

# **COILING AND DEPLOYMENT MECHANICS OF TAPE-SPRINGS**

H.H.N.D. Haggalla

208024T

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of  
Science in Civil Engineering

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

December 2021

## DECLARATION

I hereby witness that this thesis represents my original research work conducted after registration for the degree of MSc at Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa. It has not been submitted elsewhere or for any degree or diploma and the collaborative contributions and previous work related to current study have been stated and properly acknowledged.

Also, I hereby grant non-exclusive right to University of Moratuwa and its agents to archive and make accessible this dissertation, in whole or in part in print electronic or other medium. However, I (H.H.N.D. Haggalla) retain all the ownership to use this content in whole or part in publications (Article/ Book).

Signature: *UOM Verified Signature*

Date: 15/12/2021

The above candidate has carried out research for the Masters under my supervision

Name of the supervisor: Dr. H.M.Y.C. Mallikarachchi

Signature of the supervisor: *UOM Verified Signature*

Date: 15/12/2021

## **ABSTRACT**

Recent advances in space exploration call for smaller space structures that can be reconfigured to achieve large surfaces when in operation. Compact, lightweight structures that can be folded or coiled up for launch have been made possible thanks to self-deployable booms. These can then be self-deployed in orbit to support a variety of small spacecraft systems. However, prior understanding of deployment behaviour is important before launch. This study focuses on model reduction techniques in predicting the deployment behaviour of coiled long-narrow thin shells known as tape springs. Coiling, stowage, and deployment stages that demonstrate considerable cross-section deformation of the tape-spring are discussed. The developed numerical benchmarking model well agrees with the theoretical framework that has previously been established in terms of deployment time and stored strain energy. This numerical model has further been used in a stage-wise development of a beam-shell hybrid model. The effect of varying hub radius is introduced to the existing theoretical framework to predict the coiling and deployment behaviour more accurately.

## DEDICATION

*“When twilight drops her curtain down - And pins it with a star  
Remember that you have a friend - Though she may wander far.”*

— *L.M. Montgomery*

*(1874-1942)*

To my dearest friends,

Asitha, Kasun, Isuri, and Gayan,

Thank you.

I wouldn't have made it this far without you.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

My heartiest gratitude to Dr. H.M.Y.C. Mallikarachchi and Prof. W.P.S. Dias for the consistent supervision and resources that were given to me throughout this research and providing me the best exposure.

My heartiest thanks to Professor Simon Guest for the immense guidance and direction given to me on progressing through the research. Also, many thanks to all the other respective lecturers for assessing me during the research and for advising me on areas of improvement.

Special thanks to the Deployable structures research group for giving me motivation and guidance throughout the research.

Finally, I would like to convey my heartiest gratitude and respect to my dear parents who were always behind me giving me great strength and support and all my friends who have assisted me in many ways for the successful completion of this research.

H.H.N.D. Haggalla

Department of civil engineering

University of Moratuwa

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION .....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES .....	viii
LIST OF TABLES .....	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 General .....	1
1.2 Cross-section deformations of booms .....	3
1.3 Thesis background.....	4
1.4 Scope of the research.....	6
1.5 Aims and objectives .....	6
1.6 Methodology .....	7
1.7 Outcomes and significance of the research .....	7
1.8 Arrangement of the thesis .....	8
2. Literature review .....	9

2.1	Introduction .....	9
2.1.1	Folding mechanics of tape springs.....	9
2.1.2	Coiling mechanics of tape springs .....	10
2.1.3	Change in curvature in tape springs during coiling .....	15
2.1.4	Stress distribution of tape springs during coiling .....	15
2.1.5	Experimental study of coiling with respect to tension force.....	16
2.1.6	Numerical study of coiling with respect to tension force .....	18
2.2	Theoretical framework for deployment ( $\lambda_0=0$ ) .....	20
2.3	Theoretical study ( $\lambda_0>0$ ) .....	22
2.4	Stored strain energy.....	23
2.5	Numerical modelling techniques.....	24
2.6	Summary of the chapter .....	29
3.	Methodology .....	31
3.1	Benchmarking model and simulation conditions .....	31
3.2	Challenges in simulating coiling behaviour .....	36
3.3	Ploy region .....	38
3.3.1	Locations and lengths of shell elements .....	40
3.4	Beam-Shell hybrid model – Stage 01.....	40
3.5	Flowchart for import analysis .....	44
3.6	Beam-Shell hybrid model – Stage 02.....	45

