Evaluating laser and Ku-band-Radar airborne retrievals of snow depth and roughness on Arctic sea ice

Claude de Rijke-Thomas¹, Jack Landy² and Joshua King³

¹Bristol Glaciology Centre, University of Bristol, United Kingdom of Great Britain – England, (<u>claude.derijke-thomas@bristol.ac.uk</u>)

²Department of Physics and Technology, The Arctic University of Norway, Norway (jack.c.landy@uit.no)



University of

³Environment and Climate Change Canada, Toronto, Canada (joshua.king@ec.gc.ca)







- IceBridge (2016) ATM L1B Elevation and Return Strength Version 2
- CReSIS Ku-band SAR onboard Operation IceBridge (L1B Geolocated Radar Echo Strength Profiles, Version 2 (deconvolved))

Estimating snowdepths/roughnesses

 Magnaprobe snow depths from ECCC 2016 Snow on Sea Ice Campaign over Eureka

- In Situ Comparison

In Situ Comparisons



- Flyovers of in situ snowdepth measurements in Eureka
- PROBLEM: No leads for ATM laser-Ku SAR offset calibration

ATM Laser Data within Ku radar Footprints





ATM Laser Data within Ku radar Footprints





CALIBRATION SOLUTION: air-snow interface in Ku SAR echoes for calibrating with ATM laser elevation





Estimating Powers at the Interfaces



Estimating Powers at the Interfaces







First-Year Ice



Energy \approx power at interface x time to cross interface (based on roughness)

First-Year Ice



For 32.4% of samples the power of the air-snow return was stronger than the snow-ice

Despite this, the mean ratio of powers between the snow-ice interface and air-snow interface powers was 4.82 for FYI

Multi-Year Ice

For 39.7% of samples the power of the air-snow return was stronger than the snow-ice

Despite this, the mean ratio of powers between the snow-ice interface and air-snow interface powers was 4.26 for MYI



Multi-Year Ice



waveform peakiness

Mean estimated snowdepth: 28.0 ± 0.4 cm Mean in situ snowdepth: 31.2 ± 1.1 cm

Footprint-scale mean difference between estimated snowdepth and in situ: 19.8 cm

First-Year and Multi-Year Ice Combined



The Effect of Roughness on Snowdepth Uncertainty



Takeaways

- Instruments need to be calibrated to each other to estimate snow depths
- Air-snow interface seen in aircraft Ku SAR can be used to calibrate ATM laser data in leadless areas
- FYI Data supports more diffuse scattering of air-snow interface and probabilistically strong, quasi-specular scattering of snow-ice interface
- Successful retracking over FYI and mostly unsuccessful retracking over MYI
- Roughly 4-5x more energy from snow ice interface on average BUT footprint-to-footprint 33-40% of waveforms have stronger air-snow interface...
- No significant underestimate in first-year ice snow depths despite high basal salinity (11 ppt in bottom 5th of FYI)

Thankyou for Listening!

Claude de Rijke-Thomas¹, Jack Landy² and Joshua King³

¹Bristol Glaciology Centre, University of Bristol, United Kingdom of Great Britain – England, (<u>claude.derijke-thomas@bristol.ac.uk</u>)

²Department of Physics and Technology, The Arctic University of Norway, Norway (jack.c.landy@uit.no)

³Environment and Climate Change Canada, Toronto, Canada (<u>joshua.king@ec.gc.ca</u>)



Measuring The Air-Snow and Snow-Ice Interface Roughness





Calibrating ATM Laser Files to Each Other



ATM-Ku Flyover Offsets



FYI In Situ Data



MYI In Situ Data

