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INTRODUCTION

The Space Transportation Materials and Structures Technology Workshop (STMSTW) was held in Newport News, Virginia on September 23-26, 1991. The workshop consisted of a two-day plenary session, a one-day breakout session of three separate panel meetings, and a morning session for panel feedback and closing remarks.

The proceedings of the STMSTW are contained in a two-volume publication entitled *Space Transportation Materials and Structures Technology Workshop - Volume I, II;* NASA CP-3148. Volume I is an Executive Summary describing the workshop activities, conclusions and recommendations of the participants. This document, Volume II, contains the full proceedings of the workshop, including material from the three panel breakout sessions. It also presents a more comprehensive description of the workshop activities.
The use of trademarks or manufacturers' names in this document does not constitute an official endorsement, either expressed or implied, of such products or manufacturers by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
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# LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Advanced carbon-carbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRV</td>
<td>Advanced Crew Rescue Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Advanced Composites Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRSI</td>
<td>Advanced Flexible Reusable Surface Insulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Aerospace Industries Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Li</td>
<td>Aluminum-lithium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>Advanced Launch System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMLS</td>
<td>Advanced Manned Launch System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>Ames Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASRM</td>
<td>Advanced Solid Rocket Motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Carbon-carbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFD</td>
<td>Computational fluid dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>Ceramic matrix composites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Computational structural mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELVC</td>
<td>Expendable Launch Vehicles and Cryotanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>External tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETO</td>
<td>Earth-to-Orbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRSI</td>
<td>Flexible Reusable Surface Insulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>Geosynchronous Earth Orbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSFC</td>
<td>Goddard Space Flight Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPL</td>
<td>Jet Propulsion Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPO</td>
<td>Joint Project Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSC</td>
<td>Johnson Space Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/D</td>
<td>Lift-to-drag ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaRC</td>
<td>Langley Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDEF</td>
<td>Long Duration Exposure Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO</td>
<td>Low Earth orbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeRC</td>
<td>Lewis Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH₂</td>
<td>Liquid hydrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN₂</td>
<td>Liquid nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO₂</td>
<td>Liquid oxygen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;S</td>
<td>Materials &amp; Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDSSC</td>
<td>McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMC</td>
<td>Metal matrix composites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSFC</td>
<td>Marshall Space Flight Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Manned Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASP</td>
<td>National Aero-Space Plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>Non-destructive evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDT</td>
<td>Non-destructive testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEP</td>
<td>Nuclear electric propulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIT</td>
<td>NASA-industry team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>National Launch System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTP</td>
<td>Nuclear thermal propulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAET</td>
<td>Office of Aeronautics, Exploration and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAST</td>
<td>Office of Aeronautics and Space Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORCC</td>
<td>Oxidation-resistant carbon-carbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSF</td>
<td>Office of Space Flight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LIST OF ACRONYMS (cont.)

OSSA.............................................Office of Space Science Applications
PLS.............................................Personnel Launch System
PMC.............................................Permanent Manned Capability
RCC.............................................Reinforced carbon-carbon
RP.............................................Rocket Propellant (kerosene-based)
RV.............................................Reusable Vehicles
SAR.............................................Search and Rescue
SDIO..........................................Strategic Defense Initiative Organization
SEI.............................................Space Exploration Initiative
SIP.............................................Strain Isolation Pad
SPI.............................................Significant Performance Improvement
SSTAC.................................Space System and Technology Advisory Committee
SSTO..........................................Single Stage to Orbit
TPS.............................................Thermal Protection System
TRL.............................................Technology Readiness Level
VSP.............................................Vehicle System Panel
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<table>
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<th>Speaker/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>9:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Check In: Badging; Final Agenda; Banquet Tickets; Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>1:00 p.m. - 1:10 p.m.</td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>Charles Blankenship (LaRC)</td>
</tr>
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<td>1:10 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Headquarters Perspective, Office of Space Flight</td>
<td>Ron Harris (Hdqrs., Code MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m. - 1:50 p.m.</td>
<td>Headquarters Perspective, Office of Aeronautics, Exploration and Technology</td>
<td>Greg Reck (Hdqrs., Code RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Introduction to Sessions 2 through 5</td>
<td>Del Freeman (LaRC)</td>
</tr>
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</table>
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<table>
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<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m. - 2:20 p.m.</td>
<td>Cargo Vehicle Architecture Options</td>
<td>Gene Austin (MSFC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20 p.m. - 2:50 p.m.</td>
<td>NLS Structures and Materials</td>
<td>Dr. Jack Bunting (Martin-Denver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50 p.m. - 3:10 p.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Session 2 - Earth-to-Orbit Cargo Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>National Aero-Space Plane</td>
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<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Banquet</td>
<td>Dr. Will Stackhouse, (USAF Space Division)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Panel Rapporteurs
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*Panel Lead
1.0 WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

The Space Transportation Materials and Structures Technology Workshop was sponsored by the NASA Office of Space Flight (OSF) and the NASA Office of Aeronautics and Space Technology (OAST), formerly the Office of Aeronautics, Exploration and Technology (OAET). It was the third NASA meeting on critical technology areas for space transportation. The workshop was held in Newport News, VA, the week of September 23-26, 1991.

Charles Blankenship, Director for Structures, NASA Langley Research Center, chaired the workshop. Co-chairmen were Salvatore Grisaffe, Lewis Research Center; Paul Schuerer, Marshall Space Flight Center; and Don Wade, Johnson Space Center. The NASA Headquarters organization committee was comprised of Thomas Crooker, OAST; Paul Herr, OSF; and David Stone, OAST. The combined intensive efforts of the panel chairmen and organizing committee members led to a successful workshop.

To ensure that the broad scope of materials and structures technologies would be properly addressed, three working panels were developed. These panels were: Vehicle Systems, Propulsion Systems, and Entry Systems. A fourth group, the Vehicle Technology Requirements Panel, was also formed to present the status of vehicle systems for space transportation and to provide the requirement inputs to the individual working panels.

The three-day workshop began with introductory presentations by Charles Blankenship, LaRC, Ronald Harris, OSF, and Gregory Reck, OAST, on the afternoon of September 23. After the introductory presentations, the plenary session was delivered by the Vehicle Technology Requirements Panel. This session concluded on the morning of September 24. Following presentations by Samuel Venneri, Materials and Structures Division Director, OAST, and Chester Vaughan, Office of Chief Engineer and Director Technical Integration and Analysis, OSF, the working panels met separately through September 25.

The morning of September 26 included panel summary presentations delivered by the panel chairmen, followed by an open forum. This forum provided a valuable opportunity for discussions on technical and programmatic issues relative to materials and structures technologies.

1.1 Welcoming Remarks -
Charles Blankenship, NASA Langley Research Center

Charles Blankenship, Director for Structures, NASA Langley Research Center, opened the workshop on September 23, 1991. The objectives of the workshop were presented as follows:

• Identify key materials and structures technology needs for future space transportation systems
• Assess current materials and structures technology program plan vs. space transportation needs
• Identify voids and/or opportunities in materials and structures technology areas that have substantial benefits to advanced space transportation
• Identify appropriate areas for an aggressive technology development program
• Identify approaches to bridge the gap between technology developers and users
• Identify mechanisms for continuation of the technology transfer process initiated at the workshop

The continuation of constructing strong relationships between industry and the NASA centers was cited as a crucial long-term goal of the workshop. A long-range strategic plan must be developed to ensure advanced space transportation technologies will be available when needed.
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1.2 Headquarters Perspective:  
Office of Space Flight -  
Ronald Harris, OSF

Ronald Harris, Director of Advanced Flight Systems, Office of Space Flight, continued the discussion of the challenges identified by Charles Blankenship.

NASA must consider the advantages of joint projects with non-U.S. agencies. Foreign technology capabilities are constantly improving and NASA can greatly benefit from such advancements. Cooperation with non-U.S. organizations can lead to the ability to achieve both cost savings and a significant improvement in U.S. competitiveness. The inquiries into the NASA budget and management structure by federal oversight groups further emphasize the need for a highly competitive agency.
WORKSHOP CHALLENGES

DERIVED FROM:

- U.S. NATIONAL NEEDS OF CIVIL AND DOD SPACE PROGRAMS
- COMMERCIAL LAUNCH AND SPACE VEHICLE NEEDS
- INCREASING FOREIGN COMPETITION
- ANTICIPATING LIMITED FUTURE U.S. SPACE FUNDING LEVELS - DO "SMART" TECHNOLOGY

PURPOSE

- Third In A Series Of NASA Sponsored Space Transportation Vehicle Technology Reviews / Assessments From The "Grass Roots" Level
- Workshops Will Bring The Technology Developers And Users Together To Define Future Needs And Assess Current State-of-Art In Three Vital Areas Of Space Transportation - Vehicle Systems, Propulsion Systems And Entry Systems
- Provide A Forum For Participants And Attendees To Exchange Views, Ideas, Information And Preliminary Real Time Planning
- Identify Topics And Mechanisms By Which Materials / Structures Technologies Can Be Transferred / Inserted Into "Real" Programs
COST and PERFORMANCE are KEY

• COST OF RESEARCH ITSELF
  - Maintaining Current Labs
  - New Labs May Be Required
  - Technical Staff Viability

• COST OF DEVELOPMENT
  - Metallic Alloys
  - Non-Metallic Composites
  - Others, Including Coatings, Lubricants, Etc.
  - Material Physical Property Validations

• COST OF MANUFACTURE / FABRICATION
  - NDE vs Reworks

• COST BENEFITS (PERFORMANCE)
  - Durability In Space
  - Weight
  - Maintenance Free Operations

Cannot Assume That Technology Advancement Is Market-Driven.
Government Support Is Required For Most Space Unique Materials

REFERENCE SCHEDULE FOR TECHNOLOGY IDENTIFICATION
1.3 Headquarters Perspective:  
Office of Aeronautics and  
Space Technology -  
Gregory Reck, OAST

Gregory Reck, Director for Space, Office of Aeronautics and Space Technology, described the perspective of OAST on materials and structures technologies. Gregory Reck supported the views of Ronald Harris regarding the space transportation challenges facing the materials and structures community, the need for better coupling of resources and applications, and the need for communication between technology developers and users.

Earth-to-orbit systems, as well as in-space transportation systems, must be addressed by the transportation technologies. Areas of focus include:

- Enhanced capabilities for the Space Shuttle
- Technology options for the next manned launch system
- Development of low-cost heavy-lift launch vehicles
- Development and transfer of low-cost technologies to commercial ELV's and upper stages
- Identification of high-leverage technologies for in-space transportation systems, including chemical and nuclear systems for transfer between LEO and GEO and between Earth, the moon and Mars

The OAST Perspective on the  
Space Transportation Materials and  
Structures Technology Workshop

Greg Reck  
NASA Headquarters  
Code RS
SPACE R&T MISSION STATEMENT

OAST SHALL PROVIDE TECHNOLOGY FOR FUTURE CIVIL SPACE MISSIONS AND PROVIDE A BASE OF RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY CAPABILITIES TO SERVE ALL NATIONAL SPACE GOALS

- IDENTIFY, DEVELOP, VALIDATE AND TRANSFER TECHNOLOGY TO:
  - INCREASE MISSION SAFETY AND RELIABILITY
  - REDUCE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATIONS COST
  - ENHANCE MISSION PERFORMANCE
  - ENABLE NEW MISSIONS
- PROVIDE THE CAPABILITY TO:
  - ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY IN CRITICAL DISCIPLINES
  - RESPOND TO UNANTICIPATED MISSION NEEDS

INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGY PLAN FOR THE CIVIL SPACE PROGRAM

SPACE R&T PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

20-YEAR VISION OF FUTURE FLIGHT PROGRAMS

SPACE R&T PROGRAM STRATEGIES AND DECISION RULES

INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGY PLAN (BASE R&T, FOCUSED R&T, FACILITIES, R&PM)
INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGY PLAN FOR THE CIVIL SPACE PROGRAM

SPACE RESEARCH & TECHNOLOGY

RESEARCH & TECHNOLOGY BASE

DISCIPLINE RESEARCH
Aerothermodynamics
Space Energy Conversion
Propulsion
Materials & Structures
Information and Controls
Human Support
Avionics

UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

SPACE FLIGHT R&T

SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

CIVIL SPACE TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE

SPACE SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY
Science Sensing
Observatory Systems
Science Information
In Situ Science
Technology Flight Expts.

TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY
ETO Transportation
Space Transportation
Technology Flight Expts.

PLANEY SURFACE TECHNOLOGY
Surface Systems
Human Support
Technology Flight Expts.

SPACE PLATFORMS TECHNOLOGY
Earth-Oriental Platforms
Space Stations
Deep Space Platforms
Technology Flight Expts.

OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY
Automation & Robotics
Infrastructure Operations
Info. & Communications
Technology Flight Expts.

TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY

PROVIDE TECHNOLOGIES THAT SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE OPERABILITY, IMPROVE RELIABILITY, PROVIDE NEW CAPABILITIES, WHILE REDUCING LIFE CYCLE COSTS

Enhance safety, reliability, and serviceability of current Space Shuttle

Provide Technology options for new manned systems that complement the Shuttle and enable next generation vehicles with rapid turnaround and low operational costs

Support development of robust, low-cost heavy lift launch vehicles

Develop and transfer low-cost technology to support commercial EVLs and upper stages

Identify and develop high leverage technologies for in-space transportation, including nuclear propulsion, that will enable new classes of science and exploration missions

Office of Aeronautics and Space Technology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHUTTLE ENHANCEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SSME Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Durable Thermal Protection Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved Health Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Light Structural Alloys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lidar-Based Adaptive Guidance &amp; Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEXT GENERATION MANNED TRANSPORTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Configuration Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High Frequency, High Voltage Power Management/Distribution Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LOX/LH2 Propellant for OMS/RCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintenance-Free TPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advanced Reusable Propulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GPS-Based Autonomous GN&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composites &amp; Advanced Lightweight Metals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vehicle-Level Health Management for Autonomous Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAVY-LIFT CAPABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Advanced Fabrication (Forming &amp; Joining)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STME Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On-Vehicle Adaptive Guidance &amp; Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Systems &amp; Components for Electric Actuators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health Monitoring for Safe Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Al-Li Cryo Tanks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW-COST COMMERCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Alternate Booster Concepts Joining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advanced Cryogenic Upper Stage Engines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low-Cost Fab/Automated Processes/NDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuous Forging Processes for Cryogenic Tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fault-Tolerant, Redundant Avionics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN-SPACE TRANSPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• High-Power Nuclear Thermal &amp; Electrical Propulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High Performance, Multiple Use Cryogenic Chemical Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highly Reliable, Autonomous Avionics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Autonomous Rendezvous, Docking &amp; Landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long-Term, Low-Loss Management of Cryogenic Hydrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low Mass, Space Durable Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aeroassist Technologies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 Vehicle Technology Requirements

The plenary session on Vehicle Technology Requirements, chaired by Delma Freeman, followed the introductory presentations. This session included current information from systems studies on space transportation vehicle systems, with an emphasis on requirements that will drive future materials and structures programs and the benefits that these programs will provide.

These presentations are discussed in Sections 2.0 - 5.0.
2.0 EARTH-TO-ORBIT CARGO SYSTEMS

The Earth-to-Orbit Cargo Systems session featured the following presentations:

- **Cargo Vehicle Architecture Options** by Mr. R. Eugene Austin of Marshall Space Flight Center
- **NLS Structures and Materials** by Dr. Jack O. Bunting of Martin Marietta

The Manned Earth-to-Orbit Cargo Systems session featured the following presentations:

- **Advanced Manned Launch System** by Dr. Theodore A. Talay of Langley Research Center
- **Advanced Crew Rescue Vehicle / Personnel Launch System (ACRV/PLS)** by Mr. Jerry Craig of Johnson Space Center
- **Single Stage to Orbit/SDIO** by Mr. James R. French of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization
- **National Aero-Space Plane (NASP) Airframe Structures and Materials Overview** by Dr. Terence Ronald of the NASP Joint Project Office (JPO)

The Manned Transfer Vehicles session featured the following presentations:

- **Lunar Transfer Vehicle Studies** by Mr. Joseph Keeley of Martin Marietta
- **Mars Transfer Vehicle Studies** by Mr. Gordon Woodcock of Boeing
- **Aerobreaking Technology Studies** by Mr. Charles H. Eldred of Langley Research Center

The Advanced Propulsion session featured the following presentations:

- **Earth-to-Orbit Propulsion R&T Program Overview** by Mr. Steven J. Gentz of Marshall Space Flight Center
- **Advanced Rocket Propulsion** by Mr. Chuck O'Brien of Aerojet
- **Space Propulsion** by Mr. John Kazaroff of Lewis Research Center
- **Nuclear Concepts/Propulsion** by Mr. Thomas Miller of Lewis Research Center
- **Solid Rocket Motors** by Dr. Ronn Carpenter of Thiokol Corporation
- **Combined Cycle Propulsion** by Dr. Terence Ronald of NASP JPO

Many alternatives exist for evolving 300-600 klb. thrust Mars exploration-class launch vehicles. Three options of interest, which all baseline a National Launch System (NLS) common core with a diameter sized to match the Space Shuttle external tank (ET), differ primarily in the choice of strap-on boosters that would be used to increase the payload capacity of upgraded versions of the launch vehicle.

1. NASA's cargo vehicle program has continued to evolve since the workshop. The effort to develop Option 1 has been cancelled.
Successful development of a NLS that can satisfy evolutionary requirements for future launch vehicles will require overcoming challenges in several different areas. Innovative component and system designs are needed to allow future vehicles to take full advantage of advances in the state of the art for materials and structures. New materials such as advanced composites and aluminum-lithium (Al-Li) alloys as well as improved thermal protection systems will reduce launch vehicle mass, improve manufacturability, and enhance the ability of system designers to satisfy mission requirements in terms of thrust-to-weight ratios, reliability, margins, shroud size and cost. For example, both pressurized and unpressurized structures fabricated using graphite-epoxy composites would weigh less than similar structures built with Al-Li, and Al-Li structures would weigh less than aluminum structures. The performance of metal matrix composites (MMC's), however, is not yet well-defined, and MMC's cannot be compared reliably with other structural materials.

The design of a particular structure varies widely according to material choice. Optimum performance is only possible if component designs are tailored to take advantage of a given material's strengths and to minimize the impact of its shortcomings. Additional investigations are necessary to determine if new materials are fully compatible with the environment associated with projected applications. For example, Al-Li 2090 may not be compatible with certain rocket fuels.

A comparison of comparable manufacturing and design processes associated with aluminum and Al-Li reveals that system costs are driven much more by structural weight and launch costs than by the cost of the raw materials. When using Al-Li, which brings bulk costs that are three times higher than those of aluminum, system costs are reduced by selecting a manufacturing process such as integral machining that minimizes the final weight of a given structure, even though it may increase raw material requirements by a factor of four because of increased machining waste.

Space Transportation Structures And Materials Technology Workshop

Cargo Vehicle Architecture Options

R.E. Austin/MSFC
September 23, 1991
"Common Core"
A Modular Building Block For National Launch Systems

1.5 Stage
- High Earth Orbit
- Automated Planetary

HLLV
- STS Offload
- Space Station Support

Lunar Launcher
- Crew
- Cargo

Mars Launcher
- Enhanced Elements
- Mars Mission Elements

Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space Station Support</td>
<td>Transportation Node</td>
<td>Transportation Node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmanned Planetary</td>
<td>Propellants</td>
<td>Propellants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observatories/Platforms</td>
<td>MTV Systems</td>
<td>MTV Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Payloads</td>
<td>Surface Payloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 0.3 To 0.5 Million</td>
<td>- Two Million Pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pounds Per Mission</td>
<td>Per Mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Generalized Vehicle     |                          |                          |
| Size:                   |                          |                          |
| 80 - 120 KLbs           | 150 - 300 KLbs           | 300 - 600 KLbs           |
| 15 Ft. Dia.             | 15 - 33 Ft. Dia.         | 45 - 65 Ft. Dia.         |

| Rate:                   |                          |                          |
| 1 - 3/Year              | 2 - 6/Year               | 3 - 7/Year               |

Evolution Challenges

- 1.5 Stage Performance
  w "Common Core"

- HLLV Performance
  - Shroud Size
  - Weight
  - Cost

- HLLV Performance
  - Shroud Size
  - Weight
  - Cost
Evolution Flow

Lunar

Mars

NLS Reference

- ET Dia. Core
  (1.49 Mlb Prop.)

- 25 ft Shroud

- 4 ASRM's

- ET Booster

- ET Dia. Core

- 2 ET Boosters

- 2 LOX/RP Boosters

- LOX/RP Booster

Payload
(To 220 n. mi.)

150—300 kils

300—600 kils

Launch Vehicle Material Emphasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Emphasis</th>
<th>Rationales</th>
<th>Vehicle Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Li</td>
<td>Reduced Weight, Improved Manuf, Lower Costs</td>
<td>Performance, Margins, Reliability, Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal Protection System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Materials Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Unpressurized Structures</th>
<th>Pressurized Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al 2219</td>
<td>Shrouds, Skirts, Intertanks</td>
<td>Propellant Tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Li</td>
<td>Shrouds, Skirts, Intertanks</td>
<td>Propellant Tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr-Ep</td>
<td>Shrouds, Skirts, Intertanks</td>
<td>Propellant Tanks w Liners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Matrix</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weight Comparison

Unpressurized Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>% of Al 2219 Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Li</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr-Ep</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Matrix</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pressurized Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>% of Al 2219 Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Li</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr-Ep</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Matrix</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weldalite™ External Tank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>LWT</th>
<th>Delta Weight Savings (lbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weldalite™ Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO₂ Tank</td>
<td>11903</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertank</td>
<td>12166</td>
<td>409*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH₂ Tank</td>
<td>27981</td>
<td>1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>13595</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65645</td>
<td>2154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*540 Additional Pounds Saved Using 2090 Alloy
**511 Additional Pounds Saved Using 2090 Alloy
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Benefits of Using Al-Li Alloys For Cryogenic Tanks

- 19% Tank Weight Savings Due to Improved Specific Properties
- Tank Weight 42.5K lbs Raw Material 213K lbs
- 2219 Integrally Machined
- Tank Weight 50K lbs Raw Material 250K lbs
- Large Reduction in Buy to Fly Ratio Due to Reduced Scrap Rate
- Al-Li Integrally Machined
- Tank Weight 42.5K lbs Raw Material 51.0K lbs
- Material Costs
  - $0.9 M
  - $2.1 M
  + $13.8 M
- System Costs Savings
  - $15.0 M
  - $13.8 M
- Cost-to-Orbit Benefit
  - $100 M
  - $85 M
  - $15 M
- $2000/lb to Orbit

Relative Vehicle Performance

Lunar
- Al-Li Improves Payload Capability By 5%
- Gr-Epoxy Improves Payload Capability By Approximately 12%
- Metal Matrix Improves Payload Capability By Approximately 8%

Mars
- Al-Li Improves Payload Capability By 4%
- Gr-Epoxy Improves Payload Capability By Approximately 10%
- Metal Matrix Improves Payload Capability By Approximately 6%
Summary

- Improved Vehicle Design
  - Margins
  - Reliability

- Cost Reduction
  - Improved Manufacturing
  - Less Scraps

- Reduction Of Vehicle Dry Weight By > 15%
  - Al-Li
  - Composites
  - TPS
Dr. Bunting stressed that Al-Li should be incorporated as a major structural material in space transportation vehicles. The National Launch System, as a joint NASA / Air Force program, provides an opportunity to realize the potential of Al-Li. Advanced structures can reduce weights by 5-40% as well as relax propulsion system performance specifications and reduce requirements for labor and materials. The effect on costs will be substantial. For example, a redesigned external tank fabricated from Al-Li would weigh 8 klb less than existing ET's and, as a result, reduce effective launch costs by $800 per pound of payload.

Advanced assembly and process control technologies also offer the potential for greatly reduced labor during the manufacturing and inspection processes. Current practices are very labor-intensive and, as a result, labor costs far outweigh material costs for operational space transportation systems.

The technological readiness of new structural materials depends on their commercial availability, producibility and materials properties. Martin Marietta is vigorously pursuing the development of its Weldalite™ 049 Al-Li alloys in each of these areas. Al-Li alloys are now commercially available, they have been used in high quality welds, and they perform as expected in terms of yield strength and ultimate strength. Martin Marietta tests have demonstrated satisfactory welds using a variety of techniques in test articles composed entirely of Al-Li and in joining Al-Li to aluminum. Preliminary demonstrations of producibility based on the design of the Space Shuttle external tank have also been successful, and more complex tests are continuing.

Martin Marietta is also preparing to test an automated work cell concept that it has developed using discrete event simulation. One of the goals of this effort is to develop a manufacturing process that features continuous inspection of welded joints as they are created and thereby eliminate the time consuming practice of inspecting welds after the fact as a separate step of the fabrication process. Martin Marietta is currently procuring tooling for initial demonstrations.
Baseline Vehicles

1.5 STAGE
TITAN IV 86ft
SHROUD
NEW ADAPTER
UPPER STAGE OPTION

SUSTAINER STMEs

COMMON CORE
FORWARD INTERSTAGE
FORWARD SKIRT
TANKAGE / INTERTANK
- STD SIZE / MATERIALS
- BEEFUP FOR 1.5 STG APPLICATION

AVIONICS
THrust Structure / PROPULSION
- INFLIGHT SEP.
SYSTEMS
STMEs
STRUCTURE / PROPULSION FOR 2 CENTER STMEs
AFT SKIRT
- VEHICLE HOLDDOWN

HLLV
TITAN IV 86ft
SHROUD
OPTIONAL SHROUD FOR STS PAYLOADS (40' STRONG-BACK)
CTV
ASRMs

Existing Launch Vehicles

Structures Technology
- Aluminum Alloys 2219, 2014
- Fabrication Techniques
- Machine, Stretch Form
- Chem Mill to Tight Tolerances
- Manual Inspection

Assembly & Process Control Technology
- Manual Material Handling
- Manual Part Set-Up
- Manual Part Weld Prep
- Manual Part Fit-Up
- Point Design Weld Processes
- Manual Inspection

Advanced Technology

Structures Technology
- Reduce Weight (5 - 40%)
- Reduce Direct Labor/Material
- Reduce Support Labor
- Reduce Propulsion Requirements

Assembly & Process Control Technology
- Reduce Direct Assembly Labor (30%)
- Reduce Major Weld Labor (34%)
- Reduce Inspection Labor (33%)
Weldalite™ 049 and The External Tank (ET)

- Redesign of the ET Using Weldalite™ 049 Can Result in A Weight Savings of Approximately 8000 lb
- This Equates to a Savings of Cost to Orbit of about $800/lb
## Al-Li Alloys

### Success Criteria

- Demonstrated Production Capability
- Demonstrated Cost Advantage through Higher Strength
- Adequate Fracture Toughness
- Adequate Stress Corrosion Resistance
- Demonstrated Manufacturability

### Technology Readiness of Al-Li Alloys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Present Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Availability</td>
<td>Alloys Are Currently Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forming</td>
<td>Full Scale External Tank Gores and Extruded Chords Have Been Produced. All Meet Design Tolerances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chem-milling</td>
<td>Chem-milled Gores Meet Design Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Machining</td>
<td>Extruded Chords Have Been Machined and Meet Design Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technology Readiness of Al-Li Alloys (Concl.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Present Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>High Quality Welds Have Been Produced by All Conventional Processes Including VPPA. Backside Shielding Concepts Have Been Demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Allowables</td>
<td>All Product Forms of Weldalite™ 049 Have Been Shown to Meet the Specified Yield Strength of 85 ksi and the 90 ksi Ultimate Strength Goal. Reynolds Will Begin the &quot;S&quot; Basis Allowables Program in Late 1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advanced Cryotank Program - ADP 3106
Weldalite™ 049 Development

### 1988
- Concurrent Engineering Team Formed
  - Martin Marietta
  - Reynolds Metals Co.
  - Universities
  - Government Agencies
  - Laboratory Production at RMC
  - Lab Scale Properties Exceed Other Tankage Alloys

### 1989
- Full Scale Production at RMC
  - 13,000 lb Ingots Produced
  - Plate and Sheet Material Characterized
  - Typical Properties
    - Ftu =100 ksi
    - Fty = 90 ksi

- Small Scale Net Shaped Products Manufactured
  - Hook Forgings
  - Domes (18" Dia)
  - Extrusions
  - Weldability Demonstrated

![Weldalite™ 049 Yield Strength](image)

![Weld Properties](image)
### Advanced Cryotank Program - ADP 3106
### Weldalite™ 049 Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large Products Produced</strong></td>
<td><strong>In Progress:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Components for 14” Dia Tank Manufactured</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Extruded External Tank (ET) Chord</td>
<td>- Integrally Stiffened Extruded Tube Producing 105&quot; Wide x 360&quot; Length Barrel Panel</td>
<td>- Fabricate Tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ET Gore Panels</td>
<td>- 120” Dia Dome Spin Forming</td>
<td>- Test Tank at Cryogenic Temperatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Domes (42” Dia)</td>
<td>- Weld Process Optimization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Extruded Barrel Panels (18” Width)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roll Forged Ring (34” Dia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42” Dome Properties</strong></td>
<td><strong>STATUS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength (ksi)</th>
<th>UTS</th>
<th>UTS</th>
<th>YS</th>
<th>YS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATUS:**
- Alloy - Lab to Production In 3 Years
- Net Shapes Demonstrated
- Exceeded Mechanical Property Goals
3.0 MANNED EARTH-TO-ORBIT SYSTEMS

3.1 Advanced Manned Launch System – Theodore A. Talay, Langley Research Center

Several alternatives exist for the development of the next manned launch system. The Advanced Manned Launch System (AMLS), which represents a clean-sheet replacement for the Space Shuttle, faces competition from concepts such as (1) the Personnel Launch System, which would serve as a personnel transport to complement the Space Shuttle, and (2) an advanced version of the existing Space Shuttle. An AMLS system could begin operations sometime between 2005 and 2020, depending upon the level of national interest and support. It would probably demonstrate a payload capacity less than that of the Space Shuttle, although performance specifications are far from certain. Even the form of the AMLS is still under discussion. Design studies have considered a wide variety of options including all levels of hardware reusability; single-, dual- and multiple-staging; and airbreathing vs. rocket propulsion. An evaluation of the relative cost-effectiveness of these options is impossible without guidance regarding basic mission requirements such as total number of launches over the system’s life cycle and the date required. The availability of more advanced technologies will enable single-stage-to-orbit (SSTO) designs that are in general not feasible using current technology.

Alternative AMLS design concepts vary in terms of performance, risk and operational factors. Airbreathing systems minimize the substantial launch pad investments associated with rocket systems, but they also introduce more stringent requirements in thermal protection, landing gear and air data.

LaRC AMLS studies indicate that:

- A near-term AMLS, operational circa 2005, should rely on a two-stage propulsion system.
- A longer-term system, operational circa 2015, could improve its performance by using a SSTO design concept.
- Additional studies of ground operations are needed to define life cycle costs and to better discriminate between air-breathing and rocket propulsion systems.
- Rocket systems maximize the performance of vehicles using payload-to-orbit as the primary figure of merit.
- Air-breathing options provide unique capabilities in terms of cruise, loiter, recall, offset launch and all-azimuth launch.
ADVANCED MANNED LAUNCH SYSTEM

Theodore A. Talay
Space Systems Division
NASA Langley Research Center
THE NEXT MANNED SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

- Satisfy people/payload requirements
- Improve cost effectiveness
- Increase reliability
- Increase margins

WHICH PATH TO FOLLOW?

STS EVOLUTION
- Evolve existing system

ADVANCED MANNED LAUNCH SYSTEM
- Clean sheet STS replacement

PERSONNEL LAUNCH SYSTEM
- Separate people from cargo
- Complement STS

SPACE TRANSPORTATION ARCHITECTURE OPTION
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Space Shuttle
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▲ AMLS

▲ SEI

▲ PLS (Assured Access)

▲ NLS (Multi-role Heavy-lift)

SPACE STATION FREEDOM
POST-SHUTTLE AMLS OPTIONS STUDIES

EFFECTS OF VEHICLE REUSABILITY ON LIFE-CYCLE COST TRENDS

- Expendable
- Partially reusable
- Fully reusable

Life-cycle costs vs. Total launches over life-cycle
### TECHNOLOGIES FOR AMLS VEHICLE OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Technologies</th>
<th>Space Shuttle (reference)</th>
<th>Near-Term Technology</th>
<th>Advanced Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>- Al structures</td>
<td>- Composite structures</td>
<td>- Ti-Al composite structures and TPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Al tanks</td>
<td>- Reusable Al-Li tanks</td>
<td>- Reusable thermoplastic hydrogen tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited composites</td>
<td>- Durable metallic or ceramic TPS</td>
<td>- Reusable Al-Li oxygen tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ceramic TPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propulsion</td>
<td>- SSME</td>
<td>- Lightweight SSME derivative</td>
<td>- Extra lightweight SSME derivative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Turbojet/ramjet</td>
<td>- Variable mixture ratio rocket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ATR</td>
<td>- Turborocket, ramjet, scramjet propulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsystems</td>
<td>- Hydraulic power</td>
<td>- Electromechanical actuators</td>
<td>- Lightweight subsystems using advanced materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Monoprop APU</td>
<td>- All-electric</td>
<td>- Actively cooled or carbon-carbon inlets and nozzles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hypergolic OMS/RCS</td>
<td>- Lightweight fuel cells, batteries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fuel cells</td>
<td>- Cryogenic/gaseous OMS/RCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Fault-tolerant/self check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TECHNOLOGY EFFECT ON ROCKET LAUNCH VEHICLE WEIGHT

![Graph showing technology effect on rocket launch vehicle weight.](image)
NASP MATERIAL AND STRUCTURE TECHNOLOGY
BENEFITS FOR ROCKET SSTO

Advanced carbon-carbon nose cap and leading edges

Dry weight, Klb

Thermoplastic hydrogen tank

Titanium aluminide structure

Aluminum-lithium oxygen tank

Slush propellants

Variable mixture ratio engines (rocket technology)

FACTORS INFLUENCING ROCKET VEHICLE SIZING

Vehicle weight

Two-stage

Advancing technology →
Design for performance →
<-- Design for operations, safety, reliability
<-- Increasing payload, margins
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DESIGN FOR PERFORMANCE ROCKET SSTO VEHICLE

- Gross weight, lb
  - 4,206K
  - 1,703K
  - 1,408K
  - 997K
  - 895K
  - 895K

- Dry weight, lb
  - 427K
  - 160K
  - 129K
  - 88K
  - 78K
  - 70K

- Categories:
  - Near-term Technology
  - Advanced Materials
  - Advanced SSME Subsystems
  - Minimum Propellants
  - Slush
  - VMR Engine

DESIGN FOR OPERATIONS ROCKET SSTO VEHICLE

- Gross weight, lb
  - 895K
  - 1,108K
  - 1,216K
  - 1,355K
  - 1,457K
  - 1,538K

- Dry weight, lb
  - 70K
  - 90K
  - 100K
  - 112K
  - 123K
  - 131K

- Categories:
  - Design for Performance
  - Robust Subsystem
  - 15 percent Margin
  - No Slush Propellants
  - Engine-Out Capability
  - Crew Escape Module
AMLS DESIGN COMPARISONS

- Design to same mission requirements and technology levels
- Compare rocket vs. airbreather systems
- Compare single-stage vs. two-stage systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Near-term Technology</th>
<th>Advanced Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rocket two-stage</td>
<td>• Rocket two-stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Air-breather/rocket two-stage</td>
<td>• Airbreather/rocket two-stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rocket single-stage</td>
<td>• Rocket single stage (SSME-derived)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rocket single stage (VMR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Airbreather/rocket single stage (ATR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Airbreather/rocket single stage (SCRAM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEAR-TERM TECHNOLOGY AMLS

10K POLAR MISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length, ft</th>
<th>Two-stage rocket</th>
<th>Two-stage airbreather/rocket</th>
<th>SSTO rocket</th>
<th>Dry weight, klb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY AMLS**

**10K POLAR MISSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-stage rocket</th>
<th>Two-stage airbreather/rocket</th>
<th>SSTO SSME rocket</th>
<th>SSTO VMR rocket</th>
<th>ATR/rocket SSTO</th>
<th>Conical AB SSTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry weight, Klb</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL IDEAL VELOCITY REQUIRED TO REACH ORBIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delta V, ft/sec</th>
<th>2-STG SSME VMR ATR Conical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-STG Rocket AB</td>
<td>SSME Rocket SSTO AB SSTO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RELATIVE PROPELLANT COSTS

Hydrogen costs = 20 x Oxygen costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology level</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
<th>Oxygen (liquid or triple point), Klb</th>
<th>Hydrogen (liquid or slush), Klb</th>
<th>Ratio of propellant costs to baseline rockets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near term</td>
<td>Two-stage rocket</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-stage AB</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Two-stage rocket</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-stage AB</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSME-SSTO</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VMR-SSTO</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATR-SSTO</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conical AB SSTO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATIONS TRADE

![Diagram showing operations trade](image-url)

![Diagram showing figures of merit](image-url)

- **Figures of merit:**
  - Time
  - Manpower
  - $
KEY FINDINGS OF LaRC STUDIES

- IOC/technology levels crucial to vehicle options
  - IOC 2005 (near-term technology) – two-stage systems
  - IOC 2015 (advanced technology) – SSTO

- Ground operations (a key to life-cycle cost) require detailed system and facility trades to discriminate between rocket and air-breathing options

- Missions and flight operations may be discriminator
  - Rocket options best for payload-to-orbit accelerator missions (lowest dry weight two-stage and SSTO systems indicative of lowest DDT&E costs)
  - Air-breathing options provide unique capabilities
    - Offset launch
    - All-azimuth launch
    - Cruise capability
    - Loiter
    - Recall

} Selectable orbital elements
3.2 Advanced Crew Rescue Vehicle/ Personnel Launch System – Jerry Craig, Johnson Space Center

The Advanced Crew Rescue Vehicle (ACRV) will be an essential element of the Space Station to respond to three specific missions, all of which have occurred during the history of space exploration by the U.S. and the Soviets:

- **Mission DRM-1**: Return of disabled crew members during medical emergencies.
- **Mission DRM-2**: Return of crew members from accidents or as a result of failures of Space Station systems.
- **Mission DRM-3**: Return of crew members during interruption of Space Shuttle launches.

The ACRV will have the ability to transport up to eight astronauts during a 24-hour mission. Not only would the ACRV serve as a lifeboat to provide transportation back to Earth, but it would also be available as an immediately available safe refuge in case the Space Station were severely damaged by space debris or other catastrophe. Upon return to Earth, existing world-wide search and rescue assets operated by the Coast Guard and Department of Defense would be able to retrieve personnel returned to Earth via the ACRV.

The operational approach proposed for the ACRV is tailored to satisfying mission requirements for simplicity of operation (no piloting skills or specially trained personnel are required), continuous availability, high reliability and affordability. By using proven systems as the basis for many critical ACRV systems, the ACRV program is more likely to achieve each of these mission requirements. Nonetheless, the need for the ACRV to operate reliably with little preflight preparation after, perhaps, 5 to 10 years in orbit imposes challenges not faced by any previous space system of this complexity. Specific concerns exist regarding micrometeoroid impacts, battery life, and degradation of recovery parachutes while in storage.

Current policy requires that the ACRV be operational at the onset of Permanent Manned Capability (PMC) of the Space Station. PMC is unlikely to occur before 1999, and therefore the ACRV program should be able to meet this requirement.

Dozens of special tests are planned to ensure that system designers fully understand unique aspects of the ACRV vehicle and mission requirements. For example, water egress tests will ensure that recovery of both able-bodied and injured personnel is possible after landing. Integrated systems tests will verify the operability of proposed embedded systems intended to eliminate the need for a skilled pilot and to interact with ground-based search and rescue forces. Other tests and analyses will examine issues associated with communications, data handling and power systems, landing opportunities, aerothermal analysis and separation from the Space Station.

Johnson Space Center has initiated a Manned Transportation System (MTS) study of other issues related to the full scope of manned transportation systems. The objective of this eight-month study is to reach consensus on needs, attributes, and architecture products and thereby enhance the acceptance and subsequent implementation of the MTS study results. The MTS study is using a NASA-Industry Team (NIT) to serve as a forum for examining selected transportation issues. In March 1992, the NIT will issue a final report that:

- Quantifies transportation needs as a function of alternative space mission sets.
- Identifies and weighs the primary discriminating attributes that future transportation systems must possess.
- Describes and ranks manned transportation architecture options for each set of future space missions.
- Quantifies top-level transportation system mission requirements, such as the amount of payload and its
destination, for each mission set. This information will then be available for further studies.

- Identifies better ways of doing business.

To enhance crew safety, lessons learned from past experience should be used to guide the development of future systems. A close look at past failures reveals that most flight failures are associated with propulsion, and that half of them occur within 60 seconds of launch while vehicle altitude is below 50,000 feet. The current approach to man-rating launch vehicles relies on added redundancy, upgraded designs to correct known weaknesses, and more stringent quality control procedures. Unfortunately, these practices have been unable to prevent tragic accidents, and innovative approaches may be advisable to improve overall success rates. For example, one new approach that could be considered would use a twin C-5 air launch vehicle to carry a spacecraft mated to a three-stage solid-rocket booster to a drop altitude of 40,000 feet. The gross weight of the twin-fuselage aircraft would be about 1.5 to 1.8 million pounds, with a payload capacity (spacecraft plus boosters) of up to one million pounds. Maximum spacecraft weight at insertion into a 220 nautical mile, 28.5° inclination orbit would be 34,414 pounds, sufficient for either an ACRV or PLS vehicle. Air launches of this kind would provide a number of design and operational benefits such as reduced dynamic pressures and increased time margins for mission abort.
ACRV
Project Office

ACRV/MTS PRESENTATION TO THE SPACE TRANSPORTATION MATERIALS & STRUCTURES TECHNOLOGY WORKSHOP

Jerry Craig
September 23-26, 1991

NASA
ACRV Requirements

The ACRV is the Space Station Freedom Lifeboat

- Return one disabled Space Station crewmember during medical emergencies. (DRM-1)
- Return of Space Station crew from accidents or from failures of Space Station Freedom systems. (DRM-2)
- Return of Space Station crew during interruption of Space Shuttle launches. (DRM-3)

Each of these emergencies has occurred in manned spaceflight.

Report of the Advisory Committee on the Future of the U.S. Space Program ...
"The emergency recovery capability now planned for the Space Station is essential."

ACRV Typical Mission Sequence

- Space Station Freedom emergency is declared
- Crew transfers from Space Station Freedom to ACRV
- ACRV isolates crew from emergency and activates lifeboat systems
- ACRV separates from Space Station Freedom and initiates deorbit
- Retrosystem is staged and entry is initiated
- Chutes are deployed and ACRV lands on Earth
- SAR forces transfer crew to safety
Candidate ACRV Vehicle Approaches

Operations Approach

- **SIMPLE, AVAILABLE, RELIABLE AND AFFORDABLE (SARA) OPERATIONAL PHILOSOPHY**
  - SIMPLIFY CREW ROLE
  - ENSURE OPERATIONAL READINESS AND QUICK RESPONSE

- **EMBEDDED OPERATIONS**
  - OPTIMIZE USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND RESOURCES
  - STREAMLINE PRELAUNCH PROCESSING OPERATIONS

- **EXISTING CAPABILITIES**
  - USE OF FLIGHT DEMONSTRATED PROCEDURES AND TOOLS
  - EXISTING SAR CAPABILITIES

- **SYSTEMS COMMONALITY**
  - OPTIMIZE INTERFACES AND ACHIEVE OPERATIONAL SYNERGISM WITH SPACE SHUTTLE AND SPACE STATION FREEDOM

**EMBEDDED OPERATIONS**
ACRV Landing Opportunities

- GLOBAL DISTRIBUTION OF LANDING SITES PROVIDES MULTIPLE OPPORTUNITIES PER DAY
  - REDUCES WORST CASE WAIT TIME
  - PROVIDES BACKUP SITES FOR WEATHER AND MISSED DEORBIT BURNS
- SITES IN BOTH HEMISPHERES ASSURE DAYLIGHT OPPORTUNITIES
- SITES NEAR 28.5 LATITUDE CAN PROVIDE MULTIPLE OPPORTUNITIES
- ALL SITES MUST HAVE EXISTING SAR FORCES AND MEDICAL FACILITIES NEARBY

[TYPICAL SUBSET OF CANDIDATE INTERNATIONAL SITES IS SHOWN OVERLAID WITH ORBIT TRACKS FOR A 24 HOUR PERIOD]

ACRV DESIGN PHILOSOPHY

S - Simple design eliminates complex systems and interfaces
A - Available – space-based vehicle to provide high mission availability
R - Reliable – robust design, fail-safe subsystems, utilizing proven flight space technology
A - Affordable – designed to utilize existing mission, ground, and SAR infrastructure
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ACRV 8-PERSON SCRAM

STUDY ASSUMPTIONS/GROUNDRULES:

- BASED ON A LOW LIFT/DRAG CONCEPT CALLED SCRAM
  (STATION CREW RETURN ALTERNATIVE MODULE)
  - SIMPLE DESIGN, GOOD FLOTATION CHARACTERISTICS
- SIZED TO TRANSPORT 8 CREW FOR 24 HOUR MISSION
- BASELINE WATER LANDER
- USE SUBSYSTEMS THAT ARE SIMPLE, AVAILABLE, RELIABLE AND AFFORDABLE
- MINIMIZE SSF INTERFACE DURING QUIESCENT MODE

ACRV 8-PERSON SCRAM CONT.

JSC REPRESENTATIVE ACRV CONCEPT CONSISTS OF:

- 174" (14.5 FT) OD VIKING HEAT SHIELD
  - RCS SYSTEM
  - CREW MODULE BATTERIES
- 124" (10'4'') OD CREW MODULE
  - 8 CREW AND COUCHES
  - POWER DISTRIBUTION, AVIONICS, ECLSS, CREW PROVISIONS
  - TOP AND SIDE HATCHES
- 80" TO 30" SSF/ACRV TUNNEL ADAPTER
- 94" (7 10'') OD SERVICE MODULE
  - BATTERIES
  - DEORBIT PROPULSION
  - MICROMETEOROID SHIELDS
ASSURED CREW RETURN VEHICLE (ACRV)
Reference For External Integration

TUNNEL ADAPTER
80° to 30° adapter

CREW MODULE 124° OD

HEAT SHIELD 174° OD

SERVICE MODULE 94° OD

188 Inches

Shelby Lawson, ET2
483-6611

Assured Crew Return Vehicle (ACRV) - Top View
8 man, 24 hour mission

RCS Tanks 10 TYP
Batteries
Side Hatch
Heat Shield
RCS Engine 12 TYP

Shelby Lawson, ET2
483-6611
3/27/91
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STRUCTURE AND TPS:

- Weights were estimated with areal density (lbs/sq ft) parameter based on structural, thermal and aerodynamic analysis of modified Apollo capsule. Crew module, heat shield and service module surface areas were used to generate the weights shown in the mass statement.

STRUCTURE AND TPS: CONT.

ANALYSIS DOCUMENTED IN JSC-32025. AREAL DENSITIES AND WEIGHTS ESTIMATED BY ES (SERVICE MODULE STRUCTURE BY ET2)

STRUCTURE:
- Crew module: 1,552 lbs
- Heat shield: 500 lbs
- Service module: 475 lbs

TPS AND INSULATION:
- Crew module: 273 lbs
- Heat shield: 443 lbs
- Service module: 71 lbs
ACRV 8-PERSON SCRAM CONT.

RECOVERY

- APOLLO PARACHUTE SYSTEM AND COUCH ATTENUATION WEIGHTS REPRESENTED. ASSUME THREE ROUND PARACHUTES WITH PACKING VOLUME LESS THAN 40 LBS/CU FT.

PARACHUTE ASSEMBLY: 595 LBS
IMPACT & RECOVERY SYS.: 186 LBS
MOUNTING STRUCTURE: 156 LBS
TOTAL RECOVERY SYSTEM MASS: 936 LBS

Assured Crew Return Vehicle Mass Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTE: ALL MASS IS IN POUNDS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN MASS SUMMARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNCTIONAL SUBSYSTEM CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 STRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 PROTECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 PROPULSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 AVIONICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 ENVIRONMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 GROWTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRY MASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 NON-CARGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 CARGO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| INERT MASS               | 10,760      | 1,988         | 625                    | 1,840           | 602                     |
| 12.0 NON-PROPellant      | 373         | 0             |                        |                 |                         |
| 13.0 PROPellant          | 264         | 666           |                        |                 |                         |
| GROSS MASS               | 11,397      | 2,654         | 625                    | 1,840           | 602                     |

Assured Crew Return Vehicle (ACRV) 8 man, 24 hour mission

Shelby Lawson, NASA JSC, M.C. ET2, phone 483-5611

Shelby Lawson, ET2 483-5611 3/27/91

NOTE:
- Crew Module:
- Service Module:
- Berthing Adapter System:
- FSE & ASE Equipment:
- Micrometeoroid / Debris Protection:
ACRV Project Schedule


- Preliminary Project Analysis
- Requirement Definition
- Project & Systems Concepts Definition
- System Definition & Integrated Supporting Definition (including contractor participation)
- System Design & Fabrication
- Initial Ops Capability SSF Support (PMC)

Competing Contractor Teams
Team A - Rockwell
McDonnell
TRW
Honeywell
Team B - Lockheed
Boeing
IBM

11/98 OPT PMC

UNIQUE ACRV TECHNOLOGY ISSUES

- LONG TERM DORMANCY ISSUES
  - 5 TO 10 YEAR ON-ORBIT LIFETIME REQUIREMENT
    - VEHICLE REUSE CAPABILITY FOLLOWING ORBIT STAY
  - DEBRIS/MICROMETEOROID IMPACT CONCERNS
    - IMPACT RESISTANT HEAT SHIELD AND STRUCTURE
    - ON-ORBIT PROTECTION DEVICES
    - RE-ENTRY CAPABILITY FOLLOWING IMPACT DAMAGE
  - LONG TERM STORAGE OF RECOVERY PARACHUTES
  - LONG TERM BATTERY LIFE

- EMBEDDED OPERATIONS
  - NO PILOT SKILLS; AUTOMATED OPS
  - MINIMAL TRAINING
  - AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE OPERATIONS
  - EXISTING SAR CAPABILITIES
ACRV REQUIREMENTS VALIDATION TEST/SIMULATIONS

- ENTRY G LEVEL EXPOSURE TESTS
  - HUMANS
  - ANIMALS

- ZERO-G EGRESS TIME (KC-135)

- WATER LANDING FLOTATION/CREW EXTRACTION FOR ILL/INJURED DECONDITIONED CREW

- LAND LANDING DESIGN CRITERIA VALIDATION

- APOLLO IMPACT G REQUIREMENT VALIDATION

ACRV WATER LANDING REQUIREMENTS VALIDATION

- INITIATIVE: CONDUCT WATER EGRESS TESTS TO UNDERSTAND DIFFICULTIES AND REQUIREMENTS

- BASIC APPROACH IS TO BUILD A SINGLE FULL SCALE TEST ARTICLE (DESIGNED IN-HOUSE) THAT HAS VARIABLE PARAMETERS (CG, MASS, SHAPE) AND THEN CONDUCT MANNED AND UNMANNED TESTS AT TEXAS A&M OFFSHORE TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH CENTER WAVE TANK

- TEST WILL PRODUCE ENGINEERING DATA ON VEHICLE HANDLING AS WELL AS WATER EGRESS DATA

- OUR ENGINEERING TEAM HAS ALREADY CONSTRUCTED A SUBSCALE WAVE TANK AND SUBSCALE MODELS PRODUCING PRELIMINARY DATA FOR TEST PLANNING AS WELL AS DESIGN OF TEST ARTICLE

- ALSO DEVELOPING ANALYTIC MODELS OF VEHICLE HANDLING USING DERIVATIVES OF NAVAL ENGINEERING DESIGN TOOLS
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ACRV PHASE B INTEGRATED SUPPORTING DEFINITION

NASA & THE PRIME CONTRACTOR TEAMS * (LMSC & RI) WILL:

- CONDUCT ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONAL SIMULATIONS TO VALIDATE PRELIMINARY DESIGN DEFINITION AND TO IDENTIFY & EVALUATE DESIGN OPTIONS TO REDUCE/ABATE PHASE C/D RISKS AND ENHANCE THE DOWNSELECT PROCESS

- UTILIZE NASA AND CONTRACTOR FACILITIES TO PERFORM ANALYSIS, TEST, DEMONSTRATION, AND SIMULATION TASKS ON CANDIDATE (GENERIC AND COMPETITION SENSITIVE) HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE FOR A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO ..... SIMPLE & RELIABLE DESIGNS
- LOW COST, NO FRILLS APPROACHES
- MINIMIZE DESIGN RISKS IN PHASE C/D

- CONDUCT INTEGRATED TESTS (PARTIAL OR FULL SCALE), DEMONSTRATIONS, AND SIMULATIONS TO VALIDATE EMBEDDED OPERATIONS CONCEPTS

* BOTH CONTRACTOR TEAMS HAVE IDENTIFIED SIGNIFICANT COST SHARING WITH NASA
INTEGRATED SUPPORTING DEFINITION

THE ISD TASKS WILL BE CONDUCTED UNDER THE FOLLOWING MAJOR CATEGORIES:

- **ENGINEERING**  
  - LANDING & RECOVERY  
  - S/W & AVIONICS  
  - AERO/AEROTHERMAL  
  - DORMANCY  
  - DEFINITION CONTRACT SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NASA</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **OPERATIONS**  
  - EMBEDDED OPERATIONS  
  - SSF INTERFACES  
  - MAN-MACHINE & MECH. SYSTEMS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTEGRATED SUPPORTING DEFINITION

HANDS-ON TYPE TASKS TO BE PERFORMED IN FY92 & 93

BY

NASA & PRIME CONTACTORS:

- LANDING & RECOVERY ANALYSIS
- AERO-AEROTHERMAL ANALYSIS
* TPS/DEBRIS IMPACT ANALYSIS
* RESERVE LITHIUM BATTERY DEVELOPMENT
- GN & C/AVIONICS SUPPORT
- LANDING OPPORTUNITY ANALYSIS
- WATER TESTS & DEMOS
- GPS/ANTENNA ANAL & TEST
- COMM & TRACK SYSTEM SUPPORT ANALYSIS
- DATA SYSTEMS ANALYSIS
- DISPLAY & CONTROL SYSTEM ANALYSIS
- SYS. & HEALTH MONITORING & FAILURE ANALYSIS (DORMANCY)
- SYSTEMS ENG SIM DEVELOP
- PWR DIST & CONTROL BREADBOARD
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INTEGRATED SUPPORTING DEFINITION CONT.

HANDS-ON TYPE TASKS TO BE PERFORMED IN FY92 & 93

BY

NASA & PRIME CONTACTORS:

- ECLSS SUPPORT & DEMO
- SSF SEPARATION/PROX OPS ANALYSIS
- MAT'L & PROCESS EVALUATION
- DRM DEV. & DESIGN ASSESSMENT
- FAULT TOL/REDUNDANCY MGMT.
- KC135 FLTS/MOCK-UP/EGRESS SIMULATIONS
- MED COUCH/LITTER DEVELOPMENT
- MOCKUPS & TRAINERS (1-G) DEVELOPMENT
- UPDATE STD-3000 VOL VI
- MED OPS CONCEPT PLANNING
- FLT OPS CONCEPT SUPPORT PLANNING
- * EMBEDDED OPS SIM/DEMO
- DESIGN REVIEWS & SUPPORT
- SRM & QA SUPPORT
- TOTAL DEFINITION EFFORT/KSC SUPPORT
- DDMS SUPPORT

ACRV DESIGN PHILOSOPHY

S: Simple
A: Available
R: Reliable
A: Affordable

by Dave
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Manned Transportation System Study

Jerry Craig
NASA/Johnson Space Center
September 23, 1991

MTS Study

Objective
• To reach consensus on the needs, attributes, and architecture products, thereby enhancing acceptance and subsequent implementation of the study results. (In lieu of being policy makers, this can only be achieved by using a logical, measurable, and repeatable process.)

Approach
• Pull together representatives from NASA and industry and try to obtain consensus on the needs, attributes, and architectures
  • JSC, MSFC, LaRC, KSC
  • Boeing, General Dynamics, LMSC, Martin Marietta, McDonnell Douglas, RI under 8 month contract to JSC (Aug 91-March 92)
  • NASA Headquarters
  • Perhaps some additional industry input in specific areas
MTS Study Products

1 Quantified transportation needs as a function of the space agenda scenarios ("IFs") NASA may pursue from the present to 2020 (i.e., what you want the transportation system to do)

2 Determination and weighting of the primary discriminating attributes that the transportation system must possess (i.e., a "bottom-line" measure of how well the transportation system does it)

3 Due to the considerable uncertainty in our specific requirements for transportation (due to the uncertainty in our space agenda), we will
   a) determine and rank manned transportation architecture options. These architectures are a function of time and are specific to each space agenda scenario ("IF")
   b) determine top-level output requirements (such as amount and location of any cargo associated with the next manned transportation elements) to be used in future studies or design phases. This provides the framework for NASA and industry to determine the optimum solution(s) for personnel transportation to and from space.

