

The Pennsylvania State University

LionTech Rocket Labs

2018 - 2019 Solium Project

Preliminary Design Report

046 Hammond Building, University Park, PA 16802 November 2nd, 2018

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

List of Tables

List of Figures

1. Summary of Preliminary Design Report

1.1 Team Summary

Team Name and Mailing Address Lion Tech Rocket Labs: 236 S Barnard St, Unit 3, State College, PA 16801

Adult Educator/Club Advisor Dr. David Spencer – dbs9@psu.edu (814) 865-4537

NAR Contact/Mentor Justin Hess NAR L2 Certification - #102887 – jthess418@gmail.com

1.2 Launch Vehicle Summary

Size and Mass

The flight vehicle is designed to carry a rover payload along with the necessary flight systems for telemetry acquisition and a successful recovery. The flight vehicle's target apogee is 5,280 feet. A diameter of 6" was chosen to give adequate space for the rover, its retention system, and its deployment system. The length of the flight vehicle is 120" to provide enough space for the payload and the necessary avionics and flight systems. The flight vehicle's wet mass weight is 31.2 lbs. The center of pressure is located 94.34" aft of the tip of the nose cone, and the center of gravity is located 76.57" aft of the tip of the nose cone resulting in a static stability margin of 2.96 calibers.

Preliminary Motor Choice and Official Target Altitude

The motor selection is based on the mission performance criteria outlined in the NASA USLI 2018-19 Handbook and preliminarily uses OpenRocket to simulate flight characteristics. Through this motor selection process the Cesaroni L890SS was selected as the motor that will take our vehicle to the target apogee of 5,280 feet.

Recovery System

The recovery system will consist of a removable and fully redundant avionics bay containing Stratologger CF altimeters, power sources, snap connectors, and ejection charges. A dualdeployment parachute system will be utilized containing a 12" Fruity Chutes Classical Ultra drogue parachute deploying at apogee, and a 72" Fruity Chutes Iris Ultra main parachute deploying at 700 ft above ground level. This will guarantee that the flight vehicle drifts less than 2500 ft, and that all body sections impact the ground with less than 75 ft-lbs of kinetic energy.

1.3 Payload Summary

Payload Title Deployable Rover/Soil Sample Recovery System

Summary of Payload Experiment

The payload criteria section will outline the design decisions for the rover. The section is divided into 2 main parts, mechanical and software/hardware. The rover will be deployed from the launch vehicle's nose cone after landing and then autonomously move at least 10 feet away from all parts of the rocket. After the rover has reached its destination, it will collect a soil sample.

Milestone Review Flysheet

(ft-lbs)

Milestone Review Flysheet 2018-2019

PDR

covery Electronics

NA Americaloc GW300 **NA**

rogue Parachute

 $12 in$ Apogee Apogee + 2 seconds 52 142

11

26

Section 4

NA

Section 4

NA

2. Changes Made Since Proposal

2.1 Changes Made to Vehicle Criteria

Launch Vehicle

The only structural changes made to the flight vehicle since proposal have been the position switch of the main and drogue parachutes and the associated body tube couplers. This moved the center of gravity slightly to the aft of the rocket, lowering the static stability from 3.07 calibers to 2.96 calibers.

Recovery System

The team has reduced the size of the main parachute from 84" to a 72" Fruity Chutes Iris Ultra. The team has also reduced the size of drogue parachute from 24" to a 12" Fruity Chutes Classical Ultra. These changes were made after extensive modeling of the descent characteristics of the flight vehicle after launch. The reduction in main and drogue parachute size decrease the maximum drift distance of the rocket, and allow all sections of the rocket to remain within kinetic energy requirements.

2.2 Changes Made to Payload Criteria

Since proposal, the team has further developed the design for the rover. One of the main mechanisms added to the rover is a rotating payload bay mechanism. The rotational aspect will allow the rover to be oriented in the correct direction to allow it to drive out of the rocket upright upon landing.

Design decisions have also been improved upon for the retaining mechanism which will include a solenoid locking mechanism. The rover will be attached to the inside of the rocket through a 9V powered solenoid that will release the rover when the power is cut off.

2.3 Changes Made to Project Plan

Other than what the subsystems have specified, there are no changes to the project plan.

3. Vehicle Criteria

3.1 Vehicle Design and Justification

Mission Statement and Success Criteria

The mission of the structures team of LTRL for the 2019 NASA Student Launch competition is to build a launch vehicle capable of safely and consistently flying to an altitude of 5,280 feet. This launch vehicle will also be able to hold and successfully deploy a rover payload.

The mission success criteria will be defined by the launch vehicle achieving an altitude within 5% of the target altitude and allowing the rover payload to exit the rocket after landing. This criteria also includes safety standards that require that no team members, launch officials, or spectators be in harm's way at any point during the launch process.

Airframe

In the 2017-2018 competition year, the team built the launch vehicle using carbon fiber wrapped blue tube. For the 2018-2019 competition year, the team has decided to move forward with carbon fiber as the selected material to build the launch vehicle. This decision was made based on a weighted design selection matrix.

The four categories considered were creating carbon fiber tubes using shrink tape, creating carbon fiber tubes using vacuum bagging, purchasing blue tube body tubes, or purchasing glass fiber body tubes. Baking body tubes in an oven or autoclave was not considered due to a lack of necessary tools or sufficient working space.

There are six factors on the material selection matrix that were considered when determining which material would work best for the launch vehicle. A score of 1-5 was assigned to the different factors based on the material's performance in that criteria. A score of one is considered the worst, and a score of five is considered the best. The six factors that were taken into account were strength, cost, workability, material weight, educational value, and safety. Strength was rated on the materials' ability to withstand forces experienced during flight such as thrust forces, impact forces, compressive forces, potential zippering, and buckling. Materials with a higher tensile strength were given a higher score. Cost was determined by the price of the material per linear foot. If a material had a lower cost, it was given a higher score. Workability was scored based on how easy it would be to modify the material to the required dimensions. Material weight is a measure of the material's density. A higher material density received a lower score. Educational value was graded based on how much club members could learn from using the material. Finally, safety was scored based on how hazardous a material is. A safer material received a higher score.

Each of the different criteria were weighted on a scale from zero to one. The factors that the team deemed more important were given a higher weight. The sum of the scores is equal to one. Strength was given a weight of 0.15 to reflect its importance. However, strength did not receive a higher weight because the team has not seen nominal flight conditions lead to catastrophic failure for even the weakest materials. Cost was given a weight of 0.10 to account for the material's important impact on the team's budget. This weight accounts for the possibility that the team needs to rebuild the launch vehicle in the event of a catastrophic launch failure, and needs to

replace material as a result. Workability was given a weight of 0.10 to reflect the ease of handling the material under different circumstances. Material weight was given a weight of 0.15 due to its impact on the altitude achieved and the stability of the launch vehicle. Educational value was given a weight of 0.25 because of the importance the club places on educating all the members of the club. Safety was given a weight of 0.25 to account for the hazardousness of all the materials used. Safety risks can be limited if correct steps are taken, but the use of composite materials provides a greater risk to the user.

The scores for the different materials can be found in [Table 1](#page-11-1) below.

Table 1. Material Selection Matrix

Strength

Tensile strength is considered to be the most important factor when determining the strength of a material. The ratings given to the different materials can be found below in [Table 2.](#page-12-2) The launch vehicle will experience multiple forces during its flight. Some examples of these forces are compressive forces during ascent, tensile forces during separation of sections, various shear forces, and an impact force if the parachute deployment is not optimal. Carbon fiber has a high tensile strength as well as a high stiffness. It is three times stiffer than steel or aluminum for a given weight. Glass fiber has a high tensile strength just like carbon fiber, but the stiffness of the material is far lower. Since the launch vehicle is an application where a small amount of flexibility is wanted, glass fiber received a lower score of four. Carbon fiber was given a score of three or five depending on the method used to make the tubes. Shrink tape received a score of a three due to the uneven spread of epoxy throughout the laminate. The team determined that there would be more voids between the matrix and fiber bond than during the vacuum bagging method. The vacuum bagging process to create carbon fiber tubes received a score of five because the epoxy would be more evenly distributed throughout the laminate and any extra epoxy will be wicked out.

Table 2. Material Strength and Stiffness

Cost

The cost for the composite materials was measured by cost per yard of fabric. The exact cost of carbon fiber could not be determined at this time because it has not been determined how many layers of carbon fiber will be used. More testing is required to determine how many layers of carbon fiber are needed to keep the launch vehicle structurally stable during flight. The prices for all materials can be found below in [Table 3.](#page-12-3)

Table 3. Material Cost Comparison

The cost for carbon fiber was measured using the 3K-Plain Weave variant. The range for the cost per foot comes from the amount of layers the team is deciding to use. Currently, the team is looking at creating body tubes using a range of layers from four-seven. More testing is required to determine what amount of layers will provide a structurally stable rocket that is also as light as possible.

Workability

Glass fiber, carbon fiber created with shrink tape, and carbon fiber created with vacuum bagging were given low scores of three, two and one respectfully. Glass fiber was given a score of three because LTRL would purchase prefabricated tubes for the rocket. This would allow for the tubes to be almost the exact size needed for each section. However, some sanding would still need to be done to correctly fit couplers and bulkheads into the body tubes. Carbon fiber tubes made from using a heat source and shrink tape were given a score of two because the tubes would need to be cut down to get correct dimensions. Also, the tubes would need to be sanded to make flush connections with other sections. Vacuum bagged carbon fiber was given a score of one due to the members' lack of experience using this technique. Tubes using this technique would also

need to be sanded and cut down to correct sizes. Blue tube received a score of five since it can be easily modified to meet the design requirements set by the team.

Weight

There are some discrepancies between the density given from the supplier's website and the OpenRocket database. [Table 4](#page-13-3) details the differences in densities between OpenRocket's database the supplier's information.

Table 4. Density Discrepancy between OpenRocket and Supplier

For carbon fiber, the team believes that this discrepancy is caused by the specific fabric used. The process at which the tubes are cured will also have an effect on the density of carbon fiber. The team will have to take into account the discrepancies when building the launch vehicle and calculations will have to be done to determine the correct density of carbon fiber.

Educational Value

LTRL has decided to include an educational value category this year as one of the project's main objectives is to involve students in engineering projects, and for those students to learn valuable lessons for their future careers. As the aerospace industry continues to trend towards composite materials, the team decided it would be beneficial to experiment using these materials. For this reason, blue tube received a low score of one since the team has previously used this material in past years, and does not find any additional educational value in using it again. Glass fiber was given a score of two because the prefabricated tubes would be bought and cut down to the correct dimensions. This provides some educational benefit as team members can learn the different properties of glass fiber, but they are unable to learn how this material is made. Since carbon fiber is used throughout the aerospace industry, and only a few members in LTRL have experience using carbon fiber, it received a score of five.

Safety

Blue tube received a score of five as it poses no significant safety hazards. Both carbon fiber and glass fiber received low scores of two and one respectfully because of the difficulties that come with modifying the laminate. Carbon fiber and glass fiber shards are dangerous when inhaled, and can easily be embedded in the skin if proper caution is not taken. Vacuum bagged carbon fiber received a higher safety score than shrink tape carbon fiber because heating the laminate involves the extended application of heat. This requires heat gun which can be a safety hazard if the process is not carefully monitored and controlled.

Final Selection

After all the scores were assigned and weighted, vacuum bagged carbon fiber had the highest score and was selected as a result. The team will test the strength of carbon fiber using different numbers of layers of carbon fiber to determine what the correct amount is to withstand all the forces the launch vehicle is expected to encounter during flight.

Nose Cone

Two different nose cone designs are currently being considered for the flight vehicle. The optimal nose cone will be chosen based on its availability, cost, drag and mass. Currently the two nose cones being considered are ogive or Von Kármán designs. The current nose cone for the flight vehicle is an ogive 4:1 based on its availability, low cost, and mass. A Von Kármán design is being considered due to its low drag. Trade studies that have been done in the past put the ogive design ahead of Von Kármán, but new trade studies need to be done to account for changing availability and cost of a nose cone with a diameter of 6 inches.

Couplers

Couplers will be used in between separation points to hold the flight vehicle together. The coupler materials that were considered were blue tube and glass fiber. The current flight vehicle design uses one blue tube coupler and one glass fiber coupler due to the different forces each coupler will experience. The payload-drogue coupler will be a blue tube coupler because the potential for zippering from drogue parachute deployment is very low during a nominal drogue deployment. The main-booster coupler will be a glass fiber coupler because the chance of a structural failure due to zippering is much higher at main parachute deployment. Each coupler will have a length of 12" with a wall thickness of 0.2".

Bulkheads

Bulkheads are to be used on the ends of each coupler to help contain systems such as the avionics bay, and to act as attachment points for the parachutes. Each attachment point uses a coupler bulkhead, and a body tube coupler attached together with an eye-bolt resulting in a combined thickness of ½". The current flight vehicle design uses plywood as the material for the bulkheads because of its low cost, availability and low weight. The plywood bulkheads will be fastened to coupler tubes with JB-Weld steel-infused epoxy resin. Glass fiber was also considered as the potential bulkhead material because of its strength. However, glass fiber bulkheads were eliminated because of their higher cost and smaller thickness which would result in weaker epoxy bonds with the body tube.

Motor Retention

Currently, the flight vehicle's motor will be contained with three centering rings and a motor block. The three centering rings will be epoxied to the motor tube and the body tube at 1", 11", and 21" aft of the flight vehicle. The motor block will be epoxied to the body tube at the end of the motor tube 26" aft of the flight vehicle. JB-Weld steel-infused epoxy resin is the epoxy being used to epoxy the centering rings and motor block in. In the current design, the centering rings and motor block are made of ¼" plywood. Glass fiber was also considered but its cost lack of thickness resulting in weaker epoxy bonds resulted in plywood being chosen as the centering ring material. A plywood centering ring motor retention system has been verified through past

test and competition flights. The centering ring at 1" aft of the flight vehicle will be cut to accommodate for the fin brackets.

Fins

The fins were designed to increase the stability of the launch vehicle by moving the center of pressure towards the aft end of the launch vehicle. G12 Glass Fiber of 3/16" is currently being used as the fin material because its high shear modulus is necessary to resist fin flutter. A dimensioned drawing of the fin is located in [Figure 1.](#page-15-2) While plywood is lighter and costs less, it does not have the strength needed for the forces encountered during flight. The fins will be placed and bolted into fin brackets, which can be easily removed and interchanged.

Figure 1. Fin Dimensions

Separation Points

The rocket will separate during flight to release parachutes for descent. Additionally, the nose cone of the rocket will separate from the flight vehicle after it has landed. The current flight vehicle design has two separation points for the parachute. Drogue parachute separation is in between the payload body tube and the drogue body tube, and the main parachute will be deployed in between the booster body tube and the main body tube. These separation points allow for one avionics bay to deploy both parachutes.

The current rover deployment design requires a separation point between the nose cone and the payload body tube. This separation point was chosen to minimize the likelihood that the rover payload would get caught in a shock cord or parachute. The team found that the most feasible way to avoid this failure mode was to use a ground-separation event. This same separation method was used last year, so the team has experience with the complications and possible failure modes associated with this design. Effort will be taken to improve upon last year's design and further ensure the safety of this method.

3.2 Key Design Features

Fin Brackets

The team has decided to use 3D printed fin brackets to retain the fins during flight. This design feature was introduced two years ago and has been improved upon this year. The goal of the design is to easily remove and replace the fin brackets without replacing the fins. Since fins are often the most common point of structural failure on even nominal landings, this design specifically satisfies Requirement 2.10 since no epoxy or permanent fastening methods are used. The design can be seen in [Figure 2.](#page-16-2)

Figure 2. SolidWorks Model of Proposed Fin Brackets

There are holes to employ a screw only retention system. This will allow for LTRL members to quickly replace a piece if it were to fail before or after launch. The fin brackets will lay on both the interior and the exterior of the body tube to provide extra structural support. The body tube will be cut from the aft edge to allow for the full fin brackets to be inserted and laid flush with the aft end of the body tube. Eight screws will be placed in each fin bracket to keep them attached to the airframe during the entire flight. The fins will also be fastened with nuts and bolts through the top section of the brackets.

