Large Scale Shearography Inspection of the Space Shuttle External Fuel Tank
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Background: External Propellant Tank

- **External Propellant Tank (ET) Background**
  - ET holds cryogenic liquid hydrogen and oxygen fuel for shuttle main engines
  
  - Polyurethane foam insulation prevents cryogenic fuel from boiling as well as ice formation
  
  - Aero loads during launch can produce foam debris potentially damaging the shuttle orbiter
  
  - After the Columbia accident, ET foam debris was identified as a likely cause of the orbiter wing damage
  
  - Several NDE methods including shearography were developed for foam inspection to minimize debris damage to orbiter
ET-122 Background - Hurricane Katrina

Hole in Roof (not directly over ET-122)

ET-122 in Cell A after Katrina

Roof damage above VAB Cell-A shown relative to ET-122 location.

LO2 Tank Ogive Damage

Intertank Damage

Roof Debris on Access Platform Near Intertank Access Door (-Z Quadrant)
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• **Objective**
  – Perform Shearography to inspect for non-visible damage including:
    • Crushed foam
    • Delaminations
    • Embedded debris
  – Provide a screening test that could be confirmed with follow up visual and tactile inspections

**SEM Photomicrograph of Intact Foam Cells**

**Three Types of Damage Assessed with Shearography Inspection**
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**Method Description**
- Shearography (Shearing Holography) is an inspection technique that detects minute changes of shape of a part due to heat, vacuum or another form of agitation.
- The system measures the interference pattern generated by two sheared laser speckle images before and after loading.
- The result of the interference pattern is a measure of the change in out of plane surface slope which can be directly related to the local stiffness of the structure under test.

**Equipment**
- A Laser Technologies Inc. Model 5100 shearographic system along with heat lamps, vacuum, acoustic and vibration sources for structural excitation.

**Advantages**
- Useful in detecting and sizing voids, delaminations, contamination, cracks, material inconsistencies in coatings and paints, insulation layers, and polymer or elastomer based structural materials.
- The shearographic method images a large area (up to several square feet) of the part under test providing a rapid, near real time, inspection.

**Limitations**
- The part under test must have a matte, light colored, surface that will reflect the laser speckle without glare.
- The test article must be stable and not move during the acquisition time.
- The interpretation on the images requires some training and is not as intuitive as other imaging techniques.

---

**Imager/Laser**

**Acoustic source**

**Acoustic Stress**

100 dB SPL

**Defect vibrates under acoustic load**
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- **Background – Shearography System**

  Test Procedure:
  
  QTI-N-044 Drafted
  “Shearographic Inspection of the External Tank”

  Shearography Using Acoustic Stressing Performed on 8 External Tanks to Date
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• **Background - POD Summary**
  – POD Test Plan was developed following the guidelines of MIL-HNBK-1823
  – Multiple inspectors participated in study
  – 100 defects and 300 blanks were used to evaluate detection and false call rates
  – POD studies completed for non-visible crush damage and delaminations
  – Worst case POD value for shearography on net spray foam:
    • Crushed foam is 0.43” deep
    • Delamination 1.18” diameter
  – False positive rate established
    • No false positive results at or above critical flaw size
  – MSFC FCB reviewed and concurred with shearography POD for detection of crush damage and delaminations
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• **Issues**
  – Large inspection area
  – Accurate positioning of inspection grid
  – Access to +Z ogive region
  – Detection threshold for embedded concrete

Scissors lifts and stands provide access to all inspection regions except +Z, or top, of tank

Inspection area encompassing ~3100 square feet

Difficult geometries such as stringers and carrier support arm require angled shots
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- **Shearography on Acreage with Crush Damage and Embedded Concrete**
  - Test panel with net spray NCFI
  - Simple geometry allows optimal inspection
  - Test article contained 1/8” concrete chip embedded in foam plus crush damage
  - One foot field of view to detect 1/8” concrete chip
  - Smaller concrete chips were not reliably detected

