

AD-A084 006

GOULD INC GLEN BURNIE MD CHESAPEAKE INSTRUMENT DIV
DEPLOY/RETRIEVE STORAGE SYSTEM (DRSS) VOLUME II. PART I. COMPON--ETC(U)
JAN 80


F/G 13/10.1


N00039-79-C-0329

NL

UNCLASSIFIED

1 of 2
AD-A084 006






MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

DEPLOY/RETRIEVE STORAGE SYSTEM (DRSS)

VOLUME II

COMPONENT LEVEL DEFINITION AND TRADEOFF ANALYSIS

ADA084006



LEVEL

DTIC

MAY 9 1980

SUBMITTED TO:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
NAVAL ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS COMMAND
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20360

IN RESPONSE TO:

CONTRACT NO. N00039-79-C-0329

SUBMITTED BY:

GOULD ➔

CHESAPEAKE INSTRUMENT DIVISION
6711 BAYMEADOW DRIVE
GLEN BURNIE, MARYLAND 21061

This document has been approved
for public release and sale; its
distribution is unlimited.

80 3 21 112

GOULD 

①

DEPLOY/RETRIEVE STORAGE SYSTEM (DRSS)
CONCEPT STUDY FINAL REPORT
VOLUME II, Part 1,



SUBMITTED TO:

Department of the Navy
Naval Electronic Systems Command, ELEX 3102
Washington, D. C. 20360


IN RESPONSE TO:

Contract No. N00039-79-C-0329
June 1979 through January 1980

SUBMITTED BY:

Gould Inc.
Chesapeake Instrument Division
6711 Baymeadow Drive
Glen Burnie, MD 21061

Report Number 1 January 31, 1980



AD-17084006

GOULD ➔

-ERRATA SHEETS-
DRSS PHASE 1A FINAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The following errata sheets contain the Gould, CID response to preliminary NUSC review comments of the DRSS Phase 1A Final Report. There are no changes required to either the conclusions and/or recommendations as a result of the corrections listed herein. The Appendices have not been reviewed.

The format for tabulation of the corrections follows the sequence of volume and section number, with references to the page on which the comments were made. A brief summary opposite the page number highlights the NUSC comment, with an explanation provided under the comments providing the Gould, CID response.

For additional questions and/or clarifications please contact the undersigned.



William R. Richards
DRSS Project Engineer
Gould, CID
(301)760-3100 ext. 331

AD-A084006

VOLUME II - SECTION 1

- p 10 -- para 4 Change 8.8 PSI to 8.33 pounds/inch (Error in original DRSS Proposal).
- p 13 -- para 5(a) 0.5 to 6.0 represents the entire dynamic range required for the transfer mechanism. For requirements only, change 6.0 to 4.0 inches.
- p 15 -- para 1.1.4.1 Characterized (typo)
- p 22 -- item (1) Failsafe?
- Refer to Vol I, p 25 para 3.2.3 explanation.
- Cable Lengths susceptible to buckling?
- The outboard dynamic seal, is by its definition, outboard, i.e., -- outboard of the staging tube.
- item (3) Zero slippage?
- There can be no slippage as long as the relationship between input/output tension across the deploy/retrieve mechanism is less than that possible due to the coupling mechanism (grip) vs the effective coefficient of friction.
- p 24 Figure 1.1.5.4 Highly adaptable to varying cable diameters? (Figure 1.1.5.1a)
- A passive loading technique readily adapts to the minimum cable diameter via "spring applied" operation, with its dynamic range capability established by the stroke range of the articulation mechanism. Refer to Appendix A.
- two point squeeze?
- Two-point squeeze is an analogy of a traction belt type system. A high normal force is required perpendicular to the cable axis of motion.
- Maintenance is difficult?
- Belt replacement will probably be mandatory at normal maintenance intervals due to its potentially low MCBF. Accessibility will be highly restricted, for the configuration depicted.
- Highly adaptable to varying cable diameters? (Figure 1.1.5.1(b))
- Refer to Appendix B.

-- Requires 60 Pinch Roller Assemblies?

Refer to Appendix C.

p 26 -- para 1.2.2

Change the following:

Mean Value from 31.95 to 32.42

Std. Dev. from 1.60 to 1.38

Ranking:

33.57 -- no change

32.97 -- to 32.99

32.73 -- no change

30.48 -- to 30.42

30.00 -- to 30.53

and reverse positions of Traction Belt and Laminar Fluid,
with Traction Belt being ranked 3rd (along with Laminar
Fluid)

p 27 -- Figure 1.2.1(a)

Delete all *

p 28 -- Figure 1.2.1(b)

Delete all *

and change the following:

Subtotals --

21.48 to 27.26

23.79 to 29.53

24.57 to 29.16

27.00 to 23.53

23.73 to 26.63

Grand totals --

30.48 to 30.42

32.97 to 32.99

33.57 to no change

30.00 to 30.53

32.73 to 30.73

VOLUME II - SECTION 2

p 36 -- para 2.1.5.3(2)

Change Section 1, para 1.1.5.3.1 to para 1.1.5.3.

p 38 -- para 2.2.2

Change the following:

Mand Value = 28.34 to 29.09

Std. Dev. = 5.48 to 6.41

34.99 -- no change

32.05 -- 34.05

25.20 -- no change

21.12 -- to 22.12

p 39 -- Figure 2.2.1(a)

Under RIO, the (*) signifies that a limited number of antenna elements in the BCA are required -- less than for either CHETSA or Barrel Stuffing

p 40 -- Figure 2.2.1(b)

Under R5, change .2 to 2

Under R8, change .2 to 2

Subtotals --

28.99 to 28.82

22.20 to 21.14

18.12 to 18.77

26.05 to 28.44

Grand totals --

34.99 -- no change

25.20 -- no change

21.12 to 22.12

32.05 to 34.05

VOLUME II -- SECTION 3, PART 1

- p 48 -- para 3.1.1.5.1 ID $\geq$ 4 inches
- p 49 -- para 3.1.1.5.2(2)&(3) Rigid, leakproof joints required at > 1500 Psid for Pressure Hull Penetration Point and Seal and Valves?

NUSC comment - not necessary. CID must request clarification of this comment.

- para 3.1.1.5.3 Large dia. impacts on BCA buckling?

There is a direct relationship between conduit bore to BCA diameter which determines susceptibility to buckling.

- p 59 -- para 3.1.2.2(h) Change the following:

20 knots to 15 knots
3535#f to 2200#f
1.492 to 1.874

- p 60 Figure 3.1.2.2(f) Change the following:

HP = 1.481X ($\mu=.25$)	HP = 1.874X ($\mu=.40$)	HP = 2.372X ($\mu=.55$)
26.92	34.07	43.12
40.39	51.10	64.68
53.85	68.14	86.25
35.90	45.43	57.50
53.85	68.14	86.25
71.80	90.85	114.99
44.87	56.78	71.87
67.31	85.17	107.81
89.75	113.56	143.74
53.85	68.14	86.25
80.77	102.21	129.37
107.70	136.28	172.49

- p 61 -- Figure 3.1.2.2(g) Disregard figure, use new data above.

- p 62 -- Figure 3.1.2.2(h) Change the following:

1.492X to 1.874X
5000#f to 4.25#f & 30.30 to 25.00
48.6 HP reqd. to 50.37 HP reqd.
20 knots to 15 knots
1739#f to 1925#f
553#f to 613#f/linear foot

p 63 -- para 3.1.2.2(j)

Change the following:

1739#f to 1925#f
10.54 HP to 11.67 HP
10.54 HP to 11.67 HP
446.9 BTUs/Min to 494.6 BTUs/Min

p 64 -- para 3.1.2.2(j) cont.

Change the following:

63.8 BTUs/Min to 70.73 BTUs/Min
5.1°F to 5.5°F

Figure Q_{gen} 446.9 to 494.6

p 65 -- para 3.1.2.2(j) cont.

Change the following:

383.2 BTUs/Min to 423.9 BTUs/Min
1231°F/Min to 1362.2°F/Min
446.9 BTUs/Min to 494.6 BTUs/Min
10.30°F to 11.40°F
10.30°F to 11.40°F
<10.30°F to <11.40°F

VOLUME II -- SECTION 3, PART 2

p 69 -- para 3.2.1.2

---6.5 inches?

Explanation -- only if the valve(s) under discussion are inboard of the dynamic seal. Only the Failsafe Shutoff Valve (FSV) must achieve this requirement. However, it is desirable that both the Hull Valve (HV) and FSV be similar/or identical, with the FSV being the "second" valve required for SUBSAFE conditions.

p 73 -- para 3.2.1.5.3(1)

Add ". . . equal to that of the pressure only as far as the Hull Insert."

VOLUME II - SECTION 3, PART 3

p 85 -- para 3.3.1.1

Leakage values too high?

Explanation -- an engineering design assumption only. Testing is essential in order to verify any values.

-- para 3.3.1.2

Delete the words "without" and "and."

p 86 -- para 3.3.1.2

Change 8.8#/in.² to 4.08#/in.²

p 90 -- para 3.3.1.5.3

Conduit/Guide Tube?

Explanation -- There will be Conduit/Guide Tube both inboard and outboard of the Pressure Hull insert. Perhaps a redefinition for the inboard portion could be to call it all part of the staging tube subsystem.

p 92 -- para 3.3.2.2

Change the following:

Mean Value = 28.04 to 29.18

Std. Dev. = 1.60 to 2.72

30.74 -- 33.08

28.31 -- 28.64

27.33 -- 28.23

25.78 -- 26.79

p 93 -- Figure 3.3.2(a)

Change the following:

R9, 11, & 14, add arrows between #s.

p 94 -- Figure 3.3.2(b)

Change the following:

R3 -- .33 to .66; .66 to 2, 1 to 2, & .33 to 1.33

R6 -- under fixed -2 Posn., Split -- change .66 to 2

Subtotals:

22.31 to 22.67

22.78 to 20.77

27.74 to 24.33

21.33 to 22.65

Grand totals:

28.31 to 28.64

25.78 to 26.79

30.74 to 33.08

27.33 to 28.23

VOLUME II -- SECTION 4

- p 101 -- Figure 4.1.4.1 Does not show method to prevent rotation of the articulated bellmouth?
- Explanation: Rotational forces are very low, with pivoting forces far greater. If rotation cannot be prevented, the contour geometry would have to be uniform. Further definition will be required, although this is not foreseen as a high risk item.
- p 104 -- para 4.2.2(1)i Delete . . . and a load of 6205.2#f.
- para 4.2.2(1)iii Change the following:
- .530 to .64⁰/3⁰ x 2 in. + 2 in. or
(.353 linear inches to 2.427 linear inches)
.088 in.² to .608 in.²
785.3 psi to 114.33 psi
5.20 psi to 14.72 psi
- p 105 -- para 4.2.2(2)ii Change the following:
- Delete . . . X2
- Add +2 in after 1.06⁰/3⁰ x 2"
- Change .707 to 2.707 and
378.7#f/linear ft to 98.85#f/linear ft
- p 116 -- R20, Single Drum Capstan -- Confusing?
- Explanation -- comparison of various hydraulic vs electric drive options, i.e., 1 ea. Hagglund 3160 hyd. motor vs either 7 ea. PMI 3/2.5 or 4 ea. PMI 3/2.5 pressure compensated fluid-filled electric motors. An additional option would be a single 6/4.5 PMI pressure compensated electric motor.
- p 121 Asterisk -- signifies reference to previous traction belt optimization
- p 125 Laminar Fluid (6) Change +1 to +2
- p 127 Laminar Fluid (3) 1000 psi (best)?
- Explanation -- This loading is absolutely uniform and is very similar to the pressure imposed due to ambient sea pressure.
- p 128 Laminar Fluid -- (2 psi)?
- Explanation -- contribution of imposed shear loading due to fluid pressure required to generate a driving force.
- p 129 -- R3, Clamp Traction Change +AdB to +3AdB

p 133-R5

Change the following:

302 psi to 906 psi
3 ft to 1.5 ft for all references
100 psi to 302 psi

The tradeoff chart figure 2.2.2(a) 8(b) must be changed to reflect this adjustment. The relative advantage does not change, nor does the results of the Tradeoff Analysis.

p 142 -- R7

Change 1.636 to .136 ft.

p 154 -- R1

Closed?

Explanation — closed implies engaged about the cable periphery.

— R9,10,11&14

Change AQ to Q.

p 147 -- Inherent Reliability (*)?

Explanation — the bullet above should be an asterisk and the Severity Factor statement should be a footnote.



Distribution List for Final Report
Deploy/Retrieve/Storage System (DRSS)
Contract N00039-79-C-0329

Copies

Department of Defense Agencies

Defense Documentation Center
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22209
Attn: TC

2

Department of the Navy

Commander
Naval Electronic Systems Command
Washington, D. C. 20360

Attn: ELEX 3102
PME 107-133
PME 117-20
PME 117-21
PME 117-22
PME 117-23

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DDC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	<i>for</i>
<i>its on file</i>	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Available for special
<i>A</i>	

2
1
1
1
1

Commander
Naval Sea Systems Command
Washington, D C 20362
Attn: NAVSEA 611 (A. Coscarelli)
NAVSEA 921 (P. Hixon)
PMS 393A2
PMS 3931
PMS 3961 (R. Snyder)

2
2
1
1
1

Commander
Naval Ocean Systems Center
San Diego, CA 92152
Attn: Code 813

2

Commanding Officer
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D C 20375
Attn: Code 7554 (Dale Long)

2

Officer-In-Charge
David W. Taylor Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Annapolis Lab
Annapolis, MD 21402
Attn: Code 2842 (J. I. Schwartz)

2

Officer-In-Charge
David W. Taylor Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Carderock Lab
Bethesda, MD 20034
Attn: Code 1548 (B. Webster)

2

Department of the Navy

Officer-In-Charge
Naval Underwater Systems Center
New London Lab
New London, CT 06320
Attn: Code 3493

6

TABLE OF CONTENTS**VOLUME II - COMPONENT DEFINITION AND TRADEOFF ANALYSIS**

	<u>Page</u>
1 SUMMARY	1
2 INTRODUCTION	6
3 SECTION 1 - DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM STUDY	8
4 SECTION 2 - CABLE STORAGE STUDY	30
5 SECTION 3 - CABLE GUIDE STUDY	42
6 SECTION 4 - TOW/EXIT POINT STUDY	96
7 SECTION 5 - EVALUATION CRITERIA ANALYSIS	106

VOLUME II - COMPONENT DEFINITION AND TRADEOFF ANALYSIS**SUMMARY**

This volume has been prepared as part of the DRSS Final Report. This volume documents the analysis and optimization efforts performed at the component level, and provides the basis for analysis and optimization efforts performed at the system level in Vol. I.

This volume addresses the four key study areas:

Section 1 - Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism

Section 2 - Cable Storage

Section 3 - Cable Guide

Section 4 - Tow/Exit Point

The Antenna Assembly electrical/mechanical performance characteristics and interface requirements are defined where pertinent to the analysis in each section.

Technical objectives of the study efforts are (1) to support the conceptual design and perform tradeoff analysis of a DRSS which shall payout, retrieve and stow present and future buoyant cable antenna assemblies while the submarine is submerged; (2) meet specified Requirements and Goals per Statement of Work (SOW) paragraphs 3.2.2 and 3.2.3; (3) ascertain ranking of component concept configurations via specified tradeoff priorities per SOW paragraph 3.3; and (4) implement Design to Cost considerations per paragraph 3.4.

The requirements for developing a DRSS concept and addressing the technical objectives were:

1. The system shall be positive self-sealing under all conditions at all external interfaces to maximum depth of the submarine.

2. The system shall be capable of shearing the antenna assembly and completely sealing the pressure hull boundary.
3. The structureborne and airborne noise (within one (1) foot of any portion of the DRSS), at all payout/retrieval speeds shall not exceed the levels specified in NUSC drawings SKA-55250 and SKA-55251 respectively.
4. The antenna assembly including all antenna elements and in-line devices shall be deployed and totally retrieved while the submarine is submerged at all depths.
5. The system shall not exert excessive compressive, torsional bending or tensile loading within the DRSS.
6. Typically, the system shall be installed within the confines of the existing superstructure of SSN 637 and 688 submarine and compatible with SSBN submarines.
7. The total volume of the DRSS shall not exceed 85 cubic feet.
8. The deploy, retrieve mechanism and storage portion of the DRSS shall be accessible for repair/maintenance while the submarine is submerged.
9. The in-line connectors, electronic and housing connectors shall be similar to that shown on NUSC drawing D-02387-001, D-02386-001 and D-02378-001 but may vary in diameter according to the cable utilized. The maximum length shall not exceed 6 ft. in length and 1.0 inch in diameter. Minimum requirement length is 12 inches and 0.650 ± 0.025 inches in diameter.
10. The cable construction and materials shall be similar to buoyant cables specified in NUSC Specification NUSC-C-342/4141-279.
11. The antenna elements associated with the antenna assembly shall not exceed 6 ft. in length and 6 inches in diameter. Minimum requirement is 4 ft. long and 4 inches in diameter.

12. The antenna assembly length shall not exceed 5,000 ft. based on a nominal cable diameter of 0.650 inches. Minimum requirement is 3,000 ft. with a cable diameter of 0.650 inches.
13. The maximum static tensile loading at the tow point shall not exceed 10,000 lbs. Minimum requirement is 6,000 lbs.
14. The cable diameter shall be 0.650 to ± 0.020 inches in diameter.
15. The maximum payout/retrieval speed of the DRSS shall not be less than 200 fpm.
16. The DRSS shall be capable of sustaining a minimum dynamic loading of 3,000 lbs.
17. The cable deployed shall be measured and indicated to within ± 5 feet.
18. The DRSS system shall not require more than 2 persons with technical ratings to operate/control the deploy/retrieve and storage.
19. The total weight of the DRSS including foundations, controls, etc. shall not exceed 3500 lbs.
20. The maximum power available within the pressure hull or superstructure for DRSS utilization is assumed to be the following:
Hydraulic - 3000 psi with max. flow rate of 30 gpm
Electrical - 220/440 VAC-60 Hz with 300/150 amps Results of the studies made indicate the following:

The goals for developing the DRSS concept(s) and tradeoff analysis were:

1. A design goal of the DRSS is to be compatible with cable which can vary in diameter between 0.50 and 1.00 inches. The diameter would remain constant with ± 0.025 inches for relatively long lengths of cable. The specific gravity of the cable could be between 0.60 and 0.75 of 0/psi hydrostatic pressure for all cable diameters specified.
2. A design goal is to provide the DRSS with a capability to payout and retrieve cable at speeds not less than 400 fpm.

3. As a design goal, the maximum dynamic tensile loading the DRSS shall sustain is 6000 lbs. at maximum cable retrieval speeds.
4. A design goal of the DRSS is to measure the amount of cable paid out to within ± 1 foot.
5. A design goal of the DRSS system is operation/control of deploy/retrieve/storage by one person with a technician rating.

In developing the DRSS concept(s) the order of priorities for tradeoff studies was:

1. Performance based on achieving the maximum number of design goals.
2. Installation impact on available space and weight within the existing superstructure.
3. Per unit cost based on achieving the maximum number of design goals.

The goal of a moderate cost DRSS is an essential part of this program. The cost was considered when performing tradeoff analysis of the concept(s) including the individual subsystems. Cost goals were based on FY 79 dollars, assuming quantities (by year) shown in Table 1. The quantities shown were established for tradeoff analysis only, and do not indicate actual plans or intent for procurement of production units. The design to cost goals were:

DRSS Production Cost	- \$175K
Installation Cost	- \$200K

Table 1

	1985	1986	1987	1988
DRSS (SSN and SSBN)	10	30	30	50 - 70

Results of the studies made indicate the following:

1. a. It is conceptually feasible, at the component level, to meet all specified Requirements.
- b. Achievement of all design goals is also possible with the following qualifications:
 - Envelope and weight allocations will increase in order to meet the dynamic load goal for the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism.

This is due to the tractive length increase required to meet the increased dynamic load. Improved shear stress capability of the buoyant cable assembly (BCA) would eliminate this increase. Refer to Section 1 for a detailed discussion.
 - If both payout/retrieval speed and dynamic load capability are considered as mutual goals, the hydraulic power available will limit one or the other.
 - Structureborne/Airborne noise generation at design goal payout/retrieval speeds dictates stringent limitations on feasible component configurations for the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism.
2. A statistically significant difference separates the relative ranking of component configurations analyzed for the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism, Storage Assembly, and Dynamic Seal via a matrix tradeoff chart. The highest ranking components are integrated at the systems level to develop a recommended system concept configuration which can meet the technical objectives defined by the SOW. (Vol. I presents details of this analysis.)

INTRODUCTION

This volume is the second of two submitted as a Final Report of the DRSS study effort. The four key study areas are: (1) Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism; (2) Cable Storage; (3) Cable Guide and (4) Tow/Exit Point.

The Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism study, Section 1, provides definition, configuration, characterization and evaluation criteria tradeoff analysis based upon the specified Requirements and Goals, and additional CID evaluation criteria as listed in the Tradeoff Summary Chart. Five separate and distinct approaches to development of Deploy/Retrieve Mechanisms are analyzed, rank established, and recommendations made.

The Cable Storage study, Section 2, provides an identical approach to that of the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism, with four separate and distinct approaches developed. Characterization, analysis, relative ranking, and recommendations are similarly provided.

The Cable Guide study, Section 3, is broken down into three parts: (1) Conduit/Guide Tube characterization, analysis and recommendations; (2) a Valves discussion with recommendations; (3) a dynamic seals definition for four separate and distinct configurations, characterizations and tradeoff analysis employing evaluation criteria based upon the specified Requirements and Goals, and additional CID evaluation criteria. Ranking is established and recommendations made.

The Tow/Exit Point study, Section 4, provides definition, characterization, analysis, and a recommended configuration.

Design to Cost considerations have been established at the component level via a hardware cost and factored at the system level to generate a Unit Production Cost allocation for each of the System Concepts evaluated. Relative development costs and installation costs are addressed and integrated at the System Concept level.

Each study section provides the following information:

Introduction

- Definition
- Problem Areas
- Requirements
- Analytical Approach
- Candidates

The introduction to each of the studies specifically addresses those Requirements and Goals pertinent to the candidates addressed in each of the individual studies.

Discussion

- Analysis/Tradeoff Summary Chart(s) Explanation
- Ranking Summary
- Analysis of Results
- Recommendations

The discussion for each of the studies addresses the tradeoffs/analysis employed to generate the recommendations. Where required, matrix tradeoff charts are employed to support the discussion. These tradeoff charts are themselves supported by an evaluation criteria analysis (ECA) which provides a brief summary description of the methodology employed in generating the numerical assessment presented in the Tradeoff Chart. The ECA refers to supporting Appendices as the basis for all characterizations made.




