Transition Periods in the Diurnally-Varying Atmospheric Boundary Layer Over Land

Wayne Angevine, John Edwards, Marie Lothon, Margaret Lemone, Simon
Osborne

► To cite this version:

Wayne Angevine, John Edwards, Marie Lothon, Margaret Lemone, Simon Osborne. Transition Periods in the Diurnally-Varying Atmospheric Boundary Layer Over Land. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 2020, 177 (2-3), pp.205-223. 10.1007/s10546-020-00515-y . hal-03036402

HAL Id: hal-03036402

<https://hal.science/hal-03036402>

Submitted on 14 Dec 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Transition Periods in the Diurnally-Varying Atmospheric Boundary Layer Over Land

Wayne M. Angevine*

CIRES, University of Colorado, and NOAA Chemical Sciences Division, Boulder, Colorado USA.

E-mail:Wayne.M.Angevine@noaa.gov

John M. Edwards

Met Office, Exeter, UK

Marie Lothon

Laboratoire d'Aérologie, University of Toulouse, CNRS, UPS, Toulouse, France

Margaret A. LeMone

National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado USA

Simon R. Osborne

Met Office, Cardington, UK

Abstract

The atmospheric boundary layer undergoes transitions between stable and convective states. Over land, in undisturbed conditions, these transitions occur daily in the morning and late afternoon or early evening. Though less well studied and presenting more challenges than the fully stable and

fully convective states, such transitions have been the subject of growing interest over the last few decades. During transitions, all forcings are weak, and few simplifications are possible. Factors such as terrain, radiation, advection, and subsidence can seldom be safely neglected. In this paper, we review research on transitions over recent decades, with an emphasis on work published in *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*. The review is brief and inevitably reflects the interests and views of the authors.

Keywords Afternoon transition · Evening transition · Morning transition · Boundary-layer field studies · Boundary-layer simulation

1 Introduction

Over land under clear skies and in the absence of any synoptic disturbance, the atmospheric boundary layer (ABL) is often deep and strongly turbulent during the day, shallow and weakly turbulent at night. In between, the ABL undergoes morning and afternoon/evening transitions. Those transitions have been the subject of considerable research in the last 25 years, much of which has been published in *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*. Figure 1 is a schematic showing a large-eddy simulation (LES) of the diurnal cycle of an idealized mid-latitude ABL, see the caption for more details. Shown are the times of sunrise, crossover (change of sign of the surface buoyancy flux), onset of convective turbulence at a height of 200 m, rising of the entrainment zone and growth of the mixed layer during the day, cessation of growth and eventual shrinkage during the afternoon, and the times of crossover and sunset during the evening transition, followed by the growth of the stable boundary layer (SBL), and the subsidence of the capping inversion overnight. These features are discussed in more detail below. We do not provide precise definitions of the transitions because they themselves evolve through the literature reviewed. Each section addresses definitions as appropriate.

47 Motivations for the study of transitions are various. For air-quality forecasts and analyses, the
48 timing of changes in the depth of mixing with respect to time-varying emissions is important. The
49 evening transition is key to the evolution of the low-level jet (Smith et al. 2019), which often
50 influences severe weather. Fog and frost forecasting depend on understanding the evening
51 transition (Boutle et al. 2018; Price 2019).

Fig. 1 A schematic illustration of the diurnal cycle of the ABL derived from a large-eddy simulation. **a** The evolution of the vertical gradient of the horizontally-averaged potential temperature, θ , with height above the surface. Vertical white lines indicate the times of sunrise, crossover and onset during the morning transition, while vertical black lines show the times of crossover and sunset during the evening transition. The light grey line marks the top of the stable

boundary layer, defined as the height at which the linearly-extrapolated horizontally-averaged buoyancy flux becomes zero. The dashed magenta line marks the height of the elevated maximum of the gradient of θ . The crimson dashed line indicates the height of the minimum of the buoyancy flux during the period when the boundary layer is unstable. Crimson dotted lines mark the upper and lower boundaries of the entrainment zone during the same period, the former defined as the lowest height above that of the minimum of the buoyancy flux at which the absolute value of the buoyancy flux first falls below 5% of the surface value, and the latter as the lowest height at which the buoyancy flux changes sign. The figure also shows the rising of the entrainment zone through the morning, the development of the well-mixed layer, and, after the evening transition, the development of the nocturnal stable boundary layer, the radiative stabilization of the residual layer, and the subsidence of the capping inversion. **b** The evolution of the net downward shortwave flux at the surface (left axis) and the surface buoyancy flux (right axis). **c** The evolution of the square root of the variance of the vertical velocity with height. Lines as in **a** and also showing the pre-residual layer.

Transitions are complex because many processes are roughly equally important, and the simplifications and approximations that work well for the fully convective or the fully stable boundary layer do not apply. In budget analyses, more terms must be retained, often including direct radiative heating of the air, mixing due to shear, and advection. Stationarity may not apply. Full descriptions of the surface energy balance and of the energy balance at the top of the ABL are not included in this review, reflecting the contents of the literature we are considering.

Most of our increased understanding of the transition periods has been enabled by ground-based remote sensing measurements (Wilczak et al. 1996), since measurements at the surface provide only a limited perspective. The ability to view continuously the full depth of the boundary layer and especially its upper region is critical to understanding transitions. Traditional tall-tower measurements and observations taken by aircraft have also contributed.

While this should not be mistaken for a full description of the diverse possibilities, considering the diurnal cycle is an improvement over looking only at the fully convective and fully stable states. Throughout this review, we remain mindful of ways in which the real atmosphere frequently departs from the idealization. Horizontal inhomogeneity of the surface, land use, soil and vegetation properties has strong impacts. Coasts create land and sea breezes. Terrain induces mountain and valley breeze systems. The daytime ABL is not always strongly turbulent, and the nocturnal boundary layer is not always shallow.

The depth of the boundary layer is an ambiguous but important variable in discussions of the ABL in general and transition periods in particular. When the convective boundary layer (CBL) is topped by a well-defined increase in virtual potential temperature, its depth is fairly precisely measured by any of several definitions (e.g. turbulence intensity, virtual-temperature profile, virtual-temperature-flux profiles, or Richardson number) (LeMone et al. 2013). The depth of the stable boundary layer is fundamentally more difficult to define, since the turbulence-intensity profile may have a variety of shapes. Clouds add another level of complexity. Measurements of the depth of an aerosol layer, for example by lidar, can be useful but must be carefully examined to avoid mistaking the residual layer for the current boundary layer (Hogan et al. 2009; Tucker et al. 2009). The preferred technique is to measure the profile of vertical velocity variance, but this approach can produce ambiguous results because of gravity waves near the boundary-layer top (Lothon et al. 2009). Whether the ABL is stable or convective, some definitions can be readily derived from NWP or LES model output, but rarely or with difficulty in observations. Throughout this review, we will use the terms “boundary-layer depth” and “boundary-layer top” as if they were well-defined, without tediously acknowledging all of this complexity every time the term comes up.

The review proceeds as follows: First, the morning and afternoon/evening transitions as seen in observations are described in Sects. 2 and 3. In Sect. 4, key processes involved are discussed, including entrainment, radiation, advection and subsidence, length and time scales, and clouds. Sections 5 and 6 describe the current understanding provided by LES and mesoscale numerical weather prediction (NWP) models respectively, and the challenges that continue to arise in the modelling of the diurnal cycle. Finally, we provide an outlook and thoughts on needs for ongoing research.

