

Interview: Brent Barbee and Professor Bong Wie

SDE: Hypervelocity Asteroid Deflection

Say we discover a small to medium-sized asteroid (the majority of which we have yet to find), expected to impact the Earth in the next few years. Would we be able to stop it? Even utilizing the most powerful mitigation option available, thermonuclear explosives, the asteroid speeds involved can be extremely large, creating difficulties for existing navigation and control systems to target a small object. Staff writer Benjamin Deniston interviews Professor Bong Wie (Iowa State University) and Brent Barbee (NASA Goddard Space Flight Center) about their "Hypervelocity Asteroid Intercept Vehicle" concept at the Fall 2012 NASA Innovative Advanced Concepts (NIAC) symposium, held Nov. 14-15, 2012 in Virginia. NIAC examines early stage concepts that may lead to advanced and innovative space technologies critical for NASA missions in the next 10 to 100 years.



LPAC

Brent Barbee (center) and Professor Bong Wie (right) are interviewed by Benjamin Deniston at the Fall 2012 NASA Innovative Advanced Concepts (NIAC) symposium.

Brent Barbee: My name is Brent Barbee, and I'm a flight dynamics engineer at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center. I also teach astrodynamics at the University of Maryland at College Park.

Bong Wie: And my name is Bong Wie. I'm the Vance Coffman Endowed Chair Professor of Aerospace Engineering at Iowa State University.

21st Century: To get started, maybe you could discuss the general concept of asteroid defense. First, why is it an area of concern? Why is it something we should be studying now, as an interest for the scientific community and the population generally?

Barbee: Well, asteroid defense is a very important topic because we know that our planet has been struck in the past by large and small impacters that have done damage to the ground. At present I think there are on the order of 170, 180 confirmed impact structures that have been found all over the world. Of course, most of our planet surface is covered with water and weathering and geological processes that have obscured the signs of impact, but we're discovering them; we know that they're there. So we know that it's a threat that is out there, that we're going to have to deal with.

So, it behooves us to be prepared ahead of time, so that we're not scrambling to slap together some sort of hastily prepared defense at the last moment, when we discover a threat. It's much, much better to have investigated the solution, tested it, done many dress rehearsals, so that we're very, very comfortable and very adept at doing it, when the day comes that we have to call upon those systems to stop an asteroid impact.

Because there are a few layers to the discussion, correct? There's observation, detection, finding all the possible threats. And then there's also the issue of mitigation, of doing defense against something that might be a threat to the Earth. Is that correct?

Barbee: That's right. Absolutely. In fact, you could say that planetary defense rests on a tripod of detection, characterization, and mitigation. So, if we have wonderful mitigation systems that are highly capable, but our detection capabilities are poor, then we will be well able to do something about the problem, but we won't know that it's coming. Whereas if we have wonderful detection systems, but no preparation for mitigation, we may very well see it coming, but be unable to act.

So, it's important to have both systems; and historically, up to this point, we've invested a lot more in detection, because it's something that we could do from the ground, using telescopes, and it's been a very successful effort, but now the time has come to begin appropriately, devoting appropriate resources, to the mitigation/preparedness problem as well.

Wie: If I may emphasize that for mitigating the impact threat of asteroids, detection is a necessary condition, but it's not sufficient. And we do need to develop mitigation techniques in order to be ready whenever needed.

The Asteroid Threat

Here we are at the NASA Advanced Innovative Concepts conference, and so what exactly brought you here to present something to this particular audience, relating to the asteroid threat?

Wie: We proposed a concept called Hypervelocity Asteroid Impact Vehicle, to the NIAC program, and this proposal was selected, because NASA felt that it is the next logical step to move forward to develop our own national protection system against the impact threat of asteroids. So, we are here to present our concept, and my Co-I [co-investigator] Barbee and myself, we were very pleased to receive constructive comments from our colleagues who are attending this conference.

Maybe you can describe why you need to do the work you're doing. Because most people might think, well, we'll just throw a bomb up there and hit it with a bomb—but as you presented earlier, it's not quite that simple. There's actually highly complex science involved in this question, this challenge. So maybe you could present a concept of what exactly you're bringing to the discussion here.

Barbee: Sure. The reason that it's not as simple as just throwing up a bomb—the reasons are multifold. On the one hand, you have the orbital mechanics, so orbital mechanics means that you can't just send the spacecraft to the asteroid for a rendezvous mission whenever you like. There are going to be certain times when you can launch, and have a low relative velocity, naturally, when you get to the target, and thereby effect rendezvous using a reasonable amount of propellant.

So, for our study, we're saying that we want to be ready to deal with short warning-time scenarios. We want to be able to launch essentially at just about any time. So that means that our system has to be designed to come in fast at the asteroid, [at a] high relative velocity at the time that we intercept the asteroid. So, we're not going to carry a propellant to slow down, because physics dictates that that amount of propellant would be huge.

