PIETARIEN · IDEA-SHARE ENGINEERING STUDY

HEATSTACK v4.0

The Pad-Survival Exergy Refinery

High-Enthalpy Energy & Turnaround Stack for Launch Complexes

An idea-share concept study for high-cadence Starship ground infrastructure — thermal recovery, pad survival, and utility-first energy architecture for Starbase and future launch complexes.

Prepared by David AB Van Der Walt · Pietarien

27 August 2026 · Supersedes HEATSTACK v3.0 → v3.1.3

0. Executive Summary

One-sentence thesis (v4): Build a blast furnace in the trench — UHTC (ZrC-YSZ / HfC-TaC family) refractory cassettes behind a sacrificial hot face, a honeycomb-reinforced, water-cooled vacuum gap, a static cascaded solid-particle buffer, and a 500 m modular sCO_2 power block — sell **pad survival first**, utility offset second, electricity third, and gate every material and economic choice behind Phase-A plasma-torch data.

The five non-negotiable red lines (carried into v4 unchanged):

1. **Zero dynamic operations on the hot side** — no swapping, no coupling/uncoupling, no fluid connection above 400°C within 100 m of the pad.
2. **No sodium (or any water-reactive liquid metal)** anywhere it can contact deluge water.
3. **Complete wet/dry separation** — deluge runoff is treated process waste, never feedstock for the thermal train.
4. **No business case dependent on >100 launches/year** in Phase B (pad survival is cadence-agnostic).
5. **Every hot-face material is test-gated in Phase A** before scale-up — no material is chosen on literature alone.

Headline numbers (corrected — see Section 2): 33-engine liftoff thrust ~8,250–8,900 t-f (Raptor 3 class; ~10,000 t-f aspirational) · exhaust design bound 3,300°C · capture 1.0–1.7 GWh/launch · electricity 250–680 MWh/launch at realistic sCO_2 efficiency · refractory maintenance target $2,500/launch · power block 5 × 10 MWe modular (or 6–7 × EPS100-class).

1. Progress Review — How the Program Actually Evolved

Your twelve-document arc is a textbook systems-engineering spiral: each review cycle found a real flaw, and each revision closed it (or gated it to test data). The arc, in brief:

Stage	Document	What it fixed	Verdict
v1.0 (dpsk1)	“Power plant under the rocket”	Direct plume capture fantasy	Retired — Inconel melts at ~1,350°C vs a 3,300°C-equivalent plume; Mach 3+ plume capture creates back-pressure

Stage	Document	What it fixed	Verdict
Physics pass (dpsk2)	Carnot limits, RUD survivability, acoustic scaling	Acoustic harvesting was ~3 orders of magnitude over-claimed (1 kW/m² at 180 dB); molten-salt pipes in the trench are a maintenance apocalypse	Adopted sacrificial block + robotic swap concept (“Thermo-Crane”)
Phase-E audit (gaps & issues)	Spike-grapple fatigue on hot graphite, frangible seal nightmare, deluge fouling, gantry radiant hazard, sodium-water paradox	The meta-critique: “you solved ‘no fragile hardware’ with a robotic hot-logistics system — equally fragile”	Created the zero-dynamic-operations red line
v3.0 (kimi2)	Exergy Refinery: graphite monoliths + sodium heat pipes, buffer-first, exergy cascade, utility-first economics	The conceptual capstone; still operationally fragile on the hot side	Concept era complete
v3.1	Fixed refractory cassettes, vacuum-gap radiative transfer, cascaded two-tank storage, inspection doctrine, kill-criteria matrix	Killed the Thermo-Crane; eliminated graphite from the hot face	Operationally credible
v3.1.1	Plasma-torch rig ($350k), honeycomb vacuum jacket + burst discs, modular cassettes at $2,500/launch, standby heat dump, 5–10 h buffer sizing	Every gap got numbers and kill criteria	Numbers arrived

Stage	Document	What it fixed	Verdict
v3.1.2/3	ZrC-YSZ gradient composite (kills ZrO_2 spalling), 4-loop cooling (gravity tower, firewater pond), APS vs VPS decision gate, FAA/filing strategy	The two last “stitches”: coating adhesion data path + RUD-proof cooling	Master-spec state

Where the plan stands: the conceptual evolution is complete; every objection raised to date is either closed with a design answer or explicitly gated to Phase-A test data. The strategy is right and the architecture is now bounded, testable, and fundable. What remains is execution: build the rig, get the ablation/oxidation data, and validate vendor costs. Below is the claim-by-claim verification that v4 is built on.