2 The Morning Transition in Observations

The role of mixing from above the near-surface layer relative to heating from the surface was an important question in early research on the morning transition. Data from the Cabauw tower in the Netherlands were used by Driedonks (1982) to test analytical models of the early-morning boundary-layer growth. He recognized that entrainment was important in many cases, and his preferred model included a term proportional to the surface stress, based on theory provided by Tennekes (1973). Aircraft data in Australia were used by Coulman (1978) to test predictions of morning boundary-layer growth, with mixed results. He found that entrainment was probably important, and that estimating some parameters with sufficient precision was not always possible, particularly the inversion temperature gradient. Several expressions were provided by Garratt (1992) along with a useful figure showing the change in potential-temperature profile for a transition driven by surface heating vs. shear. A large dataset was examined by Angevine et al. (2001) using data from the Cabauw tower (van Ulden et al. 1996) and radar wind-profiler data from the Cabauw site and from the Flatland (Bondville, Illinois) site (Angevine et al. 1998). They defined two milestones in course of the transition, “crossover” (when the surface buoyancy flux first becomes positive) and “onset” (when convective turbulence is first detected at 200 m above

the ground). Sunrise was used as a reference time (Fig. 1). The most interesting discovery from this study was that the time required to erode the stable layer from below, using the measured heat flux and ignoring entrainment, was much longer than the time over which the layer was actually eroded. In other words, the surface heat flux was insufficient to warm the stable layer in the observed time. The conclusion was, and remains, that much of the warming arises from entrainment at the top of the eroding stable layer. The data showed a situation more like Garratt's Fig. 6.7b for a shear-driven transition. This was foreshadowed by Wyngaard (1983) in a brief remark indicating that only a small heat flux was required to switch from a stable to a convective layer.

We must caution that the definition of entrainment used in the above papers is imprecise. Formally, entrainment is "The process by which turbulent fluid within a mixed layer incorporates adjacent fluid that is nonturbulent, or much less turbulent." (American Meteorological Society *Glossary of Meteorology*). However, in the context of the morning transition, within a statically stable layer, the turbulent state of the air at each level is often not known. Some of the air that is mixed to produce a near-neutrally-stratified layer may already have been turbulent and therefore formally part of the boundary layer. The unknown turbulent state makes the formal definition difficult to apply rigorously.

It should be noted that the measurements used by Angevine et al. (2001) were influenced by a general effort in previous years to understand and exploit the capabilities of ground-based remote sensing instruments (e.g. (Angevine et al. 1994; Beyrich et al. 1995; Carter et al. 1995).

A six-year dataset from the rural research site at Cardington in central England was used by Lapworth (2006) to examine the morning and evening transitions, with an emphasis on wind speed and forecasting rules. He confirmed the finding that most of the warming during the morning

transition was due to mixing from above. Before crossover, the warming is better described as eddy diffusion rather than entrainment, since the boundary-layer top may not be rising. The near-surface air temperature is controlled by the balance between radiative cooling and turbulent mixing, which, under weak to moderate stability, is continuous. As the radiative cooling decreases, the turbulent heat flux from above warms the near-surface layer, before the surface heat flux becomes positive (upward).

Figure 2 shows observed soundings during a morning transition at Cardington. Entrainment is evidenced by cooling in the upper part of the growing boundary layer in the progression of observed soundings, especially between 0400 and 0700 UTC for example. Profiles from an operational NWP model are also shown. The simulated boundary layer is consistently too cool and too shallow, probably because of insufficient entrainment. Advection is important in most individual cases, but is not observed, so attribution of the changes in profiles due to entrainment is suggestive rather than conclusive; see Angevine et al. (2001) for more cases and discussion of their variations.

An interesting feature of the morning transition is a peak in the time series of near-surface specific humidity that is sometimes observed, e.g. (LeMone et al. 2002). When transpiration by vegetation becomes significant while the mixed layer is still shallow, the humidity may exhibit a local maximum, and then decline when the mixed layer grows. The morning peak is not seen in the Flatland or Cabauw data of Angevine et al. (2001), but was seen at Cabauw on the day used by Holtslag et al. (1995), and seems therefore to depend on the season and vegetation type. This has been further studied for the afternoon/evening transition by Blumberg et al. (2019).

It is notable that multi-day averages are necessary to make understandable behaviour emerge from data. Individual days exhibit a wide range of behaviour, dominated by advection, which is hardly

ever negligible (Baas et al. 2010), but sometimes averages out over multiple days (Betts et al. 1996). Even mild terrain can produce phenomena that overwhelm column-wise analyses, as was found by Lenschow et al. (1979). Some influence of heterogeneity cannot be ruled out in the Flatland and Cabauw cases, although the Flatland site in particular is extremely uniform for a land site.

Further development of observational equipment and techniques continues to add to our knowledge of the morning transition. Wildmann et al. (2015) conducted a study with a small remotely-piloted aircraft, emphasizing the scaling behaviour of variances compared with theory, and they include a thorough discussion of uncertainties and challenges.

3 Afternoon and Evening Transition in Observations

From a surface perspective, the boundary layer changes from unstable to stable in the “evening,” some time near sunset, but looking at the boundary-layer top, changes happen much earlier in the day. This has led to a lack of clarity and consensus in terminology. In this review, we refer to the afternoon or evening transition according to the terms used by the cited papers. Many of these terms are illustrated in Fig. 1. In general, “afternoon transition” denotes the period when the surface buoyancy flux decreases (from midday to sunset), and “evening transition” refers to the period near sunset including the change of sign of the surface buoyancy flux. A sunset-relative frame of reference was used by Wingo et al. (2015). In complex terrain, local sunset is a key time, especially when slopes are steep (Nadeau et al. 2011). In Fig. 1, we have indicated sunset and crossover, newly defined here for the evening transition as the time when the surface buoyancy flux changes sign from upward to downward, the opposite of morning crossover.

Mahrt (1981) made an early observational study of the “early evening” transition based on data from the Wangara (Australia) study, emphasizing the behavior of the wind and the low-level jet. Mahrt observed that the wind changes began well before sunset. Many studies of the evening transition consider slightly or moderately complex terrain. Acevedo et al. (2001) and Mahrt (2017) emphasized the evolution of temperature and wind through three phases. The cooling is small at the start (before zero flux), greater in the second phase (around zero net radiation), and decreases again after sunset. The wind decelerates, changes to calm or local drainage, and evolves toward regional drainage or synoptic flow, as also shown by LeMone et al. (2003), Busse et al. (2012), Román-Cascón et al. (2015), and Nilsson et al. (2016a). Those phases all depend on the characteristics of the studied sites. A peak in the time series of specific humidity may also be present, and is dependent on the season, location, and crop behavior (Blumberg et al. 2019).

Recent works have highlighted new features like the counter-gradient flux (Blay-Carreras et al. 2014a), caused by a delay between the times when the surface flux changes sign and when the temperature gradient changes sign.. It has been shown to be partly related to the eddy turnover time, and dependent on the vegetation cover and height (Jensen et al. 2016). Also the lifted temperature minimum is worth mentioning (Blay-Carreras et al. 2015), that is, a minimum of temperature at 0.1-1 m above the surface.

A detailed study by Grant (1997) used data from tethered balloon equipment at the Cardington site to describe the latter part of the transition period, after the surface buoyancy flux had changed to negative (downward). Grant showed profiles and spectra to explore the applicability of proposed scaling frameworks during the evening transition. Further data from the same site and similar equipment were used by Edwards et al. (2006). Observations of turbulent kinetic energy near the surface were used by Nadeau et al. (2011), who fitted a simple analytical model which

215 approximately showed a t^{-2} power-law decay of turbulent kinetic energy (TKE) early in the
216 transition, and t^{-6} later (t being time).

