



ELSEVIER

Encyclopedia of Atmospheric Sciences (2nd Edition) - CONTRIBUTORS' INSTRUCTIONS

PROOFREADING

The text content for your contribution is in its final form when you receive your proofs. Read the proofs for accuracy and clarity, as well as for typographical errors, but please **DO NOT REWRITE**.

Titles and headings should be checked carefully for spelling and capitalization. Please be sure that the correct typeface and size have been used to indicate the proper level of heading. Review numbered items for proper order – e.g., tables, figures, footnotes, and lists. Proofread the captions and credit lines of illustrations and tables. Ensure that any material requiring permissions has the required credit line and that we have the relevant permission letters.

Your name and affiliation will appear at the beginning of the article and also in a List of Contributors. Your full postal address appears on the non-print items page and will be used to keep our records up-to-date (it will not appear in the published work). Please check that they are both correct.

Keywords are shown for indexing purposes **ONLY** and will not appear in the published work.

Any copy editor questions are presented in an accompanying Author Query list at the beginning of the proof document. Please address these questions as necessary. While it is appreciated that some articles will require updating/revising, please try to keep any alterations to a minimum. Excessive alterations may be charged to the contributors.

Note that these proofs may not resemble the image quality of the final printed version of the work, and are for content checking only. Artwork will have been redrawn/relabelled as necessary, and is represented at the final size.

DESPATCH OF CORRECTIONS

PLEASE KEEP A COPY OF ANY CORRECTIONS YOU MAKE.

Proof corrections should be returned in one communication to Mike Nicholls (atm2proofs@elsevier.com), by [DATE 2 weeks after proofs sent out by typesetter] using one of the following methods:

1. **PREFERRED:** Corrections should be annotated (marked-up) in the PDF file and sent to Mike Nicholls in the Elsevier MRW Production Department at **atm2proofs@elsevier.com**.
2. Listed in an e-mail or in a Word document and sent to Mike Nicholls in the Elsevier MRW Production Department at **atm2proofs@elsevier.com**.

The e-mail should state the article code number in the subject line. Corrections should be consecutively numbered and should state the paragraph number, line number within that paragraph, and the correction(s) to be made.

3. Marked-up hardcopy by courier to **Mike Nicholls, Elsevier MRW Production Department, The Boulevard, Langford Lane, Kidlington, Oxford, OX5 1GB, UK**. If it is not possible to courier your corrections, please fax the relevant marked pages to the Elsevier MRW Production Department (**fax number: +44 (0)1865 843974**) with a covering note clearly stating the article code number and title.

Note that a delay in the return of proofs could mean a delay in publication. Should we not receive corrected proofs within 3 weeks, Elsevier may proceed without your corrections.

CHECKLIST

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Author queries addressed/answered? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Affiliations, names and addresses checked and verified? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Permissions details checked and completed? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Outstanding permissions letters attached/enclosed? | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Figures and tables checked? | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If you have any questions regarding these proofs please contact the Elsevier MRW Production Department at: **atm2proofs@elsevier.com**.

Non Print Items**Author and Co-author Contact Information**

Roger Pielke,
Department of Atmospheric Science,
Colorado State University,
Fort Collins,
CO,
USA.
E-mail: pielkesr@gmail.com

Keywords

Frontal circulations, Hurricanes, Lake effect snow, Local weather, Mesoscale, Mesoscale convective systems, Mesoscale weather, Mountain-induced wind storms, Mountain-valley winds, Sea-land breezes, Squall lines, Tropical cyclones, Tropical storms, Urban circulations

ELSEVIER FIRST PROOF

Author Query Form



Title: ATM2

Article Title/Article ID: Mesoscale Atmospheric Modeling/00217

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting some questions have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list. Your responses should then be returned with your marked proof/list of corrections to Mike Nicholls at Elsevier via atm2proofs@elsevier.com

Queries and/or remarks

[AU1]	Please check if the affiliation of the author has been incorporated correctly, and amend if necessary.
[AU2]	Please provide a list of articles within this Encyclopedia for the See Also section. A full table of contents is available on EMSS or on the project website.
[AU3]	Please provide text citations for references 'Cotton et al. (2009), Fedorovich et al. (2004), Kalnay (2003), Pielke (2002), Pielke et al. (2007), Warner (2011), and Whiteman (2000)' or change this heading as Further Reading.

