


The History of Venting (Part I)

Stephen C. Leiter

Project Safety Manager Code 360

NASA GSFC

July 19, 2017




(Improved) Abstract

Venting techniques and design are an important implementation strategy for observatory and payload contamination control, and yet venting analysis has seen a topsy turvey history, at least from the perspective of the simple Layman trying to design a black box.


Additionally, designing the vent has competing controls from Safety and EMI/EMC. In the days of Shuttle, Safety placed liens against the vents of blankets, boxes, and large structural items principally to protect cargo bay vents but also from a flammability perspective.

What continues to elude the Designer Community is a stable, simple way of designing vents for black boxes that satisfies everybody. But we continue to try.




Overview of Year-Events

- **1983 – TM-85016 published (CC for telescopes in cargo bay)**
- **1983 – Venting of Space Shuttle Payloads TP**
- **1986 – GEVS-SE Revision Dash published**
- **1991 – Hubble SIC&DH (etc.) box-level Venting Specification produced**
- **1993 – Safety (ISRP) gets tagged with Venting Duty**
- **1996 – Spacecraft Compartment Venting TP**
- **1997 – Hubble Servicing Mission -2 is flown**
- **2011 – JSC ISRP inserts MEVR requirements in standard hazard reports**
- **2015 – Bail-out tactics when you forgot to put vent holes**
- **2017 – ISRP retracts from MEVR & replaces with no-vent FSu**




1983

- **1983 – TM-85016 published (CC for telescopes in cargo bay)**
 - **“Abatement of Gaseous and Particulate Contamination in a Space Instrument Application to a Solar Telescope” by John J. Scialdone
April 1983**
 - Highly detailed paper (9 pages) with Keywords: gaseous purging, internal gas dynamics, gas diffusion, Shuttle environment, rarefied gas dynamics
 - I infer that OSL (Orbiting Solar Laboratory) was the primary sponsor for this paper. OSL became a Delta Launch (not a Shuttle launch) at the finished-proposal level, many years later
 - Paper quantitatively shows the benefits of having K-bottle purge plumbed into a telescope wherein the k-bottle is “Airborne Support Equipment”
 - Paper might have also had sponsorship from Starlab and/or the ASTRO mission (BBXRT, IUT, HUT) on a Spacelab Pallet via IPS (Instrument Pointing Subsystem)
 - BBXRT had a dewar and a dewar pumping system plumbed onto it’s side (flew)
- **1983 – Venting of Space Shuttle Payloads Technical Paper**
 - Very practical and useful 2 pages description of test-venting an enclosure as the external pressure is dropping off to mimic Shuttle bay venting (AIAA paper 83-2600 and A84-10936)




1986 - 1991

- **1986 – GEVS-SE Revision ‘Dash’ published**
 - GEVS-**SE** is General Envi. Verification Specification – **S**huttle and **ELV**
 - Does anybody have a copy of revision dash from about 1986 ?
 - Clearly it published that 0.25 square-inch vent per cubic foot of otherwise sealed volume will be deemed **No-Test**
 - The requirement seems to have made good use of the “Venting of Space Shuttle Payloads” Technical Paper and deemed that a few seconds of 0.5 psi differential pressure was close enough to nothing as to qualify for no-test
 - This satisfactory situation disappeared upon revision A (forever)
- **1991 – Hubble SIC&DH box-level Venting Spec produced**
 - The Science Instrument Command & Data Handling is an expensive ORU (orbital replacement unit) consisting of several metal boxes with EMI containment requirements. Demanded a A/V versus residual-pressure curve for boxes inside the telescope
 - The Design community settled on 0.10 inch⁻¹ and 0.11 psi for box use




