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ABSTRACT

The characteristic properties of cumulus convection are investigated using a semi-one-dimensional, axisymmetric, quasi-Lagrangian steady-state model which takes into consideration the influence of the pressure perturbation, density stratification and nearby moist downdraft under two different environmental situations: 1) a potentially more unstable tropical environment and 2) a less unstable middle-latitude environment with prominent stable layers in the middle troposphere. It is found that the compressional heating of the dry environment makes the cloud air warmer and reduces the updraft velocity slightly, and moist downdraft cools the cloud air and reduces both the updraft and the cloud depth, while the influence of pressure perturbation also reduces the updraft but it is effective only for clouds of radii > 1000 m. The influence of density stratification is to reduce \( w_u \), slightly at low levels and augment \( w_u \) at high levels and to slightly increase the cloud depth. The calculated precipitation rates appear to be close to the representative values obtained from observations. One most interesting result given by the model is that, under the less unstable middle-latitude environment, the precipitation rate jumps from lower than 0.7 cm h\(^{-1}\) for cloud radii < 1000 m to more than 5.4 cm h\(^{-1}\) for cloud radii > 2000 m, reflecting the inhibiting effect of the midtropospheric stable layer on the penetrative power of the smaller clouds.

Another interesting result revealed by the model is that with the pressure perturbation included, the maximum updraft velocity \( w_{max} \) achieves highest value when the cloud radius is \( \sim 8 \) km.

The influences of cumulus convection on the average thermodynamic properties of the atmosphere also have been calculated and it was found that the main heating is from latent heat but compressional heating of environmental air is also of importance, especially close to the top of the cloud.

1. Introduction

It is well known that the total life span of a vertically oriented thunderstorm or a single precipitating cumulus cell is only \( \sim 30 \) min and it can be divided into three distinct stages, viz., an updraft-dominated developing stage, a mature or rain stage with both updraft and wet downdraft, and a downdraft-dominated dissipating stage. It is also known that the strong downdraft within the domain of the cloud itself in these systems is attributable to the downwind drag created by the falling raindrops. On the other hand, the well-organized squall-line-type severe convective storms usually last for many hours even though the life span of a single cloud cell within the system may also be relatively short.

It is evident that a very complicated model is needed if one aims at representing the various processes involved during the development of these systems in detail through numerical modeling. However, essential understanding of the mechanisms of these convective systems can be achieved by the use of much simplified models, especially when our purpose is limited to the finding of the average behaviors of these systems only.

In this study we shall at first determine the representative flow fields during the whole life spans of the cumulus clouds from a simple cloud model and then calculate the average heating effects produced by them, and finally parameterize the average heating effect in terms of the large-scale flow variables. Our approach to the cumulus parameterization problem is still as that discussed by the first author in an earlier paper (Kuo, 1974), namely, to use a representative model cloud or a combination of clouds rather than use an unspecified cloud ensemble. This approach also has been followed by Anthes (1977) in his approach to the cumulus parameterization problem, but with a somewhat different cloud model.

Specifically, the cloud model we adopt in this study is a quasi-steady and quasi-one-dimensional model which is obtained by integrating the two-dimensional equation for the azimuthal vorticity over the radius of the cloud updraft; hence it takes into consideration the influence of the pressure perturbation approximately. In addition, we also take into consideration the influence of a nearly saturated strong downdraft in the immediate environment on the updraft in one type of cloud, which
is known to occur often in nature, in addition to that with a quiescent environment only.

2. The cumulus cloud model and the governing equations

As has been mentioned in the Introduction, the flow field under consideration is taken as axisymmetric; thus the radial and vertical equations of motion, the heat energy equation, the water vapor equation and the anelastic mass continuity equation can be written in the following forms in cylindrical coordinates \((r,z)\):

\[
u_t + uu_r + wu_z = -(p'/\rho_0)_r + \nu \nabla^2 u, \tag{1}
\]

\[
w_t + uw_r + ww_z = -(p'/\rho_0)_z + g \left( \frac{\theta'}{\theta} - q_i \right) + \nu \nabla^2 w, \tag{2}
\]

\[
\theta_t' + r^{-1}(ur\theta')_r + \rho_0^{-1}(\rho_0 w \theta')_z + w \theta_{oz} = \nu \nabla^2 \theta' + \frac{\pi L c_p}{\rho_0} - \frac{\partial s_0}{\partial z}, \tag{3}
\]

\[
q_t' + r^{-1}(urq')_r + \rho_0^{-1}(\rho_0 w q')_z + w q_{oz} = \nu \nabla^2 q' - C, \tag{4}
\]

\[
r^{-1}(ur)_r + \rho_0^{-1}(\rho_0 w z)_z = 0, \tag{5}
\]

where a small term \((\rho_0 \theta' / \rho_0 \theta_0) \partial \theta_0 / \partial z\) has been neglected from Eq. (12) and the subscripts \(r\) and \(z\) denote partial differentiations. Here \(u\) and \(w\) are the radial and the vertical velocity components, \(p', \theta'\) and \(q'\) are the departures of the pressure \(p\), the potential temperature \(\theta\) and the water vapor mixing ratio \(q\) from their values \(p_0, \theta_0\) and \(q_0\) in the undisturbed environment, \(\rho_0\) is the undisturbed density, \(\theta_0 = T(1 + 0.608q_0)\pi\) is the potential virtual temperature, \(C\) is the rate of condensation, \(L\) the latent heat of condensation, \(q_1\) the liquid water mixing ratio, \(\nu\) the eddy viscosity or eddy conduction coefficient, \(\nabla^2\) the one-dimensional Laplacian operator in cylindrical coordinates and \(\pi\) the ratio of the potential temperature to the temperature, which are given by

\[
\nabla^2 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \quad \nabla^2 = \nabla^2 - \frac{1}{r^2}, \tag{6a,b}
\]

\[
\pi = \left( \frac{1000}{p} \right)^{8/c_p}, \tag{6c}
\]

where \(p\) is in mb. The undisturbed quantities \(p_0, \theta_0, q_0\) and \(\rho_0\) are taken as functions of \(z\) only, and \(\nu\) is taken as proportional to \(w\) in the cloud. The definitions of the symbols used in this paper are also given in the Appendix. Note that the influences of vertical diffusion are not included in the present formulation because, as will be shown later, their contributions are much smaller than that of the entrainment. In fact, both the horizontal and the vertical diffusion terms can be taken as included in the entrainment-detrainment effect.

The condensation rate \(C\) in a unit mass of cloud is taken as given by

\[
C = -\frac{dq_s}{dt}, \tag{7a}
\]

where \(q_s\) is the saturation mixing ratio and is equal to \(q\) in the cloud. Without mixing or precipitation, the total water mixing ratio \((q_1 + q)\) of an individual parcel will remain constant and therefore \(C\) is also given by

\[
C = \frac{dq_t}{dt}. \tag{7b}
\]

For convenience, we add \(\pi L / c_p\) times (4) to (3) and obtain the following equation for the perturbation entropy \(s'\) of the moist air:

\[
s_t' + r^{-1}(urs')_r + \rho_0^{-1}(\rho_0 w s')_z + w \frac{\partial s_0}{\partial z} = \nu \nabla^2 s' + \frac{gL \pi}{c_p^2 T \bar{\theta}} (q_0 - q_0) w, \tag{8}
\]

where

\[
s' = \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}} \left( \theta' + \frac{\pi L q}{c_p} \right), \quad s_0 = \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}} \left( \theta_0 + \frac{\pi L q_0}{c_p} \right), \tag{8a,b}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial s_0}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial s_0}{\partial z} - \frac{gL \pi q_0}{c_p^2 T \bar{\theta}}, \tag{8c}
\]

and \(\bar{\theta}\) is the average value of \(\theta_0\) and hence is a constant.

