Aerosol Impacts on MC3E Case Studies - Some Preliminary Results

Susan C. van den Heever Colorado State University Fort Collins, CO

with Stephen M. Saleeby, Peter Marinescu, Sonia M. Kreidenweis and Paul J. DeMott

van den Heever et al DOE/ASR Spring Meeting 03/2014

Aerosol Impacts on MCSs

- A number of past studies have investigated AIEs on MCSs (e.g. Lynn et al. 2005a; Wang 2005; Lee et al. 2008; Li et al, 2009; Fan et al 2012; Tao et al 2013)
- More recent studies have examined the impacts of specific aerosol types e.g. dust (e.g. Seigel et al 2013)
- Modeling studies often make use of regionally averaged or "idealized" profiles of aerosol concentrations and types
- MCSs during MC3E
 - range of different aerosol types, concentrations and vertical and horizontal distributions
 - ideal opportunity to assess relative roles of different aerosols on organized deep convection through use of observational and model output

Goals

- Aerosol impacts on various MCS characteristics:
 Characteristics of MCS anvils
 - Dynamical features including cold pools and the rear inflow jet (RIJ)
 - Convective-stratiform precipitation partitioning
- 2. Impacts of the vertical and horizontal distribution of aerosols and aerosol type on MCSs
- 3. MCS impacts on the vertical and horizontal redistribution of aerosols

MC3E Case Studies



Ingredients for a Convective Outbreak 23 May 2011

Low level Jet

 Transport of warm, moist air at low levels
 High CAPE
 Dryline
 Strong Shear



(http://www.spc.noaa.gov/exper/archive/event.php?date=20110522)



W-E Cross-Section

22 May – Sulfate

- Moderate event over eastern USA
- Low-level presence over SGP

NAAPS Model output



N-S Cross-Section





W-E Cross-Section

22 May – Dust

- Concentrations relatively low
- Dust present to the west of SGP

Vertical Profile





W-E Cross-Section

22 May – Smoke

- Transport from the southwest
- Higher concentrations at midlevels



N-S Cross-Section



Transport of Smoke into Southern Parts of Southern Great Plains



Innermost Grid in Simulation

Southern and eastern parts of inner domain affected by significant concentrations of smoke

http://alg.umbc.edu/usaq/archives/2011_05.html

In-Plume Experience

 Understand the effects of smoke plumes on convective systems

Initialize RAMS with aerosol profile representative of plume transport



Mean vertical aerosol profile within box [91.5-95.5W and 31.5-34.5N] from NAAPS Aerosol Model



NASA Landsat RGB Image.

Cloud Resolving Model

RAMS model developed at CSU
 2 Moment bin-emulating bulk microphysics
 Prognostic aerosol scheme (Saleeby and Cotton, 2004) Aerosol Input

$$N_{activated} = N_{available} F_{activation}$$

Cloud droplets are nucleated from CCN as a function of temperature, w, CCN number concentrations and aerosol mean diameter

RAMS Bin-Emulating Bulk Scheme = Bulk + Bin

BULK SCHEMES





RAMS MODEL

Bin scheme in an offline parcel model for a wide range of conditions

Generate lookup tables

Access lookup tables while running online



Recently implemented HUCM bin microphysics (Khain et al 2005) Processes: Nucleation Diffusion growth Collision-coalescence Sedimentation Melting and riming

RAMS

 Recent extensive modifications to microphysics and aerosol schemes (Saleeby and van den Heever 2013)

- Aerosol scheme
 - Prognostic scheme
 - Sulfate, dust smoke, sea salt and regenerated aerosol (after evaporation)
 - DeMott et al (2010)
 IN scheme



(after Saleeby and van den Heever 2013)

MC3E Case Studies - Model Setup

- Grid 1: dx = 30km (covering most of CONUS)
 Grid 2: dx = 6km (covering Great Plains)
 Grid 3: dx = 2km (covering much of KS & OK)
- Initialized 22 May 0000Z with GFS pressure level data and soil fields.
- On 23 May 1500Z spawned grid-3 from history file
- Ran through 24 May 0800Z
- Analysis performed for Grid 3 spatially and temporally

Experiment Setup

- Runs identical except for initial aerosol field
- Exp1: Clean = 600 mg⁻³ (exponentially decreasing profile with height)
- Exp2: Polluted = 2000 mg⁻³ (exponentially decreasing profile with height)
- Exp3: Same as polluted simulation but aerosols were redistributed vertically to simulate an elevated pollution layer.

