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#### Abstract

This document outlines the Senior Design Project proposed by Dr. Aaron Drake that was assigned to a team of Mechanical Engineering students at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. The purpose of this project was to design, build, test, and finalize a launching system for two small, fixed wing, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) owned by Dr. Drake and Cal Poly. The goal was to create a system that was both portable and reliable to use, only requiring a two-person team to use effectively in the field. The most important design requirements were determined to be the launch speed, assembly time, and storage size. Multiple propulsion methods were explored, with a pneumatic piston cylinder chosen for the preliminary design. A side clamping carriage design was selected due to the shape of the UAVs being launched. A structural prototype of the UAV carriage was constructed, and the final design was developed as a result of data obtained from the prototype. Following the creation of our final design, a manufacturing plan and design verification plan were produced to bring the concept to fruition. With these plans in place, parts were ordered, and construction began. This document will describe the background research done, the objectives of the project, the preliminary and final design, the manufacturing and testing process, difficulties and obstacles faced, our final results, and what can be improved upon in the future.
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## 1 Introduction

LaunchTime UAV consisted of four senior Mechanical Engineering students at California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly) in San Luis Obispo, California: Ben Lacasse, David Garcia, Cearns, and Sean Huxley. We accepted the design challenge as presented by sponsor Dr. Aaron Drake of the Cal Poly Aerospace Department. LaunchTime UAV was advised by Professor Sarah T. Harding of the Mechanical Engineering Department at Cal Poly.

The goal of this project was to create a launch mechanism suitable for two different Aerospace Department UAVs that could be operated by a single user. The device had to be portable with a set up time of under 20 minutes and be capable of remote activation. The launcher was also required to hold the UAV in place while the propeller was running.

The initial steps of the project included extensive background research, defining our project scope, and drafting a project management plan. This background research includes information from team meetings with Dr. Drake, reviewing existing products, and describing relevant technical documents. This document also outlines the specific quantitative needs of the sponsor and considerations that had to be taken while designing.

After defining the scope of work, this document was updated to include a preliminary design, then reviewed by Dr. Aaron Drake. The process leading up to the preliminary design as well as the concept prototype, CAD model, and risks/concerns are described in detail.

A structural prototype was built, and adjustments were made to the final design. Following this, a project management plan was presented to outline the following weeks up until the Senior Project Design Expo, and Dr. Drake's personal use of the launcher.

Manufacturing was completed according to the project management plan, with assembly being nearly complete by the expo date, and testing was planned for the future.

## 2 Background

In the first three weeks after selecting the project, our team identified three different avenues warranting research: potential customer needs, similar existing products, and pertinent technical documents. During this period, the team also met with Dr. Drake on two occasions to discuss the details of the project. In these meetings, the goals for the project as well as initial observations on the two UAVs were documented. We also spent time researching the existing products on the market. Many existing UAV launchers were analyzed in order to inspire ideas for our own launcher. Most of the existing products were primarily developed to launch larger and heavier UAVs and are therefore overdesigned for our purposes. Additionally, we conducted research on existing patents associated with UAV launch systems and regulations.

### 2.1 Customer Needs

After receiving the initial project description, we met with Dr. Drake in the Cal Poly UAV lab for introductions and to discuss the project in greater detail. We observed the two UAVs in question: the Altavian Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, and the AeroVironment Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, shown in Figure 1.


Figure 1. Altavian Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, F7200 $\mathrm{AT}^{\mathrm{TM}}$ (left) and RQ20B Puma $\mathrm{AE}^{\mathrm{TM}}$ (right) fuselages

The Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ has a lower thrust to weight ratio and was the primary driving force behind the need for a UAV launcher. The UAV team has been hand launching the drones which had proven to be an unreliable method, with only a $50 \%$ success rate for the Puma ${ }^{\text {TM }}$. The Nova ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ did not fare much better; thus, an automated launching system would help to avoid damage and save time and effort in both launching the UAVs as well as training people to perform the hand launch method.

Next, we asked preliminary questions about how the UAVs should be launched from such a device. Students were taught to throw the UAVs parallel to the ground in order to maximize speed prior to attaining lift. The UAV launcher would most likely involve a track system that should be angled upwards at roughly 10 degrees. The launch system would be able to accelerate the UAVs at higher speeds than hand launching is capable of, so there would be no need to maintain a zero-degree launch angle. It was unclear what the optimal launch angle would be, so an adjustable angle was desirable.

The Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ requires between $15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ and $21 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ for a successful launch while the Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ only needs between $13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ and $20 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$. This difference indicated the need for adjustable speed so that the launcher could be calibrated to achieve an optimal launch speed for each aircraft. The other difference between the two UAVs was the body shape.

The Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ has a fuselage with a large taper towards the rear while the Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ has more of a uniform profile. The shape of the UAV was important because the UAVs could possibly be pushed by a carriage contoured to the body. Dr. Drake did not wish to make any alterations to the UAVs, such as an external pin, if possible. Pushing the UAVs would involve a significant amount of force, so each UAV needed a good way to disperse this force. It was noted that the Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ has a large indent in the back for the battery and thus it was ok to push the Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ using the battery.

The next design limitation discussed involved the portability of the device. Dr. Drake wished to travel with both UAVs in addition to the launcher using his 2016 Chevy Colorado short bed. Both UAVs have a carrying case that limited the acceptable storage space the device could
occupy. The hand launch process typically involved two members: one person launched the plane while the other operated the controls. The entire system had to be easy to assemble and operate by a single individual, allowing one person to both launch and control the drone simultaneously.

### 2.2 Existing Products

A major part of our background research included an analysis of existing UAV launchers on the market. We analyzed these products to choose an effective method of launch, comparing the advantages and disadvantages of each. Most of these launchers were designed for UAVs that are much larger, heavier, and that required higher launch velocities than our own. Five existing products were researched and evaluated for their unique launching methods. The launcher characteristics are listed in Table 1 to compare the similarities and differences to the needs of our own launcher. It is important to note that these products were chosen because they all contain several of our basic design requirements: portability, remote triggering, no external power source, and the ability to abort a launch.

Table 1: Existing Product Details

| Product | Energy Method | Max <br> Launch <br> Velocity <br> (m/s) | Max <br> Plane <br> Weight <br> (kg) | Launch <br> Angle <br> (degrees) | Total Weight (kg) | Track <br> Length <br> (m) | Carriage Type | Set Up Time (Minutes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eli ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ (Vaher) | Pneumatic | 25 | 40 | 11 | 56 | 5 | Claw on rollers | 5 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { UAV Factory }{ }^{\text {TM }} \text { (Key } \\ \text { Features) } \end{gathered}$ | Pneumatic | 24 | 35 | 11 | 110 | 3.95 | Claw on rollers | 10 |
| Seacorp ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ (Inflator-Based <br> UAV Launchers) | Airbag | NL | 5.9 | 30-60 | 1.36 | 0.4 | No carriage | 5 |
| Skywalker ${ }^{\text {rM }}$ (UUUSTORE Wholesale RC Store) | Elastic Bands | NL | 5 | 30 | NL | 2.5 | Push <br> wings | <5 |
| Senior Project (Miller, Valoria, Warnock, Coutlee) | Elastic Bands | 52.3 | 55 | 10-30 | 28.12 | 2.28 | Custom fitting to body | <10 |

NL - Not Listed

It is useful to analyze these launchers in depth for potential scaling applications. Two of the products, launchers from Eli Pneumatic ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ and UAV Lab ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, as seen in Figure 2, make use of compressed air to power a piston which pulls the aircraft along a track until it is released at the end. Compressed air appears to be the preferred method for propelling larger UAVs. This method presents a safety hazard due to the addition of pressurized components, but it also provides an easy way to disarm the device using a pressure release valve. We also would need a power source for the compressor (both of the examined launchers use small compact batteries). Both devices also use a carriage system to hold the UAV, with wheels that roll along a foldable track. The carriages have four arms extending upwards which hold a drone in place during launch as seen in Figure 2.

Both designs also have collapsible legs to allow for easy and compact storage. (Vaher) (Key Features)


Figure 2. Eli Pneumatic Catapult ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ (Vaher) and UAV Lab ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ Carriage (Key Features)

A more unique launcher we found was an airbag powered system made by Sea Corp ${ }^{\text {TM }}$. This company has a family of launchers which use commercial off-the-shelf automotive airbag inflators. The perks of this type of launcher are its lightweight design, quick deployment time, and high potential launch force for heavier payloads. The largest drawback is that the UAV must conform to a long tube that the airbag is in. The technology behind the launch mechanism is worth investigating and could be applicable to our own design. (Inflator-Based UAV Launchers)


Figure 3. SeaCorp ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Inflator Based Launcher (Inflator-Based UAV Launchers)

There are also smaller UAV launchers that use the stored energy in elastic bands to pull a UAV along a track. One such product on the market is the Skywalker $\mathrm{X8}^{\mathrm{TM}}$ catapult (Figure 4). This launcher is designed for smaller UAVs, up to 5 kg , similar to our Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ and $\mathrm{Nova}^{\mathrm{TM}}$. A carriage is attached to an elastic cord that is stretched out when the carriage is pulled back. Things worth noting about this design are the short track length, easy set up, and unique carriage. The carriage on this product has arms that extend upwards and behind the wings to push the UAV along the track. The Skywalker $\mathrm{X8}^{\text {TM }}$ catapult proves that elastic bands provide an extremely light weight
solution to propelling a small UAV, with the caveat that safety is a large concern when storing that much energy and must be taken into consideration. (UUUSTORE Wholesale RC Store)


Figure 4. Skywalker X8 ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ Catapult (UUUSTORE Wholesale RC Store)

One of the most insightful systems we researched was a past senior project conducted by a team named Rocket Power in 2014. This team was sponsored by Aerojet Rocketdyne with the goal of launching a 55 -pound UAV at $52.3 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$. This design also utilized elastic energy to launch the UAV. This project was very useful as research due to the team's extensive report on their device. The final design used six surgical bungees to propel the UAV along a track (Figure 5). (Miller, Valoria, Warnock, Coutlee)


Figure 5. 2014 Senior Project (Miller, Valoria, Warnock, Coutlee)

Rocket Power conducted their own analysis on different propulsion methods before choosing elastic bands. Our own analysis will be critical in our design choices. Although the team failed to get their UAV airborne, we can learn from their mistakes to improve upon our own design.

### 2.3 Technical Literature

Below is a list of patents related to UAV launching devices, as well as a few technical literature resources. The patents list devices built for UAVs that range in size from small toy sized to larger military and ship-based applications and utilize many different energy storage solutions. Of particular note is the patent for the electronic launcher, which describes the functions, drawbacks, and solutions of the more typical pneumatic systems. Other solutions are less practical and may never be produced, but still provide insight into previous work on the subject.

1. Electric unmanned aerial vehicle launcher, Tully, et al. U.S. Patent 9783322B2 describes an electric motor driven tape that causes movement of a shuttle along a launcher rail. This system is designed for UAVs weighing up to 30 pounds. The inclusion of an electric motor would greatly increase the complexity of the control system, the programming and building of which would be outside of our abilities.
2. Rapid unmanned aerial vehicle launcher (UAV) system, Been U.S. Patent 9994335B1 describes an elastically powered launcher with a shuttle that traverses over a rail. A powered winch retracts the carriage, elongating the elastic unit. This patent is similar to the previous senior project, but we avoided their design as it would lead to a large moment on the rail system.
3. Miniature aircraft catapult, Young, et al. U.S. Patent 6626399B2 describes a foot release bungee powered rail system to launch small aircraft. This patent details the rail, retracting, and foot operated pin-release trigger system. This system is good for small RC airplanes, but the release mechanism did not fulfill our sponsor's need of being at least 20m distance away during launch.
4. System for shipboard launch and recovery of unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) aircraft and method therefor, Urnes, U.S. Patent 8028952B2 describes an arm rotating around a pole used to elevate and release an aircraft in a confined space. This patent includes a releasable mount for the UAV, which releases when the aircraft has enough altitude and rotational velocity to sustain flight. This patent did not seem reasonable or producible, but instead served as an interesting thought experiment. We had no way of producing a launcher with this scale nor a way to safely test it.
5. Unmanned aerial vehicle management, Speasl, et al. U.S. Patent pending 20160364989A1 is an application for a side loading box containing a treadmill style runway for launching and landing UAVs. A novel idea, this patent would require quite a large box to get our UAV up to the necessary launch speed, as we would be limited by the friction of the UAV on the treadmill surface.
The ASME Standards journal article "Aerospace Hydraulic and Pneumatic Specifications, Standards, Recommended Practices, and Information Reports" lists the ASME standards for pneumatic systems, which were useful when we decided to use pneumatics to power our launcher. As the system would be reasonably high pressure, we needed to make sure that all components were rated and tested to at least that pressure, and that any added components would meet these guidelines and standards.
"Optimization of Dynamic Characteristics of a Ground Catapult for Minimizing the Guide’s Length." (Sereda) is a journal article that describes the use of pneumatics for launching an aircraft, including the staging of fluid delivery to optimize force and acceleration on the airframe. We looked into what was available to us to optimize fluid delivery, especially since a large restriction
on our design was how and where we could apply force to the UAV, and how large that force could be.

## 3 Objectives:

Dr. Drake needed a way to launch two different UAVs from the ground while simultaneously operating them. However, the existing launch method only had a success rate of $50 \%$ and required two people. The new method would have to allow one operator to be selfsufficient in quickly deploying and launching a UAV while also controlling it.

### 3.1 Boundary Diagram

Figure 6 contains a Boundary Diagram (BD) which was used to give a visual representation of the scope of the project. The dotted line encloses the things that we were directly responsible for managing and/or creating. Anything in contact with the boundary line would have to be considered for the design; everything else would be outside the scope of our design.


Figure 6. Boundary Diagram for UAV Launcher
As is shown in the diagram, this project would encompass the entirety of the launching system. The support and angle adjustments had to be accounted for, as well as the method for attaching the plane to the launching system and the overall dimensions of the UAV. The controls and the person flying the UAV are outside the BD because we had no control of the plane after its launch.

### 3.2 Design Considerations

In order to accurately determine the necessary considerations for the project, the team met with our sponsor to designate his "needs" and "wants". These factors were then given measurable engineering specifications that are testable in order to confirm that we have successfully met the needs of our sponsor. Our sponsor's needs and wants for the launching system were

- Portable: The overall design must be transported repeatedly in and out of the field as launches are performed.
- Reliable: The system must successfully launch the UAVs at a higher rate than the current manual method.
- Easy Use: The system must be simple enough to set up and operate so that there is no extended period of training new personal to use it.
- Setup Time: The system may not take an extremely long time to be both set up or taken down and stored for transportation.
- Revved Engine: The system needs to hold onto the UAV as the engines are revved in order to perform calibration and system diagnostics.
- One Person Operation: Our sponsor wanted the system to be able to successfully operate with only one person participating in the set up and launching of the UAV.
- No External Power: Since the UAVs are launched in the field, there are no external power sources and as such they need to be powered either internally or without electricity.
- Safety: The launcher would be used by both staff and students of Cal Poly, and as such will need to meet basic safety standards in order to be useable by either party.
- Multiple UAVs: The launch system needs to handle and operate with two different models of UAVs

We were not given a maximum value for our budget when we met with Dr. Drake. He did, however, place a few limitations on what we could and could not purchase. If costs exceeded $\$ 1000$ at any point, we were to contact him before making a purchase, and if any individual part exceeded $\$ 200$, then we were to contact him regarding its necessity and to explore alternatives. Regardless, our goal was to build the project within a budget of $\$ 1500$.

### 3.3 Quality Function Deployment

In order to determine if we were correctly meeting the specifications given to us by Dr. Drake, we conducted the Quality Function Deployment (QFD) process. By performing QFD, we were able to take the data and information we had compiled through our interviews and background research and assign weights and quantifiable goals to them. These goals could then be used to guide our engineering design process. Needs of the customer that have no measurable values besides a pass or fail test were still considered in the QFD, however there was no need to create a design specification for those needs. Once testing of the product began, the QFD was used to help determine both what types of needs were met and in what direction the design would need to move in order to correctly account for the remaining needs. The results of our QFD are in Appendix A for reference. By using the QFD we found that it was difficult to categorize most of the design considerations for this project into tangible technical specifications. Many of the specifications that were found would need only a simple pass or fail test in order to be approved and were thus not included in the QFD. However, we did find that most of the "important" specifications required a quantitative goal in order to be considered a success.

### 3.4 Engineering Specifications and Risk Assessment

Table 2 lists the engineering specifications that needed to be met during our tests. The parameters in Table 2 have an inherent risk of failure associated with them and are marked as either High (H), Medium (M), or Low (L) risk. In order to confirm whether they would pass their tests, they would need to be checked for compliance through either Testing (T), Analysis (A), or Inspection (I). The three most important and challenging specifications to meet were the size requirement, the number of pinch points on the launcher, and the success rate of aborting a launch prior to takeoff.

