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## Outline

- Earth-Moon Libration Point System
- Halo Orbit Families \& Geometries
- Libration Point Transfer Options
- Transfer Option Performance Example ( $\Delta \mathrm{V}$, time)
o Direct
o Lunar Flyby
o Low Energy (Manifold)
- L2 Halo Orbit Special Considerations
o Orbit Maintenance
o Communication
o Rendezvous
o Launch Opportunities
o Aborts


## Earth-Moon Libration Points

## Libration Points are Equilibrium Points in a 2-body system (Earth-Moon, Sun-Earth, Sun-Mars, etc.) <br> - Collinear points (L1, L2, L3), "unstable" <br> - Equilateral points (L4, L5), "stable" <br> - Station-keeping - very small $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ (<10 m/s/yr)

Earth-to-Moon - 384,400 km L1 - 57,731 km from Moon
L2 - 64,166 km from Moon L3-381,327 km from Earth L4 \& L5-384,400 km from Earth and Moon
+

## Halo Orbit Families and Geometry

## Halo Orbit:

- A periodic, 3-D orbit near the $L_{1}, L_{2}, L_{3}$ Lagrange Pt.
- Spacecraft travels in a closed, repeating path near the Lagrange point
- Not technically orbiting the Lagrange point
- Tend to be unstable, station keeping is required


## Rule of thumb:

- Period of halo is $\sim 1 / 2$ of the period of the primaries
- In the Earth-Moon system, a halo period is $\sim 14$ days

orthographic projection on $\hat{\mathbf{y}}-\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ plane
orthographic projection on $\hat{\mathbf{x}}-\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ plane


## Earth/Moon-L2 Halo South Family

$\square$ Halo amplitudes range from approximately 0 to 30,000 km (north) and up to $80,000 \mathrm{~km}$ (south)

- As the Z-amplitude (Az) of the halo is increased, there is a transition to a near rectilinear halo with a 6-7 day period.
$\square$ Near rectilinear halos are less unstable and require less orbit maintenance*
$\square$ Lower Az halos are more unstable*, but more amenable to transition to and from weak stability boundary manifold trajectories



## L2 Halo Selection Considerations

- L2 or L2 Halo Orbit selection dependent on various parameters besides transportation
o Environmental considerations in L2 halo orbits
- Thermal, Radiation, MMOD
o Orbit maintenance costs
o Best halo for Earth communication and visibility
o Best halo for Lunar South Pole visibility
o Science considerations in L2 Halo Orbits
o Excursions to LLO or alternate Halo Orbits



## LEO to Earth-Moon L2 Direct and Flyby - Example Cases

LEO inclination: 28.5 deg
L2 Halo orbit:
Max. Amplitude in x-axis: $11,904 \mathrm{~km}$ Max. Amplitude in y-axis: $34,672 \mathrm{~km}$ Max. Amplitude in z-axis: $10,000 \mathrm{~km}$ Orbit Period: 14 days

## LEO to Earth-Moon L2 Direct and Flyby - Example Cases

LEO inclination: 28.5 deg L2 Halo orbit:
Max. Amplitude in x-axis: $11,904 \mathrm{~km}$ Max. Amplitude in y-axis: $34,672 \mathrm{~km}$ Max. Amplitude in z-axis: 10,000 km Orbit Period: 14 days

| Destination | L2 |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mission Type | direct | flyby |
| LEO DV (km/s) | 3.149 | 3.134 |
| Lunar Periapsis DV (km/s) | 0.000 | 0.186 |
| Capture DV (km/s) | 1.107 | 0.148 |
| Total DV (km/s) | 4.256 | 3.468 |
| Transfer Time (days) | 6.14 | 8.53 |
|  |  |  |


| L2 Halo |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| direct | flyby |
| 3.151 | 3.133 |
| 0.000 | 0.175 |
| 0.957 | 0.109 |
| 4.108 | 3.416 |
| 6.29 | 8.35 |

## Earth Orbit to EM-L2 - Minimized Arrival $\Delta V$

## Example Case-Low Energy Trajectory Design

## Performance

- Earth departure $\Delta \mathrm{V}=3195 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Manifold insertion $\Delta \mathrm{V}=1 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Total flight time $=103$ days

Flight Profile

- After Earth launch, depart from a $28.5^{\circ}$, 185 km circular altitude LEO parking orbit, ( $\Delta \mathrm{V}=3195 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ )
- Achieve energy (C3) to reach the L2 Halo manifold insertion point
- Reach manifold insertion point (Earth departure +10 days)
- Insert onto manifold ( $\Delta \mathrm{V}=1 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ )
- Coast on a trajectory taking the s/c 1-2 million km where the Sun's gravity field guides the trajectory to the L2 Halo arrival point
- Reach L2 Halo arrival (Earth departure + 103 days)



## Comments

- Other low energy trajectory types (lunar flyby, lunar/earth flyby)


## Low Energy Trajectory Design Example

## Low Energy Transfer Option

- Invariant manifolds (stable and unstable) lead into and out of L1 \& L2
- Connect manifolds to construct low energy transfers to halo or other periodic orbits
- Can use this technique to generate trajectories from Earth to halo orbits in the Earth-Moon (as well as Sun-Earth) system with an extremely small arrival $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ requirement
- Earth departure $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ can be slightly higher than crewed direct or lunar flyby trajectory
- Opens selection to low $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ capability buses
- Longer trip time - uncrewed flights only
- May be limited opportunities


## Orbit Maintenance for Halo Orbit Families

- Station keeping at L2 for 1 year can be as low as <5-10 m/s/year -Near-rectilinear halo orbit
- Type of Halo Orbit impacts costs can increase to <25-30 m/s/year


| Orbit Type | Libration <br> Point | Period <br> (days) | No. of <br> Maneuvers | Avg. time between <br> maneuvers (days) | Avg. DV <br> $(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s})$ | Total DV <br> $(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Near-rectilinear halo | L2 | 7 | 86 | 4.2 | 0.057 | 4.82 |
| Near-rectilinear halo | L2 | 8 | 55 | 6.4 | 0.086 | 4.69 |
| Near-rectilinear halo | $L 2$ | 8 | 55 | 6.4 | 0.101 | 5.54 |



Station Keeping for 1 year*

| Orbit Type | Libration <br> Point | Period <br> (days) | No. of <br> Maneuvers | Avg. time between <br> maneuvers (days) | Avg. DV <br> $(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s})$ | Total DV <br> $(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Halo | L2 | 14 | 156 | 2.33 | 0.183 | 28.47 |
| Halo | $L 1$ | 12 | 60 | 6 | 1.106 | 66.33 |

[^0]
## Orbit Maintenance $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ Cost In EM-L2 Halo

$\square$ Station keep $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ depends upon:

- Control law
- Maneuver execution error
- Navigation Orbit Determination (OD)
$\square$ With a good control law, navigation accuracy and execution precision will dominate the station keeping $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ cost
- Assumptions
- 24 maneuvers over 12 revs ( $\sim 2$ maneuvers / rev)
[ Reference EM-L2 halo z-amplitude = 10 km



## Earth-Moon L2 Halo Orbit Rendezvous

[. The EM-L2 Halo rendezvous mission begins at Earth launch.
$\square$ The MPCV can be launched daily to target the EM-L2 halo itself
$\square$ There exists an optimal LEO to EM-L2 halo insertion location that occurs once during the halo period (around 14 days).
$\square$ Launching at a time designed to insert the MPCV onto the halo at this time will provide a minimum $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ requirement.
$\square$ Launching at a time away from this optimal time will incur additional MPCV $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ cost.
$\square$ MPCV inserts onto EM-L2 halo at a selected offset distance.
$\square$ MPCV later performs maneuver(s) to close this distance, ultimately docking with the Waypoint Spacecraft (WSC)


## Earth-Moon L2 Halo Orbit Rendezvous <br> - Example Methodology -

## Assumptions

- Target s/c in halo orbit about L2
- Chaser s/c inserts onto (target) halo, trailing by 10 km
- Chaser executes a 2-manuever sequence to close the distance
- Chaser burn 1 maneuver closes distance between Chaser and target over a selected duration

$\square$ Vary the departure epoch (Earth departure maneuver is delayed) from the nominal (minimum $\Delta v$ ) mission.
$\square$ For the nominal mission, the WSC is at the optimal insertion offset point at the optimal (minimum DV) MPCV insertion time.
- The nominal mission assumes zero launch delay.
$\square$ Rendezvous occurs at a new location to minimize $\Delta v$ and limit the flight time to 9 days.
$\square$ The x-axis in the plots are days past the nominal TLI.


## Effect of Launch Delays on MPCV $\Delta V$ Requirement

 Results

Insertion Into Non-Optimal Location on a Halo Orbit


Nominal
Departure

## Effect of Launch Delays on MPCV $\Delta V$ Requirement Results



Insertion Into Non-Optimal Location on a Halo Orbit

* Sum of all $\Delta$ v's performed by the MPCV after Earth-departure

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Nominal
Departure

## Effect of Launch Delays on MPCV $\Delta V$ Requirement

## Results

In this plot, t is really $(180-\alpha)$, since we are using real (not osculating) halo orbits.
$\square \alpha$ is the insertion right ascension (in the Earth-Moon rotating frame, centered at the L2 point).


## Effect of Launch Delays on MPCV $\Delta V$ Requirement Summary

$\square$ It turns out that freeing the Moon flyby altitude and flyby maneuver true anomaly constraints result in significant savings for the worst off-nominal cases.