a0005 **Mesoscale Atmospheric Modeling**

AUT

R Pielke, Sr., Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Synopsis

abspara0010

Mesoscale systems in the atmosphere are those in which the instantaneous pressure field can be determined accurately by the temperature field, but the winds, even in the absence of surface frictional effects, are out of balance with the horizontal pressure gradient force. The framework of mesoscale models is overviewed and shows that the models include a physics base core comprising the pressure gradient force, advection, and gravity, and all other physical processes which are parameterized using tuned modular representations of turbulence, longwave and shortwave radiation, cumulus, and stable cloud processes. Computational methods, lateral and initial boundary conditions, and model validation are some of the topics discussed.

s0005 **Introduction**

p0010 Atmospheric mesoscale systems are identified as those in which the instantaneous pressure field can be determined accurately by the temperature field, but the winds, even in the absence of surface frictional effects, are out of balance with the horizontal pressure gradient force. The pressure field, under this situation, is said to be 'hydrostatic'. Larger scale atmospheric features (which are called 'synoptic' weather features), in contrast, have a wind field that is close to a balance with the horizontal pressure gradient force. These large-scale winds are said to be near 'gradient wind balance'. Atmospheric features which are smaller than the mesoscale have pressure fields in which wind acceleration is a significant component (which is referred to as the dynamic wind). The pressure gradient which causes this dynamic wind is called the 'nonhydrostatic pressure'.

p0015 Atmospheric mesoscale models are based on a set of conservation equation for velocity, heat, density, water, and other trace atmospheric gases and aerosols. The equation of state used in these equations is the ideal gas law. The conservation of velocity equation is derived from Newton's second law of motion as applied to the rotating Earth. The conservation of heat equation is derived from the first law of thermodynamics. The remaining conservation equations are written as a change in an atmospheric variable (e.g., water) in a Lagrangian framework where sources and sinks are identified.

p0020 Each of these conservation equations can be written to represent the changes following a parcel of velocity, potential temperature (entropy), water in its three phases, other atmospheric gases and aerosols, and mass, including source-sink terms. Models, however, seldom express the conservation relations in a Lagrangian framework. The chain rule of calculus is used to convert to an Eulerian framework.

p0025 Several assumptions are typically made in the conservation equations. These include the neglect of small-scale fluctuation of density except when multiplied by gravity (this is called the Boussinesq approximation), the neglect of vertical acceleration relative to the differences between the vertical pressure gradient force and gravity (referred to as the hydrostatic assumption), and the neglect of all molecular transfers.

p0030 The first two assumptions have not been made in recent years in the models, however, since the numerical equations are actually easier to solve without these assumptions. Nonetheless, the spatial and temporal scales of mesoscale systems result

in the two assumptions being excellent approximations with respect to mesoscale-sized systems. The third assumption is justified since advection is much more significant at transfers of heat, momentum, water, and other chemical species, than molecular motion on the mesoscale.

These conservation relations which are written as a set of simultaneous, nonlinear differential equations, unfortunately, cannot be used without integrating them over defined volumes of the atmosphere. These volumes are referred to as the model 'grid volume'. The region of the atmosphere for which these grid volumes are defined is called the 'model domain'. The integration of the conservation relations produces 'grid volume averages', with point-specific values of the variables called 'subgrid-scale values'. The 'resolution' of data is limited to two grid intervals in each spatial direction.

The result of the grid volume averaging produces equations for the local time derivative of the grid volume-resolved variable which includes 'subgrid-scale fluxes'. An assumption that is routinely made in all mesoscale models (usually without additional comment) is that the grid volume average of subgrid-scale fluctuations is zero. This assumption, often referred to as 'Reynold's averaging', is actually only accurate when there is a clear spatial scale separation between subgrid scale- and grid volume-resolved quantities.

