LUNAR MOMENT OF INERTIA AND LOVE NUMBER J. G. Williams, D. H. Boggs, and J. T. Ratcliff, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, 91109 (e-mail James.G.Williams@jpl.nasa.gov).

Introduction: Variations in rotation and orientation of the Moon are sensitive to solid-body tidal dissipation, dissipation due to relative motion at the fluid-core/solid-mantle boundary, tidal Love number k_2, and moment of inertia differences [1,2]. There is weaker sensitivity to flattening of the core/mantle boundary (CMB) [2,3,6] and fluid core moment of inertia [1]. Accurate Lunar Laser Ranging (LLR) measurements of the distance from observatories on the Earth to four retroreflector arrays on the Moon are sensitive to variations in lunar rotation and orientation and tidal displacements. Past solutions using the LLR data have given results for Love numbers plus dissipation due to solid-body tides and fluid core [1-4]. Detection of the fluid core polar minus equatorial moment of inertia difference due to CMB flattening is now significant. This strengthens the case for a fluid lunar core. Future approaches are considered to detect a solid inner core.

LLR Solutions: Reviews of Lunar Laser Ranging (LLR) are given in [2,5]. Lunar ranges over 1970-2010 are analyzed using a weighted least-squares approach. Here we include 4.5 yr of accurate ranges from Apache Point Observatory, New Mexico with the extensive set of data from McDonald Observatory, Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur (OCA), and Haleakala Observatory. Lunar solution parameters include moment of inertia differences, dissipation at the fluid-core/solid-mantle boundary (CMB), tidal dissipation, dissipation-related coefficients for rotation and orientation terms, potential Love number k_2, displacement Love numbers h_2 and l_2, and fluid core flattening. Solutions can combine solution parameters and constraints.

Solid Moment of Inertia: The lunar solid moment of inertia I_{solid}, crust and mantle plus solid core, can be determined by combining LLR moment of inertia differences with spacecraft determined J_2 or C_{22}. Here, the LP150Q spacecraft J_2 [8] is combined with LLR moment differences to get $I_{solid}/MR^2 = 0.3928\pm0.0003$, where M and R are the mass and radius, respectively.

Fluid Core Moment of Inertia: The fluid core moment of inertia is an important lunar geophysical parameter. In the LLR analysis sensitivity comes from two effects: directly from the response of the orientation to a slow motion of the ecliptic plane and indirectly through dissipation at the CMB [1].

Theory and LLR solutions for lunar dissipation are presented in [1]. Interpretation of the dissipation results invokes both strong tidal dissipation and interaction at a fluid-core/solid-mantle boundary (CMB). Solutions include combinations of tide and core parameters plus orientation coefficients. Dissipation provided the first LLR evidence for a fluid core [1]. Evidence for CMB dissipation remains strong, with a value 10 times its uncertainty, and the fluid core moment is approximately $C_f/C \approx 10^{-3}$ using Yoder's turbulent boundary layer expression [1,11], but the moment uncertainty cannot be improved due to unknown CMB roughness contributing to CMB dissipation.

For the direct approach, the core moment and core/mantle boundary flattening are strongly correlated and separating them in the solutions is difficult. Multiple integrations and solutions show that nonlinearities impact solutions for core moment.

Extracting the core moment is challenging and the direct approach has not achieved an acceptable result. The main difficulty with using the direct approach comes from separating effects with similar frequencies and very long beat periods [1]. The increasing LLR data span should improve the separation.

Core Oblateness: Detection of the oblateness of the fluid-core/solid-mantle boundary (CMB) is evidence for the existence of a liquid core that is independent of dissipation results. In a first approximation, CMB oblateness influences the tilt of the lunar equator to the ecliptic plane [2]. A torque for CMB flattening is introduced into the numerical integration model for lunar orientation and its partial derivatives [6] to get solution parameters for CMB flattening, core moment of inertia and core spin vector. Equator tilt is also influenced by lunar moment differences, gravity harmonics and Love number k_2, solution parameters affected by CMB flattening.

Torque from an oblate CMB shape is proportional to the difference between fluid core polar and two equatorial moments, $C_f-(A_f+B_f)/2$, provided that the fluid has uniform density and the inner boundary is spherical. This moment difference depends on the product of the fluid core moment of inertia C_f and the CMB flattening f, $[C_f-(A_f+B_f)/2]/C = fC_f/C$. The LLR solution gives $[C_f-(A_f+B_f)/2]/C = (2.3\pm0.8)\times10^{-7}$. This product is much better determined than the two factors. While the flattening f is uncertain, the moment difference is significant and CMB flattening is detected.

The model equilibrium value for the CMB flattening is 2.2×10^{-5}. To match the fC_f/C value, an equilibrium f would require a very large fluid core with a moment of inertia an order-of-magnitude larger than otherwise indicated. So the CMB flattening does not appear to be at equilibrium. The whole Moon degree-2 shape and gravity field are larger than the equilibrium figure for the current tides and spin and the same ap-

pears to be true for the CMB flattening.

