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PREFACE-

The work described in this report was performed by the Earth'and Space Sciences, Systems, Telecommunications Science and Engineering, Control and Energy Conversion, Applied Mechanics, and Information Systems Divisions of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory for NASA Ames Research Center under NASA OAST Program 790, "Space Systems Studies," Stanley R. Sadin, sponsor.

A mission out of the planetary system, with launch about the year 2000, could provide valuable scientific data as well as test some of the technology for a later mission to another star. A mission to a star is not expected to be practical around 2000 because the flight time with the technology then available is expected to exceed $10,000 \mathrm{yr}$.

Primary scientific objectives for the precursor mission concern characteristics of the heliopause, the interstellar medium, stellar distances (by parallax measurements), low energy cosmic rays, interplanetary gas distribution, and mass of the solar system. Secondary objectives include investigation of Pluto. Candidate science instruments are suggested.

The mission should extend to 500-1000 AU from the sun. A heliocentric hyperbolic escape velocity of $50-100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ or more is needed to attain this distance within a reasonable mission duration. The trajectory should be toward the incoming interstellar wind. For a year 2000 launch, a Pluto encounter can be included. A second mission targeted parallel to the solar axis would also be worthwhile.

The mission duration is 20 years, with an extended mission to a total of 50 years. A system using 1 or 2 stages of nuclear electric propulsion was selected as a possible baseline. The most promising alternatives are ultralight solar sails or laser sailing, with the lasers in Earth orbit, for example. The NEP baseline design allows the option of carrying a Pluto orbiter as a daughter spacecraft.

Within the limited depth of this study, individual spacecraft systems for the mission are considered, technology requirements and problem areas noted, and a number of recommendations made for technology study and advanced development. The most critical technology needs include attainment of $50-\mathrm{yr}$ spacecraft lifetime and development of a long-life NEP system.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

FOR EXTRAPLANETARY MISSION
To permit an extraplanetary mission, such as that described in this report, to commence about the year 2000, efforts are recommended on the following topics. In general, a study should be initiated first, followed by development effort as indicated by the study.

## First priority

Starting work on the following topics is considered of first priority, in view of their importance to the mission and the time required for the advance development.

1) Design and fabrication techniques that will provide 50 -year spacecraft lifetime.
2) Nuclear electric propulsion with operating times of 10 years or more at full power and able to operate at low power levels for attitude control and spacecraft power to a total of 50 years.
3) Ultralight solar sails, including their impact upon spacecraft and mission design.
4) Laser sailing systems, including their impact upon spacecraft and mission design.
5) Detailing and application of spacecraft quality assurance and reliability methods utilizing test times much shorter than the intended lifetime.

## Second priority

Other topics that will require advance effort beyond that likely without special attention include:
6) Spacecraft bearings and moving parts with 50-yr lifetime.
7) Neutral gas mass spectrometer for measuring concentrations of $10^{-2}$ $-10^{-10}$ atom $/ \mathrm{cm}^{3}$, with $50-\mathrm{yr}$ lifetime.
8) Techniques to predict long-time behavior of spacecraft materials from short-time tests.
9) Compatibility of science instruments with NEP.
10) Methods of calibrating science instruments for 50-yr lifetime.
11) Optical vs. microwave telecommunications with orbiting DSN.
12) Stellar parallax measurements in deep-space.

FOR STAR MISSION
For a star mission, topics which warrant early study include:
13) Antimatter propulsion.
14) Propulsion alternatives for a star mission.
15) Cryogenic spacecraft.
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## INTRODUCTION

## BACKGROUND

Even before the first earth satellites were launched in 1957 , there was popular interest in the possibility of spacecraft missions to other stars and their planetary systems. As space exploration has progressed to the outer planets of the solar system, it becomes appropriate to begin to consider the scientific promise and engineering difficulties of mission to the stars and, hopefully, their accompanying planets.

In a conference on "Missions Beyond the Solar System", organized by L. D. Friedman and held at JPL in August 1976, the idea of a precursor mission out beyond the planets, but not nearly to another star, was suggested as a means of bringing out and solving the engineering problems that would be faced in a mission to a star. At the same time, it was recognized that such a precursor mission, even though aimed primarily at engineering objectives, should also have significant scientific objectives.

Subsequently, in November 1976, this small study was initiated to examine a précursor mission and identify long lead-time technology development which should be initiated to permit such a mission. This study was funded by the Study, Analysis, and Planning Office (Code RX) of the NASA Office of Aeronautics and Space Technology.

STUDY OBJECTIVE
The objective of the study was to establish probable science goals, mission concepts and technology requirements for a mission extending from outer regions of the solar system to interstellar flight. An unmanned mission was intended.

## STUDY SCOPE

The study was intended to address science goals, mission concepts, and technology requirements for the portion of the mission outward from the outer portion of the planetary system.

Because of the limited funding available for this study, it was originally planned that the portion of the mission between the earth and the outer portion of the planetary system would not be specifically addressed; likewise, propulsion concepts and technology would not be included. Problems encountered at speeds approaching that of light were excluded for the same reason. In the course of the study, it became clear that these constraints were not critical, and they were relaxed, as indicated later in this report.

## STUDY APPROACH

The study effort consisted of two tasks. Task 1 concerned science goals and mission concepts, Task 2 technology requirements.

## TASK 1

In Task 1, science goals for the mission were to be examined, and the scientific measurements to be made. Possible relation of the mission to the separate effort on Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence was also to be considered. Another possibility to be examined was that of using the data, in reverse time sequence, to examine a star and its surroundings (in this case, the solar system) as might be done from an approaching spacecraft.

Possible trajectories would be evaluated with respect to the interaction of the direction of the outward asymptote and the speed with the science goals. A very limited examınation might be made of trajectories within the solar system and accompanying propulsion concepts to assess the feasibility of the outward velocities considered.

During the study, science goals and objectives were derived by series of conversations and small meetings with a large number of scientists. Most of these were from JPL, a few elsewhere. Appendix B gives their names.

The trajectory information was obtained by examination of pertinent work done in other studies and a small amount of computation carried out specifically for this study.

## TASK 2

In this task, technology requirements that appear to differ significantly from those of missions within the solar system were to be identified. These would be compared with the projected state-of-the-art for the year $2000 \pm 15$. It was originally planned that requirements associated with propulsion would be addressed only insofar as they interact with power or other systems.

This task was carried out by bringing together study team participants from each of the technical divisions of the Laboratory. (Participants are listed in Appendix A-:) Overaill concepts were dēveloped and discussed at study team meetings. Each participant obtained inputs from other members of his division on projected capabilities and development needed for individual subsystems. These were iterated at team meetings. In particular, several iterations were needed between propulsion and trajectory calculations.

## STAR MISSION

Many of the contributors to this study, both scientific and engineering, felt an actual star mission should be considered. Preliminary examination indicated, however, that the hyperbolic velocity attainable for solar system escape during the time period of interest (year $2000 \pm 15$ ) was of the order of $10^{2} \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ or $3 \times 10^{9} \mathrm{~km} /$ year. Since the nearest star is at a distance of 4.3 light years or about $4 \times 10^{13} \mathrm{~km}$, the mission duration would exceed 10,000 years. This did not seem worth considering for two reasons.

First, attaining, and especially establishing, a spacecraft lifetime of 10,000 years by the year 2000 is not considered feasible. Secondly, propulsion capability and hence hyperbolic velocity attainable is expected to increase with time. Doubling the velocity should take not more than another 25 years of work, and would reduce the mission duration to only 5000 years. Thus, a spacecraft launched later would be expected to arrive earlier. Accordingly, launch to a star by $2000 \pm 15$ does not seem reasonable.

For this reason, a star mission is not considered further in the body of this report. A few thoughts which arose during this study and pertain to a star mission are recorded in Appendix C. It is recommended that a subsequent study address the possibility of a star mission starting in 2025, 2050, or later, and the long lead-time technology developments that 'will be needed to permit this mission.

Preliminary examination of trajectory and propulsion possibilitues indicated that a mission extending to distances of some hundred or perhaps a few thousand AJ from the sun with a launch around the year 2000 was reasonable. The following science objectives and requirements are considered appropriate for such a mission.

## SCIENTIFIC OBJECTIVES

## Primary Objectives

1) Determination of the characteristics of the heliopause, where the solar wind presumably terminates against the incoming interstellar medium.
2) Determination of the characteristics of the interstellar medium.
3) Determination of the stellar and galactic distance scale, through measurements of the distance to nearby stars.
4) Determination of the characteristics of cosmic rays at energies excluded by the heliosphere.
5) Determination of characteristics of the solar system as a whole, such as its interplanetary gas distribution and total mass.

## Secondary Objectives

1) Determination of the characteristics of Pluto and its satellites and rings, if any. If there had been a previous mission to Pluto, this objective would be modified.
2) Determination of the characteristics of distant galactic and extragalactic objects.
3) Evaluation of problems of scientific observations of another solar system from a spacecraft.

## TRAJECTORY REQUIREMENTS

The primary science objectives necessitate passing through the heliopause, preferably in a relatively few years after launch to increase the
reliability of data return. Most of the scientists interviewed preferred a mission directed toward the incoming interstellar gas, where the heliopause is expected to be closest and most well defined. The "upwind" direction with respect to neutral interstellar gas is approximately R.A. $250^{\circ}$, Decl - $16^{\circ}$ (Weller and Meier, 1974; Ajello, 1977) . (See Fig. 1. The sun's motion with respect to interstellar charged particles and magnetic fields is not known.) Presumably any direction within, say, $40^{\circ}$ of this would be satisfactory. A few scientists preferred a mission parallel to the sun's axis (perpendicular to the ecliptic), believing that interstellar magnetic field and perhaps particles may leak inward further along this axis. Some planetary scientists would Iike the mission to include a flyby or orbiter of Pluto, depending on the extent to which Pluto might have been explored by an earlier mission. Although a Pluto flyby is incompatible with a direction perpendicular to the ecliptic, it happens that in the period of interest (arrival around the year 2005) Pluto will lie almost exactly in the "upwind" direction mentioned, so an "upwind" trajectory could include a Pluto encounter.

The great majority of scientists consulted preferred a trajectory that would take the spacecraft out as fast as possible. This would minimize time to reach the heliopause and the interstellar medium. Also, it would, at any time, provide maximum earth-S/C separation as a base for optical measurements of stellar parallax. A few scientists would like to have the $S / C$ go out and then return to the solar system to permit evaluating and testing methods of obtaining scientific data with a future S/C encountering another solar system. Such a return would, roughly, halve the duration of the outward portion of the flight for any fixed mission duration. Also, since considerable propulsive energy would be required to "stop and turn around", this approach would considerably reduce the outward hyperbolic velocity attainable. These two effects would greatly reduce the maximum distance that could be reached for a given mission duration.

As a "strawman mission", it is recommended that a no-return trajectory with an asymptote near R.A. $250^{\circ}$, Dec1 $-15^{\circ}$ and a flyby of Pluto be


Fig. 1 Some Points of Interest on the Celestral Map.
From Sergeyevsky (1971) modıfıed.
considered, with a hyperbolic excess velocity of $40-90 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ or more. Higher velocities should be used if practical. Propulsion should be designed to avoid interference with scientific measurements and should be off when mass measurements are to be made.

A number of scientific observations (discussed below) would be considerably improved if two spacecraft, operating simultaneously, were used, with asymptotic trajectories at approximately right angles to each other. Thus, use of a second spacecraft, with an asymptotic trajectory approximately parallel to the solar axis, is worthwhile scientifically.

## SCIENTIFIC MEASUREMENTS

## Heliopause and Interstellar Medium

Determination is needed of the characteristics of the solar wind just inside the heliopause, of the heliopause itself, of the accompanying shock (if one exists), and of the region between the heliopause and the shock. The location of the heliopause is not known; estimates now tend to center at about 100 AU from the sun. (As an indication of the uncertainty, estimates a few years ago ran as low as 5 AU.)

Key measurements to be made include magnetic field, plasma properties (density, velocity, temperature, composition, plasma waves) and electric field. Similar measurements, extending to low energy levels, are needed in the interstellar medium, together with measurements of the properties of the neutral gas (density, temperature, composition of atomic and molecular species, velocity) and of the interstellar dust (particle concentration, particle mass distribution, composition, velocity). The radiation temperature should also be measured.

The magnetic, electric, and plasma measurements would require only conventional instrumentation, but high sensitivity would be needed. Plasma blobs could be detected by radio scintillation of small sources at a wavelength near 1 m . Radiation temperature could be measured with a radiometer at wavelengths of 1 cm to 1 m , using a detector cooled to a few Kelvins. Both in-situ and remote measurements of gas and dust properties are desirable. In-situ measurements of dust composition could be made
by an updated version of an impact-ionization mass spectrometer. In-situ measurements of ions could be made by a mass spectrometer and by a plasma analyzer. In-situ measurements of neutral gas composition would probably require development of a mass spectrometer with greater sensitivity and signal/noise ratio than present instruments. Remote measurements of gas composition could be made by absorption spectroscopy, looking back toward the sun, Of particular interest in the gas measurements are the ratios $\mathrm{D} / \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} / \mathrm{H}_{2} / \mathrm{H}^{+}$, $\mathrm{He} / \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{He}^{3} / \mathrm{He}^{4}$; the contents of $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{O}$, and if possible of Li, Be, B; and the flow velocity. Dust within some size range could be observed remotely by changes in the continuum intensity.

## Stellar and Galactic Distance Scale

Present scales of stellar and galactic distance are probably uncertain by $20 \%$. This in turn leads to uncertainties of $40 \%$ in the absolute luminosity (energy production), the quantity which serves as the fundamental input data for stellar model calculations. Uncertainties in galactic distances make it difficult to provide good input data for cosmological models.

The basic problem is that all longer-range scales depend ultimately on the distances to Cepheid varıables in nearby clusters, such as the Hyades and Pleiades. Distances to these clusters are determined by statistical analysis of relative motions of stars within the clusters, and the accuracy of this analysis is not good. With a baseline of a few hundred $A U$ between $S / C$ and earth, triangulation would provide the distance to nearby Cepheids with high accuracy. This will require a camera with resolution of a fraction of an arc second, implying an objective diameter of 30 cm to 1 m . Star position angles need not be measured relative to the sun or earth line, but only with respect to distant stars in the same image frame. To reduce the communcations load, only the pixel coordinates of a few selected objects need be transmitted to earth.

## Cosmic Rays

Measurements should be made of low energy cosmic rays, which the solar magnetic field excludes from the heliosphere. Properties to be
measured include flux, spectrum, composition, and direction. Measurements should be made at energies below 10 MeV and perhaps down to 10 keV or lower. Conventional instrumentation should be satisfactory.

## Solar System as a Whole

Determinations of the characteristics of the solar system as a whole include measurements of neutral and ionized gas and of dust. Quantities to be measured include spatial distribution and the other properties mentioned above.

Column densities of ionized material can be observed by low frequency radio dispersion. Nature, distribution and velocity of neutral gas components and some ions can be observed spectroscopically by fluorescence under solar radiation. To provide adequate sensitivity, a large objective will be needed. Continuum observation should show the dust distribution.

The total mass of the solar system should be measured. This could be done through dual frequency radio doppler tracking.

## Observations of Distant Objects

Observations of more distant objects should include radio astronomy observations at frequencies below 1 kHz , below the plasma frequency of the interplanetary medium. This will require a VLF receiver with a very long dipole or monopole antenna.

Also, both radio and gamma-ray events should be observed and timed. Comparison of event times on the $S / C$ and at earth will indicate the direction of the source.

In addition, the galactic hydrogen distribution should be observed by UV spectrophotometry, outside any local concentration due to the sun.

[^0]and nearby charged particles and magnetic fields. Surface temperature and composition should also be observed. Suitable instruments include a TV camera, infrared radiometer, ultraviolet/visible spectrometer, particles and fields instruments, infrared spectrometer.

For atmospheric properties, UV observations during solar occultation (especially for $H$ and $H e$ ) and radio observations of earth occultation should be useful.

The mass of Pluto should be measured: radio tracking should provide this.

If a Pluto orbiter is included in the mission, measurements should also include surface composition, variable features, rotation axis, shape, and gravity field. Additional instruments should include a gamma-ray spectrometer and an altimeter.

## Simulated Stellar Encounter

If return to the solar system is contemplated, as a simulation of a stellar encounter, observations should be made, during approach, of the existence of possible stellar companions and planets, and later of satellites, asteroids, and comets, and of their characteristics. Observations of neutral gas, dust, plasma, and energetic emissions associated with the star should be made, and any emissions from planets and satellites. Choice(s) should be made of a trajectory through the approaching solar system (recog-" nizing the time-delays inherent in a real stellar mission), the choice(s) should be implemented, and flyby measurements made.

The approach measurements could probably be made using instruments aboard for other purposes. For flyby, it would probably be adequate to use data recorded on earlier missions rather than carry additional instruments.

An alternative considered was simulating a stellar encounter by
"looking backwards while leaving the solar system and later replaying the data backwards". This was not looked on with favor by the scientists contacted because the technique would not permit making the operational decisions that would be key in encountering a "new" solar system: locating
and flying by planets, for example. "Looking backwards" at the solar system is desired to give solar system data per se, as mentioned above. Stellar encounter operations are discussed briefly in Appendix C.

## Gravity Waves

A spacecraft at a distance of several hundred AU offers an opportunity for a sensitive technique for detecting gravity waves. All that is needed is precision 2-way radio doppler measurements between $S / C$ and earth.

## Measurements Not Planned

Observations not contemplated include:

1) Detecting the Oort cloud of comets, if it exists. No method of detecting a previously unknown comet far out from the sun is recognized unless there is an accidental encounter. Finding a previously seen comet when far out would be very difficult because the orbits of long-period comets are irregular and their aphelia are hard to determine accurately; moreover, a flyby, far from the sun, would tell little about the comet and nothing about the Oort cloud. The mass of the entire Oort cloud might be detectable from outside, but the mission is not expected to extend the estimated $50,000 \mathrm{AU}$ out. If Lyttleton's comet model is correct, a comet accidentally encountered would be revealed by the dust detector.
2) VLBI using an earth-S/C baseline. This would require very high rates of data transmission to earth, rates which do not appear reasonable. Moreover, it is doubtful that sources of the size resolved with this baseline are intense enough to be detected and that the required coherence would be maintained after passage through inhomogeneities in the intervening medium. Also, with only 2 widely separated receivers and a time-varying baseline, there would be serious ambiguity in the measured direction of each source.

## Advantages of Using Two Spacecraft

Use of two spacecraft, with asymptotic trajectories at roughly right angles to each other, would permit exploring two regions of the heliopause
(upwind and parallel to the solar axis) and provide significantly greater understanding of its character, including the phenomena occurring near the magnetic pole direction of the sun. Observations of transient distant radio and gamma-ray events from two spacecraft plus the earth would permit location of the source with respect to two axes, instead of the one axis determinable with a single $S / C$ plus earth.

## CANDIDATE SCIENCE PAYLOAD

1) Vector magnetometer
2) Plasma spectrometer
3) Ultraviolet/visible spectrometers
4) Dust impact detector and analyzer
5) Low energy cosmic ray analyzer
6) Dual-frequency radio tracking (including low frequency with high frequency uplink)
7) Radio astronomy/plasma wave receiver (including VLF; Iong antenna)
8) Mass spectrometer
9) Microwave radiometer
10) Electric field meter
11) Camera (aperture 30 cm to 1 m )
12) Gamma-ray transient detector

If Pluto flyby or orbiter is planned:
13) Infrared radiometer
14) Infrared spectrometer

If Pluto orbiter is planned:
15) Gamma-ray spectrometer
16) Altimeter

## TRAJECTORIES

## UNITS AND COORDINATE SYSTEMS

## Units

Some useful approximate relations in considering an extraplanetary mission are:
$1 \mathrm{AU} \quad=1.5 \times 10^{8} \mathrm{~km}$
1 Iight year $=9.5 \times 10^{12} \mathrm{~km}=6.3 \times 10^{4} \mathrm{AU}$
1 parsec $\quad=3.1 \times 10^{13} \mathrm{~km}=2.1 \times 10^{5} \mathrm{AU}=3.3$ light years

1 year $\quad=3.2 \times 10^{7} \mathrm{~s}$
$1 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s} \quad=0.21 \mathrm{AU} / \mathrm{yr}=3.3 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{c}$
where $c=$ velocity of light

## Coordinate Systems

For objects out of the planetary system, the equatorial coordinate system using right ascension ( $\alpha$ ) and declination ( $\delta$ ) is often more convenient than the ecliptic coordinates, celestial longitude ( $\lambda$ ) and celestial latitude ( $\beta$ ) . Conversion relations are:

```
\(\sin \beta \quad=\cos \varepsilon \sin \delta-\sin \varepsilon \cos \delta \sin \alpha\)
```

$\cos \beta \sin \lambda=\sin \varepsilon \sin \delta+\cos \varepsilon \cos \delta \sin \alpha$
$\cos \beta \cos \lambda=\quad \cos \delta \cos \alpha$
where $\varepsilon=$ obliquity of ecliptic $\simeq 23.5^{\circ}$

DIRECTIONS OF INTEREST

## Extraplanetary

Most recent data for the direction of the incoming interstellar neutral gas are:

Weller \& Meier (1974):
Right ascension $\quad \alpha=252^{\circ}$
Declination $\quad \delta=-15^{\circ}$
Ajello (1977):
Right ascension $\quad \alpha=252^{\circ}$
Declination $\quad \delta=-17^{\circ}$

Thus, these 2 data sources are in excellent agreement.
At $\alpha=250^{\circ}$ the ecliptic is about $20^{\circ} \mathrm{S}$ of the equator, so the wind comes in at celestial latitude of about $4^{\circ}$. Presumably, it is only a colncidence that this direction lies close to the ecliptic plane.

The direction of the incoming gas is sometimes referred to as the "apex of the sun's way", since it is the direction toward which the sun is moving with respect to the interstellar gas. The term "apex", however, conventionally refers to the direction the sun is moving relative to nearby stars, rather than relative to interstellar gas. These two directions differ by about $45^{\circ}$ in declination and about $20^{\circ}$ in right ascension. The direction of the solar motion with respect to nearby stars, and some other directions of possible interest, are shown in Fig. 1.

## Pluto

Table 1 gives the position of Pluto for the years 1990 to 2030. Note that, by coincidence, during 2000 to 2005 Pluto is within a few degrees of the direction toward the incoming interstellar gas (see Fig. 1). At the same time it is near its perihelion distance, only 30-31 AU from the sun.

## SOLAR SYSTEM ESCAPE TRAJECTORIES

As a step in studying trajectorıes for extraplanetary missions, a series of listings giving distance and velocity vs. time for parabolic and hyperbolic solar system escape trajectories has been generated. These are given in Appendix $D$ and a few pertinent values extracted in Table 2. Note, for example, that with a hyperbolic heliocentric excess velocity $V_{\infty}=50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$, a distance of 213 AU is reached in 20 years and a distance of 529 AU in 50 years. With $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}=100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$, these distances would be doubled approximately.

## LAUNCHABLE MASS

Solar system escape missions typically requare high launch energies, referred to as $C_{3}$, to achieve either direct escape or high flyby velocity

## TABLE 1

| Year | Position on 1 January |  | Declination, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Distance <br> from <br> sun, <br> AU | Right ascension, |  |
| 1990 | 29.58 | 227.03 | -1.37 |
| 1995 | 29.72 | 238.51 | -6.30 |
| 2000 | 30.12 | 249.98 | -10.89 |
| 2005 | 30.78 | 261.39 | -14.92 |
| 2010 | 31.64 | 272.61 | -18.20 |
| 2015 | 32.67 | 283.53 | -20.69 |
| 2020 | 33.81 | 294.02 | -22.37 |
| 2025 | 35.04 | 304.00 | -23.32 |
| 2030 | 36.31 | 313.37 | -23.63 |

TABLE 2
Summary of Solar System Ballistic Escape Trajectories
Initial Condition: Circular Orbit at 1 AU

(See Appendix D for detail)
at a gravity assist planet. Table 3 gives projected $C_{3}$ capabilities in (km/s) ${ }^{2}$ for the three versions of the Shuttle/Interim Upper Stage assuming net payloads of 300,400 , and 500 kg . It can be seen that as launched mass increases the maximum launch energy possible decreases. Conceivably higher $\mathrm{C}_{3}{ }^{\text {'s }}$ s are possible through the use of in-orbit assembly of larger IUS versions, or development of more powerful upper stages such as the Tug. The range of $C_{3}$ values found here will be used in the study of possible escape trajectories given below.

## DIRECT LAUNGH FROM EARTH

Direct launch from the Earth to a ballistic solar system escape trajectory requires a minimum launch energy of $152.2(\mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s})^{2}$. Table 4 gives the maximum solar system $V_{\infty}$ obtainable (in the ecliptic plane) and maximum ecliptıc latitude obtainable (for a parabolic escape trajectory) for a range of possible $C_{3}$.

The relatively low $V_{\infty}$ and inclination values obtainable with direct launch make it an undesirable choice for launching of extra-solar probes as compared with those techniques discussed below.

JUPITER ASSIST

## Jupiter Gravity Assist

Of all the planets, Jupiter is by far the best to use for gravity assisted solar system escape trajectories because of its intense gravity field. The geometry of the Jupiter flyby is shown in Figure 2. Assume that the planet is in a circular orbit about the Sun with orbital velocity $V_{J h}=13.06 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$.

