## Validation of KPP in a coastal area

#### By Cécile Renaudie (Météo France/SHOM)

and Rémy Baraille (SHOM), Yves Morel (SHOM), Gwenaëlle Hello (Météo France), Hervé Giordani (Météo France)





#### Contents

- I. Data from MOUTON2007;
- II. Atmospheric forcings;
- III. Sensitivity tests of KPP using HYCOM;
- IV. Conclusions.





### I.1. MOUTON 2007



- MOUTON : project involving the French Navy and other research centers;
- Date : May 18th 2007;
- Location : Bay of Iroise;
- Mooring : (49.2N,4W) \*
- $\bullet$  Comparison with observations from a buoy located in (48.5N,5.75W)  $_{\circ}$



#### I.2. Filtering the effects of tide

- $\Delta T_{tot} = \Delta T_{tide} + \Delta T_{rad}$
- Correlation temperature/salinity : T<sub>tide</sub>=aS+b
- a = 2,25 and b=-67,4









# II.1. Validation of the atmospheric model AROME (at the location of the buoy)

AROME : Application of Research to Operations at MesoscalE : operational mesoscale weather forecast model developed by Météo France











#### II.2. Correction of radiative fluxes

Determination of  $Q(t) = \rho \int T(t, z) dz$  after simulation HYCOM







	Short-wave flux	Net radiative flux
Observations	3893.48	3271.048
Before correction	6682.902	5292.885
After correction	5062.299	4065.285

- → Too much heat
- → Short-wave flux changed : SW=SW\*0.76.





#### **III.** Sensitivity tests with HYCOM

- Initialization : with observations;
- Forcings : from the atmospheric model, at the location of the mooring;
- Comparison with observations filtered from the effects of tide;
- Vertical mixing scheme : KPP (K-Profile Parameterization, Large 1994);
- Sensitivity tests to different parameters of the KPP and to the calculation of turbulent fluxes.







#### III.1. Influence of the velocity profile

• Experiment 1 : HYCOM after correcting radiative fluxes (a), compared to observations filtered of tide (b) and difference of temperature between both (c).



- Temperature too high at the surface and too low at the bottom → mixing problem;
- Mixing is triggered when  $Ri_g = \frac{N^2}{(\partial_z \overline{U})^2 + (\partial_z \overline{V})^2} < Ri_0 = 0.7 \longrightarrow$  problem with velocities;
- Experiment 2 : The velocity of the model is forced with the one observed.



#### III.1. Influence of the velocity profile



Difference with observations

• Experiment 2 : lack of velocity gradient at the surface;

• This is because ADCP measurements are problematic near the surface : the treatment replaces the value in the first cell at 5 meters deep by the value in the second cell at 10 meters deep  $\longrightarrow$  no vertical shear in the first 10 meters;

• Experiment 3 : Experiment 1 + Experiment 2;

• Experiment 3 allows mixing, the heat penetrates all the way to the bottom and difference between experiment and observations lower.





#### III.2. Influence of the bottom boundary layer BBL





#### III.3. Influence of the nonlocal terms







#### III.4. Influence of turbulent fluxes calculation





] 0.06N/m<sup>2</sup>

Closest to the mean value : - latent and sensible : fairal03 - momentum : smith80





#### III.4. Influence of turbulent fluxes calculation

RMSE (root mean square error):  $RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{H}h_i(T_{obs}(i) - T_{exp}(i))^2}$ 



#### RMSE for twelve methods

FT=RN-LE-H





#### V. Conclusions

- The main processes here are mixed layer dynamics and shear instability;
- After correcting radiative fluxes and taking into account observed velocities, HYCOM results are close to the observations;
- The best solution is obtained when the bottom boundary layer is activated and the nonlocal fluxes are not activated;
- The fact that we did not have any observations in the atmosphere was a problem → new campaign at sea in 2008 with radio soundings and measures of surface parameters;
- Prospect : study the impact of waves, perform the same job on the moorings gathered in 2008.



## Thank you



