POST SUNSET BEHAVIOR
OF THE 6300 Å ATOMIC OXYGEN AIRGLOW EMISSION

Robert E. Smith

George C. Marshall Space Flight Center
Marshall Space Flight Center, Ala. 35812

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION • WASHINGTON, D. C. • OCTOBER 1976
11. ABSTRACT

A theoretical model of the 6300 Å airglow emission has been developed based on the assumptions that both the charged and neutral portions of the Earth's upper atmosphere are in steady state conditions of diffusive equilibrium. Intensities of the 6300 Å emission line have been calculated using electron density-time height profiles from a standard C-132 sounding rocket and occultation temperature profiles from Fabry-Perot interferometer measurements of the Doppler-broadened 6300 Å emission line shape as inputs to the model. Reaction rate coefficient values, production mechanism efficiencies, solar radiation fluxes, absorption cross sections, and models of the neutral atmosphere have been varied parametrically to establish a set of acceptable inputs which will consistently predict 6300 Å emission intensities that closely agree with intensities observed during the post-sunset twilight period by an airglow observatory consisting of a Fabry-Perot interferometer and a torque spectrometer.

Emission intensities calculated from the dissociative recombination of molecular oxygen ions were observed during the latter portion of the observational period. They were used with limiting values, taken from the literature, of the quenching coefficients and the production mechanism efficiencies to establish a representative model of the atmosphere. Based on current knowledge of the meteoric component and the configuration of the equipment used to obtain the observational data, theoretical calculations indicate that photoionization of the 6300 Å 6300 Å emission should be on the order of or less than 3 percent; however, these results are very sensitive to the wavelengths of the individual lines and their intensities relative to the 6300 Å intensity.

This combination of a model atmosphere, production mechanism efficiencies, and quenching coefficient values was used during the earlier portion of the period when the dissociative photoionization and direct impact excitation processes were contributing to the intensity to establish best estimates of solar radiation fluxes in the Schumann-Runge continuum and associated absorption cross sections.

Results of this analysis show that the Zeno-C 1971 model of the upper atmosphere combined with the Ackerman (1970) recommended solar radiation fluxes and associated absorption cross sections produces theoretically calculated intensities that more closely agree with the observed intensities than all the other combinations when the following set of reaction rate coefficients and efficiencies is used:

\[ C^+ + O_2 \rightarrow CO + \text{O} \quad 3 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \]
\[ O_3^+ + e \rightarrow O^+ + O \quad 1.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ with an efficiency of producing an O}^+(\text{2P}) \text{ atom of } 0.34 \quad (5.65) \]
\[ O_3^+ + e \rightarrow O^+ + O \quad 1 \times 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \]
\[ NO^+ + e \rightarrow N + O \quad 4.5 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ with no O}^+(\text{2P}) \text{ atoms being produced} \]
\[ O^+(\text{2P}) + O_2 \rightarrow O^+(\text{2P}) + O_2 \quad 5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \]
\[ O^+(\text{2P}) + O_2 \rightarrow O^+(\text{2P}) + O_2 \quad (1.66) \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \]

However, the analysis showed that the third sources of O(\text{2P}) atoms, by conjugate point photoelectron, contributed significantly to the overall observed intensities during the early portion of the post-sunset twilight period with the contribution decreasing with increasing conjugate point solar zenith angle. No O(\text{2P}) atoms were produced by this mechanism after conjugate point sunset, assuming a screening height of 180 km, when the conjugate point solar zenith angle was approximately 100°.
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Knowledge of the physical, chemical, and dynamical processes of the Earth's upper atmosphere has progressed at a rapid pace during this century. The advent of the rocket provided not only the impetus but also, at the same time, a means for obtaining some of the observational data required to support and verify the theoretical analyses. Knowledge of the "glow" emanating from the Earth's upper atmosphere has shared in this remarkable advancement.

From the earliest studies it was quite apparent that analyses of the twilight glow would provide an opportunity to obtain a wealth of data from ground-based observations, because the Sun itself could be used as a differential analyzer to establish altitude profiles of the various processes responsible for creating the glow. Up to the present, most of the detailed analyses of the 6300 Å emission in the twilight glow have been concentrated on the pre-dawn twilight with little emphasis on the post-sunset phase. This study concentrates on the latter situation.

In this analysis available observational data were combined with appropriate models and theories in a parametric type of analysis for the purpose of establishing a consistent theoretical model that could predict the behavior of the intensity of the 6300 Å emission during the post-sunset twilight period.

Analyses of either the pre-dawn or the post-sunset 6300 Å twilight glows require a well coordinated observational-theoretical approach. Theoretical considerations should include:

1. Chemical reactions, their rate coefficients with their temperature dependence, and their efficiencies.

2. Diffusion and mass transport of the various constituents of the atmosphere.

3. Vertical distributions of both the neutral and charged components of the atmosphere and their temporal and spatial variability.
4. The thermal structure of both the neutral and charged components.

5. Solar terrestrial interrelationships, e.g., sunlight conditions at the conjugate point compared with the sunlight conditions at the observational point and level of solar and geomagnetic activity at the time of the observation.

6. Photochemical reactions, their rate coefficients with their temperature dependence, and their efficiencies.

Observational data required either as inputs to the theoretical models of the 6300 Å emission or for comparison with the calculated results should contain:

1. Number density-height profiles of both the neutral and charged components.

2. Temperature-height profiles of both the neutral and charged components.

3. Total integrated emission intensities of the 6300 Å emission and the nearby background, independently obtained.

4. Mass motions, vertically and horizontally, of the neutral and charged components.

5. Photoelectron fluxes and energy spectra entering the atmosphere at the observation point.

Previous theoretical studies and analyses have indicated that dissociative photoexcitation of molecular oxygen by solar ultraviolet radiation in the Schumann-Runge continuum, dissociative recombination of molecular oxygen and nitric oxide ions with thermal electrons, and photoelectron impact excitation of atomic oxygen may all produce $^4D$ oxygen atoms that contribute to the 6300 Å emission in the twilight glow. These chemical and photochemical processes are discussed in detail in Section II.

The 6300 Å intensity measurements and the equipment used to obtain the observational data are discussed in Section III.

Constituent number densities at 120 km altitude from Jacchia [1] and Reber [2] are combined with analytical temperature profiles after Bates [3] to define two of the models of the neutral atmosphere used parametrically in the analysis. The third model used is the current Jacchia 1971 model [4]. The models and their influence on the computed results are discussed in Sections IV and VII.
The theoretical model of the 6300 Å emission intensity is discussed in Section V where the O(1^D) atoms are assumed to be produced only from dissociative photoexcitation and dissociative recombination. Consequences of this assumption are discussed in Section VIII.

Solar radiation fluxes in the Schumann-Runge continuum and molecular oxygen absorption cross sections from Ackerman [5], Table 14, and solar flux values of Friedman and Tousey, as reported by Hinteregger, Hall, and Schmidtke [6] with cross sections from Metzger and Cook [7], Table 13, are used parametrically in this analysis.

Computational results and comparisons with observational data are discussed in detail in Section VII.

Conclusions are presented in Section VIII with recommendations for future research activities outlined in Section IX.

II. THEORY OF THE 6300 Å TWILIGHT GLOW

A. Source of the Emission

When the lowest energy level excited state of neutral atomic oxygen undergoes a radiative transition to the ground state, a quantum of light is produced whose wavelength is proportional to the difference in energy of the levels between which the transition takes place. There are three possible radiative transitions for the O(1^D) state:

\[ ^1D \rightarrow ^3P_0 \quad \text{6392 Å} \]
\[ ^1D \rightarrow ^3P_1 \quad \text{6364 Å} \]
\[ ^1D \rightarrow ^3P_2 \quad \text{6300 Å} \]

with respective Einstein coefficients of \( 1.1 \times 10^{-6} \) s\(^{-1} \), \( 2.2 \times 10^{-3} \) s\(^{-1} \), and \( 6.9 \times 10^{-3} \) s\(^{-1} \), where the Einstein coefficient is a measure of the probability that a
radiative transition will take place between the two levels in 1 s. From the foregoing it is apparent that a 6300 Å photon is emitted about three times as frequently as a 6364 Å photon, while the probability of the emission of a 6392 Å photon is almost negligible.

Figure 1 shows the low energy portion of the atomic oxygen energy level diagram with associated Einstein coefficients, \( A \), and lifetimes, \( 1/A \). Because of its relatively long lifetime, the O(\(^1\)D) state is said to be metastable and, consequently, it should reach thermal equilibrium with the surrounding neutral constituents before it undergoes a radiative transition. For this reason the Doppler broadening of the integrated 6300 Å emission line should provide reliable information about the temperature of the neutral atmosphere in the layer from which the greater portion of the radiation is emanating.

Previous investigators have shown that three mechanisms are capable of producing atomic oxygen in the \(^1\)D excited state. Dissociative photoexcitation of molecular oxygen by solar radiation, primarily the Schumann-Runge continuum, can produce both the \(^1\)D state and the next higher excited state, \(^1\)S, which in turn can produce a \(^1\)D by a radiative transition in which a 5577 Å photon is emitted. Dissociative recombinations of molecular oxygen and nitric oxide ions with thermal electrons are both postulated to be sources of \(^1\)D's with the former also capable of producing the \(^1\)S state; however, the latter reaction, theoretically at least, is believed to be incapable of producing the \(^1\)D state because it violates selection rule criteria. Impact excitation of oxygen atoms by photoelectrons is also postulated to be a source of the \(^1\)D and \(^1\)S states. These three production mechanisms are discussed in detail in the remainder of this section.

**B. Dissociative Photoexcitation**

Photodissociation of molecular oxygen by ultraviolet solar photons is the primary source of atomic oxygen in the upper atmosphere. The average lifetime of the ground state atoms so created is on the order of days. The average lifetime of the metastable \(^1\)D oxygen atoms so produced is about 110 s. The Schumann-Runge continuum is the primary energy source for the formation of oxygen atoms about 80 km above the Earth's surface.

When an ultraviolet photon in the principal Schumann-Runge continuum wavelength interval is absorbed by an oxygen molecule, one ground state (\(^3\)P) and one metastable (\(^1\)D) oxygen atom are produced. The \(^1\)D then undergoes a radiative transition to the ground state with most of the emitted photons having a wavelength of 6300 Å.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>(eV)</th>
<th>(s)</th>
<th>(s⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¹S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.0091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Low energy portion of the atomic oxygen energy level diagram [8].
Brandt [9], on the basis of theoretical calculations, decided that this process would account for 25 to 35 kilorayleighs (kR) in the day glow 6300 Å emission. Noxon [10], from analysis of ground-based photometer measurements, concluded that the great variability of the intensity of the 6300 Å emission appeared to limit the contributions of dissociative photoexcitation to less than a few kilorayleighs in the day glow. He set 3 kR as an upper limit on the steady contribution from this process. His results also implied that the rate coefficient for quenching by O₂ was nearly $1 \times 10^{-10}$ cm³ s⁻¹, a result concurred in by Dalgarno and Walker [11].

Wallace and McElroy [12] confirmed previous results which indicated that every O₂ photodissociation by solar flux in the principal Schumann-Runge continuum resulted in a $^4D$ oxygen atom.

Current observations seem to place an upper limit of approximately 1 kR on the contribution of this process to the day glow.

C. Dissociative Recombination

Bates [13] and Barbier [14] suggested that this process might contribute to the observed post-twilight 6300 Å emission; Chamberlain [15] showed theoretically that it is probably the primary excitation process in the twilight. Brandt [9] proposed that it could account for 15 to 25 kR in the day glow. Chamberlain [16] suggested that this process was a major source of the 6300 Å emission in the night glow. Later, Noxon [10], in his analysis of ground-based photometer measurements in the day and twilight glow, concluded that the great variability in the intensity, even under almost identical ionospheric conditions, was a strong argument against its being the dominant source. By studying the redline intensity variations during the dawn and evening twilights, he showed that the observations were quite different from what would be theoretically predicted using concurrently measured electron density-height profiles. He concluded that the upper limit to contributions from this process would be approximately 3 kR in the day glow.

Despite the consistent picture that is evolving that dissociative recombination is a major process in the twilight glow, there are still some unresolved questions concerning which chemical reactions are involved and which are important, the rates at which these reactions proceed, and their efficiencies in producing $^4D$ oxygen atoms.
1. CHEMICAL REACTIONS

Original concepts involved only the recombination of electrons with molecular oxygen ions, a reaction that can produce the following combinations of products:

\[ \text{O}_2^+ + e \rightarrow \text{O}^3 \text{P} + \text{O}^3 \text{P} \]  
\[ \text{O}^3 \text{P} + \text{O}^1 \text{D} \]  
\[ \text{O}^1 \text{D} + \text{O}^1 \text{D} \]  
\[ \text{O}^1 \text{D} + \text{O}^1 \text{S} \]  
\[ \text{O}^3 \text{P} + \text{O}^1 \text{S} \]  

Later, the recombination of electrons with molecular nitric oxide ions process was included with the reaction proceeding in either of the two following ways:

\[ \text{NO}^+ + e \rightarrow \text{N}^4 \text{S} + \text{O}^1 \text{D} \]  
\[ \text{NO}^+ + e \rightarrow \text{N}^1 \text{D} + \text{O}^3 \text{P} \]  

followed by

\[ \text{N}^2 \text{D} + \text{O}^3 \text{P} \rightarrow \text{N}^4 \text{S} + \text{O}^1 \text{D} \]  

Dalgarno and Walker [11] showed that the formation of \(^1\text{D}\) oxygen atoms by reaction (6) violated the conservation of spin selection rule and also that, from an energy standpoint, \(^1\text{S}\) oxygen atoms which could then produce \(^1\text{D}\) oxygen atoms through a radiative transition could not be formed. However, Biondi and Fiebelman [17] pointed out that there was no direct evidence against the reaction to support the theoretical work of Dalgarno and Walker. Wallace and McElroy [12] supported the work of Dalgarno and Walker [11] by suggesting that quenching of \(\text{N}^2 \text{D}\) by \(\text{O}^3 \text{P}\) is unlikely and that the most likely agent is \(\text{O}_2\).
Apparently neither reaction (6) or (8) is capable of producing a significant number of $^1$D oxygen atoms; therefore, reaction (6) has not been included in this study, and only the molecular oxygen dissociative recombination process is considered.

2. CHEMICAL REACTION RATE COEFFICIENTS

Rate coefficient values for the above processes are still unresolved. Tables 1 and 2 contain values for these rate coefficients that were obtained from an extensive literature survey. In this study various combinations of these values were used parametrically to establish a consistent set which would provide the best agreement between theoretical computations and observations of the 6300 Å emission intensity in the twilight glow.

3. PRODUCTION EFFICIENCIES

Estimates of the efficiency of reactions (1) through (5) for producing $^1$D oxygen atoms range from 0.1 to 1 per each dissociative recombination, being almost equally scattered throughout the range of values quoted. Zipf and Fastie [46] reported that approximately 10 to 15 percent of the reactions resulted in the formation of a $^1$D. Their report was followed chronologically by Tohmatsu, Ogawa, and Tsuruta [47] with a value of approximately 16 percent; Peterson and Steiger [8] with a value of 10 percent; Brown and Steiger [48] with a value of 10 percent; Donahue, Parkinson, Zipf, Doering, Fastie, and Miller [49] with a value of 20 percent; Gulledge, Packer, Tilford, and Vanderslice [50] with a value of 20 percent; Zipf [51] with a value of 100 percent; Wickwar [36] with a value of 50 percent; and Forbes [52] with values of 12 percent at a temperature of 865 K, 18 percent at a temperature of 1145 K, and 15 ± 7 percent at a temperature of 1000 K. Forbes [52] also concluded that reaction (6) contributed approximately 10 percent of 6300 Å emission in the night glow. In this study efficiencies of both reactions were used parametrically to determine if a "best" value could be established.

4. SOURCE OF MOLECULAR IONS

Molecular oxygen ions are produced by the charge exchange mechanism

$$\text{O}^+ + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{O} + \text{O}_2^+$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

while nitric oxide ions are produced by the ion-atom interchange mechanism

$$\text{O}^+ + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{N}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)
TABLE 1. VALUES OF RATE COEFFICIENT, $\alpha_2$, FOR DISSOCIATIVE RECOMBINATION OF $O_2^+$ PRODUCTION MECHANISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction/Source</th>
<th>Rate Coefficient, $\alpha_2$, at Specific Temperatures or Formulas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$O_2^+ + e \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} 0^* + 0$ or $0^* + 0^*$ or $0 + 0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biondi and Brown [18]</td>
<td>$2 (-7)^a$ at 300 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayer [19]</td>
<td>$4 (-8)$ at 2500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolet and Aikin [20]</td>
<td>$3 (-8)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasner, Rogers, and Biondi [21]</td>
<td>$3.8+1 (-7)$ corrected to $1.7 (-7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danilov [22]</td>
<td>$3 (-10) T^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitten and Poppoff [23]</td>
<td>$4 (-7) -4 (-8)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanov-Kholodny [24]</td>
<td>$3 (-7) (300/T)^{1/2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton, Van Zandt, and Denison [25]</td>
<td>$2 (-7) (300/T)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bortner [26]</td>
<td>$2.2 \pm 0.5 (-7) (T/300)^{-0.7}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swider [27]</td>
<td>$\sim 1 (-7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipf [28]</td>
<td>$1.5 (-7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warke [29]</td>
<td>$1.1 (-7)$ at 300 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASA [30]</td>
<td>$3 (-7) T^{-1.2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasner and Biondi [31,32]</td>
<td>$2.2 \pm 0.2 (-7) (T/300)^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan [33]</td>
<td>$2.8 \pm 0.2 (-7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>$2 \pm 2 (-8) (T/300)^{-1}$ to $4 \pm 4 (-8) (T/300)^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biondi [35]</td>
<td>$1.9 (-7)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickwar [36]</td>
<td>$1.95 (-7) (300/T)^{0.7}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a.* Value in ( ) denotes the order of rate coefficient; e.g., $2 (-7)$ means $2 \times 10^{-7}$. 
TABLE 2. VALUES OF RATE COEFFICIENT, $\alpha_1$, FOR DISSOCIATIVE RECOMBINATION OF NO$^+$ PRODUCTION MECHANISM

| NO$^+$ + e $\xrightarrow{\alpha_1} N + O(1D)$ |  
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Nicolet and Aikin [20]                      | 3 (-9)$^a$                       |
| Gunton and Inn [37]                         | 1.3 (-6)                         |
| Lin [38]                                    | 4 (-9) at 5000 K                 |
| Syverson, Stern, Shaw, Scheibe and Gunton [39] | 1.3 (-7) at 3000 K              |
| Doering and Mahan [40]                      | 4 (-7)                           |
| Norton, Van Zandt, and Denison [25]         | 6.7 (-8) (300/T)                 |
| Swider [27]                                 | $\sim$ 1 (-7)                    |
| Saxena [41]                                 | 2.8 (-7)                         |
| Weller and Biondi [42, 43]                   | 7.4 ± 0.7 (-7) at 200 K          |
|                                             | 4.1 (+0.3, -0.2) (-7) at 300 K   |
|                                             | 3.1 ± 0.2 (-7) at 400 K          |
|                                             | 4.1 (+0.3, -0.2) (-7) (T/300)$^{-1}$ |
| Bardsley [44]                               | 2.6 (-7) at 300 K                |
| G.E. Report [34]                            | 5.0 ± 1 (-7) (T/300)$^{-1.2}$ ± 0.2 |
| Wickwar [36]                                | 4.1 (-7) (300/T)                 |
| Meira, Jr. [45]                             | 4.5 (-7) (300/T)                 |

$^a$ Value in ( ) denotes the order of rate coefficient; e.g., 2 (-7) means $2 \times 10^7$. 
Values of rate coefficients for these reactions are listed in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. These values, which were obtained by an extensive literature survey, were used parametrically in this study in an effort to establish "best" values.

