Impact of model physics on seasonal forecasts of surface air temperature in the Arctic

Qiong Yang^{1,2}, Muyin Wang^{1,2}, James Overland², Wanqiu Wang³ and Thomas Collow^{3,4}

¹JISAO, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington
²NOAA/PMEL, Seattle, Washington
³NOAA/NWS/NCEP/CPC, College Park, Maryland
⁴INNOVIM, LLC, Greenbelt, Maryland

Yang, Q., M. Wang, J. Overland, W. Wang, and T. Collow, 2017: Impact of model physics on seasonal forecasts of surface air temperature in the Arctic. *Mon. Wea. Rev.* doi:10.1175/MWR-D-16-0272.1.

Motivation

CFSv2 (Climate Forecast System Version 2) operational forecast



Wang et al. 2016

Insufficient cloud cover \rightarrow excessive downward SW \rightarrow significantly high T_{2m} over the Chukchi/Bering Sea

- Marine stratus cloud scheme is turned of on
- An artificial upper limit is set to constraint the bottom heat flux from ocean water to sea ice

Q: modified model physics improve seasonal forecasts of T_{2m}?

Goal

Understand the impacts of model physics and initial sea ice thickness on seasonal forecasts of surface energy budget and air temperature in summer (July – September).

Experiment

Model experiment	Physics modification	Initial sea ice thickness	Run period*	# of runs per month
CFSv2-ctrl	×	CFSR	20092013	5 X 5
CFSv2-piomas	×	PIOMAS	20092013	5 X 5
CFSv2-phys	✓	CFSR	20092013	5 X 5
CFSv2-phys- piomas	✓	PIOMAS	20092013	5 X 5

CFSR: Climate Forecast System Reanalysis

PIOMAS: Pan-Arctic Ice Ocean Modelling Assimilation System (Zhang and Rothrock, 2003) *For each year, five ensemble runs were initialized at March 8-12 00UTC and run for 9-month forecasts to December

Initial sea ice thickness from PIOMAS vs CFSR



CFSR has thicker sea ice over the central Arctic (~0.85 meter thicker on average) but thinner sea ice near the ice edge.

Simulated total cloud cover



After enabling the marine stratus cloud scheme, the simulated total cloud cover well captures the observed seasonal cycle except for the summer dip.

Simulated total cloud cover - CALIPSO



Yang et al. 2017, MWR

After enabling the stratus cloud scheme, the simulated total cloud cover is largely improved. The positive bias found in June and July is mainly located over the Beaufort Sea.

Surface energy budget: CFSv2-phys minus CFSv2-ctrl



Green contour: September 15% sea ice cover boundary from CFSv2-phys Magenta contour: September 15% sea ice cover boundary from CFSv2-ctrl

Surface energy budget: CFSv2-piomas minus CFSv2-ctrl



Green contour: September 15% sea ice cover boundary from CFSv2-piomas Magenta contour: September 15% sea ice cover boundary from CFSv2-ctrl

Surface energy budget: CFSv2-phys-piomas minus CFSv2-ctrl



Green contour: September 15% sea ice cover boundary from CFSv2-phys-piomas Magenta contour: September 15% sea ice cover boundary from CFSv2-ctrl

Impact on T_{2m}



Green contour: September 15% sea ice cover boundary from the corresponding simulation Magenta contour: September 15% sea ice cover boundary from the control simulation

Predicted T_{2m} minus ERA-Interim



Green: HadISST 15% sea ice cover Magenta: CFS 15% sea ice cover

Summary

- After enabling the marine stratus cloud scheme, the simulated total cloud cover resembles the observed seasonal cycle well except for the mid-summer reduction.
- Over the Chukchi/Bering Sea, the model physics modification reduces the forecast bias in surface air temperature from >3°C down to 0.5°C.
- The initial sea ice thickness alone has little effect in improving the surface air temperature over the Chukchi/Bering Sea.
 - Yang, Q., M. Wang, J. Overland, W. Wang, and T. Collow, 2017: Impact of model physics on seasonal forecasts of surface air temperature in the Arctic. *Mon. Wea. Rev.* doi:10.1175/MWR-D-16-0272.1.

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by the NOAA Climate Progame Office, Arctic Research Program and by NOAA/OAR under the auspices of the National Earth System Prediction Capability (National ESPC).