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1. Introduction

- **Sea ice thickness is highly heterogeneous** spanning a wide range of spatial scales from several meters to hundreds of kilometers in the polar oceans.
- Convergence and divergence of sea ice in the polar oceans can produce stripes of thick ridged ice and **lead with a typical range of 5-1000m in width and 1-50km in length** (Morison et al., 1992), which is unresolved by current climate model grid.
- The fluxes of **brine rejection** during ice formation and freshwater while ice melt exert strong impacts on the seasonal cycle of the ocean upper halocline. Although lead accounts for less than 10% (average around 2.0%) in the Arctic Ocean in winter months it is estimated to contribute 50% of the ice formation in winter.

![Figure 1](imageURL)

Fig. 1. (a) Monthly mean lead percentages from NIMBUS-7 SMMR and DMSP SSM/I passive microwave remote sensing data in the Arctic Ocean with one standard deviation error bar above and below the mean, and (b) the initial water temperature and salinity profiles on April 17 2011 for all cases in Table 1 and some in Table 2.
Unresolved lead in ocean grid is a subgrid scale problem.

1) **Summer ice melting case**: A vertically 1-D ice-ocean model of NCAR-CCSM 2.0 by Holland (2003) using a multi-column ocean grid (MCOG, corresponding to multi-category ice thickness) produced more realistic results compared to observations that the runs using a conventional single column ocean grid (SCOG).

2) **Winter ice formation case**
All 10 models in the Arctic Ocean Model Intercomparison Project (AOMIP) failed to reproduce the halocline partly due to lack of physics in vertical mixing process and/or shelf/basin exchanges (Holloway et al., 2007). Problems with salinity gradient degradation was observed in ocean general circulation models in the Southern Ocean (Duffy and Caldeira, 1997 and Duffy et al. 1999). Implications include deeper MLD, saltier surface and impacts on vertical heat fluxes in the ocean and to the sea ice.
Parameterization in the following form of vertical distribution of added salinity in the upper mixed layer (Nguyen et al., 2009):

\[
s(z) = \begin{cases} 
Az^n & \text{if } |z| \leq |D_{sp}| \\
0 & \text{if } |z| > |D_{sp}|
\end{cases}
\]
Questions to answer in this presentation:
1) How significant are the impacts of the subgrid brine rejection on climate model results.

2) Why there is an uncertainty of parameter n:
   n=0 in Duffy and Calderia (1997) and Duffy et al. (1999)
   N=5 in Nguyen et al. (2009)

3) A new parameter n as a function of lead percentage

Method

Climate model solution: 30km grid model results

‘True’ solution: 1km grid model results averaged in climate model grid size

Idealized model domain of (100 * 100) and vertically 3 m per layer and totally 270m.

Initial T, S profile from NPEO CTD data.
Table 1. List of model experiments for assessing the parameterization schemes. Case A03wind is forced with wind (5.5, 0) m/s in (x, y) direction. All cases in this table have 3m vertical resolution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshwater equivalent freezing in lead (m³/s)</th>
<th>Lead area (km²)</th>
<th>Lead percentage in a 30 km by 30 km box (%)</th>
<th>1km horizontal model grid</th>
<th>30km horizontal model grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No parameterization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3<em>3 5</em>5 7<em>7 7</em>7 10<em>10 15</em>15 20<em>20 25</em>25 30*30</td>
<td>1.0 2.8 5.4 5.4 11.1 25.0 44.4 69.4 100</td>
<td>A01 A02 A03 A03wind* A04 A05 A06 A07 A08</td>
<td>B0 C0n0 C0n1 C0n2 C0n3 C0n4 C0n5 C0n6 C0n7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3*3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>A11</td>
<td>B1 C1n0, C1n1, C1n2, …, C1n7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parameter n is calculated by equation (2).
Table 2. List of model experiments for sensitivity experiments of the new parameterization scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshwater equivalent freezing in lead (m$^3$/s)</th>
<th>Lead area (km$^2$)</th>
<th>Lead percentage (%)</th>
<th>H - grid (km)</th>
<th>V - grid (m)</th>
<th>Initial salinity and temperature on NPEO day</th>
<th>No parameterization</th>
<th>Fitted n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPEO data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anpeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPEO data</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bnpeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPEO data</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fnpeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3*3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A01Id18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A01Id18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A01Id18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B0Id18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B0Id20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B0h20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B0h40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Salinity anomaly distributions when lead is resolved
When lead << climate model grid

When lead ~ climate model grid
Fig. 3 Comparison of (a) vertical salinity profiles and (b) mixed layer depths among cases A03, A08, B0 and C0n5 using A03 as 'true' solution.
Wind effects on the salinity addition is modest, because
1) It is mostly blocked by sea ice
2) The effects of an arctic mean wind ~5.5m/s without sea ice blocking are small as shown below
5. Effects of Nguyen et al. (2009) parameterization with constant n

The larger the n, the more saline is added to the base on the mixed layer.

n=0 in Duffy et al. (1999) and =5 in Nguyen et al. (2009)

But how to determine the best n-value?

\[
s(z) = \begin{cases} 
  Az^n & \text{if } |z| \leq |D_{sp}| \\
  0 & \text{if } |z| > |D_{sp}|
\end{cases}
\]

Fig. 5. Comparison of (a) vertical salinity profiles and (b) mixed layer depths among cases A03 with C0n0, C0n1, C0n3 and C0n5 using A03 as 'true' solution.
6. New parameterization with $n$ as a function of lead percentage

Estimate $n$ using 1km grid cases A01 ~A07 with different lead percentage.

The pairs of lead percent ($p$) vs. parameter $n$ (>0) are used to further best fit into a curve.

$$ n = a \cdot p^b + c $$

The $n$-value turns negative when lead percentage is greater than 51%, indicating that parameterization is unnecessary under these ice conditions.
6.1 How does the parameterization fit with climate model with unknown lead position in a grid cell and varying horizontal grid scales.

Ratio of the parameter $n$ with deviated the lead center over parameter $n$ with lead centered at (50, 50).

The fit curve from results averaged in 20km, 30km and 40km grid area are converged together especially at low lead percentage.
7. Effects of new parameterization with fitted $n$: consistent improvements over time

Fig. 7. Comparison of vertical salinity profiles from (a) to (e) on different running days and (f) mixed layer depths from cases B0 and F01 using case A01 as 'true' solution.
7.1 The parameterization works with different freezing rate in lead.

Fig. 8. Comparison of (a) vertical salinity profiles and (b) mixed layer depths from cases B1 and F11 using A11 as 'true' solution.

(a) Salinity on day 40

(b) Mixed layer depth
7.2 Test of the new parameterization in real ice-ocean conditions with time-varying lead percentage and freshwater equivalent freezing rate in lead

NPEO Day 1 (N 89.26 D, E 88.71 D)
NEPO Day 40 (N 86.82 D, W 0.50 D)
7.3 The new scheme shows similar improvements for different initial vertical salinity profiles (and MLD).
7.4 Improvements are shown in model results with 9m vertical resolution.
8. Model error comparison of all cases

In order to quantitatively measure and compare model errors in different cases, the salinity profiles in each case is averaged in days 20~40 in a 30km by 30km area for 30km grid cases (note that equation 3 should be changed correspondingly to 20km by 20km area for 20km grid cases, and 40km by 40km area for 40km grid cases):

\[
\bar{S}(k) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{30 \times 30 \times 20} \sum_{i=36}^{65} \sum_{j=36}^{65} \sum_{t=20}^{40} S(i,j,k,t), & \text{for 1km grid cases} \\
\frac{1}{20} \sum_{t=20}^{40} S(50,50,k,t), & \text{for 30km grid cases}
\end{cases}
\]

The sum of squares of residuals (SSQ) of the averaged salinity profiles are calculated as:

\[
SSQ_{\text{baseline}} = \sum_{k=k_{\text{lower}}}^{k_{\text{upper}}} (\bar{S}_{\text{baseline}}(k) - \bar{S}_{\text{true}}(k))^2
\]

\[
SSQ_{\text{sensitivity}} = \sum_{k=k_{\text{lower}}}^{k_{\text{upper}}} (\bar{S}_{\text{sensitivity}}(k) - \bar{S}_{\text{true}}(k))^2
\]

Here subscript ‘true’, ‘baseline’, and ‘sensitivity’ denote case names started with ‘A’, ‘B’ and all others, respectively. Then the percentage of improvement \( I \) is defined similar to the approach in Nguyen et al. (2009) as follows:

\[
I = \frac{SSQ_{\text{baseline}} - SSQ_{\text{sensitivity}}}{SSQ_{\text{baseline}}} \times 100
\]
Table 3. Improvement percentage $I$ of model experiments in Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshwater equivalent freezing rate 50 m$^3$/s and lead percentage 1%</th>
<th>A01 as true values, B0 as baseline</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layers</td>
<td>C0n0</td>
<td>C0n1</td>
<td>C0n2</td>
<td>C0n3</td>
<td>C0n4</td>
<td>C0n5</td>
<td>C0n6</td>
<td>C0n7</td>
<td>F01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-12 m</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-42 m</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-42 m</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshwater equivalent freezing rate 50 m$^3$/s and lead percentage 5.4%</th>
<th>A03 as true values, B0 as baseline</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layers</td>
<td>C0n0</td>
<td>C0n1</td>
<td>C0n2</td>
<td>C0n3</td>
<td>C0n4</td>
<td>C0n5</td>
<td>C0n6</td>
<td>C0n7</td>
<td>F03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-12 m</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-42 m</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-89</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-64</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-42 m</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-99</td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>-118</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshwater equivalent freezing rate 100 m$^3$/s and lead percentage 1%</th>
<th>A11 as true values, B1 as baseline</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layers</td>
<td>C1n0</td>
<td>C1n1</td>
<td>C1n2</td>
<td>C1n3</td>
<td>C1n4</td>
<td>C1n5</td>
<td>C1n6</td>
<td>C1n7</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-12 m</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-42 m</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>-125</td>
<td>-164</td>
<td>-190</td>
<td>-207</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-42 m</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 . Improvement percentage \( I \) in different layers of model experiments in Table 2. The three cases in the second column represent the true, baseline and sensitivity cases, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPEO cases</th>
<th>Anpeo</th>
<th>Bnpeo</th>
<th>Fnpeo</th>
<th>0-12m</th>
<th>30-42m</th>
<th>0-42m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial salinity and temperature on NPEO day 18</td>
<td>A01ld18</td>
<td>B0ld18</td>
<td>F01ld18</td>
<td>0-12m</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30-42m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial salinity and temperature on NPEO day 20</td>
<td>A01ld20</td>
<td>B0ld20</td>
<td>F01ld20</td>
<td>0-12m</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30-42m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal model grid 20km</td>
<td>A01</td>
<td>B0h20</td>
<td>F01h20</td>
<td>0-12m</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33-45m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal model grid 40km</td>
<td>A01</td>
<td>B0h40</td>
<td>F01h40</td>
<td>0-12m</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30-42m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical model grid 9m</td>
<td>A01v9</td>
<td>B0v9</td>
<td>F01v9</td>
<td>0-18m</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>27-45m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Summary and outlook

• When lead is unresolved, both vertical salinity profile and MLD show systematic errors with saltier sea surface and deeper MLD. These errors in climate models can be magnified each year in a multi-decadal runs (or spin-up) and cause severe model drift.

• Parameterization of the sub-grid scale mixing of rejected brine in climate models have been found to improve the overall model comparison with observations in regional ice-ocean models in the Antarctica and Arctic Oceans.

• The proposed new parameter $n$ determined as a function of lead percentage in a model grid cell is proved to improve modeled salinity profile and MLD under various sea ice conditions in the polar oceans. It is also proved that the parameterization is suitable for model runs with different initial salinity profiles and different horizontal and vertical model grid resolutions.
The parameterization scheme is for ice formation only. It is also not applicable when ice concentration is low (or lead percentage is more than 51%).

In summer melting seasons, the lead area will be warmer and fresher than its surroundings and thus form a stable stratification in the local water column. The MCOG scheme (Holland, 2003) is found to improve model results of both ocean temperature and salinity structure and sea ice mass balances. Studies are under way to implement MCOG and the new parameterization scheme in climate models in separate ice formation/melt conditions or combined.

Assessment of the global climate model performance with the new scheme is our next step.

Acknowledgments.

NSF Climate Process Team (CPT) project ARC-0968676
NSF ARC-0652838
Funding support from IARC-JAMSTEC Agreement