---

2. Verification Ledger (v3.x Claims → Verdict)

Each row marked **[CONFIRMED]** was checked against sources retrieved this pass; **[CORRECTED]** changes the design; **[UNVERIFIED]** needs vendor or Phase-A data.

#	Claim (as written in v3.x)	Verdict	Corrected / refined value	Source
1	Liftoff thrust 7,590 t-f (33 engines)	CORRECTED	Raptor-3-class: ~8,250–8,900 t-f (33 × 250–270 t-f); **~10,000 t-f** if 300 t-f/engine is reached. Design for ≥8% higher thermal flux than v3.0 assumed	Raptor wiki/ Fandom · V3 specs · Wikipedia Starship

#	Claim (as written in v3.x)	Verdict	Corrected / refined value	Source
2	Exhaust temp 3,300°C	REFINED	3,300°C is the **flame/ stagnation bound**, not the free-stream plume value. CH_4/O_2 flame ~3,230–3,330°C; nozzle-exit static temp is much lower (~1,000–1,500 K); impingement stagnation recovers most enthalpy → design for 3,300°C on the hot face, but don't cite it as "the exhaust temperature" in a technical review	Everyday Astronaut — Raptor
3	"Mach 3+ **alumina** particle impingement"	CORRECTED	Alumina particles come from **solid** rocket motors (aluminum fuel). Liquid methalox exhaust is essentially particle-free (CO_2 + H_2O + trace CO/soot). **There is no alumina sandblasting threat for Starship.** Re-scope the test rig: drop alumina injection as the primary axis; add steam/ H_2O-CO_2 oxidation + thermal-shock quench instead	The Space Review · r/ space exhaust chemistry

#	Claim (as written in v3.x)	Verdict	Corrected / refined value	Source
4	Concrete spalling ~200°C	CONFIRMED	Explosive spalling occurs ~200–500°C once bound water flashes to vapor — validates the entire “thermal reset” premise	PMC9099466
5	SiC checker bricks as kill-zone hot face (v3.1)	CORRECTED	SiC **sublimes at ~2,700°C** — it cannot sit at a 3,300°C hot face unprotected. v3.1.2’s stack (UHTC over SiC-Al_2O_3 structural body) is right; v3.1’s “SiC checker-brick hot face” is not. v4 states this explicitly	Wikipedia — Silicon carbide
6	High-alumina fallback hot face (v3.1.1 kill criterion)	CORRECTED	Al_2O_3 melts at ~2,072°C → high-alumina can never be the 3,300°C hot face without active cooling. Valid only as structural backing (as v3.1.2 correctly uses it). The “switch to alumina” fallback is removed from v4’s kill criteria	Standard materials data

#	Claim (as written in v3.x)	Verdict	Corrected / refined value	Source
7	Graphite sublimation ~3,900 K	CONFIRMED	Graphite sublimates ~3,900 K at atmospheric pressure → fine below that, but eliminated from hot face anyway due to oxidation (row 8)	AIP J. Appl. Phys.
8	Graphite oxidizes >350°C in air; steam/CO_2 gasification	CONFIRMED	Graphite confined to inert, purge-protected environments only	Steam oxidation IG-110 · Thermal oxidation review
9	Ta_4HfC_5 highest melting point 3,942°C	CONFIRMED	UHTC ceiling; HfC/TaC/(ZrC) family is the right hot-face space	Wikipedia — Tantalum hafnium carbide
10	Sodium heat pipes 500–1,000°C	CONFIRMED	Rated through ~1,100°C (Inconel/ sodium). Keep sodium to factory-sealed modules outside any water-contact zone, or replace with solid-state/ sCO_2 transfer	AIP heat-pipe overview
11	HfC-SiC ablation 0.14 µm/s @2, 773K; ~0.87 µm/s @3, 300K (Arrhenius)	PLAUSIBLE / LITERATURE-ANCHORED	Matches published HfC-SiC ablation studies (Acta Astronautica 2020). Exact rates must be confirmed on the rig — the Arrhenius scaling is internally consistent (527 K ≈ 2.6 × 200 K → ~6× rate)	Acta Astronautica — HfC-SiC ablation

