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Program Management

Classic Program Management has 3 components
Cost, Schedule, and Content

- This is an usual project management time for the Shuttle Program

- Cost is a significant concern
  - Operations have ceased and all operating funds and personnel are available for Return to Flight work

- Schedule is not a driver
  - Desirable to fly as soon as practical to support the International Space Station (ISS)
  - Schedule is set from technical milestones

- Content is the only significant management concern
  - How safe is safe enough?
  - When have we done enough?
  - How can we prove it?
Aviation in itself is not inherently dangerous. But to an even greater degree than the sea, it is terribly unforgiving of any carelessness, incapacity or neglect.
CAIB Accident Scenario

• Post-launch photographic analysis determined that External Tank left bipod foam impacted Columbia’s left wing.

• The foam impacted in the vicinity of RCC panels 5 thru 9 at 81.9 seconds after launch.

• The orbiter was at an altitude of 65,860 feet, traveling at Mach 2.46 at time of impact.
CAIB Accident Scenario

- The best estimate of the foam size, based on imagery measurements, was 21 to 27 inches long and 12 to 18 inches wide.

- There was sufficient visual and debris trajectory information to implicate the left bipod ramp area as the source of debris.
CAIB Accident Scenario

- Eventually the vehicle motion was too great for the flight control system to manage, leading to loss of vehicle control and aerodynamic break-up.

Hot gas breaches the wheel well.
RCC Impact Testing June – July 2003 Confirms Accident Scenario

- Initial foam impact test on RCC Panel #6 results in a panel rib crack

- Five (5) Fiberglass panel tests were conducted to provide additional model output information

- RCC Panel #8 was tested on July 7, 2003; the 1.67 pound piece of foam impacted at approximately 775 ft/sec; resulting in a 16 inch diameter hole
Columbia Board Recommendations
Critical Path Drivers

29 Recommendations in the Following Categories:

• Improve Thermal Protection System Monitoring and Repair
• Fix Debris Shedding from the External Tank
• Improve Vehicle Imaging Capability
• Qualify the Bolt Catcher Separation Mechanism
• Improve Flight Hardware Closeout Documentation
• Improve the Foreign Object Debris Program
• Improve MMT Training
• Launch Schedules Consistent with Resources
• Upgrade Orbiter Sensor Data
• Create an Independent Technical Engineering Authority
• Upgrade Closeout Photo Process
• Improve Wire Inspection Techniques
• Re-Certify the Shuttle for Flights beyond 2010
External Tank
Return To Flight (Rtf) Planning
External Tank Certification

- Forward Bipod Ramps Redesigned
  - Spray on Foam eliminated

- Liquid Oxygen (LO2) Feedline Bellows Modified
  - Thermal protection System drip lip added

- Nondestructive testing procedures being developed
  - Eliminate critical defects in foam applications
ET Return to Flight Baseline

As-Built Critical TPS Application Certification Plan

LO2 Feedline Yokes
LO2 Feedline Pairing
LO2 Feedline LO2 Tank Acreage
LO2 PAL Ramp LO2 Tank Acreage
LO2 PAL Ramp and Cable Tray Supports
Intertank Acreage

PAL Ramp

TPS NDE Development

Redesigned Bipod Fitting

LH2 Intertank Flange Closeout Debris Elimination

LO2 Feedline Bellows Ice

ET Camera (Enhanced In-flight Imagery)
RTF Planning
External Tank Certification

• Nondestructive Evaluation (NDE) testing adds confidence to critical debris elimination plan

• Protuberance Airload (PAL) Ramp foam - certified by NDE testing

• Liquid Hydrogen Intertank Flange - Critical debris size and transport mechanism studies continue on the critical path for return to flight
Debris Impact Environment

STS-107 Mach no. = 3.00 input template
Mach = 3.00, \( \alpha = 2.950, \beta = 0.130, Re = 2.0 \times 10^6 \)
Material Foil Density \( \rho = 2.40 \text{ lbm/ft}^3 \)

every 32 trajectory plotted
Critical debris zone previously identified as +/-67.5° from Z axis, Orbiter side of tank

