

ECBC-TR-

**DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM:  
TESTING OF SAW MINICAD MKII DETECTOR  
AGAINST CHEMICAL WARFARE AGENTS  
SUMMARY REPORT**

Terri L. Longworth  
Kwok Y. Ong  
Marcia A. Johnson

RESEARCH DIRECTORATE

September 2001

Approved for public release, distribution is unlimited.

Soldier and Biological Chemical Command, AMSSB-RRT, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5424

## Disclaimer

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorizing documents.

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)		2. REPORT DATE 2001 September	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final; 99 Sept – 00 Aug	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM: TESTING OF SAW MINICAD MKII DETECTOR AGAINST CHEMICAL WARFARE AGENTS - SUMMARY REPORT			5. FUNDING NUMBERS None	
6. AUTHOR(S) Longworth, Terri L.; Ong, Kwok Y.; Johnson, Marcia A.				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) DIR, ECBC, ATTN: AMSSB-RRT, APG, MD 21010-5424			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER ECBC-TR-	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Program Director, Domestic Preparedness, 5183 Blackhawk Road ATTN: AMSSB-RTD APG, MD 21010-5424			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) This report characterizes the chemical warfare (CW) agent detection potential of the commercially available SAW MiniCAD mkII. The instrument was tested against HD, GB, and GA vapor at various conditions. This report is intended to provide the emergency responders concerned with CW agent detection an overview of the detection capabilities of the SAW MiniCAD mkII.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS HD Vapor testing Chemical Warfare Agent Detection GB Detector testing Interference testing GA Surface Acoustic Wave (SAW)			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 19	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)  
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18  
298-102

Blank

## PREFACE

The work described herein was authorized under the Expert Assistance (Equipment Test) Program for the U.S. Army Soldier and Biological Chemical Command (SBCCOM) Program Director for Domestic Preparedness. This work was started in September 1999 and was completed in August 2000.

The use of either trade or manufacturers' names in this report does not constitute an official endorsement of any commercial products. This report may not be cited for purposes of advertisement.

This report has been approved for public release. Registered users should request additional copies from the Defense Technical Information Center; unregistered users should direct such requests to the National Technical Information Service.

### Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge John Baranoski, Juan C. Cajigas, Sonny Barnhouse, and Robert Madison for their assistance in performing agent testing; and Frank DiPietro for his assistance in test planning, acquisition, and review.

The authors are grateful to the following members of the Expert Review Panel for Equipment Testing, for their constructive reviews and comments:

Dr. Jimmy Perkins, University of Texas School of Public Health, San Antonio, TX

Dr. Bruce A. Tomkins, Organic Chemistry Section, Chemical and Analytical Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN

Dr. Edward T. Zellers, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor, MI

Leo F. Saubier, Battelle Memorial Institute, Edgewood, MD

Blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION..... 7  
2. OBJECTIVE..... 8  
3. SCOPE ..... 8  
4. EQUIPMENT AND TEST PROCEDURES..... 8  
    4.1 DETECTOR DESCRIPTION..... 8  
    4.2 CALIBRATION ..... 10  
    4.3 AGENT CHALLENGE ..... 10  
    4.4 AGENT VAPOR QUANTIFICATION..... 11  
    4.5 FIELD INTERFERENCE TESTS ..... 11  
    4.6 LABORATORY INTERFERENCE TESTS ..... 12  
5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION ..... 12  
    5.1 MINIMUM DETECTABLE LEVELS..... 12  
    5.2 TEMPERATURE AND HUMIDITY EFFECTS ..... 13  
    5.3 FIELD INTERFERENCE..... 16  
    5.4 LABORATORY INTERFERENCE TESTS ..... 17  
6. CONCLUSIONS..... 18  
LITERATURE CITED ..... 19

TABLES

1. Minimum Detectable Level (MDL) for SAW MiniCAD mkII at Ambient Temperature and 5% Relative Humidity..... 13  
2. SAW MiniCAD mkII Responses to HD Vapor Concentrations ..... 14  
3. SAW MiniCAD mkII Responses to GA Vapor Concentrations ..... 14  
4. SAW MiniCAD mkII Responses to GB Vapor Concentrations ..... 15  
5. SAW MiniCAD mkII Units A and B Field Interference Testing Summary ..... 16  
6. SAW MiniCAD mkII Results of Laboratory Interference Tests with CW Agents ..... 17  
7. SAW MiniCAD mkII Results of Laboratory Interference Tests without Agents..... 17

