


Towards Validating Wave-Ice Interactions in Climate Models Using In Situ Observations




Vincent T. Cooper¹, Lettie A. Roach¹, Jim Thomson², Samuel D. Brenner³, and Cecilia M. Bitz¹

¹Atmospheric Sciences, University of Washington, ²Applied Physics Laboratory, University of Washington, ³School of Oceanography, University of Washington



PRESENTED AT:




INTRODUCTION: WHY STUDY WAVE-ICE INTERACTIONS?

Ocean waves determine the formation and fracture of sea ice “flocs.” As the Arctic climate warms and sea ice retreats, the remaining sea ice cover will be exposed to bigger waves. More wave activity leads to smaller ice flocs, and small flocs are more susceptible to further melt.

Wave-ice interaction is currently absent in global climate models. The models either omit waves entirely or include a wave component that treats the sea ice as a solid wall. We need a global-scale coupled wave-ice model to understand the full impact of waves on Arctic sea ice.

...But there are very few observations of waves in sea ice to support development of such a model.

Here, we compare in situ observations from the Beaufort Sea with a global coupled wave-ice model experiment conducted by Roach et al. (2019). We relate observations to model results by focusing on wave energy and wind-wave relations inside the marginal ice zone.




(click on image to enlarge)

[VIDEO] <https://www.youtube.com/embed/LtfPJHJe5u8?rel=0&fs=1&modestbranding=1&rel=0&showinfo=0>

See video (30 seconds) for examples of waves in Arctic sea ice. Footage by Edward Blanchard-Grigglesworth.

MODEL & MEASUREMENTS


MODEL & MEASUREMENTS



The Roach et al. (2019) experiment was the first to include two-way coupled interactions between sea ice and ocean waves in a global model.

Wave-ice coupling: wave attenuation in Wavewatch depends on the sea ice concentration, ice thickness, and size of sea ice floes. Sea ice floe formation and fracture depend on the wave spectrum.

Significant Wave Height and Ice Concentration:
Climatological Mean for Oct. and Nov. (2000-2019)
Results from Roach et al. (2019) Coupled Wave-Ice Model



Stippled white dots represent the area where ice concentrations are generally between 15% and 80% during October-November, which is the period when the BGOS and SODA instruments were most able to obtain valid measurements of waves in ice.

MODEL & MEASUREMENTS

Overview of In Situ Instruments

Beaufort Gyre Observing System (BGOS)




Adapted from Thomson (2020)

Two subsurface **BGOS** moorings in the Beaufort Sea measured ocean surface waves with the Nortek Acoustic Wave and Current (AWAC) instrument (boxed in red).

Data from 2012 were initially reported in Thomson and Rogers (2014); here, we employ an extended dataset with observations spanning 2012-2018 (Thomson 2020).

Stratified Ocean Dynamics of the Arctic (SODA)




Adapted from Lee et al. (2016)

Three subsurface **SODA** moorings in the Beaufort Sea measured ocean surface waves with the Nortek Signature-500 acoustic instrument.

Data analysis is ongoing and was last updated in June 2020 (Brenner et al. 2020).

The Challenge of Observing Waves in Ice



Source: Nortek website

Inside the sea ice edge, roughness on the bottom of ice floes can mask out the wave signal that would normally be identified by the moorings' acoustic instruments, especially when waves are small.

When the mooring is in partial ice cover, **the wave signal must be sufficiently energetic relative to noise and ice roughness** to yield a valid wave measurement.

Summary of Observations

Data set	Instrument	Time Period	Latitude	Longitude	Count of Wave Obs. (1)	
					0-100 km	100+ km
BGOS-A	AWAC	2012-2018	75° N	150° W	11	29
BGOS-D	AWAC	2013-2018	74° N	140° W	6	2
SODA-A	Signature500	2018-2019	73° N	148° W	24	16
SODA-B	Signature500	2018-2019	75° N	146° W	35	10
SODA-C	Signature500	2019	78° N	139° W	0	16
Total					76	73

(1) Count of Wave Observations: this represents the number of valid wave measurements in partial ice cover (grouped by distance inside the ice edge) that are used for comparisons with model output. Model data are based on 6-hr intervals; the measurements are averaged to 6-hour intervals for comparability (despite sampling at a higher frequency), i.e., there is a maximum of one observational datapoint per 6 hours in the "count" above.


