Table of Contents

Problem 1	. 1
Set Up	. 1
Gauss Angles Only	
Extended Gauss	
Oouble R	. 4
Explanation	
Plots for Sanity Check	

Problem 1

```
%Morgan Yost
%AERO 557 HW1
clear all
close all
```

Set Up

```
%addpath ../Vallado
global NUM OBSV
NUM OBSV = 3;
fid = fopen('input.txt', 'r');
count = 0;
deg sec = 306/86400;
Re = 6378;
while(count <7)</pre>
    count = count +1;
    line = fgetl(fid);
    type = strsplit(line, ' ');
    switch type{1}
        case 'LAT:'
            if(length(type) ~= 2)
                disp('Not enough inputs for Latitude')
                return;
            end
            siteInfo.latSite = str2num(type{2});
            continue;
        case 'LONG: '
            if(length(type) ~= 3)
                length(type)
                disp('Not enough inputs for Longitude')
                return;
            end
            siteInfo.longSite = str2num(type{2});
            siteInfo.longmin = str2num(type{3});
            continue;
        case 'ALT:'
            if(length(type) ~= 2)
                disp('Not enough inputs for Altitude')
```

```
return;
    end
    siteInfo.H = str2num(type{2});
    continue;
case 'YEAR:'
    if(length(type) ~= 2)
        disp('Not enough inputs for Year')
    end
    siteInfo.year(1:3) = str2num(type{2});
    continue;
case 'MONTH:'
    if(length(type) ~= 2)
        disp('Not enough inputs for Month')
    end
    siteInfo.month(1:3) = str2num(type{2});
    continue;
case 'DAY:'
    if(length(type) ~= 2)
        disp('Not enough inputs for Day')
    end
    siteInfo.day(1:3) = str2num(type{2});
    continue;
case 'TIME'
    if type{2} == 'RA'
        if(length(type) ~=3)
            disp('Not enough inputs for Day')
            return;
        end
        for i = 1:length(type)
            line = fgetl(fid);
            word = strsplit(line, ' ');
            time = strsplit(word{1}, ':');
            siteInfo.hour(i) = str2num(time{1});
            siteInfo.min(i) = str2num(time{2});
            siteInfo.sec(i) = str2num(time{3});
            alpha(i) = str2num(word{2});
            delta(i) = str2num(word{3});
        end
    elseif type{2} == 'DEC'
        if(length(type) ~=3)
            disp('Not enough inputs for Day')
            return;
        end
        for i = 1:length(type)
            line = fgetl(fid);
            word = strsplit(line, ' ');
            time = strsplit(word, ':');
            siteInfo.hour(i) = str2num(time{1});
            siteInfo.min(i) = str2num(time{2});
            siteInfo.sec(i) = str2num(time{3});
            alpha(i) = str2num(word{3});
```

Gauss Angles Only

```
%Site Info Struct
                     Altitude of the observation location
        longSite
                     Latitude of the observation location
        latSite
                     Longitude of the observation location
        latmin
                     Minute unit of the latitude of the observation
9
                     location
                     Year of the observation
        year
                     Month of the year of the ovservation
        month
        day
                     Day of the month of the observation
        hour
                     Hour of the day of the observation
                     Minute of the hour of the observation
        min
                     Second of the minute of the observation
[r, v, RSite, qHat, q, tau1, tau3] = gaussOD(alpha, delta, siteInfo);
[~~,~a,~ecc,~inc,~Omega,~~,~~] = RV2COEd(~r(:,~2),~v);
fprintf('The results of the gauss angles only method are as follows:
\n');
fprintf('r: %f %f %f, \t norm(r): %f \n', r(:, 2), norm(r(:, 2)));
fprintf('v: %f %f %f, \t norm(r): %f \n', v, norm(v));
fprintf('COES: \n a: %f km\n ecc: %f\n inc: %f deg\n RAAN: %f deg\n',
    norm(ecc), inc, Omega);
The results of the gauss angles only method are as follows:
r: 5813.089264 5562.490062 6496.085361,
                                          norm(r): 10340.813677
v: -4.237904 4.393942 1.405317,
                                  norm(r): 6.264301
COES:
 a: 10530.735020 km
 ecc: 0.139085
 inc: 40.045571 deg
RAAN: 329.861140 deg
```