FIGURE

1. SAW MiniCAD mkII ..... 9

Blank

**DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM:  
TESTING OF SAW MINICAD MKII DETECTOR  
AGAINST CHEMICAL WARFARE AGENTS  
SUMMARY REPORT**

1. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Defense (DOD) formed the Domestic Preparedness (DP) Program in 1996 in response to Public Law 104-201. One of the objectives is to enhance federal, state, and local capabilities to respond to Nuclear, Biological and Chemical (NBC) terrorism incidents. Emergency responders who encounter either a contaminated or potentially contaminated area must survey the area for the presence of either toxic or explosive vapors. Presently, the vapor detectors commonly used are not designed to detect and identify chemical warfare (CW) agents. Little data are available concerning the ability of these commonly used, commercially available detection devices to detect CW agents. Under the DP Expert Assistance (Test Equipment) Program, the U.S. Army Soldier and Biological Chemical Command (SBCCOM) established a program to address this need. The Applied Chemistry Team (ACT), formerly known as the Design Evaluation Laboratory (DEL), Aberdeen Proving Ground, Edgewood, Maryland, performed the detector testing. ACT is tasked with providing the necessary information to aid authorities in the selection of detection equipment applicable to their needs.

Reports of the instrument evaluations are posted in the Homeland Defense website (<http://www2.sbccom.army.mil/hld/downloads/index.htm>) for public access. Instruments evaluated and reported in 1998 and in 1999 include:

MiniRAE plus from RAE Systems, Inc.

Passport II Organic Vapor Monitor from Mine Safety Appliance Corp.

PI-101 Trace Gas Analyzer from Hnu Systems, Inc.

TVA 1000B Toxic Vapor Analyzer from Foxboro Company

Draeger Colorimetric tubes (Thioether and Phosphoric Acid Ester) from Draeger Corp.

MicroFID detector from Photovac, Perkin-Elmer Corp.

MIRAN Sapphire Air Analyzer from Foxboro Corp.

Mine Safety Colorimetric (HD and Phosphoric Acid) Tubes from Mine Safety Corp.

M90D1-C Chemical Warfare Detector from Environics OY, Finland

APD2000 Air Monitor from Envirotech Inc.

More recently (2000), the evaluation of instruments continued to include the SAW MiniCAD mkII from MicroSensor Systems, Inc (Sunnyvale, CA), UC AP2C Monitor from

Proengin (France), the ppbRAE Photo-Ionization Detector from RAE Systems (Bowling Green, KY), the SABRE2000 from Barringer Corp, Inc. (Warren, NJ), and the CAM (Type L) from Graseby Dynamics Ltd (Herts, UK). Each of these evaluations will be reported separately. This report pertains to the evaluation of the SAW MiniCAD mkII from MicroSensors Systems, Inc.

## 2. OBJECTIVE

The objective of this report is to assess the capability and general characteristics of the SAW MiniCAD mkII (Surface Acoustic Wave Chemical Agent Detector) to detect chemical warfare agent vapors. The intent is to provide the emergency responders concerned with CW agent detection an overview of the detection capabilities of the instrument.

## 3. SCOPE

The scope of this evaluation is to characterize the CW agent vapor detection capability of this Surface Acoustic Wave (SAW) detector based instrument. Due to time and resources limitations, the agents used were limited to Tabun (GA), Sarin (GB), and Mustard (HD). These representative CW agents are believed to be the most likely threats. Test procedures followed those described in the Phase 1 Test Report.<sup>1</sup> The test concept was as follows:

- a. Determine the Minimum Detectable Level (MDL) where repeatable detection readings are achieved for each selected CW agent. The current military Joint Services Operational Requirements (JSOR)<sup>2</sup> served as a guide for detection sensitivity objectives.
- b. Investigate the humidity and temperature effects on detection response.
- c. Observe the effects of potential interfering vapors upon detection performance in the laboratory and in the field.

## 4. EQUIPMENT AND TEST PROCEDURES

### 4.1 DETECTOR DESCRIPTION

Microsensor Systems Inc., a SAWTEK Company from Bowling Green, KY, is the manufacturer of the SAW MiniCAD mkII. Instrument description and operating procedures originate from the User's Guide<sup>3</sup>. The SAW device employs a pair of micro sensors that respond to changes in the mass of the surface coatings resulting in vibration frequency changes when a vapor sample flows over them in a compact, lightweight Chemical Agent Detector (CAD). The pocket-size instrument detects nerve and blister agents simultaneously. The instrument will produce an alarm (visibly and audibly) when the preset threshold levels for the CW agent detection algorithm are matched. The instrument differentiates between blister and nerve agents detection by corresponding H or G alarm.

