

Springer Theses

Recognizing Outstanding Ph.D. Research

Aims and Scope

The series “Springer Theses” brings together a selection of the very best Ph.D. theses from around the world and across the physical sciences. Nominated and endorsed by two recognized specialists, each published volume has been selected for its scientific excellence and the high impact of its contents for the pertinent field of research. For greater accessibility to non-specialists, the published versions include an extended introduction, as well as a foreword by the student’s supervisor explaining the special relevance of the work for the field. As a whole, the series will provide a valuable resource both for newcomers to the research fields described, and for other scientists seeking detailed background information on special questions. Finally, it provides an accredited documentation of the valuable contributions made by today’s younger generation of scientists.

Theses are accepted into the series by invited nomination only and must fulfill all of the following criteria

- They must be written in good English.
- The topic should fall within the confines of Chemistry, Physics, Earth Sciences, Engineering and related interdisciplinary fields such as Materials, Nanoscience, Chemical Engineering, Complex Systems and Biophysics.
- The work reported in the thesis must represent a significant scientific advance.
- If the thesis includes previously published material, permission to reproduce this must be gained from the respective copyright holder.
- They must have been examined and passed during the 12 months prior to nomination.
- Each thesis should include a foreword by the supervisor outlining the significance of its content.
- The theses should have a clearly defined structure including an introduction accessible to scientists not expert in that particular field.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/8790>

Yuan Wang

Aerosol-Cloud Interactions from Urban, Regional, to Global Scales

Doctoral Thesis accepted by
Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

Author
Dr. Yuan Wang
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, CA
USA

Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Renyi Zhang
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX
USA

ISSN 2190-5053
Springer Theses
ISBN 978-3-662-47174-6
DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-47175-3

ISSN 2190-5061 (electronic)
ISBN 978-3-662-47175-3 (eBook)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015938727

Springer Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2015

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer-Verlag GmbH Berlin Heidelberg is part of Springer Science+Business Media
(www.springer.com)

Parts of this thesis have been published in the following journal articles:

Wang, Y., M. Wang, R. Zhang, S.J. Ghan, Y. Lin, J. Hu, B. Pan, M. Levy, J. Jiang, M.J. Molina, Assessing the Effects of Anthropogenic Aerosols on Pacific Storm Track Using A Multi-Scale Global Climate Model, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, *111* (19), 6894–6899 (2014)

Wang, Y., R. Zhang, R. Saravanan, Asian pollution climatically modulates mid-latitude cyclones following hierarchical modelling and observational analysis, *Nature. Comm.*, *5*, 3098 (2014)

Wang, Y., J. Fan, R. Zhang, R. Leung, C. Franklin, Improving Bulk Microphysics Parameterizations in Simulations of Aerosol Indirect Effects, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *118*, 1–19, (2013)

Fan, J., L. Leung, Z. Li, H. Morrison, H. Chen, Y. Zhou, Y. Qian, **Y. Wang**, Aerosol impacts on clouds and precipitation in eastern China-results from bin and bulk microphysics, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *117*, D00K36, (2012)

Wang, Y., Q. Wan, W. Meng, F. Liao, H. Tan, R. Zhang, Long-term impacts of aerosols on precipitation and lightning over the Pearl River Delta megacity area in China, *Atmo. Chem. Phys.*, *11*(23), 12421–12436, (2011)

Supervisor's Foreword

Yuan Wang received a B.S. in Computer Science from Fudan University (2007) and a Ph.D. (2013) in Atmospheric Sciences from Texas A&M University. He is presently a postdoc research fellow at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology. His research areas focus on aerosol physics and chemistry, aerosol-cloud interactions and their climate implications, mesoscale and global climate modeling.

This dissertation covers several broad research topics in atmospheric sciences, ranging from development and refinement of the regional Weather Research Forecast (WRF) model and global climate model (GCM) to assessments of the aerosol-cloud-climate interaction. As recognized in the Fifth Assessment Report by the Inter-government Panel on Climate Change (IPCC AR5, 2013), the magnitude of cloud adjustment by aerosols is highly uncertain, representing the largest uncertainty in projections of future climate by anthropogenic activities. Much of the uncertainty in the assessment of the aerosol radiative forcing arises from the difficulty to resolve aerosol and cloud-scale processes in GCMs. Yuan's research involved modeling the aerosol effects on cloud formation and precipitation using the mesoscale cloud-resolving (CR) WRF model. He made key model development that, for the first time, implemented an explicit two-moment bulk microphysical scheme into WRF. Because of its broad application in numerical weather prediction, his improved WRF framework has enabled assessment of aerosol-cloud interaction for variable weather-scale systems, from individual cumulus to mesoscale convective systems. He utilized this model to investigate the aerosol effects on precipitation and lightning over a megacity region in China. He also improved the representation of cloud microphysics in the WRF model and employed the upgraded model to investigate the aerosol effects on stratocumulus over the Southeast Pacific region.

