

Is there a positive feedback between Arctic stratus  
and diminishing sea ice?  
Master thesis

Mari Fenn Kristiansen



## Abstract

This will be my abstract.

Write it later....

No more than a page and should contain:

- main findings - how it compares to others - a conclusion?

## Acknowledgements

First of all I want to thank my main supervisor Jón Egill Kristjánsson for an interesting project and for the opportunity to come and work at NCAR for a couple of weeks. I also want to thank my other supervisor Kari Alterskjær for her "poking" and setting deadlines and pushing me for the last six months. I greatly appreciate their guidance and criticism throughout this project, and the doors that were always safe to knock on. Thank you so much to Anne Claire Fuillioux for helping me with setting up and getting started with WRF, and to both her and Kjell Andresen for help with technical problems during my work with this thesis. Thanks also to Gregory Thompson whom Jón Egill and I met with in Boulder, for meeting with us and answering all my e-mails about running the new aerosol-aware microphysics scheme in WRF. These past two years have been very enjoyable in all their stress thanks to Marta and Helle especially, for all their positiveness. Last, but not least, I would like to thank Henrik, for great technical help and moral support.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Main goal . . . . .	1
1.2	My contribution . . . . .	1
1.3	Structure of the thesis . . . . .	2
1.4	Area description . . . . .	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Theory</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Arctic clouds . . . . .	5
3.2	Radiation and clouds . . . . .	5
3.3	Aerosol effects on clouds . . . . .	8
3.3.1	The first indirect effect . . . . .	9
3.3.2	The second indirect effect . . . . .	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Model and methods</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Modeling System description . . . . .	11
4.1.1	Physics, radiation and interactions in WRF . . . . .	13
4.2	Schemes . . . . .	15
4.2.1	The aerosol-aware scheme . . . . .	15
4.2.2	The RRTMG radiation schemes . . . . .	15
4.3	Model setup . . . . .	16
4.4	Model runs . . . . .	18
4.4.1	Manipulation of input files . . . . .	18
4.4.2	Changed ice run . . . . .	19
4.4.3	Changed aerosols run . . . . .	19
4.5	Input data . . . . .	19
4.6	Processing of the results . . . . .	20



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Here I will write my introduction. Something about how low clouds in the Arctic have a warming affect as opposed to the cooling effect they have on lower latitudes. This warming is due to the lack of SW radiation flux to reflect, and the emission of LW radiation flux to the ground therefore makes a greater difference.

(Something citing the IPCC report 2013 on the ice conditions in the Arctic, and something about Arctic clouds and radiation?)

Clouds are an important regulator of the Earth's radiation budget. They cover approximately 60% of the Earth's surface [8]. It is well know that low clouds have a cooling effect at the surface due to their reflecting of incoming solar radiation. However, the effect is opposite in the Arctic, which I will elaborate on in the theory section. Therefore it is important to investigate the changes in low clouds and their properties in the Arctic.

### 1.1 Main goal

### 1.2 My contribution

The findings in my thesis have been achived with some of the most recently developed code (by Greg Thompson) for cloud microphysics and their effects on radiation, in modelling. The results build further on the work of many researchers @name-some-and-cite and contribute and may raise some questions for further research within the field.

### 1.3 Structure of the thesis

In the following chapter 2 Background I will present the background for my thesis; what work I hope to compare with and relate my thesis to. Also I will touch upon why the subject of my thesis is important. In chapter 3 Theory the most important theory and basic knowledge needed to understand some of the processes in clouds and their possible effect on the sea ice. Chapter 4 Model and methods is where I explain how I have worked with different tools to get the results presented in chapter ?? which are further discussed in chapter ?. A summary of main findings and conclusions are presented in the last chapter ? Summary and conclusions, before the lists of figures and references at the very end.

### 1.4 Area description

Here I should describe the area I have studied, and why it was chosen. Shown in figure ?? in Chapter 4 Model and methods. The area was chosen because it had some ice in september, and because there have been research campaigns over the area with focus on clouds in the arctic (which is what I am studying). (show a map..?) Know the correct names of the seas and the land!!