Initial aerosol profiles for sensitivity tests



Basic Storm Structure

Radar reflectivity at 4km AGL



Leading stratiform squall line

No major structural differences between clean and polluted

Storm Structure

Ice (shaded) and liquid water (contours) mixing ratios (g/kg)



Substantial leading stratiform condensate

Significantly greater ice mass in the polluted anvils as more cloud water is being lofted to higher levels rather than being rained out

Condensate Profiles

- Greater liquid water mixing ratios between cloud base and anvil base in the polluted scenarios (up to ~40%) due to suppression of warm rain processes
 - Greater ice mixing ratios
 (~20%) from just above the
 freezing level through the
 anvil in the polluted cases
 due to the vertical lofting of
 greater amounts of available
 liquid water to these levels



Polluted – Clean differences (%) in the spatially and temporally averaged vertical profiles of liquid water (blue) and ice (gray) mixing ratios

Anvil Characteristics

Time series of (left) anvil area and (right) integrated anvil ice



 We see increased spatial coverage of convective anvils as well as the integrated ice mass in the anvils => thicker anvils covering greater areas; also composed of greater number of smaller ice particles

POLLUTED-ELEVATED falls between CLEAN and POLLUTED => aerosols are more efficiently ingested when concentrated in the boundary layer.

Vertical Velocity

Increases in vertical velocity in the POLLUTED (~10%) case throughout most of the storm => invigoration effect

 Weakened updrafts in POLLUTED-ELEVATED in the mixed phase regions and above



Vertical profiles of (left) CLEAN mean vertical velocity (w>2ms⁻¹); and (right) POLLUTED-CLEAN differences

Accumulated Precipitation

 Increased aerosol loading => substantially more vertically lofted liquid and ice, much of which is deposited in the outflow anvil.

 This process, in combination with a suppressed warm rain process leads to a REDUCTION in total accumulated volume precipitation of ~ 8 %.



Precipitation Rates

 Increased aerosol loading leads to a decrease in light and moderate precipitation rates and an increase in heavy precipitation rates

- Polluted scenarios
 - reduced stratiform precipitation due to reduced size of anvil hydrometeors
 - shift towards enhanced heavier convective precipitation



Histogram of binned precipitation rates shown as a difference between the POLLUTED and CLEAN simulations

Rain Characteristics

- Fewer but larger raindrops below cloud base in the polluted scenario => reduced evaporation rates
- Rain is more efficiently produced in the CLEAN case in the lower regions of the cloud
- Riming of raindrops is reduced in the polluted case above the freezing level leaving more liquid water in this regions



concentrations (blue) (%)

Hail Characteristics

 Increased aerosol concentrations lead to a reduction in the amount of hail produced (~25-35%)

 POLLUTED-ELEVATED once again falls between CLEAN and POLLUTED demonstrating the role of the vertical location of aerosol



Time series of (top) vertically-integrated hail in the CLEAN and (bottom) the POLLUTED-CLEAN differences

Cold Pools

Time series of (left) cold pool area and (right) minimum cold pool temperature



- An increase in pollution aerosols leads to a decrease in the expanse of the cold pool. Also the minimum cold pool temperature is warmer in the polluted scenarios.
- Under polluted conditions, the warm rain process leads to fewer and larger raindrops, which is less conducive to total sub-cloud evaporative cooling.

Summary



Path Forward

- Heterogeneous observationally-derived aerosol initialization
- Role of elevated layers
- Dust vs sulfate vs smoke
- Detailed modeling observational comparisons of microphysical processes and the feedbacks to vertical velocity using SGP data
- Microphysical-dynamical feedbacks on squall line features including RIJ
- Provide modeling data bases