Geohazards monitoring from space A new form of remote sensing

#### **Roberto Battiston**

**University of Trento and INFN-TIFPA** 

### Facing global challenges

International Year of Basic Sciences for Sustainable Development IYBSSD2022

> 20-21 June 2022 Villa Monastero - Varenna (Lake Como)

LITHOSPHERE-ATMOSPHERE-IONOSPHERE-MAGNETOSPHERE COUPLING: A NEW KIND OF REMOTE SENSING FROM SPACE

Space is a privileged point of observation of the Earth.

Satellites and satellite constellations provide remote sensing, monitoring many physical variables at ground level, within the atmosphere, within the ionosphere and the magnetosphere.

It would be interesting to exploit space remote sensing to monitor seismic phenomena.



There is an ample literature discussing physical effects which could couple the lithosphere with the layers surrounding the Earth (atmosphere, ionosphere, magnetosphere)

However, many of the effects reported are of statistical nature

Other have been identified through the analysis of each given EQ

There is a general need of <u>causal</u> description of the coupling mechanisms

#### Real data on ground→numerical calculation to space

#### 2011 M9.1 Tohuku-Oki (tsunami)



Inchin, et al. , 2020

#### ni) Real data on ground→numerical calculation to space

#### 2011 M9.1 Tohuku-Oki (tsunami)



Inchin et al., 2020

#### 2016 M7.8 Kaikoura (earthquake)

#### Real data on ground→numerical calculation to space





Inchin, et al., 2021

### How to measure these coupling phenomena reliably ?

"If you want to find the secret of the universe, think in terms of energy, frequency and vibration"

Nikola Tesla

# Atmospheric, Ionospheric Magnetospheric Invariants A-I-M-I

The Earth and its surrounding layers host a huge amount of complex, interacting physical phenomena

In order to extract a clean set of <u>deterministic signals</u> exploiting <u>resonant or oscillating phenomena will</u> <u>provide a clear advantage</u>

### China Seismomagnetic Satellite (CSES) a collaboration between CNSA-ASI-INFN-INAF-INGV

1<sup>st</sup> satellite launched in 2018 2<sup>nd</sup> being ready for launch in early 2023

# The LIMADOU collaboration







#### Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare





# **ISTITUTO NAZIONALE DI GEOFISICA E VULCANOLOGIA**

Università di Roma

Tor Vergata







### The status of Scientific Payloads on board CSES01



Payloads	Parameters	Status		
High Precision Magnetometer (HPM) Two flux gate + one coupled dark state magnetometer (CDSM)	: DC to 16 Hz	Good health condition Excellent performance		
Search-Coil Magnetometer (SCM)	10 Hz ~20 kHz	Good health condition and performance		
Electric field detector (EFD)	DC~3.5 MHz	ULF/ELF/VLF good.		
Plasma analyzer package(PAP)	Ion density : 10 <sup>2</sup> ~10 <sup>7</sup> cm <sup>-3</sup> Ion temperature: 500~10000 K Ion content: H <sup>+</sup> , He <sup>+</sup> , O <sup>+</sup> Ion drift velocity: Vxyz			
Langmuir probe (LAP)	Electron density : 1 0 <sup>2</sup> ~10 <sup>7</sup> cm <sup>-3</sup> Electron temperature : 500~10000K	Good health condition and performance		
GNSS Occultation Receiver (GOR)	TEC、Ne Profile	Good health condition and performance		
<b>Tri-Band Beacon (TBB) :</b> Three bands : 50/400/1066MHz	Air Refraction index, Profile of air temperature and pressure Ionospheric scintillation index	400 MHz band data processing algorithm and ground receivers not finished		
Energetic particle detector (HEPP-H, L, X ray)	Proton flux : $1.5 \text{MeV} \sim 200 \text{MeV}$ Electron flux : $\geq 100 \text{keV}$ Pitch angle : $5^{\circ}$	Good health condition and performance		
Italian Energetic particle detector (HEPD)	Proton flux: 30- 100 MeV Electron : 30 – 200 Mev ;	Good health condition and		

### LOCAL vs GLOBAL observables

Most effects connected to EQ's can be observed from space <u>only when the satellite is orbiting over the</u> EQ formation area

