

Precision Engineering and Optomechanics

Precision Engineering and Optomechanics

Daniel Vukobratovich
Chair/Editor

10-11 August 1989
San Diego, California

Sponsored by
SPIE—The International Society for Optical Engineering

Cooperating Organizations

Applied Optics Laboratory/New Mexico State University
Center for Applied Optics Studies/Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
Center for Applied Optics/University of Alabama in Huntsville
Center for Electro-Optics/University of Dayton
Center for Excellence in Optical Data Processing/Carnegie Mellon University
Jet Propulsion Laboratory/California Institute of Technology
Optical Sciences Center/University of Arizona
Optoelectronic Computing Systems Center/University of Colorado,
Colorado State University

Published by

SPIE—The International Society for Optical Engineering
P.O. Box 10, Bellingham, Washington 98227-0010 USA
Telephone 206/676-3290 (Pacific Time) • Telex 46-7053



Volume 1167

SPIE (The Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers) is a society dedicated to advancing engineering and scientific applications of optical, electro-

and scientific applications of optical, electro-optical, and systems, and technology.



The papers appearing in this book comprise the proceedings of the meeting mentioned on the cover and title page. They reflect the authors' opinions and are published as presented and without change, in the interests of timely dissemination. Their inclusion in this publication does not necessarily constitute endorsement by the editors or by SPIE.

Please use the following format to cite material from this book:

Author(s), "Title of Paper," *Precision Engineering and Optomechanics*, Daniel Vukobratovich, Editor, Proc. SPIE 1167, page numbers (1989).

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 89-43277
ISBN 0-8194-0203-6

Copyright © 1989, The Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers.

Copying of material in this book for sale or for internal or personal use beyond the fair use provisions granted by the U.S. Copyright Law is subject to payment of copying fees. The Transactional Reporting Service base fee for this volume is \$2.00 per article and should be paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 27 Congress Street, Salem, MA 01970. For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license by CCC, a separate system of payment has been arranged. The fee code for users of the Transactional Reporting Service is 0-8194-0203-6/89/\$2.00.

Individual readers of this book and nonprofit libraries acting for them are permitted to make fair use of the material in it, such as to copy an article for teaching or research, without payment of a fee. Reproduction or systematic or multiple reproduction of any material in this book (including abstracts) is prohibited except with the permission of SPIE and one of the authors.

Permission is granted to quote excerpts from articles in this book in other scientific or technical works with acknowledgment of the source, including the author's name, the title of the book, SPIE volume number, page number(s), and year. Reproduction of figures and tables is likewise permitted in other articles and books provided that the same acknowledgment of the source is printed with them, permission of one of the original authors is obtained, and notification is given to SPIE.

In the case of authors who are employees of the United States government, its contractors or grantees, SPIE recognizes the right of the United States government to retain a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to use the author's copyrighted article for United States government purposes.

Address inquiries and notices to Director of Publications, SPIE, P.O. Box 10, Bellingham, WA 98227-0010 USA.

PRECISION ENGINEERING AND OPTOMECHANICS

Volume 1167

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Chair

Daniel Vukobratovich, Optical Sciences Center/University of Arizona

Cochairs

George A. Hazelrigg, National Science Foundation

Roger S. Reiss, Lockheed Missiles & Space Company, Inc.

Ralph M. Richard, Optical Sciences Center/University of Arizona

Session Chairs

Session 1—Issues in Mirror Design

Daniel Vukobratovich, Optical Sciences Center/University of Arizona

Session 2—Microelectromechanical Systems

George A. Hazelrigg, National Science Foundation

Session 3—Precision Instrument Design

Ralph M. Richard, Optical Sciences Center/University of Arizona

Session 4—Mirror Mounting and Pointing

Roger S. Reiss, Lockheed Missiles & Space Company, Inc.

Conference 1167, *Precision Engineering and Optomechanics*, was part of a four-conference program on Optical Design and Engineering held at SPIE's 33rd Annual International Symposium on Optical & Optoelectronic Applied Science & Engineering, 6–11 August 1989, San Diego, California. The other conferences were

Conference 1165, *Scatter from Optical Components*

Conference 1166, *Polarization Considerations for Optical Systems II*

Conference 1168, *Current Developments in Optical Engineering and Commercial Optics*.

Program Chair: **Theodore T. Saito**, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

INTRODUCTION

Interest in optomechanics has grown enormously since the first SPIE conference on optomechanics was held in 1980. Although almost all optical projects involve optomechanics, this field has been recognized as a separate discipline in optical engineering only recently. This conference reviewed the considerable progress in optomechanics in the two years since the previous optomechanics conference.

Conference 1167, the third SPIE conference on optomechanics, is evidence of the current interest in this field. The proceedings of the first SPIE conference on optomechanics (Vol. 250, 1980) contains 13 papers; the proceedings of the second conference (Vol. 817, 1987) contains 25 papers; and this volume contains almost 40 papers. Further evidence of interest in optomechanics is the growth of the SPIE working group on optomechanics. In three years, this group has grown from 8 to 700 members.

