Examination of 1.24 and 1.6 micron cloud optical depth retrievals over snow and ice surfaces
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Objectives and Background of CERES Ed4

• Improve accuracy and reliability of cloud optical depth retrievals using CERES MODIS and VIIRS cloud algorithms

• In CERES Ed4, Cloud optical depth retrieval over snow & ice surfaces
  
  (1) Ice crystal reflectance model
      roughened single habit ice columns (SHM)

  (2) Channel selection:
      1.24 µm
Evaluations $\Rightarrow$ Ed4 Cloud Optical Depth over Snow/Ice Appear to be High

Thin cirrus over snow, global

- COD extremely biased high over snow
  - COD = 12.1 vs. 0.86
- No evaluation for thick ice clouds
  - Yost et al., TGRS, 2019

Water $\tau$ over ARM NSA, over snow

- COD reasonable over NSA site
- Overcast, relatively thick clouds
  - Dong et al. JGR, 2016

- COD retrieval for liquid water clouds not reliable, probably due to uncertainty in clear-sky radiance input
  - appears to be too high on average

- COD retrieval for ice not usable, more sensitivity to clear radiance uncertainty, single habit model overestimates COD
Approach from This Study
Examine impact of a new ice crystal reflectance model

CERES Ed4
Roughened single hexagonal column (SHM)

This study
Two-habit model (THM)

Compact particle, smaller asymmetry factor, therefore smaller COD

Yang et al. 2016
Loeb et al. 2018
Approach from This Study
Examine impact of using a different wavelength channel

Spectral Snow & Ice Albedos/Reflectances

Clear-Sky Observations

- 1.24-µm snow albedo: 0.13 - 0.50
- 1.62-µm snow albedo: 0.02 – 0.19

- Surface reflectance uncertainty much higher for 1.24 µm
- Snow stronger absorber for 1.6 µm than 1.24 µm

From Platnick et al., JGR, 2001
Examine impact of using a different wavelength channel - Conti

Theoretical Clouds

- Liquid COD saturation, 1.24 µm: ~ 64-96
  1.62 µm: ~ 32-40

- Ice COD saturation, 1.24 µm: ~ 32-60
  1.62 µm: ~ 8-16

- 1.24 µm greater COD range available
- Actual saturation COD depends on particle size and angular configurations
Three Snow / Ice Cloud Optical Depth Retrievals

CERES Ed4
(1) Single Habit Model (SHM), 1.24 μm

This Study
(2) Two Habit Model (THM), 1.24 μm
(3) Two Habit Model (THM), 1.6 μm

Pixel level cases and monthly global maps & stats
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- Consistent optical thickness between visible and 1.6 µm

Over Southern Ocean
1.6 saturates for thick clouds

THM 1.24 has better sensitivity for thicker clouds

Over Canada

Terra MODIS, March 15, 2009 UTC 17
Ice Cloud Optical Depth Scatterplots, Terra-MODIS, March 2009

THM 1.24 vs. SHM 1.24 (Ed4)

- Forced Slope = 0.638
- R = 0.842

COD Averages
- Ed4: 8.5 (5.6)
- THM 1.24: 5.8 (3.4)
- THM 1.6: 3.5 (4.3)

THM 1.6 vs. THM 1.24

- Forced Slope = 0.526
- R = 0.528

N= 42136137.
- SHM12: 8.48 (5.55)
- THM12: 5.84 (3.41)
- Y-X: -2.64 (3.26)
- RMS: 4.19

N= 31797983.
- THM12: 6.57 (4.22)
- THM16BTempMap: 3.44 (4.29)
- Y-X: -3.13 (4.14)
- RMS: 5.19
Liquid Water Cloud Optical Depth Scatterplots, Terra-MODIS, March 2009

Forced Slope = 0.426
R = 0.491

COD Averages
1.24 (Ed4): 13.8 (11.4)
1.6: 6.6 (8.3)
Comparison with MODIS ST retrieval (1621)
Ice Cloud Optical Depth over Snow & Ice surface (Northern Polar Regions)
Terra-MODIS March 2009