217 Observations through the depth of the boundary layer in the afternoon and evening were rare until
218 ground-based remote sensing instruments became available. The first full analysis was undertaken
219 by Grimsdell et al. (2002) using wind-profiling radar observations in conjunction with surface-flux
220 measurements. They found that the height of the boundary layer decreases in the afternoon,
221 starting some hours before sunset. The explanation is this: as solar heating of the surface begins to
222 decline, and the air continues to warm, thermals become less vigorous. Since the bulk of the
223 boundary layer is roughly adiabatic, the weaker thermals can still reach the boundary-layer top at
224 first. Meanwhile, several other processes are at work, and all of these tend to reduce the height of
225 thermals. Subsidence directly lowers the boundary-layer top. Subsidence, shear-driven
226 entrainment, and direct radiative heating all act to stabilize the upper part of the boundary layer. In
227 the case of subsidence, regime selection is at work: If large-scale upward motion is present, clouds
228 and precipitation often form, and these days are seldom considered for further case study analysis.
229 Direct measures of turbulence show the decreasing top height, while indirect measures, particularly
230 aerosol layer height, may not. Since the boundary layer is defined as being in recent contact with
231 the surface (Stull 1988; LeMone et al. 2019), the direct turbulence measurement is preferred
232 (Tucker et al. 2009; Barlow et al. 2011; Harvey et al. 2013; Manninen et al. 2018).

233 Lidar observations of the boundary layer over London, UK covering several full diurnal cycles
234 were published by Barlow et al. (2011). The urban boundary layer has additional complexity not
235 seen in simpler situations, but some of its characteristics are similar. Long lidar datasets from two
236 sites were analyzed by Manninen et al. (2018).

The Boundary Layer Late Afternoon and Sunset Turbulence (BLLAST) field study was focused on these transitions. It provided a comprehensive set of measurements by all types of instruments and platforms. Unlike most earlier studies, the BLLAST study embraced the challenge of complex terrain and heterogeneous land use. Lothon et al. (2014) provides an overview, early results, and a rich bibliography. The project started with careful definitions, and in addition to measurements, incorporated theory and modelling. Frequent and continuous observations through the whole depth of the boundary layer allowed more complete analysis than had previously been possible. The decay of TKE in a vertically resolved sense, and the ways in which turbulent length scales change, were particular foci.

In terms of the scaling of turbulence within the boundary layer, the BLLAST study results from aircraft (Lothon et al. 2014; Darbieu et al. 2015) and near-surface measurements (Nilsson et al. 2016a; Nilsson et al. 2016b) indicated that statistics of turbulence on days with weak shear are quasi-stationary until late afternoon. Shear delays the decay, or even prevents decay if strong enough (Pino et al. 2006). While the decay remains slow enough for statistics to be quasi-stationary, the turbulence structure does not evolve substantially, and remains scaled with the boundary-layer depth. Later in the afternoon, the decay accelerates and the turbulence structure departs from CBL scaling. The decay was found to start from the top (Darbieu et al. 2015), although this strongly depends on the shear at surface and at boundary layer top. Consistent with this, Nilsson et al. (2016b) used a simple model to identify a region of reduced turbulence that appears earlier in the upper part of the boundary layer, before the stable layer develops, and expands downward with time. They described this as a “pre-residual” layer. Scaling by the buoyancy flux clearly becomes questionable as it approaches zero.

4 Processes of Boundary-Layer Transitions

The afternoon transition is nearly unforced; all contributing processes are weak. The morning transition is forced by the rising sun, but this forcing is surprisingly weak as well. Many processes influence the boundary layer through the diurnal cycle, and the key challenge to understanding is the need to include all relevant processes. Turbulent eddy sizes and time scales change. Entrainment at the boundary-layer top and mixing of entrained air play important roles. Advection is almost always important when examining individual days and hours, and is difficult to estimate. Direct radiative heating or cooling of the air (as opposed to heating or cooling of the surface) is often small, but cannot be safely neglected during transitions. When fluxes or turbulent energy are changing rapidly, methods of analysis that neglect time rates of change may fail. Clouds may affect the profiles of mean and turbulent quantities, especially near the top of the boundary layer. This section describes these processes in more detail.

4.1 Eddy Length and Time Scales

Time scales are fundamental to transitions, in fact to the idea of transition itself. Some relevant time scales include the eddy turnover time, the time required for the boundary-layer height to change by a given fraction, and the time required for the surface buoyancy flux to change by a given fraction (or to reverse sign). Around midday, the eddy turnover time (10–20 min) is much shorter than the time scale of the evolution of the boundary-layer height, which changes only slowly. In the morning growth phase, however, the boundary layer may grow as rapidly as a thermal rises (Sorbjan 1997).

The time scale for turbulence to decay is important in the afternoon and evening, and depends on the eddy size (Pino et al. 2006; Lothon et al. 2014). Larger eddies decay more slowly, leading to an effective increase in the length scale above the surface layer.

The impact of variation in surface fluxes on time scales in the CBL was explored by Van Driel et al. (2011) in an idealized framework. They made several interesting findings: the time scale for changes in the boundary-layer depth is very long, of order 10 h, because it is controlled by the entrainment velocity. A phase lag between the changing surface flux and the mixed-layer height is due to these differing time scales. For rapidly varying fluxes, the production and dissipation of TKE become important. Their simulations included subsidence and radiative cooling specifically tuned to produce a steady boundary-layer depth and temperature. The application of these results to transitions is challenging, because, for example, the entrainment velocity during the morning transition can be very large (shortening the time scale). . Subsidence and other processes that are roughly in balance at midday, allowing the boundary-layer depth to remain approximately constant, become unbalanced when the surface flux permanently weakens in the afternoon, resulting in rapid changes of the boundary-layer depth. Nonetheless, the concept of competing time scales and transfer functions introduced by Van Driel et al. (2011) is a promising framework for future exploration.

Another important time scale from a practical point of view is the averaging time required in processing turbulence measurements, whether from a sonic anemometer or a remote sensor. If important changes happen during the averaging time, the measurements are hard to interpret (Mahrt 1981; Grant 1997). On the other hand, averaging over too short a time gives noisy and excessively uncertain results, and can lead to systematic underestimation of fluxes.

Length scales and their variation are also vital to understanding boundary-layer behaviour. With the dataset from the BLLAST study, Darbieu et al. (2015) found that the length scales of turbulence remain scaled with the boundary-layer depth until late afternoon (more precisely until about 0.75 times the decay-forcing time scale). Later, they observed a sharp decrease of the length scale in the

305 surface layer, and an increase of the length scale above. The changes occurred first at the top of the
306 boundary layer, although this depends on shear.

307 4.2 Entrainment

308 As described in sections 2 and 3 above and sections 5 and 6 below, entrainment at the boundary-
309 layer top is critical to the transitions. In the morning, most of the warming during the transition is
310 due to mixing from above, either from within the upper part of the boundary layer or from
311 entrainment. In the afternoon, entrainment is one of the processes that causes warming in the upper
312 part of the boundary layer and thereby reduces the depth of mixing. Entrainment is a complex
313 topic that deserves a whole review by itself; see Angevine (2008) for further discussion and
314 references. It is particularly worth noting that entrainment relationships depend strongly on the
315 interpretive framework, e.g. Liu et al. (2017). Figure 2 shows the importance of entrainment in the
316 morning transition, and insufficient entrainment appears to be the cause of the cool and shallow
317 bias in the morning boundary layer in the UKV NWP model.

Fig. 2 Profiles of potential temperature at the Cardington field site during the clear-sky morning of 19 July 2016.

Radiosonde ascents launched on each hour are shown as solid lines, together with tower sensors (square points) at 2 m, 10 m, 25 m and 50 m; horizontal bars on the mast data show variations of ± 5 mins centred on each hour. Model data (dotted lines) are the instantaneous hourly forecast profiles from the Met Office UKV operational 1.5 km grid spacing model, initialized at 0300 UTC.

A nearly adiabatic residual layer often exists above the nocturnal boundary layer. In the morning, when the growing boundary layer reaches the base of the residual layer, its growth rate increases until the residual-layer top is reached (Deardorff 1974; Sorbjan 1996; Blay-Carreras et al. 2014b). It is useful to note, however, that the residual layer is not simply the remains of the previous day's mixed layer at the same location; because of differential advection, the mixed layer found in the morning above a certain site was likely formed somewhere else.