Additional sources and sinks of these molecular ions that were obtained during the literature survey as well as postulated values of their reaction rate coefficients are listed in Table 5 for completeness; however, the production or loss mechanisms themselves were determined to be of minor importance in the twilight glow, because either the rate coefficient was small in comparison with other coefficients or the combination of the reactant number densities and the rate coefficient made the mechanism ineffective at the altitudes from which the 6300 Å radiation emanates during the twilight period.

D. Photoelectron Impact Excitation

Hanson [53] noticed that photoelectrons emitted above a certain altitude could escape from the sunlit atmosphere, travel along the magnetic field lines, and be injected into the conjugate atmosphere. Cole [54] then suggested that Barbier's subpolar sheet (pre-dawn enhancement of 6300 Å OI emission) could be caused by conjugate point photoelectrons causing an increase in the local electron temperature, thereby producing an increase in the rate of production of O1D atoms by collisions between fast thermal electrons and ground state oxygen atoms. This suggestion was contested by Carlson [55] who first reported observations of pre-dawn heating of the ionosphere over Arecibo, P.R., and then showed [56] that the enhancement of the 6300 Å OI emission had to be due to direct impact excitation of atomic oxygen to the 1D state by the incident conjugate point photoelectrons rather than the fast thermal electrons. This result was later supported by the theoretical studies of Fontheim, Beutler, and Nagy [86]; the analysis of simultaneous photometer and Thomson scatter observations by Duboin, Lejeune, Petit, and Weill [87]; and the 100 R enhancements reported by Cogger and Shepherd [88]. If the enhancement of O1D emission had been due to heating as proposed by Cole [54], then Duboin, Lejeune, Petit, and Weill [87] should have observed only a 3 R enhancement instead of the 40 to 50 R enhancement they reported. Added evidence in support of the direct impact excitation mechanism comes from Wallace and McElroy [12] who concluded from their analysis of the measurements from five rocket-borne photometers that this mechanism is significant in the day glow, confirming the suggestions of Fournier and Nagy [89]. It appears as if the major portion of the post-twilight and pre-dawn enhancements cannot be attributed to the fast thermal electron mechanism proposed by Cole [54].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions Studied</th>
<th>Values of Rate Coefficient, (\gamma_2) for (O_2 + O^+) Charge Exchange Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bates and Nicolet [57, 58]</td>
<td>(1 , \text{(-12)}^\text{a})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson and Sayers [59]</td>
<td>(2.5 \pm 0.4 , \text{(-11)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danilov [22]</td>
<td>(1 , \text{(-10)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertzberg [60]</td>
<td>(1 , \text{(-9)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langstroth and Hasted [61]</td>
<td>(1.8 \pm 0.2 , \text{(-12)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fite, Rutherford, Snow, and Van Lint [62]</td>
<td>(\geq 1 , \text{(-10)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton, Van Zandt, and Denison [25]</td>
<td>(5 , \text{(-11)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitten and Poppoff [63]</td>
<td>(2 , \text{(-11)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swider [27]</td>
<td>(3 , \text{(-12)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fehsenfeld, Schmeltekopf, and Ferguson [64]</td>
<td>(4.0 , \text{(-13)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue [65]</td>
<td>(3.4 , \text{(-11)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copsey, Smith and Sayers [66]</td>
<td>(2 , \text{(-13)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warneck [67]</td>
<td>(2 , \text{(-13)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohme [68]</td>
<td>(2 , \text{(-11)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strobel [69]</td>
<td>(1.15 , \text{(-11)} , (600/T))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith and Fouracre [70]</td>
<td>(3.4 \pm 0.5 , \text{(-10)} , T^{-0.48 \pm 0.5})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.E. Report [34]</td>
<td>(2 , \text{(-11)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubbe [71]</td>
<td>(1.16 , \text{(-11)} , (1 + T/1660))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates [72]</td>
<td>(2 , \text{(-11)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes [52]</td>
<td>(2 , \text{(-11)} , \text{increases slightly with temperature})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strobel and McElroy [73]</td>
<td>(1.07 , \text{(-9)} , T^{-0.7})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meira, Jr. [45]</td>
<td>(2 , \text{(-11)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biondi [35]</td>
<td>(4 , \text{(-11)})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{a. Value in ( ) denotes the order of rate coefficient; e.g., 2 \, (-7) means } 2 \times 10^{-7}.\)
### TABLE 4. VALUES OF RATE COEFFICIENT, $\gamma_1$, FOR N$_2$ + O$^+$
ION-ATOM INTERCHANGE REACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O$^+$ + N$_2$ $\xrightarrow{\gamma_1}$ NO$^+$ + N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potter [74]</td>
<td>$\sim 1$ (-8)$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krassovsky [75]</td>
<td>$\sim 1$ (-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates and Nicolet [57, 58]</td>
<td>$\sim 1$ (-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertzberg [60]</td>
<td>$\sim 1$ (-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danilov [22]</td>
<td>$\sim 1$ (-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langstroth and Hasted [61]</td>
<td>$4.7 \pm 0.5$ (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton, Van Zandt, and Denison [25]</td>
<td>1 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitten and Poppoff [63]</td>
<td>2 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swider [27]</td>
<td>3 (-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fehsenfeld, Schmeltekopf, and Ferguson [64]</td>
<td>3 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copsey, Smith, and Sayers [66]</td>
<td>2.4 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquilanti and Volpi [76]</td>
<td>5.0 $\pm$ 3 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue [65]</td>
<td>1.8 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warneck [67]</td>
<td>2 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson, Dale, and Murad [77]</td>
<td>1.5 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton [78]</td>
<td>2 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmeltekopf, Fehsenfeld, Gilman, and Ferguson [79]</td>
<td>1.8 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith and Fouracre [70]</td>
<td>2.4 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>1 (-12) $\pm$ 0.5 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxena [41]</td>
<td>3 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubbe [71]</td>
<td>1 (-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates [72]</td>
<td>1.2 (-12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$. Value in ( ) denotes the order of rate coefficient; e.g., 2 (-7) means $2 \times 10^{-7}$.
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### TABLE 5. OTHER SOURCES AND SINKS AND ASSOCIATED VALUES OF THEIR REACTION RATE COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Value(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{O}_2^+ + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO}_2^+ + \text{NO} )</td>
<td>Fite, Rutherford, Snow, and Van Lint [62]</td>
<td>Very slow compared with charge transfer or ion atom interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferguson, Fehsenfeld, Goldan, and Schmeltekopf [80]</td>
<td>(&lt;1 \text{ (-15)}^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warneck [67]</td>
<td>(&lt;3 \text{ (-15)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>1 ((-17 \pm 2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bates [72]</td>
<td>(&lt;1 \text{ (-15)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{O}_2 + \text{N}^+ \rightarrow \text{O}_2^+ + \text{N} )</td>
<td>Danilov [22]</td>
<td>5.0 ((-10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fehsenfeld, Schmeltekopf, and Ferguson [64]</td>
<td>5.0 ((-10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copsey, Smith, and Sayers [66]</td>
<td>4.5 ((-10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warneck [67]</td>
<td>4 ((-10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saxena [41]</td>
<td>5.0 ((-10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>5 (\pm 1.5 \text{ (-10)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{O}_2^+ + \text{e} \rightarrow \text{O}_2 + h\nu )</td>
<td>Nicolet and Swider [81]</td>
<td>1-5 ((-12)) radiative recombination can be neglected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chan [33]</td>
<td>2.8 (\pm 0.2 \text{ (-7)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>1 ((-12 \pm 1) \text{ (T/300)}^{-0.7 \pm 0.5})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Value in ( ) denotes the order of rate coefficient; e.g., 2 (-7) means \(2 \times 10^{-7}\).
TABLE 5. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Rate Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{NO}^+ + e \rightarrow \text{NO} + h\nu )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolet and Swider [81]</td>
<td>( 1-5 \times 10^{-12} ) ({}^a) radiative recombination can be neglected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>( 1 \times (T/300)^{-0.7 \pm 0.5} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Rate Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{O}_2^+ + e \rightarrow \text{O}_2 + h\nu )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolet and Swider [81]</td>
<td>( 1-5 \times 10^{-12} ) radiative recombination can be neglected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan [33]</td>
<td>( 2.8 \pm 0.2 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>( 1 \times (T/300)^{-0.7 \pm 0.5} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Rate Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{NO} + \text{N}_2^+ \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{N}_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, Fehsenfeld, Goldan, and Schmeltekopf [80]</td>
<td>( 5 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldan, Schmeltekopf, Fehsenfeld, Schiff, and Ferguson [82]</td>
<td>( 5 \times (1, -3) \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warneck [67]</td>
<td>( 4.8 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>( 5.0 \pm 1.5 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGowan [83]</td>
<td>( 5 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fehsenfeld, Dunkin, and Ferguson [84]</td>
<td>( 3.4 \times 10^{-10} \pm 30% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates [72]</td>
<td>( 5.0 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Rate Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{N}_2^+ + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{N} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton, Van Zandt, and Denison [25]</td>
<td>( 2 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, Fehsenfeld, Goldan, Schmeltekopf, and Schiff [85]</td>
<td>( 2.5 \pm 1 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( {}^a \) Value in ( ) denotes the order of rate coefficient; e.g., \( 2 \times 10^{-7} \) means \( 2 \times 10^{-7} \).
TABLE 5. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Rate Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{N}_2^+ + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{N} ) (continued)</td>
<td>Wallace and McElroy [12]</td>
<td>( 7 \times 10^{-11} )(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saxena [41]</td>
<td>( 2.5 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>( 2.5 \pm 0.8 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fehsenfeld, Dunkin, and Ferguson [84]</td>
<td>( 1.4 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bates [72]</td>
<td>( 2.5 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{N}_2^+ + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{O}_2^+ )</td>
<td>Danilov [22]</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fite, Rutherford, Snow, and Van Lint [62]</td>
<td>( 2 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fehsenfeld, Schmeltekopf, and Ferguson [64]</td>
<td>( 1.0 \pm 0.5 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wallace and McElroy [12]</td>
<td>( 8.6 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aquilanti and Volpi [76]</td>
<td>( 6.5 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warneck [67]</td>
<td>( 1.1 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>( 2 \pm 1 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bates [72]</td>
<td>( 4.7 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meira, Jr. [45]</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{O}_2^+ + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{O}_2 )</td>
<td>Ferguson, Fehsenfeld, Goldan, and Schmeltekopf [80]</td>
<td>( 8 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warneck [67]</td>
<td>( 7.7 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Value in ( ) denotes the order of rate coefficient; e.g., \( 2 \times 10^{-7} \) means \( 2 \times 10^{-7} \).
A third source, increased ionospheric recombination due to a lowering of the F-region, has been proposed by Noxon and Johanson [90], Nichol [91], and Pal [92]. All but approximately 20 R of the pre-dawn enhancement observed over Blue Hill, Massachusetts, could be accounted for by this source when the conjugate point was still in darkness, although there were a few enhancements that could not be attributed to any of these sources. While most of the 40 R enhancement over Hobart, Tasmania, could be attributed to this source, Nichol [91] also concluded that (1) ionization from the exosphere cascading down into the F-region after the rapid cooling at sunset, as postulated by Evans [93], was a second possible source and (2) conjugate point photoelectrons were a third source, although there was not a consistent correlation between the onset of the enhancement and conjugate point sunrise. In view of the recent results of Hernandez concerning possible contamination of observations of 6300 Å OI emission by the 9-3 OH band, which are discussed in detail in Appendix D, the possibility that some of these apparently inexplicable enhancements reported by Noxon and Johanson [90] as well as the inconsistency between onset time and conjugate point sunrise observed by Nichol [91] may be due to increases in the intensity of the hydroxyl emission cannot be ruled out, even though the time inconsistency does seem to be related to the state of the local ionosphere [91]. The amount of enhancement attributed by these investigators to direct impact excitation by conjugate point photoelectrons is in excellent agreement with the results of theoretical studies by Sudworth [94] and by Nagy and Banks [95] who showed that 13 to 25 R enhancements are possible depending upon the local atmospheric conditions.

The analyses of both Nichol [91] and Noxon and Johanson [90] suffer from a lack of observational data required to positively determine the exact amount of the observed intensity due to each of the postulated sources. Neither Nichol [91] nor Noxon and Johanson [90] had measurements of the temperatures of either the neutral or charged portions of the local atmosphere which are required to monitor changing conditions of the environment of the observation point nor did they have measurements of the conjugate point photoelectron fluxes. The analysis of the pre-dawn enhancement over Arecibo, P.R., by Wickwar [36] was based on the most complete set of observational data since he did have the necessary electron density data, including data from above the F₂ peak, and measurements of conjugate point photoelectron fluxes, although he did not have the required temperature measurements either. His analysis showed that when the conjugate point solar zenith angle was greater than 105°, the Arecibo night glow intensity could be explained by the dissociative recombination process. However, the difference between theoretical calculations and observations increased with decreasing conjugate point solar zenith angle until a plateau of 25 to 50 R was reached at approximately an angle of 95°, supporting Carlson's [96] report that the pre-dawn enhancement over Arecibo began at a conjugate point solar zenith angle of approximately 99°. Day-to-day variations in the onset time (angle) and intensity were highly correlated with the ionospheric conditions at the observation point in agreement with the report of Okuda and Misawa [97] that when the sunspot number was higher the onset time for pre-dawn enhancements over the Takhatta Night Glow Observatory during the period from November 1966 to February 1968 was earlier (solar activity effect on environment of the observation point).

Several investigators have reported on the possibility of geomagnetic field control of the location of enhancements. Bennett [98] found a 100 R twilight enhancement at solar cycle maximum and a 50 R enhancement at solar cycle minimum due to conjugate point photoelectrons. He concluded that enhancement could not occur at locations with \( L \leq 1.1 \) because the low minimum altitude of the \( L = 1.1 \) shell at 50°W resulted in too many collisions for the photoelectrons to be able to propagate from the conjugate point, nor could they occur at locations with \( L > 3.2 \) because the electric fields at the plasma-pause [99] would prevent propagation from the conjugate point. Contrary to this, Torr and Torr [100] found a 50 R twilight enhancement in winter at the Antarctica station SANAÉ, which lies on \( L = 4.0 \); Cogger and Shepherd [88] reported an enhancement at Saskatoon which lies on \( L = 4.2 \); and Nichol [91] found that the poleward cutoff of the enhancement was nearer \( L = 4.0 \) than \( L = 3.2 \). A solar activity dependent position for the plasmapause could reconcile this apparent discrepancy in the poleward cutoff for possible enhancements; however, there are still insufficient observational data to verify Bennett's [98] conjecture concerning the low latitude cutoff.
Huntsville, Alabama, is on approximately the 2.3 to 2.4 L-shell, and its conjugate point is approximately 47°S and 105°W [101]. Figure 2 shows the variation of the conjugate point solar zenith angle as a function of Central Standard Time for the night of January 6-7, 1972. If conjugate point photoelectrons are present on this night, they should affect the computational results until approximately 2233 Central Standard Time, which is conjugate point sundown, assuming a screening height of 180 km.

![Graph showing conjugate point solar zenith angle as a function of Central Standard Time on January 6-7, 1972.](image)

Figure 2. Conjugate point solar zenith angle as a function of Central Standard Time on January 6-7, 1972.
E. Quenching

The metastable $^1D$ oxygen atom has a lifetime of approximately 110 s and will probably emit a 6300 Å photon unless it is collisionally deactivated or quenched. The exact process for the quenching, which seems to be a more appropriate term for the process, is still undetermined since the $^1D$ state is so reactive and the emissions are very difficult to observe under laboratory conditions where rate coefficients can be measured. At the current time, $N_2$, $O_2$, $O$, and electrons are postulated to be the primary quenching agents. However, the rate coefficient for the $O(^1D) + O$ process is relatively slow while the electron number densities rarely exceed $10^6$ cm$^{-3}$ at night; therefore, these latter two agents do not contribute to the overall quenching process.

Rate coefficients for the first three of these quenching agents are listed in Tables 6, 7, and 8, respectively. Quenching by both $N_2$ and $O_2$ was considered to be of importance in the twilight glow; consequently, the reactions listed below were included in the computational procedure used in this study with the appropriate rate coefficients used parametrically in order to establish "best" values.

$$O(^1D) + N_2 \rightarrow O(^3P) + N_2^*$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

$$O(^1D) + O_2 \rightarrow O(^3P) + O_2^*$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

The effects of differences in the quenching rate coefficients on calculated volume emission profiles as well as integrated intensities are discussed in Section VII.

III. INSTRUMENTATION AND OBSERVATIONS

A. Instrumentation

A general purpose airglow observatory system [123] has been established at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Alabama, to study optical emissions of the night sky. In this report the system has been used to study post-sunset twilight behavior of the 6300 Å emission of atomic oxygen. The system consists of an airglow observatory, a C-4 vertical incidence ionosonde, and a phase path sounder; however, the phase path sounder was not in operation during the period of this study.
TABLE 6. VALUES OF RATE COEFFICIENT, $q_l$, FOR $O(^1D) + N_2$ QUENCHING REACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$q_l$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeMore and Raper [102, 103]</td>
<td>$3 \times (11)$^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt [104]</td>
<td>$5 \times (15)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunten and McElroy [105]</td>
<td>$5 \times (11)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snelling and Bair [106]</td>
<td>$2.2 \pm 1 \times (11)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGrath and McGarvey [107]</td>
<td>$3 \times (11)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>$5 \times (11) \pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young [108]</td>
<td>$5 \times (11)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxon [109]</td>
<td>$5 \times (11)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson and Van Zandt [110]</td>
<td>$5 \times (11) - 1 \times (10)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalgarno [111]</td>
<td>Most $O(^1D)$ are quenched by $N_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes [52]</td>
<td>$3 \times (11) - 7 \times (11)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 \times (11) - 1 \times (10)$ with negligible temperature dependence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaeffer, Feldman, and Fastie [112]</td>
<td>$6 \times (11) - 7 \times (11)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue, Parkinson, Zipf, Doering, Fastie, and Miller [49]</td>
<td>$5 \times (11) - 1 \times (10)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biondi [35]</td>
<td>$4.4 \times (11)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez [113]</td>
<td>$9 \times (1.0 \pm 0.5) \times (11)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a. Value in ( ) denotes the order of rate coefficient; e.g., $2 \times (7)$ means $2 \times 10^{-7}$.  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O(¹D) + O₂ → O(³P) + O₂*</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallace and Chamberlain [114]</td>
<td>4 (-12) - 2 (-10) a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMore and Raper [102, 103]</td>
<td>3 (-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipf [115]</td>
<td>4 (-12) - 2 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, Van Zandt, and Norton [116]</td>
<td>&gt; 1 (-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunten and McElroy [105]</td>
<td>4 (-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt [104]</td>
<td>2.5 (-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warneck and Sullivan [117]</td>
<td>4 (-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snelling and Bair [118]</td>
<td>2 (8) liter mole⁻¹ s⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>1 (-12 ± 2) - 1 (-10 ± 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmore, Bauer, and McGowan [119]</td>
<td>&gt; 1 (-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipf [120]</td>
<td>1 (-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Black, and Slanger [108]</td>
<td>4 (-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxon [121]</td>
<td>6 (-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biondi [35]</td>
<td>4.4 (-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt [122]</td>
<td>5 (-12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Value in ( ) denotes the order of rate coefficient; e.g., 2 (-7) means \(2 \times 10^{-7}\).
TABLE 8. VALUES OF RATE COEFFICIENT, $q_3$, FOR $O(^1D) + O$ QUENCHING REACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$O(^1D) + O(^3P)$ $\rightarrow q_3 2 O(^3P)$</th>
<th>1.6 $(-13)^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunten and McElroy [105]</td>
<td>1.3 $(-13 \pm 0.5)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. E. Report [34]</td>
<td>$&lt; 4 (-13)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmore, Bauer, and McGowan [119]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Value in ( ) denotes the order of rate coefficient; e.g., 2 $(-7)$ means $2 \times 10^{-7}$.