There were four sessions in Conference 1167: Issues in Mirror Design, Microelectromechanical Systems, Precision Instrument Design, and Mirror Mounting and Pointing. These sessions addressed topics ranging from design of massive meter-class optics to the development of microactuators of a few tens of micrometers in size. A strong interdisciplinary trend was evident; modern optomechanical projects demand the attention of a wide variety of specialists. Mechanical engineers must work with optical engineers, optical designers, detector experts, and materials specialists (to name just a few of the professionals attending this conference).

Session 1, Issues in Mirror Design, covered two main topics: optimization of mirror structure, and review of deformable mirrors. Papers by Cho et al. and Valente et al. discussed optimization of the shape and structure of lightweight mirrors for best possible stiffness to weight. The paper by Stone et al. covered a new technique for the measurement of shear moduli of foam materials and was the first public announcement of a new metal-matrix composite foam. Papers by Ealey et al. were the first public discussions of the considerable experience at Itek in the design and development of deformable mirrors.

Session 2, Microelectromechanical Systems, was the first SPIE session to cover the important new field of micro-miniature mechanical systems. The development of these systems was reviewed by George Hazelrigg. Microactuator designs were discussed in papers by Muller and Jacobson et al. Use of integrated circuit fabrication technology to produce microfluidic systems was presented in a paper by Kricka et al. These new microelectromechanical systems represent a rapidly developing field of considerable interest to the optical community.

Session 3, Precision Instrument Design, covered a number of areas of interest with a strong emphasis on methods of testing and evaluating optomechanical systems. A paper by McGlynn covered from start to finish a complex optomechanical system, an airborne optical scanner. Alignment issues for complex spaceborne optical instruments were discussed in a series of papers by Kohrman et al., Horchem et al., and Herendeen et al.

(continued)

PRECISION ENGINEERING AND OPTOMECHANICS

Volume 1167

Session 4, Mirror Mounting and Pointing, was very practical, covering the detail design of a variety of mirror mounts. Rundle gave details on a simple, stable all-flexural mirror mount. Ahmad's paper dealt with athermalized mounts for both small and large optics. Pelegrin et al. showed in their paper how use of a metal-matrix composite material provided a cost-effective solution to a difficult lightweight-mirror design problem. Hatheway presented and demonstrated a novel new instrument to measure transient deformations of about a nanometer. A novel virtual pivot flexure design for mounting optics was discussed by Rhoads et al.

I would like to thank personally the cochairs for their efforts in organizing this conference. George A. Hazelrigg did a splendid job of organizing the microelectromechanical systems conference, despite the handicap of working with a strange new group of people, the SPIE optomechanical members. Roger Reiss not only contributed to the conference, but organized a well-attended optomechanical working group meeting on Thursday, 10 August 1989. Special thanks go to the authors, many of whom worked to meet tight schedules and traveled long distances. Finally, the SPIE staff, as always, provided superb support.

Daniel Vukobratovich,

Optical Sciences Center/University of Arizona

(continued)

PRECISION ENGINEERING AND OPTOMECHANICS

Volume 1167

CONTENTS

	Conference Committee	vi
	Introduction	vii
SESSION 1	ISSUES IN MIRROR DESIGN	
1167-01	Optimum mirror shapes and supports for lightweight mirrors subjected to self weight M. K. Cho, R. M. Richard, D. Vukobratovich, Optical Sciences Ctr./Univ. of Arizona.	2
1167-02	Comparison of the merits of open-back, symmetric sandwich, and contoured back mirrors as lightweight optics T. M. Valente, D. Vukobratovich, Optical Sciences Ctr./Univ. of Arizona.	20
1167-03	Shear moduli for cellular foam materials and its influence on the design of lightweight mirrors R. Stone, D. Vukobratovich, R. M. Richard, Optical Sciences Ctr./Univ. of Arizona.	37
1167-04	Deformable mirrors at Litton/Itek: a historical perspective M. A. Ealey, Litton/Itek Optical Systems.	48
1167-05	Fundamentals of deformable mirror design and analysis M. A. Ealey, J. Wellman, Litton/Itek Optical Systems.	66
1167-06	Precision electrodisplacive microactuators M. A. Ealey, Litton/Itek Optical Systems.	85
1167-39	Structural dynamic analysis of laser spot motion in xerographic printers W. J. Nowak, Xerox Corp.	103
SESSION 2	MICROELECTROMECHANICAL SYSTEMS	
1167-07	Microelectromechanical devices: an overview G. A. Hazelrigg, National Science Foundation.	114
1167-09	Design, analysis, and experimental results for the wobble motor: an eccentric-motion electrostatic microactuator S. C. Jacobsen, R. H. Price, J. E. Wood, T. H. Rytting, S. J. Cunningham, Univ. of Utah.	122
1167-10	Silicon-based micromechanical structures and devices K. J. Gabriel, F. Behi, R. Mahadevan, J. A. Walker, AT&T Bell Labs.; M. Mehregany, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.	137
1167-11	Micromechanics for x-ray lithography and x-ray lithography for micromechanics H. Guckel, Univ. of Wisconsin.	151
1167-12	Liquid transport in micron and submicron channels L. J. Kricka, P. Wilding, J. Pfahler, J. Harley, H. Bau, J. N. Zemel, Univ. of Pennsylvania.	159
SESSION 3	PRECISION INSTRUMENT DESIGN	
✓ 1167-18	Performance optimization of the Boeing Infrared Sensor optical system R. P. Chase, C. D. DeJong, J. R. Smith, Boeing Aerospace & Electronics.	170
1167-20	Design and development of a rugged airborne scanning optical assembly for a calibrated IR imaging radiometer J. B. McGlynn, KMS Fusion, Inc.	183
1167-21	Endpoint deflection and slope measurements of a flexible robot arm W. Yim, Univ. of Nevada/Las Vegas.	194

