Aquaplanet Hydrologic Cycle Sensitivities to Model Configuration in Present and Future Climates





ROSENSTIEL SCHOOL James J. Benedict^{1,2} (jbenedict@rsmas.miami.edu), Amy C. Clement¹, and Brian Medeiros³ ¹ Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, University of Miami; Miami, Florida ² Visiting scientist in Climate and Global Dynamics lab, NCAR; Boulder, Colorado ³ Climate and Global Dynamics lab, NCAR; Boulder, Colorado

Background & Motivation

Aquaplanets—global climate models devoid of land masses—distill salient features of Earth's climate by damping or removing processes that may be of secondary importance (e.g., land-sea contrasts, seasonality). They provide a clean platform to examine sensitivities of simulated climate to model configuration. Like other reduced-complexity models, aquaplanets bridge gaps in our understanding between comprehensive Earth System Models and idealized



models¹; they are a vital component within hierarchies of model complexity. Here, we review sensitivities of the <u>CESM2</u> aquaplanet hydrologic cycle to model formulation in present-day and global warming climate states. Identifying and understanding such sensitivities reveals fundamental uncertainties in the presentday climate and can guide appropriate interpretation of hydrological cycle changes in warming climates.

Motivating Questions

- How does aquaplanet precipitation compare to Earth-like CESM simulations? (Similar in the extratropical time-zonal mean and in binned distributions within Tropics)
- To what aspects of model formulation is aquaplanet precipitation most sensitive? (Primarily choice of physics, but also grid resolution)
- Are aquaplanet precipitation sensitivities consistent between present-day and warmer climate states? (Changes in time-zonal mean P and extremes are physics dependent)

Modeling Strategy

Present-day and global warming CESM2 aquaplanet simulations:

- <u>Physics</u>: CAM4, CAM5*, and CAM6#
- <u>Grid resolution</u>: 1° & 2° (physics-dependent vertical resolution)
- <u>Dynamical core</u>: Finite volume
- <u>Solar</u>: Perpetual equinox; diurnal cycle retained
- <u>Ocean types</u> (all aspects are zonally uniform and equatorially symmetric):
- Fixed-SST (1) present-day CO₂ with QOBS² SST profile ("CTL"), (2) 4xCO₂ with with QOBS SST, (3) present-day CO₂ with QOBS SST+4K
- Slab ocean (SOM) using Q-fluxes computed from corresponding fixed-SST run and a globally constant 30 m mixed-layer depth: Present-day CO_2 ("CTL"), abrupt 4xCO₂, CO₂ increased at 1%/year and capped at 4xCO₂

* MG1 microphysics with constant cloud liquid and ice crystal number concentrations used for simplicity # MG2 microphysics with constant cloud liquid and ice crystal number concentrations used for simplicity; multi-decadal SOM climate runs delayed, awaiting final changes to CESM2 model

	CAM4	CAM5	CAM6
Convection - deep	ZM w/dilute CAPE & CMT	ZM w/dilute CAPE & CMT	ZM w/dilute CAPE & CMT
Convection - shallow	Hack	UW - Park & Bretherton	CLUBB
Microphysics	RK	MG1 (diag. precipitation)	MG2 (prog. precipitation)
Turbulence	Dry	Moist - Bretherton & Park	CLUBB
Radiation	CAMRT	RRTMG	RRTMG

CAM physics package comparison:



- (Above left) Dearth of "dry" days in CAM linked to surface moisture availability rather than biases in large-scale dynamics (not shown); some improvement in CAM6
- (Above right) Overabundant drizzle linked to convective precipitation; extreme precipitation linked to resolved-scale processes; CAM6 has similar profile to CAM5



Acknowledgements NSF RAPID Award AGS-1547910 "Developing a Community Aquaplanet Model"

Poster #55

REFERENCES

¹ Held, I. M. 2005: The Gap between Simulation and Understanding in Climate Modeling. Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 86, 1609–1614. doi: http:// dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-86-11-1609. 2 Neale, R., and B. Hoskins, 2002: A Standard Test for AGCMs Including Their Physical Parameterizations: I: The Proposial. Atmos. Sci. Lett.,

^{1(2), 101-107,} doi:10.1006/asle.2000.0022 3 O'Gorman, P. A., 2015: Precipitation Extremes Under Climate Change. Current Climate Change Reports, 1, 49-59, doi:10.1007/ s40641-015-0009-3.