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INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The introduction of a full capability Tug into the Shuttle mission spectrum in the 1980s will significantly broaden Shuttle's capability. To fully realize that capability it will be essential that the Tug be designed to perform its mission within a broad range of thermal environments with currently planned mission durations up to 7 days. The primary objective of this study was to develop a thermal design for the forward and intertank compartments and fuel cell heat rejection system that satisfy Tug requirements for low inclination geosynchronous deploy and retrieve missions. Key to this design was to evolve to a system that was reusable and minimized ground refurbishment requirements. Figure 1-1 presents baseline Tug configuration used in the study.

Passive concepts were demonstrated analytically for both the forward and intertank compartments. Each compartment used an external paint pattern tailored to the mission environments. The forward compartment, which contains the majority of the avionics equipment, was thermally designed with circumferential heat pipes to reduce the wide variance of skin temperatures resulting from constant attitudes. In addition, the forward shield (beta cloth) was modified to include a multilayered insulation blanket. Results indicated that the equipment used for rendezvous and docking, such as the television, laser radar, and its associated electronics, present one of the more severe thermal control problems. The most promising solution appears to be to mount the equipment on the thermal conditioning panels. The panels can be used to reduce heater power requirements. The fuel cell electrical power subsystem required an active heat rejection concept in the form of a pumped fluid radiator. Continued development of heat pipe radiators could result in their future application to thermal control of the fuel cell.

Worst-case external heating environments were determined and used in the study. All mission phases were incorporated into study with the most significant one being the heating of the Tug in the orbiter after reentry and landing. Cargo bay purging was found to be required to maintain both operating and nonoperating equipment temperature limits.

A series of three catalogues were created to provide representative equipment data for use in the thermal study. Internal distribution of the catalogues resulted in a rather wide acceptance and a desire for additional categories of information to expand their usefulness.
Key thermal control systems derived in the study were carried an additional step to preliminary sets of design and performance specifications. Three specifications were developed covering the forward compartment thermal design, battery louvers, and fuel cell heat rejection system.

A follow-on plan was developed highlighting breadboard testing of the above key areas which were advanced to the preliminary specification phase. Tests also include a honeycomb conductivity test. In addition, several areas of analytical concern were identified that were beyond the original scope of the study.

Figure 1-1 Baseline Tug Overall Configuration
2. EQUIPMENT THERMAL REQUIREMENTS, CHARACTERISTICS AND CONSTRAINTS
CATALOGUES

New spacecraft designs generally start with studies oriented toward satisfying mission requirements. Systems-level studies of this nature generally result in identifying performance requirements, allowable system weights, power budgets, etc. New equipment (or revised existing equipment) designed to satisfy specific requirements is inherent in each new spacecraft. After some basic studies are completed the thermal designer translates the preliminary design one step further to evolve the design into thermal environments and anticipated equipment temperatures. Often the thermal designer is faced with new equipment and associated thermal data are lacking. To avoid this problem, this study began by identifying the thermal requirements, characteristics, and constraints of candidate equipment items.

The approach chosen to identify, handle, and document these data was to develop a generalized data bank containing thermal and general information for each component catalogued. The data bank was written to be dynamic in nature, allowing components to be added or deleted without affecting output of other components. A FORTRAN IV program containing four major subroutines was written to compile two catalogues using the data bank data as input data. The two catalogues contain equipment thermal requirements, and equipment physical characteristics and constraints, respectively. The data bank, catalogues, and a catalogue user's guide were published in two documents, (Ref 1 and 2).

The program and data bank provide the user a means of cataloging components for potential application to Tug or any other spacecraft in a standardized manner, while maintaining visibility to the source of the information. The data bank was organized by major system (such as the Avionics System), describing each subsystem followed by the components included within each subsystem. Table 2-1 describes the data that were catalogued and the reference used in identifying the subsystem descriptive information. Table 2-2 describes the subsystems included within the Avionics System, while Table 2-3 expands upon the Guidance Navigation and Control Subsystem describing the types of equipment, requirements, timelines, and notes. Table 2-4 presents the first component catalogued and shows the generalized and standard format used in cataloging all components.
TABLE 2-1

SPACE TUG EQUIPMENT DATA BANK

THE SPACE TUG EQUIPMENT DATA BANK HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR NASA/MSFC UNDER CONTRACT NUMBER NAS 8-29670.

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS THE RAW DATA OF ALL EQUIPMENT ITEMS IDENTIFIED FOR POTENTIAL APPLICATION TO THE SPACE TUG SYSTEM.

THE FOLLOWING DATA IS INCLUDED IN THIS DOCUMENT

- EQUIPMENT THERMAL REQUIREMENTS
- EQUIPMENT PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS
- EQUIPMENT CONSTRAINTS

THIS DOCUMENT WAS PREPARED BY THE MARTIN MARIETTA AEROSPACE CORPORATION AND WAS SUBMITTED TO NASA/MSFC ON 1 MAY 1974.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE DATA CONTAINED HEREIN SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO

MR. TERRY L. WARD
PHONE 303-794-5211
EXTENSION 4702

THE SYSTEMS AND SUBSYSTEMS DESCRIBED HEREIN ARE DEFINED BY AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH

BASELINE TUG DEFINITION DOCUMENT
REVISION A
DATED JUNE 26, 1972
RELEASED BY
PRELIMINARY DESIGN OFFICE
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
GEORGE C. MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION
TABLE 2-2

AVIONICS SYSTEM

THE DATA CONTAINED IN THE AVIONICS SYSTEM SECTION PRETAINS TO THOSE CANDIDATE EQUIPMENT ITEMS WHICH HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED FOR APPLICATION TO THE FOLLOWING SUBSYSTEMS:

- Guidance, Navigation and Control
- Data Management
- Communications
- Instrumentation
- Electrical Power
**TABLE 23**

**GUIDANCE NAVIGATION AND CONTROL SUBSYSTEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>WEIGHT (POUNDS)</th>
<th>POWER (WATTS)</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>MOUNTED AT POSITION 1 WITH STAR TRACKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR TRACKER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONICS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>DEPLOYED, POSSIBLY POSITION 3 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZON SCANNER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>MIRROR YAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRONICS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>POSITION 2, FORWARD LOOKING ZOOM ONE GIMBAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEVISION (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS ELECTRONICS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>MOUNTED ON EXTERIOR AT POSITION 2 AND 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUN SENSOR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

372.8 279.5

**NOTES (A)** INCLUDED IN RENDEZVOUS AND DOCKING CATEGORY OF MASS PROPERTIES.

**TIMELINES**

**CONTINUOUS OPERATION**

- **IMU**, **ACS**

- **HORIZON SCANNER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>19.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>61.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.35</td>
<td>62.80</td>
<td>82.28</td>
<td>83.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.56</td>
<td>88.29</td>
<td>90.59</td>
<td>91.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **STAR TRACKER**

- **SUN SENSOR**

- **LASER RADAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60.35</td>
<td>61.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **TELEVISION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60.05</td>
<td>61.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUTOCOLLIMATOR** WAS EXCLUDED FROM CATALOG SINCE IT APPEARS THAT HORIZON SCANNER CAN BE ATTACHED DIRECTLY TO IMU THEREBY AVOIDING THE NEED FOR THE AUTOCOLLIMATOR.

**RATE GYROS** WHERE INCLUDED IN CATALOG HOWEVER NO FIRM REQUIREMENT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED.
SPACE TUG EQUIPMENT DATA BANK  RAW DATA  THERMAL REQUIREMENTS, PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS, AND CONSTRAINTS

AVIONICS SYSTEM
GUIDANCE NAVIGATION AND CONTROL SUBSYSTEM

-------------------------------------------------------------------
IMU 1 CAROUSEL 58  DELCO ELECTRONICS  P/N 7866091-011
DESIGN OPERATING CASE TEMPERATURE  60° TO 115° DEG. F
NON-OPERATING AND STORAGE CASE TEMPERATURE  -35° TO 160° DEG. F
ACCEPTANCE TEST TEMPERATURE REQUIREMENTS  57° TO 115° DEG. F
QUALIFICATION TEST TEMPERATURE REQUIREMENTS  56° TO 118° DEG. F
PACKAGE SHAPE  RECTANGULAR
PACKAGE SIZE * LENGTH 22.7 * WIDTH 11.4 * HEIGHT 12.0 (INCHES)
CASE MATERIAL  ALUMINUM
CASE WEIGHT  20 LBS
TOTAL WEIGHT  80 LBS

SURFACE PROPERTIES  ALPHA = 0.900  * EMISSIVITY = 0.900

INPUT STEADY STATE POWER  95 WATTS  *
21 WATTS AT 75° DEG. 94°. AT -80° DEG. (WATTS AT DEG. FAHRENHEIT)
OUTPUT POWER  0 WATTS  * MILLI-MILLI WATT OUTPUT

THERMAL DESIGN  ACTIVE  * PASSIVE

-------------------------------------------------------------------
PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND CONSTRAINTS

REMARKS
NON MISSION ON-TIMES  * PRELAUNCH YES  * ASCENT YES  * REENTRY OFF
MISSION ON-TIMES  * SHUT/TUG ON*  TUG/ORBIT ON*  TUG/PAY ON
MARRIED WITH MAGIC 352 COMPUTER
MOUNT WITH Z-AXIS ALONG LONGITUDINAL AXIS
MAX CABLE LENGTH 1.8 METERS (6.0 FEET)
QUALIFIED FOR 9 HOUR MISSION
OPERATIONAL IN 8 HOURS

-------------------------------------------------------------------

THE CAROUSEL 58 IMU IS DESIGNED AND BUILT BY
DELCO ELECTRONICS DIVISION OF GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION
6767 HOLISTER AVE., GOLTA, CALIFORNIA 90317

THE DATA CONTAINED HEREIN WAS OBTAINED FROM
MR. BILL CATTI PHONE 805-968-1011 EXTENSION 623

THIS IMU IS CURRENTLY IN A PRODUCTION PHASE AND IS BEING
PROCURED BY SAMSO FOR USE ON THE TITAN 3C TRANSTAGE AS THE SINGLE
GUIDANCE SENSOR FOR THIS SYSTEM IT IS MARRIED TO THE MAGIC 352
COMPUTER ALSO BUILT BY DELCO AND SUPPLIED AS A TWO PACKAGE SYSTEM,
THE IMU IS A 4 GIMBAL SYSTEM AND IS QUALIFIED FOR A 9 HOUR MISSION
THIS IMU IS SCHEDULED TO FLY FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 1973. A SINGLE
28 VDC SOURCE IS REQUIRED INTERCONNECTING CABLE WITH THE COMPUTER
IS LIMITED TO 1.8 M (6 FT). THE GIMBAL SET IS INTERNALLY SHOCK
MOUNTED, THE CASE IS PRESSURIZED TO 11.7 N/CM SQ (17 PSI) AND THE
UNIT IS DESIGNED WITH AN INTERNAL ACTIVELY THERMAL CONTROL SYSTEM
COMPRISED OF A FAN AND THERMOSTATICALLY CONTROLLED HEATERS. THE UNIT
IS DESIGNED TO FUNCTION WITHIN A MAXIMUM POWER BUDGET OF 205 WATTS.
APPROXIMATELY 8 HOURS ARE REQUIRED FROM POWER ON TO GO-INERTIAL.

REF. BROCHURE: UNIVERSAL SPACE GUIDANCE SYSTEM  DELCO ELECTRONICS

END

-------------------------------------------------------------------
Each component was catalogued in raw data form, identifying the appropriate system and subsystem. Preprinted keypunch sheets were used to reduce the amount of information to be written and correspondingly prepunched cards were used to reduce the key-punch task. This also limited the number of errors found in the review and editing of each component data sheet. One additional means of reducing errors was also applied. The data were assembled in the familiar set units and the program was used to convert the data to the International Units as shown in Table 2-5, the final data form.

Three major blocks of information were set aside for describing each component as shown separated by asterisk lines. The first block describes the component identifier (used by the program), name, manufacture, and part number. The remaining data in this block describe pertinent thermal design information of the component. Operating, nonoperating, and test box temperature limits are presented. The box shape and size, case material, and weights are specified. The exterior surface radiation properties, input power, variable power, and output power are presented. The last item describes the basic box thermal design for ground and flight operations. The word "active" to the left of the asterisk refers to a need of forced air cooling or a fluid loop on the ground, while "passive" refers to no special considerations required. The word "active" to the right of the asterisk refers to the need of special considerations in flight such as a fluid loop or other means beyond the mounting conduction and radiation capability of the box.

The second block of data contains information relative to the required on-times during the mission and pertinent characteristics and constraints remarks. The prelaunch, ascent, and reentry periods of flight were described as nonmission periods of flight because the Tug is attached to the Shuttle during these periods.

The third data block was set aside as a general narrative block to further identify the manufacturer, source of the material, expand the description of the component, development status, etc.

The first two data blocks were used by the program to build the two catalogues required by contract. The first catalogue, the Equipment Thermal Requirements Catalogue, is a summary of the data bank information in terms of allowable component temperatures as they relate to the various Tug mission phases. This summary was organized by subsystem and type of component as shown in Table 2-6. In addition, the thermal design and power dissipation are also presented. "Yes" was used to indicate that the component is on during mission phases while the Tug is attached to Shuttle, but not required to satisfy Tug mission requirements. "Int" indicates an intermittent usage during the mission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE 2-5</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPACE TUG EQUIPMENT DATA BANK FINAL DATA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THERMAL REQUIREMENTS, PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS, AND CONSTRAINTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVIONICS SYSTEM**

**GUIDANCE NAVIGATION AND CONTROL SUBSYSTEM**

**[IMU 1 CAROUSEL 58] DElico ELECTRONICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>P/N</strong></th>
<th>THERMAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND CONSTRAINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7086091-011</td>
<td>DESIGN OPERATING CASE TEMPERATURE: 289° TO 319° DEG. K (60° TO 115° DEG. F)</td>
<td><strong>PACKAGE SIZE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON-OPERATING AND STORAGE CASE TEMPERATURE: 236° TO 344° DEG. K (−35° TO 160° DEG. F)</td>
<td>LENGTH 57.7 * WIDTH 27.9 * HEIGHT 30.5 CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTANCE TEST TEMPERATURE REQUIREMENTS: 287° TO 319° DEG. K (57° TO 115° DEG. F)</td>
<td><strong>PACKAGE VOLUME</strong> 49102.2 CU. CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUALIFICATION TEST TEMPERATURE REQUIREMENTS: 286° TO 321° DEG. K (56° TO 118° DEG. F)</td>
<td><strong>CASE MATERIAL</strong> ALUMINUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMU 1 CAROUSEL 58**

- **AVIONICS SYSTEM**
- **GUIDANCE NAVIGATION AND CONTROL SUBSYSTEM**

**DELCO ELECTRONICS P/N 7086091-011**

- **DESIGN OPERATING CASE TEMPERATURE**
  - 289° TO 319° DEG. K (60° TO 115° DEG. F)
- **NON-OPERATING AND STORAGE CASE TEMPERATURE**
  - 236° TO 344° DEG. K (−35° TO 160° DEG. F)
- **ACCEPTANCE TEST TEMPERATURE REQUIREMENTS**
  - 287° TO 319° DEG. K (57° TO 115° DEG. F)
- **QUALIFICATION TEST TEMPERATURE REQUIREMENTS**
  - 286° TO 321° DEG. K (56° TO 118° DEG. F)

**PACKAGE SHAPE**
- **RECTANGULAR**

**PACKAGE SIZE**
- **LENGTH** 57.7 CM
- **WIDTH** 27.9 CM
- **HEIGHT** 30.5 CM

**PACKAGE AREA**
- 8440.0 SQ. CM
- 1308.2 SQ. IN.

**PACKAGE VOLUME**
- 49102.2 CU. CM
- 2996.4 CU. IN.

**CASE MATERIAL**
- ALUMINUM

**CASE WEIGHT**
- 9.1 KG (20.0 LBS)

**TOTAL WEIGHT**
- 36.3 KG (80.0 LBS)

**SURFACE PROPERTIES**
- **ALPHA** = 0.900
- **EMISSIVITY** = 0.900

**INPUT STEADY STATE POWER**
- 95 WATTS

**OUTPUT POWER**
- 0 WATTS
- MILLI-WATT OUTPUT

**THERMAL DESIGN**
- **ACTIVE**
- **PASSIVE**

**PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND CONSTRAINTS**

**REMARKS**

- **NON MISSION ON-TIMES**
  - PRELAUNCH YES
  - ASCENT YES
  - REENTRY OFF

- **MISSION ON-TIMES**
  - SHUT/TUG ON
  - TUG/ORBIT ON
  - TUG/PAY ON

- **MARRIED WITH MAGIC 352 COMPUTER**
- **MOUNT WITH Z-AXIS ALONG LONGITUDINAL AXIS**
- **MAX CABLE LENGTH** 1.8 M (6.0 FT)
- **QUALIFIED FOR 9 HOUR MISSION**
- **OPERATIONAL IN 8 HOURS**

**THE CAROUSEL 58 IMU IS DESIGNED AND BUILT BY DELCO ELECTRONICS DIVISION OF GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION 6767 HOLISTER AVE., GOLTA, CALIFORNIA 93017**

THE DATA CONTAINED HEREIN WAS OBTAINED FROM MR. BILL CATTOI, PHONE 805-968-1011 EXTENSION 623

THIS IMU IS CURRENTLY IN A PRODUCTION PHASE AND IS BEING PROCURED BY SAMSO FOR USE ON THE TITAN 3C TRANSTAGE AS THE SINGLE GUIDANCE SENSOR FOR THIS SYSTEM.

IT IS MARRIED TO THE MAGIC 352 COMPUTER ALSO BUILT BY DELCO AND SUPPLIED AS A TWO PACKAGE SYSTEM.

THE IMU IS A 4 GIMBAL SYSTEM AND IS QUALIFIED FOR A 9 HOUR MISSION.

THIS IMU IS SCHEDULED TO FLY FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 1973.

A SINGLE 28 VDC SOURCE IS REQUIRED INTERCONNECTING CABLE WITH THE COMPUTER IS LIMITED TO 1.8 M (6 FT). THE GIMBAL SET IS INTERNALLY SHOCK MOUNTED.

THE CASE IS PRESSURIZED TO 11.7 N/CM SQ (17 PSIA) AND THE UNIT IS DESIGNED WITH AN INTERNAL ACTIVE THERMAL CONTROL SYSTEM COMPRISED OF A FAN AND THERMOSTATICALLY CONTROLLED HEATERS. THE UNIT IS DESIGNED TO FUNCTION WITHIN A MAXIMUM POWER BUET OF 205 WATTS.

APPROXIMATELY 8 HOURS ARE REQUIRED FROM POWER ON TO 60-INERTIAL.