The spacecraft approaches the planet with some relative velocity, $V_{\text {in }}$, directed at an angle $\beta$ to $V_{J h}$, and departs along $V_{\text {out }}$ after having been bent through an angle $\alpha$. The total bend angle

$$
\alpha=2 \arcsin \left[1 /\left(1+V_{\text {in }} r_{p}^{2} / \mu\right)\right]
$$

where $r_{p}$ is the closest approach radius to Jupiter and $\mu=G M J$, the gravitational mass of Jupiter. Note that $V_{J h}, V_{i n}$ and $V_{\text {out }}$ need not all

## TABLE 3

## Capabilities of Shuttle with Interim Upper Stage

> | Launch energy $\mathrm{C}_{3}$, |
| :---: |
| $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s})^{2}$ |
| for indicated |
| payload (kg) |

Launch Vehicle
Shutt1e/2-stage IUS
Shuttle/3-stage IUS
Shutt1e/4-stage IUS

| Launch energy $C_{3}$, <br> $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s})^{2}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| for indicated |  |  |
| payload (kg) |  |  |

## TABLE 4

Solar Sys̄tem Escape Ūsing Direct Ballistic Launch from Earth

|  | Maximum | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | hyperbolic | ecliptic latitude, |
|  | excess velocity, | $\lambda_{\text {max }}$, for parabolic |
| Launch | $V_{\infty}$, in ecliptic | trajectory |
| energy, $\mathrm{C}_{3}$ | plane |  |
| $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s})^{2}$ | ( $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) |


| 152.2 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 155. | 3.11 | 2.73 |
| 160. | 5.15 | 4.53 |
| 165. | 6.57 | 5.80 |
| 170. | 7.73 | 6.84 |
| 175. | 8.72 | 7.74 |



Fig. 2 Geometry of Jupiter F1yby
be in the same plane, so the spacecraft can approach Jupiter in the ecliptic plane and be ejected on a high inclination orbit. The heliocentric velocity of the spacecraft after the $f l y b y, V_{s h}$, is given by the vector sum of $V_{J h}$ and $V_{\text {out }}$. If this velocity exceeds approximately $1.414 \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{Jh}}$; shown by the dashed circle in Figure 2, the spacecraft achieves by hyperbolic orbit and will escape the solar system. The hyperbolic excess velocity is given by $V^{2}{ }_{s h}-2 \mu / r$ where $\mu$ here is $G M_{S}$, the gravitation mass for the Sun, and $r$ is the distance from the Sun, 5.2 astronomical units. The maximum solar system escape velocity will be obtained when the angle between $V_{J h}$ and $V_{\text {out }}$ is zero. This will necessarily result in a near-zero inclination for the outgoing orbit. Around this vector will be a cone of possible outgoing escape trajectories. As the angle from the central vector increases the hyperbolic excess velocity relative to the Sun will decrease. The excess velocity reaches zero (parabolic escape orbit) when the angle between $V_{J h}$ and $V_{s h}$ is equal to arc cos $\left[\left(3-V_{i n}^{2} / V^{2}{ }_{J h}\right) / 2 \sqrt{2}\right]$. This defines then the maximum inclination escape orbit that can be obtained for a given $V$ in at Jupiter. Table 5 gives the dependence of solar system hyperbolic escape velocity on $V_{i n}$ and the angle between $V_{J h}$ and $V_{s h}$. The maximum angle possible for a given $V_{i n}$ is also shown.

For example, for $a V_{i n}$ at Jupiter of $10 . \mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s}$ the maximum inclination obtainable $1 s 31.41^{\circ}$, and the solar system escape speed will be $13.03 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ for an inclination of $10^{\circ}$, $10.45 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ for an inclination of $20^{\circ}$. Note that for $V_{\text {in }}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ greater than $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ it is possible to eject along retrograde orbits. This is an undesirable waste of energy however. It is preferable to wait for Jupiter to move $180^{\circ}$ around its orbit when one could use a direct outgoing trajectory and achieve a higher escape speed in the same direction.

To consider in more detail the opportunities possible with Jupiter gravity assist, trajectories have been found assuming the Earth and Jupiter in circular, co-planar orbits, for a range of possible launch energy values. These results are summarized in Table 6. Note that the orbits with $C_{3}=180(\mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s})^{2}$ have negative semi-major axes indicating that they are hyperbolic. With the spacecraft masses and launch vehicles discussed above it is thus possible to get solar systém escape velocities

TABLE 5
Solar System Escape Using Jupiter Gravity Assist

| Approach velocity relative |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| to Jupiter, $\mathrm{V}_{\text {in }}$ ( $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s}$ ) : | 6.0 | 10.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 30.0 |
| Angle between outbound heliocentric velocity of $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{sh}}$, and of Jupiter, $J_{s h} \quad$ Solar system hyperbol ${ }^{\circ}$ ) for above approach |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.0 | 4.70 | 13.81 | 21.12 | 27.42 | 33.28 | 38.90 |
| 5.0 | 4.01 | 13.61 | 21.00 | 27.32 | 33.19 | 38.82 |
| 10.0 | ***** | 13.03 | 20.63 | 27.02 | 32.93 | 38.58 |
| 15.0 | *****' | 12.00 | 20.01 | 26.53 | 32.50 | 38.19 |
| 20.0 | ***** | 10.45 | 19.13 | 25.85 | 31.91 | 37.65 |
| 25.0 | ***** | 8.12 | 17.99 | 24.97 | 31.16 | 36.97 |
| 30.0 |  | 3.93 | 16.57 | 23.91 | 30.25 | 36.15 |
| 40.0 | ***** | ***** | 12.73 | 21.25 | 28.01 | 34.13 |
| 50.0 | ***** | ***** | 6.47 | 17.89 | 25.28 | 31.69 |
| 60.0 |  | ***** | ***** | 13.75 | 22.13 | 28.92 |
| 70.0 | ※ᄎ*** | ***** | ***** | 8.32 | 18.65 | 25.94 |
| 80.0 | ***** | ***** | ***** | ***** | 14.86 | 22.83 |
| 90.0 | ***** | ***** | ***** | ***** | 10.65 | 19.70 |
|  | Maximum angle between outbound heliocentric velocity of $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Sh}_{\mathrm{h}}}$, and of Jupiter, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{Jh}},\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, for above approach velocity |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9.58 | 31.41 | 53.53 | 76.60 | 103.57 | 143.56 |
| ***** indicates unobtainable combination of $\mathrm{V}_{\text {in }}$ and angle. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Jupiter Gravity Assist versus Launch Energy

on the order of $25 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ in the ecliptic plane and inclinations up to about $67^{\circ}$ above the ecliptic plane using simple ballistic flybys of Jupiter. Thus a large fraction of the celestial sphere is available to solar systen escape trajectories using this method.

## Jupiter Powered F1yby

One means of improving the performance of the Jupiter flyby is to perform a maneuver as the spacecraft passes through periapsis at Jupiter. The application of this $\Delta V$ deep in the planet's gravitational potential well results in a substantial increase in the outgoing $V_{\text {out }}$ and thus the solar system hyperbolic excess velocity $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$. This technique is particularly useful in raising relatively low $V_{\text {in }}$ values incoming to high outgoing $V_{\text {out }}$ 's. Table 7 gives the outgoing $V_{\text {out }}$ values at Jupiter obtainable as a function of $V_{i n}$ and $\Delta V$ applied at periapsis. A flyby at $1.1 R_{J}$ is assumed. The actual $V_{\text {out }}$ might be fractionally smaller because of gravity losses and pointing errors but the table gives a good idea of the degrees of performance inprovement possible.

Carrying the necessary propulsion to perform the $\Delta V$ maneuver would require an increase in launched payload and thus a decrease in maximum launch energy and $V_{\text {in }}$ possible at Jupiter. Table 8 gives the required launched mass for a net payload of 300 kg after the Jupiter flyby, using a space storable propulsion system with $I_{s p}$ of 370 seconds, and the maximum $C_{3}$ possible with a Shuttle/4-stage IUS launch vehicle, as a function of $\Delta V$ capability at Jupiter. These numbers may be combined with the two previous tables to find the approximate $V_{\text {in }}$ at Jupiter and the resulting $\mathrm{V}_{\text {out }}$.

Launch Opportunities to Jupiter
Launch opportunities to Jupiter occur approximately every 13 months. Precise calculations of such opportunities would be inappropriate at this stage in a study of extra-solar probe possibilities. Because Jupiter moves about $33^{\circ}$ in ecliptic longitude in a 13 month period, and because the cone of possible escape trajectories exceeds $30^{\circ}$ in halfwidth for V out above about $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$, it should be possible to launch to any ecliptic longitude over a 12 year period by properly choosing the launch date and flyby date at Jupiter. With sufficient $V_{o u t}$ the

TABLE 7<br>Jupiter Powered Flyby

| Approach velocity relative to Jupiter, $\mathrm{V}_{\text {in }}$, (km/s) | Outbound velocity relative to Jupiter, $V_{\text {out }}$, ( $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s}$ ), for indicated $\Delta V(\mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s})$ applied out' at periapsis of $1.1 R_{j}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | . 50 | 1.00 | 1.50 | 2.00 | 2.50 |
| 6.0 | 9.66 | 12.30 | 14.48 | 16.38 | 18.11 |
| 8.0 | 11.03 | 13.41 | 15.44 | 17.25 | 18.90 |
| 10.0 | 12.57 | 14.71 | 16.59 | 18.29 | 19.86 |
| 12.0 | 14.22 | 16.16 | 17.00 | 19.50 | 20.99 |
| 14.0 | 15.96 | 17.72 | 19.33 | 20.83 | 22.24 |
| 16.0 | 17.76 | 19.37 | 20.86 | 22.37 | 23.61 |
| 18.0 | 19.59 | 21.08 | 22.47 | 23.80 | 25.06 |
| 20.0 | 21.46 | 22.83 | 24.14 | 25.39 | 26.00 |

TABLE 8<br>Launched Mass for 300 kg Net Payload<br>after Jupiter Powered Flyby

| $\Delta V$ at <br> Jupiter | Required launched mass <br> for $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}}}=370 \mathrm{~s}$ | Maxımum launch energy, $\mathrm{C}_{3}$, <br> attainable with <br> shuttle/4-stage IUS <br> $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s})^{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $(\mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s})$ | $(\mathrm{kg})$ |  |
| .0 | 300. | 178.4 |
| .5 | 428. | 157.4 |
| 1.0 | 506. | 147.4 |
| 1.5 | 602. | 137.0 |
| 2.0 | 720. | 127.2 |
| 2.5 | 869. | 114.9 |

high ecliptic latitudes would be available as described in an earlier section. Flight times to Jupiter will typically be 2 years or less.

## Venus-Earth Gravity Assist

One means of enhancing payload to Jupiter is to launch by way of a Venus-Earth Gravity Assist (VEGA) trajectory. These trajectories launch at relatively low $C_{3}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s}, 15-30(\mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s})^{2}$, and incorporate gravity assist and $\Delta V$ maneuvers at Venus and Earth to send large payloads to the outer planets. The necessary maneuvers add about 2 years to the total flight time before reaching Jupiter. The extra payload could then be used as propulsion system mass to perform the powered flyby at Jupiter. An alternate approach is that VEGA trajectories allow use of a smaller launch vehicle to achieve the same mission as a direct trajectory.

## POWERED SOLAR FLYBY

The effect of an impulsive delta-V maneuver when the spacecraft is close to the Sun has been calculated for an extra-solar spacecraft. The calculations are done for a burn at the perihelion distance of 0.1 AU , for orbits whose $V_{\infty}$ value before the burn is 0,5 , and $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ respective1y. Results are shown in Table 9. It can be seen that the delta-V maneuver deep in the Sun's potential well can result in a significant increase in $V_{\infty}$ after the burn, having its greatest effect when the preburn $V_{\infty}$ is small.

The only practical means to get 0.1 from the Sun (other than with a "super sail", discussed below) is a Jupiter flyby at a $V_{\infty}$ relative to Jupiter of $12 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ or greater. The flyby is used to remove angular momentum from the spacecraft orbit, and "dump" it in towards the Sun. The same flyby used to add energy to the orbit could achieve $V_{m}$ of 17 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s}$ or more without any delta-V, and upwards of $21 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ with $2.5 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ of delta-V at Jupiter. The choice between the two methods will require considerably more study in the future.

## LOW-THRUST TRAJECTORIES

A large number of propulsion techniques have been proposed that do not depend upon utilization of chemical energy aboard the spacecraft.

## Powered Solar Flyby

$\Delta \mathrm{V}$
$(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s})$
.1
. 3
. 5
1.0
1.5
2.0
2.5

Heliocentric hyperbolic excess velocity, $V_{\infty},(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s})$, after burn 0.1 AU from Sun and initial $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ as indicated ( $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s}$ )

| $\frac{0}{5.16}$ | $\frac{5}{7.19}$ | $\frac{10}{11.25}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8.94 | 10.25 | 13.42 |
| 11.55 | 12.59 | 15.29 |
| 16.35 | 17.10 | 19.19 |
| 20.05 | 20.67 | 22.42 |
| 23.17 | 23.71 | 25.26 |
| 25.93 | 26.41 | 27.82 |

Among the more recent reviews pertinent to this mission are those by Forward (1976), Papailiou et al (1975), and James et al (1976). A. very useful bibliography is that of Mallove et al (1977).

Most of the techniques provide relative low thrust and involve long periods of propulsion. The following paragrāphs consider methods that seem the more promising for an extraplanetary mission launched around 2000.

## Solar Sailing

Solar sails operate by using solar radiation pressure to add or subtract angular momentum from the spacecraft (Garwin, 1958). The basic design considered in this study is a helio-gyro of twelve 6200-meter mylar strips, spin-stabilized.

According to Jerome Wright (private communication), the sail is capable of achieving spacecraft solar system escape velocities of 15-20 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s}$. This requires spiralling into a close orbit approximately 0.3 AU from the sun and then accelerating rapidly outward. The spiral-in maneuver requires approximately one year and the acceleration outward, which involves approximately $1-1 / 2-2$ revolutions about the sun, takes about 1-1/2 - 2 years, at which time the sail/spacecraft is crossing the orbit of Mars, 1.5 AU from the sun, on its way out.

The sail is capable of reaching any inclination and therefore any point of the celestial sphere. This is accomplished by performing a "cranking" maneuver when the sail is at 0.3 AU from the sun, before the spiral outward begins. The cranking maneuver keeps the sall in a circular orbit at 0.3 AU as the inclination is steadily raised. The sail can reach $90^{\circ}$ inclination in approximately one year's time.

Chauncey Uphoff (private communication) has discussed the possibility of a super sail capable of going as close as 0.1 AU from the sun, and capable of an acceleration outward equal to or greater than the sun's gravitational attraction. Such a sail might permit escape $V_{\infty}$ 's on the order of $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$, possible up to $300 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$. However, no such design exists at present and the possibility of developing such a sail has not been studied.

## Laser Sailing

Rather et al (1976) have recently re-examined the proposal (Forward, 1962, Marx, 1966, Moeckle, 1972) of using high energy lasers, rather than sunlight, to illuminate a sail. The lasers could be in orbit
around the earth or moon and powered by solar collectors.
Rather et al found that the technique was not promising for star missions but could be useful for outer planet missions. Based on their assumptions*, a heliocentric escape velocity of $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ could be reached with a laser output power of about $30 \mathrm{~kW}, 100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ with about 1500 kW , and $200 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ with 20 MW . Acceleration is about 0.35 g and thrusting would continue until the S/C was some millions of kilometers from earth.

Solar Electric Propulsion
Solar electric propulsion uses ion engines, where mercury or other atoms are ionized and then accelerated across a potential gap to a very high exhaust velocity. The electricity for generating the potential comes from a large solar cell array on the spacecraft. Current designs call for a 100 kilowatt unit which is also proposed for a future comet rendezvous mission. A possible improvement to the current design is the use of mirror "concentrators" to focus additional sunlight on the solar cells at large heliocentric distances.

According to Carl Sauer (private communication) the solar powered ion drive 1s capable of escape $V_{\infty}$ 's on the order of $10-15 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ in the ecliptic plane. Going out of the ecliptic is more of a problem because the solar cell arrays cannot be operated efficiently inside about 0.6 AU from the sun. Thus the solar electric drive cannot be operated close into the sun for a cranking maneuver as can the solar sail. Modest inclinations can still be reached through slower cranking or the initial inclination imparted by the launch vehicle.

## Laser Electric Propu1sion

An alternative to solar electric propulsion is laser electric: lasers, perhaps in earth orbit, radiate power to the spacecraft, which is collected and utilized in ion engines. The primary advantage is that higher energy flux densities at the spacecraft are possible. This would permit reducing the receiver area and so, hopefully, the spacecraft weight. To take advantage of this possibility, receivers that can operate at considerably higher temperatures than present solar cells will be needed. A recent study by Forward (1975) suggests that a significant performance gain, as compared to solar electric, may be feasible.

* Rather et al assumed an allowable flux incident on the sail of $10^{6} \overline{\mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{m}^{2}}$, laser wavelength $0.5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, and laser ${ }_{2}$ beam size twice the diffraction limit. For this calculation, $10 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ of sail area and $20,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ total mass were assumed.


## Nuclear Electric Propulsion

Nuclear electric propulsion (NEP) may use ion engines like solar electric, or, alternatively, magnetohydrodynamic drive. It obtains electricity from a generator heated by a nuclear fission reactor. Thus, NEP is not power-1imited by increasing solar distance.

Previous studies indicate that an operational S/C is possible by the year 2000 with power levels up to a megawatt (electric) or more (James et al, 1976).

Preliminary estimates were made based on previous calculations for a Neptune mission. Those indicated that heliocentric escape velocity of $50-60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ can be obtained.

## Fusion

With a fusion energy source, thermal energy could be converted to provide ion or MHD drive and charged particles produced by the nuclear reaction can also be accelerated to produce thrust.

A look at one fusion concept gave a $V_{\infty}$ of about $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$. The spacecraft weight was $3 \times 10^{6} \mathrm{~kg}$. Controlled fusion has still to be attained.

Bussard (1960) has suggested that interstellar hydrogen could be collected by a spacecraft and used to fuel a fusion reaction.

## Antimatter

Morgan (1975, 1976), James et al, (1976), and Massier (1977a and b) have recently examined the use of antimatter-matter annihilation to obtain rocket thrust. A calculation based on Morgan's concepts suggests that a $V_{\infty}$ over $700 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ could be obtained with a mass comparable to NEP.

## Low Thrust Plus Gravity Assist

A possible mix of techniques discussed would be to use a lowthrust propulsion system to target a spacecraft for a Jupiter gravity assist to achieve a very high $V_{\infty}$ escape. If for example one accelerated a spacecraft to a parabolic orbit as it crossed the orbit of Jupiter, the $V_{i n}$ at Jupiter would be about $17.2 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$. One could use gravity assist then to give a solar system escape $V_{\infty}$ of $24 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ in the ecliptic plane, or inclinations up to about $63^{\circ}$ above the plane. Powered swingby at Jupiter could further enhance both $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ and inclination.

A second possibility is to use a solar sail to crank the spacecraft into a retrograde ( $180^{\circ}$ inclination) orbit and then spiral out to encounter Jupiter at a $V_{\text {in }}$ of over $26 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$. This would result in escape $V_{\infty}$ 's on the order of $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ and inclinations up to $90^{\circ}$, thus covering the entire celestial sphere. Again, powered swingby would improve performance but less so, because of the high $V_{i n}$ already present. This method is somewhat limited by the decreasing bend angle possible at Jupiter as $V_{\text {in }}$ increases. With still higher approach velocities the possible performance increment from a Jupiter swingby continues to decrease.

## Solar Plus Nuclear Electric

One might combine solar electric with nuclear electric, using solar first and then, when the solar distance becomes greater and the solar distance becomes greater and the solar power falls off, switching to NEP. Possibly the same thrusters could be used for both. Since operating lifetime of the nuclear reactor can limit the impulse attainable with NEP, this combination might provide higher $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ than either solar or nuclear electric single-stage systems.

CHOICE OF PROPULSION
Of the various propulsion techniques outlined above, the only ones that are likely to provide solar system escape velocities above $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ utilize either sails or nuclear energy.

The sail technique could be used with two basic options: solar sailing, going in to perhaps 0.1 AU from the sun, and laser sailing. In either case, the requirements on the sail are formidable. Figure 3 shows solar sall performance attainable with various spacecraft lightness factors (ratios of solar radiation force on the S/C at normal incidence to solar gravitational force on the $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{C}$ ). The sail surface mass/area ratios required to attain various $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ values are 1isted in Table 10. For a year 2000 launch, it may be possible to attain a sail surface mass/area of $0.3 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$, if the perihelion distance is constrained to 0.25 AU or more (W. Carroll, private communication). This ratio corresponds to an aluminum film about 100 nm thick, which would probably have to be fabricated in orbit. With such a sail, a $V_{\infty}$ of about $120 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ might be obtained.


Fig. $3 \quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Solar System Escape with Ultralight Solar Sails. } \\ & \text { Lightness factor } \lambda=\text { (solar radiation force on S/C at normal } \\ & \text { incidence) } /(\text { solar gravitational force on S/C). }\end{aligned}$
From C. Uphoff (private communication).

## TABLE 10

## PERFORMANCE OF ULTRALIGHT SOLAR SAILS

| Initial | Heliocentric | Lightness | Sail | Saı1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Perihelion | Excess | Factor | Load/ | Surface |
| Distance | $\begin{gathered} \text { Velocity, } \\ \mathrm{V}_{\infty} \end{gathered}$ | $\lambda$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Efficiency } \\ \sigma_{\mathrm{T}} / \mu \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mass/Area } \\ \sigma_{F} \end{gathered}$ |
| AU | km/s |  | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| 0.25 | 60 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 0.9 |
| 0.25 | 100 | 1.8 | 0.85 | 0.4 |
| 0.25 | 200 | 5.5 | 0.3 | 0.12 |
| 0.1 | 100 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 1.2 |
| 0.1 | 200 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| 0.1 | 300 | 5.0 | 0.3 | 0.14 |

Notes:
$\lambda=$ (solar radiation force on $S / C$ at normal (incidence)/(solar gravitational force on $S / C$ )
$\sigma_{\mathrm{T}}=$ (total $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{C}$ mass) $/$ (sail area)
$\mu=$ sail efficiency
$\sigma_{F}=$ includes sail film, coatings, and seams; excludes structural and mechanical elements of sail and non-propulsive portions of $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{C}$. Assumed here: $\sigma_{\mathrm{F}}=0.5 \sigma_{\mathrm{T}} ; \mu=0.9$.
Initial orbit assumed: semi-major axis $\simeq 1 \times 10^{8} \mathrm{~km}$. Sail angle optimized for maximum rate of energy gain.

If the perihelion distance is reduced to 0.1 AU the solar radiation force increases but so does the temperature the sail must withstand. With a reflectivity of 0.9 and an emissivity of 1.0 the sail temperature would reach $470^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ( 740 K ), so high temperature material would have to be used. Further, according to Carroll (ibid), it may never be possible to obtain an emissivity of 1.0 with a film mass less than $1 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$, because of the emitted wavelength/thickness ratio. For such films an emisslvity of 0.5 is probably attainable; this would increase the temperature to over $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ( 870 K ). Carbon films can be considered, but they would need a smooth highly reflective surface. It $1 s$ doubtful a sail surface mass/area less than $1 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ could be obtained for use at $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. This sail should permit reaching $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ of $110 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ : no better than for the 0.25 AU design.

For laser sailing, higher reflectivity, perhaps 0.99 , can be attained because the monochromatic incident radriation permits effectuve use of interference layers (Carroll, ibid). Incident energy flux equivalent to 700 "suns" (at I AU) is proposed, however. The high reflectivity coating reduces the absorbed energy to about the level of that for a solar sail at 0.1 AU , with problems mentioned above. $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ 's up to $200 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ might be achieved if the necessary very high power lasers were available in orbit.
'Considering nuclear energy systems, a single NEP stage using fission could provide perhaps 60 to $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s} \mathrm{V}_{\infty}$. NEP systems have already been the subject of considerable study and some advanced development. Confidence that the stated performance can be obtained is therefore higher than for any of the competing modes. Using 2 NEP stages or a solar electric followed by NEP, higher $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ could be obtained: one preliminary calculation for 2 NEP stages (requiring 3 shuttle launches or the year 2000 equivalent) gave $V_{\infty}=150 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$.

The calculation for a fusion propulsion system indicates $30 \%$ spacecraft velocity improvement over fission, but at the expense of orders of magnitude heavier vehicle. The cost would probably be prohibitive. Moreover, controlled fusion has not yet been attained, and development of an operational fusion propulsion system for a year 2000 launch is questionable. As to collection of hydrogen enroute to refuel a fusion reactor, this is further in the future and serious question exists as to whether it will ever be feasible (Martin, 1972, 1973).

An antimatter propulsion system is even more speculative than a fusion system and certainly would not be expected by 2000. On the other
hand, the very rough calculations indicate an order of magnitude velocity improvement over fission NEP without increasing vehicle mass. Also, the propulsion burn time is reduced by an order of magnitude.

On the basis of these considerations, a fission NEP system was selected as baseline for the remainder of the study. The very lightweight solar sail approach and the high temperature laser sail approach may also be practical for a year 2000 mission and deserve further study. The antimatter concept is the most "far out", but promises orders of magnitude better performance than NEP. Thus, in future studies addressed to star missions, antimatter propulsion should certainly be considered, and a study of antimatter propulsion per se is also warranted.

## MISSION CONCEPT

The concept which evolved as outlined above is for a mission outward to 500-1000 AU , directed toward the incoming interstellar gas. Critical science measurements would be made when passing through the heliopause region and at as great a range as possible thereafter. The location of the heliopause is unknown but is estrmated as 50-100 AU. Measurements at Pluto are also desired. Launch will be nominally in the year 2000.

The maximum spacecraft lifetime considered reasonable for a year 2000 launch is 50 years. (This is discussed further, below). To attain 500-1000 AU in 50 years requires a heliocentric excess velocity of $50-100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$. The propulsion technique selected as baseline is NEP using a fission reactor. Either 1 or 2 NEP stages may be used. If 2 NEP stages are chosen, the first takes the form of an NEP booster stage and the second is the spacecraft itself. The spacecraft, with or without an NEP booster stage, is placed in low earth orbit by some descendant of the Shuttle. NEP is then turned on and used for spiral earth escape. Use of boosters with lower exhaust velocity to go to high earth orbit or earth escape is not economical. The spiral out from low earth orbit to earth escape uses only a small fraction of the total NEP burn time and NEP propellant.

After earth escape, thrusting continues in heliocentric orbit. A long burn time is needed to attain the required velocity: 5 to 10 years are desirable for single stage NEP (see below), and more than 10 years if two NEP stages are used. The corresponding burnout distance, depending on the design, may be as great as 200 AU or even more. Thus, propulsion may be on past Pluto (31 AU from the sun in 2005) and past the heliopause. To measure the mass of Pluto, a coasting trajectory is needed; thrust would have to be shut off temporarily during the Pluto encounter. The reactor would continue operating at a low level during the encounter to furnish spacecraft power. Attitude control would preferably be by momentum wheels to avoid any disturbance to the mass measurements. Scientific measurements, including imagery, would be made during the fast flyby of Pluto.

After the Pluto encounter, thrusting would resume and continue until nominal thrust termination ("burnout") of the spacecraft. Enough propellant is retained at spacecraft burnout to provide attitude control (unloading the momentum wheels) for the 50 year duration of the extended mission. At burnout the reactor power level is reduced and the reactor provides power for the spacecraft, including the ion thrusters used for attitude control.

A very useful add-on would be a Pluto Orbiter. This daughter spacecraft would be separated early in the mission, at approximately the time solar escape is achieved. Its flight time to Pluto would be about 12 years and its hyperbolic approach velocity at Pluto about $8 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$.

The orbiter would be a full-up daughter spacecraft, with enough chemical propulsion for midcourse, approach, and orbital injection. It would have a full complement of science instruments (including imaging) and RTG power sources, and would communicate directly to Earth.

Because the mass of a dry NEP propulsion system is much greater than that required for the other spacecraft systems, the added mass of a daughter S/C has relatively little effect on the total inert mass and therefore relatively little effect on propulsive performance. The mother NEP spacecraft would fly by Pluto 3 or 4 years after launch, so the flyby data will be obtained at least 5 years before the orbiter reaches Pluto. Accordingly, the flyby data can be used in selecting the most suitable orbit for the daughter-spacecraft.

