#### DYNAMIC SUB-GRID MODELLING OF AN EVOLVING CBL AT GREY-ZONE RESOLUTIONS

#### George Efstathiou<sup>1</sup>

EXETER

R. S. Plant<sup>2</sup>, M. M. Bopape<sup>2,3</sup> and R. J. Beare<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematics, University of Exeter

<sup>2</sup> Department of Meteorology, University of Reading

<sup>3</sup> South African Weather Service

Modelling GREY zone Boundary LayerS



## **Motivation**

- Numerical Weather Prediction at O(100m) is now possible
- Dominant turbulence length scales  $\sim z_i$  (100 m 3 km)
- Boundary Layer (BL) turbulence becomes partially resolved

How do we parametrize sub-grid processes in the BL grey-zone?

# Spectral view of the grey-zone (Beare, 2014)

- LES : Resolved field scales for production (l<sub>p</sub>) and dissipation (l<sub>d</sub>) of TKE are well separated
- Grey zone : Dissipation has an impact on TKE production – Partially resolved field

A working definition for the grey-zone

$$\frac{z_i}{l_d} < 0.7$$



#### Scales



(Sullivan and Patton, 2011)

(Beare, 2014)

## **Research Tools**

- Numerical simulations with the LEM (Large-Eddy Met Office Model)
  - Quasi-steady state CBL (z<sub>i</sub>=1000 m)
  - Evolving CBL (Wangara case study)
  - A range of horizontal resolutions (LES-Greyzone-Mesoscale)
- Compare with filtered LES
- Smagorinsky type eddy-viscocity model

 $K_{M,H} = l^2 S f_{M,H} (Ri)$  $l^{-2} = (k z)^{-2} + \lambda_0^{-2}$  $\lambda_0 = c_s \Delta x$ Control :  $c_s = 0.23$ 

#### Steady State Simulations (Free Convection)



-4.50 -3.00 -1.50 -0.25 1.00 2.50 4.00

-4.50 -3.00 -1.50 -0.25 1.00 2.50 4.00

-4.50 -3.00 -1.50 -0.25 1.00 2.50

4.00

#### Quantifying sub-grid diffusion in the grey-zone

- Reducing sub-grid diffusion ?
- Increasing vertical resolution ?

 $z/z_{i} = 0.5$ 



How much resolved TKE?

(Efstathiou and Beare, 2015)

## Parametrization approaches

- Modifying Smagorinsky
  - BOUND approach (Efstathiou and Beare, 2015)
  - Dynamic Smagorinsky Modelling
  - Dynamic Blending (Preliminary results)

## **Evolution of Scales – Wangara CBL**



During the morning CBL development simulations of different  $\Delta x$  go through different regimes

# Dynamic sub-grid modelling

- Using "resolved" scales to estimate  $C_S$
- Apply a test filter  $(G_{\alpha \Delta})$  to diagnose sub-filter scales

$$\tau_{ij} = -2(C_s\Delta)^2 |\overline{S}| \overline{S}_{ij} f(Ri)$$

- $\tau$  : sub-grid stress
- T: interactions between sub-grid sub-filter
- L: "smallest" resolved scales (Leonard stress)

C<sub>s</sub> averaged over path lines (LASD)

Second filter ( $G_{2\alpha\Delta}$ ) to account for scale dependence

 $C_S(\Delta) \neq C_S(a\Delta)$ 



#### Wangara CBL development



## Comparison with the filtered fields

 $\Delta x = 100 \text{ m}$ 



### Comparison with the filtered fields

 $\Delta x = 200 \text{ m}$ 



## Comparison with the filtered fields

 $\Delta x = 400 \text{ m}$ 



# Met Office Blending Scheme

- Blending Scheme (Boutle et al., 2014)
- Implemented in the LEM (Efstathiou et al., 2016)

(based on Hong et al., 2006)



0.2

0.0

SMAG

0.1

 $W_{1D}$ 

1.0

 $\Delta x/z_{turb}$ 

Honnert et al. (2011)

10.0

1D BL

$$\underbrace{\overline{u_j'\theta'}}_{ij} = \underbrace{-K_H \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_j}}_{ij} + \delta_{3j} W_{1D} \left[ \underbrace{K_H \gamma}_{ij} + \underbrace{W'\theta'}_{ij} \left( \frac{z}{z_h} \right)^n \right]$$

 $K_H = \max \left[ W_{1D} K_H(1D), K_H(SMAG) \right]$ 

#### Wangara CBL development

 $\Delta x = 400 \text{ m}$ 



#### Wangara CBL development

 $\Delta x = 800 \text{ m}$ 



## Summary

The grey-zone imposes practical limitations in very high resolution NWP

#### Should any convective overturning be allowed in the grey-zone?

- Challenges
  - Representing coherent structures
  - Quantify the resolved TKE Energetics TKE spin-up
  - Form of transition
  - Shape and form of the coherent structures in the CBL would affect the representation of shallow Cu convection
  - Implications with deep convection and convective parametrizations

#### Dynamic modelling of sub-grid diffusion at grey-zone resolutions

- Dynamic Smagorinsky a better alternative than Standard Smagorinsky
- Improves spin-up / Representation of mean quantities and turbulence statistics
- Relies on dynamics (unable to resolve for  $\Delta x/z_i > 2$ ) Usability limit
- Modified 1D schemes suffer from delayed spin-up
- Dynamic Blending extends the benefits of dynamic modelling further into the grey-zone

#### Papers

Beare, R. J., 2014: A length scale defining partially-resolved boundary-layer turbulence simulations. Boundary-Layer Meteorol. 151: 39-55.

Efstathiou, G. A. and R. J. Beare, 2015: Quantifying and improving sub-grid diffusion in the boundary-layer grey zone. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, *141*, 3006–3017.

Efstathiou, G. A., R. J. Beare, S. Osborne, A. P. Lock, 2016: Grey zone simulations of the morning convective boundary layer development, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 121, 9

Efstathiou, G. A., Plant R. S., and M. M. Bopape, 2017: Simulation of an evolving convective boundary layer using a scale-dependent dynamic Smagorinsky model at near grey-zone resolutions. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, submitted.