Mesoscale model equations have been solved in a Cartesian coordinate framework. Each coordinate in this system is perpendicular to the other two coordinates at every location. Most mesoscale models, however, transform to a generalized vertical coordinate. The most common coordinates involve some form of terrain-following transformation, where the bottom coordinate surface is terrain height or terrain surface pressure. The result of these transformations is that the new coordinate system is not orthogonal, in general. Unless this nonorthogonality is small, the correct treatment of nonhydrostatic pressure effects in mesoscale models requires the use of tensor transformation techniques, as opposed to the separate use of the chain rule on each component of velocity, separately. The use of generalized coordinate systems introduces additional sources for errors in the models, since the interpolation of variables to grid levels becomes more complicated.

The model variables also need to be defined on a specified grid mesh. When all dependent variables are defined at the same grid points, the grid is said to be 'nonstaggered'. When

2 Mesoscale Atmospheric Modeling

dependent variables are defined at different grid points, the grid is called a 'staggered grid'. The grid meshes can also be defined with smaller grid increments in one region surrounded by coarser grid increments. Such a grid is referred to as a 'nested grid'. If the grid increments vary at all locations, with the finest grid in a specified volume, the grid is called a 'stretched grid'.

p0055 The subgrid-scale fluxes in mesoscale models are parameterized in terms of resolvable variables. Turbulence theory, as observed from atmospheric field campaigns over horizontally homogeneous landscapes, and for undisturbed atmospheric conditions, is the basis for all mesoscale model representations of the vertical subgrid-scale flux terms. The vertical fluxes are parameterized differently when the lowest 50 m or so of the atmosphere are unstably stratified and when it is stably stratified. The planetary boundary is typically represented by three layers: a thin layer of a few centimeters near the surface where laminar fluxes are important (called the 'laminar layer'), a layer above which extends upward tens of meters where wind direction with altitude is ignored (referred to as the 'surface layer'), and the remainder of the boundary layer where the winds approach the free atmospheric value (referred to as the 'transition layer'). Disturbed (unsteady) boundary layers are not parameterized accurately, however, by existing parameterizations. The effect of land surface heterogeneity has been included on the subgrid scale only as a weighting of the surface layer fluxes by the fractional coverage of each land surface type. This technique is called the 'mosaic' or 'tile' subgrid-scale surface flux parameterization.

p0060 In contrast to the vertical fluxes, horizontal subgrid-scale fluxes in mesoscale models have no physical basis. They are included only to horizontally smooth the model calculations.

p0065 The representation of the source-sink terms in the conservation equations can be separated into two basic types: those that are derived from basic concepts and those that are parameterized. The only basic source-sink terms in mesoscale models that are derived from fundamental physical concepts are the pressure gradient force, advection, and gravity. Neither of these two effects involves adjustable (i.e., tunable) coefficients, which is one method to separate fundamental terms in the conservation equation from a parameterization. The remainder of the source-sink terms needs to be parameterized. Almost all parameterizations currently used in these models are either box or vertical column representations.

p0070 The radiative flux terms are typically separated into shortwave and longwave fluxes. The shortwave fluxes, also called 'solar fluxes', are separated into direct and diffuse irradiance. The direct irradiance is the nonscattered flux, whereas the diffuse irradiance is the scattered radiative flux from the Sun. The direct irradiance is sometimes further separated into visible and near-infrared components. In cloudy model atmospheres, parameterizations based on cloud liquid water content, or more crudely on arbitrary attenuation based on relative humidity in the model, are used. Typically only diffuse irradiance is permitted for overcast model conditions. Some models weight the fluxes for partly cloudy skies, using weighted parameterizations for both clear and overcast sky conditions. Polluted atmospheres also require parameterization on their effect on solar irradiance, although only a few mesoscale models have explored this issue.

Longwave irradiance is from the Earth's surface and from within the atmosphere. Scattering of longwave radiative fluxes is typically ignored, such that only upwelling and downwelling irradiances are parameterized. This type of parameterization is called a 'two-stream approximation'. The major absorbers and emitters represented in mesoscale model parameterizations are liquid and ice clouds, water vapor, and carbon dioxide. Clouds are usually parameterized as black bodies to longwave irradiance. The water vapor and carbon dioxide are represented by the path length through the atmosphere, and their concentrations along their path. As with solar radiative fluxes, mesoscale models seldom includes parameterizations of longwave irradiance associated with pollution. This neglect is partially a result of the dependency of the absorption, transmissivity, and scattering of both solar and longwave irradiance on the specific chemical composition and size spectra of the pollution.