So, our system is designed to come in at an excess of 5 kilometers per second—5, 10, 15, 20, up to 30 kilometers

per second—relative velocity at impact. So, what that means is that we're coming at the asteroid really fast.

That's tens of thousands of miles per hour, correct?

Barbee: Oh yes, tens of thousands of miles per hour. So, I think, as a reference point, 7 kilometers per second is on the order of about 20,000 miles per hour—something like that, so yes, that's right. And as we're coming in, the asteroid starts off as this little tiny dot that the cameras on the spacecraft can just barely see, a few million kilometers away; and then, within a matter of hours, we're down to the last few minutes, and the last few seconds, and we cover hundreds of kilometers within a matter of a minute or so.

So, there's very little time for the spacecraft to react. So, we have to design robust on-board guidance, navigation, and control systems that can successfully hit that relatively small asteroid out in the huge volume of space, traveling at such high relative velocities.

What's more, is that in order to effectively disrupt the asteroid, our design calls for a two-body vehicle: an impactor and a follower. The impactor excavates a small crater, shallow crater, on the asteroid's surface, and then, within perhaps a millisecond after that crater is excavated, the follower spacecraft, which is just behind it, enters that shallow crater, and at that moment, must detonate the explosive device in order for it to be effective. If the explosive device were to strike the surface of the asteroid before detonating, it would be destroyed, and the mission would be a failure.

So, there are some very precise timing [issues] and a key sequence of events that will have to happen at hypervelocity, driven by robust, cutting-edge new sensor technology, to make all of that happen, and make it happen in a reliable way, so that we know that we can build five, six, seven of these systems, and deploy them, and have high confidence that they would work as designed.

Hyper-Fast Speeds

So, you're talking about just incredibly fast speeds and incredibly accurate timing, to be able to have this go off, in just the right fashion; and obviously, this is something where, if we were to encounter a situation where we needed this to work, we would need it to work! We couldn't—we would need to make sure this is 100% effective, and have the effect we need.

Barbee: These relative velocities that we're talking about are beyond what we can currently test in terrestrial laboratories. I mean, there are facilities with rail guns and light-gas guns that can get up to the range of 3 to 5 kilometers per second, maybe a little bit more.

But for the regime of speed that we're talking about, it's a very unexplored region. What happens to the materials that the spacecraft is made of? What are the consequences of those materials' effects on the payload that we're trying to deliver to the target? There's a whole host of issues

that we have to research. The materials science, the structural design, the hypervelocity-impact physics, and of course, the robust guidance navigation control happening on a very, very short, almost infinitesimal time frame.

So, there are several aspects to this research that are really pushing the boundaries of what's been done.

Wie: But to give the feeling of that high speed, let's say 10 kilometer per second, or even 11 kilometer per second, on someone flying an airplane, that will be more like landing an airplane from a cruising altitude of 36,000 feet, which is about 11 kilometer altitude, in one second, and landing on the runway. That is the kind of speed we don't usually talk about for airplanes. But in space, that is a common speed.

So, currently, we do have guidance navigation-control technology which can provide a reliable precision of an impactor against asteroids. But we have not demonstrated our capability against a small target—50-meter or 100-meter small size. I mean, that is our research goal. The goal is to develop flight-proven technology to be ready to be used, for a small 50-meter, 100-meter target, with a very short warning time.

I know when it comes to a discussion of mitigation, there's a complex number of scenarios and questions. You mentioned that you are specifically looking at short warning times, because the idea is, if you have a longer warning time, there's an array of methods you might be able to use. You might be able to kind of bump it, or impact it with a non-explosive device. You might be able to pull on it gravitationally, or by various other means. But you're focusing on a very specific scenario, where we might only have months, in the range of months, warning time, right?

Barbee: Even up to several years. Really, anything less than ten years falls into the range of scenarios where you would need to use some kind of a nuclear solution. The NRC [Nuclear Research Council] report that was released several years ago, sort of identified that range of warning time, from ten years down to zero, essentially, as being the regime in which you need to have some kind of a nuclear solution. Because of the energies involved.

And that's why I want to ask, just to illustrate for people: Because when you're talking about the energies needed to have an effect on these bodies—you're talking about mountains, basically, mountain-sized rocks and debris flying around in space—the energy density you get with nuclear and thermonuclear capabilities is just orders of magnitude more than you get otherwise. Is that correct?

Wie: Yes, that's correct. Also, I'd like to emphasize that we don't have correct definitions of a short warning time. Everyone has a different time scale. So, as we said, even a

ten-year warning time, we consider short. So let's assume that we have ten years lead time, but if it takes nine years to make a decision for the launch, then we have only one year engineering lead time, that is not sufficient.

So that's the situation right now. We don't have a clear definition of what do you mean by warning time. Does it include political decision time? Or do we have a system to be launched right now? Do we have to find a launch vehicle, or do we need to design a satellite? So, that is an open issue to be further studied, to be discussed.