Table 2. Engineering Specifications

| Spec \# | Parameter <br> description | Target value | Tolerance | Risk | Compliance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Assembly Time | 20 minutes | MAX | L | T |
| 2 | Max Load | 8.1 kg | MAX | L | T,A |
| 3 | Carriage Size | $12-21 \mathrm{~cm}$ | $\pm 2 \mathrm{~cm}$ | L | I |
| 4 | Minimal Pinch <br> Points | 0 pinch points | MAX | H | I,A |
| 5 | Success Rate for <br> Launch Abortion | $100 \%$ | MIN | H | T,A |
| 6 | Fit in Truck | $33 X 155 \mathrm{~cm}$ | MAX | H | T |
| 7 | Time to Abort <br> Launch | 90 sec | MAX | M | T |
| 8 | Range of Launch <br> Speed | $10-25 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ | $+2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ | M | T |
| 10 | Launch Angle <br> Range | $0-15$ degrees | MAX | L | T,I |
| 11 | Resistive Force <br> Prior to Launch | 10 N | MIN | L | T,A |
| 12 | Number of <br> Consecutive <br> Launches | 5 Launches | MAX | M | T,A |
|  | Reset Time | 10 minutes | MAX | L | T,A |

The specifications are defined as

1. Assembly Time: The amount of time taken to unload the launcher and set it up. This would be tested by averaging the amount of time it takes to go from fully stored to operational.
2. Max Load: The largest payload that the system could bring to speed safely. This would be tested through a series of deadweight launches; in which a large weight would be placed within the launcher and the final speed of the weight as it leaves the launcher would be recorded.
3. Carriage Size: The overall width of the carriage system that would secure the UAV prior to launch. This would be tested through a simple measurement of the dimensions.
4. Minimal Pinch Points: Safety measure to prevent places where extremities can be smashed or cut during operation. Would need to pass a visual and possible tactical test to be deemed a success.
5. Success Rate for Launch Abortion: Success Rate for aborted launches prior to take off. This would be tested by repeatedly aborting the launch of the system until it could successfully abort 10 times in a row without a misfire.
6. Fit in Truck: Volumetric test to ensure that the launcher could fit in the truck with the other UAV equipment. Testing for this would be done through various configurations of the supplies within the truck until everything was safely stored and did not provide any hindrance to the driver.
7. Time to Abort Launch: Overall time taken to safely release the energy stored within the launcher in the event of an aborted launch. This would be tested by repeatedly aborting the launch while averaging the time it takes to do so across several trials.
8. Range of Launch Speed: The different speeds the launcher would be required to output. This would be tested by placing the maximum load required into the launcher, and then launching at the desired speeds while measuring the results.
9. Launch Angle Range: The range of angles that the launcher would have to successfully perform under. This would be tested by launching the UAV at incremental angles in order to determine if it is still stable
10. Resistive Force Prior to Launch: The force holding the carriage in place as the engines are primed. This would be tested by attempting to rev the engines before the launcher is released and would be considered successful if the UAV did not move from its initial position or adversely affect the launcher in any way.
11. Number of Consecutive Launches: Largest number of consecutive launches that would be performed before needing to replace or recharge components. This would be tested by performing as many launches with dead weight in rapid succession as possible until the batteries were no longer charged. The process would then be repeated with the results averaged.
12. Reset Time: The amount of time needed in order to prepare another launch. This would be tested by recording the amount of time between the last launch to the start of the next launch.

If any of these specifications failed, then the design would be reconsidered in order to provide a higher chance of success.

## 4 Concept Design

Many different aspects were involved in creating our preliminary design. Numerous concepts were conceived, combined, and discarded to create a design that meets our specifications. This was done by placing the best designs for each function in a Pugh matrix and creating several different combinations of concepts from them, resulting in a functional overall design. This process will be expanded upon below.

### 4.1 Design Process

In order to accurately meet all the specifications listed in the objectives section, multiple ideation sessions were held. We conducted brainstorming exercises in order to create a list of functions and processes that would be important to accomplishing our objectives. By using the Pugh matrices found in Appendix C, we were able to narrow down the list of viable concepts by comparing different ideas and seeing how well they addressed our needs. These concepts were then placed within a morphological matrix, which can be found in Appendix D, allowing us to derive several new designs from them. Many of these ideas, while novel, were not viable for a variety of reasons, including: unrealistic expectations of feasibility, not meeting specifications, or difficulty of manufacturing.

### 4.2 Design Concepts

From our ideation process, several design concepts were generated. Some of these concepts are shown in Figure 7- Figure 11.

A trackless, pneumatic piston powered design supported by a tripod stand with a carriage designed to grip the UAVs from the side is shown in Figure 8. The side clamping design solves the issue of finding suitable attach points for UAVs to connect to the carriage.


Figure 7. Design Concept 1
A bungie powered design supported by a tripod that pulls a contoured mold along a track is shown in Figure 8. The molds would be custom fit for each UAV. Bungies would be unsafe to use, as releasing the stored kinetic energy in them would be difficult in case of an aborted launch. Building a custom contour fitted mold for each UAV also seemed more difficult than is desirable.


Figure 8. Design Concept 2

A twin spring powered design, using sliding rails to move a carriage that has pinned hooks that attach to points on the UAV with a two-legged stand is shown in Figure 9. Pins would have to be inserted into the UAVs for the hooks to attach to. Many commercial UAV launchers are designed for use with specific UAVs that have mounting pins already built into them. Dr. Drake's UAVs do not have these pins, and calculations would have to be done to determine where pins could be inserted safely. Dr. Drake has expressed that he wishes to avoid going through this process.


Figure 9. Design Concept 3
A trackless, pneumatic piston powered design, with a two-legged stand and pinned hook carriage system is shown in Figure 10. However, the two-legged stand is more prone to tipping or sliding.


Figure 10. Design Concept 4
A spring powered design which pushes the carriage directly along a track supported by a t-shaped leg is shown in Figure 11. The carriage applies force to the rear of the UAVs. Unfortunately, there is no practical way to apply such a force to the rear of the UAVs due to their shape. A custom mold would need to be created and attached to transfer energy from the spring to the UAV. Also, the stand is more prone to sliding or rolling out from under the track.


Figure 11. Design Concept 5

### 4.3 Selected Concept

In order to determine which design would be most viable, the designs resulting from the morphological matrix were placed within the weighted decision matrix in Appendix E. This matrix compared the designs based on how well they met the criteria found within the QFD, with each criterion being weighted based on importance. By adding the weighted values of each need together, total scores could be compared, and a final design could be selected.

The final concept would use three pneumatic pistons with a 50 -inch stroke (Figure 12). Three pistons would be used instead of one in order to achieve sufficient launch velocity and this will be explained further in section 4.5. The pistons would be supported in the rear by a two-legged base and supported beneath the end of the cylinders by an adjustable tripod. Junctions made of aluminum would be needed to hold the three cylinders together: one at the base of the cylinders and one at the end of the cylinders. A third junction would be needed to connect the ends of the three pistons. Junctions would be milled and be attached loosely to allow the pistons to move at slightly differing speeds. At the bottom of each junction would be an adapter for either the tripod at the front, or the two-legged base at the back. This would allow the launcher to be disassembled and stored compactly.


Figure 12. Concept Model

Mounted around the rear junction would be air tanks used to store the compressed air for the pistons. Each air tank would be connected to a compressor and could be charged and stored until the user is ready for launch. Between each air tank and its respective piston would be a solenoid valve that could be remotely triggered by the user. Each tank will also have an air release valve in case the user needs to abort the launch, which could also be controlled remotely. Not pictured in Figure 12 are the lines for compressed air between the compressor, air tank, and cylinder.

### 4.4 Carriage Prototype

After choosing a final concept to pursue, the next step was to prototype. Due to the magnitude of the project and time constraints, we had to limit ourselves to just one component to prototype. We chose the carriage due to the difficulty of the design and level of uncertainty in its capabilities. The carriage consisted of a base for the UAV to rest on, as well as two arms hinged to the base (Figure 13). Each arm had a row of compression springs along the top to apply pressure to the fuselage from both sides. The arms were then held in a locked position by a lever pinned to each arm. The top of the lever applied pressure to the arm while the bottom had a reaction force from the base. These levers could rotate to lock or release the arms when desired. The carriage would have to be triggered to open before the pistons are at their full stroke length. The tops of the levers were attached to a string which ran down the length of the track and was attached to a reel on the cylinder junction at the base. The length of string was set slightly shorter than the stroke of the piston, so the levers were pulled back just before reaching the end of the stroke. Once the levers were pulled down, the arms would be free to pop open and away from the UAV.


Figure 13. Carriage Prototype

This carriage concept would be suitable for either UAV due to the adaptive nature of the carriage arms. The base of the carriage would also have custom platforms for each UAV to sit on.

The platforms would be contoured to the specific UAV body and could be interchanged easily by sliding them into a slot. The Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ would have an additional platform that can push it from the back of its battery pack. The Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ could have a platform that supports the landing pads. The custom platforms would need to be tested and studied further.

The base and arms of the carriage would most likely be made of aluminum and manufactured using a mill. The carriage base would be welded to the junction at the end of the pistons to ensure a secure connection. Carriage weight would be a large concern because the UAV needs to achieve a minimum speed. Material would be removed from the carriage whenever possible during the detailed design to minimize the weight.

Other mechanisms of release were explored, but the lever method was chosen for prototyping due to ease of construction. This prototype was a proof of concept and more iterations were needed to improve the design. An issue with this concept was the difficulty of pulling the levers back. The force of friction on the levers was strong, especially when stiffer springs were used. We also prototyped a carriage with the walls held together by two arms which were connected by a pin. However, the problem with this design was the tight tolerance needed to make the pin move smoothly, thus we abandoned this design. The next step was to test other mechanisms of locking and releasing the arms.

The next point of uncertainty with this design was the force from the springs on the fuselage. The force of friction would have to be enough to hold the UAV in place during launch, which would require a very large normal force on the fuselage. This force could be spread over the length of the fuselage to decrease the stress, but we would have to make sure the stress was not so high as to damage the UAV. Another option was to use leaf springs which may distribute the force more evenly. The normal force required could be reduced by increasing the coefficient of friction on the spring ends. Each spring would have an end cap made of rubber in order to increase the coefficient of friction.

Most of the development time was spent on the carriage, which meant further development was needed for the pneumatic pistons and structural support. The pistons would need to be tested at a smaller scale to verify they could achieve the launch velocity we expect. Also, the tripod and base would have to be tested to ensure the system was stable during a launch.

### 4.5 Initial Calculations

Knowing the required launch speed and limited by the maximum length of a custom-built piston, 50 inches, the required acceleration was found to be about 10 g (see Appendix F for calculations). From this acceleration and the weight of the UAVs, the required force was calculated to be about 180 lbf . From this force, a total volumetric flow rate at a given pressure can be calculated. It was found that at the maximum operating pressure of 120 psi , there was too much restriction of flow due to the $1 / 4$ " National Pipe Tapered thread (NPT) inlet of a single piston of the required dimensions to produce sufficient launch force. Because the fixed orifice size would dictate a need to reduce volumetric flow rate, it was decided that the best course of action was to split the force between multiple pistons, each requiring less flow and therefore less pressure. The requirement of having multiple pistons would create the issue of uneven actuation, leading to binding of the pistons, but this would be addressed in the future.

### 4.6 Risks and Challenges

After creating the preliminary design, some potential concerns were raised. We planned on addressing these issues early in the design process so that they would not become greater problems later on. These issues were:

1. A suitable mounting mechanism to hold the UAV in the carriage would be one of the most challenging tasks. While the Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ has a flat space on the rear that can function as an attach point, the Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ is only slightly contoured from the body to the tail. This would leave very little actual space to attach our launcher to, hence the need for a sideways clamping mechanism. It would have to be seen whether we would be able to generate enough frictional resistance using this method to secure our payloads.
2. Sufficient flow rate from the air tanks to the pistons would be critical, so methods of reducing spacing and ensuring minimal amounts of pressure loss were critical. One solution may have been to mount the tanks in-line with the back of the pistons with the solenoid in-between, leading to no tubing in the critical flow path.
3. A design with multiple pistons may have led to binding due to uneven actuation of the cylinder rods. The compliance of pneumatic cylinders would need to be investigated, and if binding was found to be an issue, a flexible mounting method would have to be developed.
4. If the weight and momentum of the carriage and piston when fully extended were too great, the whole launcher will tip over. We would need to investigate if tipping would be an issue with the current design, and if so, how we can avoid it. One idea to fix this was reducing weight at the carriage end and increasing weight at the base, while another was offsetting the carriage from the ends of the pistons so that the center of mass stayed within the two supports.

Our chosen design also had to be examined from a safety-focused perspective. A design hazard checklist is included in Appendix $G$ which addressed some of these concerns.

## 5 Final Design

After many revisions were made to the design mentioned earlier, we decided to switch to a single piston design, after confirming that a custom-built component could satisfy our design specifications, while removing the problem of potential binding. A wire rope is now attached to the end of the piston, connecting it to the carriage. The carriage travels along two linear motion shafts on either side of the piston-cylinder (See Figure 17). Once fired, the cable attached to the end of the piston pulls the carriage along the track. The carriage then hits a spreader placed at the end of the track, releasing the UAV with enough speed to successfully achieve lift. Two compression spring are mounted to the end of the track as well as two shock absorbers to slow the carriage down, which also prevent the piston from hitting the end of the cylinder.

### 5.1 Carriage

The final carriage design consists of a base made from an aluminum rectangular tube, two sliding panels, and a rear support. Each side panel is mounted on two steel axles which allows lateral motion, so the system can adjust for the width of each UAV. A spring is attached to the base of each panel to keep the panels compressed on both sides. The angled tip of each side panel fits into a 3D printed receiver (Figure 15) attached to the sides of the UAV with double sided VHB tape. The tips are also designed to resist thrust while sitting on the track prior to launch. A magnet attached to the underside of the carriage keeps the UAV stationary during launch because it is stuck to the steel backplate. The carriage has four linear roller bearings beneath the rectangular tube which slide along the track system.


Figure 14. Labeled Carriage

Ideally, the carriage would push the UAV from both the front and the back supports, but due to the tapered contour of the Nova's, fuselage near its center of gravity (CG), it was necessary to use an adjustable support bar for the rear support. The CG is important because the carriage must support the UAV on all sides of it to ensure the UAV is balanced. The back of the Nova ${ }^{\text {TM }}$, is a smaller width than the Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ just behind the CG, but the support rod fits both UAVs because the rear of both UAVs simply rest on the rod. The back-support panels, or ladders, allow the height of the support rod to be adjusted via multiple holes positioned for a range of heights. This system allows the carriage to not only support the Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ and Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ but accommodate UAVs that Dr. Drake may obtain in the future.


Figure 15. Receiver
A thin receiver attaches to either side of the UAV with double sided, 4910 VHB. The side panels sit inside the indent and transfer force to the UAV. The receivers are 3D printed due to its unique shape and to reduce weight. Dr. Drake has recommended using VHB tape, because it can be removed if need be. The skin of the UAV is the weakest point in this attachment. To ensure that the UAV is not damaged, the surface area of the receiver in contact with the UAV is made large enough to ensure a sufficient distribution of force. Dr. Drake has limited the receiver thickness to $3 / 8$ inch so that they do not affect the aerodynamics of the UAVs. The current design thickness is $1 / 4$ inch. This thickness strikes a balance between a large surface area to withstand the launch force, while maintaining an aerodynamic profile.

In order to release the UAV at the end of the track, each side panel has a bumper on the inner surface. The end of the track has a spreader (Figure 16) which wedges apart the panels when the carriage runs into it. The spreader and bumper widths are set so that the panels spread just wide enough for the UAV receivers to detach from the carriage. Two spreaders are needed, one for each UAV, due to the differing widths of the Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ ( 4.5 inches) and Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, ( 6.5 inches) at the CG. Each spreader can be interchanged easily via the removal of two bolts.

During travel down the track, the side panels must be held tight to the sides of the UAV. A spring with hooked ends runs through the rectangular tube and attaches to both side panels. The side panels have a 3D printed hook for each spring to latch onto.

The cable pulling the carriage is looped to itself using a swage and the loop is place around a $1 / 4$ inch diameter bolt that goes through the front end of the carriage. A 3D printed holder is used to hold a small neodymium magnet (Figure 16) on the underside of the carriage. This magnet is
placed at the rear so that it comes into contact with the rear plate. The magnet is rated up to 20 pounds which can successfully resist the pull of the UAV's motor.


Figure 16. Spreader
Each component of the carriage has undergone stress calculations and materials have been chosen based off the results. The side panels are made of aluminum and are a quarter inch thick. This thickness allows the entire receiver on the UAV to be filled while reducing any deflection in the side panels. Finite element analysis was performed on the panels using the maximum loading, resulting in a factor of safety of 6 . These results can be seen in Appendix H.

The points on the carriage with the highest stress concentrations are located at the panel axles. The force on the panel requires a large reaction force from each axle. The force at the end of each axle cause a large moment at the point of connection to the rectangular tube. Hand calculations for this analysis can be found in Appendix I. The stresses are nearly 50,000 psi which is why steel was chosen for these components.

The bumpers, rectangular tube, and spreader are all aluminum. Aluminum was chosen for these parts to reduce the weight of the carriage as well as the overall carrying weight of the entire system.

### 5.2 Frame and Piston

The frame of the launcher is composed of a front and back plate that support the piston cylinder and two linear motion shafts, with two legs attached to each plate via quick-disconnect pins (Figure 17).


Figure 17. Labelled launcher components
The front and back plates are $3 / 8$ " steel, having two clearance holes for the threaded ends of the linear motion shafts to go through. Each rod is secured with two nuts on either side of the plate. The front plate has a clearance hole for the piston to pass through and is secured in place using a nut over the end of the cylinder. A pulley is also mounted on the front plate so that the wire rope can be directed from the end of the piston shaft, over the front plate, and along the frame to the front of the carriage assembly. The same bolts for attaching the pulley are also used to attach the L brackets holding the spreader in place. The bottom bolts for this assemble also secure the shock absorbers.


Figure 18. Front Plate

Slots are cut into the front and back plates, creating a tab with the same width as the inside of the leg tubes (Figure 18). A hole is drilled into the tab aligned with a matching hole in the leg, allowing for a quick release pin to secure the leg in place. The moment created by forces on the launcher and the leg are distributed along the edges of this tab, as well as the edge along the top of the tube and through the pin. FEA was performed to model the stress on the front plate generated by a launch, and the factor of safety was determined to be 3 .