Figure 1 is a digital photograph of the SAW MiniCAD mkII detector. Three units were purchased for this evaluation and randomly labeled A, B, and C. At the beginning of the evaluation, units A and B were used and the C unit was designated as a backup. However, unit

C was entered into the evaluation after problems were encountered with Unit B. Two units were tested throughout the evaluation depending on which two were usable on any given day.



**Figure 1: SAW MiniCAD mkII**

The instrument uses a diaphragm pump to draw a sample through a concentrator to collect and concentrate a vapor sample. The concentrated sample is then thermally desorbed. The desorbed sample passes over the sensors causing vibration frequency changes. A microcomputer analyzes the sensor responses to determine when to alarm. The SAW can be operated using four lithium cell batteries. The batteries typically last about 3 hours. Each unit is also supplied with an external 6.3V rechargeable battery pack and a battery charger. The unit runs approximately 6 hours using the rechargeable battery packs. The rechargeable battery pack connects to the external I/O connector of the device using an attached 6-pin connector cable. The same connector is used to recharge the battery using the 120V AC power adapter. Therefore, the battery pack cannot operate the instrument during its recharging process. The battery packs had to be re-charged overnight before each day of testing.

The SAW instrument is relatively simple to operate. The instrument performs a self-diagnostic check and purges itself when it is powered on. Then, it automatically begins analyzing for CW agents. Two alternating green lights show that the unit is 'ALL CLEAR' and all subsystems are 'SYS OK'. The green 'SYS OK' light means that there are no system failures such as sensor or heater malfunction, or insufficient power. The 'ALL CLEAR' green light indicates that no agents were detected. A yellow 'LOW BATT' indicator light illuminates when the batteries should be charged or replaced. According to the User's Manual, the instrument can operate in temperatures from +5°C to +40°C at non-condensing relative humidity levels of 0 to 95%.

The unit runs through 60-second cycles, continuously. For a complete cycle, the internal sample pump runs for 40 seconds to collect the sample and requires 20 seconds to desorb and analyze the sample. A red LED will flash for the 'H' or 'G' alarm if the respective agent concentration threshold level is detected. A red 'HI LEVEL' light will also flash along with the 'H' or 'G' light if a 'high' agent concentration is detected. The high agent concentration alarm threshold is set at levels 10× (ten times) the alarm threshold concentrations.

#### 4.2 CALIBRATION

No daily instrument calibration except for a semi-quantitative simulant exposure is required by the manufacturer to place the SAW MiniCAD into operation. Assurance of the detection performance was verified daily by performing a confidence test. The manufacturer provides a vapor diffusion tube that contains the G agent simulant DMMP (Dimethyl methyl phosphonate) called the Vapor Check Source. The Vapor Check Source allows a total system operational performance check of the instrument. During the confidence check, a 'G' alarm should occur at the end of the measurement cycle upon exposure to the Vapor Check Source tube. No 'H' alarm confidence check is provided nor required by the manufacturer.

#### 4.3 AGENT CHALLENGE

The agent challenges were conducted using the Multi-Purpose Chemical Agent Vapor Generation System<sup>4</sup> with Chemical Agent Standard Analytical Reference Material (CASARM) grade CW agents where available. Agent testing followed successful instrument start up and confidence check. The vapor generator system permits testing of the instrument with humidity and temperature-conditioned air without agent vapor to assure background air does not interfere before challenging it with similarly conditioned air containing the CW agent vapor. With the instrument's inlet placed under the cup-like sampling port of the vapor generator, the SAW device is exposed to the conditioned air to establish a stable background and ensure that the instrument does not exhibit undesired responses caused by the difference in temperature/RH condition before agent challenges.

Agent challenge begins when the solenoids of the vapor generation system are energized to switch the air streams from conditioned air only to similarly conditioned air containing the agent. Each unit was tested three times under each condition. The time that the detector was exposed to the agent vapor until it alarmed was recorded as the response time. The agent challenge time was extended to 5-10 minutes when the detector did not produce an alarm in 2 minutes to observe the actual behavior over several additional completed analysis cycles. This was done to simulate actual application of these instruments. The time required after agent exposures until the instrument stopped alarming was recorded as the recovery time.