+Z Stringer Panel, Area originally identified for removal/replacement with enhanced closeout
Impact of Extended Critical Debris Zone

- ET currently removing the Intertank/LH2 tank flange closeout in the specified zone – Skin/stringer substrate configuration
  - Replacing closeout with enhanced, verified and validated process
- Removal of additional closeout required due to increase in zone
  - Different substrate configuration (machined ribs) in extended zone

**Critical Debris Zone(s)**

- 67.5° from +Z
- 80.0° from +Z
- > 80.0° from +Z

**Intertank Substrate Configuration**

**Thrust Panel**
(Additional lower flange closeout removal required due to extended critical debris zone)

**Skin/Stringer Panel**
(Lower flange area originally identified for removal/ replacement with enhanced closeout)
RTF Planning
Improved Ascent Imagery

• Detection on ascent improved by using integrated approach

• Additional Ground-Based trackers added and all upgraded

• Aircraft and ship-based support under consideration

• Digital cameras on External Tank, Solid Rocket Booster, and Orbiter improve real-time assessment

• Handheld crew cameras support added systems
Several Factors Bear on Launch Window Determination

- Beta Angle Cut-Outs prohibit specific periods for ISS docking (thermal constraint)
- Launch and ET separation in daylight conditions
- Launch on Need (STS-300) vehicle available for call-up within 90 days
- De-conflicting from Soyuz launch windows
RTF Planning
Orbiter Enhancement

- Program adding Wing Leading Edge instrumentation
- Impact Monitoring System with 92 sensors per wing
- Test articles in design and fabrication
- System not a RTF constraint
RTF Planning
On-Orbit Inspection

• New boom for Shuttle system for TPS inspection
• Attaches to the existing Shuttle’s robotic arm
• Boom mounted television/laser sensors
• System compliments other RTF initiatives to understand TPS condition post-launch
• Boom system currently on critical path

Boom Installed on Starboard Sill
RTF Planning
On-Orbit Inspection

- Various techniques being considered
- Techniques for conducting inspection at ISS under study
- ISS crew with on-board cameras may provide additional Shuttle TPS evaluation
- Evaluating use of Shuttle and Station robotic arms to facilitate 100% TPS inspection capability

Orbiter Pitch-Around for Inspection and approach to International Space Station
RTF Planning
On-Orbit Repair

- Various approaches being considered
- Tile repair concept well-defined; cure in-place ablator (CIPA) and application tools in development
- RCC repair tools still in conceptual phase
- First flight to demonstrate TPS repair capabilities
RTF Planning
Orbiter Processing

• Reinforced Carbon-Carbon Wing Leading Edge panels removed and inspected; Nose Caps removed and inspected

• Discovery Rudder Speed Brake actuators inspected for corrosion, grease degradation and gear alignment – has become a fleet issue

• Wire and Flex Hose Inspections conducted on both Orbiters; repairs in work

• Discovery tiles inspected for de-bonds and replaced as necessary
Wiring

Exposed conductor with evidence of arcing

Screw head with Burr

Screw head with Burr and arcing
Rudder Speed Brake (RSB) Actuators

**Background:** During the OV-103/Discovery Orbiter Maintenance Down Period (Summer of 2003), Corrosion was found on the Orbiter’s Body Flap actuators

- Since the Body Flap actuators and Rudder Speed Brake (RSB) actuators were fleet leaders (most flight time), decision was made to also remove the RSB actuators and inspect for corrosion
  - All 4 RSB actuators appeared to have corrosion and were sent to the vendor for further inspection and refurbishment as required
Rudder Speed Brake (RSB) Actuators

• Decision was made to install the spare RSB actuators while the other units were undergoing vendor inspection
  – Issue was raised about whether the grease in the spares had degraded and might pose a threat if re-installed – independent analysis initiated

• While the RSB actuators were undergoing vendor inspection, one of the actuators was found to have an improperly installed planetary gear

Result: The improperly installed planetary gear led to a decision to look at the RSB actuators in all three vehicles and determine if there were other planetary gears improperly aligned. This had a significant impact on being able to meet a fall 2004 launch date.
Cost

- Funding the Return to Flight work
  - Supplemental money
  - Release of unused operations budget

