

# A Comparison of Space and Ground Based Facility Environmental Effects for FEP Teflon

Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio

Michael Kitral Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio

Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies Toronto, Canada, April 23–24, 1998

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Lewis Research Center

Trade names or manufacturers' names are used in this report for identification only. This usage does not constitute an official endorsement, either expressed or implied, by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Available from

NASA Center for Aerospace Information 7121 Standard Drive Hanover, MD 21076 Price Code: A03 National Technical Information Service 5287 Port Royal Road Springfield, VA 22100 Price Code: A03

#### A COMPARISON OF SPACE AND GROUND BASED FACILITY ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOR FEP TEFLON

SHARON K. RUTLEDGE AND BRUCE A. BANKS NASA Lewis Research Center 21000 Brookpark Rd. Cleveland, Ohio 44135; U.S.A.

MICHAEL KITRAL Cleveland State University Euclid Ave. at East 24th Street Cleveland, Ohio 44115; U.S.A.

#### 1.0 Abstract

Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is susceptible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whether FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in ground based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation in addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to determine what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosion rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environmental constituent at a time. This was attempted through the use of a single simulation facility (plasma asher) environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent windows. Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations could be made. First, it appears that the erosion yield of FEP Teflon with respect to that of polyimide Kapton is not greatly affected by the presence or lack of VUV radiation present in the RF plasma and the relative erosion yield for the FEP Teflon may decrease with increasing fluence. Second, shielding from charged particles appears to lower the relative erosion yield of the FEP to approximately that observed in space, however it is difficult to determine for sure whether ions, electrons, or some other components are causing the enhanced erosion.

#### **2.0 Introduction**

Materials qualification for atomic oxygen durability in low Earth orbit has been performed in both ground based facilities and in space. The ground based facilities have been developed out of the necessity to study long term atomic oxygen effects to levels greater than can be achieved with a typical mission on the Space Shuttle. They also have the advantage of quick turnaround, lower cost per exposure, and ease of experiment tailorability.

Some questions naturally occur about the applicability of ground based test data for use in predicting how a material will perform in low Earth orbit (LEO). These questions arise due to the differences in the species, energy or charged state of the arriving atoms and the intensity and wavelength of VUV radiation present. Other parameters also may play a role, such as temperature. There is currently no known facility, whether thermal plasma or directed beam, which will exactly duplicate the conditions in low Earth orbit [1-7]. Such facilities, however, are needed to screen materials for use in LEO. So it is important to understand why differences in erosion rates occur so that the test equipment can be modified to produce results closer to those in space, or to allow calibration factors to be developed.

Of all the materials, FEP Teflon seems to provide the widest disparity of data in space and ground based systems. Typically FEP Teflon Exposed in RF plasmas has an erosion yield relative to polyimide Kapton which is an order of magnitude greater than in LEO. This paper attempts to determine what is present in one type of simulation facility (RF plasma), that affects the erosion of FEP Teflon, by isolating selected components in the environment that may have an effect on the erosion rate. VUV radiation and charged species were the components selected to be the focus of this study due to the wide belief among the LEO testing community that these are the important factors.

#### **3.0 Experimental Procedure**

#### 3.1. MATERIALS

Sample coupons, 2.54 cm diameter, were punched from 0.005 cm thick sheets of polyimide Kapton HN (DuPont) and fluorinated ethylene propylene (FEP Teflon) (DuPont). All of the samples were fully dehydrated for 48 hours in a vacuum of 8-13 Pa (60-100 mTorr) prior to weighing and subsequent exposure in the atomic oxygen plasma. Samples were quickly weighed after dehydration and upon removal from the vacuum chamber after exposure to atomic oxygen in order to minimize errors in mass due to water absorption [8].

#### **3.2 PLASMA ASHER**

An SPI Plasma Prep II asher operated on air was used as the environment simulator for these tests. The asher operates by using RF (13.56 Mhz) to create a discharge between two electrodes which surround a glass reaction chamber. A thermal plasma is produced

which is at an energy of <<0.1 eV. The plasma contains atomic and excited state species as well as molecules, ions, electrons, and VUV radiation. The amounts and intensity of the latter five have not been determined. The effective arrival of atomic oxygen is estimated by determining the reaction rate of polyimide Kapton, whose space degradation rate is well known. The nitrogen in the plasma has been shown in earlier tests not to react with the materials that are being tested in this study [8]. Typical vacuum chamber pressure during operation was 16-27 Pa (120-200 mTorr). Temperature measured in the past inside the plasma chamber was 65 °C [9].

#### 3.3 FARADAY CAGES AND VUV WINDOWS

Aluminum Faraday cages were constructed from single sheets of 0.0127 cm aluminum foil so that boxes with attached lids were formed. Openings under the lids on the sides produced open re-entrant boxes and prevented line-of-sight exposure of the samples to the external air plasma. Several modifications were made to the boxes to allow various plasma components to be excluded or allowed into the boxes.

Figure 1 shows the various box designs used for testing. Figure 1A is a closed Faraday cage. This design is supposed to block VUV radiation and charged species from the samples inside while allowing atomic oxygen to scatter into the box through the openings under the lid on the side of the box. This box design was modified in Figure 1B to include an opening in the lid surrounded by aluminum foil tabs to hold various windows and filters that were 2.54 cm diameter. The window or filter after insertion was covered with a thin aluminum foil sheet with a circular hole cut in the center that was bonded to the surface of the window and box with acrylic adhesive. This prevented plasma from leaking into the box around the window.



