



# Reconciling CloudSat and GPM Estimates of Falling Snow

S. Joseph Munchak<sup>1</sup>


Gail Skofronick Jackson<sup>1</sup>, Mark Kulie<sup>2</sup>,  
Norm Wood<sup>3</sup>, Lisa Miliani<sup>2</sup>

1: NASA GSFC; 2: Michigan Technological University; 3: University of Wisconsin-Madison

# Outline


- Why measure snow from space?
- How have we measured snow from space?
- Fundamentals of snowfall estimation from radar measurements
- Comparing the CloudSat and GPM datasets
- Reconciling the CloudSat and GPM datasets

# Why measure snow from space?



Importance of snow for water supply, albedo feedback


Low population where most snow falls, sparse ground instrumentation and radars



Polar regions where climate changing most rapidly; how is the relationship between snowfall and snowpack changing?

# How have we measured snow from space?

- Passive microwave radiometers (SSM/I, AMSR-E/2, MHS, ...)
- TRMM (1997-2015)  
Ku-band radar + TMI
- **CloudSat** (2006-present) W-band radar
- **GPM** (2014-present)  
Ku+Ka band radar + GMI



# How do we measure snowfall rate with radar?

- Radar equation for distributed targets:

$$\bar{P}_R = \frac{c\pi^3}{1024 \ln(2)} \frac{\bar{P}_T \tau G^2 \Phi^2}{\lambda^2} \frac{|K|^2 Z_e}{r^2}$$

constants                      Radar properties                      Target properties


- Equivalent reflectivity factor  $Z_e$  is defined as:

$$Z_e = \frac{\lambda^4}{\pi^5 |K|^2} \int_{D_{min}}^{D_{max}} N(D, s) \sigma_b(D, s, \lambda) dD$$



# Relating Reflectivity to Snowfall Rate


$$Z_e = \frac{\lambda^4}{\pi^5 |K|^2} \int_{D_{min}}^{D_{max}} N(D, s) \sigma_b (D, s, \lambda) dD$$



When  $D \ll \lambda$ ,  $\sigma_b$  proportional to  $D^6$  (Rayleigh scattering).

When  $D \approx \lambda$ ,  $\sigma_b$  depends on shape and roughly proportional to  $D^2$ .


$$S = \frac{\pi \rho_i}{6} \int_{D_{min}}^{D_{max}} N(D, s) D^3 v_t(D, s) dD$$



In summary, relationship between Z and S is ambiguous because of:

- Different dependence on particle size
- Different dependence on particle shape

Multi-frequency measurements can provide further constraints on size/shape, and passive microwave radiometry can constrain column-integrated ice mass.




# Comparing the CloudSat CPR and GPM DPR

	CPR	DPR	
		KuPR	KaPR
Frequency	94 GHz	13.6 GHz	35.5 GHz
Footprint size	~ 1.7 x 1.4 km <sup>2</sup>	5.05 – 5.60 km of diameter	
Near surf. bin	~ 720 - 1200 m	~ 750 - 2500 m	
Sensitivity	~ -29 dBZ	~12-13 dBZ	~12-13 dBZ HS ~17-18 dBZ MS
Snowfall retrieval products	2C-SNOW-PROFILE R04	2A DPR V05 (ITE114)	
Scanning mode	Nadir pointing	Cross track	




# CloudSat vs. GPM: Snow occurrence

CPR snow frequency 03/2014-03/2017




DPR MS snow frequency 03/2014-02/2017




# CloudSat vs. GPM: Snow amount


CPR avg. snowfall rate 03/2014-03/2017





DPR MS avg. snowfall rate 03/2014-02/2017



# Accounting for differences in phase discrimination



# Accounting for differences in instrument sensitivity




# DPR and CloudSat algorithms use different scattering models and PSD assumptions. What happens when we use the same ones for both datasets?

Scattering model: Ensemble of aggregates (Kwo et al., 2016)

PSD model: a) Field et al., 2007

b) Gamma with constant  $\mu=2$  and optimize  $N_w = f(D_m)$





# Apply to CloudSat, DPR datasets

Instrument	Global Snow Occurrence (%)	Global Snow Rate (mm/day)
CloudSat (native)	2.422	0.123
DPR (MS)	0.262	0.040
CloudSat (averaged & truncated to DPR)	0.277	0.061
DPR (Field et al., 2007)	0.262	0.110
DPR ( $N_w=f(D_m)$ )	0.262	<b>0.115</b>
CloudSat (Field et al., 2007)	2.422	0.071
CloudSat (Field et al., 2007 truncated)	0.277	0.042
CloudSat ( $N_w=f(D_m)$ )	2.422	0.170
CloudSat ( $N_w=f(D_m)$ , truncated)	0.277	<b>0.115</b>



# Check for consistency with APR-2 and DPR Ku vs. Ku-Ka measurements



# Summary

- Estimation of falling snow from spaceborne radar is a difficult problem & less well-constrained than rainfall estimates
- CloudSat and GPM offer complementary radar-based snowfall products, but large discrepancies exist due to:
  - Rain/snow discrimination
  - Instrument properties
  - Scattering model and PSD assumptions
- Attempts to reconcile GPM and CloudSat require **common & accurate** assumptions for scattering and PSD.
  - Field et al., 2007 PSD not consistent with CloudSat and DPR data
  - A linear  $N_w$ - $D_m$  relationship can provide consistent CloudSat and DPR global snowfall estimates, but significant variability exists
- Global triple-frequency (Ku+Ka+W) radar measurements with sensitivity  $\leq 0$  dBZ are needed to further refine global snowfall rate!