The instruments were each tested with the agents GA, GB, and HD at different concentration levels at ambient temperatures and low (<5 %) RH in an attempt to determine the MDL. The detectors were also tested at relative humidity conditions of 50% and 90% at ambient temperatures. Cold temperatures of 5°C for both G agents and 0°C for HD, and hot temperatures of +40°C for GA, GB, and HD were used to assess temperature effects. Temperature extremes were based on the manufacturer's stated operating range using agent concentrations that

approximated the MDL. Although HD freezes at approximately +15°C, the calculated HD volatility of 92 mg/m<sup>3</sup> at 0°C easily produces a vapor concentration higher than the 2 mg/m<sup>3</sup> JSOR detection criteria allowing the instrument to be evaluated at 0°C.

#### 4.4 AGENT VAPOR QUANTIFICATION

The generated agent vapor concentrations were analyzed independently and reported in both milligrams per cubic meter (mg/m<sup>3</sup>) and parts-per-million (ppm) units in the data tables. The vapor concentration was quantified by utilizing the manual sample collection methodology<sup>5</sup> using the Miniature Continuous Air Monitoring System (MINICAMS<sup>®</sup>) manufactured by O. I. Analytical, Inc., Birmingham, Alabama. The MINICAMS<sup>®</sup> is equipped with a flame photometric detector (FPD), and was operated in phosphorus mode for the GA and GB agents, and sulfur mode for HD.

This system normally monitors air by collection through sample lines and subsequently adsorbing the CW agent onto the solid sorbent contained in a glass tube referred to as the pre-concentrator tube (PCT). The PCT is located after the MINICAMS<sup>®</sup> inlet. Then the concentrated sample is periodically heat desorbed into a gas chromatographic capillary column for subsequent separation, identification, and quantification. For manual sample collection, the PCT was removed from the MINICAMS<sup>®</sup> during its sampling cycle and connected to a measured suction source to draw the vapor sample from the agent generator. The PCT was then re-inserted into the MINICAMS<sup>®</sup> for analysis. This “manual sample collection” methodology eliminates potential loss of sample along the sampling lines and the inlet assembly when the MINICAMS<sup>®</sup> is used as an analytical instrument. The calibration of the MINICAMS<sup>®</sup> was performed daily using the appropriate standards for the agent of interest. The measured mass equivalent (derived from the MINICAMS chromatogram) divided by the total volume (flow rate × time) of the vapor sample drawn through the PCT produces the sample concentration that converts into mg/m<sup>3</sup>.

#### 4.5 FIELD INTERFERENCE TESTS

The instruments were tested outdoors in the presence of common potential interferents such as the vapors from gasoline, diesel fuel, jet propulsion fuel (JP8), kerosene, Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF, used for fire fighting), household chlorine bleach, and insect repellent. Vapor from a 10% HTH slurry (a chlorinating decontaminant for CW agents), engine exhausts, burning fuels, and other burning materials were also tested. The objective was to assess the ability of the instruments to withstand outdoor environments and to resist false alarming indications when exposed to the selected substances. In these tests, no CW agent was present.

The field tests were conducted outdoors at M-Field, Edgewood Area of Aberdeen Proving Ground in August 2000. These experiments involved open containers, truck engines, and fires producing smoke plumes, which were sampled by the detectors at various distances downwind. The SAW MiniCAD units were carried to the smoke or fume test plume to achieve moderate but not exaggerated exposures (e.g. 0.5-2 meters for vapor fumes and 2-5 meters for smokes).

Confidence checks were performed on each instrument at the beginning of each testing day and periodically between tests. The two units were exposed to each interferent for 5 minutes for three trials when possible. Testing continued with the next challenge after the instruments were thoroughly recovered from prior exposure.

#### 4.6 LABORATORY INTERFERENCE TESTS

The laboratory interference tests were designed to assess the effect on the detectors of vapor exposure from potential interfering substances. The substances were chosen based on the likelihood of their presence during an emergency response by first responders. Additionally, the laboratory interference tests were conducted to assess the CW agent detection capability in the presence of the selected vapor generated from diesel fuel or fire fighting Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) liquid.