- About $75 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ for the +4 day case
- The worst-case additional $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ cost is $165 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ (for a 6-day delay)
$\square$ This analysis does not account for delays in LEO after launch (it is assumed that TLI is always performed in the optimal LEO for the departure epoch).
$\square$ There may be cases where a multiple-maneuver insertion sequence may reduce the cost [haven't looked at this yet].
$\square$ This analysis also assumes that the WSC is a totally passive vehicle. A further study could assume that it is capable of also performing maneuvers to produce a more favorable alignment.


## Aborts

- Earth Entry Interface (EI) Target:
- Altitude: 121.9 km
- Flight path angle: -5.86

Total return time $\leq 11$ days
Start of Excursion
$\square$ Best of single-impulse and two-impulse (flyby) modes


## Aborts

$\square$ For most cases, the flyby departure will be cheaper (but there are cases where a direct return is cheaper).


## Maneuver between L2 and L1 Halo orbits - ARTEMIS Mission Example -

## ARTEMIS Mission

- Spacecraft "P1" reached vicinity of L2 Aug. 2010, "P2" reached L1 Oct. 2010
- Frequent orbit maintenance (every week) required, but maneuvers were small equivalent to $<100 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s} / y e a r$
- P1 maneuvered from L2 to L1 Jan 2011 - $\Delta V$ negligible, 10-day transfer
- P1 maneuvered ( $90 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) from L1 "lissajous" to lunar orbit June 2011, P2 joined it in July ( $120 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ )

ARTEMIS-P1 Spacecraft's Orbit - Top View


Moon Inertial Axes

|  | Time at L2 | L2-L1 Transfer | Time at L1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P1 | 131 days | 10 days | 154 days |
| P2 | - | - | 255 days |

## END PRESENTATION

## BACKUP

## Earth-Moon Libration Point Mission Design and Performance L2 TO MARS

## Earth-Moon L2 to Phobos Orbit Insertion

Example Trajectory
Transfer time: 209 days


> 3-Burn Escape:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
\Delta \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{L} 2}=144 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s} \\
\Delta \mathrm{v}_{\text {Moon }}=195 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s} \\
\Delta \mathrm{v}_{\text {Earth }}=445 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s} \\
\Delta \mathrm{v}_{\text {Mars }}=2.135 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s} \\
\Delta \mathrm{v}_{\text {Total }}=2.921 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}
\end{array}\right\} 784 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}
$$

## Earth-Moon L2 to Phobos Orbit Insertion

## $\square$ Compare to direct transfer from L2



## Natural Environments at Earth-Moon L2 Ionizing Radiation

- Major sources of radiation
o Galactic Cosmic Rays
o Solar Particle Events
o Magnetosphere
- Shielding Strategy required to protect crew.
o Mission duration and shielding strategy determine risk
o Short Duration free space missions (<30 days) can be conducted within current NASA Standards and risk models
- Spacecraft hardware assessment required to ensure surface charging and ionizing radiation levels at L2 are within existing hardware certification levels.

Natural Environments at Earth-Moon L2 Thermal \& Micro-Meteoroid

- Thermal
o Thermal environment ranges from 70-230 Kelvin depending on exposure to the sun
o Thermal environment not considered an architectural driver for L2 missions


Radiator sink temperature at L2 is invariant. It can either be very cold due to deep space or at a constant sink of 230 Kelvin (1 sun)

- MMOD
-     - Lagrange Sink Scenario 2
o Man made orbital debris not a major factor at L2 / L2 Halos, tends to "wash out" of location / orbit
o Meteoroid risk is influenced by Earth focusing (gravitational) factor and Earth shadowing while in Earth orbit
- Meteoroid risk far from Earth is typically less compared to meteoroid risk in LEO
o MMOD environment not considered an architectural driver for L2 missions.


## Earth-Moon L2 Halo Orbit Rendezvous <br> - Example Methodology -

## Assumptions

- Target s/c in halo orbit about L2
- Chaser s/c inserts onto (target) halo, trailing by 10 km
- Chaser executes a 2-manuever sequence to close the distance
- Chaser burn 1 maneuver closes distance between Chaser and



## Earth Visibility from Halo Orbit - Communications -

## Assumptions

- Visibility based on ability to view at least one of three DSN sites from the spacecraft on the halo
- There are North and South halo orbit families


## Observations

- Visibility to Earth is affected by halo orbit amplitude (94\%+)
- Visibility to Earth is essentially independent of distance from the Earth


## Earth-Moon L2 Halo Orbit Rendezvous <br> - Example Methodology -

## Assumptions

- Target s/c in halo orbit about L2
- Chaser s/c inserts onto (target) halo, trailing by 10 km
- Chaser executes a 2-manuever sequence to close the distance
- Chaser burn 1 maneuver closes distance between Chaser and target over a selected duration

Target

Burn1 Rendezvous initiation

Burn2 -
Rendezvous complete
ich Delays on MPC

irement



Insertion Into Non-Optimal Location on a Halo Orbit


## Abort Assessments

- Earth Entry Interface (EI) Target:
- Altitude: 121.9 km
- Flight path angle: -5.86
] Total return time $\leq 11$ days
- Best of single-impulse and two-impulse (flyby) modes


## Start of

 Excursion

## Abort Assessments

$\square$ For most cases, the flyby abort will be cheaper (but there are cases where a direct return is cheaper).


## LEO to Earth-Moon L1 \& L2 Direct and Flyby - Example Cases



## ASTEROID UIILZATION MISSION <br> $$
\text { Status } 1
$$
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## 1. DRO Tutorial

2. MPCV Transfer Example Cases
3. Overview of Trade Studies to Assess MPCV Accessibility to the Asteroid
Targets

## Nesa

## DRO Tutorial



## Background

- A Distant Retrograde Orbit (DRO) is another family of stable orbits found in the circular restricted three-body problem (CRTBP).
- In the Earth-Moon rotating frame, they look like circular to elliptical orbits around the Moon (with the Moon at the center of the orbit).
- DROs orbit the moon in a retrograde direction from moon's orbit/rotation.
- Some DROs are very stable over long periods of time ( $\geq 100$ years) with no orbit maintenance, even with a "real" force model.



## DROs In The CR3BP

- DRO shapes transition with increases in altitude
- Nearly circular near the Moon
- Transitioning to an elliptical shape
- Then becomes more kidney-shaped
- Then becomes more cardioid shaped
- In a "real" system, 50,000 to $70,000 \mathrm{~km}$ altitudes are stable for > $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ years
- Additional work required to determine stability of higher altitudes


Earth-Moon Rotating Frame
(Circular Restricted Three-Body Problem)

## Example DRO's (Real Force Model)

- Classified by x-axis crossing radius (b) - like a semi-minor axis: $10,000-60,000 \mathrm{~km}$ shown here
- Stable for long periods (300 days shown here)
- DROs are periodic in Circular Restricted Three Body Problem (CRTBP)
- DROs are quasi-periodic in the real force model
- Increasing period with increasing altitude above Moon


Earth-Moon Rotating Frame


## Example DRO's: Inertial Frame (Moon-Centered)



- This DRO set lies in the Earth-Moon plane
- DROs currently being pursued by JPL for ARM storage orbit


J 2000 I nertial Frame (Moon-Centered)

## Example DRO's: Inertial Frame (Earth-Centered)

- From an Earth perspective, a DRO will reside in the general vicinity of the moon and so a spacecraft in a DRO will orbit Earth about every $\mathbf{2 8}$ days
- A spacecraft in a DRO will have the same approximate position, rotational velocity, and inclination as that of the moon


J 2000 Inertial Frame (Earth-Centered)


## Summary

- "Lunar" DROs cycle in the vicinity of the moon with a range of altitudes
- DROs are generally stable (particularly lower altitude DROs)
- They can propagate for many years (some cases > 100 years) without maintenance
- In an Earth-Moon rotating frame, DROs are a quasiperiodic orbit (circle, ellipse, kidney - shaped)
- From Earth perspective, DROs approximately follow the lunar orbit motion



## Round-Trip MPCV Mission TO DRO (Example Cases)



## Overview

- This assessment contains a round-trip MPCV mission to a distant retrograde orbit (DRO) around the Moon.
- In support of a rendezvous mission with a preemplaced asteroid
- This is a feasibility assessment (i.e. just a single case) and not a trade study.
- It is not a best or worst case.
- Mission performance requirements and opportunities would be better revealed by trade studies


## Assumptions

- Impulsive ( $\Delta v$ ) maneuvers (optimized)
- DRO size (x-axis crossing distance) $\mathbf{= 6 2 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{~ k m}$
- Outbound:
- iCPS MECO state (see next slide)
- iCPS Capability:
- Total $\Delta \mathrm{v}: 2,900 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- $40.77 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ used for the PRM (raises perigee from 40.7 to 185 km , with an 1806 km apogee)
- Estimate about $80 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ gravity for losses,
- So, the impulsive limit for TLI is $2,779.23 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- iCPS Earth departure maneuver, followed 30 seconds later by an MPCV departure maneuver (if necessary to complete TLI)
- Powered lunar flyby (minimum 100 km altitude)
- Inbound:
- Direct return (no flyby)
- El Altitude: 121.92 km
- EI FPA: -5.86 deg
- Total mission duration $\leq 21$ days (optimized)
- At least one day stay in the DRO (optimized)


