Boundary-layer clouds in a changing climate

Chris Bretherton Department of Atmospheric Sciences University of Washington

Thanks: Peter Blossey, Matt Wyant, Rob Wood, Sungsu Park

Outline



- 1. Boundary-layer clouds in the current climate
- 2. Boundary-layer cloud-aerosol interaction
- 3. Boundary-layer cloud feedbacks

observations $\leftarrow \rightarrow$ process modeling $\leftarrow \rightarrow$ global modeling ...of sensitivity to climate-change-relevant perturbations

1. Boundary-layer clouds in the current climate



GOES-10 VISIBLE IMAGE October 17 2001, 15:00 UTC



Bretherton et al. 2004

Cloudy boundary layers important to climate

Boundary layer clouds

- Radiative impacts/surface temperature/circulation
- Vertical mixing
- Affect surface moisture/heat/momentum fluxes
- Air mass transformation
- Cloud-aerosol-chemistry interaction

Simulation challenges

- Strong internal feedbacks (cloud-radiation-turbulence, cloud-precipitation-aerosol)
- Horizontal heterogeneity
- Multiple interacting parameterizations
- Sensitive to vertical resolution



Estimated Inversion Strength (EIS)





1 K Δ EIS ~ -8 W m⁻² Δ CRF



- Clouds turbulently maintained by longwave cooling and surface moistening/heating.
- Turbulence drives entrainment through capping inversion, which counteracts mean subsidence.
- Shallow PBL is well mixed with Sc, deep PBL is 'Cu-coupled'
- Precipitation can accentuate decoupling

New parameterizations



- Careful coupling of moist turbulence (radiatively and surface-driven), shallow Cu convection, entrainment
- Lock et al. (2001): Separate sfc & Sc-driven turb layers
- Golaz et al. (2002): 2-Gaussian HOC for Sc&Cu
- Breth. et al. (2004): Shallow Cu penetrative entrainment
- Siebesma et al. (2007): Eddy Diffusion-Mass Flux
- Neggers et al. (2009): Dual-Mass Flux



SWCF, JJA: CAM versus CERES-EBAF



- Excessive SWCF in North Pacific (in CAM3 and CAM4) is reduced in CAM5.
- CAM5 improves stratocumulus and trade cumulus
- CAM5 reduces RSME error (true even if compared to ERBE)

C. Hannay



2. Boundary-layer cloud-aerosol interaction 'Albrecht effect': More aerosols can thicken drizzly clouds POCS: Low CCN - drizzle - decoupling - cloud breakup





PCCN

Satellite Bretherton et al. 2004

...but more aerosol can thin non-drizzly cloud.



A 'volcano track' from the South Sandwich Islands, 27 Apr 2006 (Gasso 2008)



Factor of 2 LWP reduction in the track almost cancels out brightening of the clouds due to the high CCN producing smaller droplets.

Less droplet sedimentation enhances entrainment

250

LES

- More aerosol
- Smaller, slower falling cloud droplets
- Droplets stay in entrainment zone • where they evaporatively cool entrained dry air
- More entrainment, thinner cloud •



Ackerman et al. 2004; Bretherton et al. 2007

This effect is not well represented in most climate models



Boundary-layer cloud feedbacks

- Largest cause of intermodel spread in climate sensitivity
- Important to Arctic sea-ice loss





Cloud and precipitation trends are related



a) Precipitation

Multimodel average reflects circulation shifts (Held and Soden 2006)

Cloud decrease is more pervasive than rainfall decrease

For deep clouds, this is due to weakening vertical mass fluxes. For boundary layer clouds, still no accepted physical explanation.









surface

Challenge: positive feedback involving small-scale processes that has not usefully been constrained by observations.

CGILS: CFMIP/GCSS Intercomparison of Large-eddy and Single-column models







- Focuses on three points along the GCSS Pacific Cross-section.
- Points range from shallow, wellmixed boundary layer near coast to deeper trade cumulus boundary layer well offshore.
- Five LES models and 20+ single column models participating.

Modeled Omega along cross-section



Coordinators: Minghua Zhang, Chris Bretherton, Peter Blossey, Stephan de Roode





S12: Evolution of Cloud Fraction



- Models agree well: Control case well-mixed, +2K runs deepen.
- Differences mainly due to advection schemes at sharp inversion



7.5-10 day means with/without +2K ω reduction



with $\Delta \omega$: Inversion deepening, mixed cloud response without $\Delta \omega$: Slight inversion thinning, distinct cloud thinning

 $\Delta \omega$ more important than ΔEIS to boundary-layer cloud feedback? Sat obs of same sensitivity to $\Delta \omega$: Myers & Norris A48B poster Radiative effect of CO₂ on boundary-layer cloud

- Quadruple CO₂ without changing free-trop T,q profiles
- Inversion lower and cloud thinner
- Δ SWCF = +28 W/m² as strong as a Δ EIS of 3.5 K. ctrl —



S12: Last 2.5d Avg.







- Cloud layer deepens until precipitation strengthens
- +2K has only weak impact on layer depth or cloud forcing



Conclusions



- Interplay of observations, process models and parameterization development makes better GCMs and climate predictions
- Factors controlling mean cloud distribution may be less
 important for its climate response
- Nondrizzling and drizzling BL clouds respond oppositely to aerosol increases.
- In global average, LES suggest boundary layer cloud feedbacks may have more to do with changes in radiative destabilization and subsidence than changes in stratification.
- Overall, LES support moderate positive subtropical cloud feedback in Sc regions, weaker feedback in Cu regions.