(continued)

PRECISION ENGINEERING AND OPTOMECHANICS

Volume 1167

✓ 1167-36	Optical analog analysis of optical fiber sensors A. E. Hatheway, Alson E. Hatheway, Inc.	204
✓ 1167-22	System of high precision laser alignment using the technique of CCD area image measurement Y. Zhang, J. Liang, Tsinghua Univ. (China).	209
1167-23	Fabrication of nonaxisymmetric aspheric lenses for laser printers S. Moriyama, Y. Kondou, A. A. Arimoto, Hitachi, Ltd. (Japan); K. Kugai, S. Wada, Hitachi Kouki, Ltd. (Japan).	219
1167-24	Numerical method for Cassegrain telescope baffle design K. E. Moore, T. M. Valente, Optical Sciences Ctr./Univ. of Arizona.	228
1167-26	Precision alignment of an IR imaging system R. J. Kohrman, S. D. Horchem, ITT Aerospace/Optical Div.	234
1167-27	Optical alignment of a pupil imaging spectrometer S. D. Horchem, R. J. Kohrman, ITT Aerospace/Optical Div.	243
1167-28	Optical alignment equipment and methods for visible and IR imaging meteorological radiometer R. Herendeen, N. Kreigh, J. C. Wetzel, ITT Aerospace/Optical Div.	255
1167-35	Measurement of small transient deformations W. J. Naumann, D. T. Phillips, D. J. Williams, General Research Corp.	269
1167-37	Precision engineering device to detect the fifth force N. H. Kwong, A. A. Mufti, K. J. Schaudt, Univ. of Arizona; A. E. Hatheway, Alson E. Hatheway, Inc.	280
✓ 1167-19	Vibration-design aspects of an IR-scanning earth sensor R. K. Gupta, T. M. Muraledharan, G. Anandachandran, A. S. Laxmi Prasad, ISRO Satellite Ctr. (India).	293
1167-40	Design and performance of a high resolution, high accuracy automatic autocollimator W. Duis, J. Trede, G.-J. Ulbrich, J.D. Möller Optische Werke GmbH (FRG); M. Mross, Vermont Photonics, Inc.	297
SESSION 4	MIRROR MOUNTING AND POINTING	
1167-13	Design and performance of an optical mount using cross-flexure pivots W. J. Rundle, Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc.	306
1167-14	High resonance adjustable mirror mounts A. Ahmad, Martin Marietta Electronic Systems.	313
1167-15	Design, manufacturing, and testing of a two-axis servo-controlled pointing device using a metal-matrix composite mirror P. H. Pellegrin, E. Stenne, Société Anonyme Belge de Constructions Aéronautiques (Belgium); E. Ulph, Perkin-Elmer Corp.; A. L. Geiger, P. E. Hood, Advanced Composite Materials Corp.	318
1167-16	Chopping secondary mirror for the Kuiper Airborne Observatory C. H. Downey, R. S. Abbott, P. I. Arter, D. A. Hope, D. A. Payne, E. A. Roybal, Ball Aerospace Systems Group; D. F. Lester, Univ. of Texas; J. O. McClenahan, NASA/Ames Research Ctr.	329
1167-29	Advanced flexure suspension systems R. Rhoads, J. C. Tyburski, Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Inc.	343
1167-31	Subminiature IR detector translation stage A. D. Bell, ITT Aerospace/Optical Div.	355
1167-32	Thermal/optical test setup for the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite Telescope G. E. Zurmehly, R. A. Hookman, ITT Aerospace/Optical Div.	360
1167-33	Design of the GOES telescope secondary mirror mounting R. A. Hookman, ITT Aerospace/Optical Div.	368

PRECISION ENGINEERING AND OPTOMECHANICS
Volume 1167

Volume 1167

1167-34	Fourier theory of conical scan demodulation	
	D. H. Tiszauer, Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Inc.	375
1167-38	Instrument for generation and control of submicron motion	
	A. E. Hatheway, Alson E. Hatheway, Inc.	387
	Addendum	393
	Author Index	394

SESSION 1

ABSTRACT

Issues in Mirror Design

Chair

Daniel Vukobratovich

Optical Sciences Center/University of Arizona

A parametric design study was performed utilizing the finite element method to optimize the mirror performance. The design was based on the following criteria: (1) minimization of the optical surface wavefront error, (2) minimization of the self-weight directly related to cost of manufacturing, and (3) minimization of the structural deformation. A pre-processor to automatically generate a finite element model for each mirror geometry was developed in order to obtain the structural deformations systematically. Additionally, a post-processor, which prepares an input data file for FRINGE (an optical computer code) was developed for generating the optical reflections that lead to the surface wavefront error. Procedures and modeling techniques to achieve the optimum (the lightest and stiffest mirror shape due to self-weight) are discussed.