## Assumptions: MECO State

- MECO State (EPM_OF_DATE Frame, Earth-centered)
- Radius magnitude (km): 6535.55695654
- Longitude (deg): -66.5737779
- Geocentric latitude (deg): 27.5046213
- Velocity magnitude (km/s): 8.20892236
- Geocentric azimuth (deg): 97.76124785
- Geocentric flight path angle (deg): 3.46249997



## Assumptions: Earth Departure

Periapsis Raise Maneuver


Earth Departure Finite
Burn Maneuver
(~ 20 min )
Example: MECO at 2017-Dec-12 08:14:14 TDB
hybrid_8x8_20171122_240030_base.ideck

- Fixed flight time from MECO to apoapsis (44 min).
- Fixed maneuver to raise periapsis to 185 km altitude ( $40.8 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ ).
- The $\mathbf{1 8 5} \mathbf{~ k m}$ periapsis is the actual propagated value (not osculating).
- 8x8 GGM02C Earth gravity model
- Optimized coast to the Earth departure maneuver.
- Finite Burn Earth departure maneuver with optimized control law and burn duration:
- VUW Frame
- $\alpha, \dot{\alpha}, \beta, \dot{\beta}$ SOC control law


## Results (Impulsive Only)

- MECO Epoch: 2021-Jul-19 15:59:17 TDB
- iCPS Departure: 2,779.23 m/s
- MPCV Departure: $\mathbf{6 0 . 3 6 \mathrm { m } / \mathrm { s }}$
- Flyby : $179.1 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Outbound Flight Time: 9.38 days
- DRO Arrival: $\mathbf{1 2 4 . 6} \mathbf{~ m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Stay Time: 2.49 days
- DRO Departure: $577.4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Return Flight Time: 6.61 days
- Entry velocity: 11.00 km/s
- Total iCPS $\Delta \mathrm{v}: \mathbf{2 , 7 7 9 . 2 3 \mathrm { m } / \mathrm { s }}$
- Total MPCV $\Delta \mathrm{v}: 941.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Total Mission Duration: 18.49 days


## 



## Phasing

- Assume the asteroid is at the location of the optimal insertion on previous slide (the 2021-Jul-19 departure epoch).
- Subsequent opportunity (next month) will have a higher cost due to the nonoptimal phasing (assuming the asteroid cannot be moved once placed in orbit)
- Trade studies will be necessary to assess asteroid accessibility over time for different sized DROs and asteroid insertion phase.



## Delayed DRO Departure

- Using the nominal case (MECO Epoch: 2021-Jul-19), delay the departure from the asteroid and re-optimized the Earth return.
- Direct return.
- The El constraint remains altitude and flight path angle only.


## Delayed DRO Departure




Nominal Departure

> Nominal Departure


# Orion Performance to Asteroid Rendezvous Targets 

## Asteroid Storage Orbits

- Currently monitoring JPL assessment of possible asteroid storage orbits


National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology

## Asteroid Storage Orbit Options

- Scenario 1: Lunar Circulating Eccentric Orbit
- ARM Spacecraft enters weakly captured orbit Eccentric and thrusts to increase orbit lifetime until it is Orbit long term stable in a "Frozen Orbit"
- Orbit is highly varied, but the motion is bounded
- Scenario 2: Lunar Distant Retrograde Orbit (DRO)
- ARM Spacecraft initially enters very distant, but not very stable DRO and thrusts to increase orbit lifetime
- Scenario 3: Earth Weakly Captured
- Orbit is weakly captured at Earth, escapes and is then recaptured a year later
- We don't know how to do this yet
- Scenario 4: Lunar Horseshoe
- We enter an elliptical Earth orbit that is resonant with the Moon

Circulating


The asteroid Cruithne is in a type of resonant orbit called a
"Horseshoe orbit"


## Current JPL primary ARM Earth return target:

- DRO
- TBD altitude >60,000 km


## Secondary JPL ARM Target:

- Earth-Moon L2

Reference: Strange, N., "Lunar Storage Orbits", JPL Presentation,
1/25/13

## Trade Space - Performance

- DRO Performance
- Parameters*:
- Epoch range: 2021-2025
- DRO Altitude
- 60,000, 70,000, 80,000 km
- Based on orbit lifetime. Shorter lifetimes not considered, currently.
- Mission time
- 84 total crew days available
- Assess mission times for crews of 2, 3, 4
- Stay time at the asteroid
- Direct vs LGA, Outbound/Inbound
- Current study: LGA outbound with Direct inbound
- Earth return targets: Altitude/FPA vs Entry Target-line
* Parameter sets are similar for lunar orbit and libration point targets. For an EML2H target, the "altitude" variation can be substituted with an "amplitude" of the halo.


## Trade Space - Performance

- DRO Abort Performance
- Assessment of Earth return performance cost along outbound (Earth to Asteroid orbit) trajectory
- Possibility of inclusion of a free-return on outbound
- Assess aborts for Direct vs LGA (outbound and inbound) combinations
- Assess MPCV mission opportunities
- Matching DRO orbit to resonate with lunar orbit
- MPCV performance to DRO; Orbit lifetime


## Trade Space - DRO Performance Output

- Mission DV/propellant
- Frequency of opportunities
- Increased opportunities for reduced crew
- Launch windows
- Aborts
- Cargo missions?



## Future Work

- Conduct MPCV Trades
- Performance cost for varying DRO characteristics
- Mission opportunities to DRO
- Mission duration vs. cost (for > 21 day max MPCV active life)
- Launch window for DRO mission
- Develop MPCV DRO rendezvous
- Far-field (and proximity operations)
- Orbit lifetime
- Aborts
- Continue to assess MPCV performance to alternative asteroid storage orbits


## Acronyms

- DRO
- FPA
- FPR
- iCPS
- LGA
- MPCV
- OM
- PRM
- TCM
- SLS

Distant Retrograde Orbits

Flight Path Angle
Flight Performance Reserve
interim Cryogenic Propulsion Stage
Lunar Gravity Assist
Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle
Orbit Maintenance
Perigee Raise Maneuver
Trajectory Correction Maneuver
Space Launch System


Backup

## Round-Trip

MPCV Mission
To Libration
Point
(Example
Cases)

## 1. EM-L2 Halo $\rightarrow$ EM-L2 Halo

## MPCV

- LEO Orbit: 185x1806 km, Incl. = 28.5 deg
- Earth Departure $\Delta \mathrm{v}: \mathbf{2 7 4 1}$ m/s
- Earth to L2 Halo transfer time: 8.6 days
- Flyby $\Delta \mathrm{v}: \mathbf{2 2 8}$ m/s
- L2 Halo insertion $\Delta v: 112$ m/s
- L2 halo orbit $A_{\mathbf{z}}$ : 10,000 km
- Rendezvous = 1.5 days


## WSC+MPCV

- Stay in L2 Halo orbit: 2.3 days
- Transfer from L2 halo to L2 halo 4.7 days
- Transfer $\Delta \mathrm{v}$ : $16 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- L2 halo orbit $A_{z}: 12,000 \mathrm{~km}$
- Stay in L2 Halo orbit: 5.7 days MPCV
- Earth return $\Delta \mathrm{v}: 944 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Return time: 5.9 days (direct)



## Libration Point Orbit-MPCV Performance: L1, L2

Halo orbit test cases with Copernicus
Jacob Williams, ESCG, 11/4/2011

|  | LEO to L2 Halo |  | LEO to L2 |  | LEO to L1 Halo | LEO to L1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maneuver | direct | flyby | direct | flyby | direct | direct |
| LEO DV | 3.172 | 3.155 | 3.171 | 3.156 | 3.140 | 3.137 |
| Lunar Periapsis DV | 0.000 | 0.175 | 0.000 | 0.186 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Capture DV | 0.958 | 0.109 | 1.108 | 0.148 | 0.606 | 0.717 |
| Total DV (km/s) | 4.130 | 3.438 | 4.278 | 3.490 | 3.746 | 3.855 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transfer Time (days) | 6.29 | 8.35 | 6.13 | 8.53 | 3.94 | 3.76 |



## Assumptions

Circularized Moon Orbit at 2011-Jan-1 00:00:00 Objective function is sum of Delta-V's

| LEO Departure Orbit |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| SMA | 6478 km |
| ECC | 0 |
| INC | 28.5 deg |

## L1 Halo orbit

Max. Amplitude in $x$-axis Max. Amplitude in $y$-axis Max. Amplitude in z-axis Orbit Period

6537 km 23445 km 10000 km

12 day

11904 km 34672 km 10000 km

14 day

## General Vehicle Assumptions

- MPCV
- Mass = 24092.6 kg
- Usable propellant (after removal of FPR, TCM, ACS, OMs, Sep. mnvrs) $=8086 \mathrm{~kg}$
- $\quad \mathrm{Isp}=315.1 \mathrm{sec}$
- $\quad$ Thrust $=6,000 \mathrm{lb}(26,689.3$ newton $)$
- Delta-V capability $=1340 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ (usable, translational)
- $\quad \mathrm{T} / \mathrm{W}_{\text {initial }}=0.113$
- iCPS (Current Configuration)
- Mass $_{\text {MECO }}=55,773 \mathrm{~kg}$
- Mass $_{\text {Earth_Departure }}=54,649.4 \mathrm{~kg}$
(includes $24,092.6 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{MPCV}$ )
- Usable propellant Earth_Departure+PRM $=25,902.6 \mathrm{~kg}$
- $\quad$ Isp $=460.296 \mathrm{sec}$
- Thrust $_{\text {Earth_Departure }}=110,897.4 \mathrm{~N}(24,930.7 \mathrm{lb}$.
- Earth Departure delta-V $=2859 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
(includes 24,092.6 kg MPCV)
- $\quad \mathrm{T} / \mathrm{W}_{\text {initial }}=0.207$
- iCPS (18" Extension - Stretched Configuration)
- Mass $_{\text {MECO }}=58,313.3 \mathrm{~kg}$
- Mass $_{\text {Earth_Departure+PRM }}=57,170.3 \mathrm{~kg}$
(includes 24,092.6 kg MPCV)
- $\quad \mathrm{Isp}=462.746 \mathrm{sec}$
- Thrust $_{\text {Earth_Departure }}=110,173.6 \mathrm{~N}(24,768 \mathrm{lb}$.
- Earth Departure delta-V $=2890 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- $\quad \mathrm{T} / \mathrm{W}_{\text {initial }}=0.198$


