# The Clouds of Venus in Global Context: A Multispectral Tour

#### Dr. Kevin McGouldrick

University of Colorado Boulder/ Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics

23 March 2015 University of North Dakota Department of Space Studies

## Venus Microwave emissivity



- Down to 100m spatial resolution
- Global mean ~0.87m (consistent with basalt)
- Range from ~0.5 to ~1.0

## Venus topography from Magellan



- 10km spatial resolution
- Unimodal distribution with ~8km range
- Correlation with emissivity?

#### Radar emissivity vs. Altitude



Arvidson, R. E. (1994) Icarus 112, 171-186.

### **Aglaonice Dune field**



- Many features are seen in the Magellan SAR data; since I am an atmosphericist, I'll concentrate on the aeolean features.
- Here is evidence of dines driven by East  $\rightarrow$  West winds
- NB, even these, at km-scale, are too small to be noted in Magellan topography

#### Fortuna Meshkenet Dunes



- Another example of possible spatially resolved dune fields.
- However, the curvature of the field hints that something different is going on here.
- Either prevailing winds not always E→W at the surface, or these are not winddriven dunes.
- However, note the wind streaks...

#### **Microdunes near Stowe Crater**



- Below limit of spatial resolution of Magellan SAR
- Top and bottom images show SAR data of the same region taken from the left at 25° incidence.
- Middle image shows same area imaged at 25° incidence from the right.
- Large changes in returned radiance suggest asymmetric dunes

#### **Microdunes near Stowe Crater**





 Large changes in returned radiance suggest asymmetric dunes

#### NIR emission spectrum of Venus



### 1.28 micron window



### 1.02 micron spectral window



## 1.02 micron image compared with Magellan surface elevation



### 1.18 micron spectral window



# Schematic of Cloud "removal" from Galileo NIMS data



Hashimoto et al 2008 JGR 113:E00B24

## Schematic of Cloud "removal"



Hashimoto et al 2008 JGR 113:E00B24

# Retrieval of 1.18 micron surface emissivity variations from Galileo NIMS



Binned to 250km resolution



Note larger average surface emissivity in SH vs. NH.

Large errors/noise because using band ratios; could improve with spectroscopy.

Hashimoto et al 2008 JGR 113:E00B24

# Retrieval of 1.18 micron surface emissivity variations from Galileo NIMS



Volume fraction of felsic minerals

Hashimoto et al 2008 JGR 113:E00B24 Hashimoto and Sugita 2003 JGR (2003JE002082)

### VIRTIS 1.02 micron thermal emission



1.02 micron Flux  $\mathbf{O}$ anomaly from VIRTIS compared to surface features identified from Magellan. **Negative anomalies** match tessera terrain Unfortunately much of the low emissivity regions are NH...

Mueller et al 2008 JGR 113:E00B17

### VIRTIS 1.02 micron thermal emission





match tessera terrain Unfortunately much of the low emissivity regions are NH...

Mueller et al 2008 JGR 113:E00B17

## Evidence for geologically recent resurfacing on Venus

- Regions that are morphologically likely to exhibit recent volcanism also are seen to exhibit emissivity anomalies.
- These anomalies are interpreted as regions that have experienced less surface weathering, indicating a surface with a local age of 2.5Myr, perhaps even lower than 250Kyr.



Smrekar et al. Science 328:605. 2010.

## 1.74 micron window again



#### Venus





#### Venus

#### Earth





#### Venus

### Earth

















# Radiative Heating rates in the Venus condensational clouds



#### **Radiance Variation versus Solar Time**

#### **Observation (VIRTIS)**

#### **Simulation (CARMA)**



#### **Mixing Variation versus Solar Time**





Imamura et al 2014 Icarus. 228:181.





#### Magellan topography and radar emissivity

#### **Radar Emissivity**

#### Surface Topography


### **The Venusian Cloud Decks**



# Venus in Visible wavelengths



NASA/Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory/Carnegie Institution of Washington (MESSENGER spacecraft)

# Venus in Visible wavelengths



NASA/Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory/Carnegie Institution of Washington (MESSENGER spadecaget)Courtesy NASA

### **The Venusian Cloud Decks**



### Venus lower atmosphere spectral windows



# Upper atmosphere Water Vapour Variations from Pioneer Venus OIR



Retrieved water vapour concentrations varying between 5ppmv and 100ppmv above the cloud tops.
 Local maximum seen just after local noon.

Koukouli et al. 2005. Icarus 173:84.

# 2.20-2.60 micron spectral window



# Upper atmosphere Water Vapour Variations from Pioneer Venus OIR





PV-OIR (15-45 micron) Inconsistent with VEx-VIRTIS observations (2.48-2.60 micron)

Koukouli et al. 2005. Icarus 173:84.

Cottini et al. 2012 Icarus 217:561.

