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#### Abstract

SUMMARY

An analysis was performed to determine the lateral-vibrational characteristics of a $1 / 40$-scale dynamic model of the Apollo-Saturn V vehicle-umbilical-tower configuration. The direct stiffness method was employed for the calculations. The analysis treats the vibration of the complete configuration confined to the plane of the tower and vehicle center lines, although the tower itself was analyzed in two directions. Results are presented for the umbilical tower alone, the vehicle alone, the umbilical tower mounted on the launch platform and the complete vehicle-umbilical-tower configuration. The flexible connection between the vehicle and launch platform had to be represented by a rotational spring to obtain good agreement with experiment.


All the analytical results were compared with experimental results and the good agreement indicates that the direct stiffness method provides an effective technique for computing the vibrational characteristics of complex structures.

## INTRODUCTION

Launch-vehicle systems are, in general, subjected to dynamic-loading environments such as ground winds at the launch site and launch noise at lift-off. To prevent damage to the vehicle and its supporting structures from these environments, it is necessary to have the capability of computing the dynamic response of the system to arbitrary disturbances. Often, one of the most important steps in the computation of the dynamic response is the determination of the natural frequencies and mode shapes for the system of interest.

Configurations such as the Apollo-Saturn V launch system consisting of the vehicle and its supporting structure represent very complex systems. Thus, the determination of the vibrational characteristics of this configuration requires a detailed mathematical model on which to base calculations. The methods that have previously been used to compute the vibrational characteristics of complex structures are, in general, based on replacing the structure by a series of springs and lumped masses and writing the equations of motion for the idealized structure in terms of arbitrarily assigned degrees of
freedom. The so-called finite-element method represents an improvement over previous methods in that the structure is replaced by an assemblage of structural elements such as bars, beams, and plates. These structural elements are usually coincident with the members of the actual structure and the assignment of degrees of freedom is still at the discretion of the analyst. The finite-element method is generally implemented by either of two techniques. These techniques are the force or flexibility method and the displacement or direct stiffness method.

The purpose of the analysis described herein is to demonstrate the application of the direct stiffness method to the calculation of the vibrational characteristics of a $1 / 40$-scale dynamic model of the Apollo-Saturn V vehicle-umbilical-tower configuration. Details of the direct stiffness method are given in reference 1 and its application to vibration problems is discussed in reference 2. The analysis was carried out by using the computer program described in references 3,4 , and 5.

Natural frequencies and mode shapes were computed for five cases: the umbilical tower fixed to a rigid foundation with motion parallel to the plane of the tower and vehicle center lines, the umbilical tower mounted on the launch platform with motion in the plane of the tower and vehicle center lines, the umbilical tower fixed to a rigid foundation with motion normal to the plane of the tower and vehicle center lines, the vehicle fixed to a rigid foundation with motion parallel to the tower and vehicle center lines, and finally, the complete tower-platform-vehicle configuration (fig. 1) with motion parallel to the plane of the tower and vehicle center lines. The computed frequencies and mode shapes were compared with the experimental results of references 6 and 7. The steps in the analysis are described in detail so that the method can be directly applied to structures similar to that of the present analysis.

## SYMBOLS

A cross-sectional area, inches ${ }^{2}$ (centimeters ${ }^{2}$ )

E Young's modulus, pounds/inch ${ }^{2}$ (newtons/meter ${ }^{2}$ )
f frequency of vibration, Hertz

I area moment of inertia, also identity matrix, inches ${ }^{4}$ (centimeters ${ }^{4}$ )

K element of substructure stiffness matrix
$x$
k element of system stiffness matrix
$l_{\mathrm{v}} \quad$ length of vehicle, inches (centimeters)
$l_{t}$

M
m
length of umbilical tower, inches (centimeters)
element of substructure mass matrix
element of system mass matrix
element of reduced launch-platform stiffness matrix
element of rotational-spring stiffness matrix
system degree of freedom
element of reduced umbilical-tower stiffness matrix
matrix notation for displacement in $x-, y$-, and $z$-directions
displacement in $\mathrm{x}-, \mathrm{y}$-, and z -directions
axes of reference
longitudinal, lateral, and normal distances
element of the coupling matrix
matrix defined by equation (12a)
matrix defined by equation (12b)
substructure degree of freedom
rotation about X -axis, radians

## uncoupled-system stiffness matrix

uncoupled-system mass matrix
rotation about Y -axis, radians
$\psi \quad$ rotation about Z-axis, radians

## Subscripts:

a analytical
b bottom of rotational spring
e experimental
i an integer $1 \leqq i \leqq 156$
t top of rotational spring
$\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}, \mathrm{Z} \quad$ about $\mathrm{X}-, \mathrm{Y}-$, and Z -axes, respectively
Superscripts:
P launch platform
V vehicle
T umbilical tower
Matrix notation:
[] square or rectangular matrix[] transpose of a matrix
(3) column matrix
Bar over symbol indicates a portion of a column matrix.

## MODEL DESCRIPTION AND IDEALIZATION

For this analysis the $1 / 40$-scale Saturn V-umbilical-tower configuration is considered to be composed of three substructures: the umbilical tower, the launch platform, and the Saturn V vehicle. (See fig. 1.) In this section, a brief description of each of the substructures and a discussion of how each substructure was idealized are given. Also, a brief description of the manner in which the substructures are joined and the idealization of these joining conditions are presented. The descriptions are not intended to be detailed, but are presented to indicate the reasoning behind the idealizations. A more detailed description of the model and the scaling laws which were used to relate model and full-scale properties are presented in reference 6.

## Umbilical Tower

The umbilical tower is a framed structure consisting mainly of tubular-steel members. However, in the flared portion of the structure there are eight thin diagonal rod members. Groups of solid plates are located at six positions along the length of the umbilical tower. These plates are bolted at each of their corners to steel blocks which in turn are welded to the tower structure. (See fig. 1.) Some blocks are also located where there are no plates. The plates and blocks serve to assure that the $1 / 40$-scalemodel umbilical tower has a mass distribution and center of gravity that correctly represent, to model scale, the corresponding full-scale values.

For clarity, the idealized umbilical tower is shown in figure 2 in an exploded view. The plates are shown, but the blocks are omitted in this figure. The numbers on the tower faces are gridpoints or nodes, which represent the ends of various members in the idealized umbilical tower. The umbilical tower has been idealized as a three-dimensional pin-jointed structure having 376 bar members joined at 156 nodes. The plates and blocks are assumed to be rigid. To discuss the idealization of the mass distribution, the difference between corner nodes and internal nodes must be distinguished. The corner nodes are those that are located on the vertical boundaries of a face of the tower (for example, $1,9,17, \ldots$ ) and the internal nodes are those remaining (for example, 5, 13, 21, . . .). The mass of the umbilical tower has been lumped at the corner nodes only by first dividing the mass of every member equally between its two nodes regardless of whether it was a corner node or an internal node. Then the mass that was assigned to any internal node was divided equally among all the corner nodes to which the internal node was connected. The mass assigned to a corner node was augmented by one-fourth of the mass of any plate attached to the node plus the mass of any block located at the node.

The longitudinal vibrational frequencies of the umbilical tower were assumed to be much higher than any lateral vibrational frequencies of interest in the analysis. Therefore, the umbilical tower was represented, for longitudinal motion, as a rigid body. Since four tower-tiedown points exist, the idealization of the umbilical tower for longitudinal motion consisted of four lumped masses, each equal to one-fourth of the total tower mass.

## Launch Platform

The launch platform is shown in figure 1 and details of the construction of this platform are shown in figure 3. The launch platform is basically a frame supported on 11 legs with circular cross sections. Each leg is fitted, at the lower end, into a large block, and the blocks are in turn bolted to a rigid foundation. The arrangement of the legs is not symmetrical with respect to the X -axis. (See fig. 4.) The framed portion is composed of steel I-beams with both continuous and truss-like webs. The top and bottom of the frame is covered by thin cover plates, which are welded around the periphery of the frame. Cylindrical weights are attached to several members of the frame with boits, which penetrate the cover plate on top of the frame. The weights are included so that the model launch-platform mass distributions and center of gravity correctly represent the corresponding full-scale values. These weights are not arranged in a symmetrical manner with respect to the center line of the frame. (See fig. 1.)

The idealized launch platform is shown in figure 4. This idealization consists of a frame made of 47 beam members joined at 43 nodes and supported on 11 beam members. All the beam members have bending, stretching, torsion, and shear stiffness. The mass of the launch platform was lumped at all the nodes by first dividing the mass of each member equally between its nodes and then dividing the mass of the cover plating equally among all the nodes of the frame. Finally, the mass of each cylindrical weight was divided equally between the two nodes of the member to which the weight was attached. The amount of mass assigned to each node was equal to the sum of the contributions from these three sources.

## Apollo-Saturn V Vehicle

The model of the Saturn $V$ vehicle is shown in figure 1 and is illustrated schematically in figure $5(\mathrm{a})$. The vehicle model consists of three stages and a payload section. Each stage is composed basically of a cylindrical section, models of the engines, and weights to represent the mass of the propellants. Solid weights are included in all three stages of the model to represent the mass of fuel and liquid oxygen (LOX) in the tanks of the full-size vehicle. Containers of water were included in the second and third stages to represent the mass of liquid hydrogen ( $\mathrm{LH}_{2}$ ). The total weight represented a full-scale weight condition in which the first-stage tanks were 85 percent full and the remaining
tanks were completely full. In the first stage of the model, there are two separate spring-mass arrangements which are designed to simulate the sloshing of fuel and liquid oxygen in the respective tanks of the full-scale vehicle. The payload section consists of models of the lunar, service, and command modules and the launch-escape system.