For the saturated region inside the cloud, it is more convenient to measure the mixing ratio perturbation from the saturation mixing ratio \(q_{0s} = q_s(T_0)\) at the undisturbed temperature \(T_0\) rather than from the undisturbed value \(q_0\) in the environment. Since \(q\) is equal to the saturated mixing ratio \(q_s(T)\) at the temperature \(T = T_0 + T'\) in the cloud, we have

\[
q = q_s(T) = q_{0s} + q'', \tag{9a}
\]

where

\[
q'' = \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T}_{T_0} \left( T' + \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T} \right) \bar{\theta}''. \tag{9b}
\]

Thus, on setting \(q' = q'' + q_{0s} - q_0\) in \(s'\) and writing

\[
s_{v'} = \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}} \left( \theta' + \frac{L \pi}{c_p} q'' \right) = \bar{\theta}' \left[ 1 + \frac{L \pi}{c_p} \frac{\partial q_t}{\partial T} \right]
\]

\[
= s' - \frac{L \pi}{c_p \bar{\theta}} (q_{0s} - q_0), \tag{9c}
\]

\[
s_{0s} = \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}} \left( \theta_0 + \frac{L \pi}{c_p} q_{0s} \right) = \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}} \theta_{0s}
\]

\[
= s_0 + \frac{L \pi}{c_p \bar{\theta}} (q_{0s} - q_s), \tag{9d}
\]
we find that Eq. (8) becomes
\[ s_e' + r^{-1}(urs_e)_r + \rho_0 -1(\rho_0 w s_e')_z + w \frac{\partial s_{0e}}{\partial z} = \nu \nabla^2 s_e' + \frac{gL\pi}{c_p \theta'}(q_s - q_{0e})w, \tag{10} \]
where
\[ \frac{\partial s_{0e}}{\partial z} = \frac{1}{\theta'} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \frac{L \nu}{c_p \theta} \right] = \frac{ds_0}{dz} - \frac{gL \nu q_{se}}{c_p \theta}. \tag{10a} \]

We apply \( \partial/\partial r \) to (2) and \( \partial/\partial z \) to (1) and then take their difference to obtain the following equation for the azimuthal vorticity \( \eta = w_r - u_z \):
\[ \eta_r + (u \eta)_r + (w \eta)_z - \nu \nabla^2 \eta = \frac{g}{\theta'} \left( \frac{\theta'}{\theta} - q_t \right). \tag{11} \]

Notice that the influences of the water vapor and liquid water contents on the buoyancy are included but the influence of the precipitation drag is disregarded in (11). The influence of the pressure perturbation on the flow field is included in this equation through the \( -u_z \) term in \( \eta \).

According to Eq. (5), the velocities \( u \) and \( w \) and the vorticity \( \eta \) can be expressed in terms of the stream-function \( \psi \), viz.,
\[ u = -\psi_z + \sigma \psi, \quad w = \psi_r + r^{-1} \psi, \tag{12a,b} \]
\[ \eta = w_r - u_z = \nabla^2 \psi - \sigma \psi_z + \psi_{zz}, \tag{12c} \]
where \( \sigma = -\rho_0^{-1}(\partial \rho_0/\partial z) \) is the density stratification factor. Thus the dynamics of the axisymmetric cloud can be taken as governed by the two equations (10) and (11) in terms of the two dependent variables \( \psi \) and \( s' \), since \( q_s \) and hence \( q'' \) of (9b) is determinable from \( \theta \).

### a. Equations for the cloud updraft region

Instead of solving Eqs. (10) and (11) in the two-dimensional space \((r,z)\), in this work we shall focus our attention on the cloud updraft by reducing these equations to one-dimensional forms through integration from the center of the cloud \( r = 0 \) to the edge of the cloud \( r = R \) under the assumption that we have
\[ \theta'(R) = a \theta', \quad q'(R) = b \theta'(R) = ab \theta', \tag{13a,b} \]
\[ u(R) = -\alpha \psi = -\frac{\mu}{2} R \psi, \tag{13c} \]
\[ \int_0^R \nu \nabla^2 s_e' dr = -\alpha \omega s_e', \tag{13d} \]
where \( a, b, \alpha, \) and \( \alpha' \) are constants and \( \theta' \), \( w \) and \( s_e' \) now represent their average values inside the cloud. Here \( a > 0 \) implies entrainment of relatively warm air, and \( b > 0 \) implies entrainment of air which is more moist while \( b < 0 \) is air drier than the undisturbed environment. In this study we used \( a = -0.1 \), \( b = 0.002 \) for a modest moister downdraft and \( a = 0.4 \), \( b = \partial q_0/\partial T \) for a warmer downdraft. Obviously the values of these parameters must be adjusted under other situations. From the relations (8a), (9c) and (13a,b) we also find
\[ s'(R) = \alpha' s_e', \quad \alpha' = a(c_p + bL \pi) \left( \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T} \right)_p \tag{13e,f} \]
where
\[ \alpha' = a(c_p + bL \pi) \left( \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T} \right)_p. \tag{13g} \]

We now multiply (10) by \( \rho_0 \psi dr \) and integrate over \( r \) from 0 to \( R \). After making use of these simplifying relations at the cloud boundary we then find that the net upward mass transport of entropy \( H = \rho_0 w R s_e' \) inside the cloud is given by
\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{H}{w} \right) + \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} + \frac{(\alpha' R^2 - \alpha^* R^2)}{R} H' = -M \left[ \frac{dS_{0e}}{dz} \right] + \frac{L \pi}{c_p \theta} \left[ \frac{\mu(q_{se} - q_{0e}) - g}{c_p T} (q_{se} - q_{0e}) \right], \tag{14} \]
where \( M = -(\rho_0 w R^2) \) is the upward mass transport inside the cloud and \( \alpha^* = 2 \alpha \alpha' \), where \( \alpha' \) is given by (13g). Notice that \( \alpha' = 0 \) for \( b = -c_p/L \alpha \).

In order to be able to reduce the vorticity equation (11) to one-dimensional form in a simple manner through integration over \( r \), we make use of the simplifying assumption that the radial variation of \( \psi \) is oscillatory and is represented by a function of \( r \) only. For simplicity of representation, we shall follow Holton (1973) by equating this function with the first-order Bessel function \( J_1(\alpha r/R) \) with \( \alpha = 2.405 \) instead of the more realistic radial function given by the linearized equation (see Kuo, 1965b). We then have
\[ \nabla_1^2 \psi = \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r^2} \psi = -\frac{\alpha^2}{R^2} \psi. \tag{15a} \]
Since \( \nabla_1^2 \psi = \partial w/\partial r \), this relation also implies
\[ -\psi = \frac{R^2}{\alpha^2} \frac{\partial w}{\partial r}. \tag{15b} \]
Thus, on making use of the relation (15b) in the \( -u_z \) term of \( \eta \), we then find
\[ \eta = \left[ 1 - \frac{R^2}{\alpha^2} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} - \sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right) \right] \frac{\partial w}{\partial r}. \tag{15c} \]

Further, under the assumption that the radial and the vertical variations of \( w \) are represented by two separate functions we also find that \( w \eta \) is given by
\[ w \eta = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left[ w - \frac{R^2}{\alpha^2} (w_{se} - \sigma w_z) \right]. \tag{15d} \]
In addition, we assume that we have

\[ w(R) = 0, \quad \eta(R) = -\beta_1 \tilde{\eta}, \]

\[ \int_0^R \nu \nabla^2 \eta dr = -\frac{\alpha'}{R} w_0 \tilde{\eta}, \quad (16a,b,c) \]

where \( w_0 \) is the value of \( w \) at the axis and \( \tilde{\eta} \) is the mean value of \( \eta \) inside \( R \) and is given by

\[ \tilde{\eta} = \frac{1}{R} \int_0^R \eta dr \]

\[ = -\frac{1}{R} \left[ w_0 - \frac{R^2}{\alpha^2} \left( \frac{\partial^2 w_0}{\partial z^2} - \sigma \frac{\partial w_0}{\partial z} \right) \right]. \quad (16d) \]

Observe that (16c) is of the same form as (13d). Further, we assume that the average values of \( w \), \( \theta_e' \) and \( q_1 \) are equal to half of their values at the center, viz.,

\[ w_0 = 2w_c, \quad \theta_e'(0) = 2\theta_e', \quad q_1(0) = 2q_1, \quad (16e) \]

where \( w_c \) is the mean updraft velocity. Then, on integrating Eq. (11) from \( r = 0 \) to \( r = R \) and making use of the relations given above and setting

\[ y = w_c \left[ w_c - \frac{R^2}{\alpha^2} \left( \frac{dw_c}{dz} - \sigma \frac{dw_c}{dz} \right) \right], \quad (16f) \]

we then find the following equation for \( y \):

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( y/w_c \right) + \frac{\partial y}{\partial z} + \left( \frac{\alpha'}{R} + \frac{\alpha''}{R^2} \right) y \]

\[ = g \left[ 1 - 0.5a \frac{\theta_e'}{\theta_0} - (q_1 - 0.5q_c(R)) \right], \quad (17) \]

where \( \alpha' = \alpha_1 \beta_1 \). Thus the nonsteady development of our quasi-one-dimensional cloud is governed by Eqs. (14) and (17). We point out that if the vertical diffusion terms are retained in Eqs. (1) and (2), then a term \( \nu d^2(yw_c^{-1})/dz^2 \) will be added to (17). However, on comparing the magnitude of this term with those of the other terms we find that it is very small even when \( \nu \) is assigned the high value of 100 m² s⁻¹ and therefore its omission is justified. In fact, the horizontal diffusion term \( \nu \beta R^{-2} y \) is also of much less importance than the entrainment term \( \alpha_1 R^{-1} y \).

