

Daytime Variation of Shortwave Direct Radiative Forcing of Biomass Burning Aerosols
from GOES-8 Imager

Sundar A. Christopher and Jianglong Zhang
University of Alabama in Huntsville
Huntsville, AL

Submitted to
Journal of Atmospheric Sciences
Global Aerosol Climatology Project- Special Issue
December 15, 2000.

Revised version submitted on April 12, 2001

Corresponding Author:

Sundar A. Christopher
Department of Atmospheric Science
University of Alabama in Huntsville
320 Spark man Drive
Huntsville, AL 35805
sundar@nsstc.uah.edu
(256) 961-7872

1 ABSTRACT

2 Hourly GOES-8 imager data (1344UTC-1944 UTC) from July 20-August 31,
3 1998 were used to study the daytime variation of shortwave direct radiative forcing
4 (SWARF) of smoke aerosols over biomass burning regions in South America (4-16 S,
5 51-65 W). Vicarious calibration procedures were used to adjust the GOES visible channel
6 reflectance values for the degradation in signal response. Using Mie theory and Discrete
7 Ordinate Radiative transfer (DISORT) calculations; smoke aerosol optical thickness
8 (AOT) was estimated at 0.67 μm . The GOES retrieved AOT was then compared against
9 ground-based AOT retrieved values. Using the retrieved GOES 8 AOT, a four-stream
10 broadband radiative transfer model was used to compute shortwave fluxes for smoke
11 aerosols at the top of atmosphere (TOA). The daytime variation of smoke AOT and
12 shortwave aerosol radiative forcing (SWARF) was examined for the study area. For
13 selected days, the Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) TOA SW
14 fluxes are compared against the model derived SW fluxes.

15 Our results show that the GOES derived AOT is in excellent agreement with
16 AERONET derived AOT values with linear correlation coefficient of 0.97. The TOA
17 CERES estimated SW fluxes compare well with the model calculated SW fluxes with
18 linear correlation coefficient of 0.94. The daytime diurnally averaged AOT and SWARF
19 for the study area is 0.63 ± 0.39 and $-45.8 \pm 18.8 \text{Wm}^{-2}$ respectively. This is among the first
20 studies to estimate the daytime diurnal variation of SWARF of smoke aerosols using
21 satellite data.

22

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Atmospheric aerosol particles perturb the radiative balance of the earth-
3 atmosphere system through two different mechanisms. Through the direct effect (e.g.
4 Penner et al. 1992) they scatter the incoming solar radiation thereby “cooling” the earth’s
5 surface, while through the indirect effect they modify the shortwave reflective properties
6 of clouds (e.g. Kaufman and Nakajima 1993) thereby increase the lifetime of clouds and
7 suppressing drizzle formation. Due to their absorptive nature, smoke aerosols could also
8 warm the atmosphere could lead to changes in atmospheric circulation. The direct
9 radiative forcing of anthropogenic aerosols from sulfates, fossil fuel soot and organic
10 aerosols range from -0.25 to -1.0 Wm^{-2} while the indirect radiative forcing estimates
11 range from 0 to -1.5 Wm^{-2} . The radiative forcing of greenhouse gases on the other hand
12 range from $+2.1$ to $+2.8 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ (Houghton et al. 1996). These estimates show that the
13 magnitudes of aerosol radiative forcing are almost equal to those of greenhouse gases but
14 opposite in sign. However, considerable uncertainties exist in the estimates of aerosol
15 radiative forcing due to their diverse chemical composition, microphysical properties and
16 short residence times in the atmosphere.

17 Biomass burning in the tropics accounts for more than 114 Teragrams of smoke
18 (Hao and Liu 1994) and has a significant radiative impact on regional (Christopher et al.
19 2000a; Kaufman and Nakajima 1993; Kaufman et al. 1998) and global climate (Penner
20 et al. 1992; Hansen et al. 1997). Biomass burning is used to clear extensive areas of the
21 forests and savannas for agricultural purposes and to accommodate the needs of the
22 expanding population (Andreae 1991). The permanent removal of forests is replaced with

1 grazing or cropland, while the land cleared for agricultural purposes is primarily used for
2 shifting agriculture.

3 Most satellite remote sensing studies have used polar orbiting platforms to
4 examine the radiative effects of aerosols (e.g. Christopher et al. 1996,1998, 2000a; Hsu et
5 al. 2000). The major goal of this paper is to examine the daytime variation of direct
6 shortwave radiative forcing (SWARF) of biomass burning aerosols at the TOA using the
7 new generation of high spatial and temporal resolution GOES-8 imager. Biomass burning
8 aerosols are first identified using a simple multi-spectral thresholding algorithm from the
9 GOES 8 imager. Using Mie and Discrete Ordinate Radiative Transfer (DISORT)
10 calculations, smoke aerosol optical thickness (AOT) is retrieved from the GOES 8 visible
11 channel reflectances. The GOES retrieved AOT is compared against ground-based
12 sunphotometer AOT values. These GOES 8 AOT values are then used in a four-stream
13 broadband radiative transfer model to estimate the shortwave flux at the TOA for
14 biomass burning aerosols. The SW flux in biomass burning regions from model
15 calculations are then compared against broadband SW flux values from the Clouds and
16 the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) data. The shortwave fluxes over clear and
17 aerosol regions are used to estimate shortwave aerosol radiative forcing (SWARF). The
18 daytime direct SWARF forcing of biomass burning aerosols is then computed for the
19 entire study area. This study is specifically focused upon the direct SWARF of biomass
20 burning aerosols. The effect of smoke in modifying cloud properties and reflectance is
21 not considered.

