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#### Abstract

Previous work by our group has shown that an aerogravity assist maneuver at the moon Triton might be used to capture a spacecraft into a closed orbit about Neptune if a nominal atmospheric density profile at Triton is assumed. The present study extends that work and examines the impact of atmospheric dispersions, especially important in light of the very low density and large degree of uncertainty of Triton's atmosphere. Additional variables that are analyzed in the current study include ballute size and cut time and variations in the final target orbit. Results indicate that while blunt-body, rigid aeroshells penetrate too closely to the surface to be practical, ballutes of modest size show promise for this maneuver. Future studies will examine the application of inflatable aeroshells and rigid aeroshells with higher lift-to-drag ratios such as biconics and lifting bodies.


## Introduction

Aerocapture has been studied for numerous missions, primarily focusing on Titan, Mars and Neptune. At the giant planets, these maneuvers inherently involve very high atmospheric entry speeds, severe aerothermal heating rates, and large ablative heat shields. Recent studies indicate that a direct aerocapture at Neptune will typically require aeroshell mass fractions in excess of fifty percent (ref. 1), resulting in a relatively small usable payload. Our group has previously shown that an aerogravity assist maneuver (AGA) using Titan is promising as a means of capturing a spacecraft into a closed orbit about Saturn (ref. 2,3) This method permits much lower atmospheric entry speeds and will likely produce considerably lower aerothermal heating rates than a direct aerocapture at one of the giant planets. The present study considers the use of a similar maneuver at Triton to capture a spacecraft into orbit about Neptune.

## Methodology

Atmospheric entry trajectories were calculated using the three degree of freedom version of the Program to Optimize Simulated Trajectories (POST, ref. 4). The atmosphere models used (Fig. 1) were derived from a stellar occulation studies (ref. 5) and have an entry interface at 95 km altitude. While the degree of potential variability in Triton's atmospheric density is not well known, there is evidence that temporal changes in the sub-solar latitude result in greater or lesser amounts of the atmosphere being condensed onto the surface in a frost-like state. The last two decades have seen a general global warming at Triton and a concomitant increase in the atmospheric density (ref. 6,7) This led to our choice of density dispersions which are somewhat greater than are typically used for preliminary aerocapture studies ( $200 \%$ and $50 \%$ of the nominal value).

For this investigation, all trajectories were simulated using due east, equatorial entries. A probe mass of 600 kg was used, with the
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Figure 1 Triton Atmospheric Model
overall mass varying slightly according to ballute size. A toroidal ballute was assumed, using a coefficient of drag ( $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{D}}$ ) of 1.25 ; the ballute reference area was varied from $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ to $1500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. The attached, non-lifting probe had a reference area of $12.56 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and a $C_{D}$ of 1.25 . As a means of comparison, some trajectories were calculated using a blunt body with a lift-to-drag ratio (L/D) of 0.25 , a mass of 600 kg and a reference area $12.56 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.

For the nominal case, the vehicle is targeted to an exit velocity of $3.0 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$. If this velocity is directed opposite to Triton's orbital velocity vector, it will result in a spacecraft orbit about Neptune with an periapse radius of 29000 km and an apoapse at Triton's orbital distance ( $355,000 \mathrm{~km}$ ). This design is consistent with previously established mission profiles and reflects current science objectives (ref. 1). Triton entry speeds from $4.7 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ to $22 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ were examined in this paper, corresponding to the hyperbolic excess speeds required for Neptune entries over the previously established range of 24 to $34 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ (ref. 1).