Some, like anomalies in the VAB particle fluxes or emission of EM waves, do propagate from the EQ formation area and can be <u>observed at large distances</u>

# LOCAL OBSERVABLES

- Acoustic Gravity Waves (AGW)
- Frequency Line Resonances (FLR)
- Total Electron Content (TEC)
- ULF Electromagnetic Waves
- Plasma Density Waves (PDW)

### **GLOBAL OBSERVABLES**

- VLF Electromagnetic Waves
- Van Allen Belt (VAB) electrons burst
- Schuman resonances

The MILC model is based on a set of <u>deterministic</u> <u>signals</u> exploiting <u>resonant or oscillating phenomena</u>

### The MILC model – Piersanti et al. [2020]



The model is based on three steps:

- 1) The earthquake generates an AGW, propagating through the atmosphere;
- 2) The AGW interacts with the ionosphere generating local instability in the plasma distribution through a pressure gradient
- 3) The ionospheric plasma variation generates EM waves propagating through the magnetosphere that interact with the magnetospheric field
- 4) The interaction causes a FL eigenfrequency change.
- 5) Since the FL is stretched, its eigenfrequency has to lower.

# The MILC model

1- Piersanti M., Materassi, M., Battiston, R., Carbone, V., Cicone, A., D'Angelo, G.

Magnetospheric–Ionospheric–Lithospheric Coupling Model. 1: Observations during the 5 August 2018 Bayan Earthquake, Remote Sensing 12 (20), 3299 (2020)

2 - Carbone, V., Piersanti, M., Materassi, M., Battiston, R., Lepreti F., Ubertini, P., *A mathematical model of lithosphere—atmosphere coupling for seismic events,* Sci Rep **11**, 8682 (2021)

3- Piersanti, M., Burger, W.J., Carbone, V., Battiston, R., Iuppa, R. and Ubertini, P. *On the Geomagnetic Field Line Resonance Eigenfrequency Variations during Seismic Event* Remote Sens. 2021, 13, 2839 (2021),

4 – In preparation: A mathematical model of Atmospheric-Ionospheric coupling for seismic events

### Comprehensive analysis of an EQ

# **Example of Bayan Earthquake**

Piersanti, Materassi, Battiston et al. 2020

### The Bayan Earthquake CSES&other satellite/ground data

#### Orbit CSES #2797: 2018/08/05 - 05:20 - - 06:00 UT

- On August 5, 2018 an earthquake stroked Indonesia.
- Mw= 6.8;
- λ=-8.3 °N φ=116.5 °E;
- UT=11:46,34.







CSES payloads: what did they observed?

### August 5, 2018 – AGW observations

# ERA-5 satellite data

Carbone, Piersanti, Materassi, Battiston et. al (2021)

### **Temperature Profile**

• The potential energy density is defined as (VanZandt, 1985; Piersanti et al., 2020):

$$E_P = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{g}{N}\right)^2 \overline{\left(\frac{T'}{\overline{T}}\right)^2}$$

Where g is the gravitational acceleration (constant), N is the Brunt-Vaisala frequency defined as:

$$N = \sqrt{\frac{g}{\theta} \frac{d\theta}{dz}}$$

where  $\theta = T\left(\frac{P_o}{p}\right)^{\frac{R}{c_p}}$  is the potential temperature, *z* is the altitude,  $P_o$  is the standard reference pressure (1 hPa), *R* is the gas constant of air and  $c_p$  is the specific heat capacity at a constant pressure.  $R/c_p = 0.286$  for air (Piersanti et al., 2020).

T' is the perturbation deviated from the background temperature  $\overline{T}$  that are all function of the altitude. The variance term  $\left(\frac{T'}{T}\right)^2$  is calculated within a layer of 2 km thikness as:

$$\left(\frac{T'}{\overline{T}}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{z^{max} - z^{min}} \int_{z^{min}}^{z^{max}} \left(\frac{T'}{\overline{T}}\right)^2 dz$$