22

23

1 **2. Data**

2 Hourly GOES-8 data from July 20-August 31, 1998 between 4-16 S and 51-65 W
3 were used. The GOES-8 imager has five channels centered at 0.67 ($\rho_{0.67}$), 3.9 ($T_{3.9}$), 6.8,
4 10.7 ($T_{10.7}$), 11.8 ($T_{11.8}$) μm where ρ and T denote reflectivity and temperature
5 respectively. Channel 3 that is sensitive to mid-tropospheric water vapor is not used.
6 Since the 3.9 μm channel has an emitted and reflected component, a sixth channel which
7 is the reflected portion of channel 3 ($\rho_{3.9}$) is estimated by removing the thermal emission
8 using the 10.7 μm channel (Greenwald and Christopher 2000). This $\rho_{3.9}$ information is
9 useful in separating for smoke aerosols from low level water clouds (Kaufman and Fraser
10 1997; Christopher et al. 2000a). The sampled sub point spatial resolution of channel 1 is
11 0.57 x 1 km and for the other channels is 2.3 x 4.0 km (Menzel and Purdom 1994). The
12 visible channel was sub sampled to match the resolution of the IR channels.

13 Channel 1 of the GOES-8 imager was not designed for long-term accurate
14 radiometry and thus has no onboard calibration. However, other GOES channels have
15 onboard calibration. Although, all channels of the GOES imagers undergo extensive
16 calibration testing prior to launch (Weinreb et al. 1997), only the infrared channels (2-5)
17 have onboard calibration. A lack of onboard calibration for the visible channel makes the
18 reliable retrieval of aerosol optical depth more difficult because calibration errors are one
19 of the largest sources of uncertainty in estimating visible optical depth from satellite
20 radiance measurements (Pincus et al. 1997). However, using vicarious calibration
21 methods GOES data has been used to successfully perform cloud (Greenwald and
22 Christopher 1999, 2000; Greenwald et al. 1997) and aerosol optical thickness retrievals
23 (Zhang et al. 2001).

1 There have been several recent attempts to assess and monitor the visible channel
2 calibration through vicarious means (Bremer et al. 1998; Rao et al. 1999; Nguyen et al.
3 1999). These studies all report that the GOES-8 imager have undergone signal
4 degradation due to the accumulation of material on the scanning mirror (Ellrod et al.
5 1998). The GOES-8 imager visible channel also suffered an unexpected drop of about 9%
6 in signal response soon after launch (Ellrod et al. 1998). Based on GOES imager
7 measurements of clear ocean scenes, Knapp and Vonder Haar (2000) have estimated this
8 initial drop in response to be about 7.6%. The subsequent rate of degradation for the
9 GOES-8 imager visible channel has been estimated to be about 5.6% per year (from
10 August 1995-August 1999) that is consistent with a simple GOES-8/-9 intercalibration
11 test used by Greenwald et al. (1997). Therefore, in this study we account for the
12 degradation of the GOES-8 visible channel using the methodology described by Knapp
13 and Vonder Haar (2000) that is similar to the method employed by Fraser and Kaufman
14 (1986).

15 The GOES-8 AOT retrievals were compared against ground-based AOT values from
16 the Aerosol Robotic Network (AERONET) (Holben et al. 1998). The sunphotometer
17 radiances were measured at 340 nm, 380 nm, 440 nm, 500 nm, 670 nm, 870 nm, and
18 1020 nm and converted to AOT at these 7 wavelengths. The AOT values used in this
19 paper are obtained after a careful cloud screening process as described in Holben et al.
20 (1998) and the uncertainty in ground-based AOT values is on the order of 0.01 (Smirnov
21 et al. 2000).

22 The Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) scanner TOA flux
23 values from the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM) platform (Kummerow et

1 al. 1998) are used to compare against the model-derived values. The CERES is a
2 broadband instrument (Wielicki et al. 1996) that measures the TOA radiance in three
3 bands (0.3 to $> 50 \mu\text{m}$, $0.3 - 5 \mu\text{m}$, $8-12 \mu\text{m}$) at a spatial resolution of about 20 km at
4 nadir. The measured broadband radiances are converted to fluxes using angular
5 dependence models (ADM's) (Wielicki and Green 1989) that were developed as part of
6 the ERBE program. In previous research the CERES SW flux values have been used to
7 estimate the SWARF of biomass burning aerosols over Central America (Christopher et
8 al. 2000a).

9 Figure 1 (a-f) shows the area of study and is an example of GOES channel 1
10 images from 1445-1945 UTC. The two sites in Bolivia, Los Fieros and Concepcion, were
11 sunphotometer measurements were available during 1998 are also shown. No AERONET
12 measurements were available in Brazil during 1998 where the majority of biomass
13 burning takes place (Prins et al. 1998; Christopher et al. 1998). Smoke aerosols are
14 clearly visible in these images throughout the day and clouds are primarily in the northern
15 portion of the image.

16

17 **3. Method and Results**

18 3.1 Smoke aerosol detection using the GOES-8 imager

19 Each GOES 8 imager pixel is classified into one of three categories; smoke
20 aerosols, clouds and clear sky. Clear sky denotes areas where clouds and smoke aerosols
21 are absent. The basic idea is to obtain clear sky (or background values) for each time
22 period. Then smoke and cloudy pixels are identified if the measured values are greater
23 than the background values by a certain threshold. The background values are obtained