TABLE OF CONTENTS**VOLUME II, SECTION I, DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM STUDY**

	<u>Page</u>
1.1 INTRODUCTION	9
1.1.1 Definition	9
1.1.2 Problem Areas	9
1.1.3 Requirements	13
1.1.4 Analytical Approach	15
1.1.5 Candidates	16
1.1.5.1 Selection	16
1.1.5.2 Discussion	16
1.1.5.3 Interfaces	16
1.1.5.4 Pros & Cons Summary	23
1.2 DISCUSSION	26
1.2.1 Tradeoff Summary Chart(s) Figures 1.2.1(a) and 1.2.1(b) Explanation	26
1.2.2 Ranking Summary	26
1.2.3 Analysis of Results	26
1.2.4 Recommendations	29

SECTION 1

DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Definition

1.1.1.1 The Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism is a mechanical device for paying out and retrieving the antenna assembly while the submarine is submerged. The present buoyant cable antenna systems include either the AN/BRA-24 or the AN/BRA-18 antenna transfer assemblies. The AN/BRA-24A is identified in NAVSEA Technical Manual 0967-LP-301-2010, AN/BRA-24C in NAVSEA Technical Manual 0967-LP-608-5010 and the AN/BRA-18C in NAVSHIPS Technical Manual 0967-LP-325-8010.

1.1.1.2 The concept(s) shall develop a system/method for deploying and retrieving present and future antenna assemblies at maximum tow speed and cable lengths. The concept shall utilize power available onboard the submarine. The deploy/retrieval mechanism shall be compatible with all in-line components, cables and antenna assemblies.

1.1.2 Problem Areas

1.1.2.1 The present system has the following major problem areas; exerts excessive compressive, bending, torsional and tensile forces on in-line electronic, connectors and antenna assemblies developed for present and future antennas, restricts the development of future antennas and associated components, requires extensive effort for maintainability, requires a bend radius of 6" on in-line electronics and associated components; introduces excessive structureborne noise; requires excessive manpower/effort to deploy/retrieve antenna assemblies; and does not accurately determine amount of cable deployed.

1.1.2.2 From the above, we infer that the transfer mechanism has been responsible for existing buoyant cable antenna (BCA) handling system failures and antenna/cable damage.

Part of the problem appears to stem from the detail mechanism design. However, inherent in the concept of the AN/BRA-24 is the problem associated with bending the cable/antenna assembly connectors and amplifiers around a small diameter drum. In the DRSS system, the requirement to incorporate antenna elements from 4.0 to 6.0 inches in diameter will aggravate these problems.

The proposed DRSS system concepts described in paragraph 1.1.5, define mechanisms which can be automatically adapted to BCA diameter changes and can readily handle these longer, larger diameter sections without inflicting degrading bending stresses.

Since the present antenna/cable assembly is specified at 100 pounds shear/linear foot, any transfer mechanism or wiper type seal must be limited to less than this tension applied per foot of length in order to prevent damage to the antenna. This means that a capstan or traction device can only apply 100 pounds/ft pull. It is therefore possible to relate the length of antenna which must be subjected to retrieval tension to the retrieval ship's speed and retrieval rate. Figure 1.1.2.2(a) relates the traction length to ship's speeds for inhaul speeds of 200 FPM and 400 FPM. The values are obtained by adding inhaul speed to ship's speed, determining the equivalent drag from Figure 1.1.2.2(b), applying the multiplication factor for conduit bends derived in paragraph 3.1.1.2 and dividing by 100 pounds/ft.

The shear strength of 100 pounds/linear foot amounts to 8.33 pounds/inch. More than this loading could pull the jacket off of the antenna. Therefore, traction treads or wiper seals of rubber with coefficient of friction 1.0 cannot press against the jacket with more than 8.8 PSI when the antenna is being moved.

Based on 100 lbs/foot cable shear strength and the requirement that the transfer mechanism be capable of pulling with 3000 pound dynamic force on the antenna, the traction length must be $\frac{3000}{100} = 30$ feet. This is equivalent to 2.4 wraps around a 4 foot diameter capstan. This conflict of the dynamic force requirement and the available space




Figure 1.1.2.2(a). Required Traction Length for 1.0 Inch Diameter Cable With 100 lb/ft Shear Strength




Figure 1.1.2.2(b). Drag Versus Speed in Knots for Various Antenna Configurations

for the transfer mechanism could be mitigated by an improvement in the antenna/cable shear strength. For example, if the shear strength is increased by a factor of 7 to 700 lbs/foot, the required traction length drops to 4.3 feet for a linear traction device.

Relating the above to ship speed, Figure 1.1.2.2(a) shows that for a ship speed of 5 knots, a cable retrieval speed of 200 feet per minute, and a 3000 long antenna, the required traction length is about 7.5 feet.

The above analysis indicates that the traction length will be a major factor in transfer mechanism tradeoffs. The capstan concept provides the greatest traction length in a small convenient geometrical package, however, bending stresses induced on the antenna/cable assembly components are a serious disadvantage for bend radii less than two feet.

A tractor tread concept similar to the BRA-18 transfer assembly is most advantageous from an antenna/cable handling standpoint but suffers from the greater length necessary to achieve the required retrieval force.

The details of this tradeoff are generated in the discussion. The important requirements for the transfer mechanism are it:

- a. Must automatically adapt to accommodate BCA diameters from 0.5 to 6.0 inches.
- b. Must have sufficient traction length to apply 3000 lbs. of retrieval force to the cable/antenna without damage.
- c. Must have sufficiently gentle bend radius to handle the antenna/cable components without applying damaging bending and torsional forces.

1.1.3 Requirements

1.1.3.1 The allocated Requirements and Goals to the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism are as shown in Figure 1.1.3.1.1. Additional CID evaluation criteria which were employed are:

- a. No. of Components - determine relative complexity.
 - b. Inherent Reliability - determine a characteristic MTBF.
 - c. Development Cost - determine relative budgetary cost estimate to produce a working prototype including drawings.
-

GOULD  GOULD INC. CHESAPEAKE INSTRUMENT DIVISION		DRSS SOW REQUIREMENTS/GOALS ALLOCATION TO COMPONENT LEVEL	
COMPONENT	REQUIREMENTS	GOALS	
• TON/EXIT POINT	4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16	1, 2, 3	
• CABLE GUIDE -			
- CONDUIT	4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16		
- SEALS & VALVES	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 18	1	
- CABLE/ANTENNA ELEMENT			
SHEAR DEVICE	1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 20		
• DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM	3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20	1, 2, 3, 5	
• STORAGE ASSEMBLY	1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20	1, 2, 3, 5	
• SENSORS	1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17	1, 2, 3, 4	
• CONTROLS	3, 6, 15, 17, 18, 20	2, 3, 4, 5	
• POWER SOURCE	3, 6, 8, 15, 16, 20	2, 3	
• ANTENNA/RF INTERFACE	1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17	2, 3, 4	

NOTE: (1) REQUIREMENTS #7 & 19 ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE.

Figure 1.1.3.1.1. DRSS SOW Requirements/Goals Allocation to Component Level

- d. Cable Contact Efficiency - characterized determination of cable handling method, and the consequent potential degree of impact on the cable structure geometry.
- e. Friction Dependence - evaluation of the susceptibility of performance degradation based on environmental friction characteristics variability vs a minimum friction required by the particular mechanism to transmit energy into the cable assembly system.
- f. Fatigue/Wear Impact - characterized determination of the cable handling method, and the consequent impact on cable structure failure.
- g. Producibility - relative estimate of degree of difficulty in fabrication/assembly and qualification test of the particular mechanism analyzed.

1.1.3.2 All allocated Requirements/Goals and CID evaluation criteria are employed to determine the relative ranking of the component configurations analyzed, in Tradeoff Summary Chart(s), Figures 1.2.1(a) and 1.2.1(b).

1.1.4 Analytical Approach

1.1.4.1 Each candidate component configuration is analyzed/characterized, to the extent necessary, to support the generation of numerical values which can be employed in the tradeoff summary charts for assessment of the degree to which each evaluation criteria can be met. Separate Appendices A through E provide the basis for all characterizations made for the particular component analyzed. An evaluation criteria analysis, Section 5, provides a brief summary description of the methodology employed in generating the numerical assessment values presented in the Tradeoff Summary Chart Figure 1.2.1(a). Data presented in this chart is normalized and weighted in order to establish the relative ranking of each of the candidates, and is shown in Tradeoff Summary Chart Figure 1.2.1(b). A ranking summary, analysis of results, and recommendations are made in paragraphs 1.2.2, 1.2.3, and 1.2.4 respectively, based upon the data presented in Figure 1.2.1(b).

1.1.5 Candidates


1.1.5.1 A review of the present BRA-24 and BRA-18 buoyant cable antenna handling system capabilities and problem areas, analysis of the SOW Requirements and Goals, and comparison to existing technology and hardware adaptable to application as a Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism, has resulted in the selection of five possible candidates. They are as follows:

<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Closest Analogy/ Similarity</u>	<u>Refer to Figure</u>	<u>Refer to Analysis</u>
• Linear Traction	BRA-18	Fig. 1.1.5.1(a)	Appendix A
• Clamp Traction	Pultrusion, Mech.	Fig. 1.1.5.1(b)	Appendix B
• Single Drum Capstan	BRA-24 & CHETSA	Fig. 1.1.5.1(c)	Appendix C
• Laminar Fluid	Pultrusion, Fluidic	Fig. 1.1.5.1(d)	Appendix D
• Direct Windup	AN/SQR-19	Fig. 1.1.5.1(e)	Appendix E

1.1.5.2 Each candidate operates on a different principle, with characteristics unique to the cable handling technique employed. The configurations depicted are idealized concepts which establish the basis for analytical characterizations in the respective Appendices A through E. Each Appendix includes a concept configuration layout, description, operating explanation, considerations made in the analysis, and where required, references to Appendices F through I which support the study effort characterizations.

1.1.5.3 The Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism interfaces with the following:


- Valves and Seals
- Storage Assembly
- Sensors
- Controls
- Conduit/Guide Tube
- Power Source



IDEALIZED LINEAR TRACTION DEVICE

Rev. A. J. 10/10/79
W. R. Richards

Figure 1.1.5.1(a). Idealized Linear Traction Device



Rev. A. 10/14/79
W. F. RICHMOND

Figure 1.1.5.1(b). Idealized Clamp Traction Device




Figure 1.1.5.1(c). Idealized Single Drum Capstan




- (13) The Vertical Teller Shave was found to be resistant if the Direct Wind-up Assembly were oriented vertically.
- (14) Accel/Decel, Cable Pin Sensor Vls. not shown.

IDEALIZED DIRECT WINDUP ASSEMBLY

Rev. A. 10/29/79 W.P. LEMMONS

Figure 1.1.5.1(e). Idealized Direct Windup Assembly



- $DRAG, \#_f/FT = \frac{C_D \rho Vel^2 A_{CABLE}}{2 g_c} / LINEAR FT.$
- $\Delta P, \#_f/FT^2 = \frac{2.15 \times 10^{-4} \times f \times \rho \times L \times Q^2}{d_{HYD}^5}$
- $d_{HYD} = D_2 - D_1$
- *FLUID Viscosity* $\geq 10,000$ *cs*

Figure 1.1.5.1(d). Idealized Laminar Fluid Drive

Interface Requirements Discussion

(1) Valves and Seals:

Valves

Fail Safe Static Seal and Manual Static Seal

Due to the valve bore clearance required for 4" OD Antenna Elements w/.65 Dia. cable, the unsupported cable length susceptible to buckling prior to insertion into the dynamic seal assembly equals the cable path length from the last point of contact of the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism to the Fail Safe Static Seal Valve plus bore path lengths of the two valves.

Seals

Dynamic Cable Seal Assembly

Pushing of the cable end through the seal will require capability to overcome a 60 → 200#f cable buckling force generated against the cable end by seawater ambient pressures from 0 → 600 psid operating conditions.

(2) Storage Assembly:

The cable assembly must be capable of being completely removed from the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism and being stored on the Storage Assembly.

The cable assembly must be under tension at all times for Deploy/Retrieve operation.

(3) Sensors:

Cable Scope

Employ RPMs count to achieve high accuracy, assuming zero slippage.

Speed Control

Employ pressure compensated, directional, servo flow control valving w/meter out flow regulation for single drive applications; and for multiple stage synchronization employ manifold assembly similar to

HPIs MCV-ISO System for independent simultaneous operation for up to 10 separate drive assemblies.

The PMI solid state brushless Torque Ring motor will require Hall Effect position sensors and/or encoders for input current gating.

(4) Controls:

If Hydraulic

Subplate Manifold Assembly required to interface control/status information for a Control/Indication Panel.

If Electric

A servo-controller w/DC Power Supply is required to interface to (1) Solid State Drive and (a) to a Control/Indication Panel.

- (5) Conduit/Guide Tube: Assure that cable containment is maintained during deployment from the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism discharge point to the first inline valve or seal assembly.

- (6) Power Source: Hydraulic or Electric, refer to (3) above for speed control discussion. Refer to Section 3, Part 1 for discussion on imposed loads/hydraulic power supply adequacy. The selected configurations dictate allowable approach to power source selection.

1.1.5.4 A Pros and Cons Summary for each candidate configuration is presented in Figure 1.1.5.4.

<u>Mechanism</u>	<u>Pro</u>	<u>Con</u>
● Linear Traction Figure 1.1.5.1(a)	● Highly adaptable to varying cable diameters ● Long and slender - can facilitate installation compatibility ● "Zero" bending imposed on the buoyant cable antenna assembly	● Speed Synchronization between Stages (5) required ● Low inherent reliability ● No static load holding capability, i.e., must lock the Storage Assembly ● Structureborne noise generation @ >200 FPM is a <u>serious problem</u> ● Two-point "Squeeze" may deform cable geometry — impact on seal performance ● Maintenance is difficult
● Clamp Traction Figure 1.1.5.1(b)	● Four-point (circumferential) loading of the B.C.A. ● 10,000#_f static (regenerative) holding capacity ● High adaptable to varying cable diameters ● Long and slender - can facilitate installation compatibility ● "Zero" bending imposed on the B.C.A.	● Speed synchronization between stages (8) required ● Low inherent reliability ● Structureborne noise generation @ >200 FPM is a <u>serious problem</u> ● Very serious cable buckling limitation as a function of a 2-ft stroke disp'l prior to seal passage ● Maintenance is difficult
● Single Drum Capstan Figure 1.1.5.1(c)	● Very small package envelope requirement ● High reliability ● 10,000#_f static holding capacity ● Very low structureborne noise generation ● Adaptable to varying cable diameters	● Requires -60 - articulated Pinch Roller Assemblies ● Imposes bending on the B.C.A. — (approx 1/4th that of the BRA-24 system) ● One-point loading exacerbates shear stress loading capability

Figure 1.1.5.4. Pros and Cons Summary Vol. II, Section 1 Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism

<u>Mechanism</u>	<u>Pro</u>	<u>Con</u>
● Laminar Fluid Figure 1.1.5.1(d)	● Extremely small package envelope requirement ● Very high potential reliability ● <u>Extremely</u> low potential structureborne noise generation << spec. ● <u>Ideal</u> cable handling technique ● Potential to eliminate dynamic seals	● Very long (>60 ft) to achieve 3000#_f dynamic load capability ● <u>Unproven concept</u> ● 200 FPM capability probable limit ● No static holding capability ● Cable buckling characteristics indeterminate at this time ● Requires a separate fluid recirculation system
● Direct Windup Figure 1.1.5.1(e)	● Good reliability ● Low structureborne noise generation ● Simple/proven concept	● Exceeds envelope requirement ● Limits Antenna Element placement ● Imposes bending on the B.C.A. -- (approx 1/3th that of the BRA-24 systems) ● High cable loading under static conditions @ > 6000#_f ● One-point loading ● Requires levelwind ● High impact on installation compatibility

Figure 1.1.5.4. Pros and Cons Summary Vol. II, Section 1 Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism (Cont'd)

1.2 DISCUSSION

1.2.1 Tradeoff Summary Chart(s) Figure 1.2.1(a) and 1.2.1(b) Explanation

The first Chart Figure 1.2.1(a) depicts the values derived in the evaluation criteria analysis. The second Chart Figure 1.2.1(b) depicts the final numerical summary, with values generated as follows:

- (a) Select optimum value in each of the successive columns.
- (b) Normalize all other values in that column against the optimum value.
- (c) Apply the appropriate weighting factor, i.e., CID evaluation criteria @ Base Requirements @ 2X Base; and Goal @ 3X Base.
- (d) Sum the horizontal rows to generate the intermediate Subtotal and the final Grand Total.

1.2.2 Ranking Summary

- (a) Mean Value = 31.95; Standard Deviation = 1.60
- (b) Ranking according to highest value - with significant difference equal to 1 Std. Deviation from the maximum Ranking Values:

Single Drum Capstan	-	1st @ 33.57
Traction Clamp	-	1st @ 32.97
Direct Windup	-	1st @ 32.73
Traction Belt	-	2nd @ 30.48
Laminar Fluid	-	3rd @ 30.00

1.2.3 Analysis of Results

As can be seen from the ranking summary, a statistical tie for primary consideration exists. However, severe operational limitations for both the Traction Clamp and the Direct Windup Mechanism should be highlighted.

- (a) Traction Clamp
 - Low inherent reliability
 - "High" structureborne noise

Allocated Evaluation Criteria

SOW Requirements

- R3 Airborne Noise/Structureborne Noise
- R5 Imposed Shear Stress/Tensile Stress
- R6 Installation Compatibility
- R7 Envelope < 85 ft³
- R8 Maintainability/Accessibility
- R9&14 In-line Connectors & Cable Size
- R10 Cable Construction & Materials
- R11 Antenna Elements Size > 4 in. x 4 ft
- R13 Static Load Capability > 6000#_f
- R15 FPM Compatibility to 200
- R16 Dynamic Load Capability to 3000#_f
- R19 Weight < 3500#_f
- R20 Maximum HP Required
- R20 Power Source Required

SOW Goals

- G1 Variable Cable Dia., 50 → 1.00 in.
- G2 FPM Capability to 400
- G3 Dyn. Load Capability to 6000#_f

CID Evaluation Criteria

- No. of Components
- Inherent Reliability \$, MTBF
- Development Cost, X 1000
- Cable Contact Efficiency
- μ Dependence
- Fatigue/Wear Impact
- Producibility

Deploy/Retrieve Configurations

Traction Belt	Traction Clamp	Sgl. Drum Capstan	Laminar Fluid	Direct Windup
X 4.08/9047	X 2.45/9047	X 7.35/9047	X 2.04/9047	X 7.35/9049
X 32.02	X 34.30	X 25.21	X 9.90	X 86.54
4	4	5	7	5
.65 → 4.0	.65 → 4.0	.65 → 4.0	.65 → 4.0	.65 → 4.0
-	10,000	10,000	-	10,000
X	X	X	X	X
X	X	X	X	X
1590	1907	2300	1631	2896
21.05	21.05	21.05	72.02	21.05
Hyd.	Hyd.	Hyd./Elec.	Hyd./Elec.	Hyd./Elec.
X	X	X	X	X
X*	X*	X	-	X
X*,**	X*	X**	-	X**
***	***	***	***	***
390	664	74	4	61
94	72	768	886	306
180	202.3	1362	76.0	172.6
2	3	1	3	1
.5	.33	.19	.002	.19
3	3	1	3	1
2.5	3	2	1	1.5
GRAND TOTAL				

SUBTOTAL

GRAND TOTAL

Figure 1.2.1(a). Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism Tradeoff Summary Chart

Allocated Evaluation Criteria

SOW Requirements

- R3 Airborne Noise/Structureborne Noise
- R5 Imposed Shear Stress/Tensile Stress
- R6 Installation Compatibility
- R7 Envelope < 85 Ft
- R8 Maintainability/Accessibility
- R9&14 In-line Connectors & Cable Size
- R10 Cable Construction & Materials
- R11 Antenna Elements Size > 4 in. x 4 ft
- R13 Static Load Capability > 6000#_f
- R15 FPM Capability to 200
- R16 Dynamic Load Capability to 3000#_f
- R19 Weight < 3500#_f
- R20 Maximum HP Required
- R20 Power Source Required

SOW Goals

- G1 Variable Cable Dia., .50 → 1.00 in.
- G2 FPM Capability to 400
- G3 Dyn. Load Capability to 6000#_f

CID Evaluation Criteria

- No. of Components
- Inherent Reliability, MTBF
- Development Cost, X \$1000
- Cable Contact Efficiency
- Dependence
- Fatigue/Wear Impact
- Producibility

Deploy/Retrieve Configurations		Deploy/Retrieve Configurations				Deploy/Retrieve Configurations	
Traction Belt	Traction Clamp	Sgl. Drum Capstan	Laminar Fluid	Direct Windup			
1.5	1.5	2	2	2			
1	1.67	0.55	2	0.55			
2	2	2	2	2			
.62	.56	.79	2	.26			
1.14	1.14	1.44	2	1.72			
2	2	2	2	2			
-	2	2	-	2			
2	2	2	2	2			
2	1.66	1.38	2	2			
2	2	2	1.95	1.10			
2	2	2	.58	2			
2	2	2	2	2			
3	3	3	3	3			
3*	3	3	-	3			
3*	3*	3**	-	3***			
21.48	23.79	24.57	27.00	23.73			
SUBTOTAL							
.25	.1	.82	1	1			
.11	.08	.87	1	.34			
.42	.38	.56	1	.44			
.60	1	.33	1	.33			
.38	.57	1	1	1			
1	1	.33	1	.33			
.4	.33	.5	1	.66			
30.48	32.97	33.57	30.00	32.73			
GRAND TOTAL							

Figure 1.2.1(b). Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism Tradeoff Summary Chart

- Restrictive maintainability
- High degree of drive synchronization/coordination required

(b) Direct Windup

- Low inherent reliability (due to requirement for an additional deployment aid mechanism)
- Antenna Element placement restrictions
- Exceeds envelope restrictions

1.2.4 Recommendations

1.2.4.1 Select the Single Drum Capstan as the primary candidate offering the best possibility of meeting the Requirements/Goals and having the least developmental risk.

The shear stress limitation of 100 pounds per linear foot is a major system driver. Major system gains can be achieved if better cables can be designed. The system improvements include a decrease in the number of pinch roller assemblies, weight and envelope reductions and increased reliability.

Control of cable buckling under the initial deployment conditions of $0 \rightarrow 200\#_f$ compression must be resolved through further study.




