Developing a nonhydrostatic isopycnal-coordinate ocean model
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• Overview of internal gravity waves
• Nonhydrostatic (Navier-Stokes) modeling
• Grid-resolution requirements
  → Nonhydrostatic modeling is expensive!
• A nonhydrostatic isopycnal-coordinate model
  → The cost can be reduced!
• Conclusions
Internal gravity waves

- Internal waves
- Interfacial waves

Typical speeds in the ocean: 1-3 m/s
- Frequencies: Tidal (internal tides) - minutes (internal waves)
- Wavelengths: 100s of km to 10s of m
Surface signatures induced by internal gravity waves
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Applications of internal gravity waves

- Breaking of internal tides and waves may provide the necessary mixing to maintain the ocean stratification (Munk and Wunsch 1998).
- Internal waves are hypothesized to deliver nutrients that sustain thriving coral reef ecosystems (e.g. Florida Shelf, Leichter et al., 2003; Dongsha Atol, Wang et al. 2007)
- Internal waves influence sediment transport in lakes and oceans and propagation of acoustic signals.
- Strong internal wave-induced currents can cause oil platform instability and pipeline rupture.

Mixing induced by breaking internal waves prevents the ocean from turning into a "stagnant pool of cold, salty water"...
Isopycnal vs z- or sigma-coordinates

Advantages of isopycnal coordinates:

• Reduces the number of vertical grid points from $O(100)$ in traditional coordinates to $O(1-10)$

• No spurious vertical (diapycnal) diffusion/mixing

Challenges of isopycnal coordinates:

• Cannot represent unstable stratification

• Layer outcropping (drying of layers) requires special numerical schemes

• Hydrostatic
Hydrostatic vs. nonhydrostatic flows

• **Most ocean flows are hydrostatic**
  - Long horizontal length scales relative to vertical length scales, i.e. long waves (i.e. \( L_h \gg L_v \))

• **Only in small regions is the flow nonhydrostatic**
  - Short horizontal length scales relative to vertical scales (i.e. \( L_h \sim L_v \))
  - Can cost 10X more to compute!
Overturning motions and eddies are not the only nonhydrostatic process…
Nonhydrostatic effects: Frequency dispersion of gravity waves

- Dispersion relation for irrotational surface gravity waves:
  \[ c^2 = \frac{g}{k} \tanh kD = \frac{g}{k} \tanh \pi \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon = \frac{D}{L} \]

- Deep-water limit: \( \varepsilon >> 1 \) (nonhydrostatic)
  \[ c^2 = \frac{g}{k} \]

- Shallow-water limit \( \varepsilon << 1 \) (hydrostatic)
  \[ c^2 = gD \]
When is a flow nonhydrostatic?

Aspect Ratio: \( \varepsilon = \frac{D}{L} = 2 \)
Aspect Ratio:

\[ \varepsilon = \frac{D}{L} = \frac{1}{8} = 0.125 \]

Nonhydrostatic result = Hydrostatic result + \( \varepsilon^2 \)
Example 3D nonhydrostatic z-level simulation:
Internal gravity waves in the South China Sea

From: Zhang and Fringer (2011)
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Grid resolution:
→ Horizontal: Δx=1 km
→ Vertical: 100 z-levels (Δz~10 m)
Number of 3D cells: 12 million
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Generation of weakly nonlinear wavetrains

Isotherms: 16, 20, 24, 28 degrees C

Long internal tides $O(100 \text{ km}) \rightarrow$ Short, solitary-like waves $O(5 \text{ km})$

How can we determine, apriori, how much horizontal grid resolution is needed to simulate this process?
Internal solitary waves

Nonlinear effect (steepening): \( \delta = a/h_1 \)
Nonhydrostatic effect (frequency dispersion): \( \varepsilon = h_1/L \)

Solitary wave:
Balance between nonlinear steepening and nonhydrostatic dispersion.

\( \delta \sim \varepsilon^2 \)
The KdV equation

When computing solitary waves, the behavior of a 3D, fully nonhydrostatic ocean model can be approximated very well with the KdV (Korteweg and de-Vries, 1895) equation:

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla u = - \nabla p - \nabla q
\]

Ocean Model:

\[
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} - \frac{3}{2} \delta x \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x} = - \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x} - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{6} \frac{\partial^3 \xi}{\partial x^3}
\]

KdV:

\[
z = \xi
\]

The KdV equation gives the well-known solution

\[
\xi(x, t) = -a \text{sech}^2 \left( \frac{x - ct}{L_0} \right)
\]

\[
L_0 = \sqrt{\frac{4 \varepsilon^2}{3 \delta a}}
\]
Numerical discretization of KdV

• Many ocean models discretize the equations with second-order accuracy in time and space. (e.g. SUNTANS, Fringer et al. 2006; POM, Blumberg and Mellor, 1987; MICOM, Bleck et al., 1992; MOM, Pacanowski and Griffes, 1999).