Running parallel with the piston are two steel linear motion shafts. These shafts are precision ground to a diameter tolerance of -0.001 " to -0.0005 " and a straightness tolerance of 0.002 " per ft . and are case hardened, meaning that they allow the linear motion bearing to slide without binding. The deflection of these shafts with the full weight of the UAV and carriage was modelled using FEA and found to be 0.07 ", meaning that at maximum deflection, the bottom of the linear motion bearings do not contact the piston body with a clearance of 0.51 ".

The piston is custom ordered from Bimba Pneumatics, based on their Original Line piston. The stroke length is extended to 60 " from a catalog maximum of 50 " so that the acceleration on the UAV can be reduced from around 9 G's to 7.5 G's. This also reduces the required air flow rate from 1268 SCFM to 1067 SCFM. The port on the rear is 1 " NPT, originally $1 / 8$ " NPT to allow for a higher air flow rate and reduced pressure loss through the orifice (See Appendix J for piston air flow calculations). The seal in the piston for the return action has been removed, as retracting the piston pneumatically is not necessary, and holes have been drilled into the end of the piston body to allow more air to vent and reduce resistance to extension.

### 5.3 Pneumatic and Electrical Systems

The pneumatic system consists of a tire bead-setting air tank with a 2 " fitting, and three $1 / 4$ " fittings. A 2" to 1 " pipe reducer attaches to the 2 " fitting leading to a high-pressure hose. This hose meets with a solenoid valve with then connects to the piston with a nipple. The first $1 / 4$ " NPT fitting is broken out using a tee fitting to attach the filling hose to the compressor and compressor relay. The second $1 / 4$ " fitting is also broken out with a tee fitting which connects to the safety relief valve, and the solenoid for manual tank release. The pressure gage is attached to the third fitting. The compressor is a 12 V automotive compressor.

The electrical system uses 18 V DeWalt batteries supplied by the UAV team, which are run through a 12 V voltage reducer and then wired into a pressure relay and fuse to regulate the pressure of the pneumatic system. The wiring diagram is shown in Appendix Q. Each electrical component at the air tank is connected via spade plugs so it can be easily detached for transportation. A control box with a 50 -foot extension cable houses a switch to activate the compressor relay system, a switch to open the pneumatic dump valve, and a switch and button linked in series to prevent accidental launch, to activate the larger launch solenoid.

The user pressurizes the tank until the relay turns off the compressor at 145 psi . At this point, the user may launch the UAV using the controller, or abort the launch if need be using the dump solenoid. Following launch, air continues to flow through holes at the end of the cylinder until the launch button is released by the user. The tank can be emptied using the dump valve. Once the tank is nearly empty, the carriage slides back to its return position with the piston.

### 5.4 Safety, Maintenance, and Repair

There are numerous safety risks associated with the UAV launcher. Besides those already mentioned in section 4.6 and Appendix G, the area in front of the launcher must be kept clear whenever it is being operated. Operators should stand no less than 10 ft . away from the launcher while it is prepped for launch. The two-stage switch for launch is a safety measure to prevent accidental misfiring from occurring, and the piston release valve exists in case a launch must be aborted for any reason. Also included on the air tank is a pressure relief valve which does not allow over pressurization of the system. It is extremely important to use the correct spreader respective to its UAV. The Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, uses the wider spreader while the Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ uses the narrower spreader. Failure to use the correct spreader may result in an impact with the carriage and failure to release the UAV. It is also crucial to ensure the spreader is completely straight. If the bolts on the L bracket become loose, the spreader may not be straight, and the carriage side panel may collide during launch.

Regarding maintenance, the side panel axles should be lubricated to reduce stiction while spreading. The linear bearing shafts should be cleaned and checked for debris to ensure the carriage can slide cleanly along them. The most likely component to fail in the carriage is the spring holding the side panels together. This can easily be replaced by removing the side panels and exchanging the spring for a new one. Should the linear motion bearings wear so that movement is unacceptable, replacements can be purchased from McMaster-Carr and installed in the bearing holders.

The steel rods used for the track should be wiped clean prior to each use to decrease friction and prevent bearing damage. The shock absorbers used to stop the carriage may experience wear after extensive use. Replacement shock absorbers can be purchased from McMaster-Carr.

DeWalt batteries should be charged fully before each use to ensure full pressurization. Cables should be inspected for damage prior to launch and the solenoids should be tested before pressurization each time.

### 5.5 Cost Analysis

The most expensive component of the final design was the custom piston with a price of \$439. Following the piston, the air compressor and linear bearing shafts were \$172.66 and \$107.52 respectively. The bulk of the cost was from raw materials. Most individual components are inexpensive, but collectively bring the total cost up to $\$ 2072$. Thus, the final cost of the project exceeded the original rough budget of $\$ 2000$ but this was done with approval of Dr. Drake. A full list of material purchases can be found in Appendix L.

## 6 Manufacturing

This section outlines the steps required that were required to manufacture and assemble the individual pieces of the UAV launcher. The overall system can be broken down into four subsystems, the Carriage, Piston Frame, Pneumatic, and Electrical assemblies.

### 6.1 Carriage Assembly

The carriage used to carry the UAV during the launch was constructed from mostly stock parts with a few additional manufactured components. The major individual components manufactured for the carriage were

- Body
o Square Aluminum tubing, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Ladder and Side Panels
o Aluminum stock plate, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Side Panel Axles
o Steel stock, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Metal Bumper
o Aluminum stock, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Ladder Pin
o Aluminum round stock, bought from McMaster-Carr

The different machines needed to manufacture the components were

- Water Jet Cutter
- Metal Chop Saw
- TIG Welder
- Mill

The body of the carriage was cut from square tubing on a metal chop saw. After the dimensions were confirmed, holes were drilled into the tubing using a mill. To create the side panels and ladder support, aluminum stock was waterjet-cut to its specifications. Linear sleeve bearings were then press fit into the side panels. The laddered section was originally supposed to be TIG welded to the back section of the rectangular tube, but due to time constraints, the ladders were bolted to the carriage. After further consideration, spacers were added in between the ladders and carriage to provide extra clearance for the Nova ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, due to its larger width. Once that was completed, the side panel axles were cut to size using a metal chop saw, inserted through the rectangular tube, and affixed with epoxy. The linear bearings within the side panels were placed over the side panel axles and secured using a spring. Linear roller bearings were placed under the carriage and attached using screws, nuts, and washers bought from McMaster-Carr. The ladder pin was cut from aluminum stock on a metal chop saw and a hole was drilled through one end using a mill. This was used to secure the end of the ladder using a cotter pin purchased from McMaster-Carr.

The cable which pulls the carriage was looped around a bolt within the carriage. This bolt was placed vertically in the center at the front of the carriage. The cable was wrapped around the bolt and secured to itself using a cable clamp. The front of the carriage was cut $1 / 4$ of an inch shorter in order to provide extra clearance before the end of the track.

In order to stop the carriage, two springs were placed over the linear axles at the end of the track. The carriage hits these springs immediately after releasing the UAV and the springs compress one inch before hitting two shock absorbers. The shock absorbers were bolted to the front plate and can dissipate most of the energy from the carriage into heat.


Figure 19. Water-jetting carriage components


Figure 20. Cut carriage components


Figure 21. Tapped separator wedges for carriage

### 6.2 Frame Assembly

The Frame Assembly both elevates the piston to the desired height and creates a track for the carriage to rest upon and traverse. The major individual components manufactured for the frame were

- Frame Front Legs
o Aluminum Stock tubing, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Frame Back Legs
o Aluminum Stock tubing, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Frame Front Plate
o Stainless Steel plate stock, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Frame Back Plate
o Stainless Steel stock, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Spreader
o Aluminum plate stock, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Linear Bearing Shaft
o Steel linear motion shafts, bought from McMaster-Carr
- L Bracket
o L plate, bought from McMaster-Carr
The different machines needed to manufacture the components were
- Water Jet Cutter
- Metal Chop Saw
- Mill
- Taps and Dies
- Oxy-Acetylene Torch

The front and back plates of the frame were cut using a waterjet cutter. An issue arose scheduling time in the Industrial Technology department's water-jet cutter, as the ME and IME machines were not in operation. This led to a backlog when every department at the school wanted to use their machine. Because of this, a team member needed to wait outside their door for a few hours before shop hours to ensure that we would get some time on the machine.

After they were cut, the two top holes were threaded using a tap. The linear bearing shafts were then cut using a metal chop saw. Because the shafts were hardened, it was not possible to thread the shafts as they were. The ends of the hardened steel were heated with an Oxy-Acetylene torch to $1500-1600^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ to anneal the metal, allowed to cool and then threaded on both sides with a die. Cutting the threads on the shafts proved to be very difficult, requiring a large handle and a very specific technique, eventually leading to overheating and breaking an unhardened die. Between broken drill bits and dies, there was much swapping and waiting between the hangar and Mustang 60 to find unbroken and sufficient quality tools to be able to work with steel.

After tapping the holes in the plates and fitting the rods, it was determined that the holes were not tapped straight and would not allow the rods to be parallel to each other. To fix this, the holes were drilled out to a $17 / 32$ " clearance diameter and the threads on the rods were further extended to allow them to be fastened on both sides of the plate with nuts.

Holes were drilled in the L bracket using a mill. The spreader was also cut using a waterjet cutter, and two different models were made, each for a specific UAV. Next, the front and back legs were cut separately using a metal chop saw and a single hole was drilled through the end of each of the legs. Unfortunately, due to tolerance issues, these holes ended up being insufficient to allow for proper clearance in attaching the legs to the mounting holes. These holes had to be enlarged and a side of each leg had to be grinded down in order to properly mount the legs.

The front and back plates were then screwed onto the corresponding sides of the piston, and the linear bearing shaft was screwed into the plates. The L bracket was attached to the front plate using bolts, nuts and washers from McMaster-Carr, with the spreader attached to the L bracket in the same fashion. The pulley was fixed to the front plate as well using the same method. Finally, the legs were attached to the corresponding plates using a release pin. Due to the leg holes being made larger than originally chosen, the pins are not completely fixed when the legs are attached. Though it is impossible for them to fall out, causing the legs to detach, they are a bit loose.


Figures 22 and 23. Pseudo-annealing and cutting threads on linear motion shafts

### 6.3 Pneumatic Assembly

The Pneumatic Assembly is used to propel the carriage and UAV once the launch is initiated. The system is made entirely from stock parts, with the major components being purchased.

- Air Tank
o 10-gallon air tank, bought from Amazon
- 1 '’ solenoid valve
o 1-inch solenoid valve, bought from Amazon
- Air compressor
o 12 V automotive compressor, bought from Amazon
- Pressure release valve
o Pressure release valve rated at 145 psi, included with air tank
- Pipe diameter reducer
o 2-inch to 1-inch pipe reducer, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Flexible tubing
o 1.5-inch flexible tubing, bought from McMaster-Carr
- Piston Cylinder
o 60-inch stroke, 2.5 -inch bore, 1 -inch inlet piston cylinder, custom ordered from Bimba

The compressor was first attached to the air tank along with the pressure release valve at the appropriate inlet/outlet ports. The flexible tubing was then connected to the solenoid valve, which was attached to the air tank. The other end of the flexible tubing was attached to the pipe diameter reducer, which feeds into the piston cylinder. After assembly, some leakage was detected, requiring the components to be further tightened.

The piston quote was obtained in early February, and the piston was ordered the following week, with an expected delivery date between early and late April. The company made assurances that every effort would be made for an early April delivery, but unfortunately there were multiple uncommunicated and unexplained delays. Because of this, the piston did not arrive in time for the Senior Project Expo and was never added to the assembly.

To finish the product from that point, the most important step was to receive the piston. Once it arrived, the linear bearing shafts were cut and rethreaded to match the length of the piston. Then, the wire rope needed to be attached to the end of the piston and run over the pulley. A clearance issue was identified for the attachment point at the carriage when the launcher was fully extended, as the swage on the wire rope was at the wrong angle to fit between the two L brackets.

### 6.4 Electrical Assembly

The Electrical Assembly is used to power the entire system as well as receive input from the user. The system is made mostly from stock parts, with the major components being

- DeWalt battery
o 18V DeWalt battery, supplied by Dr. Drake
- DC-DC Voltage Converter
o 24 V to 13.8 V DC voltage reducer purchased from Amazon
- Connective wiring
o Connective wiring for all the electrical components, received from Aero department
- Voltage adapter
o 18 V DeWalt battery adapter, purchased from eBay
- Toggle switches
o 2 toggle switches, purchased from McMaster-Carr
- Spring loaded toggle switch
o Spring loaded toggle switch, purchased from McMaster-Carr
- Push button
o Spring loaded push button, purchased from McMaster-Carr
- Switch Case
o Switch Case, 3D printed
The DeWalt battery was first connected to the voltage adapter, with the appropriate port available for the compressor. The voltage adapter and compressor were then soldered to the connective wiring, which in turn leads to the controller. The controller switches were placed in their respective positions, and the spring-loaded toggle switch and push button were wired in series
in order to provide a safety countermeasure. The switch was also connected to the solenoid valve on the tank for the safety release.


Figure 24. 3D printed launcher panel with switches installed

## 7 Design Verification Plan

The performance of our design would be tested once the confirmation prototype is completed. Each of our specifications had to be met for the prototype to be considered a success.

Maximum Pressure: After assembling the pneumatic side of the launcher, the system could be tested at its maximum operating pressure to ensure that there were no leaks, and no component failed. The system consisted of two solenoid valves, a safety release valve, and a pressure gage, all connected to the ten-gallon tank. For safety concerns, the system was hydro tested using a hand pump provided by the Cal Poly Mechanical Engineering department. The test was conducted outside Building 13 on the Cal Poly campus.

First, the tank was filled with water from a hose until it over flowed and then the main solenoid valve was closed. One of the ports on the tank was connected to a hand pump, as seen in Figure 25. Water was pumped into the tank as the pressure was monitored. We immediately noted that some water was slowly dribbling out of one of the ports on the tank. When the pressure first reached about 100 psi , the tank creaked, but this was the only time this occurred. The tank was slowly pressurized to about 135 psi, when the safety release valve opened. It should also be noted that once pumped up to 135 psi, the tank pressure dropped back down to about 100 psi fairly quickly, meaning that there were some air leaks to be addressed. All of these measurements have an uncertainty of $\pm 1$ psi due to the resolution of the pressure gage.


Figure 25. Hydro-testing pressure vessel and fittings
The test concluded that the system can be safely pressurized to an operating pressure of 135 psi which is when the safety release valve opened. The test also revealed that there were some minor leaks, which were resolved by tightening each joint. The next step is to tighten the joints and connect the compressor to ensure the compressor can successfully pressurize the tank.

Assembly Time: The final assembly was fully assembled by 2 members of the team. Over the course of 5 separate assemblies, it was found that the average time to assemble the launcher was 12 minutes, which was considered a success. The next step going forward is to have both Dr. Drake and his students, as well as other untrained individuals attempt to assemble the launcher using only the operator's manual as their guide.


Figure 26. Strength testing the Carriage
Max Load: In order to fully test the max load of the launcher, the piston would be fired with weights in the carriage to simulate the UAV, and the final speed would be recorded. However, since the piston was never assembled, we had to settle for testing by applying loads directly to the
carriage. By attaching weights from the carriage and hanging the carriage on the connecting point to the wire rope, the expected force was simulated, as seen in Figure 26. The carriage was able to easily withstand up to 180 lbs . of force, which was considered a success.

Carriage Size: In order to test the capabilities of the carriage sizing, a mock UAV was made from wood and weights, and was constructed with similar dimensions to the Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$. By attaching the inset tabs along the sides, the mock UAV was then placed in the carriage, to ensure that the mock UAV would be able to fit within the space provided. The mock UAV was successfully sized, and the carriage was able to accommodate the UAV while remaining stable.

Minimal Pinch Points: Once the launcher was fully assembled, the system was examined for any potential pinch points for the operator. This was done by first visually inspecting the launcher for any points in which the operator may be in danger of being pinched or crushed. Since the operator would be standing away from the launcher at a safe distance during its use, the presence of pinch points on the launcher itself is negligible, and thus passed the test.

These were the only tests we were able to complete in the given time frame due to the fact that the piston arrived so much later than expected. The following is a list of possible tests that would need to be conducted in order to completely verify the use and safety of the launcher. These tests will be done once the project has been handed off to the sponsor.

Launch Abortion: This test is important to ensure that the launcher can be successfully and safely disarmed from its prelaunch state if a launch procedure must be aborted. The system will be prepared for launch and disarmed in a series of 10 tests. If even one of these launches cannot be safely disarmed, or misfires, then the prototype is a failure, and additional safeguards will need to be implemented. We expect this test to be a success, with little chance for failure. The predicted mode of failure is an electrical wiring failure, which can easily be fixed in order to remedy the problem.

Size/Fit Test: This is a simple check to ensure that the final design will properly fit in Dr. Drake's method of transportation. An area of 33 cm by 155 cm has been set aside for the storage and transport of the launcher in its stored configuration. The prototype will be measured in its stored state to ensure that this size requirement is met. This test is a high-risk test, as the entire purpose of the project was to ensure that the device would be portable to the sponsor. However, we predict that the launcher will pass, and be safely stored within the space provided, or with a partial amount sticking out of the back of the truck.