The idealization of the model of the Saturn $V$ vehicle is represented as a branched beam. (See fig. $5(\mathrm{~b})$.) The main beam is composed of 55 beam members having bending and transverse shear stiffness, the members being joined at 56 nodes. These beam members and nodes are the same as those used in reference 7; the stiffness properties developed in this reference were used to obtain stiffness properties for a smaller number of degrees of freedom for the present analysis. The first-, second-, and third-stage engines are represented by single-degree-of-freedom branches, as are the two slosh simulators in the first stage. To reduce the number of degrees of freedom for this analysis, the mass of the vehicle is lumped at only those nodes in figure 5(b) that are represented by circles. The remaining nodes (those denoted by tick marks) are assigned zero mass. The degrees of freedom associated with the nodes having zero mass are eliminated from the equations of motion (and thus lead to a reduced-size eigenvalue problem) by a procedure described later. The mass that was lumped at a node was found by first computing the mass of each beam segment bounded by two of the nodes denoted by circles. This mass was then divided equally between these two bounding nodes. The mass of a segment of the beam included the mass of structural material in the segment plus the mass of any simulated propellant in that segment. The mass and stiffness of each branch were taken from the model specifications. The mass and stiffness properties for the main beam were taken from the model mass and EI distribution, respectively.

The Saturn V vehicle model was assumed to have longitudinal vibrational frequencies that were much higher than any lateral frequencies of interest in the present analysis. Therefore, the vehicle was idealized as a rigid body for longitudinal motion relative to the launch platform, and was represented as two lumped masses, each equal to onehalf of the mass of the vehicle.

Connections Between the Substructures
The umbilical tower is bolted to the launch platform at four locations, indicated as tower tiedown points in figure 3. These locations are approximately coincident with the four nodes in figure 4 with numbers $24,30,32$, and 37 . The connection was idealized as a rigid translational connection that was expressed by equating the displacements of the tower and the displacements of the launch platform at each tower tiedown node.

The connection between the vehicle and the launch platform is effected by bolting four vehicle-attachment blocks to the vehicle at its lower end and then by bolting each of these attachment blocks to a corresponding vehicle-support block which is welded to
the launch platform. The locations of the vehicle-support blocks on the launch platform are denoted as vehicle tiedown points in figure 3. The connection of the vehicle to the launch platform was idealized by a rigid translational connection and a flexible rotational connection; that is, the displacements of the vehicle were set equal to the displacements of the launch-platform tiedown nodes (nodes 3 and 4 in fig. 4) but the rotation of the vehicle at the tiedown node was set equal to the rotation of one side of a rotational spring and the rotation of the launch platform at each tiedown node was set equal to the rotation of the other side of the spring. This spring simulates the local flexibility of the vehicle tiedown structure, which is not included in the elastic representation of either the launch platform or vehicle. The spring rate for this idealization was determined empirically. This method of representing the connection was suggested in reference 7 where it was found that assuming a rigid rotational connection (that is, equating the rotations) led to lateral frequencies of the vehicle which were higher than the corresponding experimental frequencies. However, by assuming a flexible rotational connection, the analytical frequencies were made to agree with the experimental frequencies. The flexible rotational connection is shown schematically in sketch 1. (The arrows indicate positive direction.)


Sketch 1

## ANALYSIS

## Method of Analysis

The analysis was performed by using the direct stiffness method as implemented by the computer program of references 3 to 5 . Briefly, the steps in the analysis were as follows: stiffness and mass matrices for each of the three substructures (the umbilical tower, the launch platform, and the Saturn V vehicle) were developed in terms of the degrees of freedom of the substructures. Next, a transformation matrix was introduced which related the degrees of freedom of each substructure to the degrees of freedom of the system. By using this transformation matrix, the substructure stiffness and mass matrices were combined to form system stiffness and mass matrices. With these matrices, the equations of free vibration of the system were written and transformed to a classical eigenvalue problem which was solved by the method of Jacobi.

The stiffness matrix for each substructure was generated in terms of all the elastic degrees of freedom of the substructure. To keep the size of the final eigenvalue problem within the capacity of the computer program used, certain degrees of freedom were constrained to be zero, whereas others were removed as explicit variables by associating zero inertia with them. These two operations resulted in the substructure stiffness matrices that were used in the remainder of the analysis. In this section, the method of obtaining these substructure matrices is described.

Umbilical-tower stiffness matrix.- Information describing the structural properties and geometry of the umbilical tower was read into the computer program of references 3 to 5 . This information consisted of the elastic constants and the area of each member of the idealized umbilical tower as well as the coordinates of each node with respect to the Cartesian references axes, $X, Y$, and $Z$ (fig. 2). The areas and coordinates are presented in tables I and II, respectively. The tower material was steel, and the value of Young's modulus used was $30 \times 10^{6} \mathrm{psi}\left(2.068 \times 10^{12} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$. On the basis of this input, stiffness matrices were generated for each member of the idealized umbilical tower. (See ref. 3, pp. 44-47 for the form of these matrices.) The matrices were then superimposed to yield the complete umbilical-tower stiffness matrix. This matrix with its associated degrees of freedom is represented symbolically as follows:


The vectors $\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{1}^{\mathrm{T}}$ to $\overline{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{T}}$ and the coordinate system for the umbilical tower are defined in figure 2. The elements of the matrix (eq. (1)) are themselves matrices.

For most of the configurations analyzed, the motion of the umbilical tower was restricted to be parallel to the plane of the vehicle and tower center lines. The displacements normal to this plane (the V-displacements) are therefore eliminated completely by deleting from the stiffness matrix the rows and columns associated with the V -displacements (represented in eq. (1) by row 9 and column 9 ).

Next, the W-displacements at all the nodes and the U-displacements at the internal nodes are eliminated from the problem as explicit variables under the provision that zero inertia is associated with these displacements. This elimination followed the method of reference 2 (p. 44) and resulted in a reduced stiffness matrix for the umbilical tower:

$$
\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathrm{T}_{11} & \mathrm{~T}_{12} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot  \tag{2}\\
\mathrm{~T}_{21} & \cdot & \mathrm{~T}_{16} \\
\cdot & & & & \\
\cdot & & & & \\
\cdot & & & \cdot & \\
\mathrm{~T}_{61} & & & & \mathrm{~T}_{66}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathrm{K}_{11} & \mathrm{~K}_{12} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\mathrm{~K}_{16} & \cdot & & & \cdot \\
\cdot & & & & \cdot \\
\cdot & & & & \cdot \\
\cdot & & & \cdot & \\
\mathrm{~K}_{61} & & & & \mathrm{~K}_{66}
\end{array}\right]-\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathrm{K}_{17} & \mathrm{~K}_{18} \\
\cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot \\
\mathrm{~K}_{67} & \mathrm{~K}_{68}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{lllll}
\mathrm{K}_{77} & \mathrm{~K}_{78} \\
\mathrm{~K}_{87} & \mathrm{~K}_{88}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{lllll}
-1
\end{array}\left[\begin{array}{llll}
\mathrm{K}_{71} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\mathrm{~K}_{81} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\mathrm{~K}_{76} \\
\mathrm{~K}_{86}
\end{array}\right]\right.
$$

where, in equation (2), $T$ represents an element of the reduced stiffness matrix for the umbilical tower and $K$ represents an element of the original umbilical-tower stiffness matrix (eq. (1)). The reduced stiffness matrix for the umbilical tower is expressed in terms of the U-displacements of the 76 corner nodes of the umbilical tower. This stiffness matrix is combined with the other substructure matrices to form the system stiffness matrix.

Launch-platform stiffness matrix.- Information describing the structural properties and geometry of the launch platform was read into the computer program of references 3 to 5. This information consisted of the elastic constants for the material of the launch platform, the section properties for each member, and the coordinates of each node of the launch platform. The material used was steel with a Young's modulus of $30 \times 10^{6} \mathrm{psi}$ $\left(2.068 \times 10^{12} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ and a Poisson's ratio of 0.30 . The section properties and coordinates are presented in tables III and IV, respectively. The effective shear areas in the X - and Y -directions were taken to be one-half the actual cross-sectional area. On the basis of the input, a stiffness matrix was generated by the computer program for each
member of the launch platform. Then by superposition, the complete stiffness matrix for the launch platform was obtained. This matrix, with its associated degrees of freedom, is represented symbolically as follows:


Here the elements of the launch-platform matrix are themselves matrices. The vectors $\overline{\mathrm{W}}_{1}^{\mathrm{P}}$ to $\bar{\theta}_{2}^{\mathrm{P}}$ are defined in figure 4 along with the coordinate system of the launch platform. To obtain the hold-down condition of the launch platform, all three displacements and all three rotations at the hold-down nodes (nodes 19, 20, 23, 27, 29, 34, 35, 40, 41, 42 , and 43 ) (the bottom end of each leg) were set equal to zero. Thus, the respective rows and columns associated with these displacements were deleted from the stiffness matrix. Also, to constrain the motion of the platform in a direction parallel to the x-direction, the v-displacements and $\psi$-rotations at all the nodes were set equal to zero; again, the corresponding rows and columns were deleted from the stiffness matrix. By this method the rows and columns of the launch-vehicle stiffness matrix which are represented in equation (3) by rows and columns 8 to 13 were deleted. The next step was to eliminate, as explicit variables, the $\phi$-rotations at all nodes except the two vehicle tiedown nodes (nodes 3 and 4), thus $\bar{\phi}_{2}^{\mathbf{P}}$ was eliminated. The $\theta$-rotations at all nodes were eliminated as explicit variables. These two eliminations were based on the assignment of zero inertia to the rotations in question. The reduced stiffness matrix for the launch platform was then obtained by following the method of reference 2 (p.44) as:
where $P$ represents an element (still a matrix) of the reduced launch-platform stiffness matrix and $K$ represents an element of the original launch-platform stiffness matrix. The reduced launch-platform stiffness matrix is expressed in terms of the w -displacements at 32 nodes, the $u$-displacements at 32 nodes, and the $\phi$-rotations at 2 nodes. The platform stiffness matrix (eq. (4)) is subsequently combined with the other substructure stiffness matrices to form the system stiffness matrix.

Saturn V vehicle stiffness matrix.- The stiffness matrix for the model of the Saturn V vehicle was obtained by rewriting the element transfer matrices of reference 7 as element stiffness matrices and by combining these element stiffness matrices by superposition. The complete vehicle stiffness matrix with its associated degrees of freedom is shown symbolically as:

$$
[\mathrm{K}]\{\delta\}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
\mathrm{K}_{11} & \mathrm{~K}_{15}  \tag{5}\\
\cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \mathrm{~K}_{51} & \overline{\mathrm{U}}_{1}^{\mathrm{V}} \\
\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{2}^{\mathrm{V}} \\
\bar{\phi}_{1}^{\mathrm{V}} \\
\bar{\phi}_{2}^{\mathrm{V}} \\
\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{3}^{\mathrm{V}}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

where the vectors $\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{1}^{\mathrm{V}}$ to $\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{3}^{\mathrm{V}}$ are defined in figure 5 . This stiffness matrix is reduced by assuming that zero inertia is assigned to the rotations and that the translatory inertia is lumped only at the selected nodes (appearing in fig. 5 (b) as circles). In accordance with the lumping procedure described under "Model Description and Idealization," mass was assigned only to those degrees of freedom in figure $5(\mathrm{~b})$ which are denoted as $\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{1}^{\mathrm{V}}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{2}^{\mathrm{V}}$ (symbolized by circles). The degrees of freedom to be eliminated
as explicit variables, $\bar{U}_{3}^{V}$ and $\bar{\phi}_{2}^{V}$, are assigned zero inertia. Then, according to reference 2 ( $p .44$ ), the reduced vehicle stiffness matrix is given by:
$\left[\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{V}_{11} & \mathrm{~V}_{12} & \mathrm{~V}_{13} \\ \mathrm{~V}_{21} & \mathrm{~V}_{22} & \mathrm{~V}_{23} \\ \mathrm{~V}_{31} & \mathrm{~V}_{32} & \mathrm{~V}_{33}\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{K}_{11} & \mathrm{~K}_{12} & \mathrm{~K}_{13} \\ \mathrm{~K}_{21} & \mathrm{~K}_{22} & \mathrm{~K}_{23} \\ \mathrm{~K}_{31} & \mathrm{~K}_{32} & \mathrm{~K}_{33}\end{array}\right]-\left[\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{K}_{14} & \mathrm{~K}_{15} \\ \mathrm{~K}_{24} & \mathrm{~K}_{25} \\ \mathrm{~K}_{34} & \mathrm{~K}_{35}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{K}_{44} & \mathrm{~K}_{45} \\ \mathrm{~K}_{54} & \mathrm{~K}_{55}\end{array}\right]^{-1}\left[\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{K}_{41} & \mathrm{~K}_{42} & \mathrm{~K}_{43} \\ \mathrm{~K}_{51} & \mathrm{~K}_{52} & \mathrm{~K}_{53}\end{array}\right]$
The reduced vehicle stiffness matrix is expressed in terms of the u-displacements at 25 nodes and a $\phi$-rotation at the vehicle-tiedown point. By using the bending and shear stiffness of the vehicle presented in reference 7, the idealization shown in figure 5 , and the calculation steps just outlined, the reduced vehicle stiffness matrix was obtained. The reduced vehicle matrix is presented in table $V$.

The stiffness matrix representing the rotational spring at the vehicle tiedown node along with its associated rotations is

$$
[K]\{\phi\rangle=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{R} & -\mathbf{R}  \tag{7}\\
-\mathbf{R} & \mathbf{R}
\end{array}\right]\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\phi_{\mathrm{t}} \\
\phi_{\mathrm{b}}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

The determination of $R$ is discussed subsequently.
Development of substructure mass matrices.- A diagonal mass matrix for each of the substructures was obtained by first lumping the mass of the substructure at certain nodes of the substructure as described under "Model Description and Idealization." The mass was then assigned in such a manner that inertia loads were applied only in specified directions. For example, the mass of the umbilical tower was effective only in the direction parallel to the plane through the tower and vehicle center lines (that is, the $x$-direction). The mass of the launch platform was effective in the $z$-direction and in the $x$-direction. Finally, the mass of the vehicle was effective only in the x-direction. The mass at a certain node and acting in a given direction was placed in the mass matrix array in a location corresponding to its degree of freedom. When this placement was made for every node having mass and for every allowable direction at that node, the substructure mass matrix was obtained. The mass matrix for the launch platform was augmented by adding one-fourth of the total umbilical-tower mass to the mass assigned to the displacements represented by $\bar{W}_{2}^{P}$ and by adding one-half of the vehicle mass to the displacements represented by $\bar{W}_{3}^{P}$. These masses represent the effect of the
rigid-body longitudinal motion of the umbilical tower and the vehicle, respectively. The mass matrices are represented symbolically with their associated degrees of freedom as follows:

For the umbilical tower:

$$
[\mathrm{M}]\{6\}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{M}_{1}^{\mathrm{T}} & &  \tag{8a}\\
& \mathrm{M}_{2}^{\mathrm{T}} & \\
& & \\
& & \mathrm{M}_{6}^{\mathrm{T}}
\end{array}\right]\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{1}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{2}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{3}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{4}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{5}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{6}^{\mathrm{T}}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

For the launch platform:

$$
[\mathrm{M}]\{\delta\}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
\mathrm{M}_{1}^{\mathrm{P}} & &  \tag{8b}\\
& \mathrm{M}_{2}^{\mathrm{P}} & \\
& & 0
\end{array}\right]\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\overline{\mathrm{W}}^{\mathrm{P}} \\
\overline{\mathrm{U}}^{\mathrm{P}} \\
\bar{\phi}_{1}^{\mathrm{P}}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

where for simplicity, all the w-displacements of the launch platform are written together as a single vector $\bar{W}^{\mathbf{P}}$.

For the vehicle:

$$
[\mathrm{M}]\{\delta\}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{M}_{1}^{\mathrm{V}} &  \tag{8c}\\
& \mathrm{M}_{2}^{\mathrm{V}}
\end{array}\right]\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{1}^{\mathrm{V}} \\
\overline{\mathrm{U}}_{2}^{\mathrm{V}} \\
\bar{\phi}_{1}^{\mathrm{V}}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

The actual masses appearing in the substructure mass matrices are presented in tables VI, VII, and VIII.

## Synthesis of System Stiffness and Mass Matrices

The idealization of the complete configuration is shown in figure 6. In this figure the three idealized substructures are shown joined together and the system degrees of freedom are defined. To form the stiffness and mass matrices for the system, a transformation of the degrees of freedom was introduced. This transformation has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\{\delta\}=[\beta]\{s\} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$\{\delta\} \quad$ vector of substructure degrees of freedom
\{s\} vector of system degrees of freedom
$[\beta]$ relation between two vectors
For the present analysis, the elements of $\beta$ are either unity or zero. On the basis of the relationship expressed by equation (9), the system stiffness and mass matrices may be obtained (see ref. 2 , pp. 43 and 73):

$$
\begin{align*}
& {[\mathrm{k}]=[\beta]^{\prime}[k][\beta]}  \tag{10}\\
& {[\mathrm{m}]=[\beta]^{\prime}[\mu][\beta]} \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

where the prime denotes a transposed matrix. For the present problem, equation (9) has the following form:
where $\bar{s}_{1}$ to $\bar{s}_{7}$ are defined in figure 6 and

$$
\left[\beta_{2}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}
1  \tag{12c}\\
1 \\
\cdot \\
\cdot \\
1
\end{array}\right]_{32 \times 1}
$$

Equations (12) expresses three types of relationships: Joining conditions are expressed by equating displacements or rotations of adjacent substructures at their point of connection; any equalities between displacements of nodes on the same substructure are expressed, and substructure degrees of freedom are renamed as system degrees of freedom. To explain the meaning of equations (12) further, it is expanded.