TABLE OF CONTENTS
VOLUME II, SECTION 2, CABLE STORAGE STUDY

	<u>Page</u>
2.1 INTRODUCTION	31
2.1.1 Definition	31
2.1.2 Problem Areas	31
2.1.3 Requirements	32
2.1.4 Analytical Approach	34
2.1.5 Candidates	35
2.1.5.1 Selection	35
2.1.5.2 Discussion	35
2.1.5.3 Interfaces	36
2.1.5.4 Pros & Cons Summary	37
2.2 DISCUSSION	38
2.2.1 Tradeoff Summary Chart(s) Explanation	38
2.1.2 Ranking Summary	38
2.2.3 Analysis of Results	38
2.2.4 Recommendations	41

SECTION 2

CABLE STORAGE STUDY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 Definition

2.1.1.1 The Cable Storage Assembly is located inboard, is used to store the complete antenna assembly when retrieved, and is the mechanical electrical inboard termination/mating point for the antenna assembly.

2.1.1.2 The concept(s) address a method for storage of any portion of the antenna assembly not deployed. The storage portion of the DRSS is also the inboard termination/connectivity of the antenna assembly to rf subsystems.

2.1.2 Problem Areas

Available space will ultimately determine the configuration of the storage assembly.

The RFP requirements and goals specify that the cable can be up to 5000 feet long and 0.65 inch in diameter or 5000 ft long 0.50 + 1.00 variable diameter with an undefined number of antenna elements up to 6 inches in diameter and 6 feet long spaced along the cable.

Given an unlimited space to mount the storage assembly, the geometrical configuration and design details could easily be optimized. Since space is at a premium in any backfit installation, the details of the storage assembly must be evolved through a series of trade-offs.

The preliminary system configuration(s) studies, derived without rigorous analysis of shipboard space limitations, provide the storage assembly requirements discussed below.

- 1) The assembly should be capable of storing the cable integrally connected to large diameter antenna elements while deploying or retrieving at 400 feet per minute.
- 2) The assembly should exert a controlled line tension on the cable/antenna elements in conjunction with the transfer mechanism so that the inertias are matched to avoid slack and snap loads.
- 3) The assembly may have to be capable of withstanding a static line load equal to T.B.D. times the breaking strength of the cable.
- 4) The assembly may have to have a locking mechanism to avoid accidental loosening of the cable/antenna assembly and to withstand the static towing load of 6000 lbs. tension.
- 5) The assembly must have a minimum bend radius so that no degradation of the cable/antenna assembly occurs during operation or long term storage.
- 6) Configuration/structural requirements should be addressed towards insertion of the assembly through the access trunk.

2.1.3 Requirements

2.1.3.1 The allocated Requirements and Goals to the Storage Assembly are as shown in Figure 2.1.3.1.1. Additional CID evaluation criteria which were employed are:

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|---|---|
| a. | <u>No. of Components</u> | - | determines relative complexity |
| b. | <u>Inherent Reliability</u> | - | determine a characteristic MTBF |
| c. | <u>Development Cost</u> | - | determine relative budgetary cost estimate to produce a working prototype including drawings |
| d. | <u>Cable Contact Efficiency</u> | - | characteristic determination of cable handline method and the consequent potential degree of impact on the cable structure geometry |

GOULD 		DRSS SOW REQUIREMENTS/GOALS ALLOCATION TO COMPONENT LEVEL	
GOULD INC. CHESAPEAKE INSTRUMENT DIVISION			
COMPONENT	REQUIREMENTS	GOALS	
• TOW/EXIT POINT	4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16	1, 2, 3	
• CABLE GUIDE -			
- CONDUIT	4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16		
- SEALS & VALVES	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 18	1	
- CABLE/ANTENNA ELEMENT			
SHEAR DEVICE	1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 20		
• DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM	3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20	1, 2, 3, 5	
• STORAGE ASSEMBLY	1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20	1, 2, 3, 5	
• SENSORS	1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17	1, 2, 3, 4	
• CONTROLS	3, 6, 15, 17, 18, 20	2, 3, 4, 5	
• POWER SOURCE	3, 6, 8, 15, 16, 20	2, 3	
• ANTENNA/RF INTERFACE	1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17	2, 3, 4	

NOTE: (1) REQUIREMENTS #7 & 19 ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE.

NOTE: (1) REQUIREMENTS #7 & 19 ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE.

Figure 2.1.3.1.1. DRSS SOW Requirements/Goals Allocation to Component Level

- e. Friction Dependence - evaluation of the susceptibility of performance degradation based upon environmental friction characteristics variability vs a minimum μ required by the particular mechanism to transmit energy into the cable assembly system
- f. Fatigue/Wear Impact - characteristic determination of the cable handling method, and the consequent impact on cable structure failure
- g. Producibility - relative estimate of degree of difficulty in fabrication/assembly and qualification test of the particular mechanism analyzed

2.1.3.2 All allocated Requirements/Goals and CID evaluation criteria are employed to determine the relative ranking of the component configurations analyzed in Tradeoff Summary Chart(s), Figures 2.2.1(a) and 2.2.1(b).

2.1.4 Analytical Approach

2.1.4.1 Each candidate component configuration is analyzed/characterized, to the extent necessary, to support the generation of numerical values which can be employed in the tradeoff summary charts for assessment of the degree to which each evaluation criteria can be met. Separate Appendices (J through M) provide the basis for all characterizations made for the particular component analyzed. An evaluation criteria analysis, Section 5 provides a brief summary description of the methodology employed in generating the numerical assessment values presented in the Tradeoff Summary Chart Figure 2.2.1(a). Data presented in this chart is normalized and weighted in order to establish the relative ranking of each of the candidates, and is shown in Tradeoff Summary Chart Figure 1.2.1b. A ranking summary, analysis of results and recommendations are made in paragraphs 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 respectively, based upon the data presented in Figure 2.2.1b.

2.1.5 Candidates

2.1.5.1 Review of the present BRA-24 and BRA-18 buoyant cable antenna handling system capabilities, and problem areas, analysis of the SOW Requirements and Goals, and comparison to existing technology/hardware adaptable to application as a Storage Assembly, has resulted in the selection of four possible candidates.

<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Closest Analogy/ Similarity</u>	<u>Refer to Analysis</u>
• CHETSA	CHETSA	Appendix J
• W/Levelwind	AN/SQR-19	Appendix K
• Pressure Proof Access Trunk	-	Appendix L
• Barrel Stuffing	-	Appendix M

2.1.5.2 The CHETSA concept configuration has a 36 in. OD barrel, narrow flange-to-flange spacing, and large OD flange which eliminates the need for a levelwind mechanism. Additionally, employing low tension storage, imposed cable wrapping forces due to shear, point contact, bending and tension are minimized.

The w/Levelwind Concept configuration permits a reduction of the flange OD, along with an increase in the flange-to-flange spacing. It also has a 36 in. OD barrel. The levelwind mechanism permits much higher storage tensions due to the uniformity of layer buildup and the consequent improved support arrangement for cable overwrap.

The Pressure Proof Access Trunk Concept (PPAT) configuration provides means for incorporation of both the Storage Assembly and the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism into a pressure vessel, and is analyzed with respect to minimizing envelope and weight requirements. A unique Storage Assembly configuration is defined and discussed.

The Barrel Stuffing Concept configuration provides a method for zero tension storage and windup, with associated loss in packaging efficiency. It is intended for a free-flood environment either in the ballast tank area, or within the PPAT.

2.1.5.3 The Storage Assembly interfaces with the following:

- Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism
- Sensors
- Controls
- Power Source

Interface Requirements Discusison

- (1) Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism - Cable must be maintained under tension between these two component assemblies at all times. An articulated levelwind may be required to facilitate BCA handling.
- (2) Sensors:
 - Speed Control - Employ constant torque drive motor. Responds to Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism inhaul/outhaul speed demand by maintaining a T.B.D. cable tension.
 - Cable Scope - May employ RPMs count to achieve relatively high accuracy for scope measurement (refer to Section 1, Para. 1.1.5.3.1 for better approach).
- (3) Controls:
 - If Hydraulic - Subplate Manifold Assembly required to interface control/status information to a Control/Indication Panel.
 - If Electric - A servo-controller w/DC Power Supply is required to interface (1) Solid State Drive and (2) a Control/Indication Panel.

(4) Power Source

- Hydraulic or Electric, refer to (3) above for Speed Control discussion. Refer to Section 3, Part 1 for discussion on imposed loads/Hydraulic Power Supply adequacy.

2.1.5.4 A Pros and Cons Summary for each candidate configuration is presented in Figure 2.1.5.4.

<u>Mechanism</u>	<u>Pro</u>	<u>Con</u>
● CHETSA Concept	● Very small envelope requirements ● Excellent low tension windup configuration ● Very simple ● Adaptable to 4" OD x 4' long Antenna elements (7 ea)	● Large O.D. ● Flange design difficult to meet MIL-S-901C shock survivability
● W/Levelwind	● Incorporates Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism capabilities as "Direct Windup". Leads to an extremely simple System Configuration	● System Envelope & Weight limitations may be exceeded ● Relatively high forces imposed on the B.C.A. ● Antenna Element placement limited to last 1/5 or 1/6th of the B.C.A. length.
● Pressure Proof Access Trunk	● Eliminates dynamic seals and staging tube	● Exceeds System Envelope & Weight requirements ● Very high installation impact/difficulty
● Barrel Stuffing	● "Zero" tension, and shear loading, w/largest bend radius permitted ● Lightweight	● Free-flood environment desirable, i.e., PPAT configuration, or Aft Ballast Tank

Figure 2.1.5.4. Pros & Cons Summary Vol II, Section 2 Storage Assembly

2.2 DISCUSSION

2.2.1 Tradeoff Summary Chart(s) Figure 2.2.1(a) & 2.2.1(b) Explanation

The first chart Figure 2.2.1(a) depicts the values derived in the Evaluation Criteria Analysis, Section 5. The second chart, Figure 2.2.1(b) depicts the final numerical summary, with values generated as follows:

- (a) Select optimum value in each of the successive columns.
- (b) Normalize all other values in that column against the optimum value.
- (c) Apply the appropriate weighting factor, i.e., CID evaluation criteria @ Base; Requirement @ 2X Base; and Goal @ 3X Base.
- (d) Sum the horizontal rows to generate the intermediate Subtotal and the final Grand Total.

2.2.2 Ranking Summary

- (a) Mean Value = 28.34; Standard Deviation = 5.48.
- (b) Ranking according to highest value -- with significant difference equal to 1 Standard Deviation from the maximum Ranking Values:

CHETSA Concept	-	1st @ 34.99
Barrel Stuffing	-	1st @ 32.05
(>1 σ) w/Levelwind	-	2nd @ 25.20
>2 σ w/PPAT	-	3rd @ 21.12

2.2.3 Analysis of Results

As can be seen from the ranking summary, a statistical tie for primary consideration exists. However, the following factors must be noted.

- (a) The Barrel Stuffing Concept requires an inordinate amount of envelope volume vs its form, fit, functional capability.
- (b) The Barrel Stuffing Concept imposes a free-flood environment requirement for optimum storage/handling of the Buoyant Cable Assembly. The CHETSA Concept is amenable to either free-flood or atmosphere environment.

Allocated Evaluation Criteria

SOW Requirements

- R1 Positive-Self Sealing
- R3 Airborne Noise/Structureborne Noise
- R5 Imposed Shear Stress/Tensile Stress
- R6 Installation Compatibility
- R7 Envelope < 85 Ft
- R8 Maintainability/Accessibility
- R7&14 Inline Connectors & Cable Size
- R10 Cable Construction & Materials
- R11 Antenna Element Size > 4 in. x 4 ft
- R12 Storage Capacity 3000 → 5000 ft
- R13 Static Load Capacity > 6000#_f
- R15 FPM Capability to 200
- R16 Dynamic Load Capability to 3000#_f
- R19 Weight < 3500#_f
- R20 Maximum HP Required
- R20 Power Source Required

SOW Goals

- G1 Variable Cable Dia., .50 → 1.00 in.
- G2 FPM Capability to 400

CID Evaluation Criteria

- No. of Components
- Inherent Reliability, MTBF
- Development Cost X \$1,000
- Cable Contact Efficiency
- Dependence
- Fatigue/Wear Impact
- Producibility

Allocated Evaluation Criteria	Storage Assembly			
	CHETSA	with Levelwind	PPAT	Barrel Stuffing
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	2	1	1	2
9.78/302	9.78/3016	9.78/3016	9.78/3016	1.02/ 100
3	3	2	1	1.5
42.85	70.13	70.13	>85	110/25
3/3	3/2	3/2	2/1	1/1
.65 → 4.0	.65 → 4.0*	.65 → 4.0*	.65 → 4.0*	.65 → 4.0
5000	5000	5000	5000	5000
10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	-
X	X	X	X	X
300	1000	1000	1000	100
1887	1613	1613	6000	1336
2.06	6.85	6.85	6.85	<1.0
Hyd./Elec.	Hyd./Elec.	Hyd./Elec.	Hyd./Elec.	Hyd./Elec.
X	-	-	-	-
X	X	X	X	X
SUBTOTAL				
6	13	14	14	6
>10,000	>5,000	2,500	2,500	5,000
124	202	370	370	202
1 Pt.	2 Pt.	2 Pt.	2 Pt.	1 Pt.
.021	.063	.063	.063	.021
2	1	1	1	3
3	2.5	2	2	3
GRAND TOTAL				

Figure 2.2.1(a). Storage Assembly Tradeoff Summary Chart

Allocated Evaluation Criteria

SOW Requirements

- R1 Positive-Self Sealing
- R3 Airborne Noise/Structureborne Noise
- R5 Imposed Shear Stress/Tensile Stress
- R6 Installation Compatibility
- R7 Envelope < 85 Ft
- R8 Maintainability/Accessibility
- R9&14 Inline Connectors & Cable Size
- R10 Cable Construction & Materials
- R11 Antenna Element Size > 4 in. x 4 ft
- R12 Storage Capacity 3000 → 5000ft
- R13 Static Load Capacity > 6000#_f
- R15 FPM Capability to 200
- R16 Dynamic Load Capability to 3000#_f
- R19 Weight < 3500#_f
- R20 Maximum HP Required
- R20 Power Source Required

SOW Goals

- G1 Variable Cable Dia., .50 → 1.00 in.
- G2 FPM Capability to 400

CID Evaluation Criteria

- No. of Components
- Inherent Reliability, MTBF
- Development Cost X \$1,000
- Cable Contact Efficiency
- Dependence
- Fatigue/Wear Impact
- Producibility

CHETSA	Storage Assembly			Barrel Stuffing
	with Levelwind	PPAT		
N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A
2	1	2		2
.43	.14	.14		.2
2	1.33	.67		1
2	1.22	.57		.78
.2	1.67	.83		.66
2	1.5	1.5		2
2	2	2		2
2	2	2		2
2	2	2		2
2	1.33	1.33		2
1.42	1.66	.44		2
.97	.29	.29		2
2	2	2		2
3	-	-		3
3	3	3		3
28.99	22.20	18.12		26.05
SUBTOTAL				
1	.46	.43		1
1	.5	.25		.5
1	.61	.34		.61
.5	1	1		.5
1	.33	.33		1
.67	.33	.33		1
1	.83	.67		1
34.99	25.20	21.12		32.05
GRAND TOTAL				

Figure 2.2.1(b). Storage Assembly Tradeoff Summary Chart

2.2.4 Recommendations

2.2.4.1 Select the CHETSA Concept as the primary candidate offering the best possibility of meeting the Requirements/Goals, and having the least development risk.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
84

VOLUME II, SECTION 3

CABLE GUIDE STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Part I Conduit/Guide Tube Study	43
Part II Valves Study	66
Part III Seals Study	83

TABLE OF CONTENTS**VOLUME II, SECTION 3, PART 1 - CONDUIT/GUIDE TUBE STUDY**

	<u>Page</u>
3.1.1 INTRODUCTION	44
3.1.1.1 Definition	44
3.1.1.2 Problem Areas	44
3.1.1.3 Requirements	46
3.1.1.4 Analytical Approach	48
3.1.1.5 Candidate	48
3.1.1.5.1 Selection	48
3.1.1.5.2 Interfaces	48
3.1.1.5.3 Pros & Cons Summary	49
3.1.2 DISCUSSION	50
3.1.2.1 Characterization of the Conduit/Guide Tube	50
3.1.2.2 Analysis of Considerations	50
3.1.2.3 Recommendations	65

SECTION 3
CABLE GUIDE STUDY
PART 1
CONDUIT/GUIDE TUBE STUDY

3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1.1 Definition

The conduit must have a smooth clean bore large enough to pass the maximum diameter of the antenna elements. It should be smooth to reduce the retrieval friction losses. By minimizing the total bends in the tube, the friction loss will be also reduced.

3.1.1.2 Problem Areas

Measurements on CHETSA conduit indicate that the coefficient of friction between rubber or plastic jacketed cable and suitable metal tubes may be as high as .55. This friction in the conduit results in an increase in the force required to pull an antenna through the tube, or a multiplication factor which must be applied to the drag force on the antenna. This multiplication factor is also related to the amount of bend angle by the formula for capstans or drag brakes as follows $\frac{T_2}{T_1} = e^{\mu\alpha}$ where T_1 is the outboard or drag tension, T_2 is the inboard tension required to cause the antenna to move, μ is the friction coefficient and α is the total bend angle in radians.

For the average installation of an antenna system, the total bend will be about 90° or $\frac{\pi}{2}$ radians to get from a vertical exit through the hull to a horizontal exit from the sail. With the friction coefficient indicated above, this results in $\frac{T_2}{T_1} = e^{.55 \times \pi/2} = 2.372$. Thus the drag values shown in Figure 3.1.1.2 must be multiplied by this factor in order to determine the tension which must be applied at the inboard end of the antenna in order to pull it in. When applying Figure 3.1.1.2 it must be remembered that the actual outboard retrieval tension or drag tension depends on the ship speed plus the retrieval speed. Thus for every 100 feet/min. of retrieval speed the total antenna speed must be




Figure 3.1.1.2. Drag Versus Speed in Knots for Various Antenna Configurations

increased by one knot. Therefore in haul at 400 ft/min. at 10 knots is equivalent to the drag for 14 knots tow speed.

As can be seen, the available dynamic load capability of the system is extremely sensitive to the amount of guide tube bend angle, and to the friction coefficient. The only means by which this effect can be negated are (1) by placement of the Deploy/Retrieve mechanism exterior to the pressure hull. (However, location of the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism outboard violates Requirement 8 of the SOW); and (2) installation of an outboard idler sheave, placed so that the total bend angle can be significantly reduced.

The important considerations for the guide tube are:

- Corrosion/Fouling must be addressed vis-a-vis material selection.
- Diameter, shape, smoothness and length must be defined.
- $6000\#_f \rightarrow 10,000\#_f$ static tow load must be sustained by the Conduit/Guide Tube structural support assembly.

3.1.1.3 Requirements

3.1.1.3.1 The allocated Requirements and Goals to the Conduit/Guide Tube are as shown in Figure 3.1.1.3.1. Refer to the Discussion Para. 3.1.2 for analysis and recommendation.

Additional CID evaluation criteria which were employed are:

- a. No. of Components - determine relative complexity.
- b. Inherent Reliability - determine a characteristic MTBF.
- c. Development Cost - determine relative budgetary cost estimate to produce a working prototype (incl. drawings).
- d. Cable Contact Efficiency - characterized determination of cable handling method, and the consequent potential degree of impact on the cable structure geometry.
- e. Friction Dependence - evaluation of the susceptibility of performance degradation based upon environmental friction characteristics variability vs a minimum required by the particular mechanism to transmit energy into the cable assembly system.

GOULD

GOULD INC. CHEESAPEAKE INSTRUMENT DIVISION

**DRSS SOW REQUIREMENTS/GOALS
ALLOCATION TO COMPONENT LEVEL**

COMPONENT	REQUIREMENTS	GOALS
• TON/EXIT POINT	4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16	1, 2, 3
• CABLE GUIDE -		
- CONDUIT	4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16	
- SEALS & VALVES	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 18	1
- CABLE/ANTENNA ELEMENT SHEAR DEVICE	1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 20	
• DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM	3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20	1, 2, 3, 5
• STORAGE ASSEMBLY	1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20	1, 2, 3, 5
• SENSORS	1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17	1, 2, 3, 4
• CONTROLS	3, 6, 15, 17, 18, 20	2, 3, 4, 5
• POWER SOURCE	3, 6, 8, 15, 16, 20	2, 3
• ANTENNA/RF INTERFACE	1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17	2, 3, 4

NOTE: (1) REQUIREMENTS #7 & 19 ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE.

NOTE: (1) REQUIREMENTS #7 & 19 ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE.

Figure 3.1.1.3.1. DRSS SOW Requirements/Goals Allocation to Component Level

- f. Fatigue/Wear Impact -characterized determination of the cable handling method, and the consequent impact on cable structure failure.
- g. Producibility - relative estimate of degree of difficulty in fabrication/assembly and qualification test of the particular mechanism analyzed.

3.1.1.3.2 All allocated Requirements/Goals and CID evaluation criteria are employed to determine useability of the component configuration analyzed and are listed in Section 5.

3.1.1.4 Analytical Approach

The candidate concept configuration is analyzed/characterized to the extent necessary in the Discussion Para. 3.1.2, to assess whether or not each evaluation criteria (Allocated Requirements & Goals) can be met. CID evaluation criteria are imposed to ascertain: (1) factors impacting on engineering or manufacturing feasibility and (2) Unit production cost factors which will be used as the basis of Design to Cost evaluation at the Systems Level, Volume 1, a Recommendation is made based upon the results of the evaluations.

3.1.1.5 Candidate

3.1.1.5.1 The candidate approach selected for evaluation is a Monel 400 Guide Tube, with ID 4 inches. A detailed configuration description and consideration(s) overview is presented in the Discussion Para. 3.1.2.

3.1.1.5.2 The Conduit/Guide Tube interfaces with the following:

- Tow/Exit Point
- Pressure Hull Penetration Point
- Seals & Valves
- Sensors

Interface Requirements Discussion

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| (1) Tow/Exit Point: | Rigid Joint not possible articulation clearance of $> 1/4$ in. recommended to permit the Tow/Exit Point Bellmouth assembly to pivot for accommodation of the B.C.A. flight angle. Refer to Section 4 for a detailed explanation. |
| (2) Pressure Hull Penetration Point: | Rigid, leakproof joint required at > 1500 psid proof pressure. |
| (3) Seals & Valves: | Rigid, leakproof joint(s) required at > 1500 psid proof pressure. |
| (4) Sensors: | End termination, B.C.A. diameter sense and possible "connector count" sensors must be inserted into the Conduit/Guide Tube to assure positive DRSS control/feedback interface to B.C.A. handling for deployment and retrieval operations. |

3.1.1.5.3 Pros & Cons Summary

<u>Mechanism</u>	<u>Pro</u>	<u>Con</u>
● Conduit/Guide Tube	-	● Mandatory - to achieve Reqt. 8 ● Large Dia. impacts on B.C.A. buckling

3.1.2 DISCUSSION

3.1.2.1 Characterization of the Conduit/Guide Tube

- Configuration: Sized to accept 4 in. OD x 4' long antenna elements with the 0.65D B.C.A.
- Interfaces:
 - (1) Outboard -- to the Tow/Exit Point
 - (2) Inboard -- to the hull valve and through all required Valving to the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism and Storage Assembly.
- Considerations:
 - (a → e) Materials selection, re corrosion resistance and minimized coefficient of friction. Include Test Results.
 - (f) Total degrees of bend required.
 - (g) Structural requirements.
 - (h) Loading imposed on the B.C.A.
 - (i) Location, re Tow/Exit Point.
 - (j) Heat transfer requirements.

