Environmental Controls on Pyrocumulus and Pyrocumulonimbus Initiation and Development

3

4 N. P. Lareau¹ and C. B. Clements¹

- 5 (1){Fire Weather Research Laboratory, Department of Meteorology and Climate Science,
- 6 San José State University, San Jose, California}
- 7 Correspondence to: N. P. Lareau (neil.lareau@sjsu.edu)

8

9 Abstract:

10 In this paper we present the first direct observational evidence that the condensation level 11 in pyrocumulus and pyrocumulonimbus clouds can be significantly higher than the 12 ambient lifted condensation level. In addition, we show that the environmental 13 thermodynamic profile, day-to-day variations in humidity, and ambient wind shear all 14 exert significant influence over the onset and development of pyroconvective clouds. 15 These findings are established using a scanning Doppler lidar and mobile radiosonde 16 system during two large wildfires in Northern California, the Bald and Rocky Fires. The 17 lidar is used to distinguish liquid water from smoke backscatter during the plume rise, 18 and thus provides a direct detection of plume condensations levels. Plume tops are 19 subsequently determined from both the lidar and nearby radar observations. The 20 radiosonde data, obtained adjacent to the fires, contextualizes the lidar and radar 21 observations, and enables estimates of the plume ascent, convective available potential 22 energy, and equilibrium level. A note worthy finding is that in these cases the Convective 23 Condensation Level, not the Lifted Condensation Level, provides the best estimate of the 24 pyrocumulus initiation height.

26 **1** Introduction

27 Pyrocumulus (pyroCu) form when wildfire convective plumes rise to their condensation 28 level and subsequently develop cumuliform cloud tops (American Meteorological 29 Society 2015). The extent of pyroCu development depends on the relationships amongst 30 atmospheric stratification, ambient moisture, and fire fluxes of heat and moisture (Potter 31 2005; Luderer et al. 2006; 2009; Frietas et al. 2007). Some pyroCu release significant 32 moist instability aloft and thereby trigger deep convective clouds that sometimes grow 33 into pyrocumulonimbus (pyroCb). Compared to their lesser counterparts, pyroCb possess 34 glaciated cloud tops and can thus generate precipitation, downdrafts, and lightning 35 (American Meteorological Society 2015). In exceptional cases, pyroCbs have been linked 36 with extreme fire growth (Peterson et al. 2015), devastating firestorms (Fromm et al. 37 2006), and even fire-induced tornados (Cunningham and Reeder 2009; McRae et al. 38 2013).

39 In addition to their impact on fire behavior, pyroCu/Cb have garnered significant 40 research attention due to their affect on vertical smoke transport, atmospheric chemistry, 41 and cloud microphysics. For example, pyroCu can cause significantly deeper smoke 42 injection than in dry convective cases (Frietas et al. 2007) and pyroCb are now 43 recognized as the source of previously unexplained aerosol layers lofted in the lower 44 stratosphere (Fromm and Servranckx 2003; Fromm et al. 2006; 2010). In addition, 45 satellite and dual polarimetric radar observations of pyroCb show that the extreme 46 aerosol loading results in high concentrations of small ice particles (Rosenfeld et al. 47 2007), especially as compared to nearby clouds forming in smoke free air. The 48 abundance of ice particles changes the radiative properties of the clouds and also favors 49 atypical positive polarity lightning strokes (Rosenfeld et al. 2007; Lang et al. 2006; 50 2012).

51 Despite the significant research on pyroCu/Cb microphysics, surprisingly little is 52 known about the environmental controls on pyroCu development. To date only a handful 53 of studies explicitly examines the thermodynamic and kinematic structure of these cloud 54 topped convective columns (Potter 2005, Trentman et al. 2006; Luderer et al. 2006; 2009; 55 Frietas et al. 2007) and no studies include direct observations of pyroCu/Cb initiation. As 56 a result, there is an open scientific debate regarding the plume condensation level, which is an important parameter for modeling smoke injection height and plume evolution
(Frietas et al. 2007). Specifically, there are contrasting views in the literature about
whether the plume condensation level is expected to be higher than or lower than the
ambient lifted condensation level (LCL).

61 Potter (2005), for example, proposes that pyroCu/Cb should exhibit cloud bases 62 lower than the ambient LCL due to the moisture released during combustion of woody 63 fuels and from the evaporation of fuel moisture. Drawing on historical cases of 64 pyroCu/Cb, radiosonde data, and theoretical considerations, he hypothesizes that the 65 latent heat release may be the dominant factor in many moist-pyroconvective events. A 66 limitation of this study is the anecdotal treatment of condensation levels, which are 67 estimated, and the use of radiosonde observations that may not reflect the near fire 68 environment.

In contrast to Potter (2005), Luderer et al. (2006; 2009) use high-resolution simulations and theoretical sensitivity calculations to conclude that "the combined effect of released moisture and heat from the fire almost always results in a higher cloud base compared to ambient conditions." They also find that moisture released in combustion constitutes less than 10% of the pyroCu/Cb water budget with the remainder of the plume water resulting from entrained environmental air. While these modeled results are rather convincing, they lack clear observational support.

To that end, the only field observations that address plume moisture are from small scale grass fire experiments, where significant increases in water vapor mixing ratio are documented near the surface, but then decrease rapidly with height (Clements et al. 2006, 2007, Kiefer et al. 2012). While these observations are consistent with the dominant role of entrainment, such small-scale plumes may not be representative of deep convective plumes that extend into the upper troposphere or even lower stratosphere.

In this paper we present the first direct observations of condensation levels in two wildfire pyroCu/Cb cases. The fires, the Bald Fire and the Rocky Fire, were located in northern California, and observations were conducted on 2 August 2014 and 30 July 2015, respectively (Fig. 1). The pyroCu cloud bases and plume rise dynamics were measured using a mobile atmospheric profiling system (Clements and Oliphant 2014) that included a scanning Doppler lidar and an upper-air radiosonde system which

88 provided thermodynamic profiles immediately upstream of the fire perimeters. From 89 these data, our results clearly show that observed plume condensation levels are 90 substantially higher than the ambient LCL. Additional aspects of the plume rise, 91 including limiting factors on convective growth and the role of environmental moisture 92 are also examined.

93 **Data and Methods** 2

94 2.1 Lidar Data

95 In this study, data from a Halo Photonics scanning Doppler lidar are examined (Pearson 96 et al. 2009). The lidar emits a 1.5 µm laser beam and records two range resolved quantities: (1) the attenuated backscatter coefficient $(m^{-1} sr^{-1})$, which is a range corrected 97 measure of backscattered energy, and (2) the Doppler velocity (m s⁻¹). The lidar also 98 99 reports the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), which is useful for discriminating between 100 meteorological targets and instrument noise. The lidar range is 9.6 km and the range-gate 101 resolution is 18 m. Azimuth and elevation motors allow for scans of the full upper 102 hemisphere and the lidar is level-mounted to the bed of a pickup truck, enabling rapid 103 deployments to wildfires (Clements and Oliphant 2014).

104

2.1.1 Lidar Sensitivity

105 Near-IR lidars are sensitive to aerosol, cloud droplets, and forest fire smoke. Due 106 to these sensitivities numerous previous studies have used lidars to examine smoke layers 107 and smoke plumes (Banta et al. 1992; Kovalev et al. 2005; Pahlow et al. 2005 Charland 108 and Clements 2013; Lareau and Clements 2015).

109 Forest fire smoke typically exhibits a log-normal particle number distribution 110 with a peak near .13 µm and a long tail extending towards coarser particles (Radke et al. 111 1990, 1991; Banta et al. 1992; Reid and Hobbs 1998; Reid et al. 2005). The 112 corresponding mass distributions are bimodal with peaks near .1 and 10 µm and a local 113 minimum between 1 and 3 µm (Radke et al. 1990, 1991; Reid et al. 2005). During intense 114 forest fires, such as those in this study, additional "super-giant" aerosol with sizes 115 sometimes exceeding 1 mm may also be prevalent (Radke et al. 1990, 1991; Reid et al. 116 2005). These aerosols are typically composed of large ash and soil particles, which may
117 be scoured from the surface by strong fire-induced winds (Radke et al. 1991; Reid et al.
118 2005; Kavouras et al. 2012).

