




Testing the Two-Layer Model for Correcting Clear Sky Reflectance Near Clouds

Guoyong Wen^{1,2}, Alexander Marshak¹, Frank Evans⁴, Tamás Várnai^{1,3}, and Rob Levy¹
¹NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center, ²Morgan State University, ³JCET/UMBC, ⁴University of Colorado



Executive Summary


A two-layer model (2LM) was developed in our earlier studies to estimate the clear sky reflectance enhancement due to cloud-molecular radiative interaction at MODIS at 0.47 μm . Recently, we extended the model to include cloud-surface and cloud-aerosol radiative interactions. We use the LES/SHDOM simulated 3D **true** radiation fields to test the 2LM for reflectance enhancement at 0.47 μm . We find:

- The simple model captures the viewing angle dependence of the reflectance enhancement near cloud, suggesting the physics of this model is correct.
- The cloud-molecular interaction alone accounts for 70% of the enhancement.
- The cloud-surface interaction accounts 16% of the enhancement.
- The cloud-aerosol interaction accounts for additional 13% of the enhancement.

We conclude that the 2LM is simple to apply and unbiased.

Two-Layer Model


1. Cloud-molecular interactions



ΔR = radiance reflected from broken cloud field with a scattering Rayleigh layer above it **minus** that purely due to extinction (non-scattered).

2. Cloud-surface interactions


We use a fast Monte Carlo scheme for Poisson model of broken clouds to compute 3D cloud induced diffuse flux. The cloud-surface induced enhancement is the surf leaving radiance with atmospheric extinction.



Marshak, et. al., 2008

Left: an example of the Poisson distribution of broken cloud field

Right: clear sky diffuse transmittance as a function of cloud albedo for cloud aspect ratio of 2, SZA=36




3. Cloud-aerosol interactions

We introduce an *effective* molecular optical depth that includes aerosols $\tau_{m,eff} = \tau_m + \epsilon \tau_a$ for the 2LM, where ϵ depends on scattering phase function and single scattering albedo. For given aerosol optical depth in LES data, we find ϵ empirically such that the total error in 2LM is nearly zero.

SHDOM Simulations





- 26 fields (cloud liquid water content and relative humidity) were simulated using the UCLA large eddy simulation (LES) model
- Combined 26 LES cumulus fields with 40 GEOS-5 aerosol profiles to make 80 cloud/aerosol scene (20 km x 20 km x 15 km).
- Radiances were simulated using SHDOM at 500 m MODIS resolution with 23 viewing direction appropriate for MODIS Aqua.
- MOD04 cloud masking procedure is applied to select “good” pixels. There are 100188 “good” pixels in all 80 cloud scenes, and number of “good” 10 km x 10 km boxes is 3154.

Viewing Angle Dependence




Left: LES simulated cloud optical depth field with mean (standard deviation) and cloud fraction indicated.

Below: The 2LM (black) captures the viewing angle dependence of the truth. Though the error for each individual box can be large (50%), on the average, the error is about 20%.




Compare 2LM with Truth





Left: Compare the 2LM (cloud-molecular interactions) with the truth for given VZA.

Right: Similar to the left but for all data points. The averages and standard deviations are presented. The 2LM underestimate the truth by 25%



Left: Compare the 2LM (cloud-molecular and cloud-surface interactions) with the truth. 2LM underestimates by 9%.

Right: Similar to the left but 2LM accounts for cloud-mole, cloud-surf, and cloud-aerosol interactions. 2LM overestimates by 3%.



- PDF and cumulative distributions of 2LM error for cloud-mole interactions. The 2LM accounts for 70% of the enhancement.
- 2LM that includes cloud-mole and cloud-surf accounts for 86% of the enhancement.
- 2LM that includes cloud-mole, -surf, -aerosol accounts for 99% of the enhancement.