## Two-Body Energy vs. DRO Size

Distant Retrograde Orbits About the Moon


## Example DRO's: Inertial Frame (Earth-Centered)

J 2000 I nertial Frame (Earth-Centered)


## Example DRO's: Inertial Frame (Earth-Centered)

## J 2000 I nertial Frame (Earth-Centered)



## Example Mission - Performance Summary

## Example cases only - not for vehicle sizing

- Departure epoch: August 15, 2021
- DRO altitude $=\mathbf{6 0 , 0 0 0} \mathrm{km}$
- Halo orbit amplitudes are optimized
- Flight times are optimized

| Mission Type | Approximate Departure Epoch | LEO Departure DV | EML2 Departure DV | Lunar Flyby DV | DRO Arrival DV | DRO Departure DV | LLO Arrival DV | LLO Departure DV | EML2 Arrival DV | Flight <br> Time | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (m/s) | (m/s) | (m/s) | (m/s) | (m/s) | (m/s) | (m/s) | (m/s) | (days) |  |
| LEO to DRO Transfer (Direct) | August 15, 2021 | 3152 |  |  | 702 |  |  |  |  | 9.3 | RAAN solution 1 |
| LEO to DRO Transfer (Direct) | August 15, 2021 | 3161 |  |  | 801 |  |  |  |  | 11.8 | RAAN solution 2 |
| LEO to DRO Transfer (Flyby) | August 15, 2021 | 3134 |  | 182 | 167 |  |  |  |  | 8.1 |  |
| LEO to DRO Transfer (Flyby) | August 15, 2021 | 3134 |  | 188 | 171 |  |  |  |  | 8.0 |  |
| DRO to LLO Transfer (Direct) | August 15, 2021 |  |  |  |  | 108 | 653 |  |  | 5.5 |  |
| LLO to DRO Transfer (Direct) | August 15, 2021 |  |  |  | 107 |  |  | 653 |  | 5.5 |  |
| DRO to EML2 Halo Transfer (Direct) | August 15, 2021 |  |  |  |  | 19 |  |  | 358 | 5.3 | Halo $\mathrm{Az}=2,000 \mathrm{~km}$. Opt. Halo alt., Opt. Flt. Time. |
| DRO to EML2 Halo Transfer (Flyby) | August 15, 2021 |  |  | 146 |  | 90 |  |  | 6.9 | 41.6 | Halo $A z=2,000 \mathrm{~km}$. Opt. Halo alt., Opt. Flt. Time. |
| EML2 Halo to DRO <br> Transfer (Direct) | August 15, 2021 |  | 326 |  | 28 |  |  |  |  | 6.0 | Halo $A z=2,000 \mathrm{~km}$. Opt. Halo alt., Opt. Flt. Time. |
| EML2 Halo to DRO Transfer (Flyby) | August 15, 2021 |  | 14 | 41 | 112 |  |  |  |  | 21.5 | Halo $A z=2,000 \mathrm{~km}$. Opt. Halo alt., Opt. Flt. Time. |
| DRO to Earth EI (Direct) | August 15, 2021 |  |  |  |  | 631 |  |  |  | 5.7 | Free Az El |
| DRO to Earth El (Flyby) | August 15, 2021 |  |  | 171 |  | 94 |  |  |  | 32.0 | Free Az El |

## DRO Mission Design and Performance

- DROs are stable; No orbit maintenance required
- "Lunar" DROs cycle in the vicinity of the moon with a range of altitudes
- Visibility from Earth can be designed such that it doesn't cross disc of moon
- Possible short solar eclipsing
- DROs, being stable, do require a delta-V for insertion and departure (19 $801 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ in the examples provided). No manifold for insertion/departure.
- Current orbit maintenance delta-V budget for Gateway mission is 20 m/s/year
- Note: Artemis robotic mission in a Lissajous orbit used ~7 m/s/year
- Performance (note: based on single cases, single epochs)
- Cost from LEO to DRO appears similar to LEO to EML2H w/ flyby ~350 m/s range
- Cost from LEO to DRO appears a bit cheaper than LEO to EML2H direct - DRO: $801 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ (direct); EML2H: $957 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ (direct)
- Higher cost to go to moon's orbit (parabolic approach vs. EM-L2)
- ~761 m/s DRO ( $\sim 60,000 \mathrm{~km}$ ) vs ~640 m/s EML2
- DRO DVs: 108 m/s departure, $653 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ LLO arrival
- Note: DROs are stable, so will always have departure $\Delta v$, unlike EML2H


## Discussion / Recommendations

- Possible use as a "holding pen"
- For example: They could serve as a long term stable holding area for a returning Mars sample return (to address back contamination issues)
- Recommendation: With a reasonably small orbit maintenance delta-V, there appears to be no significant benefit to DRO for Gateway type missions
- Further, the stability of the DROs can result in additional mission delta-V cost.



## Example Trajectories

## Example Transfers

- A few example transfers to and from a DRO are shown here.
- Selected a 60,000 km DRO (which passes near both the Earth-Moon L1 and L2 libration points).
- Epoch is in the vicinity of August 15, 2021.
- Not meant to be a comprehensive performance study.


## Example LEO to DRO Transfer (Direct)

Earth-Moon Rotating-Pulsating Frame


- $b_{\text {DRO }}=60,000 \mathrm{~km}$
- LEO Departure epoch: Aug-15-2021
- LEO Departure orbit: 185 km, circular, 28.5 deg inclination (optimized RAAN and TA)
- Optimized flight times and maneuvers
- LEO Departure: 3,152 m/s
- DRO Arrival: $702 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Flight Time: 9.25 days



## Example LEO to DRO Transfer (Direct)

- $b_{\text {DRO }}=60,000 \mathrm{~km}$
- LEO Departure epoch: Aug-15-2021
- LEO Departure orbit: 185 km, circular, 28.5 deg inclination (optimized RAAN and TA)
- Optimized flight times and maneuvers
- LEO Departure: $\mathbf{3 , 1 6 1} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$
- DRO Arrival: $801 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Flight Time: 11.8 days



## Example LEO to DRO Transfer (Flyby)



- $b_{\text {DRO }}=60,000 \mathrm{~km}$
- LEO Departure epoch: Aug-15-2021
- LEO Departure orbit: 185 km, circular, 28.5 deg inclination (optimized RAAN and TA)
- Powered lunar flyby (minimum 100 km altitude)
- Optimized flight times and maneuvers
- LEO Departure: 3,134 m/s
- Flyby : $182 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- DRO Arrival: 167 m/s
- Flight Time: 8.05 days



## Example LEO to DRO Transfer (Flyby)

- $b_{\text {DRO }}=60,000 \mathrm{~km}$
- LEO Departure epoch: Aug-15-2021
- LEO Departure orbit: 185 km, circular, 28.5 deg inclination (optimized RAAN and TA)
- Powered lunar flyby (minimum 100 km altitude)
- Optimized flight times and maneuvers
- LEO Departure: $\mathbf{3 , 1 3 4} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Flyby : $188 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- DRO Arrival: $\mathbf{1 7 1} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ - Total: $359 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Flight Time: 8.0 days


J2000 Inertial Frame

## Example DRO to LLO Transfer



## Example L2 Halo to DRO Transfer (Flyby)



## Example DRO to L2 Halo Transfer (Direct)

- $b_{\text {DRO }}=60,000 \mathrm{~km}$
- Halo arrival epoch: Aug-15-2021
- Two impulse transfer
- Optimized halo amplitude
- Optimized flight times and maneuvers
- DRO Departure: $19 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ Total:
- Halo Arrival: $358 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s} \int 377 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Flight Time: 5.3 days
- Halo $A_{2}=2,000 \mathrm{~km}$


J2000 Inertial Frame

## Example DRO to L2 Halo Transfer (Flyby)

Earth-Moon Rotating Frame

dro_to_12halo_flyby_2.ideck

- $b_{\text {DRO }}=60,000 \mathrm{~km}$
- DRO departure epoch: ~ Aug-15-2021
- Optimized flight time
- Optimized halo amplitude
- Three-impulse transfer
- DRO Departure: $90 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Flyby: $146 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Halo Arrival: $6.9 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s} \int \begin{aligned} & 244 \\ & \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}\end{aligned}$
- Flight Time: 41.6 days
- Halo $\mathrm{A}_{\mathbf{z}}=\mathbf{2 , 0 0 0} \mathrm{km}$



## Example DRO to EI (Direct)

## Earth-Moon Rotating-Pulsating Frame



- $b_{\text {DRO }}=60,000 \mathrm{~km}$
- DRO departure epoch: ~ Aug-15-2021
- El Altitude: 121.9 km
- EI FPA: -5.86 deg
- DRO Departure: $631 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Flight Time: 5.7 days
- Entry velocity: 10.99 km/s


J2000 Inertial Frame

## Example DRO to El (Flyby)

Earth-Moon Rotating Frame


- $b_{\text {DRO }}=60,000 \mathrm{~km}$
- DRO departure epoch: ~ Aug-15-2021
- El Altitude: 121.9 km
- EI FPA: -5.86 deg
- DRO Departure: $94 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$
- Moon Flyby: 171 m/s Total: 265
- Flight Time: 32 days
- Entry velocity: 10.98 km/s



## Families of Periodic Orbits



Fig. 30. Typical trajectories in family $\mathbf{C}$ of retrograde periodic orbits around $\boldsymbol{m}_{2}$
From: R.A. Broucke, "Periodic Orbits in the Restricted Three-Body Problem with Earth-Moon Masses", J PL Technical Report 32-1168, 1968.

