

- Previous studies of artificial gravity implementation on human spacecraft have produced large, heavy vehicle concepts.
- These previous concepts were driven primarily by a low rotation rate (~4 rpm) that was considered the human tolerance limit and the need for continuous exposure of the crewmember to artificial gravity.
- The Human Research Program (HRP) is formulating a series of experiments to gather more data on the effectiveness of centripetal artificial gravity as an adaptive countermeasure. ("Artificial Gravity" in this presentation refers to centripetal force applied to a crewmember.)
- If these experiments provide data that support relaxation of the rotational rate constraint as well as other parameters such as the duration a crewmember needs to be exposed to artificial gravity and the allowable acceleration gradient across the body, the vehicle design trade space to implement artificial gravity widens dramatically.
- This presentation summarizes the results of a study undertaken to determine if artificial gravity could be implemented in a human spacecraft concept in the near term (i.e. within 10 years).
- The study team concluded that with a relaxation of the constraints, there are conceptual designs for pressurized elements and spacecraft that could accommodate centripetal artificial gravity.

<u>GOAL:</u> Based on a set of proposed artificial gravity needs for deep space exploration, develop concepts that show how artificial gravity might be incorporated into a spacecraft in the near term (i.e. ten years)

**DRIVERS:** To be effective, accelerations produced by an artificial gravity system must be directed through the feet.



The artificial gravity system must produce 1g acceleration at the body c.g.

The gradient of the induced acceleration from head-to-toe should be minimized.

The duration of artificial gravity exposure is assumed to be no greater than 1.5 hours/day per crewmember. This includes activation and deactivation of hardware.

Angular motion of the head that is not parallel to the spin axis will cause cross-coupled angular accelerations which can result in disorientation.

Adaptation to artificial gravity could be accomplished by slowly increasing the levels that the subject is exposed to over time.

The acceleration at the feet must be less than 2 g's.

Exercise or other crew activities are not required to be performed during the Artificial Gravity exposure period.

The team initially looked at the design drivers when considering both rigid and inflatable pressurized structures to incorporate an artificial gravity system. These design drivers include:

- The internal diameter of the pressure shell.
- The volume limitations inside the shroud of the launch vehicle.
- The lift capability of the launch vehicle.
- The need to isolate the artificial gravity system from other parts of the vehicle to avoid excessive vibration.
- The potential for a testbed to be incorporated into ISS.
- The extensibility of this concept across multiple human spacecraft.
- The angular velocity required to achieve the required acceleration at the body c.g.

This feasibility study assessed artificial gravity implementations for both rotating a human inside a pressurized element or rotating an entire transiting spacecraft.

The concepts are also intended to demonstrate that an artificial gravity implementation as part of a spacecraft appears feasible in the near-term (i.e. within ten years).

• Launch Vehicle Payload Envelope and Mass Constraints:







- attenuation)
  - inimum Payload Atlach Ting Envelope

- Al dimensions in m
- Height of the spacecraft separation/interface plane depends on spacecraft/FAF attach diameter and FAF cone angle
- Spacecrait appendages projecting below spacecrait interface plane may be permitted; coordinate with SLS/SPIE





- The currently proposed payload envelopes for the Space Launch System impose constraints on the diameter of a rigid module.
- The payload mass is also limited to about 20t to Cis-Lunar space for a dedicated SLS cargo flight.
  - An SLS cargo flight to Low-Earth Orbit would allow for greater mass, but the payload envelope constraint would remain.

Rotation Rate in rpm vs. Radius at Body CG for 1g at Body c.g. 36 33 30 27 Rotation Rate, rpm 12 15 15 Experiments will determine human operating limit. Below 9 rpm it takes 9 a significant increase 6 4 rpm – Previously discussed in radius to reduce 3 human operating limit the rotation rate. 0 7.4 7.8 7.8 8.6 9.4 9.8 10.2 3.4 3.8 4.2 4.6 5.4 5.4 5.8 6.2 6.0 0.82 2.2 2.6 1.8 3 11.4 11 11.8 Radius at Body C.G.

Increasing the allowable rotation rate significantly reduces the required radius of rotation which makes spacecraft configurations incorporating artificial gravity more feasible.

Gradient across body vs Radius to body c.g. for 1g at body c.g.



g's at the head and feet vs radius to the body c.g. for 1g at the body c.g.



Radius in meters to the body c.g. for 1g at the body c.g.

- If it is possible to reduce the rotation radius to the minimum required to satisfy both human health and human performance requirements, artificial gravity implementation in a spacecraft becomes less costly and complex.
- These graphs indicate that a very large centrifuge (greater than 6.0 meters radius) is not required to provide 25% gradient across the body.
- At 6.0 meter radius the g-levels are approximately 1.18 g's at the feet and 0.89 g's at the head for 1g at the body centerof-gravity.

#### Example ISS Frequency Interactions:

Frequency Ranges of Interest 4rpm = .07 Hz 12rpm = .20 Hz 15rpm = .25 Hz Stride Frequency (lower) = 3.90 Hz Stride Frequency (upper) = 5.30 Hz

> Interpretation: Highly likely that an AG system can find an operating frequency to reduce structural interaction although isolation would likely still be required.



RPM





Note: Actual ISS frequencies and sensitivities are dependent on configuration and disturbance location.

#### **Example:** ISS Sudden Stop Sensitivity:

Frequency Ranges of Interest 4rpm = .07 Hz 12rpm = .20 Hz 15rpm = .25 Hz Stride Frequency (lower) = 3.90 Hz Stride Frequency (upper) = 5.30 Hz

Note: Actual ISS frequencies and sensitivities are dependent on configuration and disturbance location.

CAM Rotor Sudden Stop Sensitivity 1000 in-# Square Wave MZ Input to CAM CR 15rpm 100.0 % Load/Limit Load 50.0 % 4rpm 12rpm Peak ISS 0.0% 5 10 20 15 Input Pulse Duration

Interpretation: It is highly likely that an AG system undergoing a sudden stop could adversely affect ISS without mitigation.

1000 in-lb torque for 150lb person at 4m radius rotating at  $\omega$ Hz and stopping in *t* seconds:

1000 (in-lb) =  $(150lb/386 in/s^2)*(4m*39.37in/m)^2 * (2*pi * <math>\Delta \omega / \Delta t)$ 

- Inflatable structures can provide greater volume than can be packaged in a launch shroud.
- The density of these structures is the limiting factor in what can be launched.
- Transhab was a Mars-class inflatable intended as a deep-space habitat. Its density was 39 kg/m<sup>3</sup>.
- BEAM is a prototype ISS module launched to Low Earth Orbit. Its density is 88 kg/m<sup>3</sup>.
- The radius calculations are based on a 20t limit payload to cis-lunar space.





# Artificial Gravity Research Module, 1 Barrel Section SLS-launched and attached to an orbiting vehicle



Cylindrical Length = 215"



# Artificial Gravity Research Module, 0 Barrel Sections

SLS-launched and attached to an orbiting vehicle



End Domes Only, No Cylindrical Section



Notional view of an SLS LOX tank attached to Node 1 Nadir

 The SLS Block I LOX tank is currently being developed, is much shorter than the LH2 tank and also has lower mass per unit length and less complexity, so it seemed the most applicable starting point.

- Notional view of SLS LOX tank attached to Orion.
- If an artificial gravity exposure period of approximately 21 days can provide meaningful data, perhaps an SLS LOX tank/Orion spacecraft combination could be used as a prototype demonstrator.

#### Other studies:

• AIAA 2013-5433 "Internal Layout for a Cis-Lunar Habitat" studied the use of an SLS upper stage hydrogen tank as a habitat.

Notional view of SLS LOX tank-derived module integrated to a launch vehicle.







**Stowed configuration** 

### **Deployed Configuration**





Currently proposed B330 from  $\bullet$ Bigelow Aerospace is 6.7 meters diameter.







#### **Rotating Transit Vehicle Concept**

- Vehicle consists of a large central hub with crew modules rigidly connected in a radially-symmetrical arrangement.
- The central hub spins along with crew modules as one body.
  There is no stationary section (avoids a joint between stationary and spinning modules).
- A flywheel in the central hub is used to start, stop and control the spin rate of the vehicle. The flywheel size and spin speed is in the same order of magnitude of the currently flying CMGs on the International Space Station.
- With the vehicle spinning, the crew can live for periods of time in a 1-g environment in the peripheral modules and return to the low-gravity environment of the hub. When not spinning, it can receive visiting vehicles, launch landers, undertake maneuvers or take advantage of 0g in the hub.
- Crew can shelter from radiation in the central module protected by water and fuel tanks.
- Modules and tunnels may be inflatables taking advantage of BEAM and TRANSHAB experience.



