

14th HUMAN EXPLORATION OF THE MOON AND MARS SYMPOSIUM (A5)  
Going beyond the Earth-Moon system: Human Missions to Mars, Libration points, and NEO's (4)

Author: Mr. Rob Landis  
NASA Wallops Flight Facility, United States, rob.r.landis@nasa.gov

Dr. Paul Abell  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Johnson Space Center, United States,  
paul.a.abell@nasa.gov  
Mr. Dan Mazanek  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)/Langley Research Center, United States,  
daniel.d.mazanek@nasa.gov  
Ms. Cheryl Reed  
The John Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, United States, cheryl.reed@jhuapl.edu  
Dr. James Garvin  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Goddard Space Flight Center, United States,  
James.B.Garvin@nasa.gov  
Mr. Daniel Adamo  
United States, adamod@earthlink.net  
Dr. Thomas Jones  
Association of Space Explorers, United States, skywalking@comcast.net  
Mr. Ronald Mink  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Goddard Space Flight Center, United States,  
ronald.g.mink@nasa.gov  
Mr. Brent Barbee  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Goddard Space Flight Center, United States,  
brent.w.barbee@nasa.gov  
Dr. Andrew Cheng  
The John Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, United States, andy.cheng@jhuapl.edu  
Dr. Andrew Rivkin  
The John Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, United States, Andrew.Rivkin@jhuapl.edu  
Dr. Richard Dissly  
Ball Aerospace & Technologies Corp., United States, rdissly@ball.com  
Dr. Robert Gold  
The John Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, United States, robert.gold@jhuapl.edu  
Mr. Kenneth Hibbard  
The John Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, United States, Kenneth.Hibbard@jhuapl.edu  
Mr. Lindley Johnson  
NASA Headquarters, United States, lindley.johnson@nasa.gov  
Mr. Timothy Kennedy  
NASA Johnson Space Center, United States, timothy.p.kennedy@nasa.gov

A SIMPLIFIED, MINIMAL RISK ARCHITECTURAL STRATEGY FOR THE EXPLORATION OF  
NEAR-EARTH OBJECTS

## Abstract

The impetus for asteroid exploration is scientific, political, and pragmatic. The notion of sending human explorers to asteroids is not new. Piloted missions to these primitive bodies were first discussed in the 1960s, pairing Saturn V rockets with enhanced Apollo spacecraft to explore what were then called “Earth-approaching asteroids” (Cole, 1963 and 1964; Smith, 1966; Meston, et al. [editor], 1968). Two decades ago, NASA’s Space Exploration Initiative (SEI) also briefly examined the possibility of visiting these small celestial bodies (Nash, et al., 1989; Davis, et al., 1990; Jones, et al., 1994). Most recently, the U.S. Human Space Flight Review Committee (Augustine, et al., 2009) suggested that near-Earth objects (NEOs) represent a target-rich environment for exploration via the “Flexible Path” option. The key is to complete the NEO survey and identify a sufficient number of targets to enable initial piloted missions of reasonable duration (<180 days), with longer missions possible with increased operational experience.

While roughly 87 percent of the large NEOs (>1 km diameter) have been discovered, only 2 to 3 percent of the NEO population down to 50-100 meters across have been discovered to date (Cheng, et al. 2011). Further, the majority of the NEOs identified by a study team across several NASA centers as “human-accessible” (Barbee, et al., 2010; Adamo, et al., 2010) have orbits that are too uncertain, or are probably too small, to consider mounting human expeditions.

We present a step-by-step architecture that provides an integrated forward path for international robotic and human missions to NEOs. Space agencies that are considering human NEO missions currently lack a robust catalog of human-accessible targets. The first step in developing such a catalog is conducting a space-based survey telescope. This catalog of candidate NEOs would then be transformed into a matrix of opportunities for robotic and human missions for the next several decades. This matrix would include critical mission parameters (e.g., required  $\Delta V$ s, mission durations, departure opportunities, etc.) and would be shared with the international community. This matrix would not drive architectures or schedules, but would illustrate windows of opportunity that could be exploited by the respective agencies based on their capabilities and budgets. The overall return to the NEO community in terms of science, flight techniques and technology/instrument demonstration would be increased by this collaboration more than the contribution of any single agency, and would provide many more well-characterized targets for piloted missions (Abell, et al., 2009).