We point out that in this formulation of the problem, the flow conditions in the environment are not calculated from the dynamic equations but their influences on the flow conditions in the updraft region are included through the heat, moisture and momentum fluxes across the cloud boundary represented by (13a)–(13d) and (16a)–(16c) and through the second term of \( \eta \) in (15c) which represents the pressure effect.

b. The quasi-steady equations

In this study we shall limit ourselves to the quasi-steady development of the cumulus convection with the removal of rainwater by precipitation included but without giving rise to a downward drag on the updraft. This can be taken as possible either by assuming that the ascending current is along a slanted axis or assuming rainwater is being removed from the updraft by some other process. Then the development of the cloud can be perceived as a gradual extension of the cloud top through the successive ascension of similar buoyant elements originating from the cloud base until the equilibrium level is reached, while the decay process can be taken as accomplished statically. This kind of development can be represented by the steady versions of Eqs. (14) and (17), namely, with the time rate of change terms omitted. For this case it is more convenient to solve for \( s_e' \) instead of the net upward entropy transport \( H = M_s e' \). Thus, on expanding \( dH/dz \) in the steady version of Eq. (14) and dividing by \( M \) we then find that it reduces to

\[ \frac{ds_e'}{dz} + \left( \mu - \frac{\alpha_0}{R} + \frac{\alpha''}{R^2} \right) s_e' = -\frac{dS_{0w}}{dz} \]

\[ - \frac{L}{c_p} \left[ \mu (q_{0w} - q) - \frac{g}{c_p} (q_s - q_{0w}) \right], \quad (18) \]

where \( \mu = M^{-1} dM/dz = 2\alpha_1 / R \) is the mass entrainment coefficient and \( dS_{0w}/dz \) is given by (10a). When expressed in terms of the total equivalent potential temperature \( \theta_p(\theta + L \pi q / c_p) \) of the saturated cloud air and when both \( \alpha' \) and \( \alpha'' \) are zero, i.e., when both \( \theta' \) and \( q' \) vanish at the edge of the cloud and when viscous diffusion is neglected, this equation reduces to the simple form

\[ \frac{d\theta_e}{dz} + \mu (\theta_e - \theta_{0w}) = \frac{gL}{c_p^2} q_s. \quad (18a) \]

It can readily be shown that, when expressed in terms of the temperature \( T \), this equation takes the form

\[ \frac{dT}{dz} = -\left( \frac{T_v + L q_s / R}{c_p T} + \mu \frac{T - T_0 + L}{c_p} (q_s - q_0) \right) \]

\[ \cdot \frac{0.622 L}{c_p T} \frac{d e_s}{dT}, \quad (18b) \]
where $R$ is the gas constant, $T_v$ the virtual temperature, and $e_s$ the saturation vapor pressure at the temperature $T$ of the cloud. This expression of the lapse rate in the cloud is roughly equivalent to the expression given by Stommel (1947) but is slightly more general.

Since Eq. (18) can be integrated directly if we take the entrainment coefficient $\mu$ as known, we shall use this equation instead of (18a) or (18b). According to the relations (9a), (9c) and (9b), we have

$$\frac{\pi}{\theta} \left( q_s - q_{0s} \right) = \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T} \left( \frac{\theta'}{\theta} \right) = \frac{s_e'}{\left[ 1 + \frac{L}{c_p} \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T} \right] \theta} \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T} \left( \frac{\theta'}{\theta} \right).$$

Therefore, Eq. (18) can also be written as

$$\frac{d s_e'}{dz} + \left( \mu' - \frac{\alpha^*}{R} + \frac{\alpha^*}{R^2} \right) s_e' = - \frac{d s_{0s}}{dz} - \frac{L \pi \mu}{c_p \theta} \left( q_{0s} - q_{0d} \right),$$

where

$$\mu' = \mu - \frac{g L}{c_p T_v} \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T} \left( 1 + \frac{L}{c_p} \frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T} \right)^{-1},$$

$$\frac{d s_{0s}}{dz} = \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{d \theta_0}{dz} + \frac{L}{c_p} \frac{d q_{0s}}{dz}.$$ (19b)

Here $\partial q_s/\partial T$ is for $T = T_v$. Since all the terms on the right-hand side of (19) are functions $T_v$ and $p_0$, all of them are known functions of $z$; therefore Eq. (19) can be integrated directly provided $\mu'$ is taken as known.

For $q_{0s}$ and $\partial q_s/\partial T$, we make use of the relations

$$q_s = \frac{0.622 e_s}{P - e_s},$$

$$e_s(T) = 6.11 \times \exp \left[ 25.22 \left( 1 - \frac{273 K}{T} \right) \right] \times \left( \frac{273 K}{T} \right)^{5.31}.$$ (19d)

Thus, from these relations we find

$$\frac{\partial q_s}{\partial T} = \frac{0.622 P}{(P - e_s)^2} \frac{e_s}{dT}.$$ (19e)

The variation of the liquid water mixing ratio with height due to condensation is calculated from a similar equation in accordance with (7a), viz.,

$$\frac{dq_{l, \text{cond}}}{dz} = - \frac{dq_s}{dz} - \mu' \left[ q_s - q^* + (1 + a_2) q_{l, \text{cond}} \right].$$ (20)

where $q_{l, \text{cond}}$ refers to the total liquid water mixing ratio created by condensation, $q^*$ is the mixing ratio at $r = R_v$ just outside the updraft, and $\alpha_2$ is another constant factor for allowing the effect of evaporation at the cloud boundary. The formula for calculating the rate of precipitation from the various layers will be given later in Section 4. Thus our system is represented by (19) and the steady version of (17), viz.,

$$\frac{dy}{dz} + \left( \frac{\alpha'_1}{R} + \frac{\alpha'_2}{R^2} \right) y = g \left[ (1 - 0.5a) \frac{\theta'_v}{\theta_v} - q_l + 0.5 q_l(R) \right].$$ (21)

c. Two types of immediate environment

In this paper we shall investigate the influences of two different types of immediate environment on the updraft, viz., 1) the quiescent far-away environment unaffected by convection commonly assumed in most one-dimensional cloud models; and 2) the environment characterized by a relatively strong downdraft of saturated or nearly saturated and cooler air. The existence of such saturated downdraft has long been known, and their cellular patterns have been revealed more clearly by more recent Doppler-radar observations (see, e.g., Ziegler, 1978). On the other hand, the downdraft in the far environment is characterized by a much slower sinking motion and a temperature higher than that of the undisturbed state, a consequence of the compressional heating in the stably stratified environment.

