

## Brigham Young University AUVSI Capstone Team (Team 45)

## [TITLE OF YOUR DOCUMENT]

| ID     | Rev. | Date   | Description | Author   | Checked By   |
|--------|------|--------|-------------|----------|--------------|
| [ARTI- | [RE- | [DATE] | [DESCRIP-   | [AUTHOR] | [CHECKED BY] |
| FACT   | VI-  |        | TION]       |          |              |
| ID]    | SION |        | -           |          |              |
|        | NUM- |        |             |          |              |
|        | BER] |        |             |          |              |



## 1 Evaluation Methods and Results

As can be seen from the decision matrix in Table 1,

Table 1: A decision matrix the UGV Drop Method. A scale of 1-5 was used for weights with 5 having high importance and 1 having low importance. A 1-5 scale was also used to rate each option's performance under each requirement. In this case, a 1 was used to indicate poor performance while a 5 indicates favorable performance.

| UGV Drop       | Weight | Glider | Sky Crane | Parachute | Un-aided Drop |
|----------------|--------|--------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| Method         |        |        |           |           | (Reference)   |
| UGV Weight     | 1      | 0      | 0         | 0         | 0             |
| Stowed Drag    | 1      | 0      | 0         | 0         | 0             |
| Max Drop       | 1      | 0      | 0         | 0         | 0             |
| Height         |        |        |           |           |               |
| Max Landing    | 1      | 0      | 0         | 0         | 0             |
| Velocity       |        |        |           |           |               |
| Accuracy in    | 1      | 0      | 0         | 0         | 0             |
| Hitting Target |        |        |           |           |               |
| Totals         | 0      | 0      | 0         | 0         |               |