Figure 1A. Closed Faraday cage



Figure 1B. Faraday cage with window or mesh filter

A magnesium fluoride window was used to allow VUV radiation of wavelengths greater than approximately 120 nm, and visible light to impinge onto one sample placed inside of one end of the box. The transmission versus wavelength for the window is shown in Figure 2. Another sample could be placed at the other end of the interior of the box so that it would see all of the same conditions but not be exposed to the VUV radiation entering through the window. A gold mesh filter was also used to allow all wavelengths to enter the box but block most of the charged particles from entering. A single mesh screen spot welded to an aluminum foil ring (0.0127 cm thick) was found to actually accelerate charged species into the box, so a double screen was made from two sheets of gold mesh spot welded to either side of an aluminum foil ring (0.0127 cm thick). The gold mesh was manufactured by Buckbee Mears to have 80% transparency at roughly 39 lines per centimeter of 0.00267 cm diameter gold wire.

In order to keep samples from sliding out from under the window during exposure due to vibration, a 0.0127 cm thick aluminum foil rectangle that just fit into the interior of the box was cut, as shown in Figure 1, to have tabs that would fold around the samples to hold them in place. Each sample was wrapped with approximately 0.002 cm thick aluminum foil with a 1.905 cm diameter hole punched in the front surface to allow the atomic oxygen to reach the sample of FEP Teflon or polyimide Kapton HN.

#### 3.4 DATA MEASUREMENT AND ANALYSIS

Changes in mass were recorded for FEP Teflon and polyimide Kapton HN for each test configuration. The effective fluence (number of atoms of atomic oxygen arriving per square centimeter over the test duration) was determined by measuring the mass loss per unit area of polyimide Kapton HN and using Equation 1.



Figure 2. Transmission of MgF<sub>2</sub> Window

$$=\frac{M/A}{\rho^*E}$$
(1)

Where:

F

$$F = Fluence (atoms/cm^2)$$

$$A = Area of polyimide Kapton exposed to atomic oxygen (cm2)$$

- $\rho$  = Density of polyimide Kapton (1.42 g/cm<sup>3</sup>)
- E = Erosion Yield for polyimide Kapton in LEO (3x10<sup>-24</sup> cm<sup>3</sup>/atom)

The effective erosion yield for FEP Teflon, which is the volume of FEP Teflon removed for each effective atom that arrives, was determined by using Equation 2. The erosion yield was then divided by the known erosion yield for polyimide Kapton in low Earth orbit  $(3x10^{-24} \text{ cm}^3/\text{atom})$  to obtain the measurement relative to a known standard. Erosion yields relative to polyimide Kapton were then plotted to look for potential trends in the data.

$$E_{FEP} = \frac{M / A}{\rho * F} \tag{2}$$

Where:

 $E_{FEP} = Erosion Yield for FEP Teflon (cm<sup>3</sup>/atom)$ 

 $M = Mass \ loss \ of \ FEP \ Teflon \ (g)$ 

- A = Area of FEP Teflon exposed to atomic oxygen  $(cm^2)$
- $\rho$  = Density of FEP Teflon (2.15 g/cm<sup>3</sup>)
- F = Fluence (atoms/cm<sup>2</sup>) (based on polyimide Kapton)

#### 4.0 Results and Discussion

#### 4.1 EXPOSURE DIRECTLY IN THE PLASMA

FEP Teflon exposed in the plasma should see the total environment present including charged species and VUV radiation. Several tests were conducted with FEP Teflon and polyimide Kapton samples exposed to the plasma while sitting on top of glass microscope slides that were approximately 7.62 cm x 2.54 cm in area. The average erosion yield with respect to Kapton measured over approximately the same fluence exposure was  $1.9 \pm 0.14$ . Samples of FEP Teflon and polyimide Kapton were also placed on top of some of the Faraday cages during testing to record what the effective atomic oxygen fluence was outside of the Faraday cage. It was noticed that during these tests, the erosion yield with respect to Kapton in the plasma but on top of the aluminum surface was lower than that observed on glass slides (between 1 and 1.2). This was unexpected, because the plasma environment was believed to not be affected by the sample holders. Another test was conducted, but this time the FEP Teflon and polyimide Kapton were placed in aluminum foil covers and held down to an aluminum sheet (identical sample holders used in the Faraday cages and described earlier) with aluminum foil tabs. This placed the samples in good electrical contact with the aluminum and also allowed them to sit in the same location in the asher as the samples on glass slides had been during previous testing. The erosion yield for FEP Teflon with respect to Kapton was even lower for this test  $(0.374 \pm 0.036)$ . A comparison bar chart with error bars is shown in Figure 3.

It can be seen that the differences in the erosion yields are much greater than the measurement error. Flux levels varied during each test, but the overall fluence was approximately  $2x10^{20}$  atoms/cm<sup>2</sup> on the average. Table I contains the data for all of the tests performed including the effective atomic oxygen flux. There does not appear to be any relationship between flux and relative erosion yield. It is possible that the surface conductivity may affect the arrival of charged species at the sample surface or that VUV radiation intensities may be altered near the sample. In order to try to narrow down the reason for these differences, testing was conducted inside Faraday cages where some of these environments could potentially be reduced or isolated.



