

NASA/TM—2001-211155



# Verifying Data Integrity of Electronically Scanned Pressure Systems at the NASA Glenn Research Center

Joseph W. Panek  
Glenn Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio

---

October 2001

## The NASA STI Program Office . . . in Profile

Since its founding, NASA has been dedicated to the advancement of aeronautics and space science. The NASA Scientific and Technical Information (STI) Program Office plays a key part in helping NASA maintain this important role.

The NASA STI Program Office is operated by Langley Research Center, the Lead Center for NASA's scientific and technical information. The NASA STI Program Office provides access to the NASA STI Database, the largest collection of aeronautical and space science STI in the world. The Program Office is also NASA's institutional mechanism for disseminating the results of its research and development activities. These results are published by NASA in the NASA STI Report Series, which includes the following report types:

- **TECHNICAL PUBLICATION.** Reports of completed research or a major significant phase of research that present the results of NASA programs and include extensive data or theoretical analysis. Includes compilations of significant scientific and technical data and information deemed to be of continuing reference value. NASA's counterpart of peer-reviewed formal professional papers but has less stringent limitations on manuscript length and extent of graphic presentations.
- **TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM.** Scientific and technical findings that are preliminary or of specialized interest, e.g., quick release reports, working papers, and bibliographies that contain minimal annotation. Does not contain extensive analysis.
- **CONTRACTOR REPORT.** Scientific and technical findings by NASA-sponsored contractors and grantees.

- **CONFERENCE PUBLICATION.** Collected papers from scientific and technical conferences, symposia, seminars, or other meetings sponsored or cosponsored by NASA.
- **SPECIAL PUBLICATION.** Scientific, technical, or historical information from NASA programs, projects, and missions, often concerned with subjects having substantial public interest.
- **TECHNICAL TRANSLATION.** English-language translations of foreign scientific and technical material pertinent to NASA's mission.

Specialized services that complement the STI Program Office's diverse offerings include creating custom thesauri, building customized data bases, organizing and publishing research results . . . even providing videos.

For more information about the NASA STI Program Office, see the following:

- Access the NASA STI Program Home Page at <http://www.sti.nasa.gov>
- E-mail your question via the Internet to [help@sti.nasa.gov](mailto:help@sti.nasa.gov)
- Fax your question to the NASA Access Help Desk at 301-621-0134
- Telephone the NASA Access Help Desk at 301-621-0390
- Write to:  
NASA Access Help Desk  
NASA Center for Aerospace Information  
7121 Standard Drive  
Hanover, MD 21076

NASA/TM—2001-211155



# Verifying Data Integrity of Electronically Scanned Pressure Systems at the NASA Glenn Research Center

Joseph W. Panek  
Glenn Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio

Prepared for the  
2001 19th International Congress on Instrumentation in  
Aerospace Simulation Facilities (ICIASF 2001)  
cosponsored by the IEEE AES, NASA Glenn, and OAI  
Cleveland, Ohio, August 27–30, 2001

National Aeronautics and  
Space Administration

Glenn Research Center

---

October 2001

## Acknowledgments

Even though he has been retired for almost 10 years, I would like to acknowledge Steve Gonczy for his development of the Continuity/Leak Checking and Check Pressure Processes. These were developed in the 1980's for the first generation ESP System. It is a tribute to Steve's attention to detail and forethought that these techniques are still current and effective. I would like to thank the following individuals for their expert and timely review of this paper, Robert Freedman, Alan Linne, and Timothy McCartney.

This report contains preliminary findings, subject to revision as analysis proceeds.