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\{\mathrm{U}_{1}^{\mathrm{T}}\right\} & =\left\{\mathrm{s}_{1}\right\}  \tag{13}\\
\left\{\mathrm{U}_{2}^{\mathrm{T}}\right\} & =\left\{\mathrm{U}_{3}^{\mathrm{T}}\right\}=\left\{\mathrm{U}_{4}^{\mathrm{T}}\right\}=\left\{\mathrm{U}_{5}^{\mathrm{T}}\right\}=\left\{\mathrm{s}_{2}\right\}  \tag{14}\\
\left\{\mathrm{U}_{6}^{\mathrm{T}}\right\} & =\left[\beta_{1}\right] \mathrm{s}_{3}  \tag{15}\\
\left\{\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{P}}\right\} & =\left\{\mathrm{s}_{4}\right\}  \tag{16}\\
\left\{\mathrm{U}_{1}^{\mathrm{P}}\right\} & =\left[\beta_{2}\right] \mathrm{s}_{3}  \tag{17}\\
\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{P} \\
1
\end{array}\right\} & =\phi_{\mathrm{b}}=\mathrm{s}_{5}  \tag{18}\\
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{V}
\end{array}\right\} & =\left\{\mathrm{s}_{7}\right\}  \tag{19}\\
\mathrm{U}_{2}^{\mathrm{V}} & =\mathrm{s}_{3}  \tag{20}\\
\phi_{1}^{\mathrm{V}} & =\phi_{\mathrm{t}}=\mathrm{s}_{6} \tag{21}
\end{align*}
$$

Equations (13), (16), and (19) simply rename those degrees of freedom of the tower, launch platform, and vehicle for which no constraints are stated. Equation (14) expresses the condition that all nodes of the umbilical tower joined by a common plate have the same u-displacement. Equation (15) expresses the joining condition between the umbilical tower and launch platform, and equation (17) expresses the condition that all the nodes on the frame of the launch platform have the same u-displacement. Equation (18) equates the rotation of the launch platform at the vehicle tiedown node to the rotation of the bottom of the rotational spring. Equation (20), along with equation (17), expresses the joining condition between the vehicle and launch platform. Equation (21) equates the rotation of the vehicle at the vehicle tiedown node to the rotation for the top of the rotational spring. The implication of equation (17) is that the degree of freedom represented in figure 6 as $s_{3}$ is a rigid-body "swaying" of the system on the legs of the launch platform.

The matrices $[K]$ and $[\mu]$ along with their associated degrees of freedom have the following form:



In equation (23) the mass matrices are written in terms of submatrices for clarity.

Determination of Frequencies and Mode Shapes
The operations of equations (10) and (11) yield the system stiffness and mass matrices. The equations of free vibration of the system are then expressible as

$$
\begin{equation*}
[\mathrm{k}]\{\mathrm{s}\}=\omega^{2}[\mathrm{~m}]\{\mathrm{s}\} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{m}$, and s have been previously defined and $\omega$ is the undetermined natural frequency of the system. The mass matrix is singular because zero inertia is associated with the rotation of the system at the vehicle tiedown node. This condition presents no problem, however, since the mass matrix does not have to be inverted. Equation (24) is transformed to a standard eigenvalue problem by performing a Choleski decomposition of the mass matrix as described in reference 5 (pp. 104-107). The resulting eigenvalue problem is solved by using the method of Jacobi to yield the frequencies and mode shapes of the idealized system. In addition to computing the frequencies and mode shapes of the complete configuration, it was also desired to compute the frequencies and mode shapes of the umbilical tower alone in the x - and y -directions fixed to a rigid foundation, the tower and platform together, and the vehicle alone fixed to a rigid foundation. The steps
leading to the computations for the configurations previously mentioned are simply special cases of the steps outlined previously. Each of the equations to be solved have the same form as equation (24) but equations (22) and (23) contain only the stiffness and mass matrices of the substructure(s) involved in the configuration under consideration. Also, the $\beta$-matrix contains only those rows and columns corresponding to the substructure(s) of the configuration involved. In addition, for the umbilical tower, the rows and columns of the stiffness, mass, and $\beta$-matrices corresponding to the u-displacements of the tower tiedown points were deleted. Thus equation (15) is replaced by the equation $\mathrm{U}_{6}^{\mathrm{T}}=0$. The analysis of the tower in the y -direction was accomplished by interchanging the roles of the $u$ - and $v$-displacements in the steps outlined.

For the vehicle alone, the rows and columns corresponding to the u-displacement at the vehicle tiedown points and the rows and columns corresponding to the rotation of the bottom of the rotational spring were deleted from the stiffness, mass, and $\beta$-matrices. Thus equations (18) and (20) are replaced by the equations $\phi_{\mathrm{b}}=0$ and $\mathrm{U}_{2}^{\mathrm{V}}=0$, respectively.

Finally, for the umbilical tower and launch platform, the mass matrix for the launch platform did not have to be augmented by the mass of the vehicle at the vehicle tiedown points because the vehicle was not included in this configuration.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the analysis are presented in terms of resonant frequencies and mode shapes of each of the four configurations studied. These results appear in table IX and in figures 7 to 10 along with experimental results from references 6 and 7.

To discuss the tower mode shapes, a level of the tower is defined to be a plane containing four nodes with the same z-coordinate. The top of the tower is level 1 and the base of the tower is level 19. The displacement of a level could be represented by a single displacement since at the six levels having plates, the four u-displacements were specified to be equal, and at the remaining levels the u-displacements at each of the four nodes were found, from the calculations, to be equal. The latter effect was expected because the tower was designed to be symmetrical with respect to a plane normal to the x -direction and through the center line of the tower.

The tower portions of the calculated mode shapes in figures 7 to 10 were plotted by fairing curves through the displacements of the 19 levels of the tower. The experimental displacements are represented by circles. The vehicle portions of the calculated mode shapes (figs. 9 and 10) were plotted by fairing curves through the displacements of 20 stations on the vehicle. In the configurations in which the launch platform is included,
the displacements at the base of the tower and at the base of the vehicle represent the sway of the entire configuration of the legs of the launch platform.

## Umbilical Tower Alone

The first five resonant frequencies of the umbilical tower fixed to a rigid foundation are presented in table IX. The first four corresponding mode shapes appear in figure 7. The experimental frequencies and mode shapes from reference 6 are also presented in table IX and figure 7 for comparison.

As noted in table IX, the first experimental mode did not occur solely in the plane of the tower and vehicle center lines (that is, in the x-direction). Rather, when excitation was applied in the $x$-direction, two first modes were observed, both of which had motion both in the $x$ - and $y$-directions. Furthermore, no direction of excitation was found for which motion was confined solely to the $x$-direction (or for that matter to the $y$-direction). These two experimental modes probably represent coupled motion between the first mode in the $x$-direction and the first mode in the $y$-direction. To investigate this possibility further, the frequencies and mode shapes of the tower in the y-direction were computed. The frequencies presented for the tower in the $y$-direction appear in table IX along with the experimental frequencies for motion in this direction. The interesting result of this calculation is that the frequency of the first mode of the tower in the $y$-direction (at 26.11 Hz ) and the frequency of the first mode of the tower in the x-direction (at 32.37 Hz ) bracket the two experimental first-mode frequencies (at 28.2 Hz and 29.8 Hz ). This result suggests that the lower coupled mode represents a raising of the frequency in the $y$-direction and the higher coupled mode represents a lowering of the frequency in the x-direction. The failure of the umbilical tower to have uncoupled responses in the $x$ - and $y$-direction was unexpected and is thought to be due to unintentional manufacturing asymmetries.

Inspection of table IX reveals that the first modal frequency of the tower in the x -direction is calculated to be higher than the corresponding frequency in the y -direction. This difference would seem to be unexpected since the tower flares in such a way that at its lower end the dimension measured in the $x$-direction is smaller than the corresponding dimension in the $y$-direction. The stiffness in the $x$-direction thus might be expected to be less than the stiffness in the $y$-direction (by analogy with a beam), and therefore would lead to a higher first modal frequency in the $y$-direction. However, a static test on the tower (described in ref. 6) revealed that when the tower was loaded identically in the two directions, deflections were smaller in the x-direction than in the y-direction. Therefore, the tower is stiffer in the $x$-direction.

Generally, good agreement was found between the analytical and experimental results for the umbilical tower fixed to a rigid foundation. No percentage difference is
listed for the first mode in either the $x$ - or $y$-directions, in accordance with previous remarks concerning these modes. In figure 7 the first experimental mode shape shown is a projection of the first experimental mode shape onto the plane of the vehicle and tower center lines.

## Tower on Launch Platform

The first four resonant frequencies of the umbilical tower on the launch platform are presented in table IX and the corresponding mode shapes are presented in figure 8. The displacement of the launch platform is plotted at the base of the tower and launch platform and on the legs of the launch platform.

As noted in table IX, the first experimental mode did not occur solely in the plane of the tower and vehicle center lines. Whereas the launch platform did have motion only in the $x$-direction, the tower was observed to have motion in both the $x$ - and $y$-directions when the system was excited in the $x$-direction. This motion indicates that the out-ofplane response of the umbilical-tower-launch-platform configuration is not caused by the nonsymmetrical arrangement of the legs and cylindrical weights of the launch platform but rather by the asymmetries of the umbilical tower.

Mounting the umbilical tower on the launch platform had little effect on the tower frequencies since the frequencies of the tower-launch-platform system are nearly the same as those of the tower fixed to a rigid foundation. (See table IX.) This similarity indicates that the launch platform acts essentially as a rigid foundation for the tower.

The comparison between the analytical and experimental frequencies for the towerlaunch platform system is shown in table IX. No percentage difference is listed for the first mode since it did not occur in the plane of the analysis. The agreement between analysis and experiment for the remaining frequencies, which did occur in the plane of the analysis, is considered good. The comparison between the analytical and experimental mode shapes is shown in figure 8. The first experimental mode shown in figure 8 is the projection of that nonplanar mode onto the plane of the analysis. The agreement between the experimental and analytical mode shapes is also generally seen to be good.