## Computing DRO's

- Only considering planar-DRO's here (in the Earth-Moon plane)
- Using Copernicus (latest development build)
- Force Model: Earth, Moon, Sun
- SNOPT optimizer
- DDEABM (Adams) integration method (1e-11 tolerance)
- Optimization Problem
- Optimization variables: $\Delta t$ and $v_{y}$
- $r_{x}$ coordinate specified ("semiminor axis" b)
- Target $v_{x}=0$ at next $x$-axis crossing $\left(r_{y}=0\right)$ [repeat for a couple periods]
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## Introduction

$\square$ On January 14, 2004, President Bush announced a new vision for NASA

- Extend human presence across the solar system, starting with a human return to the Moon by the year 2020, in preparation for human exploration of Mars and other destinations;
$\square$ Key Elements of New Space Policy
- Begin robotic missions to the Moon by 2008, followed by a period of evaluating lunar resources and technologies for exploration.
- Begin human expeditions to the Moon in the 2015-2020 timeframe.


## Approach

# This presentation provides a tutorial of lunar astrodynamic characteristics 

It addresses orbital mechanics as it applies to a human lunar mission design

## Outline: Part I - Lunar Orbit Mechanics

## ■Earth-Moon System

- Lunar Inclination
- Lunar Libration
- Earth to Moon (Outbound)
- Geocentric Characteristics
- Selenocentric Characteristics
- Lunar Orbit
- Moon to Earth (Inbound)
- Libration Points
- Environment



## Moon and Earth Facts

| Comparison | Moon | Earth | \% of Earth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mass (kg) | $7.3483 \times 10^{22}$ | $5.9742 \times 10^{24}$ | 1.23 |
| Volume (km $\left.{ }^{3}\right)$ | $2.1958 \times 10^{10}$ | $1.0832 \times 10^{12}$ | 2.03 |
| Equatorial radius (km) | 1738.1 | 6378.1 | 27.25 |
| Polar radius (km) | 1736.0 | 6356.8 | 27.31 |
| Ellipticity (Flattening) | 0.0012 | 0.00335 | 36.0 |
| Mean density $\left(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 3350 | 5515 | 60.7 |
| Surface gravity $\left(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}\right)$ | 1.62 | 9.80 | 16.5 |
| Escape velocity $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s})$ | 2.38 | 11.2 | 21.3 |
| Gravitational Parameter $\left(\mathrm{km}{ }^{3} / \mathrm{s}^{2}\right)$ | $4.902 \times 10^{3}$ | $3.986 \times 10^{5}$ | 1.23 |
| $\mathrm{J2}$ (effects of nonspherical/homogenous body) | $202.7 \times 10^{-6}$ | $1082.63 \times 10^{-6}$ | 18.7 |

Moon Facts

| Parameter | Moon |
| :---: | :---: |
| Semimajor axis (km) | 384,400 |
| Perigee (km) | 363,300 |
| Apogee (km) | 405,500 |
| Revolution Period (days) | 27.3217 |
| Synodic Period (days) | 29.53 |
| Mean Orbital Velocity (km/s) | 1.023 |
| Max. Orbital Velocity (km/s) | 1.076 |
| Min. Orbital Velocity (km/s) | 0.964 |
| Inclination to Ecliptic (deg) | 5.145 |
| Inclination to Equator (deg) | 18.28-28.58 |
| Orbit Eccentricity | 0.0549 |
| Sidereal Rotation Period (days) | 27.32 |
| Obliquity to orbit (deg) | 6.68 |
| Recession rate from Earth (cm/yr) | 3.8 |
| Mean Values |  |
| Distance from Earth (km) | 384,467 |
| Apparent diameter (seconds of arc) | 1,864.2 |
| Apparent visual magnitude | -12.74 |



## Lunar Mission History

| Moon |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spacecraft | Coun | Launch | Arrival | Landing Site | Comment |
| Luna 2 | USSR | 12 Sep 59 | Sep 1459 | $29.10 \mathrm{~N} \quad 0.0$ | Impact - Palus Putredinis |
| Ranger 4 | USA | 23 Apr 62 | Apr 2662 | 15.5 S 130.7 W | Impact - Far Side |
| Ranger 6 | USA | 30 Jan 64 | Feb 264 | M Tranquilit. | Impact - Mare Tranquilitatis |
| Ranger 7 | USA | 28 Jul 64 | Jul 3164 | 10.35 S 21.58 W | Impact - Mare Cognitum |
| Ranger 8 | USA | 17 Feb 65 | Feb 2065 | 2.67 N 24.65 E | Impact - Mare Tranquilitatis |
| Ranger 9 | USA | 21 Mar 65 | Mar 2465 | 12.83 S 2.37 W | Impact - Alphonsus crater |
| Luna 5 | USSR | 9 May 65 | May 65 | 315 8E | Crash (S/L attempt) - Mare Nubium |
| Luna 7 | USSR | 4 Oct 65 | Oct 65 | 9N 40 W | Crash (S/L attempt) - Oceanus Procellarum |
| Luna 8 | USSR | 3 Dec 65 | Dec 65 | 9:08N 63:18W | Crash (S/L attempt) - Oceanus Procellarum |
| Luna 9 | USSR | 31 Jan 66 | Feb 366 | 7:08N 64:33W | Softlanding - Oceanus Procellarum |
| Surveyor 1 | USA | 30 May 66 | Jun 266 | 2:27S 43:13W | Softlanding - Flamsteed P |
| Lunar 0. 1 | USA | 10 Aug 66 | Oct 2966 | $7 \mathrm{~N} \quad 161 \mathrm{E}$ | Impact (Far side) after successful orbiter mission |
| Surveyor 2 | USA | 20 Sep 66 | Sep 2266 | S Copernicus | Crash (S/L attempt) |
| Lunar 0. 2 | USA | 6 Nov 66 | Oct 1167 | 3N 119.1E | Impact (Far side) after successful orbiter mission |
| Luna 13 | USSR | 21 Dec 66 | Dec 2466 | 18:52N 62:03W | Softlanding - Oceanus Procellarum |
| Lunar 0. 3 | USA | 5 Feb 67 | Oct 1067 | 14.32 N 92.7 W | Impact (Far side) after successful orbiter mission |
| Surveyor 3 | USA | 17 Apr 67 | Apr 2067 | 2:56S 23:20w | S/L; Apollo 12 visit - Oceanus Procellarum |
| Lunar 0. 4 | USA | 4 May 67 | Oct 3167 | ? 22-30w | Impact after successful orbiter mission |
| Surveyor 4 | USA | 14 Jul 67 | Jul 1767 | 0:26N 1:20w | Crash (S/L attempt) |
| Lunar 0. 5 | USA | 1 Aug 67 | Jan 3168 | 2.79 S 83 | Impact after successful orbiter mission |
| Surveyor 5 | USA | 8 Sep 67 | Sep 1167 | 1:25N 22:15E | Softlanding |
| Surveyor 6 | USA | 6 Nov 67 | Nov 1067 | 0:25N 1:20W | Softlanding |
| Surveyor 7 | USA | 7 Jan 68 | Jan 1068 | 40:53S 11:26W | S/L rim of Tycho |
| Luna 15 | USSR | 13 Jul 69 | Jul 2169 | $17 \mathrm{~N} \quad 60 \mathrm{E}$ | Crash (during Apollo 11) - Mare Crisium |
| Apollo 11 | USA | 16 Jul 69 | Jul 2069 | 0:40N 23:29E | Manned S/L - Mare Tranquilitatis |
| Apollo 12 | USA | 14 Nov 69 | Nov 1969 | 3:02S 23:24W | Manned S/L, near Surveyor 3 - Oceanus Procellarum |
| Luna 16 | USSR | 12 Sep 70 | Sep 2070 | 0:41S 56:18E | S/L, sample return - Mare Fecunditatis |
| Luna 17 | USSR | 10 Nov 70 | Nov 1770 | 38:18N 35W | S/L, Lunochod 1 rover - Mare Imbrium |
| Apollo 14 | USA | 31 Jan 71 | Feb 571 | 3:35S 17:22 W | Manned S/L - Fra Mauro |
| Apollo 15 | USA | 26 Jul 71 | Jul 3071 | 26:05N 3:39E | Manned S/L, rover - Hadley Rille |
| Luna 18 | USSR | 2 Sep 71 | Sep 71 | 3:34N 56:30E | Crash (sample return attempt) - Mare Fecunditatis |
| Luna 20 | USSR | 14 Feb 72 | Feb 2172 | 3:32N 56:33E | S/L, sample return - Mare Fecunditatis |
| Apollo 16 | USA | 16 Apr 72 | Apr 2072 | 8:59S 15:31E | Manned S/L, rover - Descartes |
| Apollo 17 | USA | 7 Dec 72 | Dec 1172 | 20:10N 30:45E | Manned S/L, rover - Taurus-Littrow |
| Luna 21 | USSR | 8 Jan 73 | Jan 1573 | 25:54N 30:30E | S/L, Lunochod 2 rover - LeMonnier Crater |
| Luna 23 | USSR | 28 Oct 74 | Nov 74 | 12:41N 62:18E | S/L, sample return attempt failed - Mare Crisium |
| Luna 24 | USSR | 9 Aug 76 | Aug 1476 | 12:45N 62:12E | S/L, sample return - Mare Crisium |
| Prospector | USA | 6 Jan 98 | Jul 3199 | South Pole | Crash after successful orbiter mission |

## Tidal Locking

$\square$ The Moon pulls on Earth with a force that varies from point to point, thereby causing tidal bulges that follow the terrestrial sublunar point and its antipode. In the very long term, the friction caused by the attendant flow of ocean water slows the Earth's rotation rate.

