IMPLIED OCEAN HEAT TRANSPORTS IN THE STANDARD AND SUPER-PARAMETERIZED CAM 3.0

Charlotte A. DeMott and David A. Randall Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University Fort Collins, CO 80523 USA



- WHY: 1) Evaluate AGCM readiness for coupling to an ocean model, 2) Identify errors in AGCM
- HOW: Integrate oceanic net surface energy budget from South Pole to North Pole.
- WHAT: 1) CAM 3.0, 2) MMF CAM 3.0 with cloud resolving model in place of cumulus parameterization; 14-year AMIP runs



Clouds and Surface Shortwave Fluxes Model-Observations LWP differences DJF CAM-SSMI LWP JJA CAM-SSMLLWP DJF MMF-SSMI LWP 175_125_75_25 25 75 125 175 225 275 • Boreal summer north Pacific liquid water path similar in CAM and MMF, so cannot explain SW biases.

• Note high JJA LWP values in Indian

Clouds: Global view Model-Observations IWP differences JJA CAM-NOAA IWF DJF CAM-NOAA IWP DJF MMF-NOAA IWP -45-35-25-15-5 5 15 25 35 45 5 • Compared to AMSU-derived IWP values, each model produces too much ice,

storm tracks.

especially poleward of winter hemisphere

Wind, Evaporation, and Latent Heat Fluxes

Near-surface winds for models and observations, JJA (ms⁻¹)





• MMF JJA nearsurface winds are most excessive in the tropical Indian and Pacific Oceans.

JJA Surface relative humidity biases (%)





• CAM and MMF Asian monsoon-region LH biases (red boxes, left-most panel) arise from excessive winds. Biases are greater in MMF.

• MMF LH biases in sub-tropical trade wind regions result from low RH biases and slightly excessive winds.

Somali Jet winds, W.Pac rainfall, and their



	Ocean for CAM. In the MMF, high LWP is shifted northward to the Asian monsoon region.		 MMF also produces too much ice in tropical convection, a possible symptom of the cyclic boundary condition on the CRM. IWP data source: NOAA Microwave Surface and 		
			Precipitation Products System (MSPPS).		
	Marine Strat	OCL	umulus Clouds		
Lower Tropospheric Stability (LTS) and marine stratocumulus annual cycles			LTS, 1000mb relative humidity, and cloud fraction (crosses) in CAM, MMF,		
() 25 20 20 15 10 15 5 0	Californian Californian Peruvian Peruvian Peruvian Peruvian Peruvian Peruvian OBS OBS OBS O.94 O.94 O.94 O.77 O.36 O.36 O.36 O.36 O.36 O.88 O.73 O		And observations. CAM, Californian H que of the peruvian CAM, Peruvian CAM, Peruvian H que of the peruvian		
(X), low cloud (X 10) 10, 10 10 10 10 10	Namibian Australian Australian Australian 0.83 0.91 0.09 0.		$ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 $		
SI] 0 (0 25	Canarian Canarian Canarian	S	CAM, Australian 100 95 96 85 96 80 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75		
× 20 15 Nor 15 10 X 20	0.83 0.91 0.78 Californian, MA	Canarian,	JJA 70 L 10 15 20 25 30 LTS, K 70 L 10 15 20 25 30 LTS, K 10 15 20 25 30 LTS, K MMF, Canarian 00 BS, Canarian 00 BS, Canarian 100 95 90 95 90 95 90 95 90 95 90 90 95 90 90 95 90 90 95 90 90 95 90 90 95 90 90 95 90 90 95 90 90 95 90 90 95 90 90 90 95 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90		





Depiction of potential model improvements as SW & LH biases are improved.