He developed a novel hierarchical modeling approach to assess the impacts of Asian pollution on the Pacific storm track, on the basis of the aerosol forcings calculated from seasonal simulations using the CR-WRF models and incorporation of the derived aerosol forcings to the GCM to predict the associated climatic

responses. His novel approach resolved a long outstanding mismatch between simulations by regional mesoscale models and GCMs in the climate research community, allowing a more precise assessment of the global impacts of the cloud-scale processes induced by anthropogenic aerosols. His results from the hierarchical modeling and observational analysis demonstrated unambiguously that Asian pollution has exerted profound climatic impacts on mid-latitude cyclones over the past three decades. In addition, he evaluated the impacts of aerosols over the Pacific storm track on the basis of the results from multi-scale aerosol-climate model simulations, further confirming his results using the hierarchical modeling.

I believe that this dissertation will be of broad interest, not only to the scientific communities in the fields of atmospheric physics and chemistry, but also to those who are interested in global environmental and climate changes and the interface between science and policy.

College Station, USA
May 2015

Prof. Dr. Renyi Zhang
Editor, Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences
Senior Editor, Oxford Research
Encyclopedia—Environmental Science, Oxford University Press
Holder of Harold J. Haynes Endowed Chair
University Distinguished Professor
Department of Atmospheric Sciences, College of Geosciences
Department of Chemistry, College of Science
1204 O&M Building, 3150 TAMU
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my thesis advisor, Dr. Renyi Zhang, for his wise guidance and unselfish support throughout the course of this research. My committee members, Dr. Ramalingam Saravanan, Dr. Courtney Schumacher, Dr. Qi Ying, and Dr. Yangang Liu are also highly appreciated for their valuable comments and constructive advises during the my doctoral study.

I want to thank my colleagues, the department faculty and staffs in the Department of Atmospheric Sciences at Texas A&M University. Especially, the discussions with Research Scientists Jenshan Hsieh and Cara-Lyn Lappen at Texas A&M University helped me solve several technical problems in numerical modeling. Special thanks go to Jiwen Fan from Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, who offered me substantial help during my visit to PNNL. I also benefited a lot from the collaboration with Minghuai Wang from PNNL to analyze the results from the super-parameterized climate model.

I also want to extend my gratitude to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration fellowship program, which provided me a 3-year funding support.

This thesis is specially dedicated to my beloved mother, Ruoqing Zhang who passed away in 2011.

Contents

1 Introduction	1
1.1 Current Understanding on the Aerosol-Cloud Interaction	1
1.2 Urban-Scale Impacts of Air Pollution on the Thunderstorm	2
1.3 Regional-Scale Impacts of Aerosol on the Stratocumuli	3
1.4 Global-Scale Impacts of Pollution Outflows on Storm Track	4
1.5 Objectives	5
References	5
2 Numerical Model Description	9
2.1 Mesoscale Weather Research and Forecast (WRF) Model	9
2.1.1 Spectral Bin Cloud Microphysics	9
2.1.2 Bulk Cloud Microphysics—Morrison Scheme	10
2.1.3 Bulk Cloud Microphysics in the CR-WRF	11
2.2 Global Climate Model	13
2.3 Multiscale Aerosol-Climate Modeling Framework	13
References	14
3 Impacts of Urban Pollution on Thunderstorms	17
3.1 Long-Term Observations of Precipitation, Lightning Flashes, and Visibility	17
3.2 Design of Numerical Simulations	20
3.3 Model Evaluation and Sensitivities for Aerosol Levels	22
3.4 Lightning Flashes and Lightning Potential Index	25
3.5 Microphysical Properties and Convections	28
3.6 Summary	32
References	34
4 Aerosol Effects on the Stratocumulus and Evaluations of Microphysics	37
4.1 Experiment Design	37