1993 - 1996

- **1993 – Safety (ISRP) gets tagged with Venting Duty**
 - ISRP is ISS Safety Review Panel (was) PSRP
 - ELV Payloads never had an external panel like manned space flight
 - For the Hubble servicing missions and other Shuttle-based missions, Safety incurred many sets of requirements for Multi-Layered Insulation construction and Box venting, including:
 - Flammability – crew sits on top of payload in air during Interface Verification Test
 - Grounding of each layer of MLI – A single failure in an Orbiter APU can infuse cargo bay with hydrazine vapors
 - Do Not Clog – the cargo bay vents with MLI debris either from:
 - a loose piece of MLI coming off the payload
 - or a puffed-up and split MLI assembly not adequately vented within itself
- **1996 – Spacecraft Compartment Venting Technical Paper**
 - GSFC has thermal-vacuum chambers with rapid-enough pump-down capability to serve as an ascent simulator
 - Tried for “A simple rule for the evaluation of the compartment response.....”




1997 - 2011

- **1997 – Hubble Servicing Mission -2 is flown**
 - **Because boxes and flat ends of cylinders make poor pressure vessels (due to corner bending loads) we had three safety rules of thumb:**
 - **For effective vent ratio of 0.25 square-inch per cubic foot (or better), no further analysis is necessary for “adequate venting”**
 - Note that almost all of our avionic and ORU boxes were legacy-built prior to the loss of GEVS-SE revision dash
 - **For effective vent ratio of 0.10 square-inch per cubic foot (or better), a distributed pressure analysis for 0.11 psi is necessary for “adequate venting”**
 - Note that this was applied to macro-level avionic boxes, not the small Interpoint power converter lids
 - **Mesh-covered vents need to account for the effective loss of vent area versus that which would exist if this was a clear through-hole**
 - For example, we used 500 strands per inch 0.001” diameter strands loomed into a mesh material. The effective vent area is only 26% of the total area of the mesh
- **2011 – JSC ISRP inserts MEVR requirements as ‘Standard’**
 - **Maximum Effective Vent Ratio (cubic inches enclosed/square inches vent) to be < 2000 inches.**
 - **In GEVS-speak this would be 0.864 square-inch vents per cubic foot**
 - **Resulting in 0.01 psi residual pressure (modules >> avionic boxes)**



2015 - 2017

- **2015 – Leiter develops Bail-out tactics when designer people forget to put vent holes into the box:**
 - It is a project policy whether to fill unused pin-sockets on D-sub connectors or not
 - There is the opportunity to recover vent holes by leaving unused sockets as Open
- **2017 – In at least one case, ISRP retreats from MEVR requirements and replaces with no-vent FSu**
 - The same complexities exist for the Trunk environment as before (choked-flow, transonic, max-Q, the system effect of a few seconds of choked flow) but with less data
 - ISRP seems to have reassessed their original charter for requirements. Safety is basically strength requirements
 - Most cargo is OFF for two days cruising to the ISS dock (i.e. no Corona by the time the ISS is proximate to a powered payload)
 - What to do? Follow the HST SM-2 example





Honeycomb Panels

- **Strength is not the issue for intra-cellular burst**
- **However, Virtual Leaks would be a major concern for I&T**
- **Residual pressure can add-up quickly for a large enclosure. For example a 4x8 plywood panel with 0.5 psi has 2,304 pounds on it, so vent the Observatory carefully in a way that carries the particulates out**
- **Vent the panels for intra-cellular air by specifying vented core and then venting the Outside skins at 1" centers**
- **This will carry the manufacturing debris away from the interior of the instrument**
- **Also the inside might need flat black paint and this would clog the small vent holes in the skins**



Multi-Layered Insulation (MLI)





Typical Black Box

- **EMI/EMC controls are typically unappreciative of through-holes. Solutions are to use mesh or labyrinth seals that approximate a light-tight box**
- **Flammability “Chimney Effect” requires a metal box to not-vent more than 1% of the total box surface area (six sides)**
- **Bake-out Circuit Card Assemblies prior to installation into an avionics box**
- **Bake-out box intra-harnesses prior to installation**