Time to Abort Launch: During the multiple tests for successful launch abortion, the time it takes from the start of the disarming process until the process is finished will be measured. While having a reliable disarming method is important for safety, the speed in which the process can be completed is just as important, with a goal of under 90 seconds. Each abort procedure must meet this time limit to be successful. We predict that the test may not pass this goal. With such a large tank and small solenoid, the volume of air that must be released to equalize the pressure is incredibly high. However, this specification is self-imposed, and is not required for the successful use of the safety release of the air.

Launch Speed Adjustability: The catapult will be loaded with a UAV dummy weight and fired at multiple speeds while being recorded with a high-speed camera. The piston will be fired at a range of speeds by adjusting the airflow. A relation between the piston and launch speed will be determined from the data. The range of speeds should span $10-25 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ to be considered
acceptable. We predict that the launcher will not be able to pass this test as well. Being able to accurately measure and adjust the pressure is difficult given the orientation of the compressor, air tank, pressure gauge, and pressure release. Also, all of the force calculations for the travel of the piston and carriage are done under the assumption that the surface is frictionless, which it is not. Because of this, we believe that the carriage will not be able to reach the upper end of the range of speed desired, but will be able to safely launch in the lower end.

Resistive Force of Carriage Pre-Launch: A simple test, the actual UAVs will be placed in the carriage and prepared for launch. The UAVs will then be throttled up to their maximum speeds while on the carriage. The goal is for the UAVs to remain fixed in place on the carriage at the bottom of the launcher. If after 10 trials the UAVs are found to be stationary, this test will be considered successful. We predict that this test will be successful based on the strength of the magnets that we are using in order to secure the carriage to the back plate of the launcher. If the test proves unsuccessful, then the magnets can be switched to stronger magnets, or the method of holding the carriage in place could be modified as well.

Consecutive Launch Capability: The launcher will be loaded with dummy weight and fired in quick succession using one full tank of air. The number of successful launches will be recorded. Ideally, 5 successful launches in a row is desired, though 3 should be considered sufficient for success. We predict that the launcher will not be able to pass this test, as the predicted time necessary for pressurizing the air three times exceeds the amount of time the battery could power the system. To counter this, simply have more charged batteries on site to switch out between launches.

Rapid Launch Capability: The time in between launches should be minimal. Two launches with dummy weights will be performed as quickly as possible, with the time between the launches being measured and averaged over 10 trials. The goal is for the time between launches to be kept under 10 minutes for this to meet design specifications. We predict that the launcher will be unable to meet this specification as well. Since the volume of the tank is so large, the amount of time required to fully pressurize it to the correct pressure is comparatively large as well. With the current tank only having a 33\% duty cycle, it can only run for about 20 minutes an hour, making a 10-minute launch reset time difficult to achieve.

## 8 Project Management

Since this was a long-term project, it was important to layout a timeline for the completion of tasks and key milestones to ensure that our goals were met on schedule. Starting with the Fall term, we completed background research on similar launcher designs and used QFD to determine what important design criteria must be met according to the sponsor's needs. From this, we began our ideation process to find design solutions that meet those needs. After multiple concept iterations, a final concept design was selected, and a concept prototype was created of one of the design's components. Following this, a structural prototype was constructed, and the design finalized. Manufacturing and testing began following the Critical Design Review, which was presented to the sponsor. Once the sponsor's approval was obtained, the project moved into the final construction and assembly phases. Spring term was mostly dedicated to this process, including troubleshooting while giving enough time to address potential issues that arose. The
completely assembled device was to be tested for safety and success, with changes being made accordingly. The final product was to be shown at the Senior Design Expo along with the Final Design Review (FDR) and poster detailing the project for attendees. Afterwards, the system was to be delivered to the sponsor in proper working condition, ready for his personal use.

Table 3. Key Deliverable Timetable

| Deliverable | Description | Deadline |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Scope of Work | Outline of project goals and restrictions | $10 / 19 / 2018$ |
| Preliminary Design Review | Review of initial design choices | $11 / 16 / 2018$ |
| Critical Design Review | Detailed analysis of performance and costs | $2 / 08 / 2019$ |
| Manufacturing \& Test Review | Part manufacturing and scheduled testing | $3 / 14 / 2019$ |
| Hardware/Safety Demo | Live demo of final design with safety check | $4 / 25 / 2019$ |
| Final Design Review | Finished product and report, expo preparation | 5/31/2019 |

A Gantt chart is available in Appendix B for a visual representation of our projected timeline with specific dates and details.
Unfortunately, the supplier for the piston, the most important part of the launcher, was unable to meet the deadline they specified in early February for a delivery window in April. Because of this, we did not receive the piston in time for FDR and Senior Design Expo and could not present a complete design or complete testing results. Had the piston arrived on time, the timeline should have been sufficient to complete all the required tasks. As a result, for future projects, we would set aside more time to allow for supplier delays, and in this case, an alternative supplier or propulsion design.

## 9 Conclusion

The UAV catapult project proposed by Dr. Drake is presented in this document as well as the preliminary and final design by team LaunchTime. The goal was to design and construct a UAV launcher to replace the unreliable method of hand launching currently in use. We conducted research to choose a preliminary design and refined it over time with many different forms of analysis to obtain our final design. We created project management, manufacturing, and design verification plans in order to develop a launcher capable of launching two of Dr. Drake's UAVs by the end of May. Following this, a structural prototype was built to verify the final design and after successfully doing so, we began the construction phase of the final product.

The frame of the launcher was constructed during this period, through the assembly of a combination of purchased and manufactured parts. Preliminary testing of the frame was completed. Alongside this, the pneumatics system was assembled and tested for leaks, with minor adjustments made in accordance with the test results. The electronics system was also assembled at this time, with the wiring for the controller to the pneumatics system being tested for faults. All electrical systems functioned as expected. Unfortunately, at a later time, the dump solenoid
stopped functioning for unknown reasons. The wiring was checked with a different solenoid and this solenoid worked as expected, leading us to the belief that the dump solenoid itself is what failed.

However, the piston, a major component of our design, arrived on $5 / 30 / 2019$, the day before the Cal Poly project exposition. This meant that final assembly could not be performed before this point. This also meant that there were many performance-based design verification tests which we could not perform. Subsequently, we were unable to confirm whether our design meets the necessary specifications for launching the UAVs. We did mostly finish assembling our design in the days following the expo, but testing was unable to be completed before the conclusion of the project time. In hindsight, our project's scope may have been too broad to be properly addressed in the senior project time span.

Part of the reason this project ran over deadlines was that this project was very manufacturing intensive, and in the little time we had to manufacture after the piston arrived, the time spent in the shop was extremely inefficient. When arriving at the shop, it was not uncommon to wait nearly an hour to check in because it was already at capacity, then spend a majority of the time in the shop waiting. At the tool shed, tools frequently would be broken or incorrect, which meant going back to stand in line again each time. Other times, other groups would have checked out the tools needed, and we would have to wait for them to be returned. It was not uncommon to spend two hours at the shop for a 15 -minute job to be finished. Also, if a job needed to be completed, a specific shop would have to be used. For example, if a hole needed to be drilled, Mustang 60's 17/32" drill bit was chipped so the Hangar would need to be used. If a shaft needed threads cut, the die in the Hangar was needed to start threads because their handle was bigger but the die in Mustang 60 was needed because it did not have as many broken teeth. Each trip also meant waiting till the next day since the shops open on alternating days.

At the project's end, we had completed about $90 \%$ of the manufacturing and assembly we originally planned for. This is not an insignificant amount of progress when taking into account the delays faced from waiting for major parts to arrive. While our physical progress was respectable, very little of our planned testing was able to be completed, at around a third. Thus, we have very little in the way of useful data to analyze the effectiveness of our final design.

## Next Steps

For the launcher to satisfy all the goals we laid out in the beginning, a few modifications will need to be made.

1. A new method of attaching the wire rope to the carriage is needed. The current swage fitting contacts the two L-brackets as the carriage reaches the front plate and binds the motion. Alternatively, the L-brackets need to be spread further apart to provide enough clearance for the wire rope.
2. The spreader needs to be extended further down the track, probably by remaking longer L-brackets, or by making the spreader itself longer. Currently, the carriage stops against the bumpers just short of fully opening. It is possible that this will be sufficient for a successful launch, but this has not been confirmed via testing.
3. The side panels on the carriage do not always spread apart symmetrically when loading the UAV. The side panels must be equally spaced or else one of the side panel bumpers will collide with the spreader at the end of the track. A solution to this issue is to create
spacers (specific to the Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ or $\mathrm{Nova}^{\mathrm{TM}}$,) that can be placed on the side panel axels. This will ensure the side panels are equidistant from the carriage base. A simple solution is to 3d print two semicircle spaces that can be snapped on to the axels quickly.
4. The holes used to attach the legs to the front and back plate had to be drilled larger than our specified diameter, due to interference with the corresponding holes on the plates. As a result, the legs are not as secure as our design dictates, with a noticeable amount of movement possible. The easiest fix to this would be to drill new holes in the legs by flipping them upside down and using the undrilled bottom end as the new top end. Filing down one side of the legs will still be necessary to properly fit in the base plate grooves.
5. The dump solenoid failed during testing and no longer actuates. A new solenoid will need to be purchased. The specs are not critical for this solenoid; it must only be 12 VDC and $1 / 4$ " NPT.
6. A flat plate should be added to the front of the carriage where it contacts the bumpers. Currently, the thin wall of the carriage is the only part contacting the bumper and the small amount of surface area may lead to damage to the bumper.
7. The safety release valve that came with the air tank was designed to release the pressure at 145 psi. After hydro testing the system, we found that the release valve opens at 135 psi. This presents a problem because the relay for the compressor will not shut off. A 150-psi pressure release valve should be purchased and implemented. Before operating, the system should be hydro tested again, as it has never experienced this level of pressure.

Once these are completed, the firing capability of the launcher will need to be tested. Using the provided dummy-UAV, the launcher should be repeatedly fired with the pressure slowly increasing each time, being careful to note any impact inside the piston. It is crucial to make sure that an external method is used to stop the piston as it is not designed to stop itself.
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## Appendix A - QFD House of Quality



Appendix B - Gantt Chart 9/25/18-11/18/18


## Appendix B - Gantt Chart 11/18/18-3/10/19



Appendix B - Gantt Chart 3/10/19-6/7/19


## Appendix C - Pugh Matrices

## Pugh Matrix - Track System

|  | Weight | Rectangular <br> Tube with <br> Wheels (2014 <br> Senior Project <br> and UAV LAB) | "I" Channel <br> with Wheels <br> Inside | Two Tube <br> Slider | Two Tube <br> Roller | Piston <br> (No Track) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stability | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| Strength | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Friction | 3 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 1 |
| Manufacturability | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -1 | 1 |
| Lifetime | 1 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | -1 |
| Collapsibility | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |

Pugh Matrix - Track Support

| Track support |  |  |  |  |  | Weights |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | single pole | a frame | Ladder System | t frame | Tripod |  |
| Portablility | s | s | - | - | 5 | 3 |
| cost | s | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| manufacturable | s | S | - | S | S | 4 |
| assembly time | s | S | S | S | 5 | 2 |
| resistive force | S | + | S | + | + | 3 |
| stability | s | $+$ | s | + | + | 4 |
| Adjustable Angle | s | $+$ | - | 5 | + | 2 |
| Result | 0 | 8 | -10 | 3 | 8 |  |

Pugh Matrix - Carriage

| Criteria | Weight | UAV <br> Factory | AVA | H.H Tech | ElevonX | Rear <br> Holding | Side <br> Clamp |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stability | 5 |  | - | - | S | - | S |
| Resistance | 4 |  | - | S | + | - | - |
| Size | 3 |  | S | + | - | - | S |
| Complexity | 2 |  | + | + | - | + | + |
| Durability | 1 |  | S | S | S | S | S |
| Manufactur <br> ability | 4 |  | + | - | S | + | + |

Pugh Matrix - Propulsion

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size | D | + | + | + | + |
| Heght | A | + | + | - | + |
| Requation, | T | 5 | - | 4 | - |
| Duncilisy | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Safety | M | - | - | - |  |
| Cost | * | 5 | + |  |  |
| Power | \$ | 5 | 5 |  | + |
| Enameray. |  |  |  | - | 5 |
|  | * | 5 | + | - | + |
| $\frac{\text { incelamimer }}{\text { nomen }}$ | * | - | $s$ | - | $s$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon+ \\ & \varepsilon- \end{aligned}$ |  | 2 <br> 3 | 4 3 | 7 | 4 3 |

Appendix D - Morph Matrix

|  | Concepts |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sub function |  |  |  |
| Frame | 1 Frame | Tripod | 2 |
| Track | "1" channel | Two Tube Slider | No Track Piston |
| Power | Spring | 3Pneumatic Pistons | Bungie |
| Carriage | Pin Hook | Rear Grip+Mold | Side Clamp |

## Appendix E - Weighted Decision Matrix



## Appendix F - Excel calculation file



| Piston Bore [in] | 1.25 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Piston Area [in^2] | $=\mathrm{PI}()^{*}(\mathrm{~B} 1 / 2)^{\wedge} 2$ |  |
| Piston Pressure [psi] | 27.7 |  |
| Piston Force [llbf] | =B2*B3 |  |
| UAV Weight [lbm] | =18/4 |  |
| UAV Acceleration [g] | $=(\mathrm{B} 4 / \mathrm{B} 5)$ |  |
| Piston Length [in] | 50 |  |
| Piston Volume [ft^3] | $=(\mathrm{B} 2 / 12)^{*}(\mathrm{~B} 7 / 12)$ |  |
| Piston Time [s] | $=S Q R T(2 *(B 7 / 12) /(B 6 * 32.2))$ |  |
| Piston Flow Rate [cfm] | $=(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{B} 9)^{*} 60$ |  |
|  | $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ | $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s} \quad \mathrm{mph}$ |
| Final Velocity | =B6*32.2*B9 | =B12/3 =B12*0.681 |

## Appendix G - Safety Design Hazard Checklist

| Description of Hazard | Y/N | Planned Corrective Action | Planned Date | Actual Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Will any part of the design create hazardous revolving, reciprocating, running, shearing, punching, pressing, squeezing, drawing, cutting, rolling, mixing or similar action, including pinch points and sheer points? | Y | The motion of the drone carriage may create a pinch point between itself and its guide, which will be covered to prevent potential injury | 3/25/19 | TBD |
| 2. Can any part of the design undergo high accelerations/decelerations? | Y | The carriage will undergo high acceleration as part of the design. A minimum safety distance will be set for the operator to prevent injury | N/A | N/A |
| 3. Will the system have any large moving masses or large forces? | Y | Large forces will be present in the piston used to generate kinetic energy. A cover will be used to prevent operator injury | N/A | N/A |
| 4. Will the system produce a projectile? | Y | By the project's nature, the drone will be launched out of the catapult. The device should not be used if people are in front of its trajectory. | N/A | N/A |
| 5. Would it be possible for the system to fall under gravity creating injury? | Y | The device will stand on legs to provide the desired launch angle. If it were to tip over, it would present a safety risk. The legs will be secured to the ground to prevent tipping. | 2/28/19 | TBD |


| 6. Will a user be exposed to overhanging weights as part of the design? | N | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7. Will the system have any sharp edges? | N | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 8. Will any part of the electrical systems not be grounded? | N | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 9. Will there be any large batteries or electrical voltage in the system above 40 V ? | N | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 10. Will there be any stored energy in the system such as batteries, flywheels, hanging weights or pressurized fluids? | Y | High pressure air in compressor. A pressure relief device will be used to prevent over pressurization | 3/25/19 | 5/23/19 |
| 11. Will there be any explosive or flammable liquids, gases, or dust fuel as part of the system? N | N | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 12. Will the user of the design be required to exert any abnormal effort or physical posture during the use of the design? | N | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 13. Will there be any materials known to be hazardous to humans involved in either the design or the manufacturing of the design? | N | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 14. Can the system generate high levels of noise? | N | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 15. Will the device/system be exposed to extreme environmental conditions such as fog, humidity, cold, high temperatures, etc.? | Y | The device may be used in foggy, humid, hot, or cold weather, so must be able to withstand such | 4/30/19 | TBD |


|  |  | environmental <br> conditions. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16. Is it possible for the <br> system to be used in an <br> unsafe manner? | Y | The device could be <br> used to launch objects <br> other than the intended <br> drones. Users must be <br> instructed to only use <br> the catapult to launch <br> the intended items. | $4 / 30 / 19$ | $5 / 25 / 19$ |

## Appendix H - Panel FEA

Stress in Panel at Twice the Maximum Load


Strain in Panel at Twice the Maximum Load


## Appendix I - Carriage Axle Hand Calculations

Hand Calculations for Stress in the Carriage Lateral Axles


## Appendix J - Piston Air Flow Spreadsheet

428 Calcs.xlsx spreadsheet


## Appendix K - Detailed Drawings

Exploded View of Launcher


Back Support Leg


Front Support Leg


Frame Back Plate


Frame Front Plate


Carriage Exploded View


## Rectangular Tube (Carriage Base)



Ladder (Carriage Rear Support)


## Bearing Mount Plate



Penguin (Front UAV Support)


## Control Box Assembly (Laser Cut Acrylic)



Rod Holder Inside Carriage (3D Printed)


Magnet Holder Under Carriage (3D Printed)