## Chapter 2

# Background

In this chapter I shall present some recent literature on the subject. Some new (and older) research that makes my thesis interesting and relevant to the field. No one has done this study with a weather forecasting model, it is interesting to look at changes in parameters in similar meteorological conditions, the same initial and boundary conditions in every run. Describe some of the work done by Palm2010? WuLee2012 and others on autumn low clouds in the Arctic to emphasize the importance of my work.

Is my work new thinking and does it seem to be very extensive?

Should this whole chapter be a part of introduction..?



## Chapter 3

# Theory

### 3.1 Arctic clouds

The Arctic cloud cover is dominated by low clouds @cite. Most high amounts of stratus clouds are over the oceans [7]. The Arctic is the only region where the season of maximum stratus does not correspond to the season of greatest lower troposphere static stability [7], which could be due to lack of evaporation during the cold winter months. According to [7] stratus in the Arctic basin peaks during summer at nearly 62%, while during the winter season the stratus only accounts for 18% of the cloud cover. This leads them to conclude that the seasonal cycle of stratus in the Arctic is driven by the temperature cycle, thereby moisture content in the atmosphere, rather than the static stability.(, as opposed to other areas.)

Are there any typical cloud properties special to the arctic? CURRY!

The air in the Arctic is very stable in winter (polar night) and clean as there are not many sources for pollution. In Autumn the sea ice extent reaches a minimum after the summer melting and leave open water to influence low clouds and their properties.

Low clouds have bases below 2000 m. Stratus (St) are layered clouds that form when extensive areas of stable air are lifted. Stratus clouds are normally between 0.5 and 1 km thick, whereas they can be several km wide (@citeAguadoBurtpage188?).

### 3.2 Radiation and clouds

The cloud microphysical properties that determine the cloud radiative properties include: the amount of condensed water, the size and shape of the




Figure 3.1: Size of CCN, typical cloud droplet, large cloud droplet, boarderline between cloud droplets and raindrops and typical size of raindrop. Adapted from [9].

cloud particles, and the phase of the particles/and if the particles are liquid or ice [2]. The amount of condensed water can be expressed by the liquid water content (LWC) in the cloud, often presented with units  $g\ m^{-3}$ , and is proportional to the cloud droplet number concentrations when we use the median volume radius,  $\bar{r}$ ,  $\mu\ m$ . From [?] we can express the number of droplets with radius  $r$  by

$$N = \int n(r)dr \quad (3.1)$$

where  $N$  is the cloud droplet number concentration  $cm^{-3}$ , and  $n(r)$  is the number of droplets with radius  $r$ . The LWC can be written

$$LWC = \int \rho_L \frac{4}{3} \pi r^3 n(r) dr \quad (3.2)$$

$$= \frac{4}{3} \pi \rho_L \int r^3 n(r) dr \quad (3.3)$$

$$= \frac{4}{3} \pi \rho_L \bar{r}^3 \int n(r) dr \quad (3.4)$$

$$= \frac{4}{3} \pi \rho_L \bar{r}^3 N \quad (3.5)$$

where the last equation shows the proportionality of LWC to the cloud droplet number concentration  $N$ , and  $\rho_L$  is the density of liquid water.

If the LWC is integrated over the height of the cloud, or any layer with chosen base and top in the atmosphere, we find the liquid water path (LWP) of that layer.

$$LWP = \int_{base}^{top} LWC dz \quad (3.6)$$

The LWP is the column of liquid water in a cloud and is usually expressed by  $g\ m^{-2}$ .

The cloud droplet effective radius determines many important radiative properties of a cloud and is therefore of particular interest. For example it determines the cloud albedo [3], which I will go more into when describing the first indirect effect.

Cloud consist of droplets that absorb and scatter SW radiation and absorb, scatter and emit LW radiation.. (introduction@)In this thesis short-wave (SW) radiation means solar radiation and longwave (LW) radiation covers the terrestrial infrared radiation. How clouds scatter and absorb SW and LW radiation. Explain something about blackbodies, clouds and blackbodies? Stefan–Boltzmanns law states that the flux density emitted by a blackbody is proportional to the fourth power of the absolute temperature @citeLiou2002page12. For a greybody, like a cloud, the equation can be written

$$F = \epsilon \sigma T^4 \quad (3.7)$$

where the emissivity of the greybody,  $\epsilon$ , is included.  $F[W\ m^{-2}]$  is the flux density emitted by the greybody, and  $\sigma = 5.67 \cdot 10^{-8} Jm^{-2}sec^{-1}deg^{-4}$  is the Stefan–Boltzmann constant.