**REF. BROCHURE: UNIVERSAL SPACE GUIDANCE SYSTEM, DELCO ELECTRONICS**

2-7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description and Manufacture</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Design Watts</th>
<th>Ground/Orbital Max</th>
<th>PreLaunch</th>
<th>Shuttle</th>
<th>Shutt 4 Maneuvers</th>
<th>PayLoad and</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 1</td>
<td>CT-401 SENSOR PASSIVE</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>243/333</td>
<td>243/333</td>
<td>243/333</td>
<td>243/333</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>CN DURING PRELAUNCH FOR CHECKOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 2</td>
<td>STAR TRACKER HONEYWELL</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>255/302</td>
<td>255/302</td>
<td>255/302</td>
<td>255/302</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>ON DURING PRELAUNCH FOR CHECKOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-22/165</td>
<td>-22/165</td>
<td>-22/165</td>
<td>-22/165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 3</td>
<td>M40S PASSIVE</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>253/323</td>
<td>253/323</td>
<td>253/323</td>
<td>253/323</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON DURING PRELAUNCH FOR CHECKOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td>-22/140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 4</td>
<td>559B STAR TRACKER PASSIVE</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>216/348</td>
<td>216/348</td>
<td>216/348</td>
<td>216/348</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>CN DURING PRELAUNCH FOR CHECKOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-67/150</td>
<td>-67/150</td>
<td>-67/150</td>
<td>-67/150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 5</td>
<td>574 STAR CAMERA PASSIVE</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>216/343</td>
<td>216/343</td>
<td>216/343</td>
<td>216/343</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF      IN INT OFF CN DURING PRELAUNCH FOR CHECKOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-67/150</td>
<td>-67/150</td>
<td>-67/150</td>
<td>-67/150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 6</td>
<td>60A STAR TRACKER PASSIVE</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>230/327</td>
<td>230/327</td>
<td>230/327</td>
<td>230/327</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>CN DURING PRELAUNCH FOR CHECKOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-30/130</td>
<td>-30/130</td>
<td>-30/130</td>
<td>-30/130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 7</td>
<td>634 ATM STAR TRK. PASSIVE</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>233/327</td>
<td>233/327</td>
<td>233/327</td>
<td>233/327</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>CN DURING PRELAUNCH FOR CHECKOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-40/130</td>
<td>-40/130</td>
<td>-40/130</td>
<td>-40/130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 8</td>
<td>KS-199 STAR TRK. PASSIVE</td>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>272/310</td>
<td>272/310</td>
<td>272/310</td>
<td>272/310</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON DURING PRELAUNCH FOR CHECKOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-40/130</td>
<td>-40/130</td>
<td>-40/130</td>
<td>-40/130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second catalogue, Equipment Physical Characteristics and Constraints Catalogue, presents the thermal characteristics of the components as derived from the data contained in the first data block and constraints remarks from the second block. Surface area and volume, power density, radiation time constant, adiabatic rise rate, thermal mass, and allowable sink temperature are presented. The data are presented in International units and English units. Some of the components were unable to meet their temperature limits in a 100% radiation environment, hence, the quantity of heat required to be removed via conduction was calculated and printed if the sink environment requirements were less than 0°C. Within limits, the use or need of conduction to cool a component is usually an open issue for the thermal designer. Hence, the results indicate emphasis to be placed on a given component and the potential need for special considerations such as the use of heat pipes. Table 2-7 presents an example of the catalogue.

The catalogues proved to be a valuable asset during the study. We used various groups within the Denver Division to test the applicability of the data to other disciplines and projects and found a general acceptance and desire for additional data to be included. In general, the data in the catalogues were complete within the intended scope, however, several areas for expansion are apparent. For example, each component designer in the aerospace industry compiles component information relative to the needs of his particular technical discipline, but it is rarely a complete compilation of information. The data bank approach could easily be expanded to include the functional characteristics and requirements of the components tailored to meet specific component types and a complete description of testing and test requirements. The resultant catalogues would be extremely useful to the aerospace industry and would reduce the time required by those who attempt to maintain component files while limiting the amount of misinformation that is passed along by work of mouth. Follow-on work in this area is desirable and appropriate with direct benefits to the government.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF. NO.</th>
<th>MANUFACTURER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WEIGHT PACKAGE</th>
<th>SURFACE AREA</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
<th>RAD. POWER</th>
<th>POWER DENSITY</th>
<th>CONSERV</th>
<th>RISE RATE</th>
<th>MASS</th>
<th>therm. ALLOWABLE</th>
<th>SINK</th>
<th>OPERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST 6000 STAR TRACKER</td>
<td>BENDIX CORPORATION</td>
<td>7.3 RECT</td>
<td>2877 3632 797</td>
<td>6/ 20/ 20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>236 307 236 307</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 7 OMA ATM STAR TRACKER</td>
<td>BENDIX CORPORATION</td>
<td>19.1 RECT</td>
<td>11211 77677 257</td>
<td>16/ 16/ 25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>236 302 247 302</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST 8 KS-199 STAR TRACKER</td>
<td>KOLLMAN INSTR.</td>
<td>9.1 RECT</td>
<td>4842 22184 207</td>
<td>8/ 17/ 38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>247 290 226 307</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OMA-IV star tracker has a passive thermal control system. Heat is rejected by conduction to a radiation shield having a permis- sible temperature excursion of -29 to 33 deg C (-20 to 100 deg F). No heaters are required within this range. Unit is hard mounted to vehicle mounting flange. Unit requires clear unobstructed view to operate properly.

The OMA ATM star tracker is a gimbaled unit. The above dimensions are exterior limits. See ref for more detail description. Unit is mar- ried to ATM star tracker electronics unit. Unit has 3 internal heaters totaling 10 watts each. Two of the heaters have set points of -23 deg C to -15 deg C and the third heater has set point of -15 deg C to -15 deg C. Unit is thermally isolated, painted white, and has a superinsulation blanket covering.

The KS-199 star tracker was built for the MOL program. One engineering model was built and functional tested. The gimbals sensor is coupled to an electronic unit. The tracker has internal heaters totaling 10 watts and are used for fast warm up when unit is below -11 deg C (10 deg F). The unit thermal design is passive with unit thermally isolated from mounting and covered by super-insulation blanket to maintain proper operating temperature.
Essential to the thermal analysis of the Space Tug and its associated equipment is an adequate definition of the expected environments to be encountered by the Tug. Many environments had to be evaluated as to their impact on the thermal design of the Tug vehicle. Both minimum and maximum heating conditions were defined. An environments timeline was generated in accordance with a major events timeline given in Table 3-1 and used for the transient mission analysis.

The thermal environments used early in the study to determine worst-case environments are summarized in Table 3-2. These environments were generated using the Tug flux model shown in Figure 3-1. The maximum on-orbit heating condition occurs in the Case 4 park orbit shown in Table 3-2. The planetary and albedo heating contributions of the park orbit and the vehicle's solar orientation make this case's heating slightly higher than other cases considered. Also from the environments study, the minimum heating condition occurs in the Case 7 geosynchronous orbit. The minimal planetary heating in the shadow portion of the orbit led to this case being selected to evaluate cold conditions using the steady-state sink temperature model.

In addition to the hot and cold environments used in the steady-state model, additional environments were needed for the initial orbital insertion and transfer to park orbit for the mission analysis transient model. From liftoff to cargo bay door opening, the cargo bay temperature was assumed to be constant at $294^\circ K$ ($70^\circ F$) for the first 10 minutes and was then increased to $80^\circ F$ in a linear manner to $300^\circ K$ ($80^\circ F$) at 0.533 hours per Reference 3. A worst-case hot environment was simulated with the Tug in the orbiter cargo bay with the radiator doors deployed with the orbiter Z-axis solar oriented as shown in Figure 3-2.

The environments timeline used in the transient mission analysis is described in Table 3-3. These environments were input to the model for the mission simulation in the form of array tables. The launch and landing environments were simulated by driving the orbiter cargo bay liner and radiator door temperatures to the values taken from Reference 3. The reentry temperatures are shown in Figure 3-3. These temperatures represent a worst-case maximum heating condition with an assumed adiabatic payload in the cargo bay.
### Table 3-1 Space Tug Thermal Control Study Mission Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT NO.</th>
<th>START TIME (HOURS)</th>
<th>DURATION (HOURS)</th>
<th>EVENT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LIFTOFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>INSERT INTO 104 x 195 KM (56 x 105 N. MILE) ORBIT @ 111 KM (60 N. MILE) ALTITUDE 28.5° INCLINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>OPEN CARGO BAY DOORS AND DEPLOY SHUTTLE RADIATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>INSERTION INTO 185 KM (100 N. MILE) ORBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1835</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>INSERTION INTO 185 x 296 KM (100 x 160 N. MILE) TRANSFER ORBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>INSERT INTO 296 KM (160 N. MILE) CIRCULAR ORBIT AND COAST TUG/PAYLOAD DEPLOYMENT PREPARATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>MAN PAYLOAD HANDLING STATION AND TUG/PAYLOAD CONSOLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>START TIME (HOURS)</td>
<td>DURATION (HOURS)</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>0.0833</td>
<td>CHECKOUT TUG/PAYLOAD CONSOLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.227</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>CHECKOUT TUG/PAYLOAD (ELECTRICAL CONTINUITY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.477</td>
<td>0.0833</td>
<td>CHECKOUT PAYLOAD HANDLING STATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.0833</td>
<td>CHECKOUT MANIPULATOR ARMS (ELECTRICAL CONTINUITY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.644</td>
<td>0.0667</td>
<td>DEPLOY ARMS TO STANDBY POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>MULTILAYER PURGE OFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>GN &amp; C SYSTEM ACTIVATION/TUG THRUSTER INHIBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.744</td>
<td>0.0667</td>
<td>APS AND TUG PRESSURIZATION CHECKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.808</td>
<td>0.0667</td>
<td>FUEL CELL POWER SYSTEM CHECKOUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.877</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>FUEL CELL ACTIVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>DEMATE SATELLITE UMBILICALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>DEMATE TUG GROUND UMBILICALS (EXCEPT VENTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>GUIDANCE INITIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.943</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>RELEASE TUG HOLD DOWNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Start Time (Hours)</td>
<td>Duration (Hours)</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.977</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rotate Tug/Payload 50° out of Cargo Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Assume Tilt Table remains in this position until Tug Retrieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>Grasp Tug with Manipulator Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.0333</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>Demate Reentry Helium Umbilical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>.0167</td>
<td>Power Switch Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>Demate Vent and Power Umbilicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>Demate Data and C&amp;W Umbilicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.0167</td>
<td>Release Tug Adapter Latches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>.0667</td>
<td>Extend Tug/Payload with Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.234</td>
<td>.0667</td>
<td>Rotate Tug/Payload away from Cargo Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>Release Tug/Payload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tug Control Transferred to Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>Stow Manipulator Arms and Power Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>START TIME (HOURS)</td>
<td>DURATION (HOURS)</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>ORBITER APS BURN; MANEUVERS TO SAFE DISTANCE FROM TUG/PAYLOAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>VISUALLY INSPECT TUG PAYLOAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.583</td>
<td>.0500</td>
<td>POWER DOWN PAYLOAD HANDLING STATION AND TUG/PAYLOAD CONSOLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.633</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>MONITOR GROUND ACTIVITY AND VISUALLY OBSERVE TUG DEPARTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>0 - 11.0</td>
<td>PAYLOAD DELIVERY AND RETRIEVAL PHASE IN SHUTTLE ORBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>0 - 137</td>
<td>PHASING/PLANE CHANGE BURN 26.5° INCLINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>0 - 3.0</td>
<td>COAST ONE REV. IN PHASING ORBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>094 - .221</td>
<td>PERIGEE BURN 296 x 35800 KM (160 x 19300 N. MILE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>COAST IN TRANSFER ORBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>MIDCOURSE CORRECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>START TIME (HOURS)</td>
<td>DURATION (HOURS)</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>COAST TO 35800 KM (19,300 N. MILE) APOGEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>APOGEE BURN CIRCULARIZE 35,800 KM (19,300 N. MILE) ORBIT 0° INCLINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>COAST AND ORBIT TRIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>DEPLOY PAYLOAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PHASING BURN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>COAST IN PHASING ORBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>61.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PHASING ORBIT CIRCULARIZATION BURN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>61.35</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>RENDEZVOUS AND DOCKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>73.35</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>PHASE IN ORBIT FOR NODAL CROSSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>83.03</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>DEBOOST BURN 315 x 35800 KM (170 x 19,300 N. MILE TRANSFER ORBIT) 26.5° INCLINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>83.09</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>COAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>84.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>MIDCOURSE CORRECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>84.09</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>COAST TO 315 KM (170 N. MILE) PERIGEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>START TIME (HOURS)</td>
<td>DURATION (HOURS)</td>
<td>Action Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>88.29</td>
<td>.028 - .051</td>
<td>INJECT INTO RETURN PHASING ORBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>88.34</td>
<td>0 - 3.0</td>
<td>COAST 1 REV. IN PHASING ORBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>91.34</td>
<td>0 - .023</td>
<td>CIRCULARIZE INTO 315 KM (170 N. MILE) ORBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.5° INCLINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>91.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ORBIT TRIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TERMINAL PHASE INITIATION AND TUG CAPTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>91.34</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>SEARCH AND ACQUISITION OF TUG BY ORBITER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>91.38</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>VENT TUG MAIN TANKS AND CLOSE VENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>91.67</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>COECLIPTIC WINDOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>91.68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CONTROL OF TUG TRANSFERRED TO CREW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>94.77</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>PLANE CHANGE WINDOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>96.29</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>ORBITER TPI BURN AND COAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>96.867</td>
<td>.0167</td>
<td>ORBITER TPF BURN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>96.883</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>ORBITER COAST TO AND ARRIVAL AT CAPTURE POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>START TIME (HOURS)</td>
<td>DURATION (HOURS)</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>97.217</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>TUG INTERIAL HOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>97.217</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>MAN AND RECHECK PAYLOAD HANDLING STATION AND TUG CONSOLES AND RECHECK MANIPULATOR ARMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>97.55</td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>TUG CAPTURE BY ARMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>97.634</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SHUTTLE RCS INHIBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>97.634</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TUG SAFING SEQUENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>97.634</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>TUG APS INHIBIT AND POWER SWITCH TO BATTERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>98.383</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>VENT TUG TANKS (APS), FUEL CELL AND ACCUMULATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>98.383</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>CLOSE VENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>98.517</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RETRACT TUG TILT TABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>98.517</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>SECURE TUG TO TILT TABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>98.566</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>REMAKE POWER, C &amp; W, AND DATA UMBILICALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>98.60</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>REMAKE VENT AND PURGE UMBILICALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHECKOUT POWER AND DATA INTERFACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>START TIME (HOURS)</td>
<td>DURATION (HOURS)</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>98.65</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>TUG POWER AND DATA SWITCH TO SHUTTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>98.65</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>UMBILICAL INTERFACE CHECKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>98.683</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>PRESSURIZE AND VENT MAIN TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>98.717</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>PRESSURIZE MAIN TANKS FOR LANDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TUG STOWAGE SEQUENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>98.75</td>
<td>.0667</td>
<td>ROTATE TUG BACK INTO CARGO BAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>98.817</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>SECURE TUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>98.917</td>
<td>.0333</td>
<td>POWER DOWN TUG SUBSYSTEMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>98.95</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>RETURN MANIPULATOR ARMS TO STOWED POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>.0167</td>
<td>POWER DOWN MANIPULATOR ARMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>99.0167</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>RETRACT RADIATORS AND CLOSE CARGO BAY DOORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>99.067</td>
<td>.0167</td>
<td>SECURE CARGO BAY DOORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DEBOOST AND LANDING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>99.067</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>COAST TO ENTRY INTERFACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>BEGIN REENTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>LANDING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3-2 Tug Natural Environments Case Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE NO.</th>
<th>CONFIGURATION</th>
<th>PARK PHASING TRANSFER GEOSYNCHRONOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARK PHASING TRANSFER GEOSYNCHRONOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PHASING ORIENTATION ORIENTATION ORIENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ORIENTATION ORIENTATION ORIENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TUG/ORBITER</td>
<td>52 -ZLV (DEPLOY MODE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TUG/ORBITER</td>
<td>52 +ZLV (RETRIEVE MODE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>52 X-AXIS VELOCITY VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>52 X-AXIS ⊥ TO SUN VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>52 X-AXIS 11 TO SUN VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>0 X-AXIS VELOCITY VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>0 X-AXIS ⊥ TO SUN VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>0 X-AXIS 11 TO SUN VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>- 52 X-AXIS 11 TO SUN SLOW ROLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>- 0 X-AXIS 11 TO SUN SLOW ROLL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE NO.</th>
<th>CONFIGURATION</th>
<th>PARK PHASING TRANSFER GEOSYNCHRONOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARK PHASING TRANSFER GEOSYNCHRONOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PHASING ORIENTATION ORIENTATION ORIENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ORIENTATION ORIENTATION ORIENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TUG/ORBITER</td>
<td>52 -ZLV (DEPLOY MODE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TUG/ORBITER</td>
<td>52 +ZLV (RETRIEVE MODE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>52 X-AXIS VELOCITY VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>52 X-AXIS ⊥ TO SUN VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>52 X-AXIS 11 TO SUN VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>0 X-AXIS VELOCITY VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>0 X-AXIS ⊥ TO SUN VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>0 X-AXIS 11 TO SUN VECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>- 52 X-AXIS 11 TO SUN SLOW ROLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>- 0 X-AXIS 11 TO SUN SLOW ROLL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3-1 Tug Flux Model Y-Axis View

Figure 3-2 Predeployment Flux Model 3-D View
Table 3-3 Tug/Orbiter Mission Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE/ORBITS</th>
<th>MISSION TIME (HOURS)</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launch</td>
<td>0 to 0.593</td>
<td>Radiator doors closed, cargo bay wall environment being boundary temperatures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 NM Circular</td>
<td>0.593 to 2.061</td>
<td>Radiator doors deployed, fluxes calculated using TRASYS (1 orbit)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 x 160 NM Transfer</td>
<td>2.061 to 2.805</td>
<td>Same as above (0.5 orbits)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 NM Circular</td>
<td>2.805 to 4.310</td>
<td>Same as above (1 orbit)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 NM Circular</td>
<td>4.310 to 19.360</td>
<td>Tug deployed - orbiter continues in circular orbit until 98.917 hours - fluxes from Case 4 park orbit.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 x 19300 NM Transfer</td>
<td>19.360 to 24.350</td>
<td>Tug transfer to geosynchronous-fluxes calculated using TRASYS.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19300 NM Circular</td>
<td>24.350 to 84.353</td>
<td>Tug at geosynchronous fluxes from Case 7 geosynchronous (2.5 orbits)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19300 x 160 Transfer</td>
<td>84.353 to 89.343</td>
<td>Tug return transfer from geosynchronous-fluxes calculated using TRASYS.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 NM Circular</td>
<td>89.343 to 98.917</td>
<td>Tug phasing-fluxes from Case 4 park (6.4 orbits).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 NM Circular</td>
<td>98.917 to 100.13</td>
<td>Tug retrieved, radiator doors open (1.3 orbits).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing</td>
<td>100.13 to 110.0</td>
<td>Radiator doors closed, cargo bay wall environments being boundary temperatures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Incident orbital fluxes calculated with vehicle x-axis perpendicular to sun vector for the hot case (see Table 3-2).
Figure 3-3 Boundary Temperatures Used for Landing Environments
4. STEADY-STATE PARAMETRIC STUDIES

Studies were performed to evaluate the influence of various parameters on the thermal design of Tug. These studies were essential in assuring adequate thermal performance of the vehicle throughout its mission and were concerned with both active and passive means of providing thermal control to the Tug and its associated equipment. The studies relied heavily on minimum and maximum heating environments. The areas investigated as part of the study are tabulated in the order they occurred in Table 4-1. A description of each thermal model that was developed and the particular studies that it was used for is discussed in the following sections. The results of each of the studies are also presented.

Table 4-1  Parametric Studies Performed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multilayer Insulation Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermal Control Coatings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Compartment Heat Pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeycomb Wall Structure Conductance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Component Spacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Contact Conductance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Heater Sizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Mission Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified Louver System Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parametric studies began early in the program with the development of a steady-state MITAS (Ref 4) thermal math model to generate compartmental sink temperatures. This model consists of 34 nodes as shown in Figure 4-1. The Tug compartment, tank insulation, and engine are simulated by 31 arithmetic nodes (zero mass nodes) and the boundaries consisting of the LH2 node, the LOX node, and space. There were 117 radiation conductors and 12 linear conductors. Radiation conductors were calculated by the model from the configuration factors and node optical properties data with the use of the SCRFPFA subroutine. Also, the absorbed environmental fluxes were calculated within the model from the incident flux tables and the surface optical properties. This technique allowed for parametric variation of the surface optical properties to investigate their influence on compartment sink temperatures. The maximum and minimum incident heating conditions from Table 3-2 for Case 4 park orbit and Case 7 geosynchronous orbit, respectively, were used in the model.
Figure 4-1 Compartmental Sink Temperature Model
4.1 INITIAL COATING STUDIES

Tradeoff studies to select the external surface coatings were performed using the hot and cold environmental heating rates. The optical coating parameters $\alpha$ and $\varepsilon$ were varied along with the compartmental average power dissipation.

