Comet strength properties



HONEYBEE ROBOTICS Spacecraft Mechanisms Corporation

Honeybee Robotics Spacecraft Mechanisms Corporation 398 W Washington Blvd., Suite 200, Pasadena, CA 91103 www.HoneybeeRobotics.com



Kris Zacny

June 6, 2017 KISS. CalTech

Why do we care about material strength?

- **ISO** 9001 AS9100 Contract Holder
- Sample acquisition approach, energy, forces are a function of material strength
- Sample temperature during sample acquisition is a function of "all of the above"
- Sample energy can also tell us degree of cementation, material properties etc. that could be useful for science 60



Strength comes from sintering

Sintering: formation of ice bridges between the ice and/or dust particles

Transport mechanisms:

- Sublimation re condensation
- Grain boundary diffusion
- Lattice diffusion
- Surface diffusion (at low T)







(Thomas et al., 1994)



Fig. 1. The two-spheres model with different transport mechanisms (1. sublimation and recondensation, 2. surface diffusion, 3. grainboundary diffusion and 4. lattice diffusion).





(Thomas et al., 1994)



Fig. 7. Comparision of experimental and calculated crushing strengths of an icy body with a mineral content of 34Vol%.

Sintering at cryogenic temp



- At Low T, exclude the following sintering mechanisms:
- Sintering of particles where the mass transport is via the sublimation-condensation route can be excluded, since the vapor pressure of ice at temperature below IO0 K is negligibly small.
- Transport via lattice diffusion within the ice grains or grain boundary diffusion are strongly temperature dependent via their respective diffusion coefficients.
- At Low T, possible sintering mechanism:
- Surface diffusion of water molecules along the particle surfaces towards necks between particles.
- At 50K, comet can reach strengths of 10kPa

Neck growth of ice particles with radii of 0.1 and 1 micron calculated by surface diffusion for a temperature of 30K.



Ice cemented lunar soil (worst case scenario)

Atkinson and Zacny, 2017





Crystalline Ice (worst case scenario)

Arakawa and Maenor, 1997



7



Gas-laden amorphous ice



- Samples of gas-laden amorphous ice prepared at 80 K and 10^-5 Torr on a cold plate
- Scrapped into a tray until 5-10 cm deep. Final result: fluffy agglomerate of 200-µm ice grains.
- Heated from above by IR radiation
- □ 1.5 cm dia half-sphere cone penetrometer to measure strength at 1 atm (chamber opened).





--- Pure Ice --- Ice:Argon 3:1 --- Ice:Argon 1:1 --- Talcum Powder

Fig. 6. Compressive strength of the studied ice samples as function of the penetration depth in the ice.

Fig. 4. Temperature profiles of the thermocouples as a function of their distance from the 80 K bottom plate. Note also the sharp decrease and increase of the water flux vs the sluggish-response of the argon emanation, when the ice sample is covered by the cold plate and upon its removal.



- (1) Vacuum chamber
- (2) cold plate at 80 K;
- (3) 200-m amorphous gas-laden ice
- (4) homogeneous flow of water vapor and gas
- (5) water vapor and gas pipes;
- (6) 200 cm2 and 5-10cm thick ice sample
- (7) heating dome
- (8) 80 K cold knife;
- (9) thermocouples;
- (10) density measurements
- (11) mass spectrometer
- (12) ionization gauge;
- (13) heating tape
- (14) LN2 cooling pipes.