Here we consider that the downdraft is occurring side by side with the updraft just as in cellular convection, so that the precipitation in the downdraft is not falling on the updraft and therefore the situation is different from that discussed by Srivastava (1967) and Ogura and Takashi (1971), where the downdraft is directly created by the falling precipitation in the lower part of the original updraft and hence it represents the decaying stage of the development of the cumulus cloud. One way of creating a downdraft side by side with the updraft is to have the updraft take place along a sloped cold front, such as in the squall-line-type severe storms. Then the falling precipitation from the updraft can create a downdraft without impeding the updraft. Another way is through the outflow of the raindrop-laden air in the upper layer. Since our simple plume model is not able to describe the details of the development of such downdrafts, we shall here simply assume that such a downdraft is present and try to calculate its influence on the various properties of the system.
3. Numerical procedure for solving Eq. (21)

As has been pointed out before, Eq. (18) can be solved directly when the entrainment coefficient \( \mu \) is taken as known. Therefore the remaining problem is to solve Eq. (21) by making use of the values of \( \theta_i' \) obtained from (18). Observe that, if \( q_i \) is also a known function of \( z \), then (21) can also be integrated directly as a first-order equation for \( y \). However, as described in Section 4, \( q_i \) is a function of \( w_c \). Therefore (21) must be solved together with the liquid water equation. The procedure we adopted in solving these two coupled equations is an iterative procedure, which is first to solve (21) by level by level according to the traditional plume model, that is, by neglecting the pressure perturbation in (21) so that we have \( y = w_c^2 \) and using \( w_c(z_{n-1}) \) in the liquid water equation to obtain a first approximation of \( q_i(z_n) \), and use it in (21) to obtain \( y = w_c^2 \) for the next level. After the first approximation of \( w_c \) is obtained in this way for all levels, we then recalculate \( w_c \) from the complete relation (16f) which includes the pressure perturbation, i.e.,

\[
\frac{R^2}{\alpha^2} \frac{d^2 w_c}{dz^2} - \sigma w_c \frac{dw_c}{dz} - w_c^2 = -y. \tag{21a}
\]

This equation is solved by Newton’s method as a boundary-value problem using the known distribution of \( y \), including positive negative values of \( y \) above the \( y = 0 \) level. Here \( w_c \) is required to be positive everywhere except at the top, where it is required to vanish, while at the cloud base \( w_c \) is taken as known. Eq. (21) is then solved again for \( y \), using the \( w_c \) newly obtained from (21a) to determine a new set of \( q_i \). The procedure is repeated until \( y \) and \( q_i \) are no longer changing. In most of the calculations presented below we do not include the first-order differential term in (21a) which contains the density variation, i.e.,

\[
\frac{R^2}{\alpha^2} w_c \frac{d^2 w_c}{dz^2} - w_c^2 = -y. \tag{21b}
\]

However, as revealed in a later section it is of minor consequence. In all these calculations a grid step equivalent to \( \Delta p = 5 \) mb is utilized.

The location of the upper boundary for the vertical velocity with pressure perturbation is not known exactly but approximately by the location of \( y = 0 \); hence it is used as a first guess with further minor adjustments made during the calculations to give a best fit, i.e., to keep \( w_c \) positive and monotonically decreasing near the cloud top. As a final step the upper 15–30\% of the vertical velocity profile at the cloud top is checked by recomputing using a marching procedure, making use of existing velocity calculations at lower levels. Typically the only consequence is a slight adjustment in the first or maybe first two nonzero values of \( w_c \) next to the cloud top while at all other points the solutions normally agree through several decimal places. This small correction is made necessary since the location where \( w_c = 0 \) is usually not exactly at a grid point but it can be found from the marching solution by interpolating linearly between the last positive and first negative value of \( w_c \).

The presence of a pressure perturbation at the cloud base requires that \( d^2 w_c/dz^2 \neq 0 \) at \( z = 0 \). An estimate of its value can be obtained utilizing a backward extrapolation technique built around Taylor series expansion and a one-sided difference approximation of (21), i.e.,

\[
\frac{dy}{dz} + \mu y = g \beta, \tag{22}
\]

where \( y \) is defined by (21b) and \( \beta \) is given by

\[
\beta = (1 - 0.5a) \theta_i' - q_i + 0.5q_i(R). \tag{22a}
\]

Here \( q_i \) represents the total liquid water mixing ratio of the rising parcel of air after the precipitation adjustment, which is described in the next section. Assuming that we have

\[
\frac{1}{M} \frac{dM}{dz} = \mu, \quad M = w_c R^2,
\]

the approximation can be shown to be

\[
\frac{d^2 w_c}{dz^2} \approx \frac{[(1 + 2\mu h) w_c^2 - (1 - \mu h) w_c e^2 - h\beta_0 - 2w_c w_c' h + h\beta_1]}{2w_c h^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha^2} M_1 - M_0(1 + \mu h)}, \tag{23}
\]

where \( h = \Delta z \) and the subscripts zero and one refer to the variables being evaluated at \( z = 0 \) and \( z = h \), respectively. This expression quickly converges in an iterative process which as a first guess assumes \( d^2 w_c/dz^2 = 0 \) at \( z = 0 \). Thus the \( y \)-equation (21) is solved with an initial value of \( y_0 = w_c^2 \) and then the values of \( w_c \) are found from Eq. (21b). This process is repeated allowing for an evaluation of Eq. (23) which gives a correction for the initial value of \( y_0 \) until the change in \( y \) at \( z = 0 \) is less than 0.002 \( m^2 \) \( s^{-2} \). Then the procedure is as described above. As a general rule, with some minor exceptions, it is found that clouds of small radii, say, <1000 \( m \), have final values of \( y_0 \) slightly larger than \( w_c^2 \), whereas larger radii clouds have final values less than \( w_c^2 \). In our model the overall consequence of these changes in \( y_0 \), of order unity or less, is very small but included for completion.

Other important quantities utilized in our calculations are the following: entrainment coefficient, \( \mu = 0.183/R \); latent heat of condensation, \( L = 597.0 \)
\(-0.555(T-723K)\text{ cal g}^{-1}\); gravity, \(g = 9.814\text{ m s}^{-2}\); virtual temperature, \(T_v = (1 + 0.608gT)\); finally, we used \(\alpha' = 0\), i.e., we omitted viscous diffusion.

4. The calculation of liquid water

Liquid water exerts a negative buoyancy on the updraft, as evident in the effective buoyancy term (21), so its concentration must be computed simultaneously with the vertical velocity. Liquid water \(q_{cw}\) is really the sum of cloud water and rainwater, where cloud water, denoted by \(q_{cw}\), is composed of small droplets that are carried by the updraft and rainwater, denoted by \(q_{rw}\), is composed of the larger drops that fall relative to the updraft. Condensation loads the cloud via cloud water, whereas precipitation, i.e., the fallout of rainwater, unloads the updraft. This unloading is important lest the drag force becomes too unrealistic. A detailed relationship between \(q_{cw}\) and \(q_{rw}\) has been outlined by Kessler (1969). Here a simpler format, similar to that used by Anthes (1977) based on a median drop size, is followed.

Cloud water is known to increase due to the condensation process and to decrease because of the autoconversion process which creates raindrops and by collection of cloud droplets by raindrops. Thus in symbolic form

\[
\Delta q_{cw} = \Delta q_{\text{cond}} - (\Delta q_{cw})_{\text{auto}} - (\Delta q_{cw})_{\text{coll}}. \tag{24}
\]

The autoconversion process, following Kessler (1965), is given by

\[
(q_{cw})_{\text{auto}} = \begin{cases} K\Delta t(q_{cw} - a'), & q_{cw} > a' \\ 0, & q_{cw} < a', \end{cases} \tag{25}
\]

where \(a' = 0.5\text{ g m}^{-2}\) is the threshold value and \(K = 10^{-3}\text{ s}^{-1}\). The collection term is expressed as

\[
(\Delta q_{cw})_{\text{coll}} = 5.26 \times 10^{-3} q_{cw}q_{rw}^{0.875} \Delta t. \tag{26}
\]

Rainwater increases at the expense of cloud water and decreases due to fallout, thus symbolically,

\[
\Delta q_{rw} = (\Delta q_{cw})_{\text{auto}} + (\Delta q_{cw})_{\text{coll}} - (\Delta q_{rw})_{\text{fallout}}. \tag{27}
\]

It will be assumed that the fallout rate is proportional to both \(q_{rw}\) and the terminal velocity \(V_F\), so that we have

\[
(\Delta q_{rw})_{\text{fallout}} = \lambda q_{rw}V_F\Delta t, \tag{28}
\]

where \(\lambda\) is an empirical fallout coefficient whose dimension is length\(^{-1}\) and hence it is often written as \(1/H\) (Anthes, 1977; Krietzberg and Perkey, 1976). Here both \(q_{cw}\) and \(q_{rw}\) are expressed (g m\(^{-2}\)) in terms of \(pq\) and the time step \(\Delta t\) is computed from \(\Delta z/w_c\) for \(w_c > 0.005\text{ m s}^{-1}\).

Following Simpson and Wiggert (1969), we take \(V_F\) for the median size raindrops as given by the following formula in terms of \(q_{rw}\):

\[
V_F = 5.1q_{rw}^{0.125} \text{[m s}^{-1}\text{].} \tag{29}
\]

The rate of precipitation \(P_R\) [g s\(^{-1}\) m\(^{-2}\)] can be computed using

\[
P_R = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Delta t_i V_F (\Delta q_{rw})_{\text{fallout}} t^{-1}, \tag{30}
\]

where \(\Delta t_i\) is the time since development of the \(i\)th layer of thickness \(\Delta p\) and

\[
t = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Delta t_i
\]

is the total cloud development time. It is customary with plume models to equate total cloud lifetime and development time.

