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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rockets vs. Airbreathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rockets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Don’t like the atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Accelerate only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Get out quick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Tend toward vertical launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Low ISP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Drag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● High drag not a problem on ascent, desirable on descent for deceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Blunt leading edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Weight critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Mass fraction ~ 10% of GTOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Requirement to be weight sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Engine in back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Weight drives components to be clustered near engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Tail heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Hard to get forward c_g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Highly compressive loaded structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structural Differences Between Rockets and Airbreathers

- **Tanks**
  - Cylindrical, since vehicle is weight sensitive and volume insensitive

- **TPS**
  - Driven by descent
  - Low heat load due to short ascent

- **Leading edges**
  - Blunt, due to desire for descent drag
  - High heat flux

- **Structure**
  - Lightly loaded wings
  - Propulsion and airframe not highly integrated

- **Tanks**
  - Conformal, since vehicle is drag, and thus volume, critical

- **TPS**
  - Driven by ascent
  - High heat load due to long ascent time

- **Leading edges**
  - Sharp, due to low drag, low thickness/chord
  - Severe heat flux

- **Structure**
  - Highly loaded wings (some air breathers)
  - Hot wings and control surfaces due to thin cross sections and high heat flux/load
  - Propulsion and airframe highly integrated

Drag is the big driver for hypersonics
Hypersonic Vehicles

♦ Goal
  • Speed
  • Range

♦ Propulsion
  • Provide thrust

♦ Aerodynamics
  • Provide lift
  • Control the vehicle
  • Minimize drag

♦ Structures and materials
  • Minimize weight
  • Survive required mission
    ▪ Thermal / structural
    ▪ Acceleration
    ▪ Acoustic / vibration
    ▪ Environmental

♦ Weight reduction
  • High specific strength materials
    (high strength, low density)

♦ Drag reduction
  • Thin vehicle cross-sections
    □ Insulating a cold structure adds cross-sectional area
  • Sharp leading edges
  • Smooth surfaces
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Flight Vehicle Thermal Management
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History Shows That New Material Systems Help Enable the Vehicle

- Titanium
- Inconel
- Ceramic tiles and blankets
- C/C leading edges
- Ceramic Matrix Composites (CMC’s)
- SR-71
- X-15
- Orbiter
Material Specific Strength

CMC’s are the material system that will provide the required strength at elevated temperature.
CMC Hot Structure Weight Savings

- **Space Shuttle Orbiter Body Flap (AIAA-1983-913)**
  - Baseline 1460 lb, insulated cold structure
  - ACC body flap 1207 lb (253 lb, 17% weight savings)

- **HSR (NASA High Speed Research program) SiC/SiC Combustor Liner**
  - Projected 30% weight savings
  - Reduced NOx and CO emissions due to higher temp

- **X-38 C/SiC Hot Structures**
  - Bearings 50% lighter weight than traditional bearings
  - Body flap 50% less than insulated cold structure (5.25 ft x 4.6 ft, 150 lb)
  - Rudder (different design temperature)
    - PM-1000 with Ti inner structure and insulation: 133 lb with growth factor of ~ 5%
    - CMC: 97 lb with higher growth factor (27% weight savings)

- **Aircraft brakes**
  - 500-1000 lbs per plane weight savings

- **Actively cooled CMC combustor (French study, AIAA-2011-2208)**
  - 30% weight savings over metallic

Rule of thumb, ~ 25% weight savings with CMCs
Key Point – Drag Reduction

♦ Reentry vehicles (most of our prior experience), want drag to reduce velocity as they reenter.

♦ Cruise vehicles must minimize drag as they cruise through the atmosphere.
  ● Surface and cross-section

♦ Hot structure is the preferred approach (rather than TPS over cold structure)
  ● Large, smooth, hot airframe has not been addressed
A Few General Thoughts

♦ Weight is always critical

♦ High risk ≠ high payoff
  ● Might be, but not an automatic

♦ Requirements have a significant impact on TRL
  ● Number of cycles
  ● Mechanical loads
  ● Pressure (oxidation)
  ● Heat flux
  ● Etc.