## Appendix L - Bill of Materials




| Item | Cost/Unit | Units | Total Cost | Vendor | Vedor Part Number | Associated Part | Method of Purchase | Date Purchased |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ORDER 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aluminum Block ( $12 \times 8 \times 1 / 2$ ) | 36.86 | 1 | 36.86 | McMaster-Carr | 8975k222 | Spreader | Aero Department |  | 4/2/2019 |
| $1 / 44^{\prime \prime}$ Steel Wire | 1.69 | 10 | 16.90 | McMaster-Carr | 3440156 | Track | Aero Department |  | 4/2/2019 |
| SS 304 Sheet $6 \times 12 \times 3 / 8$ | 50.80 | 1 | 50.80 | McMaster-Carr | 8983k222 | Frame | Aero Department |  | 4/2/2019 |
| Compression Sleeve | 10.22 | 1 | 10.22 | McMaster-Carr | 3898718 | Frame | Aero Department |  | 4/2/2019 |
| Pulley | 17.63 | 1 | 17.63 | McMaster-Cart | 3087741 | Frame | Aero Department |  | 4/2/2019 |
| LChannel | 17.20 | 1 | 17.20 | McMaster-Carr | $8982 \times 37$ | Frame | Aero Department |  | 4/2/2019 |
| Tax + Shipping (estimated) |  |  | 21.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ORDER 6 TOTAL |  |  | 170.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Order 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Toggle Swith (spring loaded) | 8.20 | 1 | 8.20 | McMaster-Carr | 7343k763 | Controller | Aero Department |  | 4/16/2019 |
| Air Hose (3ft) | 20.43 | 1 | 20.43 | McMaster-Carr | 5304k47 | Pneumatics | Aero Department |  | 4/16/2019 |
| 1.5 inch barbed hose fitting | 4.95 | 2 | 9.90 | McMaster-Carr | 5363k55 | Pneumatics | Aero Department |  | 4/16/2019 |
| 1.5 to 1 reducer | 10.99 | 1 | 10.99 | McMaster-Carr | 44605 k 325 | Pneumatics | Aero Department |  | 4/16/2019 |
| Aluminum Tube | 3.66 | 1 | 3.66 | McMaster-Carr | 6546k51 | Carriage | Aero Department |  | 4/16/2019 |
| Rubber Bumper | 18.60 | 2 | 37.20 | McMaster-Carr | 9677k13 | Frame | Aero Department |  | 4/16/2019 |
| Spring | 9.68 | 1 | 9.68 | McMaster-Carr | 1986k151 | Frame | Aero Department |  | 4/16/2019 |
| Tax + Shipping (estimated) |  |  | 40.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ORDER 7 TOTAL |  |  | 140.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Order 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wire | 31.95 | 1 | 31.95 | Amazon | B01MU6itn 7 | Controller | Aero Department |  | May |
| Pressure Gauge | 9.64 | 1 | 9.64 | Amazon | B006K2RIV8 | Pneumatics | Aero Department |  | May |
| Voltage Reducer | 25.99 | 1 | 25.99 | Amazon | b07NzNLRLT | Controller | Aero Department |  | May |
| Pulley | 7.38 | 1 | 7.38 | McMaster-Carr | $3099+34$ | Frame |  |  | May |
| Bike Pump Adapter | 5.96 | 1 | 5.96 | Amazon | B001PlabA | Frame |  |  |  |
| $3 / 16$ wire rope | 14.90 | 1 | 14.90 | McMaster-Carr | $3440+55$ | Frame |  |  | May |
| Tax + Shipping (estimated) |  |  | 35.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ORDER 8 TOTAL |  |  | 130.82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Order9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fastenal Nuts and Miscilaneous | 21.01 | 1 | 21.01 | Fastenal | NA | Frame | Reimbursment | 5/30/2019 |  |
| Spade Connectors | 9.26 | 1 | 9.26 | Home Depot | NA | Electrical | Reimbursment | 5/26/2019 |  |
| Tax + Shipping |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ORDER 9 TOTAL |  |  | 30.27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TOTAL SPENT \$2,071.96

## Appendix M - Specification Sheets

Axle

2/14/2019 Easy-to-Machine 1144 Carbon Steel Rod, Ultra-Strength, $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ Diameter | McMaster-Carr
McMASTER-CARR.


| Length <br> Tolerance | $-3^{\prime \prime}$ to $3^{\prime \prime}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Length | 3 ft. |
| RoHS | Not Compliant |

Containing more carbon and manganese than 1117, 1144 carbon steel offers higher yield strength and hardness, even without further heat treatment. Use it to fabricate parts that require stress resistance. Also known as Fatigueproof, these rods have enhanced strength and resistance to breaking from repeated impact compared to High-Strength Easy-to-Machine 1144 Carbon Steel Rods.

## Aluminum Plate for Carriage Panels and Ladders



| Straightness Tolerance | Not Rated |
| :--- | :--- |
| Magnetic Properties | Nonmagnetic |
| Density | $0.1 \mathrm{lbs} . / \mathrm{cu} . \mathrm{in}$. |
| Surface Resistivity | 25 Ohm-Cir Mil/ft |
| Melting Point Temperature | $1080^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Modulus of Elasticity | $10.0 \mathrm{ksi} \times 10^{3}$ |
| Thermal Conductivity | $1,160 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr} . \times$ in./sq. ft. $/{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ @ $75^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Elongation | $12.5 \%$ |
| Material Composition | $95.1-98.2 \%$ |
| Aluminum | $0.4-0.8 \%$ |
| Chromium | $0.05-0.4 \%$ |
| Copper | $0-0.7 \%$ |
| Iron | $0.8-1.2 \%$ |
| Magnesium | $0-0.15 \%$ |
| Manganese | $0-0.05 \%$ |
| Nickel | $0.4-0.8 \%$ |
| Silicon | $0-0.15 \%$ |
| Titanium | $0-0.25 \%$ |
| Zinc | $0-0.25 \%$ |
| Zirconium | $0.15 \%$ |
| Other | $-1 "$ to 1 " |
| Length Tolerance | 3 ft. |
| Length | Not Compliant |
| RoHS |  |
| Often fabricated into vehicle | parts, pipe fittings, and |
| containers, 6061 is stronger | and offers better corrosion |
| resistance than MIC6 and 2011. It's also nonmagnetic, heat |  |
| treatable, and resists stress cracking. |  |

Bronze Sleeve Bearing

## High-Load Oil-Embedded SAE 863 Bronze Sleeve Bearing

Flanged, for $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ Shaft Diameter and 5/8" Housing ID, 3/4" Long


| Each | Delivers tomorrow <br> \$0.80 Each |
| :---: | :--- |
| ADD TO ORDER | 2938 T 13 |

8 each ordered on February 3 0203JCEARNS.

| Bearing Type | Plain |
| :--- | :--- |
| Plain Bearing Type | Flanged |
| For Load Direction | Combined Radial and Thrust |
| Material | SAE 863 Bronze |
| For Shaft Diameter | $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ |
| ID | $0.501^{\prime \prime}$ |
| ID Tolerance | $0^{\prime \prime}$ to $0.001^{\prime \prime}$ |
| For Housing ID | $5 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ |
| OD | $0.627^{\prime \prime}$ |
| OD Tolerance | $0^{\prime \prime}$ to $0.001^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Length | $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Length Tolerance | $-0.01^{\prime \prime}$ to $0.01^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Flange OD | $7 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Flange Thickness | $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Dynamic Radial Load <br> Capacity | 830 lbs. @ 120 rpm |
| Dynamic Thrust Load | 510 lbs. @ 120 rpm |
| Capacity | Lubricated |
| Lubrication | Embedded |
| Lubrication Method | ISO 460 Oil |
| Lubricant | Round |
| For Shaft Type |  |


| Shaft Mount Type | Slip Fit |
| :--- | :--- |
| Temperature Range | $-15^{\circ}$ to $300^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| RoHS | Compliant |

Increased iron content makes these bearings stronger and more resistant to shock loads than standard oil-embedded bearings; however they operate at lower speeds. Startup friction causes them to release a thin layer of oil on the bearing's surface. Color is silver because of the iron.

Note: Dynamic load capacity is the maximum load a bearing can withstand at a given shaft speed. If your application's load and speed requirements are below the values listed, the bearing will work.

Carriage Internal Spring

## 302 Stainless Steel Extension Springs with Hook Ends

2" Long, 0.25" OD, 0.026" Wire Diameter


| Packs of 3 | Delivers tomorrow <br> \$4.77 per pack of 3 |
| :---: | :--- |
| ADD TO ORDER | 9433 K 46 |


| Spring Type | Extension |
| :--- | :--- |
| System of Measurement | Inch |
| Length | $2^{\prime \prime}$ |
| OD | $0.25^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Wire Diameter | $0.026^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Extended Length @ Maximum <br> Load | $4.66^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Load, Ibs. <br> Min. <br> Maximum | 0.35 |
| Rate | 2.67 |
| Material | $0.87 \mathrm{lbs} . / \mathrm{in}$. |
| End Type | 302 Stainless Steel |
| OD Tolerance | Hook |
| Min. Load Tolerance | $-0.008{ }^{\prime \prime}$ to $0.008{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Rate Tolerance | -0.05 to 0.05 lbs. |
| RoHS | -0.09 lbs./in. to 0.09 lbs./in. |

Made of stainless steel, these springs are more corrosion resistant than steel springs. They're also easier to extend than steel springs. As you stretch an extension spring, it gets harder to pull. Minimum load is the amount of force required to start to extend the spring. Maximum load is the amount of force required to fully extend the spring. Rate is the amount of force required for every inch of extension.

Aluminum Rectangular Tube for Carriage Base


| Temper Rating | Hardened |
| :---: | :---: |
| Hardness | Brinell 60 |
| Hardness Rating | Soft |
| Heat Treatable | Yes |
| Temperature Range | $-320^{\circ}$ to $212^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Specifications Met | ASTM B221 |
| Straightness Tolerance | Not Rated |
| Magnetic Properties | Nonmagnetic |
| Density | $0.1 \mathrm{lbs} . / \mathrm{cu} . \mathrm{in}$. |
| Surface Resistivity | 20 Ohm-Cir Mil/ft |
| Melting Point Temperature | $1110^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Modulus of Elasticity | $10.0 \mathrm{ksi} \times 10^{3}$ |
| Thermal Conductivity | 1,420 Btu/hr. $\times$ in./sq. ft. $/{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F} @ 77^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Elongation | 11\% |
| Material Composition |  |
| Aluminum | 97.5-99.35\% |
| Chromium | 0-0.1\% |
| Copper | 0-0.1\% |
| Iron | 0-0.35\% |
| Magnesium | 0.45-0.9\% |
| Manganese | 0-0.1\% |
| Silicon | 0.2-0.6\% |
| Titanium | 0-0.1\% |
| Zinc | 0-0.1\% |
| Other | 0-0.15\% |
| Length Tolerance | $-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ to $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Length | 1 ft . |
| RoHS | Compliant |

Commonly used outdoors as architectural trim, railings, and door frames, 6063 aluminum has better machinability than 3003. It is nonmagnetic and heat treatable.

## Aluminum Block for Carriage Bumpers

## 6061 Aluminum

1" Thick x 2" Wide



3
6
8975K237

| (Web) System of | Inch |
| :--- | :--- |
| Measurement | 6061 Aluminum |
| Material | Rectangle |
| Cross Section Shape | Solid |
| Construction | $1^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Thickness | $-0.012^{\prime \prime}$ to 0.012" |
| Thickness Tolerance | Standard |
| Tolerance Rating | $2^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Width | $-0.034^{\prime \prime}$ to 0.034" |
| Width Tolerance | 35,000 psi |
| Yield Strength | T6511 Treated |
| Fabrication | Hardened |
| Temper | Brinell 95 |
| Temper Rating | Soft |
| Hardness | Yes |
| Hardness Rating | Plain |
| Heat Treatable | $-320^{\circ}$ to 300 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Appearance | ASTM B221 |
| Temperature Range | Not Rated |
| Specifications Met | Nonmagnetic |
| Straightness Tolerance | 0.1 lbs./cu. in. |
| Magnetic Properties | 25 Ohm-Cir Mil/ft |
| Density | $1080^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Surface Resistivity |  |
| Melting Point Temperature |  |


| Modulus of Elasticity | $10.0 \mathrm{ksi} \times 10^{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Thermal Conductivity | $1,160 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr} . \times \mathrm{in} . / \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft} . /^{\circ} \mathrm{F} @ 75^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Elongation | $12.5 \%$ |
| Material Composition | $95.1-98.2 \%$ |
| Aluminum | $0.4-0.8 \%$ |
| Chromium | $0.05-0.4 \%$ |
| Copper | $0-0.7 \%$ |
| Iron | $0.8-1.2 \%$ |
| Magnesium | $0-0.15 \%$ |
| Manganese | $0-0.05 \%$ |
| Nickel | $0.4-0.8 \%$ |
| Silicon | $0-0.15 \%$ |
| Titanium | $0-0.25 \%$ |
| Zinc | $0-0.25 \%$ |
| Zirconium | $0.15 \%$ |
| Other | $-1 "$ to $1 "$ |
| Length Tolerance | Not Compliant |
| RoHS |  |

Often fabricated into vehicle parts, pipe fittings, and containers, 6061 is stronger and offers better corrosion resistance than MIC6 and 2011. It's also nonmagnetic, heat treatable, and resists stress cracking.

## Socket Head Screw for Bearing Mount

Super-Corrosion-Resistant 316 Stainless Steel Socket Head Screw 6-32 Thread Size, 3/4" Long

$\square$ Packs of 25

| Delivers Wednesday |
| :--- |
| \$3.07 per pack of 25 |
| ADD TO ORDER |


| 92185A151 |
| :--- |


| 1 pack added to your order |
| :--- |
| February 12. |


| Head Type | Socket |
| :--- | :--- |
| Socket Head Profile | Standard |
| Drive Style | Inch |
| System of Measurement | Right Hand |
| Thread Direction | $6-32$ |
| Thread Size | $0.138^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Screw Size Decimal | UNC |
| Equivalent | Class 3A |
| Thread Type | $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Thread Fit | Fully Threaded |
| Length | Coarse |
| Threading | $0.226^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Thread Spacing | $0.138^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Head | $7 / 64^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Diameter | 316 Stainless Steel |
| Height | 70,000 psi |
| Drive Size | Rockwell B70 |
| Material | Compliant |
| Tensile Strength |  |

These screws are corrosion resistant in wet environments, nonmagnetic, and electrically conductive. Length is measured from under the head.

Coarse threads are the industry standard; choose these screws if you don't know the pitch or threads per inch.

## Locknut for Bearing Mounting

## 18-8 Stainless Steel Nylon-Insert Locknut <br> 6-32 Thread Size



| Packs of 100 | Delivers tomorrow <br> $\$ 4.43$ per pack of 100 |
| :---: | :--- |
| ADD TO ORDER | 91831A007 |

1 pack added to your order
February 12.

| Material | $18-8$ Stainless Steel |
| :--- | :--- |
| Thread Size | $6-32$ |
| Thread Type | UNC |
| Thread Spacing | Coarse |
| Thread Fit | Class 2B |
| Thread Direction | $5 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Width | $11 / 64^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Height | $220^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Insert Maximum Temperature | External Hex |
| Drive style | Locknut |
| Nut Type | Standard |
| Hex Nut Profile | Nylon Insert |
| Locking Type | Inch |
| System of Measurement | Compliant |
| RoHS |  |

These locknuts have good chemical resistance and may be mildly magnetic. The nylon insert grips the bolt to resist loosening without damaging threads. They're reusable, but their holding power lessens with each use.

## Linear Bearing

| Linear Bearing Component | Bearing in Housing |
| :---: | :---: |
| For Shaft Type | Round |
| Bearing Type | Ball |
| Alignment Style | Self Aligning |
| Misalignment Capability | $1{ }^{\circ}$ |
| Housing Type | Base Mount |
| With End Seals | Yes |
| For Shaft Diameter | 1/2" |
| ID | 0.500" |
| ID Tolerance | Not Rated |
| Overall |  |
| Length | 111/16" |
| Width | $2^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Height | $11 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Center Height | 11/16" |
| Center Height Tolerance | -0.001" to 0.001" |
| Base Thickness | 1/4" |
| Material |  |
| Bearing | Acetal |
| Housing | 6061 Aluminum |
| Ball | Steel |
| Load Capacity, lbs. |  |
| Dynamic | 230 |
| Static | 290 |
| Lubrication | Required |
| Replaceable Insert Bearing | Yes |
| Temperature Range | $-4^{\circ}$ to $176^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| For Shaft Material | Stainless Steel, Steel |
| For Min. Shaft Hardness |  |
| Steel | Rockwell C50 |
| Stainless Steel | Rockwell C50 |
| Mounting Holes |  |
| Number of | 4 |
| Diameter | 5/32" |
| Center-to-Center, Length | $1 "$ |
| Center-to-Center | $1.688^{\prime \prime}$ width |
| RoHS | Compliant |
| Bearings are for use with round end-supported shafts. All have end seals to keep lubricant in and dirt out. |  |
| Self-aligning bearings co misalignment. | pensate for shaft |



## Quick Release Pin

## 18-8 Stainless Steel Ring-Grip Quick-Release Pin

 3/8" Diameter. 1-5/8* Usable Length

| 1 Each | In stock <br> \$2.66 Each |
| :--- | :--- |
| ADD TO ORDER | 98404A376 |


| Pin Type | Quick Release |
| :--- | :--- |
| End Type | Spring-Loaded Ball |
| Head Type | Plain |
| Shaft Type | Chamfered |
| End Shape | Inch |
| System of Measurement | $18-8$ Stainless Steel |
| Material | $15 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Usable Length | $3 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Diameter | $-0.003^{\prime \prime}$ to 0" |
| Diameter Tolerance | $0.426^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Diameter at Extended Ball | Rockwell B85 |
| Height | 11,000 lbs. |
| Min. Hardness | 1 |
| Breaking Strength | 316 Stainless Steel |
| Number of Retaining Balls | 316 Stainless Steel |
| Ball Material | 316 Stainless Steel |
| Spring Material | Nonlocking |
| Handle Material | Not Passivated |
| Lock Type | Compliant |
| Passivation | RoHS |

The smooth ring handle on these pins won't catch on parts. A spring-loaded, nonlocking retaining ball pops out to hold pins in place. The hole should be as close to the diameter as possible, but not larger than the diameter at extended ball height. The ends are chamfered for easy insertion. Breaking strength is measured as single shear, which is the force required to break the pin into two pieces. Also known as faspins.

