Introduction to sea ice modelling

Martin Losch Alfred Wegener Institute, Helmholtz-Centre for Polar and Marine Research Bremerhaven, Germany

thermodynamics: strong heat fluxes over leads dynamics: ridges and leads, rubble, pack

Photos by M. Hoppmann, S. Hendricks, Ch. Lüpkes



"Dynamic" duo for Sea Ice







Thermodynamics Perovich, 2012, FAMOS

Overview

(very short) Introduction: Sea ice in the climate system

Thermodynamics

- heat balance
- heat capacity
- zero-layer, multi-layer models
- salinity, brine, enthalpy
- Snow on ice
- advection
- ice thickness distribution

• Dynamics

- continuum assumption
- momentum equations
- surface stress
- divergence of internal stress
- rheology, isotropy, anisotropy, Viscous-Plastic, Maxwell-Elasto-Brittle, Mohr-Coulomb
- ice thickness distribution and ridging
- Sea ice models in ECCO -> lan's talk



Numerical models

- solution techniques specific to sea-ice models
- implicit solvers
 - Picard/fixed point/FGMRES, JFNK
- explicit solvers:
 - EVP, mEVP, aEVP
 - EAP
- new rheologies
- Discrete Element Models

Biogeochemistry in sea ice models



Sea ice model equations



Flowchart stolen from https://nsidc.org/cryosphere/seaice/study/modeling.html



thermodynamics: heat balance

$$\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial t} E = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(\kappa \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \right) + Q, \qquad E(S,$$

- often simply:
- with boundary conditions

top:

bottom:



HELMHOLTZ

ice-enthalpy includes heat and chemical potential (salinity)

 $T) = c_{p,i}(T + \mu S) - \Lambda \left(1 - \phi\right) - c_{p,w}\mu S$

 $E = c_p T$

brine fraction

 $\kappa \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = Q_T \downarrow$ $T = T_f = T_f(S)$ $\rho \Lambda \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} = -\kappa \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}$ $-Q_w\uparrow$ bottom

Stefan's law of ice growth (following Leppäranta, 1993)

- assumptions:
 - no thermal inertial: E = 0
 - no internal heat source: Q = 0
 - no heat flux from ocean: $Q_w = 0$
 - known surface temperature $T_0 = T_0(t)$
- constant temperature profiles (0-layer mode):

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = \text{constant}$$

$$\rho \Lambda \frac{dH}{dt} = -\kappa \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = \kappa \frac{T_f - T_f}{H}$$
$$H \frac{dH}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{dH^2}{dt} dt = \frac{\kappa}{\rho \Lambda} \left[T_f - T_0(t) \right]$$
$$\int_0^t \frac{dH^2}{dt} dt' = H(t)^2 - H_0^2 = \frac{2\kappa}{\rho \Lambda} \int_0^t \left[T_f - T_0(t') \right]$$
sum of negotiation of negotiation of the second secon

$$H(t) = \sqrt{H_0^2 + \frac{2\kappa}{\rho\Lambda} \int_0^t \left[T_f - T_0(t') \right] dt'}$$

gives typically 140cm for 180 days of -10K freezing conditions



Sea ice model equations: "0-layer thermodynamics"

$$\rho \frac{\partial E}{\partial t} = \rho c_p \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(\kappa \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \right) + Q$$

- no internal heat source: Q = 0
- no thermal inertia => instantaneous temperature adjustment $-T_f$

$$c_p = 0 \Rightarrow \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = \text{constant} = \frac{T_0}{dz}$$

- only surface boundary conditions remain: $\frac{\kappa}{h}(T_0 T_f) = Q_T \downarrow$ with $Q_T \downarrow = Q_{SW\downarrow}(1 \alpha) + \epsilon Q_{LW\downarrow} Q_{LW\uparrow}(T_0) + Q_{IH}(T_0) + Q_{SH}(T_0)$

$$\Rightarrow T_0 \Rightarrow Q_T(T_0) \Rightarrow \rho \Lambda \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} = \kappa \frac{T_f - T_0}{H} - Q_w$$



(Semptner, 1976, 1984)

h

$$Q_{LW\downarrow} - Q_{LW\uparrow}(T_0) + Q_{LH}(T_0) + Q_{SH}(T_0) + Q_{SH}(T_0)$$





Sea ice albedo for $Q_{SW}(1 - \alpha)$

- simple parameterisations with albedo for ice and snow in freezing (brighter) or melting (darker) conditions
- use melt-pond physics to estimate albedo (e.g., Taylor and Feltham, 2004, Flocco and Feltham, 2007)
- effects of ageing snow and ice, multiple-scattering, absorptive effects of inclusions such as dust and algae (biogeochemistry!)
- important tuning parameter









Snow on sea ice

- snow is a very good insulator:
 - changes surface albedo
 - usually limits shortwave penetration
 - interface, e.g. Leppäranta, 1991) in 0-layer model:

$$\kappa_{eff} = \frac{\kappa_{ice} \kappa_{snow}}{\kappa_{snow} h_{ice} + \kappa_{ice} k}$$

Antarctica



- changes vertical diffusion of temperature (from continuity at

 l_{snow}

snow-ice: refreezing of flooded snow on sea ice, especially in

going back to more general thermodynamics

ice-enthalpy

- $\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial t} E = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(\right)$
- snow layer, e.g. Winton, 2000), more layers (Bitz and Lipscomb, 1999) used CICE/ICEPACK.
- to freezing or melting: change of volume $S_h(=dh/dt)$
- Hibler (1979): lateral freezing and melting

$$S_{c} = \frac{1-c}{h_{0}} \max(S_{h}, 0) + \frac{c}{2h} \min(S_{h}, 0)$$
lead closing parameter



$$\left(\kappa \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}\right) + Q$$

