# Sigma\_2 versus sigma\_1 .... Optimizing HYCOM's vertical coordinate

Rainer Bleck NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, New York Dongxiao Zhang NOAA Pacific Marine Environmental Lab, Seattle

May 2013

# The 3-D grid in geophysical fluids

- The distinguishing feature of geophysical fluid modeling is the pre-eminence of gravity.
- Mixing of vertical and horizontal forces in the dynamic equations must therefore be avoided at all cost.
- This is accomplished by making the *z* axis coincide with the direction of gravity.
- The other 2 coordinate directions **must** be perpendicular to the *z* axis. This way, gravity will not contaminate the force balance there.

# The 3-D grid in geophysical fluids (cont'd)

- If ALE is applied in *z* direction, differential vertical motion of fluid particles will inevitably destroy the "horizontal" alignment of neighboring grid points.
- Once that happens, the horizontal force balance must be computed from information carried on sloping coordinate surfaces.
- This is the Achilles Heel of generalized-vertical coordinate modeling of geophysical fluids.

# Vertical coordinate considerations

- $\sigma_{pot}$ =*const.* coordinate layers make it easy to properly model subgrid-scale adiabatic mixing and overflows.
- In sloping coordinate layers, computation of the horizontal pressure gradient force is tricky.
- In  $\sigma_{pot}$ =const. layers, the PGF reduces (approx-imately) to a single term a major advantage.
- HYCOM has traditionally used  $\sigma_2$  (potential density referenced to 2km depth) as vertical coordinate. This choice was made to minimize regions in the world ocean where pot. density is multi-valued in the vertical.
- σ<sub>1</sub> appears to offer certain advantages (better: tradeoffs).

# General recipe:

$$\nabla_{z} = \nabla_{s} - (\nabla_{s} z) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Big|_{s}$$

# In particular:

(pressure gradient in u,v equations)

 $\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla_z p = \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla_s p + \nabla_s (gz)$ 

Special nonsolenoidal cases:

(a) 
$$\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{p}$$
  $\left[\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla_z p\right] = \nabla_p(gz)$  (popular in meteorology)  
(b)  $\mathbf{s} = \rho$   $\left[\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla_z p\right] = \nabla_\rho (\frac{p}{\rho} + gz)$  (popular in oceanography)

# A meridional cross section showing observed $\sigma_{\text{pot}}$ in the Atlantic



Definition:  $\sigma$  = density minus 1000 kg/m<sup>3</sup>

sigma 2)at longitude 35.5 W 33.0 30 <u>36.</u> 34.8 37.2 34.2 ŝ g A. .. Ġ -35.4 Ó d. /ဗ္ဗု 35.4 -36.6--36.0 Ċ 38.0 ဖြွ 36.6 (stably stratified near bottom) -70-60-50-40-30-20-10 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70

static instability







## modelE coupled with HYCOM





Temperature for MSU channel 4 (C)



Net Heat at Z0 (W/m2)

1.30







# Not enough ice? Too much ice?









DEPTH (m) : 0 TIME : 16-JUL 20:54



# North Atlantic Overturning





Meridional overturning streamfunction in potential density space



## Layer mass census (thickness drift in m)





LONGITUDE : 20E to 20E(380) (averaged)

DATA SET: levitus\_climatology



The sum of model defects is (remarkably) constant across ocean models