Figure 3. Comparison of relative erosion yields for FEP Teflon Exposed In Plasma

Description	Matanial	Time (hm)	Effective Atomic Oxygen	Erosion Yield With
Description	Material		Ellective Atomic Oxygen	Respect to Kapton
1118 In plasma	Kapton	7.98	7.43E15 ± 7.37e14	1.0
on glass				
1118 In plasma	FEP	7.98	7.43E15 ± 7.37e14	$2.0065 \pm 0.28$
on glass				
1120 In plasma	Kapton	9.18	$6.5E15 \pm 6.485E14$	1.0
on glass				
1120 In plasma	FEP	9.18	$6.5E15 \pm 6.485E14$	1.968 ± 0.278
on glass				
406 In plasma	Kapton	4.67	5.11E15 ± 1.13E14	1.0
on plass				
406 In plasma	FEP	4.67	5.11E15 ± 1.13E14	1.6898 ± 0.050
on glass				
400 In plasma	Kapton	5	5.14E15 ± 5.13E14	1.0
409 III piasina	Mapton	5		
on glass	EED		5 14F15 + 5 13F14	$193 \pm 0.271$
409 in plasma	FEF	5	5.14E15 1 5.15E14	1.75 1 0.271
on glass			1.40(51() 5.025514	10
402 In plasma	Kapton	5.633	$1.406E16 \pm 5.037E14$	1.0
on aluminum				
holder				
402 In plasma	FEP	5.633	1.406E16 ± 5.037E14	0.3742 ± 0.03575
on aluminum				
holder				

Table I. Data From Plasma Asher Exposures

D	N	m <sup>1</sup> + (1 - )	Eff i hi i o	E STATISTICS
Description	Material	1 ime (nrs)	Effective Atomic Oxygen	Erosion Yield With
			Flux (atoms/cm <sup>2</sup> -sec)	Respect to Kapton
415 In plasma	Kapton	42.1	$4.366E15 \pm 8.66E13$	1.0
on top of double				
mesh cage				
415 In plasma	FEP	42.1	4.366E15 ± 8.66E13	$1.015 \pm 0.0284$
on top of double				
mesh cage				
410 In plasma	Kapton	5.05	4.86E15 ± 1.07E14	1.0
on top of single				
mesh cage				
410 In plasma	FEP	5.05	$4.86E15 \pm 1.07E14$	$1.223 \pm 0.037$
on top of single				
mesh cage				
410 In single	Kapton	5.05	$4.72E15 \pm 1.856E14$	1.0
mesh windowed				
cage				
410 In single	FEP (Under	5.05	4.72E15 ± 1.856E14	$3.53 \pm 0.1857$
mesh windowed	Mesh)			
cage				
410 In single	FEP (Shielded)	5.05	4.72E15 ± 1.856E14	0.0204 ± 0.0167
mesh windowed				
cage				
415 In double	Kapton	42.1	4.666E15 ± 1.64E14	1.0
mesh windowed				
cage				
415 In double	FEP (Under	42.1	4.666E15 ± 1.64E14	0.117 ± 0.00596
mesh windowed	Mesh)			
cage				
415 In double	FEP (Shielded)	42.1	$4.666E15 \pm 1.64E14$	$0.0321 \pm 0.0027$
mesh windowed				
cage				
130 Closed	Kapton	24.3	$4.07E15 \pm 4.03E14$	1.0
Cage with One	(shielded)			
MgF2 Window				
130 Closed	FEP (under	24.3	$4.07E15 \pm 4.03E14$	0.103 ± 0.0143
Cage with One	window)			
MgF2 Window				
130 Closed	FEP (shielded)	24.3	4.07E15 ± 4.03E14	0.091 ± 0.0127
Cage with One				
MgF2 Window				
331 Closed	Kapton (under	24.017	8.75E15 ± 3.08E14	$0.9432 \pm 0.047$
Cage with	window)			
MgF2 Window				
331 Closed	Kapton	24.017	8.75E15 ± 3.08E14	1.0
Cage with				
MgF2 Window				
401 Closed	Kapton	24.8	1.48E16 ± 5.19E14	1.0
Cage with				
MgF2 Window				
401 Closed	FEP (Under	24.8	1.48E16 ± 5.19E14	$0.0325 \pm 0.0018$
Cage with	window)			
MgF2 Window				

٠

.

Description	Material	Time (hrs)	Effective Atomic Oxygen	Erosion Yield With Respect to Kanton
401 (1 1	FFD (Shielded)	24.8	$1.49 \pm 16 \pm 5.10 \pm 14$	$0.0217 \pm 0.0011$
401 Closed	FEP (Snieldeu)	24.0	1.46610 ± 5.17614	0.0217 1 0.0011
Cage with				
MgF2 Window		10.0/7	1 291016 + 4 5014	10
406 Closed	Kapton	48.907	1.283E10 ± 4.5E14	1.0
Cage with				
MgF2 Window				0.0207 . 0.001(2
406 Closed	FEP (Under	48.967	$1.283E10 \pm 4.5E14$	$0.0327 \pm 0.00103$
Cage with	window)			
MgF2 Window				0.000
406 Closed	FEP (Shielded)	48.967	$1.283E16 \pm 4.5E14$	$0.0085 \pm 0.00118$
Cage with				
MgF2 Window				
522 Closed	Kapton	47.88	4.77E15 ± 4.71E14	1.0
Faraday cage				
522 Closed	FEP	47.88	4.77E15 ± 4.71E14	0.0374 ± 0.0062
Faraday cage				
530 Closed	Kapton	5.4	6.85E15 ± 6.8E14	1.0
Faraday cage				
530 Closed	FEP	5.4	6.85E15 ± 6.8E14	$0.195 \pm 0.0422$
Faraday cage				
609 Closed	Kapton	5.08	$6.64E15 \pm 6.86E14$	1.0
Faraday cage				
609 Closed	FEP	5.08	$6.64E15 \pm 6.86E14$	$0.15 \pm 0.028$
Faraday cage				
1231A Closed	Kapton (under	5	2.55E15 ± 2.56E14	1.0
cage with MgF2	window)			
window				
1231A Closed	Kapton	5	$2.55E15 \pm 2.56E14$	$0.982 \pm 0.139$
cage with MgF2	(shielded)			
window				
1231B Closed	Kapton (under	27.033	3.09E15 ± 3.05E14	1.0
cage with MgF2	window)			
window			<u></u>	
1231B Closed	Kapton	27.033	$3.09E15 \pm 3.05E14$	$0.814 \pm 0.114$
cage with MgF2	(shielded)			
window				