4.3 Advection and Subsidence

Experience with setting up cases for single-column model (SCM) and LES comparisons has shown that advection is rarely negligible, even at nearly ideal sites. Measurements of advection are difficult or impossible. The best that can be done is to estimate advection terms from observations at levels that are thought not to be affected by turbulent mixing, or to use output from mesoscale models (Barr et al. 1997; Angevine 1999). Estimates of subsidence are at least as problematic. Efforts involving many dropsondes have succeeded in producing subsidence measurements for the simplest possible situation over water (Bony et al. 2018). It should be noted, however, that comparisons between LES and other types of models using the same forcings are not subject to these uncertainties.

Baas et al. (2010) discuss the issue of specifying forcing (advection) for SCM studies. They demonstrate strong impacts on the formation of the low-level jet (an evening-transition issue) from different plausible specifications of advection. These differences make it difficult to determine which vertical mixing formulation is best. They also show that a composite case, constructed by averaging several similar cases, removes some of the “noise” and allows for clearer conclusions. Different choices of forcing, all from plausible sources, had a strong impact on shallow cumulus simulations shown by Angevine et al. (2018). Averaging over many cases was done by Angevine et al. (2001) to understand the morning transition. Systematic advection can mislead the analyst despite averaging. For example, in the central United States, the prevailing wind direction is southerly (warm and moist) in summer and northerly in winter, so advection cannot be expected to average out within a season.

The effects of subsidence (Blay-Carreras et al. 2014b) and advection (Pietersen et al. 2015) were studied for some BLLAST cases. At the BLLAST site, there was a persistent diurnal pattern of

subsidence, induced by the nearby mountain range and accentuated by moist convection over the mountains.

4.4 Radiation

Vertical turbulent heat fluxes driven by net radiation at the surface play a substantial role in the diurnal evolution of the boundary layer, but direct atmospheric radiative heating is also relevant. Radiative cooling at cloud top can generate turbulence and affect the entrainment rate (Stevens 2002; de Lozar et al. 2015). Clear-sky radiative processes have received less attention, but can play a significant role in transitions. Longwave radiative cooling erodes the capping inversion and accelerates the growth of the boundary layer through the morning transition (Edwards et al. 2014). Radiative cooling near the surface during the evening transition stabilizes the developing stable boundary layer and suppresses turbulence (Garratt et al. 1981; Ha et al. 2003). In near-calm conditions radiation can be the dominant process determining the temperature profile (Savijarvi 2006; Edwards 2009). Longwave radiative cooling rates vary on short length scales near the surface, so poor vertical resolution can produce incorrect results in either observations or models (Ha et al. 2003; Edwards 2009; Steeneveld et al. 2010).

Aerosols in the boundary layer may have large effects on radiative heating or cooling when the aerosol loading is significant or the aerosols are strongly absorbing. Aerosol layers within or above the boundary layer reduce the net radiation reaching the surface (Barbaro et al. 2014; Liu et al. 2019), thereby affecting transition timing. Aerosols within the boundary layer or the residual layer can directly heat those layers enough to affect timing as well. The effects are complex and subtle because the sun is low in the sky during transitions. Barbaro et al. (2014) give a detailed discussion of these effects, supported by model studies of two observed cases.

375 4.5 Clouds

376 Clouds are very common at the top of the boundary layer. The University of Washington Cloud
377 Atlas (<https://atmos.uw.edu/CloudMap/index.html>; accessed 15 March 2019) shows that 26% of
378 land and 55% of the oceans is covered with low cloud on an annual average basis. Most of these
379 clouds are in the boundary layer. Nonetheless, strongly cloud-influenced conditions are commonly
380 avoided or selected against in boundary-layer field research. During the morning transition,
381 Angevine et al. (2001) noted that the most extreme day-to-day variations in timing were found on
382 days with cloud. In their data from the Flatland site, cloud-free days showed more rapid increases
383 in temperature than cloudy days, but no systematic differences were found between cloud-free and
384 cloud-influenced days at Cabauw. In the afternoon, Grimsdell et al. (2002) found little systematic
385 influence of clouds. Over water, where the diurnal cycle is damped, Pennell et al. (1974) and
386 LeMone (1978) found little influence of clouds on subcloud-layer TKE budgets. Brown et al.
387 (2002) found that subcloud-layer buoyancy-flux profiles were insensitive to cloud cover. In all of
388 these analyses, regime selection probably prevented strong cloud influences.

389 An interesting and complex but not uncommon case is presented by Hogan et al. (2009). A thin
390 stratocumulus layer in the early morning is replaced by a convective boundary layer with shallow
391 cumulus. Radiative cooling in the stratocumulus layer produces mixing, which must affect the
392 timing of the morning transition. Similar cases probably arise commonly, and deserve further
393 exploration. Clouds and their effects are also seen in the data of Harvey et al. (2013) and
394 Manninen et al. (2018).

395 5 Transitions in large-eddy simulations and direct numerical simulations

396 Large-eddy simulations of transitions are challenging because they require both fine resolution and
397 large domains, and are thus computationally expensive (Beare 2008). Several LES studies of
398 transitions have been done, however. Beare (2008) produced simulations of the morning transition
399 by starting with a small, finely resolved domain and expanding to a larger, more coarsely resolved
400 domain partway through the transition. These simulations started at the time of heat-flux
401 crossover, so they describe the late phase of the transition. Beare found a shallow convective
402 boundary layer with penetrating, entraining updrafts under the remnant stable layer, which he
403 named the “mixed CBL-SBL state”. The morning transition in the third GEWEX Atmospheric
404 Boundary Layer Studies (GABLS3) case was simulated by Edwards et al. (2014), who
405 demonstrated the effect of radiation in weakening the capping inversion, thus accelerating the
406 growth of the CBL.

407 Evening-transition LESs have a longer history. It seems to have been assumed that the resolution
408 suitable for convective boundary layers was also sufficient to represent the transition. Nieuwstadt
409 et al. (1986) used an abrupt cut-off of the surface heat flux. Sorbjan (1997) introduced and showed
410 the importance of a smoother reduction, which introduces a second timescale. Pino et al. (2006)
411 used LES to show that horizontal length scales become larger during the afternoon transition. Beare
412 et al. (2006) may have been the first to simulate the evening transition at fine resolution, with more
413 realistic fluxes. Early simulations had simplified representations of non-turbulent processes such
414 as radiation, which was shown to be important in light winds by Edwards (2009). Few LES models
415 have an interactive land surface, and the choice of surface boundary condition (flux or temperature)
416 has been controversial. Details of initialization and forcing were found to be important, e.g. Kumar
417 et al. (2010). Observed surface temperature was used by Rizza et al. (2013) to study the evening
418 transition, and they found TKE-decay power-law exponents of -2 early and -6 late in the

419 transition, similar to those observed by Nadeau et al. (2011). El Guernaoui et al. (2019) explored
420 the TKE decay in the context of interacting time scales.

421 Both morning and afternoon transitions were simulated by Conzemius et al. (2008) for one day in
422 Oklahoma. In their LES model, they simulated very large relative contributions of shear-driven
423 entrainment to the total warming during the morning and afternoon. These are caused by the
424 realistic nature of the case. Profiles and TKE budgets are shown. Basu et al. (2008) simulated a
425 diurnal cycle from Wangara, emphasizing the low-level jet that appeared after the evening
426 transition. Their evening transition was abrupt, probably due to the lack of radiation and/or
427 subsidence in their setup. Full diurnal cycles were also simulated by Sharma et al. (2017), again
428 finding an abrupt evening transition without a representation of radiation and with no subsidence.
429 Both morning and evening transitions were included in the LES of Blay-Carreras et al. (2014b),
430 who emphasized the importance of the profiles above the growing boundary layer in the morning
431 and the forcing by subsidence in the afternoon. Darbieu et al. (2015) used a BLLAST case to set
432 the surface flux and initial conditions, and NWP model outputs to account for total advection
433 (including subsidence). Although the amount of TKE was different than in observations, and the
434 real conditions were much more complex than in the LES, the way that the TKE and the turbulence
435 structure evolved were very similar to the observations, showing a certain universality of the decay,
436 well reproduced by LES.