If a second spacecraft is to be flown out parallel to the solar axis, it could be like the one going toward the incoming interstellar gas, but obviously would not carry an orbiter. Since the desired heliocentric escape direction is almost perpendicular to the ecliptic, somewhat more propulsive energy will be required than for the $S / C$ going upwind, if the same escape velocity is to be obtained. A Jupiter swingby may be helpful. An NEP booster stage would be especially advantageous for this mission.

## MASS DEFINTTION AND PROPULSION

The NEP system considered is similā to those discussed by Pawlik and Phillips (1977) and by Stearns (1977). As a first rule-of-thumb approximation the dry NEP system should be approximately $30-35$ percent of the spacecraft mass. A balance is then required between the net spacecraft and propellant, with mission energy and exhaust velocity being variable. For the very high energy requirements of the extraplanetary mission, spacecraft propellant expenditure of the order of 40-60 percent may be appropriate. A booster stage, if required, may use a lower propellant fraction, perhaps 30 percent.

Power and propulsion system mass at $100-140 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ exhaust velocity will be approximately $17 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{kWe}$. This is based on a 500 kWe system with $20 \%$ conversion efficiency and ion thrusters. Per unit mass may decrease slightly at higher power levels and higher exhaust velocity. Mercury propellant is desired because of its high 1 iquid density, $\sim 13.6 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ or $13,600 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Mercury is also a very effective gamma shield. If an NEP booster is to be used, it is assumed to utilize two 500 kWe units.

The initial mass in low earth orbit (M) is taken as $32,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ for the spacecraft (including propulsion) and as $90,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ for the spacecraft plus NEP booster. $32,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ is slightly heavier than the 1977 figure for the capability of a single shuttle launch. The difference is considered unimportant, because 1977 figures for launch capability will be only of historical interest by 2000. $90,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ for the booster plus S/C would require the year 2000 equivalent of three 1977 Shuttle launches.

Figure 4 shows the estimated performance capabilities of the propulsion system for a single NEP stage.

A net spacecraft mass of approximately 1200 kg is assumed and may be broken out in many ways. Communication with Earth is a part of this and may trade off with on-board automation, computation and data processing. Support structure for launch of daughter spacecraft may be needed. Adaptive science capability is also possible. The science instruments may be of the order of $200-300 \mathrm{~kg}$ (including a large telescope) and utilize 200 kg of radiation shielding (discussed below) and in excess of 100 W of power. Communications could require as much as 1 kW .


Fig. 4 Performance of NEP for Solar Escape plus Pluto. $\alpha=$ Ratio (propulsion system dry mass less tankage)/(power input to thrust subsystem) $=17 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{kWe}$. $M_{0}=$ initial mass (in low Earth orbit) $=32,000 \mathrm{~kg}$. $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{PS} / \mathrm{C}}=$ mass of a Pluto $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{C}$ separated when heliocentric escape velocity is attained ( kg ). $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{e}}=$ exhaust velocity (km/s).

One to two kWe of auxiliary power is a first order assumption.
The Pluto Orbiter mass is taken as 500 kg plus 1000 kg of chemical propellant. This allows a total $\Delta V$ of approximately $3500 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ and should permit a good capture orbit at Pluto.

The reactor burnup is taken to be the equivalent of 200,000 hours at full power. This will require providing reactor control capability beyond that in existing NEP concepts. This could consist of reactivity poison rods or other elements to be removed as fission products build up, together with automated power system management to allow major improvement in adaptive control for power and propulsion functions. The full power operating time is, however, constrained to $70,000 \mathrm{~h}$ (approximately 8 yr ). The remaining burnup is on reduced power operation for $S / C$ power and attitude control. At $1 / 3$ power, this could continue to the 50 yr mission duration.

Preliminary mass and performance estimates for the selected system are given in Table 11. These are for a mission toward the incoming interstellar wind. The Pluto orbiter, separated early in the mission, makes very little difference in the overall performance. The NEP power level, propellant loading, and booster specific impulse were not optimized in these estimates; optimized performance would be somewhat better.

According to Table 11, the performance increment due to the NEP booster is not great. Unless an optimized calculation shows a greater increment, use of the booster is probably not worthwhile.

For a mission parallel to the solar axis, a Jupiter flyby would permit deflection to the desired $83^{\circ}$ angle to the ecliptic with a small loss in $V_{\infty}$. (The approach $V_{\text {in }}$ at Jupiter is estimated to be $23 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ ).

TABLE 11

# Mass and Performance Estimates for Baseline System ( $I_{s p}$ and propellant loading not yet optimized) 

| Allocation | Mass kg |
| :---: | :---: |
| Spacecraft | 1200 |
| Pluto orbiter (optional) | 1500 |
| NEP ( 500 kWe ) | 8500 |
| Propellant: Earth spiral | 2100 |
| Heliocentric | 18100 |
| Tankage | 600 |
| Total for l-stage ( $M_{0}$, earth orbit) | 32000 |
| Booster | 58000 |
| Total for 2-stage ( $M_{0}$, earth orbit) | 90000 |
| Performance | 1 Stage 2 Stages |
| Booster burnout: Distance | 8 AU |
| Hyperbolic velocity | $25 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Time | 4 yr |
| Spacecraft burnout: Distance (total) | 65 155 AU |
| Hyperbolic velocity | 105 [ $150 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Time (total) | $8 \quad 12 \mathrm{yr}$ |
| Distance in: 20 yr | $370 \quad 410 \mathrm{AU}$ |
| 50 yr | 10301350 AU |

## INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

## DATA GENERATION

In cruise mode, the particles and fields instruments, if reading continuously, will generate 1 to $2 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$ of data. Engineering sensors will provide less, Spectrometers may provide higher raw data rates but only occasional spectrometric observations would be needed. Star TV, if run at 10 frames/day (exposures would probably be several hours) at $10^{8} \mathrm{~b} /$ frame would provide about $10 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$ on the average. A typical TV frame might include 10 star images whose intensity need be known only roughly for identification. Fifteen position bits on each axis and 5 intensity bits would make $350 \mathrm{~b} /$ frame or $0.04 \mathrm{~b} / \mathrm{s}$ of useful data. Moreover, most of the other scientific quantities mentioned would be expected to change very slowly, so that their information rate will be considerably lower than their raw data rate. Occasional transients may be encountered, and in the region of the hellopause and shock rapid changes are expected.

During Pluto flyby, data accumulates rapidly. Perhaps $10^{11}$ bits, mostly TV, will be generated. These can be played back over a period of weeks or months. If a Pluto orbiter is flown, it could generate $10^{10} \mathrm{~b} /$ day or more: an average of over $100 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$.

## INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Among the functions of the information handling system will be storage and processing of the above data. The system compresses the data, removing the black sky that will constitute almost all of the raw bits of the star pictures. It will remove the large fraction of bits that need not be transmitted when a sensor gives a steady or almost-steady reading. It will vary its processing and the output data stream to accommodate transients during heliopause encounter and other unpredictable periods of high information content.

The spacecraft computers system will provide essential support to the automatic control of the nuclear reactor. It will also support control, monitoring, and maintenance of the ion thrusters, and of the attitude control system, as well as antenna pointing and command processing.

According to James et al (1976), the following performance is projected for a S/C information management system for a year 2000 launch:

| Processing rate: | $10^{9}$ instruction/s |
| :--- | :--- |
| Data transfer rate: | $\sim 10^{9} \mathrm{~b} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| Data storage: | $\sim 10^{14} \mathrm{~b}$ |
| Power consumption: | $10-100 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Mass: | $\sim 30 \mathrm{~kg}$ |

This projection is based on current and foreseen state of the art and ignores the possibility of major breakthroughs. Obviously, if reliability requirements can be met, the onboard computer can provide more capability than is required for the mission.

The processed data stream provided by the information management system for transmission to earth is estimated to average $20-40 \mathrm{~b} / \mathrm{s}$ during cruise. Since continuous transmassion is not expected (see•below), the output rate during transmission will be higher.

At heliosphere encounter, the average rate of processed data is estimated at $1-2 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$.

From a Pluto encounter, processed data might be several times $10^{10}$ bits. If these are returned over a 6 -month period, the average rate over these months is about $2 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$. If the data are returned over a 4 -day period, the average rate is about $100 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$.

## OPERATIONS

For a mission lasting 20-50 years, with relatively little happening most of the time, it is unreasonable to expect continuous DSN coverage. For the long periods of cruise, perhaps 8 h of coverage per month, or $1 \%$ of the time, would be reasonable.

When encounter with the heliopause is detected, it might be possible to increase the coverage for a while; $8 \mathrm{~h} /$ day would be more than ample. Since the time of heliosphere encounter is unpredictable, this possibility would depend on the ability of the DSN to readjust its schedule quickly in near-real time.

For Pluto flyby, presumably continuous coverage could be provided. For Pluto orbiters, either 8 or $24 \mathrm{~h} / \mathrm{day}$ of coverage could be provided for some months.

## DATA TRANSMISSION RATE

On the basis outined above, the cruise data, at $1 \%$ of the time, would be transmitted at a rate of $2-4 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$.

If heliopause data is merely stored and transmitted the same $1 \%$ of the time, the transmission rate rises to $100-200 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$. An alternative would be to provide more DSN coverage once the heliosphere is found. If $33 \%$ coverage can be obtained, the rate falls to $3-7 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$.

For Pluto flyby, transmitting continuously over a 6 -month period, the rate is $2 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$. At this relatively short range, a higher rate, say, $30-100 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$, would probably be more appropriate. This would return the encounter data in 4 days.

The Pluto orbiter requires a transmission rate of $30-50 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$ at $24 \mathrm{~h} /$ day or $90-150 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$ at $8 \mathrm{~h} /$ day.

## TELEMETRY

The new and unique feature of establishing a reliable telecommunications link for an extraplanetary mission involves dealing with the enormous distance between the spacecraft ( $S / C$ ) and the receiving stations on or near Earth. Current planetary missions involve distances between the $S / C$ and receiving stations of tens of astronomical units (AU) at most. Since the extraplanetary mission could extend this distance to 500 or 1000 AU , appropriate extrapolation of the current mission telecommuncation parameters must be made. Ideally, this extrapolation should anticipate technological changes that will occur in the next 20-25 years and accordingly incorporate them into the telecommunications system design. In trying to achieve this ideal we have developed a "baseline" design that represents reasonably low risk. Other options which could be utilized around the year 2000 but which may require technological advancement (e.g. development of solid state X-band or Ku-band transmitters) or may depend upon NASA's committing substantial funds for telemetry link reconfiguration (e.g., construction of a spaceborne deep space receiver) are examined to determine how they might affect link capabilities.

In the following paragraphs, the basic model for the telecommunications link is developed. Through the range equation, transmitted and received powers are related to wavelength, antenna dimensions, and separation between antennas. A currently used form of coding is
assumed while some tracking loop considerations are examined. A baseline design is outlined. The contributions and effects of various components to link performance is given in the form of a "dB" table breakdown. Other options of greater technological or funding risk are treated. Finally, we compare capability of the various telemetry options with requirements for various phases of the mission and identify the telemetry - operations combinations that provide the needed performance.

## THE TELECOMMUNICATION MODEL

## Range Equation

We need to know how much transmitted power is picked up by the receiving antenna. The received power $P_{r}$ is given approximately by

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{r}=n P A_{r} /(\lambda R)^{2} \tag{I}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

```
\(\eta=\) product of all pertinent efficiencies, i.e., transmitter
                                    power conversion efficiency, antenna efficiencies, etc.
\(P=\) power to transmitter
\(A_{t}, A_{r}=\) areas of transmitter, receiver antennas respectively
\(\lambda=\) wavelength of transmitted radiation
\(R=\) range to spacecraft
```

This received signal is corrupted by noise whose effective power spectral density will be denoted by $\mathrm{N}_{0}$.
Data Coding Considerations
We are assuming a Viterbi (1967) coding scheme with constraint length $K=7$ and rate $v=1 / 3$. This system has demonstrated quite good performance producing a bit exror rate (BER) of $10^{-4}$ when the information brt $S N R$ is $\rho_{D}=3.2 \mathrm{~dB}$ (Layland, 1970). Of course, if more suitable schemes are developed in the next $20-25$ years, they should certainly be used.

## Tracking Loop Considerations

Because of the low received power levels that can be expected in this mission, some question arises as to whether the communication
system should be coherent or non-coherent. The short term stability of the received carrier frequency and the desired data rate $R_{D}$ roughly determine which system is better. From the data coding considerations we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{D}} / \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{O}} \gtrsim \rho_{\mathrm{D}} \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{D}} \approx 2 \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{D}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $P_{D}$ is the power allocated to the data. Standard phase-locked loop analvsis (Lindsey, 1972) gives for the variance $\sigma^{2}$ of the phase error in the loop

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma^{2} \approx N_{0} B_{L} / P_{L} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $P_{L}$ is the power allocated to phase determination and $B_{L}$ is the closed loop bandwidth (one-sided). In practice, $\sigma^{2} \lesssim 10^{-2}$ for acceptable operation, so

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{L} / N_{0} \gtrsim 100 B_{L} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The total received power $P_{r}$ (eq. (1) ) is the sum of $P_{L}$ and $P_{D}$. To minimize $P_{r} / N_{0}$ subject to the constraint eqs. (2) and (4), we see that a fraction

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2 \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{D}}}{100 \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{L}}+2 \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{D}}} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

of the received power must go into the data. Since, coherent systems are 3 dB better than non-coherent systems for binary signal detection (Wozencraft and Jacobs, 1965), coherent demodulatıon is more efficient whenever

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{D} \gtrsim 50 B_{L} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Current deep space network (DSN) receivers have $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{L}} \gtrsim 10 \mathrm{~Hz}$, so for data rates roughly greater than 500 bits/s coherent detection is desirable. However, the received carrier frequencies suffer variations from Doppler rate, atmospheric (ionospheric) changes, oscillator drifts, etc. If received carrier instabilities for the extraplanetary mission are sufficiently small so that a tracking loop bandwidth of I Hz is adequate, then data rates greater than $50 \mathrm{bits} / \mathrm{s}$ call for coherent demodulation.

These remarks are summarized by the relation between $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}} / \mathrm{N}_{0}$ and data rate $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{D}}$ :

$$
P_{r} / N_{0}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
2 R_{D}+100 B_{L} & \text { for } R_{D} \geq 50 B_{L} \quad \text { (coherent system) }  \tag{7}\\
4 R_{D} & \text { for } R_{D} \leq 50 B_{L} \text { (non-coherent system) }
\end{array}\right\}
$$

This relation is displayed in Figure 5 where $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}} / \mathrm{N}_{0}$ is plotted vs $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{D}}$ for $B_{L}$ having values 1 Hz and 10 Hz . In practice for $R_{D}>50 \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{L}}$ the approach of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}} / \mathrm{N}_{0}$ to its asymptotic value of $2 \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{D}}$ could be made slightly faster by techniques employing suppressed carrier tracking loops which utilize all the received power for both tracking and data demodulation. However, for this study these curves are sufficiently accurate to ascertain $P_{r} / N_{0}$ levels necessary to achieve desired data rates. BASELINE DESIGN

## Parameters of the System

For a "baseline" design we have tried to put together a system that has a good chance of being operational by the year 2000. Consequently in certain areas we have not pushed current technology but have relied on fairly well established systems. In other areas, we have extrapolated from present trends, but hopefully not beyond developments that can be accomplished over $20-25$ years. This baseline design will be derived in sufficient detail so that the improvement afforded by the "other options" discussed in the next section can be more easily ascertained.

First, we assume that received carrier frequency stabilities allow tracking with a loop bandwidth $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{L}} \leqq 1 \mathrm{~Hz}$. This circumstance is quite likely if an oscillator quite stable in the short term is carrıed
on the $S / C$, if the propulsion systems are not operating during transmission at 1000 AU (Doppler rate essentially zero), and if the receiver is orbiting Earth (no ionospheric disturbance). Second, we assume data rates $R_{D}$ of at least $100 \mathrm{bits} / \mathrm{s}$ at 1000 AU or $400 \mathrm{~b} / \mathrm{s}$ at 500 AU are desired. From the discussion preceding eq. (6) and Figure 5 we see this implies a coherent demodulation system with $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}} / \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{O}}$ to exceed 25 dB .

As a baseline we are assuming an $X$-band system ( $\lambda=3.55 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) with 40 watts transmitter power. We assume the receiving antenna is on Earth (if this assumption makes $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{L}}=1 \mathrm{~Hz}$ unattainable, then the value of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}} / \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{O}}$ for the non-coherent system only increases by 1 dB ) so the system noise temperature reflects this accordingly.
Decibel Table and Discussion
In Table 12 we give the $d B$ contributions from the various parameters of the range eq. (1), loop tracking, and data coding. By design the parameters of this table give the narrowest performance margins. If any of the "other options" of the next section can be realized, performance margin and data rate should correspondingly increase.

The two antenna parameters that are assumed require some explanation. A current mission (SEASAT-A) has an imaging radar antenna that "unfurls" to a rectangular shape $10.75 \mathrm{~m} \times 2 \mathrm{~m}$, so a 15 m diameter spaceborne antenna should pose no difficulty by the year 2000. A 100 m diameter receiving antenna is assumed. Even though the largest DSN antenna is currently 64 m , an antenna and an array both having effective area $\gtrsim(100 \mathrm{~m})^{2}$ will be available in West Germany and in this country in the next five years. Consequently, a receiver of this collecting area could be provided for the year 2000.

## OPTIONS

## More Power

The 40 watts transmitter power of the baseline should be currently realizable being only a factor of 2 above the Voyager value. This might be increased to 0.5 -' 1 kW , increasing received signal power by almost $10-15 \mathrm{~dB}$, allowing (after some increase in performance margin) a tenfold gain in data rate: $1 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$ at $1000 \mathrm{AU}, 4 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$ at 500 AU . The problem of coupling this added energy into the transmission efficiently may cause some difficulty and should definitely be investigated.


Fig. 5. Data Rate vs. Ratio of Signal Power to Noise Spectral Power Density

Table 12. BASELINE TELEMETRY AT 1000 AU

| No. | Parameter | Nominal Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Total Transmitter power (dBm) (40 watts) | 46 |
| 2. | Efficiency (dB) (electronics and antenna losses) | -9 |
| 3. | Transmitting antenna gain (dB) (diameter = 15 m ) | 62 |
| 4. | Space loss (dB) ( $\lambda / 4 \pi \mathrm{R})^{2}$ | -334 |
|  | $\lambda=3.55 \mathrm{~cm}, \mathrm{R}=1000 \mathrm{AU}$ |  |
| 5. | Receiving antenna gain (dB) (diameter $=100 \mathrm{~m}$ ) | 79 |
| 6. | $\text { Total received power (dBm) ( } \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}} \text { ) }$ | -156 |
| 7. | Receiver noise spectral density ( $\mathrm{dBm} / \mathrm{Hz}$ ) $\left(\mathrm{N}_{0}\right)$ |  |
|  | kT with $\mathrm{T}=25 \mathrm{~K}$ | -185 |
|  | Tracking (if $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{L}}=1 \mathrm{~Hz}$ is achievable) |  |
| 8. | Carrier power/total power 9dB) | -5 |
|  | $\left(100 \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{L}} /\left(100 \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{L}}+2 \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{D}}\right)\right.$ ) |  |
| 9. | Carrier power ( dBm ) ( $6 .+8$ ) | -161 |
| 10. | Threshold SNR in $2 \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{L}}$ ( dB ) | 20 |
| 11. | Loop noise bandwidth (dB) ( $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{L}}$ ) | 0 |
| 12. | Threshold carrier power ( dBm ) $(7+10+11)$ | -165 |
| 13. | Performance margin (dB) (9-12) | 4 |
|  | Data Channel |  |
| 14. | Estimated loss (waveform distortion, bit sync, etc.) ( dB ) | -2 |
| 15. | Data power/total power ( AB )* | -2 |
|  | $\left(2 R_{D} /\left(100 \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{L}}+2 \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{D}}\right)\right)$ |  |
| 16. | Data power (dBm) $(6+14+15)$ * | -160 |
| 17. | Threshold data power ( dBm ) $(7+17 \mathrm{a}+17 \mathrm{~b})$ | -162 |
|  | a. Threshold $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}} \mathrm{T} / \mathrm{N}_{0}\left(\mathrm{BER}=10^{-4}\right)$ | 3 |
|  | b. Bit rate (dB BPS) | 20 |
| 18. | Performance margin (dB) (16-17)* | 2 |

*If a non-coherent system must be used each of these values are reduced by approximately 1 dB .

Larger Antennas and Lower Noise Spectral Density
If programs calling for orbiting DSN station are funded, then larger antennas operating at lower noise spectral densitites should become a reality. Because structural problems caused by gravity at the Earth's surface are absent, antennas even as large as 300 m in diameter have been considered. Furthermore, assuming problems associated with cryogenic amplifiers in space can be overcome, current work indicates X -band and Ku-band effective noise temperatures as low as 10 K and 14 K respectively (R. C. Clauss, private communication). These advances would increase $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}} / \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{O}}$ by approximately $12-13 \mathrm{~dB}$ making a link at data rates of $2 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$ at 1000 AU and $8 \mathrm{~kb} / \mathrm{s}$ at 500 AU possible. Higher Frequencies

Frequencies in the $K u m b a n d$ could represent a gain in directed power of $5-10 \mathrm{~dB}$ over the X -band baseline, but probably would exhibit noise temperatures 1-2 dB worse (Clauss, ibid) for orbiting receivers. Also, the efficiency of a Ku-band system would probably be somewhat less than that of X-band. Without further study, it is not apparent that dramatic gains could be realized with a Ku-band system.

Frequencies in the optical or infrared potentially offer tremendous gains in directed power. However, the efficiency in coupling the raw power into transmission is not very high, the noise spectral density is much higher than that of $X$-band, and the sizes of practical antennas are much smaller than those for microwave frequencies. To present these factors more quantitatively, Table 13 gives parameter contributions to $P_{r}$ and $N_{0}$. We have drawn heavily on Potter et al (1969) and on M. S. Shumate and R. T. Menzies (private communication) to compile this table. We assume an orbiting receiver to eliminate atmospheric transmission losses. Also, we assume demodulation of the optical signal can be accomplished as efficiently as the microwave signal (which is not likely without some development). Even with these assumptions, $P_{r} / N_{0}$ for the optical system is about 8 dB worse than that for $X$-band with a ground receiver.

Pointing problems also become much more severe for the highly directed optical, infrared systems. Laser radiation at wavelength $10 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ from a 1 m antenna must be pointed to $5 \times 10^{-6}$ radians accuracy. The corresponding pointing accuracy of the baseline system is $10^{-3}$ radians.

Table 13. OPTICAL TELEMETRY AT 1000 AU

| No. | Parameter | Nominal Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Total Transmitter power (dBm) (40 watts) | 46 |
| 2. | Efficiency (dB) (optical pumping, antenna losses, and quantum detection) | -16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3 . \\ & 4 . \end{aligned}$ | Transmitting antenna gain (dB) (diameter $=1 \mathrm{~m}$ ) Space loss ( dB ) $(\lambda / 4 \pi r)^{2}$ | 110 |
|  | $\lambda=10 \mu \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{r}=1000 \mathrm{AU}$ | -405 |
| 5. | Receiving antenna gain (dB) (diameter $=3 \mathrm{~m}$ ) | 119 |
| 6. | Total Received power ( dBm ) ( $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}}$ ) | -146 |
| 7. | Receiver noise spectral density ( $\mathrm{dBm} / \mathrm{Hz}$ ) ( $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ ) ( $2 \times 10^{-20}$ watt/ Hz ) | -167 |

## Higher Data Rates

This mission may have to accommodate video images from Pluto. The Earth-Pluto separation at the time of the mission will be about 31 AU. The baseline system at 31 AU could handle approximately $10^{5} \mathrm{~b} / \mathrm{s}$. For rates in excess of this, one of the "other option" enhancements would be necessary.

## SELECTION OF TELEMETRY OPTION

Table 14 collects the performance capabilities of the various telemetry options. Table 15 shows the proposed data rates in various S/C systems for the different phases of the mission. In both tables the last column lists the product, (data rate) $x$ (range) ${ }^{2}$, as an index of the telemetry capability or requirements.

Looking furst at the last column of Table 15 , it is apparent that the limiting requirement is transmittal of heliopause data if DSN coverage can be provided on 1 y $1 \%$ of the time. If DSN scheduling is sufficiently flexible that $33 \%$ coverage can be cranked up within a month or so after the heliosphere is detected, then the limiting requirement is transmittal of cruise data (at $1 \%$ DSN coverage). For these two limiting cases, the product (data rate) $x$ (range) ${ }^{2}$ is, respectively, $2-40 \times 10^{8}$ and $5-10 \times 10^{8}(\mathrm{~b} / \mathrm{s}) \cdot \mathrm{AU}^{2}$.

Looking now at the last column of Table 14 , to cover the cruise requirement some enhancement over the baseline option will be needed. Either increasing transmitter power to $0.5-1 \mathrm{~kW}$ or going to orbiting DSN stations will be adequate. No real difficulty is seen in providing the increased transmitter power if the orbiting DSN is not available.

If, however, DSN coverage for transmittal of recorded data from the unpredictable heliosphere encounter is constrained to $1 \%$ of the time ( $8 \mathrm{~h} /$ month), then an orbital DSN station (300-m antenna) will be needed for this phase of the mission, as well as either increased transmitter power or use of K -band.