- 4.2 Effects of Aerosol Representation on Sc Simulations 39
 - 4.2.1 Simulated Aerosol Evolution 39
 - 4.2.2 Comparison with Field Measurements 40
 - 4.2.3 Effects on the Cloud Properties 43
- 4.3 Effects of Diffusional Growth Parameterizations. 45
- 4.4 Effects of Autoconversion Parameterizations 47
- 4.5 Effects of Aerosol Representation on AIE 49
- 4.6 Summary 50
- References 52

- 5 Impacts of Asian Pollution Outflows on the Pacific**
 - Storm Track** 55
 - 5.1 Observational Evidences 55
 - 5.2 A Hierarchical Modeling Approach 58
 - 5.2.1 Configuration of CR-WRF and Experiment Design 59
 - 5.2.2 Evaluations of CR-WRF Simulations 61
 - 5.2.3 Sensitivity Study and Derived Aerosol Forcings. 63
 - 5.2.4 Response of Storm Track in the Forced CAM5 70
 - 5.3 Multiscale Aerosol-Climate Modeling Framework 75
 - 5.3.1 Numerical Experiment Design 75
 - 5.3.2 Analysis of Simulation Results 75
 - 5.3.3 Results from Host GCM 80
 - 5.4 Summary 81
 - References 82

- 6 Conclusions** 85

List of Figures

Fig. 2.1	Overview of the two-moment bulk microphysical scheme (TAMU scheme) implemented in the WRF model.	12
Fig. 3.1	AOD and flash density distribution over Southern China and flash density distribution over Southern China. a Annual mean AOD from the MODIS satellite in 2005. b Annual mean CG flash density distribution from the local lightning detection network in the Guangdong Province in 2005 (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications)	18
Fig. 3.2	Correlation between a daily visibility and the heavy rainfall rate, b daily visibility and lightning flash density over PRD from 2000 to 2006. Both daily visibility and heavy rainfall rate are averaged over the 4-month period (from March to June). The heavy rainfall rate is calculated from each rain gauge station with a daily rainfall greater than 25 mm. CG lightning flash density (flashes km^{-2}) is accumulated over 4 months each year. The <i>line</i> represents a linear regression through all data (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications)	20
Fig. 3.3	Overview of domains in the model simulations. The <i>red symbols</i> represent the radar stations, and the <i>blue symbols</i> represent the lightning detection stations (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications).	21

Fig. 3.4 Comparison of radar reflectivity between observation and CR-WRF simulation for the P-case. **a** Observation at 0900 UTC. **b** Simulation at 0900 UTC. **c** Observation at 1100 UTC. **d** Simulation at 1100 UTC (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications). 23

Fig. 3.5 Temporal evolution of the domain-averaged rainfall rate. The *red dashed line* represents the gauge measurement, the *blue solid line* corresponds to the P-case, and the *green solid line* corresponds to the C-case (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications). 24

Fig. 3.6 Comparison of accumulated precipitation from 0900 to 1500 UTC between observation and simulations. **a** Gauge measurements. **b** P-case. **c** C-case (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications). 24

Fig. 3.7 Probability distribution functions of the four different rainfall categories for the P- and C-cases. **a** Percentage of grid areas under a certain precipitation category over the entire model domain. **b** Percentage of the precipitation amount under a certain category over the total precipitation amount. *Dark blue* corresponds to the P-case, and *red* corresponds to the C-case (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications). 26

Fig. 3.8 Temporal evolution of **a** observed total CG lightning flashes and **b** calculated domain-averaged LPI. In **a** *red* denotes positive flashes and *dark blue* denotes negative flashes. In **b** *red* denotes the C-case and *dark blue* denotes the P-case (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications). 27

Fig. 3.9 Comparison of observed CG lightning distribution with the simulated LPI in the P-case. **a** Strikes (0800 UTC), **b** LPI (0800 UTC), **c** LPI (0800 UTC), **d** Strikes (0900 UTC), **e** LPI (0900 UTC), **f** LPI (0900 UTC) (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications). 28

Fig. 3.10 Temporal evolution of the horizontally domain-summed mass mixing ratio of **a** cloud water in the C-case, **b** cloud water in P-case, **c** rain water in the C-case, **d** rain water in the P-case, **e** ice in the C-case, **f** ice in the P-case, **g** graupel in the C-case, and **h** graupel in the P-case (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications). 30

