Committee Meeting

5 April 2022

Christian Nairy

Updates

- Participated in the 2022 IMPACTS field campaign
- Current writing and preparing for defense (this summer)

Latest data and Results









Confidence = 2



Confidence = 3



(NOT TO SCALE)

Chain aggregates were **defined** by:

- 3 or more discernable particles oriented in a quasilinear fashion and/or...
- Particles joined together by small joints and/or...
- Links of particles that are unusually elongated

Confidence was determined by the classifier:

- 1. Lowest Confidence (1): One of the three definitions observed.
- 2. Moderate Confidence (2): Two of the three definitions observed.
- 3. Highest Confidence (3): All three definitions observed.













Flight Legs	Total # of Chains	Total # of Images	Confidence = 1	Confidence = 2	Confidence = 3
Flight Leg 1 (FL1)	218 1,507		69	80	69
	14.5 ±	: 38.1%	4.6 ± 56.1%	5.3 ± 60.1%	4.6 ± 56.1%
Flight Leg 2 (FL2)	118	917	39	48	31
	12.9 ±	: 34.0%	4.3 ± 56.9%	5.2 ± 63.3%	3.4 ± 51.4%
Flight Leg 3 (FL3)	191	1,375	64	89	38
	13.9 ± 37.2%		4.7 ± 58.0%	6.5 ± 68.1%	2.8 ± 44.9%
Flight Leg 4 (FL4)	141	855	33	67	41
	16.5 ± 40.8%		4.0 ± 47.9%	7.7 ± 69.0%	4.8 ± 53.8%
TOTAL	668	4,654	205	284	179
	<u>14.4 ±</u>	<u>: 37.8%</u>	<u>4.4 ± 55.4%</u>	<u>6.1 ± 65.5%</u>	<u>3.8 ± 51.9%</u>

Flight Legs	# of Chains Found 100 - 70 km From Storm Core	# of Images Taken 100 - 70 km From Storm Core	# of Chains Found 70 - 40 km From Storm Core	# of Images Taken 70 - 40 km From Storm Core	# of Chains Found 40 - 10 km From Storm Core	# of Images Taken 40 - 10 km From Storm Core
FL1	58	510	124	631	36	366
	11.4 ± 33.6%		19.7 ±	44.2%	9.8 ± 17.3%	
FL2	N/A	N/A	78	520	40	397
	N/A		15.0 ±	38.6%	10.1 ± 31.7%	
FL3	18	55	121	800	52	520
	32.7 ± 56.8%		15.1 ± 38.9%		10.0 ± 31.6%	
FL4	44	178	97	677	N/A	N/A
	24.7 ± 49.6%		14.3 ± 37.7%		N/A	
Total	120	743	420	2628	128	1283
	<u>16.2 ± 40.3%</u>		<u>16.0 ±</u>	40.0%	<u>10.0 ± 31.6%</u>	





20190803_1424 Flight Legs	# of PHIPS Particles > 495 um	# of PHIPS Chains > 495 um	<pre># of PHIPS Chains > 495 um # of PHIPS Particles > 495 um</pre>	Avg. Confidence of PHIPS chains > 495 um
<u>Flight Leg 1</u>	7	7	100%	2.71
Flight Leg 2	11	8	73%	2.38
Flight Leg 3	8	7	88%	2
<u>Flight Leg 4</u>	10	8	80%	1.88
TOTAL	36	30	83%	2.2425

• A high percentage (83%) of the PHIPS images that contained particles > 495 micro-meters were chain aggregates (with moderate-to-high confidence.

- Thus, we can look at the CIP data (which has a higher sampling volume than the PHIPS) and pull the concentration of particles > 495 micro-meters.
- Chain aggregates = CIP particle concentrations > 495 um; non-chain aggregates = CIP particle concentrations between 105 315 um; Particle buffer zone = CIP particle concentrations between 315 495 um.







Convergence between the nonchain and chain Aggregate concentration (heading away from storm core

Direction of Flight





Summary/Discussion

- While the general trend for chain and non-chain aggregate concentrations decrease with distance from core, when taking the ratio of the two parameters, there is an increase in the ratio heading away from the core (to a certain distance varies per flight leg).
- Also, the peaks in the ratio are never when the aircraft was closest to the core.
- Periodicities in the data are observed.
- Meaning, when the ratio value increases, either:
 - (1) There is a net increase in chains relative to the non-chains and/or ...
 - (2) More of the non-chains are falling out, sublimating, and/or climbing within the cirrus anvil away from where the aircraft was sampling from and/or ...
 - (3) The smaller particles are taking part in the chain aggregation process allowing for less smaller particles and more larger particles.
- Or are the fluctuations in the particle sizes the product of storm convective growth and decay?