## Saturn V Vehicle Alone

The first six resonant frequencies of the model of the Saturn $V$ vehicle are presented in table IX. The mode shapes are shown in figure 9. The shape of the mode at 13.1 Hz is not shown in figure 9 since it does not differ from the first mode except that the branches corresponding to the two fuel-slosh mechanisms in the first stage have finite deflections. This branch mode is identical to the one shown in figure 10(b). The weight conditions of the vehicle for this calculation are that the first-stage tanks are 85 percent full and the remaining tanks are 100 percent full. The boundary condition,
although referred to as fixed to a rigid foundation, is more specifically one in which the lower end may not translate but is able to rotate against a rotational spring. The determination of the spring constant is discussed in reference 7.

The results for the vehicle alone are included in this report primarily to demonstrate the influence of the vehicle motion on the coupled motion of the complete umbilical-tower-launch-platform-vehicle configuration. Nevertheless, a comparison of the results for the vehicle alone with experimental results of reference 7 is included in table XI and figure 9. The calculated results are in good agreement with the experimental findings.

## Tower, Platform, and Vehicle

The first eight resonant frequencies of the complete umbilical-tower-launch-platform-vehicle configuration are presented in table IX. The corresponding mode shapes are shown in figure 10. The displacement of the launch platform represents the rigid-body sway of the entire configuration on the legs of the launch platform. Each mode shape is normalized to the maximum displacement. The experimental displacements from reference 6 are plotted in figure 10 as circles.

As noted in table IX, for the mode in which the tower motion is uncoupled from the motion of the launch platform and vehicle, the tower was observed experimentally to have motion out of the plane of the analysis. This motion was expected, since similar out-ofplane response was observed in both the tower alone and the tower-launch platform experiments. The remaining modes shown in figure 10 did have responses that were confined to the plane of the tower and vehicle center lines. The experimental data shown in figure 10(a) (that is, the third mode) represent the projection of the nonplanar motion onto the plane of the analysis.

The mode which occurred at the calculated frequency of 13.00 Hz (fig. 10(b)) is one in which the motion of the two fuel-slosh mechanisms is coupled with the first bending mode of the main-vehicle structure. This mode shape is identical to the mode which occurred at 13.09 Hz for the vehicle alone.

To compute the value of the rotational spring $R$, which connects the vehicle to the launch platform, a trial-and-error procedure was used in which a trial spring constant was inserted into equation (7), the resulting spring matrix inserted into the matrix, and the frequencies of the configuration computed. The value of the spring that gave good agreement between the computed and experimental frequencies for the first uncoupled vehicle mode, $f_{e}=9.50 \mathrm{~Hz}$ (fig. 10(a)), was taken to be the rotational-spring constant for the vehicle tiedown point. With this value of the spring constant used, all the remaining modes of the configuration involving the vehicle came into good agreement with the experimental results. The spring constant was determined to be $9.0 \times 10^{6} \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{in}$.
$\left(15.8 \times 10^{8} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}\right)$. To see the effect of neglecting this spring at the vehicle tiedown point, a calculation was made under the assumption of a cantilever end condition for the vehicle (that is, an infinite rotational-spring constant) and the results are presented in table IX.

Of the eight modes presented in figure 10, six represent uncoupled motion of either the vehicle or the umbilical tower. If the uncoupled modes are considered first, table IX and figures 7,8 , and 10 , show that the frequency of the first tower mode is independent of whether the tower is fixed to a rigid foundation or mounted on the launch platform with or without the vehicle. Also, table IX and figures 9 and 10 show that the frequencies of the higher modes of the vehicle are essentially independent of whether the vehicle is fixed to a foundation or mounted on the launch platform with the umbilical tower. The first vehicle frequency, however, is significantly affected by placing the vehicle on the launch platform. This effect was not unexpected since the vehicle was assumed to act as a beam and the first mode of a beam is known to be very sensitive to the end conditions whereas the higher modes are affected to a lesser degree. The first coupled mode is the sixth system mode and analytically occurs at 75.43 Hz . This mode represents the coupling between the third vehicle mode shown with a frequency of 68.54 Hz (fig. 9(c)) and the second tower mode shown with a frequency of 76.59 Hz (fig. $7(\mathrm{~b})$ ). The other coupled mode occurs at 130.7 Hz and represents the coupling between the fourth vehicle mode shown in figure 9 (d) with a frequency of 114.7 Hz and the third tower mode shown in figure 7(c) with a frequency of 133.5 Hz .

The experimental results tend to verify the analytical results for the complete configuration. The agreement is better for the uncoupled modes than for the coupled modes; this result is understandable since the first coupled mode is actually the sixth natural mode of the system, and better agreement is expected for the lower modes.

## CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the vibration analysis of a $1 / 40$-scale model of the Saturn V-umbilical-tower-launch-platform configuration and the comparison of the results with experiment, several observations can be made.

1. The agreement between the analytical and experimental results indicates that the direct stiffness method provides an effective technique for predicting the vibration characteristics of complex structures, such as a launch vehicle and its supporting structure.
2. It was revealed by the analysis and verified by experiment that the lowest five modes of the complete configuration consist of uncoupled motion of either the vehicle or the umbilical tower.
3. The joining condition between the vehicle and the launch platform was found to be critical for the calculated values of the vehicle frequencies. The effect of this joining condition could not be defined by a simple cantilever condition but was represented by a rotational spring.
4. The attempt to verify experimentally the analytical frequency and mode shape of the first tower mode revealed that the tower did not have a first-mode response in the plane of the tower and vehicle center lines. Instead, the tower responded in two first modes which evidently represented coupling between the first mode in the plane of the tower and vehicle center lines and the first mode in the normal plane. A calculation of the frequency of the mode in the normal plane revealed that the frequencies of the modes in the two planes bracketed the experimental frequencies for the first mode. The proposed explanation for the nonplanar behavior of the tower in the first mode is that the tower contained manufacturing asymmetries which were not taken into account in the analysis.
[^0]
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TABLE I.- AREAS OF ELEMENTS OF TOWER
[If W or N is not specified then property is same for both sides]


| Bay and element | Area |  | Bay and element | Area |  | Bay and element | Area |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | in ${ }^{2}$ | $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ |  | $\mathrm{in}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ |  | in ${ }^{2}$ | $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ |
| 1H | 0.0727 | 0.469 | 8H | 0.056 | 0.361 | 15H | 0.073 | 0.471 |
| 1V | . 045 | . 290 | 8V | . 241 | 1.55 | 15V | . 69 | 4.45 |
| 1D | . 024 | . 155 | 8D | . 048 | . 310 | 15D | . 065 | . 419 |
| 2 H | . 0499 | . 322 | 9 H | . 0617 | . 398 | 16HW | . 345 | 2.23 |
| 2V | . 045 | . 290 | 9 V | . 292 | 1.88 | 16VW | . 815 | 5.26 |
| 2D | . 0244 | . 157 | 9D | . 048 | . 310 | 16DW | . 141 | . 910 |
| 3H | . 0499 | . 322 | 10 H | . 0617 | . 398 | 16 HN | . 095 | . 613 |
| 3V | . 082 | . 529 | 10 V | . 345 | 2.23 | 16VN | . 815 | 5.26 |
| 3D | . 0244 | . 157 | 10D | . 048 | . 310 | 16DN | . 046 | . 297 |
| 4 H | . 0499 | . 322 | 11H | . 069 | . 445 | 17HW | . 110 | . 710 |
| 4 V | . 082 | . 529 | 11V | . 400 | 2.58 | 17VW | . 815 | 5.26 |
| 4D | . 0244 | . 157 | 11D | . 048 | . 310 | 17DW | . 100 | . 645 |
| 5H | . 0499 | . 322 | 12 H | . 069 | . 445 | 17HN | . 056 | . 361 |
| 5V | . 142 | . 916 | 12 V | . 436 | 2.81 | 17VN | . 815 | 5.26 |
| 5D | . 032 | . 206 | 12D | . 048 | . 310 | 17DN | . 046 | . 297 |
| 6H | . 0499 | . 322 | 13H | . 069 | . 445 | 18HW | . 110 | . 710 |
| 6V | . 142 | . 916 | 13V | . 512 | 3.30 | 18VW | . 815 | 5.26 |
| 6D | . 032 | . 206 | 13D | . 065 | . 419 | 18DW | . 039 | . 252 |
| 7H | . 056 | . 361 | 14H | . 073 | . 471 | 18HN | . 056 | . 361 |
| 7V | . 19 | 1.23 | 14 V | . 571 | 3.68 | 18 VN | . 815 | 5.26 |
| 7D | . 032 | . 206 | 14D | . 065 | . 419 | 18DN | . 458 | 2.95 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 17B | . 014 | . 0903 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 18B | . 014 | . 0903 |