Three optical measurements are required in this study: (1) the intensity of the 6300 Å emission, (2) the intensity of the background emission — in this study the 6100 Å emission is considered to be representative, and (3) the Doppler broadening of the 6300 Å emission line. Roble, Hays, and Nagy [124] have shown that this Doppler broadening of the emission line is due to the thermal motions of the metastable $O(^1D)$ oxygen atoms and that it is an accurate measure of the temperature of the neutral atmosphere at approximately the base of the exosphere. The variation of the neutral exospheric temperature during the post-sunset twilight period can be monitored by observing the 6300 Å Doppler temperature of the normal night glow.

The C-4 vertical incidence ionosonde has been used to obtain electron density-height profiles for use in the dissociative recombination portion of the theoretical model of the twilight 6300 Å emission. Since the C-4 ionosonde is only capable of making vertical soundings, only vertical scans of the 6300 Å emission have been used in this study.

1. AIRGLOW OBSERVATORY

The airglow observatory itself consists of an interference filter photometer after Purdy et al. [125] and a Fabry-Perot interferometer after Roble [123]. The photometer is capable of measuring the intensity of the night glow at four wavelengths — 5300 Å, 5577 Å, 6100 Å, and 6300 Å; however, only the latter two measurements have been used in this study. The Fabry-Perot interferometer is capable of measuring the Doppler broadening of both the 5577 Å and 6300 Å emissions from the night glow; however, only the latter wavelength
emission has been used in this study. Both of these instruments, their design considerations, construction, and operating capabilities were discussed in detail in Reference 123; however, pertinent portions of that document have been included here for completeness. The suitability and capability of the instruments for making the required measurements as well as the representativeness of the observations have been well documented; therefore, they will not be discussed in detail here. Instead, the interested reader is referred to Born and Wolf [126]; Tolansky [127]; Jenkins and White [128]; Turgeon and Shepherd [129]; Wark [130]; Jarrett, Hoey, and Paffrath [131]; Jarrett and Hoey [132]; Hernandez [113]; Biondi and Feibelman [17]; Roble, Hays, and Nagy [124]; and Roble [123].

a. Fabry-Perot Interferometer. This instrument is a conventional, pressure scanned, multiple beam interferometer. A simplified block diagram of the instrument and its supporting systems is shown in Figure 3. The primary components of the instrument are a high quality set of fused quartz etalon plates with plane surfaces carefully polished flat to 1/200 of a wavelength and a very sensitive photoelectrically cooled photomultiplier tube. The plates are 15 cm in diameter and are separated by a 1 cm spacer which Roble [123] showed to be the optimum for measuring the 6300 Å emission. Recent observations have shown that this may have been an erroneous conclusion. This is discussed in detail in Appendix D. The operating parameters of the system are shown in Table 9.

Data from this pulse counting system are displayed on a scaler-timer, recorded on a strip chart recorder and an X-Y plotter, and written on a digital magnetic tape.

(1) Data Reduction Procedure. The recorded signal output of the 6300 Å emission line is adequately represented by the following equation which is described in detail by Hays and Roble [133]:

\[
Y(x) = I_0 \left[ A_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \exp \left( -\frac{n^2}{4} \gamma T_n \right) \cos nx \right] + C \quad , \quad (13)
\]

where

\[
x \quad \text{is the phase difference;}
\]

\[
I_0 = 5 \times 10^5 A\Omega \frac{R}{\gamma} \frac{\tau}{a T_e} P_e \left( 1 - R \right) \left( 1 + R \right)^{-1} \quad (14)
\]
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Figure 3. Schematic drawing of the Fabry-Perot interferometer and associated system components [123].
**TABLE 9. OPERATING PARAMETERS OF THE FABRY-PEROT INTERFEROMETER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Etalon Plates</th>
<th>Objective Lens</th>
<th>Aperture</th>
<th>Instrument Field of View</th>
<th>Interference Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Effective diameter</td>
<td>5.25 in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flatness</td>
<td>λ/200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roughness defect, ( N_D )</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective coatings</td>
<td>Five alternate layers of ZnS and cryolite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflectivity</td>
<td>0.8275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective finesse, ( N_R )</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spherical defect finesse, ( N_{Df} )</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spacing, ( t )</td>
<td>1 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
<td>48 in. (achromat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
<td>11/64 in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finesse</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
<td>2 in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Half-width</td>
<td>5.2 Å</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak transmission</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak wavelength</td>
<td>6307 Å</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9. (Concluded)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Photomultiplier (ITT-FW-130)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantum efficiency at 6300 Å</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photocathode surface</td>
<td>S-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective aperture</td>
<td>1/10 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dark count (cooled to -15°C) (uncooled)</td>
<td>1 to 2 counts/s 80 to 90 counts/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Resolving Power</td>
<td>350 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Operating Order</td>
<td>31 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Free Spectral Range</td>
<td>0.198 Å (0.5 cm⁻¹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Scanning Gas</td>
<td>(Dry nitrogen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Pressure Change for One Order</td>
<td>1.76 psi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Overall Instrument Finesse</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where \( A \) is the effective collecting area of the interferometer, \( \Omega \) is the instrument field of view, \( R_y \) is the brightness of the source in Rayleighs, \( \tau_a \) is the transmission coefficient that includes the effects of absorption and scattering of the reflective coatings, \( T_T \) is the transmission of the various optical surfaces of the instrument and pre-monochromator, and \( P_e \) is the quantum efficiency of the photomultiplier tube;

\[
A_0 = \pi/2 ;
\]

\[
A_n = \pi^{-1} R^n \exp\left[-(n^2/4) D^2\right] \text{sinc}(2n f_a/\Delta a) \text{sinc}(2n f/\Delta a) , \quad (15)
\]
where \( R \) is the reflectivity of the etalon plates, \( D = 2 \pi d_g / (\Delta \sigma \sqrt{\ln 2}) \) with \( d_g \) being the half-width at half-height of the gaussian surface defect function, \( d_f \) is half-width at half-height of the spherical defect function, \( \Delta \sigma \) is the free spectral range of the instrument, sinc \( \beta = \sin \pi \beta / (\pi \beta) \), and \( f \) is half-width at half-height of the aperture function;

\[ n \] is the number of Fourier transforms required to describe the line shape;

\[ \gamma = 7.274 \times 10^{-12} \, M^{-1} \, \sigma_0 \, (\Delta \sigma)^{-2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (16)

where \( M \) is the molecular weight of the emitting atom and \( \sigma_0 \) is the emission wave number;

\[ T_n \] is the neutral gas temperature (K) ;

and

\[ C \] is the continuum background.

Equations (13) and (14) were combined and solved for \( R \) using the following values for the various instrument parameters described previously in conjunction with the observed intensity of the 6300 Å emission above the background continuum:

\[ A\Omega = 1.396 \times 10^{-3} \]  ,

based on an aperture with a diameter of 0.436 cm, an objective lens with a 121.9 cm focal length, a full field of view of 0.2°, and an effective diameter of the etalon plates of 13.3 cm;

\[ \tau_a = 1 \]  ;

\[ P_e = 0.05 \]  ;
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and

\[
T_{T} = 0.2139 \quad \text{based on the following.}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optical Component</th>
<th>Transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Glass plate on top of etalon</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Quartz etalon surface 1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Quartz etalon surface 2</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Glass plate below etalon</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Objective lens</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Mirror</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Collimating lens</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) 6300 Å filter</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Condensing lens</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Plexiglass surface 1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Plexiglass surface 2</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instrument is designed so that the scanning is accomplished by changing the N₂ pressure in the chamber linearly with time, similar to the method discussed by Noxon and Johanson [133a].

b. **Photometer.** The photometer in the airglow observatory is of the turret type designed by Purdy, Megill, and Roach [125]. It has space for six interference filters in a wheel that is driven by a variable speed reversible stepping motor. This wheel positions an interference filter in front of a photomultiplier tube and then a second wheel positions in succession a dark reference, a standard light source, and a sky opening between the interference filter and the mirror system that collects the light. Once this procedure is completed, a second filter is moved into position and the entire process is repeated. This continues uninterrupted during the periods in which measurements are being made.
The standard light source is a C14-activated phosphor [134-136] which provides a light of known intensity in the 4000 to 8000 Å spectral range. E. Marovich of Fritz Peak Observatory calibrated the source against a primary standard and its intensity distribution as shown in Table 10 and Figure 4. The photometer–telescope system has a 5° field of view and it uses the same scanning mirror system as the Fabry–Perot interferometer by having a 45° mirror that projects out into, but does not interfere with, the light path from the scanning mirror to the Fabry–Perot interferometer. Data from the pulse counting system of the photometer are displayed on a scaler–timer, recorded on a strip–chart recorder, and written on a digital magnetic tape.

(1) Data Reduction Procedure. The 6300 Å emission line observations were combined with the 6100 Å continuum observations to determine the intensity of the atomic oxygen redline E(6300) in a computer program using the following equation developed in Reference 123:

\[
E(6300) = \frac{(S_{ss} - S_d) \bar{C}_s}{(S_{sc} - S_d)} - \frac{(S_{cs} - S_d) \bar{C}_c}{(S_{cc} - S_d)},
\]

where \( S_{ss} \) is the sky signal from the emission line filter, \( S_{sc} \) is the calibration signal from the emission line filter, \( S_{cs} \) is the sky signal from the continuum filter, \( S_{cc} \) is the calibration signal from the continuum filter, \( S_d \) is the dark signal of the photomultiplier tube, and \( \bar{C}_s \) and \( \bar{C}_c \) are the mean values of the standard light spectral characteristics over the wavelength region of the emission line and the continuum as modified by the filters, respectively.

B. Observational Measurements

1. INTENSITY

The Fabry–Perot interferometer and the turret photometer were operated during the twilight and post–twilight periods on several days in the winter and spring of 1971–1972. The days on which they were operated, the time periods covered by the operation, and the solar activity indices existing at the time of their operation are listed in Table 11. The photometer system has a 30 Å bandpass 6300 Å filter and measurements are possibly contaminated by other
### TABLE 10. LOW BRIGHTNESS SOURCE INTENSITY DISTRIBUTION

**Date:** March 1, 1972

Calibration of Phosphor Light: NASA Huntsville Temperature 17°C

NRD C-3002-a
Serial D-010 3-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wavelength (Å)</th>
<th>Radiance (W cm⁻²sr⁻¹Å⁻¹ x 10⁻¹³)</th>
<th>R/Å</th>
<th>Radiance (W cm⁻²sr⁻¹Å⁻¹ x 10⁻¹³)</th>
<th>R/Å</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3800</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3900</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4100</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4300</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>6600</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>6700</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>6900</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4800</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4900</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>7100</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5100</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5200</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5300</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5500</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5600</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5700</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5800</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5900</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. The units of radiance are watts per square centimeter per steradian per Angstrom.
2. The precision is to within approximately 10 percent; precision is worse toward each end of the wavelength range, especially beyond approximately 7500 Å.
3. The accuracy is to within approximately ±10 percent; this is based on a partial comparison of the standards.
Figure 4. Low brightness source intensity distribution.
emissions; therefore, the intensity values derived using the procedures described previously may not be true values for the atomic oxygen redline. A more detailed discussion of the contaminating hydroxyl emission is given in Appendix D. Each filter in the photometer is calibrated with the low brightness source (LBS) immediately after each sky reading and there are only two optical surfaces that must be correctly accounted for in the data reduction scheme, the filter and a single mirror, because the scanning mirror system was not used for the overhead scans.

Although the Fabry-Perot interferometer (F-P) has a 5.2 Å half-width interference filter that will screen out some more of the contaminating emissions from nearby hydroxyl lines, it has 11 optical surfaces that are subject to variations with time. Therefore, intensities of the atomic oxygen redline emissions were calculated by normalizing the intensities derived from the F-P measurements using the procedure discussed in Section III.A.1.a.(1) to the photometer intensities during the 2300 to 2330 CST time period where the hydroxyl contamination should be minimal and then using the normalization factor to correct the remaining intensities calculated from the F-P measurements. This is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Daily 10.7 cm Flux</th>
<th>81 Day Mean Flux</th>
<th>Kp (6.7 h lag)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 10, 1971</td>
<td>1832-0500</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 17, 1971</td>
<td>1720-1920</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1, 1971</td>
<td>1712-1743</td>
<td>120.3</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 6, 1972</td>
<td>1726-2400</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 7, 1972</td>
<td>1726-2400</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 4, 1972</td>
<td>1749-1949</td>
<td>106.6-105.6</td>
<td>119.1</td>
<td>2.7-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 7, 1972</td>
<td>1745-1930</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>119.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 14, 1972</td>
<td>1752-1952</td>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>119.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
similar to the technique employed by Noxon and Johanson [133a]. Since all of the observations used in this analysis were made at the zenith, no corrections were made for extinction. It is believed that errors resulting from this procedure are rarely more than 10 percent [133a]. Also, it is believed that the absolute values of the intensities used in this analysis are accurate to ±10 percent.

The observed intensities for the night of January 6, 1972, are shown as a function of solar zenith angle in Figure 5. The ±10 percent error bars are those due to uncertainties in the calibration of the low brightness source. Errors in intensities calculated from the F-P observations were computed using the following equation from Reference 133:

$$\overline{\Delta I} = \left( \frac{I_0 \alpha' + \beta' C}{N} \right)^{1/2}$$

where $I_0$ and $C$ are defined in Section III.A.1.a.(1), $N$ is the number of data points in each line shape profile, and $\alpha'$ and $\beta'$ are given in Figure 4 of Reference 133. In this study the errors ranged from a maximum of 6.9 R at the first observation when the integrated intensity was approximately 250 R to a minimum of 1.2 R at the last two observations when the integrated intensity was approximately 18 R. These are all within the ±10 percent errors due to the LBS calibration uncertainties. This night was selected for a detailed analysis because viewing conditions permitted observations during both the sunset and post-sunset twilight periods and the C-4 ionosonde was operational for the entire period. Additional observational data are shown in Appendix C. In general there is a very rapid decrease in intensity during the first hour after sunset followed by a much slower decrease during the second hour and then usually a gentle decrease for the remainder of the period. Occasional minor perturbations, on the order of a few Rayleighs, are seen in the histories; these may be due to either small scale perturbations in the electron densities or to wave-like motions that perturb the neutral atmosphere. Determinations of the exact causes of these perturbations will require a much more detailed analysis, which is not within the scope of this investigation. The absolute values of the observed intensities are much more variable from day to day. Once again, a more detailed analysis is required to establish the causes of these variations. However, in general, it seems that these larger variations are associated with the formulation of the Jacchia models of the neutral atmosphere in which both the molecular oxygen and nitrogen number densities increase with increasing exospheric temperature. This outward expansion of the neutral atmosphere during periods of increased solar activity causes an increase in the intensity of the 6300 Å emission with all other variables, especially the ionosphere, remaining constant.
Figure 5. 6300 Å intensity as a function of solar zenith angle on January 6, 1972.
2. NEUTRAL TEMPERATURE MEASUREMENTS

The Doppler broadening of the 6300 Å emission line has been shown to be a good measure of the temperature of the neutral atmosphere. The procedure used to derive temperatures from the Fabry-Perot interferometer measurements has been discussed in detail by Hays and Roble [133]. Some typical Fabry-Perot interferometer fringes from the twilight period of January 6, 1972, are shown in Figures 6 through 13. The figures show intensity counts from the photomultiplier tube of the F-P system as a function of pressure in the etalon chamber, with the pressure being directly related to wavelength. These are, therefore, scans across the 6300 Å emission lines, and in theory the half-widths, line widths at half-heights, are proportional to the temperature of the emitting particles. In Figures 6 and 7, the rapidly decreasing intensity of the combined background and line are readily distinguishable. In the remaining figures the decrease in intensity appears to be almost negligible.

One of the assumptions in the data reduction technique discussed in References 123 and 133 is that the intensities of both the background and the emission line remain constant during the pressure (wavelength) scan. Since this is not the case for the first four or five fringes in the twilight period, the varying intensities had to be corrected before the data could be reduced. Both log and exponential curves were fit through the intensity counts from the F-P system during those portions of the pressure scans when only the background was being measured. The curve which fit the data best was then used to correct for the varying background intensity. Each fringe that showed a variable background was reconstructed by subtracting from each intensity data point the intensity value computed from the curve fit through the background intensity values only. Arbitrarily then, a value of 200 was added to each data point to preclude the possibility of obtaining negative intensity values. Figures 14 through 17 show the results of this reconstruction. These four figures correspond to Figures 6 through 9, respectively, i.e., the immediate post-sunset portion of the January 6, 1972, twilight period. In the immediate post-sunset period, the 6300 Å line is so intense that pressure scans can be accomplished in less than approximately 2 min; therefore, the varying intensity of the line itself during the scan period is so small that no additional correction is required.

These "raw" data were then reduced using a computerized version of the technique discussed in References 123 and 133. The derived temperatures are shown as a function of solar zenith angle in Figure 18.
Figure 6. Fabry–Perot interferometer observations of the 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1728 and 1732 CST on January 6, 1972.

Figure 7. Fabry–Perot interferometer observations of the 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1740 and 1742 CST on January 6, 1972.
Figure 8. Fabry-Perot interferometer observations of the 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1751 and 1756 CST on January 6, 1972.

Figure 9. Fabry-Perot interferometer observations of the 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1805 and 1811 CST on January 6, 1972.
Figure 10. Fabry-Perot interferometer observations of the 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1822 and 1832 CST on January 6, 1972.

Figure 11. Fabry-Perot interferometer observations of the 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1845 and 1855 CST on January 6, 1972.
Figure 12. Fabry-Perot interferometer observations of the 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1903 and 1910 CST on January 6, 1972.

Figure 13. Fabry-Perot interferometer observations of the 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1926 and 1940 CST on January 6, 1972.
Figure 14. 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1728 and 1732 CST on January 6, 1972, after correcting for and removal of the variable intensity of the background.

Figure 15. 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1740 and 1742 CST on January 6, 1972, after correcting for and removal of the variable intensity of the background.
Figure 16. 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1751 and 1756 CST on January 6, 1972, after correcting for and removal of the variable intensity of the background.

Figure 17. 6300 Å emission line shapes at 1805 and 1811 CST on January 6, 1972, after correcting for and removal of the variable intensity of the background.
Figure 18. Thermospheric temperatures derived from the Fabry-Perot interferometer observed 6300 Å emission line shapes as a function of solar zenith angle on January 6, 1972.
The error bars shown on the figure were calculated from the following equation from Reference 133:

\[ \Delta T = \left( \frac{\alpha}{N I_0} + \frac{\beta}{N I_0^2} \right)^{1/2} \]

where \( I_0 \) and \( C \) are defined in Section III.A.1.a.(1), \( N \) is the number of data points in the line shape profile, and \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are given in Figure 3 of Reference 133.

3. ELECTRON DENSITY MEASUREMENTS

The electron density-height profiles used in this theoretical analysis were obtained from C-4 ionosonde measurements. True height analysis was accomplished using a computer program based on the technique proposed by Doupnik and Schmerling [137]. The electron density-true height profiles above the \( F_2 \) peak were computed using a constant scale height two times that of the atomic oxygen scale height at the \( F_2 \) peak with a kinetic temperature of 1500 K.

