

GC Report: Electromagnetic Energy Input to Earth's Atmosphere (Poynting Flux)

CEDAR 2022

Alex Chartier, Tomoko Matsuo, Gareth Perry, Seebany Datta-Barua, Wenbin Wang, Bill Bristow

alex.chartier@jhuapl.edu 301-275-1607

Principal Investigator: NSF SuperDARN #1934973, NSF CEDAR #1922930, NSF OPP #2031554, NASA #80NSSC21K1557 Co-Principal Investigator: NASA LWS NNH17ZDA001N



Why should we care?

Theoretical limitations

What we don't know, and next steps



Poynting's theorem (derived from Maxwell's equations):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{B^2 + E^2/c^2}{2\mu_0} \right) + \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}}{\mu_0} \right) + \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0$$

EM energy density

Poynting vector

Joule dissipation

- **E** Electric field
- **B** Magnetic field
- \mathbf{J} current density
- c speed of light
- μ_0 Permeability of free space



In the quasi-DC treatment (periods > ~10 mins), the time-dependent term is very small in the ionosphere, so the Poynting flux approximately balances the Joule dissipation:

$$S_{\parallel}^{\text{LEO}} \approx \pm \int_{90 \mathrm{km}}^{200 \mathrm{km}} \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E} dz$$

Notes:

#1 **S** is almost constant from ~600 km up to the acceleration region (>1500km), so the exact spacecraft altitude is not important.

#2 EM energy tends to be dissipated through the ionosphere, though it can also flow out horizontally

#3 The wave (AC) term is not small – can be 30% or more *Verkhoglyadova et al.* (2018)





Poynting flux represents probably the largest unknown energy input to the upper atmosphere and ionosphere

Ionosphere-Thermosphere energy inputs:

Solar flux ~1000GW globally

S ~30-180 GW hemispheric (Knipp et al., 2011; DMSP)

K.E. ~10-35 GW hemispheric (Newell et al., 2009; DMSP)

During storms:

S >350 GW hemispheric (Cosgrove et al., 2014; FAST)

K.E. ~300 GW hemispheric (Zhang & Paxton; 2008, SSUSI/GUVI)

Unlike solar flux, Poynting flux is poorly observed and highly structured, both spatially and temporally.

Models show huge discrepancies in Joule Heating rates.

Empirical and physics-based models show totally different magnitudes and spatial structures

23:45 UT, 14 Dec 2006, South Hem. From GEM-CEDAR Challenge (Rastätter et al., 2016). **Note different color scales are used.**



(more inconsistencies)

#1 Models and data show huge increases in energy flux during southward IMF

#2 Location and magnitude of energy flux varies greatly between models

#3 AC ("wave") flux is not accounted for in either of these models



Data and models show huge 1000K disagreement in Joule heating rates, indicating importance of small-scale processes (Lamarche et al., 2021)





Theoretical limitations to interpretation of S Richmond (2010)



Does not match typical assumptions

What we don't know

How much EM energy is coming in (and going out)?

What is the conductance ("normal" + anomalous terms) that regulates the EM energy input? How do sub-auroral plasma variations influence the high-latitude ionospheric system? What are the dominant mechanisms responsible for the formation of plasma irregularities?

Next steps

- Move from climatology to global observation
- Test predictions using upcoming mission data (GDC, Dione, petitSat)
- Advance Mag-ITM models to/beyond order-of-magnitude agreement with data

JOHNS HOPKINS APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY