is simple – the sample is placed in a holder (anvil) and a force is applied by dropping a weight at increasing heights until a reaction occurs.

All materials in Table 1 were examined for impact sensitivity by the drop hammer method. Three of the participants tested the full suite of materials, and two of the participants tested a subset. The full results are available in the Supporting Information. Each material was examined usually in triplicate or more. In some cases, different sandpapers were used by LLNL and LANL. The values in the figures below are averages of all the values with a specific sandpaper type for each listed material. Pelletized results were excluded from the averages and are discussed below.


### 2.2.1 Comparison of Results from Participants

Figure 1 and Figure 2 show graphs of the impact data from the individual participants compared to the average of all the participants for each material. The values are the  $DH_{50}$ , in cm, by a modified Bruceton method, load for 50% probability of reaction. The red line is the average data and the symbols are Individual laboratory data. (Note: values above the line indicate less sensitivity than the average and values below the line indicate higher sensitivity than the average.) The apparatus used by each participant: LANL, LLNL, IHD, Type 12; AFRL, SNL, MBOM with Type 12 tooling. There are two graphs, one for  $DH_{50}$  values that indicate a material reasonably sensitive to impact, from approximately 10 to 50 cm, and the other is for  $DH_{50}$  values that indicate a material with low sensitivity to impact, from 90 to 170 cm. The highest  $DH_{50}$  value reflects the drop weight height limits for the participants (in cm): LLNL, 170; LANL, 320; IHD, 320; AFRL, 116; SNL, 115. There were other materials that exhibited  $DH_{50}$  values above 170 cm. However, for comparison purposes, the 170 cm height was deemed as the cut-off value.

The results in Figure 1 for the 10 to 50 cm range show: LLNL (red circles) values mostly are above the average line for  $DH_{50}$  values below 40 cm; LANL (blue squares) values generally are below the average line for  $DH_{50}$  below 40 cm; IHD generally tracks LANL values, but shows slightly higher corresponding sensitivity; AFRL values generally report the highest sensitivity of all the participants for a specific



**Figure 1.** Impact data ( $DH_{50}$  in cm) for the average of all participants vs. the average of each of the participants in range of 0 to 50 cm.



**Figure 2.** Impact sensitivity data ( $DH_{50}$  in cm) for the average of all participants vs. the average of each of the participants in range of 90 to 170 cm.

material. The results in Figure 2 for the 90 to 170 cm range show: LLNL and AFRL values are below the average; LANL values are above the average; IHD values do not exhibit a trend.

Table 2 shows the relative ranking of the *solid* materials tested for impact sensitivity by LLNL, LANL, IHD, and AFRL based on  $DH_{50}$  values. AFRL did not participate in all of the testing, so some materials are missing from the relative

**Table 2.** Relative ranking of impact sensitivity for selected solid mixtures.<sup>a,b)</sup>

| LLNL                        | LANL                        | IHD                         | AFRL <sup>c)</sup>        |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| PETN                        | PETN                        | PETN                        | PETN                      |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /D        | KClO <sub>3</sub> /D        | KClO <sub>3</sub> /D        | KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg AR  |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg 100   | KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg AR    | KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg AR    | NaClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg    |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg AR    | KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg 100   | GP                          | GP                        |
| KP/Al                       | HMX                         | KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg 100   | RDX                       |
| RDX                         | GP                          | NaClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg      |                           |
| NaClO <sub>4</sub> /Sg      | RDX                         | HMX                         |                           |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /D        | NaClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg      | RDX                         |                           |
| HMX                         | KP/D                        | KClO <sub>4</sub> /D        | KClO <sub>4</sub> /D      |
| AN/GP                       | AN/GP                       | AN                          | KClO <sub>4</sub> /Al     |
| GP                          | KP/Al                       | AN/GP                       | AN                        |
| AN                          |                             | KClO <sub>4</sub> /Al       |                           |
| <i>KClO<sub>4</sub>/C</i>   | <i>AN</i>                   | <i>KClO<sub>4</sub>/C</i>   |                           |
| <i>UNi/Al</i>               | <i>KClO<sub>4</sub>/C</i>   | <i>UNi/Al</i>               |                           |
| <i>UNi/Al/S<sub>8</sub></i> | <i>UNi/Al</i>               | <i>UNi/Al/S<sub>8</sub></i> |                           |
|                             | <i>UNi/Al/S<sub>8</sub></i> |                             | <i>KClO<sub>4</sub>/C</i> |

a) For abbreviations see Table 1. b) Materials in italics showed no sensitivity at the upper testing limits of the equipment. c) AFRL performed limited testing.

**Table 3.** DH<sub>50</sub> [cm], impact sensitivity of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> mixtures.

| Material <sup>a)</sup>                           | LLNL BA <sup>b)</sup> | LANL BA <sup>c)</sup> | LLNL 180 <sup>d)</sup> | IHD 180 <sup>d)</sup> | IHD CD <sup>e)</sup> |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> <sup>h)</sup> /Cmn | > 177 <sup>f)</sup>   | 109.2 ± 6.6           | 86.0 ± 1.0             | 18.0 ± 1.0            | > 50 <sup>g)</sup>   |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> <sup>h)</sup> /FI  | > 177 <sup>f)</sup>   | 292.8 ± 4.9           | 92.6 ± 2.1             | 93.0 ± 28.7           | NA <sup>j)</sup>     |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> <sup>h)</sup> /GI  | > 177 <sup>f)</sup>   | 132.3 ± 6.1           | NA <sup>j)</sup>       | NA <sup>j)</sup>      | > 50 <sup>g)</sup>   |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> <sup>h)</sup> /NM  | 30.3 ± 3.1            | 9.3 ± 1.0             | NA <sup>j)</sup>       | NA <sup>j)</sup>      | > 50 <sup>g)</sup>   |

a) See Table 1 for abbreviations. b) BA = bare anvil, 1-kg striker weight. c) Bare anvil, 0.8-kg striker weight. d) 180-grit garnet dry sandpaper on anvil. e) Cavity drop cell. f) 177 cm is the drop height limit of LLNL drop hammer. g) 50 cm is the drop height limit of IHD Cavity drop cell. h) 70% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. i) 90% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. j) Did not test.

ranking. Although there are specific differences in the relative rankings comparing individual participant results, in general, the rankings can be divided into three sensitivity groups – PETN, middle sensitive, and insensitive. Note that the insensitivity is defined differently for each participant because of equipment configuration (drop height maximum).

All participants found PETN to be the most sensitive material. The KClO<sub>3</sub> mixtures are all rated relatively highly sensitive. KClO<sub>4</sub>/D, RDX, NaClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg, and HMX fall into the middle and AN/GP fall below those. GP and KClO<sub>4</sub>/Al vary widely depending upon the participant. KClO<sub>4</sub>/C, UNi/Al, and UNi/Al/S<sub>8</sub> exhibit no sensitivity. AN varies on the low end of sensitivity, and exhibits none for LANL.

The liquid mixtures were also ranked according to relative sensitivity. They were not included in Table 2 because the testing protocols were different than for the powders. LANL used a bare anvil with a custom-built design [11,12] that employs a ring of grease to contain the liquid sample and a magnet that holds the striker 3 mm above the liquid sample before testing. LLNL also used the grease on the same anvil as used for solid samples and uses a 1-kg striker placed on top of the grease ring before testing. In addition, LLNL and IHD used sandpaper in selected cases. IHD also

used the Cavity Drop cell, ASTM D 2540–93 [11,13,14], that has a closed cavity for holding the liquid sample in place.

Table 3 shows the DH<sub>50</sub> results from the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>-based mixtures. Except for H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/NM mixture, LLNL found the mixtures insensitive when using the bare anvil. Even though LANL found all the mixtures sensitive using the bare anvil, only H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/NM exhibited any significant sensitivity (slightly less than PETN at 8.1 ± 0.6 cm). Both IHD and LLNL found the materials to be sensitive when using sandpaper to hold the mixtures in place. Using the Cavity Drop cell, IHD found the materials not to have sensitivity. However, the limiting drop height for this cell is 50 cm.

### 2.2.2 Variability Caused by Sandpaper

In the drop hammer test, Type 12A testing requires the use of sandpaper. The sample is placed on the sandpaper, and then positioned on the anvil, where the striker weight is usually placed on top of the sample, at least for solids. The testing is complete when the drop weight impacts on the striker weight. Table 4 shows the sensitivity of selected materials in this study from testing using the different sandpaper to hold the sample. DH<sub>50</sub> values are shown relative to the RDX standard measured with the corresponding sand-

**Table 4.** Variability in impact sensitivity of selected materials relative to RDX<sup>a)</sup> based on sandpaper.

| Material                  | Lab  | 120                 | 150   | 180   |
|---------------------------|------|---------------------|-------|-------|
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /D      | LLNL | 14.4                |       | −12.5 |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /Al     | LLNL | 152.9 <sup>b)</sup> |       | −4.9  |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /D      | LLNL | 152.9 <sup>b)</sup> |       | 8.7   |
| PETN                      | LLNL | −13.3               |       | −13.5 |
| AN                        | LLNL | 131.9               |       | 60.2  |
| AN/GP                     | LLNL | 61.7                |       | 25.0  |
| HMX                       | LLNL | 21.9                |       | 16.4  |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg 100 | LANL |                     | −8.4  | −10.2 |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg AR  | LANL |                     | −10.4 | −10.4 |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /D      | LANL |                     | −14.2 | −12.7 |

a) Values determined by Bruceton DH<sub>50</sub>, in cm, relative to RDX measured with the same sandpaper. b) DH<sub>50</sub> value higher than the highest drop weight level (177 cm) for LLNL.


paper. The sandpaper is delineated by grit size. LLNL performed testing on selected materials using both 120-grit Si/C sandpaper and 180-grit garnet sandpaper (IDCA standard). LANL performed testing on selected materials using 150-grit and 180-grit (IDCA standard) garnet sandpapers.

For mixture KClO<sub>3</sub>/D, KClO<sub>4</sub>/Al, KClO<sub>4</sub>/D, AN, AN/GP, LLNL data shows a very large discrepancy between the results using 120-grit Si/C and corresponding 180-grit garnet sandpapers. The military materials, PETN and HMX, show some, but little differences. For the KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg mixtures and KClO<sub>3</sub>/D, LANL data show slight differences between the results from the 150- and the corresponding 180-grit sandpapers.

### 2.2.3 Neyer D-Optimal and Bruceton Comparison

LANL performed impact testing by both Bruceton and Neyer D-Optimal analysis protocols of all the materials. Figure 3 compares these results for materials that exhibited sensitivity up to the 40 cm drop height.

The agreement of the two methods is clear from the Figure. Most determinations for a specific material fall around the 1 to 1 correlation line. Only PETN shows some discrepancy from the 1 to 1 correlation. This discrepancy is discussed below.

**Figure 3.** Comparison of DH<sub>50</sub> values determined by the modified Bruceton method to Neyer D-Optimal method.

### 2.2.4 Powder and Pressed Samples

LLNL determined the impact sensitivity of selected materials in two different forms – pelletized and free-flowing powder. The pelletized form was selected because many military-type explosives are routinely tested in this form. Table 5 shows the DH<sub>50</sub> results for the RDX standard and HMX. For both materials, the pressed pellets exhibit less sensitivity than the corresponding loose powders.

### 2.3 Friction Testing Results

Friction sensitivity was measured in the proficiency test by testing on BAM and ABL equipment. Reported herein are the friction testing results on the BAM equipment. The results for the ABL equipment will be reported elsewhere with a comparison analysis of these materials on both the ABL and BAM equipment [15]. Friction testing is used to

**Table 5.** Impact sensitivity comparing RDX and HMX in pellet and powder form.

| Form <sup>a,b)</sup>           | T [°C] | RH <sup>c)</sup> [%] | DH <sub>50</sub> <sup>d)</sup> [cm] | s <sup>e)</sup> [cm] | s <sup>e)</sup> [log unit] |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| RDX Pellet (120) <sup>f)</sup> | 24     | 18                   | 28.8                                | 2.8                  | 0.042                      |
| RDX Powder (120) <sup>f)</sup> | 23     | 22                   | 24.2                                | 0.8                  | 0.015                      |
| RDX Powder (120) <sup>f)</sup> | 23     | 23                   | 22.0                                | 1.9                  | 0.035                      |
| RDX Pellet (120) <sup>g)</sup> | 24     | 32                   | 34                                  | 4.63                 | 0.059                      |
| RDX Powder (120) <sup>h)</sup> | 24     | 18                   | 24.8                                | 3.09                 | 0.054                      |
| HMX Pellet (120)               | 24     | 18                   | 46                                  | 9.38                 | 0.088                      |
| HMX Pellet (180)               | 23     | 20                   | 41                                  | 1.13                 | 0.012                      |
| HMX Powder (180)               | 25     | 18                   | 38                                  | 3.07                 | 0.035                      |

a) Pellet is pressed in a commercial powder press, powder is loose flowing powder. b) Value in parentheses: 120 is 120-grit Si/C wet sandpaper, 180 is 180-grit garnet dry sandpaper. c) Relative humidity. d) Values determined by Bruceton DH<sub>50</sub> in cm. e) Standard deviation. f) From RDX-1 (see Supporting Information). g) From RDX-2 (see Supporting Information). h) From RDX-3 (see Supporting Information).




evaluate non-shock initiated reactions due to the energetic material being subjected to abrasion. For the BAM equipment test, the material is staged on a movable porcelain or ceramic porous surface that is actuated under a stationary stylus. The force on the pin is increased until a reaction occurs. The full results are listed in the Supporting Information.

Figure 4 shows the average friction data from the individual participants for each material compared to the average of all the participants for each material. The BAM measurements are on equipment (different vintages) at LLNL, LANL, and IHD laboratories. AFRL does not have a BAM apparatus.  $F_{50}$ , in kg, is by a modified Bruceton method, load for 50% probability of reaction. The red line is the average of all the data, in kg, and the symbols are the individual lab data.

The results in Figure 4 show: LLNL (red dots) always derives a value for  $F_{50}$  above the corresponding average value for each of the materials (except in one case); LANL (blue squares) always derives a value for  $F_{50}$  below the corresponding average value for each of the materials; IHD (green diamonds) values tend to be around the corresponding average values. LLNL finds the materials to be less sensitive.

Table 6 lists the relative order of the materials for friction sensitivity determined by the modified Bruceton method on the BAM equipment. LLNL and LANL identify about the same relative sensitivity, although in a slightly different order. In addition, the same materials are identified as insensitive. The first four most sensitive materials are the same, and the next four materials are the same, although in different order, and so on.



**Figure 4.** Friction sensitivity by modified Bruceton method ( $F_{50}$  in kg) for the average of all participants vs. the average of each of the participants taken on BAM testing equipment.

**Table 6.** BAM friction sensitivity relative ranking by Bruceton Friction method,  $F_{50}$ , for LLNL, LANL, and IHD.<sup>a,b)</sup>

| LLNL                                  | LANL                                  | IHD   |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| NaClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg                | KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg AR              | KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg AR                          |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg 100             | NaClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg                | KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg 100                         |
| PETN                                  | KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg 100             | PETN  |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg AR              | PETN                                  | H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> /Cmn                |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /Al                 | GP                                    | AN/GP   |
| HMX                                   | HMX                                   | HMX   |
| GP                                    | KClO <sub>4</sub> /Al                 | KClO <sub>4</sub> /Al                             |
| RDX                                   | RDX                                   | NaClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg                            |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /D                  | AN/GP                                 | H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> /GI                 |
| AN/GP                                 | KClO <sub>3</sub> /D                  | RDX   |
|                                       |                                       | KClO <sub>3</sub> /D                              |
| <i>KClO<sub>4</sub>/D</i>             | <i>KClO<sub>4</sub>/D</i>             |   |
| <i>KClO<sub>4</sub>/C</i>             | <i>KClO<sub>4</sub>/C</i>             | <i>KClO<sub>4</sub>/C</i>                         |
| <i>AN</i>                             | <i>AN</i>                             | <i>AN</i>   |
| <i>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/Cmn</i> | <i>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/Cmn</i> | <i>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/FI<sup>c)</sup></i> |
| <i>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/FI</i>  | <i>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/FI</i>  | <i>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/NM<sup>c)</sup></i> |
| <i>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/GI</i>  | <i>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/GI</i>  | <i>UNi/Al</i>                                     |
| <i>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/NM</i>  | <i>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/NM</i>  | <i>UNi/Al/S<sub>8</sub></i>                       |
| <i>UNi/Al</i>                         | <i>UNi/Al</i>                         |   |
| <i>UNi/Al/S<sub>8</sub></i>           | <i>UNi/Al/S<sub>8</sub></i>           |   |

a) For abbreviations see Table 1. b) Materials in italics showed no sensitivity at the upper testing limits of the equipment. c) IHD did not test by Modified Bruceton.

The relative sensitivity order determined by IHD is somewhat different. However, if the two H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> mixtures are removed from the list, the relative sensitivity order is about the same as determined by LLNL and LANL, except for the placement of NaClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg.

Table 7 lists the friction values determined on the BAM equipment using the TIL friction method by LLNL, LANL, and IHD. SNL measured the TIL values for two materials, RDX, and PETN and found (in kg)  $16.3 \pm 0.5$  and  $3.3 \pm 0.2$ , respectively. The following summarizes the TIL results, for the:

- (1) Military explosives (RDX, PETN, and HMX), LLNL always finds the material less sensitive than the others; LANL usually finds the material less sensitive than IHD, and IHD usually finds the material more sensitive than the others.
- (2) Mixtures that are solids (KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg 100, (KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg AR, KClO<sub>3</sub>/D, KClO<sub>3</sub>/Al, KClO<sub>4</sub>/D, KClO<sub>4</sub>/C, NaClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg, AN, GP, AN/GP, UNi/Al, UNi/Al/S<sub>8</sub>), LLNL shows the material to be less sensitive than both LANL and IHD for most materials; LANL and IHD vary position on sensitivity; only IHD found the UNi mixtures sensitive.
- (3) Mixtures that are liquids or viscous (H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/Cmn, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/FI, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/GI, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/NM), only IHD found any of the materials sensitive; LLNL and LANL did not register any sensitivity within the limits of their equipment.
- (4) Mixtures that were found insensitive to the limits of the equipment (KClO<sub>4</sub>/D, KClO<sub>4</sub>/C, AN, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/Cmn, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/FI, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/GI, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/NM, UNi/Al, UNi/Al/S<sub>8</sub>), LLNL and LANL