119 The 1.5 µm lidar beam interacts with the submicron smoke via Rayleigh 120 scattering, the micron sized smoke via Mie scattering, and with the coarsest aerosol (e.g., 121 large ash, debris, etc.) via geometric optics. Using a radiative transfer model, Banta et al. 122 (1992) showed that the attenuated backscatter coefficient due to the numerous small 123 smoke particles was roughly comparable to the backscatter from the sparse large particles 124 in a given volume. Similar behavior is expected with the lidar used in this study. In 125 addition, based on our own experience, we expect significant attenuation for interactions 126 with very coarse debris, especially near the base of smoke plumes.

Near-IR lidars also record high backscatter and rapid attenuation due to cloud
droplets, making them an ideal tool for cloud base and cloud top detections (Hogan et al.
2003; Winkler et al. 2009). In this study we leverage this attribute of the lidar to
determine pyroCu cloud bases and edges in convective column. Similarly, Banta et al.
(1992) used an IR lidar to identify pyroclouds in a wildfire smoke column.

132

2.1.2 Lidar Scan Strategy

The lidar was programmed to conduct "range-height indicator" (RHI) scans centered on the Bald Fire and Rocky Fire pyroconvective plumes. The scan azimuth angles were determined visually. During the Bald Fire the RHI elevation step was 0.7°, whereas an elevation step of 1° was used during the Rocky Fire. Scans were conducted between the horizon and ~85° in elevation, with a full RHI sweep taking ~1 min during the Bald Fire and ~45 sec during the Rocky Fire. Additional scan details, including the azimuth angles, are provided in the following case studies.

140 The lidar was also used to examine the velocity field near the fires and within the 141 convective plumes. For example, the Doppler radial velocity data collected during the 142 RHI scans are used to inspect the plume structure. These data have a resolution of 3-143 4 cm s⁻¹ over a range of \pm 19 m s⁻¹ (Pearson et al. 2009). In addition, conical scans were 144 interspersed with RHI scans to generate vertical profiles of the horizontal wind using the 145 "velocity-azimuth display" (VAD) technique (Browning and Wexler 1968). The VADs 146 use an elevation angle of 50° and span 360° in azimuth, taking about 1 minute to 147 complete. The post-processed wind speed and direction from the VADs reflect the 148 ambient winds above the lidar.

149 **2.1.3 Plume Edge Detection**

150 The lidar data are post-processed to determine plume boundaries and beam 151 attenuation depth. The edge detection algorithm uses a combination of the lidar signal-to-152 noise ratio (SNR) and attenuated backscatter coefficient to isolate the plume. Similar 153 approaches are presented in previous studies (Kovalelv et al. 2005; Charland and Clements 2013). In our analysis, we first apply a 5th order Butterworth filter with a 5-154 155 point window to the SNR data along each lidar beam to eliminate some of the instrument 156 noise. Next we record the radial location of maximum attenuated backscatter coefficient. 157 Starting from that location we search inward along the beam for the first range gate 158 where the SNR+1 drops below 1.01. This point is considered to be the leading plume 159 edge. The same technique is performed searching outward along the beam to find the 160 trailing plume edge. The trailing edge is considered to be the attenuation point provided 161 the SNR+1 does not again exceed the threshold at some further distance. The SNR+1 162 threshold of 1.01 was found to best discriminate between aerosol returns and background 163 noise in our data sets, though other values (e.g., SNR+1=1.02) provide similar results.

164 To demonstrate the algorithm, Fig. 2 presents lidar data extracted from two 165 elevation angles (10.2°, 46.7°) within a full RHI scan of Bald Fire convective column. 166 The lower elevations beam (Fig. 2a) intersects the base of the smoke plume while the 167 upper beam (Fig. 2b) hits the pyroCu. Of note, the SNR+1 associated with cloud is 168 somewhat higher than in the smoke (1.105 vs. 1.089) and beam's attenuation is much 169 more rapid, penetrating only 198 m into the cloud compared to 648 m into the smoke. In 170 the following case studies we show that the sudden reduction in attenuation depth and 171 increase in attenuated backscatter coefficient aloft are robust signatures of pyroCu 172 formation.

173 **2.2 Radar Data**

Data from four National Weather Service (NWS) radars are used to examine plume structure. These 10-cm radars are sensitive to large ash and precipitation particles in the convective column but insensitive to cloud droplets and sub-micron smoke. Radars have been used in numerous wildfires studies (Banta et al. 1992; Hufford et al. 1998; Fromm et al. 2006; Rosenfeld et al. 2007; Jones and Christopher 2010a,b). Recently, dualpolarization radars have been used to examine the microphysics of wildfire plumes and clouds (Melnikov et al. 2008, 2009; Lang et al. 2014).

181 In this study we leverage three aspects of the NWS radars. First we examine the 182 radar echo tops to estimate the maximum cloud height. The echo tops are the highest 183 level at which the radar reflectivity exceeds 18 dbZ (Lakshmanan et al. 2013). Second we 184 combine radar reflectivity from multiple radars to generate volume renderings of the 185 pyroconvective plumes. These volumes are constructed by creating a gridded interpolant 186 from all the available contemporaneous radar data. Data from the Medford, Reno, Beale, 187 and Sacramento radars are combined for the Bald Fire, and from the Beale and 188 Sacramento radars for the Rocky Fire. The radar locations relative to the fires are shown 189 in Fig. 1.

Finally, we inspect the differential reflectivity (Z_{dr}) data from the Medford, OR radar during the Bald Fire. Z_{dr} is the logarithmic ratio of the reflectivity from the horizontally and vertically polarized radar beams (Markowski and Richardson 2011). When Z_{dr} is large and positive it indicates the presence of large horizontal targets, including needle-like ash particles (Melnikov 2008, 2009). When Z_{dr} is near zero the targets are more spherical (e.g. hydrometeors), and when negative the targets are vertically oriented (e.g., graupel).

197 2.3 Satellite Data

198 Visible satellite observations from the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite 199 (GOES-15) are used to characterize the presence of pyroCu above each fire. These data 200 have a spatial resolution of 1 km and a nominal temporal resolution of 15 minutes, 201 depending on the scan schedule. Data from the Moderate Resolution Imaging 202 Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Terra and Aqua satellites are also used. These data include both true color visible images and fire-radiative power (FRP). The nominal resolution is
500 m. FRP is derived by differencing fire pixels from adjacent non-fire pixels using
infrared radiance (Wooster 2002) and has been shown to provide high fidelity
representation of fire activity during California wildfires (Koltunov et al. 2012; Peterson
et al. 2015). FRP data from GOES are also examined.

208 2.4 Radiosonde Observation and Analysis

209 Thermodynamic profiles were collected adjacent to both fires using a GRAW TM 210 GS-E radiosonde system. These sondes measure temperature, humidity, and wind from the surface to the tropopause, ascending at a rate of $\sim 3 \text{ m s}^{-1}$. The balloons were launched 211 212 after sunset to avoid interfering with daytime fire-suppression aircraft operations, and as 213 a result the temperature profiles include surface-based stable layers that are not representative of daytime conditions. To address this shortcoming, the afternoon 214 215 temperature from the truck weather station is used to infer the convective boundary layer 216 (CBL) depth using the "parcel method" (Holtzworth 1964).

The sonde data are used to examine the ambient condensation level by considering three lifted parcels (1) the most unstable (MU) parcel, (2) the mixed-layer (ML) parcel, and (3) the convective (CONV) parcel. The MU parcel is the parcel with the highest convective available potential energy (CAPE), whereas the ML parcel is based on the mean temperature and mixing ratio in the lowest 150 hPa. The CONV parcel reflects the surface temperature required for free convection based on the surface mixing ratio. The condensation level for each of these parcels is compared in the analyses below.