3.1.2.2 Analysis of Considerations

- (a) Based upon CHETSA program test results, two materials selection approaches are possible. Because of corrosion resistance and low coefficient of friction, copper nickel 9010 or Monel 400 are excellent, but expensive options. A cheaper approach is to use a plain steel tube with a teflon liner. This has a significantly lower coefficient of friction. However, preliminary test data shows that it may be susceptible to unacceptably high wear rates.

Analysis of CHETSA test results indicates the following: Refer to Figure 3.1.2.2.

1. The Coefficient of Friction between 100 → 210# is reduced by a value of approximately 0.1, with the dynamic value approximately 0.05




Figure 3.1.2.2. CHETSA Test Results

between that of the static for highly filter water, with final values of 0.49 (static) and 0.44 (dynamic) @ 210# for rubber jacketed tow cable 1.10 in. OD in a Monel Guide Tube of 1.50 in. I.D. and 151° total bends.

2. Under the same test conditions, except that an oil film was generated within 20 minutes of filtration termination, we saw a reduction in the final coefficient values to 0.42 static and 0.33 dynamic.
 3. PVC/Kevlar reinforced array hose and rubber array hose w/o circumferential reinforcement (which flattens under load, show a higher than predicted coefficient. Results are less certain, due to "stickshin" inducing measurement anomalies.
- (b) Assuming that, due to the lack of hard test data for the B.C.A. jacket material, and of higher loads, the coefficient of friction doesn't reduce further, and that a rubber jacket will provide higher friction than that of a polyethylene jacket, a "best estimate" for the coefficient of friction will be $0.42 \rightarrow 0.49$ static and $0.33 \rightarrow 0.44$ dynamic.
- (c) The above coefficients of friction are employed in the Euler Relation, along with the estimated total degrees of bend (in radians) to determine the outboard tension multiplication factor which would, in turn, determine the imposed inboard tension that would be required for retrieval. Note deployment outboard tensions will be divided by this same factor to determine the imposed inboard tension.
- (d) As the DRSS will operate at loads of 3000# $\rightarrow$ 6000# that is, >15X the current CHETSA test conditions, it is essential that these friction values be verified. The assumption of a lower limit as described in (c), based on values measured at 210#_f and extrapolated to 3000# and higher, is considered to be conservative. Since the Conduit/Guide Tube friction multiplication factor is

critical to optimization of DRSS performance, with high risk implied in the large extrapolation (15X) current test data alternative backup approaches to friction reduction must be investigated. Additionally, new test data will be essential in order to validate the extrapolations very early in the experiment program.

- (e) Three alternative options to friction reduction are considered as backup:

Option 1

Low pressure water injection - 10 ports/90° @ ≈ 15 psi for a 1/16th dia. orifice (very low noise generation) provides a 25% reduction in the static coefficient of friction for rubber array hose w/Monel tube (Figure 3.1.2.2(a); a 32% reduction for PVC/Kevlar array hose w/Monel tube (Figure 3.1.2.2(b), a 42% reduction for rubber array hose w/CuNi tube (Figure 3.1.2.2(c); and a 46% reduction for PVC/Kevlar array hose w/CuNi tube (Figure 3.1.2.2(d).

The test configuration is depicted in Figure 3.1.2.2(e).

- The Option 1 approach would require a separate seawater pumping system capable of maintaining 15 psi above ambient sea pressure.

Option 2

Employ an outboard sheave to eliminate 90° of bend. The sheave pitch diameter would have to be approximately 4 ft.

- The Option 2 approach would require a significant amount of volume/weight and impact significantly upon Conduit Location/routing options -- such that the DRSS be within the superstructure yet provide interface with the Tow/Exit Point and the placement of the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism within the pressure hull.





Figure 3.1.2(a). Option 1 Friction Reduction Results



NOTE 1. DATA POINT LIMITED TO TEST STAND CAPABILITY

Figure 3.1.2.2(b). Option 1 Friction Reduction Results




Figure 3.1.2.2(c). Option 1 Friction Reduction Results




Figure 3.1.2.2(d). Option 1 Friction Reduction Results




Figure 3.1.2.2(e). Option 1 Friction Reduction Test Configuration

Option 3

Place the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism outboard in conjunction with the Tow/Exit Point.

- The Option 3 approach would have the additional impact of requiring that the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism be outside the pressure hull boundary.
- (f) The total degrees of bend required are, for the purposes of the DRSS study, set at 90° . This assumption is based upon existing BRA-24 and BRA-18 installation configuration(s). Refer to Figure 3.1.2.2(f), (g) and (h) for impact on system performance with respect to: (1) HP required for various operational conditions; (2) a technique for optimization of HP requirements; and (3) a Hydraulic Power Supply Adequacy Analysis. Actual routing for the system concept selected will determine the estimated degrees of bend required. This must be determined via a detailed investigation of each of the submarine class interface requirements vis-a-vis installed location -- which was not possible within the scope of the present study.
- (g) Structural requirements indicate, for a 6000# (minimum) and 10,000# (maximum) static tow load, that an adequate factor-of-safety be employed in sizing of the conduit wall thickness and structural support point locations. A structural loading criteria of $\approx 1.5X$ the B.C.A. breaking strength is recommended.
- (h) Loading on the B.C.A. shall be considered to be a combination of imposed shear loads (inboard tension-outboard tension)/linear arc-of-contact of the total bend and tensile loads due to the outboard tension.
 - Per Appendix H, B.C.A. Depth Vs Speed Capability, assuming approximately a 20 knots speed, imposed loads at 5000 ft scope are 3535#, and @ $\mu = .40$ for 90° bend the friction multiplication factor equals 1.492 (Ref. Figure 3.1.2.2(f). This yields an inboard tension of 5274#.




Figure 3.1.2.2(f). HP Matrix Envelope Chart




Figure 3.1.2.2(g). Two-Speed Operational Mode (5000#_f)




Figure 3.1.2.2(h). Hydraulic Power Supply Adequacy Analysis

Therefore the imposed shear loading is $1739\#_f$, distributed over a 90° arc of contact. Assuming a minimum 2 ft radius, the 90° arc of contact is 3.14 ft and the imposed shear loading is $553\#_f/\text{linear ft}$.

- Per Appendix G, Cable Analysis Tests, the 2% offset yield point is approximately $733\#_f/\text{ft}$, with the allowable yield point estimated at $613\#_f/\text{ft}$. As these values are only marginally greater than required, friction reduction, degrees of bend reduction, application of sheave, and/or consideration to placement of the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism outboard must be made!
- (i) Location with respect to the Tow/Exit Point placement, determines the outboard interface starting point. We assumed that the inboard interface termination point will be severely constrained with respect to possible locations (i.e., existing BRA-24 location and/or Aft ballast tank System Concept B and E respectively). Routing of the guide tube is critical and will be a major design driver with respect to configuration requirements. Employment of an outboard sheave to eliminate $60 \rightarrow 90^\circ$ of bend would provide latitude in routing the guide tube.
 - (j) Heat Transfer requirements are characterized for the conduit with respect to the differential loading calculated in (h) above.

$$HP_{\text{loss}} = \frac{1739\#_f \times 200 \text{ FPM}}{33000\#/\text{Min-HP}} = 10.54 \text{ HP}$$

$$\& Q_{\text{gen}} = 10.54 \text{ HP} \times 42.4 \text{ BTUs/Min} = 446.9 \text{ BTUs/Min}$$

Per an equivalent analysis similar to that in Appendix O, where the B.C.A. was found to absorb >99% of the generated heat, the estimated thermal rise expected is found as follows, where absorbed heat will be approximately 14.3% of the total. (Reference Diagram below.)

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Cable Mass} &= .795 \text{ Sp. Gr.} \times 62.4 \#_{\text{m/ft}} \times 11.52 \text{ ft}^3 \text{ (5000' of .65D cable)} \\ &= 751.3 \#_{\text{m}}\end{aligned}$$

$$\dot{m} @ 200 \text{ FPM} = 22.85 \#_{\text{m}}/\text{Min.}$$


& Assuming C_p of the Polyethylene jacket is .55

$$\therefore Q_{\text{Gen}} = \dot{m} c_p \Delta T$$

$$\& 63.8 \text{ BTUs/Min} = 22.85 \#_{\text{m}}/\text{Min} \times .55 \text{ BTUs}/\#_{\text{m}} \times \Delta T, ^\circ\text{F}$$

$$\text{or } \Delta T, ^\circ\text{F}_{\text{thermal rise}} = 5.1 ^\circ\text{F}$$

This value will be significantly higher due to localized heating and the integrated effects of changing junction temperature drive potential increase along the arc-of-contact due to the higher cable jacket temperature/conduit temperature.



$$(A_s = 3.14' \times 3/16"; = .05 \text{ ft}^2)$$

$$(A_s = 200' \times 3/16"; = 3.19 \text{ ft}^2/\text{Min.})$$

Note - ratio of k , A_s indicates a 6:1 difference, assuming L_s are equivalent

The conduit thermal rise expected is similarly found as follows:

Conduit Mass, 1 in effective zone about the arc-of-contact = 3.14 ft x

1" wide x .25 wall thickness x .3#_m/in.³ = 2.83#_m; & $C_p = .11$

$$Q_{\text{Gen}} = m C_p \Delta T$$

$$\& 383.1 \text{ BTUs/Min} = 2.83/\text{m} (.11 \text{ BTUs}/\text{m}) \times \Delta T, ^\circ\text{F/Min}$$

$$\text{or } \Delta T, ^\circ\text{F/Min} = 1231 ^\circ\text{F/Min}$$

thermal
rise

However, this does not include the equilibration effect of rising junction temperature, where ---

$$Q_{\text{absorbed cable}} = k \frac{A_s}{L} \Delta T$$

$$\begin{aligned} @ 446.9 \text{ BTUs/Min} &= \frac{.068(3.19 \text{ ft}^2/\text{Min})}{.06"/12"/\text{ft}} \Delta T, ^\circ\text{F} \\ &= 43.384 \text{ BTUs/Min}, ^\circ\text{F} (\Delta T, ^\circ\text{F}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{or } \Delta T_{\text{Max}} = 10.30 ^\circ\text{F}$$

Conclusion - The junction temperature jumps to $+10.30 ^\circ\text{F}$ within the first second and stabilizes @ $<10.30 ^\circ\text{F}$ cable jacket temperature for the remainder of the retrieval cycle!

3.1.2.3 Recommendations

- (1) Test verification of extrapolated data is essential early in the experiment program.
- (2) Viable options exist with respect to configuration alternatives for friction reduction.
- (3) An outboard sheave may be required.

TABLE OF CONTENTS**VOLUME II, SECTION 3, PART 2 - VALVES STUDY**

	<u>Page</u>
3.2.1 INTRODUCTION	67
3.2.1.1 Definiition	67
3.2.1.2 Problem Areas	69
3.2.1.3 Requirements	70
3.2.1.4 Analytical Approach	72
3.2.1.5 Candidates	73
3.2.1.5.1 Selection	73
3.2.1.5.2 Discussion	73
3.2.1.5.3 Interfaces	73
3.2.1.5.4 Pros & Cons Summary	80
3.2.2 DISCUSSION	82
3.2.2.1 Characterization of the Valves	82
3.2.2.2 Analysis of Considerations	82
3.2.2.3 Recommendations	82

PART 2
VALVES STUDY

3.2.1 INTRODUCTION

3.2.1.1 Definition


A valve is defined by the establishment of an effective leakproof interface to the Ship's pressure hull. SUBSAFE requirements call for two shutoff valves immediately inboard of the pressure hull insert, since its size must be greater than 1 inch and less than 7 inches.

Three types of valve functions are required, as follows:

- Hull Valve (HV) - a remote activated shutoff valve with manual override. Operational capability at great differential pressure over the full operating range of the submarine.
- Failsafe Shutoff Valve (FSV) - a locally activated shutoff valve with manual and remote override. Shall require redundant sensors to activate the valve whenever the Buoyant Cable Assembly is not present in the valve port envelope -- redundant valve position sensors to assure local and remote status feedback -- and redundant power source and/or Failsafe closing ("Spring applied" - power to open) in conjunction with activation of the Cable/Antenna Element Shear Assembly. Pressure capability to be similar to the Hull Valve.

- Cable/Antenna Element Shear Assembly (CSA)

- a remote activated assembly with manual override; to be located inboard of the Failsafe Shutoff Valve so that it provide means to shear and permit clearing of the Buoyant Cable Assy from the Valving and Conduit/Guide Tube past both the Failsafe Shutoff and Hull Valves. It should have the same operating and static pressure capability as the Hull Valve and/or Failsafe Shutoff Valve.



3.2.1.2 Problem Areas

A minimum hull penetration (bore of 4.37 inches) will be required to meet minimum DRSS requirements for handling 4.0 inch diameter antenna elements. The specific SUBSAFE requirements must be resolved through review of the preliminary concepts defined in this study by cognizant Navy personnel at the direction of NUSC and NAVELEX.

- We believe that the valve body envelope is, an area not accessible for cable support. The consequent unsupported length provides susceptibility to cable buckling. Current calculations indicate that for a .65 diameter cable a maximum unsupported length must be less than 6.5 inches. The port face-to-face dimensions are therefore limited to less than this value.
- We investigated commercially available valving, and found that bore sizes are related to pipe sizes. In respect to DRSS requirements, typical capability is listed as follows:

Option A - AF 51; ANSI CL300: Ball Valve

<u>Pipe Size</u>	<u>Bore</u>	<u>Face-to-Face Length</u>	<u>Wt</u>	<u>Operating Pressure Capability</u>
3"	2.5"	11.12"	39.7#	1000 psi
4"	3.25"	12.00"	62.2#	1000 psi
6"	4.37"	15.88"	125.2#	1000 psi
8"	5.69"	16.50"	184.1#	600 psi ?

Option B - Miser Short Pattern: Ball Valve

3"	2.50"	4.50"	21.0#	1000 psi
4"	3.25"	5.81"	34.0#	1000 psi
6"	4.37"	7.38"	64.0#	1000 psi
8"	5.69"	Data Unavailable		600 psi ?

Option C - Miser Titanium Series 49: Ball Valve

3"	2.50"	4.37"	22.7#	1000 psi
4"	3.25"	5.27"	33.0#	1000 psi
6"	4.37"	6.77"	57.2#	720 psi
8"	5.69"	9.02"	112.2#	720 psi

Option D - Clamp-Seal or Shear-Seal Rotary Valve: (New Concepts)

-	2.50"	3.5 ± .12"	40# ± 10	600 psi
-	3.25"	3.5 ± .12"	60# ± 15	600 psi
-	4.37"	3.5 ± .12"	100# ± 20	600 psi
-	6.37"	3.5 ± .12"	200# ± 40	600 psi

Note - (1) only Options B, C & D -- "flangeless" are feasible from a cable buckling unsupported length criteria of < 6.5 inches.

(2) a 6 inch O.D. Antenna Element capability is not readily commercially available -- and/or grossly violates (1) above (it would require a 10" Pipe Size equivalent valve). Only Option D would be feasible.

(3) Option D is provided for comparison purposes only. It indicates potential for valve developments directly related to DRSS requirements.

- Corrosion, vis-a-vis materials selection must be addressed.
- Fouling could be a major area of concern since it would seriously impact the actuating torque requirements for the valves.
- Sequencing time, sensor and seal interface and position status must be rigorously analyzed at the system level to assure viability of the concept configuration operational capability.

3.2.1.3 Requirements

3.2.1.3.1 The allocated Requirements and Goals to the Valves are as shown in Figure

3.2.1.3.1. Additional CID evaluation criteria which were employed are:

- No. of Components - determine relative complexity.

GOULD  GOULD INC. CHESAPEAKE INSTRUMENT DIVISION		DRSS SOW REQUIREMENTS/GOALS ALLOCATION TO COMPONENT LEVEL	
COMPONENT	REQUIREMENTS	GOALS	
• TOW/EXIT POINT	4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16	1, 2, 3	
• CABLE GUIDE -			
- CONDUIT	4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16		
- SEALS & VALVES	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 18	1	
- CABLE/ANTENNA ELEMENT			
SHEAR DEVICE	1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 20		
• DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM	3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20	1, 2, 3, 5	
• STORAGE ASSEMBLY	1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20	1, 2, 3, 5	
• SENSORS	1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17	1, 2, 3, 4	
• CONTROLS	3, 6, 15, 17, 18, 20	2, 3, 4, 5	
• POWER SOURCE	3, 6, 8, 15, 16, 20	2, 3	
• ANTENNA/RF INTERFACE	1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17	2, 3, 4	

NOTE: (1) REQUIREMENTS #7 & 19 ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE.

Figure 3.2.1.3.1. DRSS SOW Requirements/Goals Allocation to Component Level

- b. Inherent Reliability - determine a characteristic MTBF.
- c. Development Cost - determine relative budgetary cost estimate to produce a working prototype (including drawings).
- d. Cable Contact Efficiency - characterized determination of cable handling method, and the consequent potential degree of impact on the cable structure geometry.
- e. Friction Dependence - evaluation of the susceptibility of performance degradation based on environmental friction characteristics variability vs a minimum required by the particular mechanism to transmit energy into the cable assembly system.
- f. Fatigue/Wear Impact - characterized determination of the cable handling method, and the consequent impact on cable structure failure.
- g. Producibility - relative estimate of degree of difficulty in fabrication/assembly and qualification test of the particular mechanism analyzed.

3.2.1.3.2 All allocated Requirements/Goals and CID evaluation criteria are employed to determine the relative ranking of the component configurations analyzed, in Section 5.

3.2.1.4 Analytical Approach

The candidate concept configuration is analyzed/characterized to the extent necessary in the Discussion paragraph 3.2.2, to assess whether or not each evaluation criteria (Allocated Requirements and Goals) can be met. Additional CID evaluation criteria are imposed to ascertain: (1) factors impacting on engineering or manufacturing feasibility and (2) unit production cost factors which will be used as the basis of Design to Cost evaluation at the Systems Level in Volume I. Finally, a Recommendation is made based upon the results of the evaluations.

3.2.1.5 Candidates

3.2.1.5.1 The candidates selected for the hull valve and the failsafe shutoff valve are as follows:

<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Closest Analog/ Similarity</u>	<u>Refer to Concept Config.</u>	<u>Refer to Analysis</u>
● Ball Valve	N/A	Figure 3.2.1.5.1(a+c)	Para. 3.2.2
● Rotary Shear-Seal Valve	"Barksdale Shear-seal"	Figure 3.2.1.5.1(d)	Para. 3.2.2
● Clamp-Seal Valve	BRA-24 Static Seal	Figure 3.2.1.5.1(e)	Para. 3.2.2

The candidate selected for the Shear Assy is as follows:

● Single Blade Ram	BRA-24 Shear Assy & AN/SQR-19 Cable Cutter	N/A	Para. 3.2.2
--------------------	--	-----	-------------

3.2.1.5.2 Each candidate operates on an entirely different principle, with characteristics unique to the valve isolation technique employed. The configurations depicted in the Figures 3.2.1.5.1(a → e) are utilized to establish the basis for analytical characterizations made in the Discussion Paragraph 3.2.2.


3.2.1.5.3 The Valves interface with the follow:

- Conduit/Guide Tube
- Controls
- Sensors
- Seals
- Power Source

Interface Requirements Discussion

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| (1) Conduit/Guide Tube: | Must maintain structural integrity and leak tight boundary equal to that of the pressure. |
| (2) Controls: | Must interface with the Control/Indication Panel for actuation and status condition. |


Specifics of the miser flanged ball valve




H - No. OF HOLES (150 lb.)
H₁ - No. OF HOLES (300 lb.)
I - DIA. OF HOLES (150 lb.)
I₁ - DIA. OF HOLES (300 lb.)

DIMENSION												
SIZE	A	A ₁	B	C	D	E	F	G	Port	H	H ₁	I
3"	8	11 1/4	5 1/4	5 1/4	22 3/4	3 1/4	5	11 1/2	2 1/4	4	8	7/8
4"	9	12	5 3/4	5 3/4	22 3/4	4	5 1/4	9	3 1/4	5	8	7/8
5"	10 1/4	15 3/4	8 1/4	9 1/4	33 3/4	4 1/4	8 1/4	11	4 1/4	8	12	7/8
8"	11 1/4	16 3/4	10 1/4	10 3/4	33 3/4	5 1/4	10 1/4	13 1/2	5 1/4	8	12	7/8

Head loss vs. flow



Pressure-temperature rating



Ordering Code-Flanged Miser

Body, End Plug, Ball & Stem	Seals & Seats	USAS or MSS Pressure Class
Ductile Iron	Dura B	150# or 300#
Carbon Steel	Teflon T	150# or 300#
316 S.S.	Reinforced Teflon RT	150# or 300#

Note: Stainless steel flanged valves have flat face flanges per MSS specifications, all others have 1/4" raised face per USAS (formerly ASA) specifications.

Ordering example:


8" Carbon steel body, end plug, ball & stem, 150# flanged, with teflon seats and seals.

Size	Style	Body, End Plug, Ball & Stem	Seals/Seats	Type
8"	4	4	T	150

Order: 8" 444T-150

Figure 3.2.1.5.1(a). Miser ANSI CL300 Ball Valve

"Two valves in one"... the ultimate in piping flexibility



PRESSURES UP TO 1000*** psi WOG
TEMPERATURES UP TO 450°F.

1. Miser® Short Pattern Ball Valve

The Miser Short Pattern serves as "2 valves in 1". The center section is simply and quickly inserted between two standard flanges (either 150# or 300#) and the flanges bolted together. Almost any media within the temperature-pressure limitations can be handled by the short pattern Miser because it offers a wide choice of seats, seals and body materials. Both the Miser 151 and Miser 301 are available specially adapted for either oxygen or high-vacuum service.

Original costs are less and maintenance is less with the Miser Short Pattern. Yet, this valve offers you all the unique advantages of the standard Miser: the downstream seat sealing, lower torque, longer life, bottom entry blow-out proof stem with the adjustable self-compensating stem feature of Misers. Unique design end-plug for easy field maintenance. Machining of retaining grooves allows random assembly of end plug. No presses are required. Design provides uninterrupted gasket surface permitting use of all standard type gaskets.

