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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Base heating for over a decade has been a major consideration in the design of booster systems, especially for multiple-engine configurations. Early failures in the Polaris, Jupiter and Atlas flight test programs and similar failures of the Thor during high altitude nuclear tests spotlighted the importance of proper base heating design considerations. Every major booster development program since these early failures have included extensive model testing, analytical studies and highly instrumented flight vehicles to properly assess the adequacy of the base design.

The prediction of base heating is very complex because of the large number of variables upon which it depends. There are currently no satisfactory methods for defining the base flow field and the methods of calculating convective or radiative heating from hot recirculating gases are crude at best. Experimental model and flight test data are therefore used extensively in base heating predictions although computational methods for determining radiative heat transfer from exhaust plumes have advanced rapidly in the last few years and are considered adequate for base heating predictions. Caution must be exercised in the use of experimental data in predicting base heating environments. Model scaling effects and lack of simulation complicate the use of model data and both model and flight instrumentation accuracy produce wide bands of uncertainty.

The Saturn launch vehicle development programs in the last ten years have produced a significant amount of model and flight test base heating data for a number of different configurations. The initial design of the Saturn I Block I vehicle was conceived in 1958, and the first flight in the Saturn I program was the SA-1 flight on October 27, 1961. Since that time there have been 25 additional flights with the Saturn vehicles; the most recent being the Apollo 16 flight utilizing the AS-511 Saturn V launch vehicle on April 16, 1972. The Saturn/Apollo launch vehicle configurations can be seen in Figure 1-1. The S-I and S-IB vehicles consist of two stages each and the Saturn V consists of three stages. These stage configurations have produced data for four different engine arrangements and two types of propellant. Minor configurational changes have produced parametric data useful in preliminary design work.

The MSFC Aero-Astrodynamics Laboratory felt the need for a single source of Saturn base heating data which would aid future base heating predictions on advanced booster concepts such as the Space Shuttle. Therefore, the following sections contain data from the Saturn I and IB (Section 3.0), S-IC (Section 4.0), S-IV (Section 5.0), and S-II (Section 6.0) development programs. The S-IVB stage of the Saturn V vehicle is a single engine stage producing a very low radiation heating environment. Base heating has not been an important S-IVB design consideration and has therefore not been included in this handbook.
1.0 (Continued)

The base heating handbook includes a description of the general base heating problem and prediction philosophy (Section 2.0), vehicle configuration descriptions, model and flight test data and references. Because of the volume of base heating data available, the handbook summarizes the most important data and refers the reader to more detailed data contained in the references. There is, however, enough data provided to make the handbook a good single source of Saturn base heating data which can be used for preliminary design base heating predictions.

Data contained herein have been taken from a large number of reports with differing formats and units and no attempt has been made to make the units or formats consistent. The table below is provided so that conversions from one set of units to another can be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiply</th>
<th>By</th>
<th>To Obtain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watts/cm²</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Btu/ft²sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilocalorie/m²sec</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>Btu/ft²sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°K</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>°R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meters</td>
<td>3.281</td>
<td>Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/cm²</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>PSI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1-1. SATURN/APOLLO LAUNCH VEHICLE CONFIGURATIONS
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2.0 GENERAL BASE HEATING PROBLEM DESCRIPTION AND PREDICTION PHILOSOPHY

Heating in the base region of the Saturn class booster vehicles has been one of the primary areas of concern and investigation by NASA/MSFC and its contractors throughout the last decade. Although the base heating problem differs from stage to stage and with different propellants, certain basic aspects of base heating are the same on all multi-engine boosters. Base heating is caused by radiation from the exhaust plumes and radiation and convective heating caused by hot gases which are recirculated into the base region. Both radiation and convective heating are increased when secondary combustion of fuel-rich exhaust gases occurs along the plume boundary or in the reversed flow field.

Typical multi-engine base flow fields are shown in Figure 2.1-1 for low altitude, medium altitude and high altitude conditions. Radiation and convection can be significant at lift-off with splashing from the launch pad. At low altitude, the predominant heating mode is radiation from the plumes. Due to the ejector action of the plumes, convective cooling results from the aspirated flow of ambient air across the base. As the exhaust plumes expand with increasing altitude they impinge upon one another creating high pressure areas which cause a reversal or recirculation of some of the lower energy exhaust flow. These recirculated gases create a convective heating environment, and, depending on the gas constituents, can also be a source of significant hot gas radiation. At higher altitudes, if the flow does not choke, the density of the gas in the base is reduced which reduces the heating environment. If choking occurs, the pressure and heating become constant and independent of altitude and free stream flow.
FIGURE 2.1-1. Qualitative Description of Flow Fields for a Clustered Rocket Configuration
2.1 PREDICTION PHILOSOPHY

Base region design prediction philosophy for the Saturn vehicles have varied slightly from contractor to contractor, and depended somewhat upon the sequence of vehicles under development (the Saturn V stages benefited from previous Saturn I predictions and flight data). However, in general, the following prediction philosophy has been followed on all Saturn stages:

1. Analytical and empirical techniques have been used for radiation predictions.

2. Flight data from comparable vehicles have been used to define magnitudes of gas temperature and convective heating. The effect of altitude on main plume radiation, and the radiation potential of recirculated gases can also be predicted from flight data.

3. Model test data of the specific configuration have been used to predict when hot gases would be expected in the base region, to indicate magnitudes of base pressure and base gas temperature, and to determine relative heating effects with changes in configuration.

Table 2.1-1 illustrates the prediction philosophy in block diagram form. Preliminary design predictions on the base heating environment are obtained from a combination of analytical calculations and previous launch vehicle model and flight data having similar configurations. Analytical adjustments are made for differences in parameters which affect base heating. Thermal environments for detailed design are based on preliminary predictions which are adjusted using model test data of the configuration of interest, full scale static engine test exhaust plume radiation measurements (LOX/RP-1) and analytical radiation calculations (LOX/H₂). Care must be taken in the model test simulation to provide the best possible data. The model data must be carefully scaled for application to the prototype. The best currently available scaling procedures still result in rather large uncertainties for full-scale heat fluxes. It is therefore good practice to overdesign the heat shield of early vehicles and to remove any excessive shielding from subsequent vehicles as flight test data become available. Early flights should be well instrumented to define the base thermal environment to determine the adequacy of the base area thermal design.

The prediction methods used by each stage contractor are described in more detail in each stage section. Model test data and flight test data peculiar to each stage are also included in those sections. A summary of model and flight test data has been prepared and is described in Section 2.2. A cursory review of analytical methods, with emphasis on the chronological development of these methods, is contained in Section 2.3.
TABLE 2.1-1
PREDICTION METHODS

PRELIMINARY

EXISTING MODEL AND FLIGHT TEST DATA

ANALYTICAL ADJUSTMENTS TO EXISTING DATA FOR APPLICATION TO NEW CONFIGURATION

PRELIMINARY DESIGN ENVIRONMENT

LOX RP-1

REFINED

MODEL TEST PROGRAM TO DEFINE CONVECTIVE HEATING

MODEL DATA ADJUSTED FOR SCALE EFFECTS

REFINED BASE HEATING ENVIRONMENTS

FULL SCALE ENGINE STATIC TEST RADIATION MEASUREMENTS

DEFINE SEA LEVEL PLUME

DEFINE SEA LEVEL RADIATION (ASSUME ε = 1 AND ANALYTICALLY CALCULATE VIEW FACTORS)

DEFINE RADIATION DROP-OFF WITH ALTITUDE USING EXISTING FLIGHT DATA

LOX-H₂

EXISTING MODEL AND FLIGHT TEST DATA

ANALYTICAL ADJUSTMENTS TO EXISTING DATA FOR APPLICATION TO NEW CONFIGURATION

PRELIMINARY DESIGN ENVIRONMENT

PLUME FLOW FIELD DEFINED USING MIX. FOR VARIOUS ALTITUDES

RADIATION DEFINED USING RADIATION COMPUTER PROGRAM

MODEL TEST PROGRAM TO DEFINE CONVECTIVE HEATING

MODEL CONVECTIVE HEATING ADJUSTED FOR SCALING AND NON-SIMULATION

REFINED BASE HEATING ENVIRONMENT
2.2 SUMMARY OF SATURN EXPERIMENTAL DATA

In the time span from October 27, 1961, to present, there have been 25 flights with Saturn vehicles. These flights are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEHICLE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF FLIGHTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturn I Block I</td>
<td>4 flights (SA-1 through SA-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn I Block II</td>
<td>6 flights (SA-5 through SA-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn IB</td>
<td>5 flights (SA-201 through SA-205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn V</td>
<td>11 flights (AS-501 through AS-511)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The base regions of the Saturn I, Block I and II vehicles were heavily instrumented with thermocouples, calorimeters, and pressure measurements. The first four Saturn IB flights and the first five Saturn V flights were also heavily instrumented. These instruments have produced a considerable quantity of useful base heating and pressure data. A summary of the Saturn Flight Base Heating Data is included in Table 2.2-1. Detailed discussions of the flight tests and parametric data are included in each stage section.

Throughout the Saturn program, model tests were conducted to assist the base heating design predictions and to gain insight into the effect of parametric variables and configuration changes. Early model tests for the S-I and S-IV stages of the Saturn I vehicle were hot flow, long duration tests performed mainly at AEDC Propulsion Wind Tunnel and Rocket Test Facility. Later tests with the S-IB, S-II and S-IC stages were conducted using the short-duration experimental techniques. These tests were conducted principally at CAL and Lewis Research Center. A summary of Saturn Model Base Heating Tests is presented in Table 2.2-2. Detailed discussions of the individual test programs are included in each stage section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEHICLE</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>BASE CONFIGURATION</th>
<th>ENGINE</th>
<th>TYPE PROPellant</th>
<th>( P_c ) (PSIA)</th>
<th>O/F</th>
<th>ALTITUDE RANGE (KM)</th>
<th>TYPICAL HEATING ENVIRONMENT (WATTS/CM²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SATURN I</td>
<td>S-I</td>
<td></td>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>LOX/RP-1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>RL-10</td>
<td>LOX/LH₂</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>60-225</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATURN IB</td>
<td>S-IB</td>
<td></td>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>LOX/RP-1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-IVB</td>
<td></td>
<td>J-2</td>
<td>LOX/LH₂</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>60-185</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATURN V</td>
<td>S-IC</td>
<td></td>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>LOX/RP-1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-II</td>
<td></td>
<td>J-2</td>
<td>LOX/LH₂</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>60-190</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-IVB</td>
<td></td>
<td>J-2</td>
<td>LOX/LH₂</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total heating rate measured on SA-6 is assumed to be convective heating.
### Table 2.2-2. Summary of Saturn Model Base Heating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Base Configuration</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Test Facility</th>
<th>Type Test</th>
<th>Test Conditions</th>
<th>Model Propellants</th>
<th>Model Turbine Exhaust Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturn I (Block I &amp; II)</td>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>5.47% AEDC-PWT 16 Foot Transonic</td>
<td>LONG DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>0.6 - 1.5</td>
<td>10,000 - 42,000</td>
<td>LOX/RP-1</td>
<td>LH₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.47% AEDC-RTF</td>
<td>LONG DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>0.8 - 1.5</td>
<td>16,000 - 27,500</td>
<td>LOX/RP-1</td>
<td>LH₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.47% AEDC-RTF</td>
<td>LONG DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>33,000 - 45,000</td>
<td>LOX/RP-1</td>
<td>LH₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.47% AEDC-RTF</td>
<td>LONG DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>70,000 - 80,000</td>
<td>LOX/RP-1</td>
<td>LH₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-IV</td>
<td>4 ENGINE</td>
<td>1/10 AEDC-RTF/T-3 (4 ENGINE)</td>
<td>LONG DURATION-HOT COLD FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>118,500 - 152,500</td>
<td>LOX/RP-1</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>1/10 AEDC-RTF (4 ENGINE)</td>
<td>LONG DURATION-COLD FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/10 CAL ALTITUDE CHAMBER (4 ENGINE)</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>140,000 - 200,000</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/10 CAL ALTITUDE CHAMBER (6 ENGINE)</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>120,000 - 220,000</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn IB</td>
<td>S-IB</td>
<td>5.47% AEDC-RTF/T-1</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-IVB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn V</td>
<td>S-IC</td>
<td>1/45 CAL 8x8 Transonic</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>0.6 - 1.2</td>
<td>13,000 - 34,000</td>
<td>LOX/Ethylene</td>
<td>LH₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/45 LeRC 8x6 Transonic</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>0.2 - 1.65</td>
<td>8,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>LOX/Ethylene</td>
<td>LH₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/45 LeRC 10x10 Supersonic</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>2.0 - 5.5</td>
<td>51,000 - 90,000</td>
<td>LOX/Ethylene</td>
<td>LH₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/45 CAL HIGH ALTITUDE CHAMBER</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>125,000 - 205,000</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-II</td>
<td>1/25 CAL HIGH ALTITUDE CHAMBER</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>150,000 - 265,000</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/25 MSFC IMPULSE BASE FLOW FACILITY</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION-HOT FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>150,000 - 265,000</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td>NO EXTERNAL FLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-IVB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 SUMMARY OF ANALYTICAL METHODS

The following subsections contain a description of the analytical tools available for predicting radiation and convective base heating. Extensive analytical investigations have been made over the past fifteen years to gain a better understanding of the physical phenomena associated with the base environment so that accurate mathematical models of the flow field and heat transfer mechanisms could be constructed. Programs are available to calculate the radiative heat flux from the exhaust products of solid or liquid propulsion systems. The definition of the flow field and thermodynamic properties pose the major problem to the calculation of radiation.

The convective aspect of the base heating problem is less understood. There are differing opinions among investigators about the physical flow model as well as the governing equations to be used to define the heating mechanism. The many variables and complex flow fields associated with base recirculation have made it difficult to develop accurate analytical procedures for predicting the convective environment on arbitrary configurations. Because of these limitations and basic disagreements about the physical model, the summary of convective analytical models will be limited to a listing of pertinent references. No attempt will be made to compare the various approaches or assess the applicability of individual methods.

2.3.1 Analytical Methods for Predicting Radiation from Rocket Exhausts

The significance of exhaust plume radiation in the thermal environment of rocket vehicles, and the problems involved in the accurate prediction of this radiation vary with each application. Although the most important factors in these variations are the propellants used and the altitude range to be considered, other factors, such as engine arrangement, engine chamber pressure, nozzle area ratio, and the method of exhausting fuel rich turbo-pump exhaust gases, can also have a significant influence on the problem, Reference 2-1.

The propellants define the radiating constituents which must be considered. In the first stage of both the Saturn I and the Saturn V vehicles, kerosene/oxygen propellants are used. In these cases, the dominant radiating species is carbon particles, although significant concentrations of water vapor, carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide are also present. Since the upper stages of the Saturn vehicles use hydrogen/oxygen propellants, the only significant radiative constituent for these stages is water vapor.

The primary radiation source at low altitudes (below 10 km) is the mixing layer where air combines with the fuel-rich exhaust plume to produce a high temperature afterburning mantle. As altitude increases, the reduction in atmospheric pressure eliminates the combustion on the exterior of the plume. With the elimination of plume afterburning, the most significant radiation sources become the high temperature regions formed by the shock waves surrounding the impingement planes between the plumes of clustered engines.
2.3.1 (Continued)

Two characteristics of the radiation from exhaust plumes of first-stage vehicles were used in the development of the preliminary prediction techniques. The first important characteristic is that the afterburning around the exhaust plume is most intense at low altitudes, and the second characteristic is the effect of the carbon particles in the exhaust gas. The carbon particles provide continuum radiation and greatly increase the optical thickness of the gases, so that radiation can be approximated by assuming a continuum radiation emanating from the outer layers of gases. This approximation, combined with empirical measurements of the equivalent black-body temperature of the exhaust plume, provides a flame model consisting of cylindrical sections with a temperature assigned to each section. The shape and temperatures of the cylindrical model have been determined on the Saturn I and Saturn V H-1 and F-1 engines respectively, using optical and radiometer data from full scale engine static tests. This model can be used with appropriate form factors to predict the radiation environment in the base region for sea level conditions. The decrease in radiant heating with increasing altitudes, which is estimated from previous flight data, is applied to the predicted sea level heating rates to estimate the variation in radiant heat load throughout the flight. A typical flame model and altitude decay curve are shown in Figure 2.3-1.

![Diagram of Flame Model](image)

**FIGURE 2.3-1. TYPICAL FLAME PATTERN AND ALTITUDE DECAY DATA**
2.3.1 (Continued)

This method predicts sea level heating environment extremely well but the altitude decay can be complicated by hot gas radiation from the recirculated exhaust gases. Currently experimental data must be used to predict the radiation from hot recirculating gases.

Since the initial methods depend upon a prior knowledge of certain empirical data, a more fundamental approach was sought. The ensuing research programs led to the development of a calculation method using band models with a modified Curtis-Godson approximation to account for inhomogeneous gas properties. These new methods have been found effective in predicting radiative heat transfer from LOX-H\textsubscript{2} using flow properties from a method of characteristics program and adjustments for interaction regions. However, LOX/RP-1 exhaust flow mixing layers and afterburning cannot be predicted reliably and therefore empirical data must still be obtained.

A digital computer program (Reference 2-2) has been written to calculate radiation using the band models for axisymmetric and three-dimensional exhaust plumes with water vapor, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide and carbon particles. Reference 2-3 describes the program and some of the results compared with experimental data.

Preliminary base heating radiation predictions should be based on simplified cylinder models and existing flight data. The radiation program is used to verify and refine preliminary flight data.

2.3.2 Analytical Methods for Predicting Base Convective Heating

It is difficult to present an overall analytical model of the base flow field which can be used to determine absolute values of recovery temperature or heat transfer rate. The usual procedure is to divide the reverse flow field into fundamental components which are then analyzed individually. The flow field is generally divided into the following components:

1. Internal nozzle flow including the boundary layer
2. Plume expansion
3. Turbulent mixing region
4. Interaction/recompression region
5. Reverse flow model
6. Vented mass flow
7. Plume induced flow separation

The final solution of base pressure, recovery temperature and heat transfer rate requires properties which are determined by the reverse flow and vented mass flow analyses; and inherently contains all errors and assumptions present in each component analysis.
Many investigators have constructed elaborate analytical models of individual flow components. Most of this work has been directed at the turbulent mixing region, using the original theory of Korst and interpretation of Goethert. Only a few investigators have tried to describe the complete flow field; but, in recent years, several reviews of the "state-of-the-art" have tied together the various individual flow field contributions to construct an overall flow field model. From these reviews, a list of the most significant investigators has been prepared in chronological order of their major publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigator</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goethert</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion, etc.</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page and Dixon</td>
<td>1963, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor and Tou</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer and Craven</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb, etc.</td>
<td>1969-1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3-1 summarizes the individual flow component and environment component methods used by these investigators. To illustrate the extent of publication directed at individual flow components, Table 2.3-2 has been prepared referencing approximately 130 reports. This list is only a partial compilation of the applicable literature.

Even though a significant number of analytical studies have been made to define a better method of calculating convective heating, design predictions still depend heavily upon experimental model and flight test data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>INTERNAL NOZZLE FLOW</th>
<th>PLUME EXPANSION</th>
<th>TURBULENT MIXING</th>
<th>INTERACTION/RECOMPRESSION</th>
<th>REVERSED FLOW MODEL</th>
<th>VENTED w/SS FLOW RATE</th>
<th>RECOVERY BASE TEMPERATURE</th>
<th>BASE HEAT TRANSFER</th>
<th>BASE PRESSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>ISENTROPIC CORE</td>
<td>BOUNDARY LAYER</td>
<td>PLUME INTERACTION</td>
<td>ESCAPE CRITERION</td>
<td>CHOKED FLOW AT TOTAL VENT AREA</td>
<td>( T_{ab} = T_a ) PLUME BOUNDARY</td>
<td>( Q = P_b \cdot \eta )</td>
<td>( \dot{m}_R = \dot{m}_V )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goethert (1961)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>ESTIMATED</td>
<td>LATVALA APPROXIMATE METHOD</td>
<td>MODIFIED KORST MODEL</td>
<td>( \dot{m}<em>V = \int</em>{r_1}^{r_2} \rho \cdot v \cdot \text{d}y )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion et al. (1962)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>ESTIMATED</td>
<td>METHOD OF CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>GOETHERT METHOD</td>
<td>( \dot{m}_V = \dot{m}_V ) PLUME BOUNDARY</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>( \dot{m}_R = \dot{m}_V )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page &amp; Dixon (1952, 1966)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>NEGLECTED</td>
<td>FRANDTL-MEYER EXPANSION</td>
<td>GOETHERT METHOD</td>
<td>( \dot{m}_V = \dot{m}_V ) PLUME BOUNDARY</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>( \dot{m}_R = \dot{m}_V )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Tou (1967)</td>
<td>METHOD OF CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>MODIFIED METHOD OF ELIOTT</td>
<td>ZUMWALT &amp; TANG (1964)</td>
<td>AXISYMMETRICAL JET IMPINGEMENT ON A FLAT PLATE</td>
<td>GOETHERT METHOD</td>
<td>( \dot{m}_V = \dot{m}_V ) MODIFIED CARDON-APFELT CORRELATION</td>
<td>( \dot{m}_R = \dot{m}_V )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer &amp; Cravens (1969)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>NOT APPlicable</td>
<td>INVISCID PLUME-PLUME IMPINGEMENT</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb et al. (1970)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>NEGLECTED</td>
<td>LOVE CIRCULAR ARC APPROXIMATION</td>
<td>LOVE CIRCULAR ARC APPROXIMATION</td>
<td>LAMB &amp; HOOD TURBULENT REATTACHMENT MODEL</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.3-2. Convective Heating - Survey of Analytical Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Model Component</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Internal Nozzle Flow</td>
<td>2-5, 2-6, 2-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Isentropic Core</td>
<td>2-4, 2-6, 2-7, 2-23, 2-34, 2-5, 2-60, 2-61, 2-68, 2-69, 2-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Boundary Layer</td>
<td>2-7, 2-22, 2-29, 2-45, 2-62, 2-82, 2-83, 2-16, 2-84, 2-85, 2-36, 2-90, 2-111, 2-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Plume Interaction</td>
<td>2-13, 2-14, 2-17, 2-25, 2-27, 2-28, 2-31, 2-32, 2-49, 2-35, 2-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reversed Flow Model</td>
<td>2-21, 2-18, 2-31, 2-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vented Mass Flow Rate</td>
<td>2-23, 2-24, 2-34, 2-101, 2-102, 2-103, 2-104, 2-105, 2-106, 2-107, 2-108, 2-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plume Induced Flow Separation</td>
<td>2-18, 2-15, 2-33, 2-35, 2-40, 2-42, 2-43, 2-44, 2-89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Base Environment Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Environment Component</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Convective Heat Transfer</td>
<td>2-11, 2-17, 2-40, 2-46, 2-35, 2-53, 2-84, 2-79, 2-80, 2-92, 2-97, 2-110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.4 PARAMETERS INFLUENCING BASE HEATING

Previous investigators have studied the effect of various parameters on base flow and associated heating phenomena. From these investigations and others, three general groupings of variables influencing base heating have emerged. These groups are (1) vehicle trajectory variables, e.g., vehicle altitude and Mach number; (2) propellant variables such as type of propellant, O/F ratio, combustion chamber pressure and temperature, thermodynamic and transport properties which influence the velocity and exhaust gas radiation characteristics; and (3) geometrical variables such as nozzle area ratio, nozzle exit angle, base vent area, engine spacing, distance from base to nozzle exit plane, method of turbine exhaust injection, engine shroud length, base flow deflectors, engine gimbaling, engine out and method of nozzle cooling.

A table has been prepared (Table 2.4-1 from Ref. 2-81) which summarizes the qualitative effect of some of the more important variables on such phenomena as full base recirculation altitude, base pressure, base convective heating, and gaseous radiation. These general trends are based on experimental model and flight test experience and under certain circumstances could have an opposite trend.

**TABLE 2.4-1. EFFECT OF MAJOR PARAMETERS ON BASE PHENOMENA (REF. 2-81)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR VARIABLES INCREASING</th>
<th>NOZZLE AREA RATIO</th>
<th>NOZZLE HALF ANGLE</th>
<th>BASE TO NOZZLE DISTANCE</th>
<th>ROCKET SPACING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE SPECIFIC HEAT</th>
<th>ROCKET CHAMBER PRESSURE</th>
<th>BASE VENT FACTOR</th>
<th>FREE STREAM MACH NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FULL BASE RECIRCULATION ALTITUDE</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE PRESSURE</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE CONVECTIVE HEATING</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASEOUS RADIATION TO BASE</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

▲ Increasing  ▼ Decreasing

It should be pointed out that this table represents the qualitative effect on the simple, uncomplicated flow field. It does not deal with such problems as engine gimbaling, engine-out operation, fuel-rich base injectants, combustion at the base, external fins and protuberances on the base, all of which tend to greatly complicate the problem of determining the base flow characteristics and thermal environment of a launch vehicle.
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3.0 SATURN S-I AND S-IB STAGES

Base heating on the S-I and S-IB stages was a result of radiative and convective environments produced by eight (8) H-1 engine exhausts. The engine cluster cross-type arrangement was the same on all S-I and S-IB stages. There were, however, variations in the base region configuration and in the routing of the inboard engine turbine exhausts. The following paragraphs describe the S-I and S-IB configurations, trajectories, H-1 engine characteristics, base heating prediction methods, model and flight test data and references.
In 1958 when the design of the Saturn engine cluster was conceived, the designers foresaw a circular engine arrangement. Analysis indicated, however, that the thermal environment on the inside of this engine circle would necessitate a large and massive thermal protection system. Therefore, to reduce the magnitude of the thermal protection requirements the cross-type engine arrangement shown in Figure 3.1-1 was chosen. The four inner engines were fixed and placed as closely together as possible at the center of the arrangement. The area remaining between the four inner engine nozzles was sealed near the exit plane with a flame shield. This was to prevent the hot gases reversed by the intersection of the inboard engine exhausts from circulating into the remainder of the base region. The hot recirculating gas and intense radiation expected between the inner region engines were thus confined in a small, easily protected area. The four movable outer engines were grouped about the four central engines at a distance which minimized, within design limitation, the potential jet interference and flow reversal. The centerline of each fixed inboard engine nozzle was canted out at 3 degrees. Outboard engine nozzles had a 6-degree cant in their null position and could gimbal an additional 6 degrees in any direction.

To protect the engine compartment against the recirculating high temperature gases at the higher altitudes and the radiation emitted by the H-1 engine exhausts, a base heat shield was placed forward of the flame shield. This base heat shield was positioned approximately at the throat plane of the eight H-1 engine nozzles. This effectively minimized the thermal environment to the base heat shield since it was as far removed as possible from the nozzle exit plane. The area between the movable outboard engines and the heat shield was enclosed with high temperature resistant flexible cloth curtains.

The H-1 engine gas turbine discharges a fuel-rich exhaust (O/F ≈ 0.33). Afterburning of similar turbine exhaust gases caused high heating rates on the Jupiter missile when they were discharged into the base region, so initial efforts were directed toward dumping the turbine exhaust overboard. However, since the gas generator and turbine are attached to the H-1 engine, discharge of turbine exhaust from the outboard (movable) engines into the ambient flow was mechanically difficult. Hence, the outboard engine turbine exhaust gases are discharged with an exhausterator or aspirator located circumferentially around the exit of each outboard engine nozzle. Discharge of the inboard engine turbine exhaust was initially overboard through ducts that protruded from the side wall of the engine compartment. However, later in the Saturn program the inboard engine turbine exhaust ducts were rerouted and the gases were dumped through the flame shield.

In an attempt to reduce the severity of the base region thermal environment air scoops and flow deflectors were mounted around the periphery of the base. Their purpose was to catch and divert the cool ambient air over the heat shield. However, the thickness of the boundary layer along the tail barrel and the presence of shocks at the higher velocities make the scoops and deflectors ineffective.
With the exception of the inboard engine turbine exhaust reroute, all the foregoing configurational discussion pertains equally to all Saturn S-I and S-IB stages. The following discussion attempts to identify the base region configuration changes that evolved throughout the Saturn flight test program.

The S-I stage of the first four Saturn I vehicles (SA-1 through SA-4) employed the Block I configuration. A base view schematic of this configuration is shown in Figure 3.1-2. As noted in this figure each of the movable outboard engines were protected by a shroud that extended beyond the heat shield. Their purpose was to prevent aerodynamic loads on the outer engines. The overall geometric configuration of the Block I base was scalloped with a minimum of protrusions from the tail barrel. The primary mission of the Block I flights was to check out the S-I stage with its eight 165,000 pound thrust engines.

The S-I stage of the Block II vehicles (SA-5 through SA-10) had the base configuration shown in Figure 3.1-3. Thrust for each of the H-1 engines on these vehicles was uprated to 188,000 pounds. As noted in the figure, fins were added for stability, fairings were placed around the inboard engine turbine exhaust ducts and the Block II base had a circular geometry. The outboard engine shrouds, which on the Block I configuration were an extension of the tail barrel, were attached to the Block II torque ring at the aft end of the tail unit assembly.

A profile view of the two S-I stage configurations is shown in Figure 3.1-4. Note that the Block II fins are perpendicular to the centerline of the vehicle. Also, since the upper stages of the Block I configuration were dummy and carried water ballast, there were no hydrogen vent lines required.

Generally speaking the S-IB stage external configuration was very similar to the S-I, Block II configuration. The primary exception being that the fins were redesigned with a sweep to both the leading and trailing edges. One other design change for the first five S-IB stages was the uprating of the H-1 engine sea level thrust to 200,000 pounds. The remaining S-IB stages are equipped with eight 205,000 pounds thrust H-1 engines.

Base and profile views of the S-IB-1 are shown in Figures 3.1-5 and 3.1-6, respectively. Similar views of S-IB-2 are shown in Figures 3.1-7 and 3.1-8 while S-IB-3 and subsequent S-IB stages are shown in Figures 3.1-9 and 3.1-10. Several minor configurational changes in the S-IB stage base region marked the progression from S-IB-1 to S-IB-3. The S-IB-1 base was equipped with engine shrouds mounted as shown in Figures 3.1-5 and 3.1-6. These were similar to the engine shrouds on the Saturn I, Block II configurations. These shrouds were removed from subsequent S-IB stages. S-IB-1 and S-IB-2 had flame shields that were identical to those employed on the Saturn I, Block II series. A new flame shield was designed for S-IB-3 and succeeding stages to permit dumping of turbine exhaust gases directly into the base. This eliminated the pumping required by the earlier system. Schematics of
the two flame shield designs are shown in Figure 3.1-11. The redesigned flame shield was moved to the H-1 engine nozzle exit plane and the turbine exhaust duct outlets were placed along the inward facing wall of the inboard nozzles. The surface area of the new flame shield was 652.5 square inches. This is approximately one-half of the area of the previously employed flame shields.

The flight trajectories for the S-I Block I and Block II and the S-IB vehicles are shown in Figure 3.1-12.
FIGURE 3.1-1. 'SATURN S-I AND S-IB CROSS-TYPE ENGINE ARRANGEMENT
FIGURE 3.1-2. BASE VIEW OF SATURN S-I, BLOCK I, STAGE
FIGURE 3.1-3. BASE VIEW OF SATURN S-I, BLOCK II, STAGE
FIGURE 3.1-4. SATURN S-I STAGE
FIGURE 3.1-5. SA-201 BASE CONFIGURATION
FIGURE 3.1-6. S-IB-1 EIGHT (8) 200K THRUST - H-1 ENGINES
FIGURE 3.1-9., BASE VIEW OF SA-203 AND SUBSEQUENT LAUNCH VEHICLE
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FIGURE 3.1-10. S-IB-3 THROUGH S-IB-5 EIGHT (8) 200K LB. THRUST - H-1 ENGINES
3.2 H-1 ENGINE CHARACTERISTICS

The Rocketdyne H-1 engine is a fixed thrust, bi-propellant, single start rocket engine. Basically, the physical characteristics of the inboard engines and the outboard engines in the eight-engine cluster are identical. The major difference is in the turbine exhaust system. The present inboard engines (Figure 3.2-1) have a curved exhaust duct while the outboard engines utilize an aspirator.

On the S-I and S-IB stages, the H-1 engines are started in pairs 100 milli-seconds apart beginning with the inboard engines. First stage powered flight lasts approximately 140 seconds, after which the inboard engines are shut down simultaneously. Approximately 4 seconds later the outboard engines are simultaneously shut down.

