

**NASA
Technical
Paper
3088**

July 1991

Packaging, Deployment, and On-Orbit Assembly Options for Large Geostationary Spacecraft

William T. Davis
and Charles B. King

PACKAGING, DEPLOYMENT, AND
ON-ORBIT ASSEMBLY OPTIONS FOR LARGE
GEOSTATIONARY SPACECRAFT (NASA) 34 2

CSCL 228

unclas
H1/18 0329507

NASA

1991

Packaging, Deployment, and On-Orbit Assembly Options for Large Geostationary Spacecraft

William T. Davis
*Langley Research Center
Hampton, Virginia*

Charles B. King
*The Bionetics Corporation
Hampton, Virginia*



National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Office of Management
Scientific and Technical
Information Program

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Tables and Figures | iv |
| Acronyms | v |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Design Processes | 2 |
| 3. ESGP Spacecraft | 4 |
| 3.1. ESGP Spacecraft Description | 4 |
| 3.2. ESGP Assembly Sequence Incorporation | 6 |
| 3.3. ESGP Assembly Sequence Definition | 8 |
| 3.4. ESGP Summary Remarks | 13 |
| 4. GHRMR Spacecraft | 15 |
| 4.1. GHRMR Spacecraft Description | 16 |
| 4.2. GHRMR Launch Vehicle Mass Considerations | 17 |
| 4.3. GHRMR-b Deployment/Assembly Concept | 17 |
| 4.4. GHRMR-a Hybrid Deployable/Erectable Concept | 22 |
| 4.5. GHRMR Task Summary | 24 |
| 4.6. GHRMR Summary Remarks | 26 |
| 5. Concluding Remarks | 27 |
| References | 28 |

Tables and Figures

| | |
|---|----|
| Table I. Payload Envelopes | 18 |
| Table II. Packaging Options for GHRMR Geostationary Platform | 26 |
| Figure 1. Earth sciences geostationary platform | 2 |
| Figure 2. GHRMR spacecraft concept | 3 |
| Figure 3. Spacecraft design flows and spacecraft assembly design flows | 4 |
| Figure 4. ESGP spacecraft | 5 |
| Figure 5. ESGP cargo pallets for STS orbiter | 7 |
| Figure 6. Titan 4 launch packaging for ESGP | 8 |
| Figure 7. OFA locations as suggested for Space Station <i>Freedom</i> enhanced operations capability phase | 9 |
| Figure 8. Space Station <i>Freedom</i> box truss section with proposed add-on shelf structure | 10 |
| Figure 9. Orthogonal construction station at SSF | 10 |
| Figure 10. ESGP spacecraft assembled configuration (with tooling) | 12 |
| Figure 11. Time-sequence assembly for ESGP spacecraft | 14 |
| Figure 12. Principal elements of GHRMR spacecraft | 17 |
| Figure 13. Single-fold, double-stowed truss concept | 18 |
| Figure 14. Hexagonal-panel solid-reflector deployment concept developed by Harris Corporation | 19 |
| Figure 15. GHRMR-b stowed in Shuttle C (block 1) | 20 |
| Figure 16. GHRMR-b stowed in Shuttle C (block 1) with prebuilt secondary reflector | 21 |
| Figure 17. Deployment sequence for GHRMR-b spacecraft | 22 |
| Figure 18. Reconfigured GHRMR spacecraft bus | 23 |
| Figure 19. GHRMR-b stowed in Shuttle C (baseline) | 23 |
| Figure 20. GHRMR-b stowed in STS orbiter | 24 |
| Figure 21. GHRMR-a hybrid deployable/erectable geostationary platform stowed in Shuttle orbiter cargo bay (struts and nodes packaged separately) . . . | 25 |
| Figure 22. GHRMR-a hybrid deployable/erectable geostationary platform stowed in two Shuttle orbiter cargo bays (nodes preattached to struts) | 25 |

