Institute for Climate and Atmospheric Science



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

The role of orography in convection regeneration. A case study from the Convective and Orographically-induced Precipitation Study

Victoria Smith^{1*}, Stephen Mobbs^{1,2}, Ralph Burton^{1,2}, Matt Hobby¹, Fumiko Aoshima³, Volker Wulfmeyer³, Manfred Dorninger⁴ and Emily Norton⁵

¹University of Leeds, UK ²National Centre for Atmospheric Science, UK ³University of Hohenheim, Germany ⁴University of Vienna, Austria ⁵University of Manchester, UK

EGU General Assembly 2012, Vienna, 24th April 2012



Motivation – 20th July 2007 convection regeneration above Black Forest

- North-west propagating Mesoscale Convective System passed over COPS region
- Squall line in outflow region southern part decaying upstream of Black Forest
- Convection Regeneration above Black Forest
- Intensification in lee > thunderstorms and flooding in Bavaria

Boxes - approx location of COPS study region



Orography responsible for convection regeneration? EGU General Assembly 2012, Vienna, 24th April 2012

Motivation – Orographically-generated convection poorly forecast by LAMs. This case study was no exception

Errors from

- Initial and lateral boundary conditions
- Insufficient resolution to represent orographic forcings / processes
- Over (under) estimation of precipitation on windward (leeward) side
- Poor understanding of role of orography in convection regeneration
- Would regeneration have occurred in absence of Black Forest ?
- Can high resolution modelling with modified orography explain role of the mountains in convection regeneration ?



EGU General Assembly 2012, Vienna, 24th April 2012





Observations – MCS outflow elevated due to fog in Rhine Valley.

HORIZONTAL WINDS OBSERVED FROM **RHINE VALLEY** Super Site Wind profiler (upper), AWS (lower)



EGU General Assembly 2012, Vienna, 24th April 2012

Observations – Convection regenerated above mountains.

Surface potential temperature and horizontal winds from AWSs, and observed surface precipitation



A

Detailed analysis of case study observations given in Corsmeier et al. 2012

WRF modelling – control run with '*real*' orography



- Control simulation to asses ability of WRF to reproduce key flow features
- WRF version 3.0.1.1
- Initialised at 0000 UTC (0.25°ECMWF analyses)
- 3 nested domains 2.7km, 900m
 & 300m horizontal resolution
- 120 Vertical levels
- All domains 400x400 grid points
- Morrison microphysics
- Standard M-O Surface layer
- Yonsei boundary layer
- Betts-Miller-Janic convection in d01



WRF modelling of case study – no Black Forest



- Investigate role of orography by removing it
 - All but outer 50 grid points of inner domain set to altitude equal to Rhine valley
 - Smoothed at boundary
 - Surface properties unchanged





WRF vs Observations – did the control run reproduce the case study?



320

Surface obs from VERA (Steinacker et al. 06) fingerprint analysis

- Surface equivalent potential temperature (θ_{e})
- Surface wind vectors
- Vis satellite (obs) / 700 hPa cloud cover (WRF)
- Surface precipitation

- Features simulated 1 hour late
- Errors in initial and lateral boundary conditions
- Observations and WRF compared when features aligned NOT at same times



WRF vs Observations – did the control run reproduce the case study?



- Southern part of system weaker than observations
- Decay over Rhine Valley because descent in lee of Vosges mountains reproduced
- No fog in Rhine valley in WRF YSU scheme aggressive in eroding temp inversions because BL variables vertically mixed (Weisman et al. 2008, Burton et al. 2012)
- Convergence line at leading edge of outflow with thermally-driven easterly



WRF vs Observations – did the control run reproduce the case study?



A

EGU General Assembly 2012, Vienna, 24th April 2012

WRF vs Observations – did the control run reproduce the case study?