H-1 engine and thrust chamber operational and physical characteristics are presented in Table 3.2-1. Characteristics are given for the 165K, 188K and 200K thrust versions of the H-1. Launch vehicle effectivity are also given for each of the different engines. On the SA-206 flight, and subsequent, a 205K version of the engine will be used.

The H-1 engine nozzle is shown in Figure 3.2-2. The fuel tubes noted in this figure are brazed together and supported by ten circumferential stiffener bands. During engine operation, fuel (RP-1) is pumped through these tubes and has an estimated average temperature of 120°F.

Typical H-1 engine inviscid plume boundaries are shown in Figure 3.2-3 for five (5) altitudes. Detailed plumes at 20 and 59 KM are shown in Figures 3.2-4 and 3.2-5, respectively. Plots of this type were used in obtaining configuration factors to various base region locations in connection with radiant environment predictions. Actual plume shapes are significantly affected by variations in chamber pressure, nozzle configuration, base pressure and external flow properties. Additionally, plume shapes are affected by exhaust plume chemical reactions and afterburning which have not been considered in the inviscid plume boundary of Figures 3.2-3 through 3.2-5.
FIGURE 3.2-1. H-1 ENGINE TURBINE EXHAUST SYSTEM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGINE PARAMETERS</th>
<th>UNIT OF MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>LAUNCH VEHICLE EFFECTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Operational Parameters (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SA-1 - SA-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture Ratio, O/F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impulse</td>
<td>sec</td>
<td>248.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX Weight Flow</td>
<td>lb/sec</td>
<td>455.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Weight Flow</td>
<td>lb/sec</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust Chamber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture Ratio, O/F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impulse</td>
<td>sec</td>
<td>257.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Pressure, Injector End</td>
<td>PSIA</td>
<td>578.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Star, Injector End</td>
<td>ft/sec</td>
<td>5960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&lt;sub&gt;f&lt;/sub&gt;, Injector End</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX Weight Flow</td>
<td>lb/sec</td>
<td>(451.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Weight Flow</td>
<td>lb/sec</td>
<td>(188.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Physical Parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throat Diameter</td>
<td>in.</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Diameter</td>
<td>in.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion Chamber Diameter, Injector End</td>
<td>in.</td>
<td>20.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nozzle Expansion Area Ratio, A&lt;sub&gt;e&lt;/sub&gt;/A&lt;sub&gt;t&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic Length</td>
<td>L&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;=V&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;/A&lt;sub&gt;t&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Length</td>
<td>in.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Sea Level Values

No. in ( ) are determined from other parameters
FIGURE 3.2-3. TYPICAL H-1 ENGINE PLUME SHAPE
FIGURE 3.2-4. H-1 ENGINE PLUME AT 20.24 KM ALTITUDE
FIGURE 3.2-5. H-1 ENGINE PLUME AT 59.22 KM ALTITUDE
3.3 PREDICTION METHODS

During the boost phase of flight for both the S-I and S-IB stage, the eight H-1 engine cluster produces a complex interplay of radiative and convective heating. Each of these environmental components vary with altitude and base region location. The total heating environment to any location in the base region is the sum of the radiative and convective fluxes. This subsection discusses the analytical and empirical methods which were employed to formulate S-I and S-IB stage base region thermal environment and pressure predictions.

Radiation

The tools and formulations required for reliable analytical predictions of base region radiation have only recently been developed, and were in their infancy at the time of the original S-I and S-IB design. Hence for S-I and S-IB design applications, it was necessary to rely heavily on data from full scale static tests and from previously acquired flight and model data.

Primitive analytical predictions did aid in establishing base region radiation intensities for the initial S-I design. Configuration factors to cylindrical sea level plumes (Figure 3.3-1) were calculated, an optically thick plume radiating with an emissivity of 1.0 was assumed, and plume emission temperatures were based on radiance data from H-1 engine static firings. As the Saturn flight test program progressed, vast quantities of radiant heating data were acquired from strategically located calorimeters in the base region. On the basis of these data, the base region radiant environment was continually updated.

Convection

During the design phase of the S-I and S-IB stages there were no analytical convective heating analyses that could be performed. The tools required to probe the complexities of the base flow produced by the H-1 engine cluster arrangement were not available. Initial base flow models and convective heating predictions were made on the basis of wind tunnel scale model test data. These data indicated the convective heating trends that would occur at the various altitudes, i.e., during the various phases of the base flow phenomena, and at various base region radial locations.

Flight convective heating data from the base of the Saturn I vehicles were used to update the convective heating predictions. These data were also useful in evaluating the various analytical approaches for predicting the convective base heating environment which were under development at the time of the first flights. CCSD's analytical prediction approach was formulated by noting the similarity between the reversed flow caused by two adjacent plumes and the flow issuing from a fully developed turbulent jet positioned at the point of plume interaction. Preliminary analytical predictions for heat shield convective heat transfer coefficients resulting from the use of this prediction approach are presented in Figure 3.3-2. The average heat transfer coefficient derived from S-I, Block II flight data correlations is also shown in Figure 3.3-2 to compare with the analytical prediction.
3.3 (Continued)

Base region recovery temperatures used in S-I Block II and S-IB design analyses were deduced from measured gas temperature data. A band of S-I stage heat shield gas temperature data is shown in Figure 3.3-3 as a function of vehicle altitude. Superimposed on this data band is a plot of recovery temperature ($T_R$) that is consistent with measured total calorimeter wall temperatures and convective heating rates. The difference between the $T_R$ curve and the average measured gas temperature is equal to the measured temperature rise produced by catalytic reaction ($\Delta T_C$) and/or localized burning in the base region.

**Pressure**

Base pressure predictions for the early Saturn I vehicles were made on the basis of empirical formulations resulting from Jupiter flight data and Saturn I model test data. As the flight test program progressed, the basis for predictions was gradually updated as more flight data became available. On the basis of these data it was found that, for any given base region location, pressure coefficients could be consistently correlated with Mach number. Other trajectory variations were found to have only second order effects on the base pressure coefficients.
NOTE: 1. NOT TO SCALE  
2. D=45.59 INCHES  
3. EMISSIVITY=1.0

FIGURE 3.3-1. H-1 ENGINE SEA LEVEL PLUME MODEL
FIGURE 3.3-2. COMPARISON OF ANALYTICAL AND EMPIRICAL HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT PREDICTIONS
FIGURE 3.3-3. CORRELATION OF SATURN BASE REGION RECOVERY TEMPERATURE $\Delta T_R$ AND $\Delta T_C$ WITH MEASURED GAS TEMPERATURES
Early in the Saturn program, a considerable effort was expended on model tests to determine the base heating characteristics of the Saturn design. These data were useful in determining the required heat protection for the base area of the first Saturn I vehicles.

Numerous model test programs were conducted in facilities at the Lewis Research Center, Arnold Engineering Development Center, and the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory. It is beyond the scope of this document to discuss and present all model tests and data available; however, representative tests and data are presented.

The following paragraphs give a brief discussion of three of the early model tests. A fourth test using short-duration experimental techniques on a Saturn S-IB booster model is also discussed.

Saturn S-I Booster Model at Transonic Mach Numbers (AEDC-PWT)

These tests were conducted in the 16-Foot Transonic Tunnel of the Propulsion Wind Tunnel (PWT) Facility, Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), Air Force Systems Command (AFSC), in May 1961. Results from these tests are presented in Reference 3-1. These tests were conducted to determine base heating on a 5.47-percent scale model of the Saturn S-I Booster.

Various turbine exhaust stack configurations were tested over a Mach number range of 0.6 to 1.5, an altitude range of 10,000 feet to 42,000 feet, and a missile angle-of-attack range of 0 to -7 1/2 degrees. Rocket engines using liquid oxygen and RP-1 were used to simulate the full-scale engine exhaust, and hydrogen was used to simulate the turbo-pump exhaust.

Tests were conducted both with and without simulated turbine exhaust. Various compromises were required in the scale model for these tests. The data should, therefore, be used with caution to obtain full-scale values. The data were, however, considered useful in obtaining trends and for configurational comparisons. Compromises in the model included differences in inner engine cant-angle and clearance at the exits, engine-exit to free-stream static pressure ratio, engine O/F ratio, engine combustion efficiency, and turbine exhaust aerodynamic characteristics. The effect of these compromises are discussed in Reference 3-1.

The turbine exhaust configurations tested are shown in Figure 3.4-1 and representative data from these tests are shown in Figures 3.4-2 through 3.4-10. Flame shield or star shield heating was essentially unaffected by the various exhaust configurations tested. There was, however, a noticeable difference in data obtained with turbine-exhaust-off and turbine-exhaust-on operation. This turbine exhaust on/off effect on star shield heating rates is shown in Figure 3.4-2 for various Mach numbers and altitudes. The equilibrium wall temperature determined by extrapolating the data to a heating rate of zero is shown in Figure 3.4-3.
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Gas temperature thermocouples, projecting through the primary heat shield, had a very rapid response and measured essentially constant temperatures during each of the phases of operation (turbine-exhaust-off and turbine-exhaust-on). A qualitative comparison of the base burning for the turbine exhaust stack configurations was, therefore, readily obtained from these temperature data (shown in Figure 3.4-4). The data indicate no burning with turbine exhaust configuration 3; and configuration 2, compared to 1-A, showed increased burning at $M_\infty = 1.2$ and reduced burning at $M_\infty = 0.8$. No burning was observed below 500 psfa free-stream static pressure for any of the model test configurations.

The ratio of primary heat shield base pressure to free-stream static pressure is shown in Figure 3.4-5 for trajectory conditions. At $M_\infty = 1.2$ a significant increase in base pressure was observed when the simulated turbine exhaust was used. The effect was the same for all turbine exhaust configurations. The increase in base pressure was not influenced by the exhaust stack configuration and was believed to be attributable to the change in the jet wake caused by the exhausterators.

The ratio of base pressure on the star shield to free-stream static pressure is shown in Figure 3.4-6. Comparison of the star shield base pressure ratios with the primary shield base pressure ratios indicates high aspiration at the low Mach numbers. The equalized pressures at $M_\infty = 1.4$ and 1.5 indicate the transition to backflow or flow reversal. This was also shown by the star shield heating (Figure 3.4-3).

The effect of higher trajectory altitudes at $M_\infty = 1.2$ is shown in Figure 3.4-7. The base pressure ratios for turbine-exhaust-off operation were found to be a linear function of the free-stream static pressure and increased as the free-stream static pressure was reduced. At the higher altitudes (lower pressures) the change in base pressure produced by the turbine exhaust was negligible. The effect of the engine exhaust on the base pressure was small at the higher pressures and very large at the lower pressure. The higher Mach number data at comparable free-stream static pressures indicate that the power-on base pressure is also dependent upon Mach number as well as free-stream static pressure.

Conclusions drawn from these test results, and published in Reference 3-1 are as follows:

1. Simulated turbine exhaust flow caused increased star shield equilibrium wall temperatures and lower film coefficients for all exhaust stack configurations at the lower Mach number and altitude trajectory conditions.

2. Negligible effects of the turbine-exhaust on star shield heating at the maximum test Mach number indicated the transition from inner engine base aspiration to backflow occurred at this condition. Equalization of the primary heat shield and star shield pressures at these test conditions also showed this base flow transition.
3.4 (Continued)

3. Burning of the simulated turbine exhaust gases in the missile base did occur at some of the test conditions when the other exhaust stack configurations were used.

4. The base burning phenomenon was found to be influenced by trajectory altitude at $M_\infty = 1.2$ with near zero increases in heating rates due to the turbine exhaust at higher altitudes.

5. Increased base heating due to increasing the angle of attack was not significant below approximately 4 degrees. At 7 1/2 degrees, large increases in base heating were produced.

Saturn SA-1 Booster Model at $M = 0.8$ and 1.15 (AEDC-RTF)

These tests were conducted in the Rocket Test Facility (RTF), Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), Air Force Systems Command (AFSC), during the period February through June 1961. Results from these tests are presented in Reference 3-2. The purpose of these tests was to determine the base recirculation characteristics of the simulated propellant pump turbine exhaust gases of a 5.47 percent scale model of the SA-1 Saturn afterbody.

Base heating and pressure data were obtained at simulated flight trajectory conditions of Mach number 0.8 (16,000 feet altitude) and Mach number 1.5 (27,500 feet altitude) using several turbine exhaust duct configurations. The effect on base heating of one engine inoperative, of variation in turbine exhaust gas momentum, of finned-model operation, of variation in engine O/F ratio, and of variation in altitude were also investigated. Gaseous hydrogen was used to simulate the combustible turbine exhaust gas of the full-scale missile. Liquid oxygen, RP-1 fueled rocket engines, each developing about 500 pounds thrust, were used to simulate the prototype engines. Representative data from these tests are presented in Figures 3.4-8 through 3.4-10.

For the prototype booster the turbine exhaust gases are relatively cool in comparison with the temperature of the engine exhaust jets. Therefore, little increase in base heating should occur, even if these gases do recirculate into the base; unless the gases when combined with atmospheric air ignite and burn in or very near the base. Because the gases are fuel-rich, the possibility of ignition does exist, provided the proper conditions of mixture ratio and stay time are present. The most obvious solution to this aspect of the base heating problem is to minimize the amount of recirculated turbine exhaust gases because it is not possible to control either mixture ratio or stay time.

The three overboard turbine exhaust duct configurations tested are essentially the same as were shown in Figure 3.4-1. Heating results from the Mach 0.8 and Mach 1.15 tests are presented in Figure 3.4-8 as a comparison of the maximum total heating rates obtained. The cross-hatched section of each bar represents the average heating rates recorded with turbine-exhaust-off. The solid section represents heating rates caused by hydrogen burning with turbine-exhaust-on.
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Of the three test configurations, the streamlined turbine exhaust duct, configuration 3, resulted in the lowest total peak heating rates at both Mach 0.8 and 1.15. At Mach 0.8, with configuration 3, no increase in heat flux from hydrogen burning occurred at either the heat or flame shields. It was not determined whether this was due to the lack of hydrogen recirculation into the base or due to recirculation without ignition. At Mach 1.15 the hydrogen definitely recirculated and burned near the heat shield, as shown by the 8 Btu/ft²sec increase in heat shield heating rate; burning did not occur at the flame shield.

The other duct configurations, with their larger frontal area, produced a larger and more turbulent wake than the airfoil-shaped streamlined ducts. Consequently, they entrained a greater quantity of the discharged hydrogen, which was subsequently drawn into the model base to form a combustible hydrogen-air mixture.

When one of the inboard engines was inoperative, the most noticeable change was produced in the flame shield or center region. For this condition the flame shield is no longer enclosed and much of the aspirating effect is lost. Additionally, the radiation heat source is reduced by 25-percent and the back flow from the exhaust jets into the center region is decreased. Flame shield heating rates for seven-engine and eight-engine operation are compared in Figure 3.4-9. Turbine exhaust duct configuration 1-A was used for the engine-out tests.

The addition of four stabilizing fins to the model afterbody altered the external flow field locally and created a large turbulent wake upstream of the model skirt trailing edge. At Mach 0.8 the results was a 17-percent decrease in base pressure from that obtained without the fins installed. Heating results, summarized in Figure 3.4-10, show that the addition of the fins caused a 40-percent increase in the average heat shield values. The lower base pressure for the finned configuration either caused a larger quantity of hydrogen to be drawn into the base region or altered the hydrogen-air ratio in the base region or both. Either could cause more severe base burning.

Investigations of O/F ratio on base heating showed decreased total heating when O/F ratio was increased from 1.7 to 2.2. The lower heating rates at the higher O/F ratio were assumed to be the result of a lower heat release from hydrogen burning in the base region. No significant difference in base heating rates was observed for turbine-exhaust-off operation at the higher O/F ratio.

A complete summary of the results obtained during this investigation, as published in Reference 3-2, is as follows:
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1. Based on peak total base heat transfer rates, the most effective configuration for the overboard discharge of simulated turbine exhaust gases (hydrogen) was the streamlined turbine exhaust duct configuration. Peak total base heating rates were 10.0 and 15.0 Btu/ft²sec at Mach 0.8 and 1.15, respectively.

Hydrogen discharge from the long turbine exhaust ducts resulted in peak total base heating rates of 26.5 and 33.8 Btu/ft²sec at Mach 0.8 and 1.15, respectively. Modification of the attachment brackets for the long ducts reduced the peak to 22.0 Btu/ft²sec at Mach 1.15.

Hydrogen discharge from the short turbine exhaust ducts resulted in the most severe base heating at both Mach numbers; peaks were 52.5 and 36.0 Btu/ft²sec at Mach 0.8 and 1.15, respectively.

2. The region on the model base which indicated the highest heat transfer rate usually was located between the inboard and outboard engines.

3. During firings with one engine intentionally inoperative, the flame shield and base heat transfer rates were reduced; however, base burning appeared to be marginal for this configuration because one firing at Mach 0.8 resulted in base heating rates slightly greater than those obtained during operation with all eight engines.

4. Operation with the stabilizing fins installed on the model afterbody resulted in a 40-percent increase in average base heating rates above that of the non-finned configurations.

5. The major effect on base and flame shield heating of an increase in the nominal O/F ratio from 1.7 to 2.2 was to decrease hydrogen burning in the case of the long and short duct configurations. However, the streamlined ducts did not follow this trend and indicated increased burning at both the base and flame shield.

6. Flame shield heat transfer rates increased rapidly when altitude was increased from 15,000 to 40,000 feet. Between 40,000 and 85,000 feet altitude (without external airflow) the heating rate was essentially constant.

7. Increasing the turbine exhaust gas momentum per unit area from 36 to 120 percent of the full-scale value resulted in decreasing base burning during the discharge of pure hydrogen and a hydrogen-nitrogen mixture. Base burning did not occur when the percentage of full-scale momentum per unit area was greater than 180 percent.

8. When hydrogen was discharged from the exhausterators only, there was no measurable increase in base heating above that obtained from operation without hydrogen flow.
9. With no base burning, base pressure ratio decreased approximately 13 percent as Mach number was increased from 0.8 to 1.5 because of the increase in base pumping action created by the high velocity external airstream. When base burning did occur, base pressure ratio increased about 1 percent over the same Mach number range.

10. Flame shield pressure coefficient increased from -0.58 at Mach 0.8 to -0.23 at Mach 1.15. No influence of degree of base burning or of overboard duct configuration on flame shield pressures could be detected.

Saturn SA-1 Booster Model at M = 1.63 and 3.07 (AEDC-RTF)

These tests were conducted in the Rocket Test Facility (RTF), Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), Air Force Systems Command (AFSC), during the period July through September 1961. Results from these tests are presented in Reference 3-3. The purpose of these tests was to continue the investigation of base recirculation characteristics of several different turbine exhaust ducts on a 5.47-percent scale model of the Saturn SA-1 booster afterbody.

Base heating and pressure data were obtained with external airflow at Mach numbers 1.63 (33,000 to 45,000-foot altitude) and 3.07 (70,000 to 80,000-foot altitude) using the three turbine exhaust duct configurations shown in Figure 3.4-1. The effect on base heating and base pressure of one inboard engine inoperative and of altitude variation was also investigated. Gaseous hydrogen was again used to simulate the combustible products of the turbine exhaust. Representative data from these tests are presented in Figures 3.4-11 through 3.4-13.

For these tests no burning occurred in the base region regardless of the turbine exhaust duct configuration, free-stream Mach number, or the altitude at which testing was accomplished. Although no base burning occurred some base heating was present which was attributed to recirculation of hot rocket exhaust gases.

Flame shield calorimeter data, shown in Figure 3.4-11, indicate a maximum heat transfer rate at the center of the flame shield. This was true for both test Mach numbers with the heat transfer rate generally decreasing with increased distance from the center. With one inboard engine inoperative, the heat transfer to the flame shield was substantially reduced. This decrease in heat transfer was as predicted since, (1) the radiation heat source is reduced by 25-percent, (2) the reversed flow from the intersecting jets is substantially reduced, and (3) the exit area for the flow that is reversed is greatly enlarged.
Variations of base heat shield to free-stream pressure ratio with altitude are shown in Figure 3.4-12. Several "off-trajectory" runs were made at both Mach numbers to establish a trend. Because of pressure ratio limitations the trajectory altitude for Mach = 3.07 could not be obtained. The trend of the data indicates an increase in base pressure ratio as altitude increases.

There were also small but distinct differences between various duct configurations. This was attributed to differences in aerodynamic characteristics and not to differences in amount of recirculated hydrogen.

The base pressure was affected very little when an inboard engine was inoperative. It was noted, however, that the pressures were measured on the side of the base opposite the inoperative inboard engine.

Flame shield pressure data are presented in Figure 3.4-13. These data are presented as a ratio of flame shield pressure to base pressure. This ratio was used because the gases from the flame shield region exhaust into the base region and therefore, are influenced more by base pressure than by ambient pressure. A critical pressure ratio of 1.79 (PFS/PB) was computed for the gases in the flame shield region. As shown in Figure 3.4-13, data were greater than 1.79 for all Mach 3.07 tests. An extrapolation of these data to a pressure ratio of 1.79 indicates that the flame shield to base pressure ratio would become critical at about 63,000-foot altitude.

Several tests were made at both M_∞ = 1.63 and M_∞ = 3.07 with one inboard engine inoperative. The flame shield pressure in both cases (Figure 3.4-13) showed a marked decrease when compared with that taken with all eight engines operating. This is attributed to the fact that the area available for the rejected gas to escape was greatly increased while the amount of rejected gases was decreased. The flame shield pressure was approximately equal to the base pressure at Mach number 1.63 and was only slightly higher than the base pressure at Mach number 3.07.

A summary of the results obtained during this investigation and published in Reference 3-3 is as follows:

1. No burning of the hydrogen, which simulated the turbine exhaust products, occurred in the base at either Mach number 1.63 or 3.07.
2. Maximum heat transfer was approximately 4.0 Btu/ft²sec with minimum values of 2.5 Btu/ft²sec in the region between the rocket nozzles and skirt extensions.
3. The heat transfer rate to the flame shield at Mach number 1.63 was 113 Btu/ft²sec at the center. At Mach number 3.07, the heat flux was 72 Btu/ft²sec at the center. At both test Mach numbers, flame shield heating rates decreased with increased distance from the center of the flame shield.
3.4 (Continued)

4. A profile of calculated values of film heat transfer coefficient for the flame shield indicated the maximum at the center and the minimum at the greatest distance from the center. At Mach number 1.63, data indicated the average maximum value was 0.227 Btu/ft²sec-°F, and the average minimum value was 0.066 Btu/ft²sec-°F, whereas at Mach number 3.07 the average maximum value was 0.143 Btu/ft²sec-°F, and the average minimum value was 0.059 Btu/ft²sec-°F.

5. Base pressure data indicated a slight increase, when hydrogen flow was initiated, with all duct configurations evaluated.

6. There was little effect on base pressure during operation with an inoperative inboard engine.

7. Flame shield pressure measured near the center of the shield was constant at approximately 2.87 psia for all testing with eight engines operating.

8. An extrapolation of the Mach number 3.07 data to a pressure ratio of 1.79 indicates that the flame shield to base pressure ratio would become critical at about 63,000 feet.

9. The flame shield pressure with one inboard engine inoperative was equal to the base pressure at Mach number 1.63 and was 15 percent higher than base pressure at Mach number 3.07.

Later in the Saturn flight test program consideration was given to removing the engine shrouds (effective on SA-202) and rerouting the inboard engine turbine exhaust (effective on SA-203). The following discussion involves an experimental investigation, using short-duration techniques, that was to examine the effects of these design modifications.

**Uprated Saturn S-IB Booster Model at M = 1.18 and 1.63 Using Short-Duration Techniques**

These tests were conducted in the AEDC/RTF/T-I cell with a 5.47-percent scale model of the Saturn S-IB and S-I/Block II stages during the period June through November 1965. The purpose of these tests was to examine the effects of various turbine exhaust configurations, removal of engine shrouds and flow deflectors, one outboard engine inoperative, and altitude variations on the base heating rates and pressures.

Tests were conducted at simulated trajectory conditions of M = 1.18/altitude = 30,000 feet and M = 1.63/altitude = 40,000 feet. Two basic Saturn S-IB turbine exhaust configurations were tested: (1) full exhausterators on the outboard engines and over stacks (OB) for the inboard engines (Configuration 3, Figure 3.4-1); and (2) full exhausterators on the outboard engines and partial exhausterators (PDI) on the inboard engines (see Figure 3.4-14). Gaseous oxygen (O₂) and ethylene (C₂H₄) were used to simulate the LOX/RP-1 propellant employed on the full scale S-I and S-IB. Cold hydrogen gas was used for simulation of the fuel-rich turbine exhaust gases.
Initial test results were reported in Reference 3-4. However, the figures presented herein, and the accompanying discussions were taken from Reference 3-5. These figures present a brief summary of the significant test results. For a more detailed analysis of these or any of the experimental results, the reader is referred to the original or initial test data report.

The average base (heat shield) heating rates for all S-IB configurations tested are summarized in bar chart form in Figure 3.4-15. Radiation heating was virtually independent of model configuration and ambient conditions. Total heating without turbine exhaust simulation was also effectively independent of configuration or test conditions.

Significant increases in total heating rate were experienced in all cases with hydrogen turbine exhaust flow, indicating the presence of base burning. At both Mach numbers investigated, the average base heating rate with the basic S-IB configuration was significantly less with the OB turbine exhaust configuration than for the PDI configuration. Removal of the flow deflectors and engine shrouds generally tended to increase the base heating rates with either turbine exhaust configuration. This effect was more pronounced (particularly in the base of the OB turbine exhaust) when the No. 1 outboard engine was inoperative.

Average base pressure ratios (i.e., $P_b/P_m$) for the various S-IB configurations and test conditions investigated are summarized in Figure 3.4-16. At Mach 1.18, base pressures were essentially unchanged between "engine-off" and "engine-on" conditions. At Mach 1.63 (and the higher altitude), base pressure increased substantially over the engine-off levels during engine firing. In all cases, the addition of $H_2$ turbine exhaust resulted in higher base pressures, indicative of base burning. In general, base pressure levels were similar for both the OB and PDI turbine exhaust configurations. Removal of the engine shrouds and flow deflectors resulted in significantly higher base pressures as might be intuitively expected. With No. 1 engine inoperative, the average base pressures were generally lower than the equivalent configuration with all engines operating.

For the Mach 1.18/30,000-foot trajectory condition shown in Figure 3.4-17, neither removal of the engine shrouds nor an inoperative No. 1 engine produced a noticeable effect on the flame shield heating rates. For the PDI configuration, flame shield heating rates decreased markedly (from a maximum of nearly 120 Btu/ft$^2$sec to 2 Btu/ft$^2$sec) with simulated turbine exhaust injection. This is not particularly surprising since the turbine exhaust flow would tend to provide a naturally cool barrier between the flame shield and recirculating hot rocket exhaust gases. Somewhat unexpected, however, was the indicated slight decrease in heating rate near the center of the flame shield with turbine exhaust flow from the OB ducts. It is not presently clear why a reduction in flame shield heating rates should occur when the turbine exhaust is dumped overboard into the free stream.
Flame shield heating rate distributions for the Mach 1.63/40,000-foot trajectory condition are shown in Figure 3.4-18. Considering first the OB turbine exhaust configuration, it was noted that the peak heating rate of 120-130 Btu/ft²sec is consistent with that obtained at the lower altitude M = 1.18 trajectory condition. Further, as was also observed at M = 1.18, an inoperative No. 1 engine had little effect on flame shield heating rate, either with or without turbine exhaust simulation. With all engines operating and shrouds on (Figure 3.4-18a), a comparatively large decrease in heating rate was observed with hydrogen turbine exhaust flow, in agreement with a similar observation at M = 1.18 and just as baffling. It is noted, however, that this effect was completely cancelled when the engine shrouds were removed (i.e., heat shield heating rates were the same with or without turbine exhaust flow).

Heating rates with the PDI turbine exhaust configuration appear to be independent of model geometry or number of engines firing and show a large decrease in heating rate with turbine exhaust flow similar to that observed at the M = 1.18 test condition.

Flame shield pressures are summarized in non-dimensional form in Figure 3.4-19 for the various geometries and flight conditions investigated. For the Mach 1.18/30,000-foot altitude condition, the flame shield-to-ambient pressure ratio was essentially independent of all test variables, maintaining a value of ≈0.70. For the Mach 1.63/40,000-foot condition, no valid flame shield pressure data were obtained with the OB configuration due to a faulty pressure transducer installation. With the PDI configuration, flame shield pressure was consistently slightly below free stream pressure with no turbine exhaust flow (i.e., \( \frac{P_{FS}}{P_\infty} \approx 0.9 \)), and a little higher than free-stream pressure with turbine exhaust flow (i.e., \( \frac{P_{FS}}{P_\infty} \approx 1.10 \)). No appreciable change in flame shield pressure accompanied removal of the shrouds and deflectors or an inoperative No. 1 engine.
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FIGURE 3.4-1. TURBINE EXHAUST CONFIGURATIONS
FIGURE 3.4-2. STAR SHIELD HEATING RATES AS A FUNCTION OF CALORIMETER TEMPERATURE FOR CONFIGURATION 1-A

a. $M_\infty = 0.6$, Altitude 10,000 ft

b. $M_\infty = 0.8$, Altitude 16,000 ft
FIGURE 3-4-2. STAR SHIELD HEATING RATES AS A FUNCTION OF CALORIMETER TEMPERATURE FOR CONFIGURATION 1-A (CONTINUED)

c. \( M_\infty = 1.0, \) Altitude 22,000 ft
FIGURE 3.4-2. STAR SHIELD HEATING RATES AS A FUNCTION OF CALORIMETER TEMPERATURE FOR CONFIGURATION 1-A (CONTINUED)
FIGURE 3.4-2. STAR SHIELD HEATING RATES AS A FUNCTION OF CALORIMETER TEMPERATURE FOR CONFIGURATION 1-A (CONTINUED)
FIGURE 3.4-2. STAR SHIELD HEATING RATES AS A FUNCTION OF CALORIMETER TEMPERATURE FOR CONFIGURATION 1-A (CONTINUED)
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\[ f. \ M_\infty = 1.2, \text{ Altitude 42,000 ft} \]
FIGURE 3.4-2. STAR SHIELD HEATING RATES AS A FUNCTION OF CALORIMETER TEMPERATURE FOR CONFIGURATION 1-A (CONCLUDED)
FIGURE 3.4-4. GAS TEMPERATURES CLOSE TO PRIMARY HEAT SHIELD FOR TRAJECTORY CONDITIONS
FIGURE 3.4-5. BASE PRESSURE RATIO FOR TRAJECTORY CONDITIONS ON THE PRIMARY HEAT SHIELD
FIGURE 3.4-6. BASE PRESSURE RATIO AT TRAJECTORY CONDITIONS ON THE STAR HEAT SHIELD
FIGURE 3.4-7. BASE PRESSURE RATIO AS A FUNCTION OF FREE-STREAM STATIC PRESSURE, CONFIGURATION 1-A
FIGURE 3.4-8. COMPARISON OF MAXIMUM TOTAL HEAT TRANSFER RATES FOR THREE OVERBOARD TURBINE EXHAUST DUCT CONFIGURATIONS AT MACH NUMBERS 0.8 AND 1.15
FIGURE 3.4-9. COMPARISON OF AVERAGE TOTAL HEAT TRANSFER RATES FOR SEVEN AND EIGHT ENGINE OPERATION

REF: AEDC-TN-61-134
**FIGURE 3.4-10. COMPARISON OF TOTAL HEAT TRANSFER RATES WITH AND WITHOUT STABILIZING FINS**

REF: AEDC-TN-61-134
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FIGURE 3.4-11. HEAT TRANSFER VARIATIONS WITH FLAME SHIELD CALORIMETER LOCATION
FIGURE 3.4-12. VARIATION OF BASE PRESSURE RATIO WITH ALTITUDE
FIGURE 3.4-14. INNER ENGINE TURBINE EXHAUST DUCT DETAILS, PARTIAL EXHAUSTOR (PDI)

b. PARTIAL EXHAUSTOR (PDI)
FIGURE 3.4-16. S-IB AVERAGE BASE (HEAT SHIELD) PRESSURE RATIOS
FIGURE 3.4-17. S-IB FLAME SHIELD HEATING RATE DISTRIBUTION AT M = 1.18, ALTITUDE = 30,000 FEET
a) EFFECT OF SHROUDS (ALL ENGINES OPERATING)

b) EFFECT OF ENGINE NO. 1 INOPERATIVE
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FIGURE 3.4-18. S-1B FLAME SHIELD HEATING RATE DISTRIBUTIONS AT $M = 1.63$,  
ALTITUDE = 40,000 FEET
Figure 3.4-19. S-IB Flame Shield Pressure Ratios
During the time span between October 27, 1961, and January 22, 1968, a considerable quantity of useful base heating and base pressure data were obtained from the Saturn I and IB vehicles. This time span encompasses the Saturn I, Block I flights, the Saturn I, Block II flights and the first four flights of the Saturn IB. The base region of these fourteen (14) vehicles was heavily instrumented with thermocouples, calorimeters and pressure measurements. The instrumentation plan for SA-205 and subsequent vehicles was considerably reduced.

