

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

PREVIEW

**THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE**

**NUMERICAL INVESTIGATION OF A HEATED, SHEARED
PLANETARY BOUNDARY LAYER**

**A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

**By
YU-CHIENG LIOU
Norman, Oklahoma
1996**

UMI Number: 9612654

PREVIEW

UMI Microform 9612654

Copyright 1996, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI

**300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103**

**NUMERICAL INVESTIGATION OF A HEATED, SHEARED
PLANETARY BOUNDARY LAYER**

**A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE
SCHOOL OF METEOROLOGY**

BY

OK 708

Gerard

Frederick H. Carr

Handwritten signature

Brian Fiedler

PREVIEW

PREVIEW

© Copyright by Yu-Chieng Liou 1996

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank my former major advisor, late Dr. Tzvi Gal-Chen, for his guidance, encouragement and patience. Those years with him will always be remembered. I would also like to express the most sincere appreciation to my present advisor, Dr. Douglas K. Lilly, for his warm help when I was facing the worst nightmare in my graduate study. I am deeply indebted to Drs. Kelvin Droegemeier, Frederick Carr, Brian Fiedler and George Emanuel for their suggestions and comments on this dissertation, and serving as my committee members. My gratitude extends to Dr. Robert Walko for teaching me the CSU RAMS model, on which all the numerical simulations presented in this study are performed. Thanks are due to Mr. J. C. Alexander for carefully reviewing the first draft and correcting errors.

I thank my wife Pi-Hoa, for giving me a lovely daughter—Yuan-Li. I am also very grateful to my parents, Mr. Sou-Heng Liao and Ms. Shih-Jan Hsu, for their coming to Norman to take care of our daily life during the final stage of writing this dissertation. Their generous supports undoubtedly accelerate the completion of this work.

This research is sponsored by NASA grant NAG 5-1379 and the Center for Analysis and Prediction of Storms (CAPS) at the University of Oklahoma. CAPS is funded by Grant ATM91-20009 from the National Science Foundation, and by a supplemental grant through NSF from the Federal Aviation Administration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
ABSTRACT	xiv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Buoyancy Force Coexists with Wind Shear Effect	4
1.2 Convective Gravity Waves and the Necessity of a Higher Domain for PBL studies	5
1.3 Gravity Wave–Critical Layer Interactions	7
2. FIELD OBSERVATIONS AND THE DEDUCED TURBULENCE STATISTICS IN THE FIFE PBL ON 11 JULY, 1987	10
2.1 Balloon Sounding Observations	10
2.1.1 Mean Potential Temperature	10
2.1.2 Mean Wind	10
2.2 Single Doppler Lidar Observations	13
2.2.1 Mean Wind	13
2.2.2 Momentum Fluxes	15
2.2.3 Variance	18
2.2.4 Third Moment of Vertical Velocity	20

2.2.5 Kinetic Energy Dissipation and the Surface Heat Flux	20
3. BENCHMARK EXPERIMENTS	23
3.1 Convection-Driven PBL	23
3.2 Convective-Induced Internal Gravity Waves	33
3.3 Critical Layers and Internal Gravity Waves Interaction	38
3.3.1 Solutions from <i>W.K.B.</i> method	38
3.3.2 Solutions from Frobenius Series	41
3.3.3 Counter-Gradient Momentum Flux Transport and Wave Attenuation.....	45
3.3.4 Numerical Simulation of the Critical Layer	53
4. TWO DIMENSIONAL SIMULATION OF THE FIFE PBL	58
4.1 Experimental Design	58
4.2 Simulated Mean and Statistical properties	60
4.3 Verification of the Critical Layer	68
4.4 Flow Fields	68
4.5 Convective Instability	73
5. EXAMINING THE FIFE LIDAR OBSERVATIONAL DATA	85
5.1 Mean Wind and Momentum Flux	85
5.2 Variances	90
6. THREE DIMENSIONAL SIMULATION OF THE FIFE PBL	95
6.1 Generalized Taylor-Goldstein Equations	96