1 for each time period by assuming that the lowest channel 1 reflectances ($\rho_{0.63 \text{ clear}}$) over
 2 the study period corresponds to clear sky values. Similarly clear sky values for the
 3 reflectance portion of channel 2 ($\rho_{3.9 \text{ clear}}$) is obtained. The clear sky values are obtained
 4 from July when biomass burning is less prevalent over South America (Prins et al. 1998;
 5 Holben et al. 1996, Zhang et al. 2001). Although background optical depths are not zero,
 6 the lowest channel 1 reflectance for each time period during July provides the best chance
 7 for obtaining cloud and smoke free background values. Clear sky values for channel 4
 8 ($T_{10.7 \text{ clear}}$) are obtained by averaging the channel 4 pixels that are identified if the channel
 9 1 albedo is within ± 0.02 of the channel 1 background value and if the standard deviation
 10 of a 3×3 box is less than 2K. Then all clouds with cloud top temperatures colder than
 11 273K and with channel 1 reflectances greater than 35% are removed ($\rho_{0.63} > 0.35$ and T
 12 $_{10.7} < 273\text{K}$). This leaves the image with smoke aerosols and clouds with cloud top
 13 temperatures warmer than 273K. Clouds are now separated from smoke aerosols by using
 14 the $\rho_{3.9}$ information. Smoke aerosols due to their small sizes are nearly transparent at
 15 these wavelengths (Kaufman and Nakajima 1993; Christopher et al. 2000a) whereas
 16 clouds with water droplets scatter the incoming solar radiation based on their particle size
 17 (Greenwald and Christopher 2000). Further cloud screening is done if the following
 18 criteria are satisfied: $(\rho_{0.63} - \rho_{0.63 \text{ clear}}) > 0.05$ and $(\rho_{3.9} - \rho_{3.9 \text{ clear}}) > 0.03$ and $(T_{10.7} - T_{10.7 \text{ clear}}$
 19 $> 10\text{K})$. The first criteria identify pixels as cloudy if the difference between the clear and
 20 measured channel 1 reflectance is greater than 5%. The second threshold assumes that for
 21 cloudy pixels, water clouds have a difference in channel 2 reflectivity between measured
 22 and clear sky values of 3%. Since smoke aerosols are nearly transparent in channel 2, this
 23 criterion enables for separation between smoke and cloudy regions (Christopher et al.

1 2000a). We inspected the quality of the smoke identification method by examining the
2 images visually. The results of the smoke identification method are discussed in section
3 3. The algorithm is well suited to distinguish smoke aerosols from clear and cloudy
4 regions when AOT is high ($AOT > 0.2$). However cloud edges and optically thin aerosols
5 pose problems.

6

7 3.2 Aerosol optical thickness retrieval using the GOES-8 imager.

8 A discrete ordinate radiative transfer (DISORT) model (Ricchiuzzi et al. 1998) is
9 used to pre-calculate the satellite measured spectral radiance as a function of aerosol
10 optical depth, sun-satellite viewing geometry and surface albedo (Zhang et al. 2001). A
11 tropical atmospheric profile of pressure, temperature, water vapor and ozone density is
12 used (McClatchey et al. 1972). Therefore for a given satellite visible channel radiance
13 and known sun-satellite view geometry an AOT value can be obtained from pre-
14 computed tables. However, this method requires knowledge of aerosol properties such as
15 aerosol size distribution and refractive index.

16 In this study, smoke aerosols were characterized as spheres that are well
17 supported by previous studies (Martins et al. 1998). Therefore Mie calculations were
18 performed to obtain the scattering and absorbing properties of aerosols. The biomass
19 burning aerosols are characterized as an internal mixture of black carbon core surrounded
20 by an organic shell (Ross et al. 1998; Zhang et al. 2001). A lognormal size distribution is
21 assumed with an average volume mean diameter of $0.3 \mu\text{m}$ and a standard deviation of
22 1.8 (Reid et al. 1998). The densities of the black carbon core and the organic shell were
23 assigned values of 1.8 gcm^{-3} and 1.2 gcm^{-3} respectively (Ross et al. 1998). The real part

1 of the refractive index for the organic shell was assumed to be 1.5 (Reid et al. 1998). The
2 real and imaginary part of the refractive index of the black carbon core is assumed to be
3 $1.63-0.48i$ (Chang and Charamampoulos 1990). Assuming a mass fraction of the black
4 carbon core to be 4.5% yielded a single scattering albedo (ω_0) of 0.90 (Zhang et al.
5 2001). Recent studies have shown that a ω_0 value of 0.90 at 0.67 μm provides the best fit
6 between satellite derived and AERONET derived AOT values (Zhang et al. 2001; Chu et
7 al. 1998). However, retrieval of AOT from satellite measurements is sensitive to single
8 scattering albedo assumptions (Fraser et al. 1984; Chu et al. 1998; Zhang et al. 2001).
9 Zhang et al. (2001) provides a complete description of the methodology and the
10 sensitivity of AOT retrievals due to uncertainties in ω_0 and surface albedo values.

11 Figure 2 shows the comparison between the GOES 8 and sunphotometer derived
12 AOT values for two sites, Los Fieros and Concepcion, in Bolivia during the 1998
13 biomass-burning season. A 3×3 box surrounding the two sites was used from the GOES 8
14 data to account for navigational and registration uncertainties. Only data within ± 15
15 minutes of each instrument (GOES 8 and sunphotometer) was used. The standard
16 deviation in time (along ordinate) and space (abscissa) is also indicated. There is
17 excellent agreement between the two independent methods of retrieving AOT with
18 correlation coefficient of 0.97. The mean AOT values from GOES-8 and AERONET
19 were 0.40 ± 0.41 and 0.45 ± 0.44 respectively. These results show that for point
20 measurements, the satellite retrieved AOT values are in good agreement with AOT
21 values obtained from ground-based measurements.

22

23

1 3.3 Calculation of shortwave flux (SW) using a four-stream model.

2 A delta-four-stream plane-parallel broadband radiative transfer model (Fu and
3 Liou 1993) was modified to compute TOA SW flux values for biomass burning aerosols
4 (Christopher et al. 2000b; Li et al. 2000). This model has been used to compute TOA
5 (Reid et al. 1999; Christopher et al. 2000b, Li et al. 2000) and surface SW flux values
6 (Christopher et al. 2000b) in biomass burning regions. The TOA SW flux is the ratio of
7 the reflected to the incoming solar radiation (adjusted for the earth-sun distance)
8 normalized by the solar zenith angle. The calculated downward SW irradiance values are
9 in good agreement with measured pyranometer values when information about aerosol
10 properties is available (Christopher et al. 2000b). The delta-four-stream approach agrees
11 with adding-doubling calculations to within 5% for fluxes and is an improvement over
12 the two-stream approach (Liou et al. 1988). In this model, the correlated-k distribution is
13 used for gaseous absorption and emission. The gases considered in the model include
14 H₂O, CO₂, O₃, O₂, CH₄, and N₂O. The radiative effects of Rayleigh scattering, liquid
15 water droplets, ice crystal, continuum absorption of H₂O, and surface albedo are
16 considered. The shortwave (SW) spectrum (0.2-4.0 μm) is divided into 6 bands: 0.2 - 0.7
17 μm, 0.7 - 1.3 μm, 1.3 - 1.9 μm, 1.9 - 2.5 μm, 2.5 - 3.5 μm, and 3.5 - 4.0 μm. For the
18 principal atmospheric gases, the four-stream approach matches line-by-line simulations
19 of fluxes to within 0.05% for SW calculations. See Christopher et al. (2000b) for a
20 complete description of the model and sensitivity results. When calculating the SW flux,
21 the SZA for each GOES-8 pixel is used. The wavelength dependence of single scattering
22 albedo and asymmetry parameter is from Christopher et al (2000b, Figure 2) and surface

1 albedos are from Li et al. (2000) where the surface spectral albedo is specified according
2 to ecosystem type.

3 Figure 4 shows the spatial distribution of AOT, SW flux and SW forcing for four
4 time periods (1344, 1544, 1744, 1944 UTC) for August 28, 1998 over the area of study.
5 Panels (a-d) show the smoke AOT for 1344, 1444, 1544 and 1744 respectively. Panels (e-
6 h) are the corresponding SW flux values and Panels (i-l) are the SWARF values for the
7 area. Note that the color-coding is different for each parameter to highlight the features of
8 interest. Clouds are shown in white in each panel. The corresponding GOES channel 1
9 images can be seen in Figure 2. A comparison of figures 4a-d shows that the high AOT
10 values are in Brazil, northeast of the two sunphotometer sites in Bolivia, that is an active
11 biomass-burning region (Prins et al.1998; Christopher et al. 1998). The highest AOT
12 values (2.5-3) are found during 1344 UTC over major biomass burning areas with smaller
13 values towards the end of the day (1944 UTC). Downwind from these major biomass-
14 burning areas in Brazil, AOT values are smaller (< 1.0) in Bolivia. The corresponding
15 SW fluxes computed from the four-stream over the large AOT values are around 200
16 Wm^{-2} . The SW flux values decrease towards the end of the day (Fig. 4h). The mean AOT
17 for the four time periods are 0.99 ± 0.48 , 0.89 ± 0.39 , 0.82 ± 0.37 and 0.68 ± 0.30 respectively.
18 The corresponding SW flux values are 214.4 ± 21.1 , 220.5 ± 21.5 , 211.1 ± 20.7 , and
19 168.4 ± 18.3 respectively. These SW flux values for biomass burning aerosols compare
20 well with satellite-derived values from previous research (Christopher et al. 1998;
21 Christopher et al. 2000a). The SWARF is defined as $S_0(\alpha_{\text{clr}} - \alpha_{\text{aer}})$, where α_{clr} and α_{aer}
22 refers to clear and aerosol sky albedos respectively and S_0 refers to the solar constant
23 adjusted for earth-sun distance and solar zenith angle (Christopher et al. 2000a). The

1 SWARF is obtained only for cloud free regions and the mean SWARF values from Fig
2 4(i-1) are -63.2 ± 21.2 , -54.8 ± 20.2 , -55.8 ± 19.5 , -55.0 ± 14.3 respectively.

3 To check the consistency of the model calculated TOA fluxes, we used the
4 CERES data from the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM) platform for
5 August 28, 1998 at 1848 UTC. The GOES 8 data were reduced to a spatial resolution of 4
6 km and the nominal spatial resolution at nadir of the CERES instrument is about 30 km
7 (Kummerow et al. 1998). The CERES reports latitude, longitude values at the TOA
8 (roughly 20 km). We therefore calculated the latitude, longitude values at the surface and
9 spatial collocation between GOES 8 and CERES was performed using the point-spread
10 function of the CERES scanner (Wielicki et al. 1996). The GOES 8 smoke identification
11 method was used to determine if the CERES pixel was completely filled with smoke. The
12 SW flux values for these smoke pixels were then used to compare against the model-
13 calculated fluxes (Figure 4). There is excellent agreement between the CERES derived
14 SW fluxes and model calculated fluxes (Linear correlation coefficient, $R = 0.94$). The
15 histograms for the model and CERES derived fluxes are also shown. The mean and
16 standard deviation of the SW fluxes for the model-calculated and CERES derived values
17 are 170.4 ± 33.1 and 163.0 ± 40.2 respectively.

18 Using the GOES retrieved AOT, we examined the diurnal variation of the direct
19 SWARF and AOT for the study area. Figure 5a shows the daytime diurnally averaged
20 SWARF and AOT for biomass burning aerosols over the period of study. Also shown are
21 the percentage coverage of smoke, clear and clouds with $T_{10.7} > 273\text{K}$. The AOT is quite
22 uniform except for 1444 UTC and the SWARF closely follows the AOT trend. The
23 diurnal variation of AOT is not necessarily a function of peak fire activities (Prins et al.