Acronyms

| | |
|--------|--|
| ACCESS | assembly concept for construction of erectable space structure |
| APS/MT | astronaut positioning system/mobile transporter |
| CELV | complementary expendable launch vehicle |
| ESGP | Earth sciences geostationary platform |
| EVA | extravehicular activity |
| FF | free flyer |
| GCTI | global change technology initiative |
| GEO | geostationary Earth orbit |
| GHRMR | geostationary high-resolution microwave radiometer |
| GPS | global positioning system |
| ID | identification |
| LaRC | Langley Research Center |
| LCP | launch configured package |
| LEO | low Earth orbit |
| MPES | mission peculiar equipment support structure |
| MSC | mobile servicing center |
| OFA | obstruction free area |
| OMV | orbital maneuvering vehicle |
| OTV | orbital transfer vehicle |
| PSR | precision segmented reflector |
| S/C | spacecraft |
| SSF | Space Station <i>Freedom</i> |
| STS | Space Transportation System |
| STV | space transportation vehicle |

Abstract

Large spacecraft, particularly in geostationary Earth orbit (GEO), require special attention to the design challenges of launch vehicle packaging, deployment, and/or on-orbit assembly. Design studies of two different GEO spacecraft required that packaging, deployment, and on-orbit assembly analyses be conducted to establish the viability of these concepts for future NASA missions. This study used these analyses as "strawman" concepts for an investigation of packaging, deployment, and on-orbit assembly techniques. It also revealed generic guidelines for in-space assembly and highlighted the importance of early integration of packaging, deployment, and on-orbit assembly requirements into the spacecraft design. The first study spacecraft was used to study the definition and analyses of on-orbit assembly options for large GEO spacecraft. The second study spacecraft required investigation of the feasibility of deploying large spacecraft at GEO. The second spacecraft was also used to examine the packaging requirements of a deployable spacecraft and the packaging requirements for a hybrid assembled and deployable version of that spacecraft. This investigation was done with attention to minimum volume (and minimum launches) and to the relationship between packaging and spacecraft deployment and final configuration.

1. Introduction

The Langley Research Center (LaRC) is conducting engineering studies to identify and evaluate the role for advanced technologies in proposed future space systems.

The future need for large structures in space, particularly at geostationary orbit, has frequently been highlighted and examined in the literature. (See ref. 1. Other work has been done under contract to NASA by Ford Aerospace Corporation, GE Astro-Space Division, and Lockheed Missiles & Space Company.) Studies concerning in-space construction range from the construction of spacecraft bound for the Moon and Mars (work done under contract to NASA by McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company) to partial telerobotic or autonomous assembly of the Space Station *Freedom* (SSF). (See ref. 2.) LaRC has, as part of its overall spacecraft technology studies, performed packaging, deployment, and on-orbit assembly studies relating to two large geostationary platform concepts as an adjunct to other studies in progress.

The first concept used an LaRC design of a large second-generation Earth sciences geostationary platform (ESGP) (refs. 3 through 6) as shown in figure 1. The ESGP spacecraft designed by LaRC was based on an earlier concept developed by Ford Aerospace Corporation. Configuration details, subsystem definitions, and large antenna designs necessary to conduct in-depth performance analyses were developed for the ESGP spacecraft. Assembly techniques and options necessary for low Earth orbit (LEO) assembly were studied. Packaging of this spacecraft for delivery to LEO is discussed in section 3.2 and in reference 7.

The second concept stemmed from the Global Change Technology Initiative Architecture Trade Study recently conducted at LaRC. This trade study defined an infrastructure of both LEO and geostationary orbit (GEO) spacecraft. The geostationary Earth science spacecraft from this study (fig. 2) is referred to as the "geostationary high-resolution microwave radiometer" (GHRMR) spacecraft after its principal instrument.

The study described in this paper serves to supplement the previous technology studies and provide a mechanism for examining near-term (defined here as prior to 2010) packaging, deployment, and on-orbit assembly options for this class of large geostationary spacecraft.

Specifically, the ESGP spacecraft was used in this study to examine requirements for LEO assembly of large GEO spacecraft, and the GHRMR spacecraft was included to investigate complex packaging and subsequent deployment/assembly activities. This paper addresses the two concepts separately and then presents some overall concluding remarks.

| Item | Mass, kg |
|-----------------------------------|----------|
| Instrument & housekeeping modules | 3456 |
| 15-m radiometer | 844 |
| 7.5-m radiometer | 705 |
| Truss structure | 377 |
| OTV interface | 45 |
| Solar arrays | 149 |
| Other scientific instruments | 1075 |
| Solar sail | 10 |
| Communication antenna | 20 |
| Total | 6681 |




Figure 1. Earth sciences geostationary platform.

2. Design Processes

As with most engineering design processes, early incorporation of significant requirements enhances the probability of overall success. Similarly, a design for spacecraft requiring on-orbit assembly must incorporate special requirements at the beginning of the design process. In order that the spacecraft fulfill its on-orbit mission, the designer must carefully attend to the requirements of in-space assembly as they pertain to ease and reliability of construction, time and cost of assembly operations, and the safety of the spacecraft and its assemblers.

| GHRMR option | GHRMR-a | GHRMR-b |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|
| GHRMR mass, kg | 2417 | 1947 |
| Other bay-loaded mass, kg | 732 | 732 |
| Other S/C mass, kg | 3010 | 2754 |
| Total mass, kg | 6159 | 5433 |




Figure 2. GHRMR spacecraft concept.

A process for synthesizing the design of a large geostationary spacecraft that requires in-space assembly is postulated and shown in figure 3. The normal or usual design process is indicated by the solid lines. A new group of design flows which are necessary for on-orbit spacecraft assembly are indicated by the dashed lines.

The normal inputs to a spacecraft design are shown as mission requirements, instrument requirements, spacecraft subsystem hardware needs, checkout requirements, and launch vehicle constraints. Additional items to be considered for on-orbit assembly include new techniques and hardware specifically for in-space construction, such as EVA techniques, assembly-specific jigs and tooling, and unique deployment schemes. For this new group of design flows, the ESGP and the GHRMR spacecraft provide "strawman" vehicles with a wide-ranging technology representation, which provide an elementary understanding of considerations pertinent to on-orbit assembly/deployment requirements.

| ID | Item |
|-----|--|
| 1 | 3-m box truss structure |
| 2 | Module stack (payload & housekeeping modules, thrust tube) |
| 3 | 15-m-diameter truss microwave radiometer reflector |
| 4 | 7.5-m-diameter truss microwave radiometer reflector |
| 5,6 | Subreflector masts |
| 7 | Undeployed 15-m antenna |
| 8 | Solar sail |
| 9 | Solar cell arrays |
| 10 | Solar array deployable booms |
| 11 | Other scientific instruments |




Figure 4. ESGP spacecraft.

The 15-m-diameter microwave radiometer reflector (ID 3) and the 7.5-m-diameter microwave radiometer reflector (ID 4) are the largest instruments on the platform and are the primary platform configuration drivers. Each uses offset-fed Cassegrain-type geometry, which makes use of folded optics to enhance the scanning performance of the radiometer. In this configuration, the large primary reflector focuses the radiation upon the smaller subreflector which, in turn, focuses the radiation upon the feed array. The scanning of the radiometers is accomplished by pivoting their subreflectors through the use of electromechanical actuators. The subreflectors are mounted at the top of the subreflector masts (ID's 5 and 6). These masts are deployable and are of a Minimast design. (See ref. 8.) This type of boom requires the use of a deployment canister mechanism which extends the triangular-cross-section boom two bays at a time. The 7.5-m antenna is similar in concept to the precision segmented reflector (PSR) being developed at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. (See ref. 9.) It consists of 12 precision surface hexagonal-shaped reflector

segments mounted atop a strongback truss structure. The 15-m antenna strongback is similar in concept to a General Dynamics deployable concept (ref. 10) and includes a deployable reflector membrane. The undeployed 15-m antenna is represented in figure 4 by the cylinder (ID 7) at the left end of the spacecraft.

An adjustable solar sail (ID 8) is attached to the right end of the box truss structure to reduce spacecraft control torque requirements.

The foldable solar arrays (ID 9) are attached to the housekeeping module by deployable booms (ID 10) which place them at sufficient distance from the spacecraft so that they are not shadowed by the 15-m radiometer reflector. These deployable booms are 0.5 m in diameter with flexible longerons and are deployed from the housekeeping module by electric motors. Each solar panel boom rotates to maintain solar pointing.


Attached to the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth bays of the box truss, between the housekeeping module and the 7.5-m reflector, are other elements of the scientific instrumentation complement (ID 11) of the spacecraft.

3.2. ESGP Assembly Sequence Incorporation


A number of factors influenced the incorporation of the on-orbit assembly sequence into the ESGP spacecraft design. First, other studies relating to this spacecraft were reviewed to acquire spacecraft functional understanding (i.e., the design of the mission, instruments, checkout requirements, launch vehicle constraints, subsystem hardware design). This, in effect, was a review of the spacecraft design process, as shown in figure 3 by the solid lines.

The launch packaging study (ref. 7) identified three viable scenarios for delivery of the ESGP spacecraft to Space Station *Freedom* (SSF) in LEO. Two scenarios use the STS orbiter while the third utilizes the Titan 4 complementary expendable launch vehicle. In the shuttle scenarios, the ESGP components are packaged in three specialized pallets as shown in figure 5. A similar arrangement of three modified payload modules (fig. 6) is integrated into the Titan 4 launch vehicle in a No Upper Stage configuration. The launch configured payload pallets or modules are henceforth referred to as "launch configured packages" (LCP's). Mass and center-of-gravity launch constraints for the three configurations were verified as being met. The Titan 4 scenario and the shuttle single launch scenario both require orbital maneuvering vehicle (OMV) retrieval to SSF for assembly, whereas the shuttle two-flight scenario is launched directly to SSF. This paper uses these launch vehicle assumptions and the launch packaging findings of the launch packaging study (ref. 7) as a starting point for assembly definition.


The design flows represented by the dashed lines in figure 3 were next undertaken to define a strawman example of an assembly sequence. An investigation of previous in-space assembly experience (ref. 11), new in-space assembly methods (ref. 12), and new in-space assembly technology (ref. 13), along with previously gathered spacecraft hardware and design data, became the basis for an assembly/deployment technology information base. This information base, along with the spacecraft design options chosen, allowed the definition of an assembly node (an assembly place and process) for the ESGP spacecraft. The specific design form of the assembly node can have a number of acceptable solutions and is normally based on the engineering criteria of simplicity, safety, cost, and so forth, and their respective priorities.



(a) Pallet 1.



(b) Pallet 2.



(c) Pallet 3.

Figure 5. ESGP cargo pallets for STS orbiter.




Figure 6. Titan 4 launch packaging for ESGP.

3.3. ESGP Assembly Sequence Definition

Assembly sequence design decisions are strongly influenced, if not dictated, by the specific spacecraft design under consideration. In any event, certain issues must be addressed (with mutually compatible conclusions) prior to determining an acceptable assembly sequence. These are as follows:

Where is the assembly to occur? The options considered were the Space Transportation System orbiter, a free flyer (FF) arrangement where the spacecraft is its own assembly node, and the SSF. Although assembly at the STS does not depend on other elements such as the SSF or an FF, it does have limited on-orbit mission duration, leaving little, if any, contingency assembly time. The FF requires EVA support and/or astronaut transfer from either the SSF or the STS and active spacecraft control during at least part of the assembly period to point the large reflectors away from the Sun. The analysis assumes that the SSF has obstruction free area (OFA) available for both the assembly and the storage of the spacecraft in its launch-configured packages. EVA support is assumed to be available from either the orbiter or the SSF, and there is no limited-time constraint (before the shuttle's return to Earth) on the allowable time to build. Other factors, not quantifiable in a strawman scenario, such as disturbance of microgravity science experiments, should also be considered. Based on these considerations, the SSF was chosen as the assembly node.

Where and how large is the OFA? Sufficient OFA for assembly of the ESGP spacecraft must be found and allocated for both the assembly process and the storage of LCP's (until required for assembly). Although availability may change as the SSF design evolves, sufficient OFA for assembly was found along the back of the lower boom in the enhanced operations capability configuration of the evolutionary SSF (unpublished data from the Space Station *Freedom* Office at LaRC). (See fig. 7.) This configuration is scheduled to be within the time frame used for this study (before 2010). OFA used in assembly must also allow room for any special tooling required. OFA for storage of the spacecraft LCP's should be in near proximity to the assembly OFA and could be on either the port or the starboard keel near the lower boom. Any environmental protection needed for the LCP's must also be included. For this study, it is included in the launch packaging. Alternative solutions to the OFA include (1) along the inside of the starboard lower keel (fig. 7), (2) a hanger structure built on the evolutionary SSF dual beam truss structure (particularly if a protective enclosure is needed), (3) a temporary shelf-type truss structure (fig. 8) specifically designed for this spacecraft assembly, and (4) a special construction station capable of efficient assembly with the spacecraft oriented orthogonally to the SSF truss structure (fig. 9).

What will be the assembly sequence? Several options to this major question are (1) build the spacecraft truss structure first and then add the other components, (2) build the three-piece module stack first and expand from there, or (3) build the spacecraft in an end-to-end sequence with major deployments last. Although the first and second options may also provide acceptable assembly sequences, the third option was chosen to complement the special tooling discussed later and as a method of minimizing the EVA translational movements and resulting astronaut physical exhaustion as recommended in reference 14.




Figure 7. OFA locations as suggested for Space Station *Freedom* enhanced operations capability phase.




Figure 8. Space Station *Freedom* box truss section with proposed add-on shelf structure.




Figure 9. Orthogonal construction station at SSF.

How is the assembly implemented? The choices are EVA, telerobotics, automation, or combinations thereof. EVA requires much of a limited resource and provides significantly less astronaut safety than the other methods. Telerobotics may require as much or more assembly time than EVA but provides the desired safety.

Telerobotics is applicable to many but not all assembly tasks. Robotics may be faster than either EVA or telerobotics and also maintains astronaut safety but is usually best applied to repetitive tasks. In addition, its application to this type of assembly task is not a near-term option. (See ref. 13.) Therefore, for the near-term assembly techniques that were set up as ground rules for this study, a combination of EVA and telerobotics was chosen as a baseline assembly method. The assembly process, in whole or in part, could be automated as an enhancement when the necessary automation technology becomes available.

What assembly tooling is required? The unpacking and temporary stowage of the LCP items would require the use of a translatable remote manipulator arm device such as the SSF mobile servicing center (MSC). These one-time tasks would appropriately be done telerobotically to avoid EVA. For spacecraft truss assembly and instrument/appendage attachment via EVA, a build-extend turntable-type structure was devised. This special tooling was designed with similarity to ACCESS (ref. 11) and to a proposed SSF truss structure assembly tooling (ref. 12) to minimize astronaut EVA physical exertion. The build-extend descriptor refers to a truss section or bay being built on the tooling fixture, then extended outward but still held as the next bay is assembled. As each bay is being assembled, the turntable is partially rotated or rocked to give the astronauts access to all assembly nodes. This process is repeated until the complete truss is assembled. The same basic tooling apparatus that has been used to build the spacecraft truss can then be reconfigured to support the assembly of the 7.5-m solid reflector and its truss strongback. Another possible option, although not considered here because of unknown availability, would be to use the reconfigured SSF astronaut positioning system/mobile transporter (APS/MT) proposed for SSF assembly. (This system was discussed by D. R. Barron of McDonnell Douglas Mechanical Systems at a planning review meeting at Johnson Space Center.) This tooling configuration would have been used in SSF truss assembly and possibly could be downsized to accommodate the smaller truss of the ESGP spacecraft. A drawing of the assembled ESGP spacecraft and its tooling is shown in figure 10.

Restating from the above discussion, the strawman assembly sequence was defined within the following guidelines:

1. The assembly is to occur at SSF
2. The assembly is to use OFA along the back of the lower boom
3. The spacecraft is to be built in an end-to-end order
4. The minimum technology approach (EVA, telerobotics) was chosen as a baseline instead of an advanced technology approach (automation)
5. The basic tooling required was defined as a build-extend fixture incorporating a turntable

Once the basic approach has been selected, a more detailed review of the assembly scenario should be conducted. Examples of this more comprehensive review of the assembly design are now discussed.

This review should investigate the need for identifying other resources and their impact on the assembly node. This would include electrical power, propellant handling scenarios, other fluids usage, special checkout requirements, and any special instrumentation required for either assembly or checkout. The appropriate selection of either EVA or (tele) robotics

for the implementation of particular assembly tasks must be considered. For instance, some tasks may be significantly quicker to implement via EVA although the risks associated with other tasks may be too high for EVA. Use and scheduling of other SSF resources such as the MSC, the SSF crew, if available, or an auxiliary crew must be taken into account. The requirements for environmental protection of the LCP while stored at SSF must be addressed.




Figure 10. ESGP spacecraft assembled configuration (with tooling).