Camera Cover

As part of the team derived requirements, a down body camera has been included to supply visual data of flight performance and monitor fin flutter. For the past two years, the rocket has used a large, cylindrical camera with a diameter of 0.75 in and length of 4 in. This system has not only proven to be aerodynamically inefficient, but the faulty camera has also had multiple recording failures. To prevent this from happening again, a camera system will be built from scratch using a Raspberry Pi. Therefore, the structures team must design a new cover to house this system. To securely seat the camera on the exterior of the rocket, a 3D printed cover will be designed to tightly hold the camera to the body while also providing aerodynamic efficiency.

3.3 Motor Selection

The motor selection is based on the mission performance criteria outlined in the NASA USLI 2018-19 Handbook and preliminarily uses OpenRocket to simulate flight characteristics. Through this motor selection process the Cesaroni L851 was selected as the motor that will take the vehicle to the target apogee of 5,280 ft. The flight profile is detailed in [Figure 3.](#page-17-2)

Figure 3. OpenRocket Flight Profile Simulation

The motor selection process was constrained by several factors:

- A 75mm diameter motor, due to the diameter of the rocket.
- Cesaroni or Aerotech brand, due to past experiences with these brands.
- A non-"Skidmark" propellant type, due to competition guidelines.
- A total impulse lower than 1150 lbf*s, due to competition guidelines and member certification restrictions.
- Model is based on a single stage motor and shall not be a hybrid, clustered motor, include forward firing motors, or motor that expels titanium sponges.
- The launch vehicle will accelerate to a minimum velocity of 52 fps at rail exit.
- The launch vehicle will have a minimum static stability margin of 2.0 at the point of rail exit. Rail exit is defined at the point where the forward rail button loses contact with the rail.

With this model, all motors that fell within the enumerated constants were simulated in OpenRocket. The motor that resulted in a predicted apogee closest to the competition's target altitude of 5280 feet was the Cesaroni L851 at 5377 feet; therefore it will be designated as the primary motor. In the event that the OpenRocket model is inaccurate regarding the final mass of the rocket, two contingency motors were also selected. The Cesaroni L1720-WT resulted in an apogee of 5487 feet, and the Cesaroni L800 resulted in an apogee of 5563 feet. The club has never experienced the rocket's total mass being less than the initial estimated mass, so the team doesn't feel the need to include a motor that achieves an apogee lower than the target altitude. The thrust curves for the various motors are listed in [Figure 4,](#page-18-0) [Figure 5,](#page-19-0) and [Figure 6.](#page-19-1) A more detailed comparison between the motors is listed in [Table 5.](#page-20-1)

Figure 6. L851 Thrust Curve

Table 5. Motor Characteristics

	Cesaroni L1720	Cesaroni L851	Cesaroni L800
Predicted Apogee	5487 ft	5377 ft	5563 ft
Velocity off the Rail	87.6 ft/s	58.7 ft/s	65.6 ft/s
Thrust to Weight Ratio	13.1	11.7	7.6
Total Impulse	831 lbf*s	827 lbf*s	839 lbf*s
Average Thrust	394 lbf	192 lbf	181 lbf
Maximum Thrust	438 lbf	220 lbf	230 lbf
Burn Time	2.11 s	4.32 s	4.63 s
Liftoff Mass	118 oz	134 oz	124 oz
Burnout Mass	55.9 oz	56.2 oz	60.7 oz
Length	19.1 in	19.1 in	19.1 in
Propellant Grains	3	3	3

Mission Performance Predictions

An OpenRocket model was created to simulate flight and vehicle characteristics. This model was used to calculate the static stability margin, the center of pressure (CP), and the center of gravity (CG). The CP is located 94.34" aft of the tip of the nose cone, and the CG is located 76.57" aft of the tip of the nose cone. The preliminary flight vehicle has a static stability margin of 2.96 calibers. The target apogee of exactly 5,280 feet will be achieved by altering the rocket's mass very slightly via incorporated ballast. Additionally, the team will continue to improve the model of drag calculation and thrust curve for more accurate apogee calculation. Improvements to modeling the rocket's flight will be made via static motor testing at Penn State's High Pressure Combustion Lab and experimental data from wind tunnel testing using a closed-circuit wind tunnel.

Verification of OpenRocket

To verify the OpenRocket simulation results, the center of pressure, center of gravity, and flight apogee were calculated using LTRL's own MATLAB script.

To calculate the center of pressure, the following calculations were conducted. First, the center of pressure of the nosecone, X_n , was calculated using Equation 1.

$$
X_n = 0.466 * L_n \tag{1}
$$

 X_n is the location of the center of pressure for the fins as measured from the tip, and L_n is the length of the nose cone. The center of pressure of the fins was then calculated using Equation 2.

$$
X_f = X_b + \frac{X_r * (C_r + 2 * C_t)}{3 * (C_r + C_t)} + \frac{1}{6} * (C_r + C_t - \frac{C_r * C_t}{C_r + C_t})
$$
(2)

 X_f is the location of the center of pressure of the fins as measured from the tip, X_b is the length from the tip to the fin root chord, X_r is the length from the fin root leading edge to the fin tip leading edge, C_r is the fin root chord length, and C_t is the fin tip chord length. The coefficient for the center of pressure of the fins, C_{nf} , was calculated using Equation 3.

$$
C_{nf} = 1 + \frac{R}{S+R} * \frac{4N\left(\frac{S}{D}\right)^2}{1 + \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{2 * Lf}{C_r + C_t}\right)^2}}
$$
(3)

Where R is the radius of the rocket body, S is the semi span of the fins, N is the number of fins, and L_f is the length of fin mid-chord line. The center of pressure as measured from the tip, X, was calculated using Equation 4.

$$
X = \frac{C_{nn} * X_n + C_{nf} * X_f}{C_{nn} + C_{nf}} \tag{4}
$$

Where C_{nn} is the coefficient for the center of pressure for the nose cone. The center of pressure was calculated to be 90.001 inches aft of the tip.

To calculate the center of gravity, cg, Equation 5 was used.

$$
cg = \frac{d_n * m_n + d_p * m_{payload} + d_m * m_m + d_d * m_d + d_b * m_b}{M}
$$
(5)

Where d_n is the distance from the center of mass of the nose cone to the tip, m_n is the mass of the nose cone, d_p is the distance of the center of mass of the payload section to the tip, $m_{payload}$ is the mass of the payload section, d_m is the distance of the center of mass of the main parachute section to the tip, m_m is the mass of the main parachute section, d_d is the distance of the center of mass of the drogue section to the tip, m_d is the mass of the drogue section, d_b is the distance of the center of mass of the booster section to the tip, m_h is the mass of the booster section, and M is the total mass of the rocket.

The center of gravity was calculated to be 68.491 in. aft of the tip.

To calculate the flight apogee, the altitude at which the motor burnout occurs must first be calculated. To calculate the burnout altitude, first the average mass, m_a , must be calculated. The average mass was calculated using Equation 6.

$$
m_a = m_r + m_e - \frac{m_{prop}}{2} \tag{6}
$$

Where m_r is the mass of the rocket without a motor, m_e is the mass of the motor, m_{prop} is the mass of the propellant. The aerodynamic drag coefficient, k, was calculated using Equation 7.

$$
k = \frac{1}{2} * \rho * C_d * A \tag{7}
$$

Where ρ is the density of air, C_d is the drag coefficient, and A is the cross-sectional area of the rocket. The burnout velocity, q_1 , was calculated using Equation 8.

$$
q_1 = \sqrt{\frac{T - (m_a * g)}{k}} \tag{8}
$$

Where T is the average thrust of the motor, ma is the average mass of the rocket, and g is the gravitational constant. The burnout velocity decay coefficient, x_1 , was calculated using Equation 9.

$$
x_1 = \frac{2 * k * q_1}{m_a} \tag{9}
$$

The burnout velocity, v_1 , was calculated with Equation 10.

$$
v_1 = q_1 * \frac{1 - e^{-x_1 * t}}{1 + e^{-x_1 * t}} \tag{10}
$$

Where t is time at motor burnout. Finally, the altitude at which the motor burnout occurs, y_1 was calculated using Equation 11.

$$
y_1 = -\frac{m_a}{2*k} * \ln\left(\frac{T - (m_a * g) - (k * \nu_1^2)}{T - m_a * g}\right)
$$
(11)

With the burnout altitude known the total altitude coasted can be calculated. To calculate the cost distance, the coast mass, m_c , must first be calculated. The coast mass was calculated using Equation 12.

$$
m_c = m_r + m_e - m_{prop} \tag{12}
$$

Where m_r is the mass of the rocket, m_e is the mass of the motor, and m_{prop} is the mass of the propellant. Next, the coast velocity coefficient, q_c , was calculated using Equation 13.

$$
q_c = \sqrt{\frac{T - m_c * g}{k}} \tag{13}
$$

Where T is the average thrust of the motor, g is the gravitational constant, and k is the aerodynamic drag coefficient. The coast velocity decay coefficient, x_c , was calculated using Equation 14.

$$
x_c = \left(\frac{2*k*q_c}{m_c}\right) \tag{14}
$$

The coast velocity, v_c , was calculated using Equation 15.

$$
v_c = q_c * \frac{1 - e^{-x_c * t}}{1 + e^{-x_c * t}} \tag{15}
$$

The coast distance, y_c , was calculated using Equation 16.

$$
y_c = \frac{m_c}{2 * k} * \ln\left(\frac{m_c * g + k * v_c^2}{T - m_c * g}\right)
$$
 (16)

Lastly, the flight apogee altitude, PA, was calculated using Equation 17.

$$
PA = y_1 + y_c \tag{17}
$$

The flight apogee altitude was calculated to be 5540 ft. The code used to calculate these values can be seen in Appendix C: Verification of OpenRocket Flight Calculations.

With the results of both simulation techniques, the team compared the two sets of results. A comparison of the OpenRocket results and the MATLAB results is in [Table 6](#page-24-1) and the margin of error between the methods is in [Table 7.](#page-24-2) All margins of error were below 5%.

Table 6. OpenRocket and MATLAB Discrepancies

Table 7. Margin of Error

The larger discrepancy in the predicted apogee altitudes is likely due to the MATLAB simulation's simplistic calculation of altitude. The simulation does not account for any angle in the launch rail, winds horizontal to the flight path, turbulence in the air, or a changing coefficient of drag due to airspeed. However, in the team's experience, OpenRocket has proven to be very accurate in predicting apogee, and values the OpenRocket predictions more as a result. Regardless, the team will continue to improve the MATLAB simulation to account for the various factors listed previously.

3.4 Recovery Subsystem

The recovery system components include the avionics board, avionics bay structure, all-threads, parachutes and harnesses, GPS, charge wells, ejection charges and the shear pins at the separation points of the rocket. The avionics bay will contain electromagnetic shielding to act as a faraday cage to prevent interference with the altimeters. The avionics board will contain two independent sets of altimeters, charges, mechanical switches, initiators, and 9V batteries for power sources. By designing an avionics bay containing a secondary recovery system, the team ensures redundancy in the avionics bay that guarantees parachute deployment at the selected altitudes even with a failure of one system. The secondary redundant altimeter will be on a twosecond delay to assure that both ejection charges do not detonate at the same time. This prevents a potential overpressure event which would risk damaging the body of the rocket. The recovery subsystem used decision matrices in order to determine the optimal avionics bay design.

Avionics Bay Design

The avionics bay consists of the avionics board and avionics board retainment. The avionics board is the component that the altimeters, batteries, and wiring are attached to. The avionics board retainment system is the all-thread rods, nuts and bolts that provide the structural support between the avionics board and the surrounding avionics bay bulkheads. The triangular avionics bay design was used by the team two years ago and is pictured in [Figure 7.](#page-25-1)

Figure 7. 2016-2017 Avionics Bay

The avionics bay with door design is similar to the one used in the 2017- 2018 competition. This design is pictured in [Figure 8.](#page-25-2)

Figure 8. 2017-2018 Avionics Bay

The standard avionics bay design is similar to the one used by club members for their NAR certification flights. This design is pictured in [Figure 9.](#page-26-0)

Figure 9. NAR Certification Flight Avionics Bay

The team has experience with building each of the three candidate designs, and can guarantee that any of the three preliminary designs could complete this year's objectives.

The avionics selected the five selection criteria of accessibility, mass, ease of assembly, precision, and cost to adequately score and rank the three preliminary designs for the avionics bay.

The attribute for accessibility represents the difficulty for the team to access the altimeters and internals of the avionics bay after the rocket is fully constructed. It was given a weight of 0.4 since this is the most important requirement for the design. A score of one means that the entire avionics bay has to be removed from the rocket to access the avionics board wiring. A score of five is given if the entire wiring of the avionics bay can be accessed from the outside of the rocket without having to disassemble any of body sections.

The mass of the avionics bay was given a weight of 0.1 because it is a very important component that is acceptable to be massive. The other factor is that the motor can be picked out after the final design and can be determined with the knowledge of how massive the avionics bay is. A score of five means the mass is less than two ounces, and a score of one means that the avionics bay weighs more than ten ounces.

The ease of assembly attribute represents how easy it is for the avionics bay to be built into the rocket during the designing and construction prior to the competition. This was given a weight of 0.1 because the team has sufficient time during the months leading up to the competition to assemble the rocket. A score of five is given if the avionics bay requires no equipment other than hand tools, and if a team member can build the avionics bay without knowledge of the rest of the rocket. A score of one is given if the avionics bay requires multiple extra power tools as well as specialized knowledge.

The precision attribute for the avionics bay represents tolerance that the avionics bay can be built and flown in. This was given a weight of 0.3 because it is vital that the avionics board containing the electronics is kept stable during flight, and can be assembled in the exact same location after multiple flights. A score of five will be given if the design can be easily manufactured to required tolerances, and can be launched multiple times without having to adjust or tighten any of the non-replaceable components. A score of one is given to the design that will be difficult to manufacture to the required tolerances, and has to be completely disassembled and then reassembled in between launches.

The cost attribute is the amount of time and money that would be required to build the selected design. Cost was given a weight of 0.1 due to all the options having a relatively similar and low cost. Time is considered to be a cost since the printer cannot be used to create other parts while the avionics bay is being printed. However, as long as the total print time is fewer than 15 hours which is considered "overnight", then the time to print the design is not considered as a cost. Raw material cost is the domination factor for the amount of money to print the designs. All of the designs were priced as being printed from a \$20, 1 kg spool of PLA.

The three preliminary design options were scored in [Table 8](#page-27-0) below.

Selection Criteria	Weight	Triangular AV Bay		AV Bay with Door		Standard AV Bay	
		Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Accessibility	0.4	$\overline{2}$	0.8	5	$\overline{2}$	3	1.2
Mass	0.1	3	0.3	1	0.1	$\overline{4}$	0.4
Ease of Assembly	0.1	3	0.3	$\overline{2}$	0.2	$\overline{4}$	0.4
Precision	0.3	3	0.9	$\overline{4}$	1.2	3	0.9
Cost	0.1	3	0.3	1	0.1	5	0.5
Total	$\mathbf{1}$		2.6		3.6		3.4

Table 8. Avionics Bay Design Selection Matrix

The triangular avionics bay design from [Table 8](#page-27-0) was given a score of two for accessibility because the only way to access the components on launch day is to take out the avionics section of the rocket and reach into the body tube after unscrewing the bolts on the all-thread rods. This proves to be an inefficient use of time, and may prevent the team from relaunching the rocket within the two hour window. The mass of this design was given a score of three because it is estimated to weigh 9.35 ounces. Its ease of assembly was scored at a three due to it being difficult to access the components and the inability to reach both the batteries and the altimeters at the same time when reaching down the body tube. The second difficulty is that the wiring has to be wrapped from top to bottom and can become tangled easily, but this can be mitigated with wiring labeling and attaching the wires to points on the avionics board. The triangular avionics bay was given a three for precision it requires three all-thread rods which can be difficult to line up, which creates issues when positioning the avionics board on the all threads. Finally the cost for this design was given a three because it is estimated to cost \$5.12 in materials and can be printed overnight.