3.7	Summary of the chapter .....	47
4.	Results.....	48
4.1	Theoretical results .....	48
4.1.1	Variation of effective coiling radius .....	48
4.1.2	Variation of tension force .....	51
4.2	Numerical results (benchmarking model).....	54
4.2.1	Effect of varying coiling radius .....	55
4.2.2	Effects from initial unspooled length.....	56
4.3	Variation of curvature .....	57
4.3.1	Transverse curvature .....	57
4.3.2	Longitudinal curvature.....	59
4.4	Stress distribution.....	60
4.4.1	Transverse stress distribution.....	61
4.4.2	Longitudinal stress distribution.....	62
4.5	Energy variation of the model.....	63
4.6	Numerical results (Beam-shell hybrid model) .....	65
4.7	Computational time of the analyses .....	66
4.8	Summary of the Chapter .....	68
5.	Conclusions and recommendation .....	69
6.	References.....	72



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Main and subclasses of booms.....	2
Figure 1.2: Geometry of tape springs.....	3
Figure 1.3: Three main regions of cross-section deformation of tape springs during coiling.....	4
Figure 1.4: Idealized beam-shell hybrid model.....	5
Figure 1.5: Flowchart for the proposed methodology.....	7
Figure 2.1: (a) Opposite and (b) equal sense bending.....	9
Figure 2.2: Moment-rotation relationship of folding of tape springs (Seffen, 1999).....	9
Figure 2.3: Three main regions in coiling of tape springs with respect to coiling ratio (Wilson, 2017).....	10
Figure 2.4: The curvature changes in a tape spring due to equal and opposite moments $M$ applied. The (+) sign convention for $T$ , $r$ , $u$ is shown (Wilson et al., 2020).....	11
Figure 2.5: (a) A tape spring coiled around a spool (b) when partially uncoiled, creates localized folds stabilized by a (c) tension force or (d) radial springs (Wilson, 2017).....	13
Figure 2.6: (a) Undeformed; (b) longitudinal bending and flattening; (c) transverse load application of the section (Wilson et al., 2020).....	14
Figure 2.7: Experimental setup where the tape spring is enclosed around a cylinder (Wilson et al., 2020).....	17
Figure 2.8: Photographs of the experiment (a-f) where a steel tape spring is enclosed around a steel cylinder and its corresponding averaged force profile vs. extension plot (over three repeated experiments) (Wilson et al., 2020).....	17

Figure 2.9: (a) By introducing the displacements  $u_{x, fold}$ ,  $u_{y, fold}$  two folds are created with the use of temporary cylinders which are later removed for cases (b) for  $r_c / R > 3$  and (c) for  $r_c / R < 3$ . Later a displacement of  $u_x$  is applied (Wilson et al., 2020).....18

Figure 2.10: The graph of force against extension obtained from coiling simulation and its corresponding photographs of the simulation at points (a)–(f) (Wilson et al., 2020).....19

Figure 2.11: Experimental results for minimum tension force (to fully enclose the tape spring around the cylinder) vs. coiling ratio for different boundary conditions considered (clamped and pinned) (Wilson et al., 2020).....20

Figure 2.12: Configuration of a tape spring coiled around a hub that is free to rotate (Seffen, 1999).....21

Figure 2.13: Standalone boom (fixed-free) and a boom with a CubeSat model (free-free) (Mallol & Tibert, 2013).....24

Figure 2.14: Coiled configuration and snapshots uncoiling of the tape spring using LS-Dyna (Wilson, 2017).....25

Figure 2.15: (a)-(c) torsional modes of opposite sense coil and (d)-(f) bending modes of equal sense coil obtained from the stability analysis.....26

Figure 2.16: Coupling details between shell and beam regions in the hybrid model (Sadowski, 2019).....28

Figure 2.17: Stress distribution of full shell model (left) vs beam-shell hybrid model (right).....29

Figure 3.1: Numerical (benchmarking) model for coiling simulation.....32

Figure 3.2: Mesh details and part geometry defined in the tape spring.....33

Figure 3.3: Experimental setup to determine the kinetic friction coefficient between the surfaces of the tape spring and the hub.....34