Figure 19 is a plot of contours of constant electron density versus solar zenith angle for the approximate 7 h period following sunset. Both the height of the \( F_2 \) peak and the maximum electron density decrease relatively smoothly with time, and no large scale motions of the charged particles are apparent in this record.

During the course of this investigation much effort was spent in establishing the electron density-true height profiles. Several different reduction techniques were compared using known electron density-true height profiles as input data. Various starting techniques, amounts of input data, location of input data, and types of input data (X-ray only, O-ray only, X- and O-ray data) were used in the available data reduction programs to determine which output results most closely matched the known profiles. The electron density-true height profiles referenced above are believed to be most representative of the ionospheric conditions existing over Huntsville, Alabama, on the night of January 6, 1972. They were determined by using the combination of starting point, amount, type, and location of input data established during the study as the one combination that produced output results which most nearly matched the known electron density-true height profiles. Although these results are satisfactory insofar as this analysis is concerned, this area requires a concerted
research effort. Until such time as this additional research is concluded, electron density-true height profiles, other than possibly those reduced by the group at NOAA, Boulder, Colorado, should not be used without additional verification.
IV. NEUTRAL ATMOSPHERE

A. Models

Three models of the neutral upper atmosphere of the Earth were used in this analysis. The original Jacchia 1964 model and the same model with the 120 km boundary conditions recommended by Reber\(^2\) both used the analytical representation of the neutral gas temperature–height profile developed by Bates \([3]\) and modified by Walker \([138]\) to calculate constituent number density–height profiles. The third model used was the Jacchia 1971 model which was used in its original form. Table 12 contains the boundary condition values used as inputs to the Jacchia 1964 model atmosphere. Corresponding number densities at 120 km altitude for the constituents in the Jacchia 1971 model atmosphere are variable and dependent upon the exospheric temperature. Differences in the computed 6300 Å emission integrated intensities and volume emission profiles only from the differences inherent in these models are discussed in detail in Section VII.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N_2)</td>
<td>(O_2)</td>
<td>(O)</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7131 (x 10^{11}) cm(^{-3})</td>
<td>6.0645 (x 10^{10}) cm(^{-3})</td>
<td>9.4607 (x 10^{10}) cm(^{-3})</td>
<td>Reber ([2])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 (x 10^{11}) cm(^{-3})</td>
<td>7.5 (x 10^{10}) cm(^{-3})</td>
<td>7.6 (x 10^{10}) cm(^{-3})</td>
<td>Jacchia ([1])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Columnar Number Densities

The production of \(^1\)D oxygen atoms and the subsequent emission of the 6300 Å photons are dependent upon the number densities of the neutral constituents as well as their total densities in a unit column between the altitude of the emitting atoms and the source of the agent causing the excitation, the Sun in the case of dissociative photoexcitation and the magnetic conjugate point in the case of photoelectrons.

To calculate the total columnar number densities for use in the dissociative photoexcitation calculations, information is required on the constituent number density variation with height in the atmosphere. All major atmospheric constituents are believed to be in diffusive equilibrium above approximately 120 km altitude; therefore, at any altitude, \( z \), above 120 km the constituent number density, \( n_i(z) \), can be calculated from

\[
n_i(z) = n_i(z_0) \frac{T(z_0)}{T(z)} \exp \left( - \int_{z_0}^{z} \frac{dz}{H_i(z)} \right),
\]

where \( z_0 \) is a reference height in the diffusive equilibrium region of the atmosphere, taken as 120 km in this study; \( T \) is the kinetic temperature; and \( H_i(z) \), the scale height of the \( i \)th constituent at altitude, \( z \), is defined as

\[
H_i(z) = \frac{R T(z)}{M_i g(z)}
\]

where \( R \) is the universal gas constant, \( M_i \) is the molecular mass of the \( i \)th constituent, and \( g(z) \), the acceleration due to gravity at the height \( z \) in kilometers, is defined as

\[
g(z) = 9.80665 \times 10^{-3} \left( \frac{6356.77}{6356.77 + z} \right)^2.
\]

From the perfect gas law and the hydrostatic equation, the total number density in a unit vertical column above a height, \( z \), in an isothermal atmosphere is

\[
N_i(z) = n_i(z) H_i(z).
\]

For nonvertical incidence during twilight observations, the zenith angle of the Sun must be known. For geographic latitude, \( \theta \), local time (angle from noon), \( \psi \), and solar declination, \( \delta \), the zenith angle, \( \chi \), is obtained from
\[
\cos \chi = \cos \theta \cos \delta \cos \psi + \sin \theta \sin \delta .
\]

During the twilight period studied here, the zenith angle ranged from 97.5° to 166°. When the zenith angle, \( \chi \), is 60° or less, the curvature of the atmosphere may be neglected and the constituent total columnar number density above an altitude, \( z \), is approximated by

\[
N_1(z) \approx n_1(z) H_1(z) \sec \chi .
\]

However, this is not the case during the twilight period and the curvature of the atmosphere must be included in the calculations. Chapman \[139, 140\] first investigated the problem of calculating total columnar number densities in a slant path through a spherical isothermal atmosphere. In an isothermal atmosphere the scale height, \( H_i \), for a given constituent is constant and independent of height. If the constituent is in hydrostatic equilibrium, the total columnar number density above an altitude \( z \), can be calculated from

\[
N_1(z) = n_1(z) H_1(z) \left\{ x(1) \sin \chi \int_0^\chi \csc^2 \lambda \exp \left[x(1) \left(1 - \frac{\sin \chi}{\sin \lambda}\right)\right] d\lambda \right\} ,
\]

where \( x(1) = (R_E + z)/H_1(z) \) and \( R_E \) is the Earth's radius. The Chapman function, generally denoted as \( \text{Ch}(x, \chi) \), is the quantity between the braces. It was developed on the assumption of an isothermal atmosphere, a situation which exists only above about 250 km in the Earth's atmosphere. Since the height profile of the constituent number density, \( n_1(z) \), is almost exponential, the major contribution to the total column density comes from a narrow altitude range near \( z \) over which the temperature is nearly constant. The total column density is relatively insensitive to the temperature-height profile; therefore, the constituent scale height at the observational altitude can be used in the Chapman function. A number of approximations to the Chapman function have been developed; however, the one used in this study was introduced by Rishbeth and Garriott \[141\]:
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\[
\text{Ch}(x, \chi) = \left[ \frac{\pi}{2} x(1) \sin \chi \right]^\frac{1}{2} \exp \left[ \frac{x(1)}{2} \cos^2 \chi \right] \left\{ 1 \pm \text{erf} \left[ \frac{x(1)}{2} \cos^2 \chi \right]^\frac{1}{2} \right\},
\]

where the symbols are as previously defined and the plus sign is used for zenith angles \( \geq 90^\circ \) while the minus sign applies to zenith angles \(< 90^\circ \).

C. Exospheric Temperatures

The exospheric temperatures required to establish the constituent number density height profiles in the atmospheric models used in the analysis were derived from the analysis of the Doppler broadened emission line profiles measured with the Fabry-Perot interferometer after the varying background correction had been made.

V. THEORETICAL APPROACH

The theoretical model established to study the 6300 Å emission intensities during the twilight period contains two production sources of \(^1\text{D}\) oxygen atoms.

A. Photodissociation

The number of \(^1\text{D}\) oxygen atoms produced at each altitude level by solar photons in the principal Schumann-Runge continuum was calculated by

\[
n\left[ \text{O}(^1\text{D}) \right]_z = \sum_{\lambda=1125}^{1775} \sigma(\lambda, \text{O}_2) \times \text{FLUX}(\lambda)_z \times n(\text{O}_2)_z,
\]

where \(\sigma(\lambda, \text{O}_2)\) is the molecular oxygen absorption cross section for radiation of wavelength \(\lambda\), and \(\text{FLUX}(\lambda)_z\) is the photon flux of wavelength \(\lambda\) at height \(z\). The photon flux of wavelength \(\lambda\) at each altitude \(z\) was calculated from
where $\text{FLUX}(\lambda)_z$ is the flux of solar photons of wavelength $\lambda$ at the top of the atmosphere, 500 km in this study; $N(I)_z$ is the column density of the constituent $I$ above level $z$; and $\sigma(\lambda, I)$ is the absorption cross section of the constituent $I$ for photons of wavelength $\lambda$. The column density of the constituent $I$ is calculated from

$$N(I)_z = n(I)_z \times H(I)_z \times CH(I)_z,$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

where $n(I)_z$ is the number density of the constituent $I$ at altitude $z$; $H(I)_z$ is its scale height at altitude $z$ computed from

$$H(I)_z = \frac{RT_z}{M(I) g_z},$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)

and $CH(I)_z$, the Chapman function for constituent $I$ which is used to correct for the atmosphere at the large zenith angles during the twilight period, is calculated from equation (25). Each photodissociation was assumed to produce one $^{1}D$ oxygen atom.

### B. Dissociative Recombination

Dissociative recombination of both $O_2^+$ and $NO^+$ with thermal electrons, as discussed in Section II, where both of these ions are produced as a result of collisions between atomic oxygen ions and oxygen and nitrogen molecules [equations (9) and (10)] was included in the computations. Since the atomic oxygen ion density-height profiles required for the calculations were not available, the $O^+$ number density at each altitude, $z$, was computed from
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{n}(O^+)_z &= \frac{0.95 \times [\text{n}(E)_z]^2}{\text{n}(E)_z + \frac{\gamma_1 \text{n}(N_2)_z}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\gamma_2}{\alpha_2} \times \text{n}(O_2)_z} \\
\text{n}(O^+)_z &= \frac{0.95 \times [\text{n}(E)_z]^2}{\text{n}(E)_z + \frac{\gamma_1 \text{n}(N_2)_z}{\alpha_1} + \frac{\gamma_2}{\alpha_2} \times \text{n}(O_2)_z}
\end{align*}
\]

in a manner similar to that of Wickwar [142], where \( n(E)_z \) is the electron number density at altitude \( z \), \( n(N_2)_z \) and \( n(O_2)_z \) are the molecular nitrogen and oxygen number densities at altitude \( z \), and the Greek symbols are the rate coefficients for the following reactions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{O}^+ + \text{N}_2 &\rightarrow \text{NO}^+ + \text{N} : \gamma_1 \\
\text{NO}^+ + \text{e} &\rightarrow \text{N} + \text{O}(^1\text{D}) : \alpha_1 \\
\text{O}^+ + \text{O}_2 &\rightarrow \text{O}_2^+ + \text{O} : \gamma_2 \\
\text{O}_2^+ + \text{e} &\rightarrow \text{O} + \text{O}^* : \alpha_2
\end{align*}
\]

In this formulation \( O^+ \) is assumed to be in a steady-state chemical equilibrium and it can never exceed 95 percent of the electron density, even at and above the F2 peak. Neither of these assumptions is critical to the calculated production of 6300 \( \lambda \) emission intensity.

The number of \(^1\text{D} \) oxygen atoms at altitude \( z \) from this production mechanism is calculated by

\[
\text{n}[\text{O}(^1\text{D})]_z = \text{n}[O^+]_z \left[ \text{n}(O_2)_z \times \gamma_2 \text{EFF1} + \text{n}(N_2)_z \times \gamma_1 \text{EFF2} \right]
\]

where EFF1 and EFF2 are the efficiencies of these reactions for producing \(^1\text{D} \) oxygen atoms.

The number density of \( \text{O}(^1\text{D}) \)s at altitude \( z \) is the total of these two production mechanisms.
C. Volume Emission Rate

The volume emission rate at altitude \( z \) is computed from

\[
E_{6300} = \frac{6.9 \times 10^{-3} \times n\{O({}^{1}D)\}_z}{9.1 \times 10^{-3} + q_1 \times n(N_2)_z + q_2 \times n(O_2)_z} \quad \text{(photons cm}^{-3}\text{s}^{-1})
\]

where \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) are the rate coefficients for quenching by molecular nitrogen and oxygen, respectively.

D. Integrated Emission Intensity

Integrated emission intensity is calculated by using a trapezoidal integration technique.

VI. SOLAR FLUXES AND ABSORPTION CROSS SECTIONS

Two separate sets of solar flux values in the Schumann–Runge continuum with associated \( O_2 \) absorption cross sections were used in this study. Table 13 contains solar flux values from Friedman and Tousey of the Naval Research Laboratory as reported by Hinteregger, Hall, and Schmidtke [6]. The cross sections contained in this same table are from Metzger and Cook [7]. Table 14 contains solar fluxes and absorption cross sections recommended by Ackerman [5].

VII. DISCUSSION

On the night of January 6, 1972, conjugate point sundown occurred at approximately 2233 CST, assuming a screening height of 180 km; therefore, the airglow over the observation point (Huntsville, Ala.) after this time could only be the result of dissociative recombination of the molecular ions, \( O_2^+ \) and \( NO^+ \). On this night only the observations at 2303 and 2330 CST occurred after 2233 CST.
TABLE 13. SCHUMANN-RUNGE CONTINUUM SOLAR FLUXES OF FRIEDMAN AND TOUSEY WITH ASSOCIATED O₂ ABSORPTION CROSS SECTIONS FROM METZGER AND COOK [6,7]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave Length (Å)</th>
<th>Solar Fluxes (cm⁻² s⁻¹)</th>
<th>Cross Sections (cm²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1775 - 1725</td>
<td>1.06 × 10¹²</td>
<td>1.70 × 10⁻¹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725 - 1675</td>
<td>7.00 × 10¹¹</td>
<td>8.60 × 10⁻¹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675 - 1625</td>
<td>4.20 × 10¹¹</td>
<td>2.20 × 10⁻¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625 - 1575</td>
<td>2.60 × 10¹¹</td>
<td>5.20 × 10⁻¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575 - 1525</td>
<td>1.33 × 10¹¹</td>
<td>8.00 × 10⁻¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525 - 1475</td>
<td>7.30 × 10¹⁰</td>
<td>1.13 × 10⁻¹⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475 - 1425</td>
<td>3.70 × 10¹⁰</td>
<td>1.43 × 10⁻¹⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425 - 1375</td>
<td>1.83 × 10¹⁰</td>
<td>1.43 × 10⁻¹⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375 - 1325</td>
<td>1.77 × 10¹⁰</td>
<td>5.80 × 10⁻¹⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Airglow intensities for these two times were calculated using the set of equations discussed in detail in Section V with all three atmospheric models discussed in Section IV and the electron density-height profiles discussed in Section III. The neutral atmospheric constituent distributions are established by the derived exospheric temperatures. Once these components are established, the only inputs to the set of equations that affect the calculated intensities are the rate coefficients for equations (31) through (34), the efficiencies of the O(^1D) production mechanisms in equation (35), and the quenching coefficients in equation (36).
TABLE 14. SCHUMANN-RUNGE CONTINUUM SOLAR FLUXES AND ASSOCIATED O\textsubscript{2} ABSORPTION CROSS SECTIONS RECOMMENDED BY ACKERMAN [5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \Delta A (\text{Å}) )</th>
<th>( q (\text{cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}) )</th>
<th>( \sigma(O_2) (\text{cm}^2) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ly(\alpha) 1.215,67</td>
<td>3.00 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{11}</td>
<td>1.00 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-20}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.170 – 1.163</td>
<td>1.03 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{8}</td>
<td>2.00 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-20}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.176 – 1.170</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.25 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-18}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.183 – 1.176</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.55 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-19}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.190 – 1.183</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.00 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-20}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.198 – 1.190</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>3.75 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-19}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.205 – 1.198</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4.45 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-18}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.212 – 1.205</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.220 – 1.212</td>
<td>2.28 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{8}</td>
<td>6.00 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-19}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.227 – 1.220</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.235 – 1.227</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.242 – 1.235</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.250 – 1.242</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.75 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-17}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.258 – 1.250</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>8.95 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-19}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.266 – 1.258</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.274 – 1.266</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.282 – 1.274</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.290 – 1.282</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.299 – 1.290</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.307 – 1.299</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.316 – 1.307</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.324 – 1.316</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.45 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-18}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.333 – 1.324</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.342 – 1.333</td>
<td>1.24 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{10}</td>
<td>2.30 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{-18}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.351 – 1.342</td>
<td>1.99 (\times) 10\textsuperscript{9}</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.360 – 1.351</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.370 – 1.360</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 14. (Concluded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΔA (Å)</th>
<th>q (cm⁻² s⁻¹)</th>
<th>(\sigma(O_2)) (cm²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.379 - 1.370</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.23 \times 10⁻¹⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.389 - 1.397</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.408 - 1.389</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.428 - 1.408</td>
<td>1.01 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.449 - 1.428</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.470 - 1.449</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.492 - 1.470</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.515 - 1.492</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.538 - 1.515</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>9.91 \times 10⁻¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.562 - 1.538</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.587 - 1.562</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.613 - 1.587</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.639 - 1.613</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.667 - 1.639</td>
<td>1.19 \times 10^{11}</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.695 - 1.667</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.724 - 1.695</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>7.22 \times 10⁻¹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.739 - 1.724</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.754 - 1.739</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Reaction and Quenching Rate Coefficients

It was assumed that the results of Dalgarno and Walker [11] were correct and that no O(¹D) atoms were formed from the dissociative recombination of NO⁺. Since quenching of O(¹D) atoms by O₂ is insignificant in comparison with quenching by N₂ and its reaction rate coefficient appears to be reliably known (Table 7), the value of \(5 \times 10⁻^{11}\) cm³ s⁻¹ was used throughout the calculations. With the exception of the N₂ quenching coefficient and the efficiency
of the $O_2^+ + e$ production mechanism, the remaining rate coefficients also appear to be reliably known; therefore, the following values were used throughout the calculations:

\[
\begin{align*}
NO^+ + e & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} N + O & \alpha_1 & = 4.1 \times 10^{-7} \frac{(300/T)}{cm^3 s^{-1}} \\
O_2^+ + e & \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} O + O & \alpha_2 & = 1.95 \times 10^{-7} \frac{(300/T)^{0.7}}{cm^3 s^{-1}} \\
O^+ + O_2 & \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} O_2^+ + O & \gamma_2 & = 2 \times 10^{-11} cm^3 s^{-1} \\
O^+ + N_2 & \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} NO^+ + N & \gamma_1 & = 1 \times 10^{-12} cm^3 s^{-1} \\
O(1D) + O_2 & \xrightarrow{q_2} O_2 + O & q_2 & = 5 \times 10^{-11} cm^3 s^{-1}
\end{align*}
\]

With these input parameters fixed, there are only two parameters that can be varied to obtain agreement between the calculated and observed intensities at 2303 and 2330 CST. These are the $N_2$ quenching coefficient and the efficiency of the $O_2^+ + e$ production mechanism. All possible combinations of these two rate coefficients were used with all three model atmospheres. In all of the succeeding figures the solid line connects the observed intensity values while the broken line connects the calculated intensity values. Figures 20 through 22 show results using the Jacchia 1964 model atmosphere.

In Figure 20 the molecular nitrogen quenching coefficient is $1 \times 10^{-10}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$ and the $O_2^+ + e$ production mechanism efficiency is $1.00$, which means that one $O(1D)$ atom is formed from every dissociative recombination. These are maximum values for both of these parameters, as reported in the literature. The calculated intensities at both 2303 and 2330 CST are approximately three times the observed intensities. Calculated intensities during the remainder of the period being studied are substantially larger than the observed intensities.