Trade names or manufacturers' names are used in this report for identification only. This usage does not constitute an official endorsement, either expressed or implied, by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Available from

NASA Center for Aerospace Information  
7121 Standard Drive  
Hanover, MD 21076

National Technical Information Service  
5285 Port Royal Road  
Springfield, VA 22100

Available electronically at <http://gltrs.grc.nasa.gov/GLTRS>

# VERIFYING DATA INTEGRITY OF ELECTRONICALLY SCANNED PRESSURE SYSTEMS AT THE NASA GLENN RESEARCH CENTER

Joseph W. Panek  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
Glenn Research Center  
Cleveland, Ohio 44135

## ABSTRACT

The proper operation of the Electronically Scanned Pressure (ESP) Systems at the NASA Glenn Research Center is critical to accomplish the following goals; acquisition of highly accurate pressure data for the development of future aerospace and commercial aviation systems and continuous confirmation of data quality to avoid costly, unplanned, repeat wind tunnel or turbine testing. Standard automated setup and checkout routines are necessary to accomplish these goals. Data verification and integrity checks occur at three distinct stages, pre-test pressure tubing and system checkouts, daily system validation and in-test confirmation of critical system parameters. This paper will give an overview of the existing hardware, software and methods used to validate data integrity.

## BACKGROUND

Electronically Scanned Pressure systems have been in use at NASA Glenn since the late 1970's to measure large numbers of pressures with high accuracies. The classic and the newer Digital Thermal Compensation (DTC) pressure scanners are currently being utilized. Both styles of scanner have an array of silicon pressure transducers that are multiplexed, amplified, scanned by an analog to digital converter and converted to engineering units. An integral, pneumatic calibration valve allows the scanners to be insitu calibrated by a secondary pressure standard. Periodic calibrations maintain system accuracy. For the classic scanner, three to five precision pressures are sequentially applied to all of the transducers and new coefficients are calculated. The general equation for a standard five point ESP calibration is

$$P = C_0 + C_1 V + C_2 V^2 + C_3 V^3 + C_4 V^4$$

where

V is the transducer output voltage  
P is the transducer pressure and  
C<sub>0</sub>, C<sub>1</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>, C<sub>3</sub>, C<sub>4</sub> are the calibration coefficients.<sup>5</sup>

The Digital Thermal Compensation (DTC) scanners have been successfully used in a recent wind tunnel test. These scanners employ technology that allows the transducer temperatures to be measured and used in conjunction with coefficients that are stored in the scanner EEPROM to compensate for the transducers' temperature changes. This temperature compensation routine extends the calibration interval of the scanners from less than one hour to as much as four hours. These scanners require only a two-pressure calibration to correct zero and span errors. The general equation for this two point DTC ESP calibration is

$$P = S(P_C + Z),$$

where

S is the span adjustment  
Z is the zero adjustment  
P is the transducer pressure and  
P<sub>C</sub> is the computed pressure from the internal coefficients.

The checkout and verification of both types of scanners will be addressed.

## HARDWARE

The Electronically Scanned Pressure Systems at the NASA Glenn Research Center use the Pressure Systems Incorporated (PSI) System 8400.<sup>2</sup> These systems employ up to 1024 pressure transducers in ranges from 0.361 Psid (2.5 kPa) to 500 Psid (3500 kPa). Periodic insitu calibrations maintain the system accuracy to ±0.05% of transducer range. Four styles of pressure scanners are currently employed to acquire data; 16 and 32-port rack-mount, 32-port miniature and 32-port miniature digital thermal compensated. The system architecture allows the use of all four concurrently. Miniature scanners are generally located in or near the model or test article. The System Processor (SP), scanner interface, Pressure Calibrate Units (PCU's) and rack-mount scanners are located near the test article in either a temperature-controlled




Figure 1. NASA Glenn Research Center Pressure Acquisition System Configuration

environmental enclosure or an air-conditioned room. Keeping the classic pressure scanners at a constant temperature increases the stability of the transducers and decreases the number of calibrations that are required.<sup>4</sup> The system is controlled via a fiber-optically extended IEEE-488 communication link to the Pentium™ PC and Alpha-based steady-state data system computer. These are located in or near the control room. A typical System 8400 wind tunnel installation is shown above in Figure 1.

### SOFTWARE

Standard ESP System software was developed at the NASA Glenn Research Center and is used in over 24 facilities. This software operates on a 133 Mhz (or higher) Pentium™ PC running the Windows™ 95 or 98 operating system with a commercially available IEEE-488 card and driver.

