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The objective of this research is to develop FEM compatible methodologies to:

1) **capture** the knowledge gained in vibration tests of spacecraft and other complex structures, and then to

2) **extrapolate** this knowledge to **predict** the dynamic behavior of new designs.
Dr. Edward Stone, the previous director of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL),
told some students in the wake of the failures of two Mars spacecraft in 1999,
“The key thing is to test. Build it, test it, and test it some more.  
Because once it’s gone, it’s too late.”

But, Vibration tests of flight spacecraft are difficult to justify because they are:  
1) expensive, 2) time consuming, 3) risky, 4) late in the program, and 5) of little 
use to future programs.

• To be succeed in today’s environment of many smaller projects, the knowledge  
gained in each project must be captured, accumulated, and made available to 
new projects.

• The emphasis in the spacecraft development, design, and verification process is  
more and more on analysis. FEM is the dominant analysis tool in the structures  
area, now and in the foreseeable future.

• Extrapolation techniques are also needed to project  from vibration tests of DTM  
to flight configurations, and from flight to on-orbit configurations
Related Work

- Extrapolation techniques: Mahaffey-Smith, Burst-Himelblau, Eldred, Curtis, Barrett, Franken, etc.
- The Extrap I routine in the SEA program VAPEPS
  - Two five-element SEA templates with different parameters, one for existing system for which data were available, and the other for a future system with no data
  - The Extrap I routine used SEA theory, to extrapolate frequency response measurements from the existing system to the new system.
- FEM correlation, model updating, reconciliation, etc.
- Substitution analysis and impedance modeling
- Metamodels and response modeling (SNL and LANL)
- Data bases and tools, e.g. VISPERS and commercially available software
- Other ?????????
Two Proposed Extrapolation Approaches

I. Modal Mass Acceleration Curve Method
II. Reconciliation Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System A</th>
<th>System B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical FEM</td>
<td>Theoretical FEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental data</td>
<td>No data!!!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both approaches, ratios of experimental (x) to theoretical (t) modal parameters: natural frequency $f_n$, damping quality factor $Q_n$, and effective mass $M_n$ are extrapolated from A to B:

$$\frac{f_{nA}}{f_{nA}} \times f_{nBt} = f_{nPb}, \text{ projected values}$$
$$\frac{Q_{nA}}{Q_{nA}} \times Q_{nBt} = Q_{nPb}, \text{ "}$$
$$\frac{M_{nA}}{M_{nA}} \times M_{nBt} = M_{nPb},$$
I. Modal Mass Acceleration Curve Method

1. Plot measured normalized modal acceleration versus theoretical effective modal mass for existing system A. (The mean-square modal acceleration is used for random vibration tests.)

2. Use theoretical modal parameters for new system B to take data off the MMAC and to predict the responses of system B.

From Mile’s Eq., the mean-square modal acceleration is:

\[ E(a_n^2) = \frac{\pi}{2} S_o f_n Q_n M_n / M_{nn} \]

\[ E(a_n^2) / [ (\pi/2) S_o f_n Q_n M_o / M_{nn} ] = M_n / M_o \]

\[ E(a_n^2)_x / E(a_n^2)_t = f_{nx} / f_{nt} * Q_{nx} / Q_{nt} * M_{nx} / M_{nt} \]

where: \( a_n \) is modal acceleration, \( S_o \) is input acceleration power spectral density, \( f_n \) is the modal resonance frequency, \( Q_n \) is modal damping quality factor, \( M_n \) is modal effective mass, and \( M_{nn} \) is modal mass, which is usually normalized to unity.
Theoretical (FEM) MMAC *
Random Vibration Test of Mars Pathfinder DTM Lander
Vertical, Apex-Mount Configuration
Mary Baker, ATA, from 2001 S/C & L/V TIM

Normalized MMAC for Pathfinder
Z-Axis Vibration Test (Input: 0.0001 G^2/Hz)

Z-Axis Effective Mass Fraction (Mzn/Mo)
Random Vibration Test of Mars Pathfinder DTM Lander (Vertical, Base-Mount Configuration)
Schematic of Pathfinder DTM Lander with Mass Simulator Plates (Total Weight ~730 #)
Experimental MMAC *