Figure 3.4: Top and side configurations of ploy region.....39

Figure 3.5: Assembly of the hybrid model for stage 01.....	40
Figure 3.6: Different methods available in Abaqus to define beam sections.....	41
Figure 3.7: Different techniques available to ensure moment transfer between shell-beam interface.....	42
Figure 3.8: MPC beam constraint used at the shell-beam transition.....	43
Figure 3.9: Flow chart for the import analysis.....	45
Figure 3.10: Assembly of the hybrid model for stage 02.....	45
Figure 3.11: Constraint conditions used in the hybrid model – Stage 02.....	46
Figure 4.1: $\lambda$ vs. deployment time when the effective coiling radius is equal to the (a) hub radius (12.7 mm), (b) final coiling radius (13.27 mm) and, (c) effective coiling radius calculated using the modified equation.....	49
Figure 4.2: Variation of effective hub radius with respect to time.....	50
Figure 4.3: $\lambda$ vs. tension force in the bending dominated-region.....	52
Figure 4.4: $\lambda$ vs. tension force in the tension dominated-region.....	53
Figure 4.5: Coiling of tape-spring during the time steps, $t =$ (a) 2 s, (b) 7 s, (c) 10 s, (d)14 s, (e) 17 s, and (f) 20 s.....	54
Figure 4.6: Deployment of tape-spring during the first 0.12 seconds.....	54
Figure 4.7: Variation of unspooled length with respect to deployment time obtained for FE simulation and the theoretical equation (Seffen, 1999).....	55
Figure 4.8: Variation of unspooled length with respect to deployment time obtained for FE simulation and the modified equation.....	56
Figure 4.9: Variation of unspooled length with respect to deployment time when an initial unspooled length is present for modified equation and FE results.....	57

Figure 4.10: Variation of transverse curvature obtained from Abaqus.....	58
Figure 4.11: Transverse curvature vs. non-dimensional transverse coordinate (z measured in the transversal direction).....	58
Figure 4.12: Variation of longitudinal curvature obtained from Abaqus.....	59
Figure 4.13: Longitudinal curvature vs. true distance measured along the centerline of the tape spring in the longitudinal direction.....	59
Figure 4.14: Transverse ( $\sigma_{11}$ ) and Longitudinal stress ( $\sigma_{22}$ ) directions of the tape spring.....	60
Figure 4.15: Transverse stress ( $\sigma_{11}$ ) of the bottom surface obtained from the numerical model vs. non-dimensional transverse coordinate (z measured in the transversal direction).....	61
Figure 4.16: Transverse stress ( $\sigma_{22}$ ) of the bottom surface obtained from the numerical model vs. non-dimensional transverse coordinate (z measured in the transversal direction).....	62
Figure 4.17: Longitudinal stress ( $\sigma_{22}$ ) of the bottom surface obtained from the numerical model vs. true length along the centreline in the longitudinal direction.....	63
Figure 4.18: Variation of Kinetic energy Strain energy and Total energy (energy balance) in the explicit simulation.....	64
Figure 4.19: Resultant coiling simulation of the hybrid model – Stage 01.....	65
Figure 4.20: Resultant coiling simulation of the hybrid model – Stage 02.....	65

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Parameters used in the numerical model (Seffen, 1999).....	32
Table 3.2: Loads and boundary conditions activated in the model.....	33
Table 3.3: Loads and boundary conditions activated in stage 01 of the hybrid model.....	44
Table 3.4: Loads and boundary conditions activated in stage 02 of the hybrid model.....	47
Table 4.1: Summary of information on computational efficiency of the analyses.....	66
Table 4.2: Comparison of stable time increments in the beam-shell hybrid model.....	67

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

STEM - Storable Tubular Extendible Member booms

CTM - Collapsible Tubular Masts

TRAC - Tubular Rollable, and Coilable booms

STACER - Spiral Tube and Actuator for Controlled Extension and Retraction

SIMPLE - Self-contained Linear Meter-class deployable

1D – One dimensional

2D – Two dimensional

MATLAB - MATrix LABoratory

MPC – Model Predictive Control

CAE – Complete Abaqus Environment

FE – Finite Element

FEM – Finite Element Method

BeCu - Beryllium Copper

S4R – 4 node general-purpose shell, reduced integration with hourglass control, finite membrane strains

B31 - 2 node linear generalized beam