The avionics bay with doors was scored a five for accessibility because the design allows the team to access the altimeters and batteries easily by opening the door on the outside of the rocket while it is completely assembled. The mass of this concept is expected to be 20.67 ounces and so was given a one. The ease of assembly scored a two as well because of the difficulty in incorporating the slider and creating a hole in the body tube and coupler of the rocket. This requires structural changes to the body tube as well as the combination of several 3D printed parts for the avionics bay. The precision of the avionics bay with a door scored a four since the slider fits tightly on the rail in the avionics bay and can be easily removed and reinserted at any time. The cost for building this design was given a one because it is estimated to be \$11.36 and can be printed overnight. This is the most complicated preliminary avionics bay design and will require more time to design in SolidWorks.

The standard avionics bay scored a three for accessibility because of the need to disassemble part of the rocket to be able to reach down the body tube and access the avionics components. The standard design earned a score of four on mass because it is estimated to weigh 2.82 ounces. This design earned a four for its ease of assembly because it only requires two all-thread rods and is easily incorporated into the rocket. The wiring is all on one side of the board so wire management is simple. The standard avionics bay was given a score of three for precision since the avionics board can slide up and down on the all-threads. The cost attribute received a score of five since it is estimated to cost \$1.60 and can be printed within a few hours.

The avionics bay with a door design received the highest weighted score was chosen for this year's rocket as a result. This design allows for the rocket to be completely assembled before the altimeters are wired to the initiators which allows for more streamlined assembly process. This design is not yet complete, and several components and their locations have not been finalized yet. Two all-thread rods will be installed running through the entire avionics bay, to support in flight loading on the fragile avionics equipment. The location for these all-threads will be in the optimal place to mitigate the stresses. The initiator wire holes going through the bulkheads on either end of the avionics bay have not been designed yet as proper stress calculations must be modeled on the bulkhead. The team does not have knowledge on where the optimal initiator hole location would be, and a FEA SolidWorks simulation needs to be run to determine the best location. The team is planning to evaluate a design that removes excess plastic on the external wall of the avionics bay from solid to colonnaded. This design needs to be tested first, but if chosen, this design will reduce the mass of the avionics bay while retaining sufficient structural integrity.

Avionics Bay Wiring Layout

The interior of the avionics bay is a completely independent system, pictured in [Figure 10,](#page-29-2) with two altimeters that are wired independently of each other. Each Stratologger CF altimeter is wired to a 9 volt battery. The batteries are located on the reverse side of the avionics bay slider. The altimeter is also separately connected to two initiators which will ignite the ejection charge for both the main and drogue parachutes. The ejection charges are located in the charge wells on the outside of the two bulkheads on either end of the avionics bay. The switch connected to each altimeter is called a quick snap connector, these are solid locking connectors and is a physical switch that cannot be engaged before launch, or mechanically agitated to the off position in flight.

Figure 10. Avionics Bay Wiring Layout

Altimeters

LTRL must use an altimeter which is able to measure and report peak altitude as well as maximum velocity during flight. The altimeter must be able record at least ten samples per second and must store information on altitude, temperature, and battery voltage. This data must be able to be transferred to a computer after measurements are made for calculation. It is important for the altimeter to store data even without power in case of an unforeseen loss of power after landing and during flight in case of a brownout. The altimeter needs to be able to deploy drogue and main parachutes by sending a signal to two initiators at independent events.

The altimeter must also allow for programming of various altitudes for main parachute deployment.

The team used a weighted selection matrix to select an altimeter for the 2018-2019 competition year by comparing five important attributes: cost, size, reliability, accuracy, and programmability.

The cost attribute is the asking price of the altimeter in USD from the manufacturer's website. This attribute is assigned a weight of 0.1 because the team will be able to use the chosen altimeter for subscale launches and certification flights in the future. An altimeter will receive a five in the cost category if the team already owns the altimeter, resulting in zero dollars out of pocket. A score of one will be given, if the altimeter costs more than \$125.

Size is given a score of 0.1 since the team would prefer the chosen altimeter to be as small as possible to allow the AV bay to be smaller which would reduce print time and filament costs. A five in the size category will be given to an altimeter that has a footprint of .90 inches cubed or smaller. A score of one will be given to an altimeter that has a footprint of 2 inches cubed or larger.

Reliability is one of the most important attributes for an altimeter as it needs to be able to survive the stresses of flight and the pressure differentials that accompany it. The reliability attribute was given a weight of 0.3. An altimeter will be given a five in reliability if the altimeter is guaranteed by the manufacture to operate through all the conditions that the flight vehicle will face. A score of one will be given to an altimeter that is not operating within warranty period or not guaranteed to survive in flight forces.

Accuracy is imperative for all altimeters to properly deploy the parachutes and to record apogee and was given a weight of 0.2 as a result. The altimeter will receive a score of five if it is accurate past 50,000 feet and accurate to within 0.1%. An altimeter will receive a score of one if it is not accurate past 10,000 feet or accurate to within 1%.

The final attribute that the team is considering when choosing altimeters is ease of programmability. This factor was given a weight of 0.3, as it is one of the most important factors. This high weight was given in order to ensure that both experienced and inexperienced team members can effectively read, understand, interpret data, and program the accompanying software. A score of five was given for programmability if the team would describe the altimeter as user-friendly and easy to operate. A score of one would be given to an altimeter with software and data that the team members cannot easily work with.

The weighted scores for each preliminary design option are shown below in [Table 9.](#page-31-0)

Selection Criteria	Weight		StratoLoggerCF	StratoLogger SL100		Jolly Logic AltimeterThree	
		Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Cost	0.1	5	0.5	5	0.5	$\overline{2}$	0.5
Size	0.1	5	0.5	3	0.3	5	0.5
Reliability	0.3	$\overline{4}$	1.2	$\overline{4}$	1.2	$\overline{4}$	1.2
Accuracy	0.2	5	$\mathbf{1}$	5	$\mathbf{1}$	3	0.6
Programmability	0.3	$\overline{4}$	1.5	$\overline{4}$	1.5	5	1.2
Total	$\mathbf{1}$		4.40		4.20		4.30

Table 9. Altimeter Selection Matrix

The StratoLoggerCF and the StratoLogger SL100 both scored a five in the cost category as the club currently has both of these altimeters while the Jolly Logic AltimeterThree scored a 2 in the cost category as it is priced at around \$110 on the manufacturer's website.

For the StratoLoggerCF, the footprint is only 2.0"x0.84"x0.5" in length, width, and height respectfully, while the StratoLogger SL100 has a footprint of 2.75"x0.9"x0.5" in length, width, and height. The total area of the StratoLoggerCF is 0.84 inches cubed. When compared to the StratoLogger SL100's area of 1.2375 inches cubed, the CF model has a 32% smaller footprint. When comparing these two altimeters to the Jolly Logic AltimeterThree, it has a smaller size of 1.93"x.71"x.57", giving it a footprint of only .74 inches cubed. Compared to the StratoLoggerCF, the Jolly Logic AltimeterThree has a footprint that is nearly 12% smaller. These footprints resulted in the CF and AltimeterThree models achieving a five in the size category due to their very small size while the SL100 achieved a three due to its larger size.

All models of altimeter are roughly of the same reliability, with differences in brownout protection and amount of flight data stored during power loss. The StratoLoggerCF model only has a two second brownout protection period compared to the Stratologger SL100's three seconds of protection. However, the StratoLoggerCF is able to store more flight data if the power were to be lost during flight. Comparing both to the AltimeterThree, the Jolly Logic version has an integrated rechargeable battery, resulting in much more reliability if the rocket were to lose power in flight. However, the Jolly Logic altimeter can store only one flight. The StratoLoggerCF model is the leading competitor in terms of memory storage as it has the advantage of being able to store multiple flights which prevents the possibility of accidental overwriting of previous flights whose data was not transferred. Since all of these altimeters are guaranteed for three years, the club ranked all three of these altimeters as a four due to small issues that differ between models.

The accuracy of both the StratoLoggerCF and Stratologger SL100 are rated for within 0.1% pressure fluctuations and up to 100,000 feet. However, the AltimeterThree is only rated for up to 29,500 feet reliability and there is no data known for pressure sensitivity. As a result, the AltimeterThree scored a three for accuracy and both Stratologger models scored a five.

Both StratoLogger altimeters use the same software which the team has experience using in the past and were given a score of four for programmability as a result. The AltimeterThree variant allows the data to be sent to a smartphone or other smart device, such as a tablet or a laptop. This prevents issues stemming from software which allows for anybody to use this altimeter and transfer and graph data effectively. As a result, the AltimeterThree was given a score of five for programmability.

The StratoLoggerCF altimeter received the highest weighted score, and was chosen to be the altimeter of choice for the 2018-2019 competition year. This altimeter shows a few advantages over the StratoLogger SL100 model such as smaller size, smaller footprint, and ease of accessibility. This allows the team to be much more conservative in the use of materials. The Jolly Flight altimeter might be smaller and easier to use, but it is more expensive and less accurate.

Electronic Shielding

The electronic shielding, also known as a faraday cage, is employed to shield the electrical components inside of the avionics bay from electronic interference to prevent the accidental ignition of one of the separation charges. In past years, LTRL has constructed a wire mesh cage around the avionics bay. However, this made it difficult to reach in and access the inside of the avionics bay before launch. This mesh caused cuts to members' hands and was difficult to install. This year, LTRL is using a new design for electronic shielding that combats many of the issues that the wire mesh had created. The avionics bay will be wrapped in aluminum foil in between the outer and inner diameter of the avionics bay's colonnaded wall to act as the faraday cage. By using aluminum foil, the avionics systems will avoid inadvertent electronic excitation. The aluminum foil wrap is a lightweight option that is easier to install and doesn't restrict access to the avionics bay.

Separation Charges

The team must select an ejection charge which is compact and able to fit inside the rocket's main and drogue chambers. The ejection charge also needs to be reliably ignited when in contact with the initiator that receives a signal from the altimeter. The ejection charge must produce a reliable force that can be calculated in order to ensure that the charge detonation will break the shear pins and allow the rocket to separate. The three potential options for ejection charge material are black powder, CO₂, and Pyrodex. These potential ejection methods were scored in a weighted design matrix based on the following selection criteria: volume, cost, ease of use, tolerance, and safety.

The volume selection criteria is a measure of how much space inside the rocket the ejection system will require. The team is limited in space and would prefer to use at little space as possible so this attribute was given a weight of 0.3. A score of five in this category will be given to a charge that requires 5 cubic centimeters of space or less. A score of one will be given if the charge requires more than 20 cubic centimeters of space.

The cost of all explosives charges is relatively small and can be purchased in bulk so this attribute was given a weight of 0.1. A score of five will be given to a charge with a per-launch cost of 10 ϕ or less. A score of one will be given to a charge that costs more than 50 ϕ per launch.

Ease of use is a measure of how easy it is to get the explosive charge installed in the rocket on launch day. This attribute was given a weight of 0.2. A score of five for this attribute will be given to a charge that can installed by one person within two minutes. A score of one will be given if it takes one person more than ten minutes to set it up in the rocket.

Ease of modelling is how well the team can model the behavior of the explosion. This was given a weight of 0.1 since the team can use a factor of safety to ensure proper separation if modelling is variable. A charge will be given a score of one if the team cannot model the event without using multiple correction factors. A score of five will be given to the charge if it can be modelled without using any fudge correction.

The last attribute used to judge potential ejection systems is safety. This attribute is the most important to the team and was given 0.3 weight. This is a measure of how many precautions the team must take when handling the explosives charge. A score a five in this attribute is given to a charge that only requires one extra safety measure. A score of one will be given to a charge that requires many safety measures as well as specialized training for members of the team in handling the material due to its hazardousness nature, and potential danger to team members.

The weighted scores for each preliminary design option are shown below in [Table](#page-33-0) *10*.

Selection Criteria	Weight	Black Powder		CO ₂		Pyrodex	
		Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Volume	0.3	5	1.5	$\mathbf{1}$	0.3	$\overline{4}$	1.2
Cost	0.1	5	0.5	$\mathbf{1}$	0.4	5	0.5
Ease of Use	0.2	5	$\mathbf{1}$	3	0.6	3	0.6
Ease of Modelling	0.1	$\overline{4}$	0.1	$\overline{2}$	0.2	$\overline{4}$	0.4
Safety	0.3	$\mathbf{1}$	0.3	5	1.5	$\overline{2}$	0.6
Total			3.40		3.00		3.30

Table 10. Separation Charges Design Selection Matrix

Black powder and Pyrodex are similar in density and in many applications can be substituted in a 1:1 ratio. Pyrodex, which is closely compared to 3F black powder, has grains that range in size from .021"-.034" (.05334-.08636 centimeters) in diameter while the grains of 4F powder are only .009"-.020" (.02286-.0508 centimeters) in diameter. Black powder received a five in volume while Pyrodex only received a four due to the extra packing material that would be required to keep it tightly compressed during launch. The $CO₂$ charge requires 14 cubic centimeters of space for one 12 gram charge which is the smallest size that can be purchased. With the additional hardware required to hold the $CO₂$ container, this ejection system will take up more than 20 cubic centimeters and received a one as a result.

For cost, both black powder and Pyrodex scored a five, as each material only costs less than 10 cents per charge per flight. The $CO₂$ cartridge scored a one in this category as well since they have to be purchased in sets, and cost around 70 cents per charge per flight.

For the ease of use attribute, black powder received a five due to it easily being measured and poured into the charge wells. Pyrodex received a three because it requires tight packing of the powder to correctly ignite. The $CO₂$ option was given a three because the $CO₂$ container has to be screwed in place and then armed.

For ease of modelling, black powder and Pyrodex were both given scores of 4 because their explosion characteristics can be easily modeled using known laws of physics and a simple idealization of the body tube. There are also many online calculators for amateur rocketry black powder charge sizes to verify the team's calculations. Additionally, Range Safety Officers have greater experience with black powder charges, and can also additionally verify that the team is using the correct size charges. The $CO₂$ cartridges were given a two since it is harder to model the pressure distribution from ejection due to the uneven and slow pressure release of the $CO₂$ cartridge when they are popped.

The MSDS sheets for both black powder and Pyrodex are listed in Appendix C**.** Based on this, the team will give black powder a safety score of one and Pyrodex a two. CO2 cartridges only discharge if punctured which the team will guarantee will not happen. Additionally, the $CO₂$ tanks contains no handling hazards and received a five as a result.

Black powder received the highest weighted scored, and was chosen to be the separation charge of choice for the 2018-2019 competition rocket. This material showed exceptional performance in volume required, cost, ease of use, and tolerance, despite being an unsafe material. The team will employ fail safe methods to ensure safe handling of the black powder at all times.

Separation Charge Wells

The black powder used to separate the rocket for drogue and main parachute deployment will be contained within a charge well. The purpose of these wells is to contain the explosive charge during launch, and to direct the flow of hot gases away from the avionics bay and towards the separation point. These will be approximately 1" long and 1" in diameter. These charge wells will be epoxied to the bulkheads on either side of the avionics bay. The three preliminary ejection well designs considered were PVC pipe, steel pipe, and 3D printed ejection wells. These designs were evaluated in a weighted selection matrix based on the following selection criteria: ease of manufacturing, cost, strength, and weight.

Ease of manufacturing represents the amount of knowledge, and equipment required to create each black powder well. A score of one means that manufacturing the charge well requires specialized knowledge or equipment. A score of five means that team members with no knowledge of the rocket or access to equipment past hand tools could build this component. This attribute was given a weight of 0.4 since the charge wells are simple components that should not require excessive time to manufacture.

Cost represents the amount money and time that will need to be allocated to produce these parts. A score of one means that the component is more than \$10 and will take more than one hour to produce. A score of 5 is given to a component that costs less than \$1 and takes less than ten minutes to make. This attribute was assigned a weight of 0.2 due to the necessity of the charge wells to be built quickly and cheaply.