Write about optical depth from Wallace and Hobbs: Normal optical depth or optical thickness,  $\tau_\lambda$  is a measure of the cumulative depletion that

a beam of radiation directed straight downward (zenith angle  $\theta = 0$ ) would experience in passing through a defined layer [? ]. The optical depth can be expressed as

$$\tau_\lambda = \int_z^\infty k_\lambda \rho r dz \quad (3.8)$$

where  $k_\lambda$  is the mass absorption coefficient, which has units of  $m^2 \text{ kg}^{-1}$ ,  $\rho$  is the density of air, which has units of  $\text{kg m}^{-3}$ , and  $r$  is the mass of the absorbing gas per unit mass of air.

As mentioned in Chapter 1 Introduction there is no solar radiation to reflect during winter and the polar night in the Arctic, where as in the summer the zenith angle is so high that even though there is sunlight 24 hours a day the cooling effect in summer does not average out the heating effect the clouds have in winter. The low clouds' ability to absorb and emit terrestrial radiation dominates over their reflective effect on the solar radiation. @cite?

How do clouds reflect radiation? What is the effect of more water? Or more ice? What about the droplet size? (effective radius)  
How do clouds absorb and emit radiation? Effect of more or less water or ice? Droplet size?

Ice is more effective in reflecting SW than water. Snow has a higher albedo than rain. Is there any use in presenting some albedo values for water, snow, ice? Or open water versus sea ice? New ice versus old sea ice?

Make sure to include something on how LWC/LWP and effective radii plays in, if this is to be mentioned in the results or discussion!!

### 3.3 Aerosol effects on clouds

Aerosols affect clouds in numerous ways. They have a direct effect on the climate by scattering and absorbing SW radiation. acting as CCNs or INs. elaborate? If there are few CCNs a cloud in the area would be a clean cloud with few, but large droplets and therefore have a low albedo and precipitate easily. If the area had high aerosol concentration, the cloud would be polluted and have more numerous but smaller droplets, which means it would have a higher albedo and precipitation would be suppressed.

Not only the aerosol burden is important, if it is the same for two areas with different meteorological forcing that would also affect the cloud properties. Say an area has weaker updraft than another area, a cloud formed due to the weaker updraft will have lower LWC, lower albedo and little precipitation. The cloud formed in a stronger updraft will have higher LWC,

higher albedo and be more precipitating.

@introduction?— Diminishing sea ice could lead to an increase in the aerosol number concentrations in the area where ice has retreated. The open sea surface it self would lead to an increase in release of sea salt to the lower atmosphere @cite. The lack of sea ice would also increase the likelihood that the sea could be used for shipping, which would pollute the area @cite. — There are two known indirect effects that aerosols have on radiation, through clouds. The first indirect effect was proposed by [16] and is often referred to as the Twomey effect. The second indirect effect was proposed by [1] and is also known as the lifetime effect.

### 3.3.1 The first indirect effect

(Maybe just call it all indirect effects and refer to Lohmann and Feichter)  
The first indirect effect, suggested by [16], describes the enhancement of cloud albedo as a consequence of an increase in aerosol content and thereby available CCNs. In short, the first indirect effect is a cloud albedo enhancement. By increasing droplet concentration and hence the optical thickness of a cloud, pollution acts to increase the reflectance of clouds [17]. The optical thickness is increased when the number of CCN is increased. Although the changes are small, the long term effects on climate can be profound [16].

Meg: The optical depth will change with changes in aerosol number concentrations and changes in clouds and their properties. For instance if a cloud has many small droplets, the optical depth will be higher. Where as fewer cloud droplets will yield a lower optical depth, resulting in more SW radiation reaching the ground — possibly having a warming effect on the area.

### 3.3.2 The second indirect effect

Albrecht 1989 The second indirect effect, or the cloud lifetime effect, suggests more numerous but smaller droplets reduce the precipitation efficiency and by that enhances the cloud lifetime and hence the cloud reflectivity [1]. This effect has been estimated to be of roughly as large as the first indirect effect [8].