5. Discussion of results

In our formulation of the simple, quasi-Lagrangian, axisymmetric steady-state cumulus cloud model, the entrainment effect discussed by Stommel (1947) is introduced in a more systematic manner by integrating the dynamic and thermodynamic equations over the area occupied by the cloud, thereby also introducing additional terms in these equations which represent the influences of the nearby environment on the cumulus. The physical properties of the air in the nearby environment are very different from that in the far environment on account of the existence of the descending motion in this region; therefore their inclusion in our model's physics is distinctively different from the lateral mixing effect used by Ogura and Takahashi (1971) in their study of the cumulus dynamics. It has been shown by several observational studies (Johnson, 1976; Nitta, 1978; Zipser, 1977; and others) that cumulus convection can be influenced significantly by the heat and mass transports produced by the nearby downdraft, whose vertical velocity can reach one-half of that of the adjacent updraft or even higher, according to Nitta (1978) and Sinclair (1979).

Two different undisturbed environmental situations have been investigated by our model: 1) a potentially more unstable environment represented by the mean Gulf of Mexico hurricane season temperature and relative humidity profiles (Herbert and Jordan, 1959) and 2), for later consideration, a less unstable sounding in middle latitudes. Fig. 1 illustrates the potential (solid line) and equivalent potential temperature (dashed and dotted curves) of the mean tropical sounding. Two \(\theta_e\) curves are given in this figure, the very small differences between them being due to the fact that in the dashed curve, the latent heat of vaporization is taken as constant, viz., \(L = 600\text{ cal g}^{-1}\), whereas in the dotted curve, \(L = 597 - 0.555t\) is used; here \(t\) is in °C and the latent heat of freezing, 80 cal g\(^{-1}\), is also included.
Fig. 1. Profiles of environmental potential temperature $\theta_e$ (solid line) and equivalent potential temperature $\theta_{eq}$ (dashed and dotted lines) for the mean Gulf of Mexico hurricane season sounding. In the dotted curve, variation of latent heat of vaporization with temperature is allowed and latent heat of freezing is included linearly between $-10$ and $-40^\circ$C.

linearly between $-10$ and $-40^\circ$C. Fig. 2 shows the vertical derivative of the entropy $S_{eq}$ for the constant $L$ case, which appears as a forcing function in the

perturbation entropy Eq. (19). A positive contribution by this term is indicated below 595 mb. Unless stated otherwise all figures refer to calculations using this mean tropical sounding.

Here we shall present the results based on (21b) first, that is, with $\sigma = 0$. The cloud temperature excesses obtained from our plume model for a cloud with $R = 1000$ m are illustrated in Fig. 3. Here the dashed curve is with moist downdraft while the solid curve is without moist downdraft. The relative humidity of the downdraft is taken as 95%. It is seen that the downdraft air is cooler than the undisturbed air represented by the mean sounding and as a consequence the overall depth of the cloud is re-

Fig. 2. Vertical profile of $\partial S_{eq}/\partial z$ for the tropical sounding in Fig. 1.

Fig. 3. Cloud temperatures excesses for radius $R = 1000$ m with $(a = -0.1, b = 0.002$, dashed curve) and without $(a = 0.0, solid line)$ moist downdraft cooler than the undisturbed air.

Fig. 4. Vertical velocity profiles for cloud radius $R = 1000$ with (dashed curve) and without (solid line) moist downdraft. The dotted curve includes the small additional influence evaporation at the cloud boundary $(a_e = 0.15)$ for the case.
duced by nearly 60 mb in pressure measure. As shown in Fig. 4, the corresponding reduction of the vertical velocity is substantial. Both of these changes are the results of the reduction of the buoyancy, which itself is directly attributable to the fact that, even though the moist downdraft temperature $T_{d} = T_{v}$ is lower than the temperature $T_{0}$ of the undisturbed environment, the virtual temperature perturbation $(T_{d} - T_{v})$ is positive on account of the higher mixing ratio of the moist downdraft. This tendency can be reversed if $T_{d}$ becomes much lower than $T_{0}$. Our calculations show that, for the same temperature and humidity distributions, the influence of the downdraft on the buoyancy decreases with increasing cloud radius and vice versa. These results are not significantly affected by the presence of other physical processes such as evaporation at the cloud boundary or inclusion of latent heat of fusion, as illustrated by the dotted curve in Fig. 4 and dashed curve in Fig. 5, respectively. The latter effect is introduced by incorporating the latent heat of freezing linearly between 0 and $-10^\circ$C.

As is well known, varying the entrainment coefficient can result in large changes of the velocity field and the depth of the cloud. For example, by doubling the entrainment coefficient from $\mu = 0.183 \text{R}^{-1}$ to $\mu = 0.366 \text{R}^{-1}$ we find that the maximum vertical velocity $w_{\text{max}}$ in the $R = 1000$ m cloud is reduced to about two-fifths of its former value and the depth is reduced by about 300 mb, while for the $R = 2000$ m cloud $w_{\text{max}}$ is reduced to about one-half of its original value and its depth is reduced by $-200$ mb.

The consequences of environmental compressional heating on cloud potential temperature excesses when no nearby moist downdraft is present are displayed in Fig. 6 for three cloud radii. The solid lines represent the cloud perturbation in the absence of compressional heating. The overall effect, as revealed in the dashed curves (with $a = 0.4$), is to warm the updraft especially at upper levels. The vertical velocity however is reduced because of the net reduction in buoyancy due to the term $-a/2$ in Eq. (21) that more than compensates for the enhanced cloud temperature excesses. This is clearly seen in Fig. 7 by comparing the profiles computed with (dotted curve) and without (dashed curve) compressional heating.

For a small radius cloud, $R = 500$ m (Fig. 7), the large changes in the vertical velocity due to com-
Compressional heating dwarfs the influence due to pressure perturbation. The latter causes a very minute reduction as indicated in Fig. 7 by the differences between the solid (no pressure perturbation) and dashed curves. However, increasing the cloud radius to 5000 m substantially enhances the role of the pressure perturbation so that these two influences become nearly equivalent in importance. The effect of the pressure perturbation as revealed in this figure and in others, shown and not shown, is to reduce the magnitude of the vertical velocity, to shift the maximum vertical velocity, $w_{\text{max}}$ downward and to slightly increase the cloud's depth, as can be seen from a comparison between the solid and dashed or dashed-dotted curves in Fig. 8, while the dotted curve illustrates the influences of compressional heating in the environment. The distinction between the dashed and dashed-dotted curves, both of which contain pressure perturbation, is that in the latter the $\sigma$ term in Eq. (21a) is included. The influence of this term is to further reduce the velocity by a small amount except near the cloud top where $w_e$ is enhanced by it. The value of $w_{\text{max}}$ is only slightly decreased but shifted upward in this deeper cloud. The general trend with or without the inclusion of this first-order term is much the same; hence this term is ignored in most of our calculations. These conclusions about the pressure perturbation are in major agreement with those of Yau (1979) obtained using analytical models.

Holton (1973) has found by the use of a one-dimensional Eulerian cloud model that for clouds with radii $> 1$ km, the pressure perturbation substantially reduces the growth rate. Within the framework of our Lagrangian model it is not possible to compute the growth rate. On the other hand, another very interesting effect of the pressure perturbation is revealed by our solutions, namely, when the pressure perturbation is included, $w_{\text{max}}$ achieves its highest value when the cloud radius is $\sim 8$ km, whereas in the absence of the pressure perturbation $w_{\text{max}}$ increases monotonically with increasing radius, as can be seen from the solid and the dashed curves in Fig. 9. Our results also show that small clouds are only slightly affected by the pressure perturbation but, as already known previously, are greatly influenced by the entrainment effect which is inversely proportional to the radius.

**Fig. 8.** As in Fig. 7 except for a 5000 m radius cloud. Dashed-dotted curve is without compressional heating but with both the $\sigma$ term in (21a) and pressure effect included and is to be compared with dashed curve.

**Fig. 9.** Variation of $w_{\text{max}}$ with cloud radius with (dashed curve) and without (solid line) pressure perturbation.