You get positive shut-off, easier operation, longer valve life and faster maintenance if necessary when you use Miser Short Pattern Ball Valves.


*Trademark of Worcester Valve Co., Inc.

Minimum Space Requirements—Check This!

The weight of Miser Short Patterns is 40% to 60% less than conventional USAS** ball valves. Their configuration is a lot more compact, too. The center to top dimension of a 4" Miser is only 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " as opposed to 27 $\frac{3}{4}$ " for a standard gate valve... valuable space savings to original equipment manufacturers and in new installations.

**USAS formerly ASA

***725 psi for bronze and aluminum



The Miser Short Pattern is simply and quickly inserted between two standard flanges as shown. Correct studs and nuts furnished with valve.

Figure 3.2.1.5.1(b). Miser Short Pattern Ball Valve




Series 49

The unique wafer design of Worcester's Series 49 titanium ball valve uses minimum wetted surfaces, and features the Miser sealing package, resulting in high performance at minimum material cost.

Now you can enjoy all the advantages of the famous Miser ball valve in corrosive service

beyond the capabilities of conventional ball valves:

- Leaktight shutoff
- Quarter-turn operation
- Visual indication of valve position
- Easily automated
- Bottom entry system
- Compact



This valve is designed to fit between standard #150 flanges, with a minimum space requirement, effecting cost and weight savings. Studs for flange make up are provided with the valve.




The Worcester Series 49 Ball valves use pure, unalloyed titanium with chemical and physical properties as shown.



CV DATA	
VALVE SIZE	CV (GPM)
1/2"	8
3/4"	12
1"	32
1 1/2"	80
2"	104

Chemical	Mechanical	
125 (Grade 1)	125	Tensile
20 max	23-36 tf/in. ²	Strength
10 max	15 tf/in. ²	Proof Stress
03 max	19%	Elongation
013 max		
20 max		
Balance	Titanium	

Figure 3.2.1.5.1(c). Miser Titanium Series 49 Ball Valve



SHEAR-SEAL ROTARY VALVE

Figure 3.2.1.5.1(d). Shear-Seal Rotary Valve Concept (Sheet 1)


AD-A084 006

GOULD INC GLEN BURNIE MD CHESAPEAKE INSTRUMENT DIV F/G 13/10.1
DEPLOY/RETRIEVE STORAGE SYSTEM (DRSS) VOLUME II. PART I. COMPON--ETC(U)
JAN 80 N00039-79-C-0329


NL

UNCLASSIFIED

2 of 2
ALL
REPRODUCTION



END
DATE
FILMED
6-80
DTIC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A





Figure 3.2.1.5.1(d). Shear-Seal Rotary Valve Concept (Sheet 2)



CLAMP-SEAL VALVE

Figure 3.2.1.5.1(e). Clamp-Seal Valve Concept

(3) Sensors:

Must interface with valve position sensors with the Buoyant Cable Assembly interface sensors, and all associated seals etc., to coordinate operation of the valves during passage of the cable end termination thru the Conduit/Guide Tube. Must also respond to either cable loss, or severing command.

(4) Seals:

Sequencing will be required with the seals during passage of the cable end termination to assure that SUBSAFE integrity of the pressure hull is maintained.

(5) Power Source:

Actuation power, either electric or hydraulic. Note that manual override will also be required. Additionally, alternate power sources may be required to assure redundant, positive action of the failsafe shutoff valve and perhaps the hull valve.

3.2.1.5.4 Pros & Cons Summary

Hull Valve & Fail-Safe Shutoff Valve

	<u>Pro</u>	<u>Con</u>
● Ball Valve (Miser Titanium Series 49)	● Simple/Reliable ● Commercial Available	● 6.77 in. Face-to-Face ● Extremely expensive @ \$9,700 for 6" size (4.37 in. bore)
● Rotary Shear-Seal Valve (Monel 400)	● Simple construction ● Sound Operating principle ● Est. @ \$5,000 cost ● 3.0 ± .12 in. Face-to-Face	● <u>New concept</u> (only in flow thru) vs. 90 or 180° Barksdale Shear-Seal Valve.

- Clamp-Seal Valve (Monel 400) either 2 or 4 clamp
- Simple construction
- Requires gravity drain to assure zero leakage.
- Sound operating principle
- Est. @ $\approx$ \$5,000 cost
- $3.5 \pm .12$ in. Face-to-Face
- Could operate potentially as a manual static seal with proper resilient ram tip configuration.
- Single Blade Ram
- Can Shear a 1.1 in GIPEX armored cable, 90,000#_f test with 3 in. bore hyd. cyl. w/3000 psi. Cutting blade & Ram Stop plate details per AN/SQR-19 design.

3.2.2 DISCUSSION

3.2.2.1 Characterization of the Valves

During the current study effort, we have shown that viable alternatives exist for assuring that both the hull valve and the Failsafe Shutoff Valve can be selected from the options proposed in 1.1.5.1. Additional research is suggested in order to fully define the tradeoff alternatives, make detailed analysis and resolve the available options to a single recommendation. Development of an acceptable valve configuration is considered to be a high risk engineering effort. Further definition is suggested.

The Cable/Antenna Element shear assembly capable of shearing the buoyant cable and/or a 4 in. OD antenna element is considered to be a medium risk engineering effort.

3.2.2.2 Analysis of Considerations

The hull valve, cable/antenna element shear assembly and the failsafe shutoff valve are all located outboard of the dynamic seal. This consequently reduces the susceptibility of the buoyant cable assembly to buckling. However, the inboard failsafe shutoff valve, if required in the configuration, is critical vis-a-vis face-to-face dimensional impact on cable unsupported length, and consequent buckling.

Conventional, commercially available valving cannot provide a reasonable face-to-face dimension for a 6 in. O.D. antenna element capacity.

3.2.2.3 Recommendations

Further definition, analysis is recommended. The Miser Titanium Series 49, 6 in. size is currently considered to be an acceptable choice for the DRSS, and would meet all SOW requirements. However, the two new concept alternatives proposed could offer significant advantages with respect to enhanced Buoyant Cable Assembly performance at greater submergence depths. These alternative concepts should also cost less.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
VOLUME II, SECTION 3, PART 3 - SEALS STUDY

	<u>Page</u>
3.3.1 INTRODUCTION	84
3.3.1.1 Definition	84
3.3.1.2 Problem Areas	85
3.3.1.3 Requirements	87
3.3.1.4 Analytical Approach	87
3.3.1.5 Candidates	89
3.3.1.5.1 Selection	89
3.3.1.5.2 Discussion	90
3.3.1.5.3 Interfaces	90
3.3.1.5.4 Pros & Cons Summary	91
3.3.2 DISCUSSION	92
3.3.2.1 Tradeoff Summary Chart(s) Explanation	92
3.3.2.2 Ranking Summary	92
3.3.2.3 Analysis of Results	92
3.3.2.4 Recommendations	95

PART 3
SEALS STUDY

3.3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.3.1.1 Definition

A seal is defined by the establishment of an effective leakproof interface between the ship's pressure hull and the Buoyant Cable Assembly; and shall be located inboard of the Failsafe Shutoff Valve. Refer to Figure 3.1.1.1.*




Figure 3.3.1.1.1

*A detailed description and discussion of the configuration depicted is found in Section 3, Part 2, Valves Study.

A leakproof interface shall be defined as follows:

- Static Seal - less than 5 in.³/Hr @ 600 PSID.
- Dynamic Seal - less than 12 in.³/Min @ 600 PSID, .003 annulus.

In both cases, the ship's gravity drain system is to be employed to remove seawater from within the seal mechanism envelope, to achieve a net zero leakage through the pressure hull.

3.3.1.2 Problem Areas

The state-of-the-art of static and dynamic seals must be advanced to provide reliable equipment that will pass antenna elements up to six inches in diameter. This is true for both static and dynamic seals. This problem is further complicated by the requirement to seal against full submergence depth and at line speeds of 200 feet per minute to 400 feet per minute without damage to the cable/antenna.

- **Static Seal for Steady State Towing**

This seal must operate against the cable without (0.65 inches and/or 0.5 to 1.0 inches diameter) and at zero line speed. It must be capable of opening its bore to pass the full diameter of the antenna elements which may be up to 6.0 inches. Since this seal must have zero leakage. It must restrain the submergence pressure from pushing the cable into the submarine. This restraining force is the cable cross section area times the depth pressure minus the hydrodynamic drag. The seal must not damage nor deform the cable during use and must not contribute to cable buckling.

- **Dynamic Seal for Fixed Diameter Cable**

One of the system concepts generated in this study requires a dynamic seal to be used to seal against the small diameter cable (0.65 inches). This diameter will be a fixed constant over the portion of the cable/antenna where sealing is required. In order to pass the large antenna elements, the seal must be capable of opening its bore to the full diameter of the antenna elements. Sealing is not required during this operation. This seal must

create a very low friction drag force (approaching zero) on the cable to achieve a line speed of 200 to 400 feet per minute. The allowed volume of seawater leakage through the seal depends on the system configuration. The seal must function at all submarine operating depths and must not damage or degrade the cable during use, and must not contribute to cable buckling.

- **Dynamic Seal for Variable Diameter Cable/Antenna**

Two system concepts utilizes dynamic seals which can automatically increase their small cable sealing diameter to accommodate the larger diameter antenna elements. These devices must operate automatically and maintain their sealing integrity at maximum submergence pressure and cable/antenna line speeds of 200 to 400 feet per minute, they must not contribute to cable buckling.

Some friction can be allowed in the sealing mechanism and some seawater leakage may also be tolerated depending on the system configuration. However, the seals must not exert more than 100 lbs/foot shear force on existing antennas (approximately 8.8 lbs per square inch of cable surface area).

In order to achieve capability to deploy the Buoyant Cable Assembly, .65, 4.0 or 6.0 inch diameter -- and/or a .50 to 1.00 inch diameter -- against submergence pressures, it will be necessary to consider means to equalize the pressure differential against changes in cross-sectional area as it passes thru the outboard seal. Otherwise, unacceptable cable buckling forces (for diameters greater than 0.65 inch) would be sustained. Current design capability is 80#_f for the existing cable @ 6.5 inch unsupported length. A Staging Tube is mandatory in order to permit the minimum antenna element diameter of 4.0 inch O.D. to pass through the outboard seal. This force

could exceed the design Requirement of 3000#_f dynamic load and design Goal of 6000#_f dynamic load capability of the DRSS study effort.

3.3.1.3 Requirements

3.3.1.3.1 The allocated Requirements and Goals to the Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism are as shown in Figure 3.3.1.3.1. Additional CID evaluation criteria which were employed are:

- a. No. of Components - determine relative complexity.
- b. Inherent Reliability - determine a characteristic MTBF.
- c. Development Cost - determine relative budgetary cost estimate to produce a working prototype (including drawings).
- d. Cable Contact Efficiency - characterized determination of cable handling method, and the consequent potential degree of impact on the cable structure geometry.
- e. Friction Dependence - evaluation of the susceptibility of performance degradation based on environmental friction characteristics variability vs a minimum μ required by the particular mechanism to transmit energy into the cable assembly system.
- f. Fatigue/Wear Impact - characterized determination of the cable handling method, and the consequent impact on cable structure failure.
- g. Producibility - relative estimate of degree of difficulty in fabrication/assembly and qualification test of the particular mechanism analyzed.

3.3.1.3.2 All allocated Requirements/Goals and CID evaluation criteria are employed to determine the relative ranking of the component configurations analyzed, in Tradeoff Summary Chart(s), Figures 3.3.2(a) and 3.3.2(b).

3.3.1.4 Analytical Approach

3.3.1.4.1 Each candidate component configuration is analyzed/characterized, to the extent necessary, to support the generation of numerical values which can be employed in the tradeoff summary charts for assessment of the degree to which each evaluation

GOULD  GOULD INC. - CHESAPEAKE INSTRUMENT DIVISION		DRSS SOW REQUIREMENTS/GOALS ALLOCATION TO COMPONENT LEVEL	
COMPONENT	REQUIREMENTS	GOALS	
• TOW/EXIT POINT	4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16	1, 2, 3	
• CABLE GUIDE - - CONDUIT	4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16		
- SEALS	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 18	1	
- CABLE/ANTENNA ELEMENT			
SHEAR DEVICE	1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 20		
• DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM	3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20	1, 2, 3, 5	
• STORAGE ASSEMBLY	1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20	1, 2, 3, 5	
• SENSORS	1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17	1, 2, 3, 4	
• CONTROLS	3, 6, 15, 17, 18, 20	2, 3, 4, 5	
• POWER SOURCE	3, 6, 8, 15, 16, 20	2, 3	
• ANTENNA/RF INTERFACE	1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17	2, 3, 4	

NOTE: (1) REQUIREMENTS #7 & 19 ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE.

Figure 3.3.1.3.1. DRSS SOW Requirements/Goals Allocation to Component Level

criteria can be met. A separate Appendix (N thru S) provides the basis for all characterizations made for the particular component analyzed. An evaluation criteria analysis, Section 5, provides a brief summary description of the methodology employed in generating the numerical assessment values presented in the Tradeoff Summary Chart Figure 3.3.2(a). Data presented in this chart is normalized and weighted in order to establish the relative ranking of each of the candidates, and is shown in Tradeoff Summary Chart Figure 3.3.2(b). A Ranking Summary, Analysis of Results and Recommendations are made in paragraphs 1.2.2, 1.2.3, and 1.2.4, respectively based upon the data presented in Figure 3.3.2(b).

3.3.1.5 Candidates

3.3.1.5.1 A review of the present BRA-24 and BRA-18 buoyant cable antenna handling system capabilities, problem areas, analysis of the SOW Requirements and Goals and comparison to existing technology/hardware adaptable to application as a dynamic seal, has resulted in the selection of four possible candidates. They are as follows:

<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Closest Analogy/ Similarity</u>	<u>Refer to Analysis</u>
• Dyn. Seal Var. Articulated Seg.	-	Appendix P
• Dyn. Seal, Var., Bladder	BRA-18, 24 & CID Proposal	Appendix Q
• Dyn. Seal, Fixed, Two-Posn., Split	CID Proposal	Appendix R
• Dyn. Seal, Var., Iris	-	Appendix S
• Static Seal	Fixed, 2-Posn., Split Dyn. Seal Concept	Appendix R

3.3.1.5.2 Each candidate operates on an entirely different principle, with characteristics unique to the cable sealing technique employed. The configurations depicted are idealized concepts, which establish the basis for analytical characterizations in their respective Appendixes P → S — and supported by Appendices N and O. Each appendix includes a concept configuration, layout, description, operating exploration, considerations made in the analysis, and, where required references to other Appendices which support the study effort characterizations.

3.3.1.5.3 The Seal mechanisms interface with the following:

- Valving
- Conduit/Guide Tube
- Controls
- Sensors
- Power Source

Interface Requirements Discussion

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| (1) <u>Valving</u> | Must interface with associated, immediately adjacent valving, i.e. - <ul style="list-style-type: none">● At the Subsafe Interface to the Cable/Antenna Element Shear Assembly. . .● At the Staging Tube Interface, to the Seawater Vent/Fill Valve . . .● At the Inboard portion of the Staging Tube, to the Failsafe Shutoff Valve. |
| (2) <u>Conduit/Guide Tube</u> | Must maintain structural integrity and leaktight boundary equal to that of the pressure hull. |
| (3) <u>Controls</u> | Must interface with the Control/Indicational Panel for actuation and status condition. |

(4) Sensors

Must interface with the Buoyant Cable Assembly interface sensors, and all associated valving status sensors, to coordinate operation of the seals during passage of the antenna elements through the staging tube.

(5) Power Source

Actuation power, either electric or hydraulic. Note also that a Manual Override may be required.

3.3.1.5.4 Pros & Cons Summary

<u>Mechanism</u>	<u>Pro</u>	<u>Con</u>
● Dyn. Seal, Var., Articulated Seg.	● Variable dia. @ .50 → 1.00 or .65 → 1.38 in. ● Very low leakage	● Complex-low reliability ● Cannot accommodate > 2:1 ratio in cable diameter
● Dyn. Seal, Var., Bladder	● Simple ● Variable dia. @ .50 → 1.00 or .65 → 1.38 in. ● Zero leakage	● Cannot accommodate > 2:1 ratio in cable diameter
● Dyn. Seal, Fixed, Two-Posn., Split	● Simple ● Seals either .50 or .65 in. diameter cable -- opens to > 4.0 inch ● Very low leakage ● Meets all Requirements and Goals	● Cannot accommodate continuously variable dia. cable
● Dyn. Seal, Var., Iris	● Seals all diameter cables, incl. continuously variable	● Complex-low reliability ● Med to High leakage ● Large envelope reqd.
● Static Seal, 2-Posn., Split (alt. is a 4-Posn., Split --	● Can achieve zero leakage ● Simple ● Accommodates .50 <u>OR</u> .65 in. B.C.A.	-

3.3.2 DISCUSSION

3.3.2.1 Tradeoff Summary Chart(s) Figure 3.3.2(a) and 3.3.2(b) Explanation

The first Chart Figure 3.3.2(a) depicts the values derived in the Evaluation Criteria Analysis. The second Chart Figure 3.3.2(b) depicts the final numerical summary, with values generated as follows:

- (a) Select optimum value in each of the successive columns.
- (b) Normalize all other values in that column against the optimum value.
- (c) Apply the appropriate weighting factor, i.e., CID evaluation criteria @ Base; Requirements @ 2X Base; and Goal @ 3X Base.
- (d) Sum and horizontal rows to generate the intermediate Subtotal and the final Grand Total.

3.3.2.2 Ranking Summary

- (a) Mean Value = 28.04; Standard Deviation = 1.60
- (b) Ranking according to highest value -- with significant difference equal to 1 Standard Deviation from the maximum Ranking Values:

Dyn. Seal, Fixed, Two-Posn; Split	-	1st @ 30.74
Dyn. Seal, Var., Articulated Seg.	-	2nd @ 28.31
Dyn. Seal, Var., Iris	-	2nd @ 27.33
Dyn. Seal, Var., Bladder	-	3rd @ 25.78

3.3.2.3 Analysis of Results

- (a) Although a significant advantage appears for selection of the Fixed Two Position Split type of dynamic seal direct application of such a configuration would be very difficult in meeting the G1 goal of .50 + 1.00 diameter. A continuously varying cable diameter would necessitate a variable articulation adaption, whereas antenna elements going from .50 + 1.00 in. could be

Allocated Evaluation Criteria

SOW Requirements

R1 Positive Seal Sealing
R2 Shear Seal Capability
R3 Airborne Noise/Structureborne Noise
R4 Dynamic Load Capability, Δ PSI
R4 Static Load Capability, Δ PSI
R5 Imposed Shear Stress/Tensile Stress
R6 Installation Compatibility
R7 Envelope, Ft³
R8 Maintainability/Accessibility
R9 Cable Size
R15 FPM Capability
R19 Weight, #_f

SOW Goals

G1 Variable Diameter .50 $\rightarrow$ 1.0 in.
G2 400 FPM Capability

CID Evaluation Criteria

- No. of Components
- Inherent Reliability, MTBF
- Developmental Cost X 1000 \$
- Cable Connect Efficiency
- μ Dependence
- Fatigue/Wear Impact
- Producibility
- Level I Mat'l Control Traceability System

		Seals Configurations			
		Variable- Artic. Seg.	Variable- Bladder	Fixed-2 Posn., Split	Variable Iris
R1	.003	.003	.075	.003	.06
R2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
R3	1	1	3	3	2
R4	180	180	150	180	180
R4	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000
R5	4.08	4.08	4.08 8.16	4.08	4.08
R6	1	1	3	3	2
R7	.5	.5	.5	.5	.75
R8	1	1	3	2	1
R9	.65 1.38	.65 1.38	.60 1.38	.65 4.0	.65 4.0
R15	200	200	200	200	200
R19	100	100	100	100	100
G1	X	X	X	-	X
G2	X	X	-	X	X
SUBTOTAL					
-	45	45	6	8	81
-	1203	1203	761	3185	822
-	112	112	36	261	80
-	93	93	100	100	90
-	3	3	1	3	3
-	3	3	1	3	2
-	3	3	5	9	4
-	X	X	X	X	X
GRAND TOTAL					

Figure 3.3.2(a). Seals Configurations Tradeoff Summary Chart

Allocated Evaluation Criteria

SOW Requirements

- R1 Positive Seal Sealing
- R2 Shear Seal Capability
- R3 Airborne Noise/Structureborne Noise
- R4 Dynamic Load Capability, Δ PSI
- R5 Static Load Capability, Δ PSI
- R6 Imposed Shear Stress/Tensile Stress
- R7 Installation Compatibility
- R8 Envelope, Ft
- R9 Maintainability/Accessibility
- R10 Cable Size
- R11 FPM Capability
- R12 Weight, #_f

SOW Goals

- G1 Variable Diameter .50 $\rightarrow$ 1.0 in.
- G2 400 FPM Capability

SUBTOTAL

CID Evaluation Criteria

- No. of Components
- Inherent Reliability, MTBF
- Developmental Cost X 1000 \$
- Cable Connect Efficiency
- μ Dependence
- Fatigue/Wear Impact
- Producibility
- Level I Mat'l Control Traceability System

GRAND TOTAL

Seals Configurations				Variable Iris
Variable-Artic. Seg.	Variable-Bladder	Fixed-2 Posn., Split		
2	.08	2		.1
-	-	-		-
.33	.66	1		.33
2	2	2		2
2	2	2		2
2	1	2		2
.66	2	.66		1.33
2	2	2		1.33
.66	2	1.33		.66
.69	.69	2		2
2	2	2		2
2	2	2		2
3	3	-		3
3	-	3		3
22.31	22.78	27.74		21.33
SUBTOTAL				
.13	1	.75		.07
.38	.24	1		.26
.18	.56	1		.25
.95	1	1		.9
1	.33	1		1
1	.33	1		.66
.33	.56	1		.44
.2	2	2		2
28.31	25.78	30.74		27.33
GRAND TOTAL				

Figure 3.3.2(b). Seals Configurations Tradeoff Summary Chart

accommodated. In order to meet both the R9 → 11, R14 size capability and the G1 requirement, two staged seal assemblies, i.e., in tandem, would have to be installed, with the assumption that the .50 → 1.00 G1 criteria implies antenna elements.

A key development consideration must be the characterization of the viscous fluid for sealing vs temperature and pressure differentials — and what happens to the fluid when the split seal opens up. (Up to .75 in.³ fluid could be lost with each opening.) An optional consideration could be to incorporate a drain circuit between wipers in the seal assembly and/or eliminate the viscous fluid entirely.