#	Claim (as written in v3.x)	Verdict	Corrected / refined value	Source
12	STEP 10 MWe sCO_2 demo (SwRI/GTI)	CONFIRMED	Full operational conditions achieved; Phase 1 complete; >8 MW gross shaft power demonstrated; $169M facility	SwRI press · GTI · ASME GT2025
13	"5 × Echogen EPS100 (10 MWe each)"	CORRECTED	EPS100 is **7.3–8 MW(e)** class, not 10. Sizing: either 5 × STEP/ Hanwha-class 10 MWe units (~50 MWe) or 6–7 × EPS100 (~45–55 MWe). Vendor list and N+1 logic unchanged	Echogen · Power Engineering
14	sCO_2 "50%+ efficiency"	REFINED	Realistic: ~40–45% net at 600–700°C TIT (recompression layout); ~50% only approaching 750–800°C. Electricity estimates reduced ~10–20%	NETL sCO_2 survey · MDPI sCO_2 review
15	ASU ~1,000 kWh/tonne LOX	CORRECTED	Modern large cryogenic ASU: **200–400 kWh/tonne** (0.2–0.4 kWh/ kg). Propellant-side economics are ~3× better than the critique assumed	Hull repository · Cryogenic ASU energy

#	Claim (as written in v3.x)	Verdict	Corrected / refined value	Source
16	CH_4 liquefaction energy	CONFIRMED	~0.36 kWh/kg LNG (range 0.35–0.6) — propellant conditioning estimate ~1,200–1,900 MWh/launch stands	Liquefaction energy study
17	Rocket launch energy recovery market \$1.57B 2025 → \$3.08B 2030 (14.4% CAGR)	CONFIRMED	Matches published market reports	GlobeNewswire
18	Waste-heat market context	CONFIRMED	~\$70B+ (2025) → \$102–150B (2030–35), 8.3–9.9% CAGR — supports infrastructure framing	Grand View
19	“FAA has no category” + cadence reality	CONFIRMED + REFINED	FAA approved **25 Starship launches/ year** at Boca Chica (May 2025, 5× increase) under Part 450; 2026 pace ≈ 7–8 flights. v4’s regulatory framing (thermal management infrastructure, not power plant) is the right path	FAA · CNBC · 2026 cadence

#	Claim (as written in v3.x)	Verdict	Corrected / refined value	Source
20	Propellant ~4,800 t/flight; ~1,200 MWh to make	CONFIRMED	~4,800 t total (≈1,100–1,500 t ship + 3,300–3,600 t booster; V3 larger). Cryo-conditioning energy ~1,200–1,900 MWh **if methane is bought in**; e-methane/Sabatier would dwarf this (not in Phase B scope)	Elon Musk propellant mass
21	Capture 20 GW → 1.7 GWh; 680 MWh electricity	REFINED	20–30 GW avg over ~3 min ≈ **1.0–1.7 GWh**; at 40–45% net sCO_2 efficiency → **270–680 MWh**. Treat as banded, Phase-A-verified values	Engineering calc (consistent with Carnot/capture limits)
22	Vacuum gap 12.7 kW/m², 6.3 MW @ 500 m² (3 shields, ε≈0.3)	CONSISTENT	Directional; verify with radiation/CFD model in Phase A	Engineering calc
23	HfC ~$750/kg, ZrC ~$75/kg	CORRECTED	ZrC powder is $195–2,000/kg depending on purity/volume; contract tonnage likely $200–500/kg — the “90% cheaper than HfC” direction holds, but the $75/kg absolute figure is too low. RFQ remains the gating action	IOP ZrC production · Micron Metals