A summary of the flight data from the S-I Block I and Block II and the S-IB flights is contained in this paragraph and the data were taken from References 3-6, 3-7, 3-8 and 3-9. For a more detailed presentation of these flight data the above referenced summary reports and/or the individual flight evaluation reports should be consulted. Instrumentation used to measure the base environment on the Block I vehicles was not considered representative of the "state-of-the-art" at that time. Simple evolutionary changes were made from flight to flight to improve the situation, however certain inherent losses in the instrumentation and calibration techniques precluded in the Block I data any attainment of a great degree of accuracy in the measurement of the thermal environment. More sophisticated instruments were developed and installed on the Block II and IB vehicles which eliminated some of the sources of error.

Early in the Saturn flight test program it was found that the best correlation of base region data was obtained when plotted versus altitude. For similar configurations and base region locations the environment is influenced most by the exhaust plumes, which are influenced most by pressures, which are dependent on altitude. The figures discussed in the remainder of this subsection contain curves that are representative of measured pressures, heating rates and gas temperatures. These curves were obtained by averaging all data traces recorded under normal operating conditions from a given location or region. The areas of the base region for which data are presented include two regions of the heat shield. These two heat shield regions, shown in Figure 3.5-1, were defined by data as areas of uniform heating.

In presenting the average data traces for the various locations a designation has been made between the basic vehicle configurations. There were generally four distinguishable data bands for a given location. The average of each data band is presented herein and labeled as either: S-I, Block I; S-I, Block II; S-IB, 201/202; or, S-IB, 203/204. The S-IB, 201/202 label refers to data obtained from the SA-201 and SA-202 flight vehicle. Variations in data between SA-201 and SA-202 that could be attributed to engine shroud removal were nil. Hence, the two data groups were combined. Alterations in the base region environment produced by the inboard engine turbine exhaust reports on S-IB-3 and subsequent S-IB stages are shown by the curves labeled S-IB, 203/204. In all instances it should be noted that on an altitude plot, the initial phase of the flight is very distorted. The first kilometer of altitude covers a time span of approximately 25 seconds. Hence many of the data variations that occur during the early stages of launch are not accurately portrayed.
3.5.1 Flame Shield

The most severe environment measured in the base region was on the flame shield. Averages of the data from this region shown in Figure 3.5-2 reflect the nearness of the flame shield to the inboard engine exhaust. The peak or hump that occurs prior to 10 kilometers of altitude is due to the strong flow reversal produced by the intersecting inboard engine exhausts. Above an altitude of 15 kilometers the data are nearly steady and "choked" conditions exist in the flame shield region. Note that for SA-203 and -204 the reversal and "choked" condition occurred at lower altitudes and the environment was less severe. Both conditions are directly attributable to the turbine exhaust dump, at approximately 750°K, into the flame shield region. Since flame shield radiation calorimeters were not flown on the S-I, Block I configuration nor on the SA-201/202 vehicles, their relatively low total heat flux data cannot be explained.

Average flame shield pressure data are represented in Figure 3.5-3 as the difference in flame shield pressure and ambient pressure. The data comparison in Figure 3.5-3 supports the thermal data by showing that flow reversal and "choked" flow condition in the flame shield region occurred at a lower altitude on SA-203 and -204 than on the previous flight vehicles. Data also show that under "choked" conditions the flame shield pressures were approximately 50 percent higher for the SA-203/204 configuration.

3.5.2 Heat Shield

Average heat shield thermal data for the four basic configurations are compared in Figures 3.5-4 and 3.5-5 for the inner and outer regions, respectively. With the heat shield located approximately 54 inches forward of the nozzle exit plane the thermal environment is less severe than on the flame shield. Additionally the spacing of the nozzles around the heat shield is effectively farther apart than for the flame shield. Therefore, reversal of the exhaust gases onto the heat shield does not begin until an altitude of approximately 10 kilometers. The effects of this reversal was shown by data to be more pronounced in the outer region of the heat shield. Also, incident radiation in the outer region was more significant at all altitudes. The reasoning here is that a significant portion of the view from the inner region is of the relatively cool engine nozzles.

For the inner region there were no radiation calorimeters flown on SA-201 or SA-202. Hence, there was one less curve to add to the already wide range of average inner region heat flux data. The only agreement between the average data for the four configurations was with the general trend of the data.

In the outer region the data spread was a little tighter and the trends were repeated on practically all configurations. The average S-IB total heat flux data for the 201/202 configuration and the 203/204 configuration were very close to being the same. Hence the average S-IB total heat flux data are presented as one curve.
3.5.2 (Continued)

Heat shield pressure data for the S-I, Block II and S-IB vehicles are presented in Figure 3.5-6. For pressures, there was no distinction made between the inner and outer region. Also, the spread of pressure data for the S-IB configurations was small. Hence, only one S-IB heat shield average data trace is presented. The larger pressure difference for the flame shield area (Figure 3.5-3) than for the heat shield reflects the effects of nozzle spacing and extension length. At the low altitudes the closer spacing of the nozzles allows the exhaust to create a lower pressure in the star region. In the heat shield area the aspirating effect is reduced by the greater distance between nozzle exhausts and the distance aft of the heat shield where the pumping action occurs. Following flow reversal, there is sufficient area in the heat shield to vent the reversed gases from the area. However, in the flame shield area the gases are trapped because of the small spacing between nozzles.

3.5.3 Fin Trailing Edge

A direct comparison of the S-I, Block II and S-IB fin trailing edge thermal environment cannot be made without a brief explanation. The trailing edge of the S-I, Block II and S-IB fins are depicted in Figure 3.5-7. The trailing edge of the Block II fins were perpendicular to the vehicle axis and joined the tail barrel approximately 17 inches forward of the heat shield. For the S-IB, the fin trailing edge is swept aft at a 25-degree angle and joins the tail barrel approximately 60 inches forward of the heat shield. Due to the change in configuration, the form factors from the S-IB fin trailing edge near the tail barrel to the exhaust plumes is lower than it was on the S-I, Block II. This is shown in Figure 3.5-8 by the S-IB/Block II fin trailing edge form factor ratios at location R1. For locations away from the tail barrel (locations R2 and R3), the blockage afforded by the tail barrel decreases and the S-IB fin trailing edge form factors exceed those computed for comparable radial locations on the Block II fins. These form factors as well as the data presented in Figure 3.5-9 are for fins located between outboard engines. For these fins the influence of the Block II and SA-201 engine shrouds on thermal environment was negligible.

On the Block II vehicles the fin trailing edge gas temperature probe and the total calorimeter were mounted relatively close to the tail barrel at approximately the position designated as R1 in Figure 3.5-7. Radiation calorimeters were mounted at both R1 and R3 and their data traces on each of the Block II flights were very similar. Hence, for presentation herein (Figure 3.5-9), there is no distinction made between inboard and outboard position for the Block II data. For the SA-201 and -202 vehicles there were instruments of all three kinds at both the inboard (R1) position and the outboard (R3) position. Furthermore, data traces from these two fin trailing edge positions were very distinct for all three sets of data. There is no apparent S-IB/Block II form factor correlation with measured data. However, there is a very definite form factor correlation with S-IB data at inboard and outboard positions.
3.5.4 Engines

Fifteen slope-type total calorimeters were flown on the bell and aspirator surface of the engines on the last two Block II vehicles. These instruments were exposed to the external, base region, environment through cut-outs in the asbestos insulation which covered the exterior of the engine nozzles. Unfortunately, either due to unfavorable installations and/or instrument malfunctions, a complete and accurate evaluation of the Block II engine thermal environments could not be made.

On SA-201 through -204, eighteen engine measurements were flown, seventeen membrane type total calorimeters and one gas temperature thermocouple. Data from these measurements were of better quality than received from the Block II flights. Average total heat flux data traces shown in Figure 3.5-10 were recorded near the exit plane on the outboard facing side of the inboard engine nozzle. The original thinking was that the inboard engine turbine exhaust reroute would have little or no effect on the thermal environment at this location. However, data for the 203/204 configuration are noticeably higher during the middle altitude range. Average total heat flux data for the aspirator neck, which is labeled in Figure 3.1-9, are presented in Figure 3.5-11. These data were notably higher than the inboard engine data at the low altitudes. This correlation is in agreement with radiation form factors at the two locations.

The most severe thermal environment on the engines occurs near the exit on the inboard facing side of the outboard engine. Total heat flux data measured at this location were very erratic, but indications were that heating at this location is more severe than at any other instrumented location in the S-IB base region. Near sea level, data ranged between 45 and 74 watts/cm². Following the typical dip in heating at around 10 kilometers of altitude (with data between 28 and 36 watts/cm²) the data increased to heating levels of between 55 and 72 watts/cm² at altitudes above 45 kilometers. Gas temperatures at this location, which were measured on SA-204, were generally 100 to 300°K above the average S-IB, 203/204 heat shield data. Above 25 kilometers of altitude these gas temperature data were steady at 1250°K.

3.5.5 Inboard Engine Out Effects

Data from two Saturn I flights have shown that the thermal effects of a premature shutdown of an inboard engine are most pronounced in the flame shield area. Effects in other areas of the base were within the bounds established by data from other flights. For the heat shield area adjacent to the inoperative engine there was a slight reduction in heating. This was attributed to a reduction in radiation form factor for this area.

On the second S-I, Block II flight (SA-6) one of the inboard engines shut down after approximately 117 seconds of a scheduled 140 second burn. On S-I, Block I flight (SA-4) a scheduled premature inboard engine shutdown occurred at 100 seconds of a 113 second normal burn. Flame shield flight data for the last 50 to 60 seconds of the SA-6 flight are shown in Figure 3.5-12. The dashed vertical line indicates the approximate time of Engine No. 8 cutoff (E8CO).
3.5.5 (Continued)

Since heating rates on SA-6 were recorded by slug-type calorimeters the heat flux data response at 117 seconds was not instantaneous. However, the data did show a definite increase in total heating rate and a decrease in radiant heating rate. Gas temperature and pressure data both dropped sharply at 117 seconds. These changes in environment on SA-6 were caused by the premature shutdown of an inboard engine. Similar trends were observed on SA-4 when an engine shut down early.

3.5.6 Infrared Spectra

The infrared radiant spectra of the S-IB rocket engine exhaust plumes were measured on the SA-203 vehicle. An analysis and evaluation of these flight spectra data was documented in Reference 3-10. Basically the data showed that the infrared spectrum from the plumes was a continuum and that its intensity level decreased with altitude. Below an altitude of thirty-thousand feet, there was evidence of strong H2O, CO2, and CH molecule absorption. These absorption bands are shown by the spectral data shown in Figure 3.5-13. The black body curves at 5000°R through 2500°R are shown in this figure for intensity level reference.

The following conclusions, originally reported in Reference 3-10 were reached after careful evaluation of all the SA-203 spectral data:

1. The fact that the radiation levels early in flight were of the same order or perhaps slightly greater than for a black body at the temperature of the rocket engine exhaust (about 4200°R) implied that the plume emissivity in the longer wavelength region was approximately unity. Temperatures in the plume that are slightly greater than the engine exhaust value do exist due to the phenomenon of afterburning at low altitudes.

2. The presence of a large amount of carbon indicated by the near-continuum radiation in the plumes was expected because the Saturn IB H-1 engines burn a mixture of RP-1 (similar to kerosene) and liquid oxygen, which can produce large amounts of soot. Turbine exhaust gases dumped at the nozzle exit also contribute to the high carbon concentration.

3. The absorption by H2O and CO2 were caused by relatively cool gases in the base region along the line of sight of the spectrometer.

4. The presence of CH absorption was probably caused by raw fuel injected into the base region by the engine turbine exhaust.

5. The decrease in the intensity level at elevated altitudes was caused by plume expansion to the lower pressures and cessation of afterburning due to lack of oxygen in the ambient atmosphere.
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Saturn S-I data comparisons presented herein were originally presented in Reference 3-6. Representative comparisons of total heating rates, radiation heating rates, base gas temperatures and base pressures are presented.

Data shown in Figure 3.6-1 compares radiation heating rates taken from AEDC and Cornell tests on an S-I booster 5.47-percent scale model with Block I flight data at approximately the same location on the base. Both the flight and AEDC measurements were made with similar slug type calorimeters. The Cornell data were obtained by a totally different procedure using thin-film resistance gages on a short duration test technique model. The model heating rates shown are all for a sensor temperature of 38°C. From a radiation standpoint, the model turbine exhaust flow simulation was poor since hydrogen gas was used for all the model tests. During flight the engine turbine exhausts a kerosene fuel-rich mixture (O/F = .33) which has significantly different radiation characteristics from the model simulation. Basic gas laws indicate that similarity between the model and full scale exists only when the exhaust plumes are optically thin and when the products of a linear dimension and density are identical for both. The Saturn plume is far from optically thin, and at altitudes up to about 10 kilometers the radiation is predominantly due to secondary combustion of the fuel-rich engine exhaust with air. This process is influenced by scale, and the plume geometry of the model deviates significantly from the flight plume. It is indeed remarkable, considering all the negative factors involved, that the model and flight data shown in Figure 3.6-1 compare so well.

Model and flight total heating rates are compared in Figure 3.6-2. The convective component of these data require an additional correction for scale effects before a valid comparison is possible. The proper scaling procedure for this type of base flow has been very difficult to determine, and additional effort in this area is needed. The present data were corrected and correlated for heat transfer on the rear of bodies in separated flow. On this basis the Nusselt number is proportional to the Reynolds number to the two-thirds power. The scaling method used is discussed in Appendix C of Reference 3-6. The equation used for correlating the convective heating rates is

\[
\dot{q}_{c_{flt}} = \left[ \frac{D_{mod}}{D} \right]^{1/3} \frac{(T_R - T_w)_{flt}}{(T_R - T_w)_{mod}} \dot{q}_{c_{mod}}
\]

where:
- \( \dot{q}_{c_{flt}} \) = convective component of the flight measured heating rate data
- \( D_{mod} \) = diameter of the model base
- \( D_{flt} \) = diameter of the flight vehicle base
3.6 (Continued)

\[ (T_R - T_w)_{mod} = \text{recovery temperature minus calorimeter temperature for the model} \]

\[ (T_R - T_w)_{flt} = \text{recovery temperature minus calorimeter temperature for the flight vehicle, } T_R = T_{gas} \text{ for the flight data} \]

\[ \dot{q}_{C,mod} = \text{model convective heating rate data} \]

After the scaling, this equation was applied to the convective component of the model data, the radiation was then added, and the total value plotted (Figure 3.6-2). Although comparison with the range of the Block I data is good, the spread of the data in both cases is rather large.

Flight and model base gas temperatures are compared at approximately the same location in Figure 3.6-3. The model data required no correction and follow well the Block I measurement of C65-3 up to the altitude where reverse flow becomes a factor. Beyond this altitude the model gas temperature decreases; this indicates that there is less burning of the simulated turbine exhaust flow in the base or that less of the hydrogen turbine exhaust gas reaches the base of the model. It is believed that, from this critical altitude on up, scale effects prohibit burning of the turbine exhaust in the base area of the models, while it may continue on the flight vehicle.

Pressures were measured at various locations on the base of all model tests; average base pressure ratios were obtained and compared with the flight results in Figures 3.6-4, 3.6-5 and 3.6-6. The model data for the base-to-ambient pressure ratio in Figure 3.6-4 indicate generally lower pressure for the three model tests up to the point of the inboard flow reversal. Above this altitude the model data indicate a higher pressure than the flight data. According to Reference 3-6 the differences below 12 kilometers of altitude can be attributed to the mismatch of the flow boundary conditions upstream of the model base and the improper scaling of the flow deflectors and air scoops to the model boundary layer conditions (they were scaled geometrically from the flight dimensions).

The flame shield to ambient pressure ratio model data are compared to flight in Figure 3.6-5. The comparison of the data in this region is very good over the whole model test range. This is due in part to the small influence of the external flow conditions on this region and to the similarity of the model engine and flight plume shapes. The flame shield to the base pressure ratio data shown in Figure 3.6-6 also compared well with the model data.

These curves, in Figure 3.6-6, are equivalent to the pressure ratio across a supersonic nozzle with the space between the inboard engines taken as the nozzle throat, the flame shield pressure as the reservoir, and the base pressure as the downstream conditions. The critical pressure ratio, or the condition where Mach one is reached in the areas between adjacent inboard
engines, is found at some point along the curve. This defines the altitude at which the inboard engine reverse flow becomes fully choked and at which the maximum possible mass of hot gas is introduced into the heat shield area. The critical pressure ratio is defined as

$$\left( \frac{P_c}{P_1} \right)_{\text{crit}} = \left( \frac{\gamma + 1}{2} \right)^{\frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma}} = \left( \frac{P_F}{P_B} \right)_{\text{crit}}$$

where: $P_o =$ reservoir pressure
$P_1 =$ downstream pressure
$\gamma =$ specific heat ratio for the hot exhaust gases
$P_F =$ flame shield pressure
$P_B =$ average base pressure

The critical pressure ratio, assuming $\gamma$ to be 1.23, is equal to 1.79.

Data shown for SA-1, SA-2, and SA-4 in Figure 3.6-6 for this ratio would indicate that the flow chokes between 16.9 and 19.2 km. Confirmation of this range is derived from the observation of the absolute flame shield pressure, temperature, and the total heating rate. All these data indicate that choking occurred between 15 and 20 km altitude. The choking altitude derived from model data was reported in Reference 306 to be 18.74 km. This was for a critical pressure ratio of 1.72.
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4.0 SATURN S-IC STAGE

4.1 S-IC CONFIGURATION

The S-IC stage provides first stage boost of the Saturn V launch vehicle to an altitude of about 200,000 feet (approximately 38 miles), and provides acceleration to increase the vehicle velocity to 7,700 feet per second (approximately 4,560 knots). It then separated from the S-II stage and falls to earth about 360 nautical miles downrange.

The S-IC stage (Figure 4.1-1) is a cylindrical booster, 138 feet long and 33 feet in diameter, powered by five liquid propellant F-I rocket engines. These engines develop a nominal sea level thrust of 7,650,000 pounds total and have a burn time of 150.7 seconds. The stage dry weight is approximately 305,100 pounds and total weight at ground ignition is approximately 4,792,200 pounds.

The Saturn V/S-IC stage base configuration consists of five F-I engines mounted in a cross-engine arrangement of four maneuverable engines around a fixed center engine (Figure 4.1-2). A heat shield is located 19 feet forward of the engine exit and base flow deflectors were located on the AS-501 around the periphery of the base to flush combustible gas mixtures from the base area. These flow deflectors were removed on AS-502. The heat shield panels are constructed of 15-7-MO stainless steel honeycomb, 1.00 inch thick, brazed to 0.01 inch steel face sheets. A 0.25 inch thick honeycomb sheet is crushed to 0.14 inch thick and brazed to the hot side facing sheet. M-31, which is a ceramic composed of an inorganic binder with asbestos and potassium titanate fibers, is troweled into the crushed core and is approximately 0.3 inch thick.

Each outboard F-I engine is protected from aerodynamic loading by a conically shaped engine fairing (Figure 4.1-1). The fairings also house the retro-rockets and the engine actuator supports. The fairing components are primarily titanium alloy below Station 115.5 and aluminum alloy above this station. Four fixed, titanium covered, stabilizing fins augment the stability of the Saturn V vehicle.

Each F-I engine is enclosed in a "cocoon" which consists of fibrous silica insulation enclosed in inconel foil, except for the nozzle extension where wire reinforced asbestos is used as shown in Figure 4.1-3.

AS-501 flight trajectory data are tabulated in Table 4.1-1. All Saturn V flight trajectories were similar.
FIGURE 4.1-3. S-IC STAGE CENTER F-1 ENGINE WITH INSULATION COCOON
TABLE 4.1-1. AS-501 FLIGHT TRAJECTORY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLIGHT TIME (SECONDS)</th>
<th>ALTITUDE (FEET)</th>
<th>PRESSURE (PSF)</th>
<th>TEMPERATURE (°R)</th>
<th>MACH NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>878.0</td>
<td>447.4</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>427.5</td>
<td>395.6</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>51,400</td>
<td>240.0</td>
<td>359.5</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>140.5</td>
<td>362.3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>69,400</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>381.3</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>80,500</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>398.0</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>90,800</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>403.0</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>405.0</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>404.0</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>435.0</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>355.0</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.4</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>471.0</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.1</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The F-1 engine (Figure 4.2-1) is a single start, 1,530,000 pound fixed thrust, calibrated, bi-propellant engine which uses liquid oxygen as the oxidizer and RP-1 as the fuel at a mixture ratio of 2.26:1. Engine features include a bell-shaped thrust chamber with a 10:1 expansion ratio and detachable, conical nozzle extension which increases the thrust chamber expansion ratio to 16:1. The thrust chamber is cooled regeneratively by fuel, and the nozzle extension is cooled by gas generator exhaust gases injected (parallel to the main nozzle flow) inside the F-1 nozzle from a shingle-type construction from the 10:1 to 16:1 area ratio. This produced a fuel-rich gas mixture surrounding each of the engine exhaust flows. Liquid oxygen and RP-1 fuel are supplied to the thrust chamber by a single turbopump powered by a gas generator which uses the same propellant combination. RP-1 fuel is also used as the turbopump lubricant and as the working fluid for the engine fluid power system. The four outboard engines are capable of gimbaling and have provisions for supply and return of RP-1 fuel as the working fluid for the thrust vector control system. External thermal insulation provides an allowable engine environment during flight operation.

One-dimensional nozzle exit plane properties and nominal propellant flow rates are tabulated in Table 4.2-1 and 4.2-2, respectively.

**TABLE 4.2-1. F-1 ENGINE PROPERTIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit Pressure</td>
<td>890.94 psf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Temperature</td>
<td>2599.3°R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Mach Number</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>1.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Constant</td>
<td>64.1 ft.1bf/1bm °R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Pressure</td>
<td>139,000 psf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Temperature</td>
<td>6510°R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Divergence Angle</td>
<td>11°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nozzle Exit Diameter</td>
<td>140 inches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 4.2-2. NOMINAL F-1 ENGINE PROPELLANT FLOW RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMBUSTION CHAMBER</th>
<th>TURBINE EXHAUST</th>
<th>OVERALL ENGINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxidizer Flow (lbm/sec)</td>
<td>3931.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>3981.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Flow (lbm/sec)</td>
<td>1633.4</td>
<td>120.3</td>
<td>1753.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Flow (lbm/sec)</td>
<td>5564.4</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td>5734.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture Ratio (O/F)</td>
<td>2.405</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.2702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Single F-1 engine plumes were generated for several altitudes for the AS-501 flight by using the LMSC/HREC Method of Characteristics Computer Program (Reference 4-1). These plumes were calculated using two-dimensional exit conditions.

The NASA/Lewis Thermochemical Program was used to perform the real gas calculations, and it was found that frozen flow conditions exist in the plume flow fields for all flight times investigated.

Table 4.2-3 presents the frozen-flow gas species concentrations, and the Mach number profiles are given in Figures 4.2-2 through 4.2-11. The pressure and temperature profiles for the plumes are given in Figures 4.2-12 and 4.2-13, respectively.

### TABLE 4.2-3. PLUME FROZEN FLOW SPECIES CONCENTRATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>SPECIES MASS FRACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.3398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>0.1620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>0.1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O</td>
<td>0.3337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F-1 engine dimensions

NOZZLE AREA RATIO $\epsilon = 16:1$

**FIGURE 4.2-1. F-1 ENGINE**
FIGURE 4.2-6  F-1 ENGINE PLUME MACH NUMBER CONTOURS

FIGURE 4.2-7  F-1 ENGINE PLUME MACH NUMBER CONTOURS
ALTITUDE=111,000 FEET

FIGURE 4.2-10  F-1 ENGINE PLUME MACH NUMBER CONTOURS
Figure 4.2-11 9-1 Engine Plume Mach Number Contours
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FIGURE 4.2-12. VARIATION OF PRESSURE FOR THE F-1 ENGINE PLUME MACH NUMBER CONTOURS
FIGURE 4.2-13 - Variation of Temperature for the F-1 Engine Plume Mach Number Contours
4.3 PREDICTION METHODS

S-IC stage base heating predictions have been based primarily upon model and flight test data for convection, and analytical and experimental methods for radiation.

Radiation

Prior to the first flight, the maximum value of radiation was believed to occur at sea level. The prediction method at that time consisted of a sea level prediction using a shell model (Figure 4.3-1) based on F-1 engine radiance measurements (Figure 4.3-2) from engine development tests and analytical methods to define form factors. The decrease in radiation with altitude was based upon Saturn I and IB flight data. S-IC short duration model data could not be used to substantiate the prediction because of poor turbine exhaust simulation and incorrect plume emissivity with the model.

After the first flights, it was determined that maximum values of radiation do not occur at sea level, but instead result from recirculated gases present in the base region at higher altitudes. Radiation at altitudes above sea level after the start of recirculation are currently defined using flight test data. Based upon flight data, it is evident that the earlier the gases are present in the base, the higher will be the temperature and, consequently, higher radiation will result. The ability to predict the radiation hump analytically is seriously limited and requires additional development of analytical tools.

Convection

Convective heating environment predictions were based originally on model and flight data from the Saturn I and model data from the S-IC. Analytical calculations were not adequate to predict convective heating because of the complexity of the flow field. The convective heating rates from the model tests were conservative and were tempered by the S-I flight data to originally define the prototype S-IC convective heating as shown in Figure 4.3-3. Model data were used to predict initial flow reversal into the base, base pressure, base gas temperature, and relative heating effects with changes in configuration.

Pressure

Base pressure predictions included an average base pressure for design criteria as well as base pressure distributions at five heat shield locations. The average analytical estimate was made using S-I Block I flight data and Korst's two-dimensional mixing theory. The base pressure distributions were based on S-I Block II flight data and S-I and S-IC model data.
FIGURE 4.3-2. F-1 ENGINE PLUME PHOTOGRAPHIC PYROMETER DATA
FIGURE 4.3-3. COMPARISON OF THEORETICAL AND EXPERIMENTALLY DERIVED HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENT
All Saturn V/S-IC stage model base heating tests were performed with a 1/45th scale test model utilizing the short-duration test technique. Tests were conducted at four separate test facilities, in the time period from February 1963 through August 1965. The test results provide S-IC stage base heating and pressure wind tunnel data through the first 100,000 feet of flight and trajectory altitude chamber data from 125,000 through 205,000 feet. The complete analysis of all tests was reported in a single two-volume document, Reference 4-5.

A general description of the model, instrumentation, test facilities, and test conditions is contained in the following paragraphs. Representative data are presented for all base locations with the basic configuration model (nearest simulation to the actual S-IC flown on the Saturn V). Data are also shown to illustrate the effects of parametric variations in base geometry and operating characteristics.

Model Description

The same general model was used throughout the test program with major modifications on the combustor from one test sequence to the next. The 2.22 percent scale test model of the Saturn S-IC stage, Figure 4.4-1, was designed by Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory (CAL) and fabricated by Marshall Space Flight Center, NASA. Detailed descriptions of the model, including the engines, engine fairings, scoops and flow deflector configurations, and base plate are included in Reference 4-5, and are shown in Figures 4.4-2 through 4.4-4.

Model Operation

A schematic of the model propulsion system is shown in Figure 4.4-1. The system employed the standard short-duration techniques for metering the gases, mixing, ignition, and discharging the gases. These techniques have been described in detail in CAL documentation and will not be discussed in this section. The S-IC model had approximately 20 to 30 milliseconds of steady state operation.

Two methods of turbine exhaust simulation were used with the S-IC model. Ethylene was originally used for a few low altitude runs because it more nearly simulates the actual gas conditions of the flight vehicle. It did burn in the base but it coated the heating gages so badly with soot that it was impractical to use. Hydrogen gas was used for the remaining tests since it had a wide flammability limit but did not impose a sooting problem. The hydrogen was injected at a rate that simulated the caloric content of the unburned fuel in the prototype turbine exhaust.
TABLE 4.4-1. COMBUSTION PARAMETERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>GOX-ETHYLENE</th>
<th>LOX RP-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O/F</td>
<td>2.20 - 2.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tc</td>
<td>6830 - 6870°R</td>
<td>6400°R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc</td>
<td>1030 - 1100 psia</td>
<td>1050 psia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.22 - 1.206</td>
<td>1.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>73.6 - 72.5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Conditions and Facilities

Table 4.4-2 lists the test conditions for the four facilities used in the test program. Test and trajectory total temperature and altitude comparisons are shown in Figure 4.4-5. The dates of the tests are shown in parentheses.

Each model configuration is described by groups of letters and numbers using the following format:

a) Forebody
b) Engine Fairing Length
c) Deflector Size
d) Engine Fairing Scoop Size
e) Engines
f) Base Plate

Subscript numbers indicate the configuration variations and are defined in Figures 4.4-1, 4.4-3 and 4.4-4. Table 4.4-3 is a compilation of the various configurations tested in each of the facilities.

Instrumentation

The short-duration instrumentation, provided by CAL, consisted of: 1) thin-film heat transfer gages for the measurement of short duration heating, (2) CAL developed piezo-electric pressure transducers to measure short duration surface pressures, (3) a pressure rake to measure boundary layer total pressure distribution, and (4) Kistler piezo-electric crystal transducers and chromel-alumel thermocouples to measure model performance. Detailed descriptions of the short duration instrumentation can be obtained from References 4-6 through 4-8. Calibration procedures for the S-IC short duration tests are contained in Reference 4-9.
### Table 4.4-2. Facility Test Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Mach</th>
<th>Test Altitude (Feet)</th>
<th>Trajectory (Feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewis 8 by 6</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May - August 1965)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>22,600</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis 10 by 10</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(October 1963)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL 8 by 8</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(February 1963)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL Altitude Chamber</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(June 1963)</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>205,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4.4-3. CONFIGURATIONS TESTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>CAL 8 x 8</th>
<th>LeRC 8 x 6</th>
<th>LeRC 10 x 10</th>
<th>CAL Altitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOREBODY</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td>B₃</td>
<td>B₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFIGURATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁N₁-5</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td>PL₁, PL₃</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td>PL₁, PL₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₄N₁-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁D₂N₁-5</td>
<td>PL₁, PL₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₄D₂N₁-5</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₄SC₁N₁-5</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁D₁SC₁N₁-5</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₂SC₁N₁-5</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₄D₁SC₁N₁-5</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁D₃SC₁N₁-5</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁D₃SC₂N₁-5</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁N₇</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PL₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁₁N₇</td>
<td></td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁₂N₇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PL₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁NG₃NG₄</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁NG₅NG₆</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁₂NG₇NG₈</td>
<td>PL₁, PL₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁₁SC₂NG₇NG₈</td>
<td>PL₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS₁₂NG₁₀NG₁₁NG₁₂</td>
<td>PL₁, PL₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. PL₁ - base plate instrumented with both heating and pressure
   PL₂ - base plate is instrumented only for pressure
   PL₃ - Hot base plate
2. Base plate shown in table indicates configurations tested and facilities used.
4.4 (Continued)

Polaroid pictures record the oscilloscope traces of the instrumentation outputs. Data were measured directly from the pictures.

Base instrumentation consisted of total heating, radiation heating, and static pressure gages on the three base plates. The instrumentation locations on each base plate are shown in Figure 4.4-6. Figures 4.4-7 and 4.4-8 show the external and internal nozzle instrumentation. The base of the fin and the engine fairing are instrumented as shown in Figure 4.4-9.

Model Development

Considerable development of the short-duration technique occurred during the test program. Non-symmetrical exhaust was noted in the first tests in the Cornell Transonic Tunnel. CAL revised the mixer plate and testing was resumed in the CAL high-altitude facility. Flow symmetry nozzles continued unsatisfactory, and the means for measuring the oxygen-to-fuel (O/F) ratio was believed to be unreliable.