The phase changes of water and this effect on the conservation of heat source-sink term are separated into stable cloud, cumulus convective cloud, and precipitation parameterizations. Stratiform cloud parameterizations range in complexity from algorithms which instantaneously precipitate rain (or snow) when the model relative humidity exceeds a user-specified relative humidity (referred to as a 'dump bucket' scheme), to individual conservation equations for several categories of hydrometers (e.g., cloud water, rain water, ice crystals, snow, graupel, and hail). For the larger hydrometers, a nonzero, finite terminal fall velocity is usually specified. More detailed microphysical representations, where cloud hydrometer spectra are classified into more size class intervals (called 'microphysical bin parameterizations') are also used.

The parameterization of cumulus cloud rainfall utilizes some form of one-dimensional cloud model. These are called 'cumulus cloud parameterization schemes'. Their complexity ranges from instantaneous readjustments of the temperature and moisture profile to the moist adiabatic lapse rates when the relative humidity exceeds saturation, to representations of a set of one-dimensional cumulus clouds with a spectra of radii. These parameterizations typically focus on deep cumulus clouds, which produce the majority of rainfall and diabatic heating associated with the phase changes of water. Cumulus cloud parameterizations remain one of the major uncertainties in mesoscale models, since they usually have a number of tunable coefficients, which are used to obtain the best agreement with observations. Also, since mesoscale model resolution is close to the scale of thunderstorms, care must be taken so that the cumulus parameterization and the resolved moist thermodynamics in the model do not 'double count' this component of the source-sink terms.

The grid volume-averaged conservation equations are nonlinear, and, therefore, must be solved using numerical approximation schemes. The solution techniques include finite difference, finite element, interpolation (also called semi-Lagrangian), and spectral methods. Both temporal-spatial terms and the source-sink terms must be represented by these approximation schemes. An important aspect of mesoscale models is that only advection and the pressure gradient force involve horizontal gradients explicitly. All other model terms, including each of the source-sink terms, are one-dimensional column models or point values.

p0095 Finite difference schemes involve some form of truncated Taylor series expansion. The finite element technique uses a local basis function to minimize the numerical error, whereas the spectral method utilizes global basis functions. A spectral method has the advantage that differential relations are converted to algebraic expressions. The semi-Lagrangian scheme is based on fitting interpolation equations to data at a specific time and advecting the data with model winds.

p0100 Mesoscale models have predominately utilized the finite difference and (for advection) the semi-Lagrangian approaches. A few groups have applied the finite element method, but its additional computational cost has limited its use. The spectral method, which is most valuable for models without lateral boundaries, has not generally been used since mesoscale models have lateral boundaries.

p0105 The use of numerical approximations introduces errors. Linear stability analyses show that it is impossible to create a numerical solution scheme which accurately represents both amplitude change over time and speed of motion (advection and gravity wave propagation) for features that are shorter than about four grid increments in each spatial direction. In addition, products of the variables (which are a nonlinear terms) produce transfers of spatial scales to larger and smaller scales. The inability of the numerical model to sample the smallest scales (less than two grid intervals) results in the information (e.g., winds and temperature) erroneously appearing at a larger spatial scale. This error is called 'aliasing' and unless corrected can result in an incorrect accumulation of atmospheric structure at the wrong spatial scale. For these reasons, the term 'model resolution' should be reserved for features that are at least four grid intervals in each direction.

p0110 To integrate the models forward in time, the variables must be initialized. These values are called 'initial conditions'. Observed data, or a combination of observed data and previous model calculations, are typically used to initialize the mesoscale models. The insertion of data during a model calculation is called 'four-dimensional data assimilation (4DDA)'. Lateral, top, and bottom boundary conditions are also needed for the duration of the model calculations. Lateral boundary conditions in mesoscale models can be idealized for theoretical studies (e.g., cyclic boundary conditions), or derived from large-scale observations, such as the NCEP Reanalysis or from larger scale model simulations (which is referred to as dynamic downscaling). Mesoscale models are often strongly influenced by the lateral boundary conditions, such that their accurate representation is a necessary condition for an accurate mesoscale simulation.