KOSI Experiments



- □ 11 KOSI experiments performed at various conditions.
- All experiments used water ice with some mixing of CO2, methanol, formaldehyde, ammonia, etc.
- **α** Refractory constituents were minerals olivine and montmorillonite (4-15 µm median grain distribution)
- Aixture of carbon (soot or charcoal) used to reduce albedo
- Derous mixtures created by spraying a water suspension of materials into liquid nitrogen
- Heated from above by horizontal IR radiation

| Experiment (KOSI-No.) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 A | 11 |
|---|------|-------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------|------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| Basic composition (wt.%): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H ₂ O | 90 | 77.8 | 77.6 | 70.2 | 41.6 | 83 | 100 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 52 |
| CO ₂ | | 13.8 | 13.8 | 16.8 | 15.0 | 15 | | | | | |
| CH ₃ OH | | | | . 4.2 | | | | | | | 2 |
| CH ₂ O | | | | | | | | | | | 6 |
| Olivine | 9 | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 30.9 | 2 | | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Montmorillonite | 1 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 7.4 | | | | | | 20 |
| Carbon | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 5.1 | 0.01 | | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | |
| Dust/ice ratio | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.77 | 0.02 | 0 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.67 |
| Local admixtures: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Isotopic tracers | | | HDO | HDO | HDO | | HDO | | | | D_2O |
| - | | | $^{13}CO_{2}$ | ¹³ CO ₂ | ¹³ CO ₂ | | | | | | - |
| Chemical species | | | | | - | kerogen | | | | | NH ₃ , CO ₂ |
| Contaminants | | | | | N_2,O_2 | | | | | | N_2, O_2 |
| Density $(g \text{ cm}^{-3})$ | 0.55 | 0.48 | 0.51 | 0.56 | 0.59 | 0.46 | 0.40 | 0.44 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.54 |
| Porosity (%) | 40 | 50 | 50 | 40 | 29 | 45 | 56 | 53 | 63 | 49 | 49 |
| Reflectivity, before/after (%) | 6/- | 17/15 | 9/12 | 8/14 | 12/18 | 7/ | 90/92 | 6/12 | -/ | -/- | 56/65 |
| Inclination (horizontal = 0°) | 45° | 45° | 20° | 40° | 40° | 40° | 30° | 40° | 45° | 45° | 40 ° |
| Insolation, nominal [SC] (1 SC = 1370 W m^{-2}) | 0.9 | 1.35 | 0.65 | 1.16* | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 |

*Corrected estimate : 1.4 SC.



Parameters of KOSI experiments

| Experiment | KOSI-1 | KOSI-2 | KOSI-3 | KOSI-4 | KOSI-5 | KOSI-6 | KOSI-7 | KOSI-8 | KOSI-9 | KOSI-10 | KOSI-11 |
|--|--------------|----------|---------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Date | May 87 | April 88 | Nov. 88 | May 89 | Nov. 89 | May 90 | Jan. 91 | Oct. 91 | Dec. 91 | Dec.92 | May 93 |
| Sample size (height / diameter in cm) | 12 /29 | 15 / 29 | 14/29 | 13/29 | 13/29 | 13/29 | 29/60 | 30 / 60 | 13/30 | 13 / 30 | 13/30 |
| Sample composition (weight %) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| H ₂ O-ice | 90 | 90 | 77.8 | 77.6 | 70.2* | 41.6* | 83* | 100* | 90 | 90 | 45 1 |
| CO ₂ -ice | - | - | 13.8 | 13.8 | 16.8* | 15.0* | 15* | - | - | - | 58 |
| other ices | - | - | | - | methanol 4.2 | - | - | - | _ · · | _ | 0.1+ |
| total dust content | 10 | 10 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.8 | 43.4 | 2.1 | - | 10 | 10 | 40 |
| Dust composition (weight %) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| olivine | - | 89 | 89.1 | 89.2 | 89.3 | 71.3 | 88.9 | - | 00.0 | 00.0 | 50 |
| montmorillonite | - | 10 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 17.0 | - | - | - | 33.3 | 50 |
| carbon | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 11.7 | 3.1 | - | 0.1 | 01 | 50 |
| other | kaolinite 99 | • | - | - | ** | - | kerogene 8.0 | · - | - | - | - |
| Initial sample properties | | | | | | | | | | | |
| albedo | 0.2 | 0.06 | 0.17 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.90 | 0.06 | n d | 0.56 |
| density (g cm ⁻³) | 0.4 | 0.55 | 0.48 | 0.51 | 0.56 | 0.59 | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| porosity | 60% | 50% | 55% | 55% | 40% | 29%: | 45% | 56% | 53% | 49% | 49% |
| Irradiance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| flux range (sc) | 0.15 - 1.15 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 0.65 - 0.85 | 12-10 | 12-14 | 1.0- | 1.0 | 14-015 | 10.06 | 1205 |
| duration (h) (including dark phases) | 38.4 | 39.4 | 47.2 | 44.5 | 12.9 | 30.3 | 34.0 | 40.0 | 59.0 | 4.75 | 15.25 |