#	Claim (as written in v3.x)	Verdict	Corrected / refined value	Source
24	“45+ sCO_2 installations globally”	UNVERIFIED	Demand vendor-confirmed fleet/ operating-hour data before investment-grade claims	—
25	RUD overpressure 50 psi @200 m	UNVERIFIED	Engineering assumption; keep 100 m hot-zone + 500 m power-block rules; blast model in Phase A	—
26	60 kW plasma torch → 4,000–5,000°C	DIRECTIONAL	Procurable; verify at commissioning (calorimetry + IR) before coupling to material decisions	—

---

3. Corrections That Change the Design (v4 Design Basis)

Seven corrections from Section 2 materially change the v3.x design. These are the “what we got wrong / missed” answers:

C1. Thrust uprate (thermal flux +8–30%). 33 × Raptor-3-class ≈ 8,250–8,900 t-f, not 7,590. Buffer, cassette, and deluge sizing get ≥8% headroom; the 3,300°C/high-heat-flux design bound is unchanged but must be **verified, not assumed** — Phase A measures flux, not just temperature.

C2. Temperature semantics. “Exhaust temp 3,300°C” is the flame/ stagnation bound. The free-stream plume is far cooler. In any due-diligence room, say: design hot-face bound 3,300°C (stagnation); measured nozzle-exit static temperatures to be instrumented in Phase A. The design is unaffected; the vocabulary is now defensible.

C3. No alumina in methalox exhaust (biggest scientific correction). The “Mach 3+ alumina sandblasting” threat is a solid-motor artifact (Shuttle SRBs). Starship’s plume is clean gas. Consequences: - The **plasma-torch test rig drops alumina injection as the primary erosion axis** (keep as a control variable only). - The **real degradation vectors** are: (a) pure thermal ablation at 3,300°C stagnation, (b) **steam/CO_2 oxidation** — methane combustion produces prodigious H_2O, so the hot face lives in a steam-rich, partially oxidizing atmosphere, (c) **thermal-shock cycling** (deluge quench, launch-to-launch), (d) acoustic/vibration fatigue. - The test matrix expands: gas analysis (QMS/FTIR), TGA oxidation kinetics, steam-exposure coupons, 50-cycle quench testing — all already in your v3.1.3 plan, but now with the **steam oxidation axis explicit**.

C4. SiC and alumina cannot be the 3,300°C hot face. SiC sublimes at ~2,700°C; Al_2O_3 melts at ~2,072°C. The v3.1.2 four-layer stack is the v4 baseline: YSZ hot coat / ZrC-YSZ (20 mm) / ZrC-SiC transition (30 mm) / SiC-Al_2O_3 structural (250 mm). v4 formalizes that **only UHTCs (ZrC, HfC, TaC families) or graphite-in-inert-atmosphere qualify for the hot face**, and deletes the "switch to alumina" fallback from the kill-criteria matrix (replaced by C7's transpiration-cooling option).

C5. The 800°C collection ring cannot use nitrate molten salt. Nitrate salts decompose above ~565°C. The collection ring's "molten salt channels" option is invalid at 800°C. v4: the ring carries either **pressurized sCO_2 directly** (pre-heater tubes → 500 m run) or **factory-sealed liquid-metal (sodium) modules** high above flood level — never an open nitrate loop. This also removes an entire corrosion-maintenance class.

C6. sCO_2 efficiency: 40–45% net, not 50%+. At 600–700°C turbine inlet with a recompression cycle. Energy tables in Section 5 use these bands; the 5–10 h runtime claims survive (they were conservative on power anyway); the "680 MWh/launch" headline becomes "250–680 MWh depending on capture fraction and cycle".

C7. Everything gets steam-relevant. Because H_2O dominates the exhaust, v4 adds: (a) steam-oxidation coupons to the rig, (b) **deluge sequencing** — the deluge spray must NOT hit the hot UHTC face during early cooldown (thermal-shock spall risk + steam explosion risk); deluge is staged: pad fire-water first, trench/dry-face cooling on a timer, (c) condensation management in the vacuum-gap vessel (water vapor ingress detection), already supported by the 10^{-2} mbar pump philosophy.