TABLE II.- NODAL COORDINATES OF UMBILICAL TOWER

| Node | X |  | y |  | $z$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | in. | cm | in. | cm | in. | cm |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90.0 | 228.6 |
| 2 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 90.0 | 228.6 |
| 3 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 90.0 | 228.6 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 90.0 | 228.6 |
| 5 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 90.0 | 228.6 |
| 6 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 90.0 | 228.6 |
| 7 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 90.0 | 228.6 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 90.0 | 228.6 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84.0 | 213.36 |
| 10 | 12.0 | 30,48 | 0 | 0 | 84.0 | 213.36 |
| 11 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 84.0 | 213.36 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 84.0 | 214.36 |
| 13 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 84.0 | 213.36 |
| 14 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 84.8 | 213.36 |
| 15 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 84.0 | 213.36 |
| 16 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 84.0 | 213.36 |
| 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78.0 | 198.12 |
| 18 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 78.0 | 198.12 |
| 19 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 78.0 | 198.12 |
| 20 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 78.0 | 198.12 |
| 21 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 78.0 | 198.12 |
| 22 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 78.0 | 198.12 |
| 23 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 78.0 | 198.12 |
| 24 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 78.0 | 198.12 |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72.0 | 182.88 |
| 26 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 72.0 | 182.88 |
| 27 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 72.0 | 182.88 |
| 28 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 72.0 | 182.88 |
| 29 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 72.0 | 182.88 |
| 30 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 72.0 | 182.88 |
| 31 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 72.0 | 182.88 |
| 32 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 72.0 | 182.88 |
| 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66.0 | 167.64 |
| 34 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 66.0 | 167.64 |
| 35 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 66.0 | 167.64 |
| 36 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 66.0 | 167.64 |
| 37 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 66.0 | 167.64 |
| 38 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 66.0 | 167.64 |
| 39 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 66.0 | 167.64 |
| 40 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 66.0 | 167.64 |
| 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60.0 | 152.40 |
| 42 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 60.0 | 152.40 . |
| 43 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 60.0 | 152.40 |
| 44 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 60.0 | 152.40 |
| 45 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 60.0 | 152.40 |
| 46 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 60.0 | 152.40 |
| 47 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 60.0 | 152.40 |
| 48 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 60.0 | 152.40 |
| 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54.0 | 137.16 |
| 50 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 54.0 | 137.16 |

TABLE II.- NODAL COORDINATES OF UMBILICAL TOWER - Continued

| Node | x |  | y |  | $z$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | in. | cm | in. | cm | in. | cm |
| 51 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 54.0 | 137.16 |
| 52 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 54.0 | 137.16 |
| 53 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 54.0 | 137.16 |
| 54 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 54.0 | 137.16 |
| 55 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 54.0 | 137.16 |
| 56 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 54.0 | 137.16 |
| 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48.0 | 121.92 |
| 58 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 48.0 | 121.92 |
| 59 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 48.0 | 121.92 |
| 60 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 48.0 | 121.92 |
| 61 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 48.0 | 121.92 |
| 62 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 48.0 | 121.92 |
| 63 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 48.0 | 121.92 |
| 64 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 48.0 | 121.92 |
| 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42:0 | 106.68 |
| 66 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 42.0 | 106.68 |
| 67 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 42.0 | 106.68 |
| 68 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 42.0 | 106.68 |
| 69 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 42.0 | 106.68 |
| 70 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 42.0 | 106.68 |
| 71 | 6:0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 42.0 | 106.68 |
| 72 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 42.0 | 106.68 |
| 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36.0 | 91.44 |
| 74 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 36.0 | 91.44 |
| 75 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 36.0 | 91.44 |
| 76 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 36.0 | 91.44 |
| 77 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 36.0 | 91.44 |
| 78 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 36.0 | 91.44 |
| 79 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 36.0 | 91.44 |
| 80 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 36.0 | 91.44 |
| 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30.0 | 76.20 |
| 82 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 30.0 | 76.20 |
| 83 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 30.0 | 76.20 |
| 84 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 30.0 | 76.20 |
| 85 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 30.0 | 76.20 |
| 86 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 30.0 | 76.20 |
| 87 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 30.0 | 76.20 |
| 88 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 30.0 | 76.20 |
| 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24.0 | 60.96 |
| 90 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 24.0 | 60.96 |
| 91 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 24.0 | 60.96 |
| 92 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 24.0 | 60.96 |
| 93 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 24.0 | 60.96 |
| 94 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 24.0 | 60.96 |
| 95 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 24.0 | 60.96 |
| 96 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 24.0 | 60.96 |
| 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18.0 | 45.72 |
| 98 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 18.0 | 45.72 |
| 99 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 18.0 | 45.72 |
| 100 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 18.0 | 45.72 |

TABLE II.- NODAL COORDINATES OF UMBILICAL TOWER - Concluded

| Node | x |  | y |  | $z$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | in. | cm | in. | cm | in. | cm |
| 101 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 18.0 | 45.72 |
| 102 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 18.0 | 45.72 |
| 103 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 18.0 | 45.72 |
| 104 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 18.0 | 45.72 |
| 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 |
| 106 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 |
| 107 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 |
| 108 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 |
| 109 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 |
| 110 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 |
| 111 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 |
| 112 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 |
| 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 |
| 114 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 |
| 115 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 |
| 116 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 |
| 117 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 |
| 118 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 6.0 | 15.24 |
| 119 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 |
| 120 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 6.0 | 15.24 |
| 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 122 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 123 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 |
| 124 | 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 |
| 125 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 |
| 126 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 127 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 0 | 0 |
| 128 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 12.0 | 30.48 | 0 | 0 |
| 129 | -. 812 | -2.06 | 14.687 | 37.30 | -5.304 | -13.47 |
| 130 | -. 812 | -2.06 | 6.0 | 15.24 | -5.304 | -13.47 |
| 131 | -. 812 | -2,06 | -2.687 | -6.825 | -5.304 | -13.47 |
| 132 | 6.0 | 15.24 | -2.687 | -6.825 | -5.304 | -13.47 |
| 133 | 12.812 | 32.54 | -2.687 | -6.825 | -5.304 | -13.47 |
| 134 | 12.812 | 32.54 | 6.0 | 15.24 | -5.304 | -13.47 |
| 135 | 12.812 | 32.54 | 14.687 | 37.30 | -5.304 | -13.47 |
| 136 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 14.687 | 37.30 | -5.304 | -13.47 |
| 137 | . 562 | 1.43 | 12.406 | 31.51 | -9.088 | -23.08 |
| 138 | . 562 | 1.43 | -. 406 | -1.03 | -9.088 | -23.08 |
| 139 | 13.374 | 33.97 | -. 406 | -1.03 | -9.088 | -23.08 |
| 140 | 13.374 | 33.97 | 12.406 | 31.51 | -9.088 | -23.08 |
| 141 | -1.937 | -4.920 | 18.812 | 47.782 | -12.873 | -32.697 |
| 142 | -12.873 | -32.697 | 6.0 | 15.24 | -12.873 | -32.697 |
| 143 | -1.937 | -4.920 | -6.812 | -17.302 | -12.873 | -32.697 |
| 144 | 6.0 | 15.24 | -6.812 | -17.302 | -12.873 | -32.697 |
| 145 | 13.937 | 35.400 | -6.812 | -17.302 | -12.873 | -32.697 |
| 146 | 13.937 | 35.400 | 6.0 | 15.24 | -12.873 | -32.697 |
| 147 | 13.937 | 35.400 | 18.812 | 47.782 | -12.873 | -32.697 |
| 148 | 6.0 | 15.24 | 18.812 | 47.782 | -12.873 | -32.697 |
| 149 | -2.468 | -6.269 | 14.812 | 37.622 | -17.072 | -43.363 |
| 150 | -2.468 | -6.269 | -2.812 | -7.142 | -17.072 | -43.363 |
| 151 | 14.468 | 36.749 | -2.812 | -7.142 | -17.072 | -43.363 |
| 152 | 14.468 | 36.749 | 14.812 | 37.622 | -17.072 | -43.363 |
| 153 | -3.0 | -7.62 | 23.625 | 60.007 | -21.271 | -54.028 |
| 154 | -3.0 | -7.62 | -11.625 | -29.528 | -21.271 | -54.028 |
| 155 | 15.0 | 38.10 | -11.625 | -29.528 | -21.271 | -54.028 |
| 156 | 15.0 | 38.10 | 23.625 | 60.007 | -21.271 | -54.028 |

TABLE III.- LAUNCH-PLATFORM-SECTION PROPERTIES


Local coordinate system for element

| Element <br> no. | $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{X}}$ |  | $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{Y}}$ |  | $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{Z}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{in}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ | in 4 | $\mathrm{~cm}^{4}$ | $\mathrm{in}^{4}$ | $\mathrm{~cm}^{4}$ |
| 1 | 1.508 | 9.729 | 11.19 | 465.763 | 0.045 | 1.873 |
| 2 | 1.508 | 9.729 | 11.19 | 465.763 | .045 | 1.873 |
| 3 | .720 | 4.65 | 3.08 | 128.199 | .022 | .916 |
| 4 | 1.373 | 8.858 | 10.04 | 417.896 | .082 | 3.413 |
| 5 | .720 | 4.65 | 3.08 | 128.199 | .022 | .916 |
| 6 | 1.05 | 6.774 | 7.28 | 303.02 | .047 | 1.956 |
| 7 | 1.05 | 6.774 | 7.28 | 303.02 | .047 | 1.956 |
| 8 | 1.05 | 6.774 | 7.28 | 303.02 | .047 | 1.956 |
| 9 | .062 | .400 | 1.76 | 73.257 | .003 | .125 |
| 10 | 1.05 | 6.774 | 7.28 | 303.02 | .047 | 1.956 |
| 11 | .062 | .400 | 1.76 | 73.257 | .003 | .125 |
| 12 | 1.05 | 6.774 | 7.28 | 303.02 | .047 | 1.956 |
| 13 | 1.373 | 8.858 | 10.04 | 417.896 | .082 | 3.413 |
| 14 | .947 | 6.11 | 7.67 | 319.250 | .101 | 4.204 |
| 15 | 1.200 | 7.74 | 6.36 | 264.723 | .041 | 1.707 |
| 16 | 1.808 | 11.664 | 6.44 | 268.053 | .114 | 4.745 |
| 17 | 1.808 | 11.664 | 6.44 | 268.053 | .114 | 4.745 |
| 18 | .830 | 5.353 | 6.00 | 249.739 | .143 | 5.952 |
| 19 | 1.068 | 6.889 | 5.51 | 229.344 | .129 | 5.37 |
| 20 | 1.2 | 7.74 | 6.36 | 264.723 | .041 | 1.707 |