**Table 7.** BAM friction sensitivity as measured by TIL method for LLNL, LANL, IHD.<sup>a,b,c)</sup>

| Material                           | LLNL [kg]          | LANL [kg]            | IHD [kg]             |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| RDX 1                              | 19.2 ± 2.4         | 19.2                 | 15.1 ± 0.7           |
| RDX 2                              | 18.0 ± 1.2         | 10.4 ± 1.4           | 11.8 ± 0.7           |
| RDX 3                              | 16.8               | 11.4 ± 1.4           | 11.4 ± 0.7           |
| RDX 4                              | 16.3 ± 0.5         | 13.9 ± 1.4           | 11.8 ± 0.6           |
| PETN                               | 6.4 ± 0.8          | 4.9                  | 4.7 ± 0.9            |
| HMX                                | 13.1 ± 1.2         | 12.2                 | 8.6                  |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg 100          | 6.8 ± 1.1          | 2.4                  | 2.0 ± 0.6            |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg AR           | 8.8 ± 2.1          | < 2.4 <sup>d)</sup>  | 2.8 ± 0.2            |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /D               | 12.3 ± 0.9         | 7.2                  | 2.8 ± 0.2            |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /Al              | 9.6 ± 1.2          | 7.2                  | 12.2 ± 2.5           |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /D               | > 36 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36 <sup>e)</sup>   | 33.1 ± 3.7           |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /C               | > 36 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36 <sup>e)</sup>   | > 36.7 <sup>e)</sup> |
| NaClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg             | 6.1 ± 0.2          | 2.4                  | 4.4 ± 1.6            |
| AN                                 | > 36 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36 <sup>e)</sup>   | > 36.7 <sup>e)</sup> |
| GP                                 | 16.4 ± 1.8         | 5.6 ± 1.4            | 13.9 ± 1.4           |
| AN/GP                              | 27 ± 2.5           | 13.0 ± 1.4           | 12.2                 |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> /Cmn | > 36 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36.7 <sup>e)</sup> | 8.6                  |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> /FI  | > 36 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36.7 <sup>e)</sup> | 11.4 ± 0.7           |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> /GI  | > 36 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36.7 <sup>e)</sup> | 11.8 ± 0.7           |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> /NM  | > 36 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36.7 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36.7 <sup>e)</sup> |
| UNi/Al                             | > 36 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36.7 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36.7 <sup>e)</sup> |
| UNi/Al/S <sub>8</sub>              | > 36 <sup>e)</sup> | > 36.7 <sup>e)</sup> | 13.1 ± 1.2           |

a) Threshold Initiation Level (TIL) is the load /kg, at which zero reactions out of twenty or fewer trials with at least one reaction out of twenty or fewer trials at the next higher load level. b) Average of individual values ± standard deviation. c) Numbers without ± values indicate all the same value was measured. d) Sensitivity too high for instrument to measure. e) Sensitivity too low for instrument to measure.

always agreed; IHD often did not agree and usually found the materials moderately sensitive (not just marginally sensitive).

- (5) Mixtures with sugar as the fuel (KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg 100, KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg AR, NaClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg), the sensitivity order determined is LLNL < IHD < LANL.

## 2.4 Electrostatic Discharge Testing Results


ESD testing is used to evaluate the non-shock initiated reactions due to the energetic material becoming exposed to spark or static discharge. The test is simple, the material is located between two electrodes and increasingly energetic sparks are discharged until a reaction is detected. In the proficiency test, two ESD systems were used, the commercially available ABL system (differing vintages) and a custom built system by LLNL. Except where noted, all the data compared below were derived from comparable ABL systems. The full results are listed in the Supporting Information.

## 2.4.1 Comparison of Performance

Figure 5 shows the ESD TIL data taken by the ABL equipment. TIL is the load (joules), at which zero reactions out of twenty or fewer trials with at least one reaction out of twenty or fewer trials at the next higher energy level. The averages of individual data of each participant are represented vs. average data of all the participants (1:1 is red line). LLNL (red dots) and AFRL (black triangles) have limited data sets with the ABL device. In general, IHD (green diamonds) report lower sensitivities compared to LANL (blue squares).

Table 8 shows the average TIL values for the ESD measurements. All the data shown were from measurements with no additional resistance incorporated in the circuit. LLNL, using a custom made ESD system with a 510-Ω resistor in the circuit (to mimic the human body), measured sensitivity of multiple materials (RDX 1, RDX 2, KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg 100, KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg AR, KClO<sub>3</sub>/D, NaClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg, AN, GP, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/Cmn, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/FI, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/GI H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/NM). This is discussed below. During the proficiency test, LLNL also brought on-line an ABL ESD system and was able to complete testing at 0-Ω resistance of some materials in Table 8. SNL was also able to bring online an ABL system very late in the proficiency test, and found PETN to have sensitivity between what AFRL and IHD measured.

The relative ranking of the TIL values in Table 8 as well as the comparison with the group average values is difficult to accomplish because of the limited data available taken on the same ESD platform. However, as in Figure 5, LANL and IHD have complete data sets for all the materials on the same platform, which allows for a relative ranking between the two participants based on sensitivity:



**Figure 5.** ESD sensitivity data (TIL in J) for the average of all participants vs. the average of each of the participants taken on ABL testing equipment.

**Table 8.** Average threshold initiation level<sup>a)</sup> data for ABL ESD testing.<sup>b–f)</sup>

| Material <sup>g)</sup>                           | LLNL [J]      | LANL [J]       | IHD [J]       | AFRL [J]      |
|--|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| RDX 1  | NA            | 0.025          | 0.095         | ND            |
| RDX 2  | NA            | 0.0375 ± 0.022 | 0.037         | ND            |
| RDX 3  | 0.038         | 0.025          | 0.076 ± 0.033 | ND            |
| RDX 4  | 0.038         | 0.025          | 0.095         | ND            |
| PETN <sup>h)</sup>                               | 0.033 ± 0.004 | 0.025          | 0.219 ± 0.093 | 0.043 ± 0.023 |
| HMX  | 0.068 ± 0.006 | 0.0375 ± 0.022 | 0.219 ± 0.093 | ND            |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg 100                        | NA            | 0.0625         | 0.272 ± 0.093 | ND            |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg AR                         | NA            | 0.125          | 0.272 ± 0.093 | 0.092 ± 0.001 |
| KClO <sub>3</sub> /D                             | NA            | 0.125          | 0.142 ± 0.040 | ND            |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /AI                            | 0.0088        | 0.0125         | 0.020 ± 0.005 | 0.025 ± 0.006 |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /D                             | 0.25          | 0.25           | 0.118 ± 0.040 | 0.273 ± 0.032 |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /C                             | 1.09 ± 0.30   | 0.208 ± 0.072  | 0.272 ± 0.093 | 0.13          |
| NaClO <sub>3</sub> /Sg                           | NA            | 0.208 ± 0.072  | 0.142 ± 0.040 | 0.177 ± 0.023 |
| AN   | NA            | 0.125          | 0.326         | 0.313 ± 0.058 |
| GP   | NA            | 0.025          | 0.1625        | ND            |
| AN/GP  | NA            | 0.0625         | 0.165         | ND            |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> <sup>i)</sup> /Cmn | NA            | 0.0625         | 0.326         | ND            |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> <sup>j)</sup> /FI  | NA            | 0.025          | 0.326         | ND            |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> <sup>j)</sup> /GI  | NA            | 0.038 ± 0.023  | 0.142 ± 0.040 | ND            |
| H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> <sup>j)</sup> /NM  | NA            | 0.025          | 0.118 ± 0.040 | ND            |
| UNi/AI   | 0.323 ± 0.051 | 0.125          | 0.099 ± 0.064 | ND            |
| UNi/AI/S <sub>8</sub>                            | 0.25          | 0.125          | 0.791 ± 0.805 | ND            |

a) Threshold Initiation Level (TIL) is the load (J) at which zero reaction out of twenty or fewer trials with at least one reaction out of twenty or fewer trials at the next higher load level. b) Data from measurements using ABL system with 0-Ω resistance. c) Data are the average of typically 3 measurements using 0/10 or 0/20 trials. d) Values with ± indicate a range in results for the TIL trials, values with no ± indicate all results were the same. e) NA = data not taken with 0-Ω resistance. f) ND = not determined. g) For abbreviations, see Table 1. h) SNL measured 0.125 ± 0.043 J. i) 70% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> concentration. j) 90% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> concentration.

LANL: KClO<sub>4</sub>/AI > PETN = RDX 1 = RDX 3 = RDX 4 = GP = H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/FI = H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/NM > RDX 2 = HMX > H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/GI > H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/Cmn = AN/GP = KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg 100 > KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg AR = KClO<sub>3</sub>/D = AN = UNi/AI = UNi/AI/S<sub>8</sub> > KClO<sub>4</sub>/C = NaClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg > KClO<sub>4</sub>/D

IHD: KClO<sub>4</sub>/AI > RDX 2 > RDX 3 > RDX 1 = RDX 4 > UNi/AI > KClO<sub>4</sub>/D = H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/NM > KClO<sub>3</sub>/D = NaClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg = H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/GI > GP > AN/GP > PETN = HMX > KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg 100 = KClO<sub>3</sub>/Sg AR = KClO<sub>4</sub>/C > AN = H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/FI = H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/Cmn > UNi/AI/S<sub>8</sub>

Other than KClO<sub>4</sub>/AI, there is little correlation between the two lists. Even using groupings based on sensitivity ranges, there are few if any matches.

#### 2.4.2 Comparison of ABL and Custom Built ESD

As mentioned above, LLNL started the proficiency test with a custom-built ESD system. This system was designed with a 510-Ω resistor in the circuit to mimic the human body. Several of the materials were tested with that system. Table 9 shows those results using the TIL method. During the proficiency test, LLNL obtained a new ABL ESD testing system and retested several of the materials. Table 9 shows these results and compares them to the ESD testing results by the custom-built system. The LLNL custom-built system indicates most of the materials to be insensitive to ESD. Only the KClO<sub>4</sub>/AI mixture exhibits sensitivity to ESD. However, for the ABL systems, all laboratories reported measurable sensitivity of these same materials.

