Correlation between Sodankylä surface temperature and the geomagnetic disturbance index  $A_p$ .

#### Juha Vierinen, Antti Kero j@sgo.fi

Sodankylä Geophysical Observatory, Finland

October 6, 2008

Sac

# Geomagnetic disturbance indices

► A<sub>k</sub> is a *heuristically* formed measure of the largest magnetic field variation within three hours (in nT scale).

- A<sub>p</sub> index is a global equivalent, averaged over different stations around the world.
- A proxy of high energetic particle precipitation.
- (E. Kataja, Magneettisen aktiivisuuden mittaamisesta)

# Geomagnetic disturbance indices



Yearly averaged Ap and Sodankylä Ak

Figure: Yearly averaged Sodankylä  $A_k$  and planetary  $A_p$ .

▲ロ > ▲母 > ▲目 > ▲目 > ▲目 > ④ < ④ >

# $A_k$ and EUVB flux

#### Yearly averaged Ak and Solar radio flux



Figure: Yearly averaged Sodankylä  $A_k$  and Solar EUVB flux (Tobiska et.al. 2000).  $A_k$  and EUVB flux correlated, with a certain lag.

# Polar surface temperature T and the $A_k$ index

- There are several reports of the correlation between northern hemisphere polar spring-time surface temperature and the geomagnetic disturbance indices (Bucha 2002, Palamara 2003).
- Recently, work by Seppälä (2004, 2008), Rosanov (2005), and Lu (2008) have renewed interest in the topic, by suggesting a new mechanism for the effect.

Sodankylä has a long time-series of temperature with no urban heat-island effect – what does the data look like?

#### The strongest correlation is in the Spring



Correlation between Ap and Sodankylä surface temperature

Month

◆□ > ◆□ > ◆臣 > ◆臣 > ─ 臣 ─ のへで

# Sodankylä February surface temperature and Ap



Figure: Sodankylä averaged  $A_k$  over September-February, and preceding surface temperature in February.

# Sodankylä February surface temperature and Ap



Figure: Sodankylä averaged  $A_k$  over September-February, and preceding surface temperature in February. Two-year average.

# Sodankylä February surface temperature and A<sub>p</sub>



Figure: Sodankylä averaged  $A_k$  over September-February, and preceding surface temperature in February.

#### Possible explanations

- Stratospheric ozone is affected by ultraviolet radiation flux, that depends on the solar cycle (*Humphreys 1910*).
  Correlation with A<sub>p</sub> is a side-effect of the fact that A<sub>p</sub> is also somewhat correlated with EUVB flux.
- Correlation between A<sub>p</sub> and surface temperature is indirectly caused by changes in wave ducting conditions. (Lu, H., M. A. Clilverd, A. Seppälä, and L. L. Hood, 2008)
- The magnetometer measurement is temperature dependent (e.g., 0.7 nT/K, Kataja). However, A<sub>p</sub> is global index and measurement stations are kept at nearly constant temperature.
- Reactive radicals (NOx) produced by auroral activity are transported to the stratosphere, where they interact with ozone, causing changes in global circulation. (Rosanov et.al. 2005, Sinnhuber et.al. 2007)

# Detected NO<sub>2</sub> enhancements and O<sub>3</sub> depletions



Figure: Detection of NO<sub>2</sub> enhancements and O<sub>3</sub> depletions during the polar winter (A. Seppälä 2004).

# Global circulation model, taking this into account



Figure 6. Changes in geopotential height at 50 hPa (m), and SAT (K) for boreal winter due to EEP. The light/dark/ heavy shading shows the regions where the changes are judged statistically significant at or better than the 20%/10%/5% levels.

Figure: Modeled surface temperature changes, assuming (Rosanov 2005).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# Speculation

 Geomagnetic forcing drives ENSO and NAO (Bucha 2002, Palamara 2003).

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

However, no conclusive proof yet.

# Conclusions

- There is a strong Solar signal in polar spring-time surface temperature.
- ▶ Why is A<sub>p</sub> and spring-time surface temperature T correlated? It is an open question.
- Does high energetic particle precipitation effect polar surface temperature, or does surface temperature effect the measurement of the geomagnetic disturbance index – or is the mechanism even more complicated?

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

• Correlation  $\neq$  causality.



## Sun Storm: A Coronal Mass Ejection

The Sun-orbiting SOHO spacecraft has imaged many erupting filaments lifting off the active solar surface and blasting enormous bubbles of magnetic plasma into space. Direct light from the sun is blocked in the inner part of the above image, taken in 2002, and replaced by a simultaneous image of the Sun in ultraviolet light. The field of view extends over two million kilometers from the solar surface. While hints of these explosive events, called coronal mass ejections or CMEs, were discovered by spacecraft in the early 70s, this dramatic image is part of a detailed record of this CME's development from the presently operating SOHO spacecraft. Near the minimum of the solar activity cycle CMEs occur about once a week, but near solar maximum rates of two or more per day are typical. Strong CMEs may profoundly influence space weather. Those directed toward our planet can have serious effects. Credit: SOHO Consortium, ESA, NASA