**Fig. 10.** Vertical velocity profiles for three different cloud radii taking the cloud-base mass flux as constant. 1) $w_0 = 2$ m s$^{-1}$ and $R = 2000(2)^{-1/3}$ m (dotted curve); 2) $w_0 = 1$ m s$^{-1}$ and $R = 2000$ m (solid line); 3) $w_0 = 0.5$ m s$^{-1}$ and $R = 2000 \times 2^{1/3}$ m (dashed curve).
whereas for large cloud the reverse is true. Thus the presence of the optimal cloud size when both of these two factors are taken into consideration appears to represent a balance between these two opposing effects.

The importance of the initial updraft radius and velocity is shown in Fig. 10 for three velocity profiles computed using a constant mass flux, $M_c = w_c R^2$, at the cloud base. The three profiles differ considerably at higher levels due mainly to the entrainment processes, thus indicating especially the importance of the proper choice of the updraft radius. In contrast, Squires and Turner (1962) did not obtain this large variation mainly due to their use of the theoretical saturated environmental sounding. For radii much larger than those considered here, e.g., $R > 10,000$ m, the importance of entrainment is replaced by the importance of the pressure perturbation, and in contrast to the results in Fig. 10, the largest radius cloud will have the smallest vertical velocity maximum. Nevertheless, the largest cloud will have the deepest penetration.

Many previous investigations have attempted to account for the influence of the pressure perturbation by utilizing a reduced gravity, i.e., in the vertical velocity equation $g$ is replaced by $g/(1 + \beta)$, where $\beta$ is usually assigned a constant value of $-0.5$ and the pressure perturbation term is otherwise neglected completely. As previously pointed out the pressure perturbation is included in this model since the vertical variation of $\psi$ is retained in the vorticity equation. But if in Eqs. (21b) and (22) we define

$$\beta = \frac{-R^2}{\alpha^2 w} \frac{d^2 w}{dz^2},$$

then for the special case $\beta$ equals a constant the modified gravity formulation is obtained. In reality $\beta$ is not constant as shown in Fig. 11. For this mean tropical sounding note that the reduction of the effective buoyancy is generally much less than the commonly used factor $\frac{5}{4}$. Fig. 12 shows another set of $\beta$ profiles from an individual Salem, Illinois sounding which contains several stable layers above the cloud base at 832.64 mb, as indicated by positive values of $\delta S_{sw}/\delta z$ in Fig. 13. The $\beta$ profiles for $R$
Vertical velocity profiles for three radii obtained with the Salem sounding. Dashed curves include pressure perturbation; solid lines, without pressure effect.

The perturbation pressure inherent in our solutions can be solved for directly by integrating the traditional vertical velocity equation using our computed velocities. The vertical profiles of the scaled perturbation pressure, \( \pi^* = \pi - \pi_0 \), where \( \pi \) is the ratio of the perturbation pressure to the environmental density, is found to be negative at low levels and positive near the top of the cloud as shown in Fig. 15 for cloud radii of 2000 (dotted curve), 5000 (dashed curve) and 10 000 m (solid line). The unknown constant of integration \( \pi_0 \) was assigned the value of \( \pi \) at 400 mb. The slope of each curve, i.e., \( \partial \pi^*/\partial z \), indicates the degree to which the buoyancy is adjusted by the non-hydrostatic pressure perturbation. Positive slope implies that the buoyancy is reduced whereas negative slope indicates an enhanced buoyancy, as found, for example, near the cloud top. The Salem, Illinois \( \pi^* \) profile (not shown) contains a negative slope between 667.64 and 472.64 mb, showing that the pressure perturbation, in part, is offsetting the reduction in buoyancy caused by the stable layers found in the sounding between 732 and 572 mb.

In Fig. 16 the perturbation pressure profile is displayed in the same format as \( \pi^* \) above. Note the exceedingly small values of less than 0.2 mb for \( R = 2000 \) m (dotted line) and the large positive and negative values at the cloud base and top, respectively, for a radius of 10 000 m (solid line). Also, with compressional heating (dashed-dotted curve), there is a slight reduction when compared against the no compressional heating case, as represented by the dashed curve. The opposite slopes of \( \pi^* \) and \( \rho^* \) are due to scaling.

Vertical profiles of the average liquid water
concentration for cloud radii of 500 (dotted curve), 2000 (dashed curve) and 5000 m (solid line), after fallout, are shown in Fig. 17. It is seen that associated with increasing cloud size, and hence larger vertical velocities, is the upward movement of the maximum $q_{lw}$ toward the cloud top. A similar trend is not clearly evident in the fallout rate within each 5 mb interval as illustrated in Fig. 18 for the same cloud radii. Except for the 500 m cloud (dotted curve) the fallout rate is a maximum at nearly the middle point of the vertical profile. The total precipitation rate for the tropical sounding without ice phase is 1.57, 4.73 and 5.17 cm h$^{-1}$ for cloud radii of 500, 2000 and 5000 m, respectively. The addition of the ice phase will increase the precipitation rate to various degrees, roughly 10–25% depending on details of its inclusion. In these calculations the constant of proportionally $\lambda$ in the fallout term [Eq. (28)], is equated with $R^{-1}$ for 100 m $\leqslant R \leqslant 2000$ m and $\lambda = 10^{-4}$ m$^{-1}$ for $R > 2000$ m. The Salem, Illinois sounding, with an ice phase inserted linearly between $-10$ and $-40^\circ$C and with $\lambda = 6.6 \times 10^{-4}$ m$^{-1}$, produces precipitation rates of 0.69, 5.34 and 5.79 cm h$^{-1}$ for cloud radii of 1000, 2000 and 5000 m, respectively. The large increase between 1000 and 2000 m is due to the fact that for the larger radius the cloud is able to penetrate the stable layers and reach a considerable height.

It should be pointed out that the precipitation rates given above represent the average precipitation rates for the developing period of the different types of clouds only. If, instead of decaying, the deep cumulus cloud and its circulation remain in a semi-steady state after full development, then the precipitation rate can be much higher than the values given above since then almost all the water vapor coming into the cloud through its base and sides will be precipitated.

So far as we are aware, no direct measurement of in-cloud pressure perturbation has been attempted because of the difficulties involved, and even the most recent attempts on retrieving $p'$ and $\theta'$ from given velocity and mean temperature fields

---

**Fig. 16.** Profiles of the perturbation pressure plotted in the same format as $\sigma^*$ in Fig. 15, with the addition of the dashed-dotted curve computed including compressional heating for a 5000 m cloud.

**Fig. 17.** Vertical profiles of the liquid water concentration $q_{lw}$ for cloud radii of 500 (dotted), 2000 (dashed) and 5000 m (solid curve).

**Fig. 18.** As in Fig. 17 except showing the fallout rate within each 5 mb interval.
are only based on numerical model output (e.g., Hane and Scott, 1978). We are therefore unable to make any direct comparison of our results on the pressure effect with observations. On the other hand, vertical velocities in cumulus clouds have been deduced both from Doppler radar data and from aircraft measurement and it is found that maximum vertical velocities ranging from 25 to 35 m s⁻¹ are very common in the larger updrafts of the severe storms (see, e.g., Heymsfield, 1978; Wilson and Fujita, 1979), and locally much higher values have also been reported (Sinclair, 1979). Further, these studies also indicate that \( w_{\text{max}} \) usually occurs within the upper half of the cloud in middle latitude. Thus, the results obtained from our simple cloud model are in rough agreement with these observations. It is also known that in cumulus clouds in the tropics, the vertical velocity usually attains its maximum at a relatively low level and the value of \( w_{\text{max}} \) is usually not much higher than 10 m s⁻¹, much lower than that in the severe storms in middle latitude. These differences are likely attributable to the different properties of the environment air, for example, in the tropics the lapse rate of the equivalent potential temperature \( \theta_e \) is close to neutral and the atmosphere is nearly saturated. Our results also show a significant reduction of \( w \) by the entrainment of colder and wet environmental air into the cloud updraft.

Sinclair (1979) has also observed the existence of warmer and dry descending air extending outward from the visible cloud boundary with temperature 1–3°C higher than that in the far environment, while inside the visible cloud boundary a strong wet and colder downdraft exists side by side with the updraft. This magnitude of the warming of the unsaturated descending region is consistent with our result of the compressional heating in the near cloud environment. The positive temperature excess observed by Sinclair in the updraft ranges from 4 to 14°C over the temperature of the far environment, which also encloses the results given by our model.

