

÷ž

औ

 \approx

四日

NOAA

National Weather Service

An overview on Mesoscale **Convective Systems and their** forward motion

Brian Squitieri, Ph.D. **Storm Prediction Center**



















What is an MCS?

A **Mesoscale Convective System** (MCS) is "a cloud system that occurs in connection with an ensemble of thunderstorms and produces a contiguous precipitation area on the order of 100 km or more in horizontal scale in at least one direction" (AMS Glossary – 2025).

- This definition can be applied liberally to any organized thunderstorm clusters that:
 - Is at least 100 km long
 - Lasts for at least 3 hours
 - Shares a common feature, such as a trailing precipitation region or cold pool.
- MCSs may take on many forms, morphology and evolution
- MCSs may be accompanied by all thunderstorm hazards:
 - Heavy rain and potential flooding
 - Frequent Lightning
 - Strong, damaging winds/gusts
 - Tornadoes
 - Hail



MCS Types



Campbell et al. (2017)

• Parker and Johnson (2000): MCS defined as convective phenomenon where Coriolis acceleration is the same order of magnitude as all other terms in Navier-Stokes equations of motion.

• Parker and Johnson (2000): MCS defined as convective phenomenon where Coriolis acceleration is the same order of magnitude as all other terms in Navier-Stokes equations of motion.

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + fv + F_u$$

• Parker and Johnson (2000): MCS defined as convective phenomenon where Coriolis acceleration is the same order of magnitude as all other terms in Navier-Stokes equations of motion.

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + fv + F_u$$

 Parker and Johnson (2000): MCS defined as convective phenomenon where Coriolis acceleration is the same order of magnitude as all other terms in Navier-Stokes equations of motion.

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + fv + F_u$$

• Markowski and Richardson (2010): Most Phenomena have space/time scale ratios on the same order of magnitude (10 m s⁻¹)

 Parker and Johnson (2000): MCS defined as convective phenomenon where Coriolis acceleration is the same order of magnitude as all other terms in Navier-Stokes equations of motion.

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + fv + F_u$$

- Markowski and Richardson (2010): Most Phenomena have space/time scale ratios on the same order of magnitude (10 m s⁻¹)
- In mid-latitudes: $f = 2\Omega sin\Phi \sim 10^{-4}s^{-1}$, so $fv = (10^{-4}s^{-1}) * (10 m s^{-1}) = 10^{-3}m s^{-2}$

 Parker and Johnson (2000): MCS defined as convective phenomenon where Coriolis acceleration is the same order of magnitude as all other terms in Navier-Stokes equations of motion.

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + fv + F_u$$

- Markowski and Richardson (2010): Most Phenomena have space/time scale ratios on the same order of magnitude (10 m s⁻¹)
- In mid-latitudes: $f = 2\Omega sin\Phi \sim 10^{-4}s^{-1}$, so $fv = (10^{-4}s^{-1}) * (10 m s^{-1}) = 10^{-3}m s^{-2}$
- In mid-latitudes, L < 1000 km means that Coriolis becomes less relevant, L > 1000 km and ageostrophic motions become less
 significant, so:

 Parker and Johnson (2000): MCS defined as convective phenomenon where Coriolis acceleration is the same order of magnitude as all other terms in Navier-Stokes equations of motion.

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + fv + F_u$$

- Markowski and Richardson (2010): Most Phenomena have space/time scale ratios on the same order of magnitude (10 m s⁻¹)
- In mid-latitudes: $f = 2\Omega sin\Phi \sim 10^{-4}s^{-1}$, so $fv = (10^{-4}s^{-1}) * (10 m s^{-1}) = 10^{-3}m s^{-2}$
- In mid-latitudes, L < 1000 km means that Coriolis becomes less relevant, L > 1000 km and ageostrophic motions become less
 significant, so:

• In mid-latitudes:
$$-\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{1 \ kg \ m^{-3}}\frac{10 \ mb}{1000 \ km} \sim 10^{-3} m \ s^{-2}$$
, with F_u also $10^{-3} \ m \ s^{-2}$

• Parker and Johnson (2000): If Coriolis is equal to other forces in Navier-Stokes, then the timescale should be f^1 .

- Parker and Johnson (2000): If Coriolis is equal to other forces in Navier-Stokes, then the timescale should be f¹.
- This works out to: $\frac{1}{f} = \frac{1}{2\Omega sin\Phi} \sim \frac{1}{10^{-4}s^{-1}} \sim 10^4 s$, or 10,000 s (divided by 3600 s) is 2.77 or **3 h**.

• Parker and Johnson (2000): If Coriolis is equal to other forces in Navier-Stokes, then the timescale should be f^1 .