6.2 Wave Properties Near the Critical Layer	99
6.2.1 Phase, Group and Perturbations Velocities	99
6.2.2 Momentum and Energy Flux	102
6.2.3 Two Dimensionality of the Three Dimensional Critical Layer Singularity.....	106
6.3 Experimental Design	109
6.4 Results and Discussions	111
6.4.1 Flow Fields	111
6.4.2 Mean and Statistical Properties	115
7. DATA ASSIMILATION AND CONSTRAINED SIMULATION	125
7.1 Data Assimilation of the Observations	125
7.2 Simulation with Constraints	132
8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	137
REFERENCES	141
APPENDIX A	146
A.1 Basic Equations.....	146
A.2 Advective Operator.....	147
A.3 The Turbulence Parameterization.....	148
A.4 Spatial Boundary Condition.....	150
A.5 Time and Space Differencing Scheme.....	150

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 FIFE sounding observations of the mean potential temperature ($\overline{\theta}$)	11
2.2 FIFE sounding observations of the west wind (\overline{u})	12
2.3 FIFE sounding observations of the south wind (\overline{v})	12
2.4 Single Doppler lidar observations of the x-component of wind (\overline{u})	14
2.5 Single Doppler lidar observations of the y-component of wind (\overline{v})	14
2.6 Single Doppler lidar observations of the mean vertical wind (\overline{w})	16
2.7 Lidar-derived x-direction momentum flux ($\overline{u'w'}$)	17
2.8 Lidar-derived y-direction momentum flux ($\overline{v'w'}$)	17
2.9 Lidar-derived variance of u ($\overline{u'^2}$)	19
2.10 Lidar-derived variance of v ($\overline{v'^2}$)	19
2.11 Lidar-derived variance of w ($\overline{w'^2}$)	21
2.12 Lidar-derived third moment of w ($\overline{w'^3}$)	21
3.1 Simulated mean x-component of wind (\overline{u}) in Wangara CBL	24
3.2 Simulated x-direction momentum flux ($\overline{u'w'}$) in Wangara CBL	24
3.3 Simulated mean y-component of wind (\overline{v}) in Wangara CBL	25

3.4 Simulated y-direction momentum flux ($\overline{v'w'}$) in Wangara CBL	25
3.5 Simulated mean potential temperature ($\overline{\theta}$) in Wangara CBL	26
3.6 Simulated potential temperature flux ($\overline{w'\theta'}$) in Wangara CBL	26
3.7 Normalized horizontal velocity variances ($\overline{u'^2}$ or $\overline{v'^2}$) in Wangara CBL	27
3.8 Normalized vertical velocity variances ($\overline{w'^2}$) in Wangara CBL	27
3.9 Normalized potential temperature variances ($\overline{\theta'^2}$) in Wangara CBL	28
3.10 Simulated skewness in Wangara CBL	28
3.11 The vertical velocity in Wangara CBL	30
3.12 The vertical velocity perturbations at Z=1125m ($\sim Z_i$) in Wangara CBL	31
3.13 The potential temperature perturbations at Z=1125m ($\sim Z_i$) in Wangara CBL	31
3.14 The vertical velocity perturbations at Z=125m ($\sim 0.1 Z_i$) in Wangara CBL.....	32
3.15 The potential temperature perturbations at Z=125m ($\sim 0.1 Z_i$) in Wangara CBL	32
3.16 Initial wind profile for the convection-induced gravity wave simulation	34
3.17 Initial potential temperature for the convection-induced gravity wave simulation	34
3.18 Contour plots of vertical velocity at (a)50; (b)70; (c)90; (d)110 minutes	35-36
3.19 Contour plots of potential temperature at (a)50; (b)70 minutes	37
3.20 Initial potential temperature for the critical layer simulation	54
3.21 Evolution of mean wind profiles for the critical layer simulation	56