Figure 4-2 presents the hot-case average radiation sink temperature as a function of optical properties and selected power dissipations for the forward compartment. The specific optical property ratios used to generate the curves correspond to white paint ($\alpha/\varepsilon = 0.2/0.9$), aluminum paint ($\alpha/\varepsilon = 0.26/0.26$), and a 50% mixture of white and aluminum paint ($\alpha/\varepsilon = 0.23/0.58$). Forward compartment average sink temperature data are presented in Figure 4-3 for the shadow portion of Case 4 park orbit to show the effect of coating emissivity. The same parametric runs were repeated using the cold-case environments and the results are presented in Figures 4-4 and 4-5 for the sun and shadow portions of the orbit, respectively.

4.2 INSULATION AND COATING SELECTION

Figure 4-5 indicates that coatings by themselves will be inadequate to maintain thermal control. This is based on maintaining the forward compartment average sink temperature above a minimum of 200K (-100°F). This criterion (200K) was chosen based on past experience on a similar system and a survey of minimum temperatures obtained from Reference 2. Before pursuing coating selection further, an investigation of vehicle heat leaks was conducted in an effort to raise compartmental sink temperatures. It was found that a significant heat leak existed at the forward compartment beta cloth shield. By using a 24-layer Mylar insulation blanket with gold on one side of each Mylar sheet, the effective emissivity across the blanket was reduced to 0.025 per Reference 5. Using the insulation, the forward compartment heat leak was reduced to a point where selective coatings were adequate in controlling internal compartment sink temperatures.

The hot and cold cases were reanalyzed using the multilayer insulation blanket and the results are shown in Figures 4-6 thru 4-8. Figure 4-6 presents the forward compartment maximum sink temperatures versus $\alpha/\varepsilon$ ratio and shows the influence of the insulation blanket. Figure 4-7 shows similar results for the sun portion of Case 7 geosynchronous orbit. Minimum forward compartment sink temperatures are shown in Figure 4-8 for shadow portion of the Case 7 geosynchronous orbit. This curve shows an emittance of 0.475 which gives the desired minimum operating sink temperature 200K (-100°F) for nominal power dissipations of 800 to 1000 watts.
Figure 4-2  
Parametric Runs, Hot Case Compartment Average Sink Temperature Park Orbit Case 4 (Full Sun)
Figure 4-3
Parametric Runs, Forward Compartment Average Sink Temperature, Park Orbit Case 4 Earth Shadow Temperatures
Figure 4-4
Parametric Runs, Compartment Average Sink Temperature, Synchronous Orbit Case 7 (Full Sun)
Figure 4-5
Parametric Runs, Compartment Average Sink Temperature, Synchronous Orbit Case 7, Earth Shadow Temperatures
Figure 4-6
Parametric Runs, Forward Compartment Average Sink Temperature, Park Orbit Case 4
Figure 4-7
Parametric Runs, Forward Compartment Average Sink Temperature, Synchronous Orbit Case 7
Figure 4-8
Parametric Runs, Forward Compartment Average Sink Temperature, Synchronous Orbit Case 7
Establishing a maximum sink temperature of 297°K (75°F), from Figure 4-6 dictates an $a/e$ value of 0.50. The previous emittance value of 0.475 fixes an $a$ value of 0.2375. A similar analysis on the intertank compartment indicated an $a/e$ value of 0.60 was needed with $a = 0.246$ and $e = 0.41$.

The paint pattern needed to simulate the necessary optical properties is derived from Figure 4-9. The $a$ and $e$ for all-white paint and all-aluminum paint are plotted on the left and right abscissas, respectively, and connected by straight lines. Finding the optical property on the graph fixes the percentages of aluminum to white paint needed for a mosaic pattern. For the forward compartment 63.5% aluminum paint and 36.5% white paint is needed, and for the intertank compartment 75% aluminum paint and 25% white paint is needed.

4.3 FORWARD COMPARTMENT HEAT PIPES

Upon completion of the thermal coating studies, heat pipes were simulated in the forward compartment to isothermalize the compartment walls. This was necessary because hot-case wall temperature gradients in excess of 72°K (130°F) existed between the sun and shadowed side of the vehicle. The average compartment sink temperature was unaffected by the heat pipes as shown in Figures 4-10 and 4-11. These curves compare directly with those of the coating study, Figures 4-6 and 4-8. Heat pipe performance data for a typical high capacity heat pipe was taken from Reference 6. The pipe operates at a 2 kW load over a temperature drop of 3.89°K (7°F). Based on the performance data, six parallel circumferential heat pipes were integrated into the compartment walls for simulation in the model.

Using a fin effectiveness of 0.85 and a joint conductance of $12.1 \frac{W}{m^2 \cdot ^\circ K}$ (800 Btu/hr-°F-ft²) Reference 7, a conductance value of 467 W/°K (2870 Btu/hr-°F) was calculated between each wall and each heat pipe node. The heat pipe performance data were reduced to an effective conductance between each heat pipe node of 879 W/°K (5400 Btu/hr-°F). The large heat pipe conductance caused oscillations when running the math model, resulting in excessive machine time for temperature convergence. A more efficient technique was then employed that replaced the original heat pipe nodes and network with an equivalent series network connecting adjacent compartment wall nodes with a conductance of 184.6 W/°K (1134 Btu/hr-°F). A reduction in the number of iterations was also achieved by first solving the network without the heat pipes and calculating a fourth power temperature average of the wall nodes. This temperature was applied to the wall nodes as starting wall temperatures for the heat pipe simulation.
Figure 4-9  Parametric Runs, Surface Properties
HEAT PIPES IN FORWARD COMPARTMENT

BETA CLOTH PLUS 24 LAYERS OF INSULATION

Figure 4-10
Parametric Runs, Forward Compartment Average Sink Temperatures Park Orbit Case 4
HEAT PIPES IN FORWARD COMPARTMENT

BETA CLOTH PLUS 24 LAYERS OF INSULATION

EARTH SHADOW

Figure 4-11
Parametric Runs, Forward Compartment Average Sink Temperatures, Synchronous Orbit Case 7
The effectiveness of the heat pipe in reducing circumferential gradients is shown in Figures 4-12 and 4-13 for Case 7 geosynchronous and Case 4 park orbits, respectively. The forward compartment wall temperature gradient is reduced from 50 to 2.8°K in geosynchronous orbit and from 36 to 2.2°K in park orbit.

4.4 HONEYCOMB STUDIES

A study was performed to determine the influence of the honeycomb structure on compartmental temperatures. A duplicate set of forward compartment wall nodes were added to the model simulating the fiberglass epoxy, aluminum core honeycomb structure. Figures 4-14 and 4-15 show the influence of the honeycomb conductance on the forward internal sink temperature for the hot and cold cases, respectively. The ΔTs from the above curves should be added to Figures 4-6 and 4-8, respectively, to obtain the internal sink temperatures for the honeycomb structure. The maximum conductance value of 1 watt/°K (1.94 but/°F) per 0.093 m² (1 ft²) results in a compartment sink temperature 3.3°K (6°F) warmer than no honeycomb for the hot case. The conductance value was obtained assuming an infinite value for the joint conductances. A more realistic value for the joint conductances would result in lower overall conductance values, thus increasing the effect on compartment sink temperatures. The use of a nonmetallic core, such as fiberglass would further increase the ΔT by reducing the conductivity as shown in the curves. Hence, the choice of the honeycomb structure for Tug will have an influence on the thermal design and could impact the basic passive concept chosen. A further discussion of the honeycomb structure is included in Section 7.
Figure 4-12
Forward Compartment Wall Temperatures, Geosynchronous (Vehicle in Sun)

Figure 4-13
Forward Compartment Wall Temperature, Hot Case (Vehicle in Sun)
Figure 4-14
Effect of Honeycomb Conductance on Compartment Sink Temperature, Hot Case

Power = 800 Watts
\( a/e \times = 0.238 / 0.475 \)
\( \Delta T = T \text{ Sink (with honeycomb)} - T \text{ Sink (no honeycomb)} \)
Figure 4-15
Effect of Honeycomb Conductance on Compartment Sink Temperature, Cold Case

- Power = 800 Watts
- $a/\varepsilon = 0.238/475$
- $\Delta T = T_{Sink\ (with\ honeycomb)} - T_{Sink\ (no\ honeycomb)}$
5. TRANSIENT ANALYSIS

5.1 MODEL DESCRIPTION AND ASSUMPTIONS

A transient mission model was constructed to simulate an actual Tug mission from liftoff through landing and subsequent cooldown. This model was used to predict individual component temperature histories along with the structural temperatures of the Tug vehicle. The model incorporated the thermal control features resulting from the previous studies using the steady-state sink temperature model. These features include the use of heat pipes in the forward compartment, multilayer insulation on the forward compartment beta cloth shield, and the external paint pattern determined from the optical properties tradeoff studies. The transient model takes both the thermal capacitance and a realistic power distribution for each component into account in arriving at temperatures.

The overall transient mission model consists of two separate submodels for the forward and intertank compartments. The forward and intertank compartment equipment is listed and described in Tables 5-1 and 5-2, respectively. Figure 5-1 is a TRASYS (Ref 9) computer plot showing the forward compartment equipment, equipment identifiers, node numbers, and their locations. An expanded rollout view of the forward compartment is shown in Figure 5-2 and top view is shown for clarity in Figure 5-3. The intertank equipment, equipment location, and node numbers are shown in Figures 5-4 and 5-5.

The radiation network for the forward compartment consisted of 214 surfaces comprised of eight forward compartment cylinder walls, the beta cloth shield, LH\textsubscript{2} forward dome, and 204 component surfaces. The 214 original surfaces were reduced to 44 nodes for inclusion in the thermal model. The radiation model for the intertank consists of 56 surfaces condensed into 28 nodes. These include eight interior wall nodes, LH\textsubscript{2} and LOX domes, and 18 equipment nodes.

The six sides of each component were used in calculating the blackbody view factors using the TRASYS program. The view factors were used to calculate the grey-body exchange factors also using TRASYS, and were then condensed to single node components using the program radiation condenser option.

Many thermal aspects of the mission analysis are common to both the forward compartment and the intertank compartment models. The time sequence of environments used is shown in Figure 5-6 and is presented in Table 3-3. The liftoff and landing environments are controlled by time varying boundary temperatures for the radiator doors and the
Table 5-1 Forward Compartment Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsystem Equipment</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Node Numbers</th>
<th>Data Reference</th>
<th>Baseline Document</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance, Navigation &amp; Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inertial Measurement Unit I MU-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Tracker ST-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>310, 320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Scanner ES-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Scanner Electronics HRE-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>350, 360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Radar LR-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>370, 380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Radar Electronics LRE-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>390, 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television TV-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>410, 420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer COPE-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>430, 440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Acquisition Unit --</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>430, 440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemetry Formatter --</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>460, 570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Bus Controller --</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>480, 590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Recorder TR-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transponder, PH TPM-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>430, 440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmitter, FM TPM-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>430, 440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoder DSC-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>470, 480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Amplifier PA-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500, 510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF Multiplexer RCM-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Junction --</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter --</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation processor --</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>620, 630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5-2 InterTank Compartment Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System/Subsystem Equipment</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Node Numbers</th>
<th>Data Reference</th>
<th>Baseline Document</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Propulsion System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Tanks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>201, 206, 221, 226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valve Amplifier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>241, 246, 261, 266</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Propulsion System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helium Pressurization Spheres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>231, 236, 251, 256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management Subsystem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Acquisition Unit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td>Page 67</td>
<td>Grouped in pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Power Subsystem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Cell PCI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH2 Sphere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX Sphere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 5-1 Tug Forward Compartment Equipment
Figure 5-2 Tug Forward Compartment Equipment Locations
Figure 5-3  Tug Forward Compartment Interior Nodes
Figure 5-4 Tug Intertank Compartment Equipment Nodes
Figure 5-5 Tug Intertank Interior Nodes

( ) Indicates Nodes On Back Side
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>185 km Circular Orbit (Tug + Orbiter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>185 km x 296 km Transfer Orbit (Tug + Orbiter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>296 km Circular Orbit (Tug + Orbiter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>296 km Circular Orbiter (Case 4 - Tug Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>296 km x 35,800 km Transfer Orbit (Tug Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35,800 km Geosynchronous Orbit (Tug Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35,800 km x 296 km Transfer Orbit (Tug Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Liftoff/Landing - Cooldown (Tug + Orbiter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5-6 Tug Mission Event Sequence**
cargo bay liner (ref 3). All on-orbit environments consist of the natural absorbed solar, albedo, and planetary heating, and were calculated using TRASYS in conjunction with the surface optical properties that were determined from the steady-state trade-off studies.

The Tug and orbiter radiation interchange was accounted for and depends on the vehicle configuration, which follows the events timeline shown in Figure 5-7. Additionally, convection interaction between the orbiter and the Tug was accounted for at liftoff and landing. A natural convection coefficient (h) was calculated with the use of the following correlation from Reference 10 for a horizontal wall.

\[
N_u = 0.35 \left( \frac{G_r}{\Pr} \right)^{1/4}
\]

where

- \( N_u \) = Nusselt Number,
- \( G_r \) = Grashof Number,
- \( \Pr \) = Prandtl Number.

Evaluating the properties of air at a temperature of 311°C (100°F) and assuming a constant acceleration of 2 g results in the following expression for

\[
h = K \left( \rho^2 \Delta T \right)^{1/4}
\]

where

\[
K = 0.92278 \frac{\text{watts}}{\text{meter}^2 \cdot \degree K} = 0.5267 \frac{\text{Btu}}{\text{hr} \cdot \text{ft}^2 \cdot \degree F}
\]

\( \rho \) = air density,
\( \Delta T \) = temperature difference between orbiter cargo bay air temperature and the Tug skin.

The air density is a function of altitude (taken from Reference 3), and input to the model as a time varying array. Also the quantity used for \( \Delta T \) assumes that the entering air will be heated to the average cargo bay temperature as it passes through the orbiter structure. The resulting \( h \) value used in the model is shown in Figure 5-8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tug in Orbiter, Doors Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tug in Orbiter, Doors Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tug Deployed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5-7 Mission Geometry Sequence
Figure 5-8 Free Convection Heat Transfer Coefficient
A circumferential heat pipe was simulated in the forward compartment similar to the heat pipe used in the steady-state model. The major difference was that the fourth power average of the eight wall node temperatures was substituted for the calculated wall node temperature at the beginning of each time step. This technique saved computer time by reducing the number of iterations needed for each transient time step.

The emergency battery used in the intertank model also included a simulated louver system as shown in Figure 5-9. The battery was modeled assuming five of the sides were insulated with an integral 5 watt thermostatically controlled heater to maintain its storage temperature at \(290.3^\circ\text{K} (62.5^\circ\text{F}) \pm 1.39^\circ\text{K} (2.5^\circ\text{F})\). The base of the battery was assumed to be coupled to a louver system whose blades were fully closed at \(292^\circ\text{K} (65^\circ\text{F})\) and fully open at \(303^\circ\text{K} (85^\circ\text{F})\). The louver system radiated to the external skin of the intertank. This assumed inner honeycomb paneling was removed from the louvered area. The effective emittance of the louver system was input to the model as a function of the baseplate temperature and is shown in Figure 5-10. The battery was activated at 97.63 hours at which time 45 watts of internal energy were assumed to be generated within the battery for 0.5 hours.

The fuel cell was modeled as an insulated component that operated at a continuous boundary temperature of \(356^\circ\text{K} (180^\circ\text{F})\) until it is deactivated at 97.63 hours. At this time the fuel cell temperature was allowed to respond like any normal diffusion node.

A contact conductance value between the component and the mounting surface was calculated based on the number of bolted contacts assuming a \(0.60 \frac{\text{watts}}{\text{K}} \left(1.13 \frac{\text{Btu}}{\text{hr} \cdot \text{F}}\right)\) conduction coupling per bolt for individual clip or rail mounts. This nominal value was taken from Reference 11 and based on aluminum bolted joints used in spacecraft application. In the final analysis, the original value had to be reduced for most of the components because the contact conductance couplings were dominating all other couplings. The component contact conductance used in the model along with other component thermal characteristics are given in Tables 5-3 and 5-5 for the forward compartment model and intertank compartment models respectively.

Transient analyses were run for two environment conditions designated "hot case" and "cold case." The hot case uses the environments time line described in Table 3-3 and shown in Figure 5-7 and the configuration time line shown in Figure 5-8. Component power dissipation cycles are indexed in Tables 5-3 thru 5-6. The hot case represents a mission consisting of a hot biased park orbit (Table 3-2, Case 4 park) and landing environment coupled with a hot geosynchronous orbit which included a cyclic shadow period (Table 3-2, case 7 geosynchronous).
Figure 5-9 Louver System/Mounting Configuration
Figure 5-10  Louver System Effective Emittance Versus Battery Baseplate Temperature
Table 5-3  Forward Compartment Component and Hot-Case Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System/Component Name</th>
<th>Node No.</th>
<th>Surface Area, m²</th>
<th>Contact Conductance, Watts/°K</th>
<th>Thermal Mass, Watt-hr/watts</th>
<th>Dissipated Power, watts</th>
<th>Power Time History (Fig.)</th>
<th>Heater Duty Cycle (Fig.)</th>
<th>Heater Size, watts</th>
<th>Avg Heater Power Consumption, watts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Navigation and Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inertial Meas. Unit</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>144.0*</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-46</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Tracker Pri</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>5-48</td>
<td>5-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Tracker Sec</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>5-50</td>
<td>5-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Scanner</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>5-52</td>
<td>5-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Scanner Elec</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>5-54</td>
<td>5-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Radar Pri</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>5-56</td>
<td>5-122</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Radar Sec</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>5-58</td>
<td>5-124</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Radar Elec Pri</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>5-60</td>
<td>5-126</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Radar Elec Sec</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>5-62</td>
<td>5-128</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Pri</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>5-64</td>
<td>5-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Sec</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>5-66</td>
<td>5-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Pri</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-68</td>
<td>5-134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sec</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-70</td>
<td>5-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Acc Unit 1,2</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>5-72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Acc Unit 3,4</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>5-74</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Acc Unit 4,5</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>5-76</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Meas Frmr Pri</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-78</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Meas Frmr Sec</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-80</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Bus Cont (Pri)</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-82</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Bus Cont (Sec)</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-84</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Recorder</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-86</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transponder, PM Pri</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-88</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transponder, PM Sec</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmitter, PM Pri</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-92</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmitter, PM Sec</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-94</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoder Pri</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-96</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoder Sec</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-98</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Amplifier Pri</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Amplifier Sec</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-102</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF Multiplexer</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-104</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Junction</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-106</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-108</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation Proc Pri</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-110</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation Proc Sec</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5-112</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Continuous power from liftoff to 98.92 hours.
(2) On for 0.5 hours prior to each main engine burn per Table 3-1.
(3) Power on at 60.83 hours. Power off at 61.83 hours.
(4) Power on at 61.33 hours. Power off at 61.83 hours.
(5) Continuous power from liftoff through landing.