In Figure 21 the quenching coefficient remains as $1 \times 10^{-10}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$ while the dissociative recombination production efficiency is decreased to $0.50$, which means that only one $O(1D)$ atom is formed from every two recombinations. The calculated intensities at 2303 and 2330 CST are still almost 50 percent larger than the observed intensities. A similar decrease is evident in the calculated intensities during the remainder of the period being analyzed, although they are still larger than the observed intensities.
Calculated using:
Jacchia 1964 Model
$q_1(N_2) = 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$
$O_2^+ + e(\text{EFF}) = 1.00$
Friedman and Tousey Solar Flux
Metzger and Cook $O_2$ Absorption Cross-Sections

Figure 20. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

In Figure 22 the quenching coefficient value remains at $1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ while the efficiency of the dissociative recombination production mechanism is decreased to 0.333, which means that only one $O(^1D)$ atom is produced from every three recombinations. Agreement is excellent between calculated and observed intensities at both 2303 and 2330 CST. Once again, as expected,
Calculated using:

- Jacchia 1964 Model
- $q_1(N_2) = 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$
- $O_2^+ + e(\text{EFF}) = 0.50$
- Friedman and Tousey Solar Flux
- Metzger and Cook $O_2$ Absorption Cross-Sections

Figure 21. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

Agreement has improved between calculated and observed intensities during the remainder of the period. For the Jacchia 1964 model atmosphere, then, the best combination of parameters is a quenching coefficient of $1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$ and a dissociative recombination efficiency of 0.333. This result tends to reinforce the assumption that the $NO^+ + e$ mechanism does not produce any
Figure 22. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

$O(^4D)$ atoms, since any additional $O(^4D)$ atoms would require either a quenching coefficient larger than the value used, which is the maximum found in the literature, or an $O_2^+$ production efficiency of less than 0.333. This, however, contradicts the results of Wickwar [142] who found that a value of 0.50 provided
the best results. A larger quenching coefficient would not agree with the results obtained by Hernandez [113] from the Ionospheric Modification Experiment which yielded a value of \( 9 \left( \begin{array}{c} +1, 0 \\ -0, 5 \end{array} \right) \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \) based on a Jacchia 1964 model atmosphere formulation using an \( N_2 \) number density boundary value of \( 2.0 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3} \) instead of the \( 4.0 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3} \) values used herein.

Figures 23 and 24 show results using the Jacchia 1971 model atmosphere. In Figure 23 the quenching coefficient is \( 5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \), and the dissociative recombination production efficiency is 0.50. The calculated intensities at both 2303 and 2330 CST are approximately 60 percent larger than the observed emission intensities. Calculated intensities are greater than the observed intensities throughout the observation period. In Figure 24 the quenching coefficient is increased to \( 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \). Agreement between calculated and observed intensities at both 2303 and 2330 CST is perfect. Calculated intensities are greater than observed intensities during that portion of the period when sunlight contributes to the emission intensity, prior to approximately 1805 CST, and less than observed intensities from approximately 1805 to 2303 CST. Any other combination of values of these parameters would result in the use of either a value of the quenching coefficient larger than the maximum value quoted in the literature or a value of the dissociative recombination production mechanism efficiency of less than 0.50, the value currently quoted in the literature as being most acceptable.

Figures 25 through 27 show the results of these combinations using the 120 km boundary conditions recommended by Reber\(^3\) with the Jacchia 1964 model formulation and a constant temperature shape parameter of 0.01875, also recommended by Reber. These values were established by Reber in conjunction with his efforts to establish a new U.S. Standard Atmosphere; however, the resulting number density–height profiles he established are significantly different from those calculated herein because he used vertical flux and molecular diffusion terms that effectively changed the models from static to pseudo-dynamic. These fictitious flux terms, which were used to ensure compatibility between the model and observational data, increased the molecular nitrogen number densities while decreasing the molecular oxygen number densities at all altitudes. Both of these modifications would result in a decrease in the calculated intensity of the emission line.

In Figure 25 the quenching coefficient is \( 5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \), while the dissociative recombination production mechanism efficiency is 0.50. Calculated intensities are almost 80 percent larger than the intensities observed at both 2303 and 2330 CST. Calculated intensities are larger than the observed intensity value throughout the period.

3. Ibid.
Calculated using:
Jacchia 1971 Model
$q_1 = 5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$
EFF = 0.50
Friedman and Tousey Solar Flux
Metzger and Cook Cross-Sections

Figure 23. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

In Figure 26 the quenching coefficient has been increased to $1 \times 10^{-10}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$ without changing the efficiency of the dissociative recombination production mechanism. Agreement between calculated and observed emission intensities has been improved throughout the period; however, the calculated intensities are still larger than those observed at both 2303 and 2330 CST.
Calculated using:
  Jacchia 1971 Model
  $q_1 = 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$
  EFF = 0.50
  Friedman and Tousey Solar Flux
  Metzger and Cook Cross-Sections

Figure 24. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

In Figure 27 the quenching coefficient remains at $1 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$, while the production mechanism efficiency has been reduced to 0.434. Agreement between calculated and observed intensities at both 2303 and 2330 CST is excellent. That is the best combination of values for this model atmosphere; however, if the fictitious flux and diffusion terms recommended by Reber had
Calculated using:
Jacchia 1964 Model with Reber Boundary Values
and Temperature Shape Parameter = 0.01875
\( q_1 = 5 \times 10^{-11} \, \text{cm}^3 \, \text{s}^{-1} \)
EFF = 0.50
Friedman and Tousey Solar Flux
Metzger and Cook Cross-Sections

Figure 25. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

been included so that his number density-height profiles would have been produced by the model, a quenching coefficient of approximately \( 9 \times 10^{-11} \, \text{cm}^3 \, \text{s}^{-1} \) and a production mechanism efficiency of approximately 0.60 would probably have been the best combination of values.
Calculated using:
Jacchia 1964 Model with Reber Boundary Values
and Temperature Shape Parameter = 0.01875
$q_1 = 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$
EFF = 0.50
Friedman and Tousey Solar Flux
Metzger and Cook Cross-Sections

Figure 26. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

B. Solar Radiation Fluxes and Associated Absorption Cross Section Effects

Once agreement between calculated and observed intensities resulting only from the dissociative recombination process has been attained, it seems reasonable to assume that the preferred values of the quenching rate coefficient
Figure 27. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

and the O$_2^+$ + e production mechanism efficiency so established for each atmospheric model should remain constant during the remainder of the comparisons in which other parameters make an important contribution. In this section the Schumann-Runge continuum fluxes and their associated absorption cross sections are varied to study their effects on the calculated intensities.
Figures 28 and 29 are comparisons of observed intensities with intensities calculated using the Jacchia 1964 model atmosphere, a quenching rate coefficient of $1 \times 10^{-10}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$, an $O_2^+ + e$ production mechanism efficiency of 0.333, and Hinteregger et al. [6] reported fluxes with the Metzger and Cook [7] cross sections (Table 13) and the Ackerman [5] recommended fluxes and cross sections (Table 14), respectively.

**Calculated using:**
- Jacchia's 1964 Model
- $q_1 = 1 \times 10^{-10}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$
- $\text{EFF} = 0.333$
- Friedman and Tousey Solar Flux
- Metzger and Cook Cross-Sections

**Figure 28.** 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.
Figure 29. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

In Figure 28 the agreement of the calculated and observed intensities at 2303 and 2330 CST deteriorates immediately and becomes progressively worse as one gets nearer the time of sunset. Between sunset and approximately 1811 CST, the time period when the dissociative photoexcitation process contributes...
significantly to the overall intensity of the 6300 Å emission, the calculated intensities are significantly larger than the observed intensities. From 1811 CST to approximately 2300 CST, the calculated intensities are smaller than the observations with the difference between the two decreasing with time after sunset.

In Figure 29 the agreement of the calculated and observed intensities at 2303 and 2330 CST once again becomes progressively worse the nearer one gets to the time of sunset; however, the major difference between these results and those shown in Figure 28 is that the calculated intensities are always smaller than the observed intensities.

From a comparison of these two analyses, it appears that either the Hinteregger et al. reported fluxes are not representative of the incoming solar flux on the night of January 6, 1972, or the associated Metzger and Cook cross sections are incorrect. It also appears that if the Ackerman recommended fluxes and absorption cross sections are indeed representative of the solar conditions, there is another source of O(1D) atoms on this night. The magnitude of this contribution is shown as a function of time in Figure 30. This is comparable to the results reported by Wickwar [36] and attributed to direct impact excitation of atomic oxygen by conjugate point photoelectrons. His results and those here show that the enhancement continues until at least conjugate point sundown which occurred on January 6, 1972, at approximately 2233 CST assuming a screening height of 180 km. At this time the conjugate point solar zenith angle was approximately 103°, which is less than the approximate 105° conjugate point solar zenith angle at which Wickwar [36] reported a cessation of the enhancement over Arecibo, P.R. The time at which the conjugate point (CP) photoelectron contribution ceased is in excellent agreement with Figure 5 of Reference 143 which shows that during a period of low solar activity, CP photoelectrons should not be present over the Huntsville area after 2300 CST in January. The magnitude of this conjugate point photoelectron impact excitation contribution is much larger than the approximate 20 R contribution over Blue Hill Observatory, Mass., reported by Noxon and Johanson [133] and somewhat larger than that reported by Wickwar [36].

Figures 31 and 32 are comparisons of observed intensities with calculated intensities using the Jacchia 1971 model atmosphere, a quenching rate coefficient of $1 \times 10^{-10}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$, and a dissociative recombination production mechanism efficiency of 0.50 with the Hinteregger et al. [6] and Metzger and Cook [7] combination of fluxes and cross sections and the Ackerman [5] fluxes and cross sections, respectively. The only differences in these two calculations occur prior to 1805 CST where the intensities calculated with the Hinteregger et al. and Metzger and Cook data combination (Fig. 31) are approximately 80 percent
Figure 30. Difference between observed and calculated 6300 Å emission line intensities as a function of time after sunset, attributed to direct impact excitation of atomic oxygen by conjugate point photoelectrons.

larger than the observed intensities, while those calculated with the Ackerman data are about 20 percent less than the observed. If the Jacchia 1971 model is truly representative of the atmosphere on this night, the Hinteregger et al. and Metzger and Cook combination is not a representative set of solar fluxes and absorption cross sections. On the other hand, if the Jacchia 1971 model and the Ackerman data are both representative, there must be a third source of O(1D) atoms. Again, this could be the direct impact excitation of oxygen atoms by conjugate point photoelectrons with the contribution at Huntsville continuing.
Calculated using:
Jacchia 1971 Model
\[ q_1 = 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \]
EFF = 0.50
Friedman and Tousey Solar Flux
Metzger and Cook \( \text{O}_2 \) Absorption Cross-Sections

Figure 31. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

until conjugate point sundown at approximately 2233 CST. Figure 33 shows the magnitude of this third contribution as a function of time. As with the results obtained using the Jacchia 1964 model, the contribution ceases approximately at the same cutoff time observed over Arecibo, P. R., as reported by Wickwar [36].
Calculated using:
Jacchia 1971 Model
\[ q_1 = 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \]
EFF = 0.50
Ackerman Recommended Solar Flux and Associated
\[ O_2 \] Absorption Cross-Sections

Figure 32. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

Figures 34 and 35 show the same comparison using the Jacchia 1964 model formulation with the boundary conditions and temperature shape parameter proposed by Reber without the vertical diffusion and flux corrections. Although these results can be discussed only qualitatively, they are identical to those
Figure 33. Difference between observed and calculated 6300 Å emission line intensities as a function of time after sunset, attributed to direct impact excitation of atomic oxygen by conjugate point photoelectrons.

using both the Jacchia 1964 and 1971 model atmospheres. If both this model and the Ackerman data are representative, then a third source of O(^1D) atoms of approximately the same magnitude is present with the variation with time as shown in Figure 36.
Calculated using:
Jacchia 1964 Model with Reber Boundary Conditions
and Temperature Shape Parameter 0.01875
\[ q_1 = 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1} \]
EFF = 0.434
Friedman and Tousey Solar Flux
Metzger and Cook Cross-Sections

Figure 34. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

C. Neutral Gas Temperature Effects

Estimated errors in temperatures derived from the F-P observations range from approximately ±85 K near sunset to approximately ±195 K at midnight, as shown in Figure 18. If the actual temperatures are higher than
the ones derived from the Fabry-Perot interferometer measurements that were used in theoretically calculating the intensities used in this analysis, then:

1. The \( N_2 \) quenching rate coefficient of \( 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \), determined as a result of this analysis, is too small by approximately 9 to 10 percent, or
Figure 36. Difference between observed and calculated 6300 Å emission line intensities as a function of time after sunset, attributed to direct impact excitation of atomic oxygen by conjugate point photoelectrons.

2. The dissociative recombination production mechanism efficiency of 0.50 is too large by approximately 9 to 10 percent, or

3. Both of these results are in error by a lesser amount such that the combination is in error by approximately 9 to 10 percent.

Figures 37 and 38 are plots of constant N₂ number density and volume emission rate, respectively, as a function of solar zenith angle for January 6–7, 1972, for each time during the observational period when simultaneous
observations of the electron density-height profile, the integrated intensity and an exospheric temperature from the Fabry-Perot interferometer, and integrated intensity from the turret photometer were available. The solid line in each of the figures shows the computational results using the actual temperatures derived
from the F-P measurements, while the dotted lines show the results using temperatures increased by 50 K. Figure 37 shows that the model of the atmosphere expands upward with increased exospheric temperature, while Figure 38 shows that the contours of constant volume emission rate are also displaced upward while the peak volume emission rate values are increased approximately
2 to 3 percent. The calculated integrated intensities are increased 9 to 10 percent. Figure 39 shows calculated and observed intensities as a function of time with the same inputs to the calculations, while Figure 40 shows the third source contribution under these conditions. Exospheric temperatures derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer measurements are used in these calculations.

Figure 39. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.

Calculated using:
- Jacchia 1971 Model
- $q_1 = 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$
- $\text{EFF} = 0.50$
- Ackerman Recommended Solar Flux and Associated $\text{O}_2$ Absorption Cross-Sections
with the Jacchia 1971 model atmosphere, a quenching rate coefficient of $1 \times 10^{-10}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$, a dissociative recombination production mechanism efficiency of 0.50, and the Ackerman [5] recommended values for the Schumann-Runge continuum with associated absorption cross sections. In these figures the altitude of the peak of the volume emission rate, $I$, can be considered to be the same as the altitude of the derived temperature. The height of this peak is variable; however, in all instances it is between 220 and 255 km. In the Jacchia 1971 model
atmosphere this is well below the altitude where the atmosphere becomes iso-
thermal, for all practical purposes; therefore, the derived temperatures should
be lower by 15 to 25 K than the true exospheric temperatures.

Figure 41 shows the observed and calculated intensities on January 6,
1972, where the calculations are based on the same inputs as those used for the
results shown in Figure 39 with the exception that the exospheric temperature

Calculated using:
Jacchia 1971 Model
$q_1 = 1 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$
EFF = 0.50
Ackerman Recommended Solar Flux and Associated
$O_2$ Absorption Cross-Sections

Figure 41. 6300 Å emission line intensities derived from Fabry-Perot
interferometer observations and theoretically calculated intensities
as a function of time after sunset on January 6, 1972.
values are all increased 50 K. The third source contributions under these conditions are shown in Figure 42. Since the contributions at 2303 and 2330 CST are both negative, the dissociative recombination process efficiency would have to be reduced and, once this is done, the results would be identical to those shown on Figure 40. Similar calculations have been made for the other models; however, since the results are almost identical, they are not shown here.

**Figure 42.** Difference between observed and calculated 6300 Å emission line intensities as a function of time after sunset, attributed to direct impact excitation of atomic oxygen by conjugate point photoelectrons.
D. Electron Density-True Height Profile Effects

There are several problems associated with the true height analysis of ionograms which, although they are outside the scope of this analysis, affect the results. Problems associated with the reduction of daytime ionograms obviously do not affect the results of this analysis; however, the start problem discussed in detail in ionospheric literature, as well as all the scale problems, can significantly affect the results.

Scaling problems arise from multiple traces resulting from multiple reflections, some of which, or perhaps all, are from off-vertical reflections, proper selection of points to be used in the program, correct tracing of the negative on the scaling form, and correct identification of the ordinary and extraordinary ray signals. From the ionograms created by the standard C-4 ionosonde used in this study, it is impossible to discriminate between vertical and off-vertical returns if there are multiple traces on the film. Fortunately, for this analysis, enough ionograms were available to preclude the use of any with multiple traces; however, there is no way of knowing whether the single traces on the ionograms are from vertical incidence reflections or not. They have all been assumed to be from vertical incidence reflections.

As previously stated in Section III, the start problem was investigated by using several different programs in conjunction with several known electron density-true height profiles until the data reduction program output the known electron density-true height profiles, to the accuracy required, from which the input data were originally selected. This technique should minimize the possibility of large errors in the electron density-true height profiles; however, if errors do occur, the analysis shows that the reduction technique tends to underestimate the height of the $F_2$ maximum. These errors in height can be on the order of 10 to 20 km with the mean errors expected to be closer to 10 km. If the actual height of the $F_2$ maximum is approximately 10 km higher than the height calculated by the true height reduction technique, that portion of the intensity due to dissociative recombination computed using the calculated height will be approximately 20 percent greater than it actually is. This will lead to overestimating the value of the quenching coefficient and/or the molecular nitrogen number density and/or underestimating the dissociative recombination production mechanism efficiency and/or the molecular oxygen number density or various combinations of these.

Accurate electron density-true height profiles, especially near the $F_2$ maximum, are a necessity in 6300 Å emission line intensity analyses.
E. General

Figure 43 is a composite of the observational and theoretical data for the night of January 6, 1972. From Figures 43(a) and (b) it is readily apparent that each time the height of the $F_2$ maximum changed, there was a corresponding change in the temperature derived from the Fabry-Perot interferometer. The second line on Figure 43(a) shows that the altitude of the calculated maximum volume emission rate also varied in agreement with the two measured quantities; therefore, the temperature of a higher altitude layer of the atmosphere is being measured. Correspondence between changes in the altitude of the $F_2$ maximum and the height of the peak value of the volume emission rate is not as good during the early portion as it is during the latter portion of the twilight period. This is because there is a substantial contribution from the dissociative photoexcitation process in addition to the dissociative recombination process. This supports the conditions of Roble, Hays, Nagy [124] that the O($^1D$) atoms are in thermal equilibrium with the neutral atmosphere and 6300 Å emission can be used to monitor the exospheric temperature.

Figure 43(c) shows the electron density at the $F_2$ maximum, while Figure 43(d) shows a combination of observed and calculated intensities as a function of solar zenith angle. The top curve in Figure 43(d) represents the total observed intensity on the night of January 6, 1972. The bottom curve in this figure connects the intensity values attributed from the theoretical calculations at each observation time to the dissociative recombination of molecular oxygen ions.

On the left side of Figure 43 the difference between the short horizontal line and the observed intensity curve is attributed, from the calculations, to the dissociative photoexcitation of molecular oxygen by solar fluxes in the Schumann-Runge continuum. The remainder of the observed intensity, the difference between the bottom curve and the curve composed of the short horizontal lines at a value of 183 R and the total intensity curve between solar zenith angles of 104° and 162°, is believed to be due to direct impact excitation of atomic oxygen by conjugate point photoelectrons. As expected, there appears to be an excellent correspondence between the electron density curve and the curve that represents the intensity attributable, from the calculations, to the dissociative recombination process. This is shown in more detail in Figure 44 where the O's show the observed intensity as a function of the electron density at the $F_2$ peak. There appears to be an excellent correspondence between the two parameters with the exception of those three points relating the higher intensities to the larger electron densities, and the deviation here is due to the contribution to the intensity from the dissociative photoexcitation process. If
Figure 43. Composite of observational and theoretical data as a function of local solar zenith angle on January 6, 1972.
this intensity was adequately calculated and its contribution removed, it would seem as if the resulting intensities should fall on the straight line defined by the other observed intensities and electron densities. The squares, which denote the results of subtracting the intensity calculated to be due to dissociative photoexcitation from the observed intensity, do not indicate the same correspondence between the electron density and 6300 Å intensity as the other observations; therefore, it appears as if there is a possibility that either the dissociative photoexcitation process is improperly modeled or there is a change in the electron density-dissociative recombination intensity relationship when the sun is
contributing to the emission line intensity. These results are identical to those shown in Figure 43 (d), and both seem to indicate that the dissociative photo-excitation and dissociative recombination processes combine in some manner to effectively control the effect of conjugate point photoelectrons on the local 6300 Å O I emission. On Figure 44 the circles show the intensities, calculated on the basis of the dissociative recombination process only, as a function of the electron density at the F 2 peak. Correspondence between these two parameters is excellent, as expected. The equation of a straight line fit to these data is

\[ I(R) = \left( \frac{20}{7} \right) (N_e - 2.50) \times 10^{-4} \]

When the calculated dissociative photoexcitation process contribution was subtracted from each observed intensity when the sunlight was making a contribution, a value of 183 R remained in each instance. From the previous equation the intensity should be 183 R when the electron density is 6.672 \times 10^5 \text{ cm}^{-3}. Perhaps this is an indication of how the conjugate point effects are controlled by the local ionosphere, but verification of that is beyond the scope of this analysis and, undoubtedly, would require much additional observational data.