Strength represents the amount of stress the charge wells can undergo without failing. A score of one means that the material has a Young's modulus of less than 1 GPa. A score of five is given if the material has a GPa of greater than 100 GPa. This attribute was assigned a weight of 0.2 since the team does not want to over design these simple components, but still needs them to hold up under pressure.

Weight represents the amount of mass added to the rocket by the charge wells. A score of one is given to a material that will weigh more than 1 pound per foot. A score of five is given to materials with a weight less than 0.1 pound per foot. This attribute was assigned a weight of 0.2 to keep the mass low in the avionics bay.

The weighted scores for each preliminary design option are shown below in [Table 11.](#page-35-0)

Selection Criteria	Attribute Weight	PVC Pipe		Steel Pipe		3D printed	
		Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Ease of Manufacturing	0.4	5	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{4}$	1.6	$\overline{2}$	0.8
Cost	0.2	$\overline{4}$	0.8	3	0.6	$\overline{4}$	0.8
Strength	0.2	$\overline{2}$	0.4	5	$\mathbf{1}$	1	0.2
Weight	0.2	$\overline{4}$	0.8	$\mathbf{1}$	0.2	$\overline{4}$	$\boldsymbol{.8}$
Total			4.0		3.4		2.6

Table 11. Separation Charge Wells Design Selection Matrix
The PVC pipe option scored a perfect five in ease of manufacture because the material is easy to cut to proper lengths, and requires only a hand saw and less than ten minutes build. PVC pipe scored a four in cost since it can only be purchased in three foot sections for a few dollars. The material was given a two in strength, because it only has an average Young's modulus of 58 MPa. With a relatively low weight, at 1.08 grams per milliliter, PVC pipe earned a score of four in weight.

The metal pipe option was given a 4 for ease of manufacturing because it only requires a hand saw to cut, but leaves metal shavings that have to be safely disposed of. This option scored a three for cost since it is \$2 per foot and can be purchased from multiple online vendors. This option received a perfect five in strength because it has a Young's modulus of 200 GPa. Due to its relatively high weight at 8 grams per milliliter, the metal pipe charge well was given a score of one.

The 3D printed option earned a score of two for ease of manufacturing because members must be familiar with modeling software and it takes over an hour to print. This option was given a four for the cost criteria because PLA filament and operating a 3D printer is expensive. This material scored a one in strength due to the inherent flaws in 3D printing, and because PLA filament has a Young's modulus of approximately 40 MPa. The weight of a plastic 3D printed part is comparable to PVC plastic, at 1.3 grams per milliliter, and received a score of four.

PVC pipe received the highest weighted score and the charge wells will be made from PVC pipe as a result. It is low cost, light weight, and all team members have the knowledge on how to create ejection wells from PVC pipe without additional training. LTRL has used this design in the past, and is confident that PVC pipe will hold up to the stresses experienced during black powder ejection and will perform exceptionally.

Recovery Harness

The recovery harnesses is estimated to be 26 feet in length for main and 11 feet in length for drogue. These lengths will ensure that body tubes will not collide with each other after parachute deployment. The elasticity of the harness also ensures that there is low inertial loading on the rocket frame during separation. The recovery harness had been selected to be a ½" Kevlar cord. The cord is secured to the rocket by using $\frac{1}{2}$ " quick links, connecting the cord to 3/8" steel Ubolts on the bulkheads. This design has been used for many previous LTRL rockets, and can withstand all the forces acting on the cord during parachute ejection and descent. The main and drogue parachutes will be covered and protected by Nomex blankets to ensure that the black powder charges do not burn them during deployment. The Nomex blankets will be attached to the recovery harness with ½" quick links. A fireball will be connected to the recovery harness to prevent zippering of the body tubes. [Figure 11](#page-37-0) shows a diagram of the planned descent including positioning of the sections during freefall and the location of the two events not to scale.

Black Powder Calculation

After selecting an ejection charge and a containment method for the ejection charge, the team was able to calculate the required black powder charge. [Table 12](#page-37-1) lists the masses of black powder the team will use for drogue and main parachute ejections. These amounts were chosen based on previous year's knowledge of what amount of black powder is able to reliably and safely separate the rocket.

Table 12. Black Powder Calculation

Using the dimensions of the drogue parachute bay and main parachute bay the team is able to calculate the number of shear pins that a given mass of black powder will break. The calculation for the volume of the chamber that is pressurized by the explosion is shown in the equation b.

$$
V = \frac{\pi D^2 L}{4} \tag{18}
$$

The volume is then substituted into Equation 18 for V where N is the mass of black powder in grams from [Table 12](#page-37-1)**.** P is the pressure in psi that will result from the black powder detonation in the chamber. Equation 18 assumes that the pressure inside will have equalized with the atmosphere prior to detonation and also contains the conversions from pounds to grams and the gas constant.

$$
P = \frac{(N * \left(\frac{1\,bf}{454\,grams}\right) * 266 \,^{in \,lbf} /_{lbm} * 3370^{\circ}R)}{V} \tag{19}
$$

The team is using two 56 brand shear pins for all separation points on the flight vehicle. These shear pins fail at an average shear force of 25 lbs which has been confirmed in past flights, ground tests, and is listed on the shear pins manufacturer's site. Equation 20 solves for the force required to break the shear pins in lbs. P is the chamber pressure calculated from Equation 19 and A is the cross sectional area of the chamber.

$$
F = PA \tag{20}
$$

Once the total force is known, it is divided by 25 and then rounded down for the maximum number of shear pins that amount of black powder will break. The number of 2-56 shear pins the team calculated is listed in the second row of [Table 13.](#page-39-0) A factor of safety was then applied to each of the results to account for any unknown factors. The last row in [Table 13](#page-39-0) has listed the number of shear pins the team plans on using on the flight vehicle for each chamber. The redundant charges must have the same number of shear pins as the other charge in its respective chamber.

Table 13. Shear Pin Calculations

GPS Unit

The team needs to have a GPS unit contained within the rocket to ensure it will be located after launch. The GPS needs to be able to be tracked remotely from a phone or laptop to within an accuracy of 25 ft. The GPS needs to able to maintain power for at least one day in case the team is not able to locate the rocket right away. It will be mounted securely inside the nose cone of the rocket so the GPS needs to be small enough to fit within that space. This location for the GPS mounting was chosen because it is far away from the payload section, avionics bay, and the motor. The team used a weighted selection matrix to select a GPS for the 2018-2019 competition year by comparing five important attributes: cost, ease of use, size, reliability, and range.

Cost is the price in US dollars of the GPS unit being implemented. Cost was given a weighting of 0.2 because a GPS unit is a large upfront cost, however it is a reusable piece of equipment that will be used in future years. A GPS will be given a score of five if the team already owns the GPS. A GPS will be given a score of one if it costs more than \$400.00.

Ease of use is a measure of how easy it is for the team to integrate the GPS into the rocket, and is also a measure of how easy it is for a team member to operate and track the GPS. Ease of use was given a weight of 0.4 because it is vital that the team is able to track the rocket and only has a short window on launch day to correctly set up the GPS. A GPS unit will be given a score of five if it can be set up by one, unskilled team member in less than five minutes. A GPS unit will be given a score of one if it requires one skilled person with training in the operation of the GPS to mount and correctly turn on the GPS system.

Size is based on the volume the GPS takes up in the rocket. This attribute was given a weight of 0.1 since there is extra space inside the rocket for a small device the size of a few cubic inches. A GPS will be given a score of one if it has a volume greater than 10 cubic inches, and a score of five if it has a volume smaller than 1 cubic inch.

Reliability is based on the battery life the manufacturer claims the GPS has as well as the warranty that comes with the GPS. A GPS will be given a score of one if it has a battery life of less than one day or if it does not come with any warranty. A GPS will be given a score of five if it has a battery life of one day and provides a year or longer warranty. This attribute was given a score of 0.2 because the team plans on using this GPS in future years.

Range is the distance that the GPS will be able to be tracked from the launch site. A GPS will be given a score of one if the GPS has a range of under one mile and will be given a score of five if the range is anywhere on earth.

The weighted scores for each preliminary design option are shown below in [Table 13.](#page-39-0)

Selection Criteria	Attribute Weight	Americaloc GL300W		Spy TEC STI GL300		BRB900Tx/Rx	
		Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Cost	0.2	5	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{4}$	0.8	$\overline{2}$	0.4
Ease of Use	0.4	5	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{4}$	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{2}$	0.8
Size	0.1	1	0.2	5	$\mathbf{1}$	5	0.5
Reliability	0.2	5	1	$\overline{4}$	0.8	$\overline{2}$	0.4
Range	0.1	5	0.5	5	0.5	3	0.3
Total			4.7		4.7		2.4

Table 14. GPS Selection Matrix

The Americaloc GPS costs \$109.90 and was given a score of four for the cost attribute. The SKY TEC costs \$49.90 and was given a score of five. The BRB 9000 costs \$309 and so was given a score of two.

For ease of us, the Americaloc GPS was given a score of five since it can be accessed using any tablet or phone with an app without having a wired connection, and can display zones and mark events. Additionally, the Americaloc GPS be placed into a structure within the rocket quickly due to its sturdy rectangular design. The SKY TEC GPS was given a score of five since it can be accessed using any tablet or phone without being wired to it. The SKY TEC can also be placed into the rocket quickly due to its small design. The BRB 9000 must have the ground station wired into a laptop to receive data in real time. This GPS also does not have a sturdy exterior so it must be carefully designed into a safe location in the rocket and received a score of two as a result.

The Americaloc GPS has a volume of 4.3 x 2.6 x 2.6 inches and so was given a score of 1. The SKY TEC has a volume of 2 x 1 x .8 inches and so was given a score of five. The BRB 9000 has a volume of 2.6 x 1 x .5 inches and so was given a score of five for the size attribute.

For reliability, the Americaloc GPS was given a score of five since it has a two week battery life as well as a two year warranty. The SKY TEC GPS was given a score of four since it has a two week battery life, but its warranty needs to be purchased separately. The BRB 9000 has an estimated battery life of three days per charge and does not come with a warranty so was given a score of two.

For the range attribute both the Americaloc and the BRB 9000 have an unlimited range because they are tracked by satellite so they received a score of five. The SKY TEC requires a ground station to be within 15 miles of the large antenna that is attached and so was given a score of three.

After summing up the weighted scores for each preliminary design option, the Americaloc GW300 and the SPY TEC STI tied. The team has decided to use the Americaloc GW300 as the 2018-2019 competition year GPS, because the team has used this model before and members are already familiar it. This transmitter uses an AT&T brand cell phone SIM card to relay its position and it operates at 850 MHz. Since this GPS unit actively sends out its position, all the electronics in the rocket will have shielding to prevent interference.

Parachute Selection

The team used OpenRocket's flight predictions to determine the best parachute for this year's rocket. The team also used a MATLAB script as a second mode of verification to verify OpenRocket's results. LTRL's MATLAB rocket descent simulation program runs a recovery model in which the force balance between gravity and drag is integrated over time with separate phases for drogue and main. The model assumes that the parachutes do not deploy and expand instantaneously, but rather assumes the parachutes expand in a linear fashion. In this MATLAB model, the parachute area increases linearly with respect to time until the deployment time is complete. The parameters of the parachute's coefficients of drag are based on experimentally derived values from previous launches. The 12" Fruity Chutes Classical Ultra drogue parachute is estimated to have a coefficient of drag of 1.5, and the 72" Fruity Chutes Iris Ultra main parachute is estimated to have a coefficient of drag of 1.6. Using OpenRocket and MATLAB, the team is able to confirm that these parachutes will land within the landing zone and with a safe amount of kinetic energy. The team's MATLAB model calculated that the rocket will take 82.6 seconds to descend from apogee to landing. The predicted descent profile from the MATLAB model can be seen in [Figure 12.](#page-41-0) OpenRocket predicts the launch vehicle's descent time to be 81.6 seconds. This verifies the team's MATLAB model prediction that the launch vehicle will fulfill requirement 3.10.

Figure 12. Descent Graph

Landing

To ensure safe descent of the rocket within the landing zone, the team calculated drift distances for 5 mph, 10 mph, 15 mph, and 20 mph wind speeds. These calculations assumed there would be no launch angle. In [Figure 13](#page-42-0)**,** the distance the rocket drifts from apogee is shown. The MATLAB model does not account for weather cocking during ascent. As a result, launches where there are winds and no launch angle underestimate the rocket's drift distance. OpenRocket predicts a drift distance that is approximately 500 feet shorter than the MATLAB model from apogee to landing in 20 mph wind. This is due to OpenRocket not accounting for body drag once the drogue parachute has deployed. If OpenRocket accounted for this extra drag it would drift further as well as descend slower. This problem explains OpenRocket's faster descent rate and shorter time to landing from apogee.

Figure 13. Drift During Descent

Exact drift distances from apogee to landing for wind velocity are given in [Table 15.](#page-42-1)

Table 15. Drift Distance Calculations

Kinetic Energy

The MATLAB simulations predicted that the landing velocity of the rocket is 21.21 ft/s. Kinetic energy of each body tube section was calculated using equation 21. The function of parachute size versus parachute radius is given in [Figure 14](#page-43-0)**.** The kinetic energy of each section of the rocket at landing is given in [Table 16](#page-44-0)**.**

$$
KE = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 \tag{21}
$$

Figure 14. Kinetic Energy at Landing vs. Necessary Parachute Radius

Section	Mass	Kinetic Energy at landing (Matlab)	Kinetic Energy at landing (Openrocket)
Nose	125.5 OZ	54.85 ft*lbs	58.78 ft*lbs
Avionics	123.3 OZ	53.89 ft*lbs	57.75 ft*lbs
Booster	167.0 OZ	72.99 ft*lbs	78.21 ft*lbs

Table 16. Kinetic Energy per Separation

The kinetic energy at landing based on the OpenRocket calculations is higher than the MATLAB calculations and the expected value. This is due to OpenRocket not modelling body drag, and the rocket will actually descend slower due to a higher drag than what OpenRocket models. The MATLAB model's predicted velocity versus time for the flight of the launch vehicle is shown in [Figure 15.](#page-44-1)

Figure 15. Velocity versus Time for Launch

4. Safety

LTRL understands that there are many inherent dangers when building, testing, and launching high powered model rockets. In the safety plan below, LTRL outlines the risks and hazards identified throughout the process of constructing, testing, and launching of the rocket, along with the preliminary steps to mitigate them.

4.1 Safety Officer Responsibilities

Ben Akhtar is the Safety Officer for LionTech Rocket Labs during the 2018-2019 season. As Safety Officer, he is responsible for the overall safety for the team, students, the public, and any other persons involved or at any LionTech Rocket Lab events.

Statement of Work Requirements

The statement of work requirements for Safety provided by NASA are shown in the requirements verification in section 6.2 below.

Safety Requirements Verification

LTRL has created a set of team derived responsibilities that will increase and ensure further safety throughout the 2018-2019 season. These responsibilities can be found in section 6.1.

4.2 Safety Statement

LTRL will comply with all National Association of Rocketry (NAR), Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) regulations pertaining to high powered model rocketry. For convenience, and to help ensure the safety of LTRL members and the general public, LTRL will only launch at NAR or Tripoli Rocket Association certified club launches. LTRL and its members will comply with all instructions and guidance issued by the Range Safety Officer (RSO) of these launches. LTRL and its members will also comply with all instructions and guidance issued by the RSOs at the USLI launch in Huntsville.

4.3 NAR and TRA Regulations

NAR Safety Code

[Table 17](#page-45-0) describes every component of the NAR High Power Rocket Safety Code and how LTRL plans on following with each and every rule or regulation.