# AGW evaluation – results



- The vertical wavelength of stratospheric AGW is about 2–10 km (Tsuda et al., 1994).
- The vertical temperature profile (left) at the EQ epicenter retrieved from ERA5 is hence filtered by a moving average (2 km), to obtain the background temperature profile (second panel from left);
- Then the temperature deviation (third panel) is computed by subtracting the background from the original temperature profile.
- Besides, the squared term of the Brunt-Väisälä frequency (Figure forth panel) can also be derived from the temperature profile. Finally, all the variables are substituted into equation (1),
- and the potential energy is calculated (right panel).
- The  $E_P$  value is absolutely maximum around the altitude of 17 km (the tropopause). The temperature inversion around this altitude is filtered out by the moving average. The similar increase can also be found in Brunt-Vaisala frequency.
- Gravity waves disturb the temperature profile, and their influence is revealed in the temperature deviation profile (third panel).
- The wavelength is thus defined by a full period in the sinusoidal variation in the temperature deviation but not in the EP profile.



- Four wave crests are found in the temperature deviation ٠ profile at the altitudes of 17.8, 27.6, 36.6, and 44.8 km. There exist two sinusoidal periods, and the corresponding vertical wavelengths are 9.8 and 7.2 km, respectively.
- On the other hand, the EP profile maximizes only for the first ٠ wavelength.

#### So, there is a AGW of 9.8 km wavelength propagating in the atmosphere.



#### **Temperature quiet**







### August 5, 2018 – Ionospheric observations



#### Total Electron Content (TEC) from GPS

The observed modulation of the traveling time and direction of the signals (GHz) are sensitive to the electron density.





# **Total Electron Content (TEC)**

Total number of electrons in a column with cross section of  $1m^2$  along the satellite-receiver path (1 TECU =  $10^{16}$ electrons/m<sup>2</sup>)

$$TEC = \int_{h_{sat}}^{h_{rec}} N_e ds$$

As TEC measurements take place at different elevation angles and are related to different ionospheric sectors, in order to obtain TEC values independent on the geometry of the GNSS constellation and on the receiver's network we verticalized TEC according to the following equation

$$vTEC = TEC\cos(\chi')$$

By assuming the ionosphere as a single thin ionized layer, located between 300 and 500 km above the Earth's surface, where the electron density maximizes





- Clear anomaly of vTEC with respect to monthly average.
- The first anomaly starts around 5:45 UT.
- The second anomaly starts around 09:00 UT with its peak at the EQ.
- Possible clear relation with EQ.



# August 1-31, 2018 – ULF observations: Magnetic

• As for EFD we evaluated the Background



- A signature at ≈20 Hz is visible at all components, related to the Schumann ionospheric resonance at CSES orbit.
- The peak around 12 kHz is the signature of the lower-hybrid resonance of the ionosphere F2 layer.

Piersanti et al. Remote Sens. 2020, 12, 3299; doi:10.3390/rs12203299

- Anomalous peak (magenta line) at 180 Hz with respect to the background has been detected along the Bx and Bz component.
- Interestingly, this oscillation is perpendicular to the one detected to the EFD. It is an EM wave!

# August 1-31, 2018 – ULF observations: Electric

• On the basis of Piersanti et al. [2020], we first evaluated both the environmental and the instrumental background over Bayan cell [3°x3° - latxlon] for SQ and M<2 conditions.



- A signature (pink circle) at ≈8 Hz is visible at all components, related to the Schumann ionospheric resonance at CSES orbit.
- The peaks detected at frequency around 2 Hz are due to the VxB electric field present in the ELF band.
- The peak around 1kHz is the signature of the Plasmaspheric hiss [Balazs, 2008; Vellante et al, 2014; Zhima et al., [2019].
- The peak around 250-300 Hz are a portion of the whistler mode chorus generated around L=5 propagating into the plasmasphere [Li et al. 2009; Zhima et al., 2019].

Piersanti et al. Remote Sens. 2020, 12, 3299; doi:10.3390/rs12203299

Anomalous peaks at 180 Hz (E<sub>y</sub> and E<sub>z</sub> component, magenta) and at 630 Hz (E<sub>y</sub> component, red line) with respect to the background has been detected.

### August 5, 2018 – Poynting flux



• The Poynting flux analysis confirms the injection of EM wave coming from downward.