♦ Thinking of how much it will cost to develop a technology is often a better gage of how far away we are than asking how long it will take
Leading Edges

♦ **State of the art**
  - Space shuttle orbiter RCC
  - Hyper-X coated C/C
  - HTV-2 oxidizing C/C

♦ **Requirement**
  - Multi-use
  - Light weight
  - Durable
  - Sharp

♦ **Technical challenges**
  - Manufacturing
  - Life
  - Thermal stress
  - High heat flux / temperature
  - Environmental durability
Typical Ascent Leading-Edge Heat Flux for SSTO

In comparison, Shuttle Orbiter leading edge ~ 80 W/cm², CEV heatshield ~ 800 W/cm²
Leading-Edge Radius Effect on Stagnation Heat Flux

Heat flux, \( \alpha \) \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{radius}}} \)

1 cm radius, 500 W/cm\(^2\)

Heat flux, W/cm\(^2\)

Radius, cm
Sharp leading edges produce intense, localized heating.
Active Oxidation of Si-Based Materials

- Transition from passive to active oxidation function of
  - Temperature
  - Oxygen partial pressure
  - Plasma speed
  - Degree of dissociation

- Destroys protection of Si containing system
  - C/SiC
  - SiC/SiC
  - Coated C/C
  - UHTC
  - … etc.

Arc-jet test of DLR C/C-SiC for X-38 at NASA JSC

Arc-jet test of MT Aerospace C/SiC in the German PWK2 facility
Heat-Pipe-Cooled Leading Edges

Heat pipe results in an isothermal leading edge.
**NASP Heat-Pipe-Cooled Wing Leading Edge**

- **Carbon/carbon (C/C) structure**
- **Mo-Re container**

**Challenges**
- Material compatibility, f(t,T)
- Thermal stresses

- Mo-Re embedded in C/C
- Li working fluid
- D-shaped heat pipes
Control Surfaces

♦ **State of the art**
  - Space shuttle orbiter (insulated)
  - X-38 (CMC hot structure)
  - HTV-2 C/C
  - NASA X-37 evaluated C/C and C/ SiC

♦ **Requirement**
  - High strength at elevated temperature
  - Light weight

♦ **Technical challenges**
  - Volume constrained
  - Manufacturing
  - Recession / stressed oxidation
  - Thermal stress
  - High heat flux / temperature
  - High heat load
  - Heat conduction into vehicle / insulation
Types of Control Surfaces

♦ Insulated
  • Suitable for very large structures
  • Minimal thermal expansion issues
  • Heavy
  • Little thermal margin
  • Thick cross section

♦ Hybrid
  • Affordable manufacturing for large structures
  • May not require TPS on upper surface
  • Thermal growth mismatch between metal/PMC and CMC
  • Weight increase 30-40% over all CMC

♦ Hot Structure
  • Lowest weight and thin cross section
  • Minimal thermal expansion mismatch problems
  • Thermal margin
  • High manufacturing/tooling costs for box structure
  • Challenging for very large structures
**X-38 Hot Structures**

- **C/SiC nosecap, skirts & chin panel**
  - Nosecap provided by DLR (Germany)
  - Nose skirts (2) provided by Astrium (Germany)
  - Chin panel provided by MT Aerospace
  - Nose assembly has undergone full qualification (qual units)
    - Vibration
    - Thermal (radiant)
    - Mechanical

- **C/SiC body flaps**
  - Provided by MT Aerospace
  - Qualified for flight
Dutch Space Metallic Hot Rudder

**X-38 hot rudder**

- Fabricated and tested a PM-1000 rudder to 2192°F (1200°C) in 1 yr
- Requirements changed
- Qualified Ti/ceramic tile rudder (1 yr)
- Planned Ti/CMC rudder for crew return vehicle (CRV)
MT Aerospace Integrated Fabrication Approach

♦ **Advantages**
  - Fewer joints
  - Better mechanical performance

♦ **Disadvantages**
  - Complex tooling and associated fabrication expense
  - Risk of damage during fabrication

♦ **Fabrication**
  - 2-D prepreg of carbon fabric
  - Cured and pyrolyzed
  - Further densified with CVI SiC
  - No fasteners (less mass)
Acreage TPS / Hot Structure Aeroshell

♦ State of the art
  ● Ceramic tiles and blankets
  ● Ablators
  ● Oxidizing C/C hot structure

♦ Requirement
  ● Durable
  ● Thin cross section
  ● Smooth OML
  ● Insulate interior (keep the heat out)

♦ Technical challenges
  ● Manufacturing
  ● Durability
  ● High temperatures
  ● Large heat load due to extended duration flight
  ● High temperature insulation
  ● Combined loads
Trade studies required on how to best meet requirements and optimize performance – need to keep trade space wide open
Windward CMC Standoff (Shingle) TPS (Sncema, IXV)

- Total mass of CMC shingle system
  - ~3 lb/ft² (15 kg/m²) (very much f(req.))
  - Not optimized

