



# Vertical Structure of the Intraseasonal Variability from Contemporary Satellite Data: AIRS, CloudSat, and TRMM

### Xianan Jiang

Joint Institute for Regional Earth System Science & Engineering (JIFRESSE) / UCLA

Baijun Tian, and Duane Waliser

Jet Propulsion Laboratory / California Institute of Technology



- I. Moisture and temperature structures of the MJO: AIRS observations versus ERA-Interim
- II. Cloud structures of the boreal summer ISO: CloudSat versus ERA-Interim
- **III. Diabatic heating** structures associated with the MJO: **TRMM** observations and reanalysis datasets (ERA-Interim, MERRA, CFS-R).





# <u>Part I</u>

### Vertical moist thermodynamic structure of the MJO in AIRS Observations: An update and a comparison to ECMWF Interim Reanalysis

Analysis by Baijun Tian

Acknowledgements: Eric Fetzer/JPL, and Yuk Yung/Caltech

Tian et al., 2010: Mon Wea Rev, in press.

#### Tian, B., et al., 2006: Vertical moist thermodynamic structure and spatialtemporal evolution of the MJO in AIRS observations. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 63, 2462-2485, doi:10.1175/JAS3782.1.



Over the Eastern hemisphere, enhanced (suppressed) convection is generally preceded in both time and space by a low-level warm and moist (cold and dry) anomaly and followed by a low-level cold and dry (warm and moist) anomaly.

# LIMITATION OF TIAN ET AL. (2006)

Only 2.5 years (2002-2005, 8 MJO events) of V4 AIRS data were used.

# OBJECTIVE

◆ Here, we further examine the large-scale vertical moist thermodynamic structure of the MJO using currently available 7-year V5 AIRS data (2002-2009; 17 MJO events) to test its dependence on the AIRS data record lengths, AIRS retrieval versions and MJO event selection and compositing methods employed.

◆ We also compare the large-scale vertical moist thermodynamic structure of the MJO between AIRS and the newer ECMWF Interim reanalysis (ERA-Interim) to evaluate the performance of ERA-Interim in describing the large-scale vertical moist thermodynamic structure of the MJO.

# DATA

#### **TRMM 3B42 Rainfall:**

40S-40N, 0.25° x 0.25°, 3-hourly, 01/01/1998-05/31/2009. Huffman et al. (2007)

#### **X** AIRS Temperature & H2OVapMMR

global, 1.0° x 1.0°, V5, L3, 2xdaily, 09/01/2002-06/30/2009. 24 pressure levels for Temp and 12 layers for H2OVapMMR. <u>Chahine et al. (2006)</u>

**ECMWF Interim Reanalysis Temperature & Specific Humidity** global, 1.5° x 1.5°, 4xdaily, 09/01/2002-05/31/2009.

37 pressure levels from 1000 to 1 hPa for both temperature and specific humidity.

# **MJO ANALYSIS METHODS**

- (1) Method 1 is the **Extended EOF (EEOF)** method used by Tian et al. (2006).
- (2) Method 2 is the **Multivariate EOF (MEOF)** method introduced by Wheeler and Hendon (2004).

# EEOF METHOD

- (1) All the data were binned into pentad (5-day) values.
- (2) Intraseasonal anomalies were obtained by removing the annual cycle and data filtering through a 30–90-day band pass filter.
- (3) Perform an EEOF analysis on band-passed (30-90 day) rainfall data (e.g., TRMM, CMAP) over the tropical Indian Ocean and western Pacific.
- (4) Identify MJO events from the PC time series of 1<sup>st</sup> EEOF mode.
- (5) Composite MJO events in band-passed rainfall and target quantity (e.g., temperature, moisture, ozone, aerosols).

**Tian et al. (2006)** 



SPATIAL-TEMPORAL PATTERN OF THE 1<sup>ST</sup> EEOF MODE OF RAINFALL MJO ANOMALY

1998-2005 Tian et al. (2006)

# AMPLITUDE TIME SERIES OF THE 1ST EEOF MODE OF RAINFALL MJO ANOMALY



The x indicates the dates of selected MJO events for 2002-2005 (8)



# COMPARISON OF 2.5- AND 7-YR







q'

12

Rainfall (mm/day)

# **COMPARISON OF EEOF AND MEOF**



7-yr V5 AIRS data & MEOF method







q'







-2 Phase 4 93 days 0 0 -2 -4 Rainfall (mm/day) Phase 5 126 days 2 0 -2 -4 Phase 6 130 days -2 Phase 7 91 days 2 Ω -2 -4 Phase 8 102 days 2 Ω -2 -4 30 60 90 120 150 180 210 240 270 300 330 360 Longitude (E) ERA-Interim temp MJO Anom (Kelvin) (Nov-Apr) -0.2 0.0 0.2 -04 0.4 7-yr ERA data & MEOF method