 Weaker but successful convection above crests of Black Forest (Will be shown in more detail in later slide)

- Thermally-driven plain-mountain flow not generated > weaker convergence
 - Later (not shown) show simulated precipitation significantly less than observations
 - WRF diverges most clearly in southern end of regenerated convection



Inability of WRF to reproduce thermal flow



- Temperature gradient of 1 K developed during the morning of the 20th July between the plain and the mountain (over a distance of ~30 km) drove a thermal plain-mountain flow
- No temperature gradient in WRF
- Too well-mixed countergradient BL parameterisations fail to allow generation of temperature gradients



- Model error attributed to boundary layer parameterisation mixing issue and errors in initial conditions
- Convection regenerated above mountain crests occurred *despite* model error
- Convection less intense; but similarly located to observations
- WRF therefore 'useful' for investigating role of orography in convection regeneration above crests of Black Forest mountains



Role of orography in convection regeneration

Results from control run – equivalent potential temperature and convergence (grey)



Outflow undercut and lifted warm moist valley air above mountain height

- Elevated warm / moist buoyant air
- Convergence ahead of outflow when gust front encountered orography
- Convection initiated above mountains
- Convergence strengthened but was weaker than observations because thermal plain-mountain not generated



Origin of high Θ_e air behind gust front

Surface moisture flux (SSR and SSM are marked)



- Comparison of cross sections of potential temperature and equivalent potential temperature suggest that higher Θ_e is from moisture
 From simulated surface moisture flux we estimate that 1 kg m⁻² s⁻¹ of water is transferred to the boundary layer
- If mixing occurs up to an altitude of approximately 1 km, the mixing ratio will increase from 10.5 g m⁻³ to 11.5 g m⁻³ over a period of ~2 hrs, which equates to an increase of ~3 K



Convection regeneration without orography?



Convection regeneration didn't occur without Black Forest

EGU General Assembly 2012, Vienna, 24th April 2012





EGU General Assembly 2012, Vienna, 24th April 2012





 Outflow propagated across domain undisturbed – density current Warm moist valley air undercut and still lifted as in real orography case **•** Higher θ_{e} from prolonged influence of moisture flux insufficient for convection Convergence and updrafts generated IMMEDIATELY as outflow encountered orography of Swabian Jura



EGU General Assembly 2012, Vienna, 24th April 2012



 Outflow propagated across domain undisturbed – density current Warm moist valley air undercut and still lifted as in real orography case **•** Higher θ_{e} from prolonged influence of moisture flux insufficient for convection

 Convergence and updrafts generated *IMMEDIATELY* as outflow encountered orography of Swabian Jura



EGU General Assembly 2012, Vienna, 24th April 2012



- Outflow propagated across domain undisturbed – density current
- Warm moist valley air undercut and still lifted as in real orography case
- Higher θ_e from prolonged influence of moisture flux insufficient for convection
- Convergence and updrafts generated *IMMEDIATELY* as outflow encountered orography of Swabian Jura



Downstream convection – no orography sumulation

Middle domain surface θ_e , wind vectors, convergence and precipitation for no orography case at 1240 UTC



324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342

- Outflow propagated across domain undisturbed
- Warm moist valley air undercut and lifted as in real orography case
- Convergence and updrafts generated IMMEDIATELY as outflow encountered orography of Swabian Jura
- 20 minutes later, convection regeneration above mountain crests
- Convection regeneration occurred instantly when outflow encountered some orography



CONCLUSIONS

- Convection regeneration occurred because MCS outflow encountered significant orography
- Undercutting of warm moist air generated elevated region of warm / moist buoyant air
- Development of convergence line, resulting from forced orographic lifting and intensification of a gust front
- Boundary layer parameterisation critical for development of thermal gradients
- Prolonged undercutting of warm and moist air by MCS outflow insufficient for convection
- For this case, small but significant forcing required from orography





Thank you for listening.

Any Questions?

<u>References</u>

Burton, R. R., A. Gadian, A. Blyth, and S. D. Mobbs (2012). The representation of boundary layer processes in a high-resolution numerical model: a sensitivity study from the COPS experiment. Met. Zeit. COPS Special issue. In Prep

Corsmeier, U., N. Kalthoff, C. Barthlott, A. Behrendt, P Di Girolamo, M. Dorninger, J. Handwerker, C. Kottmeier, H. Mahlke, S. Mobbs, G. Vaughan, J. Wickert, and V. Wulfmeyer (2011). Driving processes for deep convection over complex terrain: A multiscale analysis of observations from COPS-IOP9c. Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.

Weisman, M. L., C. Davis, W. Wang, K. W. Manning, and J. B. Klemp (2008). Experiences with 0-36-h explicit convective forecasts with the WRF-ARW model. Weather and Forecasting 23(3), 407–437.

The results from this presentation will be submitted to a Met. Zeit. COPS Special issue, which is planned to be published online in late 2012.