Random Vibration Test of Mars Pathfinder DTM Lander
(Vertical, Base-Mount Configuration)

*Bob Coppolino, MAC

Experimentally Determined MMAC

Comparison of Measured and Reconstructed Base Apparent Mass
Comparison of Experiment and Theory
Random Vibration Test of Mars Pathfinder DTM Lander
(Vertical, Base-Mount Configuration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode*</th>
<th>So [G^2/Hz]</th>
<th>fn</th>
<th>Qn</th>
<th>Mn/Mo</th>
<th>Mode*</th>
<th>So [G^2/Hz]</th>
<th>fn</th>
<th>Qn</th>
<th>Mn/Mo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>113.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>154.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total = 0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Modes with effective mass, Mn/Mo, greater than or equal to 0.01, ordered greatest to least value of Mn/Mo.
Frequency and Damping Factors in Normalized MMAC

Ratio of Experimental to Theoretical Modal Frequencies, $\frac{f_{ex}}{f_{th}}$

Ratio of Experimental to Theoretical Modal Quality Factors, $\frac{Q_{ex}}{Q_{th}}$
Effective Mass Factor and Normalized MMAC

**Ratio of Experimental to Theoretical Modal Effective Masses, Mn**

**Experimental Mean-square Modal Acceleration**
(Normalized by Theoretical Parameters)
II. Reconciliation Method

(Method to be used to extrapolate DTM Rover/Base Vibration Test Data to the Flight Hardware Tests)

1. Calculate the ratio of measured to theoretical modal parameters (frequency, damping, and effective mass) for an existing system A.

2. Reconcile the measured and theoretical modal parameters of system A by changing the physical mass and stiffness matrices.

3. Project the system A measurements to system B by multiplying the aforementioned ratios of unreconciled system A modal parameters by the theoretical values for system B.

4. Reconcile the projected and theoretical modal parameters of system B by changing it’s mass and stiffness matrices in a manner similar to that which reconciled system A.

5. Use the reconciled model of system B to predict it’s responses.
Mars Exploration Rover (MER) Development Test Model (DTM) Rover/Base Petal Vibration Test
Mars Exploration Rover (MER) Development Test Model (DTM) Rover/Base Petal Vibration Test Data

Cross-Axis (Y) Response of MiniTES Instrument Mass Simulator
Vibration Test of Mars Exploration Rover (MER) Flight Spacecraft #1
Measured and Predicted Frequencies of Fundamental Vibration Modes of MER1 Spacecraft

**Vertical Axis** -- Force/Acceleration
- Measured -- 48 Hz
- Predicted -- 40 Hz

**Lateral Axes** -- Force/Acceleration X
- Measured -- 16 Hz X & 17 Hz Y
- Predicted -- 14 Hz X & Y

Predicted Frequencies were ~20% too low, primarily because stiffness of face sheets of composite panels was neglected.
Mars Exploration Rover (MER) Base Petal
Inadvertent 20 G Pulse During HESSI Quasi-static Load Test
HESSI Spacecraft Over Test Incident
Vertical Vibration Test of GRACE Spacecraft
(Cross-Axis Coupling of Two Spacecraft)
GALEX Spacecraft Vibration Tests

Telescope Vibration Test

Instrument Vibration Test
GALEX Spacecraft Vibration Test Analyses and Data

Full Level FEM Analyses

Low Level Test data
Conclusions

- "Interpolation is dangerous; extrapolation is insane."
- Two techniques for extrapolating vibration test data have been proposed, one based on the MMAC and the other based on reconciliation.
- A hybrid MMAC approach was investigated using an FEM model and data for a vibration test of the MARS Pathfinder DTM Lander, and the results using effective mass and frequency scaling were poor. Mode Shape?
- The reconciliation approach is more rational and takes advantage of conventional model updating techniques, but it is complex.
- The reconciliation approach will be evaluated using vibration test data obtained on the DTM and Flight MER Rover/Base-Petals
- MER Spacecraft Vibration Test Showed Value of Base Drive Modal Testing
- HESSI Incident Resulted from Applying New Technology in Old Facilities
- GRACE Spacecraft Test Showed Modal Coupling not in Analyses
- GALEX Spacecraft Vibration Test Showed High Internal and Modal Coupling Damping