IMPLICATIONS OF ATMOSPHERIC TEST FALLOUT DATA FOR NUCLEAR WINTER

Dissertation

George H. Baker III
Defense Nuclear Agency

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR UNIVERSITY
AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio
IMPLICATIONS OF
ATMOSPHERIC TEST FALLOUT DATA
FOR NUCLEAR WINTER

DISSERTATION

George H. Baker III
Defense Nuclear Agency

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited
IMPLICATIONS OF
ATMOSPHERIC TEST FALLOUT DATA
FOR NUCLEAR WINTER

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of the School of Engineering
of the Air Force Institute of Technology
Air University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

George H. Baker III, B.A., M.S.
Defense Nuclear Agency

Accession For
NTIS \checkmark
DTIC TAB
Unannounced
Justification

By
Distribution/
Availability Codes
Avail and/or Special

Dist A-1

February 1987

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited
IMPLICATIONS OF ATMOSPHERIC TEST FALLOUT DATA
FOR NUCLEAR WINTER

George II. Baker III, B.A., M.S.
Defense Nuclear Agency

Approved:

C. J. Bridgman, Chairman

March 5, 1987

David L. Auton

2/28/87

George John

3/9/87

Ronald F. Tuttle, LTC USAF

3/9/87

Dennis W. Quinn

3/9/87

Accepted:

J. S. Przemieniecki
12 Mar 87

Dean, School of Engineering
Preface

The purpose of this research has been to revisit the atmospheric nuclear test data of the 1950's and 1960's in order to gain information germane to nuclear winter. I have concentrated on resolving the size distribution of the debris ensemble because particle size strongly governs the magnitude and duration of sunlight attenuation. By modeling the removal of nuclear debris from the atmosphere, it has been possible to bound the admissible distribution of lofted particulates. In addition, I have shown how gravitational cloud stratification creates particle populations approximated by a power law distribution. The results should be useful for fallout and dust effects modeling as well as nuclear winter studies. I was frustrated by time limitations—there is much more to be learned from the ~400 events which have occurred in our atmosphere.
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ABSTRACT

Atmospheric test fallout data have been used to determine admissible dust particle size distributions for nuclear winter studies. The research was originally motivated by extreme differences noted in the magnitude and longevity of dust effects predicted by particle size distributions routinely used in fallout predictions versus those used for nuclear winter studies. Three different sets of historical data have been analyzed:

1) Stratospheric burden of Strontium-90 and Tungsten-185, 1954-1967 (97 contributing events)
2) Continental U.S Strontium-90 fallout through 1958 (75 contributing events)
3) Local Fallout from selected Nevada tests (16 events)

The contribution of dust to possible long term climate effects following a nuclear exchange depends strongly on the particle size distribution. The distribution affects both the atmospheric residence time and optical depth. One dimensional models of stratospheric/tropospheric fallout removal were developed and used to identify optimum particle distributions. Results indicate that particle distributions which properly predict bulk stratospheric activity transfer tend to be somewhat smaller than number size distributions used in initial nuclear winter studies. In addition, both $^{90}$Sr and $^{185}$W fallout behavior is better predicted by the lognormal distribution function than the prevalent power law hybrid function. It is shown that the power law behavior of particle samples may well be an aberration of gravitational cloud stratification. Results support the possible existence of two independent particle size distributions in clouds generated by surface or near surface bursts. One distribution governs late time stratospheric fallout, the other governs early time fallout. A bimodal lognormal distribution is proposed to describe the cloud particle population. The distribution predicts higher initial sunlight attenuation and lower late time attenuation than the power law hybrid function used in initial nuclear winter studies.
IMPLICATIONS OF ATMOSPHERIC TEST FALLOUT DATA FOR NUCLEAR WINTER

I. Introduction.

A. Background.

The possibility of serious climatic consequences of a nuclear war has been recently investigated by several groups (1,2,3,4,5). Perhaps the best known investigation, and one with the most cataclysmic predictions, was by R. P. Turco, O. B. Toon, T.P. Ackerman, J.B. Pollack, and C. Sagan. The "TTAPS" group concluded that attenuation of incoming solar radiation leading to subfreezing land temperatures could occur over the northern hemisphere due to vast amounts of dust and smoke aerosols injected into the atmosphere during a major nuclear exchange. Their initial calculations (1, see figure 1 inset) were based upon a 9800 megaton baseline exchange between the superpowers but indicated that the yield threshold for major optical (and therefore climatic) effects may be as low as 100 megatons. The outcome the TTAPS baseline scenario is a peak 35°C temperature drop of roughly 6 month duration (figure 2). A subsequent, independent evaluation of these findings by the National Research Council (3) questioned the plausibility of certain of the TTAPS assumptions (e.g. treatment of smoke injection), but confirmed the possibility of large and prolonged temperature drops across the northern hemisphere leading to what the TTAPS group dubbed "nuclear winter." Ramaswamy and Kiehl (abbreviated R-K), in a recent parametric evaluation of the optical properties of dust and smoke, also calculated significant temperature drops (5). In these initial studies, smoke appears to dominate dust because of its higher absorption properties, and the large fuel densities assumed for targeted urban areas. Thus most of the research to date has been devoted to verifying smoke effects. This lopsided attention to smoke has also been warranted by the large number of variables in the fire problem which has left much more room for interpretation and hence much larger uncertainties. Differing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF BURST</th>
<th>YIELD PER WARHEAD (megatons)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BURSTS</th>
<th>YIELD EXPENDED (megatons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land surface</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land surface</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land near-surface</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low airburst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exo-atmospheric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low airburst</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low airburst</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low airburst</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water surface</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low airburst</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water surface</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16160</td>
<td>9800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. TTAPS Nuclear Exchange
assumptions concerning whether fires start at all, whether they spread significantly, whether firestorms occur and, if so, whether the smoke reaches the stratosphere have led to extreme variations in the severity of predicted outcomes.

While it may be true that the amplitude of dust induced climate effects is less severe, the longevity of stratospheric dust aerosols (as compared to longevity of smoke which is confined predominantly to the troposphere and is therefore subject to rapid removal by washout) prolongs the dust induced temperature drop for periods exceeding one year. Indeed, dust alone is sufficient to produce significant temperature changes according to the results of a TTAPS scenario in which no smoke was injected (figure 2). The relative significance of dust has been enhanced by declining estimates of urban fuel loading and the addition of scavenging to smoke removal models (6,7).

Although not as formidable as those for smoke, large uncertainties do exist in the parameters used for the modeling of dust effects. One of the largest of these uncertainties is the particle size distribution. The optical thickness of a given mass of dust is extremely sensitive to the size distribution of the dust. This is illustrated in Chapter II where the optical thickness is computed for three different size distributions as proposed by Nathans (and used by TTAPS), Ramaswamy (5), and Norment (8). The large differences in the magnitude and duration of the sunlight occlusion for the three selected size distributions and the obvious extreme sensitivity of optical thickness behavior to the dispersion of the size distribution are worrisome in that the relative effect on the climate ranges from nil (Norment) to potentially severe (Nathans, Ramaswamy).

B. Research Objective.

The objective of the present effort has been to reduce the uncertainties in the admissible weapon debris aerosol size distributions. While large uncertainties still remain with respect to the mass lofted vs. yield and burst height, the uncertainties in size distribution are more significant because they affect both the amplitude and duration of sunlight attenuation. Variance in the lofted mass affects only the amplitude of the attenuation and probably does not exceed an order of magnitude for surface bursts (1,3). This translates into a factor of ten uncertainty in the optical thickness. It is evident from figure 3 that larger uncertainties in the optical thickness can
Figure 3. OT vs. Time, Cloud Initially Centered at 25 km
be attributed to variance in size distribution.

C. Approach.

This effort has used activity tracing to bound admissible size distributions. Activity tracing involved starting with historical data recording nuclear weapon fallout in the atmosphere and on the ground and then back-calculating the size distribution(s) which could have caused the measured activity transfer. This method of determining admissible size distributions has not been previously used.

The approach proceeded as follows. First, fallout removal/deposition mechanisms were modeled. The models were exercised against available data. Size distribution parameters were adjusted to achieve favorable comparisons between the models and the data. Care was taken to identify and resolve differences between the size distributions derived from activity tracing, and those previously reported (which were based upon microscopic techniques). A variety of historical data was used. Chapter IV contains a detailed discussion of the approach, how it differed from previous n(r) investigations, and how it was affected by the types of data available.

D. Other Methods.

Other methods have been used and are being developed to characterize size distributions. In the past, particle size distributions have been measured primarily by microscopic examination of fallout samples. Another method presently under development uses laser interferometry. Both methods are “direct” in that they measure the size of individual particles in isolated samples. By contrast, the activity tracing method is indirect in that size information is inferred from bulk activity transfer data.

D.1. Microscopic Techniques.

Particle size distributions have been primarily determined from the microscopic study of individual samples from clouds (particles collected on aircraft filters) or the ground (gummed paper, granular collectors). A discussion of aircraft sampling methods is contained in documentation of the DNA High Altitude Sampling Program (HASP) (9,10,11,12). A discussion of ground fallout collection methods is contained
in test director reports for many of the atmospheric test series (examples 13, 14, 15).

D.1.a. Nathans' Cloud Sample Analysis.

Nuclear winter studies have based their particle size distributions on Nathans' laboratory analysis of cloud samples from four ground bursts: Johnie Boy, Castle Bravo, Koon, and Zuni (16). In his experimental procedure, sections of the sampling filter paper were "ashed" leaving behind the debris particles plus some limited filter residue. Low temperature ashing was used when possible to avoid losing volatile fission products. Because small particles were masked by larger ones (diameters range over several orders of magnitude), samples were put into solution and separated via centrifuge into (typically ten) size fractions. About 100 particles from each size fraction were measured so that the size distribution of each sample was based on ~1000 particles. By adding the size distributions of the fractions weighted by number, composite size distributions were plotted. Apparently, histograms for these surface bursts were based upon irregularly shaped particles only. Spherical particles were present in significant numbers only in the three smallest size fractions of Johnie Boy and had a size distribution which differed from the irregulars. Nathans' results for samples from the four surface bursts appear in figures 4-6. His results include a slight correction for sedimentation (further discussion in Section V.E). The TTAPS and NRC particle size distributions were based on these results.

Nathans has also done a similarly meticulous evaluation of clouds from eleven air bursts (17, 18) and finds in all cases a unimodal lognormal size distribution with a slope similar to that of the submicron surface burst cloud population, but having a smaller median radius on average (.07µ air burst vs .25µ surface burst). Nathans claims to have been able to detect particles down to and slightly below .02µ in diameter. Below 0.1µ he used activity to isolate the particles. For extremely small particles he developed a method to agglomerate several smaller particles in order to detect their presence (19). Nathans noted a lower cutoff diameter for debris particles in the vicinity of .02µ (18). Nathans' analysis included the correlation of specific activity (equivalent fissions per gram) with particle radius. This correlation was an essential input to the activity tracing method pursued in the present effort.
Figure 4. Size frequency curves for three Koon samples

Figure 5. Size frequency curves for a Bravo and a Zuni sample

Figure 6. Size frequency for some Johnnie Boy samples

Reprinted with permission from Advances in Chemistry Series: Radionuclides in the Environments, Copyright 1970 American Chemical Society.
D.1.b. Ground Sample Analysis.

Unfortunately, the documentation of n(r) analysis for ground samples is very sparse. Most analysis was concerned primarily with the radiochemical morphology of the particles and to a lesser extent with the size distribution. In addition, reported ground sample particle size distributions exhibit much more variability than do cloud samples. Norment's DELFIC nominal distribution, previously discussed (8), is a unimodal lognormal function with median radius, \( r_m = 0.204 \mu \) and a logarithmic slope \( = 4 \). Freiling (20) reports lognormal distributions with mass median radii of the order of 100\( \mu \) and logarithmic slopes of 1.68 to 1.98. Tompkins (21) reports a mass median radius of 250\( \mu \) and a logarithmic slope of 1.9 for a Small Boy sample 5.8 km from ground zero. At greater distances, his samples are not unimodal. The WSEG fallout model (22), based on ground deposition, uses an activity median of 60\( \mu \) and slope of 2. The present research has developed evidence that the extreme variability in ground samples may well be due to cloud stratification caused by gravity sorting (see section V.E).

D.2. Laser Interferometry.

Optical methods involving laser interferometry are presently being perfected for analysis of nuclear cloud samples (23). In particular, Los Alamos is developing a method using the doppler shift of laser light to correlate the Brownian motion of particulates in solution, thereby determining particle size from diffusion velocity (24). While laser techniques have been successfully employed for in situ measurement of particle sizes during recent high explosive events, systematic studies of old nuclear cloud samples by such methods are not yet available. These techniques look very promising.

E. Some Problems Associated with Other Methods.

The advantages of the direct techniques are obvious. The analyst is measuring and counting observable particles from real samples. The analyst knows when and where the sample originated as well as which event (and relevant detonation parameters) was the primary contributor to observables. However, there are drawbacks. The size separation techniques may well affect particle size (some dissociation of
agglomerated particles may occur in the solution). There are questions about the
degree to which the filter ash may mask the properties of the debris. In addition,
there appear to be large variabilities between samples taken at different times and
locations (even for cloud samples). The question then remains, "which sample is to be
trusted as the most truly representative of the total cloud?" The analysis procedure
is extremely tedious and very few events have been systematically characterized (five
surface burst clouds, eleven air burst clouds). Surface burst data is of most impor-
tance for optical effects since air bursts loft little mass. Despite sample analysis for
many events, ground fallout histograms are so highly variable it is difficult to con-
struct a composite size distribution for any one event based upon microscopic tech-
niques.

F. Purpose.

As stated above the purpose of this research was not to rework the direct
methods described above, but rather to determine size distributions using a different
approach. This approach, activity tracing, involved back-calculating the size distri-
bution from recorded fallout data. The data and methods used to trace activity are
presented in Chapters III and IV respectively.
II. Sensitivity of Optical Thickness to Dust Size

The optical properties of any aerosol are extremely sensitive to the population vs radius. Assuming a unimodal lognormal size distribution for the aerosol, it is possible to derive a relatively simple expression for the optical thickness of dust to illustrate this size sensitivity.

A. Optical Attenuation.

The attenuation of sunlight results from scattering and absorption by particulates lofted into the atmosphere. If a cloud of particles is separated into vertical lamina, then the differential change (due to absorption and scattering) in the number of photons traversing each lamina is related to the aggregate cross section of the particles in the laminar volume:

$$\frac{d\phi}{\phi} = \frac{\text{aggregate particle area}}{\text{cloud cross section}} = \frac{nA_c \, dx <\mu>}{A_c} \tag{1}$$

$A_c$ denotes cloud cross section, which is roughly equal to the area of the northern hemisphere ($1.14 \times 10^{14} \text{ m}^2$) in a nuclear winter scenario; $n$ is the particle number density; and $<\mu>$ represents the average optical cross section of the particles. Integration of equation (1) yields an exponential attenuation:

$$R = e^{-\frac{N_t}{A_c}} <Q_e \pi r^2> = e^{-\tau} \tag{2}$$

where $\tau$ is the "optical thickness" and $N_t$ is the total number of particles in the cloud. $Q_e$ is the Mie extinction efficiency which is a function of refractive index and the ratio of diameter to wavelength (25). The extinction efficiency is largest for submicron particles and averages about 2.5 at wavelengths of 0.5 $\mu$m for particle radii between 0.1 and 10 $\mu$m (figure 7). It is evident from this expression that the optical thickness is directly proportional to the aggregate surface area of the particles in the cloud. Thus, the rate of decay of $\tau$ with time is directly proportional to the decrease in the second moment of particle number distribution as particles are
removed from the atmosphere by gravity and diffusion, i.e.,

\[ OT(t) \propto \int_{0}^{\infty} \pi r^2 \hat{n}(r,t) dr \] (3)

where

\[ \int_{0}^{\infty} \hat{n}(r,0) dr = 1 \] (4)

\( N_t \) is simply:

\[ N_t = \frac{M_T}{\frac{4}{3} \pi <r^3> \rho_s} \] (5)

where \( M_t \) is the total mass lofted, \( \rho_s \) is the debris density, and

\[ <r^3> = \int_{0}^{\infty} r^3 \hat{n}(r,0) dr \] (6)

Assuming a lognormal distribution (a discussion of the mathematical properties of lognormal distributions is provided in Appendix B):

\[ \hat{n}(r,0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \beta r} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\ln(r) - \ln(r_m)}{\beta} \right)^2 \right] \] (7)

then

\[ <r^3> = \exp \left[ 3\ln(r_m) + \frac{9}{2} \beta^2 \right] \] (8)

Similarly,

\[ <r^2> = \exp \left[ 2\ln(r_m) + 2\beta^2 \right] \] (9)

and the initial optical thickness can be expressed in terms of total mass lofted (roughly \( 10^{12} \) kg for the 5000 megaton TTAPS scenario), effective particle radius, cloud cross section, and particle density (2600 \( \frac{kg}{m^3} \) according to Nathans, ref. 16):

\[ OT_{t=0} = \frac{3M_T Q_c}{4r_c \rho_s A_c} \] (10)
Note that the optical thickness of the initial stabilized cloud is dependent on both the median radius and dispersion of the size distribution. The ratio of the initial optical thickness predicted by any two lognormal distributions is given by:

$$\frac{OT_1}{OT_2} = \frac{r_{m_1}}{r_{m_2}} \exp \left[ -\frac{5}{2} \left( \beta_1^2 - \beta_2^2 \right) \right]$$

(11)

A mode radius of .204\(\mu\) and a slope of 4 is used as the nominal parameters in the Department of Defense Land Fallout Interpretive Code (DELFIC, ref. 8). Ramaswamy and Kiehl (5) use a pure lognormal number distribution with a median radius of .16\(\mu\) and a slope of 2. A factor of 47 difference in optical thickness results which translates to a -2 order of magnitude difference in predicted sunlight attenuation (using a radiative transfer algorithm in which full account is taken of multiply scattered radiation, refs. 26,27; figure 9). Note the exponential effect that the assumed slope has on the sunlight attenuation. As will become evident, the slope also has a dramatic effect on the rate of dust removal.

B. Submicron Particle Criticality.

B.1. Optical Efficiency.

As is evident from figure 7, the extinction efficiency is largest below 1\(\mu\) at the peak solar wavelength. Ramaswamy (5) illustrates the importance of submicron particulates to optical attenuation by computing the optical thickness as the product of a mass attenuation coefficient, \(\psi_e\) (units \(m^2/g\)), and a columnar particle area density:

$$OT = \int_0^\infty \psi_e \left[ \int m(r,z) \, dz \right] \, dr$$

(12)

where \(r\) is particle radius and \(m\) is the mass density of the aerosol. He then plots the \(\psi_e\) as a function of surface mode radius for assumed particle size distributions of slope 2. His results are graphed in figure 8 and vividly illustrate the contribution of the submicron particle population to the optical thickness. An attenuation maximum occurs at a surface mode radius of 0.2\(\mu\). Figure 8 also illustrates the very small
Figure 7. Extinction Efficiency of Dust Aerosols at Wavelengths of 0.5 and 11 μm, as a Function of Size

Source: Journal of Geophysical Research, Vol. 90, No. D3 p5598, Copyright American Geophysical Union

Figure 8. Dependence of the Specific Extinction and Absorption of (a) Smoke Aerosols and (b) Dust Aerosols at a Wavelength of 0.5 μm on the Mode Radius

Source: Journal of Geophysical Research, Vol. 90, No. D3, p5600, Copyright American Geophysical Union
Figure 9. Fraction of incident solar radiation reaching the surface as a function of extinction optical depth for smoke and dust particulates.
contribution of the absorption component, $\psi_a$, to the attenuation coefficient of dust. Dust is not highly absorbing, and the optical attenuation in dust clouds is primarily due to scattering. Thus for a given optical thickness, optical attenuation in dust is much lower than for smoke which is highly absorbing (figure 9).

B.2. Longevity.

Because of the extremely low sedimentation velocities of particles smaller than 1μ, the fraction of the particle ensemble in the submicron range governs the duration of optical attenuation over periods necessary to induce climate changes. For instance, a spherical 10μ particle falls from 20 km to the tropopause (average altitude 12 km) in approximately 3 days whereas a 1μ particle takes 190 days. A graph of fall time vs radius and altitude for spherical particles is included as figure 10. The graph is based upon Stokes-Davies-Macdonald fall mechanics model as described in Appendix A. It is clear from this graph that the submicron particle fraction, in addition to dominating the optical attenuation, also governs the duration of sunlight attenuation.

C. Ground vs Cloud Sample Dichotomy.

Depending upon the origin of particle samples, size distributions determined from the analysis of atmospheric test dust exhibit markedly different submicron fractions. Most available samples fall into two major categories: (1) local fallout (down within roughly 24 hours of event) ground samples, and (2) early time (within several hours) cloud samples.

The tendency has been to use cloud samples as representative of initially lofted particle distributions. Intuitively, one would expect that because of sedimentation, ground samples would be biased toward the larger end of the size spectrum and cloud samples would be oppositely biased. This seems to be true. However, one should also expect that since the origin of both cloud and ground samples for any event is ultimately the same explosion, there should be similarities in particle characteristics.

A point in favor of using ground sample distributions is that near ground zero, fallout appears to result from the vertical component of toroidal circulation within the cloud (as well as sedimentation). Ground samples near ground zero should
Figure 10. Fall Time versus Size and Altitude
therefore represent a homogeneous mixture of lofted particles, both large and small (28:51). Indeed, by ascribing ground sample size distributions to clouds and then modeling deposition by sedimentation, reasonable predictions of ground fallout contours are obtained (29,30,31,32). Ground samples cannot be easily dismissed as non-representative of the particle population. In addition, since many cloud samples (16) were taken at altitudes considerably below the cloud vertical center (since for high yield events, the cloud eluded the altitude capabilities of sampling aircraft), these samples may also be nonrepresentative of the aggregate cloud population.

There is some additional cause for questioning the use of distributions derived from available analysis of surface burst cloud samples. The TTAPS and NRC studies used particle size distributions based upon surface burst cloud sample analysis of Marcel Nathans (16). Nathans measured and counted particles from four surface bursts: Johnie Boy, Castle Bravo, Koon, and Zuni. Of these, the high yield shots (of most interest for nuclear winter predictions) were detonated over coral. Johnie Boy, the only burst over silicate soil, was low yield (.5 kiloton) and slightly buried. Since the nuclear winter phenomenon is based on mass lofted by megaton surface bursts over silicate soil there is good reason to question the applicability of the measured size distributions. Admittedly, test ban restrictions have prevented extending the data base. Nonetheless, as the present research indicates, there is much more that can be learned from the existing atmospheric test data base.

To investigate the effect of differing size distributions on both the magnitude and longevity of optical effects, three distributions were selected for initial comparisons—one (the Defense Land Fallout Interpretive Code or DELFIC nominal distribution) representative of ground sample data, the other two (TTAPS, R-K) representative of cloud sample data. A discussion of the characteristics of each size distribution follows.

C.1. DELFIC Nominal Distribution.

DELFIC is a full physics, main frame fallout code developed by Hillyer Norment for the Defense Nuclear Agency (8). Although any size distribution may be used as input, a nominal or default unimodal lognormal distribution is provided which is based upon close-in ground fallout samples over the area out to the 10 rad/hr
contour from events Small Boy and Ess (33). Although his \( n(r) \) analysis has never been documented, Norment says that the close-in size distributions from these two events were very similar. This is somewhat surprising since Small Boy was a near-surface burst and Ess was buried. A graph of the DELFIC size distribution and its 2nd moment (proportional to surface area) and 3rd moment (proportional to mass) appears in figure 11. The median radius, \( r_m \), and the logarithmic slope are .204µ and 4 respectively (\( r_m \) will always be used to designate median radius for the number distribution). The distinguishing characteristic of this distribution is its broad dispersion (large logarithmic slope). The median radius is quite similar to those of the TTAPS or R-K distributions. The submicron particle population accounts for 5% of the aggregate surface area of the DELFIC distribution.

