

Air Force Institute of Technology

Integrity - Service - Excellence

Solutions Analysis for Helicopter Brownout



**9th SE Conference
Oct 2006**

Major Lee Anderson, Major Pete Doty
Major Manuel Griego,
Major Ken Timko,
Dr Brian Hermann, Dr John Colombi



U.S. AIR FORCE

Overview

- **Background (Helicopter Brownout)**
- **Requirements**
 - Mishap Analysis
 - Operational Tasks
- **Solutions Analysis**
- **Conclusion**



Integrity - Service - Excellence

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE OCT 2006		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Solutions Analysis for Helicopter Brownout 9th SE Conference				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Institute of Technology 2950 Hobson Way WPAFB, OH 45433-7765				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 15	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Hovering Flight

Not as easy as it looks

Changing flight dynamics during approach to hover require large control inputs

Flight Controls


Main Rotor Thrust Axis
Main Rotor Thrust Magnitude
Directional Control Inputs (Anti-Torque)

All 3 Controls are Interdependent



Flight Regime

Static Instability
Dynamic Instability
Constant Perturbations



Pitch + Power $\neq$ Aircraft Control


The Question

How to safely perform a vertical landing when you can't see outside due to recirculating dust/snow?

Do something different to keep visibility

or

Replace and/or degrade the effects of lost information



Do Something Different to Keep Visibility



- Land fast to stay ahead of the dust cloud
 - Requires suitable long flat/smooth LZ
 - Requires High Decel Rates at touchdown
 - Dependent on surface winds
 - Aircraft Specific
 - Allowable Landing Attitude (Deceleration)
 - H-60, H-46, H-47 **Good** (Tail Wheels)
 - MH-53M, **Bad** (No Tail Wheels)
 - May or may not work out well in formation

Do Something Different to Keep Visibility




Sometimes it works...

Do Something Different to Keep Visibility



Sometimes it doesn't work

Replacing Lost Information (and degrading loss of capability)



Replacing Lost Information (and degrading loss of capability)

- **Aircraft Navigation Systems**
 - GPS/INS, Doppler, Radar Altimeter
 - Mission Computer (Waypoint Navigation)
- **Low Speed Aircraft Control Symbolology**
 - Drift Vector, Vertical Velocity, Altitude, Heading, etc.
- **Geospatial Information (What's out there?)**
 - Digital Map (Imagery, Terrain, etc.)
 - Sensor Information (FLIR, Radar, etc.)
- **Reduced Aircraft Control Workload**
 - Stability Augmentation
 - Self Contained Approach Guidance
 - Coupled Approach/Hover Capabilities



V-22 Hover Display

What can be done to improve the situation?


Mishap Analysis

Long known problem, just more prevalent

- 33 Identified USAF Mishaps (1971 – 2006)
 - Loss of effective visibility causal
 - Landing/Takeoff phase of operations
 - HH-3E, MH-53H/J/M, HH-60G & UH-1F
- Mishap Costs
 - \$72M Total pre 9/11 (30 Years)
 - \$72M Total post 9/11 (5 Years)
 - DoD Costs estimated at \$100M per year
- Mishap Factors
 - Inadequate Aircraft Control
 - Undetected Surface Hazards
 - Undetected Lateral Obstacle




1980 - Desert One (Operation Eagle Claw)
Failed rescue of American hostages, Iran




CSAR-X (~\$45 Million)



CV-22 (\$80+ Million)



Measurable Requirements



Used to compare relative value between alternative solution sets

Starting point for tech demo system development


Framework for future combat system development



Major Tasks & Attributes

- **Core Operational Tasks**
 - Maintain Geospatial Awareness of Intended Landing Point
 - Confirm LZ Size & ID/Refine Landing Point
 - Locate Surface Hazards
 - Locate Proximate Obstructions
 - Successfully fly to safe landing point and land/hover as required
- **Other Requirements (System Attributes)**
 - Human Factors
 - Programmatic
 - Physical Characteristics
 - Sustainability
 - Operating Environment


Note: Related requirements sources: AFSOC No/Low Visibility ICD, Cable Warning/ Obstacle Avoidance ICD, CSAR-X CDD

Core Operational Tasks (OV-5) Execution Timeline





Objective System Architecture (SV-1) & Focus Areas



The Notional Baseline Aircraft



(MH-53M + HH-60G + CSAR-X + CV-22)

4

=

- INS/GPS
- Turreted FLIR
- Radar Altimeter
- Digital World Model (Digital Map)
- Mission Computer / Flight Director
- Automatic Flight Control System (Waypoint Nav & Coupled Approach)
- Cockpit Digital Displays (VSD/HSD)

