

High-resolution MM5 Simulations of Hurricane Erin 2001: Role of Microphysical Processes

 Henian Zhang*, Greg. M. McFarquhar*, Gerald Heymsfield, Robbie Hood, Jimy Dudhia, Jeffrey B. Halverson, and Frank Marks Jr.

*Department of Atmospheric Sciences University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

McFarquhar, G. M., H. Zhang, G. Heymsfield, J. Dudhia, J. B. Halverson, R. H. Hood, and F. D. Marks, 2005: Factors affecting the evolution of Hurricane Erin and the distributions of hydrometeors: Role of microphysical processes. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, in press. 2005 WRF/MM5 Workshop **Goal:** Determine if MM5 predictions of rain and graupel are consistent with high resolution observations of Hurricane Erin 2001

Method: Compare the observed and simulated radar reflectivity (Z), Doppler winds and microwave brightness temperatures (Tb) obtained during the Fourth Convection and Moisture Experiment (CAMEX-4)

<u>Outline:</u>

- Model setup
- Sensitivity to microphysics scheme
- Sensitivity to graupel fall speeds
- Application of a new iterative condensation scheme

Acknowledgments:

This research is sponsored by the NASA CAMEX-4.

Model Setup

- * Time period: 0000 UTC 7 September to 0000 UTC 11 September
- * Four domains with horizontal resolutions of 54, 18, 6, 2 km
- * 36 sigma levels in the vertical
- Burk Thompson planetary boundary layer scheme
- Betts-Miller cumulus parameterization for Domains 1, 2 and 3
- Control simulation: Goddard microphysics scheme



Results

- 1. Sensitivity to microphysics scheme
 - ---- Simple ice

- --- Reisner mixed phase
- **····** Goddard (control simulation)
 - Observation: from the ER-2 Doppler Radar



Comparison of the observed and simulated Tb

Observed Tb: Advanced Microwave Precipitation Radiometer (AMPR) at 10.7, 19.35, 37.1 and 85.5 GHz channel

Simulated Tb: Calculated using Kummerow's Radiative Transfer Model from modeled hydrometeor fields

— AMPR observation

- **MM5** output
- MM5 output without graupel
- **—** MM5 output without snow





- Less than 1% of q_g are > 0.5 g/kg observed in Hurricane Norbert (1984) and Emily (1987) near melting level (McFarquhar and Black 2004).
- More than 10% of q_g are > 0.5 g/kg for simulated Erin.

Are Predicted Updrafts for Erin Too Large?

- Black et al. (1996) showed that only 5% of updrafts in the eyewall at 9 km are stronger than 5 m s⁻¹ (averaged over 7 tropical cyclones).
- •Control simulation produces more than 30% of updrafts stronger than 5 m s⁻¹ for Erin.



Simulations with varying (a,b) have no significant impact on frequency distribution of the 18-hour averaged q_{g} .



3. Application of a new iterative condensation scheme (McFarquhar et al. 2005)



New scheme suppressed the strongest updrafts



The new scheme reduced the frequency of $w > 3 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ and the maximum Z from 53 dBZ to 47 dBZ near the melting level. But such conditions contribute less than 5 % to Erin's area.

Conclusions

1. Simulations with various microphysics schemes overestimate the frequency of higher Z and underestimate that of moderate Z.

- 2. Enhanced scattering at 37.1 and 85.5 GHz channels produced by the control simulation is mainly due to over-prediction of graupel.
- 3. Varying representation of graupel fall-out produces a difference up to 7 mb in central pressure, but has no significant impact on the time-averaged graupel mixing ratio frequency distribution.
- 4. An improved condensation scheme that limits artificial increases of Θ_e reduces the areas of highest Z and strongest updrafts. However, such areas represent less than 5% of Erin's area.