

Matthew D. Shupe*

Science and Technology Corporation, NOAA/ETL, Boulder, CO

Taneil Uttal

NOAA, Environmental Technology Laboratory, Boulder, CO

Sergey Y. Matrosov

Cooperative Institute for Research in the Environmental Sciences, NOAA/ETL, Boulder, CO

1. INTRODUCTION

Clouds are important in determining the radiative balance of the Earth's atmosphere, particularly in the Arctic where there are low temperatures, low atmospheric moisture, and highly reflective ice/snow-covered surfaces. Several studies have demonstrated the importance of specific cloud microphysical properties on cloud-radiation and ice-albedo feedback mechanisms; these in turn have bearing on sea-ice thickness and the onset/length of the melt season (e.g. Curry and Ebert 1992; Zhang et al. 1996). Profiles of a priori cloud microphysical properties can also be used to calculate more accurate atmospheric heating rate profiles than those that are typically calculated with bulk cloud parameterizations.

In spite of the importance of clouds in the Arctic environment, both global climate models (GCMs) and more focused single column models (SCMs) have difficulty specifying and handling clouds. A comparison of many GCMs showed that even cloud fraction results in the Arctic are highly uncertain and significantly impact other modeled parameters (Tao et al. 1996). Morrison et al. (2002) demonstrated that an Arctic-specific SCM that contains detailed cloud microphysical processes still has difficulty partitioning cloud phases. To address these modeling issues, more cloud data, including realistic fields of cloud microphysics, is needed.

This paper presents an annual cycle of cloud microphysics derived from radar, microwave, and infrared radiometer measurements. These instruments were operated for one year during the Surface Heat Budget of the Arctic (SHEBA) field project (Uttal et al. 2002) deployed at a ship-supported ice camp in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas north of Alaska during 1997-1998. Results presented here are an extension of the four-month cloud analysis given by Shupe et al. (2001). The framework used to produce the SHEBA cloud data set is currently being applied to similar measurements from the DOE - Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Program's North Slope of Alaska (NSA) site - producing over two years of cloud microphysics data at that site to date.

2. INSTRUMENTS AND RETRIEVAL TECHNIQUES

A suite of retrieval techniques (three for ice clouds and three for water clouds) have been developed to accommodate the variable cloud scenes that were encountered over the SHEBA year. The retrieval techniques are based primarily on 35-GHz radar reflectivity and/or Doppler velocity measurements. A dual-channel microwave radiometer (MWR), measuring brightness temperatures at 23.8 and 31.4 GHz, provides estimates of the column integrated liquid water path (LWP) which is used to constrain one liquid cloud retrieval technique. An infrared radiometer, measuring spectral IR radiances from 3-20 μm , also provides an optical depth constraint on one of the three ice cloud retrieval techniques. A depolarization lidar and radiosondes, were used in conjunction with the radar and radiometer measurements to classify cloud scenes as all-ice, all-liquid, mixed-phase, or precipitating so that the appropriate retrieval techniques could be applied.

Profiles of ice cloud properties, including the ice water content (IWC), ice water path (IWP), particle characteristic size (i.e., the mean diameter, D_{mean}), and particle concentration, were derived using three techniques. The radar-radiometer, tuned regression technique of Matrosov (1999) utilizes the infrared radiometer measurements of the cloud optical depth to constrain power-law relations between radar reflectivity and IWC. The Doppler velocity technique (Matrosov et al. 2002) is based on a relationship between particle size and fall speed. These two techniques use a bulk particle size to density relationship that allows for the consistent retrieval of size from water content (for the first technique) and water content from size (for the second technique). A third technique utilizes empirical power-law relationships between radar reflectivity and ice cloud parameters with a monthly set of empirical coefficients derived from periods when the first two techniques were applicable. Since the first ice retrieval technique relies on infrared measurements, it is only useful for cirrus clouds that are unobstructed by low-level clouds that contain liquid. Therefore, this technique was used relatively infrequently. The technique was not used at all after June 1998 because the infrared radiometer became inoperational. The second and third ice retrieval techniques, since they only rely on radar measurements, were used in all ice clouds observed by the radar.

For the subset of cases for which all three ice retrievals could be performed simultaneously, particle sizes showed a 33-38% standard deviation between techniques with

* Corresponding author address: Matthew D. Shupe, R/ETL6, 325 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80305; e-mail: matthew.shupe@noaa.gov

biases no larger than 10%. Retrieved ice water contents showed standard deviations of 60-68% with biases less than 15%. Matrosov et al. (2002) showed agreement with in situ measurements on the order of 25% and 55% for retrieved particle size and IWC, respectively, for one case study comparison at SHEBA.

Profiles of liquid cloud properties, including liquid water content (LWC), LWP, droplet effective radius (R_e), and droplet concentration were also performed using three techniques. The Frisch et al. (1995) radar-radiometer technique combines LWP retrievals from the MWR with radar reflectivity measurements to determine microphysical profiles. Additionally, two empirical, power-law radar reflectivity techniques were employed; the first uses a fixed droplet concentration and the second allows the concentration to vary as a function of reflectivity. The radar-radiometer technique requires that all liquid in the atmospheric column be contained in all-liquid layers. Thus, when mixed-phase clouds are present this technique is not applicable.