#### 4.2 EXPOSURE INSIDE A CLOSED FARADAY CAGE

The closed Faraday cage was used in an attempt to prevent VUV radiation from reaching the surface of the samples by allowing no line-of-sight viewing of the samples to the plasma. It was also designed to prevent charged species from entering by allowing the box to float to plasma potential. Several tests at a variety of fluence levels were conducted with FEP Teflon inside the Faraday cage. Results varied but the erosion yield for FEP Teflon relative to Kapton was less than 0.2 in all cases as shown in Figure 4. It was noticed that the relative erosion yield seemed to decrease with increasing fluence. The data plotted as a function of effective fluence is shown in Figure 5. The relative erosion yield does appear to take on an almost exponential decay



Figure 4. Comparison of relative erosion yields for FEP Teflon inside a closed Faraday cage

with increasing fluence. It is not known why this would occur in an isotropic plasma. More testing and data are needed to verify this trend.

Another puzzling feature noticed during these tests is that the effective flux inside and outside of the Faraday cage is approximately the same. One would expect the flux inside the Faraday cage to be greatly reduced because atoms would need to scatter in through slots underneath the lid in order to enter the box. However, this does not appear to be the case. It is possible that the RF field is exciting a plasma inside the box, but no glow was observed inside during testing. The greatly reduced relative erosion yield for FEP Teflon also does not support this theory. The relative erosion yield measured inside the Faraday cage is near that observed in space on the Long Duration Exposure Facility (LDEF)  $(0.11 \pm 0.002)$  [10].

## 4.3 EXPOSURE INSIDE FARADAY CAGE WITH MAGNESIUM FLUORIDE WINDOW

Because it is difficult to draw conclusions from samples experiencing different fields and fluxes, a Faraday cage was developed which could expose two samples inside the same Faraday cage environment, but allow only one of them to have line of sight to the plasma. This was accomplished by putting a magnesium fluoride window in the lid towards one end of the Faraday cage box. Initially, polyimide Kapton HN erosion was



Figure 5. FEP Teflon relative erosion yield as a function of effective atomic oxygen fluence inside a closed Faraday cage

compared in order to verify that the window seal did not let additional plasma into the box. The results shown in Figure 6 verify that the polyimide Kapton HN is not affected by VUV radiation and that the seal functions as expected, because the erosion rates both under the window and shielded from the plasma are nearly identical and within experimental error.

The relative erosion yield of FEP Teflon was tested in a similar manner, but a sample of polyimide Kapton was placed between the two FEP Teflon samples so that the exposure flux could be measured. Figure 7 contains the data for the FEP Teflon. The effect of VUV radiation transmitted by magnesium fluoride appears to be very low. There may be a slight increase in relative erosion yield with VUV radiation, but not enough to account for the nearly order of magnitude difference observed when exposed directly in the plasma.

#### 4.4 EXPOSURE INSIDE FARADAY CAGE WITH GOLD MESH SCREEN FILTER

In order to determine if shorter wavelength VUV radiation plays a role, it was necessary to block charged species from entering the box but allow all wavelengths of radiation to enter. A single gold mesh screen was installed in the Faraday cage replacing the magnesium fluoride window used in the previous test. FEP Teflon and polyimide Kapton HN were tested in the same manner as previously. During exposure,



Figure 6. Comparison of relative erosion yields for Kapton HN exposed in a Faraday cage with and without VUV radiation

a directed plasma beam was observed that was approximately 1 cm in length extending perpendicular to the mesh, centered on it and extending down through it. The erosion yield of the FEP relative to Kapton in the shielded area of the box was roughly the same as in the closed Faraday cage test. The relative erosion yield for the sample under the mesh, however, was  $3.53 \pm 0.186$ . This is much higher than what was observed when the sample was sitting directly in the plasma. It appears that the mesh screen may have been acting like an electrostatic accelerator grid increasing the flux of charged species into the box.

Because it was still not possible to determine if other wavelengths of VUV radiation played a role, a double mesh was developed and installed in place of the single mesh making sure that it was electrically connected to the box to provide an equipotential gap to reduce the flux of charged species entering. The relative erosion yield was then observed to drop for the sample underneath the double mesh in the Faraday cage to approximately  $0.12 \pm 0.006$ . This value is near that observed inside the closed Faraday cage and is similar to that observed in space.



Figure 7. FEP Teflon exposed inside a Faraday cage with and without VUV radiation

#### 4.5 TESTING SUMMARY

Figure 8 contains a comparison chart of samples tested in the plasma asher under various conditions as compared to the value measured in space. It appears that placing FEP Teflon inside a Faraday cage will yield results very close to those observed in low Earth orbit. It does not appear to matter whether VUV radiation can enter the Faraday cage, only if charged species can enter. The greatly reduced erosion yield for FEP Teflon samples sitting on a conductive plate but directly inside the plasma also indicates that charged species may play a role. It is very difficult to isolate the effects of charged species inside of an RF field. In order to draw more firm conclusions about what is causing the differences in erosion yields, tests will need to be conducted in a facility where the sample region is not inside the RF field such as in a directed beam facility.



