High resolution 3-D LES simulations: a link between shallow and deep cumulus?

Jon Petch Met Office

December 16th 2002

EUROCS Madrid



Content

Results from shallow cumulus

- ARM diurnal cycle case (thanks to Andy Brown)
- Aims
 - Some questions I am trying to answer
- The experiments
 - High resolution 3-D runs based on deep case
- New experiments
 - Better surface fluxes (closer to shallow case)
 - More moist I.C
 - Sensitivity studies
- Summary



Results from shallow case – high resolution tests



Results from shallow case – high resolution tests



Results from shallow case – low resolution tests



Results from shallow case – low resolution tests



Shallow case summary

Basic information

- Cloud forms around 12pm local time
- Peak is between 1 and 4pm local time
- Cloud fractions peak around 20%
- Cloud top builds to 3 km at 6pm
- Liquid water paths of 30 g m⁻²
- Resolution study
 - 100 m and less shows convergence
 - 200 m not too bad
 - 400m or 800 m is poor and blows up or forms no cloud
 - Other models gave similar results at default 100 m (not shown)
- Domain and 2D/3D differences
 - 2D not tested but had given strange results in BOMEX case
 - Domain was 6.4km x 6.4km



Some questions (I don't plan to answer many of them!)

Can we begin to bridge the gap between the shallow and deep cases?

Model related questions. What is the impact of:

- higher resolution?
- smaller domain size?
- going from 2-D to 3-D?
- more detailed microphysics?

Simulation related questions. How important are:

- the initial conditions?
- the surface fluxes?
- Large scale forcing and/or radiation?



Points of interest

At what point does the shallow cumulus deepen?
How long does it stay shallow?
How long does it take to rain after it goes deeper?
How long does it take to reach upper troposphere?
Do interesting things occur at freezing level?



Intermediate simulations

Model

- Met Office CRM/LEM (as used in shallow case)
- 120 vertical levels (15 km domain)
- 100m or higher vertical resolution
- Forced with standard semi-idealised case

Simulation

• 2D

- » 250 m ensemble from 15 runs (250 km domain)
- » 100 m (160 km domain)
- 3D (100x100 points)
 - » 100 m (10 km x 10 km)
 - » 250 m (25 km x 25 km)



Initial conditions





Cloud cover and rain rate





Cloud top height and column hydrometeor





Water vapour transport (w'q')



Too little cloud

3D runs produce very little cloud water and no deep convection

 Surface fluxes were very different to Shallow case and not very realistic due to variational analysis done by ARM



New surface fluxes (NSF)





Impact of NSF on basic 2D runs: rain rate





Rain rate and w_{max} (NSF)





Cloud fraction and total hydrometeor (NSF)





Cloud top height and liquid water (NSF)



Water vapour transport (NSF)



In-cloud liquid water (NSF)



Cloud fraction (NSF)



Summary so far

3D runs of CRM are very similar to shallow case
 timing of initial cloud and peak; cloud fractions; LWP

- High resolution (100m) runs do develop convection (shallow and deep) earlier than the 250 m runs but results are similar otherwise
- Bigger differences between the 2D and 3D runs
 - Similar in cloud water contents but much less cloud area above 4km
 - Are differences due to small domain?



Total hydrometeor and cloud cover





Cloud top height and rain rate



Increased moisture and rectangular domain





Increased moisture, bigger domain but lower resolution (1km)





Increased moisture, bigger domain but lower resolution (1km)





Total water vapour transport



Resolved water vapour transport



2D, 3D and resolution

• 3D produces less deep cloud and rain than 2D at 250m and 100m resolution

- no very large domain 3-D runs but went up to over 60km in a rectangle and 50km in a square
- little sensitivity to domain size between 25 and 50 km
- 3D and 2D produce similar amounts of cloud and rain at 1km resolution
 - even with smaller domains (i.e. ones used at high res.)
 - much of the transport of water vapour is by sub grid processes right up to the time of significant precipitation





APR 2002 33













7.00162

8.00108

100m v 250m cloud sizes





Poor representation of the formation of clouds in 1km simulations



Cloud properties summary

- Ikm runs do not have realistic clouds during shallow or deepening phase
- 2D and 3D have similar size clouds and cloud spacing
- Typical cloud spacing during significant rain is of the order 40km and this increases with time
- 250 m and 100m runs have similar sized clouds



Final summary!

Experimental issues:

- We can do runs using similar I.C. and surface fluxes which begin like the shallow case and deepen
- Large scale forcing and radiation is not too important

Model issues:

- 2D and 3D differ at high res but so no large 3D runs
- At 1 km resolution 2D and 3D are the same even at small domain sizes
- 3D or higher resolution (e.g. 100m) produce clouds earlier but this is a small effect
- We can produce quite realistic cloud with 250m or better

