Sensing Needs for Advanced Crew and Environmental Monitoring and Associated Materials Considerations for Space Exploration Missions

Brian Dunaway Bill Atwell

The Boeing Company Space Exploration Houston, TX 77059

27 March 2007

The Prospect of Human Space Flight (1/2)

- In order for humans to safely explore space across great distances and for extended durations, there is still much work to be done, and *Bioastronautics* – the study of man in space – is *the* critical path to space exploration success
 - NASA's *Bioastronautics Roadmap* (*BR*) has identified 45 key risks associated with human space exploration, and there are many risks associated with a manned mission to Mars that have been assessed as "high"
 - These risks are as diverse as bone demineralization, radiation-induced carcinoma, immunodeficiency, and reliability of Environmental Control and Life Support (ECLS) systems, including Trace Contamination (TC) detection and mitigation

The Prospect of Human Space Flight (2/2)

- Experience on the International Space Station (ISS) certainly supports the assessment of these risks
 - Though various hardware failures and crew health issues through the years have been rectified, the solutions would not have been possible without close proximity to Earth
 - As ex-astronaut Bonnie Dunbar has said, "There are no Home Depots in space"
 - One might add, "There are no Kelsey Seybolds in space"
- Sufficiently mitigating these critical risks is a matter of life and death

The Critical Nature of Materials Selection

- Materials selection will play a critical role in mitigating the BR risks
- Among key desired materials characteristics:
 - Radiation shielding
 - Mechanical properties, e.g. strength, modulus and dimensional stability, MMOD mitigation
 - Lightweight
 - Low toxic off-gassing
 - Flame retardancy and reduced smoke emissions
 - Chemical resistance
 - Decreased permeability to gases, water and hydrocarbons
 - Thermal stability
 - Multifunctional

Materials: A Radiation Mitigation Perspective (1/3)



"It is well known that the primary sources of radiation exposure in space are Galactic Cosmic Rays (GCRs) and Solar Particle Events (SPEs). However, due to a number of independent variables associated with these sources, there is uncertainty about the total shielding required for longduration missions. <u>Research is needed to confidently predict the</u> <u>shielding capabilities of various materials and spacecraft components</u> along with corresponding research to understand crew exposure limits. <u>Most hydrocarbon-based composites have value as radiation shielding,</u> <u>thus many materials (e.g., ones developed for lightweight structures) may</u> <u>also be useful for radiation protection.</u>"

⁻⁻⁻⁻ NASA's Exploration Systems Architecture Study – Final Report, NASA TM-2005-214062, p. 629, November 2005 (aka ESAS Report)

Materials: A Radiation Mitigation Perspective (2/3)

- Desired characteristics specific to radiation mitigation:
 - High hydrogen content
 - Minimal secondary particle production, especially neutrons
- Suitable materials:
 - Aluminum (baseline reference material)
 - High-density polyethylene (HDPE)
 - Boron- and lithium-doped polymers
 - "Graded-Z" materials
 - Lithium hydride
 - Nanomaterials
- HDPE is currently being used to line Russian Segment (RS) sleep quarters to mitigate radiation exposure

Materials: A Radiation Mitigation Perspective (3/3)

Annual Lunar Surface GCR BFO* Exposures

Annual Martian Surface BFO* Exposures



* BFO – Blood-Forming Organs

§ Hydrogenated Graphite NanoFiber (HGNF) performance (upon which this data is based) has not yet been duplicated

Materials: An Advanced Life Support Perspective

- Desired characteristics specific to Advanced Life Support (ALS) – Trace Contaminant (TC) control:
 - Low toxic off-gassing
 - Flame retardancy and reduced smoke emissions
 - Chemical resistance
 - Decreased permeability to gases, water and hydrocarbons
- TCs are generated from various sources, e.g.,
 - Materials off-gassing
 - Structural
 - Electrical wiring and electronics
 - Compromise of reactant enclosures
 - Combustion events
 - Human metabolism and pathology
- TC detection, control and analysis is very tenuous for long-duration space flight

Interaction of Systems : Nominal / Chronic



Interaction of Systems : Emergency / Acute



Recent ISS Life Support Anomalies

- ECLS system performance is currently very tenuous for long-duration space flight
 - **A selection of recent ISS Failures:**
 - Repeated CO₂ Removal System (CRS) (CDRA (CO₂ Removal Assembly) and Vozdukh) failures caused by Zeolite dust
 - The causes of CDRA failures were not discovered until the unit was returned to Earth
 - Zeolite CO₂ adsorption is a decades-old technology
 - Newly-designed CDRA bed delivered, problems continue
 - Continued Elektron failures have threatened to place ISS at critical O₂ reserves
 - Major Constituent Analyzer (MCA) failure threatened abandonment of ISS
 - Volatile Organic Analyzer (VOA) failure
 - For extended periods there has been no real-time trace contaminant visibility at all

ISS Trace Contamination Control & Detection (1/2)

- Hundreds of molecular species that are the result of ISS off-gassing, human metabolism, etc. are considered to be potentially harmful to the crew if allowed to accumulate
- The ISS TC Control System (TCCS) as well as Condensing Heat Exchangers (CHX) provide TC control
- As noted, TC detection is inconsistent and often nonexistent in ISS
 - Aside from major constituents, the Major Constituent Analyzer (MCA) tracks CH₄ and H₂, but output not considered at all reliable for these molecules
 - The RS equivalent analyzer (ΓA) tracks CO, but less is known about RS equipment performance
 - MCA and VOA have both failed
- No real-time continuous biological detection in ISS

ISS Trace Contamination Control & Detection (2/2)

- For example, one of the most problematic TCs has been formaldehyde (H2CO)
 - It is off-gassed from a variety of sources, as well as produced metabolically
 - It is among the most toxic TCs
 - Ground-based material screening methods are very limited in their sensitivity
 - For long duration missions, source accumulation contributes to generation rate growth that eventually overloads active controls
 - The technology for real-time monitoring below the 180-day SMAC (0.05 mg/m3 – ppb range) is not currently available (rather, flight proven?)
 - For nine months H2CO concentration (indicated from returned air samples) was above the 180-day SMAC, and as high as 0.065 mg/m³ (30% above SMAC)

Formaldehyde Concentrations on US and RSS



From J. L. Perry, Formaldehyde Concentration Dynamics of the International Space Station Cabin Atmosphere, August 2004.