The units were tested against 1% of the headspace concentrations of vapors of gasoline, JP8, diesel fuel, household chlorine bleach, floor wax, AFFF, Spray 9 cleaner, Windex, toluene, and vinegar. They were also tested against 25 ppm NH<sub>3</sub> (ammonia). If the detector false alarmed at 1% concentration, it was tested at the 0.1% concentration of the substance. A dry air stream carries the headspace vapor of the substance by sweeping it over the liquid in a tube or through the liquid in a bubbler to prepare the interferent gas mixture. Thirty milliliters/minute or 3 milliliters/minute of this vapor saturated air was then diluted to 3 liters/minute with the conditioned air at 23°C and 50% RH to produce the 1% or 0.1% concentration of interferent test mixture, respectively. The 25-ppm ammonia was derived by proper dilution of a stream from an analyzed 1% NH<sub>3</sub> vapor (10,000b ppm) compressed gas cylinder with the appropriate amount of the conditioned air.

For the tests that included CW agent, the interferent test gas mixture was prepared similarly. The resultant stream of 3 liters/minute of CW agent vapor was used as a dilution stream to blend in with the 3 or 30 milliliter/minute of the substance vapor to obtain the desired 0.1 or 1% mixture of the substance vapor in the presence of CW agent concentration. The two units were tested three times with each agent/interferent combination.

### 5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 5.1 MINIMUM DETECTABLE LEVELS

The minimum detectable levels (MDL) for the SAW MiniCAD are shown in Table 1 for each agent at ambient temperatures and low relative humidity (<5%RH). The MDL values represent the lowest CW agent concentration that produced an alarm consistently for two of the SAW MiniCAD units. Table 1 shows the range of response times observed for the MDL listed. The MDL concentrations are expressed in milligrams per cubic meter (mg/m<sup>3</sup>) with equivalent parts per million (ppm) values given in parentheses. To compare the detectors' performance, the current military JSOR requirements for CW agent sensitivity for point detection alarms, the Army's established values for Immediate Danger to Life or Health (IDLH), and the Airborne Exposure Limit (AEL) are also listed in Table 1. Army Regulation AR 385-61 does not establish an IDLH for HD due to concerns over carcinogenicity.

No MDL could be established for the SAW detectors in a 60 second response time as stated by the manufacturer. Given that none of the units responded within 60 seconds during the CW evaluations and because of the inability for the operator to determine the beginning and the end of a cycle for the SAW units, extra long exposure time was tried for observation purposes to determine if there were additive effects. Observations showed these detectors to require longer response times due to the sampling (40 seconds) and desorption (20 seconds) cycles that may have prevented detection within the 60 seconds the manufacturer claim. Alarm responses usually required more than one 60 seconds cycle even at the higher concentrations. For example, if the agent challenge was introduced at other than the beginning of the sampling cycle, it would have prevented a full sample analysis for that cycle. This prevented the response time from occurring within 1 minute unless the concentration was sufficiently high such that a partial sample would cause an alarm signal. Many times throughout the evaluations, the detectors produced no alarm at concentrations greater than the JSOR levels even with exposure times up to 10 minutes.

None of the SAW units could detect at the JSOR, IDLH, or AEL levels for GA, GB, or HD in <2 minutes or even up to 5 minutes. The units were able to detect HD at approximately the JSOR concentration level with 7 minutes response times.

**Table 1. Minimum Detectable Level (MDL) for SAW MiniCAD mkII at Ambient Temperature and 5% Relative Humidity**

AGENT	Concentration in Milligrams per Cubic Meter, mg/m <sup>3</sup> . With Parts per Million Values In Parenthesis (ppm) and Response Times			
	SAW MDL	JSOR*	IDLH**	AEL ***
HD	2.3 (0.35) in 235-444 seconds	2.0 (0.300) in 120 seconds	N/A	0.003 (0.0005) up to 8 hours
GA	5.0 (0.74) in 121-304 seconds	0.1 (0.015) in 30 seconds	0.2 (0.03) up to 30 minutes	0.0001 (0.000015) up to 8 hours
GB	0.4 (0.07) in 158-301 seconds	0.1 (0.017) in 30 seconds	0.2 (0.03) up to 30 minutes	0.0001 (0.000017) up to 8 hours

\* Joint Service Operational Requirements for detectors.

\*\* Immediate Danger to Life or Health values from AR 385-61 to determine level of CW protection. Personnel must wear full ensemble with SCBA for operations or full face piece respirator for escape.

\*\*\* Airborne Exposure Limit values from AR 385-61 to determine masking requirements. Personnel can operate for up to 8 hours unmasked.