TABLE III.- LAUNCH-PLAT FORM-SECTION PROPERTIES - Concluded

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Element } \\ & \text { no. } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{A_{X}}$ |  | $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{Y}}$ |  | $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{Z}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{in}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ | in 4 | $\mathrm{cm}^{4}$ | in ${ }^{4}$ | $\mathrm{cm}^{4}$ |
| 21 | 0.975 | 6.290 | 6.58 | 273.880 | 0.057 | 2.373 |
| 22 | . 890 | 5.303 | 6.44 | 268.053 | . 117 | 4.870 |
| 23 | . 890 | 5.303 | 6.44 | 268.053 | . 117 | 4.870 |
| 24 | 1.222 | 7.882 | 8.98 | 373.568 | . 065 | 2.704 |
| 25 | 1.296 | 8.359 | 10.43 | 433.888 | . 122 | 5.075 |
| 26 | . 975 | 6.289 | 6.58 | 273.880 | . 057 | 2.371 |
| 27 | 1.508 | 9.729 | 11.19 | 465.663 | . 045 | 1.873 |
| 28 | 1.508 | 9.729 | 11.19 | 465.663 | . 045 | 1.873 |
| 29 | . 720 | 4.65 | 3.08 | 128.199 | . 022 | . 916 |
| 30 | 1.373 | 8.858 | 10.04 | 417.896 | . 082 | 3.413 |
| 31 | . 720 | 4.65 | 3.08 | 128.199 | . 022 | . 916 |
| 32 | 1.05 | 6.774 | 7.28 | 303.02 | . 047 | 1.956 |
| 33 | 1.05 | 6.774 | 7.28 | 303.02 | . 047 | 1.956 |
| 34 | 1.05 | 6.774 | 7.28 | 303.02 | . 047 | 1.956 |
| 35 | 1.05 | 6.774 | 7.28 | 303.02 | . 047 | 1.956 |
| 36 | 1.373 | 8.858 | 10.04 | 417.896 | . 082 | 3.413 |
| 37 | . 947 | 6.108 | 7.67 | 319.250 | . 101 | 4.204 |
| 38 | 1.808 | 11.664 | 6.44 | 268.053 | . 114 | 4.745 |
| 39 | 1.808 | 11.664 | 6.44 | 268.053 | . 114 | 4.745 |
| 40 | . 83 | 5.354 | 6.00 | 249.739 | . 143 | 5.952 |
| 41 | 1.068 | 6.889 | 5.51 | 229.344 | . 129 | 5.37 |
| 42 | 1.2 | 7.74 | 6.36 | 264.723 | . 049 | 2.038 |
| 43 | . 975 | 6.289 | 6.58 | 273.880 | . 057 | 2.371 |
| 44 | . 890 | 5.303 | 6.44 | 268.053 | . 117 | 4.870 |
| 45 | . 890 | 5.303 | 6.44 | 268.053 | . 117 | 4.870 |
| 46 | 1.296 | 8.359 | 10.43 | 433.888 | . 122 | 5.075 |
| 47 | . 994 | 6.441 | . 078 | 3.244 | . 078 | 3.244 |
| 48 | . 994 | 6.441 | . 078 | 3.244 | . 078 | 3.244 |
| 49 | . 307 | 1.980 | . 007 | . 291 | . 007 | . 291 |
| 50 | . 994 | 6.441 | . 078 | 3.244 | . 078 | 3.244 |
| 51 | . 994 | 6.441 | . 078 | 3.244 | . 078 | 3.244 |
| 52 | . 307 | 1.980 | . 007 | . 291 | . 007 | . 291 |
| 53 | . 307 | 1.980 | . 007 | . 291 | . 007 | . 291 |
| 54 | . 307 | 1.980 | . 007 | . 291 | . 007 | . 291 |
| 55 | . 994 | 6.441 | . 078 | 3.244 | . 078 | 3.244 |
| 56 | . 994 | 6.441 | . 078 | 3.244 | . 078 | 3.244 |
| 57 | . 307 | 1.980 | . 007 | . 291 | . 007 | . 291 |
| 58 | . 975 | 6.289 | 6.58 | 273.890 | . 057 | 2.373 |

TABLE IV.- NODAL COORDINATES OF LAUNCH PLATFORM

| Node | X |  | Y |  | Z |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | in. | cm | in. | cm | in. | cm |
| 1 | 40.2 | 102 | -7.2 | -18.3 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 40.2 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 33.0 | 83.8 | -7.2 | -18.3 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 33.0 | 83.8 | 7.2 | 18.3 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 40.2 | 102 | -13.4 | -34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 47.4 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 40.2 | 102 | 7.2 | 18.3 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 47.4 | 120 | 13.4 | 34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 25.8 | 65.5 | 7.2 | 18.3 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 33.0 | 83.8 | -13.4 | -34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 25.8 | 65.5 | -7.2 | -18.3 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 33.4 | 83.8 | 13.4 | 34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 40.2 | 102 | 13.4 | 34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 47.4 | 120 | -13.4 | -34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 25.8 | 65.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 47.4 | 120 | 19.95 | 50.7 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 25.8 | 65.5 | 13.4 | 34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 25.8 | 65.5 | -13.4 | -34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | 47.4 | 120 | 19.95 | 50.7 | 8.375 | 21.27 |
| 20 | 47.4 | 120 | -25.2 | -64.0 | 8.375 | 21.27 |
| 21 | 18 | 45.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | 47.4 | 120 | -19.95 | -50.7 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | 47.4 | 120 | -19.95 | -50.7 | 8.375 | 21.27 |
| 24 | 18 | 45.7 | 19.95 | 50.7 | 0 | 0 |
| 25 | 18 | 45.7 | 13.4 | 34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | 18 | 45.7 | -13.4 | -34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27 | 18 | 45.7 | 19.95 | 50.7 | 8.375 | 21.27 |
| 28 | 12 | 30.5 | -13.4 | -34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29 | 9.13 | 23.2 | 19.95 | 50.7 | 8.375 | 21.27 |
| 30 | 18 | 45.7 | -19.95 | -50.7 | 0 | 0 |
| 31 | 12 | 30.5 | 13.4 | 34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 32 | 0 | 0 | 19.95 | 50.7 | 0 | 0 |
| 33 | 6 | 15.24 | 13.4 | 34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 34 | 18 | 45.7 | -25.2 | -64.0 | 8.375 | 21.27 |
| 35 | 9.13 | 23.2 | -19.95 | -50.7 | 8.375 | 21.27 |
| 36 | 6 | 15.24 | -13.4 | -34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37 | 0 | 0 | -19.95 | -50.7 | 0 | 0 |
| 38 | 0 | 0 | 13.4 | 34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39 | 0 | 0 | -13.4 | -34.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40 | 0 | 0 | -19.95 | -50.7 | 8.375 | 21.27 |
| 41 | 0 | 0 | -25.2 | -64.0 | 8.375 | 21.27 |
| 42 | 18 | 45.7 | -19.95 | -50.7 | 8.375 | 21.27 |
| 43 | 0 | 0 | 19.95 | 50.7 | 8.375 | 21.27 |

TABLE V.- REDUCED STIFFNESS MATRIX FOR 1/40-SCALE SATURN V LAUNCH VEHICLE
[Each number is followed by the letter $\mathbf{E}$ (for exponent), a minus symbol or a blank space

TABLE V.- REDUCED STIFFNESS MATRIX FOR 1/40-SCALE SATURN V LAUNCH VEHICLE - Continued





TABLE V.- REDUCED STIFFNESS MATRIX FOR 1/40-SCALE SATURN V LAUNCH VEHICLE





TABLE VI.- MASS ASSIGNED TO NODES OF UMBILICAL TOWER

| Node | Nodal mass |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
|  | lbf-sec $2 / \mathrm{in}$. | kg |
| $1,2,3,4$ | 0.01057 | 1.85109 |
| $9,10,11,12$ | .00097 | .16987 |
| $17,18,19,20$ | .003975 | .69613 |
| $25,26,27,28$ | .001095 | .19176 |
| $33,34,35,36$ | .001265 | .22154 |
| $41,42,43,44$ | .009875 | 1.72938 |
| $49,50,51,52$ | .001585 | .27758 |
| $57,58,59,60$ | .001895 | .33187 |
| $65,66,67,68$ | .001893 | .33152 |
| $73,74,75,76$ | .002485 | .43519 |
| $81,82,83,84$ | .002780 | .48685 |
| $89,90,91,92$ | .02830 | 4.95609 |
| $97,98,99,100$ | .003355 | .58755 |
| $105,106,107,108$ | .003750 | .65673 |
| $113,114,115,116$ | .01320 | 2.31167 |
| $121,122,123,124$ | .00695 | 1.21713 |
| $129,131,133,135$ | .02090 | 3.66015 |
| $141,143,145,147$ | .0084 | 1.47107 |
| $153,154,155,156$ | .003155 | .55253 |

