

### **1. Motivation**

- □ Jiang et al. (2008) showed observational evidence of aerosol effects on clouds and precipitation in the dry season of South America, but the physical mechanisms were unclear.
- □ Limited modeling studies were conducted with coupled aerosol-cloud-precipitation interactions.

# **2. Model configuration and experiment design**

- □ Time period: Sep. 15 to Sep. 24, 2006
- Horizontal resolution: 36 km and 4 km
- Initial and boundary conditions: FNL (meteorology) and MOZART (chemistry)
- Physics:
  - $\succ$  Lin et al. microphysics with prognostic cloud droplet number
  - Grell-Devenyi ensemble cumulus
  - RRTMG longwave scheme
  - Goddard shortwave scheme

### **D** Experiments:

- PC: polluted case
- $\succ$  CC: clean case (without biomass burning emission)
- > PCNR: polluted case without feedback from aerosols to radiation.



22 23 24

20

Day

19

18

21

- Chemistry:
- RADM2 chemistry and MADE/SORGAM aerosols
- Anthropogenic emissions: RETRO and EDGAR
- Wildfire emissions: WF\_ABBA and a plume rise model with modification  $\succ$  Gas phase, aerosol, wet scavenging, vertical trubulent mixing and cloud
- chemistry
- Feedback from aerosols to radiation



# **Biomass Burning Aerosol Effects on Clouds and Precipitation** in the Dry Season of South America

Longtao Wu, Hui Su and Jonathan H. Jiang (longtao.wu@jpl.nasa.gov) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology

**4. Aerosol total effects (PC-CC)** (Pad (Pad (Pad) (P 500 600 700 22 23 AOT (a) 200 200 ⊟ 300 400 500 600 700 800 Temperature Dav .16 .32 100 <u>ल</u> 200 т<mark>о</mark> 300 400 ≌ 500 600 700 Day Moisture Diff. of QVAPOR (%) -9-6-30369

- Overall, the evolution of aerosols and their effects on local atmosphere show a clear signal of diurnal variation throughout the simulation, but with some different responses due to the difference of aerosol intensity and locations before and after 1500 UTC 20 Sep., 2006.
- > We divide the simulation time period into two phases. In each phase, we select one typical day (shown in the figure of AOT difference) to look at the aerosol effects in detail.





# 8. Conclusions

- and temporal variation.

## Acknowledgements

We thank the funding support from the NASA ACMAP, AST and IDS programs. This work was performed as the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under contract with NASA.

- layers extends longer time. increase at night of phase one is not shown in phase
- When aerosols transport to moistening are shown in the
- More ice clouds increase at

> The WRF-Chem simulations approximately reproduce the distributions of aerosols and chemical tracers in response to convection, but the magnitudes of modeled clouds are weaker than observations. The modeled precipitation agrees well with TRMM observations, in both intensity

> Biomass burning aerosols cool the surface by scattering and absorbing solar radiation while they warm the middle-layer atmosphere by absorbing solar radiation.

> Contributed primarily by the aerosol radiative effect, surface precipitation is suppressed in the daytime while precipitation is enhanced at night, suggesting a delay of precipitation process.

 $\succ$  More cloud ice is shown at night with slightly higher altitude due to aerosol effects.

> When aerosols are transported to the upper troposphere, significant warming and moistening are shown in the upper troposphere.