* Contains an internal heater.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Component Name</th>
<th>Node No.</th>
<th>Temp History (Fig.)</th>
<th>Heater Duty Cycle (Fig.)</th>
<th>Heater Size, watts</th>
<th>Average Heater Power Consumed, watts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inertial Meas. Unit</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5-47</td>
<td>5-113</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Tracker Pri</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>5-49</td>
<td>5-117</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Tracker Sec</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>5-51</td>
<td>5-119</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Scanner</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>5-53</td>
<td>5-121</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Scanner Elec.</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>5-55</td>
<td>5-121</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Radar Pri</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5-57</td>
<td>5-123</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Radar Sec</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>5-59</td>
<td>5-125</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Radar Elec Pri</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>5-61</td>
<td>5-127</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Radar Elec Sec</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>5-63</td>
<td>5-129</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Pri</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>5-65</td>
<td>5-131</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Sec</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5-67</td>
<td>5-133</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Pri</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>5-69</td>
<td>5-135</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sec</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>5-71</td>
<td>5-137</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Acc Unit 1,2</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>5-73</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Acc Unit 3,4</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>5-75</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Acc Unit 4,5</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>5-77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlmtry Frmtr Pri</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>5-79</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlmtry Frmtr Sec</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>5-81</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Bus Cont Pri</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>5-83</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Bus Cont. Sec</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>5-85</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Recorder</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>5-87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-5 Intertank Compartment Component and Hot-Case Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System/Component Name</th>
<th>Node No.</th>
<th>Surface Area, m²</th>
<th>$\varepsilon$</th>
<th>Contact Conductance, Watts/K</th>
<th>Thermal Mass, Watt-hr/K</th>
<th>Oper. Power, watts</th>
<th>Power Time History (Fig.)</th>
<th>Heater Size, watts</th>
<th>Average Heater Power Consumption, watts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Propulsion System</td>
<td>APS Tanks 601*</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>0.10(1)</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>Heater Node</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-178**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valve Amplifier 290</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>5-180</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MainPropulsion Sys. Helium Press Spheres 231*</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>0.10(1)</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>Arithmetic Nodes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-182</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Management Sys. Data Acc Unit 280</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>5-184</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Represents emissivity of insulation blanket.
(2) Continuous power from liftoff to 98.92 hours.
(3) Continuous power from liftoff through landing.
* 601 is representative of the eight APS tanks.
** 231 is representative of the 4 helium pressurization spheres.
** Represents the temperature of outside insulation blanket.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Component Name</th>
<th>Node No.</th>
<th>Surface Area m²</th>
<th>Contact Conductance, Watts/M²°C</th>
<th>Thermal Mass Conductance, W/°K</th>
<th>Oper. Power, Watts</th>
<th>Power Time, Hours</th>
<th>Temperature History (Fig.)</th>
<th>Heater Duty Cycle (Fig.)</th>
<th>Heater Size, watts</th>
<th>Average Heater Power Consumption, watts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH₂ Sphere</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>0.10⁽¹⁾ Isolated</td>
<td>Arithmetic Node</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-186*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX Sphere</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>0.10⁽¹⁾ Isolated</td>
<td>Arithmetic Node</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-188*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery**</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.10⁽¹⁾ Louvered</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>45W</td>
<td>5-190</td>
<td>5-194</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Cell***</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.10⁽¹⁾</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-192</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁽¹⁾ Represents emissivity of insulation blanket.
* Represents temperature of outside of insulation blanket.
** Five sides of the battery are insulated 0.11 m² (1.19 ft²), = 0.1. The base 0.29 m² (0.3125 ft²) is covered by louvers (c shown in Figure 5-10).
*** The fuel cell temperature is held at a constant 356°C (180°F) until 97.63 hours when its temperature is calculated normally.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System/Component Name</th>
<th>Node No.</th>
<th>Temperature History (Fig.)</th>
<th>Heater Duty Cycle (Fig.)</th>
<th>Heater Power Consumed, watts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aux. Propulsion System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Tanks</td>
<td>601*</td>
<td>5-179**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valve Amplifier</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>5-181**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Propl'sn System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helium Press Sphere</td>
<td>231*</td>
<td>5-183</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Mgmt System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Acc. Unit</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>5-185</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elec. Power Subsys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH₂ Sphere</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>5-187</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX Sphere</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>5-189</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>5-191</td>
<td>5-195</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Cell</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>5-193</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 601 is representative of the eight APS tanks; 231 is representative of the four helium spheres.
** Represents temperature of outside insulation blanket.
*** Represents net heat transfer to maintain fluid at 278°K (40°F).
The cold case used environments consistent with the hot case until 24.35 hours, corresponding to the first shadow point in geosynchronous orbit. At this time the Tug was reoriented with the longitudinal axis parallel to the solar vector (Table 3-2, Case 8 geosynchronous) to minimize external orbital heating. Component power dissipation cycles continued as in the hot case. The cold-case simulation was terminated at 45 hours.

5.2 FORWARD COMPARTMENT RESULTS

The results of the hot and cold cases for the forward compartment analyzed are summarized in Tables 5-3 and 5-4. Many of the forward compartment components had simulated thermostatically controlled heaters to maintain their temperature limits.

Each component was reviewed after the initial hot case run for compatibility with its allowable temperature limits while the compartment power was at the 800-watt level. Energy balances were performed on the components that dropped below their lower temperature limits to determine major heat leaks and heater sizing requirements. As previously discussed, the mounting conduction was reduced and heaters added where required. The heaters were sized to maintain the lower temperature limit of each component in the hot case. During this exercise, it became apparent that excessive heater power was being consumed for the hot case and this was expected to be significantly worst in the later cold-case run. The cold-case run was performed to further determine heater requirements. These runs pointed to the need for an alternative thermal control concept to avoid the excessive heater power consumption.

The total heater energy required by these components was calculated by time integrating the instantaneous heater power over the total mission duration. Individual component heater powers are tabulated in Table 5-3 and the total integrated heater energy for the entire forward compartment is shown in Figures 5-11 and 5-12 for the hot and cold cases, respectively. The hot-case mission resulted in an average of 275 watts of heater power over most of the mission. The cold-case mission consumed an average of 774 watts of heater power after 25 hours in the mission. This was not sufficient to maintain the component lower temperature limits. This emphasizes the need to alter the thermal control concept originally chosen. The transient model wall nodes are shown in Figure 5-13 and the hot and cold case temperature results for these nodes are given in Figures 5-14 thru 5-45. Figures 5-46 thru 5-137 present the forward component temperatures.
The remaining areas of the forward compartment are presented in Figures 5-138 thru 5-143. Figures 5-138 and 5-139 present the outer layer of insulation on the LH$_2$ tank dome temperature for the hot and cold cases. Figures 5-140 and 5-141 present the forward shield inner surface temperatures and Figures 5-142 and 5-143 present the outer surface (beta cloth) temperatures for the hot and cold cases respectively. Figures 5-144 and 5-145 present the forward compartment internal sink temperatures derived from each case. Comparison of these data with the previous steady-state results accounts for the honeycomb AT and should be compared only where steady-state conditions exist.

5.3 INTERTANK COMPARTMENT RESULTS

The intertank compartment results are presented beginning with the outer and inside skin temperatures in Figures 5-146 through 5-177. Tables 5-5 and 5-6 summarize the component data and refer to the appropriate figures for the hot and cold case temperature results. This compartment contains several tanks as shown in Figures 5-4 and 5-5, hence the data presented in the report is representative of each of the various types of tanks. Figure 5-178 presents the insulation temperature for one of the eight APS tanks where each tank was controlled to 278°C (40°F). Node 231, Figure 5-182, presents representative data for the four helium pressurization spheres. The fuel cell LH$_2$ and LOX tank plots represent the insulation temperatures. Each tank was held at its liquid temperature during the mission simulations. Insulation properties derived from Reference 5 were used on the LH$_2$, LOX, and APS tanks, assuming the configuration is as applied to the forward shield.

The LH$_2$ tank lower dome insulation and LOX tank upper dome insulation temperatures are presented in Figures 5-196 thru 5-199. The intertank compartment sink temperature is presented in Figures 5-200 and 5-201.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. 115  Forward Compartment Integrated Power

MIN OF 0.  OCCURRED AT TIME 0.
MAX OF 11327.128  OCCURRED AT TIME 110.000

FIGURE 5-11.  ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. 115  Forward Compartment Integrated Power

MIN OF 0.  OCCURRED AT TIME 0.
MAX OF 75930.034  OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000

FIGURE 5-12.  ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
( ) Interior Nodes

Figure 5.17, Transient Model Skin Nodes
TEMP NODE NO. 71 Outer Skin, Forward
MIN TEMP OF 232.722 OCCURRED AT TIME 49.800
MAX TEMP OF 338.194 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

FIGURE 5-14. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

TEMP NODE NO. 71 Outer Skin, Forward
MIN TEMP OF 216.374 OCCURRED AT TIME 43.300
MAX TEMP OF 312.534 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.600

FIGURE 5-15. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NO. 1 Inner Skin, Forward
MIN TEMP OF 239.099 OCCURRED AT TIME 49.000
MAX TEMP OF 333.999 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

MIN TEMP OF 221.599 OCCURRED AT TIME 43.300
MAX TEMP OF 308.466 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-16. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-17. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-18. ANALYSIS OF TUG FK-10. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-19. ANALYSIS OF TUG FK-13. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW FT.
**MIN TEMP OF 238.474 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.800**

**MAX TEMP OF 333.012 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400**

**MIN TEMP OF 221.496 OCCURRED AT TIME 43.300**

**MAX TEMP OF 306.620 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800**

**FIGURE 5-20. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES**

**FIGURE 5-21. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.**
FIGURE 5-22. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. CORP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-23. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. CORP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
TEMP NODE NO.  3 Inner Skin, Forward
MIN TEMP OF  237.094 OCCURRED AT TIME  46.800
MAX TEMP OF  334.065 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

MIN TEMP OF  221.080 OCCURRED AT TIME  44.500
MAX TEMP OF  306.266 OCCURRED AT TIME  1.800

FIGURE 5-24. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-25. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-26. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-27. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-28. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

TEMP NODE NO. 4 Inner Skin, Forward
MIN TEMP OF 237.246 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.800
MAX TEMP OF 334.193 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

FIGURE 5-29. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

TEMP NODE NO. 4 Inner Skin, Forward
MIN TEMP OF 226.310 OCCURRED AT TIME 44.800
MAX TEMP OF 306.194 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800
Mission Time - Hours

Temp Node No. 75 Outer Skin, Forward

Min Temp: 231.033 occurred at time 49.800
Max Temp: 339.714 occurred at time 101.400

Figure 5-30: Analysis of Tug Fwd. Comp. + Components with Heat Pipes

Mission Time - Hours

Temp Node No. 75 Outer Skin, Forward

Min Temp: 215.550 occurred at time 44.800
Max Temp: 306.225 occurred at time 1.800

Figure 5-31: Analysis of Tug Fwd. Comp. Stationed at Geo. Shadow Pit.
TEMP NODE NO. 5 Inner Skin, Forward
MIN TEMP OF 236.02\degree C OCCURRED AT TIME 48.000
MAX TEMP OF 334.27\degree C OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

MIN TEMP OF 219.71\degree C OCCURRED AT TIME 44.800
MAX TEMP OF 306.04\degree C OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-32 . ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-33 . ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-34. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-35. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADON PT.
1. **MISSION TIME** - HOURS

   **TEMP NODE NO.**  6 Inner Skin, Forward
   **MIN TEMP** 236.810 OCCURRED AT TIME 46.800
   **MAX TEMP** 334.235 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

2. **MIN TEMP** 219.605 OCCURRED AT TIME 44.900
   **MAX TEMP** 306.115 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

**FIGURE 5-36**.
ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

**FIGURE 5-37**.
ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-38. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + CO-PROJECTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-39. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
TEMP NODE NO. 7 Inner Skin, Forward
MIN TEMP OF 237.217 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.600
MAX TEMP OF 334.061 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

MIN TEMP OF 219.972 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 306.854 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-40. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-41. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 6-42. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 6-43. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MIN TEMP OF 239.153 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.800
MAX TEMP OF 333.670 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

MIN TEMP OF 220.924 OCCURRED AT TIME 43.300
MAX TEMP OF 308.459 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.000

FIGURE 544. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 546. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-46. ANALYSIS OF TUG PID. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-47. ANALYSIS OF TUG PID. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS
TEMP NODE NO. 310 Star Tracker Pri
MIN TEMP OF 258.123 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.900
MAX TEMP OF 324.259 OCCURRED AT TIME 102.200

FIGURE 5-48. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

MISSION TIME - HOURS
TEMP NODE NO. 310 Star Tracker Pri
MIN TEMP OF 236.182 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 302.516 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-49. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO. 320 Star Tracker Sec

MIN TEMP OF 250.579 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.900
MAX TEMP OF 324.213 OCCURRED AT TIME 102.200

FIGURE 5-50 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO. 320 Star Tracker Sec

MIN TEMP OF 225.501 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 302.503 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.600

FIGURE 5-51 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-52. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

TEMP NODE NO. 330 Horizon Scanner
MIN TEMP OF 248.259 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.900
MAX TEMP OF 328.487 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.800

FIGURE 5-53. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

TEMP NODE NO. 330 Horizon Scanner
MIN TEMP OF 228.270 OCCURRED AT TIME 44.900
MAX TEMP OF 303.737 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800
FIGURE 5-54. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-55. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-56. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

MIN TEMP OF 291.207 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.900
MAX TEMP OF 317.372 OCCURRED AT TIME 103.000

FIGURE 5-57. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

MIN TEMP OF 275.599 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 299.523 OCCURRED AT TIME 4.300
Figure 5.58: Analysis of Tug Fwd. Comp. + Components with Heat Pipes

Figure 5.59: Analysis of Tug Fwd. Comp. Stationed at GEO. Shadow Pt.
FIGURE 5-60: ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-61: ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
TEMPERATURE - DEGREES KELVIN

MISSION TIME - HOURS

Upper Limit

MISSION TIME - HOURS

Lower Limit

FIGURE 5-62: ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-63: ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

TEMP NODE NO. 300 Laser Radar Elec Sec
MIN TEMP OF 287.571 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 302.565 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

TEMP NODE NO. 300 Laser Radar Elec Sec
MIN TEMP OF 290.703 OCCURRED AT TIME 24.700
MAX TEMP OF 304.325 OCCURRED AT TIME 106.200

TENP NO. 300 Laser Radar Elec Sec
MIN TEMP OF 287.571 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 302.565 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-62: ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-63: ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

TENP NO. 300 Laser Radar Elec Sec
MIN TEMP OF 290.703 OCCURRED AT TIME 24.700
MAX TEMP OF 304.325 OCCURRED AT TIME 106.200
MISSON TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO. 390 Television Pri
MIN TEMP OF 260.359 OCCURRED AT TIME 49,000
MAX TEMP OF 317.465 OCCURRED AT TIME 103,000

MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO. 360 Television Pri
MIN TEMP OF 237.861 OCCURRED AT TIME 45,000
MAX TEMP OF 298.045 OCCURRED AT TIME 1,800

FIGURE 5-64. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWO. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-65. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWO. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-66. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-67. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO. 410 Computer Pri
MIN TEMP OF 296.315 OCCURRED AT TIME 49.900
MAX TEMP OF 335.281 OCCURRED AT TIME 102.000

FIGURE 5-68. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES
FIGURE 5.70. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5.71. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MIN TEMP OF 250.615 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.900
MAX TEMP OF 320.000 OCCURRED AT TIME 102.200

MIN TEMP OF 225.139 OCCURRED AT TIME 44.900
MAX TEMP OF 303.659 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-72. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-73. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MIN TEMP of 251.667 OCCURRED AT TIME 40.000
MAX TEMP of 327.002 OCCURRED AT TIME 102.200

Figure 5-74. Analysis of TUG FWD. Comp. + Components with Heat Pipes
MIN TEMP OF 250.015 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.900
MAX TEMP OF 376.202 OCCURRED AT TIME 102.200

FIGURE 5-76. ANALYSIS OF TUG FD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

MIN TEMP OF 225.642 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 303.706 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.000

FIGURE 5-77. ANALYSIS OF TUG FD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MIN TEMP OF 248.326 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.900 MIN TEMP OF 226.167 OCCURRED AT TIME 44.900
MAX TEMP OF 327.394 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.900 MAX TEMP OF 306.463 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-78: ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES
FIGURE 5-79: ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-80. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWQ. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-81. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWQ. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5.82. ANALYSIS OF TUG FLIGHT COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5.83. ANALYSIS OF TUG FLIGHT COMPONENTS STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-84. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-85. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-86  ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-87  ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMPONENTS STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-88. ANALYSIS OF TUG FLID. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEMP NODE NO.</th>
<th>MIN TEMP</th>
<th>OCCURRED AT TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transponder, PM Pri</td>
<td>244.731°C</td>
<td>48.800 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 Transponder, PM Pri</td>
<td>330.203°C</td>
<td>101.700 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 5-89. ANALYSIS OF TUG FLID. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEMP NODE NO.</th>
<th>MIN TEMP</th>
<th>OCCURRED AT TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transponder, PM Pri</td>
<td>223.125°C</td>
<td>45.000 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 Transponder, PM Pri</td>
<td>308.395°C</td>
<td>1.800 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 5.90. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5.91. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT ECD. SHADOW PT.
Figure 5-92. Analysis of Tug FWD Comp. + Components with Heat Pipes

Figure 5-93. Analysis of Tug FWD Comp. Stationed at OG2, Shadow PT.
FIGURE 5-96 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-97 ANALYSIS OF TUG RWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
Figure 5-98: Analysis of Tug FWD Comp. + Components with Heat Pipes

- Min Temp of 243.354°C occurred at time 48.900 hours.
- Max Temp of 329.004°C occurred at time 101.800 hours.

Figure 5-99: Analysis of Tug FWD Comp. stationed at Geo. Shadow Pt.

- Min Temp of 222.782°C occurred at time 45.000 hours.
- Max Temp of 306.209°C occurred at time 1.800 hours.
FIGURE 5-100 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-101 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-102 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

TEMP NODE NO. 510 Power Amplifier, Sec
MIN TEMP OF 294.143 OCCURRED AT TIME 100.200
MAX TEMP OF 332.457 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.500

FIGURE 5-103 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

TEMP NODE NO. 510 Power Amplifier, Sec
MIN TEMP OF 246.765 OCCURRED AT TIME 42.800
MAX TEMP OF 329.485 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800
MIN TEMP OF 240.261 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.900
MAX TEMP OF 326.480 OCCURRED AT TIME 102.000

MIN TEMP OF 240.331 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 303.814 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-104. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-105. ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-106 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

TEMPT NODE NO. 600 Hybrid Junction
MIN TEMP OF 242.4 K OCCURRED AT TIME 48.900
MAX TEMP OF 320.0 K OCCURRED AT TIME 101.900

FIGURE 5-107 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

TEMPT NODE NO. 600 Hybrid Junction
MIN TEMP OF 220.8 K OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 303.3 K OCCURRED AT TIME 1.600
Figure 5-108 Analysis of Tug FWD. Comp. + Components with Heat Pipes

Temp Node No. 610 Filter
Min Temp of 242.390 occurred at time 48.900
Max Temp of 327.729 occurred at time 101.800

Figure 5-109 Analysis of Tug FWD. Comp. Stationed at GEO. Shadow Pt.