Figure 45 compares the 6300 Å total emission intensity over Huntsville, Ala., on the night of January 6, 1972, with the mean winter twilight 6300 Å intensities over the Blue Hill Observatory, Mass., during the 1968-1970 time period. During the early portion of the twilight period, the Blue Hill Observatory intensities are about 50 percent greater than those over Huntsville. During the latter part of the twilight period, the difference between the two sets of intensity observations increases to a factor of 3.5 to 4. Figure 46 provides a partial explanation for this difference in observed intensities in that the mean winter time densities at the F 2 peak over Blue Hill for the 1968-1970 time period are between 1.5 and 2.5 times as large as those over Huntsville on January 6, 1972.

**VIII. CONCLUSIONS**

**A. Atmospheric Model**

The results of this analysis indicate that the Jacchia 1971 model atmosphere is more representative of the molecular oxygen and nitrogen concentrations over Huntsville, Ala., on the night of January 6, 1972, than other existing
Figure 45. Comparison of 6300 Å emission intensities over Huntsville, Ala., and Blue Hill Observatory, Mass., as a function of solar zenith angle.
Figure 46. Comparison of $F_2$ peak electron number densities over Huntsville, Ala., and Blue Hill Observatory, Mass.
models. All other models require either dissociative recombination production mechanism efficiencies lower than the currently preferred value of 0.50 or rate coefficients for the quenching of O($^1\text{D}$) by molecular nitrogen higher than the highest value currently accepted by the scientific community, $1 \times 10^{-10}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$. The imposition of these limits on theoretical calculations of the 6300 Å emission shows that the Jacchia 1971 model consists of a lower limit on the molecular nitrogen number density and an upper limit on the molecular oxygen number density. Current planned revisions to the Jacchia 1971 model atmosphere include an increase in the molecular nitrogen number density and a decrease in the molecular oxygen density. These changes could readily be accommodated within the rate coefficient limits discussed above.

The 6300 Å emission can provide data concerning the N$_2$ and O$_2$ densities for use in the refinement and development of atmospheric models; however, additional emission lines must be monitored simultaneously to obtain the data required for the future refinement of the models at orbital altitudes where the principal constituent is atomic oxygen.

**B. Photochemical Rate Coefficients**

Results show that the following values constitute an internally consistent set that is capable of describing the post-sunset twilight behavior of the 6300 Å emission intensity:

\[
\begin{align*}
O^+ + O_2 & \rightarrow O_2^+ + O & 2 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \\
O_2^+ + e & \rightarrow O^* + O & 1.95 \times 10^{-7} \left(\frac{300}{T}\right)^{0.7} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ with an efficiency of producing O($^1\text{D}$) atoms of } 0.50^{+0.32}_{-0.12} \\
O^+ + N_2 & \rightarrow NO^+ + N & 1 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \\
NO^+ + e & \rightarrow N + O^* & 4.5 \times 10^{-7} \left(\frac{300}{T}\right) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ with an efficiency of producing O($^1\text{D}$) atoms of } 0.00 \\
O(^1\text{D}) + O_2 & \rightarrow O + O_2 & 5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \\
O(^1\text{D}) + N_2 & \rightarrow O + N_2 & \left(1^{+0.00}_{-0.11}\right) \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}
\end{align*}
\]
The first three of these are upper limits since use of larger values would require that the upper limit on the \( N_2 \) quenching rate coefficient be exceeded or the dissociative recombination mechanism efficiency be less than 0.50, while the last two values are those currently most acceptable.

C. Solar Flux and Absorption Cross Sections

The conclusions reached above rule out the possibility of the Friedman and Tousey solar flux data as reported by Hinteregger et al. [6] as being representative of the solar conditions over Huntsville, Ala., on January 6, 1972, if the data are to be used in combination with the Metzger and Cook [7] absorption cross sections. The Ackerman [5] recommended solar fluxes and absorption cross sections are acceptable; however, additional observational data, such as fluxes and energy spectra of conjugate point photoelectrons, are required to positively establish the exact combination of solar flux and absorption cross section at any single point in time. For example, the Schumann-Runge contribution at 1726 CST could be increased from 67 R to 109 R and the agreement between the observed and calculated intensities would be perfect without the requirement for a large conjugate point photoelectron contribution. Therefore, although the Schumann-Runge fluxes and associated absorption cross sections listed in Table 14 are acceptable, an upper limit could be established as that combination of fluxes and absorption cross sections which would produce 109 R of 6300 Å OI intensity at 1726 CST. However, at 1726 CST the \( F_2 \) maximum electron density is decreasing rapidly with time and it is reasonable to assume that at least a comparable rate of decrease existed between sunset at 1703 CST and 1726 CST. Therefore, it is believed that this upper limit would not be realistic, since it appears that its use at smaller solar zenith angles would result in the calculated intensities becoming larger than the observed intensities.

Since no observational data are available prior to a local solar zenith angle of 97.5°, this analysis cannot provide any additional information about the conclusion of Noxon and Johanson [133] that the local photoelectron direct impact excitation process must be included for solar zenith angles between 90° and 95°, since the dissociative photoexcitation process alone cannot account for the difference between observed intensities and those calculated from the dissociative recombination process alone. In the winter the effects of CP photoelectrons further complicate the analysis.
D. Conjugate Point Photoelectrons

There is a sizeable contribution to the 6300 Å emission line intensity from conjugate point photoelectrons, at least during the period from a local solar zenith angle of approximately 97.5° to a conjugate point solar zenith angle of approximately 103°. These limits are set in this analysis by the earliest observation time and conjugate point sunset, assuming a screening height of 180 km. Based on the calculations in this analysis, the contribution of the combined dissociative recombination and conjugate point photoelectron direct impact excitation processes to the 6300 Å emission line intensity was approximately 183 R during the period from a local solar zenith angle of approximately 97.5° to a local solar zenith angle of approximately 103°. If these observations and calculations can be extrapolated to earlier times in the twilight period, perhaps the results imply that conjugate point photoelectrons do not contribute to the 6300 Å intensity as long as the local thermal electron densities are capable of producing 183 R through the dissociative recombination process.

E. Atmospheric Motions

Variations in the heights of the F₂ peak in the ionosphere were not associated with variations in the observed intensity; however, they were highly correlated with variations in the temperature derived from the Doppler broadening of the 6300 Å emission line. This implies that both the neutral and charged particle atmospheres were moving together and that observations of intensity enhancement by other investigators were more probably associated either with movements of the ionosphere that were not in phase with the neutral atmospheric movement or with travelling patches with increased electron densities.

Even though the variations in the temperature observations were highly correlated with the height of the F₂ peak, the magnitudes of the variations are such that the changes cannot be accounted for solely on the basis of observing another altitude region in a quiescent atmosphere. Changes of 20 to 40 km in the altitude of the F₂ peak are associated with temperature changes on the order of 10⁰K. At the heights at which these observations apply, temperature-height profiles in current models are nearly isothermal and changes of 10⁰ to 50⁰K would be expected over these height intervals. Therefore, either the temperature-height profiles in the models are in error or the observations are being made at different altitudes in air masses with different exospheric temperatures. Wind measurements from the Doppler shift of the 6300 Å emission
line could be used to determine whether these temperature variations should be attributed to vertical and/or horizontal motions or to differences between the true and the model temperature-height profiles. No detailed measurements of the variations in the outside pressure, the reference pressure for the etalon chamber, are available for the time period being analyzed; therefore, no data are available that can be used to derive vertical wind speeds which might provide some insight into this problem.

F. General

The total 6300 Å emission intensity over Huntsville, Ala., appears to be much lower than that reported by other investigators [133, 142, 17]; however, the conjugate point photoelectron contribution appears to be much larger during this declining portion of the 20th solar cycle. The lower integrated intensity over Huntsville can be attributed to the lower overall electron densities over Huntsville due to (1) its geographic location with respect to the geomagnetic equator which places it in an area of relatively low electron densities, (2) the fact that this analysis covered a twilight period in January when the annual variation would predict a minimum in the electron density, and (3) a time with respect to the solar cycle when the electron densities would be expected to be generally lower than those present for the time periods covered in the analyses referenced above. All of these factors would contribute to the increased CP photoelectron contribution observed over Huntsville if the local ionosphere controls the CP photoelectron input.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The 6300 Å emission line intensity and line shape are excellent tools for studying the Earth's upper atmosphere, its composition, temperature, and dynamics; however, results are extremely sensitive to the electron density-height profiles used in the theoretical calculations required to substantiate and interpret the observational data. The phase path sounder at Huntsville, Ala., which is currently being modified, will soon be operational and capable of producing electron density-true height profiles with an accuracy of ±0.1 km.

The increased accuracy of these data will allow a better determination of molecular oxygen and nitrogen density-height profiles, if independent experiments such as the Ionospheric Modification Experiment can provide reliable
results for the molecular nitrogen and/or oxygen quenching rate coefficients. Therefore, as soon as this sounder is available, the study should be reaccomplished to confirm these results.

The phase path sounder and a CW Doppler array currently being installed will be capable of providing additional data concerning the horizontal and vertical motions of the ionosphere. The etalon chamber pressure should be referenced to a baratron so that line of sight motions of the O(\(^{1}\text{D})\) atoms could be measured. The motions of both the charged particles and the O(\(^{1}\text{D})\) atoms could then be used in conjunction with changes in the 6300 Å emission intensity and the temperature of the neutral gas to study the effects of these motions on the emission intensity and the neutral gas temperature.

Observational data for other periods should be subjected to this same analysis to ascertain the magnitude of the CP contribution as well as any possible seasonal variations in onset time and/or magnitude. Seasonal variations due to changes in electron densities should also be studied in conjunction with the observed variations in the emission line intensity.

In view of the recent results of Hernandez\(^4\) concerning the possible contamination of 6300 Å OI emission observations by the (9-3) hydroxyl band, extreme care should be taken to ensure that the data used in any analysis consist solely of 6300 Å photons from the atomic oxygen transition. Depending on its position with respect to the 6300 Å OI line shape profile, the (9-3) OH band emission can produce changes that imply:

1. Either lower or higher than actual temperatures for the \(^{1}\text{D}\) oxygen atoms.
2. More or less than actual atomic oxygen red line emission intensity.
3. Mass motions of the \(^{1}\text{D}\) oxygen atoms either toward or away from the observer.

The results of Sivjee [144] are quite significant with respect to the 6300 Å OI emission intensities and derived exospheric temperatures obtained with the Fabry–Perot interferometer in its present configuration. The low and rapidly fluctuating temperatures derived from the emission line profiles on other nights might be due to changes in the intensity and temperature of the 9-3 band OH emission (see Appendix D). The F-P configuration should be

\(^4\) Hernandez, op. cit.
changed so that emission lines of this band system do not fall at the peak of the 6300 Å OI emission line profile. In addition, other measurements, perhaps with photometers containing filters that would provide data on the $P_1(3)$ line of the 9–3 OH band, should be made simultaneously so that the OH emission could be separated from the 6300 Å OI emission. This combination of observational data could then be used to study the dynamics of the D-region of the atmosphere. This might resolve questions concerning the origin of the low temperatures occasionally derived from 6300 Å OI emission line profiles.
APPENDIX A

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Newcomb [145] attributed the light of the night sky to the flux of radiation from stars that were too faint to be seen individually. Atmospheric light was studied intensively at the Lowell Observatory, Flagstaff, Arizona, from 1915 onward, and the two atomic oxygen redlines, 6300 and 6364 Å, were discovered there [146, 147]. Seasonal, day-to-day, and daily variations of the airglow were gradually discovered [148-152]. Chapman [139] first proposed the theory that the airglow was caused by emission of photons associated with the recombination of ionized and, more particularly, dissociated particles produced by the absorption of sunlight, in the ultraviolet portion of the spectrum, during the day. Dufay [153] showed that the luminance of the night sky must come from a combination of the zodiacal light and the self-luminescence of the atmosphere, not from faint stars.

Excitement of the 6300 and 6364 Å atomic oxygen lines during twilight was first discovered by Garrigue [154, 155]. His investigations showed that after twilight the 6300 Å emission diminished in intensity from 70 to 5 (arbitrary units) at sunset at approximately 10° above the horizon and from 20 to 5 in the north at the same elevation angle. He concluded that the radiation was emitted by excitation resulting from solar radiation because of the progressive decrease after twilight.

Cabannes and Garrigue [156] and Currie and Edwards [157] were the first to document and discuss the post-twilight decrease in the intensity of the 6300 Å emission. Their analysis of observations in December 1935 and January 1936 at Pic du Midi and the spring of 1936 at Montpelier showed that the 6300 Å emission intensity was affected by rapid perturbations, that it came from an altitude between 105 to 110 km, and that approximately 3 h after sunset it reached and thereafter remained fixed at a value approximately one-tenth the value at twilight with the intensity at the zenith two to three times weaker than at the horizon. These phenomena could not be explained by the action of sunlight even though they originated in the same atmospheric layers. The first explanations of the variation in intensity with the time based on the resonance scattering of sunlight were untenable; however, the photochemical dissociation of molecular oxygen by ultraviolet (λ < 1750 Å) could not be truly effective at very high altitudes in view of the rarity of molecular oxygen [158] and the slow decrease after sunset required the presence of a very large number of oxygen atoms at very great heights, a very large scale height.
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The spectrographic studies of Elvey and Farnsworth [159] and Elvey [160] showed that the slow decrease of the intensity of the 6300 Å emission extended well into the night. The studies of Elvey and Farnsworth [159] also placed the height of the emitting layer at approximately 500 km with the twilight enhancement due to illumination of the atmosphere by the Sun, as postulated by Cabannes and Garrigue [156]. However, they also concluded that this effect could not account for all of the enhancement since it lasted for approximately 4 h after sundown. Resonance seemed unlikely because the emission was from a forbidden transition. Their study showed a difference between the morning and evening twilights; therefore, they concluded that the enhancement was due to some phenomenon of the upper atmosphere independent of the direct illumination of the Sun. From their pre-dawn enhancement analysis they concluded that there was a much slower decrease in the number of oxygen atoms with height than previous theoretical calculations had indicated. A gradual increase in intensity long before sunrise was also discovered at this time.

Bates [161] postulated that the 6300 Å emission originated in the F-region of the ionosphere and suggested that dissociative recombination of ions and electrons could be the source. Dufay and Tcheng Mao-Lin [162] confirmed both of these post- and pre-twilight enhancements that were investigated in more detail photoelectrically by Barbier [163] and photographically by Berthier [164] and Robley [165]. Berthier's [164] observations showed a very marked asymmetry between the morning and evening twilights. In the evening there was a very rapid decrease until the Sun was approximately 14° below the horizon and then a much slower decrease. According to his analysis the peak of the intensity occurred at an altitude between 90 and 100 km.

It had seemed quite likely [166] that a large part of the twilight 6300 Å emission arose from resonance scattering of sunlight; however, Chamberlain [15] showed that a comparison of observations with theory suggested that virtually none of the emission came from resonance scattering, a conclusion reached by Elvey and Farnsworth almost 15 years earlier. Chamberlain also showed that dissociation of molecular oxygen in the Schumann-Runge continuum contributed, but did not give by itself, either the observed intensity or its variations with time. He then advanced the hypothesis that the main excitation of the 6300 Å twilight emission arose from dissociative recombination of O$_2^+$ following suggestions of Bates and Massey [61], Bates [166], and Barbier [167]; however, he assumed that molecular oxygen was the principal deactivating particle. His study supported the results of Dufay and Tcheng Mao-Lin [168] and Barbier [14] that the emission height was approximately 250 to 300 km.
The rocket results of Heppner, Stolarik, and Meredith [169] and Heppner and Meredith [170] placed the emission height above 163 km, while the results of Zipf and Heath [171] raised the emission height to above 208 km. The rocket-borne measurements of Gulledge and Packer [172] and the satellite measurements of Reed and Blamont [173] gave further evidence that the maximum of the 6300 Å emission is at an altitude of approximately 250 to 300 km with the emitting layer on the order of 80 to 100 km thick.

The ionospheric analyses of Ratcliffe, Schmerling, Setty, and Thomas [174] and Bates [175, 176] presented further evidence of the importance of dissociative recombination. St. Amand [177] and Barbier [167] showed a connection between the F-layer and the redlines. Huruhata, Nakamura, Tanabe, and Tohmatsu [178] concluded from their analysis of rocket-borne measurements that the 6300 Å emission was approximately proportional to the maximum electron density in the F-region of the ionosphere. The dissociative recombination theory was further advanced and developed by Lagos, Bellew, and Silverman [179], Peterson, Van Zandt, and Norton [116], Holmes, Johnson, and Young [180], Zipf [28], Wallace and McElroy [12], Ferguson, Fehsenfeld, Goldan, Schmeltekopf [80], Swider [27], and Okuda [181, 182].

Brandt [9] predicted that the 6300 Å emission in the day glow would be approximately 50 kR, and Noxon and Goody [183] and Jarrett and Hoey [132] obtained similar values. However, Zipf and Fastie [46], Wallace and Nidey [184], and Nagata, Tohmatsu, and Ogawa [185] got values of approximately 5 kR. Noxon [10] reported observed values ranging from 5 to 50 kR with very large day-to-day variations.

The first reported redline altitude intensity distribution from rocket-borne measurements was by Gulledge and Packer [186] followed by Huruhata, Nakamura, and Tanabe [187] and Wallace and McElroy [12]. The zenith intensity during the 1964 rocket flight reported on by Gulledge and Packer was approximately 22 R with no emission above 300 km with an intensity greater than 5 R. This result was consistent with the dissociative recombination theory in which the emitting layer moved upward during the night. The results of Huruhata, Nakamura, and Tanabe [187] were similar with an integrated intensity of less than 25 R and an emission layer from 200 to 320 km, peaking at an altitude between 270 and 280 km. Gulledge, Packer, Tilford, and Vanderslice [50] reported on the results of another rocket-borne measurement which showed that approximately 5 h after sunset the peak emission occurred at 246 km. The zenith intensity on the upleg was approximately 70 R, while the downleg intensity was approximately 90 R. The difference was attributed to an observed downward motion of the ionosphere, thereby lending more credence to the correlation between the redline emission and the ionosphere.
Ether [188] reported that the average night glow 6300 Å emission was approximately 35 R north of 80° invariant latitude, then decreased to as low as 5 R between 40 and 55° invariant latitude, and then increased to 30 R in the 15 to 25° latitude region. These results were obtained from a tilting photometer flown on a Convair 990. The photometer system included a C¹⁴ radioactive light source that had been calibrated at Fritz Peak Observatory by M. Gadsden.