Production of DMS by phytoplankton Charlson 1987....





## Chapter 4

# Model and methods

### 4.1 Modeling System description

To produce results for the thesis, a formulation of the Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) Model called the Advanced Research WRF (ARW) has been used, Version 3.6.1, released in April 2014. The model is developed at the National Centre for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) in Boulder, Colorado. The ARW model is the first fully compressible conservative form nonhydrostatic model designed for both research and operational numerical weather prediction (NWP) applications [12].

As can be seen from figure 4.1 the WRF Modeling System consists of four major programs [18]:

- The WRF Preprocessing System (WPS)
- WRF-Data Assimilation (WRF-DA)
- ARW solver
- Post-processing & Visualization tools

WPS is used primarily for real data simulations [18], like the study presented in this thesis. Its functions include defining simulation domains, interpolating terrestrial data and degribbing and interpolating meteorological data from another model to this simulation domain [18]. WRF-DA is optional and can be used to ingest observations into the interpolated analyses created by WPS [18], but was not used in this study. The ARW solver is the key component of the modeling system, which is composed of several initialization programs for idealized, and real-data simulations, and the numerical integration program [18]. Fully compressible nonhydrostatic equations




Figure 4.1: Flowchart for the WRF ARW Modeling System Version 3. From [18].

with hydrostatic options, regional and global applications, complete coriolis and curvature terms and that vertical grid-spacing can vary with height are among the WRF models key features according to [18].

The model can be run for ideal cases or real cases. I have run the REAL-TIME WRF, real.exe — to produce inputfiles for wrf.exe.

The continuous equations solved in the ARW model are the Euler equations cast in a flux form where the vertical coordinate,  $\eta$ , is defined by a normalized hydrostatic pressure,

$$\eta = (p_h - p_{ht})/\mu \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\mu = (p_{hs} - p_{ht})$  [12].  $p_h$  is the hydrostatic component of the pressure and  $p_{hs}$  and  $p_{ht}$  are the values of the hydrostatic pressure in a dry atmosphere at the surface and top boundaries respectively [12].




Figure 4.2: This figure is shown as presented in [12], and is a schematic of the terrain following a  $\sigma$  coordinate.  $P_{hs}$  and  $P_{ht}$  is the hydrostatic pressure at the surface and the top respectively.

The vertical coordinate is the traditional  $\sigma$  coordinate used in many hydrostatic atmospheric models, shown in a diagram in figure 4.2.

#### 4.1.1 Physics, radiation and interactions in WRF

Based on the WRF-ARW Version 3 User's Guide by [18]. The physics options in WRF fall into several categories, each containing several choices. Table 4.1 shows the different categories and the choice of scheme within each category.

Table 4.1: Table of physics categories and choice of scheme for this thesis

<b>Physics categories</b>	<b>Scheme selected within category</b>
(1) microphysics	aerorol-aware [11], [14], [15] [13]
(2) cumulus parameterization	Grell 3D nr5 @cite authors
(3) planetary boundary layer (PBL)	Yonsei University scheme nr1 @cite authors
(4) land-surface model	Noah Land Surface Model nr2 @cite authors
(5) radiation	RRTMG LW & SW nr4 @cite authors

The microphysics includes explicitly resolved water vapor, cloud, and precipitation processes. The aerosol-aware scheme was chosen to avoid the use of WRF-Chem, but to still have scavenging of aerosols and have proper enough representation of aerosols to study aerosol-cloud interactions.

The choice of cumulus parameterization was based on the grid resolution, and the best fit for it. A horizontal grid spacing of 4 km can be fine enough to not use cumulus parameterization, but in this thesis I chose a parameterization that was more suitable for grid sizes less than 10 km, the Grell 3D parameterization. (Grell 3D an improved Multi-closure, multi-parameter ensemble method with typically 144 sub-grid members, that may be used on high resolution (like mine))

(Yonsei University scheme. Non-local-K scheme with explicit entrainment layer and parabolic profile in unstable mixed layer.)

The land-surface model choice came to Noah Land Surface Model, which provides sensible and latent heat fluxes to the PBL scheme. Additionally, it predicts soil ice, and fractional snow cover effects, which could be important in the Arctic, but it is probably not the most important choice, since there is very little land in the area investigated, figure ?? . (Noah Land Surface Model: Unified NCEP/NCAR/AFWA scheme with soil temperature and moisture in four layers, fractional snow cover and frozen soil physics.)