# Lower atmosphere Water Vapour Variations from VIRTIS-M-IR

- Retrieved water vapour
  concentrations varying between
  20ppmv and 40ppmv below the
  clouds.
- Possible correlation with cloud opacity.
- Retrieval likely affected by cloud acidity variations.

Tsang et al 2010 GRL 37:L02202. Barstow et al 2012. Icarus 217:542.



# Lower atmosphere Water Vapour Variations from VIRTIS-M-IR

- Retrieved water vapour concentrations varying between 20ppmv and 40ppmv below the clouds.
- Possible correlation with cloud opacity.

 Retrieval likely affected by cloud acidity variations.



Barstow et al 2012. Icarus 217:542.



# Long term variability in Venus clouds





1.74 micron variations ➢ i.e., clouds See long-term trend exceeding variability **Possibly see** mid-latitude oscillation with ~140d period.

0

McGouldrick et al. (2015) In Prep.

region	δl <sub>0</sub> (x10 <sup>-3</sup> )	dl/dt(x10 <sup>-3</sup> )	dl/dt x ∆t(x10 <sup>-3</sup> )
pol	2.85	-0.0139	-12.8
mid	4.96	+0.0193	+17.8
equ	3.55	+0.0216	+19.9
hem	3.63	+0.0251	+2.3

# Long term variability in Venus clouds





Size parameter  $> |_{1.74} / |_{2.32}^{0.53}$ Larger size parameter can indicate larger particles See a trend of increasing size parameter at the 5-10% level, especially at low latitudes.

0

McGo	uldrick et a	
(2015)	) In Prep.	

region	δm(x10 <sup>-3</sup> )	dm/dt(x10 <sup>-3</sup> )	dm/dt x ∆t(x10 <sup>-3</sup> )
pol	3.58	+0.0342	+31.5
mid	2.73	+0.0911	+83.9
equ	2.84	+0.0760	+70.0
hem	4.30	+0.0361	+33.3

### **The Venusian Cloud Decks**



### Microphysics, Chemistry, and Radiation cloud model



### Microphysics, Chemistry, and Radiation cloud model



# Results from Radiative Dynamical Feedback Simulations



Solid line in each plot is a constant (with time) eddy diffusion profile dictating vertical motions other than sedimentation

The three broken lines are simulations with varying parameters affecting the calculation of a variable eddy diffusion profile that responds to the lapse rate.
Symbols represent values derived from LCPS in situ observations.

# Low temperature behavior of sulfuric acid

- Sulfuric acid tends to supercool rather than freeze
  - But, in the Venus atmosphere, the melting point of  $H_2SO_4$ occurs at about the transition between upper and middle clouds.



# **Coalescence Sensitivity Test**

#### Coag T: Mass loading

#### **Effective radius**

#### Water vapor







#### Coag F:







# **Coalescence Sensitivity Test**

#### Coag T: Mass loading

#### **Effective radius**

#### Water vapor







Coag F:







# **Cloud size parameter comparison**

- More consistent with observations when coalescence included Not a surprise, since coalescence is
  - coalescence is important in the lower clouds
- May have significant effect if applied to upper clouds only

Table 1: Size parameter: I(1.74)/I(2.3) <sup>0.53</sup>			
titude	No	With	Wilson et al.
	coalescence	coalescence	(est)

	coalescence	coalescence	(est)
0-30	0.294	0.615	0.6
30-45	0.231	0.658	0.65
45-60	0.191	0.676	0.7
60-75	0.273	0.550	0.65
75-85	0.251	0.545	0.8

# Venus in Ultraviolet wavelengths



NASA (Pioneer Venus spacecraft – PV Orbiter Cloud PhotoPolarimeter – 365nm)

### **The Venusian Cloud Decks**



# Venus in Ultraviolet wavelengths



molecule

section [cm<sup>2</sup>

Absorption cross

NASA (Pioneer Venus spacecraft – PV Orbiter Cloud PhotoPolarimeter – 365nm)

#### 1e-15 1e-16 1e-17 1e-18 Golomb et al. (1962) 1e-19 Thompson et al.(1963) Warneck et al. (1964) McMillan (1966) 1e-20 Sidebottom et al. (1972) Thompson et al. (1975) Kelly et al. (1976) 1e-21 Hicks 300K Brassington (1981) Leroy et al. (1983) 1e-22 Weibring (1986) McGee and Burris (1987) Hearn and Joens (1991) (I) Δ 1e-23 Hearn and Joens (1991) (II) $\nabla$ Martinez and Joens (1992) Ahmed and Kumar (1992) (I) 1e-24 Ahmed and Kumar (1992) (II) Manatt and Lane (1993) Vandaele et al. (1994) 1e-25 Sprague and Joens (1995) Vattulainen et al. (1997) Prahlad and Kumar (1997) 1e-26 Bogumil et al. (2003) For complete citations see the lin-plots 1e-27 100 150 200 250 300 350 400 Wavelength [nm]