Figure 8. Comparison of FEP Teflon relative erosion yields

#### 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

These tests have shown that the accelerated erosion can be reduced by exposing the samples on a conductive plate or inside a Faraday cage whether or not the samples are exposed to the VUV radiation from the plasma. This may provide a means for testing of samples such as FEP Teflon in plasma environments which more closely mimics the erosion observed in LEO. More work needs to be done to determine if electrons, ions, or some effect of the RF field is causing the accelerated erosion of FEP Teflon in plasma asher facilities.

#### 6.0 REFERENCES

- 1. Stidham, C.R.; et al. "Low Earth Orbital Atomic Oxygen Environmental Simulation Facility for Space Materials Evaluation", NASA TM-106128, 1993.
- Johnson, C.L.; et al. "The Vanderbilt University Neutral O-Beam Facility", 18<sup>th</sup> International SAMPE Technical Conference Proceedings, Oct. 7-9, 1986.
- 3. Arnold, G.S.; Peplinski, D.R.; "A Facility for Investigating Interactions of Energetic Atomic Oxygen with Solids", Aerospace Report No. ATR-94(8540)-3, 1985.
- Brinza, D.E.; et al. "Production of Pulsed Atomic Oxygen Beams Via Laser Vaporization Methods", 18<sup>th</sup> International SAMPE Technical Conference Proceedings, Oct. 7-9, 1986.
- Rempt, R.D.; "Production of a Beam of Ground State Oxygen Atoms of Selectable Energy", 18<sup>th</sup> International SAMPE Technical Conference Proceedings, Oct. 7-9, 1986.

- Sjolander, G.W. and Bareiss, L.E.; "Martin Marietta Atomic Oxygen Beam Facility", 18<sup>th</sup> International SAMPE Technical Conference Proceedings, Oct. 7-9, 1986.
- 7. Caledonia, G.E.; et al. "A High Flux Source of Energetic Oxygen Atoms for Material Degradation Studies", AIAA 85-7015.
- 8. Rutledge, S.K.; et al. "An Evaluation of Candidate Atomic Oxygen Resistant Materials for Space Applications in LEO", NASA TM-100122, 1986.
- Rutledge, S.K., Banks, B.A. and Cales, M.; "A Comparison of Atomic Oxygen Erosion Yields of Carbon and Selected Polymers Exposed in Ground Based Facilities and in Low Earth Orbit", AIAA-94-2628.
- 10. Banks, B.A.; "The Use of Fluoropolymers in Space Applications", Modern Fluoropolymers, Scheirs, J. Ed.; John Wiley & Sons, New York, (1997), 103-111.

