

A Bio-Molecular Barrier for Contamination Control

Shannon MacKenzie¹, Jennifer Eigenbrode², Robert E. Gold¹, Erich Schulze¹

¹Johns Hopkins University, Applied Physics Laboratory ²NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Planetary Environments Laboratory

and the **Contamination Control for Life Detection Team**: Antonios Seas, John Canham, Chris Lorentson, Therese Errigo, David Kusnierkiewicz, Faith Kujawa, Alfonso Davila, Chris McKay, Anthony Dazzo, Michael Swift, Andrew, Santo, Charles Sandy, Tony Asti, John Lin

ELSAH Technology Study Team, funded by NASA's New Frontiers Program, 2018-2020









Questions

- What mitigations reduce the risk of terrestrial contamination compromising our measurements conducted afar?
- 2. Can we reduce molecular contamination down to femtomole levels?

Traditional Contamination Control Engineering Launch cleanliness requirements \rightarrow End of Mission contamination levels

- Determine requirements
- Account for possible contaminant transfer using bulk transfer physics
- Protect the sample path until science operations
- Verify hardware cleanliness at launch



Search for life missions

- Determine requirements
- Account for possible contaminant transfer using bulk transfer physics
- Protect the sample path until science operations
- Verify hardware cleanliness at launch

LOD: pico to femtomole, 1-10 cells



Search for life missions

- Determine requirements
- Account for possible contaminant transfer using bulk transfer physics —
- Protect the sample path until science operations
- Verify hardware cleanliness at launch



Search for life missions

- Determine requirements
- Account for possible contaminant transfer using bulk transfer physics
- Protect the sample path until science operations
- Verify hardware cleanliness at launch ——



- Determine requirements
- Account for possible contaminant transfer using bulk transfer physics
- Protect the sample path until science operations
- Verify hardware cleanliness at launch



Despite the effectiveness of traditional, well-proven techniques for many planetary missions, these methods alone are insufficient for meeting the stringent contamination requirements of missions seeking signatures of life.









Colors represent the flow velocity magnitude in m/s

A new model for contamination-transport during launch

- **High-fidelity model** \bullet
 - computational fluid dynamics of the launch ightarrowvehicle environment
 - physics of <=monolayer molecule interaction with \bullet ultraclean surfaces
- Enables evaluation of \bullet
 - launch redistribution on all spacecraft surfaces ullet
 - decontamination activity (in-cruise bakeout of ulletsample collector)



0.01

0.001



Full-Spacecraft Barrier

- Soft-sided Barrier
- Semi-rigid Skeletal Support



1/3 Scale Demonstration of Full Spacecraft Barrier Deployment

The barrier would open after the fairing is jettisoned at the altitude necessary to avoid new terrestrial contamination.



Model comparisons of with and without barrier Contaminate build-up during launch



Model comparisons of with and without barrie Contaminate build up during launch

No Barrier

With Barrier



Colors represent the percent area of the surface covered by particles.

Model comparisons of with and without barrier Contaminate build up during launch

No Barrier

With Barrier



Colors represent the percent area of the surface covered by particles.

The barrier effectively isolates most of the spacecraft from fairing and launch environments.

Model comparisons of with and without barrier In-cruise bake out of sample collector

Time 0 = one monolayer



After 1 hr heating (mostly n-pentacosane remains)



Colors represent the linear scale of 0.5 to 5 Angstroms

Molecules used in model: n-dioctyl phthalate n-hexadecane n-eicosane n-pentacosane

- New model indicates 87.1% reduction of molecules.
- The traditional "bulk" transport model (unrealistic assumptions) indicated a 10⁻¹² reduction.

Model comparisons of with and without barrier In-cruise bake out of sample collector

Time 0 = one monolayer



After 1 hr heating (mostly n-pentacosane remains)



Colors represent the linear scale of 0.5 to 5 Angstroms

Molecules used in model: n-dioctyl phthalate n-hexadecane n-eicosane n-pentacosane

Bake out was remarkably effective at accomplishing further reduction in molecular levels on the sample collector surfaces. Comparable in-flight decontamination steps should be considered for other mission scenarios.



Conclusions

- Both the full-spacecraft barrier that protects an ultra-clean spacecraft from the launch environment and fairing AND secondary cleaning steps (collector bake out) are effective contamination control techniques consistent with traditional engineering approaches.
- With the new, high-fidelity physics model we now know that
 when starting with an attainable cleanliness levels for the
 - when starting with an attainable cleanliness levels for the spacecraft,
 - adding the barrier and bake-out step,
 the cleanliness levels required to meet the Level 1-Science
 Requirements are both practical and reasonably cost
 effective.
- The mitigation steps studied here are applicable to other life detection missions. However, in each case, high-fidelity physics modeling will be needed for determining mission design.



Conclusions

 For more details, see Eigenbrode, J. L., et al. "Contamination Control for Ultra-Sensitive Life-Detection Missions." *Frontiers in Space Technologies*: 6. (2021) <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/frspt.2021.734423</u>

TECHNOLOGY AND CODE article Front. Space Technol., 08 October 2021 | https://doi.org/10.3389/frspt.2021.734423



Contamination Control for Ultra-Sensitive Life-Detection Missions

🚊 Jennifer L. Eigenbrode1*, 🚊	Robert Gold ² , 🚊 Je	ohn S. Canham ^{1,3} ,	🔄 Erich Schulze², 🧝 Alfonso
F. Davila4, 💄 Antonios Seas1, 🕒	Therese Errigo ¹ , 🚊	Faith Kujawa², 💄	David Kusnierkiewicz², 🚊
Charles Lorentson ¹ and 🚬 Christopher McKay ⁴			
¹ NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, G	reenbelt, MD, United State	es	
² Applied Physics Laboratory, Johns Ho	pkins University, Laurel, M	D, United States	

³Peraton, Inc., Beltsville, MD, United States

⁴NASA Ames Research Center, Mountain View, CA, United States

• *Future work:* Barrier engineering tests and verification of the model to understand errors.