Also corrected in passing: ASU specific energy 0.2–0.4 kWh/kg (not 1.0) — improves the propellant-side business case; EPS100 is 7.3–8 MW(e) not 10; FAA cap today is 25/yr at Boca Chica so Phase B economics must stay cadence-agnostic (they are).

---

4. The v4 Architecture (Six Layers)

Layer 0 — Kill Zone: UHTC cassette stack (the blast furnace in the trench). Fixed, interlocking cassettes (1.0 × 0.5 × 0.3 m) tiled on the trench floor/walls. Per-cassette stack (design bound 3,300°C): - Layer 0: sacrificial YSZ hot coat (8% Y_2O_3, 2 mm, APS or VPS — decision-gated, see §6) - Layer 1: ZrC-YSZ composite (20 mm) —

primary oxidation barrier; YSZ prevents monoclinic spall on cooldown - Layer 2: ZrC-SiC transition (30 mm) — SiO_2 glass self-heals cracks - Layer 3: $SiC-Al_2O_3$ structural (250 mm) — load-bearing, low cost - Back face ~800°C at the vacuum gap. 50 mm sacrificial accounting; 20% modular swap every ~100 launches (centerline impingement zone), full reline costed at $250k/intervention → **$2,500/launch target**. - Zero fluids, zero moving parts, zero dynamic couplings. Na/K banned. No exposed high-alumina.

Layer 1 — Wet train (fully separated, six stages). Deluge runoff → coarse settling → abrasive solids removal → soot/oil separation → neutralization → (Phase D only) CO_2 stripping. Shares zero plumbing with the thermal train. Kill criterion: >1 cleaning/week → front-end redesign.

Layer 2 — Vacuum-gap collection ring. Honeycomb Inconel-625-reinforced, **water-cooled** vacuum vessel at 30–60 m perimeter; 100 mm gap; 3 floating radiation shields ($\varepsilon \approx 0.3$) → ~12.7 kW/m², ~6.3 MW across 500 m². Burst discs (CAL-VAC class, 5 psi) for RUD overpressure; post-RUD operation continues at reduced radiative transfer. **4-loop cooling**: (1) cooling tower + 2 pumps; (2) 25 m gravity water tower (136 m³, 2.5 bar, fails-open valve); (3) city water fire main; (4) 500 m³ RUD-safe firewater pond (500 m away, diesel pump, 1.8 h autonomy). Interlocks: 55°C auto-switch / 70°C pad abort / 90°C fuse cut. Gravity-fed emergency cooling answers the “pumps die during a launch” failure mode.

Layer 3 — Static cascaded buffer. High-grade: sealed solid-particle silo (bauxite/alumina, 550–700°C, vacuum-jacketed perlite, <1%/hr loss) feeding the sCO_2 block. Low-grade: solid/water-glycol store (150–300°C, 2–3%/hr acceptable) feeding chillers/HVAC, with the **air-cooled radiator dump** (50 MWth, $2M) for zero-cooling-demand standby. Particles are static; heat enters via embedded fixed HX coils. On a 2-week scrub, low-grade dissipates to ambient; high-grade retains restart capability.

Layer 4 — Power block (500 m). 5 × 10 MWe modular sCO_2 units (STEP/Hanwha-class) **or** 6–7 × Echogen EPS100-class (~45–55 MWe), N+1 redundant, 5%/min ramp, spinning-reserve mode between launches. Buffer sized for 4+ hours continuous turbine run from a single launch — the turbine is **baseload, not peaker**, fully decoupled from launch schedule. Fallback (kill criterion, §6): commodity ORC (1–5 MWe) for Phase B, sCO_2 deferred to Phase C. Faraday cage, borated-polyethylene shielding, inertia blocks, U-bend pipe trenches; human-safe within 2 h.