4 New ways of doing business "better"

Study Approach

• NASA - Industry Team (NIT) Forum
  • Bring together the best in NASA and industry to work together to obtain maximum consensus
  • Have JSC, industry, headquarters and other centers work together in a single focused activity

• Architecture solutions will be "needs-based" as a function of the programs that may be implemented. For example,
  • If we just do Big Science program missions
  • If we do Big Science and basic SSF program missions
  • If we do Big Science and basic SSF program missions and SEI

• Determine and prioritize (weight) attributes desired of the potential solutions

• Assemble/develop candidate transportation element concepts that meet the need, determine the values of their attributes, assemble into architectures, and score the architectures

Note
• Don't force consensus where consensus doesn't exist
• Obtain credible data to support conclusions reached
### MTS Study Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS KICKOFF</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL FORUM MEETINGS (AT JSC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 1 - Needs Analysis</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 2 - Attribute Identification</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 3 - Tech Data &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 4 - Admin Data &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACTOR TECHNICAL DATA PACKAGE DELIVERED</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIT FINAL REPORT</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manned Transportation Long Range Schedule (Calendar Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manned Transportation Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Concept Definition (Agency-wide)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± PLS (BICONIC, EEL-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± STS/STS Evolution</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± AMLS</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± Air Launched</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± SSTO</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± NASP/NASPDerived Vehicles</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manned Transportation System Study</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Providing Focus for Determining Which Path to Follow for Manned Transportation and Providing Top-Level Requirements)</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± Task 1 - Transportation Needs Analysis</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± Task 2 - Attribute Identification</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± Task 3 - Tech Data &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± Task 4 - Admin Data &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused Transportation Concept Definition</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± NASA Inhouse</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± Industry (Contracted)</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± RFP</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± Manned Trans Concept/Requirements Definition(s)</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase A/B (as req'd) Definition(s)</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± RFP</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MANNED TRANSPORTATION DESIGN PRINCIPLES TO ENHANCE CREW SAFETY

LESSONS FROM HISTORY

LAUNCH SYSTEMS - DEMONSTRATED SUCCESS/FAILURE
- MAJORITY OF FLIGHT FAILURES ARE PROPULSION
- FIFTY PERCENT OF ALL FAILURES OCCUR WITHIN FIRST 60 SECONDS AND BELOW 50,000 FEET
- HIGH DYNAMIC PRESSURES ASSOCIATED WITH GROUND LAUNCH CONTRIBUTE TO RAPID BREAK-UP WHEN FAILURES OCCUR -- REACTION TIMES ARE RELATIVELY SHORT
- SATISFACTORY ABORTS FROM LOW ALTITUDE FAILURES ARE EXTREMELY DIFFICULT
- SUCCESS RATES ARE EXTREMELY LOW COMPARED TO OTHER SYSTEMS -- CONFIRMED BY HIGH INSURANCE RATES
- IMPROVEMENTS IN SUCCESS RATES ARE ESSENTIAL FOR FUTURE MANNED SPACE LAUNCHES
LAUNCH SYSTEMS - PRIMARY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISSION TYPE</th>
<th>PRIMARY REQUIREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANNED SPACECRAFT</td>
<td>RELIABILITY (CREW SAFETY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMANNED CARGO</td>
<td>OPERATING COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FREQUENT FLIGHTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAVY HEAVY CARGO</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- INFREQUENT FLIGHTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MISSION SUCCESS IS CRITICAL TO ALL TYPES

MAN-RATING APPROACH TO LAUNCH VEHICLE SAFETY

- ADDED REDUNDANCY WHERE NEEDED AND PRACTICAL
- DESIGN FIXES FOR ALL KNOWN DESIGN WEAKNESSES
- EXTRA QUALITY CONTROL TO MINIMIZE PROCESS FAILURES

- MAN-RATING APPROACH ALONE HAS NOT PROVEN EFFECTIVE
- MAN-RATING APPROACH IS NECESSARY BUT NOT SUFFICIENT
PURPOSE OF CASE STUDY

- DEMONSTRATE THAT A LARGE INCREASE IN RELIABILITY IS FEASIBLE

- IDENTIFY ANY MAJOR IMPEDIMENTS TO FEASIBILITY (SHOW-SToppers)

- AIR LAUNCH WITH SOLID ROCKETS NOT THE ONLY SOLUTION

TWIN C5 AIR LAUNCH VEHICLE

FINAL VERSION

| Speed | 0.68 - 0.7 Mach |
| Payload | 0.51 x 10^6 - 1.0 x 10^6 lb. |
| OMS | 0.67 x 10^6 lb. |
| Gross weight | 1.74 x 10^6 - 1.82 x 10^6 lb. |
| AIR | 10.83 |

Diagram of the Twin C5 Air Launch Vehicle with dimensions and specifications.
**AIR LAUNCH VEHICLE CONFIGURATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spacecraft</th>
<th>Launch wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Insertion wt. (lb)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45,624</td>
<td>34,414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Total wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Propellant wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Visp. sec.</th>
<th>Inert wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Stage wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Motor wt. (lb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68,021</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>301.6</td>
<td>8,021</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>7,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Total wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Propellant wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Visp. sec.</th>
<th>Inert wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Stage wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Motor wt. (lb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218,790</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>293.1</td>
<td>18,790</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>16,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Total wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Propellant wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Visp. sec.</th>
<th>Inert wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Stage wt. (lb)</th>
<th>Motor wt. (lb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>757,379</td>
<td>657,605</td>
<td>283.5</td>
<td>69,774</td>
<td>3,257</td>
<td>66,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gross Ignition wt. (lb) | 1,111,806 |
| To 220 n. m. 28.5° |

---

**MAJOR PARAMETERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF SYSTEM</td>
<td>~1,000,000 POUNDS</td>
<td>LARGEST PRACTICAL ADAPTATION OF EXISTING AIRCRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRCRAFT CHOSEN</td>
<td>TWIN C5</td>
<td>VERY LARGE HIGH-WING AIRCRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROP ALTITUDE</td>
<td>40,000 FEET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKET DESIGN</td>
<td>3-STAGE SOLIDS</td>
<td>ADAPTATION OF EXISTING SOLID MOTORS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SPACECRAFT

ASSUMPTIONS

• SPACECRAFT PROVIDED FUNCTIONS -- STS CONCEPT
  - GUIDANCE, NAVIGATION, AND CONTROL
  - COMMUNICATIONS, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND TRACKING SYSTEMS
  - PYROTECHNIC SEQUENCING, SAFE AND ARM FUNCTIONS, EXCLUDING INDEPENDENT RANGE SAFETY STAGE REQUIREMENTS
  - THERMAL PROTECTION DURING ASCENT (NO SHROUD)
  - PROPELLANT AND THRUST FOR ORBITAL INSERTION AND CIRCULARIZATION

• SPACECRAFT WEIGHT AT INSERTION (220 N.ML, 28.5°) = 34,414 POUNDS
  - FOR REFERENCE:
    PLS LIFTING BODY, 10 PEOPLE ......................... 34,354
    PLS BICONIC, 10 PEOPLE ............................. 30,524
    ACRV, LAUNCH CONFIG., 8 PEOPLE, EST. .......... 27,000

LOW DYNAMIC PRESSURE CONSIDERATIONS

• THE MAXIMUM DYNAMIC PRESSURE ENCOUNTERED WITH AN AIR LAUNCHED MANNED SPACECRAFT IS APPROXIMATELY 1/3 TO 1/2 THAT ENCOUNTERED WITH GROUND LAUNCH

• FLIGHT VEHICLE STRUCTURAL BENEFITS OF LOW DYNAMIC PRESSURES
  - LOWER Q'S WILL TEND TO REDUCE THE Q-ALPHA OF THE LAUNCH VEHICLE WHICH IN TURN WILL REDUCE THE OVERALL BENDING MOMENT INDUCED INTO THE STRUCTURE
    • LOWER AXIAL LOADS ON THE FLIGHT VEHICLE STRUCTURE
    • LOWER DELTA PRESSURES ACROSS THE SKIN OF THE FLIGHT SYSTEM
    • LOWER INITIAL PRESSURES IN THE VENTED FLIGHT SYSTEM COMPARTMENTS

• IMPROVED ABORT SYSTEM AND CREW REACTION TIME MARGINS
LAUNCH VEHICLE FLIGHT ENVIRONMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAUNCH SYSTEM</th>
<th>LIFTOFF T/W</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DYNAMIC PRESS., PSF</th>
<th>MAXIMUM AXIAL ACCELERATION, G'S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHUTTLE</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA II-7920</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITAN IV</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS I</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR LAUNCH 2 STG.</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>*296</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR LAUNCH 3 STG.</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>*327</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NOTE: LOWER MAXIMUM DYNAMIC PRESSURES ARE SIGNIFICANT

AIR LAUNCH DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

- USES ROCKETS WHERE ROCKETS ARE EFFICIENT, AIRBREATHERS WHERE AIRBREATHERS ARE EFFICIENT
- MAY PERMIT CROSSING CERTAIN_THRESHOLDS
  - LARGE MONOLITHIC SOLID MOTORS
  - FIXED NOZZELS
  - FULLY REUSABLE BOOSTERS
- THESE FACTORS SHOULD BE EVALUATED IN THE CONCEPTUAL DESIGN PROCESS
ASSUME HISTORICAL AVERAGE RELIABILITY

LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS  .9896
SEGMENTED SOLID MOTORS  .9910
MONOLITHIC SOLID MOTORS  .9983
AIRCRAFT TURBOFAN ENGINES  .9999+

ABORT CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRACTION OF FAILURES ABORTABLE (ASSUMED)</th>
<th>LV-A</th>
<th>LV-B W/ABORT</th>
<th>AIR LAUNCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGMENTED SOLID MOTORS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONOLITHIC SOLID MOTORS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURBOFANS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.9999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTION OF ABORTS SUCCESSFUL (ASSUMED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGMENTED SOLID MOTORS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONOLITHIC SOLID MOTORS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURBOFANS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.9999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUGGESTED RELIABILITY GOALS FOR SPACE LAUNCHED SYSTEMS 1991 -- 2000 & BEYOND

ASSESSMENT OF FEASIBILITY

- NO MAJOR SHOW-STOPPERS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED
- POTENTIAL EXISTS FOR SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT IN FLIGHT CREW SAFETY
- LIFT CAPABILITY OF 30,000 LB. TO 220 NMI. CIRCULAR AT 28.5° INCLINATION IS FEASIBLE
- AIR-LAUNCH WITH SOLID ROCKETS NOT THE ONLY SOLUTION
  - BETTER SOLUTIONS ARE PROBABLY ATTAINABLE
3.3 Single Stage to Orbit/SDIO—
James R. French, Strategic Defense Initiative Organization

This paper included a discussion of the United States' need for a launch system that demonstrates both high capacity and low cost. Current systems, which typically require two years' lead time to provide on-orbit service to space platforms, are too inflexible for many missions. A system is needed that is able to operate in much the same way as existing commercial aircraft. The SSTO program is focused on satisfying aircraft-like operations and logistics support requirements such as engine-out intact abort capability and seven-day, 350-man-day vehicle turnaround times.

The SSTO program underway by the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization has the following objectives:

- To unite today’s advanced aeronautics and space technologies developed by the government and industry for NASP and other relevant applications
- To demonstrate an alternative U.S. launch system with the potential for weekly or daily scheduling and low operational costs
- To ensure the capability to meet civil and military space mission needs involving both satellite deployment and personnel transfer
- To design, develop and validate an SSTO launch system for manned and unmanned missions

SDIO's SSTO program is benefiting from previous investments in advanced technologies to aggressively challenge existing limits on vehicle operability, maintainability, reliability and cost. The present program has completed Phase I, which featured competition between Boeing, General Dynamics, McDonnell Douglas and Rockwell International. The initial solicitation allowed industry to consider a wide variety of potential designs such as vertical and horizontal take-off and landing schemes, winged vehicles and ballistic vehicles. Phase I demonstrated that multiple SSTO concepts using all-rocket propulsion appear feasible.

The SSTO program is now proceeding into Phase II with the fabrication and flight test of a subscale “X” rocket demonstration vehicle using the ballistic vertical take-off, vertical landing design developed by McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Corporation (MDSSC). In parallel, SDIO and MDSSC will define a full-scale “Y” rocket. Based upon the results of Phase II, which is scheduled to extend through FY 1993, the SDIO will decide upon proceeding with Phase III and the fabrication and flight testing of the “Y” experimental prototype.

The SSTO program, which is predicated on full reusability, is using a streamlined set of mission-oriented contract specifications. Key performance parameters, such as the ability to take 10 klb. to polar orbit, or 20 klb. to a lower inclination orbit, would allow SSTO to handle 60-80% of U.S. payloads. The SSTO vehicle is also intended to ultimately satisfy requirements for improved operability and man-rateable levels of safety. The “Y” vehicle will include a cockpit and crew compartment for use on manned missions, but a crew is not necessary and the SSTO vehicle will be able to operate unmanned. In fact, the cockpit and crew compartment could be removed for unmanned missions although the advantage of greater payload capacity would be offset by the added complexity of recertifying the vehicle for manned flight following the reinstallation of the cockpit and crew compartment.

The SSTO vehicle will carry its payload amidships. This offers the important advantage of minimizing the impact of payload mass and mass distribution on the vehicle's center of gravity, and it also provides operational advantages in preparing for launch on short notice as well as minimizing the change in vehicle flight performance after the payload is delivered to orbit.
The McDonnell Douglas operations concept includes vertical take-off, up to four days of on-orbit operations, a nose-forward reentry with a crossrange capability of 1640 km, and a nose-up vertical landing following a pitch-up maneuver at an altitude of 10,000 feet. The SSTO office is aware of the many technical challenges that they must overcome to make this concept a reality. For example:

- Special care is necessary to control propellant positioning in the tanks and lines during the pitch-up maneuver prior to landing.

- Weight growth is critical because the viability of all SSTO designs is closely tied to propellant mass fraction and, hence, vehicle weight. Langley Research Center reviewed the current baseline design for the SSTO and provided important feedback to SDIO. In particular, LaRC suggested that vehicle inert weight, which was at that point estimated to be 80 klb. and has since increased to about 100 klb., might grow to as much as 150 klb.

- Engine performance is also extremely important. The existing program includes two LO₂ / LH₂ engine design options for eventual use in the “Y” vehicle: a modular aerospike engine, and a cluster of new high-performance bell engines. The much smaller “X” vehicle will use four RL-10’s modified for sea-level start and throttling.

Three materials and structures issues are evident:

- **Thermal Protection System.** A thermal protection system is needed which demonstrates elevated temperature limits, minimum weight, resistance to impact by bird strikes, minimal or no coating requirements, and no moisture absorbancy. Absorption of moisture is impermissible because of its effect on performance and vehicle weight. If a coating is required, it should last for at least five-to-10+ flights to lessen its impact on operations and turnaround time.

- **Cryogenic Tankage.** Cryogenic tanks must be easy to fabricate and operate leak-free for many thermal cycles. The ability to conduct reliable and meaningful inspections of tanks between flights becomes a very important and difficult challenge, especially for wrapped tanks.

- **Structure.** Vehicle structures must provide adequate rigidity, strength, and vibration damping with minimum weight. They must also be compatible with effective joining techniques and resist all types of mechanical failure, including fatigue, for the number of cycles the structure will undergo during the total vehicle lifetime.
BACKGROUND

- LAUNCH CAPACITY VS CAPABILITY
  - NUMEROUS BOTTLENECKS IN INTEGRATION AND OPERATIONS
  - SCHEDULES OFTEN PERTURBED BY LAUNCH DELAYS
  - COMMERCIAL USERS DISCOURAGED BY LACK OF SCHEDULE ASSURANCE
  - LAUNCH RATE LESS THAN ONE-THIRD OF THE USSR

- U.S. SPACE LAUNCH IS HIGH COST
  - LARGE STANDING-ARMIES REQUIRED FOR LAUNCH SUPPORT
  - CUSTOM BUILT SINGLE EVENT SYSTEMS (DISPOSABLE/PARTLY REUSABLE)

- U.S. SPACE SYSTEMS LACK MARGIN
  - LAUNCHES HELD UP BY WEATHER (RAIN, COLD, WINDS ALOFT, CLOUDS)
  - PAYLOADS HAMPERED BY LACK OF GROWTH POTENTIAL
  - NO SLACK IN TURNAROUND TIME
  - TRAFFIC LIMITATIONS - #LAUNCHES/YEAR

SDIO SSTO OBJECTIVES

- BRING TOGETHER TODAY'S TECHNOLOGIES
  - NASP AND SDIO MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES
  - BITE AND OTHER AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGIES
  - COMMERCIAL PRODUCTION AND DESIGN ADVANCEMENTS

- DEMONSTRATE A U.S. LAUNCH SYSTEM ALTERNATIVE
  - HIGH CAPACITY (WEEKLY/DAILY SCHEDULE)
  - LOW COST ASSURED ACCESS TO SPACE

- ENSURE A WIDE VARIETY OF POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS
  - SDS DEPLOYMENT (GPALS)
  - SPACE EXPLORATION INITIATIVE (SEI)
  - PERSONNEL TRANSPORT
  - ON-ORBIT SERVICING AND REPAIR

- DESIGN, DEVELOP, AND VALIDATE MANNABLE SSTO LAUNCH SYSTEM
DESIGN GOALS

• AIRCRAFT LIKE OPERATIONS AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT
  — ENGINE OUT INTACT ABORT CAPABILITY
  — 7-DAY, 350 MAN-DAY TURNAROUND
• 10,000 POUNDS TO POLAR ORBIT
• 600 FT/SEC ON-ORBIT ΔV FOR MANEUVER
• MANNED OR UNMANNED

SDIO SSTO PROGRAM
MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

• USE RAPID PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY (DELTA 180, 181, & DELTA STAR)
  — SMALL TECHNOLOGY COMPETENT GOVERNMENT TEAM
    -- SDIO, NASA, AF SPACECOM, SSD, NASP ASTRONAUTICS LAB
    -- TASKON-CALL MODELING/SIMULATION FOR THE GOVT TEAM
  — SHORT SINGLE LINE OF AUTHORITY
  — MINIMIZE MICROMANAGEMENT -- GIVE THE CONTRACTORS ROOM TO BE INNOVATIVE
  — USE APPLIED TECHNOLOGY WISELY, AVOID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS
  — DO NOT OVER ENGINEER THE CONCEPT; DO NOT OPTIMIZE TO DEATH

• DEMONSTRATOR/PROTOTYPE APPROACH
  — SHOW THAT SSTO IS AN ENGINEERING PROBLEM NOT A TECHNOLOGY QUESTION
  — BUILD AND FLY VEHICLE NOT EXCESS PAPER
  — USE TEST BUILDING BLOCK APPROACH
    -- SUBORBITAL DEMO SHOWS AIRCRAFT OPERABILITY IN THE FLEET MODE
    -- GET HARD DATA NOT ESTIMATES OR ENGINEERING JUDGEMENTS
PHASE ONE COMPLETED

• FOUR CONTRACTORS
  — BOEING
  — GENERAL DYNAMICS
  — MCDONNELL DOUGLAS
  — ROCKWELL

• CONCEPT DEFINITION
  — CONCEPT EVALUATION/SELECTION
  — CONCEPT REFINEMENT AND RISK REDUCTION

PHASE ONE RESULTS

• VEHICLE CONCEPT DEFINITION & EVALUATION
  • BASIC CONCEPTUAL DESIGN
  • TURNAROUND APPROACH DEFINED AND ANALYZED
  • EARLY RISK REDUCTION DEMONSTRATIONS
  • DEFINE APPLICABLE TECHNOLOGIES

• PROGRAM EVALUATION
  • PROGRAM PLAN & SCHEDULE DEFINED
  • EMPHASIZE LOW COST
  • IDENTIFY INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS
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PHASE TWO

- TWO TRACK APPROACH
  - PROTOTYPE VEHICLE DESIGN TO “CDR”, LATE FY 93
  - PARALLEL TECHNOLOGY/HARDWARE DEMOS LEADING TO SUBORBITAL FLIGHT IN '95

- COMPETITION FOR PHASE TWO CARRIED OUT MAY THRU AUGUST '91
  - THREE BIDDER TEAMS
  - MDSSC - LED TEAM SELECTED

THE MDSSC DELTA CLIPPER CONCEPT

73
MAJOR MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES
TECHNICAL ISSUES

- THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEM
  - TEMPERATURE LIMIT
  - MINIMUM WEIGHT
  - NO MOISTURE ABSORBENCY
  - IMPACT RESISTANT
  - NO (OR MINIMAL) COATING
- CRYOGENIC TANKAGE
  - CYCLE LIFE
  - LEAK FREE (COMPOSITE)
  - FABRICABILITY
- STRUCTURE
  - MINIMUM WEIGHT
  - RIGIDITY
  - VIBRATION DAMPING
  - FABRICATION / JOINING TECHNIQUES
  - FATIGUE / CYCLE LIFE

SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Exploration</td>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>Design Selection</td>
<td>Final Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototype Design &amp; Hardware Demonstrations</td>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>DSR</td>
<td>CDR</td>
<td>X Prototype Design</td>
<td>Hardware Demonstration</td>
<td>X Rocket Fabrication &amp; Flight Test</td>
<td>1st Flight</td>
<td>SSTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Prototype</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPLETED
3.4 National Aero-Space Plane (NASP) Airframe Structures and Materials Overview – Terence Ronald, NASP Joint Project Office (JPO)\textsuperscript{1}

Terence Ronald presented an overview of the NASP airframe structures and materials. Due to International Traffic in Arms Regulation (ITAR) restrictions, this presentation has not been reproduced for this publication.

\textsuperscript{1}Speaking on behalf of J. Arrington, who was unable to attend.
4.0 MANNED TRANSFER VEHICLES

4.1 Lunar Transfer Vehicle Studies – Joseph Keeley, Martin Marietta

Lunar transportation architectures exist for several different mission scenarios. Direct flights from Earth are possible, as the Apollo program clearly demonstrated. Alternatively, a space transfer vehicle could be constructed in space by using the Space Station as a base of operations, or multiple vehicles could be launched from Earth and dock in LEO without using a space station for support. Similarly, returning personnel could proceed directly to Earth or rendezvous at the Space Station for a ride back home on the Space Shuttle. Multiple design concepts exist which are compatible with these scenarios and which can support requirements of cargo, personnel, and mission objectives. Regardless of the ultimate mission selected, some technologies will certainly play a key role in the design and operation of advanced lunar transfer vehicles. Current technologies are capable of delivering astronauts to the lunar surface, but improvements are needed to affordably transfer the material and equipment that will be needed for establishing a lunar base. Materials and structures advances, in particular, will enable the development of more capable cryogenic fluid management and propulsion systems, improved structures, and more efficient vehicle assembly, servicing and processing.

Advanced materials such as aluminum-lithium and graphite epoxy composites are anticipated to reduce the weight of vehicle structures and increase the payload mass fraction of space transfer vehicles. Even without optimizing the component design to most advantageously use the improved properties of these materials, a comparison of the weights of system elements indicates that component dry mass could be reduced by 15% to 55%. The greatest weight savings are available on items such as tanks and Lunar Excursion Vehicle lander legs.

Additional studies are needed to assess and prioritize technology development efforts. The assessment of alternative concepts must include more than just life cycle costs. Performance, schedule and other factors, such as operational life, producibility, maintainability, and fault tolerance, are also key discriminators. Nonetheless, affordability is undeniably important, and a careful examination of the life cycle costs of aeroassisted vs. all-propulsive systems reveals that payoffs may exist for the use of aerobrakes for reusable manned lunar transfer vehicles. If aerobrakes are used as part of the propulsion system, advanced structural and material sciences will play a key role in their development.
LUNAR TRANSFER SYSTEMS
TECHNOLOGIES

Joseph Keeley
(303) 977-8614

MARTIN MARIETTA
Agenda

Space Transfer Objectives
Lunar Transfer Concept
Technology Applications/Benefits
Aerobrake Technology
"Design of Experiments" for Materials
Program Summary

Lunar Transfer Options

To the Moon

- Direct Flight and Return (Apollo)
- Space Based (90 Day SEI Study)
- Ground Based Rendezvous & Docking in LEO

From the Moon

- Return Direct to Earth (Apollo)
- LEO Rendezvous at Station/Shuttle Deorbit/Landing
LTV Configuration with Cargo

Mass Properties Summary (t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mass (t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Tanks</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Propulsion</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Engines</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN&amp;C</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; DM</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal Control</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobrake</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew Module</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dry Weight</td>
<td>22.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Single Propulsion Lunar Transportation System

- Single Stage Yields Low Life Cycle Cost
  - Single Propulsion System
  - Single Crew Module
  - High Reusability Of Elements

- No Aerobrake Penetrations

- Piloted Configuration Supports 33.0 mt "Cargo-Only" Requirement

- Single Stage Yields Lowest Number of Mission Failure Modes
  - No Crew Transfers
  - No Cargo/Crew Transfer

- Potential For Reusable "Cargo-Only Vehicles"

- 25 ft x 100 mt ETO Capability Requirement
LTS Configuration Family

Piloted Configuration

Cargo (Reusable) Configuration

Cargo (Expendable) Configuration

- Single Propulsion System
- Common Propulsion/Avionics Core
- Single Crew Module
- Large Cargo Platform - 14.8 m x 10.5 m
- Rigid Aerobrake - 13.7 m
- Piloted Cargo - 14.6 t
  - w/Propellant Mass - 174.0 t
- Expendable Cargo - 33.0 t (max - 37.4 t)
  - w/Propellant Mass - 146.5 t (max - 161.3 t)
- Reusable Cargo - 25.9 t
  - w/Propellant Mass - 169.3 t

STV as HLLV Upper Stage

- Several STV DRMs Require Similar ΔVs

- Future HLLV's Will Need a Generic High Energy Capability
- Any New HLLV Will Be At Least 27.6' Diameter (Same as ET)
- Upper Stage (STV) Should Be Designed to Maximize Payload To Commonly Used Destinations: GEO, LLO, X-Mars
- Burning Upper Stage to LEO Drives Stage to Different Design
STV Objectives

- Define the Preferred Concept(s) and Programmatics of a Space Transfer Vehicle System to Accomplish Unmanned Delivery and Manned Exploration Missions
- Evolve from an Initial Vehicle that Captures National Unmanned Earth Orbit and Planetary Missions (DOD and NASA)
- Identify Critical Technology Requirements and Provide Technology and Advanced Development Program Planning Data
- Expand Space Transfer Vehicle Interfaces/Interactions For:
  - Operating at Space Station, or LEO Node
  - A Range of Launch Vehicles
  - Manrated Reusable Vehicles
  - NASA & Air Force Joint Use

Provide a Cost-Effective Space Transfer Vehicle System Capable of Meeting National Goals for Unmanned Space Transfer and Meeting the Needs of a Manned Exploration Program Leading to Human Presence on the Moon and Evolution to Mars

LTV/LEV Configuration

Lunar Transfer Vehicle (LTV)  Lunar Excursion Vehicle (LEV)
### STV As HLLV Upper Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payload Capabilities to LLO (4 km/s)</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All Masses in tonnes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Mass</td>
<td>2,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage-0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Advanced Solid Rocket Boosters</td>
<td>1,214.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage-1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Tank &amp; SSME Engine Pod</td>
<td>780.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage-2</strong> (Ignited Sub-Orbital)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Propellant</td>
<td>106.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inert Mass</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Engine Thrust (kN)</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impulse (sec)</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payload Fairing (ALS Design)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STV Represents Potential Upper Stage Candidate to Support On-going HLLV Development**

### STV Technology & Advanced Development Areas

- Cryogenic Fluid Management
- Avionics, Power, Software and Vehicle Health Mgt
- Cryogenic Engines and Propulsion
- Vehicle Structure and Tankage
- Aerobrake
- Flight Operations
- Ground Operations
- Advanced Propulsion
- Vehicle Assembly, Servicing & Processing
- Crew Module
- Environmental Control & Life Support System
- Lunar and Mars Surface Operations
STV Space-Based Zero Base Technology Concept

STV Phase 1 Lunar Study Reference Vehicle
With State-Of-The-Art Technology

• RL10A-4 Engine (Man-Rated & Space-Base Certified)
• Aluminum Tanks and Structure
• Centaur Cryogenic Fluid Management/Wet Tanks
• Off-The-Shelf Aluminum/Mylar MLI
• Space Station Avionics
• Nickel Zinc Batteries
• Apollo Thermal Protection System
• Hydrazine Auxiliary Propulsion System


Zero Base Technology Concept Recurring Cost Profile: 90 day Reference Vehicle

Launch Ops $875 M.
Program Man. $48 M
System Eng. $24 M
LTS Production $134 M

Launch Ops. $5 M
ETO $870 M
Crew Module $57 M
Aerobrake $3 M
Structures $60 M
Avionics $48 M
Propulsion $16 M
STV Technology & Adv. Dev. Assessment Criteria

• Cost
  - Life Cycle Cost - Recurring and Nonrecurring
  - Recurring Savings per Vehicle
  - DDT&E and R&T Costs
  - Cost Benefit - LCC/R&T Cost
  - Net Present Value @ 5%

• Performance
  - Satisfy Operation Requirements
  - Satisfy Safety Requirements
  - Reliability
  - STV Impacts
  - Launch Vehicle and Infrastructure Impacts
  - Robust Design - Large Margins

• Schedule
  - Readiness Level 6 by STV Preliminary Design Review
  - Risk - Lead Time

• Other
  - Operational Life - Reusability
  - Producibility
  - Maintainability
  - Adaptability
  - Ability to Man-Rate
  - Fault Tolerance Capability
  - Ability to Space-Base

Aeroassist vs All Propulsive

Objectives
• Determine Relative LCC Benefits of Aeroassist as a Function of:
  - Aerobrake Mass Fraction
  - ETO Cost per Pound
  - Aerobrake Development Cost

Ground Rules
• Return to LEO From Lunar Mission
• Rigid AB, 5 Reuses
• Concept
  - Single Propulsion Module
  - Single Crew Compartment
  - AB Stays in LEO for Aeroassist Version
  - TEI/LEO Propellant Tanks Stay in LEO for All Propulsive Version
• ASE Engines; Isp = 475 sec.
• Piloted Vehicle Missions Only, 21 Flights
• 14.6 t Cargo in Addition to Crew
• ΔV from Aeroassist = 3150 M/Sec (10,332 ft/sec)
• AB Recurring Cost = $12M
• AB Development Cost = Variable
• ETO Cost ($/lb) = Variable
• AB Weight Fraction = Variable
• AB Weight Fraction Definition:
  - AB Str/TPS Mass
  - Total Entry Mass
LTV Aerobrake

13.72 m (45 ft)
Diameter Rigid
Aerobrake
Folds in 2 Places

Aerobrake LCC Savings Relative to All Propulsive

10% Savings Plane
Break Even Plane

ETO Costs of $2500/lb
LTV Aerobrake Technology Needs

Aerobrake/Aeroassist Structures/Materials

TPS - Rigid/Flexible, Temps to 3500°F, Reusable, Human Safe, Repairable in Space, Propellant Resistant, High Q

Backup Structure - Stiff, Heat Resistant > 600°F Light Weight, Foldable


NDE/NDT - Pre Flight Configuration, Mfg Inspection, In Flight or Space-Based Certification

Thermal Control

Solar Cells - Flex Deployment/Retraction

Debris/Environment Protection

Aerobrake Summary

Results

- Rigid vs Flexible
  Rigid Retained as Baseline
  - 3-Piece Hinged Concept Minimizes Rigid A/B on-Orbit Assembly Operations
  - Rigid Brake Technology More Mature
  - Flexible Brake Technology Should Be Developed Since It Offers Better (Lower Cost) ETO Manifesting, Fewer Joints, and Assembly Advantages

- Aerobrake vs All Propulsive
  Life Cycle Cost Payoffs Exist for Aerobraking Over a Wide Range of Aerobrake Efficiencies

Issues

- Flight Testing Prior to Full Scale Vehicle Flights
- Reusability
- Shape - Wake Heating / Packaging
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Structures DOE Analysis

- Evaluated Structural Components of the STV Phase I Configuration
  - Core Structure, Aerobrake, Drop Tanks, Crew Cab, Core Tanks, Lander Legs and Drop Tanks Support Structure

- Evaluated Three Materials
  - Aluminum, Aluminum-Lithium and Composites (Graphite Epoxy)

- Maintained Same Design Configuration for All Materials
  - Did Not Optimize Component Design for Al-Li or Composites
  - Composite Sizing Based on Constant Material Properties, Not Adjusted for Ply Direction or Minimum Ply Thickness

- DOE L27 Matrix Used to Evaluate Combinations of the Seven Structural Components with the Three Materials
  - Response is the Vehicle Dry Mass
  - 15% Growth Factor Included in Dry Mass

- All Pressure Vessels Sized for Burst Pressure

Structural Component Mass Summary

- Structural Component Mass (kg) Based on Material Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Aluminum</th>
<th>Aluminum-Lithium</th>
<th>Composites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Structure</td>
<td>6235</td>
<td>5078</td>
<td>4979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobrake</td>
<td>5768</td>
<td>4521</td>
<td>4194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Tanks</td>
<td>4965</td>
<td>2634</td>
<td>2412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew Cab</td>
<td>11644</td>
<td>8290</td>
<td>7978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Tanks</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lander Legs</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Tank Support Structure</td>
<td>7493</td>
<td>6305</td>
<td>6165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Aluminum-Lithium Structure Reduces Component Dry Mass By 16 to 50%
- Composite Structure Reduces Component Dry Mass By 18 to 56%

* Composite Structure Not Optimized - Greater Mass Reduction Possible if Structure Redesigned
Structures DOE Analysis Results

• DOE Reduced Number of Analysis Combinations from 343 to 27

$$343 = 7 \text{ Components with 3 Combinations}$$

• Comparison of Component DOE Results to the Percent of Overall Vehicle Mass Indicates Which Component Was Influenced Most by Materials Change

![Graph showing % Contribution to Variation (DOE Results) vs % of Overall Vehicle Dry Mass](image)

Comparison of Structural Material Changes

• Comparison of Materials Change on Vehicle Components
  - Aluminum Structure Is the Heaviest Option
  - Overall Vehicle Dry Mass Reduced Approximately 28% By Using Advanced Structures
  - Vehicle Dry Mass Reduction Trends Illustrated in Graphs

![Graphs showing Comparison of Material Change on Crew Cab, Drop Tanks and Aerobrake](image)

![Graphs showing Comparison of Material Change on Drop Tank Structure, Core Structure and Core Tanks](image)
## LTS Program Overview

### Lunar Transportation System Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference Milestones</td>
<td>A/B Demo</td>
<td>HLLV Test Flight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Milestones</td>
<td>Ø B ATP</td>
<td>Ø C/D ATP</td>
<td>SDR ATP</td>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>PDR</td>
<td>C/Compart Qual Tests</td>
<td>C/Ground Qual Tests</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>1st Cargo Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase B Concept Definition</td>
<td>Tech / Adv. Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase C/D Design &amp; Dev</td>
<td>LTS Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LTS Design</td>
<td>Subsystem Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LTS Qual Testing (STA, FTA, FTA, GTV)</td>
<td>Operational Support Eqmt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Operational Support Eqmt</td>
<td>KSC Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LTS (90 Day Reference) At LEO
Program Flexibility & Schedule Is Technology Limited

- Study Developing Technology Roadmaps
  - Technology Assessment
  - Improvement Schedules
  - Prioritization

- Schedule & Vehicle Flexibility/Evolution Are Constrained By Technology Maturity.
  - RL-10 vs. ASE
  - Propulsive vs. Aeroassist
  - Expendable Upper Stage vs. Advanced Avionics Architecture
  - Operations Intensive vs. Autonomy

- Aggressive Technology & Advanced Development Program Required To Meet All Objectives.
  - Early Flight Tests For Technology Validations

The STV Study Will Identify The Required Technology Accelerations And Improvements Incorporated via Planned Staged Insertion.
4.2 Mars Transfer Vehicle Studies -
Gordon Woodcock, Boeing

Earth-to-Mars distances vary from 60 to 400 million kilometers over a 14-year cycle. This complicates Mars mission design as a function of calendar time. Stay times at Mars are also strongly driven by opportunities for a return flight path which are within the limits of delta-V associated with practical space vehicles.

The biggest difference between Mars and lunar transfer missions is mission time, which grows from a few days for the moon, to as much as a few hundred days for Mars missions. As a result, modules for similarly sized crews must be much larger for Mars missions than for transfer to lunar orbit.

Technology challenges for one Mars mission scenario analyzed by Boeing include aerobrakes, propulsion, and life support systems. Mission performance is very sensitive to aerobrake weight fraction and, as a result, there is an incentive to use high performance materials such as advanced composites and thermal protection systems. Lander aerobrake would be used twice (for both planetary capture and descent to the Mars surface), and it would need to survive temperatures up to 3500 degrees.

The ascent from the lunar surface could use a cryogenic propulsion system to maximize performance. Cryogenic storage concepts such as a vacuum jacket combined with multi-layer insulation could be used to insulate the cryogenic tank. Otherwise, storable propellants would need to be used.

Boeing has examined various propulsion systems. Nuclear propulsion systems offer good potential performance, but aerobrakes are still needed for the descent vehicle even if the transfer vehicle uses propulsive orbital capture at Mars.

Nuclear thermal propulsion systems use all-hydrogen fuel. Because of its low density, these nuclear thermal systems are sensitive to hydrogen tank fraction, which depends greatly on tank structural and thermal control technologies.

Studies at LeRC have shown that acceptable trip times can be accomplished by nuclear electric propulsion systems with powers on the order of 15-20 MW. Nonetheless, high power nuclear electric propulsion systems can also involve serious technology challenges such as high power dynamic power conversion, assembly in space of large mechanical structures and fluid systems, long-term performance of liquid metal systems, and overall complexity.

Solar electric systems are, in many respects, simpler to deal with than the alternatives. Although they are large, fabrication involves repetitive operations, they have minimal fluid systems, and they are inherently redundant. Technology challenges include the need to reduce the cost of the arrays by a factor of about 10 (from approximately $2000 to $200 per watt) to make solar electric systems affordable. Terrestrial solar arrays are currently available for about $2 per watt.

Assuming an ETO launch vehicle with a capacity of 100-150 tons, it would take six or seven launches to stage in LEO a transfer vehicle with a nuclear thermal propulsion system. Assembly would also require establishment of a platform as a base for the assembly process. New concepts and technologies are needed to facilitate in-space construction. For example, it may be possible to use some of the systems and structures of the Mars transfer vehicle to support the assembly platform, rather than first constructing a separate and self-contained assembly platform.

Aerobrakes have their own set of construction issues which vary somewhat with aerobrake design parameters such as the L/D ratio.

Boeing has studied the challenges associated with the need to place large cargos on the Martian surface. Assuming a cargo diameter of seven-to-eight meters and a length of 15 meters, the size of the cargo drives the overall size of the lander. If more than one lander is used to deliver, for example, separate sections of a Martian base, then the landers will also need some ability to relocate on the surface (so that the payload elements may be joined after
delivery) unless the mission also includes a separate surface transporter.

It would be possible to deliver a Mars lander to LEO in a single piece using a 150-ton class launch vehicle. However, the launch vehicles included within the proposed NLS program will not be able to accommodate the mass and configuration of the Mars lander analyzed by Boeing.

Mission requirements for Mars are not yet fixed. Mass requirements seem to be growing with each new study. As mass requirements grow, it increases the advantage of using a separate, electrically-driven vehicle to deliver cargo in advance of the crew vehicle. Solar electric propulsion could be used, especially if it was augmented by a beamed power system using a terrestrial laser beam. Such a system could increase the power density of the solar array by a factor of five-to-ten over solar illumination and greatly shorten the time required to escape from Earth orbit as well as reduce the size (and cost) of the solar array.

The trade-off analyses for Mars transfer vehicle concepts are, obviously, very complex. Options such as solar and nuclear electric offer high reusability and low launch mass. Chemical propulsion systems using cryogenic expendables require higher launch mass and feature less reusability, but have significantly lower development costs.
MARS TRANSFER VEHICLE STUDIES

GORDON WOODCOCK
BOEING
Nuclear Ops Working Group Mission Ground Rules

Mission #1 - 2014

• Outbound direct, conjunction-like profile.
• Window close (latest) departure 2456690 = 2/2/2014
• Mars arrival 2456840; 90-day stay.
• Earth return via Venus swingby 2457240; total duration 550 days.
• Aborts: (1) powered, on nominal trajectory; (2) unpowered Venus swingby 720-day total duration.

• Mission options:
  1) All-up, single mission.
  2) Surface cargo sent ahead prior opportunity, NTP all-up test.
  3) Surface cargo and crew MEV sent ahead prior opportunity, rendezvous in Mars orbit.
  4) Like (3) but extra propellant sent ahead for fast return trip.

---

**Delta Vs**

| Earth depart impulsive (max at window close) | Mars arrival | 4170 |
| Finite burn (est.) | Finite burn (est.) | 100 |
| Plane change | Mars depart | 3260 |
| | Line of Apsides | 150 |
| *Total Earth depart* | Mars parking orbit | 3410 |

**Total Mars arrive** 4270

24-hr capture at Earth return 1440

**Mission Profile**

[Diagram of mission profile with labels for Earth Departure, Outbound Transit, Space Station Assembly, Mars Departure, etc.]
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Earth departure 1/17/14 C3=13.9
Deep space maneuver 3/2/15 Δv=2.95
Mars departure 10/19/14 C3=73.2
Earth return 6/16/15 Vhp=5.8

2014 Manned Mission:
Deep Space Maneuver

Mars arrival 7/11/14 Vhp=6.2
Earth return 7/11/14 Vhp=6.2

2014 Manned Mission:
Venus Swingby

Mars departure 10/19/14 C3=42.2
Earth return 7/26/15 Vhp=5.5

Venus swingby 2/28/15 nonpowered

Plane Change Requirements for 2014
Mars Opportunity, 150-day Transfer

Node Angle, degrees
Plane Change, degrees
Plane Change Delta Vs
for Range of Elliptic Orbit Periods

Three Burn Departure Opens Launch Windows
Nuclear Thermal Propulsion Vehicle
2013 Opposition (100 d stay) 175 d Outb Transfer Mass Statement

Reusable, crew of 6, two 75k lbf thrust PBR engines at 925 lsp, T/W=20, MEVs: 43 tons cargo minus asc sig

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Number of MEVs:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEV total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72236</td>
<td>144472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTV crew habitat system tot</td>
<td>549(0)</td>
<td>549(0)</td>
<td>549(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTV frame, struts &amp; RCS inert wt</td>
<td>52(0)</td>
<td>52(0)</td>
<td>52(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactor/engine weight</td>
<td>34(0)</td>
<td>34(0)</td>
<td>34(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation shadow shield weight</td>
<td>9(000)</td>
<td>9(000)</td>
<td>9(000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC propellant (dV= 1756 m/s)</td>
<td>248(30)</td>
<td>248(30)</td>
<td>248(30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEI propellant (dV= 3840 m/s)</td>
<td>724(26)</td>
<td>724(26)</td>
<td>724(26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEI/EOC common tank wt (1)</td>
<td>158(62)</td>
<td>158(62)</td>
<td>158(62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOC propellant (dV= 3457 m/s)</td>
<td>108(930)</td>
<td>148(470)</td>
<td>188(280)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOC tanks (2)</td>
<td>20(094)</td>
<td>25(216)</td>
<td>30(356)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMI propellant (dV=4318 m/s)</td>
<td>237(250)</td>
<td>320(220)</td>
<td>405(200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMI tanks (2)</td>
<td>36(986)</td>
<td>47(105)</td>
<td>58(405)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCV</td>
<td>8(000)</td>
<td>8(000)</td>
<td>8(000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMLEO</td>
<td>596700</td>
<td>806687</td>
<td>1020153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Mission Boiloff vs. Time for Reference NTR Vehicle
CRV Configuration

6 Crew CRV

Habitable volume: 12 m³

rem/yr to BFO

Upper Deck

GCR External Environment
119.37 rem/yr
Solar Minimum
1978-1984 (Adams et al.)

Lower Deck
### NTP Reference Mission Description P. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Event/Sequence</th>
<th>Issues and Open Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.** Multiple ETO launches to assembly station - sequence:  
  - Assembly station (first time)  
  - Habitat  
  - Truss  
  - Engine & aft tank assembly  
  - MEV(s) (if needed)  
  - Expendable tanks, loaded  
  - Top-off tank, if required | • Lift capacity and shroud size for ETO vehicle; number of launches.  
• Whether mission is split; how many MEVs go on crew mission.  
• Location of assembly station re Space Station Freedom (presumably co-orbital).  
• How much EVA is needed (presumably very little).  
• Where CTV is based and how refueled. (Recommend basing at SSF & refueling by fuel pod on each ETO MTV cargo launch).  
• Tests performed after assembly complete, or incremental crew-aboard testing?  
• Means of crew delivery (presumed CTV). |
| **2.** Cargo Transfer Vehicle (CTV) serves as ferry from ETO delivery orbit to assembly station. | |
| **3.** Checkout crew delivered to MTV for pre-launch tests and checkout. | |

### NTP Reference Mission Description P. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Event/Sequence</th>
<th>Issues and Open Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4.** Mission crew delivered to MTV for countdown and launch. | • Delivered by ETO launch or from Space Station Freedom (SSF)? (Presumed SSF.)  
• OK to depart from assembly orbit at ~ 500 km? (Not clear that moving to "nuclear-safe" orbit measurably improves safety.)  
• Is it OK (safety) to depress perigee on this burn to reduce third burn delta V.?  
• If either NTR engine fails before or immediately after TMI, mission rules call for crew abort return to Earth. Reactor disposal means in this event needs to be determined. |
| **5.** First burn to 72-hr elliptic orbit. Finite burn raises perigee to about 1000 km. | |
| **6.** Coast to apogee. | |
| **7.** Second burn at apogee for plane change. | |
| **8.** Coast to third burn start point, approx. 1000 km. altitude | |
| **9.** Third burn accomplishes TMI. TMI tanks jettisoned. | |
### NTP Reference Mission Description P. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Event/Sequence</th>
<th>Issues and Open Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Coast to Mars; midcourse corrections accomplished by GH₂RCS using compressed boiloff.</td>
<td>• If abort decision prior to Mars capture, first choice is powered abort to fast return trajectory. Second choice is free-return; nominal trajectory or longer return time (opportunity dependent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. NTP capture into elliptic orbit at Mars. Period between 12 and 24 hours to optimize mission. MOC tanks jettisoned.</td>
<td>• One or more reactor disposal options may prohibit NTP capture at Mars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If the mission is split such that both MEVs go earlier, a rendezvous with the cargo mission is required.</td>
<td>• Is there a feasible cargo mission parking orbit that enables minimum-energy rendezvous?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. MEV descent(s) to Mars using aerobrake.</td>
<td>• Cargo MEV lands first. One candidate split mode sends the cargo MEV earlier with automatic landing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NTP Reference Mission Description P. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Event/Sequence</th>
<th>Issues and Open Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Crew conducts surface mission.</td>
<td>• Does the entire crew land or is it necessary to leave one or more crew in orbit to tend the MTV? Assumed that entire crew lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Crew returns to MTV using crew MEV ascent stage. MEV-active rendezvous.</td>
<td>• One or more reactor disposal options may prohibit NTP return to vicinity of Earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Nuclear propulsion for TEI.</td>
<td>• In-plane return to Space Station Freedom orbit is generally not possible due to misalignment of lines of nodes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Coast to Earth; midcourse corrections accomplished by GH₂RCS using compressed boiloff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Crew separates in Crew Return Vehicle ~ 1 day before Earth arrival; direct entry to Earth landing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mission Event/Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event/Sequence</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>NTP vehicle propulsively captures into 500 km by 24-hour orbit at 28.5° inclination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Wait up to 55 days for nodal alignment with Space Station Freedom orbit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>NTP vehicle refueled by cryo. LTV; about 30 t. LH₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>NTP vehicle deorbits to 500 km. circular; rendezvous with assembly node for refurbishment and reuse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issues and Open Questions

- One or more reactor disposal options may prohibit NTP return to vicinity of Earth. Assumed that return to Earth orbit is OK.
- See discussion of reactor disposal options.
- This must be carried out quickly (~1 day) because differential nodal regression is about 6° per day.

---

### Nuclear Reactor Disposal Options, NTP

- Assumed that NTP including reactor captures into safe Earth orbit (500 km x 24 hr) if nuclear engine has enough life for next mission. Otherwise, engine/reactor require safe disposal.
- Dedicated disposal vehicle, delivers reactor from safe Earth parking orbit to safe disposal orbit, e.g. between Earth and Venus.
- NTP serves as disposal vehicle, delivers reactor from safe Earth parking orbit to safe disposal orbit, e.g. between Earth and Venus. Crew cab can be removed for reuse prior to disposal mission.
- NTP vehicle performs Earth swingby/gravity assist at Earth return. Subsequent maneuvers may be required to avoid Earth-intersecting orbit. Crew hab could be separated and aerocaptured (unmanned).
- NTP left in long-life Mars orbit; cryo propulsion for trans-Earth injection.
- NTP performs Mars swingby/gravity assist at Mars arrival. Aerocapture used for Mars orbit capture and cryogenic propulsion for trans-Earth injection. Subsequent maneuvers may be required to avoid Mars-intersecting orbit.
Mission Planning Issues

• How do we deal with space assembly and ground ops overlap between cargo and crew missions?

• Should we plan the first cargo mission as an all-up test of the nuclear thermal propulsion system, including propulsive return to LEO?

• Is direct entry and landing (DEL) of MEVs an option for later cargo missions?

• What additional equipment does the MEV need to fly the DEL mode?

• Can cargo be prepositioned in elliptic parking orbits compatible with later rendezvous by crew missions?

• Is it acceptable to plan on powered aborts where a timely free return is not available?

• Assuming cargo is predeployed on Mars' surface, what health monitoring implications follow from the need to have the payload powered down (to a power level consistent with deployable array) until the crew arrives?
For a Mars Expedition, aerobrakes can play a vital role in several major mission events, including aerocapture to achieve orbit and descent to the planetary surface both at Mars and upon return to Earth. The feasibility of aerobrake designs will depend upon materials and structures technologies because they will serve as a key factor in determining:

- Aerobrake mass and mass fraction
- The extent to which aerobrakes can survive the thermal environment. This is especially important for reusable aerobrakes. With the cancellation of the Aeroassist Flight Experiment, the effort to validate aerobrake designs has focused on laboratory test and analysis.
- The feasibility of assembling and/or deploying large aerobrakes. On-orbit assembly is a critical issue for all spacecraft intended for Mars exploration missions. Current studies are addressing options related to in-space assembly and construction.
- Configuration lift-to-drag (L/D) ratio. High L/D increases convective heating, whereas low L/D emphasizes radiative heating. In general, the lowest L/D design that can satisfy mission requirements is preferred.

Most aerobraking environments are different than those experienced by previous space programs. An aeroassisted Earth entry from the Moon would be similar to the Apollo missions, but significant differences are involved in aerocapture for Earth orbit. The velocities of vehicles returning from Mars could be as high as 15 km/sec. This compares to 8 km/sec for the Space Shuttle and about 11 km/sec for return from the Moon. The use of aerobraking technology in the Martian atmosphere would go far beyond our past experience and require mission planners to accommodate highly variable entry and atmospheric conditions including possible dust storms.
AEROBRAKING Technology Studies

Charles H. Eldred
Aerobrake Technology Project Manager
NASA Langley Research Center

to
Space Transportation Materials and Structures Technology Workshop

September 23-26, 1991
Newport News, Virginia
Aerobraking

- Aerobraking Benefits
- Aerobraking Modes & Applications
- Structures & Materials Issues
- Aerobrake Status
- Summary

Aerobrake Systems vs Propellant Mass
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Aerobraking enhances propulsion performance for large $\Delta V$ maneuvers
AEROBRAKING MODES

Aerocapture
(from hyperbolic trajectory
or high orbit)

Direct Entry
(from hyperbolic trajectory
or high orbit)

Orbital Entry

Mars Propulsion Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Event Sequence</th>
<th>Propulsion Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMI Manned Cargo</td>
<td>NTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOC MEV Cargo</td>
<td>NTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAO Cargo</td>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEI MTV Cargo</td>
<td>Chem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/EE</td>
<td>NTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aerobraking is required for 1/3 to 1/2 of all major mission events
Nuclear Thermal Propulsion Vehicle Concept

Cryogenic Aerobraking Vehicle Concept
Nuclear/Aerobraking Hybrid Vehicle Concept

Structures and Materials Issues

- Configuration L/D
- Mass fraction
- Thermal environment
- Assembly/deployment
### The L/D Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>High L/D</th>
<th>Low L/D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Authority</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g loads</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nav errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere variations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payload packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convective</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy:** Find the lowest L/D which satisfies mission requirements.

---

**MINIMUM AEROBRAKE L/D FOR MARS AEROCAPTURE**

1° CORRIDOR WIDTH REQUIREMENT, 5-G DECELERATION LIMIT, AND ENTRY INTO A 1 SOL PARKING ORBIT

![Graph showing the minimum aerobrake L/D for Mars aerocapture](image)

- Minimum required L/D
- High α
- Moderate α
- High α
Mass Fraction Effects on Benefits of Lunar Aerobraking

Aerobraking Environments

Lunar Missions:
- Extension of Apollo flight experience
  Entry velocity conditions the same
  Repeatable for various opportunities
- Significant differences in flow conditions between:
  Direct entry (like Apollo) and aerocapture

Mars Missions:
- Extend flight environments significantly beyond our past experience for both Mars aerocapture and Earth aerocapture/direct entry
- Highly variable entry velocity conditions with:
  Opportunity year
  Type of mission trajectory
- Highly variable Mars atmosphere
  Atmospheric density
  Dust storms
EARTH ENTRY VELOCITY ENVELOPES

Shuttle  □

GEO Return/AFE  □

Lunar Return/Apollo  □

Return from Mars
1000 Day Mission
500-600 Day Transfer
300-400 Day Transfer
200 Day Transfer
500 Day Mission
350 Day Mission

8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
V entry*, km/sec

* Inertial

MARS ENTRY VELOCITY ENVELOPES

Orbital Entry
1000 Day
500 Day
Sprint 440 day
Sprint 360 Day

4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
V entry, km/sec

Transit time reduction
Aerobrake Heating Environments

**TPS Dust Erosion**

- Possible Mars dust storm during aerocapture maneuver
- TPS erosion modeled for worst case dust storm, high aerocapture velocity
- Surface erosion calculated as about 10 mm in stagnation region for ablator TPS
- Assessment: A manageable problem
Aerobrake Deployment/Assembly

Issue: Aerobrakes are too large for conventional intact launch and require precision assembly. What is the impact of Aerobrake deployment/assembly requirements?

Answer:

- Current studies are examining:
  - Designs for simplified assembly
  - Alternatives to assembly
  - Intact launch options
  - Deployable, space rigidized
- Precision assembly is not unique to Aerobrake
- Propellant feedline connects/disconnects are common to all configurations
- On-orbit deployment/assembly and precision assembly is required regardless of Aerobrake utilization

On-orbit assembly is a critical issue for Aerobrakes as well as all Exploration missions. Current studies are addressing a variety of options.

Aerobraking Status

- Synthesis Report:
  Nuclear Thermal Propulsion for all missions
  Aerobrake design issues elevated to showstoppers
- AFE Cancellation Impact
  Shift validation emphasis to ground test
- Architecture Assessments
  Baseline NTP but trade alternatives
- Technology Program
  Multidiscipline, based on flight demonstrated technologies
  High priority in transportation thrust
  Continuing at reduced level
Aerobraking Summary

Aerobraking provides:
- Essential capabilities for Mars entry and return to Earth
- Potentially enhancing capabilities for Mars orbit capture

- There are no Aerobraking showstoppers
- There are significant structure and materials challenges in
  - Performance
    - Low weight
    - Thermal protection materials
  - Operations
    - Assembly/deployment
5.0 ADVANCED PROPULSION

5.1 CSTI Earth-to-Orbit
Propulsion R&T Program
Overview – Steven J. Gentz,
Marshall Space Flight Center

NASA supports a vigorous Earth-to-orbit (ETO) research and technology program as part of its Civil Space Technology Initiative. The purpose of this program is to provide an up-to-date technology base to support future space transportation needs for a new generation of lower cost, operationally-efficient, long-lived and highly reliable ETO propulsion systems by enhancing the knowledge, understanding and design methodology applicable to advanced oxygen/hydrogen and oxygen/hydrocarbon ETO propulsion systems. Program areas of interest include analytical models, advanced component technology, instrumentation, and validation/verification testing. Organizationally, the program is divided between technology acquisition and technology verification as follows:

- Technology Acquisition
  - Bearings
  - Structural Dynamics
  - Turbomachinery
  - Fatigue, Fracture and Life
  - Ignition and Combustion

- Fluid and Gas Dynamics
- Instrumentation
- Controls
- Manufacturing, Producibility and Inspection
- Materials

- Technology Verification
  - Large Scale Combustors
  - Large Scale Turbomachinery
  - Controls and Health Monitoring

The ETO Propulsion Technology Program is tightly linked to the user community, and it supports all advanced engine programs. Many of these program elements are directly related to advanced materials and structures, as are recent program highlights such as the demonstration of extended life silicon nitride bearings.

NASA's ETO Program is well-coordinated with research and development activities by industry and other government agencies to avoid duplication of effort. NASA's efforts in the area of aerospike engines are limited to a small study effort because SDIO is sponsoring significant research as part of its SSTO program. Similarly, the ETO program is monitoring the airbreathing propulsion work in progress by NASP rather than fund a separate effort.
NASA CSTI
Earth-To-Orbit
Propulsion R&T Program
Overview

James L. Moses
MSFC

Presented by
Steve J. Gentz, MSFC
NASA Earth-To-Orbit Propulsion R&T Program

**Purpose**
- Provide an up-to-date technology base to support future space transportation needs

**Objective**
- Continuing enhancement of knowledge, understanding, and design methodology applicable to the development of advanced oxygen/hydrogen and oxygen/hydrocarbon ETO propulsion systems

**Justification**
- Space transportation systems can benefit from advancements in propulsion system performance, service life and automated operations and diagnostics

**Contents**
- **Analytical models** for defining engine environments and for predicting hardware life (flow codes, loads definition, material behavior, structural response, fracture mechanics, combustion performance and stability, heat transfer)
- **Advanced component technology** (bearings, seals, turbine blades, active dampers, materials, processes, coatings, advanced manufacturing)
- **Instrumentation** for empirically defining engine environments, for performance analysis, and for health monitoring (flow meters, pressure transducers, bearing wear detectors, optical temperature sensors)
- **Engineering testing** at subcomponent level to validate analytical models, verify advanced materials, and to verify advanced sensor life and performance
- **Component/test bed engine** for validation/verification testing in true operating environments
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### NASA Earth-to-Orbit Propulsion R&T Program

#### Work Breakdown

- **Technology acquisition phase**
  - Seeks improved understanding of the basic chemical and physical processes of propulsion
  - Develops analyses, design models and codes using analytical techniques supported by empirical laboratory data as required
  - Results are obtained through ten discipline working groups
    - Bearings
    - Structural dynamics
    - Turbomachinery
    - Fatigue/fracture/life
    - Ignition/combustion
    - Fluid & gas dynamics
    - Instrumentation
    - Controls
    - Manufacturing/producing/inspection
    - Materials

#### Work Breakdown (Continued)

- **Technology verification phase**
  - Validates technology arising from the acquisition phase at the large scale component, subsystem or engine system (TTB) level
  - Three categories of effort
    - Large scale combustors
    - Large scale turbomachinery
    - Controls and health monitoring
## Transportation Technology
### Earth-To-Orbit Transportation

### Earth-to-Orbit Propulsion

#### Objectives
- **Programmatic**
  - Develop and validate technology, design tools and methodologies needed for the development of a new generation of lower cost, operationally-efficient, long life, highly reliable ETO propulsion systems.

  - **Technical**
    - Manufacturing: High quality, low cost, Inspectable
    - Safety: Safe shutdown to fault tolerant ops
    - Maintainability: Condition monitoring diagnostics
    - Ground Ops: Automated servicing and checkout
    - Performance: Max commensurate with life
    - Advanced Cycles: Full flow, combined cycle, etc.

- **Operational**
  - **Performance**
  - **Advanced Cycles**

#### Schedule
- **1992**
  - Electronic engine simulation capability operational
- **1993**
  - 3D CFD codes for turbomachinery flows validated and documented
- **1995**
  - Low cost manufacturing processes applicable to shuttle and NLS/HLV propulsion verified and documented
- **1996**
  - System monitoring capability for safe shutdown and for enhanced preflight servicing and checkout demonstrated
- **1999**
  - Probabilistic codes, fatigue methodology and life prediction/damage models validated and documented
- **2005**
  - Advanced manufacturing processes and design methodologies applicable to fully reusable, long life AMLS propulsion verified and documented; propulsion system monitoring and control for automated operations demonstrated

#### Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$21.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$28.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$33.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$25.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$26.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$27.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$28.8 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This element is closely coordinated with development efforts in NASA/OSF and other related government programs; resources shown are NASA/OAET only*

#### Participants
- Marshall Space Flight Center
  - Lead Center-technology acquisition, test rig validation, large scale validation, technology test bed
- Lewis Research Center
  - Participating Center-technology acquisition, test rig validation
- Langley Research Center
  - Supporting Center-vehicle systems analysis
- Stennis Space Center
  - Supporting Center-facility turbomachinery

### ETO Propulsion Technology Approach

- Civil Space Technology Initiative (CSTI) program emphasizes validated technology delivered on schedule.
- Concepts, codes, techniques obtained in the Technology Acquisition Phase.
- Validated at the appropriate level by means of component subsystem or system level testing (TTB).
- OAET provides technology to TTB. OSF provides integration funds to incorporate technology items into TTB.
- Technology is transferred to industry via papers & conferences such as Biannual Propulsion Conference at MSFC and Biannual Structural Dynamics Conference at LeRC.
  - Technologists also are working flight programs
- Technology must be generic, but should be applicable to on-going or anticipated programs.
  - Goal is to provide a broad technology base that will support a wide variety of propulsion options
## ETO PROPULSION FUNDING SUMMARY - $K

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION</th>
<th>FY99</th>
<th>FY90</th>
<th>FY91</th>
<th>FY92</th>
<th>FY93</th>
<th>FY94</th>
<th>FY95</th>
<th>FY96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEARINGS</td>
<td>2093</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUC. DYNAMICS</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURBOMACHINERY</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATIGUE/FRACTURE</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBUSTION</td>
<td>3123</td>
<td>2875</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLUID &amp; GAS DYN.</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUMENTATION</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLS</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUFACTURING</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATERIALS</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TECH. ACQ.</td>
<td>16217</td>
<td>12434</td>
<td>13347</td>
<td>13400</td>
<td>15220</td>
<td>10800</td>
<td>11300</td>
<td>12700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALIDATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBUSTION VALID.</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURBO. VALID.</td>
<td>5285</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>4619</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS. MONITOR. VALID.</td>
<td>4578</td>
<td>4459</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>8800</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL VALIDATION</td>
<td>12023</td>
<td>7493</td>
<td>7975</td>
<td>12100</td>
<td>15280</td>
<td>10700</td>
<td>11300</td>
<td>10900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROGRAM</td>
<td>28240</td>
<td>19927</td>
<td>21322</td>
<td>25500</td>
<td>30500</td>
<td>21500</td>
<td>22600</td>
<td>23600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMS</td>
<td>3375</td>
<td>3484</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTER TOTALS</td>
<td>31615</td>
<td>23411</td>
<td>23938</td>
<td>28700</td>
<td>33900</td>
<td>25100</td>
<td>26400</td>
<td>27600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY91 ETO FUNDING DISTRIBUTION MSFC & LeRC

- **In-House:** 25.5%
- **Universities:** 16.9%
- **Government:** 12.7%
- **Prime Contractors:** 12.7%
- **Other Contractors:** 32.2%
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**NASA Earth-To-Orbit Propulsion R&T Program**

**Recent Program Highlights**

- Silicon nitride bearings have shown greatly extended life over SSME flight bearings in MSFC bearing tester.

- Completed assembly of a cryogenic rolling element bearing tester at LeRC.

- Turbopump test stand design complete. Stand is in MSFC FY93 C of F budget.
  - Reviewed with Headquarters August 1990

- First ever measurement of heat flux on a flight type rocket engine turbine blade with a plug type heat flux sensor.

- Management approval obtained for proceeding with advanced main combustion chamber technology (full scale program).
  - Reviewed with Headquarters April 1990
  - Concept adopted by STME and evolutionary SSME

- CFD Consortium turbine team is interactive with ALS Design Process

**Earth-To-Orbit Propulsion R&T Program Activities**

- Conducted biannual ETO Technology Conference May 15-17, 1990. 123 papers presented. 400 attendees.


- Conducted Detailed ALS assessment of ETO Propulsion Project, March 1991, MSFC.

- Conducted 3rd screening of technology items for TTB March 8, 1991.


- Presented program to Space Systems and Technology Advisory Committee, June 1991.

- Presented program to Space Technology Interdependency Group (STIG) July 12, 1991, JSC.
Focused Technology: ETO Propulsion

Summary

**IMPACT:** The ETO Propulsion Technology Program supports all advanced engine programs. Half of the 200 tasks in the Program were judged by an ALS consortium contractor team to be directly applicable to ALS propulsion technology needs. ETO addresses the top 3 priority technology issues of the Office of Manned Space Flight.

**USER COORDINATION:** Closely tied to SSME/ALS. SSME review held at Tyson's Corner, Va., Oct. 1989. ALS/SSME review held at MSFC February 1990. A special ALS review was held for ALS at MSFC in March 1991. Interagency coordination provided by Space Technology Interdependency Group (STIG).

**TECHNICAL REVIEWS:** Annual RTOP review held in Nov/Dec each year, Government only. Covers each task, technical and budget, in the program. Other reviews as required.

**OVERALL TECHNICAL and PROGRAMMATIC STATUS:** Activities are maturing. Technology items for validation are being developed, such as bearings, sensors, and health monitoring algorithms.

**RATIONALE for AUGMENTATION:** Several areas require additional funding, Advanced Manufacturing, Propulsion System Studies and Additional Testing. Capability. In addition the combination of budget constraints and the CSTI emphasis on validated technology starves the program of new technologies.

**MAJOR TECHNICAL/PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES:** Several propulsion options are available to the U.S. for the next generation of vehicles. The ETO program must maintain a broad base of technology to address a range of options. In addition, the absence of Program Advanced Development programs makes the ETO program the Nation's propulsion Advanced Development Program by default.