**Table 9.** ESD data from LLNL custom and ABL systems.

| Sample                | Custom 510-Ω, TIL | ABL 0-Ω, TIL    | Laboratory |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------|
| RDX                   | 0/10 at 1.0 J     | 0/10 at 0.038 J | LLNL       |
| HMX                   | 0/10 at 1.0 J     | 0/10 at 0.068 J | LLNL       |
| PETN                  | 0/10 at 1.0 J     | 0/10 at 0.033 J | LLNL       |
| UNi/AI                | 0/10 at 1.0 J     | 0/10 at 0.038 J | LLNL       |
| KClO <sub>4</sub> /AI | 0/10 at 0.25 J    | 0/10 at 0.088 J | LLNL       |

### 3 Discussion

Many of the figures show comparisons of the testing results on the same materials from the different participants. Clearly, there are some notable trends. It is important to note that these trends are not due to differences in the materials tested at each site. Each material was purchased by one participant from a single batch as specified by the manufacturer and distributed to all the other participants. The material was then pretreated as designated at the start of the proficiency test. Most of the materials studied are mixtures of two or more components, and the formulation and mixing procedures were also specified. In addition, some materials required specialized storage after pretreatment, which was also designated. These procedures are documented elsewhere [6,16]. Most pretreatment requirements were drying and sieving, and most mixing require-



ments were following component ratios and times from preparation to making measurements [4, 16].

Although some effort was given to determine the nature of the differences in results among the participants, most of the reasons for these differences are not well defined. Much more research needs to be conducted on specific topics to link cause and effect that is beyond the scope of this paper.

### 3.1 Impact Results

#### 3.1.1 Comparison of Individual Results

Figure 1 and Figure 2 show that, compared to the average, LLNL drop hammer results show less sensitivity when testing is below 40 cm  $DH_{50}$  and LANL drop hammer results show less sensitivity when testing above 40 cm  $DH_{50}$ . This can be attributed to LLNL and LANL detection methods compared to the other participants. Both use microphones for positive detection, so detection sensitivity can potentially be more systematic than observation. However, the microphone type, placement, and response factors are not standardized. The LLNL microphone system is less sensitive at low  $DH_{50}$  values, but is more affected by background noise at high  $DH_{50}$  values than the LANL microphone. AFRL values generally show each material has the highest sensitivity compared to corresponding values from other participants. This could be due AFRL using the largest striker weight and operator sensitivity. Also, IHD values generally track the LANL corresponding values but show higher sensitivity than LANL values. This is probably due to operator sensitivity compared to microphone sensitivity. IHD shared the design of the drop hammer with LANL, so they have almost the same equipment (different vintages, IHD – 1945; LANL – 1954).

Table 2 compares the relative rankings of impact sensitivity of the powdered materials. All four participants agree on the most sensitive materials. Except for AN, they agree on the insensitive materials also. AN is ranked with low sensitivity by all except LANL, where it is ranked with no sensitivity. AN has been shown to give a wide range of results because of the difficulty in determining a positive reaction [17]. The details of this will be reported elsewhere.

Table 3 compares the  $DH_{50}$  results for the mixtures containing  $H_2O_2$ . Different testing protocols were used for these materials than for the powders due to the physical nature of the samples. The principal issue is how to contain a material that can flow on the flat anvil surface. Using a bare anvil, as do LLNL and LANL, requires containment. Both used a ring of grease. This method, however, shows relatively insensitive results, probably because flat, finished surfaces (bare anvil and bare striker) provide few if no sites for reactions. Early work in impact testing has shown that abrasive action assists in initiating non-shock reactions [18], and the bare/smooth anvil does not have many of these sites. LLNL and IHD used 180-grit sandpaper for two of the

mixtures. The results in the table reflect the increased number of abrasive sites of the sandpaper that facilitate reactivity as demonstrated by the increased sensitivity measured. IHD also used the Cavity Drop cell for some of the materials. The cell has flat surfaces touching the sample, but the sample is contained with an O-ring. The O-ring seals the sample into an airtight chamber. The chamber is filled 50% with the liquid sample and 50% with air. Adiabatic compression is the primary cause if there is initiation, although there may be small areas where the metal surface impacts the sample. The measured sensitivity is likely to be similar to the bare anvil. However, the design of the cell does not permit drop heights above 50 cm.

The only  $H_2O_2$  mixture that shows significant sensitivity is the  $H_2O_2$ /NM. This is probably because the  $H_2O_2$  component is 90% pure.

#### 3.1.2 Sandpaper Effects

Table 4 shows that the relative values of the impact sensitivity of a solid material differ, depending upon what type of sandpaper is selected to hold the material on the anvil. This behavior varies much more for the HME materials than for the standard military materials.

To further highlight this difference, Table 10 shows results of impact testing of the  $KClO_4$ /Al mixture as performed by LANL, LLNL, IHD, and AFRL using different sandpapers. The values are averages of three or more determinations (listed in the Supporting Information). All laboratories used 180-grit garnet sandpaper, and LLNL also used 120-grit Si/C sandpaper.

**Table 10.** Impact testing results for  $KClO_4$ /Al mixture.<sup>a)</sup>

| Laboratory | Sandpaper       | $DH_{50}^{b)}$ [cm] |
|------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| LLNL       | 120-grit Si/C   | > 177               |
| LLNL       | 180-grit garnet | 16.9 ± 0.9          |
| LANL       | 180-grit garnet | 62.1 ± 6.8          |
| IHD        | 180-grit garnet | 41.3 ± 2.1          |
| AFRL       | 180-grit garnet | 41.4 ± 4.3          |

a) Each value average from three or more values listed in the Supporting Information. b) Modified Bruceton method [cm], load for 50% probability of reaction ( $DH_{50}$ ).

The average  $DH_{50}$  values based on sandpaper are: 120-grit Si/C, insensitive (exceeds equipment response); 180-grit garnet,  $40.6 \pm 15.8$  cm (14 determinations). The standard deviation is below the 0.16 log unit range where applicable. For impact testing, when using 180-grit sandpaper, all participants show the  $KClO_4$ /Al mixture to be relatively insensitive. LLNL found it more sensitive than the LLNL-determined sensitivity of RDX, while the other participants found the  $KClO_4$ /Al mixture value less sensitive than their determined sensitivity of RDX. This is further complicated by the LLNL determined sensitivity of the  $KClO_4$ /Al mixture using 120-grit sandpaper. LLNL could not measure a positive

event in the drop hammer testing range using this sandpaper (LLNL drop height limit is 177 cm).

The results in Table 10 and Table 4 show a substantial difference in  $DH_{50}$  values for a specific material when different sandpapers are used. This could be due to several factors seen in the properties of the sandpapers. Full analysis is beyond the scope of the proficiency test and will be reported in the future. Briefly, the types of sandpaper differ in several properties. (1) The different grit size means different average particle sizes (in mm: 120-, 150-, 180-grit; 0.115, 0.092, 0.082) [19]. This would suggest more particles per mm with smaller grit size, and therefore more reaction sites. However, this appears not the case because a visual inspection of SEM images indicates the particle counts are the same on all of the sandpapers (note: this count was hand done on a limited number of SEM images). (2) The grit composition also could be a factor. The 120-grit particle is Si/C and the 150- and 180-grit particles are garnet [general formula  $X_3Y_2(SiO_4)_3$ ,  $X$ =several 2+ cations,  $Y$ =usually Al]. (3) The hardness of the grit could be a factor because the values are different (garnet, 6.5–7.5; Si/C, 9–10, on the Mohs hardness scale [20]). This could greatly affect the number of actual reaction sites because the garnet may shatter more readily upon contact with the striker. Early work on non-shock initiation suggested that the harder the particulate, the better the chance for a reaction, although thermal conductivity cannot be ruled out [18]. (4) Sandpaper thickness and composition of the sandpaper backing may also play a role. The 120-grit paper is a woven fabric (consistent with wet/dry papers) with a thickness of 0.406 mm (0.016 in). The garnet papers are thin plain papers (consistent with dry only applications) with a thickness of 0.229 mm (0.009 in). This could affect energy transfer between the striker and the sample. (5) The glue could also affect the performance. The 120-grit sandpaper has a proprietary water resistant resin and the garnet papers have hide glue.

These other features of sandpaper, along with grit particles, must be included in a discussion of the role of sandpaper in non-shock initiated reactions. This subject has been studied for a long time, but almost all the studies focus on grit, and not the other aspects of the sandpaper. Clearly grit is important. Early work suggested grit hardness [21] as being a deciding factor, but more detailed studies indicated grit melting point and thermal conductivity were also important [22]. Unfortunately, the original studies did not represent hardness particularly well. Later studies have shown that grit interactions with metal surfaces cause hot spots (particularly relevant in skid tests), so hardness of the grit is important (with caveats of grit melting point and thermal conductivity), as well as particle size [23–27]. Although these studies are very important in understanding the effect of grit or dirt contamination on the stability of energetic materials, and include some sandpaper data, the definitive study on sandpaper still needs to be done. HME contributes additional issues as it can be considered grit in

some cases (mixtures with solids) that has definite particle size ranges.

### 3.1.3 Neyer D-Optimal and Bruceton Method Comparison

Figure 3 compares the impact sensitivity ( $DH_{50}$ ) of each of the materials as determined by the Neyer D-Optimal and the modified Bruceton methods. Note that these determinations are on separate testing data collected and reduced as opposed to the same testing data reduced by two different methods. For almost all the materials, these two methods give similar  $DH_{50}$  values for a specific material. However, PETN was the exception where the results from the two methods were considerably different:  $DH_{50}$  average three determinations, in cm, Neyer  $10.3 \pm 0.4$ ; Bruceton  $8.1 \pm 0.5$ . This may be an anomaly in the proficiency test. LANL has extensive experience with a different preparation of PETN (RPS 3518) where the two methods give almost identical results averaged over several years: 3 recent years ( $n=40$ ) Bruceton,  $13.8 \pm 1.7$  cm; 1.5 recent years ( $n=36$ ) Neyer  $12.4 \pm 1.9$  cm. The measurements on the proficiency test PETN need repeating to understand the behavior.