224

225 3 The Bald Fire

The Bald Fire (40.9 N, 121.3 W) was started by lightning late on 31 July 2014. It was one of several lightning ignited fires in northern California and southern Oregon, including the adjacent Eiler Fire. The fire growth patterns on 1 and 2 August, determined from nightly U.S. Forest Service airborne infrared sensing (<u>http://nirops.fs.fed.us/</u>), are shown in Fig. 3. Based on these data, the fire consumed 7275 ha of mixed conifer forest during its first day, and by the end of the subsequent day had burned an additional 6821 ha. The

weather conditions on both days featured afternoon high temperatures near 30° C, relative humidity of ~15 % and west winds gusting up to 6 m s⁻¹.

During its rapid expansion on 2 Aug., the Bald fire developed a towering pyroCu that subsequently matured into pyroCb. Visible satellite data show the pyroCu initiation occurred at 1330 PDT, with continued cloud growth through mid-afternoon (Fig. 4a-d). At 1426 PDT the MODIS-Aqua satellite recorded a detailed image of the growing pyroCu, showing crisp cumuliform cloud features above the fire perimeter with more diffuse cloud elements extending to the northeast (Fig. 4e). The spreading cloud features were detrained from the primary updraft and then advected in southwesterly flow aloft.

The total FRP from the Bald Fire at the time of the MODIS-Aqua image was 19700 MW summed over 30 fire pixels. The pixel maximum was 2258 MW, though the pyroCu obscures a substantial portion of the fire. For comparison, the earlier MODIS-Terra overpass at 1245 PDT yielded a maximum FRP of just 829 MW and a total FRP of 3836 MW summed over 13 fire pixels. Clearly the fire experienced a rapid change in size and intensity during the early afternoon, coincident with the development of the pyroCu.

247

248 **3.1 Lidar Observations**

The truck-mounted Doppler lidar was situated ~7 km southwest of the fire where it conducted RHI scans of the windward edge of the developing pyroCu from 1350 to 1532 PDT on 2 August. During this time, 95 RHI scans were completed, providing a time and space resolved measure of the plume evolution, including the height of the condensation level. The lidar location relative to the fire perimeter is indicated in Figs. 3 and 4e. Figure 4f provides photograph from the lidar vantage point showing the windward edge of the cloud capped smoke column.

Figure 5 shows a sequence of lidar scans spanning the 5-minute period prior to the MODIS-Aqua overpass. These data are expressed as the logarithmic attenuated backscatter coefficient (hereafter backscatter) in units of $m^{-1} sr^{-1}$. Red and blue dots represent the leading plume edge and attenuation point, respectively, along each individual beam. The backscatter is due to smoke and debris in the lower portion of the plume (below 5500 m) and due to cloud droplets in the pyroCu aloft. The laser beam

attenuates in both the smoke and the cloud water, but the cloud edge is marked by a distinct increase in the backscatter and more rapid attenuation. For example the distance between the leading plume edge (red dots) and the attenuation point (blue dots) tends to be much larger in the lower portion of the plume, whereas above 5500 m the attenuation occurs over just a few range gates. These aspects of the data give the pyroCu cloud returns a "crisper" edge.

While pyroCu were already present at the beginning of the scan sequence, the data show the development of a new cloud element. Figures 5a, b for example, show only a few points of rapid attenuation and high backscatter aloft, whereas starting at Fig. 5c a new, upright cloud edge is detected. This nascent pyroCu element then rapidly expands during the subsequent RHI scans, reaching a height of at least 8500 m before moving out of the lidar field of view (Fig. 5d-f). As we show in the radar analysis below, the actual plume top was as high as 12 km in the 10 minutes following these scans.

275 The scans, which were roughly parallel to the mean wind direction, also reveal 276 that the plume experienced significant variations in tilt with time, alternating between 277 windward (Fig. 5a) and rearward sloping geometries (Fig. 5f). In fact, the windward 278 protrusion of the plume was as much as 2 km away from its base. Large coherent vortices 279 are also apparent along the plume edge, especially in Fig. 5a,b as the "stair step" pattern 280 in the plume edge detections. Based on the radial velocity data (not shown) the inward 281 clefts in the plume edge correspond to enhanced flow into the plume and outward lobes 282 reflecting flow towards the lidar. Vortices of this sort are a well-known feature of rising 283 thermals and plumes and play a leading role in entrainment (Scorer 1957; Woodward 1959). 284

285 Following the initial plume rise, sustained pyroCu were observed with the lidar 286 until 1532 PDT, at which point the truck was relocated for safety reasons. To determine 287 the plume condensation level, we aggregate data from all of the lidar scans during this 288 period. From this larger data sample, Fig. 6a presents the time-maximum backscatter as a 289 function of height and distance, and in Fig. 6b as a function of height only. In addition, Fig. 6c shows the computed percentiles (5, 50, and 95th percentiles) of the attenuation 290 291 depth binned into 100 m intervals. Collectively, these data reinforce many of the aspects 292 of the initial plume rise sequence discussed above. For example, there is a persistent transition in backscatter near 5500 m (blue line in Fig. 6a,b). Below this level, the backscatter approximately linearly decreases with height, consistent with the entrainment of clear air into an aerosol-laden plume. In contrast, at 5500 m the backscatter sharply increases (as does the SNR, not shown), corresponding to the condensation level and development of the pyroCu. The backscatter intensity remains high there and above due to the continued presence of liquid water.

299 The attenuation depth also shows a sharp transition at 5500 m (Fig. 6c). Below that 300 level the median attenuation depth increases with height, which is again consistent with 301 the dilution of the smoke plume via entrainment. At 5500 m the attenuation depth (across 302 all percentiles) sharply decreases, converging towards a median value of ~200 m. The 303 rapid attenuation aloft is consistent with the presence of liquid water drops and supports 304 our interpretation that the change in backscatter intensity is due to condensation in the 305 plume. From these data, we therefore conclude that the observed condensation level 306 occurs very near 5500 m and was nearly constant throughout the 1.5 h observation period 307 despite many changes in fire intensity.

308 3.2 Radar Analysis

309 Since the pyroCu cloud tops exceeded the lidar range the maximum smoke injection 310 depth is obtained from the radar echo tops product from the NWS radar in Medford, OR 311 (KMAX), which is ~ 200 km to the northwest. Figure 7a shows the time-maximum of the 312 echo tops above the Bald Fire on 2 August. These data indicate that smoke reached 313 altitudes in excess of 12 km, and thus the convective column rose an additional 3.5 km 314 above the maximum height resolved in the lidar scans. The radar returns also show that 315 the highest echo tops occur in a localized region above the fire perimeter where pyroCu 316 were most prevalent. In contrast, the smoke layers without pyroCu correspond to plume 317 heights closer to 6 km.

An additional interesting aspect of the radar data is the presence of deep echo tops southwest (e.g., upwind) of the infrared fire perimeter (solid contours, Fig. 7a). This observation is consistent with the periodic forward tilt of the plume as observed in the lidar backscatter (Figs. 5, 6). We hypothesize that the forward tilt relates to large-scale vortices that form as the plume penetrates through a stable layer at the top of the boundary layer (Saunders 1961), and due to the deflection of the ambient flow around theplume.

325 Figure 7b shows the corresponding time series of the maximum radar echo tops. 326 The pyroCu initiation at 1330 PDT, as shown in Fig. 4b, corresponds to a rapid rise in 327 echo tops from 6500 m to 10000 m. Following the initial plume growth, the plume tops 328 slowly rise until 1420 PDT at which point a second period of rapid plume growth occurs, 329 pushing the convective column to heights above 12 km. The onset of this deep plume 330 penetration closely corresponds to the lidar plume rise sequence shown in Fig. 6, as well 331 as the MODIS-aqua image. The plume heights subsequently subside, remaining near 10 332 km for the balance of the afternoon before diminishing more substantively at night.

333 A 3-D volume rendering of radar reflectivity from the Bald Fire at the time of 334 maximum injection height (1429 PDT) reveals additional aspects of the plume structure 335 (Fig 7c). The isosurfaces for 30, 28, 26, 24, and 18 dbZ are shown, along with the fire 336 perimeters (red shading), lidar scan plane (black dots), lidar plume edge detections 337 (yellow dots), and the lidar derived condensation level (green contour). These volume 338 data show an expansive region of high reflectivity immediately above the fire perimeter. 339 The reflectivity and plume height diminish towards the northeast, consistent with the fall 340 out of the larger soot and ash particles in the downwind direction (e.g., southwest flow 341 aloft). We note that since the radar is not sensitive to cloud droplets or micron sized 342 smoke, it is possible that the cloud edges and some smoke reside outside of the radar 343 volume rendering. It is also clear from these data that the lidar sees only the leading edge 344 of the plume before attenuating in dense smoke and cloud water, consistent with the 345 analyses presented above.