Furthermore, the minimization of assembly sequence times (or other selected parameters) can be significantly enhanced by attention to the following generic design considerations:

1. Design of the vehicle/node interface with possible incorporation of assembly requirements into the node design
2. Design for minimum spacecraft assembly (maximum prebuild on Earth)
3. Design for quick assembly (e.g., snap-lock fittings versus nuts and bolts)
4. Incorporation of self-alignment features
5. Incorporation of self-verifying locking features
6. The innovative design and use of assembly aids
7. Examination of the assembly sequence to minimize the need for time and other resource-intensive operations such as MSC translation and plane changes
8. The use of hybrid deployable/erectable designs that can yield significant resource savings or may give other unrelated benefits
9. The generation and use of a lessons-learned compilation to avoid previous mistakes (a study made by Rick Vargo, Fred Mitchell, Ken Flemming, and Maurice Willis of McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company for Kennedy Space Center)

Each spacecraft element must be kept compatible with the design of the assembly sequence. As an illustration of this necessity, an incompatibility was found with the proposed design of the spacecraft propulsion system. The hardware that was selected in the spacecraft design (not the assembly design) was an all-titanium, all-welded design for both propellant storage tanks and propellant transfer lines. Thrusters were placed on the instrument module and its supporting truss bay. To minimize the potential complexity of in-space operations (the assembly and welding of this hardware), the option of prebuilding the module stack and its truss bay as a single assembly before launch was selected. Therefore, for a small Earth to LEO transportation volume penalty (i.e., the truss bay launched assembled vs launched as struts and nodes), the need for complex in-space assembly and welding of the propulsion system plumbing was avoided. This type of potential incompatibility illustrates the desirability of integrating the assembly sequence, as early as possible, into the total spacecraft design process.

A time-sequence depiction of the construction sequence is shown in figure 11. The assembly begins with the +x end of the ESGP spacecraft (left end in fig. 4) and grows toward the opposite end. In all drawings, the build-extend tooling would be at the right end of the so-far-assembled spacecraft. In general, attachments are secured incrementally as construction progresses. The payload and housekeeping modules, thrust tube, and associated truss bay are constructed on Earth before launch and assembled into the spacecraft as a single entity. The 7.5-m reflector is constructed after all truss bays are completed. This requires reconfiguration of the tooling turntable. After construction, the 7.5-m reflector is attached to the spacecraft. Next, using the Minimast deployment mechanism, both Minimast subreflector booms are deployed and attached to the spacecraft with the aid of the MSC. The 15-m reflector canister (ID 7 in fig. 4), attached to the left end of the spacecraft, is then deployed. Individual checkouts occur as appropriate during spacecraft construction with full integrated checkout occurring last. A rough order-of-magnitude estimate for assembly time was desired. Based on previous experimental in-space construction timeline studies (refs. 12 and 14), a preliminary estimate for assembly of the ESGP spacecraft, using the specified baseline technology (EVA, telerobotics), is at least three and probably four standard 6- to 8-hour EVA periods. Contingency assembly time was not estimated for this study. Integrated checkout, being spacecraft and payload dependent, was not included in this estimate.

3.4. ESGP Summary Remarks

A spacecraft design process to accommodate on-orbit assembly design for an Earth Sciences Geostationary Platform was postulated. With this process, an information base was collected utilizing relatively near-term technology parameters. The information base was next applied in the specific definition of an assembly sequence for an already defined strawman vehicle (the ESGP spacecraft). The use of a strawman test case for an on-orbit assembly-required spacecraft design helped to identify and highlight the significant steps needed for this design process.

We recommend that the assembly tasks be planned as an integral part of the original design process and considered second in importance only to the spacecraft functional requirements. When this is not possible, they must be integrated as soon as feasible within the overall design process. The on-orbit assembly tasks must be verified as compatible




Figure 11. Time-sequence assembly for ESGP spacecraft.

with the spacecraft design and with the Earth to LEO packaging. This is done not only to assure compatibility between spacecraft design and assembly requirements but to increase the probability of optimal engineering design, cost and time savings, and safety. In addition, to assure compatibility between spacecraft design and assembly design, certain major issues should always be addressed. They are as follows:

1. Where is the assembly node?
2. How much assembly space is needed?
3. What is the basic build sequence?
4. What are the crew/EVA requirements?
5. Are there telerobotics/automation requirements?
6. What assembly tooling may be required?
7. How much overall time is required for the assembly?

A review of the assembly design followed an assessment of the major issues. Recommendations for assembly time minimization are made in the form of suggested generic design considerations.

Initial feasibility of on-orbit assembly for a strawman spacecraft was assessed. An assembly sequence for this spacecraft was designed and EVA requirements were estimated. Small spacecraft design modifications (in this instance, prebuilding the module/bay 2 stack) may significantly enhance (or even allow) the assembly task.