### 3.1.4 Pressed Samples Compared to Powder Samples

Table 5 shows a limited data set on materials examined for impact sensitivity on both powder and corresponding pressed sample forms. Clearly pressing tends to make the material less sensitive to impact, consistent with early work on non-shock initiated reactions [28]. The choice of examining the HMEs as powders only was based on the unlikelihood of the materials ever being pressed in practice.

## 3.2 BAM Friction Sensitivity

### 3.2.1 Comparison of Individual Results

Figure 4 shows, for the BAM friction testing results, LLNL generally always has the highest  $F_{50}$  values compared to the other laboratories indicating LLNL finds each material less sensitive than LANL and IHD (note AFRL does not have BAM equipment and SNL limited data is not included). This is likely due to the LLNL system being completely enclosed in a glove box with a HEPA filter than other systems (see Experimental below for the configuration). These added environmental and safety controls make determining a positive reaction more difficult because of the noise insulating effect of the glove box and the added background noise of the HEPA filter system. LANL sometimes has values lower than IHD that possibly is caused by room acoustics, operator differences, and/or humidity.

Table 6 shows the relative order based on the  $F_{50}$  values of sensitivity. As noted, LLNL and LANL have similar rankings due to sensitivity, and, if the  $H_2O_2$ -based materials are removed from the list, IHD also agrees, in general. Both LLNL and LANL measured the  $H_2O_2$  mixtures to be com-

pletely insensitive to the friction stimulation. The reasons for this have not been elucidated, but are suspected to be due to the ceramic sample holder and the stylus used for stimulation not being standardized for the proficiency test or also due to humidity effects. The stylus used by LANL, for example, was purchased from a different source than the stylus used by LLNL. As far as humidity effects, the ceramic sample holder is dried before use, but the differences among ambient relative humidity at the three participants (IHD, approximately 50%; LANL, <10%; LLNL, 10–25%) could effect how much the porous ceramic absorbs moisture before analyzing the sample.

The friction sensitivities as measured by the TIL method, shown in Table 7, for the most part follow the relative order or sensitivities as measured by the  $F_{50}$  method. IHD found more of the  $H_2O_2$  mixtures sensitive, while LLNL and LANL did not. This result, combined with the behavior seen in the  $F_{50}$  data suggests that IHD system responds to viscosity differently than the LLNL and LANL systems for an undetermined reason.

### 3.3 ESD Sensitivity

#### 3.3.1 ABL ESD Sensitivity

Figure 5 shows for the ESD testing, IHD reports materials to be less sensitive compared to corresponding values determined by LANL. This could be due to IHD having the oldest ABL ESD equipment of the participants, using different needles, operating in higher humidity, and operation with a detection procedure with the room lights on versus off. The IHD instrument was one of the first brought into production and has not had the same calibration as the newer equipment. The absolute values of these energy levels are likely different than later-built equipment. In addition, the age of the instrument is reflected in the lack of flexibility in setting energy levels, something very important in TIL measurements. The Supporting Information also lists the relative humidity during the measurements for all the participants. IHD levels are always close to 50% RH, whereas LANL levels are <10% except for two months in the late summer. Humidity has been known to affect static discharge [29]. Note, in these determinations, AFRL measured a limited subset of materials, and most of LLNL data is from the custom built system that was not included in the figure.

#### 3.3.2 Comparison of ABL and Custom ESD Sensitivity

Table 9 compares selected ESD sensitivity determined by the TIL method from data taken by LLNL on the ABL and the custom-built systems. The 510- $\Omega$  resistor in the circuit of the custom-built system has a very large effect on the indication of sensitivity. Only  $KClO_4/Al$  of the entire suite of materials measured by LLNL had any sensitivity with this system. The 510- $\Omega$  resistor is a more practical assessment

of electrostatic transfer through the body, which was the design criterion of the system. NIOSH has determined the human body response varies depending upon the energetic bias placed on it, but uses 1000  $\Omega$  as a guideline for the human body resistance [30]. While resistance can be added to new versions of the ABL system, older systems, such as those at LANL and IHD do not have this capability. As a result, 0- $\Omega$  resistance was used as the baseline setting.


### 3.4 Parameter Variations

The proficiency test sample suite presents several permutations in materials and/or test conditions. These variations were chosen to see if certain material properties (such as a series of oxidizers) or if test conditions (such as sandpaper type) can make a difference in SSST results. These variations are:

1. RDX Standard tested 4 times or more.
2. 10+ materials, where  $DH_{50}$  values measured at two or more types of sandpaper (120-, 150-, and 180-grit).
3. 20+ materials analyzed by two  $DH_{50}$  analysis methods (Neyer and Bruceton).
4. 20+ materials analyzed by two friction analysis methods [threshold (TIL) and Bruceton ( $F_{50}$ )].
5. 10+ materials analyzed on two ESD apparatuses (ABL and LLNL Custom).
6.  $H_2O_2$  mixtures with two different concentrations of  $H_2O_2$  (90 and 70%).
7.  $H_2O_2$  mixtures with four different organic fuels.
8. 18+ materials measured in DSC with two sample holders (vented and sealed).
9. 20+ materials analyzed on two different friction apparatuses (ABL and BAM).
10. Two mixtures with particle size differences in  $KClO_3$ .
11. Two fuels (sugar and dodecane) mixed with three different oxidizers ( $KClO_3$ ,  $KClO_4$ ,  $NaClO_3$ ).
12. One oxidizer ( $KClO_4$ ) mixed with three different fuel types (Al, C, and dodecane).
13. Two component mixture combinations (AN, gunpowder, AN/gunpowder; UNi/Al and UNi/Al/ $S_8$ ).

The data for variation 1 are presented here in summary form. However, the data were reduced using statistical methods and the results will be published separately. Variations 2–7 are discussed above. Variations 8 and 9 will be published separately. Variations 10–13 are discussed below.

Variation 10:  $KClO_3/Sg$  100 and  $KClO_3/Sg$  AR mixtures differ based on particle size of the  $KClO_3$  [31]. The  $KClO_3$  in  $KClO_3/Sg$  100 mixture was separated using a 0.149 mm sieve; in  $KClO_3/Sg$  AR was used as received (all went through a 0.400 mm sieve). Figure 6 shows the pore size distribution and photographs of the two preparations of  $KClO_3$  used in the  $KClO_3/Sg$  mixtures. Except for large particles in the AR photos, there are little differences in the size distributions. Likewise, Table 11 shows there is little differ-



**Figure 6.** Size distribution by laser light scattering (left side) and photograph (right side) of  $\text{KClO}_3$  as received and screened through a 0.149 mm sieve.

**Table 11.** Average SSST testing results for  $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$  100 and  $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$  AR.<sup>a)</sup>

|                               | LLNL                           | LANL                           | IHD                            |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Impact                        | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$ AR  | 15.6                           | 10.3                           | 10.3                           |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$ 100 | 14.9                           | 10.6                           | 14.3                           |
| Friction                      | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$ AR  | 9.5; 11.8                      | 2.4; 4.9                       | 3.2; 3.6                       |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$ 100 | 6.9; 9.9                       | 4.8; 5.8                       | 2.3; 4.4                       |
| ESD                           | TIL [J]                        | TIL [J]                        | TIL [J]                        |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$ AR  | 0/10 at 1.0                    | 0/20 at 0.125                  | 0/20 at 0.272                  |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$ 100 | 0/10 at 1.0                    | 0/20 at 0.0625                 | 0/20 at 0.272                  |

a) Impact sandpaper, LLNL 120-grit, LANL and IHD, 180-grit; TIL for BAM friction, 0/10 for LLNL; 0/20 for LANL and IHD; ESD LLNL Custom built; LANL and IHD ABL.

ence in the SSST results for the two mixtures when comparing intra-laboratory results.

As shown above, sandpaper grit particulate size possibly has some effect on determining the sensitivity of a material, certainly in drop hammer studies. It does not appear that this extends to the particle size of the materials themselves. However, Figure 6 shows that both the particle size and distribution of the two materials are about the same, except for very large particles. Because the sampling is so small in SSST testing, a potential reason for the similar DH<sub>50</sub> sensitivities of the two mixtures could be that the sampling selected about the same size materials and left out the large size material, and therefore the testing gave similar results. The

probable hidden parameter is there are no particle size differences for these two mixtures.

**Variation 11:** Mixtures of sugar with  $\text{KClO}_3$  and  $\text{NaClO}_3$  [32] and dodecane with  $\text{KClO}_3$  and  $\text{KClO}_4$  [33] were examined to see if the oxidizer had much affect on the sensitivity of the mixture. Table 12 compares the SSST results between  $\text{KClO}_4/\text{D}$  and  $\text{KClO}_3/\text{D}$  for LLNL, LANL, and IHD. Clearly the oxidizer does make a difference in the results for impact and BAM friction sensitivity. Not shown is the comparison between  $\text{NaClO}_3$  and  $\text{KClO}_3$  mixtures with sugar (raw data can be found in the Supporting Information). Similarly, when comparing intra-laboratory results, the  $\text{NaClO}_3/\text{Sg}$  mixture was less sensitive to impact, yet similar

**Table 12.** Average SSST testing results for  $\text{KClO}_4/\text{D}$  and  $\text{KClO}_3/\text{D}$ .<sup>a)</sup>

|                          | LLNL                           | LANL                           | IHD                            |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Impact                   | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{D}$ | 30.5                           | 28.8                           | 19.3                           |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{D}$ | 9.3                            | 8.1                            | 10.3                           |
| Friction                 | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{D}$ | > 36; > 36                     | > 36; > 36                     | 33; > 36                       |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{D}$ | 12.3; 25.5                     | 7.2; 19.1                      | 16.5; 26.8                     |
| ESD                      | TIL [J]                        | TIL [J]                        | TIL [J]                        |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{D}$ | 0/10 at 1.0                    | 0/20 at 0.250                  | 0/20 at 0.118                  |
| $\text{KClO}_3/\text{D}$ | 0/10 at 1.0                    | 0/20 at 0.125                  | 0/20 at 0.140                  |

a) All DH<sub>50</sub>, 180-grit garnet sandpaper; BAM friction, TIL 0/10 for LLNL, 0/20 for LANL and IHD; ESD LLNL Custom Built, LANL and IHD, ABL.