27 March 2007 Page 14

Ambiguity Regarding Crew Symptoms (1/2)

- Sample analyses typically suggest all tracked TC species below 180-day SMACs (with the exception of H2CO)
- However, ISS crew has reported a preference for operating both CDRA and Vozdukh during crew exchange
 - Crew notes a significant increase in "mental clarity"
 - Increase in CRS performance accomplishes two things:
 - Reduces CO₂ concentration (from 5 to 3 mm Hg)
 - Increased filtration with both CRS systems operating reduces TC concentration
 - US and Russian toxicology experts have not suggested any synergetic effects of CO₂ with total non-methane Volatile Organic Carbons (VOCs), humidity, or temperature

Ambiguity Regarding Crew Symptoms (2/2)

- Flight surgeons have that stated ground tests typically indicate at least one crewmember (CM) per flight will have sensitivity to CO₂ at concentrations > 3 mm Hg (this is far below the SMAC!)
- But this doesn't explain why that, according to crew reports, the entire crew feels a "significant increase in mental clarity" when both CRSs are operating
- If all species are below their SMACs, then why does the crew report increased well-being at (*perhaps*) lower levels of concentration?
 - Due to microgravity effects (SMACs developed in 1-g)?
 - Concentrations are diffusion-driven
 - Differences in absorption or reaction at the cellular level
 - *Rate of increase* of CO₂ is also a significant factor
- More accurate sensing and improved analysis: <u>a necessity</u>
- No consensus explanation for this phenomenon

Communication Breakdown

- The real-time Crewmember–Flight Surgeon–EECOM– Engineering communication path is virtually non-existent
 - Crew sickness during STS-96 (ISS 2A.1) critical reporting to engineering was delayed until post-mission – TC? CO₂? *Humidity? All of the above?*
 - Similar lack of real-time reporting of crew symptoms during recent Orbiter missions to ISS
 - Recently an EECOM flight note stated that "Crewmember misconfigured EVA tool because of CO₂ symptoms" – jumping to conclusions?
 - Very recently (STS-121 (ISS ULF1.1)) reports of crew headaches also delayed
- Even in ground tests, e.g., headaches during testing in (old) Weightless Environment Training Facility (WETF) unreported
- This communication gap only adds to the problems of low detection performance and consequent incomplete analysis

The Future of Manned Space Exploration?

The canary effect – adverse health conditions perceived by the crewmember – is often the first line of defense

• This is positively unacceptable for long-term, long-range space exploration

- Without proper diagnosis:
 - There can be no real-time treatment
 - There can be no design response

The Necessity of Diagnostic Data

- A comprehensive and coordinated collection of data is required for accurate diagnosis, prognosis and treatment
 - Stimulus perceived by the human ("canary effect") is a valuable diagnostic tool, but advanced sensing devices are needed to detect the presence of chronic or acute illness before subject-reported symptoms:
 - Increased concentration of trace contaminants or their by-products when absorbed by the human system
 - DNA structure anomalies for early detection of radiation-induced carcinoma
 - Early presence of pathogens and antigens
- A superior integrated sensing web and diagnostic capability is required to yield safe long-range manned space exploration

Life Science Sensor Requirements

- Among the critical requirements expressed by NASA Space Life Sciences for sensors that will facilitate this diagnostic capability:
 - Non-invasive
 - Portable
 - Low mass & volume
 - High accuracy
 - Rugged and reliable
 - Adaptive and intelligent
 - Easy to calibrate
 - Multifunctional
- Cutting-edge technologies will be required to acquire critical information in various *in situ* settings
 - Multifunctional lab-on-chip technologies
 - Enabled by microfluidics and nanotechnology

Advanced Life Support Sensor Web



Fly-by-Wireless Life Science Sensing

- However, in order for TC and radiation sensing to be most effective, sensor data needs to be mapped to the space vehicle or habitat as a function of space and time
 - This will require position information for each crewmember as a function of time
 - Complementary Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) and other 3-D analyses will pinpoint the performance of specific systems and possible crew health hazards
 - Off gassing from surfaces or experiments
 - Residue concentrations from combustion events
 - Effluents via crew metabolism or pathology
 - Radiation mitigation performance as a function of material and geometry

4-D Mapping for TC and Radiation Analysis

CFD TC Analysis

3-D Radiation Analysis

Bottom View





Side View



Fly-by-Wireless for Life Science Conclusions

- The study of TC and radiation exposure mitigation on ISS fits very well with NASA's *ISS Utilization Plan*
- 4-D mapping each CM's TC and radiation exposure to the ISS will significantly facilitate this study, allowing:
 - Advanced knowledge of materials in their in situ settings
 - Provide information necessary for developing related countermeasures
 - Aid in the development of a 1000-day SMAC, critical for long duration manned space exploration
 - Provide visibility to and diagnosis of chronic ISS concerns
 - Provide a solution pathway to ISS and future Constellation vehicles for long-term crew health and safety