Extended Gauss

```
[ r2, v2 ] = extendedGaussUV( RSite, v, qHat, q, tau1, tau3);
```

```
% Get Better COEs
[~~,~a,~ecc,~inc,~Omega,~~,~~] = RV2COEd( r2(:, 2), v2);
fprintf('The results of the exended gauss method are as follows:\n');
fprintf('r: %f %f %f, \t norm(r): %f \n', r2(:,2), norm(r2(:,2)));
fprintf('v: %f %f %f, \t norm(r): %f \n', v2, norm(v2));
fprintf('COES: \n a: %f km\n ecc: %f\n inc: %f deg\n RAAN: %f deg\n',
a,...
   norm(ecc), inc, Omega);
The results of the exended gauss method are as follows:
r: 5813.089264 5562.490062 6496.085361,
                                          norm(r): 10340.813677
v: -4.508948 4.780784 1.572110,
                                  norm(r): 6.757073
COES .
a: 12680.318206 km
ecc: 0.237166
inc: 40.045571 deg
RAAN: 329.861140 deg
```

Double R

```
qHat = qHat*diag(q);
[r2vec, v2vec] = doubleR(qHat(:,1),qHat(:, 2),qHat(:,3), RSite(:,
1),...
                         RSite(:, 2) ,RSite(:, 3), tau1, tau3);
% Get More COEs
[ p, a, ecc, inc, Omega, w, theta ] = RV2COEd( r2vec, v2vec);
fprintf('The results of the Double r method are as follows:\n');
fprintf('r: %f %f %f, \t norm(r): %f \n', r2vec, norm(r2vec));
fprintf('v: %f %f %f, \t norm(r): %f \n', v2vec, norm(v2vec));
fprintf('COES: \n a: %f km\n ecc: %f\n inc: %f deg\n RAAN: %f deg\n',
a,...
   norm(ecc), inc, Omega);
The results of the Double r method are as follows:
r: 5967.762704 5784.152800 6696.626439,
                                          norm(r): 10673.116742
v: -4.448319 4.722157 1.563498,
                                  norm(r): 6.673143
COES:
a: 13215.526390 km
ecc: 0.246946
 inc: 39.957296 deg
RAAN: 330.007181 deg
```

Explanation

```
fprintf('The results shown above vary due to differences in the assumptions \n')

fprintf('that were made to arrive at them. The gauss angles only method \n')

fprintf('assumes the angles from the observation are coplanar and does not \n')

fprintf('include an iterative scheme to refine the answer. The Double R \n')
```

```
fprintf('and Gauss extension, however, do use an iterative scheme and
  it \n')
fprintf('can be seen that this iterations resulted in a much higher
  guess \n')
fprintf('for the semi-major axis. It makes sense that the ecc also
  varies \n')
fprintf('especially between angles only and the other two methods for
  this \n')
fprintf('reason. The inc and RAAN are very similar between the 3
  methods, as \n')
fprintf('as are the r vectors. This just proves that our assumption of
  \n')
fprintf('coplanar observations was correct because these parameters
  are \n')
fprintf('are closely related to the observed right ascention and
  declination. \n')
```

The results shown above vary due to differences in the assumptions that were made to arrive at them. The gauss angles only method assumes the angles from the observation are coplanar and does not include an iterative scheme to refine the answer. The Double R and Gauss extension, however, do use an iterative scheme and it can be seen that this iterations resulted in a much higher guess for the semi-major axis. It makes sense that the ecc also varies especially between angles only and the other two methods for this reason. The inc and RAAN are very similar between the 3 methods, as as are the r vectors. This just proves that our assumption of coplanar observations was correct because these parameters are are closely related to the observed right ascention and declination.