Schaeffer, Feldman, and Fastie [112], based on the results of an analysis of a rocket flight at a solar zenith angle of 60°, reported that the measured 6300 Å emission above 100 km was approximately 1.1 kR with 0.29 kR due to photodissociation, 0.56 kR due to direct electron impact excitation, and 0.26 kR due to dissociative recombination. They did not claim high accuracy for their electron impact results but believed the photodissociation production rate was approximately equal to one-third of that expected from the solar flux values of Detwiler, Garrett, Purcell, and Tousey [189]. However, their results were in good agreement with the solar flux values of Parkinson and Reeves [190].

Brasher and Hanson [191] have provided further evidence of the connection between the ionosphere and the redline emission. They showed theoretically that a lifting of the F₂ peak by only 20 km reduced the peak night glow intensity by a factor of approximately three and in so doing confirmed the suggestion by Van Zandt and Peterson [192] that there is a correlation between the midnight enhancement of the 6300 Å emission and the ionospheric drifts.
APPENDIX B

LISTING OF COMPUTER PROGRAM OF THEORETICAL MODEL

```plaintext
* DIMENSION FFM(1)
  DIMENSION FFLUX(1), COLTM(3), COL(3), FLUX(3), FLMX(3), CRH(3)
  COMMON TAU(13), TEMPO(4), FLUX(9), SIGMA(1, 2), AHC1, AHC2, AHC3, AT
  DATA A(10), T(10), B(10), R(10), E(10), T(10), W(10), E(10), T(10), W(10)
  C PROGRAM FOR THE CALCULATION OF FASLA AIRFLOW AT SPECIFIED ALTITUDES.
  10   IN=5
  20   TCO=27
  30   IP=7
  40   201 FORMAT(F9.4,E13.5)
  50   211 FORMAT(3E16.9)
  60   212 FORMAT(3E15.9)
  70   213 FORMAT(3E15.9)
  80   214 FORMAT(3E15.9)
  90   215 FORMAT(3E15.9)
  100  FORMAT(11H INPUT DATA/8H TOTA, CON12, (1), FON12, (1))
  110  1(1) = 2.7*(F15.14) + 3.1(15.15))
  120  9(9) FORMAT(29H YEAR, DD, MM, NV, MTH = 71X*F7.1F9.2)
  130  181 FORMAT(F9.4,1E1.1)
  140  C NUMBER DENSITIES
  150  C *********** DEFINITION OF CONSTITUENTS ***********
  160  C ** READ THE INPUT PARAMETERS
  170  10 I7 L=10
  180  11 READ(IN,92) FFLUX(L), SIGMA(1, L), SIGMA(2, L), SIGMA(3, L)
  190  READ(IN,94)
  200  READ(IN,201) CON12(1), CON12(2), CON12(3)
  210  READ(IN,202) CHEM(YEAR, DD, MM, NV, MTH = 71X*F7.1F9.2)
  220  READ(IN,94) FFLUX(L), SIGMA(1, L), SIGMA(2, L), SIGMA(3, L)
  230  READ(IN,94) FFLUX(L), SIGMA(1, L), SIGMA(2, L), SIGMA(3, L)
  240  WRITE(10,90) TOTA, CON12(1), CON12(2), CON12(3)
  250  TPI=6.28*18.56
  260  XCON=57.79*77.95
  270  EPS=35.45/XCON
  280  C FLONG IS LONGITUDE OF HUNTSVILLE
  290  FLONG=-85.63
  300  PR1=1.5*70.763
  310  PI=3.1411*976
  320  CALL ANGLE(H, YEAR, DD, MM, NV, MTH = 71X*F7.1F9.2)
  330  WRITE(10,90) TOTA, CON12, NV, MTH = 71X*F7.1F9.2)
  340  DO 11 I=1, M
  350  11 DIPS=15.0
  360  85 CONTINUE
  370  85 C THE INITIAL VALUES OF THE ARRAYS - FLUX, COLTM, COL, AND PFLUX
  380  C ARE NOW ESTABLISHED
  390  C THESE PARAMETERS ARE CALCULATED ONLY ONCE AND THOSE WITH THE
  400  C PREFIX - AHC - ARE USED IN THE SUBROUTINE PFLUX, AND ARE SPECIFIED
  410  C IN COMMON
  420  01 INF=800.0
  430  AHC2=0.1722*75.0
  440  AHC3=0.1*75.0
  450  AHC3=0.1722*80.0
  460  AHC2=0.1*80.0
  470  AHC3=0.1722*80.0
```

99
C ATM1 AND ATM2 ARE IN CENTIMETERS, WHILE ATM2 IS IN KILOMETERS

ATMC1=120.05
ATMC2=6474.77
ATMGAM1=6386.77E5
ATMGAM(1):=(1+1.953*79.1)/(ATMS*TINF)
ATMGAM(2):=ATMGAM(1)*132.0/298.0
ATMGAM(3):=ATMGAM(2)*4.5
J=1
Z(J)=ZMAX
Z(J)=Z(J)
THETA=THETA/XCON
CALL JAC(ZJ)
CADC=9.9E-11
CA0=5.0E-11
CARN=2.0E-12
C4=4.0E-11
ALTH=25.0E-7
ALTH=1.0E-7
DO 5445 I=1,3
XZ(I)=(ATMC1+777)/(42(I)+1.55)
5445 TAU(I):=SQR(1.5*XZ(I)*(COS(THETA)*COS(THETA)))
CALL ERFS(ERF)
IF(PIT-THETA)<533.543,515
533 DO 599 I=1,3
599 CH(I):=(SQR(PIT+XZ(I)*SIN(THETA)*I)*EXP(TAU(I))*CH(I))*(1.-ERF(I))
50 TO 566
566 DO 577 I=1,3
577 COLUMNN(I,J):=TEMPOZ(I)*H2(I)*CH(I)*1.5
577 DO 66 I=1,5
66 Flux(I)=0.0
DO 5333 J=1,3
333 FLUX(L)=FLUX(L)+SIGAPS(I,J)+COLUMNN(I,J)
DO 8 FLUX(L)=EXP(-FLUX(L))
CONTINUE
CALL CONTI
CALL EMISS
CONTJ(J)=EMISS(J)
MM:=(E10+1097)*TEMPOZ(I),I=1,N)*EMISS(J)*E(J)*INTG5(J),
100,020,030,0P
020 DO J=2,500
010 IF(Z(J)>=Z(J-1)-DEZ)50 TO 21
020 Z(J)=Z(J)
030 CALL JAC(ZJ)
040 DO 54 I=1,3
54 XZ(I)=(ATMC1+777)/(42(I)+1.55)
54 TAU(I):=SQR(1.5*XZ(I)*(COS(THETA)*COS(THETA)))**2
7 CALL ERFS(ERF)
7 IF(PIT-THETA)<533,55
55 DO 60 I=1,7
60 CH(I):=(SQR(PIT+X2(I))*SIN(THETA)*I)*EXP(TAU(I)*CH(I))*(1.-ERF(I))
55 DO 60 I=1,7
60 CH(I):=(SQR(PIT+X2(I))*SIN(THETA)*I)*EXP(TAU(I)*CH(I))*(1.-ERF(I))
100
101
52: FD=9(1)^(2)2(0:9)+93(1:0:9)**2*8(0:9-0)**2*8(5:0:9-0)**4
53: 1B(F)*(-90)**6+17(0:9-0)**6
54: FD:FD,*x:Wu565/(1+656356766)+1*9)
55: FD:FD/(XX+XX+10-125,+X+10-125)**3+Y(0-125)**4
56: C QN: QUAD: SIMPSONS RULE QUADRATURE = 3.1*QUAD
57: C DEFINITIONS
58: C A = LOWER LIMIT OF INTEGRATION
59: C B = UPPER LIMIT OF INTEGRATION
60: C FUNC = INTEGRAND FUNCTION SUBPROGRAM
61: C EPS = RELATIVE ERROR CONVERGENCE CRITERION
62: C QN = RESULT OF INTEGRATION
63: C N = NUMBER OF INTEGRATIONS REQUIRED TO FIND R.
64: C N=0
65: PREV=U*
66: CONE=(3-4)*(FA*Ф)/2.
67: N=N+1
68: IF (N-W) 72,72,75
69: 71: NINT=2*N
70: $NW=O;
71: DEL=(O-A)/FLOAT(NINT)
72: C 73 1=1,NINT+2
73: X=1+DEL*FLOAT(I)
74: FXY=9F+(X-0)+3*(X-A)**2*2*8(A)**(X-0)**2*8(X-0)**4
75: 1B(F)*(X-90)**6+17(0:9-0)**6
76: FXY=FXY**4*FLOAT(5)/(1+656356766+3)**3**7
77: FXY=FXY**4*FLOAT(3)/(1+656356766**3)**3**3
78: <TWO=STWO+FX
79: CUP=CONE+FXDEL*TWO
80: IF (CPE=30) CU=450{UP,PRV}) 74,75,75
81: CPE=CONE+CUR
82: CPE=(CONE+CUR)/4.
83: GO TO 71
84: 75: =CPR
85: IF (Z-1UG+) 44,75,75
86: 40: IF (Z-IUG+) 176,75,75
87: 76: TENG=QHENU-T=*
88: FXP(-R/FX) / (Z**29.9<79)
89: ZL=XLOZ(0NS)
90: PAR=AV+ENF/FM
91: AN=XLOZ(0N=EM=IP/28.96)
92: A=KXLOZ(0N=EN=IP/28.96)
93: A4=KXLOZ(0N=EN=IP/28.96)
94: AQ=XLOZ(0+PAR+(1-**28.96))
95: AQ=XLOZ(PAR+(1+0.02)/28.95-1.3)
96: AE=AK-0.
97: U7: TEMPO(2)=A.
98: TEMPO(2)=AO?
99: TEMPO(3)=E.0
100: 010:3331 I=I+3
111: 3331 12(F)+18O+77.1/8X(11)
112: RETURN
113: 40: 73=10U.
114: 72=T1+Z+Z+Z+(Z-125)**3*(Z-125)**3+Y+1(71-125)**4
115: 73=31(1)+8(2)+I*0**11(1)+1**2(1)+1**3(2)+I*0**4+4(6)+I**4.5
116: 1**4.7*10+5.
117: 0=100.
`A0 = XLOG(DIT(3))
A1 = XLOG(DIT(4))
A2 = XLOG(DIT(5))
IF(Z-50U-) A7, A9, A4
DIT(6)=10***(-K)
A4 = XLOG5(DIT(6))
AN = AMAX1(-U-, AN)
A02 = AMAX1(U-, A02)
AN = AMAX1(-U-, AN)
A4 = AMAX1(U-, A4)
DO 3332 'I='I'
3332 Z(I)= (BOLTZ*T7) / XN(T)
RETURN
T0 = TX+TA*ATAN(T1*375.*((1.+G.F.-C.*775.*0.5)/A3)
DIT(6)=U**((T3-1.)*744*4*XLOG5(1.)*5.5*XLOG3(1.)*XLOG5('))
A1 = U00
IF(Z<50U-) A4, 60, 60
U = A10
50 FA1=2-A1/TX*TX*ATAN(T1*(A1-125.))*(1.*G.F.-C.*A1-125.)**2.5/A2))
D1=7
IF(Z<50U-) 61, 62, 67
60 = D1500*
62 FD1=2.5*G.F./((1.+01/6)356766*1)**2)
U1 = FD1/TX*TX*ATAN(T1*(M1-125.)*(1.*G.F.-C.*D1-125.)**2.5/A2))
U2 = T1
PREV = D
SUN overthrow = D
N = N+1
IF (N = W) 99, 92, 95
69 = NINT=2**N
T2 = T2+U
DEL = (01-A1)/FLOAT(NINT)
20 97 = 1+NINT+2
10 X = A1*DEL*FLOAT(T1)
11 X = 2.4*G.F.((1.+X)/6.356766*3)**2)
12 FX = X1/IX*IX*ATAN(T1*(Y1-125.)*(1.*G.F.-C.*X1-125.)**2.5/A2))
13 S0 = S0 + 0.5*DEL*2*X1
14 CUR = ONE + 0.5*DEL*2*X0
15 IF (EPR*4350*CUR.*S5+CUR-PREV)) = 4.95, 95
10 PREV = CUR
170 ONE = (ONE + CUR)/W.
180 TO 31
190 = 4/UR/*
200 T7 = TX*TX*ATAN1((7-125.)*(1.*G.F.-C.*7-125.)**2.5/A2)
210 IF(Z<50U-) 63, 64, 64
22 = 97 = 97
23 64 DIT(6)=DIT(5) + T7*FX1*E1(E6)/FX1
240 GO TO 56
250 END

1 compilation: no diagnostics.
FUNCTION XLOG(X)
XLOG=ALOG10(X)
RETURN
END

DC COMPIIATION: NO DIAGNOSTICS.

SUBROUTINE CONSTI
REAL INTEGS
DIMENSION I(10)
COMMON TAU(3), TEMPO(4), FLUX(45), SIGARS(3, 45), ATMC1, ATMCR, ATMCR, AT
IMA, TMC, TMC(3), CON120(3), E, E*TS, EU, INTEST, DEL ZOF, Y
ZINF, CAFO, ALATH, CABNI, ALATH, CAOA, CAOC, NP(3), O1O, O1D, O1O, OR
0E(J)
PRD=0.30
PRC=0.15
PAA=0.15
PR=1.0
SUM=0.0
DO 51 L=1,45
DISSOC=SIGARS(2, L)*FLUX(J)*TEMPO(J)
51 SUM=SUM+DISSOC
100 O1R=SUMO
150 NP=O1R=0.0+O1O+TEMPO(J)*CA941/AL8TH*TEMPO(J)*CA9F0/AL8TH
110 O1O=O1XO+CAFO*TEMPO(J)*OP
140 O1R=O1R+CA941*TEMPO(J)*OP
190 TEMPO(J)=O10+O1O
210 RETURN
220 END

DC COMPIIATION: NO DIAGNOSTICS.

SUBROUTINE EMISS
REAL INTEGS
DIMENSION I(10)
COMMON TAU(3), TEMPO(4), FLUX(45), SIGARS(3, 45), ATMC1, ATMCR, ATMCR, AT
IMA, TMC, TMC(3), CON120(3), E, E*TS, EU, INTEST, DEL ZOF, Y
ZINF, CAFO, ALATH, CABNI, ALATH, CAOA, CAOC, NP(3), O1O, O1D, O1O, OP
455 BE-9*TEMPO(4)
90 EMISS=[4/(9+I)+CAOA*TEMPO(J)+CAOA*TEMPO(J)]
100 RETURN
100 END

3 OF COMPIIATION: NO DIAGNOSTICS.

107
SUBROUTINE ERFF(ERF)
DIMENSION ERF(3)
COMMON TAU(3)
A1=25482959
A2=73493674
A3=1.4714137
A4=-1.453142
A5=1.651454
R=3276811
DO I=1,3
GS=1/(1+EXP(-TAU(I)))
ERF(I)=1-((A5*GS+A8)*GS*A3)*A2*(A+1)*EXP(TAU(I)*TAU(I))
RETURN
END

} OF COMPIATION: NO DIAGNOSTICS.
APPENDIX C

OBSERVATIONAL DATA

The airglow equipment was operated on approximately 15 nights during the period November 10, 1971, through September 1, 1972; however, equipment status, weather conditions, and the requirement for a moonless condition limited to 5 the number of nights on which observations were made simultaneously by the C-4 ionosonde, Fabry-Perot interferometer, and the turret photometer. The temperature histories of the nights of January 7, 1972, and February 7, 1972, both contain very low temperatures that may be due to contamination of the Fabry-Perot 6300 Å OI emission observations by OH emissions. This is discussed in more detail in Appendix D. Electron density-height profiles, required for a detailed analysis, were not available on the nights of November 17, 1971, and February 4, 1972, due to equipment malfunctions. The night of January 6, 1972, was selected for analysis because the records were somewhat more complete on that night; however, the data from the remaining four nights are provided here for comparison. The intensity time histories of all five are quite similar; however, the temperature histories of all five show large variations in short time periods with extremely low temperatures being observed near midnight on January 7, 1972. These temperatures are comparable to temperatures derived on other nights when observations were begun long after the sunset period; however, to date no explanation has been found.

Although the peak electron number density-time histories are similar, the actual number densities on January 6, 1972, are smaller than those observed on the other four nights.

It is believed that these data will support the contention that the data of January 6, 1972, are not atypical of the airglow measurements over Huntsville, Alabama, and, therefore, the conclusions reached on the basis of the analysis of this single night are truly representative of the majority of atmospheric conditions and not merely fortuitous.

Figures C-1 through C-7 present the observational data.
Figure C-1. Observational data for November 17, 1971.
Figure C-2. Observational data for January 7, 1972.
Figure C-3. Observational data for February 4, 1972.
Figure C-4. Observational data for February 7, 1972.
Figure C-5. Composite of sunset exospheric temperature data.
Figure C-6. Composite of sunset intensity data.
Figure C-7. Composite of sunset $F_2$ maximum electron density data.
APPENDIX D

CONTAMINATION OF THE 6300 Å OI EMISSION BY HYDROXYL EMISSIONS

The dominant emissions in the night sky come from radiative transitions of the OH radical. The intensity and temperature of the OH(9-3) band, which has its origin at 6356 Å [16], is important to an analysis of the 6300 Å OI emission because the OI line is embedded in this band system. Therefore, since both the turret photometer and Fabry-Perot interferometer filters used to obtain observational data in this analysis are of finite thickness, they transmit some of the OH (9-3) band emission along with the 6300 Å OI emission. The problem is to determine the magnitude of this contaminating emission.

A. Photochemistry

The detailed analysis of the OH band system by Meinel [193] showed that there was an absence of OH band emissions originating from vibrational levels with \( v \geq 10 \). Bates and Nicolet [194] and Herzberg [195] suggested that the source of the observed radiation might be hydroxyl radicals formed by the following mechanism, since the excitation energy of the \( v = 9 \) level in the electronic ground state of OH is 3.32 eV:

\[
O_3 + H \rightarrow OH + O_2 + 3.32 \text{ eV} \quad \text{(D-1)}
\]

Hydrogen was proposed to be regenerated by

\[
OH + O \rightarrow H + O_2 \quad \text{(D-2)}
\]

The spectral characteristics of the OH night glow have been reproduced in the laboratory by the ozone mechanism, equation (D-1) [196]. A photochemical model by Bates and Nicolet [194] indicated that this reaction, equation (D-1), was capable of producing the observed emission rate.
Krassovskiy and Lukashenka [197] suggested the following alternative mechanism involving vibrationally excited oxygen molecules:

\[ O_2^* (v \geq 27) + H \rightarrow OH^* (v = 9) + O \text{,} \quad (D-3) \]

with the hydrogen being regenerated by equation (D-2). Excitation of OH to the \( v \geq 10 \) vibrational levels, which required \( O_2^* (v > 26) \), was precluded by the following:

\[ O_2^* (v > 26) + O_2 \rightarrow O + O_3 \quad (D-4) \]

This mechanism was disputed by Bates and Moiseiwitsch [198, 199].

Although no conclusive evidence supporting either of these mechanisms, equations (D-1) or (D-3), is in the literature, the general consensus seems to support the ozone mechanism, equation (D-1).

Table D-1 contains a more detailed list of the reactions, with their rate coefficients, that might be involved in the OH chemistry. The principal reactions involved in the OH chemistry are shown in Figure D-1 with reactions of equations (D-1) and (D-2) currently believed to be the most important.

Table D-2 lists the reactions, with their rate coefficients, currently believed to be involved in the atomic hydrogen chemistry, while Figure D-2 shows the principal reactions. Table D-3 and Figure D-3 contain the same data on the ozone chemistry. These tables and figures are from Reference 34.