437 Figure 1 illustrates the evolving sophistication of coupled LES models. It was performed using the
438 large-eddy Met Office-NERC Cloud model (MONC) (Brown et al. 2015) coupled to the Joint UK
439 Land Environment Simulator (JULES) land-surface model (Best et al. 2011) and the Suite of
440 Community Radiative Transfer codes based on Edwards and Slingo (SOCRATES) radiation code
441 (Manners et al. 2015). The specifications of the simulation were chosen for visual clarity in the

figure. The latitude was set as 57° N and a geostrophic wind speed of 8 m s^{-1} was prescribed. The land surface was specified as short grass and the initial atmospheric profiles of temperature and specific humidity were chosen to avoid the formation of cloud. The period shown begins on 2 March.

Direct numerical simulation (DNS) has recently become practical for application to atmospheric problems. Mellado et al. (2016) simulated a free-encroachment case relevant to the late morning transition. Fedorovich et al. (2017) performed DNS simulations relevant to the formation of the low-level jet at the end of the evening transition.

6 Transitions in Mesoscale Numerical Models

Operational NWP models simulate transitions and the diurnal cycle regularly over large areas. These models inherently simulate subsidence and advection. Radiation, boundary-layer physics, clouds, and interaction of the atmosphere with the surface are parametrized. Climate-model simulations likewise include many diurnal cycles under all kinds of conditions. However, research specifically targeting transitions in mesoscale models is relatively rare in the literature. The GEWEX Atmospheric Boundary Layer Study (GABLS) is a long-running project to improve the simulation of the boundary layer in models and has proceeded through increasingly realistic intercomparisons. Two of the three GABLS studies looked at diurnal cycles over land, and provide the most complete view of mesoscale model performance during the transitions. The results show considerable room for improvement. An overview of GABLS is given by Holtslag et al. (2013).

For GABLS2, Svensson et al. (2011) simulated a diurnal cycle from the CASES-99 experiment in Kansas, USA. Many single-column models participated. Their behaviour during the transitions was diverse. One conclusion was that choosing the most realistic or most useful boundary

conditions and forcings is both difficult and critical. Specified surface temperatures were used as the bottom boundary condition, and it became clear that the fluxes produced by the different models for the same atmospheric and surface temperatures diverged. Heat flux during the morning transition was too small and the boundary layer grew too slowly. This may have been due to too little entrainment (see above), which also led to wind speeds that were too low. Different kinds of boundary-layer scheme in the models had different kinds of errors, but no type of scheme was clearly better for the whole diurnal cycle.

The GABLS3 study (Bosveld et al. 2014) benefited from the lessons learned in GABLS2. The case was derived from measurements at Cabauw, The Netherlands. The single-column models included land-surface and radiation modules, removing the need for specified lower boundary conditions. Several of the conclusions of GABLS3 involved the land-surface formulations, which dominated the transitions and stable boundary-layer behaviour. Another important conclusion was the importance of longwave radiation from within the stable boundary layer (see above). Evening-transition timing varied by 1.5 h among the models. In the morning, the simulated time of crossover from downward to upward surface flux varied by 2 hours between models, and the interval from crossover to onset of turbulence at 200 m was about half an hour too long.

Using a single-column model, Edwards et al. (2006) simulated two evening-transition cases, as observed at Cardington. Observed surface temperature was prescribed to the model as a lower boundary condition. They emphasized the importance of specifying realistic advection. In both cases, the simulated boundary layer was too shallow during the transition. They found limited sensitivity to the resolution or the parameterization of turbulence in the stable boundary layer. At the moderate wind speeds in these cases, longwave radiative cooling was a significant, but not the dominant process in the development of the nocturnal boundary layer. Edwards (2009) described a

487 case of very light winds (about 1 m s^{-1}) and strong surface cooling and showed that radiative
488 cooling to the surface was the dominant process determining the evolution of the near-surface air
489 temperature through the transition. It was noted that the assumptions underlying standard surface-
490 layer similarity theory failed during the transition, leading to cold biases in operational forecasts in
491 such conditions.

492 Extensive observations of temperature profiles were examined by van Hooijdonk et al. (2017) to
493 study the growth rate of the surface-based temperature inversion, and compared with bulk and
494 single-column models of varying complexity. They found that the simplest models could not
495 reproduce the observations, because history effects were important. This reinforces the idea that
496 the boundary layer is not in equilibrium during some parts of the evening transition.

497 Mesoscale modelling for the BLLAST campaign also pointed out the importance of the land
498 surface. Lothon et al. (2014) and Couvreux et al. (2016) found variations of the vegetation among
499 different measurement sites to be an important contribution to variations in afternoon transition
500 timing. Angevine et al. (2014) devised a technique for making soil moisture match a limited-area
501 model better to produce more realistic simulations. Couvreux et al. (2016) found that a finer-
502 resolution NWP model (around 2 km grid spacing) resolves the vertical structures better than the
503 coarser models (around 10 km), in particular a well-defined maximum of the water-vapour mixing
504 ratio that arises during the evening in the upper part of the residual layer due to fine-scale
505 advection. The finer- resolution model also provides a good simulation of the diurnal variability of
506 the turbulent kinetic energy, including its late afternoon decay, while the coarser model still shows
507 the right order of magnitude.

508 **Fig. 3** (Top) surface and minimum sensible heat flux from a single-column simulation with the TEMF scheme and two
 509 LES models for 6 June 2015 at the ARM SGP site in Oklahoma. Potential temperature flux is shown for SCM and
 510 LES1, virtual potential temperature flux for LES2. See text for details. (Bottom) Ratio of minimum flux to surface
 511 flux, one way of calculating the entrainment ratio.

Diagnosing entrainment in mesoscale or NWP models is difficult because they rarely produce flux-profile output by default. One exception is the Total Energy Mass Flux (TEMF) boundary-layer scheme available in the Weather Research and Forecast model (WRF) (Angevine et al. 2018). Figure 3 shows the diurnal cycle of the surface kinematic heat flux and the minimum flux in the profile within the boundary layer for 6 June 2015 at the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Southern Great Plains site in Oklahoma. Along with the single-column model running TEMF, two LESs of that day are also shown. The ratio of entrainment flux to surface flux is commonly used in parameterizations, even though it is strictly applicable only to pure free convection driven from the surface, and different methods of calculation yield different ratios (Conzemius et al. 2006; Liu et al. 2017). With those caveats in mind, the lower portion of Fig. 3 shows the entrainment ratio through the diurnal cycle. TEMF has large ratios of the magnitude of entrainment flux to that of the surface flux early and late in the day, consistent with some of the observational studies. TEMF also has a relatively large ratio in midday. Breaks in the curve are due to limited vertical resolution in the SCM. Both LESs show some of the same tendency to larger ratios in the morning and afternoon transition periods. LES1 is from the U.S. Department of Energy LES Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Symbiotic Simulation and Observation Workflow (LASSO) archive, simulation code 0030 of 6 June 2015 (Gustafson et al. 2016a; Gustafson et al. 2016b). It has a 30-m vertical grid spacing. LES2 was created by Glenn et al. (2019) using the System for Atmospheric Modeling (SAM), with a vertical grid spacing 20 m above 600 m.