Temp Node No. 610 Filter
Min Temp of 220.751 occurred at time 45.000
Max Temp of 303.135 occurred at time 1.800
FIGURE 5-10 ANALYSIS OF TUG THD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

MIN TEMP OF 231.895 OCCURRED AT TIME 49.000
MAX TEMP OF 323.418 OCCURRED AT TIME 102.300

FIGURE 5-11 ANALYSIS OF TUG THD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

MIN TEMP OF 224.825 OCCURRED AT TIME 44.900
MAX TEMP OF 303.094 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800
MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO. 630 Modulation Proc. Sec
MIN TEMP OF 251.415 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.900
MAX TEMP OF 323.412 OCCURRED AT TIME 102.300

TEMP OF 225.041 OCCURRED AT TIME 44.900
MAX TEMP OF 303.085 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5.112 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5.113 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-114 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-115 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. 112 Star Tracker Sec Heater Power

MIN OF 0.0 OCCURRED AT TIME 110.000
MAX OF 68.260 OCCURRED AT TIME 73.400

MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. 112 Star Tracker Sec Heater Power

MIN OF 0.0 OCCURRED AT TIME 24.900
MAX OF 68.260 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000

FIGURE 5-116 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-117 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. HOR. SCANNER HEATER POWER
MIN OF 0. OCCURRED AT TIME 110.000
MAX OF 51.195 OCCURRED AT TIME 73.300

FIGURE 5-118 ANALYSIS OF TUG FNO. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. HOR. SCANNER HEATER POWER
MIN OF 0. OCCURRED AT TIME 24.900
MAX OF 51.195 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000

FIGURE 5-119 ANALYSIS OF TUG FNO. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-120  ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

MIN OF 0. OCCURRED AT TIME 110.000
MAX OF 95.325 OCCURRED AT TIME 73.700

FIGURE 5-121  ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

MIN OF 0. OCCURRED AT TIME 25.400
MAX OF 95.325 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
**Figure 5-122** Analysis of Tug Fwd. Comp. + Components with Heat Pipes

- **Node No. 109** Laser Radar Pri Heater Power
- **MIN** of 0.000 occurred at time 110.000
- **MAX** of 511.950 occurred at time 100.600

**Figure 5-123** Analysis of Tug Fwd. Comp. Stationed at Geo. Shadow Pt.

- **Node No. 109** Laser Radar Pri Heater Power
- **MIN** of 0.000 occurred at time 23.900
- **MAX** of 611.950 occurred at time 45.000
FIGURE 5-124 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-125 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. 107 Laser Radar Electronics Pri Heater Power

MIN of 0. OCCURRED AT TIME 110.000
MAX of 511.950 OCCURRED AT TIME 109.300

FIGURE 5-126 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. 107 Laser Radar Electronics Pri Heater Power

MIN of 0. OCCURRED AT TIME 25.100
MAX of 511.950 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000

FIGURE 5-127 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO.  108  Laser Radar Electronics Sec Heater Power
MIN OF  0. OCCURRED AT TIME 110.000
MAX OF  511.950 OCCURRED AT TIME 100.300

MIN OF  0. OCCURRED AT TIME 24.600
MAX OF  511.950 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000

FIGURE 5-128  ANALYSIS OF TUG FW. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-129  ANALYSIS OF TUG FW. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. 105 Television FRI Heater Power
MIN OF 0. OCCURRED AT TIME 110.000
MAX OF 69.260 OCCURRED AT TIME 73.600

FIGURE 5-130 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. 105 Television FRI Heater Power
MIN OF 0. OCCURRED AT TIME 24.900
MAX OF 68.260 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000

FIGURE 5-131 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIN Of 0. OCCURRED AT TIME</th>
<th>MAX Of 68.260 OCCURRED AT TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110.000</td>
<td>73.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.900</td>
<td>45.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5-132** ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

**Figure 5-133** ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-134  ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-135  ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
Figure 5-136 Analysis of TUG FWD Comp. + Components with Heat Pipes

Figure 5-137 Analysis of TUG FWD Comp. stationed at GEO. Shadow Pt.
FIGURE 5-138 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-139 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO. 33 Forward Shield Inner Surface
MIN TEMP OF 231.671 OCCURRED AT TIME 49.800
MAX TEMP OF 336.627 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

FIGURE 5-140 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5-141 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
Figure 5-142  Analysis of TUG FWD Comp. + Components with Heat Pipes

Figure 5-143  Analysis of TUG FWD Comp. Stationed at Geo. Shadow Pt.

Temp Node No. 35 Forward Shield Outer Surface - Beta Cloth

Min Temp of 55.627 occurred at time 47.900
Max Temp of 359.712 occurred at time 101.300

Min T/L/P of 49.320 occurred at time 44.900
Max Temp of 299.138 occurred at time .600
FIGURE 5.144 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. + COMPONENTS WITH HEAT PIPES

FIGURE 5.145 ANALYSIS OF TUG FWD. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADY PT.
FIGURE 5-146 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO.  B1 Outer Skin
MIN TEMP OF  104.830 OCCURRED AT TIME  48.800
MAX TEMP OF  366.314 OCCURRED AT TIME  101.400

FIGURE 5-147 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO.  B1 Outer Skin
MIN TEMP OF  100.201 OCCURRED AT TIME  45.000
MAX TEMP OF  338.364 OCCURRED AT TIME  1.800
MIN TEMP of 165.000 occurred at time 48.600
MAX TEMP of 355.295 occurred at time 101.400

MIN TEMP of 166.405 occurred at time 45.000
MAX TEMP of 336.514 occurred at time 1.800

FIGURE 5-148 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE
FIGURE 5-149 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
**Figure 5-150** Analysis of Tug Int. Compartment + Components No Heat Pipe

- Temp Node No: 62 Outer Skin
- Min Temp of 163.6°K occurred at time 48.800
- Max Temp of 356.3°K occurred at time 101.400

**Figure 5-151** Analysis of Tug Int. Comp. Stabilized at C.E.O. Shadow Pt.

- Temp Node No: 62 Outer Skin
- Min Temp of 99.9°K occurred at time 45.000
- Max Temp of 320.6°K occurred at time 1.800
**FIGURE 5-152** ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

- **TEMP NODE NO.**: 10 Inner Skin
- **MIN TEMP**: 163.923°C occurred at time 48.600 hours
- **MAX TEMP**: 356.357°C occurred at time 101.400 hours

**FIGURE 5-153** ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

- **TEMP NODE NO.**: 10 Inner Skin
- **MIN TEMP**: 100.146°C occurred at time 45.000 hours
- **MAX TEMP**: 324.199°C occurred at time 1.800 hours
MIN TEMP OF 160.389 OCCURRED AT TIME 72.800
MAX TEMP OF 357.182 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

MIN TEMP OF 98.365 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 330.778 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-154 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

FIGURE 5-155 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-156 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

FIGURE 5-157 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
**Figure 5-158** Analysis of T/L Int., Compartment + components no heat pipe

- **Temp Node No.:** 94 Outer Skin
- **Min Temp:** 160.133°C occurred at time 72.600
- **Max Temp:** 357.233°C occurred at time 101.400

**Figure 5-159** Analysis of T/L Int. Comp. stationed at Geo. Shd. Pt.

- **Temp Node No.:** 94 Outer Skin
- **Min Temp:** 97.839°C occurred at time 45.000
- **Max Temp:** 339.705°C occurred at time 1.800
TEMP NODE NO.  12 Inner Skin
MIN TEMP OF  150.080 OCCURRED AT TIME  72.800
MAX TEMP OF  350.931 OCCURRED AT TIME  101.400

FIGURE 5-160  ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

TEMP NODE NO.  12 Inner Skin
MIN TEMP OF  98.025 OCCURRED AT TIME  45.000
MAX TEMP OF  337.589 OCCURRED AT TIME  1.800

FIGURE 5-161  ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. CORP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO.  85 Outer Skin
MIN TEMP OF 160.255 OCCURRED AT TIME 72.800
MAX TEMP OF 357.260 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

FIGURE 5-162 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COOPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE
MISSION TIME - HOURS

Temperature - Degrees Kelvin

Temp Node No. | 13 Inner Skin
Min Temp Of | 161.000 Occurred At Time | 72.800
Max Temp Of | 527.000 Occurred At Time | 101.400

Figure 5-184 Analysis of tug int. compartment + components no heat pipe.

Mission Time - Hours

Temperature - Degrees Kelvin

Temp Node No. | 13 Inner Skin
Min Temp Of | 98.635 Occurred At Time | 45.000
Max Temp Of | 337.692 Occurred At Time | 1.000

Figure 5-185 Analysis of tug int. comp. stationed at geo. shadow pt.
FIGURE 5-166
ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COUPLING + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

MISSION TIME - HOURS
TEMP NODE NO. 86 Outer Skin
MIN TEMP OF 160.693 OCCURRED AT TIME 72,000
MAX TEMP OF 357.272 OCCURRED AT TIME 101,460

FIGURE 5-167
ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. 56.004 FT.

MISSION TIME - HOURS
TEMP NODE NO. 86 Outer Skin
MIN TEMP OF 99.698 OCCURRED AT TIME 46,000
MAX TEMP OF 330.865 OCCURRED AT TIME 1,800
MISSION TIME - HOURS

**FIGURE 5-168**: ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

**FIGURE 5-169**: ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-170  ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

TEMP NODE NO.   07 Outer Skin
MIN TEMP OF 175.309 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.600
MAX TEMP OF 356.320 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

FIGURE 5-171  ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

TEMP NODE NO.   07 Outer Skin
MIN TEMP OF 141.459 OCCURRED AT TIME 44.600
MAX TEMP OF 321.562 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800
Figure 5.172 Analysis of Tug Int. Compartment + Components No Heat Pipe

- Temp Node No.: 15 Inner Skin
- Min Temp of 176.341 occurred at time 48.000
- Max Temp of 356.227 occurred at time 101.400

Figure 5.173 Analysis of Tug Int. Comp., Stationed at Geo. Shadow Pt.

- Temp Node No.: 15 Inner Skin
- Min Temp of 142.275 occurred at time 44.600
- Max Temp of 324.817 occurred at time 1.800
FIGURE 5-174 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COUPLING + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

FIGURE 5-175 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COUPL. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
TEMP NODE NO. 16 Inner Skin
MIN TEMP OF 169.093 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.800
MAX TEMP OF 355.940 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

MIN TEMP OF 106.704 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 336.715 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-176 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

FIGURE 5-177 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MIN TEMP OF 169.203 OCCURRED AT TIME 48.000
MAX TEMP OF 350.367 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

MIN TEMP OF 121.052 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 330.057 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-179 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-180 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

FIGURE 5-181 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
TEMP NODE NO. 231 Helium Press. Sphere
MIN TEMP OF 104.752 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 333.693 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.800

FIGURE 5-182 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

FIGURE 5-183 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. CO/P. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
MIN TEMP OF 240.321 OCCURRED AT TIME 49.000
MAX TEMP OF 334.591 OCCURRED AT TIME 102.300

MIN TEMP OF 128.029 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 317.204 OCCURRED AT TIME 3.400.
Figure 5-186 Analysis of TUG Int. Compartment + Components No Heat Pipe

Temp Node No. 211 LH₂ Sphere
Min Temp of 164.320 occurred at Time 48.800
Max Temp of 335.322 occurred at Time 101.400

Figure 5-187 Analysis of TUG Int. Comp. Stationed at Geo. Shadow Pt.

Temp Node No. 211 LH₂ Sphere
Min Temp of 104.600 occurred at Time 45.000
Max Temp of 332.288 occurred at Time 1.800
MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO. 216 LOX Sphere
MIN TEMP OF 164.100 OCCURRED AT TIME 49.600
MAX TEMP OF 356.431 OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

FIGURE 5-188 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO. 216 LOX Sphere
MIN TEMP OF 104.295 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX TEMP OF 334.005 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.000

FIGURE 5-189 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
TEMP NODE NO.  275 Battery
MIN TEMP OF  291.479 OCCURRED AT TIME  97.100
MAX TEMP OF  327.634 OCCURRED AT TIME  60.650

FIGURE 5-190  ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

TEMP NODE NO.  275 Battery
MIN TEMP OF  291.476 OCCURRED AT TIME  25.400
MAX TEMP OF  232.120 OCCURRED AT TIME  4.600

FIGURE 5-191  ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-192 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

FIGURE 5-193 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-194  ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPES

MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. 402 Battery Heater Power

MIN OF 0. OCCURRED AT TIME 110.000
MAX OF 5.000 OCCURRED AT TIME 97.150

FIGURE 5-195  ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

MISSION TIME - HOURS

NODE NO. 402 Battery Heater Power

MIN OF 22.035 OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000
MAX OF 22.035 OCCURRED AT TIME 0.
FIGURE 5-196 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

FIGURE 5-197 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
FIGURE 5-19A ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEMP NODE NO.</th>
<th>LOX Tank Forward Dome Insulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIN TEMP OF</td>
<td>165.026°C OCCURRED AT TIME 48.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX TEMP OF</td>
<td>359.930°C OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 5-19B ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEMP NODE NO.</th>
<th>LOX Tank Forward Dome Insulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIN TEMP OF</td>
<td>107.042°C OCCURRED AT TIME 45.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX TEMP OF</td>
<td>332.002°C OCCURRED AT TIME 1.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISSION TIME - HOURS

TEMP NODE NO. 44 Inner Tank Compartment Sink Temperature
MIN TEMP OF 165.97K OCCURRED AT TIME 48.600
MAX TEMP OF 356.39K OCCURRED AT TIME 101.400

MIN TEMP OF 110.04K OCCURRED AT TIME 43.000
MAX TEMP OF 332.59K OCCURRED AT TIME 1.000

FIGURE 5-200 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMPARTMENT + COMPONENTS NO HEAT PIPE

FIGURE 5-201 ANALYSIS OF TUG INT. COMP. STATIONED AT GEO. SHADOW PT.
5.4 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Thermal control of the forward and intertank compartments for hot-case missions was achieved with the need of heater power. The heater power was concentrated in the low duty cycle components, namely, the primary and secondary laser radars and their electronics packages. Increasing the external coating a/c ratio would reduce the amount of heater power required by increasing the internal compartmental sink temperature; however, the cold-case heater power consumption would likely remain high. The cold-case simulation resulted in all components except the fuel cell and battery dropping below the allowable lower temperature limits. Fifteen of the components were 10°K or less below limits while 31 were 10 to 20°K below and seven were 20 to 30°K below limits. Out of the latter group, the IMU heater power curve was 50% of expected, which would eliminate its cold problem. Several methods are available to solve the cold-case problems, reduce the lower limit qualifications temperature, add heater power, increase conduction isolation, change component coatings, and add insulation. All of these would rely upon heater power however, and some of the components would be affected in the hot case. In any event the hot case would still require heater power which ideally should not require any heat.

An alternative forward compartment layout would be prudent to solve the cold case problems while reducing the need of heater power. The components should be grouped to allow mounting of active and inactive components on the same mount. Mounting high and low duty cycle components on thermal conditioning panels (highly conductive panels) would be a desirable configuration from a thermal point of view. The configuration considered here is shown in Figure 5-202. As shown, louvers are mounted to the skin side of the panel. The louvers provide the means of reducing panel heat losses in the cold case, while the thermal conditioning panel distributes heat between components, thus reducing the heater power required by low duty cycle components. Figures 5-203 and 5-204 present the results of a study to determine the heat flux required to maintain various panel temperatures as a function of skin temperature and internal compartmental sink temperature (TE).

Referring to the hot case curve, Figure 5-203, and assuming the skin and internal sink temperatures at 294.4°K (70°F), the panel flux range would vary from 56.7 to 179.7 watts/meter² (18 to 57 Btu/hr-ft²). This corresponds to a panel temperature range of 300 to 311°K (80 to 100°F). For the 600-watt heat load a total panel area of 3.34 meters² (36 feet²) would result in a panel flux of 179.4 watts/meter², yielding a panel temperature of 311°K. The advantage in using this configuration is apparent when the cold-case data for a 200°K (-100°F) skin and internal sink temperature are considered. The flux required to maintain a 272°K (30°F) panel temperature is 220.8 watts/meter² (70 Btu/hr-ft²). Comparing
the hot and cold case values results in a heater requirement of 41.4 \text{ watts/meter}^2 to maintain the selected panel temperature. Scaling this up to the assumed panel area, 138.3 watts would be required. This compares with the amount of heat required in the hot case and reduces the cold-case heater power by more than 600 watts. Increasing the total panel area by 1/3 increases the heater power significantly to 101.4 \text{ watts/meter}^2 or a total of 508 watts. This would still yield a savings in excess of 275 watts for the cold case.

As shown, a significant reduction in heater power can be achieved using this method. Several other advantages are derived from this approach. As the Tug design evolves, the forward compartment power level will probably change. This method of thermal control provides a means of reducing the sensitivity of steady-state power on heater power requirements by maintaining preselected panel heat fluxes. Minimum cable weight can be achieved by properly grouping components on individual panels while satisfying thermal requirements. The structural design would be simplified by reducing the number of component structural interfaces to a minimum. One tradeoff would be required to determine if the reduced cable and consumable weights would offset the added weight of the louvers and thermal conditioning panels. Other tradeoffs concerning cost and design flexibility would also be in order.

The intertank compartment suffers from the lack of heat dissipated to maintain acceptable internal sink and skin temperatures. Coatings, thermal standoffs, and heaters could be used as a solution. Due to number of components expected in this compartment the louver/thermal conditioning panel concept appears to be too heavy for application.
Figure 5-202 Forward Compartment Component Mounting
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Figure 5-203 Hot-Case Mounting Panel Heat Fluxes, Louvers Open
Figure 5-204 Cold-Case Mounting Panel Heat Fluxes, Louvers Closed
Thermal control of the fuel cell electrical power subsystem represents a critical design consideration because a failure in this area could result in failure to achieve the specific mission objectives and the loss of a Tug. Two approaches were explored in this area; each used radiators. The approaches differed only in how the heat was transported from the fuel cell to the radiators. The system chosen was a redundant pumped fluid system using series-series bypassed radiators. The pumped fluid system was chosen over variable conductance (VC) heat pipes because of the current state of the art of pumped fluid systems and the current problems with VC heat pipes. The Tug is penalized in power and weight by this choice. As VC heat pipe technology expands in the future, the use of VC heat pipes in this part of the Tug design should be possible with less risk.

The fuel cell in this study was based upon design data obtained from Pratt and Whitney (Ref 13). The fuel cell heat rejection system is required to maintain the fuel cell internal fluid loop within an acceptable temperature range 349.67 to 355.2°C (170 to 180°F) independent of heat load. The baseline for the study included a single fuel cell which, when coupled with the components used in the study, resulted in an electrical load that varied from 600 to 1500 watts. The radiator design was based on rejecting resultant waste heat loads plus the fuel cell pump and radiator pump power.

Four equally sized radiator panels were assumed consistent with the baseline. The four radiators were located in each quadrant of the intertank compartment forward of and clocked 45° from the APS modules. The four panels, located as shown in Figure 6-1, reduce the effects of plume heating from the APS modules and minimize attitude influences from external heating. The apparent choice of a hydrazine APS configuration provides one of the more significant changes from earlier configurations (Ref 8), and will reduce the plume heating on the radiators to levels experienced on the Titan IIIC Transtage vehicle. These levels did not impair the radiator performance in seven flights of that vehicle.

The thermal environments were evaluated to determine the worst-case design environments for use in the radiator design. The cold-case design conditions were obvious; because at synchronous altitude the earth emitted and albedo is near zero and the Tug could be aligned with the sunline to result in no heat being applied to the radiator panels. The case 4 park orbit, β = 52°, resulted in slightly higher incident fluxes than the other cases studied and was chosen for the hot case. The vehicle orientation maximized absorbed heating when two radiators were exposed to the sun and when the included angle between the center of each radiator and the sun line was 45° as shown in Figure 6-1.
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Figure 6-1 Tug Exterior
The maximum heat load to be rejected was used with the hot-case thermal environment and minimum heat load to be rejected was used with the cold-case environment to obtain the thermal design conditions. These conditions are consistent with orbital altitude requirements of 296 to 35,750 km (160 to 19300 n mi) with no attitude constraints.

Operationally the fuel cell was assumed to be activated in orbit before the Tug and payload were released by the orbiter. The fuel cell was also assumed to be deactivated before the Tug was remated to the orbiter. This sequence of events was sufficient to permit the fluid system to be designed without interfacing with the orbiter for thermal control. The potential for a fluid loop failure during a 7-day mission was considered sufficient for adding a redundant fluid loop. Each loop was designed to carry the full heat load. In addition, the radiators were used to provide micrometeorite protection for the fluid lines.

The fuel cell system shown in Figure 6-2 was obtained from Reference 13. The fuel cell generates waste heat, which is removed by a fluid loop. The coolant temperature control valve, pump, and interconnecting lines are an integral part of the system. Cell performance is predicated on maintaining the coolant through the fuel cell in a narrow temperature range independent of the electrical load. The primary parameters are control of the inlet temperature to 355.4°K (180°F) ±9°K and limiting the temperature rise through the cell to 5.6°K (10°F) under maximum load conditions. Figure 6-3 presents the waste heat rejection as a function of electrical load with the design conditions shown. The warmup heater shown in Figure 6-2 is used to heat the fluid and the cell to the operating temperature level during the activation period and is not used during the normal operational period. Pratt and Whitney suggests the use either water or FC-43 as the working fluid on the fuel cell side of the interface. FC-43 was used in the simulations; however, water could have been used because the interface temperatures chosen in the study will not result in freezing temperatures.

