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## Purpose of Task

- Projected growth in demand will make it increasingly hard to accommodate launches on a SUA basis
- Looking for a more rational approach that:
- can adapt to fluctuating frequency of launches
- can accommodate uncertainties in trajectories
- ensures proper separation at all times
- can be integrated with FAA's NextGen system


## Research Objectives

1. Develop plausible architectures for an Integrated Airspace Management System (IAMS)
2. Research and develop the foundation of such a tool based on time-space probabilistic trajectories
3. Greate a prototype implementation for a proof-ofconcept system

- During first few months, we are focusing on item 2


## Methodology \& Results

- Problem:
- Need Special Use Airspace (SUA) for rocket launch
- Current method for creating SUA may be overly conservative
- Fairness issues are we favoring one industry over another?
- No quantitative framework for creating SUAS
- Proposed Solution:
- Greate a probabilistic framework for creating SUAs to a specified level of safety


## Conceptual Framework



Time

## Initial Research Goals

- Focus on:
$\checkmark$ Investigate ways in which a compact 4D envelope can be created and specified
$\checkmark$ Demonstrate the 4 D envelope concept in $3 D(x, y, t)$
$\checkmark$ Begin creating a software architecture that generates 4-D envelopes for specific launch profiles
$\checkmark$ Use Monte Carlo simulation to approximate the rocket location PDF, sampled at many points, to a given level of safety
- Provide hooks for, but do not spend significant time on (refined later):
- Accurate characterization of weather profiles, failure modes and probabilities, debris model


## Nominal Trajectory

- 2-D round rotating Earth
- Propagate $r, V, \varphi, y$
- SSTO launch vehicle
- Optimal trajectory has thrust vectoring (T T )
- Aerodynamic effects are roughly modeled


Source: Capristan, F. "Aerodynamic Effects in Launch Vehicle Optimal Trajectories"

## Weather Uncertainty



20\% Uncertainty in Wind Velocity

Random Wind Profiles for 100 random runs


## Creates Drag Uncertainty

$$
C_{D}=(2-\cos \alpha) \frac{0.4750 M_{\infty}^{2}-0.7127 M_{\infty}+0.3049}{M_{\infty}^{2}-1.914 M_{\omega}+1.042}
$$



## Uncertain Lift-off Time



- Rockets do not always launch on time

One-sided, multi-modal pdf

## Failure Uncertainty



## What We've Got So Far

- Software framework that accepts arbitrary:
- Thrust profiles (TVC, etc)
- Weather profiles for wind and temperature, with uncertainty parameters for each
- Failure parameters and distributions
- Debris model
- Outputs:

- Collection of uncertain trajectories with debrisgenerating failure events from a MC simulation


## 4D Probabilistic Trajectories and Envelopes

- Trajectories as points in space and time
- Risk level of $10^{\wedge}-10$, approximated with MC
- How do we turn this set of trajectories into something useful?
- Methods Available
- Level Sets
- Delauney Triangulation
- Convex Hülls
- Non-convex Footprints


## Swinging Arm

- Generates multiple disconnected "footprints"
- Non-convex, non-regular polygon
- Creates groupings that visually appear more accurate
- Generalizes up to 3D
- Arm short enough multiple footprints


Source: Galton, A. "What is the region occupied by a set of points?"

- Cons:
- Non-regular polygons


## Footprint Example



## Footprint Example

## Making the next footprint

- Arm length short enough, get multiple footprints
- Remove interior and boundary points
- Crossings:
-. Odd is in
- Even is out


An Early Footprint

## Footprint Through NAS (L=40km)

Footprint Through NAS (L=4km)

Footprint Through NAS (L=2km)

## Volume Savings

- Tube: $51,400 \mathrm{~km} 2 \mathrm{sec}$
- Conservative. No safety factors.
- Convex $15,300 \mathrm{~km} 2 \mathrm{sec}$
- $30 \%$ of the original volume
- Footprint 2 km arm 6,500 km2 sec
- Only $13 \%$ of the original volume!


# . Conclusions \& Future Work 

- Code accepts arbitrary thrust, weather, and failure profiles for Monte Carlo simulation of uncertain trajectories
- Creates multiple polygonal envelopes around the trajectories (and debris) that represent a no fly zone
- Demonstrates the possibility of significant volume (area*sec) savings over conventional tube approach
- Future Work
- Full 4 D (Swinging Slab)

- Accurate weather and debris models with uncertainty
- Active control in rocket during ascent and staging
- Integration with NASA's FACET tool for scenarios with
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## Backup Slides

Level Sets


Useful for visualizing dynamic interfaces

- N Dimensional surface is slice of an $(\mathrm{N}+1) \mathrm{D}$ function
- Easily handles pinching and merging interfaces
- Set operations are easy

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Level_set method

## Level Set Example

- Hard to create the distance function
- Finding the area enclosed is not straightforward
- Allows holes within the boundary
- Slow


## Delauney Triangulation



Source: Galton, A. "What is the region occupied by a set of points?"

- Overview
- Connect all dots with series of triangles
- Remove boundary edges
- Generates single connected regular polygon
- Cons:
- Want to eliminate most points! Worth it?
- Creates a single shape


## Convex Hulls

- Easy to generate
- Wastes a lot of space
- Only get one shape
- Can get these with footprint methods



## Swinging Arm Algorithm

- Order all points from top to bottom, right to left.
- Set all points as available and pick an arm length
- Store top-right available point in footprint and set it as current point:
- Swing the arm clockwise from current point until it hits another point
- Store this point as being in the footprint and set it as the new current point
- Repeat until current point - starting point
- Set all points that form or are interior to the footprint as 'unavailable'
- Repeat until all points are unavailable
- XXXX

