HIRLAM Physics developments 2009/2010

Sander Tijm Thanks: Ulrik Korsholm, Kristian Pagh Nielsen, Jan Barkmeijer, Hans de Leeuw, Wim de Rooy, Lisa Bengtsson-Sedlar







Contents

- HIRLAM physics work
 - Developments Rasch-Kristjansson condensation scheme
 - Chemistry branch
 - Solar radiation in tilted columns
- HARMONIE physics work
 - Impact of SLHD on convection
 - Impact microphysics on convection
 - Sensitivity of outflow to microphysics
 - Inclusion of Rasch-Kristjansson in ALARO
 - EDMF developments (see presentation Valery Masson)







Chemistry branch

- HIRLAM chemistry branch set up
- Chemistry included, no direct aerosol effects yet, but extended chemistry and indirect aerosol effects through clouds
- Impact tested during month long run







Impact indirect aerosol effect



Monthly averaged CCN number concentration $(x10^7 \text{ m}^{-3})$ at 850 hPa.



Monthly averaged difference in T_s (° C) (RUN - BASELINE)



Impact indirect aerosol effect



Change in T_s (° C) over Denmark on 8 June 2009 at 12 UTC (RUN - BASELINE)

700 500 500 300 100 100 -100 -300 -300 -300 -500

nwp central europe

Change in net SW radiation at the surface (W m⁻²) on 8 June 2009 at 12 UTC (RUN - BASELINE)

Tilted array modelling: Introduction



Til venstre et termogram fra Horsens. Til højre et termogram fra Beldringe ved Ødense.









Tilted array modelling - First results (2009-09-01)



Impact SLHD on convection



Impact SLHD on convection



nwp central europe

Microphysics impact AROME

- Convection too active for certain cases
- Link with outflow? Objective tests to see if outflow is overestimated
- Studies on removal of processes for graupel, snow and graupel, reduction of graupel production, reduction of evaporation, impact of fall speed hydrometeors







Impact graupel & snow

- Graupel very important for intensity of convection
- Snow large impact on outflow, low fall speed, transport of hydrometeor to unsaturated environment
- Correct balance between graupel, snow, cloud water, cloud ice?







Removal of snow



Outflow, impact hydromet.



2m temperature/10hPa_v-component of wind 3.5"E 4"E 4.5"E 5"E 5.5"E 6"E 6.5"E 7"E 7.5"E 8"E 8.5"E 9"E 9.5"E 10"E 30 29 28 27 26 25 ENE. 24 23 22 21 20 19 18 17 16 4*E 4.5*E 5*E 5.5*E 6"E 6.5*E 7*E 7.5*E 8*E 3.5*E 8.5*E

Friday 3 July 2009 00UTC ATHEN Forecast t+16 VT: Friday 3 July 2009 16UTC

NOSNOW 16.00h

٦F

REF 16.00h



Outflow study

- Cases with and without convection and outflow studied
- Difficult to couple observations directly to model. Look at distributions of obs. & model parameters over longer time (10-22 UTC)
- Parameters wind speed, wind gust (through TKE method), temperature (cold pool), wind direction
- No signal in wind speed and gust







Impact no evaporation

- Evaporation of rain plays a major role, in addition to snow
- Putting evaporation at 30-50% gives best results, subgridscale effect?
- Convection too active due to 2.5 km cells, evaporation same resolution problem?
- Possible solution: Brake on vertical velocity plus reduced evaporation?
- Subgrid scale microphysics







Subgrid microphysics









EDMF developments

- Inclusion of MUSC in KPT with EDMF and EDKF daily runs
- Statistical clouds scheme improvement (see presentation Valery Masson)
- KF-problem, too much detrainment of moisture close to cloud base, too strong moistening of air, tendency to produce Sc.
- Second problem of KF: no entrainment in cloud hostile environment, cloud too deep.







Comparison EDMF - EDKF



Comparison EDMF - EDKF











• Questions?







Compar • More spread in model wind direction distribution than observed

Hir

lam



Compar • No (!) evaporation of rain comes close to observed distribution

Optimum 30-50%

Hi

am