Table 17. NAR Safety Code

4.4 Lab Safety

Design and construction of both the Subscale and fullscale requires the use of power tools, such as a dremel, a drill, and a finishing sander. Additionally, it requires the use of potentially harmful chemicals, typically epoxies. These create hazards, which can be mitigated by following proper protocols and rules and wearing proper personal protective equipment (PPE) and exercising extra caution when necessary to ensure the safety of all team members. To create a proper atmosphere, where safety is of the utmost importance, and to educate members about proper chemical safety and disposal, basic laboratory safety, and the proper use of PPE, all team members are required to take safety training that is offered through Penn State's Environmental Health and Safety (EHS). In addition, safety and emergency equipment is available to LTRL members in the lab and at launches.

Safety Training

All LTRL team members are required to take a four-part Initial Lab Safety and Hazards Awareness training course offered online by Penn State's EHS. The course consists of four training videos: Introduction to Safety, Chemical Safety, Hazardous Waste Management and Disposal, and Emergency Preparedness. Each training video concludes with a quiz. Members must score at least an 80% to pass that portion of the training. LTRL Members who have already completed the initial course in a previous year can take a refresher course instead. The refresher course is also offered online, in a similar training video format. Members must score an 80% to pass the quiz at the end of the video. If they do not score 80% or higher, they must retake the quiz. If they do not pass after two times, they are required to set up an appointment with the Safety Officer and review all the topics covered in the videos and ask any questions they may have. In either case, participating in the four-part training course or the refresher, after passing the quiz, a certificate is generated, which is then submitted and verified by the Safety Officer, allowing that team member to work in the laboratory. The Safety Officer keeps both a physical and electronic database recording all members who have completed their safety training and are

allowed to work in the laboratory. The physical storage of the safety certificates is in a binder, located within the laboratory. If a member has yet to complete their training once work beings in the laboratory, the appropriate subsystem lead is notified about which members are not compliant with the Safety Training requirement. Members who have not completed safety training are not allowed to work in the lab.

Safety and Emergency Equipment

Safety glasses, dust masks, and gloves are available in the LTRL lab. They are also brought to launches and used as necessary. In case of an emergency, a first aid kit is available in the lab and brought to launches. Fire extinguishers, both dry chemical and $CO₂$ types, are available in the hallway directly outside of the lab. Additionally, there is a bathroom directly down the hallway from the lab in the case a team member needs to wash a chemical off.

4.5 Local/State/Federal Law Compliances

The team has closely examined, reviewed, and acknowledged all regulations regarding unmanned rocket launches and motor handling. The following regulations are included in the team's safety manual and available to all members: Federal Aviation Regulations 14 CFR, Subchapter F, Part 101, Subpart C, Code of Federal Regulation 27 Part 55: Commerce in Explosives; and fire prevention, and NFPA 1127 "Code for High Power Rocket Motors"

The team's preferred launch sites are listed below in [Table 18.](#page-50-0)

Table 18. Preferred launch sites for the 2018-2019 competition

All of these launch sites are in compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations as well as any rules and regulations put forth by the NRA. Additionally, both sites are have a high standard of safety. LTRL's main launch site for the 2018-2019 season will be in Grove City, Pennsylvania through Pittsburgh Space Command, which is an NRA affiliated launch site.

4.6 Motor Safety

LTRL plans to use an I-class motor for the subscale rocket. Last year a J-class motor was used. Additionally, LTRL used an L-class motor for the fullscale last year and LTRL tentatively plans that a similar class motor will be used for fullscale this year. The rocket motors are purchased, handled, and transported by Justin Hess. Justin Hess holds a NAR Level 2 certification. Any team member who has obtained at minimum a Level 2 certification will also be allowed to assist in this process. Additionally, Matt Easler, the team's Flight Systems lead and Gregory Schweiker, the team's President, currently hold NAR Level 1 certifications and are attempting their Level 2 certification launches during the season. An individual who has obtained at least a Level 2 certification has demonstrated that they understand the safety guidelines regarding motors and the proper procedures for purchasing, handling, and transporting them. Any certified team member that partakes in any of these activities is responsible for the appropriate safety measures. All motors are stored in the High Pressure Combustion Lab (HPCL) when not in use. The HPCL has storage magazines for H/D 1.1 and H/D 1.3 energetic materials and propellants. These magazines are sited, licensed, and operated in compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations. The motors for all launches will be transported by car to the launch site.

Motor CATO Awareness and Prevention

In order to ensure the team's utmost safety, the team will monitor and reference the Manufacture Notifications and Modification Announcements at <http://www.motorcato.org/> to ensure that scheduled motors for subscale and fullscale have no warnings issued or a higher risk for a hazard. Additionally, if a catastrophic event at take-off (CATO) occurs during any launch this season, the team will report through the malfunctioning engine statistical survey (MESS) to assist other teams and peoples in tracking the reliability of rocket motors.

4.7 Hazard Analysis

Risk Assessment Matrix

By thoroughly examining every human interaction, environment, rocket system and components, and previous year's hazards, hazards for this season have been identified. These hazards are not the only hazards that may occur during the construction, testing, or launching of the rocket and as new hazards and risks are identified with new rocket components. These hazards will be added to the list of hazards and thoroughly analyzed to properly mitigate their risk. Hazard identification and risk assessment are vital to the safety and success of the team and the safety of the public.

Each currently identified hazard has been thoroughly evaluated through a risk assessment matrix that first identifies the hazard, then lays out the possible causes of the hazard, and the effects of the hazard occurring. Additionally, the risk assessment matrix identifies the likelihood and severity of the said hazard and mitigations of those hazards to demonstrate the pre-mitigation risk and the post-mitigation risk.

To determine the likelihood of every hazard, a score from one to five, with a score one being the highest, was given. To accurately give a likelihood score, the following conditions were considered:

- All team members have undergone proper lab safety training and understand how to properly use the equipment
- All team members understand when they are required to wear PPE and how to properly use the PPE to prevent harm
- All team members understand all rules set forth in the safety manual and any laws and regulations that may be in place relating to the project at hand
- All procedures were correctly followed during testing, launching, and construction of the rocket
- Any equipment was properly inspected before use and if determined inadequate, was properly disposed
- Any component used during testing, launching, or construction of the rocket was properly inspected before and if determined inadequate was either properly disposed of or replaced to ensure a safe build of the rocket for any tests or launches

The criteria for the selection of the likelihood value is outlined below in [Table 19.](#page-52-0)

Table 19. Likelihood Value Criteria

A severity value has been assigned from 1 to 4 for all hazards, with a value of 1 being the most severe. To determine the severity value for each hazard, a set of criteria has been established based on injuries, damage to any equipment and/or the rocket, and any possible environmental

damage, which will be compared to the possible outcome of the hazard or issue. This criteria can be found below in [Table 20.](#page-53-0)

Table 20. Severity Value Criteria

By using the likelihood value and the severity value, an appropriate risk level has been determined and assigned using the risk assessment matrix found in [Table 21.](#page-54-0) The matrix identifies all combinations of severity and likelihood as either, low, moderate, or high risk. An ideal outcome for the team is to have all hazards to be at a low risk by the time the competition launch occurs to ensure the safest environment. Hazards that are above a low risk level and are

not an environmental risk that the team has no control over will be readdressed through a number of different options including redesign, additional safety regulations, analysis and tests, or other measures that may be required. Additionally, through verification systems, the risk may be further mitigated.

Table 21. Risk Assessment Matrix

Preliminary risk assessments have been evaluated for possible hazards that have been identified so far in the design process for the 2018-2019 season. Identifying the hazards this early in the design process allows the team to pay special attention to possible failure mechanisms within at risk components. By redesigning, analyzing and testing, or creating safety procedures, the mechanisms can be reduced or further understood while creating a safer environment for the team at this design stage. The team will work through the design stage and throughout the year to mitigate current hazards and any other hazards that are identified throughout the year.

At this time, some identified risks are unacceptably high. This is because all risks have been identified and addressed through some early concept design work, recommended processes, and hand calculations as testing has not been able to occur yet for the specified risks. As these risks are analyzed and tested, designs will be mitigated and verified as safe or redesigned. Risk levels will only be lowered once physical testing or evidence has proven the safety of the mechanism and the design are verified.

Overall Team Risk Assessment

During the project there are many possible hazards that could hinder the team as a whole, not just for specific subsystems. These all do not relate to the environment. These hazards can be found in Failure Modes [and Analysis \(FMEA\)](#page-64-0)

[Table 25](#page-64-0).

Lab and Learning Factory Risk Assessment

During the construction and manufacturing of components for the rocket, there will be many risks associated. All of this construction and manufacturing will be conducted either at the Learning Factory or the LTRL Lab. The hazards assessed from working with machines, tools, or chemicals can be found in [Table 22.](#page-57-0)

Launch Vehicle Assembly and Launch Risk Assessment

The hazards found in [Table 26](#page-66-0) are hazards that could be encountered during the launch of the vehicle or the assembly of the vehicle.

Propulsion Risk Assessment

Because the team is buying commercially produced motors, this area is of lower risk than if team produced its own motors. There are still risks associated, however. The team plans on allowing only members who have proper motor level certifications to use, handle, purchase, and work with the rocket motors. The team plans on accurately producing a stable rocket that can handle the rocket motor the team chooses. All hazards associated with propulsion are found in [Table 27.](#page-67-0)

Avionics and Recovery Risk Assessment

Because LTRL is required by NASA to use dual deployment, many of the hazards stated would be possible for all of the systems. To be concise, all the stated hazards will only be stated once. The hazards that are associated with avionics and recovery can be found in [Table 28.](#page-68-0)

Payload Risk Assessment

Because the team is planning on building a rover this year, there are many associated hazards or possible outcomes that could cause a failure or pose a safety concern. The team plans to ensure that the payload is properly secured, which will require many different components to ensure safe deployment, testing, assembly, and other flight hazards. The hazards that are associated with the payload can be found in [Table 29.](#page-73-0)

Hazards to the Environment Risk Assessment

During construction, testing, or launching of the rocket there may be hazardous to the environment. The associated hazards can be found in [Table 24.](#page-61-0)

Environmental Hazards to Rocket Risk Assessment

The hazards found in [Table 23](#page-59-0) are risks that the environment could impact the rocket or a component of the rocket. Unfortunately, the team has no control over environmental hazards and cannot reduce the risk of the hazard. Because of this, these hazards can be considered outside of the team's ideal scenario of having all hazards be at a low risk level. To ensure proper safety, if the environment poses a moderate risk to the rocket or a component of the rocket, the launch will be delayed until the Safety Officer lowers the risk level to low and approves the team to consult the Range Safety Officer to see if it is safe to launch.

Launch Procedures

Throughout the season, the Safety Officer is responsible for writing, maintaining, and ensuring that up to date and proper launch procedures are available at any time. These are critical to team members, the public, the range's personnel, the equipment, and the environment. Checklists will be required for all launches.

The checklists will be divided into checklists for each subsystem for pre-launch preparations, necessary launch day equipment, and launch day. By creating these checklists, each subsystem remains more organized and can quickly and effectively prepare for launch day. For a checklist to be considered complete, the head of the appropriate subsystem must sign off on that checklist after verifying every single item on the checklist has been completed. The Safety Officer will collect and verify the completion of all subsystem checklists. Once all subsystems have completed their appropriate tasks, the final assembly of the launch vehicle may be occur. Once the final assembly is complete, all subsystem leads and executive members, including the Safety Officer, must approve the rocket for launch. Once the rocket is a go for launch, the launch pad checklist can be started. Subsystem leads or executive members will be assigned a specific component of the rocket to track during the flight and recovery of the rocket. If the Safety Officer or Range Safety Officer determine something may be unsafe at any time, then they may call off the launch at any time if they believe the risk level is too high.

Safety Data Sheets (SDS)

All potentially hazardous materials that the team has stored in the lab or will be used throughout the competition have been identified and appropriate SDS have been found. These SDS can be found in Appendix B: Safety Data Sheets. This appendix will include the name and the first page for each SDS along with the corresponding link to that SDS to view the full SDS.

4.8 Safety Risk Assessment

Table 22. Lab and Learning Factory Risk Assessment

Table 23. Environmental Hazards to Rocket Risk Assessment

Table 24. Hazards to Environment Risk Assessment

4.9 Failure Modes and Analysis (FMEA) Table 25. Overall Team Risk Assessment

Table 26. Launch Vehicle Assembly Risk Management

Table 27. Propulsion Risk Assessment

Table 28. Avionics and Recovery Risk Assessment

Table 29. Payload Risk Assessment

5. Payload Criteria

The objective of the payload is to create an autonomous rover that will be deployed after the rocket lands. After deployment, the rover will drive at least 10 feet away from the rocket and collect a soil sample of at least 10 milliliters.

In order to successfully complete the competition, payload will need to fulfill 3 objectives. First, the team must ensure that the rover is safely secured in the rocket until landing. Second, the rover needs to deploy from the rocket after landing and autonomously drive at least 10 feet away. Finally, the rover must collect a soil sample of a least 10 milliliters.

To complete the 3 objectives stated above the payload team will be broken into 5 branches based on relevance of what needs to be focused on to complete the objectives. The branches are rocket integration, chassis and electronics, drivetrain and wheels, software, and soil sample collection. The engineers in the payload subsystem will alternate between these branches in order to complete the objectives.

5.1 Rocket Integration

The rocket integration subsystem will be responsible for safely securing the rover within the rocket. Similarly, the rover and other electronics within the payload bay must be protected from the black powder charge during the separation of the rocket. The rocket integration subsystem will also ensure that the rover is able to easily exit the rocket after landing.

Last year, the team had issues with the amount of space used by the containment mechanism. The containment system was integrated into the rover, taking up space and complicating the rover itself. To avoid similar challenges, the team has decided to keep the integration and security system separate from the rover. The designs described in [Table 30](#page-77-0) reflect this decision.

Three different designs are being considered for the integration and retainment of the rover inside the payload bay. The designs are outlined in [Table 30](#page-77-0) with a brief description of the design.

Table 30. Retention Description, Testing, and Verification

Keeping the rover secured is essential to protect the safety of the team and everyone in attendance at launches, to avoid damage to the rover body and electronics, and to ensure that the rover does not fall out of the payload bay after rocket separation.

The solenoid lock design is the most viable and current front-runner for rover integration and security. The simplicity of the design is one of the most important features. The software necessary to hold and release the rover is basic, and the addition of a thin metal rod to the rover would be easy. Along with simplicity, there are very few ways the system could fail during flight or after landing. Testing will be required to ensure the battery can last long enough to hold the rover even after sitting on the launch pad for a period of time. Importantly, the solenoid locking mechanism is quick and easy to set up on launch day.

The door design is the second best design for securing the rover. It is simple to set up on launch day and would require little time to secure the rover. The design also does not need any additions to the rover in order to secure it inside the payload bay. The down side of the door design is the locking mechanism could be difficult to construct with a servo and some other small parts. The complexity could also lead to a higher likelihood of the system failing.

The tether design is the least viable design. Tying down the rover could result in tangles and other complications after the rocket lands. Also, the mechanism that would be needed to lock down the wires and then release them would be complicated and difficult to set up on launch day.

The final integration and security design will be attached inside a rotating payload bay to ensure that the rover can drive out of the rocket right-side-up. The rotating payload bay pictured in [Figure 16](#page-79-0) will be suspended on one end by a screw mounted to the bulkhead and an epoxied faceplate. The bay itself will be nearly flush with the inside of the rocket to maximize space. The rotating bay system will allow for the heavier side to settle to the bottom and make sure that the rover exits the rocket in an upright position. [Figure 16](#page-79-0) is a 3D printed model of the first prototype for this system.

Figure 16. Rotating Payload Bay SolidWorks Model

Figure 17. Payload Bay Prototype

The rover will rest on the shelf depicted in [Figure 17](#page-79-1) and will be secured using one of the retainment designs above. One of the major challenges the team faced while designing the rover last year was creating a rover that would work regardless of the orientation the rocket landed in. Previous designs sacrificed ground clearance and wheel size. Learning from these mistakes from last year, the team has designed and tested the rotating payload bay to ensure that the rover always exits the rocket upright. The bottom shelf would be weighted so that it always ends up on the bottom, while the top shelf (not depicted in [Figure 17\)](#page-79-1) can be used to hold some light electronics for deployment and retainment.

