## 20+ Years of Chimera Grid Development for the Space Shuttle

# STS-107, Return To Flight, End of the Program

Reynaldo J. Gómez III EG/Aeroscience & Flight Mechanics NASA Johnson Space Center Houston, Texas September 2010

# STS-107 Debris

## AIAA 2005-1223



Reynaldo J. Gomez III NASA/JSC/EG3

The loss of STS-107 initiated an unprecedented detailed review of all external environments.

Ascent airloads, acoustics, heating

Debris liberation, **transport** and capability assessments.

### Bipod redesign assessments.

Greatly increased emphasis on verification & validation.

## STS-114

PAL ramp foam loss, additional redesign work.

# Space Shuttle Aerodynamic Tools



# Bipod Ramp Redesign







**Current Configuration** 

# SSLV Grid System Evolution

Early 80's grid system

3 Grids

10k surface pointsLate 80's grid system0.3 million volume points14 Grids

35k surface points

I.6 million volume points

Early 90's grid system

113 Grids

268k surface points

16.4 million volume points

2004 grid system 267 Grids 636k surface points 34.8 million volume points

# Current SSLV Grid System

600+ Grids

1.8M surface points

95+ million volume points

# Wind tunnel validation & CFD extrapolation



#### Wind Tunnel Test (IA-700) Comparisons - Orbiter - Phi = 180°

CFD conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 1.550$ ,  $\alpha = 0.00^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.00^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.50 \times 10^{6}$ /ft, IB elevon = 10.00°, OB elevon = -2.00° WTT conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 1.550$ ,  $\alpha = -0.12^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.06^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.50 \times 10^{6}$ /ft, IB elevon = 10.00°, OB elevon = -2.00°, Run = 212, Point = 4, LOX Roll = 0° WTT conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 1.551$ ,  $\alpha = -0.10^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.06^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.52 \times 10^{6}$ /ft, IB elevon = 10.00°, OB elevon = -2.00°, Run = 308, Point = 4, LOX Roll = 15° WTT conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 1.551$ ,  $\alpha = -0.08^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.02^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.50 \times 10^{6}$ /ft, IB elevon = 10.00°, OB elevon = -2.00°, Run = 315, Point = 4, LOX Roll = -15°



#### Wind Tunnel Test (IA-700) Comparisons - External Tank - Phi = 203.75°

CFD conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 1.550$ ,  $\alpha = 0.00^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.00^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.50 \times 10^{6}$ /ft, IB elevon = 10.00°, OB elevon = -2.00° WTT conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 1.550$ ,  $\alpha = -0.12^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.06^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.52 \times 10^{6}$ /ft, IB elevon = 10.00°, OB elevon = -2.00°, Run = 212, Point = 4, LOX Roll = 0° WTT conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 1.551$ ,  $\alpha = -0.10^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.06^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.54 \times 10^{6}$ /ft, IB elevon = 10.00°, OB elevon = -2.00°, Run = 308, Point = 4, LOX Roll = 15° WTT conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 1.551$ ,  $\alpha = -0.08^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.02^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.52 \times 10^{6}$ /ft, IB elevon = 10.00°, OB elevon = -2.00°, Run = 315, Point = 4, LOX Roll = 15°



## CFD vs. IA-613B Wing Pressures

#### Mach 2.50, Y = -250"

CFD run with as measured elevons

CFD conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 2.50$ ,  $\alpha = 2.03^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.00^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.50 \times 10^6$ /ft, IB elevon = 4.07°, OB elevon = -4.39° WTT conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 2.50$ ,  $\alpha = 2.03^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.00^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.50 \times 10^6$ /ft, IB elevon = 4.07°, OB elevon = -4.39°



#### Proposed ice/frost ramp configuration, tested but not flown.

#### Wind Tunnel Test Comparisons - Ice/Frost Ramp Station 1151.8

CFD conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 1.250$ ,  $\alpha = -4.00^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.00^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.50 \times 10^{6}$ /ft, IB elevon = 10.00°, OB elevon = 9.00° IS-21A conditions:  $M_{\infty} = 1.252$ ,  $\alpha = -4.03^{\circ}$ ,  $\beta = 0.05^{\circ}$ , Reynolds  $\# = 2.51 \times 10^{6}$ /ft, IB elevon = 10.00°, OB elevon = 9.00°, Run = 709, Point = 4, pal = 0



Offbody and integrated validation was required to support debris transport tools.