### What Earth-To-Orbit Does Not Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Aerospike nozzle</td>
<td>• Small study efforts&lt;br&gt;• SDIO is spending significant funds on Aerospike SSTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Airbreathing/Combined Cycle</td>
<td>• NASP Program&lt;br&gt;• OEAT Workshop is planned&lt;br&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Storable propellants</td>
<td>• No identified requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hybrid propulsion</td>
<td>• Commercial program; augmented for '95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pressure fed</td>
<td>• Residual activity at MSFC, no further work planned after current contracts expire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MSFC Structural Dynamics Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>FY90</th>
<th>FY91</th>
<th>FY92</th>
<th>FY93</th>
<th>FY94</th>
<th>FY95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B9 Blade Tip Rubbing Stress Prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14 Structural Damping Prediction Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18 Detection of Degradation in Turbomachinery Bearings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19 Acoustic Characteristics of Turbomachinery Cavities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20 High Frequency Flow/Structure Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22 Turbine Blade-Damper Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23 Dynamics of Bearings Components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24 Dynamics Analysis Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Verified Method for Predicting Blade Tip Rubbing Stress
- Summary of SSME Measured Damping Characteristics
- Test Verified Method of Identifying Bearing Signatures
- Prediction Method for Acoustic Response of Turbomachinery Cavities
- Method for Predicting Flow/Structure Interaction
- Analysis Capability for Large Blade-Damper Systems
- Method for Predicting the Dynamic Motion of Bearing Balls & Cage
- Implement a Universally Acceptable General Purpose Analytic Code

### LeRC Structural Dynamics Working Group Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>FY90</th>
<th>FY91</th>
<th>FY92</th>
<th>FY93</th>
<th>FY94</th>
<th>FY95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B15(A) Probabilistic Structural Analysis Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14(C) Analysis/Tailoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15(F) Coupled Fluid/Structure Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15(G) Probabilistic Fracture Finite Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16 Composite Load Spectra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Methods/Codes for Reliability & Risk
- Contract/Grants Code Validation & Concept Demonstration
- Methods/Codes Hot Fluid/Structure Interaction
- Methods/Codes for Probabilistic Fracture
- Methods/Codes for Probabilistic Loads Simulation
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### MSFC Materials Development/Evaluation Working Group Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1</th>
<th>Hydrogen Alloy Development</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determination of Ignition</td>
<td>Weldable, High Strength, Corrosion Resistant Structural Alloy with Immunity to Hydrogen Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2a</td>
<td>Temperatures and Burning Rates in High Pressure Oxygen</td>
<td>Develop Theoretical Understanding of Fundamental Oxidation Process in High Pressure Oxygen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2b</td>
<td>Oxidation of Materials in High Pressure Oxygen</td>
<td>Develop Methodology for Evaluating Materials Undergoing Oxidation in High Pressure/Temperature Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2c</td>
<td>Coefficient of Friction Investigations</td>
<td>Develop a Test System to Evaluate the Coefficient of Friction of Materials in High Pressure Oxygen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4a</td>
<td>Fracture Characteristics of Single Crystal Blade Materials</td>
<td>Develop Methodology for Evaluating Fracture Surfaces of Hydrogen Environment as a Function of Temperature, Pressure, and Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4b</td>
<td>Evaluation and Characterization of Single Crystal Materials</td>
<td>Characterization of Orientation Effects of PWA 480 as a Function of Temperature and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M18</td>
<td>Development of a New Cage Material/Composite for Cryogenic Bearings</td>
<td>Develop a 3,000 psi LOX Compatible Bearing Cage Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M19a</td>
<td>Development of New Materials for Cryogenic Turbopump Bearings</td>
<td>Complete Bearing Materials Comparisons According to Developed Materials Evaluation Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M19b</td>
<td>Development of Fracture Tough and Corrosion Resistant Bearing Material</td>
<td>Formulate Fundamental Methodology for Development of Fracture Tough and Corrosion Resistant Cryogenic Bearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M20</td>
<td>Crack Growth in Turbopump Bearing Materials</td>
<td>Validate Crack Growth Model of Defects in Bearing Raceways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M22</td>
<td>Ductile Coatings for Hydrogen Embrittlement Protection</td>
<td>Develop Ductile Coatings for Hydrogen Protection of Advanced Propulsion Components (Over Existing Guidelines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M27</td>
<td>Superplastic and Solid-State Joining Process Development</td>
<td>Identify Materials and Process Requirements for Incorporation into Advanced Propulsion Components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LeRC Materials Development/Evaluation Working Group Summary

| M12 | ADVANCED SINGLE CRYSTAL TURBINE BLADE MATERIALS | Advanced single crystal processing techniques to increase life and reliability of turbopump turbine blades |
| M12b | FABRICATION PROCESS DEVELOPMENT FOR W-Re-Hf-C WIRE | A demonstrated process for production of 0.14 mm W-Re-Hf-C wire for use in W-Wire reinforced superalloy turbine blades |
| M13c | FRS ENGINEERING DESIGN PROPERTY STUDY | A characterized fiber reinforced superalloy system ready for scale up for turbopump turbine blades |
| M21 | HYDROCARBON FUELS/MATERIALS COMPATIBILITY | Validated approach to protect MCC cooling channels from sulfur corrosion and a method for cooling passage refurbishment |
| M24 | TUNGSTEN/COPPER COMBUSTION LINER MATERIAL PROPERTY STUDY | A validated computer code to assist in the design of fiber reinforced combustion chamber liners and characterization of the effect of composite wire distribution on mechanical and thermal properties |
| M25 | FIBER REINFORCEMENT COMBUSTION LINER FABRICATION STUDY | A full scale contoured combustion chamber with a liner of refractory metal wire reinforced copper alloy capable of being test fired. |
| M26 | ADVANCED COPPER ALLOYS | Improved copper-base alloys for high heat flux applications |
Advanced Rocket Propulsion Agenda

C.J. O'Brien
Aerojet Propulsion Division

- Summary of Approaches
- Modular Platelet Engine
- Dual Fuel Dual Expander Engine
- Variable Mixture Ratio Engine
- Materials & Structures Issues

High performance propulsion systems with improved manufacturability and maintainability are needed for single stage to orbit vehicles and other high performance mission applications. One way to satisfy these needs is to develop a small engine which can be clustered in modules to provide required levels of total thrust. This approach should reduce development schedule and cost requirements by lowering hardware lead times and permitting the use of existing test facilities. Modular engines should also reduce operational costs associated with maintenance and parts inventories.

Existing NASA research contracts are supporting development of advanced reinforced polymer and metal matrix composites for use in liquid rocket engines of the future. Advanced rocket propulsion concepts, such as modular platelet engines, dual-fuel dual-expander engines, and variable mixture ratio engines, require advanced materials and structures to reduce overall vehicle weight as well as address specific propulsion system problems related to elevated operating temperatures, new engine components, and unique operating processes.
Advanced Rocket Propulsion Approaches

MODULAR PLATELET ENGINE
- Structural Jacket/liner
- Hip Bonding
- Injector

MIXED POWER CYCLE
- High Pc
- High F/W

DUAL FUEL DUAL EXPANDER
- High Chamber Structure

ADVANCED ROCKET PROPULSION

NOZZLE CONFIGURATION
- Plug Structure (SSTO)
- E.D. Structure (MIST)

FORMED PLATELET COMBUSTION LINER
- Platelet Regen Liners
- Platelet Forming Technol
- Hip Bonding

VARmABLE MIXTURE RATIO
- High Temp Turbine

COMPOSITE SUBSTITUTION
- High F/W
- Forward c.g.

Requires Advanced Structures & Materials Technology

Advanced Propulsion Operating Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>MPE</th>
<th>HPE</th>
<th>DUAL MR</th>
<th>DFDE/DFDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propellants</td>
<td>02/H2</td>
<td>02/H2</td>
<td>02/H2</td>
<td>02/C3H8/H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>AUG EXP</td>
<td>SC/EXP</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pc, psia</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td>4887</td>
<td>4157/2736</td>
<td>284/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV, Klb</td>
<td>135.8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>525/376</td>
<td>69/146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Ratio</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>73/169</td>
<td>60/120</td>
<td>3.3;7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR O/F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14/7</td>
<td>384/461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IsV, sec</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>346/465</td>
<td>15894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 Pd, psia</td>
<td>6826</td>
<td>17762</td>
<td>9904/7046</td>
<td>7632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2 Pd, psia</td>
<td>6734</td>
<td>6536/15662</td>
<td>5080/3756</td>
<td>6685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC Pd, psia</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2 Tt, R</td>
<td>995 OR</td>
<td>484 FR</td>
<td>3130/1868 FR</td>
<td>1660 OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 Tt, R</td>
<td>896 FR</td>
<td>2500 FR</td>
<td>3130/1868 FR</td>
<td>1880 FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV/Wt</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>99/142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>APD</td>
<td>RKD</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>APD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTO</td>
<td>AL-TR-90</td>
<td>AL-TR-90</td>
<td>AL-TR-90</td>
<td>F04611-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-051</td>
<td>-036</td>
<td>-C-0113</td>
<td>-C-0113</td>
<td>-20149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advanced High Pressure Cycles
LO₂/LH₂ Engines with Extendible Nozzles

HPE (RKD) Fuel-Rich Hybrid Cycle With Regenerator

Dual MR (P&W) Cycle

Modularity is the Key to SSTO Engine Manufacturability and Maintainability

- Develop a Small Engine and Cluster in Modules
  - 100K lb vs. 1 M lb Thrust Range

- Benefits
  - Shorter Hardware Lead Times
  - Lower Development Hardware Cost
  - Available Test Facilities
  - Lower Testing Cost
  - Shorter Turnaround For Development Iterations
  - Lower Spares Cost/Inventory For Flight Program
  - Easier Handling, Lower Cost For Maintenance and Servicing

MPE Module
Composite Materials Needed For SSTO Weight Reduction

Thrust Chamber Assembly
Fluid Passages Producibility
Platelet Structure Can Be Scaled Photographically
Or With More Or Less Platelets

More Elements

More Platelets

Photo Reduced

Smaller Diameter Controls System

Key Element Design

Dual Expander Operating Modes
Match SSTO Trajectory Requirements

High Thrust
at See Level

Dual Expander Chamber Mode 1 Operation

Low Thrust
at Altitude

Dual Expander Chamber Mode 2 Operation
Dual Expander Engine Cycle Features

- Minimizes Use of LH2
- Mixed Gas Generator/Staged Combustion Cycle
  - Allows Hi Pc at Low Pump Discharge Pressure
  - Performance Penalty Small at Low Altitude
- LH2 Cooled Chambers
  - Transpiration Cooled Inner Throat Section
- O2/H2 Stoichimetric Preburner/Gas Generator
  - No Unburned Propellant Afterburning at Turbine
  - Low Temperature Turbine Possible
- Platelet Chamber Fabrication Maintains Throat Alignment

Formed Platelet Combustion Chamber Benefits

- Very Thin Hot Gas Walls
  - Higher Coolant Temperatures (Expander Cycle)
  - Increased Cycle Life - Lower Liner ΔT
  - Cooler Wall Temperatures - Higher Q to Coolant
- High Aspect Ratio Coolant Channels
  - Chamber Pressure Drop Savings
  - Large Number of Coolant Channels - More Uniform Temperature Distribution Through Liner
- Platelets Offer Design Flexibility
  - Complex Cooling Channel Designs
  - Ribbed Coolant Channels
  - Gas Side Wall Ribs Easily Incorporated
  - Lower Cost Fabrication
Composite Material Application to Liquid Rocket Engines

- Component Weight Savings up to 80% with Composite Material
- Engine Weight Savings up to 30% with 1980 Composite Technology
- Future Savings to 45%
- Composite Material Substitution Technology Needs Development
- Reinforced Plastic Composites Selected for Cost, Fabricability, and Specific Strength
- Metal Matrix Composites to be Considered for High Temperature Application
- Contracts NAS 8-34623 & NAS 8-33452

Advanced Rocket Propulsion Structures and Materials Technology Issues Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPE</td>
<td>Jacket Box Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Composite Material Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plug Nozzle Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lightweight Engine Vehicle Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Regenerator Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O2-Rich /Augmenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual MR</td>
<td>Oxidation Resistant Main Chamber Coating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Active Turbine Cooling With H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Strain Management Chamber Structural Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altitude Compensating Nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Element Main Injector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPE</td>
<td>Advanced High Temperature Wall Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI/RKD</td>
<td>Composite Structural Shell &amp; Nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protected/Coated Carbon-Carbon Nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cast Advanced Materials Injector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composite Cold &amp; Hot Ducts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFDE</td>
<td>Dual Chamber Assembly/Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD</td>
<td>Oxidizer-Rich (Stoichiometric) Preburner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composite Material Substitution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lewis Research Center is developing broad-based new technologies for space chemical engines to satisfy long-term needs of ETO launch vehicles and other vehicles operating in and beyond Earth orbit. Specific objectives are focused on high performance LO₂/LH₂ engines providing moderate thrusts of 7,5-200 klb. This effort encompasses research related to design analysis and manufacturing processes needed to apply advanced materials to subcomponents, components, and subsystems of space-based systems and related ground-support equipment.

High-performance space-based chemical engines face a number of technical challenges. Liquid hydrogen turbopump impellers are often so large that they cannot be machined from a single piece, yet high stress at the vane/shroud interface makes bonding extremely difficult. Tolerances on fillets are critical on large impellers. Advanced materials and fabricating techniques are needed to address these and other issues of interest.

Turbopump bearings are needed which can provide reliable, long life operation at high speed and high load with low friction losses. Hydrostatic bearings provide good performance, but transients during pump starts and stops may be an issue because no pressurized fluid is available unless a separate bearing pressurization system is included. Durable materials and/or coatings are needed that can demonstrate low wear in the harsh LO₂/LH₂ environment.

Advanced materials are also needed to improve the lifetime, reliability and performance of other propulsion system elements such as seals and chambers.
SPACE CHEMICAL ENGINES TECHNOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

LOOKS TOWARD LONG-TERM MISSIONS IN AND BEYOND EARTH ORBIT AND INTO THE SOLAR SYSTEM. BROAD BASED TO BE UTILIZED BY EARTH TO ORBIT (ETO) ENGINES.

OBJECTIVES

GOAL IS TO PROVIDE THE TECHNOLOGY NECESSARY TO CONFIDENTLY PROCEED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MODERATE-THRUST (7.5-200 KLBF) HIGH PERFORMANCE LIQUID OXYGEN/LIQUID HYDROGEN ENGINE FOR VARIOUS SPACE TRANSPORTATION APPLICATIONS. MAJOR PROGRAM OBJECTIVES INCLUDE:

- IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF PROPULSION TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS;

- IDENTIFICATION, CREATION, AND/OR VALIDATION OF DESIGN AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGIES/SOFTWARE, MATERIALS WITH REQUIRED/DESIRABLE PROPERTIES, AND RELIABLE, COST EFFECTIVE MANUFACTURING PROCESSES;

- DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF ENGINE SUBCOMPONENT, COMPONENT, SUBSYSTEM, AND SYSTEM TECHNOLOGIES FOCUSED ON IMPROVING PERFORMANCE, COMPACTNESS, DURABILITY, RELIABILITY, AND OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY, AS WELL AS REDUCED COST;

- DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF TECHNOLOGIES FOR OPERATIONALLY-EFFICIENT SPACE-AND/OR GROUND-BASED PROPULSION SYSTEM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.

CHARACTERISTICS

SPACE ENGINE LIQUID HYDROGEN TURBOPUMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLOWRATE</td>
<td>773 GPM</td>
<td>563 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCHARGE PRESSURE</td>
<td>1917 psi</td>
<td>4563 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN SPEED</td>
<td>99220 rpm</td>
<td>98240 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURBINE POWER</td>
<td>1290 hp</td>
<td>1180 hp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Impeller - Fabrication Difficulties**

- Dimensions are such, cannot machine out of one piece
- High stress at vane/shroud interface, bonding on shroud difficult
- Tolerance on fillets critical due to size

**SBE Turbopump Bearings**

Desired Attributes in a Bearing

- Long life at high speed
- High load capacity
- Low friction loss
- Reliability
- Low cooling flow
- Added damping

Leads to fluid film bearings as primary candidates

![Diagram of Hydrostatic Foil Bearing](image)
SPACE PROPULSION TECHNOLOGY DIVISION

MATERIAL ISSUES FOR FLUID FILM BEARINGS

MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE IS ACCOMMODATING TRANSIENTS - THE TURBOROTOR'S STARTS AND STOPS WHERE NO PRESSURIZED FLUID IS AVAILABLE AND WEAR IS MOST SEVERE

DIRECT SLIDING STARTS & STOPS OFFER SEVERAL ADVANTAGES
• NO NEED FOR SEPARATE BEARING PRESSURIZATION SYSTEM
• LESS ENGINE WEIGHT
• SIMPLER, FEWER PARTS

NEED
DURABLE MATERIALS/COATINGS THAT PROVIDE LOW WEAR/LUBRICITY IN LH\textsubscript{2} AND LOX ENVIRONMENTS

MATERIAL CONCERNS FOR SEALS IN SPACE BASED ENGINES

OBJECTIVE: LONG LIFE, LOW LEAKAGE, LOW POWER LOSS SEALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE SEALS</th>
<th>PROBLEMS</th>
<th>APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOX SPIRAL-GROOVE</td>
<td>• Oxygen Compatibility</td>
<td>• Inconel 718 Runner with Silver Plate on Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE SEAL</td>
<td>• Floating Ring Must Have Low Inertia</td>
<td>• P5N Carbon Floating Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wear During Start/Stop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT WEAR- RING SEAL</td>
<td>• Oxygen Compatibility</td>
<td>• Frictional Ignition Tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rubbing Contact Creates Ignition Source</td>
<td>VESPEL SP21 and KEL-F against MONEL K-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uneven Wear Opens Clearance</td>
<td>Rotor in 300 PSI LOX at 17,000 RPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Large Debris</td>
<td>- VESPEL SP21 Ignited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUSH SEAL</td>
<td>• Hydrogen Compatibility</td>
<td>- KEL-F Did not Ignite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wear of Bristles</td>
<td>- KEL-F Generates Stringy Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wear of Rotor/Coatings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Frictional Heating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bonding Coatings to Rotor for Either</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LH\textsubscript{2} Use or 1500°F GH\textsubscript{2} Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bristles made of Haynes 25</td>
<td>• Will Test Bare Inconel 718 Rotor &amp; Coatings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of AL\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3}, Silver, and Chrome Carbide in LH\textsubscript{2}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPACE PROPULSION TECHNOLOGY DIVISION

LONG LIFE RELIABLE CHAMBERS

- HIGH HEAT FLUX ENGINES NEED LONG LIFE MATERIAL FOR CHAMBERS
- LOW COST CONSTRUCTION
- PRESENT METHODS AND MATERIALS; CHANNEL AND ADVANCED COPPER ALLOYS
- OTHER METHODS AND MATERIALS BEING INVESTIGATED
Nuclear thermal and nuclear electric propulsion systems will enable and/or enhance important space exploration missions to the moon and Mars. Current efforts are addressing certain research areas, although NASA and DOE still have much work yet to do.

Relative to chemical systems, nuclear thermal propulsion offers the potential of reduced vehicle weight, wider launch windows, and shorter transit times, even without aerobrakes. This would improve crew safety by reducing their exposure to cosmic radiation. Advanced materials and structures will be an important resource in responding to the challenges posed by safety and test facility requirements, environmental concerns, high temperature fuels and the high radiation, hot hydrogen environment within nuclear thermal propulsion systems.

Nuclear electric propulsion (NEP) has its own distinct set of advantages relative to chemical systems. These include low resupply mass, the availability of large amounts of onboard electric power for other uses besides propulsion, improved launch windows, and the ability to share technology with surface power systems. Development efforts for NEP reactors will emphasize long-life operation of compact designs. This will require designs that provide high fuel burn-up and high temperature operation along with personnel and environmental safety.
Integrated Technology Plan
for the
Civil Space Program

FOCUSED TECHNOLOGY: NUCLEAR PROPULSION

Nuclear Thermal Propulsion

Nuclear Electric Propulsion

SUMMARY

• IMPACT:
  - Nuclear Propulsion Enables and/or Enhances Space Exploration Missions
    - Nuclear Electric Propulsion (NEP)
      Enables: Robotic Science Missions
      Enhances: Lunar & Mars Cargo, & Mars Piloted Space Exploration
    - Nuclear Thermal Propulsion (NTP)
      Mars Piloted
      Lunar & Mars Cargo, Lunar Piloted & Robotic Science Space Exploration

• USER COORDINATION:
  - Exploration Studies Identify Nuclear Propulsion as a Key Technology
  - OAST/RZ - Provide Performance Predictions for NASA Studies
  - OSSA Study on NEP for Robotic Science Missions
  - DOE, DoD & NASA Included on Steering Committee (also Astronaut Office)

• TECHNICAL REVIEWS:
  - Interagency Design Review Teams will Periodically Review Technical Progress

• OVERALL TECHNICAL AND PROGRAMMATIC STATUS:
  - High Priority Technology Areas Identified (some efforts initiated)
  - Budget Deliberations Continue
  - Single Multi Agency Plan Defined for FY92 Implementation

• MAJOR TECHNICAL/PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES:
  - Agency/Department Roles
  - Funding to Initiate Technical Efforts
  - Projected Budget Does Not Support Schedules
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Nuclear Thermal Propulsion

**PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>STATE-OF-THE ART</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THRUST (Lbf)</td>
<td>75K (NERVA)</td>
<td>75K-125K/Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250K (PHOEBUS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC impulse</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMBER PRESSURE</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>500 - 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXHAUST TEMP (K)</td>
<td>5500 - 5600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER (MW)</td>
<td>1100 (NERVA)</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(for aerocapture, safety &amp; reliability margins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,200 (PHOEBUS)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFETIME (hrs)</td>
<td>Single Burn: 1.0</td>
<td>Cumulative: 2.5 (5 missions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REUSABILITY (No. Missions)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHALLENGES**
- High Temperature Fuel and Materials
- Hot Hydrogen Environment
- Test Facilities
- Safety
- Environmental Impact Compliance
- Concept Development

**MISSION BENEFITS**
- Short Transit Time Missions are Enabled
- Reduced IMLEO (~ 1/2 of Chemical)
- Crew Safety Enhanced
- Wider Launch Windows
- More Mars Opportunities
- High Thrust Available
- Aerobrake Not Required

Nuclear Electric Propulsion System Schematic

Example High Power Dynamic System for Piloted Missions

![Nuclear Electric Propulsion System Schematic](image-url)
Nuclear Electric Propulsion

**PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>STATE-OF-THE-ART</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POWER</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>≥ 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER LEVEL (MW)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC MASS (kg/kgw)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPELLION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC IMPULSE (sec)</td>
<td>2000-9000</td>
<td>1000-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>0.7-0.8</td>
<td>0.7-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER LEVEL (MW)</td>
<td>0.01-0.03</td>
<td>0.01-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFETIME (hr)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFICIENCY</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC MASS (kg/kgw)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>≤ 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REJECTION TEMP. (F)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHALLENGES**

- Long Operational Lifetime
- High Temperature Reactors, Turbines, Radiators
- High Fuel Burn-up Reactor Fuels, Designs
- Efficient, High Temperature Power Conditioning
- High Efficiency, Long Life Thrusters
- Safety
- Environmental Impact Compliance
- Concept Development

**MISSION BENEFITS**

- Low Resupply Mass
- Availability of Onboard Power
- Reduced IMLEO Sensitivity w/Mission Opportunity
- Broad Launch Windows
- Commonality with Surface Nuclear Power
- Aerobrake Not Required
FOCUSED TECHNOLOGY: NUCLEAR PROPULSION
SUMMARY

- IMPACT:
  - Nuclear Propulsion Enables and/or Enhances Space Exploration Missions
    - Nuclear Electric Propulsion (NEP)
      - Enables: Nuclear Electric Propulsion (NEP)
      - Enhances: Nuclear Electric Propulsion (NEP)
  - Nuclear Thermal Propulsion (NTP)
    - Enables: Nuclear Thermal Propulsion (NTP)
    - Enhances: Nuclear Thermal Propulsion (NTP)

- USER COORDINATION:
  - Exploration Studies Identify Nuclear Propulsion as a Key Technology
  - OAST/RZ - Provide Performance Predictions for NASA Studies
  - OSSA Study on NEP for Robotic Science Missions
  - DOE, DoD & NASA Included on Steering Committee (also Astronaut Office)

- TECHNICAL REVIEWS:
  - Interagency Design Review Teams will Periodically Review Technical Progress

- OVERALL TECHNICAL AND PROGRAMMATIC STATUS:
  - High Priority Technology Areas Identified (some efforts initiated)
  - Budget Deliberations Continue
  - Single Multi Agency Plan Defined for FY92 Implementation

- MAJOR TECHNICAL/PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES:
  - Agency/Department Roles
  - Funding to Initiate Technical Efforts
  - Projected Budget Does Not Support Schedules
5.5 Solid Rocket Motors – Ronn L. Carpenter, Thiokol Corporation

Structural requirements, materials and, especially, processing are critical issues that will pace the introduction of new types of solid rocket motors. Designers must recognize and understand the drivers associated with each of the following considerations:

- **Cost.** Developers must understand the cost constraints of the users as well as the important cost drivers of solid systems and alternative technologies. The simplicity of solid rocket motors should produce significant cost savings relative to other systems, but current systems have not achieved their full potential in this area. A better understanding of solid propellants is needed to allow product improvement based less on empirical methods and more on analytical methods. Specifically, constitutive propellant theories are needed to explain how different processing techniques and high stress environments influence the properties and ultimate performance of solid rocket motors.

- **Energy density.** Future systems must continue to demonstrate high power output. The Space Shuttle solid rocket motors consume two million pounds of propellant in two minutes.

- **Long term storage with use on demand.** Although this was originally a requirement based on military uses of solid rocket motors, it is still an important consideration for civil systems which hope to demonstrate acceptable operational flexibility and cost.

- **Reliability.** Currently, both solid and liquid systems demonstrate reliability levels of approximately 98%. Failure mode analysis is most effective when started early in the design stage of new systems. The ability to conduct health monitoring of key design variables must be designed into new systems.

- **Safety of processing and handling.** To improve system safety, future propellants should be insensitive to impact and to electrostatic discharge, and they should ignite only when pressurized.

- **Operability.** Simplified on-site preparation of solid rocket motors will help to reduce launch delays and, as a direct result, decrease unplanned costs of space programs relying on solid rocket launch vehicles.

- **Environmental acceptance.** Solid propulsion systems must continue to address environmental effects of manufacturing processes; waste disposal and motor exhaust. At a minimum, the cost of toxic waste handling and disposal will continue to escalate. Ultimately, it may become necessary to evaluate the continued cost-effectiveness of current systems by carefully analyzing the expected costs, impact on performance and environmental benefits of alternatives such as solvent-free manufacturing, waste recycling or incineration, and propellants which are chlorine- and/or metal-free.

The performance of solid rocket motors is directly related to the technology status of key system elements such as:

- **Insulated Case.** The case contains hot combustion gases, provides thrust takeout, and, in some cases, supports the vehicle on the pad. Cases should be lightweight, and they should also both facilitate and tolerate the shipping and handling process.

Insulation is normally applied to the case in sheets or as a thermoplastic spray. Finding areas where the insulation has failed to adequately bond to the case is not uncommon. This implies that (1) the materials are too sensitive to the processing methods used, or (2) the effects of processing methods on bonding the insulation to the case material is not understood.
Current case manufacturing processes rely heavily on final proof tests as the primary inspection method. At this point in the manufacturing process it is often too late to easily make corrections. Improvements are needed in in-process testing to better predict and control the performance of the final product.

• **Propellant.** Solid rocket propellants are evaluated in terms of the system considerations described above. Mechanical strength, ease of production and nonhomogeneity reduction are also important.

• **Nozzles.** Nozzles typically consist of several components bonded together, and the bonded interface can cause problems. The nozzle environment is very harsh. In the entrance region, temperatures and pressures can exceed 3000° C and 700 psi, respectively.

• **Chemical and Mechanical Interfaces.** The most serious failures of solid rocket motors often are caused by chemical or mechanical interface problems. This may sometimes occur because the responsibility for interfaces often resides in more than one organizational element. As a result, interface management can suffer.

Interfaces must be strong and stable over time, providing tight seals against hot, high pressure gases and corrosive chemicals. They should be easy to inspect, or they must be so robust that inspection is not necessary. Furthermore, they should be simple to process and insensitive to variations in processing procedures. This last requirement is often the most difficult to meet.

– **Chemical Interfaces.** The typical solid rocket motor cross section includes the case, primer, insulation, liner, and propellant. The close contact of each of these different elements to its neighbors allows chemical constituents such as plasticizers and moisture to migrate across boundaries into adjacent materials. As a result, the key parameters of each element may change from its original, specified value. These variations must be predicted and, as much as possible, controlled to ensure that the final product will operate as intended.

– **Mechanical Interfaces.** Although current designs for mechanical interfaces are strong and tight, they are also complex and involve time-consuming assembly procedures.
Solid Rocket Motors

Structural Requirements, Materials, and Processing

Ronn L. Carpenter
Considerations for Solid Rocket Motors

- Low cost
- High energy density
- Storable with use on demand
- Reliability
- Safe processing and handling
- Operability
- Environmental acceptability

Solid Rocket Motor Components

[Diagram showing the components of a solid rocket motor, including the case, propellant, and nozzle.]
Insulated Case

**Functions of Insulated Case**

- Contains hot combustion gases
- Provides thrust takeout
- Supports vehicle on pad
**Filament Wound Case Manufacturing**

- Mandrel
- Wind Insulation
- Wind Case
- Wind Skirts
- Cure Case
- Remove Mandrel
- Inspect Case
- Proof Test

**Methods for Insulating the Case**

**Steel Case**
- Lay Insulation sheets in case
- Spray thermoplastic Insulation in case

**Composite Case**
- Either of above approaches
- Lay up Insulation on mandrel
- Strip-wrap Insulation on mandrel
Propellant

**Desired Propellant Properties**

- Easily produced and formed into grain configurations
- No degradation with time or exposure to ambient environment
- Safe to manufacture and handle
- Low variability
- High energy density
- Good mechanical properties
- Low-cost ingredients and production
**Propellant Ingredients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredient</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP (ammonium perchlorate)</td>
<td>Oxidizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN (ammonium nitrate)</td>
<td>Oxidizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAN (hydroxyl ammonium nitrate)</td>
<td>Oxidizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaNO₃ (sodium nitrate)</td>
<td>Oxidizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMX (nitramine)</td>
<td>Oxidizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al (aluminum)</td>
<td>Fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg (magnesium)</td>
<td>Fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTPB (ASRM binder)</td>
<td>Binder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBAN (shuttle binder)</td>
<td>Binder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPE (thermoplastic elastomer)</td>
<td>Binder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVA (polyvinyl alcohol)</td>
<td>Binder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Propellant Batch Processing**

1. Pre-Mix Inert Ingredients
2. Move to Remote Mixer
3. Add Oxidizer and Mix
4. Transport to Casting Pit
5. Vacuum Cast Motor
6. Cure Motor
7. Remove Casting Tooling
8. Inspect Case/Grain
Propellant Continuous Processing

Pre-Blend Ingredients → Mix Propellant → Deaerate Propellant → Cast Propellant in Motor and Cure

Remove Tooling → Inspect Case/Grain

Nozzle
Solid Rocket Motor Nozzle

Conditions Within a Solid Rocket Motor Nozzle
Nozzle Manufacturing

**Carbon Phenolic**

- Weave Rayon Cloth
- Carbonize Cloth
- Impregnate Cloth
- Cut Cloth on Bias
- Sew Into Tape
- Tape Wrap Part
- Bag and Cure Part
- Machine Part
- Inspect Part

**Carbon Carbon**

- Manufacture Carbon Fiber Preform
- Impregnate Preform
- Carbonize Preform
- Machine Part From Billet
- Inspect Part
Interfaces--Chemical, Mechanical

Solid Rocket Booster Components
Requirements for Interfaces

- Remain stable with time
- Maintain pressure seal in hot gas (5,000°F, 1,000 psi) environment
- Provide a mechanical bond
- Act as a chemical barrier
- Be simple to process and insensitive to process variations
- Allow for inspection or be so robust as to not require inspection

Propellant/Insulation/Case Bond

![Propellant/Insulation/Case Bond Diagram](image-url)
Issues to Consider in Developing Solid Rocket Motor Technology

- Environment
- Reliability
- Operability
- Cost

Environmental Solid Rocket Motor Technology Needs

- Determine if there are environmental problems with current systems
  - Manufacturing processes
  - Waste disposal
  - Chemicals in motor exhaust
  - Particulates in motor exhaust
- If there are problem areas, define technology and associated cost benefits
  - Solvent-free manufacturing
  - Waste reclamation or incineration
  - Non-chlorine-containing oxidizers
  - Non-metal-containing propellants
**Operability Technology Needs**

- Shorten timelines associated with on-site preparation of solid rocket boosters
  - Simplify assembly and checkout processes for solid rocket boosters
  - Design attach structures and associated handling equipment that allows for rapid attachment and alignment of solid rocket boosters
- Reduce hazards associated with the handling of solid rocket boosters
  - Develop propellants that will not ignite unless pressurized
  - Develop electrostatic discharge-insensitive propellants
  - Develop impact-insensitive propellants

**Reliability Technology Needs**

- Improve component and system design processes
  - Understand failure modes
  - Link design variables to failure modes
  - Link process characterization and control to key design variables
  - Limit-test key design variables
  - Design in inspection and health monitoring for key design variables
- Reduce variability
  - Use reproducibility as a driver in material and process selection
  - Simplify formulations and designs
  - Identify and control critical ingredient parameters
  - Eliminate sensitive processing steps
  - Identify and control critical processing steps
  - Develop bond systems that are less sensitive to processing conditions
Reliability Technology Needs (cont)

- Improve analytical methods by basing them on a fundamental understanding of materials and processes
  - Propellant, case, nozzle, and bondline processing
  - Propellant constitutive theory
  - Composite case performance
  - Resin flow and cure
  - Nozzle performance
  - Bonded interfaces

Cost-Related Technology Needs

- Eliminate delays and failures through better design practices and increased emphasis on fundamental understanding, design, test, process characterization, and process control
- Simplify designs and processes
  - Braided nozzles
  - Single instant-cure resin for case and insulation
- Develop materials that allow for low-cost, robust processes
  - Thermoplastics
  - Moldable materials
- Develop low-cost materials
  - Ammonium nitrate oxidizers
- Reduce waste
5.6 Combined Cycle Propulsion – Terence Ronald, NASP JPO

Terence Ronald gave a presentation on combined cycle propulsion. Due to International Traffic in Arms Regulation (ITAR) restrictions, this presentation has not been reproduced for this publication.
6.0 CHARGE TO PANELS

6.1 Samuel Venneri, Office of Aeronautics and Space Technology

Technology issues associated with materials and structures for launch systems concern metallics, composites, design concepts and, more importantly, manufacturing methods that allow cost-effective implementation of new designs by relying on new technologies. NASA conducts a great deal of research and development, but it must rely on industry to implement new technologies using new manufacturing methods.

New materials and structures technologies will help to address requirements in many application areas such as vehicle structures, cryotanks and thermal management. In addition to offering improved performance, new technologies must be affordable in terms of fabrication, sub- and full-scale testing of prototypes, and routine inspection of operational systems. The need for spacecraft to satisfy particular mission profiles introduces additional constraints on new technologies in terms of their ability to survive in a variety of space environments.

The development of new aerospace technologies now proceeds as an integrated effort in which systems developers work closely with materials and structures specialists so that performance requirements and specifications evolve along with and are tailored to the capabilities of new materials and structures. Fabrication and test of hardware are also essential elements of the development process. As a result, new systems can take full advantage of the strengths of emerging new technologies. Similarly, current space research efforts are tailoring the performance of new materials to meet the challenges of the space environment head-on.

Consider the Space Shuttle External Tank (ET), which uses aluminum (AL 2219) as the primary structural material. Current manufacturing techniques, which are based on 1970's technology, start with a block of aluminum and machine much of the raw material to produce the desired product. Changes are needed as NASA prepares to move into the 21st century. For example, as part of the USAF Advanced Launch System Program, an alternative method has been proposed which would use joining techniques such as spot welding or adhesive bonding to produce a built-up structure that makes much more efficient use of raw materials. Waste of raw materials becomes particularly important to system cost when considering a switch to high performance, high cost materials such as Al-Li.

During development and operations, some Space Shuttle main engines have encountered problems associated with blade cracking in the main turbo-pump, hydrogen embrittlement, coatings, and acoustic and thermal loading. Deterministic analysis methods used by the SSME development program did not adequately assist SSME designers in avoiding these problems because of uncertainties in the engine load spectrum and in material response properties. Instead of the standard design approaches used in the past, designers must rely on stochastic methods to accurately account for uncertainties in both (1) the exact properties of operational components (because of variability in the manufacturing process) and (2) the load placed on each individual component during each phase of its operational life. This approach requires new thinking in terms of risk analysis because it requires specification of a numerical risk of failure rather than a positive safety margin. How to select an appropriate value for the risk of failure of a given component or structure, and who should assign it, is an open question.

Certification of systems for flight is another key area where advanced technologies can play a role. Imbedded sensors, new methods of conducting non-destructive evaluation, and smart structures may all have important roles to play in this area.

Keeping the above points in mind, deliberations by the Workshop panels can significantly help NASA in the development of advanced technologies suitable for operational systems of the future. In particular, OAST needs to understand the interests and needs of participating organizations in terms of technology – not mission – requirements. Validation of advanced technologies and relevant manufacturing pro-
cesses are particularly important. Development of point designs for large-scale missions, however, is neither practical nor cost-effective.

Another important aspect to consider is the benefit of industry-government cost-sharing, even if it is in the form of IR&D or indirect cost-sharing. How should NASA structure its efforts to work more effectively with industry? NASA and industry need to depart from business as usual.

Deliberations should consider both near-term efforts that can build on existing systems and technologies as well as longer-term efforts focused on applications such as nuclear propulsion. It may also be beneficial to investigate cost savings that may be available from the use of non-aerospace approaches to solve potential problems.

SAMUEL VENNERI
OAST MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES DIRECTOR
INDUSTRY IDENTIFIED TECHNOLOGY INTERESTS FOR EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES

MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES

Advanced Al-Li Cryotanks
Isogrid Structures
Common Dome Concepts
Composite Intertank/Shroud Structures
Composite Cryotanks
LH₂ Impermeable Tank Liner
Improved Thermal Insulation
Structural Loads/Response
Tank Inspection/Testing
Test Technology

MANUFACTURING

Al-Li Welding
Automated Weld, Process Control, NDE
Metal Forming Methods
Advanced Composite Fabrication
Joining Technology
Automated Assembly
In Process NDE
Scale-Up/Size Limit
EARTH-TO-ORBIT TRANSPORTATION

Technology Element

Vehicle Structures and Cryotanks

Technology Sub-Elements

Materials Characterization
Structural Design/Analysis
Low-Cost Processing and Fabrication Development
Sub-Component Design, Fab and Test

STRUCTURES AND MATERIALS FOR LOW-COST COMMERCIAL TRANSPORTATION

Lightweight Materials  Properties Related Design  Efficient Structures

Materials Characterization:
Al alloys eg. Al-Li
RMC eg. Gr/Ep

Design and Analysis:
Cryotank - Barrels
Drybay - Domes
Inter tank - Shroud
Aft skirt - Aft skirt

Fabricability:
Net-shape extrusion
Roll forging
Spin forming
Built-up structure
Filament winding

Properties vs Processing
Low Cost Manufacture

Benefits:
- 20-30% weight savings
- 30% cost savings
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SPACE TRANSPORTATION

**Technology Element**

Vehicle Structures and Cryotanks

**Technology Sub-Elements**

Materials Characterization
Materials Processing
Environmental Effects and Durability
Cryogenic Insulation/TPS
Structural Design/Analysis
Sub-Component, Design, Fabrication, and Test

ADVANCED MATERIALS, STRUCTURAL CONCEPTS, AND FABRICATION METHODS FOR VEHICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL CONCEPTS</th>
<th>FABRICATION METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIGHT ALLOYS</td>
<td>INTEGRALLY STIFFENED SHELLS</td>
<td>LIGHT ALLOYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALUMINUM-LITHIUM</td>
<td>GEODESIC SHELLS</td>
<td>SUPERPLASTIC FORMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITANIUM</td>
<td>HONEYCOMB SANDWICH</td>
<td>DIFFUSION BONDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERMETALLICS</td>
<td>INTEGRAL STRUCTURE-CRYOTANKS</td>
<td>POWDER PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAL MATRIX COMPOSITES</td>
<td>HYBRID STRUCTURE (COMPOSITES/METAL)</td>
<td>METAL MATRIX COMPOSITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLYMER MATRIX COMPOSITES</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOT PRESSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED TPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOINING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERAMIC MATRIX COMPOSITES</td>
<td></td>
<td>POLYMER COMPOSITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARBON-CARBON SPRAY-ON FOAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>TAPE PLACEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WOVEN PLY LAY-UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PULTRUSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RESIN INJECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THERMOFORMING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MATERIAL SCIENCE
POWER AND PROPULSION MATERIALS

TECHNOLOGY NEEDS

- High Temperature, Creep Resistant Materials for Nuclear Power Systems
- Very High Temperature, High Strength Materials for Nuclear Propulsion Systems
- Advanced, High Temperature Composite Systems for Nuclear Power Applications
- Low Mass, High Conductivity Materials for Thermal Management Systems

LAUNCH VEHICLE HEALTH MONITORING

OBJECTIVE

- Develop and validate adaptive structures technology for application to health monitoring of launch vehicle structures
  - Develop/demonstrate the technology as applicable to launch vehicle structures and structural components
  - Validate technology for acceptance by launch vehicle programs

APPROACH

- Leverage extensive adaptive structures technology work performed to date for large space truss structures for use on launch vehicle structures
- Investigate cradle-to-grave structural health monitoring needs
- Coordinate development/validation effort with launch vehicle program to facilitate technology transfer to launch vehicle production
  - Perform feasibility studies based on actual requirements
  - Perform technology development for application to current and planned launch vehicles
  - Perform validation experiments required for program acceptance
BENEFITS OF USING AL-LI ALLOYS FOR CRYOGENIC TANKS

15% tank weight savings due to improved specific properties

2219 Integrially machined
Tank weight 50K lbs
Raw material 200K lbs

80% raw material weight savings due to reduced scrap rate (80:20)

Al-LI Built-up structure
Tank weight 42.5K lbs
Raw material 51K lbs

100K Ibs
10. $2000/lb to orbit
$100 M
$85 M
$15 M

Material costs
$1.0 M
$4.2 M
+$3.2 M

System costs savings
+$3.2 M
-$15.0 M
-$11.8 M

$1.0 M
$1.0 M
0

$250K Ibs
42.5K Ibs

Panel Actions

- Identify and Prioritize Critical Technology Areas for Various Vehicle Classes

- Establish Potential Benefits for New Material Systems and Fabrication Methods
  - Use Current Baseline SOA as Reference
  - Provide Cost-Benefit Comparisons (X% Lighter and X% Part Count Reduction, X% Acquisition Cost Reduction)

- Explore "Nonaerospace Approach" for Structural Design
  - Higher Safety Margins and Weight for Lower Vehicle Cost

- New Material Concepts for Engine Designs
  - Ceramic and Carbon-Carbon Nozzles, Turbines, etc.
  - High Temperature Composites

- Proposed NASA/Industry Teaming Approaches
  - Specific Technology Development Activities
  - Potential for Cost Sharing
MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM
FOR SPACE TRANSPORTATION
(continued)

- Combined NASA Funding and Industry Cost-Sharing (IR&D)
- Comprehensive Technology Program Plan
  - Near-Term Requirements
  - Far-Term R&D

MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM
FOR SPACE TRANSPORTATION

- Identify Industry Interest and Needs

- Establish Industry/NASA Team Concept
  - Jointly Planned Programs
  - Use NASA NRA to Solicit Competitive Approaches

- Technology Development and Validation
  - Evaluate Cost-Effective Manufacturing Concepts
  - Establish Materials Screening and Testing Activity
  - Develop Fabrication Methods
  - Establish Structural Demonstration Program
    * Subcomponent Level
    * Full-Size Test Articles
    * Validated Design Concepts
NASA AERONAUTICS STRATEGY FOR TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

- Focus on Industry Requirements and Needs
  - Integrate NASA/Industry Teams: Aerospace Primes; Material Suppliers; Fabrication Companies; NASA
  - Establish Critical Technology Objectives and Goals

- Establish New Approaches for Program Implementation
  - Requires Material Suppliers Working with Prime Contractors
  - Compete for Best Ideas Using NRA

- Use Workshops, Conferences as Mechanisms to Disseminate Technical Data and Accomplishments

NASA AERONAUTICS STRATEGY FOR TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (continued)

- Technology Hardware Demonstration Programs Final Product
- Requires "Technology" Project Office Activity at NASA
  - In-House Programs Included in Critical Path
  - Industry Teams Compete Ideas
  - Technology Transfer of R&D into Product
6.2 Chester Vaughan, Office of Space Flight

The Space Shuttle will remain in use through the 2015-2020 time frame. That is a long time to use technology that dates back to the 1970's, although there will be opportunities to initiate block changes to upgrade the Shuttle fleet. The Assured Shuttle Availability program will prevent problems associated with the obsolescence of parts based on 30-year-old designs as well as improve Shuttle performance. The elusive Space Shuttle hydrogen leaks during the summer of 1990, which were caused by a total of four seals which had undergone ineffective acceptance testing or improper installation, demonstrated that small problems in critical areas can cause major impacts on operational programs.

NASA is preparing to embark on the deployment of Space Station Freedom which will remain operational for 30 years. Other major initiatives include the NLS program. Introducing new technology into these and other programs will be a great challenge because of both the cost and risk associated with transferring new technologies to operational space systems.

During the conception of the Space Shuttle, the goal was to develop a fully reusable, two-stage launch system capable of 65 launches per year for about $300 per pound of payload delivered to LEO. Although the Space Shuttle clearly provides unprecedented and still unique capabilities, it is also true that budget and technical realities have prevented NASA from accomplishing its early goals in terms of affordability and operability.

From a technology point of view, there is an opportunity to examine only a limited number of new concepts and vehicles. Therefore, NASA must carefully invest its resources to maximize their payoff. Limiting the number of initiatives will ensure that individual efforts have enough resources to make a real difference in NASA's future.

Nonetheless, a broad technology base is essential to maintain U.S. leadership in space. With respect to materials and structures, the emphasis should be on:

- Materials and processes for selected applications
- Design and construction methods for space-based systems
- Use of space as an R&D facility, as NASA demonstrated with the Long Duration Exposure Facility

The deliberations of the Workshop Panels should attempt to answer several key questions:

- What needs to be done to make new capabilities technically viable?
- Can improved materials technologies alone provide the desired capability?
- What relative priority should NASA assign to the recommended efforts?
- What are the expected benefits to the NASA user?
- Is the development and operation of the proposed new technology likely to be affordable?
- Are there other potential sponsors or users besides NASA?

If NASA looks at things a little differently, it may be able to use existing and future assets to develop new concepts with greater effectiveness. It is also important to consider factors such as the cost impact of using materials which have limited or no use outside NASA and which are available from only one or two vendors.
OSF - USER NEEDS

AN INTRODUCTION
TO THE
MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES WORKSHOP PANELS

CHESTER A. VAUGHAN
Chief Engineer and Director,
Technical Integration & Analysis Div.
Office of Space Flight,
NASA Headquarters

Office Of Space Flight
### OSF - STRATEGIC PLAN

- **Utilize Shuttle for Manned Missions Through 2015-2020**

- **Develop and Operate Space Station Freedom for 30 Years**
  - First Element Launch (FEL) in 1996

- **Develop NLS and CTV as a Complement to Shuttle for Cargo**

- **Develop Alternative to Shuttle for Manned Missions**
  - Start in 2005-2010 Time Frame

- **Implications of the OSF Strategic Plan**
  - "Reality of New Program Opportunities for Implementing New Technologies is Limited"

- **Challenge for Existing and Near Term Programs**
  - Look for Opportunities to Upgrade Through Block Changes
KEY ISSUES FOR THE PANELS TO ADDRESS

* NASA STRATEGIC PLANNING SUGGESTS SEVERAL NEW MAJOR PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
  - NLS
  - CTV
  - SEI

* ONLY A LIMITED NUMBER OF PLANNING OPTIONS AVAILABLE

* NEED IS TO IDENTIFY AND PRIORITIZE THOSE ACTIVITIES THAT NASA CAN / SHOULD PURSUE

* THREE AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION ARE APPARENT:
  - MATERIALS AND PROCESSES ISSUES FOR SELECTED APPLICATIONS
  - DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION METHODS FOR SPACE BASED SYSTEMS
  - UTILIZATION OF THE SPACE R & D FACILITY FOR CHARACTERIZATION

HOW CAN / WILL THE USER COMMUNITY UTILIZE MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES TECHNOLOGIES?

CHARGE TO THE PANELS

* OSF HAS PROVIDED TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS TO OAET (Apr. 1991)
  MAJOR AREAS OF INTEREST IN M & S:
    - Advanced Heat Rejection Devices
    - Aluminum-Lithium Characterization
    - Thermal Protection Systems For High Temperature Applications
    - Orbital Debris Protection
    - Environmentally Safe Cleaning Solvents, Refrigerants, & Foams

* THREE PANELS WERE FORMED TO ASSESS THE M & S TECHNOLOGY BASE
  - Propulsion Systems (Incl. Advanced Nuclear)
  - Vehicle Systems
  - Entry Systems

* OSF HAS INITIATED BRIDGING PROGRAMS AS A RESULT OF TWO PREVIOUS REVIEWS (Avionics & Propulsion)
    - Aluminum - Lithium Characterization
    - AGN&C
    - Electro-mechanical Actuators
    - Vehicle Health Monitoring (New Start, FY92)

* PANEL DELIBERATIONS ARE CRITICAL TO THE IDENTIFICATION AND PRIORITIZATION OF OSF ADVOCATED TECHNOLOGIES
  - Define Specifically What Needs To Be Done To Make The Capability Technically Viable
  - Does Improved Materials Technologies Alone Provide This Capability
  - Provide Some Perception Of The Relative Priority; What Is The Benefit To The NASA User!
  - Can We Afford To Fully Mature It; ---and Then Use It
  - Are There Other Apparent Requirements / Sponsors?
OSF Technology Requirements Evaluation

NASA Program Unique Technologies

1. Vehicle Health Management
2. Advanced Turbomachinery Components & Models
3. Combustion Devices
4. Advanced Heat Rejection Devices
5. Water Recovery & Management
6. High Efficiency Space Power Systems
7. Advanced Extravehicular Mobility Unit Technologies
8. Electromechanical Control Systems/Electrical Actuation
9. Crew Training Systems
10. Characterization of Al-Li Alloys
11. Cryogenic Supply, Storage & Handling
12. Thermal Protection Systems for High Temperature Applications
13. Robotic Technologies
14. Orbital Debris Protection
15. Guidance, Navigation & Control
16. Advanced Avionics Architectures

Industry Driven Technologies

Signal Transmission & Reception
Advanced Avionics Software
Video Technologies

- Environmentally Safe Cleaning Solvents, Refrigerants & Foams
- Non-Destructive Evaluation

(*) OSF Materials Technology Requirements

SPACE R&D FACILITIES

- USE SPACE ENVIRONMENT TO CHARACTERIZE ADVANCED MATERIALS
  - Atomic Oxygen
  - Radiation Exposure
  - Cycles At Environmental Conditions
  - Orbital Debris, Etc. (Physical Impacts)
  - In-Space Fabrication

- CONSIDER "LDEF" TYPE PROGRAMS TO GAIN ESSENTIAL CONFIDENCE IN CURRENT AND NEW MATERIALS, MATERIAL PROCESSES & FUNCTIONS
  - Establish Partnership Between Code R & Code M
  - What Can / Should Be Implemented On SSF To Achieve Long-Term Objectives
DESIGN / CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES

• IDENTIFICATION & DEVELOPMENT OF INNOVATIVE STRUCTURAL DESIGN CONCEPTS
  - MECHANISMS FOR DEPLOYMENT OF LARGE SPACE STRUCTURES
    -- Antennas
    -- Solar Collectors
    -- Large Truss
    -- Aerobrakes
    -- Etc.
  - INNOVATIVE DESIGNS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SHIELDS
    -- Micrometeorite
    -- Radiation (Natural and Nuclear Propulsion and Power Systems)
  - INNOVATIVE DESIGN CONCEPTS FOR IN-SPACE ASSEMBLY
  - TECHNIQUES FOR VERIFICATION

• POTENTIAL / CANDIDATE MATERIALS AND PROCESSES
  -- Aluminum - Lithium
  -- Metallic - Composites
  -- In-Space Material Processing/Fabrication/Assembly

MAJOR MATERIALS AND PROCESSES ISSUES

• PROGRAM MANAGERS ARE RELUCTANT TO CHANGE METHODS DUE TO TECHNICAL AND COST UNCERTAINTIES

• LIFE AND CYCLIC LIFE (OPERABILITY) ISSUES MUST BE ADDRESSED AND DEFINED UPFRONT
  - MINIMUM GAGE CRYO TANKAGE
  - MLI
  - NUCLEAR POWER RADIATION EFFECTS

• MATERIALS SELECTION / MATURATION / CHARACTERIZATION MUST ACCOMMODATE MORE THAN ONE APPLICATION
  - A SINGLE PROGRAM CANNOT BE THE SOLE SUPPORT OF MATERIALS DEFINITION, CHARACTERIZATION, MANUFACTURE AND TESTING

• EASE OF PRODUCTION AND REPRODUCIBILITY OF PROPERTIES
  - TECHNIQUES MUST BE MODERNIZED/IMPROVED
  - INDEPENDENT MANUFACTURING PROCESSES WITH PROCESS CONTROL

• SELECTED MATERIALS MUST BE AMENABLE TO NON-DESTRUCTIVE EVALUATION (NDE) TECHNIQUES
  - WHEN NEW
  - AS A FUNCTION OF AGE, CYCLES, EXPOSURE
  - REWORK: TO MINIMIZE AND/OR DETERMINE WHEN

LONG DURATION AND/OR SPACE BASED, MULTI-MISSIONS REQUIRE NEW METHODS / NEW WAYS OF DOING BUSINESS

MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT WITH SHORT TERM TERRESTRIAL OR IN-SPACE CHARACTERIZATION OF PROPERTIES IS INADEQUATE AND INSUFFICIENT FOR LONG TERM APPLICATIONS
CLOSING COMMENTS

• RIGHT PEOPLE COMMUNICATING WITH ONE ANOTHER TO DO THE JOB
  - Code MD Hqs. Program Office Representatives
  - Code RM Hqs. Program Office Representatives
  - Field Center Personnel
  - Key Industry Technologists Participating

• AVIONICS & PROPULSION SYMPOSIA HAVE BEEN HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL AND PRODUCTIVE TO THOSE PARTICIPATING:
  - Follow-On Activities Are The Result

• VERY IMPORTANT ACTIVITY TO NASA FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
  - Provide Good Technology Foundation
7.0 PANEL SUMMARY REPORTS

The final paper presentations were made on the final day of the workshop. This section includes the final presentations by the Vehicle Systems Panel, the Propulsion Systems Panel, and the Entry Systems Panel. Papers presented during the individual panel deliberations are included in Sections 8.0, 9.0, and 10.0.
7.1 VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL
7.1.1 Final Presentation
VEHICLE SYSTEMS

CO-CHAIRMAN
TOM BALESTOM MODLIN

RAPPORTEURS
JACK SUDDRETH
TOM WHEELER

VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES AND CRYOTANKS
SUBPANEL REPORT

THOMAS BALESSUBPANEL CHAIRMAN
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PERSPECTIVES OF THE SUBPANEL ON EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE STRUCTURES AND CRYOTANKS

- NEW MATERIALS PROVIDE THE PRIMARY WEIGHT SAVINGS EFFECT ON VEHICLE MASS/SIZE
  - PROVIDE ROBUSTNESS IN DESIGN
  - YIELD SYSTEMS COST SAVINGS

- TODAY'S INVESTMENT
  - DISPROPORTIONATELY SMALL
  - SIGNIFICANT BENEFITS APPARENT
  - NO FOCUSED PROGRAMS IN MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES TECHNOLOGIES WITHIN NASA FOR LAUNCH VEHICLES

- TYPICALLY 10-20 YEARS TO MATURE AND FULLY CHARACTERIZE NEW MATERIALS
  - MANUFACTURING PROCESSES MUST BE DEVELOPED CONCURRENTLY
  - USER NEEDS CAN ACCELERATE MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT
    - SELECTED EXAMPLES (8090, 2219, 7XXX)
VEHICLE SYSTEMS

TECHNOLOGY NEEDS ADDRESSED BY THE EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES AND CRYOTANKS SUBPANEL

- MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT
  - ADVANCED METALLICS
  - COMPOSITES
  - TPS/INSULATION

- MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY
  - NEAR NET-SHAPE METALS TECHNOLOGY
  - COMPOSITES
  - WELDING

- NDE
# EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES AND CRYOTANKS
## VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

### DESCRIPTION:
- ADVANCED STRUCTURAL MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONES &amp; RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- IN THE LAST 10 YEARS, MANY NOVEL MATERIALS HAVE BEEN DISCOVERED THAT HAVE APPLICABILITY TO SPACE PROGRAMS
- THESE INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:
  - ULTRA LIGHTWEIGHT AL ALLOYS
  - METAL MATRIX COMPOSITES
  - POLYMER BASED COMPOSITES
- DEVELOPMENT OF THESE MATERIALS TO MATURITY, AND APPLICATION IN NASA PROGRAMS, WILL HAVE A PROFOUND INFLUENCE ON WEIGHT AND COST SAVINGS AS WELL AS TECHNOLOGICAL IMPACT

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- EVALUATE THE APPLICATION AREAS AND STATE OF MATURITY OF THESE NEW MATERIALS
- DESIGN AND ANALYTICAL TOOL TO REALISTICALLY CALCULATE COST AND WEIGHT BENEFITS ARISING FROM INCORPORATION OF SUCH MATERIALS
- PRIORITIZE AND SELECT FOR FUNDING THE FEWER MATERIALS THAT OFFER THE MOST SIGNIFICANT PAY-OFF IN THE 3-10 YEAR TIME FRAME
- INSIST ON A TEAMING APPROACH THAT INCLUDES NASA, PRODUCERS, AND USERS AND INVOEVES SELECTION, DESIGN, MANUFACTURING, AND ENGINEERING CRITERIA

### DESCRIPTION:
- NEAR NET SHAPE FABRICATION TECHNOLOGY FOR VEHICLE STRUCTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONES &amp; RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- CURRENT VEHICLE SYSTEM STRUCTURES EMPLOY CONVENTIONAL MATERIALS AND FABRICATION TECHNOLOGY
- RESULTANT STRUCTURES ARE TYPICALLY HIGH COST AND WEIGHT PENALTIES ARE BUILT INTO THE DESIGN
- NUMEROUS NEAR NET SHAPE FABRICATION OPPORTUNITIES EXIST, EMPLOYING FORMING AND JOINING TECHNOLOGIES WHICH ARE RECOGNIZED, BUT REQUIRE DEVELOPMENT
- PAYOFFS WILL INCLUDE SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENTS IN PERFORMANCE AND LOWER FABRICATION AND TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- INITIATE AGGRESSIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TO DEMONSTRATE FORMING AND JOINING PROCESSES SUITABLE FOR ALL APPROPRIATE VEHICLE SYSTEM STRUCTURES
- IDENTIFY VEHICLE STRUCTURES DESIGN CONCEPTS AND REQUIREMENTS AMENABLE TO NEAR NET SHAPE PROCESSING
- SELECT NEAR NET SHAPE PROCESSES AMENABLE TO VEHICLE HARDWARE
- DEVELOP CANDIDATE HARDWARE PROGRAM TO DEMONSTRATE/VALIDATE FABRICATION TECHNOLOGY
### EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES AND CRYOTANKS
#### VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILESTONES &amp; RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- NOE OF ADVANCED STRUCTURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• NEED AUTOMATED REAL-TIME TECHNIQUES TO REDUCE COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HIGHER-STRENGTH MATERIALS NEED MORE RELIABLE NOE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FRACTURE TOUGHNESS DRIVEN DESIGNS REQUIRE PRECISE FLAW IDENTIFICATION/Detection</td>
<td>• NOE PROCESSES TO EVALUATE INCLUDE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- REAL-TIME X-RAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- REAL-TIME ULTRASONICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ACOUSTIC EMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EDDY CURRENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• INCORPORATE AUTOMATION FEATURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EVALUATE BUILT-IN SENSORS FOR COMPOSITES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESCRIPTION:
- AU: TECHNOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SPACE PROGRAMS REQUIRE UNIQUE LIGHT WEIGHT MATERIALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ALLOYS DEVELOPED FOR COMMERCIAL AND MILITARY AIRCRAFT NOT DIRECTLY APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MATERIAL PRODUCERS ARE NOT CURRENTLY PLANNING TO INDEPENDENTLY DEVELOP THE REQUIRED LAUNCH VEHICLES ALLOYS. DEVELOPMENT WILL BE MARKETER DRIVEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NEAR-TERM AU ALLOYS CAN PROVIDE UP TO 15 PERCENT WEIGHT SAVINGS. LONGER-TERM ALLOYS HAVE POTENTIAL WEIGHT SAVINGS UP TO 30 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AU ALLOYS PROVIDE UNIQUE PROCESSING OPTIONS, I.E. SUPERPLASTIC FORMING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LACK OF CODE R FUNDING LIMITS EFFECTIVENESS OF BRIDGING PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FUND GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRY, AND PRODUCER PROGRAM TO ACCELERATE NEAR-TERM AND FAR-TERM AU DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TAILOR MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT WITH SELECTED MANUFACTURING PROCESSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BENEFITS OF USING AL-LI ALLOYS FOR CRYOGENIC TANKS

15% tank weight savings due to improved specific properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material costs</th>
<th>System costs savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.0 M</td>
<td>+ $3.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.2 M</td>
<td>- $15.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ $3.2 M</td>
<td>- $11.8 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2219 Integrally machined
Tank weight 42.5K lbs
Raw material 213K lbs

Cost-to-orbit benefit
$100 M
$85 M
- $15 M

80% raw material weight savings due to reduced scrap rate (80:20)

AI-LI Built-up structure
Tank weight 42.5K lbs
Raw material 51K lbs

Material costs
$1.0 M
$4.2 M
$200 M
0

System costs savings
0
- $15.0 M
- $15.0 M

EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES AND CRYOTANKS
VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

DESCRIPTION:
- COMPOSITE TECHNOLOGY FOR CRYOTANKS AND DRY BAY STRUCTURES (WITH EMPHASIS ON FIBER REINFORCED PLASTIC SYSTEMS)

MILESTONES & RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- PROCESSES MUST BE DEFINED TO ACCOUNT FOR FRP MANUFACTURING CAPABILITIES
- A TOTALLY INTEGRATED MATERIALS, DESIGN, MANUFACTURING, INSPECTION, AND TESTING PROCESS MUST BE IDENTIFIED WHICH WILL ACCOUNT FOR THE UNIQUE PROCESS NEEDS AND CAPABILITIES OF COMPOSITES
- WEIGHT REDUCTION POTENTIAL IS 20-30 PERCENT