346 The shape of particles within the plume can be inferred by considering the 347 differential reflectivity (Z_{dr}) from the Medford, OR radar at different heights (Fig. 8). 348 Three elevation angles are inspected (0.5, 1.5, and 2.4 deg.), intersecting the updraft core 349 at heights of 4115, 7742, and 11009 m, respectively. The lowest scan shows very high 350 Z_{dr} , indicative of large, horizontally oriented particles, which is consistent with ash 351 (Melnikov 2008, 2009; Lange et al. 2014) (Fig. 8a). In contrast, the mid elevation scan 352 intersects the plume above the condensation level and shows a significant reduction in 353 Z_{dr} , with values between 0 and 2.5 in the updraft core (Fig. 8b). These values correspond to more spherical particles and small ice, suggesting the presence of large hydrometeors. Finally the upper-most portion of the plume, at ~11 km, exhibits negative Z_{dr} , posing the possibility of vertically oriented graupel particles (Fig. 8c).

357 3.3 Thermodynamic Analysis

The lidar observed condensation level and radar estimated plume tops provide valuable constraints on the plume structure when contextualized with atmospheric profiles collected adjacent to the fire. Figure 9a, for example, shows data from a radiosonde launched at 2100 PDT from ~15 km to the southwest of the fire (location shown in Fig. 3).

The sounding shows that the afternoon CBL extends from the surface (1364 m) to ~4000 m and is capped by a pronounced stable layer. Within the CBL, the water vapor mixing ratio is roughly constant at ~5 g kg⁻¹, whereas above the CBL a layer of very dry air is observed with a mixing ratio of only ~0.5 g kg⁻¹. Further aloft, near 400 hPa, a layer of higher humidity air, reflecting monsoonal moisture, is found. The height of the tropopause is ~13 km.

Relative to the observed profile, the "in cloud" profile is estimated by pseudoadiabatically lifting a parcel from the lidar observed condensation level at 5500 m. The resulting parcel possesses 910 J kg⁻¹ of CAPE, which is an upper bound on the energy available for buoyant ascent. The equilibrium level (EL) of the pyroCu parcel is 11,742 m, which is in close agreement with the radar estimated echo tops, but does not account for the inertial overshoot of the parcel, which is likely reflected in the localized region of radar plume heights exceeding 12 km (Fig. 7a).

Also of note, the homogeneous freezing level (-38° C) in the plume profile occurs at 10,158 m and the temperature at the EL is -52° C, indicating that the upper portion of the cloud must be glaciated. As such, this particular pyroconvective cloud should be classified as a pyroCb. In fact, pyroCb from other nearby fires on that day were known to produce lightning as well as a significant and destructive fire-whirl (Muller and Herbster 2014)

382 3.3.1 Lifted Parcels

One of the main goals of this paper is to compare the observed plume properties with conventional estimates of condensational level and convective potential. To that end, in this subsection we consider each of the three lifted parcels described in Section 2.4 as representations of the observed plume. The parcel ascents are shown in Fig. 9b.

387 In this case, the MU parcel (red line, Fig 9b) originates in the CBL and produces an 388 LCL of 4367 m, which is more than 1 km lower than the lidar observed condensation 389 level. In addition, compared to the observed plume structure, the MU parcel possesses 390 minimal CAPE and must overcome appreciable convective inhibition (CIN) before 391 reaching its level of free convection. Similarly, the ML parcel encounters its LCL at 4641 392 m, possesses almost no CAPE, and also must overcome appreciable CIN (cyan line, Fig. 393 9b). The LCL for the ML parcel is higher than that of the MU parcel because the layer 394 averaged mixing ratio is less than the maximum mixing ratio in the CBL.

395 Interestingly, the CONV parcel provides the best representation of the observed plume (dark blue line, Fig. 9b). In this case the surface mixing ratio is 5.2 g kg^{-1} and the 396 corresponding convective condensation level (CCL) is found at 5549 m, which is very 397 398 close to the lidar derived 5500 m. Commensurately, the EL and CAPE for the CONV 399 parcel are also close to the observed values. The convective temperature, which is the 400 surface temperature that must be reached to support convection, is 36.4° C. The high 401 temperature for the day was 29° C, making surface based convection extremely unlikely 402 outside of the fire modified environment.

403 From these analyses it is clear that the plume condensation level is substantively 404 higher than the ambient LCL, supporting the results of Luderer et al. (2006; 2009). 405 Further, using the CCL, not the LCL, and assuming that the fire readily exceeds the 406 convective temperature, provides the best representation of the plume condensation level 407 in this case. This is a potentially useful diagnostic for forecasters and fire managers. It 408 should be noted, however, that the CONV parcel, and its associated dry-adiabat up to the 409 CCL (dark blue line, Fig. 9b), does necessarily reflect the actual properties of the lower 410 plume. Rather, the plume must be superadiabatic near its base, cooling largely due to 411 entrainment as it decays towards adiabatic ascent further aloft (Emanuel 1994; 412 Trentmann et al. 2006; Frietas et al. 2007).

414 **4 The Rocky Fire**

415 The Rocky Fire (38.9° N, 122.5° W) started late on 29 July 2015 (cause unknown) in the 416 coastal range of northern California and burned in complex terrain through fuels 417 consisting of grass, brush, and conifers (Figs. 1, 10). The U.S. Forest Service NIROPS 418 fire perimeters show that the fire burned 3356 ha during the first day, and then consumed another 3153 ha on 30 July, the day of our observations. The fire growth on the 30th was 419 420 complex, expanding along multiple flanks (Fig. 10). Notably the first day's fire growth, 421 while rapid, did not generate pyroCu, whereas the second day did (Fig. 11). In addition, 422 compared to the long-lived Bald Fire pyroCu/Cb, the Rocky Fire plumes were transient, 423 repeatedly forming and dissipating in rapid succession. In this section we examine the 424 structure of these transient pyroCu along with the environmental conditions affecting 425 their evolution.

426 4.1 Lidar Observations

Lidar RHI scans where conducted between 1545 and 2008 PDT from an already burned area within the Rocky Fire perimeter (Fig. 10). This location allowed for scans of four separate pyroCu plumes rising from the complex fire perimeter. A total of 267 RHI scans were performed.

431 PyroCu were first observed with the lidar starting at ~ 1600 PDT rising from the 432 northwest flank of the fire (319° azimuth, scan path #1 in Fig. 10). Figure 12 shows a 433 sequence of photographs (top panels) and contemporaneous lidar scans (bottom panels) 434 detailing the onset and expansion of this cloud topped plume. The plume was initially 435 observed as it penetrated through a stable layer at the top of the CBL, evident as a lateral 436 smoke layer at 2600 m in the backscatter data and as a diffuse haze in the photographs. 437 During this time a thin pileus cloud accompanied the developing pyroCu and the lidar 438 cloud returns were limited to a few points near the plume top (Fig. 12f).

By 16:03 PDT, however, a distinct cumuliform cloud had developed (Fig. 12b)
and the lidar backscatter showed a commensurate increase in intensity and attenuation
along the pyroCu edge (Fig. 12g). Based on these data the cloud base was at ~4200 m.

The subsequent scans show the rapid pyroCu development, and by 1609 PDT cloud
edges were detected as high as 7500 m. Interestingly, soon thereafter the pyroCu
detrained from the convective column and dissipated (not shown).

445 Another pyroCu event at 1800 PDT is detailed in Fig. 13 corresponding to a lidar 446 azimuth of 86° (scan path #3 in Fig. 11). This plume initiated ~ 2.5 km east of the lidar location. As in the previous case, the rapidly growing plume was first recorded as it rose 447 448 through the boundary layer top, now at ~2300 m, and expanded into the free troposphere 449 (Fig. 13a,e). Subsequent scans revealed the onset of pyroCu with a condensation level of 450 4200 m, which is unchanged from the earlier Rocky Fire pyroCu event detailed in Fig. 451 12. In this case, however, the cloud top was not as well documented because attenuation 452 at the cloud base shielded the lidar view of the upper plume.