Prior to tests in the Lewis Research Laboratory 10-by-10-foot supersonic tunnel, the combustor was redesigned and a splash plate was introduced. Results from this series of tests indicate that radiation and convection was considerably lower than estimated. Data repeatability was poor and motion pictures indicated continued combustion instability.

Before testing in the Lewis transonic tunnel extensive tests were run at CAL and some combustor redesign was accomplished. The instabilities of the previous test were traced to liquefaction of the ethylene. Preheating the ethylene eliminated the problem.

Configuration changes also occurred during the two years in which tests were conducted. Consequently, the configurations tested in one facility may be inconsistent with those of another facility. For example, during two tests (CAL Altitude Chamber and LRC 10-by-10), two gimbal patterns were run. These represented extreme cases; outboard engines gimbaled as far as they physically could toward each other and toward the center engine. Before the LRC 8-by-6 test was conducted a nominal prototype gimbal pattern was established. Because of time limitations, this was the only gimbal pattern tested in the LRC 8-by-6 tunnel. Therefore, the plots in this section showing the effects of gimbaling do not have the same gimbal pattern for the entire altitude range.

Test Results

Detailed data presentations including most of the pertinent model test results are shown in Volumes 1 and 2 of Reference 4-5. The format in the Reference was to show composite data in Volume 1 and specific results from each test facility in Volume 2. The procedure followed in this section of the handbook is to elaborate on the composite data with specific emphasis on the parametric comparisons. In general, data from all four test...
facilities will be combined and plotted versus altitude. The figures and the purpose of each figure comparison are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE NUMBER</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF PRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figures 4.4-1 through 4.4-9</td>
<td>Model Description and Instrumentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures 4.4-10 through 4.4-13</td>
<td>Nominal Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures 4.4-14 through 4.4-16</td>
<td>Turbine Exhaust Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures 4.4-17 through 4.4-19</td>
<td>Engine Fairing Length Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures 4.4-20 through 4.4-22</td>
<td>Scoops and Flow Deflector Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures 4.4-23 through 4.4-25</td>
<td>Gimbaling Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures 4.4-26 through 4.4-28</td>
<td>Center Engine Out Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.4-29</td>
<td>Engine On - Engine Off Base Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures 4.4-30 through 4.4-36</td>
<td>Internal Engine Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures 4.4-37 and 4.4-38</td>
<td>Wall Temperature Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.4-39</td>
<td>Model Boundary Layer Thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures 4.4-40 through 4.4-52</td>
<td>Environment Distributions over Heat Shield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief descriptions of the model test data comparisons are included in the following paragraphs. The discussion will be limited to data comparison only. Comparisons of the model data with theoretical predictions and with Saturn V/S-IC stage flight data are included in Section 4.6. Detailed discussions of the data repeatability, exhaust flow composition, and flow establishment are included in Reference 4-5 and are not presented in the handbook.

**Nominal Environments**

Average radiation and convective heating rate data and base pressure data are shown in Figures 4.4-10 and 4.4-11 for the nominal configuration heat shield and center engine, respectively. The nominal configuration, designated FS1N1-5PL1, has nominal length engine fairings, no scoops and flow deflectors, and the engines in the null positions. All data shown were taken from runs without turbine exhaust simulation.

Radiation heating rates at various base locations are shown in Figure 4.4-12, including data measured on the heat shield, engine, engine fairing and trailing edge of the fin. A similar comparison with measured convective heating rates is presented in Figure 4.4-13.
4.4 (Continued)

Turbine Exhaust Effect

The effect of turbine exhaust simulation on the heat shield environments can be seen in the comparisons of Figures 4.4-14, 4.4-15 and 4.4-16. All data shown for the configuration with turbine exhaust utilized hydrogen simulation. In general, the effect of turbine exhaust injection on base region radiation is negligible, i.e., within the scatter and accuracy of the data. A noticeable increase of approximately 300 percent in convective heating occurred with turbine exhaust in the CAL 8-by-8 test which encompassed the transonic range from $M = 0.6$ to 1.2. Convective heating measured at the other test facilities was unaffected by the addition of turbine exhaust.

Engine Fairing Length Effect

Data from a short fairing length configuration is compared with the nominal configuration data in Figures 4.4-17 through 4.4-19. At the lower altitudes reducing the fairing length reduced the heat shield radiation and slightly increased the heat shield convection. No effect on either environment component was experienced at the higher altitudes (above 40,000 feet).

Scoops and Flow Deflector Effect

The addition of nominal scoops and flow deflectors to the basic configuration produced the effect on the environments shown in Figure 4.4-20 through 4.4-22. A very slight increase in radiation was noticed at the lower altitudes. A significant reduction in convective heating occurred on the heat shield (Figure 4.4-22) at lower altitudes up to 100,000 feet, indicating that during aspiration the scoops and deflectors aid in scavenging the base region of recirculated gases. The engine fairings and engines show some reduction in convective heating also.

Gimbaling Effect

The most pronounced effect of gimbaling was the increased convective heating which occurred at the higher altitudes as seen in Figures 4.4-23 through 4.4-25. Radiation heating was not greatly affected, although some reduction in average heat shield radiation was noted in the sea level to 40,000-foot range.

Center Engine Out

The effect of an inoperative center engine on the base region radiation and convective heating environments can be seen in Figures 4.4-26 through 4.4-28. As seen in Figure 4.4-26, average radiation to the heat shield is reduced with the center engine out at the lower altitudes. Convective heating is also reduced throughout the entire range of altitudes tested.
Engine-On - Engine-Off Base Pressure

Static pressures were measured on the heat shield prior to engine firing and during engine firing with the PL₁ base plates. Pressures from the CAL 8-by-8 test and Lewis 10-by-10 test, which were on trajectory, are compared in Figure 4.4-29. The upper curve compares engine-on and engine-off base pressure for the baseline configuration without scoops and deflectors. A similar comparison for the nominal scoop and deflector configuration is compared in the lower curve. In both curves, it is noted that when the engines are operating, there is a distinct base pressure increase. It is also evident that the no-engine-flow base pressure is higher with scoops on as would be expected.

Internal Engine Environment

Radiation heating to the internal surfaces of the non-operating center engine is shown in Figures 4.4-30 through 4.4-33. A limited amount of data is also shown on Figures 4.4-30 and 4.4-31 for an outboard engine out. As seen in these figures, the internal engine radiation is slightly higher than the base heat shield radiation levels and exhibits a similar drop-off with altitude. Due to the low magnitudes of the measured radiation and scatter in the data, there is no significant difference noted in the data measured near the nozzle lip and that measured internally near the throat.

Internal engine convective heating is shown in Figures 4.4-34 through 4.4-36. Convective heating inside the center engine is severe especially at the higher altitudes as seen in Figure 4.4-36. A significant decrease is also noted between the lip and internally near the throat.

Wall Temperature Effect

A special base plate was fabricated with internal electrical coils so that convective heating rates could be obtained at various wall temperatures. The equation and sketch below illustrate the procedure used to calculate recovery temperature and heat transfer coefficients:

$$q = h_c (T_r - T_w)$$

Slope of Curve is Heat Transfer Coefficient ($h_c$)

Extrapolated Base Gas Recovery Temperature ($T_r$)
4.4 (Continued)

Heating rate data were obtained at three wall temperatures; 350°F, 200°F, and the cold base temperature of 130°F. The heating rates are plotted as a function of wall temperature and the line through the data is then extrapolated to the zero heating rate point which is the adiabatic wall temperature or assumed base gas recovery temperature. The slope of the curve corresponds to the heat transfer coefficient as is evident from the equation.

Typical test results in the transonic range are shown in Figure 4.4-37. The base recovery temperature ranged from 400°F to 600°F for all configurations tested. The heat transfer coefficients were in the range of 0.008 to 0.016 Btu/ft²sec-°R. Data from this portion of the test are of low quality, containing a large amount of scatter. Some of the data even indicated a physical impossibility, an increase in heating rate with increase in wall temperature. However, the results are generally substantiated by the convection heating rate data.

Typical test results at high altitude (165,000 feet) are shown in Figure 4.4-38. Convective heating rates were measured at wall temperatures of 80°F, 400°F, 700°F and 900°F. The average recovery gas temperature obtained at this altitude was 1500°F. Problems were encountered which made the data interpretation difficult. The total heating rates with the hot base at ambient conditions do not compare well with those obtained using the non-heated (cold) base. Radiation heating rates are considerably higher on the hot base plate. It was expected that the radiation heating would be lower. For these reasons, the recovery gas temperature obtained is questionable.

Model Boundary Layer Thickness

Boundary layer measurements were made in the three wind tunnels by a total pressure rake. Actual total pressure in the boundary layer is determined by correcting the probe readings for the normal shock that stands in front of the rake. The boundary layer edge is defined as the point at which 0.998 of the free-stream velocity is reached. In all three tunnels, the measured boundary layer thickness coincides with the turbulent flow estimate as seen in Figure 4.4-39.

Environment Distributions Over Heat Shield

Radiation heating rate distributions across the heat shield are shown in Figures 4.4-40 through 4.4-43. At the lower altitudes, the maximum radiation rate is recorded at a radial position of r/R = 0.75 between outboard engines. At higher altitudes, the magnitudes are quite low and there is no significant variation with radial position.
Convective heating distributions across the heat shield are shown in Figures 4.4-44 through 4.4-49. At lower altitudes, a consistent trend was not noted in the location of the maximum value. However, at the higher altitudes, convective heating increases in the outboard direction with maximum values occurring at approximately \( r/R = 0.775 \).

Base pressure distributions are shown in Figures 4.4-49 through 4.4-52. In general, minimum base pressure (static) occurred near \( r/R = 0.65 \) indicating maximum velocity over the heat shield at this location. The radial position \( r/R = 0.65 \) is located approximately at the minimum vent area between outboard engines. Base static pressure on either side of the minimum vent area (outboard or inboard) has approximately the same magnitude.
FIGURE 4.4-1. MODEL COMBUSTION SYSTEM
NOTE: Turbine exhaust injected normal to nozzle internal surface at 10:1 area ratio by two rows of 52, 0.0595-inch diameter holes spaced on 0.0714-inch staggered centers.

FIGURE 4.4-2. MODEL BASE GEOMETRY
GIMBAL PATTERN #1 \((N_{o, 4}N_{o, 6})\)

GIMBAL PATTERN #2 \((N_{o, 5}N_{o, 5})\)

GIMBAL PATTERN #3 \((N_{o, 6}N_{o, 6})\)

GIMBAL PATTERN #4 \((N_{o, 7}N_{o, 8})\)

NOTE: \(N_2\) AND \(N_{i_0}\) INDICATE PLUGGED AND INSTRUMENTED ENGINE LOCATED AT ENGINE POSITIONS 5 AND 2 RESPECTIVELY (SEE NOMENCLATURE)

ENGINE NO. 2 PLUGGED

NOTE: ARROWS INDICATE DIRECTION OF ENGINE GIMBAL

FIGURE 4.4-3. GIMBAL PATTERNS
FIGURE 4.4-9. FIN AND ENGINE FAIRING INSTRUMENTATION
O - FS1N1-5PL1  BASELINE CONFIGURATION WITHOUT TURBINE EXHAUST

DATA AVERAGED:  H2, 4, 6, 8, 10

DATA AVERAGED:  H1, 3, 5, 7, 9

DATA AVERAGED:  P1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

FIGURE 4.4-10  NOMINAL CONFIGURATION HEAT SHIELD ENVIRONMENTS
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FIGURE 4.4-11  NOMINAL CONFIGURATION ENGINE ENVIRONMENTS
FIGURE 4.4-13  NOMINAL CONFIGURATION BASE REGION CONVECTION
BASELINE CONFIGURATION WITHOUT TURBINE EXHAUST

BASELINE CONFIGURATION WITH TURBINE EXHAUST

DATA AVERAGED: $H_2,4,6,8,10$

DATA AVERAGED: $H_1,3,5,7,9$

DATA AVERAGED: $P_1,2,3,4,5,6,7$

ALTIMETER - KILOFEET

FIGURE 4.4-14 EFFECT OF TURBINE EXHAUST ON HEAT SHIELD ENVIRONMENT
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FIGURE 4.4-15 EFFECT OF TURBINE EXHAUST ON BASE REGION RADIATION
FIGURE 4.4-16  EFFECT OF TURBINE EXHAUST ON BASE REGION CONVECTION
FIGURE 4.4-17 EFFECT OF ENGINE FAIRING LENGTH ON HEAT SHIELD ENVIRONMENTS
FIGURE 4.4-18  EFFECT OF ENGINE FAIRING LENGTH ON BASE REGION RADIATION
Figure 4.4-19  EFFECT OF ENGINE FAIRING LENGTH ON BASE REGION CONVECTION
Figure 4.4-20  Effect of Scoops and Flow Deflectors on Heat Shield Environments
Figure 4.4-21 Effect of scoops and flow deflectors on base region radiation.
FIGURE 4.4-22 EFFECT OF SCOPS AND FLOW DEFLECTORS ON BASE REGION CONVECTION
FIGURE 4.4-23  EFFECT OF GIMBALING ON HEAT SHIELD ENVIRONMENTS
Figure 4.4-25  EFFECT OF GIMBALING ON BASE REGION CONVECTION
FIGURE 4.4-27  EFFECT OF CENTER ENGINE OUT ON BASE REGION RADIATION
ENGINE OFF (FS1N1-5)

ENGINE OFF (FS1D1SCN1-5)

MODEL DATA FROM CAL 8x8 AND LeRC 10x10 TUNNELS

COMPARISON OF ENGINE OFF AND ENGINE ON BASE PRESSURE
TUNNEL LEWIS 8 BY 6

SYM. INST. CONFIG.

◇ H₅₄,₅₆ B₄ FS₁ D₂ N₇ P₁

NOTE: 1. Flag denotes gauge H₅₆
   2. Solid symbol denotes turbine exhaust

FIGURE 4.4-30 INTERNAL ENGINE RADIATION FROM M = 0.55 TO M = 1.96
TUNNEL Lewis 8 by 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYM.</th>
<th>INST.</th>
<th>CONFIG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H44</td>
<td>B4FS1D2NPL1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H48</td>
<td>B4FS1D2NPL1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H50</td>
<td>B4FS1D2NPL1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H52</td>
<td>B4FS1D2NPL1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Solid symbol denotes turbine exhaust

**Figure 4.4-31** INTERNAL ENGINE RADIATION FROM M = 0.55 TO M = 1.96
TUNNEL - Lewis 10 by 10

SYM. INST. CONFIG.

○ H 501 H 601
△ H 502 H 602
□ H 503 H 603
○ H 504 H 604
△ H 505 H 605

FIGURE 4.4-32 INTERNAL ENGINE RADIATION FROM M = 2.0 TO 3.5
TUNNEL Cornell Altitude Chamber

SYM. INST. CONFIG.

- H₂₂: H₁₂₁₁₅₁₅₁
- H₄₄: H₁₂₁₁₇₁₁
- H₂₄: H₁₂₁₁₇₁₁
- H₂₈: H₁₂₁₁₇₁₁

FIGURE 4.4-33  INTERNAL ENGINE RADIATION FROM 125,000 TO 205,000 FEET
TUNNEL Lewis 8 by 6

SYM. INST. CONFIG. SYM. INST. CONFIG.

○ H43 BuFS1D1N7PL1 ○ H51 BuFS1D2N10NG11NG12NG13PL2
□ H47 BuFS1D1N7PL1 □ H47 BuFS1D2N10NG11NG12NG13PL2
▼ H49 BuFS1D1N7PL1 ▽ H49 BuFS1D2N10NG11NG12NG13PL2

NOTE: Solid Symbol denotes turbine exhaust

Figure 4.4-34 Internal Engine Convection from M = 0.55 to 1.96
FIGURE 4.4-35  INTERNAL ENGINE CONVECTION FROM M = 2.0 TO 3.5
FIGURE 4.4-36  INTERNAL ENGINE CONVECTION FROM 125,000 TO 205,000 FEET
FIGURE 4.4-37 EFFECT OF WALL TEMPERATURE ON BASE CONVECTIVE HEATING
FIGURE 4.4-38  EFFECT OF WALL TEMPERATURE ON BASE CONVECTIVE HEATING
FIGURE 4.4-39  MODEL BOUNDARY LAYER THICKNESS VERSUS THEORY
TUNNEL Lewis 8 by 6
SYM. INST. CONFIG. SYM. INST. CONFIG.
○ H10,8,6,4,2 BuFS1N1-5PL1

NOTE: 1. Solid symbol denotes H2 turbine exhaust
2. Half solid symbol denotes C2H4 turbine exhaust

MACH 0.55

MACH 1.00

MACH 1.66

MACH 1.95

FIGURE 4.4-40 RADIATION HEATING DISTRIBUTION FROM M = 0.55 TO 1.95
TUNNEL CAL 8 BY 8

SYM. INST. CONFIG. SYM. INST. CONFIG.
☐ ☐ B_{1}FS_{1}N_{1-5}PL_{1} ☐ ☐ B_{1}FS_{1}N_{1-5}PL_{1}
☐ ☐ B_{1}FS_{1}N_{1-5}PL ☐ ☐ B_{1}FS_{1}N_{1-5}PL_{1}

NOTE: Solid symbol denotes turbine exhaust

\[ \theta = 225 \text{ DEGREES} \]

\[ q_{r} = \text{HEATING RATE - BTU/FT}^{2}\text{SEC} \]

\[ 0 \leq \theta \leq 360 \]

\[ r/R = \text{RADIAL LOCATION} \]

\[ H_{20,14,2,18,12} \]

\[ \theta = \text{ANGULAR LOCATION - DEGREES} \]

\[ \theta = 225 \text{ DEGREES} \]

\[ H_{20,14,2,18,20} \]

FIGURE 4.4-41 RADIATION HEATING DISTRIBUTION AT M = 1.2
NOTE: 1. Solid symbol denotes turbine exhaust
2. Flag right denotes Mach 2.0 data
3. Flag left denotes Mach 3.5 data

FIGURE 4.4-42 RADIATION HEATING DISTRIBUTION FROM M = 2.0 TO 3.5
**TUNNEL** Cornell Altitude Chamber

**SYM. INST.** CONFIG.

- □ $H_2,4,6,8,10$ $B_1F_1N_1-5PL_1$
- △ $H_2,4,6,8,10$ $B_1F_1N_2N_3PL_1$

**FIGURE 4.4-43** RADIATION HEATING DISTRIBUTION FROM 125,000 TO 205,000 FEET
TUNNEL    LEWIS 8 BY 6
SYM.      INST.      CONFIG.
O        H₁,3,5,9        B₄F₁N₁-5

NOTE: 1. Solid symbol denotes H₂ turbine exhaust
  2. Half solid symbol denotes C₂H₄ turbine exhaust

FIGURE 4.4-45  CONVECTIVE HEATING DISTRIBUTION FROM M = 0.55 TO 1.95
FIGURE 4.4-46  CONVECTIVE HEATING DISTRIBUTION AT M = 3.5
TUNNEL  Cornell Altitude Chamber

NOTE: Solid symbol denotes turbine exhaust.

FIGURE 4.4-47  CONVECTION HEATING DISTRIBUTION AT 125,000 FEET
TUNNEL Cornell Altitude Chamber

SYM. INST. CONFIG.
- H₁,3,5,7,9 B₁FS₁N₁-5PL₁
- H₁,3,5,7,9 B₁FS₄Sc₁N₁-5PL₁

SYM. INST. CONFIG.
- H₁,3,5,7,9 B₁FS₁Ng₃Ng₄PL₁
- H₁,3,5,7,9 B₁FS₁Ng₅Ng₆PL₁
- H₁,3,5,7,9 B₁FS₁Ng₇PL₁

NOTE: Solid symbol denotes turbine exhaust

![Graph of convective heating distribution at 165,000 feet](image)

**Figure 4.4-48** Convective Heating Distribution at 165,000 Feet
TUNNEL CAL 8 by 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYM.</th>
<th>INST.</th>
<th>CONFIG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P₁,₂,₃ or 5</td>
<td>B₁FS₁N₁-₅PL₁</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₁,₂,₃ or 5</td>
<td>B₁FS₂D₁SC₁N₁-₅PL₁</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: 1. Flagged symbol denotes Mach 1.2
2. Flag left denotes Mach 1.0
3. Flag right denotes Mach 0.8
4. No flag denotes Mach 0.6

RADIAL LOCATION - r/R

FIGURE 4.4-49 BASE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION FROM M = 0.6 TO 1.2
FIGURE 4.4-50  BASE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION FROM M = 0.55 TO 1.95
FIGURE 4.4-51  BASE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION FROM M = 2.0 TO 3.5
TUNNEL Cornell Altitude Chamber

SYM. INST. CONFG.

- P₂,₆ BIFS N₁-₅ PL₁
- P₁,₇ BIFS N₁-₅ PL₁

NOTE: Flagged symbol denotes P₆,₇

FIGURE 4.4-52: BASE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION FROM 125,000 TO 205,000 FEET
Apollo 4, 6, 8, 9 and 10 (AS-501 through AS-505) were launched successfully November 9, 1967; April 4, 1968; December 21, 1968; March 3, 1969; and May 18, 1969, respectively, from Cape Kennedy Florida. These missions were the first five flights of the Saturn V launch vehicle and the primary objectives were qualification of the vehicle and spacecraft for the lunar landing mission. Apollo 8 was the first manned Saturn V Apollo flight.

This section contains the S-IC base region flight heating and pressure data for vehicles AS-501 through AS-505. For convenience of analysis, the AS-501, AS-502 and AS-503 data are plotted and compared on one set of graphs and the AS-504 and AS-505 are plotted and compared on another. Figures 4.5-8 through 4.5-34 contain nearly all of the base heating data measured during these flights; and, since much of the flight instrumentation on the S-IC stage was removed on AS-506 and subsequent vehicles, these data constitute the majority of the S-IC base heating data existing. The data were taken from References 4-10 and 4-11.

Configurational changes on the S-IC stage included removal of the base region flow deflectors after the flight of AS-501, 2-degree outboard cant on the F-1 control engines of AS-503 and subsequent vehicles and early AS-503 inboard engine cutoff. No significant vehicle configuration or flight operating procedure changes were made which affected the base heating environments on vehicles AS-504 and AS-505.

The following paragraphs describe briefly the flight instrumentation, base flow field, thermal environments and flight parametric effects. Flight data will be compared to illustrate the parametric effects of flow deflectors, engine out, nozzle gimbaling and engine pre-cant.

Instrumentation

Thermal environment measurements were made in the S-IC stage base region by instruments located on the base heat shield, engines and fin trailing edge.

The S-IC base heat shield thermal instrumentation consisted of radiation calorimeters, total calorimeters, and gas temperature probes. The instruments were located on the heat shield as shown in Figure 4.5-1. These instruments are described and summarized in Table 4.5-1. Base heat shield pressure instrumentation consisted of static pressure taps and pitot-static pressure probes. The pitot-static and static pressure probe locations are shown in Figure 4.5-2 and are described and summarized in Table 4.5-2.

The F-1 engine instrumentation consisted of radiation calorimeters, total calorimeters, gas temperature probes, static pressure taps and pitot-static pressure probes. The instruments were located on the engines as shown in Figures 4.5-3 through 4.5-5 and are described and summarized in Table 4.5-3.
The total and radiation calorimeter sensing surfaces were 0.17 inches and 0.55 inches in diameter, respectively. They were mounted such that the sensing surfaces of the total calorimeter and the sapphire windows of the radiation calorimeters were flush with the heat shield surface. The radiation calorimeter window surfaces were nitrogen purged to eliminate carbon particle contamination. The calorimeters were asymptotic instruments which maintain a low wall temperature (610°R 'effective'). These calorimeters are discussed in more detail in References 4-12 and 4-13. The instrument temperatures were monitored at the sensing surface edge during flight. An "effective" sensing surface temperature, which is used with the indicated heating rate, was determined by techniques discussed in Reference 4-14.

The heat shield gas temperature probes consisted of a platinum-platinum rhodium thermocouple with a 0.25 inch diameter molybdenum single shield. Gases were admitted to the sensing surface through four equally spaced openings facing parallel to the heat shield. Gas temperature probe installations were used with the sensing surface mounted at distances aft of the heat shield surface of 0.25, 0.50, 1.00 and 2.50 inches.

Base Flow Fields

During liftoff, the flow fields near the base region were erratic due to the disrupting influence of the launch complex. The Saturn V AS-501 sea level flow field is shown in Figure 4.5-6. The reflected flame resulting from the F-1 engine exhaust being turned by the trench flame deflector and the steam resulting from the flame and LOX water quench influenced the base and engine environment until the vehicle cleared the launch complex.

Afterburning of exhaust gases was clearly evident in flight tracking films at the lower altitudes for all three vehicles. Dark fuel-rich exhaust gases were noted at the F-1 nozzle exit plane followed by a flame front approximately three-fourths of a nozzle diameter downstream. Radiation from these high temperature exhaust plumes was the major contributor to the thermal environment during the early part of flight. Exhaust gas recirculation was noted on the engine nozzle extensions.

As altitude increases, the exhaust plumes expanded until they interacted with each other. The exhaust plume interactions created high pressure regions in the exhaust flow field, forcing low energy exhaust gases forward into the base region. It was noted in the review of flight film that the plumes remain highly luminous until 25 to 28 KM of altitude. A gradual graying of the plumes was then observed from 28 to 40 KM of altitude, and the plumes were totally gray and virtually indistinguishable from 40 KM to the end of S-IC stage boost.
Exhaust flow reversal was not clearly indicated by pressure probes located in the S-IC base region of AS-501, AS-502, or AS-503. Neither the pitot pressure probes located on the three vehicles nor the pitot-static pressure probes located on AS-503 indicates significant changes in flow directions or velocities. Refer to Tables 4.5-1, 4.5-2, and 4.5-3 for a description of the location of these instruments.

Television cameras were mounted on the S-IC heat shield of AS-502 and AS-503 vehicles. The flow field visualization provided by the TV cameras was extremely important because of the correlations which were possible with flight data from the heat shield and engine instrumentation. A comparison of AS-503 heat shield radiation heating rates and events observed by the base region TV cameras is presented in Figure 4.5-7. The TV camera data showed recirculated gases were first present in the base region near the heat shield at 12.2 kilometers for AS-502 and at 12.7 kilometers for AS-503. The recirculated exhaust flow appeared fully established at 18.5 and 20.1 kilometers for AS-502 and AS-503, respectively. The arrival of recirculated gases in the base area was accompanied by radiation increases on all base and engine calorimeters.

The flight data and TV data also showed that flow field changes occurred at center engine cutoff. Center engine cutoff was characterized by a momentary brightening of the base area. The effects of center engine cutoff on base heating levels are described in the following paragraphs.

S-IC Heat Shield Thermal Environment

The S-IC heat shield heating and pressure environments which have been measured on the AS-501 through AS-505 launch vehicles are shown in Figures 4.5-8 through 4.5-16.

The radiation at sea level agrees well with analytical calculations. The radiation was expected to decrease with increasing altitude but a sharp rise in radiation is noted which peaks between 18 and 30 KM. This hump corresponds to the TV camera data which indicated hot exhaust gases reaching the base about the time of radiation increase. It has been concluded that the radiation hump which was measured is caused by hot recirculating gases in the base region. A similar hump was noted on the Saturn I and IB flights but because of the significantly higher sea level radiation on the Saturn I and IB, the hump was not as prominent.

The AS-501 base environments were not as severe as the data from AS-502 through AS-505 because of the removal of the flow deflectors after the AS-501 flight. Flow deflector effects will be discussed in a subsequent paragraph.
The total heating environments to the heat shield are also shown in Figures 4.5-8 through 4.5-16. The principal component of total heating was radiation and the shapes and trends of the total calorimeter data are similar to those previously discussed for radiation. The total calorimeters did indicate rundown periods of data loss or drop-out which are unexplained. Maximum total and radiation heating rates measured on the base heat shield are 22 and 20 Btu/ft²/sec, respectively, occurring at approximately 20 KM. The differences between total and radiation calorimeter measurements on the heat shield indicate that a convective cooling rate was experienced by the calorimeters to approximately 9 KM. Small convective heating rates occurred from 9 KM through the remainder of first stage boost. Total and radiation heating was approximately the same at all heat shield locations along a radial line between engines. Comparisons of gas temperature measurements on the heat shield surface are shown in Figure 4.5-12. It is evident that a significant gas temperature gradient exists near the heat shield.

Total heating and gas temperature data on the heat shield between an outboard engine and engine fairing are shown in Figure 4.5-13. The heating environments are significantly reduced in these areas.

The base pressures measured on the AS-501, AS-502 and AS-503 vehicle are shown in Figures 4.5-14 through 4.5-16. The base pressure exceeds the ambient pressure at approximately 10 KM.

Total heating and gas temperature data from AS-501, AS-502 and AS-503 for the engine fairing and base of the fin are shown in Figure 4.5-17. It is evident that fin total heating measurements for all three flights are approximately the same. The initial rise in heating occurs at 15 KM which correlates with the recirculated exhaust gases reaching the heat shield as observed by TV cameras. The second rise in the total heating environment occurs shortly after flow separation is first observed.

S-IC Engine Thermal Environment

The S-IC stage heating and pressure measurements on the F-1 engines during the AS-501 through AS-505 flights are shown in Figures 4.5-18 through 4.5-34.

In general, the F-1 engine thermal environment flight data exhibited similar trends throughout flight as the S-IC heat shield data. The heating to the engines is significantly higher than to the heat shield. The characteristic "radiation hump" starts at 10 KM (about 2 KM earlier than the heat shield) and peaks at approximately 20 KM. The gas temperature on the engines are generally higher than the heat shield and correlate with the rise in engine radiation. Total heating rates and radiation rates are similar at low altitude. The forward part of the engine experiences a convective cooling early in flight with a small amount of convective heating at the higher altitudes (similar to the heat shield). Near the nozzle exit the total heating rate is generally higher than the radiation heating. Maximum total and radiation heating rates to the engines are 32 and 27 Btu/ft²/sec, respectively, occurring at approximately 16 KM.
Total heating rates measured at similar locations on three different engines are shown in Figure 4.5-30 and indicate the flow in the base is reasonably symmetrical. F-1 engine pressure data are shown in Figures 4.5-31 through 4.5-34. The exit plane pressures begin to exceed ambient pressures at 8 to 10 kilometers.

Base Flow Deflector Effects

The flow deflectors which were on the AS-501 flight vehicle to remove combustible hot gas mixtures from the base area were removed on the AS-502 vehicle, since the measured base environment on the AS-501 was well below design limits. The comparison of AS-501 and AS-502 flight data on the heat shield (Figure 4.5-9) show that significant differences do exist with radiation and total heating peaking higher and earlier for the AS-502 than for the AS-501. It was expected that flow deflectors would only affect the convective heating; but because of the unexpected radiation from the recirculated exhaust gases in the base region, radiation was the heating mechanism most affected.

Engine areas near the exit plane were not as significantly affected by the flow deflectors as the heat shield (Figure 4.5-20). Outboard locations, such as the outboard surfaces of the outboard engine and the base of the fins, were not expected to experience significant flowfield or heating changes when the deflectors were removed. The comparison of flight data to the base of the fin in Figure 4.5-17 shows similar environments for both flights. The AS-501 base pressures on the heat shield shown in Figure 4.5-14 were higher in the 3 to 12 km altitude regime than on AS-502 which is attributed to the flow deflector removal on AS-502. Flow deflectors, however, did not affect the engine external surface pressures.

It was concluded that the differences between the AS-501 and AS-502 flight data were almost entirely due to flow deflector effects. Subsequent flight data have also confirmed this conclusion.

Center Engine Out Effects

The center engine on the S-IC stage is shut down prior to outboard engine shutdown to limit the g loading on the upper stages. This provides base heating data for an engine out configuration. At engine shutdown a spike in the calorimeter and gas temperature data is evident and is coincident with a momentary brightening in the base region observed by the TV camera coverage. This brightening is probably caused by the high concentration of residual exhaust products and carbon particles from the center engine residual fuel which could raise the emissivity of the base gases and therefore the radiation. As the residual exhaust products are depleted, a reduction in emissivity and radiation would occur. The level of heating following the IECO spike is for a center engine out configuration. IECO occurred at 135.5 seconds (49.64 kilometers), 144.72 seconds (56.07 kilometers), and 125.88 seconds (41.5 kilometers) on flights AS-501, AS-502, and AS-503,
respectively. S-IC heat shield and engine environments during IECO are shown in Figures 4.5-35 and 4.5-36. These figures show the most pronounced effects of center engine out. Most of the flight data after the spike returned to the levels and trends which were evident before center engine out.

Gimbaling Effects

F-1 engine gimbal angles have not exceeded 1° during Saturn V flights through AS-509. No specific effect due to this small gimbal angle has been discernible from the flight data. Gimbal effects are within the accuracy of the instrument readings for these small angles.

Engine Outboard Pre-Cant

Gas temperatures measured on the S-IC heat shield are shown in Figures 4.5-8, 4.5-9 and 4.5-11. The delay in the initial rise in radiation and the slightly lower peak values recorded on AS-503, when compared with AS-502, is also evident in the heat shield gas temperature data in the inboard locations. This effect is attributed to the outboard engine cant on AS-503, which delayed the altitude of initial plume impingement and allowed cooler gases to be recirculated around the center engine. Gas temperatures near the periphery of the base heat shield were not greatly affected by the 2 degree cant and were in close agreement with AS-502 flight data.
### TABLE 4.5-1. S-IC BASE HEAT SHIELD THERMAL ENVIRONMENT INSTRUMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT TYPE</th>
<th>RANGE °R</th>
<th>STATION</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C66-106</td>
<td>Cal., Rad.</td>
<td>0-22.72°</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.84, Pos. II</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C61-106</td>
<td>Cal., Rad.</td>
<td>0-22.72°</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.61, Pos. II</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C151-106</td>
<td>Cal., Rad.</td>
<td>0-22.72°</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.60, Fin A</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C49-106</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.84, Pos. II</td>
<td>Mounted 0.25° Off Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C50-106</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.61, Pos. II</td>
<td>Mounted 0.25° Off Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C51-106</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.61, Pos. II</td>
<td>Mounted 1.0° Off Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C52-106</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.61, Pos. II</td>
<td>Mounted 2.5° Off Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C53-110</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>r/R = 1.11</td>
<td>Mounted 1.0° Off Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C54-106</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 1.28, Fin D</td>
<td>Mounted 0.50° Off Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C55-106</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.46, Fin A</td>
<td>Mounted 1.0° Off Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25-106</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>0-45.44°</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.84, Pos. II</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26-106</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>0-45.44°</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.61, Pos. II</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27-106</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>0-45.44°</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.60, Fin A</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28-114</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>0-45.44°</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>r/R = 1.51</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C144-106</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>0-56.80°</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.46, Pos. II</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C148-110</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>0-45.44°</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>r/R = 1.11, Fin C Side of Engine Fairing, Fin D</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D36-106</strong></td>
<td>Pitot Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79°</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.61, Pos. II</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D39-106</strong></td>
<td>Pitot Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79°</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.61, Pos. II</td>
<td>Facing Inboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D40-106</strong></td>
<td>Pitot Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79°</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.61, Pos. II</td>
<td>Facing Outboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D168-106</strong></td>
<td>Pitot-Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-3.45]</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.61, Pos. II</td>
<td>Facing Inboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D169-106</strong></td>
<td>Pitot-Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-3.45]</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>r/R = 0.61, Pos. II</td>
<td>Facing Outboard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N/cm²**

1. Trailing Edge of Fin D
2. Internal Engine Fairing Fin D

* watt/cm²

- Platinum - Platinum + 10% Rhodium Thermocouple Probe
- AS-S01 and AS-S02
- AS-S03
### TABLE 4.5-2. S-IC STAGE F-1 ENGINE THERMAL ENVIRONMENT INSTRUMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Number</th>
<th>Instrument Type</th>
<th>Range °F</th>
<th>Station °F</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C57-101</td>
<td>Cal., Rad.</td>
<td>-116.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C58-105</td>
<td>Cal., Rad.</td>
<td>-116.0</td>
<td>Facing Pos. II</td>
<td>Engine No. 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C150-101</td>
<td>Cal., Rad.</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C43-101</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>-116.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 102</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C44-101</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>-116.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C45-101</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>-48.0</td>
<td>Facing Outboard</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C46-101</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 103</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C47-101</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48-101</td>
<td>Gas Temp.</td>
<td>273-2023</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>Facing Outboard</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C56-105</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-116.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14-101</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-116.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C55-105</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-116.0</td>
<td>Facing Pos. II</td>
<td>Engine No. 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18-101</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-45.44</td>
<td>-48.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19-101</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-45.44</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20-105</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-45.44</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 104</td>
<td>Engine No. 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21-101</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-45.44</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22-101</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-45.44</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23-101</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-22.72</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine Fairing Fin A</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C123-103</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-68.16</td>
<td>-48.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C142-105</td>
<td>Cal., Total</td>
<td>-56.80</td>
<td>-48.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 101</td>
<td>Engine No. 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23-101</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>-110.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 102</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24-101</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>-110.0</td>
<td>45° From Fin A Toward Position II</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D25-101</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>-110.0</td>
<td>Facing Outboard</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26-101</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>-70.0</td>
<td>Facing Outboard</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D27-101</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>-15.0</td>
<td>Facing Outboard</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28-107</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>-110.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D29-101</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>-70.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30-101</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>-15.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 105</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031-105</td>
<td>Pitot Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>Facing Forward</td>
<td>Engine No. 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*032-105</td>
<td>Pitot Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*033-105</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>Facing Engine No. 101</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*034-105</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>Facing Position II</td>
<td>Engine No. 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**0166-105</td>
<td>Pitot-Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-3.45</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>Facing Forward</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**0167-105</td>
<td>Pitot-Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-3.45</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>Facing Aft</td>
<td>Engine No. 101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Symbols:
- **watts/cm²**
- ▲ platinum - Platinum + 10% Rhodium Thermocouple Probe
- * AS-501 and AS-502
- ** AS-503
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### Table 4.5-3. S-IC Base Heat Shield Pressure Instrumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Number</th>
<th>Instrument Type</th>
<th>Range $N/cm^2$</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D0035-106</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>Station 112, 166 Inch Radius, Position II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0036-106*</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>Station 112, 120 Inch Radius, Position II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0037-106</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>Station 112, 91 Inch Radius, Fin C Centerline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0038-106</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>Station 112, 220 Inch Radius, 80 Inches from Fin B Centerline toward Position II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0042-106</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>Station 112, 260 Inch Radius, 40° from Position II toward Fin B Centerline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0043-106</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>Station 112, 80 Inch Radius, Position II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0044-106</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>Station 112, 150 Inch Radius, 25° from Fin A Centerline toward Position II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0045-106</td>
<td>Static Pressure</td>
<td>0-13.79</td>
<td>Station 112, 80 Inch Radius, 25° from Fin A Centerline toward Position II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0046-106</td>
<td>Differential Pressure</td>
<td>± 2.07</td>
<td>Station 112, 120 Inch Radius, Position IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0047-106</td>
<td>Differential Pressure</td>
<td>± 2.07</td>
<td>Station 112, 91 Inch Radius, Fin D Centerline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Instrument not on AS-503
FIGURE 4.5-1. S-IC BASE HEAT SHIELD THERMAL INSTRUMENTATION
FIGURE 4.5-4 F-1 ENGINE GAS TEMPERATURE INSTRUMENTATION
OBSERVED EVENT
TV CAMERA COVERAGE

1. FIRST FLAME (RECIRCULATION)
2. FULL RECIRCULATED FLOW IN BASE REGION
3. HEAT SHIELD BLACKENED
4. AREA BETWEEN ENGINES BECOMES CLEAR
5. BRIGHTENING AT CENTER ENGINE CUTOFF

RADIATION CALORIMETER
C61-106

FIGURE 4.5-7. COMPARISON OF FLIGHT DATA AND TV CAMERA COVERAGE, AS-502 FLIGHT DATA
FIGURE 4.5-8  S-IC HEAT SHIELD ENVIRONMENT - r/R = 0.84 BETWEEN OUTBOARD ENGINES - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
Figure 4.5-12  S-IC Heat Shield Gas Temperature - AS-503 and AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-13 S-IC HEAT SHIELD ENVIRONMENT - BETWEEN OUTBOARD ENGINE AND ENGINE FAIRING - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-14. S-1C BASE PRESSURE DIFFERENTIAL
FIGURE 4.5-15.  S-1C BASE PRESSURE DIFFERENTIAL
FIGURE 4.5-16: S-1C BASE PRESSURE DIFFERENTIAL
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FIGURE 4.5-17. S-IC ENGINE FAIRING AND FIN TRAILING EDGE THERMAL ENVIRONMENT - AS-501 THROUGH AS-503
FIGURE 4.5-18 F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - OUTBOARD ENGINE EXIT PLANE FACING INBOARD - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-19  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - OUTBOARD ENGINE NEAR HEAT SHIELD FACING OUTBOARD - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
AS-501, 502, 503

AS-504, AS-505

FIGURE 4.5-20  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - INBOARD ENGINE EXIT PLANE FACING OUTBOARD BETWEEN TWO ENGINES - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-21  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - OUTBOARD ENGINE EXIT PLANE FACING OUTBOARD ENGINE - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
AS-501, 502, 503

AS-504, AS-505

FIGURE 4.5-22 F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - OUTBOARD ENGINE NEAR HEAT SHIELD FACING INBOARD ENGINE - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-23  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - INBOARD ENGINE MANIFOLD FACING OUTBOARD ENGINE - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
AS-501, 502, 503

FIGURE 4.5-24  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - OUTBOARD ENGINE MANIFOLD FACING OUTBOARD - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-25  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - OUTBOARD ENGINE NEAR HEAT SHIELD FACING OUTBOARD - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-26  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - OUTBOARD ENGINE FLEXIBLE MANIFOLD FACING INBOARD - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
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FIGURE 4.5-27  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - INBOARD ENGINE NEAR HEAT SHIELD FACING OUTBOARD ENGINE - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-28  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - OUTBOARD ENGINE MANIFOLD FACING INBOARD - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-29  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - OUTBOARD ENGINE MANIFOLD FACING INBOARD - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-30  F-1 ENGINE ENVIRONMENT - FLOW SYMMETRY, AS-503 AND AS-505

4-122
FIGURE 4.5-32  F-1 ENGINE PRESSURE AXIAL VARIATION ALONG OUTBOARD ENGINE FACING INBOARD - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505
ENGINE PRESSURE MINUS AMBIENT PRESSURE, N/cm²

FLIGHT DATA

AS-501, 502, 503

AS-504, AS-505

AS-504, AS-505

AS-501, AS-504, AS-505

AS-501, AS-502, 503

AS-504, AS-505

F-1 ENGINE PRESSURE - AXIAL VARIATION ALONG OUTBOARD ENGINE FACING OUTBOARD - AS-501 THROUGH AS-505

FIGURE 4.5-33

A-125
FIGURE 4.5-34  S-IC HEAT SHIELD AND ENGINE TOTAL PRESSURE - AS-504 AND AS-505
FIGURE 4.5-35  ENGINE OUT EFFECT ON HEAT SHIELD ENVIRONMENT
INBOARD ENGINE CUTOFF
AS-503 125.88 SECONDS

FIGURE 4.5-36 ENGINE OUT EFFECT ON CENTER ENGINE ENVIRONMENT
4.6 COMPARISON OF MODEL AND FLIGHT TEST RESULTS

Two comparisons are possible between the 1/45th scale short duration test results and the Saturn V/S-IC stage flight data. The AS-501 flight vehicle was flown with base flow deflectors and can be compared with the scoop and deflector model configuration designated FS1D1SC1N1-5. The base flow deflectors were removed on the AS-502 (and subsequent) flight vehicle. Flight data from AS-502 can be compared with data from the baseline model configuration designated FS1N1-5.

The model and flight data comparisons were enhanced by the close similarity in model and flight instrumentation locations; on the engines as well as the heat shield. The overall base geometry was simulated closely with the short duration model especially the external nozzle shape (the short duration model does not require cooling jackets for the hot flow nozzles therefore allowing good simulation of the engine external geometry). However, the small scale model created heating environments which contained significant scaling effects. Additional uncertainty in the validity of the comparisons occurs because of the poor simulation of turbine exhaust injection and instrumentation inaccuracies.

Heating Rates

Flight vehicle and model heat shield and center engine heating environments are compared in Figures 4.6-1 and 4.6-2, respectively. The heat shield comparisons in Figure 4.6-1 were made from data measured along a radial line between outboard engines. The center engine comparisons in Figure 4.6-2 were made from data measured near the nozzle exit plane facing outboard between two engines. In both figures, comparisons are made for the configuration with scoops and flow deflectors (AS-501 flight data compared to FS1N1-5PL1 model data) and for the configuration without scoops and flow deflectors (AS-502 flight data compared to FS1N1-5PL1 model data). The AS-501 flight vehicle did not have engine fairing scoops; however, the flow deflectors on the flight vehicle provided a scoop area to base area ratio closely approximated on the model with the D1SC1 scoop and deflector combination.

Radiation is expected to increase with increase in size such that the flight vehicle radiation is significantly higher than the model. Although the flight radiation data are higher than the model radiation data, as shown in the upper curve comparisons of Figures 4.6-1 and 4.6-2; no conclusions can be drawn from these comparisons because of the poor quality of the model radiation data. The model exhaust gases (GOX/ethylene) were not similar to the full scale and did not contain sufficient carbon to maintain correct similarity of emissivity with a LOX/RP-1 plume. The negligible radiation heating to the model heat shield and engines is caused by both scaling and non-simulation and therefore prevents any meaningful conclusions on the scalability of the radiation data.
Convective heating in the base is a function of size (the smaller the size, the larger the convective heating) and, consequently, the convective heating on the model was expected to be much larger than that experienced on the flight vehicle. Based upon simple turbulent and laminar theory scaling laws, the model data were expected to be between two and six times greater than the flight values. This trend is generally substantiated by the lower left curve comparisons on the heat shield and engine in Figures 4.6-1 and 4.6-2. However, it was impossible to define a scaling factor because of model and flight instrumentation inaccuracies and model simulation problems.

The model convective heating data did exhibit the same trend as the flight data when the scoops and flow deflectors were removed. The heat shield and center engine heating was increased with the removal of the flow deflectors. The trend may be more easily seen in the model data comparisons of Section 4.4, Figures 4.4-20 through 4.4-22.

Base Pressures

Average model base pressure, for model configurations with and without scoops and deflectors, is compared with AS-501 and AS-502 flight measured base pressure in Figure 4.6-3. The AS-501 pressure is higher than AS-502 as expected because of the flow deflectors. The effect of the flow deflectors on the model data is not as pronounced with approximately the same magnitude measured with both model configurations.

The trends of the base pressure minus ambient curves are very similar between the model and flight data; i.e., the base pressure is lower than ambient during aspiration and exceeds ambient after fully recirculated flow is established. The base pressure becomes equal to the ambient pressure at a higher altitude on the model than on the flight vehicle. The trend may be an indication that the flight vehicle plumes (with mixing and afterburning at the lower altitudes) impinge with each other earlier in flight causing recirculation into the base at the lower altitudes.

Gas Temperature

Gas recovery temperature in the base region was derived from heated base plate convective heating data at four test altitudes with the short duration model. These data were obtained for the model configuration without scoops and deflectors, and exhibited a considerable degree of scatter as discussed in Section 4.4.
The model recovery temperatures obtained by this method are compared with flight measured gas temperatures on the heat shield for the AS-501 and AS-502 flight in Figure 4.6-3. The flight data show large gradients in gas temperature near the heat shield and the accuracy of the model data is not good but it is evident that the flight and model data have comparable magnitudes of gas temperature at the higher altitudes.

Distributions Across Heat Shield

Flight and model data distributions across the heat shield are compared at 18,000 feet and 96,000 feet in Figures 4.6-4 and 4.6-5, respectively. Each figure contains both scooped and unscooped configuration data. The two altitudes were chosen as typical altitudes for aspirating flow through the base (18,000 feet) and fully recirculated flow into the base (96,000 feet).

The heating rate distribution comparisons are not conclusive although the trend exhibited by the low altitude model radiation (increase in the outboard direction) is as expected. The radial distributions in base pressure are very similar for the model and flight data at both altitudes and for the scooped and unscooped configuration.
HEAT SHIELD HEATING ENVIRONMENTS

WITH SCOOPS AND FLOW DEFLECTORS

NOTE: MODEL AND FLIGHT DATA MEASURED ALONG A RADIAL LINE BETWEEN OUTBOARD ENGINES

WITHOUT SCOOPS AND FLOW DEFLECTORS

NOTE: MODEL AND FLIGHT DATA MEASURED ALONG A RADIAL LINE BETWEEN OUTBOARD ENGINES

FIGURE 4.6-1. COMPARISON OF FLIGHT AND MODEL HEAT SHIELD ENVIRONMENTS
CENTER ENGINE HEATING ENVIRONMENTS

WITH SCOOPS AND FLOW DEFLECTORS

WITHOUT SCOOPS AND FLOW DEFLECTORS

**Figure 4.6-2. Comparison of Flight and Model Center Engine Environments**
BASE PRESSURE AND GAS TEMPERATURE

WITH SCOOPS AND FLOW DEFLECTORS

WITHOUT SCOOPS AND FLOW DEFLECTORS

FIGURE 4.6-3. COMPARISON OF FLIGHT AND MODEL BASE PRESSURE AND GAS TEMPERATURE
FIGURE 4.6-5. COMPARISON OF FLIGHT AND MODEL DATA DISTRIBUTIONS ACROSS HEAT SHIELD AT M = 3.5
(96,000 FEET) - FULLY RECIRCULATED FLOW
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The S-IV stage was the second stage of the Saturn I program. The primary objective of this program was the development of a two-stage launch vehicle. The program consisted of 10 vehicles which were divided into two main groups: Block I (SA-1 through SA-4) and Block II (SA-5 through SA-10). The Block I series utilized a dummy S-IV stage. The first active S-IV stage was flown on the SA-5 flight, January 29, 1964. The S-IV stage configuration used in the Block II series is shown in Figure 5.1-1.

The original design concept of the S-IV stage propulsion system had four uprated Pratt and Whitney RL-10A-3 engines (17,500 pounds thrust). This design was terminated in favor of a six-engine configuration using the standard RL-10A-3 engines (15,000 pounds thrust). The engines were circular arranged as shown in Figure 5.1-1. In the nominal positions the engines are canted outboard six degrees. Each engine is gimbal mounted on the stage thrust structure to provide engine thrust vectoring for vehicle altitude control and steering. (See Figure 5.1-2.) Two hydraulic actuators are utilized to gimbal each engine. All engines are gimbaled for pitch and yaw control and engine 1, 2, 3 and 4 are gimbaled for roll control.

A helium heater exhaust nozzle was located in the center of the heat shield. The helium heater is a low pressure combustor which burns oxygen and hydrogen at the following conditions: mixture ratio of one to one, chamber pressure of 7 psia, exhaust flow rate of 0.05 lb/sec, and exhaust total temperature of 800°F. The helium heater's purpose is to warm cold helium stored in high pressure spheres within the hydrogen tank for pressurization of the oxygen tank during flight. (See Figure 5.1-3.)

Additional information and flight objectives are contained in the MSFC Technical Information Summary for each flight. The preceding data were taken from Reference 5-1.
S-IV STAGE WEIGHT*

DRY:  ~13,900 LBS
AT S-IV IGNITION:  ~115,000 LBS
AT S-IV VELOCITY:  ~15,200 LBS CUTOFF

*NOTE: EXCLUDES WEIGHT OF ULLAGE ROCKETS, AFT INTERSTAGE AND IU EQUIPMENT IN FORWARD INTERSTAGE.

FIGURE 5.1-1. S-IV STAGE CONFIGURATION
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FIGURE 5.1-2. S-IV STAGE THRUST VECTOR CONTROL SYSTEM
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O₂ Continuous Non-Propulsive Vent

H₂ Continuous Non-Propulsive Vent

H₂ Blowdown Non-Propulsive Vent

LH₂ Tank Vent Valve

Helium Spheres for LOX Tank pressurization

He/Ar 30-33 psia

LH₂ Tank 16,870 lbs at Ignition

GH₂ from RL10A-3 Engines (6) during S-IV burn for tank pressurization

LOX Tank Vent Valve

LH₂ Fill & Drain

LOX Fill & Drain

He Makeup Sphere provides LH₂ Tank pressurization during engine cooldown

Helium heater

FIGURE 5.1-3. S-IV STAGE HELIUM HEATER
The S-IV stage utilized six RL-10 engines in a circular arrangement. The engine system is shown in Figure 5.2-1. Each engine develops 15,000 pounds thrust using LOX-H₂ as propellants. The nominal engine operating characteristics are presented in the following table.

**RL-10 ENGINE OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Pressure</td>
<td>300 psia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Temperature</td>
<td>5240°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxidizer Fuel Weight Ratio, O/F</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nozzle Expansion Ratio</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RL-10 engine exit plane conditions and the exhaust plumes have been determined and reported in Reference 5-2. Data from this reference are presented in Figures 5.2-2 through 5.2-9. The nozzle exit plane and exhaust plume flow properties are based on shifting equilibrium during an isentropic expansion. Static pressure, static temperature, molecular weight, and effective specific heat ratio are presented in Table 5.2-1 as a function of Mach number. The equilibrium gas flow properties were used to determine the flow field for the nozzle contour shown in Figure 5.2-2. The distribution of Mach number, static pressure, static temperature, and effective specific heat ratio across the nozzle exit plane are presented in Figures 5.2-3 through 5.2-6, respectively.

Using the exit plane flow properties, a method of characteristics axisymmetric solution of the exhaust plume flow field was obtained. The Mach number distribution for an altitude of 160,000 feet is shown in Figure 5.2-7, and plume boundaries at altitudes between 80,000 and 250,000 feet are shown in Figure 5.2-8. The exhaust plume boundaries based on one-dimensional equilibrium gas flow within the nozzle and perfect gas properties beyond the nozzle exit plane are presented in Figure 5.2-9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MACH NUMBER</th>
<th>PRESSURE PSIA</th>
<th>TEMPERATURE °R</th>
<th>MOLECULAR WEIGHT LB/LB MOLE</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE SPECIFIC HEAT RATIO, $\gamma^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.00x10²</td>
<td>5240</td>
<td>11.9436</td>
<td>1.1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.59x10²</td>
<td>5139</td>
<td>11.9623</td>
<td>1.1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.70x10²</td>
<td>4847</td>
<td>12.0087</td>
<td>1.1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.85x10¹</td>
<td>4392</td>
<td>12.0574</td>
<td>1.1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.89x10¹</td>
<td>3829</td>
<td>12.0859</td>
<td>1.2143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.57x10¹</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>12.0946</td>
<td>1.2327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>2713</td>
<td>12.0959</td>
<td>1.2494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.2672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.2847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.86x10⁻¹</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.35x10⁻¹</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.20x10⁻¹</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.50x10⁻²</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.69x10⁻²</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.17x10⁻²</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.33x10⁻²</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.36x10⁻³</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.40x10⁻³</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.57x10⁻³</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.41x10⁻³</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.67x10⁻³</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>12.0961</td>
<td>1.3642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THROAT DIA. - 5.975 IN.
EXIT PLANE DIA. - 37.8 IN.

FIGURE 5.2-1. S-IV STAGE RL-10 ENGINE SYSTEM
CONTOUR COORDINATES UNAVAILABLE IN THE REGION DESIGNATED X₁.

\( r_t = 2.99 \text{ IN.} \)

DISTANCE FROM NOZZLE THROAT - \( x/r_t \)

\( 3x/r_t - X_1 \)

FIGURE 5.2-2. SATURN S-IV RL-10 ENGINE NOZZLE CONTOUR

5-9
FIGURE 5.2-3. S-IV STAGE RL-10 ENGINE EXIT PLANE MACH NUMBER DISTRIBUTION

\[ P_c = 300 \text{ PSIA} \]
\[ T_c = 5240^\circ \text{R} \]
\[ r_t = 2.99 \text{ IN.} \]
$P_c = 300$ PSIA
$T_c = 5240^\circ R$
$r_t = 2.99$ IN.

FIGURE 5.2-4. S-IV STAGE RL-10 ENGINE EXIT PLANE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.2-5. S-IV STAGE RL-10 ENGINE EXIT PLANE TEMPERATURE DISTRIBUTION

\[ \begin{align*}
    P_c &= 300 \text{ PSIA} \\
    T_c &= 5240^\circ \text{R} \\
    r_t &= 2.99 \text{ IN.}
\end{align*} \]
$P_c = 300 \text{ PSIA}$

$T_c = 5240^\circ \text{R}$

$r_t = 2.99 \text{ IN.}$

**Figure 5.2-6. S-IV Stage RL-10 Engine Exit Plane Effective Specific Heat Ratio Distribution**
Fig. 5.2-8. S-IV Stage RL-10 engine exhaust plume boundaries for various altitudes.
5.3 PREDICTION METHODS

The S-IV base region design heating rates were primarily based on model test data. Convection, caused by flow reversal, was shown in early analyses to be the major heat source but analytical techniques were not available to provide a confident solution to the problem. Exhaust gas radiation was not significant because of the highly expanded, low density, non-luminous plumes (which are composed of hydrogen gas and water vapor with a very low emissivity).

Radiation

Although radiation was not a significant design consideration, detailed analytical predictions of the radiation heat flux on the base of the S-IV stage were made and reported in References 5-3 through 5-5. The procedure used in these predictions involved a determination of total incident radiation of various base locations from the RL-10 exhaust plume intersection regions as well as the supersonic core regions. The procedure is described in detail in Reference 5-3 and the results of the analytical prediction are shown in Figure 5.3-1. The bottom curve represents the calculated energy from the intersecting regions only. The center curve and upper curve consider contributions from the intersecting regions and supersonic core assuming beam lengths of X/D ≤ 4 and X/D ≤ 25, respectively. The top curve of Figure 5.3-1 was thought to be the realistic heat flux on the S-IV stage base. The design criteria value of 0.5 Btu/ft²·sec was based upon experimental data measured by a radiometer with a 2.5 inch circular field of view normal to the RL-10 exhaust plume and centered approximately 5 inches downstream of the nozzle. Details of these experiments are contained in Reference 5-6.

Convection

Prototype design convective heating was based upon model heating rates determined from 1/10 scale long duration "combustion model" and short duration "shock tube" model tests. The scale models that were tested to establish the design environment are described in Reference 5-7 and discussed in detail in Subsection 5.4. The relationship between model and full scale base thermal environments is discussed in Reference 5-8. It was concluded in this reference that model convective heating rate will be essentially equal to prototype convective heating rate up to a wall temperature of about 1000°F if the model is a geometric scale of the prototype and operates with combustion at the same chamber pressure as the prototype.

The heat flux data measured during model testing are "cold wall" values; that is, the calorimeter surface temperatures rise only a few degrees during the short test duration. Heating rates experienced during flight are the result of both the convective inputs (base recirculation) and radiation losses due to radiation from the hot face of the heat shield. The heat shield attains a surface temperature of approximately 1200°F. Also, the first two flights of the S-IV carried a back-up LOX tank pressurization system in the event of helium heater malfunction. Therefore, the heat shield had to be designed to withstand heating rates associated with an inoperable helium heater.
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5.3 (Continued)

To avoid undue conservatism, it was necessary to translate the cold wall heat fluxes to equivalent hot wall values. This was accomplished by the following equation:

\[
\frac{q_{\text{hot wall}}}{q_{\text{cold wall}}} = \frac{(T_{\text{gas}} - T_{\text{hot wall}})}{(T_{\text{gas}} - T_{\text{cold wall}})} \frac{(W \ c_p)_{\text{copper calorimeter}}}{(W \ c_p)_{\text{copper calorimeter}}}
\]

where: \( q \) = heating rate, Btu/ft\(^2\)sec

- \( T_{\text{gas}} = 3600^\circ F \)
- \( T_{\text{hot wall}} = 1500^\circ F \) at \( q = 3.0 \) Btu/ft\(^2\)sec
- \( T_{\text{cold wall}} = 87^\circ F \) (measured during tests)

\((W \ c_p)_{\text{copper calorimeter}}\) = Equal values for either test since the same calorimeters were used and the specific heat of copper is essentially constant over the temperature range of 70-1500°F.

This results in a ratio of two-thirds (hot wall heat flux to cold wall heat flux). Applying this to the cold wall heating rate of 3.0 Btu/ft\(^2\)sec at the center of the heat shield results in an equivalent hot wall value of 2.0 Btu/ft\(^2\)sec, which, by coincidence, closely equals the cold wall heat flux with helium heater effects. The final design of the heat shield was therefore based on a heat flux of 2.0 Btu/ft\(^2\)sec which was expected to be somewhat conservative because of the helium heater effects. While there was a reduction in heating rate radially, tests on heat shield materials showed that the final design could not benefit appreciably by this variation.
5.4 MODEL TESTS AND PARAMETRIC DATA

Four major model test programs were conducted on the four- and six-engine configurations. (See Table 5.4-1.) The first two programs used a 1/10 scale four-engine combustion model and a 1/27.5 four-engine cold flow model. These models were tested between February and October 1961 at Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC) and FluiDyne Engineering Company (FEC). During this period a 1/10 scale four-engine shock tube model was tested at Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory (CAL). The first series of tests using this model were to verify the short-duration techniques and provide base region heating and pressure data. The second series of testing used the same model with minor modifications to provide data to determine the effects of Reynolds number and temperature on the base heating. After the S-IV base configuration was changed to the six-engine arrangement, a 1/10 scale shock tube model was tested at CAL. The original test program was completed in February 1962 and additional tests were conducted during May and October 1962. These tests provided data to be used in the design of the stage and to verify trends which were indicated by the four-engine model test data. A second series of tests were conducted later (full-scale flight tests had already been made) to provide supplementary pressure data for trajectory and performance analyses. Also, additional information was desired to define the effects of the helium heater exhaust flow on the heat shield heating rates and base flow field characteristics.

5.4.1 1/10 Scale S-IV Four-Engine Combustion Model

The purpose of these tests was to evaluate the reverse flow and heating phenomena in the base region of the original, four-engine, Saturn S-IV stage by measuring pressure and heat flux distribution on a 1/10 scale model with gaseous hydrogen/oxygen rocket engines. The model was tested (1) at approximately 143,000 feet to investigate base pressure and heat flux distribution in the base region, and (2) from 118,500 feet to 152,500 feet to investigate base pressure distribution as a function of altitude. All data have been normalized to a chamber pressure of 350 psia to permit direct comparison between various tests. Data presented in this section are representative data taken from Reference 5-9. These data show general magnitudes, trends and parameter effects. Complete data presentation and detail descriptions are contained in Reference 5-9.

Model Description and Test Conditions

A 1/10 scale model of the original Saturn S-IV stage base region presented in Figure 5.4-1 was used in these tests. This model was tested in the T-3 test cell in the Rocket Test Facility (RTF) at Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC) between March and May 1961. The model consisted of four gaseous hydrogen-oxygen rocket engines, a heat shield, secondary exhaust nozzle and secondary exhaust nozzle diverter. The engines were water cooled and operated at a nominal chamber pressure of 350 psia with an oxidizer-to-fuel weight ratio of 5.0. The engines had the same nozzle area ratio as the prototype. Each engine was canted 4 degrees outboard at the zero gimbal position and could be shifted ±5.66 degrees in the pitch and yaw directions to simulate maximum gimbaling. A small supersonic nozzle was positioned in the center of the heat shield to simulate the prototype helium heater nozzle.
5.4.1 (Continued)

A 90-degree cone acting as a flow diverter could be attached to the helium heater nozzle to divert the flow outward parallel to the heat shield surface. The nozzle and diverter configuration is presented in Figure 5.4-2.

The heat shield was instrumented with 20 pressure transducers, a traversing pressure probe and 22 calorimeters as shown in Figure 5.4-3. The calorimeters were of the transient (slug) type and were insulated from the surrounding heat shield structure by 0.031-inch air gaps and later by Min-k. Eleven (11) of the calorimeters had gold faces and the other half were painted black to determine the radiative and convective heat fluxes. Detailed descriptions of these instruments are contained in Reference 5-9. The amount of radiant heat flux was to have been determined by the differences between the heat fluxes indicated by the high absorptivity calorimeters which measured total heat flux and the low absorptivity gold plated calorimeters which measured primarily convective heat flux. The test results indicated that these differences were very small and sometimes negative. The quality of the reflectivity of the gold calorimeters was initially poor and deteriorated during the tests.

Model Test Parametric Data

The purpose of these tests was to evaluate the reverse flow and heating phenomena in the base region. The objectives for this evaluation were to determine the effects of secondary exhaust, engine gimbaling, and altitude.