External Sensors

Range, Resolution, Penetration

3D Capable

3D Active MMW
LADAR
Sparsely Populated Radar Array
IFSAR
Active Acoustic System
Image Stereo Pair Modeling

2D Capable

IR Video
Image Intensified (I² Video)
Fused IR/I² Video
2D Active MMW
Passive MMW (w/ external illuminator)
Passive MMW
SAR
Geo-rectified Digital Image

Preloaded Data

Digital Terrain
Vertical Obstruction Data
Digital Maps & Imagery (CIB)

Other Systems


Station Keeping Equipment (range/bearing)
DataLink (aircraft range/bearing + sensor data)

Primary Solution Option

Technology Interest Area

Human Interfaces

Enabling Effective Task Performance



Aerodynamics & Flight Controls

Effective Aircraft Control

Manual Aircraft Control

Self Contained Approach Guidance

Improved Low Speed Stability (Handling Qualities)

Performance Based Flight Controls

Approach Guidance with Enhanced Obstacle Avoidance

Coupled Aircraft Control

Coupled Hover

Coupled Approach

Coupled Approach with Enhanced Obstacle Avoidance

Aerodynamics

Modeling & Simulation

Visible Null Areas (H-101 & H-53E)

Primary Solution Option

Research Area


Flight Controls

No Addition

Improved Aircraft Handling Qualities

Coupled Approach with Enhanced Obstacle Avoidance

Coupled Approach with Enhanced Obstacle Avoidance +
Improved Aircraft Handling Qualities



Solution Configuration Matrix of 192

Sensors

No Addition

Sparse Array

MMW

LADAR

Sparse Array + MMW

Sparse Array + LADAR

MMW + LADAR

Sparse Array + MMW + LADAR

Human Interface

No Addition

Helmet Mounted Display (Symbology)

Head Tracked HMD (Video & Symbology)

3D Audio & Tactile

HMD + 3D Audio/Tactile

Head Tracked HMD + 3D Audio/Tactile


Selecting Solution Configurations for Evaluation

Resource/Time Constrained (Can't Assess all 192)

Assess Acquisition
Likelihood
(Cost Balance, Synergy)

Select Minimum
Matrix Sample
(Design of Experiments)

Select Additional
Configurations
Based on Likelihood




System Configuration Assessment

Generating Relative Solution Value

Assess Quantitative
Component Measures
(Sensor Range, Weight, etc.)

Assess
System Measures
(Quantitative & Qualitative)


Generate Individual
& Composite
Utility Values



Evaluate Solutions

Sensors

- Millimeter Wave System
 - Low Task Performance
 - High Cost & Size/Weight
- Sparse Array
 - Moderate Task Performance
 - Low Cost & Size/Weight
- LADAR
 - High Task Performance
 - High Cost & Size/Weight



Human Interfaces


- Head Tracked HMD
 - Slim Benefit in High Cost Solutions
 - Slim Penalty in Low Cost Solutions
- 3D Audio/Tactile
 - Penalty in Low Cost Solutions
 - Neutral in High Cost Solutions
 - High Cost for Stereo ICS

Flight Controls

- High Benefit
 - Improved Handling Quality -> Enhanced Ops
 - Both > Either

Sensitivity Analysis

Performance vs. Other Factors (Cost, Weight, Etc.)




Helicopter Brownout Conclusions

- High Performance System (SOF)
 - Sparse Radar Array + LADAR Sensors
 - Fusion Processing & Persistent 3D World Model
 - Head-tracked Helmet Mounted Display
 - Symbology
 - Enhanced and/or Synthetic Vision
- Lower Performance System (Conventional)
 - Sparse Radar Array
 - Helmet Mounted Display (Symbology)
- Flight Control Systems & Guidance
 - Handling Qualities
 - Flight Directed & Coupled Approach Capabilities
 - Assess and Develop per Aircraft MDS
 - Tiltrotor vs. Helicopter Issues
 - Digital FCS vs. Augmented Mechanical Controls

SE Wisdom

- **Clear measurable requirements are the most useful in situations when they are hardest to generate**
- **There is nothing more potentially complicated than a blank sheet of paper**
 - It is impossible to effectively consider and choose from an infinite number of design options when developing a new system
 - Overcome analysis paralysis with active management and hard decisions to create a manageable number of potential solutions
- **Use systems engineers with actual ops experience**
 - Operate in the Region of Effective Communication (REC)



Questions?