The photographs detailing the plume rise show changes in smoke colour near the base of the convective column (Fig. 13a-d). For example, at 1805 PDT the smoke is a dark gray (Fig. 13a), whereas later the smoke is increasingly white (Fig. 13d). We believe the change in smoke coloration is associated with changes in the completeness of combustion: flaming combustion produces smoke dominated by black carbon aerosols, whereas smoldering combustion generates more organic carbon aerosol, which more effectively backscatter sunlight and appear whiter (Bellouin 2014; Saleh et al. 2014).

460 An additional aspect of the observed plume rise is the relationship between the 461 updraft strength and the ambient wind. This relationship is examined in Fig. 14, which 462 displays VAD wind profiles (Fig. 14 a,b) and RHI radial velocities detailing the plume 463 structure (Fig. 14c-e). The wind profiles show significant shear over the lowest 2 km of the atmosphere. Strong (5-7 m s⁻¹) northwesterly winds near the surface transition to 464 weak flow at the boundary layer top (0-1 m s⁻¹ near 2300 m), then reverse to easterly flow 465 466 aloft (Fig. 14a,b). The observed near-surface wind speed maximum is atypical in the 467 atmospheric boundary layer and "adverse" wind profiles of this character have previously 468 been linked to blow-up fires (Byram 1954).

Compared to the ambient wind, the flow within the plume is characterized by much stronger velocities (Fig. 14c,d). For example, outbound speeds in excess of 15 m s⁻¹ are recorded at numerous locations within the plume at 1809 PDT. The actual updraft speed likely exceeds these values since the radial velocity data only reflect the projection 473 of the updraft onto the oblique lidar beam. Significant downdrafts are also observed in474 the upper portion of the plume, especially at 1813 PDT (blue shading, Fig. 14c,d).

The RHI velocity data also show that the strength of the updraft diminished with time. For example, comparative histograms demonstrate that strong outbound velocities were both higher and more common at 1809 than 1813 PDT (Fig. 14e). This observation is consistent with the change in smoke coloration described above: flaming combustion is likely to produce stronger updrafts due to more rapid heat release.

Changes in plume geometry also accompany the reduction in updraft strength. The plume is at first mostly upright (Fig. 14c) and later becomes more sheared (Fig. 14d). Specifically, the leading plume edge becomes tilted downwind within the boundary layer while the upper portion of the plume bends back towards the observing location. Based on these data, we hypothesize that as the fire's updraft weakens it becomes more susceptible to the ambient shear. The role of wind shear as a limiting factor in plume development is further discussed below.

487 A more robust examination of the plume condensation level during the Rocky 488 Fire's multiple pyroCu events is presented in Fig. 15. These analyses leverage the 489 aggregated data from all of the RHI scans on 30 July. Unsurprisingly, the time-maximum 490 backscatter exhibit a sharp transition near 4200 m (Fig. 15a, b), as was indicated in the 491 earlier plume rise sequences (Figs. 12, 13). Below 4200 m the backscatter decays roughly 492 linearly with height, and above that level the backscatter converges to a value of near -4 m⁻¹ sr⁻¹ (Fig. 15b). Likewise, the attenuation depth linearly *increases* from the surface up 493 494 to 4200 m, then abruptly decreases to a median depth of ~200 m. This pattern is 495 consistent with the dilution of the smoke plume by entrainment and the onset of 496 condensation aloft. Importantly, these analyses are remarkably similar to those during the 497 Bald Fire suggesting a clear lidar signature of pyroCu onset. Moreover, the condensation 498 level is once again found to be constant throughout the observing period, indicating that 499 ambient atmospheric conditions rather than variations in water released during 500 combustion likely control its height.

501 4.2 Radar Analysis

Radar data are again used to estimate the maximum smoke injection depth. The Rocky
Fire was within ~100 km of both the Sacramento (KDAX) and Beale Air Force Base
(KBBX) NWS radars (Fig. 1), and data from both sites are in agreement.

The maximum echo tops (from KDAX) occur between 7000 m and 7500 m, consistent with the lidar cloud detections (Fig. 16a). The spatial pattern of echo tops indicate that plumes of similar height developed on all of the expanding flanks of the fire. Interestingly, the corresponding time series demonstrates the plume transience, showing rapid variations in plume height throughout the late afternoon (Fig. 16b). Each spike corresponds to a short-lived pyroCu with durations ranging from 10-30 minutes. Satellite data confirm the episodic nature of these plumes (not shown).

512 The variability in echo tops is also due to the presence of multiple updrafts. For 513 example, a volume rendering of the reflectivity data at 1609 PDT shows the two distinct 514 updrafts associated with the complex fire perimeter (Fig. 16c). The narrow updraft rising 515 from the northwestern flank of the fire is the same plume shown in Fig. 12, and the lidar 516 plume detections agree well with the radar data (yellow dots, Fig 16c). A second broader 517 plume rises from the north and northeastern flanks of the fire at the same time. Above 518 5000 m the upper portions of both plumes are tilted to the north-northwest due to 519 southeasterly flow in that layer. Later in the fire's evolution the plume growth shifted 520 towards the east and southeast (not shown).

521 4.3 Thermodynamic Analysis

522 The Rocky Fire pyroCu development is interesting in that the thermodynamic 523 environment theoretically supports much deeper convection than was observed. Using 524 radiosonde data from ~15 km southwest of the fire at 2105 PDT, Fig. 17a shows that moist adiabatic ascent from the observed 4200 m cloud base would generate 2035 J kg⁻¹ 525 526 of CAPE and that the plume equilibrium level would be ~ 13 km, impinging on the 527 tropopause. The radar and lidar data indicate, however, that the plumes ascended to no higher than ~ 7.5 km, corresponding to plume top temperature of -20° C. As such, these 528 529 clouds are best classified as pyroCu, and never developed as deep pyroCb.

530 What then limits the growth? There appear to be two related limiting factors in the 531 plume rise: (1) wind shear, and (2) dry air entrainment. The lidar wind profiles, presented 532 above in Fig. 14, indicate significant wind shear between the CBL and free troposphere. 533 This wind shear is also apparent in the radiosonde wind profile, which shows a 180-534 degree wind shift at 2300 m (wind barbs and hodograph Fig 17a). The flow below this 535 level is from the west-northwest, whereas the flow above, and extending up to ~ 7 km, is 536 from the east-southeast. The layer of southeasterly flow is associated with a surge of 537 monsoonal moisture.

538 A second layer of significant wind shear at 7000 m separates the monsoon flow 539 from southwesterly flow in the upper troposphere. This shear also coincides with a rapid 540 decrease in dew point temperature, and thus relative humidity. It is notable then that the 541 maximum echo tops occur only about 500 m above the upper shear layer. Visual 542 observations throughout the afternoon and early evening suggest this shear zone affected 543 the pyroCu development, tending to sweep the upper portion of the cloud away from the 544 updraft core. The detraining upper portions of the cloud subsequently developed ragged 545 and wispy edges indicative of dry air entrainment as opposed to the crisp crenellations of 546 growing cumulus congestus.

547 The effect of the wind shear on a buoyant parcel is easily visualized by examining 548 the ascent track of the radiosonde, which rose at a mean rate of 2.7 m s⁻¹ (Fig. 17b). The 549 ambient shear causes a pronounced zigzag pattern that is clearly detrimental to sustained 550 upright convection despite the substantive CAPE. This result is not surprising in that 551 CAPE is known to overestimate convective development and updraft strength 552 (Markowski and Richardson 2011).

