

#### Full Scale Crash Testing at NASA Langley Research Center's Landing and Impact Research Facility with Application Toward Electric Vertical Take off and Landing (eVTOL) Crashworthiness

ASTM Powerplant meeting February 3 2023 Justin Littell Ph.D. NASA Langley Research Center Structural Dynamics Branch (D322)









#### NASA Full Scale Crash Testing / Research Programs (not a complete list)

NASA

- Metallic General Aviation (GA) Aircraft Tests and Analysis
  - 1970-1980s Historical
  - 2015 Emergency Locator Transmitter Survivability and Reliability (ELTSAR) Project
- Transport Category Crashworthiness
  - Boeing 737 fuselage section drop tests
  - 2019 Fokker F28 full scale crash test
- Composite General Aviation Aircraft Tests
  - 1994 Lear Fan
  - Beech Starship
  - Lancair
- Composite Energy Absorbing (EA) evaluations
  - 2009-2010 MD-500 Tests with Deployable Energy Absorber (DEA) Development
  - Transport Rotorcraft Airframe Crash Testbed
- Electric Vertical Take off and Landing (eVTOL)
  - 2022 NASA Lift+Cruise
- Discussion on test data acquisition and usage, analysis methodology, and knowledge obtained from conducting full scale crash testing

#### Landing and Impact Research Facility (LandIR)





- Subscale & full-scale landing/impact dynamics test facility
- Landing/impacts onto water, concrete, or soil
- Free flight conditions can be simulated by releasing swing cables just before impact. *i.e. pendulum swing*



#### Outdoor 70' and 50' Drop Tower



Indoor 30' and 15' drop tower



- In 1974, a cooperative research program was initiated between NASA, the FAA, and the GA industry to assess and improve the crash safety of small aircraft.
- Objectives of the research program were to determine:
  - Dynamic responses of the airframe, seats, and occupants
  - Effect of flight parameters at impact on the magnitude and pattern of structural damage
  - The failure modes of seats and occupant restraint systems
  - The impact loads imposed on the occupants
- 33 crash tests were performed between 1974 1983 on Piper Navajos, Aztecs, and Cherokees, along with Cessna 172s

#### **Historical GA Crash Test Video**







#### TABLE I.- SUMMARY OF DATA FROM CONTROLLED CRASH TESTS OF AIRPLANES

#### (a) Experimental and calculated normal pulse parameters

| Test  | Flight-path<br>angle, γ, deg | Pitch angle,<br>θ, deg | Flight-path<br>velocity,<br>V <sub>fp</sub> , m/sec | Experimental normal pulse parameters                                |                               |   |  | Calculated normal pulse parameters     |  |
|-------|------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
|       |                              |                        |   | Maximum<br>deceleration,<br><sup>Ž</sup> a,max <sup>,</sup> g units | Pulse<br>duration,<br>At, sec | Velocity change,<br>^V <sub>Z</sub> , m/sec | Impulse,<br><sup>Z</sup> a,max At, sec | Impulse,<br>Ž <sub>a,max</sub> Δt, sec | Velocity<br>change,<br>∆V <sub>Z</sub> , m/sec |
| 2     | -16                          | -12                    | 27  | 20  | 0.089                         | 8.5   | 1.78                                   | 1.49                                   | 7.44   |
| 3     | -18.75                       | -18                    | 26.2  | 28  | .05                           | 8.74  | 1.40                                   | 1.63                                   | 8.42   |
| 4     | -15                          | 4                      | 27  | 16  | .102                          | 8.5   | 1.63                                   | 1.42                                   | 6,99   |
| 5     | -20.5                        | -19.5                  | 26.1  |   |                               |   |  | 1.76                                   | 9.14   |
| 6     | -16                          | 14                     | 27  | 18  | .110                          | 10.4  | 1.98                                   | 1.47                                   | 7.44   |
| 7     | -47.5                        | -47.25                 | 28.6  | 20  | 0.174                         | 20.73                                       | 3,48                                   | 2,92                                   | 21,1   |
| 8     | -30                          | -31                    | 27  | 18  | .135                          | 13  | 2.43                                   | 2.36                                   | 13.5   |
| 9     | -16                          | -13                    | 26.3  |   |                               |   |  | 1.44                                   | 7.25   |
| 10    | -18                          | -14                    | 27.8  |   |                               |   |  | 1.70                                   | 8.59   |
| 11    | -31                          | -27                    | 25  | 12  | .1 32                         | 10  | 1.58                                   | 2.34                                   | 12.87  |
| 12    | -15                          | 9                      | 25  | 12  | 0.149                         | 9.5   | 1,79                                   | 1.30                                   | 6,47   |
| 13    | -29                          | -26                    | 25  | 27  | .049                          | 13  | 1.32                                   | 2,22                                   | 12.12  |
| 14    | -16.75                       | -11.75                 | 32.7  |   |                               |   |  | 1.88                                   | 9.42   |
| 15    | -18                          | -12                    | 41  | 46  | .064                          | 17  | 2,94                                   | 2.53                                   | 12.67  |
| 16    | ~15                          | -4                     | 40  | 46  | .054                          | 15  | 2.48                                   | 2.11                                   | 10.35  |
| 17    | -30                          | -38                    | 40  | 42  | 0.097                         | 19  | 4.07                                   | 3.22                                   | 20.0   |
| 18    | -30                          | -31                    | 27.9  | 27.2  | .083                          | 11.3  | 2.26                                   | 2.34                                   | 13.5   |
| 19    | -15                          | -17.7                  | 27  | 16  | .12                           | 10.6  | 1.92                                   | 1.38                                   | 6.99   |
| 20    | -15.4                        | 2                      | 26.6  | 31  | .057                          | 9.1   | 1.77                                   | 1.43                                   | 6.99   |
| 21    | - 30                         | -29.5                  | 27.1  | 29.9  | .096                          | 12.3  | 2.87                                   | 2.39                                   | 13.5   |
| FAA-1 | -32                          | -30                    | 25  | 21  | 0.120                         | 11  | 2.52                                   | 2.34                                   | 13.24  |
| FAA-2 | -17                          | -13.5                  | 23  | 7   | .160                          | 6   | 1.12                                   | 1.33                                   | 6.72   |
| FAA-3 | -34.5                        | -39                    | 25.9  | 18  | .12                           | 13.8  | 2.2                                    | 2.33                                   | 14.7   |
| FAA-4 | -32                          | -34.5                  | 25.3  | 18  | .13                           | 14.8  | 2.34                                   | 2.25                                   | 13.41  |

Carden, H. "Correlation and Assessment of Structural Airplane Crash data with Flight Parameters at Impact." NASA TP 2083. 1982

#### 2015 – ELTSAR Project – Crash Tests of GA Aircraft





- Main ELTSAR Objective System level Emergency Locator Transmitter (ELT) tests (beacon, cabling, antennas, remote switches, and associated hardware) to examine ELT system functionality and survivability
- Added objective #1 Evaluate differing types of restraint systems
- Added objective #2 Evaluate stand-alone onboard crash data recorders

\*total time on airframe

Littell, J.D. "Crash Test of Three Cessna 172 Aircraft at NASA Langley Research Center's Landing and Impact Research Facility." NASA TM-2015-218987. 2015

# ELTSAR Test 2 – 2015 - Controlled Flight into Terrain (CFIT) Nose Down





- Flight Path Velocity = 74 ft/sec (44 kt)
- Horizontal Velocity = 68.6 ft/sec
- Vertical Velocity = 28.7 ft/sec
- Pitch Angle = 12.2 deg nose down
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FsRwIr7RDkk

#### **Airframe Response – Data Collection**



Ω

0.1

Time after impact, sec

0.2

0.3

• Pilot head hitting yoke caused high accelerations, leading to high Head Injury Criteria (HIC) value (4241)

0.3

- Even with Co-Pilot restraint failing, y-harness was able to restrain Co-Pilot enough to avoid yoke, leading to low HIC value (274)
- Lumbar loads below established limit of 1,500 lb
- Pilot injurious crash

30

20

-10

-20<sup>L</sup>

01

Time after impact, sec

0.2

Acceleration, g

- Vertical Acceleration
  - Triangular to trapezoidal in nature
  - Peaks of 23.2 g and 24.7 g for Pilot floor and DAS floor, respectively
- Horizontal Acceleration
  - Triangular in nature with peaks of 27.1, 39.5 and 19.9 g in Pilot Floor, DAS Floor and Tail
  - Uniform in shape
  - Large spike in DAS floor could be from any number of dynamic events onboard



#### **ELTSAR Calibrated Model**





• Airframe, soil, lifting hardware all modelled

Time, s

- Peak acceleration is over predicted, but timing is close
- Occupants and seats are not modelled



- Full-scale crash test data feeds into standards developments and minimum operational performance standards (MOPS)
  - RTCA DO204 RevB (2018)
    - Table 4.4 drop testing
    - Chapter 6
  - Full Spectrum Crashworthiness Criteria for Rotorcraft
- Full-scale crash test data feeds into design guides and other reference materials
  - Small Airplane Crashworthiness Design Guide
  - Aircraft Crash Survival Design Guide Vol iii