Analysis of alternative assembly sequences for the ESGP spacecraft could similarly be conducted by selecting any combination of available alternatives of the major questions discussed in section 3.3. The examination of resultant timeline scenarios from alternate assembly sequences can be an effective assessment tool for assembly sequence timeline definition and overall sequence selection based on comparative assembly times.

4. GHRMR Spacecraft

The geostationary high-resolution microwave radiometer spacecraft (fig. 2), which is named for its principal instrument, was conceptualized as a geostationary Earth science platform for geographic regional process environmental studies. A conceptual design of the GHRMR spacecraft was done as part of the Global Change Technology Initiative Architecture Trade Study. The GHRMR spacecraft is described in section 4.1.

The deployment, packaging, and assembly design concepts chosen for the GHRMR are discussed in section 4.3 and section 4.4. They were selected in parallel with and in conjunction with the spacecraft design. This follows the guideline established while studying the in-space assembly of the ESGP spacecraft, that is, to incorporate the in-space assembly requirement into the overall design process as early as possible.

4.1. GHRMR Spacecraft Description

Although the GHRMR is only one of seven instruments on this platform, it dominates the configuration of the spacecraft in that its large size, offset parabolic antenna design, and viewing requirements greatly limit the placement of other instruments as well as placement of the spacecraft bus. The GHRMR instrument was conceptualized during the GCTI trade study by LaRC researchers to meet the requirements of both high spatial resolution and high accuracy. Its Cassegrain multiple reflector antenna design provides wide-angle scanning to cover large portions of a hemisphere of the Earth from a geostationary orbit position. The concept is composed of a 15-m-diameter primary reflector, a 7.5-m-diameter secondary reflector, a moving tertiary reflector, and a phased-array feed system. The large scanning angle requirement necessitates long focal lengths for the GHRMR reflectors, the longest being around 30 m for the primary reflector. The overall spacecraft dimensions are approximately 40 by 24 by 15 m.

Spacecraft designers developed two options for the structure of the GHRMR. Option a (GHRMR-a) was a hybrid deployable/erectable concept which provided the greater capability of the two with a surface sufficiently smooth to operate up to 220 GHz, whereas option b (GHRMR-b) was a completely autonomously deployable concept which provided a surface accuracy sufficient for operation up to 90 GHz. Option b, however, completely eliminated the need for in-space construction. The first option was based on precision segmented reflector technology (ref. 9), which includes solid surface reflector panels and a stiff lightweight supporting truss. This option would be deployed/assembled into its flight configuration at low Earth orbit by using both EVA assembly and autonomous deployment steps. It subsequently uses a space transfer vehicle for transfer and insertion into its operational geostationary orbit. The total mass of the GHRMR-a spacecraft is 6159 kg (13581 lb).

The second option is based on a solid hexagonal panel concept developed by the Harris Corporation (ref. 15) and was originally designed to operate up to 40 GHz with the technology extrapolated to 90 GHz for the GHRMR application. This option is designed for a single launch to geostationary orbit (GEO). It requires a propulsion stage (Centaur G') for geostationary transfer and orbit circularization. After GEO placement, it will be fully deployed and made operational. The total mass of the GHRMR-b spacecraft is 5433 kg (11980 lb).

The complexities of packaging and autonomous deployment of either of these very large spacecraft have a significant influence on the overall spacecraft design. The packaging and subsequent deployment at GEO of the GHRMR-b spacecraft was chosen as the primary strawman design task for investigating a large geostationary spacecraft having complex packaging and autonomous deployment schemes. A preliminary packaging-options examination for the partially erectable GHRMR-a spacecraft was also conducted.

Principal elements of the GHRMR spacecraft (whether a or b) are identified in figure 12. At the lower end of the spacecraft is the 15-m-diameter primary reflector and its supporting truss structure. It is connected via truss sections A and B to the feed and tertiary reflector support bay. This bay in turn is connected by truss section C to the spacecraft bus assembly. Each truss bay in a section is 2 m in length along each orthogonal direction. The bus assembly houses spacecraft subsystems (e.g., power switching, communications equipment) and also serves as a mounting platform for the other spacecraft science instruments. A one-piece hinged boom structure attaches the secondary reflector to the spacecraft bus.




Figure 12. Principal elements of GHRMR spacecraft.