Plots for Sanity Check

 $figure (1) \ hold \ on \ plot 3([0 \ RSite (1, 1)], [0 \ RSite (2, 1)], [0 \ RSite (3, 1)]) \ plot 3([0 \ RSite (1, 2)], [0 \ RSite (2, 2)], [0 \ RSite (3, 2)], 'r') \ plot 3([0 \ RSite (1, 3)], [0 \ RSite (2, 3)], [0 \ RSite (3, 3)], 'g') \%\% \ plot 3([RSite (1, 1)], [RSite (2, 1)], [RSite (2, 1)], [RSite (2, 1)], [RSite (3, 1)], [RSite (3, 1)], [RSite (3, 1)], 'c') \ plot 3([RSite (1, 2)], [RSite (1, 2)], [RSite (2, 2)], [RSite (2, 2)], [RSite (2, 2)], [RSite (3, 2)], [RSite (3, 2)], [RSite (3, 2)], [RSite (2, 3)], [RSite (2, 3)], [RSite (2, 3)], [RSite (3, 3)], [$

Published with MATLAB® R2015b

Table of Contents

Problem 2	. 1
Set Up	1
Lambert's Universal	. 1
Min Energy	
Lambert's Gauss	
zzo Gooding	
Result	
Explanation	

Problem 2

```
%Morgan Yost
%AERO 557 HW1
clear all
```

Set Up

```
r0 = [15945.34; 0; 0];

r = [12214.83899; 10249.4731; 0];

tm = 1;

dt = 76*60;

mu = 398600;
```

Lambert's Universal

```
[f, g, gdot] = lambertUV(r0, r, dt, tm);
v0_universal = (r-f*r0)/g;
v universal = (gdot*r-r0)/g;
```

Min Energy

```
[a_min, e_min, t_min_abs, v0_minE] = LambertsMinEnergy( r0, r );
```

Lambert's Gauss

```
[f, g, ~, gdot] = Lambert_Gauss( r0, r, dt, tm );
v0_LM = (r-f*r0)/g;
v_LM = (gdot*r-r0)/g;
```

Izzo Gooding

```
[v0_izzo, v_izzo, extremal_distances, exitflag] = IzzoGooding(... r0', r', dt/(60*60*24), 0, mu);
```

Result

```
fprintf('Universal Variable v0: %f %f %f\n', v0 universal');
fprintf('norm: %f\n', norm(v0_universal));
fprintf('Min Energy v0: %f %f %f\n', v0_minE);
fprintf('norm: %f\n', norm(v0_minE));
fprintf('Lambert Gauss v0: %f %f %f\n', v0_LM);
fprintf('norm: %f \n', norm(v0 LM));
fprintf('Izzo Gooding v0: %f %f %f\n', v0 izzo);
fprintf('norm: %f \n', norm(v0_izzo));
Universal Variable v0: 2.058911 2.915965 0.000000
norm: 3.569589
Min Energy v0: 2.047409 2.924002 0.000000
norm: 3.569548
Lambert Gauss v0: 2.059422 2.915608 0.000000
norm: 3.569593
Izzo Gooding v0: 2.058911 2.915965 0.000000
norm: 3.569589
```

Explanation

```
fprintf('The variance in v vectors from observed r vectors and time
  are very \n')
fprintf('small. The difference comes from minor differences in
  implementation. \n')
fprintf('Lamberts min energy is a direct calculation scheme while the
  other\n')
fprintf('methods are not. It is not suprising to me that the min
  energy and \n')
fprintf('Lambert Gauss methods are so similar because they are both
  geometric \n')
fprintf('methods. \n')
```

The variance in v vectors from observed r vectors and time are very small. The difference comes from minor differences in implementation. Lamberts min energy is a direct calculation scheme while the other methods are not. It is not suprising to me that the min energy and Lambert Gauss methods are so similar because they are both geometric methods.

Published with MATLAB® R2015b