<u>Replacement Human Occupied Vehicle</u> <u>Project Summary</u>

9-10 June 2008 Woods Hole, MA





RHOV Technical Status





Sphere Fabrication



Sphere Status

- Ladish successfully formed both hemisphere disks
- Hemi forgings will proceed in parallel vs series
- Sphere insert forging process has begun
- Stadco preparing to build welding/machining fixture
- EB preliminary weld procedure has been successfully tested, and scheduled for ABS approval in June
- No delays expected with GTAW and Stud weld procedures
- Reviewing Buckling Analysis
- Sphere completion scheduled for mid-July 2010

Workflow Diagram

Risks – Personnel Sphere

130" Disc Forming

- Buckling of billet
- Over thinning of disc during paddling

Hemisphere Forming

Over thinning of hemisphere dome

• Electron Beam (EB) Welding

Girth weld is thicker longer duration than normal

Post Weld Stress Relief

Possible deformity of sphere resulting in de-rating

Personnel Sphere Fabrication Schedule

Forge Disks into Hemispheres	6/19/08
ABS/SwRI Inspection of Hemispheres	7/08
Heat Treat Hemispheres (Bodycote)	8/08
Rough machine Hemispheres	9/08-10/08
Hemisphere Vacuum Anneal (Bodycote)	12/08
Hemisphere machining	12/08-3/09
Hemisphere Girth weld	3/09
Insert Welding	4/09-10/09
Post Weld Stress Relief	12/09
Final Assembly	3/10
Hydro Test	6/10
Sphere Complete	7/10

Video RHOV Personnel Sphere Forging Update May 2008

RHOV Vehicle Design Update

RHOC June 2008

Project Status

RHOV Design Effort

Scope scaled back to include only systems that overlapped with *Alvin* upgrade concept development.

- Key Vendor Visits
 - Penetrator
 - Foam
 - Battery
- Battery Risk Assessment
 - NSWC Technology Investigation
 - Shinkai Evaluation
 - 1 Atmosphere Approach
- I/O Architecture Design
- Hydrodynamic Modeling

Penetrators

Teledyne D.G. O'Brien Seabrook, NH

- Fiber and copper penetrator development considered low risk
- RHOV double bulkhead penetrator design similar to Alvin
- No ABS experience but several MIL-STD-24217 compliant designs
- In-house pressure testing facility rated to 20,000 psi (14,235 psi required for RHOV)

Testing and Qualification procedure development should begin immediately to reduce risk

Trelleborg Emerson and Cummings, Inc. Mansfield, MA

Foam production in Mansfield, MA, facility Micro-balloon production in Randolph, MA, facility

- RHOV design based on DS-33 foam
- DS-33 requires modified test procedure for use on RHOV
- 580 cubic feet required to yield the necessary 300 cubic feet
- 18 month lead time

Testing and Qualification procedure development should begin immediately to reduce risk

Battery

Lithion Inc. (Yardney Technical Products Inc.) Pawcatuck, CT

Yardney believes they can meet Pressure Balanced Oil Filled (PBOF) battery specification using 55 Ah cell with steel bellows based on the following experience:

- Several high reliability applications:
 - Orion Crew Exploration Vehicle
 - Advanced Seal Delivery System
 - Mars Lander
- Have Lithium battery cells in service with 38,000 cycles (40% depth of discharge)
- Developed Sea Cliff Silver Zinc PBOF battery

However:

- No pressure balanced oil filled Lithium applications
- No ABS experience

Testing and Qualification procedure development should begin immediately to reduce risk

John Inman, NSWC Subject Matter Expert (SME), believes that a SAFE Pressure Balanced Oil Filled Lithium Chemistry battery can and will be developed using current technology.

