Thermal Stability of Ices and Organics at the Poles of Mercury
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Earth-based radar observations of Mercury have revealed the presence of anomalously bright, depolarizing features that appear to be localized to the permanently shadowed regions of high-latitude impact craters [1]. Observations of similar radar signatures over a range of radar wavelengths implies that they correspond to deposits that are highly transparent at radar wavelengths and extend to depths of several meters below the surface [1]. Thermal models with idealized crater topographic profiles have predicted the thermal stability of surface and subsurface water ice at these same latitudes [2].

One of the major goals of the MESSENGER mission is to characterize the nature of radar-bright craters and presumed associated frozen volatile deposits at the poles of Mercury through complementary orbital observations by a suite of instruments [3]. Here we report on an examination of the thermal stability of water ice and other frozen volatiles in the north polar region of Mercury using topographic profiles obtained by the Mercury Laser Altimeter (MLA) instrument [4] in conjunction with a three-dimensional ray-tracing thermal model previously used to study the thermal environment of polar craters on the Moon [5].

Annual average surface temperatures for the north polar region of Mercury calculated from the model are shown in Fig. 1. The annual average temperatures are representative of the expected temperatures at depths greater than ~0.4 m, the depth of penetration of Mercury’s annual temperature wave [2]. The results show excellent general agreement between the locations of regions mapped as radar-bright from Earth and the locations of regions with low model-calculated temperatures. Figure 2 shows histograms of annual average and annual maximum temperatures for all regions that are radar-bright. Annual average temperatures in the radar-bright regions have a distinct peak at 100 K, and annual maximum temperatures in the radar-bright regions have a broader peak at ~170 K. Figure 2 also shows the volatility temperatures of ammonia, water ice, sulfur, and aromatic hydrocarbons. These are the temperatures at which these volatiles would sublimate to a vacuum at a rate of 1 mm per billion years [9,10].

For the radar-bright regions, model-calculated annual maximum surface temperatures are too warm to permit the long-term thermal stability of exposed surface water ice deposits. In contrast, at approximately 10 cm below the surface, the thermal model calculations show that water ice should be thermally stable for billions of years. Less volatile aromatic hydrocarbons and sulfur may also be cold-trapped at the surface and below the surface on Mercury. However, the fact that predicted subsurface temperatures in the radar-bright regions peak at the water ice volatility temperature is strong evidence that the radar-bright features mapped by MLA thus far are dominantly due to the accumulation of thermally stable subsurface water ice.

In addition to mapping the topography of Mercury’s north polar region, MLA observations are revealing that the reflectivity of radar-bright regions at 1064-nm-wavelength is distinctly lower than adjacent non-radar-bright areas [7]. Observations by the Lyman-Alpha Mapping Project (LAMP) on the Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter have detected analogously lower surface albedos at ultraviolet wavelengths in the permanently shadowed regions near the lunar north and south poles [11]. Both observations require that dark surface deposits are actively forming in regions of permanent shadow at rates faster than those for horizontal transport of regolith by impact gardening, which tends to spatially homogenize surface albedo. The LAMP team hypothesized that the lower albedos they observe are due to a difference in regolith density [11]. The MLA results on Mercury and the thermal model results suggest that the lower albedos may instead be due to a difference in composition. Mercury has a very dark surface, and there are few solar system materials that have lower albedos. The main exceptions are complex hydrocarbon compounds found in comets and volatile-rich asteroids [9,10] The results in Fig. 2 show that surface temperatures in Mercury’s radar-bright regions are in the correct range to actively cold-trap dark, impact-delivered hydrocarbon species. This conclusion leads us to suggest that the warmer near-surface regions of Mercury’s
polar cold traps may consist of a thin, ~10-cm-thick active layer of dark, organic-rich regolith that overlies thermally stable water ice [7].

Why do all the thermal niches for water ice on Mercury appear to be filled, whereas most of the Moon’s niches appear not to be filled to nearly the same degree? Results from the Lunar Crater Observation and Sensing Satellite (LCROSS) experiments show that cold-trapped water and organics are definitely present on the Moon [12], but the ~35 K temperatures at the LCROSS impact site apparently prevent appreciable diffusive migration of water into the regolith [5]. On Mercury, temperatures are sufficiently warmer to permit much greater mobility of water. It is therefore likely that the process of impact deposition of volatiles and cold-trapping at the poles is occurring on both bodies, but the higher temperatures on Mercury have permitted water ice to become concentrated in polar cold traps to a much higher degree than on the Moon.
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Figure 1. Model-calculated annual average temperatures in the north polar region of Mercury

Figure 2. Histograms of annual average and annual maximum surface temperatures for all the areas, and separately for radar-bright areas. The volatility temperatures of ammonia, water ice, sulfur, and aromatic hydrocarbons are also indicated [9,10].