**C.2. Nathans/TTAPS Distribution.**

In contrast to the simple unimodal DELFIC size distribution, the TTAPS distribution is a hybrid function in which the submicron population is fit to a lognormal function, and the supermicron population is fit to a power law "tail":

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{for } r < \mu: & \quad n(r) = n_0 \frac{r_m}{r} \left( \frac{r_o}{r_m} \right)^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\ln \frac{r}{r_m}}{\beta} \right)^2 \right] \\
\text{for } r \geq \mu: & \quad n(r) = n_o \left( \frac{r_o}{r} \right)^p
\end{align*}
\]

(13) (14)

The functions join at \( r_o \) which is chosen such that the functions and their first derivatives are continuous at the splice:

\[
r_o = r_m \exp \left[ (p-1)\beta^2 \right]
\]

(15)

The function was originally used by Nathans to fit his surface burst cloud data (34). TTAPS adopted Nathans function using parameters typical of Nathans' results: \( r_m = .25\mu, \) log slope = 2, \( p = 4 \) and \( r_o = 1.06\mu. \) The TTAPS number, area, and mass distributions are plotted in figure 12. Besides being more difficult to manipulate, the third moment of the power law tail (if \( p \leq 4 \)) is not analytic unless a maximum particle radius is defined. If \( p = 4, \)
Figure 11. DELFIC Nominal Distribution
Figure 12. TTAPS Distribution
\[ r_{\text{max}} = r_o \exp \left[ \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\beta(1-f_m)}{2f} \right] \]  

where \( f_m \) is the mass fraction below \( r_o \) (see Appendix C for a more general expression for \( r_{\text{max}} \)). The TTAPS choice of parameters \((r_o=1.08\mu \text{ and } f=0.084)\) yields \( r_{\text{max}} = 1.3 \text{ cm} \). The fraction of surface area on particles below 1\( \mu \) (roughly \( r_o \)) is given by:

\[
f_s = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\beta e^{2\beta^2 r_o^2} \frac{r_{\text{max}}^{1/2}}{r_m^{1/2}} \text{CNF} \left[ \ln \frac{r_o}{\beta} \right]}{\sqrt{2\pi}\beta e^{2\beta^2 r_o^2} \frac{r_{\text{max}}^{1/2}}{r_m^{1/2}} \text{CNF} \left[ \ln \frac{r_o}{\beta} \right] + r_o \ln \left( \frac{r_{\text{max}}}{r_o} \right)}
\]

where \( \text{CNF} \) denotes the cumulative normal function:

\[
\text{CNF}[x] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-w^2} \, dw
\]

and \( r_2 \) is the median radius of the second moment of the submicron population. A derivation of the Nathans' function and its moments is included in Appendix C.

The submicron population accounts for 60% of the total surface area of the TTAPS distribution. This large submicron surface fraction yields optical effects which are dramatically different in both magnitude and duration from those predicted using the DELFIC nominal distribution (figure 3).


The R-K distribution, like the DELFIC distribution, is a unimodal lognormal function. The R-K distribution, however, is more typical of particle populations observed in air burst clouds (17). Ramaswamy uses a surface mode radius of \( .26\mu \) which translates into a median radius for the number distribution of \( .16\mu \). He uses a logarithmic slope of 2. Nathans has overlaid his results for multiple air burst clouds and determined that at a median radius of around \( .07\mu \) and slope of 2.1 are reasonable averages (35).

The submicron population of the R-K distribution accounts for 90% of the surface area, larger even than the TTAPS distribution. Thus the R-K distribution predicts the largest initial optical thickness and the slowest decay with time.
D. Comparative Results.

To illustrate the relative magnitude and duration of optical effects among the DELFIC, TTAPS, and R-K distributions, OT vs time was computed for $10^{12}$ KG of dust distributed over a hemisphere (estimate based on 5000 MT exchange). The initial cloud vertical centroid was taken as 25 km (peak density altitude of the TTAPS study). For a description of the code used to compute stratospheric debris removal see section IV.A.3. The results (figure 3) clearly demonstrate the large differences in optical effects predicted by the three distributions. Note that the TTAPS and R-K distributions are removed at nearly identical rates (a residence half life of roughly 9 months). This is explained by the large fraction of surface area below 1 micron which is removed by the turbulent diffusion process rather than sedimentation. The broad DELFIC distribution, with its large fraction of particles above 1μ, is removed predominantly by sedimentation which accounts for its rapid decrease with time (half life roughly 1 week). The differences in OT behavior between the R-K and DELFIC distributions are predominantly a result of the factor of two difference in slope.

E. Summary.

It is obvious that the optical occlusion of sunlight energy responsible for climate effects is extremely sensitive to the modeled size distribution and that several plausible size distributions would produce effects ranging from scant to severe. It is also clear that the submicron population governs both the magnitude and duration of optical attenuation. The next chapter discusses activity injection into the atmosphere and the data types available for use in the activity tracing model.
III. Data.

A. Data Records.

The radioactive behavior of debris from nuclear events can be used to trace the rate of its removal from the atmosphere. Since sedimentation is a function of particle size, it is possible to derive particle size statistics from the observed bulk vertical transfer of radioactivity in the atmosphere. Two basic types of data are available:

Stratospheric Removal. The stratospheric burden of certain radionuclides has been recorded over long periods of time (9, 10, 11, 12, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46). Best records were kept for $^{90}$Sr, $^{95}$Zr, HTO, $^{14}C$ and $^{186}W$. $^{90}$Sr burdens have been recorded since 1954 and reflect the contributions of 92 high yield (megaton class and greater) events (38).

Ground Deposition. The downrange cloud arrival time was recorded for 30 events at the Nevada Test Site (47). The yields of these events ranged from .1 to 50 KT. From this information it was possible to determine activity grounded as a function of time. In addition, following the 1958 test moratorium, rough $^{90}$Sr contours were plotted over the continental United States which reflect the contributions of roughly 75 Nevada shots up until that time (36).

B. Merits and Drawbacks of Activity Tracing.

There are major drawbacks to using activity tracing. Unlike microscopic techniques where actual debris is examined in detail, this is an indirect method. In order to extract size information from activity data, it was necessary to relate radioactive content to particle size via specific activity behavior. Nathans found that specific activity could in fact be correlated with particle size using a single correlation function (17:82). Unfortunately, specific activity data is somewhat sparse, highly variable and, in some cases, difficult to interpret. This problem is the weak link in the activity tracing method and may explain why this approach has not been
previously used for particle size characterization.

However, there are some distinct advantages to the method particularly with respect to the nuclear winter problem. Nuclear winter is predicated on the average behavior of debris from hundreds of bursts, and in particular, the bulk removal of such material from the stratosphere. Indeed, the nature of the available activity trace data enables bounding the \( n(r) \) behavior governing depletion of the stratospheric debris from a very large number of events, both U.S. and foreign. Activity tracing data gives the bulk behavior of clouds and is not subject to the sample variance quandary associated with microscopic techniques. Activity tracing supplemented by comparisons with the results of previous microscopic analysis was used successfully in the present research to determine \( n(r) \) parameter bounds averaged over many events.

C. Fallout Formation and Removal.

An understanding of fallout formation and dispersal processes is important to interpreting activity data. When a nuclear weapon is detonated, fragments of fissionable material, unfissioned active material, the bomb tamper and casing are vaporized. This collection of material is referred to as bomb debris. Soil debris engulfed by the expanding fireball is also vaporized (the vaporization temperature of soil is \( \approx 1700^\circ \text{K} \)). Other close-in soil debris is melted or partially melted while more distant soil particles within the range of the blast wave and subsequent gust is lofted in its solid form. The height (or depth) of the burst, the nature of the terrain, and the weapon's yield determine the relative amounts of soil debris which are vaporized, melted, or simply lofted.

In the case of a free air burst, where the rising fireball does not entrain surface dust, no soil debris is present in the highly radioactive fireball. The free air burst threshold altitude is \( \approx 700 \text{m} \) for 1 KT (13.3-6). The fireball cools to debris vaporization temperatures within 1-5 seconds. Within 10 minutes the cloud of vapor condensate stabilizes at altitudes high enough (5-35 km depending upon yield) that virtually no local fallout occurs. Local fallout is defined as that occurring within 24 hours of detonation. The absence of local fallout in the case of free air bursts implies that the condensed bomb debris particles are very fine. Indeed, Nathans (17,18) measures distributions tightly clustered about a median radius of \( \approx 1 \mu \).
For a surface burst or low air burst of a given yield, even though the cloud rises to similar altitudes as for a free air burst, soil particles present provide the "carrier" for local fallout. The fact that roughly 60% of the activity falls within 24 hours (48:414) of a surface detonation is due mainly to the presence of larger particles, and to a lesser degree to the toroidal hydrodynamic motion which brings down a homogeneous mixture of particles close to the burst point. Since sedimentation velocity is a function of particle radius, it should be possible to correlate activity down vs time, A(t), with A(r) and thence infer n(r) from A(r). The larger particles are due to the presence of a large mass of molten earth drawn into the cloud of hot fission product vapor and mixed to a greater or lesser degree by the toroidal circulation within the cloud. Judging from specific activity behavior for surface bursts, the mass of melted or partially melted soil is at least an order of magnitude greater than the mass of material directly vaporized (49:388).

During the condensation phase, volatile mass chains with vaporization temperatures lower than soil (viz. As, Se, Br, Kr, Rb, Mo, Tc, Te, I, Xe, Cs, ref. 50) tend to coat the surface of the previously condensed soil particles and refractory nuclides (those with high condensation temperatures). The refractory nuclides (the products of the mass chains not listed above), tend to be volumetrically mixed in fallout particles. Thus, the relative concentration of volatile nuclides goes roughly as the square of the particle radius and the concentration of refractory nuclides goes roughly as the cube. The different nuclide condensation temperatures, different thermal histories of material, and mixing inhomogeneities within the cloud lead to nonuniform concentrations of the different nuclides on fallout particles. This phenomenon is known as "fractionation" and serves to complicate the activity tracing method. A further complication, noted by Nathans in his analysis of air burst debris, is that below 1μ, the specific activity in some cases grows very rapidly with decreasing radius (roughly as r⁻³). The present effort has produced evidence that this "specific activity catastrophe" is probably due to the condensation of unmixed fission products to form high activity particles (section V.C.3).
D. Fallout Data Categories.

Fallout data may be grouped into three general categories: global fallout, intermediate fallout, and local fallout. By definition, local fallout is deposited within 24 hours of detonation and within roughly (depending upon prevailing winds) 500 km of ground zero. Intermediate fallout is not as precisely defined. For this research it was defined as falling between one and several days following the detonation and as deposited within roughly 5000 km of ground zero (continental scales). Global fallout is present only for large yield ($\geq 1MT$) weapons capable of lofting contaminated debris into the stratosphere. Fine material in the stratosphere lingers for months and circulates the globe many times before being removed by sedimentation and turbulent diffusion. The longevity of debris in the troposphere is limited by washout/rainout and thermal circulation to periods of less than 3 weeks (residence time is function of altitude). Because the rainout and washout mechanisms are not operative in the stratosphere, the lifetime of submicron particles reaches 6-12 months above ~12 km.

Each fallout data category is roughly associated with a certain range of particle sizes (figure 13). These associations become apparent by studying the graph in figure 10 for the case where particles start from an altitude of 10 km (~100 KT cloud vertical centroid). Within 24 hours particles 20$\mu$m and greater will have been removed by sedimentation and local fallout data will yield information on the fraction of particulates in this range. Within 1 week (intermediate fallout period), particles up to ~5 microns will have sedimented. Beyond a week, only particles less than 5 microns will remain aloft. Thus global fallout behavior reveals information on the submicron size fraction. These ranges are only approximate and depend upon the initial cloud height and wind velocities.

D.1. Global (Stratospheric) Fallout Data.

Several programs have been instituted over the years by the Department of Defense and Department of Energy to sample radionuclides in the stratosphere. Early estimates of stratospheric burden were based upon limited balloon sampling and global ground sampling. With the advent of thermonuclear weapons capable of lofting significant amounts of debris into the stratosphere, the advisability of continued testing demanded an evaluation of stress of this global fallout on the earth's
environment and ecology. In 1954, the Joint Chiefs of Staff instituted efforts at the Defense Atomic Support Agency (now the Defense Nuclear Agency) to quantify the concentration of radioactivity in the stratosphere (12). This led to the organization of the DoD High Altitude Sampling Program (HASP). An element of this program, Project Stardust, provided the stratospheric tracer data used in the present research. Beginning in 1957 Stardust flew up to two U2 aircraft sampling missions per week. Sampling occurred at altitudes up to 60,000 feet over the North and South American continents. A map of the HASP flight profiles appears in figure 14.

Following the 1962 test ban, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (later the Department of Energy) assumed responsibility for sampling and instituted its own High Altitude Sampling Program including the use of balloons (Project Ashcan) and B57 aircraft (Project Airstream) for sampling. The balloon probes sampled up to 35 km, while the aircraft sampling was between altitudes of 15-20 km with flight paths following the west coast of North and South American from $72^\circ$ N to $50^\circ$ S.

Sampling was accompanied by extensive radiochemical analysis. Nuclides which have yielded the most useful results for determining the removal of debris from the stratosphere include $^{90}$Sr, $^{95}$Zr, HTO (tritiated water vapor), $^{14}$C ($^{12}$CO$_2$), and $^{185}$W. Of these nuclides, $^{90}$Sr has been studied in the most detail because of its long half life (28.1 years) and biological hazard. Spacial and temporal averaging of the data was used in plotting the stratospheric burden of $^{90}$Sr shown in figure 15 (51). Of particular interest are the massive injections which occurred in the autumn of 1961 during a high yield Soviet test series. Because of the extreme altitude of the cloud (center around 35 km) and a debris residence time which spanned several years, the erratic effect of seasonal variations in the vertical diffusion constant was reduced. In addition, for high clouds, sedimentation was not totally masked by diffusion as it appears to be for debris near the tropopause (37). Since $^{90}$Sr has noble gas precursors which condense late in the fallout formation process it is not the best choice for tracing fallout removal. Refractory nuclides, such as $^{95}$Zr or $^{185}$W, are expected to be more evenly mixed in the debris. In addition refractory nuclides tend to be mixed volumetrically in debris particles and are less subject to concentration variation due to fractionation. Although modeling $^{90}$Sr removal provided interesting and useful results, it was deemed prudent to also model the bulk vertical transfer of a refractory nuclide.
Figure 13. Fallout Data Categories
Figure 14. HASP Flight Tracks (DoD)
Figure 15. $^{90}$Sr Stratospheric Inventory, 1951-1974
Figure 16. Mean Distribution of Stratospheric $^{137}$Cs, Sept.-Oct. 1968
TUNGSTEN-185 ACTIVITY (dpm/SCF corrected to 10 Aug. 1968)

THE VARIATION INACTIVITY AT 10° NORTH DURING MAY - JULY 1968.
(TROPOPAUSES ARE SHOWN AS DARK BANDS)

Figure 17. Tungsten Cloud Movement

Source: Reference 10
For several reasons $^{185}W$ was selected as the refractory nuclide for this study. The nuclide was injected into the stratosphere only during a three month period in 1958 (mean injection date of 1 July). The tracer was an activation product unique to several devices in the Hardtack Series. The devices producing $^{185}W$ were detonated on barges containing silica sand (10:102). Project Stardust carefully monitored tungsten data to determine debris transfer mechanisms and removal rates in the stratosphere. Both the vertical and lateral diffusion rates of actual tungsten clouds were determined based on isopleths constructed from aircraft sampling data (figures 16,17). The stratospheric tungsten burden was charted for a 14 month period following injection (figure 18). The tungsten was injected at tropical latitudes where the effective vertical diffusion constant is low. Nonetheless, the stratospheric Tungsten burden decays relatively quickly, falling to half its initial value in 5 months. This indicates that sedimentation is an important factor in the activity transfer process since the diffusion half-life is 9 months on average. Mason et al (37) have shown that tritiated water vapor (HTO) and $^{95}Zr$ from midlatitude Chinese shots are removed at almost identical rates from the lower stratosphere (half residence time of 9 months) implying diffusion is the dominant factor in that case. A discussion of stratospheric removal processes is included in section IV.A.3.


Intermediate fallout data was the least profuse of any category. Data taken and analyzed during the DoD High Altitude Sampling Program (36,52) was used. HASP computed the rate of deposition of stratospheric debris using $^{90}Sr$ soil concentrations collected from a world-wide network of sampling stations in 1959 (53). In order to discriminate the stratospheric fallout detected by U.S. stations it was necessary to subtract the Nevada Test Site contribution (all Nevada shots were less than 100 KT and did not contribute significantly to the stratospheric burden). Thus, it was necessary to construct isopleths of the $^{90}Sr$ deposition downwind of the Nevada Test Site through 1958. Combining measured soil concentrations with known rainfall data over the region, the contour plot shown in figure 19 was constructed (52). A combined total of 995 KT fission yield is estimated to have injected 100 kilocuries of $^{90}Sr$ through 1958 (very nearly 0.1 kilocurie/KT fission on average, ref. 36). An estimated 41 kilocuries of $^{90}Sr$ fell within the the 10 millicurie/mi$^2$ contour. Below 10
Figure 18. $^{185}\text{W}$ Stratospheric Inventory, 1958-1959
FIGURE 18. $^{90}$Sr in U.S. Soils from Intermediate Fallout

Source: Reference 52
Figure 20. Operation PLUMBOB - Coulomb B.
Off-site dose rate contours in r/hr at H+1 hour.

Source: Reference 47
millicuries/m² it was not possible to discriminate NTS fallout from the world-wide fallout background. The uncertainty in the intermediate $^{90}\text{Sr}$ total is estimated to be 25% (52).

D.3. Local Fallout Data.

For many of the U.S. Nevada and Pacific shots, an effort was made to plot activity contours down wind from ground zero. An unclassified compendium of fallout data for U.S. atmospheric tests including ground deposition contours (when available) has been published by the Defense Nuclear Agency (47). For several events an approximate cloud location vs time is included with the fallout contours. An example is shown in figure 20. Unfortunately, most Nevada tests were air bursts and since large amounts of ground debris were not entrained in the fireball, only a very small part of the activity was deposited locally. Davis (54) has attempted to determine particle size distributions from local activity contours with some limited success (discussion section V.F).

E. Summary.

This chapter has surveyed the available data and discussed the intrinsic advantages and disadvantages of the activity tracing method. A strong point in favor of activity tracing is that data is available on the rate of activity depletion from the stratosphere over a period of more than a decade. The data reflects the behavior of debris from close to 100 high yield events. Since stratospheric material is the source of prolonged sunlight attenuation, this data is particularly germane to the nuclear winter problem.
IV. Modeling Global and Intermediate Fallout.

This chapter describes the modeling used to predict fallout, including both stratospheric depletion and ground deposition. The models used an assumed particle size, \( n(r) \), as input. The input was varied in a systematic way to make the calculated activity burden and deposition match the data summarized in the last chapter.

Two separate models were required. For stratospheric data comparisons, a model of tracer burden above the tropopause as a function of time was developed. To utilize intermediate fallout data a model of ground deposition vs time was required. The basic ingredient of each model was an algorithm to compute cloud sedimentation and diffusion in one dimension.

Admittedly the atmosphere is not one dimensional and thus any 1-D parameterization will have limited accuracy. However, in order to facilitate multiple variations in \( n(r) \) parameters, it was necessary to simplify the physics of the atmospheric transfer model. There is precedent for 1-D modeling. One dimensional codes have been used extensively in estimating the environmental impact of atmospheric pollutants. Bauer has used 1-D models to track the transfer of nuclear debris from the stratosphere with reasonable success (38,39). The TTAPS results were based on a 1-D model of the atmosphere. Detailed descriptions of the debris removal models used in this study follow.

A. Stratospheric Transfer Modeling.


Megaton class nuclear detonations inject large portions of the resulting radioactive clouds into the stratosphere. Particle removal from the stratosphere is dominated by turbulent diffusion and sedimentation (38,39). The sedimentation process was modeled using Stokes or Davies-McDonald fall mechanics depending upon the particle size and altitude (discussed in appendix A).
The turbulent diffusion process is not yet totally understood but is strongly influenced by the characteristics of the tropopause (figure 21). Because of its stable temperature profile, there is very little vertical convective motion in the stratosphere itself. This is especially true at tropical latitudes where clouds from nuclear explosions can remain intact for several passes around the globe (47:145) with less than a two mile change in altitude. Figure 16 provides evidence of this behavior. However, there is considerable lateral transfer in the stratosphere which is influenced by the gaps in the tropopause in each temperate zone. The gap regions are extremely turbulent and it is believed that a considerable transfer of air between the stratosphere and troposphere occurs there (confirmed by higher ground activity concentrations at latitudes underneath the gap region, ref. 36). The gap region migrates north in the summer and south in the winter creating a "peeling" effect which is strongest in spring and autumn months as evidenced by more rapid global fallout during these periods (37,38,39,41,42). In addition, the tropopause rises and falls with the ground temperature which also adds to the seasonal variation in transfer rates.

Although the vertical diffusion process is stronger in the polar region (because of the gaps) than in the tropics, it is reasonable to define an average vertical diffusion constant since nuclear injections spread quite rapidly in the lateral direction. Lateral mixing coefficients are of the order of $10^5$ m$^2$sec$^{-1}$ (larger in the polar regions) which yields a meridional spread of 40° in 6 months time (9). Thus, because of their large lateral span, clouds experience an effective diffusivity which is in effect averaged over latitude. Bauer (38) has plotted the eddy diffusivity profiles used in the one dimensional models of several researchers (figure 22). For this research, a seasonal average eddy diffusivity ($K_z$) of 0.5 m$^2$sec$^{-1}$ was used with a mean tropopause height of 12 km. This value of $K_z$ predicts a diffusivity half life for submicron particles in the lower stratosphere (12-25 km) of about 9 months which agrees with the measured values reported by Mason for $^{95}$Zr and IITO (37).

Naturally occurring stratospheric aerosols are extremely tenuous (the latent vertical optical depth at visible wavelengths is only .005). It is not expected that their presence significantly affected the formation or size distribution of nuclear debris particulates during the condensation phase. Thus it is reasonable to assume that radioactive tracers were attached to weapon debris rather than ambient particulates.
Figure 21. Hypothetical Model of Stratospheric Mixing and Transfer
Figure 22. Eddy Diffusivity Profiles
(Source: Reference 28)
Source: Journal of Geophysical Research, Vol. 83, p4819. Copyright American Geophysical Union
A.2. Cloud Injection.

A.2.a. Injection Altitude.

Since the model computes cloud behavior over a period of weeks to months and since clouds stabilize in less than 10 minutes, it was reasonable to omit cloud rise physics and to initialize the computation at cloud stabilization time. At stabilization the cloud was given a Gaussian profile in altitude per Telegadas and Bauer (38:5-2):

\[ f(z_0) = f_0 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{z-z_0}{\sigma_z} \right)^2 \right) \]

where

\[ f(z,t) = \frac{\text{burden of tracer at } z \text{ and } t}{\text{ambient air mass at } z} = \frac{n_a(z,t)}{n_a(z)} \]

and \( \sigma_z = 2.15 \text{ km} \) for stratospheric injections. The computations are fairly insensitive to the choice of initial dispersion (38:5-3) since the total burden of tracer is being computed over months. Results are much more sensitive to the injection height and \( K_z \).

There are several empirical models for cloud injection height vs yield. The Foley-Ruderman model used in the TTAPS study fits a power law to visible cloud extremities observed for U.S. tests (figure 23). Fits for cloud top and bottom were developed separately (43):

\[ CT = 21.64Y^{-2} \text{ km} \]

\[ CB = 13.41Y^{-2} \text{ km} \]

One drawback of the Foley-Ruderman model is that it is based upon the dimensions of the visible cloud. The cloud radioactivity profile may not match the visible cloud profile, and indeed Zuni rocket sampling indicates activity residing near the lower boundary of the visible cloud (22:24).

Seitz et al (44) estimated cloud top and bottom based upon the behavior of radioactive debris a few days after the 1961-62 U.S. and Soviet tests. Because data was not available much above an altitude or 24 km, Seitz arbitrarily assigned cloud
Figure 23. Nuclear Cloud Rise Height as a Function of Yield

Source: Reference 28
top altitudes of 24 km to high yield events. Thus Seitz' curve fits are systematically low, and should be used with caution (45). Peterson (46) has fit the clouds from U.S. tropical tests. However these clouds are consistently lower than those from similar bursts at northerly latitudes. Chang et al (45) conclude that the Foley-Ruderman model is useful as an upper bound, while the Seitz model is useful for a lower bound. Bauer (38) believes the Seitz model to be more realistic, but comes to this conclusion based upon a fast diffusion calculation of .1μ monosized particles in which sedimentation effects are negligible.

The Foley-Ruderman fit was used in the present effort to set cloud injection height. The fit is based on actual observations of U.S. events. There is limited evidence that the fit predicts the cloud injection height of the high yield Soviet shots (38:3-5). The fact that activity has been observed to concentrate low in the visible cloud may have been due to sedimentation prior to sampling time. In addition, since the cloud was modeled as being distributed normally with atmospheric pressure (equation 19), the modeled activity centroid is below the injection altitude, z0 (see section IV.A.3.b). Bauer's underprediction of transport from Foley-Ruderman altitudes is overcome if a finite spread is introduced into his particle size distribution. Indeed, the spread which best predicts bulk vertical transfer is nearly identical to microscopically observed dispersions for air burst samples (see section V.A).

A.2.b. Event Data Input.

During the 1950's and 1960's 97 atmospheric events lofted significant amounts of $^{90}\text{Sr}$ into the stratosphere. Yield information for most of these events is classified. To keep the results unclassified, events which occurred in close succession were grouped together. Bauer (38) and Seitz (44) have published unclassified grouping schemes. Bauer's event groups were used with slight modifications (tables I,II). A mean value of .1 kilocurie $^{90}\text{Sr}$ was injected per kiloton of fission yield (38:40, 50:321). Bauer's estimates of fission fractions were used (38:5-3).

$^{185}\text{W}$ was injected by several events in the late spring and early summer of 1958. For classification reasons, the model treated these events as a single injection occurring on 1 July with a stabilized cloud center at 20 km. The stabilized cloud altitude was based on isopleths generated from U2 measurements (9).
### TABLE I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Injection Date</th>
<th>April 54</th>
<th>June 56</th>
<th>Sept 56</th>
<th>June 57</th>
<th>June 58</th>
<th>Oct 58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>US/UK</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Tropic</td>
<td>Tropic</td>
<td>mid-hi lat</td>
<td>mid-hi lat</td>
<td>Tropic</td>
<td>Arctic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Events</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Yield</td>
<td>9.6MT</td>
<td>3.5MT</td>
<td>1.5MT</td>
<td>2.4MT</td>
<td>.7MT</td>
<td>3.6MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated $^{90}Sr$ Inj.</td>
<td>2.4MC</td>
<td>880KC</td>
<td>300KC</td>
<td>1.4MC</td>
<td>1.1MC</td>
<td>1.1MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley-Ruderman Cloud Center</td>
<td>26km</td>
<td>21km</td>
<td>20km</td>
<td>21km</td>
<td>17km</td>
<td>23km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Injection Date</th>
<th>Oct 01</th>
<th>Nov 01</th>
<th>Jul 02</th>
<th>Oct 02</th>
<th>Oct 02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Events</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Yield</td>
<td>2.8MT</td>
<td>41.5MT</td>
<td>5.3MT</td>
<td>25MT</td>
<td>9.8MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated $^{90}Sr$ Inj.</td>
<td>640KC</td>
<td>600KC</td>
<td>430KC</td>
<td>4.6MC</td>
<td>2.0MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley-Ruderman Cloud Center</td>
<td>22km</td>
<td>38km</td>
<td>25km</td>
<td>35km</td>
<td>26km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 24. Velocity versus Radius and Altitude

A.3.a. Sedimentation.

The particle sedimentation model is based on that used in the Defense Land Fallout Interactive Code (8). The Stokes, Davies-McDonald, and Beard equations were used depending upon the value of the Davies number:

\[ Q_s = \frac{4 \rho_s (\rho_s - \rho_a) g d^3}{3 \eta^2} \]  

(23)

where \( \rho_a \) is air density, \( \rho_s \) is particle density, \( g \) is the acceleration of gravity, \( d \) is particle diameter, and \( \eta \) is dynamic viscosity (see appendix A).

The atmosphere was modeled according to equations in the U.S. Standard Atmosphere publication (55). Hopkins (56) has shown that the U.S. atmosphere is also a reasonable approximation for the atmosphere over the Pacific test sites for purposes of fallout modeling.

Particles were treated as smooth spheres of density 2600 \( \text{kg/m}^3 \) (16) settling in still air. The Knudsen-Weber slip correction factor was used (57) which gives terminal velocities slightly smaller than the commonly used Cunningham slip. The Knudsen formula fits terminal velocity data over a wider range of \( d/\lambda_{MFP} \) (MFP denotes mean free path).

Appendix A presents the fall velocity equations used and includes a printout of the fall velocity subroutine. Figures 10 and 24 (fall velocity vs size and altitude) were generated using this subroutine.

A.3.b. Diffusion.

The diffusion model used is similar to Bauer's "model I" (39). Diffusion of a chemically inert tracer of mixing ratio \( f(z,t) \) is described by the following diffusion equation:

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ n_a(z) \frac{\partial f(z,t)}{\partial z} \right] = n_a(z) \frac{\partial f(z,t)}{\partial t} \]  

(24)

where \( n_a(z) \) is the ambient atmosphere's number density, \( f(z,t) \) is described by eqn. 20 and \( K_d \) is the eddy diffusion coefficient. In this model, \( K_d \) was treated as constant.
(.5 m²/sec). The boundary at the tropopause was treated as an infinite sink because tropospheric washout/rainout is very rapid compared to stratospheric removal processes.

If the stratosphere is treated as isothermal, i.e.,

\[ n_s(z) = n_o \exp \left[ -\frac{(z-z_o)}{z_{scale}} \right] \]  

(25)

where \( z_o \) is the cloud center altitude, \( z_{scale} \) is the atmospheric scale height, and \( n_o \) is the tracer density at \( z_o \), then the diffusion equation (24) simplifies to:

\[ K_d \frac{\partial^2 f(z,t)}{\partial z^2} - \frac{K_d}{z_{scale}} \frac{\partial f(z,t)}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial f(z,t)}{\partial t} \]

(26)

Solving the equation for a point source injection, we find:

\[ f(z,t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \sigma_z}} \exp \left[ -\frac{\sigma_z^2}{8} \left( \frac{1}{z_{scale}} + \frac{2\Delta}{\sigma_z^2} \right) \right] \]

(27)

where

\[ \Delta = z_o - z \]

(28)

and

\[ \sigma_z = \sqrt{2K_d t} \]

(29)

This \( f(z,t) \) is equivalent to an \( n_s(z,t) \) of the following form:

\[ n_s(z,t) = K_N \left[ \frac{e^{-\frac{4(\Delta/\sigma_z)^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi \sigma_z}} \right] \left[ e^{\left( \frac{\Delta}{z_{scale}} \right)} \right] \]

(30)

which may be thought of as the product of two probability distributions, the first relating to the diffusion profile of the tracer, the second relating to the atmospheric density gradient. \( K_N \) is a normalization factor which is a function of \( \sigma_z \) and \( z_{scale} \).

With some further manipulation it can be shown that \( n_s(z,t) \) is also Gaussian:

\[ n_s(z,t) = \frac{K_N}{\sqrt{2\pi \sigma_z}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{z - \left( z_o - \frac{\sigma_z^2}{z_{scale}} \right)}{\sigma_z} \right]^2 \right\} \]

(31)

The ambient atmospheric number density gradient effectively displaces the cloud
center below $z_0$ by the factor $\sigma_z^2 / z_{scale}$. As $\sigma_z$ increases with time, the effective cloud center moves downward. Note that $n_z$ has the same dispersion as $f(z,t)$.

\textbf{A.3.c. Transport.}

Sedimentation and diffusion were combined in a multigroup transport computation. The cloud was separated into 60 velocity (or size) groups:

$$n_z(z,t) = \sum_{g=1}^{60} n_g \left(v_g(r_g,z_g),z,t\right)$$

(32)

where $v_g$ is group sedimentation velocity and $z_g$ is the vertical group centroid. The cloud was treated in effect as sixty rigid clouds with separate streaming and eddy diffusion characteristics. The initial vertical dispersion of each group was taken as the dispersion of the composite cloud (2.15 km). Because eddy diffusion is a bulk process, the same diffusion constant ($K_d$) was applied to each group. It was assumed that once the particles were formed during the thermal processes immediately after detonation, the particle size distribution stayed reasonably constant in time, i.e., agglomeration was not included. Turco et al estimate the effects of agglomeration on dust burden to be less than 10% (1:63). Yoon et al state that no clear evidence of nuclear debris particle agglomeration exists (13:3-43).

Streaming was governed by the sedimentation velocity of particles at altitude $z_g$. Since the sedimentation velocity is a function of altitude, treating the clouds as rigid (all particles at centroid velocity regardless of altitude) introduces some error into the streaming calculation. Since $dv/dz$ increases with decreasing radius (see figure 24), so does the sedimentation error. An indication of the magnitude of the error is given in figure 25. The figure shows a comparison of the stratospheric burden predicted by rigid cloud descent vs the descent of a multigroup cloud (initially Gaussian) of mono-size particles. The clouds were given an initial centroid height of 25 km and a dispersion of 2.15 km. For particles of radius $r > 10 \mu$, the error is small enough to be imperceptible given the large time increments (1-2 weeks) used in the stratospheric debris transfer calculations. In the submicron regime, the cloud dispersion decreases significantly (the cloud "bunches up") due to the increasing fall velocity with altitude. This bunching effect is reflected in the more sudden drop in burden for the multigroup treatment than for the rigid cloud approximation (figure 25b). The
Figure 28. Sedimentation Error Introduced by Rigid Cloud Model
sedimentation half-life is roughly the same for the two calculations. The early time burden predicted by the rigid cloud approximation is accurate to within 30% of the multigroup treatment. At later times, the error is mitigated since for small particles turbulent diffusion is the dominant removal mechanism, especially as particles approach .1μ and less (the results in Chapter V show that in admissible size distributions most particles are submicron with a median radius of ~.1μ). Thus, the error introduced by the rigid cloud approximation is negligible above 10μ and probably less than a factor of 2 across the remaining size spectrum.


The transport was calculated using a Fortran subroutine (subroutine STRATFAL of Appendix D) which injected clouds at Foley-Ruderman altitudes and computed subsequent size group diffusion and sedimentation. Figure 26 depicts the transport of the 1μ group as computed by STRATFAL for the Castle Bravo event (area under curves normalized to 1). The stratospheric burden vs time, B(t) is:

$$B(t) = \sum_{g} \int_{z} A_g(r_g, z, t) \, dz$$

(34)

where the activity, A_g(r) is a function of n_g(r) and the specific activity, S(r). A global mean tropopause height of 12 km was used. The stratospheric burden computed in equation 34 can be directly compared with atmospheric test data as depicted in figures 15 and 18.

A.4. Specific Activity Treatment.

In order to relate activity burden to number size distribution, a functional relationship must be determined relating the activity expected on a particle to its radius. Freiling has proposed a "radial model" of activity content in which refractory nuclide activity is approximately proportional to particle volume:

$$A_r(r) = K_r n(r) r^3$$

(35)

and volatile nuclide activity is approximately proportional to particle surface:

$$A_v(r) = K_v n(r) r^2$$

(36)

where K_r and K_v are constants of proportionality.
Figure 28. Group Fall Illustration
Available data on individual particle activity is usually presented in the form of equivalent fissions per gram, a quantity called specific activity. Some authors use "specific abundance" which is probably a better term, although less prevalent in the literature. An equivalent fission is defined as the number of fissions that must have occurred in a device to produce the amount of a particular radionuclide observed on a particle (49:382). There are $6.02 \times 10^{23}$ nuclei in 235 grams of $^{235}$U and each fission releases 180 MeV. Thus 1 ton ($2.6 \times 10^{22}$ MeV) of completely fissioned material when completely mixed with 1 ton of soil will yield particles with an average specific activity of $1.4 \times 10^{14}$ fissions/g.

Observed particle activities vary between $r^2$ and $r^3$ over the range of particle sizes of interest for cloud modeling, conforming to Freiling's hypothesis. Some anomalous behavior has been noted and explained for large particles (100 - 1000\textmu m) by R. C. Tompkins (21). In addition, as previously discussed in section IV.A.4, Nathans has observed a strong, non-Freiling radial dependence below .2\textmu m in air burst debris. Since this phenomenon is probably due to the presence of unmixed fission products, a similar effect may not be present for surface bursts where much more mixing material (carrier) is available.

It was initially assumed that in the cloud most of the activity resided on particles between .01 and 10 microns and, further, that the specific activity in this size range obeyed Freiling's radial model. The first assumption was justified by what is known about size distributions from microscopic analysis. Since these analyses show the bulk of cloud particle surface and volume lies below 10\textmu m, it was expected that the activity would probably behave likewise. The second assumption is confirmed from measured specific activity data (see for example figures 27-29). In most cases, specific activity varied between that expected for refractory and volatile species:

\begin{align*}
\text{refractory:} & \quad S_r(r) \propto \frac{A_r(r)}{r^3} \propto \text{constant} \\
\text{volatile:} & \quad S_v(r) \propto \frac{A_v(r)}{r^2} \propto \frac{1}{r}
\end{align*}

Note from the example plots that for the same nuclide, S(r) behavior varies from event to event.
Figure 27. Specific Activities of $^{90}\text{Sr}$ and $^{147}\text{Pm}$ in a Tower Burst
Figure 28. Specific Activities of $^{90}\text{Sr}$ and $^{147}\text{Pm}$ in a Wilson Sample
Figure 29. Specific Activities of $^{90}\text{Sr}$ and $^{147}\text{Pm}$ in a Hood Sample
In the computation of stratospheric burden, a normalized n(r) was converted to A(r) using:

$$A(r) \propto n(r) \cdot r^l$$  \hspace{1cm} (39)

From this relationship, the fraction of activity in each group was computed from:

$$A_g = K_n \int_{r_{g-1}}^{r_g} n(r) \cdot r^l \, dr$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)

where

$$K_n = \left[ \exp \left( \frac{l \ln(r_m) + l^2 \beta^2}{2} \right) \right]^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (41)

in the case of lognormal distributions or

$$K_n = \left[ \sqrt{2\pi} \beta e^{\frac{l^2 \beta^2}{2}} r_o \beta^{5/2} r_m^{-3/2} C N F \left( \frac{\ln r_o - \ln r_l}{\beta} \right) + \frac{r_o}{l-p+1} \left( r_{max}^{l-p+1} - r_o^{l-p+1} \right) \right]^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (42)

in the case of Nathans' distribution. In the expression above, p is the exponent of the power law tail and r_l is the median radius of the lth moment of the log normal portion of the distribution:

$$r_l = r_m \cdot e^{l \beta^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (43)

For $^{90}$Sr, l was set to a nominal 2.5 based upon Nathans' specific activity graphs. For the highly refractory $^{186}$W, l was set to a nominal 3.0. A sensitivity study was performed by varying l between 2 and 3 for both nuclides. This variation altered the median radius bound by less than a factor of 2 for a lognormal n(r).

A.5. Matching the Model to the Stratospheric Data.

$^{90}$Sr data comparisons were carried out by main programs SHOT50 and SHOT60 (1950s and 1960s comparisons were run separately) which varied the n(r) parameters ($r_m$, $\beta$, p, f_m) and then called subroutines to set the activity distribution, inject the clouds from the combined events, and then compute activity removal with time. Appendix D lists the optimization program for the 1960s $^{90}$Sr data comparisons. Similar programs were developed for 1950s $^{90}$Sr and 1958-59 $^{186}$W data comparisons. In all cases, optimum n(r) parameters were determined by maximizing $\mathcal{z}$.
figure of merit expressed by:

\[ \chi = \left\{ \sum_j \left[ B^+(t_j) - B(t_j) \right]^2 \right\}^{-1} \]  

(44)

where \( B^+(t_j) \) represented the measured stratospheric burden data from the last chapter and \( B(t_j) \) represented the model results (eqn. 34). The program flow is shown in figure 30.

Three sets of optimization runs were performed. 1960s \(^{90}\text{Sr}\) data was optimized in a separate run from the 1950s \(^{90}\text{Sr}\). The third set used the \(^{185}\text{W}\) data from the 1958 Hardtack series. The \(^{90}\text{Sr}\) data was split for two reasons:

1. 1950s data was not as uniformly trustworthy as 1960s. Prior to Project Stardust (under which regular U2 sampling was conducted beginning in 1957), the \(^{90}\text{Sr}\) burden estimates were based on ground samples and limited balloon sampling. Thus, estimated stratospheric burdens prior to 1957 were subject to considerable uncertainty.

2. The 1950s high yield events were mostly contact surface bursts (detonated within 1 meter of surface). In the 1960’s, although the exact burst heights were not available, they tended to be higher in general to avoid local fallout (58). Thus, running separate optimizations might identify systematic differences in particle size distributions between the two eras. Indeed, results indicate a larger size distribution for the 1950s events as compared to the 1960s but the difference is small enough that it could be due to uncertainties in the data and model.

Results from stratospheric \( n(r) \) optimization runs are presented in section V.A.
Figure 30. N(r) Optimization: Code Flow Diagram
B. Tropospheric (Local/Intermediate) Fallout Transfer Modeling.

B.1. Properties of the Troposphere.

Because of the unstable temperature profile in the troposphere, a different vertical transfer model was needed. Stronger vertical air currents exist and the hygroscopic nature of debris particles leads to removal by washout. Disregarding horizontal transport, the following equation governs particulate density in the troposphere (Equation 50:507):

\[ K_d \frac{\partial^2 n}{\partial z^2} - an - bn^2 - w \frac{\partial n}{\partial z} = 0 \]  

where \( K_d \) is the eddy diffusion coefficient, \( n \) is the vertical particle concentration, \( a \) is the washout removal rate (\( a \) is the reciprocal of the residence time, \( T \)), \( b \) is the coagulation coefficient, and \( w \) is the sedimentation velocity. According to Junge, washout is the predominant removal mechanism for naturally occurring particulates (average radius .03 \( \mu \)) below 5 km so that equation (45) may be simplified to:

\[ K_d \frac{\partial^2 n}{\partial z^2} - an = 0 \]  

By noting the altitude range over which \( n \) decreases by a factor of ten, Junge estimates residence time for particulates below 5 km to be somewhere between 1 and 10 days. Above 5 km, removal by washout diminishes and the effective particulate residence time increases. The TTAPS study used a tropospheric residence time of 10 days for smoke however this represented a global average. Since Junge's estimates were based upon data taken over the continental United States' midsection, the present model varied \( T \) between his bounds. Even though the average initial cloud center height was in the vicinity of 10 km for Nevada shots, sedimentation lowers the activity centroid to altitudes for which Junge's values were considered reasonable. Constant exponential washout was assumed.

Tropospheric sedimentation was modeled using the same algorithms developed for stratospheric sedimentation (Section IV.A.3). Based upon Junge's analysis, washout was assumed to dominate eddy diffusion effects.
B.2. Tropospheric Cloud Injection and Removal.

B.2.a. $^{90}$Sr Injection.

The Foley-Ruderman model was not needed for intermediate fallout modeling. Since all events considered were low yield U.S., the measured cloud heights were available (47). The initial cloud centroid was taken as the mean of the reported cloud top and bottom.

Initially, an attempt was made to model injection and removal event by event. This approach proved extremely unwieldy since it was determined that 75 bursts contributed to offsite $^{90}$Sr between 1951 and 1958 (Table III). Although wind data over the test site was readily available at shot time, properly modeling individual bursts would have required including wind and rain data over the central United States for 3 days following each event, a grueling proposition. Instead, the average behavior of the 75 bursts was determined and a composite injection of $^{90}$Sr was modeled. Table III lists the contributing events and their injection parameters (based on information in reference 47).

The 75 events had a combined total yield of 995 KT and lofted roughly 99.5 kilocuries of $^{90}$Sr. Yield weighted average injection parameters were as follows:

- $Y = 13$ KT
- Cloud center $= 10.4 \pm 1.2$ km
- Wind Speed $= 70 \pm 15$ km/hr (at cloud center)
- Wind Direction $= 248^\circ \pm 24^\circ$ (compass)

B.2.b. $^{90}$Sr Removal.

The model included both sedimentation (same model as for stratospheric tracers) and washout. The change in the activity aloft as a function of time was described as follows:

$$\left( \frac{dA}{dt} \right)_{\text{total}} = -\lambda A(t) - \left( \frac{dA}{dt} \right)_{\text{sed}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (47)

where $\lambda$ is the reciprocal of the washout residency time, $T$. The solution is of the form:
### TABLE III

Events Contributing to Off-Site Fallout Through 1958

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT NAME</th>
<th>YIELD (kt)</th>
<th>CLOUD CENTER (kt)</th>
<th>WIND DIRECTION (°)</th>
<th>WIND SPEED (mph)</th>
<th>BURST HEIGHT (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION: RANGER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 *</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33 *</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 *</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION: BUSTER-JANGLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9 *</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION: TUMBLER-SNAPPER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 *</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30 *</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37 *</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34 *</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34 *</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION: UPSHOT-KNOTHOLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dube</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badger</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encore</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*estimated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT NAME</th>
<th>YIELD (kt)</th>
<th>CLOUD CENTER (kft)</th>
<th>WIND DIRECTION (*)</th>
<th>WIND SPEED (mph)</th>
<th>BURST HEIGHT (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grable</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climax</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesla</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turk</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple-1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasp'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33*</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>HI Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple-2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zucchini</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottman</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priscilla</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diablo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>HI Alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepler</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doppler</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin'</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoky</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileo</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70**</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*estimated

**extremely erratic winds
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT NAME</th>
<th>YIELD (kt)</th>
<th>CLOUD CENTER (kft)</th>
<th>WIND DIRECTION (°)</th>
<th>WIND SPEED (mph)</th>
<th>BURST HEIGHT (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION: PLUMBBOB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulomb-B</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>16 0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laplace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATION: HARDTACK II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wragguy</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushmore</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanafor</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Beach</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages:</strong></td>
<td>13.3 kt</td>
<td>29.2 kft</td>
<td>238°</td>
<td>30 mph</td>
<td>99.5 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*estimated
\[
A(t) = A_0 e^{-\lambda t} - e^{-\lambda t} \int_0^t \left( \frac{dA}{dt'} \right)_{sed} e^{\lambda t'} dt'
\] (48)

where \( A_0 \) is the initial atmospheric activity burden. A separate expression is needed for sedimentation rate since this is a function of particle radius (washout rate is not). If \( g(t) \) is defined as the fractional activity removal rate by sedimentation such that:

\[
\left( \frac{dA}{dt'} \right)_{sed} = A_0(t) \frac{d\hat{a}}{dt'} = A_0(t') g(t')
\] (49)

where \( \hat{a} \) is normalized activity and \( A_0 \) as the activity remaining in the atmosphere from which sedimentation can still progress (the "sedimentation pool"), then \( A(t) \) becomes:

\[
A(t) = e^{-\lambda t} \left[ A_0 - \int_0^t e^{\lambda t'} A_0(t') g(t') dt' \right]
\] (50)

But since the sedimentation pool is being exponentially depleted by washout:

\[
A_s = A_0 e^{-\lambda t}
\] (51)

we have finally:

\[
A(t) = e^{-\lambda t} A_0 \left[ 1 - \int_0^t g(t') dt' \right]
\] (52)

This expression was incorporated into Fortran program INTOPT (Appendix E) as the basis for intermediate fallout removal calculations.


Equation 52 gives the rate of tracer removal. In order to compare with the available data (which is presented in the form of ground contours), fallout smearing was modeled. The Bridgman-Bigelow approximation (29:215) was adapted for this purpose. Bridgman and Bigelow developed a simple expression for ground activity surface density \( A_p \) which in terms of unit time reference activity \( A_1 \) reduces to:

\[
A_p(x,y) = \frac{A_1 f(y,t_o) g(t_o)}{v_z}
\] (53)
where the cloud is moving in the x direction, y is the transverse direction, \( t_a \) is the cloud arrival time, and \( f(y,t_a) \) is the cloud spatial distribution in the transverse direction (assumed to be Gaussian). In order to include washout, the present model replaced the Bridgman-Bigelow \( g(t) \) function with \( \frac{dA}{dt} \) (equation 47). Other modifications included ascribing a Gaussian vertical profile to the cloud and incorporating DELFIC fall mechanics (as described in section IV.A.3.). A constant wind velocity was assumed but the wind direction was changed according to the direction of the activity hotline (figure 31).

Given \( A_x(x,y) \), contours were drawn using the linear interpolation routine contained in the \textit{DISSPLA}\textsuperscript{tm} graphics system (80). The model was checked by comparing contours with an example case computed by Bridgman and Bigelow (29:215-216).

**B.4. Matching the Model to the Intermediate Fallout Data.**

For reasons discussed in section IV.B., rigorous contour correlations between the data and the model were not performed. Instead, given the tremendous uncertainties inherent in the calculation, a simple comparison of activity grounded vs distance was used in an attempt to optimize \( n(r) \). The activity contours were subdivided by breaking the hotline into six segments as shown in figure 31. The activity deposited along each hotline segment was estimated assuming a Gaussian transverse distribution such that:

\[
\Delta A_i = A_{\rho_i} \Delta x_i \sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_y,
\]

where \( A_{\rho_i} \) is the peak surface activity density along hotline segment \( i \), \( \Delta x_i \) is the segment length, and \( \sigma_y \) was estimated from:

\[
\sigma_y \approx Y_{10} \left( 2 \ln \frac{A_{\rho_i}}{10} \right)^{1/2}
\]

\( Y_{10} \) was determined by bisecting each hotline segment and averaging the distance from the hotline to the 10 mC/m\( ^2 \) contour. While upper and lower bounds for the activity density were available for segments 2-8, no upper bound was available for segment 1. Possibly high values of activity density due to local fallout within the 60 mC/m\( ^2 \) contour would have made a large difference in the average activity density.
Figure 31. Distribution of Strontium-90 in U.S. Soils in Excess of World-Wide Fallout Amounts
TABLE IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>segment number</th>
<th>$A_x$ (millicur/mi$^2$)</th>
<th>$\Delta x$ (miles)</th>
<th>$\sigma_y$ (miles)</th>
<th>$\Delta A$ (kilocuries)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
density along segment 1. Checks of local maps of $^{90}$Sr deposition in Nevada and Utah revealed that 65 mC/mi$^2$ is a reasonable average (61,62). Table IV gives the deposition computed for each segment.

This method allows for the presence of activity outside the 10 mC/mi$^2$ contour (in contrast to roughly 40% computed within the 10 mC/mi$^2$). Isotopes, Inc. (52) constructed the intermediate fallout map used for the analysis and guessed that the bulk of the remaining 60% was deposited locally. The present analysis supports the opposite conclusion, namely that the remaining activity was still aloft.

The intermediate fallout n(r) optimization proceeded similarly to the stratospheric n(r) optimization (Section IV.A.5). The only difference was that the intermediate fallout n(r) optimization was based on ground activity fraction rather than the stratospheric fraction. Optimization was performed by a main program INTOPT which varied n(r) parameters, called subroutine INTFAL to compute tracer removal, and finally computed a figure of merit as in equation 44. The results of the optimization are discussed in section V.B.
V. Results.

The previous chapter described the modeling of vertical activity transfer in the stratosphere and troposphere and the approach used to optimize \( n(r) \). Chapter V presents the results of the optimization calculations. Chapter VI summarizes the findings and presents recommendations for their implementation.

A. Global (Stratospheric) Tracer Removal.

A.1. \(^{90}\text{Sr}\) Removal.

The unaltered DELVIC size distribution was used as the initial \( n(r) \) input to the stratospheric fallout subroutine, STRATFAL (see listing, Appendix D). The DELVIC distribution was obviously too heavy to explain the data as is evident from figure 32. A combination of the 1950s and 1960s results are shown. If the activity were distributed according to the DELVIC ground fallout nominal, the stratospheric burden would have decayed in days rather than months. The DELVIC distribution is obviously biased much too strongly toward the heavy end of the particle size spectrum.

It was expected that the TTAPS distribution, with its larger activity fraction below 1\(\mu\), would better match the data. This was indeed the case, as shown in figure 33. Although some improvement was evident in comparison to the DELVIC nominal, even this distribution was too heavy to explain the data (the modeled stratospheric burden again drops too quickly). The critical parameter in Nathans' distribution is \( f_m \), the mass fraction below \( r_o \). This turns out to be a rather complicated function of Nathans' \( n(r) \) parameters:

\[
f_m = \begin{cases} \left[ 1 + \frac{\left( \frac{r_o}{r_{\text{max}}} \right)^{p-4} - 1}{\beta(4-p) e^{\beta(r-4)^{p/2}} CNF[\beta(p-4)]} \right]^{-1}, & p \neq 4 \\ \left[ 2 \ln r_{\text{max}} \right]^{-1}, & n = 4 \end{cases}
\]

(56a)

(56b)
Figure 32. $^{90}$Sr Burden from U.S. and Foreign Tests, DELFIC Nominal
Figure 33. $^{90}$Sr Burden from U.S. and Foreign Tests, Nethans' Distribution
$R_o$ is a function of the power exponent, $p$, and varies between 0.7 and 1.7$\mu$ for $3 \leq p \leq 5$. Thus over the range of $p$ bracketing Nathans' data, $f_m$ is a good indicator of the fraction of mass in the submicron range.

Best fits to the stratospheric data were obtained when all of the mass was placed in the submicron regime ($f_m \rightarrow 1.0$). For fixed $r_{\text{max}}$, $f_m$ is optimized for high values of $p$ ($p \rightarrow \infty$). For fixed $p$, $f_m$ is maximized as $r_{\text{max}} \rightarrow r_o$. In either case, best fits to the stratospheric data were obtained with $f_m = 1$ such that optimum $r_{\text{max}}$ and $p$ values are not physically reasonable. As an example, figure 34 depicts the data-model comparison with 100% of the mass below $r_o$. The fit looks good, but the size distribution is truncated at $r_o$. Thus, the Nathans' hybrid function does not adequately predict the removal of $\text{Sr}$ from the stratosphere.

Next, parameters for a pure lognormal distribution were optimized by varying $r_m$ from .01 to $10\mu$ and the slope from 1.01 to 4. A Gauss-Newton optimization was used at first but later abandoned because the data did not yield a unique solution (see figures 35, 36). It was more expedient to vary the parameters continuously and generate a three dimensional plot of the figure of merit, $\chi$, vs $r_m$ and slope. The figure of merit was defined as:

$$\chi(r_m, \beta) = \left\{ \sum_j \left[ B^+(t_j) - B(r_m, \beta, t_j) \right]^2 \right\}^{-1} \quad (57)$$

where $B^+(t_j)$ represents the measured stratospheric burden, and $B(t)$ the model results.

Separate parameter variations were performed for 1950s and 1960s data. A total of 450 cases were run for each era. Figures 35 and 36 plot $\chi$ vs $r_m$ and slope for 1950s $\text{Sr}$ removal and 1960s $\text{Sr}$ removal respectively. Note the lack of a unique solution (see figures 35, 36). Rather, for any slope, an optimum $r_m$ is indicated. If the slope is $-2$ (Nathans' value) the median radius is in the vicinity of $0.1\mu$ for each optimization, somewhat lower than the $r_m$ indicated by Nathans' surface burst sample analysis. The figure of merit improves slightly as $r_m$ decreases. Thus the distribution which best predicts the removal of $\text{Sr}$ from the stratosphere is biased more toward smaller particles than even the TTAPS distribution and can be modeled as a simple lognormal function rather than a hybrid splice. Figure 37 plots model results.
Figure 34. $^{90}$Sr Burden from U.S. and Foreign Tests, $f_m = 1 (r_{max} = r_o)$
Figure 35. N(r) Parameter Variation, 1950s $^{90}$Sr
Figure 38. $N(r)$ Parameter Variation, 1980s $^{90}\text{Sr}$
Figure 37. $^{90}$Sr Burden from U.S. and Foreign Tests, Reasonable Fit
vs stratospheric data using \( r_m = 0.1\mu \) and \( \beta = \ln(2) \). The fit is quite reasonable given the large uncertainties in the stratospheric measurements. The disparity between model and data around 1960-61 is possibly explained by the arrival of debris from two high yield exoatmospheric bursts (250 km), Teak and Orange, which occurred in late 1958 (52:82). These bursts were not included in the burden calculations.

It might be argued that the bias toward a smaller particle distribution was a result of the volatility of \(^{90}\text{Sr}\) precursors (63:3). The mass chain condenses late (roughly 5 minutes after detonation for megaton class weapons) such that the gaseous precursors, not heavily influenced by gravity, may have risen higher than early condensing chains. The rare gas precursors would have inhibited \(^{90}\text{Sr}\) scavenging by local fallout. At the time of condensation, sedimentation would have lowered the concentration of the heaviest particles to some degree, such that condensation nuclei may have been generally smaller for \(^{90}\text{Sr}\). The best test of this possible explanation for the smallness of the particulates carrying the \(^{90}\text{Sr}\) was to compare the behavior of a refractory nuclide. Fortunately, data on the stratospheric removal of \(^{185}\text{W}\), with one of the highest condensation temperatures on the periodic chart (therefore highly refractory), were available.

A.2. \(^{185}\text{W}\) Removal.

The sequence of optimization trials for \(^{185}\text{W}\) was identical to that used for \(^{90}\text{Sr}\). As in the case of \(^{90}\text{Sr}\), the nominal DELFIC distribution predicted a stratospheric removal rate which was much too rapid (figure 38). But again, surprisingly, the TTAPS distribution predicted a faster removal than indicated by stratospheric sampling data (figure 39). Indeed, the behavior of \(^{185}\text{W}\) appeared to be very similar to that for \(^{91}\text{Sr}\), such that the TTAPS function again did not give satisfactory results except for non-physical values of \( n(r) \) parameters (see discussion in section V.A.1).

As with \(^{90}\text{Sr}\), parameters were optimized for a lognormal function based on a figure of merit as expressed in equation 57. The results were not extremely different from \(^{90}\text{Sr}\). Apparently, the two nuclides resided on similar debris particle distributions. A reasonable data-model comparison for \(^{185}\text{W}\) is shown in figure 40 for \( r_m = 0.2\mu \) and \( \beta = \ln(2) \). Figure 41 plots best fit \( r_m \) and logarithmic slope values from \(^{90}\text{Sr}\) and \(^{185}\text{W}\) optimization calculations. Notice that the \(^{185}\text{W}\) results are
Figure 38. 185W from Hardtack Series, DELFIC Nominal Distribution
Figure 39. 185W from Hardtack Series, Nathans' Distribution
Figure 40. 185W from Hardtack Series, Reasonable Fit
Figure 41. Stratospheric Strontium and Tungsten Removal, Best Fit Median Radius and Slope
straddled by the $^{90}\text{Sr}$ results, evidence that the tracers reside on similar particle populations despite differing mass chains and physical properties. These curves by themselves did not isolate a unique size distribution. In order to limit the range of admissible parameter values, another experimental observation was needed.

In his experience with test sample data, Nathans noted that he rarely if ever saw nuclear debris particles of radius less than .01$\mu$ (84). Since he based his size distribution statistics on samples of typically 1000 particles, the probability of the presence of particles $\leq .01\mu$ is at most .001. By plotting the locus of $r_m$ vs slope which satisfy the inequality:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^{.01\mu} \frac{1}{\beta r} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \ln r_m - \ln r \right)^2 \right] dr \leq .001$$

(58)

it was possible to bound the admissible values of $r_m$ and slope (figure 42 shaded area). Since for each nuclide the figure of merit improved with decreasing $r_m$, actual parameters are expected to lie closer to the lower boundary of the admissible area (lower $r_m$, higher logarithmic slope).

The particles which linger in the stratosphere obey a size distribution which may be described by a lognormal function and is smaller in general than either the DELFIC or TTAPS distributions. Thus, stratospheric particulates were initially expected to be removed at an even slower rate than the nuclear winter studies predicted (1,2,3,4,5). However, this conclusion turned out to be premature, and was contradicted by the intermediate and local fallout results.

An important clue to determining the true size distribution parameters was the fact that, for both $^{90}\text{Sr}$ and $^{185}\text{W}$, the size distribution which predicted their long term behavior was quite similar to size distributions which Nathans determined for air bursts. This was despite the fact that all bursts producing $^{185}\text{W}$ were contact surface bursts, and that the 1950s events producing significant stratospheric $^{90}\text{Sr}$ were predominantly surface or near-surface bursts.

**B. Intermediate Fallout.**

As described in section IV.B, intermediate fallout data consisted of $^{90}\text{Sr}$ activity contours over the continental U.S. The initial comparison calculation used the $n(r)$
bounds determined from the analysis of stratospheric $^{90}\text{Sr}$ removal (nominally taken as $r_m = .1\ \mu, B = \ln(2)$). The results were quite puzzling. Virtually no intermediate fallout due to sedimentation was predicted if the $^{90}\text{Sr}$ was carried by particles obeying a stratospheric size distribution. Washout appeared to be the only removal mechanism (figure 42). A reasonable comparison between predicted and actual contours was obtained by turning off the sedimentation effect entirely and using a washout e-folding time of 48 hours (figure 43).

Because of the tremendous uncertainties inherent in the computation of intermediate fallout (combining 75 bursts, assuming constant wind along the hot line, assuming exponential washout which may completely mask sedimentation effects), it was not possible to predict size distribution parameters from intermediate fallout data with any confidence. However one set of optimization calculations was made using plausible atmospheric parameters (constant wind speed of 40 mph, washout e-folding of 72 hours) to determine if the size distribution could be described with a lognormal function. Indeed it could, as shown in figure 44. A median radius of $0.27\mu$ and slope of 3.1 optimized intermediate $^{90}\text{Sr}$ removal for the assumed atmospheric behavior.

As a point of interest, the model was exercised using the DELFIC nominal distribution and the TTAPS distribution, with results shown in figures 45 and 46. The DELFIC distribution obviously overpredicted grounded activity. Indeed, the DELFIC distribution by itself came close to predicting observed contours. However, it is extremely unlikely that the true distribution resembled the DELFIC $n(r)$ since most of the 75 bursts contributing to off-site activity were air bursts and the nominal DELFIC distribution is based on contact surface and buried burst particles. The TTAPS distribution gave a reasonable fit but this was considered fortuitous given the uncertainties in the model. A rigorous optimization of the TTAPS distribution was considered to be unfruitful.

The most useful information from the intermediate fallout analysis was that the stratospheric distribution, based largely upon data from surface and near-surface burst injections, predicted virtually no fallout by sedimentation. This result was puzzling since significant local fallout was observed on clear days (no washout) for all surface and near-surface U.S. events (47). The intermediate fallout results implied
Figure 42. Activity Grounded vs. Distance, Stratospheric n(r) Parameters
Figure 43. Composite Event Fallout Contours
Figure 44. Activity Grounded vs. Distance, Best Fit n(r)

DIST 1, RM=.270E-06, SLOPE=.312E+01
Figure 45. Activity Grounded vs. Distance,
DELFIC Nominal,
Figure 46. Activity Grounded vs. Distance, Nathans' Distribution
that the stratospheric \( n(r) \) did not represent the complete description of the actual particle size distribution for surface bursts.

C. Resolving the Global vs Local Fallout \( n(r) \) Dichotomy.

The stratospheric and intermediate fallout results were paradoxical. The stratospheric tracers resided on particles lofted predominantly by surface and near-surface bursts. Yet the stratospheric activity resided on particle distributions more representative of air bursts. The intermediate fallout model predicted no activity deposited via sedimentation when upper bound stratospheric size distributions were used thus contradicting observed local fallout particle size distributions from surface bursts (DELFIC being one example). These local size distributions are removed primarily by sedimentation as predicted by Bridgman-Bigelow (29) and others. Additional information was sought to explain coexistence of these different size distributions each of which explained one portion (global vs local) of the observed fallout but not the other.

C.1. Cloud Samples vs Ground Samples.

The differences observed between particles from cloud and ground samples provided an important clue to resolving the size distribution dichotomy. Tompkins et al. have published a comparative study (49:381-400) of cloud and ground samples from four events in which they superimposed plots of specific activity \( (S) \) vs particle size for cloud and close-in fallout samples. Figures 47-50 show these superpositions for \( ^{144}\text{Ce}, \ ^{99}\text{Mo}, \ ^{140}\text{Ba}, \) and \( ^{45}\text{Ca} \) respectively. A careful examination of these plots reveals that, invariably, \( S(r) \) is lower for ground samples than for cloud/distant samples by a significant margin (roughly a factor of 5 for refractory chains when averaged over radius; less pronounced for volatile chains). **Thus it appears that for the same event specific activity is bivariate, and fundamental differences exist in the physical properties of particles deposited locally vs particles remaining in the cloud or deposited at some distant location.**

The existence of these fundamental differences is further supported by Tompkins’ separation of ground samples from the 5 megaton barge-mounted Tewa event (samples were from a location 17.5 km upwind and probably represent debris which fell
Figure 47. Specific Activity of $^{144}$Ce in Fallout versus Particle Size
Figure 46. Specific Activity of $^{99}$Mo in Fallout and $^{147}$Pm in Cloud versus Particle Size
Figure 49. Specific Activity of $^{137}$Ba in Fallout and $^{90}$Sr in Cloud versus Particle Size
Figure 50. Specific Activity of $^{46}$Ca in Fallout versus Particle Size
within 1 hour of detonation) into spherical and irregular fractions. The specific activity of these fractions are overlaid in figure 48. It is interesting that the higher specific activity of the spherical particles (over their admittedly limited size range) more closely matches that of the cloud particles while the lower specific activity of the irregular particles more closely matches that of the ground samples. Thus even though Tompkins did not separate cloud samples into spherical and irregular fractions, one might expect that cloud samples would be richer in spherical particles and close-in samples would be richer in irregular particles. Tompkins concluded that the high specific activity of the spherical particles was the result of a more intense thermal history such that refractory chains were incorporated in the spherical particles during a hot early phase which the irregular particles never experienced (49:395). Apparently the spheres originated from the condensation of material vaporized in the fireball at a time when the fission product concentration was very high. The irregular particles did not reach fireball temperatures and probably were unmelted or partially melted soil particles whose material was not homogeneously mixed with fission products, hence they exhibited a lower specific activity.

C.2. Spherical and Irregular Particles in Cloud Samples.

Nathans confirmed the existence of spherical and irregular particles in debris clouds by separating cloud samples into spherical and irregular particles on two silicate surface bursts of yield .5 KT and 10 KT (16:367;64). He found that his smaller size fractions were richer in spherical particles, and that the bulk of radioactivity was carried by the spheres (as a consequence of their higher specific activity). For the 10 KT event, he performed independent size statistics for spherical and irregular particles and found that they obeyed different lognormal distributions (figure 51). The spherical particles tended to be smaller with median radius of 0.1μ and a logarithmic slope of 2. The irregular particles tended to be larger and more disperse with median radius of .17μ and a logarithmic slope of 3. For both events he found that spheres outnumbered irregulars in cloud samples approximately 2.3:1. The larger irregular particle ensemble would sediment more rapidly than the smaller more narrow spherical particle distribution. It is interesting that the size distribution of spherical particles is typical of the size distributions Nathans measured for air bursts (17). This fact, taken together with the optimum distribution derived for stratospheric debris,
Figure 51. Round vs. Irregular Particle Distributions
implies that surface burst particle distributions contain a component which is similar
if not identical to the size distribution for free air bursts (in which little or no soil is
mixed with the weapon debris and all debris reaches fireball temperature).

C.3. Specific Activity Catastrophe.

From free air burst data it is apparent that debris which reaches fireball tem-
perature tends, through hydrodynamic processes, toward a characteristic size distribu-
tion with \( r_m \approx 1 \mu, \beta \approx \ln(2) \). This behavior is corroborated by the size distribution
of what appears to be unmixed fission products in air burst debris. Nathans observed
that below \( 1 \mu \) the specific activity of particles increased rapidly with decreasing
radius (64) in a manner uncharacteristic of the Freiling radial behavior (in which
activity increases as the 2nd or 3rd moment of the number size distribution, refs. 66,
67). An example of this behavior for Promethium is shown in figure 52. Nathans
described the effect, which leads to extremely high specific activities at low radius, as
a "catastrophe" which he was unable to explain. For the several airbursts which he
studied, the specific activity for submicron particles was observed to vary between
\( r^{-2.5} \) and \( r^{-3.5} \) for refractory chains.

The effect was of concern for the present research because the fraction of total
activity carried by submicron particles could be dramatically affected by the cata-
trophe. The effect can be explained if at the time of detonation a totally random
fission product dispersion occurs such that nuclide concentrations on individual parti-
cles are roughly independent of radius. Particle specific activity would then be scat-
tered about \( r^{-3} \), as observed. In one study (64) Nathans overlaid \(^{95}Zr\) specific
activity data for a range of yields. A linear fit to his points in log space reveals that
the submicron specific activity obeys the following relation roughly independent of
yield:

\[
S(r) \approx \frac{16 \times 10^{17}}{r^{2.5}} \frac{\text{fissions}}{\text{gram}} \quad (r \text{ in micron})
\]  

(50)

It is hypothesized that the submicron particles are pure fission products, and that
they therefore obey the characteristic size distribution for high temperature debris. If
the fission product dispersion is totally random, it is useful to compute an average
activity per gram. This average, if indeed the particles are composed of pure
Source: Reference 17

Figure 52. Specific Activity Catastrophe Example
fissioned material, should equal the total activity available \((1.4 \times 10^{28} \text{ fissions/megaton})\) divided by the mass of totally fissioned bomb material \((5.7 \times 10^4 \text{ g/megaton})\). Using the number size distribution characteristic of stratospheric surface burst debris and air burst debris, the average specific activity is in fact within 10% of this quotient, i.e.:

\[
<S(r)> = \int_0^\infty S(r)\hat{n}(r)dr \approx \frac{1.4 \times 10^{28} \text{ fissions}}{5.7 \times 10^4 \text{ gram}} 
\]

where,

\[
\hat{n}(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}ln2r}\exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left\{\frac{\ln(1.1) - \ln(r)}{\ln 2}\right\}^2\right] 
\]

The equality expressed by equation 60 lends further credence to the parameter values believed to govern the high temperature debris size distribution.

D. Proposed Cloud Distribution.

The evidence discussed in section V.A, V.B, and V.C supports the existence of a bimodal cloud particle distribution for surface bursts:

\[
n(r) = n_1(r) + n_2(r) 
\]

where \(n_1\) represents high activity spherical particles formed from the condensation of vaporized bomb and surface materials. The second mode, \(n_2\), represents irregularly shaped particles of unmelted or partially melted (low temperature history) surface material with a lower activity concentration in general.

Such a distribution explains the apparent differences in size distributions governing the behavior of fallout at early and late times. In the stratosphere at late times, an \(n_1\) type distribution governs tracer removal as demonstrated by the \(^{90}\text{Sr}\) and \(^{185}\text{W}\) optimization results of section V.A. The early cloud (within several hours of detonation) particles represent both \(n_1\) and \(n_2\) behavior as indicated by Nathans' analysis of surface burst clouds (16,64). As should be expected, close-in ground sample particles are more characteristic of \(n_2\) as noted by Tompkins (predominantly irregular in shape, ref. 49:396) and Norment (DELFIC distribution more closely approximates \(n_2\), ref. 8). Air bursts with little or no surface material present such that all debris reaches fireball temperatures produce an \(n_1\) type distribution almost
\[ n(r) = n_1(r) + n_2(r) \]

**Figure 53. Debris Composition, Conceptual Picture**
without exception (exceptions include some tower shots, and lower air bursts with some limited surface material contamination). A heuristic illustration of the origin of the \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) distributions appears in figure 53.

The \( n_1 \) parameters are well established by the independent results previously discussed—namely, a lognormal distribution with \( r_m \) of .1 \( \mu \) and slope of 2 describes the behavior of stratospheric tracers, air burst debris, and unmixed fission products. The establishment and corroboration of \( n_2 \) parameters was not as straightforward.

E. Characterization of \( n_2 \).

The most direct evidence available for an actual \( n_2 \) size distribution is Nathans' analysis of cloud samples from the 10 KT silicate surface burst discussed in section V.C.2. Nathans divided his samples into spherical and irregular particle fractions and characterized their size distributions separately. The results for one sample are shown in figure 51. His \( n_2 \) distribution is lognormal with a median radius of .17 \( \mu \) and a slope of 2. Unfortunately, this is the only instance in which he intentionally characterized spherical and irregular particle size distributions separately (68).

Nathans did characterize what is purported to be the undifferentiated size distributions of clouds from four surface bursts (Johnie Boy, Koon, Zuni, and Bravo, ref. 18). However, a careful reading of his documentation reveals that (for undisclosed reasons) he included only irregular particles in his size analysis (16:367). Thus, the particle size statistics for these events were used to get additional information on \( n_2 \).

A puzzling aspect of Nathans' particle statistics for the four surface bursts was the power law behavior (not lognormal) of the size distributions above 1\( \mu \) diameter (see figures 4-6). This behavior can be explained by noting the position of the aircraft with respect to the cloud at the time of sampling. Apparently the sampling aircraft could not get up to the cloud altitude. In all but two of Nathans' samples for the four events, samples were extracted at altitudes below the visible cloud (see table V). Only Johnie Boy samples 827L and 842L, although lower than the cloud vertical centroid, were within the visible cloud. It was apparent that the low sampling altitudes affected the size distribution of the samples vis-a-vis the aggregate cloud.

Nathans did correct for sedimentation in plotting his size distributions (16:379). However, his correction factor did not account for a variable vertical cloud
Figure 54. Group Fall Illustration
### Table V

Nathans' Samples: Bravo, Zuni, Koon, Johnie Boy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event/sample</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Top*</th>
<th>Bottom</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Altitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bravo (1954)</td>
<td>15 MT</td>
<td>coral</td>
<td>34km</td>
<td>16.6km</td>
<td>4hrs</td>
<td>15.5km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni (1956)</td>
<td>3.4 MT</td>
<td>coral</td>
<td>24.5km</td>
<td>15km</td>
<td>3.1hrs</td>
<td>12.7km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koon (1954)</td>
<td>150 KT</td>
<td>coral</td>
<td>16.5km</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1hrs</td>
<td>11.95km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/1086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/7269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnie Boy (1962)</td>
<td>.5KT</td>
<td>silicate</td>
<td>5.18km</td>
<td>3.81km</td>
<td>.6hrs</td>
<td>2.95km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/842R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/842L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/245L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/827L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In fallout calculations, the cloud centroid was taken as the mean of top and bottom altitudes. The stabilized cloud was modeled as Gaussian in the vertical dimension with \( \sigma_z = 1/4(CT-CB) \)

*A strong wind shear at about 11km directed the bottom portion of the cloud away from the remainder of the cloud.*
concentration profile and consequently was not very large (less than a factor of 2 in all cases). Thus, his corrected distributions are very nearly equal to what was actually measured. Nathans' correction factor does account for the vertical velocity gradient which does not produce as large an effect as the vertical concentration gradient (Section A.3.c).

Nathans used aircraft samples taken between 4 - 4 hours after detonation. Figure 51 illustrates size group stratification predicted (assuming Gaussian dispersion and using subroutine STRATFAL) at 4 hours following the Bravo event. The graph is plotted with \( n(r) \) as constant so that only variations due to the vertical concentration gradient are depicted. Note that at any sampling altitude, \( z_s \) (a 12 KM sampling altitude is marked), the sample \( n(r) \) is greatly affected by the vertical stratification. At time \( t=0 \), assuming that all size groups are distributed uniformly in the \( z \) direction, a distribution, \( n_s(r_j, t=0, z_s) \), proportional to the true cloud distribution would be measured at any altitude. If a sample is taken at a later time, a distribution of \( n_s(r_j, t, z_s) \) is measured. It is then possible to relate \( n_o \) to \( n_s \) by using the correction factor, \( C_j \):

\[
\frac{n_o(r_j, 0, z_s)}{n_s(r_j, t, z_s)} = C_j \tag{63}
\]

\( C_j \) is defined as

\[
C_j = \frac{f(z_j - z_s)}{f(z_o - z_s)} \tag{64}
\]

where \( f \) is the vertical distribution function. In this case, analogous to equation 30,

\[
f(z - z_s) = e^{-\frac{(z - z_s)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}} \left[ \frac{e^{-\frac{(z - z_s)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_s} \right] \left[ e^{-\frac{(z - z_s)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}} \right] \tag{65}
\]

\( C_j \) for Bravo is plotted in figure 55 (DELFIC fall mechanics were used). Note that the correction factor peaks at that particle diameter which has just reached aircraft altitude at sampling time. The apparent population at this diameter would be enhanced in the sample. The sample would be depleted in larger particles since they would have fallen past the sampling altitude. The smallest particles would be present in their true proportions \( (C_j = 1) \).
Figure 55. Size Distribution Correction Factor
Figure 56. Zuni Cloud vs. Sample Distribution
It is suspected that this correction factor boosted the population in Nathans' samples in the 10-100μ range and that this effect causes a lognormal distribution to approximate a power law. This possibility was investigated by using Nathans' lognormal characterization of irregular particles for the 10 KT silicate surface burst as the aggregate cloud \( n^2 \) distribution for the four events. For the 10 KT event, Nathans realized that sedimentation had affected the population of particles larger than 10μ in his samples and therefore confined his analysis to particles of diameter 2μ and smaller (see figure 52). Gravity sorting would not have significantly affected the relative population of these small particles at sampling time (figure 10). Thus the 10 KT particle statistics were a reasonable standard of comparison. It was suspected that the lognormal parameters developed for \( \leq 2\mu \) particles would also describe the larger particle population.

Starting with a lognormal aggregate cloud distribution, the correction factor was applied to determine the sample population at the time and altitude of extraction. The calculation for Zuni sample 049 is illustrated in figure 56. Application of the correction factor to the lognormal distribution yields a curve that does in fact approximate a power law function. Indeed, a straight line fit to the curve falls as \( r^{-3.9} \) (Nathans' fit yielded an exponent of -4.07). Similar results are obtained for the other samples. In each case, the correction factor applied to a lognormal distribution with \( r_m = 0.17 \mu \) and \( \beta = \ln(3) \) masquerades as a power law function. In order to determine the best slope, \( r_m \) was held constant and \( \beta \) was varied until the slope of the corrected lognormal distribution matched Nathans' power law exponent. In each case a logarithmic slope of -3 provided the best fit (see figures 57-59). Varying \( r_m \) between 0.1-0.5μ did not significantly affect the optimum \( \beta \).

The correction factor as expressed in equation 64 did not explain the depletion of submicron particles in Nathans' samples (figures 4-6). A more elaborate correction, taking into account variations in \( f(z) \) with size group is probably needed. Since Nathans did not find spherical particles in samples taken underneath the visible cloud, there is reason to believe that smaller particles were more tightly clustered at the cloud center (smaller \( \sigma_z \)) such that their presence at sampling altitude would have been considerably diminished (65:3). Such clustering could be caused by the centrifugal action of the toroidal cloud motion which should preferentially disperse the
Figure 57. Lognormal vs. Power Law Fit, Johnie Boy Sample 245L
Figure 58. Lognormal vs. Power Law Fit, Johnnie Boy Sample 842L
Figure 59. Lognormal vs. Power Law Fit, Bravo Sample
heavier particles. This phenomenon would explain the absence of spherical particles in Bravo, Koon, and Zuni samples (all significantly below the cloud centroid) and the presence of spherical particles in Johnie Boy samples (taken near the cloud centroid). Another possible explanation for small particle depletion is agglomeration due to differences in group fall velocity. The relatively motionless small particles might have been depleted by sticking to larger particles falling through their midst.

Admittedly there are many remaining questions concerning the $n_2$ distribution. Only one instance (10 KT silicate burst) was found in which $n_2$ was intentionally analyzed as a separate, independent entity. It appears that only $n_2$ type particles were analyzed for Johnie Boy, Bravo, Zuni and Koon. It is puzzling that few if any spherical particles were present in the Bravo, Zuni, and Koon samples. A possible explanation has been offered but there may be others. For instance, Pacific events may not have produced significant numbers of spherical particles (although some were observed on the ground near Tewa). Even though present results indicate a fairly consistent $n_2$ parameter values among events, significant excursions are expected since these particles originate from surface materials which differ considerably in morphology and thermal history ($n_1$ originates from fireball vapors whose initial temperature is nearly independent of surface material and yield). Indeed there is evidence that for buried bursts $n_2$ is multimodal (69). And Norment's nominal DLFIC distribution implies that larger logarithmic slopes exist.

Nathans' 10 KT silicate surface burst results provide the most solid evidence for the existence of an independent $n_2$ distribution. The 10 KT results are consistent with Nathans' distributions for Johnie Boy, Bravo, Zuni, and Koon if a Gaussian cloud stratification correction factor is applied. Assuming these $n_2$ parameters to be representative of clouds, an important remaining question is what are the relative populations of $n_1$ and $n_2$? The relative number (or mass) of particles in each distribution determines the optical properties and longevity of nuclear clouds.

F. The $n_1 - n_2$ Split.

The measured $n_1/n_2$ ratio for cloud samples from the two silicate surface bursts discussed in section V.E were nearly identical. The ratio was 2.3 for Johnie Boy and 2.2 for the 10 KT silicate surface burst. These ratios would not have been
significantly affected by sedimentation since nearly 100% of the population lies below 5μ for both n₁ and n₂. The mass ratio may then determined from:

\[
\frac{M_1}{M_2} = \frac{\frac{4}{3} \pi \rho_1 \int_0^\infty N_1 \hat{n}_1(r) r^3 dr}{\frac{4}{3} \pi \rho_2 \int_0^\infty N_2 \hat{n}_2(r) r^3 dr} = \frac{N_1 <r_1^3>}{N_2 <r_2^3>} \tag{66}
\]

assuming particle densities (ρ₁, ρ₂) are roughly the same between the modes. Using a lognormal n₁ with rₘ of .1 μ and slope of 2, and a lognormal n₂ with rₘ of .17 μ and slope of 3, and \(N_1/N_2 = 2.2\), the result is:

\[
\frac{M_1}{M_2} = 1.7 \times 10^{-2} \tag{67}
\]

Thus, even though n₁ has a higher population, it represents only 1.7% of the mass lofted. The mass ratio expressed in equation 67 can be used to compute the combined fraction of mass below 1μ, \(f_m\), which equals 5.8%. This result is close to the TTAPS value of 8.4%.

Since the mass of soil lofted decreases with height of burst (13:3-7), \(M_1/M_2\) should increase accordingly. An indication of increase with HOB may be obtained by estimating the fraction of activity carried by n₁ vs n₂. Local fallout data can be used to get an indication of the activity split. Davis (54) has attempted to derive size distributions from local activity deposited vs time. Unable to model air burst deposition using a unimodal lognormal distribution, he found that a bimodal distribution could explain the data. He fit the observed rate of local activity deposition for actual events of varying scaled height of burst using the following expression:

\[
A(t) = A_o \left[ F_1 \int_{r(t)}^\infty a_1(r) dr + F_2 \int_{r(t)}^\infty a_2(r) dr \right] \tag{68}
\]

where \(A_o\) is the total activity lofted, \(r(t)\) is the radius of particles grounded at time t, \(F_2\) is the fraction of activity carried by n₂, and \(F_1 = 1 - F_2\). By fixing n₁ (lognormal with \(r_m = .1 \mu\) and slope = 2) and assigning n₂ an \(r_m\) of .2 μ, Davis obtained the results in Table VI (plotted in figure 60). The results indicate that 10 - 100% of the activity is carried by n₂ for a \(\leq 3\) foot scaled height of burst (SHOB=HOB\*KT^{-1/3})
Figure 60. Fraction of Activity on n₂ vs. Scaled Height of Burst
Figure 61. $F_1/F_2$ vs. Scaled Height of Burst
but that the fraction drops rapidly above 100 scaled feet. If the activity is distributed as the mass of particles, then \( S_1(r) \) and \( S_2(r) \) are constant and the mass ratio is proportional to the activity ratio:

\[
\frac{F_1}{F_2} = \frac{\frac{4}{3} \pi \rho_1 \int_0^\infty n_1(r) r^3 S_1(r) dr}{\frac{4}{3} \pi \rho_2 \int_0^\infty n_2(r) r^3 S_2(r) dr} \approx \frac{<S_1>}{<S_2>} \frac{M_1}{M_2}
\]

\( (69) \)

Davis' \( F_1/F_2 \) vs scaled height of burst is plotted in figure 61. These results will of course change with assumed particle size parameters and should be used with caution. However, the indicated trends are correct. It is interesting that the functional form of \( F_2 \) vs SHOB (figure 50) is reminiscent of Carpenter's fit to the total mass lofted vs SHOB (ref. 70, figure 62). This is logical since, for higher bursts, less surface mass is available to mix with fission products, hence \( F_2 \) should decrease roughly proportional to mass lofted. It is interesting that Davis' cliff in mass lofted occurs at \( \approx 200 \) scaled feet, noticeably lower than the \( \approx 700 \) ft. cliff exhibited by Carpenter's fit.

Notice that if the activity is radially distributed on particles it is not necessary to know specific activities, but rather mass ratios can be determined from number ratios via simple scaling relations:

\[
\frac{M_1}{M_2} = \frac{A_1/<S_1>}{A_2/<S_2>} = \frac{N_1 <r_1^3>}{N_2 <r_2^3>}
\]

\( (70) \)

These number ratios can be readily determined from microscopic examination of fallout samples preserved from atmospheric tests. If size distributions are known then average specific activity ratios may be determined from a knowledge of the total activity carried by each mode. Aggregate area fractions also obey a simple scaling relation:

\[
\frac{\text{Area}_1}{\text{Area}_2} = \frac{M_1 <r_2^3>}{M_2 <r_1^3>} <r_2^2> <r_1^2>
\]

\( (71) \)

The lognormal behavior of \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) further simplifies the moments calculations.

The results in Table VI give evidence of the suspected variability of \( n_2 \). The logarithmic slope varies from 3.2 to 6, with a mean of 4.2 which is near the DELFIC nominal value of 4.0. While the uncertainties inherent in Davis' calculations are large
Figure 62. Dust Mass lofted into the Stabilized Cloud (Showing Estimated Fraction of Glass and Relative Contributions of Blast Ejecta and Sweep-up)
Table VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>$F_2$</th>
<th>Median Radius $r_{m_s}$</th>
<th>Log Slope ($e^\beta_s$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Bursts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBBOB Coulomb-B</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSTER-JANGLE Sugar</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tower Bursts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAPOT Hornet</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAPOT Bee</td>
<td>0.0282</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAPOT Apple</td>
<td>0.0404</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBBOB Shasta</td>
<td>0.0994</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPSHOT-KNOTHOLE Nancy</td>
<td>0.0871</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAPOT Apple II</td>
<td>0.0852</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPSHOT-KNOTHOLE Harry</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPSHOT-KNOTHOLE Simon</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Bursts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBBOB Morgan</td>
<td>0.00583</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBBOB Owens</td>
<td>0.0407</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPSHOT-KNOTHOLE Grable</td>
<td>0.0240</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBBOB Stokes</td>
<td>0.00036</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBBOB Priscilla</td>
<td>0.0386</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBBOB Hood</td>
<td>0.00212</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nominal $n_1$ assumed with $r_{m_1} = .1 \mu$ and $\beta_1 = \ln 2$
and difficult to quantify, his results give further support to the existence of a bimodal
particle distribution in clouds and also give a rough indication of activity partitioning
between the modes.
VI. Summary and Conclusions.

This chapter will discuss the ramifications of Chapter V results and suggest further applications of atmospheric test data to the nuclear winter problem.

A. Bimodal Cloud Debris.

The major conclusion of this study is that cloud debris behavior can be explained by the existence of a bimodal size distribution. The puzzling dichotomy between early time and late time debris sedimentation (vividly demonstrated by the failure of the stratospheric size distribution to produce appreciable intermediate/local fallout by the sedimentation process) can be explained if:

\[
N_1 \frac{\sqrt{2\pi\beta_1}}{e^{-\frac{\ln(r) - \ln(r_m)}{\beta_1}}} + N_2 \frac{\sqrt{2\pi\beta_2}}{e^{-\frac{\ln(r) - \ln(r_m)}{\beta_2}}} \tag{72}
\]

where \( n_1 \) governs the late time behavior of activity removal and \( n_2 \) governs the early time behavior. Figure 63 plots \( n(r) \) as expressed above using Nathans' measured 10 KT silicate surface burst parameters. The TTAPS and DELFIC distributions are included for comparison. Supporting evidence for the bimodal distribution includes the size distribution indicated by the bulk vertical transfer of stratospheric tracers over a period of months to years (section V.A) and Nathans' analysis of early time cloud debris from surface bursts (section V.C). The \( n_1 \) (or "hot") component of cloud debris appears to originate from the condensation of material vaporized in the fireball and is present for both surface and air bursts. The \( n_2 \) (or "cold") component appears to be unmelted or partially melted surface material which never reached fireball temperatures. The \( n_2 \) component is not present in cloud samples from free air bursts. Table VII contrasts the properties of \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \).

The microscopically measured size distribution parameters for the \( n_1 \) component are fairly consistent from event to event (17). It is significant that the parameters properly predicting the removal of activity from the stratosphere are consistent with
Table VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of $N_1$ vs $N_2$ Particles</th>
<th>(N_1)</th>
<th>(N_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spherical</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high specific activity (S_1(r) \propto r^3)</td>
<td>low specific activity (S_2(r) \propto r^2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaporized material</td>
<td>unmelting/partially melted material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weapon mass + soil</td>
<td>soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size Distribution:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lognormal</td>
<td>lognormal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r_m \approx .1 \mu)</td>
<td>(r_m \approx .2 \mu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta \approx \ln(2))</td>
<td>(\beta \approx \ln(3) - \ln(5))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratospheric Removal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedimentation + Diffusion</td>
<td>Sedimentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENCE*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air burst......yes</td>
<td>..............no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low air/tower...varies with HOB</td>
<td>....varies with HOB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface...small fraction of mass</td>
<td>....large fraction of mass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reference 76
Figure 63. Bimodal Distribution Compared to Nathans' and DELFIC
the microscopically measured size distributions for hot particles from air and surface bursts (figures 35,39,42). Representative values for the median radius and slope are .1μ and 2 respectively. These values predict the average behavior of stratospheric 90Sr debris injected by 97 events over a 15 year period.

Characterization of n2 has been less satisfactory due to data limitations and the expected variation in n2 parameters with surface material and burst height. Analysis of limited data for surface bursts provided by Nathans indicates a median radius and slope in the vicinity of .17μ and 3 for the n2 component. Davis' results (54) indicate that logarithmic slopes may vary considerably about a mean of ~4. Clearly, more work is needed to bound the size and mass properties of the "cold" distribution. It may be that n2 is itself multimodal, especially for buried bursts (69). In addition the relation of n2 fraction to burst height needs to be resolved with confidence. This relation is bound up with the problem of determining mass lofted per kiloton.

The existence of a bimodal cloud distribution leads to a new equation for computing the total mass lofted:

$$M_T = A_T \left[ \frac{F_1}{<S_1>} + \frac{F_2}{<S_2>} \right]$$

The present effort has not investigated the full implications of this equation which enables computation of mass lofted based upon a knowledge of total activity deposited. Reasonable estimates of F1 and F2 should be possible from a careful evaluation of existing fallout data. For example, Tompkins (71) has developed fits for the fraction of activity deposited locally based upon data from several Nevada events. Since a large part of the n2 distribution and almost none of the n1 distribution falls in 24 hours, Tompkins' fraction roughly approximates F2, at least for above ground shots.

There is considerable uncertainty in the average specific activity parameters. The data required to narrow these uncertainties does not appear to be plentiful, particularly for determining the variation of <S1> and <S2> with height of burst. However data from surface bursts and free air bursts are available, which taken together with some reasonable physics could be used to develop a credible model. For purposes of illustration, consider an approximate calculation for Johnie Boy whose fission yield was .5 KT (equivalent to 7 x 1022 fissions). Tompkins (71)
indicates that \(70\%\) of the activity from Johnie Boy was deposited locally. Using this as a rough value for \(F_2\) and estimating \(<S_1>\) and \(<S_2>\) to be \(10^{18}\) and \(10^{15}\) respectively, then \(M_T \approx 0.051\) KT. This translates to .12 kilotons of dust lofted per kiloton of yield.

B. Cloud Stratification Effects.

An important conclusion from the investigation of the power tail behavior of samples from Johnie Boy, Bravo, Zuni and Koon (section V.E) is that size distributions vary tremendously with sample location and time due to sedimentation induced vertical cloud stratification. Consequently, extreme caution should be exercised in generalizing a cloud distribution from the distributions of isolated samples. The results show specifically that clouds whose total particle ensemble is lognormally distributed can yield sample distributions which obey a power law function. It is quite possible that Natl .ns' power law distributions originated from clouds whose aggregate population was closer to lognormal.

Cloud stratification effects on sample distributions become extremely pronounced with increasing distance from the cloud centroid. The stratification effect may in fact explain the narrow distributions observed for ground samples which seem to vary so much with distance downwind. An example of the size distribution which would be measured on the ground 12 hours post shot underneath a Gaussian cloud with a standard devia. on of 700m is shown in figure 84. The distribution peaks at 35\(\mu\) with a half-width of only 5\(\mu\). The half-width is a function of the sedimentation correction factor (equation 81) which is in turn a function of the cloud vertical density distribution. Thus, it may be possible to learn something about the vertical density of clouds by studying the half width of particle size distributions of ground samples.

C. Optical Depth Implications.

Using the bimodal size distribution expressed in equation 73, it is possible to compute the optical thickness vs time for a stratospheric dust cloud representative of the TTAPS 5000 Megaton exchange. Analogous to equation 10:

\[
OT = \left[ \frac{3M_T Q_e}{4\rho_s A_e} \right] \frac{<r^2>}{<r^3>}
\]

(74)
Figure 64. Ground Sample Distribution, 12 Hours Post-Shot
Using equations 6 and 7 for the 2nd and 3rd moments of the lognormal distributions \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) the following expression for the initial optical thickness results

\[
\sigma_T = \left[ \frac{3M_T Q_e}{4 \rho_e A_c} \right] \left[ \frac{N_1}{N_2} e^{2 \ln (r_{m_1} + 2 \beta)} + e^{2 \ln (r_{m_1} + 2 \beta)} \right]
\]

Using the cloud parameter values from section I.B.1 (\( A_c = 1.14 \times 10^{14} \ m^2 \), \( \rho_e = 2600 \ kg/m^3 \), and \( Q_e = 2.5 \)) the initial optical thickness is 2.0. This is comparable to the initial dust optical thickness of 1.25 computed by the TTAPS group. Recall (figure 3) that the nominal DELFIC \( n(r) \) predicts an initial O.T. of .25, and the Ramaswamy-Kiehl (R-K) distribution predicts 11.6. The bimodal distribution was used in subroutine STRATFAL to predict the rate of decay of optical thickness for a cloud initially centered at 25 KM. The results are overlaid with DELFIC, TTAPS, and R-K in figure 85. The bimodal distribution optical attenuation is initially higher than the TTAPS result, but decays more rapidly leveling off to a value of \( \frac{1}{4} \) of the TTAPS optical thickness (the factor of \( \frac{1}{4} \) is certainly within model uncertainties). The curves are parallel at late times because the remaining particles are small enough that their removal is governed by the exponential turbulent diffusion effect. Thus, the size distribution derived in this research, although different than the size distribution used in the TTAPS study, yields similar estimates of optical thickness magnitude and decay (other effects being equal). Although the power law behavior may well be an aberration of cloud stratification, Nathans’ distribution appears to provide a reasonable estimate of sunlight attenuation magnitude and duration. The similarity of the results is due to the fact that the submicron fractions are comparable.

D. Recommendations.

1. The evidence supports the existence of a bimodal particle size distribution in nuclear clouds. The distribution expressed in equation 72 should be seriously considered for predicting optical attenuation effects and fallout removal. The existence of distributions of different consistencies and thermal origins (Table VII) warrants an investigation of possibly large differences in optical properties as well.
Figure 65. OT vs. Time, Cloud Initially Centered at 25 km
2. Work is needed to characterize $n_2(r)$. This research has uncovered only one instance of separate size analysis of spherical and irregular particles. There may be others. If not, it is recommended that further analysis of samples from atmospheric test clouds be conducted and that any such analysis develop separate statistics for spherical and irregular particles. The $n_2$ parameter values used here (median radius $0.17\mu$ and slope of 3) are based on analysis of actual data by Marcel Nathans, and are certainly reasonable values to use in the interim for estimates of surface burst effects. Indications are that the slope ranges higher. Thus the nominal DELFIC distribution is also a plausible representation of $n_2$.

3. Computations of mass lofted per kiloton should be reexamined in light of the bimodal nature of the cloud distribution. An attempt should be made to quantify the parameters of equation 73 based upon test data over a range of scaled burst height/depth. It is reasonable to expect that the uncertainty in estimates of mass lofted vs yield and height of burst can be considerably reduced.

4. It would be useful to run the rigorous models of climate effects from nuclear war using the bimodal $n(r)$ function and parameters developed in the present research. Although it appears that optical effects are not drastically different from TTAPS, the effect on temperature drop needs to be investigated. The higher initial magnitude and more rapid decay rate may cause larger differences in the predicted temperature changes.
APPENDIX A

TREATMENT OF FALL MECHANICS

Fall mechanics involves the solution of the one dimensional force balance equation including a viscosity term:

\[ F(t) = f u - m \frac{du}{dt} \]  

(A.1)

where \( m \) is the particle's mass, \( u \) is its velocity, and \( f \) is the viscous damping coefficient. Particles are assumed to be spherical. The functional relationship between the viscous force, \( f u \), and particle diameter varies with particle size and altitude. At sea level, for particles less than 10\( \mu \), Stoke's law applies:

\[ f = 6\pi \eta r \]  

(A.2)

and the force balance equation becomes:

\[ 6\pi \eta r = \frac{4}{3} \pi r^3 \rho g \]  

(A.3)

where \( \eta \) is the dynamic viscosity (kg/sec/m) and \( r \) is the particle's radius. Note that the resisting force is proportional to radius. Solving for terminal velocity:

\[ u_{term} = \frac{2r^2 \rho g}{9\eta} \]  

(A.4)

For particles greater than 10\( \mu \), aerodynamic drag is significant and the force balance equation becomes:

\[ \frac{1}{2} \rho_s u^2 C_d \pi r^2 = \frac{4}{3} \pi r^3 \rho g \]  

(A.5)

The solution of this equation is complicated by the fact that \( C_d \) is a function of the particle's velocity. McDonald (73) suggested a method of solution by defining \( u \) in terms of the Reynolds number:

\[ u = \frac{R_e \eta}{2\rho_s r} \]  

(A.8)
McDonald then defined a quantity, $Q$:

$$Q = R_e^2 C_d = \frac{32 \rho_a (\rho - \rho_a) g r^3}{3 \eta^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.7)

which Davies (74) has fit to various polynomial expressions depending upon its magnitude. $Q$ is referred to as the "Davies number". For a given altitude, the fall velocity is computed by calculating $Q$, finding $R_e$ from Davies' polynomial fits, and then computing $u$ from $R_e$. Polynomial fits for determining $R_e$ are as follows:

for $140 < Q \leq 4.5 \times 10^7$:

$$\log_{10} R_e = -1.29536 + 0.986 \log_{10} Q + 0.048677 \log_{10}^2 Q + 1.1235 \times 10^{-3} \log_{10}^3 Q$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.8)

for $84.175 < Q < 140$:

$$R_e = Q \left( 4.168887 \times 10^{-2} - 2.3383 \times 10^{-4} Q + 2.0154 \times 10^{-8} Q^2 - 8.9105 Q^3 \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.9)

for $0.3261 < Q < 84.175$:

$$R_e = \exp \left[ -3.18657 + 0.902696 \ln Q - 0.153193 \ln^2 Q - 0.987059 \ln^3 Q - 0.578876 \ln^4 Q 
- 0.855176 \ln^5 Q - 0.327815 \ln^6 Q \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.10)

for $Q < 0.3261$

Stokes equation (A.5) applies.

For particle diameters approaching the mean free path ($L$) of air molecules, the drag for a given velocity is less than predicted by the polynomial fits and a slip correction factor must be introduced. For example, when $d/L=10$ the Stokes equation underestimates $u$ by about 15 percent (9). At 50,000 ft, $L=0.4$ microns, so it is clear that the slip factor is important for gravity fall calculations.

The Cunningham slip correction factor used in HASP analysis (10) and DELFIC (8) was derived for $d/L$ ratios between 2 and 100. Knudsen and Weber (57) proposed a general formula that fits data over a wider range of $d/L$ values:

$$C = 1 + \frac{L}{r} \left[ A_1 + A_2 \exp \left( -\frac{2A_3 r}{L} \right) \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.11)
where $A_1=1.644$, $A_2=.552$, and $A_3=.656$. The Knudsen-Weber slip correction formula was incorporated into the fall velocity model.

The equations in this appendix were encoded as shown in the listing which follows. Computed terminal velocities compare to within 20% of those computed by models used in the High Altitude Sampling Program for particle diameters ranging from .001 - $10\mu$ (10:154).
FUNCTION VEL(ZB,RP)

C COMPUTES TERMINAL VELOCITY OF SPHERICAL PARTICLES USING
FULL DELFLIC
C FALL MECHANICS AND U.S. STANDARD ATMOSPHERE EQUATIONS
C SUBROUTINE ATMOS RETURNS DENSITY, VISCOSITY AND MEAN FREE
PATH AT ALT ZB
REAL MFP,LOGREY
C EXTERNAL ATMOS
CALL ATMOS(ZB,DENS,VISC,MFP)
DENSF=2600.
G=9.8
QZ=4.*DENS*(DENSF-DENS)*Q*(2.*RP)**3/(3.*VISC*VISC)
C WRITE(6,1051)QZ,DENS,VISC,MFP
C1051 FORMAT('QZ,DENS,VISC,MFP',4(E10.3))
YY=ALOG(QZ)
C DENSF IS PARTICLE DENSITY, G IS GRAV, QZ IS DAVIES NUMBER
DEFINED IN
C DNA TR-5159F-1, P24
IF(QZ .LE. .3261)THEN
VEL=VISC*QZ/(24.*DENS*2.*RP)
GO TO 1100
ENDIF
IF((QZ .GT. .3261) .AND. (QZ .LE. 84.175))THEN
VEL=(VISC/(DENS*2.*RP))*EXP(-3.18657+.992696*YY-
1.5313E-3*YY**2-9.87059E-4*YY**3-5.78878E-4*YY**4
+8.551759E-5*YY**5-3.27815E-6*YY**6)
GO TO 1100
ENDIF
IF((QZ . GT. 84.175) .AND. (QZ .LT. 140))THEN
VEL=VISC*QZ*(4.166667E-2-2.3363E-1*QZ+2.0154E-6*Q
Z**2
-6.9105E-9*QZ**3)/(DENS*2.*RP)
GO TO 1100
ENDIF
IF((QZ .GE. 140) .AND. (QZ .LT. 4.5E7))THEN
LOGREY=-1.29536+.986*YY/2.303-.046677*(YY/2.303)*
+.0011235*(YY/2.303)**3
REYNOL=10.*LOGREY
VEL=REYNOL*VISC/(2.*DENS*RP)
ENDIF
C KNUDSEN SLIP CORRECTION
1100 IF(RP.GT.100.*MFP) THEN
EXPFAC=0.
ELSE
EXPFAC=EXP(-0.6562*RP/MFP)
ENDIF
VEL=VEL*(1.+0.044+.552*EXPFAC)*MFP/
(2.*RP)
RETURN
END

*****************************************************************************
SUBROUTINE ATMOS(ZB, DENS, VISC, MFP)
C SUBROUTINE CALCULATES ATMOSPHERIC TEMPERATURE, PRESSURE AND VISCOSITY
C FOR ALTITUDES UP TO 84,852 METERS (MKs UNITS EMPLOYED)
REAL LK, NUMDEN, MFP
IF(ZB .LE. 11000.) THEN
    LK=0.006545
    TK=288.15
    PK=101300.
    TB=TK+LK*ZB
    PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(0.034164/LK)
    GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 11000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 20000.)) THEN
    ZK=11000.
    TK=216.65
    PK=22690.
    LK=0.
    TB=TK
    PB=PK*EXP(-0.034164*(ZB-ZK)/TK)
    GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 20000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 32000.) ) THEN
    ZK=20000.
    TK=216.65
    PK=5528.
    LK=.001
    TB=TK+LK*(ZB-ZK)
    PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(0.034164/LK)
    GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 32000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 47000. ) ) THEN
    ZK=32000.
    TK=228.65
    PK=888.8
    LK=.0028
    TB=TK+LK*(ZB-ZK)
    PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(0.034164/LK)
    GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 47000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 51000. ) ) THEN
    ZK=47000.
    TK=270.65
    PK=110.873
    LK=0.
    TB=TK
    PB=PK*EXP(-0.034164*(ZB-ZK)/TK)
    GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 51000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 71000. ) ) THEN
    ZK=51000.
    TK=270.65
    PK=110.873
    LK=0.
    TB=TK
    PB=PK*EXP(-0.034164*(ZB-ZK)/TK)
    GO TO 1240
ENDIF
PK=.669218
LK=-.0028
TB=TK+L*(ZB-ZK)
P=PK*(TK/TB)**(.034164/LK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF

IF((ZB .GT. 71000.) AND (ZB .LE. 84852.)) THEN
ZK=71000.
TK=214.65
PK=3.95536
LK=-.002
TB=TK+L*(ZB-ZK)
P=PK*(TK/TB)**(.034164/LK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF

IF((ZB .GT. 84852)) THEN
WRITE (6,1230)
GO TO 1241
ENDIF

1230 FORMAT('PARTICLE ALTITUDE BEYOND RANGE OF PROGRAM
APPLICABILITY:')

1240 VISC=1.46E-6*TB**1.5/(TB+110.4)
DENS=.003484*PB/TB
NUMDEN=DENS*2.55E25/1.23
C
C PER CUBIC METER: 2.55E25 MOLECULES PER CUBE AT SEA
LEVEL.
C DENSITY AT SEA LEVEL IS 1.23 KG/CUBE
C MFP=1/(1.414*NUMDEN**.5E-19)
C MFP=1/(ROOT2*N(SIGMA))

1241 RETURN
END
END OF FILE
APPENDIX B

THE LOGNORMAL DISTRIBUTION AND ITS MOMENTS

The lognormal distribution derives from the normal distribution if the variable of integration is replaced by its logarithm: if
\[ r \rightarrow \ln(r), \]
then
\[ dN = \frac{dr}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left(-\frac{(r-r_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \tag{B.1} \]
\[ \longrightarrow dN = \frac{dr}{\sqrt{2\pi}\beta r} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln(r)-\ln(r_m))^2}{2\beta^2}\right) \tag{B.2} \]

where \( r_m \) is the median radius of the number distribution (50% of particles are smaller than \( r_m \)) and \( \beta \) governs the dispersion of the distribution:
\[ \beta = \exp\left[\frac{r_{84.13\%}}{r_m}\right] = \exp\left[\frac{r_m}{r_{15.87\%}}\right] = \exp\left[S\right] \tag{B.3} \]

\( S \) is known as the "logarithmic slope" (or sometimes just "slope") of the distribution.

The distribution function appears in several forms:
\[ \frac{dN}{d(\ln r)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\beta} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln(r)-\ln(r_m))^2}{2\beta^2}\right) \tag{B.4} \]
or
\[ \frac{dN}{dr} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\beta r} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln(r)-\ln(r_m))^2}{2\beta^2}\right) \tag{B.5} \]
or
\[ n(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\beta r} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln(r)-\ln(r_m))^2}{2\beta^2}\right) \tag{B.6} \]
The last expression is used in the present research. The symbol ", " denotes the function as normalized, i.e.

\[ \int_{0}^{\infty} \hat{n}(r) dr = 1 \]  
(B.7)

The mode radius of a lognormal distribution lies below \( r_m \):

\[ r_{mode} = r_m e^{-\beta^2} \]  
(B.8)

The mean radius lies above \( r_m \):

\[ r_{mean} = r_m e^{\frac{1}{2} \beta^2} \]  
(B.9)

Any moment of a lognormal distribution is itself lognormal (true for both positive and negative moments). This can be demonstrated by successive substitutions for the variable of integration. Consider the \( l \)th moment:

\[ A(r) = \int_{0}^{r} \hat{n} \hat{(r)} \, dr \]

\[ = \int_{0}^{r} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \beta r} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\ln(r) - \ln(r_m)}{\beta} \right)^2 \right] \, dr \]  
(B.10)

letting

\[ z = \left( \frac{\ln(r) - \ln(r_m)}{\beta} \right) \]  
(B.11)

\[ A(r) \] becomes:

\[ A(r) = e^{l \mu(r_m)} \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{lnr-lnr_m}{\beta}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-w^2/2(2\beta)} \, dw \]  
(B.12)

completing the square in the exponent of the integrand yields:

\[ A(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{l \beta^2/2} e^{l \mu(r_m)} \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{lnr-lnr_m}{\beta}} e^{-w^2} \, dw \]  
(B.13)

changing variables again, let

\[ w = z - l \beta \]  
(B.14)
Then:

\[ A(r) = \left[ e^{i \sqrt{\beta} r} e^{i \left( \ln r_m \right)} \right] \frac{\ln r - \left( \ln r_m + i \beta \right)}{\beta} \int_{-\infty}^{\beta} e^{-\frac{1}{2} w^2} dw \]  

(B.15)

Letting

\[ r_l = \ln r_m + l \beta \]  

(B.16)
yields a very useful integral expression for \( A(r) \):

\[ A(r) = \left[ e^{i \sqrt{\beta} r} e^{i \left( \ln r_m \right)} \right] \frac{\ln r - \ln r_l}{\beta} \int_{-\infty}^{\beta} e^{-\frac{1}{2} w^2} dw \]  

(B.17)

The expression above is readily evaluated using approximations in Abramowitz and Stegun (72: 932-933). Equation B.17 can be manipulated further into lognormal form by letting:

\[ w = \frac{\ln r - \ln r_l}{\beta} \]  

(B.18)

Then,

\[ A(r) = e^{i \sqrt{\beta} r} e^{i \left( \ln r_m \right)} \int_0^{r_l} \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left( \ln r' - \ln r_l \right)^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi \beta r'}} dr' \]  

(B.19)

Differentiating,

\[ \frac{dA(r)}{dr} = e^{i \sqrt{\beta} r} e^{i \left( \ln r_m \right)} \frac{\ln r - \ln r_l}{\beta} \sqrt{2\pi \beta r} dr \]  

(B.20)

\[ = a(r) \quad \text{(analogous to eqn. B.6)} \]

Thus the \( l \)th moment is lognormal with the same dispersion (\( \beta \)) but a different median radius, \( r_l \):

\[ r_l = r_m e^{l \beta} \]  

(B.21)

Normalized expressions for \( a(r) \) are:

\[ a(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \beta r}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left( \ln r - \ln r_l \right)^2} \]  

(B.22a)
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\[ \frac{r^l}{\sqrt{2\pi\beta r}} e^{-\frac{\ln r - \ln r_m}{\beta}} \]

Note that the average value of \( r^l \) is:

\[ \langle r^l \rangle = \int_0^\infty r^l \hat{n}(r) dr = A(\infty) = e^{\frac{\ln^2 \beta + l}{2} \ln r_m} \]

(B.23)

The ease of manipulating the moments of the lognormal distribution greatly simplifies \( n(r) \) parameter analysis.
NATHANS' DISTRIBUTION AND ITS MOMENTS

Nathans fit his particle size data to a function of the following form:

\[ n(r) = n_A(r) = n_0 \left( \frac{r_m}{r} \right)^p \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\ln(r) - \ln(r_m)}{\beta} \right)^2 \right], \quad r < r_o \]

\[ - n_B(r) = n_0 \left( \frac{r_o}{r} \right)^p, \quad r \geq r_o \quad (C.1) \]

where \( n_0 = n(r_o) \).

The transition radius, \( r_o \), is found by requiring that the number size distribution and its first derivative be continuous there. This radius is given by:

\[ r_o = r_m \exp[(p-1)/\beta] \quad (C.2) \]

Note that the 3rd moment (mass distribution) of \( n(r) \) is not analytic for \( p \leq 4 \), i.e.,

\[ \int_0^\infty n_0 \left( \frac{r_o}{r} \right)^p r^3 dr \rightarrow \infty, \quad p \leq 4 \quad (C.3) \]

This problem is mitigated by defining a maximum radius, \( r_{max} \) as a function of the mass fraction \( f_m \) below \( r_o \). Starting with:

\[ f_m = \frac{\int_0^{r_o} n_A(r)r^3 dr}{\int_0^{r_{max}} n_A(r)r^3 dr + \int_0^{r_{max}} n_B(r)r^3 dr} \quad (C.4) \]

Solving for \( r_{max} \):

\[ r_{max} = \left[ r_o (1 - 1/f_m)(p - 4)e^{\delta(p-4)^2}\sqrt{2\pi}\beta\text{CNF}[\beta(n-4)] + 1 \right]^{1/(4-n)}, \quad p < 4 \]

\[ = r_o \exp \left[ \sqrt{2\pi}\beta(1 - f_m/2f_m) \right], \quad p = 4 \quad (C.5) \]
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where CNF designates the normal or Gaussian probability function:

\[
CNF(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} dy
\]  

Having defined \( r_{\text{max}} \) for the 3rd moment, the lower moments must be normalized assuming no particles exist with radius greater than \( r_{\text{max}} \).

The normalized moments of \( n(r) \) are:

\[
\hat{A}(r) = \frac{\int_{0}^{r} n(r) r^l dr}{I_A + I_B}, \quad r < r_o
\] (C.7a)

\[
\hat{A}(r) = \frac{\int_{0}^{r_o} n_A(r) r^l dr + \int_{r_o}^{r} n_B(\tilde{r}) \tilde{r}^l d\tilde{r}}{I_A + I_B}, \quad r \geq r_o
\] (C.7b)

where

\[
I_A = \int_{0}^{r_o} r^l dr = \sqrt{2\pi} e^{\frac{1}{2} \beta^2 \beta^2} r_0^{5/2} r_m^{-3/2} \text{CNF} \left( \frac{\ln(r_o) - \ln(r_1)}{\beta} \right)
\] (C.8)

and

\[
I_B = \int_{r_o}^{r_{\text{max}}} r^l \left( \frac{r_o}{r} \right)^p dr = \frac{r_o^p}{l-p+1} \left[ r_{\text{max}}^{l-p+1} - r_o^{l-p+1} \right], \quad l \neq p-1
\] (C.9a)

\[
I_B = r_o^p \ln \left( \frac{r_{\text{max}}}{r_o} \right), \quad l = p-1
\] (C.9b)

Thus,

\[
\hat{A}(r) = \frac{I_A + \frac{r_o^p}{l-p+1} \left[ r_{\text{max}}^{l-p+1} - r_o^{l-p+1} \right]}{I_A + I_B}, \quad r \geq r_o, l \neq p-1
\] (C.10b)

\[
\hat{A}(r) = \frac{I_A + r_o^p \ln(r/r_o)}{I_A + I_B}, \quad r \geq r_o, l = p-1
\] (C.10c)
These equations are the basis for the activity group computation in subroutine SIZNAT (see Appendix E for a listing).
APPENDIX D

Program SHOT60 Listing
PROGRAM
SHOT60(INPUT,OUTPUT,TAPE5=INPUT,TAPE6=OUTPUT,TAPE2,TAPE4,
'PLFILE=0)
C PROGRAM IDENTIFIES BEST VALUES OF MOMENT, MEDIAN RADIUS,
AND BETA OF C ALOG NORMAL STRATOSPHERIC PARTICLE SIZE DISTRIBUTION BASED
UPON C
C ATOMIC TEST DATA
DIMENSION TRUEDA(20),BURDEN(20),RCOUNT(336),MONTH(336)
DIMENSION RO(20),R(20),TRUEYR(20),YEARD(336)
DIMENSION A(8,8),B(8,8),DELTA(8,8)
COMMON RGROUP(60),WEIGHT(60),OFFSET(11),Y(11),MC(11)
REAL MO, M01, MONTH, MC, LOGR
INTEGER OFFSET
C OPEN AUXILIARY DATA FILE
OPEN(2,FILE='F1')
C FIRST ESTABLISH VALUES FOR DATA (TRUE) AGAINST WHICH TO
OPTIMIZE
TRUEDA(1)=1.60
TRUEDA(2)=1.20
TRUEDA(3)=.903
TRUEDA(4)=1.00
TRUEDA(5)=.933
TRUEDA(6)=1.62
TRUEDA(7)=1.10
TRUEDA(8)=.933
TRUEDA(9)=2.07
TRUEDA(10)=6.41
TRUEDA(11)=3.56
TRUEDA(12)=1.47
TRUEDA(13)=.750
TRUEDA(14)=.310
TRUEDA(15)=.280
TRUEYR(1)=6./12.
TRUEYR(2)=12./12.
TRUEYR(3)=24./12.
TRUEYR(4)=36./12.
TRUEYR(5)=48./12.
TRUEYR(6)=60./12.
TRUEYR(7)=72./12.
TRUEYR(8)=84./12.
TRUEYR(9)=96./12.
TRUEYR(10)=108./12.
TRUEYR(11)=120./12.
TRUEYR(12)=132./12.
TRUEYR(13)=144./12.
TRUEYR(14)=156./12.
TRUEYR(15)=168./12.
C INPUT OFFSET,YIELD,SR90 FOR ATOMIC "EVENTS"
OFFSET(1)=6
OFFSET(2)=58
OFFSET(3)=64
OFFSET(4)=82
OFFSET(5)=106
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OFFSET(6)=114
OFFSET(7)=186
OFFSET(8)=188
OFFSET(9)=204
OFFSET(10)=210
OFFSET(11)=210
X(1)=9.6
X(2)=3.5
X(3)=1.5
X(4)=2.4
X(5)=7
X(6)=3.6
X(7)=2.8
X(8)=41.5
X(9)=5.3
X(10)=25.
X(11)=6.8
MC(1)=2.4
MC(2)=.88
MC(3)=3
MC(4)=1.4
MC(5)=1.1
MC(6)=1.1
MC(7)=.644
MC(8)=.689
MC(9)=.427
MC(10)=4.56
MC(11)=1.95

SET VALUES FOR THE MOMENT, MEDIAN RADIUS, AND SLOPE (BE1)

BETA IS THE NATURAL LOG OF THE SLOPE

WRITE(6,*)' INPUT NDIST (1=LOG NORM, 2=NATHANS HYBRID)'
READ(5,*)NDIST
WRITE(6,*)' INPUT MOMENT'
READ(5,*)MO1
I=0
DO 20 BE1=1.01,4.,2
  I=I+1
  J=0
DO 10 LOGR=-2.,1.,1
  J=J+1
  RM1=10.**LOGR
  FORMAT (A)
  IF(NDIST.EQ.2)WRITE(6,*)' INPUT FMASS (P1=4) '
  IF(NDIST.EQ.2)READ(5,*)F
  FO=0.
  CALL STRATF(NDIST,MO1,RM1,BE1,F,BURDEN,RCOUNT)
  DO 30 K=10,15
    R0(K)=BURDEN(K)-TRUEDA(K)
    R0(K)=R0(K)*R0(K)
    FO=FO+R0(K)
  CONTINUE
  WRITE(6,32) I,J,BE1,RM1,FO
  WRITE(2,50)I,J,LOGR,BE1,FO
  FORMAT( I4,I4,E12.5,E12.5,E12.5)
10 CONTINUE
20 CONTINUE
32 FORMAT( 'I',14,' J',14,' B',E8.3,' R',E8.3,' FO',E8.3)
DO 40 I=1,336
MONTH(I)=FLOAT(I)/2.
YEAR(I)=MONTH(I)/12.
40 CONTINUE
GO TO 999
C DISSPLA PLOTTING CALLS FOLLOW
77 CALL COMPRES
CALL XNAME('YEAR$',100)
CALL YNAME('STRATOSPHERIC BURDEN (MC)$',100)
CALL PAGE(8.5,11.)
CALL AREA2D(5.1,4.)
CALL HEADIN('SR90 BURDEN FROM U.S. FOREIGN TESTS$',100,1.,1)
CALL INTAXS
CALL GRAF(0.,1.,14.,0.,1.,8.)
CALL THKFRM(0.02)
CALL FRAME
CALL CURVE(TRUEYR,TRUEDA,15,1)
CALL MARKER(0)
CALL CURVE(YEAR,RCOUNT,336,12)
CALL GRID(1,1)
ENCODE(60,15,LABEL)MO1,RM1,BE1,FO15
FORMAT( 'MOMENT=',F4.1,' RM=',F4.1,' SLOPE=',F4.1,' FO=',E9.3,'$')
CALL RLMESS(LABEL,100,1.,7.)
CALL XDTAXS(540101,4,YEAR,680101,5.1,'$',100,0.,-.75)
CALL ENDPL(0)
CALL DONEPL
999 END

SUBROUTINE MTXEQ(A,X,B,N,K)
C
C MATRIX EQUATION SOLVER
C
C USAGE...
C
C TO SOLVE THE LINEAR SYSTEM AX=B
C
C CALL MTXEQ(A,X,B,N,K)
C
C WHERE A MUST BE DIMENSIONED N X N
C X MUST BE DIMENSIONED N X K
C B MUST BE DIMENSIONED N X K
C N IS THE NO. OF EQUATIONS (ROWS IN A,X,B)
K is the no. of solution vectors (cols. in X, B)

Note... to change dimensions of arrays C and PIV, also change values of NMAX and NKMAX in data statement.

Declarations

```
INTEGER KP, NP, J, I, IFROM, IP1, IPIV, ITO, L, NP1, NPJ, NPK
REAL A(8,8), B(8,8), X(8,8)
REAL PIV(16), C(8,16), ATPE, RM
DATA NMAX, NKMAX / 8, 16 /
```

Get arguments N and K

```
NP = N
KP = K
```

Test N and K for correct range

```
IF (NP .LE. 0 .OR. NP .GT. NMAX) GO TO 190  
IF (KP .LE. 0 .OR. (NP + KP) .GT. NKMAX) GO TO 190
```

Move arrays A(I,J) and B(I,J) into C(I,J)

```
DO 10 J = 1, NP
   DO 10 I = 1, NP
      C(I,J) = A(I,J)
10    C(I,NPJ) = B(I,J)
```

Set to perform N elimination sweeps (I = 1, N)

```
NP1 = NP + 1
NPK = NP + KP
DO 120 I = 1, NP
   IP1 = I + 1
```

Search for next pivot row (I-th pivot is in col. I)

```
ATPE = 0.
   DO 40 J = 1, NP
      IF (ABS(C(J,I)) - ATPE) 40, 30, 30
30   ATPE = ABS(C(J,I))
      IPIV = J
40    CONTINUE
```

Operate on the pivot row

```
IF (ATPE) 210, 210, 50
```
DO 60 J=IP1,NPK
   IF (C(IPIV,I) .EQ. 0) THEN
      WRITE(6,302)
      WRITE(6,327)
      STOP
   ELSE
      PIV(J)=C(IPIV,J)/C(IPIV,I)
   ENDIF
60 CONTINUE

C PERFORM ELIMINATIONS BELOW THE DIAGONAL (COL. I)

IFROM=NP
IT0=NP
70 IF (IPROM-IPIV) 80,100,80
80 RM=-C(IFROM,I)
   DO 90 J=IP1,NPK
   90 C(ITO,J)=C(IFROM,J)+RM*PIV(J)
   ITO=ITO-1
100 IFROM=IFROM-1
   IF (IFROM-I) 110,70,70
C PUT THE I-TH PIVOT ROW IN THE VACATED ROW I
C
110 DO 120 J=IP1,NPK
120 C(I,J)=PIV(J)
C
NOW DO THE BACK SOLUTION
C
I=NP
130 IP1=I
   I=I-1
140 IF (I) 160,160,140
   DO 150 J=NP1,NPK
   DO 150 L=IP1,NP
   150 C(I,J)=C(I,J)-C(I,L)*C(L,J)
   GO TO 130
C MOVE THE SOLUTION TO ARRAY X(I,J)
C
160 DO 170 J=1,KP
   NPJ=NP+J
   DO 170 I=1,NP
   170 X(I,J)=C(I,NPJ)
   RETURN
C
190 WRITE(6,1000) NP, KP
   CALL SYSTEM (200,'L')
   STOP
210 WRITE(6,1001)
   CALL SYSTEM (200,'L')
   STOP
302 FORMAT(4(/),51H *** DIVISION BY ZERO OCCURED IN SUBROUTINE MTXEQ -

DURING EVALUATION OF PIV(J) ***

FORMAT(24H PLEASE CHECK YOUR INPUT,4(/))

1000 FORMAT(3HON=,I12,3H K=,I12,35H ARE INCORRECT FOR SUBROUTINE MTEQ )

1001 FORMAT (37HODET(A)*O IN CALL TO SUBROUTINE MTXEQ)

SUBROUTINE SYSTEM
RETURN
END

SUBROUTINE STRATF( NDIST, MOMENT, RMICRON, SLOPE, F, BURDEN, RCOUNT)

VERSION TO GENERATE PSEUDO DATA TO CHECK OPTIMIZATION TECHN

TAPE5 FROM KEYBOARD, TAPE6 TO SCREEN, TAPE2=EVENT
DATA, TAPE3=DATA OUT FOR PBBBR

DIMENSION CONTR(60), ZGROUP(60)
DIMENSION GRPSUM(11,336), RCOUNT(336), GCOUNT(336)
DIMENSION PLTEAU(336), TVEL(60)
DIMENSION BURDEN(20), HOC(11)
COMMON RGROUP(60), WEIGHT(60), OFFSET(11), MC(11)
REAL MONTH, LNY, MOMENT, MC
INTEGER OFFSET, EVENT, CONTR, TABS, TAB
EXTERNAL STRAF, VEL
RM=RMICRON*1.E-6
B=ALOG(SLOPE)

OPEN AUXILIARY DATA FILES
OPEN(2,FILE='EV60', STATUS='OLD')
OPEN(3, FILE='PSEUDA')

INPUT RUN PARAMETERS FROM KEYBOARD
WRITE(6,5) ' WHAT IS TROPOPAUSE ALT (M) ?'
ZTROP=12000.
READ(5,*) ZTROP
WRITE(6,6)ZTROP

5 FORMAT(A)
6 FORMAT( ' TROPOPAUSE ALTITUDE (M)=',E10.3)

INITIALIZE ARRAYS
DO 10 TABS=1,336
PLTEAU(TABS)=0.
RCOUNT(TABS)=0.
GCOUNT(TABS)=0.
FALL(TABS)=0.
CONTINUE

DO 20 EVENT=1, 11
DO 30 INCRE=1,336
GRPSUM(EVENT,INCRE)=0.
CONTINUE

DEFINE PHYSICAL CONSTANTS
G=9.8

SET UP SIZE GROUPS, LOG NORMAL, OR LOG NORMAL + EXPONENTIAL
TAIL

NGROUP=60
IF (NDIST.EQ.2) CALL SIZNA25(RM,B,MOMENT,F)
IF(NDIST.EQ.1) CALL SIZCNF(RM,B,MOMENT)
C
INPUT TERMINAL VELOCITIES FOR EACH GROUP AT TROPOPAUSE
DO 190 J=1,NGROUP
 TVEL(J)=VEL(ZTROP,ROGROUP(J))
C
WRITE(6,191) RGROUP(J),TVEL(J)
190 CONTINUE
191 FORMAT( 2E10.3)
C
DEFINE DETONATION PARAMETERS
NBURST=11
HOC(1)=26000.
HOC(2)=21000.
HOC(3)=20000.
HOC(4)=21000.
HOC(5)=17000.
HOC(6)=23000.
HOC(7)=22000.
HOC(8)=38000.
HOC(9)=25000.
HOC(10)=35000.
HOC(11)=26000.

C FOR EACH EVENT COMPUTE STRATOSPHERIC BURDEN VS TIME
DO 710 EVENT=7,11
C COMPUTE STABILIZATION ALTITUDE AND INITIAL Z DISPERSION. Y IN MT
C
USING HOPKINS FORMULA
LNY=ALOG(Y(EVENT)*1000.)
C
ZOM=EXP(7.889+.34*LNY+.001226*LNY**2-.005227*LNY**3
   +.000417*LNY**4)
ZOM=HOC(EVENT)
SIGZ0=2.15E3
C
DETERMINE WHICH SIZE GROUPS HAVE HIT THE GROUND WITHIN 1 DELTAT
DELTAT=365.25/24.
DELSAC=DELTAT*24.*3600.
DO 420 J=1,NGROUP
 TFMX=ZOM/TVEL(J)
 IF(TFMX.LT.DELSEC) THEN
  CONTR(J)=0
 ELSE
  CONTR(J)=1
 ENDIF
 IF( (CONTR(J).EQ.0) .AND. (CONTR(J-1).EQ.1)) THEN
  JCUT=J-1
 ENDIF
420 CONTINUE
C
SET INITIAL ALTITUDE OF EACH GROUP TO ZOM
DO 440 J=1,NGROUP

ZGROUP(J) = ZOM
CONTINUE

C FIND INITIAL FRACTION OF EACH CONTRIBUTING GROUP IN
THE STRATOSPHERE

INCRE = 1
TLAPSE = 0.
TABS = OFFSET(EVENT)

WRITE(6, 479) ZGROUP(1), SIGZO, TLAPSE
FORMAT( 'ZGROUP, SIGZO, TLAPSE', 3E10.3)
FRAC = STRAF(ZGROUP(1), SIGZO, TLAPSE, ZTROP)
DO 480 J = 1, JCUT
   GRPSUM(EVENT, INCRE) = GRPSUM(EVENT, INCRE) + WEIGHT

HC(J) =
FRAC * MC(EVENT)
CONTINUE

RCOUNT(TABS) = RCOUNT(TABS) + GRPSUM(EVENT, INCRE)
DO 495 TAB = OFFSET(EVENT), 336
   PLTEA[U(TAB)] = PLTEA[U(TAB)] + MC(EVENT) -
   GRPSUM(EVENT, INCRE)
CONTINUE

WRITE(6, 500) FRAC, TABS, RCOUNT(TABS),
MC(EVENT),
FORMAT( 'FRAC', E10.3, 'TAB', I4, 'COUNT', E10.3, 'MC',
      E10.3, 'GROUPSUM', E10.3, 'PLATEAU', E10.3)

C SET TIME, INCREMENT IN STEPS OF 1/24 YEAR (TWO WEEKS)

INCRE = INCRE + 1
TABS = INCRE + OFFSET(EVENT) - 1
IF(TABS .GT. 336) THEN
   GO TO 710
ENDIF
IF((GRPSUM(EVENT, INCRE - 1)).LT.1.E-1) THEN
   GO TO 710
ENDIF
TLAPSE = INCRE * DELTAT

C COMPUTE NEW Z(T) FOR EACH CONTRIBUTING GROUP
DO 680 J = 1, JCUT
   RP = RGROUP(J)
   IF(ZGROUP(J).GT.0.) THEN
      ZB = ZGROUP(J)
   ELSE
      ZB = 0.
   ENDIF
   DZ = VEL(ZB, RP) * DELSEC
   ZGROUP(J) = ZGROUP(J) - DZ
   GRPSUM(EVENT, INCRE) = GRPSUM(EVENT, INCRE) +
   STRAF(ZGROUP(J), SIGZO, TLAPSE, ZTROP) * WEIGHT(J)
   *MC(EVENT)

WRITE(6, 679) EVENT, INCRE, J, ZB, VEL(ZB, RP),
C STRAF(ZGROUP(J), SIGZO, TLAPSE, ZTROP),
C GRPSUM(EVENT, INCRE)
FORMAT( 'EV', I3, 'INCRE', I4, 'J', I3,
      'ZB', E10.3, 'VEL', E10.3, 'STRAF', E10.3,'
SUBROUTINE SIZCNF(RM,B,MOMENT)

C PROGRAM TO PARTITION PARTICLE MASS DISTRIBUTIONS INTO GROUPS

COMMON RCENTR(60),MASFRA(60),OFFSET(11),Y(11),MC(11)

DIMENSION RLEFT(60),RRIGHT(60),MASCNF(60)

REAL MASCNF,MASFRA,MOMENT,MC

INTEGER GROUP,OFFSET

EXTERNAL CNF

C CNF IS THE CUMULATIVE NORMAL FUNCTION (RADIUS, RM, BETA, MOMENT)

OPEN(7,FILE='TAPE7')

C DEFINE LOG NORMAL FUNCTION PARAMETERS, RM BETA

FORMAT (13,4(E10.3))

WRITE (6,40)

40 FORMAT(' GROUP RLEFT RRIGHT RCENTROIDE MASS FRAC')
EXPON=-9.

GROUP=1

RLEFT(GROUP)=0.
RRIGHT(GROUP)=10.**EXPON
RCENTR(GROUP)=RRIGHT(GROUP)

WRITE(6,60) RRIGHT(GROUP),RM,B

C WRITE(6,60) RRIGHT(GROUP),RM,B

C60 FORMAT ( 3E10.3)
MASCNF(GROUP)=CNF(RRIGHT(GROUP),RM,B,MOMENT)
MASFRA(GROUP)=MASCNF(GROUP)

DO 130 GROUP=2,60
EXPON=EXPON+.10
RRIGHT(GROUP)=10.**EXPON
RLEFT(GROUP)=RRIGHT(GROUP-1)
RCENTR(GROUP)=SQRT(RLEFT(GROUP)*RRIGHT(GROUP))
R=RRIGHT(GROUP)
MASCNF(GROUP)=CNF(R, RM, B, MOMENT)
MASFRA(GROUP)=MASCNF(GROUP)-MASCNF(GROUP-1)

WRITE (6,30)
GROUP, RLEFT(GROUP), RRIGHT(GROUP), RCENTR(GROUP)
C
130 CONTINUE
RETURN
END

SUBROUTINE SIZNA25(RM,B,MOMENT,F)
COMMON RCENTR(60), ACTFRA(60)
C
SUBROUTINE PARTITIONS NATHANS R4 DISTRIBUTION INTO ACTIVITY GROUPS
DIMENSION RLEFT(60), RRIGHT(60), ACTCUM(60)
REAL MOMENT, PI, MC
INTEGER GROUP, OFFSET
EXTERNAL CNF
C	CNF IS THE CUMULATIVE NORMAL FUNCTION
C	DEFINE NATHANS PARAMETERS
RO=RM*EXP(3.*B*B)
R25=RM*EXP(2.5*B*B)
PI=3.14159
R2PI=SQRT(2.*PI)
RMAX=RO*EXP(R2PI*B*(1.-F)/2./F)
30 FORMAT (13,5E10.3)
WRITE(6,140)
140 FORMAT(' GROUP RLEFT RRIGHT RCENTR ACTY FRAC CUM')
EXPON=-9.1
GROUP=0
60 FORMAT (3E10.3)
DO 280 GROUP=1, 49
EXPON=EXPON+.1
RRIGHT(GROUP)=10.*EXPON
IF (GROUP.EQ.1) THEN
  RLEFT(GROUP)=0.
  RCENTR(GROUP)=RRIGHT(GROUP)
ELSE
  RLEFT(GROUP)=RRIGHT(GROUP-1)
  RCENTR(GROUP)=SQRT(RLEFT(GROUP)*RRIGHT(GROUP))
END IF
RT=RRIGHT(GROUP)
C CALCULATE DENOMINATOR WHICH IS PROPORTIONAL TO TOTAL ACTIVITY
DENOM=R2PI*B*RM*RO**2.5*EXP(3.125*B*B)*CNF(RO,RM,B,MOM)
ENT)
C=RO**4*2.*("1./SQRT(RO) - 1./SQRT(RMAX))
C NOW CALCULATE NUMERATOR WHICH IS PROPORTIONAL TO ACTIVITY DOWN
IF (RT.LT.RO) THEN
  CNFPART=CNF(RT,RM,B,MOMENT)
ELSE
  CNFPART=CNF(RO,RM,B,MOMENT)
END IF
ST = R2PI * B * RM * RM * 2.5 * EXP(3.125 * B * B) * CNFPART
BT = RO ** 4 * 2 * (1 ./ SQRT(RO) - 1 ./ SQRT(RT))
IF (RT.LT.RO) BT = 0.
XNUM = ST - BT
ACTCUM(GROUP) = XNUM / DENOM
IF (GROUP.EQ.1) THEN
  ACTFRA(GROUP) = ACTCUM(GROUP)
ELSE
  ACTFRA(GROUP) = ACTCUM(GROUP) - ACTCUM(GROUP - 1)
END IF
WRITE(6, 30)
GROUP, RLEFT(GROUP), RRIGHT(GROUP), RCENTR(GROUP)
* ACTFRA(GROUP), ACTCUM(GROUP)
280 CONTINUE
C DEFINE GROUP WHICH LUMPS BIG PARTICLES TOGETHER WITH
RCENTR = 100 MICRONS
GROUP = 50
RLEFT(GROUP) = RRIGHT(GROUP - 1)
RIGHT(GROUP) = RMAX
RCENTR(GROUP) = RRIGHT(GROUP - 1)
ACTFRA(GROUP) = -ACTCUM(GROUP - 1)
ACTCUM(GROUP) = ACTCUM(GROUP - 1) + ACTFRA(GROUP)
WRITE(6, 30)
GROUP, RLEFT(GROUP), RRIGHT(GROUP), RCENTR(GROUP)
* ACTFRA(GROUP), ACTCUM(GROUP)
RETURN
END
C*************************************************************************
*************************************************************************
FUNCTION CNF(R, RM, B, MOMENT)
C COMPUTES CUMULATIVE NORMAL FUNCTION FOR MASS DISTRIBUTION
REAL MOMENT
R3 = RM * EXP(MOMENT * B * B)
Z = (ALOG(R) - ALOG(R3)) / B
C WRITE(6, 50) Z
C 50 FORMAT ('Z=',E10.3)
IF (Z) 1060, 1050, 1050
1050 CNF = 1. - 5 / (1. + 1.96854 * Z * 1.15194 * Z ** 2 + .000344 * Z ** 3 + .019527 * Z ** 4)
GO TO 1070
1060 Z = -Z
CNF = 5 / (1. + 1.96854 * Z * 1.15194 * Z ** 2 + .000344 * Z ** 3 + .019527
Z ** 4)
1070 RETURN
END
C*************************************************************************
*************************************************************************
FUNCTION STRAF(ZB, SIGZO, TLAPSE, ZTOP)
FUNCTION VEL(ZB, RP)

C COMPUTES TERMINAL VELOCITY OF SPHERICAL PARTICLES USING
FALL MECHANICS AND U.S. STANDARD ATMOSPHERE EQUATIONS
SUBROUTINE ATMOS RETURNS DENSITY, VISCOSITY AND MEAN FREE
PATH AT ALT ZB
REAL MFP, LOGREY
EXTERNAL ATMOS
CALL ATMOS(ZB, DENS, VISC, MFP)
DENSF = 2600.
G = 9.8
QZ = 4.0 * DENS * (DENSF - DENS) * Q * (2.0 * RP) / (3.0 * VISC * VISC)
WRITE(6, 1051) QZ, DENS, VISC, MFP
C1051 FORMAT ( 'QZ, DENS, VISC, MFP', 4(E10.3))
YY = ALOG(QZ)
C DENSF IS PARTICLE DENSITY, G IS GRAV, QZ IS DAVIES NUMBER
DEFINED IN
C DNA TR-5159F-1, P24
IF(QZ .LE. .3261) THEN
   VEL = VISC * QZ / (24.0 * DENS * 2.0 * RP)
   GO TO 1100
ENDIF
IF((QZ .GT. .3261) .AND. (QZ .LE. 84.175)) THEN
   VEL = (VISC / (DENS * 2.0 * RP)) * EXP(-3.18657 - 992696 * YY -
1.53193E-3 * YY**2 - 9.87059E-4 * YY**3 - 3.78878E-4 * YY**4 -
8.551759E-5 * YY**5 - 3.27815E-6 * YY**6)
   GO TO 1100
ENDIF
IF((QZ .GT. 84.175) .AND. (QZ .LT. 140)) THEN
   VEL = VISC * QZ * (4.166667E-2 - 2.33633E-4 * QZ + 2.0154E-6 * Q
154
Z**2
-6.9105E-9*QZ**3/(DENS*2.*RP)
GO TO 1100
ENDIF
IF((QZ .GE. 140) .AND. (QZ .LT. 4.5E7)) THEN
LOGREY=-1.29536+.986*YY/2.303-.046677*(YY/2.303)**2
ENDIF

Z**2
+.0011235*(YY/2.303)**3
REYNOL=10.*(LOGREY
VEL=REYNOL*VISC/(2.*DENS*RP)
ENDIF

C KNUDSEN SLIP CORRECTION
1100 IF(RP.GT.100.*MP) THEN
EXPFAO=0.
ELSE
EXPFA=EXP(-.656*2.*RP/MFP)
ENDIF
VEL=VEL*(1.+(1.64+.552*EXPFA)*MFP/(2.*RP))
RETURN
END

C==============================================================================
C==============================================================================
C==============================================================================
SUBROUTINE ATMOS(ZB,DENS,VISC,MFP)
C SUBROUTINE CALCULATES ATMOSPHERIC TEMPERATURE, PRESSURE AND VISCOSITY
C FOR ALTITUDES UP TO 84,852 METERS (MKS UNITS EMPLOYED)
REAL LK,NUMDEN,MFP
IF(ZB .LE. 11000.) THEN
LK=-.006545
TK=288.15
PK=101300.
TB=TK+LK*ZB
PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(.034164/LK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 11000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 20000.)) THEN
ZK=11000.
TK=216.65
PK=22690.
LK=0.
TB=TK
PB=PK*EXP(-.034164*(ZB-ZK)/TK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 20000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 32000.)) THEN
ZK=20000.
TK=216.65
PK=5528.
LK=0.01
TB=TK+LK*(ZB-ZK)
PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(.034164/LK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 32000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 47000.))THEN
ZK=32000.
TK=228.65
PK=888.8
LK=.0028
TB=TK+LK*(ZB-ZK)
PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(.034164/LK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 47000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 51000.))THEN
ZK=47000.
TK=270.65
PK=110.873
LK=0.
TB=TK
PB=PK*EXP(-.034164*(ZB-ZK)/TK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 51000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 71000.))THEN
ZK=51000.
TK=270.65
PK=66.9218
LK=-.0028
TB=TK+LK*(ZB-ZK)
PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(.034164/LK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 71000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 84852.))THEN
ZK=71000.
TK=214.65
PK=3.9536
LK=-.002
TB=TK+LK*(ZB-ZK)
PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(.034164/LK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 84852.))THEN
WRITE (6,1230)
GO TO 1241
ENDIF
1230 FORMAT("PARTICLE ALTITUDE BEYOND RANGE OF PROGRAM APPLICABILITY")
1240 VISCM=1.46E-6*TB**1.5/(TB+110.4)
DENS=.003484*PB/TB
NUMDEN=DENS*2.55E25/1.23
C PER CUBIC METER: 2.55E25 MOLECULES PER CUBE AT SEA LEVEL.
C DENSITY AT SEA LEVEL IS 1.23 KG/CUBE
MFP=1/(1.414*NUMDEN*4.5E-19)
C MFP=1/(ROOT2*N*SIGMA)
1241 RETURN
SUBROUTINE SIMGROU(RM,B,MOMENT)
C PROGRAM TO PARTITION PARTICLE ACTIVITY DISTRIBUTION INTO GROUPS
C USES SIMPSON INTEGRATION
COMMON RCENTR(60),FRAC(60),MC
DIMENSION R(60)
REAL MOMENT,MC,LRL1
EXTERNAL GRANDLN
C GRANDLN COMPUTES NORMAL FUNCTION INTEGRAND FOR SIMPSON INTEGRATION
C
C WRITE (6,*) 'GROUP LEFT RRIGHT CENTROID ACT
FRAC'
LRL1=ALOG(RM)+(MOMENT-1.)*B*B
C (MUST DECREMENT MOMENT TO COMPENSATE FOR LOGARITHMIC R INCREMENTS)
J=0
SUM=0.
DP=.1
DO 130 POWER=-9.,-3.,DP
   J=J+1
   R(J)=10.*POWER
   RUP=10**POWER+DP
   DR=RUP-R(J)
   RCENTR(J)=SQRT(R(J)*RUP)
   ARG=R(J)
   F1=GRANDLN(ARG,LRL1,B)
   ARG=.5*(R(J)+R(J)+DR)
   F2=GRANDLN(ARG,LRL1,B)
   ARG=R(J)+DR
   F3=GRANDLN(ARG,LRL1,B)
   DNDR=(1./6.)*(F1+4.*F2+F3)
   FRAC(J)=DNDR*DR
   SUM=SUM+FRAC(J)
C WRITE (6,30) J,R(J),RUP,RCENTR(J),FRAC(J)
30 FORMAT (13,4(E10.3))
130 CONTINUE
RETURN
END
C

FUNCTION GRANDLN(R,LRL1,B)
C COMPUTES LOG NORMAL FUNC AS INTEGRAND OF SIMPSON INTEGRATION
PROCEDURE
REAL LRL1
R2PI=SQRT(2*3.14159)
EXPARG=-.5*(ALOG(R)-LRL1)**2/B/B
IF( EXPARG.LT. -200. ) EXPARG = -200.
GRANDLN = 1. / R2PI / B / R * EXP ( EXPARG )
RETURN
END

END OF FILE
APPENDIX E

Program INTOPT Listing
PROGRAM
INTOPT1(INPUT, OUTPUT, TAPE5=INPUT, TAPE6=OUTPUT, PLFILE=0)
C COMBINES 75 EVENTS INTO ONE EVENT BASED UPON PARAMETER
STATISTICS
C PROGRAM COMPUTES INTERMEDIATE FALLOUT FROM ATMOSPHERIC TEST
SERIES AT NEVADA
C PROGRAM USES MODIFIED BRIDGMAN-BIGELOW SHEARING EQUATION TO
INCLUDE VERTICAL
C SPREAD IN CLOUD SPACIAL DISTRIBUTION
COMMON RCENTR(33), WEIGHT(33), WORK(10000)
EXTERNAL VEL
DIMENSION
ACT(150, 101), ZGROUP(33), ATTRUE(6), XTRUE(6), IPKRAY(60)
DIMENSION ACTCENT(150), ACTCUM(100, 100), WASH(149), X(149)
REAL LOGNOR, NATHAN, MOMENT, MC, PIVX, PIVY
INTEGER EVENT
DATA((ACTCUM(I, J), I=1, 100), J=1, 100)/10000*0./
ACTMAX=0.
C EVENT DATA FOR INTERMEDIATE FALLOUT COMPUTATION
C PARAMETERS FOR SINGLE REPRESENTATIVE BURST FOLLOW (YIELD
WEIGHTED AVG)
YIELD = 13.27
ZOKPT = 34.1
VECTOR = 246.
VWIND = 27.5
C MPH ---> KM/HR
VWIND = VWIND*1.609
SHEAR = 5.38
C SET WASHOUT TIME CONSTANT, HRS (REF. C. E. JUNGE, JOURNAL OF
METEOROLOGY)
WRITE(5,*) 'INPUT TWASH (HRS)'
READ(6, *) TWASH
C SET UP SIZE GROUPS, LOG NORMAL, OR LOG NORMAL +
EXPONENTIAL TAIL
NGROUP = 33
WRITE(6, *) 'INPUT NDIST (1>LOG NORMAL, 2>NATHANS
W/TAIL)'
READ(5, *) NDIST
12 IF(NDIST.EQ.1) WRITE(6, *) 'INPUT ROLLOFF N AND RMAX
(MICRONS)'
IF(NDIST.EQ.2) READ(5, *) P1, RMAX
IF(NDIST.EQ.2) RMAX = RMAX*1.E-6
WRITE(6, *) 'INPUT RM (MICRONS) AND SLOPE'
READ(5, *) RM, SLOPE
IF(RM.LT.0) STOP
RM = RM*1.E-6
C DO 1001 RM = 2.1E-6, 1.E-6, .1E-6
C DO 1000 SLOPE = 1.5, 3.5, .25
B = ALOG(SLOPE)
MOMENT = 2.5
IF(NDIST.EQ.2) CALL SIZNAT(RM, B, MOMENT, P1, RMAX)
IF(NDIST.EQ.1) CALL SIZCNF(RM, B, MOMENT)
C BEGIN EVENT LOOP
DO 710 EVENT = 1, 1