The reactants, H₂ and O₂, enter the cell as low-pressure gases and exit as slightly superheated steam at 355°K. The reactant consumption is presented in Figure 6-4. For this study the water vapor was assumed to be dumped continuously. However, payload contamination requirements could require a different approach. For example, the water could be stored in a tank after being condensed and dumped overboard during main engine burns, thus reducing the water vapor around the Tug during coast periods.
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Figure 6-2 Fuel Cell Flow Schematic
Figure 6-3 Waste Heat Rejection

Figure 6-4 Reactant Consumption
The fuel cell heat rejection fluid loop is presented in Figure 6-5, which shows a single fluid loop through the thermal control valve and the radiators. The schematic is presented in this manner for clarity purposes only, and should be interpreted as having a redundant loop. The regenerator was considered to be a single unit with a redundant secondary loop.

The four radiator panels are in series with tubes on each panel in series, thus the series-series description. The radiators are similar in design to the Transtage radiator using the P-tube rail concept, Figures 6-5 and 6-6, details A and B, which allows two P-tubes to be attached to a single rail. Each panel has two continuous P-tubes from inlet to outlet with the flange removed in the bend and rail crossover areas. This concept minimizes the number of fluid connections and potential leakage points. The concept also provides micrometeorite protection.

The fluid is bypassed around the radiators, Figure 6-5, as the return fluid temperature drops below a predetermined level, 333°K (140°F). The thermal control valve was envisioned as a mechanically actuated valve using an electronic controller that senses the mixed fluid temperature going to the regenerator, T₃, and controls 333°K (140°F). This temperature was selected to meet the heat rejection requirements while minimizing radiator area. A lower temperature would also result in lower flowrates through the radiator in the cold case coupled with lower fluid temperatures. The pump was located on the outlet side of the regenerator to maximize the fluid temperature entering the radiators in the cold case. Freon E-1, the chosen working fluid, was developed primarily to yield heat transport properties similar to Freon 21 while eliminating the compatibility problems of that fluid. The cold-case results, discussed later, indicate that a heater is not required to avoid excessively cold fluid temperatures.

The system results in a relatively constant headrise requirement on the pump because the system pressure drop should remain relatively constant. Flow trimming problems experienced on parallel flow systems are avoided with the series configuration. One concern with this design is the confirmation of the transitional flow characteristics of a single panel. Although past radiator designs have been based on a turbulent or laminar operation, the Tug radiator was designed to operate through the transition region with Reynolds numbers ranging from 27,000 in the hot case to 600 in the cold case.

Two advantages of the bypass radiator design are the limited pressure drop and reduction in heat transfer coefficient as the fluid is cooled. The maximum pressure drop through the radiators occurs at full flow when the fluid is at its high temperature and is reduced as flow is bypassed around the panels.
Figure 6-5 Fuel Cell Heat Rejection
Figure 6-6 Radiator Details
Ideally, the radiator designer desires high heat transfer coefficients at maximum heat load conditions and minimum coefficients at minimum heat load conditions. This allows the total panel area to be minimized while limiting the minimum fluid temperature. The transitional flow design permits the designer to accomplish this.

This design assumes predictable operation over the above Reynolds number range using data Colburn presented in 1936 (Ref 12). The Transtage radiator was designed to operate down to Reynolds numbers of 7000 however, the complete transition region was not explored. Successful Skylab Airlock Module radiator operation was demonstrated up to Reynolds numbers of 2500. A verification test of a single panel is needed to confirm the design philosophy considered here. A further discussion follows in the cold case results discussion.

6.1 RADIATOR MODELING TECHNIQUES

A 79-node thermal model using variable material and fluid properties to evaluate the system performance was developed. Heat transfer coefficients were evaluated for each individual radiator tube. Classical heat exchanger theory was applied in evaluating the regenerator performance.

The tube heat transfer coefficients were obtained using the Colburn J-Factor method discussed in Reference 12. Figure 6-7 was obtained from Reference 12, page 394, which relates the Colburn J-Factor to Reynolds number. The Colburn J-Factor is related to the heat transfer coefficient by the equation:

\[ J = \left( \frac{h_c}{\rho C_p V} \right) N_p^{2/3} \left( \frac{\mu_f}{\mu_w} \right)^{0.14} \]

where

- \( C_p \) = fluid specific heat
- \( V \) = fluid velocity in tube
- \( \rho \) = bulk fluid density
- \( N_p \) = Prandtl Number
- \( \mu_f \) = bulk fluid viscosity
- \( \mu_w \) = fluid viscosity at the tube wall
Figure 6-7 Colburn J-Factor vs Reynolds Number
\[ J = \text{Colburn J-Factor} \]
\[ k = \text{fluid conductivity} \]
\[ N_R = \text{Reynolds number} \]
\[ D = \text{tube internal diameter} \]
\[ h_c = \text{heat transfer coefficient to tube} \]

Solving for \( h_c \)

\[ h_c = Jk N_R^{1/3} \left( \frac{\mu_w}{\mu_f} \right)^{0.14}/D \]

A subroutine with this equation was used in calculating the heat transfer equation and applying it to the model. Inherent in the subroutine was another technique used in evaluating radiator designs at the Denver Division for several years. This technique is directly adaptable to the finite differencing technique used by most thermal analyzer programs. Consider fluid flowing through a single tube and further consider this to be a part of a parallel flow heat exchanger.

The heat balance on the tube is governed by the following equations:

**Fluid**

\[ Q = \dot{\omega} C_p (T_{in} - T_{out}) \]

**Tube**

\[ Q = \varepsilon \dot{\omega} C_p (T_{in} - T_w) \]

\[ \dot{\omega} C_p (T_{in} - T_{out}) = \varepsilon \dot{\omega} C_p (T_{in} - T_w) \]

where

- \( Q \) = heat rate
- \( \dot{\omega} \) = mass flow rate
- \( C_p \) = specific heat of the fluid
- \( T_{in} \) = fluid inlet temperature
- \( T_{out} \) = fluid outlet temperature
- \( T_w \) = tube wall temperature
- \( \varepsilon \) = heat exchanger effectiveness
solving for $T_{\text{out}}$

\[ T_{\text{out}} = (1-e) \, T_{\text{in}} + T_{w} \]

For a parallel flow heat exchange the effectiveness is

\[ \varepsilon = \frac{1 - e^{-\text{NTU} \left(1 + \frac{C_{\min}}{C_{\max}}\right)}}{1 + \frac{C_{\min}}{C_{\max}}} \]

where

\[ C = \dot{m} C_{p} \]

$C_{\min}$ = the minimum enthalpy flow

$C_{\max}$ = the maximum enthalpy flow

NTU = number of heat exchanger units = $h_{c} \, A/C_{\min}$

If the tube wall were assumed to be a constant temperature, the enthalpy flow outside the tube would approach infinity of $C_{\max} \to \infty$ hence $C_{\min}/C_{\max} = 0$. The above equation reduces to

\[ \varepsilon = 1 - e^{-h_{c} \, A/C_{\min}} \]

Having solved for $T_{\text{out}}$ in terms of $T_{\text{in}}$ and $T_{w}$ and determined $\varepsilon$, the finite difference equation was reviewed.

\[ T_{A} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} G_{j-A} \, T_{j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} G_{j-A}} \]
where

\[ T_A \] = temperature of node A

\[ G_{j-A} \] = conductance from node \( j \) to node A

\[ T_j \] = temperature of node \( j \)

\( n \) = number of nodes conducted to node A

The finite differencing equations would therefore solve for \( T_{out} \) in the following manner:

\[
T_{out} = \frac{(1 - \epsilon) T_{in} + \epsilon T_w}{1 - \epsilon + \epsilon}
\]

which reduces to Equation [1].

The network for Equation [3] is:

```
T_in 1 - \epsilon
\[ \longrightarrow \]
T_out
```

The tube equation is satisfied by adding the additional conductor to the network between \( T_{in} \) and \( T_w \).

```
T_in 1 - \epsilon
\[ \longrightarrow \]
T_out
\[ \epsilon \omega C_p \]
```

Hence the subroutine calculated the above network for each of the 16 radiator tubes, impressing the appropriate conductor values in the thermal network each iteration. In addition, the Reynolds numbers, Colburn J-Factors, and heat transfer coefficients were saved for printout purposes.
To complete the radiator evaluation, the fin effectiveness was evaluated by the following equation obtained from Reference 14.

\[
\mu_F = \frac{\tanh \frac{2L_F}{k\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma \varepsilon T_R^3}{k\delta}}}{2 \frac{L_F}{k\delta} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma \varepsilon T^3}{k\delta}}}
\]

where

\( T_R \) = Fin root or rail root temperature

\( \varepsilon \) = Surface emissivity

\( k \) = Conductivity of the fin

\( \delta \) = Fin thickness

\( L_F \) = Fin width

\( \sigma \) = Stefan-Boltzman constant

Solving for the root temperature in the model the fin heat radiated is determined by

\[
Q = \sigma A \mu_F T_R^h
\]

6.2 REGENERATOR SIZING

The regenerator was sized using the effectiveness approach described in Reference 15. For a counter flow heat exchanger, the effectiveness is defined as

\[
\varepsilon = \frac{1 - e^{-\text{NTU}} (1 - C_{\min}/C_{\max})}{1 - (C_{\min}/C_{\max}) e^{-\text{NTU}} (1 - C_{\min}/C_{\max})}
\]
where

\[ \text{NTU} = \frac{\text{number of heat transfer units}}{\text{UA/C}_{\min}} \]

\[ C = \omega C_p \]

\[ C_{\min} = \text{minimum } \omega C_p \]

\[ C_{\max} = \text{maximum } \omega C_p \]

\[ A = \text{heat transfer area} \]

\[ U = \text{overall heat transfer coefficient} \]

NTU was evaluated by assuming that on an individual iteration basis the fuel cell fluid loop was at steady state. This agrees with the use of arithmetic nodes to simulate the fluid. With that assumption it follows that the heat dissipated by the fuel cell must be transferred through the regenerator. Using the previous iterations regenerator \( \Delta T \), the UA was calculated by the following equation.

\[ UA = \frac{Q}{\Delta T} \]

NTU was derived from the above equation after determining the minimum of the hot and cold side \( \omega C_p \) values.

6.3 RADIATOR PRESSURE DROP

Radiator pressure drop was evaluated directly from the following equation which was obtained from References 12 and 16.

\[ J = \frac{f}{8} \]

or

\[ f = 8J \]

where

\[ J = \text{Colburn J-factor} \]

\[ f = \text{friction factor} \]
\[ \Delta P = 8J \frac{L_0 V^2}{D \cdot 2g_c} \]

where

- \( L \) = tube length
- \( D \) = tube internal diameter
- \( \rho \) = fluid density
- \( V \) = average fluid velocity
- \( g_c \) = gravity term

Substituting the velocity with the continuity equation

\[ \Delta P = 8J \frac{L}{D} \frac{\rho}{2g_c} \left( \frac{\omega}{\rho A} \right)^2 \]

where

- \( A \) = internal tube cross sectional area
- \( \omega \) = fluid mass flow rate

Pressure drops for tube bends were evaluated using the above equation modified for equivalent L/D ratios obtained from Reference 16.

6.4 FUEL CELL MODEL

The fuel cell was modelled and integrated with the radiator model. The model schematic is shown in Figure 6-8.

Table 6-1 describes the nodes of the fuel cell model.

The conductor values used were temperature-dependent based upon FC-43 as the working fluid and were \( \omega \) C one-way conductors. The system mass flow was 5.75 kg/minute (12.67 lb/minute). The use of water in this loop would reduce the mass flow in proportion to the specific heat ratio.
Table 6-1 Fuel Cell Model Node Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Fuel Cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Pump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Fluid Node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Regenerator Inlet - Fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Regenerator Outlet - Fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Coolant Temperature Thermal Control Valve - Fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Bypass Fluid and Fast Warm-up Heater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Boundary Temperature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q200</th>
<th>Fuel cell heat dissipation function of electrical load Figure 6-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q201</td>
<td>Pump heat dissipation - 30 watts constant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The coolant temperature control valve was simulated by a linear curve assuming 100% flow through the regenerator at \(356^\circ K\) (181°F) and 10% flow at \(353^\circ K\) (176°F) regenerator outlet temperatures. The control range used was smaller than the 5.5°K (10°F) range obtained from Pratt and Whitney. The range was reduced to provide better control of the fuel cell and was based on experience with wax plug designs that tend to control in the range used. Pratt and Whitney also stated that the design of the valve is such that the minimum regenerator flow is 5 to 10% at the lower allowable fluid temperatures.

Node 207 was used as a boundary node to remove heat from the fluid using the regenerator equations and the following equations. The effectiveness is related to the heat flow by

\[
\varepsilon = \frac{q}{q_{\text{max}}} = \frac{C_h \left( T_{\text{h in}} - T_{\text{h out}} \right)}{C_{\min} \left( T_{\text{h in}} - T_{\text{c in}} \right)}
\]

\[
= \frac{C_c \left( T_{\text{c out}} - T_{\text{c in}} \right)}{C_{\min} \left( T_{\text{h in}} - T_{\text{c in}} \right)}
\]

where

\(q\) = heat flow from hot to cold side

\(q_{\text{max}}\) = maximum heat flow for \(\varepsilon = 1\)

\(C_h\) = \(\dot{\omega} C_p\) for the hot side fluid (fuel cell)

\(C_c\) = \(\dot{\omega} C_p\) for the cold side fluid (fuel cell heat rejection system)

\(C_{\min}\) = minimum of \(C_h\) and \(C_c\)

\(T_{\text{h in}}\) = fluid hot side inlet

\(T_{\text{h out}}\) = fluid hot side outlet

\(T_{\text{c in}}\) = fluid cold side inlet

\(T_{\text{c out}}\) = fluid cold side outlet

solving for \(q\)

\[q = \varepsilon C_{\min} \left( T_{\text{h in}} - T_{\text{c in}} \right)\]
Using arithmetic nodes to simulate the fluid implies that the heat generated must be removed from the system because the nodes are relaxed to steady state each iteration. The heat stored in the fuel cell and pump, nodes 200 and 201, was not considered due to expected small variations from one iteration to the next. The sum of Q200 and Q201 was used along with an assumed 5.6°C (10°F) temperature drop of the fuel cell fluid through the regenerator to calculate the UA term thus enabling the effectiveness to be calculated. Node 207 was set by the maximum temperature difference.

\[ T_{207} = T_{204} - (T_{\text{h in}} - T_{\text{c in}}) \]

or

\[ T_{207} = T_{204} - (T_{203} - T_{34}) \]

where \( T_{34} \) was the cold side inlet temperature.

The above equation defining \( q \) was satisfied by substituting the individual temperatures.

\[ q = \varepsilon C_{\text{min}} (T_{204} - T_{207}) \]

\[ = \varepsilon C_{\text{min}} (T_{204} - T_{204} + (T_{\text{h in}} - T_{\text{c in}})) \]

hence

\[ q = \varepsilon C_{\text{min}} (T_{\text{h in}} - T_{\text{c in}}) \]

6.5 FUEL CELL HEAT REJECTION SYSTEM MODELING

The control portion of the fuel cell heat rejection system fluid loop was modelled as shown in Figure 6-9.

Table 6-2 presents a description of the nodes contained in Figure 6-9.
Figure 6-9
Fuel Cell Heat Rejection System
Flow Control Loop Model

Table 6-2 Radiator Control Loop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Radiator fluid inlet temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Radiator fluid outlet temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Thermal control valve outlet temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Regenerator inlet temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Regenerator outlet temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Pump outlet temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Fluid temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Boundary temperature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heat was applied to node 36 as $Q_p$ which was set at 51 watts. These data were derived from a Block II Apollo pump with Freon E-1 as the working fluid. The conductor values were obtained using temperature varying properties and represent the mass flow times specific heat. The pump flow was held constant at 1.81 kg/minute (4 lb/minute). Node 208 was used to add the heat removed from the fuel cell loop to the radiator loop and was evaluated by the following equation

$$T_{208} = T_{35} + (T_{h\text{ in}} - T_{c\text{ in}})$$

$$= T_{35} + (T_{203} - T_{34})$$

The conductor value between nodes 35 and 208 was set equal to $\epsilon C_{\text{min}}$. 
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The radiator model is presented for a single panel. Each panel was modelled individually and integrated into the complete model. The first panel in the loop is shown in Figure 6-10.

\[ Q_E = \text{External Heating} \]

**Figure 6-10 Radiator 1 Nodal Diagram**

Nodes 1 through 9 and node 37 represent fluid nodes. Node 9 was equivalent to node 1 on panel number 2 with the entire numbering sequence contained. The series of nodes beginning with 41 were tube wall nodes while the nodes beginning with 61 were rail root nodes. Node 460 was the boundary node representing the space sink temperature of 0°C. The fluid conductors between radiator rails were \( \omega C_p \) values. The tube-to-rail root and rail root-to-rail root conductors were handled as linear conductors. \( Q_E \) represents the application absorbed external heating.

6.6 **HOT-CASE PERFORMANCE**

The hot-case analysis was performed to size the area of the radiators and regenerator performance for the maximum external heating and maximum heat load condition. The results of the study
resulted in the radiator being sized to 8.05 m² (22 ft²) or 2.01 m² (5.5 ft²) per panel. The regenerator requirements derived from the analysis indicated that an effectiveness of 0.90 or greater was achievable. Table 6-3 presents the conditions used. As previously discussed, the maximum external environment was obtained from flux case 4 in park orbit and was a transient environment. The use of higher inclination angle orbits would require resizing the radiator area for a constant solar exposure in near-earth orbit.

Table 6-3 Hot-Case Radiator Design Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum External Heating</th>
<th>Flux Case 4 Park Orbit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Attitude</td>
<td>Sun Normal to Tug Longitudinal Axis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Radiators Exposed to Sun 45° from Sun Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Electrical Load</td>
<td>1500 Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Heat Load</td>
<td>744 Watts Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81 Watts for Pumps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A radiator coating selection study was pursued where primary requirements for screening were a low \( \alpha/c \), demonstrated stability of the properties, ease of application, ease of maintenance, and durability. White paints were eliminated by most of the above considerations. Optical solar reflectors (OSR) were deleted due to anticipated problems with handling and maintenance. Silver-coated teflon tape was selected because of its favorable optical property values, stability, ease of application, and maintenance. The properties used to represent silver Teflon in the analysis were \( \alpha = 0.09 \) and \( c = 0.76 \), obtained from Reference 17.

Figures 6-11 thru 6-13 present key temperatures of the fuel cell loop, the regenerator inlet, regenerator outlet, and coolant temperature control valve outlet temperatures, respectively. The first temperature peak is due to the initial temperature in the radiators being set at 355.4 K (180°F). Hence, the first half hour of the simulation was used to gain control of the system. Most of this time was used to allow the control valve to respond; the valve was not allowed to change more than 0.5% of full flow from one iteration to the next. This logic was to limit the valve cycling. The same logic was also applied to the radiator loop thermal control valve. The resultant regenerator inlet temperature was 359.73 K (187.75°F), as shown in Figure 6-11, while the outlet of the regenerator was 344.54 K (160.5°F), as shown in Figure 6-12. The 0.1-hour output interval accounts for the seemingly jagged minor peaks in the curves indicating some minor cycling of the coolant control valve temperature at 353.7 K (177°F), as shown in Figure 6-13. Hence, the system was controlled within the desired temperature limits under maximum heating and load conditions.
FIGURE 6-11  RADIATOR HOT CASE

FIGURE 6-12  RADIATOR HOT CASE
Figures 6-14 thru 6-16 represent the fluid inlet temperature to the radiators, fluid outlet temperature from the radiators, and the radiator loop thermal control valve outlet temperature, respectively. Figure 6-16 also represents the regenerator cold side inlet temperature and demonstrates control at the desired 333°K (140°F). Figure 6-17 presents the regenerator cold side outlet temperature. Figure 6-18 presents the heat rejected by the radiator fluid loop and Figure 6-19 presents the net heat radiated from the four radiator panels. The net heat rejected was evaluated by summing the total heat radiated from the panels and subtracting the summation of the absorbed heating rates. Figure 6-20 presents the radiator fluid mass flow, which ranged from 1.772 to 1.322 kg/minute (3.904 to 2.914 lb/minute). As shown the maximum system flow was 1.814 kg/minute (4 lb/minute). The maximum radiator flow of 1.772 kg/minute provides a 2% margin in flow in the hot case after the initial temperature transient.