Love Number Determination: LLR sensitivity to the potential Love number k_2 comes from rotation and orientation while h_2 and l_2 are determined from tidal displacement of the retroreflectors. Solving for k_2 and h_2, but fixing l_2 at a model value of 0.0108, gives k_2 = 0.0229±0.0020 and h_2 = 0.048±0.008. The tidal deformation affects the lunar orientation in three ways: through the gravity field torque, and through the responding moment of inertia and its derivative with respect to time. The LLR k_2 value is sensitive to the interior model and the choice of solution parameters. Orbiting spacecraft results for the lunar Love number k_2 are 0.026±0.003 [7], 0.0248±0.003 for LP150Q [8] and 0.0240±0.0015 for SGM100h [9], determined from tidal variation of the gravity field.

Model Love Numbers: Model Love number calculations, using seismic P- and S-wave speeds deduced from Apollo seismology, were explored. A sequence of solid-mantle/fluid-core/solid-core models were computed, satisfying the solid moment of inertia. The seismic speeds were extrapolated from the sampled mantle regions into the deeper zone above the core. A 30 km thick crust and a 2% density gradient across the mantle were used. Fluid core radii ≥358 km and solid core radii <358 km were found with fluid core mixtures of Fe and FeS, and solid Fe for the inner core. The smaller-fluid-core end of the sequence, with k_2 = 0.0230, h_2 = 0.0403, and l_2 = 0.0108, has a solid core nearly filling the fluid cavity. Larger fluid cores, with smaller solid cores, have larger model k_2 and h_2 values. Lower seismic velocities in the lower mantle, such as a partial melt would give, would increase k_2 and h_2. A density gradient >2% across the mantle permits fluid cores <358 km. The Apollo seismic uncertainties contribute ~5% uncertainty to the model k_2 and h_2 Love numbers.

Dissipation from Tides: Analysis of the dissipation coefficients is similar to that in [1]. Tidal Q depends weakly on period; Q increases from ~30 at a month to ~35 at one year, using k_2 = 0.0229.

Inner Core Possibilities: A solid inner core might exist inside the fluid core. Gravitational interactions between an inner core and the mantle could reveal its presence in the future. An inner core might rotate independently, but gravitational interactions are expected to lock it to the mantle rotation.

The theoretical precession and longitude dynamics for locked rotation have been investigated. Inner core torques arise from gravitational interactions with both the Earth and the mantle, and through inner-core/fluid-core boundary oblateness. Like the mantle, the equator of the inner core would be tilted with respect to the ecliptic plane and precessing along that plane with an 18.6 yr period. This is a forced retrograde precession. The tilt may be more or less than the mantle's 1.54˚ tilt

and could have opposite sign. The attraction between a triaxial inner core field and the interior gravitational harmonics of the mantle has unknown strength but it would introduce its own inner core free precession and longitude resonances. These unknown resonance periods determine which mantle orientation and rotation terms are more strongly perturbed by the inner core and hence which terms are potentially observable by LLR. Inner core effects are likely subtle and depend on a number of currently unknown parameters including inner and outer core moments, inner core gravity coefficients, and mantle inward gravity coefficients.

An inner core might also be detected from its gravitational field [10]. Tilted by a different amount than the mantle, inner core degree-2 harmonics would cause time varying C_{21} and S_{21} harmonics viewed in a mantle-fixed frame. The period would be 27.212 days. A search for variable C_{21} and S_{21} harmonics should be a goal of future lunar orbiting spacecraft missions.

Summary: Adding new lunar ranges gives solutions for lunar parameters with improved uncertainties. Love number k_2 has improved and an updated solid moment is given. Dissipation parameters continue to indicate a fluid core and strong tidal dissipation. The detection of the fluid core polar/equatorial moment difference due to the fluid-core/solid-mantle boundary flattening is additional evidence for a fluid lunar core. Detection of a solid inner core is a future possibility. Additional ranges should improve the determination of these lunar science results. A wider network of lunar retroreflectors would strengthen the results.

References: [1] Williams J. G. et al. (2001) *J. Geophys. Res., 106,* 27,933-27,968. [2] Dickey J. O. et al. (1994) *Science*, *265*, 482-490. [3] Williams J. G. et al. (2010) Abstract No. 2336 of *Lunar and Planetary Science Conference XXXXI*. [4] Williams J. G. et al. (2006) *Advances in Space Research*, *37*, Issue 1, 67-71. [5] Williams J. G. and Dickey J. O. (2003) Proceedings of 13th International Workshop on Laser Ranging, Washington, D. C. [6] Williams J. G. and Boggs D. H. (2009) in Proceedings of 16th International Workshop on Laser Ranging, 101-120. [7] Konopliv A. S. et al. (2001) *Icarus, 150,* 1-18. [8] Konopliv A. S. (2000) PDS website. [9] Matsumoto K. et al. (2010) *J. Geophys. Res., 115*, E06007, doi:10.1029/2009JE003499. [10] Williams J. G. (2007) *Geophys. Res. Lett., 34*, L03202, doi:10.1029/2006GL028185. [11] Yoder C. F. (1995) *Icarus, 117,* 250-286. [12] Rambaux N. and Williams J. G. (2010) *Cele. Mech. and Dyn. Ast*., doi:10.1007/s10569-010-9314-2