553

554 4.3.1 Lifted Parcels

555 Despite their limited vertical development the Rocky Fire pyroCu provide 556 additional support for the hypothesis that the plume condensation level occurs above the 557 ambient LCL. Following the same procedures described for the Bald Fire we examine 558 three convective parcels, the ascents of which are shown in Fig. 18. The LCLs for the 559 MU and ML parcels are 3503 m and 3768 m, respectively (red and cyan lines, Fig. 18). 560 Both of these lifted parcels must overcome modest CIN to reach their level of free 561 convection. In contrast, the computed CCL of 4250 m is much closer to the lidar 562 observed condensation level at ~4200 m. The corresponding convective temperature is 563 ~43° C, which is higher than the observed daytime temperature of 39° C. These results, 564 like those from the Bald Fire, again suggest that the CCL is a useful parameter for 565 estimating pyroCu/Cb convective initiation heights.

566 **4.4 Fire Radiative Power and Environmental Moisture**

Figure 19a shows the GOES-15 and MODIS FRP in for the Rocky Fire on 29-30 July 2015. From these data it is clear that the diurnal cycle of fire intensity is similar during the first two days of fire growth, with peak FRP values near 1500 MW in the late afternoon and fire activity extending into the late evening. Interestingly, despite comparable fire intensity, pyroCu were not observed on the 29th but were widespread on the 30th.

To better understand this disparity Fig. 19b-e compares the ambient meteorological conditions between days. These data are from a weather station just outside the fire perimeter, the location of which is shown in Fig. 10 (data obtained from MesoWest, Horel et al. 2002), and the 1700 PDT upper air soundings at Oakland International Airport (KOAK, location shown in Fig. 1). The high temperature on both days was ~39° C and afternoon winds were from the west with peak gusts near 6 m s⁻¹. The relative humidity was higher on the 30th than the 29th.

580 Figures 19d, e show the time series of the water vapor mixing ratio and the 581 differences in the relative humidity from the KOAK soundings for two afternoons. From 582 these data it is apparent that the onset of pyroCu on 30 July corresponds to the arrival of 583 much higher humidity air, both at the surface and aloft. For example, the mixing ratio increases from 4.5 g kg⁻¹ to 8 g kg⁻¹ while the relative humidity at 5500 m jumps from 584 585 7% to 66%. The corresponding change in the CCL is substantial, dropping from 5848 m on 29th to 4267 m on the 30th. Since the fire intensity was similar on both afternoons it is 586 587 likely that reduction in the height of CCL due to the influx of monsoon moisture was the 588 driving factor in pyroCu formation. These observations support the conclusions of 589 Luderer et al. (2006; 2009) that environmental moisture, not water released in590 combustion, is the primary control on pyroCu development.

591

592 **5 Summary and Conclusions**

593 The observations presented in this paper demonstrate that plume condensation levels 594 can exceed the height of the ambient LCL, sometimes substantially. For example, during 595 the Bald Fire the plume condensation level was more than 1 km higher than the 596 environmental LCL. As such, we conclude that the LCL should not be used, as it has 597 been, as a parameter for assessing pyroCu/Cb potential outside of the limiting case where 598 the CCL and LCL coincide, which is to say that widespread convective clouds are 599 possible. While our observational results span a limited portion of the parameter space, 600 they nonetheless provide strong support for the modeling results of Luderer et al. (2006; 601 2009) and Trentman et al. (2006), and seemingly contradict the results of Potter (2005).

602 While the CCL and the corresponding moist adiabatic ascent provide a useful 603 approximation for plume properties, other factors must also be considered. Specifically, 604 CAPE alone cannot determine the convective outcome. Our results from the Rocky Fire 605 show, for example, that ambient wind shear and dry air entrainment can significantly 606 curtail the convective development even in an environment that might otherwise support 607 deep pyroCb. In addition, our results show that the change in environmental humidity, 608 often in the form of a monsoonal surge, exerts a significant influence over the onset of 609 pyroCu/Cb by raising or lowering the height of CCL. These results suggest that the 610 moisture release during combustion is of secondary importance, at least in these observed 611 cases.

612 While our results mark an advance in understanding pyroCu/Cb development 613 there is a clear need for new measurement and modeling investigations of pyroconvective 614 clouds. Future field campaigns should include observations of the ambient environment 615 (e.g. radiosondes, CBL properties), the lower plume structure (temperature, moisture, and 616 momentum fluxes), and cloud properties (e.g. liquid and ice water path, particle size 617 distributions, etc.). These data should subsequently inform physical fluid dynamical 618 models in order to investigate aspects of plume dynamics that may not be observable. 619 Some potential avenues for obtaining these observations include dropsondes from

- 620 aircraft, surface and aircraft based dual-polarization radars, unmanned aerial vehicles,
- 621 and dual-Doppler lidar deployed during large-scale prescribed burn experiments where
- 622 the fuel loading and extent of combustion is known or can be determined after the fact.
- 623

624 Author Contributions

- 625 C.C. conceived of the field program, N.L. and C.C. conducted the field measurements,
- and N.L. led the data analysis and writing.
- 627

628 Acknowledgements

629 The lidar and radiosonde data are available upon request from the authors. All 630 other data sources are publically available. This research is supported under grant AGS-

- 631 1151930 from the National Science Foundation. Christopher C. Camacho contributed to
- 632 the field observations during the Rocky Fire.

633 6 References

- American Meteorological Society: "Pyrocumulus". Glossary of Meteorology. [Available
 online at http://glossary.ametsoc.org/wiki/Pyrocumulus], cited 2015.
- American Meteorological Society: "Pyrocumulonimbus". Glossary of Meteorology.
 [Available online at http://glossary.ametsoc.org/wiki/Pyrocumulonimbus], cited 2015.
- Banta, R. M., Olivier, L. D., Holloway, E. T., Kropfli, R. A., Bartram, B. W., Cupp, R.
- E., and Post, M. J.: Smoke-column observations from two forest fires using Doppler
 lidar and Doppler radar. J. Appl. Meteorol, 31, 1328-1349,
- 641 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(1992)031<1328:SCOFTF>2.0.CO;2, 1992.
- Bellouin, N.: Aerosols: The colour of smoke. Nat. Geosci., 7, 619-620.
 doi:10.1038/ngeo2226, 2014.
- Browning, K. A., and Wexler, R.: The determination of kinematic properties of a wind
 field using Doppler radar. J. Appl. Meteorol., 7, 105-113, doi: 10.1175/15200450(1968)007<0105:TDOKPO>2.0.CO;2, 1968
- Byram, G. M.: Atmospheric conditions related to blowup fires. Sta. Pap. 35. Asheville,
 NC: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment
 Station. 1954.
- Charland, A. M., and Clements, C. B.: Kinematic structure of a wildland fire plume
 observed by Doppler lidar. J. Geophys. Res. 118, 3200-3212, doi: 10.1002/jgrd.50308,
 2013.
- 653 Clements, C. B., Potter, B.E., Zhong, S.: *In situ* measurements of water vapor, heat and
 654 CO₂ gluxes within a prescribed grass fire. Int. J. Wildland Fire, 15, 299-306, doi:
 655 10.1071/WF05101, 2006.
- 656 Clements, C. B., Zhong, S., Goodrick, S., Li, J., Bian, X., Potter, B.E., Heilman, W.E.,
 657 Charney, J.J., Perna, R., Jang, M., Lee, D., Patel, M., Street, S., and Aumann, G.:
 658 Observing the dynamics of wildland grass fires: FireFlux- A field validation
 659 experiment. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 88, 1369-1382, doi: 10.1175/BAMS-88-9660 1369, 2007.
- 661 Clements, C. B., and Oliphant, A. J.: The California State University mobile atmospheric
 662 profiling system: A facility for research and education in boundary layer meteorology.
 663 Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc. 95, 1713-1724, doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00179.1, 2014.
- 664 Cunningham, P., and Reeder, M. J.: Severe convective storms initiated by intense
 665 wildfires: Numerical simulations of pyro-convection and pyro-tornadogenesis.
 666 Geophys. Res. Lett., 36, L12812, doi:10.1029/2009GL039262, 2009.