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- ESTABLISH COMPOSITE CRYOTANK SYSTEM DESIGN REQUIREMENTS: IDENTIFY LINER REQUIREMENTS
- DETERMINE STATE-OF-THE-ART CAPABILITIES IN FRP COMPOSITES FOR MATERIALS, DESIGN, MANUFACTURING, INSPECTION AND TESTING SPECIFICALLY CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING:
  - IN-LINE INSPECTION
  - IN-SITU CURING TECHNOLOGY
  - TOOLING APPROACH
  - JOINING TECHNOLOGY
  - COMPOSITE DAMAGE TOLERANCE AND REPAIR
- DESIGN A BASELINE CRYOTANK
- CONDUCT MANUFACTURING PROCESS TRADES
- ESTABLISH A BASELINE MANUFACTURING PROCESS
- DEFINE FACILITY SIZE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT FRP
MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES TECHNOLOGY FOR SPACE TRANSFER VEHICLES

Cryotank
- Materials
  - Al-Li
  - SiCp/Al MMC
  - Ti
  - RMC
- Low cost fabrication
  - Spun formed domes
  - SPF, Built-up structure
  - Filament wound RMC tanks
  - Explosively formed components

Core primary structure
- Materials
  - Al-Li
  - B/Al MMC
  - Gr/E
- NDE/durable materials
  - Real time radiography
  - Advanced ultrasonics
  - Space hardened materials
  - Protective coatings/platings

Benefits
- Advanced materials: 20-30% weight savings
  Increased payload
  Greater range
- Low cost fabrication: 30% cost savings
  Reduced assembly time
- NDE/durable materials: Increased reliability and vehicle life

EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES AND CRYOTANKS
VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

DESCRIPTION:
- WELDING
  - PROCESS UNDERSTANDING, OPTIMIZATION, AND AUTOMATION FOR JOINING STRUCTURES

MILESTONES & RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- WELDING USED AS JOINING TECHNIQUE ON ALL MAJOR AEROSPACE HARDWARE
- REPAIR OF WELDING DEFECTS MAJOR COST IN MANUFACTURING
- HUMAN ERRORS A MAJOR CAUSE OF WELDING DEFECTS
- LACK OF UNDERSTANDING OF PROCESS VARIABLES AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON PROPERTIES
- AUTOMATION POTENTIALLY CAN REDUCE NDE

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- IDENTIFY PROCESS VARIABLES RELATIONSHIPS
- DEVELOP PROCESS MODELS
- IDENTIFY AND DEVELOP SENSORS FOR PROCESS MONITORING AND FEEDBACK
- IDENTIFY AND DEVELOP CONTROL HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE
- VERIFY AND VALIDATE PROCESSES AND CONTROLS
EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES AND CRYOTANKS
VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

DESCRIPTION:
• NEAR NET-SHAPE METALS TECHNOLOGY
  - BUILT-UP STRUCTURES FOR CRYOGENIC TANKS
    AND DRY-BAY APPLICATIONS

MILESTONES & RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
• INTEGRALLY STIFFENED STRUCTURES FABRICATED
  BY MACHINING FROM A THICK PLATE RESULTS IN
  HIGH SCRAP RATES (85%)
• LOW BUY-TO-FLY RATIO REQUIRED FOR ECONOMIC
  UTILIZATION OF NEW HIGH PERFORMANCE METALS
• BUILT-UP STRUCTURE APPROACH IS APPLICABLE TO
  BROAD RANGE OF STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS
  ENCOMPASSING TANKS AND DRY-BAY STRUCTURES
• PAYOFFS WILL INCLUDE SIGNIFICANT
  IMPROVEMENTS IN PERFORMANCE AND LOWER
  FABRICATION COST

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
• IDENTIFY VEHICLE STRUCTURES, DESIGN CONCEPTS
  AND REQUIREMENTS AMENABLE TO BUILT-UP
  STRUCTURE APPROACH
• DEVELOP FORMING AND JOINING PROCESS TO
  FABRICATE APPROPRIATE STRUCTURAL PREFORMS
• DESIGN, FABRICATE AND TEST STRUCTURAL
  SUBELEMENTS
• DEMONSTRATE STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY UNDER
  REALISTIC SERVICE CONDITIONS
• VALIDATE TECHNOLOGY THROUGH DESIGN,
  FABRICATION AND TESTS OF FULL-SCALE TANKS AND
  DRY-BAY STRUCTURAL ARTICLES

SUMMARY OF THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE EXPENDABLE
LAUNCH AND CRYOTANKS SUBPANEL
• THE MAJOR NEAR TERM ISSUE FOR AL-LI IS WHETHER FUNDING WILL BE
  PROVIDED TO ASSURE INCORPORATION IN THE NLS
  - PRODUCTION CAPABILITY IS IN PLACE FOR 8090, WELDALITE, AND 2090
  - NEAR NET SHAPE PROCESSES HAVE BEEN DEFINED AND SCALE UP
    ACTIVITIES ARE UNDERWAY
  - PROGRAM MANAGEMENT DECISIONS ARE REQUIRED TO EXPLOIT
    POTENTIAL
• MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS WITHIN NASA ARE TOO
  LIMITED/RESTRICTIVE
  - NO FOCUSED PROGRAMS IN MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES TECHNOLOGIES
    WITHIN NASA FOR LAUNCH VEHICLES
  - CLEAR NEED FOR SUSTAINED/CONTINUING PROGRAMS TO SUPPORT USER
    NEEDS/LONG TERM NASA MISSIONS
• SIGNIFICANT NEEDS EXIST FOR STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND OPTIMIZATION
  PROGRAMS
• NDE TECHNIQUES AND METHODS MUST BE EXPLOITED TO ASSURE
  INTEGRITY, RELIABILITY AND COST REDUCTIONS
• JOINING AND BONDING TECHNIQUES AND CONCEPTS MUST BE DEVELOPED
  AND CHARACTERIZED FOR FUTURE LARGE LAUNCH VEHICLE APPLICATIONS
REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL
ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

PERSPECTIVES
- FUTURE VEHICLES REQUIRE LOW COST, HIGH RELIABILITY, ROBUSTNESS, LOW MAINTENANCE, ON-TIME LAUNCH CAPABILITY
- CURRENT TECHNOLOGY GAPS EXIST RELATIVE TO ACCOMPLISHING THE ABOVE GOAL
- MAJOR TECHNOLOGY CATEGORIES
  - MATERIALS
  - STRUCTURAL CONCEPTS
  - FABRICATION/MANUFACTURING
  - DESIGN/ANALYSIS/CERTIFICATION
  - NON-DESTRUCTIVE EVALUATION (NDE)

MAJOR PAYOFF ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL CONCEPTS</th>
<th>FABRICATION/MANUFACTURING</th>
<th>DESIGN/ANALYSIS/CERTIFICATION</th>
<th>NDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• COMPOSITES • ALI • TPS</td>
<td>• NEAR NET SHAPES • INTEGRALLY-MACHINED</td>
<td>• BOND • WELD • EXTRUDE • FORGING • POWDER • LIQUID ATOMIZATION</td>
<td>• CRITERIA • SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION</td>
<td>• DESIGN FOR INSPECTABILITY • HEALTH MONITORING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION:
- IN SPACE JOINING
  - WELDING
  - BONDING

MILESTONES & RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- REPAIR TECHNIQUES FOR IN SPACE HARDWARE REQUIRED
- IN SPACE ASSEMBLY TECHNIQUES FOR LARGE STRUCTURES
- WELDING AND BONDING PROVIDE HIGH WEIGHT, LEAK PROOF STRUCTURES
- SOVIETS HAVE MADE EMERGENCY WELDING REPAIR ON MIR
- ELECTRON BEAM PROCESS ONLY PROCESS PRESENTLY USED IN VACUUM

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- IDENTIFY AND DEVELOP WELDING AND BONDING PROCESSES FOR IN SPACE USE
- IDENTIFY LIMITING FEATURES OF ARC WELDING PROCESSES FOR USE IN SPACE
- DEVELOP WELDING HARDWARE/SOFTWARE FOR SPACE USE
- IDENTIFY SAFETY ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH WELDING IN SPACE
- DEVELOP REMOTE CONTROL AND MANIPULATORS FOR OPERATIONS
- PLAN AND CONDUCT PROOF OF EXPERIMENT FOR SHUTTLE FLIGHT
### REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL

#### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES &amp; RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DAMAGE TOLERANT DESIGN FOR COMPOSITE STRUCTURES</td>
<td>• PUBLISH DAMAGE TOLERANT DESIGN DATA BOOK FOR COMPOSITE STRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SPACE TRANSPORTATION MISSIONS ARE WEIGHT DRIVEN</td>
<td>• DEVELOP DAMAGE TOLERANT PHILOSOPHY/Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• COMPOSITES REDUCE WEIGHT, REDUCE PART COUNT AND ARE ADAPTABLE TO COMPLICATED SHAPES</td>
<td>• ASSEMBLE INDUSTRY AVAILABLE TEST DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNLESS PROPERLY DESIGNED, EASILY DAMAGED</td>
<td>• IDENTIFY CANDIDATE FIBERS, RESINS, LAY-UPS, AND MANUFACTURING PROCESSES FOR DAMAGE TOLERANT SKIN DESIGNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GOAL: VISUALLY INSPECT ONLY WITH MINIMAL IMPACT ON WEIGHT</td>
<td>• DEVELOP DESIGNED EXPERIMENT UTILIZING DAMAGE TOLERANT TESTING TO IDENTIFY DRIVERS (TEMPERATURE RANGE R.T. TO 80°F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UTILIZE BEST SKIN DESIGNS FOR HONEYCOMB PANELS AND PERFORM DESIGNED EXPERIMENT TO AGAIN IDENTIFY DRIVERS (TEMPERATURE RANGE R.T. - 80°F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES &amp; RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• LOW MARGINS IN THE ASCENT OPERATIONAL ENVELOPE INCREASES OPERATIONAL COST</td>
<td>• DEVELOP CONCURRENT ENGINEERING TOOLS FOR FLIGHT MECHANICS, CONTROL, PERFORMANCE, LEADS, AERODYNAMICS, MANUFACTURING, OPERATIONS, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MAINTENANCE AND REFURBISHMENT OF LOW-LIFE PARTS IS COSTLY IN INSPECTION, ANALYSIS AND CHANGE-OUT</td>
<td>• DEVELOP INTER-DISCIPLINARY, TOTAL COST OPTIMIZATION AND TRADES ANALYSIS TOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ROBUSTNESS PROVIDES LOWER TOTAL COST, LESS REWORK, LAUNCH TIME, HIGHER PERFORMANCE AND LESS COMPLEX OPERATION</td>
<td>• DEVELOP ACCURATE STATISTICAL QUANTIFICATION TOOLS FOR ALL SENSITIVE PARAMETERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DEVELOP ATMOSPHERIC (WINDS) CHARACTERISTICS FOR DESIGN AND OPERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ANALYTICAL TOOLS TO MORE ACCURATELY PREDICT AERODYNAMICS, PLUMES, ACOUSTICAL, etc. INDUCED ENVIRONMENT DATA CFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DEVELOP MODEL SYNTHESIS TOOLS TO REDUCE MODEL DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DEVELOP SYSTEM PROBABILISTIC TOOLS TO GUIDE OPTIMIZATION CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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REUSABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES AND CRYOTANKS
VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

DESCRIPTION:
• Maintenance and refurbishment philosophy

MILESTONES & RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
• Current reusable space vehicles are essentially de-certified as flight vehicles at the moment of touchdown
• Re-certification requires large scale disassembly, inspection, and test prior to next flight
• These activities are labor intensive and account for a large part of the operations cost of the vehicle.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
• Examine maintenance and refurbishment philosophies of non-space vehicle operators to identify "lessons learned" for space systems
• Define experience data base from past reusable vehicle flights to allow statistical correlation of system failure modes, effects, and frequencies with maintenance and refurbishment approaches
• Develop criteria to design for maintenance and assembly
• Identify maintenance and refurbishment requirements for proposed vehicle technologies
• Coordinate test philosophy and structural design criteria efforts (i.e., design for assembly, repair approaches)

TECHNOLOGIES
• Advanced structural materials
• AL-Li technology
• Near net shape fabrication technology for vehicle structures
• Near net shape metals technology
• Near net shape extrusions for structural hardware
• Near net shape: forgings
• Near net shape: spin forgings
• Welding
• In-space welding/joining
• Composites technology for cryotanks and dry bay structures
• Joining technology for composite cryotanks
• Tooling approach for manufacturing large diameter cryotanks
• Develop a cure methodology for large composite cryotanks
• State-of-the-art buckling structure optimizer program
• State-of-the-art "shell of revolution" analysis program
• NDE for advanced structures
• In-line inspection of composites
• Scale-up of launch vehicles
• Launch vehicle TPS/insulation beyond 27.5 ft. diameter
• Design & fabrication of thin wall cryotanks for space exploration (5-20 ft. dia.)
7.1.2 Supporting Charts
### REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL

#### VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CRYSogenic TANKage</td>
<td>• SUFFICIENT DATA BASE FOR PROGRAM MANAGERS TO ACCEPT THE MATERIAL IN NEW LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- LIGHTWEIGHT CRYSogenic TANKs WILL INCREASE THE PAYLOAD TO ORBIT OF VARIOUS LAUNCH SYSTEMS
- AL-LI HAS NOT REACHED THE MATURITY TO INCORPORATE INTO THE DESIGN WITHOUT CONSIDERABLE ADDITIONAL EFFORT BEYOND THAT CURRENTLY FUNDED.

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- CONDUCT A PROGRAM COORDINATED WITH EXISTING PROGRAMS TO ENSURE THAT THE NECESSARY TECHNOLOGY HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED AND THAT ENGINEERING PROPERTIES INCLUDING MIL-HDBK-S STATISTICALLY DERIVED PARENT MATERIAL AND WELD PROPERTIES, FRACtURE TOUGHNESS, STRESS CORROSION, RESISTANCE, ETC. HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED

### DESCRIPTION:
- CRYSogenic TANKage
  - QUALIFY AL-LI TANKAGE

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- GREATER PAYLOAD TO ORBIT CAN BE OBTAINED WITH COMPOSITE TANKS SUITABLE FOR USE WITH LIQUID HYDROGEN
- RECENT TESTS WITH A 1/3 FULL SCALE NASP TANK WITH LIQUID NITROGEN (L nitrogen) DEMONSTRATED THAT THE COMPOSITE WAS NOT PERMEABLE AT LN2 TEMPERATURES. EARLIER SMALL SCALE TESTS WITH GASEOUS HELIUM AT -420°F DEMONSTRATED TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE PERMEABILITY AND RESISTANCE TO MICROCRAKING WHEN THERMALLY CYCLED. NASP 1/3 SCALE TANK IS CURRENTLY IN TEST, THERMAL CYCLE TESTS AND LIQUID HYDROGEN LOADING ARE BEING CONDUCTED.

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- ESTABLISH THE ENABLING TECHNOLOGY TO BUILD, INSULATE AND TEST A SUB-Scale TANK. TANK TEST SUCCESSFUL
- IDENTIFY WHERE THE TECHNOLOGY IS ADEQUATE AND WHERE DEVELOPMENT IS REQUIRED
- DEMONSTRATE ADEQUATE TECHNOLOGY
- DEVELOP TECHNOLOGY (SUBSCALE)
- DECIDE ON MANUFACTURING APPROACH
- DESIGN SUBSCALE TANK WITH ALL THE FEATURES OF A FULL SCALE TANK
- FABRICATE, INSULATE, INSPECT AND TEST TANK WITH LH2
### REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL
**VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL**

#### DESCRIPTION:
- **CRYOGENIC TANKAGE**
  - QUALIFY COMPOSITE TANKAGE FOR USE WITH LIQUID OXYGEN

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:
- DEMONSTRATE THE ABILITY TO MEET SAFETY REQUIREMENTS
- FEASIBILITY PROGRAM: $500K

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- GREATER PAYLOAD TO ORBIT CAN BE OBTAINED WITH COMPOSITE TANKS SUITABLE FOR USE WITH LOX
- RECENT TESTS WITH A 1/3 FULL SCALE NASP TANK WITH LIQUID NITROGEN ($N_2$) DEMONSTRATED THAT THE TANK WAS NOT PERMEABLE (IN AN ENGINEERING SENSE) AT $N_2$ TEMPERATURES. NASP 1/3 SUBSCALE TANK IS CURRENTLY IN TEST. THERMAL CYCLE TESTS AND LIQUID HYDROGEN LOADING ARE BEING CONDUCTED.

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- ESTABLISH FEASIBILITY PROGRAM WITH THE FOLLOWING AS A MINIMUM:
  - ESTABLISH SET OF DESIGN GUIDELINES
  - DEVELOP LINERS WITH DAMAGE THAT WILL PREVENT A CONFLAGRATION
  - TESTS TO DEMONSTRATE NO CONFLAGRATION
  - 100 CYCLES OF RAPID O$_2$ PRESSURIZATION
  - CONDUCT RAPID FILL WITH PARTICLE IMPINGEMENT
  - BURST TEST

---

#### DESCRIPTION:
- LAUNCH VEHICLE TPS/INSULATION

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- CLEAN AIR ACTS MANDATE ELIMINATIONS OF FREON BLOWING AGENTS
- ROBUST DESIGN PHILOSOPHY DICTATES DURABLE TPS SYSTEMS
- LONG DURATION SPACE MISSIONS REQUIRE SPACE QUALIFIED TPS MATERIALS TO SURVIVE ENVIRONMENT AND NOT CREATE DEBRIS FOR OTHER CRITICAL OPERATIONS

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- CONTINUE ASAP TO DEVELOP ALTERNATE BLOWING AGENTS
- LOOK BEYOND NEAR-TERM FIXES TO FUND LONG-TERM REPLACEMENT MATERIALS
- DEVELOP ROBUST/REUSABLE OR EASILY REPLACEABLE TPS

---
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## REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL
### VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DESCRIPTION:</strong></th>
<th><strong>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DURABLE PASSIVE THERMAL CONTROL DEVICES AND/OR COATINGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</strong></th>
<th><strong>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• REUSABLE CTV PROGRAM REQUIRES LIGHTWEIGHT DURABLE INSULATION FOR MINIMUM COST AND QUICK TURN AROUNO</td>
<td>• DEVELOP ROBUST HIGH PERFORMANCE, LOW COST AND REUSABLE THERMAL CONTROL DEVICES AND/OR COATINGS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DESCRIPTION:</strong></th>
<th><strong>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOPMENT AND CHARACTERIZATION OF PROCESSING METHODS TO REDUCE ANISOTROPY OF MATERIAL PROPERTIES IN AL-LI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</strong></th>
<th><strong>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• THE ANISOTROPY OF ALI ESPECIALLY THE REDUCED STRENGTH IN THE SHORT TRANSVERSE DIRECTION, SIGNIFICANTLY IMPACTS THE UTILITY OF AL-LI APPLICATIONS</td>
<td>• REFINE EXISTING LABORATORY SCALE PROCESS TO PRODUCE ISOTROPIC ALI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DESIGN ALLOWABLES ARE FREQUENTLY DICTATED BY THE 3-T STRENGTH (PREVENTING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF MAXIMUM BENEFIT FROM AL-LI USE) AND COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT BUILDERS HAVE HESITATED TO USE AL-LI BECAUSE OF CONCERN OVER THE LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF ANISOTROPY</td>
<td>• SUPPORT SCALE-UP OF LAB PROCESS TO PROTOTYPE COMMERCIAL PRODUCTION VOLUMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CHARACTERIZE MATERIAL PROTOTYPES OF AL-LI PRODUCED BY THESE METHODS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL

**VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DURABLE THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEM (TPS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• FUTURE REUSABLE VEHICLE PROGRAMS REQUIRE LIGHTWEIGHT/DURABLE TPS FOR MINIMUM COST AND QUICK TURNAROUND</td>
<td>• CONTINUE DEVELOPMENT OF DURABLE BOND-ON CERAMIC TILES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DURABILITY FOR WIND/RAIN AND SERVICING OPERATIONS IS REQUIRED</td>
<td>• CONTINUE DEVELOPMENT OF DURABLE MECHANICALLY ATTACHABLE METALLIC AND CERAMIC DESIGNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MECHANICALLY ATTACHABLE TPS CAN PROVIDE ACCESS FOR INSPECTION AND REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>• DEVELOP HIGH TEMPERATURE ADHESIVES FOR BOND-ON DESIGNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TPS FOR INTEGRAL LOAD CARRYING CRYOGENIC TANKAGE DOES NOT EXIST</td>
<td>• DEVELOP SPECIFIC TPS DESIGNS FOR INTEGRAL LOAD CARRYING CRYOGENIC TANKAGE INCLUDING HIGH STRENGTH &amp; TEMPERATURE FOAM INSULATION - MAY INVOLVE GROUND PURGE SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DEMONSTRATE SUITABILITY OF DESIGNS BY FABRICATION AND TESTING TO APPROPRIATE WIND/RAIN, ACOUSTIC, AEROPRESSURE, THERMAL REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESCRIPTION:

• UNPRESSURIZED A.I.L. STRUCTURES (INTERSTAGES, THRUST STRUCTURES)
  • QUALIFY A.L. FOR USE WITH UNPRESSURIZED VEHICLE AND STABILITY LIMITED STRUCTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• MAJOR PORTIONS OF VEHICLE STRUCTURES ARE STABILITY LIMITED, THESE INCLUDE COMPRESSION AND BENDING LOADED STRUCTURES. A.L. ALLOYS OFFER INCREASED IN SPECIFIC STIFFNESS OF 20-40% OVER CURRENT ALUMINUM ALLOYS, WITH THE POTENTIAL FOR CORRESPONDING WEIGHT SAVINGS IN THESE STRUCTURES</td>
<td>• FUND DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING OF DEMONSTRATION OF STABILITY LIMITED STRUCTURES (THRUST STRUCTURES, INTERTANK CONNECTORS, WING BOXES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• COORDINATE WITH LOW COST MANUFACTURING AND NEAR NET SHAPE ACTIVITIES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL**

**VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • NEAR NET SHAPE SECTIONS  
  - EXTRUSIONS  
  - FORGINGS |                                          |

**BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • COST OF SCRAP METAL ON INTEGRALLY MACHINED HARDWARE IS NOT COST EFFECTIVE FOR NEWER METAL ALLOYS  
  • RECENT ADVANCES IN ROLL FORGING AND INCREMENTAL FORGING OFFERS SIGNIFICANT MATERIAL COST AND PART COUNT REDUCTIONS FOR LAUNCH VEHICLES  
  • PROCESS PARAMETERS NEED TO BE DEVELOPED FOR EACH NEW ALLOY |
| • IDENTIFY CANDIDATE HARDWARE FOR LARGE EXTRUSIONS, ROLL AND INCREMENTAL FORGING PROCESSES  
  • DEVELOP CANDIDATE HARDWARE TO DEMONSTRATE VALIDATE FABRICATION TECHNOLOGY  
  • GENERATE DESIGN ALLOWABLES |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PRESSURIZED STRUCTURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • PRESSURIZED STRUCTURES COMMONLY USED AS CREW COMPARTMENTS ON SHUTTLE AND SPACE STATION ARE CURRENTLY FABRICATED FROM CONVENTIONAL MATERIALS  
  • NEW APPLICATIONS SUCH AS NASP, SSTO, AND MTV WILL HAVE GREATER DEMANDS TO REDUCE WEIGHT WHILE BEING SUBJECTED TO HARSHER ENVIRONMENTS  
  • ADVANCED MATERIALS SUCH AS ALU AND/OR COMPOSITES HAVE PROPERTIES CONDUCIVE TO THE ABOVE REQUIREMENTS. INTEGRAL SKIN AND STRINGER, SANDWICH PANELS, ETC. ARE ALL DESIGNS WHERE THESE MATERIALS WOULD PROVE ADVANTAGEOUS |
| • CONTINUE DEVELOPMENT OF DESIGN CRITERIA FOR THESE STRUCTURES  
  • CONDUCT DEVELOPMENT TESTS TO DETERMINE THE APPLICABILITY OF THESE MATERIALS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS  
  • DESIGN AND FABRICATE TEST ARTICLES TO VERIFY THE APPROACH |
### REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL
#### VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

#### DESCRIPTION:
- **Welding and Joining**
  - Process understanding, optimization, and automation for joining structures

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- Repair of welding defects major cost in manufacturing
- Human errors a major cause of welding defects
- Lack of understanding of process variables and their influence on properties
- Welding used as joining technique on all major aerospace hardware
- Automation potentially can reduce NDE

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Identify process variables relationships
- Develop process models
- Identify and develop sensors for process monitoring and feedback
- Identify and develop control hardware and software
- Verify and validate processes and controls
- Development of telerobotic capability for on-orbit repair/maintenance/inspection

### DESCRIPTION:
- Micrometeoroid and Debris Hypervelocity Shields

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- The threat to space vehicles from orbital debris has been rapidly increasing
- Current aluminum double-bumper shielding is very heavy and newer systems such as Nextel have not been qualified

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Develop and qualify lightweight shields and attachment techniques
- Conduct a program to evaluate lightweight shielding designs to meet the threat requirements
- Establish and verify analytical models. Goal is to minimize secondary eject as well as develop and qualify an ultra-lightweight shielding design

---
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# REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL
## VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

## DESCRIPTION:
- State-of-the-art shell buckling structure optimizer program to serve as a rapid design tool

## MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

## BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- Current emphasis on development of large complicated finite element programs suited to detailed analysis, not design optimization
- Available codes are out of date, not comprehensive and user unfriendly
- Will improve the quality and speed of both preliminary design and detailed design

## RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Provide following features
  - Macintosh or Windows user interface with graphic displays and pull-down menus
  - Simple user format designed for use by both design and analysis disciplines
  - Complete library of stiffened shell configurations

## DESCRIPTION:
- Test philosophy
  - Restrict structural test to a load factor that allows alternate usages of expensive hardware
  - No test factor

## MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

## BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- Hardware has been tested to destruction or yield to the point where it is unusable for other applications
- Structures of advanced materials present significant cost to programs
- "No test factor" may be used as an alternate where weight may not be critical

## RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Develop a test code that restricts test to loads which maximize the structures' "reusability." Independent tests should be conducted that allow for data extrapolation from the lower leads to qualify hardware.
### REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL

#### VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- REDUCED LOAD CYCLE TIME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- LONG TURNAROUND TIME LOAD CYCLES GREATLY INCREASES COST AND RESTRICTS IMPLEMENTATION OF NEEDED CHANGES</td>
<td>- PROVIDE AN INTERDISCIPLINARY LOADS ANALYSIS TOOL THAT OUTPUTS LOADS AND STRESS INSTEAD OF SEQUENTIAL LOADS AND STRESS ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LOAD CYCLE COSTS ARE EXCESSIVE</td>
<td>- DEVELOP MODEL SYNTHESIS TECHNIQUES TO REDUCE MODEL DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- DEVELOP AN OPTIMIZED CODE TO REDUCE COMPUTER COST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### DESCRIPTION:

- STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- CURRENT ANALYSIS METHODS INVOLVE ANALYSIS BEING CONDUCTED BY ISOLATED GROUPS AND DISTRIBUTING RESULTS TO NEXT GROUP IN A SERIAL FASHION</td>
<td>- DEVELOP ELECTRONICALLY INTERFACED SELF-CHECKING, AS-RADIANT, THERMODYNAMIC, DYNAMIC &amp; STRESS ANALYSIS TOOLS THAT ALLOW RAPID ITERATION AND APPLY THE BENEFITS OF CONCURRENT ENGINEERING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ITERATIONS ARE LONG AND LABORIOUS</td>
<td>- REVIEW AVAILABLE DOCUMENTATION ON STABILITY ANALYSIS DERIVING CONCURRENCE ON KNOCK DOWN FACTORS TO BE USED IN ABOVE ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ANALYTICAL METHODS, PARTICULARLY IN THE AREA OF STABILITY KNOCK-DOWN FACTORS, SHOULD BE REVIEWED, UPDATED AS NECESSARY AND FORMALIZED</td>
<td>- TEST AS REQUIRED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL
VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• OPTIMIZATION OF STRUCTURAL CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CURRENT STRUCTURAL CRITERIA DOES NOT ALLOW ASSESSMENT OF VEHICLE RISK AS RELATED TO LOAD VARIABILITY, SUBSYSTEM REDUNDANCY AND FACTOR OF SAFETY</td>
<td>• DEVELOP SIMPLE PROBABILISTIC APPROACH WITH NECESSARY DATA TO DERIVE AND JUSTIFY STRUCTURAL CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LACK OF SIMPLE PROBABILISTIC APPROACH TO RISK ASSESSMENT STIFLES EXAMINATION OF REQUIRED FACTOR OF SAFETY TO MEET PROGRAM OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>• DEVELOP ANALYSIS TOOLS TO IMPLEMENT STRUCTURAL RELIABILITY APPROACH AND SELECTION OF FACTORS OF SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CURRENT APPROACH IS TO USE F.S. ≥ 1.25 FOR UNMANNED AND F.S. ≥ 1.4 FOR MANNED SYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOP AN ENGINEERING APPROACH TO PROPERLY TRADE MATERIAL AND STRUCTURAL CONCEPTS SELECTION, FABRICATION, FACILITIES, AND COST (TOTAL COST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• STRUCTURAL SIMPLICITY REDUCES ASSEMBLY COST AND OPERATIONAL COST</td>
<td>• DEVELOP CONCURRENT ENGINEERING TOOLS (ALL DISCIPLINES) THAT PROPERLY TRADE BETWEEN MATERIAL, STRUCTURAL CONCEPT, FABRICATING FACILITIES, PERFORMANCE, AND OPERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PROCESSING CAN INCREASE COST, MR HARDWARE, AND LOWER MARGINS (SENSITIVITIES)</td>
<td>• DEVELOP OPTIMIZATION CRITERIA FOR TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TOTAL COST IS THE DRIVER, NOT JUST WEIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SEQUENTIAL ENGINEERING IS COSTLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SEQUENTIAL ENGINEERING TENDS TO HIDE SENSITIVITIES AND PROPER TRADES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 PROPULSION SYSTEMS PANEL
7.2.1 Final Presentation
# PROPULSION SYSTEMS PANEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIQUID PROPULSION</th>
<th>SOLID PROPULSION</th>
<th>NUCLEAR PROPULSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. Johnston / MSFC</td>
<td>G. Baaklini / LeRC</td>
<td>J. Stone / LeRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Bruce / SSC</td>
<td>J. Cross / PDA</td>
<td>S. Bhattacharya / Argonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dennies / Aerojet</td>
<td>F. Davidson / ARC</td>
<td>R. Carruth / MSFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Dickenson / KSC</td>
<td>W. Figge / ARC</td>
<td>M. Cooper / Westinghouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Dreshfield / LeRC</td>
<td>D. Guilhot / Thiokol</td>
<td>R. Cooper / ORNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Karakulko / Lockheed</td>
<td>A. Holzman / UT-CSD</td>
<td>G. Haltford / LeRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. McGaw / LeRC</td>
<td>W. Kearney / Aerojet</td>
<td>T. Herbell / LeRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Munafio / MSFC</td>
<td>J. Koenig / SRI</td>
<td>B. Matthews / DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Rhamer / P&amp;W</td>
<td>B. Loomis / SAIC</td>
<td>W. Long / B&amp;W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Sackheim / TRW</td>
<td>B. Marsh / MICOM</td>
<td>J. Wooten / Rocketdyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Wooten / Rocketdyne</td>
<td>C. Olsen / Thiokol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Woodcock / Boeing</td>
<td>R. Sullivan / MSFC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Wendel / Hercules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. Woodis / MSFC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ISSUES / TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

### SOLID PROPULSION

**CASES:**

- HIGH RELIABILITY CASE JOINTS AND ATTACHMENTS COMPATIBLE WITH OPTIMIZED COMPOSITE DESIGNS (1)
- COMPOSITE CASE DESIGN AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY (5)
- CASE MATERIALS AND MATERIAL FORMS SUITABLE FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY SAFE, LOW COST, RELIABLE, HIGH RATE PRODUCTION (1)
- CASE EQUIPMENT AND PROCESSES SUITABLE FOR LOW COST/HIGH RATE PRODUCTION (1)
- COMPOSITE CASE CODE DEVELOPMENT (1)
- SELF-INSULATING CASE (1)
- LOW COST/RAPID TURNAROUND CASE TOOLING (1)
PROPULSION SYSTEMS PANEL

ISSUES / TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

SOLID PROPULSION

NOZZLES:

• CHARACTERIZATION OF MATERIAL RESPONSE AND CONSTITUTIVE MODELING OF ABLATIVE MATERIALS (4)
• PROCESS UNDERSTANDING AND LIMIT DETERMINATION FOR OPTIMIZATION AND CONTROL OF NOZZLE COMPONENTS (4)
• NOZZLE FAILURE CRITERIA, DAMAGE, MATERIAL VARIABILITY AND EFFECTS OF DEFECTS (3)
• ROBUST ABLATIVE NOZZLE MATERIALS AND PROCESS DEVELOPMENT (4)
• NOZZLE THERMOSTRUCTURAL CODE DEVELOPMENT (2)
• NOZZLE DESIGN METHODOLOGY (3)
• LIGHTWEIGHT, LOW TORQUE FLEX BEARING DESIGN MATERIALS, AND PROCESS DEVELOPMENT (1)
• ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND CLEANING PROCESSES FOR CASE AND

SOLID PROPULSION

NOZZLES(CONT):

• CORRELATION OF CHEMICAL PROPERTIES TO MECHANICAL PROPERTIES FOR CRITICAL NOZZLE MATERIALS, STRUCTURAL ADHESIVES, ABLATIVE COMPOSITES, FLEX SEAL ELASTOMERS (1)
• LOW COST ABLATIVE NOZZLE MATERIALS AND PROCESS DEVELOPMENT (1)
• DESIGN GUIDE FOR NOZZLE STRUCTURAL ADHESIVE SELECTION (2)
• CARBON-CARBON CHARACTERIZATION AND MICROMECHANICAL MODELING (1)
• CONSTITUTIVE MODELING AND FAILURE CRITERIA FOR NONINSULATORS (2)
• EROSION MODELING OF NOZZLE MATERIALS (1)
• LARGE NOZZLE 3D CARBON-CARBONITE AND BACKUP INSULATOR DEVELOPMENT AND CHARACTERIZATION (2)
PROPULSION SYSTEMS PANEL

ISSUES / TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

SOLID PROPULSION

BONDLINES/PROPELLANT:

• Material and process variability reduction (3)

• Analytically driven test technology for propellant and bondline constitutive model development (11)

• Bondline design for inspectability (4)

• Bondline structural and health monitoring methodologies (5)

• Bondline contamination studies (1)

• Propellant and bondline failure criteria (7)

• Effects of defects for bondlines (5)

• Clean solid propellant development and verification (1)

• Bondline processing protocol (repair/rework) (1)

• NDF for propellant (1)

SOLID PROPULSION

INSULATION:

• Thermoplastic elastomer (TPE) insulator fabrication technology and bondline characterization for large motors (2)

• Advanced bonding concepts for linerless insulation development (2)

• Low cost insulation performance test methodology development and correlation with motor performance (1)

• Fiber/polymer interaction tailoring for developing improved fiber for internal insulators (1)

• Sprayable solvent-free, high temperature TPE thermal protection (external) system (1)

HYBRID ROCKET PROPULSION:

• Hybrid rocket propulsion feasibility demonstration (2)
LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUBPANEL
ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED FABRICATION PROCESSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• OPTIMIZATION OF FABRICATION PROCESSES IS REQUIRED TO INCREASE YIELD AND QUALITY AND REDUCE COST</td>
<td>• FULL-SCALE COMPONENT TRIALS FOR COMBUSTION CHAMBER FABRICATION TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CURRENT SOME MCC PROCESS TIME COULD BE REDUCED BY 70%</td>
<td>• PLASMA SPRAY FORMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEMONSTRATION OF FABRICATION PROCESSES ON FULL SCALE HARDWARE IS REQUIRED TO DEFINE PROCESS LIMITATIONS AND ASSURE TRANSITION TO PRODUCTION</td>
<td>• PLATELET TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LIQUID INTERFACE DIFFUSION BONDED (LIDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TUBULAR CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CHARACTERIZATION OF IMPROVED FABRICATION PROCESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NEAR NET SHAPE FABRICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FINE-GRAINED CASTINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SUPERPLASTIC FORMING ENGINE COMPONENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MACHINING OF HIGH ASPECT RATIO COOLANT CHANNELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ELECTROFORMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• INFLATION FORMED LASER-MELED COOLANT TUBES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• JOINING PROCESS DEVELOPMENT FOR FULL-SCALE ENGINE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUBPANEL
### ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED ANALYSIS AND TEST METHODS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• INADEQUATE ANALYSIS AND CERTIFICATION TEST PROGRAMS FOR LONG LIFE ENGINE COMPONENTS AND SYSTEMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOP DURABILITY MODELING PROCEDURES IN ONE COMPUTER CODE THAT ACCOUNT FOR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CYCLIC INELASTIC CONDITIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CRACK INITIATION AND GROWTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOP TESTING METHODS TO EVALUATE THE AGING CHARACTERISTICS OF MATERIALS AND COMPONENTS IN A TIME PERIOD SIGNIFICANTLY SHORTER THAN THE ACTUAL INTENDED SERVICE LIFE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PROPELLANT-COMPATIBLE MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• EPA-DRIVEN REQUIREMENTS (ENABLING)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• FUELS FOR SPACE SYSTEMS MAY DEGRADE MATERIALS BEHAVIOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HYDROGEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SULFUR IN HYDROCARBONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NITROGEN TETROXIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HYDRAZINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MATERIALS WHICH RUB IN AN OXIDIZING ENVIRONMENT MAY IGNITE AND BURN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS DICTATE ELIMINATION OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• HYDROGEN RESISTANT MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED MATERIALS FOR RUBBING IN OXYGEN ENVIRONMENT (IMPELLERS, TURBINES, BEARINGS, ETC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ENVIRONMENTALLY COMPATIBLE MATERIALS FOR PRE-CLEANING AND FINE-CLEANING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• METHOD TO NEUTRALIZE EFFECTS OF NITROGEN TETROXIDE IN RCS VALVES AND PLUMBING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EFFECTS OF IMPURITY ADDITIONS IN HYDROGEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FUNDAMENTAL STUDY OF MATERIAL BEHAVIOR IN OXYGEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DESCRIPTION:
• IMPROVED BEARING AND SEAL MATERIAL AND FABRICATION PROCESSES

MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:
• CRYOGENIC SLIDING WEAR TESTER
  - LGX CAPABILITY
• STAGE HYDROSTATIC BEARING (1988) (SHARJAD)

BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
• TURBOPUMP BEARINGS ARE LIFE-LIMITING IN SSME
• CONTINUED IMPROVEMENT OF BEARINGS AND SEALS IS REQUIRED TO INCREASE RELIABILITY OF REUSABLE ENGINE SYSTEMS
• DEVELOPMENT OF HYDROSTATIC BEARINGS WILL PROVIDE SIMPLER DESIGNS, EASE OF MANUFACTURE AND HIGHER STIFFNESS AND DAMPING WITHOUT STEADY-STATE WEAR

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
• CONTINUE DEVELOPMENT OF ROLLING ELEMENT BEARING MATERIALS FOR CRYOGENIC APPLICATIONS
• CONTINUE DEVELOPMENT OF BEARING CAGE MATERIALS WHICH PROVIDE SOUND LUBRICATION TO THE ROLLING ELEMENTS
• DEVELOP IMPROVED SEAL MATERIALS
• INVESTIGATE MATERIALS FOR APPLICATION TO CRYOGENIC HYDROSTATIC BEARINGS
• DEVELOP FOIL BEARINGS
• CONTINUE INVESTIGATION OF DUAL PROPERTY BEARING RACE PROCESSING
• INVESTIGATE THE APPLICATION OF CERAMIC MATERIALS IN CRYOGENIC BEARINGS
• INVESTIGATE THE APPLICATION OF NANOCRYSTALLINE MATERIALS TO BEARINGS

FINDINGS:
• TECHNOLOGIES HAVE BEEN PRIORITIZED WITH A VIEW TOWARD RELATIVELY NEAR TERM REQUIREMENTS
• A SUBSTANTIAL BASE R&T PROGRAM IS ALSO REQUIRED TO ADDRESS HIGH-PAYOFF TECHNOLOGIES
• SIGNIFICANT POTENTIAL EXISTS FOR SHARING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH BURDEN WITH OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND INDUSTRY

RECOMMENDATIONS:
• A LONG-RANGE TECHNOLOGY PLAN TO DEFINE LONG-TERM PRIORITIES
• AN AGGRESSIVE INITIATIVE TO ESTABLISH TECHNOLOGY-SHARING AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS SUCH AS:
  - CERAMIC TURBINES WITH AIR FORCE
  - ELECTRIC PROPULSION WITH AF AND SDI
FINDINGS:

• MAJOR PERFORMANCE-ENHANCING TECHNOLOGIES HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED WHICH ARE NOT CLEARLY WITHIN THE PURVIEW OF MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES:
  - CFC-FREE INSULATIONS
  - GELLED PROPELLANTS

• QUAD CHARTS OF THESE TECHNOLOGIES ARE INCLUDED IN THE PANEL REPORTS

RECOMMENDATIONS:

• THESE TECHNOLOGIES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR INCORPORATION INTO THE CODE R RESEARCH PLAN

LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUBPANEL
ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH RELIABILITY CASE JOINTS/ATTACHMENTS COMPATIBLE WITH OPTIMIZED COMPOSITE DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEFICIENCIES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- JOINT DESIGNS HEAVY/STRUCTURALLY INEFFICIENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LOW RELIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- INCOMPATIBLE WITH OPTIMIZED COMPOSITE DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEMS APPLICATIONS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CRITICAL NEED FOR ALL SYSTEMS USING COMPOSITE CASES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENEFIT/SPOFFF:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IMPROVED RELIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- REDUCED WEIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- REDUCED COST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Liquid Propulsion Systems Subpanel
### Issues/Technology Requirements

#### Description:
- Characterization of material response and constitutive modeling of ablative materials
- Chemical decomposition physics
- Pyrolysis gas flow
- Material property characterization
- Develop verified models

#### Milestones and Resource Requirements:
- (EPA driven requirements) (enabling)

#### Background & Related Factors:
- Deficiencies:
  - Thermo-structural response of ablative not sufficiently understood for reliable design
  - Pore pressure generation is the underlying cause of pocketing, ply lift, wick out, delamination, etc.
  - Current state of the art in nozzle design analysis lacks explicit treatment of pore pressure
  - Improved constitutive relations are required for accurate analytical predictions and safe design

- System applications:
  - All systems using ablative tips including ARSRM, NLV, and all other solid rocket motors (potential application in entry systems)

- Benefits/payoffs:
  - This effort is the key to optimized design, improved reliability, correct material selection and lower systems development and operational costs

#### Recommended Actions:
- Design and conduct exploratory laboratory experiments to characterize key properties
- Perform analysis to support experiment design, data interpretation and model correlation
- Develop constitutive relations for thermal gas flow and structural modeling
- Determine the necessity for coupled/progressive analysis
- Construct and conduct analog experiments to validate models
- Explore the use of micromechanical models to improve analysis tractability
- Investigate the effects of property variation by characterizing alternate materials

---

#### Description:
- Process understanding and limit determination for optimization and control of nozzle components
- Tape wrapped cured ablative
- Flowable fabrics
- Adhesive bonding

#### Milestones and Resource Requirements:

#### Background & Related Factors:
- Deficiencies:
  - Material and process variable influence on critical properties is not sufficiently understood for design reliability
  - Lack of understanding of process reduces manufacturing yield

- System applications:
  - All systems including ARSRM, ASRM, TITAN, SRM, and NLV

- Benefits/payoffs:
  - This effort contributes increased reliability, reproducibility, and manufacturing yield

#### Recommended Actions:
- Perform designed experiments to identify critical properties
- Evaluate material and process variable influences on critical properties
  - Ablatives
    - Permeability
    - Interlaminar properties
    - Microstructure
    - Volatiles/Moisture
  - Flowable fabrics
    - Shroud/elastomer interfacial bonding
    - Adhesives
    - Bond strength
- Establish raw material and process limits and controls
- Verify and validate processes and controls

---
LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUBPANEL
ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

| DESCRIPTION: |
| PROPELLANT AND BONDLINE MATERIAL AND PROCESS VARIABILITY REDUCTION |
| INSULATION, LINER, ADHESIVE, AND PROPELLANT VARIABILITY DETERMINATION |
| PROCESS CONTROL AND MONITORING |
| TQM PHILOSOPHY: INTERACTION WITH MATERIAL SUPPLIERS |

| MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS: |

| BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS: |
| DEFICIENCIES: |
| IMPACT OF RAW MATERIAL VARIABILITY AND NON-CONFORMING MATERIALS ON BOND STRENGTH AND PROCESSES IS NOT FULLY KNOWN |
| LACK OF QUANTIFICATION OF PROCESS VARIABLES ON CRITICAL PROPERTIES |
| SYSTEM APPLICATION: |
| ALL CURRENT AND PROJECTED SOLID ROCKET MOTORS |
| BENEFITS/PAYOFFS: |
| REDUCED MATERIAL AND PROCESS VARIABILITY WILL LEAD TO IMPROVED RELIABILITY AND REDUCED FABRICATION COST |

| RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: |
| IDENTIFY CRITICAL MATERIALS AND ACCEPTANCE TESTS WITH SUPPLIER INTERACTION |
| CONDUCT STATISTICAL TESTS TO DEFINE DEGREE OF VARIABILITY OF COMPONENTS PROPERTIES AND EFFECT ON BONDLINE STRENGTH AND PROCESSES |
| DEVELOP A CRadle-TO-GRAVE ANALYTICAL PROCESSING MODEL TO CONTROL AND MONITOR TO A STATE (I.E. DEGREE OF CURE) NOT TIME, TEMPERATURE, PRESSURE, ETC. |
| ESTABLISHED GO-NO-GO CRITERIA |

HYBRID ENGINE OPERATION

- GAS GENERATOR
- LIQUID OXIDIZER
- SOLID FUEL
- ABLATIVE NOZZLE
- VALVE
- INJECTOR
### LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUBPANEL
### ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

#### DESCRIPTION:
- **HYBRID ROCKET BOOSTER DEMONSTRATION**
  - Develop codes and experimental data base for the design of large hybrid rocket motors
  - Demonstrate hybrid rocket motors at booster thrust levels (150k-1.5M Ib thrust)

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- **HYBRID ROCKETS OFFER:**
  - Inert handling
  - Clean exhaust
  - Elimination of explosive hazards and effects of defects in cracks and debonds
- **HYBRID ROCKETS CAN BE:**
  - Throttled
  - Shut down
- **THE COST OF HYBRID BOOSTERS IS ESTIMATED AT 80% TO 100% OF SFRS AND MUCH LOWER THAN SOLIDS.**
- **HYBRIDS USE EXISTING TECHNOLOGY FOR CASE, NOZZLE, AND LIQUID FEED SYSTEMS.**
- **HIGHER THAN SOLIDS AND EQUAL TO THAT OF LOX/HYDROCARBON.**

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:
- **TEST FACILITY CAPABLE OF:**
  - 1.5M-Ib thrust
  - 3,500 lbs/sec LOX flow @ 1200 psia

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- **CODE DEVELOPMENT AND DATA BASE AT 500-lb, 15K-lb, AND 150K-lb THRUST LEVEL (JOINT NASA/CORPORATE/RAD PROGRAMS)**
- **750K-lb THRUST DEMONSTRATION**
- **1.5M-Ib THRUST DEMONSTRATION**

#### FINDINGS:
- **INTERFACE ACROSS GOVERNMENT AGENCIES IS CRITICAL FOR TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER TO AVOID DUPLICATION OF EFFORT.**
- **CONCURRENT ENGINEERING IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE SUCCESSFUL DEVELOPMENT OF A SOLID ROCKET MOTOR SYSTEM.**
- **KEY TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS OFFERING THE POTENTIAL TO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE COST, IMPROVE RELIABILITY AND PERFORMANCE OF SOLID ROCKET MOTORS ARE COMMON ACROSS ALL SUBSYSTEMS.**
  - Understanding and control of material and process variability
  - Analytically driven test methodology development and improved constitutive models
  - Establishment of failure criteria
  - Understanding effects of defects
  - Design for inspectability
  - Environmentally driven process and technology development
- **SOLID PROPULSION INTEGRITY PROGRAM (SPIP) AND ALS LOW COST CASE INSULATION AND NOZZLE (LOCC) PROGRAMS ARE CORNERSTONES FOR TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER (COMMUNICATION WITHIN INDUSTRY).**

219
RECOMMENDATIONS:

• Form a technical steering group which contains representatives from the major propulsion houses, members from the JANNAWC structures and mechanical behavior subcommittee, the composite case subcommittee, and the rocket nozzle technology subcommittee steering groups under a charter to promote and enhance solid rocket motor technology.

• Utilize a multidisciplinary approach in preparation of research and development proposals to address technology requirements and as a criteria for funding.

• Implement thermal analysis in flexseal and phenolic mandrel tool design.

• Transfer developed nozzle design, analysis, and testing technologies through establishment of regularly scheduled seminars, handbook development, and accessible computerized data bases.

PROPULSION SYSTEMS PANEL

"BRIDGING THE GAP"

• Formalize the process for technology transfer
  - Provide guidance to technology developers in the RTOP call
    -- Major program directors/chief engineers “Top Ten” list of technology needs
  - Keep major program directors/chief engineers involved in the technology review process
    -- Review and comment on developers proposed response to technology needs list
    -- Promote technology transfer between developer and prime contractors (establish early communication links between technology developers and technology users - prime and subcontractors)
  - Use technologists as an internal consulting resource

• Build on the informal personal relationships between technology developers and technology users established in the structures and materials workshop.
## Propulsion Systems Panel

### Issues / Technology Requirements

#### Nuclear Propulsion

- NTP Fuels & Coatings (E)
- NEP Refractory Alloys (E)
- NEP Fuels (E)
- NEP Radiator Materials (E)
- NTP Nozzles (SPI)
- Turbopump Materials (SPI)
- Light-Weight Tankage / Insulation (SPI)
- Hi Temperature Thermal & Electrical Insulation (SPI)
- Pressure Vessels (SPI)
- Non-Fuel Coatings (SPI)
- Hi Temperature Seals
- Neutronic Control Materials
- Light Radiation Shielding
- Radiation Hard, Hi Temperature Electronics

### Nuclear Propulsion Subpanel

#### Issues/Technology Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Milestones and Resource Requirements</th>
<th>Recommended Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTP Fuels and Coatings</td>
<td>- Development, characterization, and expiry testing to select high temperature NTP fuel - 1998</td>
<td>- Reduce concepts by defining criteria, eliminating non-performers, downselecting, and combining designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Modify testing facilities and perform prototypical tests - 1999</td>
<td>- Start R&amp;D on common fuels &amp; coating technology issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construct nuclear furnace and test assemblies - 1999</td>
<td>- Construct testing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- R&amp;D on advanced concepts - Continuing</td>
<td>- Start R&amp;D to demonstrate evolutionary improvements in safety and performance (increase time &amp; temperature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Start fabrication and characterization development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Start prototypical fuel element testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Generate data to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support engineering decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Quality operating margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Predict reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Complete safety analyses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Background & Related Factors:

- Pyrolytic Carbon Fuels (Most experience, TRL-4) - Proven operating experience to 275 HR for 24 in HB
- Subject to thermal shock, cracking, & HI corrosion
- Plausible designs up to 900K exit temp and Targs
- Cermet Refractory Fuels (Safer, most reliable) - Robust fuel design, compatible with H2
- High fission product retention
- Low BP and thrust weight
- Particle Bed Carbon Fuels (Best Performance) - High thrust/weight, high operating temperature
- High fuel loss and fission producer release
- No experience for long life, high technology risk
- Gas phase fuels (Most “spotty”) - Containment and compatibility of gas phase fuel

#### Background & Related Factors:

- Pyrolytic Carbon Fuels (Most experience, TRL-4) - Proven operating experience to 275 HR for 24 in HB
- Subject to thermal shock, cracking, & HI corrosion
- Plausible designs up to 900K exit temp and Targs
- Cermet Refractory Fuels (Safer, most reliable) - Robust fuel design, compatible with H2
- High fission product retention
- Low BP and thrust weight
- Particle Bed Carbon Fuels (Best Performance) - High thrust/weight, high operating temperature
- High fuel loss and fission producer release
- No experience for long life, high technology risk
- Gas phase fuels (Most “spotty”) - Containment and compatibility of gas phase fuel
NUCLEAR PROPULSION SUBPANEL
ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• NEP REFRACTORY ALLOY TECHNOLOGY FOR ALL MAJOR SUBSYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LIFETIMES &gt; 2 YEARS AT TEMPERATURES &gt; 1500K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SIMILARITY WITH CANDIDATE FUELS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SIMILARITY WITH WORKING FLUENTS AND COOLANTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HIGH STRENGTH AT OPERATING TEMPERATURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RESISTANCE TO RADIATION DAMAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MANUFACTURER INTO COMPLEX COMPONENTS</td>
<td>• RECEIVE PRODUCT FORMS OF CANDIDATE MATERIALS BY 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FRACTAL Alloy TECHNOLOGY FOR ALL MAJOR SUBSYSTEMS</td>
<td>• ACQUIRE PRELIMINARY DATA BASES 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LIFETIMES &gt; 2 YEARS AT TEMPERATURES = 1500K</td>
<td>• MECHANICAL PROPERTIES TESTS AND DESIGN VALIDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WORKING FLUID AND COOLANT SIMILARITY</td>
<td>• IMPACT DAMAGE EFFECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPACT DAMAGE EFFECT</td>
<td>• WORKING FLUID AND COOLANT SIMILARITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MATEW WITH OPTIMUM ALLOY FOR REFERENCE SYSTEM DESIGN 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ACQUIRE ENGINEERING DATA BASE SUITABLE FOR APPROVAL FOR GROUND OPERATION OF REACTOR-2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• MOST CANDIDATE ALLOYS ARE NOT IN PRODUCTION NOW</td>
<td>• REDUCE CANDIDATE CONCEPTS AND SELECT CANDIDATE MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A SIGNIFICANT TECHNICAL DATA BASE EXISTS FROM THE SPACE POWER PROGRAMS (1960's) AND THE SP-100 (1980's)</td>
<td>• DEVELOP MATERIALS SPECIFICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nb AND Ta-BASED ALLOYS HAVE A HIGHER LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>• OPTIMIZE FABRICATION METHODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nb AND Ta-BASED ALLOYS HAVE A HIGHER LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>• IDENTIFY SUPPLY INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nb AND Ta-BASED ALLOYS HAVE A HIGHER LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>• GENERATE PRELIMINARY DATA BASE FOR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nb AND Ta-BASED ALLOYS HAVE A HIGHER LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>• RADIATION DAMAGE EFFECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nb AND Ta-BASED ALLOYS HAVE A HIGHER LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>• COMPATIBILITY WITH COOLANT &amp; WORKING FLUID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nb AND Ta-BASED ALLOYS HAVE A HIGHER LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>• HIGH TEMPERATURE MECHANICAL PROPERTIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nb AND Ta-BASED ALLOYS HAVE A HIGHER LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>• REFURBISH FACILITIES TO SUPPORT THE ABOVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• NEP FUELS AND CLADDINGS:</td>
<td>• DEVELOPMENT OF STABLE FUELS 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HIGH BURNUP 16-25 AT .% FOR LIQUID METAL COOLED AND 3-5 AT.% FOR GAS COOLED REACTORS</td>
<td>• LAB SCALE COMPARISON TESTING 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LOW FUEL R&amp;D RECOGNITION AND DEVELOPMENT FUELS/CLADDINGS/COMPARISON FABRICATION</td>
<td>• PROTOTYPEICAL FUEL ELEMENT TESTING 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FUEL CLADDING INTEGRITY</td>
<td>• FUEL ASSEMBLY TESTING 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HIGH OSTIC STRENGTH CLADDINGS MATERIALS</td>
<td>• SYSTEM SELECTION 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• THERMALIC FUEL ELEMENT INTEGRITY</td>
<td>• INTEGRATED GROUND ENGINEERING SYSTEM TEST FACILITY 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MECHANICAL AUTHORITY FOR NORMAL PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>• BUDGETS DEPEND ON NUMBER OF CONCEPTS, HOMEST EVAULATIONS SHOULD BE COMPLETED BEFORE CONCEPT SPECIFIC TESTING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• LIQUID METAL COOLED REACTOR FUELS</td>
<td>• REDUCE CONCEPTS BY DEFINING CRITERIA, ELIMINATING NON-PERFORMERS, DOWN SELECTING, AND COMBINING DESIGNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEMONSTRATE 40% OPERATION AT 1 AT .% BURNUP AT 1400K</td>
<td>• DEVELOP AND TEST STABLE, COMPARABLE, HIGH TEMPERATURE FUELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEMONSTRATE 40% OPERATION AT 1500K FUELS</td>
<td>• START PROTOTYPEICAL, HIGH BURNUP IMPROVEMENT TESTING PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEMONSTRATE 40% PROPERTIES AT 1500K FOR 3 YEARS</td>
<td>• CONSTRUCT GROUND TESTING FACILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEMONSTRATE 40% PROPERTIES AT 1500K FOR 3 YEARS</td>
<td>• GENERATE DATA TO:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEMONSTRATE 40% PROPERTIES AT 1500K FOR 3 YEARS</td>
<td>• SUPPORT ENGINEERING DESIGNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GAS COOLED REACTOR FUELS</td>
<td>• QUALITY OPERATING MACHINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OPERATE AT 10 AT .% FUEL FUELS WITH MATERIAL CAPABILITIES</td>
<td>• PREDICT RELIABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OPERATE AT 10 AT .% FUEL FUELS WITH MATERIAL CAPABILITIES</td>
<td>• COMPLETE SAFETY ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE MAJOR ISSUES WITH NEP REACTORS ARE THE HIGH BURNUP REQUIRED TO COMPLETE MISSION TIMES AND RELATIVELY HIGH TEMPERATURES REQUIRED TO DECREASE MASS TO POWER RATIO
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NUCLEAR PROPULSION SUBPANEL

ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

DESCRIPTION:
- LIGHT, HIGH TEMPERATURE, HIGH PERFORMANCE RADIATOR MATERIALS
  - T>1000K
  - HIGH SPECIFIC CONDUCTIVITY
  - PROTECTION FROM ALKALI METALS
  - HIGH STRENGTH/StIFFNESS
  - HIGH EMISSIVITY/COfATING

MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:
- SELECT MATERIAL SYSTEM 1985
- RADIATOR PROTOTYPE DEMONSTRATION 1990

BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- REFRACTORY METALS WELL DEVELOPED BUT HEAVY
- CARBON/CarBON COMPOSITES USING HIGH STRENGTH FIBERS DEVELOPED, BUT LOW STRAIN TO FAILURE OF HIGH CONDUCTIVITY FIBERS LIMIT FABRICATION OF COMPOSITES. LIGHTWEIGHT PROTECTION FROM ALKALI METALS ALSO A PROBLEM
- GRAPHITE/COPPER UNDER DEVELOPMENT. INTERFACIAL STRENGTH/WETING IS PROBLEM. HEAVIER THAN CARBON/CARBON NEED PROTECTION FROM ALKALI METALS

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- CARBON/Carbon
  - SELECT MOST ROBUST HIGH CONDUCTIVITY FIBER
  - DEVELOP COMPOSITE ARCHITECTURE TO REDUCE WEIGHT AND INCREASE THROUGH-THICKNESS CONDUCTIVITY
  - DEVELOP LIGHT PROTECTIVE LINER
  - OPTIMIZE SURFACE EMISSIVITY
- GRAPHITE/COPPER
  - OPTIMIZE INTERFACIAL BONDING
  - DEVELOP JOINING PROCESS
  - OPTIMIZE SURFACE EMISSIVITY
- FABRICATE SUBSCALE RADIATOR SEGMENT

PROPULSION SYSTEMS PANEL

NUCLEAR PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUBPANEL

FINDING:
- OPERATING CONDITIONS LIKELY TO BE SIGNIFICANTLY OUTSIDE CURRENT EXPERIENCE BASE
- MULTIPLECTY OF UNCERTAINTIES EFFECTING DURABILITY
- LARGE NUMBER OF MATERIALS WHICH MIGHT BE CONSIDERED FOR VARIOUS COMPONENTS
- CRITICAL MATERIALS ARE NOT AVAILABLE
  - NO LONGER PRODUCED
  - IN LABORATORY DEVELOPMENT
  - IN CONCEPTUAL STAGE ONLY
- FUNDING PRECLUDES CONCURRENT DEVELOPMENT OF MANY CANDIDATES

RECOMMENDATIONS:
- ENSURE CONCURRENT ENGINEERING BETWEEN SYSTEM DESIGN AND MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT
- ENSURE MINIMAL DUPLICATION IN QUALIFICATION OF MATERIALS BETWEEN DIFFERENT PROGRAMS AND CONTRACTORS
- ENSURE ADVANCED DESIGN METHODOLOGY/VALIDATION IS INCLUDED EARLY TO ASSURE A HIGH PERFORMANCE, DURABLE, AND SAFE DESIGN
7.2.2 Supporting Charts
SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS PANEL

ISSUES / TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

SOLID PROPULSION

• IMPLEMENTATION OF THERMAL ANALYSIS IN FLEX SEAL AND PHENOLIC MANDREL TOOL DESIGN

• NOZZLE DESIGN/ANALYSIS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER BY SEMINARS, HANDBOOK DEVELOPMENT, AND COMPUTERIZED DATA BASES

SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL

ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

FINDINGS:

• INTERFACE ACROSS GOVERNMENT AGENCIES IS CRITICAL FOR TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER TO AVOID DUPLICATION OF EFFORT

• CONCURRENT ENGINEERING IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE SUCCESSFUL DEVELOPMENT OF A SOLID ROCKET MOTOR SYSTEM

• KEY TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS OFFERING THE POTENTIAL TO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE COST, IMPROVE RELIABILITY AND PERFORMANCE OF SOLID ROCKET MOTORS ARE COMMON ACROSS ALL SUBSYSTEMS
  - UNDERSTANDING AND CONTROL OF MATERIAL AND PROCESS VARIABILITY
  - ANALYTICALLY DRIVEN TEST METHODOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVED CONSTITUTIVE MODELS
  - ESTABLISHMENT OF FAILURE CRITERIA
  - UNDERSTANDING EFFECTS OF DEFECTS
  - DESIGN FOR INSPECTABILITY
  - ENVIRONMENTALLY DRIVEN PROCESS AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

• SOLID PROPULSION INTEGRITY PROGRAM (SPIP) AND ALS LOW COST CASE INSULATION AND NOZZLE (LOCCIN) PROGRAMS ARE CORNERSTONES FOR TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER (COMMUNICATION WITHIN INDUSTRY)
SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL
ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Form a technical steering group which contains representatives from the major propulsion houses, members from the JANNAF Structures and Mechanical Behavior Subcommittee, the Composite Case Subcommittee, and the Rocket Nozzle Technology Subcommittee steering groups under a charter to promote and enhance solid rocket motor technology.