1. THEORETICAL PHOTOCHEMICAL MODELS

Temporal variations of the OH intensity are of great interest since they are closely related to the chemistry of the D-region of the ionosphere. Bates and Nicolet [194] were the first to attempt theoretical calculations of the night-time kinetics in an oxygen hydrogen atmosphere. Hunt [104, 122], Gattinger [200], and Hestvedt [201] have also theoretically investigated diurnal variations in the OH radical production and loss rates and their height profiles. Hunt's [122] results show that the OH production rate maximum occurs at approximately 40 km altitude at noon and at approximately 80 km at midnight and while the total columnar production rate decreases by approximately
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions Forming</th>
<th>Reactions Removing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( O^+ + H \rightarrow OH + e ) ( 1 \times 10^{-10} \pm 2 )</td>
<td>( OH + H + M \rightarrow H_2O + M ) ( 1 \times 10^{-31} \pm 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H_2O + h\nu \rightarrow OH + H ) ( \lambda &lt; 2390 \text{Å} )</td>
<td>( OH + O \rightarrow H + O_2 ) ( (5\pm 2) \times 10^{-11} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H_2O_2 + h\nu \rightarrow HO + HO ) ( \lambda &lt; 5650 \text{Å} )</td>
<td>( OH + O \rightarrow H + O_2 ) ( 9 \times 10^{-12} \pm 0.3 ) ( e^{-3800/T} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( O(1D) + H_2O \rightarrow OH + OH ) ( 1 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>( OH + H \rightarrow O + H_2 ) ( 6.3 \times 10^{-11} \pm 0.3 ) ( e^{-2750/T} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H + O_2 \rightarrow OH + O ) ( 4 \times 10^{-10} \pm 0.3 ) ( e^{-8400/T} )</td>
<td>( OH + OH \rightarrow H_2O + O ) ( 1.4 \times 10^{-11} \pm 0.3 ) ( e^{-500/T} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H + O_3 \rightarrow OH + O_2 ) ( 1 \times 10^{-11} \pm 2 ) ( e^{-500/T} )</td>
<td>( OH + O_3 \rightarrow O_2 + HO_2 ) ( 1.5 \times 10^{-11} T^{0.5} e^{-4/RT} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( O + HO_2 \rightarrow OH + O_2 ) ( 1 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>( OH + HO_2 \rightarrow H_2O + O_2 ) ( 2 \times 10^{-11} \pm 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H + HO_2 \rightarrow OH + OH ) ( 2 \times 10^{-10} \pm 1 ) ( e^{-500/T} )</td>
<td>( OH + H_2O_2 \rightarrow H_2O + HO_2 ) ( 3 \times 10^{-11} \pm 1 ) ( e^{-500/T} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( O + H_2O_2 \rightarrow OH + HO_2 ) ( 1 \times 10^{-12} \pm 2 ) ( e^{-2000/T} )</td>
<td>( OH + OH + M \rightarrow H_2O_2 + M ) ( 3.3 \times 10^{-30} \pm 5 ) ( (T/300)^{1.5} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
60 percent between noon and midnight, the integrated intensity remains approximately the same. This is because the higher production rate in the daytime occurs at a lower altitude where the excited state is collisionally deactivated before it can radiate. Intensity-height profile results from Hunt's [122] theoretical calculations also agree very well with the rocket observations of Packer [202].

OH intensity temporal variations in the night glow can only be due to changes in the concentration of hydrogen or ozone. These changes may be due either to changes in the altitude of the emitting layer or to changes in the reaction rate coefficients due to changes in the ambient temperature. According to Sivjee [144], theoretical calculations of ozone and hydrogen concentrations at a fixed altitude based on chemical equilibrium concepts show long rise and fall times, on the order of 6 to 12 h. These results are in serious conflict with
### TABLE D-2. CHEMICAL KINETICS OF H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions Forming</th>
<th>Reactions Removing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_2O + \nu \rightarrow H + OH \lambda &lt; 2390\AA$</td>
<td>$H + O^- \rightarrow OH + e \times 10^{-10\pm2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O + OH $\rightarrow$ H + O$_2$ $5\pm2 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>$H + O_2 + M \rightarrow$ HO$_2 + M$ $5\pm2 \times 10^{-32}$ ($T/300$)$^{-2.0\pm0.5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + H $\rightarrow$ H + H$_2$O $6.3 \times 10^{-11\pm0.3}$ e$^{-2750/T}$</td>
<td>$H + O + M \rightarrow$ OH + M $1 \times 10^{-33\pm1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H + H + M \rightarrow$ H$_2 + M$ $1 \times 10^{-32\pm0.5}$ ($T/300$)$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H + OH + M \rightarrow$ H$_2$O + M $1 \times 10^{-31\pm1}$ ($T/300$)$^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H + OH \rightarrow$ H$_2 + O$ $9 \times 10^{-12\pm0.3}$ e$^{-3800/T}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H + O_3 \rightarrow$ OH + O$_2$ $1 \times 10^{-11\pm2}$ e$^{-500/T}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H + O_3 \rightarrow$ O + HO$_2$ $1 \times 10^{-12\pm2}$ e$^{-120/T}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H + HO_2 \rightarrow$ H$_2$O + O $1 \times 10^{-12\pm2}$ e$^{-500/T}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H + HO_2 \rightarrow$ OH + OH $2 \times 10^{-10\pm1}$ e$^{-500/T}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H + HO_2 \rightarrow$ H$_2 + O_2$ $6 \times 10^{-11\pm1}$ e$^{-500/T}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H + H_2O_2 \rightarrow$ H$_2 +$ HO$_2$ $1 \times 10^{-12\pm2}$ e$^{-1800/T}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H + O_2 \rightarrow$ O + OH $4 \times 10^{-10\pm0.3}$ e$^{-4800/T}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
observational data that show short-lived variations [144], on the order of minutes to hours; therefore, constituent number density variations at a fixed altitude do not appear to be the cause of the temporal variations.

Sivjee [144] concludes that the short-lived variations in OH intensity are due to changes in the altitude of the emitting layer with the higher intensities occurring when the layer moves up to the altitude of the atomic oxygen number density peak near 95 to 97 km. These higher intensities are primarily a combined result of an increase in the atomic oxygen number density that controls the amount of O₃ available to react with atomic hydrogen through

\[ O + O₂ + M \rightarrow O₃ + M \]  \hspace{1cm} (D-5)
and an increase in the reaction rate coefficient for equation (D-1) due to an increase in the ambient temperature, although the atomic hydrogen number density does increase somewhat with height at these altitudes. His calculations are in excellent agreement with the rocket observations of Packer [202] and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions Forming</th>
<th>Reactions Removing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$O_3^- + N_2^+ \rightarrow O_3 + N_2 2 \pm 1.5 \times 10^{-7} (T/300)^{-1 \pm 0.5}$</td>
<td>$O_3 + e \rightarrow O_3^- + h\nu 1 \times 10^{-17 \pm 2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3^- + O^+ \rightarrow O_3 + O 2 \pm 1.5 \times 10^{-7} (T/300)^{-1 \pm 0.5}$</td>
<td>$O_3 + e \rightarrow O^- + O_2 3 \times 10^{-1.2 \pm 1.5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3^- + NO^+ \rightarrow O_3 + NO 2 \pm 1.5 \times 10^{-7} (T/300)^{-1 \pm 0.5}$</td>
<td>$O_3 + O_2^- \rightarrow O_3^- + O_2 4.0 \pm 1.3 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3^- + h\nu \rightarrow O_3 + e 6 \pm 2 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$O_3 + O^- \rightarrow O_3^- + O 5.3 \pm 2 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2^- + O \rightarrow O_3 + e 2.5 \pm 1.5 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>$O_3 + h\nu \rightarrow O + O_2$ wavelength and flux dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O^+ + O_2 \left(^1\Delta\right) \rightarrow O_3 + e 5 \times 10^{-15}$</td>
<td>$O_3 + O_2 \left(^1\Sigma\right) \rightarrow O_2 + O_2 6 \times 10^{-13 \pm 1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O^+ + O_2 \left(^1\Sigma\right) \rightarrow O_3 + e 5 \times 10^{-15}$</td>
<td>$O_3 + O + O_2 1.4 \pm 0.3 \times 10^{-12} e^{-1.500 \pm 200}/T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3^- + NO_2 \rightarrow O_3 + NO_{2} 7 \times 10^{-10 \pm 2}$</td>
<td>$O_3 + N \rightarrow NO + O_2 5.7 \times 10^{-13 \pm 0.3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2^- + NO_2 \rightarrow O_3 + NO + O 9.5 \pm 1 \times 10^{-13} e^{-1.300 \pm 100}/T$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3^- + NO \rightarrow O_2 + NO_2 2.6 \times 10^{-13 \pm 5} e^{-7.000 \pm 600}/T$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3^- + H \rightarrow OH + O_2 1 \times 10^{-11 \pm 2} e^{-500}/T$</td>
<td>$O_3 + NO_2 \rightarrow O_2 + NO_3 2.6 \times 10^{-13 \pm 5} e^{-7000 \pm 600}/T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3 + NO \rightarrow O_2 + NO_2 9.5 \pm 1 \times 10^{-13} e^{-1.300 \pm 100}/T$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3 + NO_2 \rightarrow O_2 + NO_3 2.6 \times 10^{-13 \pm 5} e^{-7000 \pm 600}/T$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3 + H \rightarrow OH + O_2 1 \times 10^{-11 \pm 2} e^{-500}/T$</td>
<td>$O_3 + H \rightarrow O + HO_2 1 \times 10^{-12 \pm 2} e^{-120}/T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3 + OH \rightarrow HO_2 + O_{2} 1.5 \times 10^{-11 \pm 1.5} e^{-4}/RT$</td>
<td>$O_3 + HO_2 \rightarrow OH + O_{2} + O_{2} 1 \times 10^{14 \pm 2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3 + O\left(^1\Delta\right) \rightarrow O_2 + O_2 7 \times 10^{-12 \pm 1}$</td>
<td>$O_3 + NO^+ \rightarrow NO_{2}^+ + O_2 1 \times 10^{-13 \pm 2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3 + NO^+ \rightarrow NO_{2}^+ + O_2 1 \times 10^{-13 \pm 2}$</td>
<td>$O_3 + NO^+ \rightarrow NO_{2}^+ + O_2 1 \times 10^{-13 \pm 2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baker and Waddoups [203]. When the emitting layer moves upward, it moves where the ambient temperature is higher; thus, his calculations support the observational data of Krassovsky et al. [204] and Huruhata [205] that there is a dependence of OH intensity on rotational temperature.

If Sivjee's [144] conclusions are correct, a dynamical atmosphere at D-region altitudes, approximately 80 to 100 km, might provide a possible explanation for the extremely low and rapidly changing temperatures derived from Fabry-Perot interferometer measurements (Fig. C-1 through C-5) of the 6300 Å OI emission. The configuration of the F-P interferometer used in this study is such that any OH (9-3) band contamination is added to the 6300 Å OI emission line profile at the peak. The addition of any OH emission that is at a lower temperature (approximately 150 to 250 K) causes a reduction in the derived temperature with the reduction being almost linearly related to the amount of OH intensity present as well as the rotational temperature of the emitting OH radicals. For example, if the observed emission consists of 80 percent 6300 Å photons from \(^{1}\text{D}\) atoms at a temperature of 1000 K and 20 percent 6306.837 Å photons from OH radicals at a temperature of 200 K, the data reduction technique used herein would derive a temperature of approximately 800 K for the emission. Additional observational data are required to
separate the possible two components that may have resulted in the low temperature data shown in Figures C-1 through C-5; however, it appears from Sivjee's [144] work that vertical motions on the order of 10 to 15 km due to vertical circulations or acoustic or internal gravity wave propagation could very well explain the observed abrupt, short-lived changes in intensity and/or temperature.

B. Observations of Intensity and Rotational Temperature

The original work on the OH emissions was done by Meinel [193] who found that for the time period from about 1.5 h after sunset to approximately 1.5 h before sunrise, approximately 50 percent of the 6300 Å OI emission measured with a broad bandpass filter was really due to the OH(9-3) band system. Chamberlain and Smith [205a], on the basis of theoretical calculations, predicted that the intensity of the OH(9-3) band should be approximately 110 R. Blackwell et al. [206] reported an observed value of 81 R at a rotational temperature of 294 K. The following year Krassovsky et al. [204], from observations at Yakutsk, USSR, reported a value of 140 R with a dependence on the rotational temperature. They also observed a seasonal variation with a winter maximum at Yakutsk. In the same paper they reported that observations at Zvenigorod, USSR, showed neither a temperature dependence nor a seasonal variation but a definite enhancement on cloudy nights. G. Kvifte [207] reported an intensity of 160 R for the OH(9-3) band. Huruhata [205] found that large variations in the intensity of hydroxyl emissions in one night were due to ascending and descending motions of the emitting layer. He also found that the intensity increased when the 10 mb pressure surface (approximately 30 km) decreased. However, a review paper by Krasovsky and Shefov [208] attributed the variations in intensity and rotational temperature to spatial patchiness and not vertical displacements. Greenspan [209] in an analysis of the spatial variability of the OH emissions reported that the latitudinal distribution showed a minimum near 30°N. G. J. Kvifte [210] reported a value of 90 to 110 R for the OH(9-3) band over an observatory in Norway, while Chiplonkar and Tillu [211] reported an intensity value of 113 R over Poona, India. L. L. Smith [212] reported that observations over Hawaii indicated that OH(9-3) band intensity did not covary with the 6300 Å OI emission intensity, while Shefov [213] showed that there was a correlation between the OH intensity and the solar cycle. He also found that seasonal variations in wind speed and direction did affect the seasonal variations in OH intensity. Sivjee [144] found no enhancement of OH intensity during either electron or proton auroras. Thus, it appears that there are many inconsistencies and unknowns in the strength and variability of the OH emissions. From the sparse data available, Huntsville, Alabama, is apparently
located where there is a minimum in the latitudinal distribution of the intensity; however, this could be offset by the fact that there is a winter maximum in intensity of the upper vibrational levels [213] and also by the fact that the level of solar activity was relatively high on January 6, 1972. Observational data [144, 213] indicate a minimum in OH intensity between approximately 2200 and 2345 CST.

Rao and Kulkarni [214] reported that contamination of the 6300 Å OI emission intensity observations by nearby hydroxyl lines is very small where filters with half-widths ≤ 10 Å are used; however, the contamination could not be neglected for filters with half-widths > 40 Å. They reported the following relative intensities for the lines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Relative Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6300 Å</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6264 Å</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6287.6 Å</td>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;(2) (9-3)</td>
<td>0.0763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6298.7 Å</td>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;(3) (9-3)</td>
<td>0.0390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6306.8 Å</td>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;(3) (9-3)</td>
<td>0.0922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that for every three photons of 6300 Å OI emission there is one 6364 Å photon, 0.0763 P<sub>1</sub>(2) photons, 0.0390 P<sub>2</sub>(3) photons, and 0.0922 P<sub>1</sub>(3) photons.

The photometer used to obtain the observational data used in this analysis had a 6300 Å filter with a 15 Å half-width and an 80 percent transmission at the peak. Portions of the emissions in all three lines listed were transmitted through the filter and recorded as 6300 Å OI intensity.

The filter transmission function is combined with the above information on the position and relative intensities of these lines to compute the percentage of the observed intensity that should be attributed to the OH (9-3) band using the following:
Total Relative Int. = \( T_{6287.6} R(I)_{6287.6} + T_{6306.8} R(I)_{6306.8} \)
\[ + T_{6298.7} R(I)_{6298.7} \]
\[ = (0.13)(0.0763) + (0.44)(0.0922) \]
\[ + (0.73)(0.0390) \]
\[ = (0.0099) + (0.0406) + (0.0285) = 0.0790 \]

The percent of the observed intensity due to the OH(9–3) band emission is, therefore, equal to the total relative intensity of the three OH lines divided by the relative intensity of the 6300 Å OI emission, or

\[
\frac{0.0790}{3.0} \times 100 = 2.63\% \]

The Fabry-Perot interferometer used in this analysis had a filter with a 5.2 Å half-width and a 55 percent transmission at the peak. A recent report by Hernandez\(^5\) contains the new determinations of the positions of the P\(_1\)(3) and P\(_2\)(3) lines as 6306.83 ± 0.009 Å and 6297.99 ± 0.004 Å, respectively. Figure D–4 shows the 6300 Å filter transmission function. The positions of the three nearby OH lines are indicated on the figure, which shows that only approximately 3 percent of the P\(_1\)(3) line is transmitted through the filter, approximately 36 percent of the P\(_2\)(3) line, and less than 3 percent of the P\(_1\)(2) line.

With these new wavelengths and an etalon spacing of 1 cm, which results in a free spectral range of 0.198 Å for this Fabry-Perot interferometer, it is possible to calculate where the above OH emission lines lie with respect to the OI line. These calculations show that:

1. The P\(_2\)(3) line lies between 0.054 and 0.062 Å from the OI line with the most probable position being 0.060 Å from the OI line.

2. The P\(_1\)(3) line lies between 0.003 and 0.021 Å from the OI line with the most probable position being 0.007 Å from the OI line.

3. The P\(_1\)(3) line lies 0.036 Å from the OI line.

\( ^5 \) Hernandez, op. cit.
Figure D-5 shows the position of these OH lines on a plot of an OI line shape which is a convolution of 18 emission line profile measurements on the night of January 6, 1972, between 1800 and 2330 CST. The average temperature derived from this convolution is 841 K. From the plot it is impossible to ascertain if there is any emission from the P1(3) line mixed with the OI line; however, neither the P2(3) nor the P1(2) lines appear to be present. During this time period the OI line intensity decreased from approximately 100 R to approximately 18 R; therefore, it is believed that a P2(3) line intensity of a constant 2 R would be discernible on this plot. If this value can be used as an upper limit on the intensity of the P2(3) line, the results of Rao and Kulkarni [214] and those of Hernandez indicate that the intensity of the P1(3) line should have been approximately 4.6 R. The transmission function of the filter is such that only 3 percent of the intensity of this line is transmitted; therefore, only approximately 0.138 R could be attributed to the OH emission.

The individual emission line shape measurements for this night are shown in Figures 6 through 17. There is no indication in any of these measurements that the P2(3) emission line is present; therefore, it is believed that the contamination of the OI emission line by the P1(3) OH emission line is negligible on this night.
Figure D-5. Convolution of 18 emission line profiles from January 6, 1972, with expected positions of OH lines.

To support this contention, the data were subjected to two additional analyses. First, the data were input to a computerized version of a statistical analysis technique capable of separating a mixture of distribution into its components. This analysis showed that the data were not a mixture of signals but a single distribution.

In the second analysis, several theoretical emission line profiles were generated and reduced with the results shown on Figure D-6. The values of the coefficients of the transforms for the theoretical 200 K profile and the 1000 K profile are shown as squares and circles, respectively. For comparison, the
Figure D-6. Comparison of values of Fourier transform coefficients from theoretical line profiles with those from observational data.
triangles show values of the coefficients obtained from theoretically calculated emission line profiles containing varying ratios of the intensities from a 1000 K and a 200 K source. The transforms from the observational data are also plotted on this figure with all values normalized to the value of the coefficient of the first transform of the 1000 K profile. Neither the values of the coefficients obtained from the analysis of the theoretical mixtures of sources at two different temperatures nor their trends with transform number have characteristics that are significantly different from those of a single temperature source. Therefore, this technique cannot be used to distinguish emission lines due to a mixture at two different temperatures from emission lines due to a single temperature source.

The decrease in the observed intensity at conjugate point sundown provides additional evidence that the major portion of the observed emission is due to the atomic oxygen transition, since the OH emission cannot be affected in any way by conjugate point conditions.

For these reasons it is believed that the observational data used in this analysis are from the 6300 Å OI line uncontaminated by any 9–3 OH band emission.
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