Polar Meteorology Group, Byrd Polar Research Center, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

Development and Testing of Polar WRF

Keith M. Hines¹, and David H. Bromwich^{1,2}

¹Polar Meteorology Group Byrd Polar Research Center The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio

²Atmospheric Sciences Program Department of Geography The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio

7th Annual WRF User's Workshop Boulder, CO

<u>Outline</u>



- Applications
- Lessons from Polar MM5 work
- WRF development simulations for Greenland Test vs. AWS and Polar MM5 December 2002 (winter) June 2001 (summer)

Temperature Wind Speed Specific Humidity Surface Pressure Wind Direction Shortwave Radiation Longwave Radiation

Summary

Applications of Polar WRF

Operational

- AMPS real-time Antarctic forecasts
- Other real-time forecasts
- Climate
 - Antarctic tropical interactions (e.g., ENSO)
 - Paleoclimate (e.g., Last Glacial Maximum)
 - Arctic Rivers hydrology
 - Greenland and Antarctic ice budget
 - Decadal Antarctic variability

Arctic System Reanalysis (ASR)

- 1. Rapid climate change appears to be happening in the Arctic. A more comprehensive picture of the coupled atmosphere/land surface/ ocean interactions is needed.
- 2. Global reanalyses encounter many problems at high latitudes. The ASR would use the best available description for Arctic processes and would enhance the existing database of Arctic observations. The ASR will be produced at improved temporal resolution and much higher spatial resolution.
- 3. The ASR would provide fields for which direct observation are sparse or problematic (precipitation, radiation, cloud, ...) at higher resolution than from existing reanalyses.
- 4. The system-oriented approach would provide a community focus including the atmosphere, land surface and sea ice communities.

5. The ASR would provide a convenient synthesis of Arctic field programs (SHEBA, LAII/ATLAS, ARM, ...)

Lessons from Polar MM5

 The Pennsylvania State University/National Center for Atmospheric Research Fifth-generation Mesoscale Model (PSU/NCAR MM5) was adapted for polar applications

(1) Real-time forecasting/Operational

(2) Climate studies

2. Polar Optimizations to MM5

(1) Revised cloud / radiation interaction

- (2) Modified explicit ice phase microphysics
- (3) Optimized turbulence (boundary layer) parameterization
- (4) Implementation of a sea ice surface type
- (5) Improved treatment of heat transfer through snow/ice surfaces

(6) Improved upper boundary treatment

- 3. Test for at least <u>3 different polar surface types</u>.
 - (1) Ice Sheets (Antarctica and Greenland)
 - (2) Oceans and Sea Ice
 - (3) Arctic Land

Polar WRF Simulations for Greenland 110x100 Grid, 40 km horizontal grid spacing, 28 sigma levels

Modify surface energy balance of Noah LSM for snow cover

Try the YSU and Eta PBL schemes, the Noah and RUC land surface models, the 5-class WSM (WRF single-moment) and Hall-Thompson 2-moment cloud microphysics

Run for December 2002 (winter) and June 2001 (summer)

Compare 48-hour WRF simulations with AWS observations from the Greenland Climate Network, 30-hour Polar MM5 simulations (121x103 nested grid with 24-km horizontal resolution and 28 vertical levels), and radiation observations at Summit



WRF simulations with Dudhia shortwave radiation, RRTM longwave radiation, and initial and boundary conditions from the AVN Model





WRF simulations with Dudhia shortwave radiation show a <u>large</u> <u>negative bias</u> in downward shortwave at Summit.
MM5 simulations produce reasonable downward shortwave.



WRF simulations with RRTM longwave radiation <u>reasonably produce</u> <u>the mean and range</u> of downward longwave at Summit. **MM5** simulations show a <u>large deficit</u> in downward longwave.





Run (Correlation	Bias
WRF - Swiss Camp	0.907	0.47
MM5 – Swiss Camp	0.938	-2.56
WRF - Summit	0.846	1.35
MM5 – Summit	0.853	-2.34

WRF simulations with Hall-Thompson microphysics, YSU PBL, Noah LSM, Dudhia shortwave and RRTM longwave radiation, and AVN-driven boundary conditions **MM5** simulations with Eta PBL, Reisner microphysics and ECMWF-driven boundary conditions

<u>Summary</u>

- Following the path of development for Polar MM5, WRF is being optimized for polar applications.
- Polar WRF shows similar synoptic skill to Polar MM5 for Greenland simulations.
- Polar WRF is at least as successful as Polar MM5 for simulations of the Greenland winter boundary layer.
- Polar MM5 simulations of the Greenland summer boundary layer are superior to those of Polar WRF.
- Polar WRF well represents the longwave radiation at Summit, however, the downward shortwave radiation is under-simulated.
- Testing of WRF continues for the North Slope of Alaska (NSA) [Arctic land] and SHEBA [Polar Ocean] sites.

Greenland Climate Network Automatic Weather Stations (AWS)

(Konrad Steffen & Jason Box)

Up to 16 stations are active for June 2001 and December 2002

Interpolate WRF and MM5 output to these sites





WRF simulations with Hall-Thompson microphysics, YSU PBL, Noah LSM, Dudhia shortwave and RRTM longwave radiation, and AVN-driven boundary conditions **MM5** simulations with Eta PBL, Reisner microphysics and ECMWF-driven boundary conditions



Run	Correlation	Bias
WRF - Swiss Camp	0.865	0.47
MM5 – Swiss Cam	o 0.938	4.32
WRF - Summit	0.863	1.83
MM5 – Summit	0.896	2.34

Wind Speed: MM5 shows a higher correlation. WRF has a smaller bias







WRF simulation shows a <u>cold bias</u> for late June. Both WRF and MM5 exaggerate the diurnal cycle for late June. Analysis suggests that slow spin-up of the subsurface temperatures contributes to the cold bias.





MM5 shows higher correlations and smaller bias for June.