- (b) The Variable, Articulated Segment type is too complex and limits Antenna Element Size Capability to 1.38 in. OD.
- (c) The Variable Iris type is felt to be limited in capability to minimize leakage and is extremely complex. However, it does appear capable of handling all cable sizes from .50 → 4.00 in.
- (d) The Variable Bladder type is limited to a 2:1 expansion ratio limitation (maximum) due to inherent material elastic properties limitations. If some means could be developed to permit higher expansion ratios up to 6.15:1 with a bladder material that can withstand a 600 psi operational pressure difference without integral material reinforcement, then this type would become preferential in selection over (b) and (c) — and perhaps (a).

3.3.2.4 Recommendations

Select the Fixed Two Position Split type of dynamic seal as the primary candidate offering the best possibility of meeting the Requirements/Goals with the least development risk and highest cost effectiveness.

SECRET

SECRET

TABLE OF CONTENTS
VOLUME II, SECTION 4, TOW/EXIT POINT STUDY

	<u>Page</u>
4.1 INTRODUCTION	97
4.1.1 Definition	97
4.1.2 Problem Areas	97
4.1.3 Requirements	98
4.1.4 Analytical Approach	98
4.1.5 Candidate	100
4.1.5.1 Selection	100
4.1.5.2 Interfaces	100
4.1.5.3 Pros & Cons Summary	100
4.2 DISCUSSION	102
4.2.1 Characterization of the Tow/Exit Point	102
4.2.2 Analysis of Considerations	102
4.2.3 Recommendation	105

SECTION 4
TOW/EXIT POINT STUDY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.1 Defintion

4.1.1.1 The Tow point is the point outboard of the pressure hull at which the antenna assembly exits the superstructure of the submarine.

4.1.1.2 The concept(s) shall optimize the tow/exit point location, shape and size to obtain maximum speed/depth performance from the antenna system; and sustain the loading imposed by high speed/long cable length towing. The tow/exit point shall not impose constraints, or excessive loading on the cable, and in-line components of present and future antenna assemblies.

4.1.2 Problem Areas

4.1.2.1 The configuration requirements imposed direct possible solution(s) toward a bellmouth having a contour radius greater than 12 inches, with arc-of-contact of 90°. The bellmouth must sustain a 6000# to 10,000# tow load at 90° flight angle under high speed/long cable length deployment, retrieval or streaming operation -- with the submarine in a sharp turn. The concept configuration objective must be directed towards a means by which this can be achieved, yet minimize both structural impact and the hydrodynamic drag profile.

4.1.2.2 The tow point must be located to allow the cable/antenna assembly to clear the vertical rudder, horizontal stabilizers, and propeller. This could be accomplished by locating the tow point on the horizontal stabilizers. However, at this location it would interfere with existing STASS and TB-16 towed array tow points and the future CHETSA tow point. The top of the rudder is an acceptable location. However it is hard to implement mechanically. If the tow point is located at the top most aft position of the sail, the cable/antenna assembly will clear the rudder and stabilizer. Also, the depth at which the submarine can operate while communicating will be enhanced.

4.1.2.3 Corrosion/Fouling must be addressed vis-a-vis material selection.

4.1.3 Requirements

4.1.3.1 The allocated Requirements and Goals to the Tow/Exit Point are as shown in Figure 4.1.3.1. Refer to the Discussion paragraph 4.2 for analysis and recommendation.

Additional CID evaluation criteria which were employed are:

- a. No. of Components - determine relative complexity.
- b. Inherent Reliability - determine a characteristic MTBF.
- c. Development Cost - determine relative budgetary cost estimate to produce a working prototype, (including drawings).
- d. Cable Contact Efficiency - characterized determination of cable handling method, and the consequent potential degree of impact on the cable structure geometry.
- e. Friction Dependence - evaluation of the susceptibility of performance degradation based on environmental friction characteristics variability vs a minimum μ required by the particular mechanism to transmit energy into the cable assembly system.
- f. Fatigue/Wear Impact - characterized determination of the cable handling method, and the consequent impact on cable structure failure.
- g. Producibility - relative estimate of degree of difficulty in fabrication/assembly and qualification test of the particular mechanism analyzed.

4.1.3.2 The Evaluation Criteria are employed to ascertain whether the proposed concept configuration is capable of meeting the Requirements and goals and CID evaluation criteria. Refer to Section 5 for Analysis.

4.1.4 Analytical Approach

4.1.4.1 The candidate concept configuration is analyzed/characterized to the extent necessary in the Discussion paragraph 4.2, to assess whether or not each of the allocated Requirements and Goals can be met. Additional CID evaluation criteria are imposed to

GOULD

GOULD INC. - CINCINNATI INSTRUMENT DIVISION

**DRSS SOW REQUIREMENTS/GOALS
ALLOCATION TO COMPONENT LEVEL**

COMPONENT	REQUIREMENTS	GOALS
• TON/EXIT POINT	4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16	1,2,3
• CABLE GUIDE -		
- CONDUIT	4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16	
- SEALS & VALVES	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 18	1
- CABLE/ANTENNA ELEMENT		
SHEAR DEVICE	1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 20	
• DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM	3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20	1,2,3,5
• STORAGE ASSEMBLY	1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20	1,2,3,5
• SENSORS	1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17	1,2,3,4
• CONTROLS	3, 6, 15, 17, 18, 20	2,3,4,5
• POWER SOURCE	3, 6, 8, 15, 16, 20	2,3
• ANTENNA/RF INTERFACE	1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17	2,3,4

NOTE: (1) REQUIREMENTS #7 & 19 ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE,

NOTE: (1) REQUIREMENTS #7 & 19 ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE,

Figure 4.1.3.1. DRSS SOW Requirements/Goals Allocation to Component Level

ascertain: (1) factors impacting on engineering or manufacturing feasibility and (2) unit production cost factors which will be used as the basis of Design to Cost evaluation at the Systems Level in Volume I. Finally, a Recommendation is made based upon the results of the evaluations.

4.1.5 Candidate


4.1.5.1 The candidate approach selected for evaluation is an articulated bellmouth, per Concept Configuration Figure 4.1.5.1. A detailed configuration description, operating explanation and consideration(s) overview is presented in the Discussion paragraph 4.2.

4.1.5.2 The Tow/Exit Point interfaces with the following:

- Conduit/Guide Tube: Rigid joint not possible, articulation clearance of $> 1/4$ in. recommended.
- Submarine Superstructure: Minimize envelope requirements such that installation feasibility is possible for both potential locations. Minimize hydrodynamic drag profile impact.

4.1.5.3 Pros and Cons Summary

<u>Mechanism</u>	<u>Pro</u>	<u>Con</u>
● Articulated bellmouth Tow/Exit Point	● Envelope $< .84 \text{ ft}^3$ ● Wt $< 150 \text{ lb}_m$ ● 90° bend capability ● Bellmouth entrance/ exit max. cross- sectional area $< 64 \text{ in.}^2$	Imposed shear load approx. $379 \text{ lb}_t/\text{linear ft}$ for 0.65 Dia cable and 12 in. contour radius



10/29/79 W.R. RICHARDS

Figure 4.1.5.1. Articulated Bellmouth, Tow/Exit Point

4.2 DISCUSSION

4.2.1 Characterization of the Tow/Exit Point

- Configuration:

Sized to accept 4 in. OD x 4' long antenna elements, the bellmouth is required to accept $\approx 90^\circ$ of bend concentric to the ship longitudinal centerline -- constrained that hull superstructure boundaries including aft horizontal and vertical stabilizers do not intercept the free streaming B.C.A. under maneuvering conditions. Assume static guide surfaces.

As a conventional bellmouth permitting 90° of bend accommodation would require an exit opening approximately 28 inches across, an articulated bellmouth, having a 12 inch max width is analyzed. Refer to Figure 4.1.5.1. This will provide the minimum impact on installation envelope requirements, hydrodynamic drag profile, and system weight.

- Operation:

The bellmouth is passively reactive to outboard force imbalance (beyond the spherical ball joint pivot point -- and is forced to align itself to minimize this imbalance. Maximum accommodation is a 45° pivot plus that of the exit bellmouth fairing of 45° -- or 90° . Bellmouth articulation commences at a flight angle $> 5^\circ$; with a 2.50 F.S. @ 30° - - assuming $\mu_{\text{ball}} \leq .05$, cable tension = 6000#_f and $\mu_{\text{bellmouth}} \leq .50$.

- Interfaces:

- (1) Option 1 -- Sail Superstructure and Conduit
- (2) Option 2 -- Aft Vertical Stabilizer and Conduit

- Considerations:
 - (a) Materials Selection
 - (b) Structural Requirements
 - (c) Loading imposed on the B.C.A.
 - (d) Location
 - (e) Heat Transfer

4.2.2 Analysis of Considerations


- (a) Materials selection, re corrosion resistance, is limited to the material options listed in Section 3, Part 1 — with Monel 400 (or equivalent) recommended. Due to the conic bellmouth geometry required for the Tow/Exit Point, a cast structure is indicated -- with material - Monel - per QQN-288, $\sigma_y = 32,000 \rightarrow 80,000$ psi.
- (b) Structural Requirements are based upon determination of the operating profile for Retrieval/Deployment and $\tan \theta$, array elevation vs scope @ varying speeds up to 3000#_f minimum requirement and 6000#_f, goal. (Refer to Appendix H.)
 - (1) At 5 knots, 420.9' elev./4992 ft scope = 186.6#_f; $\theta = 4.84^\circ$
 - (2) At 7.5 knots, 274.5' elev./4992 ft scope = 397.2#_f; $\theta = 3.15^\circ$
 - (3) At 10 knots, 201.3' elev./4992 ft scope = 696.3#_f; $\theta = 2.31^\circ$
 - (4) At 15 knots, 128.2' elev./4992 ft scope = 1555.5#_f; $\theta = 1.47^\circ$
 - (5) At 20 knots, 91.9' elev./4992 ft scope = 2760.4#_f; $\theta = 1.06^\circ$

The static tow load requirement is 6000#_f minimum and 10,000#_f goal.

- (c) Calculation of Loading, imposed on the B.C.A. is made for two cases: (1) Point Contact or Side Loading due to towing and (2) Imposed Shear Load during Retrieval/Deployment operations.

- (1) i Per Appendix H, the minimum Requirement 13 for a static tow load of 6000#_f. At this load and 5000 ft of scope, an elevation of 55.6 ft yields a rise angle of 0.64° and a load of 6205.2#_f.

- ii By a vector approximation, to find the imposed side load,



$$\sin 0.64^\circ = \text{side load/tow load}$$

$$0.01118 \times 6205.2\#_f = \text{side load} =; = \underline{69.37\#_f}$$

- iii As $\approx 3^\circ$ included angle is incorporated at the bellmouth throat, thru an arc-of-contact of 2 in., the 69.37#_f is distributed over $.53^\circ/3^\circ \times 2$ in. or .353 linear inches by approx. 0.25 in. cable contact width; or .088 in.².

$$\text{Point Contact Loading, psi} = 69.37\#_f / .088 \text{ in.}^2$$

$$= \underline{785.3 \text{ psi}}$$

Distributed loading would occur over an arc-of-contact of 18.85 in. for a submarine at high speed in a sharp turn; or P.C.L. = 5.20 psi !

This is acceptable.

- (2) i Per Requirement 16, the minimum dynamic loading is 3000#_f. This load is found at approximately 20 knots speed, 5000 ft of scope, where an elevation of 91.9 ft yields a rise angle of 1.06° and a load of 2760.4#_f.

- ii By the Euler Relation, the distributed load across a bend angle of 1.06° is found as follows:

$$T_i/T_o = e^{\mu\alpha}$$

$$\text{where } T_o = 2760.4\#_f \approx 3000\#_f$$

$$\mu = .40$$

$$\& \alpha = 1.06^\circ \times 2$$

$$\therefore T_i = T_o \times 1.00743$$

$$= 3022.3\#_f$$

$$\therefore \text{The distributed load is } 22.3\#_f$$

- iii As the arc-of-contact equals $1.06^\circ/3^\circ \times 2"$, or .707 inches the imposed shear load is:

$$\text{Shear load, per linear ft} = (22.3\#_f/.707 \text{ in.}) \times 12 \text{ in./ft}$$

$$= \underline{378.7\#_f/\text{linear ft}}$$

- iiii Per Appendix G, the allowable shear loading equals $733\#_f/\text{linear ft}$. Therefore the above value in iii is acceptable.

- (d) There are two desirable locations for the Tow/Exit Point: (1) the topmost, aft point of the sail superstructure and (2) the topmost, leading edge of the vertical stabilizer. System Concept A, B, C and D uses location (1) and System Concept E uses location (2). Location (1) is recommended since it provides the maximum possible submerged running depth. Space requirements for the articulated bellmouth are $< .84 \text{ ft}^3$ ($\approx 10 \text{ in. cylinder} \times 17.5 \text{ inches long}$). Consequently the Hydrodynamic drag profile upset is minimized.
- (e) Heat transfer requirements impose minimal constraints upon the design. Refer to Section 3, Part 1, paragraph (j) for analysis.

4.2.3 Recommendation

Employ the candidate concept configuration as defined since all evaluation criteria (per paragraph 4.3.1), and considerations appear to be met.

Section 3

SECTION 5
EVALUATION CRITERIA ANALYSIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	107
5.1 DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM	108
5.2 CABLE STOWAGE	133
5.3 CABLE GUIDE	143
Part 1 Conduit/Guide Tube	143
Part 2 Valves	144
Part 3 Seals	145
5.4 TOW/EXIT POINT	151

INTRODUCTION

The evaluation criteria analysis (ECA) provides a summary of the methodology employed in generating the numerical ratings presented in the tradeoff summary charts. The ECA includes some of the assumptions used in the analysis so that a better understanding of the assessment may be obtained. The detailed calculations to back up the ECA are contained in the appendices and are referenced where appropriate.

Three kinds of evaluation criteria were used in the study. The first two are SOW requirements and goals. The third is the CID evaluation criteria. The CID evaluation criteria were employed because these additional engineering considerations were considered necessary by CID to help discriminate among the many candidates in each tradeoff analysis.

5.1 DEPLOY/RETRIEVE MECHANISM EVALUATION CRITERIA ANALYSIS

R5 - Imposed Shear Stress/Imposed Tensile Stress

- $\tau = \text{Force}/A_{\text{surface}}$; $\sigma = \text{Force}/A_{\text{cross-section}}$
- Per Spec. criteria of 100#_f shear/linear ft yields 8.33 #_f/in, or, with 0.65D cable — equals 8.33#_f/(in. x π x .65 Dia) or 4.08 psi.
- Per Cable Analysis, Appendix G. The modulus of elasticity measured equals 17,882#_f/in² for a load of 100#_f and an elongation of .2003 in. over an 11.88 inch test specimen. This yields an ϵ of .0169 in/in.

Linear Traction: $\tau = 4.08$ psi; $\sigma_t = 9047$ psi

Analogy - BRA-18 (Double Belt w/Clamps). Refer to Appendix A.

- 2 point loading
- 100#_f/linear ft yields $\tau = 4.08$ psi
- 3000#_f dyn. loading yields $\sigma_t = 9047$ psi
- No bending contribution to τ
- μ est @ .5; $\tau_c = 2 \times \sigma$ reqd.

Clamp Traction: $\tau = 2.45 \text{ psi}$; $\sigma_t = 9047 \text{ psi}$

Analogy - Pultrusion, Mechanical. Refer to Appendix B.

- 4 point loading
- $400\#_f/2$ linear ft yields $\tau = 8.16 \text{ psi}$
 $\sigma_c = 1332\#_f \text{ preload}/24.504 \text{ in}^2 = 54.36 \text{ psi}$
as this is $6.66 \times > 8.16 \text{ psi}$ (above)
assume $\tau_{\text{equiv}} = 16.32/6.66 = 2.45 \text{ psi}$
- $3000\#_f$ dyn. loading yields $\sigma = 9047 \text{ psi}$
- No bending contribution to τ
- $\mu_{\text{est}} @ .333$
reqd

Single Drum Capstan: $\tau = 7.35 \text{ psi}$; $\sigma_t = 9047 \text{ psi}$

Analogy - BRA-24 Single Drum Capstan and CHETSA. Refer to Appendix C.

- 1 point loading
- $100\#_f/\text{linear ft}$ yields $\tau = 4.08 \text{ psi}$
- $3000\#_f$ dyn. loading yields $\sigma = 9047 \text{ psi}$
- Cal. of bending contribution to $\tau = dr/ds = .65/48 = .0135 =$
1.35% elongation
- Present BRA-24 $\tau_{\text{equiv}} = 419.5\#_f/24.504 \text{ in}^2$
 $= 17.12 \text{ psi or, } \approx \underline{2.33X} !$

Per cable analysis, Appendix G,

@ $100\#_f$ loading, $\epsilon = .0169 \text{ in/in}$

$\therefore$ equivalent load $= .0135/.0169 \times 100\#_f$ or $80.1\#_f$

$\therefore \tau_{\text{equivalent}} = 408 \text{ psi} + \frac{80.1\#_f}{100\#_f} (408 \text{ psi}) = 7.349 \text{ psi}$

- $\mu_{\text{est}} @ .188$. Ref. Capstan Characterization, Appendix I
reqd

Laminar Fluid: $\tau = 2.04 \text{ psi}$; $\sigma_t = 9047 \text{ psi}$

Analogy - Pultrusion, Fluidic. Refer to Appendix D.

- Uniform loading
- $50\#_f/\text{linear ft}$ yields $\tau = 2.04 \text{ psi}$
- $3000\#_f$ dyn. loading yields $\sigma = 9047 \text{ psi}$
- No bending contribution to τ
- μ_{est} - not applicable
reqd

Direct Windup: * $\tau = 4.08 \text{ psi}$; $\sigma_t = 9047 \text{ psi}$

Analogy - AN/SQR-19. Refer to Appendix E

- 1 point loading
- $100\#_f/\text{linear ft}$ yields $\tau = 4.08 + \text{bending contribution (see Single Drum Capstan) or } \tau_{\text{equiv}} = 7.349 \text{ psi}$
- $3000\#_f$ dyn. loading yields $\sigma = 9047 \text{ psi}$
- μ_{est} - not applicable
reqd
- Requires additional mechanism to assist in deployment --
est @ $400 \rightarrow 600\#_f$.

R9, 10, 11 & 14 - Cable Size Capability

- Cable dia equals $0.650 \pm .020 \text{ in. (R14)}$
- Inline conn., elect. and housing conns., per D-02386, 7 & 8-001. Max. $6' \text{ Lg} \times 1" \text{ OD}$; min. $12" \text{ lg} \times .65 \text{ OD (R9)}$
- Cable const. similar to NUSC Spec. C-342/4141-279 (R10)
- Antenna lements Max. $6' \text{ Lg} \times 6" \text{ OD}$; Min. $4' \text{ Lg} \times 4" \text{ OD (R11)}$
- Add'l Considerations: (Peak values - All Mechanisms)
 - (a) No. longitudinally rigid connector structure elements
 $> 6\% / 2 = 3.25 \text{ in.}$

(b) $\tau_{\text{Limit}} = 7.35 \text{ psi}$; $\sigma_{t_{\text{limit cable}}} \geq 9047 \text{ psi}$;

$$\tau_{c_{\text{limit cable}}} = 54.6 \text{ psi}$$

(c) Point contact loading, 4" element $< 207\#_f$

Point contact loading, 65" cable $\leq 46\#_f$

Point contact loading, .65" connectors $\leq 541\#_f$

Linear Traction

Refer to Appendix A; .65 $\rightarrow$ 4.00 in.

Clamp Traction

Refer to Appendix B; .65 $\rightarrow$ 4.00 in.

Single Drum Capstan

Refer to Appendix C; .65 $\rightarrow$ 4.00 in.

Laminar Fluid

Refer to Appendix D; .65 $\rightarrow$? (4.00 in. may be possible!)

Direct Windup

Refer to Appendix E; .65 $\rightarrow$ 4.00 in.

R16 - Dynamic Load Capability

- Per spec. criteria, equals $3000\#_f$ minimum

Linear Traction

Refer to Appendix A; $3000\#_f$

Clamp Traction

Refer to Appendix B; $3000\#_f$

Single Drum Capstan

Refer to Appendix C; $3000\#_f$

Laminar Fluid

Refer to Appendix D; $3000\#_f$

Direct Windup

Refer to Appendix E; $3000\#_f$

R13 - Static Load Capability

- Max. static tensile 10,000#_f; Min. equals 6,000#_f
- Consideration: non-operational, steady-state towing

Linear Traction

Per Appendix A; staging required, necessitates coordination or uniform locking, i.e., N^0_{locks} equals N^0_{stages} . A single lock would see loading equal to N^0_{stages} x greater than operational loading.

Conclusion: locking of the traction belt(s) not recommended -- therefore must lock the storage assembly.

Clamp Traction

Per Appendix B; each stage incorporates inherent regenerative braking equivalent to 3.33 x dyn. loading, or 10,000#_f.

Single Drum Capstan

Per Appendix C; pawl locking mechanism required to minimize cable burying on the storage assembly under high static loads.

Laminar Fluid

Per Appendix D; no locking capability, therefore, must lock the storage assembly.

Direct Windup

Per Appendix E; must lock the storage assembly.

R15 - FPM Capability

- Minimum speed equals 200 FPM

Linear Traction

Refer to Appendix A; 200 FPM

Clamp Traction

Refer to Appendix B; 200 FPM

Single Drum Capstan

Refer to Appendix C; 200 FPM

Laminar Fluid

Refer to Appendix D; 200 FPM

Direct Windup

Refer to Appendix E; 200 FPM

R20 - HP Required

- (a) 3000 psi @ 30 GPM = 52.5 HP
- (b) 200/440 VAC; 300/150 Amps, 3Ø, 60 Hz = 153.3 HP
- (c) Consideration: 3000#_f dyn. loading and 200 FPM w/optimum drive selected

Linear Traction

Refer to Appendix A; 21.05

- Using a SAMM M18-80 hyd. drive motor - @ 6.5 ft-lbs/100 psi; 4.88 in.³/rev, 6" PD drive sheave and idler sheave @ 128 RPM, GPM/drive belt motor equals $4.88 \times 128 \div 231$ in.³/rev = 2.704 GPM. The Δ Psi required equals 300#_f load/belt x .25 ft radius + 6.5 ft-lbs per 100 psi equals 1154 psi. HP/drive belt motor equals 2.704×1154 psi = 1714 = 1.821 HP.
- ∴ For 2 drive belt motors/stage x 5 Stages, Net HP_{reqd} @ $\eta_o = .865$ equals 21.05.