## TELEMETRY OPTIONS

OPTIONS

Baseline ( $40 \mathrm{~W}, 100-\mathrm{m}$ receiving antenna, $X$-band)

More power (0.5-1 kW)
Orbating DSN (300-m antenna)
X-band ( 10 K noise temperature)
K -band ( 14 K noise temperature)
Both more power and orbiting DSN X -band
Improvement
Over Baseline,
dB

| Data Rate (b/s) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | At | At |
| 1000 AU | $\underline{500 \mathrm{AU}}$ | 150 AU | $\underline{\mathrm{At} \mathrm{AU}}$ |

(Data Rate )
$\times$ (Range)
$(\mathrm{b} / \mathrm{s}) \cdot \mathrm{AU}^{2}$

| $1 \times 10^{2}$ | $4 \times 10^{2}$ | $4 \times 10^{3}$ | $1 \times 10^{5}$ | $1 \times 10^{8}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \times 10^{3}$ | $4 \times 10^{3}$ | $4 \times 10^{4}$ | $1 \times 10^{6}$ | $1 \times 10^{9}$ |

$2 \times 10^{3} \quad 8 \times 10^{3} \quad 9 \times 10^{4} \quad 2 \times 10^{6} \quad 2 \times 10^{9}$
$5 \times 10^{3} \quad 2 \times 10^{4} \quad 2 \times 10^{5} \quad 5 \times 10^{6} \quad 5 \times 10^{9}$

23-28
$3 \times 10^{4} 1.2 \times 10^{5} 1 \times 10^{6}$
$3 \times 10^{7}$
$3 \times 10^{10}$

TABLE 15
PROPOSED DATA RATES

| Mission Phase | Tele- <br> Communi- <br> cation <br> Range <br> AU | Raw <br> Data | ated Data Rate, <br> Processed <br> Data, <br> Average | Transmitted Data | Fraction of Time Transmitting | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (Data } \\ & \text { irate } \\ & \times(\text { Range })^{2} \\ & \text { b/s } \cdot \mathrm{AU}^{2} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cruise | 500 | 1.2-1.5 $\times 10^{4}$ | $2-4 \times 10^{1}$ | $2-4 \times 10^{3}$ | 0.01 | $5-10 \times 10^{8}$ |
| Heliopause | $\begin{array}{r} 50- \\ 150 \end{array}$ | $1.2-1.5 \times 10^{4}$ | $1-2 \times 10^{3}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} 1-2 \times 10^{5} \\ 3-7 \times 10^{3} \end{array}\right.$ | 0.01 0.33 | $\begin{aligned} & 2-40 \times 10^{8} \\ & 0.8-15 \times 10^{7} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $1-10^{5}$ | $104$ | $\int^{1 \times 10^{5}}$ | 0.33* | $1 \times 10^{8}$ |
| Pluto Flyby | $\sim 31$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{c} 1-2 \times 10^{5} \\ \left(10^{11}\right. \text { total } \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3-5 \times 10^{4} \\ & \left(3 \times 10^{10} \text { bits }\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} 10^{4} \\ 3 \times 10 \end{array}\right.$ | 1.00* | $3 \times 10^{7}$ |
| P1uto Orbiter | $\sim 31$ | $1-2 \times 10^{5}$ | $3-5 \times 10^{4}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} 9-15 \times 10^{4} \\ 3-5 \times 10^{4} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.33 \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9-15 \times 10^{7} \\ & 3-5 \times 10^{7} \end{aligned}$ |

*To return flyby data in 4 days.

## RELATION OF THE MISSION TO SEARCH FOR EXTRATERRESTRIAL INTELLIGENCE

The relation of this mission to the search for extraterrestrial intelligence appears to lie only in its role in development and test of technology for subsequent interstellar missions.

## TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS AND PROBLEM AREAS

## LIFETIME

A problem area common to all $S / C$ systems for this mission is that of lifetime. The design lifetime of many items of spacecraft equipment is now approaching 7 years. To increase this lifetime to 50 years will be a very difficult engineering task.

These consequences follow:
a) It is proposed that the design lifetime of the $S / C$ for this mission be limited to 20 years, with an extended mission contemplated to a total of 50 years.
b) Quality control and reliability methods, such as failure mode effects and criticality analysis, must be detailed and applied to the elements that may eventually be used in the spacecraft, so as to predict what the failure profile will be for system operating times that are much longer than the test time and extend out to 50 years. One approach is to prepare for design and fabrication from highly controlled materials whose failure modes are completely understood.
c) To the extent that environmental or functional stresses are conceived to cause material migration or failure during a 50 -year period, modeling and accelerated testing of such modes will be needed to verify the 50 -year scale. Even the accelerated tests may require periods of many years.
d) A major engineering effort will be needed to develop devices, circuits, components, and fabrication techniques which, with appropriate design, testing, and quality assurance methods, will assure the lifetime needed.

## PROPULSTON AND POWER

The greatest need for subsystem development is clearly in propulsion. Further advance development of NEP is required. Designs are needed to permit higher uranium loadings and higher burnup. This in turn will require better control systems to handle the increased reactivity, including perhaps throw-away control rods. Redundancy must be increased to assure long life and moving parts will need especial attention. Development should also be aimed at reducing system size and mass, improving efficiency, and providing better and simpler thermal control and heat disslpation. Simpler and lighter power conditioning
is needed, as are ion thrusters with longer lifetime or self-repair capability. Among the alternatives to fission NEP, ultralight solar sails and laser sailing look most promising. A study should be undertaken of the feasibility of developing ultralight solar sails (sails sufficiently light so that the solar radiation pressure on the sail and spacecraft system would be greater than the solar gravitational pull) and of the implications such development would have for spacecraft design and mission planning. Similarly, a study should be made of the possibility of developing a high power orbiting laser system together with high temperature spacecraft sails, and of the outer planet and extraplanetary missions that could be carried out with such laser sails.

Looking toward applications further in the future, an antimatter propulsion system appears an exceptionally promising candidate for interstellar missions and would be extremely useful for missions within the solar system. This should not be dismissed as merely "blue sky": matter-antimatter reactions are routinely carried out in particle physics laboratories. The engineering difficulties of obtaining an antimatter propulsion system will be great; containing the antimatter and producing it in quantity will obviously be problems. A study of possible approaches would be worthwhile. (Chapline (1976) has suggested that antimatter could be produced in quantity by the interaction of beams of heavy ions with deuterium/tritium in a fusion reactor). Besides this, a more general study of propulsion possibilities for interstellar flight (see Appendix C) should also be considered.

## PROPULSION/SCIENCE INTERFACE

Three kinds of interactions between the propulsion/attitude control system and science measurements deserve attention. They are:

1) Interaction of thrust and attitude control with mass measurements.
2) Interaction of electrical and magnetic fields, primarily from the thrust subsystem, with particles and fields measurements.
3) Interactions of nuclear radiation, primarily from the power subsystem, with phaton measurements.

Interaction of thrust with mass measurements
It is desired to measure the mass of Pluto and of the solar system as a whole through radio tracking observations of the spacecraft accelerations. In practice, this requires that thrust be off during the acceleration observations.

The requirement can be met by temporarily shutting off propulsive thrusting during the Pluto encounter and, if desired, at intervals later on. Since imbalance in attitude control thrusting can also affect the trajectory, attitude control during these periods should preferably be by momentum wheels. The wheels can afterwards be unloaded by attitude-control ion thrusters.

Interaction of thrust subsystem with particles and fields measurements
A variety of electrical and magnetic interference with particles and fields measurements can be generated by the thrust subsystem. The power subsystem can also generate some electrical and magnetic interference. Furthermore, materials evolved from the thrusters can possibly deposit upon critical surfaces.

Thruster interferences have been examined by Sellen (1973), by Parker et al. (1973), and by others. It appears that thruster interferences should be reducible to acceptable levels by proper design, but some advanced development will be needed. Power system interferences are probably simpler to handle. Essentially all the thruster effects disappear when the engines are turned off.

Interaction of power subsystem with photon measurements
Neutrons and gamma rays produced by the reactor can interfere with photon measurements. A reactor that has operated for some time will be highly radioactive even after it is shut down. Also, exposure to neutrons from the reactor will induce radioactivity in other parts of the spacecraft. In the suggested science payload the instruments most sensitive to reactor radiation are the gamma-ray instruments, and, to a lesser degree, the ultraviolet spectrometer.

A very preliminary analysis of reactor interferences has been done. Direct neutron and gamma radiation from the reactor was considered and also neutron-gamma interactions. The latter were found to be of little significance if
the direct radiation is properly handled. Long-lived radioactivity is no problem except possibly for structure or equipment that uses nickel. Expected flux levels per gram of nickel are approximately $0.007 \gamma / \mathrm{cm}^{2}-\mathrm{s}$.

The nuclear reactor design includes neutron and gamma shadow shielding to fully protect electronic equipment from radiation damage. Requirements are defined in terms of total integrated dose. Neutron dose is to be limited to $10^{12}$ nvt and gamma dose to $10^{6} \mathrm{rad}$. A primary mission time of 20 years is assumed, yielding a LiH neutron shield thickness of 0.9 m and a mercury gamma shield thickness of 2.75 cm (or 2 cm of tungsten). Mass of this shielding is included in the 8500 kg estimate for the propulsion system.

For the science instruments, it is the flux that is important, not total dose. The reactor shadow shield limits the flux level to $1.6 \times 10^{3}$ neutrons or gammas $/ \mathrm{cm}^{2}$. This is apparently satisfactory for all science sensors except the gamma-ray detectors. They require that flux levels be reduced to 10 neutrons/ $\mathrm{cm}^{2}-\mathrm{s}$ and 0.1 gamma/ $\mathrm{cm}^{2}-\mathrm{s}$. Such reduction is most economically accomplished by local shielding. The gamma ray transient detector should have a shielded area of possibly $1,200 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}(48 \mathrm{~cm} \times 25 \mathrm{~cm})$. Its shielding will include a tungsten thickness of 8.7 cm and a lithium-hydride thickness of 33 cm . The weight of this shielding is approximately 235 kg and is included in the spacecraft mass estimate. It may also be noted that the gamma ray transient detector is probably the lowest-priority science instrument. An alternative to shielding it would be to omit this instrument from the payload. (The gamma ray spectrometer is proposed as an orbiter instrument and need not operate until the orbiter is separated from the NEP mother spacecraft). A detailed Monte Carlo analysis and shield development program will be needed to assure a satisfactory solution of spacecraft interfaces.

## TELECOMMUNICATIONS

## Microwave vs. Optical Telemetry Systems

Eight years ago JPL made a study of weather-dependent data links in which performance at six wavelengths ranging from $S$-band to the visible was analyzed (Potter et al., 1969). A similar study for an orbiting DSN (weather-
independent) should determine which wavelengths are the most advantageous. The work of this report indicates $X$-band or $K$-band are prime candidates, but a more thorough effort is required that investigates such areas as feasibility of constructing large spaceborne optical antennas, efficiency of power conversion, feasibility of implementing requisite pointing control, and overall costs.

## Space Cryogenics

We have assumed cryogenic amplifiers for orbiting DSN stations in order to reach 4-5 K amplifier noise contributions. Work is being done that indicates such performance levels are attainable (R. C. Clauss, private communication; D. A. Bathker, private communication) and certainly should be continued. At the least, future studies for this mission should maintain awareness of this work and probably should sponsor some of it.

Lifetime of Telecommunications Components
The telecommunications component most obviously vulnerable to extended use is the microwave transmitter. Current traveling-wave-tube (TWT) assemblies have demonstrated 11-12 year operating lifetimes (H. K. Detweiler, private communication; also, James et al., 1976) and perhaps their performance over 20-50 year intervals could be simulated. However, the simple expedient measure of carrying $4-5$ replaceable TWT's on the missions might pose a problem since shelf-lifetimes (primarily limited by outgasing) are not known as well as the operating lifetimes. A more attractive solution is use of solid-state transmitters. Projections indicate that by 1985 to 1990 power transistors for $X$-band and $K u-b a n d$ will deliver $5-10$ watts/device and a few watts/device respectively with lifetimes of $50-100$ years (J. T. Boreham, private communication). Furthermore, with array feed techniques, 30-100 elements could be combined in a near-field Gassegrainian reflector for signal transmission (Boreham, ibid). This means a Ku-band system could probably operate at a power level of $50-200$ watts and an $X$-band system could likely utilize 0.2 - 1 kW .

Other solid state device components with suitable modular replacement strategies should endure a 50 year mission.

## Baseline Enhancement vs. Non-Coherent Communication System

The coherent detection system proposed requires stable phase reference tracking with a closed loop bandwidth of approximately 1 Hz . Of immediate concern is whether tracking with this loop bandwidth will be stable. Moreover, if the tracking is not stable, what work is necessary to implement a non-coherent detection system?

The most obvious factors affecting phase stability are the accelerations of the $S / C$, the local oscillator on the $S / C$, and the medium between transmitter and receiver. If the propulsion system is not operating during transmission, the first factor should be negligible. However, the feasibility of putting on board a very stable (short term) local oscillator with a 20-50 year lifetime needs to be studied. Also, the effect of the Earth's atmosphere and the planetary or extraplanetary media on received carrier stability must be determined.

If stability cannot be maintained, then trade-off studies must be performed between providing enhancements to increase $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{r}} / \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{O}}$ and employing non-coherent communication systems.

## INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Continued development of the on-board information system capability will be necessary to support control of the reactor, thrusters, and other portions of the propulsion system, to handle the high rates of data acquisition of a fast Pluto flyby, to perform on-board data filtering and compression, etc. Continued rapid development of information system capability to very high levels is assumed, as mentioned above, and this is not considered to be a problem.

THERMAL CONTROL

The new thermal control technology requirement for a mission beyond the solar system launched about $2000 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{D}$. involve significant advancements in thermal isolation techniques, in heat transfer capability and in lifetime extension. Extraplanetary space is a natural cryogenic region ( $\sim 3 \mathrm{~K}$ ). Advantage may be taken
of it for passive cooling of detectors in scientific instruments and also for the operation of cryogenic computers. If cryogenic computer systems and instruments can be developed, the gains in reliability, lifetime, and performance can be considered. However, a higher degree of isolation will be required to keep certain components (electronics, fluids) warm in extraplanetary space and to protect the cryogenic experiments after launch near Earth. This latter is especially true if any early near-solar swingby is used to assist escape in the mission. A navigational interest in a 0.1 AU solar swingby would mean a solar input of 100 suns which is beyond any anticipated nearterm capability.

More efficient heat transfer capability from warm sources (e.g., RTG's) to electronics, such as advanced heat pipes or active fluid loops, will be necessary along with long life (20-50 years). The early mission phase also will require high heat rejection capability, especially for the cryogenic experiments and/or a near solar swingby.

NEP imposes new technology requirements such as long-term active heat rejection (heat pipes, noncontaminated radiators), and thermal isolation. NEP also might be used as a heat source for the S/C electronics.

Beyond this, the possibility of an all-cryogenic spacecraft has been suggested by Whitney and Mason (see Appendix C). This may be more appropriate to missions after 2000 but warrants study. Again, there would be a transition necessary from Earth environment (one $g$ plus launch, near solar) to extraplanetary environment (zero g, cryogenic). The extremely low power ( $\sim 1 \mathrm{~W}$ ) requirement for superconducting electronics and the possibility of further miniaturation of the $S / C$ (or packing in more electronics with low heat dissipation requirements) is very attractive. Also looking ahead, the antimatter propulsion system mentioned above would require cryogenic storage of both solid hydrogen and solid antihydrogen using superconducting (cryo) magnets and electrostatic suspension.

Table 16 summarizes the unusual thermal control features of an extraplanetary mission.

TABLE 16

THERMAL CONTROL CHARAC̄TERISTICS OF EXTRAPLANETARY MISSIONS

## Baseline Mission

1. Natural environment will be cryogenic
a) Good for cryogenic experiments - can use passive thermal control.
b) Need for transition from near Earth environment to extraplanetary space.
i. Can equipment take slow cooling?
ii. Well insolated near sun. ${ }^{*}+$
iii. Cryogenic control needed near Earth?* $\dagger$
2. 'NEP
a) Active thermal control - heat pipes - lifetime problems.*
b) Heat source has advantages \& disadvantages for $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{C}$ design.

## Not Part of Baseline Mission

3. Radioisotope thermal electric generator (RTG) power source provides hot environment to cold S/C
a) Requires high isolation.*
b) Could be used as source of heat for warm S/C.
i. Fluid loop - active devices will wear - lifetime problem.*
ii. Heat pipes.
c) Must provide means of cooling $\mathrm{RTG}^{\prime}$ s.
4. Close Solar Swingby $\sim 0.1$ AU*
a) 100 "suns" is very high thermal input - must isolate better.*
b) Contrasts with later extraplanetary environment: almost no sun.
c) Solar Sail requirements 0.3 AU (11 suns), Super Sail 0.1 AU.*
[^1]
## COMPONENTS AND MATERIALS

By far the most important problem in this area is prediction of long-term materials properties from short-term tests. This task encompasses most of the other problems noted. Sufficient time does not exist to generate the required material properties in real time. However, if in the time remaining we can establish the scaling parameters, the required data could be generated in a few years. Hence development of suitable techniques should be initiated.

Another critical problem is obtaining bearings and other moving parts with 50 years lifetime. Effort on this should be started.

Less critical but also desirable are electronic devices that are inherently radiation-resistant and have high life expectancy. DOE has an effort underway on this looking both at semiconductor devices, utilizing amorphous semiconductors and other approaches that do not depend on minority carriers, and at non-semiconductor devices, such as integrated thermionac circuits.

Other special requirements are listed in Table 17.

SCIENCE INSTRUMENTS
Both the problem of radiation compatibility of science instruments with NEP propulsion and the problem of attaining 50-year lifetime have been noted above. Many of the proposed instruments have sensors whose lifetime for even current missions is of concern and whose performance for this mission is at best uncertain. Instruments in this category, such as the spectrometers and radiometers, should have additional detector work performed to insure reasonable-performance.

Calibration of scientific instruments will be very difficult for a 20-50 year mission. Even relatively short term missions like Viking and Voyầger pose serious problems in the area of instrument stability and calibration verification. Assuming that "reliable" 50-year instruments could be built, some means of verifying the various instrument transfer functions are needed. Calibration is probably the most serious problem for making quantitative measurements on a 50-year mission.

The major problems in the development of individual science instruments are 1isted below. These are problems beyond those likely to be encountered and resolved in the normal course of development between now and, say, 1995 or 2000 .

1. Diffusion Phenomena
1.1 Fuses
1.2 Heaters
1.3 Thrusters
1.4 Plume Shields
1.5 RTG's
1.6 Shunt Radiator
2. Sublimation and Erosion Phenomena
2.1 Fuses.
2.2 Heater
2.3 Thrusters
2.4 Plume Shields
2.5 RTG's
2.6 Polymers
2.7 Temperature Control Coatings
2.8 Shunt Radiator
3. Radiation Effects
3.1 Electronic components
3.2 Polymers
3.3 Temperature Control Coatings
3.4 NEP and RTG Degradation
4. Materials Compatibility
4.1 Thrusters
4.2 Heat Pipes
4.3 Polymeric Diaphragms \& Bladders
4.4 Propulsion Feed System
5. Wear and Lubrication
5.5 Bearings
6. Hermetic Sealing and Leak Testing
6.1 Permeation Rates
6.2 Pressure Vessels
7. Long-Term Material Property Prediction from Short-Term Tests
7.1 Diffusion
7.2 Sublimation
7.3 Wear and Lubrication
7.4 Radiation Effects
7.5 Compatibility
7.6 Thermal Effects
8. Size Scale-Up
8.1 Antennae
8.2 Shunt Radiator
8.3 Pressure Vessels
9. Thermal Effects on Material Properties
9.1 Strength
9.2 Creep and Stress Rupture

Neutral Gas Mass Spectrometer
Designing a mass spectrometer to measure the concentration of light gas species in the interstellar medium poses difficult questions of sensitivity. Current estimates of $H$ concentration in the interstellar medium near the solar system are $10^{-1}-10^{-2}$ atom $/ \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ and of He contraction about $10^{-2}$ atom $/ \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ (Bertaux and Blamont, 1971; Thomas and Krassna, 1974; Weller and Meier 1974; Freeman et al., 1977; R. Carlson, private communication; Fahr et al., 1977; Ajello, 1977; Thomas, 1978). On the basis of current estimates of cosmic relative abundances the corresponding concentration of $C, N, O$ is $10^{-5}$ to $10^{-4} \mathrm{atom} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ and of $\mathrm{Li}, \mathrm{Be}, \mathrm{B}$ about $10^{-10}$ atom $/ \mathrm{cm}^{3}$.

These concentrations are a long way beyond mass spectrometer present capabilities, and it is not clear that adequate capabilities can be attained by 2000. Even measuring $H$ and $H e$ at $10^{-2}$ to $H^{-1}$ atom/cm ${ }^{3}$ will require a considerable development effort. Included in the effort should be:
a) Collection: Means of collecting incoming gas over a substantial frontal area and possibly of storing it to increase the input rate and so the $S / N$ ratio during each period of analysis.
b) Source: Development of ionization sources of high efficiency and satisfying the other requirements.
c) Lifetime: Attaining a 50-year lifetime will be a major problem, especially for the source.
d) $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}$ : Attaining a satisfactory $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}$ ratio will be a difficult problem in design of the whole instrument.
Thus, if a mass spectrometer suitable for the mission is to be provided, considerable advanced development work will be needed.

## Camera Field of View vs. Resolution

Stellar parallax measurements present a problem in camera design because of the limited number of pixels/frame in conventional and planned spacecraft cameras. For example, one would like to utilize the diffraction-limited resolution of the objective. For a 1-m objective, this is $0!12$. To find the center of the circle of confusion accurately, one would like about 6 measurements across it, or, for a 1-m objective, a pizel slze of about 0! 02 or 0.1 prad. (Note that this also implies fine-pointing stability similar to that for earth-
orbiting telescopes). But according to James et al. (1976) the number of elements per frame expected in solid state cameras by the year 2000 is $10^{6}$ for a single chip and $10^{7}$ for a mosaic. With $10^{7}$ elements, or $3000 \times 3000$, the field of view for the case mentioned would be $3000 \times 0.02=1$ minute of arc. At least five or six stars need to be in the field for a parallax measurement. Thus, a density of 5 stars per square minute or 18,000 stars per square degree is needed. To obtain this probably requires detecting stars to about magnitude 26 near the galactic poles and to magnitude 23 near galactic latitude $45^{\circ}$. This would be very difficult with a 1-m telescope.

A number of approaches could be considered, among them:
a) Limit parallax observations to those portions of the sky having high local stellar densities.
b) Use film.
c) Find and develop some other technique for providing for more pixels per frame than CCD's and vidicons.
d) Sense the total irradiation over the field and develop a masking technique to detect relative star positions. An example would be the method proposed for the Space Telescope Astrometric Multiplexing Area Scanner (Wissinger and McCarthy, 1976).
e) Use individual highly accurate single-star sensors, like the Fine Guiding Sensors to be used in Space Telescope astrometry (Wissinger, 1976).

Other possibilities doubtless exist. A study will be needed to determine which approaches are most promising and development effort may be needed to bring them to the stage needed for project initiation.

The problems of imaging Pluto, it may be noted, are rather different than those of star imagery. For a fast flyby, the very low light intensity at Pluto plus the high angular rate make a smear a problem. Different optical trains may be needed for stellar parallax, for which resolution must be emphasized, and for Pluto flyby, for which image brightness will be critical. Besides this, image motion compensation may be necessary at Pluto; it may be possible to provide this electronically with CCD's. It is expected that these needs can be met by the normal process of development between now and 1995.
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## APPENDIX C

## THOUGHTS FOR A STAR MISSION STUDY

The primary problem in a mission to another star is still propulsion: obtaining enough velocity to bring the mission duration down enough to be of much interest. The heliocentric escape velocity of about $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$ believed feasible for a year 2000 launch, as described in this study, is too low by two orders of magnitude.

## PROPULSION

A most interesting approach, discussed recently in Papailou in James et al. (1976) and by Morgan (1975, 1976) is an antimatter propulsion system. The antimatter is solid (frozen antihydrogen), suspended electrostatically or electromagnetically. Antimatter is today produced in small quantities in particle physics laboratories. Chapline (1976) has suggested that much larger quantities could be produced in fusion reactors utilizing heavy-ion beams. For spacecraft propulsion, antimatter-matter reactions have the great advantage over fission and fusion that no critical mass, temperature, or reaction containment time is required; the propellants react spontaneously. (They are "hypergolic"). To store the antimatter (antihydrogen) it would be frozen and suspended electrostatically or electromagnetically. Attainable velocities are estimated at least an order of magnitude greater than for fission NEP.

Spencer and Jaffe (1962) showed that multistage fission or fusion systems can theoretically attain a good fraction of the speed of light. To do this, the products of the nuclear reaction should be used as the propellants and the burnup fraction must be high. The latter requirement may imply that fuel reprocessing must be done aboard the vehicle.

The mass of fusion propulsion systems, accorđing to James et al. (1976) is expected to be much greater than that of fission systems. As this study shows, the spacecraft velocity attainable with fusion, for moderate payloads, is likely to be only a little greater than for fission.

CRYOGENIC SPACECRAFT
P. V. Mason (private communication, 1975) has discussed the advantages for extraplanetary or interstellar flight of a cryogenic spacecraft. The following is extracted from his memorandum:
"If one is to justify the cost of providing a cryogenic environment, one must perform a number of functions. The logical extension of this is to do all functions cryogenically. Recently William Whitney suggested that an ideal mission for such a spacecraft would be an ultraplanetary or interstellar voyager. Since the background of space is at about 3 Kelvin, the spacecraft would approach this temperature at great distances from the Sun using only passive radiation (this assumes that heat sources aboard are kept at a very low level). Therefore, I suggest that we make the most optimistic assumptions about low temperature phenomena in the year 2000, and try to come up with a spacecraft which will be far out in design, as well as in mission. Make the following assumptions:

1. The mission objective will be to make measurements in ultraplanetary space for a period of 10 years.
2. The spacecraft can be kept at a temperature not greater than 20 Kelvin merely by passive radiation.
3. Superconductors with critical temperatures above 20 Kelvin will be available. A11 known superconducting phenomena will be exhibited by these superconductors (e.g., persistent current, Josephson effect, quantization of flux, etc.).
4. All functions aboard the spacecraft are to be performed at 20 Kelvin or below.

I have been able to think of the following functions:
I. SENSING
A. Magnetic Field

Magnetic fields in interstellar space are estimated to be about $10^{-6}$ Gauss. The Josephson-Junction magnetometer will be ideal for measuring the absolute value and fluctuations in this field.
B. High Energy Particles

Superconducting thin films have been used as alpha-particle detectors. We assume that by 2000 A.D. superconducting devices will be able to measure a wide variety of energetic particles. Superconducting magnets will be used to analyze particle energies.
C. Microwave and Infrared Radiation

It is probable that by 2000 A.D. Josephson Junction detectors will be superior to any other device in the microwave and infrared regions.

## II. SPACECRAFT ANGULAR POSITION DETECTION

We will navigate by the visible radiation from the fixed stars, especially our Sun. We assume that a useful optical sensor will be feasible using superconductive phenomena. Alternatively, a Josephson Junction array of narrow beam width, tuned to an Earth-based microwave beacon could provide pointing information.
III. DATA PROCESSING AND OTHER ELECTRONICS

Josephson Junction computers are already being built. It takes very little imagination to assume that all electronic and data processing, sensor excitation and amplification and housekeeping functions aboard our spacecraft will be done this way.
IV. DATA TRANSMISSION

Here we have to take a big leap. Josephson Junction devices can now radiate about one-billionth of a watt each. Since we need at least one watt to transmit data back to Earth, we must assume that we can form an array of $10^{+9}$ elements which will radiate coherently. We will also assume that these will be arranged to give a very narrow beam width. Perhaps it could even be the same array used for pointing information, operating in a time-shared mode.
V. SPACECRAFT POINTING

We can carry no consumables to point the spacecraft--or can we? If we can't, the only source of torque available is the interstellar magnetic field. We will point the spacecraft by superconducting coils interacting with the field. This means that all other field sources will have to be shielded with superconducting shields.

It may be that the disturbance torques in interstellar space are so small that a very modest ration of consumables would provide sufficient torque for a reasonable lifetime, say 100 years.