1 1998) due to synoptic conditions and cloud cover. Table 1 is a summary of the results
2 from August 1998. The SWARF changes from -40 to -49 Wm^{-2} from 1344-1944 UTC
3 with an average value of $-45.8 \pm 18.8 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$. The mean AOT value over all time periods is
4 0.63 ± 0.39 . The SWARF values are large due to the large AOT and the persistent smoke
5 coverage during August 1998. The average smoke coverage was about 60%. The
6 percentage of clouds of cloud top temperatures greater than 273K was about 23%. Also
7 shown in Table 1 are mean and standard deviation values for each class and for each time
8 period and the number of images used. The daytime diurnally averaged mean clear sky
9 channel 1 reflectance was $9.5 \pm 1.9 \%$ and the smoke $\rho_{0.63}$ was $12.7 \pm 2.8\%$. Clouds with
10 $T_{10.7} > 273\text{K}$ had channel 1 reflectances on the order of $24.9 \pm 14.1\%$. The $\rho_{3.9}$ values for
11 smoke aerosols are less than that of clouds due to their small particle sizes. Figure 5b
12 shows the SWARF as a function of AOT for the seven different time periods. A linear fit
13 to the points is also shown for each time and the mean value is also indicated by the thick
14 line. The diurnally averaged SWARF is related to AOT as: $\text{SWARF} = -20.18 -$
15 $44.44 \times \text{AOT}(\text{at } 0.67 \mu\text{m})$. The mean SWARF per unit AOT is -64.6 Wm^{-2} .

16

17 **4. Summary**

18 This study is among the first to estimate the daytime diurnal variation of smoke
19 AOT and SWARF over biomass burning regions using GOES 8 imager data. Using
20 GOES 8 retrieved AOT values; a broadband radiative transfer model is used to compute
21 SWARF as a function of four major ecosystems in South America during August 1998.
22 The GOES 8 AOT values compare well against AERONET AOT values (linear
23 correlation coefficient = 0.97). The broadband SW flux values from the model are also in

1 excellent agreement with SW flux values estimated from the CERES broadband scanner
2 measurements (linear correlation coefficient = 0.94). The daytime diurnal variation of the
3 SWARF for August 1998 for the entire study region is $-45.8 \pm 18.8 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$. This study has
4 addressed only the direct radiative forcing of biomass burning aerosols. The GOES data
5 with its high temporal and spatial resolution could also be used to examine the impact of
6 smoke aerosols on cloud properties such as cloud optical depth and particle size.

7

8 **References**

- 9 Andreae, M. O., 1991: Biomass burning: Its history, use, and its distribution and its
10 impact on environmental quality and global climate. *In Global Biomass Burning*,
11 J. S. Levine, ed., 1-2.
- 12 Bremer, J. C., J. G. Baucom, H. Vu, M. P. Weinreb, and N. Pinkine, 1998: Estimation of
13 long-term throughput degradation of GOES-8 and -9 visible channels by
14 statistical analysis of star measurements. *Conference on Earth Observing Systems*
15 *III*, W. L. Barnes, Ed.
- 16 Chang, H and T.T. Charalampopoulos, 1990: Determination of the wavelength
17 dependence of refractive indices of flame soot. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.*, **430**,577-591.
- 18 Christopher, S. A., D. V. Kliche, J. Chou, and R. M. Welch, 1996: First estimates of the
19 radiative forcing of aerosols generated from biomass burning using satellite data.
20 *J. Geophys. Res.*, **101**, D16, 21265-21273.
- 21 Christopher, S. A., M. Wang, T. A. Berendes, R. M. Welch, and S.K. Yang, 1998: The

- 1 1985 Biomass Burning Season in South America: Satellite Remote Sensing of
2 Fires, Smoke and Regional Radiative Energy Budgets. *J. Appl. Meteor.*, **37**, 661-
3 678.
- 4 Christopher, S.A., J. Chou, J. Zhang, X. Li and R.M. Welch, 2000a: Shortwave Direct
5 Radiative Forcing of Biomass Burning Aerosols Estimated From VIRS and
6 CERES. *Geophys. Res. Letters*, **27**, 2197-2200.
- 7 Christopher, S.A., X. Li, R.M. Welch, P.V. Hobbs, J.S. Reid, and T. F. Eck, 2000b:
8 Estimation of Downward and top-of-atmosphere Shortwave Irradiances in
9 Biomass Burning Regions during SCAR-B. *J. Appl. Meteorology*, **39**, 1742-1753.
- 10 Chu, D.A., Y.J. Kaufman, L.A. Remer, and B.N. Holben, 1998: Remote sensing of
11 smoke from MODIS airborne simulator during the SCAR-B experiment. *J.*
12 *Geophys. Res.*, **103**, 31,979-31,987.
- 13 Ellrod, G.P., R.V. Achutnui, J.M. Daniels, E.M. Prins, and J.P. Nelson III, 1998: An
14 assessment of GOES-8 imager data quality. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **78**, 1971-
15 1983.
- 16 Fraser, R. S., Y. J. Kaufman, and R. L. Mahoney, 1984: Satellite measurements of
17 aerosol mass and transport. *Atmos. Environment*, **18**, 2577-2584.
- 18 Fraser, R. S., and Y. J. Kaufman, 1986: Calibration of satellite sensors after launch. *Appl.*
19 *Optics.*, **25**, 1177-1185.
- 20 Fu, Q., and K. N. Liou, 1993: Parameterization of the radiative properties of cirrus
21 clouds. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **50**, 2008-2025.
- 22 Greenwald, T.J., S.A. Christopher, and J. Chou, 1997: Cloud liquid water path
23 comparisons from passive microwave and solar reflectance satellite