- In the face of a renewed engineering challenge, workforce is expanding in a permanent manner to significantly improve safety

- Next challenge will be cost containment
  - Challenge of maintaining engineering excellence in the face of a future falling budget
Strategy Based on Long-Term Affordability

NOTE: Exploration missions – Robotic and eventual human missions to Moon, Mars, and beyond
Human/Robotic Technology – Technologies to enable development of exploration space systems
Crew Exploration Vehicle – Transportation vehicle for human explorers
ISS Transport – US and foreign launch systems to support Space Station needs especially after Shuttle retirement
**Schedule**

- Currently, the Space Shuttle Program schedule is being driven by the time required to make the safety of flight changes.

- Schedule is not a consideration in the classic Project Management sense.

- The Mission driving objective is to fly before the International Space Station suffers a serious problem.

**WHEN IS THAT?**

- Current safety milestones result in a Return to Flight date no earlier than March 6, 2005.

- Our goal is to fly as soon as it is safe to do so to achieve our mission objectives.
RTF Planning Focus
OV-103/Discovery Critical Path Assessment

Key:
- Green triangle: Activity has Occurred
- Grey triangle: Activity Scheduled to Occur
- Yellow triangle: Critical Path
- Red triangle: Schedule in Jeopardy

Data Sources
1. USA Schedule Status 2/20/04
2. Feb 19 SFLC Meeting
3. Shuttle Program Reviews

NET 3/06/05
STS-114 Launch

Interim Milestones
Under Review

OV-103 Activities
- NET 3/06/05
- STS-114 Launch

Potential Impacts - Summary

RTF Planning Focus
OV-103/Discovery Critical Path Assessment

Feb 20
Chin Panel Arrives KSC
Apr 5
All WLE at KSC
Completion Date TBD
Inspections On-Going; Spare Availability Under Review
Oct 11
ET-120 ready to Ship

Data Sources
1. USA Schedule Status 2/20/04
2. Feb 19 SFLC Meeting
3. Shuttle Program Reviews

Rudder Speed Brake
RCC Ops Complete
Boom and Sensor (OBSS)
RTF ET Delivery
Power On Testing

X-Ray Only Option (Preliminary)
FY 2005 Shuttle Mission Planning

- 3 missions to ISS
- STS-114 and STS-121 may have mission emphasis on demonstrating RTF capabilities
- February 19 Space Flight Leadership Council announced new target launch window of NET March 6 – April 18, 2005
- RTF remains milestone driven
Management Challenges

• Culture change required
  • Space Shuttle is not an “operational” vehicle
    • It is experimental/research and development
  • Worker concerns are not to be dismissed by management
  • Additional engineering oversight of the process is required

• 13 Separate Independent Review Teams overseeing Space Shuttle Return to Flight
  • NASA Office of Inspector General has 17 audits of RTF in progress

• New Independent Technical Authority to oversee any “waivers” from standards
  • Over 5,6000 waivers in the Space Shuttle system today
  • No demarcation between waivers to standards, safety, or other requirements
Origins of Standards and Requirements

- Federal Laws
- Executive Orders
- Federal Regulations
  - OSHA
  - ITAR
  - USAF/RANGE
  - EPA

- NASA Standards
  - NPG, NPR, NPD, NMI

- KSC Standards
- JSC Standards
- MSFC Standards
- SSC Standards

- SSP Level I Requirements

- SSP Level II Requirements
  - NSTS 07700 Program Requirements
  - Interface Control Documents
  - EMI Requirements
  - Launch Commit Criteria
  - Flight Rules
  - Operations Maintenance Requirements

- SSP Level III Requirements

Innumerable
- 110 Titles
- ~45,000 Standards
- Retired
- 34 Volumes
Why is it so hard?

Why does it cost so much?