18-8 stainless steel pins offer a balance of strength and corrosion resistance. They may be mildly magnetic.


Air Tank


Specifications

- Weight:41.3lbs
- Package Dimensions: $25.6 \mathrm{in}(\mathrm{L}) \times 15.75 \mathrm{in}($ W) $\times 15 \mathrm{in}(\mathrm{H})$
- Material: \#235 steel
- Color: Yellow
- Weight: 23.5 Lbs
- Maximum Pressure: 145 PSI (1 MPa)


## Specifications

. Thickness: 3 MM

- Capacity: 10 Gallons
- Work on tire up to 24.5 in
- Operating Pressure: 87-116 PSI (0.6-0.8 Mpa)
- ATV Tire: 40 PSI
- Lawn Tractor Tre: 40-50 PSI (2.7-3.4 bar) \Tractor Tire: 100-120(6.88.2 bar)
- Large Tractor Tire: 120 PSI (8.2 bar)
- Car Tire: 50-60 PSI (3.4-4.1 bar)
- Truck Tire: 100-130 PSI (6.8-8.2 bar)
- $4 \times 4$ Tire: $6-80$ PSI (4.1-4 bar)



## 1-inch pipe nipple



Pressure Relay


## Compressor

## Technical Details

| Brand | VIAIR |
| :--- | :--- |
| Model | 40040 |
| Item Weight | 9.7 pounds |
| Product Dimensions | $11.8 \times 9 \times 7$ inches |
| California residents | Click here for Proposition 65 warning |
| Item model number | 40040 |
| Exterior | Painted |
| Manufacturer Part Number | 40040 <br> OEM Part Number <br> Folding <br> Special Features |
| Amp Draw: 26 amps, Compressor: Heavy Duty, <br> Dimensions: Viair 40040 Dimensions., Duty <br> Cycle: 33 percent, Max PSI: 150, Note: Uses <br> replacement direct mount air filter assembly <br> $92623 . ~ U s e s ~ r e p l a c e m e n t ~ r e m o t e ~ m o u n t ~ a i r ~ f i l t e r ~$ <br> assembly 92622., Performance Data: Viair <br> 40040 Performance and Tire Fill Rate data. |  |
| Voltage | 12 volts |

## 1-inch Solenoid Valve

Product description
Size Nime:Brass - 1 Inch
Specifications:

1. Suitable Media:Air Water Oil.
2.Operation Mode:Normally Closed (Opens when powered)
3.Plunger Tip:NBR
4.Working Pressure:0-1.0Mpa
5.Fluid Temperature: $-5-80$ Degrees Celsius / 23 F to 176 F
6.Operating Viscosity: Under 20CST

7 Valve Type:Direct Acting, Wet Armature. Semi-Direct lift valve. Suitable for gravity feed.
8.Installation: Fluid direction should be as the arrow shows

9 .Versatile, small, responsive, light and durable
10. One year warranty. Contact leoling0420@hotmail.com

Product Description:
1). 1 "ports, brass body, Viton seal, 12 volt DC, for air, water, or oil
2).BACOENG normally closed ( $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{C}$ ) electric solenoid valve is constructed with a durable brass body, two-way inlet and outlet ports with 1 inch female threaded (NPT) connections, and heat and oil resistant Viton gasket,
3).The coil uses alternating current and energizes at 12 voits $D C$; voltage range + of $-10 \%$. 18 Watt power rating.
4). Semi-direct lift valve operates from 0 PSI to a maximum pressure of 145 PSI ( 0 MPa to 1.0 MPa ). Operationat pressure range for water: 0 to 101 PSI; for oil: 0 to 72 PSS ; for air or gases: 0 to 101 PSI
5). Operational temperature range is 23 to 176 degrees Fahrenheit; -5 to +80 degrees Celsius. Suitable for outdoor use; not for use underwater.

Application:
1). Suitable for use with hot or cold water, gases, air, very low viscosity fluids ( $<20 \mathrm{cst}$ ), oils and hydrocarbons, e.g., gasoline, kerosene, or diesel fuel.
2). Customers chose this general purpose valve for: do-it-yourself projects, moderate temperature applications, harsh chemicals, flow control for irrigation systems, reverse osmosis systems or to control flow of propane gas This solenoid valve serves as an excellent propane regulator.
Package Includes:
$1 \times$ Electric Solenoid Valve
$1 \times$ User Manual

## ¼ Inch Solenoid Valve

Product description
Slze Name: 1/4" Brass
Specifications:
1.Suitable Media:Air Water Oil
2.Operation Mode:Normally Closed (Opens when powered)
3.Plunger Tip:NBR
4. Working Pressure:0-1.0Mpa
5.Fluid Temperature: -5-80 Degrees Celsius / 23 F to 176 F
6.Operating Viscosity: Under 20CST
7.Valve Type:Direct Acting, Wet Armature. Semi-Direct lift valve. Suitable for gravity feed.
8.Installation: Fluid direction should be as the arrow shows
.Versatile, small, responsive, light and durable.
10. One year warranty. Contact leoling0420@hotmail.com

Product Description:
1).1/4"ports, brass body, Viton seat, 12 volt DC, for air, water, or oil
2).BACOENG normally closed (N/C) electric solenoid valve is constructed with a durable brass body, two-way inlet and outlet ports with $1 / 4$ inch fermale threaded (NPT) connections, and heat and oil resistant Viton gasket 3).The coil uses alternating current and energizes at 12 volts DC ; voltage range + or $-10 \%$. 18 Watt power rating.
4) Semi-direct lift valve operates from O PSI to a maximum pressure of 145 PSI (0 MPa to 1.0 MPa ) Operational pressure range for water: 0 to 101 PSI: for oil- 0 to 72 PSI - for air or gases: 0 to 101 PSI,
5). Operational temperature range is 23 to 176 degrees Fahrenheit; -5 to +80 degrees Celsius. Suitable for outdoor use; not for use underwater.
1). Suitable for use with hot or cold water, gases, air, very low viscosity fluids ( $<20 \mathrm{cst}$ ), oils and hydrocarbons, e.g., gasoline, kerosene, or diesel fuel.
2).Customers chose this general purpose valve for: do-it-yourself projects, moderate temperature applications, harsh chemicals, flow control for irrigation systems, reverse osmosis systems or to control flow of propane gas. This solenoid valve serves as an excellent propane regulator.

## Package Includes:

$1 \times$ Electric Solenoid Valve
$1 \times$ User Manual
$1 / 4$ Inch Tee

| Low-Pressure Pipe Fitting Iron, Tee Connector, $1 / 4$ NPT Female |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Each In stock <br> \$4.32 Each  |  |  |
|  | For Use With | Air, Natural Gas, Oil, steam, Water |
|  | Shape | Tee |
| Type |  | Connector |
| Class |  | 150 |
| Gonnection Type |  | Pipe |
| Connection Style |  | Threaded |
| Connection |  | NPT Female |
| Pipe Size |  | 1/4 |
| Maximum Pressure |  | 150 psi @ $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Maximum Steam Pressure |  | 150 psi @ $350^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Material |  | Black-Coated Iron |
| For Pipe |  |  |
| Schedule |  | 40 |
| Material |  | Steel |
| For Flange Material |  | Iron, Steel |
| Specifications Met |  | ANSI/ASME B1.20.1, ANSI/ASME B16.3, UL Listed |
| RoHS |  | Compliant |
|  | Use these fittings for environments. | -pressure applications in noncorrosive |



## ¼-Inch Pipe Nipple



| $\square$ Each | In stock <br> \$1.31 Each |
| :--- | :--- |
| ADD TO ORDER | 44615 K 412 |


| For Use With | Air, Natural Gas, Oil, Steam, Water |
| :--- | :--- |
| Shape | Straight |
| Type | Pipe |
| Schedule | 40 |
| Threading | Fully Threaded |
| Connection Type | Pipe |
| Connection Style | Threaded |
| Thread Type | NPT |
| Gender | Male |
| Pipe Size | $1 / 4$ |
| Length | $7 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ |
| OD | $35 / 64^{\prime \prime}$ |
| ID | $0.364^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Wall Thickness | $0.088^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Construction | Welded |
| Material | Black-Coated Steel |
| For Fitting | 125,150 |
| Class | Iron, Steel |
| Material | Iron, Steel |
| For Flange Material |  |
| Specifications Met | ANSI/ASME B1.20.1, ASTM A53, ASTM A733 |
| RoHS | Not Compliant |

Also known as Schedule 40, this pipe is designed for lowpressure applications. Use in noncorrosive applications.

Welded pipe has a weld bead on the inside.
Fully threaded pipe is also known as a close nipple; it is threaded on each end to the center.


Toggle Switch


Push Switch


DeWalt Battery Adapter

| Seller assumes all responsitility for this listing. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Last updated on May 26, 2019 07:05:58 PDT View all revisions |  |  |  |
| Item specifics |  |  |  |
| Condition: | Open box: A new. unused item with absolutely no sugns of wear. The item may be missing the original packaging, or in the original packaging but not sealed. The item may be a factory second or a new, unused item with defects. See the seller's listing for full detalls and description of any imperfections, see all condition defintions | Bundie Listing: | Yes |
| Type: | battery adapter | Model: | NA |
| MPN: | TF2 | Country/Region of Manufacture. | United States |
| Battory Voltage: | 20 V | Battery Type: | Lithlum-lon (Li-lon) |
| Brand: | Terrafirma | UPG | Does not apply |

Includes 1black battery adapter (c2).

This battery adapter/cover has been tested to work with DeWALT 20V Max Li-ion batteries. Including models: DCB184, DCB204, and DCB205

Adapter has 10 inches of 12 gauge wire installed; ready for high power applications.

Recommended to use M4 mounting screws.

- Do not use this alapter to charge your lattory
- Do not short circuit baitery or draw more than 2oamps continuous
- Disconnect the battery before if reaches 1 Ivolts, (prolongs battery life)
- Do not leave batlery charged al $100 \%$ for long periods of time, recomuended to store batery ai $70 \%$ charge (prolongs latitery ilie)
- Do pot leave battery outduors (especially in hot climates)


## Aluminum Tube for Legs

Multipurpose 6061 Aluminum Round Tube $1 / 4^{-}$Wall Thickness, 1-1/2" 0 D


| Material | 6061 Aluminum |
| :---: | :---: |
| Shape | Round Tube |
| Shape Type | Round Tubes |
| Wall Thickness | 1/4 ${ }^{\text {i }}$ |
| Wall Thickness Toleranoe | $-0.025^{\prime \prime}$ to $0.025^{\circ}$ |
| Tolerance Rating | Standard |
| OD | $11 / 2^{*}$ |
| OD Tolerance | -0.035 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ to $0.035^{\prime}$ |
| 10 | 1 " |
| i0 Tolerance | Not Rated |
| Yield Strength | 35.000 psi |
| Fabrication | Extruded |
| Temper | T6519 |
| Heat Treatment | Hardened |
| Hardness | Brinell 95 |
| Hardness Rating | Soft |
| Heat Treatable | Yes |
| Appearance | Plain |
| Temperature Fange | $-320^{\circ}$ to $300^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Specifications Met | ASTM B241 |
| Aluminum Performance Properties | Corrosion Resistant. Easy to Machine. Easy to Weld |
| Straightness Tolerance | 0.020 "per ft. |
| Elongstion | 12.5\% |
| Material Composition |  |
| Aluminum | 95.1-98.2\% |
| Chromium | 0.4-0.8\% |
| Copper | 0.05-0.49 |
| Iton | 0.0.7\% |
| Magnesium | 0.8-1.2\% |
| Manganese | 0.0.15\% |
| Nickel | 0.0.05\% |
| Silioon | 0.4-0.8\% |
| Titanium | 0.0.15\% |
| Zinc | 0.0.25\% |
| zirconium | 0-0.25\% |
| Other | 0.15\% |
| Warring Message | Physical and mechanical properties are not guaranteed. They are intended only as a basis for comparison and not for design purposes. |
| Rohs | Compliant |

The most widely used aluminum, 6061 is fabricated into everything from pipe fittings and containers to automotive and aerospace parts. It is strong and corrosion resistant, plus it's easy to machine and weld.

## Spreader

| Multipurpose 6061 Aluminum <br> 1/2' Thick $\times 8^{*}$ Wide |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Material | 0061 Aluminum |
|  | Shape | Sheet and Bar |
| 7 | thickness | $11^{\prime}$ |
|  | Thickness Tolerance | -0.009 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ to $0.009^{\circ}$ |
|  | ralerence Aating | Stendard |
|  | Widtir | $8^{+}$ |
|  | Width Tolerance Range | -0.054" to 0.084* |
|  | Sengtn Tolerance- | -1"t0 1" |
|  | Vield Strongth | 35.000 psi |
|  | Fabrication | Extruded |
|  | remmer | T6511 |
|  | Heat Treament | Hardened |
|  | Hardness | Brineli 95 |
|  | Hardness fating | Soft |
|  | Heat Treatable | Yes |
|  | Appearance | Plain |
|  | remperature zange | -320- to 300 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
|  | Speecifioations Me: | ASTM 8221 |
|  | Aluminum Performance Properties | Corrosion Aesistant, Easy to Machine, Easy to Weld |
|  | Ratness Tolerance | Not Rated |
|  | Straightness Toierance | Not Rated |
|  | Elongation | 12.5\% |
|  | Material Composition |  |
|  | Aluminum | 95.1-98.28 |
|  | Chromium | 0.4-0.8\% |
|  | Copper | 0.05-0.4\% |
|  | tron | 0.0.7\% |
|  | Magnesium | 0.8-1.2\% |
|  | Marganese | 0.0.15\% |
|  | Nickel | 0-0.05\% |
|  | Sihson | 0.4-0.88\% |
|  | Titanium | 0.0.15\% |
|  | Zinc | 0.0.25\% |
|  | Zirconum | 0.0.25\% |
|  | Other | 0.15\% |
|  | Warning Message | Physical and mechanical properties are not guaranteed. They are intenced only as a basis for comparison and not for design purposes. |
|  | ACHS | Not Compliant |
|  | The most widely used a tittings and containers gorrosion resistant, plus | . 6031 is fabricated into everything from pide motive and aerospace parts it is strong and $y$ to machine and weld |


| 304 Stainless Steel Sheet $6^{*} \times 12^{\prime \prime}, 3 / 8^{*}$ Thick |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Material | 304 Stainless Steel |
|  | Cross Section Shape | Rectangle |
|  | Construction | Solid |
|  | Appearance | Plain |
|  | Thickness | a/8 ${ }^{\text {n }}$ |
|  | Thickness Tolerance | -0.055' to $0.055^{\prime}$ |
|  | Tolerance Rating | Standard |
|  | Width | 6 " |
|  | Width Tolerance | $-1 / a^{n}$ to $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ |
|  | Length | $12^{\prime \prime}$ |
|  | Length Tolerance | $-1 / 8^{4}$ to $1 / 88^{\prime \prime}$ |
|  | Vield Strength | 30,000 psi |
|  | Fabrication | Hot Rolled |
|  | Hardness | Rockwell B80 (Medium) |
|  | Temper Rating | Softened (Annealed) |
|  | Heat Treatable | No |
|  | Min. Temperature | Not Rated |
|  | Maximum Temperature | 1500 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
|  | Specifications Met | ASTM A240 |
|  | Flatness Tolerance | Not Rated |
|  | Density | $0.29 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{cu}$. in. |
|  | Surface Resistivity | 469 ohm-cir, mil/ft. |
|  | Melting Point Temperature | 2400 F |
|  | Modulus of Elasticity | $28 \mathrm{ksi} \times 10^{3}$ |
|  | Thermal Conductivity | $100 \mathrm{Btu} / \mathrm{hr} . \times \mathrm{in} . / \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft} / /^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ (9) $212^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
|  | Elongation | 50\% |
|  | Material Composition |  |
|  | Iron | 53.48-74.5\% |
|  | Carbon | 0-0.08\% |
|  | Chremium | 17.5-24\% |
|  | Cobalt | $0.0 .29 \%$ |
|  | Copper | $0 \cdot 1 \%$ |
|  | Manganese | 0-2\% |
|  | Molybdenum | 0.2.5\% |
|  | Nickel | 8-15\% |
|  | Nitrogen | $0-0.1 \%$ |
|  | Phosphorus | $0.0 .2 \%$ |
|  | Silicon | 0-1\% |
|  | Sulfur | 0-0.35\% |
|  | Warning Message | Physical and mechanical properties are not guaranter They are intended only as a basis for comparison and for design purposes. |
|  | ROHS | Compliant |

## Compression Sleeve for Steel Cable

## Wire Rope Compression Sleeve - for Lifting <br> for Steel Rope, Zinc-Plated Copper, for $3 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ Rope Diameter



| Fitting Type | Compression Sleeve |
| :--- | :--- |
| Application | For Lifting |
| Material | Zinc-Plated Copper |
| For Wire Rope Material | Steel |
| For Wire Rope |  |
| Diameter | $3 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Construction | $6 \times 19$ IWRC |
|  | $7 \times 7$ Strand Core |
|  | $7 \times 19$ IWRC |
|  | $7 \times 19$ Strand Core |
| Attachment Type | $15 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Sleeve Length | Compression Tool |
| Required Installation Tool | 4 |
| Required Number of | $100 \%$ of the Rope's Capacity |
| Compressions | ASME B30.9, MS-51844 |
| Capacity | Compliant |
| Specifications Met | Compression Tools |
| RoHS |  |

Install with a compression tool to create a strong, permanent loop. Compression sleeves are also known as ferrules, crimps, swaging, and splicing sleeves. They're compatible with Nicopress compression tools.