Gravitational deflections for a mirror with its optical axis horizontal, vertical, or in an arbitrary orientation are generally required for design of an optical system. Typical conventional mirrors are usually massive so that associated self-weight deflections are the cause of the optical wavefront errors. Numerous theoretical and analytical efforts in opto-mechanical engineering have been devoted to minimizing self-weight deflections by either reducing weight and/or optimizing support systems. Parameters behind the methodology applied during the design process involve the optical performance specification and the definition of imposed constraints. It is often necessary to perform parametric analyses in order to develop the correlation between design characteristics. Once the structural analysis of a mirror has been achieved, an evaluation of the optical performance is required. Based on the imposed error budget and design requirements, which define the RMS variation over the optical surface, the best mirror configuration can be selected. In this research, a parametric mirror shape study was conducted. Improvements in the optical performance were made based on the minimizing the self-weight deflections, optimizing support locations, and imposed optical constraints.

3. PRE- AND POST-PROCESSORS

Procedures to evaluate the effects of the performance of optical mirrors due to gravity load have been developed at the Optical Sciences Center of the University of Arizona. These methodologies involve the implementation of finite element programs and the optical program FRINGE. The FRINGE program is utilized to quantitatively estimate the characteristics of optical surfaces from either test data or finite element analyses. In addition, the FRINGE program is accepted as its input, the selected output from the structural analysis finite element program SAP IV. The current version of FRINGE has been further modified by the authors in order to accept the output from the structural analysis program NASTRAN. Thus structural deflections over the optical surface, which are output from the finite element program NASTRAN, then become the input to program FRINGE which performs a wavefront error analysis.

Optimum mirror shapes and supports for light weight mirrors subjected to self-weight

Myung K. Cho, Ralph M. Richard, and Daniel Vukobratovich

Optical Sciences Center
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721

ABSTRACT

A parametric design study of light weight mirror shapes with various support conditions was performed utilizing the finite element program NASTRAN. Improvements in the mirror performance were made based on the following design criteria: (1) minimization of the optical surface wavefront variations, (2) minimization of the self-weight directly related to cost of manufacturing, and (3) optimal location of support points. A pre-processor to automatically generate a finite element model for each mirror geometry was developed in order to obtain the structural deformations systematically. Additionally, a post-processor, which prepares an input data file for FRINGE (*an optical computer code*) was developed for generating the optical deflections that lead to the surface wavefront variations. Procedures and modeling techniques to achieve the optimum (*the lightest and stiffest mirror shape due to self-weight*) are addressed.

1. INTRODUCTION

Gravitational deflections for a mirror with its optical axis horizontal, vertical, or in an arbitrary orientation are generally required for design of an optical system. Typical conventional mirrors are usually massive so that associated self-weight deflections are the cause of the optical wavefront errors. Numerous theoretical and analytical efforts in opto-mechanical engineering have been devoted to minimizing self-weight deflections by either reducing weight and/or optimizing support systems. Parameters behind the methodology applied during the design process involve the optical performance specification and the definition of imposed constraints. It is often necessary to perform parametric analyses in order to develop the correlations between design characteristics. Once the structural analysis of a mirror has been achieved, an evaluation of the optical performance is required. Based on the imposed error budget and design requirements, which define the RMS variation over the optical surface, the best mirror configuration can be selected. In this research, a parametric mirror shape study was conducted. Improvements in the optical performance were made based on the minimizing the self-weight deflections, optimizing support locations, and imposed optical constraints.

2. PRE- AND POST-PROCESSORS

Procedures to evaluate the effects of the performance of optical mirrors due to gravity load have been developed at the Optical Sciences Center of the University of Arizona. These methodologies involve the implementation of finite element programs and the optical program FRINGE.¹ The FRINGE program is utilized to quantitatively estimate the characteristics of optical surfaces from either test data or finite element analyses. Iraninejad *et. al.*,² modified the FRINGE program to accept as its input, the selected output from the structural analysis finite element program SAP IV. The current version of FRINGE has been further modified by the authors in order to accept the output from the structural analysis program NASTRAN. Thus structural deflections over the optical surface, which are output from the finite element program NASTRAN, then become the input to program FRINGE which performs a wavefront error analysis.

2.1. Pre-processor

The major effort in finite element modeling is defining the geometry of the structure. For a complicated three dimensional structure, a tremendous amount of time and effort may be required. Thus a generic shape equation which can define mirror shape contours is extremely useful. In this paper, a pre-processor with a generic mirror contour shape equation was written, which produces a NASTRAN input data file based on the generic shape equation. The processor is made up of three programs - EQN, MPROP, and MGEN3D. Program EQN calculates parameters of each contour shape, identifies the shape, and then stores the generic shape equation. The generic equation is given by

$$Y = A + B(C - X^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{D}(X - E)^G + F X \quad (1)$$

Parameters in Equation (1) generate circular, parabolic, linear, and combinations of these shapes for each mirror. Through this routine, a database for each mirror shape is established.