**Table 13.** Average SSST testing results for  $\text{KClO}_4/\text{fuel}$  mixtures.<sup>a)</sup>

|                           | LLNL                           | LANL                           | IHD                            |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Impact                    | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{C}$  | > 177                          | > 320                          | > 320                          |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{Al}$ | 17                             | 62                             | 41                             |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{D}$  | 30.5                           | 28.8                           | 19.3                           |
| Friction                  | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{C}$  | > 36; > 36                     | > 36; > 36                     | > 36; ND                       |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{Al}$ | 12.3; 25.5                     | 7.2; 19.1                      | 16.5; 26.8                     |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{D}$  | > 36; > 36                     | > 36; > 36                     | 33; > 36                       |
| ESD                       | TIL [J]                        | TIL [J]                        | TIL [J]                        |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{C}$  | 0/10 at 1.0                    | 0/20 at 0.250                  | 0/20 at 0.118                  |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{Al}$ | 0/10 at 0.25                   | 0/20 at 0.125                  | 0/20 at 0.140                  |
| $\text{KClO}_4/\text{D}$  | 0/10 at 1.0                    | 0/20 at 0.250                  | 0/20 at 0.118                  |

a) Impact sandpaper, LLNL 120-grit, LANL and IHD, 180-grit; BAM friction TIL 0/10 for LLNL, 0/20 for LANL and IHD; ESD LLNL Custom Built, LANL and IHD, ABL.

**Table 14.** Average SSST testing results for AN, GP, and AN/GP.<sup>a)</sup>

|          | LLNL                           | LANL                           | IHD                            |
|----------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Impact   | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          | DH <sub>50</sub> [cm]          |
| AN/GP    | 46.8                           | 29.0                           | 21.3                           |
| GP       | 54.2                           | 20.7                           | 12.3                           |
| AN       | 82                             | > 320                          | 201                            |
| Friction | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] | TIL [kg]; F <sub>50</sub> [kg] |
| AN/GP    | 27.0; 32.7                     | 13.0; 19.0                     | 12.2; 12.7                     |
| GP       | 16.4; 20.7                     | 5.6; 9.3                       | 13.8; NA                       |
| AN       | > 36; > 36                     | > 36.7; > 36.7                 | > 36.7; > 36.7                 |
| ESD      | TIL [J]                        | TIL [J]                        | TIL [J]                        |
| AN/GP    | 0/10 at 1.0                    | 0/20 at 0.0625                 | 0/20 at 0.165                  |
| GP       | 0/10 at 1.0                    | 0/20 at 0.0250                 | 0/20 at 0.1625                 |
| AN       | 0/10 at 1.0                    | 0/20 at 0.125                  | 0/20 at 0.326                  |

a) All DH<sub>50</sub>, 180-grit garnet sandpaper; BAM friction TIL 0/10 for LLNL, 0/20 for LANL and IHD; ESD LLNL Custom Built, LANL and IHD, ABL.

in sensitivity to BAM friction, and ESD compared to the corresponding results for the  $\text{KClO}_3/\text{Sg}$  AR mixture.

**Variation 12:**  $\text{KClO}_3$  was mixed with three different fuel sources to see the effects certain types of fuel have on sensitivity [34]. Dodecane and C (as activated charcoal) are organic based materials; Al was selected as an inorganic component (added to energetic materials for increased afterburn). Table 13 shows the comparisons of the average results. The big differences are in the impact and the friction

sensitivity, as the C mixture shows insensitivity. For ESD, however, the fuel source is sensitive to spark and possibly drives the results.

**Variation 13:** AN and GP were tested separately and then combined and tested [35]. Table 14 shows the average results. Interestingly, the AN/GP sensitivities are not linear combinations of the two component sensitivities.

Synergetic affects between the GP and AN are likely the cause of this. However, AN is an extremely difficult material






Figure 7. Particle size distribution of GP and AN.

to subject to SSST testing [36], especially for the drop hammer experiment. It has low sensitivity and is difficult to discern a positive reaction (a more detailed account of this will be presented elsewhere). Another issue is sampling. DSC studies have shown it is difficult to obtain a representative sample because of the difference in particle size distribution. Figure 7 shows the particle size distribution for the two component materials. The GP is much more narrow in the distribution and if small samples are obtained, the sample can easily not match the bulk compositionally. Also studied were the UNi/Al and UNi/Al/S<sub>8</sub> mixtures. These mixtures exhibited almost no sensitivity, so a comparison of the effects of adding sulfur cannot be assessed.

## 4 Experimental Section

### 4.1 Materials

#### 4.1.1 Sources

Table 1 lists the materials used in this study. The mixtures were prepared according to IDCA procedures [6]. Each material came from a common batch that was distributed at the beginning of the program to each participant, except for H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, which was distributed by the purchasing laboratory to the participants, because of safe handling requirements by the manufacturer (FMC). The batch was portioned by the manufacturer and then distributed to the participants (FMC required special handling procedures and training). The H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> was received as 90% and 70%; concentrations checked by refractive index and used directly [40]. The RDX Type II Class 5 standard was lot # HOL89D675-081; the PETN Class 4 was lot # W723220, both manufactured by Holston Army Ammunition plant and both donated by IHD. In the case of mixtures, the components were distributed and mixed at the testing site. The following chemicals were purchased: KClO<sub>4</sub> and KClO<sub>3</sub> from Columbus Chemicals Industry; NaClO<sub>3</sub>, AN, nitromethane, and

glycerine from Fisher Scientific; Bullseye® smokeless powder from Alliant; UNi from TCI America; Al from Valimet; charcoal from Aldrich; dodecane from Alfa Aesar; S from Sigma-Aldrich; icing sugar from C & H; flour from Piggly Wiggly (Laxmi brand); cumin from Safeway (generic), C (as activated DARCO brand charcoal) from Sigma-Aldrich, and HMX from ATK.

#### 4.1.2 Pretreatment, Storage, and Mixing

Details of sample pretreatment, storage, and mixing are described in detail elsewhere [6, 16]. Briefly, RDX, KClO<sub>3</sub>, KClO<sub>4</sub>, NaClO<sub>3</sub>, sugar, cumin, flour, AN, and C were dried at 60 °C for 16 h, cooled, and stored in a dessicator until use. KClO<sub>3</sub>, sugar, cumin and flour materials were separated by sieves before pretreatment. RDX, AN and C were dried at each laboratory, while cumin and flour were separated by sieves (0.149 mm), dried, and finally distributed.

All materials were mixed at 10 g or less. The solid-solid mixtures were blended by hand (Teflon spatula) for 5 to 10 min and then mixed using a jar mill or V-blender for an additional 5–10 min. Solid-liquid mixtures (except H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> mixtures) were blended for 5 to 10 min until homogeneous by hand or with a magnetic stirring system. The liquid-liquid systems (H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> mixtures) were mixed using a magnetic stirring system for 10–15 min while the temperature was monitored with thermocouple. All mixtures were used after a 1-h rest period.

**Safety Note:** H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> mixtures have been documented to self-heat with time at larger batch sizes. It is recommended to use the mixtures within a few hours of mixing and then destroy the residuals. If longer term experiments are necessary, monitor the temperature profile for the on-set of runaway reactions [37].


### 4.2 Testing Methods

For the Proficiency test, the SSST testing methods were aligned as much as possible without significantly modifying the standard test procedures incorporated at each laboratory. There were slight differences in procedures, but when possible, these procedures were standardized (such as distributing the same sandpaper for drop hammer testing) if the change had little or no deviation from the adopted procedure for each laboratory.

#### 4.2.1 Impact Testing

Impact testing was performed with custom built equipment at LLNL, LANL, and IHD as Type 12, and with commercial equipment at AFRL and SNL as modified Bureau of Mines (MBOM) to Type 12 testing. Figure 8 shows examples of both systems (LLNL and AFRL).

For the drop hammer testing of solids, the sample size was 35 ± 2 mg; 180-grit garnet dry, 150-grit garnet dry, and 120-grit Si/C wet/dry sandpaper were used to hold sample




**Figure 8.** Examples of drop hammer equipment: (a) Type 12 at LLNL (circa 1956); (b) MBOM with Type 12 tooling at AFRL (circa 2009).

in place; drop weight was 2.5 kg; striker weight was variable (LLNL, IHD, AFRL and SNL 2.5 kg, LANL 0.8 kg); positive reaction was a pop, flash or smoke; detection was by sound meter (LLNL, LANL) and/or observation (LLNL, LANL, IHD, AFRL, SNL). For drop hammer testing of liquids, these apply: sample held by grease ring (LANL, AFRL, SNL), grease ring or sandpaper (LLNL), grease ring, cavity drop or sandpaper (IHD); drop weight 1.0 kg (LLNL only).

#### 4.2.2 BAM Friction Testing

Friction testing was performed with BAM friction test equipment of various vintages, but all of essentially the same design.