Secondary Exhaust

The distributions of steady-state heat flux in the base region with and without secondary exhaust and secondary exhaust with diverter are shown in Figure 5.4-4. All heat flux values are hot-wall heat fluxes, and average values are given. The attempt to show a unique difference between the results obtained with the two methods of insulation (Min-K and air gap) was inconclusive. The distribution of base static pressure with and without secondary exhaust and secondary exhaust with diverter is presented in Figure 5.4-5.

Gimbaling

The engines could be shifted ±5.66 degrees in the pitch and yaw directions to simulate maximum gimbaling as shown in Figure 5.4-6. Heat flux and static pressure as a function of radial position are presented in Figure 5.4-7 through Figure 5.4-10 for the various gimbal conditions. All gimbaling runs were performed with secondary exhaust without diverters.

Altitude

The effect of altitude (120,000 to 150,000 feet) on the radial distribution of base pressures is shown in Figure 5.4-11.
The basic objective of these tests was to define the flow field in the base region of the original, four-engine, Saturn S-IV stage by determining static and total pressure distributions. Data presented in this section are representative data taken from References 5-9 through 5-11, and show general magnitudes and parameter effects. Complete data presentation and data descriptions are contained in the references.

Model Description and Test Conditions

Fluidyne Engineering Corporation designed and fabricated a 1/27.75 S-IV four-engine scale model. This model was tested at the Medicine Lake Laboratory of the Fluidyne Engineering Corporation (FEC) and at the Rocket Test Facility (RTF) at Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC) between February and October 1961. The model consisted of four conical nozzles, a chamber, a heat shield, and a secondary exhaust nozzle and diverter. A schematic of the model base is presented in Figure 5.4-12. The nozzles were designed to operate on 2000°R air at 87 psia with an expansion ratio of 10.4. At AEDC the maximum air supply temperature was 1000°R. This temperature required a supply pressure of 84 psia and a nozzle expansion ratio of 9.7; therefore, the simulation was not exact. The same was also true for simulating with unheated air which also required a nozzle expansion ratio of 9.7. Nozzle data for the cold flow model test are presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLD FLOW NOZZLE DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expansion Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throat Diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Mach Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nozzle Length (exit to effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gimbal point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coné Wall Thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence Half Angle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A removable nozzle in the center of the heat shield was used to simulate the helium heater exhaust by injecting ambient air into the base. A small flow diverter could be soldered to the heat shield above the helium heater nozzle to divert the secondary exhaust out along the heat shield. The helium heater exhaust nozzle and the diverter are presented in Figure 5.4-13.
5.4.2 (Continued)

The instrumentation on the heat shield consisted of six flush mounted static and four total pressure taps (1/16 inch aft of surface) positioned as shown in Figure 5.4-14. A static pressure tap located in the center of the heat shield was interchangeable with either a convergent-divergent nozzle or a total pressure tube. Five separate total pressure tubes could replace the helium heater nozzle with the location of the ends of the tubes at distances of 0, 0.295, 0.590, 0.885, and 1.380 inches aft of the heat shield surface. A total pressure rake was mounted between two nozzles with the tubes located in the vent area as shown in Figure 5.4-15. The helium heater nozzle was also used to measure the pressure at the center of the heat shield.

Model Test Parametric Data

These tests were conducted to determine the effects of the recirculation of exhaust gases into the base region. Objectives of the tests were to determine the altitude above which the base pressure remains constant (critical altitude), effects of heat shield locations, gimbaling, lip configuration, one engine not operative, secondary exhaust, chamber pressure, and chamber temperature.

The repeatability of the data is good as shown in Figure 5.4-16.

Critical Altitude

Early theory and experiments predicted that the base pressure would become constant after a critical altitude was reached. Base pressure data verify that the base pressure becomes independent of increasing altitude, but only after a triple reversal of the base pressure has occurred as seen in Figure 5.4-17.

Heat Shield Location

The purpose of varying the heat shield location was to alter the vent area ratio, \( A_c/A_L \) - the ratio of the nozzle exit plane reverse flow area to the lateral vent area. The heat shield pressure distribution for the ratio of \( A_c/A_L \) varying from 0.7 to 1.3 at an altitude of 150,000 feet is presented in Figure 5.4-18. At this altitude where the flow is not choked, the pressure distribution is not appreciably affected by \( A_c/A_L \) over the range tested. It is seen that the center base pressure increases as the lateral area is decreased.

Gimbaling

With four different mounting plates the engines could be gimbaled into any of the gimbal positions shown in Figure 5.4-19. Normally, the engines were canted four degrees radially from the model centerline. The pressure distributions due to gimbaling are compared to that of the gimbal null position (4° radial cant with model centerline) in Figures 5.4-20 through 5.4-24. The pressure distribution along a diameter perpendicular to the
5.4.2 (Continued)

The gimbal direction is not altered significantly as shown in Figure 5.4-20. The pressure distribution parallel to the gimbal direction shifts the distribution in the direction of the gimbal as shown in Figure 5.4-21. Along a diameter not perpendicular or parallel to the gimbal direction, the same effect is noticed considering the parallel and normal components of the gimbal. (See Figures 5.4-22 and 5.4-23.) The effect of roll on the pressure distribution is presented in Figure 5.4-24.

Heat Shield Lip Configuration

The lip configuration of the heat shield could be modified with three different lips. (See Reference 5-11.) The lip configuration and the data from this configuration are presented in Figure 5.4-25. These data indicated that the lip configuration had no effect on the base pressure distribution; therefore, the other two lip configurations were not tested.

Secondary Exhaust

The effects of the helium heater exhaust simulation is presented in Figure 5.4-26. A flow diverter was placed over the helium heater exhaust nozzle to determine its effect on the base pressure. These data are also presented in Figure 5.4-26.

One Engine Inoperative

For the condition of one engine inoperative the reverse flow flows out around the inoperative engine, relieving the base pressure. As a result, the base pressure is very close to ambient as shown in Figure 5.4-27.

Chamber Temperature

The center base pressures for two altitude traverses, one with a chamber temperature of 1000°R and the other at ambient temperature, are compared in Figure 5.4-28. The chamber temperature effect on the heat shield pressure distribution at an altitude of 150,000 feet is presented in Figures 5.4-29 and 5.4-30. The chamber temperature traverse at 150,000 feet presented in Figure 5.4-31 indicates the effect on the pressures in the vent area above the heat shield. Rake pressures at an altitude traverse for two chamber temperatures are presented in Figure 5.4-32. Since the local flow directions are not parallel to the rake total pressure tubes, the indicated rake pressure may differ from the true total pressure.

Chamber Pressure

The possibility of simulating altitude by increasing the chamber pressure instead of decreasing the ambient pressure was investigated. A chamber pressure traverse for PCELL/PCH simulating altitudes above the critical altitude is presented in Figure 5.4-33. This simulation of altitude may be good below the critical altitude as well as above it as seen in Figure 5.4-34. Points A, B and C are defined in Figure 5.4-17.
5.4.3 1/10 Scale Four-Engine Hot-Flow Model - Short Duration

A four-engine 1/10 scale shock tube model was tested at Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory (CAL) during 1961. These tests were to verify the short duration techniques and provide base region pressure and heating data. Later a modified model was tested to determine the effects of Reynolds number and temperature on base heating. Data presented in this section are representative data taken from References 5-12 through 5-15. These data show general magnitudes, trends and parameter effects. Complete data presentation and detail descriptions are contained in the references.

Model Description and Test Conditions

The short-duration rocket combustion model employed in these tests was a 1/10 scale version of the S-IV four-engine stage. The model consisted of a combustion chamber, heat shield, four engine nozzles and a secondary exhaust nozzle. The first series of tests used a constant volume combustor and a constant pressure combustor was used in the second series. Descriptions of these combustors are contained in References 5-14 and 5-15, respectively. The model base configuration is shown in Figure 5.4-35. The engine nozzles were scaled versions of the Pratt and Whitney RL-10A-3 uprated rocket engines and were canted outboard 4 degrees. The helium heater exhaust nozzle was set in the center of the heat shield. A diverter was used on some tests to divert the secondary exhaust flow outward parallel to the heat shield. The secondary exhaust nozzle and diverter are shown in Figure 5.4-36. Cold hydrogen was used to simulate the hydrogen-rich combustion products of the prototype heater exhaust. The model engine and exhaust parameters are presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL ENGINE AND EXHAUST PARAMETERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Engine</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Pressure: 350 psia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Temperature: 5260°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/F Ratio: 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ: 1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex: 4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pex: 0.637 psia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Composition: 62.5% H₂O₂, 37.5% H₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helium Heater</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Pressure: 15 psia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Temperature: 530°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust Composition: 100% H₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Area: 0.229 in²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The instrumentation for the first series of tests consisted of pressure transducers and heat transfer gages as shown in Figure 5.4-37. Pressure and heat transfer probes were also used to survey the exit conditions of the nozzles. For the second series of tests the heat shield was instrumented for pressure, temperature and heat transfer as shown in Figure 5.4-38. A single pressure transducer was installed in the heat shield on the model centerline for a cross check on the extensive pressure data obtained in the first series of tests. Eleven (11) chromel-alumel thermocouples were imbedded in the heat shield to measure the local heat shield temperature. Heat transfer rates were determined by a technique that relies on sensing the transient surface temperature of the model heat shield. The sensing element is a thin film platinum strip fused on a flat pyrex substrate. The film temperature is equal to the instantaneous surface temperature. The output of the heat transfer gage is fed through an analog network which converts the signal from one representing temperature to one directly proportional to the instantaneous heat transfer rate.

Model Test Parametric Data (First Series)

Data were obtained to determine the variation of base pressure and heat transfer with altitude and the effect of base plate height, secondary exhaust flow with and without diverter, and combustor pressure. A constant volume combustor was used in these tests as described in Reference 5-14.

Variation with Altitude and Radial Distance

Test data were taken with the base plate at two axial locations. The standard base plate height (2.26 inches from nozzle exit) is shown in Figure 5.4-35. The second base plate position was 3.12 inches from the nozzle exit.

The standard configuration was run at an altitude of 200,000 feet several times. The base pressure and heat transfer distribution from these repeat runs are shown in Figure 5.4-39 and provide an indication of the repeatability of data.

The base pressure distributions across the base are shown for the two base plate configurations in Figures 5.4-40 and 5.4-41. Heat transfer data taken from the altitude series are presented in Figure 5.4-42 and 5.4-43 and indicate the same trends with altitude as the pressure data.

Effect of Base Plate Height

The effects of base plate height (2.26 and 3.12 inches from nozzle exit) on base pressure and heat transfer are shown in Figures 5.4-44 and 5.4-45, respectively. The actual difference in height was small and a large influence would not be expected. These two sets of data were taken at slightly different rocket chamber conditions which tend to obscure any comparison. By plotting the ratio base static pressure/chamber pressure, the effect of these differences should be minimized.

5-26
5.4.3 (Continued)

Effect of Secondary Exhaust

To simulate the secondary exhaust, room temperature hydrogen was injected into the center of the base. Two cases were investigated, 1) hydrogen was injected directly into the base region, and 2) a flow diverter was used to turn the flow parallel to the base plate. The secondary exhaust effects (with and without diverter) on the base pressure and heat transfer distribution are presented in Figures 5.4-46 and 5.4-47, respectively.

Effect of Variable Chamber Pressure

A range of combustor pressures ranging from 1/3 to 5 times the nominal design were tested. The effect of varying chamber pressure on the local base pressure is shown in Figures 5.4-48 and 5.4-49 for both the case of a constant ratio of ambient static to chamber pressure and for a constant ambient static pressure, respectively. In both cases, there are large differences in base static pressure/chamber pressure ratio with the highest chamber pressure showing the lowest value. This shows a very significant chamber pressure or Reynolds number effect since the base pressure has been non-dimensionalized by dividing through by the chamber pressure.

The effect of chamber pressure on base heat transfer measurements are presented in Figures 5.4-50 through 5.4-52. The effect for the case of a constant ratio of ambient static to chamber pressure and for a constant ambient pressure are presented in Figure 5.4-50 and 5.4-51, respectively. Heat transfer data at the constant ratio of ambient to chamber pressure is replotted in Figure 5.4-52 as a function of chamber pressure. The heat transfer data have been correlated with the local base pressure and are presented in Figure 5.4-53. These data fall on a straight line with a slope of 0.96.

Model Test Parametric Data (Second Series)

Data were obtained from the second series of tests using the constant pressure combustor as described in Reference 5-15. These data indicate the effects of chamber pressure and temperature; and the base recovery temperature based on model test data was determined.

Recovery Temperature

The technique employed to determine the recovery temperature consisted of simultaneously heating the heat shield and gages to consecutively higher temperatures and recording the corresponding heat transfer rates. Plots of heat transfer versus gage temperature were then made with the purpose of extrapolating the data to zero heat transfer rate and recording the intersecting point on the abscissa of gage temperature as the indicated recovery temperature. It was not possible to maintain the heat shield and gage temperatures exactly equal except at room temperature; therefore, the gages were in most cases only nominally equal in temperature to the heat shield. Typical data obtained by this technique are shown in Figure 5.4-54, additional data are contained in Reference 5-15.
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Effect of Chamber Pressure

The base heat shield heat transfer rates are presented as a function of the combustion chamber pressure at various values of \( r/r_0 \) in Figure 5.4-55. These heat transfer rates are also presented in Figure 5.4-56 as a function of the local heat shield pressure. The effect of chamber pressure on the recovery temperature for various ratios of \( r/r_0 \) is presented in Figure 5.4-57. The slope of the curves give the variation of recovery temperature with chamber pressure at each gage location. The actual values of recovery temperatures expressed as a percentage of the combustion chamber temperature are shown in Figure 5.4-58 as a function of combustion chamber pressure. These data were obtained at a constant ratio of chamber pressure to ambient pressure \( (P_c/P_\infty) \) of 106x10^3 (which corresponds to \( P_c = 350 \) psia at 200,000 feet). This ratio represents conditions normally referred to as a "choked base flow" for this model configuration.

Limited data were also obtained as a ratio of chamber pressure to ambient pressure of 11.3x10^3 (which corresponds to \( P_c = 350 \) psia at 140,000 feet) at chamber pressures of 85, 200, 350, 525 and 700 psia and at several wall temperatures. Only the variation in recovery temperature with chamber pressure can be implied from these data and not actual values of recovery temperature. The upper graph of Figure 5.4-59 shows the variation in heat transfer rate with chamber pressure for several gage locations (or various ratios of \( r/r_0 \)), at a fixed heat shield temperature of 530°R and \( P_c/P_\infty = 11.3x10^3 \). The recovery temperature as a function of chamber pressure for various ratios of \( r/r_0 \) is also shown in the bottom graph of Figure 5.4-59. Data were obtained which show the effects of chamber pressure on the choking pressure ratio. While the data are limited, it appears that a trend toward increasing choking pressure ratio accompanies increases in chamber pressure. A plot of choking pressure ratio as a function of chamber pressure is shown in Figure 5.4-60.

Effect of Nozzle Wall Temperature

The effect of the initial nozzle wall temperature on base heat transfer rates and recovery temperatures were investigated. The heat shield and gage temperatures were maintained at ambient temperatures while the nozzle was heated to temperatures of 1460°R. The variation in heat transfer rate with nozzle wall temperature for heat transfer gages located at various radii from the center of the heat shield is presented in Figure 5.4-61.

A significant increase in heat transfer rate is observed as the nozzle wall temperature increases. These data obtained for the minimum (540°R) and maximum (1460°R) wall temperatures are presented in Figure 5.4-62 as a function of \( r/r_0 \). A uniform increase in heat transfer rate of approximately 40 percent is indicated across the heat shield for these conditions.
Two series of tests were conducted using a 1/10 scale model of the Saturn S-IV six-engine configuration at the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory. The first series of tests were completed in February 1962 and additional tests were conducted during May and October 1962. The second series were conducted later (full-scale flight tests had already been made) to provide supplementary pressure data for trajectory and performance analyses. Data presented in this section are representative data taken from References 5-16 and 5-17. These data show general magnitudes, trends, and parameter effects. Complete data presentation and detail descriptions are contained in the references.

Model Description and Test Conditions

The first series of tests utilized a 1/10 scale Saturn S-IV six-engine model configuration. The model consisted of six nozzles \((A/A^* = 39.87)\) and an instrumented base plate which was shock mounted from the plenum chamber. The six-engine model used a constant pressure combustor. The hydrogen and oxygen gases are stored under pressure in separate tubes. A mylar diaphragm is mechanically ruptured, allowing the gases to mix and then be ignited prior to discharging through the nozzles. In the nominal position, the nozzles were canted radially outboard at an angle of 6 degrees. The model configuration (from the heat shield aft) used for the first series of tests is shown in Figure 5.4-63. This model was tested at the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory for an altitude range of 120,000 to 220,000 feet, which was achieved by duplicating the ambient pressure. The second series of tests utilized a hexagonal shaped heat shield rather than the round heat shield used in the first series of tests as shown in Figure 5.4-64. The model engine parameters are presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL ENGINE PARAMETERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propellants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PMR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pc</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tc</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(\gamma)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A/A^</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exhaust Composition</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For helium heater exhaust simulation, a small section in the center of the base heat shield was replaced by a nozzle. This nozzle was fitted with a removable flow-diverter attachment, which diverted the flow outboard parallel to the heat shield. A schematic of the secondary flow arrangement is shown in Figure 5.4-65. A preheated hydrogen-nitrogen mixture was used to simulate the prototype helium heater exhaust flow.
The base of the model, which is located in the plane of the heat shield, was instrumented with heat transfer and pressure instrumentation as shown in Figure 5.4-66 for the first series of tests. Extensive pressure instrumentation was employed on the heat shield during the second series of tests. Twelve pressure transducers were located on radii between and in line with the model engines. Two redundant pressure tap locations were provided to check the base flow symmetry and to provide backup measurements for certain of the transducers. Two types of heat shield pressure probes were fabricated: 1) total pressure probe rakes of varying angle of attack, and 2) vertical (normal to the heat shield) pressure probes of varying heights (5/8", 1" and 1 3/4"). Six heat transfer gages measured the convective heat transfer rates to the heat shield along a ray between engines. Locations of these instruments are shown in Figure 5.4-67. A special heat-transfer gage capable of being externally heated was employed to measure the recovery temperature at the center of the base plate.

A specially made instrumented nozzle was employed in the base region. Static pressure orifices were located over the portion of the nozzle protruding into the base region and were oriented normal to the exterior nozzle contour. Rotation of the instrumented portion allowed the entire nozzle pressure profile to be determined.

Model Test Parametric Data (First Series)

The purpose of these tests was to determine base heating and pressure distribution over an altitude range of 140,000 feet to 220,000 feet. Data were obtained to determine the effects of altitude combustion chamber pressure, secondary flow, and gimbaling.

Radial Distribution

The distributions of static pressure, total pressure, and heat transfer rate across the base of the ungimbaled six-engine configuration, with no secondary flow, for an altitude of 220,000 feet are shown in Figure 5.4-68. These data have been normalized to the nominal 300 psi plenum pressure.

Altitude Series

1) Normal Combustor Operation

The effect of altitude on the base-static pressure at the various radial locations is shown in Figures 5.4-69 and 5.4-70. Base-total pressures for probe heights of 0.25 and 1.00 inches are presented in Figure 5.4-71 as a function of ambient pressure. Base heat-transfer rates as functions of ambient pressure and altitude are presented in Figure 5.4-72. These data are for the normal combustor operation and have been corrected to a plenum pressure of 300 psi.
5.4.4 (Continued)

2) Modified Combustor Operation

The effect of altitude on base-static pressure for the modified combustor operation is presented in Figures 5.4-73 and 5.4-74. Comparison of these data with similar data for normal combustor operation shows that although the center-base pressures are somewhat lower, the outboard pressures compare favorably with the normal operation. The lower center-base pressures may result from the fact that the modified combustor operation does not show the high initial overpressure characteristics of the normal operation. Heat transfer data obtained with modified combustor operation over a simulated altitude range of 160,000 to 220,000 feet are presented in Figure 5.4-75. These data indicate that with the modified combustor operation, there was no apparent altitude effect.

Details of the modified combustor operation are contained in Reference 5-16.

Effect of Combustion Chamber Pressure

The variable combustor chamber pressure series were run with two different sets of ambient conditions: 1) ambient or receiver tank pressure was the same at all combustion chamber pressures, 0.013 psia simulating 220,000 feet altitude, and 2) the ratio of plenum to ambient pressure was held constant for all runs. The ratio \(2.3 \times 10^5\) corresponds to the basic condition of 300 psi plenum pressure and 220,000 feet altitude.

1) Constant Ambient Pressure

The radial variation of base-static pressure for normal combustion chamber pressures of 100, 200, 300 and 350 psi is shown in Figure 5.4-76. The effect of plenum pressure on base-total pressure is shown in Figure 5.4-77 for nominal plenum pressures of 100, 200, 300 and 350 psi. The radial variation of base heat transfer rates for the nominal 100, 200, 300 and 350 psi plenum pressures is shown in Figure 5.4-78. These data have been corrected to the desired nominal values.

2) Constant Ratio of Ambient Pressure to Plenum Pressure

The radial variations of static pressure, total pressure, and heat transfer rates for the nominal 100, 200, 300 and 350 psi plenum pressures are shown in Figures 5.4-79, 5.4-80, and 5.4-81, respectively. These data have been corrected to the desired nominal values.

The correlation between base static pressure and heat transfer for both sets of ambient conditions is shown in Figure 5.4-82 and 5.4-83.
5.4.4 (Continued)

Effects of Secondary Flow

The effects of injecting secondary flow into the base region are shown in Figures 5.4-84 through 5.4-90. The radial distribution of static pressure is presented in Figure 5.4-84. The radial distribution of total pressure for probe heights of 1/4, 5/8 and 1 inch are presented in Figure 5.4-85. The effect on static and total pressure of diverting the secondary flow radially is shown in Figure 5.4-86. A comparison of base pressure distribution (static and total) without secondary exhaust, with secondary exhaust, and with secondary exhaust with a diverter is presented in Figure 5.4-87. The radial distributions of heat transfer for secondary flow and secondary flow with a diverter are shown in Figure 5.4-88. Heat transfer data taken with secondary flow where the 5/8 and 1 inch total pressure probes were installed are presented in Figure 5.4-89. These data indicate that the probe height had no noticeable effect on the base heat transfer rates. A comparison showing the base heat transfer distributions without secondary flow; with secondary flow; and with secondary flow with a diverter is presented in Figure 5.4-90.

Effects of Gimbaling

A schematic of the S-IV six-engine gimbaling is presented in Figure 5.4-91. The effects of gimbaling on base static pressure are shown in Figures 5.4-92 through 5.4-95; total pressure, Figures 5.4-96 through 5.4-99; and heat transfer, Figures 5.4-100 through 5.4-103. These data are plotted in such a manner that the data are combined from comparison gimbaling runs to present distributions completely across the base on three different diameters. The base schematic on each plot shows the orientation of each engine for the model altitude plotted. All gimbaling runs were made with helium heater exhaust secondary flow without a diverter.

Model Test Parametric Data (Second Series)

The primary objective of these tests was to obtain base thrust and nozzle drag measurements. These data are discussed in detail in Reference 5-17. The secondary objectives were to define the effects of the helium heater exhaust flow, and to determine the base recovery temperature.

Effect of Secondary Exhaust

The effect of the secondary exhaust flow on the base static pressure profiles along a ray between engines and along a ray in line with an engine are presented in Figures 5.4-104 and 5.4-105. Heat shield vertical probe pressure data along a ray between engines with and without secondary exhaust are presented in Figure 5.4-106 through 5.4-108.

Nozzle outer surface pressure profiles without and with secondary exhaust flow as functions of nozzle azimuth and height above the heat shield are shown in Figures 5.4-109 through 5.4-112.
5.4.4 (Continued)

The effect of the secondary exhaust on the heat shield heat-transfer rates is shown in Figure 5.4-113.

Recovery Temperature

Data obtained with the heated heat-transfer gage are shown as a function of gage temperature in Figure 5.4-114 along with an extrapolation of the data to an indicated recovery temperature of 2190°F.

5.4.5 Model Test Data Comparison

Different types of tests have been conducted using scale models of the S-IV stage. A partial listing of the different parameters and test conditions are presented in Table 5.4-2. Due to the different test conditions, it is difficult to make comparisons between the parameter data from each test. For general trends, a comparison of the helium heater exhaust effects on heating and pressure environments are compared in Figures 5.4-115 and 5.4-116, respectively. No attempt was made to isolate the parameter effect from the different test conditions at which these data were recorded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF TEST</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>NO. OF ENGINES</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>ALTITUDE RANGE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combustion Model - Long Duration</td>
<td>AEDC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>118,500 to 152,500 feet</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Flow Model</td>
<td>AEDC &amp; FEC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/27.75</td>
<td>100,000 to 194,000 feet</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>5-9 &amp; 5-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot-Flow Model - Short Duration</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>125,000 to 250,000 feet</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>5-12 - 5-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot-Flow Model - Short Duration</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>140,000 to 220,000 feet</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>5-16 &amp; 5-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 5.4-1. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE COMBUSTION MODEL-BASE REGION CONFIGURATION
NOTE: DIMENSIONS ARE IN INCHES

FIGURE 5.4-2. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE COMBUSTION MODEL - HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST NOZZLE AND DIVERTER
NOTE: AXIAL TRAVERSING PROBE NOT SHOWN

FIGURE 5.4-3. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE COMBUSTION MODEL - BASE HEAT SHIELD INSTRUMENTATION
Figure 5.4-5. S-IV 4-Engine 1/10 Scale Combustion Model - Effect of Secondary Exhaust on Base Static Pressure Distribution
I YAW AXIS - ROLL

FIGURE 5.4-6. VIEW LOOKING FORWARD

P = PITCH  Y = YAW  R = ROLL

5.66° GIMBALING INDICATED BY ARROW TOUCHING CIRCLE

4° GIMBALING INDICATED BY ARROW NOT TOUCHING CIRCLE

DASHED LINE IS GIMBALLING PERIMETER, COMMON TO ALL ENGINES

FIGURE 5.4-6. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE COMBUSTION MODEL - GIMBAL PATTERNS
FIGURE 5.4-7. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE COMBUSTION MODEL - BASE HEAT FLUX AND STATIC PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE POSITIVE PITCH/POSITIVE YAW, 4° GIMBAL CONFIGURATION
FIGURE 5.4-8. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE COMBUSTION MODEL - BASE HEAT FLUX AND STATIC PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE POSITIVE PITCH/NEGATIVE YAW, 4° GIMBAL CONFIGURATION
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FIGURE 5.4-9. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE COMBUSTION MODEL - BASE STATIC PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION FOR THE POSITIVE PITCH, 5.66° GIMBAL CONFIGURATION
FIGURE 5.4-10. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE COMBUSTION MODEL - BASE STATIC PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION FOR THE POSITIVE ROLL GIMBAL CONFIGURATION
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FIGURE 5.4-11. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE COMBUSTION MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE STATIC PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-12. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - BASE REGION CONFIGURATION
EXIT DIAMETER = .317 INCHES
A/A* = 5.856

FIGURE 5.4-13. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST NOZZLE AND DIVERTER
NOTE: The inside diameters of the static taps are approximately 0.039 inches except number 5 which is 0.064 inches. The inside diameters of the total pressure taps are approximately 0.05 inches and are approximately 0.063 inches above the heat shield.

FIGURE 5.4-14. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - BASE HEAT SHIELD INSTRUMENTATION
FIGURE 5.4-15. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - BASE REGION INSTRUMENTATION
**Figure 5.4-16. S-IV 4-Engine 1/27.75 Scale Cold Flow Model - Repeatability of Base Heat Shield Pressure Data**
\( P_{\text{ch}} = 84 \) LARGE SYMBOLS RUN 42
\( P_{\text{ch}} = 120 \) SMALL SYMBOLS RUN 72

CHAMBER TEMP = 500 °R

BASE PRESSURE/CHAMBER PRESSURE

CELL PRESSURE/CHAMBER PRESSURE

FIGURE 5.4-17. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - ALTITUDE EFFECT ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURES
GIMBAL NULL NO HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST

ALTITUDE = 150,100 FEET

$A_c/A_l$ - VENT AREA RATIO

HEAT SHIELD LOCATION
$A_c/A_l$

1.3
1.1
0.7

SYM | DAC | $A_c/A_l$
----|-----|------
 6  |   O  |  0.7
 1  |   △  |  1.1
 1  |   □  |  1.3

BASE PRESSURE, PSIA

HEAT SHIELD RADIUS, INCHES

0  0.4  0.8  1.2  1.6  2.0

0.06
0.05
0.04
0.03
0.02
0.01
0

MINIMUM AREA

NOMINAL HEAT SHIELD LOCATION

FIGURE 5.4-18. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF HEAT SHIELD LOCATION ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
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FIGURE 5.4-19, S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - GIMBAL PATTERNS
$A_c/A_l = 1.1$

NO HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST.

- **TOTAL PROBE**
- **STATIC ORIFICE**

**FIGURE 5.4-20. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION**
Figure 5.4-21. S-IV 4-Engine 1/27.75 Scale Cold Flow Model - Effect of Gimballing on Base Heat Shield Pressure Distribution
Figure 5.4-22. S-IV 4-engine 1/27.75 scale cold flow model - effect of gimballing on base heat shield pressure distribution.
FIGURE 5.4-23. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
Figure 5.4-24. S-IV 4-engine 1/27.75 scale cold flow model - effect of gimbaling on base heat shield pressure distribution.
FIGURE 5.4-25. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF LIP CONFIGURATION ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
ALTIMETER = 150,100 FEET
Pch = 84 PSIA

FIGURE 5.4-26. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST AND DIVERTER ON BASE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
\[ \frac{A_c}{A_l} = 1.1 \]

GIMBAL NULL + NO HELIUM HEATER, EXHAUST
ALTITUDE = 141,500 FEET
SIMULATED ALTITUDE = 150,000 FEET

AEDC RUN NO. 423
DAG RUN NO. 49
\[ P_{ch} = 110.2 \text{ PSIA} \]
\[ T_{ch} = 308^\circ \text{R} \]
- TOTAL PRESS
- STATIC ORIFICE

**Figure 5.4-27. S-IV 4-Engine 1/27.75 Scale Cold Flow Model - Base Heat Shield Pressure Distribution One Engine Out Configuration**
FIGURE 5.4-28. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE AND CHAMBER TEMPERATURE ON THE BASE CENTER PRESSURE
FIGURE 5.4-29. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER TEMPERATURE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION

\[ \frac{A_c}{A_i} = 11 \]

GIMBAL NULL - NO HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST
ALTITUDE = 150,000 FEET

- TOTAL PROBE
- STATIC CRIFICE

BASE PRESSURE, PSIA

HEAT SHIELD RADIUS, INCHES
FIGURE 5.4-30. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER TEMPERATURE ON THE BASE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-31. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER TEMPERATURE ON VENT AREA PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION.
Figure 5.4-32. S-IV 4-Engine 1/27.75 Scale Cold Flow Model - Vent Area Pressure Distribution
FIGURE 5.4-33. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION FOR ALTITUDES GREATER THAN CRITICAL
FIGURE 5.4-34. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/27.75 SCALE COLD FLOW MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE FOR ALTITUDES ABOVE AND BELOW THE CRITICAL ALTITUDE
FIGURE 5.4-35. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE REGION CONFIGURATION
THROAT DIA. = 0.160 INCHES
EXIT DIA. = 0.540 INCHES

NOTE: HYDROGEN GAS, AT THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS, WAS USED TO SIMULATE THE PROTOTYPE HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST. (SECONDARY EXHAUST)

CHAMBER TEMPERATURE: 530°F
CHAMBER PRESSURE: 15 PSIA

FIGURE 5-436. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST NOZZLE AND DIVERTER
FIGURE 5.4-37. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE REGION INSTRUMENTATION (FIRST SERIES)
FIGURE 5.4-38. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE REGION INSTRUMENTATION (SECOND SERIES)
ALTITUDE-200,000 FT. $P_R = 350$ PSIA

SYMBOLS INDICATE 4 REPEAT RUNS TAKEN AT VARIOUS TIMES DURING THE PROGRAM

FIGURE 5.4-39. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - DATA REPEATABILITY
FIGURE 5.4-40. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS
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FIGURE 5.4-41. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS (INCREASED BASE PLATE HEIGHT)
FIGURE 5.4-42. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT TRANSFER DISTRIBUTION (INCREASED BASE PLATE HEIGHT)
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FIGURE 5.4-43. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - CORRELATION OF BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT TRANSFER AND AMBIENT PRESSURE

$\text{AMBIENT PRESSURE/CHAMBER PRESSURE } \times 10^5$

$\text{HEATING RATE } \times 10^{-4}$

$\text{HEATING RATE - BTU/FT}^2/$SEC

$r_o = 2.64 \text{ IN.}$
**Figure 5.4-44.** S-IV 4-Engine 1/10 Scale Shock Tube Model - Effect of Base Plate Location on Base Pressure Distributions
FIGURE 5.4-45. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF BASE PLATE LOCATION BASE HEATING RATES
FIGURE 5.4-46. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF SECONDARY FLOW ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-47. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF SECONDARY EXHAUST ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEATING RATE

MODEL RADIUS - $\frac{r}{r_0}$

$\text{ALTITUDE = 150,000 FT}$

$\text{ALTITUDE = 240,000 FT}$

$\text{MINIMUM AREA}$

$\text{MINIMUM AREA}$

$\text{CHAMBER PRESSURE, } \frac{P}{R} = 350 \text{ PSIA}$

$\text{CONFIG.- NULL POSITION}$

$\text{SYN SEC. EXHAUST DIVERT.}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYN SEC. EXHAUST</th>
<th>DIVERT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_0 = 2.64 \text{ IN.}$
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FIGURE 5.4-48. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-49. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
AT CONSTANT RATIO OF AMBIENT TO ROCKET CHAMBER PRESSURE

\( \frac{P_\infty}{P_R} = 0.92 \times 10^{-5} \) EQUIVALENT TO 200,000 ft @ \( P_R = 350 \) psi

\( r_0 = 2.64 \) IN.