Our initial approach was to determine if the proper amount of energy could be dissipated by a given vehicle during an atmospheric pass. For a rigid, lifting aeroshell, the maximum energy loss for a given entry state will be achieved by flying the vehicle on a full lift down trajectory. The


Figure 2. Overshoot trajectory altitude histories for a ballute and a rigid aeroshell entering at 8 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s}$
entry angle which achieves the target exit energy for such a full lift down pass is known as the overshoot boundary. This is the shallowest angle at which the vehicle can enter and execute a successful maneuver. For a ballute (which has no lift), the shallowest entry will be achieved when the ballute is held throughout the atmospheric pass, rather than being released at some intermediate time. Steeper entries will require the ballute to be released earlier, and the steepest allowable angle is set either by heating constraints on the probe or (more probably) on the ballute material or possibly by minimum altitude constraints on the probe after the ballute releases.

## Results

## Rigid Aeroshell

Trajectory simulations reveal that the rigid aeroshell penetrates quite low in the atmosphere, even for the overshoot trajectory entering the nominal atmosphere at $8 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ (Fig. 2). For the low-density atmosphere, steeper entries would be required, and these would result in closer approaches to the ground, leaving an inadequate margin for error. At entry speeds of $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ or more, capture to the target orbit was impossible since steeper flight path angles were required and these lead to vehicle crashes. These results indicate that blunt body, rigid aeroshells are not suited for this application.


Figure 3 The required atmospheric entry angle as a function of atmospheric entry speed for a range of ballute sizes. The ballute is not released during the atmospheric passage. A nominal density profile is assumed

## Ballutes

Figure 3 illustrates that throughout the range of potential entry speeds, the correct amount of energy can be dissipated by a wide range of nonreleasing ballutes. Figure 3 also shows the sensitivity of the entry angle with respect to the ballute size. Figure 4 shows the relationship of atmospheric exit velocity to the entry angle for a non-releasing, $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ballute at several specific entry speeds. While it is clear that the exit velocity becomes increasingly sensitive to entry angle as entry speed goes up, it must be noted that these sensitivities will be significantly reduced by allowing for a releasing ballute.

Another major concern in performing such a maneuver is whether or not trajectories can be achieved while allowing for potential atmospheric dispersions. Figure 5 shows the variation in the required entry angle for a nonreleasing, $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ballute in all three atmospheric density profiles. The extreme density atmospheres do cause some appreciable differences in the required atmospheric entry angles for a non-releasing ballute, but again, this impact will be minimized by allowing for an early ballute release. This approach is illustrated in Fig. 6 where it is clear that a wide range of entry angles can be accommodated using a single ballute simply by varying the release time.

## Conclusions

Aerogravity assist at the Triton-Neptune system is probably not feasible using blunt body, rigid


Figure 4 Exit velocity vs entry angle for a nonreleasing $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ballute entering at various speeds


Figure 5. Impact of atmospheric dispersions on required entry angle for a $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ non-releasing ballute


Figure 6. Cut time for a $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ballute entering the nominal atmosphere at $8 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$
aeroshells with low lift-to-drag ratios. The significant potential variability in the atmospheric density coupled with the low altitudes reached during the aeroshell trajectories are likely to result in a catastrophic failure. However, it appears that modest sized ballutes stay high enough in the atmosphere and offer adequate corridor widths to warrant further study.

## Future Work

More work must be done to more clearly determine the appropriate degree of atmospheric variability for dispersion studies. Once this is accomplished, it will be necessary to examine the aeroheating environment and design trajectories for both nominal and off nominal atmospheric conditions that meet the constraints of inflatable materials.

Another interesting area to examine will be the use of high L/D, rigid aeroshells (biconics or lifting bodies) and low ballistic coefficient aeroshells, such as those with inflatable skirts to perform the maneuver.

The approach and departure geometry with respect to both Triton and Neptune must be more fully evaluated to determine desirable encounter turn angles.

## Acknowledgements

The work described in this paper was funded in whole or in part by the In-Space Propulsion Technology Program, which is managed by the NASA Science Mission Directorate in Washington, D.C., and implemented by the InSpace Propulsion Technology Projects Office at Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala. The program objective is to develop in-space propulsion technologies that can enable or benefit near and mid-term NASA space science missions by significantly reducing cost, mass or travel times.