Fig. 3.11 Domain averaged column maximum vertical velocity in the simulations. The *solid lines* represent the updraft and the *dashed lines* represent the downdraft. The *dark blue lines* represent the P-case and the *red lines* represent the C-case (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications). 32

Fig. 3.12 Temporal evolution of latent heat profiles: **a** C-case and **b** P-case (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2011) with permission of Copernicus Publications). 32

Fig. 4.1 **a** Domain overview for the simulation case. *Red line* denotes the flight track of C130 research aircraft on Oct 28, 2008. **b** Aerosol size distribution from field measurement and used in the model initialization (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2013) with permission of John Wiley and Sons) 38

Fig. 4.2 Temporal evolution of the domain-averaged aerosol number concentration from the three simulations with SBM, Bulk-OR, and Bulk-2M in the Sc case (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2013) with permission of John Wiley and Sons) 40

Fig. 4.3 Comparison of the vertical profiles of cloud microphysical properties from the three simulations SBM, Bulk-OR and Bulk-2M with the C130 aircraft measurements. The *first, second, and third columns* present the liquid water content, cloud droplet number concentration, and cloud droplet effective radius, respectively. The *black dots* denote the mean values of observations at given heights within ± 25 m. *Shading areas* denote the standard derivation of the sampling data over the flight track (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2013) with permission of John Wiley and Sons). 41

Fig. 4.4 Comparison of time series of **a** LWP, **b** cloud base height, **c** cloud thickness, and **d** radar reflectivity at 100 m from the three simulations SBM, Bulk-OR, and Bulk-2M with the C130 aircraft measurements. The *error bar* denotes the standard derivation of the sampling data over the flight track region at each altitude (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2013) with permission of John Wiley and Sons) 43

Fig. 4.5 Temporal evolution of the domain-averaged **a** cloud droplet number concentration, **b** cloud mass mixing ratio, **c** raindrop number concentration, **d** rain mass mixing ratio, **e** accumulated rainfall, and **f** core-area updraft velocity from the three simulations (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2013) with permission of John Wiley and Sons) 44

Fig. 4.6 Vertical profiles of cloud properties on cloud points from 0000 to 0100 UTC and from 0100 to 0300 UTC in the 3 h simulations using SBM and Bulk-2M without collision/sedimentation processes and radiation scheme (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2013) with permission of John Wiley and Sons) 46

Fig. 4.7 Temporal evolution of the domain-averaged cloud properties from four bulk simulations using the different autoconversion schemes and SBM (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2013) with permission of John Wiley and Sons) 48

Fig. 4.8 Comparisons of the domain-averaged cloud properties from simulations with SBM, Bulk-OR, and Bulk-2M under clean and polluted (control) aerosol conditions (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2013) with permission of John Wiley and Sons) 49

Fig. 5.1 Leading principal component of **a** 850 mb EMHF and **b** 300 mb EMWV over the northwest Pacific 57

Fig. 5.2 Spatial distribution of the EMHF at 850 hPa during **a** 1979–1988, **b** 2002–2011, **c** difference between the two decades and the EMWV at 300 hPa during **d** 1979–1988, **e** 2002–2011, **f** difference between the two decades over the northwest Pacific from NECP/DOE Reanalysis II Dataset. *Dots* in **(c)** and **(f)** indicate the 90 % level of statistical significance based on the Student’s t-test. 58

Fig. 5.3 Spatial distribution of the eddy meridional heat flux (EMHF) at 850 hPa during **a** 1979–1988, **b** 2002–2011, **c** difference between the two decades and the eddy meridional wind variance (EMWV) at 300 hPa during **d** 1979–1988, **e** 2002–2011, **f** difference between the two decades over the northwest Pacific from ECMWF ERA-Interim Dataset. *Dots* in **(c)** and **(f)** indicate the 90 % level of statistical significance based on the Student’s t-test 59

Fig. 5.4 Domains overview for CR-WRF simulations. 60

Fig. 5.5 Vertical profile of aerosol number concentration in the initial conditions of CR-WRF. **a** Number concentration profile of ammonium sulfate (cm^{-3}). *Red line* denotes M-case and *dark blue line* denotes P-case. **b** Number concentration profile of sea salt (cm^{-3}). 61

