A11A-0033

AGU FALL MEETING 2007

ARM

The Role of Adiabaticity in the Aerosol First Indirect Effect

Byung-Gon Kim[@], Mark A. Miller[#], Stephen E. Schwartz[$], Yangang Liu[$], and Qilong Min[&]

[@] Department of Atmospheric Environmental Sciences, Kangnung National University, Gangnung, 210-702, Korea (bgk@kangnung.ac.kr)

[#]Department of Environmental Sciences, Rutgers University, NJ 08901

[$]Environmental Sciences Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973

[&]Atmospheric Science Research Center, State University of New York at Albany, 251 Fuller Road, Albany NY, 12203

Motivation

A lot of recent studies demonstrated aerosol indirect effects such as modifications of cloud properties due to aerosols and their corresponding changes in shortwave and longwave radiative fluxes (IPCC, 2007).

Kim et al. (2003) also have found in measurements in north central Oklahoma that the cloud drop effective radius (r_e) was weakly associated with the variation in aerosol loading; this association is supportive of the aerosol first indirect effect, but there was substantial scatter in the observations, which was attributed to unquantified meteorological influences such as drizzle and entrainment.

The propensity for layer clouds to maintain sub-adiabatic (Kim et al., 2005; Chin et al., 2000) motivates us to determine analytically the probable impacts of a reduction of liquid water on the cloud optical properties, relative to purely adiabatic clouds without mixing or evaporating drizzle.

Approach

We extend a previous study to investigate the role of adiabaticity facilitated by mixing in modulating cloud optical properties. We quantify the effects of mixing by measuring the ratio of the observed cloud water path to its adiabatic value, (adiabaticity, α), which is used to characterize the entrainment-mixing processes, and attempts are made to determine the extent to which these properties affect cloud optical properties, apart from the aerosol first indirect effect.

The screening criteria for relatively homogeneous stratus cloud yield fourteen analysis days (see Fig. 2) from the 3-year (1999 - 2001) data collected in relatively uniform stratus clouds by ground-based remote sensing at the Department of Energy Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) Southern Great Plain (SGP) site in north central Oklahoma.

Adiabaticity

Examining how cloud optical properties could be influenced by entrainment mixing;

$$\bar{r}_e = \exp(\bar{\sigma}_r^2)\left(\frac{A\alpha\bar{\Gamma}_l\Delta z}{N}\right)^{1/3} \qquad \alpha = \frac{L}{L_a}$$

$$\tau = 2\pi A^{2/3}\left(\frac{\bar{\Gamma}_l^2 N\alpha^2\Delta z^5}{\exp(3\bar{\sigma}_r^2)}\right)^{1/3} \qquad A = \frac{3}{8\pi}\frac{\bar{\rho}}{\rho_l}$$

where σ_r is termed the "dispersion" of the droplet spectrum (the standard deviation of the logarithm of r), Γ_l is vertical variation of the adiabatic liquid water mixing ratio, N is cloud drop number concentration, Δz is cloud thickness, ρ is air density, and ρ_l is density of liquid water, L is liquid water path.

The above derivation is based on the homogeneous mixing in that properties are impacted by the reduction in liquid water path denoted by α.

From the theoretical derivation,
- τ is primarily governed by cloud thickness,
- Adiabaticity is the next most influential factor.
- r_e is found to be equally sensitive to adiabaticity and cloud thickness.

Sensitivity of Cloud Property to Adiabaticity



Fig. 1. Effective radius (r_e) as a function of α and Δz (a), and optical depth (τ) as a function of α and Δz (b). Red line is based on the analytical derivation.

The relationship between r_e and α, a proxy for mixing, is weak and only slightly dependent upon Δz (Fig. 1a). Note that the observed mixing does not appear to be homogeneous.

There is a notable increase in τ with an increase in α and distinct segregation in the two cloud thickness populations (Fig. 1b). Certainly the sensitivity of τ to Δz is greater than that of τ to α.