The radiation schemes were chosen simply because they are the best match for the microphysics scheme at the time of writing. According to [13] the RRTMG schemes for SW and LW are the only radiation schemes which include the effects of the effective radii calculated in aerosol-aware. (RRTMG LW: An accurate scheme using look-up tables for efficiency. Accounts for multiple bands and microphysics species, and includes the MCICA method of random cloud overlap. Major trace gases are constant in my runs, and

their values are  $CO_2 = 379e - 6$ ,  $N_2O = 319e - 9$ ,  $CH_4 = 1774e - 9$ . nr4  
@cite authors)

## 4.2 Schemes

The ARW model offers a wide selection of schemes to treat different physics that one wants represented in the model. The schemes treat the physics slightly differently and some schemes are better for certain horizontal and vertical resolutions than others, so one needs to be careful when choosing how the model is to treat the physics. For my thesis, the especially relevant scheme to mention is the cloud microphysics scheme that I chose, which is the aerosol-aware scheme described in [13] which is a development of the bulk microphysics scheme described in [15], to include aerosols and scavenging of them. The scheme is a true double moment scheme and therefore treats cloud water, cloud ice, rain and snow in a complex and detailed way (@???litt vagt og rart å skrive) [13]. At the time of writing, the only radiation schemes that make use of the effective radii are the Rapid Radiative Transfer Model (RRTM) for General Circulation Models (GCMs) (RRTMG) radiation schemes [10] [5] [4] [6] for both SW and LW. These were therefore used in combination with the aerosol-aware cloud microphysics scheme.

### 4.2.1 The aerosol-aware scheme

According to the ARW User's Guide by [18], the aerosol-aware scheme considers water- and ice-friendly aerosols, and a climatological dataset may be used to specify initial and boundary conditions for the aerosol variables. I have used this climatological dataset, which is explained in Section 4.5 Input data. The microphysics option 28, the aerosol-aware scheme [13] is built on the schematic shown in figure 4.3, from [11]. It is a double moment scheme, which means it computes both mixing ratios and number concentrations for the same water species (hydrometeors).

Figure 4.3 show the processes in the microphysics scheme developed by [11], which the first bulk microphysics scheme by Thompson [14] was based on. The aerosol-aware scheme is an extension of the Thompson bulk microphysics scheme.

### 4.2.2 The RRTMG radiation schemes

Radiation [10] The RRTM scheme described in [10] uses the correlated-k method, which is an approximated technique for the accelerated calculation of




Figure 4.3: Cloud microphysical parameterization scheme typically used in NWP models as shown in [11]. A full list of the acronyms used in the schematic can be found in [11].

### 4.3 Model setup

@Area description. Sea names: Beaufort and East Siberian Sea. By Canada and Alaska, this is because data from the area has been used for research by

others @citations. The area is not completely ice free any part of the year @cite, and provides a good place to simulate cloud and sea ice interaction. Approximately 7 hours behind UTC time, the times given in the WRF ARW modeling system are UTC. This means that figures showing 1200 UTC are for approximately 0500 in the morning local time in Canada and Alaska.

I ran ARW with a horizontal resolution of 4 km, and 72 vertical layers. This resolution is sufficient to resolve clouds @citation. 300· 300 gridpoints, with 4 km spacing, between .

I call the vertical layers in the ARW model eta levels, because of the choice of  $\eta$  as the vertical coordinate. These levels have uneven vertical spacing. Since the level height is dependent on pressure, the height varies in both time and space. Consequently the levels in the lower troposphere are closer to each other than higher up in the troposphere. Therefore the low clouds in the area can be resolved. (@How close? what heights??)

The sea ice in the area was removed by editing the input file constructed? built? by WPS and real.exe, to get results to compare with results from runs with ice.

From diminishing sea ice we might experience an increase in sea traffic, which would lead to an increase in aerosol content in otherwise clean air @citation. To include increase in aerosol concentrations due to lack of sea ice I used the microphysics scheme developed by Greg Thompson and Trude Eidhammer described in [13].