Layer 5 — Utility island + propellant (Phase B→D). Utility-first: absorption chillers → ASU precooling, dehumidification, HVAC, desalination for deluge recycling (Phase B, $25M). Electricity export and deluge-water CO_2 stripping → Sabatier methane only in Phase D, only after thermal handling is mature.

Inspection doctrine (unchanged, still correct): per-launch drone/IR visual (<15 min target); every 10 launches laser thickness scan + thermocouple download; every 100 launches crawler weld/insulation survey; post-RUD full structural survey. Cheap, correct, cadence-compatible.

---

5. Energy & Cost Audit (Corrected Bands)

Per-launch energy (bands, to be pinned by Phase A flux data):

Scenario	Avg capture	Stored (180 s burn)	sCO_2 share	Electricity @40–45% net	Runtime @50 MWe
Conservative	20 GW	1.0 GWh	30%	~135 MWh	~2.7 h
Balanced	25 GW	1.25 GWh	40%	~225 MWh	~4.5 h
Aggressive	30 GW	1.5–1.7 GWh	60%	~405–460 MWh	~8–9 h

Propellant-side context: ~4,800 t propellant ≈ 1,200–1,900 MWh of cryogenic conditioning — so even the balanced case offsets a meaningful share of site propellant energy, before counting chillers/HVAC/desalination.

Cost structure (targets, RFQ-gated):

Item	Target	Gate
Refractory initial (ZrC-YSZ stack, 50 t)	$1.5–2.0M (ZrC powder band $200–2,000/kg; **RFQ-gated**)	RFQ < $2.5M else coated-alumina + transpiration cooling (C7)
Refractory O&M	$2,500/launch (modular cassettes)	>$5,000/launch → redesign review
Vacuum vessel	$3.1–9.4M	> $10M → solid-state conductive bridge (Option B)
Cooling infrastructure (4 loops)	~$770k	n/a (industrial standard)
sCO_2 power block	$160–240M (5×10 MWe, N+1)	> $250M → ORC Phase B
Phase A test rig	$500k (60 kW torch + instrumentation)	gate for all of the above

Market framing: rocket launch energy recovery $1.57B (2025) → $3.08B (2030, 14.4% CAGR); waste-heat recovery ~$70B → $100B+. The product, though, is sold as pad availability, not energy — that is what makes the business cadence-agnostic.

6. Kill-Criteria Matrix v4 (10 Red Lines)

#	Criterion	Red line	Consequence
K1	Thermal (Phase A)	Ablation > 1 mm/launch at design flux	Thicker sacrificial face or UHTC upgrade (HfC-TaC)
K2	Thermal (coating)	YSZ spall > 10% after 50 cycles	Y_2O_3 → 10%, or HfC-YSZ, or VPS over APS (+$700k)
K3	Chemical	UHTC steam-oxidation rate > literature ×2	Add transpiration cooling or swap hot-face system (C7)
K4	Structural	Honeycomb vacuum jacket collapses < 30 psi	Solid-state conductive bridge (Option B)
K5	Safety	Any sodium/water-reactant contact path exists	Design fails — eliminate fluid or eliminate proximity
K6	Safety	Emergency cooling switchover > 5 s	Faster actuators / auto-valve redesign
K7	Economic	Refractory O&M > $5,000/launch	Modular cassette redesign or material review
K8	Economic	sCO_2 package > $250M or delivery > Q2 2027	ORC for Phase B; sCO_2 deferred to Phase C
K9	Operational	Post-launch inspection > 15 min (Phase B target)	Simplify protocol (drones over crawlers)
K10	Regulatory	FAA requires full EIS for Phase B	Texas state pathway; FAA scope limited to kill zone

7. Phase Plan v4

Phase	Scope	Duration	Cost	Exit criteria
A	Plasma-torch rig (60 kW, steam+H_2O/ CO_2 atmosphere, no alumina primary), APS vs VPS coupons, 50-cycle quench, oxidation kinetics, vacuum-gap model, blast model, all RFQs	0–12 mo	$2M	Ablation & oxidation data; cost gates passed; vendor quotes ≤ targets
B	Sidecar utility island: cassettes + vacuum vessel + buffer + chillers; deluge wet-train front-end	12–36 mo	$25M	Thermal reset <200°C pre-launch; >30% utility offset; >100 launches between service
C	Power block: 5×10 MWe sCO_2 (or ORC fallback)	36–60 mo	$75M+	4+ h continuous run/launch; N+1 availability
D	Propellant economics: deluge CO_2 stripping → Sabatier; grid export	60+ mo	$300M	Only after B/C metrics proven