- 1 measurements: Assessment of sub-field-of-view cloud effects in microwave
2 retrievals. *J. Geophys. Res.* **102**, 19585-19597.
- 3 Greenwald T.J., and S.A. Christopher, 1999: Daytime variation of Marine Stratocumulus
4 Properties as observed from Geostationary Satellite. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **26**,
5 1723-1726.
- 6 Greenwald, T. J., and S. A. Christopher, 2000: The GOES-IM Imagers: New Tools for
7 studying the microphysical properties of boundary layers clouds. *Bulletin of*
8 *Amer. Meteorol. Soc.*, **81**, 2607-2620.
- 9 Hao, W. M., and M-H. Liu, 1994: Spatial and temporal distribution of biomass burning.
10 *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, **8**, 495-503.
- 11 Hansen, J., M. Sato, A. Lacis and R. Ruedy, 1997: The missing climate force. *Phil.*
12 *Trans. R. Soc. Lond.*, **352**, 231-240.
- 13 Holben, B. N., A. Setzer, T. F. Eck, A. Pereira, and I. Slutsker, 1996: Effect of dry-
14 season biomass burning on Amazon basin aerosol concentrations and optical
15 properties, 1992-1994. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **101**, 19465-19481.
- 16 Holben, B. N., T. F. Eck, I.Slutsker, D.Tanre, J.P.Buis, A.Setzer, E.Vermote, J.A.Reagan,
17 Y.J.Kaufman, T.Nakajima, F.Lavenu, I.Jankowiak, A.Smirnov, 1998: AERONET
18 - A Federated Instrument Network and Data Archive for Aerosol
19 Characterization. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, **66**, 1-16.
- 20 Houghton, J. T., L. G. Meira Filho, B. A. Callander, N. Harris, A. Kattenberg, and K.
21 Maskell, Eds., 1996: *Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change*.
22 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, 572 pp.

- 1 Hsu, C. N., J. R. Herman, and C. Weaver, 2000: Determination of radiative forcing of
2 Saharan dust using combined TOMS and ERBE data. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 2069-
3 20661.
- 4 Kaufman, Y. J., and T. Nakajima, 1993: Effect of Amazon smoke on cloud microphysics
5 and albedo. *J. Appl. Meteor.*, **32**, 729-744.
- 6 Kaufman, Y.J., and R.S. Fraser, 1997: Confirmation of the smoke particles effect on
7 cloud and climate. *Science*, **277**, 1636-1639.
- 8 Kaufman, Y. J., P. V. Hobbs, V. W. J. H. Kirchoff, P. Artaxo, L. A. Remer, B. N.
9 Holben, M. D. King, E. M. Prins, D. E. Ward, K. M. Longo, L. F. Mattos, C. A.
10 Nobre, J. D. Spinhirne, Q. Ji, A. M. Thompson, J. F. Gleason, and S.A.
11 Christopher, and S.C. Tsay, 1998: The Smoke, Clouds, and Radiation Experiment
12 in Brazil (SCAR-B). *J. Geophys. Res.*, **103**, 31783-31808.
- 13 Knapp and Vonder Haar, 2000: Calibration of the eighth Geostationary Operational
14 Environmental Satellite (GOES-8) Imager Visible Sensor. *J. Atmos. Oceanic
15 Tech.*, **17**, 1639-1644.
- 16 Kummerow, C., W. Barnes, T. Kozu, J. Shiue, and J. Simpson, 1998: The Tropical
17 Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM) Sensor Package. *J. Atmos. Oceanic Tech.*,
18 **15**, 809-817.
- 19 Li, X., S.A. Christopher, J. Chou, and R.M. Welch, 2000: Estimation of shortwave direct
20 radiative forcing of biomass burning aerosols using angular dependence models.
21 *J. Appl. Meteor.*, **39**, 2278-2291.

- 1 Liou, K. N., Q. Fu, and T. P. Ackerman, 1988: A simple formulation of the delta-four
2 stream approximation for radiative transfer parameterizations. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **45**,
3 1940-1988.
- 4 Martins, J. V., P. V. Hobbs, R. E. Weiss, P. Artaxo, 1998: Sphericity and morphology of
5 smoke particles from biomass burning in Brazil. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **103**, 32,051-
6 32,058.
- 7 McClatchey, R.A. R. W. Fenn, J.E. A. Selby, F. E. Volz, J. S. Garing, 1972: Optical
8 properties of the atmosphere. *Rep. AFCRL-72-0497*-Air Force Cambridge
9 Research Lab, Bedford, Massachussets.
- 10 Menzel, W. P., and J. F. W. Purdom, 1994: Introducing GOES-I: The first of a new
11 generation of Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellites. *Bull. Am.*
12 *Meteorol. Soc.*, **75**, 757-781.
- 13 Nguyen, L., P. Minnis, J. K. Ayers, W. L. Smith, Jr., and Shu-Peng Ho, 1999:
14 Intercalibration of geostationary and polar satellite imager data using AVHRR,
15 VIRS, and ASTR-2 data. *10th Conference on Atmospheric Radiation*, Madison,
16 WI.
- 17 Penner, J.E., R.E. Dickinson, and C.A. O'Neill, 1992: Effects of aerosol from biomass
18 burning on the global radiation budget. *Science*, **256**, 1432-1434.
- 19 Pincus, R., M. A. Baker, C. S. Bretherton, 1997: What controls stratocumulus radiative
20 properties? Lagrangian observations of cloud evolution. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **54**, 2215-
21 2236.