3.22 Momentum flux ($\overline{u'w'}$) in the critical layer simulation	56
3.23 Contour plots of horizontal velocity at (a)10 min. ; (b) 1 hour	57
4.1 Evolution of mean potential temperature ($\overline{\theta}$) in 2-D FIFE simulation	61
4.2 Evolution of mean horizontal velocity (\overline{u}) in 2-D FIFE simulation	62
4.3 Momentum flux ($\overline{u'w'}$) in 2-D FIFE simulation	62
4.4 Horizontal velocity variance ($\overline{u'^2}$) in 2-D FIFE simulation	64
4.5 Vertical velocity variance ($\overline{w'^2}$) in 2-D FIFE simulation	64
4.6 Third moment of w ($\overline{w'^3}$) in 2-D FIFE simulation	66
4.7 Potential temperature flux ($\overline{w'\theta'}$) in 2-D FIFE simulation	67
4.8 Potential temperature variance ($\overline{\theta'^2}$) in 2-D FIFE simulation	67
4.9 Spatial spectrum of w at T=9 hour in 2-D FIFE simulation	69
4.10 Temporal spectrum of w from T=8 to 10 hour in 2-D FIFE simulation	70
4.11 Flow structure at T=1 hour in 2-D FIFE simulation (a) w ; (b) u field	71
4.12 Flow structure at T=3 hour in 2-D FIFE simulation (a) w ; (b) u field	72
4.13 Horizontal velocity perturbations at T=4 hour in 2-D FIFE simulation	74
4.14 Horizontal velocity perturbations at T=6 hour in 2-D FIFE simulation	74
4.15 Contour plots of horizontal velocity at T=8 hour in 2-D FIFE simulation	75
4.16 Contour plots of horizontal velocity at T=9 hour in 2-D FIFE simulation	75
4.17 Contour plots of horizontal velocity at T=10 hour in 2-D FIFE simulation.....	76

4.18 Distribution of horizontal wind (u) and wave velocity (C) in region A	78
4.19 Two possible potential temperature distributions around region A	80
4.20 Contour plots of the difference between horizontal velocity (u) and the estimated wave speed (12.5 m/s) in 2-D FIFE simulation	82
4.21 Contour plots of potential temperature at $T=9$ hour in 2-D FIFE simulation.....	82
4.22 A detailed plot of the potential temperature evolution near $Z\sim 2\text{km}$	83
5.1 Initial potential temperature ($\bar{\theta}$) for the "ideal" PBL simulation	86
5.2 Evolution of mean horizontal wind (\bar{u}) in the "ideal" PBL simulation	87
5.3 Momentum flux ($\overline{u'w'}$) in the "ideal" PBL simulation	87
5.4 Horizontal velocity variance ($\overline{u^2}$) in the "ideal" PBL simulation	91
5.5 Vertical velocity variance ($\overline{w^2}$) in the "ideal" PBL simulation	91
6.1 A schematic description of the relation between the total internal gravity wave phase velocity and its components on a horizontal plane	101
6.2 The relation between the total horizontal mean flow velocity and its components	101
6.3 Vertical velocity field on a x - z cross-section in 3-D FIFE simulation at $T=5$ hour	112
6.4 Horizontal velocity on a x - z cross-section in 3-D FIFE simulation at $T=5$ hour	112
6.5 Vertical velocity on a y - z cross-section in 3-D FIFE simulation at $T=5$ hour.....	113
6.6 Vertical velocity perturbations on a x - y cross-section at $Z=150\text{m}$ in 3-D FIFE simulation when $T=$ (a) 5; (b) 2; (c) 9 hour	113-114

6.7 Vertical velocity perturbations on a x-y cross-section at Z=1050m in 3-D FIFE simulation at T=5 hour	116
6.8 Vertical velocity perturbations on a x-y cross-section at Z=2050m in 3-D FIFE simulation at T=5 hour	116
6.9 Evolution of the mean potential temperature ($\overline{\theta}$) in 3-D FIFE simulation.....	117
6.10 Evolution of the mean x-component of wind (\overline{u}) in 3-D FIFE simulation....	117
6.11 The x-direction momentum flux ($\overline{u'w'}$) in 3-D FIFE simulation	118
6.12 The y-direction momentum flux ($\overline{v'w'}$) in 3-D FIFE simulation	118
6.13 The variance of u ($\overline{u^2}$) in 3-D FIFE simulation	120
6.14 The variance of v ($\overline{v^2}$) in 3-D FIFE simulation	120
6.15 The variance of w ($\overline{w^2}$) in 3-D FIFE simulation	121
6.16 The third moment of w ($\overline{w^3}$) in 3-D FIFE simulation	121
6.17 The potential temperature flux ($\overline{w'\theta'}$) in 3-D FIFE simulation	123
6.18 The variance of potential temperature ($\overline{\theta^2}$) in 3-D FIFE simulation	123
7.1 Model-generated mean horizontal wind (\overline{u}) from different assimilation methods.....	129
7.2 Model-generated momentum flux ($\overline{u'w'}$) from (a) Method I; (b) Method II	130
7.3 Model-generated horizontal flow field from (a) Method I; (b) Method II	131
7.4 Aircraft sounding observations of the mean potential temperature ($\overline{\theta}$) during the PHOENIX II project on 22 June, 1984	134

