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Complex Volatile Environment

Just beginning to be understood:
• LRO: Observe both deep H reservoirs and surface frost in PSR/polar cold traps; H₂ gas emission from surface
• LCROSS: Observation of impact-released water and possibly complex hydrocarbons like CO₂, C₂H₄ and CH₃OH.
• Chandrayaan-1/EPOXI/Cassini: IR observations of hydroxyl at mid-latitude surface
• Kaguya/Chandrayaan-1: Detection of reflected H⁺ and emitted fast neutral H
• LADEE: Detection of methane at mid-latitudes and possibly CO⁺ and C⁺ also detected in exosphere
• LACE made preliminary detection of exospheric CO and CO₂

How do you place all of this in context?
How are all of these volatile observations inter-connected?
Non-Polar Volatiles: Complex Array of Sources
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Dynamic Diurnal Surface Variation of H

Li and Milliken, 2017 – Effective Single Particle Absorption Thickness, proportional to H content
Dynamic Meteoric Effects

Colaprete et al, 2015 ESF talk – LADEE UVS Pre- and Post- Geminids with meteoric release of OH
Note: RMK assignment of 300 nm to K; 308.5 to OH; 103 to O (not shown)
Consider the Poles.....

Siegler et al., 2016 – LP Neutron Spectrometer shows distribution of deeper H concentrations, Near-antipodal distribution, not a modern source
A Cabeus shift
LEND Map – 2012 press release of neutron data also shows the Cabeus shift
Hayne et al 2015- Locations of surface water frost in the UV. Cabeus shift not obvious.
Fisher et al 2017- LOLA’s 1064 nm lidar; Anomalous bright pixels possibly from water surface frost Also no Cabaeus shift
Gladstone’s 2011 Provocative idea: Polar Crater Water Frost is Locally Generated

Source: Local delivery of volatiles into PSRs by meteoritic infall
- Prompt Vaporization
- Most of vapor cloud local

Loss: PSD via Lyman-α, prompt impact vaporization

In dynamic equilibrium - disequilibrium creates the heterogeneity in T and illumination, etc

Don’t necessarily need a global migration system

Surfaces of PSRs than originally thought. At this reduced desorption rate the loss of water from IPM Ly α photolysis is comparable to the steady source of water due to micrometeoroids and the episodic source due to comets (i.e., $1.9 \times 10^5$ cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and $3.4 \times 10^5$ cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, respectively, from Morgan and Shemansky [1991, Table 3]). The fact that the sources and sinks of water are roughly equal may explain the observed heterogeneity in the FUV albedos of the PSRs, since it would make the retention of frost very dependent on local conditions and their history. Over the billion-year history of the PSRs some frost migration (vertically and horizontally) is expected. At the lowest PSR temperatures measured by Diviner, thermal diffusion is extremely slow [Schorghofer and Taylor, 2007]. However, in warmer PSRs, thermal cycling can increase diffusion rates considerably [Siegler et al., 2011]. Thus, some heterogeneity may be caused by temperature differences. Even in the coldest regions, impact gardening is expected to substantially redistribute volatiles with depth [e.g., Crider and Vondrak, 2003].

Zimmerman et al., 2014
Hayne et al., 2015
Hurley et al 2017: Evolution of an impact-generated plume of 1 g of water vapor
Prompt vaporization
Most of water stays local – within 2° or ~60 km of source
Energetic tail of water energy distribution spreads 100’s of km
Farrell et al. 2013 model of polar crater water emission via impact vaporization and sputtering.
Back to Mid-Latitudes.....
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What does it really mean?

Li and Milliken 2017 – Map of surficial OH in the IR from $M^3$

Phenomenal, very revealing map but still difficult to determine the dynamics
- Is it representative of solar wind hydrogen implantation?
- Is it residual of photo-dissociated water at equator migrating pole-ward?
- Is it a signature of water outflowing from poles?
Scenario #1 – Strong Cycle-Reservoir Connection featuring migrating species (hopping volatiles)
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Via weathering, surface frost feeds into reservoir

If true, might expect frost and reservoirs to be spatially aligned
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Disconnection of modern frost to reservoir

Reservoir is ancient Siegler et al - delivered by ancient comet?

Polar crater frost is then a ‘red herring’ and not really indicative of the properties of the reservoir

And the problem with 10 cm separation is.......[Insert Answer Here]
Scenario #3 – No Cycle, Volatile Frost via Infall

A (mostly) local effect
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- Disconnection of modern frost to reservoir
- Reservoir is ancient Siegler et al - delivered by ancient comet?
LVN Questions

• Do water molecules and other volatiles actively migrate poleward or to equator – to get trapped in PSRs?
• Is the modern frost in PSRs locally generated?
• Is the modern frost in PSRs connected or disconnected from the deeper neutron-sensed H reservoirs?
  – Is 10 cm enough to separate the modern H cycle from the deeper H-reservoir in PSRs?
• How is the space environment connected to volatile manufacturing and transport?
LVN Concept

• Assumption: Have Flagship level of funding (maybe why we are the ‘Dream team’...keep dreamin’!)
• Assumption: Strong political shift toward the Moon
• Place a set of small landers to observe any migration of volatiles along the lunar surface
• Make use of environmental extreme events: lime meteor showers, solar storms, passages into/out of magnetosphere [LADEE/MAVEN approach]
LVN Placement: Ring around the Poles

Li and Milliken 2017 – Map of surficial OH in the IR from $M^3$  
32 stations and PSR stations
LVN Placement: Ring around the Poles

Li and Milliken 2017 – Map of surficial OH in the IR from M³

20 stations and PSR stations
Instrument Complement

• Look down at Surface: Near IR, UV, Plasma, Dust Detector, 3 micron LIDER, Drill?
• Look up at Exosphere: UV, Laser fluorescence system? (any other recommendation?)
• Release Experiment: Lander at mid-latitudes release D cloud to be tracked by other landers
• Orbiter: Provides context
• Use both orbiter and landers to feed to modern models of the volatile system on daily basis – observations-based forecast modeling tool
Polar Cold Trap Lander

• A dedicate lander to be placed into a south pole crater like Cabeus
  – Has both surface frost and deeper H reservoir
• Assume it would be short-lived
• Add drill to get at the H reservoir

From Hayne et al 2015
RP at crater edge (illustration)
Conclusions

• LVN Concept still ‘loosely defined’, high level here
  – However, parallel’s ARC’s Bob Haberle’s Pascal Scout mission to place network weather landers on Mars
  – If you can talk about a Mars Weather Network to feed GCMs, why not a Lunar Volatile Network to feed migration models?

• Issues:
  – Strategic: Costs and fit to Flagship/NF program
  – Tactical: Exosphere observations from landed platform

• Solutions:
  – Since this a form of resource prospecting, could be a joint SMD-HEOMD-STMD program

• To do: Better define where this fits....Discovery, NF, Flagship; Embodiment of the landers
Backup
Scenario #1 – Strong Cycle-Reservoir connection
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Via weathering, surface volatiles ‘leech’ or feed into reservoir

If so, might expect frost and reservoirs to spatially overlay
‘Spillage’ of polar crater volatiles onto adjacent polar terrain

- Prompt impact vaporization can release water to topside terrain
- Monte Carlo models of impact vaporization and sputtering release
- **Dynamic Equilibrium:** LRO/LAMP detects a light water ‘frost’ on regolith
  - DREAM2 models set water loss rates near $10^8/m^2\cdot s$ for 1% icy regolith
  - Dynamic source of water has to exist to offset environmental losses

Water test particles in 200 km region about polar crater (via Impact Vaporization)