Piersanti et al. Remote Sens. 2020, 12, 3299; doi:10.3390/rs12203299

### August 5, 2018 – FLR frequency observations Ground Stations



Battiston, Burger, Piersanti, luppa in preparation (2021)

#### On the Geomagnetic Field Line Resonance Eigenfrequency Variations during Seismic Event

Mirko Piersanti <sup>1,\*</sup>, William Jerome Burger <sup>2,3</sup>, Vincenzo Carbone <sup>4</sup>, Roberto Battiston <sup>2,5</sup>, Roberto Iuppa <sup>2,5</sup> and Pietro Ubertini <sup>1</sup>

Remote Sens. 2021, 13, 2839. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13142839



FLR	Date	UTC Time	Kp	М	Latitude	Longitude	Region
Х	17/07/2001	14.50.57	0	6.3	3.061° S	148.180∘ E	Bismarck Sea
Х	27/11/2002	00.17.20	1	5.4	12.279∘ N	120.753∘ E	Philippines
Х	12/12/2003	08.07.30	1	5.2	0.110∘ S	123.991∘ E	Indonesia
Х	28/01/2004	07.41.04	1	5.7	4.931∘ S	153.584∘ E	New Guinea
-	09/02/2006	05.44.30	2	6.2	4.810∘ S	133.063° E	Indonesia
х	17/05/2006	01.21.26	1	6.0	3.743∘ S	144.305∘ E	New Guinea
х	24/06/2006	00.03.07	1	6.3	3.071° S	127.183∘ E	Indonesia
х	16/09/2007	01.20.38	2	6.4	2.763∘ S	101.106° E	Indonesia
-	26/10/2007	16.34.47	0	6.0	3.271∘ S	143.763∘ E	New Guinea
х	14/11/2007	17.44.04	2	5.7	23.215° S	70.526° W	Chile
	25/07/2008	20.11.07	1	6.5	5.808° S	146.658∘ E	New Guinea
Х	11/09/2008	00.00.02	1	6.6	1.885∘ N	127.363∘ E	Indonesia
-	19/12/2008	00.34.58	2	6.8	20.372∘ N	146.339° E	Mariana Islands
Х	06/01/2009	19.56.25	2	6.0	0.566∘ S	132.784∘ E	Indonesia
Х	16/02/2009	00.33.36	2	6.1	3.664∘ S	149.608° E	Bismarck Sea
Х	02/03/2009	00.03.39	1	6.5	1.105° S	119.868° E	Indonesia
Х	25/07/2009	18.41.58	2	5.8	1.869° N	97.020∘ E	Indonesia
Х	15/10/2009	03.34.28	1	6.0	1.111° N	85.322∘ W	Ecuador
-	24/02/2008	04.36.29	2	6.5	3.741∘ S	101.986° E	Indonesia
NA	07/06/2008	19.10.48	2	5.0	3.552∘ S	140.851° E	Indonesia
	02/07/2008	00.08.31	2	5.2	12.451° N	44.202° W	Mid-Atlantic
Х	07/02/2008	23.16.41	1	5.3	17.558∘ N	144.922∘ E	Mariana Islands
-	19/12/2006	12.48.16	2	6.0	2.458∘ N	98.000° E	Idonesia
Х	16/11/2009	18.34.24	0	5.2	19.556° S	70.365° W	Chile
NA	11/01/2009	14.03.49	1	5.6	6.388∘ S	147.423∘ E	New Guinea
NA	11/01/2009	14.15.54	1	5.0	0.769∘ S	133.506° E	Indonesia
Х	16/09/2008	21.47.14	2	5.7	17.438∘ N	73.915∘ E	India
Х	24/05/2003	01.46.06	1	5.9	14.428° N	53.813° E	Owen region
-	14/11/2007	18.55.49	2	5.1	22.670° S	70.292∘ W	Chile
NA	26/10/2007	16.34.47	1	5.6	3.271° S	143.7630 E	New Guinea
Х	22/11/2003	09.30.03	1	5.1	13.281° N	57.466° E	Arabic Sea
Х	12/03/2008	01.32.34	2	6.0	1.934° N	132.519° E	Indonesia
Х	02/02/2013	14.17.33	1	6.9	42.8∘ N	143.27∘ E	Japan
-	25/10/2013	17.10.16	2	7.1	37.194∘ N	144.66° E	Japan
Х	06/10/2017	07.59.32	1	6.2	37.325° N	144.02° E	Japan
X	08/01/2019	12.39.31	2	6.3	30.526° N	131.113° E	Japan
х	18/06/2019	13.22.22	0	6.4	38.563° N	139.504° E	Japan
x	27/07/2019	18.31.07	1	6.3	33.015° N	137.413° E	Japan
x	19/04/2020	20.39.08	2	6.3	38.858° N	141.99∘ E	Japan
	21/11/2016	20.58.47	1	6.9	38.296° N	141.642° E	Japan
x	05/08/2018	11.58.00	0	6.5	8.28∘ S	116.4∘ E	Indonesia
X	25/04/2015	06 / 5 21	2	6.6	29.19° N	94 72 E	Nonal

