## **HYCOM1 VS HYBGEN FOR ALE REGRIDDING**

**Alan Wallcraft** 

Center for Ocean-Atmospheric Prediction Studies (COAPS) Florida State University

**CESM Ocean Model Working Group Meeting** 

9 February 2023

## **BASIC ALE APPROACH**

- For each time step:
- Solve the layered continuity equation
  - Move all the layers
- Apply Arbitrary Lagrangian Eulerian (ALE) Method in the vertical
  - Regrid: select the "desired" layer structure
    - HYCOM1 and HYBGEN:
      - · Favor isopycnals that outcrop into fixed depth layers
  - Remap: from the source to the regrid layers
    - Interfaces can move, but the fluid does not move
    - Choose interpolation that is conservative, with no new extrema
    - Nominally, this does not change the solution but it does add diffusion

## MOM6 ALE: HYCOM1

- Regridding walks a monotonic vertical profile
  - Source is layer sigma2 potential density, with a compressibility factor
    - Factor reduces the chance that layer N+1 is lighter than layer N
  - From these layer densities and the layer thicknesses, construct a vertical profile using piecewise polynomials
    - Profiles can be from a remapping scheme (e.g. PPM\_H4)
      - P1M\_H2, linear between H2 interfaces, is the only practical scheme
  - $\circ$  Target is interface sigma2 potential density plus compressibility factor
    - Constant in time and space
  - $\circ$  The new interface depths are at the location of targets on the profile
    - Unique mapping from a monotonic profile to the target isopycnals
- Vertical remapping typically uses PPM\_H4 for all layers, where H4 indicates a cubic polynomial calculation of interface (edge) values
  - PPM limits edge values to lie between layer averages
- Produces smooth interfaces, no need for an additional interface smoother

### MOM6 ALE: HYCOM1 REGRIDDING

- Why not use the REMAP piecewise polynomials for REGRID?
  - **PPM\_H4** eventually produces unstable layers
  - PPM\_CW, Colella and Woodward (1984), might be OK.
    - Adds a monotonic profile constraint to \_H4 edges
    - Not yet in dev/gfdl
- The new interface depths are at the location of targets on the profile
- However, the actual new interface densities are:
  - Remap (e.g. PPM\_H4) T & S to new interfaces, and then reapply
    \_H2 (linear) or \_H4 (cubic) to the new layer densities and thicknesses
    - The latter step is not performed in the running model
- The new interface densities can be approximated by holding the density profile fixed except for a single interface and applying the remapping and edge recalculation steps to get the new density at that interface
  - $\circ$  Allows us to visualize the effect of moving the interfaces
    - Orange curves on upcoming plots



Potential Density at 95W25N, REGRID=P1MH2 REMAP=PPMH4



Potential Density at 95W25N, REGRID=REMAP=PPMH4



Potential Density at 95W25N, REGRID=REMAP=PPMCW

# HYCOM (MOM6) ALE: HYBGEN

• Target is layer average sigma2 potential density

• Constant in time, constant (MOM6) or varying (HYCOM) in space

# Regridding uses entrainment

- Maintain isopycnal layers
  - If layer is too heavy, entrain from layer above
  - If layer is too light, entrain from layer below
- $\circ$  Sometimes an interface needs to move both up and down
  - Greedy algorithm, start from top and work down
  - Often get thick-thin-thick-thin layer structure
- Use PCM for near-isopycnal layers: regridding and remapping
  - Greatly simplifies entrainment/detrainment regridding
    - Detrainment (thinning) does not change layer density
  - $\circ$  PCM is 1st order accurate and very diffusive
    - Regridding does not effect most (iso-pycnal) layers
      - $\cdot$  No regridding, no loss of accuracy and no diffusion
- Vertical remapping typically uses PPM with WENO-based cubic edge calculations for fixed and non-isopycnal coordinate layers
- Produces noisy interfaces, that require an interface smoother

## **HYBGEN vs HYCOM1**

- HYBGEN assumes the source layer structure is close to the desired result, HYCOM1 makes no such assumption (number of layers in/out can differ)
  - HYCOM1 can regrid from z coordinates to isopycnals, HYBGEN can't
  - MOM6 uses HYCOM1 as a vertical interpolator, e.g. for initialization, INTERPOLATE\_SPONGE\_TIME\_SPACE and ODA\_INCUPD
- HYBGEN often produces a thick-thin-thick-thin layer structure, and HYCOM1 does not
- HYBGEN maintains isopycnal layers exactly but HYCOM1 does not
  - If a layer changes thickness adiabatically:
    - Its layer average potential density (HYBGEN) is unchanged
    - Its interface potential density (HYCOM1) is not, because this depends on nearby layer thicknesses and densities
    - So the associated interfaces are moved by the HYCOM1 regridder and preserved by the HYBGEN regridder
- In general, HYBGEN moves interfaces significantly less than HYCOM1, so HYBGEN likely causes less diapycnal diffusion than HYCOM1

### **GULF STREAM LAYER 22 REGRID THICKNESS CHANGE (M/DAY) SNAPSHOT**

- 0.08 degree Atlantic MOM6 with 41 layers, CFSR 2003 repeated forcing
- Run for 31 days with INTERFACE\_FILTER after 10 years of HYCOM1
- Change from REGRID only, 50 m/day is 17 cm/timestep (DT\_THERM=300s)

![](_page_9_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### HYBGEN

### HYCOM1

### GULF STREAM 31N & 33N REGRID THICKNESS CHANGE (M/DAY) SNAPSHOT

- 0.08 degree Atlantic MOM6 with 41 layers, CFSR 2003 repeated forcing
- Run for 31 days with INTERFACE\_FILTER after 10 years of HYCOM1

![](_page_10_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### **31N & 33N HYBGEN**

31N & 33N HYCOM1

## ATLANTIC OVERTURNING STREAMFUNCTION, OVER YEARS 8-10 (I)

- 0.08 degree Global with 41 layers, CFSR 2003 repeated forcing
- 25S to 65N and 0 to 6500m depth, 2.5 Sv contour interval GLOBAL HYCOM (HYBGEN) GLOBAL MOM6 (HYCOM1)

![](_page_11_Figure_3.jpeg)

HYCOM at 26°N: max 11.6Sv at 1000m; 0Sv at 3500m MOM6 at 26°N: max 14.0Sv at 0900m; 0Sv at 2730m RAPID array at 26°N: max 17.0Sv at 1000m; 0Sv at 4300m

• GFDL's MOM6 HYCOM1 cases (e.g. 75-layer OM4\_025) are similar

## **ATLANTIC OVERTURNING STREAMFUNCTION, OVER YEARS 8-10 (II)**

- 0.08 degree Atlantic-only with 41 layers, CFSR 2003 repeated forcing
- SPONGE to monthly climatology near 28S and 80N
- 25S to 65N and 0 to 6500m depth, 2.5 Sv contour interval

![](_page_12_Figure_4.jpeg)

ATLANTIC HYCOM (HYBGEN)

ATLANTIC MOM6 (HYCOM1)

HYCOM at 26°N: max 14.9Sv at 1000m; 0Sv at 6200m MOM6 at 26°N: max 14.8Sv at 0900m; 0Sv at 2910m RAPID array at 26°N: max 17.0Sv at 1000m; 0Sv at 4300m 0.08 ATLANTIC BOTTOM SIGMA-2 P.DENSITY: FEBRUARY YR10 (I)

- A shallow Atlantic overturning streamfuction is often due to too light overflow from the Nordic Seas
- HYCOM is denser below 1500m isobath
  - Slightly lighter than observed

![](_page_13_Figure_4.jpeg)

• Both are slightly denser than their GLOBAL twins

### **BEST MOM6 ATLANTIC CONFIGURATION**

- 0.08 degree Atlantic-only with 41 layers, CFSR 2003 repeated forcing
- USE\_MEKE=False, **BBL\_EFFIC=0**, CORRECT\_BBL\_BOUNDS=True
- CORIOLIS\_SCHEME="SADOURNY75\_ENERGY"
- KD=.1E-4, KV=.3E-4, HENYEY\_IGW\_BACKGROUND=False
- KH\_VEL\_SCALE=.00286, AH\_VEL\_SCALE=.02, no SMAGORINSKY
- REGRIDDING\_COORDINATE\_MODE="HYCOM1":
  - KH\_ETA\_CONST=20 (for OM\_025 this would be 62.5),
    DETANGLE\_INTERFACES=True, KHTH\_MAX\_CFL=.8
  - REGRID\_COMPRESSIBILITY\_FRACTION=0.01
  - INTERPOLATION\_SCHEME="P1M\_H2", REMAPPING\_SCHEME="PPM\_H4"
  - REGRID\_FILTER\_SHALLOW\_DEPTH=90, REGRID\_FILTER\_DEEP\_DEPTH=114, REGRID\_TIME\_SCALE=6000 (5 \* DT\_THERM): better Gulf Stream separation
- or REGRIDDING\_COORDINATE\_MODE="HYBGEN":
  - THICKNESSDIFFUSE=False, APPLY\_INTERFACE\_FILTER=True
  - INTERFACE\_FILTER\_ORDER=4, INTERFACE\_FILTER\_TIME=10800
  - REMAPPING\_SCHEME="WENO\_HYBGEN"
  - HYBGEN\_RELAX\_PERIOD=16 (16 x DT\_THERM = 4800s)
  - **DT\_THERM=300** (same as **DT**)

0.08 ATLANTIC BOTTOM SIGMA-2 P.DENSITY: FEBRUARY YR10 (I)

- HYBGEN: INTERFACE\_FILTER\_TIME=10800, DT\_THERM=300 — slightly denser than ATLANTIC HYCOM —
- HYCOM1: KH\_ETA\_CONST=20, DT\_THERM=1200
- correct/to dense west/east of the Reykjanes Ridge -

![](_page_15_Figure_4.jpeg)

• However, "BEST" GLOBAL MOM6 HYCOM1 still very light

**ATLANTIC OVERTURNING STREAMFUNCTION, OVER YEARS 8-10 (III)** 

- Best 0.08 degree Atlantic-only with 41 layers, CFSR 2003 repeated forcing
- 25S to 65N and 0 to 6500m depth, 2.5 Sv contour interval

**ATLANTIC MOM6 HYBGEN** 

![](_page_16_Figure_3.jpeg)

**ATLANTIC MOM6 HYCOM1** 

HYBGEN at 26°N: max 16.2Sv at 1000m; 0Sv at 3900m HYCOM1 at 26°N: max 16.3Sv at 1000m; 0Sv at 3600m RAPID array at 26°N: max 17.0Sv at 1000m; 0Sv at 4300m

# SUMMARY

- Based on results presented here, and other evidence, HYCOM1 has more diapycnal diffusion than an isopycnal-favoring method should
  - o PPM\_CW + PPM\_CW less diffusive than P1M\_H2 + PPM\_H4
  - No exact measurements, but for a Gulf of Mexico domain HYBGEN with 10x KD has better Loop Current eddy behavior that HYCOM1
- HYBGEN has minimal diapycnal diffusion, but has other issues
  - Thick-thin-thick-thin layer structure reduces effective vertical resolution
  - MOM6: DT=DT\_THERM, no compressibility factor, not an interpolator
  - Requires additional interface smoothing
- Can we engineer a layer density based approach that improves on HYBGEN?
  - HYBGENI walks a monotonic vertical density profile, like HYCOM1
    - Does not produce a thick-thin-thick-thin layer structure
    - More diapycnal diffusion than HYBGEN, much less than HYCOM1
    - Stabilizes the density profile, but not with a compressibility factor
    - Working in HYCOM, still being tested in MOM6
- Can we engineer a HYCOM1-like scheme with acceptable diapycnal diffusion?
  - Still some ideas to try, but not so far for interface density targets
  - HYBGENI, which targets layer density, is inspired by HYCOM1
    - Similar to HYCOM1 P1M\_H2 when its isopycnal detection is turned off