This ESP software, PASCAL (**P**ressure **A**cquisition, **S**etup, **C**heckout and **L**ogging), consists of three distinct programs; Setup, Checkout and Acquire.<sup>1</sup> The separate programs allow for the optimization of the three primary functions. They share over thirty pages of text and graphical help. On-line log messages document critical system parameters and are written to files for later viewing

*PASCAL Setup* is used to generate a parameter file that defines the system hardware and data acquisition modes for the other two programs. The program employs

algorithms that check for illegal configurations that, if implemented, could damage the equipment. Both graphical and text documentation are generated. *PASCAL Checkout* is the primary tool for daily system verification and trouble-shooting. System calibration, pressure scanning, tubing continuity/leak checking and diagnostic routines are automated. This provides a tool for verifying the integrity of the pressure system from the test article pressure tap to the steady-state data system. An automated system checkout routine performs up to six go-no-go user-selectable tests; verification of system temperatures, calibration pressures, transducer coefficients, transducer integrity, tubing continuity and pneumatic calibration integrity. A generated report can be printed or sent to a file. *PASCAL Acquire* controls scanner calibration, performs post-calibration tests to confirm proper operation and acquires data. This pressure data is automatically corrected for reference pressure changes and passed to the steady-state data system for viewing and use in performance calculations. If the vertical distance from the test article to the pressure scanners is greater than ten feet, the elevation-induced pressures errors can be easily corrected in the steady state data system.<sup>3</sup>

### PRE-TEST VERIFICATION AND SYSTEM CHECKOUTS

#### Tubing Verification

Pressure data fidelity is dependent not only upon transducer accuracy but the tubing system that connects

the transducer to the test article static or total pressure tap. The tubing is verified at the farthest accessible point from the pressure transducer to the transducer itself. Continuity Checks determine if the pressure taps are connected to the proper data channel. Leak Checks measure the tubing leak rate and compare it to pre-determined criteria to determine acceptability. The leak-check pressure,  $P_{LeakCheck}$ , is applied to a test article static or total pressure tap. The pressure source is manually valved-off to seal the pressure back to the transducer and the trapped pressure is allowed to settle. A continuity check (identification of the port with the highest or lowest pressure) is performed and the system measures the trapped pressure,  $P_0$ . If the pressure is not within the specified tolerance, leak checking is stopped and an error message is generated. After ten seconds, the pressure is again measured and the actual leak rate in Psi/Min is computed.

$$\text{Leak Rate}_{\text{Actual}} = [P_{\text{tube}}(10) - P_0] \cdot 6 \quad \text{Psi/Min}$$

where  $P_{\text{tube}}(10)$  is the port pressure (pressure trapped in the tube) 10 seconds after the initial pressure reading,  $P_0$ . If the actual leak rate is higher than the maximum acceptable rate, the operator is alerted and the port is flagged in the leak check documentation.

The maximum acceptable leak rate is derived from the conservation of mass.<sup>8</sup>

$$\text{Vol} \cdot \frac{dp(t) + p(t) - \Delta Pu(t)}{dt} = 0 \quad 1/LR_{\text{ref}}$$

where

- $p(t)$  = tube pressure at time, t      psi
- $LR_{\text{ref}}$  = Reference Leak Rate      in<sup>3</sup>/sec.
- $\Delta Pu(t)$  =  $(P_{\text{Atm}} - P_{\text{LeakCheck}}) \cdot \text{Unit Step}$       psi
- $\text{Vol}$  = tube volume =  $(\pi \cdot D^2 \cdot l) / 4$       in<sup>3</sup>
- $P_{\text{Atm}}$  = atmospheric pressure      psi
- $D$  = tube diameter      in
- $l$  = tube length      in

The reference Leak Rate,  $LR_{\text{ref}}$ , was chosen to be twice the manufacturer's specification for transducer leak rate. In this case,  $LR_{\text{ref}} = 0.000244 \text{ in}^3/\text{sec}$ . To simplify,  $\tau = \text{Vol} / LR_{\text{ref}} \text{ sec}^{-1}$ , and the solution is

$$p(t) = [P_{\text{Atm}} - P_{\text{LeakCheck}}] [1 - e^{-t/\tau}] + P_{\text{LeakCheck}} \quad \text{Psi.}^{10}$$