7 Outlook and Research Needs

The progress in understanding ABL transitions over land in the last several decades has laid a firm foundation for future research. Much could be learned from better-resolved LES modeling through transitions, including all relevant processes, such as interactive radiation and an interactive ground

surface. These processes are already represented in mesoscale models. Better understanding of cloudy boundary layers could also come from LES, and from mining existing datasets for cases that may have been discarded from previous analyses. Entrainment is still an open topic, especially its variation with wind shear, aerosol, and surface inhomogeneity. Non-column effects, such as terrain, coasts, and surface heterogeneity, must be considered as model grid sizes decrease. The proper representation of transitioning boundary layers in the grey zone or terra incognita (Wyngaard 2004; Efsthathiou et al. 2016) requires exploration. The full energy balance at the surface and at the top of the boundary layer should be taken into account, including soil, canopy, and vegetation contributions to heat and moisture. Evolving measurement techniques can also contribute. Because real transitional boundary layers are influenced by even small surface or terrain variations, multi-scale networks of observations have the most promise to provide useful insight.

Acknowledgements

The editors and referee are thanked for their careful reading and thoughtful comments, which improved the manuscript. M. LeMone is sponsored by NCAR, which is supported by the National Science Foundation.

References

- Acevedo OC, Fitzjarrald DR (2001) The early evening surface-layer transition: Temporal and spatial variability. *J Atmos Sci.* 58(17):2650-2667.
- Angevine WM (1999) Entrainment results including advection and case studies from the Flatland boundary layer experiments. *J Geophys Res.* 104(D26):30947-30963.
- Angevine WM (2008) Transitional, entraining, cloudy, and coastal boundary layers. *Acta Geophys.* 56:2-20 doi:10.2478/s11600-11007-10035-11601.
- Angevine WM, Bazile E, Legain D, Pino D (2014) Land surface spinup for episodic modeling. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 14(4):8165-8172.
- Angevine WM, Grimsdell AW, Hartten LM, Delany AC (1998) The Flatland boundary-layer experiments. *Bull Am Meteorol Soc.* 79:419-431.
- Angevine WM, Klein Baltink H, Bosveld FC (2001) Observations of the morning transition of the convective boundary layer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 101:209-227.

- Angevine WM, Olson J, Kenyon JS, Gustafson WI, Endo S, Sušelj K, Turner DD (2018) Shallow cumulus in WRF parameterizations evaluated against LASSO large-eddy simulations. *Mon Weather Rev.* 146:4303-4322.
- Angevine WM, White AB, Avery SK (1994) Boundary-layer depth and entrainment zone characterization with a boundary-layer profiler. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 68:375-385.
- Baas P, Bosveld FC, Lenderink G, van Meijgaard E, Holtslag AAM (2010) How to design single-column model experiments for comparison with observed nocturnal low-level jets. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 136(648):671-684.
- Barbaro E, de Arellano JV-G, Ouwersloot HG, Schröter JS, Donovan DP, Krol MC (2014) Aerosols in the convective boundary layer: Shortwave radiation effects on the coupled land-atmosphere system. *J Geophys Res Atmos.* 119(10):5845-5863.
- Barlow JF, Dunbar TM, Nemitz EG, Wood CR, Gallagher MW, Davies F, O'Connor EJ, Harrison RM (2011) Boundary layer dynamics over London, UK, as observed using Doppler lidar during REPARTEE-II. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 11:2111-2125.
- Barr AG, Betts AK (1997) Radiosonde boundary-layer budgets above a boreal forest. *J Geophys Res.* 102:29,205-229,212.
- Basu S, Vinuesa J-F, Swift A (2008) Dynamic LES modeling of a diurnal cycle. *J Appl Meteorol Climatol.* 47:1156-1174.
- Beare RJ (2008) The Role of Shear in the Morning Transition Boundary Layer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 129(3):395-410.
- Beare RJ, Edwards JM, Lapworth AJ (2006) Simulation of the observed evening transition and nocturnal boundary layers: Large-eddy simulation. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 132:81-99.
- Best MJ, Pryor M, Clark DB, Rooney GG, Essery RLH, Ménard CB, Edwards JM, Hendry MA, Porson A, Gedney N, Mercado LM, Sitch S, Blyth E, Boucher O, Cox PM, Grimmond CSB, Harding RJ (2011) The Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES), model description – Part 1: Energy and water fluxes. *Geosci Model Dev.* 4(3):677-699.
- Betts AK, Barr AG (1996) First International Satellite Land Surface Climatology Field Experiment 1987 sonde budget revisited. *J Geophys Res.* 101(D18):23,285-223,288.
- Beyrich F, Goersdorf U (1995) Composing the diurnal cycle of mixing height from simultaneous sodar and wind profiler measurements. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 76(999):387-394.
- Blay-Carreras E, Pardyjak ER, Pino D, Alexander DC, Lohou F, Lothon M (2014a) Countergradient heat flux observations during the evening transition period. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 14(17):9077-9085.
- Blay-Carreras E, Pardyjak ER, Pino D, Hoch SW, Cuxart J, Martínez D, Reuder J (2015) Lifted temperature minimum during the atmospheric evening transition. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 15(12):6981-6991.
- Blay-Carreras E, Pino D, Vilà-Guerau de Arellano J, van de Boer A, De Coster O, Darbieu C, Hartogensis O, Lohou F, Lothon M, Pietersen H (2014b) Role of the residual layer and large-scale subsidence on the development and evolution of the convective boundary layer. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 14(9):4515-4530.
- Blumberg WG, Turner DD, Cavallo SM, Gao J, Basara J, Shapiro A (2019) An Analysis of the Processes Affecting Rapid Near-Surface Water Vapor Increases during the Afternoon to Evening Transition in Oklahoma. *J Appl Meteorol Climatol.* 58(10):2217-2234.
- Bony S, Stevens B (2018) Measuring Area-Averaged Vertical Motions with Dropsondes. *J Atmos Sci.* 76(3):767-783.
- Bosveld F, Baas P, Steeneveld G-J, Holtslag AM, Angevine W, Bazile E, de Bruijn EF, Deacu D, Edwards J, Ek M, Larson V, Pleim J, Raschendorfer M, Svensson G (2014) The Third