SO<sub>2</sub> absorption cross section

Low- and medium resolution absorption cross sections of sulfur dioxide SO<sub>2</sub> at room temperature (106-405 nm)

Long-term (years to decades) variation in SO<sub>2</sub>: from the 1970s to today



# Long-term (years to decades) variation in SO<sub>2</sub>: from the 1970s to today



### SO<sub>2</sub> UV absorption coefficient



Low- and medium resolution absorption cross sections of sulfur dioxide SO, at room temperature (106-405 nm)

### SO<sub>2</sub> UV absorption coefficient



Low- and medium resolution absorption cross sections of sulfur dioxide SO, at room temperature (106-405 nm)

### SO<sub>2</sub> UV absorption coefficient



Low- and medium resolution absorption cross sections of sulfur dioxide SO, at room temperature (106-405 nm)

# Comparison with previous work



 Crosses represent analysis making the same assumptions as Esposito et al 1988

Good match

 Diamonds represent analysis using laboratory calibration only.

# Spatial variations of SO<sub>2</sub>

 Order of magnitude variations in retrieved SO<sub>2</sub> over the observed disk of the planet





# Spatial variations of SO<sub>2</sub>

- Order of magnitude variations in retrieved SO<sub>2</sub> over the observed disk of the planet
- Some can be explained by discrepancies in assumed haze properties or concentrations





# Temporal variations of SO<sub>2</sub>

 Order of magnitude variations in retrieved
 SO<sub>2</sub> over timescales ranging from days to years.



# Photolysis of H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> in upper atmosphere



Fig. 8. Same as Fig. 2, for the sulfur oxides. The SO<sub>2</sub> and SO observations with errorbars are from the Belyaev et al. (2012). The temperature at 100 km is 165–170 K for the observations. The OCS measurement (0.3–9 ppb with the mean value of 3 ppb) is from Krasnopolsky (2010).

#### Zhang et al. (2012) Icarus 217:714.

# The Varied Clouds of Venus



Image Courtesy NASA



# Venus clouds movie


# Summary of Cloud and Hole Evolution timescales

# VIR0383

### **VIR0384**

Mean Timescale	-13.2 hr		Mean Timescale	-13.7 hr
Mean Absolute Timescale	32.2 hr		Mean Absolute Timescale	34.5 hr
Mean Timescale (Holes only)	+17.8 hr		Mean Timescale (Holes only)	-26.6 hr
Abs. Timescale (Holes only)	35.6 hr		Abs. Timescale (Holes only)	36.5 hr
Mean Timescale (Clouds only)	+6.4 hr		Mean Timescale (Clouds only)	+12.2 hr
Abs. Timescale (Clouds only)	27.0 hr		Abs. Timescale (Clouds only)	30.4 hr

Typical timescale is about 30 hours, ignoring direction.
In each case, the locally dark features tended to evolve more quickly than the locally bright features.
The bright features in the observation of orbit 383 tend to be growing brighter with time, while those from orbit 384 are growing dimmer.

 Positive vorticity appears to be correlated with negative divergence (i.e., convergence) among holes and vice versa. •This is consistent with holes being caused by downdrafts, and winds tracked near cloud base. •However, just as on Earth, divergence (convergence) aloft must be balanced by convergence (divergence) below. •Tracking same feature at different altitudes can measure this...



Fig. 14. Divergence versus vorticity. Holes are indicated by (◊), clouds are indicated by (×). The lines associated with each feature indicate error bars calculated from the standard deviation of the best fit to the constituent winds.

McGouldrick et al. (2012) Icarus 217:615.



© 2007 Thomson Higher Education

•Tracking same feature at different altitudes can measure this... -0.3 -0.2 -0.1 -0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 vorticity [m/s km<sup>-1</sup>]

Fig. 14. Divergence versus vorticity. Holes are indicated by (◊), clouds are indicated by (×). The lines associated with each feature indicate error bars calculated from the standard deviation of the best fit to the constituent winds.

#### McGouldrick et al. (2012) Icarus 217:615.

# Summary of Cloud and Hole Wind Speed Effects

## VIR0383

### **VIR0384**

Point	<u></u>	<v></v>	Point	<u></u>	<v></v>
West Edge	-50 m/s	+1.0 m/s	West Edge	-57 m/s	+3.9 m/s
East Edge	-55 m/s	+7.0 m/s	East Edge	-71 m/s	-0.3 m/s
Peak rad	-64 m/s	+2.6 m/s	Peak rad	-65 m/s	+2.4 m/s

On average, for these two orbits, the western edge is measured to be slower than the eastern edge.
But the speed of the location of the peak in the radiance in each feature seems to be about the same across the two orbits.

# The Clouds of Venus in Global Context: <u>A Multispectral Tour</u>