Since the leak rate is measured over a ten second interval, the following is evaluated at  $t = 10 \text{ sec}$ . to arrive at the maximum acceptable leak rate.

$$\text{Leak Rate}_{\text{max}} = [p(t) - P_{\text{LeakCheck}}] \cdot 6 \quad \text{Psi/min.}$$

The theoretical pressure error that is introduced in a leaky tube can be calculated. A pressure drop across the tube is induced due to airflow. Since we do not know the exact location of the leak(s), we can assume a worst-case scenario with all the flow occurring through the entire tube. The theoretical measurement error due to the leak can be found using Poiseuille's Law,<sup>9</sup>

$$P_{\text{error}} = \frac{128 \mu l LR_{\text{ref}}}{\pi \cdot D^4} \quad \text{Psi}$$

where  $\mu = \text{viscosity} = 2.7 \cdot 10^{-9} \frac{\text{lb-sec}}{\text{in}^2}$ .

At the end of leak checking, the tubing is quickly vented to atmosphere. Pressure data is stored during venting to characterize the tubing pressure step response. The data is fit to an exponential function to determine the pressure time constant of the tubing. This data is then used to identify pinched or blocked tubing. The following exponential function is used to determine the pressures for the calculated time constant.

$$P_{\text{calc}}(t) = [P_{\text{Atm}} - P_{\text{Initial}}] [1 - e^{-t/\tau}] + P_{\text{Initial}} \quad \text{Psi}$$

where

- $P_{\text{calc}}(t)$  = calculated tube pressure at time, t      psia
- $P_{\text{Atm}}$  = atmospheric pressure      psia
- $P_{\text{Initial}}$  = Initial stored data pressure      psia
- $\tau$  = computed tube time constant      sec.<sup>-1</sup>.

Typical time constant data is shown below in Figure 2. An iterative process is used to compute the pressure time constant. A series of time constants are used to calculate the sum of the difference between the actual and calculated data. When the sign of the sum-of-errors




Figure 2. Tubing Time Constant Data

changes, the final time constant is interpolated between the last two time constants. In Figure 2, it can be seen that the time constant of scanner port 18 is about three times that of port 24. With the same size tubes, this is indicative of a partially pinched or blocked tube. This method can be used to either identify and repair the defective tube or accept the condition and determine the data settling time that is required after a change in test conditions.

### System Noise Checks

Before a new test program begins, the re-configured ESP hardware needs to be checked for noisy data. Two mechanisms are supplied in the PASCAL Checkout program to establish the data's noise levels. The first is a bar graph display that graphically indicates the mean, maximum, minimum and standard deviations of the selected pressures. Lines on the graph show precisely where the aforementioned statistical variables are located. Scanners that have noisy outputs can be identified very quickly. A color-augmented bar graph demonstrating the statistical noise check is shown below in Figure 3. The second method for locating




Figure 3. Graphical Statistical Noise Check

noise is an engineering unit window that displays scanner statistics. The mean, maximum, minimum, range and standard deviation of the scanner pressures are calculated. Pressure ports that are known to be bad can be de-selected from the statistic's calculations to properly measure the rest of the scanner. These checks can be used during the daily checkouts.

### DAILY SYSTEM VALIDATION

A number of checks are performed daily before acquiring data. The Checkout and Acquire programs are separate so the acquisition of data can occur with a smaller, more robust, set of code. The Checkout program is run first. At program startup, users are alerted to the calibration status of the Pressure Calibration Units (PCU's). A window warns the user when the PCU calibration expires or is past due. This information is also entered into the system log file.

After calibration, an automated system verification routine checks the PCU(s) temperature(s), calibration pressures' accuracy, transducer coefficients, scanners' accuracies, pressure ports for plugged tubes and calibration systems' leak rates. An example of the Automated System Checkout routine is shown on the following page in Figure 4.