p0115 The top boundary conditions are similar to the lateral boundary condition and must be accurately represented. Most mesoscale models extend into the stratosphere, in order to minimize the effect of the model top on the mesoscale simulation. Damping zones at the model top (referred to as an 'absorbing layer') are usually inserted so that upward propagating model simulated gravity waves do not erroneously reflect from the artificial model top.

p0120 The surface boundary is the only surface of a mesoscale model which is physically based. This surface is typically separated into ocean (and fresh water lakes) and land surfaces. Ocean and lake surfaces can be represented simply as prescribed sea surface temperatures or using mesoscale

atmospheric models coupled to mesoscale ocean, lake, and/or sea ice models. Over land, the ground is separated into bare soil and vegetated land. Soil-vegetation-atmosphere transfer schemes (SVATS) have been introduced to represent the fluxes of velocity, heat, moisture, and other trace gases between the atmospheres and the surface. Most SVATS include the effect on water flux of transpiration. Recently, vegetation dynamical processes, such as plant growth have been included in longer term (months to seasons) mesoscale model calculations.

Model performance is assessed in several ways. The comparison of observations with model results using statistical skill tests is a major assessment tool. A complication of these evaluations is that observations have a different sampling volume (e.g., a point) than the model grid volume. Comparisons of simplified (usually linearized) version of numerical models with analytic theory have been completed to test the accuracy of linear components of the model. Several models can be intercompared to assess what features they have in common, and which they do not. The mass and energy budgets of the mesoscale models, if they are each calculated in two separate manners, provide an opportunity to check the internal consistency of the model. Peer-reviewed scientific publications and the availability for scrutiny of the model source code provide two additional valuable procedures to assess the value of the mesoscale model and the degree to which the programmed model logic agrees with the mathematical formulations presented in the literature. Proposals have been made to standardize the model computer codes, in order to assist in their more general use.

Mesoscale models have been applied to two basic types of mesoscale systems: those found primarily by initial and lateral boundary conditions (referred to as synoptically forced mesoscale systems) and those forced by surface boundary conditions (referred to as surface-forced mesoscale systems). Of the latter type, there are mesoscale systems which are caused when terrain is an obstacle to the flow (referred to as 'terrain-forced' or orographic mesoscale systems) and those generated by horizontal gradients in sensible heating of the surface (called 'thermally forced' mesoscale systems).

With the improvement in computational power, global models will soon approach mesoscale spatial and temporal resolution (which requires horizontal grid increments of ~ 1 km). This high resolution will eliminate lateral boundary conditions as a component in the accurate simulation of mesoscale atmospheric features models.

Bibliography

- Cotton, W.R., Bryan, G., Van den Heever, S., 2009. Storm and Cloud Dynamics. In: International Geophysics, second ed. vol. 99. Academic Press.
- Fedorovich, E., Rotunno, R., Stevens, B. (Eds.), 2004. Atmospheric Turbulence and Mesoscale Meteorology. Cambridge University Press.
- Kalnay, E., 2003. Atmospheric Modeling, Data Assimilation and Predictability. Cambridge University Press.
- Pielke, R.A., 2002. Mesoscale Meteorological Modeling, second ed. Academic Press.
- Pielke Sr., R.A., Stokowski, D., Wang, J.-W., Vukicevic, T., Leoncini, G., Matsui, T., Castro, C., Niyogi, D., Kishitawal, C.M., Biazar, A., Doty, K., McNider, R.T., Nair, U., Tao, W.K., 20 February 2007. Satellite-based model parameterization of diabatic heating. EOS, vol. 88 (8), 96–97.
- Warner, T., 2011. Numerical Weather and Climate Prediction. Cambridge University Press.
- Whiteman, C.D., 2000. Mountain Meteorology Fundamentals and Applications. Oxford University Press.

AU2

AU3