Pressure sensors vs. CFD  $\approx$  0.01 Cp Integrated Loads vs. CFD  $\approx$  5% of flt Pressure Sensitive Paint Particle Imaging Velocimetry ± 20 ft/sec



Reynaldo J. Gomez III NASA/JSC/EG3

1.6

0.4

Mach Number = 1.55 $\alpha = \beta = 0^{\circ}$ 

M. Sellers/AEDC

# **Grid Generation Automation**

#### **GlobalDefs.tcl**



### Scripted control surface motion is key to automation.





Overset CFD was a key input to many External Tank redesign assessments.

Multiple ice/frost ramp redesigns Ascent & entry windows airloads Discrete airloads data book updates Venting database updates Aerothermal support & others RCS Tyvek<sup>®</sup> covers **Bipod Ramp** Removal ±Z Aerovent Modification Modified Aft Longeron **STS-121** LO<sub>2</sub> feedline bracket redesigns PAL Ramp Removal Reynaldo J. Gomez III NASA/JSC/EG3

# Debris transport aerodynamic models & prediction tools development



AIAA-2006-0662







NSTS 08303 day of launch ice ball launch commit tool developed by Stuart Rogers/ARC NAS-07-004



# Other applications **Entry Calculations** Mach = 0.8, $\alpha = 17^{\circ}$ L. Marek/JSC Shuttle Carrier Aircraft Mach = 0.3, $\alpha = 3^{\circ}$ G. Schauerhammer 20 Reynaldo J. Gomez III NASA/JSC/EG3

#### Timeline of Computing & Overset Space Shuttle Applications



# Overset Legacy



SSLV 1987-1993 Initial OVERFLOW development, collar grids, complex geometry issues, plumes





Advanced Subsonic Transport 1987-1993 Chimera Grid Tools, tcl scripting, turbulence modeling, PEGASUS 5

DoD High Performance Computer Modernization Project 1992-present OVERGRID, OVERFLOW-D, rotorcraft applications.

Space Launch Initiative 2000-2002 OVERFLOW 2.0, moving body tools

Constellation 2004-2010

OVERFLOW 2.1, robustness improvements for high gradient plume driven unsteady flows.

Reynaldo J. Gomez III NASA/JSC/EG3

22

After 20+ years was overset the right choice?

Weaknesses

- Relatively steep learning curve for new users.
- Double valued surface issues.

Strengths

- Accuracy
- Efficiency- Structured grids, grid scripts
- Flexibility Nearly ideal for Shuttle redesign work.

Overall a pragmatic choice for our application.

# But there is still more work to be done...

#### STS-133, STS-134, STS-135?

Some STS-1 flight anomalies are still beyond current CFD tool capabilities, e.g.

- Acoustics and heating on complex configurations with strong shock wave-boundary layer interactions
- Physical models (turbulence, chemistry, multiphase flows,...) are key limitations that need to be improved.

Future programs will need 10s to 100s of millions of CPUhours to characterize external environments

 There is evidence that we need 10x more resolution and 10x more solutions than we can currently produce to generate grid converged solutions and populate databases.



# Acknowledgments

Many contributors NASA ARC Joseph Steger William Chan Ing-Tsau Chiu Robert Meakin Shigeru Obayashi Stuart Rogers Edward Tejnil Scott Murman

Wind tunnel model design, manufacturing and testing.

NAS facility

#### NASA JSC

Fred Martin Steve Labbe **Darby Vicker** Jim Greathouse Phil Stuart Steve Parks Jeff Slotnick Dan Pearce Scott Stanley Edward Ma Thomas Wey Lindsay Marek Alex Dobrinsky

Other organizations Norm Suhs Bill Dietz