Li Cell Vendors:

- Yardney
- Eagle Picher Kokam
- International Battery

Development:

- Battery monitoring system
- Cell construction and chemistry
- Capacity vs. age
- Storage

Testing:

- Develop test requirements with vendor
- Overcharging testing
- Propagation testing
- Testing and Analysis must lead to a mitigation plan

RHOC

June 2008

NSWC is willing to collaborate with WHOI and cell manufacturer in the development of purchase and test specifications

NSWC has solicited a quotation for Design Feasibility and prototype demonstration of PBOF Li cells to include:

- Cell Gassing Volumetric Analysis
- Compensation Method development
- Five prototype cells for testing
- Test Plan development
- WHOI assisted cell testing

Shinkai PBOF Li Battery

- JAMSTEC switched Shinkai 6500 battery from Silver Zinc (AgZn) to a GS Yuasa-developed Lithium Cobalt Oxide (LiCoO2) battery in 2004 because of performance, cost, and maintenance issues
- The Shinkai 6500 battery does not meet RHOV requirements:
 - Voltage: 108VDC vs. 240VDC required
 - Charge/Discharge Cycles: 180 vs. 2000
 - Energy: 43.2KwHr vs. 84KwHr
- Yuasa was solicited for RHOV battery quote; their quote was highest and double the next lowest competitor's
- Extensive NRE costs for new cell qualification, 240 volt configuration, sense electronics development, etc.
- Lessons learned on the design and implementation for the *Shinkai 6500* can be used to improve performance on the RHOV

Battery Pressure Housing

A Quick Study conducted on 1 atmosphere battery housings concluded that the option is viable for 4500 meter vehicle, but may present weight problems if designed for 6500 meter depth

Reviewed critical system designs applicable to both the RHOV and upgraded *Alvin* vehicle.

- Telemetry System
- Power Switching
- Computer Architecture
- Video System
- High Voltage Selection

WHOI and LM Lead Engineers agreed on way forward

Focus on safety, reliability and maintainability

Hydrodynamic Analysis

LM completed work on a High Fidelity RHOV model and determined the static drag coefficients for 3 axes

Hydrodynamic analysis required to determine buoyancy, thrust and horsepower requirements:

- Refined analysis method
- Verified RHOV initial analysis
- Confirmed an optimized RHOV shape

Case 1: Static: Forward @ 2.5 kts±10° Yaw Static Drag ~ 485.5 lbs Case 2: Static: Ascent @ 44 m/min, ±10° Roll Static Drag ~ 530 lbs Case 3: Static: Descent @ 44 m/min, ±10° Roll Static Drag ~ 495 lbs

Model	Direction	Drag (Ibs)	Margin Included	Comment
RHOV-14	FWD	780	20%	LM – PDR Analysis
RHOV-14	Ascent	758	17.8%	LM – PDR Analysis
RHOV-14	Descent	732	17.8%	LM – PDR Analysis
RHOV-18	FWD	449.4	0% *	LM – Updated Analysis
RHOV-18	FWD	485.5	0% *	CD-adapco Analysis
RHOV-18	Ascent	530	0% *	CD-adapco Analysis
RHOV-18	Descent	495	0% *	CD-adapco Analysis
* - Updated margin values have not been determined				

- Drag for models determined at arbitrary velocity
- Results improved for RHOV-18 design

Alvin Upgrade Option

Develop concept for *Alvin* Upgrade using the titanium personnel sphere now in production

- Satisfy as many target RHOV design goals as possible
- Keep RHOV improvements
- Leverage RHOV design efforts
- Reduce project costs
- Allow for phased upgrade to full 6500m vehicle over time

Design Goals for RHOV from NRC Study

Design Goals

- Increased bottom time
- Increased battery capacity
- Improved fields of view
- Improved interior ergonomics
- Improved interior electronics
- Automatic position keeping
- Reduced seabed disturbance
- Increased science payload
- Increased operating depth

Further information: www.unols.org/committees/dessc/replacement_HOV/replacement_hov.html

Alvin Upgrade Capabilities vs. RHOV Goals

RHOV Goals Accomplished:

- ✓ Increased on-bottom time
- ✓ Increased battery capacity
- Larger personnel sphere; more interior space and improved ergonomics
- ✓ Improved field of view for pilots and observers
- ✓ Improved interior electronics
- ✓ Automated position keeping
- ✓ Sampling basket load limits significantly increased
- ✓ Improved lighting and video systems
- Increased hydraulic plant capacity (improved manipulator performance)
- ✓ Increased thruster horsepower (better maneuverability)
- ✓ Improved mid-water research capability

RHOV Goals Not Accomplished:

- X Increased operating depth to 6500m
- X Reduced seabed disturbance (will continue to rely on drop weights for ascent/decent)
- X Multi-purpose, large capacity seawater ballast system (for trim, variable ballast, ascent/descent)
- X Elimination of mercury trim system

Enhancements still feasible with upgraded Alvin:

- ✓ Could upgrade later to operating depth to 6500m
- Could upgrade later with enhanced 3-D HiDef imaging system; microfiber cable for high bandwidth, two-way comms to surface

RHOC

June 2008

Project Evolution

- Concept Development
- General Arrangement
- Weight and Trim
- Hydrodynamic Analysis
- Structural Analysis

Concept Development

- Revised System Operations Requirements
- Revised Vehicle Design Fabrication Specification
- Made Assumptions
- Developed Task List
- Assigned Responsibilities

General Arrangement

- Generate complete model of *Alvin* frame
- Fuse RHOV frame to *Alvin* frame
- Model reusable *Alvin* components
- Generate new component concept models
- Identify RHOV components

Hydrodynamic Shape

Color codes:

RHOV Green New Yellow

Alvin Grays

Alvin Recyclables

- Frame (Partial)
- Foam (50%)
- Thrusters
- VB pump, valves, and hydraulics
- High Pressure Air system
- Hydraulic Power Unit
- Motor Controller Cans (2)
- Aft Skins
- Aft Main Ballast Tank

Frame Modifications

Starboard Side

Cross Section

Exploded View

240V LiCoO ₂ Launch		
Hook LCG	81.00"	
Hook Wt (L)	37313 #	
Hook Angle (L)	+6.48%+3.74°	
Descent WW	-551 #	
Trim w/o Payload	+29.57%-18.80%	

240V LiCoO ₂ Recovery		
Trim w/ Payload	+9.48%-33.95°	
Ascent WW	+433 #	
Hook Wt (R)	36313 #	
Hook Angle (R)	+5.94%+3.09°	

- Vehicle air weight 38,000 pounds
- Worst case trim range of +9/-18 degrees

Structural Analysis

	ALVIN	ALVIN Upgrade
Max Depth	4,500M	4,500M
Hook Weight	36,000 lbs	37,313 lbs
Ascent/Descent Method (2500M)	Steel Drop Weights	Steel Drop Weights
Descent Time (2500M)	1.5 hrs	1.3 hrs
Ascent Time (2500M)	1.5 hrs	1.2 hrs
Bottom Time (2500M)	5-6 hrs	7-8 hrs
Pitch Trim System	Mercury	Mercury
Pitch Trim Angle	+11/-15 deg	+9.5/-19.0 deg

	ALVIN	ALVIN Upgrade
Energy Source	Lead Acid Battery	Lithium Battery
Battery Weight	5,300 lbs	3,100 lbs
Total Useable Energy	57.6 kWHr	84kWHr
Main Bus Voltage	120 VDC	240 VDC
Science Payload (Internal plus External)	400 lbs at release	400 lbs
Science Hydraulic Circuits	6 functions	6 functions
Science Power Available	1000 Watts (12 & 26 volts)	800 Watts Interior 1,000 Watts Exterior

Overall Vehicle Dimensions

Alvin

Technical Risks

New Risks

- NSF Approval to Re-scope project
- ABS Certification Issues
 - Frame
 - Pressure Vessels
- Schedule Delays
- Management/Engineering Resources

Avoided Risks

- Foam
- Variable Ballast System
- A-Frame Capacity Issues