Figure 9 [41] shows examples of the different configurations of the BAM friction equipment. For the testing, the sample sizes ranged from 5 to 40 mg (approximated but not weighed); samples were held on a ceramic plate that varied in size and composition; pin on which the load is applied also varied in composition; environmental control with a suction duct (IHD, LANL) or with a closed glove box



**Figure 9.** Examples of BAM friction equipment: (a) diagram, (b) IHD venting configuration, (c) LLNL venting configuration.

and HEPA filter (LLNL); detection for a positive event is by observation for all participants of a pop, smoke, or jetting.

#### 4.2.3 ESD Testing

For the proficiency test, all participants employed ABL ESD testing equipment of different vintages. In addition, LLNL utilized a in-house custom built system with a 510- $\Omega$  resistor in series in the circuit to mimic the human body. The test is simple, the sample is placed between two electrodes and a charge that is stored in a capacitor is discharged through the sample. Figure 10 shows examples of the ESD equipment utilized by the participants. Generally, the sample size was 5 to 40 mg (approximated but not weighed); the sample was held in place by tape (LANL-scotch, LLNL-Mylar) or none (IHD, AFRL); detection by observation for all participants; positive detection by a pop, puff, smoke, noise. Energy is set at discrete levels as dictated by the version of the ABL ESD and the custom-built system.



**Figure 10.** Examples of the ESD equipment used in the proficiency test: (a) close-up of ABL electrodes, (b) ABL equipment, (c) custom-built equipment by LLNL.

#### 4.3 Data Reduction Methods

For impact testing, two methods were used – modified Bruceton [7,38] and Neyer D-Optimal [8]. For friction testing, three methods are used – modified Bruceton, Neyer D-Optimal (rarely), and TIL (threshold) [9]. The D-Optimal method was applied to friction data in two cases at the high end of insensitivity because test conditions no longer met the modified Bruceton assumptions test criteria. For ESD testing, one method was used – TIL. These methods have been reviewed previously, are well established and will only be summarized briefly herein.

##### 4.3.1 Threshold Initiation Level (TIL)

This method [9] tests at discrete energy levels and determines the level that gives no reaction in a set amount of trials as well as levels that trigger reactions. For BAM friction, the TIL is the load (kg) at which zero reaction out of twenty or fewer trials with at least one reaction out of twenty or fewer trials at the next higher load level. In this BAM friction test, the load levels are controlled by the posi-

tion and size of the weight positioned on the load arm. For ESD, the TIL is the load (joules) at which zero reactions out of twenty or fewer trials with at least one reaction out of twenty or fewer trials at the next higher load level. In ESD, the load level is set by the energy (which is converted to joules at a fixed voltage) charged to the circuit to generate the spark that passes through the sample.

#### 4.3.2 Probability of Reaction

Both the modified Bruceton and the Neyer D-Optimal are employed to determine 50% probability of reaction. For the proficiency test, all laboratories used the modified Bruceton method, and LANL also used the Neyer D-Optimal method. The general approach of the two methods is the same: choose an algorithm for picking test levels and number of tests, carry out testing, following the algorithm, noting the result at each level, and then analyze the results for mean and standard deviation. An optimized algorithm meets laboratory and testing needs: faster determination with fewer tests, better determination of mean (higher confidence), and better determination of standard deviation. However, there are drawbacks in this approach. Attempts to optimize all of these simultaneously, usually leads to trading confidence for more rapid testing (fewer tests).

The modified Bruceton method was developed at ERL, Bruceton PA, in early 1940s, and was optimized by Tukey [39], Dixon, and Mood [7]. It is optimal for determining 50% reaction level, but is not optimal for determining standard deviation without extra testing. The Neyer D-Optimal method was developed at EG&G Mound, Miamisburg, OH in the 1980s by Barry T. Neyer [8]. It does not rely on very strict assumptions, and can run tests optimized for mean or some other probability level – at any positive or negative test level. The result is equal confidence in mean and standard deviation.

#### 4.3.3 Averaging Methods

Almost all determinations (experimental data sets for each data reduction method) were performed in triplicate (or more). The Bruceton and Neyer methods produce a value that represents 50% probability of reaction (midway on a reactivity curve) and a standard deviation. The individual determinations were averaged and these values were used for the graphs and the comparisons in this report. The TIL method determines the onset of the sensitivity (approximately 2 or 3% on the upswing of the reactivity curve). This uses a discrete insult level approach, so only specific levels are recorded in the raw data. These specific levels correlate to limited settings on the equipment. As a result, because each participant had different vintages of the same equipment, each participant reported different, but discrete levels in the raw data. Although somewhat of an inexact method, the three (or more) discrete results for a specific material were averaged for the comparisons. This

can result in a value that the participant can not actually measure. For example, ESD data for HMX by IHD is 0.165, 0.326, 0.165 J, which are discreet settings of the ABL equipment used by IHD for the measurements. In this report, the three values are averaged to 0.219 J, which is not a setting on the IHD equipment. However, this estimates the average insult level determined by IHD in the ESD comparison figure.

## Conclusions

Many of the HME materials tested in this study are sensitive to the differences in the test methods and equipment employed by each laboratory. This leads to differing evaluations of sensitivity, some of which are significant from a safety standpoint. Some of these differences can be eliminated by standardization but others are inherent in the configurations and environments that each laboratory has established to safely test energetic materials. Elimination of the differences will require further research to accomplish, however. The work has shown that it is important to be able to test materials under a variety of conditions because of the multiple types of insults possible to these materials. Exploring a range of variables provides the best chance of probing the particular set of test parameters that highlight the extent of sensitivity of the material. Sandpaper properties, striker mass, and the method of detecting the generated sound or reaction are all examples of important variables. Because these variables may not be easily explored at a single facility, it is very beneficial, if possible, to have materials tested at multiple laboratories and reported in the literature. The established standards that each laboratory uses are still appropriate for testing HME materials because they generally show that an instrument and method are working as expected, as long as material is well characterized and the standards are well studied.

## Supporting Information (see footnote on the first page of this article): Symbols and Abbreviations

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| ABL              | Allegany Ballistics Laboratory   |
| AFB              | Air Force Base   |
| AFRL             | Air Force Research Laboratory, Tyndall AFB, FL   |
| AN               | Ammonium nitrate   |
| AR               | As received  |
| BAM              | German Bundesanstalt für Materialprüfung   |
| DH <sub>50</sub> | The height the weight is dropped in the drop hammer experiment that cause the sample to react 50% of the time, calculated by the Bruceton or Neyer methods |
| DHS              | Department of Homeland Security  |
| DSC              | Differential Scanning Calorimetry  |
| ESD              | Electrostatic Discharge  |

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| F <sub>50</sub> | The weight used in friction test that cause the sample to react 50% of the time, calculated by the Bruceton or Neyer methods |
| HEPA            | High efficiency particulate air filter   |
| HMEs            | Home made explosives (improvised explosives)   |
| HMX             | Cyclotetramethylene-tetranitramine   |
| IDCA            | Integrated Data Collection and Analysis Program  |
| IHD             | Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head Division   |
| LANL            | Los Alamos National Laboratory   |
| LLNL            | Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory   |
| MBOM            | Modified Bureau of Mines drop hammer   |
| NIOSH           | National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health   |
| PETN            | Pentaerythritol tetranitrate   |
| RDX             | 1,3,5-Trinitroperhydro-1,3,5-triazine  |
| SEM             | Scanning Electron Microscope   |
| SNL             | Sandia National Laboratories   |
| SSST            | Small Scale Safety and Thermal Testing   |
| TIL             | Threshold Initiation Level   |
| UNI             | Urea nitrate   |

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank Doug Bauer, Laura J. Parker and Greg Struba for their enthusiastic support. This work was performed by the Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program, a five-lab effort supported by Los Alamos National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, the Air Force Research Laboratory, and Indian Head Division, Naval Surface Warfare under sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Science and Technology Directorate, Explosives Division. Los Alamos National Laboratory is operated by Los Alamos National Security, LLC, for the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC52-06NA25396. Sandia is a multi-program laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation, a Lockheed Martin Company, for the U.S. Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under Contract DE-AC04-94AL85000. This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. The Air Force Research Laboratory and Indian Head Division, Naval Surface Warfare also performed work in support of this effort under contract HSHQDC10X00414. LLNL-JRNL-649574 (769520).