- 1 Prins, E. M., J. M. Feltz, W. P. Menzel, D. E. Ward, 1998: An overview of GOES-8
2 Diurnal Fire and Smoke Results for SCAR-B and the 1995 Fire Season in South
3 America. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **103**, 31821-31,836.
- 4 Rao, C.R.N., J. Chen, and N. Zhang, 1999: Calibration of the visible channel of the
5 GOES imager using the advanced very high resolution radiometer, *10th*
6 *Conference on Atmospheric Radiation*, Madison, WI.
- 7 Reid, J. S., P. V. Hobbs, R. J. Ferek, D. R. Blake, J. V. Martins, M. R. Dunlap, and C.
8 Liousse, 1998: Physical, chemical and optical properties of regional hazes
9 dominated by smoke in Brazil. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **103**, 32,059-32,080.
- 10 Reid, J.S., T. Eck, S.A. Christopher, B. Holben, and P. Hobbs, 1999: Use of the
11 Angstrom Exponent to Estimate the Variability of Optical and Physical Properties
12 of Aging Smoke Particles in Brazil. *J. Geophys. Res.* **104** ,27,473-27490.
- 13 Ricchiazzi, P., S. Yang, C. Gautier, D. Sowle, 1998: SBDART: A Research and Teaching
14 Software Tool for Plane-Parallel Radiative Transfer in the Earth's Atmosphere,
15 *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **79**, 2101-2114.
- 16 Ross, J. L., P.V. Hobbs, and B. N. Holben, 1998: Radiative characteristics of
17 regional hazes dominated by smoke from biomass burning in Brazil: Closure
18 tests and direct radiative forcing. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **103**, 31925-31942.
- 19 Smirnov, A., B.N. Holben, T.F. Eck, O. Dubovik and I. Slutsker, 2000: Cloud screening
20 and quality control algorithms for the AERONET database. *Rem. Sensing*
21 *Environ.*, **73**, 337-349.

- 1 Weinreb, M. P., M. Jamison, N. Fulton, Y. Chen, J. X. Johnson, J. Bremer, C. Smith, and
2 J. Baucum, 1997: Operational calibration of Geostationary Operational
3 Environmental Satellite 8 and 9 imagers and sounders. *Appl. Opt.*, **36**, 6895-6904.
- 4 Wielicki, B. A., and R.N. Green, 1989: Cloud identification for ERBE radiative flux
5 retrieval. *J. Appl. Meteor.*, **28**, 1133-1146.
- 6 Wielicki, B. A., B. R. Barkstrom, E. F. Harrison, R.B. Lee III, G. L. Smith and J. E.
7 Cooper, 1996: Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES): An Earth
8 Observing System Experiment. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **77**, 853-868.
- 9 Zhang, J., S. A. Christopher, and B. Holben, 2001: Intercomparison of aerosol optical
10 thickness derived from GOES-8 Imager and Ground-Based Sun Photometers. *J.*
11 *Geophys. Res.*, **106**, 7387-7398.
- 12

1 **List of figures**

2 Figure 1. GOES 8 channel 1 images for six time periods. a) 1344 UTC, b) 1444 UTC, c)
3 1544 UTC, d) 1644 UTC, e) 1744 UTC, and f) 1844 UTC. Also shown are the
4 sunphotometer sites in Bolivia.

5 Figure 2. Intercomparison of GOES 8 retrieved AOT and sunphotometer AOT for two
6 sites in Bolivia. Also shown are the histograms for the GOES and AERONET AOT. The
7 dashed line is the one to one correspondence and the solid line is the regression fit.

8 Figure 3. Spatial distribution of smoke properties and radiative forcing for four time
9 periods, 1344, 1544, 1744 and 1944 UTC. a-d: GOES 8 smoke aerosol optical thickness,
10 e-h: SW flux at the TOA, i-l: SW Aerosol Radiative Forcing. Clouds are indicated in
11 white.

12 Figure 4. Comparison between CERES (1848 UTC) and model derived SW flux using
13 GOES 8 (1858 UTC) AOT for smoke aerosols for August 28, 1998. Also shown are the
14 histograms for the fluxes.

15 Figure 5. a) Diurnal variation of AOT and SWARF and b) SWARF per unit optical
16 thickness for the seven different times (1344-1944 UTC). The mean value is shown as the
17 dark line.

18

19 **Acknowledgements**

20 This research was supported by NASA's Global Aerosol Climatology Project
21 (NCC8-200). The GOES data were obtained through the Global Hydrology and Climate
22 Center. We thank Mr. Nair for providing the GOES calibration code and Dr. Xiang Li for
23 his help with the broadband radiative transfer model. We thank Drs. Fu and Liou for the

1 4-stream radiative transfer code and Dr. Wiscombe for the Mie Code for stratified
2 spheres. We also thank Dr. Jedlovec for the GOES 8 data. We also wish to thank the
3 CERES science team for the point spread function algorithm. The CERES data were
4 obtained from the NASA Earth Observing System Data and Information System,
5 Distributed Active Archive Center (DAAC) at the Langley Research Center.

Table 1. Summary of Results From the Study Period for August 1998.

