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Typical Pyrocumulus Lightning Flash
(Lang et al. 2014)

Hewlett Fire flash detected by Colorado Lightning Mapping Array (COLMA)

- Intracloud (not CG)
- High-altitude (~10 km MSL)
- Shallow (~2 km deep)
- Duration << 1 s
- Small! $L \sim 5$-$7$ km
- Positive charge overlaying negative (“normal” polarity)
- Numerous precursor VHF sources starting ~30 s prior to flash
Below LCL – High $Z_{DR}$/low $\rho_{HV}$ indicating mostly smoke
Above LCL – increasing $\rho_{HV}$ and decreasing $Z_{DR}$ – condensation/freezing?
Mid-level cloud bookending plume – Low $Z_{DR}$/high $\rho_{HV}$ relatively clean
Near and above -40 °C altitude – ZDR -1 to +1 dB, $\rho_{HV}$ ~0.6 or more
Lightning occurred in this inferred ice/ash mixture
What about non-lightning-producing plumes?
Many examples during DC3!
Only smoke signature evident in polarimetric data
No growth above -40 °C
Motivation

• The lightning and microphysical structures observed in Colorado during 2012 are very unusual for thunderstorms. Are these observations seen in PyroCu elsewhere?

• The NEXRAD radar network was recently upgraded to dual-pol. Can we document the internal microphysical structures of PyroCu elsewhere?

• The 2012 PyroCu produced no NLDN-detected flashes. The NLDN was upgraded after 2012; can it now observe at least some PyroCu lightning?

• GOES-R will be launched soon and will feature the Geostationary Lightning Mapper (GLM) instrument. Can we expect GLM to provide useful information about PyroCu lightning?
2013 Cases
10 Total - 7 Lightning, 3 Null

Carpenter 1

GOES Visible and Shortwave IR
4-5 July 2013 (~2200-0200 UTC)
(Source: pyrocb.ssec.wisc.edu)

Las Vegas polarimetric NEXRAD
0.5° & 5.1° sweeps
00:00-01:00 UTC, 5 July 2013
NLDN IC @ 00:23:20 UTC, I_{pk} = +4.5 kA
NLDN IC @ 00:25:16 UTC, I_{pk} = +7.6 kA
NLDN -CG @ 00:35:54 UTC, I_{pk} = -8.5 kA
Hardluck Fire (Wyoming)
- Pyrocumulus development and lightning during 26-27 July 2013
Radar Values in Hardluck Pyrocumulus

- $Z_H$: 15 to ~40 dBZ
- $Z_{DR}$: 0.5 to -0.5 dB
- $\rho_{HV}$: 0.7-1.0 (unitless)
- Indicates ice particles
- Pyrocumulus echo-top height: ~8.0 km
- 18 NLDN lightning flashes in 151 minutes

Similar results for other 2013 incidents – West Fork (CO), Rim (CA), Silver (NM), Yarnell Hill (AZ), Elk Complex (ID)
Radar Values in Black Forest (CO) Smoke Plume

- $Z_H$: 0 to ~30 dBZ
- $Z_{DR}$: 1-5 dB
- $\rho_{HV}$: 0.7 or less
- Indicates smoke particles
- Plume echo-top height: ~5.0 km
- No NLDN lightning

Similar results for other 2013 incidents – Royal Gorge (CO), Miner Paradise Complex (MT)
Simple particle identification
- Ice vs. Smoke
- Ice development leads occurrence of lightning

Table 1. List of radar parameter values used for determining if the radar was detection ice or smoke (from Lang et al. 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parameter Minimum Value</th>
<th>Parameter Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ice</td>
<td>Reflectivity (dBZ)</td>
<td>&gt;= 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZDR (dB)</td>
<td>&gt;= -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ρHV</td>
<td>&gt;= 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke</td>
<td>Reflectivity (dBZ)</td>
<td>&gt;= 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZDR (dB)</td>
<td>&gt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ρHV</td>
<td>&gt;= 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Geostationary Lightning Mapper Proxy Data

Motivation
• Many of these PyroCu flashes are small, low-current ICs
• Will GLM be able to provide information about them?

Method
• GLM proxy data were created using algorithms developed at MSFC (Bateman 2013)
• Algorithms based on statistical comparison of LMA and Lightning Imaging Sensor (LIS) observations of same lightning
• Proxy optical events clustered into proxy flashes
• Applied to Lang et al. (2014) LMA-mapped PyroCu lightning dataset

Colorado 2012 PyroCu LMA Observations
• Hewlett
• High Park
• Waldo Canyon

Bateman (2013) GLM Proxy Data Algorithm

GLM Proxy Dataset for lightning-producing PyroCu
Hewlett Fire Lightning

5/16 1948-2005 UTC

- LMA = 20 Flashes (10+ sources)
- GLM Proxy = 21 Flashes

GLM Proxy Statistics
(Min, Median, Max)

Footprint (km²)
98.2, 294.4, 786.5

Events per Flash
1, 3.0, 15
High Park Fire Lightning

6/13-14 2328-0033 UTC
- LMA = 28 Flashes (10+ sources)
- GLM Proxy = 18 Flashes

Magenta Stars
GLM Proxy Flashes

GLM Proxy Statistics
- (Min, Median, Max)
  - Footprint (km²): 97.6, 196.5, 490.0
  - Events per Flash: 1, 2.0, 8
Waldo Canyon Fire Lightning

6/26-27 2310-0006 UTC

- LMA = 117 Flashes (10+ sources)
- GLM Proxy = 56 Flashes

Magenta Stars
GLM Proxy Flashes

GLM Proxy Statistics

- Footprint (km²): 93.3, 188.1, 749.4
- Events per Flash: 1, 1.5, 13
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Summary and Conclusions

- Ten additional case PyroCu studies (lightning and non-lightning) examined

- The novel 2012 pyrocumulus lightning observations described in Lang et al. (2014) were not an exception!
  
  - Vertical growth of cloud leads to development of precipitation-sized ice signature in polarimetric radar data, distinctive from smoke signature
    
    - Modest to high $Z_H$, noisy but near-0 $Z_{DR}$, improved correlation
    - Presence of ice associated with occurrence of lightning
    - No ice signature, no lightning!
  
- Higher-sensitivity NLDN detects at least some of the weak ICs

- GLM appears capable of detecting many of these ICs

- Pyrocumulus development and lightning associated with significant fire growth

Dual-Pol NEXRAD + Upgraded NLDN + GOES-R/GLM = Nationwide Pyrocumulus Electrification Observing Network