Fig. 5.6 Snapshot of storm event. **a** CR-WRF simulated cloud water path in Jan 20. **b** CR-WRF simulated cloud water path on Jan 21. **c** CR-WRF simulated cloud water path on Jan 22. **d** MODIS Terra L3 Daily cloud water path on Jan 20. **e** MODIS Terra L3 Daily cloud water path on Jan 21. **d** MODIS Terra L3 Daily cloud water path on Jan 22 (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2014a) with permission of Nature Publication Group) 62

Fig. 5.7 Comparison of cloud fraction. **a** MODIS L3 monthly cloud fraction in January. **b** WRF simulated cloud fraction in January. **c** MODIS L3 monthly cloud fraction in February. **d** WRF simulated cloud fraction in February (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2014a) with permission of Nature Publication Group) 64

Fig. 5.8 Comparison of precipitation. **a** TRMM monthly accumulated rainfall in January. **b** WRF simulated monthly accumulated rainfall in January. **c** TRMM monthly accumulated rainfall in February. **d** WRF simulated monthly accumulated rainfall in February. 65

Fig. 5.9 Temporal evolution of domain-averaged TOA **a** shortwave forcing. **b** longwave forcing and **c** net forcing. 5-day smoothing is employed. *Dark blue lines* represent P-case and *red lines* represent M-case. 66

Fig. 5.10 Spatial distribution of 2-month averaged daily precipitation **a** in P-case and **b** in M-case. **c** Temporal evolution of domain-averaged precipitation rate. 5-day smoothing is employed. *Dark blue lines* represent P-case and *red lines* represent M-case 67

Fig. 5.11 Time series of domain-averaged **a** cloud number concentration, **b** cloud effective radius, **c** cloud water path, **d** cloud ice path, **e** cloud optical thickness and **f** cloud core area percentage. 5-day smoothing is employed. *Dark blue lines* represent P-case and *red lines* represent M-case 68

Fig. 5.12 Heating rate profiles from CR-WRF simulations. The *blue lines* denote the heating rates from P-case and red lines for M-case. The *black dot-dash lines* denote the heating difference between P-case and M-case. In (e), the *dash lines* denote the latent heat release rates (positive only) and the *dot-dot-dash lines* denote the cooling (negative only) rates 70

Fig. 5.13 Location of additional heating in the GCM domain 71

Fig. 5.14 Comparison of EMHF and EMWV between CTRL and AERO 72

Fig. 5.15 Comparison of temperature profiles between CTRL and AERO. *Dark blue line* denotes the profile from AERO, *red line* denotes the profile from CTRL, and the *dash line* denotes the difference between AERO and CTRL 73

Fig. 5.16 Comparison of maximum updraft velocities between CTRL and AERO. The *blue line* denotes the result from AERO and the *red line* denotes that from CTRL 73

Fig. 5.17 Comparison of high cloud fractions between CTRL and AERO (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2014a) with permission of Nature Publication Group) 74

Fig. 5.18 **a** The difference of aerosol optical depth (AOD) between PD and PI over NW Pacific. **b** The comparison of aerosol mass concentration and chemical composition in the accumulation mode between PD and PI over the NW Pacific in PNNL-MMF (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2014b) with permission of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America) 76

Fig. 5.19 The difference of **a** cloud number concentration (Nc), **b** liquid water path (LWP), **c** ice water path (IWP), **d** high cloud fraction, **e** shortwave cloud radiative forcing (SWCF), **f** longwave cloud radiative forcing (LWCF), **g** precipitation (PREC) and **h** eddy meridional heat flux at 850 mb (EMHF) between PD and PI over the NW Pacific in PNNL-MMF. *Black dots* indicate the regions with significance of t-test larger than 90 % (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2014b) with permission of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America). 77

Fig. 5.20	The difference of vertical distribution of a convective cloud fraction and b cloud top fraction between PD and PI over the NW Pacific in PNNL-MMF (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2014b) with permission of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America)	79
Fig. 5.21	The difference of a aerosol optical depth (AOD), b liquid water path (LWP), c ice water path (IWP) and d precipitation (PREC) between PD and PI over the NW Pacific in CAM5 (Reprinted from Wang et al. (2014b) with permission of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America).	80

List of Table

Table 3.1	Domain-averaged properties of hydrometeors in the CR-WRF simulations	29
-----------	--	----