The PCU's temperatures indicate the readiness of the system to acquire data. For most instrumentation, a warm-up period is required to allow for the stabilization of the transducers and associated electronics. If the temperature is close to ambient, the system (including scanners) has probably not had enough warm-up time. The normal operating range is between 80 °F (26.5 °C) and 105 °F (40.5 °C). If the temperature is too high (>115 °F, >46 °C), a fan may have failed or the system environment may not be suitable. The system log is color coded to denote the severity of problems. In this case, temperatures below 105 °F (40.5 °C) are black, between 105 °F (40.5 °C) and 115 °F (46 °C) are blue and above 115 °F (46 °C) are red.

The actual calibration pressures that are generated by each PCU are compared to the requested pressures. A calibration pressure tolerance is generally set between 0.05% and 0.01% of full-scale pressure.<sup>6</sup> If the difference between the requested and generated pressure is greater than the tolerance, the calibration is considered to have failed. A failed calibration may still produce what appear to be valid transducer coefficients but signifies that something in the system has changed. A leak may exist in the vacuum or pressure sources.

The transducer coefficients that are computed after the insitu calibration are analyzed to determine if they are within normal limits. The coefficients give the user system "health" information that is very useful for insuring good data.

For the classic (non-DTC) scanners, the criteria on the following page are used for determining "good" coefficients.<sup>7</sup>




Figure 4. PASCAL Checkout Software – Automated System Checkout

1. The Absolute Value of  $C_0$  should be less than  $(C_1 / 2)$  i.e.  $\pm 10\%$  of the scanner's range.  
[For an Absolute Calibration,  $C_0$  will be near the reference pressure with a tolerance of  $(C_1 / 2)$ .]

The  $C_0$  Coefficient indicates the individual transducer's health. A  $C_0$  that fluctuates between calibrations is generally an indication of an intermittent transducer. The  $C_1$  Coefficient gives us information about the health of the Scanner Digitizer Unit (SDU), as well as the scanners transducers. If its value is higher or lower than normal, this could signify that the scanner's voltage is not within specifications or that the SDU's A/D converter is not working properly.

2. The Absolute Value of  $C_1 / C_2$  should be greater than 350 for Scanners  $\leq 100$  Psid.  
The Absolute Value of  $C_1 / C_2$  should be greater than 165 for Scanners  $> 100$  Psid

The magnitude of the  $C_2$  Coefficient indicates the linearity of the calibration. A high  $C_2$  generally signifies a leak in or near the calibration pressure line, PCU or scanner. If a single or group of scanners has a  $C_2$  that is higher than the others, it is a good assumption that the leak is physically near those scanners. If all scanners have the same magnitude of  $C_2$ , the leak is probably closer to the PCU.

3. The Absolute Value of  $C_1 / C_3$  should be greater than 1000 for all Scanners Ranges. This tests  $C_3$ .
4. The Absolute Value of  $C_1 / C_4$  should be greater than 5000 for all Scanners Ranges. This tests  $C_4$ .

A high  $C_3$  or  $C_4$  coefficient could indicate leaks that are not linear with pressure. A leak on one side of the reference pressure could be higher than the other.

For the newer Digital Thermal Compensation (DTC) scanners, a two-point pressure calibration will only adjust the zero and span of the coefficients. Current analytical methods are inadequate to determine if the calibration is valid. Pneumatic leaks in the calibration system can result in coefficients that appear to be valid but produce erroneous pressure readings. A new method had to be devised. This new technique is in the process of being incorporated into the PASCAL software. The DTC scanners require two calibration pressures but will produce valid results with up to five pressures. To minimize the calibration time, three pressures will be utilized. With this new method, calibration non-linearities can be computed, identified and alarmed with generally less than twenty seconds added to the total calibration time. In this way, poor calibrations can be quickly identified.