5.2 Chassis and Electronics

The chassis/electronics subsystem will be responsible for creating the frame of the rover and the electronics board that will house all of the electronics. The electronics board is being created to organize the electronic components and ensure they are secure during all aspects of rocket flight and rover deployment. Based on the results from the previous year, it has been decided that a sheet of fiberglass will be used to mount the electronics. The electronics will be mounted to the sheet with 3D printed mounting devices. The isolated housing compartments will be vital in keeping electronics of the rover protected as well as being efficient with the amount of space. The sheet will allow for optimal clearance for the wheels to ensure the rover does not get stuck in the soil. For the electronics, an Arduino Nano will be used to help reduce the amount of space needed for the chassis while having enough pinouts for connecting the soil collector. [Table 31](#page-80-0) outlines the possible materials for the chassis design as well as the pros and cons of each material.

[Figure 18](#page-81-0) is a SolidWorks model of the current design for the rover chassis. The rover's electronics components, which are modeled on top, will be mounted to a fiberglass sheet that has 3D printed mounts attached to the bottom. The decision to use a combination of 3D printed parts and fiberglass is because fiberglass can provide the structural capabilities that are necessary and the 3D printed parts can provide the complexity necessary to mount various components. The mounts shown at the bottom of the figure are for holding dual shaft DC motors that will have axles for the wheels to attach to.

Figure 18. Rover Chassis

5.3 Soil Sample Collection

The soil sample collection subsystem is responsible for designing and manufacturing a system to collect a soil sample of at least 10 milliliters. The system will deploy after the rover has driven 10 feet away from the rocket.

Three designs are being considered for the soil sample collection. In [Table 32](#page-81-1) the different designs are described briefly. Tests that will be done to determine the best design along with a list of pros and cons of each design.

	Description	Testing/Verification
Auger	The auger will be powered by a servo. This will pull the soil up into a container to retain the soil.	Ground tests using soil similar to that at the launch site will determine the effectiveness of the auger.
Wheel	The separate wheel will pull the soil up as it turns. The soil will be directed into a container built onto the rover.	Ground tests using soil similar to that at the launch site will determine the effectiveness of the wheel.
Scoop	A mechanical scoop will dig into the earth and deposit the soil into a container on the rover.	Ground tests using soil similar to that at the launch site will determine the effectiveness of the scoop.

Table 32. Soil Collection Description, Testing, and Verification

The designs in [Table 32](#page-81-1) will require testing and multiple design iterations to finalize. The best design must be effective at soil collection and easy to integrate into the rover. Testing for the most effective soil collector will require full scale 3D printed models to ensure the design works effectively. The tests will utilize soil of similar consistency to that at the launch site. Importantly, the final design must integrate onto the design of the rover while staying within the bounds of the payload bay. Models of the soil collection designs will be drawn in SolidWorks to test the ease of integration onto the rover. After a series of tests, the primary design will be chosen for the final rover.

5.4 Software Subsystem

The software subsystem will be responsible for working with the rocket integration, drivetrain, and soil sample collection subsystems to develop the code required to execute their respective tasks.

[Table 33](#page-82-0) is detailing the necessary software tasks that must be completed by the payload subsystem.

Table 33. Software Tasks

The rover's processor will be an Arduino Nano microcontroller. An Arduino was chosen over other microcontrollers and portable computing platforms because of the weight and size constraints on the rover. An Arduino Nano is the smallest and lightest platform which is still powerful enough to run the control software for the rover and has enough pins for all necessary electronic components. Additionally, Arduinos are more suitable for servo and motor control. The software will be programmed in $C++$, using the Arduino's setup and loop functions as main functions of the program. The logic for the rover's software is outlined in [Figure 19.](#page-83-0)

Figure 19. Software Control Logic

Upon receiving the activation signal from the ground station via LoRa RFM9x radio, the control software will trigger the nose cone separation mechanism of black powder. To account for any issues after the separation of the nose cone, the team will be testing delay times until there is no movement of the rocket before moving onto the next step. After a decided delay time, another signal will be sent to unlock the retainment mechanism holding the rover in place. After another delay time, acquired from the process explained above, the rover will drive out of the rocket onto the ground. The rover will then be in a loop to drive for a predetermined amount of time to ensure it reaches the goal of 10 feet. Distance will be determined based on time because the results obtained from last year's distance measurement system were not accurate enough for the desired specifications. It was determined that using GPS is not accurate enough and would present a large margin of error compared to time based methods. After the rover has traveled for the specified time, the rover will stop and use a servo-powered soil collection mechanism to collect the desired 10 milliliter of soil.

5.5 Payload Wheel Design

Last year, the rover's wheel design did not perform well in the soil of Huntsville, Alabama. The wheels were designed and tested only on the terrain at Penn State, which is groomed, hard soil. The grooves for the treads were too shallow to get traction against the loose soil at the launch site. Since the payload competition is very similar to last year's, the new wheel designs are made with the previous wheels' problems in mind. All of the wheel designs focus on getting sufficient traction to effectively drive on the loose soil of the launch site.

Figure 20. Gear Wheel

The first design, the "gear wheel", as shown in [Figure 20,](#page-84-0) was the first iteration of the "larger grooves" idea. It included a hollow middle and cut spaces to allow the loose soil to pass through without clogging the spokes. This design included two mirrored plates that connected individual spokes on each tooth of the wheel. Because of its over-complicated nature, this design was taken out of consideration.

Figure 21. Sun Wheel

The second design was a much less complicated version of the gear wheel, adequately named the sun wheel, as seen in [Figure 21.](#page-84-1) The design was simply two different parts with one half including the spokes and the other as a connecter plate. The sun wheel features curved teeth rather than hard angles but kept the hollowed out center. When printed, however, the design was still too complicated for the printers available. After seeing the final product, the idea for a more rounded, oval edge would eliminate the need for the hollowed out section of the part and reduce the inaccuracies from coming from printing two different parts.

Figure 22. Wheel with Angled Treads

The latest design is named the angled treads wheel, shown by [Figure 22,](#page-85-0) for its slightly askew pinpoints. The overall idea of "more traction" was kept in mind while designing this part as well as the need for accurate simplicity. With the outside diameter of the treads at about 2.3 inches, these wheels will fit properly into the approximate payload area. Although the wheels will be heavier, the increased weight will give the rover more power to push through the soil. The solid nature of the wheel will also prevent soil from getting clogged within the wheel itself. When printed, the single part printed accurate enough to standard with what is needed.

Testing the wheels in soil similar to that of the launch site will be essential for picking the best wheel design for the rover. After the wheels are modeled in SolidWorks, the can then be 3D printed and tested using a basic test rover to determine the best traction in the loose soil. The best design can then be changed if necessary in SolidWorks, printed, and tested again to improve the design. Each design iteration will allow for improvements on the best design. The final wheel design will be tested thoroughly because the wheels were one of the major shortcomings of last year's design.

6. Project Plan

6.1 Requirements Verification

General Requirements

Vehicle Requirements

Recovery System Requirements

Payload

Safety

6.2 Team Derived Requirements

Vehicle

Recovery

Payload

Safety

6.3 Gantt Charts

LionTech Rocket Labs Gantt Chart

Structures and Propulsion Gantt Chart

Avionics and Recovery Gantt Chart

Payload Gantt Chart

6.4 Budget

[Table 34](#page-115-0) displays the expected costs of the 2018-2019 with the current design plan. This table includes all anticipated costs for the club for the NASA Student Launch competition.

Fullscale			
Payload	Quantity	Per item	Total
Radio	$\mathbf{1}$		
Soldering Iron and Soldering wire	$\mathbf{1}$	\$58.22	\$58.22
Stainless Steel Tubing	$\mathbf{1}$		
Dual Shaft Motor	$\mathbf{1}$	\$7.62	\$7.62
Miscellaneous	$\mathbf{1}$	\$100.00	\$100.00
Structures			
6.0" Fiberglass 4:1 Ogive Nosecone	$\mathbf{1}$	\$149.95	\$149.95
6.0" Fiberglass Coupler	$\mathbf{1}$	\$69.13	\$69.13
6.0" Blue Tube Couplers	$\overline{2}$	\$19.95	\$39.90
3K Plain Weave Carbon Fiber Wrapping	$\overline{2}$	\$249.95	\$499.90
Low Temperature Release Film	$\overline{2}$	\$14.95	\$29.90
Vacuum tubing	$\mathbf{1}$	\$1.55	\$1.55
Vacuum Connectors	1	\$5.25	\$5.25
2 Quart Resin Trap	$\mathbf{1}$	\$129.95	\$129.95
1.5" Rail Buttons	1	\$4.65	\$4.65
Center Rings 75mm to 6.00"	3	\$13.55	\$40.65
3.0" Fiberglass Motor Tube	$\mathbf{1}$	\$50.00	\$50.00
Plywood Bulkheads	11	\$8.93	\$98.23
3.0" G12 Coupler	$\mathbf{1}$	\$15.00	\$15.00

Table 34. Expected Outflow for 2018-2019

[Table 34](#page-115-0) shows the projected line item expenses. The fullscale and subscale sections are broken up by subsystems. Each subsystem has estimates for fullscale as most of these materials have not yet been purchased. Only structures and propulsion are given expenses from subscale because avionics and recovery and payload used equipment from previous years. Travel costs consist

mostly of the trip to Alabama as well as fuel costs for getting to and from launches. Outreach costs also contribute to the club's expenditures due to the purchase of miscellaneous supplies needed to host events throughout the academic year.

[Table 35](#page-118-0) gives the breakdown for the budget by each overall component of the competition.

Table 35. Overall Outflow

[Table 35](#page-118-0) shows the total costs from each header of [Table 34](#page-115-0) to more easily show where the funds are being used. As expected, travel and fullscale are LTRL's most expensive sectors. An additional \$500 was added into the budget in case unexpected costs arise.

6.5 Funding

Table 36. Expected Inflow for 2018-2019

[Table 36](#page-118-1) shows the sources of funding that LTRL plans to use during the 2018-2019 academic year. The Penn State College of Engineering has repeatedly supported LTRL and is expected to do so again. The Penn State Department of Aerospace Engineering aerospace engineering consistently supports LTRL's goals and high number of aerospace engineering student members. The Penn State Department of Mechanical Engineering shows support for the mechanical engineering student members of LTRL. University Park Allocations Committee (UPAC) is a Penn State organization that supports the clubs at Penn State. They offer funding to LTRL to cover most of the expenses related to travel and large equipment purchases such as a 3D printer. Club fundraising is represented largely by the club's required dues to become a member. The Pennsylvania Space Grant offers the club support in recognition of furthering STEM involvement in NASA related fields. Each year the Boeing Company offers funds in support of LTRL's mission.

In order to prevent any unseen expenses from impacting the club's performance LTRL will be pursuing as much additional funding as possible. Additional funds may be available from the Pennsylvania Space Grant if those funds are depleted. The club will be attempting to collaborate with corporate sponsors such as the Boeing Company to acquire additional funding.

Having extra funds available to the club will allow the club to set more goals and expand current goals. Extra funds will allow participation in other projects such as supporting club members to acquire their level 1 and 2 certifications through the National Association of Rocketry. This is important to the club since LTRL needs current members to have proper certifications to launch the subscale and fullscale rocket.

7. Appendix A: MSDS Sheets

GHS SAFETY DATA SHEET (SDS)

SECTION 1 - PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

PRODUCT: Part #2000 System 2000 Epoxy Resin

FIBRE GLAST DEVELOPMENTS CORP. 385 CARR DRIVE BROOKVILLE, OH 45309

TELEPHONE: (937) 833-5200
FAX: (937) 833-6555 FOR CHEMICAL EMERGENCY CALL (801) 629-0667 24 HRS.

RECOMMENDED USE: Industrial Epoxy Resin supplied exclusively for workplace use.

Full SDS:<https://s3.amazonaws.com/cdn.fibreglast.com/downloads/PDCT-SDS-00130.pdf>

Epoxy Hardener SDS

GHS SAFETY DATA SHEET (SDS)

SECTION 1 - PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

PRODUCT: Part #2060 Epoxy Hardener

FIBRE GLAST DEVELOPMENTS CORP. 385 CARR DRIVE BROOKVILLE, OH 45309

TELEPHONE: (937) 833-5200 FAX: (937) 833-6555 FAX. (937) 633-6353
FOR CHEMICAL EMERGENCY
CALL (801) 629-0667 24 HRS.

RECOMMENDED USE: Industrial Curing Agent supplied exclusively for workplace use.

PDCT-SDS-00132 [Version 1.02] Page 1 of 6

Full SDS:<https://s3.amazonaws.com/cdn.fibreglast.com/downloads/PDCT-SDS-00132.pdf>

Black Powder SDS

SAFETY DATA SHEET-BLACK POWDER

Full SDS: [https://goexpowder.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/sds-sheets-goex-black](https://goexpowder.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/sds-sheets-goex-black-powder.pdf)[powder.pdf](https://goexpowder.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/sds-sheets-goex-black-powder.pdf)

Carbon Fiber SDS

GHS SAFETY DATA SHEET (SDS)

SECTION 1 - PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

PRODUCT: Part #530 - 3K Plain Weave Carbon Fiber Fabric

FIBRE GLAST DEVELOPMENTS CORP. 385 Carr Drive
BROOKVILLE, OH 45309

TELEPHONE: (937) 833-5200 FAX: (937) 833-6555
FOR CHEMICAL EMERGENCY CALL (801) 629-0667 24 HRS.

RECOMMENDED USE: Standard Composite Manufacturing

SECTION 2 - HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION

Warning! This may cause mild, temporary mechanical eye and skin irritation. Vapor or fumes evolved during use and/or heating or curing the product may cause respiratory tract and eye irritation. Dust or particulates from machining, grinding or sawing the cured product may cause skin, eye and upper respiratory tract irritation, allergic
skin reaction and possible sensitization.

> PDCT-SDS-00074 [Version 1.01] Page 1 of 7

Full SDS:<https://s3.amazonaws.com/cdn.fibreglast.com/downloads/PDCT-SDS-00074.pdf>

Fiberglass Safety Data Sheet

SECTION 1: Identification of the substance/mixture and of the company/undertaking

- 1.1 Product identifier
	- Fiberglass
- 1.2 Relevant identified uses of the substance or mixture and uses advised against
	- Structural reinforcement for thermoset resin products.

1.3 Details of the supplier of the safety data sheet

- NOV Fiber Glass Systems

17115 San Pedro Avenue, Suite 200 San Antonio, Texas 78232 USA 1-210-477-7500 Tel: Fax: 1-210-231-5915 E-mail: Mike.Thayer@nov.com

1.4 Emergency telephone number(s)

- 3E Company, 24-Hour Support (Access Code/Contract Number: 333386)
	-
	-
	- Europe, Middle East, Africa 1-760-476-3961
	-

SECTION 2: Hazards identification

2.1 Classification of the substance or mixture

Physical

- Not classified

Health

- Skin irritation, Category 2
- Eye irritation Category 2
- Specific target organ systemic toxicity single exposure, Category 3 (respiratory tract irritation)

Environmental

Not classified

www.fgspipe.com · fgspipe@nov.com

Full SDS: http://www.nov.com/docHandler.aspx?puid=UvdNvuUs3oL35C

Isopropyl Alcohol SDS

TSI MSDS 1080546 Rev H

Version: 1.2 Revision date: 03-06-2015

SAFETY DATA SHEET

1. Identification

Product identifier: Isopropyl Alcohol

Other means of identification

Product No.: 9088, 5892, 9095, 9084, 9083, 9082, 9079, 9078, 9059, 9055, 9045, 5986, 5978, 5977, 5967, 5873, 5863, 9827, 5373, 9334

Recommended use and restriction on use

Recommended use: For use in the PortaCount® Respirator Fit Tester Restrictions on use: Not known.