For the subset of cloud cases for which all three liquid techniques could be applied, effective radius retrievals showed a standard deviation of 25% with no significant bias. Retrieved LWCs had standard deviations of about 70% with biases between techniques of 15% or less. In statistical comparison with aircraft in situ observations made at SHEBA, retrieved droplet sizes were in good agreement, however retrieved LWCs were 20-40% smaller than aircraft measurements.

Preliminary (and more approximate) retrievals have been made for mixed-phase and precipitating cloud scenes. However, only the results for the all-ice and all-liquid cloud retrievals discussed above are presented in the following section.




Figure 1: Time-height contours of retrieved liquid and ice water content for 10 June, 1998 at SHEBA.

3. RESULTS

An example of retrieved cloud ice and liquid water contents from 10 June, 1998 at SHEBA is shown in Figure 1. On this day there was a low-level liquid cloud under a

high cirrus layer. For this cloud scene, all three liquid retrieval techniques could be applied to the low-level layer since no cloud liquid was contained within the upper cirrus. Only the Matrosov et al. (2002) and empirical techniques were applicable for the cirrus layer since the low-level liquid radiometrically obscured the infrared measurements.




Figure 2: Monthly averages of cloud type fraction for the SHEBA annual cycle.

The annual cycle of SHEBA measurements reveals substantial annual variation in the fraction of time that different cloud types were present. Figure 2 shows monthly-average cloud fractions for each of six cloud/precipitation classification categories. Frequently more than one cloud type existed simultaneously (i.e. Figure 1), therefore the sum of the cloud type fractions may be higher than the total cloud fraction in some months. All-ice clouds are prevalent in all seasons in the Arctic, showing some monthly variability but no clear annual trend. Liquid clouds occur about 10% of the time in winter and increase to 35% of the time in summer due to warmer temperatures and higher levels of atmospheric moisture. Of particular interest is the high frequency of occurrence and annual variation of mixed-phase clouds. These data show that mixed-phase clouds occur most frequently in the transition seasons and relatively less frequently in mid-winter and mid-summer. The single-phase cloud scenes over the full annual cycle are described here using monthly- and yearly-averages for each retrieved parameter.

All-ice clouds were observed above the SHEBA ice camp 31% of the time. Monthly averages of ice particle sizes and water contents are shown in Figure 3 for each of the three ice cloud retrieval techniques. The Matrosov et al. (2002) and empirical techniques were run on all clouds classified as ice while the Matrosov (1999) technique could only be applied to optically thin clouds that were not radiometrically obscured. The three techniques show monthly agreement in particle size within about 30% with the smallest particles observed in the winter and the largest particles observed in the summer. IWCs follow a similar yet substantially shifted annual trend with the smallest values in spring and the largest values in fall. IWC retrievals agree to within 50%, except for during the winter when the Matrosov (1999)




Figure 3: Monthly-averaged ice particle D_{mean} and IWC using the three ice cloud retrieval techniques.

results are about half as much as those from the other techniques. This wintertime difference is likely due to the limited set of ice clouds to which the Matrosov (1999) technique was applied. Annual averages and standard deviations for each retrieval technique are summarized in Table 1.

All three ice cloud techniques were highly correlated for retrieved ice cloud parameters above about 1 km. Correlation with the Matrosov et al. (2002) Doppler velocity technique degraded above 6 km due to contaminations in the Doppler velocity measurements from the horizontal winds because the radar was slightly out of vertical alignment. Vertical profiles of retrieved ice cloud parameters (not shown) indicate particle sizes and mass content growing from cloud top down to approximately 1/4th of the cloud depth from the cloud base, with rapid sublimation of cloud particles in the lowest quarter of the cloud depth.

	D_{mean} [mm]		IWC [mg m ⁻³]		IWP [g m ⁻²]	
	Mean	StDev	Mean	StDev	Mean	StDev
M99	72	49	7	9	21	23
M02	90	53	14	26	37	54
Emp	73	43	12	22	33	49
Annual Mean Values						
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Ice	80	40-120	10	4-25	30	10-60

Table 1. Annual mean and standard deviation of retrieved ice cloud parameters for each retrieval technique and reasonable annual mean values with reasonable ranges of monthly-mean values. M99=Matrosov (1999), M02=Matrosov et al. (2002), Emp=Empirical.

Annual averages of ice cloud microphysical parameters (taking into consideration known sampling, instrument, and retrieval issues) indicate mean diameters of 80 μm , IWCs of 9-12 mg m^{-3} , and IWPs of 25-35 g m^{-2} . These values and the annual range of monthly-averaged values are summarized in Table 1.