## References

[^1]Providence, Rhode Island, AIAA 20044951, August 16-19, 2004.
2) Ramsey, P. and Lyne, J.E., "An Investigation of Aerogravity Assist at Titan and Triton for Capture into Orbit About Saturn and Neptune," presented at the $2^{\text {nd }}$ International Planetary Probe Workshop, Moffett Field, California, Aug. 2004.
3) Ramsey, P. and Lyne, J.E., "An Investigation of Titan Aerogravity Assist or Capture into Orbit About Saturn," AAS Paper AAS-03-644, presented at the AAS/AIAA Astrodynamics Scecialists Conference, Big Sky, Montana, Aug. 2003.
4) Brauer, G.L, et. al.,"Program to Optimize Simulated Trajectories (POST)," NASA Contract Report NAS1-18147, September 1989.
5) Elliot, J.L. et al, "The Prediction and Observation of the 1987 July 18 Stellar Occultation by Triton: More Evidence for Distortion and Increasing Pressure it Triton's Atmoshpere," Icarus, 148, pp.347369, 2000
6) Elliot, J.L., "Global Warming on Triton," Nature, 393, pp. 765-767.

Philip Ramsey \& James Evans Lyne
The University of Tennessee at Knoxville
3rd International Planetary Probe Workshop
Anavyssos, Greece
June 27- July 1, 2005
Motivation Atmospheric entry speeds at Neptune are inherently very high
(typically $28-30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ )

Such a maneuver would entail much lower entry speeds than a
direct aerocapture and would result in a less severe aerothermal
environment
Objectives
Present study seeks to determine if an aerogravity assist at
Triton is feasible as a means of capture into orbit about Neptune
Evaluate entry corridors as a function of atmospheric entry speed
Determine the characteristics of a vehicle necessary to
accomplish the proposed maneuver
Determine the impact of off-nominal atmospheric conditions
on vehicle design and maneuver feasibility

| 0 |
| :--- |
| $\cdots$ |
|  |
| 0 |
| $\infty$ |

Triton -

A diameter of 2700 km - by far the largest of Neptune's moons
Near-circular, retrograde orbit at $355,000 \mathrm{~km}$ radius with a 157
degree inclination
Orbital speed about Neptune of $4.4 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$
small percent methane
Extremely tenuous
extrely tenuous atmosph

-
Surface
temporal variation
Assumptions
Mission
Triton entry speeds from 4.7 to $22 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ (corresponding to
Neptune entry speeds of 24 to $34 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ )

Target orbit about Neptune $355,000 \mathrm{~km}$ apoapse and $29,000 \mathrm{~km}$
periapse (based on previous Neptune aerocapture studies
by Lockwood et al)
A nominal target for the Triton atmospheric exit velocity of $3.0 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$
(if the outbound trajectory is opposite to Triton's orbital velocity,
this gives a periapse at the specified 29000 km radius)

Methodology
Trajectory simulations carried out with 3D POST
Due east, equatorial entries
No winds or horizontal density dispersions were considered
Entry interface at 95 km altitude
Assumed probe mass is 600 kg
Toroidal ballute used with $C_{D}=1.46$ and area ranging from
100 to $1500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$
Triton Atmospheric Model Based
on Stellar Occultation Studies






Cut Time for $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ Ballute
Entering at $8 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$


Conclusions
Aerogravity assist at Triton/Neptune is probably not feasible
using a rigid aeroshell because of the significant potential
variability in the atmospheric density, coupled with the low
trajectories expected under nominal conditions (i.e. crash
probable)
Ballutes offer substantial corridor width and high enough
trajectories to merit further study
Future Work

Aeroshells with very low ballistic coefficients (such as designs
using inflatable skirts) for Triton/Neptune AGA
More work is required in collaboration with atmospheric
scientists to determine the probable range of variability in
Triton's atmospheric structure
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