Closure between HALO measured CCN (S), cloud base updraft and cloud droplets concentration

Ramon Braga, National Institute for Space Research (INPE), Brazil Daniel Rosenfeld, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

Ilha Bela, 2016

Closure

Definition: Closure study is a set of analysis which combines in-situ measurements and model simulations in order to generate the understanding of physical processes.

Importance: The learnings from closures provide the capability to reproduce it for larger coverage in time and space via simulation but not measured.

 Cloud base -> objective: understand what determines the number of cloud droplets concentration (Nd).

Aerosol + Updrafts



CLOUD MICROPHYSICS MEASUREMENTS WITH HALO AIRCRAFT ON FLIGHT AC17





CCN measurements with fixed SS (%) and variable SS (%)



CCN measurements under the cloud base



Procedure of normalization based with fixed SS(%)

CCNcor = CCN(S) * [CCN(S) / CCN(0.55%)]



AC11 START: 14:58:21 (593 s) CCN = 1985.7 * SS^{0.731} R:0.91 AC14 START: 15:21:40 (800 s) $CCN = 1509.7 + SS^{0.973} R:0.89$ START: 16:50:50 (831 s) $CCN = 2743.2 + SS^{\circ719} R:0.97$ AC17-START: 19:38:20 (1000 s) $CCN = 1064.1 + SS^{0576} R:0.93$

CLOUD MICROPHYSICS MEASUREMENTS WITH HALO AIRCRAFT ON FLIGHT AC17





Cloud base updrafts + aerosol concentration • Number of droplets in the cloud base



Generally the direct correlation between Nd and W is not high. The solution is to apply the probability match.

CDP



 $N_{dT} = 0.88 * N_0 (2/k+2) * [0.07 * (W_b 1.5)] (k/k+2)$





 $S_{max} = C(T,P) * W_b 3/4 * N_d -1/2$

CCN = 2743.2 * S ^{0.719}







 $W^* = \int W_j^2 / \int W_j$; for $W_j > 0$



Nd* = Nd (percentile of W*)

PROBES CORRELATION



PROBES CORRELATION

















Cloud Profile



Closure of cloud profiles using parcel model (Pinsky and Khain, 2002)

Input:

- Atmospheric sounding (BAHAMAS file);
- Estimated updrafts based on HALO measurements (BAHAMAS).
- 3 aerosol modal function (PCASP/UHSAS);

Output:

• Vertical profile of cloud microphysics properties (e.g. Nd, LWC, Re etc.)

Closure of cloud profiles using parcel model (Pinsky and Khain, 2002)

Input:

3 aerosol modal function (PCASP/UHSAS);



Calculate Kappa to fit parcel model aerosol input (NaCl)



Calculate Kappa to fit parcel model aerosol input (NaCl)



Closure of cloud profiles using parcel model (Pinsky and Khain, 2002)

Input:

• 3 aerosol modal function (PCASP/UHSAS);



Closure of cloud profiles using parcel model (Pinsky and Khain, 2002)

Input:

• 3 aerosol modal function (PCASP/UHSAS);



We hypothesize that the aircraft measures swollen particles under cloud base. When ascribing it erroneously as dry particle causes large underestimate of kappa.

Paradoxially, larger real kappa shows as smaller indicated kappa.



We hypothesize that the aircraft measures swollen particles under cloud base. When ascribing it erroneously as dry particle causes large underestimate of kappa.

Paradoxially, larger real kappa shows as smaller indicated kappa.



We observe smaller indicated $\kappa \rightarrow$ larger real κ , for aerosols under clouds with larger Nd Is this real?

If so, what can be the reason?

Summary

- 1. A closure was sought by comparing the measured Nd to the calculated based on W_b and S.
- 2. Closure (i.e., good agreement) was achieved in most, but not all cases, specially for the CCP-CDP.
- 3. The closure was best for the CCP-CDP, and degraded for CAS-POL and even more for the NIXE-CAPS. Possible reasons are distortions of DSD by the CAS probes below 10 μm, possibly causing inaccuracies in the drop concentrations at the low end of the DSD.
- 4. Calculating Kappa for the PCASP and UHSAS measured under cloud base shows unreasonably low values, which is compatible with swelling of the aerosols by a large factor of up to more than 2.
- 5. Much more aerosol swelling occurred in days with larger Nd. The reason is still unknown.