### Statistical analysis for the Ionosphere-Magnetosphere coupling during EQ

- □ We made a statistical analysis of the possible FLR signature associated to EQ in the time span from 2001-07-17 and 2020-08-31.
- □ We selected 42 case events for which the planetary geomagnetic Kp index [Matzka et al., 2021] is lower than 3 in order to exclude any possible variation of solar origin;
- □ To evaluate the *f*\*, we studied the crossspace spectrum [Waters et al., 1994] between the North-South magnetic field components observed at two geomagnetic observatories close enough to the EQ epicentre location

# Statistical analysis for the Ionosphere-Magnetosphere coupling during EQ



EQ00:20

00:30

00:40

00:10

UT

23:40

23:50

00:00

- □ We found 28 cases out of 42 in which there is a clear variation of the estimated *f*\* (indicated with the "X").
- □ In 4 cases it was not possible to correctly evaluate *f*\* because of the post-sunset occurrence of the EQ (indicated with the "NA").
- □ Finally, no *f*\* variations has been detected for 10 case events (indicated with "-").





□ The co-seismic FLR eigenfrequency variation is characterized by a frequency decrease of 12±3 mHz and a time duration of 36±3 min.

### August 5, 2018 Van Allen Belt electron bursts linked to EQ



Battiston et al. in preparation (2022)

#### Trapped Particle Motion in the Van Allen Radiation Belts



$$J_{1} = \frac{\pi p_{\perp}^{2}}{qB} \qquad \frac{p^{2} \sin^{2} 90^{\circ}}{2m_{o} B_{m}} = \frac{p^{2} \sin^{2} \alpha}{2m_{o} B} \qquad \text{Gyr}$$

$$\frac{J_{2}}{2p} = \frac{1}{2} \oint \cos \alpha \, ds = \int_{s_{m}}^{s'_{m}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{B(s)}{B_{m}}} \, ds \qquad \text{Bounce for}$$

$$J_{3} = q \oint B \cdot dS = q \Phi = q \int_{R_{o}}^{\infty} B_{o} \left(\frac{R_{E}}{r}\right)^{3} 2\pi r dr$$

Gyration orbit (pitch angle) constant magnetic moment

ounce motion between mirror points integral invariant

> Longitudinal Drift flux invariant



C. Fidani and R. Battiston: NOAA particle data and seismic activity Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 8, 1277–1291, 2008



Fig. 7. The NOAA-15 orbits, PBs geographical distribution, PB times with respect to the Sumatra EQ times and fault positions (on the left), and the NOAA-15 PB count dynamic (on the right) are shown in two cases. In the first case we can only observe post-seismic PBs while in the second we can observe pre-seismic PBs. Bold lines define the selection of particle precipitation outside the SAA while the dotted lines indicate the polar regions with L>2.2 and arrows define the direction of the satellite motion.









### Conclusions

- Coupling between litosphere and magnetosphere has been demonstrated for EQ of magnitude M > 5 Richter Scale
- Local and global non imaging observables from space and from ground define a clear causal sequence of couling events linking ground to space
- The MILC model provides for the first time quantitative predictions which can be verified experimentally with great accuracy
- Use of this technique for tsunami forecasts seem possible and will be investigated
- Using the causal coupling approach based on the measurements of AIMI invariants study of EQ precursor phenomena can be studied based on solid physical evidence and methods