Can anyone suggest a way of emitting equal numbers of positive and negative charged particles at high speed, given that we are to consume little power, and are to operate under 20 Kelvin? These could be used for both attitude control and propulsion.
VI. POWER

We must have a watt to radiate back to Earth. All other functions can be assumed to consume the same amount. Where are we to get our power?

First try--we assume that we can store our energy in the magnetic field of a superconducting coil. Fields of one mega-Gauss will certainly be feasible by this time. Assuming a volume of one cubic meter, we can store $4 \times 10^{9}$ joules.

This will be enough for a lifetime of 60 years.
If this is unsatisfactory, the only alternate $I$ can think of is a Radio Isotope Thermal Generator. Unfortunately, this violates our ground rule of no operation above 20 Kelvin and gives us thermal power of 20 watts to radiate. If this is not to warm the rest of the spacecraft unduly, it will have to be placed at a distance of (TBD) meters away. (No doubt we will allow it to unreel itself on a tape rule extension after achieving our interstellar trajectory.) We will also use panels of TBD square meters to radiate the power at a temperature of TBD."

LOCATING PLANETS ORBITING ANOTHER STAR
Probably the most important scientific objective for a mission to another star here would be the discovery of planets orbiting it. What might we expect of a spacecraft under such circumstances?

1) As soon as the vehicle is close enough to permit optical detection techniques to function, a search must begin for planets. Remember, at this point we don't even know the orientation of the ecliptic planet for the system in question. The vehicle must search the region around the primary for objects that
a) exhibit large motion terms with respect to the background stars and
b) have spectral properties that are characteristic of reflecting bodies rather than self luminous ones. When one considers that several thousand bright points (mostly background stars) will be visable in the field of view and that at most only about a dozen of these can be reasonably expected to be planets, the magnitude of the problem becomes apparent.

Some means of keeping track of all these candidate planets or some technique for comprehensive spectral analysis is in order. Probably a combination of these methods will prove to be the most effective.

Consider the following scenario. When the vehicle $1 s$ about 50 AU from the star, a region of space abont 10 or 15 AU in radius is observed. Here the radius referred to is centered at the target star. This corresponds to a total field of interest that is about 10 to 15 degrees in solid angle.

Each point of light (star, maybe planet) must be investigated by spectrographic analysis and the positions of each candidate object recorded for future use. As the vehicle plunges deeper into the system, parallax produced by its
own motion and motion of the planets in their orbits will change their apparent position relative to the background stars. By an iterative process, this technique should locate several of the planets in the system.

Once their positions are known then the onboard computer must compute the orbital parameters for the objects that have been located. This will result in, among other things, the identification of the ecliptic plane. This plane can now be searched for additional planets.

Now that we know where all of the planets in the system may be found, a gross assumption, we can settle down to a search for bodies that might harbor Iife.

If we know the total thermal output of the star, and for Barnard we do, we can compute the range of distances where black body equilibrium temperature ranges between $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. This is where the search for life begins.

If one or more of our planets falls between these boundaries of fire and ice, we might expect the vehicle to compute a trajectory that would permit either a flyby or even an orbital encounter with the planet. Beyond observation of the planet from this orbit, anything that can be discussed from this point on moves rapidly out of the range of science and into science fiction and as such is outside the scope of this report.

## APPENDIX D

SOLAR SYSTEM BALLISTIC ESCAPE TRAJECTORIES

The listings which follow give distance (RAD) in astronomical units and velocity (VEL) in $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{s}$ for ballistic escape trajectories with perihelia ( $Q$ ) of $0.1,0.3,0.5,1.0,2.0$, and 5.2 AU , and hyperbolic excess velocities ( $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ ) of 0., 1., 5., 10., 20., 30., 40., 50., and $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$. For each $V_{\infty}$ output is given at 0.2 year intervals for time ( $T$ ) less than 10 years after perihelion, and one year intervals for time between 10 and 60 years after perihelion.

For higher $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ and long times, the distance (RAD) can be scaled as proportional to $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$ and the velocity VEL $\mathrm{V}_{\infty}$.

|  | V－INFINITY＝ |  | ． $0 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{S}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $T-Y_{R S}$ | $\begin{gathered} Q \\ R A D \end{gathered}$ | $.1 \text { AU }$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \operatorname{RAD} \end{gathered}$ | ． 3 A！ VEL | $\begin{gathered} n \\ \text { PAD } \end{gathered}$ | $.5 \mathrm{nU}$ | $\begin{gathered} \therefore \\ \operatorname{RAD} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & A \\| 1 \\ & V F_{L} \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{o A n}^{0}=2.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AII } \\ & \text { VEI. } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{\text {OAD }}^{n}=5$ | $U_{V F 1}$ |
|  | ． 00 | ． 1000 | 133.2018 | ． 3 n00 | 76． 9041 | ．50nn | 50．5¢аб | $1.00 n 0$ | 49．1031 | 2．nnon | 20．7047 | 5.20 nn | 19．4747 |
|  | ． 20 | 1.8279 | 31.1552 | 1.5749 | 32.5553 | 1．57ヶ2 | 23．5R＞0 | 1.5605 | ＜3．710n | P．1857 | PR．4013 | 5.92 Cl | 1R．＂nns |
|  | ． 40 | ？． 9552 | 24.5029 | 2．783？ | 25．24A4 | P．6474 | 25．9175 | 2.4411 | 96．9507 | 2．6430 | 25．0n51 | 5.2151 | 10.9736 |
|  | ． 60 | 3.9016 | 21.3250 | 3．7226 | 21.8315 | 3.5666 | 22.3038 | 3.2875 | 93．0314 | 3.9751 | 2x．4559 | 5.15544 | $10.0 \times 58$ |
|  | ． 80 | 4.7466 | 19.3339 | 4.563 A | 19.7172 | 4.3096 | ？n．0R18 | 4．077A | 2n．R50n | 3.8465 | 21．4769 | 5.6410 | 17．7297 |
|  | 1.00 | 5.5233 | 17.9270 | 5.3381 | 18.2312 | 5．1986 | 1月．5p77 | 4.8107 | 12.186 G | 4.4730 | 10.0149 | $5.071 n$ | 17．9041 |
|  | 1.20 | 6.2496 | 16.8493 | 6.0627 | 17.1071 | 5.8995 | 17．356a | 5.5216 | 17．0ア5号 | 5.09935 | 19.6577 | 6．1＊58 | 17．nn5？ |
|  | 1.40 | 6.9365 | 15．903？ | 6.7483 | 15．？14a | 6.5723 | 15.4304 | 6．1904 | 16．0アロ7 | 5.7017 | 17．8434 | 6．upas | 1R．f．al |
|  | 1.60 | 7.5914 | 15.2879 | 7.4021 | 15．4R？1 | 7.2240 | 15．671A | 6．P31？ | 16.1151 | 6.9097 | 16．7015 | 6．74fa | 1F．3ing |
|  | 1.80 | 8.2195 | 14.6032 | 8.0294 | 14．8551 | 7．8405 | 15.0244 | 7.44 Pn | 15.4344 | 6.9707 | 1F．7R07 | 7．nR×1 | 95．asto |
|  | 2.00 | ค． 2247 | 14.1794 | R．6330 | 14.3357 | R．4526 | 14.4981 | R．04\％ 0 | 14.9517 | 7.4345 | 15．4408 | 7.4341 | 15．1447 |
|  | 2.20 | 9.4100 | 13.7313 | Q． 218 K | 13．Rフィ3 | O．n×6s | 14.0125 | 8．6P14 | 14.3456 | 7．0854 | $14.9 n 50$ | 7.7967 | f15．ne5s |
|  | 2.40 | 9.9779 | 13.3349 | －． 786 n | 13.4650 | 9．fnn＞ | 12．503n | a．trib | 12．0nn\％ | 9.58 \％ | 14.4975 | R．967n | 910．7785 |
|  | 2.60 | 10.5302 | 1？．9805 | 1 C .3378 | $1 \times 1077$ | 10.1535 | 17．2191 | 9．720i． | 13.5043 | 9．05n7 | 14．0n1？ | R．5457 | pritunon |
|  | 2.80 | 11.0584 | 12．66n9 | 10.8757 | 17.7796 | 10．6ank | 17．8P97 | 10．pfipu | 13.1487 | 9．5iga | 13．6183 | R．a＞a， | 1110 nnth |
|  | 3.00 | 11.5940 | 12.3706 | 11.4010 | 13.4740 | $11.215 ?$ | 12．577a | 10.7835 | 1？．8つ71 | 10．n7＞0 | 13.9719 | 9．71＊0 | 9x．anon |
|  | 3.20 | 12.1081 | $1 ? .1052$ | 11.9148 | $12.20{ }^{1} n$ | 11.7983 | 12.9096 | 11.9076 | 19．5310 | in．56af | 13．9563 | 9.7 918 | 17．との天3 |
|  | 3.40 3.60 3.80 | 12.6115 $13.105 ?$ | 11.8611 | 12.4179 | 11.953 ？ | 17.2300 | 19．n44？ | 11.7085 | 12．9655 | 11．05975 | 12．657？ | in．nana | 9x．3ann |
|  | 3.60 | $13.105 ?$ | 11.6355 | 12.9114 | 11.79 ¢ | 12.7939 | 11.8 Raf | 17．7840 | 12．019？ | 11.5371 | $13.4 n 11$ | 10．agn5 | 12．nt1s |
|  | 3.80 4.00 | 13.5898 14.0660 | 11.4262 | 13.3958 | 11.5087 | 13．2n7R | 11．5anx | 12：7657 | 11．7807 | 12．nnan | 12.1550 | 10．07nn | 19.7759 |
|  | 4.20 | 14．5343 | 11.0487 | 14．339 | 11.10314 | 14．1519 | 11．3871 | 13.2309 13.7051 | 11.6765 11.3781 | 12.4775 19.9312 | 11.9369 11.7135 | $11.257 n$ 11.8470 | 19.5593 10.7105 |
|  | $4.4 n$ | 14.9952 | 17.8776 | 14．ROOR | 1 n .94 RA | 14．6115 | 11.0195 | 14.1637 | 11．109 | 13．38＞5 | 11.5144 | 12．nสス7 | 19.1405 |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | 4.60 | 15.4492 | 10.7165 | 15.2544 | 10.7847 | 15．745n | 10．85？ | 14.6156 | 11．0170 | 13．8Р75 | 11.3276 | 12．419n |  |
|  | 4.80 | 15.8967 | 1 n .5646 | 15.7017 | 10.6307 | $15.512 n$ | 10.6048 | 15.0612 | 10．8537 | 14． 356 F | 11.1519 | 12．anak | 11.7739 L |
|  | 5.00 | 16.3380 | 10.4210 | 16.1420 | 1n．4R3A | 15.9529 | 10．546n | 15．50n7 | 1n．fara | 14．7001 | 1n．0rk？ | 13.1844 | 11．ann5 0 |
|  | 5.20 | 16.7734 | 10.2848 | 16.5788 | 10．345？ | 16．3879 | $10.4 n 51$ | $15.0 \times 44$ | 10．55＞1 | 15．198 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | in．roak | 12．554\％ | 11.4359 |
|  | 5.40 | 17.2033 | 10.1555 | 17．0080 | 10．？177 | 16．9175 | 10.2714 | 16.3697 | 1n．4131 | 15．5514 | 10.6813 | 13．0430 | 11．38n9 |
|  | 5.60 | 17.6279 | 10.0325 | 17.4325 | 10.0885 | 17．2417 | 1 n .144 ？ | 16.7850 | 1n．pain | 15．9607 | 1n．5un5 | 14．017 ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ | 11.1718 |
|  | 5.80 | 18.0475 | 9.9152 | 17．852n | 0.9603 | 17．6F10 | 10.0231 | 17．0341 | 17.1553 | 15．78311 | 10．4n65 | 14．fala | 10．08ロ号 |
|  | 6.00 | 18.4623 | 9.8031 | 18.2667 | 9．8555 | 19.0755 | 0.00775 | 17.6176 | 10.0354 | 16.7095 | $1 \mathrm{n} \cdot \mathrm{P79n}$ | 15．0624 | 10．pesa |
|  | 6.20 6.40 | 18.8725 19.2784 | 9.6961 9.5934 | 18．6758 | 9．7467 | 19.4954 | $9.797 n$ | 1R．nP6G | 0.0979 | 17.1975 | $1 \mathrm{n} .157 ?$ | $15.43>8$ | 10．7nッ？ |
|  | 6.40 6.60 | 19.2784 19.6800 | 9.5934 9.4950 | 19.0825 19.4841 | 0.6425 0.5426 | 18.8910 10.2023 | 9.6013 0.5099 | 18.4812 18.8317 | a． 8114 $0.7 n 65$ | 17.5987 $17.095 \%$ | $1 n .0440$ 0.9096 | $15.08 n 9$ 16.1659 | 1n．fnf 10.4765 |
|  | 6．80 | 20.0776 | 9.4005 | 19.9816 | 0.44 AR | 10.5807 | 0.44927 | 18.8317 $10 . p p 83$ |  |  |  |  | 1n．4765 in． 2 man |
|  | 7.00 | 20.4713 | 9.3097 | 20．275？ | 0.3545 | 2n．0931 | a．309？ | 19．f？io | 9．5naz | 18．7777 | Q．73n5 | ifigan | in．oaas |
|  | 7.20 | 20.8612 | 9.2223 | 20.6651 | 0.2659 | ？ n .47 Pa | $9.3 n 93$ | 20.0100 | 0.4154 | 10．153A | O．fア刀t | 17.9477 | 10．9194 |
|  | 7.40 | 21.2476 | 9.1380 | 21.0514 | ？．1805 | pn． m an | 9．2ア2R | 20.3055 | a．3ア7n | 19.5461 | 9.5275 | 17．6043 | 10．nアn2 |
|  | 7.60 | 21.6305 | 9．0568 | 21.4343 | 0.0082 | 21.2417 | 9．1393 | 20.7775 | $9.04{ }^{\text {a }}$ 8 | 19．035\％ | $0.4 \times 64$ | 17．0589 | n．nxof |
|  | 7.80 | 22.0101 | ${ }^{8.9784}$ | 21．A138 | 9.0187 | 21.6911 | 9.1588 | 21．1569 | 9．1578 | 20． 3014 | 9．34Af | 18．711？ | $0.811 \times 5$ |
|  | 8.00 | 22.3864 | 8.9026 | $22.190 n$ | 8.9419 | 21.9073 | 8．gain | P1．5318 | 9．0．7775 | 20．674 ${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | 9.7630 | IR．fitif | －．Pan |
|  | 8.20 | 22.7596 | 8． 8293 | 22.563 ？ | 8.8676 | 22．3703 | 8．an5s | 21.904 ？ | a．0กกก | 21．044 | 9．1R＞1 | 10．ntnn | 0．finna |
|  | 8.40 | 23.1298 | R． 7583 | 22.9333 | 8.7958 | 22．74n3 | R．A33n | 29.9737 | A．0351 | 21.4114 | $9.1 n 3 n$ | 10． 3564 | $0.974 n$ |
|  | 8.60 | 23.4971 | R． 6896 | 23.3005 | R．7262 | $23.1 n 74$ | R．7626 | 22．6473 | A．R5P5 | 21.7757 | 9．nつks | 10．70na | 0.4 ann |
|  | 8.80 | 23.8615 | R． 6230 | 23.6649 | R．6588 | 23.4717 | 8． 6043 | 23.0040 | A．7aアオ | 23．137\％ | 8.9575 | 2n．0434 | 0.43895 |
|  | 9.00 | 24.2232 | 8．5584 | 24.0265 | 8.5934 | 23．873？ | R．6PR！ | 23． 3650 | R．7141 | 23．496？ | A．gans | 20．3941 | 0.3906 |
|  | 9.20 9.40 | 24.5822 24,9386 | 8.4957 8.4347 | 24.3855 24.7419 | 8.5299 8.4682 | 24.1921 24.5484 | A． 5630 | 23：7234 | 9．64R1 | 22．A5p6 | R．8113 | 30.7390 | $0.353 n$ |
|  | 9.40 9.60 | 24．9386 | 8.4347 8.3755 | 24.7419 25.0957 | 8.4682 8.40 BJ | 24.5484 24.9721 | R．5615 8.4400 | 24.0793 24.4326 | R．5R39 R． 5216 | 23.7064 23.5570 | A．7439 8.6784 |  | 0.1787 0.1 0.1 |
|  | 9.80 | 25.6440 | 8.3179 | 25.4471 | 8.3500 | 25.2534 | B．3A20 | 24.7835 | 8．4611 | 23．907n | R．6148 | 21．7アP4 | 0.7364 |
|  | 10.00 | 25．9931 | 8.2619 | 25.7962 | 8.2934 | 25.6024 | A．3247 | 25．132n | A．40？2 | 24.2538 | A． 5530 | ？2．060n | A． 6 ¢82 |



V－INFINITY $=1.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$


| T－YRS | $\begin{gathered} \therefore= \\ \text { RAD } \end{gathered}$ | $.1 \text { AU }$ | $\begin{gathered} \therefore= \\ \text { RAD } \end{gathered}$ | nu VEL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ． 00 | .1000 | 133．2050 | －30กの | 76．9103 |
| ． 20 | 1.8283 | \％1．1677 | 1．8745 | 32．5663 |
| ． 40 | 2．956？ | 24.5189 | 2.7847 | 25.3633 |
| ． 60 | 3.9034 | 21.3435 | 3.7245 | 21.8490 |
| ． 80 | 4.7492 | 10.3543 | 4.5665 | 19.7367 |
| 1.00 | 5.5269 | 17.9450 | 5.3417 | 18．2595 |
| 1.20 | 6.2542 | 16.8728 | 6.7677 | 17．1270 |
| 1.40 | 6.9421 | 16.0181 | 6.7530 | 16．P390 |
| 1.60 | 7．598．1 | 15．313月 | 7．4n8a | 15．5n74 |
| 1.80 | R． 2273 | $14.719 ?$ | R．037） | 14.8915 |
| 2．0n | 8.8337 | 14.2074 | A．6427 | 14.36 .96 |
| $2 \cdot 20$ | a． 4202 | 13.7603 | 9．2アス7 | 13．9015 |
| 2.40 | 9.9893 | 13.3647 | 9．7975 | 17．494\％ |
| 2.60 | 10.5429 | 13.0111 | 10.3506 | 17.1307 |
| $2 \cdot 80$ | 11.0925 | 13.6973 | 10．8898 | 17.8034 |
| 3.00 | 11.6095 | 12．4728 | 11.4165 | 13.5065 |
| 3.20 | 12.1249 | 1 1．13An | 11.0316 | 12.2353 |
| 3.40 | 12．6297 | 11.8946 | 12．4369 | 11．986？ |
| 3.60 | 13.1249 | 11.6697 | 12.931 n | 11.7542 |
| 3.80 | 13.6109 | 11.4610 | 13.4160 | 11.543 n |
| 4.00 | 14.0886 | 11.2 ¢66 | 13.8944 | 11.3444 |
| 4.20 | 14.5584 | 11.0847 | 14.3640 | 11.1590 |
| 4.40 | 15．0209 | $10.914 ?$ | 14.8263 | 10．985n |
| 4.60 | 15.4765 | 10.7537 | 15.2817 | 10.8214 |
| 4.80 | 15.9255 | 10.6023 | 15.7306 | 20．6672 |
| 5.00 | 16.3684 | 10.4592 | 16.1734 | 10．5p15 |
| 5.20 | 16.8055 | 10.3236 | 16.6103 | 10.3835 |
| 5.40 | 17.2370 | 10.1947 | 17.0417 | 10.25 .94 |
| 5.60 | 17.6633 | 10.0732 | 17.4670 | 10.1278 |
| 5.80 | 19.0846 | 9.9553 | 17.8891 | 10.0030 |
| 6.00 | 18.5011 | 9.8438 | 19.3055 | 9．8957 |
| 6.20 | 18．9131 | 9．7371 | 18．7174 | 0．7873 |
| 6.40 | 19.3206 | 9． 6349 | 19.1240 | 9．6R36 |
| 6.60 | 19.7240 | 9．5370 | 19.5287 | 9．584？ |
| 6.80 | 20.1234 | 9.4429 | 19．0275 | 9.4887 |
| 7.00 | 20.5189 | 9.3525 | 20．7229 | 9.3970 |
| 7.20 | 20.9107 | 0.2655 | 20.7146 | a．3087 |
| 7.40 | 21.2989 | 9.1816 | 21．102R | a．2．37 |
| 7.60 | 21.6937 | Q． 1008 | 21.4875 | 9．1419 |
| 7.80 | 22．0651 | 9.0277 | 21．9688 | 0.0627 |
| R． 00 | 22.4434 | 8． 9473 | 22.3470 | A．98f？ |
| 8.20 | 22．8185 | R． 8744 | 22．6221 | R．9124 |
| 8.40 | 23.1906 | R． 80.38 | 2？．9941 | R．8409 |
| A． 60 | 23.5598 | A． 7355 | 23.3633 | R． 7717 |
| 8.80 | 23.9262 | 8． 6692 | 23.7296 | 8．7046 |
| 9.00 | 24．2898 | 8． 6050 | 24．093？ | R．6395 |
| 9.20 | 24.6508 | A． 5426 | 24．4549 | R． 5764 |
| 9.40 | 25．0092 | 8.4820 | 24．8125 | 8.5151 |
| 9.60 | 25．3651 | 8.4231 | 25.1684 | R． 4555 |
| 9.80 | 25．7186 | 8.3658 | 25．5218 | R． 3976 |
| 10.00 | 26，0697 | 8.3102 | 25．1728 | R． 3412 |