The observation suggests that mixing processes may overwhelm the reduction in cloud droplet size dictated by the nucleation processes



Relationship of r_e to Aerosol Load

A general decrease in r_e is shown with an increase of σ_{sp} (light scattering coefficient) with a slope of 0.15 (Fig. 2a). Poor correlations of r_e and σ_{sp} in the subadiabatic clouds, and the significant correlation (R^2 = 0.53) of r_e and σ_{sp} in the adiabatic clouds are exhibited (Fig. 2b).

The thicker clouds of high LWP tend to contain sub-adiabatic LWP and lower IE values, partly due to larger interacting surface area for the entrainment-mixing processes, which could eventually damp aerosol first indirect effect with an increasing LWP.





Fig. 2. Scatterplot of r_e vs. σ_{sp} of submicrometer aerosols for all cases (Up), and scatterplot of r_e vs. σ_{sp} for the different LWP classes(Down) in the left figure (a). Scatterplot of r_e vs. σ_{sp} for the subadiabatic and adiabatic clouds (b).

Discussion on Entrainment-Mixing Effects

$$r_e = \alpha_\beta\left(\frac{\alpha_L}{\alpha_N}\right)^{1/3} r_{ea} \qquad \alpha_x = \frac{x}{x_a}$$

r_{ea} is r_e for an adiabatic cloud, x is a variable being considered, and β is relative dispersion of droplet spectrum.

Potential response of r_e to mixing processes

	Homogeneous Mixing	Heterogeneous mixing/ETEM[$]		
		Extreme case	Secondary activation	Enhanced growth
Underlying mechanism	Faster Mixing	Uniform evaporation	Nucleation	Coalescence
α_N and α_L	α_N=1	$\alpha_N = \alpha_L$	$\alpha_N > \alpha_L$	$\alpha_N < \alpha_L$
Mixing function	Mixing does not change N but reduce the sizes	Mixing changes L & N proportionally	Stronger mixing results in more droplets,	Stronger mixing results in less but bigger droplets
Response of r_e	Depending on α_β and α_L	r_e independent of α_L	r_e decreases with decreasing α_L	r_e increases with decreasing α_L
Formula	$r_e = \alpha_\beta r_{ea}(\alpha_L)^{1/3}$	$r_e = \alpha_\beta r_{ea}$	$r_e = \alpha_\beta\left(\frac{\alpha_L}{\alpha_N}\right)^{1/3} r_{ea}$	$r_e = \alpha_\beta\left(\frac{\alpha_L}{\alpha_N}\right)^{1/3} r_{ea}$
AIE Effect	Less AIE Effect	No change	More AIE effect	Less AIE effect

[$] ETEM means Entity Type Entrainment Mixing proposed by Telford (AR, 1996)

Conclusions

The first indirect effect can be observed in adiabatic clouds with few drizzle or entrainment, which places a severe limitation on observations made in continental clouds.

The difficulty in observing the first aerosol indirect effect in subadiabatic clouds is compounded by the sensitivity of the cloud properties to the mixing process because homogeneous and heterogeneous mixing apparently produce different microphysical responses.

Our study emphasizes the role of adiabaticity in evaluating the aerosol indirect effect, and suggests that adiabaticity is a convenient variable for the classification of clouds.

References

- Chin, H.S., D.J. Rodriguez, R.T. Cederwell, C.C. Chuang, A.S. Grossman, and J. Yio (2000), Mon. Wea. Rev., 128, 2511-2527.
- Kim, B.-G, S.E. Schwartz, M.A. Miller, and Q. Min (2003), J. Geophys. Res., 108, doi:10.1029 /2003JD003721.
- Kim, B.-G., S.A. Klein, and J.R. Norris (2005), J. Geophys. Res., 110, doi:10.1029/ 2004JD005122.
- International Panel on Climate Change (2007), Climate Change 2007: The physical basis, Summary for Policymakers.
- Telford, J.W. (1996), Clouds with turbulence; the role of entrainment, Atmos. Res., 40, 261-282.

This work is in press in JGR2007008961.