(click on images to enlarge)

METHOD OF COMPARISON AND WAVE ENERGY RESULTS

METHOD OF COMPARISON

Using Satellite Data To Estimate Distance from the Ice Edge

Distance and Ice Concentration



Illustrative Data from 2018-07-23

- To compare observations at a specific point with gridded model data, we need to control for model bias in ice edge position and in ice concentration
- We defined the “**Distance from the Ice Edge**” as the distance from a point inside the ice cover to the nearest location with ice concentration less than 15%, and **we compare wave metrics from the observations with model results that are located at a similar Distance from the Ice Edge**
- We limited the domain of comparison to the Beaufort-Chukchi Sea Region near the in situ observations

Ice Concentration from NOAA/NSIDC Climate Data Record of Passive Microwave Sea Ice Concentration (Meier et al. 2020)


WAVE ENERGY RESULTS

Comparison of Wave Energy at 100+ km Inside the Marginal Ice Zone

- Focusing on waves present at 100+ km inside the MIZ, we find that **the model broadly captures the distribution of wave height** (a measure of wave energy)
- This result is an initial indication that the model can produce a realistic simulation of wave-ice interactions, but there are notable differences between the distributions
- Additional analysis is needed to attribute the differences to model bias vs. sampling challenges in the observations

Distribution of Significant Wave Height at 100+ km Inside MIZ

Model Results span 2012-2019 in the Beaufort-Chukchi Sea Region




Blue lines denote observations

Domain shown is limited to waves > 33 cm, i.e., waves large enough to overcome the signal-to-noise threshold for all instruments considered. Smaller waves detected only by a subset of the moorings are excluded here.

(click on images to enlarge)


SPECTRAL RESULTS: WIND WAVES AND SWELL

RESULTS: WAVE SPECTRA



RESULTS: IMPLIED FETCH

- Implied Fetch for Wind Waves in the MIZ
- Wind-wave theory also allows us to estimate the **implied fetch**, i.e., the distance of water over which waves are generated
 - Implied fetch for observed waves 100+ km inside the ice indicates that **waves are locally generated at length scales comparable to the size of model grid cells**
 - Additionally, **satellite observations show more low ice concentrations** at 100+ km inside the ice edge compared to the model
 - The combination of **short fetch scales and model bias towards too-high ice concentrations** appears responsible for the absence of wind waves in the model
 - Testing these observed wind wave spectra in the *Horvat & Tziperman (2015)* parametrization suggests that **locally-generated wind waves are strong enough to fracture sea ice** and will be important to consider in future model development



SUPPLEMENTARY: WIND-WAVE THEORY

- Additional Detail: Wind-Wave Theory Methods
- In the marginal sea region of the observations considered here, fetch is generally the limiting variable for wave generation (*Hasselmann et al., 1973; Thomson & Rogers, 2014*)
 - We apply the theory of fetch-limited wind waves (*Young, 1999*) to evaluate the types of modeled and observed waves in partial ice cover
 - First, we use the 10-meter wind speed (U_{10}) from JRA55 reanalysis at the location of the relevant wave data to transform Significant Wave Height (H_s), Peak Frequency (f_p), and Fetch (x) to their non-dimensional counterparts (E , F , and X , respectively):
$$E = \left(\frac{gH_s}{4U_{10}^2}\right)^2 \quad F = \frac{f_p U_{10}}{g} \quad X = \frac{gx}{U_{10}^2}$$
 - E vs. F for wind-generated waves should follow the power-law relationship implied in *Young (1999)*:
$$E = (6.9 \pm 3.8) \times 10^{-6} F^{-3.2}$$
 - Power-law relationships relating E and F with X enable extrapolation of an implied fetch, x , for the waves that follow the wind-wave theory:
$$E_{max} = (7.5 \pm 2.0) \times 10^{-7} x^{0.8}$$
$$F_{min} = (2.0 \pm 0.3) x^{-0.25}$$

(click on images to enlarge)

CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS

▪ **Wave energy inside the Marginal Ice Zone**


- The model broadly captures the distribution of significant wave height at 100+ km inside the ice edge, but there are notable differences due to model bias and sample size of observations

▪ **Wind waves in ice** are present in the *Observations* but not in the *Model*

- Model resolution is likely not fine enough to capture short wind waves, and...
- Too-high ice concentration bias in the model at 100+ km inside the ice edge hinders wind wave generation
- The wind waves appear strong enough to fracture ice and need to be considered in model development

▪ **Swell waves in ice** are present in the *Model* but not in the *Observations*

- Swell waves could be absent in the observations considered here because the wave signal may not be strong enough to overcome the instrument noise floor and ice roughness, and/or...
- The model may not be sufficiently attenuating swell waves, resulting in excess swell at 100+ km inside the ice edge



(click on image to enlarge)