V－INFINITY $=1.0 \mathrm{kM} / \mathrm{S}$

|  | T－YRS | $\underset{R A D}{Q}=$ | AU VEL | $\begin{gathered} Q \\ \text { RAD } \end{gathered}$ | $A U$ VEL | $\underset{\operatorname{RAn}}{ }=$ | $A$ VEL | $\begin{gathered} Q= \\ \text { RAN } \end{gathered}$ | All VFL | $\begin{gathered} \theta= \\ 0 A D \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A!! } \\ & \text { VF! } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} n= \\ \text { QAN } \end{gathered}$ | VFt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10.00 | 26.0697 | R．3101 | 25．8778 | A． 3412 | 25．6791 | A．372？ | 25．2n9） | A．44AR | 24．330n | A． 9976 | 29．1455 | O．nnas |
|  | 11.00 | 27.7918 | 8.0524 | 27．5947 | A．0806 | 27.4007 | A．InAA | 26．9．87 | $\cdots .1795$ | PR． 1438 |  | 27．7Rロ！ | －．rova |
| 00 | 12.00 | 29.4630 | 7.8243 | 29.2658 | 7．A5n？ | P0．0714 | 7．8760 | PR．5978 | 7.9790 | 27.7069 | A． 7646 | 75． 7976 | A．4184 |
| 바ํ | 13.00 | 31.0890 | 7.6204 | 30.8917 | 7.6443 | 30.6970 | 7．6681 | 30．？${ }^{\text {P20 }}$ | 7.7271 | 29．3246 | 7．A4，${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 36.9610 | 8.1745 <br> .057 |
| $\square$ | 14.00 | 32.6744 | 7.4365 | 32.4769 | 7.4586 | 32.9819 | 7．4R07 | 31：8058 | 7．5355 | 30.9032 | 7.6479 | PA．497n | 9．0527 7.7550 |
| \％ 2 | 15.00 | 34.2229 | 7.2694 | 34.0253 | 7.2901 | 33．8301 | 7.3107 | 33.3529 | 7.3618 | 32．4459 | 7.4621 7.2074 | 30．4113 | 7．9741 |
| － | 16.00 | 35.7379 | 7.1166 | 35.5402 | 7.1360 | 35.3448 | 7.1553 | 34．8666 | $7.203 \%$ | 33.9556 35.4351 | 7.2974 7.1464 | 31．4．0p56 | 7.4096 |
| E | 17.00 | 37.2222 | 6.9761 | 37.0244 | 6.9944 | 36．9PR | 7.0125 | 36.3497 | 7.0577 6.993 | 35.4351 36.8866 | 7．1484 $7.0 n 7 ?$ | 32.985 34.3407 | 7.3582 |
| $e_{-1}^{\infty}$ | 18.00 | 38.6780 | 6.8463 | $38.480 ?$ 39.9097 | 6.8636 6.7472 | 38.2944 39.7138 | 6.8807 6.7584 | 37.8046 39.2372 | 6.9783 6.7988 | 36.8 \％6K $38.312 \pi$ | 7.017 $6.978 \%$ | 34.3407 35.7504 | 7．35R2 |
|  | 19.00 20.00 | 40.1076 41.5128 | 6.7259 6.6136 | 39.9097 41.3148 | 6.7422 6.6291 | 79.7138 41.1187 | 6.7584 6.6445 | 79.2372 40.6375 | 6.7988 $6.6 A P 0$ | $38.312 \%$ 30.7130 | 6.7504 | 37.1709 | R．O． 0.47 |
| （x） | 21.00 | 42.8951 | 6.5087 | 42.6970 | f． 5734 | 42．5nna | 6．5AR1 | 42.0191 | 6.5746 | 41．0¢\％ | 6.6465 | 3R．4R74 | 6． $\mathrm{a}_{6} 90$ |
| － | 22.00 | 44.2561 | 6.4102 | 44.0580 | 6.4242 | 4x．RG17 | 6．4783 | 43.3793 | 6.4731 | 42．45na | 6.5419 | 30.8969 | 6.7401 |
| $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ | 23.03 | 45.5970 | 6.3176 | 45.3988 | 6.3310 | $45.7 n 24$ | 6.3444 | 44.7195 | 6.3777 | 47.7809 | 5.4475 | 41.1456 | K． 6473 |
|  | 24.00 | 46.9190 | 6.2302 | 46.7208 | 6.2431 | 46.5247 | 6.9559 | 46.0409 | 6.2878 | 45.1084 | 6．35nA | 4P．4496 | 6．5419 |
|  | 25.00 | 48.2231 | 6.1476 | 48．02．48 | 6.1599 | 47．8283 | 6．172？ | 47．3444 | 6.9 209 | 46．41爯 | 6.9534 | 43. | 6.4473 |
|  | 26.00 | 49.5103 | 6.0693 | 49.3120 | 6.0811 | 49.1153 | 6.0930 | 48．f311 | 6.1224 | 47．6951 | 6．12n6 | 45.0 ก67 | K． 2578 |
|  | 27．00 | 50.7815 | 5.9949 | 50.5831 | 6.0063 | 50.3 ¢¢4 | 6.0177 | 49．9718 | 6.0461 | 48．064？ | 6.1 ¢？ | 46．9695 | K．ご天1 |
|  | 28．00 | 52.0374 | $5.924 ?$ | 51.8390 | $5.935 ?$ | 51．54？？ | $5.046 ?$ | 51.157 ？ | 5.9735 | 50．？ 181 | 6． $0 \rightarrow 75$ | 47．504n | F．1037 |
|  | 29.00 | 53.2788 | 5.8567 | 53.0804 | 5.3674 | 52．9835 | 5．R780 | 52.3981 | 5.9047 | 51.4576 | 5.9565 | 48．7710 | 6．1143 |
|  | 30.00 | 54.5063 | 5.7924 | 54.3078 | 5.8076 | 54.1109 | 5.8129 | 53．6P5？ | 5.9307 | 52．6834 | 5．RRRA | 49.9465 | A． n 434 |
| $\infty$ | 31.00 | 55.7206 | 5.7308 | 55．5221 | 5.7407 | 55.3351 | 5.7506 | 54.8791 | 5.7753 | 53.8967 | 5.8941 | 51.1487 | 5．9n76 |
|  | 32.00 | 56.9222 | 5.6718 | 56.7237 | 5.6815 | 56.5266 | 5.6010 | 56.0403 | 5.7149 | 55.0960 | 5．76P？ |  | $5.9 n 76$ |
|  | 33.00 | 58.1117 | 5．6153 | 57.9131 | 5.6246 | 57.7160 | 5.6739 | 57．2394 | 5.6571 | $56.784 n$ | $5.7 n 79$ | 53.5176 | 5．9440 |
|  | 34.00 | 59.2895 | 5.5611 | 59.0909 | 5.5701 | 58．8937 | 5.5791 | 58．4n69 | 5.6016 | 57.46 n 4 | 5.6461 | 54.6859 | 5.7032 |
|  | 35.00 | 60.4561 | 5.5089 | 60.2575 | 5.5177 | 6n．0fin？ | 5.5264 | 59．573？ | 5.548 ？ | 58.6757 | 5.5014 | 55.8430 | 5.7348 |
|  | 36.00 | 61.6120 | 5.4597 | 61.4133 | 5.4672 | 61．？160 | 5.4757 | 60.7287 | 5.4969 | 59．7An？ | 5.5789 | 5 F ．0ARA | 5．FifRA |
|  | 37.00 | 62.7575 | 5.4103 | 62.5588 | 5.4186 | 62．3614 | 5.4769 | 61.8739 | 5，4475 | 60.9245 | 5.4984 | 5月．195\％ | F．f147 |
|  | 38.00 | 63.8930 | 5.3637 | 63.6947 | 5.3718 | 67.4969 | 5.3798 | $6 \pi .0019$ | 5.3909 | 6． 058 AR | 5.4797 | 59．9592 | 5．5R27 |
|  | 39．0n | 65.0188 | 5.3187 | 64.8201 | 5.3265 | 64.6725 | 5.3744 | 64.1347 | 5． 3579 | 63．18x | 5.3777 | 60.2701 | 5． 5137 |
|  | 40.00 | 66.1353 | 5.2752 | 65．9366 | 5．？RP9 | 65.7371 | 5．9005 | 65.9510 | 5.3095 | 64．${ }^{\text {a a an }}$ | 5.3477 | 61.4789 | 5.4644 |
|  | 41.00 | 67.2429 | 5.2331 | 67.0441 | 5.2476 | 66.9466 | 5.2481 | 6fi．358x | 5. P6ta | 65.4 月55 | 5．3n75 | 6 R ． 5791 | 5．4178 |
|  | 42.00 | 68.3417 | 5.1925 | $68.142^{\circ}$ | 5.1997 | 67.9454 | $5 \cdot 2070$ | 67.4560 | 5.2951 | 66.5037 | 5.7611 | 63．6708 | F． 2757 |
|  | 43.00 | 69.4321 | 5.1530 | 69.2333 | 5.1602 | 69.0357 | 5.1673 | 6R．5470 | 5.1950 | 67．59？ | 5.23 ก1 | 64.7545 | $5.7 n n 1$ |
|  | 44.00 | 70.5144 | 5.1148 | 70．3155 | 5.1718 | 7n．1179 | 5.1787 | 69．6791 | 5.1460 | 68.6741 | 5.1 An3 | 65．R3\％ | 5．）R7\％ |
|  | 45.00 | 71.5887 | 5.0778 | 71．3898 | 5．0846 | 71.1927 | 5.0914 | 70．7n3？ | 5.1 AR3 | 69.7476 | 5.1418 | 6figars | －2mF1 |
|  | 46.00 | 72.6553 | 5.0418 | 72.4565 | 5.0485 | 72.958 A | 5.0551 | $71.760_{6}$ | 5.0716 | 7n． 8184 | 5.1044 | 67.9528 | 5.3 OR5 |
|  | 47.00 | 73.7145 | 5.0069 | 73.5156 | 5.0134 | 7月．3179 | 5.0199 | 72．89 6 | 5.0761 | 71.9717 | 5.0 FRR | 69．n179 | 5.18 A ！ |
|  | 48.00 | 74.7664 | 4.9730 | 74.5675 | 4.9794 | 74.3698 | 4.9857 | 73．8903 | 5.0015 | 72．92？9 | 5．0イx | 70.0595 | E． $13 n \mathrm{l}$ |
|  | 49.00 | 75．8113 | 4.9400 | 75.6124 | 4.9462 | 75.4145 | 4.9524 | 74.9750 | 4.9670 | 7\％．067 | 4．9087 | 71．n9An | c．ñ4k |
|  | 50.00 | 76．8493 | 4.9079 | 76.6504 | 4.9140 | 76.4526 | 4.9901 | 75.9629 | 4.9353 | 75．0047 | 4．9654 | 7？．13nの | ＊．n594 |
|  | 51.00 | 77．8807 | 4.8767 | 77.6818 | 4．88P6 | 77.4939 | 4.8886 | 76.9941 | 4．9の75 | 76．0イ5 | $4.9 \times 7 \%$ | 7＊．1571 | F．nつ5 |
|  | 52.00 | 78.9056 | 4.8462 | 78．7066 | 4.8521 | 79．5088 | 4．8579 | 78．7198 | 4.8735 | 77．0591 | 4.9015 | 74.1771 | 4.7010 |
|  | 53.00 | 79.9241 | 4.8166 | 79．725？ | $4.82 ? 3$ | 79．5273 | 4．RPRR | $79.1037 ?$ | 4.8494 | 78．077n | 4．87n9 | 75.19 9a | 4.0595 |
|  | 54.00 | 80.9365 | 4.7876 | 80.7376 | 4.7033 | An． 5396 | 4.7089 | A0．0494 | 4.8170 | 79．0889 | 4.94 तR | 76．19AR | 4.0379 |
|  | 55.00 | 81.9429 | 4.7594 | 81.7439 | 4.7650 | 81.5460 | 4.7705 | A1．0556 | 4.7843 | 80．0945 | 4.9117 | 77.9 กn7 | $4.8 n 7 ?$ |
|  | 56.00 | 82.9434 | 4.7319 | 82． 7444 | 4.7374 | R2． 5464 | 4.7428 | R2． 0560 | 4.7563 | 81.0944 | 4．7a3？ | 78．19\＆の | 4．967？ |
|  | 57.00 | 83.9382 | 4.7051 | 82.7393 | 4.7104 | $83.541 ?$ | 4.7157 | 83．0506 | 4.7890 | AP．NRAK | 4.7554 | 79．1875 | 4. AR79 |
|  | 58.00 | 84.9274 | 4.6788 | 84.7284 | 4.6841 | 84.5204 | 4．6997 | R4．0397 | 4.7074 | 83．077 | $4.758 \%$ | R日． 1797 | $4.8 n 04$ |
|  | 59.00 | 85.9111 | 4.6532 | 85．7121 | 4.6583 | 25.5141 | 4.6635 | 85．023\％ | 4.6763 | 84．0604 | $4.7 n 18$ | R1．1595 | 4.7916 |
|  | 60.00 | 86.8895 | 4.6281 | 86.6905 | 4．6372 | Af．4024 | 4．6783 | 86.0015 | 4．6509 | R5． 3 38 | 4.6759 | 8P．1271 | 4.7543 |



V －INFINITY $=5.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$

|  | T－YRS | $\underset{0}{Q}=$ | $.1 \mathrm{AU}$ | $\underset{\operatorname{RAD}}{\theta}=$ | $.3 \mathrm{AU}$ | $\underset{\operatorname{RAD}}{Q}=$ | ． 5 | $\stackrel{A U}{V F_{1}}$ | $\underset{\text { RAD }}{\theta}=1.0$ | $\stackrel{A U}{V F L}$ | $\underset{\text { RAD }}{A}=2.0$ | $\stackrel{A!}{V}{ }^{\prime}$ | $\underset{\text { RAD }}{A}=5.2$ | $u_{V F 1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10.00 | 27．8549 | 9.4179 | 27．65RR | 9.4418 | 27．4669 |  | 9.4655 | 27.0045 | 9．5238 | 26.1557 | 0.6351 | 24．1907 | 9．9363 |
|  | 11.00 | 29．8149 | 9.1929 | 29.6187 | 0.2143 | 29.4263 |  | $9.2 \times 55$ | 28：9521 | 9．9R77 | 2R．1057 | 9．3A77 | Pf．nlf？ | 0.6589 |
|  | 12.00 | 31．7306 | 8.9953 | 31.5343 | 9.0147 | 31.3416 |  | 9.0338 | 3 C .875 A | 9．0A10 | 30．01pa | 9.1715 | 27．9609 | 9.6161 |
|  | 13.00 | 33.6074 | A．8201 | 33.4109 | 8.8377 | 33.2179 |  | R．8559 | 32，7508 | A．R9RO | 31．RAP\％ | R．9an5 | 29．697， | C．）ncta |
|  | 14.00 | 35.4493 | 8.6632 | 35.2527 | 8.6793 | 35.0595 |  | A．6052 | 34.5911 | A． 7345 | 33.7178 | A．R1ns | 31.4883 | a．n19？ |
|  | 15.00 | 37.2600 | 8． 5216 | 37.0633 | 8.5365 | 36．8698 |  | R．551？ | 36.4004 | A． 5874 | 35．52？7 | A．657？ | 33.9578 | 0.9515 |
|  | 16.00 | 39.0423 | 8.3931 | 38．8455 | 8.4068 | 3R．6519 |  | R．4204 | 38.1815 | R．4529 | 37．70nn | A．G196 | $35.910 \times 5$ | 0.8099 |
|  | 17.00 | 40.7989 | 8.2757 | 40.6020 | 8． 2895 | 40.4081 |  | A． 3011 | 39.9370 | 8.3523 | 29.0519 | 8.3925 | $36.727 \%$ | 口．afis |
|  | 18.00 | 42.5318 | R． 1680 | 42.334 R | 8.1799 | 42．1408 |  | 8.1016 | 41．66A9 | R．？2n7 | 40.7807 | R． 2769 | 38.4307 | R，4×61 |
|  | 19.0 O | 44．2430 | R．06R6 | 44.0450 | 8.0797 | 43．8518 |  | R．000R | 43．3791 | R．11R0 | 42.48 Al | $8.17 \pi 6$ | 4 n ＋1154 | R． $\mathrm{Sanc}^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | 20.00 | 45.9341 | 7.9766 | 45.7370 | 7.9870 | 45.54 .7 |  | 7.9974 | 45.0694 | A．nファa | 44.1752 | 8.0724 | 41．781A | 0.3187 |
|  | 21.00 | 47.6066 | 7.8911 | 47.4094 | 7.9009 | 47.9149 |  | 7.9106 | 46.7411 | 7.0347 | 45．8451 | 7.9813 | 43.4310 | A． 1149 |
|  | 22.00 | 49.2616 | 7.8113 | 49.0644 | 7.8206 | 48.8699 |  | 7.8298 | 49.3955 | 7.8575 | 47.4973 | 7．Ra65 | 45.7855 | A．n531 |
|  | 23.00 | 50.9005 | 7.7368 | 50.7037 | 7.7455 | 50.5086 |  | 7.754 ？ | $50.0 \times 37$ | 7.7757 | 49.1335 | 7． 7173 | 4F．GRAC | 7．0275 |
|  | 24.00 | 52.5242 | 7.6668 | 52.3269 | 7.6751 | 59.1221 |  | 7.6833 | 51.6568 | 7.7037 | 59.7547 | 7.7432 | 48.9026 | 7.0575 |
|  | 25.00 | 54.1337 | 7.6010 | 53.9363 | 7.60 Ra | 53.7414 |  | 7.6167 | 53． 2657 | 7．636t | 52． 26.19 | 7.6736 | 49.8457 | 7.7834 |
|  | 26.00 | 55.7297 | 7.5390 | 55．532？ | 7.5455 | 55.3373 |  | $7.554 n$ | 54：．8611 | 7.5724 | 53.0557 | 7.6081 | 51.4565 | 7.7199 |
|  | 27.00 | 57．3130 | 7.4805 | 57．1155 | 7.4876 | 56.9305 |  | 7.4047 | $56.444 n$ | 7.5133 | 55.537 n | 7.5463 | 53.0359 | 7.6455 |
|  | 28.00 | 58．8844 | 7.4250 | 58．6868 | 7.4319 | 58.4918 |  | 7.4386 | 58.0149 | 7.4554 | 57.1064 | 7.4879 | 54.5937 | 7.5038 |
|  | 29.00 | 60.4444 | 7.3725 | 60.2468 | 7.3790 | 60.0517 |  | 7.3855 | 59.5744 | $7.4 n 15$ | 58.6647 | 7.4396 | 56.1417 | 7.5025 |
|  | 30.00 | 61.9936 | 7.3226 | 61.7960 | 7.3788 | 61.6008 |  | 7.3750 | 61．1933 | 7.3503 | 60.2193 | 7.3808 | 57.6787 | 7.4673 |
| $\infty$ | 31.00 | 63.5326 | 7.2751 | 63.3350 | 7.2811 | 63.1397 |  | $7.287 n$ | 62.6619 | 7．3n17 | 61.7496 | 7.3303 | 59.7 7f6 | 7．444n $V$ |
| $\bigcirc$ | 32.00 | 65.0618 | 7.2298 | 64．864？ | 7.2356 | 64．f689 |  | 7.2413 | 64.1907 | 7.7554 | $63.277 \times$ | 7．2928 | 6 n .7954 | $7.25 \times 3$ |
|  | 33.00 | 66．5818 | 7.1866 | 66.3841 | $7.192 ?$ | 66.1987 |  | 7.1076 | 65.7103 | 7.2112 | 64.7959 | 7．9376 | 62.9354 | $7{ }^{7} 9150$ |
|  | 34.00 | 68.0928 | 7.1454 | 67．8951 | 7.1507 | 67.6997 |  | 7.1560 | 67.2210 | $7.16{ }^{\circ} 0$ | 66.3056 | 7.1944 | $63.737 n$ | 7.3689 |
|  | 35.00 | 69.5954 | 7.1059 | 69.3977 | 7.1110 | 69.2022 |  | 7.1161 | 68.7233 | $7.12 \mathrm{R6}$ | 67．806R | $7.15 \times 1$ | 65.9307 | 7.3949 |
|  | 36.00 | 71.0898 | 7.0681 | 70.8921 | $7.07 \times 0$ | 7 7 .6065 |  | 7.0779 | 70.9174 | 7.01006 | 69.3001 | 7.1135 | 6F．716F | $7.10>9$ |
|  | 37.00 | 72.5765 | 7.031 R | 72.3787 | 7.0366 | 72.1831 |  | 7.0413 | 71.703 B | 7.0578 | 70.7855 | 7.0757 | 68．1959 | 7.11785 |
|  | 38.00 | 74.0556 | 6.9970 | 73．8578 | 7.0016 | 73．669？ |  | $7.006 ?$ | 73．1827 | 7.0174 | 72． 7685 | 7.0394 | 6a．f666 | 7.1941 |
|  | 39.00 | 75.5276 | 6.9636 | 75.3298 | F．96R7 | 75.1341 |  | 6.9724 | 74.6544 | 6.9833 | 73.7345 | 7.0045 | 71.1313 | 7.0671 |
|  | 40.00 | 76.9927 | 6.9314 | 76.7949 | 6.9357 | 76．599？ |  | 6.9790 | 76.1197 | 6.9505 | 75．19R6 | 6.9710 | 72.5803 | $7.0 \times 15$ |
|  | 41.00 | 78.4512 | 6.9004 | 78．？533 | 6.9046 | 7R．0576 |  | 6．9nR7 | 77.5774 | 6.9189 | 76.6560 | 6．9887 | $74 . n 41 n$ | R．0974 |
| 为 | 42.00 | 79.9032 | 6.8706 | 79.7053 | 6.8746 | 79.5095 |  | 6．R786 | 79.0797 | K．RRR4 | 78.1079 | $6.9 n 77$ | 75.4965 | A．7545 |
| \％ 0 | 43.00 | 81，3491 | 6.8418 | 81.151 ？ | 6.8457 | AN． 9554 |  | 6． 8496 | 81.4749 | 6.8991 | $79.55{ }^{2} 1$ | 6.8777 | 76.0767 | R．083R |
| 82 | 44.00 | 82.7890 | 6.8140 | 82.5911 | 6．8178 | A2．305？ |  | G．RP15 | R1． 9146 | G．ATnR | An．991？ | 6． 2489 | 78．96n3 |  |
|  | 45.00 | 84.2232 | 6.7872 | $84.025 ?$ | 6.7909 | 83.8994 | ＇ | 6.7045 | 83.3486 |  | 8 BP .4245 | G．R21n | 79．78R7 | R．8739 R． 2445 |
|  | 46.00 | 85.6518 | 6.7613 | 85.4538 | 6.7648 | 85.2579 |  | 6.7683 6.7431 | 84.7770 R6．p001 | 6.7771 6.7515 | 83.8584 85.9748 | 6．7a4 f．76an | R1．${ }^{\text {RP．fyan }}$ |  |
| co | 48.00 | 88.4931 | 6.7119 | 88.2951 | 6.7153 | RR， 099 ？ |  | 6．7186 | R7．6179 | 6．7P68 | 86.5978 | 6.7479 | R4．n4PR | 6．70n5 |
| E | 49.00 | 89.9061 | 6.6884 | 89.7081 | 6.6916 | R9．5121 |  | 6.6949 | R9．0208 | 6．7n＞0 | 88.1045 | 6．7185 | R5．45na | 6．7649 |
|  | 50.00 | 91.3143 | 6.6656 | 91.1163 | f．finh | 90．9ア0\％ |  | 6.6710 | 90．43A8 | 6.6707 | 89.5119 | 6.6949 | 96．954 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | R．9\＃nn |
|  | 51.00 | 92.7177 | 6.6435 | 92.5197 | 6.6456 | 92.3236 |  | 6．6496 | 91.8420 | 6.6572 | 90.9147 | 6．6730 | RA．953？ | 6．7160 |
| ar | 52.00 | 94.1166 | 6.6221 | 93.9185 | F．6251 | 97．7P25 |  | 6．6p8n | 93.2407 | 6.6354 | 92.3179 | 6．6498 | R9．6476 | R．fnct |
|  | 53.00 | 95.5110 | 6.6012 | 95.3129 | 6．604？ | 05.1168 |  | 6.6071 | 94.6350 | 6.6143 | 93，7067 | K．6PR3 | $91.0 \times 77$ | R．K7nn |
|  | 54.00 | 96.9010 | 6.5810 | 96．7030 | 6.5839 | 96.5069 |  | 6.5867 | 96.0249 | 6.5037 | 95．0969 | 6．6n74 | 99.4277 | R．f4A1 |
|  | 55.00 | 98．2869 | 6.5614 | 98.0889 | 6.5642 | 97．8927 |  | 6.5669 | 97.4107 | 6.573 B | 96.4815 | G．5R71 | 93．01755 | Rorotr |
|  | 56.00 | 99.6687 | 6.5423 | 99.4707 | 6.5450 | 99， 2745 |  | 6.5477 | 98.7923 | f． 51543 | 97．R697 | 6．567\％ | 95.1875 | R．fnct |
|  | 57.00 | 101.0466 | 6.5937 | 100．8485 | 6.5264 | 100.6523 |  | 6．5990 | 100．1700 | 6.5355 | 9a．p4nn | 6．548？ | 96．5576 | f．5R6n |
|  | 58.00 | 102.4205 | 6.5056 | 102．2224 | 6.50 A ？ | 102．006P |  | 6．5108 | 101．5439 | 6.5171 | 100．6134 | 6.5995 | 97．227a | f．5R64 |
|  | 59.00 | 103.7908 | 6.4880 | 103.5927 | 6.4905 | 103．7064 |  | 6.4031 | 102．914n | 6．490？ | 101．9871 | $6.511^{3}$ | 90．0946 | R．5474 |
|  | 60.00 | 105.1573 | 6.4709 | 104．9592 | 6.4733 | 104．7630 |  | 6.4758 | $1 \mathrm{n}_{4.2804}$ | g．4A1A | 103．3403 | 6.4037 | 10n．6577 | 6． 5389 |

$V$-INFINITY $=10.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$

| $T-Y_{R S}$ | $\begin{gathered} Q= \\ \text { RAD } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} .1 \text { AIJ } \\ \text { VEL } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 00 | . 1000 | 133.5761 |
| - 20 | 1.8696 | 27.3 ARP |
| . 40 | 3.0591 | 26.0767 |
| -60 | 4.0789 | 33.1207 |
| . 80 | 5.0056 | 21.3179 |
| 1.00 | 5.9709 | 20.0554 |
| 1.2n | 6.6912 | 19.1092 |
| 1.40 | 7.4771 | 18.3655 |
| 1.60 | 8.2354 | $27.76 \cap 7$ |
| 1.80 | 8.9709 | 17.2563 |
| 2.00 | 9.6871 | 16.8273 |
| $2 \cdot 20$ | 10.3868 | 15.4566 |
| 2.40 | 11.0721 | 16.1321 |
| 2.60 | 11.7447 | 15.8452 |
| 2.80 | 12.4060 | 15.5800 |
| 3.00 | 13.0573 | 15.3585 |
| 3.20 | 13.6994 | 15.1497 |
| 3.40 | 14.3332 | 14.9595 |
| 3.60 | 14.9595 | 14.7853 |
| 3.80 | 15.5787 | 14.6250 |
| 4.00 | 16.1915 | 14.4768 |
| 4.20 | 16.7984 | 14.3395 |
| 4.40 | 17.3998 | 14.2116 |
| 4.60 | 17.9960 | 14.0923 |
| 4.80 | 18.5873 | 13.9805 |
| 5.00 | 19.1742 | 13.8756 |
| 5.20 | 19.7568 | 13.7770 |
| 5.40 | 20.3354 | 13.6839 |
| 5.60 | 20.9102 | 13.5960 |
| 5.80 | 21.4814 | 13.5128 |
| 6.00 | 22.0492 | 13.433R |
| 6.20 | 22.6138 | 13.3589 |
| 6.40 | 23.1754 | 13.2875 |
| 6.60 | 23.7340 | 13.2195 |
| 6.80 | 24.2899 | 13.1547 |
| 7.00 | 24.8431 | 13.0927 |
| 7.20 | 25.3937 | 13.0334 |
| 7.40 | 25.9420 | 17.9766 |
| 7.60 | 26.4879 | 12.9222 |
| 7.80 | 27.0316 | 12.8700 |
| 8.00 | 27.5731 | 12.8198 |
| 8.20 | 28.1125 | 12.7716 |
| 8.40 | 28.6500 | 12.7251 |
| 8.60 | 29.1856 | 12.6804 |
| 8.80 | 29.7193 | 12.6373 |
| 9.00 | 30.2513 | 12.5957 |
| 9.20 | 30.7815 | 12.5555 |
| 9.40 | 31.3101 | 12.5167 |
| 9.60 | 31.8371 | 12.4792 |
| 9.80 | 32.3625 | 12.4428 |
| 10.00 | 32.8864 | 12.4077 |



PAn $=.5 \mathrm{Al}$
A)
PAN VFI
$n=1.0 \mathrm{AlO}$
DAT
ロAT
VFL.
$n=2.0$
$\operatorname{BAn}$
$2.00 n n$
VFL

| 2.00nn |
| :---: |
| . 3 .754 |
| . 7697 |
| 3.44A4 |
| 4.17n |
| . 8904 |
| 5.6735 |
| 6. 3371 |
| 7.0307 |
| -7907 |
| 9.4nan |
| - 0778 |
| . 7 \% 6 |
| .3960 |