Manufacturer/Importer/Supplier/Distributor information

Manufacturer Company Name: Address:

TSI Incorporated 500 Cardigan Road Shoreview, MN 55126

Customer Service: 800-874-2811 Telephone:

Fax: Contact Person: e-mail: answers@tsi.com

Emergency telephone number:

24 Hour Emergency: 908-859-2151

Chemtrec: 800-424-9300

2. Hazard(s) identification

Hazard classification

Physical hazards

Flammable liquids

Category 2

Category 2A

Category 3

Health hazards

Serious eye damage/eye irritation Specific target organ toxicity - single exposure

Label elements

Hazard symbol:

Danger

Signal word:

Hazard statement:

Highly flammable liquid and vapor. Causes serious eye irritation. May cause respiratory irritation. May cause drowsiness or dizziness.

SDS_US - SDS000000696

Page 1 of 10

Full SDS: http://www.tsi.com/uploadedFiles/_Site_Root/Products/Literature/MSDS/1080546-MSDS-Isopropyl-Alcohol-TSI.pdf

MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET

1. Product and Company Identification **Product Name** J-B Kwik Synonym(s) Resin and Hardener CAS# Mixture Product use Bonds and repairs Manufacturer J-B Weld Company P.O. Box 483 Sulphur Springs, TX 75482 US Phone: 903-885-7696 2. Hazards Identification **Emergency overview CAUTION** MAY CAUSE EYE IRRITATION. MAY CAUSE SKIN IRRITATION. MAY CAUSE ALLERGIC SKIN REACTION. Potential short term health effects Routes of exposure Eye, Skin contact, Ingestion. Eyes May cause irritation. Skin Contact with skin can cause irritation and allergic reaction (sensitization) in some individuals. Not a normal route of exposure. Inhalation May cause stomach distress, nausea or vomiting. Ingestion Eyes. Skin. **Target organs** Prolonged or repeated exposure can cause drying, defatting and dermatitis. **Chronic effects** Symptoms may include redness, edema, drying, defatting and cracking of the skin. Signs and symptoms Symptoms of overexposure may be headache, dizziness, tiredness, nausea and vomiting. This product is a "Hazardous Chemical" as defined by the OSHA Hazard **OSHA Regulatory Status** Communication Standard, 29 CFR 1910.1200. See section 12. Potential environmental effects

3. Composition / Information on Ingredients

4. First Aid Measures

Full SDS: [https://cdn.shopify.com/s/files/1/0411/5921/files/J-B-Weld-MSDS-](https://cdn.shopify.com/s/files/1/0411/5921/files/J-B-Weld-MSDS-KwikWeld.pdf?1921)[KwikWeld.pdf?1921](https://cdn.shopify.com/s/files/1/0411/5921/files/J-B-Weld-MSDS-KwikWeld.pdf?1921)

J-B Steel Reinforced Epoxy Resin SDS

Issuing Date 11-Nov-2014

Revision Date 11-Nov-2014

Revision Number 1

1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE SUBSTANCE/PREPARATION AND OF THE **COMPANY/UNDERTAKING**

Product identifier

Product SDS Name Steel Reinforced Epoxy Resin - Twin Tubes - Part A

J-B Weld FG SKU Part Numbers Covered

8265, 8265F, 8276, 8276F, 8265S, 8265A, 8265H, 8272, 8272F, 8280, 8280F, 8281, 80165, 7265S, 7280, 8276A, 8273H, 8270, 8270F, 8271, 80176, 7276, 7270

J-B Weld Product Names Covered

J-B Weld™ (all Twin Tubes), KwikWeld™ (all Twin Tubes), MarineWeld™ (Twin Tubes Only)

J-B Weld Product Type

Steel Reinforced Epoxy

Recommended use of the chemical and restrictions on use

Full SDS:

[https://cdn.shopify.com/s/files/1/0411/5921/files/Steel_Reinforced_Epoxy_Twin_Tubes.pdf?785](https://cdn.shopify.com/s/files/1/0411/5921/files/Steel_Reinforced_Epoxy_Twin_Tubes.pdf?785811878289892783) [811878289892783](https://cdn.shopify.com/s/files/1/0411/5921/files/Steel_Reinforced_Epoxy_Twin_Tubes.pdf?785811878289892783)

SAFETY DATA SHEET

Mystik® JT-6® Synthetic Hi-Temp Grease, No. 2,
ISO 220

Full SDS: http://docs.mystiklubes.com/msds_pi/665077002.pdf

SAFETY DATA SHEET

51601

Full SDS:<https://www.krylon.com/document/SDS/en/US/724504016014>

Talcum Powder Resin SDS

Full SDS:

https://www.mineralstech.com/docs/defaultsource/company/talc.pdf?sfvrsn=47ea573b_2

Acetone SDS

SAFETY DATA SHEET

Page: 1

Klean-Strip Acetone

Revision: 05/24/2017 Supersedes Revision: 04/15/2015

Flammable Liquids, Category 2 Serious Eye Damage/Eye Irritation, Category 2 Specific Target Organ Toxicity (single exposure), Category 3

Licensed to W.M. Barr and Company

GHS format

Full SDS: http://www.kleanstrip.com/uploads/documents/GAC18_SDS-LL34.pdf

SAFETY DATA SHEET

 $2411 -$

Full SDS:<http://archpdfs.lps.org/Chemicals/Thompsons-Water-Seal.pdf>

Paint Thinner SDS

SAFETY DATA SHEET

Klean Strip Paint Thinner

Revision: 05/24/2017

Page: 1

Supersedes Revision: 11/16/2015

2. HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION

Flammable Liquids, Category 3 Acute Toxicity: Inhalation, Category 4 Skin Corrosion/Irritation, Category 2 Serious Eye Damage/Eye Irritation, Category 2B Germ Cell Mutagenicity, Category 1B **Toxic To Reproduction, Category 2** Specific Target Organ Toxicity (single exposure), Category 3 Specific Target Organ Toxicity (repeated exposure), Category 2 **Aspiration Toxicity, Category 1**

GHS format

Full SDS: http://www.kleanstrip.com/uploads/documents/GKPT94002_SDS-GL42E.pdf

Bondo® Fiberglass Resin Kit, P.N 401, 401C, 402, 402M, 402C, 402ES, 402T, 402Z, 404, 404C, 404Z

 $01/12/18$

Safety Data Sheet

Copyright, 2018, 3M Company.

All rights reserved. Copying and/or downloading of this information for the purpose of properly utilizing 3M products is allowed provided that: (1) the information is copied in full with no changes unless prior written agreement is obtained from 3M, and (2) neither the copy nor the original is resold or otherwise distributed with the intention of earning a profit thereon.

Product identifier

Bondo® Fiberglass Resin Kit, P.N. 401, 401C, 402, 402M, 402C, 402ES, 402T, 402Z, 404, 404C, 404Z

ID Number(s):

60-4550-4826-8, 60-4550-5662-6, 60-4550-5663-4, 60-4550-5664-2, 60-4550-5665-9, 60-4550-5666-7, 60-4550-5667-5, 60-4550-
6602-1, 60-4550-6603-9, 60-4550-6605-4, 60-4550-6742-5, 60-4550-7373-8, 60-4550-7374-6, 60-4550-7375-4550-7377-9, 60-4550-8100-4, 60-4550-8101-2, 60-4550-8102-0, 60-4550-8287-9, 60-4550-8288-7, 60-4550-8297-8, 60-4550-8298-6, 60-4550-8299-4, 60-4550-8325-7, 60-4550-8326-5, 60-4550-8327-3, 70-0080-0014-6, 70-0080-0015-3, 70-0080-0016-1, 70-0080-0148-2, 70-0080-0149-0, 70-0080-0150-8, 70-0080-0151-6, 70-0080-0152-4, 70-0080-0153-2

Recommended use

Automotive, Repairing Auto Body

Supp lier's details

1-888-3M HELPS (1-888-364-3577) Telephone:

Emergency telephone number 1-800-364-3577 or (651) 737-6501 (24 hours)

This product is a kit or a multipartproduct which consists of multiple, independently packaged components. A Safety Data Sheet (SDS), Article Information Sheet (AIS), or Article Information Letter (AIL) for each of these components is included. Please do not separate the component documents from this cover page. The document numbers for components of this product are:

24-2429-9, 24-2440-6

DISCL AIMER: The information in this Safety Data Sheet (SDS) is believed to be correct as of the date issued 3MMAKES NO WARRANTIES, EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE OR COURSE OF PERFORMANCE OR USAGE OF TRADE.User is responsible for determining whether the3Mproduct is fit for a particular purpose and suitable for user's method of use or application. Given the variety of factors that can affect the use and application of a3Mproduct, some of which are uniquely within the user's knowledge and control,it is essential that the user evaluate the3Mproduct to determine whether it is fit for a particular purpose and suitable for user's method of use or application.

> Page 1 of $\overline{2}$

Full SDS:

https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/mediawebserver?mwsId=SSSSSsuUn_zu8l00xM8tvNxm1Mv70 k17zHvu9lxtD7SSSSSSS--

Pyro-Paint SDS

SAFETY DATA SHEET

 $\mathbf{1}$

Full SDS: https://www.audec.co.jp/products/pdf/msds_bond107.pdf

WD-40 SDS

Page 1 of 5

Full SDS: [https://www.wd40company.com/files/pdf/sds/mup/wd-40-multi-use-product-aerosol](https://www.wd40company.com/files/pdf/sds/mup/wd-40-multi-use-product-aerosol-sds-us-ghs-7-20-14.pdf)[sds-us-ghs-7-20-14.pdf](https://www.wd40company.com/files/pdf/sds/mup/wd-40-multi-use-product-aerosol-sds-us-ghs-7-20-14.pdf)

Great Stuff Gaps and Cracks SDS

GREAT STUFF Gaps and Cracks GMID 277059

MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET

1) PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY. Midland Michigan 48674 USA.

24-Hour Emergency Phone Number: 989-636-4400 Customer Service: 800-366-4740 PRODUCT NAME: GREAT STUFF* Gaps and Cracks MATERIAL TYPE : One component system ISSUE DATE: 04/26/2007 REVISION DATE: 01/25/2007

2) COMPOSITION/INFORMATION ON INGREDIENTS

3) HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION

EMERGENCY OVER VIEW

Sprayed or heated material harmful if inhaled. May cause allergic skin reaction. May cause allergic respiratory reaction and lung injury. Avoid temperatures above 105F $(41C)$. Toxic flammable gases and heat are released under decomposition conditions. Toxic fumes may be released in fire situations. Reacts slowly with water, releasing carbon dioxide, which can cause pressure buildup and rupture of closed containers. Elevated temperatures accelerate this process.

May cause moderate eye irritation. May cause very slight transient (temporary) corneal injury.

Prolonged or repeated exposure may cause slight skin irritation. May cause allergic skin reaction in susceptible individuals. Animal studies have shown that skin contact with isocyanates may play a role in respiratory sensitization. May stain skin. A single prolonged exposure is not likely to result in the material being absorbed in harmful amounts.

INGESTION

Single dose oral toxicity is considered to be low. No hazards anticipated from swallowing small amounts incidental to normal handling operations.

INHAL ATION

At room temperature, vapors are minimal due to low vapor pressure. However, certain operations may generate vapor or aerosol concentrations sufficient to cause irritation Such operations include those in which the material is or other adverse effects. heated, sprayed or otherwise mechanically dispersed such as drumming, venting or

"" or (R) indicates a Trademark of The Dow Chemical Company

Page 1 of 8

Full SDS:

https://www.vercounty.org/MSDS/EMA/34Dow%20Great%20Stuff%20Spray%20Foam.pdf

EYE

SKIN

Gloss Protective Enamel SDS

Date Printed: 5/9/2017

Page 1/6

RUST-OLEI CORPORATION

> * Trusted Quality Since 1921 * www.rustoleum.com

1. Identification

Product Name: STRUST +SSPR 6PK GLOSS NAVY BLUE **Revision Date:** 5/9/2017 Product Identifier: 7723830 **Supercedes Date:** 3/8/2017 **Product Use/Class:** Topcoat/Aerosols Rust-Oleum Corporation Rust-Oleum Corporation Supplier: Manufacturer: 11 Hawthorn Parkway 11 Hawthorn Parkway Vernon Hills, IL 60061 Vernon Hills, IL 60061 **USA USA** Preparer: Regulatory Department 24 Hour Hotline: 847-367-7700 **Emergency Telephone:**

2. Hazard Identification

Classification Symbol(s) of Product

Signal Word Danger

Possible Hazards

32% of the mixture consists of ingredient(s) of unknown acute toxicity.

Safety Data Sheet

GHS HAZARD STATEMENTS Carcinogenicity, category 2 H351 Suspected of causing cancer. Compressed Gas H280 Contains gas under pressure; may explode if heated. H319 Eye Irritation, category 2 Causes serious eye irritation. Flammable Aerosol, category 1 H₂₂₂ Extremely flammable aerosol. H373 STOT, repeated exposure, category 2 May cause damage to organs through prolonged or repeated exposure. STOT, single exposure, category 3, NE H336 May cause drowsiness or dizziness. **GHS LABEL PRECAUTIONARY STATEMENTS** P₂₀₁ Obtain special instructions before use. P210 Keep away from heat, hot surfaces, sparks, open flames and other ignition sources. No smoking. P211 Do not spray on an open flame or other ignition source. P251 Do not pierce or burn, even after use. P260 Do not breathe dust/fume/gas/mist/vapors/spray. P264 Wash hands thoroughly after handling. P271 Use only outdoors or in a well-ventilated area. P280 Wear protective gloves/protective clothing/eye protection/face protection. P304+P340 IF INHALED: Remove person to fresh air and keep comfortable for breathing. P305+P351+P338 IF IN EYES: Rinse cautiously with water for several minutes. Remove contact lenses, if present and easy to do. Continue rinsing.

Full SDS:<https://www.rustoleum.com/MSDS/ENGLISH/7723830.pdf>

Cleaner Degreaser Disinfectant SDS

Page 1/9

Full SDS:<https://www.parish-supply.com/documents/CLO35296-01.pdf>

Page 1 of 6

MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET

Finished Product

Date Issued: 01/18/2003 **MSDS No: 3500-A** Date Revised: 02/01/2012 **Revision No: 7**

Heavy Duty Adhesive Spray

1. PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

PRODUCT NAME: Heavy Duty Adhesive Spray PRODUCT DESCRIPTION: Contact Adhesive PRODUCT CODE: 3500-115

MANUFACTURER

Techspray, L.P. 1001 N.W. 1st Street P.O. Box 949 Amarillo, TX 79107 **Emergency Contact: Chem trec** Emergency Phone: 1-800-858-4043 Service Number: 1-800-858-4043

24 HR. EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBERS

CHEMTREC CCN#21858 (US Transportation): (800) 424 - 9300 CANUTEC (Canadian Transportation) :(613) 996 - 6666 Emergency Phone: (800) 858 - 4043

2. HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION

EMERGENCY OVERVIEW

PHYSICAL APPEARANCE: Clear to amber, sticky resin.

POTENTIAL HEALTH EFFECTS

EYES: Liquid contact can cause irritation, which may be severe.

SKIN: Prolonged or repeated contact may cause skin irritation.

INGESTION: Harmful if swallowed.

INHALATION: Prolonged or excessive inhalation may cause respiratory tract irritation.

SIGNS AND SYMPTOMS OF OVEREXPOSURE

EYES: Symptoms of overexposure include: stinging, tearing, redness and pain.

SKIN: May cause slight irritation.

INGESTION: Not a likely route of exposure.

3. COMPOSITION / INFORMATION ON INGREDIENTS

4. FIRST AID MEASURES

EYES: Immediately flush eyes with plenty of water for at least 15 minutes. Get immediate medical attention. SKIN: Wash with soap and water. Get medical attention if irritation develops or persists.

Full SDS: https://www.techspray.com/content/msds/3500_US_ENG_SDS.pdf

All Purpose Putty SDS

Bondo® All-Purpose Putty, 20052, 20054, 30054, 31252, 31254 03/19/15

Safety Data Sheet

Copyright, 2015, 3M Company.

