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Motivation

• Biomass burning and precipitation:
  • Radiative impact – cooling at the surface due to reduction of SW rad., warming above due to absorption of SW
  • However: literature does not show consistent results
• Cloud microphysics: larger number of CCN’s tend to decrease but may also have a significant impact in ice concentration, leading to precip. increase
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Scheme of aerosol effects on precipitation

- **Accumulated rain**
- **Maritime & moderate (wet) continental clouds** (like GATE and PRESTORM)
  - **Dry unstable situation** (like Texas clouds)

Khain & Rosenfeld, 2003
Conclusion

• Aerosol effect on microphysics in the transition season in the Amazon provides a good test for new developments

• Preliminary results indicate that aerosol and radiation effects combined change horizontal distribution of precipitation in a regional sense.
Reduction on the Convective precipitation (mm)

$$\Delta P = (P - P_{aer})$$

Longo et al. 2004

Radiative effect only
However, precipitation response in other cases not always consistent!

Any other mechanism??
• BRAMS-2.0 model (www.cptec.inpe.br/brams) with emission and transport module for gases and particulate matter (Freitas, 1999; Vendrasco, 2005), and a complex model for solving the radiative process (CARMA – Toon et al. 1988).

• Test case: Cuiabá/Santarém

• Nested grids: 40 and 10km resolution

• Observed fires
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Experiment 8 differs from Exp 1 by the emission rate (4X) larger.
Figure 1: Mean precipitation for simulations with and without biomass burning emission (upper) and particulate matter concentration (lower). Precipitation in mm.h⁻¹ and Particulate matter concentration in µg.m⁻³.
Figure 2: Mean precipitation for simulations with and without biomass burning emission for all simulations, starting in simulation 2 (lower) and ending in simulation 7 (upper). Precipitation in mm.h⁻¹.
With Biomass Burning

Without Biomass Burning

With Biomass Burning (emission x 4)

Spatial and temporal sum
- 4869.7
  + 7521.9
Temporal sum
- 10.5
  + 15.9

Spatial and temporal sum
- 4869.7
  ○ 2582.0
Temporal sum
- 10.5
  ○ 5.4

Spatial and temporal sum
  + 11651800.0
  ○ 1584890.0
Temporal sum
  + 23873.9
  ○ 3253.9
Figure 4: Potential temperature for simulation 1 without biomass burning (shaded). Difference between potential temperature in the cases with and without biomass burning (contour).
Partial conclusions:

• Radiative impact: can either increase or decrease precipitation
• Experiments indicate that precipitation changes is non-linearly related to PM emission

• Possible mechanism??????
Local circulations induced by horizontal thermal gradients caused by localized smoke plumes???
Mean wind divergence and convergence for 3 simulations. Without emission (closed circle), with typical emission (open circle), and with 4 times the typical emission (plus signal).
Figure 6: Mean vertical velocity increasing or decreasing due to the biomass burning. Simulation 1 (open circle) and simulation 8 (plus sign).
Conclusions

In the mean, the biomass burning radiative forcing tends to decrease the precipitation: thermodynamical effect dominates.

However, very large concentrations of aerosols may lead to an increase in the precipitation due to the dynamical forcing associated to the horizontal pressure gradients.

Thermodynamical versus dynamical forcing → decrease or increase

Dynamical forcing is similar to a local breeze effect caused by the smoke plumes