Uncertainties in Convective Storm Modeling

Kristen Lani Rasmussen¹, Wiebke Deierling^{1,2}, Mitchell Gregg¹, Marqi Rocque^{1,3} ¹Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO ²National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO ³Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA

Lightning Modeling Workshop • Albuquerque, NM • 1-3 April 2024

Weather disasters are becoming more frequent



Atmospheric science fundamentally involves processes across scales



Conceptual diagram of convective storms



From Markowski and Richardson

Conceptual model of lightning charge distribution



Source: NSSL

Global Lightning Frequency



Rainfall from the TRMM Satellite (1st Precipitation Radar in Space; 1997-2014)

Revolutionized our understanding of clouds and precipitation in the tropics and subtropics



Most Intense Thunderstorms on Earth



Zipser et al. (2006)

Environments supporting the deepest convection on Earth have *both* convective instability *and* convective inhibition

- → Allows for the build-up of convective energy that is critical for generating deep intense convection
- → Combination of Convective Available Potential Energy (CAPE) and Convective Inhibition (CIN) generated from mountain flows (i.e., low level jets, elevated flows over mountains, etc.)

"The most intense thunderstorms on earth" according to satellite observed storm height, organization, severe hail, lightning proxies



Nesbitt and Zipser (2003) Zipser et al. (2006) Nesbitt et al. (2006) Houze et al (2015) Romatschke and Houze (2011. 13) Rasmussen et al. (2014) Rasmussen and Houze (2011, 2016)

Source: Steve Nesbitt

Hail Frequency Comparison



Cecil and Blankenship (2012)

Diurnal Cycle of Lightning in Argentina





Significantly more intense echoes and graupel are found in South American storms compared to Colorado and Alabama storms



Lightning flash regressions applied to 1-km WRF simulations agree well with observations

$f = (1.08 \times 10^{-2}) \times V35$ f = (4.18 \times 10^{-9}) \times GRM f = (3.24 \times 10^{-1}) \times IWP



Rocque et al. (2023)

Lightning regressions based on U.S. storms <u>significantly</u> overestimate flash rates in South America



Physical Approach

- What physics are implemented in modeling convective storms?
 - Mesoscale models using community-developed parameterizations to represent unresolved processes
 - Planetary boundary layer
 - Cloud microphysics
 - Land surface processes
 - Lightning
 - And many more
 - How has this modeling activity been motivated by a larger scientific problem?
 - Severe weather hazards
 - Numerical Weather Prediction efforts

Physical Approach

What physics are implemented in modeling convective storms?

- Describe the current capability
 - Very well-developed mesoscale models with known challenges
 - Hard to get the right storm in the right place at the right time
- How does the wider scientific community use this model component and similar tools?
 - Regularly used for operational Numerical Weather Prediction efforts (e.g., HRRR, FV3 operational models)
 - Used for research studies from case studies to high-resolution convectionpermitting regional climate simulations



Future of Weather and Climate Forecasting

Climate models implicitly represent convective mass flux (CMF) → processes important to CMF not captured



Digital twins are a current reality



(after Voosen 2020)

So all problems solved then?

Ongoing Challenges in State-of-the Art Models



Vertical motion is a major source of error in our weather and climate models

Deep convection overshoots in NWP forecasts

- 10-year ground-based U.S. radar climatology of overshooting top echotop heights connected with very intense convective storms
- Very strong convective mass flux required to support overshooting tops above the tropopause



Courtesy: Ken Bowman; NASA DCOTSS Campaign

Deep convection overshooting tops from a 10-year radar climatology (2004-2013)



- Comparison between overshooting tops in a 3-km operational NWP model (HRRR; left) and ground-based radar observations (right)
- Consistent methodology using 10 dBZ echo tops extending above the tropopause
- Model significantly underestimates the height of overshooting tops associated with deep convection compared to observations

Physical Approach

What are the gaps

- Most mesoscale model overestimate the vertical motion in strong convective storms
- At the same time, the HRRR model underestimates the height of overshooting tops
- Bulk microphysics schemes greatly simplify the complexity of dynamic-microphysics interactions
- Resolve different components of the storms with different grid spacings
 - Mesoscale processes are reasonably well represented at ~4km horizontal grid spacing
 - Thermals and individual updrafts are well represented at LES (~100m) grid spacing

Convection Evolves Rapidly







Cloud 140646 CDT

140934

141246



Cloud 142014 CDT



142533

1

Development of a deep convective cloud over a 20 minute time period (images: Ted Fujita)

142230

Convective development - 30 min period

Convective storms vertically transport and mix the atmosphere

NASA Investigation of Convective Updrafts Mission

← ∆t=30secs → ₩

∆t=120sec

Short Δt = 30 secs Best estimate of strongest updrafts

Moderate $\Delta t = 90$ secs Robust compromise between detection and false alarm probability

Flight Direction

∆t=90secs

Space Craft: 100kg
Inclination: tropical (22.5 to 39°)

7 km s⁻¹, 95 minute orbit, 15x per day

Δt Approach:
1. To study different parts of the CMF intensity spectrum
2. To quantify duration of the vertical transport
3. Evolution of storm structures

Launch: 2026 Duration: 2 years

~330,000 convective cores at 39°

Model Use and Validation

- How is this model component validated?
 - Comparisons to available observations
 - Limited in time/space around the world

• How will model errors be quantified?

- Overestimates of vertical motion in convective storms has been quantified by 3D wind retrievals from field campaigns → limited in availability and the estimates have their own uncertainties
- Radar reflectivity structures (i.e. storm modes) provides a useful validation opportunity
- Rainfall

• What observations are necessary for validation

- Concurrent radar, lightning, and vertical motion estimates
- Available now in limited regions (i.e., field campaigns)

Funding Sources

Provide a list of programs that fund research in your focus area. The purpose of this section is to survey how we might organize long-term support for the work.

| Sponsoring organization | Funding program | Funding program element | Funding cadence (R = regular interval; I = irregular intervals; L = time-limited opportunity) | Comments |
|----------------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|
| NASA | ESSP | Earth Venture Mission 3 (INCUS Mission) | R | Interest in connecting CMF with lightning across the storm lifecycle |
| NSF | PDM | | R | Storm comparisons between Colorado and Argentina |

Avenues for Collaborations

Describe the type of collaborations that have been beneficial for your field of research, what challenges currently exist for establishing collaborations, and/or what type of collaborations you would like to see better supported.

- Across national organizations or agencies (public and private)
 - Satellite missions like INCUS
- International partnerships
 - Field campaigns (e.g., RELAMPAGO, KPOP-MS in South Korea, etc.)
- What is the balance of student, postdoc, and career-expert work?
 - 1-3 students, 1-2 postdocs and 1-2 career-experts in my research group working on convective storms and lightning

Questions?



Funding support: NSF grants AGS-1661657, AGS-2146709 NASA INCUS Mission: 80LARC22DA011 27