The scheme uses a monthly mean for aerosol number concentrations derived from multi-year (2001-2007) global model simulations @citationCollarco2010??(det har de cita) in which particles and their precursors are emitted by natural and anthropogenic sources and are explicitly modeled with multiple size bins for multiple species of aerosols by the Goddard Chemistry Aerosol Radiation and Transport (GOCART) model (@desiterteGinoux2001) [13].

Choice of schemes and reasons should be presented. As should how WPS and real.exe and wrf.exe works. At least short about what they do and contribute with to get to the end results. Explain some of the improvements in the micro physics scheme in combination with the revised radiation schemes (RRTMG for SW and LW).

## 4.4 Model runs

Table 4.2: Table showing the name of the runs and what is included

Name	Horisontal resolution	Dimensions	Vertical layers	$\Delta t$	Sea ice	Aerosol concentration
control	4 km x 4 km	300 x 300	72	24 s	yes	control
NoIce	4 km x 4 km	300 x 300	72	24 s	no	control
Aero10	4 km x 4 km	300 x 300	72	24 s	yes	control x 10
Aero10NoIce	4 km x 4 km	300 x 300	72	24 s	no	control x 10
Aero100	4 km x 4 km	300 x 300	72	24 s	yes	control x 100
Aero100NoIce	4 km x 4 km	300 x 300	72	24 s	no	control x 100

Which table?

Table 4.3: Caption could say: Table showing the names of the runs and if they have sea ice or not, and if the aerosol concentration has been increased by a factor of 10 or 100 through input files. All the runs have the same horisontal resolution of 4kmx4km, dimenons 300x300, vertical layers 72 and time step 24 s.

Name	Sea ice	Aerosol concentration
control	initial	control
NoIce	removed	control
Aero10	initial	control x 10
Aero10NoIce	removed	control x 10
Aero100	initial	control x 100
Aero100NoIce	removed	control x 100

### 4.4.1 Manipulation of input files

wrfinput\_d01 and wrfbdy\_d01 are input files for domain 1, in my case the only domain, and are made by real.exe. These files are then used as initialization or forcing when wrf.exe is run. To run the model without ice and with an increased number of aerosols I manipulated the input files for WRF. I used a netCDF Operator (NCO) tool, ncap2. This allowed me to manipulate the netCDF files from my terminal window in the folder where



they were located. Elaborate on removal or placing of sea ice. Elaborate on multiplying the aerosol number concentration with a factor 10 or 100. By use of ncap2 from NetCDF (NCO).

#### 4.4.2 Changed ice run

The sea ice variable in the wrfinput\_d01 file was simply multiplied by 0 in every gridpoint and by that removed. Removed ice from the input file for the model run by using NCO and ncap2. The point of this is to compare the run with no ice to the control run, and see if there are any changes to the cloud properties.

#### 4.4.3 Changed aerosols run

The increase in aerosol concentration was a bit more complicated, but the same method. The number of water and ice friendly aerosols were multiplied by 100 and so were their tendencies and respective concentrations at the boundaries of the area. The goal is to find changes in cloud properties compared to those in the control run, for that purpose the aerosol concentration was multiplied by a factor of 100. Hoping to get a signal.

### 4.5 Input data

The model runs were initialized with data downloaded from the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF). The downloaded data is from the ERA-Interim dataset, which is a global atmospheric reanalysis from 1979 to present and continues to be updated in real time. Through WPS the data from ERA-Interim was interpolated over the area, with a 2 degree minute spacing between the points, to be used to initialize the model. The data used is in 6-hourly atmospheric fields on pressure levels, for the first five days of September 2012, which was the period the model was run for. This is done to make sure the initial meteorological conditions are the same in every run, so that the effects of changing a variable in the input files for the modeling system are only due to that change.

To use the climatological aerosol dataset, the file containing monthly means had to be called through WPS for real.exe to make input data for water- and ice-friendly aerosols in the wrfinput\_d01 and wrfbdy\_01 files.

## 4.6 Processing of the results

Figures presented in my thesis, I made (unless other is stated) by use of National Centre for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) Command Language (NCL) and MatLab. For the NCL scripts I found a lot of help and inspiration from the example scripts for WRF-users available at ([URL for examples](#)).