![Test Panel](image1.png)
![Shearography Image of Test Panel](image2.png)
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- **Shearography on Stringers with Embedded Concrete**
  - Stringer geometry introduces difficulties
  - Test article is approx. stringer geometry with approx. 1/8" concrete chips embedded
  - At approx. 30° off normal, concrete chips are detected on top and side of stringer
  - Stringer inspections will require two shots, at ±30° to capture tops and sides of stringers
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- **Shearography System Positioning Fixtures**

  SLA-22 Shearography fixture at KSC (VAB Check-out Cell)

  Acreage Shearography fixture at MAF (Bldg 420)
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- **Shearography Inspections Were Performed in Three configurations**
  - -Z region: modified Genie Lift tool adapted for shearography camera
  - Region below +Y and -Y: SLA tool (another modified Genie Lift model)
  - Region above +Y and -Y: Crane mounted tool

-Z Inspection  
-Y and +Y Inspection  
+Z Inspection
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• **Shearography Inspection Approach**
  – Inspection Layout
    • Regions were identified by ogive, barrel, or inter tank panel
    • Inspections were performed by panel to work with manageable sizes
    • An LCD projector was used to project an Excel worksheet onto the panel
    • The Excel grid was adjusted to provide 12” cells
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• Shearography Inspection Approach
  – Defect Identification
    • Defects were identified with the worksheet cell number
    • Defect locations were marked on the tank with permanent marker
    • Defects were marked at the time they were identified, using the live view of the shearography camera to provide accurate location
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- **Shearography Acoustic Stressing Technique**
  - Band limited white noise in the audio frequency range
  - Intensity 105 ±5dB at part
  - Frequency bands are established to distinguish deeper delaminations from near surface crush damage

- Delamination Test Panel
  - No response in the mid to high frequency range

- Crush Damage Test Panel
  - Response in the mid to high frequency range

- Low Freq Band 1  Low Freq Band 2  Mid Freq Band 1
- Mid Freq Band 2  High Freq Band 1  Broad Band
- Low Freq Band 1  Low Freq Band 2  Mid Freq Band 1
- Mid Freq Band 2  High Freq Band 1  Broad Band
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• Shearography Results - Examples

Visible Indication
Strong Shearography response and damage was visibly evident

Non-visible Indication
Strong Shearography response but no visible damage on tank

Embedded Concrete Chip
Strong Shearography response, small but visible damage on tank
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• **Shearography Results**
  – 95 total defect indications
  – 74 indications involved visible TPS damage
  – 21 indications exhibited no visible damage
  – Two occurrences of embedded concrete chips were detected

![Distribution of Visible and Nonvisible Defect Indications](image)

**Distribution of Defect Indications by Size**
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• **Additional Results**
  – Of 95 total defect indications:
    • 94 were crush damage
    • 1 was a possible delamination
    • 1 was a possible crack
  – No visible defects exhibited additional nonvisible damage
  – Follow on visual, tactile, and destructive test did not confirm any of the 21 nonvisible indications as actual foam damage
  – Inspections were intentionally conservative since no experience base was available for debris damaged foam

Contamination adjacent to visible impact damage was determined by shearography not to be actual foam damage

Distinct crush damage indication from recent ET135 inspection

Many ET122 indications were faint and not distinct in all frequency bands
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• **Conclusions**
  – Shearography was successfully used to inspect the damaged region of ET122 for nonvisible damage
  – The shearography inspection was extensive covering over 3100 square feet of foam and lasting 9 months
  – Most foam damage was visible and shearography results confirmed that foam damage in visibly impacted regions did not extend outside the area with visible damage
  – Of the 21 nonvisible defect indications detected with shearography, none were determined to be actual foam damage
  – Inspections were intentionally conservative since no experience base was available for debris damaged foam
  – Shearography results were used in conjunction with tactile and visual inspection to support the acceptance of the foam application allowing the tank to move forward for refurbishment