Program MPROP uses the shape equations of the database and determines the properties such as cross sectional area, mirror weight, location of the center of gravity, mass moments of inertia, and geometry of the section. The mirror geometry can be plotted and examined in this stage before going into actual structural analysis. Once this geometry has been determined, program MGEN3D is used to generate the three dimensional mesh mirror models for NASTRAN. Mirror geometry and finite elements are generated in accordance with contour equations in the database.

The attributes of this pre-processor are the followings: (1) all three routines can be either run separately or linked together by a means of a batch command, (2) control data files for the routines are easy and simple to prepare, (3) the database can hold as many as 1000 contour shape equations, and (4) geometry of each mirror model can be previewed prior to making a structural analysis.

2.2. Post-processor

Surface distortion over the mirror controls the qualitative performance of the optical system. For optical design purposes, the wavefront errors are required in terms of the components such as tilt, defocus, astigmatism, coma, spherical, trefoil, and other common aberrations. Program FRINGE, an optical program, was used to generate a least square fit of Zernike polynomials to the deformed surface to evaluate the optical quality.

Either a one sixth model (60 degrees) or a one half model of a mirror (180 degrees) was utilized depending upon the symmetry of the support systems and the loading conditions. The post-processor consists of the two computer programs, TRANS and FRINGE. Program TRANS uses output from NASTRAN, and selects information about the geometry and the displacement components over the surface of the mirror for input data to FRINGE. During the conversion procedure, the symmetry was applied. At this stage the deformed shape can be viewed and evaluated. Program FRINGE provides the peak to peak variation, RMS wavefront error, deformation contours, the spot diagram, and the radial energy distribution. Shown in Figure 1 is a flow diagram of procedure used in this research.

3. CONVENTIONAL MIRROR ANALYSIS

In general, mirrors may be classified in accordance with the contour of the back surface. A plate with uniform thickness is one of the simplest mirrors, and it is the classical or conventional mirror model. A concave mirror with a flat back, a meniscus mirror, and a double concave mirror fall into the same category. Figure 2 (a) shows a concave flat back mirror which is not light weighted. Shown in Figure 2 (b) is a meniscus mirror whose back surface has the same contour as the optical surface. Figure 2 (c) represents a double concave mirror which has a convex back contour. Shown in Figure 2 (d) is a tapered back mirror with a straight contour. The mirror in Figure 2 (e) is a convex back mirror with a parabolic contour. Mirrors in Figures 2 (f) and (g)

represent single and double arch mirrors with parabolic contours. Figures 2 (a), (b) and (c) show mirror shapes that are regarded as conventional whereas Figures (d) through (g) show light weighted contour shapes. In this section the conventional mirror shapes, the first three in Figure 2, are analyzed. The light weighted mirrors will be treated in sections 4 and 5.

Each contoured back shape was analyzed for the following five support systems: (1) a ring support, (2) twelve equally spaced supports at 30 degrees denoted as 12-30, (3) six equally spaced supports at 60 degrees denoted as 6-60, (4) four equally spaced supports at 90 degrees denoted as 4-90, and (5) three equally spaced supports at 120 degrees denoted as 3-120. Each contoured back mirror was 40 inches in diameter, with a radius of curvature of 160 inches, and an outer edge thickness of 5.0 inches. The reason for the limit on the thickness is that for an optical glass, for example Corning code 7940 fused silica, a circular blank can be manufactured up to 5.0 inch thickness without material inhomogeneity. Support ratios (r/R_o) ranging from 0.1 to 1.0 were made for each support system. Additionally, two extreme mirror orientations, which are the optical axis vertical (ZENITH) and the optical axis horizontal (HORIZON), are considered for each support condition. For the HORIZON case, the mirror is always supported at the center of the gravity for all analyses.

3.1. Concave flat back mirror

A 40 inch diameter f/2.0 concave flat back mirror model made out of SXA was used to estimate the effect of thickness variation. SXA, an aluminum and silicon carbide metal matrix composite, has the following material properties:

Elastic modulus = 16.0×10^6 psi

Poisson's ratio = 0.30

Weight density = 0.10 lb/in³

The concave back shape was regarded as a "baseline", and the surface deformations were evaluated. Table 1 shows the optical surface RMS wavefront error versus the support ratio for the support systems. The RMS values for lower support ratios, ranging from 0.1 to 0.4, are not sensitive for the support systems in ZENITH position whereas larger RMS variations are found as r/R_o increases. Comparing support systems 4-90 and 3-120, for example, more than a factor two in RMS is observed in the case of $r/R_o=1.0$. In the HORIZON position, however, surface deformations do not change significantly for these support systems. In Figure 3 is shown the RMS wavefront error versus support ratio for the five support systems in ZENITH. Since the RMS values for both the ring and 12-30 supports are practically identical, these plots are given in a single curve. For this particular shape of mirror, the lowest RMS wavefront error results when either the ring support or 12-30 support system is at about 0.6 radius. If the 3-120 support system is a design requirement, then the optical structure needs to be supported at about 0.5 radius to get the optimum optical performance. Through these analyses it is found that the optimum support location depends on the support systems, and the support ratio lies between 0.5 and 0.6 for all the concave flat back mirrors.

3.2. Meniscus mirror

A 40 inch aperture, f/2.0 meniscus SXA mirror with a uniform thickness of 5.0 inches was analyzed to examine the effect of contoured back shapes. The weight of this shape is 620 pounds. As the previous analyses, five support systems with both orientations are considered with exception of support locations. The meniscus mirror is now supported at the outer edge ($r/R_o=1.0$). The optical performance in RMS variation is given in Table 2.

3.3. Double concave mirror

A 40 inch SXA mirror with both the optical and back surfaces concave and supported at the outer edge ($r/R_o=1.0$) was analyzed. The same radius of curvature of 160 inches with an outer edge

thickness of 5.0 inches, labelled as configuration 1, was used. Evaluation of the optical performance for this configuration was made with various boundary conditions. In order to examine the effect of the thickness of the mirror, another configuration with an outer thickness of 4.0 inches and inner of 1.6 inches, labelled as configuration 2, was analyzed as well. A comparison between those configurations has been made and listed in Table 3. As shown in the table, the reduction of the thickness and 25 percent of the self-weight increased the RMS wavefront errors by about 60 percents in ZENITH position but remained unchanged in HORIZON. If the mirror is to be used in HORIZON position, it would be acceptable to reduce the thickness for this double concave shape. Again, this mirror was supported at the center of the gravity for the HORIZON position.

4. LIGHT WEIGHT MIRROR ANALYSES

Minimizing self-weight deflections of a mirror by reducing its self-weight or optimizing support systems has been attempted by many researchers. Generally, lightweighting a mirror guarantees better optical performance if it is properly supported. Figures 2 (d) through (g) show typical light weight mirrors.

4.1. Single arch mirror analysis

A 40 inch single arch SXA mirror with a maximum depth of 5.0 inches was analyzed. As shown in Figure 4, the mirror has a 4.0 inch diameter central hole, an outer edge thickness of 0.5 inches, and a 2.0 inch land. The self-weight was 135 pounds and it was supported at $r/R_o=0.15$. The optical performance data is listed in Table 4. Shape studies on single arch and single arch like mirrors with contours such as straight tapered back, and convex back will be discussed in detail in the next section.

4.2. Double arch and double arch like mirror designs

The attributes of a double arch shape are (1) excellent stiffness to weight ratio, (2) ease in fabrication, (3) design flexibility of the support system, (4) relatively good mass distribution to mirror orientation, and (5) resistance in torsional excitation. A primary 40 inch mirror with a focal ratio $f/2$, was selected for a trade study between cost and performance. The maximum depth of the primary mirror was 5.0 inches as in earlier analyses.

Four basic mirror back shapes of these 40 inch SXA mirrors with various support conditions were considered. Each of them has a distinctive back contour, but has the same inner edge thickness of 0.5 inches and outer edge of 0.5 inches. The radius of curvature was set at 160 inches for all mirrors. Typical cross sections of the basic shapes and the parameters of each back contour defined by Equation (1) are shown in Figure 5. A typical finite element model for a 40 inch double arch mirror is shown in Figure 6. The deformed shape of the surface of the mirror with 3-120 support in ZENITH position is shown in Figure 7. Radial deflections of each mirror surface, plotted for the different support ratios in ZENITH position, are shown in Figure 8. Figure 8 (a), for example, shows the structural deflections of each contoured back shape supported at $r/R_o=0.50$ radius. The optical surface performance in terms of RMS wavefront errors are listed in Tables 5 through 8. For $r/R_o=0.50$ shown in Figure 8 (a), the contour shape (EQN 2-3) shows the smallest variation in slope of the deflected surface whereas (EQN 4-5) has the largest. Models identified as (EQN 2-3 and 6-7) produced the RMS wavefront errors of 0.021 waves at $r/R_o=0.50$ with a ring support. For a ring support at 0.55 radius, the lowest RMS is found from (EQN 6-7) in ZENITH position. The value is well below that from (EQN 1-2) which produced the least slope variation of the deflected optical surface as shown in Figure 8 (b). A similar pattern is also observed for (EQN 4-5) with $r/R_o=0.60$. It is apparent that there is no precise correlation between the slope of the deflected surface and the RMS wavefront error; however, the variation in the slope of the surface gives a reasonable indication of the actual optical performance.

Figure 9 shows that the optimum support position varies for contoured back shapes in ZENITH position. For a ring and a 6-60 support systems as shown in Figures 9 (a) and (b), the best

optical performance can be obtained when the contoured back shape of (EQN 6-7) is supported at 0.55 radius. Figure 9 (c) shows that an optimum support position for the shape of (EQN 4-5) is found when it is supported by 4-90 support system at 0.55 radius while both shapes of (EQN 1-2) and (EQN 6-7) should be supported at less than 0.5 radius. For a 3-120 support shown in Figure 9 (d), on the other hand, supports at less than 0.5 radius are the best regardless of the contour shapes. These plots give an indication where support systems should be located. It is noted that the RMS value is strongly dependent upon contour back shape and support system.