Zinc-plated copper sleeves are more corrosion resistant than tin-plated copper.

Warning: Fittings must match rope diameter and be installed correctly to obtain maximum holding power. Test all assemblies for required strength before use. Do not use with coated rope unless the coating is removed.

## Aluminum L Chanel for Spreader Support

| Multipurpose 6061 Aluminum 90 Degree Angle with Round Edge, $1 / 4^{-}$Thickness, $2.5^{*}$ High $\times 25^{\circ}$ Wide Outside |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lengtin, th. | Each |
| andionzeer |  |  |
| in stock \$17.20 Each 8982K37 |  |  |
|  |  | Shape | 90\%Angle |
|  |  | Shapo Type | 90\% Angles |
|  | Watt Tichness | ui |
| Wall Thickness Toierance |  | -0.009' to 0.009' |
| Tolersace PetingOutside |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Helght $2+2^{2}$ |  |  |
| Width $21 / 2^{n}$ <br> Widh Tolecrnce $-0.044^{*}$ to $0.044^{*}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| lnside |  |  |
| Hefight $21 / 3^{*}$ |  |  |
| Weath 2/14 |  |  |
| Length Tolerance $\quad-12^{2}$ to v2 $\mathbf{2}^{*}$ |  |  |
| Vied Strength 35.000 psi |  |  |
| Fabrication Extruded |  |  |
| Temper T6 |  |  |
| Heat Trentment Harcened |  |  |
| Haraness Brinell 80 (Sott) |  |  |
| Heat Ticatable Ves |  |  |
| Adperance Plain |  |  |
| terperatue Range $\quad-320^{\circ}$ to $300^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |  |  |
| Spreifiations Met ASTM E221 |  |  |
| Aldiminum Peutomance Corrosion Resistant. Easy to Machine, Easy to Weld |  |  |
| Corner Shape |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Outside } & \text { Square } \\ \text { Inside } & \text { Round }\end{array}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| weg Eagr Stiape $\quad$ Rourd |  |  |
| Elongation $12.5 \%$ |  |  |
| Material Composition |  |  |
| Aluminumr $\quad 95.158 .2 \%$ |  |  |
| Soppe $0.05-0.44$ |  |  |
| hon $0.7 \%$ |  |  |
| Magresium $\quad 0.8 \mathrm{tr.2} \mathrm{\%}$ |  |  |
| Mangenese $\quad 00.15 \%$ |  |  |
| Nickel 00.055 |  |  |
| Slicoun $\quad 0.4 .0 .8 \%$ |  |  |
| Tentium $\quad 00.15$ \% |  |  |
| Zinc $00.0 .25 \%$ |  |  |
| zirsomum 0 0.0.25\% |  |  |
| Otrer $\quad 0.15 \%$ |  |  |
|  | Wearting Messuge | Physicaf and mechanical properties are not guaranteed. They are intended only as a basis for comparison and not for design purposes. |
|  | 5 Strighenss Tiemanco | Nol Rated |
|  | Lenath | 1ft. |
|  | PROHS | Not Compliant |
|  | The most widely used al frtings and containers corrosion resistant, ples | m. 6061 is fabricated into everything from pipe omotive and serospace parts. It is strong and sy to machine and weld. |



Spring Loaded Toggle Switch
Toggle Switch
2Position, Round, Momentary. 2 Terminals, SPST-NO, 10A

## Air Hose

Ft. In stock 1-99 Ft. $\$ 6.81$ 100 or more $\$ 5.45$ 5304 K47

3 ft . added to your order April 9.

| For Use With | Air |
| :--- | :--- |
| Temperature Range | $-40^{\circ}$ to $200^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Connection Type | Hose |
| Hose Connection Type | Without Fittings |
| Compatible Hose Fittings | Barbed |
| ID | $11 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ |
| OD | $2^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Bend Radius | $101 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Clarity | Opaque |
| Maximum Pressure | 200 psi @ $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| For Use Outdoors | Yes |
| Material | EPDM Rubber |
| Cover Material | EPDM Rubber |
| Interior Texture | Smooth |
| Internal Reinforcement | Yarn |
| Maximum Continuous Length | 100 ft. |
| Color | Black |

Hose is made of EPDM rubber, which is the most common material for air applications.

Hose to Tank Fitting


Low-profile barbs and a longer first barb allow for a smoother installation than with other barbed hose fittings.

Also known as hose nipples, they connect hose to threaded pipe.

1.5 to 1 Inch Reducer

| Low-Pressure Pipe Fitting <br> Iron, Straight Reducer, $1-1 / 2 \times 1$ NPT Female |
| :--- |



Aluminum Tube for Carriage Rear Support Spacer


| Material | 6061 Aluminum |
| :---: | :---: |
| Shape | Rectangular Tube |
| Wall Thiokness | 1/ta" |
| Wail Thickness Tolerance | -0.007"10 $0.007^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Tolerance Rating | Standard |
| Outside |  |
| Height | $1 / 2^{*}$ |
| Herght Tolerance | -0.085" to 0.085" |
| Width | 1 " |
| Width Tolerance | -0.085 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ to $0.085^{\prime \prime}$ |
| inside |  |
| Height | $38^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Width | $7 / 6^{\text {a }}$ |
| Length Toierance | -1/4* 10 1/4 ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |
| Yield Strength | 35,000 psi |
| Fabrication | Extruded |
| Temper | T6 |
| Heat Treatment | Hardened |
| Hardness | Brinell 80 (Soft) |
| Heat Treatable | Yes |
| Appearance | Plain |
| Temperature Range | $-320^{\prime}$ to $300^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
| Specifications Met | ASTM 8221 |
| Aluminum Perfornrance Properties | Corrosion Resistant, Easy to Machine, Easy to Weld |
| Corner Shape |  |
| Outside | Round |
| inside | Square |
| Elongatión | 12.5\% |
| Material Composition |  |
| Alummuts | 95.97-97.36\% |
| Chromium | 0,04-0.35\% |
| Copper | 0.15-0.41\% |
| Iron | 0.7\% |
| Magnesium | 0.8-1.2\% |
| Manganese | 0.15\% |
| Sllicon | 0.4-0.8\% |
| Titanium | 0.15\% |
| Zinc | 0.25\% |
| Other | 0.15\% |
| Warning Message | Physical and mechanical properties are not guaranteed. They are intended only as a basis for comparison and not for design purposes. |
| Straightness Tolerance | Not Rated |
| ROHS | Compliant |

Compression Impact Absorber

| Ultra-High-Load Fastener-Mount Compression Spring <br> 1.188" Long |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  Each In stock <br>  $\$ 18.60$ Each  <br> ADD TO ORDER 9677 K 13  |
|  | Spring Type Compression |
|  | Length $1.188^{\prime \prime}$ |
|  | 00 1.31* |
| + | 1 L |
| 10 | Base Diameter $\quad 1.16^{*}$ |
| 4 | Compressed Length © Maximum Load |
|  | Compressed 00 G Maximum $1.7^{*}$ Load |
|  | Maximum Load $\quad 1,600 \mathrm{lbs}$. |
|  | Energy Capacity 400 in .-ibs. |
|  | Mounting Hole Diamotor (A) 0.31* |
|  | Mounting Fasteners Included No |
|  | Material Polyester/Rubber Blend |
|  | Color Black |
|  | Hardness Durometer 55D |
|  | Temperature Aange $\quad-40^{\circ}$ to $120^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ |
|  | Fohts Compliant |
|  | For the heaviest loads, these springs have more than double the load capacity of High-Load Fastener-Mount Compression Springs. Secure by inserting a fastener through the hole at the base. Springs are a polyester/rubber blend that is wear, oil, and fuel resistant. |
|  | Energy is calculated in one of two ways. For an object that is dropped, energy equals the weight of the item multiplied by distance dropped. For an object moving horizontally, energy equals half of the mass of the item multiplied by velocity squared ( $1 / 2 \mathrm{mv}^{2}$ ). |



## Compression Spring

\section*{302 Stainless Steel Corrosion-Resistant Compression Springs <br> $4^{\prime \prime}$ Long, $0.938^{\prime \prime} 0 \mathrm{D}, 0.642^{*} \mathrm{ID}$ <br>  <br> | Packs of 3 | in stock <br> \$9.68 per pack of 3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| ADD TO ORDER | 1986 K 151 |}


| Spring Type | Compression |
| :---: | :---: |
| System of Measurement | Inch |
| Length | 4" |
| OD | $0.938^{\prime \prime}$ |
| ID | $0.642^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Wire Diameter | $0.148^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Compressed Length © Maximum Load | $2.37{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Maximum Load | 153 lbs . |
| Rate | $93.75 \mathrm{lbs} . / \mathrm{in}$. |
| Material | 302 Stainless Steel |
| End Type | Closed |
| Rate Tolerance | Not Rated |
| OD Tolerance | Not Rated |
| RoHs | Compliant |

These springs are more corrosion resistant than standard compression springs. They're also easier to compress than standard compression springs. As you squeeze a compression spring, it pushes back to return to its original length. Rate is the amount of force required for every inch of compression. The higher the rate, the harder it is to compress the spring

302 stainless steel springs have good corrosion resistance.


## Speaker Cable Wire



250ft 16AWG 4 Conductors (16/4) CL2 Rated Loud Speaker Cable Wire, Pull Box (For In-Wall Installation) (16AWG / 4 Conductors, 250ft)
by Cables Direct Online

List Price: $\$ 55.95$
Price: $\$ 31.95$ /prime
You Save: $\$ 24.00$ ( $43 \%$ )
Thank you for being a Prime member. Get $\$ 70$ off instantly: Pay $\$ 0.00$ upon approval for the Amazon Prime Rewards Visa Card. No annual fee.
Free Amazon product support included
Item Shape: 16AWG / 4 Conductors

| 12AWG / 2 Conductors | 16AWG / 2 Conductors | 18AWG / 2 Conductors |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14AWG / 2 Conductors | 14 AWG / 4 Conductors | 16AWG / 4 Conductors |

18AWG / 4 Conductors

Length: 250ft
toft 100ft 250 ft 500ft

- CCA (COPPER CLAD ALUMINUM) - CCA wire offers the same signal frequency and reliability in terms of corrosion resistance to copper wire. The advantage of the CCA speaker wire is lighter and more flexible than copper wire. The cost of CCA vs Oxygen free copper is much lower and you can enjoy the same functions and reliability as copper wire without paying the extra cost for the installation.
- Tough, yet flexible white insulated jacket is market with a stripe on one side for polarity and is marked with FT count for easy installation.
- The 65 Strands 0.16 mm conductors provide exceptional performance, sound quality for professional speaker and audio connections
- $16 / 4$ cable rated CL2 for in-wall use, complies with fire safety for use inside the walls of residential class buildings
- Pull-Out Box with multiconductor cable reduces need to pull multiple wires for easy installation


## Pressure Gage



Product description
Item Package Quantity: 1 | Size:200PSI
Dial Size: $2^{\prime \prime}$ Dial Size (Crimped Casing)
Accuracy: $+/-4 / 3 / 4 \%$
Scale: Dual Scale - PSI / Bar
Movement: Copper Alloy
Bourdon Tube: Copper Alloy
Window: Glass
Case: Steel case for protection in harsh environments
Connection: Copper Alloy Center Back Mount; 1/4* NPT (for $2^{*}$ dial)
Normal Ambient Temp.: -4 F to $+140 \mathrm{~F}(-20 \mathrm{C}$ to +60 C )

## Product details

them Package Quantity: 1 I Size: 200ps
Item Weight: 4.8 ounces
Shipping Weight: 4 ounces (View shipping rates and policies)
ASIN: B006K2RIY8
California residents: Click here for Proposition 65 warning
Item model number: PA204B-200

Amazon Best Sellers Rank: \#284,357 in Industrial \& Scientific (See Top 100 in Industrial \& Scientific) \#762 in Industrial Pressure Gauges

Would you like to tell us about a lower price?

## Voltage Reducer



## Product description

Wiring: INPUT+ to BAT+, INPUT- to BAT-, OUTPUT+ to LOAD+, OUTPUT- to LOAD-
Reminder: Never reverse the polarity. Use the enough big cable to avoid the voltage drop. Never connect to solar panel or wind turbine. Never charge the battery.

## Efficiency: 95\%

Input Voltage:OC $24 \mathrm{~V}(18-36 \mathrm{~V})$
Output Voltage: DC 13.8 V
Output Current: 30
Ripple: 130 mV p
Line Regulation: $\pm 0.2 \%$
Load Regulation: $\pm 0.2 \%$
Voltage Accuracy: $\pm 1.5 \%$
Enclosures: IP67
Dimension: 74*74*32
mm Net Weight: 0.32 kg
Case Operating Temperature: $-40 \sim 85^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
Warranty: 1 year
MTBF: 100,000 hours
Application:
24 V DC battery of vehicles as input power to 12 VDC appliances as output load.
Questions
How to choose the correct current for loads?
For example, if the max current of your load device is 10 A , then choose $10 \mathrm{~A} / 0.8=12.5 \mathrm{~A}$ at least for resistive loads according to international standard
If the load device is motor or compressor, then you may choose $10 \mathrm{~A} / 0.5=20 \mathrm{~A}$ according to real testing result since the motor and compressor starting current may be $2-3$ times than nominal current.

Pulley
Pulley for Wire Rope-for Lifting
Mounted. for $3 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ Diameter. $2^{*}$ OD


| Style | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Application | For Lifting |
| For Use With | Wire Rope |
| Puiley type | Mounted |
| For Rope Diameter | 3/16" |
| Capacity | 500 lbs . |
| Number of Grooves | 1 |
| insertion style | Foed Through |
| OD | $2 *$ |
| Width | $5 / 8{ }^{+}$ |
| Overall Length | $2 \times$ |
| Qverall Height | $23 / 8{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Material | Steel |
| Housing Material | Steel |
| Mounting Hole |  |
| Number of | 4 |
| Diameter | 3/16" |
| Center-to-Center (A) | $17 / 75^{*}$ |
| Center-to-Center (B) | 11/19 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Specifications Met | ASME B30.26 |
| Rohs | Compliant |



Housing Material
Mounting Hole
Number of
Diameter $\quad 3 / 16^{\prime \prime}$
Center-to-Center (A) $17 / 75^{*}$ Specifications Met ASME B30.26


## Wire Rope

| Wire Rope |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| for Lifting. Unfinished Steel, $6 \times 19,3 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ Diameter |  |

This wire rope provides a good balance of abrasion resistance and flexibility. Individual wire strands are preformed to maintain their shape and prevent rope from unraveling when cut. Rope is lubricated to reduce wear,

Warning: Never use to lift people or items over people.

## Appendix N - Risk Assessment

## designsafe Report

| Application: | UAV Launcher | Analyst Name(s): | Jordan Cearns, Ben Lacasse, Sean Huxley, David Garcia <br> Description: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Safety precautions for all hazards involving testing, setup <br> and launch | Company: | California Polytechnic State University |  |

Limits:
Sources:
Risk Scoring System: ANSI B11.0 (TR3) Two Factor
Guide sentence: When doing [task], the [user] could be injured by the [hazard] due to the [failure mode].