• A second-order accurate discretization of the KdV equation using leapfrog (i.e. POM) is given by

\[
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + \left(1 - \frac{3}{2} \delta \xi_i \right) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{6} \frac{\partial^3 \xi}{\partial x^3} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\xi_{i+1}^n - \xi_i^{n-1}}{2\Delta t} + \left(1 - \frac{3}{2} \delta \xi_i \right) \frac{\xi_{i+1}^n - \xi_{i-1}^n}{2\Delta x} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{6} \frac{1}{2} \xi_{i+2}^n - \xi_{i+1}^n + \xi_{i-1}^n - \frac{1}{2} \xi_{i-2}^n = 0
\]

• Use the Taylor series expansion to determine the modified equivalent form of the terms, e.g.

\[
\frac{\xi_{i+1}^n - \xi_{i-1}^n}{2\Delta x} = \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x}\bigg|_i^n + \frac{(\Delta x)^2}{6} \frac{\partial^3 \xi}{\partial x^3}\bigg|_i^n + \frac{(\Delta x)^4}{120} \frac{\partial^5 \xi}{\partial x^5}\bigg|_i^n + \frac{(\Delta x)^6}{5040} \frac{\partial^7 \xi}{\partial x^7}\bigg|_i^n + O((\Delta x)^8)
\]
The discrete form of the KdV equation produces a solution to the modified equivalent PDE (Hirt 1968) which introduces new terms due to discretization errors:

\[
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + \left(1 - \frac{3}{2} \delta \xi\right) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{6} \frac{\partial^3 \xi}{\partial x^3} = 0
\]

Modified equivalent KdV:

\[
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + \left(1 - \frac{3}{2} \delta \xi\right) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x} + \left(1 + \Gamma \right) \frac{\epsilon^2}{6} \frac{\partial^3 \xi}{\partial x^3} = O \left(\epsilon^2 (\Delta x)^2, \delta (\Delta x)^2, (\Delta x)^4, (\Delta t)^4\right)
\]

\[
\Gamma = K \left(\frac{\Delta x}{h_1}\right)^2 = \frac{\text{Numerical dispersion}}{\text{Physical dispersion}} = K \lambda^2
\]

\[
\lambda = \Delta x/h_1 \quad \text{grid "lepticity"}
\]

(Scotti and Mitran, 2008)

K=O(1) constant.

The numerical discretization of the first-order derivative produces numerical dispersion. Note that the errors in the nonlinear term are smaller by a factor \(\delta\).

\textbf{For numerical dispersion to be smaller than physical dispersion, }\lambda < 1.\]

Vitousek and Fringer (2011)
Hydrostatic vs. nonhydrostatic for $\lambda=0.25$

Numerical dispersion is 16 times smaller than physical dispersion.

Vitousek and Fringer (2011)
Hydrostatic vs. nonhydrostatic for $\lambda=8$

$\Delta x=8h_1$

"Numerical solitary waves!"

Numerical dispersion is 64 times larger than physical dispersion.

Vitousek and Fringer (2011)
Nonhydrostatic isopycnal model?

- Zhang et al. simulation: 12 million cells, $\Delta x=1$ km = 5 $h_1$
- To begin to resolve nonhydrostatic effects, $\Delta x=200$ m = $h_1 \rightarrow 300$ million cells! With $\Delta x=100$ m, 1.2 billion!
- The z-level SUNTANS model requires $O(100)$ z-levels to minimize numerical diffusion of the pycnocline.
- Solution: Isopycnal model with $O(2)$ layers = 50X reduction in computation time.

$\rightarrow$ Nonhydrostatic isopycnal coordinate model.

2-layer hydrostatic result with isopycnal model of Simmons, U. Alaska Fairbanks.
Essential features of the nonhydrostatic isopycnal-coordinate model

- Staggered C-grid layout
- Split Montgomery potential into Barotropic (implicit) & Baroclinic (explicit) parts
- MPDATA for upwinding of layer heights
- Implicit theta method for vertical diffusion
- Explicit horizontal diffusion
- Predictor/corrector method for nonhydrostatic pressure
  → Second-order accurate in time and space

Vitousek and Fringer (2014)
Nonhydrostatic test cases

No stratification

Two-layer

Smooth pycnocline

Note: density need not change in each layer
Hydrostatic internal seiche
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Dispersion relation
speed = function(wavelength)

Vitousek and Fringer (2014)
Internal solitary wave formation

z-level model leads to numerical diffusion, or thickening of the pycnocline.

Isopycnal-coordinate model:
→ eliminates spurious numerical diffusion
→ captures solitary wave behavior at 1/50 cost…

Vitousek and Fringer (2014)
10-layer isopycnal model following Buijsman et al. (2010)
2-layer isopycnal model vs. an LES model (Bobby Arthur, 2014)

Test case similar to:
Michallet & Ivey 1999
Bourgault & Kelley 2004

Vitousek and Fringer (2014)
Conclusions

• Simulation of nonhydrostatic effects in the SCS requires $\Delta x < h_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\text{billion})$ grid cells in 3D with z-level model.

• We have developed a nonhydrostatic isopycnal-coordinate model using stable higher-order time-stepping.

• More isopycnal layers are needed:
  – To resolve stratification
  – To resolve nonhydrostatic effects

• Most oceanic/lake processes are weakly nonhydrostatic and so <10 layers suffice for many applications. The result is a reduced computational cost by $\mathcal{O}(10)$.

• Ongoing work: Development of unstructured-grid model.