Figure 6-21 presents the heat flow across the regenerator, which averaged 809 watts (2763 Btu/hour). The fuel cell loop flow through the regenerator, Figure 6-22, averaged 2.31 kg/minute (5.1 lb/minute), while the system capability was 5.75 kg/minute (12.67 lb/minute) as recommended by Pratt and Whitney. Based upon these results, the fuel cell loop flow could be reduced to 2.72 kg/minute (6 lb/minute) with adequate margin maintained.

The Reynolds numbers, Colburn J-Factors, heat transfer coefficients, and radiator pressure drop in the hot case were influenced by the tube L/D chosen for cold-case performances. With an L/D of 200 the hot-case parameters varied as shown in Table 6-4.

The radiator fin effectiveness varied between 0.908 to 0.923 for rail root temperatures of 354.2 to 330.2°K (177.8 to 134.6°F) at the maximum flow condition and 0.909 to 0.929 for rail temperatures of 352.3 to 320.8°K (174.5 to 117.7°F) at minimum flow conditions.

In reality, the hot-case electrical load on the fuel cell would occur during a main engine burn, which would result in the vehicle being oriented to the proper attitude before the burn. This required burn attitude would probably result in external heating rates less than the hot-case environment, which would yield more radiator performance margin than indicated. Further, the maximum load would be a relatively short interval, on the order of 200 to 300 seconds.
FIGURE 6-13. RADIATOR HOT CASE

FIGURE 6-14. RADIATOR HOT CASE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEMP NODE NO.</th>
<th>MIN TEMP</th>
<th>OCCURRED AT TIME</th>
<th>MAX TEMP</th>
<th>OCCURRED AT TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>121.200</td>
<td>5.310</td>
<td>180.000</td>
<td>4.310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 6-15** RADIATOR HOT CASE

**FIGURE 6-16** RADIATOR HOT CASE
Temp Node No. 35: Regenerator Fluid Outlet Temperature

- Min Temp of 180.000 occurred at time 4.310
- Max Temp of 355.801 occurred at time 4.410

FIGURE 6-17: RADIATOR HOT CASE

Node No. 300: Radiator Fluid Heat Rejection

- Min of 0. occurred at time 4.310
- Max of 3047.005 occurred at time 4.410

FIGURE 6-18: RADIATOR HOT CASE
FIGURE 6-19  RADIATOR HOT CASE

Radiator Net Heat Radiated

MIN TEMP OF 2846.932 OCCURRED AT TIME 9.910
MAX TEMP OF 3537.414 OCCURRED AT TIME 4.310

FIGURE 6-20  RADIATOR HOT CASE

Radiator Loop Fluid Mass Flow

MIN TEMP OF 2.913 OCCURRED AT TIME 5.310
MAX TEMP OF 4.000 OCCURRED AT TIME 4.310
MIN TEMP OF 2761.494 OCCURRED AT TIME 7.710
MAX TEMP OF 3070.784 OCCURRED AT TIME 4.310

FIGURE 6-21 RADIATOR HOT CASE

MIN TEMP OF 5.048 OCCURRED AT TIME 4.910
MAX TEMP OF 12.421 OCCURRED AT TIME 4.310

FIGURE 6-22 RADIATOR HOT CASE
Table 6-4 Radiator Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow (kg/minute)</th>
<th>Reynolds Numbers inlet/outlet</th>
<th>J inlet/outlet</th>
<th>Heat Transfer Coefficient watt/m² °K (Btu/hr-ft²-°F) inlet/outlet</th>
<th>Pressure Drop N/m² (psi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.772 (3.906)</td>
<td>20561/27655/0.00407/0.00400</td>
<td>1117/2517/946/946</td>
<td>1.75058 x 10⁵/20561/0.00407/0.00407</td>
<td>(25.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.322 (2.914)</td>
<td>14553/20444/0.00418/0.00467</td>
<td>842/512/705/705</td>
<td>9.84364 x 10⁴/14553/0.00418/0.00467</td>
<td>(14.277)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COLD-CASE PERFORMANCE

The cold-case analysis was performed to verify that the radiator system performance was adequate in a minimum external heating environment with a minimum heat rejection requirement. For this case the heat load was reduced to 281 watts from the fuel cell, which results from a 600 watt electrical load. The external environment was reduced to no external heating being applied to the radiators, which would result from the vehicle longitudinal axis aligned to look at the sun.

The predicted radiator performance indicated that this environment could be flown under minimum heat load conditions without experiencing excessively cold fluid temperatures. The radiator flow was controlled at 12% of full flow.

Figures 6-23, 6-24, and 6-25 present the major fuel cell fluid temperatures. Figures 6-23 and 6-24 present the fluid inlet and outlet temperatures for the fuel cell side of the regenerator. Figure 6-25 presents the coolant temperature control valve outlet temperature. As discussed in the hot case, the high flow in this loop and the restricted response of the coolant temperature control valve resulted in the negative peak in fluid temperatures. The inlet to the fuel cell was maintained at 352.8°K (175.3°F).
Figure 6-23: Radiator Cold Case

**Node No. 203**
- Fuel Cell Loop Regenerator Inlet Temp.
- Min Temp of 130.153° occurred at time 0.300
- Max Temp of 190.000° occurred at time 0.

Figure 6-24: Radiator Cold Case

**Node No. 204**
- Fuel Cell Loop Regenerator Outlet Temp.
- Min Temp of 188.265° occurred at time 0.300
- Max Temp of 190.000° occurred at time 0.
FIGURE 6-25 RADIATOR COLD CASE

TEMP NODE NO. 205 Fuel Cell Loop Coolant Temperature Control
MIN TEMP OF 125.373 OCCURRED AT TIME 0.300
MAX TEMP OF 175.316 OCCURRED AT TIME 2.000

FIGURE 6-26 RADIATOR COLD CASE

TEMP NODE NO. 1 Radiator Fluid Inlet Temperature
MIN TEMP OF 121.023 OCCURRED AT TIME 0.300
MAX TEMP OF 180.000 OCCURRED AT TIME 0.
The radiator inlet temperature showed a similar negative peak with a resultant temperature of 344.3°K (160°F), Figure 6-26. Of major interest in this run was the radiator outlet fluid temperature, as shown in Figure 6-27, which leveled out at 227.6°K (-50°). For the chosen fluid in the radiator loop, Freon E-1, this temperature is well above the freezing temperature of 119°K (-246°F). Figure 6-28 presents the radiator thermal control valve outlet temperature and shows that control was achieved as desired at just under 333°K (140°F). The negative peak shown in the figure also resulted from restricting the valve response. This figure also corresponds to the regenerator cold side inlet temperature. Figure 6-29 shows the regenerator outlet temperature was maintained at 343°K (158°F).

Figures 6-30 and 6-31 present the heat rejected from the radiator loop fluid and by radiation from the radiators. Figure 6-32 presents the radiator mass flow with control maintained at 0.215 kg/minute (0.474 lb/minute), which represents 12% of full flow.

Figure 6-33 presents the heat flow across the regenerator and Figure 6-34 presents the fuel cell mass flow through the regenerator.

The flow through the radiators resulted in Reynolds Numbers ranging from 2554 at the inlet to 589 at the outlet. This represents flow in the lower end of the transition region to fully developed laminar flow. The Colburn J-Factors derived from Figure 6-7 ranged from 0.0024 at the inlet to 0.0084 at the outlet, with the minimum of 0.0021 achieved in the fourth tube of the first panel. Correspondingly the heat transfer coefficients ranged from 238 \( \text{watts per meter}^2\text{-degree K} \) (42 \( \text{Btu/hr-ft}^2\text{-oF} \)) at the inlet to 324 \( \text{watts per meter}^2\text{-degree K} \) (57 \( \text{Btu/hr-ft}^2\text{-oF} \)) at the outlet. The minimum coefficient, 173 \( \text{watts per meter}^2\text{-degree K} \) (30.5 \( \text{Btu/hr-ft}^2\text{-oF} \)) was in the fourth tube. The pressure drop through the radiators was 2096 N/m² (0.304 psi). The low pressure drop illustrates one of the desirable features of the bypassed radiator design, which allows low pressure drops in the radiator loop during cold fluid conditions while achieving essentially a constant pressure drop in the pump loop.

The transitional flow through the radiators permits the fluid to be decoupled slightly from the radiators, thus allowing warmer fluid temperatures and higher flow rates to be maintained. The Colburn J-Factor approach to radiator design has not been pursued to any great extent by the industry except on the Transtage radiators, which have experienced seven successful flights. The Transtage design did not, however, require the full transition region to satisfy the design requirements operating down to Reynolds numbers of 7000. The Airlock Module radiator on Skylab was successfully and predictably operated at Reynolds numbers up to 2500. Hence, before pursuing the radiator design further, it would be desirable to conduct some breadboard level testing on a four-tube panel to explore and verify the heat transfer and pressure drop characteristics through the transition region.
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FIGURE 6-27 RADIATOR COLD CASE

TEMP NODE NO. 32 Radiator Fluid Outlet Temperature
MIN TEMP OF -51.996 OCCURRED AT TIME 1.000
MAX TEMP OF 180.000 OCCURRED AT TIME 0.

FIGURE 6-28 RADIATOR COLD CASE

TEMP NODE NO. 33 Radiator Loop Thermal Control Valve Plate Outlet Temperature
MIN TEMP OF 99.216 OCCURRED AT TIME .300
MAX TEMP OF 140.539 OCCURRED AT TIME .600
TEMP NODE NO. 35 Radiator Loop Regenerator Outlet Temp.

MIN TEMP OF 117.921 OCCURRED AT TIME 0.300
MAX TEMP OF 180.000 OCCURRED AT TIME 0.

FIGURE 6-29 RADIATOR COLD CASE

NODE NO. 300 Radiator Fluid Heat Rejection

MIN OF 0. OCCURRED AT TIME 0.
MAX OF 2102.452 OCCURRED AT TIME 0.100

FIGURE 6-30 RADIATOR COLD CASE
FIGURE 5-31 RADIATOR COLD CASE

NODE NO.  301  Radiator Heat Radiated
MIN OF  1382.566  OCCURRED AT TIME   .600
MAX OF  4352.077  OCCURRED AT TIME   0.

FIGURE 5-32 RADIATOR COLD CASE

NODE NO.  302  Radiator Loop Fluid Mass Flow
MIN OF  .397  OCCURRED AT TIME   .500
MAX OF  4.000  OCCURRED AT TIME   0.
FIGURE 6.33  RADIATOR  COLD CASE

NODE NO.  303  Regenerator Heat Flow
MIN  OF  573.7°F  OCCURRED  AT  TIME  .400
MAX  OF  2442.0°F  OCCURRED  AT  TIME  0.

FIGURE 6.34  RADIATOR  COLD CASE

NODE NO.  304  Fuel Cell Fluid Mass Flow
MIN  OF  1.267  OCCURRED  AT  TIME  .500
MAX  OF  12.421  OCCURRED  AT  TIME  0.
Design and performance parameters of the fuel cell heat rejection system are documented in the form of a specification and are presented in Appendix I.
7. FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The Tug design confronts the state of the art in several areas. Inherent in the Tug mission is the goal of maximizing the payload delivery and retrieval capability. This has resulted in significant minimum weight requirements being placed on all systems. When designing the structural system, structural designers have been forced to explore the extensive use of composite structural designs aimed at minimizing weight.

7.1 HONEYCOMB STRUCTURES

A honeycomb design for the forward skirt of Tug, for example, has been proposed by most investigators. While this appears to provide a minimum weight design, further tradeoffs are necessary before arriving at the preferred baseline. The past use of the aluminum skin stringer-longeron design, while being potentially heavier than the honeycomb design, has afforded the thermal designer a significant amount of flexibility. Use of the skin as a radiation skink for compartment heat dissipation was a simple and reliable means of achieving thermal control. However, the application of honeycomb designs in this area adds an unknown to the problem, and in some cases would result in significant thermal design problems.

Heat transfer through thin aluminum skin panels results in small temperature drops (<<1\textdegree\text{K}) and is usually considered to be zero. The honeycomb material represents two surfaces separated by a core material through which heat must be transferred. Depending on the core material and the bondline characteristics, large temperature drops can result when transferring the required heat. The use of high conductivity materials such as aluminum is required because the major mode of heat transfer through the honeycomb is via conduction. The use of fiberglass or other low conductivity materials would severely impact the internal compartmental temperature in the hot case and would require large holes in the skirt to allow heat to be dissipated in local areas. To achieve the required strength characteristics such a design would probably eliminate the weight advantages gained. Continued development of lightweight skirt structural concepts should include an evaluation of the thermal design impact that each concept might yield. One of the key requirements in a supporting thermal evaluation would be to determine experimentally the thermal characteristics of each candidate concept.
The thermal design of the auxiliary propulsion system (APS) was not specifically investigated in this study. However, experience in the design and flight of the Transtage hydrazine attitude control system provides several guidelines. The selection of a hydrazine system for Tug will simplify the thermal design problem and will make it an integral part of limit cycling requirements of the system. The thruster module thermal design is the primary concern. Depending on the individual thruster design, heat is required to maintain the catalyst temperature at some minimum level to ensure that the desired minimum impulse can be delivered upon demand. The Transtage system used engine heat to maintain the catalyst bed temperatures above $450^\circ K (350^\circ F)$. Normal limit cycling of the engines required by the guidance system to maintain the required vehicle attitudes was sufficient to supply the major portion of required heat. Computer software was added to account for the fuel consumption over 10-minute periods, comparing that against predicted cold-case fuel consumption requirements. Shortage of the required cold-case fuel consumption in any 10-minute flight interval resulted in a burn of the required thruster to make up the difference. Hence, the design used the propellant consumption instead of heaters to satisfy module thermal design requirements. Further, definition of the Tug module and engine design will be required before a thermal design can be determined. Local application of high temperature fiberous insulation will be required.

The APS propellant storage and feed system will require insulation and thermostatically controlled heaters to eliminate propellant freezing. This should not represent a significant problem. In addition, the application of low conductance tank and feedline supports will be required.
Thermal control system specifications were developed for those problem areas that required the application of specific thermal control devices. It was not considered necessary to develop a specification for the use of insulation and/or heaters. The specifications are presented in the Appendixes to this report.

The fuel cell heat rejection system specification (Appendix I) outlines the basic system's thermal design requirements. Appendix II presents the louver specification for application to the thermal control of the battery.

Appendix III presents the specification for development of the forward compartment thermal design using circumferential heat pipes, louvers, and thermal conditioning panels. The panels will provide a means to control those equipment items with low duty cycles, such as the laser radar, its associated electronics, and the TV cameras. Mounting these equipment items with other equipment which operate throughout the mission will allow components to share heat, thus reducing heat power requirements. This also provides structural panels for mounting the equipment. The heat pipes avoid excessively high or low skin temperature during constant attitudes and further enable heat to be shared between the thermal conditioning panels.
9. FOLLOW-ON PLAN

Several areas were identified for future study and test to lead to an orderly development of the Tug vehicle. In a study of this nature as many questions are identified as are answered during the course of the study.

9.1 STUDY AREAS

As the avionics system evolves in the future, the power dissipation level is expected to change. This will require altering the paint pattern and possibly revising heater power for some components. Component placement and arrangement studies on the thermal conditioning louver panels is warranted to further develop this techniques. Parametric studies investigating panel Q/A, equipment Q/A, component arrangement, matching of qualification requirements, proper mix of high and low duty cycle, and environment temperature ranges should be pursued to identify the capabilities and limitations of this concept. The APS thermal control will require some future investigations as that system evolves. The use of heater power to maintain the catalyst temperature may be required; however, the limit cycle pulsing of that system will contribute significantly to maintaining the desired temperatures. Early identification of timelines will be essential to develop the engine module thermal design.

9.2 TESTING

Breadboard testing in several areas of the Tug thermal design is warranted at this time. Two areas will be explored in the follow-on to this contract. The application of louvers to the thermal control of the battery is currently being examined along with the performance of a thermal conditioning panel that will be coupled with a heat pipe radiator. Thermal conditioning panel capabilities will be further demonstrated. The design of a variable conductance heat pipe radiator will be verified. The successful demonstration of the radiator design will lend confidence in the credibility of heat pipe systems to satisfy the fuel cell heat rejection system requirements.
The pumped fluid system described here deserves further attention. The proposed design requires some breadboard-level testing to verify the radiator's operation through the transition region. This testing will verify the techniques used in the analytical models for design and mission analysis.

Testing should also be performed to determine the effective thermal conductance through honeycomb skin panels. The major unknown is the influence of the two bondlines on the overall conductance. The data generated in the study indicate that the forward compartment thermal design is sensitive to this conductance. This could have a severe impact on the compartment design concept.

The forward compartment heat pipes were envisioned as single closed circular pipes. Current technology in heat pipes has generally been limited to relatively short pipes. One 4.6-m-diameter pipe has been built and tested (Ref 18). Continued development in this area is warranted.
The analysis has shown that thermal control of Tug, exclusive of the fuel cell, can be maintained through the use of surface coatings, heat pipes, insulation, and louvers. Components can be maintained within their temperature limits by using isolation mounts, surface coatings, multilayer insulation, and in some cases thermostatically controlled heaters. A second component thermal control approach using thermal conditioning panels was also investigated, which reduced the required heater power. Both hot and cold environments for a simulated Tug mission were used to analyze the thermal control techniques. The analysis was performed for no orientation constraints during the Tug mission, thus providing flexibility in satisfying future payload requirements.

The transient analysis of the forward compartment used a paint pattern \((\alpha/\varepsilon = 0.5)\) derived from the steady-state parametric studies using 800 watts of internal power. However, initial transient analyses resulted in both hot and cold problems, with a high power (187 watts) tape recorder which had a narrow operating range of 289°F to 314°F (80°C to 105°C). A tape recorder that dissipated 8.4 watts was substituted. With the new power level for the tape recorder, the actual average power dissipation for the forward compartment was reduced to approximately 600 watts. Based upon this power level a new value of \(\alpha/\varepsilon = 0.60\) is necessary to maintain the temperature level of the forward compartment at 297°F (80°C). This would replace the original \(\alpha/\varepsilon = 0.2375/0.475 = 0.50\). An \(\alpha/\varepsilon\) of 0.6 is obtainable using an \(\alpha\) of 0.24 and \(\varepsilon = 0.40\). This results in a paint pattern ratio of aluminum to white equal to 75% to 25%.

In addition to the high-power tape recorder that was subsequently replaced with a tape recorder of moderate power, other components were marginally acceptable in regards to their temperature limits. These include the laser radars and the laser radar electronics. These components have a very high lower temperature limit in both the operational and storage phases of the mission (operational minimum = 293°F (88°C), maximum = 323°F (122°C); storage minimum = 288.7°F (82°C), maximum = 323°F (122°C)). A large amount of heater power is required to maintain their temperatures, even in the hot case. Heater power for these components for the hot case included 84 watts for each of the laser radars and 65 watts for each of these four components while the rest of the components require less than 5 watts for this case. This indicates that these particular components should be requalified to temperatures more in line with the rest of the forward compartment components or additional thermal design features incorporated into individual components.
Many components exceeded their lower temperature limits in the cold-case simulation. However, this simulation used an unusually cold environment. This environment occurs only if the Tug longitudinal axis is maintained parallel to the solar vector and there is no significant planetary or albedo flux (i.e., Tug in a geosynchronous orbit). All of these component problems could be solved with additional heater power, further component isolation, and altering paint patterns. However, this reduces the flexibility of the design by making the component temperatures approach their upper limit in a hot case.

An alternative to the complex task of optimizing the isolation and heater power of each component is a new component mounting concept. In this concept, by grouping individual components with regard to electrical power output duty cycle and temperature limits on thermal conditioning panels, a reduction in heater power requirements in both hot and cold conditions can be obtained.

