Spring WRF Conference, Jun. 24, 2009 Boulder

Coupling WRF 3 & CLM 3.5 for Regional Climate Simulation & Understanding Land Cover Feedbacks to Climate

Zachary M. Subin*, Jiming Jin, Lara M. Kueppers, William J. Riley, Danielle S. Christianson, Margaret S. Torn *UC Berkeley subin@berkeley.edu Interactions between Land Cover and the Atmosphere
Ecosystem forcing of climate: albedo, emissivity, evapotranspiration, & surface roughness

 Vegetation type change can cause 1-3°C local temperature changes (Snyder et al 2004; Diffenbaugh 2005)

Vegetation properties & distribution may be affected by changes in temperature and precipitation, or by policy responses to Climate Change

Land Models in RCMs

- RCMs, like WRF, have extensive atmospheric physics with fine grid spacing, but less land surface processes than some GCMs
- Including additional mechanisms allows more specific vegetation properties to be changed for vegetation change experiments

WRF-CLM is analogous to previous community efforts: WRF-Noah, RegCM-CLM (Steiner et al 2005), MM5-LSM (Cooley et al 2005)

WRF3-CLM3.5 Software Approach

- WRF2-CLM3 coupled by Jiming Jin, Utah State University
- CLM biogeophysics runs as WRF's LSM
- CLM called independently at each timestep, preserving WRF's driver layer and compile / run procedures
- Can run using PFT & soil lookup table with WRF's land surface categories

WRF3-CLM3.5 Evaluation



1981-1991, forced by NCEP-DOE RP2 (2°) Compared to PRISM data Identically configured WRF3-Noah run Parent: 1/2º (55 km), nest: 1/6° (18 km)

Annual 2m T_{max} (K)



6

Annual 2m T_{max} Bias (K)



7

Annual 2m T_{min} Bias (K)



Noah



Annual Precip. Bias (m y⁻¹)



9

Annual Dewpoint Bias (K)



Evaluation: Summary

Overall statistics (not shown): WRF3-CLM3.5 outperforms WRF3-Noah for T_{min} and dewpoint, and is comparable for precip. and T_{max}.

Both models reproduce absolute spatial patterns well but leave room for improvement in biases

WRF3-CLM3.5's additional mechanisms and subgrid PFT patches offer advantages for land cover change experiments

Afforestation

- Strategy for CO₂ sequestration that may have effects on regional climate
- Contrasting results in previous studies for net surface temperature effect of midlatitude / temperate forest cover
 - Albedo decrease \rightarrow warming
 - LH increase \rightarrow cooling
 - (sometimes cloudiness, winds) \rightarrow ?

California's Diverse Ecosystems





Antelope Valley

San Bernardino



Big Basin

Joshua Tree

Regional Climate Model Experiment

- Kueppers et al (2008) CEC Report, Subin et al to be submitted to Earth Interactions
- 20 km resolution (75 x 80 gridcells)
- GFDL Boundary Conditions: Future A2 (2058-2070)
- Future Potential Vegetation (Lenihan et al 2006 – based on MC1 Model) + Afforestation Scenario (Brown et al 2004)
- I6 California-specific plant functional types combined into 14 ecosystem categories

Afforestation Experiment

Broad summer cooling Localized winter warming Same seasonal contrast found in 42°N previous 40°N studies: e.g. 38°N Snyder et 36°N al 2004 34°N

32°N



Summer 4pm Differences



Discussion

- Afforestation may cause significant cooling in snowfree regions
 - Albedo decrease is overwhelmed by ET increase
 - Statistically significant cooling downwind of added forest
 - More cooling than lower resolution studies
- More work needed to better parameterize ecosystems, test realism of afforestation scenario in future climate, & include effects of increased CO₂ over domain

Acknowledgments

- Ron Neilson, Jim Lenihan, and Sandra Brown: provided scenarios of vegetation change in California
- Sebastien Biraud and Ramona Butz: helped with mapping & interpolation
- California Energy Commission Funding (Contract #500-02-004)