7.5 Balloon sounding observations of mean potential temperature ($\bar{\theta}$) during the FIFE project on 11 July, 1987 134

7.6 The "ideal" evolution of mean potential temperature ($\bar{\theta}$) in a boundary layer driven by surface heating 135

PREVIEW

ABSTRACT

A planetary boundary layer (PBL) developed on 11 July, 1987 during the First International Satellites Land Surface Climatology Project (ISLSCP) Field Experiment (FIFE) is investigated numerically by a two dimensional and a three dimensional large eddy simulation (LES) model. Most of the simulated mean and statistical properties are utilized to compare or verify against the observational results extracted from single Doppler lidar scans conducted by Gal-Chen *et. al.* (1992) on the same day. Through the methods of field measurements and numerical simulations, it is found that this PBL, in contrast to the well-known convective boundary layer (CBL), is driven by not only buoyancy but also wind shear. Large eddies produced by the surface heating, as well as internal gravity waves excited by the convection, are both present in the boundary layer. The most unique feature is that in the stable layer, the momentum flux $(\overline{u'w'})$, transported by the gravity waves, is counter-gradient. The occurrence of this phenomenon is interpreted by Gal-Chen *et. al.* (1992) using the theory of critical layer singularity, and is confirmed by the numerical simulations in this study. Furthermore, due to the existence of the critical layer, the structures of some of the statistical properties are also altered. For example, the vertical profiles of horizontal velocity $(\overline{u'^2})$, potential temperature flux $(\overline{w'\theta'})$ and its variance $(\overline{\theta'^2})$ are all found to exhibit a second local absolute value maximum in the stable layer.

Qualitative agreements are achieved between the model-generated and lidar-derived results. However, quantitative comparisons are less satisfactory. The most serious discrepancy is that in the stable layer the magnitudes of the observed momentum flux $(\overline{u'w'})$ and vertical velocity variance $(\overline{w'^2})$ are unusually larger than their simulated counterparts. Nevertheless, through the technique of numerical simulation, evidence is

collected to show inconsistencies among the observations. Thus, the lidar measurements of $\overline{u'w'}$ and $\overline{w'^2}$ seem to be doubtful.

A Four Dimensional Data Assimilation (FDDA) experiment is performed in order to connect the evolution of the model integration with the observations. The results indicate that the dynamical relaxation (nudging) scheme appears to be an appropriate method by which the observed mean quantities such as mean wind (\bar{u}) and potential temperature ($\bar{\theta}$) can be assimilated into the model without causing data rejection. Finally in this study, the so-called "constrained simulation" technique is introduced. This method was utilized successfully by Lilly and Mason (1990) to the PHOENIX II PBL on 22 June, 1984 to recover large- or meso-scale forcing which was not directly measured. However, due to the differences in the forcing process, the application of this technique to the FIFE PBL is not recommended.

PREVIEW

NUMERICAL INVESTIGATION OF A HEATED, SHEARED PLANETARY BOUNDARY LAYER

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1987 near Manhattan, Kansas a field project named First International Satellites Land Surface Climatology Project (ISLSCP) Field Experiment (FIFE) was conducted to study the atmospheric boundary layer processes. During the experiment, a short-pulse ($\approx 0.4 \mu\text{s}$) CO_2 Doppler lidar ($\lambda = 10.6 \mu\text{m}$) was operated by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Wave Propagation Laboratory (WPL). Later Gal-Chen *et. al.* (1992) proposed a specially designed scanning sequence to extract boundary layer parameters from the single Doppler lidar observations. Readers are encouraged to consult this paper for detailed explanations of the method. By applying this new technique to two case studies (11 July, 1987, from 11:11 to 12:10 and from 12:29 to 13:20 CDST, CDST stands for the local Central Daylight Saving Time and is 5 hours earlier than the Coordinated Universal Time, or UTC), they were able to obtain (1) mean wind ($\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{w}$), where (u, v, w) are the Cartesian velocities in the (x, y, z) directions respectively; (2) the variances ($\overline{u'^2}, \overline{v'^2}, \overline{w'^2}$), where the prime indicates deviations from the mean; (3) the covariances associated with the vertical fluxes of horizontal momentum ($\overline{u'w'}, \overline{v'w'}$); (4) the third moment of the vertical velocity ($\overline{w'^3}$); (5) the kinetic energy dissipation (ϵ); and (6) the surface heat flux. In addition to the lidar observations, seven balloon soundings were released on the same day which gave the "snapshots" of the atmosphere in terms of vertical distributions of horizontal mean wind and potential temperature ($\bar{\theta}$).