TABLE VII.- MASS ASSIGNED TO NODES OF LAUNCH PLAT FORM

| Node | Nodal mass |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{lbf}-\mathrm{sec}^{2} / \mathrm{in}$. | kg |
| 1 | 0.01213 | 2.12429 |
| 2 | . 01734 | 3.03670 |
| 3 | . 01374 | 2.40624 |
| 4 | . 01373 | 2.40449 |
| 5 | . 01889 | 3.30815 |
| 6 | . 03501 | 6.13119 |
| 7 | . 01213 | 2.12429 |
| 8 | . 03030 | 5.30634 |
| 9 | . 01988 | 3.48152 |
| 10 | . 02750 | 4.81599 |
| 11 | . 02001 | 3.50429 |
| 12 | . 02400 | 4.20304 |
| 13 | . 01989 | 3.48327 |
| 14 | . 02930 | 5.13122 |
| 15 | . 04418 | 7.73710 |
| 16 | . 02292 | 4.01391 |
| 17 | . 02563 | 4.48850 |
| 18 | . 02926 | 5.12421 |
| 19 | . 00305 | . 53414 |
| 20 | . 00225 | . 39404 |
| 21 | . 05104 | 8.93848 |
| 22 | . 02518 | 4.40969 |
| 23 | . 00305 | . 53414 |
| 24 | . 05336 | 9.34477 |
| 25 | . 02638 | 4.61985 |
| 26 | . 02628 | 4.60233 |
| 27 | . 00305 | . 53414 |
| 28 | . 03844 | 6.73188 |
| 29 | . 02272 | 3.97888 |
| 30 | . 03518 | 6.16096 |
| 31 | . 03305 | 5.78794 |
| 32 | . 01575 | 2.75825 |
| 33 | . 04044 | 7.08213 |
| 34 | . 00225 | . 39404 |
| 35 | . 00225 | . 39404 |
| 36 | . 03844 | 6.73188 |
| 37 | . 01788 | 3.13127 |
| 38 | . 02645 | 4.63210 |
| 39 | . 02645 | 4.63210 |
| 40 | . 00305 | . 53414 |
| 41 | . 00213 | . 37302 |
| 42 | . 00305 | . 53414 |
| 43 | . 00305 | . 53414 |

TABLE VIII.- MASS ASSIGNED TO NODES OF SATURN V MODEL

| Node | Nodal mass |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | lbf-sec $2 / \mathrm{in}$. | kg |
| 1 | 0.000482 | 0.084411 |
| 2 | .002419 | .423632 |
| 3 | .051489 | 9.017106 |
| 4 | .051036 | 8.937773 |
| 5 | .014549 | 2.547920 |
| 6 | .00008 | .014010 |
| 7 | .000161 | .028195 |
| 8 | .000161 | .028195 |
| 9 | .000161 | .028195 |
| 10 | .000161 | .028195 |
| 11 | .000743 | .130119 |
| 12 | .002803 | .490881 |
| 13 | .004451 | .779490 |
| 14 | .002938 | .514523 |
| 15 | .003264 | .571614 |
| 16 | .005614 | .983162 |
| 17 | .035469 | 6.211574 |
| 18 | .010611 | 1.858271 |
| 19 | .03544 | 6.206495 |
| 20 | .096603 | 16.917778 |
| 21 | .127199 | 22.275959 |
| 22 | .1947 | 34.097196 |
| 23 | .026832 | 4.699003 |
| 24 | .142015 | 24.870638 |
| 25 | .009165 | 1.605037 |

table ix.- Frequencies for various configurations
[Experimental frequencies are obtained from refs. 6 and 7]

| Mode | Vehicle alone |  |  | Tower alone, x-direction |  |  | Tower alone, y -direction |  |  | Tower mounted on platform <br> No vehicle |  |  | Tower and vehicle mounted on platiorm |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Vehicle with spring restraint | Vehicle cantilevered to plot form |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Hz}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{e}}$, Hz | Difference, percent (a) |  |  |  | $\mathrm{f}_{2} \mathrm{~Hz}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{e}}, \mathrm{Hz}$ | Difference percent (a) | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Hz}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{e}}, \mathrm{Hz}$ | Difference, percent (a) | $\mathrm{f}_{2} \mathrm{~Hz}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{e}}$, Hz | Difference, percent (a) | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{Hz}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{e}}, \mathrm{Hz}$ | Difference, percent (a) | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{a}}, \mathrm{Hz}$ | Difference, percent (a) |
| 1st vehicle bending | 10.52 | 10.9 | -3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.75 | 9.5 | +2.6 | 11.61 | +22.0 |
| 1st vehicle bending and slosh | 13.18 | 12.9 | +2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.0 | 12.9 | $+0.77$ | 13.95 | +8.1 |
| 1st tower |  |  |  | 32.37 | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{b}_{28.2} \\ \mathrm{~b}_{29.8} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ---------- | 26.11 | $\begin{aligned} & b_{28.2} \\ & b_{29,8} \end{aligned}$ | -..------- | 32.29 | b27.5 | ---------- | 32.29 | ${ }^{\text {b } 28.4}$ | ----- | 32.29 | -- |
| 2 d vehicle bending | 36.13 | 34.7 | +4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.15 | 34.9 | +0.72 | 38.38 | +10.0 |
| 3d vehicle bending | 68.54 | 63.2 | +8.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67.27 | 61.9 | +8.4 | 70.56 | +14.0 |
| Coupled 3d vehicle bending and 2 d tower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 75.43 | 68.1 | +11.0 | 75.51 | +11.0 |
| 2d tower |  |  |  | 76.59 | 77.1 | -0.66 | 93.67 | 95.0 | -1.4 | 75.4 | 67.48 | +12.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th vehicle bending | 114.7 | 95.7 | +20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 113.4 | 98.1 | +16.0 | 115.4 | +17.0 |
| Coupled 5th vehicle bending and 3d tower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 130.7 | 111.9 | +17.0 | 130.7 | +17.0 |
| 5 th vehicle bending | 138.8 | 127.0 | +8.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3d tower |  |  |  | 133.5 | 139.1 | -3.6 | 180.9 | 173.8 | $+4.0$ | 131.2 | 142.7 | -8.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th tower |  |  |  | 202.4 | 214.0 | -5.4 | 249.2 | 227.1 | +9.7 | 205.5 | 215.1 | -4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5th tower |  |  |  | 275.5 | 269.0 | +2.4 | 279.2 | 273.3 | +2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$$
a_{\text {Percent difference }}=\frac{f_{\mathrm{a}}-f_{e}}{f_{e}} \times 100 .
$$

${ }^{b_{S i g n i f i c a n t ~ o u t-o f-p l a n e ~ m o t i o n ~ o b s e r v e d ~ e x p e r i m e n t a l l y . ~}^{\text {a }} \text {. }}$


Figure 1.- $1 / 40$-scale dynamic model of the Apollo-Saturn $V$ - umbilical tower configuration. L-64-8911.1


Figure 2.- Idealization of umbilical tower.

Figure 3.- Launch-platform construction.


Figure 4.- Ideatization of kunch platarm.


Figure 5.- Schematic and idealization of Apollo-Saturn V launch vehicle.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \bar{s}_{1}=U_{i}(i=25,26, \ldots 72) \\
& \bar{s}_{2}=v_{i}(i=73,74, \ldots 78) \\
& \bar{s}_{3}=\text { Defined on figure } \\
& \bar{s}_{4}=W_{i}(i=79,80, \ldots 108) \\
& \bar{s}_{5}=\phi_{109} \\
& \bar{s}_{6}=\phi_{110} \\
& \bar{s}_{7}=U_{i}(i=1,2, \ldots 24)
\end{align*}
$$



Figure 6.- Idealization of complete Apollo-Saturn V-umbilical-tower configuration.


(c) Third mode; $f_{a}=133.5 \mathrm{~Hz} ; f_{e}=139.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$.

Figure 7.- Natural modes of $1 / 40-$ scale Saturn $V$ umbilical tower fixed to rigid foundation.

(a) First mode; $f_{a}=32.29 \mathrm{~Hz} ; f_{e}=27.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$.
(b) Second mode; $f_{a}=75.40 \mathrm{~Hz} ; f_{e}=67.48 \mathrm{~Hz}$.


Figure 8.- Natural modes at $1 / 40$-scale Saturn $V$ umbilical tower mounted on the launch platform.

(a) First mode; $f_{a}=10.52 \mathrm{~Hz} ; f_{e}=10.9 \mathrm{~Hz} . \quad$ (b) Second mode; $f_{a}=36.13 \mathrm{~Hz} ; f_{e}=34.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$.


Figure 9.- Natural modes of $1 / 40$-scale Apollo-Saturn $V$ launch vehicle fixed to a rigid foundation.

(a) First mode; $f_{a}=9.75 \mathrm{~Hz} ; f_{e}=9.50 \mathrm{~Hz}$.

(b) Second mode; $f_{a}=13.0 \mathrm{~Hz} ; f_{e}=12.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$.

Figure 10.- Natural modes of $1 / 40$-scale Apollo Saturn $V$ vehicle-umbilical tower configuration. First stage, 85 percent full; all other stages, 100 percent full.

(c) Third mode; $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{a}}=32.29 \mathrm{~Hz} ; \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{e}}=28.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$.

(d) Fourth mode; $f_{a}=35.15 \mathrm{~Hz} ; f_{e}=34.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$.

Figure 10.- Continued.

(e) Fifth mode; $f_{\mathrm{a}}=67.27 \mathrm{~Hz} ; \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{e}}=61.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$.

(f) Sixth mode; $f_{a}=75.43 \mathrm{~Hz} ; f_{e}=68.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$.

Figure 10.- Continued.

(g) Seventh mode; $f_{a}=113.4 \mathrm{~Hz} ; f_{e}=98.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$.

(h) Eighth mode; $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{a}}=130.7 \mathrm{~Hz} ; \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{e}}=114.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$.

Figure 10.- Concluded.
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