# Some Preliminary Results from WRF-LES Simulations

Satoshi Endo, Yangang Liu, and Wuyin Lin



The WRF model is utilized in several ways in order to provide dataset for studies.



From the slide of Liu in the kick off meeting

□ The first warm-up case is March 2000 IOP at SGP

Realistic/complicated external forcings

Before the IOP case, it is better to test

Idealized simple settings

As one of the tests, an idealized simulation of marine boundary layer clouds off the California coast is performed.

#### Idealized case Macrophysics vs Microphysics

The wintertime clouds have a smaller cloud fraction and LWP, higher cloud-top, cloud-base and degree of decoupling, similar cloud thickness and inversion strength (Lin et al. 2009).

The wintertime clouds have a smaller LWC and cloud droplet concentration but larger effective radius and drizzle rate (Liu, 2010).



	Summer	Winter	
Cloud top	710 m	1220 m	
Cloud base	430 m 950 m		
LWP	70.12 g m <sup>-2</sup>	40.06 g m <sup>-2</sup>	
LWC	0.26 g m⁻³	0.15 g m <sup>-3</sup>	
Ncloud	53 cm <sup>-3</sup>	15 cm <sup>-3</sup>	

and more ...

Goal of this study is to discern the relative roles of macro- and microphysics using WRF

As the first step, winter case simulation using a single moment cloud microphysics scheme is performed.

Model	WRF ARW v.3.1.1	
Microphysics	Lin et al.	
Radiation	RRTMG	
Turbulence	1.5 order TKE	
Grid size	$\Delta x, \Delta y = 50 \text{m} \Delta z = 30 \text{m}$	
Domain	6 km x 6 km x 2.7 km	
Surface	Constant flux LHF = 87, SHF = 12.5 W m <sup>-2</sup>	
Lateral boundary	Periodic boundary conditions	

RH [%]

Initial condition is based on Lin et al. (2009) and monthly mean values of NCEP-Reanalysis 2 at 130W 27.5N for Jan. 2007(dots).



#### Time evolution



After 2 hours, the boundary layer consisting of dry convection, intermittent cumulus, stratocumulus is formed.

Color: w, Contours:  $\theta v$ , Thick line:  $qc = 0.01 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ 



The stratocumulus layer just below the inversion layer almost decouples from the underlying dry convective boundary layer.

The structure is consistent with the obs.

#### Comparison with the observation



Results of the simulation of wintertime boundary layer clouds off the California coast were examined as a preparation for the CRM simulation of the warm up case.

Simulated structure is consistent with the results from the observation: the stratocumulus layer decoupled from dry convective boundary layer.

Simulated values are reasonably close to the observation but some of them (e.g., CF) showed difference.

Need to implement large-scale forcings for equilibrium (also for the March 2000 IOP case).

□ Simulations using a double moment micro-physics scheme and the summer case are in progress.

## **Bench Warmers**

### Cloud Properties based on Observation

Season	Summertime	Wintertime	Relative Diff (%)
Property			
Cloud fraction	Larger, 74.77%	Smaller, 57.34%	23
Liquid water path	Higher, 70.12	Lower, 40.06	43
Cloud thickness	Similar, 280 m	Similar, 270 m	4
Cloud-base height	Lower, 430 m	Higher, 950 m	-121
Cloud-top height	Lower, 710 m	Higher, 1220 m	-72
LTS*	Stronger, 22 <sup>0</sup> C	Weaker, 17 <sup>0</sup> C	23
Inversion strength	Stronger, 7.4 <sup>0</sup> C	Weaker, 6.0 <sup>0</sup> C	19
LCL*	Lower, 410 m	Higher, 470 m	-15
Surface-latent heat flux	Smaller, 71 Wm <sup>-2</sup>	Larger, 87 Wm <sup>-2</sup>	-23
SST*	Higher, 19 <sup>0</sup> C	Lower, , 14 <sup>0</sup> C	26
Liquid water Content	Larger, 0.26 g $\mathrm{m}^{-3}$	Smaller, 0.15 g m <sup>-3</sup>	42
Droplet Concentration	Larger, 53 cm <sup>-3</sup>	Smaller, 15 cm <sup>-3</sup>	72
Effective radius	Smaller, 11.4 µm	Larger, 14.6 µm	-28
Drizzle rate	Smaller, 0.67	Larger, 2.38	-255