Clamp Traction

Refer to Appendix B; 21.05

- Using 1 in. bore cyl., .65 dia. rod, 24 in. stroke x 100 strokes/min; 8 stages and 100#_f/clamp (=2 ft long) x 4 clamps/stage.
- GPM_{reqd} = 146.95; Δ Psi_{reqd} = 212.06
- ∴ @ an $\eta_o = .865$ equals net HP_{reqd} = 21.05

Single Drum Capstan

Refer to Appendix C; 21.05

- Using a Hagglunds 3160 hyd. drive motor - @ 275 ft-lbs/100 psi; 207 in.³/Rev w/48" PD capstan drive drum rotating @ 15.92 RPM

$$\text{GPM}_{\text{reqd}} = 14.3; \Delta \text{Psi}_{\text{reqd}} = 2182$$

$$\therefore @ \text{an } \eta_o = .865 \text{ equals net HP}_{\text{reqd}} \text{ 21.05}$$

Laminar Fluid

Refer to Appendix D; 72.02 or Viewgraph 2156

- Note: HP_{reqd} is directly a function of cable OD, tube ID! Unit sized for 3000#_f dyn. loading, w/drag coefficient $C_D = 6.57$; Drag Force = 50#_f/Linear Ft. Reynolds No. of viscous fluid = 0.0408; Hyd. dia. = 2.0 for Cable OD = 0.65 in. @ an Absolute Flow Vel. = 9.33 ft/sec, relative flow vel. = 6.00; Average Flow = 57.21 GPM; $\Delta \text{PSI/ft}$ head loss = 33.2; 60 ft tube length equals a net HP_{reqd} @ $\eta_o = .865$ 72.02

Direct Windup

Refer to Appendix E; 21.05

- Identical characteristics to that of the single drum capstan drive.
- Additional deployment aid not included as deployment initial loads << 21.05 HP.

Number of Components

- Consideration: To develop means to evaluate inherent reliability and development/operating and support cost basis.

- Staging determines total number indicated as a multiple of the base configuration.
- Source energy transformer(s)/additional transfer mechanism aids not considered.

Linear Traction

Refer to Appendix A; 390

- 78 Components/Stage x 5 Stages = 390

Clamp Traction

Refer to Appendix B; 664

- 83 Components/Stage x 8 Stages = 664

Single Drum Capstan

Refer to Appendix C; 74

- 74 Components/Assembly

Laminar Fluid

Refer to Appendix D; 4

- Single tube 60 ft lg, w/dir./flow control - Pressure compensated valve (servo operated); and end seal assemblies

Direct Windup

Refer to Appendix E; 61

- Drum, Support Bearings, Drive Motor, and Levelwind Mechanism w/Ball Screw Assembly, Support Bearings, Pulleys, Timing Belt, and End Support Flanges
(NOTE - An additional mechanism must be added to aid in deployment. Assume a single stage traction belt @ 48 components/stage)

R20 - Power Source Required

- Drive characterization determines source required, i.e., either electric or hydraulic.
- Consideration: Energy source transformers specified where necessary to meet drive unit requirements.

Linear Traction Belt: Hydraulic

Refer to Appendix A;

- 75 ft-lbs del. torque @ 128 RPM required. Direct-coupled to eliminate noise generators.
- Hyd. motors most efficient drive units with respect to specific vol and wt per unit del. HP.

Clamp Traction: Hydraulic

Refer to Appendix B;

- Functional configuration requirements/required loads, dictate hyd. cylinders.
- Energy source transformer required to convert ship source power by inverting GPM-PSI relationship.

Single Drum Capstan: Hydraulic/Electric

- 6000 ft-lbs Del. torque @ 15.92 RPM required.
Direct-coupled to eliminate noise generators.
- Hyd. Motor - 1 ea. Hagglunds 3160
- Solid State Drive - 7 ea PMI
Torque Ring 4/2.5 @ 880 ft-lbs (continuous)
(Pressure compensated version could reduce N^0 . required to 2 ea.
i.e., 19.4 ft-lbs/Amp yields 90.72 Amps w/DC of Approx.
 $170_{\max}$ (Est. Only.)
 $\therefore kw = I \times V = 15.42 kw$
& 4 ea. Motors = 61.68 kw

- Energy source transformer required to convert ship source electric power from 220/440 VAC, 300/150 Amps, 3Ø, 60 Hz to a DC Power Supply or use ships DC bus.

Laminar Fluid: Electric

- Special Fluid Required having 3049#_m/ft-sec Absolute Viscosity @ 85°F
- Energy source transformer required to convert ship source electric power to electric/hydraulic prime mover such as IMO or SIMPLEX recirculation pump

Direct Windup: Hydraulic/Electric

- Identical characteristics to that of the single drum capstan

R7 - Envelope

- Based upon Min/Max analysis, with values selected accurate to ranges indicated.
- Based upon 3000#_f Dyn. Load and 200 FPM requirements with antenna element capacity up to 4 in.

Linear Traction

Refer to Appendix A; 32.02 ± 10%

Clamp Traction

Refer to Appendix B; 34.30 ± 10%

Single Drum Capstan: 25.21 ± 10%

Refer to Appendix C; 25/21 ± 10%

Laminar Fluid

Refer to Appendix D; 9.90 ± 10%

- Does not include weight required for Energy Source Transformers. Refer to R20 for Discussion.

Direct Windup

Refer to Appendix E; $86.54 \pm 10\%$

- Does not include weight required for Energy Source Transformers. Refer to R20 for Discussion.

R19 - Weight

- Based upon Min/Max analysis with values selected accurate to range indicated
- Based upon 3000#_f dyn. load and 200 FPM requirements, with antenna element capacity up to 4 in.

Linear Traction

Refer to Appendix A; $1500\# \pm 10\%$

Clamp Traction

Refer to Appendix B; $1814 \rightarrow 2000\#$

- Required lightweight technology application to achieve $226.8\# + 23.2\#/\text{Stage} \times 8 \text{ Stages} \rightarrow$ yields $1814 \rightarrow 2000\#$
- Does not include weight required for Energy Source Transformer. Refer to R20 for Discussion.

Single Drum Capstan

Refer to Appendix C; $2300\# \pm 10\%$

Laminar Fluid

Refer to Appendix D; $1483.1 \rightarrow 1779.8\#$

- $1483.1 \pm 2\%$ yields a range of $1483.1 \rightarrow 1779.8\#$
- Does not include weight required for Energy Source Transformer. Refer to R20 for Discussion.

Direct Windup

Refer to Appendix E; $2896\# \pm 10\%$

Inherent Reliability

- Based upon FARADA Shipboard Equipment Failure Rate Data - Control Components/Valving excluded
- Analogous components/generalizations employed to ascertain relative MTBF comparisons. (Series Analysis employed)

Linear Traction

<u>Items/Stage</u>	<u>No. Req'd.</u>	<u>$\lambda/10^6$ Hrs.</u>	<u>λ Net/10^6 Hrs.</u>
a. Main Bearings	8	93.2	745.6
b. Idler Bearings	14	93.2	1304.8
c. Belts-4" wide	2	3125.0	6250.0
d. Hyd. Motors	2	167.0	303.0
e. Gripping Attach.	242	1.0	242.0
f. Timing Chains	2	347.0	694.0
g. Hyd. Actuators	4	667.0	2668.0
h. Stage Support Str.	2	0.1	.2
			<u>12,207.6</u>

$$\text{STAGE MTBF}_{\text{est}} = \frac{1}{\sum \lambda_i} = \frac{1 \times 10^6 \text{ Hrs.}}{12,207.6 \text{ Failures}}$$

$$= 81.82 \text{ Hrs.}$$

- Assuming an R&D optimization of the following items:
 - (a) & (b) Change to Kamatics Bushings @ > 100, 730 Hrs MTBF or select appropriate B_{10} @ 10X
 - (c) LC-54 belt configuration @ > 1000 Hrs MTBF
 - (d) SAMM hyd. motors, actual = > 12,000 Hrs MTBF
 - (e) Timing chains to > 6000 Hrs MTBF
 - (f) Hyd. actuators to > 6000 Hrs MTBF
 - (g) No change

$$\text{STAGE MTBF}_{\text{adj}} = \frac{1}{\Sigma \lambda_{\text{adj}}} = \frac{1 \times 10^6 \text{ Hrs}}{3697.1 \text{ Failures}}$$

$$= \underline{270.5 \text{ Hrs}}$$

- Conclusion: (a) Belt replacement mandatory approximately every 250 operating hrs. to assure that the system remains operational. An adjusted MTBF_{est} assuming belt maintenance yields:

$$\therefore \text{STAGE MTBF}_{\text{adj.}} = \frac{1}{\Sigma \lambda_{\text{adj.}}} = \frac{1 \times 10^6 \text{ Hrs.}}{2134.9 \text{ Failures}}$$

$$= \underline{468.4 \text{ Hrs}}$$

$$\& \text{ SYSTEM MTBF} = \frac{1}{\Sigma \lambda_{\text{STAGE}}} = \frac{1 \times 10^6 \text{ Hrs}}{10,674.5 \text{ Failures}}$$

$$= \underline{93.7 \text{ Hrs}}$$

Clamp Traction

	<u>Items/Stage</u>	<u>No. Reqd</u>	<u>$\lambda / 10^6 \text{ Hrs.}$</u>	<u>$\lambda \text{ Net} / 10^6 \text{ Hrs.}$</u>
a.	Tube	1	.1	1.0
b.	Clamp Support Hsg.	4	.5	2.0
c.	T&B Linkage Members	8	10.0 est	80.0
d.	Linkages	16	20.0 est	320.0
e.	Hyd. Actuators	8	166.7*	1333.6
f.	Flanges	2	.1	.2
				1736.8

*Refer to previous analysis for Traction Belt optimization.

$$\therefore \text{STAGE MTBF} = \frac{1}{\sum \lambda_i} = \frac{1 \times 10^6 \text{ Hrs}}{1736.8 \text{ Failures}}$$

$$= 575.8 \text{ Hrs.}$$

$$\& \text{SYSTEM MTBF} = \frac{1}{\sum \lambda_{\text{STAGE}}} = \frac{1 \times 10^6 \text{ Hrs}}{13.894.4 \text{ Failures}}$$

$$= 72.0 \text{ Hrs.}$$

Single Drum Capstan

<u>Item</u>	<u>No. Reqd</u>	<u>$\lambda/10^6 \text{ Hrs.}$</u>	<u>$\lambda \text{ Net}/10^6 \text{ Hrs.}$</u>
(a) Drum	1	.1	.1
(b) Bearing Supports	2	.1	.2
(c) Bearings	2	9.3*	18.6
(d) Hyd. Motor	1	83.3*	83.3
(e) Shaft w/Mts	1	.1	.1
(f) Pinch Roller Supports	2.5	.1	.5
(g) Pinch Roller Assys. (analogy - 2x Linkages)	60	20.0 est	1200.0
			<u>1302.7</u>

$$\therefore \text{SYSTEM MTBF} = \frac{1}{\sum \lambda_i} = \frac{1 \times 10^6 \text{ Hrs.}}{4902.8 \text{ Failures}}$$

$$= 768.0 \text{ Hrs.}$$

Laminar Fluid

<u>Item</u>	<u>No. Reqd</u>	<u>$\lambda/10^6 \text{ Hrs.}$</u>	<u>$\lambda \text{ Net}/10^6 \text{ Hrs.}$</u>
(a) Tube	1	.1	.1
(b) Dir. F.C. Vlv.	1	417.0	417.0
(c) End Seals	2	356.0	712.0
			<u>1129.1</u>

$$\therefore \text{SYSTEM MTBF} = \frac{1}{\sum \lambda_i} = \frac{1 \times 10^6 \text{ Hrs.}}{1129.1 \text{ Failures}}$$

$$= 885.7 \text{ Hrs.}$$

Direct Windup

<u>Item</u>	<u>No. Reqd</u>	<u>$\lambda / 10^6$ Hrs.</u>	<u>λ Net/10^6 Hrs.</u>
(a) Drum	1	.1	.1
(b) Support Brgs	2	9.3*	18.6
(c) Drive Motor	1	83.3*	83.3
(d) Ball Scw	1	347.0	347.0
(e) Support Brgs		9.3*	18.6
(f) Pulleys/Gears	2	160.0	320.0
(g) Timing Belt/Chain	1	347.0	347.0
(h) Support Flgs	2	.1	.2
(i) Deployment Aid, Single Stage Traction Belt (or equivalent)	1	2134.9*	2134.9
			3269.7

$$\therefore \text{SYSTEM MTBF} = \frac{1}{\sum \lambda_i} = \frac{1 \times 10^6 \text{ Hrs.}}{3269.7 \text{ Failures}}$$

$$= \underline{305.8 \text{ Hrs.}}$$

Development Cost

- Tabulation of Criteria: (= Σ Multiples)
 - (a) 3 x Base Hardware Cost for Prototype Model Des.
 - (b) 2 x Base Hardware Cost for Optimization Req'd (R&D)
 - (c) 1.5 x Base Hardware Cost for Shop Fab. Dwgs.
 - (d) 1.0 x Base Hardware Cost for Prototype Model Hdwe.
- Above factors adjusted for % of Total Required

*Ref. Linear Traction Stage

Linear Traction:

● Base Hardware Cost Est. @ \$24,000 x 3	=	\$ 72k
● R&D Required -- x 2	=	48k
● Shop Fab. Dwgs. Required x 1.5	=	36k
● Prototype Model Hardware Required x 1.0	=	<u>24k</u>
		\$180k

Clamp Traction:

● Base Hardware Cost Est. @ \$23,800 x 3	=	\$ 71.4k
● R&D Reqd -- x 3 (No existing R&D)	=	71.4k
● Shop Fab. Dwgs. Required x 1.5	=	35.7k
● Prototype Model Hardware Reqd x 1.0	=	<u>23.8k</u>
		\$202.3k

Single Drum Capstan:

● Base Hardware Cost Est. @ \$22,700 x 3	=	\$ 68.1k
● R&D Reqd -- x 1 (Existing R&D avail.)	=	22.7k
● Shop Fab. Dwgs. Required x 1.5	=	22.7k
● Prototype Model Hardware Reqd x 1.0	=	<u>22.7k</u>
		\$136.2k

Laminar Fluid:

● Base Hardware Cost Est @ \$8k x 3 (\$6 + 12k) range	=	\$ 24.0k
● R&D Reqd -- x 5 (No existing R&D)	=	40.0k
● Shop Fab. Dwgs. Reqd x 0.5 (very simple)	=	4.0k
● Prototype Model Hardware Reqd x 1.0	=	<u>8.0k</u>
		\$ 76.0k

Direct Windup:

• Base Hardware Cost Est. @ \$26,700 x 3	=	\$ 80.1k
• R&D Reqd -- x 1 (Existing R&D avail.)	=	26.7k
• Shop Fab. Dwgs. required x 1.5	=	40.1k
• Prototype Model Hardware Reqd x 1.0	=	26.7k
		<u>26.7k</u>
		\$172.6k

R8 - Maintainability/Accessibility

- Considerations: (1) Staging as required for removal/repair and replacement; (2) Simplicity -- Standardized components; (3) Function of Envelope and Weight; (4) Accessibility within the Pressure Hull; (5) Required Tooling/Maintenance Equipment; and (6) Inherent Reliability
- Most significant factor, (6), to be weighed @ 2x

Linear Traction:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) Has staging	+1
(2) Standardized	+1
(3) Ranked 3rd Vol & 1st wt	+1
(4) Long and slender	+1
(5) Equipment required is very high	0
(6) Ranked 4th by MTBF	<u>0</u>
	4.0

Clamp Traction:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) Has staging	+1
(2) Standardized	+1
(3) Ranked 3rd vol and 3rd wt	+1
(4) Long and slender	+1
(5) Equipment required is med	0
(6) Ranked 5th by MTBF	<u>0</u>
	4.0

Single Drum Capstan:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) P.R. Assemblies staged	+1
(2) Standardized	+1
(3) Ranked 2nd vol and 4th wt	0
(4) Very bulky	0
(5) Equipment required is low	+1
(6) Ranked 2nd by MTBF	<u>+2</u>
	5.0

Laminar Fluid:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) Only end seals	+1
(2) Standardized	+1
(3) Ranked 1st vol and 2nd wt	+1
(4) Long and <u>very slender</u>	+1
(5) Equipment required is very low	+1
(6) Ranked 1st by MTBF	<u>+1</u>
	7.0

Direct Windup:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) Separable levelwind	+1
(2) Standardized	+1
(3) Ranked 5th vol & 5th	0
(4) Narrow profile	+1
(5) Equipment required is low	+1
(6) Ranked 3rd by MTBF	<u>+2</u>
	6.0

Cable Contact Efficiency

- Consideration: Evaluation of potential impact upon Buoyant Cable and Antenna Element Characteristics: (1) Point Contact; (2) Circumferential Contact; (3) σ_c required

Linear Traction:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) 2-Point	+ .5
(2) Modified Circumferential	+ .5
(3) 8-16 psi (ok)	<u>+1.0</u>
	2.0

Clamp Traction:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) 4-Point	+1.0
(2) Full Circumferential	+1.0
(3) $\sigma_c = 54.36$ psi (ok)	<u>1.0</u>
	3.0

Single Drum Capstan:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) 1-Point	0
(2) No Circumferential	0
(3) 2.66 psi _{est} (ok)	<u>+1.0</u>
	1.0

Laminar Fluid:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) 4-Point +	+1.0
(2) Full Circumferential	+1.0
(3) $\sigma_c = \Delta \overline{PSI}$ 1000 psi (best)	<u>+1.0</u>
	3.0

Direct Windup:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) 1-Point	0
(2) No Circumferential	0
(3) 2.66 psi _{est} (ok)	<u>+1.0</u>
	1.0

Friction Dependence

- Consideration: Evaluation of sensitivity to environmental degradation of performance

Linear Traction Belt

Refer to Appendix A; $\mu = 0.5$

Clamp Traction

Refer to Appendix B; $\mu = .33$

Single Drum Capstan

Refer to Appendix C; $\mu = .19$

Laminar Fluid

Refer to Appendix D; $\mu = .002$

- Avg $\sigma_c = 1000$ psi; generates 50#_f per 24.50 in.² 2 psi
or coupling efficiency @ .002

Direct Windup

Refer to Appendix E; $\mu = .19$

Fatigue/Wear Impact

- Consideration: Evaluation of potential impact upon Buoyant Cable and Antenna Characteristics: (1) Flexure Required; (2) Scuffing Required; (3) Cable Snap

Linear Traction:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) No Flexure	+1.0
(2) No Scuffing	+1.0
(3) No Snap	<u>+1.0</u>
	3.0

Clamp Traction:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) No Flexure	+1.0
(2) No Scuffing	+1.0
(3) No Snap	<u>+1.0</u>
	3.0

Single Drum Capstan:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) Flexure	0
(2) Scuffing	0
(3) No Snap	<u>+1.0</u>
	1.0

Laminar Fluid:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) No Flexure	+1.0
(2) No Scuffing	+1.0
(3) No Snap	<u>+1.0</u>
	3.0

Direct Windup:

<u>Consideration</u>	<u>Value Earned</u>
(1) Flexure	0
(2) No Scuffing	1.0
(3) Snap	<u>0</u>
	1.0

R3 - Structureborne Noise/Airborne Noise

- **Consideration:** Evaluation of inherent structureborne noise generation. Refer to Analysis Appendix F.

Linear Traction

Allowable Amplitude equals .00245 in. Will meet Spec., ± 3 AdB uncertainty, to meet or exceed specification.

Clamp Traction

Allowable Reciprocating imbalance @ 0.25%. Will meet Spec., + AdB uncertainty, to meet or exceed specification.

Single Drum Capstan

Allowable Amplitude equals .159 in. Will meet Spec., @ + 3 AdB margin, to be below specification.

Laminar Fluid

Only noise source due to Fluid-borne transmission. Will meet Spec. @ >> 3 AdB margin, to be below specification.

Direct Windup

Allowable Amplitude equals .159 in. Will meet Spec. @ > 3 AdB margin, to be below specification.

- Consideration: Evaluation of estimated airborne noise generation. Refer to Appendix F, for comparison of specification requirements.
- Experience with identical hydraulic motors, recommended for DRSS, and utilized on the CHETSA development program indicate the following:
 - (1) The ship's hydraulic power supply/operating pressure is the fundamental critical factor in being capable of meeting the airborne noise criteria. Additionally, fluid velocity/fluid shear effects thru valves/restrictions as a function of Δ PSID operating, are a function of the sixth or seventh power of velocity in noise generation.
 - (2) Low RPMs of hydraulically powered machinery; line/flow path sizing to effect a < 3 FPS flow velocity, and employment of hydraulic motors (i.e., Hagglunds 3160 @ < 8% of maximum rated speed and SAMM M18-80 @ < 17% of maximum rated speed, assure minimum airborne noise generation. (A doubling of speed from 200 FPM to 400 FPM could add 36.1 dBs to the noise generation contribution of the fluid flow/shear effects.)
 - (3) Utilizing the above considerations, it is felt that all mechanisms can meet the airborne noise specification requirements, with the following predicted ranking.

Linear Traction: (@ 128 RPM) - barely meet

Clamp Traction: (@ 60 CPM) - barely meet

Single Drum Capstan: (@ 15.92 RPM) - significantly below spec.

Laminar Fluid: (@ 9.33 ft/sec) - below spec.

Direct Windup: (@ 21.22 RPM) - significantly below spec.

R6 - Installation Compatibility

- Consideration: Must be within the confines of the existing superstructure of the SSN-637, 688 class and compatible with SSBN submarines.
- All Mechanisms analyzed appear to meet the minimum requirements of % of the total allowed Vol (R7) and Wt (R19), with the Direct Windup being marginal.

Producibility

- Consideration: Must be able to fabricate and assemble to the tolerances required, employ available materials, employ minimum number of components and qualification tested.
- Ranking as follows: 1 - Low Difficulty; 2 = Medium Difficulty; and 3 = High Difficulty

Linear Traction: 2 + 3

Clamp Traction: 3

Single Drum Capstan: 2

Laminar Fluid: 1

Direct Windup: 1 + 2

G1 - Variable Diameter

- Consideration: 0.50 + 1.0 Dia. Capability

All Mechanisms appear capable of meeting this cable variability.

G3 - 6000#_f Dynamic Load

- Consideration: A single asterisk indicates staging Requirements must be impacted with respect to R7 and R19. A double asterisk indicates pressure limitation. A triple asterisk indicates a HP related Power Source potential limitation.

Linear Traction Belt: 6000#_f *, **, ***

Clamp Traction: 6000#_f^{*}

Single Drum Capstan: 6000#_f^{**,***}

Laminar Fluid: 3000#_f (Does not meet)

Direct Windup: 6000#_f^{**,***}

G2 - 400 FPM Capability

- Consideration: A single asterisk indicates speed limitation with respect to Noise Generation. A double asterisk indicates a HP related Power Source potential limitaiton.