$\square$ Similarly, Earth pulling on the Moon over many millennia caused a tidal bulge that has become frozen in place while concurrently putting the Moon into a state of gravity-gradient stabilization. This keeps it "tidally locked" so that it rotates at the same rate at which it revolves, showing the Earth only one face.

## Lunar Inclination

## 18 Year Lunar Inclination Cycle

$\square$ Lunar inclination (with respect to the Earth equator) varies from minimum of $18.3^{\circ}$ to a maximum $28.6^{\circ}$ over a period of about 18.6 years

The next maximum inclination:
June 2006
The next minimum inclination:
October 2015
$\square$ The lunar inclination affects the geocentric lunar transfer orbit inclination, hence propulsion costs

- Dependent upon launch scenario
- Ground launched to immediate departure phasing orbit
- Fixed Earth orbit departure


## Lunar Inclination

The Earth's equator is tilted $23.4^{\circ}$ from the ecliptic plane
The Moon's orbit is tilted $5.1^{\circ}$ from the ecliptic plane
The Moon's orbit rotates about the ecliptic north $360^{\circ}$ about every 18.6 years

- In 2006, this results in a $28.5^{\circ}$ lunar inclination to the Earth equator
- In 2015, this results in an $18.3^{\circ}$ lunar inclination to the Earth equator



## 18 Year Lunar Inclination Cycle

Lunar Inclination wrt Earth Equator vs Date


## Lunar Libration

## Lunar Libration

$\square$ Lunar libration causes a variation in the lunar surface that faces Earth
-Up to 59\% of the lunar surface is visible from Earth (about 50\% without libration)
$\square$ Libration occurs in both longitude ( $\pm 8^{\circ}$ ) and latitude ( $\pm 6.7^{\circ}$ )
$\square$ Note: Lunar libration can cause points on the lunar surface to rotate in and out of view from Earth

## Lunar Libration and Phases

## Lunar Libration - Latitude

$\square$ The Moon 'faces the Earth' as it rotates about the Earth
$\square$ The Moon maintains a $5.1^{\circ}$ inclination to the ecliptic
$\square$ The Moon's rotational axis is inclined:

- $1.6^{\circ}$ from the ecliptic north
- $6.7^{\circ}$ from the angular momentum vector of the lunar orbit plane
$\square$ This results in an apparent latitude movement of about $6.7^{\circ}$ (up and down) as viewed from Earth



## Lunar Libration -- Latitude



## Lunar Libration - Longitude

$\square$ The Moon 'turns the same face to the Earth', so that its rotation about its axis is equal in period to the time for one orbit around the Earth
$\square$ The Moon's speed of rotation about its axis remains essentially constant as a consequence of the conservation of angular momentum
$\square$ The Moon has an elliptical orbit about the Earth, so the Moon speeds up near perigee and slows down near apogee in accordance with Kepler's laws
$\square$ The differences between the lunar rotation rate and the rotation rate of the Moon's velocity vector create an apparent back and forth (east-west) nodding of the Moon.

## Lunar Libration - Longitude

The differences between the lunar rotation rate and the rotation rate of the Moon's velocity vector create an apparent back and forth (east-west) nodding of the Moon.


## Moon View From Earth

## Percentage Viewing Over One Lunar Rotation



## Minimum $0^{\circ}$ Mask Angle at Moon <br> Mar-2011

## Moon View From Earth

## Percentage Viewing Over One Lunar Rotation



Minimum $5^{\circ}$ Elevation Mask Angle at Moon
Mar-2011

## Moon View From Earth

## Percentage Viewing Over One Lunar Rotation



Minimum $10^{\circ}$ Elevation Mask Angle at Moon
Mar-2011

## Moon View From Earth

## Percentage Viewing Over One Lunar Rotation



Minimum $15^{\circ}$ Elevation Mask Angle at Moon
Mar-2011

## Moon View From Earth

## Percentage Viewing Over One Lunar Rotation
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Minimum $0^{\circ}$ Elevation Mask Angle at Moon
Mar-2011

## Moon View From Earth

## Percentage Viewing Over One Lunar Rotation
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Minimum $5^{\circ}$ Elevation Mask Angle at Moon
Mar-2011

## Moon View From Earth

## Percentage Viewing Over One Lunar Rotation
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Minimum $10^{\circ}$ Elevation Mask Angle at Moon Mar-2011

## Moon View From Earth

## Percentage Viewing Over One Lunar Rotation

| Percent Coverage Time |
| :--- |
| 0 |
| 10 |
| 20 |
| 20 |
| 40 |
| 50 |
| 60 |
| 70 |
| 80 |
| 90 |
| 100 |
| + |



Minimum $15^{\circ}$ Elevation Mask Angle at Moon
Mar-2011

## Lunar Libration - Summary

$\square$ Up to 59\% of the lunar surface is visible from Earth (about 50\% without libration)
$\square$ Libration occurs in both longitude ( $\pm 8^{\circ}$ ) and latitude $\left( \pm 6.7^{\circ}\right)$
$\square$ Landing sites near the limb of the Moon (e.g., north and south poles and east and west limbs) may nod in and out of Earth view periodically with lunar rotation about Earth

- Surface crew out of Earth communication (without bent-pipe satellite aid)
$\square$ Lunar terrain may exacerbate the Earth-viewing problem
- A polar landing site in a valley would have Earth viewing further reduced
- A polar landing site on a high hill may have continuous Earth view
- Better lunar terrain models are needed*

[^1]
## Geocentric Transfer Characteristics

## Earth to Moon Transfer

- High thrust Earth-

Moon transfer consists of two primary maneuvers: Earth orbit departure (EOD) and Lunar Orbit Insertion (LOI)
$\square$ The $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ cost for EOD and LOI is about $3100 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ and 900 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$, respectively


## Earth to Moon - $\Delta \mathbf{V}$ Cost

## Earth Parking Orbit to Lunar Parking Orbit $\Delta V$ Cost vs. Flight Time



## Earth-Moon Transfer

## $\square$ Earth orbit departure (EOD)

- Tangential EOD
- Non-coplanar, non-tangential thrusting has severe performance penalties


## Departure Options:

1. EOD after ground launch to a low Earth orbit (LEO) phasing orbit

- Selectable departure plane
- Daily launch/EOD opportunities

2. EOD from pre-established LEO parking orbit (e.g., ISS, $28.5^{\circ}$ construction orbit)

- Fixed departure plane
- EOD opportunities average every 9-10 days*
*The combination of the Moon's orbital motion ( $\sim 13^{\circ} /$ day ) plus ISS nodal regression of $\sim 5^{\circ} /$ day results in $\sim 18^{\circ} /$ day relative movement between orbit plane and Moon or a coplanar EOD opportunity averaging about every 10 days. For a $28.5^{\circ}$ orbit, EOD opportunities occur on the average about every 9 days.


## Earth-Moon Transfer

| Lunar Transfer Opportunities |
| :--- |
| - Ground launch ... every day |
| - Fixed orbit departure ... every |
| 9-10 days (average) |



## 18 Year Lunar Inclination Cycle Example: Departure from Fixed (ISS) Parking Orbit




## 18 Year Lunar Inclination Cycle

## Example: Departure from Fixed (28.5) Parking Orbit




## Geocentric Wedge Angle

Best and worst case geocentric wedge angle as a function of maximum and minimum lunar orbit inclination

|  | $\mathbf{2 8 . 5 ^ { \circ }}$ Departure Orbit |  | $\mathbf{5 1 . 6 ^ { \circ } \text { (ISS) Departure Orbit }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lunar Inclination <br> (w.r.t. Earth Equator) | $18.3^{\circ}$ <br> (Minimum) | $28.6^{\circ}$ <br> (Maximum) | $18.3^{\circ}$ <br> (Minimum) | $28.6^{\circ}$ <br> (Maximum) |
| Worst-Case Geocentric Wedge <br> Angle between Earth-Moon Transfer <br> Orbit and Lunar Orbit Plane | $46.8^{\circ}$ | $57.1^{\circ}$ | $69.9^{\circ}$ | $80.2^{\circ}$ |
| Best-Case Geocentric Wedge Angle <br> betwaen Earth-Moon Transfer Orbit <br> and Lunar Orbit Plane | $10.2^{\circ}$ | $0.0^{\circ}$ | $33.3^{\circ}$ | $23.0^{\circ}$ |

## Ground Launch Delta-V Cost


$\square$ Earth Launch

- 100\% Earth gravity; largest drag velocity losses
$\square$ Mars Launch
- 38\% Earth gravity; reduced drag velocity losses
$\square$ Moon Launch
- 17\% Earth gravity; no drag velocity losses


## Delta-V vs Geocentric Inclination for Earth to Moon Transfer

## Earth Parking Orbit to Lunar Parking Orbit Transfer $\Delta V$ vs.

 Geocentric Inclination w.r.t. Moon's Orbit Plane

## Earth-Moon Transfer Summary

$\square$ Ground launched lunar missions provide daily opportunities
$\square$ Lunar missions departing from an existing fixed orbit provide opportunities only about every 9 days for a $28.5^{\circ}$ parking orbit or every 10 days for $51.6^{\circ}$
$\square$ The general $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ cost for lunar missions is about $3100 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ for Earth Orbit Departure and about 900 for Lunar Orbit Insertion

# Selenocentric Characteristics 

## Minimum Energy Orbital Transfer

A high thrust orbital transfer between the Earth and the Moon with the least fuel requirement traverses a central angle of $180^{\circ}$ and has a tangential departure and arrival. This is known as a Hohmann Transfer.


## OUTBOUND

Initial orbit: Spacecraft (S/C) in circular orbit

$$
\mathbf{V}_{\text {circ_initial }}
$$

Transfer orbit: S/C at perigee of elliptical orbit

$$
\mathrm{V}_{\text {perigee }}=\mathrm{V}_{\text {circ_initial }}+\Delta \mathbf{V}_{1}
$$

Hohmann Transfer

Transfer orbit: S/C at apogee of elliptical orbit

## $\mathbf{V}_{\text {apogee }}$

Final orbit: Spacecraft in circular orbit

$$
V_{\text {circ_final }}=V_{a_{\text {pogee }}}+\Delta V_{2}
$$

## Minimum Energy Orbital Transfer



## INBOUND

Initial orbit: Spacecraft (S/C) in circular orbit

$$
\mathbf{V}_{\text {circ_initial }}
$$

Transfer orbit: S/C at apogee of elliptical orbit

$$
V_{\text {apogee }}=V_{\text {circ_initial }}-\Delta \mathbf{V}_{1}
$$

Hohmann Transfer

Transfer orbit: S/C at perigee of elliptical orbit

## $\mathbf{V}_{\text {perigee }}$

Final orbit: Spacecraft in circular orbit

$$
V_{\text {circ_final }}=V_{\text {perigee }}-\Delta V_{2}
$$

## Earth to Moon Transfer

I In the geocentric reference frame, a delta-velocity maneuver $\left(\Delta \mathrm{V}_{1}\right)$ in low Earth orbit establishes a Moon intercept transfer ellipse trajectory
$\square$ After coasting from perigee to apogee (at lunar altitude) on the transfer ellipse, the spacecraft ( $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{c}$ ) encounters the Moon ( $\mathrm{V}_{\text {apogee }}$ )
$\square$ Since the apogee velocity of the transfer ellipse is slower than the circular lunar orbit velocity $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\text {moon }}\right)$, the Moon overtakes the s/c
$\square$ The difference between $V_{\text {moon }}$ and $V_{\text {apogee }}$ (of the transfer ellipse) is the lunar approach vector known as $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$
The $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ is a measure of the energy per unit mass of a lunar approach hyperbolic trajectory

## Earth to Moon Transfer

## Geocentric Reference Frame

Faster moving Moon ( $\mathrm{V}_{\text {moon }}$ ) overtakes slower moving spacecraft $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\text {apogee }}\right)$ at lunar encounter.


## Selenocentric Reference Frame

From the perspective of the lunar surface, the spacecraft appears to be approaching from the opposite direction of the Moon's motion at a velocity which is the difference between the Moon's velocity and the spacecraft velocity at the apogee of its transfer orbit.


The spacecraft approaches the Moon on a hyperbolic trajectory*.
*Without a propulsive capture maneuver, the spacecraft will fly by the Moon into gepcentric or heliocentric space, depending on the loçation of the lunar flyby.


Tutorial on $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$

LOI: 2-D Seleocentric View

The incoming hyperbola $\left(\mathrm{V}_{\infty}\right)$ can be adjusted at Earth departure (for a negligible $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ cost) to poise the arriving spacecraft to perform lunar orbit insertion (LOI) into a posigrade or retrograde lunar parking orbit.

Minimum $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ LOI occurs at the closest approach to the planet (the periapse radius of the incoming hyperbola, $\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{per}}$ )


## Earth to Moon Transfer

$\square$ In general, the hyperbolic $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ approach vector is the vector difference between the geocentric velocity of the spacecraft and Moon's geocentric velocity at the lunar encounter
$\square$ The $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ vector can be adjusted at Earth orbit departure, for a negligible $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ cost, to allow a coplanar LOI to any inclination (greater than or equal to the declination of the incoming $\vee_{\infty}$ vector asymptote)

- Inclinations lower than the declination of the lunar approach $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ vector can also be achieved, but with a required out-ofplane maneuver


## Earth to Moon Transfer



## Lunar Parking Orbits

## Lunar Parking Orbit Inclination

$\square$ The magnitude of the lunar parking orbit inclination establishes a band of landing site latitudes (equal to the magnitude of the inclination)

- Within this latitude band, coplanar descent and ascent are possible, given that the rendezvous orbit contains the landing site
- For landing site latitude magnitudes greater than that of the rendezvous orbit inclination, the descent and ascent are noncoplanar
$\square$ For a given landing site within the latitude band, there are two ascent opportunities every lunar rotation cycle (about 27.3 days)
- Exception: There is only one opportunity about every 27.3 days when the magnitude of the latitude of the landing site equals that of the rendezvous orbit inclination


## Lunar Parking Orbit Inclination

Lunar inclination establishes a band of landing sites achievable with coplanar descent

At least one in-plane lunar ascent \& rendezvous available about every 27 days


## Lunar Powered Descent and Landing/Ascent Unplanned Ascent

$\square$ For a given lunar orbit inclination, a coplanar descent/ascent can be achieved to/from any landing site latitude magnitude that is equal to or less than that of the rendezvous orbit inclination

- Landing can be achieved outside this range, but will be subject to a plane change penalty (i.e., non-coplanar descent or ascent)
$\square$ In general, nominal lunar descent and ascent are coplanar maneuvers
$\square$ Upon nominal landing, the spacecraft moves at a rate equal to the lunar rotation rate (about $360^{\circ} / 27.3$ days)
$\square$ An unplanned ascent would require a plane change
- The magnitude of the plane change will be dependent upon the time of the ascent


## Worst Case Lunar Plane Change Cost

Lunar Rendezvous Altitude $=100 \times 100 \mathrm{~km}$

For any lunar orbit inclination, global lunar access dictates that there is a lunar landing site where a $90^{\circ}$ plane change could be required

| Worst-Case Descent/Ascent Plane Change for Global Lunar Surface Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Landing Site <br> Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (deg) | 0 | 15 | 30 | 45 | 60 | 75 | 90 |
| 0 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 45 | 60 | 75 | 90 |
| 15 | 15 | 30 | 45 | 60 | 75 | 90 | 75 |
| 30 | 30 | 45 | 60 | 75 | 90 | 75 | 60 |
| 45 | 45 | 60 | 75 | 90 | 75 | 60 | 45 |
| 60 | 60 | 75 | 90 | 75 | 60 | 45 | 30 |
| 75 | 75 | 90 | 75 | 60 | 45 | 30 | 15 |
| 90 | 90 | 75 | 60 | 45 | 30 | 15 | 0 |

Worst-Case Descent/Ascent $\Delta \mathbf{V}$ Cost for Global Lunar Surface Access
Landing Site
Plane Change $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ )
Latitude


| $(\mathrm{deg})$ | 0 | 15 | 30 | 45 | 60 | 75 | 90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 426 | 845 | 1250 | 1633 | 1988 | $\mathbf{2 3 0 9}$ |
| 15 | 426 | 845 | 1250 | 1633 | 1988 | $\mathbf{2 3 0 9}$ | 1988 |
| 30 | 845 | 1250 | 1633 | 1988 | $\mathbf{2 3 0 9}$ | 1988 | 1633 |
| 45 | 1250 | 1633 | 1988 | $\mathbf{2 3 0 9}$ | 1988 | 1633 | 1250 |
| 60 | 1633 | 1988 | $\mathbf{2 3 0 9}$ | 1988 | 1633 | 1250 | 845 |
| 75 | 1988 | $\mathbf{2 3 0 9}$ | 1988 | 1633 | 1250 | 845 | 426 |
| 90 | $\mathbf{2 3 0 9}$ | 1988 | 1633 | 1250 | 845 | 426 | 0 |

## Reference Coplanar Lunar Ascent Cost

$\Delta V=1850 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$

Target $100 \times 100 \mathrm{~km}$ Low Lunar Orbit

Note: The $\Delta V$ cost of a $90^{\circ}$ plane change is greater than the cost of a coplanar transfer from the lunar surface to a $100 \times 100 \mathrm{~km}$ parking orbit.

## Lunar Orbit Stability

- Low (circular) lunar orbit altitudes (<~1000 km) are less stable
- Perturbations to orbit due to non-uniform seleno-potential
$\square$ Higher (circular) lunar orbit altitudes (>~5000 km) are less stable
- Perturbations to orbit due to Earth and Sun gravity
$\square$ Lunar orbit altitudes in the ~1000 - 5000 km altitude range are more stable


NOT TO SCALE
More ...