To examine the effects of material properties, a 40 inch mirror made of Corning code 7940 was analyzed. This fused silica has the following material properties:

Elastic modulus = 10.7×10^6 psi

Poisson's ratio = 0.17

Weight density = 0.092 lb/in³

The mirror has the same configuration as (EQN 6-7) with $r/R_o=0.5$. Summarized in Table 9 is a comparison of the SXA and fused silica 40 inch mirror results. The RMS wavefront errors for both materials are not affected significantly for support systems of the ring, 12-30, and 6-60 in ZENITH position. The fused silica mirror had about 30 or 40 percent higher RMS values for support systems of the 4-90 and 3-120. The reason is that surface deflection is a function of specific stiffness (weight density to Elastic modulus ratio). The evaluations of optical performance of various contoured back shapes addressed in this section are summarized and listed as Table 10. The RMS values of the concave flat and double arched (EQN 2-3) mirrors are listed only for $r/R_o=0.6$.

5. SINGLE ARCH AND SINGLE ARCH LIKE MIRROR ANALYSES

A study of a 16 inch f/1.5 primary mirror was performed to achieve both minimum weight and surface deformation. In this design study, single arch and single arch like contoured back shapes (*tapered straight back, convex back, parabolic curved back, and combined curved back*) were used. Each mirror had maximum depth of three inches, an outer edge thickness of 0.25 inches, and a ring support at the inner radius for both ZENITH and HORIZON positions.

5.1. Solid SXA mirror

Eight solid SXA 16 inch mirrors with various back contour shapes were considered. In order to examine the sensitivity of radius of curvature of the mirror, mirror models with flat and concave surfaces were used. For the concave surface model, the radius of curvature of the mirror was 48 inches. Typical contoured back shapes are shown in Figure 10. Shown in Table 11 are the performances due to self-weight for the optical axis in the vertical and horizontal positions.

Mirrors identified by SXA13 through SXA15 had flat optical surfaces, whereas a radius of curvature of 48 inches was used for the others. SXA13, a typical single arch contoured back as shown in Figure 10 (a), gave the lowest RMS values of both HORIZON and ZENITH among all the shapes. SXA14, a straight back contour in (b) of the same figure, had not only the lowest RMS value in HORIZON but a relatively low RMS in ZENITH. Among flat optical surface mirrors, SXA15, a parabolic contoured back which produces a constant radial bending stress^{3,4} and illustrated in Figure 10 (c), showed the largest surface distortions in both mirror positions and was the heaviest. SXA23, the same back shape as SXA13 with a concaved optical surface, had higher values of RMS wavefront errors but was the lightest. This model, however, has a thickness inside the outer edge, which is thinner than that at the edge of the mirror because of the concave optical surface. SXA24, had the same back shape as SXA14. SXA 25 shown in Figure 10 (c) uses the same contoured back shape as SXA15. SXA29 shown in Figure 10 (d), a version of SXA23 (*a combined back shape of an arch and a higher order contour revised to eliminate the thin interior section*), had essentially the same RMS values for both positions. From the standpoint of reduction of the self-weight, this would be the best choice, however there are some trade-offs. First, it has a discontinuity in the contour of the back which may cause difficulties during manufacturing process. Next, the optical performance of this model

turned out to be the worst in HORIZON and ZENITH. SXA30, a modified single arch model illustrated in Figure 10 (e), showed the lowest RMS in HORIZON as well as relatively low in ZENITH. If the lowest weight and RMS wavefront error in HORIZON were the design requirements, the best configuration would be SXA30. A finite element model of this configuration is shown in Figure 11.

5.2. SXA foam mirror

The use of foamed metals and ceramics as core materials in light weight structural applications has been of interest in recent years. Material properties of the composite structures, however, are difficult to accurately establish because of the variables associated with foam materials. The foam core is usually bonded to face plates which are relatively thin; therefore, the core resists shear force whereas the face plates resist flexural forces. The overall structural deformation of the foam mirror is a combination of flexural and shear deformation. Tests⁵ were made to determine the shear modulus for a SXA foam and a nickel foam which controls the structural deformation of a composite foam.

As a demonstration of the potential of foam core mirror technology, a 12 inch aperture, f/5.0 Cassegrain telescope weighing ten pounds was recently designed and fabricated at the University of Arizona Optical Sciences Center.⁶ The telescope was designed with a primary mirror composed of aluminum face plates and aluminum foam composite. Aluminum foam core mirrors with aluminum face plates have been produced using dip brazing to attach the core to the face plates. A comparison between the finite element analysis and the test of the aluminum foam core mirror was made by Pollard.⁷ In that paper, the authors found that the discrepancy between the actual and analytically predicted performance of the optical surface was significant. They attributed this to the lack of accurate material properties of the aluminum foam core. Moreover, for applications requiring surface precision greater than about 630 nm (nano meter) RMS, aluminum is questionable because of its dimensional instability.