Linear Traction: 400 FPM^{*}

Clamp Traction: 400 FPM^{*}

Single Drum Capstan: 400 FPM^{**}

Laminar Fluid: 200 FPM (Does not meet)

Direct Windup: 400 FPM^{**}

5.2 CABLE STORAGE EVALUATION CRITERIA ANALYSIS

R1 - Positive Self-Sealing:

- Imposed on the RF interface only. Not defined for this study. No problems anticipated is achievement (for the RF interface - slip ring configuration).
- Not depicted on the Tradeoff Summary Charts.

R5 - Imposed Shear Stress, Tensile Stress:

CHETSA

- Refer to Appendix J - 9.78 psi shear
302 psi tensile
- derived from 3 ft minimum bend radius w/criteria of Appendix I, and $< 300\#_f$ tension. Shear stress is an absolute worst case!

W/Levelwind

- Refer to Appendix K - 9.78 psi shear
3016 psi tensile
- Derived from 3 ft minimum bend radius w/criteria of Appendix I, and $< 1000\#_f$ tension.

PPAT

- Refer to Appendix L - 9.78 psi shear
3016 psi tensile

Derived from requirement for the drive train to be within the PPAT — assuming $1000\#_f$ capability and a minimum bend radius of 3 ft (to assure minimum envelope requirements).

Barrel Stuffing

- Refer to Appendix M - ≤ 1.02 psi shear
 ≤ 100 psi tensile
- Estimate only, probably lower! Assume $< 25\#_f$ /linear ft and $< 100\#_f$ net tensile loading.

R16 - Dynamic Load Capability:

CHETSA

- Refer to Appendix J: $300\#_f$
- Based upon a maximum allowable storage tension approximately 3X greater than the existing CHETSA development program requires. This provides a margin of safety to assure that the Antenna Elements 4" OD x 4' long can be wrapped 'snug' for storage -- yet keep point-contact loading (compression/deformation) well below critical limits.

W/Levelwind

- Refer to Appendix K: $1000\#_f$
- Based upon the assumption that a Deploy/Retrieve Mechanism is required. $1000\#_f$ is a best estimate of achievable capability without imposing severe cable handling forces on the B.C.A. Also refer to Section 1, Para. 1.2.4 Recommendations.

PPAT

- Refer to Appendix L: $1000\#$
- Allocation from $3000\#_f$ total required, to the Storage Assembly, as an achievable capability. Note that a Deploy/Retrieve mechanism is required.

Barrel Stuffing

- Refer to Appendix M: $100\#_f$
- Estimate only, of maximum imposed tensile load on the buoyant cable assembly.

R13 - Static Load Capability:

CHETSA

- Refer to Appendix J: $10,000\#_f$

- Although capable of 10,000#_f, caution must be made - due to possible cable burying effect. Note that 10,000#_f is generated at maximum scope deployed, high ship speed, implying very few wraps or layers remaining on the barrel. Compression/deformation -- assuming no crossover (overwrap) the loading could be sustained by employment of a LeBus barrel. Note that the Storage Assembly is not the ideal location for introduction of static load holding capability.

W/Levelwind

- Refer to Appendix K: 10,000#
- See above discussion

PPAT

- Refer to Appendix L: 10,000#
- See above discussion

Barrel Stuffing

- Refer to Appendix M:
- No capability

R15 - FPM Required: 200 FPM

All mechanisms are capable of achieving the required inhaul/outhaul speed.

R20 - HP Required:

CHETSA

- Refer to Appendix J - 2.06 HP

W/Levelwind

- Refer to Appendix K - 6.85 HP

PPAT

- Refer to Appendix L - 6.85 HP

Barrel Stuffing

- Refer to Appendix M - <1 HP

R20 - Power Source Required:

Hydraulic/Electric

- All mechanisms are amenable to integration of either hydraulic or electric drivers.

R7 - Envelope Required:

CHETSA

- Refer to Appendix J - 42.85 ft^3

W/Levelwind

- Refer to Appendix K - 70.13 ft^3

PPAT

- Refer to Appendix L - $> 85.0 \text{ ft}^3$

Barrel Stuffing

- Refer to Appendix M - $110, 25 \text{ ft}^3$
- atmosphere vs free flood displacement

R19 - Weight Required:

CHETSA

- Refer to Appendix J - $1887 \#_m$

W/Levelwind

- Refer to Appendix K - $1613 \#_m$

PPAT

- Refer to Appendix L - $> 6000 \#_m$

Barrel Stuffing

- Refer to Appendix M - $1336 \#_m$

Number of Components

CHETSA

- No. of Components Appendix J - 6

W/Levelwind

- No. of Components Appendix K - 13

PPAT

- No. of Components Appendix L - 14

Barrel Stuffing

- No. of Components Appendix M - 6

Inherent Reliability, MTBF:

CHETSA

- Refer to Appendix J - >10,000 Hrs
- Direct extrapolation of CHETSA development program

W/Levelwind

- Refer to Appendix K - >5000 Hrs
- Direct extrapolation of AN/SQR-19 development programs

PPAT

- Refer to Appendix L - >2,500 Hrs.
- A very generous allocation -- at least 4X less reliable than CHETSA.

Barrel Stuffing

- Refer to Appendix M - >5,000 Hrs.
- Potentially as reliable as the CHETSA Concept, but speed synchronization-control/feedback - dictates a 2X reduction in reliability as a best estimate.

Developmental Cost:

- Note - does not include assembly or test certification!
- Tabulation of Criteria: (= Σ Multiples)
- If employ PMI Solid State Torque Ring Drive, add \$25-75k
 - (a) 3X Base Hardware Cost for Prototype Model Design
 - (b) 1 + 2X Base Hardware Cost for R&D required
 - (c) 1 + 2X Base Hardware Cost for Shop fabrication drawings

(d) 1X Base Hardware Cost for Prototype Model Hardware

CHETSA

- From Appendix J - B.H.C. = \$20,667 (estimated)
- $(3 + 1 + 1 + 1) \times \text{BHC} = \underline{\$124k}$

W/Levelwind

- From Appendix K - B.H.C. = \$28,860 (estimated)
- $(3 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1) \times \text{B.H.C.} = \underline{\$202k}$

PPAT

- From Appendix L - B.H.C. = \$46,250 (estimated)
- $(3 + 2 + 2 + 1) \times \text{B.H.C.} = \underline{\$307k}$

Barrel Stuffing

- From Appendix M - B.H.C. = \$31,077 (estimated)
where cost of Divertor Value w/injector assembly included
in the total
- $(3 + 1 + 1.5 + 1) \times \text{B.H.C.} = \underline{\$202k}$ (estimated)

R8 - Maintainability/Accessibility:

Inherent Reliability, -- No. of elements requiring repair/replacement;

Simplicity -- Standardized components; Function of Envelope & Weight,
and/or accessibility within the pressure hull.

CHETSA: 3 & 3

Based upon relative comparison to other three concepts -- highest
ratings

W/Levelwind: 3 & 2

Based upon relative comparison to other three concepts -- similar to
CHETSA but levelwind increases the degree of difficulty re-access-
sibility

PPAT: 2 & 1

Environmental aspects increase potential maintainability requirements. Accessibility is very difficult.

Barrel Stuffing: 1 & 1

Inaccessible; non-maintainable -- similar to PPAT -- as location in Aft ballast tank

Cable Contact Efficiency:

CHETSA

- Refer to Appendix J: 1 Point
- By inspection

W/Levelwind

- Refer to Appendix K: 2 Point
- By inspection, employs levelwind

PPAT

- Refer to Appendix L: 2 Point
- Assumes levelwind is required to minimize envelope -- i.e., increases packaging efficiency of cable storage

Barrel Stuffing

- Refer to Appendix L: 1 Point
- Although 1 Point, extremely low imposed shear and tensile loading make this a poor comparison for this evaluation criteria

Friction Dependence:

CHETSA

- Refer to Appendix J: .021
- Analogous to Single Drum Capstan Concept discussed in Section 1 where $\mu = .19$ required to assure that shear stress of $100\#_f/\text{ft}$ is not exceeded (@ $3000\#_f$ dynamic load). Equivalent to a 9X reduction.

W/Levelwind

- Refer to Appendix K: .063
- Similar analogy @ 3X load increase

PPAT

- Refer to Appendix L: .063
- Similar analogy @ 3X load increase

Barrel Stuffing

- Refer to Appendix M: <.021
- Similar analogy @ <1X load

Fatigue/Wear Impact:

- Ranking according to imposed shear plus tensile loading, and bend radius. (3 equals least impact)

CHETSA: 2

Higher than Barrel Stuffing but less than w/Levelwind or PPAT.

W/Levelwind: 1

Highest shear and tensile loading

PPAT: 1

Highest shear and tensile loading

Barrel Stuffing: 3

Lowest shear and tensile loading

R3 - Airborne Noise/Structureborne Noise:

- RPMs, required supply pressure (if hydraulic) -- i.e., a direct function of HP required.
- 2 equals highest ranking (lowest noise)

"CHETSA" Concept: 2

Excellent capability to be below specified limits

W/Levelwind: 1

Good capability to be below specified limits

PPAT:

Good capability to be below specified limits

Barrel Stuffing

Excellent capability to be below specified limits

R6 - Installation Compatibility:

- Ranking according to degree-of-difficulty to install or backfit the component configuration analyzed. A function of Envelope & Weight, and assemblability.
- 3 equals highest compatibility.

CHETSA: 3

W/Levelwind: 2

PPAT: 1

Barrel Stuffing: 1.5

Producibility:

- Ranking according to degree-of-difficulty in fabrication, assembly and test certification.
- 3 equals highest producibility.

CHETSA: 3

W/Levelwind: 25

PPAT: 2

Barrel Stuffing: 1.5

The synchro-speed control adjustment (divertor valve and injector assembly coordination) could be potentially unique for each unit produced -- requiring extensive test and adjustment.

G2 - 400 FPM Capability:

All concept configurations can achieve the goal performance of 400 FPM.

G1 - Variable Diameter, 0.50 → 1.00:

CHETSA: OK

W/Levelwind:

- Cannot be employed
- The levelwind mechanism is not easily configured to accept varying diameters w/o very high increase in complexity. (The AN/SQR-19 handles a 1.1 in. OD → 3.25 in. OD cable assembly.)

PPAT:

- Cannot be employed
- Refer to above

Barrel Stuffing: OK

G3 - 6000#_f Dynamic Load:

- The Storage Assembly(s) contributes capacity to handle the load -- but is not the primary means by which this capability is generated.
- Not depicted on the Tradeoff Summary Charts.

G5 - Operation/Control by One Person w/Technical Rating:

- Indeterminate. Refer to Systems Level integration and analysis, Volume I.
- Not depicted on the Tradeoff Summary Charts.

5.3 PART 1: CONDUIT/GUIDE TUBE EVALUATION CRITERIA ANALYSIS

- R4 - No impact, acceptable
- R5 - Ref. 1.2.2(h), acceptable
- R6 - Designed to be within the confines of the existing super-structure, acceptable
- R7 - Total Envelope @ $1.636 \text{ ft}^3/\text{linear running ft}^*$
- R11 - Can accommodate a 4.0 in. OD x 4 ft long Antenna Element, acceptable
- R13 - To be designed for 1.5X B.C.A. breaking strength or $6000\#_f$, whichever is greater, acceptable
- R14 - Accommodates $.650 \pm .020$ in. diameter B.C.A., acceptable
- R15 - Permits 200 FPM payout/retrieval speed. Refer to 1.2.2(j)
- R16 - Sustains $3000\#_f$ dynamic loading. Refer to 1.2.2(h)
- R19 - Total Weight @ $13.43\#_m/\text{linear running ft}^*$
- G1 - Obviously compatible with .50 → 1.00 dia. B.C.A.
- G2 - Can sustain 400 FPM payout/retrieval speed, acceptable
- G3 - Can sustain $6000\#_f$ dynamic loading, acceptable

*Ship's structural interface must be determined in order to define overall length required.

5.3 PART 2: VALVES EVALUATION CRITERIA ANALYSIS

This is a critical program area which could not be adequately addressed during this phase. We suggest that valves definition be a high priority critical area for follow-on studies.

Preliminary concept configuration definition for both the Shear-Seal and the Clamp Seal indicates great potential to resolve valving requirements as related to the DRSS application. A further detailed definition with respect to these two new concepts - and comparison to off-the-shelf valving options is recommended.

5.3 PART 3: SEALS EVALUATION CRITERIA ANALYSIS

R1 - Positive Self-Sealing:

- All are acceptable
- All dynamic seals are failsafe to the closed position. Refer to Appendix N, P, Q, R & S.
- The manual static seal - similar to the Fixed, 2-Posn., Split Seal, per Appendix R - is acceptable

R5 - Imposed Shear Stress, Tensile Stress:

- 4.08 psi shear & $< 25 \#_f$ tensile
- All dynamic seals are essentially non-contact, or assuming a viscous fluid - pressure compensated - w/wiper seal "in" and "out". This is a best estimate of achievable performance for each of the configurations.
- The manual static seal is engaged in the non-operational mode. Clamping or compression loading shall be over a 1.5 inch length of cable @ < 600 psi.

R9, 10, 11 & 14 - Cable Size Capability:

- The Articulated Seg., per Appendix P can only achieve a 2:1 cable dia. ratio.
- The Var. Bladder, per Appendix AQ, can only achieve a 2:1 cable dia. ratio.
- The Fixed 2-Posn., Split, per Appendix R, can achieve .65 → 4.0 in. cable dia.
- The Var. Iris, per Appendix S, can achieve .65 → 4.0 in. cable dia.
- The Static Seal shall be configured to seal about the smallest cable diameter and capable of opening to pass a 4.0 inch Antenna Element.

R4 - Static Load Capability:

- Δ PSI to maximum submarine operating depths
- All seals appear capable of achieving this Δ PSI capability.

R15 - FPM Capability:

- 200 FPM
- All seals are acceptable

R2 - Shear-Seal Capability:

Refer to Section 3, Part 2, for discussion of Cable/Antenna Element Shear Assembly. This assembly should be evaluated in a later study effort to ascertain whether or not the functional requirement for shearing and sealing is a desirable design concept goal.

R7 - Envelope:

- All seals are $< .5 \text{ ft}^3$, except for Iris @ 150%
- Refer to Appendices P $\rightarrow$ S.

R19 - Weight:

- All seals are $< 100\#_m$
- Refer to Appendices P $\rightarrow$ S

Number of Components:

Art. Seg. - - - - - 45, Per Appendix P
Var., Bladder - - - - - 6, Per Appendix Q
Fixed, 2-Posn., Split - 8, Per Appendix R
Var., Iris - - - - - 81, per Appendix S
Manual Static - - - - - 8, Per Appendix P

Inherent Reliability:

- Severity Factor Set equal to 10 for submarine operating environment and 20 for condition of material rubbing contact.

		$\lambda \times 10^6 \text{HRS}$	Severity Factor*	Total
<u>Art. Seg.</u>				
32	Segments	0.50	10	160.0
1	Bellows Sent	65.43	10	654.3
5	"O" Rings - static	2.39	1	12.0
5	Hsg. Str. Elem.	-	1	-
<u>2</u>	Adiprene Max OD	2.39	10	<u>4.8</u>
45	Sealing Elem			831.1

$\therefore \text{MTBF} = \underline{\underline{1203 \text{ HRS}}}$

Var., Bladder

1	Bellows Diaphragm	65.43	20	1308.6
1	Housing	-	1	-
2	End Flg. Assy.	-	1	-
<u>2</u>	"O" Rings - static	2.39	1	<u>4.8</u>
6				1313.4

$\therefore \text{MTBF} = \underline{\underline{761 \text{ HRS}}}$

Fixed, 2-Posn., Split

2	Split Clamp Assy.	-	1	-
2	Split "O" Ring Seals, Dyn.	2.39	20	96.0
2	Hyd. or Elec Actuators	10.71	10	214.2
<u>2</u>	"O" Rings - static	2.39	1	<u>4.8</u>
8				314.0

$\therefore \text{MTBF} = \underline{\underline{3185 \text{ HRS}}}$

Var., Iris

64	Iris Elements	.50	10	320.0
8	Hyd. or Elect. Actuators	10.71	10	856.8
8	Elem. Staging Str.	.50	10	40.0
<u>1</u>	Housing	-	-	<u>-</u>
81				1216.8

$\therefore \text{MTBF} = \underline{\underline{822 \text{ HRS}}}$

Developmental Cost:

- Tabulation of Criteria: ($= \Sigma$ Multiples)
 - (a) 3X Base Hardware Cost for Prototype Model Design
 - (b) 1 $\rightarrow$ 2X Base Hardware Cost for Optimization Req'd. (R&D)
 - (c) 1 $\rightarrow$ 2X Base Hardware Cost for Shop Fab. Dwgs.
 - (d) 1X Base Hardware Cost for Hardware
- Base Hardware Cost includes: Sensors, Controls, and Seal Hardware

Art. Seg. - $(2k + 2k + 10k) \times (3 + 2 + 2 + 1) = \$112k$

Var., Bladder - $(1k + 1k + 4k) \times (3 + 1.5 + .5 + 1) = \$36k$

Fixed, 2-Posn., Split - $(5k + .5k + 3k) \times (3 + 1 + 1 + 1) = \$24k$

Var., Iris - $(2k + 3k + 5k) \times (3 + 2 + 2 + 1) = \$80k$

R8 - Maintainability/Accessibility:

- Ranked on a scale of 1 (worst) to 3 (best) according to the degree of difficulty in removal, disassembly and repair.

Art. Seg. - 1

Var., Bladder - 3

Fixed, 2-Posn., Split - 2

Var., Iris - 1

Cable Contact Efficiency:

Art. Seg. - 32 Segments @ .0625 width = 2.0 in. vs. 2.042 in. cable periphery; = 98%

Var., Bladder - 100% (by inspection)

Fixed, 2-Posn., Split - 100% due to peripheral contact of the split wiper seals

Var., Iris - 90% — due to cascade configuration (8 actuators w/64 elements). Refer to layout Appendix S.

Friction Dependence:

- Ranked on a scale of 1 (worst) to 3 (best)
- All seals - except for the bladder - are non-contact or viscous fluid contact. The bladder -- in distending at a 2:1 ratio will automatically double the shear and tensile load resistance.

Fatigue/Wear Impact:

- Equals a function of contact force loading and susceptibility of cable scuffing/tearing and/or hangup during passage through the seal. Ranked on a scale of 1 (worst) to 3 (best).

Art. Seg. - 3 (non-contact)

Var., Bladder - 1 (potential regenerative effects cable jacket to bladder jacket!)

Fixed, 2-Posn., Split - 3 (non-contact)

Var., Iris - 2 (potential scuffing due to multiple elements .005 inches thk.)

R3 - Airborne Noise/Structureborne Noise:

- Ranked on a scale of 1 (worst) to 3 (best). Consideration given of noise generation due to Δ PSID seal leakage @ high fluid shear velocity.

Art. Seg. - 1 (A .003 $\rightarrow$.010 annular clearance is necessary)

Var., Bladder - 2 (due to cable pumping action)

Fixed, 2-Posn., Split - 3 (essentially leak tight w/viscous fluid seal OR gravity drain w/small annular clearance of the wiper seals)

Var., Iris - 1 (A .003 $\rightarrow$.010 annular clearance is necessary)

R6 - Installation Compatibility:

- Ranked on a scale of 1 (worst) to 3 (best)

Art. Seg. - 1 (very complex - alignment is critical due to bladder centering)

Var., Bladder - 3 (very simple)

Fixed, 2-Posn., Split - 3 (very simple)

Var., Iris - 2 (very complex - but mechanical linkages reduce alignment criticality)

Producibility:

- Consideration given to the following items; ranked 1 (worst) to 3 (best):

- (a) for Off-the-Shelf
- (b) for Fabrication/Assembly Difficulty
- (c) for Qualification Testing Requirements

Art. Seg.: $1 + 1 + 1 = 3$

Var., Bladder: $2 + 1 + 2 = 5$

Fixed, 2-Posn., Split: $3 + 3 + 3 = 9$

Var., Iris: $2 + 1 + 1 = 4$

Level I Material Control Traceability System

All seals must meet this requirement.

G1 - Variable Diameter, .50 → 1.00 inch:

- All except Fixed, 2-Posn., Split can achieve.
- The Fixed, 2-Posn., Split Seal cannot adapt to a continuously variable cable diameter. If the .50 → 1.00 inch cable is stepwise variable -- then this would pass.

G2 - 400 FPM Capability:

- All seals pass except the Var., Bladder.
- The Var. Bladder Seal is susceptible to potential regenerative effects -- cable jacket to bladder jacket.

5.4 TOW/EXIT POINT EVALUATION CRITERIA ANALYSIS

- R4 - No impact, acceptable
- R5 - Ref. 1.2.2(c) (1) and (2) -- acceptable, imposed loading
- R6 - Designed to be installed with the confines of the existing superstructure with minimum hydrodynamic drag profile impact -- acceptable
- R7 - Total Envelope is $< .84 \text{ ft}^3$ -- acceptable
- R10 - Characterized in 1.2.2(c) (1) and (2) and in Appendix G -- acceptable for specified cable construction
- R11 - Characterized for 4 in. OD Antenna Element
- R13 - Characterized for $6000\#_f$ minimum static tow load in 1.2.2(c) (1)
- R14 - Refer to 1.2.2(b) and 1.2.2(c) (2) and 1.2.2(e) -- acceptable
- R15 - Refer to 1.2.2(e) -- acceptable for 200 FPM
- R16 - Refer to 1.2.2(c) (2) -- acceptable for $3000\#_f$ dynamic load
- R19 - Total Weight $< 150\#_m$ -- acceptable
- G1 - Compatible with .50 + 1.00 diameter cable
- G2 - Capable of permitting 400 FPM payout/retrieval cable speeds
- G3 - Capable of permitting $6000\#_f$ maximum dynamic tensile loading
- No. of Components - 2 ea; Structural Bellmouth Assy and Kamatics Spherical Bearing
- Inherent Reliability - In excess of 10,000 Hrs MTBF (for the Bearing)
- Development Cost - 3x Base Hardware Cost - Design
 + .5x Optimization (R&D reqd)
 + .5x Shop, Fab. Drawing preparation
 + 1.0x Prototype Hardware
 As Base Hardware Cost = 5.5k,
 $5.0 \times 5.5k = \$27.5k$

- Cable Contact Efficiency - 1 point; arc-of-contact $0.53 \pm 90^\circ$
- Friction Dependence -Capable of operation @ $\mu > .6$
- Fatigue/Wear Impact -@ 50% of max allowable shear stress. Bend radius @ $2x > \text{BRA-24}$. A 4 in. OD Antenna Element must not be on the fairing for high speed towing !
- Producibility - Low to Medium difficulty

ED
80