It is known that observations always suffer from numerous difficulties and the

FIFE PBL field experiment is no exception. In the single Doppler lidar operations by Gal-Chen *et. al.* (1992), the stability of the reference frequency is a severe hardware problem. The lidar range resolution (150 m) is another serious limitation for boundary layer studies. Velocity estimations are doubtful below the range 600 m. The maximum distance beyond which the signal-to-noise ratio is too low to permit radial wind measurement is 6 km in the horizontal and 2 km in the vertical. Despite the efforts to reduce errors such as exploiting a large sample size, some results are questionable. For example, the observed vertical velocity is suspiciously large in the mixed layer. The deduced third moment of vertical velocity shows a perplexing negative value above the mixed layer. These problems led the author to consider the usage of a numerical model as a consistency check on the data. Thus, the purpose of this research is to investigate the FIFE PBL on 11 July, 1987 by numerical simulations. The model-generated results are utilized to compare or verify against the field observations. Through this procedure, the properties of the FIFE PBL can be further explored. Another advantage of using a model is that it is capable of providing information which is not measured by any field instruments. Therefore, a more complete understanding of the PBL is possible.

The previous discussions point out that use of a numerical model to conduct simulations and instruments to collect data for analyses provide complementary data for atmospheric research. The matching of models with observations is a persistent problem. Observational data should be used to initialize numerical models while the results predicted from a numerical model should be compared against subsequent observations. In reality, this is a far more involved process. Observations suffer from the limited resolution of the instruments, and the inhomogeneity and incompleteness of the measurements. Models tend to diverge from the real atmosphere because of the errors embedded in initial data and the unavoidable inaccuracy of the numerical methods, as well as inadequate modeling assumptions. On the other hand, observations can be utilized to

further constrain the evolution of numerical models. A numerical model can generate physically and dynamically consistent data sets with desired spatial and time resolutions at many more points than there are observations. This leads scientists to recognize that assimilating observed data into a physically comprehensive time-dependent, dynamical model is fundamental for the synthesis of temporally and spatially diverse incomplete data into a coherent representation of a geophysical system.

Techniques for the systematic matching of dynamical models with spatial and temporal observations are commonly called "four dimensional data assimilation" (FDDA). Charney *et al.* (1969) first showed the possibility that the present state of an atmosphere in hydrostatic balance can be inferred from incomplete historical data. Since then this technique has been extensively and fruitfully used for global and mesoscale analysis. By contrast, small scale data assimilation techniques are relatively new (Gal-Chen and Kropfli, 1984; Gal-Chen *et al.*, 1991; Liou *et al.*, 1991; Xu and Gal-Chen, 1993). In this study it is desired to find an appropriate method by which the observed mean quantities, namely \bar{u} and $\bar{\theta}$, can be assimilated into the model without causing any data rejection. A successful method, if any, should be able to improve the mean value profiles and at the same time keep the vertical structure of statistical properties physically reasonable.

Large geostrophic wind shears (or vertical variation of large horizontal pressure force) are caused by large horizontal temperature gradients. Even in an idealized PBL above a flat terrain, some baroclinity is to be expected due to the climatological temperature differences. For example, a common north-south temperature gradient with magnitude $1^\circ \text{C}/100 \text{ km}$ gives rise to a geostrophic shear as large as $3.5 \text{ m s}^{-1} \text{ km}^{-1}$. However, these large scale forcing terms cannot be obtained by means of direct simulation in a numerical model with periodic horizontal boundary conditions. Lilly and Mason (1990) conducted simulations with the mean field forcing included. This was

accomplished by requiring the horizontally averaged velocity and/or the potential temperature profiles to remain roughly as observed. By applying this technique to the 22 June, 1984 PHOENIX II PBL they successfully estimated the mesoscale horizontal temperature gradient and temperature advection. Nevertheless, the usefulness and limitation of this approach are not well understood. Thus, another goal of this dissertation is to explore the possibility of recovering large scale forcing in the FIFE PBL by utilizing a similar method, the so-called "constrained simulations".