160
WRITE(6,'(EVENT=EVEN\ET)',EVENT
C SET UP BURST PARAMETERS (MT,TOTAL CURIES)
C Y=YL\IE/1000.
C MEGATONS
FF=1.
MC=75.*Y**.1*FF**1.69
C MILLICURIES
C SET UP WIND CONDITIONS (ANGLE IN DEGREES, VELOCITY IN
\K\M/HR)
C VECTOR=VECTOR+270.
C SET INITIAL CLOUD HEIGHT, Z DISPERSION, YY DISPERSION
INX=0
SIGYO=50.
SIGYO=1.609*
EXP(-.7+ALOG(Y)/3.-(3.25/(4.+(ALOG(Y)+5.4)**2.)))
WSUG FORMULA
C ZOKFT=44.+6.1*ALOG(Y)+.205*(ALOG(Y)+2.42)*ABS(ALOG(Y)+2.42)
ZOM=ZOKFT/3.28*1000.
C USING HOPKINS FORMULA
C LNY=ALOG(Y(EVENT)**1000.)
C ZOM=EXP(7.889-.34*LNY+.001226*LNY**2-.005227*LNY**3
+.000417*LNY**4)
DO 100 K=1,NGROUP
ZGROUP(K)=ZOM
100 CONTINUE
SIGZ=18*ZOM/1000.
TC=12.*ZOKFT/60.-2.5*(ZOKFT/60.)**2
C BEGIN X INCREMENT LOOP
<--------
DELTX=20.
C SET XX=DISTANCE DOWNWIND FROM GZ, COMPUTE ARRIVAL
TIME
DO 700 INX=1,149
GRPSUM=0.
XX=FLOAT(INX)*DELTX
GO TO 670
669 PIVX=0.
PIVY=0.
VECTOR=38.
XXSTART=0.
IF(XX.GT.1443.) THEN
VECTOR=24.
XXSTART=443.
PIVX=443.*COSD(38.)
PIVY=443.*SIND(38.)
ENDIF
IF(XX.GT.1662.) THEN
VECTOR=-30.
XXSTART=1662.
PIVX=PIVX+(1662.-443.)*COSD(24.)
PIVY=PIVY+(1662.-443.)*SIND(24.)
ENDIF
IF(XX.GT.2069.) THEN

VECTOR=-40.
XXSTAR=2069.
PIVX=PIVX+(2069.-1662.)*COSD(-30.)
PIVY=PIVY+(2069.-1662.)*SIND(-30.)
ENDIF

TA=XX/VWIND
DELTAT=DELTX/VWIND
DELSec=DELTAT*3600.
C
COMPUTE CLOUD DISPERSION IN YY DIRECTION (KM)
TSTAR=MIN(3.,TA)
SIGY=SQRT
(SIGYO**2.*(1.+(8.*TSTAR/TC))+.5*(SHEAR*SIGZ0*TA)**2.)
SIGY=50.+555.*(EXP(-TA/40.)-EXP(-TA/10.))
C
WRITE(6,*).' ZOM=' ,ZOM,' SIGY=' ,SIGY,' TA=' ,TA
C
SIZE GROUP
DO 680 K=1,NGROUP
RP=RCENTR(K)
IF(ZGROUP(K).GT.0.)THEN
   ZB=ZGROUP(K)
ELSE ZB=0.
ENDIF
DZ=VEL(ZB,RP)*DELSec
IF((ZGROUP(K).GT.0.).AND.
   ((ZGROUP(K)-DZ).LT.0.))
   RDEP=RCENTR(K)
   ZGROUP(K)=ZGROUP(K)-DZ
   GRPSUM=GRPSUM+
   GRNDP(ZGROUP(K),SIGZ0,TA,0.)*WEIGHT(K)
   *MC
C
WRITE(6,679)INX,K,ZB,DZ,
C
GRNDP(ZGROUP(K),SIGZ0,TA,0.),GRPSUM
679
FORMAT(' INX=',I3,' GP',I3,' ZB=',E10.3,' DZ=',E10.3,
   ' GRNDP',E10.3,' GRPSUM',E10.3)
680
CONTINUE
C
SET VALUE OF CUMULATIVE ACTIVITY ON CENTERLINE(MILLICURIES)
   SED=GRPSUM*EXP(-TA/TWASH)
   WASH(INX)=MC*(1.-EXP(-TA/TWASH))
   ACTCENT(INX)=WASH(INX)+SED
C
WRITE(6,685)XX,TA,SED,WASH(INX),RDEP
685
FORMAT(' XX=',E8.3,' TA=',E8.3,' SED=',E8.3,
   ' WASH=',E8.3,' RDEP=',E8.3)
C
WRITE(6,*).' INX=',INX,' ACTCENT=',ACTCENT(INX)
C
GO TO 390
C
COMPUTE ACTIVITY/AREA ON THE GROUND ('ACT' IN CURIES/SQ M)
C
FOR EACH XX POSITION, VARY YY OUT TO +100 KM
DO 380 J=1,101
YY=FLOAT(J-1)*20.-1000.
EXPON=.5*(YY/SIGY)**2.
IF (EXPON.GT.100.) THEN
EXPFAC=0.0
ELSE
EXPFAC=EXP(-EXPON)
ENDIF
FYTA=(SQRT(2.*3.14159)*SIGY)*((-1.)*EXPFAC
IF(INX.EQ.1) THEN
ACT(INX,J)=ACTCENT(INX)
*FYTA/DELTX*2.59
MILLICURIES PER SQUARE MILE
ELSE
ACT(INX,J)=(ACTCENT(INX)
-ACTCENT(INX-1))*FYTA/DELTX
ENDIF
C
UPDATE CUMULATIVE ACTIVITY
XC=PIVX+(XX-XXSTART)*COSD(VECTOR)
-YY*SIND(VECTOR)
YC=PIVY+(XX-XXSTART)*SIND(VECTOR)
+YY*COSD(VECTOR)
IC=INT((XC+3000.)/60.)-2000./60.
IF(IC.LE.0) GO TO 690
JC=INT((YC+3000.)/60.)
ACTCUM(IC,JC)=ACTCUM(IC,JC)+ACT(INX,J)/9.
ACTMAX=MAX(ACTMAX,ACTCUM(IC,JC))
690 CONTINUE
C
WRITE(6,*),' XX=',XX,' YY=',YY,' ACT=',ACT(INX,J)
380 CONTINUE
390 CONTINUE
700 CONTINUE
710 CONTINUE
WRITE(6,*),' ACTMAX=',ACTMAX
GO TO 212
C COMPUTE ACTIVITY ENCLODED BY EACH CONTOUR
C EACH 60 X 60 KM CELL IS 1390 SQUARE MILES
208 DATA DOWN10,DOWN20,DOWN30,DOWN40,DOWN50,DOWN60 /6*0. /
AREA10=0.
DO 210 I=1,100
DO 210 J=1,100
IF(ACTCUM(I,J).GT.10.)AREA10=AREA10+1390.
IF((ACTCUM(I,J).GT.10.).AND.(ACTCUM(I,J).LE.60.)) THEN
DOWN60=DOWN60+1390.*ACTCUM(I,J)
ACTCUM(I,J)=60.
ENDIF
IF((ACTCUM(I,J).GT.50.).AND.(ACTCUM(I,J).LE.60.))
*DOWN50=DOWN50+1390.*ACTCUM(I,J)
IF((ACTCUM(I,J).GT.40.).AND.(ACTCUM(I,J).LE.50.))
*DOWN40=DOWN40+1390.*ACTCUM(I,J)
IF((ACTCUM(I,J).GT.30.).AND.(ACTCUM(I,J).LE.40.))
*DOWN30=DOWN30+1390.*ACTCUM(I,J)
IF((ACTCUM(I,J).GT.20.).AND.(ACTCUM(I,J).LE.30.))
*DOWN20=DOWN20+1390.*ACTCUM(I,J)
IF((ACTCUM(I,J).GT.10.).AND.(ACTCUM(I,J).LE.20.))
*DOWN10=DOWN10+1390.*ACTCUM(I,J)
210 CONTINUE
200 CONTINUE
CUM10=DOWN60+DOWN50+DOWN40+DOWN30+DOWN20+DOWN10
WRITE(6,209)DOWN60,DOWN50,DOWN40,DOWN30,DOWN20,DOWN10
209 FORMAT( ' DOWN60-10=',6(E10.3))
WRITE(6,*)'CUMULATIVE DOWN UP TO CONTOUR 10=',CUM10
WRITE(6,*)'CUMULATIVE AREA UP TO CONTOUR 10=',AREA10
212 CONTINUE
C COMPUTE FIGURE OF MERIT FOR SIZE DISTRIBUTION OPTIMIZATION
DATA
(ATRUE(I),I=1,6)/0.,14.7E6,47.1E6,55.2E6,60.3E6,63.3E6/
DATA(XTRUE(I),I=1,6)/.480.,1700.,2100.,2460.,2800./
F0=0.
F0=F0+(ATRUE(2)-ACTCENT(24))**2.
F0=F0+(ATRUE(3)-ACTCENT(85))**2.
F0=F0+(ATRUE(4)-ACTCENT(105))**2.
F0=F0+(ATRUE(5)-ACTCENT(123))**2.
F0=F0+(ATRUE(6)-ACTCENT(140))**2.
WRITE(6,*)ATRUE(2),ACTCENT(24)
WRITE(6,*)ATRUE(3),ACTCENT(85)
WRITE(6,*)ATRUE(4),ACTCENT(105)
WRITE(6,*)ATRUE(5),ACTCENT(123)
WRITE(6,*)ATRUE(6),ACTCENT(140)
WRITE(6,*)'RM= ',RM,' SLOPE=',SLOPE,' F0=',F0
1000 CONTINUE
1001 GO TO 11
GO TO 800
C DISPLAY CONTOUR PLOTTING CALLS FOLLOW---------
C PACKAGE PLOTS ACTIVITY GROUND NO VS TIME
799 CALL COMPRS
CALL PAGE(8.5,11.)
CALL AREA2D(5.,5.)
CALL LINES( 'DATA',IPKRAY,1)
CALL LINES( 'WASHOUT ONLY',IPKRAY,2)
CALL LINES( 'WITH SEDIMENT',IPKRAY,3)
CALL HEADIN( 'ACTIVITY GROUNDED VS DISTANCE',100,1.75,1)
CALL INTAXS
CALL XNAME('KILOMETERS',100)
CALL YNAME('KILOCURIES',100)
CALL GRAF(0.,500.,3000.,0.,10.,100.)
ENCOD(100,15, LABEL)NDIST,RM,SLOPE
15 FORMAT( ' DIST',I2,' RM=',E8.3', SLOPE=',E8.3',)
CALL RLMESS(LABEL,100,100.,75.)
CALL THKFRM(.02)
CALL FRAME
DO 10 I=1,149
  X(I)=20.*FLOAT(I)
  WASH(I)=WASH(I)/1.E6
  ACTCENT(I)=ACTCENT(I)/1.E6
10 CONTINUE
DO 20 I=1,6
ATRUE(I)=ATRUE(I)/1.E6
20 CONTINUE
CALL MARKER(15)
CALL CURVE(XTRUE,ATRUE,6,-1)
CALL MARKER(5)
CALL CURVE(X,WASH,149,15)
CALL MARKER(17)
CALL CURVE(X,ACTCENT,149,15)
CALL LEGEND(IPKRAY,3,.25,4.)
CALL ENDPL(O)
CALL DONEPL
STOP
800 CONTINUE
END

C-----------------------

C SUBROUTINE SIZCNF(RM,B,MOMENT)
C SUBROUTINE TO PARTITION PARTICLE MASS DISTRIBUTIONS INTO
GROUPS

COMMON RCENTR(33),MASFRA(33)
DIMENSION RLEFT(33),RRIGHT(33),MASCNF(33)
REAL MASCNF,MASFRA,MOMENT,MC
INTEGER GROUP,OFFSET
EXTERNAL CNF
C CNF IS THE CUMULATIVE NORMAL
FUNCTION(RADIUS, RM, BETA, MOMENT)
C DEFINE LOG NORMAL FUNCTION PARAMETERS, RM BETA
30 FORMAT (I3,5(E10.3))
C WRITE(6,*) 'RM=',RM, ' B=',B, ' MOMENT=',MOMENT
WRITE(6,*)'PURE CUMULATIVE NORMAL SIZE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATIVE'
C WRITE(6,40)
40 FORMAT(' GROUP RLEFT RCENTROID RRIGHTOID ACTV FRAC
CUMULA')
EXPON=-6.
GROUP=1
RLEFT(GROUP)=0.
RRIGHT(GROUP)=10.*EXPON
RCENTR(GROUP)=RRIGHT(GROUP)
C WRITE(6,60) RRIGHT(GROUP),RM,B
C60 FORMAT (3E10.3)
MASCNF(GROUP)=CNF(RRIGHT(GROUP),RM,B,MOMENT)
MASFRA(GROUP)=MASCNF(GROUP)
DO 130 GROUP=2, 32
EXPON=EXPON+.1
RRIGHT(GROUP)=10.*EXPON
RLEFT(GROUP)=RRIGHT(GROUP-1)
RCENTR(GROUP)=SQRT(RLEFT(GROUP)*RRIGHT(GROUP))
R=RRIGHT(GROUP)
MASCNF(GROUP)=CNF(R,RM,B,MOMENT)
MASFRA(GROUP) = MASCNF(GROUP) - MASCNF(GROUP - 1)

CONTINUE

C LUMP LARGE SIZES TOGETHER IN GROUP WITH RCENTR = 1000 MICRONS

K = 33
RIGHT(K) = 999.
LEFT(RIGHT(K) - 1)
RCENTR(K) = RIGHT(K)
MASFRA(K) = 1. - MASCNF(K)
MASCNF(K) = CNF(RIGHT(K), RM, B, MOMENT)

C OUTPUT GROUP DIVISIONS
DO 140 K = 1, 33

WRITE(6, 30) K, LEFT(K), RCENTR(K), RIGHT(K), MASFRA(K), MASCNF(K)
CONTINUE
RETURN
END

SUBROUTINE SIZNAT(RM, B, MOMENT, P1, RMAX)
COMMON RCENTR(33), ACTFRA(33)

C SUBROUTINE PARTITIONS NATHANS R FOR DISTRIBUTION INTO ACTIVITY GROUPS
DIMENSION RLEFT(33), RIGHT(33), ACTCUM(33)
REAL MOMENT, MC, IA, IB
INTEGER GROUP, OFFSET
EXTERNAL CNF

C CNF IS THE CUMULATIVE NORMAL FUNCTION
C DEFINE NATHANS PARAMETERS
RO = RM * EXP((P1 - 1.) * B * B)
R2PI = SQRT(2. * 3.14159)

30 FORMAT (I3, 5(E10.3))
C WRITE(6, 40)
40 FORMAT(' GROUP RLEFT RRIGHT RCENTR ACTV FRAC CUM.\)
EXPON = 6.1
GROUP = 0
60 FORMAT (3E10.3)
DO 280 GROUP = 1, 32

EXponent = EXPON - 1
RIGHT(GROUP) = 10. ** EXPON
IF (GROUP .EQ. 1) THEN
LEFT(GROUP) = 0.
RCENTR(GROUP) = RIGHT(GROUP)
ELSE
LEFT(GROUP) = LEFT(GROUP) + 10.
RCENTR(GROUP) = (RIGHT(GROUP) - LEFT(GROUP)) / 2.
END IF
RP = RIGHT(GROUP)

C CALCULATE DENOMINATOR WHICH IS PROPORTIONAL TO TOTAL ACTIVITY
IA = RO**(P1/2. + 5) * RM**(5 - P1/2.) * RM**MOMENT * B * R2PI
EXP(.5*MOMENT*MOMENT*B*B)*CNF(RO, RM, B, MOMENT)
IF (MOMENT.EQ.(P1-1.)) THEN
  IB=RO**P1*Aalog(RMAX/RO)
ELSE
  IB=RO**P1*(RMAX**(MOMENT-P1+1.)-RO**(MOMENT-P1+1.))
ENDIF

END IF

DENOM=IA+IB
F=IA/(IA+IB)

C NOW CALCULATE NUMERATOR WHICH IS PROPORTIONAL TO ACTIVITY

DOWN

IF (RP.LT.RO) THEN
  CNFPART=CNF(RP, RM, B, MOMENT)
ELSE
  CNFPART=CNF(RO, RM, B, MOMENT)
END IF

VIA=RO**(.5+P1/2.)*RM**(.5-P1/2.)*RM**(MOMENT)*B*R2

PI*

EXP(MOMENT*MOMENT*B*B*.5)*CNFPART
IF (RP.LT.RO) THEN
  VIB=0.
  GO TO 250
ENDIF

IF (MOMENT.EQ.(P1-1.)) THEN
  VIB=RO**P1*Aalog(RP/RO)
ELSE
  VIB=RO**P1*(RP**(MOMENT-P1+1.)-RO**(MOMENT-P1+1.))
ENDIF

END IF

CONTINUE

ACTCUM(GROUP)=(VIA+VIB)/DENOM

IF (GROUP.EQ.1) THEN
  ACTFRA(GROUP)=ACTCUM(GROUP)
ELSE
  ACTFRA(GROUP)=ACTCUM(GROUP)-ACTCUM(GROUP-1)
ENDIF

WRITE (6,30)
GROUP, RLEFT(GROUP), RRIGHT(GROUP), RCENTR(GROUP)

C DEFINE GROUP WHICH LUMPS BIG PARTICLES TOGETHER WITH

RCENTR=1000 MICRONS
RCENTR=33
RLEFT(GROUP)=RRIGHT(GROUP-1)
RRIGHT(GROUP)=RMAX
RCENTR(GROUP)=RRIGHT(GROUP-1)
ACTFRA(GROUP)=1.-ACTCUM(GROUP-1)
ACTCUM(GROUP)=ACTCUM(GROUP-1)+ACTFRA(GROUP)
WRITE (6,30)
GROUP, RLEFT(GROUP), RRIGHT(GROUP), RCENTR(GROUP)

ACTFRA(GROUP), ACTCUM(GROUP)
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FUNCTION CNF(R, RM, B, MOMENT)
C COMPUTES CUMULATIVE NORMAL FUNCTION FOR ACTIVITY DISTRIBUTION
REAL MOMENT
R3 = RM*EXP(MOMENT*B*B)
Z = (ALOG(R) - ALOG(R3))/B
C WRITE(6,50) Z
C 50 FORMAT (' Z=',E10.3)
IF (Z) 1060, 1050, 1050
1050 CNF = 1. -.5/(1.+.196854*Z+.115194*Z**2+.000344*Z**3
+.019527*Z**4) #4
GO TO 1070
1060 Z = -Z
CNF = .5/(1.+.196854*Z+.115194*Z**2+.000344*Z**3+.019527
*Z**4)
1070 RETURN
END

FUNCTION GRNDF(Z3, SIGZO, TA, ZTROP)
REAL KDZ
KDZ=0.
SIGZ=SIGZO*1000.+SQRT(2.*KDZ*TA*3600.)
DELTZ=ZB-ZTROP
A=DELTZ/SIGZ
IF (A) 1060, 1050, 1050
1050 CUMNF = 1. -.5/(1.+.196854*A+.115194*A**2+.000344*A**3
+.019527*A**4) #4
GO TO 1070
1060 A = -A
CUMNF = .5/(1.+.196854*A+.115194*A**2+.000344*A**3+.019527
*7*A**4)
1070 GRNDF = 1.-CUMNF
RETURN
END

FUNCTION VFL(ZB, RP)
C COMPUTES TERMINAL VELOCITY OF SPHERICAL PARTICLES USING FULL DELPIC
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C FALL MECHANICS AND U.S. STANDARD ATMOSPHERE EQUATIONS
C SUBROUTINE ATMOS RETURNS DENSITY, VISCOSITY AND MEAN FREE
PATH AT ALT ZB
REAL MFP,LOGREY
C EXTERNAL ATMOS
CALL ATMOS(ZB,DENS,VISC,MFP)
DENSF=2600.
G=.98
QZ=4*(DENSF-DENS)*(2.*RP)*(3.*VISC*VISC)
C WRITE(6,1051)QZ,DENS,VISC,MFP
C1051 FORMAT('QZ,DENS,VISC,MFP',4(E10.3))
YY=ALOG(QZ)
C DENS IS PARTICLE DENSITY, G IS GRAV, QZ IS DAVIES NUMBER
DEFINED IN
C DNA TR=5159F-1, P24
IF(QZ .LE. 8.326)THEN
  VEL=VISC*QZ/(24.*DENS*2.*RP)
  GO TO 1100
ENDIF
IF((QZ .GT. 8.326) .AND. (QZ .LE. 84.175))THEN
  VEL=(VISC/(DENS*2.*RP))*EXP(-3.18657+.992696*YY-
1.53193E-3*YY**2-9.87059E-4*YY**3-5.78878E-4*YY**4
+8.551759E-5*YY**5-3.72815E-6*YY**6)
  GO TO 1100
ENDIF
IF((QZ .GT. 84.175) .AND. (QZ .LE. 1140))THEN
  VEL=(VISC*QZ*(4.166667E-2-2.3363E-4*QZ+2.0154E-6*Q
-6.9105E-9*QZ**3)/(DENS*2.*RP))
  GO TO 1100
ENDIF
IF((QZ .GE. 140) .AND. (QZ .LT. 1.45E7))THEN
  LOGREY=-1.29536+.986*YY/2.303-.046677*(YY/2.303)**2
  LOGREY=10.*LOGREY
  VEL=REYNOL*VISC/(2.*DENS*RP)
ENDIF
C KNUDSEN SLIP CORRECTION
1100 IF(RP .LT. 100.*MFP) THEN
  EXPFAC=0.
ELSE
  EXPFAC=EXP(-.656*2.*RP/MFP)
ENDIF
VEL=VEL*(1.+(1.644+.552*EXPFAC)*MFP/(2.*RP))
RETURN
END

SUBROUTINE ATMOS(ZB,DENS,VISC,MFP)
SUBROUTINE CALCULATES ATMOSPHERIC TEMPERATURE, PRESSURE AND VISCOSITY
FOR ALTITUDES UP TO 84,852 METERS (MKS UNITS EMPLOYED)
REAL LK, NUMDEN, MFP
IF(ZB .LE. 11000.) THEN
  LK=.006545
  TK=288.15
  PK=101300.
  TB=TK+LK*ZB
  PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(.034164/LK)
  GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 11000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 20000.)) THEN
  ZK=11000.
  TK=216.55
  PK=22690.
  LK=0.
  TB=TK
  PB=PK*EXP(-.034164*(ZB-ZK)/TK)
  GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 20000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 32000.)) THEN
  ZK=20000.
  TK=216.65
  PK=5528.
  LK=.001
  TB=TK+LK*(ZB-ZK)
  PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(.034164/LK)
  GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 32000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 47000.)) THEN
  ZK=32000.
  TK=228.65
  PK=888.8
  LK=.0028
  TB=TK+LK*(ZB-ZK)
  PB=PK*(TK/TB)**(.034164/LK)
  GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 47000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 51000.)) THEN
  ZK=47000.
  TK=270.65
  PK=110.873
  LK=0.
  TB=TK
  PB=PK*EXP(-.034164*(ZB-ZK)/TK)
  GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 51000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 71000.)) THEN
  ZK=51000.
  TK=270.65
  PK=66.9218
  LK=-.0028
  TB=TK+LK*(ZB-ZK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF
PB = PK * (TK / TB)**(.034164 / LK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 71000.) .AND. (ZB .LE. 84852.)) THEN
ZK = 71000.
TK = 214.65
PK = 3.95536
LX = -.002
TB = TK + LK * (ZB - ZK)
PB = PK * (TK / TB)**(.034164 / LK)
GO TO 1240
ENDIF
IF((ZB .GT. 84852)) THEN
WRITE(6, 1230)
GO TO 1241
ENDIF
1230 FORMAT('PARTICLE ALTITUDE BEYOND RANGE OF PROGRAM APPLICABILITY')
1240 VISC = 1.46E-6 * TB**1.5 / (TB + 110.4)
DENS = 0.003484 * PB / TB
NUMDEN = DENS * 2.55E25 / 1.23
C PER CUBIC METER: 2.55E25 MOLECULES PER CUBE AT SEA LEVEL.
C DENSITY AT SEA LEVEL IS 1.23 KG/CUBE
MFP = 1. / (1.414 * NUMDEN**4.5E-19)
C MFP = 1./(ROOT2*N*SIGMA)
1241 RETURN
END
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Abstract: Historical atmospheric nuclear test data has been examined to gain information germane to nuclear winter. The size distribution of the nuclear debris aerosol is shown to govern the magnitude and duration of sunlight attenuation. By modeling the removal of nuclear debris from the atmosphere it has been possible to bound the admissible distribution of lofted particulates. This distribution bound reflects the average behavior of particulates from 97 tests contributing debris to the stratosphere. The results should be useful for fallout and dust effects modeling as well as nuclear winter studies.