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Recruitment coordination
Aeronautics Flight Research

- Over 60 years of flight research (NACA Muroc Flight Test Unit)
- Edwards Air Force Base (EAFB)
- Remote Location
- Varied Topography
- 350 Testable Days Per Year
- Extensive Range Airspace
- 29,000 Ft Concrete Runways
- 68 Miles of Lakebed Runways
- Supersonic Corridor
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Motivation

- Simulated next generation commercial sonic boom levels, 70-80 PLdB (database of human responses to over 100 booms)
- Provide data for FAA and ICAO to determine regulations and requirements for over-land sonic booms
- Low Boom Demonstrator shows the ability to meet sonic boom requirements

- FAA and ICAO rule change allowing quiet supersonic flight
- US manufacturing of quiet supersonic aircraft
- Greatly reduced travel time for people and products worldwide

OBJECTIVES

• Key goal – Test and demonstrate the techniques for gathering data from an in-home low-level sonic boom community response test

• Project objectives
  – Investigating surveying methods, data acquisition and analysis methods, and human response subject recruitment strategies.
  – Expose 100+ volunteer human response subjects to a schedule of sonic booms with a C-weighted day-night average sound level (CDNL) of 42-58 dB

• Flight objectives – *(First ever low boom community response test)*
  – Execute 20 – 25 flights over 2 weeks, up to 4 flights/day
  – Accurately place “low booms” on community. Produce sonic booms with peaks of 0.13 – 0.53 lb/ft²
    • With the use of a of a unique, NASA-designed F-18 dive maneuver
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Web-based surveys
   — Instruction via emails and phone calls

Paper/Pencil surveys
   — Instructions and materials mailed via postal service

Smartphone application surveys
   — Door-to-door installations for Apple® iOS application on subject-owned devices
   — Centralized meetings for distribution of Android™ phones with application pre-installed (to be returned after the project)

Recruitment and Outreach

- Military-controlled community constraints
  - High resident turnover rate
  - Approval of outreach methods
  - No door-to-door solicitation

- Knowledge of housing types

- Confident projections of occupancy and turnover rate

- EAFB allowed exclusive communication channels
  - EAFB newspaper
  - Base-wide emails
  - Facebook, Twitter, EAFB website

- Recruitment letters
  - Endorsed by NASA and EAFB
  - Could not be mailed by non-military parties
Remote sonic boom recording

- Sonic Boom Unattended Data Acquisition System (SBUDAS)
- Contributed and operated by Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation (Savannah, Georgia, USA) and Pennsylvania State University (University Park, Pennsylvania, USA)
- 13 recorders distributed throughout the community
- GRAS Type 41AO-S2 microphones
- Remotely triggered over a Wi-Fi network from a host station
- Solar powered
- Hardware concealed in National Electrical Manufacturers Association-rated (NEMA) box

• Autonomous sonic boom recording
  – Supersonic Notification Of Overpressure Instrumentation (SNOOPI)
  – All-weather enclosure (dog house)
  – Automatically records events greater than a preset overpressure threshold
    • Continuous ring-buffer technique
    • SenSym SCXL004DN pressure transducer: +/- 20.8 lb/ft² range, at 0.00304 lb/ft² per count resolution

• Meteorology
  – Sonic boom propagation is extremely sensitive to atmospheric conditions
  – Meteorological data was required for both pre-flight planning and post-flight analysis
    • Surface weather towers placed within the community
    • GPS radiosonde weather balloons
PRE-TEST

• Three day test to identify possible problems with survey questionnaires or data collection procedures

• 21 volunteer human response subjects from NASA Armstrong
  – Instructed to treat workspace as their home

• Six full sonic booms were generated on second day
  – Adventitious sonic booms were expected on other days

• Select lessons learned:
  – Update Apple® iOS smartphone survey to require manual entry of date & time
  – Poor connectivity can result in data transmission delays for smartphone surveys
  – More frequent follow-up telephone calls required with paper/pencil method
  – Greater latency was expected with web survey method
  – Ensure ID numbers for respondents are easy to remember (Web and Paper/pencil)
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“Low Boom Dive” Maneuver

- Unique, NASA-designed maneuver to simulate the sound of future civil supersonic aircraft’s sonic booms
  - Requires intricate pre-flight planning
    - Pre-flight weather data, canned F-18 trajectory, sonic boom propagation simulation software
    - Produced a waypoint (Latitude/Longitude) for the pilot to begin “low boom dive” maneuver
  - 49,000 ft. altitude, Mach 0.96. Upon reaching waypoint
    - Roll to inverted, -53° flight path angle accelerated dive to Mach 1.10
    - Airplane recovers straight and level at 34,000 feet
  - Produces undesirable focus sonic boom