4.2. GHRMR Launch Vehicle Mass Considerations

The Titan 4/Centaur G' mass capability to GEO is 4536 kg (10 000 lb)—not quite enough for the deployable GHRMR-b whose mass is 5433 kg (11 980 lb). The mass capability of the STS/Centaur G' to GEO (before this program was canceled) was 6350 kg (14 000 lb). For this study, it was assumed that a Shuttle C (block 1)/Centaur G' and a Shuttle C (baseline)/Centaur G' would have at least the same or more mass capability to GEO than the already sufficient, though canceled, STS/Centaur G'. The STS, however, can easily carry either the GHRMR-a or GHRMR-b to LEO, where an STV could be utilized for GEO transfer. The GHRMR packaging task, therefore, becomes a volume-constrained problem, that is, to determine if GHRMR-b can be packaged in Shuttle C (block 1) or even in Shuttle C (baseline) and to also determine if GHRMR-a can utilize the STS orbiter for transfer of the assembly parts to LEO.

4.3. GHRMR-b Deployment/Assembly Concept

The deployment design concept for the GHRMR-b was undertaken first because portions of it would be applicable to GHRMR-a. The spacecraft design was examined, and the major functional elements were identified as the 15-m primary reflector, the 7.5-m secondary reflector, the tertiary reflector and feed assembly, the spacecraft bus including the other science instruments, and the supporting and connecting truss structures. Not shown in figure 12 is the final major element, the geostationary propulsion stage (the Centaur G').

The descriptions of current and near-term launch vehicle payload envelope capabilities (table I), including the Titan 4, the Shuttle orbiter, the proposed Shuttle C (baseline) and Shuttle C (block 1), gave volume and shape bounds for the GHRMR-b packaging envelope. These envelope restrictions indicated that accommodation of this spacecraft by any current or near-term launch vehicle of reasonable size would require that deployable technology be applied, as a minimum, to the truss structure and the large primary and secondary reflectors.

Table I. Payload Envelopes

| Launch vehicle | Length, m | Diameter, m | Payload to to LEO, kg | Payload ^a to GEO, kg |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Shuttle orbiter | 18.3 | 4.6 | 25 850 | ≈6000 |
| Shuttle C (baseline) | 25.0 | 4.6 | 70 000 | >6000 |
| Shuttle C (block 1) | 27.0 | 7.6 | 60 000 | >6000 |
| Titan 4 | 18.9 | 4.6 | 18 600 | 4536 |

^a In combination with Centaur G'.




Figure 13. Single-fold, double-stowed truss concept.

After review of a number of deployable truss options, a deployable truss system described as a single-fold, double-stowed design (fig. 13) was selected for the spacecraft truss sections. Since this truss design is not self-deploying, it requires a deploying mechanism. Although this mechanism was not specifically designed in this study, it was verified that sufficient space was available for several different acceptable designs of a motorized deployer. For the 1.25-cm-diameter struts chosen for this spacecraft, a stowed truss length

compression of approximately 98 percent was calculated (ref. 16) as achievable (i.e., a deployed 100-m-long truss section would have a length of 2 m in its stowed configuration). For the GHRMR, having truss bay lengths of 2 m, the 14-m truss section A (7 bays) becomes only 0.28 m long when stowed. Likewise, the 20-m truss section B (10 bays) becomes 0.4 m, and the 10-m truss section C (5 bays) becomes 0.2 m.




Figure 14. Hexagonal-panel solid-reflector deployment concept developed by Harris Corporation.

The truss bay containing the tertiary reflector and the feed assembly was used as a starting point for the design of the deployment sequence (fig. 12). This bay, whether it is a truss structure or a solid structure, would be preassembled, aligned, and checked out before launch. The deployable truss sections B and C would be attached to opposite longitudinal sides of the feed assembly bay. The spacecraft bus and secondary reflector assembly would be attached to the opposite end of truss section C. At the opposite end of truss section B, truss section A must be attached in an orthogonal direction. Since the truss bays are 2 m in length on all sides, judicious selection of the truss section fold placements makes the direct attachment of truss section A orthogonally to section B possible with deployment in the required direction. The primary reflector assembly would then be attached to the opposite end of truss section A.

A hexagonal-solid-panel concept developed by the Harris Corporation (ref. 15) for extreme precision antenna structures was chosen as the method of assembly-compatible implementation for the large primary and secondary reflectors. This concept is presented

an appropriate STV. Options 2a and 2b meet the GHRMR-a concept requirements of