\( \frac{P_R}{P_{RD}} \)

1/3 N
2/3 N
N
2 N
3 N
5 N

MODEL RADIUS - \( r/r_0 \)

FIGURE 5.4-50. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE HEAT TRANSFER

5-84
FIGURE 5.4-51. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT TRANSFER
FIGURE 5.4-52. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEATING RATE
FIGURE 5.4-53. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - CORRELATION OF HEAT TRANSFER RATE WITH BASE PRESSURE

\[ n = SLOPE = 0.96 \]

\[ r_0 = 2.64 \text{ IN.} \]

SYM. \( r/r_0 \)

\( \circ \) 0.286

\( \square \) 0.523

\( \triangle \) 1.000

BASE PRESSURE - PSIA
\[ \begin{align*} 
T_B & = T_G = T_N = 540^\circ R \quad \text{(DATA FROM FIG. B-1)} \\
\triangle T_B & = 860^\circ R, T_G = \text{VARIABLE}, T_N = 540^\circ R \\
\bigcirc T_B & = 1460^\circ R, T_G = \text{VARIABLE}, T_N \approx 540^\circ R \\
\square T_B & = T_G = 540^\circ R, T_N = 1460^\circ R
\end{align*} \]

**FIGURE 5.4-54. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE REGION RECOVERY TEMPERATURE**
HEAT TRANSFER AT $r/r_o = 0.50$
AS A FUNCTION OF GAGE TEMPERATURE
T NOZZLES = 540°R (NOMINAL)
T_G & T_B NOMINALLY EQUAL

SYMBOLS OF $F$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{diamond}$</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{circle}$</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 5.4-54. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE REGION RECOVERY TEMPERATURE**
FIGURE 5.4-55. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT TRANSFER RATE
FIGURE 5.4-56. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - CORRELATION OF HEAT TRANSFER RATE WITH HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE
FIGURE 5.4-57. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE REGION RECOVERY TEMPERATURE

\[ \frac{P_C}{P_{\infty}} = 106 \times 10^3 \]

CHAMBER PRESSURE - PSIA

RECOVERY TEMPERATURE - °R

n = SLOPE
\[ \frac{P_c}{P_\infty} = 106 \times 10^3 \]

- \( T_N = 540^\circ R \)
- \( T_N = 1460^\circ R \)

**Figure 5.4-58.** S-IV 4-Engine 1/10 Scale Shock Tube Model - Effect of Chamber Pressure on Recovery Temperature/Chamber Temperature Ratio.
FIGURE 5.4-59. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE REGION HEAT TRANSFER RATE AND RECOVERY TEMPERATURE AT $P_c/P_\infty = 11.3 \times 10^3$
FIGURE 5.4-60. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON CHOKING ALTITUDE PRESSURE RATIO
FIGURE 5.4-62. S-IV 4-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF NOZZLE WALL TEMPERATURE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT TRANSFER RATES

MODEL RADIUS - \( r/r_0 \)

HEATING RATE - BTU/FT^2SEC

\( r_0 = 2.64 \) IN.

\( P_c = 350 \) PSIA

\( P_c/P_\infty = 106 \times 10^3 \)

T NOZZLE WALL = 1450° R

T NOZZLE WALL = 540° P

Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4, Q_5
FIGURE 5.4-63. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE REGION CONFIGURATION (FIRST SERIES)
FIGURE 5.4-64. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE REGION CONFIGURATION (SECOND SERIES)
FIGURE 5.4-65. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST NOZZLE AND DIVERTER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>RADIUS (IN.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 5.4-66.** S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE HEAT SHIELD INSTRUMENTATION (FIRST SERIES)
FIGURE 5.4-67. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE HEAT SHIELD INSTRUMENTATION (SECOND SERIES)
FIGURE 5.4-68. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE HEAT SHIELD
RADIAL DISTRIBUTION OF NOMINAL STATIC AND TOTAL PRESSURE AND
HEAT TRANSFER RATES
NORMAL COMBUSTOR OPERATION

$P_R = 300$ psi (NOMINAL)

FIGURE 5.4-69. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD STATIC PRESSURE
NORMAL COMBUSTOR OPERATION

\[ P_r = 300 \text{ psi (NOMINAL)} \]

**Figure 5.4-70.** S-IV 6-Engine 1/10 Scale Shock Tube Model - Effect of Altitude on Base Heat Shield Static Pressure Distribution
FIGURE 5.4-71. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD TOTAL PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
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FIGURE 5.4- 72. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT TRANSFER RATES
MODIFIED COMBUSTOR OPERATION

FIGURE 5.4-73. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD STATIC PRESSURE.
FIGURE 5.4-74.  S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD STATIC PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-75. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT TRANSFER RATES

MODIFIED COMBUSTOR OPERATION

HEATING RATE - BTU/FT²SEC\(^{\circ}\)

ALTITUDE - 1000 FEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYM</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>RAD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYM</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>RAD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALTITUDE CHAMBER PRESSURE HELD CONSTANT AT 0.0013 psi (220,000 ft)

FIGURE 5.4- 76. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE HEAT SHIELD STATIC PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-77. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE TOTAL PRESSURE
ALTITUDE CHAMBER PRESSURE CONSTANT
AT 0.0013 PSIA (220,000 FT)

FIGURE 5.4-78. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE HEAT TRANSFER RATES
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NOMINAL $\frac{P_R}{P_\infty} = 2.30 \times 10^5$ (CONSTANT)

SOLID SYMBOLS ARE FAIRED DATA POINTS
FROM BASIC CORRELATION SERIES AND
CONSTANT $P_\infty$, VARIABLE $P_R$ SERIES

FIGURE 5.4-79. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF
CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE STATIC PRESSURE
FIGURE 5.4-80. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE TOTAL PRESSURE

NOMINAL \( P_R/P_\infty = 2.30 \times 10^5 \)

PROBE HEIGHT = 1/4

SOLID SYMBOLS ARE FAIRED DATA POINTS FROM BASIC CORRELATION SERIES AND CONSTANT \( P_\infty \), VARIABLE \( P_R \) SERIES

BASE RADIUS - INCHES

BASE TOTAL PRESSURE/CHAMBER PRESSURE \( \times 10^5 \)
Figure 5.4-81. S-IV 6-Engine 1/10 Scale Shock Tube Model - Effect of Chamber Pressure on Base Heat Transfer Rates.
ALTITUDE CHAMBER PRESSURE HELD CONSTANT
AT 0.0013 psi (220,000 FT)

FIGURE 5.4-82. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - CORRELATION OF
BASE HEAT TRANSFER RATES WITH BASE PRESSURE
FIGURE 5.4-83. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - CORRELATION OF BASE HEAT TRANSFER RATES WITH BASE PRESSURE
FIGURE 5.4-84. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE STATIC PRESSURE WITH SECONDARY EXHAUST
FIGURE 5.4-85. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE TOTAL PRESSURE WITH SECONDARY EXHAUST
ALTITUDE - 220,000 FEET

FIGURE 5.4-86. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - BASE PRESSURES WITH SECONDARY EXHAUST AND DIVERTER
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FIGURE 5.4-87. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECTS OF SECONDARY EXHAUST ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURES
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FIGURE 5.4-88. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF SECONDARY EXHAUST AND DIVERTER ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT TRANSFER RATES
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BASE HEAT TRANSFER RATES WITH SECONDARY EXHAUST
5/8" TOTAL PROBES INSTALLED

BASE HEAT TRANSFER RATES WITH SECONDARY EXHAUST
1" TOTAL PROBES INSTALLED

FIGURE 5.4-89. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECTS OF SECONDARY EXHAUST ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT TRANSFER RATES
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FIGURE 5.4-90. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECTS OF SECONDARY EXHAUST ON BASE HEAT TRANSFER RATES
FIGURE 5.4-91. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - GIMBAL PATTERNS
ALTITUDE = 220,000 FEET

STANDARD UNGIMBALED OPERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYM</th>
<th>RUN</th>
<th>SCHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HEAT SHIELD RADIUS - INCHES

FIGURE 5.4-92. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD STATIC PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-93. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD STATIC PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
ALTITUDE = 220,000 FEET

STANDARD UNGIMBALED OPERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYM</th>
<th>RUN</th>
<th>SCHEL</th>
<th>RUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 5.4-94. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECTS OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
STANDARD UNGIMBALED OPERATION

FIGURE 5.4-96. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECTS OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD TOTAL PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-97. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD TOTAL PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-98. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD TOTAL PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-99. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD TOTAL PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
FIGURE 5.4-100. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT FLUX DISTRIBUTION
Figure 5.4-101. S-IV 6-Engine 1/10 Scale Shock Tube Model - Effect of Gimballing on Base Heat Shield Total Flux Distribution
ALTIMETRY = 220,000 FEET

STANDARD UNGIMBALED OPERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYM</th>
<th>RUN</th>
<th>SCHED.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 5.4-103. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF GIMBALLING ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEAT FLUX DISTRIBUTION
\[ 25.6 = \frac{P_{\text{EXIT}}}{P_{\infty}} \quad \text{FOR SECONDARY EXHAUST NOZZLE} \]

\text{FIGURE 5.4-104. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF SECONDARY EXHAUST ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION}
25.6 = \frac{P_{\text{EXIT}}}{P_{\infty}} \quad \text{FOR SECONDARY EXHAUST NOZZLE}

FIGURE 5.4-105. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF SECONDARY EXHAUST ON BASE HEAT SHIELD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION

$P_{\infty} = 0.00335 \text{ PSIA}$

BASE RADIUS - INCHES

BASE STATIC PRESSURE/AMBIENT PRESSURE
FIGURE 5.4-106. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECTS OF SECONDARY FLOW ON HEAT SHIELD VERTICAL PROBE PRESSURES (ALONG A RAY BETWEEN ENGINES)
FIGURE 5.4-107. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECTS OF SECONDARY FLOW ON HEAT SHIELD VERTICAL PROBE PRESSURES (ALONG A RAY BETWEEN ENGINES)

DATA AVERAGED FROM 4 RUNS

PROBE HEIGHT = 1.00 INCH

WITH SECONDARY EXHAUST

W/O SECONDARY EXHAUST

\[ P_{\infty} = 0.00335 \text{ PSIA} \]

BASE RADIUS - INCHES

VERTICAL PROBE PRESSURE/AMBIENT PRESSURE

TRANSUDER NUMBER

-5-142
FIGURE 5.4-108. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECTS OF SECONDARY EXHAUST ON HEAT SHIELD VERTICAL PROBE PRESSURES (ALONG A RAY BETWEEN ENGINES)
FIGURE 5.4-109. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - NOZZLE SURFACE PRESSURE (NO SECONDARY EXHAUST)
FIGURE 5.4-111. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - NOZZLE SURFACE PRESSURE (WITH SECONDARY EXHAUST)
FIGURE 5.4-113. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - EFFECT OF SECONDARY FLOW ON HEAT SHIELD HEAT TRANSFER RATES (ALONG A RAY BETWEEN ENGINES)
FIGURE 5.4-114. S-IV 6-ENGINE 1/10 SCALE SHOCK TUBE MODEL - HEAT SHIELD RECOVERY TEMPERATURE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1/10 COMBUSTION MODEL - AEDC</th>
<th>1/27.75 COLD FLOW MODEL - AEDC</th>
<th>1/10 SHOCK TUBE MODEL - CAL, 1ST SERIES</th>
<th>1/10 SHOCK TUBE MODEL - CAL, 2ND SERIES</th>
<th>1/10 SHOCK TUBE MODEL - CAL, 1ST SERIES</th>
<th>1/10 SHOCK TUBE MODEL - CAL, 2ND SERIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF ENGINES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/F RATIO</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5:1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST</td>
<td>AMBIENT AIR</td>
<td>15 PSIA 100% H₂ @ 530° R</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>PREHEATED HYDROGEN-NITROGEN MIXTURE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIMBALING</td>
<td>±5.66° &amp; 4° ALL RUNS WITH HELIUM HEATER EXHAUST</td>
<td>±1, ±2, ±3, ±4, AND ±5</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>5.6°</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>1/27.75</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPELLANT</td>
<td>LOX - H₂</td>
<td>AIR @ 1000° R NOMINAL</td>
<td>LOX - H₂</td>
<td>LOX - H₂</td>
<td>LOX - H₂</td>
<td>LOX - H₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINE CANT</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>4°</td>
<td>6°</td>
<td>6°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMBER PRESSURE</td>
<td>350 PSIA</td>
<td>84 PSIA</td>
<td>350 PSIA</td>
<td>350 PSIA</td>
<td>300 PSIA</td>
<td>300 PSIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTITUDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF TEST</td>
<td>LONG DURATION</td>
<td>COLD FLOW</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION (SHOCK TUBE)</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION</td>
<td>SHORT DURATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA RATIO</td>
<td>SAME AS PROTOTYPE</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 5.4-115. COMPARISON OF SECONDARY EXHAUST EFFECTS ON BASE HEAT SHIELD HEATING RATES
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FIGURE 5.4-116. COMPARISON OF SECONDARY EXHAUST EFFECTS ON BASE HEAT SHIELD STATIC PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
The S-IV stage was flown six times; the first on the SA-5 flight on January 27, 1964.

Instrumentation was located on the stages to obtain data to verify design adequacy and to provide, if possible, correlation with model data.

The first two stages (S-IV-5 and -6) were instrumented to determine the net heat flux to the heat shield by calorimeter measurements. The locations of the heat shield instrumentation for S-IV-5 and -6 are shown in Figure 5.5-1. The only significant differences between the first two flights were that slug-type calorimeters were used on S-IV-5 and asymptotic calorimeters were used on S-IV-6.

The second two stages (S-IV-7 and -9, which were flown out of order) did not record base region heating rates.

The S-IV-8 and -10 stages had three calorimeters and four pressure sensors. The range of the pressure sensors was 0 to 1 psia. This was unfortunate since the accuracy of the gages was approximately the same as the expected measurement (0.02 psia). The location of these instruments are shown in Figure 5.5-1.

Flight data for the S-IV stage base region are presented in Figure 5.5-2. The SA-5 flight data are different from the other flight data. This difference is believed to be caused by the change in instrumentation with the SA-6, -8 and -10 data being more reliable.

Attempts were made on the SA-5 flight to determine the convective and radiation heating rates by using black and gold surface calorimeters. The radiant heat flux was to be determined by measuring the difference between the high absorptivity black calorimeters, and the low absorptivity gold calorimeters which measure primarily convective heat flux. The gold calorimeter surfaces deteriorated during flight and the data from the calorimeters (black and gold) are approximately the same.

Average measured heat flux ranged from 0.68 to 1.14 watts/cm² with peak transients of 2.16 watts/cm² occurring at S-IV-6 engine start. (See Figure 5.5-2.) S-IV-8 flight data have similar trends and magnitudes as the S-IV-6 flight data. The average level of absorbed heat flux for each of the calorimeters was slightly higher on S-IV-10 than on S-IV-6 and S-IV-8. The rapid rise in heat flux measured by the inboard calorimeter on S-IV-10 beginning at 350 seconds is due to the helium heater cycling to single coil operation which results in a higher helium heater exhaust temperature. The decrease in heat flux of the inboard calorimeter at approximately 500 seconds is again due to a change in helium heater exhaust temperature which decreased due to hydrogen tank step pressurization at 491 seconds. (See Figure 5.5-2.)
Base pressure measurements, with a range of 0 to 0.7 N/cm\(^2\) (1 psi), were flown for the first time on the S-IV-8 heat shield. The base pressure data show the effects of LOX chilldown gas on the compartment pressure and reveal the effect on base pressure of and retro rocket gas impingement after the heat shield clears the interstage. (See Figure 5.5-3.) Pressure levels were similar to model test data. The pressures measured were below the usual expected measurement accuracies so it is difficult to determine the actual force on the heat shield. However, they do indicate that the pressures are not significantly higher than the test results, and most likely, may be lower.

Four base pressure sensors (0 to 0.7 N/cm\(^2\) measuring range) located on the S-IV-10 base heat shield failed to give useful data; they appear to have been plugged during most of the S-IV flight.
FIGURE 5.5-1. S-IV BASE HEAT SHIELD INSTRUMENTATION
This section presents comparison of flight data with selected model data. Parameter effects are included. The radial distribution of the heat flux for the S-IV-5 heat shield compared with model data are presented in the upper graph of Figure 5.6-1. A shift in the location of peak heating outboard as compared to the model data and a greater peak heating rate were experienced during the S-IV-5 flight. The radial distribution of the heat flux for the S-IV-6 heat shield compared to the six-engine shock tube model data with and without simulated helium heater secondary flow are shown in the lower graph of Figure 5.6-1. These comparisons were based on model test data taken from Reference 5-16.

Additional model data were determined from the second series of tests (Reference 5-17). These data are compared with the flight data from the S-IV-6 stage and are presented in Figures 5.6-2 and 5.6-3. The flight data/model data comparison without secondary exhaust is presented in Figure 5.6-2 and the comparison with secondary exhaust is presented in Figure 5.6-3. In general, the model data agree well with the flight data. Flight data without secondary exhaust was measured at the start of S-IV burn prior to the establishment of secondary flow.
FIGURE 5.6-1. COMPARISON OF S-IV STAGE FLIGHT HEATING RATE WITH MODEL TEST DATA
FIGURE 5.6-2. COMPARISON OF S-IV STAGE FLIGHT DATA AND MODEL TEST DATA - WITHOUT SECONDARY EXHAUST
FIGURE 5.6-3. COMPARISON OF S-IV STAGE FLIGHT DATA AND MODEL TEST DATA – WITH SECONDARY EXHAUST

MODEL DATA AVERAGED FROM 12 RUNS
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6.0 SATURN S-II STAGE

6.1 S-II CONFIGURATION

The S-II stage is the second stage of the Saturn V vehicle. Separation from the S-IC stage is accomplished using a dual-plane method. The first separation plane is at Station 0 (16 inches forward of the engine exit plane) and separation at this point may occur at altitudes as low as 53.4 km. Approximately 30 seconds after first plane separation, when dynamic pressure has dropped to a negligible value, the interstage skirt is separated at Station 196 and falls away without any mechanical guidance.

Propulsion for the S-II stage is provided by a cluster of five Rocketdyne J-2 engines arranged as shown in Figure 6.1-1. A heat shield located at Station 44 (aft face) protects the components and structure in the base region from the recirculating exhaust gases of the engine cluster. Flexible curtains between the engines and the heat shield permit engine movement, and the outboard engines are gimbaled for control. Extreme engine movements from null (including over-shoot) are limited to 7.5 degrees in both pitch and yaw or 10.6 degrees resultant toward or away from the center engine (or in the plane normal to this movement). Because of engine and stage misalignments and deflection (compliance) of the thrust structure under load, the exact alignment of the engines is difficult to define. In order to assure that the thrust structure compliance does not cause engine deflections which increase the severity of the base environment, the outboard engines are precanted outboard under no load so that they will not be canted toward the center engine when thrust is applied. The initial precant angle was 1.8 degrees directly away from the center engine, but this has been changed to account for changes in the thrust structure flexibility. The precant angle was increased to 2.3 degrees on the 504 vehicle to compensate for the new thrust structure which was expected to be more flexible. Subsequent evaluation of the thrust structure compliance led to the reduction of the precant angle to 1.3 degrees on AS-505, and a further reduction to 0.6 degrees was required on AS-510 to prevent possible interstage collision.
FIGURE 6.1-1. S-II BASE GEOMETRY
6.2 J-2 ENGINE CHARACTERISTICS

The J-2 engine used on the S-II stage was uprated during development by increasing chamber pressure and propellant flow rate. The final flight version produces 230,000 lbf at altitude with a nozzle stagnation pressure of 718 psia and an overall mixture ratio (oxygen/hydrogen) of 5.5. Although this mixture ratio is maintained for most of the stage operation, the engines are started at a propellant mixture (PMR) of 5.0 then switched to 5.5 with a later shift to 4.7 near the end of the flight. Another propulsion system variable which has been added in later flights is the center engine cutoff (CECO) to reduce the vehicle acceleration. The operation of the propulsion system can be varied to suit particular flight objectives, and some representative values of flight timing are outlined in Table 6.2-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>TIME FROM IGNITION (SECONDS)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHIFT TO PMR = 5.5</td>
<td>INTERSTAGE SEPARATION</td>
<td>CECO</td>
<td>SHIFT TO PMR = 4.7</td>
<td>SHUT-DOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Nominal</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Engine-Out</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504 Flight</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>287.3</td>
<td>371.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505 Flight</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>295.5</td>
<td>324.4</td>
<td>388.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The J-2 engine has a regeneratively (hydrogen) cooled nozzle with an area ratio of 27.15. Turbine exhaust gases are introduced through 180 orifices between the tubes which form the nozzle wall in a plane approximately 48 inches forward of the exit (area ratio = 13.2). Typical data which illustrate the mixture ratio effect and mass flow of the turbine exhaust are given in Table 6.2-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMBUSTION CHAMBER</th>
<th>TURBINE EXHAUST</th>
<th>OVERALL ENGINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxidizer Flow (lbm/sec)</td>
<td>454.39</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>457.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Flow (lbm/sec)</td>
<td>79.54</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>83.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Flow (lbm/sec)</td>
<td>533.93</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>541.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture Ratio (O/F)</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6-4
Exhaust plume characteristics vary with mixture ratio and chamber pressure. Typical gas property variations for an overall mixture ratio of 5 are presented in Table 6.2-3, with corresponding plume isomachs shown in Figure 6.2-1. These data from Reference 6-1 were obtained using the last right running characteristic as a start line with smoothing of the flow directions near the nozzle centerline to eliminate negative flow angles. The Mach number along the start line varies from 3.39 at the lip to 4.1 on the axis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MACH. NUMBER</th>
<th>PRESSURE (PSF)</th>
<th>TEMPERATURE (°R)</th>
<th>SPECIFIC HEAT RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>1.2937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>1.3184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1.3342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>1.3438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>1.3503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1.3551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.3603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1.3642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.3670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mixture Ratio = 5.17  
Chamber Pressure = 680 psia  
Chamber Temperature = 5958°R  
Molecular Weight = 12.423  
Propellant analysis based on equilibrium composition during expansion.
Altitude = 300,000 feet
Exit radius = $R_e = 38.5$ inches
Thrust chamber condition:
PMR = 5.17
$P_o = 680$ psia
$T_o = 3310$ K
$A = \text{Start line}$

Figure 6.2-1 Typical J-2 engine plume.
6.3 PREDICTION METHODS

Pre-flight base heating predictions for the S-II stage were based on model test results for convection and analytical predictions of radiation.

Radiation

Because of the significant scale effects anticipated in the water vapor radiation from the exhaust plume, it was necessary to rely on analytical techniques to estimate the radiance to the heat shield. Two independent radiance estimates were made using different techniques. The design environment (Reference 6-2) was calculated by NAR using total emissivity data of Hottel, and later spot checks were made using a band model representative of the water vapor radiation with data averaged over 25 cm⁻¹ spectral intervals.

The exhaust plume properties used in the total emissivity radiation prediction were determined by a method of characteristics for the free plume with estimates of properties in the interaction regions between plumes. The pressure and temperature in the interaction regions were assumed to be uniform normal to the impingement plane with variations in the axial direction.

The exhaust plume for the five-engine cluster used in the band model prediction was approximated by using an axisymmetric method-of-characteristics program with the flow configuration shown in Figure 6.3-1. The flow was expanded into a cone at the nozzle exit then turned into a cylinder with a radius equal to the distance from the nozzle axis to the impingement plane. It was necessary to use a 45 degree angle cone (Figure 6.3-2); rather than one approximating the free boundary so that an oblique shock could exist at the cone/cylinder corner. The arrangement of radial planes used in the flow field approximation is shown by Figure 6.3-3.

The points in the base region at which the radiant flux was calculated are illustrated in Figure 6.3-4 and a comparison of the band model results with the total emissivity calculation is presented in Table 6.3-1. In general, the predictions of the two methods are in good agreement.

Convection

Since the S-II stage operates at altitudes which cannot be conveniently duplicated in continuous flow test facilities, the short duration base heating test technique developed by Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory was used. Experience with the S-IV indicated that flight measurements were in reasonably good agreement with unscaled results from the 0.1 scale short duration model (Reference 6-3), so the same technique of using unscaled model data was chosen to define convective heating on the S-II. The opposing effects of scale on the heat transfer coefficient and recovery temperature produces characteristics similar to those depicted in Figure 6.3-5. Because of problems with the turbine exhaust simulation on the model and the apparent predominant effect of the turbine exhaust in cooling the reversed flow, the prediction method proved to be conservative.
During the model test program it was found that any inboard deflection of an outboard engine would cause an increase in convective heating in the base region. A full actuator movement (in one plane) of 7.5 degrees combined with the corresponding trim deflections from other engines caused the heat shield convective heating to increase approximately 400 percent. Even moderate deflections of less than 1 degree indicated significant increases in heating. Due to the sensitivity of the heating to gimbaling and the inability to characterize the deflection effects so that they could be systematically investigated, it was necessary to test failure cases and the resulting trim deflections for each failure mode likely to be of interest. Initially, generous 3-sigma control movements were included with trim and failure effects in the test patterns, but the high heating encountered caused a change to more realistic conditions. These included the failure condition to be tested with 3-sigma engine misalignments added along with the resultant trim deflections. After a time, the sensitivity to deflection caused a more thorough investigation of engine deflections, and it was found that structural compliance of the thrust cone caused significant inboard deflections which were added to the misalignment and trim deflections. The resulting high heating rates for the nominal and outboard-engine-out conditions caused concern that the heat shield design might be marginal, so the engines were precanted outboard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT</th>
<th>COORDINATES (1) - INCHES</th>
<th>RADIATIVE FLUX - WATTS/CM²</th>
<th>TOTAL EMISSIVITY REFERENCE 6-2</th>
<th>BAND MODEL REFERENCE 6-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat Shield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS-1</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS-2</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>-70.7</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nozzle Exit (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE-1</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE-2</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust Structure (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-1</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>-140.0</td>
<td>-212</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS-2</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>-124.5</td>
<td>-212</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS-1</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>-140.0</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS-2</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>-140.0</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:  (1) See Figure 6.3-4.
        (2) Surface at NE-1 faces aft at the nozzle exit, while NE-2 faces laterally inboard.
        (3) Without the interstage skirt in place.
FIGURE 6.3-1. S-II RADIATION PREDICTION - TYPICAL FLOW FIELD SECTION ACROSS THREE NOZZLE EXITS
FIGURE 6.3-2. CONFIGURATION FOR AXISYMMETRIC FLOW FIELD APPROXIMATION

FIGURE 6.3-3. LOCATION OF PLANES USED IN APPROXIMATING THE S-II FLOW FIELD
FIGURE 6.3-4. LOCATION OF POINTS IN THE BASE REGION AT WHICH BAND MODEL CALCULATIONS WERE MADE
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NOTE: This figure is an illustration only and should not be used for determining magnitudes of convective heating rate.

FIGURE 6.3-5. EXAMPLE OF ASSUMED MODEL AND PROTOTYPE HEATING
All base heating tests on the Saturn S-II were conducted using short-duration tests with no simulated external flow. Two models were used. First, a model in which the base geometry could be varied was tested in 1962 (Reference 6-4) to evaluate the effects of the number and spacing of the engines. Subsequent testing was performed using a model of the prototype base region. Tests of this model were conducted first at Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory during 1963 and 1964 (Reference 6-5) and then at the Impulse Base Flow Facility at MSFC in 1964 and 1965. Both of the test models were 0.04 scale and used scaled J-2 nozzle contours (area ratio of 27.5 and exit diameter of 3.08 inches).

Data from the two tests will be presented along with brief descriptions of the models. In presenting the data, effects of parametric variations will be emphasized rather than distributions of heating rates in the base region.

**Parametric Model Tests**

The parametric test model, Figure 6.4-1, was designed so that the engine and base spacing could be varied. There was a movable cylindrical skirt to simulate the interstage structure and a flame deflector to simulate the type heat shield under consideration for the S-II stage. In addition to the parametric variations available in the five-engine configuration, the center J-2 model nozzle could be removed for 4-engine tests. Due to the large number of variations tested, much of the data available came from a single run with no repeat runs to check the validity of the data. Since repeat runs of a given model configuration often exhibit data scatter of ±20 percent above the mean, caution should be used in evaluating the data as being an absolute indication of the parametric variation under consideration.

Model data were recorded by photographing oscilloscopes and was usually limited to about 20 measurements per test firing. Instrumentation on the model base consisted of 36 calorimeters and 41 surface pressures. In addition, a contoured strip was available for attachment to the exterior of the nozzles which had 27 calorimeters arranged in three rows. Calorimeters were the thin film type with a platinum resistance element deposited on a Pyrex substrate. Pressure measurements were made using piezo-electric transducers mounted to minimize acceleration effects from the model firing.

Parametric variations during the test included engine spacing, base location, interstage length, flame deflector position, ambient pressure, and combustion chamber pressure. Results of these variations taken from Reference 6-4 are presented in Figures 6.4-2 through 6.4-15. Brief comments on the results of each variation are presented below.
6.4 (Continued)

Engine Spacing

Results of varying the engine mounting circle diameter presented in Figures 6.4-2 and 6.4-3 illustrate the different characteristic distributions of heating and pressure and show a marked reduction of heating with increasing engine spacing on the four-engine configuration. The trend in heating rate on the five-engine configuration is not well defined due to lack of data, but the trend in base pressures indicates that the heating rates should be expected to decrease with increasing engine spacing.

Base Location

Effects of varying the position of the base forward of the nozzle exits are shown in Figure 6.4-4 for the five-engine configuration. This illustrates the increasing base pressure and heating rates which occur as vent areas between the engines are reduced by moving the base toward the nozzle exit plane. Results of the four-engine configuration, Figure 6.4-5, follow the same trend except for the case where the base is located at the nozzle exits. The shift in pressure distribution at this point and the slight reduction in heating rate may indicate a significant change in the base flow pattern, but since the data represent only one test run and the heating and pressure trends do not agree, no conclusion seems justified.

Interstage Length

As the interstage length is increased from flush with the base to a position in the plane of the nozzle exits an increase in base pressure would be expected, particularly in the outer portions of the base. This general trend is evident in the five-engine results, Figure 6.4-6, but in the outer areas of the four-engine base, Figure 6.4-7, insufficient pressure data are available and the trends in heating are not consistent. Much of the variation in the inner region of the base is likely to have resulted from run-to-run variations rather than the effect of the interstage.