	1344	1444	1544	1644	1744	1844	1944	Average
AOT(0.67 μ m)	0.65 \pm 0.45	0.55 \pm 0.33	0.66 \pm 0.38	0.70 \pm 0.39	0.65 \pm 0.37	0.59 \pm 0.39	0.49 \pm 0.29	0.63 \pm 0.39
% clear	13.7	14.1	6.0	5.6	9.8	15	17.9	10.9
$\rho_{0.67}$ (%)	8.0 \pm 1.5	8.4 \pm 1.4	9.6 \pm 1.6	10.7 \pm 1.8	10.9 \pm 1.7	10.4 \pm 1.6	10.1 \pm 1.7	9.5 \pm 1.9
$\rho_{3.9}$ (%)	5.7 \pm 2.9	6.5 \pm 3.3	8.0 \pm	9.2 \pm 4.5	9.1 \pm 4.0	8.6 \pm 3.7	10.0 \pm 4.2	8.0 \pm 4.1
T _{10.7} (K)	298.0 \pm 3.4	300.4 \pm 3.9	302.8 \pm 4.4	303.4 \pm 4.3	302.2 \pm 4.3	299.8 \pm 3.3	298.0 \pm 2.6	300.1 \pm 4.2
% smoke	64.2	62.7	61.8	60.0	60.6	54.4	48.5	59.6
$\rho_{0.67}$ (%)	12.2 \pm 3.4	11.1 \pm 2.4	12.2 \pm 2.4	13.2 \pm 2.5	13.6 \pm 2.5	13.8 \pm 2.9	13.7 \pm 2.6	12.7 \pm 2.8
$\rho_{3.9}$ (%)	5.6 \pm 3.1	7.1 \pm 3.5	7.8 \pm 3.9	8.7 \pm 4.3	9.0 \pm 4.3	9.0 \pm 4.2	10.1 \pm 5.0	7.9 \pm 4.2
T _{10.7} (K)	297.2 \pm 3.6	299.2 \pm 4.2	300.0 \pm 4.5	300.7 \pm 4.8	299.8 \pm 4.2	298.4 \pm 3.6	297.9 \pm 2.8	299.1 \pm 4.3
% cloud (T _{10.7} <273K)	5.5	4.6	5.6	5.9	6.2	9.3	11.8	6.7
$\rho_{0.67}$ (%)	47.0 \pm 20.5	48.3 \pm 21.9	47.7 \pm 21.3	44.9 \pm 21.3	47.8 \pm 21.6	48.2 \pm 21.8	45.8 \pm 21.1	47.0 \pm 21.3
$\rho_{3.9}$ (%)	8.5 \pm 5.3	8.2 \pm 5.3	8.8 \pm 5.6	8.4 \pm 5.8	7.5 \pm 5.8	7.0 \pm 5.1	7.8 \pm 5.7	8.0 \pm 5.5
T _{10.7} (K)	255.6 \pm 16.0	256.4 \pm 15.7	254.8 \pm 16.7	251.9 \pm 18.3	247.9 \pm 20.4	245.2 \pm 21.1	243.5 \pm 21.2	250.2 \pm 19.5
% cloud (T _{10.7} >273K)	16.6	18.6	26.6	28.6	23.5	21.2	21.8	22.8
$\rho_{0.67}$ (%)	24.9 \pm 14.2	26.4 \pm 15.7	24.0 \pm 13.9	24.3 \pm 13.4	25.9 \pm 14.1	26.4 \pm 14.7	23.7 \pm 13.5	24.9 \pm 14.1
$\rho_{3.9}$ (%)	11.5 \pm 4.2	11.9 \pm 3.8	12.5 \pm 4.1	13.4 \pm 4.4	14.3 \pm 5.1	14.3 \pm 5.4	15.6 \pm 6.4	13.2 \pm 4.9
T _{10.7} (K)	286.4 \pm 6.5	288.0 \pm 6.8	289.6 \pm 7.0	290.3 \pm 7.0	289.9 \pm 7.2	288.0 \pm 7.0	288.4 \pm 7.3	289.0 \pm 7.1
$\rho_{0.67}^{\text{clear}}$ (%) TOA	7.4 \pm 1.4	7.8 \pm 1.4	8.4 \pm 1.5	9.3 \pm 1.6	9.8 \pm 1.5	9.6 \pm 1.4	9.3 \pm 1.3	8.8 \pm 1.7
$\rho_{0.67}^{\text{clear}}$ (%) sfc.	5.8 \pm 1.5	6.2 \pm 1.5	6.7 \pm 1.6	7.6 \pm 1.7	7.9 \pm 1.6	7.2 \pm 1.4	6.2 \pm 1.2	6.8 \pm 1.7
SW flux (aerosol) (Wm ⁻²)	196.0 \pm 23.9	198.1 \pm 22.1	207.0 \pm 23.3	208.1 \pm 23.1	200.4 \pm 22.3	184.8 \pm 21.9	156.2 \pm 18.1	196.6 \pm 26.6
SW flux (clear) (Wm ⁻²)	148.6 \pm 16.4	158.1 \pm 18.1	162.8 \pm 18.9	161.0 \pm 18.7	152.9 \pm 17.58	136.6 \pm 15.3	110.9 \pm 13.5	150.9 \pm 22.7
SWARF (Wm ⁻²)	-47.4 \pm 20.8	-40.0 \pm 17.4	-44.2 \pm 19.0	-47.2 \pm 19.2	-47.5 \pm 18.3	-48.2 \pm 18.0	-45.3 \pm 13.9	-45.8 \pm 18.8
A*	-19.52	-13.28	-13.75	-15.76	-18.22	-22.67	-24.18	-20.18
B*	-43.04	-48.85	-46.04	-44.69	-45.09	-42.98	-42.87	-44.44
SWARF/AOT (Wm ⁻²)	-62.56	-62.13	-59.79	-60.45	-63.30	-66.64	-67.05	-64.62
SZA range (deg)	29-56	18-47	12-41	14-44	24-52	38-62	52-73	
VZA range (deg)	12-36	12-36	12-36	12-36	12-36	12-36	12-36	
Number of images	20	12	24	18	15	13	12	

*SWARF = A + B \times AOT