## Earth Return



## Earth Return and Landing Site Options

$\square$ Major influences on the Moon to Earth trajectory design

- Lunar departure date
- Moon to Earth flight time
- Inclination of the transfer orbit from the Moon to Earth
$\square$ Earth Return Options
- Direct Entry
- Lighting conditions at landing depends on the Lunar departure date
- Limited range of accessible latitudes varies with the departure date
- Range of accessible longitudes varies with the Moon to Earth flight time
- Intermediate Low Earth Orbit
- Insert into orbit using either propulsion or aerobrake
- Plane change may be required to insert into a specific orbit
- Orbit inclination is greater than or equal to the landing site latitude
- Loitering in orbit may be required to target a landing site
$\square$ Landing Site Location
- Land landing
- Requires both primary and alternate sites
- Sites at various latitudes will be required for the direct entry option
- Water landing
- Requires ship fleet(s)


## Earth Return

A direct (to surface) return as well as a return to a selectable LEO parking orbit is always available given adequate lunar departure capability

Return to a fixed Earth parking orbit requires proper orientation of that orbit


## Earth Return: Fixed Orbit Arrival


#### Abstract

A return to a fixed parking orbit is available (on average) about every 9 or 10 days for return to a LEO parking orbit inclination of $28.5^{\circ}$ or $51.6^{\circ}$, respectively




Modified from original. Original courtesy K. Joosten.

## Effect of Lunar Parking Orbit Inclination on Lunar Transfer Opportunities $\rightarrow$ Moon to Earth Transfer

Coplanar Equatorial Orbit Departure Opportunity

Coplanar Polar Orbit Departure Opportunity


## Earth Return: Trip Time vs Arrival Location

For a given inbound (Earth return) trajectory, a variation in trip time provides some movement of the Earth arrival perigee location


## Earth Return: Earth Arrival

The time of lunar departure determines the location of the Moon's antipode

For a given trip time with a negligibly small $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ adjustment at lunar departure, the incoming (Moon to Earth) entry interface and landing points can be rotated about the Moon's antipode


## Earth Return: Earth Arrival



Motion of Moon's Anțipode


## Variation in Accessible Latitudes during a Sidereal Month (Direct Entry)

Moon at Max. Inclination of $28.5^{\circ}$


## Accessible Latitudes from Intermediate Low Earth Orbit

$\square$ A return to a LEO parking orbit provides a landing latitude band equal to the magnitude of the arrival inclination

- For example: Arrival into a $28.5^{\circ}$ parking orbit provides a $57^{\circ}$ latitude band ( $-28.5^{\circ}$ to $+28.5^{\circ}$ )
$\square$ This latitude band covers $360^{\circ}$ of longitude
$\square$ Any (land or water) landing site within the latitude band is accessible provided:
- Adequate on-orbit loiter time (about 24 hours min.)
- Adequate spacecraft cross-range capability

Accessible Latitudes from
Intermediate Low Earth Orbit
Intermediate Low Earth Orbit Inclination of $28.5^{\circ}$


Note: May require some loitering time for groundtrack to intersect with desired landing site

## Libration Points

## Earth-Moon Libration Points




## Libration Points

$\square$ Possible staging point for robotic and human missions

- Lunar Gateway Mission for lunar sorties

- Possible telescope (e.g. vvébb Telescope, NGST) deploy/maintenance point
- Minimal $\Delta \mathrm{V}$ transfer costs between Earth-Moon and Sun-Earth libration points


# Environment Considerations 

## Radiation

0
[. Van Allen Radiation Belts
More ...

- Inner (proton) belt 1,000-12,000 km altitude
- Outer (electron) belt 19,000-57,000 km altitude
- Solar Flares
- Can cause ionization damage and single-event effects in sensitive devices
- Energetic protons reach Earth within 30 minutes
- Other solar materials and magnetic fields reach Earth in 1 to 4 days
- Solar Flux
- 9 to 13 year cycle
- Proton energy range from 10 MeV to 1 GeV
- Galactic Cosmic Ray (GCR) Flux
- Causes single-event effects in sensitive devices
- Peaks around solar minimum
- Particle energy up to and over 10 GeV


## Orbital Debris



## End Part 1 Lunar Orbit Mechanics Tutorial

# Back Up Charts for: Part 1 Lunar Orbit Mechanics Tutorial 

## On-Orbit Plane Changes

## Earth and Moon

## Delta-V vs. Plane Change For Earth and Moon (200x200 km Altitude)



## Mass Ratio versus $\Delta V$

Propellant to Initial Mass Ratio as a Function of $\Delta V$ and Specific Impulse


## Declination of Moon At Arrival w.r.t. Fixed Departure Plane

Departure Planes: $51.6^{\circ}$ ISS and $28.5^{\circ}$ Construction Orbit Time $=0$ at Jan 9, 2009, RAAN $=0^{\circ}$, Altitude $=407 \times 407 \mathrm{~km}$


## Lunar Orbit Stability




## Vis-Viva Equation

Vis-Viva "Life Force" Equation is a statement of conservation of energy


## Kinetic Energy



C3 determines the type of conic section describing the orbit.


## Typical Form of Vis-Viva Equation

From the general equation for a conic:


$$
V^{2}=\frac{2 \mu}{r}-\frac{\mu}{a}
$$

$$
\longrightarrow \frac{C 3}{\mu}=-\frac{1}{a}
$$

dynamic quantity
geometric quantity

This is valid for all equations

Typical form of Vis-Viva equation used by flight mechanics:

$$
\begin{equation*}
V^{2}=\frac{2 \mu}{r}-\frac{\mu}{a} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
V^{2}=\frac{2 \mu}{r}+C 3 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

## Vis-Viva Equation and Hyperbolic Excess Speed

Let's look at (1) $\quad V^{2}=\frac{2 \mu}{r}-\frac{\mu}{a}$

$$
\text { as } \mathrm{r} \longrightarrow \infty \quad V_{\infty}{ }^{2}=\frac{2 \mu \hat{\mu}}{\not r_{\infty}}-\frac{\mu}{a} \text { a } \longrightarrow \quad V_{\infty}{ }^{2}=-\frac{\mu}{a}
$$




## Circular \& Parabolic Orbit Case

Circular orbit case
Using (1) for a circular orbit, $a=r$

$$
V^{2}=\frac{2 \mu}{r}-\frac{\mu}{r}=\frac{\mu}{r} \quad V_{\text {circ }}=\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{r}} \quad \text { (Circular orbit speed) }
$$

Parabolic orbit case
Using (1) for a parabolic orbit, $C 3=-\frac{\mu}{a}=0$

$$
V_{\text {parabola }}^{2}=\frac{2 \mu}{r} \quad \text { 涼 }
$$

(Escape speed)

## Using Vis-Viva Equation to determine $\Delta \mathbf{V}$ requirements

Departure

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Delta V_{\text {departure }}=V_{\text {required }}-V_{\text {current }} \\
& V_{\text {required }}=\sqrt{\frac{2 \mu}{r_{\text {perigee }}}+C 3} \\
& V_{\text {current }}=\sqrt{\frac{2 \mu}{r_{\text {perigee }}}-\frac{\mu}{a}} \\
& \Delta V_{\text {departure }}=\sqrt{\frac{2 \mu}{r_{\text {perigee }}}+C 3}-\sqrt{\frac{2 \mu}{r_{\text {perigee }}}-\frac{\mu}{a}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Parking orbit

hyperboga

For an Earth departure (robotic mission)


## Typical C3 Values

| Robotic Mars Missions <br> Mars Sample Return |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 2011 C3 (km²/ ${ }^{2}$ ) | Type | Arrival Entry Speed (km/s) |
| 9.8 | II | 5.6 |
| 12.5 | I | 6.2 |
| 17.7 | IV | 6.4 |
| $\underline{2013}$ |  |  |
| 10.2 | II | 5.9 |
| 13.1 | I | 6.7 |
| 14.7 | IV | 5.9 |
| Human Mars Missions |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mars Combo Lander } \\ & \underline{2014} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\leq 18.8$ | 1 | $\leq 7.36$ |
| Lunar Missions |  |  |
| 0.9 | na | na |

## Van Allen Radiation Belts - Trapped Proton Belt Dose Rate for Circular Orbits



## Van Allen Radiation Belts

Trapped Particle Trails
Van Allen (Proton) Radiation Belt

## Solar Flux

Estimate of 13-Month Smoothed Solar Flux for Cycle 23 and Cycle 24


## Solar and GCR

$\square$ Solar Flares

- Can cause ionization damage and single-event effects in sensitive devices
- Energetic protons reach Earth within 30 minutes
- Other solar materials and magnetic fields reach Earth in 1 to 4 days
$\square$ Solar Flux
- 9 to 13 year cycle
- Proton energy range from 10 MeV to 1 GeV
$\square$ Galactic Cosmic Ray (GCR) Flux
- Causes single-event effects in sensitive devices
- Peaks around solar minimum
- Particle energy range from 0 to over
 10 GeV


## End of Part I Lunar Orbit Mechanics


[^0]:    ${ }^{*}$ Multibody Orbit Architectures for Lunar South Pole Coverage. D. Grebow, M. Ozimek and K. Howell

[^1]:    * Currently, proposals exist to provide high-resolution lunar gravity mapping and improved lunar terrain models.