Ice COD Average (0 – 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>COD</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHM (1.24)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THM (1.24)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THM (1.6)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIS ST</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- THM 1.6 COD comparable with MODIS ST, ~0.4 smaller than MODIS ST
- MODIS ST has more no-retrieval
Liquid Water Optical Depth over Snow & Ice surface (Northern Polar Regions)
Terra-MODIS March 2009

Water Cloud

Liquid COD Average (0 – 60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ed4 (1.24 µm)</th>
<th>1.6 µm</th>
<th>MODIS ST (1621)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>14.0 (11.2)</td>
<td>8.5 (9.9)</td>
<td>8.6 (7.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1.6 COD agrees with MODIS ST well
- MODIS ST has lots no-retrieval over snow covered land or call them ice
Validation with CALIPSO
Single layer, transparent, ice clouds over snow/ice

**Mean COD (Ed4):** 8.0 (12.5)

**Mean COD (THM 1.24):** 5.3 (5.5)

**Mean COD (THM 1.6):** 3.7 (11)

Mean COD (CALIPSO): 1.1 (0.76)

- Ed4 extremely biased high
- THM 1.6 the best choice to retrieve thin cirrus clouds
Liquid Water Clouds Optical Depth, Validation with CALIPSO, C3M, April 2009
Single layer, transparent clouds, over snow/ice

1.24 \mu m (Ed4)

1.6 \mu m

Mean COD (Ed4): 9.8 (8.6)
Mean COD (1.6): 3.4 (4.0)
Mean COD (CALIPSO): 1.3 (0.8)

• Ed4 extremely biased high
• 1.6 \mu m the best choice to retrieve thin clouds
Issue with THM 1.6
High no-retrieval percent
Terra-MODIS September 26, 2009 UTC 23
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GEOS4 Skin T too warm for sea ice covered ocean and some of snow covered land.

GEOS4 Skin T ok over permanent snow sfc except near coasts, where MOA Skin T a little too cold.
Using GEOS4 Skin T

Using Obs CS BTemp 11 µm
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No Retrieval Percent, Terra MODIS, March 2009

With GEOS4 Skin Temp                  With Obs Clear Sky BTemp 11 µm

Avg No Retrieval = 15%                 Avg No Retrieval = 11%

• Improvement over sea ice ocean and snow covered land
Summary

- THM 1.6 μm the best picking up optically thin clouds, but saturates at Tau (ice) ~ 16-20, Tau (water) 32-40
  THM 1.24 μm better sensitivity up to 32-60 for ice clouds, 64-96 for water

- Mean optical depth
  - Ice (tau < 30):
    - SHM (1.24) ~ 8.5
    - THM (1.24) ~ 5.8
    - THM (1.6) ~ 3.4
  - Liquid water (Tau < 60):
    - 1.24 μm ~ 13.8
    - 1.6 μm ~ 6.6

- Comparison with MODIS ST:
  - Ice (tau < 30): MODIS ST mean tau = 4.9, ~1.5 larger than THM 1.6
  - Water (tau < 60): MODIS ST agrees well with THM 1.6 over Greenland, larger than THM 1.6 over Arctic Ocean

- CALIPSO Validation (for single transparent ice clouds):
  - CALIPSO ~ 1.13 (0.8)
  - THM 1.6 ~ 3.7 (11)
  - THM 1.24 ~ 6.5
  - SHM 1.24 (Ed4) ~ 13.3

- GEOS4 Skin T ~ 5.6 K too warm over sea ice ocean, and 3.3 K warm over snow covered land.
  Using observed clear sky MODIS 11 μm, reduced no retrieval from 15% to 11%.
Future Plan

• Combine THM1.6 & THM1.24
  Ice Clouds:
    \[ \tau < 8 - 16 \rightarrow \text{use THM 1.6} \]
    \[ \tau > 8 - 16 \rightarrow \text{use THM 1.24} \]

  Water Clouds:
    \[ \tau < 32 - 40 \rightarrow \text{use } 1.6 \ \mu m \]
    \[ \tau > 32 - 40 \rightarrow \text{use } 1.24 \ \mu m \]

• GEOS 4 skin temperature too warm for snow & ice covered ocean and land. What to do? Updating snow / ice covered surface temperature with 11 \( \mu m \) BTemp observations? Or hoping an improved version of GEOS skin T?