- Attachment system design
  - Mechanically attach panel to structure
  - Transfer loads from panel to structure
  - Enable expansion differences
  - Prevent large OML deformation through sufficient stiffness
  - Participate in thermal protection of structure
  - Easily replaced

- C/SiC pressure ports
  - 10 windward

- Sealing approaches

- Curved C/SiC panel (IXV side panel)
Internal Insulation

♦ Light-weight
♦ Flexible
♦ Non load-bearing
♦ Non-oxidizing
♦ Reflective foils or no foils
♦ High volumetric heat capacity
♦ Low effective thermal conductivity
♦ Capable of long duration flight at elevated temperatures
Propulsion Structures

♦ State of the art
- Passive heat sink
- Actively cooled superalloy

♦ Requirement
- Light weight
- High heat flux/temperature
- Reduced fuel

♦ Technical challenges
- Hermetically sealed CMC with no tubes
- Manifold

♦ MBDA (France)
- Fuel cooled CMC combustor
- No metallic tubes

♦ NASA & AF (Teledyne Scientific)
- Last funding several years ago
- No tubes

♦ NASA (HyperTherm)
- SiC/SiC with refractory metal tubes
Passive CMC Combustor Material Evaluation

- **Simulated Mach 6 conditions**
  - Actual flow velocity ~ Mach 2
  - \( q = 1000 \text{ psf} \) (479 hPa)
  - \( H = 793 \text{ Btu/lb} \) (1.846 MJ/kg)

- **Hydrogen fuel**

- **4 tests**
  - M ~ 6 enthalpy
  - 20 sec tare (no fuel)
  - 3 x 44 sec fueled tests

- **C/C-SiC Panel #1 Post Test**
  - 4 tests
  - M ~ 6 enthalpy
  - 20 sec tare (no fuel)
  - 3 x 44 sec fueled tests

**DLR C/C-SiC test article**

**C/C-SiC hot surface, post test**
Design and Manufacturing

- **Design for manufacturing**
  - Involve manufacturers in the process
  - Don’t “throw it over the wall”

- **Properties in a complex structure are often different than material test coupons**

- **Attachments and joints**
  - Different material systems
    - Severe thermal gradients in multiple directions
  - Mechanical loads

- **Metrology often “required” for accurate fabrication and assembly**
  - Optical / laser devices
  - Accuracy to < 0.001 in., f(size)

- **TRL = f(requirements / loads)**
  - Can’t change the requirements / loads and keep the TRL

- **Affordable, robust, & simple**

A state-of-the-art material is not the same thing as a state-of-the-art structure

Big difference!
How do we qualify the vehicle for flight?

We are unable to test many components in relevant, combined loads, environments (even small scale)
- Thermal, mechanical, plasma, shear, oxygen partial pressure, vibration and acoustic, etc.
- Apply appropriate boundary conditions over entire structure
- Thermal gradients (spatial and temporal) from boundary layer transition

Thermally generated stress ≠ mechanically generated stress

Extensive testing is required
- Performance testing and benchmarking for analyses

Building block approach

Test as much as you can, and still include adequate margins for uncertainties
Thermal-Structural Analysis

♦ Adequate material properties
  ● f(T), f(processing), etc.
  ● Adequate quantities (shape of curve and statistics)
  ● Capture non-linear behavior

♦ Boundary conditions
  ● Thermal, mechanical
  ● Boundary layer transition

♦ Mesh convergence

♦ Local / global models
  ● Apply global loads to local models

♦ Mechanical / thermal stresses

♦ Factors of Safety (FOS)

♦ Failure modes
  ● Biaxial stress interaction
  ● Thermal ≠ mechanical failure
Thermal Stress

- **Generated by restrained thermal growth**
  - Temperature gradients and / or different materials (CTE)

- **Very different from mechanical stresses**
  - Driven by thermal gradients, not just high temperatures
  - Thicker structure can make it worse
  - Structurally connected, dissimilar materials, also drive thermal stress

- **Complicated by different materials, 3-D thermal gradients, moving hot spots, asymmetric heating, etc.**

SR-71 grows ~ 3 in. during flight

Thermal stress must be understood and accurately tested and modeled
Concluding Remarks

♦ Reduction of weight and drag are key for all hypersonic vehicles

♦ A state-of-the-art material is not the same thing as a state-of-the-art structure

♦ TRL = f(requirements / loads)
  ● Can’t change the requirements / loads and keep the TRL

♦ Long duration flight results in high integrated heat loads that impact design

♦ Hot structure should be traded versus insulated (TPS) cold structure
  ● Open up the trade space

♦ Thermal stress must be understood and accurately tested and modeled