Validation of Satellite AIRS Retrievals with Aircraft NAST-I Soundings and Dropsondes – Implications for Future Satellite Sounding Capabilities

<u>W. L. Smith</u>, D. K. Zhou, and A. M. Larar (NASA/LaRC)
H. E. Revercomb, P. Antonelli, H. B. Howell, H. L. Huang, R.O. Knuteson, Jun Li, D. Tobin, and H. M. Woolf (UW/CIMSS)
Xu Liu (AER), L. Strow (UMBC), and the AIRS Science Team

NOAA G-IV

NASA ER-2

# **Empirical Orthogonal Function (EOF) NAST-I/AIRS Regression Retrieval**

For clear sky and opaque cloud:

$$R = \varepsilon_{s,c} B_{s,c} \tau_{s,c} - \int_{P_{ac}}^{P_{s,c}} Bd \tau - (1 - \varepsilon_{s,c}) \tau_{s,c} \int_{P_{s,c}}^{0} Bd \tau^{*}$$

$$Radiance EOF$$

$$Amplitudes$$

$$C_{i} = \sum_{j=1}^{nc} R_{j} E_{ji}$$

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{T}_{s}, \\ \mathbf{\varepsilon}_{s}(\mathbf{v}), \\ \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{p}), \\ \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{p}) \end{array} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} K_{mi} C_{i} + K_{mn} P_{s}$$

$$\frac{Retrieval}{Solution}$$

R = radiance $\varepsilon_{s,c}$  = surface or cloud emissivity  $B_{s,c}$  = surface or cloud Planck radiance  $\tau$  = transmittance between aircraft and atmospheric Pressure level (P)  $\tau_{sc}$ =atmospheric transmittance between aircraft and surface or cloud  $(P_{Sc})$  $\tau^*$  = atmospheric transmittance between surface or cloud P and aircraft  $P_{ac}$  = aircraft pressure,  $P_s$  = surface pressure  $\Re$  = radiance E = radiance covariance EOFs C = radiance EOF amplitudes T = temperature $Q = H_2O$  mixing ratio K = regression coefficients

- Physical Regression EOFs and regression training based on calculated radiances
- Training includes cloud, sfc emissivity, sfc skin temp, and solar variability effects
- Null radiance errors assumed for PC specification and regression training
- EOF # selected by spatial radiance RMSD (observed minus retrieval) minimization



17:13 17:20 17:28 17:35 17:42 UT (hh:mm)

## **NAST-I and AIRS Spectra and Retrieval Channels**



# Aqua Overpass Flight (March 3, 2003)

Underpass Leg Used For Comparison

### AIRS, NAST, Dropsondes Used for Intercomparison



#### **Retrieval Comparisons (Full Resolution AIRS vs NAST)**



Some Differences in fine scale structure but spatial average is in good agreement



#### AIRS vs NAST (with AIRS noise added)



AIRS level single sample noise upsets spatial continuity of small scale vertical features



#### 3 x 3 AIRS Average Vs NAST & Dropsonde Cross-sections



Vertical structure radiance signal is small; retrieval requires small spectrally random noise



#### 3 x 3 AIRS Average Vs NAST & Dropsonde Cross-sections



# Aqua Overpass Flight (March 11/12, 2003)



### **Temperature (March 11/12, 2003)**





#### **Temperature Deviation** (March 11/12, 2003)



## Aqua Overpass Flight (March 12/13, 2003)



## **Retrieval Comparisons (Deviation from the Mean)**



## **Retrieval Comparisons (Deviation from the Mean)**



## **Retrieval Comparisons (Deviation from the Mean)**



#### Temp (K) at 200 mb (~12 km)



#### RH (%) at 500 mb (~5.6 km)



# Conclusions

- AIRS provides high vertical resolution sounding information
- The vertical structure radiance signal is small (<0.2 K)
- The vertical structure signal is raised above the noise by compressing 1000s of spectral radiances into 10s of pieces of independent information (e.g., amplitudes of radiance covariance eigenvectors). This results in a large S/N advantage [e.g., sqrt(1500/30) ≈7]
- High vertical resolution soundings can be retrieved down to cloud level by including cloud effects in the formulation of the retrieval algorithm (e.g., include clouds in the training of the EOF regression algorithm)
- Small scale horizontal features are resolved in AIRS full spatial resolution soundings

<u>The challenge for NWP</u>: to capture the high spatial resolution sounding signal, for both the clear and the clouded atmosphere

International TOVS Study Conference, 13<sup>th</sup>, TOVS-13, Sainte Adele, Quebec, Canada, 29 October-4 November 2003. Madison, WI, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Space Science and Engineering Center, Cooperative Institute for Meteorological Satellite Studies, 2003.