

## Using MODIS AQUA Collection 5 data to Constrain GISS ModelE Aerosol Climatology - Preliminary Results Li Liu<sup>a,b</sup>, Andrew A. Lacis<sup>b</sup>, Dorothy Koch <sup>a,b</sup>, Barbara E. Carlson<sup>b</sup> <sup>a</sup>Columbia University, New York, NY 10025 <sup>b</sup>NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, New York, NY 10025 GCM– New aerosol fields GCM– Old aerosol fields AQUA Collection 5 ഹ °2 45° 호0.15 O 0.2 —— GCM–New aerosol fields - GCM–Old aerosol fields

# Abstract

A physically based aerosol climatology is essential to address the questions of global climate changes. The previous comparisons of the GISS ModelE aerosol with satellite and ground-based measurements [Liu et al., 2006] show that the agreement in the distributions of global optical depth between GCM aerosols and satellite data is qualitatively reasonable. However the Angstrom exponent of the GCM aerosol is clearly biased low compared to satellite data, implying that the GCM aerosol sizes are overestimated. Consequently, the aerosol size distributions specified in the latest ModelE aerosol fields provided by Koch [2006, personal communications] are reduced. In this study we compare the newly available MODIS AQUA Collection 5 Level 3 quality assured monthly averaged data available from July 2002 to July 2006 with both the old that we used in Liu et al. [2006] and the new aerosol fields [Koch, 2006, personal communication]. Compared to MODIS AQUA Collection 4 data, the aerosol optical depth distributions are improved, particularly over land. The Angstrom exponent values are significantly smaller both over land and over ocean. We also present in the study preliminary results of the improved GCM aerosol climatology using the MODIS AQUA Collection 5 retrievals as constraints.



strom exponent (bottom two panels) for MODIS AQUA Collection 5 (black curves) and Collection 4 (red curves) data.









Figure 5. Regional analysis of overall monthly mean aerosol optical depth averaged over the various aerosol regimes shown in Fig.4. Averages are computed over water surfaces (top three rows) and land areas (bottom three rows) if the designated area contains both land and water masses.

Scaling Factor for Each Aerosol Component (New Aerosol Fields)



Black Carbor



Figure 7. Scaling factor for each aerosol component to minimize JJASOND the differences in annual mean Figure 9. Seasonal dependence of overall monthly mean aerosol optical depth aerosol optical depth between the (left panel) and the relative contributions of each principle aerosol component Figure 8. Differences in annual mean aerosol optical depth between GCM new fields [Koch, 2006] and considered in the GCM [Koch, 2006] to the total AOD (right panel) over North MODIS Aqua Collection 5 data and the fitted GCM aerosol distribu-MODIS AQUA Collection 5 data. Pacific shown in Fig.4. The dotted curves present the relative contributions (times tion. The global area weighted mean is 0.0056. the scaling factors) of each principle aerosol species to the fitted GCM aerosol.

ASOND



Figure 6. As in Fig. 5, but for seasonal dependence of overall monthly mean Angstrom exponent at different places shown in Fig.4.

J F M A M J J A S O N D

.3 .6 .9 1.2 1.5 1.8 2.1 2.4 2.7



NASA

Figure 4. Regions selected for comparison of GCM aerosol climatology with MODIS AQUA data.

## Conclusions and Discussions

The GISS ModelE [Schmidt et al., 2006] aerosol optical depth reasonably agree with the newly released MODIS AQUA Collection 005 data, but the Angstrom Exponent is clearly biased low, implying that the aerosol size specified in the GCM are overestimated.

The new aerosol climatology [Koch, 2006] shows some improvements, particularly in terms of the seasonality of aerosol optical depth. But the Angstrom exponent is now too large. Increasing organic carbon size would be appropriate to start with since the bias is greatest in biomass burning regions like South Africa, South America and Sahel.

We present preliminary results of the improved aerosol optical depth distributions using the newly available MODIS AQUA Collection 5 data as constraints.

### References

Schmidt, G. A., (2006), Present-day atmospheric simulations using GISS ModelE: comparison to in-situ, satellite, and reanalysis data, J. Climate, 19, 153-192, doi: 10.1175/JCLI3612.1.

Liu, L., A. A. Lacis, B. E. Carlson, M. I. Mishchenko, and B. Cairns (2006), Assessing GISS ModelE aerosol climatology using satellite and ground-based measurements: A comparison study, J. Geophys. Res., in press.

