### Sensitivity of Arctic Sea Ice Simulation to Treatment of Sea Ice Dynamics

Xiangdong Zhang and Liran Peng International Arctic Research Center and Department of Atmospheric Sciences University of Alaska Fairbanks

Blue Waters Symposium, June 3-6, 2019

#### **Motivation**

Global warming has been amplified in the Arctic and Arctic sea ice cover has continually reached its record minimum values.











#### **Motivation**

Global Climate model simulations show a large spread, leading to uncertainties in understanding sea ice as well as climate system changes, as well as policy-decision making.



Zhang and Walsh, J. Climate, 2006; Zhang, Tellus 2010

#### **Motivation**

The simulated ice thickness spatial distributions have the largest bias across different climate models, and sea ice dynamics is less investigated using climate models.



Fig. 5 March mean sea ice thickness (m), averaged over the period 2003–2007, for all the ORA-IP systems. Top left is the estimate from ICESat mean thickness over all February–March campaigns in the period 2003–2007

Chevallier et al., 2016

**Scientific questions** 

### How do (1) sea ice internal force/strength and (2) air-ice momentum flux impact sea ice motion and thickness distribution?

#### **Experiment design**

- Community Earth System Model (CESM 1.2)
  - Parallel Ocean Program, version 2 (POP2; Danabasoglu et al., 2012)
  - Los Alamos National Laboratory sea ice model, version 4 (CICE4)
- Horizontal grid: one-degree displaced the North Pole in Greenland grid
  - Average grid size: 41 km
  - 22.34 km near the East coast of Greenland
  - 61.72 km over the Chukchi Sea
- Atmospheric forcing data: ten-year period (1979-1988) averaged ERA-Interim data (Dee et al., 2011)
  - Five atmospheric state variables
    - 10m surface wind components, 2m-air temperature, specific humidity, and the mean sea level pressure
  - Radiation
    - downward long wave and short wave radiation
  - Precipitation

#### Why Blue Waters?

#### Computational Cost for each experiments <Total usage: 405,412>

- For CESM2 normal year forcing simulation <~94% of the total usage>
  - Model Cost: 448.56 pe-hrs/simulated year
  - Model Throughput: 5.14 simulated\_years/day
- For CESM2 interannual forcing simulation <~3% of the total usage >
  - Model Cost: 439.56 pe-hrs/simulated\_year
  - Model Throughput: 5.24 simulated\_years/day
- For CESM1.2 interannual forcing simulation <~3% of the total usage >
  - Model Cost: 337.88 pe-hrs/simulated\_year
  - Model Throughput: 9.09 simulated\_years/day

#### Why Blue Waters?

#### Total Storage Used for each experiment

- NYF:
  - Ice: 2.5T (monthly and daily outputs)
  - Ocean: 4.08T (monthly and daily outputs)
  - Total: 6.6T
- IAF:
  - Ice: 3.2T (monthly, daily, and 6-hourly outputs)
  - Ocean: 709G (monthly and daily outputs)
  - Total: 3.9T (1984-2018)
- Atmospheric forcing data: 25G

CICE4 dynamic workflow <2>

• Ai-Ice momentum flux:

 $\tau_{ai} = c_a \rho_a \left| \vec{u}_a \right|^2 \frac{\left( \vec{u}_a \right)}{\left| \vec{u}_a \right|},$ 

C<sub>a</sub>: momentum exchange coefficient (Jordan et al., 1999)

• Sea ice internal force:

$$P = C_f C_p \int_0^\infty h^2 w_r \, dh,$$

C<sub>f</sub>: the ratio of total energy losses to potential energy changes.

CICE4 dynamic workflow <3>

### There is an uncertainty in defining C<sub>f</sub>

- No direct observations.
- Hibler (1980) estimated that  $C_f$  was between <u>2 and 10</u>.
- Hopkins and Hibler (1991) and Hopkins (1994) indicated that  $C_f$  in the range of <u>9 to 17</u>.
- Flato and Hibler (1995):  $C_f 13-43$ .
- Martin et al., (2016): C<sub>f</sub> <u>10 and 20</u>.
- Default value: C<sub>f</sub> = 17 in the model used by the modeling community.





Sea ice thickness are highly sensitive to perturbed air-ice momentum flux and sea ice strength



0



$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$1.0 \cdot c_a$ W10S10       W10S08       W10S06       W10S04 $0.8 \cdot c_a$ W08S10       W08S08       W08S06       W08S04	$1.0 \cdot c_a$ W10S10       W10S08       W10S06       W10S04 $0.8 \cdot c_a$ W08S10       W08S08       W08S06       W08S04 $0.6 \cdot c_a$ W06S10       W06S08       W06S06       W06S04	$1.0 \cdot c_a$ W10S10       W10S08       W10S06       W10S04 $0.8 \cdot c_a$ W08S10       W08S08       W08S06       W08S04 $0.6 \cdot c_a$ W06S10       W06S08       W06S06       W06S04 $0.4 \cdot c_a$ W04S10       W04S08       W04S06       W04S04		10.0	0.8.C	0.6.C	04.0
$0.8 \cdot c_a$ W08S10 W08S08 W08S06 W08S04	$1.0 \cdot c_a$ W10310       W10308       W10300       W10304 $0.8 \cdot c_a$ W08S10       W08S08       W08S06       W08S04 $0.6 \cdot c_a$ W06S10       W06S08       W06S06       W06S04	$1.0 \cdot c_a$ W10310       W10308       W10304 $0.8 \cdot c_a$ W08S10       W08S08       W08S06       W08S04 $0.6 \cdot c_a$ W06S10       W06S08       W06S06       W06S04 $0.4 \cdot c_a$ W04S10       W04S08       W04S06       W04S04	1.0	W10S10	W10508	W10806	W10S04
$0.8 \cdot c_a$ wossio wossos wossos wossos wossos	$0.8 \cdot c_a$ W08510 W08508 W08506 W08504 $0.6 \cdot c_a$ W06510 W06508 W06506 W06504	$0.8 \cdot c_a$ W08510       W08508       W08506       W08504 $0.6 \cdot c_a$ W06S10       W06S08       W06S06       W06S04 $0.4 \cdot c_a$ W04S10       W04S08       W04S06       W04S04	$1.0 \cdot c_a$	W08510	W10508	W08506	W08504
	$0.6 \cdot c_a$ W06S10 W06S08 W06S06 W06S04	$0.6 \cdot c_a$ W06S10       W06S08       W06S06       W06S04 $0.4 \cdot c_a$ W04S10       W04S08       W04S06       W04S04	$0.8 \cdot c_a$	W06510	W06508	W06500	W06504

The spatial distribution of the sea ice velocity, and thickness are highly sensitive to perturbed air-ice momentum flux and sea ice strength



- A larger air-ice stress corresponding to a more extensive kinematic energy gained by sea ice and therefore results in a larger magnitude of sea ice velocity.

- At the same latitude, a larger sea ice velocity leads to a large Coriolis force on sea ice, causing sea ice buildup north of the Canadian Archipelago.

#### **Increase the air-ice stress**



- A larger air-ice stress corresponding to a more extensive kinematic energy gained by sea ice and therefore results in a larger magnitude of sea ice velocity.

- At the same latitude, a larger sea ice velocity leads to a large Coriolis force on sea ice, causing sea ice buildup north of the Canadian Archipelago.



- Following the transpolar drift, sea ice moves across the ice strength contour from low ice strength region to the high ice strength region.



A larger sea ice strength gradient results in a larger the magnitude of the internal sea ice stress gradient.



Decrease in sea ice strength results in thicker ice within the center of the Arctic Ocean, and therefore a larger ice volume throughout the year, since more kinetic energy is converted to the potential energy to build sea ice ridge, instead of causing frictional loss.

Schematics showing sensitivity of sea ice velocity and thickness structures



- Increased sea ice strength or decreased air-ice momentum flux cause a counter-clockwise
  rotation of the ice transpolar drift, resulting in an increase in sea ice export through Fram Strait
  and therefore reduction of mean sea ice thickness within the Arctic.
- Sea ice thickness distribution influences energy balance and albedo feedback, and sea ice export via Fram Strait is one of important driving mechanism for Atlantic meridional circulation.