V-INFINITY $=10.0 \mathrm{kM} / \mathrm{S}$


V－INFINITY $=20.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$

|  | $Y=Y R S$ | $\begin{gathered} Q= \\ R \wedge D \end{gathered}$ | － 1 AU VEL | $\begin{gathered} \theta= \\ \text { PAD } \end{gathered}$ | $.3 \mathrm{AU}$ | $\underset{\text { pAn }}{2}=$ | $\begin{gathered} .5 \mathrm{Al} \\ \quad V F L \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} n= \\ \operatorname{RAn} \end{gathered}$ | All VFL | $\begin{gathered} n=2 \\ \text { RAN }^{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { VFI } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\operatorname{nan}}{n}=$ | $V_{V=1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | － 00 | .1000 | 174.6943 | ． 300 ก | 70.4619 | ． 5000 | $69.8 \times 7 ?$ | 1.0000 | 4F．6．69a | ？．00nn | ＊5． 2766 | C．jnnn | 27．925n |  |
|  | － 20 | 1.9905 | 55．9357 | 1.8471 | 36．8R57 | 1．7509 | 37．5ア61 | 1.7614 | 77．514n | 7．34n9 | 74．n＞0 | 5.3087 | 2\％．11n4 |  |
|  | ． 40 | 3.3546 | 30.4778 | 3.1945 | $30 . a_{0} a_{6}$ | 3.1773 | 31.2559 | P．9177 | 71．7506 | 3.1185 | 21．1977 | 5.6757 | P6．7005 |  |
|  | ． 60 | 4.5759 | pR．06G7 | 4.4094 | 29．3263 | 4.2739 | 29．5505 | $4.057 ?$ | P8．0763 | 4．0518 | 29．94R\％ | 6．nnos | 3R．शa 77 |  |
|  | ． 80 | 5.7225 | P6．6457 | 5.5525 | 2f．AP4？ | 5.4110 | 96．9an ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5.1597 | 27．974n | 5.0710 | 27．4336 | 6.562 A | pe．ann4 |  |
|  | 1.00 | 6.8217 | 25.6922 | 6.6495 | 25．8ア30 | 6.5024 | 75．9306 | 6：33na | 96．1677 | 6.0271 | 26．3548 | 7．2n94 | 95．1503 |  |
|  | 1.20 | 7.8875 | 24.9789 | 7.7137 | 25.10 nn | 7．5636 | 25．10n0 | 7.9774 | 25．37ス3 | 7.0137 | 25．5536 | 7.0184 | 20．an！ |  |
|  | 1.40 | 8.9283 | 24.46 AB | 8.7534 | $24.54{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{A}$ | R．finia | 24.6729 | R． 3039 | 24．7793 | 7．99p\％ | 24．9xat | A．A．754 | 94．5nka |  |
|  | 1.60 | 9.9497 | 24.0483 | 9.7730 | 24.1149 | 0.6196 | 24．175？ | 9．3143 | 24．3nn | R．076\％ | 24．4471 | 9．146F5 | Pt． 2 \％RR |  |
|  | 1.80 | 10.9554 | 23．7055 | 10．7780 | 22．7644 | 10．5フォ1 | P＊．R1？1 | 10.3119 | 23．0．an | 0.0476 | 24．74n1 | 10．38つ3 | 2\％．nのタ1 |  |
|  | 2.00 | 11.9481 | 23.4200 | 11.7710 | 97．4677 | 11．5141 | 23．5110 | 11．2067 | 2x．fnP1 | 10．a12\％ | 2\％．710n | 11．11an | 2x．fafi |  |
|  | 2.20 | 12.9290 | 23.1780 | 12.7527 | 23．219？ | 13.5044 | 23．256i | 17． 17 7ク5 | 23．7ス¢1 | $11.87 \cap 9$ | 27．4月n7 | 11．nfin | の7．1961 |  |
|  | 2.40 | 13.9023 | 27.9700 | 13.7243 | 23．0061 | 17．5656 | 27．0780 | 13.7300 | 23．1拞 | 17．9285 | 27．9nつ¢ | 1p．Rアのn | 23．3n＊4 |  |
|  | $2 \cdot 60$ | 14.8667 | 2？．7891 | 14.6883 | 22．82ก9 | 14．5989 | 23．8490 | 14.1 ana | 23．0117 | 13.7710 | 23．7nat | 13．684\％ | $\mathrm{P}^{2} \cdot 0143$ |  |
|  | 2.80 | 15．824n | 2？．6302 | 15.6453 | 23．6584 | 15.4953 | ？？．684\％ | 15．1535 | 29．7205 | 14.713 R | 2？．A164 | 14．55119 | 2？，atct |  |
|  | 3.00 | 16.7751 | 22.4993 | 16．596？ | 22.5146 | 16．4．356 | 22．5378 | 16.1013 | 29．5R75 | 15．659 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3P．6574 | 15．4＞09 | 2？．RCTA |  |
|  | 3.20 | 17.7207 | 22.3634 | 17.5415 | ？2．3R63 | 17.3504 | 23．4n73 | 17．0439 | 23．4539 | 16．5Ran | 29．5161 | 16．xn5？ | P9．E5¢a |  |
|  | 3.40 | 18．6612 | ？2．2503 | 18.4818 | 23．2711 | 18．3）n3 | 2P．pan1 | 17．9R19 | 39． $2 \times n 0$ | 17．5164 | 39．3n0¢ | 17．18tug | 30．4マス |  |
|  | 3.60 | 19.5073 | 22.14 RO | 19.4177 | 2？．1659 | 19．7558 | 23．1843 | 18．9155 | 29．2916 | 19.4434 | 29．9755 | 1A．nGFA | 29．30n7 |  |
|  | 3.80 | 20.5293 | 2？．0551 | 20.3495 | 2？．0724 | 10．107\％ | P？．กロa？ | 10．8454 | 23．1975 | 10．367\％ | 39.1793 | 18.3470 | pn．990 |  |
|  | 4.00 | 21.4576 | 21.9701 | 21.2776 | 21．986n | 21.1151 | 2？．0nob | 20.7718 | 29．172？ | Pn．pAR1 | 39．n783 | 10．月711 | 29．1929 |  |
|  | 4.20 | 22.3825 | P1．89P？ | 22.2024 | 21．9nfia | 22．0305 | 21.9904 | 21.6940 | 21．9405 | P1．Plas | 31.0034 | ？n．714R | P9．nス95 |  |
|  | 4.40 | 23．3043 | 21.8205 | $23.124 n$ | 21.8341 | 22．9600 | 31．8466 | 22．615n | 21．8736 | 23．1719 | 71．9176 | 21．50po | 24．0578 |  |
| 0 | 4.60 | 24.2231 | 21.7542 | 24.0427 | 21.76 Áa | 23．8704 | 21．7784 | 33．5324 | 21． 1 ก36 | 23.7350 | 91．R4na | $39.49 *$ | 24．9041 | $\xrightarrow{1}$ |
| N | 4.80 | 25.1393 | 21.6928 | 24.958 A | 21.7045 | 24．705？ | 21.7153 | 24.4473 | 91．739R | 23.7450 | 91．7747 | 27．2672 | 21．9458 | $\pm$ |
|  | 5.00 | 26.0531 | 21.6357 | 25．8725 | 21.6466 | 25．7087 | 29．6567 | 25．3597 | 31．67RG | 24.854 A | 21．7114 | 24．3515 | 71．7533 | 0 |
|  | 5.20 | 26.9645 | 21.5824 | 26.7838 | 21.5927 | ？6．fica | $31 \cdot 6 \pi 21$ | 26．27n0 | $31.62>7$ | P5．7617 | 31.6534 | 25.1354 | 31．6nzn |  |
|  | 5.40 | 27.8737 | 21.5326 | 27.6920 | 21.5423 | 27．5P88 | 21．5511 | 37．1789 | 29．57n4 | 26．666R | 21．5094 | 26．0101 | 21．4．77 |  |
|  | 5.60 | 28.7810 | 21.4860 | 28.6001 | 21.4050 | 28.4357 | 21.5034 | PR． 1844 | 21.5915 | 27.57 nl | 21.54 .99 | ？6．0n95 | 29．5059 |  |
|  | 5.80 | 29.6863 | 21.4422 | 29.5054 | 21.4507 | 29.34 ก9 | 21.4596 | 2R．9R87 | 29．4757 | 29．4718 | 91．5n15 | 77．7856 | 79．5873 |  |
|  | 6.00 | 37.5899 | 21.4010 | 30.4080 | 21.4090 | 30.9447 | 21．4965 | 29.8914 | 21.4376 | 20．3710 | 21.4571 | 2R．fGRD | P9．4nt 6 |  |
|  | 6.20 | 31.4918 | 21.3621 | 31.3107 | 21.3697 | 31．1459 | 21.3768 | 30.7985 | 31.3031 | $30.37 \% \mathrm{~F}$ | 99．495x | 20．55n5 | 39.41306 |  |
|  | 6.40 | 32.3921 | 21.3254 | $32.210^{\circ}$ | 21.3327 | 32．0460 | 29．3＊9\％ | $31.693 n$ | 31.3539 | 31.1678 | 39．3759 | 3 \％．uアフ2 | 24．tunan |  |
|  | 6.60 | 33.2909 | 21.2907 | 33.1097 | 21.2976 | 32.9446 | 21．3n30 | 32．59nn | 71.3176 | 37．0639 | 29．3xAf | 31．21＊7 | 21．3R06 |  |
|  | 6.80 | 34.1883 | 21.2579 | 34.0070 | 21.2544 | 33．8418 | 21.2704 | 33.4967 | $31.28 \pi / 4$ | 35．0585 | 21.3034 | 3p．1047 | 91．2273 |  |
|  | 7.00 | 35.0844 | 21.2267 | 34.9030 | 21．23P9 | 34.7377 | 21．2アA5 | 34．3R21 | 91．351 | 33．85pn | 91．270n | 33．n75 | 21．9nR9 |  |
|  | 7.20 | 35.9791 | 21.1970 | 35.7977 | 21.2029 | 35.6393 | 21.2 n 87 | 35．276？ | 91．23n？ | 34．7447 | 31.3787 | 33．055\％ | 91．0RR？ |  |
|  | 7.40 | $36.8727$ | 21．1688 | $36.691 ?$ | 21.1744 | 76．5957 | 91.1796 | 36．169？ | 21.1909 | ＋5．6756 | P9．PnR？ | 34.2348 | 91．9\＃5？ |  |
|  | 7.60 | 37.7651 | 21.1419 | 37.5836 | 21.1473 | 37.41 An | 21．1522 | 47.161 n | 31.163 | 36．5P59 | 71.1796 | 35.7170 | 21．3n57 |  |
|  | 7.80 | 38.6564 | 21.1163 | 38.474 R | 21.1214 | 3ค．3nas | 21．1961 | 37：951A | 31.1365 | $37.415 n$ | 31.1523 | 36．5936 | 91．1775 |  |
|  | 8.00 | 39.5467 | 21.0918 | 30．3651 | 21.0967 | 39.1993 | P1．1n1？ | 79．8415 | 21．1111 | 38.3037 | 31.1963. | 37.47 のタ | 21．1507 |  |
|  | 8.20 | 40.4359 | 21.0684 | 40.2543 | 21.0731 | 4n．nAR4 | 21.0774 | 30.7303 | 21.0 RRa | 39.1976 | 31.1015 | \％ $\mathrm{R}_{0}$ 74RA | 21．1950 |  |
|  | B． 40 | 41.3242 | 21．0460 | 41.1425 | 21.0505 | 40.9766 | 21.0547 | 40．6181 | 31.0637 | 4n． 0771 | 21.0777 | 3a．325a | 21．10n5 |  |
|  | 8.60 | 42.7116 | 21.0246 | 42.0298 | 21.0289 | 41．8638 | $31.0 \times 20$ | 41．5050 | 71.0416 | 40．969R | 21．0550 | 4n．1739 | 31.0791 |  |
|  | 8.80 | 43.0981 | 21.0040 | 42.9163 | 21.00 Al | 42.7502 | 21．0120 | 42．3910 | 31.0203 | 41.8476 | 21.0337 | 4n．07as | 21．nctu |  |
|  | 9.00 | 43.9837 | 20.9843 | 43．8019 | $2 \mathrm{C} \cdot 98 \mathrm{AR}$ | 43.5358 | P0．9919 | 4\％．2763 | 91．0nno | 42.7316 | P1．n1p4 | 41．8ら5\％ | 21．nアア1 |  |
|  | 9.20 | 44．8685 | 20.9653 | 44.6867 | 20.9691 | 44.5205 | 20．9727 | 44.1607 | ？n．7an4 | 43.5150 | 2n．9n34 | $42.43 n 0$ | 21．0194 |  |
|  | 9.40 | 45.7526 | 20.9471 | 45.5707 | 20.9508 | 45.4044 | 20．954？ | 45.0444 | 30.9616 | 44.4975 | 30.9732 | 47．ROK1 | 9n．añ6 |  |
|  | 9.60 | 46.6359 | 213.9295 | 46.4540 | 20.9331 | 46．2876 | 20．9764 | 45．0273 | 20．9435 | 45.3704 | 20．0547 | 44．1t8in | 9月， 9785 |  |
|  | 9．80 | 47.5185 | 20.9126 | 47.3365 | 20.9161 | 47.1701 | 20.9192 | 4R．An95 | 20．0962 | 46.2607 | Pn．9369 | 45.2554 | 2n．0n¢？ |  |
|  | 10.00 | 48．4003 | 20.8964 | 48.2184 | 20.8997 | 48．0519 | 20.9027 | 47．6910 | 20．9094 | 47．1419 | 20.9198 | $46.32^{94}$ | 2 2．0775 |  |

V-INFINYTY $=20.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$
$r$-YRS $\quad Q=.1$ AU

|  | 10.00 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 11.00 |
|  | 12.00 |
|  | 13.00 |
|  | 14.00 |
|  | 15.00 |
|  | 16.00 |
|  | 17.00 |
|  | 18.00 |
|  | 19.00 |
|  | 20.00 |
|  | 21.00 |
|  | 22.00 |
|  | 23.00 |
|  | 24.00 |
|  | 25.00 |
|  | 26.00 |
|  | 27.00 |
|  | 28.00 |
|  | 29.00 |
|  | 30.00 |
|  | 31.00 |
| $\stackrel{6}{\omega}$ | 32.0n |
|  | 33.00 |
|  | 34.00 |
|  | 35.00 |
|  | 36.00 |
|  | 37.00 |
|  | 38.00 |
|  | 39.00 |
|  | 40.00 |
|  | 41.00 |
| 2 | 42.00 |
| - | 43.00 |
|  | 44.00 |
|  | 45.00 |
|  | 46.00 |
|  | 47.00 |
|  | 48.00 |
|  | 49.00 |
|  | 50.00 |
|  | 51.00 |
|  | 52.00 |
|  | 53.00 |


| 10.00 | 48.4003 | 20.8964 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11.00 | 52.8001 | 20.8231 |
| 12.00 | 57.1857 |  |
| 13.00 | 61.5593 |  |
| 14.00 | 65.9224 |  |
| 15.00 | 70.2765 |  |
| 16.00 | 74.6226 |  |
| 17.00 | 78.9616 |  |
| 18.00 | 83.294 |  |
| 19.00 | 87.6212 |  |
| 20.00 | 91.941 |  |
| 21.00 | 96.260 |  |
| 22.00 | 100.530 |  |
| 23.00 | $104.8 B 23$ |  |


$V=$ INFINITY $=30.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$

| T- YRS | $\underset{R A D}{Q}=$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \mathrm{AU} \\ \text { VEL } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .00 | .1000 | 136.5378 |
| . 20 | 2.1796 | 41.4007 |
| . 40 | 3.8036 | 36.9657 |
| . 60 | 5.3147 | 35.1760 |
| -80 | 6.7699 | 34.0893 |
| 1.00 | R. 1909 | 3*.4158 |
| 1.20 | 9.5ARG | 3?.9399 |
| 1.40 | 10.9694 | 32.5844 |
| 1.60 | $17.337 ?$ | 37.3081 |
| 1. Bn | 13.6947 | 37.0867 |
| 2.00 | 15.0439 | 31.9057 |
| 2.20 | 16.3862 | 71.7534 |
| 2.40 | 17.7226 | 31.6946 |
| 2.60 | 19.0541 | 31.5138 |
| 2.80 | 20.3813 | 31.4174 |
| 3.00 | 21.7047 | \$1.3328 |
| 3.20 | 23.0247 | 31.2570 |
| 3.40 | 24.3418 | 31.1912 |
| 3.60 | 25.6563 | 31.1313 |
| 3.80 | 26.9684 | 31.0772 |
| 4.00 | 28.2783 | 31.02R1 |
| 4.20 | 29.5863 | 30.9834 |
| 4.40 | 30.9924 | 30.9424 |
| 4.60 | 32.1970 | 30.9048 |
| 4.80 | 33.5000 | 20.8701 |
| 5.07 | 34.8016 | 30.8380 |
| 5.20 | 36.1019 | 30.8082 |
| 5.40 | 37.4010 | 30.7805 |
| 5.60 | 38.69an | 30.7546 |
| 5.80 | 39.9959 | $30.7 \times 15$ |
| 6.00 | 41.2919 | 30.7078 |
| 6.20 | 42.5869 | 30.6865 |
| 6.40 | 43.R811 | 70.6665 |
| 6.60 | 45.1744 | 30.6476 |
| 6.80 | 46.4670 | 30.6298 |
| 7.00 | 47.7589 | 30.6129 |
| 7.20 | 40.0500 | 30.5969 |
| 7.40 | 50.3405 | 30.5818 |
| 7.60 | 51.6304 | 30.5674 |
| 7.80 | 52.9197 | 30.5537 |
| 8.00 | 54.2084 | 30.5406 |
| 8.20 | 55.4966 | 3n.5282 |
| 8.40 | 56.7843 | 30.5163 |
| 8.60 | 58.0715 | 30.5050 |
| 8.80 | 59.3583 | 30.4941 |
| 9.00 | 60.6446 | 30.4837 |
| 9.20 | 61.9304 | 30.4737 |
| 9.40 | 63.2159 | 30.4642 |
| 9.60 | 64.5009 | 30.4550 |
| 9.80 | 65.7856 | 30.4462 |
| 10.00 | 67.0699 | 30.4377 |

'V-INFINITY $=30.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$

| $T \sim Y_{R S}$ | $\begin{gathered} Q= \\ R A D \end{gathered}$ | AU VEL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.00 | 67.0699 | 30.4377 |
| 11.0n | 73.4865 | 30.3997 |
| 12.00 | 79.8957 | 30.3679 |
| 13.00 | 86.298R | 30.3407 |
| 14.00 | 92.6965 | 30.3173 |
| 15.00 | 99.0897 | 30.2970 |
| 16.00 | 105.4788 | 30.2791 |
| 17.00 | 121.8644 | 30.2632 |
| 18.00 | 118.2468 | 30.2490 |
| 19.00 | 124.6264 | 30.2363 |
| 20.00 | 131.0035 | 30.2249 |
| 21.00 | 137.3783 | 30.2145 |
| 22.00 | 143.7510 | 30.2050 |
| 23.00 | 150.1218 | 30.1963 |
| 24.00 | 156.490R | 30.1894 |
| 25.00 | 162.8582 | 30.1810 |
| 26.00 | 169.2341 | 30.1742 |
| 27.00 | 175.5887 | 30.1679 |
| 2R.0n | 181.9519 | 30.1621 |
| 29.00 | 188. 3140 | 30.1566 |
| 30.00 | 194.6750 | 30.1515 |
| 31.00 | 201.0349 | 30.1467 |
| 32.00 | 207.393R | 30.1422 |
| 33.00 | 213.7518 | 30.1380 |
| 34.00 | 220.1090 | 30.1340 |
| 35.00 | 226.4654 | 20.1.303 |
| 36.00 | 232.8209 | 30.1267 |
| 37.00 | 239.1759 | 30.1234 |
| 38.00 | 245.5300 | 30.1202 |
| 39.00 | 251.8835 | 30.1172 |
| 40.00 | 259.2364 | 30.1143 |
| 41.00 | P64.5886 | 30.1116 |
| 42.00 | 270.9404 | 30.1089 |
| 43.00 | 277.2915 | 30.1065 |
| 44.00 | 283.642? | 30.1041 |
| 45.00 | 289.9924 | 30.1018 |
| 46.00 | 296.3422 | 30.0996 |
| 47.0n | 302.6914 | 30.0975 |
| 48.00 | 309.0403 | 30.0955 |
| 49.00 | 315.3887 | 30.0936 |
| 50.00 | 321.7367 | 30.0918 |
| 51.00 | 328.0844 | 30.0900 |
| 52.00 | . 34.4317 | 30.0 RA3 |
| 53.00 | 340.7786 | 30.0866 |
| 54.00 | $347.125 ?$ | 20.0851 |
| 55.00 | 353.4714 | 30.0835 |
| 56.00 | 359.8174 | 30.0821 |
| 57.00 | 366.1630 | 30.0807 |
| 58.00 | 372.5084 | 30.0793 |
| 59.00 | 378.8534 | 30.0780 |
| 60.00 | 385.1932 | 30.0767 |

V-INFINITY $=40.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$

|  | T - YRS | $\begin{gathered} 0= \\ R A D \end{gathered}$ | $.1 \text { AU }$ | $\begin{gathered} Q= \\ R A D \end{gathered}$ | AIJ VFL. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | . 00 | . 1000 | 139.0775 | -300n | 86. 5844 |
|  | . 20 | 2.4236 | 48.2917 | 2.3050 | 49.6799 |
|  | . 40 | 4.3647 | 44.7940 | 4.7320 | 44.9350 |
|  | . 60 | 6.2188 | 43.4201 | 6.0821 | 43.4930 |
|  | . 80 | 8.0316 | 42.6721 | 7.8925 | 43.7177 |
|  | 1.00 | 9.820 2 | 42.1981 | 9.6793 | $42.22^{9}$ |
|  | 1.20 | 11.5922 | 41.8675 | 11.4504 | 41.8921 |
|  | 1.47 | 13.3527 | 41.6278 | 13.7101 | 41.6451 |
|  | 1.60 | 15.1045 | 41.4423 | 14.061? | 41.4559 |
|  | 1.80 | 16.8493 | 41.2053 | 16.7056 | 41.3053 |
|  | 2.00 | 18.5886 | 41.1758 | 18.4445 | 41.1849 |
|  | 2.20 | 20.3234 | 41.0768 | 20.1790 | $41.08^{44}$ |
|  | $2.4 n$ | 22.0544 | 40.9933 | 21.9097 | 40.9098 |
|  | 2.60 | 23.7822 | 40.9219 | 23.637? | 4 n .9775 |
|  | 2.80 | 25.5072 | 40.8602 | 25.3620 | 40.8651 |
|  | 3.00 | 27.2299 | 40.8064 | 27.0845 | 40.8906 |
|  | 3.20 | 28.9502 | 40.7589 | 28.8049 | 40.7627 |
|  | 3.40 | 30.668R | 40.7167 | 30.5233 | 4n.72n1 |
|  | 3.60 | 32.3858 | 40.6790 | 32.340n | 4n.6871 |
|  | 3.80 | 34.1012 | 40.6452 | 33.0554 | 40.6479 |
|  | 4.00 | 35. $115 \%$ | 40.6145 | 35.6693 | $40.617 n$ |
|  | 4.20 | 37.5281 | 40.5867 | 37.3821 | 4n.5499 |
|  | 4.40 | 39.2308 | 40.5613 | 30.0937 | 4n.5633 |
| 6 | 4.60 | 40.9506 | 40.5380 | 40.8044 | 4n.5309 |
| 0 | 4.80 | 42.6603 | 40.5165 | 42.5141 | 4n.5983 |
|  | 5.00 | 44.3692 | 40.4968 | $44.223 n$ | 40.4084 |
|  | 5.20 | 46.0774 | 40.4785 | 45.0310 | 4n.48n号 |
|  | 5.40 | 47.7847 | 40.4615 | 47.6387 | 40.4620 |
|  | 5.60 | 49.4914 | 40.4456 | 49.3450 | 4n.4470 |
|  | $5 \cdot 80$ | 51.1975 | 40.4309 | 51.0510 | 40.4321 |
|  | 6.00 | 5P.9029 | 40.4271 | 52.7564 | $40.41^{\text {R2 }}$ |
|  | 6.20 | 54.6078 | 40.4041 | $54.461 ?$ | $40.405 ?$ |
|  | 6.40 | 56.3121 | 40.3919 | 56.1655 | 4n.39?9 |
|  | 6.60 | 5月.0160 | 40.3805 | 57.8697 | 4n.3914 |
|  | 6.80 | 59.7194 | 40.3697 | 59.5727 | 40.3706 |
|  | 7.00 | 61.4223 | 40.3595 | 61.2756 | 40.3603 |
|  | 7.20 | 63.1249 | 40.3498 | 62.9781 | 4n.3506 |
|  | 7.40 | 64.8270 | 40.3407 | 64.6807 | 40.3414 |
|  | 7.60 | 66.5288 | 40.3320 | 66.3819 | 40.3327 |
|  | 7.80 | 68.2302 | 40.3237 | 68.0133 | 40.3244 |
|  | 8.00 | 69.9312 | 40.3159 | 69.7844 | 40.3166 |
|  | 8.20 | 71.6320 | 40.3084 | 71.4851 | 40.3091 |
|  | 8.40 | 73.3324 | 40.3013 | 73.1855 | 40.3019 |
|  | 8.60 | 75.0326 | 40.2945 | 74.8856 | 40.2951 |
|  | 8.80 | 76.7324 | 40.2880 | 76.5855 | 40.2885 |
|  | 9.00 | 78.4320 | 40.2818 | 78.2850 | 4n.2823 |
|  | 9.20 | 80.1314 | 40.2758 | 79.9844 | 4 n .2763 |
|  | 9.40 | 81.8305 | 40.2701 | 81.6834 | 40.2706 |
|  | 9.60 | 83.5293 | 40.2646 | 83.3823 | 4n.2651 |
|  | 9.80 | 05.2279 | 40.2594 | 85.0809 | 40.2598 |
|  | 10.00 | 86.9264 | 40.2543 | 86.7793 | 40.2548 |