![Diagram showing the maneuver and its impact on the community and ground.]
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MISSION PLANNING & SONIC BOOM SCHEDULE

Armstrong Flight Research Center

- Sonic Boom Schedule
  - Optimized for target daily CDNL, with different level combinations
  - Four target sonic boom levels at center of community:
    - Low booms: 0.13 lb/ft² (low), 0.33 lb/ft² (medium), 0.53 lb/ft² (high)
    - Full sonic booms, approximately 1.2 lb/ft²
  - Pseudo-random sonic boom spacing
  - Two aircraft/flights required for most missions

- Sonic boom placement planning
  - Sonic boom propagation software PCBoom (developed by Wyle)
  - A template, “ideal” Low Boom Dive maneuver adjusted for day-of-flight upper-atmosphere conditions
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MAXIMUM OVERPRESSURES

Armstrong Flight Research Center

- 89 planned sonic booms within the community
  - 84 planned low booms
    - 75 of which were actually low booms (less than 0.60 lb/ft²)
    - 5 planned full sonic booms
  - 14 additional adventitious full sonic booms

- 76% of the planned low booms were within +/- 0.15 lb/ft² of target
  - The lowest target attempt (0.13 lb/ft²) was most difficult to achieve
  - 0.13 lb/ft² attempts were within 30% of target for only 30% of the attempts
  - All other low boom attempts were within 30% of their targets for 60% of the attempts

*All measurements recorded at center of community*
PCBoom versus SBUDAS

- PCBoom analysis done using real aircraft trajectory and time-of-takeoff upper atmospheric conditions
- Maximum overpressures on SBUDAS recorders within 0.15 lb/ft² for only approximately 35% of the low booms
- Consistent yet precision inaccuracy
- Possible reasons for poor magnitude agreement
  - Spiking and rounding due to turbulence
  - Very low overpressure levels
LOW BOOM DIVE REPEATABILITY

- Used extensively for previous tests – Low Boom/No Boom (2006), HouseVIBES (2007) and SonicBOBS (2010)
- Template maneuver chosen from SonicBOBS
- Heading and flight path angle were relatively consistent during test
- Dynamic pressure (Mach & pressure altitude) was much less precise and typically larger than designed
  - Yielded louder sonic booms than planned
- Possible causes for inconsistency
  - The need for a better-defined maneuver
  - Four different pilots used for WSPR
- WSPR still had overall success planning and generating low sonic booms within the residential community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test description</th>
<th>Successful out of total</th>
<th>Success rate, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonic booms successfully planned and executed</td>
<td>89 out of 91</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low booms successfully planned and executed</td>
<td>75 out of 83</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low booms within 0.15 lb/ft² of planned target value</td>
<td>63 out of 83</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low boom attempts with overpressures higher than planned target values</td>
<td>59 out of 83</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHALLENGES & LESSONS LEARNED

Recruitment
- Two-week delay (out of a 14-week recruitment effort) due to unanticipated approvals required for recruitment letters
- Failed to meet target # of subjects (76 out of 100) after initial outreach
  - $50 pre-paid debit card incentive introduced, and target was achieved
- Distribution/training of Android™ smartphones was tedious as it required several small meetings due to participants’ varying schedules
  - Suggestion: Distribute individually, and include a tutorial video
- Due to an inadequate sign-off process, two participants received their incentives prior to returning their smartphones
- SNOOPI had excessive false-triggers due to high winds (226 in one day)
- SBUDAS installation required unanticipated, extensive EAFB approval
- Incomplete description of SBUDAS hardware created concerns during EAFB approval process
- Installation time for SBUDAS was underestimated
- Weather balloons sometimes terminated prior to reaching the necessary altitude
  - Old data was used to fill in gaps
- Confusions among civilian air traffic controllers not accustomed to supersonic aircraft
- Unanticipated need for full sonic booms to be generated
- Non-WSPR sonic booms toward the end of testing

Smartphones

Support
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Mission Planning

& Sonic Boom Schedule

FUTURE WORK

• Community response using low boom dives on a larger community unaccustomed to sonic booms
  – Continued methodology studies

• Community response using a large-scale shaped low-boom demonstrator vehicle on large communities
  – Data used for proposal of overland sonic boom regulations change
QUESTIONS?