## The Artemis Project



### Lunar Regolith Excavator Student Competition ME Team #8 / ECE Team #1

James Dickson

Anthony Gantt

**Christopher Loftis** 

Jennifer Schrage

Nick Stroupe

Lindsey Alan Williams

Jeremy Nagorka

Florida A&M University ( Florida State University

### **NASA Lunabotics Mining Competition**

- Purpose
  - Primaryeducate students
  - -Secondarylunar excavation



# Guidelines

- Maximum excavation hardware mass:
  - 80 kilograms
- Maximum power supply voltage:
  40 Volts
- Maximum power supply current:
  - 15 Amps
- Maximum setup/takedown time:
  - 10 minutes
- Maximum operation time:
  - 30 minutes

- Minimum excavated regolith mass:
  - 150 kilograms
- Minimum communication delay:
   2.0 seconds
- Maximum communication bandwidth:
  - 1.0 Megabits per second
- Max hardware width/length:
  - 1.3 meters
- Max hardware height:
  - 2.4 meters

# **Sub-Systems**

- Excavation
- Locomotion
- Obstacles

- Power Supply
- Microcontroller and
  - Communications
- Navigation







#### **Bucket-wheel**

- •Current Applications:
  - -Surface mining excavation
- •Design:
  - -Bucket-wheel excavates regolith -Regolith is transported to collection bin via conveyor belt within connecting arm
- •Pros:
  - -Uniform excavation
  - -High efficiency
  - -Good scalability
  - -Excellent controllability
  - -Proven design
- •Cons:
  - -Few off-the-shelf parts available-Works best for soft soil (large objects pose a problem)





#### Split Inward V-plow

- •Current Applications:
  - -Commonly used for the clearing of debris from roadways
- •Design:
  - -Blades angled inward
  - -Separation between blades "funnels" the regolith
  - -Conveyor belt transports regolith to collection bin

#### •Pros:

- -Simple design (1 dof)
- -Low cost
- -Ease of fabrication
- -Uniform excavation

#### •Cons:

- -Unproven design
- -High power requirement
- -Effectiveness directly tied to performance of drive system





#### <u>Backhoe</u>

•Current Applications:

-General usage excavation equipment (primarily digging)

•Design:

-Consist of a two-part articulating arm with a bucket attached to the end -Bucket is forced into soil and drawn toward the vehicle during excavation

•Pros:

-Proven design

-Low cost

#### •Cons:

- -Slow excavation rate
- -Difficult controls
- -Low volume bucket





#### Paddle belt

- •Current Applications:
  - -Used in excavation as a means of material transport

•Design:

-Works under the same principle as bucket-chain. Paddles excavate and transport regolith

#### •Pros:

- -Uniform excavation
- -Relatively basic design
- -Variable speed capability
- -Only one motor necessary

#### •Cons:

-Unproven excavation method -Few off-the-shelf parts available





#### Front Loader

- •Current Applications:
  - -Used in construction to as a material loader

•Design:

-Consist of large volume bucket attached to the vehicle via one or more arms

#### •Pros:

- -Proven design
- -Large volume
- -Low cost
- -Good controllability
- -Low maintenance

•Cons:

Excavation rate directly tied to performance of locomotion
Few off-the-shelf parts available



#### **Bucket Chain**

Current Applications:

•Canal dredging and large scale material handling

Method of Operation:

•Buckets attached to a belt remove material and deposit it directly into a bin

#### Pros:

Eliminates separate conveyorLess post-excavation material loss

#### Cons:

- •High inertia
- •High power requirements



#### <u>Clamshell</u>

**Current Applications:** 

•Limited access material removal

Method of Operation:

•Hydraulic cylinder closes buckets to remove material

Pros:

Operates in small areasDoes not affect platform position

Cons:

•Requires high downward force

•Difficult to control over large area



#### **Powered Brushes**

Current Application: •Street sweepers

Method of Operation:

•Circular and cylindrical brushes rotate to move material in the desired direction

Pros:

Easy to controlSimple to implement

#### Cons:

Creates large amounts of dustOnly works for loose surface material



### **Boring**

**Current Applications:** 

•Creating tunnels through rock, installing utility lines

Method of Operation:

•Grind material off rock face and transport backward to remove Pros:

•Groundbreaking application of technology

Cons:

- •Need solid/semi-solid material
- •Overly complex



### **OBSTACLES**

### Obstacles •Rocks

-4 total

-20 to 30 cm in diameter

-Approximate mass of 7 to 10 kg

-Placed randomly

-Minimum difference between any two rocks is 40 cm



## **Rock Handling Methods**

#### **Bumper/Pilot/Angled Plow**

Current Applications: •Go-karts, automobiles, trains, snowplows

Method of Operation:

- •Shield fragile parts from direct impact
- •Use angular force to move objects out of vehicle path



#### Pros:

InexpensiveSimple to fabricate and implement

#### Cons:

- •Adds mass
- •Drag on drivetrain





### **Rock Handling Methods**

#### **Post-excavation**

Current Application: •Sorting machines, quality control

Method of Operation:

•Ignoring – excavate the rock directly into the dump bin

•Conveyor rejection/Bin screening – prevent the rock from entering the bin

#### Pros:

- •Easy to implement
- •No moving parts

Cons:

May hurt weight capacity of robotRequires overpowered conveyor system



## **Rock Handling Methods**

#### <u>Catapult</u>

Current Applications: •Recreation, historical reenactment

Method of Operation:

•Using spring loaded launcher, forcefully ejec

Pros:

•Permanently solves rock problem

Cons:

ComplexHazardous to humans



### **Locomotion Subsystem Requirements**

- Speed
- Traction
- Maneuverability
- Stability
- Power
- Simplicity
- Maintenance
- Dust Resistance



### **Concept Generation**

- Locomotion
  - Legged Locomotion
    - C-Legs
    - Piston-Compliant Legs
  - Wheeled Locomotion
    - 4 Wheels
    - 6 Wheels
  - Tracked Locomotion
    - Tracks
    - Tracks with integrated excavation equipment (buckets)
  - Other Locomotion
    - "Earth Worm" digs through dirt while "eating"

### Legged Locomotion



Flocida A&M University ( Flocida State University )







## **The Worm**



## **Tracked Locomotion**





# **Final Selection**

- Standard Tracks
  - -Provide traction, maneuverability, stability
  - -Proper motors provide speed

## **Power Regulation**

#### **Source Options:**

I. Use 40V/15A source delivered by tether (unconfirmed)

II. Implement a battery pack

III. Combination of the tether source and a battery pack

#### **Power Distribution Options:**

I. Design one power electronic circuit

II. Use multiple circuits for powering specific devices



### **Battery Options**

#### I. Lead Acid

-Inexpensive but large and heavy -High current output Optimal choice if limiting factor is money.

#### **II. Lithium-Ion**

-Expensive but lightweight -Fast charge with zero memory effect Optimal choice if limiting factor is weight.

#### **III. Lithium – Polymer**

-High current output -Lightweight but expensive -Lower energy density Optimal choice if limiting factor is weight with maximal current desired

specific battery output parameters ultimately depends on required power of motors.







#### **General Power Distribution Circuit (Low Cost):**



- Two (or more) 12V DC sources connected in series
- Switching regulator to step down the voltage (~ 7V)
- Multiple switching regulators can be implemented if necessary
- -Optimal choice so long as money is the greatest limiting factor

### **Conceptual "Next-Step" Procedures**

1. Verify money is the greatest limiting factor

2. Obtain motor requirements to appropriately select source parameters

3. Research and implement safety features (diodes, capacitors, fuses)

4. Simulate and test.



# **Microcontroller Pros/Cons**

- FPGAs
  - Very fast, Tons of I/O, Can do many different things at once
  - Harder to program and debug, Would need most of the functions already implemented on a  $\mu$ C, No analog inputs
- 8-bit  $\mu$ C (ex. AVR ATMEGA)
  - "Easy" to program, Good low level functions, Very popular with robotics tons of support, Plenty of development boards,
  - Slower especially with FP, Limited amount of memory
- 32-bit µC ( ex. AVR32, ARM7 )
  - Faster and more memory than 8-bit, Can run OS, More I/O pins, Built in higher level functions(LCD, Image processing),
  - More complicated and expensive than 8-bit, Less selection of lower level functions, Fewer boards available, Most aren't TTL

# **Microcontroller Selection**

- Decided on 8-bit. Most likely the Axon (AVR ATMEGA 640)
- An FPGA would take far too long to get working
- Low level functions far more important for motor control and sensor reading
- Program shouldn't be complicated so extra speed isn't needed
- Tons of examples/tutorials on
- to use them
- Used a similar chip before



# **Telerobotics Interface**

- Wired vs. Wireless
  - Ethernet is simpler but cable gets tangled
  - Wireless is more expensive, complicated but no cable
- Power tether supplied: Wired, No power tether: Wireless
- Types of Wireless available:
- Zigbee
  - Slow speeds, <250kb/s, 10m range, Low power, More for communication between sensors
- Bluetooth
  - Faster 1-3Mb/s, 10-100m range, Medium power, Acts as Wireless serial connection
- WiFi 802.11
  - Very fast 54Mb/s, 50-100m range, Highest power, High complexity

# **Communication System**

- Max bandwidth is 1Mb/s so zigbee is too slow
- The bottleneck is the  $\mu C$  serial connection to the modem of ~ 1Mb/s
- Bluetooth is cheaper and seems to have a simpler interface
- A PC receives data from  $\mu C$  and acts as a server through the delay
- The server laptop can also be used for additional processing power



### **Navigation/Sensors Subsystem Requirements**

The excavating robotic device must have the ability to move about the course freely and return to its starting position throughout the competition; as well as calculating the amount of regolith collected. To do so the device will need navigational sensors that have the ability to

- Measure speed
- Distance
- Position
- Mass measurements.

# **Concept Generation**

- Types of Sensors
  - Position, angle, displacement, distance, speed, acceleration
  - Acoustic, sound, & vibration
  - Navigation instruments
  - Optical, light, imaging







# **Concept Generation**

- Types of Sensors
  - Proximity, presence
  - Electric current, magnetic, radio, voltage
  - Pressure, force, density, level
  - Environment, weather







# **Navigational and Weight Sensor(s)**

Inertial Sensor



Relative Sensor



- Beacon Sensors
- Weight Sensor(s)





# Conclusion

- V-plow
- Track
- 2 DC motors
- MCU

- Inertial Sensor
- Digital Scale
- Current Sensor
- Beacons
- At this time are there any questions?