- Utilize a multidisciplinary approach in preparation of research and development proposals to address technology requirements and as a criteria for funding.

- Implement thermal analysis in Flexseal and phenolic mandrel tool design.

- Transfer developed nozzle design, analysis, and testing technologies through establishment of regularly scheduled seminars, handbook development, and accessible computerized data bases.

DESCRIPTION:

- High reliability case joints/attachments compatible with optimized composite design

BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:

- Deficiencies:
  - Joint designs heavy/structurally inefficient
  - Low reliability
  - Incompatible with optimized composite design

- Systems applications:
  - Critical need for all systems using composite cases

- Benefits/payoffs:
  - Improved reliability
  - Reduced weight
  - Reduced cost

MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

- Develop case designs which minimize or eliminate joints
- Optimize joint designs compatible with composites eliminate holes, minimize local reinforcements
- Fabricate/test joint designs
### SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL
### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

#### DESCRIPTION:
- Composites Material Process Design and Analysis Methodology
- Development of Material Test Methods
- Failure Criteria and Effects of Defects
- Composites Case Process Modeling
- Design Guide for Composite Rocket Motor Cases

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- Deficiencies:
  - Lack of standards for case design/analysis
  - Current modeling procedures are inadequate
  - High cost of full-scale testing
  - Material property definition is inadequate
  - Current failure criteria are inadequate
  - Scaling phenomena must be understood
  - Analysis and test data are not available for determining effect of defects
  - Need to consider alternative manufacturing methods (e.g., inflatable materials)
  - Need to address residual stresses from manufacturing
- System applications:
  - All 36 in. utilizing filament wound cases
  - Benefits and payoffs:
    - Standardization to streamline design and verification process
    - More optimum designs and lower cost of development

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Assemble interdisciplinary team of experts in case design/analysis/test
- Develop consensus and document relevant theories of behavior as fundamental basis for design/analysis/test
- Define comprehensive test requirements
- Design/analyze/test analog experiments for case design verification
- Develop a comprehensive material property database
- Conduct analytical correlation to unify analog, sub-scale, and full-scale case response with material property database
- Develop verified failure criteria
- Explore the effects of defects
- Document technology in the form of a design guide

---

#### DESCRIPTION:
- Case Material/ Material forms suitable for environmentally safe, low-cost, reliable and high-rate production

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- Deficiencies:
  - Material forms potentially unsafe, not suitable for high-rate production
  - Process sensitive
  - Systems applications: critical for all composite structures including cases
  - Benefits/payoffs:
    - Reduced production cost
    - Environmentally safe materials
    - Improved performance and reliability

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Develop low cost/high performance environmentally-safe fiber/resin systems
- Develop process insensitive materials forms suitable for high-rate production
- Demonstrate high-rate case production capabilities using analog cases

---

227
## SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL

### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CASE EQUIPMENT/PROCESS SUITABLE FOR LOW COST/HIGH RATE PRODUCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:

**DEFICIENCIES:**

- SLOW/COSTY, LIMITED IN-PROCESS CONTROL
- SYSTEMS APPLICATIONS:
  - APPROPRIATE TO FABRICATION FOR ALL COMPOSITE STRUCTURES, INCLUDING CASES

**BENEFITS/PAYOFFS:**

- IMPROVED RELIABILITY
- REDUCED COSTS
- HIGH-RATE PRODUCTION

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

- EVALUATE B.O.A IN COMMERCIAL COMPOSITE PRODUCTION SECTOR
- SELECT/DEVELOP OPTIMUM EQUIPMENT/PROCESS FOR LOW-COST, HIGH-RELIABILITY CASE PRODUCTION INCLUDING IN-LINE PROCESS CONTROL/INSPECTION
- DEMONSTRATE TECHNOLOGY FOR SUB- AND FULL-SCALE ANALOG CASES

---

### DESCRIPTION:

• COMPOSITE CASE ANALYSIS CODE DEVELOPMENT
  - A CODE WHICH APPLIES THE RESULTS OF TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT IN THE AREA OF PREDICTING STRUCTURAL RESPONSE OF ROCKET MOTOR CASES
  - CODE TO EMULATE THE "CASE", BUT TO CONTAIN ACCURATE SUB-MODELS OF GRAN, INBLULATOR, BOND-LINE AND ATTACHMENT STRUCTURES
  - THE GOAL IS A STANDARDIZED CODE THAT PREDICTS CASE RESPONSE VERY ACCURATELY

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:

**DEFICIENCIES:**

- NON-STANDARD METHODOLOGY
- DIFFICULTY IN USING DESIGN DATA TO CREATE ADEQUATE MODELS
- INADEQUATE MATERIAL PROPERTY SYNTHESIS AND NONLINEAR THEORIES
- INADEQUATE ACCOUNTING FOR LARGE DEFORMATION AND ROTATION EFFECTS
- UNSUBSTANTIATED FAILURE CRITERIA
- UNKNOWN IN SITU MATERIAL PROPERTIES
- BUILDUPS NOT PREDICTABLE
- POOR SHEAR PLY MODELS FOR J OINT AND BOX REGIONS
- 3D VS 2D, HOLE ATTACHMENTS
- POOR MODELING OF JOINTS
- INTERFACE TO COMMERCIAL SOFTWARE (CAD NEEDED)

**INITIAL CONDITIONS FOR ANALYSIS NEED TO REFLECT PROCESSING HISTORY (E.G., RESIDUAL STRESS, MANUFACTURING DEFORMATION, ETC.)**

**EXISTING APPLICATIONS:**

- APPLIES TO ALL BCE AND ROCKET MOTOR CASE REQUIREMENTS AND COMPOSITE FUEL TANKS

**BENEFITS AND PAYOFFS:**

- MORE ACCURATE ANALYSIS
- IMPROVED DESIGN EFFICIENCY
- PROMOTES PERFORMANCE UPGRADES AND CONTRIBUTES TO ENHANCED RELIABILITY

### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

**RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:**

- PHASE 1 PROGRAM TO ADDRESS STANDARDIZATION, USER FEATURES AND INTEGRATION WITH MULTIPLE COMMERCIAL SOFTWARE PACKAGES IN THE CAD AND CASE AREAS. USER FEATURES TO INCLUDE RAPID GEOMETRY DEFINITION LINKED TO DESIGN FEATURE, AUTOMATED MESH GENERATION, MATERIAL PROPERTY GENERATION USING MICRO-MECHANICS AND COMPUTERIZED DATA BASES, INTERFACE TO BACKLIP-PROCDING FOR PLY STRESS, FIBER STRESSES AND STRAINS
- PHASE 2 PROGRAM TO ADDRESS NONLINEAR MATERIAL BEHAVIOR (ANISOTROPY, SHEARPLY, AND SUBLINE INTERFACES, SLIDING AND ROLLING OF JOINTS, LARGE DEFORMATIONS, NEAR IMPOSSIBILITY FOR GRAN AND LOW SHEAR MODULUS MATERIALS, CRAZING, ETC.). PHASE 2 SHOULD BE COORDINATED WITH AN EXPLORATORY TEST DRIVEN TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM. IT SHOULD ALSO BE DEVELOPED IN CONCERT WITH SUBSCALE TEST DATA
- PHASE 3 PROGRAM TO ADDRESS FAILURE CRITERIA, FRACTURE MECHANICS PROBABILISTIC PHENOMENA, IN SITU MATERIAL PROPERTIES, MODELING MANUFACTURING EFFECTS (E.G., RESIDUAL STRESS), OPTIMIZATION. PHASE 3 SHOULD DEMONSTRATE ACCURATE PREDICTION OF FULL-SCALE CASE RESPONSE AND CONNECT TO COUPON AND SUBSCALE DATA.
# Solid Propulsion Systems Sub-Panel
## Issue/Technology Requirement

### Description:
- Self Insulating Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background &amp; Related Factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficiencies:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Costly Multi-Step Insulation and Case Fabrication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential Bondline Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems Applications:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All Systems Using Composite Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits/Payoffs:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Eliminates Bondline Failure Thereby Improving Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduced Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones and Resources Requirements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Actions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop Self-Insulating Case Material/Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fabricate/Demonstrate Sub- and Full-Scale Cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description:
- Low Cost/Rapid Turn-Around Case Tooling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background &amp; Related Factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficiencies:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tooling Cost Excessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Require Long Lead Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incapable of Assisting Process Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems Applications:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All Systems Using Composite Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits/Payoffs:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduced Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rapid Turn-Around</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones and Resources Requirements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Actions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop Low Cost/High Rate Tooling Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fabricate/Demonstrate Sub- and Full-Scale Tooling Concepts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL
ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Characterization of material response and constitutive models of ablative materials</td>
<td>• Design and conduct exploratory laboratory experiments to characterize key properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chemical decomposition physics</td>
<td>• Perform analyses to support experiment design, data interpretation and model correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pyrolysis gas flow</td>
<td>• Develop constitutive relations for thermal, gas flow and structural modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Material property characterization</td>
<td>• Explore the use of micromechanical models to improve analysis tractability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop verified models</td>
<td>• Determine the necessity for coupled/progressive analyses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Deficiencies</td>
<td>• Conduct designed experiments to identify critical properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thermomechanical response of ablative materials not sufficiently understood for reliable design</td>
<td>• Evaluate material and process variable influences on critical properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thermal-structural response of ablative materials not sufficiently understood for reliable design</td>
<td>• Ablatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Porous pressure generation is the underlying cause of rocketing, plume lift, wedge-out, delamination, etc.</td>
<td>• Permeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current state-of-the-art in nozzle design analysis lacks explicit treatment of pore pressure</td>
<td>• Interlaminar properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved constitutive relations are required for accurate analytical predictions and safe designs</td>
<td>• Microstructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• System applications</td>
<td>• Volatiles/Moisture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All systems using ablative TPS including RSRM, ASRM, HS1, and all other solid rocket motors (potential application in entry systems)</td>
<td>• Flexseal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Benefits/Payoffs:</td>
<td>• Shime/lastomer interfacial bonding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This effort is the key to optimized design; improved reliability, correct material selection and lower systems development and operational costs</td>
<td>• Adhesives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Process understanding and limit determination for optimization and control of nozzle components</td>
<td>• Establish raw material and process limits and controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tape wrapped/cured ablative</td>
<td>• Verify and validate processes and controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexseal fabrication</td>
<td>• Benefits/Payoffs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adhesive bonding</td>
<td>• This effort contributes increased reliability, reproducibility, and manufacturing yield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Deficiencies</td>
<td>• Perform designed experiments to identify critical properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Material and process variable influence on critical properties is not sufficiently understood for desired reliability</td>
<td>• Evaluate material and process variable influences on critical properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of understanding of process reduces manufacturing yield</td>
<td>• Ablatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• System applications:</td>
<td>• Permeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All systems including RSRM, ASRM, Titan, SMM, and NLY</td>
<td>• Interlaminar properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Benefits/Payoffs:</td>
<td>• Microstructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This effort contributes increased reliability, reproducibility, and manufacturing yield</td>
<td>• Volatiles/Moisture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Solid Propulsion Systems Sub-Panel

## Issue/Technology Requirement

### Description:
- **Nozzle Failure Criteria**
- **Criteria to Assess Performance**
- **Assess Variability as Related to Material Issues**
- **Define Inherent Defects**
- **Relate Defects to Performance**
- **Determine Best NDE for Detection of These Defects**
- **Evaluate Reliability of NDE Detection**
- **Develop System Performance Related Acceptance Criteria**
- **Develop Nominal/Process History Traceability**
- **Utilize Above to Sort Aging Effects**

### Background & Related Factors:
- **Deficiencies**
  - There are no commonly accepted formulations for failure criteria of carbonphenolics
  - Current NDE is not related to known defects
  - Multiaxial, off-axis, and fracture mechanics data are really lacking
  - Evidence with manufacturing variables on material property variation is unknown
  - Current acceptance criteria for nozzle structures are based on subjective rules rather than understandings of physical and chemical aspects of failure
  - Materials and process variations are difficult to trace during discrepancy review
- **System Application**
  - All ram systems which use ablative thermal protection systems
- **Benefits/Payoffs**
  - Includes improved reliability, improved design analysis, higher confidence margins, and improved inspection capability

### Milestones and Resources Requirements:

### Recommended Actions:
- **Define Material Requirements**
- **Engineer Materials which are insensitive to raw material and process variations (target throat and exit cone)**
- **Evaluate Candidate Material Systems**
- **Pan/Fiber, PAN/PAN**
- **Alternative Architectures**
- **Noncondensate Resin/High Char Yield**
- **Low Density Exit Cones**
- **Hardware Demonstration/Validation**

---

### Description:
- **Robust Ablative Nozzle Material and Process Development**

### Background & Related Factors:
- **Deficiencies**
  - Current materials are defect and process sensitive
  - Promising candidates exist but warrant maturation of material and process control
- **System Application**
  - Current and projected launch vehicle (SRM, ASRM, Titan, SMAV, and Delta)
  - Incorporate ablative nozzle component
- **Benefits/Payoffs**
  - Contribute increased reliability, reproducibility, and manufacturing yield

### Milestones and Resources Requirements:

### Recommended Actions:
## SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL
### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• NOZZLE THERMSTRUCTURAL CODE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CODE REQUIREMENTS DEFINITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CODE DEVELOPMENT - 2D/3D COUPLED NONLINEAR HEAT TRANSFER, PYROLYSIS GAS GENERATION AND FLOW, AND STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS CAPABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:**

- **DESCRIPTION:**
  - BOLD ROCKET MOTOR ANALYSIS COMMUNITY BELIEVES THAT THE ONLY VALID SOLUTION METHODOLOGY FOR ANALYZING SLS NOZZLES IS A COUPLED HEAT TRANSFER, PYROLYSIS GAS GENERATION AND FLOW, AND BRIEF STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS SOLUTION.
  - A SIMIO NEED EXISTS TO DEVELOP HUMANE TECHNIQUES THAT EMPO USE NEW MATERIAL CONSTRUCTIVE OUTLINE, DIAGRAM DECOMPOSITION MODELS, PYROLYSIS GAS FLOW MODELS AND WHICH EXPLICITLY ACCOUNT FOR PYROLYSIS GAS FLOW AND STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.
  - CURRENT SOFTWARE TOOLS CAN NOT PERFORM THE JOB.
  - SYSTEMS APPLICATIONS:
    - ALL SOLID ROCKET MOTORS WHICH USE ABLATIVE TIP.

- **BENEFIT OR PAYOFF:**
  - THIS EFFORT WILL DEVELOP THE NECESSARY SOFTWARE TOOLS FOR ACCURATELY PREDICTING THE THERMORSTRUCTURAL RESPONSE OF NOZZLE UNDER MATERIALS. IT WILL REDUCE OPERATIONAL AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND IMPROVE RELIABILITY.

**RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:**

- IDENTIFY THE EXTENT OF NECESSARY COUPLING BETWEEN THE VARIOUS DISCIPLINES.
- EFFECT OF STRESS STATE ON PERMEABILITY.
- EFFECT OF MECHANICAL STRAIN ON PORE PRESSURE.
- EFFECT OF STRESS STATE ON THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY.
- DEFINE THE NUMERICAL TECHNIQUES AND SOLUTION ALGORITHMS.
- JUDGE WHETHER PATH DEPENDENCIES ARE REQUIRED.
- THE CODE SHOULD BE BUILT IN STAGES, MODELING THE SIMPLEST SCHEMES FIRST, FOLLOWED BY THE INCORPORATION OF MORE COMPLEX, COUPLED PHENOMENA ONCE THE CODE HAS REACHED A SUFFICIENT LEVEL OF MATURITY.
- THE EFFORT WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED BY A MULTI-COMPANY TEAM COMPOSED OF EXPERTS IN THE VARIOUS DISCIPLINES ALONG WITH CONSULTANTS FROM GOVERNMENT AND UNIVERSITIES.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• NOZZLE DESIGN METHODOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEVELOP A TESTING AND CORRELATIVE ANALYSIS PHILOSOPHY WHICH CAN BE USED TO VERIFY AN IMPROVED DESIGN ANALYSIS METHOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EVALUATE NEW MATERIALS (E.G., PAN, BRAID, LFP, PAA AND NOVEL DESIGN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- INCORPORATE PORE PRESSURE DRIVEN ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY AND DEVELOP REQUIRED MATERIAL PROPERTIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:**

- **DESCRIPTION:**
  - CURRENT BGA THERMORSTRUCTURAL ANALYSES ARE DESIGNED TO JUST MEET MINIMUM CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS AND DO NOT REALLY IMPACT DESIGN DECISIONS.
  - NEEDS EXIST TO VERIFY ANALYSIS RESULTS.
  - SENSITIVITY TO MATERIAL AND PROCESS PARAMETERS IS POORLY UNDERSTOOD, SELECTING NEW MATERIALS FOR FUTURE NOZZLES IS RISKY.
  - THE POTENTIAL OF NEW MATERIALS IS POORLY TO DETERMINE BORING MEASURES ARE INADEQUATE.
  - AFFECTS RELIABILITY, FABRICATION COST, MATERIAL SELECTION, PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY, COST.

- **SYSTEM APPLICATIONS:**
  - ALL SRL ABLATIVE NOZZLES (MPAL, ASML, ALL, MB, ETC.).

- **BENEFIT OR PAYOFF:**
  - THIS IS KEY TO IMPROVED RELIABILITY, OPTIMIZED DESIGNS, PROPER MATERIAL SELECTION ENABLING IMPROVED PRODUCIBILITY, WEIGHT MINIMIZATION, LOWER FABRICATION COST.

**RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:**

- DEVELOP A SERIES OF ANALOG TESTS WHERE EACH TEST ISOLATES A PARTICULAR PHYSICAL EVENT UNDER KNOWN BOUNDARY CONDITIONS SO THAT ANALYSIS CAN BE VERIFIED INCORRECTLY.
- ANALYSIS OF ANALOGS SHOULD BE ITERATIVE WITH UPDATING OF THE ASSUMPTIONS AND APPROACH UNTIL GOOD CORRELATION IS OBTAINED.
- DEVELOP SENSITIVITY DATA THROUGH EXTENSIVE PARAMETRIC STUDIES. IDENTIFY USEFUL THEORETICAL DESCRIPTIONS OF TRENDS.
- UTILIZE BEST POSSIBLE CODE COMPARISONS.
- EXTEND MODELING METHODS TO NEW NOZZLE CONCEPTS.
- CONDUCT INTERACTIVE PROGRAMS BETWEEN MATERIAL/TEST ANALYSIS FOR DESIGN EVOLUTION.
- DOCUMENT MATERIAL PROPERTY AND CODE INPUT DATA BASE.
- CHARACTERIZE PORE PRESSURE DRIVEN PROPERTIES FOR "NEW" MATERIALS.
- VERIFY ANALYSIS WITH HIGHLY INSTRUMENTED SUB SCALE MOTOR FIRING.
**SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL**
**ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• LIGHTWEIGHT, LOW TORQUE FLEX BEARING DESIGN, MATERIALS AND PROCESS DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:**
- **DEFICIENCIES:**
  - CURRENT FLEXSEALS ARE PROCESS SENSITIVE
  - NOT OPTIMIZED FOR PERFORMANCE (WEIGHT, TORQUE)
  - NEW ELASTOMER AND SHIM MATERIALS AND FLEXSEAL DESIGN CONCEPTS ARE AVAILABLE TO OPTIMIZE PERFORMANCE AND REDUCE VARIABILITY

**SYSTEM APPLICATION:**
- ALL LARGE SOLID ROCKET MOTORS AND ETO BOOSTERS
- BENEFIT OR PAYOFF:
  - IMPROVED RELIABILITY
  - REDUCED SYSTEM WEIGHT YIELDS INCREASED PAYLOAD CAPABILITY AND LOWER COST TO ORBIT

**RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:**
- DEFINE REQUIREMENTS
- ENGINEER MATERIALS AND PROCESSES TO OPTIMIZE PERFORMANCE
- EVALUATE CANDIDATES
  - HIGH STRENGTH/HIGH-STRAIN ELASTOMERS
  - HIGH STRENGTH SHIMS
- IMPROVED AND AUTOMATED PROCESSING (INJECTION)
- HARDWARE DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND CLEANING PROCESSES FOR CASE AND NOZZLE BONDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CHEMISTRY REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FACILITY REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:**
- **DEFICIENCIES:**
  - ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION LIMIT USE OF VAPOR DE-GREASERS
  - OTHER SOLVENT SYSTEMS HAVE SAFETY AND EFFICIENCY ISSUES
  - PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF NASA CRITICAL TO CONTINUED SUPPORT

**SYSTEM APPLICATION:**
- ALL SRM CLEANING APPLICATIONS
- BENEFIT OR PAYOFF:
  - IMPROVED RELIABILITY
  - ENABLING TECHNOLOGY

**RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:**
- INVOLVE CONTRACTORS AND NASA TECHNOLOGY CENTERS
- INVESTIGATE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER FROM AUTOMOTIVE APPLICATIONS
- INCLUDE CORROSION RESISTANCE, BOND STRENGTH AND MANUFACTURABILITY IN STUDY
## SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL
### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

### DESCRIPTION:
- Correlation of chemical properties to mechanical properties for critical materials
  - Structural adhesives
  - FlexSeal elastomers ablative composites

### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- **DEFICIENCIES:**
  - Relationship between receiving inspection and material performance is unquantified
  - Material variations have detrimental, undocumented effects on component performance
  - Failure investigations unable to gather needed data from after the fact efforts
- **SYSTEM APPLICATION:**
  - All SRM systems
- **BENEFIT OR PAYOFF:**
  - Improved reliability
  - Reduced fabrication costs

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Characterize critical materials, adhesives, ablative, nozzle elastomers
- Determine optimum method of instrumental analysis
- Perform designed experiment to correlate analysis to material performance characteristics
- Establish statistical data base for each critical material

### DESCRIPTION:
- Low cost ablative nozzle materials and process development
  - Innovative designs and material/structures architectures
  - Raw materials
  - Processes
  - Life cycle cost definition/assessment

### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- **DEFICIENCIES:**
  - Current systems employ expensive raw materials which require complex processes
  - Cost and reliability are drivers for new launch systems
  - New materials and processes are required to meet reduced cost goals
- **SYSTEM APPLICATION:**
  - Future systems upgrades including RSRM, ASRM, Titan and NLS
- **BENEFIT OR PAYOFF:**
  - Reduced cost
  - Increased reliability

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Define material requirements
- Engineer materials which contribute to reduced cost
- Evaluate candidate material systems
  - Low cost fibers
  - Net shape fabrication
  - Injection molding
- Hardware demonstration/validation

---
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### SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL

#### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DESIGN GUIDE FOR NOZZLE STRUCTURAL ADHESIVE SELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RECOMMENDED SELECTION TEAM STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RECOMMENDED SELECTION PARAMETERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SCREENING TEST METHODS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OPTIMIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEFICIENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• &quot;EXPERT&quot; OPINION USED IN THE PAST TO SELECT ADHESIVES, NO OPTIMIZATION PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• REQUIREMENT FOR SIMILARITY TO PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS LIMITED CHOICE OF MATERIALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPORTANT SELECTION CRITERIA ARE NEGLECTED IN DECISION PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SYSTEM APPLICATION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ALL NEW SRM NOZZLES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ADHESIVE REPLACEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BENEFIT OR PAYOFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED RELIABILITY FROM ROBUST DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED PRODUCTION TIME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• APPLY CONCURRENT TEAMS TO SELECTION PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USE ANALYSIS CODES IN PRELIMINARY SELECTION PHASE TO ESTABLISH PROPERTY REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DOCUMENT ACTUAL SELECTION PROCESS IN A DESIGN GUIDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESCRIPTION:

- CARBON-CARBON CHARACTERIZATION AND MICROCHEMICAL MODELING
- DATA FOR ADVANCED MODELING (2D/3D)
- EFFECTS OF DEFECTS/ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA
- MATERIALS DATA BASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEFICIENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ASRM ITE REJECTED IN PART DUE TO NEGATIVE MARGINS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TECHNOLOGY DOES NOT EXIST TO UTILIZE AND DESIGN 3D CC ITE AND OTHER CARBON-CARBON STRUCTURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ANALYSIS INCONSISTENT WITH EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DATA BASE DOES NOT EXIST FOR DESIGN (PARTIAL 2D/POOR 3D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ENABLING TECHNOLOGY, IMPROVED RELIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SYSTEM APPLICATION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SRM SYSTEMS WHICH USE CARBON-CARBON COMPONENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NASP AND OTV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BENEFIT OR PAYOFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED RELIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEM APPLICATION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED RELIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ITERATIVE ANALYSIS/TEST PROGRAM FOR IMPROVED PREDICTION CAPABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PROGRAM FOR CHARACTERIZATION OF EFFECTS OF DEFECTS, AND RELATIONSHIP TO NDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOPMENT OF A PHYSICAL, MECHANICAL AND THERMAL PROPERTIES DATA BASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL

### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

#### DESCRIPTION:
- Erosion modeling of nozzle materials
- Particle erosion: mechanical and chemical mechanisms
- Particle radiation: data and models are lacking
- Chemical reactions at surface: equilibrium or kinetically controlled
- Surface convective boundary condition: turbulent, roughwall regime

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- Deficiencies:
  - Surface cannot be predicted with accuracy without resort to empirically determined adjustment factors: demonstrated in firing and flight
- System application:
  - All SRM systems, particularly NL8 boosters
- Benefit or payoff:
  - More accurate prediction of performance and insight into material improvements, resulting in improved reliability

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Construct and conduct experiments to explore:
  - Particle impact on charring ablatives
  - Radiation heat load at surface
  - Char-gas chemistry
  - Convective heat transfer
  - Laboratory, arc-jet and/or ground test
  - Analyze data and construct models
  - Validate models through analog and/or predictions of ground firings
  - Disseminate computer code modules

### DESCRIPTION:
- Constitutive modeling and failure criteria for non-stabilizers
- Measure flex bearing elastomeric material response
- Develop constitutive relations for flex bearings
- Obtain strength properties for adhesives
- Develop failure criteria for adhesives used in nozzle bondlines

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- Deficiencies:
  - There is currently no universally accepted approach for modeling the structural response of nozzle bondlines, some analysts model the bondline as a continuum, while others model the bondlines with spring elements
  - There is currently no universally accepted failure criteria for nozzle bondlines
  - There is a lack of material properties to support proposed constitutive models and failure criteria for adhesives used in nozzle bondlines
  - There is no universally accepted approach for modeling nozzle flex bearings. Some nozzle manufacturers model the elastomeric material used in flex bearings as a linear elastic material, while in fact, these materials are not linearly elastic
  - There is a lack of available material response properties to support proposed constitutive models for elastomers used in flex bearings
  - The stiffening of nozzle flex bearings is generally not well predicted. The true stiffening of a flex bearing is not known. The flex bearing is built and tested
- System application:
  - All solid rocket motors
  - Benefit or payoff:
  - Improved reliability
  - Reduced development cost

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- The appropriate form of the constitutive relations for adhesives used as nozzle bondlines should be determined through experimental methods
- Constitutive coefficients for adhesive bondlines should be determined
- A number of different forms of a failure criteria for nozzle bondlines should be investigated
- Testing should be conducted in order to select the appropriate form of the failure criteria and to determine the strength parameters for adhesives used as nozzle bondlines
- Constitutive relations for elastomeric materials should be investigated
- Tests should be conducted to determine the appropriate form of the constitutive relations and to determine the constitutive coefficients for bondlines and elastomeric materials

---
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### SOLID PROPELLION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL

#### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• LARGE NOZZLE CARBON CARBONITE AND BACKUP INSULATOR DEVELOPMENT AND CHARACTERIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOP THE TECHNOLOGY REQUIRED TO DESIGN, ANALYZE, CHARACTERIZE AND PROCESS LARGE CARBON CARBONITE WITH OPTIMAL PROPERTIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MATERIALS CHARACTERIZATION, DESIGN AND ANALYSIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PROCESS UNDERSTANDING AND OPTIMIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PRODUCT VERIFICATION</td>
<td>• NON-DEGRADING THERMAL STRUCTURAL INSULATOR DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEFICIENCIES</td>
<td>THREE CURRENT TASKS COMPRIS THE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• INABILITY TO ACCURATELY ANALYZE 3D C-C MATERIALS</td>
<td>• TASK 1 - MATERIAL CHARACTERIZATION, DESIGN AND ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• INABILITY TO EXPERIMENTALLY OBTAIN NONORTHOGONAL PROPERTIES</td>
<td>• EXPLORATORY TESTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PROCESSING SCALE UP ISSUES ARE UNKNOWN</td>
<td>• STRESS-STRAIN MODEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• INSPECTION TECHNIQUES LIMITED EFFECTS OF DEFECTS NOT UNDERSTOOD</td>
<td>• FAILURE CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MATERIALS DATA BASE IS LIMITED; NO DATA EXISTS ON NEW FIBER SYSTEMS</td>
<td>• CHARACTERIZATION, TEST METHODOLOGY AND DATA GENERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FAILURE CRITERIA ARE INSUFFICIENT</td>
<td>• TASK 2 - PROCESS UNDERSTANDING AND OPTIMIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SYSTEM APPLICATION</td>
<td>• CONSTITUENT MATERIAL AND PROCESS DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FUTURE SM SYSTEMS AND UPGRADES TO ORBITAL TRANSFER VEHICLES WITH SOLID, LIQUID OR NUCLEAR PROPULSION</td>
<td>• PROCESS MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND VERIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BENEFIT OR PAYOFF</td>
<td>• PROCESS/PROPERTY SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED ANALYTICAL AND MATERIAL TESTING CAPABILITIES FOR ALL CARBON-CARBONITE</td>
<td>• TASK 3 - PRODUCT VERIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ADVANCED INSPECTION TECHNIQUES AND RELIABILITY ASSESSMENT CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>• ACCEPTANCE TEST DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PROVIDE NEW MATERIALS WITH INHERENTLY HIGHER SAFETY MARGINS</td>
<td>• DOE TECHNIQUE AND ADVANCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ADVANCED CARBON-CARBON TECHNOLOGY ENABLING APPLICATION TO NEW SYSTEMS</td>
<td>• EFFECTS OF DEFECTS CHARACTERIZATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PROPELLANT AND BONDLINE MATERIAL AND PROCESS VARIABILITY REDUCTION</td>
<td>• NON-DEGRADING THERMAL STRUCTURAL INSULATOR DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• INSULATION, LINER, ADHESIVE, AND PROPELLANT VARIABILITY DETERMINATION</td>
<td>• MATERIALS CHARACTERIZATION, DESIGN AND ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PROCESS CONTROL AND MONITORING</td>
<td>• EXPLORATORY TESTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TOM PHILOSOPHY: INTERACTION WITH MATERIAL SUPPLIERS</td>
<td>• STRESS-STRAIN MODEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEFICIENCIES</td>
<td>• IDENTIFY CRITICAL MATERIALS AND ACCEPTANCE TESTS WITH SUPPLIER INTERACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPACT OF RAW MATERIAL VARIABILITY AND NON-CONFORMING MATERIALS ON BONDLINE STRENGTH AND PROCESSES IS NOT FULLY KNOWN</td>
<td>• CONDUCT STATISTICAL TESTS TO DEFINE DEGREE OF VARIABILITY OF COMPONENTS PROPERTIES AND EFFECT ON BONDLINE STRENGTH AND PROCESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LACK OF QUANTIFICATION OF PROCESS VARIABLES ON CRITICAL PROPERTIES</td>
<td>• DEVELOP A GRADE-TO-GRADE ANALYTICAL PROCESSING MODEL TO CONTROL AND MONITOR TO A STATE (E.G. DEGREE OF CURE) NOT TIME, TEMPERATURE, PRESSURE, ETC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SYSTEM APPLICATIONS:</td>
<td>• ESTABLISHED GOING-DO CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ALL CURRENT AND PROJECTED SOLID ROCKET MOTORS</td>
<td>• REDUCED MATERIAL AND PROCESS VARIABILITY WILL LEAD TO IMPROVED RELIABILITY AND REDUCED FABRICATION COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BENEFIT/PAYOFFS:</td>
<td>• REDUCED MATERIAL AND PROCESS VARIABILITY WILL LEAD TO IMPROVED RELIABILITY AND REDUCED FABRICATION COST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

## DESCRIPTION:
- **Analytically Driven Test Technology for Propellant and Bondline Constitutive Model Development**
  - Develop standardized test techniques
  - Evaluate propellant/bondline response
  - Develop models and incorporate into structural codes to determine effect on design margins of safety/structural integrity

## MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- **Deficiencies:**
  - Current test data typically used in analyses inadequate to describe propellant and bondline behavior under actual loading conditions
  - Models and constitutive theory development limited by inability to measure propellant/bondline behavior under real loading conditions
  - Multi-axial and microstructural test technology currently available too costly to be practical

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Survey literature for current multi-axial and microstructural test techniques
- Develop low cost test techniques for multi-axial propellant/bondline characterization
- Develop test techniques to examine micro- and macrostructural behavior under actual motor stress/thermal conditions
- Develop models/constitutive theory to describe multi-axial and microstructural propellant behavior
- Compare predicted theoretical behavior with data covering a broad range of measured behavior
- Incorporate models/constitutive theory into structural analyses codes/methodologies.

---

## DESCRIPTION:
- **Analytically Driven Test Technology**
  - Insulation, Liner, Adhesive, and Propellant Variability Determination
  - Process Control and Monitoring
  - TOM Philosophy: Interaction with Material Suppliers

## MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- **Deficiencies:**
  - Impact of raw material variability and non-conforming materials on bond strength and processes is not fully known
  - Lack of quantification of process variables on critical properties
  - System applications: All current and projected solid rocket motors

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Identify critical materials and acceptance tests with supplier interaction
- Conduct statistical tests to define degree of variability of components properties and effect on bondline strength and processes
- Develop a cradle-to-grave analytical processing model to control and monitor to a state (i.e. degree of cure) not time, temperature, pressure, etc.
- Established go/no-go criteria

---
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### SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL
### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

#### DESCRIPTION:
- **BONDLINE DESIGN FOR INSPECTABILITY**
- **ASSURE ACCESSIBILITY FOR NONBY**
- **MODIFYING EXISTING DESIGNS**
- **ADAPTING EXISTING NDE METHODOLOGIES**
- **USING EMBEDDED SMART SENSORS**

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- **DEFICIENCIES:**
  - CURRENT BONDLINE DESIGN IS BASED ON PERFORMANCE VS. COST AND SAFETY VS. DESIGN MARGINS WITH MINIMAL CONSIDERATION GIVEN TO THE ABILITY TO VERIFY BONDLINE INTEGRITY PRIOR TO LAUNCH
  - **SYSTEM APPLICATIONS:**
    - ALL SOLID ROCKET MOTORS
- **BENEFITS/PAYOFFS:**
  - IMPROVED RELIABILITY OF BONDLINE SYSTEMS
  - REDUCED MAINTENANCE COST
  - COST SAVINGS THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF MATERIAL REVIEW BOARD
  - INFORMATION GENERATED WILL HELP MAKING FUTURE SRMS MORE REPRODUCIBLE

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:
#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- **IDENTIFY UNINSPECTABLE, UNINSPECTED AND UNDER INSPECTED AREAS**
- **ASSESS STATE-OF-THE-ART NDE AND MODIFY AS NEEDED TO EVALUATE CRITICAL AND DIFFICULT-TO-INSPECT REGIONS**
- **DEVELOP/INTEGRATE NEW NDE MORALITIES INCLUDING SMART MATERIAL SENSORS**
- **MODIFY EXISTING DESIGNS FOR INCORPORATION OF NDI INSTRUMENTATION**
- **DEMONSTRATE INSPECTABILITY IMPROVEMENTS WITH DESIGN CHANGES**

---

#### DESCRIPTION:
- **BONDLINE STRUCTURAL AND HEALTH MONITORING METHODOLOGIES**
- **IN-SITU EVALUATION OF BONDLINE STRENGTH**
- **BONDLINE DESIGN METHODOLOGIES**
- **TRANSODUCER DEVELOPMENT**

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- **DEFICIENCIES:**
  - **ACTIVE HEALTH MONITORING TECHNIQUES FOR SRMS ARE CURRENTLY INEXSISTENT**
  - **CONTINUED MONITORING OF AN SRM WILL ALLOW A MORE ACCURATE MANNER OF SAFETY DETERMINATION DUE TO BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF TEMPERATURE, HUMIDITY, STRESS AND STRENGTH**
  - **DETECTION METHODS CAN INCLUDE CONTACT, NON-CONTACT, EMBEDDED TECHNIQUES OR BE INCORPORATED INTO THE MATERIAL USED**
  - **STEEL STRESS GRADIENTS IN LARGE SRMS REQUIRE SMALLER STRESS SAGS THAN CURRENTLY AVAILABLE**
  - **STRESS TRANSODUCERS ARE NEEDED TO MEASURE BOTH NORMAL AND SHEAR STRESS**
  - **TECHNIQUES FOR DETERMINING BONDLINE STRENGTH CAN EXPLOIT CHEMICAL AND/OR MECHANICAL DESIGN APPROACHES**
- **SYSTEM APPLICATIONS:**
  - **ALL SRMs**
- **BENEFITS/PAYOFFS:**
  - **THIS TECHNOLOGY WILL PRODUCE IMPROVED UNDERSTANDING OF BONDLINE AGING, THEREBY IMPROVING SRM RELIABILITY**

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:
#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- **IDENTIFY CANDIDATE TECHNIQUES, DETECTION METHODS AND TRANSODUCERS (1)**
- **DEVELOP Viable MINIATURIZED TRANSODUCERS (1)**
- **VALIDATE TRANSODUCERS ON ANALOG MOTORS (1)**
- **DEMONSTRATE ON A SELECTED SRM (2)**
### SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

#### DESCRIPTION:
- **BONDLINE CONTAMINATION STUDIES**
  - Identify sources of contamination and their affect on bond strength
  - Detection of contamination during the manufacturing operation

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- **DEFICIENCIES:**
  - Contamination identified as the number one critical process parameter to control and improve reliability
- **SYSTEM APPLICATIONS:**
  - All current and projected solid rocket motors
- **BENEFITS/PAYOFFS:**
  - Improved process control will lead to improved reliability

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Identify techniques to detect contaminants on metal and non-metals
- Establish protocol for controlled laboratory contamination studies
- Determine sensitivity of contamination on bond strength and correlate with detector techniques
- Develop methodology to implement detector technique in production with ODMO-DO criteria

---

#### DESCRIPTION:
- **PROPELLANT AND BONDLINE FAILURE CRITERIA**
  - Both flawed and unflawed materials
  - Broad range of environmental and mechanical loadings

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- **DEFICIENCIES:**
  - Current failure criteria do not accurately predict failures in propellants and bondlines; this causes low reliability and lack of confidence in structural margins
  - A satisfactory fracture mechanics theory does not exist for bondlines with manufacturing defects
  - Analysis and test techniques must be developed to determine the strength of unflawed materials and the fracture mechanics behavior for flawed materials
- **SYSTEM APPLICATIONS:**
  - All SRMs
- **BENEFITS/PAYOFFS:**
  - Improved confidence in prediction, accuracy, better defect acceptance procedures, higher reliability

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- Identify viable failure criteria and fracture mechanics approaches
- Develop theories for failure and fracture, and model fitting techniques
- Plan an experimental program to test failure theories
- Manufacture material samples and conduct tests
- Refine/modify theory based on test results
- Validate theory using analog motor designed for propellant and bondline failure

---
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**SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL**

**ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• EFFECTS OF DEFECTS FOR BONDLINES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEFICIENCIES:</td>
<td>• IDENTIFY CAUSES OF REAL BONDLINE DEFECTS (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IN CURRENT BONDLINE DESIGN, KNOWLEDGE OF SHEAR AND TENSILE STRENGTH, SHEAR AND TENSILE STIFFNESS, AND CHEMICAL MIGRATION IS NOT PROPERLY UNDERSTOOD</td>
<td>- DEVELOP MATHEMATICAL MODELS WHICH SIMULATE REAL BOND BEHAVIOR (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FAILURE CRITERIA ARE NOT WELL UNDERSTOOD FOR SYSTEMS WITH DEBONDS/FLAWS</td>
<td>- DEVELOPMENT OF MANUFACTURING PROTOCOL AND FABRICATION OF SPECIMENS (2)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BONDLINES IN CURRENT SYSTEMS HAVE REGIONS THAT ARE UNINSPECTABLE, OR WHERE THE SIZE OF A CRITICAL DEFECT IS SMALLER THAN THE RESOLUTION OF NDE METHODS</td>
<td>- ACQUISITION AND CORRELATION OF NON-DESTRUCTIVE CHARACTERIZATION (NDC) AND MATERIAL PROPERTIES ON DEFECT SAMPLES (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SYSTEM APPLICATIONS:</td>
<td>- ANALYZE BALLISTIC AND THERMAL EFFECTS OF DEFECTS (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ALL SOLID ROCKET MOTOR SYSTEMS</td>
<td>- ESTABLISH APPICABILITY OF FRACTURE MECHANICS (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BENEFITS/PAYOFFS:</td>
<td>- DEFINE METHODOLOGY TO CONSIDER DEFECTS DURING DESIGN PROCESS (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED RELIABILITY OF MOTOR SYSTEMS AND IMPROVED UNDERSTANDING OF THE CRITICAL PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS NECESSARY TO DEFINE SYSTEM SPECIFIC ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA</td>
<td>• VERIFY UTILIZING ANALOG MOTORS (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CLEAN SOLID PROPELLANT DEVELOPMENT AND VERIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PROCESSABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BALLISTIC PERFORMANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEFICIENCIES:</td>
<td>• SURVEY EXISTING TECHNOLOGY AND CONDUCT FURTHER RESEARCH TO ADDRESS DEFICIENCIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CURRENT SOLID PROPELLANTS PRESENT ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS AND LIABILITIES</td>
<td>• SELECT MOST PROMISING FORMULATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LOW HCL FORMULATIONS AVAILABLE DO NOT MEET PERFORMANCE OR SAFETY REQUIREMENTS OF SYSTEM NEEDS</td>
<td>• DEMONSTRATE PERFORMANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SYSTEM APPLICATIONS:</td>
<td>• CONDUCT PROCESSING AND INTERFACE TRADE STUDIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ALL SOLID ROCKET MOTORS</td>
<td>• MATERIAL PROPERTY CHARACTERIZATION AND CONSTITUENT FINGERPRINTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PRIMARY APPLICATION FOR LARGE ETO BOOSTERS</td>
<td>• PROCESS DEVELOPMENT AND VERIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BENEFITS/PAYOFFS:</td>
<td>• PATHFINDER AND FULL-SCALE DEMONSTRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MITIGATES ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS AND LIABILITIES PRESENTED BY EXISTING PROPELLANTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL

#### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **BONDLINE PROCESSING PROTOCOL**  
**ESTABLISH PROCEDURES/METHODOLOGIES FOR CONDUCTING BONDLINE REPAIR/REWORK PROCEDURES** | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **DEFICIENCIES:**  
- Bondlines will require repairs and rework; these are unplanned and have substantial cost/reliability impacts  
- System applications: All current and projected solid rocket motors  
- Benefits/payoffs: Improved bonding procedures will improve reliability and reduce cost | **DEFINE CURRENT REPAIR/REWORK PROCEDURES AND CRITICAL PROCESS PARAMETERS**  
**CONDUCT BOND EXPERIMENTS AND DEFINE:**  
- Define variability  
- Process windows  
- Accept/reject criteria |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **NDE FOR PROPELLANT**  
- Variations in mechanical properties of propellant need to be evaluated  
- Damage, e.g., internal crack growth and microvoids formation need to be characterized | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **DEFICIENCIES:**  
- Changes in properties due to aging conditions are not fully known  
- Propellant density variations mask NDC of bondlines  
- System applications: All solid rocket motors  
- Benefits/payoffs: Improved performance prediction  
- Improved reliability | **ESTABLISH CORRELATIONS BETWEEN NDE PARAMETERS AND MATERIALS PROPERTIES**  
**ESTABLISH EFFECTS OF DEFECTS**  
**POD STATISTICS FOR QUANTITATIVE NDC**  
**PREDICT STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY FOR ONDE** |

---
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### TRIM PROVIDE AND CHARGE OF THE LARGEST SOLID ROCKETS

**Description:**
- **Bondline and Propellant Aging**
- Establish methods to measure and correlate age-related changes to properties
- Determine affects of aging on flight performance and safety

**Background & Related Factors:**
- **Deficiencies:**
  - Limited correlation and understanding of aging effects on structural integrity of propellants and bondlines in Earth environments
  - No data exists showing aging effects on propellants and bondlines in the near-Earth space environment

**Milestones and Resources Requirements:**

**Recommended Actions:**
- Identify all significant age-related sources of change to critical properties
- Identify component interaction aging mechanisms
- Conduct experiments to measure changes to critical properties in the storage/depolyment environments
- Develop aging model that accounts for age-related changes
- Incorporate models into appropriate codes

---

### THERMOPLASTIC ELASTOMER (TPE) INSULATOR FABRICATION TECHNOLOGY AND BONDLINE CHARACTERIZATION FOR LARGE ROCKETS

**Description:**
- Thermoelastic elastomer (TPE) insulator fabrication technology and bondline characterization for large rockets
- Develop new insulator technology for improved reliability and reduced cost

**Background & Related Factors:**
- **Deficiencies:**
  - At present, there is no technology developed or under development to fabricate large TPE insulators (>3000 lbs) required by the largest solid motors. Also better understanding of linerless, adhesive free bonding is needed
  - System applications:
    - All large SRM systems and large ETO boosters

**Milestones and Resources Requirements:**

**Recommended Actions:**
- This program would develop application technology for applying TPE insulations at high rates to 5000 lbs/hr in a controlled manner in practice this technology could be used in conjunction with the spray technology (LOCOIN DEV) which could provide precision thickness control and possible adhesion advantages
- The effort consists of 3 major tasks:
  - Investigation of current technology for forming large thermoplastic structures
  - Design or modify equipment including a robotics controlled delivery head to deliver the TPE insulation to the core of mandrel
  - Fabricate and test large motor insulators demonstrating the equipment and process to obtain reliability and cost data
  - Demonstrate performance in a NASA material evaluation motor
  - TPE insulator bondline characterization and analysis

---
### Solid Propulsion Systems Sub-Panel

#### Issue/Technology Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Milestones and Resources Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Description:**  
- Advanced bonding concepts for linerless insulation development  

**Background & Related Factors:**  
- **Deficiencies:**  
  - Current propellants/insulation bonding generally results in decreased strength due to complexity of the system, poor bonding, age-out difficulties in manufacturing, higher cost, etc.  
  - System applications:  
    - All SRM systems  
  - Benefits/Payoffs:  
    - Improved Reliability  
    - Extended life  
    - Reduced fabrication costs and time  
    - Technology eliminates the use of solvents and reduces environmental risk  

**Recommended Actions:**  
- Advanced bonding concepts for class 1.3 propellants used for space launch applications would be demonstrated  
- Develop a bond system where stable bonding additives are incorporated into the insulation and no additional adhesives are needed  
- Evaluate advanced bonding concepts for propellant/insulation to include linerless, insulator, and barrier concepts as a minimum  
- Evaluate innovative manufacturing concepts for bonding |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Milestones and Resources Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Description:**  
- Low cost insulation performance methodology and correlation with motor performance  
- Low cost insulation performance tests for improved dc and reliability  

**Background & Related Factors:**  
- **Deficiencies:**  
  - Performance of the insulator is critical yet no direct method of assessing the ablative performance of each lot is available  
  - The methodology would also be useful in optimizing new insulation materials  
  - System applications:  
    - All SRM systems, large eto boosters  
  - Benefits/Payoffs:  
    - Improved quality control of insulation material  
    - Improved reliability  
    - Reduced development costs  

**Recommended Actions:**  
- This program would develop the theory, test and correlation necessary to predict performance of insulation materials in full scale motors form data from a set of inexpensive laboratory tests  
- A four task program is recommended:  
  - Literature search and development of theory  
  - Development of the specific test(s) required for evaluation  
  - Correlation of test results with motor test results and refinement of theory  
  - Development of statistical correlation of theory and full scale motor performance |

---
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## Solid Propulsion Systems Sub-Panel

### Issue/Technology Requirement

#### Description:
- Fiber/polymer interaction tailoring for developing improved fibers for internal insulations
- Develop technology for improved non-asbestos insulation for improved reliability and reduced costs

#### Background & Related Factors:
- **Deficiencies:**
  - Currently fibers are required for ablative performance in high performance insulations but the non-asbestos fibers in state-of-the-art insulations today limit the strain capability of the materials much more than asbestos fibers
  - Reduced strain capability of non-asbestos insulation reduces reliability of the insulation
- **Systems Applications:**
  - All SRM systems. Primary application for large ETO boosters
- **Benefits/Payoffs:**
  - Reduced cost
  - Reduced environmental risk
  - Easy, reliable repairability
  - Increase reliability because of increased mechanical properties and higher temperature capabilities

#### Milestones and Resources Requirements:

#### Recommended Actions:
- **This program would develop alternatives to the currently used organic fibers providing technology to significantly improve strain capability and reduce cost of advanced insulation materials**
- **The program would consist of 4 tasks:**
  - Literature and industry search to find new or promising fibers and technology
  - Formulation of new insulations incorporating the new fibers and/or technology
  - Subscale evaluation of the ablative performance of the new insulations
  - Large scale evaluation (NASA Test Motor) of the new insulations

---

#### Description:
- Sprayable solvent-free, high temperature TPS thermal protection (external) system
- Develop improved external TPS for environmental risks

#### Background & Related Factors:
- **Deficiencies:**
  - Current sprayable TPS technology requires use of solvents which add significant cost and/or environmental risk
  - Future applications will require higher temperature capability, reduced cost and solvent-free processing to reduce environmental risk
- **Systems Applications:**
  - All SRM systems. Primary application for large ETO boosters
- **Benefits/Payoffs:**
  - Reduced cost
  - Reduced environmental risk
  - Easy, reliable repairability
  - Increase reliability because of increased mechanical properties and higher temperature capabilities

#### Milestones and Resources Requirements:

#### Recommended Actions:
- **Development of sprayable TPS materials using thermoplastic or the binder for low density fillers will meet the requirements of reduced cost and reduced environmental risk**
- **The program would consist of 4 tasks:**
  - Laboratory development of materials with required properties
  - Spray process selection, modification and development
  - Optimization of materials, large scale manufacturing and spray process
  - Characterization of sprayed TPS materials, bonding, and aging
### SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL
### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• HYBRID ROCKET BOOSTER DEMONSTRATION</td>
<td>• TEST FACILITY CAPABLE OF:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOP CODES AND EXPERIMENTAL DATA</td>
<td>• 1.5M-lb THRUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE FOR THE DESIGN OF LARGE HYBRID</td>
<td>• 3,500 lb LOX FLOW @ 1200 pascals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKET MOTORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEMONSTRATE HYBRID ROCKET MOTORS AT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOSTER THRUST LEVELS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(150k-1.5M-lb THRUST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• HYBRID ROCKETS OFFER:</td>
<td>• CODE DEVELOPMENT AND DATA BASE AT 500-lb,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• INERT HANDLING</td>
<td>15k-lb, AND 150k-lb THRUST LEVEL (JOINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CLEAN EXHAUST</td>
<td>NASA/Corpor ate IR&amp;D PROGRAMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ELIMINATION OF EXPLOSIVE HAZARDS AND</td>
<td>• 750K-lb THRUST DEMONSTRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTS OF DEFECTS IN CRACKS AND DEBONDS</td>
<td>• 1.5M-lb THRUST DEMONSTRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HYBRID ROCKETS CAN BE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• THROTTLED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SHUT DOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• THE COST OF HYBRID BOOSTERS IS ESTIMATED AT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% TO 100% OF SRMs AND MUCH LOWER THE LRBs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HYBRIDS USE EXISTING TECHNOLOGY FOR CABE,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOZZLE, AND LIQUID FEED SYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HIGHER ISP THAN SOLIDS AND EQUAL TO THAT OF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX/HYDROCARBON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHY AREN'T HYBRIDS OPERATIONAL?

- EARLY BOOSTER EMPHASIS WAS PLACED ON HIGH DENSITY IMPULSE SYSTEMS. COST, SAFETY, ENVIRONMENTAL AND RELIABILITY ISSUES WERE OF LOW PRIORITY IN THE HEYDAY OF THE AMERICAN SPACE PROGRAM

- PRESENT AND FUTURE EMPHASIS IS ON COST, ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS, SAFETY AND OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY

- OPERATIONAL SUCCESSES OF LARGE LIQUID ENGINES AND SRM BOOSTERS FOR THE SHUTTLE AND TITAN III CAUSED INTEREST/ Need IN HYBRIDS TO WANE

- ALL THE 1960s AND 70s WORK IN HYBRIDS WAS DONE BY PRIMARILY LIQUID OR SOLID PROPULSION COMPANIES WITHOUT A HIGH DEGREE OF SERIOUS INTEREST

- "POLITICAL FACTORS APPEAR TO INTERFERE WITH TECHNICAL FACTORS." - CULTURAL ISSUE
### SOLID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL
### ISSUE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENT

#### DESCRIPTION:
- TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER
  - THERMAL ANALYSIS APPLIED TO FLEXSEAL AND PHENOLIC MANDREL TOOL DESIGN
  - COMMON DESIGN TOOL
  - UNIFORM PART CURVES
  - HIGH PAYBACK IMMEDIATE IMPLEMENTATION ON ARMS CONTRACT

#### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- **DEFICIENCIES:**
  - CURRENT TOOLING DESIGN CRITERIA ARE ONLY STRESS-BASED
  - NON-UNIFORM HEAT TRANSFER CAN RESULT IN MATERIAL VARIATION DETRIMENTAL TO PERFORMANCE
- **SYSTEMS APPLICATIONS:**
  - ALL ARM CURE TOOLING
- **BENEFITS/PAYOFFS:**
  - REDUCED FABRICATION COST
  - IMPROVED PRODUCTION TIME

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- IDENTIFY CRITICAL TOOLING AND IMPOSE THERMAL ANALYSIS AS A CONTRACT REQUIREMENT
- IMPLEMENT COMMON DESIGN TOOLS FOR BOTH COMPONENT DESIGN AND TOOL DESIGN (CAD SYSTEM)

### DESCRIPTION:
- TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER
- ANALYSIS AND TESTING KNOW-HOW AND TOOLS MUST BE DISTRIBUTED TO GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY TO OBTAIN PROPER BENEFIT OF R&D EXPENDITURE
- CURRENT PROBLEMS ARE VERY MULTI-DISCIPLINARY WHICH COMPLICATES TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

### MILESTONES AND RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS:

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- A RECENT NASA STUDY RECOMMENDED AN INDUSTRY WIDE MILITARY HANDBOOK PROJECT TO DEVELOP DESIGN/ANALYSIS DATA FOR CARBON-CARBON AND CARBON-PHENOIC
- THERE IS A NEED FOR STANDARDIZED TESTING METHODS TO IMPROVE THE RELIABILITY AND CREDIBILITY OF DATA
- NEW MATERIALS HAVE TEST REQUIREMENTS
- NEW ANALYSIS PROCEDURES REQUIRE PEER REVIEW
- PERIODIC SEMINARS HAVE BEEN SHOWN TO BE AN EXCELLENT VEHICLE FOR TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER
- COMPUTERIZED AND CENTRALIZED DATA BASES ARE NEEDED TO GET THE MOST BENEFIT FROM DATA ACQUISITION PROGRAMS
- **SYSTEMS APPLICATIONS:**
  - ALL SMDs
- **BENEFITS/PAYOFF:**
  - IMPROVED COMMUNITY/CULTURE, IMPROVED RELIABILITY, MORE EFFICIENT DESIGN/ANALYSIS AND COST SAVINGS

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- CONDUCT A MILITARY HANDBOOK PROJECT FOR HIGH TEMPERATURE COMPOSITES
- PATTERN AFTER MILITARY HANDBOOK 17 FOR COMPOSITES
- SELECT A MILITARY SPONSOR
- APPOINT AND FIND AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO PLAN SEMINAR, OVERSEE DOCUMENTATION OF HANDBOOKS AND MEET QUARTERLY
- APPOINT AND FUND A HANDBOOK EDITOR
- SPONSOR ROUND-ROBIN TEST ACTIVITIES
- HOLD SEMINAR TWICE A YEAR
- INVITE ANALYSIS, TEST AND DESIGN PEOPLE FROM ALL COMPANIES AND GOVERNMENT AGENCIES INVOLVED IN SOLID ROCKET NOZZLE RELATED R&D
- SELECT, DESIGN AND IMPLEMENT A CENTRALIZED COMPUTER DATA BASE FOR MATERIAL PROPERTY DATA
- PUBLISH AN INITIAL VERSION OF BOTH HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE FORMS
- UPDATE THE HANDBOOK ANNUALLY
- PROVIDE TESTING GUIDELINES TO GOVERNMENT PROJECTS
- SPONSOR TEST METHOD DOCUMENTATION FOR PEER REVIEW

---
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### Liquid Propulsion Systems Sub-Panel

#### Issues/Technology Requirements

**Description:**
- Improved Combustion Chamber Materials
  - Regeneratively Cooled
  - Radiation Cooled

**Background & Related Factors:**
- Thermal Environments, e.g., high temperatures, high strains, limit life in current SSME Combustion Chamber
- Improved conductivity, higher strength would extend life, lower life cycle costs
- Material Development required to support smaller thrusters for lunar/mars missions

**Milestones and Resource Requirements:**
- SSME Combustion Chamber, 1996 (Enabling)

**Recommended Actions:**
- Material Development activities high conductivity materials
  - High temperature (>3000F) material systems
  - Thermal Barrier Coatings
  - Metal Matrix Composites
  - Metal Matrix Composites Jactet
  - Ceramic Matrix Composites
  - Metal-coated copper liner (blanch resistance)

---

**Description:**
- Improved Turbopump Materials

**Background & Related Factors:**
- Historically, materials have been a limiting factor in turbopump development
  - Life limiting in SSME
  - Materials and processes limiting design in SSME turbopumps
  - Promising materials exist, but development to engineered material status usually lags design requirements. As a result, performance is limited by material capability
  - Complacency problem: designers believe materials and processes will be there when needed

**Milestones and Resource Requirements:**

**Recommended Actions:**
- Hydrogen-resistant material
  - Improved turbine blade materials
  - Composites
    - Metal
    - Ceramic
    - Intermetallic
    - Polymeric
  - Titanium/Titanium Aluminides
  - Oxygen and cryogen compatible elastomers
  - Powder Metal Alloys

---

248
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED NOZZLE MATERIALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED, MORE EFFICIENT NOZZLE FABRICATION CONCEPTS REQUIRE MATERIALS WITH SUPERIOR STRENGTH/WORKABILITY CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>• CERAMIC/REFRACTOR COMPOSITE NOZZLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PROJECTED DEEP SPACE MISSIONS REQUIRE LONGER LIFETIME LIGHTER WEIGHT NOZZLE DESIGNS</td>
<td>• HIGH STRENGTH, HIGH ELONGATION SHEET MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• METAL MATRIX COMPOSITES</td>
<td>• HIGH TEMPERATURE ELASTOMERIC SEALANTS AND ADHESIVES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOP GLOBAL MATERIALS AND PROCESSES DATABASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DESIGN EFFORTS LIMITED BY LACK OF INFORMATION ON MATERIALS AND PROCESSES</td>
<td>• NASA WIDE MATERIALS DATABASE WORKING GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• INADEQUATE COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION OF MATERIALS AND PROCESSES DATA</td>
<td>• STATE WORKING GROUP AS STARTING POINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• INAPPROPRIATE FORM OF DATA NOT RESPONSIVE TO CONTEMPORARY ANALYSIS METHODS</td>
<td>• CONSORTIUM FOR MATERIALS TESTING TO FEED DATA BASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• COMPANIES BECOME LOCKED INTO FAMILIAR MATERIALS</td>
<td>• STANDARDIZE TEST METHODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EXPAND AND UPDATE DATA REPORTING FORMAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FRACTURE MECHANICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LOW/HIGH CYCLE FATIGUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PROCESSING HISTORY, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• COMPUTERIZE DATA BASE AND IMPROVE ACCESSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DEVELOP ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE FOR MATERIALS AND PROCESS SELECTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Liquid Propulsion Systems Sub-Panel
#### Issues/Technology Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• LIGHTWEIGHT MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT (STRUCTURAL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• REDUCED WEIGHT IS A MAJOR DESIGN GOAL</td>
<td>• ALUMINUM-LITHIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NON-METALLIC ENGINE COMPONENTS TANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PLUMBING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• VALVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NOZZLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TURBOPUMP COMPONENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• LIGHTWEIGHT INSULATION MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• EPA RESTRICTIONS Dictate Major Changes in Current Material Formulations</td>
<td>• CFC-FREE MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • DEVELOPMENT HARDWARE FOR STME AND IMPROVED SSME AMCC CONFIGURATIONS | • HARDWARE  
• HOT FIRE TEST |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • CANDIDATE ADVANCED MAIN COMBUSTION CHAMBER (AMCC) CONFIGURATIONS FOR STME | • PROVIDE TWO DEVELOPMENTAL AMCC's FOR EACH:  
  - LIID  
  - VPS |
| • LIID (LIQUID INTERFACE DIFFUSION BONDING)  
• VPS (VACUUM PLASMA SPRAY) | • VERIFY BY:  
  - TESTING  
  • MATERIAL AND BOND JOINT EVALUATIONS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOP A TRULY ONE SHOT CHAMBER AND NOZZLE SUCH AS USED ON SOLID ENGINES</td>
<td>• BEGIN TESTING AND DESIGN COMPOSITE CERAMIC TYPE NOZZLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ONE OF THE MOST EXPENSIVE PARTS OF THE ROCKET ENGINE IS THE THRUST CHAMBER AND NOZZLE, USUALLY BECAUSE IT IS DESIGNED FOR 10-20 USES NEEDED TO QUALIFY AN ENGINE SYSTEM. A TRULY EXPENDABLE SYSTEM DESIGNED FOR ONE FIRING COULD SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE COST OF AN ENGINE.</td>
<td>• BEGIN TESTING AND DESIGN COMPOSITE CERAMIC TYPE NOZZLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DIAGNOSTIC/PROGNOSTIC HEALTH MONITORING SYSTEMS SUPPORT (COMPONENT DURABILITY MODELS)</td>
<td>• $250K/YR FOR DESIGN/TEST TIME FRAME OF ENGINE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ENGINE SYSTEM DURABILITY AND RELIABILITY</td>
<td>• DEVELOP COMPONENT DURABILITY MODELS RELATING DAMAGE TO MISSION HISTORY/ENGINE PERFORMANCE USAGE FOR RELEVANT COMPONENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ENABLING TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPROVED RELIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• REDUCED MAINTENANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• REDUCE FRICTION, GALLING, AND BINDING PROBLEMS IN PROPULSION SYSTEM COMPONENTS WHICH HAVE METAL TO METAL SLIDING SURFACES (POMPETS, PISTONS, GUIDES)</td>
<td>• MATERIALS CHARACTERIZATION PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1-2 YEARS, 500 YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1-2 YEARS, 1000 YEAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SLIDING METAL SURFACES IN FLOW CONTROL DEVICES SUCH AS VALVES AND REGULATORS TEND TO GALL AND STICK</td>
<td>• INITIATE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TO INVESTIGATE THE POSSIBILITY OF USING CERAMIC MATERIALS FOR COMPONENT PARTS TO ALLEVIATE THE METAL-TO-METAL SLIDING SURFACE PROBLEMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DEMONSTRATE BY TEST CERAMIC COMPONENT PARTS IN RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUB-PANEL
### ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOP LIGHTWEIGHT PROJECTILE SHIELDING FOR SPACE PROPULSION SYSTEMS</td>
<td>• SURVEY EXISTING TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• BUILD PROTOTYPE SHIELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 YEAR, 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TEST SHIELDS AT WSTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 YEAR, 800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- THE METEORITE/SPACE DEBRIS SHIELDING FOR THE SSF PROPULSION MODULE WEIGHS 1300 LBS.
  (MODULE STRUCTURE WEIGHS 1000 LBS.)