6. Influence of cumulus convection on the mean properties of the atmosphere

We have illustrated how environmental factors near the updraft can influence the basic cloud properties. The reverse process, i.e., the net effect of short-lived cumulus convection on the thermodynamic, moisture and momentum structure of meso scale and synoptic-scale systems has been recognized for years. Various parameterization techniques have been introduced to incorporate the vertical distributions of condensation heating and momentum transfer into the large scale flow (see, e.g., Kuo, 1965a, 1974; Kreitzberg and Perkey, 1976; Anthes, 1977).

It is well known that the overall effect of cumulus convection is to warm its surroundings. The contribution to the mean heating from a single cloud is from the combination of the latent heat and the upward transport of sensible heat. We want to compute the mean heating rate, \( \partial T/\partial t \), produced by the cumulus convection, including both the effects of the compressional heating in the far environment and the effect of the moist and cool downdraft. We represent the areas of the updraft, moist downdraft and far-away downdraft by \( A_c, A_{dw}, \) and \( A_d \), respectively, and let the vertical velocities in these areas be \( w_c, w_{dw} \) and \( w_d \). Then the condition of zero net vertical mass flux can be taken as

\[
A_c w_c + A_{dw} w_{dw} + A_d w_d = 0, \tag{31}
\]

where the influence of the difference in density in the different areas has been disregarded for simplicity. Further, we shall express \( w_{dw}, \theta_{dw} \) and \( A_{dw} \) in terms of \( w_c, \theta_c \) and \( A_c \) of the cloud updraft by introducing the nonnegative factors of proportionality \( \alpha_d, a \) and \( k \) and writing them as

\[
w_{dw} = -\alpha_d w_c, \quad \theta_{dw} = a \theta_c, \quad A_{dw} = k A_c. \tag{32a,b,c}
\]

On substituting these relations in (31) we then obtain

\[
A_d w_d = -(1 - \alpha_d) A_c w_c \tag{33}
\]

We consider that the heating effect of the cumulus convection in the layer \( \Delta z \) is produced by the following three different processes:

(i) The net upward transport of sensible heat into this layer inside the cloud and in the convective moist downdraft in the immediate environment.

(ii) The compressional heating created by the slow descending motion in the far away environment.

(iii) The release of latent heat in the cloud updraft.

Here the first two processes are directly concerned with the sensible heat while (iii) is due to the latent heat. We shall calculate these three contributions separately below.

According to the relations (32a,b,c) the area average of the upward heat transport \( T_{\theta}^* \) inside the cloud and its immediate moist environment is given by

\[
T_{\theta}^* = (1 - \alpha_d a) \bar{w}_c \theta_<, \tag{34}
\]

where

\[
a_0 = \frac{A_c}{A} \tag{34a}
\]

Thus, using \( R^2 \) to represent \( A_c \) for the axisymmetric cloud we find that the mean heating effect produced by the first process is given by

\[
\frac{\partial T_{\theta}^*}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\pi \rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\rho T_{\theta}^*). \tag{35}
\]

The contribution of the compressional heating in
the far environment to the mean heating can be taken as given by
\[
\frac{\partial T_{1,2}}{\partial t} = - \frac{A_d w_d}{A \pi_0} \frac{\partial \theta_0}{\partial z} \Delta l \frac{\partial T_{1,2}}{\partial t} = (1 - \alpha_k) \frac{A_d w_c}{\pi_0} \frac{\partial \theta_0}{\partial z} \Delta l,
\]
where \(\Delta l/l\) is the ratio of the existence of the cloud at the level \(z\) to the total time \(l\) of existence of the cloud. Thus, on making use of the relation (33) we then find
\[
\frac{\partial T_{1,2}}{\partial t} = (1 - \alpha_k) \frac{A_d w_c}{\pi_0} \frac{\partial \theta_0}{\partial z} \Delta l.
\]  
(36)

The sum of these two effects represents the total heating from sensible heat. We shall represent this sum by \(\partial T_1/\partial t\), viz.,
\[
\frac{\partial T_1}{\partial t} = - \frac{1}{\rho \pi_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \rho T_e \alpha_{\gamma} \right)
\]  
(37)

where \(T_e \alpha_{\gamma}\) is given by (34).

The heating due to the release of latent heat can be taken as
\[
\frac{\partial T_2}{\partial t} = - a_0 \frac{L}{c_p} \left[ q^* - \frac{\partial q}{\partial z} - \mu (q^* - q_d) \right],
\]  
(38)

where \(q^*\) is the value of \(q\) just outside the updraft. From the results given above we find that the total heating rate is given by
\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial t},
\]  
(39)

where \(\partial T_1/\partial t\) is defined in (37) and \(\partial T_2/\partial t\) in (38).

Note the reduction in the heating rate profile shown in Fig. 19 for a 1000 m updraft, compared with the effect of a moist and cool downdraft (dashed line) as opposed to that computed without this effect (solid line). Here the ratio of moist downdraft area to the updraft area, i.e., \(k = A_d w_d / A_c\), is taken as 1.0, and the ratio of vertical velocities, \(\alpha_d = -w_d / w_c\), is taken as 0.4. In both cases the role of compressional heating has been included, assuming tentatively that the ratio of updraft area to total area, i.e., \(A_c/\pi \alpha_0 = 0.1\). The total sensible heating profile for the moist downdraft case (dashed-dotted curve), is slightly negative at low levels and only slightly positive at high levels. Thus latent processes are responsible for most of the total heating. The contribution of the compressional heating in the environment to the total sensible heat is indicated by the dotted curve.

The significance of latent heating (dotted curve) is shown in Fig. 20 for a 2000 m radius cloud containing compressional heating, along with the total sensible heating rate (dashed curve) and their sum, i.e., the total heating rate (solid line). Note the importance of the total sensible heat contribution near the cloud top but otherwise the heating is due mainly to latent heat. This peaking near the cloud top is even more pronounced in the cloud sensible heating rate (dashed-dotted curve, Fig. 21) for a 5000 m radius cloud. The magnitude of the negative contribution at lower levels is also fairly large but is considerably diminished provided the positive contribution from compressional heating (dotted curve) is added to form the total sensible heating rate. The importance of compressional heating is revealed also in Fig. 21 by the difference between
by the cloud during its whole life span should be given by
\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial t} - \frac{A q_{lw}^{(e)}}{A \rho v c_p},
\]
(40)
where \(q_{lw}^{(e)}\) stands for the amount of liquid water re-evaporated into the environment. The rate of moistening of the atmosphere is given by
\[
\frac{\partial q_e}{\partial t} = \frac{A_c}{A} (q_e - q_0 + q_{lw}^{(e)}).
\]
(41)

Because of our lack of more reliable knowledge of the relation between the cloud type and \(q_{lw}^{(e)}\), the influence in reevaporation of the cloud water into the environment has not as yet been included in our calculations. If we assume that all the unprecipitated liquid water drops in the cloud are reevaporated into the environment at the same level as they occur in the cloud as the cloud dissipates, then a larger cooling will take place near the cloud top than at low levels as the cloud dissipates.

It is evident that the various area-mean effects produced by a specific type of cumulus can be calculated by the use of the cloud model provided the area ratio \(a_o = A_e/A\) and the other physical parameters are known. Obviously, a model cloud representative of the average conditions can also be constructed by combining a number of clouds of different radii. The heating and transporting influences of such a cloud can be obtained from those of the individual clouds by assigning proper weighting factors to them.

We have shown that for large cloud radii, e.g., \(R = 5000\) m, compressional heating increases the total heating rate. This conclusion is also valid for cloud radii of 2000 and 500 m (not shown), but obviously proportionally less. For the range of parameters considered, the role of the moist and cool downdraft is found to increase the sensible heat transport \(T_s^*\) [Eq. (34)] slightly by the addition of the small positive factor \((-\alpha_{ak})\) in \(T_s^*\) but also shown to reduce the vertical velocity, so that there is some net reduction in the total heating rate by this effect.