All rights reserved. Copying and/or downloading of this information for the purpose of properly utilizing 3M products is allowed provided that: (1) the information is copied in full with no changes unless prior written agreement is obtained from 3M, and (2) neither the copy nor the original is resold or otherwise distributed with the intention of earning a profit thereon.

Product identifier

Bondo® All-Purpose Putty, 20052, 20054, 30054, 31252, 31254

ID Number(s):

41-0003-7991-1, 41-0003-7992-9, 60-4550-6801-9, 60-4550-6802-7, 60-4550-6829-0, 60-4550-8112-9, 60-4550-8113-7

Recommended use

Putty/Filler used for home repairs.

Supp lier's details

Telephone:

Emergency telephone number 1-800-364-3577 or (651) 737-6501 (24 hours)

This product is a kit or a multipart product which consists of multiple, independently packaged components. A Safety Data Sheet (SDS), Article Information Sheet (AIS), or Article Information Letter (AIL) for each of these components is included. Please do not separate the component documents from this cover page. The document numbers for components of this product are:

30-8057-9, 29-5993-0

DISCLAIMER: The information in this Safety Data Sheet (SDS) is believed to be correct as of the date issued. 3M MAKES NO WARRANTIES, EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE OR COURSE OF PERFORMANCE OR USAGE OF TRADE. User is responsible for determining whether the 3M product is fit for a particular purpose and suitable for user's method of use or application. Given the variety of factors that can affect the use and application of a 3M product, some of which are uniquely within the user's knowledge and control, it is essential that the user evaluate the 3M product to determine whether it is fit for a particular purpose and suitable for user's method of use or application

3M provides information in electronic form as a service to its customers. Due to the remote possibility that electronic transfer may have resulted in errors, omissions or alterations in this information, 3M makes no representations as to its completeness or accuracy. In addition, information obtained from a database may not be as current as the information in the SDS available directly from 3M

Page 1 of 2

Full SDS:

https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/mediawebserver?mwsId=SSSSSuUn_zu8l00xmxtel8_9mv70k1 7zHvu9lxtD7SSSSSSS--

8. Appendix B: Recovery Decent Profile Calculator

- % RECOVERY DESCENT PROFILE CALCULATOR (RDPC)
- % WRITTEN BY EVAN KERR
- % PENN STATE LION TECH ROCKET LABS
- % AVIONICS AND RECOVERY LEAD
- % LATEST UPDATE: 4/20/2017

Calculate necessary area of Parachute to meet certain KE on landing

```
clc, clear, close all
%Gravitational acceleration, units: m/s^2
g = 9.81;%Density in kg/m^3
rho = 1.225;
%Kinetic Energy Limit in ft-lbs
keMax = 75;
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%% Input Begin %%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
%Coefficient of drag of drogue, main, and tumbling rocket respectively
Cdd = 1.5;
Cdm = 2.2;
Cdr = 1.0;%These should be in kg
mass(1) = 4.030; % For the fore
mass(2) = 3.478; % For the avionics bay (model minus chord, chutes, and copter)
mass(3) = 4.660; % For the booster
mass(4) = 0.953; %Main parachute
mass(5) = 0.502; %Drogue parachute
%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%% Input End %%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
maxMass = max(mass);totMass = sum(mass);radiusMainM = ones(1,10);
keMatFtLbs = (30:1:75);keMatJoule = keMatFtLbs*1.3358;
for i = 1:length(keMatJoule)
   radiusMainM(i) = sqrt((maxMass*totMass*g)/(Cdm*keMatJoule(i)*rho*pi));
end
radiusMainFt = 3.281*radiusMainM;
radiusMainIn = radiusMainFt * 12;
```
figure (1) ; plot(keMatFtLbs,radiusMainIn,'--o') title('Kinetic Energy at Landing vs. Necessary Parachute Radius'); xlabel('Desired Maximum Kinetic Energy at Landing (ft*lbs)'); ylabel('Radius of Main Parachute Required (in)'); grid on;

Calculating Force based results

%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%% Input Begin %%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%% $Rd_in = 6$; % radius of drogue[in] $Rm_in = 42$; % radius of main[in] $Rr_in = 7.5$; %simulated radius of "tumbling" rocket parachute[in] apogeeft = 5280; %apogee altitude above ground level [ft] altDrogueft = apogeeft-1; %altitude above ground level of drogue deployment[ft] altMainft = 600; %altitude above ground level of main parachute deployment[ft] altLaunchSite = 183; % Altitiude above sea level of the launch site in meters %%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%% Input End %%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%% $Rd = 0.0254*Rd_in$; % radius of drogue[m] Rm = 0.0254*Rm_in; %radius of main[m] $Rr = 0.0254*Rr_in; % simulated radius of "tumbling" rocket parachute[m]$

 $apogee = 0.3048*apogeeft;$
altDrogue = 0.3048*altDrogueft; altMain = $0.3048*$ altMainft:

% Declare Constants

h = apogee+altLaunchSite; % Initial altitude of the rocket above sea level h_matrix(1) = h;

time $(1) = 0$; $dt = 0.01;$ $v(1) = 0;$ $a(1) = g$; $i = 1$: % Counter variable Temp = 2; % Temperature in Celcius at ground level.

 $Weight = totMass*g;$

% Deployment time and counter initialization for the main and drogue

% parachutes

Kd_dep = 0; % Drogue deployment factor, or how many iterations have run since the drogue was deployed. Td_dep = 0.25; % Drogue deployment time (how long it takes) in seconds $Td_dep_elapsed = 0$; % Time elapsed since drogue deployment Km_{e} dep = 0; % Main deployment factor, or how many iterations have run since the main was deployed Tm_{\perp} dep = 2; Tm_{eq} dep_elapsed = 0;

%Drag Calculation

while(h >= altLaunchSite) % Although we are integrating over time, the check is whether the height is still above ground level.

rho_new = rhocalcestSI(h,Temp); % Calculate the density at the given altitude and temperature

Dragr(i) = .5*Cdr*rho_new*v(i)^2*pi*Rr^2; % Drag of the rocket body

Dragd(i) = .5*Cdd*rho_new*v(i)^2*pi*Rd^2; % Drag of the drogue parachute

Dragm(i) = .5*Cdm*rho_new*v(i)^2*pi*Rm^2; % Drag of the main parachute

 if h > (altDrogue + altLaunchSite)% Determines which state of descent the rocket is in and adjusts accordingly by adding the drags $\text{Diag} = \text{Dragr}(i)$; % If the drogue has yet to deploy, the drag of the rocket is the only factor

elseif h > (altMain + altLaunchSite)

Kd_dep = Kd_dep + 1; % Increment drogue deployment factor

Td_dep_elapsed = Kd_dep*dt; % Use the drogue deployment factor to calculate time since drogue deployed

 $Drag = Dragr(i) + Dragd(i); % Calculate drage when drogue fully deployed$

```
 % This loop only runs right after chute deployment and models
   % the chute as opening in a linear matter
   if Td_dep_elapsed < Td_dep
     Drag = Dragr(i) + (Td\_dep\_elanged/Td\_dep)*Dragd(i); end
 else
  Km_{\text{p}}dep = Km_{\text{p}}dep + 1;
  Tm_dep_elapsed = Km_dep*dt;
  Drag = Dragr(i) + Dragd(i) + Dragm(i);
```

```
 if Tm_dep_elapsed < Tm_dep
          \pmb{\text{Diag} = \text{Dragr}(i) + \text{Dragd}(i) + (\text{Tm\_dep\_elanged}/\text{Tm\_dep}) * \text{Dragm}(i);} end
      end
  i = i + 1; % Increment i, the current index value
   a(i) = (-Drag+Weight)/totMass;
  v(i) = v(i-1) + a(i)*dt;delh(i) = v(i)*dt;h = h-delh(i);
  h_matrix(i) = h;time(i) = time(i-1) + dt;end
figure(2);
ax11 = subplot(2,1,1);title('Descent Profile In SI Units');
plot(time,h_matrix-altLaunchSite,'LineWidth',2)
ylabel('Altitude (meters)');
xlabel('Time (seconds)');
grid on;
grid minor;
axis([0 max(time) 0 max(h_matrix-altLaunchSite)*1.2]);
ax21 = subplot(2,1,2);plot(time,v,'LineWidth',2);
ylabel('Velocity (meters/second)');
xlabel('Time (seconds)');
grid on;
grid minor;
axis([0 max(time) 0 max(v)*1.2]);linkaxes([ax11 ax21],'x');
figure(3)
ax12 = subplot(2,1,1);title('Descent Profile in English Units');
plot(time,(h_matrix-altLaunchSite)*3.281,'LineWidth',2);
ylabel('Altitude (ft)');
xlabel('Time (s)');
grid on;
grid minor;
axis([0 max(time) 0 max(h matrix-altLaunchSite)*3.281*1.2]);
```
 $ax22 = subplot(2,1,2);$ plot(time,v*3.281,'LineWidth',2); ylabel('Velocity (ft/s)'); xlabel('Time (s)'); grid on; grid minor; axis([0 max(time) 0 max(v)*3.281*1.2]); linkaxes([ax12 ax22],'x');

figure(4) title('G Forces vs Time'); plot(time,abs(a/g),'LineWidth',2); ylabel('G Force'); xlabel('Time (s)'); grid on; grid minor; $axis([0 max(time) 0 max(abs(a/g))*1.2]);$


```
Windmph = 0:1:25; % Velocity of wind[mph]
Windfps = 1.467*Windmph;
Windmps = Windfps*0.3048;
% Calculate drift distance in metric and standard
```
 $descentTime = max(time);$

driftDistM = Windmps*descentTime; driftDistFt = Windfps*descentTime; % Plot drift distance figure(5) plot(Windmph,driftDistFt,'LineWidth', 2); ylabel('Drift Distance (ft)'); xlabel('Wind Velocity (mph)'); grid on; grid minor; title('Drift During Descent'); legend('Drift Distance (ft)'); % Output max drift distance fprintf('The drift distance at a wind velocity of 25 mph is %6.1f ft\n\n', max(driftDistFt));

The drift distance at a wind velocity of 25 mph is 2894.0 ft

KEforeSI_mat = $(1/2)*v.^2*mass(1);$ KEavSI_mat = $(1/2)*v.^2*mass(2);$ KEboostSI_mat = $(1/2)*v.^2*mass(3);$

maxKE_SI = max([max(KEforeSI_mat),max(KEavSI_mat),max(KEboostSI_mat)]);

KEforeST_mat = KEforeSI_mat*0.7376; KEavST_mat = KEavSI_mat*0.7376; KEboostST_mat = KEboostSI_mat*0.7376;

maxKE_ST = max([max(KEforeST_mat),max(KEavST_mat),max(KEboostST_mat)]);

% Calculate the KE of each component in Joules at landing KEforeSI = KEforeSI_mat(end); $KEavSI = KEavSI_matrix$ (end); $KEboostSI = KEboostSI$ mat(end);

maxLandingKE_SI = max([KEforeSI,KEavSI,KEboostSI]);

% Calculate the KE of each component in Ft-lbs at landing $KEforeST = KEforeST_mat(end);$ KEavST = KEavST_mat(end); KEboostST = KEboostST_mat(end);

maxLandingKE_ST = max([KEforeST,KEavST,KEboostST]);

figure(6) $ax13 = subplot(3,1,1);$ title('Kinetic Energy of Each Component vs. Altitude');

plot(time,KEforeST_mat,'LineWidth',2); ylabel('KE of Fore(ft-lbs)'); xlabel('Time (s)'); grid on; grid minor; axis([0 max(time) 0 maxKE_ST*1.2]);

 $ax23 = subplot(3,1,2);$ plot(time,KEavST_mat,'LineWidth',2); ylabel('KE of Middle(ft-lbs)'); xlabel('Time (s)'); grid on; grid minor; linkaxes([ax13 ax23],'x');

 $ax33 = subplot(3,1,3);$ plot(time,KEboostST_mat,'LineWidth',2); ylabel('KE of Booster(ft-lbs)'); xlabel('Time (s)'); grid on; grid minor; linkaxes([ax23 ax33],'x');

 $vf = v(end)$; % Find final landing velocity

% Print Results

fprintf('The kinetic energy of the nosecone section is %4.2f ft*lbs\n', KEforeST); fprintf('The kinetic energy of the avionics bay section is %4.2f ft*lbs\n', KEavST); fprintf('The kinetic energy of the booster section is %4.2f ft*lbs\n\n', KEboostST);

fprintf('The velocity at landing is %4.2f m/s or %4.2f ft/s \n', v(end),v(end) * 3.281);

The kinetic energy of the nosecone section is 38.96 ft*lbs The kinetic energy of the avionics bay section is 33.63 ft*lbs The kinetic energy of the booster section is 45.05 ft*lbs

The velocity at landing is 5.12 m/s or 16.80 ft/s

[Published with MATLAB® R2016a](http://www.mathworks.com/products/matlab)

9. Appendix C: Verification of OpenRocket Flight Calculations

 $D = 0.1397$; %diameter of body tube [m] R = D/2; %radius of body tube [m] $g = 9.81$; %gravity constant $[m/s^2]$ $T = 1405$; % we wave thrust of motor [N] $t = 3.63$; % motor burnout time [s]

%CALCULATIONS ----

%Center of Pressure

 $Xn = 0.466 * Ln$; %CP location for fins, from tip [m] $Xf = Xb + ((Xr*(Cr + 2*Ct))/(3*Cr + Ct)) + (1/6)*((Cr + Ct) - ((Cr*Ct)/(Cr + Ct)))$; %CP location of fins, from tip [m] $Cnf = (1+R/(S+R))*(4*N*(S/D)^{2}/(1+sqrt(1+(2*Lf/(Cr+Ct))^{2})))$; %CP of fins, from tip [m] $X = ((\text{Cnn}^*Xn + \text{Cnf}^*Xf)/(\text{Cnn} + \text{Cnf}))$; %CP location of rocket from tip [m]

%Center of Gravity

 $cg = (dn*mn + dp*mpayload + dm*mn + dd*md + db*mb)/M$; %CG location of rocket from tip [m]

%Static Stability Calculation

 $stab = (X - cg) / D$; % static stability margin [calibers]

%Apogee

%Burn Calculations

 $ma = mr + me - (mprop/2); % (average) burn mass [kg]$ A = $pi^*(R^2)$; %cross-sectional area of rocket $[m^2]$ $k = (1/2) *rho * Cd * A;$ %aerodynamic drag coefficient [kg/m] $q1 = sqrt((T - (ma * g))/k)$; %burnout velocity coefficient [m/s] $x1 = (2*k*q1)/ma$; %burnout velocity decay coefficient [1/s] $v1 = q1*((1-exp(-x1*t))/(1+exp(-x1*t)))$; % burnout velocity [m/s] $y1 = (-ma/(2*k))*log((T - (ma * g) - (k*v1)*v1))/(T-ma * g))$; %burnout altitude [m]

%Coast Calculation

 $mc = mr + me - mprop$; %coast mass [kg] $qc = sqrt((T-mc*g)/k); % coast velocity coefficient [m/s]$ $xc = ((2*k*qc)/mc)$; %coast velocity decay coefficient [1/s] vc = $qc*(1-exp(-xc*t))/(1+exp(-xc*t)))$; %coast velocity $[m/s]$ $yc = (mc/(2*k))^*log((mc*g + k*(vc^2))/(T-mc*g))$; %coast distance [m]

%Total Calculation

 $PA = y1 + abs(yc)$; %apogee [m]

%PRINT VALUES

fprintf('Center of Pressure: %2.4f inches \n', X*39.37); %print CP [in] fprintf('Center of Gravity: %2.4f inches \n', cg*39.37); %print CG [in] fprintf('Static Stability Margin: %2.4f calibers \n', stab); %print static stability margin [calibers] fprintf('Apogee: %2.4f feet $\langle n', PA^*3.281 \rangle$; %print aprogee [ft]

Attempt to execute SCRIPT fullscale_simulations as a function: C:\Users\Evan\Downloads\fullscale_simulations.m

[Published with MATLAB® R2016a](http://www.mathworks.com/products/matlab)