

4<sup>th</sup> World Climate Research Programme International Conference on Reanalyses Silver Spring, MD, May 9, 2012

# Land Surface Analysis and Reanalysis at the NASA GMAO

# **Rolf Reichle**

# G. De Lannoy, C. Draper, B. Forman, R. Koster, Q. Liu, S. Mahanama, A. Toure, and many others

Global Modeling and Assimilation Office, NASA

Rolf.Reichle@nasa.gov

301-614-5693







#### **MERRA-Land**

- Motivation and data product design
- Validation

**Developments in land surface analysis** 

- Soil moisture
- Snow



#### Satellite observations









# A generic land data assimilation system





# A generic land data assimilation system

















# Outline





# **Motivation for MERRA-Land: Precipitation**

#### MERRA – GPCPv2.1



 $\rightarrow$  Correct MERRA precipitation with gauge-based precipitation observations to the extent possible.

**Reichle et al. J Clim (2011)** doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-10-05033.1



# **MERRA-Land precipitation corrections**





# **MERRA** precipitation and radiation forcing





# Land-only ("off-line") replay



# Interception loss frac. = canopy evap. / rainfall (2003-2007)



Improvement everywhere from revised interception parameters (b). Additional improvement from precipitation corrections (c).



# Latent heat flux (August 1994)











# Soil moisture validation (2002-2009)





Runoff

Validation against naturalized streamflow observations from 9 "large" and 9 "small" basins (~1989-2009).



NB: Numbering does not match figure below.



Precipitation corrections yield significantly better runoff for 3 basins. MERRA and MERRA-Land (0.5 deg) better than ERA-Interim ("1.5 deg"). Not shown: In all cases the revised interception parameters yield improved runoff anomalies (albeit not significant).



NOT

# Snow depth



MERRA and MERRA-Land have similar skill.

- Similar results for comparison vs. in situ obs. (583 stations).
- **SHOWN** Similar results for snow water equivalent (SWE).
  - Step in 1998/99 in CPCU high-lat avg precip.  $\rightarrow$  step in snow mass.



http://gmao.gsfc.nasa.gov/merra/merra-land.php





### Introduction

# **MERRA-Land**

- Motivation and data product design
- Validation

**Developments in land surface analysis** 

- Soil moisture
- Snow

# Satellite remote sensing of (surface) soil moisture



2002-2011 C/X-band passive 40 km resolution



2007-present C-band active 40 km resolution



2009-present L-band passive 40 km resolution interferometric & multi-angular



Launch: 2014 L-band active/passive 3-40 km resolution

Frequency band	Sensing depth
C/X-band	1 cm
L-band	5 cm



#### Soil moisture assimilation

Skill increases significantly through data assimilation.

Similar improvements from AMSR-E and ASCAT.

Root-zone *not* observed by satellite. Improvements may be critical for applications.

Metric: Anom. time series corr. coeff.

Anomalies ≡ mean seasonal cycle removed







# Precipitation corrections v. retrieval assimilation



Liu et al. JHM (2011) doi:10.1175/JHM-D-10-05000.

Different precipitation<sup>•</sup> forcing inputs

## Precipitation corrections v. retrieval assimilation



Precipitation corrections and retrieval assimilation contribute approximately:

- evenly and
- independently to skill improvement.

Results from single sensor per watershed (SCAN data) are consistent with those from distributed CalVal in situ sensors.



# Soil moisture assimilation



For the SMAP L4\_SM product use **brightness temperature** (radiance) assimilation.

Need **L-band** radiative transfer model (RTM).

#### L-band brightness temp.: SMOS vs. Catchment/RTM

Annual mean [K]

CMEM-EC



Model

1/1/2011 - 1/1/2012 H-pol *42.5*<sup>*o*</sup> (validation period) Literature values for parameters yield strongly biased Tb.

> RTM parameters **Prescribed:** SMAP Level2 ATBD LMEB literature SMOS-monitoring at ECMWF (CMEM-EC)

#### L-band brightness temp.: SMOS vs. Catchment/RTM

300

LMEB

Calibrated

Annual mean [K]

SMAP

CMEM-EC



Model

H-pol 1/1/2011 – 1/1/2012 (validation period)
Calibrated parameters yield mostly unbiased long-term mean Tb.

> RTM parameters Prescribed: SMAP Level2 ATBD LMEB literature SMOS-monitoring at ECMWF (CMEM-EC)

Calibrated:

From multi-angular calibration during 1/1/2010 – 1/1/2011

# L-band brightness temp.: SMOS vs. Catchment/RTM

Seasonally varying, residual biases after calibration. Need to address in assimilation system.

RFI in V-pol from Distant-Early-Warning (DEW) Line? Suppressed in H-pol through calibration?







#### Introduction

# **MERRA-Land**

- Motivation and data product design
- Validation

**Developments in land surface analysis** 

- Soil moisture
- Snow

# Assimilate AMSR-E snow water equivalent (SWE)?



## Satellite SWE retrievals not (yet) suitable for assimilation. Radiance assimilation?



# GEOS-5 vs. AMSR-E brightness temp. (18 GHz, V-pol)

Artificial Neural Network for GEOS-5 global snow model Input: Snow water equivalent, density, liquid water content, snow/air/soil *temperature*) **Output:** Tb (H-/V-pol, 10/18/36 GHz)

# Robust forward modeling of AMSR-E Tb using GEOS-5.

Forman et al. (2012), IEEE/TGARS, submitted.







# Satellite observations



- Supplemental MERRA-Land data product provides enhanced land surface reanalysis estimates (through use of precipitation observations and land model improvements).
- Land surfa (MODIS, A) Retrieval-based **soil moisture assimilation** can further improve reanalysis. Radiance-based soil moisture analysis for SMOS and SMAP requires careful calibration of radiative transfer model.



**3. Snow water equivalent** retrievals not (yet) suitable for assimilation. Developed neural network-based forward operator for radiance assimilation.



Rad

4. Other topics: Assimilation of **skin temperature, snow cover,** and **terrestrial water storage** not discussed in this presentation.

# OUTLOOK

- Focus has been on univariate, off-line assimilation. Need multivariate analysis of soil moisture, LST, snow cover, and snow water equivalent.
- (CERES, 2. We are integrating land and atmospheric assimilation to allow feedbacks in **coupled** land-atmosphere analysis system.
  - 3. Assimilate satellite-based vegetation/carbon observations.





e elevation *)* 





Carbon , *DESDynl, DIRI, LIST,* DS )



#### THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!



# Snow cover extent (SCE) v. MODIS



Larger bias in MERRA-Land snow cover extent vs. MODIS (compared to same in MERRA) due to parameter change in snow model (WEMIN).



# Land surface temperature (LST) assimilation



Assimilate ISCCP LST retrievals into two off-line land models.

Validate against in situ obs.

"Model" LST better than ISCCP.

Assimilation reduces RMSE (by up to ~0.7 K), increases anomaly R (by up to 0.05).

Model formulation impacts assimilation: Dynamic bias correction key for CLSM.

Fluxes can be MUCH worse if bias is not addressed (not shown).



Reichle et al. (2010), JHM, doi:10.1175/2010JHM1262.1.

# Assimilation of GRACE terrestrial water storage (TWS)





Zaitchik et al. (2008) J. Hydrometeorology, doi:10.1175/2007JHM951.1

# Assimilation of GRACE terrestrial water storage (TWS)



Assimilation disaggregates GRACE data into snow, soil moisture, and groundwater. Assimilation estimates of groundwater better than model estimates.

Zaitchik et al. (2008) J. Hydrometeorology, doi:10.1175/2007JHM951.1