Another test verifies the integrity of the transducers and the calibration. This transducer pressure check can be performed to determine if the transducers are measuring pressures properly. The calibration valves are placed in the calibration position and the PCU's are commanded to generate a pressure that is 95% of the value of the calibration pressures. This is to verify near the full-scale values of the scanners but not at the exact values used to calculate the transducer coefficients. Data is acquired from all scanners and compared to the generated pressure that is read by the PCU's secondary pressure standard. Ports that do not match the generated pressure to within  $\pm 0.05\%$  of the scanner range are shown in the Out-of-Tolerance Port Pressure display. This test verifies the integrity of the transducers and the calibration.

Plugged or pinched tubes can be found before testing begins. All ports, except Check Pressures, (see In-Test System Verification for definition) need to be vented to atmosphere. The pressures are then scanned and compared to the lowest range PCU that is reading barometric pressure. If the difference between a port pressure and barometric pressure is greater than  $\pm 0.05\%$  of the scanner range, it is logged.

A calibration subsystem leak-check routine determines its pneumatic integrity. For each PCU, the lowest and highest calibration pressures are re-applied to the system with the scanner calibration valves in the calibration and then run positions. Solenoid valves in the PCU are closed to trap the pressures from the secondary pressure standards to the scanners. The PCU's secondary standard measures the pressures over a 30 second interval and calculates a leak rate in PSI per minute. This leak rate must meet the following manufacturer's criteria in order to maintain system specifications.<sup>11</sup>

- With the scanner calibration valve(s) in the RUN mode, the leak rate must be less than 0.5% of Scanner Range/(Every 32 Ports in the Cal Range) /Minute.
- With the scanner calibration valve(s) in the CAL mode, the leak rate must be less than 1% of Scanner Range/(Every 32 Ports in the Cal Range) /Minute.

Calibration ranges that do not meet the criteria need to have the leaks corrected.

### IN-TEST SYSTEM VERIFICATION

Three methods are utilized to insure the detection of problems that may affect quality during data acquisition. The PASCAL Acquire program provides two mechanisms for detecting calibration errors; the third method resides with the steady state data system.

The PASCAL Acquire routines are similar to the ones used in the Checkout program. The generated PCU calibration pressures are checked to insure they are set to the specified values. Out-of-tolerance pressures stop the data acquisition process. It can be assumed that a major change has occurred if the system cannot set the pressures properly. This type of error requires immediate investigation. Transducer coefficients are also verified after every calibration. Out-of-tolerance coefficients are flagged and logged for the user. Bad coefficients do not automatically stop data acquisition. See Figure 5 for examples of out-of-tolerance calibration pressures and transducer coefficients.




Figure 5. Calibration Pressures and Coefficients

An applied Check Pressure is the third mechanism for systematic verification of system performance. A known pressure is applied to either the first or last port of every pressure scanner. This known 'Check Pressure' is read with an independent transducer and compared to the scanner ports to check for systematic errors. This comparison is done on the steady state data system. If the Check Pressure is not within  $\pm 0.05\%$  of the scanner's range, an alarm alerts the user that an error has occurred. The system can then be re-calibrated to see if the problem can be resolved. If this does not resolve the problem, the *PASCaL Checkout* program can be used to identify if the source of the error resides in the ESP system or independent check pressure transducer.

### CONCLUSIONS

The techniques used to verify the integrity of the ESP Systems at the NASA Glenn Research Center have resulted in the acquisition of accurate pressure data for its research customers. The continuous confirmation of data has resulted in avoidance of costly unplanned repeat testing. The integrity of the tubing system is quantified from end-to-end. System reliability is enhanced and day-to-day checkout time is reduced by the automated verification of critical system attributes. During data acquisition, the on-line diagnostics indicate current system health and increase the user's confidence in their data.

