

Katia Lamer, kxl5431@psu.edu

## Katia Lamer<sup>1</sup>, Catherine M. Naud<sup>2</sup>, and James F. Booth<sup>1</sup>

# 

### 1. Motivations and Goal

Issues with the representation of cloud cover in the Southern oceans in most CMIP5 models has revealed that most model have difficulty representing clouds in extratropical cyclones (*Bodas-Salcedo et al*, 2014), and more specifically in the wake of cold fronts (post-cold frontal region, PCF). This problem is found globally, and is also found in northern hemisphere cyclones in the winter time. Clouds in these dynamical regimes are mostly low-level clouds, driven by shallow convection in conditions of subsidence.

Here we exploit the wealth of observations from the ENA site to explore these PCF conditions. Cloud macroscopic properties were first examined in *Naud et al.* (2018), but so far little is known on the properties of precipitation during these periods.

### 2. Methods

Collect ARM observations and reanalysis output centered on the ENA observatory between 10-2015 and 09-2018  $\,$ 

Focus on periods with marine boundary clouds (cloud tops lower than 3km) and identified periods with subsidence associated or not with a cold front.

Estimate precipitation and cloud attributes using 2-s resolution observations then take the hourly average for comparison with coarser resolution large-scale driver datasets.

To overcome scatter emerging from the different time resolutions and measurement uncertainties, establish correlations using observations binned by "driver intensity";

### 3. Identification of Subsidence and Post-Cold Frontal (PCF) Conditions

Subsidence<sub>North</sub> = subsidence with Northerly wind Subsidence<sub>South</sub> = subsidence with Southerly wind Subsidence<sub>PCF</sub> = subsidence after the passage of a cold front

 Subsidence: standard definition,  $\omega_{500} > 0$  hPa hr<sup>-1</sup> [MERRA-2 reanalysis]

 Fronts require: 1- Extratropical cyclone near ENA

 2-  $\theta$  gradient and wind dir. changes

 [MERRA-2]

Effect to ENA verified: 1- wind direction shifts to

Northerly as the front passes [Met. Station] 2- wind returns to Southerly as PCF event ends

3 - event lasts > 2hrs

4. Large-Scale Drivers	5. Cloud Attributes/Drivers
	<ul> <li>Cloud base height [KAZR2+Ceilometer]</li> <li>Cloud top height [KAZR2]</li> <li>Cloud thickness [KAZR2+Ceilometer]</li> </ul>
7 Con One Lever Scale Driver Fourisis is All?	

7. Can One Large-Scale Driver Explain it All?

Fletcher et al. (2016) presented the Marine Cold Air Outbreak (MCAO) parameter M M parameter =  $\theta_{skin}$ - $\theta_{800}$  [MERRA-2/Sonde]

The M parameter was shown to delineate between two common regimes for shallow clouds Higher M parameter = Higher frequency of open cells (*McCoy et al.*, 2017)

The M parameter was also recently shown to be highly correlated to cloud properties (first shown in *Naud et al.*, 2018):

- Higher M parameter = 1) Higher cloud top height,
  - 2) Lower cloud top temp.
     3) Higher cloud base height
  - 4) But overall deeper clouds.







Deeper rain shafts that do not penetrate as far down







which were both found to be highly correlated to

several precipitation characteristics in subsidence regimes

## 6. Precipitation Attributes : Variability + Relation to Large-scale Drivers and Clouds

#### Precipitation shaft base [KAZR2+Ceilometer] :

 $\begin{array}{l} Sub_{PCF} \mbox{ characterized by rain that does not} \\ reach as far down especially in the fall \\ Sub_{PCF} \mbox{ also presents: 1) lower RH_{sfc}, 2) \\ higher CBH \mbox{ and 3) somewhat deeper clouds} \end{array}$ 

From the correlations, only the  $RH_{sfc}$  and CBH trends are consistent with the rain trend suggesting that  $RH_{sfc}$  and CBH play a more important role in determining the lowest height where rain can penetrate.



"In-rain" rain rate at 0.5 km [Drizzle PI product]: Rate of rain reaching 0.5 km not accounting for clear sky

Cloud thickness (m)

No distinction across subsidence regimes and seasons

Sub<sub>PCF</sub>'s <u>lower RH<sub>sfc</sub></u>, which is related to a reduction in rain rate at 0.5 km, seems balanced by the presence of higher cloud tops (i.e., deeper clouds) which tend to produce more intense rain at 0.5 km.



\* Significant correlation (p<0.05) in solid lines and random correlations in dashed lines.</p>
\* Black line represents all subsidence conditions.

Precipitation shaft vertical extent [KAZR2]: (Max height with Z >-15dBZ) – (Min height with radar echo)

 $\operatorname{Sub}_{\operatorname{PCF}}$  characterized by deepest rain, especially in spring

 $\begin{array}{l} Sub_{PCF} \mbox{ also presents: 1) higher sea-air} \\ temperature \mbox{ contrast} \ (\Delta T_{surf}), \mbox{ 2) lower } RH_{sfc} \mbox{ and } \\ 3) \mbox{ somewhat higher CTH} \end{array}$ 

Only changes in  $\Delta T_{surf}$  and CTH are consistent with the rain trend <u>suggesting that  $\Delta T_{surf}$  and</u> CTH play a more important role in determining the depth of precipitation shaft.



Precipitation to cloud fraction [KAZR2+Ceilometer]: In an hour, #profiles w/ precip. divided by # profiles w/ cloud

 $\begin{array}{l} Sub_{PCF} \mbox{ characterized by higher rain to cloud} \\ fraction, highest in winter and spring \\ Sub_{PCF} \mbox{ also presents: 1) higher sea-air} \\ temperature \mbox{ contrast } (\Delta T_{surf}) \mbox{ and somewhat} \\ higher \mbox{ CTH} \end{array}$ 

Both changes in  $\Delta T_{surf}$  and CTH are consistent with the rain trend <u>suggesting that  $\Delta T_{surf}$  and</u> <u>CTH are both related to cloud propensity to</u> <u>precipitate</u>.



