

Influence of Lifting Condensation Level on Low-Level **Outflow and Rotation in Simulated Supercell Thunderstorms**

Introduction

- Tendency towards higher boundary layer relative humidity (and thus lower LCLs) in tornadic supercell environments (e.g. Thompson et al 2003; Craven and Brooks 2004)
- Ability of outflow parcels to be lifted depends on buoyancy of air near the updraft, and significantly tornadic storms often have less negatively buoyant outflow (e.g. Markowski et. al 2002; Grzych et al. 2007)
- Colder outflow inhibits the stretching of near-surface air and can potentially undercut low-level circulations, thus reducing the effectiveness of the vertical perturbation pressure gradient force (Gilmore and Wicker 1998; Markowski and Richardson 2014)
- Guarriello et al. (2018) found that low-level shear characteristics of simulated supercells affected the relative positioning of near-ground circulation embedded within storm outflow relative to the overlying updraft and mesocyclone, and subsequent production of near-surface vertical vorticity
- Given the relationship between LCL and outflow characteristics, it is plausible that LCL could influence mesocyclone positioning in a similar manner. We will assess this possibility by varying LCL in idealized simulations over a set of low-level wind profiles. The following research hypotheses will be addressed in doing so:

1) Changes in LCL will affect cold pool buoyancy in supercell thunderstorms, with higher LCLs leading to more negatively buoyant outflow.

2) A lower LCL will lead to less forward propagation of outflow and embedded near-surface circulation relative to the mesocyclone aloft in supercells.

3) Near-surface vertical vorticity will be largest when the horizontal distance between the near-surface circulation and the mesocyclone aloft is minimized and the dynamic vertical perturbation pressure gradient force coincident with near-surface circulation is maximized.

Methods and Sounding Design

Three thermodynamic profiles were developed with different LCLs (~0.5, 1, 1.5 km) and combined with four low-level shear orientations, as illustrated below. Though previous studies, notably Lerach and Cotton (2012), have analytically altered LCL in model input soundings, this study changes LCL in a manner that minimizes variability in CAPE.





5400 s

7200

0006

ш

The position of the low-level mesocyclone is equally important for dynamic uplift and stretching near-surface rotation. We ot quantify this using circulation fraction, defined as the fraction of grid points beneath the low-level mesocyclone (area at z = 1 km with $w > 1 m s^{-1}$ and circulation $> 10^4$ m² s⁻¹) containing appreciable nearsurface circulation. This quantity is positively correlated with nearsurface vertical vorticity.

Matthew Brown and Christopher Nowotarski Department of Atmospheric Sciences, Texas A&M University

LCL and Outflow Buoyancy



pool buoyancy Cold profiles diverge within the last 1.5 hours of model integration. This same divergence appears when the buoyancy profiles are separated by low-level shear orientation.

For a given shear angle ($\alpha = 90^{\circ}$, shown below for example), the cold pool becomes broader and more negatively buoyant as LCL is increased, supporting our first research hypothesis.



Influence on Near-Surface Vertical Vorticity



We can quantify mesocyclone **←** separation by looking at the average displacement of appreciable nearsurface circulation and the midlevel mesocyclone. A 5-minute lag correlation between this quantity and the maximum near-surface vertical velocity in our domain o yields a general inverse correlation, which is consistent with our third hypothesis.



Following Hastings and Richardson (2016), we can decompose our pressure field one time step prior to the maximization of near-surface vertical vorticity. Integrating the 0-500 m vertical forcing beneath the mid-level mesocyclone, we see that positive dynamic VPPGF is collocated with appreciable near-surface circulation for the simulations which realize the largest values of near-surface vertical vorticity.

<u>Circulation/Mesocyclone Alignment</u>

In order to assess the influence of LCL on circulation positioning, we can create heat maps of appreciable (>5000 m² s⁻¹) near-surface circulation relative to the mid-level mesocyclone (500 m² s⁻² 2-5 km integrated UH contour). These heat maps reveal a more forward positioning of near-surface circulation with higher LCLs. The influence of low-level shear orientation can also be distinctly seen.







Conclusions

- As LCL increases, storm outflow becomes more forward propagating and negatively buoyant.
- 2. Appreciable near-surface circulation tends to propagate faster, and is more likely to advect beneath and subsequently ahead of the mesocyclone aloft as LCL is increased.
- When appreciable, positive near-surface circulation is collocated with the mesocyclone aloft and positive dynamic perturbation forcing at low levels, intense vertical vorticity can develop at the surface.
- The interaction between low-level shear and LCL plays a distinct role in regulating the magnitude of rotation realized at the surface.
 - \rightarrow The combination of LCL and shear effects influence the ability of surface circulation to propagate beneath the mesocyclone.
 - \rightarrow Depending on low-level shear orientation, the LCL most favorable for the development of intense near-surface rotation may not be the lowest one.

Future Work

- Compare results with the near-storm environments of observed tornadic supercell cases, particularly those with higher LCLs and/or an ambient wind profile similar to our $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$ simulations
- Rerun simulations with different model parameters, including:
 - \rightarrow Grid spacing how does the positioning of circulation change when smaller scale vortices are resolved?
 - \rightarrow Microphysics how does the model's handling of hydrometeors change precipitation fields, and thus the spatial patterns of buoyancy
 - \rightarrow Friction to what extent does frictionally-generated vorticity contribute to observed trends in near-surface rotation, especially as they relate to low-level shear alterations?

References

Craven, J. P., Brooks, H. E., & Hart, J. A. (2004). Baseline climatology of sounding derived parameters associated with deep, moist convection. Natl. Wea. Dig, 28(1), 13-24. Gilmore, M. S., & Wicker, L. J. (1998). The influence of midtropospheric dryness on supercell morphology and evolution. Monthly Weather Review, 126(4), 943-958. Grzych, M. L., Lee, B. D., & Finley, C. A. (2007). Thermodynamic analysis of supercell rear-flank

downdrafts from Project ANSWERS. Monthly weather review, 135(1), 240-246. Guarriello, F., Nowotarski, C. J., & Epifanio, C. C. (2018). Effects of the Low-Level Wind Profile on Outflow Position and Near-Surface Vertical Vorticity in Simulated Supercell Thunderstorms. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences, 75(3), 731-753.

Hastings, R., & Richardson, Y. (2016). Long-term morphological changes in simulated supercells following mergers with nascent supercells in directionally varying shear. Monthly Weather Review, 144(2), 471-499.

Lerach, D. G., & Cotton, W. R. (2012). Comparing aerosol and low-level moisture influences on supercell tornadogenesis: Three-dimensional idealized simulations. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences, 69(3), 969-987.

Markowski, P. M., Straka, J. M., & Rasmussen, E. N. (2002). Direct surface thermodynamic observations within the rear-flank downdrafts of nontornadic and tornadic supercells. Monthly weather review, 130(7), 1692-1721.

Markowski, P. M., & Richardson, Y. P. (2014). The influence of environmental low-level shear and cold pools on tornadogenesis: Insights from idealized simulations. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences, 71(1), 243-275.

Shabbott, C. J., & Markowski, P. M. (2006). Surface in situ observations within the outflow of forwardflank downdrafts of supercell thunderstorms. Monthly weather review, 134(5), 1422-1441. Thompson, R. L., Edwards, R., Hart, J. A., Elmore, K. L., & Markowski, P. (2003). Close proximity soundings within supercell environments obtained from the Rapid Update Cycle. Weather and Forecasting, 18(6), 1243-1261.

This work is funded by NSF grant AGS-1446342 through the NSF Physical and Dynamic Meteorology program.