### **REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**

-

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

Person Parameters	Public reporting human for this collection of in	normation is astimated to average 1 house		
1: AGENY USE ONLY (Leave Darks)       2: REPORT DATE       3: REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED         1: July 1998       1: TREAME TYPE AND DATES COVERED       Technical Memorandum         4: THLE AND SUBTITLE       5: FUNDING NUMBERS         A. THLE AND SUBTITLE       5: FUNDING NUMBERS         A. THLE AND SUBTITLE       5: FUNDING NUMBERS         A. THOR(S)       5: Authony (S)         Sharon K. Rutledge, Bruce A. Banks, and Michael Kitral       7: PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aeronautics and Space Administration       8: PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aeronautics and Space Administration       SPONSORINGAMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aeronautics and Space Administration       SPONSORINGAMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aeronautics and Space Administration       SPONSORINGAMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ANDORESS(ES)         National Aeronautics and Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space         Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space         Tervironment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23-24, 15         Sharon K. Rutledge an Bure A. Barks, NASA Lewis Research Center, and Michael Kitral, Cleveland Stude University         Unclassified - Unlimited         Subject	gathering and maintaining the data needed, a collection of information, including suggestions Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22	indomination is essimated to average 1 hour per ind completing and reviewing the collection of is is for reducing this burden, to Washington Hear 202-4302, and to the Office of Management as	response, including the time for review information. Send comments regarding dquarters Services, Directorate for Info nd Budget, Paperwork Reduction Proje	Inity instructions, searching existing data sources, g this burden estimate or any other aspect of this immation Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson (ct (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.
July 1998         Technical Memorandum           A THE AND SUBTILE         5. FUNDING NUMBERS           A Comparison of Space and Ground Based Facility Environmental Effects for FEP Teflon         5. FUNDING NUMBERS           6. AUTHON(S)         WU-632-1A-1E-00           Sharon K. Rutledge, Bruce A. Banks, and Michael Kitral         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)           National Aeronautics and Space Administration Lewis Research Center         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)           National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546-0001         10. SPONSORINGAMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)           11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23-24, 19.           12. DISTIBUTIONAVAILABILITY STATEMENT         Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category: 27           Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category: 27         Distribution: Nonstandard FIP FIPION Will survice dimag a mission is the wide dignarity of crosion rates observed for this material in space and ing pased facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the entregy of the artivity species and temperature. These variations make in difficult to deter missing the observed differences in each orbit. Two somered for this material in space and ing pased facilities. Each environment containsthis this paper attemptis to narrow down with factors	1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank	) 2. REPORT DATE	3. REPORT TYPE AND D	DATES COVERED
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE       5. FUNDING NUMBERS         4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE       5. FUNDING NUMBERS         5. AUTHOR(S)       5. AUTHOR(S)         5. AUTHOR(S)       5. BARON K. Rutledge, Bruce A. Banks, and Michael Kitral         7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aeronautics and Space Administration       E-11194         5. SPONBORINGAMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       10. SPONBORINGAMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aeronautics and Space Administration       Washington, DC 20546-0001         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Foronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23-24, 19         12. OUSTRIBUTION/AVAILABULTY STATEMENT       Uclassified - Unimited         Subject Category: 27       Distribution: Nonstandard         This publication is available from the NASA Center for Aerospace Information, (301) 621-0390       12. DISTRIBUTION Work, It is suscitte to oresion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of crosion rates observed for this material in space and in group which factors affect the crosi rate of attermine residue as the erosping of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during an sussion is the wi		July 1998	Tech	inical Memorandum
A Comparison of Space and Ground Based Facility Environmental Effects for FEP Tefton	4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5.	FUNDING NUMBERS
	A Comparison of Space an FEP Teflon	nd Ground Based Facility Enviro	onmental Effects for	WIL (22 14 15 00
Sharon K. Rutledge, Brace A. Banks, and Michael Kitral         7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5) National Aeronautics and Space Administration Lewis Research Center Cleveland, Ohio 44135–3191       a. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER         9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(6) AND ADDRESS(E5) National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546–0001       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23–24, 15 Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Research Center; and Michael Kitral, Cleveland State University Cleveland, Ohio 44115–2403. Responsible person, Sharon K. Rutledge, organization code 5480, (216) 433–2219.         12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category: 27       Distribution: Nonstandard         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       Futorinate for the NASA Center for Aerospace Information, (301) 621–0390         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       Futorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widel used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is susc tible to crosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties to ach environment contain failure in low Earth orbit. Two observed for this material in space and in gr based facilities. Each environment contain failure in low Earth orbit. Two observations could be made. I is a of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environmentati constitont at a time. This was attempted through we of a singl	6. AUTHOR(S)			WU-032-1A-1E-00
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)       8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)         National Aeronautics and Space Administration       E-11194         1. SPONSORINGMONITORING AGENCY NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)       10. SPONSORINGMONITORING AGENCY NAME(5) AND ADDRESS(E5)         National Aeronautics and Space Administration       NASA TM1998-207918/RE         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space         Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23-24, 15         Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Research Center, and Michael Kitral, Cleveland State Universi         Cleveland, Ohio 44115-2403. Responsible person, Sharon K. Rutledge, organization code 5480, (216) 433-2219.         12a. DISTRIBUTIONAVAULABILITY STATEMENT         Unclassified - Unlimited         Subject Category: 27         Pistribution: Nonstandard         FIP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for the instantial in space and in present in the Version and erosion save and words)         FIP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for the EPT PTEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for the indical to there what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one	Sharon K. Rutledge, Bruce	A. Banks, and Michael Kitral		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration Lewis Research Center Cleveland, Ohio 44135–3191       E-11194         9. SPONSORINGMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546–0001       10. SPONSORINGMONITORING AGENCY NEPORT NUMBER         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23–24, 15 Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Research Center, and Michael Kitral, Cleveland State Universi Cleveland, Ohio 44115–2403. Responsible person, Sharon K. Rutledge, organization code 5480, (216) 433–2219.         12.       DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category: 27       Distribution: Nonstandard         TEP TERIO will sarvice words)       Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is sust tible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet EEP TEFIO will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of crosion rates observed for this material in space and in gro based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VVV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion meets observed for this material in space and in gro based facilities. Each environment winds aratery of Franday cages and VUV randiated the t	7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION N	IAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	8.	PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
Lewis Research Center Cleveland, Ohio 44135–3191       E-11194         9. SPONSORINGMONITORING AGENCY NAME(\$) AND ADDRESS(E\$) National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546–0001       10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER NASA TM—1998-207918/RE         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23–24, 19.         12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category: 27 Distribution: Nonstandard This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, (301) 621–0390         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 word) Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is sust tible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of crosion rates observed for this material in space and in gro based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environmental constituent at a time. This was attempted through use of a single simulation tofilty (Plasma asher) environment via variety of Farady cages and VUV transparent window Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations c	National Aeronautics and S	Space Administration		