Phase 2 89 days

Phase 3 111 days



# **COMPARISON OF AIRS AND ERA-INTERIM**

2

-2

2

-2

2

-2

2

-2

-4

74

2

0

-2

-4

**-** 4

2

0

-2

-4

2

-2

74

2

Ω

-2

-4

0.5

0.1

0.3

Rainfall (mm/day)

# SUMMARY FOR PART (I)

✤ There is a strong consistency of the large-scale vertical moist thermodynamic structure of the MJO between different AIRS data record lengths (2.5 versus 7 years) and different MJO event selection and compositing methods (the EEOF method used by Tian et al. (2006) versus the MEOF method used by Wheeler and Hendon (2004)).

✤ Deficiencies still exist in the ERA-Interim describing the largescale vertical moist thermodynamic structure of the MJO although ERA-Interim seems doing much better than NCEP/NCAR in this regard.

# Part II

# Vertical Cloud Structures of the Boreal Summer Intraseasonal Oscillation Based on CloudSat Observations and ERA-Interim reanalysis

Acknowledgments: Frank Li, and Chris Woods (JPL)

Jiang et al., 2010: Climate Dynamics, published on-line.



#### Why the Boreal Summer Intraseasonal Oscillation (BSISO) important?

•Primary source for monsoon predictability;

Modulate synoptic system activity;





•Affect high/mid-latitude climate through Rossby wave tele-connection.

Lawrence and Webster (2002)

### Challenging issues on the BSISO:

- A perfect theory for the northward propagation of the BSISO, particularly to explain its interannual variability is still elusive;
- Current GCMs exhibit limited skills in simulating and predicting the BSISO (Waliser et al., 2003; Kim et al. 2008; Wang 2009).





- Launched in April 2006
- Provides a global view of cloud vertical structure
- 94 GHz, nadir-viewing cloud profiling radar
- □ 1.4 km across-track by 2.5 km along-track footprint
- 500m vertical resolution
- Crossing Equator at 1:31pm

# <u>Dataset</u>

CloudSat (Jun-Sep 2006, 2007, 2008)

Horizontal resolution: 1x1 degs, 40 vertical levels between 1025 and 50 hPa

<u>Variables:</u>

Cloud liquid water content (LWC), Ice water content (IWC)

Cloud types (7): High: Cirrus Middle: Altocumulus (Ac), Altostratus (As) Low: Stratocumulus (Sc), Stratus (St), Nimbostratus (Ns) Vertical: Cumulus (Cu)

**ERA-Interim reanalysis:** 

Horizontal resolution 1.5 x 1.5 deg, 37 vertical levels LWC, IWC for Jun-Sep from 2006-2008

TRMM rainfall version 3B42 (1997-2008):

horizontal resolution: 1x1 deg., 20-70-day band-pass filtered



#### Hovmöller diagram of TRMM precipitation (20-70-day filtered; 75-95°E)

Time series of EEOF1 of daily 1-D 20-70d filtered TRMM rainfall over Indian Sector (5°S~25°N, averaged over 75-95°E sector) for MJJAS, 1996-2008.



### Composite BSISV Evolution (10 events) TRMM rainfall

#### **Northward propagation**

#### Time-latitude evolution (75-85°E)

![](_page_23_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### **Composite CloudSat LWC (80-95°E average)**

(no time-filtering, seasonal mean removed)

![](_page_24_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### **Composite CloudSat IWC (80-95°E average)**

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Composite EC-Interim LWC (80-95°E average)**

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

**EC LWC** 

#### **Composite EC-Interim IWC (80-95°E average)**

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Composite LWC & IWC relative to convection center (mg/m<sup>3</sup>; 80-95°E)

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Cloud fraction & circulation associated with the BSISV**

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Decompose total cloud fraction by cloud types**

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

# **SUMMARY FOR PART (II)**

• A marked vertical tilting structure is evident in the cloud liquid water content (LWC) with respect to the convection center of the BSISO based on both CloudSat and ERA-Interim reanalysis.

Increased LWC tends to appear to the north of rainfall maximum, i.e., leads the convection, particularly in the lower troposphere. This northward shift of increased LWC could be fundamental responsible for the northward propagation of the BSISO.

• The transition in cloud structures associated with BSISV convection is observed based on CloudSat, with shallow cumuli at the leading edge, followed by the deep convective clouds, and then upper anvil clouds.