• This works out to:
$$\frac{1}{f} = \frac{1}{2\Omega sin\Phi} \sim \frac{1}{10^{-4}s^{-1}} \sim 10^4 s$$
, or 10,000 s (divided by 3600 s) is 2.77 or **3 h**.

• Parker and Johnson (2000): Making an advective assumption, length scale is $L = U\tau = 10 m s^{-1} * 10^4 s = 10^5 m$ or 100 km.



horizontal length scale



horizontal length scale



*Mesoscale doesn't allow for these forces to be neglected, and Markowski and Richardson (2010) explicitly cite long-lived MCSs as an example where all forces need to be accounted for.

horizontal length scale



*Mesoscale doesn't allow for these forces to be neglected, and Markowski and Richardson (2010) explicitly cite long-lived MCSs as an example where all forces need to be accounted for.

*Synoptic phenomena in mid-latitudes are usually generated by baroclinic instability, which is usually realized by disturbances with 3X the wavelengths of:

 $L_R = \frac{NH}{f} \sim 1000 \text{ to } 1500 \text{ km}$



*Mesoscale doesn't allow for these forces to be neglected, and Markowski and Richardson (2010) explicitly cite long-lived MCSs as an example where all forces need to be accounted for.

*Synoptic phenomena in mid-latitudes are usually generated by baroclinic instability, which is usually realized by disturbances with 3X the wavelengths of:

 $L_R = \frac{NH}{f} \sim 1000 \ to \ 1500 \ km$

*Markowski and Richardson: Lagrangian timescales of mesoscale fall between buoyancy oscillation and pendulum day scales, so: $\frac{2\pi}{N} < \tau < \frac{2\pi}{f}$ or $10 \ min < \tau < 17 \ h$



*Mesoscale doesn't allow for these forces to be neglected, and Markowski and Richardson (2010) explicitly cite long-lived MCSs as an example where all forces need to be accounted for.

*Synoptic phenomena in mid-latitudes are usually generated by baroclinic instability, which is usually realized by disturbances with 3X the wavelengths of:

 $L_R = \frac{NH}{f} \sim 1000 \ to \ 1500 \ km$

*Markowski and Richardson: Lagrangian timescales of mesoscale fall between buoyancy oscillation and pendulum day scales, so: $\frac{2\pi}{N} < \tau < \frac{2\pi}{f}$ or $10 \ min < \tau < 17 \ h$ Cold-pool-driven MCSs tend to differ in structure from synoptically forced squall lines, with differences in wind swath attributes



























- Johns and Hirt (1987) and Corfidi et al. (2016) both found that derechos move faster (sometimes much faster) than the full mean wind speed.
- Derecho wind swaths are produced by thunderstorm clusters where either cold pool dynamics or other internal mechanisms dominate the processes that produce severe/destructive wind gusts.
- Corfidi et al. (1996) and Corfidi (2003) devised a routine that can determine MCS forward motion based on the interaction between the cold pool and ambient flow fields.

MCS motion has 2 components (<u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u>)

• Advection:

 <u>Advection</u>: Component of motion involving cells being carried with or by the mean wind in the cloud layer (V_{CL}).

 <u>Advection</u>: Component of motion involving cells being carried with or by the mean wind in the cloud layer (V_{CL}).



 <u>Advection</u>: Component of motion involving cells being carried with or by the mean wind in the cloud layer (V_{CL}).












MCS motion has 2 components (<u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u>)

Propagation:

















MCS motion has 2 components (<u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u>)

- MCS motion has 2 components (<u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u>)
- The <u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u> components are both additive.

- MCS motion has 2 components (<u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u>)
- The <u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u> components are both additive.



- MCS motion has 2 components (<u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u>)
- The <u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u> components are both additive.



- MCS motion has 2 components (<u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u>)
- The <u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u> components are both additive.



- MCS motion has 2 components (<u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u>)
- The <u>Advection</u> and <u>Propagation</u> components are both additive.



$V_{\mbox{\scriptsize MCS}}$ Magnitude and Direction







We can find the speed and direction of the MCS motion vector using trigonometry.



We can find the speed and direction of the MCS motion vector using trigonometry.

However, these calculations are sensitive to the depth of the cloud layer of the mean wind, and the inflow layer available to the MCS, which can influence propagation.



We can find the speed and direction of the MCS motion vector using trigonometry.

However, these calculations are sensitive to the depth of the cloud layer of the mean wind, and the inflow layer available to the MCS, which can influence propagation.

$$\varphi = \arcsin(\frac{|V_{Prop}| * \sin(\theta)}{V_{MCS}})$$



We can find the speed and direction of the MCS motion vector using trigonometry.