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- DEVELOP LIGHTWEIGHT MATERIALS FOR USE AS SHIELDING AGAINST PROJECTILES MOVING AT ORBITAL VELOCITIES. BUILD THE SHIELDS AND TEST THEM AT NASA'S HAZARDOUS HYPERSONIC TEST FACILITY AT WHITE SANDS.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>MILESTONES AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• GELLED PROPELLANTS FOR ORBITAL BOOSTERS, AND SPACE TRANSFER VELOCITIES</td>
<td>• DEMONSTRATE GEL PROPELLANT CAPABILITIES AND PROPERTIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ESTABLISH SYSTEM &amp; COMBUSTION DESIGN CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ESTABLISH SYSTEM BENEFITS &amp; TECHNOLOGY IMPACTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CONDUCT DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION TESTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• COMPLETE FULL SCALE DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ESTABLISH RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS TO ACCOMPLISH THE ABOVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- GELLED PROPELLANTS ARE LIQUID FUELS AND OXIDIZERS THAT HAVE SPECIAL GELLING AGENTS AND METALS ADDED TO FORM THIXOTROPIC COMPOUNDS WITH INCREASED SAFETY AND PERFORMANCE.
- BOTH EARTH STORABLES AND CRYOGENIC LD,(U,H) PROPELLANTS CAN BE GELLED TO INCREASE DENSITY, PERFORMANCE, AND TO SUPPRESS THE BOILING POINT.
- GELLED LH2 SLUSH AND GELLED LH2/SOLID CH4
- SPECIFIC BENEFITS INCLUDE:
  - HIGH PROPELLANT PERFORMANCE
  - HIGH DENSITY & BOILING POINT SUPPRESSION
  - PACKAGING FLEXIBILITY AND EFFICIENCY
  - GREATLY IMPROVED SAFETY OVER LIQUIDS & SOLIDS
  - ENERGY MANAGEMENT (THROTTLING, PULSING, ETC.)
  - HIGH MASS FRACTION

#### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- CONDUCT MISSION/SYSTEM ANALYSES TO IDENTIFY TECHNOLOGY IMPACTS AND REQUIREMENTS
- CONDUCT TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS TO DEVELOP ADVANCED HIGH PERFORMANCE GELS
- CHARACTERIZE GELS IN THE LABORATORY
- DESIGN & DEVELOP GEL PROPULSION SYSTEM
- ESTABLISH GEL PROPULSION TEST BED
- CONDUCT FULL SCALE DEVELOPMENT
FINDINGS:

• THE PREVAILING APPROACH TO TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CAN BE STATED AS FOLLOWS:
  - "ESTABLISH CO-OWNERSHIP OF TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS"
  - "PROMOTE CONSTANT DIALOGUE BETWEEN TECHNOLOGISTS AND SYSTEM DEVELOPERS"
  - "REQUIRE VALIDATION OF TECHNOLOGY IN APPROPRIATE ENVIRONMENT AND CONFIGURATION - DON'T PLACE BURDEN OF PROOF ON SYSTEM DEVELOPERS"

• A MECHANISM IS REQUIRED TO FORCE THAT PROCESS

RECOMMENDATIONS:

• A NASA BUDGET LINE ITEM FOR A NATIONAL COMPONENT/SUB-SYSTEM TEST BED PROGRAM, DEDICATED TO TECHNOLOGY VALIDATION

COMMENTS

• COMPLACENCY PROBLEM: PROJECTS BELIEVE MATERIALS AND PROCESSES WILL BE THERE WHEN NEEDED

• ORGANIZATIONS TEND TO BECOME "LOCKED IN" TO FAMILIAR MATERIALS
  - THE SITUATION IS EXACERBATED BY NEAR-SIGHTED MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

• TECHNOLOGIES/PRIORITIES EMERGING FROM THIS WORKSHOP REPRESENT A CURRENT SNAPSHOT. A MECHANISM SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR PERIODIC UPDATE
  - STEERING COMMITTEES?

• NASP: TOO FAR ALONG TO BE DRIVER TO THIS MEETING, BUT SHOULD BENEFIT FROM LONG-RANGE INITIATIVES

• PARALLEL/COMPLEMENTARY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS NEED TO BE COORDINATED WITHIN THE GOVERNMENT
NUCLEAR ELECTRIC PROPULSION

SYSTEM NEEDED FOR:
- CARGO TO MARS
- CARGO TO MOON
- LUNAR SURFACE POWER
- MARS SURFACE POWER

KEY COMPONENTS
- REACTOR
- POWER CONVERSION SYSTEM
- RADIATORS
- PMAD
- ION THRUSTER

KEY REQUIREMENTS
- $1700K + 7-10 YRS \cdot 4$ CYCLES
- $1700K + 7-10 YRS \cdot 10^8$ CYCLES
- $1200K + 7-10 YRS \cdot e>0.9$
- HI RAD FLUX
- Cs Erosion Resistance, High alpha

SOA
- SP-100 - COMPONENTS UNDER DEVELOPMENT-NO SYSTEMS TEST

ONGOING PROGRAMS
- PWC-11 CREEP
- W/Nb COMPOSITE FUEL CLAD MATERIAL
- G/Cu RADIATOR MATERIAL

GAPS
- REFRACTORY METAL DESIGN/VALIDATION

NEEDS & OPPORTUNITIES
- STRUCTURAL ALLOY WITH DENSITY = 6-8

PRIORITIES RATIONAL
- 
-
### NUCLEAR ELECTRIC PROPULSION

**SUMMARY OF KEY MATERIAL REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL</strong></td>
<td>(UZR) C</td>
<td>(W/UC2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STOICHIOMETRY CONTROL</td>
<td>• FISSION PRODUCT CONTAINMENT COATING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STABILITY TO 3000K IN H₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUEL CLAD</strong></td>
<td>PWC-11</td>
<td>Re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PRODUCTION OPTIMIZATION</td>
<td>• WELDING OPTIMIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POWER CONVERSION SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BRAYTON-TURBINE</td>
<td>FRS</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PRODUCTION TECH FOR RADIAL</td>
<td>• DATA BASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DATA BASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STIRLING-TUBING-SEALS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOP COMPOSITE</td>
<td>• DATA BASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL
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ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL

GENERAL FINDINGS:

- LESSONS LEARNED FROM SHUTTLE:
  - BRIDGE ESTABLISHED BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT CENTER (JSC), RESEARCH CENTERS (ARC, LARC), AND INDUSTRY (RI, LMSC, CORNING, MANSVILLE, 3M, LTV, UNION CARBIDE, HEXCEL) FOR SHUTTLE TPS
  - NOT ALL TEST RESULTS ADEQUATELY ANALYZED OR, IN HINDSIGHT, COMPLETELY ENCOMPASSING ALL FAILURE MODES.
    - TIE - SIP SEPARATION
    - SHOCK ON OMS POD EFFECTS ON AFRSI
    - OTHER EXAMPLES
  - GAP HEATING EFFECTS FROM GROUND FACILITIES NOT TOTALLY INDICATIVE OF FLIGHT EXPERIENCE
  - NEED TO DESIGN WITH OPERATIONS IN MIND (NOT JUST TO COST) EX: MOISTURE INTRUSION OF GR/EP, MANY OTHER EXAMPLES
  - RSI - DEVELOPED AS POINT DESIGN FOR MANEUVERING ENTRY VEHICLE OF HIG L/D
  - RSI - 15 YEARS FROM INVENTION TO USE ON FLIGHT HARDWARE
ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL

GENERAL FINDINGS (CONT):

• ENTRY SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY NOT EASILY DIVORCED FROM SPECIFIC MISSION REQUIREMENTS
  - PEAK HEATING, DURATION OF HEATING
  - GROUND OR ON-ORBIT ASSEMBLY
  - REUSE REQUIREMENT

• NEED FAMILY OF TPS FOR VARYING VEHICLE PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS
  - SHUTTLE - FRSI, AFRSI, LRSI, HRSI, RCC
  - AEROBRAKES MAY NEED ABLATORS OR C-C OR CMC OR RSI OR TBD DEPENDING ON MISSION

• FLIGHT TESTS ENABLING FOR MANNED AEROBRAKE VEHICLES
  - AEROTHERMODYNAMICS ISSUES
  - DEMONSTRATE ON-ORBIT ASSEMBLY/DEPLOYMENT/SERVICING

• DIFFERENCES FOUND IN GROUND TEST RESULTS
  - FLIGHT VS ARC JETS
  - JSC VS AMES ARC JETS

GENERAL FINDINGS (CONT):

• MATERIALS DATA NOT READILY AVAILABLE
  - NEED DATA BASE THAT IS CERTIFIED, MAINTAINED, ACCESSIBLE
  - NO ORGANIZATION WILLING TO FUND

• DESIGN PHILOSOPHY MUST CONSIDER GROUND HANDLING OF VEHICLE
  - ACCESSIBILITY TO EQUIPMENT AND STRUCTURE FOR INSPECTION AND SERVICING

• U.S. TECHNOLOGY - FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS BOTH WAYS
  - U.S. BUYING FRENCH DEVELOPED MATERIAL TECHNOLOGY
    - METALLIC MULTIWALL TPS
      -- DEVELOPED IN U.S. 1970's
      -- ENHANCED IN GERMANY 1980's
      -- ENHANCED CONCEPT CURRENT BASELINE ON PORTIONS OF SDIO SSTO
  - RUSSIANS AND FRENCH USING U.S. DEVELOPED TILE AND BLANKET TECHNOLOGY
ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL

GENERAL FINDINGS (CONT):

- BE WARY OF PRELIMINARY LOADS
- DON'T SKIP SUB-ASSEMBLY TESTING
- DESIGN FOR HANDLING, MAINTENANCE & REPAIR
- DON'T ALLOW DEVELOPMENT HISTORY TO VANISH
  - DOCUMENT DESIGN DRIVERS AND IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

TPS CRITICAL NEED

- FLIGHT TESTING
  - DEMONSTRATE AERO-ASSIST TECHNOLOGIES
  - DEMONSTRATE ON-ORBIT ASSEMBLY/DEPLOYMENT
  - VALIDATE NEW TPS TECHNOLOGIES
ENTRY SYSTEMS QUAD CHARTS

TECHNOLOGY ITEMS
1. TOUGHENED CERAMIC TPS
2. ADVANCED C-C's
3. FLEXIBLE TPS
4. METALLIC TPS
5. LIGHTWEIGHT ABLATORS
6. JOINTS, FASTENERS, SEAMS, etc...
7. TPS/STRUCTURAL INTEGRATION
8. TPS/SYSTEM RESOURCE INTEGRATION
9. INSPECTION, NDE, AND SMART MATERIALS
10. SIMPLIFIED CERT/RE-CERT
11. ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY
12. ON-ORBIT ACTIVITIES
13. TEST FACILITIES
14. NEW MODELING CODES (INTERDISCIPLINARY)

DESCRIPTION:
• DEVELOP DURABLE, REUSABLE SURFACE INSULATION WITH HIGHER STRENGTH AND TEMPERATURE CAPABILITY

PAYOFFS:
• PROVIDES MORE DURABLE, LIGHTER WEIGHT, MORE REFRACTORY RSI

BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
• PRESENT RSI MATERIALS WERE DESIGNED WITH MINIMAL IMPACT RESISTANCE.
• HIGHER STRENGTH RSI ENHANCES DIRECT BOND CAPABILITY
• TOUGH NEW COATINGS AND/OR SURFACE TREATMENTS WILL ENHANCE DURABILITY
• ADVANCED FIBERS PROVIDE MORE REFRACTORY RSI

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
• INITIATE A PROGRAM TO IDENTIFY AND DEVELOP TOUGHENED COATINGS AND ADVANCED FIBERS
• PERFORM MATERIAL CHARACTERIZATION TESTS ON THE NEW RSI MATERIALS
• PERFORM THERMAL RESPONSE AND ARC PLASMA TESTS ON PROMISING CONCEPTS
• PERFORM TPS SYSTEMS TESTS THAT LEAD TO ACCEPTANCE FOR USE ON THE EMERGING B1B VEHICLES
**ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL**

**ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Thin, structural oxidation-resistant carbon-carbon (ORCC) composites for TPS and structural applications  
- Low weight  
- Durable/reusable  
- Low maintenance and repair  
- Tailored for service environments | - Lightweight, passive thermal protection for projected NASA planetary missions  
- Fabrication facilities  
- Limited coating capability, but can be expanded  
- Facility needs dependent on particular material system |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Reinforced carbon-carbon (RCC) Shuttle leading edge and nose cap have no flight anomalies  
- Higher specific strength of ACC demonstrated (up to 5X RCC)  
- Advanced ORCC composites baselined as TPS on NASA X-30  
- Design, fabricability, and assembly of built-up structure demonstrated for advanced C-C  
- Major deficiency is long-life oxidation protection | - Develop improved concept for oxidation protection (coatings, inhibitors, sealants, glazes)  
- Continue efforts to improve mechanical properties  
- Increase efforts to adapt/develop effective "one-side" nose techniques  
- Identify critical life-limiting tests for advanced ORCC materials  
- Full-scale testing of components  
- Document process and design allowables |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Higher temperature flexible insulations (felts, quilts, woven blankets)</td>
<td>- Flexible insulations/structures are useful for all entry systems/structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Flexible insulations offer excellent benefits  
- Low weight  
- Minimum certification investment required  
- Lower life cycle costs  
- No attachment hardware  
- Currently available (used) flexible insulations are temperature limited  
  - FRSI 700°F  
  - AFRL 1500°F  
- Available advanced high temperature fibers can significantly increase temperature capability | - Develop and evaluate inorganic/organic yarns, fabrics, felts and blends  
- Improve low cost fabrication methods  
- Develop flexible ceramic coatings having:  
  - High temperature resistance  
  - High emissivity  
  - Moisture resistance  
  - Aerodynamic/vibroacoustic stability  
- Develop high temperature, flexible adhesives to take advantage of warm (high temperature composite) structures |
**ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL**  
**ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>PAYOFF/RESOURCES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• METALLIC TPS MATERIAL &amp; INTEGRATION DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION</td>
<td>• LIGHT-WEIGHT DURABLE TPS FOR EXTENDED WEATHER ENVIRONMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• METALLICS OFFER POTENTIAL FOR MORE FLEXIBILITY IN WEATHER ENVIRONMENTS</td>
<td>• DETERMINE HIGH-TEMPERATURE STRENGTH &amp; THERMAL PROPERTIES (STATIC TEST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CURRENT TPS MATERIALS LIMIT FLIGHT THROUGH WEATHER ENVIRONMENTS</td>
<td>• TEST IMPACT RESISTANCE IN PARTICLE IMPINGEMENT TEST FACILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• METALLICS CAN WITHSTAND LIGHTNING STRIKES</td>
<td>• CONFIRM DETERMINE MINIMUM GAGE TOLERANCE REQUIREMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• METALLIC TPS OFFER HIGH MECHANICAL STRENGTH</td>
<td>• DEVELOPMENT OF LOW-CATALYTICITY, HIGH EMITTANCE, COMPATIBLE COATINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• METALLIC TPS IS MECHANICALLY ATTACHED WITH BACK-FACE CLIPS</td>
<td>• DETERMINE OXIDATION &amp; CORROSION RESISTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CERAMIC TILES MUST BE ADHESIVELY BONDED</td>
<td>• TEST THERMAL PERFORMANCE AS INTEGRATED TPS PANEL (WITH INSULATION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NOT EASILY DETACHED/REPLACED</td>
<td>• ACOUSTIC TOLEANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SUBJECT TO DEBONDING</td>
<td>• EFFECTIVE CONDUCTIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IMPAIRS INSPECTION OF STRUCTURE</td>
<td>• HOT GAS FLOW PREVENTION EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• METALLIC TPS IS WEIGHT-COMPATIBLE WITH CERAMICS &amp; CMC TPS TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOP ADVANCED, LOW DENSITY, HIGH TEMPERATURE ABLATIVE TPS FOR ADVANCED EARTH AND PLANETARY ENTRY SPACECRAFT APPLICATIONS</td>
<td>• ENABLING TECHNOLOGY FOR RADIATION EQUILIBRIUM TEMPERATURE ABOVE 3000°F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ABLATIVE TPS SUCCESSFULLY USED FOR MANNED VEHICLES, NO DEVELOPMENT SINCE APOLLO/VIKING.</td>
<td>• DEVELOP NEW, ADVANCED LOW DENSITY ABLATION MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ABLATOR TPS THERMAL PERFORMANCE PREDICTABLE</td>
<td>• IDENTIFY AND CHARACTERIZE ADVANCED ABLATION MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LIGHTWEIGHT TPS REQUIRED TO MAXIMIZE PAYLOAD WEIGHT AND DECREASE COST</td>
<td>• DESIGN, FABRICATE ABLATIVE TPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNEXPECTED THERMAL EXCURSIONS NOT CRITICAL</td>
<td>• CHARACTERIZE THERMAL PERFORMANCE OF SUB-SCALE TPS PANEL IN ARC JET SIMULATION OF ENTRY ENVIRONMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AEROASSIST AND DIRECT ENTRIES FOR LUNAR AND PLANETARY MISSIONS REQUIRE HIGH TEMPERATURE TPS</td>
<td>• UPDATE AND VERIFY ANALYTICAL MODELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MODIFY ARC JET FACILITIES TO TEST LARGE TPS PANEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PAYOFFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTION:</strong></td>
<td><strong>PAYOFFS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL TPS COMPONENTS:</td>
<td>• ENABLING TECHNOLOGY FOR SPACE ASSEMBLED TPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• JOINTS</td>
<td>• REDUCE COST AND SCHEDULE IMPACTS ON FUTURE PROGRAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FASTENERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SEAMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NOSETIP &amp; LEADING EDGES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SPECIAL TPS COMPONENTS HAVE HAD COST AND SCHEDULE IMPACTS ON EXISTING SYSTEMS:</td>
<td>• DESIGN, FABRICATE, AND TEST ADVANCED SPECIAL TPS COMPONENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SEAMS, JOINTS, FASTENERS, ATTACHMENTS, MOVING SURFACES AND ADHESIVES ARE CRITICAL INTERFACES IN ALL TPS DESIGNS</td>
<td>• MODIFY FACILITIES FOR TESTING THESE TPS COMPONENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• VERY HIGH HEATING REGIONS SUCH AS NOSE TIPS AND LEADING EDGES REQUIRE SPECIAL DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS INCLUDING POSSIBLE USE OF HEAT PIPES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTION:</strong></td>
<td><strong>PAYOFFS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LIGHTWEIGHT, INSULATING CERAMIC MATRIX COMPOSITES (CMC):</td>
<td>• LIGHTWEIGHT, PASSIVE THERMAL PROTECTION FOR PROJECTED NASA SPACE FLIGHT MISSIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WARM STRUCTURE (BACKFACE TEMP 600°F) WHICH CONSISTS OF CONTINUOUS FIBER REINFORCED FACESHETS WITH A REUSABLE SURFACE INSULATION CORE HARD BONDED TO A LOAD BEARING POLYIMIDE/GRAFITE OR BMI SUBSTRATE</td>
<td>• DAMAGE TOLERANT SURFACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HOT STRUCTURE (SANDWICH STRUCTURE), CONSISTS OF CONTINUOUS FIBER REINFORCED CMC FACESHETS DIRECTLY BONDED TO AN RSI CORE. THIS CMC SANDWICH IS A LIGHTWEIGHT STRUCTURE FOR LOAD BEARING HOT STRUCTURE</td>
<td>• HIGH OXIDATION RESISTANCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• THE BASELINE GLASS COATED RSI MATERIALS ARE FRAGILE, HAVE MINIMAL STRENGTH, AND ARE LIMITED TO 2500°F USE TEMPERATURE</td>
<td>• IDENTIFY AND DEVELOP FUNCTIONALLY GRADIENT CORE MATERIALS THAT ARE COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING CMC FACESHETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• THE BASELINE RSI &amp; RCC SYSTEMS REQUIRE LABOR INTENSIVE INSTALLATION PROCEDURES</td>
<td>• DEVELOP PROCESSING METHODS TO COMBINE CMC FACESHETS WITH LOW DENSITY CORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PERFORM OVEN SOAK, THERMAL RESPONSE AND ARC JET SCREENING TESTS TO DETERMINE CONCEPT FEASIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PERFORM MATERIAL CHARACTERIZATION TESTS ON THE PROMISING NEW LIGHTWEIGHT CMC STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PERFORM THERMAL AND STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE CMC USING THE BASELINE DATA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL
### ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- WATER BASED COMPOSITE THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEM AND STRUCTURE</td>
<td>- ELIMINATES COSTLY ASSEMBLY AND DEPLOYMENT TECHNIQUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WATER BASED SYSTEMS NONTOXIC</td>
<td>- DEMONSTRATION REQUIRED BEFORE SEI ARCHITECTURE FINALIZED TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF WEIGHT AND COST SAVINGS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- WEIGHT AND COST OF PAYLOAD-TO-ORBIT KEY TO SEI FEASIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SYNERGISTIC USE OF ON-BOARD RESOURCES MINIMIZES WEIGHT TO ORBIT, I.E. WATERBASED POLYMER OR ICE MATRIX COMPOSITES UTILIZES RESOURCES NOW CONSIDERED EXPENDABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEPLOYMENT AND RIGIDIZATION MINIMIZES MANPOWER AND ENERGY FOR ON-ORBIT FABRICATION OF AEROSKIN STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- PERFORM STUDIES OF WATER BASED POLYMERICE MATRIX COMPOSITES: PROPERTIES, PROCESSES, FABRICATION OF COMPOSITE DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FABRICATE AND TEST REPRESENTATIVE CONCEPTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEMONSTRATE ON SHUTTLE OR SPACE STATION FOR DEPLOYMENT AND RIGIDIZATION ON ORBIT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- NOT/NDE/SMART MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DESIGN SHOULD ALLOW FOR SELF-ANALYSIS OF MATERIAL USING NOT/NDE OR SMART INSTRUMENTATION WITHIN (OR ATTACHED TO) THE MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- LOWER LIFE CYCLE COSTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- INCREASED FUNDING REQUIRED TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL TESTING AND EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- UNKNOWN AMOUNT OF OXIDATION/DAMAGE IN RCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SUSPECT RSI BOND CONDITION REQUIRES REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CURRENT NDE/BOND VERIFICATION LIMITED BY SCHEDULE/FUNDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NDE/TECHNIQUES REQUIRED TO PREVENT UNNECESSARY REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ON-ORBIT INSPECTION IMPRACTICAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- DEVELOP NOT/NDE DURING ORIGINAL DESIGN/ MANUFACTURE (BASELINE NEW INSTALLATION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DESIGN FAILURE INDICATORS INTO MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PERFORM TESTING TO VERIFY NDE/NDE/INDICATORS PERFORMANCE IN DETECTION.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• REDUCE COMPLEXITY OF TPS CERTIFICATION/RECERTIFICATION</td>
<td>• TPS MODIFICATION AND DESIGN RELATED UPGRADES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TECHNOLOGY APPLICATION TO BOTH PRESENT, AS WELL AS FUTURE SPACECRAFT DESIGNS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PRESENT METHOD OF INCORPORATING DESIGN CHANGES COSTLY AND TIME CONSUMING</td>
<td>• USE MODELING FOR ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EX PROVIDED MEANS TO CERTIFY WITHOUT EXTENSIVE CERTIFICATION</td>
<td>• USE EX DEVELOPED TECHNIQUES FOR CERTIFYING NEW MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CERTIFICATION BY SIMILARITY</td>
<td>• CHANGE DOCUMENTATION BY ALLOWING CHANGES AT SUB-LEVELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PRESENT DRAWING CHANGES REQUIRED TREEING INTO TOTAL PACKAGE</td>
<td>• USE SIMILARITY IN NON-CRITICAL AREAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• STANDARDIZE RECERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS (I.E., MISSION REQUIREMENTS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• WEATHERPROOFING TPS AGAINST TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>• MISSION FLEXIBILITY IN WEATHER ENVIRONMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• REDUCED LIFE CYCLE COSTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• RAIN, TAPWATER ABSORPTION INCREASES LAUNCH WEIGHT, CAUSES FREEZE DAMAGE TO TPS</td>
<td>• DEVELOP REUSABLE COATINGS/SYSTEM IMPERVIOUS TO IMPACT DAMAGE/INTERIOR ENVIRONMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HAIL, ICE IMPACTS ERODE TPS - LOSS OF INTEGRITY</td>
<td>• DEVELOP SEALS, FLOW PATHS TO PRECLUDE ABSORPTION OF MOISTURE IN INTERNAL INSULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PROTECTION (EITHER FACILITY AND/OR MATERIAL) PRESERVES INTEGRITY OF TPS DURING UNWANTED ENVIRONMENTS</td>
<td>• ASSESS REAL THREAT TO EACH ELEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• COMPATIBILITY OF OPERATING ENVIRONMENT (E.G., FUELS, VAPORS, ETC.)</td>
<td>• FACILITY DESIGN TO ACCOMMODATE ENVIRONMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

267
### ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL

#### ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Determine long term space exposure effects on TPS for interplanetary vehicles</td>
<td>• Enabling technology for planetary entry TPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Atomic oxygen (AO) affects polymer materials and coatings</td>
<td>• Determine long term effects of vacuum, AO, debris/dust impact, radiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long term environmental durability unknown</td>
<td>• Determine compatibility with other spacecraft system materials/fuels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Radiation may degrade materials, coatings, films</td>
<td>• Develop protective systems and evaluate TPS performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Materials, coatings, film properties must remain predictable over long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Particle impact can damage TPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESCRIPTION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enabling technology is required for verification and certification of space assembled and/or deployed hardware systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required 3-5 years prior to SEI missions (Lunar Mission-2002, Mars Mission-2020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No launch systems available for delivering ground assembled large TPS structures to orbit</td>
<td>• Develop flight test plan and associated entry system hardware for demonstration of on-orbit operations of entry hardware systems which may include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deployment of entry system structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assembly of entry system structural components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL
### ISSUES/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>PAYOFFS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DEFINE AND UPGRADE FACILITY CAPABILITIES FOR TPS TESTING</td>
<td>• PROVIDES RELIABLE THERMAL STRUCTURAL DATA BASE FOR NEW THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• REQUIRED 10-15 YEARS PRIOR TO SEI MISSIONS (LUNAR MISSION-2002, MARS MISSION-2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACKGROUND &amp; RELATED FACTORS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• NO NEW ARC-JET FACILITIES IN 20 YEARS</td>
<td>• UPGRADE ARC-JET FACILITIES TO:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CURRENT ARC-JET FACILITIES NOT ADEQUATE TO TEST LARGE TPS SUBSYSTEMS ELEMENTS AT REPRESENTATIVE CONDITIONS</td>
<td>• ACCOMMODATE LARGE SIZE TPS SUBSYSTEM ELEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CURRENT ARC-JET INSTRUMENTATION LIMITED TO INTRUSIVE FLOW MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>• PROVIDE UNIFORM HIGH QUALITY FLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PROVIDE COMBINED RADIATIVE AND CONVECTIVE HEATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PROVIDE APPROPRIATE PLANETARY GAS COMPOSITIONS (MARS, VENUS, TITAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UPGRADE ARC-JET FACILITY INSTRUMENTATION TO MEASURE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TUNNEL FLOW CONDITIONS AND CHEMISTRY USING NON-INTRUSIVE FLOW METHODOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TEST ARTICLE STRESS/STRAIN AT TEMPERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SURFACE TEMPERATURE DISTRIBUTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AEROCOUSTIC ENVIRONMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESCRIPTION:
- DEVELOPMENT OF INTERDISCIPLINARY MODELING CODES FOR ADVANCED THERMAL PROTECTION MATERIALS AND SYSTEMS WITH CAPABILITY TO HANDLE
  - MICRO-LEVEL MATERIAL EFFECTS
  - MATERIALS RESPONSE
  - TPS/STRUCTURAL RESPONSE
  - LIFE PREDICTIONS
  - AEREOELASTICITY
  - DESIGN OPTIMIZATION

### PAYOFFS:
- ADVANCED CODE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION IS AN ENABLING ACTIVITY FOR FUTURE VEHICLE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT
- SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES IN COMPUTATIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED EARLIER IN DEVELOPMENT CYCLE
- ADVANCED INSTRUMENTATION AND FACILITY UPGRADES REQUIRED TO GENERATE BENCHMARK DATA
- 5-10 YEAR DEVELOPMENT TIME

### BACKGROUND & RELATED FACTORS:
- ABLATIVE MODELING CODES ARE 10-20 YEARS OLD
- INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES ARE ESSENTIAL FOR VEHICLE MULTI-PARAMETER OPTIMIZATION
- COUPLING TO ADVANCED CFD CODES REQUIRED FOR COMPLETE SYSTEM RESPONSE MODELING

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:
- ESTABLISH WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CFD, CSM, AND COMPUTATIONAL MATERIALS COMMUNITIES
- SUPPORT COMPUTATIONAL RESOURCES AND CODES DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
- GENERATE NECESSARY BENCHMARK DATA FOR MULTIDISCIPLINARY CODE VALIDATION
ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL
TPS IMPROVEMENTS WILL FULFILL FUTURE PROGRAM NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVED PERFORMANCE SAFETY/RELIABILITY</th>
<th>LOWER OPERATING COST</th>
<th>INCREASED CAPABILITY/ SUPPORTABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZARD RISK REDUCED THROUGH IMPACT RESISTANCE &amp; HIGHER TEMPERATURE CAPABILITY</td>
<td>OPERATIONAL COST REDUCED THROUGH IMPROVEMENTS IN TPS THERMAL CAPABILITY &amp; DURABILITY (IMPROVED MAINTAINABILITY)</td>
<td>VEHICLE CAPABILITY IMPROVED THROUGH USE OF LIGHTER WEIGHT TPS MATERIALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGINS INCREASED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF HIGHER STRENGTH MATERIALS</td>
<td>TURNAROUND TIME DECREASED</td>
<td>FLIGHT PERFORMANCE MARGINS INCREASED BY REDUCING SUSCEPTIBILITY OF TPS TO WEATHER DAMAGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.0 VEHICLE SYSTEMS PANEL DELIBERATIONS

The Vehicle Systems Panel addressed materials and structures technology issues related to launch and space vehicle systems not directly associated with the propulsion or entry systems. The Vehicle Systems Panel was comprised of two subpanels - Expendable Launch Vehicles & Cryotanks (ELVC) and Reusable Vehicles (RV). Tom Bales, LaRC, and Tom Modlin, JSC, chaired the expendable and reusable vehicles subpanels, respectively, and co-chaired the Vehicle Systems Panel. The following four papers are discussed in this section.

- "Net Section Components for Weldalite™ Cryogenic Tanks," by Don Bolstad
- "Built-up Structures for Cryogenic Tanks and Dry Bay Structural Applications," by Barry Lisagor
- "Composite Materials Program," by Robert Van Siclen
- "Shuttle Technology (and M&S Lessons Learned)," by Stan Greenberg

8.1 PRESENTATION SUMMARIES

8.1.1 AL-LI TECHNOLOGY STATUS

Presentations described current capabilities in fabricating aluminum-lithium (Al-Li) parts for launch vehicle components and cryotanks. Much of the material presented illustrated specific components that have been created for the Advanced Launch System (ALS).

The ALS program has pursued advances in the following:

- Net-shape development
- Weld processing
- Efficient manufacturing
- Weld sensor development
- Tank fabrication and testing

Tank fabrication activities are primarily focused on reducing manufacturing and materials costs. Al-Li materials have lower weight (potential reduction of 15% or more) and density, and higher strength and modulus of elasticity than conventional aluminum alloys. To decrease machining scrap in the fabrication process, companies are exploring methods to extrude large sections in near-net shapes from Al-Li. Several extruded components have been demonstrated by the ALS program.

Laboratories are also exploring methods of creating built-up structures from Al-Li. Initially, much of the work in built-up Al-Li structures focused on cryogenic tank applications, but now application to dry-bay structures is being examined. The payoffs for advancing technology in this area are expected to be lower vehicle dry weight and lower system costs due to reduced machining requirements. Examples of built-up Al-Li structures manufactured for the ALS were provided. Continued work is required in built-up Al-Li structures. Fracture and fatigue characteristics are several of the areas to be studied.

8.1.2 COMPOSITES TECHNOLOGY

Composite matrix and reinforcing materials include a range of polymers, metals and ceramics. In the case of space transportation vehicles, high temperature strength is sought through composites. Composites are therefore enabling in some vehicle programs (e.g. NASP) and offer excellent commercialization potential for a variety of applications, including cryogenic tankage, actively-cooled structures and high-temperature heat shields. Currently, 400 material fabricators and suppliers, 150 universities and research centers and 12 government entities research composites, although not all for space applications.

Composites technologies have rapidly advanced in recent years, although a national plan is needed to better implement composites technology in the building of space structures. Such a plan was developed by the Aerospace Industry Association (AIA), in its report entitled "Key Technologies for the 90's," which provided roadmaps for composites technologies. Implementation of the roadmaps is
uncertain, however, and the organization is currently developing a National Composites Strategic Plan. Key issues associated with implementation of a national plan include:

- International competition
- Supplier vulnerability
- High product cost
- Evolving national educational policy
- Government budget and structure uncertainty
- Pace of technology implementation

The most significant requirement is involvement of the composites community to support a unified national agenda.

8.2 SUBPANEL ACTIVITIES

Many of the issues and technologies discussed by each subpanel were pertinent to both reusable and expendable systems, although the subpanels addressed technology issues differently because the applications required a different perspective. Cost was a consideration which differed the most between reusable and expendable applications. For example, material cost is a stronger driving force for expendable vehicles, which require construction of a new vehicle for every mission. For reusable vehicles, mission costs associated with vehicle mass are the primary life cycle cost driver and material costs are not as significant.

The subpanel sessions yielded a number of proposed activities. To better specify each of the specific issues and to obtain a consensus of the members, the subpanels considered each issue on its merits, evaluated the content of all of the submissions and identified the specifics of the subpanels' broad interests. The result of this effort was a constrained list of 20 specific issues for the ELVC subpanel and 23 for the RV subpanel. These issues are discussed further in the following sections.

8.2.1 EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES AND CRYOTANKS SUBPANEL

The 13-member Expendable Launch Vehicles & Cryotanks subpanel included individuals with a wide cross section of skills and experience, and with both industrial and government affiliations. The diversity of the subpanel was very advantageous for assessing ELVC materials and structures technology.

In reaching a consensus, the subpanel concentrated on three major areas of concern:

- Materials development
  - Advanced metallics
  - Composites
  - Thermal protection system (TPS) / insulation
- Manufacturing technology
  - Near-net shape metals technologies
  - Composites
  - Welding
- Non-destructive evaluation methods and processes
Table 8.2.1 Priority Technology Issues for Expendable Launch Vehicles & Cryotanks

| 1. Advanced structural materials |
| 2. Al-Li technology |
| 3. Near-net shape fabrication technology for vehicle structures |
| 4. Near-net shape metals technology |
| 5. Near-net shape extrusions for structural hardware |
| 6. Near-net shape forgings |
| 7. Near-net shape spin forgings |
| 8. Welding |
| 9. In-space welding/joining |
| 10. Composites technology for cryotanks and dry-bay structures |
| 11. Joining technology for composite cryotanks |
| 12. Tooling approach for manufacturing large diameter cryotanks |
| 13. Develop a cure methodology for large composite cryotanks |
| 14. State-of-the-art buckling structure optimizer program |
| 15. State-of-the-art "shell of revolution" analysis program |
| 16. NDE for advanced structures |
| 17. In-line inspection of composites |
| 18. Scale-up of launch vehicles |
| 19. Launch vehicle TPS/insulation beyond 27.5 ft. diameter |
| 20. Design and fabrication of thin-wall cryotanks for space exploration (5-20 ft. dia.) |

Priority concerns of the Expendable launch vehicles and cryotanks Sub-Panel:

1. The primary near-term issue regarding Al-Li is availability of funding to ensure incorporation in the National Launch System.
   - Production capability is in place for 8090, Weldalite and 2090 Al-Li alloys
   - Near-net shape processes have been defined; scale-up activities are underway
   - Program management decisions are required to exploit the potential of Al-Li alloys

This issue addresses producibility of Al-Li alloys for the National Launch System. The subpanel expressed concerns about the maturity of specific Al-Li alloys and progress in near net shape processes and scale-up activities. The subpanel would like to see program managers at NASA, DoD and the NLS Joint Program Office recognize the full potential of Al-Li alloy systems, and NLS program funding sufficient to allow program managers to act in a timely and definitive way to support Al-Li technology maturation for use in the NLS.

2. NASA materials technology programs should include research on expendable launch vehicles and cryotanks.
   - A focused materials and structures technology program for launch vehicles is necessary.
   - Sustained programs to support user needs and long-term NASA missions are clearly needed.

3. Structural analysis and optimization programs are needed.

The subpanel stressed a need for additional efforts at all levels in the area of structural analysis and optimization, computational methods and experimental verification, particularly for long duration and complex space environmental conditions.

4. Non-destructive evaluation (NDE) techniques and methods must be exploited to assure integrity, reliability and cost reductions.

This issue emphasizes the need to (1) define and develop NDE capabilities that enhance the production of advanced materials systems, including composites, and (2)
verify the integrity and inherent quality of flight system hardware. These technologies, techniques and capabilities are required for expendable launch vehicle and cryotank applications to achieve reliability in operations and to provide necessary cost reductions.

5. Joining and bonding techniques and concepts must be developed and characterized for future large launch vehicle applications.

This statement emphasizes the need to develop advanced joining and bonding concepts for the large vehicle, cryotank and dry-bay applications envisioned for future system applications. This statement applies to both evolving composite systems and built-up intermetallic structures.

8.2.2 REUSABLE VEHICLES SUBPANEL

The Reusable Vehicles (RV) subpanel agreed to include vehicles meant for multiple missions or for repeated mission events, as expected with Mars exploration missions. Although an actual quantity of repeated missions was not agreed upon, most agreed that the set of critical issues (e.g., fracture mechanics and safe-life analysis) are the same for five to 10 missions as they are for 50 to 100 missions. Ideally, reusable vehicles are those which can return from flight, undergo inspection, and fly again in a reasonable time. Several panel members suggested the analogy of a commercial aircraft.

In creating a list of highest priority issues, the primary framework for discussion was future reusable vehicles requirements. The four most pertinent requirements for reusable vehicles were defined:

- Low cost
- High reliability
- Low maintenance
- On-time launch or deployment capability

The RV subpanel identified several technologies required for envisioned and existing missions and vehicle programs. Materials technology was the primary focus of subpanel discussions. Within the context of existing programs which require reusable vehicles such as NLS, SEI, NASP, SDIO/SSTO, Al-Li and composites technologies received the most attention.

Materials

As previously mentioned, metallics and composites were the primary topics discussed by the subpanel. Because of its near-term potential for upcoming missions, Al-Li technology was discussed in great detail, particularly for cryogenic tank applications. The benefits of Al-Li alloys were stressed, particularly:

- Lightweight as compared to conventional aluminum alloys
- High strength at cryogenic temperatures

The subpanel agreed that the technology for Al-Li must be advanced and that Al-Li alloys need focused development in the near term to impact planned launch vehicle designs. One clear Al-Li technology issue was that although several alloys are currently under development, specific knowledge about any one alloy has not progressed to a point where a vehicle designer can safely baseline Al-Li for any particular application. The subpanel recommended that Al-Li development follow a two-pronged path. One or two alloys should be chosen and fully characterized to enable evaluation for specific program needs. Simultaneously, a continuing effort should be supported to improve Al-Li characteristics such as strength-to-weight ratios, transverse strength and isotropy.

Composites were also discussed in detail by the RV subpanel. Recall that prior to the individual subpanel meetings, Robert Van Siclen presented an industry perspective on composites technology for space applications. The issues addressed in this presentation were enhanced by a discussion of potential applications of composites to reusable vehicle systems. In particular, application of composites technology to cryogenic tankage was addressed.
Table 8.2.2 Priority Technology Issues for Reusable Vehicles

- Cryogenic tankage
- Cryogenic tankage with LH2
- Cryogenic tankage with LO2
- Launch vehicle TPS/insulation
- Durable passive thermal control devices and/or coatings
- Development and characterization of processing methods to reduce anisotropy of material properties in Al-Li
- Durable thermal protection system
- Unpressurized Al-Li structures (interstages, thrust structures)
- Near net shape sections
- Pressurized structures
- Welding and joining
- In space joining
- Micrometeoroid and debris hypervelocity shields
- State-of-the-art shell buckling structure optimizer program to serve as a rapid design tool
- Damage tolerant design for composite structures
- Test philosophy
- Reduced load cycle time
- Optimized system engineering approach to ensure robustness
- Structural analysis methods
- Optimization of structural criteria
- Develop an engineering approach to properly trade material and structural concepts selection, fabrication, facilities and cost
- Maintenance and refurbishment philosophy

Through use of composites technology for NASP applications, much has been learned about composites and hardware manufacture for cryogenic hydrogen tanks using composites. By building a prototype composite cryogenic H2 tank, NASP has advanced the state of the art in composites technology and suggested that Al-Li may not be the only alternative for reusable vehicle cryotanks. Composites and Al-Li alloys should be competed at all levels. The subpanel agreed that the benefits of composites for cryogenic tanks (in particular, weight savings, high strength properties and lower part count) warrant a level of effort that will allow continued research in composites technology for cryogenic applications. However, issues such as penetration effects (sealing), H2 compatibility (liners) and H2 leakage must be priorities for research to assess the realistic potential of composites. An example of composite material for cryotank applications is 8551-7 graphite-fiber-reinforced toughened resin.

The potential of composites for LO2 tanks and the primary issue associated with composite LO2 tanks — flammability protection — were also discussed. The hydrogen content in composite resins requires that tank liner technology be advanced to seal the resin from the LO2. Technology issues for liners involve safety from microcracking and permeability. Also, non-ignition source level sensors must be developed to reduce risk with composite LO2 tanks. The greatest benefit of composite cryotanks is expected to be a 10-15% reduction in tank weight and the associated significant cost savings. However, the realistic potential for composite LO2 tanks was not readily conceded by the entire subpanel.

Metal matrix composites (MMC) technologies are being pursued by the NASP program, especially titanium-based composites, because of their potential as hot structure materials. Many MMC properties must be better characterized to allow lower risk decisions regarding use of MMC on vehicle systems. A better mathematical characterization of nonlinear structural stress properties must also be gained.

Advanced thermal protection system materials are needed which are durable,
lightweight and can be used in an increasing spectrum of erosion environments. High temperature, high-strength reusable spray-on foams acceptable to the Environmental Protection Agency are needed for cryogenic tanks. Limited work in this area has recently been started. Maintenance costs are also very important criteria for TPS system selection. Many current systems are adhesively attached, which makes them very expensive to remove for inspection.

**Structural Concepts**

For reusable structures, low structural weight is one of the most important design considerations. Safe designs are needed which offer the lowest possible structural design weight to maintain low operational costs. A fundamental means of achieving low structural weight is to use advanced lightweight materials like those previously mentioned in conventional structures. Another is to develop structural optimization techniques which will lessen design conservatism while not exceeding acceptable risk levels.

For actively-cooled structures, innovative structural designs are needed to lower structural weight and improve cooling effectiveness, which would allow lower coolant flow rates and reduce liquid coolant weights. Though primarily a design consideration and not a technology, this requirement identifies the need for less-expensive and faster computational structural analysis methods to reduce uncertainty and enhance the capability of designers to include more sophisticated computer models into the design process.

**Fabrication and Manufacturing**

Most of the discussion of fabrication techniques focused on advanced metallics, specifically Al-Li. Recall that two papers were presented before the entire VSP panel which described the state of the art in manufacturing capability by providing examples of existing structures using advanced materials. Because of concern that machining wastes large quantities of expensive material, different methods of fabricating parts were discussed.

For Al-Li alloys such as 2090, technology is lacking in cryotank manufacturing areas including stretch-forming gores, spur domes and large-scale extruded net sections. The Soviets claim that they have extruded a 0.8 m x 10.0 m section from an Al-Li material with better properties than 2090 and Weldalite™.

**Design, Analysis and Certification**

Though not necessarily a technology issue, the test philosophy commonly employed for advanced structures technology development efforts does not include a strong commitment to test structures to failure. Such a test philosophy must be developed, as well as a simple, probabilistic approach to derive structural design criteria.

Another fundamental design philosophy discussed was the design margins for vehicle systems. A design with margins beyond what is required would permit more robust vehicles than vehicles built to operate at existing structural design limits. In the latter case, low structural weight will be a primary design criteria and advanced structures will need to operate reliably under the most extreme limits of their design. To ensure safety with reduced design margins, better non-linear structural analysis tools will be needed.

**Non-Destructive Evaluation**

Techniques to inspect and evaluate the fidelity of vehicle components without causing damage to parts are vital to lowering the cost of planned and existing vehicle systems. Current post-flight methods used to ensure recertification for follow-on flights of many reusable vehicles require large-scale disassembly, inspection and testing (e.g., Shuttle Orbiter). These labor-intensive activities produce significant increases in operation costs for the vehicle. Space vehicle developers should perhaps look to non-space industry philosophies to realize "lessons-learned."

Though not identified in the final list of critical issues, in-situ health monitoring was also identified as an important materials and structures consideration for reusable space vehicles.
8.3 PRESENTATIONS
8.3.1 Built-up Al-Li Structures for Cryogenic Tank and Dry Bay Applications by Barry Lisagor, LaRC
BUILT-UP AI-Li STRUCTURES FOR CRYOGENIC TANK AND DRY BAY APPLICATIONS

W. Barry Lisagor
NASA Langley Research Center
ADVANCED LAUNCH SYSTEM

Structures, Materials & Manufacturing

Built-up structures for ALDP #3104

Responsible Org: NASA/LaRC
Execution: LaRC/Rockwell/GD
Funding ($M):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>ΔTC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Built-up panel concepts defined
SPF and RSW parameters established
Test stiffener and column buckling panels
Materials characterization and properties
Fab and test subscale barrel section

Payoffs:
- Lower weight/lower system costs
- Significant reduction in tank costs
- Reduced scrap rate/lower material costs
- Reduction in major machining costs
- Avoid thick plate issues

Objectives:
- Demonstrate the cost benefits of built-up cryotank & dry bay structures
- Conventional AI alloys
- Low density Al-Li alloys
- Evaluate alternative low-cost stiffener and joining concepts

Machined thick plate
Built-up sheet metal
TASK #3104 BUILT-UP STRUCTURE FOR CRYOTANKS

Program Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Key activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASA - LaRC</td>
<td>SPF/RSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Martin Marietta</td>
<td>• Alternate forming &amp; joining methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reynolds</td>
<td>- SPF of chemistry modified Weldalite™</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Weldalite stiffener extrusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell</td>
<td>SPF of Al &amp; Al-Li alloys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Dynamics</td>
<td>RSW of Al &amp; Al-Li alloys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADP TASK #3104 BUILT-UP ALUMINUM CRYOTANKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY OR MILESTONE NAME</th>
<th>Activity Start Date</th>
<th>Activity Finish Date</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 STRUCTURAL CONCEPTS &amp; COST STUDIES</td>
<td>2/88</td>
<td>9/92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 DEFINE DESIGN CRITERIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 DEFINE BUILT-UP CRYOTANK STRUCTURE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 DEFINE BUILT-UP INTERTANK STRUCTURE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 COST BENEFITS ANALYSIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 SPF OF HIGH STRENGTH AL &amp; AL-LI ALLOYS</td>
<td>10/88</td>
<td>1/91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 MATERIAL SELECTION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 ESTABLISH SPF PARAMETERS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 SPF PROCESS OPTIMIZATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 POST-SFP PROPERTIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 RSW OF HIGH STRENGTH AL &amp; AL-LI ALLOYS</td>
<td>8/89</td>
<td>6/93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 DETERMINE RSW PARAMETERS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 WELD CERTIFICATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 DESIGN WELD ARAY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 FAB WELD EFFECTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 INPECTABILITY &amp; RELIABILITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 ALTERNATE FORMING &amp; JOINING</td>
<td>8/89</td>
<td>12/93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 EXTRUDE &amp; ROLL FORM STIFFENERS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 ESTABLISH ADHESIVE &amp; WELD BondING TECH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 MATERIALS CHARACTERIZATION &amp; PROPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 FAB &amp; TEST ELEMENTS &amp; SUBCOMPONENTS</td>
<td>9/92</td>
<td>6/93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 COMPLETE SINGLE STIFFENER TESTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 FAB ALU DEMO PART</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 COMPLETE MULTIPLE STIFFENER TESTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 COMPLETE COLUMN BUCKLING TESTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 FAB &amp; TEST FULL THICKNESS STRUCTURAL COMP.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 AUTOMATION &amp; SCALE-UP</td>
<td>1/93</td>
<td>12/93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 DEVELOP SCALE-UP PLAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 PROJECTED FAB. COST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BENEFITS OF USING AL-LI ALLOYS FOR CRYOGENIC TANKS

15% tank weight savings due to improved specific properties

- 2219 Integrally machined
- Al-Li Built-up structure

Large reduction in buy to fly ratio due to reduced scrap rate

- Tank weight 42.5K lbs Raw material 213K lbs
- Tank weight 42.5K lbs Raw material 51.0K lbs

Material costs

- $0.9 M
- $2.1 M
- $1.2 M

Cost-to-orbit benefit

- $100 M
- $85 M
- $15 M

System costs savings

+ $1.2 M
- $15.0 M
- $13.8 M

$2000/lb to orbit

SPECIFIC PROPERTIES VERSUS TEMPERATURE FOR SELECTED AL ALLOYS IN T8 TEMPER

- Weldalite 049
- 2090
- 8090
- 2219

Strength

Specific yield strength, 10^6 in.

Temperature, °F

1.2
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
-300 -200 -100 0 100

Stiffness

Specific modulus, 10^6 in.

130
120
110
100
90

Room temperature
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EXPERIMENTAL VERIFICATION OF SUPERPLASTIC FORMING PROFILE

OPTIMUM POST-SPF PROPERTIES OF AL-LI ALLOYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Maximum Strength (Under-aged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Strength</td>
<td>(ii) Adequate Ductility (&gt;5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Strength</td>
<td>(iii) Practical Aging Time (&lt;40 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elongation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing tensile strength and elongation for AL-LI alloys](image)

**Legend**:
- Ultimate Strength
- Yield Strength
- Elongation

**Considerations**:
- (i) Maximum Strength (Under-aged)
- (ii) Adequate Ductility (>5%)
- (iii) Practical Aging Time (<40 hrs)

**Graph**

- **8090**
  - T6: 72, T5: 70, T5/AC: 70
  - SPF Strain: 80% (0.6)

- **2090**
  - T6: 72, T5: 62, T5/AC: 69

- **X2095**
  - T6: 89, T5: 88, T5/AC: 88

**Tensile Strength, ksi**

- 0 to 100

**Elongation, %**

- 0 to 10
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CHARACTERIZATION OF RESISTANCE SPOT WELDS
8090 T-6 to 2090 T-8E50
Splitting, High strength (1603 lbs overlap shear)

Feedback from welder

Top view X-ray of weld

Side view of cross-sectioned weld

RESISTANCE SPOT WELDS OVERLAP SHEAR STRENGTHS

Strength, lbs

2500
2000
1500
1000
585
500

± 25%

± 12.5%

MIL-W-6858D avg strength
BUILT-UP STRUCTURE APPROACH TO REINFORCE FUSION WELDS

Conventional weld land arrangement

Doubler reinforced fusion weld

Weld land
Fusion weld
Skin

Resistance spot weld
Fusion weld

Doubler
Skin

Fusion weld stress, ksi

Thickness - 0.100”
Spacing - 0.75”

Width - 6.0”
Spacing - 0.75”

Width - 6.0”
Thickness - 0.100”

35 40 45

Doubler width, in.
Doubler thickness, in.
Spot weld spacing, in.

35 40 45

35 40 45

Fusion weld stress, ksi

Tensile strength

35 40 45

70 000

Load, lbs

2090-T6(SPF)/2090-T8 Al-Li COMPRESSION PANELS
Tested at NASA LaRC

Beaded web curved cap

Stepped-hat curved cap

Beaded web flat cap

Stiffener configuration

Head displacement

285
SUPERPLASTICALLY FORMED Al-Li MULTIPLE STIFFENED PANEL

BUILT-UP Al-Li STRUCTURES FOR NLS

- SPF stiffeners
- Reduced part count
- Minimum machining
- RSW assembly
- 15% weight savings
- Lower fabrication costs

Forward adapter
LO$_2$ tank
Intertank
LH$_2$ tank
Aft skirt
PERFORMANCE BENEFITS USING AL-LI (G.D.)

- Direct substitution of Al-Li for conventional Al alloys can add 6000 lbs of payload to the baseline 11/2 stage vehicle. Redesigning the structure to take full advantage of the higher properties of Al-Li alloys could add >12000 lbs in payload savings.
- Weight savings of ~10% achievable by making the propellant tank of the 11/2 stage vehicle from Al-Li.
- Weight savings of ~5% achievable by making the adapter and thrust structure of the 11/2 stage vehicle from Al-Li.
- High raw material costs of Al-Li are the primary driver in selecting the appropriate fabrication approach.
- Dependent on the material substitution approach and fabrication method, the increased cost of using Al-Li could range from $0.5M to $4.0M per vehicle.
- In the baseline 11/2 stage vehicle, the cost performance for Al-Li ranges from $150/lb to $750/lb of payload increase compared with the current projected payload performance of $1500/lb using other alternatives.

ALDP BUILT-UP STRUCTURE FOR CRYOGENIC TANKS #3104

STATUS

- SPF OF Al-Li ALLOYS
  - Post-forming mechanical properties determined
  - 3' x 5' multiple stiffener panel formed
- RSW OF Al-Li ALLOYS
  - RSW schedules optimized using taguchi design of experiments
  - RSW strength of Al-Li alloys exceeds standard military specs
- STRUCTURAL TESTING
  - Crippling panels tested and shown to meet design req'ts
  - Stiffener design selected for column buckling panel
- COST/TRADE STUDIES
  - Cost analysis comparing roll forming, brake forming, extrusion and SPF fabrication methods near completion
- Current program focus assessing the benefits of Al-Li built-up dry-bay structures (intertank, fwd adapter, aft skirt)
8.3.2 Orbital Lessons Learned - A Guide to Future Vehicle Development by H. Stan Greenberg, Rockwell International
ORBITER LESSONS LEARNED
A GUIDE TO FUTURE VEHICLE DEVELOPMENT

presented at Space Transportation Materials and Structures Technology Workshop
at Newport News, Virginia, September 24, 1991
by Rockwell International - H. Stan Greenberg
Need - Wind persistence loads methodology

BACKGROUND
- Space Shuttle was designed to a synthetic wind environment for high Q portion of flight
- Last wind measurement taken 2 hours before launch
- Initial estimates grossly underestimated wind persistence (variability)

ACCOMPLISHMENTS
- Thorough assessments of wind pairs indicate the method of analysis is critical to magnitude of wind persistence
- Wind pairs can be evaluated at constant Mach number, at peak load, or at minimum margin

FUTURE NEED
- Assure that wind persistence is properly developed for vehicle design
- Use minimum margin approach in statistical determination of persistence load increment at launch assessment

Need - Emphasize Supportability in Design of Reusable Vehicles

BACKGROUND
- 1970's Orbiter design: supportability at KSC represents significant facility (OPF) and manpower costs - turnaround time is approximately 2 months
- All future reusable vehicles require reduced supportability cost and some require more rapid turnaround time

FUTURE NEEDS
- Emphasize supportability engineering in integrated systems design process - in particular ease of subsystems removal/replacement
- Design for ease of access and inspection - creatively use GSE
- Emphasize durability and maintainability in structures materials, construction, and configuration design
- Develop new and automated inspection techniques
Need - Design for Robustness

BACKGROUND
- Design margins are small for high O boost phase
- Pre-flight predictions of the probability of having acceptable winds for safe launch were low enough to be a significant program concern
- Evolving missions with new payloads and trajectories are identifying vent pressures outside certified pressure envelopes

ACCOMPLISHMENTS
- Developed the capability to modify the flight trajectory and to perform real-time analysis of the balloon data
- Performed detailed analysis for each mission to assess structural suitability to vent pressure

FUTURE NEED
- A systems engineering approach considering all aspects of launch procedures, wind persistence, entry and landing, and future mission parameters to effect a more robust design - performance vs operational flexibility

Need - Improved aerodynamic environment prediction methods for complex vehicles

BACKGROUND
- Early flights indicated unexpected wing bending - attributed to aerodynamic complexity of mated vehicle and thrust plume effects
- Wing strain gage flight data indicated discrepancies with aerodynamic analysis predictions - attributed to plume effects
- Analysis and wind tunnel data identified non-uniform pressure distribution around fuselage due to rapidly moving shock waves

ACCOMPLISHMENTS
- Development of analysis of mated vehicle with plume effects - wind tunnel testing with plumes - update of aerodynamic data
- Increased interaction between aerodynamics and structures through FEM analysis

FUTURE NEEDS
- Develop rapid/accurate aerodynamic prediction tools
- Improved techniques for scaling of wind tunnel data and low cost flight instrumentation for analysis verification
Need - Automated integration of aerothermal, manufacturing, and structures analysis

BACKGROUND

- TPS TILE GAPS AND STEPS INFLUENCE TRANSITION FROM LAMINAR TO TURBULENT FLOW - INCREASED HEATING
- FLIGHT TEMPERATURE MEASUREMENTS INDICATED GRADIENTS IN EXCESS OF PREDICTIONS - CONSERVATIVE MAXIMUM TEMPERATURE PREDICTIONS CAN MASK HIGH GRADIENT CONDITIONS

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- REFINED THERMAL ANALYSIS CHARACTERIZATION OF TPS GAPS, STEPS AND STRUCTURE MODEL - FLIGHT MEASUREMENT DATA USED
- DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY - MISSION HEATING PARAMETERS TO MARGIN OF SAFETY - PARTIALLY AUTOMATED

FUTURE NEED

- DEVELOP RAPID AND ACCURATE AUTOMATED ANALYSIS FROM MISSION HEATING PARAMETERS AND AERODYNAMIC PRESSURES TO MARGIN OF SAFETY - INCLUDE MANUFACTURING/STRUCTURAL IMPOSED GAPS AND STEPS

Need - Continued development of durable TPS

BACKGROUND

- ORBITER TPS SYSTEMS ACCOMPLISH MISSION PERFORMANCE GOALS WITH LIGHTWEIGHT, STATE OF THE ART BOND-ON FRSI, AFRSI, COATED CERAMIC TILES AND CARBON-CARBON LEADING EDGES
- ORBITER SUPPORTABILITY EXPERIENCE IN REGARD TO DEBRIS IMPACT, WIND RAIN/erosion, AND ACTIVITY AT HIGH SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE REGIONS INDICATE THE DESIRABILITY OF MORE DURABLE TPS

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- DEVELOPED PBI, HTP CERAMIC TILE COATED WITH TUF1 AND ACC - SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN DURABILITY WITH COMPARABLE WEIGHT

FUTURE NEEDS

- SOME VEHICLE SYSTEMS REQUIRE OPERATION IN MUCH MORE SEVERE WIND/RAIN ENVIRONMENTS
- EASE OF REPLACEMENT IS DESIRABLE AND FACILITATES STRUCTURE INSPECTION
- CONTINUE ONGOING DEVELOPMENTS OF MORE DURABLE TILE, METALLICS, BLANKETS AND ACC FOR MINIMUM SUPPORTABILITY
Need - Continued Electronic Documentation of Structural Design and Analysis

BACKGROUND

- 1970's Orbiter Structures documentation comprised of hand-prepared drawings, analysis reports, typed specifications - considerable volume of documents
- Continuing development of integrated computer design techniques such as IDEAS, CATIA, NASTRAN FEM, analysis subroutines reduce engineering hours but are in electronic form
- The magnitude of electronic data for a program such as Shuttle will be enormous

FUTURE NEED

- Develop approaches to electronic documentation that are feasible, efficient and satisfactory to both contractor and government agencies

Need - Landing gear rollout load simulations

BACKGROUND

- Orbiter and other aircraft gear systems are designed by military specifications and FAR 25
- Orbiter experience indicates flight control and gear system coupling during rollout can impose gear loads in excess of specification requirements

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Accurate flight control system incorporated into landing gear loads simulation
- Monte Carlo assessment is performed to determine realistic 3-sigma limit loads

FUTURE NEED

- Include minimum control surface oscillations in preliminary landing gear rollout load simulations to bound control and gear system interactions
20 years of Technology development could result in Orbiter Structure of

- ALUMINUM LITHIUM CREW COMPARTMENT
- GRAPHITE/BMI FUSELAGE, WING, TAIL, AND CARGO BAY DOORS (450°F INNER MOLD LINE TEMPERATURE)
- ACC ON LEADING EDGE, NOSE CAP, AND CONTROL SURFACES
- DIRECT BONDED HTP ON LOWER SURFACE (WITHOUT SIP)
- ONTO REMAINING FUSELAGE SURFACES - NEKTEL BLANKET INSULATION OR PBI OR FRSI ACCORDING TO TEMPERATURE LIMITS
- CARBON FIBER OVERWRAPPED PRESSURE VESSELS
The Propulsion Systems Panel was established because of the specialized nature of many of the materials and structures technology issues related to propulsion systems. This panel was co-chaired by Carmelo Bianca, MSFC, and Bob Miner, LeRC. Because of the diverse range of missions anticipated for the Space Transportation program, three distinct propulsion system types were identified in the workshop planning process: liquid propulsion systems, solid propulsion systems and nuclear electric/nuclear thermal propulsion systems.