KMLB Vol Scan: 16:02:01







Flight Leg 4 (FL4) ^{16:21:30 - 16:27:00}

KMLB Vol Scan: 16:23:55







ELECTRIC FIELD DATA & KSCLMA ANALYSIS





Flight Legs	Time [UTC]	Ex - Range [kV/m]	Ex - Mean [kV/m]	Ey - Range [kV/m]	Ey - Mean [kV/m]	Ez - Range [kV/m]	Ez - Mean [kV/m]
FL1	15:51:15 - 16:01:00	[-4.01, 0.17]	-0.89	[-0.16, 8.04]	0.93	[-22.37, 1.50]	-0.87
FL2	16:02:00 - 16:07:00	[-5.63, 1.52]	-1.96	[-4.93, 6.42]	0.78	[-11.22, 5.53]	-1.76
FL3	16:09:00 - 16:17:00	[-6.59, -0.21]	-2.95	[-3.43, 6.67]	1.05	[-4.70, 10.80]	1.15
FL4	16:21:30 - 16:27:00	[-4.86, -0.40]	-2.36	[-5.86, 4.28]	-0.11	[-0.58, 6.15]	0.68





Lightning Strike @ 16:01:43 UTC

NOTE: According to NLDN data This was the last lightning strike associated with our storm of Interest.



Summary/Discussion

- The largest sources of electric fields are when the aircraft is in close proximity to the storm core.
- Near the storm core the vertical electric field values are mainly on the order of 10⁰ kV/m for each FL.
 - Although, there is a strong E_z signal during the end of FL1 where E_z reached -22.37 kV/m, which is an order of magnitude higher than what is typically observed.
 - The temporal span (electric build-up) of this peak is on the order of seconds, and detection of electric discharges are on the order of micro seconds, thus it is believed that this peak in electric field is due to the aircraft entering in a 'high' electric charge region and not by lightning.
 - Based on the KSCLMA data, is it possible that the upper positive region is the culprit for fluctuations in E_z?
- The electric field magnitude (E_{mag}) for all flight legs peaked on the order of 10¹ kV/m.
 - Cloud chamber experiments only utilized a horizontal electric field.
- The *E_{mag}* values are the same order of magnitude to what was used in cloud chamber experiments performed by Saunders and Wahab (1975).
 - However, in the cloud chamber experiments, chain aggregates were only generated while using an electric field greater than or equal to 60 kV/m.
- Is the E-Field threshold smaller than previously tested?
 - Evidence from previous research coupled with these results -> can propose that yes it may?

Conclusion and Comments

- Cloud chamber experiments suggest that chain aggregates are optimally formed when electric fields are > 60 kV/m at temps ~ -8 to -12 C using unrealistic (high) ice crystal concentrations.
 - In typical T-storms, these values would suggest the chains to be formed near the mix-layer region
- PHIPS observations show chain aggregates spread out across the anvil region.
 - Particles of different habits
 - Lack of riming
- CIP concentration data suggest that in the cirrus anvil:
 - (1) There is a net increase in chains relative to the non-chains and/or ...
 - (2) More of the non-chains are falling out, sublimating, and/or climbing within the cirrus anvil away from where the aircraft was sampling from and/or ...
 - (3) The smaller particles are taking part in the chain aggregation process allowing for less smaller particles and more larger particles.
- The fluctuations in the particle sizes cloud be the product of storm convective growth and decay.
 - Further radar analysis needed.
- The E_{mag} values are the same order of magnitude to what was used in cloud chamber experiments performed by Saunders and Wahab (1975).
 - Similar values to other field projects where chain aggregates were also observed.
 - E-Field thresholds for chain aggregation in the cirrus anvil may be less than 60 kV/m.

Request

- The scanning capabilities of the S-band NWS radar is extremely limited (especially during the 3 August 2019 flight).
 - Lack of radar data > 100 km away
 - low resolution
 - Not concurrent with aircraft measurements
- The MCR (CPR-HD) thrives where the NWS radars do not.
- With the scanning capabilities of the MCR (CPR-HD), the data will be extremely beneficial when comparing to the in-situ microphysical data.
- The MCR (CPR-HD) data will be used to see if chain aggregation is occurring within the convection induced, cirrus anvil region.
- Due to FL4 being more oriented to the SR-anvil wind direction and occurring when there is only one CLEAR main source of convection, it is proposed to obtain the MCR (CPR-HD) data or flight leg 4 [16:21:30 – 16:27:00 UTC] for further radar analysis.

Extra Slides

KMLB Vol Scan: 15:50:30







KMLB Vol Scan: 15:56:16







KMLB Vol Scan: 16:02:01







Flight Leg 4 (FL4) ^{16:21:30 - 16:27:00}

KMLB Vol Scan: 16:19:25







Flight Leg 4 (FL4) ^{16:21:30 - 16:27:00}

KMLB Vol Scan: 16:23:55







Flight Leg 4 (FL4) 16:21:30 – 16:27:00 KMLB Vol Scan: 16:28:16





