

QBO Changes in E3SM

Jadwiga (Yaga) Richter

Jack Chen, Qi Tang, Shaocheng Xie, Phil Rasch

9/19/2019





Overview

- Introduction
- QBO in E3SM
- GW parameterization
- Results of GW tunings
- Impacts
- Future work





Introduction

 QBO: Alternating easterly and westerly shear zones near the equator



Mean Period: 28 months

 Oscillation also in temperature, ozone, & tropopause height





Why is QBO important?

- Influences residual circulation, temperature & chemical transport
- Effects the strength of the polar vortex & NAO
- Strong observational evidence of QBO influence on MJO



QBO W – QBO E 1000 hPa Geopotential height



-40 -30 -20 -10 0 10 20 30 40 geopotential height (m)

Figures from Anstey & Shepherd (2014)

+NAO



Energy Exascale Earth System Model

QBO E3SM v1: U: 5S to 5N (zonal mean)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF



What's needed to model the QBO?

- 1) Kelvin & Rossby-gravity waves Often underrepresented
- 2) Small-scale gravity waves
 (~ 10's to 100s km)
 Mostly parameterized
- 3) Vertical resolution Often inadequate

arth System Model

4) Dynamical core Sometimes overly diffusive





Resolved waves in E3SM



Largely underrepresented





GW Parameterization

- Lindzen (1981) GW propagation parameterization
- Two non-orographic sources: fronts and convection
- Convective Source spectrum parameterization: Beres et al. (2004)



- Based on linear theory of wave generation by thermal forcing
- 40 waves with -100 < c < 100 m/s
- Dominant phase speed related to h (depth of heating)
- Wave Amplitude $\propto Q^{2}$ (Q = heating rate from Zhang and McFarlane scheme)
- Wave spectrum impacted by wind in heating

Tunable parameters:

 CF: conversion factor from grid cell avg to that representative of heating cell; Default: 20 (5%)
 Efficiency: How efficiently is convection generating GWs? Default: 0.4





New vs Old QBO



E3SMv1: CF = 20; Eff = 0.4





MOD: CF = 12.5; Eff = 0.35



Power Spectrum and Amplitude

Avg QBO Period: ERAI: 28 months E3SMv1: 18 months E3SMv1_MOD: 26 months



Amplitude (m/s)

Energy Exascale Earth System Model **QBO** Driving







Energy Exascale Earth System Model



QBO: E3SM vs Other Models (mostly high top)



Left: QBOs in QBOi models and ERAi (Bushell et al. 2019, in review)



Stratospheric U & T Changes DJF



1980 – 2009 DJF Avg

nergy Exascale arth System Model

U Variability



DJF Standard deviation of U





Surface Changes:

Black Contour: Sig at 95% level

.....

Energy Exascale Earth System Model



-2.5 -2.0 -1.5 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5

d) TS E3SMv1_MODGW - ERAI





h) TS E3SMv1_MODGW - E3SMv1



Surface Changes: Variability

Energy Exascale

Earth System Model



Black Contour: Sig at 95% level

-2.5 -2.0 -1.5 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5

QBO Impacts on the MJO: OBS



Son et al. 2017



Energy Exascale Earth System Model

QBO Impacts on the MJO: OBS

MJO Propagation

OBS

MOD GW

Stronger MJO in phase 5-6 in MOD GW (but might not be statistically significant)

Summary & Future Work

- We improved the representation of the QBO in E3SMv1
- QBO Period & overall amplitude are now much closer to observations
- Easterly QBO phase still deficient
- Kelvin & RG waves underrepresented
- Modest changes to mean/variability of overall simulation Richter et. (2019) in press
- Will monitor changes to QBO as convection parameterization changes occur
- Looking at effects of QBO on MJO, but:
- MJO not quite right: period too long; Variance too high & doesn't propagate properly

Future Work

- Improvement of momentum transport in convection
- Verification of in-cloud momentum transport
- Additional of mesoscale convective momentum transport

WRF