Author email:

vcooper@uw.edu

FUTURE RESEARCH

FUTURE RESEARCH

Model	Observations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ We are currently preparing sensitivity analyses to evaluate how the model vs. observations comparisons change in response to alternative wave attenuation schemes and coupling frequencies<ul style="list-style-type: none">– These experiments will illustrate the sensitivity of the MIZ to uncertainties in wave-ice physics, informing observational campaigns that can constrain further model development▪ We plan to investigate whether adjusting parameters in the model will lead to more locally-generated wind waves at 100+ km inside the ice edge▪ We need to expand analysis of model results beyond the Beaufort-Chukchi Sea region	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ We need more observations of waves in ice at basin scale<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Satellite measurements of waves that overlap with in situ wave observations would be valuable for validation and increased spatial coverage▪ We plan to investigate why swell waves were not observed at 100+ km inside the ice edge by comparing the wave spectra considered here with Beaufort Sea surface buoys (SWIFTs) placed in sea ice during the Arctic Sea State campaign

(click on image to enlarge)

Author email:

vcooper@uw.edu

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Vincent T. Cooper

First Year Graduate Student, Atmospheric Sciences

University of Washington

vcooper@uw.edu

ABSTRACT

The retreat of Arctic sea ice coincides with increased ocean surface wave activity, and wave-ice interactions are consequently poised to have a growing influence on the Arctic climate system. Recent field campaigns have focused on rectifying the scarcity of wave measurements inside the marginal ice zone, and work is now underway to incorporate wave-ice interactions in global climate models. Here, we apply a collection of in situ wave observations spanning multiple years in the Beaufort Sea and including wave activity beyond 100 kilometers inside the sea ice edge. To better understand waves in the presence of sea ice, we connect the in situ data with satellite-derived ice concentrations across the Arctic and compare the observations with a recent global climate model experiment that includes coupled interactions between waves and a sea ice floe size distribution. We present a series of comparisons focused on wave energy and wind-wave relationships in partial ice cover. These analyses provide a framework for assessing the impact of uncertainty in wave-ice physics on the marginal ice zone in new experiments in the coupled wave-ice model. Our work provides insights to guide both further model development and future observational campaigns.

REFERENCES

Brenner, S., Crews, L., Rainville, L., Thomson, J., & Lee, C.M. (2020). Waves data products from Nortek Signature-500 data for the SODA project. In prep.

Hasselmann, K., et al. (1973), Measurements of wind-wave growth and swell decay during the Joint North Sea Wave Project (JONSWAP), *Erganzungsheft Dtsch. Hydrogr. Z. Reihe, A(8)*, (Nr. 12), 95 pp.

Horvat, C., & Tziperman, E. (2015). A prognostic model of the sea-ice floe size and thickness distribution. *Cryosphere*. <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-9-2119-2015>

Lee, C.M., et al. (2016), "Stratified Ocean Dynamics in the Arctic: Science and Experiment Plan," APL-UW TR 1601, Technical Report, Applied Physics Laboratory, University of Washington, Seattle, 46pp.

Meier, W. N., Fetterer, M. Savoie, S. Mallory, R. Duerr, and J. Stroeve. 2017. NOAA/NSIDC Climate Data Record of Passive Microwave Sea Ice Concentration, Version 3. Boulder, Colorado USA. NSIDC: National Snow and Ice Data Center. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7265/N59P2ZTG>. 5 Sep. 2020.

Roach, L. A., Bitz, C. M., Horvat, C., & Dean, S. M. (2019). Advances in Modeling Interactions Between Sea Ice and Ocean Surface Waves. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001836>

Roach, L. A., Horvat, C., Dean, S. M., & Bitz, C. M. (2018). An Emergent Sea Ice Floe Size Distribution in a Global Coupled Ocean-Sea Ice Model. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017JC013692>

Smith, M., & Thomson, J. (2016). Scaling observations of surface waves in the Beaufort Sea. *Elementa*. <https://doi.org/10.12952/journal.elementa.000097>

Squire, V. A. (2020). Ocean Wave Interactions with Sea Ice: A Reappraisal. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-fluid-010719-060301>

Thomson, J. (2012). Wave breaking dissipation observed with "swift" drifters. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-12-00018.1>

Thomson, J., & Rogers, W. E. (2014). Swell and sea in the emerging Arctic Ocean. *Geophysical Research Letters*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL059983>

Thomson, J. (2020), "Long-term Measurements of Ocean Waves and Sea Ice Draft in the Central Beaufort Sea," Technical Memorandum, APL-UW TM 1-20, Applied Physics Laboratory, University of Washington, Seattle, 22pp.

Young, I. R. (1999). Wind generated ocean waves. In Elsevier Ocean Engineering Series.

We acknowledge the use of imagery from the NASA Worldview application (<https://worldview.earthdata.nasa.gov/>), part of the NASA Earth Observing System Data and Information System (EOSDIS)