It should be pointed out that the expression (38) for the heating rate from latent heat is based on the total condensation rate. When the cloud dissipates, the liquid water carried by the cloud will reevaporate and therefore the mean net heating rate produced

**Fig. 22.** \(\pi_6\) times the local rate of latent heating for three different cloud radii with \((a = 0.4, b = \pi^{-1} \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial T},\) dashed curve) and without \((a = 0.0,\) solid line) compressional heating, without moist downdraft.
The use of the mean stability and boundary-layer properties of the atmosphere and large-scale and mesoscale lifting to determine whether cumulus convection will occur or not in the region, and to use the large-scale and mesoscale net convergence of moisture as the measure of the average condensation rate in such systems as proposed by the first author (Kuo, 1965a, 1974) still appear to be the proper road for the parametric representation of the time and space average heating effect of cumulus convection. However, the question of whether cumulus convection will occur at a given locality and a given time can not be answered by utilizing large-scale properties alone. The problem is complicated further by the fact that cumulus convection is of the nature of overturning and hence, if restricted to a small region, it can occur only once and after completing this process the stratification will become stable and the moisture content exhausted. On the other hand, if the convection takes an organized form with a continuous supply of moist air from far away, such as those in mesoscale storms, then the system can have a much longer life and yield more precipitation than the short-lived cloud. Evidently whether such a system will be created in a given region or not can only be determined by studying the general dynamic and thermodynamic conditions, and not by using the mean large-scale stratification and transport properties alone.

In view of the many uncertainties concerning the average heating effect of cumulus convection, it appears preferable to determine it by a less involved simple method rather than by the use of a detailed model. One simple way is to use the vertical distribution of the potential temperature excess $\theta_e$ given by (18) or $T_e$ given by (18b) as the vertical distribution of the heating rate. On comparing the total heating profiles in Figs. 19, 20, and 21 for clouds with radius > 1000 m with the cloud potential temperature profile in Fig. 6 we see that they are fairly similar to each other, indicating that the distribution of the potential temperature excess $\theta_e$ can be used as a reasonable approximation to the vertical distribution of the mean heating effect created by the cloud activity, as proposed by Kuo (1965a, 1974). The average precipitation and heating produced by deep cumulus convection can also be obtained in this way when the ratio of moisture storage to moisture convergence is adequately represented (see Kuo, 1974). It should be pointed out that these parametric representations of the effects of cumulus convection in terms of large-scale moisture convergence apply to the relatively deep cumulus only, because most of the shallow cumulus are unrelated to the large scale moisture convergence (see Kuo, 1974).

The question of how the latent heat and sensible heat accumulated by an individual cloud is transmitted to the mean atmosphere may also be addressed. Here at least two different processes can be visualized, viz., 1) by random and equal chance distribution of the cloud population in time and space over a large area and longer time span and 2) by excitation of large-scale circulation and dispersion. Both of these two processes are effective in the atmosphere and such effects can be taken as have been included in the parameterization scheme.

7. Summary

A quasi-one-dimensional and quasi-Lagrangian steady-state model which takes into consideration the influences of the pressure perturbation, vertical density stratification and nearby moist downdraft on the axisymmetric cumulus cloud convection is obtained by integrating the combined heat and moisture equations and the azimuthal vorticity equation from the cloud center to the outer edge and utilizing various entrainment considerations. This model shows that the influence of the pressure perturbation is proportional to the square of the cloud radius and hence it is small for small clouds. This model is used to investigate the variations of the various cloud properties with the radius of cloud under two different environmental conditions, one for the potentially more unstable and more smooth mean tropical atmosphere during the hurricane season and the second for a less unstable middle-latitude environment with prominent thin stable layers in mid-lower troposphere. Further, two different kinds of cumulus convection are considered: 1) the form of a simple updraft surrounded by the almost unaltered far environment, either with or without a feedback from the compressional heating in this environment, and 2) a nearly saturated and cooler nearby downdraft, as is often observed in the cloud clusters in the tropics. In this latter case the cloud is not influenced by the far environment directly.

It is found that the pressure perturbation in the cloud can reach from ±2.5 to ±7 mb at the cloud base and the cloud top as the radius of the cloud increases from 5 to 10 km but is small for cloud radius < 2 km. Further, the magnitude of the perturbation pressure is reduced by the inclusion of the temperature feedback from the compressionally heated environment.

Since the temperature equation (18) involves neither the pressure nor the vertical velocity, the pressure perturbation has no direct influence on the cloud temperature excess. On the other hand, the inclusion of the pressure perturbation reduces the vertical velocity in the cloud, as it must since pressure perturbation transmits energy to the
environment. One interesting and possibly also important effect of the pressure perturbation is that it gives rise to an optimal cloud radius of about 8 km, corresponding to the highest value of \( w_{\text{max}} \), under the tropical environment, while without the pressure effect \( w_{\text{max}} \) increases monotonically with increasing \( R \).

The influence of the density stratification is to reduce \( w_c \) slightly below the level of \( w_{\text{max}} \) and to increase \( w_c \) above this level and also to increase the cloud depth slightly, but the total influence is not prominent. The results show that, for the normal tropical atmosphere, cloud properties change gradually with cloud radius, while for the less unstable environment with prominent stable layers in the mid-lower stratosphere, the cloud properties change abruptly as the cloud radius increases from less than to larger than 2 km, reflecting the inhibiting influence of the shallow stable layer in mid-lower troposphere on the smaller clouds.

It is also found that the presence of a moist but cooler convective downdraft reduces both the updraft and the cloud depth. It also augments the precipitation rate, especially for the smaller clouds.

The heating and moistening influences of cumulus cloud convection on the large-scale atmosphere have also been calculated by the model. On comparing the average heating rate with the potential temperature excess \( \theta_c' \) given by a simple equation we find a close similarity between them for cloud radius \( > 1 \) km. It is therefore concluded that \( \theta_c' \) can be used as a rough approximation to the vertical distribution of the average net heating effect produced by cumulus convection in the parameterization scheme. Of course, results obtained from detailed calculations from cloud model can also be used.
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APPENDIX

List of Symbols

\[
\begin{align*}
T_v & \quad \text{virtual temperature of moist air} \\
\theta_v & \quad \text{virtual potential temperature} \quad [= \pi T_v] \\
c_p & \quad \text{specific heat at constant pressure} \\
R & \quad \text{gas constant of dry air, and radius of cloud updraft} \\
\pi & \quad \left( \frac{1000 \text{ mb}}{p} \right)^{\frac{R}{c_p}} = \pi_0 \\
q_s(T), q_{o_0} & \quad \text{saturation mixing ratio at temperature} \ T \ 
\text{of cloud and at temperature} \ T_0 \ 
\text{of environment} \\
q_s & \quad \text{liquid water mixing ratio in cloud updraft} \ =[q_{cw} + q_{re}]; q_{cw} \text{ is liquid mixing ratio of rainwater} \\
C & \quad \text{rate of condensation} \\
L & \quad \text{latent heat of condensation, which may also include the latent heat of freezing buoyancy factor, defined by (22a).} \\
\hat{\beta} & \quad \text{constant average value of} \ \theta_0 \\
\hat{\theta} & \quad \text{equivalent potential temperature} \\
\hat{\theta}_e & \quad \text{[= \theta + \pi Lq/c_p]} \\
\theta_0 & \quad \text{density stratification factor} \\
\sigma & \quad \text{[= - \theta \log p_0/\Delta z]} \\
\theta(R), \theta' & \quad \text{b = q'(R)/(\theta'(R)); \alpha' = s'(R)/s_e'} \\
\alpha_1 & \quad \text{coefficient of evaporation effect at} \ r = R \ 2a_1 \alpha' \\
\alpha_2 & \quad \text{mass entrainment coefficient \ [=2a_1/R]} \\
\beta_1 & \quad \text{coefficient of eddy diffusion effect} \\
\psi & \quad \text{streamfunction for} \ u \ 
\text{and} \ w \\
\mu & \quad \text{radial variation coefficient of} \ \psi \ (2.405) \\
\nu & \quad \text{saturation vapor pressure} \\
\psi & \quad \text{threshold value of cloud liquid water} q_{cw} \\
\alpha & \quad \text{coefficient of cloud drop autoconversion process} \\
\alpha_s & \quad \text{average terminal velocity of raindrops} \\
\alpha_s & \quad \text{precipitation rate} \\
\eta & \quad \text{empirical fallout coefficient \ [=1/H]} \\
\kappa & \quad \text{liquid water mixing ratio (g g\textsuperscript{-1})} \\
\lambda & \quad \text{area ratio of moist downdraft to updraft} \\
\kappa & \quad \text{ratio of moist downdraft velocity to updraft velocity} \\
\end{align*}
\]
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