A design study of a 16 inch primary foam mirror was made to determine an optimum contoured back shape as well. The same geometries were applied for the foam mirrors as for the SXA solid mirrors. A SXA foam with 10 percent density of solid SXA, an aluminum and silicon carbide metal matrix composite, and nickel foam with 2 percent density were analyzed. The following are the material properties of the SXA foam and the nickel foam.

	SXA FOAM	NICKEL FOAM
Elastic modulus	13,000 psi	4,000 psi
Shear modulus	6,500 psi	2,000 psi
Weight density	0.01 lb/in ³	0.0062 lb/in ³

Six contoured mirrors with different foam core materials were analyzed. Each had SXA face plates of 0.125 inches for both the front and the back surfaces. Shown in Table 12 are the optical performances due to its self-weight in both ZENITH and HORIZON positions. In addition, the overall weight and the foam core weight ratio of each mirror are listed in the table.

SXA face plates with an SXA foam core were used for mirrors of SW27 through SW31, whereas SXA face plates with a nickel foam core were used for SW40. Typical contoured back shapes are shown in Figure 10. SW27, a single arch mirror shown in Figure 10 (a), gave the highest RMS value in HORIZON among the SXA foam core mirrors. SW28, a much stiffer version of SW27, reduced the RMS distortion by 15 percent in HORIZON but increased it by four percent in ZENITH. A straight back shape which is SW29, the heaviest shape shown in Figure 10 (b), had the lowest RMS value in HORIZON but the highest in ZENITH. A parabolic back shape illustrated in Figure 10 (e), SW30, gave an intermediate RMS value in HORIZON and the lowest in ZENITH, and it weighed only 7 pounds. SW31, a straight back type, had higher RMS values. SW40, the same shape as SW30, was made of a nickel foam which had a lower shear modulus and weight density than the SXA foam. SW30 in comparison with SW40 which had 15 percent less self-weight gave about 80 percent higher RMS distortion. This shows that the shear modulus of a form core material has a significant effect

on the optical surface quality. Provided that a 0.1 RMS wavefront error in HORIZON and the lowest RMS in ZENITH were the design requirements, the optimum configuration would be SW30.

6. CONCLUSIONS

A parametric design study of light weight mirrors has been made based on the following design constraints:

- 1) Gravitational load applied both in ZENITH and HORIZON;
- 2) A 40 inch mirror with a total depth of 5.0 inches and a radius of curvature of 160 inches;
- 3) A 16 inch mirror with a total depth of 3.0 inches and a radius of curvature of 48 inches;
- 4) For the HORIZON position, the mirror was supported its center of gravity.

Through examining various contoured back shapes based on the imposed design constraints, the following conclusions were drawn:

- 1) The optical performances were very sensitive to the material parameters, contoured back shape, and support location;
- 2) There was not a precise correlation between the slope variation of a deflected surface and the optical RMS wavefront errors; however, the slope variation of the deflected surface may be used as a first order approximation to the optical performance;
- 3) An optimum shape of a double arch mirror for a ring support at 0.55 radius was found with the contoured back shape of (EQN 6-7);
- 4) An optimum location for a three equally spaced support system was smaller than 0.5 radius regardless of the contoured back shapes;
- 5) For a single arch mirror supported by a ring, the optimum shape was a parabolic contour with the vertex at the base of the mirror, which was used for SXA30 and SW30.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This Study was partially supported by NASA Ames Research Center through the NASA Cooperative Agreement NAG2-426 with the University of Arizona. The authors wish to acknowledge Ramsey Melugin, the technical monitor of the program at the NASA Ames, for his helpful comments and suggestions.

8. REFERENCES

1. Anderson, D., *FRINGE Manual*, Version 3, Optical Sciences Center, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, April 1982.
2. Iraninejad, B. and Vukobratovich, D., *Double Arch Mirror Study*, Engineering Analysis report, NASA Grant 2-220, NASA Ames Research Center, Mail Stop 244-7, Moffett Field, California 94035, Mary 1983.
3. Lee, J. P., *Approximate Solutions of Circular Plates of Constant Radial Bending Stress*, Developments in Theoretical and Applied Mechanics, Proceedings of the Ninth Southeast Conference on Theoretical and Applied Mechanics, May 1971.
4. Lee, J. P., *Symmetrical Bending of Circular Plates of Constant Radial Bending Stress*, Journal of Applied Mechanics, No. 12, December 1962.
5. Stone, R. M., *Shear Moduli for Cellular Foam Materials*, Masters Thesis, University of Arizona, Tucson, 1989.
6. Vukobratovich, D., *Lightweight Laser Communications Mirrors made with Metal Foam Cores*, Proceedings of SPIE, Vol. 1044, 1989.
7. Pollard, L. W., Vukobratovich, D., and Richard R. M., *The Structural Analysis of a Light-Weight Aluminum Foam Core Mirror*, Proceedings of SPIE, Vol. 748, 1987.