AMWG - The Vertical Extent of Convection in CAM7: A Simple Total Energy Approach

Rich Neale (rneale@ucar.edu) and Cecile Hannay

Climate and Global Dynamics Lab. (CGD) NSF National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR)





29th Annual CESM Workshop, Boulder, CO (June 10th, 2024)



This material is based upon work supported by the National Center for Atmospheric Research, which is a major facility sponsored by the National Science Foundation under Cooperative Agreement No. 1852977.

Deep Convective Overshoot





Young (2012): 10.13140/RG.2.1.2699.2720

CESM3 (FLT) 1980-2020 10 10 30 30 100 100 J F M A M J J A S O N D J F M A M J J A S O N D 1.6 1.8 2.0 2.2 2.4 2.6 2.8 3.0 1e-6 Q (kg/kg) **MJO-QBO** Interaction a OBO QBOE wind 🗲 Colder, higher tropopause; reduced stratificatio Increased cirrus cloud Decreased cirrus cloud

Tape Recorder

Obs.

Convective overshoot

- A few percent of the time (especially over land)
- Above the level of neutral buoyancy •
- Zhang-McFarlane deep convection cannot represent this
- Equilibrium potential energy (CAPE) framework



Martin et al. (2021): 10.1038/s43017-021-00173-9



Remaining Deep Convection Issues

Top Heaviness

- Zhang McFarlane behavior has shallowed over time CAM3->CAM6
- Increased sensitivity to moisture (good for MJO, diurnal cycle)
- Compensation from non-convection physics
- Implications for lower stratosphere (QBO, tape recorder)?





Simple Plume Dynamics (KE/PE)

Reference	Acronym	Equation	a	Ь	Remarks
Simpson and Wiggert (1969)		(1)	$\frac{2}{3}$		$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial w_c^2}{\partial z} = aB_c - 0.18\frac{w_c^2}{R}$, where R is cloud radius
Bechtold et al. (2001)	BBGMR	(12)	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	
Gregory (2001)	G01	(11)	$\frac{1}{6}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial w_c^2}{\partial z} = aB_c - (b'\delta + b\epsilon)w_c^2, b' = \frac{1}{2}$
Von Salzen and McFarlane (2002)	SF	(29)	$\frac{1}{6}$	1	
Jakob and Siebesma (2003)	JS	(7)	$\frac{1}{3}$	2	
Bretherton et al. (2004) Cheinet (2004) Soares et al. (2004) Rio and Hourdin (2008)	BMG C04 SMST RH	(17) (1) (6) (5)	1 1 2 1	2 1 1 1	$\frac{\partial \sigma w_c^2}{\partial z} = a\sigma B_c - b'\delta\sigma w_c^2, b' = \frac{1}{2}$
Neggers et al. (2009) Pergaud et al. (2009)	NKB PMMC	(12) (7)	1 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	b value found after substitution of Eq. (4) $\frac{1}{2}(1-2\mu)\frac{\partial w_c^2}{\partial z} = aB_c - b\epsilon w_c^2, \mu = 0.15$
Rio et al. (2010)	RHCJ	(9)	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial w_c^2}{\partial z} = aB_c - (b' + b\epsilon)w_c^2, b' = 0.002$
De Rooy and Siebesma (2010)	RS	(27)	0.62	1	
ECMWF (2010)	ECMWF	(6.9)	$\frac{1}{3}$	1.95	
Kim and Kang (2011)	KK	(11)	$\frac{1}{6}$	2	$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial w_c^2}{\partial z} = a(1 - C_{\epsilon}b)B_c, C_{\epsilon} = 1/\overline{RH} - 1$

Roode, Stephan R. et al. "Parameterization of the Vertical Velocity Equation for Shallow Cumulus Clouds." *Monthly Weather Review* 140 (2012): 2424-2436.

Bulk Convective Parcel Energetics

 $KE_p(k) = pe2ke_eff^*PE_p(k)+KE(k-1)+KE_{LS}(k)$

 $\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{KE}_{\mathsf{p}}(\mathsf{k}) = \mathsf{Kinetic} \ \mathsf{energy} \ \mathsf{at} \ \mathsf{level} \ \mathsf{k} \\ \mathsf{PE}_{\mathsf{p}}(\mathsf{k}) = \mathsf{Potential} \ \mathsf{energy} \ \mathsf{at} \ \mathsf{level} \ \mathsf{k} \ (\mathsf{buoyancy} \ \mathsf{based}) \\ \mathsf{KE}_{\mathsf{LS}}(\mathsf{k}) = \mathsf{Kinetic} \ \mathsf{energy} \ \mathsf{of} \ \mathsf{resolved} \ \mathsf{K} \end{array}$

pe2ke_eff = Efficiency PE->KE conversion (0.1 - 0.05, 0.2) P_{ini} = Cloud base parcel energy (5 - 2, 20) J/kg



Vertical Profile of Convection

- Convective top is where KE equals zero
- Top heavy convective mass flux, steady increase near surface
- Overshooting?





Top Heaviness

- Near surface tendencies reduced
- Deep heating restored
- Maximum convective heating elevated







Convective Heating Change

Top Heaviness

- Near surface tendencies reduced
- Deep heating restored
- Maximum convective heating elevated







Cloud Top Height – Goldilocks Behavior



Occasionally deep, mostly shallow (L58) Excessive, constant depth (+KE) Nearly always shallow (+PBL) Mostly deep, sensitive to stability (+KE/PBL)

Parcel Vertical Range

- Cloud base more responsive to the environment with the PBL parcel changes
- Cloud top more responsive to the environment with the ZM KE changes



Single Column L32



Single Column CAM (SCAM) – TOGA COARE (Tropical W. Pacific)

-12



CAM Simulations (L32, 2 deg) - Precipitation





CAM6 Simulations

- 6 years, CAM6, F2000climo
- ZM total parcel energy (**KE**) and CAM7 near-surface mixing (**PBL**) + combined



CAM Simulations (L32, 2 deg) – Deeper Convection (DJF)

Deep convective moistening at 200.0 (mb)



Pressure of Mean Convective Cloud Top (mb)





CAM Simulations (L32, 2 deg) – Deeper Convection (DJF)

Deep convective moistening at 200.0 (mb)



NCAR UCAR





- 0.8 - 0.6 - 0.4

0.2

-0.4

-0.6 -0.8

-1.0

0.0 0.0 PPM/day

Convective Precipitation, % of total



CAM Simulations (L32, 2 deg) – Top Heavy (DJF)







Motivation

ZM PBL-based launch level properties in CAM6-dev Decreased ZM deep heating came in at CAM6 (single layer stability) Potential for L58 to be more sensitive (2x thinner layers)

Talk

Implemented a total energy criteria (PE+KE>0) for ZM plume viability -> SCAM TOGA: Performs well for tropics; noise, deep heating, convective top ARM site: Marginal improvements, tuning of parameters needed Low-resolution CAM6 simulations: Consistently deeper convection (tunable!)

Next steps:

CAM7 simulations 1 deg L58 Improve realism of energetics (initial plume energy, conversion efficiency Implement a KE_{ini} based on CLUBB TKE (CLUBB-MF definitely better)