Cleveland, Ohio 44135–3191         9. SPONSORINGMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Aeronautics and Space Administration         Washington, DC 20546–0001         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23–24, 15         Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Research Center; and Michael Kitral, Cleveland State Universit Cleveland, Ohio 44115–2403. Responsible person, Sharon K. Rutledge, organization code 5480, (216) 433–2219.         12a. DISTRIBUTIONAVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category: 27       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Mextinum 20 words)       12c. DISTRIBUTION and addition is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, (301) 621–0390.         13. ABSTRACT (Mextinum 20 words)       12florin is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is sus tible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficultics in determining wheth FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide signarity of crosion rates observed for this material in space and in gro based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the ariving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through atte	Lewis Research Center			E-11194
9. SPONSORINGAMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)       10. SPONSORINGAMONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)         National Acronautics and Space Administration       Nashington, DC 20546–0001       NASA TM—1998-207918/RE         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       NASA TM—1998-207918/RE       NASA TM—1998-207918/RE         Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23–24, 15         Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Research Center; and Michael Kitral, Cleveland State University Cleveland, Ohio 44115–2403. Responsible person, Sharon K. Rutledge, organization code 5480, (216) 433–2219.         12a. DISTRIBUTIONAVAILABILITY STATEMENT       Unclassified - Unlimited         Subject Category: 27       Distribution: Nonstandard         This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, (301) 621–0390       14. SBSTRACT (Mexhum 200 words)         Statistic Category: 27         Prefon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of crosion rates observed for this material in space and in grobased facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation didition to parameters such as the energy of the ariving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to determine gring is simulation facility (plasma ashe'n environment winding species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to determine for suce stratin side of a radio frequency (RF) plasma prov	Cleveland, Ohio 44135–3	191		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration       AGENCY REPORT NUMBER         Washington, DC 20546-0001       NASA TM—1998-207918/RE         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23–24, 19 Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Research Center; and Michael Kitral, Cleveland State University Cleveland, Ohio 44115–2403. Responsible person, Sharon K. Rutledge, organization code 5480, (216) 433–2219.         124. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         Unclassified - Unlimited       Subject Category: 27         Distribution: Nonstandard       This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, (301) 621–0390.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 worde)       Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is succ tible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in gro based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environment constituent at a time. Th	9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGE	ENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10	. SPONSORING/MONITORING
Washington, DC 20546-0001       NASA TM—1998-207918/RE         11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23-24, 15         Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Research Center; and Michael Kitral, Cleveland State Universi Cleveland, Ohio 44115-2403. Responsible person, Sharon K. Rutledge, organization code 5480, (216) 433-2219.         12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         Unclassified - Unlimited       Subject Category: 27         Distribution: Nonstandard       This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, (301) 621-0390.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 worda)       FIP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in gre based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. This was attempted through use of a single simulation facility (plasma asher) environment at a time. This was attempted through use of a single simulation facility (plasma asher) environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent windov Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations could be made. I it appears that the erosion yield of TEP Teflon with respect to that of polyimide Kapton is not greatly affected by the presen or lack of VUV radiation present in the RF plasma and the relative erosion yield for the FEP Tefl	National Aeronautics and S	nace Administration		AGENCY REPORT NUMBER
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23–24, 15 Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Research Center; and Michael Kitral, Cleveland State Universit Cleveland, Ohio 44115–2403. Responsible person, Sharon K. Rutledge, organization code 5480, (216) 433–2219.         12a. DISTRIBUTIONAVAILABILITY STATEMENT       [12b. DISTRIBUTIONAVAILABILITY STATEMENT]         Unclassified - Unlimited       [12b. OISTRIBUTION CODE]         Subject Category: 27       [12b. DISTRIBUTION Code]         12 ABSTRACT (Meximum 200 words)       [12b. OISTRIBUTION code]         Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is sust tible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in grobased facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to determing whete the erosion rates observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environmental constituent at a time. This was attempted through use of a single simulation facility (plasma asher) environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent window Isolating on factor inside of a ra	Washington DC 20546_0	001		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23–24, 19 Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Research Center; and Michael Kitral, Cleveland State Universit Cleveland, Ohio 44115–2403. Responsible person, Sharon K. Rutledge, organization code 5480, (216) 433–2219.         12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT       12b. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT         Unclassified - Unlimited       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       12b. DISTRIBUTION code to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in grv based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation dadition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent window Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations could be made. I it appears that the erosion yield of FEP Teflon with respect to that of polyimide Kapton is not greatly affected by the present or lack of VUV radiation present in the RF plasma and the relative erosion yield of the FEP to approximatel that observed in space, however it is difficult to determin	Wushington, DC 20340 0			NASA TM—1998-207918/REV1
Prepared for the Fourth International Space Conference on Protection of Materials and Structures from the LEO Space         Environment sponsored by the University of Toronto Institute for Aerospace Studies, Toronto, Canada, April 23–24, 15         Sharon K. Rutledge and Bruce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Research Center, and Michael Kitral, Cleveland State Universi         Cleveland, Ohio 44115–2403. Responsible person, Sharon K. Rutledge, organization code 5480, (216) 433–2219. <b>12a.</b> DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT         Unclassified - Unlimited         Subject Category: 27         Distribution: Nonstandard         This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, (301) 621–0390. <b>13.</b> ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is susc         tible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet         FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in gr         based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent w	11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         12a. Distribution:       Nonstandard         This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information. (301) 621–0390.       12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)       Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is suscentible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in grow based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosior rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent windou Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations could be made. I it appears that the erosion yield of FEP Teflon with respect to that of polyimide Kapton is not greatly affected by the preser or lack of VUV radiation present in the RF plasma and the relative erosion yield of the FEP tapproximatel that observed in space, however it is difficult to determine for sure whether ions, electrons, or some other components are causing the enhanced erosion.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       11. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF	Environment sponsored by Sharon K. Rutledge and Br Cleveland, Ohio 44115–24	the University of Toronto Institu- uce A. Banks, NASA Lewis Res 03. Responsible person, Sharon	Protection of Materials and the for Aerospace Studies, 7 earch Center; and Michael K. Rutledge, organization of	I Structures from the LEO Space Foronto, Canada, April 23–24, 1998. Kitral, Cleveland State University, code 5480, (216) 433–2219.
Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Category: 27       Distribution: Nonstandard         This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, (301) 621-0390. <b>13. ABSTRACT (Meximum 200 worde)</b> Fluorinated Ethylene Propylenc (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is susc tible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in gru- based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent window Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations could be made. I it appears that the erosion yield of FEP Teflon with respect to that of polyimide Kapton is not greatly affected by the present or lack of VUV radiation present in the RF plasma and the relative erosion yield of the FEP teflon may decrease with incr ing fluence. Second, shielding from charged particles appears to lower the relative erosion, yield of the FEP to approximatel that observed in space, however it is difficult to determine for sure whether ions, electrons, or some other components are causing the enhanced erosion. <b>14.</b> SUBJECT TERMS FEP; Teflon; Atomic oxygen; Low Earth Orbit; Plasma asher Unclassified <b>15.</b> SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassifie	12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY	STATEMENT		b. DISTRIBUTION CODE
Subject Category: 27       Distribution: Nonstandard         This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, (301) 621–0390.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is susc tible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in gro based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environmental constituent at a time. This was attempted through use of a single simulation facility (plasma asher) environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent window Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations could be made. I it appears that the erosion yield of FEP Teflon with respect to that of polymide Kapton is not greatly affected by the preser or lack of VUV radiation present in the RF plasma and the relative erosion yield of the FEP to approximatel that observed in space, however it is difficult to determine for sure whether ions, electrons, or some other components are causing the enhanced erosion.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       16. NUMBER OF PAGES         FEP; Teflon; Atomic oxygen; Low Earth Orbit; Plasma asher       16. NUMBER OF PAGES </td <td>Unclassified - Unlimited</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Unclassified - Unlimited			
Subject Category. 27       Distribution. Notistandard         This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, (301) 621–0390.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is suscitible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet         FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in grow based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent window Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations could be made. I it appears that the erosion yield of FEP Teflon with respect to that of polyimide Kapton is not greatly affected by the preser or lack of VUV radiation present in the RF plasma and the relative erosion yield of the FEP to approximatel that observed in space, however it is difficult to determine for sure whether ions, electrons, or some other components are causing the enhanced erosion.         14.       SUBJECT TERMS       11.         PEP; Teflon; Atomic oxygen; Low Earth Orbit; Plasma asher       11.         15.       NUMBER OF PAGES       21	Subject Category: 27	Distrib	ution: Nonstandard	
This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, (301) 621–0390.         13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is suscible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in group based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environmental constituent at a time. This was attempted through use of a single simulation facility (plasma asher) environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent window Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations could be made. I it appears that the erosion yield of FEP Teflon with respect to that of polyimide Kapton is not greatly affected by the presen or lack of VUV radiation present in the RF plasma and the relative erosion yield for the FEP Teflon may decrease with incring fluence. Second, shielding from charged particles appears to lower the relative erosion, yield of the FEP to approximatel that observed in space, however it is difficult to determine for sure whether ions, electrons, or some other components are causing the enhanced erosion.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT         19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION O		Distric	ution. Nonstandaru	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)         Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is used tible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in group based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environmental constituent at a time. This was attempted through use of a single simulation facility (plasma asher) environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent window Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations could be made. I it appears that the erosion yield of FEP Teflon with respect to that of polyimide Kapton is not greatly affected by the preser or lack of VUV radiation present in the RF plasma and the relative erosion yield of the FEP teflon may decrease with incring fluence. Second, shielding from charged particles appears to lower the relative erosion yield of the FEP to approximatel that observed in space, however it is difficult to determine for sure whether ions, electrons, or some other components are causing the enhanced erosion.         14. SUBJECT TERMS       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT         0. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT       Unclassified       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF A	This publication is available fro	m the NASA Center for AeroSpace In	formation, (301) 621–0390.	
Fluorinated Ethylene Propylene (FEP) Teflon is widely used as a thermal control material for spacecraft, however, it is sust tible to erosion, cracking, and subsequent mechanical failure in low Earth orbit. One of the difficulties in determining whet FEP Teflon will survive during a mission is the wide disparity of erosion rates observed for this material in space and in gro based facilities. Each environment contains different levels of atomic oxygen, ions, and vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation addition to parameters such as the energy of the arriving species and temperature. These variations make it difficult to deter what is causing the observed differences in erosion rates. This paper attempts to narrow down which factors affect the erosi rate of FEP Teflon through attempting to change only one environmental constituent at a time. This was attempted through use of a single simulation facility (plasma asher) environment with a variety of Faraday cages and VUV transparent window Isolating one factor inside of a radio frequency (RF) plasma proved to be very difficult. Two observations could be made. If it appears that the erosin yield of FEP Teflon with respect to that of polyimide Kapton is not greatly affected by the preser or lack of VUV radiation present in the RF plasma and the relative erosion yield of the FEP to approximatel that observed in space, however it is difficult to determine for sure whether ions, electrons, or some other components are causing the enhanced erosion.         14.       SUBJECT TERMS       15.       NUMBER OF PAGES         17.       SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT       18.       SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT       20.       LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT         17.       SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT       18.       SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT       20	13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 word	is)		
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT       18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE       19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT       20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRA         Unclassified       Unclassified       Unclassified       20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	<ul> <li>tible to erosion, cracking, an FEP Teflon will survive duri based facilities. Each enviro addition to parameters such what is causing the observed rate of FEP Teflon through a use of a single simulation fa Isolating one factor inside of it appears that the erosion yi or lack of VUV radiation preing fluence. Second, shieldin that observed in space, howe causing the enhanced erosion</li> <li>14. SUBJECT TERMS FEP; Teflon; Atomic oxyge</li> </ul>	In a subsequent mechanical failure in ing a mission is the wide disparity nment contains different levels of as the energy of the arriving speci- d differences in erosion rates. This attempting to change only one envi- cility (plasma asher) environment f a radio frequency (RF) plasma p eld of FEP Teflon with respect to esent in the RF plasma and the rel- ng from charged particles appears ever it is difficult to determine for n.	In low Earth orbit. One of the of erosion rates observed for atomic oxygen, ions, and va- ies and temperature. These va- paper attempts to narrow d ironmental constituent at a with a variety of Faraday ca- roved to be very difficult. T that of polyimide Kapton is ative erosion yield for the F to lower the relative erosion sure whether ions, electrons	the difficulties in determining whether or this material in space and in ground acuum ultraviolet (VUV) radiation in variations make it difficult to determin own which factors affect the erosion time. This was attempted through the ages and VUV transparent windows. wo observations could be made. First is not greatly affected by the presence EP Teflon may decrease with increas- n yield of the FEP to approximately s, or some other components are 15. NUMBER OF PAGES 21 16. PRICE CODE A03
Unclassified Unclassified Unclassified	17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATIO	DN 20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
Unclassified Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	Ur AdSIMAUI	
		Unclassified		

٠

•