### REFERENCES

1. ISA Paper # 2602, "Standard Pressure Acquisition Software at the NASA Glenn Research Center," Joseph W. Panek, Presented at the 46th International Instrumentation Symposium, ISA, May 2000.
2. ISA Paper # 2603, "Pressure Acquisition System Enhancements at the NASA Glenn Research Center," Joseph W. Panek, Presented at the 46th International Instrumentation Symposium, ISA, May 2000.
3. NASA Technical Memorandum 107240, "Elevation Correction Factor for Absolute Pressure Measurements," Joseph W. Panek and Mark R. Sorrells, Presented at the 42nd International Instrumentation Symposium, ISA, May 1996.
4. NASA Lewis Research Center, Aeropropulsion Facilities and Experiments Division, Preliminary Information Report # 064, "Configuring a PSI System 8400 for Maximum Accuracy," Joseph W. Panek, November 1995.
5. ISA Paper # 0227-7576/97/021-030, "Using Digital Thermal Correction of Electronic Pressure Scanners to Improve Windtunnel Productivity," Harold N. Klaser and Douglas B. Juanarena, Presented at the 43<sup>rd</sup> International Instrumentation Symposium, ISA, May 1997.
6. "Pressure Systems Incorporated, System 8400 Users Manual," June 1999, Version 4.0.
7. "How to tell if an ESP Calibration is 'Good'," Dan Ridenour, Internal Report, Pressure Systems Incorporated, Hampton, VA, September 1995.
8. Gas Dynamics; Maurice J. Zucrow and Joe D. Hoffman, Copyright 1976, John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York, NY.
9. Modeling Engineering Systems; Jack W. Lewis, Copyright 1994, HighText Publications, Inc., Eagle Rock, VA.
10. Basic Electric Circuit Analysis; David E. Johnson, John L. Hilburn and Johnny R. Johnson, Copyright 1978, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
11. Phone conversation with Dan Ridenour, Applications Engineer, Pressure Systems Incorporated, Hampton, VA.

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

*Form Approved*  
*OMB No. 0704-0188*

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

<b>1. AGENCY USE ONLY</b> <i>(Leave blank)</i>	<b>2. REPORT DATE</b> October 2001	<b>3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED</b> Technical Memorandum	
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b>  Verifying Data Integrity of Electronically Scanned Pressure Systems at the NASA Glenn Research Center		<b>5. FUNDING NUMBERS</b>  WU-708-90-1A-00	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b>  Joseph W. Panek			
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b>  National Aeronautics and Space Administration John H. Glenn Research Center at Lewis Field Cleveland, Ohio 44135-3191		<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b>  E-13011	
<b>9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b>  National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546-0001		<b>10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER</b>  NASA TM-2001-211155	
<b>11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b>  Prepared for the 2001 19th International Congress on Instrumentation in Aerospace Simulation Facilities (ICIASF 2001) cosponsored by the IEEE AES, NASA Glenn, and OAI, Cleveland, Ohio, August 27-30, 2001. Responsible person, Joseph W. Panek, organization code 7545, 216-433-3760.			
<b>12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b>  Unclassified - Unlimited Subject Categories: 35 and 61 Available electronically at <a href="http://gltrs.grc.nasa.gov/GLTRS">http://gltrs.grc.nasa.gov/GLTRS</a> This publication is available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information, 301-621-0390.		<b>12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE</b>	
<b>13. ABSTRACT</b> <i>(Maximum 200 words)</i>  The proper operation of the Electronically Scanned Pressure (ESP) Systems at the NASA Glenn Research Center is critical to accomplish the following goals; acquisition of highly accurate pressure data for the development of future aerospace and commercial aviation systems and continuous confirmation of data quality to avoid costly, unplanned, repeat wind tunnel or turbine testing. Standard automated setup and checkout routines are necessary to accomplish these goals. Data verification and integrity checks occur at three distinct stages, pretest pressure tubing and system checkouts, daily system validation and in-test confirmation of critical system parameters. This paper will give an overview of the existing hardware, software and methods used to validate data integrity.			
<b>14. SUBJECT TERMS</b>  Pressure measurement; ESP; Data integrity		<b>15. NUMBER OF PAGES</b> 13	
		<b>16. PRICE CODE</b>	
<b>17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT</b> Unclassified	<b>18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE</b> Unclassified	<b>19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT</b> Unclassified	<b>20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b>