The thermal conditioning panels (see Appendix III) are mounting panels containing integral heat pipes and provide a means of obtaining an isothermal condition. Components are hard mounted to one side of the panel with a louver system on the other. The louvered side faces the compartment wall, which is maintained at a uniform temperature by circumferential heat pipes. The panel temperature is primarily controlled by the modulation of the temperature-sensitive louver blades. This concept offers a passive means of component control by allowing excess electrical power generation to be shared in maintaining other nonoperating components on the panel above their lower temperature limit.
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**SYSTEM DESCRIPTION**

The Space Tug fuel cell heat rejection system provides the means of maintaining the primary electrical power system, the fuel cell, within the desired operating temperature range during the tug mission. The fuel cell is activated in flight with power transfer occurring at T + 3.877 hours, and provides demand electrical power until T + 97.634 hours when power transfer to battery occurs.

During the mission the fuel cell rejects heat per Figure 1 and generates the byproduct water in the form of steam per Figure 2. Figure 3 is a simplified flow schematic of the fuel cell. Two major interfaces for the fuel cell heat rejection system are the internal fluid loop with the regenerator and the byproduct steam with the vent system.

The heat rejection system is comprised of the necessary plumbing and fittings, a redundant set of pumps, accumulators, thermal control valves, and controllers. The interface is accomplished with a single regenerator which has redundant secondary fluid loops. The 4 radiators are located in each quadrant around the intertank compartment with redundant fluid lines. Figures 4 through 6 schematically present the system.

The fuel cell fluid loop uses water or FC-40 Freon for a working fluid. The radiator system use E-1 Freon as the working fluid.

The fuel cell system is designed for a $\Delta T$ through the stack of $5.56^\circ K$ ($10^\circ F$) at electrical load of 1500 watts. This results in a heat rejection of 744.22 watts (2540 Btu/Hr). The coolant pump adds an additional 30 watts to the system. The coolant temperature control valve controls the stack inlet temperature within a nominal operating temperature range 349.67 to $355.2^\circ K$ ($170^\circ F$ to $180^\circ F$). The minimum flow to the regenerator at the lower temperature is 5 to 10% of full flow.
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FIGURE 3 - FUEL CELL FLOW SCHEMATIC
DETAIL A

FLANGE THICKNESS

.254 CM (.1 IN)

.635 CM (.25 IN)

.457 CM (.18 IN)

.762 CM (.3 IN)

DETAIL B

FLANGE REMOVED

SCALE = 2/1

FIGURE 6 - RADIATOR DETAILS
The radiator system is a series-series-bypass flow system which has the radiators in series with flow through each radiator in series. The radiators are bypassed dependent upon the load by the thermal control valve which maintains a near constant fluid temperature to the regenerator of $333 \, ^\circ K$ ($140 \, ^\circ F$).

Micrometeorite protection is provided by using a redundant fluid loop and a P-tube rail concept as shown in Figure 6.

The regenerator, accumulators, pumps, thermal control valves, controls, and instrumentation will be packaged within a box designated as the Thermal Control Unit (TCU) as shown in Figure 5. The TCU and the Fuel Cell will be isolated from the inter-tank compartment by thermal washers and multi-layer insulation.
SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS AND PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS

Fuel Cell Requirements:
1. Maintain the fuel cell radiant to the stack within the design operating temperature range of 352.6 to 355.2 °K (175 to 180°F) over the required heat load range.
2. The heat load range shall vary per Figure 1 with the heat load increased by 30 watts to account for the fuel cell pump heat dissipation.

Radiator System Requirements:
1. The system shall meet all fuel cell thermal requirements.
2. The system shall operate in earth orbit from 296 to 35750 kilometers (160 to 19300 nautical miles) with no attitude constraints for an inclination of 28.5°.
3. The radiators shall provide micrometeorite protection for the fluid lines.
4. The fluid system shall have a redundant loop.
5. The regenerator inlet temperature shall be maintained at 333 °K (140 °F) ± TBD.
6. Regenerator flow shall be maintained at 1.814 kilograms/minute (4 lb/minute).
7. The working fluid shall be Freon E-1.
8. The regenerator (counter flow heat exchanger) shall exhibit a minimum effectiveness of .900. The effectiveness (Eff) shall be defined as

\[
Eff = \frac{1 - e^{-\frac{\text{NTU}}{C_{\text{min}}/C_{\text{max}}}} \left(1 - \frac{C_{\text{min}}}{C_{\text{max}}} \right)}{1 - \left(\frac{C_{\text{min}}}{C_{\text{max}}} \right) e^{\frac{-\text{NTU}}{C_{\text{min}}/C_{\text{max}}}} \left(1 - \frac{C_{\text{min}}}{C_{\text{max}}} \right)}
\]

where:

\[
\begin{align*}
C & = W C_p \\
C_{\text{min}} & = \text{minimum enthalpy flow} \\
C_{\text{max}} & = \text{maximum enthalpy flow} \\
\text{NTU} & = \frac{\text{UA}}{C_{\text{min}}} \\
W & = \text{mass flow rate} \\
C_p & = \text{specific heat of fluid at constant pressure}
\end{align*}
\]
Either fluid loop shall be capable of carrying the heat load to be dissipated. The radiators shall be sized to dissipate the maximum heat load minimum altitude and maximum external absorbed heating. The fluid shall not be permitted to freeze 1190K (-246°F) or reach highly viscous state. The cold case shall be defined as the minimum heat load with no external flux on the radiators. Radiator coating shall exhibit stable thermal properties. Radiator shall be sized assuming an adabatic vehicle side.
Predicted System Performance

Hot Case

Conditions:

1. Fixed attitude with respect to the sun. Normal sun to longitudinal axis with sun angle to center of 2 radiator panels of 45 degrees.
2. Attitude 296 kilometers (160 nautical miles).
3. $\beta = 52^\circ$ orbit.
5. Maximum heat dissipation is 744 watts plus 81 watts pump power.

Performance

See Figures 7 thru 10.
FIGURE 7
NET HEAT REJECTED

Net Heat Rejected Watts

[Graph showing data points for Q RADIATED and Q FLUID vs. Mission Time - Hours]

FIGURE 8
FLUID FLOW

[Graph showing fluid flow rate vs. Mission Time - Hours]

FIGURE 9 - RADIATOR FLUID TEMPERATURE

Fluid Temperature Degrees Kelvin

[Graph showing inlet and outlet fluid temperatures vs. Mission Time - Hours]

FIGURE 10
Radiator ΔP

Delta Pressure Newtons/Meter² x 10⁻³

[Graph showing ΔP vs. Mission Time - Hours]
Cold Case

Conditions:

1. Fixed attitude with respect to the sun (parallel to longitudinal axis).
2. Altitude 35750 kilometers (19300 nautical miles).
3. Minimum electrical load 600 watts.
4. Minimum heat load is 281 watts plus 81 watts pump power.

Performance

See Figures 11 thru 14.

Performance is based upon a transitional flow design where the fluid heat transfer is based upon the Colburn J-Factor analogy per Figure 15. The fluid heat transfer coefficient is related to the J-Factor by the equation

\[ h_c = J \cdot k \cdot N_R \cdot N_p \cdot \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{\mu_n}{\mu_f} \right)^{14/3} / D \]

- \( J \) = Colburn J Factor
- \( k \) = Fluid Conductivity
- \( N_R \) = Reynolds Number
- \( N_p \) = Prandtl Number
- \( \mu_w \) = Fluid Viscosity at the Tube Wall Temperature
- \( \mu_f \) = Fluid Viscosity at the Average Fluid Temperature
- \( D \) = Tube Internal Diameter

Performance is based upon an L/D per straight tube of 200.
Colburn J-Factor vs Reynolds Number

Colburn J-Factor

Reynolds Number - NR

$\frac{L}{D} = 50$

$\frac{L}{D} = 200$

$\frac{L}{D} = 400$

$\frac{1}{D} = 100$

$\frac{1}{D} = 50$

$\frac{1}{D} = 100$

$S/D = 0.001$

$S/D = 0.002$

$S/D = 0.003$

$S/D = 0.004$

$S/D = 0.005$
## HARDWARE LIST & DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>PUMP</strong> - Flow 1.59 to 2.04 KG/min. (3.5 to 4.5 lbs/min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>REGENERATOR</strong> - Redundant cold side loops approximately $1.379 \times 10^5$ Newtons/meter² (20 psi) pressure drop at 1.81 KG/min (4 lbm/min) flow/loop. Hot side loop pressure drop TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>ACCUMULATOR</strong> - Volume TBD. Pressure $\approx 3.447 \times 10^5$ Newtons/meter² (50 Psi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>DISCONNECTS</strong> - Primary and secondary loops 2 each. Line size TBD. Pressure Drop $\leq 6.89 \times 10^3$ Newtons/meter² (1 psi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>THERMAL CONTROL VALVE</strong> - Maintain regenerator inlet temperature at 333°C (140°F) by mixing radiator return fluid with pump outlet fluid. Flow range 0 to 2.04 KG/minute 0 to 4.5 lbs/min. Pressure drop TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>FILL DISCONNECT</strong> - System fill and drain, zero leakage after disconnect. Size - TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>PRESSURE TRANSDUCERS</strong> - Range 0 - 6.895 $\times 10^5$ Newtons/meter² (0 - 100 Psia) Accuracy 1% of full scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>TEMPERATURE SENSORS</strong> - Range 172 to 394°C (150 to +250°F), Accuracy 1% of full scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>FLOW MEASUREMENT</strong> - Range 0 - 2.04 kilograms/minute (0 - 4.5 pounds/minute) Accuracy 1% of full scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>RADIATORS</strong> - Each panel with 4 integral rails, minimum fin efficiency = .9. P-tubes welded to rails per Figure 6, single tube L/D = 200. Size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.44 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(36 inches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area .511 meters²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panel thickness 0.0762 cm (0.030 inches). Tube ID 0.4572 cm (0.18 inches).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interconnecting Lines

11  10  ALUMINUM TUBING - Length as required: OD - .9525 CM (375 inches)
      ID - TBD

12  16  DISCONNECTS - Line size .9525 CM (.375 inches)
      Pressure Drop ≤ 6.89 Newtons/meter^2
      (1 Psi)
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SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

The louver system provides thermal control to the fuel cell primary battery which will be used when the fuel cell is deactivated at \( T + 97.634 \) hours. The battery will also function as an emergency backup power supply unit in the event of fuel cell failure. The battery is designed to provide 450 watts of electrical power for a time period of 0.5 hours. Based on the power output and a 90% efficiency of the battery, 45 watts of thermal energy will be generated within the battery.

The louver system will dissipate the 45 watts of thermal energy and maintain the battery operational temperature below the allowable limit temperature of 305.3\(^\circ\)K (90\(^\circ\)F) for the required 0.5 hours of operation. The louver system will also add in controlling the non-operational temperature above 288.7\(^\circ\)K (60\(^\circ\)F).

The louver thermal control system consists of a component mounting baseplate attached to a set of moveable aluminum louver blades by low conductance screws. The blades are automatically actuated by temperature sensitive bimetallic spiral wound springs radiatively coupled to the baseplate. The baseplate and louver blades are housed in a conductively isolated frame which is mounted on the interior side of the tug skin using minimum conductance fasteners. The louver assembly and mounting configuration are shown in Figure 1.
FIGURE 1 - LOUVER SYSTEM/MOUNTING CONFIGURATION
A thermal model of the louver system shown in Figure 1 was constructed for
the MITAS thermal analyzer (Reference 1). The model was necessary because steady
state, worst condition analysis tended to over design the system. The model
accounts for the thermal characteristics of both the louver system and the emer-
gency battery. A GFP absorbed heating environment was simulated in the model and
is shown in Figure 2. This environment was calculated assuming an \( \alpha/\epsilon \) of the
external skin equal to .2/.9. The thermal capacitance of the battery, baseplate
and external skin along with a time line to adequately account for the battery
power generation is included. Conduction through the multi-layer insulation and
through the louver system standoffs is included as well as the contact resistance
between the battery and the baseplate.

The louver system parameters used in the model correspond to a commercially
available bimetallic actuated louver system (Reference 2). The blade angle is
determined by the baseplate temperature (289°K (60°F) blades closed, 303°K (85°F)
blades fully open). The effective emittance is then determined by the blade angle
as shown in Table 1. The louvered area consists of 0.165 sq. m (1.78 sq. ft.)
which was also used for the area of the baseplate and the external skin. The base-
plate was assumed to be 0.32 CM (1/8 in.) thick aluminum and the external skin was
assumed to be 0.25 CM (0.10 in.) thick aluminum. The emergency battery simulated
was taken from the tug data bank (Reference 3) and had a thermal mass of 1.79
watt-hrs/°K (3.39 btu/°F). Also a 10 watt, thermostatically controlled, heater
was incorporated in the battery to maintain temperature limits in the non-operating
condition.
Figure 2  External Skin Absorbed Environmental Flux
System Requirements and Performance Specifications

1. Maintain primary battery temperature below 305.4°K (90°F) for 0.5 hours of operation.

2. Provide means of dissipating 45 watts of thermal energy while battery is operating.

3. Control non-operational battery temperatures above 288.7°K (60°F).

4. Provide control of blade position as a function of baseplate temperature, 288.7°K (60°F) blades closed, 303.0°K (85°F) blade open.
Predicted System Performance

Two cases were simulated using the previously described math model and the absorbed environment shown in Figure 2. In both cases the initial temperatures were started at 294.4°K (70°F) and the problem was simulated for 5 orbits approximately 8 hours corresponding to the heating rate in Figure 2. In the middle of the third orbit (approximately 4 hours) the battery was activated for 0.5 hours. The two cases differ in that the second case uses only 10 percent of the absorbed heating rate shown in Figure 2. This case demonstrates the adequacy of the 10 watt heater to maintain temperature control. The results of the first case are shown in Figures 3 through 7. The results of the second case are shown in Figure 8 through 12.
Figure 3, Case 1 Emergency Battery Temperature History

Figure 4, Case 1 Louver Cover Temperature History

Figure 5, Case 1 Louver Blade Angle History
Figure 6, Case 1 Louver Cover Absorbed Heating

Figure 7, Case 1 Instantaneous Heater Power
Figure 8, Case 2 Emergency Battery Temperature History

Figure 9, Case 2 Louver Cover Temperature History

Figure 10, Case 2 Louver Blade Angle History
Orbit Time (hours)

Figure 11, Case 2 Louver Cover Absorbed Heating

Orbit Time (hours)

Figure 12, Case 2 Instantaneous Heater Power
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLADE ANGLE DEG</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE EMITTANCE $\bar{\varepsilon}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 (Full Open)</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (Full Closed)</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(for a covered louver system assuming a diffuse wall and a diffuse baseplate $\varepsilon = 0.9$)
# Hardware List & Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Louver frame and blade assembly - minimum covered area of 0.17 $M^2$ (1.78 $ft^2$). Complete with temperature sensitive bimetallic actuators. Blades are specular and have an $\varepsilon \leq 0.5$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Component mounting baseplate - 0.318 cm (0.125 in.) thick aluminum plate with a minimum surface area of 0.49 $M^2$ (5.30 $ft^2$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multilayer insulation blanket - 20 alternate layers of perforated aluminized mylar and tissue glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interior thermal control coatings - radiating surface of component baseplate and interior of louver cover/skin, painted with a high emittance ($\varepsilon \geq 0.9$) diffuse coating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exterior thermal control coatings - a minimum area of 0.17 $M^2$ ($1.78 ft^2$) of the external cover/skin should be covered with second surface mirrors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Mounting panel thermal isolators-low conductance screws, washers, standoffs, etc. for the purpose of mounting the louver assembly to the cover/skin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

The tug forward compartment is designed thermally to operate over a range of worst case environments which include a fixed attitude with respect to the sun in near earth orbit and a zero heating attitude at geosynchronous attitude. The design incorporates several thermal devices whose purposes is to provide temperature control of the avionics components.

The basic concept is to mount the components on thermal conditioning panels which are mounted to the structure with louver assemblies attached to the skin side of panels as shown in Figure 1. Heat pipes are mounted on the interior surface of the honeycomb skin to provide a relatively uniform temperature around the forward skirt.

The thermal conditioning panels are honeycomb panels with integral heat pipes. The panels are designed to permit two-dimensional heat flow, thus approaching an isothermal plate concept. Mounting of high and low duty cycle components on each panel permits distribution of heat between components thus reducing if not eliminating the need of component heaters. The skin side louvers provide the means to reduce radiation losses from the panel as the panel temperature begins to drop in cold environments by closing the blades. This permits the panel temperature to be passively controlled to a relatively narrow range thus simplifying the component thermal design problems as well as heater power requirements.

The heat pipes on the internal surface of the skin act to isothermalize the skin dependent upon the external and internal heating on the skin. Heat is transferred from the hot side of the vehicle to the cold side thus providing
Figure 1 Forward Compartment Thermal Control Concept
a more uniform environment for the panels and the components.

System Requirements and Performance Specifications

The primary purpose of this system is to maintain the tug avionics components within acceptable temperature limits during the tug mission. To achieve this objective each of the major elements shall meet the following requirements.

Thermal Conditioning Panel

Non-Operating Temperature Range
255 to 367°C
0 to 200°F

Operating Temperature Range
272 to 311°C
30°F to 100°F

Maximum Component Heat Load
300 Watts

Maximum Gradient Across Panel Surface
2.77°C
5°F

Maximum Thermal Load Density
.31 Watts/cm²
2 Watts/in²

Size
As Required

Bolt Pattern
.1 x .1 Meters
4 x 4 inches

Panel Mass
≤ 13.8 KG/m²

Maximum Component Mass
45.4 KG
100 Pounds
LOUVERS

Size
40.64 x 20.32 x 4.9 CM
(16 x 8 x 1.93 inches)

Weight
.27 KG .6 Pounds

Blade Operating Temp. Range
288.7 to 302.6°K (closed to open)
(60 to 85°F)

End Point Adjustment
±5.6°K (±10°F)

Blade Emissivity
≤ 0.1

Temperature Survivability
199.8 to 394.3°K
(-100 to 250°F)

Effective Emissivity of
Baseplate
Open ≥ .8
Closed ≤ .1

SKIN HEAT PIPES

Number/Spacing
6 Pipes One Every 5 Inches in Longitudinal Direction

Length
14.77M, (45.03 ft.) Circumferential

Diameter
1.27 CM, (0.5 in.) (Nominal)

Non-operating Temperature Range
144 to 366°K
-200 to 200°F

Operating Temperature Range
172 to 311°K
-150 to 100°F

Heat Flux Capability
60 Watts/M Per Pipe
at 300°K (80°F)
(19.7 Watts/Ft) Per Pipe

Evaporator to Condenser
< 5.6°K

Maximum ΔT at 300°K (80°F)
(10°F)

Heat Transport Capability
TBD
PREDICTED PERFORMANCE

Mounting panel heat fluxes are given in Figures 2 and 3 for hot and cold conditions respectively. These curves were generated from the following equation:

\[ \frac{Q}{A} = \sigma_{\text{eff}} (T_p^4 - T_s^4) + \varepsilon_p (T_p^4 - T_e^4) \]

where

- \( Q/A \) = Panel Net Heat Transfer
- \( \sigma \) = Stefan-Boltzmann Constant
- \( \varepsilon_{\text{eff}} \) = Louver System Effective Emissivity
- \( T_p \) = Mounting Panel Temperature
- \( T_s \) = Skin Temperature
- \( T_e \) = Interior Environmental Temperature
- \( \varepsilon_p \) = Emissivity of Mounting Panel
Figure 2 Hot-Case Mounting Panel Heat Fluxes, Louvers Open
$e_{EFF} = 0.1$

Legend:

- $e_p = 0.9$
- Panel = 283°K (50°F)
- Panel = 277.5°K (40°F)
- Panel = 272°K (30°F)

$T_E = -80°F$

$T_E = -60°F$

$T_E = -40°F$

$T_E = -20°F$

Figure 3 Cold-Case Mounting Panel Heat Fluxes, Louvers Closed
HARDWARE LIST

6 - Circumferential Heat Pipes and Mounting Brackets

5 to 6 Thermal Conditioning Panels - Number and Size Dependent Upon Component Groupings

Thermal Control Louver Assemblies One for Each Thermal Conditioning Panel