9.1 LIQUID PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUBPANEL ACTIVITIES

The Liquid Propulsion Systems Sub-panel was chaired by Larry Johnston, MSFC. Eight global issues were identified and 25 specific issues/technology requirements quad charts were prepared by the Liquid Propulsion Systems subpanel. The initial global issues identified were:

- Combustion Chamber Materials
- Propellant-Compatible Materials
- Fabrication Techniques
- Turbopump Materials
- Nozzle Materials
- Bearing Materials
- Data Base
- Lightweight Insulations

The specific issues/technology requirements developed for each of the subpanel topics were presented by the lead member of each of the subpanels (Paul Munafo for Materials, Larry Johnston for Structures and Walt Karakulko for Operations). Ensuing discussions resulted in additions to both global and specific issues and the final list developed by the panel is shown in Figure 9.1. The number in parentheses which follows the issues listed in Figure 9.1. indicates the number of times each issue was raised in the liquid propulsion system quad charts.
The subpanel then prioritized the specific issues/technology requirements to define the highest priority issues which would be provided to the Propulsion Systems Panel Co-chairman, Carmelo Bianca, and subsequently presented to the workshop as part of the Propulsion Systems Panel report. Prior to undertaking that task, Tom Herbell, Lewis Research Center, presented a briefing on ceramic composite technology research being conducted at Lewis for application to liquid rocket turbopump parts. He cited the benefits of composites — higher turbine inlet temperatures and extended service life — and indicated the funding requirements over a period of time that would be required to establish the technology base.

While prioritizing, the subpanel raised a number of additional issues, which are listed below:

- What criteria should be used to select top priority technologies: near-term (materials compatibility) vs. longer-term (composite materials) technologies?
- Propellant management technology issues should be raised as a comment.
- Launch costs are again increasing the importance of performance.
- Technology programs have insufficient funds to carry technology far enough and program managers are unwilling to take risk with new technologies (fear of failure syndrome).
- Technology sharing with Air Force should be encouraged.

The specific issues and technology requirements included in the Panel Summary Report were:

• **Improved analysis and test methods:** Durability modeling in one computer code and accelerated test techniques

• **Propellant-compatible materials:** Hydrogen-resistant alloys, improved materials for rubbing in an oxygen environment, environmentally-compatible materials for cleaning, and methods to neutralize the effects of nitrogen-tetroxide on materials.

• **Improved bearing and seal materials and fabrication processes:** Cryogenic rolling-element bearing materials, bearing cage materials, improved seal materials, foil bearings, dual-property bearing race processing, application of ceramic materials to cryogenic bearings, and the application of nanocrystalline materials to bearings.

### 9.2 SOLID PROPULSION SUBPANEL ACTIVITIES

The objective of the Solid Propulsion Subpanel, chaired by Raymond Clinton, MSFC, was to assess the state of the art in solid propulsion materials, structures and manufacturing processes, compare this to needs identified prior to and during the plenary session of the workshop and determine the areas where additional technology effort should be expended to meet these needs.

The Solid Propulsion Subpanel divided into ten task teams representing each of the basic elements of solid rocket motors. These task teams were: 1) motor cases, 2) propellants, 3) nozzles, 4) bondlines, 5) nondestructive evaluation, 6) motor case insulation, 7) materials properties, 8) analysis, 9) adhesives, and 10) hybrid motors.

The task teams prepared inputs prior to the workshop regarding the state of current technology and the needs in each of the ten areas. As a result of this thorough assessment of current technology and future propulsion system needs, a preliminary determination of the technology required to satisfy these needs was completed. A total of 90 technology needs were defined by the task teams. In order of greatest number, these were: bondlines - 25; analysis - 14; propellants - 13; nozzles - 8; NDE - 7; motor case insulation - 6; materials properties - 6; motor cases - 5; adhesives - 4; and hybrid motors - 2. The Liquid Propulsion Subpanel added to this list four additional needs in NDE and motor cases. After review and combination of the needs, the following list resulted: 1) bondlines/propellant - 42; 2) nozzles - 28; 3) motor cases - 11; 4) motor case insulation - 7; 5) hybrid rocket propulsion - 2.

Presentations in the following areas in which additional technology effort was determined to be needed were made:

• **Motor cases**
  - Improved case materials/forms
  - Improved case joints/attachments
  - Self insulating case

• **Propellant/Bondlines**
  - Material and process variability
  - Bondline design for inspectability
  - Propellant and bondline failure criteria
  - Propellant test techniques

• **Insulation**
  - TPE insulator fabrication technology and bondline characterization for large motors

• **Nozzles**
  - Process understanding, optimization and control for ablative nozzle components
  - Robust ablative nozzle material and process development

• **Analytical issues**
  - Material response characterization and constitutive modeling of ablative materials

• **Hybrid propulsion**
  - Hybrid propulsion feasibility demonstration

The two white papers in Section 9.4 address issues discussed by the solid propulsion
subpanel. They were submitted by subpanel members subsequent to review and are included for information.

9.3 NUCLEAR PROPULSION SYSTEMS SUBPANEL ACTIVITIES

The Nuclear Propulsion Subpanel of the Propulsion Panel was chaired by Bob Miner, LeRC, and co-chaired by James Stone, LeRC. This subpanel was organized to assess nuclear propulsion materials and structures technology issues. The subpanel meetings began with presentations on Nuclear Thermal Propulsion (NTP) and Nuclear Electric Propulsion (NEP) systems and materials. The titles and authors of the presentations were:

- "Fuels Development for Nuclear Propulsion Systems," by Bruce Matthews, Los Alamos National Laboratory
- "Materials for Space Nuclear Thermal Propulsion Systems" and "Refractory Alloys for Space Nuclear Electric Propulsion Systems," by Roy Cooper, Oak Ridge National Laboratory

The primary driving force behind renewed interest in space nuclear propulsion is SEI. The Stafford Synthesis Group labeled nuclear thermal propulsion an enabling technology for SEI. During 1991, an interagency (NASA/DOE/DoD) technical panel has been evaluating nuclear thermal propulsion concepts as well as planning a joint technology development project in nuclear propulsion. The present plan calls for demonstrating Technology Readiness Level (TRL) six for NTP and TRL five for NEP by the year 2006.

Currently, the state of the art in nuclear technology is defined by the NERVA/ROVER nuclear rocket programs from the 1960s and 1970s for NTP and the latest results on SP-100 for NEP. New NTP systems for SEI require the reactor to operate at temperatures (3000 K exhaust temperature) beyond the capabilities of current fuels and materials technology used in the NERVA/ROVER program. Advances in materials systems hold the potential to significantly reduce NTP mass and realize the full impulse power potential of these concepts. Five major NTP subsystems can be identified: propellant tank, propellant pump, radiation shield, nuclear heat source, and thruster nozzle. Although no detailed designs exist for these systems or sub-systems, candidate materials for construction of these subsystems can be identified and developed. The high operating temperatures for the fuels and core materials is the major technical feasibility issue for NTP reactors.

For NEP systems, five major subsystems can be identified: nuclear heat source, radiation shield, power conversion, thermal management, and electric thruster. High-performance space nuclear electrical power systems will place severe demands on candidate alloys for fuel cladding and structural applications. Alloy selection criteria of major importance include creep strength, producibility, weldability and tolerance to radiation effects. Qualification of refractory alloys could be the pacing, and possibly the limiting, technology need of the space nuclear electric propulsion program. High burnup at end of life and accompanying swelling of the major fuels and cladding materials are technical feasibility issues for NEP reactors. The SP-100 engine operates at 1375 K and has a seven-year operating lifetime. However, for significantly higher operating temperatures and a target lifetime of seven years for NEP applications, presently-available alloys appear inadequate. New alloys will be required to achieve the goal of TRL five by 2006.

Ground testing was identified as the most critical need for qualifying nuclear propulsion systems. Construction of new facilities and refurbishment of present facilities will be necessary. These facilities range from fuel manufacturing plants to environmentally-safe, terrestrial-based propulsion systems test facilities. These new facilities may prove to be very difficult to design, fabricate and most importantly, afford.
Fuels and coatings were deemed the highest priority for NTP propulsion systems. This is because: (1) NTP was selected by SEI as the propulsion system of choice for Mars missions, and (2) nuclear fuels and coatings are the very foundation of nuclear propulsion. A description of the desired characteristics for NTP fuels and coatings follows:

- ~100% fission product retention
- Thermal stability (low mass loss at $T \geq 3000$ K in H$_2$ over five hours)
- High melting point (> 3400 K)
- High fuel density
- Thermal shock resistance
- Slow degradation mechanisms
- Chemical compatibility with coating and matrix materials
- High surface area to volume ratio
- Fabricability

The recommended actions to produce these fuels and coatings are:

- Reduce concepts by defining criteria, eliminating non-performers, down-selecting, and combining designs
- Initiate R&D on issues common to proposed fuels and coating technologies
- Construct test facilities
- Initiate R&D to demonstrate evolutionary improvement in safety and performance (increase time & temperature)
- Initiate fabrication and characterization development
- Initiate prototypical fuel element testing
- Generate data to:
  - Support engineering designs
  - Qualify operating margins
  - Predict reliability

The Nuclear Propulsion Subpanel assigned the second highest priority to NEP refractory alloys and described the desired characteristics for NEP refractory alloys as follows:

- Lifetime greater than two years at temperatures greater than 1500 K
- Compatibility with candidate fuels
- Compatibility with working fluids and coolants
- High strength at operating temperatures
- Resistance to radiation damage
- Readily fabricated into complex components

The actions necessary to produce NEP refractory alloys are:

- Reduce candidate concepts and select candidate materials
- Develop materials specifications
- Optimize fabrication methods
- Establish supply infrastructure
- Generate preliminary data base for:
  - Radiation damage effects
  - Compatibility with coolant & working fluids
  - High temperature mechanical properties
- Refurbish facilities to support the above

NEP fuels and claddings were assigned the third highest priority, and the desired characteristics for them are:

- High burnup: 10-25% at end of life for liquid metal cooled and 3-5% for gas cooled reactors
- Low fission gas release and swelling
- Fuel/cladding/fission product compatibility
• Fuel cladding integrity

• High creep strength for cladding materials

• Fuel element integrity for thermionic conversion systems

• Benign off-normal performance

The actions necessary to produce NEP fuels and claddings efficiently are:

• Reduce concepts by defining criteria, eliminating non-performers, down selecting, and combining designs

• Develop and test stable, comparable, high temperature fuels

• Start prototypical, high-burnup irradiation testing program

• Construct ground testing facilities

• Generate data to:
  - Support engineering designs
  - Qualify operating margins
  - Predict reliability
  - Complete safety analysis

Lightweight, high-temperature, and high-performance radiator materials were given the fourth highest priority, but are key for NEP systems. Increased weight reduces the NEP thrust-to-mass ratio and also results in more initial mass to Low Earth Orbit. These radiator materials should have the following characteristics:

• T>1000 K

• High specific conductivity

• Protection from alkali metals

• High strength/stiffness

• High emissivity/coating

The actions necessary to produce lightweight, high-temperature, and high-performance radiator materials are:

• Carbon/carbon
  - Select most robust high conductivity fiber
  - Develop composite architecture to reduce weight and increase through-thickness conductivity
  - Develop light protective liner
  - Optimize surface emissivity

• Graphite/copper
  - Optimize interfacial bonding
  - Develop joining process
  - Optimize surface emissivity

• Fabricate subscale radiator segment
9.4 PRESENTATIONS
9.4.1 Hybrid Rocket Propulsion by Allen L. Holzman, United Technologies/Chemical Systems
HYBRID ROCKET PROPULSION

Allen L. Holzman

UNITED TECHNOLOGIES/CHEMICAL SYSTEMS
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA
HYBRIDS

HYBRID ENGINE OPERATION
COMPARISON OF THE THEORETICAL SPECIFIC IMPULSES ATTAINABLE WITH SOLID, LIQUID AND HYBRID PROPELLANT SYSTEMS

COMPARISON OF THE DENSITY-SPECIFIC IMPULSES ATTAINABLE WITH SOLID, LIQUID AND HYBRID PROPELLANT SYSTEMS
HISTORY

- 1930's
  - California Rocket Society - static tests

- 1940's - 50's
  - Pacific Rocket Society - LOX/Douglas fir fuel flight tested to 30,000 ft.
  - GE - evaluated H2O/TE engine

- 1950's - 60's
  - APL - reverse hybrid NE2NO/JP

- 1960's - 70's
  - CSD - fundamental regression/combustion studies
    - supersonic target drones, flight tests (Sandpiper/HAST/Firebolt)
    - High energy FLOX/Li/LiH/HTPB tests
    - 380-sec t_s, 8/40/1 expansion ratio
    - 50K-lb thrust N2O/Al/FRAN
  - ONERA/SNECKA/SEP - HNO3/amine fuel, sounding rockets, flight tests

- 1980's
  - AHROC - 50K-lb thrust LOX/PB

- 1990's
  - AHROC - 75K-lb thrust LOX/PB

GENERAL PROPULSION SYSTEM FEATURES COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Solid</th>
<th>Liquid LOX-JP</th>
<th>Classical Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOT classification</td>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>Inert when-MT</td>
<td>Inert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explosive classification</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>60% TNT equiv.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity to grain cracks/voids</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch abort capability (propulsion termination)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling costs</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isp</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$ Isp</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust HCl</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust particulate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Either</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HYBRID COMBUSTION BOUNDARY LAYER

Basic Hybrid Burning Rate Laws

Elementary pipe flow
\[ Q_w = \dot{m}_F h_v = (h/c_p) \Delta h_c \]

\[ \dot{i} = \frac{1}{\rho_f} \left( \frac{h/c_p}{\Delta h_c/h_v} \right) \]

with \( h_c \approx \frac{c_p G^{0.8}}{D^{0.2}} \) (turbulent pipe flow)

Refined relation
\[ \dot{i} = \left( \frac{0.036\mu^{0.2}}{D^{0.2}} \right) \left( \frac{C_H}{CH_0} \right) \left( \frac{U_e}{U_b} \right) \left( \frac{\Delta h_c}{h_v} \right) G^{0.8} + \frac{Q_R}{\rho_f h_v} \]

Good working equation
\[ Q_w = \text{heat flux to wall (fuel)} \]
\[ m_F = \text{fuel flow rate} \]
\[ h_v = \text{effective heat of vaporization} \]
\[ \Delta h_c = \text{heat of combustion of fuel} \]
\[ G = \text{mass flux in port} \]
\[ U = \text{gas velocity} \]

\[ \dot{i} = a G^n \]
WHY AREN'T HYBRIDS OPERATIONAL?

- Operational success of liquid F-1 engines and SRM boosters for the shuttle and Titan III caused interest in hybrids to wane.
- Early emphasis was only for high density impulse systems. Cost, safety, environmental and reliability issues were of second order.
- All the 1960s and 70s work in hybrids was done by primarily liquid and solid propulsion companies. In any selection process for upcoming systems, hybrids were always perceived second best.
- Customer liquid and solid propulsion communities (incumbents) are not interested in sharing funding.
- It is difficult to generate funding for an order of magnitude scale increase to 750K and larger thrust engines.
- "Political factors interfere with technical factors."

HPIAG

HYBRID SYSTEMS

BOOSTER APPLICATIONS
ATLAS BOOSTER DEVELOPMENT AND QUALIFICATION

1. Fuel formulation studies
2. Sub-scale port tests
3. Injector development
4. Analytical modelling
5. Trade studies
6. Full-scale motor tests
7. Nozzle development
8. Thrusting tests
10. Full scale qualification testing

HYBRID SYSTEM ADVANTAGES

BOOSTER APPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hybrids</th>
<th>Solids</th>
<th>Liquids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explosive hazard</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCl in exhaust</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Impulse</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Impulse</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>highest</td>
<td>lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throttleability</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On pad costs</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System cost</td>
<td>low/medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abort capability</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of basic analytical regression/burnout model</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMPARISON OF THROAT BETAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solid propellant</th>
<th>O/F</th>
<th>T&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;\alpha+e&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>c&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>m/l Al&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt; @ throat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASRM TP-H-1233</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6411</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>297.2</td>
<td>5178</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX/Hydrogen</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6110</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>433.7</td>
<td>7961</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX/100% HC</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>6698</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>323.5</td>
<td>5830</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX/35% aluminum/65% HC</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>7148</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>321.2</td>
<td>5786</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX/45% Aluminum/55% HC</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>7377</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>319.3</td>
<td>5716</td>
<td>.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All values theoretical for P<sub>c</sub> = 1000 psia, nozzle area ratio = 10.0

## HYBRID SYSTEM DISADVANTAGES

### NON-METALLIZED FLOW

### BOOSTER APPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hybrids</th>
<th>Solids</th>
<th>Liquids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nozzle erosion</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>n.s.(regeneratively cooled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual fuel/ox</td>
<td>6%/1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated dust</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HYBRID SYSTEMS

UPPER STAGE PROPULSION APPLICATIONS

UPPER STAGE HYBRID MOTOR DEVELOPMENT AND QUALIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fuel formulation studies</td>
<td>X—X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sub-scale port tests</td>
<td>X—X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Injector development</td>
<td>X—X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analytical modelling</td>
<td>X—X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Trade studies</td>
<td>X—X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Full-scale motor tests</td>
<td>X—X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nozzle development</td>
<td>X—X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Throttling tests</td>
<td>X—X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Full scale qualification testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Aerojet
AMROC
Atlantic Research
Boeing Aerospace
General Dynamics
Hercules
Lockheed
Martin Marietta
Rocketdyne
Thiokol
United Technologies

HPIAG SUPPORTS HYBRID PROPULSION DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION

HPIAG Program Planning Presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASA/MSFC (W. Littles)</td>
<td>12/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA HQ (Dr. Rosen, G. Reck)</td>
<td>1/11/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA/MSFC (J. Lee, J. McCarty)</td>
<td>7/24/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA HQ (A. Aldrich, G. Reck)</td>
<td>8/10/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Space Council (I. Bekey)</td>
<td>8/29/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA HQ (J. R. Thompson)</td>
<td>8/29/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Systems &amp; Technology Advisory Committee</td>
<td>9/13/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA HQ (J. R. Thompson)</td>
<td>9/20/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA/MSFC--Program Development*</td>
<td>10/25/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF Space Division (Col. Colgrove)*</td>
<td>10/29/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel</td>
<td>10/31/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford Group</td>
<td>11/16/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA/MSFC (J. Lee, J. McCarty)</td>
<td>12/5/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA/Code R (A. Aldrich)</td>
<td>12/18/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA HQ (J. R. Thompson)</td>
<td>12/19/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF Space Division*</td>
<td>3/14/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA/MSFC--Research and Technology (J. Moses/J. Redus)*</td>
<td>6/20/91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Full HPIAG not present
Augustine Report Excerpts on the Future of the U.S. Space Program

"Over the longer term, the nation must turn to new and revolutionary technologies..."

- More capable and significantly less costly means to launch manned and unmanned spacecraft
- Architecture studies now underway will define capable, low-cost launch vehicles
- Maintain vigorous advanced launch system technology program
  - Enhancement of current fleet
  - Basis for revolutionary launch systems

Hybrid Propulsion Positively Addresses OAST's Civil Space Transportation Requirements

Hybrid Propulsion Attributes

- Expanded mission abort modes
- Inert VAB operations
- Booster operation verified prior to launch commit
- Reduced infrastructure costs
- All hybrid vehicle options
- High thrust minimizes number of boosters required
- Reduced system complexity
- Modular application of boosters for vehicle growth options
- No pad detonation concern
- Applications identified for Atlas and Titan
- Highest leverage technology identified by MM/SDV study
An Industry Consensus on the Hybrid Potential

- Radically improves safety in all phases of manufacture, vehicle stacking/assembly, and flight, and reduces environmental concerns
- Offers a reasonable design alternative to large clusters of LO₂/LH₂ engines for heavy-lift boost propulsion
- May enable major reduction in booster life cycle costs

The United States aerospace community cannot afford to overlook the hybrid propulsion option.

Review of Initial NASA Hybrid Propulsion Technology Program

- Phased technology acquisition and demonstration
  - Initial approach to technology acquisition resulting from formulation of NASA-HPT program
  - Address technology deficiencies in series of graduated subscale motor tests (Phase II)
  - Demonstrate technology at 1.5 Milbf thrust level (Phase III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>$M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPT Phase I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify</td>
<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>the Necessary</td>
<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>Technology</td>
<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>(four contracts)</td>
<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>HPT Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire the</td>
<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>Technology</td>
<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>(two contracts)</td>
<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>CBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<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>May</td>
<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>Complete</td>
<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>May</td>
<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>Complete</td>
<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>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Funding Commitment Required is $41M

- Problems
  - Technology development does not demonstrate large-scale feasibility in time frame required for heavy-lift (SEI) applications
  - Does not utilize national aerospace assets (HPAAG)
An Alternative Development Approach Provides A Fast Track Large-Scale Hybrid Demonstration

- Focused technology acquisition and demonstration
- Approach suggested by J. R. Thompson based on successes of F-1 engine and large solid rocket motor development
- Define specific technical issues for large booster development via early testing of Shuttle SRM-scale hybrid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Element</th>
<th>Months After ATP</th>
<th>Funding Required (one engine concept/two engine concepts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.75M lbf Design and Mfg Test</td>
<td>PDR CDR TRR</td>
<td>$13M/$25M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5M lbf Design and Mfg Test</td>
<td>PDR CDR Classical HDWR Avail</td>
<td>$27M/$47M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2M lbf Design and Mfg Test</td>
<td>PDR CDR Classical HDWR Avail</td>
<td>$45M/$71M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOX Facility</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Problems
  - Effort includes a large-scale feasibility demonstration only—subsequent mix of subscale and full-scale demonstrations to address point design problems requires definition

Final HPT Development Approach Recommended to J. R. Thompson in December 1991

- Demonstration Testing at NASA
  - 20 klbf
  - 8 months
  - HPIAG sponsored

- Large-Scale Feasibility Verification and Technology Development
  - 20 klbf/100 klbf/750 klbf
  - 30 months
  - $25M for large scale feasibility
  - Up to $15M for optional technology

- Full-Scale Development and Demonstration
  - 750 klbf/3.2 Mlbf
  - Not more than 78 months
  - $150 M

- Production for Government and Commercial Applications
Recommended HPT Program Was Included in Budget Request From MSFC and LeRC for GFY 93 Start—Subsequently Pushed to GFY 95

Thrust: TRANSPORTATION-AUGMENTATION NEW START

Date: 2/21/91

Key Technology Objective: 3.0 Provide Technologies to Support the Development of a Robust, Cost Effective Heavy-Lift Capability

Specific Objective: 3.7 Develop Technologies for Achieving Low Cost Booster Options and Demonstrate at an Appropriate Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target/Milestone:</th>
<th>TASK TITLE: TRANSPORTATION-HYBRID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers WBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSFC 590-21-XX</td>
<td>1993 Authority to release NASA Research Announcement for Hybrid Booster Technology Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1993 Award contracts to begin development and testing of both Gas Generator and &quot;Classical&quot; Hybrid test motors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994 Complete 100 klbf testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994 Initiate development of 750 klbf test motors for both &quot;Classical&quot; and Gas Generator concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996 Test both Hybrid Booster concepts at 750 klbf testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996 Complete analysis of performance data and validation of analytical models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996 Complete documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeRC 590-21-XX</td>
<td>1993 Begin development of analytical models and materials data base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995 Validate models at 100 klbf level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996 Validate models at 750 klbf level and extrapolation of Hybrid unique scaling data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Near-Term HPIAG Initiative Provides Program Bridge to GFY 95 HPT New Start

Program concept: Combine industry discretionary resources with NASA R&T funds to begin near-term HPT development

- Initiate basic technology studies at JPL
- Explore technical feasibility of hybrid propulsion for space launch applications via subscale and small-scale hybrid motor tests:
  - Both classical and aft injection cycles
  - 500-lbf, 15-klbf, 150-klbf motors (typical thrust levels)
- Begin limited hybrid propulsion launch vehicle infrastructure studies:
  - Operability issues
  - Reliability evaluation
  - Cost
- Develop program bridge to $40M CSTI effort
Multiple Motor Scales Provide Initial Feasibility Evaluation and Hardware Basis for NRA Follow-on Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motor Thrust Level</th>
<th>Classical Objectives</th>
<th>Aft Injection Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 lbf</td>
<td>Fuel regression rate characteristics</td>
<td>GG propellant ballistic characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effects of defects</td>
<td>Effects of defects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Throttle response characteristics</td>
<td>Initial concept throttling characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 klbf</td>
<td>Fuel regression scale-up characteristics</td>
<td>GG propellant scale-up characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple-port grain retention and fuel utilization</td>
<td>LO₂ injector feasibility verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combustion stability and efficiency</td>
<td>Combustion stability and efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 klbf</td>
<td>Initial HPT demonstrations at thrust level of significance for potential launch</td>
<td>vehicle application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended NASA/HPIAG Organization to Accomplish Goal

- Create two consortiums to pursue development of both classical and gas generator engine cycles
- Companies and NASA initially linked by MOU

```
General Dynamics  HPIAG  HPIAG
    Martin Marietta     Classical Leader     Gas Generator Leader
                      |                                  |                                  |
                      |                                  |                                  |
                      |                                  |                                  |
                      |                                  |                                  |
                      |                                  |                                  |
AMROC                     |                                  |                                  |
Hercules                 |                                  |                                  |
Thiokol                  |                                  |                                  |
UTC/CSD                  |                                  |                                  |
```

NASA

Lockheed

Aerojet

ARC

UTC/P&W

Rocketdyne
Bridge Program Elements

- Program duration 24 months
- Program total cost $5.6M
  - $1.1M industry discretionary
  - $4.5M NASA R&T funds
- Three basic program tasks include both classical and aft injection cycles
  - Task 0--JPL Fundamental Studies (Hybrid Rocket Technology Program)
  - Task 1--Launch Vehicle Infrastructure Studies
  - Task 2--Motor Evaluation and Demonstration

---

Program Master Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months Following ATP</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Program Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Task 0--JPL Technology Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Booster Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Mission Model Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Operability Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Reliability Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>LCC Delta Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Task 1--Infrastructure Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Task 2--Motor Evaluation and Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>0.5-kibf Motor Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>15-kibf Motor Development and Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>150-kibf Motor Development and Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Test Operations (Classical) Test Operations (Aft Injection)
9.4.2 Reliability of Solid Rocket Motor Cases and Nozzles
by J.G. Crose
A recent article in Aerospace America* claims that "the average success ratio of the current U.S. stable of launch vehicles, including upper stages, is about 92% (without upper stages it is close to 95%). The 8% failure probability implies an expected loss of $12M per flight, not including the lost opportunity costs." Since payload costs are likely to be much greater than launch costs and even more so for the new launch vehicles for the Advanced Launch Development Program (ALDP), the cost of rocket motor unreliability at the current 8% rate can run into billions of dollars if expected increases in demand are realized.

At an 8% failure rate, it is extremely unlikely that failure will occur during the first few ground tests of a new system. At that time, most of the design, analysis and tooling costs of the program have been expended. Since most systems are expected to be used ten to a hundred or more times, the likelihood of one or more failures is very large, and it can be expected that the above losses will be realized in the future. This will occur unless the problems are addressed and remedied. Recent trends suggest the problem is not being addressed adequately.

The obvious causes of failure are poor design, lack of quality control of raw materials entering the manufacturing process, lack of quality control during the manufacturing process and inadequate NDE or proof testing. The root causes of failure relate to an inadequate understanding of the influence of design variables on performance and reliability, an inadequate understanding of raw material and process parameter variations on performance and reliability and the inability to find and recognize defects in manufactured parts. It is believed that solid rocket motor reliability can only be improved by addressing the above issues in a highly disciplined scientific approach. The build and test system presently used cannot assure reliability beyond the present levels.

The predictability of material behavior lies at the base of reliability improvement and feeds into the above issues relating to design variables, raw material and process variations and defect identification. The keys to predicting material behavior are the performance of tests which enable one to measure the response to a variety of environmental conditions, the development of verified behavioral theories, and the implementation of measured data and verified numerical algorithms into verified performance predictions. Because of the geometric and environmental complexity of rocket motor systems, these procedures require computer automation.

The above translates into a need for effective computer programs for design/analysis, a comprehensive materials data base, process environment modeling, defect identification and improved materials. Mathematical algorithms are needed to simulate physical behavior and

predict behavior with confidence beyond the envelope of the data base. Additional testing of material response to produce data in appropriate environments and during processing needs to be performed and the data organized into easily accessible computerized materials data bases. Scientific labor must be expended to develop appropriate material response tests, interpret test data, innovate physically based models of behavior and implement this knowledge into computer aided engineering tools for use by the solid propulsion industry. Appropriate industry representation needs to be a part of the process through seminars, publications, shared data bases and round robin verification of design/analysis techniques. Acceptance tests must be upgraded to monitor relevant responses to SRM performance.

The current Solid Propulsion Integrity Program (SPIP) at Marshall Space Flight Center should be considered a model for future efforts to improve solid rocket motor (SRM) reliability. However, the current funding levels are not sufficient to accomplish much more than a small subset of the overall need. A key issue confronting the community is the need for a change in the "culture". Interviews with designers of SRM's have convinced this author that they are very apprehensive of the first firing of a new design, even if it involves a small change. This means that the design is heavily based on experience and not on the level of technology that goes into many other products that exhibit more reliability such as jet engines on commercial aircraft. This results in SRM's with lower response and reliability than could be achieved with a physically based model of material response.

The solid rocket motor community has tried throughout the years to adapt technology developed elsewhere to their needs. This has been largely due to economics. Many of these technologies are credible in their prior use, but lack specific features that would make them more relevant to solid rocket motors. For example, the SRM community was quick to adopt finite element methods for analysis of grains and nozzles in the late 60's, but has been very slow in further developments to reflect the unique nonlinear behavior of the materials used in SRM's. It is no wonder that the methodology has been found to be inadequate. Unfortunately, the community seems to have resolved the problem with mistrust of available methods and a design philosophy that precludes substantial change from one system to the next. The economic consequences of unreliability are severe enough to have warranted the further development of analytical methods and material behavior studies, but the lack of customer pressure in a highly competitive arena has in effect traded reliability for low system development cost. Therefore, a clear need exists for a change of emphasis and NASA should provide a leadership role due to the enhanced sensitivity to reliability related to manned vehicles and to heightened public awareness. The key technology requirements offering the potential to significantly reduce overall systems cost, improve reliability and performance of solid rocket motors are common across all subsystems:

- Understanding and control of material and process variability
- Analytically driven test methodology development and improved constitutive models
- Establishment of improved failure criteria
- Understanding effects of defects
• Design for inspectability
• Environmentally driven process and technology development
• Design and optimization of materials for the environment.

This workshop identified specific technology needs directly related to known problem areas in solid rocket motors. The issues were separated between cases, nozzles, bondlines/propellant and insulation. Bondlines, propellants and insulation are covered in a separate narrative elsewhere in this report. The following problem areas require funding support to improve the reliability of U.S. solid rocket motors:

• **Nozzles**
  • Inadequate material property data base
  • Lack of knowledge of influence of process variables on performance and reliability
  • Inadequate failure criteria, influence of material variability and effects of defects
  • Inadequate design/analysis codes
  • Inadequate nozzle design methodology
  • Inadequate flex bearing design data
  • Inadequate cleaning for bonding
  • Lack of relationships between materials chemical constituency and material properties
  • Need for low cost materials
  • Need for design data on structural adhesives
  • Need for better material property characterization and micro-mechanical modeling
  • Constitutive modeling of nozzle materials
  • Erosion modeling of nozzle materials
  • Large nozzle technology requirements.

• **Cases**
  • Inadequate understanding of case joint and attachment
  • Need for definitive case design and analysis methodology
  • Environmental concerns over materials used in processing
  • Costs for high rate production
  • Inadequate case codes
  • Need for self insulating case designs
  • Need lower cost/quicker turn around case tooling.

The attached figure illustrates the interrelationships between the various functions of design and analysis. Improvements in one area can benefit others while in other cases, multiple improvements must be made simultaneously to realize the expected benefits. The shaded boxes represent the end points where improvements will lead to improved performance and reliability.

Approaches have been defined which can be implemented to achieve the goals associated with increased reliability of solid rocket motors. The quad charts outline these
specific programs. There are some key concerns that have driven the recommendations in the nozzle and case areas. Lessons learned from previous ground and flight failures provide much of the background.

In the nozzle area, design analysis is a major shortfall. More accurately measured material properties, verified modeling procedures and comprehensive failure criteria are badly needed to assess designs before programs are committed to them. A major deficiency is lack of treatment of pyrolysis gas flow through the materials and bondlines of the nozzle. Resultant pore pressures are a source of loads not accounted for in contemporary designs. This deficiency may have been partly or totally responsible for failures of the IUS and STAR 48 motors. Also, anomalous erosion in the SRM is attributed to pocketing, ply-lift and wedgeout failure modes involving pore pressure loadings.

In the case area, design analysis is also a major shortfall. In addition to the need for more accurately measured material properties, verified modeling procedures and comprehensive failure criteria, a unique need is to be able to predict the detailed geometry of a wound case as a function of design and manufacturing variables. This includes definition of residual stresses in the cured case and/or changes in geometry resulting from cure. Large cases need joints. The recent Challenger disaster highlights a number of problem areas requiring attention such as the need for highly detailed nonlinear 3D analysis of joint action and need for material properties as a function of all environmental variables (temperature, humidity, etc.). One of the results of a weak technology base is that engineers lose credibility when their methods produce mixed or erroneous results. The resulting mistrust of engineering conclusions by management can lead to disastrous decisions as was the case in the Challenger disaster when engineers could not convince management that real dangers were present in a cold launch of the shuttle.

The preliminary efforts conducted by SPIP and elsewhere have illustrated the potential for design improvements which will result in both high reliability and improved performance. The increase in asset allocation required to carry these efforts to an appropriate level are nominal when compared to the cost of projected failures based on current design reliability. Significant improvements in future design can be accomplished with the basic technology described above.
Pore Pressure Analysis

Accurate Design Analysis

Failure Criteria

Defect Characterization

Material Optimization

Selection and Optimization of NDI

Accurate Margin

Relevant Acceptance Tests

Material Evaluation

Acceptance Criteria

Material Selection

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER TO RELATED APPLICATIONS

325
9.4.3 Solid Propulsion Integrity Program (SPIP) for Verifiable Enhanced Solid Rocket Motor Reliability
by Barry L. Butler
Goal: To increase the success rate of U. S. built Solid Rocket Motors (SRM).

Recommendations: Increase SPIP funding from $10.0 M/year to $20.0 M/year. Develop a Liquid Propulsion Integrity Program (LPIP) of similar nature and funding level.

Benefit: Solid & Liquid rocket engines of today have nearly equal reliabilities of 98%. Solid rockets have system advantages at liftoff due to high thrust. Liquid rockets have system advantages later in flight. Access to space costs an average of $318M per NASA launch. NASA has 89 launches scheduled over the next five years. The loss of two launches would cost NASA $636M. The combined SPIP and LPIP would cost NASA only $200M and could eliminate lost launches.

Approach: Set common reliability goals for Nozzles, Cases, Bondline, Propellant, and Insulation. Build a common engineering data base to support standard industry-wide reliability assessment models. Structure or enhance existing Industry/Government/User team to develop the tools, methods needed, and the data to support them. Areas where unreliabilities are found must be improved (See figure).

Solid Rocket Motor Failures Highlight Need For Improved Reliability

Supporting Data: Solid Rocket Motor Nozzles, Cases, Bondlines, Propellant, and Insulation lack the basic engineering understanding needed to assess their true margins of safety. The key technology requirements offering the potential to significantly reduce overall systems cost, improve reliability and performance of solid rocket motors are common across all subsystems:

- Understanding and control of material and process variability.
- Analytically-driven test methodology development and improved constitutive models.
- Establishment of improved failure criteria.

* Dr. Butler was unable to attend the conference, but as Program Manager of the NASA SPIP Bondline Program, was asked to review the conference material and present his views on what needs to be done to enhance SRM reliability.
• Understanding effects of defects.
• Design for inspectability.
• Environmentally driven process and technology development.

Specific enhancements needed in each area, in priority order, are given below.

Solid Propulsion:
1. A national data base to support a unified reliability method is badly needed for all component areas, i.e., Nozzles, Bondlines, etc.

Nozzles:
1. The areas of nozzle processing and inspection verification are severely underfunded. Hence, they are unable to emphasize design methods and process controls needed to increase permeability which would greatly reduce nozzle erosion.
2. Pore pressure enhanced models for nozzle thermomechanical and erosion response must be completed and validated. Pore pressure causes the surface to blow off during firing, increasing the threat of erosion by 100%.
3. Modeling for analysis and defect acceptance must be validated. The efforts to measure the impact of defects on nozzle margins must be known to assess reliability. Validation tests must be done.

Cases:
1. Design and testing of high reliability cases and seals for both steel and composite materials are needed. Joints are a weak link in the process. The underpinnings of joints and seals must be added to the data base for all SRM manufacturers to use in reliability analysis.
2. A case and joint instrumentation program is needed. This will allow pressurization stresses and strains to be verified and error signal generated.
3. A case contamination tolerant processing initiative must be undertaken to eliminate environmentally unsafe solvents and cleaning steps. Reusable corrosion and contamination resistant cases will reduce cost.

Bondlines:
1. Inspection methodologies for layer thickness and contaminants must be validated. Detailed testing for effects of liner thickness variation on bondline strength must be done as well as bondline strength versus detected contamination level must be verified. This is required for early introduction of X-ray Fluorescence (XRF) thickness gaging and Ultraviolet Fluorescence Contamination (UFC) inspection into production motors.
2. Defect acceptance based on unified test data needs to be enhanced. The methods and data needed to correlate real defects with bondline strength and fracture toughness are not being developed fast enough to help ASRM and NLS.
3. Design methodology, aging methods, and defect acceptance models are inadequate. An extensive test program is needed to obtain the data to validate motor health at launch time.

Propellants:
1. Relationship between constituent propellant properties and cooldown stress is not being determined and is essential. Propellant mechanical property variability affects bondline stress and propellant strength. Data show a 25% variation in properties from sample to sample. This occurrence must be understood.
2. Biaxial PBAN data are available for RSRM evaluations. Biaxial HTPB data must be taken to validate models. HTPB is the propellant for the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor (ASRM) and National Launch System (NLS) and must be measured and evaluated.

Insulation:
1. Insulators which provide both insulation and lining functions are needed. Fewer layers means fewer process steps and higher reliability.
2. Anisotropic modeling of non-asbestos fiber filled insulation is needed. Insulation anisotropic affects debond fracture location and direction.
3. Design methods and data for validating insulation optimization are needed. The current tools do not allow insulation anisotropic properties and thickness to influence bondline stresses, and they are a significant factor.
10.0 ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL DELIBERATIONS

The Entry Systems Panel was chaired by Don Rummler, LaRC and Dan Rasky, ARC. As requested, each panel participant prior to the workshop prepared and delivered presentations to:

1) Identify technology needs
2) Assess current programs
3) Identify technology gaps
4) Identify highest payoff areas R&D

Participants presented background on the entry systems R&D efforts and operations experiences for the Space Shuttle Orbiter. These participants represented NASA Centers involved in research (Ames Research Center), development (Johnson Space Center), and operations (Kennedy Space Center) and the Shuttle Orbiter prime contractor. The presentations lead to the discovery of several lessons learned.

10.1 Technology Needs

Three key technology drivers for all anticipated vehicles and missions were identified:

- Improved TPS performance for safety/reliability
- Lower operating costs
- Increased vehicle capability and supportability

These technology drivers lead to the identification of fourteen high-payoff technology needs as discussed in the following sections.

Metallic TPS Concepts

Metallic concepts offer the potential for more flexibility in adverse weather environments (moisture, impact, and lightning strikes), are mechanically attached to the structure, and are weight-compatible with ceramic, ceramic matrix composite, and carbon-carbon TPS concepts. However, metallics lack the certification testing and flight experience of other TPS systems. Also, little R&D has been conducted in the U.S. in the last decade on this class of TPS. Coatings having high temperature resistance and emissivity, moisture resistance, and aerodynamic/vibroacoustic stability should be improved. High-temperature, flexible adhesives that take advantage of warm (high-temperature composite) structures should be developed. Finally, all improvements should be demonstrated through appropriate tests of integrated TPS/structural systems.

Research to provide improvements in high-temperature properties, coatings for low catalytic and high emissivity, and oxidation and corrosion resistance should be pursued. To supplement this technology base, tests should be conducted to verify thermal performance, effectiveness of preventing hot gas flow to the interior, and tolerance to acoustic loads.

Flexible Ceramic TPS Concepts

Flexible insulations such as felts, quilts, and woven blankets offer excellent benefits such as low weight, minimum certification investment required for improved concepts due to flight experience on the Shuttle Orbiter, and potentially lower life cycle costs. However, these concepts are currently temperature limited (FRSI - 700°F, AFRSI - 1500°F). Available high-temperature fibers can significantly increase the temperature capability for this class of TPS.

Inorganic/organic yarns, fabrics, felts and blends should be developed and evaluated using the existing high-temperature fibers. Fabrication methods to achieve lower cost, develop flexible coatings having high temperature resistance and emissivity, moisture resistance, and aerodynamic/vibroacoustic stability should be improved. High-temperature, flexible adhesives to take advantage of warm (high-temperature composites) structures should be developed. Finally, all improvements should be demonstrated through appropriate tests of integrated TPS/structural systems.

Toughened Ceramic TPS Concepts

A strong motivation exists to continue with the current RSI-type TPS, if its durability and strength and temperature capabilities can be improved, because of the extensive certification data and flight experience available. Higher-strength RSI could lead to direct-bond applications, which would eliminate the need for a strain isolation pad (SIP). Advanced fibers
suggest the possibility of developing more refractory RSI materials.

A program should be initiated to identify and develop toughened coatings and advanced fibers. These new materials would require characterization and thermal response tests in arc-jets. The best candidates would then be subjected to systems tests that demonstrate acceptable performance for use on future space transportation vehicles.

**Advanced Carbon-Carbon TPS**

Reinforced carbon-carbon (RCC) leading edges and nose caps on the Shuttle Orbiter have no flight anomalies. The advanced carbon-carbon (ACC) materials have demonstrated up to five times the strength of RCC, and fabrication of a large, built-up structure of ACC has been demonstrated. Thin, structural, oxidation-resistant carbon-carbon (ORCC) composites for both TPS and structural applications offer the potential of low weight, durability, low maintenance and repair, and can be tailored for various service environments. The major deficiency is long-life oxidation protection. To eliminate this deficiency, improved methods for oxidation protection, including coatings, inhibitors, sealants, and glazes should be developed. Critical, life-limiting tests should be conducted to demonstrate advanced ORCC materials. Continued efforts to improve mechanical properties and to develop "one-side" NDE techniques (see technology item 9) will be very beneficial. The process and design allowables should be well documented, and full-scale components should be fabricated and tested.

**Low-Weight Ablators**

Ablative TPS has been successfully used for manned vehicles. Performance of an ablative system is predictable, and unexpected thermal excursions are not critical. However, no development work has been conducted for this class of material since the Apollo and Viking projects. Aeroassist and direct entry for lunar and planetary missions require high-temperature materials. Also, low weight is required to maximize payload weight and/or decrease cost.

New advanced low density ablation materials should be developed and characterized. Using these materials, subscale TPS should be built and tested in arc-jets to verify performance.

Also, analytical models must be updated, then verified. Arc-jet facilities to test large TPS panels (see technology item 13) for certification should be modified.

**Special TPS Components**

Special TPS components such as joints, fasteners, and seams have had cost and schedule impacts on the Space Shuttle Orbiter. Such components, as well as TPS for moving surfaces, are critical interfaces in all TPS designs. Also, very high heating regions such as nose tips and leading edges require special design considerations including the possible use of heat pipes or mass addition cooling techniques. Research programs tend to address acreage applications at the expense of such "generic" details as gaps and fasteners, leaving the solution of these problems to the more costly development phases of hardware programs.

Advanced special TPS components must be designed, fabricated and tested. Their efforts should be coordinated with concept design efforts under technology items one through five. Design studies of proposed vehicles/missions to determine potential need for and/or benefits of heat pipe/mass addition cooling techniques for regions of local, intense heating should be conducted. Components for most promising applications should be developed and demonstrated. Modify facilities for testing of these TPS components (see technology item 13) should be modified.

**TPS/Structural Integration**

Better integration of TPS and structure offers the potential of damage tolerant, oxidation-resistant, lightweight systems with lower acquisition and operational costs. One concept consists of continuous fiber-reinforced ceramic matrix composite (CMC) face sheets bonded to a RSI core that is hard bonded to a load-bearing structure of CMC or graphite/polymide. This combination combines the oxidation resistance, durability, and strength of CMC materials with the low weight and good insulation capabilities of RSI. Other concepts utilizing other material combinations also offer potential benefits.

Promising materials, concepts, and applications must be identified. Material characterization tests for new materials will need to be performed, and appropriate analysis codes should be developed and identified. Processing/fabrication methods should be developed and
radiant heating and arc-jet screening tests to determine concept feasibility should be performed.

**Water-Based Composite TPS and Structures**

Highly-innovative concepts may be needed to meet the weight and cost goals of SEI-type missions. The synergistic use of on-board resources minimizes weight to orbit. For example, water-based polymer or ice matrix composites, which are non-toxic systems, could utilize resources now considered expendable. Deployment and rigidization of such a system would minimize manpower and energy for on-orbit fabrication of aerobrake structures.

Studies of water-based polymer/ice matrix composites must be performed to determine properties, processes, and fabrication techniques for such materials. Representative concepts should be fabricated and tested. Deployment and rigidization on orbit should be demonstrated on Shuttle or Space Station Freedom.

**Inspection, NDE and Smart Materials**

Current technology is typified by an inability to determine the amount of oxidation/damage in RCC as installed on the Orbiter; suspect RSI bond conditions require removal and replacement; current NDE/bond verification is limited by schedule and funding (and this limitation in turn adversely affects program schedule and cost); on-orbit inspection is impractical. The desired technology level calls for designs that allow for self-analysis of the material using NDT/NDE or smart instrumentation within (or attached to) the material.

NDT/NDE should be developed during original design and manufacture of hardware. Failure indicators should be designed into the material. Tests will be necessary to verify that NDE/NDT indicators performance is acceptable.

**Simplified Certification/Recertification Procedures**

The present method of certification and recertification is complex, costly and time consuming. The OEX program provided a means to certify without extensive certification effort. Certification by similarity is not used as extensively as it could be. The existing certification policy was a major contributor to the decision to not use advanced TPS concepts on the last orbiter built despite their many offered benefits indicated by all research efforts.

OEX development techniques should be extended for certifying new materials, and modeling/analytical methods for structural changes/modifications should be used. Documentation requirements should be changed so that changes at sub-levels are allowed rather than "treeing" into total package. Recertification requirements as affected by changes in mission requirements should be standardized. In non-critical areas, certification by familiarity is recommended.

**Environmental Compatibility**

A need to improve weatherproofing of TPS against terrestrial environments exists as evidenced by the following:

- Rain and tap water absorption increases launch weight and causes freeze damage to TPS.
- Hail and ice impacts erode TPS, causing loss of TPS integrity.
- Some fuels, vapors, etc. are incompatible with TPS materials.

Seals and flow paths to preclude absorption of moisture in internal insulation (see technology item 6) are needed. Coatings or outer face sheets resistant to impact damage, impermeable to water intrusion, and capable of surviving the entry thermal environment should be developed. Design studies of new or modified facilities to protect space transportation vehicles for the environment may be required.

The knowledge based on long-term space environmental durability is small, although it is increasing as results are obtained from analyses of the Long Duration Exposure Facility. Atomic oxygen attacks polymer materials and coatings, radiation may degrade materials including coatings and films, and particle impacts can damage TPS. This item could be an enabling technology for planetary missions.

The long term effects of vacuum, atomic oxygen, debris/dust impact, and radiation on materials must be determined. The compatibility of proposed TPS materials with other spacecraft system materials and fuels should be determined. Protective systems (improved materials, shields, coatings, films, etc.) should be developed.
and TPS performance in appropriate environments and for appropriate duration to provide acceptable design margins need to be evaluated.

On-Orbit Activities

The Entry Systems panel expects that TPS structures for planetary missions will have to be deployed/erected and serviced on orbit due to the size of the vehicles for planetary missions and the size of constraints of Earth-to-orbit launch vehicles. Virtually no experiments have been performed in space to date. Thus, this item is an enabling technology for planetary missions.

A technology program similar to the program developed for large space structures, including Space Station, needs to be developed and implemented. Ground simulations of deploying/erecting and servicing TPS for vehicles for planetary missions must be devised and used to evaluate various concepts and techniques. The ground testing program must be followed by flight experiments similar to the MAST experiment on the Shuttle Orbiter conducted in the mid 1980’s, but with a focus on assembly of TPS/structure for proposed vehicle concepts for planetary missions such as an aerobrake. On-orbit-assembled TPS hardware should be returned to ground for inspection and arc-jet testing to assure that the required thermal performance was obtained for hardware that was assembled on-orbit.

Test Facilities

No new arc-jet facilities have been activated in the past 20 years. Some facilities, such as those at Langley Research Center, have been decommissioned. Existing operational arc-jet facilities are inadequate for testing large TPS arrays at representative conditions. Existing arc-jet instrumentation is limited to intrusive flow measurements. There are no facilities that would provide the proper on-orbit simulation for ground tests for assembly of various concepts and techniques.

To adequately meet the experimental needs of technology development and hardware demonstration efforts, upgrades of existing arc-jet facilities and associated instrumentation are needed. Facilities should be improved to:

• Provide uniform high quality flow
• Provide combined radiative and convective heating
• Provide appropriate planetary gas compositions (Mars, Venus, Titan)

Instrumentation should be developed to measure:

• Tunnel flow conditions and intrusive flow methodology
• Test article strain at elevated temperatures
• Surface temperature distribution
• Aero/ acoustic environment

Facilities to adequately simulate conditions for evaluation of the viability of various TPS/structure concepts for on-orbit assembly should be devised and built.

Interdisciplinary Modeling Codes

For advanced thermal protection materials and concepts optimum TPS with adequate performance considering all requirements can best be obtained by use of interdisciplinary codes with the capability to consider:

• Micro-level material effects
• Materials response
• Coupling to advanced CFD codes for complete system response modeling
• TPS/structure thermal and structural response
• Life predictions
• Aeroelastic response
• Design optimization

Such codes do not exist. Specific analysis codes, such as ablative modeling codes, are 10-20 years old, and other codes such as those required for analyzing micro-level material effects are only beginning to evolve.
The first essential step is to establish a working relationship between the CFD, CSM, computational materials, and structural optimization communities. The next step is to build on the existing methodology for interdisciplinary codes, such as those evolving for aeroelastic and strength optimization and integrated flow/thermal/structural analysis. Significant computational resources must be available to support code development. The final necessary step is to generate the required benchmark data for validation of the multidisciplinary code.

10.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to identifying the fourteen technology items described above, which define in essence “what we need to do,” the Entry Systems Panel discussed issues related to “how we do it.” The following items summarize this discussion:

- Technologists tend to overlook mundane problem areas, which is why we still struggle with problems such as accessibility to equipment and structures for inspection and servicing, weatherproofing of TPS, and extensive checkout operations.

- A gap between technology products and program needs often exists. Advanced development programs should be supported (funded) to bridge this gap, or the technologist should make his products readily useable by the system developer and the system user.

- Cultural and programmatic barriers to efficient technology transfer exist. Responsible and dedicated NASA-wide working groups are recommended for various disciplined to plan specific programs. A step in this direction was the Ames-Johnson group effort on RSI and the Langley-Johnson group effort on carbon-carbon, but technology transfer can still be improved, especially before NASA commits to a project and the clock has started.

- Entry Systems test facilities in the U.S. are aging and must be upgraded. Flight test “facilities” are also needed. SEI cannot succeed without efficient, cost effective test facilities with realistic test environments.

- Certification for space-based/long duration flight entry systems will be a major issue and will need to augment our current methodology to accommodate it.
10.3 PRESENTATIONS
10.3.1 Space Assembled Entry Systems Certification
by Donald M. Curry, NASA JSC
SPACE ASSEMBLED ENTRY SYSTEMS

CERTIFICATION

Donald M. Curry
ISSUE:

- HOW DO YOU SAY YOU'RE "GOOD FOR GO" IF YOU SPACE ASSEMBLE AN ENTRY VEHICLE?

APPROACH:

- SHUTTLE ORBITER THERMAL PROTECTION CERTIFICATION
- SHUTTLE THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEM FLIGHT EXPERIENCE
- SPACE ASSEMBLED ENTRY SYSTEM CERTIFICATION
• ORBITER TPS CERTIFICATION PROCESS
  • TESTS
    • THERMAL PERFORMANCE
    • AERODYNAMIC FLOW
    • ACOUSTIC FATIGUE
    • STRENGTH INTEGRITY
    • MATERIAL PROPERTIES
  • ANALYSIS
    • NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS
    • INDUCED ENVIRONMENTS
    • MISCELLANEOUS
  • SIMILARITY
  • COMMIT-TO-FLIGHT

**SPACE ASSEMBLED ENTRY SYSTEMS**

**ORBITER TPS ENVIRONMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION**

- **Natural Environments**
  - Temperature - Atmospheric
  - Thermal - Vacuum
  - (Solar Radiation - Thermal)
  - Pressure
  - Fungus
  - Meteoroids
  - Humidity
  - Lightning
  - Ozone
  - Rain
  - Salt Spray
  - Sand/Dust
  - Solar Radiation - Nuclear
  - Wind

- **Induced Environments**
  - Temperature
  - Ascent Heating
  - On-Orbit and Entry Heating
  - Pressure
  - Acoustics
  - Shock
  - Random Vibration
  - Structural Loads
  - Limit and Ultimate
  - Acceleration

- **Miscellaneous Environments**
  - Life - Full and Limited
  - Fluid Compatibility
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SPACE ASSEMBLED ENTRY SYSTEMS

- SHUTTLE TPS FLIGHT EXPERIENCE
  - IMPACT DAMAGE
  - GAP FILLER DAMAGE
  - WINDOW CONTAMINATION

Structures and Mechanics Division
Donald M. Curry  September, 1991
ORBITER TPS FLIGHT EXPERIENCE

IMPACT DAMAGE

- STATIC AREAS
- DYNAMIC INTERFACES

ORBITER TPS FLIGHT EXPERIENCE

GAP FILLER DAMAGE/TILE SLUMPING
CERTIFICATION OF SPACE ASSEMBLED ENTRY SYSTEM

- SCOPING OUT THE ENVIRONMENT
  - TEMPERATURES - SURFACE, STRUCTURES
  - VIBROACOUSTIC/AEROSHOCK
  - AIRLOADS

- HOW THE VEHICLE IS DESIGNED
  - IDENTIFY CRITICAL LOCATIONS
    - TEMPERATURE
    - LOADS
    - MARGINS OF SAFETY
    - MATERIALS DATA BASE

- HOW THE VEHICLE IS BUILT/ASSEMBLED
  - CRITICAL PROCESSING PARAMETERS
  - INSPECTION POINTS/RIGOR
  - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA
  - REPAIRS/MAINTAINABILITY

- FLIGHT EXPERIENCE
  - LESSONS LEARNED
  - FLIGHT TEST
  - ANOMALY RESOLUTION

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE TPS DESIGN

Maturity
Density
Aerothermal (Temperature)
Strength (Airloads/Vibroacoustic)
Outgassing
Oxidation Resistance
Atomic
Diatomic
Damage Tolerance/Impact Resistance
Repairability
Refurbishment
Long Term Space Exposure
Multi-use
Man-rated
Size Limits - Fabrication
CERTIFICATION - KEY ISSUES

- DESIGN/ASSEMBLY
  - GAP HEATING IN JOINT REGIONS BETWEEN SEGMENTS
  - SEAL PERFORMANCE AT INTERFACES
  - PREVENTION OF HOT GAS/RADIATION LEAKS
  - TPS PENETRATIONS

  SUCH DESIGN PROBLEMS ARE NOT REALISTICALLY ASSESSED UNTIL A REQUIREMENT EXISTS TO "FLY THE SYSTEM."

- MATERIALS
  - DAMAGE TOLERANCE/IMPACT RESISTANCE
  - LONG TERM SPACE EXPOSURE

CERTIFICATION - METHODS

- UTILIZATION OF EXISTING DATA BASE
  - Analytical Methods
  - Ground Test Results
  - Flight Tests

- GROUND-BASED TESTING OF SPACE ASSEMBLED ENTRY SYSTEM CONCEPTS
  - Ability to simulate environment
  - Lack of correlation with actual flight environment

- ANALYTICAL CERTIFICATION
  - Verified models using available flight and ground test data
  - Aeroassist Flight Experiment (AFE) data
CERTIFICATION - METHODS (cont.)

• FLIGHT TEST OF A SPACE ASSEMBLED ENTRY SYSTEM
  • Forces disciplined Design and Fabrication
  • Encourages acceptance of new (revolutionary) concepts
  • Addresses complex problem of mutual interactions within system
  • Acquires vital quantitative data not available through ground test

SUMMARY

• Significant advances have been made in the design, fabrication, certification and flight tests of entry systems (Mercury through Shuttle Orbiter).
• Shuttle experience has identified some key design and operational issues.
• Space assembled entry system certification/verification
  • Demonstration of advanced technology
  • Attention to vehicle design, fabrication and assembly
  • Flight experience
ORBITER TPS FLIGHT EXPERIENCE

WINDOW HAZING/CONTAMINATION
10.3.2 Thermal Protection System of the Space Shuttle Orbiter
by F.E. Jones, NASA KSC
Thermal Protection System of the Space Shuttle's Orbiter

F. E. Jones
KSC
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ORBITER TPS DAMAGE REVIEW TEAM

1. FINDING 9

It is the team's view that there is a general lack of awareness of orbiter tile susceptibility to damage by debris - the same applies to the care and critical nature of the shuttle elements and operations process so necessary to minimizing damaging debris - it is essential that all involved employees, both government and contractor, understand that miniscule loose objects or materials coming off the elements will most likely cause some tile damage at the speed encountered during ascent.

