Experimenting with SAM's CRM

Chin-Hoh Moeng NCAR CMMAP Jan. 2011 meeting

The CRM setup

- 1. SAM 6.8.2 version
- 2. Grid points: 128 x 128 x 64
- 3. Grid size: 1.6 km in horizontal, vary in vertical
- 4. GATE-IDEAL case (same as the Giga-LES)
- 5. Benchmark: Giga-LES solution

Comparison of cloud amounts

Giga-LES (benchmark)

CRM run using SAM6.8.2

128 x 128 x 64 over 204.8 km x 204.8 km x 27 km



too much low cloud amount

Horizontally-averaged cloud properties between Giga-LES (blue) and CRM (red)



Problem #1: too much low cloud.

CRM's low cloud field vs. surface flux

Non-precipitating cloud amount at $z \sim 1 \text{ km}$

Surface latent heat flux



The large low-cld amount may not be a PBL problem??!

CRM's low cloud vs. vertical velocity

Non-precipitating cloud field at $z \sim 1 \text{ km}$

Layer-averaged w below 1 km





Lots of "grid-scale" low-cloud and w & they are somewhat related.

qn at z~ 1km (zoom in)

layer-averaged w below 1 km



Is the "grid-scale" w field realistic?

Compare the w-spectra between Giga-LES and CRM



Power spectra of w at z ~ 1 km & 5km



Problem #2: too much w-variance near the CRM grid cutoff

Why do I care about the unrealistic "grid-scale" vertical velocity and low-cloud amount in CRM?

Would they significantly affect (or interact with) microphysics and radiation over long simulations?

A quick fix: set Cs=0.5 (from 0.15)



Increasing SGS constant Cs (or Ck/Ce) drains more w-energy out...

Increasing Cs also reduces the low-cloud amount



The horizontally-averaged cloud field agrees better with Giga-LES, but there are issues to consider.....

Issues related to the unrealistic w and low-cloud amount:

- 2nd-order centered FF adv scheme for momentum numerical overshoot in w?
- SGS length scale = ∆z for vertical K, but
 = ∆h for horizontal K
 physically justified?
- Does the "PBL" matter? How to represent it?