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Research Motivation

Is Directional LST Difference Significant?

- Affect to LST validation process
- Affect to produce climate data record
- Affect to LST applications, e.g. data assimilation for forecast model
Concept of the Directional Effect

One of directional effect described by Modified Geometric Projection Model

\[
\langle T(\theta, \phi) \rangle = \left[ \frac{1}{\langle \varepsilon(\theta, \phi) \rangle} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \varepsilon_k T_k^4 X_k (\theta, \phi) \right]^{1/4}
\]

\[
\langle \varepsilon(\theta, \phi) \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \varepsilon_k X_k (\theta, \phi)
\]

\(k=N\) endmembers

- \(X\): fraction of the cover probability
- \(\varepsilon\): emissivity of the endmember
- \(T\): temperature of the endmember

Four endmembers:
- Sunlit Crown
- Shaded Crown
- Sunlit Background
- Shaded Background
Concept of the Directional Effect
MGP Model Run Example

Examples of the surface temperature distributions and the mean emissivity distributions (solid line) along with the satellite view zenith angle. The temperature and emissivity distributions are calculated from the MGP model temperature settings, for solar zenith angle at 0, 30 and 60 degrees, respectively; the LAI value is 1.

The vegetation coverage is 60%.

The vegetation coverage is 30%.
Directional Effect Observed in AVHRR Data

Daily daytime AVHRR

- a) Land surface temperature and
- b) View zenith angle.

[Pinheiro et al., Remote Sensing of Environment, 103 (2006)]

Demonstrated LST variability is a combination of:

- a) residual atmospheric effects
- b) real aggregate temperature differences
- c) emissivity angular variability

Daytime AVHRR, LST observations, at Ghanzi, Botswana

Ghanzi (21.7 S; 21.6 E)

Ghanzi (21.7 S; 21.6 E)
**Directional Effect Observed in Geostationary Satellite Data**

GOES-8 and GOES-10 Imager data were applied in validating LST algorithm using ground data from SURFace RADiation (SURFRAD) budget network stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>Lat/Lon</th>
<th>Surface Type*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University, PA</td>
<td>40.72/77.93</td>
<td>Mixed Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bondeville, IL</td>
<td>40.05/88.37</td>
<td>Crop Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goodwin Creek, MS</td>
<td>34.25/89.87</td>
<td>Evergreen Needle Leaf Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fort Peck, MT</td>
<td>48.31/105.10</td>
<td>Grass Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td>40.13/105.24</td>
<td>Crop Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Desert Rock, NV</td>
<td>36.63/116.02</td>
<td>Open Shrub Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duration of Data: Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2001
Two-directions from GOES Satellites
Difference of LSTs observed by GOES-10 and GOES-8 imager at the same location of SURFRAD station Desert Rock, NV, 36.63°N, 116.02°W. The simultaneous observation pairs are about 2096.

View zenith of GOES-8: 60.14°
View zenith of GOES-10: 46.81°
Goodwin Creek, MS, observation pairs are about 510. View Zenith of GOES-8/-10: 42.68°/61.89°
LST Directional Effect in GOES-8 and -10 Imager (3)

Boulder, CO, observation pairs are about 510. View Zenith of GOES-8/-10: 42.68°/61.89°
LST Directional Effect in GOES-8 and -10 Imager (4)

Bondville, IL. Data pairs: 710

- View Zenith of GOES-8: 48.12°
- View Zenith of GOES-10: 66.14°

Fort Peck, MT. Data pairs: 912

- View Zenith of GOES-8: 62.42°
- View Zenith of GOES-10: 62.36°

Note the difference of the two sites
Summary

- LST directional effect were observed from Polar-orbiting satellite data (NOAA/AVHRR) and Goestationary satellite data (GOES/Imager)
- LST difference due to the viewing angle difference changes diurnally; the effect during daytime is considerably bigger than that is during nighttime.
- The satellite LST uncertainty due to the directional effect is considerably larger comparing to the requirement, and cannot be ignored (particularly during the daytime).
- VIIRS/LST should provide correction/complimentary information on it after the launch (do work from now).
Possible Solution?

Different satellite observations over common areas can be calibrated each other for the data consistency.

Sample of common area observed by GOES-E, GOES-W and POES satellites. LSTs derived from those satellite data will be used to develop an unified LST algorithm.
• Back-ups
Goodwin Creek
Desert Rock
Boulder
WE CAN TRY TO USE NIGHTTIME OBSERVATION TO EVALUATE SYSTEMATIC ERRORS IN LST

Mean differences $\Delta_{i,j}$ between nighttime observed LST.

Let us consider that nighttime LST observation at five selected SURFRAD stations is unbiased. In such assumption all GOES-8 observed LST should be corrected by adding constant bias $\sim 1.0$ $^\circ$C, and all GOES-10 observed LST should be corrected by adding constant bias $\sim 1.3$ $^\circ$C. This table will be recomputed!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURFRAD Network</th>
<th>Systematic Differences, $\Delta_{i,j}$, $^\circ$C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station Name</td>
<td>$\text{GOES } -8 - \text{SURFRAD}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin Creek, MS</td>
<td>$\Delta_{2,1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Rock, NV</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondville, IL</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Peck, MT</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>