## 5.2 TEMPERATURE AND HUMIDITY EFFECTS

Tables 2, 3, and 4 list the responses of the SAW detectors at the various test conditions for HD, GA, and GB, respectively. The results show the alarm reading and the range of response times for the three SAW units tested. The results listed represent multiple challenges with test units at agent concentrations between 0.4 and 43 mg/m<sup>3</sup>. These units demonstrated agent detection with more consistent responses when exposed to relatively high concentrations of CW agent vapors for several minutes.

**Table 2. SAW MiniCAD mkII Responses to HD Vapor Concentrations**

Temp., °C	Relative Humidity, %RH	HD Challenge Concentration		Unit A		Unit B		Unit C	
		mg/m <sup>3</sup>	ppm	Alarm Reading	Response Time Range, minutes	Alarm Reading	Response Time Range, minutes	Alarm Reading	Response Time Range, minutes
0	0	3.4	0.48	H Low	7-8	H Low	3-5	H Low	4-6
40	<5	Up to 9	1.45	No alarm	No alarm	No alarm	No alarm	No alarm	No alarm
20	<5	2.0	0.30	H Low	6-7	No alarm	No alarm	Not tested	Not tested
		2.3	0.35	H Low	4-6	H Low	6-7	Not tested	Not tested
		3.0	0.45	H Low	2-4	H Low	4-5	Not tested	Not tested
		3.4	0.51	H Low	3-4	H Low	3-4	Not tested	Not tested
20	>90	3.7	0.56	H Low	3-4	H Low	5-6	Not tested	Not tested
20	50	4.3	0.65	H Low	2-3	H Low	3-4	Not tested	Not tested
20	<5	8.1	1.20	H Low	1.5-2	H Low	2-3	Not tested	Not tested
		23	3.50	H Low	1.5-2	H Low	1-2.5	Not tested	Not tested
		29	4.40	H Low*	~2	H Low	~2	Not tested	Not tested
		43	6.50	H Low*	~1	H Low	~1.5	Not tested	Not tested

\*Low alarm changed to high alarm during clear down cycles

**Table 3. SAW MiniCAD mkII Responses to GA Vapor Concentrations**

Temp. °C	Relative Humidity, %RH	GA Challenge Concentration		Unit A		Unit B		Unit C	
		mg/m <sup>3</sup>	ppm	Alarm Reading	Response Time Range, minutes	Alarm Reading	Response Time Range, minutes	Alarm Reading	Response Time Range, minutes
5	0	Up to 4.5	0.63	Not tested	Not tested	No Alarm	No Alarm	No Alarm	No Alarm
40	0	Up to 4.5	0.63	No Alarm	No Alarm	No Alarm	No Alarm	No Alarm	No Alarm
24	<5	2.7	0.41	No Alarm	No Alarm	Not tested	Not tested	G Low	4-4.5
22		4.0	0.60	No Alarm	No Alarm	Not tested	Not tested	G Low	3-3.5
20		5.0	0.74	G Low	~7	G Low	~2	G Low	2.5-5
23	50	5.2	0.77	No Alarm**	No Alarm	Not tested	Not tested	G Low	4.5-5.5
24	90	6.1	0.92	No Alarm	No Alarm	Not tested	No Alarm	G High	3.5-4
24	<5	7.0	1.10	No Alarm	No Alarm	Not tested	No Alarm	G Low*	2-3

\*Low alarm changed to high alarm during clear down cycles

\*\*Alarmed 2 out of 3

At times, unit B developed symptoms of contamination that caused long recovery times. When this became a problem, unit C was tested in its place. Likewise, when any given unit was experiencing problems, the two best working units would be tested on that day. Therefore, the results listed in the tables contained many “not tested” situations.