*: Isotopically marked layers of HDO and $13CO_2$ SC: Solar constant = 1.37 kW m⁻²

":" indicates uncertain data

KOSI Experiments



- Strength measurement using 0.5 mm diameter rod with hemispherical tip at 0.2 mm/s
- All KOSI experiments showed hard layer beneath dust mantle resulted from the sublimed and after inward diffusion re-crystallized volatiles components.
- Strength, thickness, and depth of the crust varied. The crust formation follows crystallization temperature of the different volatile components (water, methanol, CO2)

| Experiment | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | KOSI 3 |
|--|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Material Before Insolation Mineral composition (olivine:montmorillonite) | 7:3 | 9:1 | 7:3 | 7:3 | 9:1 | 9:1 |
| Spraying pressure (atm.) | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 1.6-1.9 |
| Spraying flow (ml/sec) | 1.7-2.0 | ~2.2 | ~1.6 | 1.3-1.4 | 2.9-3.3 | ~2.0 |
| Content of CO2-ice (wt.%) | 6.5 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 | 13.0 | 13.8 |
| Density (g/cm^3) | 0.41 | 0.43 | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.41 | 0.48 |
| Porosity (%) | | _ | 59 | 63 | 60 | 57 |
| Texture | mud | snow | snow | mud | snow | mud/snow |
| Intensity of irradiation | 2.0-2.4 | 2.0 | 2.0-2.4 | 2.0-2.4 | 2.0-2.4 | 1.3-1.4 |
| Period of irradiation (hr:min) | 3:38 | 2:12 | 2:15 | 2:45 | 3:38 | 41:10 |
| T _i , T _f (K) 2 cm below surface* | 149-196 | 143-209 | 151-218 | 163-211 | 164-222 | 100-~150 |
| Max. dust activity ($\mu g/cm^2 min$) | | 132 | 19 | 607 | 173 | - |
| Material After Insolation | | | | | | |
| Thickness of crust (mm) | 20-25 | 16-18 | 20-24 | 10-26 | 20-42 | 28-70 |
| Strength of crust (MPa) | 0.30-1.3 | 0.43-0.55 | 0.15-0.19 | 0.75-1.10 | 0.35-0.88 | 1.3-5.1 |
| Strength below crust (MPa) | 0.1-0.3 | 0.04-0.06 | 0.03-0.05 | 0.08-0.24 | 0.03-0.08 | 0.2-0.5 |
| No. of strength measurements | 4 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

 T_i , T_f = initial and final temperature of the sample during the experiment.

KOSI Experiments #5



Kochan et al. 1998



0.05 to 2 MPa where recrystallization of water vapor was less extensive



Fig. 21. Stress-depth profiles of a cometary analgous sample before (left) and after insolation (right). Small chamber experiment.



fardness test of the insolated sample using a eter.

Conclusions



- Knowledge of material strength drives sampling approach, sample acquisition energies and forces and thermal impact on the sample captured
- Sintering seems to be the primary strengthening mechanism of a cometary material
- Sintering occurs at any temperature but sintering mechanisms and sintering rate changes with temperature (rate is lower at low temperature)
- At higher temperature sintering rate is greater (and we expect higher strength) but sublimation rate is higher (loss of volatile species which reduce material strength)
- The upper limit on strength is ice cemented ground or ice at cryogenic temperatures can reach 10s of MPa (much harder than commercial concrete)
- Strength of crystallized ice is higher than that of amorphous ice