2. RECOMMENDATION 9

It is recommended that descriptive material, photos, video tape, debris samples and other appropriate matter be assembled and provided to the proper organizations for dissemination to their employees - it should emphasize that the tiles perform outstanding in their debris-free design environment; but, are extremely sensitive to small particle damage.
DEBRIS DAMAGE LOCATIONS

6 HITS ON 1/8 SIDE OF ELEVON
6 HITS ON 1/8 SIDE OF ELEVON
30 HITS WITH 2 > 1":
1 X 1/4 X 1/4
1 X 1 X 1/2 X 3/8
1 1/2 X 1/2 X 1/8
13/8 X 1/2 X 3/8

3 HITS ON 1/8 SIDE OF ELEVON
1 3/8 X 1/2 X 1/8
1 1/8 X 3/8 X 1/8

2 AREAS OF MISSING TILE MATERIAL ON ET DOOR LEADING EDGE:
2 1/2 X 1 X 3/4
1 X 1 X 5/8

1 1/2 X 1/2 X 1/8
1 3/8 X 3/8 X 1/8

MISSING REPAIR MATERIAL
1 X 1/2 X 1/8
2 1/2 X 3/4 X 1/4
1 X 1/2 X 1/4
1 X 3/8 X 1/4

MISSING REPAIR MATERIAL
(2 LOCATIONS)

TOTAL HITS = 153
HITS > 1 INCH = 23

PROTRUDING GAP FILLER
1 1/2 X 1/2 X 1/4
1 X 1/4 X 1/4
1 1/4 X 3/8 X 1/4

PROTRUDING GAP FILLER

DOOR LATCH FITTING THERMAL EROSION
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DEBRIS DAMAGE LOCATIONS

TOTAL HITS = 23
HITS > 1 INCH = 2

1 1/4 X 1/4 X 1/4

5 HITS < 1"
1 HIT 1 1/2" DIA.

6 HITS < 1"
DEBRIS DAMAGE LOCATIONS

4 CARRIER PANEL TILES PROTRUDING APPROX. 3/8" (LOCATED DIRECTLY BENEATH FORWARD DOWN-FIRING RCS THRUSTER)

8" PROTRUDING GAP FILLER CAUSED SIGNIFICANT DAMAGE TO ADJACENT WHITE TILE

1" X 1" BLACK TILE CORNER MISSING

1" X 1" WHITE TILE CORNER MISSING

6 SMALL COATING LOSSES ON TRAILING EDGE OF RUDDER SPEED BRAKE

TOTAL HITS = 15
HITS > 1 INCH = 0
STS-40
DEBRIS DAMAGE LOCATIONS

FRAYED THERMAL BARRIER
(4 PLACES)

WHITE TILE MISSING CORNERS

BROKEN/PROTRUDING WHITE TILE CORNER

TOTAL HITS = 6
HITS > 1 INCH = 0

2 SMALL AREAS OF COATING LOSS ON TRAILING EDGE OF RUDDER SPEED BRAKE

FRAYED THERMAL BARRIER
(ON BOTH SIDES OF RUDDER)
### STS-40 Debris Damage Assessment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Hits &gt; or = 1&quot;</th>
<th>Total Hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Surface</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Surface</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Side</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Side</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right OMS Pod</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left OMS Pod</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMPARISON TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Hits &gt; or = 1&quot;</th>
<th>Total Hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STS-6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-25</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-26</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-26R</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-27R</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-29R</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-30R</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-28R</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-33R</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-32R</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-31R</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS-40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMPARISON TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORBITER TPS DEBRIS DAMAGE</th>
<th>STS-28R THROUGH STS-40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF DEBRIS HITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Hits ≥ 1"**
- **Total Hits**
Minimum work for OPF turnaround

TOTAL PAPER
2225 (100%)

FLIGHT DAMAGE (MSRTS + THERMAL)
793 (36%)

PLANNED WORK

MODS
5 (.2%)

OMRSD's and INSPECTIONS
20 (.9%)

RESTRICTED PAPER

WORK
83 (3.7%)

RERESTRICTED
80 (3.6%)

PROCESSING DAMAGE
965 (43%)

WORKMANSHIP
243 (11%)

ACCESS AND SUPPORT
20 (.9%)

EO TO FOLLOW
9 (.4%)

STS-34 TPS WADS
8/14/89
MLO601-9026 REPAIR PROCEDURES

REPAIR TITLE

TPS-307  REPAIR OF TILE COATING FOR EROSION RESISTANCE
TPS-311  REPAIR OF DAMAGED RSI TILE
TPS-312  REPAIR OF DAMAGED THERMAL BARRIERS USING BLACK RTV
TPS-314  RSI TILE IMLFILL
TPS-315  REPAIR OF DAMAGED GAP FILLERS USING HIGH PURITY SILICA COATING
TPS-319  RSI IML MACHINING
TPS-321  RSI TILE SIDEWALL TRIM
TPS-324  REPAIR OF RSI TILE IML DAMAGE
TPS-328  REWORK OF INSTALLED TILES WITH EXCESSIVE GAPS USING CERAMIC BONDED SHIMS
TPS-330  LARGE DAMAGE COATING REPAIR
TPS-335  FLEXIBLE INSULATION PLUG REPAIR
TPS-340  REPAIR OF FLEXIBLE INSULATION BLANKET ASSEMBLIES OUT-OF-TOLERANCE STEP CONDITIONS
TPS-341  REPAIR OF FLEXIBLE INSULATION BLANKET USING QUARTZ FABRIC PATCH/SEWING/SILICA COATING
TPS-342  FABRICATION OF MULTIPLE FLEXIBLE INSULATION BLANKETS
TPS-352  REWORK OF OVERTOLERANCE OML STEPS AND WAVINESS ON INSTALLED TILES
TPS-353  THERMAL PASSIVATION OF OUT-OF-TOLERANCE STEPS AND GAPS USING GAP FILLERS
TPS-354  RTV REFURBISHMENT AND UPPER SURFACE RTV REPAIRS
TPS-355  RCC REPAIR
TPS-367  SUBSTITUTION OF MBO135-085 (RTV 566) FOR MBO135-119 TYPE II (RTV 560)
TPS-368  BROKEN TILE REPAIR
TPS-369  REWORK OF MAIN LANDING GEAR DOOR FLOW RESTRICTORS
TPS-370  FABRICATION AND INSTALLATION OF MAIN LANDING GEAR DOOR THERMAL BARRIER PATCH
TPS-377  LARGE AREA REPAIR OF RSI COATING

DATA SOURCE: L50C PROGRAM OFFICE
DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

- COMPATIBLE MATERIALS (ON-BOARD, NATURAL)
- PROVIDE ASSOCIATED NDE (TOOLS/ANALYSIS)
- FIELD REPAIRABLE TECHNIQUES
- PROCESS CONTROL INSTALLATIONS
- BLIND INSTALLATIONS
- GENERIC DRAWING CHANGES
- NON-HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
- PARTS IDENTIFICATION
10.3.3 Reentry Systems - Material Technology Needs
by R.M. Ehret, Rockwell International
REENTRY SYSTEMS-
MATERIAL TECHNOLOGY NEEDS

R. M. (MIKE) EHRET
M&P ENGINEERING & LABS
SPACE SYSTEMS DIVISION
9/24/91

Rockwell International
Space Systems Division
BACKGROUND IN ENTRY SYSTEMS

- MIKE EHRET - MATERIALS ENGINEER
- 23 YEARS ROCKWELL SPACE DIVISION
  - SATURN S-II
  - SPACE SHUTTLE ORBITER
- MANAGER: MATERIALS & PROCESSES
  - ENGINEERING & LABORATORIES
- ENTRY SYSTEMS BACKGROUND
  - STRAIN ISOLATION
  - TILE DENSIFICATION
  - FRC TILE CERTIFICATION
  - AFRSI DEVELOPMENT
  - WATER PROOFING
- PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES:
  - DESIGN (PERFORMANCE)
  - BUILD
  - OPERATIONS
  - MAINTAINABILITY

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS EXIST WITHIN CURRENT ORBITER TPS SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>700°F</th>
<th>1,500°F</th>
<th>2,300°F</th>
<th>3,200°F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$/ft²</td>
<td>$850/ft²</td>
<td>$2,000/ft²</td>
<td>$10,000/ft²</td>
<td>$30,000/ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lb/ft²</td>
<td>0.15 - 0.25</td>
<td>0.62 - 1.25</td>
<td>0.90 - 3.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft²</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXISTING SYSTEM IS FUNCTIONAL BUT MAY NOT BE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE
ADVANCED TPS OPPORTUNITIES

TPS MATERIAL ENHANCEMENTS ARE FEASIBLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL/CONCEPT</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>TECHNOLOGY GAPS</th>
<th>TRENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RIGID TPS: (i.e., AETB, HTP, ACC-HARDSHELL, METALLIC STANDOFF, TUFI COATING, TITANIUM MULTIWALL, IMD, SOL-GEL RCG) | - HIGHER STRENGTH  
- HIGHER TEMPERATURE  
- IMPACT RESISTANT  
- LIGHTER WEIGHT  
- ADJUSTABLE DENSITY | - PRODUCTION SCALE-UP  
- AVAILABILITY  
- MAINTAINABILITY  
- COATINGS  
- COATINGS APPLICATION  
- INDUSTRY DATA BASE  
- MECHANICAL PROPERTIES  
- INSTALLATION PROCEDURES | - LIGHTER WEIGHT  
- DURABLE COATINGS  
- MATERIAL CONSISTENCY  
- HIGHER TEMPERATURE  
- TAILORED DENSITIES  
- STRONGER |
| FLEXIBLE TPS: (i.e., TABI, PBI) | - INCREASED TEMPERATURE  
- TAILORABLE PROPERTIES  
- PRODUCT FORMS  
- LOWER COST THAN RIGID  
- REDUCED VULNERABILITY | - PRODUCTION SCALE-UP  
- COATINGS  
- IN-SERVICE USE  
- INDUSTRY DATA BASE | - CONSTRUCTION METHODS  
- FIBER TREATMENT  
- OPTIMIZATION  
- MIXING FIBER BLENDS  
- USED IN LIEU OF RIGID  
- HIGHER TEMPERATURE |
| FOAMS/ABLATORS: (i.e., SOFI, NCFI, SLA 561, POLYIMIDE, POLYMETHACRYLIME) | - LOWER COST vs TILE  
- FORMABLE  
- HIGH DIMENSIONAL STABILITY UNDER HEAT  
- FIRE RESISTANCE  
- EXCELLENT RADIATION TRANSMISSION | - IMPROVED MECHANICAL PROPERTIES AT ELEVATED TEMPERATURE  
- LIGHTWEIGHT SANDWICH CONSTRUCTION  
- PRODUCTION SCALE-UP  
- AVAILABILITY  
- INDUSTRY DATA BASE | - NON-CFC BLOWN  
- LIGHTER WEIGHT  
- IMPROVED HEAT TRANSFER PROPERTIES  
- IMPROVED FABRICATION |
| REFRUCTORY COMPOSITES: (i.e., ACC, C-C, SiC, SiC-SiC) | - HIGH TEMPERATURE  
- LOAD CARRYING AT HIGH TEMPERATURE  
- WEIGHT SAVINGS  
- DIMENSIONALLY STABLE | - INSPECTION  
- COATING REPAIR  
- HIGH TEMP COATINGS  
- LOW COST  
- JOINING  
- COMPLEX STRUCTURES  
- IN-SERVICE | - OXIDATION RESISTANCE  
- THERMALLY STABLE FIBERS  
- IMPROVED MATRIX  
- AUTOMATED PROCESSING |
SUMMARY OF TECHNOLOGY NEEDS AND DIRECTION

NEEDS
• LIGHTWEIGHT AND DURABLE RIGID INSULATION AND HIGHER TEMPERATURE FLEXIBLE MATERIALS
• INSPECTION, REPAIR, PRODUCIBILITY, AND MAINTAINABILITY OF REFRACTORY COMPOSITES

DIRECTION OF EFFORTS
• FUNDING BASE IS RELATIVELY SMALL FOR FUTURE YEARS
• TO MAXIMIZE RETURNS, COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMS APPEAR TO BE PRACTICAL
  • SSD'S APPROACH IS TO IMPLEMENT NASA DEVELOPED TECHNOLOGY

SPACE TRANSPORTATION STRUCTURES AND MATERIALS WORKSHOP
ENTRY SYSTEMS PANEL

• DON'T DESIGN A SPACECRAFT AS THOUGH IT WILL BE TREATED LIKE A SPACECRAFT
• DON'T BELIEVE PRELIMINARY LOADS
• DON'T ALLOW MATERIALS R&T HISTORY TO VANISH
• DON'T CERTIFY WITHOUT SYSTEM LEVEL TESTS
• DON'T BELIEVE THAT THE DESTROYER OF "GOOD" IS "BETTER"
• DON'T BUILD ANYTHING NEW WITH SOA MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY
10.3.4 Thermal Protection Systems for All-Weather Reusable Launch Vehicles by Marc J. Giegerich, McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company
THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS
FOR ALL-WEATHER,
REUSABLE LAUNCH VEHICLES

BY
MARC J. GIEGERICH
McDONNELL DOUGLAS SPACE SYSTEMS COMPANY
Thermal Protection System Technology Needs

Support Current and Future Launch, Reentry and Planetary Vehicles

* Lightweight, High-performance, Low-maintenance
* Weather resistant (humidity, rain, hail, lightning, etc.)
* High resistance to oxidizing environments (ETO/OTE)
* Ease of Attachment/Removal
  - Minimum number of attachment points
  - Minimum tooling required
  - Minimum down-time impact
  - Minimum disturbance to flowfield
* Rugged Construction Method
  - Accidental ground-handling damage
  - In-flight damage tolerance
* Well-characterized Inspection Methods
  - Visual (quick turnaround)
  - Non-visual (regular maintenance)
  - Non-visual (vehicle overhaul)

Launch and Entry System Technology Gaps

Long-term, reusable thermal protection materials

* Recently developed materials (CMC’s, metallics, ceramics, etc.) require ground and flight testing - Requires sharing of risks between Industry, Vendors and Government
* Basic Material Properties which need verification/quantification
  - Long-term degradation of thermal, optical and structural properties
  - Catalytic reaction rates in high-temperature, low pressure dissociated flow
  - Lightning strike damage tolerance
  - Acoustic fatigue
  - Flutter (including coating behavior)
  - Impact resistance (rain, hail, meteorite, etc.)
* Load-Carrying Hot Structures and Control Surfaces
  - Fabrication and bonding/attachment of large scale panels
* Lightweight fabrication techniques of ceramic matrix composites
  - Rigid construction methods that rival metallics
    - Sandwich, fluted core, bi-directional stiffeners, etc.
Suggested Discussion Topics

On-Orbit Repair Modes/Options
- Vacuum bonding/bandages
- Durability
- Inspection

Attachment Techniques and Issues
- Internal vs. external attachments
- Long-term degradation of attachment hardware
- Composite attachment hardware
- Detachment/reattachment
- Heat-short paths

Ground Handling
- Inspection Requirements and Methods
  - Visual/Non-visual
  - TPS life assessment
  - Repairs/Replacements
10.3.5 Thermal Protection Systems for Aerobrakes by Stephen S. Tompkins, NASA LaRC
THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS FOR AEROBRAKES

Stephen S. Tompkins
Applied Materials Branch
Materials Division
NASA Langley Research Center
Hampton, Virginia
BACKGROUND IN TPS FOR ENTRY SYSTEMS

1962 - 1980
- Ablative TPS
  - Apollo, Viking, Space Shuttle
  - Experimental Studies
    - developed ground test simulation techniques and methods
    - evaluation arc jet tests on new materials/joints
  - Analytical Studies
    - developed analytical models for ablator TPS
    - predicted performance in entry environments
- Ablative Materials Development
- Shuttle Tile TPS
  - Ablator/tile compatibility studies
  - Shuttle TPS certification tests

1990 - present
- Materials Division Aerobrake support team to LaRC SEIO

![Diagram of Ablator](image)

*Figure 1.* Schematic diagram of ablating ablator.
QUESTIONS ADDRESSED IN SHUTTLE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

- What ablation materials are suitable?
- What defects are critical to the TPS performance?
- Can fabrication costs be reduced?
- How would an ablative TPS be refurbished?
- What is the lowest weight, lowest cost, most efficient ablative TPS design?
- Do ablator TPS have multi-use capability?
SUMMARY OF ADVANTAGES TO ABLATIVE TPS

- Proven reliable TPS systems
- Well characterized (thermally) with good, existing thermal analysis capability
- Good candidate materials are available
- Not sensitive to defects and more difficult to damage than RSI or C-C
- Design program was completed which demonstrated simple (direct bond) application of large panels
- Thermal excursions not catastrophic
- No SIP required

AEROBRAKE TPS TECHNOLOGY NEEDS

- Well defined service environment
- Performance requirements
  - multi use
  - repair
  - panel size/assemble techniques
- Established ground test methodology
- Joint materials/design/evaluation
- Established material systems compatibility
AND IN CONCLUSION

- Several candidate TPS options exist
  - ablators
  - C-C
  - Ceramic tiles

- Multi TPS on aerobrake deserve consideration

- A number of technology needs exist
10.3.6 Flexible Thermal Protection Materials for Entry Systems
by D.A. Kourtides, NASA ARC
Flexible Thermal Protection Materials for Entry Systems

D. A. Kourtides
Ames Research Center
Background

• Composite Flexible Blanket Insulation (CFBI)
  • Silicon Carbide Interlock top fabric
  • Contains reflector shields—aluminized Kapton
  • Alumina Insulation
  • IML has 2 inch centers to reduce foil/fabric damage
  • Thermally stable (short term) at heat flux rates up to 31 Btu/ft$^2$·s, surface temperatures ~2700°F
  • Density similar to AFRSI-TABI
  • Lower thermal conductivity at high temperatures than AFRSI or TABI
  • Requires ceramic coating for exposure to higher heating rates
  • Vibroacoustic performance of ceramic coating unknown

Background

• Types of Flexible TPS currently available
  • Tailorable Advanced Blanket Insulation (TABI)
    • Integrally woven with silicon carbide yarn
    • Insulation is alumina or aluminoborosilicate
    • Thermally stable (short term) at heat flux rates up to 31 Btu/ft$^2$·s, surface temperatures ~2700°F
    • Thermal Conductivity approximately similar to AFRSI
    • Better vibroacoustic performance (Interlock version) than AFRSI
    • Density 9-10 lb/ft$^2$, approximately similar to AFRSI
    • Requires ceramic coating for exposure to higher heating rates
Technology Needs

• High temperature (>1800 °F) Flexible Coating for flexible insulations/fabrics

• Flexibility required for TPS installation purposes

• Present coating applied “green” or unfired and rely on entry heat for curing.

• Suitable for fast reentry such as AFE, may not be suitable for slower reentries.

• Prior firing may be required to survive
  • High (>165 dB) vibroacoustic loads
  • High aerodynamic effects
  • Particulate impact and
  • Moisture effects

• Should not provide significant weight penalty (>15%)

• Have suitable emissivity values ≥ 0.85

Technology Needs

• Simple, Lightweight, Durable and Waterproof Insulations

  • Intermediate (~ 2000 °F) temperature applications.

  • Utilize existing AFRSI, TABI or CFBI fabrication technology
    Use 2 inch centers on AFRSI or CFBI.

  • Utilize metal coated ceramic (Nextel, etc.) OML fabric.

  • Use existing graphite coating technology.

  • Bond metal foil (Ni, etc.) on OML fabric utilizing induction brazing techniques.

  • Provides non-stitched impermeable surface

  • Resistant to moisture/water, high vibroacoustic loads, and aerodynamic effects
Metallic CFBI / TABI

1. Metal Surface (Induction Brazed to Fabric)
2. Ceramic Fabric with Embedded Woven Wires or Metal coated Fabric
3. Ceramic Insulation with Reflective Metal foils (left) or Ceramic Fabric Supports (right)
4. Bond (RTV)
5. Vehicle Structure

Technology Gaps for Flexible Insulations

- Ceramic Coatings
  - Require high temperature firing -- reduce mechanical properties of fibers/fabrics
  - Weight penalty
  - Reduce flexibility
  - Questionable reusability
  - Low adhesion (unfired)

- Metallic Surfaces
  - Temperature limitation due to oxidation

- Close-out of complex shapes
- Instrumentation, installation and attachment methods
Highest Payoff Areas for Flexible Insulations

- Low cost fibers for high-temperature applications
- Simplify fabrication procedures for insulations
- Effective coatings-- use with low cost fibers

---

**CURRENT HEAT SHIELD MATERIALS THERMAL LIMITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>MAXIMUM USE TEMPERATURE, °F</th>
<th>EMITTANCE (Θ °F)</th>
<th>MAXIMUM HEAT FLUX CAPABILITY BTU/FT²-SEC</th>
<th>EQUIVALENT USE TEMPERATURE, °F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MULTIPLE FLIGHT</td>
<td>SINGLE FLIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEXIBLE ORGANIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRSL</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>.9(800)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBI</td>
<td>900+</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>.9(1000)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRSI, TABI, CFBi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILICA</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>.48(2000)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGID CERAMIC INSULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI-900</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>.9(2500)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI-2200</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>.9(2800)</td>
<td>(2600 FOR AFE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRCI-12</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>.9(2800)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AETB-12/TIF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AETB-12/RCG</td>
<td>2600**</td>
<td>2800**</td>
<td>.9(2800)**</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASMII</td>
<td>2600**</td>
<td>2900**</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AETB-8/RCG</td>
<td>2600**</td>
<td>2800**</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITANIUM</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENON 41</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCONEL 817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCP/ACC</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>55 (F.C.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

379
Current Programs

• Aeroassist Flight Experiment
  • Evaluate thermal performance of advanced Rigid and Flexible Insulations and Reflective Coating
  • Lighter than baseline materials
  • Rigid insulations perform well
  • Flexible insulations require ceramic coating
  • Reflective Coating effective at >15% radiative

• NASP
  • High and low temperature insulations
  • Attachment/standoff methodology critical-- affects thermal performance
10.3.7 Recent Advanced Carbon-Carbon Efforts at LTV
by Garland B. Whisenhut, LTV Missiles and Electronics Group
CONCLUSIONS

0 ACC SUBSTRATE FABRICATION TECHNOLOGY IN GOOD SHAPE.

0 ACC COATING IMPROVEMENTS SATISFACTORY BUT ADDITIONAL WORK NEEDED.

0 NON-DESTRUCTIVE TEST TECHNIQUES TO MONITOR HARDWARE DURING OPERATIONAL LIFE NEEDED.

0 COST REDUCTION APPROACHES A HIGH PRIORITY.
10.3.8 Ceramic Matrix Composites (Continuous Fiber Reinforced) Thermal Protection Systems by Salvatore R. Riccitiello, NASA ARC
SPACE TRANSPORTATION MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES TECHNOLOGY WORKSHOP

Salvatore R. Riccitiello
Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA
CERAMIC MATRIX COMPOSITES
[CONTINUOUS FIBER REINFORCED]
THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS

BACKGROUND

- Initiated program with American Inc. to develop continuous fiber reinforced CMC thermal protection materials based on silicon carbide.
- Reticulated low density ceramic foam core panel structures, based on silicon carbide, were fabricated and evaluated.
- Reticulated silicon carbide low density foam susceptible to thermal shock.
- "TOPHAT" thermal protection system utilizing a continuous fiber reinforced CMC and reusable surface insulation developed.
- Single-ply/multi-ply continuous fiber reinforced silicon carbide CMC successfully evaluated, in the "TOPHAT" thermal protection system, to 3100°F.

BACKGROUND cont.

- The carbon reinforced CMC material showed little degradation after a 100 minute exposure to surface temperatures of 2000°F and 2700°F.
  - The carbon reinforced CMC material showed little change in physical property after 100 minutes exposure to surface temperatures of 2000°F and 2700°F.
CERAMIC MATRIX COMPOSITES
[CONTINUOUS FIBER REINFORCED]
THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS

TECHNOLOGY NEEDS

○ Fabrication Methods / Processes (silicon carbide based systems)
  ▶ Large Components
  ▶ Architecture
  ▶ Costs

○ Material Property Data Base
  ▶ Fatigue (loaded, unloaded, thermal, isothermal)
  ▶ Baseline Thermal/ Mechanical Properties
  ▶ Environmental Effects
    • Aero-acoustic (with/without shock impingement)
      – sound levels in excess of 170 db
      – oscillating pressure (1-5 psi peak to peak)
  ▶ Particle Impact
  ▶ Water Adsorption/Absorption

○ Attachment Techniques
  ▶ Integral Structure / TPS
  ▶ Hot Structure
  ▶ Warm Structure
  ▶ Seals

○ Non-Destructive Evaluation
  ▶ Quality Assurance
  ▶ Flaw / Separation Detection
CERAMIC MATRIX COMPOSITES
[CONTINUOUS FIBER REINFORCED]
THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS

TECHNOLOGY GAPS

- High Temperature Continuous Fiber Reinforced CMC Materials
  - Temperatures > 3500°F
- High Strength / High Temperature Fibers
  - Property Retention At Temperatures > 2200°F
- High Temperature / High strength Matrices
  - Property Retention At Temperatures > 2200°F

- Process Developments
  - New Processes
  - Shorter Fabrication Times

HIGHEST PAYOFF AREAS

- High Temperature / High Strength Continuous Fiber Reinforcements
  - Temperatures > 3500°F
  - Strength Retention > 3500°F
  - High Temperature Strengths Comparable To RT Strengths of present State-of-the-Art Fibers
10.3.9 Thermal Protection Systems for Space Transportation Vehicles by Howard Goldstein, NASA ARC
Thermal Protection Systems for Space Transportation Vehicles

By
Howard Goldstein
NASA, Ames Research Center
• EARLY 1960'S
  - TILE CONCEPT INVENTED BY LMSC
• LATE 1960'S AND EARLY 1970'S
  - SMALL R&D CONTRACTS TO LMSC 1968-69
  - COMPETITIVE R&D CONTRACTS TO LMSC, GE, McDAC, MARTIN 1969-72
    BY NASA
  - R&D AT NASA CENTERS ON SHUTTLE TPS
• RSI CHOSEN AS PRIMARY TPS FOR SHUTTLE 1972
• ROCKWELL AWARDED CONTRACT TO LMSC TO MANUFACTURE RSI 1973
• 1973-1978: PILOT PLANT, MANUFACTURING SETUP, DDT&E PERFORMED,
  ORBITER TPS DESIGNED BY RI
• 1972-1981: IMPROVED RSI MATERIALS DEVELOPED AND ADOPTED
  AFRSI (1978), FRCI-12 (1981)....
• 1978-1989: FIVE ORBITERS WERE BUILT WITH 24000+RSI TILES, 3000+FT²
  OF FRSI, UP TO 3000 FT² OF AFRSI BLANKETS
  BLANKETS TABI + CFBI WERE DEVELOPED

EXAMPLES OF SHUTTLE RSI DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES

• MANUFACTURING
  - RAW MATERIALS: FIBERS, COATING COMPONENTS
  - PROCESSES: SLURRY BLENDING, PRODUCTION UNIT
    MOLDING, SINTERING, TILE MACHINING, GLAZING

• DESIGN
  - TILE PLANFORM SIZE
  - STRAIN ISOLATION
  - GAP HEATING

• INSTALLATION
  - BONDING, BOND VERIFICATION
  - TOLERANCES
  - QUALITY CONTROL

• OPERATION
  - DURABILITY
  - WATERPROOFING
SHUTTLE ORBITERS
TPS LOCATIONS

TOTAL RSI CERAMIC TILES - 24,300
REINFORCED CARBON/CARBON (RCC) (44 PANELS/NOSE CAP)
FELT REUSABLE SURFACE INSULATION (FRSI) (3,581 FT²)
ADVANCED FLEXIBLE REUSABLE SURFACE INSULATION (AFRSI) (4,100 FT²)

OEX-AMES ADVANCED CERAMIC TPS EXPERIMENT
LOCATIONS OF UNCOATED AFRSI BLANKETS ON OV-099

WINDSHIELD FORWARD OF RH SIDE
FORWARD CANOPY, LH SIDE
FORWARD MID-FUSELAGE LH SIDE
MID-FUSELAGE LH SIDE
UPPER WING LH SIDE
VERTICAL TAIL LH SIDE (REPAIRED)
RÜDDER/SPEED BRAKE, LH SIDE (AFT BLANKET COATED)
OMS POD SIDEWALL LH POD
**REPLACEMENT/REPAIR OF UNCOATED AFRSI BLANKET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blanket Location / No.</th>
<th>POST FLIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STS-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Windsheild, RH #391142-012</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Canopy, LH #391142-013</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#391142-014</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Mid Fuselage, LH #391142-015</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#391142-016</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Fuselage, LH #391142-017</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#391142-018</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Wing, LH #195056-001</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#195056-002</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMS Pod Sidewall, LH #391142-019</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Tail, LH #391142-021</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#391142-028</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudder/Speed Brake, LH #391142-023</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#391142-024</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPACE TRANSPORTATION STRUCTURES AND MATERIALS WORKSHOP**

**LESSONS LEARNED**

- MURPHY'S LAW ALWAYS APPLIES TO NEW MATERIALS
- BE SURE DESIGN REQUIREMENTS ARE NECESSARY AND REALISTIC
- TEST PROGRAMS MUST BE ADEQUATE AND EARLY
- CANNOT IGNORE DETAILS
NEW THERMAL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY
DIRECTED TOWARDS:

- SAVING WEIGHT
- LOWERING COST
- INCREASED TEMPERATURE CAPABILITY
- INCREASED DURABILITY
- IMPROVED RELIABILITY

FUTURE MISSIONS

- SPACE SHUTTLE UPGRADE

- NEXT GENERATION SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM
  - NATIONAL AERO-SPACE PLANE
  - SHUTTLE EVOLUTION-II/C
  - NATIONAL LAUNCH SYSTEM (ADVANCED LAUNCH SYSTEM)
  - ASSURED CREW RETURN VEHICLE FOR SPACE STATION (PERSONAL LAUNCH SYSTEM)

- SPACE EXPLORATION
  - MARS SAMPLE RETURN
  - LUNAR RETURN AEROBRAKES
  - MANNED MARS AEROBRAKE AND RETURN
  - PLANETARY PROBES: NEPTUNE, TITAN, VENUS, URANUS

- FLIGHT EXPERIMENTS
  - AEROASSIST FLIGHT EXPERIMENT, 1986
  - SWERVE-PEGASUS
• RIGID LOW DENSITY CERAMIC
  - SHUTTLE TPS FLIGHT PROVEN
    - LI-900, LI-2200, FRCI-20-12
  - IMPROVED MATERIALS DEVELOPED
    - FRCI, AETB, HTP
  - TOUGHENED COATING
  - OPTIMIZED MATERIALS TO BE DEFINED

• RIGID HIGH DENSITY CERAMIC
  - CERAMIC MATRIX COMPOSITES IN DEVELOPMENT
  - DIBORIDE COMPOSITES RESEARCH INITIATED

• FLEXIBLE
  - SHUTTLE TPS FLIGHT PROVEN
    - FRSI, AFRSI
  - IMPROVED MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT
    - TABI, CFBI, MLI CERAMIC COMPOSITES

• ABLATORS
  - MARS RETURN MISSION REQUIREMENTS BEING DEFINED
  - NON CATALYTIC REFLECTIVE ABLATOR DEVELOPMENT STARTING

COMPARISON OF VEHICLE REGIMES IN EARTH'S ATMOSPHERE
### SEI/PATRIFINDER

#### COMPARISON OF ASTV AND SHUTTLE TPS REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Shuttle</th>
<th>Lunar Return ASTV</th>
<th>Mars Return ASTV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Peak Convective Heating BTU/ft²-sec</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3-60</td>
<td>80-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peak Velocity, m/sec</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>11+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peak Radiant Heating, BTU/ft²-sec</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>30-3</td>
<td>25-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peak Dynamic Pressure, psi</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turbulent Heating</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Entry Heating Time, sec</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>&lt; 400</td>
<td>&lt; 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exposure to Adverse Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Handling</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO^*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rain/Weather</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO^*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aeroacoustics (dB)</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>&lt; 90</td>
<td>&lt; 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Debris Impact</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Launch</td>
<td>LESS</td>
<td>MORE</td>
<td>MORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On-Orbit Flight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ONCE DEPLOYED*

### THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEM FOR AEROASSIST FLIGHT EXPERIMENT (AFE)

**BASELINE DESIGN AS OF 10/89**

[Diagram of thermal protection system for aeroassist flight experiment (AFE)]

**STAGNATION REGION**

LI - 2200

**FOREBODY**

**AFTERBODY**

**CARRIER VEHICLE**

**AFRSI**

**NASA - AMES**
AEROASSIST FLIGHT EXPERIMENT
ALTERNATE THERMAL PROTECTION MATERIALS

- AETB-12 RIGID TILE
  ALUMINA-ENHANCED THERMAL BARRIER AT 12 LB/FT³ DENSITY (AETB-12) HAS GREATER COMBINED STRENGTH AND TEMPERATURE CAPABILITIES THAN EARLIER LOW DENSITY RIGID INSULATORS. THE REACTION CURED GLASS (RCG) COATING IS THE SAME AS THAT USED ON BASELINE TILES.

- AETB-8 RIGID TILE
  AETB-8 IS AN 8 LB/FT³ VERSION OF THE AETB-12 MATERIAL. LOWER DENSITY AND GOOD TEMPERATURE PROPERTIES ENHANCE ITS ADVANTAGES AS A HEAT SHIELD MATERIAL.

- ASMI RIGID TILE
  ALUMINA SOL-MODIFIED INSULATION (ASMI) WITH ABOUT 15 LB/FT³ DENSITY HAS LOW SHRINKAGE CHARACTERISTICS AND IS MADE USING SOL-GEL PROCESSING TECHNOLOGY. THE COATING WILL BE RCG.

- SPECTRALLY REFLECTIVE COATINGS
  SPECTRALLY REFLECTING COATINGS APPLIED TO BASELINE APE TILES WILL BE CAPABLE OF REDUCING VEHICLE HEATING BY REFLECTING AWAY PART OF THE SHOCK LAYER RADIATION.

- TABI FLEXIBLE BLANKET INSULATION
  TAILORABLE ADVANCED BLANKET INSULATION (TABI) IS FORMED AS A INTEGRALLY WOVEN FABRIC STRUCTURE THAT HAS INTERNAL CHANNELS FILLED WITH LOW DENSITY ALUMINA FIBER INSULATION. TABI WILL BE WOVEN FROM SILICON CARBIDE YARN FOR HIGH TEMPERATURE CAPABILITY.

- CFBI FLEXIBLE BLANKET INSULATION
  COMPOSITE FLEXIBLE BLANKET INSULATION (CFBI) IS FORMED FROM A SILICON CARBIDE FABRIC AS AN OUTER SURFACE, A LAYER OF LOW DENSITY ALUMINA FIBER INSULATION, AND MULTIFOIL INSULATION AT THE BOTTOM FOR REDUCED RADIATION HEAT TRANSFER. THE LAYERED COMPONENTS ARE FASTENED TOGETHER BY STITCHING. THIS INSULATION HAS GREATLY REDUCED THERMAL CONDUCTANCE AT THE LOW PRESSURE CONDITIONS OF AEROPASS MANEUVER.
ADVANCED RSI THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS

CURRENT SHUTTLE TILE SYSTEM
- TILE COATING RCG OR LRSI
- RSI LI 900, LI-2200 FRCI 20-12
- FILLER BAR
- STRAIN ISOLATOR PAD
- ALUMINUM STRUCTURE
- BONDLINE

ADVANCED TILE SYSTEM
- TOUGHENED HIGH TEMPERATURE THERMAL CONTROL SURFACE
- SMALL GAPS
- ADVANCED RSI OPTIMIZED ρ, ε, k
- COMPOSITE STRUCTURE
- BONDLINE

IMPACT RESISTANCE OF RSI COATING SYSTEMS

SHUTTLE TECHNOLOGY, 1978
- RCQ-O
- 0.015 in
- SIGNIFICANT DAMAGE

CURRENT TECHNOLOGY
- TUFF
- 0.1 in
- NO DAMAGE

DAMAGE RESISTANCE AS A FUNCTION OF AREAL WEIGHT IMPACT = 1.2 x 10^2 lb

RELATIVE DAMAGE RESISTANCE

AREAL WEIGHT, lb/in^2
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# Rigid RSI Property Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>LI-900</th>
<th>LI-2200</th>
<th>FRCI-12</th>
<th>AETB-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tensile Strength</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP (PSI)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTT (PSI)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modulus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP (KSI)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT (KSI)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temperature Capability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Isothermal Shrink.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700°F - 1 HR (%)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500°F - 1 hr (%)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thermal Conductivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure = 10^3 ATM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = 1000°F BTU-IN/FT²-HR°F</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Top Hat**

Thermal Protection System

- Ceramic matrix composite
- High temperature felt
- Rigid reusable insulation
- Spacecraft structure
MANNED MARS-EARTH RETURN
THERMAL PROTECTION ABLATOR MATERIALS COMPARISON
(RAKED CONE GEOMETRY) \( R_N = 1 \) METER

\( V_E = 14 \) km/sec, \( L/D = 0.5, \beta = 300 \) kg/m

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABLATOR THICKNESS (IN)</th>
<th>CARBON(^1) PHENOLIC</th>
<th>CARBON(^2) CARBON</th>
<th>AVCOAT(^3)</th>
<th>RSI (LI-2200)(^4)</th>
<th>AVCOAT (APOLLO)(^5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.5 - 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSULATION **</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>(--)(^{\text{tt}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE MASS LOADING ((\text{lbm} / \text{ft}^2))</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.5 - 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS MASS</td>
<td>3478</td>
<td>6210</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS WT.%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{1}\) FOREBODY HEATSHIELD ONLY; BASED ON NON-OPTIMIZED DESIGN, I.E. UNIFORM THICKNESS; DOES NOT INCLUDE TPS SUPPORT STRUCTURE
\(^\text{2}\) LI-920 RSI INSULATION
\(^\text{3}\) APOLLO ENTRY VELOCITY, \( V_E = 11 \) km/sec, \( V_e = 15 \) ft, \( \beta = 350 \) kg/m
\(^\text{4}\) APOLLO INSULATION IS Q-FELT/STAINLESS STEEL HONEYCOMB (Q-FELT INCLUDED IN TPS MASS)
\(^\text{5}\) INITIAL DENSITY, \( p_i = 89 \) lb/ft
\(^\text{6}\) INITIAL DENSITY, \( p_i = 108 \) lbm/ft
\(^\text{7}\) INITIAL DENSITY, \( p_i = 22 \) lbm/ft
FLEXIBLE TPS CONSTRUCTION

SURFACE TOUGHENING OF TABI TO AEROACOUSTIC ENVIRONMENTS

Aeroacoustic survival of flexible TPS after 600 sec at 170 dB
(after exposure to radiant heat cycle)
Thermal Protection Materials at NASA Ames Research Center

Presented by
Daniel J. Rasky

for the
Entry Systems Panel
Space Transportation Structures and Materials Technology Workshop
September 23-26, 1991
Omni Hotel
Newport News, VA
A Synergistic, Multidisciplinary Approach
Continual Research/Technology Development Supports Projects

Projects

- Space Exploration Initiative (SEI)
  Development of advanced TPS (reusable, ablative) for aerobraking applications.

- Aeroassist Flight Experiment (AFE)
  Wall Catalysis (WCE), Alternate Thermal Protection Materials (ATPM), and Heat Shield Performance (HSP) experiments.

- Mars Environmental Survey (MESUR)
  Heat shield analyses and design.

- National Aero-Space Plane (NASP)
  Internal insulation (#95) and arc-jet testing (#93) government work packages.

- Pegasus and Pegasus/SWERVE Hypersonic Testing
  Fabricating Wing Glove. Performing vehicle leading edge and heat shield analyses and arc-jet testing.

- Personnel Launch System TPS evaluation
  Initial TPS evaluation.
Material/TPS Testing Areas

- **Arc-Jet Testing**
  - Aerodynamic Heating Facility
  - Interactive Heating Facility
  - Panel Test Facility
- **Material Characterization**
  - XRD, SEM, XRF, Optical Microscopes
  - Dilatometer, Large Sample TGA
  - Infrared & Ultraviolet Spectrometers
- **Special Testing**
  - Laser Time-of-Flight Mass Spectrometer
  - Side Arm Reactor
  - Radiant Heating

Material/TPS Analysis Areas

- **Computational Surface Thermochemistry**
  - Surface catalysis (BLIMPK, AMIR, LAURA, VSL)
  - Ablation and shape change (ASC, CMA, ACE)
- **Computational Materials**
  - CVD/CVI Processing (GENMIX, NACHOS)
  - Reflective TPS analyses
  - Material properties (MATX)
- **Computational Solid Mechanics**
  - Multi-dimensional conduction/radiation Analysis (PATRAN, SINDA, TRASYS)
Material/TPS Development Areas

- Ceramic Matrix Composites
  - Very-High Temperature Ceramics (HfB₂ + SiC)
  - High Temperature, High Strength Ceramics (C/SiC)
  - TOPHAT CMC/Rigid Tile TPS
  - Polymer Precursors (Si/C/B fibers)

- Lightweight Ceramic Insulations
  - Rigid Tiles (AETB, METB, SMI)
  - TUFI Rigid Tile TPS
  - TABI and CFBI Flexible Blanket TPS
  - Aerogel Studies

- Lightweight Ablators
  - Polymer Filler + Rigid Ceramic Insulation

- Surface Coatings
  - Low Catalytic Efficiency, High Emissivity
  - Reflective

Diboride Materials

- Manlabs Inc. (Cambridge MA) tested and compiled a database on a large number of refractory materials in the 60's and early 70's
- The diborides of zirconium and hafnium (ZrB₂ and HfB₂) were found to be the most oxidation resistant, high temperature materials in the study, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arc testing of ZrB₂ + 20 v/o SiC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>surface temp. 2510 °C, stagn. press. 1.0 atm, stagn. enthalpy 11.6 kJ/gm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recession: 0.66 mm/2 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivalent graphite recession: 30 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivalent SiC recession: 45 cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"These results illustrate the reuse capability of the boride composites... This capability is unrivaled by any other material system." - Quote from Dr. Larry Kaufman, Principal Investigator in the Manlabs Studies
Post-Test Photographs of RCC and ZrB₂ + 20 v/o SiC Samples

Test Conditions: test time = 3 min, cold wall heat flux = 270 W/cm²
stag. press. = 0.046 atm, stag. enth. = 25 kJ/gm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Maximum Use Temp. (°C)</th>
<th>Emissivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HfB₂+SiC</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiC (or Coated C-C)</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid Tiles</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coated Niobium</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Cold Wall Heat Flux Computations

For one-dimensional, radiative equilibrium, the maximum cold wall heat flux, \( Q_{cw} \), can be computed from the maximum material use temperature, \( T_{max} \), by:

\[
Q_{cw} = \epsilon \sigma T_{max}^4 (1 - H_w/H_r)
\]

where \( \epsilon \) is the emissivity and \( H_w \) is the wall gas enthalpy at \( T_{max} \), and \( H_r \) is the local recovery enthalpy.

With values for the material maximum use temperature and emissivity, \( Q_{cw} \) can be easily computed.
Maximum Cold Wall Heat Flux Computations (Cont.)

* Non-catalytic surface effects can considerably increase $Q_{cw}$ from the values shown (i.e., can substantially increase $H_w$)

Major Goals

- New very-high temperature ceramic matrix composites/TPS for 4000+ F reusability (Zr and Hf ceramics)
- High strength ceramic matrix composites for structural TPS applications at 3000+ F (SiC/TiB2 matrix ceramics)
- Durable, lightweight ceramic TPS for 3000+ F use (TUFI, TOPHAT)
- Lightweight, rigid, ceramic insulations for 3000+ F use (AETB, METB, SMI)
- Flexible lightweight ceramic insulations/TPS for 2500+ F use (TABF, CFBI)
- New very lightweight ablators with 20-30% weight savings compared to state-of-the-art materials
- High emissivity, low surface catalytic efficiency, and reflective coatings for advanced TPS
- New 3-D computational surface thermochemistry (CST) code for predicting detailed near surface fluid/material response interaction for advanced TPS/vehicle analyses
10.3.11 Some Materials Perspectives for Research for Space Transportation Systems by Howard G. Maahs, NASA LaRC
SOME MATERIALS PERSPECTIVES FOR SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

Howard G. Maahs
Applied Materials Branch
Materials Division
NASA Langley Research Center
PERSONAL BACKGROUND IN ENTRY SYSTEMS

Graphite Ablation (1964-1971)
• Application: single-use ballistic entry manned vehicle
• Materials identification & characterization
  - Artificial graphite, glassy carbon, pyrolytic graphite
• Performance evaluations (arc jet)
• Erosion rates and mechanisms

Carbon-Carbon Composites (1982-present)
• Applications: reusable airframe TPS or hot structure (generic hypersonic vehicles, NASP)
• Materials identification and characterization
  - Thin, structural oxidation-resistant carbon-carbon composites
• New materials/concepts development
  - Mechanical property improvements
  - Oxidation resistance
• Performance evaluations (mission simulation, arc jet)
• Failure mechanisms

COMMON NEEDS FOR SPACE TRANSPORTATION VEHICLES:
PASSIVE THERMAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS

• Space Shuttle Orbiter
• Shuttle evolution
• Single-stage-to-orbit (NASP)
• Advanced hypersonic vehicles
• Personnel launch system (PLS)
• Lunar transfer vehicle
• Martin transfer vehicle

Additional performance benefits possible if a single material serves dual functions of TPS and structure.
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AN AEROBRAKE CONCEPT

BASIC AEROBRAKE CRITERIA

Aerobrake Performance Objectives

• Lifetime
  - Lunar missions: ≥ 7 flights
  - Mars missions: ≥ 2 flights
• Entry velocity range: 6 to 14 km/sec
• Maximum g-loads: 5 to 6
• Aerobrake/vehicle mass fraction: ≤ 15%

Basic Heatshield Requirements (configuration & trajectory dependent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment composition</th>
<th>Maximum radiation equilibrium temperature, °F</th>
<th>Aeropass time, sec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth entry (Lunar mission)</td>
<td>air</td>
<td>2000-3000°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth entry (Mars mission)</td>
<td>air</td>
<td>3500-4000°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars entry</td>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>2500-3500°F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AEROBRAKE MATERIALS

General Materials Requirements

- High temperature capability
- High load bearing
- Lightweight
- Fully reusable (mission specific)
- Space durable in LEO/Lunar/interplanetary environments
- Material database as a function of temperature
- Verified performance capability in relevant service environments

SPECIFIC MATERIALS NEEDS

Thermal Protection System (TPS)
- Capability to 4000°F
- Tailored thermal conductivity for optimum heat distribution
- Non-catalytic surfaces
- High emittance (≥ 0.8)
- Methodology to predict service performance from ground-based and limited flight data

TPS Support Structure
- Low coefficient of thermal expansion
- High temperature insulative capability
- Load introduction concepts/materials to support structure

TPS Seals
- Same as for TPS
- Compatibility with TPS materials
- Design concepts for minimum leakage
- Acoustic load tolerance

Heatshield Support Structure
- Concepts for heavily loaded structure
- Lightweight materials
- Low coefficient of thermal expansion
SOME HEATSHIELD MATERIALS OPTIONS

- Ablators
- Oxidation-resistant carbon-carbon composites
- Rigid surface insulation
- Flexible ceramic materials
- Ceramic matrix composites

RECENT TECHNOLOGY ADVANCES IN CURRENT PROGRAMS

- Carbon-Carbon Composites -

- Mechanical properties (program focus: generic airframe structure)
  - Improved strengths for 2-D constructions
  - Strength benefits of 3-D constructions

- Oxidation resistance (program focus: NASP)
  - Carbon-carbon mission cycling data to 200 hours
  - Carbon-hybrid materials
  - Dynamic (arc jet) test data
INFLUENCE OF TOW SIZE AND DENSIFICATION TYPE ON SELECTED MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF 2-D CARBON-CARBON COMPOSITES

Reinforcement: T-300 8HS fabric; 0, 90 layup
Heat stab. temp: 2000°C

- Interlam. tens. strength
- Interlam. shear strength (4 pt bend)
- In-plane tensile strength
- In-plane compressive strength

Densif.type: P-phenolic, L-LOPIC, C-CVI

STRENGTH BENEFITS OF A CVI-DENSIFIED 3-D ORTHOGONAL CARBON-CARBON COMPOSITE

- Strength, KSI
- Modulus, MSI

* test capability limit
Typical Oxidation Performance Results for HC, RS and BFG Materials

![Graph showing mass change unit area for different temperatures and cumulative exposure times for HC, RS, and BFG materials.]

Typical Oxidation Performance Results for Hitco SiC/C Materials

![Graph showing mass change unit area for Hitco SiC/C materials at 1700°F and 2000°F with cumulative exposure times.]
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AEROBRAKE MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES TECHNOLOGY NEEDS

- Mission/configuration/trajectory trade studies ⇒ Environmental definition
- Integrated structures/materials concepts trade studies
- Candidate materials identification/development
- Materials screening in relevant environments
- Dynamic (arc jet) tests
- Mathematical models to predict service performance from ground-based test data
- Materials property design data base
- Design and analysis of aeroshell and support structure
- Construct and verify performance of representative subelement assemblies
- Inspection and repair technology
- Flight experiments to verify predictive capability
- Materials performance/durability certification testing
SUMMARY REMARKS

- A common need for all space transportation vehicles is an effective thermal protection system
- An aerobraking vehicle exemplifies many common TPS issues
- Numerous materials and structural options exist
- Current programs in oxidation-resistant carbon-carbon composites provide a strong technology foundation for a combined TPS/hot structure approach
- Major materials and structures technology needs must be identified and addressed
10.3.12 Materials and Structures Technologies for Hypersonics
by George F. Wright, Sandia National Laboratory
SPACE TRANSPORTATION
MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES
TECHNOLOGY WORKSHOP

GEORGE F. WRIGHT
SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORY
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
G. F. WRIGHT: PERSONAL HISTORY IN ENTRY SYSTEMS

- **1963 - 1970 - ENTRY MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING**
  - HEAT SHIELD MATERIALS - C/C, ORGANICS
  - RADAR WINDOW MATERIALS - CERAMICS

- **1971 - 1980 - AEROTHERMAL ANALYSIS OF REENTRY VEHICLES**
  - ANALYSIS OF BOTH BALLISTIC AND MANEUVERING VEHICLES
  - CONTINUED MATERIALS TESTING
  - PARTICIPATE IN CODE DEVELOPMENT

- **1980 - PRESENT - PROGRAM MANAGER FOR SEVERAL AEROSPACE PROGRAMS**
  - SPACEPLANE - MANNED MANEUVERING VEHICLES
  - SHR V - HYPersonic RESEARCH VEHICLE
  - NUBE - HIGH ALTITUDE SOUNDING ROCKET
  - STARMATE - HIGH ALTITUDE SOUNDING ROCKET
  - SEAM - SPACECRAFT TO MEASURE LOCAL SPACECRAFT ENVIRONMENTS
  - HYFLEX - HYPersonic FLIGHT EXPERIMENT

- **PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES**
  - AIAA - ASSOCIATE FELLOW
  - ASTM - MEMBER, COMMITTEE E-21 ON SPACE SIMULATION (FORMER CHAIRMAN)
  - CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE E-21.08 ON THERMAL PROTECTION

**CURRENT PROGRAMS**

MATERIALS & STRUCTURES FOR HYPERSONICS

- **NASP SUPPORTS MOST PROGRAMS (100M + FOR MATERIALS)**

  - **AVAILABILITY OF MATERIALS DATA TO GENERAL COMMUNITY**
    - DEVELOP MATERIALS DATABOOK OF THESE MATERIALS
    - NASP TASK?
    - NASA PROJECT?

- **NASA - GENERIC HYPERSONICS**

  - DESIGN PRIMARILY TO ADDRESS FLOW ISSUES
  - SUITABLE TESTBED FOR NEW MATERIALS AND TECHNIQUES
    - REQUIRES DATA ON MATERIALS AND FASTENERS
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BASIC TECHNOLOGY NEEDS
MATERIALS & STRUCTURES FOR HYPERSONICS

• MATERIALS DEVELOPED FOR TEMPERATURES ABOVE 4000°F
  • REUSABLE
  • FABRICABLE IN LARGE ENOUGH COMPONENTS TO BE USEFUL FOR VEHICLE CONSTRUCTION
  • TAILORABLE PROPERTIES; MODULUS, THERMAL EXPANSION
  • FASTENERS WITH TECHNIQUES DEVELOPED FOR USE

• MATERIALS FOR CONTINUOUS SERVICE ABOVE 4000°F IN LARGE SIZES
  • STANDARDIZED FASTENER SYSTEMS
  • COOLING TECHNOLOGY FOR NOSETIPS, LEADING EDGES, ETC.
  • BUILT INTO STRUCTURE
  • COMMUNICATION OF DATA AND TECHNOLOGY ON MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES. CENTRAL CLEARING HOUSE.

• INSTRUMENTATION FOR FLIGHT VEHICLES
  • TEMPERATURE - HOT SURFACES
  • HEATING RATE - HOT SURFACES
  • BLT MEASUREMENT - HOT SURFACES
  • STRAIN - HOT SURFACES
PAYOFF AREAS
MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES FOR HYPERSONICS

- CENTRALIZED DATA SYSTEM
  - COMPUTERIZED NETWORK OR UPDATE SYSTEM
  - HANDBOOK OF DATA

- STANDARDIZED MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS FOR HOT SURFACES

- ATTACHMENT TECHNIQUES

- SIZE ISSUES

Two-Stage Pegasus with a 213' Payload
Proposed SWERVE/Pegasus launch profile

with parachute recovery at Poker Flat Research Range

Launch from B-52

Stage 2 Impact

Stage 1 Impact

Fairbanks

60 N

50 N

40 N

30 N

20 N

145 W

150 W

155 W

160 W

20.5

NOSE TIP HEAT PIPE PROPOSAL

CERAMIC NON-OXIDIZING COATING

020 HEAT PIPE WALL

100 MESH WICK (0.030)

400 MESH WICK (0.008)

MOLYBDENUM HEAT PIPE CONTAINER

CERAMIC INSULATOR / STRUCTURAL SPACER

VAPOR SPACE (LITHIUM WORKING FLUID)

COOLING TUBES BRAZED TO SUBSTRUCTURE

GRADED CARBON FIBER FLAKE INSULATION

ALUM SUBSTRUCTURE

FLUID RESERVOIR 25 LBS WATER 61 CU IN

CARBON-CARBON HEATSHIELD
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Sketch of the Proposed Test Model Design.
10.3.13 Rigid Fibrous Ceramics for Entry Systems
by Ronald P. Banas, Lockheed Missiles & Space Company, Inc.
RIGID FIBROUS CERAMICS
FOR ENTRY SYSTEMS

RONALD P. BANAS
LOCKHEED MISSILES & SPACE COMPANY, INC.
HIGH PAYOFF AREAS WITH REUSABLE SURFACE INSULATION

- A REWATERPROOFING OR FACTORY WATERPROOFING COMPOUND WITH A 1800°F TEMPERATURE CAPABILITY
- WOULD ALLOW REWATERPROOFING OF ABOUT 25-50% OF THE ORBITER TILES

TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES/GAPS

- LIGHTWEIGHT, INSULATING CERAMIC MATRIX COMPOSITES FOR LOAD BEARING STRUCTURE
  - RIGID FIBROUS CERAMIC (RFC) CORES
  - FACESHEETS OF HIGH TEMP (2000°F+) INORGANIC MATERIALS
  - SURFACE DENSIFICATION OF RFC CORES

- ULTRA-LIGHTWEIGHT, LOW THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY RFC, USE BEHIND C/SiC, RCC OR ACC SHINGLES/PANELS
COATINGS FOR
RIGID FIBROUS CERAMICS

DESCRIPTION
CLASS 2 (RCG) BLACK BOROSILICATE GLASS
CLASS 1 WHITE BOROSILICATE GLASS
CLASS 1, MOD 3 BOROSILICATE, WHITE
CLASS 2 ON HTP-IND-39-8, HTP-6-22 and HTP-8-22 TILES
TUFFI
CLASS 2 WITH 250 MICRON SiC PLATELETS

STATUS
PRODUCTION: USED ON ORBITER TILES
PRODUCTION: USED ON ORBITER TILES
PRODUCTION: MATCHES CTE OF HTP-12-35
RED AT LMSC. SUCCESSFULLY TESTED TO 40 THERMAL CYCLES TO 2300°F AT NASA/JSC
RED AT NASA/Arc. VARIOUS TESTS. APPLIED TO HTP-8-22, SUCCESSFULLY TESTED TILES AT NASA/JSC FOR 20 CYCLES TO 2300°F
RED AT LMSC. APPLIED TO HTP-8-22 AND HTP-39-8: SUCCESSFULLY TESTED TO 10 THERMAL CYCLES TO 2300°F AT NASA/JSC

CHALLENGES FOR REUSABLE RIGID FIBROUS CERAMICS:
LUNAR/MARS AEROBRACING HEATSHIELDS

- ADVANCED FIBERS THAT CAN PRODUCE A 3000 TO 4000 °F USE-TEMPERATURE RFC MATERIAL REQUIRE THE FOLLOWING FIBER CHARACTERISTICS:
  - LOW THERMAL EXPANSION (3 TO 8 x 10⁻⁷ IN/IN °F)
  - SMALL AVERAGE FIBER DIAMETER (1.5 TO 3 MICRONS)
  - HIGH MELTING POINT (4000 TO 4500°F)
  - MODERATE TENSILE STRENGTH (150 TO 220 x 10³ LB/IN²)
  - LOW FIBER POROSITY TO ENHANCE STRENGTH
  - THERMAL STABILITY AT 3000 TO 4000°F

- ADVANCED COATINGS COMPATIBLE WITH 3000 TO 4000°F RIGID FIBROUS CERAMICS
  - CTE COMPATIBLE WITH RFC CHLORINATE
  - HIGH EMITTANCE (≥ 0.80)
  - LOW CATALICITY, SIMILAR TO CLASS 2 (RCG) COATING
ENTRY SYSTEMS BACKGROUND: RON BANAS

1960-1964 (NASA/DFRC) PLANNED, CONDUCTED AND REPORTED ON TURBULENT BOUNDARY LAYER AERODYNAMIC HEATING EXPERIMENTS ON THE X-15 RESEARCH AIRCRAFT.

1965-1972 (LMSC, INC) AERODYNAMIC HEATING ANALYST FOR ASCENT/ORBIT/REENTRY VEHICLES SYSTEMS TEST ENGINEER FOR AEROHEATING WIND TUNNEL TESTS.
- PLANNED PERFORMED REPORTED ON MATERIAL CHARACTERIZATION TESTS
- PLANNED PERFORMED REPORTED ON RSI ENVIRONMENTAL TESTS - THERMAL, ACOUSTIC, ARC-JET AND ATTACHMENT TESTS

1973-1979 ANALYST PERFORMING TPS TRADE STUDIES
- ACTIVE VS PASSIVE COOLING
- METALLIC VS RSI (CERAMIC) EXTERNAL INSULATION
- TPS SIZING

1979-1984 ENGINEERING MANAGER FOR ALL ASPECTS OF HRSI CONTRACT WITH ROCKWELL/NASA-JSC
- RESPONSIBLE FOR SCALE-UP TO PRODUCTION OF CL 2 (RCG) COATING AND FRD-12
- RESPONSIBLE FOR TECHNOLOGY CONTRACTS WITH NASA/JSC & NASA/ARC

1985-1991 MARKETING, CUSTOMER INTERFACE/REQUIREMENTS FOR ALTERNATE USES OF RSI MATERIALS.
- PROJECT LEADER ON VARIOUS EFFORTS WITH RIGID FIBROUS CERAMICS
- PRODUCTION SCALE-UP OF HTP-6, HTP-12, HTP-12 & HTP-60
# COMPARISON OF LI-900 AND HTP PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL PROPERTY</th>
<th>LI-900</th>
<th>HTP-6-22</th>
<th>HTP-12-22</th>
<th>HTP-16-22</th>
<th>HTP-60-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY (LB/FT³)</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENSILE STRENGTH (LB/IN²)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- THRU-THE-THICKNESS</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IN-PLANE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPRESSION STRENGTH (LB/IN²)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- THRU-THE-THICKNESS</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IN-PLANE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COEF. OF THERMAL EXPANSION (IN/IN/F, 70 TO 1500°F)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IN-PLANE X10⁻⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPARENT THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY (BTU-IN/FT²-HR-°F)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- THRU-THE-THICKNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ 1 ATM AND 1000°F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIELECTRIC CONSTANT</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOSS TANGENT</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* AVERAGE VALUES AT 70°F UNLESS NOTED

## HTP: WHAT’S HAPPENED SINCE 1984

1985
- HTP-16-22 GOES INTO PRODUCTION: 200+ BILLETS, 13x13x5 INCHES
- INTEGRAL MULTIPLE DENSITY HTP DEVELOPED
- HTP-60 PROVEN AS A HIGH TEMPERATURE RADOME

1986-1987
- HTP-6-22 ENTERS PRODUCTION: LOAD-BEARING CRYOGENIC INSULATOR
  200 BILLETS FABRICATED, 13x13x5 INCHES.
- VACUUM FORMING FACILITY: LARGE, NEAR-NET SHAPE HTP PARTS
- BOROSILICATE GLASS COATING MODIFIED TO MATCH HTP-12-35 THERMAL EXPANSION

1988
- RCG COATED INTEGRAL MULTIPLE DENSITY HTP PASSES RAIN EROSION TESTS
- HTP-6 PASSES 2700°F ARC-JET PLASMA TEST
- HTP-6 USED FOR CRYOGENIC ULLAGE CONTROL
- FIRST LASER-MACHINED HTP PARTS
COMPARISON OF MICROSTRUCTURES

• HTP FORMULATION AND PROCESSING ACHIEVES CONTROLLED MICROSTRUCTURE OF LI-900 AND BORON FUSION MECHANISM OF FRCI WITHOUT LOSS OF SUB-MICRON SILICA FIBER.

• SELECTIVE FIBER RATIOS ALLOW CTE CONTROL INDEPENDENT OF BORON FUSION REACTIVITY.

• HTP TECHNOLOGY
  - TAILOR FIBER COMPOSITES
  - FORMULATION
  - FIBER ORIENTATION
  - CONTROLLED FUSION
  - BINDER
  - FLUX
  - ADAPTABLE TO OTHER PROCESSING METHODS COMMON IN FIBER PRODUCTS INDUSTRY

(Original figure unavailable)
10.3.14 Entry Systems Technology Assessment
by Archie Gay, General Dynamics Space Systems Division
ENTRY SYSTEMS BACKGROUND

- HYPERSONIC VEHICLES STUDIES
  - Aerothermal / Structural Concepts
    AFWAL 1985-1987

- AEROBRAKING SPACE TRANSFER VEHICLES (ASTV) STUDIES
  - Concepts Definition studies/ Turnaround Operations/ Space Navigation and Aerobraking/ Centaur- derived Lunar Transfer Vehicles
    NASA centers 1979-1990
  - ASTV-related IR&D Studies involving wind- tunnel testing, aerothermodynamics, GN&C and STV design studies
    1983-1991

AEROTHERMAL / STRUCTURAL CONCEPTS STUDY

OBJECTIVES

- Establish aerothermal environments for hypersonic aerospace vehicles.
- Develop thermostructural design concepts.
- Obtain optimum thermostructural designs by performing trade studies
- Identify areas for further development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>95 ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>26 ft 8 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing span</td>
<td>27 ft 8 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeoff weight</td>
<td>98,000 lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payload</td>
<td>5,000 lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>43,000 lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propealnts</td>
<td>46,400 lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO₂</td>
<td>41,500 lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNH₂</td>
<td>6,900 lb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suborbital vehicle and booster
TPS TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

• ADVANCED RADIATORS, INSULATORS AND ABLATORS
  - COATED REFRACTORY METALS
  - RIGID CERAMICS
  - FLEXIBLE CERAMICS
  - ADVANCED CARBON CARBON

• ACTIVE COOLING DEVICES FOR HOT STRUCTURES

PROGRAM ENABLING TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

Program Area: Hypersonics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Requirement</th>
<th>Government Technology Development</th>
<th>Industry Technology Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerodynamic Heating</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real gas effects</td>
<td>• SEI Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary layer transition</td>
<td>• NASP related studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbulence modeling</td>
<td>• HYFLEX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock boundary layer interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock impingement</td>
<td>• Validated CFD methods</td>
<td>Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarefied flows</td>
<td>• Ground test (materials) data</td>
<td>Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical non-equilibrium</td>
<td>• Flight test data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal non-equilibrium</td>
<td>• HGV flight test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface catalysis/surface reflectance</td>
<td>• AFE (14' brake)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal Control</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High temperature heat pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nose-tip and Leading edge cooling/ temperature control</td>
<td></td>
<td>Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active cooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antenna cooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics cooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROGRAM ENABLING TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

**Program Area:** Hypersonics  
**Technology Area:** High Temperature Structures and TPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Requirement (Source)</th>
<th>Government Technology Development</th>
<th>Industry Technology Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable, Reliable Hot Structures</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High temperature materials</td>
<td>Needed</td>
<td>Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joints, seals and adhesives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nose and leading edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasteners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Temperature TPS</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon/carbon insulation</td>
<td>Needed</td>
<td>Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High temperature flexible TPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High temperature rigid TPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active cooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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