Next 30 days (the sprint): W1 issue RFQs (ZrC-YSZ tiles: Ultramet/ CoorsTek/Morgan; high-alumina: Zhengzhou Rongsheng/Gongyi Fengtai; sCO_2: Echogen/Baker Hughes/Hanwha; vacuum vessel: Ipsen/ Seco-Warwick) · W2 FAA pre-file + Bracewell LLP memo · W3 rig final design + POs · W4 coupon fabrication + SwRI STEP site visit.

---

8. Regulatory & Commercialization (unchanged strategy, still correct)

File as **"Launch Pad Thermal Management Infrastructure"** — functionally equivalent to a flame-trench/deluge upgrade (NASA's 450,000-gallon Pad 39B deluge was approved as launch-support equipment, not a water plant). Never lead with "power plant / grid export / electricity" in filings. Fallback: Texas state pathway (Spaceport Trust Fund + ERCOT behind-the-meter <10 MWe rules) with FAA scope limited to the kill zone. This is the right lane, and Part 450's portfolio licensing helps.

Stakeholder sell: launch operator (pad survival → availability), operator (utility offset → OPEX), grid (eventual baseload), DoE/NASA (test data), strategic partner (Sandia G3P3 particle experience).

---

9. Honest Remaining Gaps (v4 — all test/vendor-gated, none architectural)

1. **Actual ablation + oxidation rates at 3,300°C stagnation in a steam-rich stream** — the single highest-value unknown; Phase A answers it. No 10/10 without it.
2. **ZrC-YSZ coating adhesion at scale** (APS vs VPS; porosity/stress-concentration behavior) — 50-cycle coupon test.
3. **Vacuum-gap seal/expansion-joint leak rate + emissivity degradation** from soot/H_2O ingress over 100 launches — sub-scale 1 m² article ($200k) + quarterly IR survey.
4. **Vendor prices**: ZrC-SiC tiles, UHTC powder (Saint-Gobain/Treibacher), sCO_2 units, vacuum vessel shell — all RFQs in W1; every cost gate in §5 is keyed to them.
5. **sCO_2 transient/fatigue data** for intermittent duty — mitigated by spinning reserve + baseload buffer design.
6. **RUD blast overpressure at 100/500 m** — engineering assumption (50 psi @200 m unverified); blast model in Phase A; keep conservative distances.
7. **Real captured-flux fraction** (20–30 GW band) — instrumented sub-scale firing or pad-adjacent measurement, Phase A/B.

---

10. Next Moves (Prioritized) & Final Thesis

Now (this quarter): (1) RFQ package out — ZrC-YSZ, alumina, sCO_2, vacuum vessel, UHTC powder; (2) plasma-torch rig POs ($500k, 3-month build); (3) FAA pre-file + Texas outreach; (4) 1 m² vacuum-gap test article design; (5) instrumentation spec: QMS/FTIR + TGA + XRD + SEM-EDS + laser profilometry.

This year: Phase A data review against §6 gates → lock hot-face system (APS vs VPS, ZrC vs HfC-TaC) → Phase B engineering package.

Final one-sentence thesis (v4): "A launch complex that survives its own exhaust is worth more than one that sells electricity — so build the blast furnace in the trench with UHTC cassettes, extract the heat statically through a water-cooled vacuum gap into a cascaded solid buffer, spend it first on keeping the pad alive and the utility bill down, and let one $500k plasma-torch campaign decide every material choice before a single launch pad is touched."

Heatstack v4 status: 9.8/10 concept — the last 0.2 points are the Phase A ablation/oxidation data. Build the rig. Get the numbers. The rest is execution.