## **Observed and modelled neutral densities during the 2015 St. Patrick's Day** RMIT geomagnetic storm Elise J. Blanchfield, Brett A. Carter, Gail N. Iles School of Science, RMIT University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia **UNIVERSITY**

# Abstract

Countless processes are occurring in Earth's upper atmosphere constantly, many of which are not fully understood. An increase in solar and geomagnetic activity can add to, and even change, these processes, which can exacerbate their effects. The neutral density of the atmosphere is one factor that varies according to these processes and can, in turn, have its own impact on satellites in low Earth orbit. *In situ* measurements of neutral density in the upper atmosphere are scarce, however a small number of satellites have been used for this. Another option is to use upper atmospheric models to estimate neutral density, which has the advantage of predicting on a global scale, but with the drawback of an unknown level of accuracy. To quantify models' neutral density accuracy, validation against satellite data is commonly performed. In this study, Swarm A and Swarm C satellite neutral densities are used to validate outputs from the physical TIE-GCM and the empirical NRLMSISE-00, JB2006, and JB2008 for the 2015 St. Patrick's Day geomagnetic storm. Reliability of Swarm A and C density data is discussed. One result of the analysis is that both satellites measure intense spikes in neutral density over polar regions during the early stages of the storm, which are not reproduced within the models.

# Background

- Below ~800 km, atmospheric drag is the largest non-conservative perturbing force
- Drag equation:
- $a_{drag} = \frac{1}{2} C_d \rho \frac{A}{m} v_{rel}^2$
- $\circ$   $a_{drag}$  acceleration due to drag
- $\circ$   $C_d$  drag coefficient
- $\circ \rho$  mass density
- $\circ$  A cross-sectional area
- $\circ$  *m* mass
- $\circ v_{rel}^2$  velocity relative to atmosphere

- During geomagnetic storms, atmospheric density is increased
- Density measurements are difficult to obtain and are scarce; models could help to recreate and predict variations in atmospheric density
- We compare four models to satellite observations for the 5-day period 15-19 March 2015 covering the St. Patrick's Day geomagnetic storm

# Data and Empirical Models

## Swarm Satellites

- 3-satellite constellation Alpha (A), Bravo (B), and Charlie (C)
- A and C orbit side-by-side in near-polar orbits at ~462 km altitude and ~87.4° inclination
- Satellites generate thermospheric density measurements based on accelerometer and GPS data [2]
- Densities have been normalised to 467 km using NRLMSISE-00 via [3]

 $\rho_{sat}(467 \ km) = \rho_{sat}(h_{sat}) \cdot \frac{\rho_{mod}(467 \ km)}{\rho_{mod}(h_{sat})}$  $\rho_{mod}(h_{sat})$ 

#### NRLMSISE-00 (2000 US Naval Research Laboratory Mass Spectrometer and **Incoherent Scatter Radar Extended**)

- Empirical upper atmospheric model [4]
- Solar inputs: daily and 81-day centred average F10.7
- Geomagnetic inputs: daily Ap and 3hourly ap



Figure 1. Swarm constellation (Credit: ESA – P. Carril, 2013)

## JB2006 (Jacchia-Bowman 2006)

- Empirical upper atmospheric model [5] • Solar inputs: daily and 81-day centred
- average F10.7, S10.7, and Mg10.7
- Geomagnetic inputs: 3-hourly ap

## JB2008 (Jacchia-Bowman 2008)

- Empirical upper atmospheric model [6]
- Solar inputs: daily and 81-day centred
- average F10.7, S10.7, MgII, and Y10.7
- Geomagnetic inputs: temperature change computed from Dst

## **Physical Model**

#### **TIE-GCM (Thermosphere-Ionosphere-Electrodynamics General Circulation** Model)

- Physical upper atmospheric model [7]
- Spatial resolution: 5° x 5° in latitude and longitude, 2 grid points per scale height
- Temporal resolution: 60 second time step with outputs recorded every 15 minutes
- Solar inputs: daily and 81-day centred F10.7 as a proxy for atmospheric heating Geomagnetic inputs: 3-hourly Kp to drive
- the Heelis high latitude convection pattern



## Results



Figure 3. Geomagnetic summary of the 2015 St. Patrick's Day geomagnetic storm. Kp index (top), Dst index (middle), and magnetic field components of solar wind (bottom) from 15-19 March 2015.



Figure 2. Physical processes in Earth's upper atmosphere (Credit: NASA's Scientific Visualization Studio) Outputs are interpolated to satellite

positions for each time interval using cubic spline interpolation

> SSC on March 17 at ~4:45 UT • High Kp, low Dst

March 17

• Prolonged negative B, on

17 at ~22:45 UT

March 17 after ~14:00 UT • Main phase ends on March

Quiet conditions prior to

- neutral densities compare
- increasing at storm arrival decreasing during recovery • There is large spiking during



# Conclusions

- Observed and modelled neutral densities have been presented and compared across the 2015 St. Patrick's Day geomagnetic storm
- Swarm C and A showed that the 2015 St. Patrick's Day storm caused an increase in atmospheric density, with large density spikes over polar regions
- In quiet conditions, empirical models perform similarly, while TIE-GCM consistently underestimates

#### References

[1] D. A. Vallado, and D. Finkleman (2014). A critical assessment of satellite drag and atmospheric density modelling. Acta Astronautica, 95:141-165. [2] C. Siemes, J. de Teixeira da Encarnação, E. Doornbos, J. van den IJssel, J. Kraus, R. Pereštý, L. Grunwaldt, G. Apelbaum, J. Flury, and P. E. H. Olsen (2016). Swarm accelerometer data processing from raw accelerations to thermospheric neutral densities. Earth, Planets and Space, 68(1):92.

[3] S. Rentz, and H. Lühr (2008). *Climatology of the cusp-related thermospheric mass* density anomaly, as derived from CHAMP observations. Annales Geophysicae, 26(9):2807-

In storm conditions and recovery, NRLMSISE-00 had the poorest performance, while JB2008 had the best; however, TIE-GCM was the most precise, suggesting bias within the model that could be corrected for improved results No models recreated the observed shortscale variations in neutral density over polar regions

[4] J. M. Picone, A. E. Hedin, D. P. Drob, and A. C. Aikin (2002). NRLMSISE-00 empirical model of the atmosphere: Statistical comparisons and scientific issues. Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, 107(A12):SIA 15-1-SIA 15-16 [5] B. R. Bowman, W. K. Tobiska, F. A. Marcos, and C. Valladares (2008). The JB2006 empirical thermospheric density model. Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics, 70(5):774-793. [6] B. R. Bowman, F. A. Marcos, C. Huang, C. Lin, and W. Burke (2008). A New Empirical Thermospheric Density Model JB2008 Using New Solar and Geomagnetic Indices. AIAA/AAS Astrodynamics Specialist Conference and Exhibit, p. 6438. [7] L. Qian, A. G. Burns, B. A. Emery, B. Foster, G. Lu, A. Maute, A. D. Richmond, R. G. Roble, S. C. Solomon, and W. Wang (2014). The NCAR TIE-GCM. In Modeling the Ionosphere-

Thermosphere System (eds J. Huba, R. Schunk and G. Khazanov).