# Numerical Simulations of a Cold-Season Turbulence Outbreak

Stan Trier and Bob Sharman NCAR, Boulder, Colorado

## Todd Lane and Simon Caine University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

AMS 15<sup>th</sup> Conference on Aviation, Range, and Aerospace Meteorology

Los Angeles, California, 1 August 2011









25

ND 05

10

15 20

30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 DBZ

Key Questions :

- What is the effect of the precip system on the upper-level flow?
- Does the convection contribute to CAT in this case? If so, what are the mechanisms?



SKEW-T/LOG-P VALID 0000 UTC 03/10/2006 KDVN Lat = 41.62 , Lon = -90.58

SKEW-T/LOG-P VALID 0000 UTC 03/10/2006 KSGF

Lat = 37.23 , Lon = -93.38

#### Simulation of the 9-10 March 2006 Turbulence Outbreak



## Nested Simulation Domains ( $\Delta$ = 30 km, 10 km, and 3.3 km)

#### Simulations:

- Control (started 24-h prior to reported turbulence)
- Dry simulation (microphysics scheme disabled in D3)
  - eliminates effects of convection within 6-h prior to reported turbulence

- Nested simulations with ARW-WRF version 3.1.1
- 80 vertical layers with 20-hPa model top, 3 fixed horizontal domains
- Kain-Fritsch Cumulus Scheme <sup>20</sup> N on D1 and D2 with fully explicit convection on D3 ( $\Delta x = 3.3$  km)
  - Initial and boundary conditions from 6-hourly GFS analyses

#### Model parameterizations

- Lin et al. microphysics
- MYJ PBL scheme
- Dudhia SW radiation
- **RRTM LW** radiation



### 24-h Forecast (CTRL) over Domain 3 at 0000 UTC 10 March



- 225-hPa winds
- 210-hPa TKE (brown contours)

225-hPa isotachs

- 225-hPa winds
- 195-225-hPa turbulence reports



#### 10.5-km MSL Total Horizontal Flow (10 Mar case) $_{90 \text{ W}}$ 10.5-km MSL Perturbed Horizontal Flow (10 Mar case) 80 W 100 W 80 H 300 DBZ 300 ш 75 ш. Ы 70 200 200 40 N 40 N Δ. 65 60 100 100 Αh. 55 MЦ <u>M</u>1 MI 50 Щ <u>A</u>111 MIL 45 K1111 200 500 200 100 300 400 100 300 400 500 11.5-km MSL Total Horizontal Flow (17 Jun MCS case) 11.5-km MSL Perturbed Horizontal Flow (17 Jun MCS case) 40 100 10 110 1 500 500 35 30 400 400 25 40 N 40 N 20 ĮW 300 300 15 ۵ī. 10 nı 05 200 200 9 ND KUIL AND 100 100

Un.

400

500

600

100

200

300

400

500

600

Ահ.

300

ա

ш

100

w

Ш

200

W

-ШL

#### Reflectivity/ Outflow Vertical Shear Magnitude in Current (top) and MCS (bottom) cases













#### Line-Averaged Cross Section of Cloud (colorfill), θ, Winds, TKE (green), Nm (red)



CTRL 24-h Forecast (0000 UTC 10 March 2006)

# Summary

- A nested version of ARW-WRF used to simulate a midlatitude cyclone case (9-10 March 2006) associated with severe aviation turbulence
  - Both organized convection and upper-level flow structure well simulated
- Comparison of full physics CTRL run with dry simulation reveal convection significantly impacts upper-level jet and its associated vertical shear

#### •Possible turbulence mechanisms are being examined using the simulations

- CIT related to the convectively-enhanced vertical shear (e.g., K-H instability)
- Mechanical forcing of gravity waves from convection below (Lane et al. 2003, Lane and Sharman 2008)
- Gravity-wave emission from unbalanced jets (Knox et al. 2008)