- GABLS Intercomparison Case for Evaluation Studies of Boundary-Layer Models. Part B: Results and Process Understanding. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 152(2):157-187.
- Boutle I, Price J, Kudzotsa I, Kokkola H, Romakkaniemi S (2018) Aerosol-fog interaction and the transition to well-mixed radiation fog. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 18:7827-7840.
- Brown AR, Cederwall RT, Chlond A, Duynkerke PG, Golaz J-C, Khairoutdinov M, Lewellen DC, Lock AP, Macvane MK, Moeng C-H, Neggers RAJ, Siebesma AP, Stevens B (2002) Large-eddy simulation of the diurnal cycle of shallow cumulus convection over land. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 128:1075-1093.
- Brown N, Weiland M, Hill A, Shipway B, Maynard C, Allen T, Rezný M (2015) A highly scalable Met Office NERC cloud model. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Exascale Applications and Software, Edinburgh, UK2015, City*, pp. 132-137.
- Busse J, Knupp K (2012) Observed Characteristics of the Afternoon–Evening Boundary Layer Transition Based on Sodar and Surface Data. *J Appl Meteorol Climatol.* 51(3):571-582.
- Carter DA, Gage KS, Ecklund WL, Angevine WM, Johnston PE, Riddle AC, Wilson J, Williams CR (1995) Developments in UHF lower tropospheric wind profiling at NOAA's Aeronomy Laboratory. *Radio Science.* 30(4):977-1001.
- Conzemius R, Fedorovich E (2006) Dynamics of sheared convective boundary layer entrainment. Part II: Evaluation of bulk model predictions of entrainment flux. *J Atmos Sci.* 63:1179-1199.
- Conzemius RJ, Fedorovich E (2008) A case study of convective boundary layer development during IHOP-2002: Numerical simulations compared to observations. *Mon Weather Rev.* 136:2305-2320.
- Coulman CE (1978) Boundary-layer evolution and nocturnal inversion dispersal - part I. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 14:471-491.
- Couvreur F, Bazile E, Canut G, Seity Y, Lothon M, Lohou F, Guichard F, Nilsson E (2016) Boundary-layer turbulent processes and mesoscale variability represented by numerical weather prediction models during the BLLAST campaign. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 16(14):8983-9002.
- Darbieu C, Lohou F, Lothon M, Vilà-Guerau de Arellano J, Couvreur F, Durand P, Pino D, Patton EG, Nilsson E, Blay-Carreras E, Gioli B (2015) Turbulence vertical structure of the boundary layer during the afternoon transition. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 15(17):10071-10086.
- de Lozar A, Mellado JP (2015) Mixing driven by radiative and evaporative cooling at the stratocumulus top. *J Atmos Sci.* 72:4681-4700.
- Deardorff JW (1974) Three-dimensional numerical study of the height and mean structure of a heated planetary boundary layer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 7(81-106).
- Driedonks AGM (1982) Models and observations of the growth of the atmospheric boundary layer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 23:283-306.
- Edwards JM (2009) Radiative processes in the stable boundary layer: Part II. The development of the nocturnal boundary layer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 131:127-146.
- Edwards JM, Basu S, Bosveld FC, Holtslag AAM (2014) The impact of radiation on the GABLS3 large-eddy simulation through the night and during the morning transition. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 152:189-211.
- Edwards JM, Beare RJ, Lapworth AJ (2006) Simulation of the observed evening transition and nocturnal boundary layers: Single-column modelling. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 132:61-80.
- Efstathiou GA, Beare RJ, Osborne S, Lock A (2016) Grey zone simulations of the morning convective boundary layer development. *J Geophys Res.* 121:4769-4782.

656 El Guernaoui O, Reuder J, Esau I, Wolf T, Maronga B (2019) Scaling the Decay of Turbulence
 657 Kinetic Energy in the Free-Convective Boundary Layer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.*
 658 173(1):79-97.
 659 Fedorovich E, Gibbs JA, Shapiro A (2017) Numerical study of nocturnal low-level jets over gently
 660 sloping terrain. *J Atmos Sci.* 74:2813-2834.
 661 Garratt JR (1992) *The atmospheric boundary layer.* Cambridge University Press.
 662 Garratt JR, Brost RA (1981) Radiative cooling rates within and above the nocturnal boundary
 663 layer. *J Atmos Sci.* 38:2730-2746.
 664 Glenn IB, Feingold G, Gristey JJ, Yamaguchi T (2019) Quantification of the radiative effect of
 665 aerosol-cloud-interactions in shallow continental cumulus clouds. *J Atmos Sci.* submitted.
 666 Grant ALM (1997) An observational study of the evening transition boundary layer. *Q J R*
 667 *Meteorol Soc.* 123:657-677.
 668 Grimsdell AW, Angevine WM (2002) Observations of the afternoon transition of the convective
 669 boundary layer. *J Appl Meteorol.* 41(1):3-11.
 670 Gustafson WI, Vogelmann AM, Cheng X, Endo S, Krishna B, Li Z, Toto T, Xiao H: 2016a,
 671 Description of the LASSO Alpha 1 Release, DOE Atmospheric Radiation Measurement
 672 Research Facility
 673 Gustafson WI, Vogelmann AM, Cheng X, Endo SK, B., Li Z, Toto T, Xiao H: 2016b, LASSO
 674 alpha 1 data bundles. 36° 36' 18.0" N, 97° 29' 6.0" W: Southern Great Plains Central
 675 Facility (C1), ARM Data Archive: Oak Ridge, Tennessee, USA
 676 Ha K-J, Mahrt L (2003) Radiative and turbulent fluxes in the nocturnal boundary layer. *Tellus.*
 677 55A:317-327.
 678 Harvey NJ, Hogan RJ, Dacre HF (2013) A method to diagnose boundary-layer type using Doppler
 679 lidar. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 139:1681–1693.
 680 Hogan RJ, Grant ALM, Illingworth AJ, Pearson GN, O'Connor EJ (2009) Vertical velocity
 681 variance and skewness in clear and cloud-topped boundary layers as revealed by Doppler
 682 lidar. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 135:635-643.
 683 Holtslag AAM, Svensson G, Baas P, Basu S, Beare RJ, Beljaars A, Bosveld FC, Cuxart J, Lindvall
 684 J, Steeneveld GJ, Tjernstroem M, van de Wiel BJH (2013) Stable atmospheric boundary
 685 layers and diurnal cycles: Challenges for weather and climate models. *Bull Am Meteorol*
 686 *Soc.* 94:1691-1706.
 687 Holtslag AAM, van Meijgaard E, De Rooy WC (1995) A comparison of boundary layer diffusion
 688 schemes in unstable conditions over land. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 76:69-95.
 689 Jensen DD, Nadeau DF, Hoch SW, Pardyjak ER (2016) Observations of Near-Surface Heat-Flux
 690 and Temperature Profiles Through the Early Evening Transition over Contrasting Surfaces.
 691 *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 159(3):567-587.
 692 Kumar V, Svensson G, Holtslag AAM, Meneveau C, Parlange MB (2010) Impact of surface flux
 693 formulations and geostrophic forcing on large-eddy simulations of diurnal atmospheric
 694 boundary layer flow. *J Appl Meteorol Climatol.* 49:1496-1516.
 695 Lapworth A (2006) *The Morning Transition of the Nocturnal Boundary Layer.* *Boundary-Layer*
 696 *Meteorol.* 119(3):501-526.
 697 LeMone MA (1978) *The Marine Boundary Layer, Workshop on the Planetary Boundary Layer.*
 698 AMS, Boston.
 699 LeMone MA, Angevine WM, Bretherton CS, Chen F, Dudhia J, Fedorovich E, Katsaros KB,
 700 Lenschow DH, Mahrt L, Patton EG, Sun J, Tjernstroem M, Weil J (2019) 100 Years of
 701 Progress in Boundary-Layer Meteorology, AMS Centennial Monograph. AMS, Boston.