Compare space travel within aviation - compare the Space Shuttle to a Boeing 737
## Comparison of the Space Shuttle to a Boeing 737

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Space Shuttle</th>
<th>Boeing 737</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>122 feet</td>
<td>138 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wingspan</strong></td>
<td>78 feet</td>
<td>112 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empty (dry) weight</strong></td>
<td>173,500 pounds</td>
<td>93,680 pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First flight</strong></td>
<td>April 12, 1981</td>
<td>B737-100 April 9, 1967 (-900 Nov 20, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Payload</strong></td>
<td>To low earth orbit: 56,000 lbs (including crew of 7 &amp; provisions)</td>
<td>52,500 pounds Crew of 2 + 189 Passengers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fuel**
- 6,875 US GAL = 55,000 pounds

**SHUTTLE EXTERNAL TANK:**
- DRY 66,000 LBS; LOADED 1,655,600 LBS

**SHUTTLE SRB (EACH):**
- EMPTY 192,000 LBS; LOADED 1,292,000 LBS

**SHUTTLE SYSTEM DRY WEIGHT:**
- 173,500 + 66,000 + 192,000 + 192,000 = 623,500 LBS

**ORBITER ONBOARD PROPELLANT LOAD (OMS + RCS):**
- 23,876 + 7,256 = 31,091 LBS

**SHUTTLE SYSTEM PROP WT:**
- 1,100,000 + 1,100,000 + 1,589,600 + 31,091 = 3,821,000 LBS
Comparison of the Space Shuttle to a Boeing 737

- TOTAL SHUTTLE VEHICLE WEIGHT AT LIFTOFF: 4.5 MILLION LBS
- 85% IS PROPELLANT
- 14% IS VEHICLE STRUCTURE
- 1.3% IS PAYLOAD AND CREW
- PROPELLANT RESERVE AT MECO --- 2,300 LBS = 00.060

- B737 MAX TAKEOFF WEIGHT 174,200 LBS
- 31% IS FUEL
- 54% IS VEHICLE
- 30% IS PAYLOAD (passengers, crew, baggage)
- FAA REQUIRED FUEL RESERVE: 45 MINUTES LOITER PLUS DIVERT
Comparison of the Space Shuttle to a Boeing 737

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Space Shuttle</th>
<th>Boeing 737</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max operating speed</td>
<td>17,500 MPH (M=25 at 400,000 feet)</td>
<td>M 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max certified altitude</td>
<td>41,000 feet</td>
<td>41,000 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3,158 statute miles (6 hours)</td>
<td>2CFM56-7B26 engines 26,300 pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Trip Distance</td>
<td>4 Million miles (14 days)</td>
<td>3,158 statute miles (6 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeoff thrust</td>
<td>6,750,000 pounds</td>
<td>26,300 pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero payload</td>
<td>600 N. Miles (3,600,000 feet)</td>
<td>41,000 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why so much difference?
Energy for Spacecraft vs Aircraft

Typical commercial airline cruise: 30,000 ft (5 N.MI.) at 500 MPH
Orbital spacecraft minimum: 100 N. MI. at 17,500 MPH

\[ E = PE + KE = m \ h \ gc + \frac{1}{2} \ m \ v^2 \]

Energy = Mass X Altitude X Gc + \( \frac{1}{2} \) Mass X Velocity Squared

FOR THE SAME MASS

- Altitude difference: 20 times greater (5 miles vs 20 miles)
- Potential energy difference: 20 times greater
- Velocity difference squared is \( \frac{(17,500)^2}{(500)^2} \)
- Kinetic energy difference: 1000 times greater

*If it was easy, everyone would be doing it!*
What About Re-Entry?

Commercial aircraft land with what they take off with Spacecraft, until the Space Shuttle, do not

97% of all orbital launches recover --- nothing

Soyuz can return 50 kg of scientific equipment and experimental results

Apollo could bring back 250 pounds of lunar rocks, film, experiments

Space Shuttle can return 30,000 pounds of payload, safely to the earth
What About Re-Entry?

The Law of Conservation of Energy
Everything that goes into putting the Space Shuttle into orbit (4+ million pounds of high energy chemicals), must be removed during re-entry

Orbital velocity is approximately 25,600 FPS

Deorbit burn changes velocity by approximately 300 FPS

Main gear touchdown to wheel stop - brakes, drag chute, speed brakes - remove approximately 300 FPS

25,000 FPS = 98% of the velocity = 99.96% of the kinetic energy – removed by air friction alone

100% of the potential energy removal is accomplished by air friction