**Table 4. SAW MiniCAD mkII Responses to GB Vapor Concentrations**

Temp. °C	Relative Humidity, %RH	GB Challenge Concentration		Unit A		Unit B		Unit C	
		mg/m <sup>3</sup>	ppm	Alarm Reading	Response Time Range, minutes	Alarm Reading	Response Time Range, minutes	Alarm Reading	Response Time Range, minutes
5	<25	1.0	0.16	No Alarm	No Alarm	G Low	3-4	G Low	3.5-4.5
		1.7	0.28	G Low	~3	G Low	1.5-2	Not tested	Not tested
40	<5	1.9	0.35	No Alarm	No Alarm	No Alarm	No Alarm	Not tested	Not tested
		3.8	0.70	G Low**	3-3.5	G Low**	2.5-4.5	Not tested	Not tested
20-22	<5	0.40	0.07	G Low	4-5	G Low	2.5-4.5	Not tested	Not tested
		0.6	0.10	No Alarm	No Alarm	Not tested	No Alarm	No Alarm	No Alarm
		1.0	0.20	G Low	1.5-2.5	G Low	1.5-2.5	Not tested	Not tested
		1.9	0.33	G Low	2-3	Not tested	Not tested	G Low	1.5-2
		9.7	1.70	G Low	1-1.5	Not tested	Not tested	G Low	1-1.5
		36	6.20	G High	1-2	Not tested	Not tested	G High	1-1.5
22	50	2.1	0.36	G Low	1.5-2	Not tested	Not tested	G Low	1.5-2
22	90	2.0	0.35	No Alarm***	3.5	Not tested	Not tested	G Low	1.5-3

\*\*Alarmed 2 out of 3

\*\*\*Alarmed 1 out of 3 trials

High temperature (40°C) seemed to affect the instrument’s detection capability. The units would not alarm to HD up to 9 mg/m<sup>3</sup> or to GA up to 4.5 mg/m<sup>3</sup> at 40°C. High temperature appears to have defeated the proper functioning of the sample concentrator. The units alarmed to GB only at a relatively high concentration of 3.8 mg/m<sup>3</sup>.

Units A and B appeared to be most problematic with GA detection at all conditions. Responses to GA vapor were erratic. No consistent data could be gathered for GA among the units tested although unit C was able to detect GA at concentrations >2.7 mg/m<sup>3</sup>. In general, humidity changes did not appear to cause adverse effects on these SAW detectors except that unit A had problems at 90% RH for both GA and GB.

Recovery times typically required several cycles (several minutes) after agent exposure. The recovery time required up to 25 minutes for the units to clear when operated in cold temperatures. The units were observed to require longer recovery times even after the routine confidence checks as the testing progressed.

### 5.3 FIELD INTERFERENCE

The results of the field test interferent exposures are presented in Table 5. The ambient temperature and relative humidity levels during these tests were in the range of 27-32°C and 45-80% RH, with gentle wind. Units A and B were used for the field interference evaluations as unit C would not power up into ready mode. Both A and B units were slow to alarm to the simulants checks and required up to 10 minutes to clear after the simulant alarm. Neither unit responded to any of the field interferences tested. There were no false alarms. Each unit was tested three times for 5 minute exposures against the listed interferences with the exception of the insect repellent, doused fire, and burning tire, as shown.

**Table 5. SAW MiniCAD mkII Units A and B Field Interference Testing Summary**

Interferent	Total Trials, 5 Minute Exposures	Total False Alarms
Gasoline Exhaust, Idle	6	0
Gasoline Exhaust, Revved	6	0
Diesel Exhaust, Idle	6	0
Diesel Exhaust, Revved	6	0
Kerosene Vapor	6	0
Kerosene on Fire	6	0
JP8 Vapor	6	0
Burning JP8 Smoke	6	0
Burning Gasoline Smoke	6	0
Burning Diesel Smoke	6	0
AFFF Vapor	6	0
Insect Repellent	2	0
Diesel Vapor	6	0
Gasoline Vapor	6	0
HTH Vapor	6	0
Bleach Vapor	6	0
Burning Cardboard	6	0
Burning Cotton	6	0
Burning Wood Fire Smoke	6	0
Doused Wood Fire Smoke	2	0
Burning Rubber	4	0

Post field test responses showed residual effects from the field exposures. Tests of the SAW MiniCAD units A and B against HD required twice the response time to alarm to agent concentrations as required for similar concentrations prior to the field test. Unit A would not

respond at all to GA or GB after field test exposures. Unit B was slower to alarm to GA than before the field test and needed more than 20 minutes to recover after an agent challenge. Unit B responded to GB equally well before and after the field test for exposures.

#### 5.4 LABORATORY INTERFERENCE TESTS

Table 6 presents the results of testing the detectors with conditioned air containing GB or HD in the presence of either diesel fuel vapor or AFFF vapor. The tests were completed at ambient temperatures and 50% RH using CW agent concentrations greater than the MDL. Each test was repeated three times. Units A and B were able to detect and identify the CW agent class in the presence of these vapors except Unit A did not alarm to GB even with an 8-minute exposure time.