During FIFE 1987 observations were taken over 77 selected days from May to August. The reason for choosing 11 July for this study is that through analysis of the observed data three principal physical processes are identified. Each one of these processes has been investigated by the scientific community. But a numerical simulation of the PBL with all these processes combined together is an interesting and challenging task. In what follows these three processes, as well as the relevant literature reviews, are introduced separately.

1.1 Buoyancy Force Coexists with Wind Shear Effect

The windless convective boundary layer (CBL) has been extensively studied by scientists using laboratory experiments (e.g. Deardorff *et. al.* 1969; Willis and Deardorff 1974; Deardorff and Willis 1985) or large eddy simulation numerical models (e.g. Deardorff 1974 a,b; Moeng 1984; Nieuwstadt and Brost 1986; Mason 1989; Schmidt and Schumann 1989; Nieuwstadt *et. al.* 1993). When wind shear becomes important, the flow pattern and turbulence statistics can be quite different. Deardorff (1972) proposes the quantity $-Z_i/L$ is an appropriate stability parameter, where Z_i is the height of the mixed layer and L is the Monin-Obukhov length defined by

$$L = - \frac{u_*^3 \theta_m}{k g \langle w\theta \rangle_s} \quad (1.1)$$

Here u_* is friction velocity, k is the von Karman's constant 0.4, θ_m is the mean value of potential temperature throughout the PBL and $\langle w\theta \rangle_s$ is the surface heat flux. When $-Z_i/L > 4.5$, the PBL is in the convective regime. In FIFE PBL the quantity $-Z_i/L$ is about 1.75. Therefore, it represents an intermediate boundary layer in which both the buoyancy and wind shear forcing are important.

Sykes and Henn (1989) conducted a series of large eddy simulations of free and sheared convective flow between two moving flat plates. They found that $u_*/w_* > 0.35$ is an important criterion for the formation of longitudinal rolls. Here w_* represents the convective velocity and is defined in Deardorff (1970) as

$$w_* = \left(\frac{g}{\theta} \langle w\theta \rangle_s Z_i \right)^{1/3} \quad (1.2)$$

Moeng and Sullivan (1994) also utilized a LES model to investigate the discrepancies among shear-driven, buoyancy-driven, and the intermediate PBL that is driven by both forces. A new scaling for velocity is developed for the intermediate case. A common feature in these two studies is that the shear forcing considered is primarily concentrated near the surface. By contrast, the wind shear effect in the FIFE environment is found to exist throughout the PBL (Refer to Chapter 2), therefore provides a different type of problem to be studied.

1.2 Convective Gravity Waves and the Necessity of a Higher Domain for PBL Studies.

The derived momentum flux profiles as well as the spectrum analyses of the vertical velocities in the FIFE PBL by Gal-Chen *et al.* (1992) all strongly suggest the existence

of internal gravity waves in the stable layer. Widespread gravity waves have been found, probably by glider pilots first, to exist above the convectively active boundary layers in the presence of vertical wind shear over flat terrain. The mechanism that produces these gravity waves is believed to be the "obstacle effect", which occurs when large eddies or clouds at the top of the mixed layer act as small hills in a sheared environment. The requirement that some of the air must flow over these hills results in the gravity waves. Chimonas *et. al.* (1980) demonstrated the possibility that a gravity wave can reach sufficiently large amplitude to induce condensation. Under certain circumstances the heat released through this process may substantially reinforce the wave itself. Therefore a positive feedback mechanism is established through which both the waves and condensation experience a mutually accelerated growth. However, numerical experiments conducted by Mason and Sykes (1982) show that dry thermals alone are capable of launching waves. Aircraft observations taken by Kuettner *et. al.* (1987) over the western plains of Nebraska on 12 June, 1984 during the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) Convection Wave Project and a companion paper (Clark and Hauf, 1986) which simulated the tropospheric internal gravity waves detected on the same day all conclude that convection, not convective cloud formation, is the essential ingredient of convective waves. Small fields of clouds are acting primarily as markers and have only a slight effect on the boundary layer eddies and internal gravity waves response. In the FIFE experiment, the data sets and mission logs were reviewed by participating scientists to identify the so called "golden days" as the highest priority for data processing and submission. The day selected for this research, 11 July, 1987, is one of the golden days. An overview paper by Sellers *et. al.* (1992) indicates that only minimum cloud cover and zero precipitation were recorded on that day. Thus, as far as this research is concerned, it is appropriate to carry out our numerical studies in a dry model.

Traditional research on CBL usually concentrates only on the first 1 to 2 km of the