668 Freitas, S. R., Longo, K. M., Chatfield, R., Latham, D., Silva Dias, M. A. F., Andreae, M. O., and Carvalho Jr, J. A.: Including the sub-grid scale plume rise of vegetation fires 669 670 in low resolution atmospheric transport models. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 7, 3385-3398, 671 doi:10.5194/acp-7-3385-2007, 2007. 672 Fromm, M., Lindsey, D. T., Servranckx, R., Yue, G., Trickl, T., Sica, R., and Godin-Beekmann, S.: The untold story of pyrocumulonimbus. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc. 91, 673 674 1193-1209, DOI:10.1175/2010BAMS3004.1, 2010. 675 Fromm, M., Tupper, A., Rosenfeld, D., Servranckx, R., and McRae, R.: Violent pyro-676 convective storm devastates Australia's capital and pollutes the stratosphere. Geophys. 677 Res. Lett., 33, L05815, doi:10.1029/2005GL025161, 2006. Fromm, M. D., and Servranckx, R. (2003). Transport of forest fire smoke above the 678 679 tropopause by supercell convection. Geophys. Res. Lett., 30, 1542, 680 doi:10.1029/2002GL016820, 2003. 681 Gatebe, C. K., Varnai, T., Poudyal, R., Ichoku, C., and King, M. D.: Taking the pulse of 682 pyrocumulus clouds. Atmos. Environ., 52, 121-130, 683 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.01.045, 2012 Jones, T. A., and Christopher, S. A.: Satellite and radar observations of the 9 April 2009 684 685 Texas and Oklahoma grassfires. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 91, 455-460. Doi: 686 10.1175/2009BAMS2919.1, 2010. 687 Jones, T. A., and Christopher, S. A.: Satellite and radar remote sensing of southern plains 688 grass fires: A case study. J. Appl. Meteorol, 49, 2133-2146, doi: 10.1175/2010JAMC2472.1, 2010. 689 690 Kiefer, C. M., Clements, C. B., and Potter, B. E.: Application of a mini unmanned aircraft 691 system for in situ monitoring of fire plume thermodynamic properties. J. Atmos. 692 Oceanic Technol., 29, 309-315, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-11-00112., 693 2012 694 Koltunov, A., Ustin, S. L., and Prins, E. M.: On timeliness and accuracy of wildfire 695 detection by the GOES WF-ABBA algorithm over California during the 2006 fire 696 season. Remote Sens. Environ, 127, 194-209, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2012.09.001, 2012. 697 Hogan, R. J., Illingworth, A. J., O'connor, E. J., and Baptista, J. P. V.: Characteristics of 698 mixed-phase clouds. II: A climatology from ground-based lidar. Quart. J. Roy. 699 Meteor. Soc., 129, 2117-2134, doi: 10.1256/qj.01.209, 2003. 700 Hogan, R. J., Grant, A. L. M., Illingworth, A. J., Pearson, G. N. and O'Connor, E. J.: 701 Vertical velocity variance and skewness in clear and cloud-topped boundary layers as 702 revealed by Doppler lidar. Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc., 135: 635-643. doi: 10.1002/gj.413, 703 2009.

Emanuel, K. A.: Atmospheric convection. Oxford University Press., 580 pp, 1994.

667

- Holzworth, G. C.: Estimates of mean maximum mixing depths in the contiguous United
 States, Mon. Weather Rev., 92, 235–242, doi: 10.1175/15200493(1964)092<0235:EOMMMD>2.3.CO;2,1964
- Horel, J., Splitt, M., Dunn, L., Pechmann, J., White, B., Ciliberti, C., Lazarus, S.,
 Slemmer, J., Zaff, D., and Burks, J.: Mesowest: cooperative mesonets in the Western
 United States. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 83, 211–225.
 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2002)083<0211:MCMITW>2.3.CO;2,
- 711 <u>2002</u>
- Lakshmanan, V., Hondl, K., Potvin, C. K., and Preignitz, D.: An improved method for
 estimating radar echo-top height. Wea. and Forecasting, 28, 481-488, doi:
 10.1175/WAF-D-12-00084.1, 2013.
- Lang, T. J., and Rutledge, S.A.: Cloud-to-ground lightning downwind of the 2002
 Hayman forest fire in Colorado, Geophys. Res. Lett., 33, L03804,
 doi:10.1029/2005GL024608, 2006
- Lang, T.J., Rutledge, S.A., Dolan, B., Krehbiel, P., Rison, W., and Lindsey, D.T.:
 Lightning in wildfire smoke plumes observed in Colorado during summer 2012. Mon.
 Wea. Rev., 142, 489–507. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-13-00184.1, 2014
- Luderer, G., Trentmann, J., Winterrath, T., Textor, C., Herzog, M., Graf, H. F., and
 Andreae, M. O.: Modeling of biomass smoke injection into the lower stratosphere by
 a large forest fire (Part II): sensitivity studies. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 5261-5277,
 2006, http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/6/5261/2006/.
- Luderer, G., J. Trentmann, and M. O. Andreae: A new look at the role of fire-released
 moisture on the dynamics of atmospheric pyro-convection. Int. J. Wildland Fire, 18,
 554-562, doi: /10.1071/WF07035, 2009
- Markowski P, and Richardson, Y.: Mesoscale Meteorology in Midlatitudes. John Wiley
 and Sons, 430 pp, 2011.
- McRae, R. H., Sharples, J. J., Wilkes, S. R., and Walker, A.: An Australian pyrotornadogenesis event. Natural hazards, 65, 1801-1811, doi: 10.1007/s11069-012-0443-7, 2013.
- Melnikov, V. M., Zrnic, D. S., Rabin, R. M., and Zhang, P.: Radar polarimetric
 signatures of fire plumes in Oklahoma, Geophys. Res. Lett., 35, L14815,
 doi:10.1029/2008GL034311, 2008.
- Melnikov, V. M., Zrnic, D. S., and Rabin, R. M. : Polarimetric radar properties of smoke
 plumes: A model, J. Geophys. Res., 114, D21204, doi:<u>10.1029/2009JD012647</u>, 2009.
- Muller, B. M., and C.G. Herbster: Fire Whirls: Twisters That Light the Sky.
 Weatherwise, 67, 12-23, doi: 10.1080/00431672.2014.960326, 2014.

- Pahlow, M., Kleissl, J., Parlange, M. B., Ondov, J. M., and Harrison, D.: Atmospheric
 boundary-layer structure observed during a haze event due to forest-fire smoke,
- 742 Bound.-Lay. Meteorol., 115, 53–70, doi:10.1007/s10546-004-6350-z, 2005.
- Peterson, D. A., Hyer, E. J., Campbell, J. R., Fromm, M. D., Hair, J. W., Butler, C. F.,
 and Fenn, M. A.: The 2013 Rim Fire: Implications for predicting extreme fire spread,
 pyroconvection, and smoke emissions. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 96, 229-247, doi:
 http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00060.1, 2015.
- Potter, B.E.: The role of released moisture in the atmospheric dynamics associated with
 wildland fires. Int. J. of Wildland Fire, 14, 77-84, doi:10.1071/WF04045, 2005
- Radke, L.F., Lyons, J.H., Hobbs, P.V., Hegg, D.A., Sandberg, D.V., and Ward,
 D.E.: Airborne monitoring and smoke characterization of prescribed fires on forest
 lands in western Washington and Oregon, Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-251, 81 For. Serv.,
 U.S. Dep. of Agric., Portland, Ore., 1990.
- Radke, L.F., Hegg, D.A., Hobbs, P.V., Nance, J.D., Lyons, J.H., Laursen, K.K., Weiss,
 R.E., Riggan, P.J., and Ward, D.E.: Particulate and trace gas emissions from large
 biomass fires in North America, Global Biomass Burning: Atmospheric, Climatic and
 Biospheric ImplicationsJ. S. Levine, 209–224, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1991.
- Reid, J. S., Koppmann, R., Eck, T. F., and Eleuterio, D. P.: A review of biomass burning
 emissions part II: intensive physical properties of biomass burning
 particles. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 5, 799-825, 2005.
- Rosenfeld, D., Fromm, M., Trentmann, J., Luderer, G., Andreae, M. O., and Servranckx,
 R.: The Chisholm firestorm: observed microstructure, precipitation and lightning
 activity of a pyro-cumulonimbus, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 7, 645-659, doi:10.5194/acp7-645-2007, 2007.
- Saleh, R., Robinson, E. S., Tkacik, D. S., Ahern, A. T., Liu, S., Aiken, A. C., and
 Donahue, N. M.: Brownness of organics in aerosols from biomass burning linked to
 their black carbon content. Nat. Geosci.,7, 647-650. doi:10.1038/ngeo2220, 2014.
- Saunders, P. M.: Penetrative convection in stably stratified fluids, Tellus, 14, 177-194,
 doi: 10.1111/j.2153-3490.1962.tb00130.x, 1962
- Scorer, R. S.: Experiments on convection of isolated masses of buoyant fluid. J. Fluid
 Mech., 2, 583-594. doi:<u>10.1017/S0022112057000397</u>, 1957.
- 771 Trentman, J., Luderer, G., Winterrath, T., Fromm, M. D., Servranckx, R., Textor, C.,
- Herzog, M., Graf, H.-F., and Andreae, M. O.: Modeling of biomass smoke injection
- into the lower stratosphere by a large forest fire (Part I): reference simulation. Atmos.
- 774 Chem. Phys., **6**, 5247–5260, doi: 10.5194/acp-6-5247-2006, 2006.