I made all the figures that are over maps with NCL, the others were made with MatLab provided by the University.

MathWorks, it is very useful and easy to use.

NCL it is free and there are a lot of available example scripts to quickly learn how to use the graphics.

# Bibliography

- [1] Albrecht, Bruce A. 1989. Aerosols, Cloud Microphysics, and Fractional Cloudiness. *Science*, **245**(4923), 1227–1230.
- [2] Curry, Judith A., Schramm, Julie L., Rossow, William B., & Randall, David. 1996. Overview of Arctic Cloud and Radiation Characteristics. *Journal of Climate*, **9**(8), 1731–1764.
- [3] Hansen, J. E., & Travis, L. D. 1974. Light scattering in planetary atmospheres. *Space Science Reviews*, **16**(1957), 527–610.
- [4] Iacono, Michael J. 2003. Evaluation of upper tropospheric water vapor in the NCAR Community Climate Model (CCM3) using modeled and observed HIRS radiances. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **108**(D2).
- [5] Iacono, Michael J., Mlawer, Eli J., Clough, Shepard a., & Morcrette, Jean-Jacques. 2000. Impact of an improved longwave radiation model, RRTM, on the energy budget and thermodynamic properties of the NCAR community climate model, CCM3. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **105**(D11), 14873.
- [6] Iacono, Michael J., Delamere, Jennifer S., Mlawer, Eli J., Shephard, Mark W., Clough, Shepard a., & Collins, William D. 2008. Radiative forcing by long-lived greenhouse gases: Calculations with the AER radiative transfer models. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, **113**(13), 2–9.
- [7] Klein, S. A., & Hartmann, D. L. 1993. The seasonal cycle of low stratiform clouds. *Journal of Climate*, **6**, 1587–1606.
- [8] Lohmann, U., & Feichter, J. 2005. Global indirect aerosol effects: a review. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions*, **4**(6), 7561–7614.
- [9] McDonald, James E. 1958. *The Physics of Cloud Modification*.

- [10] Mlawer, Eli J., Taubman, Steven J., Brown, Patrick D., Iacono, Michael J., & Clough, Shepard a. 1997. Radiative transfer for inhomogeneous atmospheres: RRTM, a validated correlated-k model for the long-wave. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **102**(D14), 16663.
- [11] Reisner, J, Rasmussen, R M, & Bruintjes, R T. 1998. Explicit forecasting of supercooled liquid water in winter storms using the MM5 mesoscale model. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, **124**(548), 1071–1107.
- [12] Skamarock, William C., & Klemp, Joseph B. 2008. A time-split nonhydrostatic atmospheric model for weather research and forecasting applications. *Journal of Computational Physics*, **227**(7), 3465–3485.
- [13] Thompson, Gregory, & Eidhammer, Trude. 2014. A study of aerosol impacts on clouds and precipitation development in a large winter cyclone. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 140507124141006.
- [14] Thompson, Gregory, Rasmussen, Roy M., & Manning, Kevin. 2004. Explicit Forecasts of Winter Precipitation Using an Improved Bulk Microphysics Scheme. Part I: Description and Sensitivity Analysis. *Monthly Weather Review*, **132**, 519–542.
- [15] Thompson, Gregory, Field, Paul R., Rasmussen, Roy M., & Hall, William D. 2008. Explicit Forecasts of Winter Precipitation Using an Improved Bulk Microphysics Scheme. Part II: Implementation of a New Snow Parameterization. *Monthly Weather Review*, **136**, 5095–5115.
- [16] Twomey, S. 1974. Pollution and the Planetary Albedo. *Atmospheric Environment*, **8**, 1251–1256.
- [17] Twomey, S. 1977. The Influence of Pollution on the Shortwave Albedo of Clouds. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, **34**, 1149–1152.
- [18] Wang, Wei, Bruyère, Cindy, Duda, Michael, Dudhia, Jimmy, Gill, Dave, Kavulich, Michael, Keene, Kelly, Lin, Hui-Chuan, Michalakes, John, Rizvi, Syed, Zhang, Xin, Berner, Judith, & Smith, Kate. 2015. *WRF ARW Version 3 Modeling System User's Guide*. Mesoscale & Microscale Meteorology Division, National Centre for Atmospheric Research.