- LeMone MA, Grossman RL, McMillen RT, Liou K-N, Ou SC, McKeen S, Angevine W, Ikeda K, Chen F (2002) Cases-97: Late-morning warming and moistening of the convective boundary layer over the Walnut River watershed. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 104:1-52.
- LeMone MA, Ikeda K, Grossman RL, Rotach MW (2003) Horizontal Variability of 2-m Temperature at Night during CASES-97. *J Atmos Sci.* 60(20):2431-2449.
- LeMone MA, Tewari M, Chen F, Dudhia J (2013) Objectively determined fair-weather CBL depths in the ARW-WRF model and their comparison to CASES-97 observations. *Mon Weather Rev.* 141:30-54.
- Lenschow DH, Stankov BB, Mahrt L (1979) The rapid morning boundary-layer transition. *J Atmos Sci.* 36:2108-2124.
- Liu C, Fedorovich E, Huang J (2017) Revisiting entrainment relationships for shear-free and sheared convective boundary layers through large-eddy simulations. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 144:2182-2195.
- Liu C, Fedorovich E, Huang J, Hu X-M, Wang Y, Lee X (2019) Impact of aerosol shortwave radiative heating on entrainment in the atmospheric boundary layer: A large-eddy simulation study. *J Atmos Sci.* 76:785-799.
- Lothon M, Lenschow DH, Mayor SD (2009) Doppler Lidar Measurements of Vertical Velocity Spectra in the Convective Planetary Boundary Layer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 132(2):205-226.
- Lothon M, Lohou F, Pino D, Couvreux F, Pardyjak ER, Reuder J, Vilà-Guerau de Arellano J, Durand P, Hartogensis O, Legain D, Augustin P, Gioli B, Lenschow DH, Faloona I, Yagüe C, Alexander DC, Angevine WM, Bargain E, Barrié J, Bazile E, Bezombes Y, Blay-Carreras E, van de Boer A, Boichard JL, Bourdon A, Butet A, Campistron B, de Coster O, Cuxart J, Dabas A, Darbieu C, Deboudt K, Delbarre H, Derrien S, Flament P, Fourmentin M, Garai A, Gibert F, Graf A, Groebner J, Guichard F, Jiménez MA, Jonassen M, van den Kroonenberg A, Magliulo V, Martin S, Martinez D, Mastrorillo L, Moene AF, Molinos F, Moulin E, Pietersen HP, Piguet B, Pique E, Román-Cascón C, Rufin-Soler C, Saïd F, Sastre-Marugán M, Seity Y, Steeneveld GJ, Toscano P, Traullé O, Tzanos D, Wacker S, Wildmann N, Zaldei A (2014) The BLLAST field experiment: Boundary-Layer Late Afternoon and Sunset Turbulence. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 14(20):10931-10960.
- Mahrt L (1981) The early evening boundary layer transition. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 107:329-343.
- Mahrt L (2017) The near-surface evening transition. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 143:2940-2948.
- Manners J, Edwards JM, Hill P, Thelen JC: 2015, SOCRATES (Suite Of Community RAdiative Transfer codes based on Edwards and Slingo) Technical Guide, UK Met Office
- Manninen AJ, Marke T, Tuononen M, O'Connor EJ (2018) Atmospheric boundary layer classification with Doppler lidar. *J Geophys Res.* 123:8172-8189.
- Mellado JP, van Heerwarden CC, Garcia JR (2016) Near-surface effects of free atmosphere stratification in free convection. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 159:69-95.
- Nadeau DF, Pardyjak E, Higgins CW, Fernando HJS, Parlange MB (2011) A simple model for the afternoon and early evening decay of convective turbulence over different land surfaces. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 141:301-324.
- Nieuwstadt FTM, Brost RA (1986) The decay of convective turbulence. *J Atmos Sci.* 43(6):532-546.
- Nilsson E, Lohou F, Lothon M, Pardyjak E, Mahrt L, Darbieu C (2016a) Turbulence kinetic energy budget during the afternoon transition – Part 1: Observed surface TKE budget and boundary layer description for 10 intensive observation period days. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 16(14):8849-8872.

- Nilsson E, Lothon M, Lohou F, Pardyjak E, Hartogensis O, Darbieu C (2016b) Turbulence kinetic energy budget during the afternoon transition – Part 2: A simple TKE model. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 16(14):8873-8898.
- Pennell WT, LeMone MA (1974) An experimental study of turbulence structure in the fair-weather trade wind boundary layer. *J Atmos Sci.* 31:1308-1323.
- Pietersen HP, Vilà-Guerau de Arellano J, Augustin P, van de Boer A, de Coster O, Delbarre H, Durand P, Fourmentin M, Gioli B, Hartogensis O, Lohou F, Lothon M, Ouwersloot HG, Pino D, Reuder J (2015) Study of a prototypical convective boundary layer observed during BLLAST: contributions by large-scale forcings. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 15(8):4241-4257.
- Pino D, Jonker HJJ, vilà-Guerau de Arellano J, Dosio A (2006) Role of shear and the inversion strength during sunset turbulence over land: characteristic length scales. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 121:537-556.
- Price J (2019) On the formation and development of radiation fog: An observational study. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 172:167-197.
- Rizza U, Miglietta MM, Degrazia GA, Acevedo OC, Marques Filho EP (2013) Sunset decay of the convective turbulence with large-eddy simulation under realistic conditions. *Physica A.* 392:4481-4490.
- Román-Cascón C, Yagüe C, Mahrt L, Sastre M, Steeneveld GJ, Pardyjak E, van de Boer A, Hartogensis O (2015) Interactions among drainage flows, gravity waves and turbulence: a BLLAST case study. *Atmos Chem Phys.* 15(15):9031-9047.
- Savijarvi H (2006) Radiative and turbulent heating rates in the clear-air boundary layer. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 132:147-161.
- Sharma V, Parlange MB, Calaf M (2017) Perturbations to the spatial and temporal characteristics of the diurnally-varying atmospheric boundary layer due to an extensive wind farm. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 162:255-282.
- Smith EN, Gebauer JG, Klein PM, Fedorovich E, Gibbs JA (2019) The Great Plains low-level jet during PECAN: Observed and simulated characteristics. *Mon Weather Rev.* 147:1845-1869.
- Sorbján Z (1996) Effects caused by varying the strength of the capping inversion based on a large eddy simulation model of the shear-free convective boundary layer. *J Atmos Sci.* 53:2015-2024.
- Sorbján Z (1997) Decay of convective turbulence revisited. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 82:501-515.
- Steeneveld GJ, Wokke MJJ, Groot Zwaftink CD, Pijlman S, Heusinkveld BG, Jacobs AFG, Holtslag AAM (2010) Observations of the radiation divergence in the surface layer and its implication for its parameterization in numerical weather prediction models. *J Geophys Res.* 115:D06107.
- Stevens B (2002) Entrainment in stratocumulus-topped mixed layers. *Q J R Meteorol Soc.* 128:2663-2690.
- Stull RB (1988) An introduction to boundary layer meteorology. Kluwer Academic.
- Svensson G, Holtslag AAM, Kumar V, Mauritsen T, Steeneveld GJ, Angevine WM, Bazile E, Beljaars A, de Bruijn EIF, Cheng A, Conangla L, Cuxart J, Ek M, Falk MJ, Freedman F, Kitagawa H, Larson VE, Lock A, Mailhot J, Masson V, Park S, Pleim J, Söderberg S, Weng W, Zampieri M (2011) Evaluation of the diurnal cycle in the atmospheric boundary layer over land as represented by a variety of single column models – the second GABLS experiment. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 140:177-206.

- Tennekes H (1973) A model for the dynamics of the inversion above a convective boundary layer. *J Atmos Sci.* 30:558-567.
- Tucker SC, Senff CJ, Weickmann A, Brewer WA, Banta RM, Sandberg SJ, Law D, Hardesty RM (2009) Doppler lidar estimation of mixing height using turbulence, shear, and aerosol profiles. *J Atmos Ocean Technol.* 26:673-688.
- Van Driel R, Jonker HJJ (2011) Convective boundary layers driven by nonstationary surface heat fluxes. *J Atmos Sci.* 68:727-738.
- van Hooijdonk IGS, Clercx JH, Abraham C, Holdsworth AM, Monahan AH, Vignon E, Moene AF, Baas P, van de Wiel BJH (2017) Near-surface temperature inversion growth rate during the onset of the stable boundary layer. *J Atmos Sci.* 74:3433-3449.
- van Ulden AP, Wieringa J (1996) Atmospheric boundary layer research at Cabauw. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 78:39-69.
- Wilczak JM, Gossard EE, Neff WD, Eberhard WL (1996) Ground-based remote sensing of the atmospheric boundary layer: 25 years of progress. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 78:321-349.
- Wildmann N, Rau GA, Bange J (2015) Observations of the Early Morning Boundary-Layer Transition with Small Remotely-Piloted Aircraft. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 157(3):345-373.
- Wingo SM, Knupp KR (2015) Multi-platform Observations Characterizing the Afternoon-to-Evening Transition of the Planetary Boundary Layer in Northern Alabama, USA. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* 155(1):29-53.
- Wyngaard JC (1983) Lectures on the planetary boundary layer. In: Lilly DK and Gal-Chen T (eds.), *Mesoscale Meteorology - Theories, Observations, and Models*. D. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Wyngaard JC (2004) Toward numerical modeling in the "Terra Incognita". *J Atmos Sci.* 61:1816-1826.