However, these calculations are sensitive to the depth of the cloud layer of the mean wind, and the inflow layer available to the MCS, which can influence propagation.

$$\varphi = \arcsin(\frac{|V_{Prop}| * \sin(\theta)}{V_{MCS}})$$

$$|V_{MCS}| = \sqrt{|V_{CL}|^2 + |V_{Prop}|^2 - 2(|V_{CL}| * |V_{Prop}|)\cos\theta}$$










```
V_{PROP/LLJ} = 30 \text{ kts}
\theta = 50 \text{ degrees (0.87 radians)}
V_{MCS}?
\varphi?
```

V_{PROP/LLJ} = 30 kts θ = 50 degrees (0.87 radians) V_{MCS}? φ? 50° 60 kts 30 kts

 $V_{PROP/LLJ} = 30 \text{ kts}$ θ = 50 degrees (0.87 radians) V_{MCS}? φ? 50° 60 kts 30 kts A5 Kts 50 30 kts















- Not a straightforward relationship. MCS can propagate both upwind and downwind of the mean vertical wind field.
- Corfidi et al. (1996) demonstrated how to account for upwind propagation. What about downwind propagation?



• The Corfidi et al. (1996) method only factors mean-wind and lowlevel wind/convergence-driven propagation influences.

- The Corfidi et al. (1996) method only factors mean-wind and lowlevel wind/convergence-driven propagation influences.
- What about the cold pool? Studies have shown that MCS forward speed is dependent on cold pool evolution (Charba 1974; Newton and Fankhauser 1975; Betts 1976; Miller and Betts 1977).

- In reality, MCS forward motion is influenced by 3 factors: Mean Wind Speed - V_{CL}, Upwind (low-level-convergence-driven) propagation - V_{Prop-Upwind}, and Downwind (cold-pool-driven) propagation – V_{Prop-Downwind} (Corfidi 2003).
- However, the Corfidi et al. (1996) V_{MCS} vector already takes into upwind propagation, so we can substitute this vector in as a component of MCS motion. Henceforth, we will call the ' V_{MCS} ' vector ' V_{upwind} '.

• Again, the components of MCS forward motion are additive, so we add V_{CL} and V_{upwind} to get $V_{downwind}$. As such,

• Again, the components of MCS forward motion are additive, so we add V_{CL} and V_{upwind} to get $V_{downwind}$. As such,



• Again, the components of MCS forward motion are additive, so we add V_{CL} and V_{upwind} to get $V_{downwind}$. As such,



 Again, the components of MCS forward motion are additive, so we add V_{CL} and V_{upwind} to get V_{downwind}. As such,



Where V_{MCS} = V_{Upwind}

 Again, the components of MCS forward motion are additive, so we add V_{CL} and V_{upwind} to get V_{downwind}. As such,



Where V_{MCS} = V_{Upwind}

- Downwind-propagating MCSs are dominated by the cold pool, and derechos are also produced by cold-pool-driven MCSs, which are dominated by internal forcing mechanisms.
- As such, V_{downwind} would be a useful vector for monitoring derecho progression.
- Note that $V_{downwind}$ is a longer vector than V_{CL} .



MCSs moving faster than the mean wind speed is an excellent discriminator between cold-pool-driven MCSs and their squall line counterparts.



Note: Cold-pool-driven MCSs and strongly forced squall lines both have degrees of internal and external forcing (i.e. a level of contribution from the cold pool

The argument is that to define derechos as a distinct phenomena, internal forcing mechanisms must dominate, which is defined by the MCS moving faster than the full mean wind speed.

References

- Corfidi, S. F., 2003: Cold pools and MCS propagation: Forecasting the motion of downwind-developing MCSs. Wea. Forecasting, 18, 997–1017, <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0434(2003)018<0997:CPAMPF>2.0.CO;2</u>.
- Corfidi, S. F., Merritt J. H., and Fritsch J. M., 1996: Predicting the movement of mesoscale convective complexes. Wea. Forecasting, 11, 41–46. <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0434(1996)011<0041:PTMOMC>2.0.CO;2</u>.
- Houze, R. A., 2018: 100 years of research on mesoscale convective systems. A Century of Progress in Atmospheric and Related Sciences: Celebrating the American Meteorological Society Centennial, Meteor. Monogr., No. 59, Amer. Meteor. Soc., <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/AMSMONOGRAPHS-D-18-0001.1</u>.
- Parker, M. D., and R. H. Johnson, 2000: Organizational modes of midlatitude mesoscale convective systems. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 128, 3413–3436, <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2001)129<3413:OMOMMC>2.0.CO;2</u>.