International Collaboration

I wonder if you also could speak to the idea of international collaboration, because obviously, the first thing that comes up with this, is—these asteroids, they don't distinguish between NATO countries and non-NATO countries, or which economic bloc it's going to impact somewhere on the Earth. This is a global threat that transcends a lot of national boundaries, obviously.

You know, we're interested in collaboration with, especially Russia and China, for example. This should be an effort where we should be pooling the scientific capabilities of the best nations of the world, and I was wondering if you had any thoughts on the importance of that aspect of the threat.

Barbee: Well, planetary defense, for all the reasons you just said, would be a wonderful thing for all the people of the world to cooperate in. That would be fantastic. But until that day comes, there are going to be some pretty thorny issues that have to be dealt with.

For example, if you have an object whose diameter is 1 kilometer or larger, when asteroids get to be that big, or bigger than that, that's when you really have the threat of global consequences from the impact. For things smaller than that—when you're talking about a several-hundred-meter asteroid, maybe a 100-meter, 50-meter asteroid—the effects of those impacts, while still devastating, are on a more localized scale. We'll know ahead of time, when we've spotted the asteroid coming, what are the possible impact locations on the Earth. And so, if it's going to be impacting one region or one country, and it's only going to affect them, then who's responsible for building and deploying and managing the deflection mission, if that country's not capable of doing it themselves?

Those are the kinds of questions that are going to be asked.

And then there's the question of liability. Who's liable if the effort fails, or if it makes the problem worse than it was to begin with? So, the questions of responsibility and liability really rise to the top, when you're talking about this small several-hundred-meter, down to maybe 50-meter, asteroid size in range, which is difficult to deal with, but it's something that really has to be thought about, because the smaller asteroids, between 50 and several hundred meters in size, are more numerous than the very large ki-

lometer-sized and larger asteroids.

So, it's much more likely that, within any given time frame, we're going to be faced with the threat by one of the smaller asteroids than one of the very, very large ones. So, it's something that we should... I don't know what the answer is, but these are some of the questions we need to start thinking about for the first steps in international collaboration.

The Big Picture

As a last question, let's take it to the big picture. Say, we live on this planet. If you look at it on the scale of the Solar System, it's a relatively small location. Our Solar System is located in this entire galactic system. Here, we've got records of the history of life coming and going on this planet, mass extinctions, major extinctions; some we think are related to asteroid impacts, others maybe to other events—global climate changes, maybe supernovae, all kinds of things that go on in our environment that tend to be in an area that's, say, above the heads of most of the general population.

But it seems like taking on this issue has some rather profound philosophical, cultural implications for what this means for mankind, to actually consciously take on a challenge like that. And I wanted to know if you wanted to speak to any of these bigger-issue pictures that are related, when you bring in questions of tackling these


types of challenges.

Wie: Yes, I agree with you that there are many other natural disasters that we cannot do anything about, to prevent those events, but the impact threat by asteroids can be detected in advance, and probably such an impact threat can be prevented, because we have the technology. But the technology is not quite ready. And we need to develop those technologies which can be used when they are needed, at the right time, in the future.

Any last comments?

Barbee: Well, it's true that asteroid impact is probably one of *the* most serious natural disasters that is, in principle at least, preventable. And so, it seems to me that for any species that's going to survive for a very long period of time, such a species would almost certainly have to make the deliberate choice to learn to protect itself from any extinction-level event, and that, if we, as human beings, are able to make that jump, and make that decision, and make that choice, that bodes really well for long-term survival.

Not just because of stopping the asteroid from hitting, but for what that means about us as a people, and us as a species, that we're able to have the forethought and be willing to behave cooperatively towards that end—that, in and of itself, regardless of the technology to deflect the asteroid, that decision, that choice, means a lot for our future.



Krafft Ehrlicke's Extraterrestrial Imperative by Marsha Freeman

From this new book the reader will gain an insight into one of the most creative minds in the history of space exploration.

Krafft Ehrlicke's contribution to space exploration encompasses details of new, innovative ideas, but also how to think about the importance and value of space exploration for society.

The reader will gain an understanding of the early history of the space pioneers, what they have helped accomplish, and how Ehrlicke's vision of where we should be going can shape the future.

At this time, when there are questions about the path of the space program for the next decades, Krafft Ehrlicke has laid out the philosophical framework for why space exploration must be pursued, through his concept of the "Extraterrestrial Imperative," and the fight that he waged, over many years, for a long-range vision for the program.

Readers will find it a very imaginative work, and a very up-lifting story.

Krafft Ehrlicke's *Extraterrestrial Imperative* is the summation of his work on encouraging the exploration and development of space. The book contains all of his reasons why we need to get off the planet and explore space.

ISBN 978-1-894959-91-9, Apogee Books, 2009, 302pp, \$27.95

1-888-557-7223



www.apogeebooks.com