

Transmission of Planetary Wave Effects to the Upper Atmosphere by Modulation of Turbulent Mixing

Vu A. Nguyen¹ and Scott E. Palo¹

(1) Department of Aerospace Engineering Sciences, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, USA



Thursday, June 27, 2013 – CEDAR Workshop



Planetary Waves

- Resonant responses of the atmosphere at multi-day periods (2-day, 10-day, 16day etc.)
- Seen as global oscillations in wind, temperature, density, etc.
- Forced in the troposphere and stratosphere
- Waves typically dissipate in the MLT (mesospherelower thermosphere) but effects still be seen at higher attitudes



16-day planetary wave modulation of ionospheric total electron content at ~350 km and 22:00 local time. Data obtained from the CHAllenging Minisatellite Payload (CHAMP) satellite. Figure adapted from *Pedatella and Forbes, 2009*.



Possible Mechanisms of Planetary Transmission

- 1. Modulation of upward propagating gravity waves (*Meyer, 1999*) and atmospheric tides through nonlinear interactions (*Forbes, 1996*)
- 2. Direct propagation: More common for shorter period waves
- 3. In-situ generation of planetary waves by EUV/Joule heating in the lower thermosphere (*Meyer and Forbes, 1997*)
- 4. Filtering of gravity waves driving the E-region dynamo
- 5. Modification of turbulent mixing in the MLT region (*Forbes, 1996*)



Modification of Turbulent Mixing



Thursday, June 27, 2013 – CEDAR Workshop



Research Objective

- Understand how the modulation of eddy diffusion at planetary wave periods can affect upper atmospheric density
- Quantify the effects on the upper atmospheric density at different modulation periods

Procedure

- Use the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) Thermosphere-Ionosphere-Electrodynamics General Circulation Model (TIE-GCM)
- Modulate the eddy diffusion coefficient (20% of the mean value) at a specified period at the model lower boundary (~97 km).
- Compute globally averaged quantities and percent change from the control run
- Repeat for different modulation periods (4-day, 8-day, 16-day, 32-day)



Neutral Density at Constant Pressure Level

- Black line shows relative eddy diffusion value over the model run
- Percent change in neutral density at constant pressure level is directly proportional to the eddy diffusion coefficient



 Neutral density response is determined by the diffusion of minor species



Thursday, June 27, 2013 – CEDAR Workshop



Neutral Density at Constant Altitude

- Increase/decrease in mean molecular mass at constant pressure level causes decrease/increase in atmospheric scale height
- As a result, percent change in neutral density at *constant altitude* is *inversely proportional* to the eddy diffusion coefficient





Thursday, June 27, 2013 – CEDAR Workshop

4

3

2

0

-1

-2

-3



Electron Density at Constant Altitude

- Electron density change follows the change in neutral species composition
- Different drivers are present in different altitude regimes
 - Below 180 km: Electron density is primarily driven by change in N₂ and O₂
 - Above 180 km: Electron density is driven by change in O







Percent Change in Neutral Species and Electron Density at 117.5 km

Thursday, June 27, 2013 – CEDAR Workshop



Electron Density at Constant Altitude

- Experiment is repeated for different modulation periods (4-days, 8-day, 32-day) to compare amplitude response
- Results show that the atmosphere acts like a low pass filter for this mechanism
 - The amplitude of the response is larger for longer eddy diffusion modulation periods
- Cutoff period is determined by the lag of the response
 - More response lag will result in a larger cutoff period





Conclusions/Future Work

Conclusions

- Varying the eddy diffusion coefficient in the MLT has the potential to induce planetary wave oscillations in the upper atmosphere
 - A 20% change in eddy diffusion causes a ~5% change in neutral and electron density at 400 km
- Results show this mechanism is more efficient for longer period waves

Future Questions

- How does gravity wave filtering by planetary waves actually modulate the eddy diffusion in the MLT region?
- How does this mechanism compare to other mechanisms for planetary transmission in the upper atmosphere?



 This research was supported by NSF grant AGS-0836518, part of the CEDAR program under Dr. Scott Palo.







Thursday, June 27, 2013 – CEDAR Workshop



- Forbes, J. M., Planetary Waves in the Thermosphere-Ionosphere System, J. Geomag. Geoelec., 48 (1), 91-98, 1996.
- Meyer, C. K., and J. M. Forbes, Natural resonance of the lonosphere-Thermosphere-Mesosphere (ITM) system, J. Atmos. Sol. Terr. Phys., 59(17), 2185-2202, 1997.
- Meyer, C. K., Gravity wave interactions with mesospheric planetary waves: A mechanism for penetration into the thermosphere-ionosphere system, J. Geophys. Res., 104, 28181-28196, 1999.
- Pedatella, N. M., and J. M. Forbes, Modulation of the equatorial F-region by the quasi-16-day planetary wave, Geophys. Res. Lett., 36, 2009.