Flame Deflector Position

In this configuration the flame deflector is sealed around the nozzles and represents a heat shield while the model base can be considered to represent the vehicle thrust structure. The important effects are the variation in base heating rates near the edge of the base and the effect of the interstage in increasing both base pressure and heating rates. These effects are illustrated in Figure 6.4-8 for the five-engine configuration, but since data on the four-engine configuration in Figure 6.4-9 are limited to the inner region of the base, the trend near the edge of the base was not documented.
Ambient Pressure

Base pressures and heating rates are presented in Figures 6.4-10 through 6.4-13, but no effects of pressure are apparent except in the outer base regions. This result is not unexpected since the range of altitudes for S-II operation did not go low enough for the ambient pressure to have a significant influence.

Combustion Chamber Pressure

Simulated model combustor pressure was varied from approximately 300 to 700 psia with representative effects on base pressure and heat transfer rate as shown in Figure 6.4-14. The indicated variation of base recovery temperature with chamber pressure and typical data taken for recovery temperature are illustrated in Figure 6.4-15. The variation in heating rate at each base temperature is an indication of the uncertainty in a particular measurement. Because of the uncertainty in recovery temperature on this test, results of the chamber pressure effects are not considered to be as accurate as those obtained later in the research test program reported in Reference 6-3.

Prototype Model Test

The prototype test model, Figure 6.4-16, was designed to simulate the flight configuration as closely as possible. Several components were simulated on the conical thrust structure and a removable interstage skirt was provided to simulate the base configuration during the time between first and second plane separations. The model was initially intended to operate at a propellant mixture ratio (PMR) of 5 with a nozzle stagnation pressure of 632 psia, but during the tests, mixture ratio of the model was varied from 4.5 to 5.5 with nozzle pressures of 546 to 715 psia to cover the range of PMR planned for the prototype.

Flexible rubber boots were used on the model to simulate the flexible heat shield curtains on the prototype and allow engine gimbaling to study various misalignment and malfunction control patterns. Preliminary tests were conducted with round heat shields representing full scale diameters of 210, 228, and 246 inches before the final 256-inch configuration shown in Figure 6.4-16 was chosen.

The prototype model was first tested at Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory (Reference 6-5) in a program consisting of approximately 350 runs and then it was transferred to MSFC for a test of approximately 700 runs. (MSFC results were used for design, but have not been published for other use.) Tests were primarily for heat transfer with comparatively little base pressure data taken. The large number of runs were required by the great number of configuration variables and the policy of making several repeat runs in tests at MSFC in an attempt to assure the data were representative. The regions of interest for heat transfer data were the nozzle walls, heat...
shield, engine components forward of the heat shield, and the thrust
structure. Tests with the interstage skirt indicated that its presence
had a large effect on the thrust structure and region forward of the heat
shield, but effects on the heat shield and nozzle walls were not significant
and often difficult to define. The parametric variation which had the
greatest effect on heating rates on the nozzles and heat shield aft surface
was engine deflection. Approximately 30 deflection patterns were tested
which represented engine and gimbal actuator failures as well as normal
engine misalignments.

Since most of the engine deflection patterns represented assumed misalignments
and actual control responses, there was generally no step-by-step variation
of a single gimbal angle to evaluate its effect, so the results are
difficult to characterize for general application. Considering this
problem, the results to be presented are intended to demonstrate the
general effect that was observed without going into details of specific
deflection patterns. The parametric variations to be reviewed include the
effect of heat shield size, interstage structure, turbo-pump exhaust
simulation, outboard engine failure, single gimbal actuator failure, dual
gimbal actuator failure, and variations in mixture ratio.

Heat Shield Size

Heat shield size was increased in an attempt to reduce heating rates in the
thrust cone (structure) area since no thermal protection was planned for the
structure and components mounted on the structure had relatively low
temperature limits. Initial experiments used heat shield diameters of 210,
228 and 256 inches (full scale) with both flat and turned edges as shown in
Figure 6.4-16. Based on the results of these tests, the 256-inch trapezoidal
heat shield was chosen for the prototype and was used on almost all of the
model tests at MSFC. During tests at CAL it was doubtful that steady flow
was achieved on the thrust structure and the results of heat shield size on
heating rate, shown in Figure 6.4-17, did not present a consistent trend.
However, there was a general indication of a reduction in heating with
increasing heat shield size, and tests indicated that heating with the smaller
heat shield was more likely to increase with increasing altitude while the
large heat shield did not indicate this trend. Later tests of longer
duration at MSFC gave more confidence of steady flow being attained on
the thrust cone and the measured heating rates were slightly higher, but
there was no indication of a better definition of heat shield size effects.

Interstage Skirt

The interstage structure extends from the first separation plane, Station 0,
to the second separation plane, Station 196, as indicated in Figure 6.4-16.
Although there sometimes appear to be effects of the interstage on the heat
shield aft side heating distribution, there was no consistent indication
that the peak heating increased. The primary effect of the interstage is
on the thrust cone heating rates as illustrated in Figure 6.4-18. It is
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apparent that the interstage traps the flow off of the heat shield and directs it toward the thrust cone. The data shown are on a radial line between outboard engines where the heating is the highest. Lowest heating on the thrust cone is on a radial line through an outboard engine, but heating in this location is also increased significantly by the interstage.

Turbo-Pump Exhaust

The turbo-pump exhaust injection into the J-2 nozzle described in Section 6.2 was simulated on the nozzle by fifty 0.067-inch diameter holes drilled normal to the nozzle wall. Hydrogen heated to the estimated turbine exhaust gas temperature (1140°F) was used in the model simulation. The mass flow rate was simulated assuming an orifice discharge coefficient of 0.88 with sonic flow and a 16 psia stagnation pressure. Simulation of the mass flow rate with the lower molecular weight hydrogen causes an increase in the injection velocity and momentum and increases the relative volume in the base region. Simulation was also doubtful because of the probable different effects the injection would have on the nozzle and full scale boundary layer and possible separation and reattachment. In addition to these theoretical inaccuracies in simulation, it was also difficult to time the flow of heated hydrogen to correspond to the short test event. If the hydrogen arrived too soon, it flowed into the base region causing instrumentation problems and required more time for the initiation of steady flow when the combustor fired. This is particularly important in regard to the thrust cone heating. Because of the piping the gas passed through on the way to the manifold around the model nozzle, there was a tendency for the gas to cool, but three turbine exhaust qualification runs indicated the desired temperature could be maintained by using a supply reservoir temperature of 1460°F. The effects of the simulated turbine exhaust in lowering the peak heating rates are illustrated in Figures 6.4-19 through 6.4-22, but possible increases in some regions are also indicated in Figures 6.4-21 and 6.4-22. Although turbine exhaust injection is expected to lower the base recovery temperature since it cools the plume boundary, it was decided to base the S-II thermal environment on testing without the simulated injection because of the difficult and questionable simulation and the expected increase in recovery temperature with scale due to boundary layer effects.

Outboard Engine Failure

The significant effects resulting from an outboard engine failure are due to the engine deflections required for trim rather than the absence of the outboard exhaust plume. Experimental outboard engine failure patterns and the resulting increase in peak heat shield heating are illustrated in Figure 6.4-23. As the engines deflect, the location of the peak heating on the heat shield moves in the direction of the inboard deflection component and occurs at a smaller radius from the base center.
6.4 (Continued)

Single Actuator Failure

Deflection patterns which were tested as being representative of a single actuator failure at 7.5, 5, and 3 degrees are shown in Figure 6.4-24 as cases 3C, 5, 6 and 6A. In addition, three variations of combined engine misalignment and thrust structure compliance patterns (Cases 9, 9A and 9B) are considered as being representative of the type of flow pattern resulting from single actuator failures. As the gimbal angle increases, the peak heating moves across the heat shield (towards the outboard engine at which the maximum deflection component is pointed) and finally occurs on the flexible curtain attachment flange at the nozzle for the maximum angle tested. To illustrate this effect, results are presented in Figure 6.4-24 for both the rigid heat shield and the flexible curtain attachment flange. The results presented for the heat shield illustrate the most significant effect of a single actuator failure, but other effects have been observed. Heat rates on the nozzle wall increase for failures which direct the engine inboard, and increases in thrust cone heating have been noted when the failure directs the engines outboard.

Dual Actuator Failure

Movement of both actuators in an inboard direction causes significant increases in heating on the heat shield and center nozzle. In the extreme case of 7.5-degree deflection in pitch and yaw, plume impingement on the center nozzle was evident on the model, and good correlation was obtained between the peak measured heating and predictions using stagnation point heat transfer analysis. The effects of dual actuator deflection on the heat shield are illustrated in Figure 6.4-25. As in the case of a single actuator failure, the point of peak heating moves from the rigid portion of the heat shield to the flexible curtain at large deflection angles. Effects of dual actuator movement on the environment of the center nozzle are illustrated in Figure 6.4-26. The extremely high heating rates near the nozzle lip rapidly decrease as the distance from the plume impingement point increases, so there is no appreciable increase in heating on the forward portion of the nozzle.

Mixture Ratio

As the mixture ratio is increased on the J-2 engine, the total propellant flow rate also increases, so the chamber pressure varies with mixture ratio as indicated in Table 6.4-1. The resulting heating rate variations will be affected by both the pressure and temperature change. Test results were conclusive from a qualitative standpoint that the heating rates and base pressure increase with mixture ratio, but quantitative results were not significant since test-to-test variations in heating are comparable to a significant portion of the anticipated variation in heating.
TABLE 6.4-1. EFFECT OF MIXTURE RATIO CHANGE ON S-II BASE ENVIRONMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PMR</th>
<th>PREDICTED NOZZLE PRESSURE - $P_0$ - PSIA</th>
<th>STAGNATION TEMPERATURE - $T_0$ - °R</th>
<th>$P_0/P_0(5.0)$</th>
<th>$T_0/T_0(5.0)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>5626</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>5717</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>5891</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>6101</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nominal Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Model Scale Inches</th>
<th>Full Scale Inches</th>
<th>Dimensionless Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d_e (I.D.)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>d_e/D = 0.1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d_m</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>d_m/D = 0.5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>h/D = 0.1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>j/D = 0.1086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chamber pressure =** \( P_R = 632 \text{ psia} \)

No Flame Deflector

Five Engines

**FIGURE 6.4-1. SATURN S-II PARAMETRIC MODEL ARRANGEMENT**
FIGURE 6.4-2.
EFFECT OF ENGINE MOUNTING CIRCLE DIAMETER ON BASE PRESSURE AND HEAT TRANSFER (5 ENGINE)
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5 ENGINE CONFIGURATION

\[ P_c = 632 \text{ PSIA NOMINAL} \]
\[ \text{ALT} = 240,000 \text{ FT} \]
\[ P_{\infty}/P_c = 0.08 \times 10^{-5} \]

FIGURE 6.4-4. EFFECT OF BASE LOCATION ON BASE PRESSURE AND HEAT TRANSFER (5 ENGINE)
FIGURE 6.4-5. EFFECT OF BASE LOCATION ON BASE PRESSURE AND HEAT TRANSFER (4 ENGINE)
FIGURE 6.4-6. EFFECT OF INTERSTAGE LENGTH ON BASE PRESSURE AND HEAT TRANSFER (5 ENGINE)
FIGURE 6.4-7. EFFECT OF INTERSTAGE LENGTH ON HEAT TRANSFER AND BASE PRESSURE (4 ENGINE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYM (AVE)</th>
<th>RUNS</th>
<th>$d_m/D$</th>
<th>$j/D$</th>
<th>$h/D$</th>
<th>$h_f/D$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>55, 56, 58, 86, 100</td>
<td>.5303</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.3130</td>
<td>.2110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△</td>
<td>59, 91, 94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>95, 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△</td>
<td>57, 61, 87, 88</td>
<td>.3130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>90, 92, 93, 108, 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2110</td>
<td>.1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOLID SYMBOLS ARE FLAME DEFLECTOR DATA**

**5 ENGINE CONFIGURATION**

$P_0 = 632$ PSIA NOMINAL

$\text{ALT} = 240,000$ FT

$P_{\infty}/P_c = 0.08 \times 10^{-5}$

**FIGURE 6.4-8. EFFECT OF FLAME DEFLECTOR (NO GAP) POSITION ON BASE PRESSURE AND HEAT TRANSFER (5 ENGINE)**
4-ENGINE CONFIGURATION

FIGURE 6.4-9. EFFECT OF FLAME DEFLECTOR (NO GAP) POSITION ON BASE PRESSURE AND HEAT TRANSFER (4 ENGINE)
FIGURE 6.4-10. EFFECT OF AMBIENT PRESSURE ON BASE PRESSURE (5 ENGINE)
5 ENGINE
CONFIGURATION

$P_c = 632$ PSIA (Nominal)
ALT - VARIABLE
$P_{\infty}/P_R$ - VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFIGURATION</th>
<th>$d_m/D$</th>
<th>$J/D$</th>
<th>$h/D$</th>
<th>$h_f/D$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.5303</td>
<td>.1086</td>
<td>.1086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYM</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>$r/R^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◇</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 6.4-11. EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT TRANSFER RATES (5 ENGINE)
FIGURE 6.4-13. EFFECT OF ALTITUDE ON BASE HEAT TRANSFER (4 ENGINE)
**FIGURE 6.4-14.** EFFECT OF COMBUSTION CHAMBER PRESSURE ON BASE HEAT TRANSFER AND PRESSURE (5 ENGINE)
FIGURE 6.4-15. HEATED BASE - RECOVERY TEMPERATURE RESULTS
(5 ENGINE)
FIGURE 6.4-16. S-II PROTOTYPE MODEL SCHEMATIC
FIGURE 6.4-17. EFFECT OF HEAT SHIELD EDGE CONFIGURATION ON BASE REGION HEAT FLUX

PMR = 5
P₀ = 632 psia

MODEL RADIUS - INCHES

-20 0 20 40 60 80 100 120 140 160 180 200

MODEL STATION

G - FT²/SEC.
Section shown with gages 20 thru 25 is in a plane between outboard engines

PMR=5
$P_0=632$ psia

FIGURE 6.4-18. EFFECT OF INTERSTAGE ON BASE HEAT TRANSFER RATES
Section shown with gages 20 thru 25 is in a radial plane between outboard engines.

**Figure 6.4-19. Effect of Turbo-Pump Exhaust (TPE) on Base Region Heat Flux**
Section shown with gages 20 thru 25 is in a radial plane between outboard engines.

**Figure 6.4-20. Effect of Turbo-Pump Exhaust (TPE) on Base Region Heat Flux**
FIGURE 6.4-21. EFFECT OF TURBO-PUMP EXHAUST (TPE) ON HEAT SHIELD HEAT FLUX
Figure 6.4-23 Effects of outboard engine failure on the maximum heat shield heating rate.
Model Deflection Patterns

Case 9

Case 9A

Case 9B

Case 6

Case 6A

Case 5

Case 3C

Instrumentation in this octant.

Data adjusted to $F_{c}=5.5$, $P_{0}=715$ psia

\[\text{Peak Heating Rate - \text{Rtu/Ft}^2\text{-sec}}\]

Out of Inboard Deflection Arcs, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ - Degrees

Figure 6.4-24 Effects of single actuator failure inboard on heat shield heating rates.
Model Deflection Patterns
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Figure 6.4-25 Effects of dual actuator failure on heat shield heating rates.
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Symbol $\beta_p = \beta_y$

- ○ 7.5
- ◊ 6
- □ 5

Data adjusted to PMR=5.5, $P_o=715$ psia

Full scale distance forward of exit - inches

Figure 6.4-26 Effects of dual actuator failure on center nozzle heating.
S-II base environment instrumentation consisted of pressure transducers, total and radiation calorimeters, gas temperature probes, and structural temperature sensors. The first five vehicles (AS-501 through AS-505) had extensive instrumentation, but the instrumentation was very limited on subsequent flights. The quality of the flight data was generally good. The design of the gas temperature probes did not permit a direct gas temperature measurement, but the correction procedures used to estimate gas temperatures from the probe temperature appear to give results which are consistent with other heating measurements.

In presenting the flight results, the pressure, interstage effect, and gas temperature results will be reviewed first, then the radiation and total heating results for the heat shield and thrust structure will be reviewed. The results presented are taken primarily from the first five vehicles, (References 6-6 and 6-7) but experience in later flights is summarized where significant differences have been noted.

**Pressure**

The pressures on the aft face of the heat shield shown in Figure 6.5-1 are constant to slightly decreasing through most of the flight following the transient caused by interstage separation approximately 30 seconds after ignition. The PMR shift and consequent chamber pressure reduction produce a marked drop in the 450 to 500 second range. On AS-505, the PMR shift was preceded by CECO at about 460 seconds which also caused an appreciable drop.

The interstage separation can cause opposite effects as illustrated on instrument D95 (Figure 6.5-1). On AS-505 there is a pronounced rise which is counter to most interstage separation results, but this effect was also noted on total heating rates on other flights. This apparent anomaly may be caused by changes in the pressure distribution since most evidence points to a general pressure drop in the base region after interstage separation. The drop in pressure after the second separation is most pronounced forward of the heat shield as illustrated in Figure 6.5-2.

**Interstage Separation**

More detailed records of the base environment during interstage separation are presented in Figure 6.5-3. In these data the separation process is shown to have a pronounced transient effect which is particularly noticeable in the pressure. The slower response of the calorimeters and gas temperature probe tend to attenuate the rapid changes, but the more sensitive radiation calorimeter shows a marked change.
6.5 (Continued)

Gas Temperature

Gas temperature on the aft face of the heat shield is measured with unshielded probes extending approximately 2 inches from the heat shield. The probe have a high heat capacity and emissivity, so a large discrepancy exists between the probe indicated temperature and the gas recovery temperature. To correct the probe indication to the gas recovery temperature, assumptions must be made to evaluate the convective and radiative heat gain and the radiation and conduction heat losses. Since heating rates and recovery temperatures vary in the base region, each probe must be corrected differently. The procedure used in making the corrections is outlined in Reference 6-8, and typical results are shown in Figure 6.5-4.

There is a definite increase in recovery temperature caused by CECO as illustrated on AS-505 (Figure 6.5-4) and a decrease in recovery temperature due to the lower mixture ratio after PMR shift. On AS-507 the engine precant was reduced from 2.3 to 1.3 degrees to bring the engines to a more nearly null position during firing and a definite increase (to 856°K) was noted in the recovery temperature during five-engine operation. On AS-508 it appeared that a steady state engine deflection caused a more severe thermal environment and CECO occurred prematurely at 330 seconds so the flight was longer than nominal. The maximum temperatures recorded on AS-508 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Predicted Recovery Temperature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before CECO</td>
<td>910°K (1180°F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After CECO</td>
<td>1045°K (1420°F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After PMR Shift</td>
<td>940°K (1230°F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the highest temperatures recorded to date.

Heat Shield Heating Rates

Since the incident radiation on the heat shield was expected to be fairly uniform, only two radiation calorimeters were installed on the heat shield for the first five flights. The indicated incident radiation shown in Figure 6.5-5 indicates little variation in the peak heating rates. The radiation calorimeters generally show a gradual response which is particularly apparent in the slow initial rise, and the delay in dropping to an equilibrium value after the PMR shift.

Recent evaluation of this behavior (Reference 6-9) presents convincing evidence that it is caused by gradual heating of the radiometer quartz window by both convection and radiation beyond the window cut-off (~3.5 μm). Radiation from the heated window is then added to the plume radiation transmitted by the window, so the calorimeter indication changes gradually in response to the window temperature variation. The example analyzed indicated
that the total plume radiation (both long and short wave length) is 30 to 40 percent less than the calorimeter indication. Due to variations in the correction with instrument location and flight time which have not been computed, it was not practical to correct the flight data to be presented, so the results shown in Figures 6.5-3 and 6.5-5 are indicated values. No analysis has been made of possible errors in the thrust cone radiation presented in Figure 6.5-10.

Variations in radiation are caused by the IMR shift and by engine shutdown on flights AS-502 and AS-505. On AS-502, Engines 2 and 3 shut down at approximately 413 seconds causing a large drop on instrument C665 (adjacent to Engine 2) and a small dip followed by a rise on instrument C692. The rise on C692 must be attributed to deflection of Engines 1 and 4, but it is difficult to interpret due to the response of the radiometer to window heating.

The center engine cut-off on AS-505 causes a definite drop on both radiation instruments followed by a further drop at IMR shift. Due to the rapid response of the calorimeter at this point and the general rise in total heating at CECO, this decrease is attributed to a radiation decrease rather than changes in the window temperature.

Representative total heating rates for AS-501 through AS-505 are presented in Figures 6.5-6 through 6.5-9. These data have not been corrected to cold wall conditions, but the calorimeters remain relatively cool, so the correction would be small. The results indicate much more variation than the radiation. This could be caused by variations in engine performance and alignment which would affect both the overall heating and the distribution of heating rates. The divergence in trends caused by interstage separation noted earlier in the heat shield aft face pressures is also apparent in the total heating rates.

The reduction of heating resulting from the IMR shift is apparent in all total heating rates, but an increase in heating as a result of CECO on AS-505 is not consistently indicated. Although there is no pronounced decrease in total heating due to CECO, some instruments do not show an increase. For example the maximum increase is indicated on C687 (Figure 6.5-8) while C720 (also Figure 6.5-8) in the same area, shows a very slight declining trend. This indicates a definite shift in distribution, but there is no evidence of an increase in peak heating.

Shutdown of Engines 2 and 3 on AS-503 causes both increases and decreases in heating depending upon position. Instruments C721 and C858 are between Engines 2 and 3 so they (Figure 6.5-7) indicate a drastic drop in heating, while instruments C687 and C720 between Engines 1 and 4 indicate an increase in heating (Figure 6.5-8).
6.5 (Continued)

The only total heating calorimeter on AS-506 through AS-509 (C722) indicated somewhat higher heating rates than the maximum of 3 watts/cm² noted on AS-503 (Figure 6.5-6). When precant was reduced on AS-507, the C722 heating rate reached a peak of 3 watts/cm² compared to approximately 2.7 watts/cm² on flights AS-504 and AS-505 which had a similar thrust structure and the higher precant (precant was increased to 2.3 degrees with the new thrust structure on AS-504 and was reduced to 1.3 degrees on AS-507). On AS-509, C722 indicated a peak of 3.22 watts/cm² after the premature CECO.

The heating rate on the forward face of the heat shield was measured on AS-504 and AS-505 (Calorimeter C723, Figure 6.5-9). The results indicated the expected significant effect of the interstage skirt, but a large increase was also noted after interstage separation on AS-504. It is suspected that this peak was caused by leakage at the flexible curtain around Engine 4 because of improper lacing of the curtain to the heat shield. This would allow leakage which could be modulated by small engine gimbal movements.

Thrust Cone Heating Rates

The thrust cone total and radiation heating rates are presented in Figure 6.5-10. They indicate significant convective heating with the interstage in place, particularly near the middle of the thrust cone (C666 and C821). After interstage separation the total heating rates are so low that it is difficult to evaluate the relative effects of convective and radiant heating. The results indicate a reduction in heating at the PMR shift and a transient increase on C688 for AS-502. This increase was associated with hot gas leakage forward of the heat shield from the failure of Engine 2.
FIGURE 6.5-1 STATIC PRESSURES ON THE HEAT SHIELD AFT FACE.
FIGURE 6.5-2 STATIC PRESSURES FORWARD OF THE HEAT SHIELD.
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Figure 6.5-3 Typical Base Region Environment During Interstage Separation (AS-505)
FIGURE 6.5-4 TYPICAL HEAT SHIELD GAS RECOVERY TEMPERATURES ON AS-504 and AS-505.
FIGURE 6.5-5 INDICATED HEAT SHIELD AFT FACE RADIATION ON AS-501 THRU AS-505.
FIGURE 6.5-6 HEAT SHIELD AFT FACE TOTAL HEATING RATES ON AS-501 thru AS-505.
FIGURE 6.5-7 HEAT SHIELD AFT FACE TOTAL HEATING RATES ON AS-501 thru AS-505.
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FIGURE 6.5-8 HEAT SHIELD AFT FACE TOTAL HEATING RATES ON AS-501 thru AS-505.
FIGURE 6.5-9 TOTAL HEATING RATES ON HEAT SHIELD FORWARD AND AFT SURFACES ON AS-504 and AS-505.
FIGURE 6.5-10 THRUST CONE TOTAL AND RADIATION HEATING RATES ON AS-501 tho AS-503.
A precise comparison of model and flight results is almost impossible because of variations in both model and flight data which make it difficult to define a basis for comparison. During the process of model testing, a large range of configurations are tested and the data for each configuration exhibit considerable scatter. The vehicle design environment is selected from a conservative evaluation of the model results because of the large uncertainties involved in model simulation and operation. Because of this, flight deviations from the resulting design values are not necessarily representative of poor model simulation accuracy, but rather a combination of uncertainties in model simulation and in the important factors which affect the base environment. Because of these uncertainties, the model results can be evaluated based on different criteria to indicate agreement with the flight test results or large discrepancies depending upon the perspective chosen. Based on the conservative evaluation of model results which represents the design environment, the convective heating on the flight vehicle was significantly over-predicted by the model results. But evaluation of the model results based on flight experience with adjustments for the cooling effects of the turbine exhaust injection into the rocket nozzle wall can show reasonably good agreement with the measured convection heating.

The comparisons to be presented for convective heating will illustrate the range of model and flight results with comments on the effect of reduced recovery temperature. Comparisons will be made using the analytical predictions of radiation since scale effects limited the model radiation to approximately 4 percent of the values measured in flight. Before reviewing the comparison of radiative and convective heating, the base pressure results will be compared.

Pressure

Since base pressure was not a critical factor in the S-II base design, a conservative estimate of the base pressure was used for design and relatively few measurements of pressure were made during the model test program. Based on the measurements which were made, heat shield aft face pressures in the range of 0.02 to 0.035 psia would have been predicted from prototype model tests with engines near the null position. Parametric model tests with the heat shield closer to the nozzle exit (43 rather than 60 inches) indicated an average pressure of 0.045 psia at the maximum pressure location. This would increase to 0.051 psia if corrected for the increase in nozzle stagnation pressure from 632 to 715 psia for the PMR shift from 5.0 to 5.5.

Flight test results indicate good agreement with the model results on the inner portion of the heat shield while they are much higher in the outer regions. The general behavior and range of data are illustrated in Figure 6.6-1. The flight results shown illustrate pressures (averaged over the indicated flights) for three flight conditions: (1) interstage on, (2) just after second plane separation, and (3) at high altitude just before the PMR step (or CECO on AS-505). Model data should be expected to agree with the lowest flight results since external flow was not simulated in the model tests, but the flight results at the peak location are 60 to 70 percent above the model
results. This is probably due to the increase in the reversed mass flow from the turbine exhaust injection into the nozzle boundary layer. Comparative model results with and without turbine exhaust are limited, but at two comparable locations (both at a full scale radius of 83 inches) the model turbine exhaust simulation caused an increase in heat shield pressure of 30 to 56 percent.

Pressures on the thrust cone with the interstage skirt removed are so low on both model and flight tests that measurement is difficult and comparisons would be more representative of instrumentation problems than scale differences. With the interstage in place the pressure measured on the model (0.024 psia) is slightly lower than the range of 0.029 to 0.035 psia recorded in flight, but the measurements were in slightly different positions. Considering the difficulties in achieving steady flow in the interstage during a short duration test, the agreement is considered very good.

Radiation Heating

Two methods of predicting radiation described in Section 6.3 were used to define the base environment since model radiation is greatly different from full scale values. In the comparison with flight results, the radiation predictions used as the design environment (Reference 6-2) will be referred to as "design prediction," while the later analysis using a band model description of the gaseous radiation (Reference 6-10) will be referred to as "band model."

Comparison of the flight data and predicted radiation on the heat shield is shown in Figure 6.6-2. The indicated flight results are reduced by 35 percent for comparison with the design environment to compensate for calorimeter errors described previously. The size of the adjustment was taken from the sample analysis of Reference 6-9 which was for a gage at the 100 inch radius. It is expected that the correction required at the 53 inch radius would be less due to the reduced total heating at this location, but no evaluation of this effect has been made. The comparison of flight radiation measurements with preflight predictions indicate that the predictions are 25 to 75 percent too high on the heat shield, but the indicated error is questionable due to the large correction required in the flight data and the uncertainty in some of the data used in the correction.

Peak values of radiation heating indicated on the thrust cone close-out (typical data in Figure 6.5-10) are approximately equal to the predicted values, but no evaluation has been made of the possible errors in thrust cone measurements caused by the calorimeter construction. The low level of total heating on the thrust cone might reduce the error due to heating of the calorimeter window, but the relatively low spectral cut-off of the window transmission (3.5 μm) would block a significant portion of the radiation from the plumes. The result could be that the actual incident radiation is higher than indicated. Comparisons both with and without the interstage shown in Table 6.6-1 present the range of indicated results and design predictions.
6.6 (Continued)

TABLE 6.6-1. COMPARISON OF THRUST CONE RADIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heating Rate - Watts/cm²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interstage On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Design Prediction</td>
<td>0.13-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Model</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Convective Heating

Due to interest in various engine deflection arrangements, model tests with a true null engine arrangement at a mixture ratio of 5.5 were limited, and no tests were run with slight outboard deflections representative of the engine positions resulting from precant on the first five flight vehicles. However, the probable effect of the slight outboard deflection would be to reduce the heating rate by less than 20 percent which is small in comparison to the spread between flight and model data.

The comparison of flight and model convective heating on the heat shield in Figure 6.6-3 shows good agreement near the center nozzle on a line between outboard engines with the model results becoming much greater at larger radii and between center and outboard engines. The differences in the results are attributed to the higher recovery temperature on the model because of the absence of turbopump exhaust injection into the nozzle.

A possible explanation of the good agreement near the center nozzles is that heating at this location is caused by recirculation of gas from the reversed flow impingement regions farther out on the heat shield. Because of this, the model flow is cooled more than the flight vehicle by the cooler heat shield surface so the temperature difference between model and flight conditions is reduced and better data agreement results.

Adjustments for recovery temperature are difficult since the recovery temperature varies with position on the heat shield and no direct measurement of recovery temperature could be made on the model. Based on temperature measurements made on the model it is expected that the recovery to surface temperature difference is nominally about twice the flight value in regions of maximum heating and increases to almost three times the flight value for model measurements used in the design criteria. If the model heating rates could be adjusted to flight conditions based on the correct temperature difference for flight conditions with turbine exhaust injection into the nozzles, the flight and model heating would probably agree within the uncertainties in the measurements and engine misalignment effects. This would indicate that there is no large scale effect on the heat transfer coefficient.
Figure 6.6-1 Comparison of model and flight measurements of heat shield aft face pressures.

Average Flight Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Flights</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>△</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flags:
- Interstage on
- Just after interstage separation
- None Just before PMR step or CECO
- Average Prototype Model data from MSFC tests for O/F = 5.5
- Average Prototype Model data from CAL corrected to O/F = 5.5
Indicated flight data averaged from peak values on AS501 thru AS505
Flight indication x 0.65
Band model prediction
Design prediction for all θ
Distribution used to reduce total heating data to convective heating.

Figure 6.6-2 Comparison of heat shield radiation heating rates for 5 engine operation with PMR = 5.5.
Figure 6.6-3 Comparison of model and flight convective heating.

Heat shield radius - inches
(a) Radial lines between outboard engines at 0°, 180°, or 270° except, as noted.

Note: Radiation values used in reducing total heating rates are indicated in Fig. 6.6-2.

Flight

○ 501
△ 502
□ 503
◇ 504
▽ 505

Average model data from MSFC tests at PMR=5.5

Range of model data

Inst. C724 - other data at 75 in. is C722

(b) \( \theta = 45° \)
6.7 REFERENCES


7.0 OTHER DATA

7.1 GENERAL DISCUSSION

This section includes a list of references which contain base heating data from previous model and flight test programs such as Polaris, Minuteman, Titan, Delta, Thor and Jupiter. These references provide the reader additional base heating data for defining effects of solid propellants, base geometry and engine operating conditions. Most of these references are classified. The following show the references pertinent to various booster vehicles.

a. Polaris (References 7-1 through 7-7)

b. Minuteman (References 7-8 through 7-13)

c. Titan (References 7-14 through 7-21)

d. Delta (Reference 7-22)

e. Thor (References 7-23 and 7-24)

f. Jupiter (Reference 7-25)
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7.2 (Continued)


7-23. Jackson, R. H., "Base Region Environmental Results Obtained from Three Thor Boosters," DAC-46507, June 1965 (Confidential).

7-24. "Base Recirculation on a 10.7-Percent Scale Model of Thorad Afterbody at Trajectory Mach Number of 0.33 to 3.05," AEDC-TDR-63-136, August 1963 (Confidential).
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