## References

- [1] Good general description of small safety and thermal testing of explosives can be found at: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Safety\\_testing\\_of\\_explosives](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Safety_testing_of_explosives).
- [2] DOE Manual 440.1-1A, *DOE Explosives Safety Manual*, 2006, January 9, <http://www.directives.doe.gov>.
- [3] J. A. Bullock, G. D. Haddow, D. P. Coppola, *Introduction to Homeland Security, Principals of all Hazards Risk Management*, 4th Ed., Elsevier, Waltham, 2013.
- [4] J. G. Reynolds, M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, K. F. Warner, T. J. Shelley, P. C. Hsu, Challenges of Small-Scale Safety and Thermal Testing of Improvised Explosives Presentation, *Pacificchem*, Honolulu, HI, USA, December 17, 2010, LLNL-PRES-461618.
- [5] J. G. Reynolds, M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, K. F. Warner, J. J. Phillips, T. J. Shelley, J. A. Reyes, P. C. Hsu, DHS Small-Scale Safety and Thermal Testing of Improvised Explosives – Comparison of Testing Performance, *APS-SCCM & AIRAPT-24 Joint Conference*, Seattle WA, USA, July 7–12, 2013, Journal of Physics Conference Series, 2014, 500, 052037.
- [6] B. D. Olinger, M. M. Sandstrom, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, J. S. Moran, T. J. Shelley, L. L. Whinnery, P. C. Hsu, R. E. Whipple, M. Kashgarian, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – Mixing Procedures and Materials Compatibility*, IDCA Program Analysis Report 002, LLNL-TR-422028, Livermore, CA, USA, 2009, December 27.
- [7] W. J. Dixon, A. M. Mood, A Method for Obtaining and Analyzing Sensitivity Data, *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 1948, 43, 109–126.
- [8] B. T. Neyer, D-Optimality-Based Sensitivity Test, *Technometrics* 1994, 36, 48–60.
- [9] Department of Defense Ammunition and Explosives Hazard Classification Procedures, TB 700-2 NAVSEAINST 8020.8B TO 11A-1-47 DLAR 8220.1, Washington, DC, USA, January 5, 1998.
- [10] For a Current list of IDCA Analysis Reports see: M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, J. J. Phillips, T. J. Shelley, J. A. Reyes, P. C. Hsu, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – Bullseye Smokeless Powder* IDCA Program Analysis Report 026, LLNL-TR-637818 (756807), Livermore, CA, USA, May 30, 2013, and references within.
- [11] M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, L. L. Whinnery, J. J. Phillips, T. J. Shelley, J. A. Reyes, P. C. Hsu, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – SSST Testing Methods*, IDCA Program Analysis Report 009, LLNL-TR-630173 (742792), Livermore, CA, USA, March 25, 2013.
- [12] D. N. Preston, *ERL Drop Weight Impact Procedure with Liquids*, IDCA Program Data Report 118, Livermore, CA, USA, January 18, 2012.
- [13] *Standard Test Method for Drop-Weight Sensitivity of Liquid Monopropellants*, ASTM D 2540-93 (reapproved in 2001). This method is identical in substance with the JANNAF method, “Drop Weight Test”, Test Number 4, Liquid Propellant Test Methods, DTIC Selected Report AD-B193 877, 94 8 03 077, 94-24646, Chemical Propulsion Information Agency, Laurel, MD, USA, 1964.
- [14] D. Levine, C. Boyars, Sensitivity of Nitroglycerin to Impact, *Combust. Flame* 1965, 9, 131–140; and United States Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, MD, USA, NOLTR 65-54, May 20, 1965.
- [15] K. F. Warner, M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, D. L. Remmers, J. J. Phillips, T. J. Shelley, J. A. Reyes, P. C. Hsu, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – ABL and BAM Friction Analysis Comparison*, *Propellants Explos. Pyrotech.* submitted, 2014.
- [16] B. D. Olinger, M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, J. S. Moran, T. J. Shelley, L. L. Whinnery, P. C. Hsu, R. E. Whipple, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – Drying Procedures*, IDCA Program Analysis Report 004, LLNL-TR-465872, Livermore, CA, USA, April 27, 2010.
- [17] M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, L. L. Whinnery, J. J. Phillips, T. J. Shelley, J. A. Reyes, P. C. Hsu, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – Ammonium Nitrate*, IDCA Program Analysis Report 025, LLNL-TR-636915 (755705), Livermore, CA, USA, May 17, 2013.

- [18] F. P. Bowden, O. A. Gurton, Initiation of Explosions by Grit Particles, *Nature* **1948**, 162, 654–655.
- [19] Grit Size Comparison Chart, L. Rawlins, <http://www.cs.rochester.edu/u/roche/rec.wood.misc/grit.sizes.html>.
- [20] The Mohs hardness scale was created by Fredrick Mohs in 1826. Talc has a hardness of 1 and Diamond has a hardness of 10; [http://www.reade.com/Particle\\_Briefings/mohs\\_hardness\\_abrasive\\_grit.html](http://www.reade.com/Particle_Briefings/mohs_hardness_abrasive_grit.html).
- [21] W. Taylor, A. Weale, Conditions for the Initiation and Propagation of Detonation in Solid Explosives, *Trans. Faraday Soc.* **1938**, 34, 995–1010.
- [22] F. P. Bowden, O. R. Gurton, Initiation of Explosives by Impact and Friction: the Influence of Grit, *Proc. R. Soc. London A* **1949**, 198, 337–349.
- [23] W. L. Perry, J. A. Gunderson, M. M. Balkey, P. M. Dickson, Impact-Induced Friction Ignition of an Explosive: Infrared Observations and Modeling, *J. Appl. Phys.* **2010**, 108, 084902.
- [24] P. D. Peterson, G. R. Avilucea, R. L. Bishop, J. A. Sanchez, Individual Contributions of Friction and Impact on Non Shock Initiation of High Explosives, *15th Conference of the American Physical Society Topical Group on Shock Compression of Condensed Matter*, Waikoloa, HI, USA, June 24–29, **2007**, AIP Conference Proceedings 955, p. 983–986.
- [25] R. V. Browning, P. D. Peterson, E. L. Roemer, M. R. Oldenborg, D. G. Thompson, R. Deluca, Experimental Study of Grit Particle Re-Enhancement in Non Shock Ignition, *14th Conference of the American Physical Society Topical Group on Shock Compression of Condensed Matter*, Baltimore, MD, USA, July 31–August 5, **2005**, AIP Conference Proceedings 845, p. 1041–1044.
- [26] G. R. Parker Jr., E. M. Heatwole, M. D. Holmes, J. A. Gunderson, A. M. Novak, P. Dickson, *The Effect of Grit on Frictional Heating During Oblique Impacts with PBX 9501*, Los Alamos National Laboratory Report, LA-UR-13–25703, Rev 1, Los Alamos NM, USA, July 30, **2013**.
- [27] R. V. Browning, P. D. Peterson, E. L. Roemer R. J. Scammon, Grit Particle Enhanced Non Shock Ignition of Explosives, *13th Conference of the American Physical Society Topical Group on Shock Compression of Condensed Matter*, Portland, OR, USA, July 20–25, **2003**, AIP Conference Proceedings 706, p. 921–924.
- [28] A. S. Dyer, J. W. Taylor, Initiation of Detonation by Friction on a High Explosive Charge, *5th Symposium (International) on Detonation*, Pasadena, CA, USA, August 18–21, **1970**, p. 291–300.
- [29] R. C. Allen, *Humidity and ESD Control*, ESD Systems Report, Desco Industries, Inc., **1998**, [http://esdsystems.descoindustries.com/whitepapers/wp\\_humidity.html](http://esdsystems.descoindustries.com/whitepapers/wp_humidity.html).
- [30] Worker Deaths by Electrocution, *A Summary of NIOSH Surveillance and Investigative Findings*, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 98–131, **1998**.
- [31] M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, D. N. Preston, C. J. Pollard, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, T. J. Shelley, P. C. Hsu, R. E. Whipple, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – KClO<sub>3</sub> (as received)/Icing Sugar*, IDCA Program Analysis Report 011, LLNL-TR-484715, Livermore, CA, USA, May 26, **2011**.
- [32] M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, D. N. Preston, C. J. Pollard, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, T. J. Shelley, P. C. Hsu, R. E. Whipple, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – NaClO<sub>3</sub>/Icing Sugar*, IDCA Program Analysis Report 019, LLNL-TR-617403 (721773), Livermore, CA, USA, February 11, **2013**.
- [33] M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, D. N. Preston, C. J. Pollard, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, T. J. Shelley, L. L. Whinnery, P. C. Hsu, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – KClO<sub>4</sub>/Dodecane Mixture*, IDCA Program Analysis Report 015, LLNL-TR-522941, Livermore, CA, USA, May 12, **2012**.
- [34] M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, D. N. Preston, C. J. Pollard, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, T. J. Shelley, P. C. Hsu, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – KClO<sub>4</sub>/Carbon*, IDCA Program Analysis Report 018, LLNL-TR-614974 (717752), Livermore, CA, USA, January 31, **2013**.
- [35] M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, D. N. Preston, C. J. Pollard, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, J. J. Phillips, T. J. Shelley, J. A. Reyes, P. C. Hsu, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – AN and Bullseye® Smokeless Powder*, IDCA Program Analysis Report 029, LLNL-TR-641024 (760296), Livermore, CA, USA, July 17, **2013**.
- [36] M. M. Sandstrom, G. W. Brown, K. F. Warner, D. N. Sorensen, D. L. Remmers, L. L. Whinnery, J. J. Phillips, T. J. Shelley, J. A. Reyes, P. C. Hsu, J. G. Reynolds, *Integrated Data Collection Analysis (IDCA) Program – Ammonium Nitrate*, IDCA Program Analysis Report 025, LLNL-TR-636915 (755705), Livermore, CA, USA, May 17, **2013**.
- [37] R. Whipple, P. C. Hsu, M. Kashgarian, J. L. Maienschein J. G. Reynolds, *Safety Note: Runaway Reactions in HP/Tang*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Report, LLNL-TR-417211, Livermore, CA, USA, September 29, **2009**.
- [38] The Bruceton method also assumes that testing begins in the vicinity of the mean. Often this is not true and the initial testing to home in on the mean can skew the statistics. In practice, a “modified” Bruceton method is used, in which initial tests are used to bracket the mean before starting to count Go’s and No-Go’s. This is used by LANL in this work.
- [39] J. W. Tukey, Statistical Analysis for A New Procedure in Sensitivity Experiments, *AMP* **1944**, 101.1R, SRG-P No. 40.
- [40] P. A. Giguere P. Geffrion, Refractive Index of Hydrogen Peroxide Solutions – A Revision, *Can. J. Res. B* **1949**, 27, 168–173.
- [41] NOF Corporation, Functional Chemical & Polymer Product Information, Organic Peroxides, [http://www.nof.co.jp/english/business/chemical/product01\\_05.html](http://www.nof.co.jp/english/business/chemical/product01_05.html).

Received: May 6, 2014

Revised: July 31, 2014

Published online: September 29, 2014