# MCS response to storm environment in **UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS** convection permitting simulations

Ben Maybee<sup>1</sup>, Cornelia Klein<sup>2</sup>, John H Marsham<sup>1</sup>, Emma J Barton<sup>2</sup>, Douglas J Parker<sup>1,3,4</sup>, Christopher M Taylor<sup>2,5</sup>

(1) School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, UK; (2) Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (CEH), Wallingford, UK; (3) National Centre for Atmospheric Science (NCAS), University of Leeds, UK; (4) NORCE Norwegian Research Centre AS, Bergen, Norway; (5) National Centre for Earth Observation, Wallingford, UK

#### **Motivation**

Observations show that variability in extremes of rainfall and convective intensity in Mesoscale Convective Systems (MCSs) predominantly depend on atmospheric moisture and low-level vertical wind shear<sup>[1]</sup>. Convection permitting (CP) km-scale or modelling should capture these dependencies; yet a previous 10 year, 4.4km run of the Met Office Unified Model (UM) over Africa showed poor shear response<sup>[1,2]</sup>.<sup>20°s</sup> Here we explore if new, updated UM runs show improved storm environmental responses, and how results fit with theoretical mechanisms for MCS dynamics.







Â

b.w.maybee@leeds.ac.uk

## The LMCS project

The balance of mechanisms whereby shear affects MCS dynamics is not fully understood. Nor are crucial land-surface interactions, which influence low level shear and mature MCSs<sup>[3]</sup>. The LMCS project is investigating these interactions in global observations and CP simulations. New 40 day, 1.5km grid UM run over Sahel currently running.

Key model Q: does theory explain observed land-MCS coupling? Need to test aspects of shear response in explicit models; not seen in previous UM run!





## <u>Results: Sahel, 12°W – 12°E, 9 – 19°N</u>



### The K-Scale UK project, led by Met Office

Met Office developing very large domain regional and global convection permitting modelling capacity at the km grid-scale (K-Scale). Lead: Huw Lewis.

Existing pan-Africa run: CP4-A; 10years past + future climate, 4.4km. Showed greatly improved MCS populations vs parametrised convection (PC)<sup>[2,6]</sup>.

New km scale runs for 40 day DYAMOND summer and winter: 10km global driving model; four Local Area Models (LAMs); and novel Cyclic Tropical Channel. Hourly data on common 0.1° grid shared via JASMIN platform.

Key change vs CP4-A: RAL3 configuration. CASIM microphysics (5 phase, 2 moment) + improved BL turbulence scheme and land surface representation.

#### **Methods**

- $MCS = contiguous area > 5000 km^2$
- of Cloud Top Temp. (CTT)  $< -50^{\circ}$ C.
- Hourly snapshots, 16–19UTC.
- Environment = 12UTC pre-storm
- profile. Use TCW or 925hPa q, and
- zonal shear = u650 u925.
- Require max precip > 1mm/h.

#### Sahel linear q/shear relationships

16

configuration.



New RAL3 runs show generally improved MCS responses to environmental q and shear vs previous CP4-A, c.f. observations. Rainfall rates too high in Channel, and CTTs too low in all. But critically, correct shear responses now seen for precipitation. Why? Importance of low-level inflow? LLMC<sup>[5]</sup> depends on storm propagation

Zonal shear (m s<sup>-1</sup>

speed – improved in LAM vs CP4-A; but not in Channel. Shear decreases entrainment dilution of updraft cores<sup>[8]</sup>; improved in model? Look at differences between anvil heights and LNB,  $\theta_{e}$  profiles. Importance of **microphysics**? CASIM is 2-moment scheme, vs CP4-A single. 



Zonal shear (m  $s^{-1}$ )

 $n_{Cp4}$ =23305;  $n_{Ch. RAL3}$ =1001;  $n_{Lam}$ =984;  $n_{Obs}$ =26727



**LMCS**: project investigating MCS dynamics + land interactions in observations and explicit models.



Acknowledgements: Huw Lewis, James Warner and wider Met Office K-Scale project for model data/access; James Bassford for valuable discussions; Julia Crook for access to storm-tracking algorithm.

Natural	References		
	1) C Klein et al (2021), <i>Environ. Res. Lett.</i> <b>16</b> 104023	5)	D Alfaro (2017), <i>JAS</i> <b>74</b> 1
Environment	2) C Senior et al (2021), BAMS 102 6	6)	J Crook et al (2019), Earth Space Sci. 6 5
	3) C Klein and CM Taylor (2020), <i>Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.</i> <b>117</b> 35	7)	THM Stein et al (2014), <i>MWR</i> <b>142</b> 9
Research Council	4) R Rotunno et al (1988), JAS 45 3	8)	Mullholland et al (2021), JAS 76 6

Zonal shear (m s<sup>-1</sup>)

25 20 10 15 Mean propagation speed (ms<sup>-1</sup>) n.b. Storm speeds obtained using a Lagrangian tracking algorithm<sup>[6,7]</sup>.

Upgraded model configuration (RAL3) and improved resolution (2.2km) improves shear response of max rainfall rates from MCSs. Correct shear response in km scale models essential for confidence in upscale projections. Next steps: explore mechanisms

responsible for improvements.