**Table 6. SAW MiniCAD mkII Results of Laboratory Interference Tests with CW Agents**

Agent	Interferent	Concentration		Units A and B		
		mg/m <sup>3</sup>	ppm	Alarm Response		Range of Response Times (seconds)
GB	1% AFFF	1.5	0.02	G	Low	97-268
	1% Diesel	1.5	0.02	G	Low	116-133*
HD	1% AFFF	6.6	1.00	H	Low	209-276
	1% Diesel	5.4	0.08	H	Low	182-252

\*Unit B only. Unit A did not respond to GB even after an 8 minutes GB exposure.

Laboratory evaluations to determine if other potential interferents would cause the detector to false alarm are summarized in Table 7. These tests did not include CW agent and were conducted at ambient temperatures and 50% RH. Since the SAW Unit B would not respond to the simulant check and Unit C would not power on, the laboratory interferent testing was completed using Unit A only. Unit A was exposed twice to each of the substance vapors for a minimum of five minutes per trial. Since these substances did not cause false alarms at the 1% (of saturation) level, they were not tested at the 0.1% level.

**Table 7. SAW MiniCAD mkII Results of Laboratory Interference Tests without Agents**

Interferent	Unit A 5 minute Interferent Exposures
1% JP8	No Alarm
1% Vinegar	No Alarm
1% Gasoline (*)	No Alarm*
1% Windex	No Alarm
1% Spray Nine	No Alarm
1% Floor Wax	No Alarm

Interferent	Unit A 5 minute Interferent Exposures
1% Bleach	No Alarm
1% Toluene	No Alarm
25 ppm Ammonia	No Alarm
1% AFFF	No Alarm
1% Diesel	No Alarm

\*Unit alarmed for H Low approximately 6 minutes after having been removed from the source.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions are based solely on the results observed during this testing. Aspects of the detectors, other than those described, were not investigated.

Civilian first responders and HAZMAT personnel use Immediate Danger to Life or Health (IDLH) values to determine levels of protection selection during consequence management of an incident. The SAW MiniCAD devices demonstrated CW agent vapor detection for HD, GA, and GB only at high concentrations or over long (>5 minute) response times. The instruments were unable to detect CW agent at the JSOR, IDLH, or the AEL values for HD, GA, or GB. In addition, no consistent or conclusive analysis could be drawn from the GA data collected.

Humidity changes did not appear to cause adverse effects on the SAW detectors with the exception that unit A had problems at 90% RH for both GA and GB. However, high temperatures affected the instruments' ability to detect the agents and cold temperatures affected the instruments' ability to recover from agent exposures. The units also required long recovery times, as they were only able to detect the presence of agent vapor when exposed to higher agent concentrations. As testing progressed, the units were observed to require longer recovery time even after the routine confidence checks.

The problematic behaviors observed throughout the evaluation limit the usefulness of the SAW MiniCAD as a viable warning device. These instruments showed unpredictable behavior among the units that plagued the evaluation even though the detector appears to be unaffected by the commonly found substances used in the field and laboratory interferent tests. There were no false alarms recorded, however, the units performed sluggishly in responding to their simulant checks, indicating a lack of sensitivity.

## LITERATURE CITED

- 
1. Longworth, Terri L. et al, Testing of Commercially Available Detectors Against Chemical Warfare Agents: Summary Report, ECBC-TR-033, U.S. Army Chemical Research, Development, and Engineering Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, May 1999, UNCLASSIFIED Report.
  2. ATCD-N, MEMORANDUM, Subject: Joint Service Operational Requirement (JSOR) for the Automatic Chemical Agent Detector Alarm (ACADA), HQDA United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, Fort Monroe, Virginia, 3 August 1990.
  3. SAW MiniCAD mkII User's Guide, Version 1.0, Microsensor Systems Inc., Bowling Green, KY, 1996.
  4. Ong, Kwok Y., Multi-Purpose Chemical Agent Vapor Generation System, ERDEC-TR-424, U.S. Army Chemical Research, Development, and Engineering Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, July 1997, UNCLASSIFIED Report.
  5. Ong, Kwok Y., et al, Analytical Methodology for Quantitative Determination of O-ethyl-S-(2-Diisopropylaminoethyl) Methylphosphonothiolate (VX), ERDEC-TR-476, U.S. Army Chemical Research and Engineering Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, March 1998, UNCLASSIFIED Report.