Crew modules, each: $M_c$ = 4,500 kg, $R_c$ = 12.2mCentral hub: $M_h$ = 68,000 kg $R_h$  = 3.05m

**Other Concepts Considered:** 





Rotating a section of a spacecraft



#### Spherical inflatables



Large rotating spacecraft



Toroidal inflatables



Turbolift 2017 NAIC Linear acceleration

#### Potential Trade Studies

- 1g Artificial Gravity at the Body C.G. short duration (not continuous):
  - Use a dedicated pressurized element or incorporate AG system into a habitat or multipurpose element?
  - Is AG exposure the only activity the crew is performing or is exercise, hygiene or other tasks performed as well?
  - Constant rotation vs. Spin-up for use?
  - Vibration isolation techniques for inputs to the module from the artificial gravity system?
  - Two Counter-rotating artificial gravity systems vs. One Artificial Gravity system with counter-rotating flywheel?
  - Choices of drive system (mechanical, crew-power supplemented, electro-magnetic).
- 1g Artificial Gravity at the Body C.G. continuous duration
  - Rotate the entire spacecraft, a portion of the spacecraft or incorporate artificial gravity system inside a module?
  - Required angular velocity range vs. the activities planned.
  - Vibration isolation techniques for inputs to the module from the artificial gravity system?
  - Pass-through of utilities from rotating section to non-rotating section of spacecraft?
  - Choices of drive system (mechanical, crew-power supplemented, electro-mechanical)?



#### **Conclusions**

- With the relaxation of certain constraints, the implementation of artificial gravity in a prototype spacecraft demonstrator appears feasible in the near-term (i.e., within the next decade).
- Rotation rates from 9 15 rpm open up the design trade space to a wide variety of artificial gravity implementations.
- Below about 25% gradient across the body, increasing the radius of rotation beyond 6m provides diminishing returns.
- An SLS LOX tank is a structure currently being developed that could be studied for integration of an artificial gravity system if the rotation radius (~3.5m) is acceptable for a prototype demonstrator.
- Inflatable/deployable structures appear to be the best option for larger radii of rotation, due to launch vehicle payload envelope constraints. However, these large inflatable/deployable structures would require a dedicated development effort.
- Current launch vehicle lift capability limits an inflatable structure to about 7m radius in a single launch.
- Sudden stopping of a rotating artificial gravity system can induce significant loads into the spacecraft.
- An artificial gravity system operating nominally in the range of 4 15 rpm does not induce drastic loading into the structure but it will have to be isolated to avoid any concerns with appendage vibrations and expenditure of structural life.

#### **Recommendations:**

- These are the major drivers for artificial gravity implementation on a spacecraft which must be quantified by research:
  - 1. What is the range of angular velocity that a human can be subjected to when 1g is applied at the body c.g.?
  - 2. What is the maximum allowable gradient from head to toe across the body when 1g is applied at the body c.g.?
  - 3. What is the required duration of 1g artificial gravity exposure to be an effective countermeasure?
  - 4. Can the required magnitude of artificial gravity exposure be less than 1g at the body c.g. and still be an effective countermeasure?
- If a ~3.5-meter radius can provide useful data for assessing artificial gravity as a countermeasure, perform a study to determine whether an SLS LOX tank could be outfitted with a human centrifuge and launched either to ISS or included as part of a deep space architecture.
- A detailed trade study of the various vibration isolation and locomotion options for an internal human centrifuge must be performed.
- If a centrifuge with a radius larger than ~3.5m is required, perform trade studies on a 6-meter radius inflatable structure containing a centrifuge or a rotating spacecraft or rotating spacecraft element that provides a 6m radius of rotation.

# Team Members

- Aaron Allcorn
- Damien Calderon
- Gilles Clement
- Mike Grygier
- Jeff Hagen
- James Hampton
- Mykale-jamal C. Holland
- George James
- Steve Koontz
- Greg Lange
- Doug Litteken

- Kevin Macneil
- Canaan Martin
- Brett D. Montoya
- Kornel Nagy
- Joshua Peterson
- Taylor Phillips-Hungerford
- Jasen Raboin
- Satish Reddy
- Khadijah Shariff
- Bob Wilkes
- Ken Wong