# <u>Caveats</u>

• Differences in the cloud water content between ERA-Interim reanalysis and the CloudSat observations.

Retrieved estimates from CloudSat are expected to also include precipitation sized liquid and ice particles in addition to suspended cloud liquid and ice water content which is the case for the model (e.g., Waliser et al. 2009).

• Uncertainties involved with the CloudSat estimates, particularly in the low cloud and some of thin cirrus cloud (e.g., Zhang et al. 2007; Terry Kubar, personal communication).

Shallow cumulus could be underestimated by CloudSat.

# <u>Part III</u>

### Vertical Diabatic Heating Structure of the MJO based on TRMM estimates and Reanalysis Datesets

Acknowledgments:

King-Fai Li, Yuk L. Yung /Caltech

**TRMM latent heating**: Wei-Kuo Tao/GSFC, Bill Olson/UMBC, Shoichi Shige/U. Kyoto

#### TRMM radiative heating: Tristan L'Ecuyer/CSU

### **Diabatic heating and MJO theories**

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### "Residual Budget Analysis" Yanai (1973)

$$C_p[\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + V \cdot \nabla T + w(\frac{RT}{pC_p} - \frac{\partial T}{\partial p})] = Q_1$$

![](_page_35_Figure_2.jpeg)

TOGA COARE (10/01/1992~02/28/1993) sounding array budgets *Lin et al. 2004.* 

Johnson et al. 1999; Kukuchi and Takayabu 2004; Kiladis et al 2005; Schumacher et al. 2007; and others.

![](_page_36_Picture_0.jpeg)

TMI, VIRS観測幅 Swath:>700km PB観測幅

### Tao et al. (2006), BAMS

# RETRIEVAL OF LATENT HEATING FROM TRMM MEASUREMENTS

by W.-K. Tao, E. A. Smith, R. F. Adler, Z. S. Haddad, A. Y. Hou, T. Iguchi, R. Kakar, T. N. Krishnamurti, C. D. Kummerow, S. Lang, R. Meneghini, K. Nakamura, T. Nakazawa, K. Okamoto, W. S. Olson, S. Satoh, S. Shige, J. Simpson, Y. Takayabu, G. J. Tripoli, and S. Yang

TRMM-based latent heating products—not long ago considered out of our technological reach—are beginning to contribute to global modeling, but the necessary retrieval algorithms produce varying results and will require further research.

$$Q_{1} = \underbrace{\frac{L_{v}}{c_{p}}(\overline{c} - \overline{e}) + \frac{L_{f}}{c_{p}}(\overline{f} - \overline{m}) + \frac{L_{s}}{c_{p}}(\overline{d} - \overline{s}) + \overline{\pi}\left(-\overline{V' \cdot \nabla \theta'} - \frac{1}{\overline{\rho}}\frac{\partial \overline{\rho}\overline{w' \theta'}}{dz}\right) + Q_{R}}{\text{phase change or "latent heating"}} \quad \text{eddy sensible heat} \quad \text{radiative heating}$$

### Dataset and approach:

**TRMM Q<sub>1</sub> estimates** 

Olson/Grecu: TMI-Based "TRAIN" Estimates Tao/Lang: PR -Based "CSH" Algorithm Shige: PR -Based "SLH" Algorithm

**TRMM Q\_R estimates:** L'Ecuyer ( $Q_R$ )

#### **Reanalysis datasets:**

ERA -Interim (Residual Budget Approach derived; u, v, w, T);NASA MERRA (Direct model output);NCEP CFS-R (Direct model output);

Period: 1998-2008 Composite Approach: Wheeler and Hendon  $RMM_1$ ,  $RMM_2$  index Amplitudes >= 1 for November to December.

![](_page_38_Figure_0.jpeg)

### Q<sub>1</sub> (10S-10N)

#### TRAIN

![](_page_39_Figure_2.jpeg)

-1.6-1.4-1.2-1-0.8-0.6-0.4-0.20.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 1.4 1.6

![](_page_39_Figure_3.jpeg)

CSH

Total TRMM (CSH) heating Q1 (10S-10N)

![](_page_39_Figure_6.jpeg)

### Q<sub>1</sub> (150-160°E; 10°S-10°N; ~ TOGA-COARE)

![](_page_40_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_3.jpeg)

# Caveats

### TRMM algorithm:

 Look-up table for TRMM estimates heavily depends on CRM which is subject to parameterization in microphysics.

### **Reanalyses:**

- Model responses to large-scale dynamical/thermodynamical forcing by cumulus parameterization module.
- Need to understand satellite vs. reanalysis differences in terms of water vapor & cloud differences.