#### Fokker F28 Full Scale Crash Test - Purpose



- Evaluate transport category aircraft under dynamic conditions which includes a forward velocity
  - Evaluate missing factors from a pure vertical component test
- Evaluate advanced Anthropomorphic Test Devices (ATD's aka crash test dummies) for injury
- Evaluate experimental ATDs
- Generate data for computer modelling purposes





F-28 taxi into LaRC - 2001

#### Fokker F28 – 2019 - Full Scale Crash Test - Video





#### **Composite GA with Crashworthiness**







- Testing conducted under
  - NASA AGATE Advanced Crashworthiness Group
  - Aviation Safety Program

#### Lear Fan – 1994 - Composite Baseline



- Baseline configuration, ~7053 lb.
- Impact conditions:  $V_v = 31$  ft/sec,  $V_h = 81$  ft/sec, AoA = 0 degree
- 7 seats installed, both 9 g static and dynamic prototype
  - Dynamic limited loads, but still over 1,500
    lb. criteria
- Determine composite aircraft structural behavior for crash loading conditions and provide baseline for similar aircraft



- Limited amount of full-scale test data is available for the study of composite crashworthiness
- NASA Langley has tested composite airframes and components to generate test data
- eVTOL vehicles will incorporate new technologies such as all-composite fuselage design, electric powertrain systems and other novel features







#### **Energy Absorber Development**

- Limit dynamic loading transmitted to onboard occupants to tolerable levels
- Composites are used to save weight, however crashworthiness is mostly overlooked
  - How do the composites fail?
  - Many aircraft/parts are built from "black aluminum"
    - 1 for 1 replacement composite retrofit
  - Is a skin stringer (semi-monocoque) system the way to go?
- NASA Langley has evaluated many energy absorbing designs, ranging from seat crush tubes to subfloors to external devices
- Designs are be developed at subscale level, then tested in full-scale aircraft









#### Deployable Energy Absorber (DEA) for GA/Rotorcraft Concept





- Retrofit on existing small aircraft
- One example of crash energy management developed by NASA
- Kevlar honeycomb which can be folded and stowed

#### DEA Application – 2009/2010 - Full Scale MD-500 Tests





- Two identical tests conducted, one with and one without DEA
- DEA test conducted first, presented in reverse order here

#### **DEA Performance**





• 67% and 60% Peak load attenuation for pilot and co-pilot respectively when using the DEA

#### Electric Vertical Take-off and Landing (eVTOL) Full Scale Crash Testing - Goal





## eVTOL Full Scale Crash Testing – Vehicle Development

- NASA Lift + Cruise (L+C) concept vehicle chosen for full-scale test campaign
- Test Article Specifications
  - Dimensions: 18'x6'x7'
  - Seats: 6 passenger
  - Wing Type: High wing
- Design features
  - Carbon fiber weave skin
  - Carbon fiber weave frames
  - Rigid overhead Wingbox area
  - Rigid and energy attenuating seats
  - In-house EA designs
    - Seat, Subfloor



### eVTOL – L+C Energy Absorber Integration



- After development, a single accordion modular subfloor design was used in the subfloor region of the L+C
- Self supported cruciform geometry exhibited robust response to multi-axis loading
  - Similar crush response across impact energy and direction variations within subfloor designs
- Subfloor component integrated into vehicle structure

- Subfloor, in conjunction with energy absorbing seats, is intended to achieve loading levels below established limits

#### eVTOL - Lift + Cruise Full Scale Test – November 9, 2022





## eVTOL - Finite Element Modeling (FEM)

- Evaluate capability of FEM to predict vehicle crash response
  - Validation of composite structural models through full scale test data
  - Validation of EA mechanisms under multi-axis integrated loading environment
- Demonstrate analytical techniques for defining "survivable" crash space
  - Expansion of crashworthiness through EA mechanisms
  - Validation through enveloping test selection
- Extend the full-scale crash matrix by simulating additional cases









- NASA has extensive history in GA aircraft crash testing and data from NASA testing is published
- Full scale test data guides regulations and provides industry knowledge
- NASA has tested composite historical composite aircraft and new designed eVTOL reference vehicles as a way to generate test data for evaluation
- NASA has designed and tested various internal and external energy absorbing systems as a way to limit occupant loads in a crash
- Crashworthiness involving a systems level approach must be able to address the features as a system
  - Subscale / individual tests give insight into systems behavior
  - Full scale dynamic test is necessary to verify system performance
- NASA Lift+Cruise eVTOL concept used to generate crash test data to inform development of eVTOL specific crashworthiness regulations
  - Utilize NASA's test capabilities and experience to conduct full-scale crash testing of generic eVTOL vehicle designs
- Numerical simulations supplement full scale data where applicable