| PRW＊＊ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sate 033077 |  | DAGF 14 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $V-I N F I N Y T Y=40.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | T－ | $\begin{gathered} Q \\ \text { RAD } \end{gathered}$ | $\text { . } 1 \begin{gathered} A U \\ \\ V E L \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\text { RAD }}{Q}=$ | $.3 \mathrm{AU} \mathrm{VEL}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \operatorname{RAN} \end{gathered}$ | $.5 \text { AU VEL }$ | $\underset{\operatorname{RAn}}{0}=$ | $\stackrel{A 1 S}{V E L}$ | $\hat{R A D}^{n}=9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A! } \\ & \text { VEI. } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\operatorname{san}}{n}=$ | AIS VFI． |
|  | 10.00 | 86.9264 | 40.2543 | 86.7793 | 40.2548 | 86.6642 | 40.2551 | 86．4551 | 40.2557 | A6．p01R | 40.2585 | A5．0075 | 4n．9473 |
|  | 11.00 | 95.4155 | 40.2318 | 95.2684 | 40.2321 | 95.1531 | 40.2324 | 94.9435 | 40.2389 | 94.6881 | 4 n .23 .35 | 94.8759 | 4n．9343 |
|  | 12.00 | 103.9003 | 40.2129 | 103.7531 | 40.2132 | 103.6377 | 40.2134 | 103.4276 | 40.2139 | 103．17n6 | 40.2944 | 102.8471 | $4 n .9151$ |
|  | 13.00 | 112.3814 | 40.1969 | 112．2341 | 40.1971 | 112．1186 | 40.1973 | 111．ana？ | 40.1977 | 111.6498 | 40.1081 | 111．x166 | $4 n .1087$ |
|  | 14.00 | 120.8593 | 40.1831 | 120.7121 | 40.1833 | 120.5965 | 40.1835 | 120.3857 | 40.1838 | 120．1769 | $40.194 ?$ | 119.7847 | $4 n .1947$ |
|  | 15.00 | 129.3346 | 40.1711 | 129.1873 | 40.1713 | 129.0717 | 40.1715 | 128.8606 | 40.1717 | 12 c ．6nnn | 40.1721 | 178．9517 | 4 CH 1796 |
|  | 16.00 | 137.8075 | 40.1606 | 137．660） | 40.1608 | 137.5445 | 40.1609 | 137．333？ | $40.161 ?$ | 137.7715 | 40.1615 | 136.7167 | 45.1519 |
|  | 17.00 | 146.2784 | 40.1513 | 146．1310 | 40.1515 | 146.0153 | 40.1516 | 145．8037 | 47.1518 | 145．5414 | 4n．1591 | 145．98na | 40.1595 |
|  | 18.00 | 154.7474 | 40.1431 | 154．6000 | 40.1432 | 154．4842 | 40.1433 | 154.2724 | 47.1435 | 154．0794 | 40.1437 | 153．6439 | 40.1441 |
|  | 19.00 | 163.2147 | 40.1357 | 163．0673 | 40.1358 | 1 fr .9514 | 4 n .1350 | 162．7395 | 40.1360 | 162．475R | 47.1463 | 169．1050 | 4\％．176\％ |
|  | 20.00 | 171.6806 | 40.1290 | 171．5331 | 40.1291 | 171.4173 | 40.1998 | 171：2052 | 40.1973 | $170.94 n 9$ | 40.1795 | 17n．567n | 40.1908 |
|  | 21.00 | 180.1451 | 40.1229 | 179．9976 | 40.12 万 | 179．8817 | 40.1031 | 179．6695 | 4n．193？ | 179.4047 | 40.1284 | 179．nP72 | 4 n ＋10\％7 |
|  | 22.00 | 188.6084 | 40.1174 | 188.4609 | 40.1175 | 18 AR .345 n | $4 \pi .1176$ | 18R． 1378 | 40.1177 | 187．967\％ | $4 n .1179$ | 197．4866 | 4n．1191 |
|  | 23.00 | 197.0706 | 40.1124 | 196．9231 | 40.1125 | 106．Rn7s | 40.1125 | 196.5947 | $4 n .1197$ | 196． 72 Ra | 40.1178 | 195．0459 | 4n．1120 |
|  | 24.00 | 205．5318 | 40.1078 | 205．3843 | $4 \mathrm{n} .1 \mathrm{n}^{7} \mathrm{~A}$ | ？ 05.2683 | 40.1179 | 205.0557 | 4 n .10 R n | PR4．7896 | $40.1 n 89$ | 2n4．4n7n | 40.1 n24 |
|  | 25.00 | 213.9920 | 40.1035 | 213．8445 | 40.1035 | P13．72R5 | 40.1136 | 213．5158 | 40.1037 | 213．2407 | $4 n .1 n 30$ | 219．96ns | $4 n .1 n 4 t$ |
|  | 26.00 | 222.4514 | 40.0906 | 222．3039 | 40.0936 | 29P．1月7n | 40.0997 | 291．9750 | $4 \pi .0998$ | 221．7093 | $40 . n 909$ | 291．716a | 4n－inns |
|  | 27.00 | 230.9100 | 40.0959 | 23n．7624 | 40.0960 | 23n．6464 | 40.0960 | P30．4335 | $4 n .0061$ | P3n．1564 | 4n．naks | 330．779R | 4 n .0054 |
|  | 28.00 | 239.3678 | 40.0925 | 239．2207 | 40.0096 | 239．1042 | 40.0926 | 238．R912 | $4 n .0037$ | 238．6238 | 4 n ．naps | 23R．アPR | $4 n .0 n \times n$ |
|  | 29.00 | 247．8250 | 40.0894 | 247.6774 | 40.0894 | 247．5613 | 40.0895 | 247．74R3 | 40.0896 | 247．n8nk | 40.0897 | 246.69831 | 4n．mana |
|  | 30.00 | 256． 2815 | 40.0864 | 256.1339 | 40.0865 | 256．0178 | 40.0965 | 255．8047 | 4 n ． $\mathrm{HRG6}$ | 255.5367 | $4 n \cdot n$ R67 | 255．1576 | 4 H ． Hag a |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{v}$ | 31.00 | 264.7374 | 40.0837 | 264.5898 | 40.0837 | 264.4737 | 40.083 P | ？64．2505 | $4 \pi$, HRTA | 263．992＊ | $4 n .0 n 89$ | 263．2015 | 4 n .1041 |
|  | 32.00 | 273.1928 | 40.0811 | 273．045？ | 40.0811 | 272．979n | $40.081 ?$ | 272.7158 | $4 n .781{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 273．4474 | 4 n ．n913 |  | $4 n . n$ n14 |
|  | 33.00 | 281.6476 | 40.0787 | 281．5000 | 40.0787 | 2R1．383R | 40.0787 | 281.1705 | 4 n ． 1278 R | 280．0010 | 40.7789 | PRn．4081 | $40 . n \rightarrow 00$ |
|  | 34.00 | 290.1019 | 40.0764 | 289．9543 | 40.0764 | P80．8381 | 40.0764 | PR9．f248 | 40.0765 | 289，356n | 40.0765 | 2RR．05AR | 4n．n767 |
|  | 35.00 | 298.9558 | 40.0742 | 298．408？ | 40.0743 | 299．2020 | 40.0743 | 29R．n7as | 40.0743 | 297．8nak | $4 n .0744$ | 297．4071 | 4 n ．n745 |
|  | 36.00 | 307．0092 | 40.0722 | 306．8615 | $40.072 ?$ | 3n6． 7454 | $40.072 ?$ | 306.5319 | 40.0793 | 306．7697 | 40.07794 | 305．8551 | 40.0724 |
|  | 37.00 | 315.4622 | $40.07 n 2$ | 315.3146 | $4 n .0703$ | 315.1983 | 47.0703 | 314.9848 | $40.07 \pi 3$ | 314.7155 | 40.0784 | 314．2067 | $4 n .07045$ |
|  | 38.00 | 323.9148 | 40.0684 | 323.7671 | 40.0684 | 373.6509 | 40.0685 | 323.4374 | 4 n .06 A 5 | 723.1670 | 40．n6at | 392．754n | 4 n －n697 |
|  | 39.00 | 332.3670 | 40.0667 | 332.2194 | 40.0667 | 7x2．1n31 | 40.0667 | $331.989_{6}$ | 4 n ． 066 R | 721．6199 |  | $33^{3} .300 n$ | 4 n －nFiga |
|  | 40.00 | 340．9189 | 40.0650 | 340．671？ | 40.0650 | 34n．5550 | 40.0651 | 34n． 3414 | 40.0651 | 340.7715 | 4n．065\％ | 339.5505 |  |
|  | 41.00 | 349．2704 | 40.0634 | 349.1227 | 40.0635 | 349．0n65 | 40.0635 | 348．7928 | 4 n 0665 | 348．5290 | 4n．nakg | 348．11 10 | 4 n ，nam 7 |
|  | 42.00 | 357.7216 | 40.0620 | 357.5739 | 40.0690 | 357.4577 | $40.062 n$ | 357.2440 | 4 n － 5690 | 256，9739 | 4n－nfit | K5¢．56n？ | 40.0639 |
|  | 43.00 | 366.1725 | 40.0605 | 366.0248 | 40.0605 | 365．9nR6 | 4 H .0 ¢ng | 365.6948 | 4 n －n6ng | 365，4246 | 4n．nang | 365．0101 | 4 n ．nant |
|  | 44.00 | 374.6231 | 49.0592 | 374.4754 | $40.059 ?$ | 374.3591 | $40.059 ?$ | 374.1454 | 40.0159 | ＊73．8751 | 40.0608 | 373.4507 | 4 n ．n50x |
|  | 45.00 | 383.0734 | 40.0579 | 382，9257 | 40.0579 | 389.8094 | $40 . n 570$ | 382．5957 | 40.0579 | 382．375？ | 40.0588 | 721．0001 | 4 n ．neRn |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 46.00 | 391.5234 | 40.0566 | 391．3758 | 40.0565 | 301.2595 | 40.0566 | 391.0457 | 40.0567 | 390.7751 | 40.06667 |  | 4 nonkRa |
|  | 47.00 48.00 | 399.9732 408.4228 | 40.0554 40.0543 | 399.8256 408.2751 | 40.0554 40.0543 | $300.7 n 93$ 408.1588 | $4 n .0 n 554$ $4 n .0543$ | 399.4054 477.9449 | 40.0555 40.0543 | 309.7248 407.674 | 40.7555 40.0944 | 308． 2077 477.9559 | $4 n \cdot n 555$ $4 n .0544$ |
|  | 49.00 | 416.8721 | 40.0532 | 416，7244 | 4n．053？ | 416．6n81 | 40.053 ？ | 416.3947 | 40.0538 | 416．1234 | 40．05z3 | 415．7n44 | 4n．n5³ |
|  | 50.00 | 425.3212 | 40.0521 | 425.1735 | 40.0521 | 425．0578 | 40.0521 | 474．A43？ | 40.0592 | 424．572\％ | 40．05？ | 434．1598 | 4 n ．ncos |
|  | 51.00 | 433.7700 | 40.0511 | 433．6223 | 4 n .051 .1 | 433.5060 | 40.0511 | 433．2921 | 40.0512 | 433．n211 | $4 \mathrm{CaF1} \mathrm{\%}$ | 432．anna | 4nonct？ |
|  | 52.00 | 442.2187 | 40.0501 | 442．0710 | 40.0501 | 441.9547 | $40.05 \pi 2$ | 441．7407 | 4n．05n？ | 441.4606 | 4 n －n5n？ | 441．n4R9 | 4n．nans |
|  | 53.00 | 450.6671 | 40.0492 | 450.5194 | 40．049？ | 450.4031 | 40.0498 | 450.1801 | 4non49？ | 449.9179 | 40.01103 | 449．4968 | 4 n .01103 |
|  | 54.00 | 459.1154 | 40.0483 | 458，9677 | $40.04{ }^{\text {P3 }}$ | 458.8514 | 40.0483 | 458．6373 | 110.0483 | 458.3669 | 40.0484 | 457．0448 | 4 n ．n4R4 |
|  | 55.00 | 467.5635 | 40.0474 | 467．4158 | 40.0474 | 467.9994 | 40.0474 | 467.0854 | 40.0475 | 466．R14n | 40.7475 | 46F． 7017 | 40.01275 |
|  | 56.00 | 476.0114 | 40.0466 | 475，8636 | 40.0465 | 475．7473 | 40.0466 | 475.5332 | 40.0466 | 475，P69R | 40.0466 | 474．a3an | 40.04467 |
|  | 57.00 | 484.4591 | 40.0458 | 484.3114 | 40.0458 | 484.1050 | 40.0458 | 483．9809 | 4 n ． 0458 | 4R3．70a4 | 40.0459 | 4R才．गRA | 4 n ．n459 |
|  | 58．0n | 492.9066 | 40.0450 | 492．75Ra | 40.0450 | $49 P .6425$ | 40.0450 | 492.4284 | 17.0450 | 492.1569 | 4 n .0450 |  | 4 n ． 1451 |
|  | 59.00 | 501.3540 | $4 \pi .044$ ？ | 501．206 | 40.0442 | 501．n499 | $40.044 ?$ | 5no．R75R | $4 \pi .0443$ | 507.6042 | 40.1443 | 500．180n | $4 n .0 n 43$ |
|  | 60.00 | 509.8012 | 40.0435 | 509.6535 | 40.0435 | 509.5371 | 40．0435 | 509.3230 | 40.7435 | 509.0513 | 40.0435 | 508．6P67 | $4 n .04 * 6$ |

$V-$ INFINITY $=50.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$

| $T-Y R S$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { RAO } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| . 00 | .1000 |
| . 20 | 2.7095 |
| . 40 | 5.0041 |
| . 60 | 7.2315 |
| -80 | 9.4283 |
| 1.00 | 11.6073 |
| 1.20 | 13.7746 |
| 1.40 | 15.9336 |
| 1.60 | 1R.0864 |
| 1.80 | 20.2344 |
| $2 \cdot 00$ | 22.3786 |
| 2.20 | 24.5197 |
| 2.40 | 26.6581 |
| $2 \cdot 60$ | 28.794 3 |
| 2.80 | 30.9287 |
| 3.00 | 33.0614 |
| 3.20 | 35.1926 |
| 3.40 | 37.3226 |
| 3.60 | 39.4514 |
| 3.80 | 41.5793 |
| 4.00 | 43.7062 |
| 4.20 | 45.8323 |
| 4.40 | 47.9577 |
| 4.50 | 50.0824 |
| 4.80 | 52.2064 |
| $5.0 n$ | 54.3299 |
| 5.20 | 56.452R |
| 5.40 | 58.5753 |
| 5.60 | 60.6973 |
| 5.80 | 62.8188 |
| 6.00 | 64.9400 |
| 6.20 | 67.0608 |
| 6.40 | 69.1812 |
| 6.60 | 71.3013 |
| 6.80 | 73.4211 |
| $7 \cdot 00$ | 75.5406 |
| 7.20 | 77.6599 |
| 7.40 | 79.7788 |
| 7.60 | 81.8975 |
| 7.80 | 84.0160 |
| 8.00 | 86. 1343 |
| 8.20 | 88. 2523 |
| 8.40 | 90.3702 |
| 8.60 | 92.4879 |
| 8.80 | 94.6053 |
| 9.00 | 96.7226 |
| 9.20 | 98.8397 |
| 9.40 | 100.9567 |
| 9.60 | 103.0735 |
| 9.80 | 105.1902 |
| 10.00 | 107.3067 |

$V$ INFINITY $=50.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$
$r-Y R S \quad \begin{array}{ll} & Q=-1 \text { AU } \\ \text { RAD }\end{array}$

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10.00 | 107.3067 |
| 11.00 | 117.8874 |
| 12.00 | 128.4652 |
| 13.00 | 139.0406 |
| 14.00 | 149.6140 |
| 15.00 | 160.1856 |
| 16.00 | 170.7556 |
| 17.00 | 181.3243 |
| 18.00 | 191.8918 |
| 19.00 | 202.4583 |
| 20.00 | 213.0237 |
| 21.00 | 223.5883 |
| 22.00 | 234.1521 |
| 23.00 | 244.7152 |
| 24.00 | 255.2777 |
| 25.00 | 265.8395 |
| 26.00 | 276.4008 |
| 27.00 | 286.9615 |
| 28.00 | 297.5218 |
| 29.00 | 308.016 |
| 30.00 | 318.6410 |
| 31.00 | 329.2000 |
| 32.00 | 339.7587 |
| 33.00 | 350.3170 |
| 34.00 | 360.8750 |
| 35.00 | 371.4327 |
| 36.00 | 381.9901 |
| 37.00 | 392.5472 |
| 38.00 | 403.1041 |
| 39.00 | 413.6607 |
| 40.00 | 424.2171 |
| 41.00 | 434.7733 |
| 42.00 | 445.3293 |
| 43.00 | 455.8851 |
| 44.00 | 466.4406 |
| 45.00 | 476.9961 |
| 46.00 | 487.5513 |
| 47.00 | 498.1063 |
| 48.00 | 508.6613 |
| 49.00 | 519.2160 |
| 50.00 | 529.7706 |
| 51.00 | 540.3251 |
| 52.00 | 550.8794 |
| 53.00 | 561.4336 |
| 54.00 | 571.9877 |
| 55.00 | 582.5416 |
| 56.00 | 593.0955 |
| 57.00 | 603.6492 |
| 58.00 | 614.2028 |
| 69.00 | 624.7563 |
| 60.00 | 635.3098 |
| 10 |  | 50.1651 50.1503

50.1379 50.1274
$\underset{\text { RAD }}{\theta=}$
3 AU VEL $\quad \theta=.5 \mathrm{AU}$
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { RAN } & \text { VEL }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}50.1184 & 149.4851\end{array}$ 5n．1504 107．nR45 117．6R50 $50.12^{76}$ 13R．818n $\begin{array}{ll}50.1186 & 149.3913\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}50.1107 & 159.9628\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}50.11079 & 170.532 R\end{array}$ 50.0924 191．6689 $\begin{array}{ll}50.0876 & 202.2353 \\ 50.0833 & 212.8007\end{array}$ 50.0793 2？3．3653 50．0758 233.9790 $\begin{array}{ll}51.0758 & 243.9290 \\ 50.0725 & 244.4921\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}50.1695 & 255.0545 \\ 50.0657 & 255.6163\end{array}$ 50．064？？76．1775
 50.0596297 .2085 50.0576 50.0557 50.0539 50.0506 37．5353 50.0492 550．0936 50.047 B 371．2n93 50.0454 3R1．2193 50.0452 3aの． 5237 50.0440 4n？．8206 50.0429413 .4373 50.0418 50.0418 $50.0408 \quad 434.5498$ $50.039 \mathrm{R} \quad 445.1$ 17R $50.0389 \quad 455.6616$ 5n．0380 466．2171 50.0372476 .7725 50．0354 487．327A 50．0356 497．RR2R 50．0349 50～．4377 5n．034？518．9925 50.0335 50.0335529 .5471 5n．03P8 540.1015 50.0322550 .6558 $50.0316 \quad 561.2100$ 50.0310571 .7641 50.0305 5R2．31A1 50.0299597 .8719 50.0294603 .4256 50.0299613 .9792 50.0294624 .5327 50.0279 635． 2 RE
50.1654 106．0759 50.1654
50.1506 50.13 AR
50.137 F 50.1186 $\begin{array}{ll}50.1186 & 149.7312 \\ 50.110 \mathrm{~A} & 159.8 n 22\end{array}$ 50.110 R 159．8R25 $50.1 n 39$ 170．3723 $\begin{array}{ll}50.0979 & 180.0407 \\ 50.0925 & 101.5080\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}50.0925 & 191.508 n \\ 50.0877 & 2 n 2 . n 743\end{array}$ 5n．ก13\％212．6396 50.0794 5n．075R 233．7677 5n． 11725 244．33n7 5n．तद75 $254.892 \pi$ 5n．OFGR PG5．4547 50．n64？ 376.0150 50．061A 2RG．5765 5 n．0．096 297．1367 50.0576 3n7．6965 50.0557 50.0557 50.0539 5n．n52？ $3 \times 2.8148$ 5n．0507 340．9316 50.1492 360．4996 $50.0478 \quad 371.0478$ 50.0465 389．047？ 5n．045？3R1．6045 50.044 n 302．1616 50.0429413 .2750 50．041A 423．9314 50.040 H 44.3876 50.039 A 444.9435 $50.039 R \quad 444.9435$ 5n． 1838 455．499？ $\begin{array}{ll}50.0381 & 466.014 R \\ 50.037 ? & 476.6102\end{array}$ $50.0764 \quad 487.1654$ 50．0356 497．79n4 50．0ス40 508．2753 5n．0ヶ4？51R．87n 50.0935 ．539．3846 50.072 F 59.9790 50．0ネアR 539．999ก $\begin{array}{ll}5 \text { 0．032？} & 550.4933 \\ 50.0316 & 561.0475\end{array}$ $50.0716 \quad 561.0475$ $50.0310 \quad 571.6016$ $50.07 \pi 5$ 5R2． 1555 50.0290 592．709\％ 5n． 0794 6n3．263n 5n．02RO 617．R166 5n．02R4 634．37n1 50.0279634 .9235
5ก．1657 1067467 5n．15n9 106．7467 117.3240 50.177 A $13 A .4749$ 5n． 11 Rタ $149.047 n$ 50.1109159 .6175 50.1040 17n．1RFR $\begin{array}{ll}50 . n 99 n & 18 n .7545 \\ 50 . n 026 & 191.3217\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}50 . n 076 & 191.3217 \\ 5 n .0877 & 201.887 n\end{array}$ 50．nR34 312.451 A 5n．0704 ？2＊． 1159 5n．0759 $3 \pi 3.5799$ 50.0796244 .1418 5ก．ก696 954．7nzの 5n．nfigh 265．Р659 50． 06 fit？ 275.9267 5 5．nf19 PRG．उRAK 5त．0597 296．046k 5 5．n576＊n7．5n6i 5п． 5557 ₹18．n65＊ 5ก．ก5ア9 xว9．674n 5 n． 1523 339．18＞5 $50.0507 \quad 3497406$ 5n． 149 ？xin 29 p4 $50.0478 \quad 37 ก .8599$ 50.0465 3R1．4131 50.0459 291．07nत 50． 0440 407．5？67 5n．nupa 413．nイz？ 5月．1141月 423．お行 50．ก4n8 434.1955 50.0390444 .7514 5n．n389 455． $217 n$ $\begin{array}{ll}50 . n 2 R 1 & 465.8675 \\ 50.027 ? & 476.4177\end{array}$ $50.037 ? 476.4177$
 50． 1 756 407．527A 5n．nx49 5nR．nApA 5n．n342 518．6377 5n．0735 529．199A 5n．ñクロ 5\％9．74к刀 5n．nxp？550． 3 nn4 $50 . n 716$ 560．8545 $\begin{array}{ll}5 n .0310 & 571.4 n 85 \\ 5 n .02 n 5 & 581.9624\end{array}$ 5ก． n 9 a 9 592．5162 5n． 1794 кп3．nGaR 5n．nPRq 617．6234 50．nPR4 624．176月 5n． 10279 634．73n？
50.1659
$5 n .1659$
$5 n .1590$ $\underset{\text { DAD }}{\sim}$ M 19.1974 50．1ห月5 197．6946 5N．ITRN 138．2611 50.1189 50.1110 14 A .8267
159.297 50.1041169 .0559 mnenari lRn．EIol 5n．กap7 191．nRつ\％
 5n．na34 ？1？．0n64 En．ก7a5 P3p．7677 50.0759 $50 . n 726$ 5n•กロロ
 5n．nffr 265 nnal 50．n64 275.5673 50．nfin pRf．175a 5n．0597 p96．6847 5n．n577 3 ก7．04つけ 5n．ก55タ $317.20 n 3$ 5n． 1540 50.05 5ス 5n．n5n7 33R．a15n 5n．ก5ก7 240．4719 5n．nル9？3fn．nวR7 $5 n .0478 \quad 370.5 R 57$ $\begin{array}{ll}51.0465 & 3 A_{1} .1414 \\ 50.0459 & 299.6075\end{array}$ 5n．n45 591.6075 50.0441 4n2．2574 5n．ก14＞0 4t2．8nロ1 5n．0419 473．2546 5n．П4nR 4x\％．0100
 5n．0290 45天．nzan 5n．0290 45K．n2nn
 5n．ñद4 4Rf．6941 5n．0256 407．24R5 5n．ก249 5n7．RกつR

 $5 ก .0399530 .4649$ 50．กスのค 55n． 1 197 $\begin{array}{ll}5 n . n x 2 ? & 55 n \cdot n 187 \\ 5 n . n \pi 16 & 56 n .5794\end{array}$ $5 n .0316 \quad 56 n .5734$ 50．0र17 571．176n
 5n．nクQ4 fn？．TRKi
 5n．nつA4 6P3．2924 5n． 0279 634．4454

5月．1RR？ 5n．1543 5n．17月A 5n．19R？ 5n．1191 5n．111？ 5n．in 43 5n．noss 5n．nors 5n．nora
 5n．nフas 5n． 0 フィス 5n． 1 プフ 5n． 1 フラ 5 n ． 1507 5n．nfイa 5n．nfily
5n．nx？
 5n，nenR 5n．n5ク7
5n．n55R 5n，n55R 5n．ncun
5n．nne？ 5n，n5：3 5n，n5n7 5n．nuas 5．nu79 5月．niff 5n． 1453 5n． 51441 5n．$n 430$ 5n． 1419 5n．n4na 5n．nyoa 5n．$n$ yoa そn．$n$ そon 5n． 0 スR1 5n，ก27？ $5 n . n 354$ 50. nx57 50.0749 50．nर4？ 5n．n¥35 5n．nマクの 5n．nマク？ 5n．nर？ 5n．nश1！ 5n．n711 5n．ñn5 5n．$n$ フロa $5 n .1204$ 5n．nのR9
 5n．nsan
$\begin{array}{llll}60.00 & 635.3098 & 50.0284 & 624.6271 \\ & 50.0279 & 635.1805\end{array}$

VMINFINITY $=60.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$

| $T-Y_{R S}$ | $\begin{gathered} Q= \\ R A D \end{gathered}$ | -1 AU | $\begin{gathered} Q= \\ R A D \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 00 | .1000 | 146.09no | . 300 n |
| - 20 | 3.0269 | 64.7005 | 2.9354 |
| . 40 | 5.6975 | 62.5413 | 5.5961 |
| . 60 | 8.3159 | 61.7524 | 8.2110 |
| . 80 | 10.9109 | 61.3401 | 10. 2047 |
| 1.00 | 13.4926 | 61.0860 | 13.3849 |
| 1.20 | 16.0656 | 60.9134 | 15.9572 |
| 1.40 | 18.6325 | 60.7884 | 18.5236 |
| 1.60 | 21.1940 | 60.6936 | 21.0855 |
| 1.80 | 23.7538 | 60.6193 | 23.6441 |
| 2.00 | 26.3099 | 60.5594 | 26.1990 |
| 2.20 | 28.8637 | 60.5101 | 2R.753 6 |
| 2.40 | 31.4157 | 67.4688 | 31.305* |
| 2.60 | 33.9660 | 60.4337 | 33.8555 |
| 2.80 | 36.5150 | 60.4036 | 36.4044 |
| 3.00 | 39.0628 | 60.3773 | 38.9521 |
| $3.2 n$ | 41.6096 | 60.3543 | 41.4987 |
| 3.40 | 44.1554 | 60.3339 | 44.0445 |
| 3.60 | 46.7005 | 60.3158 | 45.5895 |
| 3.80 | 49.2448 | 60.2095 | 49.1338 |
| 4.00 | 51.7885 | 60.2448 | 51.6774 |
| 4.20 | 54.3316 | 60.2715 | 54.2204 |
| 4.40 | 56.8742 | 60.2594 | 56.7629 |
| 4.60 | 59.4162 | $60.24 \mathrm{A3}$ | 59.3050 |
| 4.80 | 61.9579 | 60.2382 | 61.8466 |
| 5.00 | 64.4991 | 60.2988 | 64.3877 |
| 5.20 | 67.0399 | 50.2201 | 66.9286 |
| 5.40 | 69.5804 | 60.2121 | 69.4697 |
| 5.60 | 72.1206 | 60.2047 | 72.009? |
| 5.80 | 74.6605 | 60.1977 | 74.5400 |
| 6.00 | 77.2001 | 60.1912 | 77. ก895 |
| 6.20 | 79.7394 | 60.1851 | 79.6.278 |
| 6.40 | 82.2784 | 60.1794 | $82.166^{\circ}$ |
| 6.60 | 84.8173 | 60.1741 | 84.7057 |
| 6.80 | 87.3559 | 6it. 1690 | 87.2443 |
| 7.00 | 89.8943 | 60.1643 | 89.7827 |
| 7.20 | 92.4325 | 60.1597 | 92.3200 |
| 7.40 | 94.9706 | 60.1555 | 94. 8580 |
| 7.60 | 97.508.4 | 60.1514 | 97. 296R |
| 7.80 | 100.0461 | 60.1476 | 99.9344 |
| 8.00 | 102.5837 | 60.1440 | 102.4720 |
| 8.20 | 105.1210 | 60.1405 | 105.009 |
| 8.40 | 107.6583 | 60.1372 | 107.5466 |
| B. 60 | 110.1954 | 60.1340 | 110.0837 |
| 8.80 | 112.7324 | 60.1310 | 112.6206 |
| 9.00 | 115.2692 | 60.1281 | 115.1575 |
| 9.20 | 117.8060 | 60.1254 | 117.694? |
| 9.40 | 120.3426 | 60.1227 | 120.2308 |
| 9.60 | 122.8791 | 60.1202 | 122.7673 |
| 9.80 | 125.4155 | 60.1178 | 125.3037 |
| 10.00 | 127.9518 | 60.1154 | 127.8400 |

$V$-INFINITY $=60.0 \mathrm{KM} / \mathrm{S}$




[^0]:    Pluto
    If a Pluto flyby is contemplated, measurements should include optical observations of the planet to determine its diameter, surface and atmosphere features, and an optical search for and observations of any satellites or rings. Atmospheric density, temperature and composition should be measured,

[^1]:    * Significant technology advancement required.
    $\dagger$ Not part of baseline mission.