- Winker, D., Vaughan M. A., Omar, A., Hu, Y., Powell, K. A., Liu, Z., Hunt, W. H.,
 and Young, S. A.: Overview of the CALIPSO mission and CALIOP data processing
 algorithms, J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol., 26, 2310–2323, doi:
 <u>10.1175/2009JTECHA1281.1</u>, 2009
- Woodward, B.: The motion in and around isolated thermals. Quart. J. Roy. Meteor.
 Soc., 85, 144-151, doi: 10.1002/qj.49708536619, 1959.
- 781 Wooster, M. J.: Small-scale experimental testing of fire radiative energy for quantifying
- mass combusted in natural vegetation fires. Geophys. Res. Lett., 29, 2027,
- 783 doi:10.1029/2002GL015487, 2002



Fig. 1. Overview map showing the regional topography (terrain shading), locations of the
Rocky and Bald Fires (red circles), the locations and names of the NWS radars used in
the plume analysis (white circles), and the KOAK sounding site (white circle).

- . . .



Fig. 2. Examples of the plume detection and attenuation algorithm based on the filtered (solid black line) and unfiltered (gray line) lidar signal-to-noise ratio (SNR+1). (a) Low elevation angle (10.2 deg) lidar beam intersecting the base of the Bald Fire convective column. (b) High elevation angle (46.7 deg) beam intersecting the pyroCu in the upper plume. The red stars indicate the leading plume edge and the blue stars the attenuation point. The SNR+1 threshold of 1.01 is indicated with a dashed yellow line.



Fig. 3. Bald and Eiler Fire progression map for 1 and 2 August. The fire perimeters are
from the US National Forest Service National Infrared Operations (NIROPS) flights. The
background is a satellite image draped over the terrain, which is highlighted with hill
shading. Also shown are the truck location (yellow dot), lidar scan path (yellow line), and

807 radiosonde location (yellow star).



Fig. 4. Overview of the pyrocumulus initiation and growth on 2 August 2014. (a-d) GOES-15 visible imagery showing the pyroCu initiation. (e) MODIS-Aqua visible image at 1426 PDT along with fire-radiative power (FRP, colored circles). (f) Photograph of the lidar vantage point and the windward edge of convective column and pyroCu at 1401 PDT. The truck location is indicated in as a green dot in panel (e). The fire perimeters are as in Fig. 3.







Fig. 6. Statistical analysis of lidar data between 1350 and 1502 PDT showing the plume condensation level. (a) Maximum backscatter as a function of height and distance. (b) Maximum backscatter as a function of height only. (c) 5, 50 and 95th percentiles of the attenuation depth as a function of height. The dashed blue line indicates the inferred condensation level.



Fig. 7. Radar analysis of the Bald Fire convective column. (a) Maximum echo top heights (color shading) during the Bald Fire along with the NIROPS fire perimeters (gray and black contours). (b) Time series of the maximum echo tops heights. Gray shading shows the period of lidar observations. (c) Volume rendering of the Bald Fire plume at 1429 PDT. Reflectivity isosurfaces are displayed at 30, 28, 26, 24, 22 and 18 dbZ. The lidar scan path and plume detections are shown in black and yellow dots, respectively. Fire perimeters are shown in red shading. The lidar derived condensation level is indicated by the green contour.





Fig. 8. Differential reflectivity (Z_{dr}) analysis of the Bald Fire plume at 1429 PDT. (a-c) Z_{dr} at the 0.5, 1.5, and 2.4 deg. elevation sweeps. The black contour shows the fire

perimeter on 2 August.



Fig. 9. Thermodynamic analysis of the ambient environment and plume parcels. (a) Observed sounding from 2 August 2014, 2100 PDT showing the adjusted boundary layer profile (dashed red line), the lidar derived condensation level (gray circle), the moist-adiabatic ascent from the condensation level, equilibrium level, and the radar derived echo tops. (b) Analysis of lifted parcels, showing the most unstable (MU), mixed-layer (ML), and convective (CONV) parcel trajectories. The condensation and equilibrium levels for each parcel are shown, and their CAPE is shaded.



Fig. 10. Rocky Fire progression map for 30 July 2015. The fire perimeters are from the US National Forest Service National Infrared Operations (NIROPS) flights. The background is a satellite image draped over the terrain, which is indicated with hill shading. Also shown are the truck location (yellow dot), lidar scan paths (colored lines), radiosonde location (yellow star), and weather station location (white star).



Fig. 11. Visible satellite (GOES-15) images showing the difference in the Rocky Fire plume between 1645 PDT on 29 and 30 July. The data show a pyroCu tower on 30 July that is absent on 29 July.







Fig 13. Pyrocumulus development from 1805-1813 PDT on 30 July 2015. (a-d) Photographs of the plume rise and pyroCu development. (e-i) Lidar backscatter showing the onset of condensation and subsequent cloud growth. The dashed blue lines shows the lidar derived condensation level.





Fig. 14. Analysis of the interaction of the plume with the ambient wind. (a-b) VAD
derived profiles of the ambient wind speed and direction. (c-d). Radial velocities during
the plume rise and smoke backscatter (black contours). (e) Comparative histogram of
radial velocities at 1809 and 1813 PDT.



909 910 Fig. 15. Statistical analysis of lidar data between 1545 and 2008 PDT on 30 July 2015.

(1) Maximum backscatter as a function of height and distance. (b) Maximum backscatter 911 as a function of height only. (C) Attenuation depth as a function of height. The dashed

- 912
- 913 blue line indicates the inferred condensation level.



Fig. 16. Radar analysis of the Rocky Fire convective column. (a) Maximum echo top heights (color shading) along with the NIROPS fire perimeters (gray and black contours). (b) Time series of the maximum echo tops heights. Gray shading shows the period of lidar observations. (c) Volume rendering of the Rocky Fire plume at 1609 PDT. Reflectivity isosurfaces are displayed at 30, 28, 26, 24, 22 and 18 dbZ. The lidar scan path and plume detections are shown in black and yellow dots, respectively. Fire perimeters are shown in red shading.



Fig. 17. Thermodynamic analysis of the ambient environment during the Rocky Fire. (a) Observed sounding from 2105 PDT showing the adjusted boundary layer profile (dashed red line), the lidar derived condensation level (gray circle), the moist-adiabatic ascent from the condensation level, and the radar derived echo tops. The inset is a hodograph and the wind barbs on the right indicate how the wind speed and direction change with height. (b) Balloon ascent path showing the affect of wind shear on a buoyant parcel.



916 Temperature (°C) 917 Fig. 18 Analysis of lifted parcels, showing the most unstable (MU), mixed-layer (ML),

and convective (Conv) parcel trajectories. The condensation levels and CAPE for eachparcel is described in the text.



Fig 19. Analysis of the environmental conditions on 29 and 30 July. (a) Fire radiative power from GOES-15 (red dots) and MODIS (purple dots). (b) Temperature (black line) and relative humidity (green line) time series. (c) wind speed (black line), gust (dashed black line) and direction (green starts). (d) Surface mixing ratio. (e) Comparison of the vertical profile of relative humidity from the KOAK sounding at 1700 PDT on 29 and 30 July. The location of the weather station is shown in Fig. 10.