All-liquid clouds were observed at SHEBA 14% of the year. Both retrieved droplet sizes and LWCs show a minimum in winter and a maximum in the summer when there is more moisture available for cloud formation (Figure 4). We note that the monthly-averaged data points for October and/or November appear to be somewhat inconsistent with the other monthly values and may have been impacted by radar sensitivity issues during those months. In general, the Frisch et al. (1995) technique results are based on fewer samples than the results from the other techniques. This technique was not used at all for the months prior to May 1998 because cloud scenes for which the technique is useful did not occur in that time period. Retrieved effective radii demonstrate agreement between the three retrieval techniques of better than 10% in a monthly-mean sense. LWCs agree well in most months, however in the months of July and August the Frisch et al. (1995) results, which are based on the MWR-derived LWP, are about 50% larger than the empirically-derived values of LWC. Similar discrepancies are observed in the LWP retrievals. Underestimation of LWP by the empirical techniques may be due to a priori retrieval assumptions (such as the assumed values and/or profile shapes of droplet concentration and logarithmic width of the droplet size distribution) or due to the differences in atmospheric volumes observed by the radar and MWR. Table 2 summarizes the annual averages and standard deviations of liquid cloud parameters derived from each retrieval technique.




Figure 4: Monthly-averaged liquid cloud R_e and LWC using the three liquid cloud retrieval techniques.

Liquid clouds at SHEBA were semi-adiabatic with droplet sizes and water contents growing from cloud base to about 2/3 of the averaged cloud depth from the base (not shown).

The top 1/3 of the average cloud depth contained highly variable profiles, demonstrating variability in cloud-top mixing and/or overall adiabatic nature.

Considering all sampling, instrumental, and retrieval issues, Arcticliquid clouds contain average effective radii of 7.0 μm , LWCs of 85 mg m^{-3} , LWPs of 30-40 g m^{-2} , and droplet concentrations of about 50 cm^{-3} . These values and the annual range of monthly-averaged values are summarized in Table 2.

	$R_e [\text{mm}]$		$LWC [\text{mg m}^{-3}]$		$LWP [\text{g m}^{-2}]$	
	Mean	StDev	Mean	StDev	Mean	StDev
F95	7.1	3.6	96	110	56	48
Emp1	6.8	2.5	80	90	38	44
Emp2	6.9	2.2	83	110	40	49
Annual Mean Values						
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Liquid	7	5-8	85	4-130	40	15-80

Table 2. Annual mean and standard deviation of retrieved liquid cloud parameters for each retrieval technique and reasonable annual mean values with reasonable ranges of monthly-mean values. F95=Frisch et al. (1995), Emp1=Fixed concentration empirical, Emp2=Variable concentration empirical.

4. SUMMARY

This radar-based cloud data set is unique in that it gives a first look at the variability of cloud microphysical properties and cloud type occurrence over a complete annual cycle in the Arctic. Furthermore, it demonstrates the ability to apply cloud retrieval techniques to diversecloudscenes observed in all seasons of the year. Cloud retrievals have been applied to all clouds observed above SHEBA and therefore provide an excellent data set for comparisons with satellite observations and testing of model parameterizations. This data set is currently being used by a number of modeling groups (e.g., Morrison et al. 2002). A similar cloud data set from the ARM-NSAsite is being refined. All SHEBA and NSA

retrievals to date are displayed on the internet at:

<http://www.etl.noaa.gov/arctic>.

Acknowledgments. This research was conducted under support from the NSF SHEBA (OPP-9701730), the NASA EOS Validation (S-97895-F), and the NASA FIRE (L64205D) Programs. We would like to thank the many participants in the SHEBA field campaign.

REFERENCES

- Curry, J.A. and E.E. Ebert, 1992: Annual cycle of radiative fluxes over the Arctic Ocean: Sensitivity to cloud optical properties. *J. Climate*, **5**, 1267-1280.
- Frisch, A. S., C. W. Fairall, and J. B. Snider, 1995: Measurements of stratus cloud and drizzle parameters in ASTEX with a Ka-band Doppler radar and microwave radiometer. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **52**, 2788-2799.
- Matrosov, S. Y., 1999: Retrievals of vertical profiles of ice cloud microphysics from radar and IR measurements using tuned regressions between reflectivity and cloud parameters. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **104**, 16,741-16,753.
- Matrosov, S.Y., A.V. Korolev, and A.J. Heymsfield, 2002: Profiling cloud ice mass and particle characteristic size from Doppler radar measurements. *J. Atmos. Ocean Tech*, in press.
- Morrison, H., M. D. Shupe, and J.A. Curry, 2002: Evaluation of a bulk cloud microphysics parameterization using SHEBA observed and retrieved cloud properties. *J. Geophys. Res.*, submitted.
- Shupe, M.D., T. Uttal, S.Y. Matrosov, and A.S. Frisch, 2001: Cloud water contents and hydrometeor sizes during the FIRE - Arctic Clouds Experiment. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **106**, 15,015-15,028.
- Tao, X., J.E. Walsh, and W.L. Chapman, 1996: An assessment of global climate model simulations of Arctic air temperature. *J. Climate*, **9**, 1060-1076.
- Uttal, T., and Coauthors, 2002: Surface Heat Budget of the Arctic Ocean. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **83**, 255-275.
- Zhang, T., K. Starnes, and S.A. Bowling, 1996: Impact of clouds on surface radiative fluxes and snow melt in the Arctic and Subarctic. *J. Climate*, **9**, 2110-2123.