| Item Id | User I Task | Hazard / <br> Failure Mode | Initial Assess Severity Probability | ent <br> Risk Level | Risk Reduction Methods /Control System | Final Assess Severity Probability | Risk Level | Status I <br> Responsible /Comments /Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-1-1 | operator Launching | mechanical : crushing Human Interferance | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | No standing area | Catastrophic Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 1-1-2 | operator Launching | mechanical : cutting / severing Cable Snapping | Catastrophic Remote | Low | No standing area | Catastrophic Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 1-1-3 | operator Launching | mechanical : unexpected start <br> Valve Failure | Serious Unlikely | Medium | Inspection | Serious Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 1-1-4 | operator Launching | mechanical : break up during operation <br> Structural Failure | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | Inspection | Catastrophic Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 1-1-5 | operator Launching | mechanical : machine instability Frame Tipping | Serious Unlikely | Medium | Weighted feet | Serious <br> Remote | Low | Action Item [2/28/2019] Jody |
| 1-1-6 | operator Launching | mechanical : impact Bystanders | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | No standing area | Catastrophic Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 1-1-7 | operator Launching | electrical / electronic : shorts <br> / arcing / sparking <br> Damaged Insulation | Serious Remote | Low | Inspection | Serious Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] Operator |


| Item Id | User I <br> Task | Hazard / <br> Failure Mode | Initial Asses <br> Severity <br> Probability | Risk Level | Risk Reduction Methods /Control System | Final Assess <br> Severity <br> Probability | Risk Level | Status/ <br> Responsible <br> /Comments <br> /Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-1-8 | operator Launching | electrical / electronic : water / wet locations Weather | Moderate Unlikely | Low | weatherproofing | Minor Unlikely | Negligible | Action Item [4/25/2019] Ben |
| 1-1-9 | operator Launching | electrical / electronic : unexpected start up / motion Controller Failure | Serious Unlikely | Medium | two stage starter | Serious Remote | Low | Complete [2/14/2019] Ben |
| 1-1-10 | operator Launching | electrical / electronic : power supply interruption Battery Failure | Moderate Unlikely | Low | check battery | Moderate Remote | Negligible | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 1-1-11 | operator Launching | fluid / pressure : pneumatics rupture Overpressurization | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | pressure release valve | Catastrophic Remote | Low | Complete [2/14/2019] Ben |
| 1-2-1 | operator <br> Setup/Clean up | mechanical : crushing Dropped Equipment | Moderate Unlikely | Low | PPE, shoes | Moderate Remote | Negligible | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 1-2-2 | operator Setup/Clean up | mechanical : cutting / severing Sharp Edges | Moderate Likely | Medium | PPE, gloves | Moderate Remote | Negligible | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 1-2-3 | operator Setup/Clean up | electrical / electronic : energized equipment / live parts <br> Connecting Battery | Moderate Remote | Negligible | PPE, grounding | Moderate Remote | Negligible | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 1-2-4 | operator <br> Setup/Clean up | slips / trips / falls : trip Tripping over Equipment | Moderate Remote | Negligible | Inspection | Moderate Remote | Negligible | In-process Operator |
| 1-2-5 | operator Setup/Clean up | material handling : excessive weight <br> Picking up Equipment | Moderate Likely | Medium | weight reduction | Moderate Unlikely | Low | In-process David |


| Item Id | User 1 <br> Task | Hazard / <br> Failure Mode | Initial Asses <br> Severity <br> Probability | ent <br> Risk Level | Risk Reduction Methods IControl System | Final Assess Severity Probability | ent <br> Risk Level | Status / <br> Responsible <br> /Comments <br> /Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\overline{1-3-1}$ | operator <br> Troubleshooting | mechanical : pinch point UAV impact | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium |  | Catastrophic Remote | Low | Action Item [5/1/2019] Sean |
| 1-3-2 | operator <br> Troubleshooting | electrical / electronic : improper wiring Controller Failure | Moderate Remote | Negligible | PPE, gloves | Moderate Remote | Negligible | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 1-3-3 | operator <br> Troubleshooting | fluid / pressure : high pressure air Leakage | Serious Remote | Low | inspection | Serious Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 2-1-1 | passer by / non-user walk near machinery | mechanical : impact Hit by UAV | Catastrophic Likely | High | no standing area | Catastrophic Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 2-1-2 | passer by / non-user walk near machinery | fluid / pressure : pneumatics rupture <br> Hit by Part | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | inspection | Catastrophic Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] Operator |
| 3-1-1 | Builders <br> Launching | mechanical : crushing Human Interferance | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | No standing area | Catastrophic Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-1-2 | Builders Launching | mechanical : unexpected start <br> Valve Failure | Serious Unlikely | Medium | Inspection | Serious Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-1-3 | Builders <br> Launching | mechanical : break up during operation <br> Structural Failure | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | Inspection | Catastrophic Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-1-4 | Builders <br> Launching | mechanical : machine instability Frame Failure | Serious Unlikely | Medium | Weighted feet | Serious Remote | Low | Action Item [2/28/2019] Jody |


| Item Id | User $/$ Task | Hazard/ <br> Failure Mode | Initial Assessment Severity |  | Risk Reduction Methods /Control System | Final Assessment <br> Severity <br> Probability Risk Level |  | Status / <br> Responsible /Comments /Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3-1-5 | Builders Launching | mechanical : impact Bystanders | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | No standing area | Catastrophic Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-1-6 | Builders <br> Launching | electrical / electronic : shorts / arcing / sparking Damaged Insulation | Serious Remote | Low | Inspection | Serious Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-1-7 | Builders <br> Launching | electrical / electronic : water wet locations Weather | Moderate Unlikely | Low | Weatherproofing | Moderate Unlikely | Low | Action Item [4/25/2019] Ben |
| 3-1-8 | Builders Launching | electrical / electronic : unexpected start up / motion Controller Failure | Serious Unlikely | Medium | Two stage starter | Serious Remote | Low | Complete [2/14/2019] Ben |
| 3-1-9 | Builders Launching | electrical / electronic : power supply interruption <br> Battery Failure | Moderate Unlikely | Low | Inspection | Moderate Remote | Negligible | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-1-10 | Builders <br> Launching | fluid / pressure : pneumatics rupture <br> Overpressurization | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | Pressure release valve | Catastrophic Remote | Low | Complete [2/14/2019] Ben |
| 3-2-1 | Builders <br> Setup/Cleanup | mechanical : crushing Dropped Equipment | Moderate Unlikely | Low | PPE, shoes | Moderate Unlikely | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-2-2 | Builders <br> Setup/Cleanup | mechanical : cutting / severing Sharp Edges | Serious Unlikely | Medium | PPE, gloves | Serious Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-2-3 | Builders Setup/Cleanup | electrical / electronic : <br> energized equipment / live parts <br> Connecting Battery | Serious Remote | Low | PPE, gloves | Serious Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |


| Item Id | User I <br> Task | Hazard / <br> Failure Mode | Initial Assess <br> Severity <br> Probability | ent Risk Level | Risk Reduction Methods /Control System | Final Assess <br> Severity <br> Probability | Risk Level | Status / <br> Responsible /Comments /Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3-2-4 | Builders Setup/Cleanup | slips / trips / falls : trip Tripping over Equipment | Minor Unlikely | Negligible | Inspection | Minor Unlikely | Negligible | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-2-5 | Builders <br> Setup/Cleanup | material handling : excessive weight <br> Picking up Equipment | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | Weight reduction | Catastrophic Remote | Low | In-process David |
| 3-3-1 | Builders Testing | mechanical : crushing Human Interferance | Catastrophic Likely | High | follow safety procedures | Catastrophic Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-3-2 | Builders Testing | mechanical : cutting / severing Sharp Edges | Moderate Likely | Medium | PPE, gloves | Moderate Remote | Negligible | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-3-3 | Builders Testing | mechanical : pinch point Assembly | Serious Likely | High | PPE, gloves | Serious Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-3-4 | Builders <br> Testing | electrical / electronic : shorts / arcing / sparking Wiring | Serious Unlikely | Medium | PPE, gloves | Serious Remote | Low | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-3-5 | Builders Testing | electrical / electronic : improper wiring Controller Failure | Moderate Unlikely | Low | ground equipment | Moderate Remote | Negligible | On-going [Daily] All members |
| 3-3-6 | Builders Testing | ergonomics / human factors : repetition Fatigue | Minor Likely | Low | take breaks | Minor Unlikely | Negligible | Action Item All members |
| 3-3-7 | Builders Testing | fluid / pressure : fluid leakage $l$ ejection Pneumatic System | Catastrophic Unlikely | Medium | inspection | Catastrophic Remote | Low | Action Item All members |

## Appendix O-DVP\&R

| Senior Project DVP\&R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date: |  | Team: Launch Time | Sponsor: Dr. Drake |  |  | Description of System: |  |  |  |  |  | DVP\&R Engineer: |  |
| TEST PLAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TEST REPORT |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Item } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Specification | Test Description | Acceptance Criteria | Test Responsibility | Test Stage | SAMPL | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LES } \\ & \text { y Type } \end{aligned}$ | Start date | IING Finish date | Test Result | TEST RESUL | Quantity Fail | NOTES |
| 1 | Assembly Time | Time total time to assemble launcher from start to finish. | Total time to build is less than 20 minutes | Sean | FP | 5 | SYS | 6/5/2019 | 6/5/2019 | 12 minutes Average | 5 | 0 | Amount of time required slowly was reduced as we determined which parts could be leff together when transporting the launcher |
| 2 | Max Load | Load the maximum expected weight into the frame and ensure that the system does not fail. | System does not fail when there is a load applied | David | FP | 5 | SUB | 5/28/2019 | 5/28/2019 | Carriage withstood 185 lbs | 5 | 0 | Carriage was able to withstand the repeated loading of 185 lbs . The test was originally designed to test the entire project, but was changed at the last minute due to delays with the piston |
| 3 | Carriage Size | Carriage size will not exceed the given tolearances from the specification sheet | Carriage will be within $12-21 \mathrm{~cm}$ in length | Jody | SP | 1 | c | 2/5/2019 | 2/5/2019 | Carriage length 28 cm | 0 | 1 | Carriage was larger than originally planned. However, this was not a priority goal and we will still continue to work on the rest of they systems instead of resdesigning the carriage. |
| 4 | Minimal Pinch Points | All components of the system will be moved carefully and slowly to detect if there are any pinch points for the user while operating the launcher safely. | Zero pinch points for the user while the launcher is in use | David | FP | 5 | SYS | 5/30/2019 | 5/30/2019 | 0 pinch points for user | 5 | 0 | No pinch points for user as long as they are the reccomended distance away from the launcher. |
| 5 | Succes Rate for Launch Abortion | Successfully decompress the air inside the tank and abort a launch without damage to the system or UAV | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100\% success rate } \\ & \text { of the launch } \\ & \text { cancelation system } \end{aligned}$ | Ben | FP | 10 | SUB | TBD | TBD |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Fit in truck | Launcher will be dismanteled and stored in the bed of Dr. Drakes truck | Launcher Fits within the bed of the truck | Jody | FP | 1 | SYS | TBD | TBD |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Time to Abort Launch | Time the total time to abort a launch by emptying the air tank | Launcher is completely inert after 90 seconds | Sean | FP | 10 | SYS | TBD | TBD |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Range of Launch Speed | Launcher will be fired at a variety of different air pressures in order to vary the launch speed, and will be measured using a high speed camera | Launcher will be able to launch the UAV at a range of speeds from 10 - | Ben | FP | 30 | SYS | TBD | TBD |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Resistive Force Prior to Launch | Launcher will be set up and UAV will run its engines while on the launcher, in order to detect any movement from the carriage | Carriage will not move while motors are supplying up to 10 N of force | Jody | FP | 5 | SYS | TBD | TBD |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Number of Consecutive Launches | Launcher will be constructed and fired consecutively until unable to safely fire | Launcher will be able to launch the UAV a total of 5 times before becoming | Sean | FP | 3 | SYS | TBD | TBD |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Reset Time | Time the total time required to reset the launcher and prepare it for another launch | Launcher will be operable again after at most 10 minutes | David | FP | 5 | SYS | TBD | TBD |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix P - Operator's Manual

## Operator's Manual

Warning: This device is intended for use with only an AeroVironment RQ-20 Puma ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ or Altavian Nova F7200 ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ UAV (Unmanned Aerial Vehicle). It is not recommended to use this device with other UAVs. Follow these instructions and designated maintenance procedures to prevent injury or damage to the launcher.

Parts List: 4x legs, launcher frame, 2x spreaders, carriage, air tank with compressor, controller, DeWalt battery


## Setup

After arriving at the chosen launch site, the user will need to unload all equipment from the bed of the truck. One person will need to handle the piston track assembly while another carries the air tank. While the track assembly can be carried with little effort, the air tank is heavy and must be lifted carefully. The piston track assembly must be handled carefully because the carriage is mounted on the track and can slide freely if not secured to the magnets. The air tank must also be handled carefully and must be placed on stable ground to prevent tipping; there are multiple attachments at the ports that could be damaged if impacted. All pieces of equipment should be unloaded and laid out at the launch site. It is important that the chosen launch site is a flat area clear of obstructions and at least 10 feet by 10 feet in size.

## Assembly

First, the user should attach all four legs to the front and back plate of the track assembly (Figure 1). The two front legs are distinguishable by their longer length. One side of the leg is flattened to slide into the slot on the plate (Figure 2).


Figure 6. Front and back leg, front and back plate, quick release pins.


Figure 2. Flattened edge of leg.

First make sure that the flattened side of the leg is facing the groove in the plate. The leg can then be attached by simply sliding the hollow leg over the rectangular notch on the front plate (Figure 3).


Figure 3. Sliding rear leg on rear plate.

Align the hole on the leg with the hole on the plate and slide the quick release pin through, ensuring that the pin is locked in place. (Figure 4)


Figure 4. Inserting quick release pin.

Repeat the process for each of the four legs. Once the track system is assembled, if more stability is needed during launch, place a sandbag at the foot of each leg.


Figure 5. Fully attached front leg to front plate.

Next, make sure the air tank is upright and the safety release valve on the air tank is not pointed towards any other equipment (Figure 6). Check that the compressor is secured to the tank tightly. Check that all tee connectors are secured tightly to the tank and components.


Figure 6. Air system assembly
Next, take the group of wires coming from the control box, and identify each wire by its label. The control box has three wires with spade connectors that will need to be connected: the compressor power signal, dump solenoid positive, and launch solenoid positive. Each wire's corresponding wire near the air tank will be labeled as such.


Figure 7. Launch solenoid wires


Figure 8. Battery unit connection

Now connect the air tank to the piston via the provided hose. Ensure that both ends are tightly secured tightening the hose clamps attached.

## Verification

Once all connections have been checked, place all switches in the off position (Figure 9). Now, plug in the battery and test both solenoid valves to check that they open and close accordingly. You will be able to hear the solenoids "click" when turned on or off. Next, check that the main tank valve (large green handle) is open. With both solenoids closed, briefly turn on the compressor to check that it works. Release this air by opening the release valve. Before beginning launch procedures, double check that both solenoid valves are closed.


Figure 9. Control panel

Next, the track system should be tested. Wipe the linear steel rods with a clean rag to clear any debris from the surface. Slide the carriage up and down the rods to make sure the bearings roll smoothly. Connect the designated spreader to the two L brackets at the end of the track using two bolts (Figure 5). Run the carriage into the end of the track to check that the side panels separate. Bring the carriage to the start of the track and make sure the cable is inside the groove of the pulley.

Before placing the UAV in the carriage, adjust the rear support rod to an appropriate height. This can be adjusted later but must be close prior to inserting the UAV. Have one person spread the carriage side panels apart while another person places the UAV onto the carriage by aligning the slots in the receivers on the UAV with the carriage walls. Double check that the spreader at the end of the track is meant for the desired UAV. Make sure the carriage is slid to the back of the track and the magnets are in contact. There should be resistance to sliding when the magnets are engaged.

## Launch

Enable the compressor using the toggle switch on the controller. Turn off the compressor when the pneumatic system reaches the desired pressure. Note: The relay was designed to stop the compressor when pressure reached 145 psi, but the safety release valve releases the pressure at 135 psi. The user should either watch the pressure gage until the desired pressure is reached, then turn off the compressor, or, the user can wait until the pressure release valve opens, knowing that the pressure is 135 psi. (A pressure release valve that opens at 150 psi should be purchased and implemented. Then the user can wait at a safe distance until the relay turns off the compressor automatically). At this point, clear the area around the launcher and move at least 40 feet away from the launcher to a safe position. When ready to launch, hold the launch toggle switch up and press and hold the red launch button. After the UAV has launched, release the launch button.

To release all air pressure in the system, toggle on the dump valve switch and keep toggled until the whole system has been drained.

## Take Down

Begin by checking for any remaining air in the tank; discharge if necessary. Disconnect the battery to depower the system. Disconnect the air tank from the piston. Remove the launcher's legs. Begin with the back legs as they are shorter; this will keep the launcher more stable while you remove the front legs. Remove the quick release pins from a single leg at a time, then remove the respective leg from the back/front plate. Disconnect the labeled spade connectors and wind the excess controller wire into a spool for easy transportation. Have at least one person carry the track assembly while another person carries the air tank and transfer the system into the truck bed.

## Maintenance

The linear motion shafts on the launcher frame should be kept oiled and dry to prevent surface tarnish or rusting.

The two axels in the carriage should be kept oiled and dry to prevent surface tarnish or rusting.

Batteries should be fully charged between uses so the compressor can fully pressurize the tank.

Visually inspect the shock absorbers at the end of the track to make sure there are no cracks or deformations.

Check that the spring inside the carriage is still stiff by pulling apart the side panels.

Periodically check the air tank for signs of leaking air. A replacement tank may be required if any are found.

## Storage

The launcher frame, piston, air tank, and electrical components should be stored in a cool, dry environment to prevent rusting and corrosion of the metals. All air should be released from the system prior to storage, and no batteries should be left connected.

## Safety

In order to minimize the risk of injury or damage to the launcher, the following safety concerns should be noted and avoided.

- Do not stand or place objects directly in front of the launcher for approximately 60 ft ., as the UAV and/or piston shaft may collide with the person or object before it has a chance to maneuver.
- Do not operate the machinery if the wiring appears to be worn or the insulation has been removed, as this may cause a short and either electrocute someone or cause the launcher to activate prematurely and without warning.
- Always make sure that the air tank is completely drained before transporting it. Any compressed air left in the tank could cause it to rupture if the tank is impacted.
- Do not leave the air tank fully pressurized for extended periods of time. Doing so could cause leakage in the connections.


## Troubleshooting

The following is a list of possible problems that may arise from operating the launcher, along with suggestions to resolve the underlying issues.

| Pressure is dropping before the launch | Pressurize the air tank to 60psi and place soapy <br> water at each connection for the fittings. If any <br> bubbles are formed, there is a leak and the part <br> may need to be tightened, re-taped, or replaced <br> as needed |
| :--- | :--- |
| Launcher is unstable prior to launch | Ensure that the launcher is on level ground. If <br> the ground does not provide enough friction to <br> prevent movement of the launcher during the <br> launch, place sandbags or weights at the ends <br> of the legs. |
| Electronics are not functioning | Ensure that the battery is fully charged and <br> fully plugged into the adapter. If so, then <br> examine the connections between the battery <br> and the inoperable component, and solder or <br> replace any connections that are faulty. If the <br> electronics still do not respond, use a <br> multimeter to determine if the part itself is no <br> longer operable. If so, replacement for the <br> adapters or electrical components should be <br> ordered and installed |
| Piston is not reaching correct speed | Ensure that the pressure in the air tank is set <br> correctly before launching the piston. Also <br> examine the bearing shafts and remove any <br> debris that may be providing excess friction. |

## Appendix Q - Wiring Diagram