• Simplest model is a three-layer model (two ice layers, one

• any excess conductive heat flux ($k\partial T/\partial z$) through the ice leads



ice thickness distribution (static)

- ice growth
- allow thin ice

$$Q = (1 - c) Q_0 + c \sum_{k=1}^{N} Q \left(\frac{2k - 1}{N} \right)$$







images: Castro-Morales et al. (2014)



dynamic ice thickness distribution: redistribution + ridging



red: observations, blue: model

from Ungermann and Losch (2018)



Dynamics and Deformation



(RGPS data near SHEBA drift station, 1997, R. Kwok)







Sea Ice Deformation







ice compression and shear: ridges, rubble fields

breaking ice: cracks, leads



Importance of sea ice deformations

- Affect the thickness distribution through formation of ridges and leads. Heat flux through new leads is 1-2 orders of mag higher than over thick ice
- (Maykut, 1978)
- 25-40% of new ice formation occurs in leads (Kwok, 2006) Ridges affect the air-ice and ice-ocean drag
- Ocean upwelling associated to shear





McPhee et al., 2005

Digression: Newtonian Fluid

- 1. Fluid is continuous + stresses are a linear function of the strain rates
- 2. Fluid is isotropic
- 3. In the limit where the strain rates go to zero, the stresses must reduce to the hydrostatic pressure

$$\rho \frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = \nabla \cdot \sigma + R, \qquad R = \text{other terms}$$

for PE (ocean): $\sigma = \nu \nabla \mathbf{u} - p \Rightarrow \nabla \cdot \sigma = \nabla \left(\nu \nabla \mathbf{u} - p\right)$
strain rates $\left(\nabla \mathbf{u}\right)_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i}\right)$





Sea ice is different (AIDJEX model)

- ensemble of many ice floes with interactions continuity assumption at large scales (questionable) non-Newtonian (non-normal) fluid (honey vs. mayonnaise) strong in compression, weak in tension, intermediate in shear • elastic response to small perturbations, plastic to large pert. => plastic-elastic model (Coon 1974)

- viscous-plastic framework is similar, but numerically simpler (Hibler 1977, 1979), small strain rates lead to viscous creep.
- granular material (like sand: floes = grains) => Mohr-Coulomb law of failure relates shear to normal stress: $\tau = \mu \sigma + c$







Stress tensor



- assumption: symmetric $\Rightarrow \sigma_{21} = \sigma_{12}$
- Mohr-Coulomb law: $\tau = \mu \sigma + c$ or $\sigma_{II} = \mu \sigma_I + c/2$



$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11}\sigma_{21} \\ \sigma_{12}\sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{xx}\sigma_{yx} \\ \sigma_{xy}\sigma_{yy} \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{1} & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

principle stresses
$$\sigma_{1,2} = \frac{\sigma_{11} + \sigma_{22}}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{(\sigma_{11} - \sigma_{22})^{2}}{4}} + \sigma_{12}\sigma_{2}$$

normal stress σ
$$\sigma_{I} = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{1} + \sigma_{2}) = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{11} + \sigma_{22})$$

shear stress τ
$$\sigma_{II} = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{1} - \sigma_{2}) = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(\sigma_{11} - \sigma_{22})^{2} + 4\sigma_{22}}$$



21





principal stress plane and yield curve, plastic limit

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11}\sigma_{21} \\ \sigma_{12}\sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \sigma_I \text{ and } \sigma_I \text{$$





consequence: sea ice dynamics are very non-linear

$$m\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \sigma + R, \qquad R = \text{other terms}$$
with $\sigma_{ij} = \frac{P}{2\Delta} \left\{ 2\dot{\epsilon}_{ij} e^{-2} + \left[(1 - e^{-2})(\dot{\epsilon}_{11} + \dot{\epsilon}_{22}) - \Delta \right] \delta_{ij} \right\}$
with abbreviations
$$\Delta = \sqrt{(\dot{\epsilon}_{11} + \dot{\epsilon}_{22})^2 + e^{-2} \left[(\dot{\epsilon}_{11} - \dot{\epsilon}_{22})^2 + 4\dot{\epsilon}_{12} \right]}$$

$$\dot{\epsilon}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} \right) \qquad \text{(strain rates)}$$

$$ice \text{ strength p}$$

$$Hibler (197)$$

$$Rothrock (197)$$



parametrizations: **79):** $P = P^*h e^{-C^*(1-c)}$ (1975): $P = C_f C_p \int_0^\infty h^2 \omega_r(h) dh$



Sea ice dynamics and solvers

- Picard solvers (LSR, Krylov)
- JFNK solver
- EVP solvers: mEVP, aEVP

new MEB rheology

discrete element models (DEM)







solution techniques: Picard method

\Rightarrow solve

- and Hibler (1997), (Gauss-Seidel) for linear solver
- Krylov method for linear solver (Lemieux and Tremblay, 2009), requires preconditioner
- stable, but slow



$A(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{b}$ $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{u}_{n-1}) \cdot \mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{b}$

traditional method, e.g., PSOR, Hibler (1979), LSOR, Zhang

solution techniques: JFNK solver

- $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{u} \mathbf{b}$

$\mathbf{F}'_{n-1} \, \delta \mathbf{u} = - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}_{n-1}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_{n-1} + \delta \mathbf{u}$ \Rightarrow solve

- better (quadratic) convergence near minimum (Lemieux et al. 2010, 2012, Losch et al 2014)
- preconditioner for Krylov solver necessary
- expensive
- unstable, especially at high resolution
- Picard methods)





stabilization (e.g. Mehlmann and Richter 2017, involves mixing JFNK and





Picard vs. JFNK





Does it matter?









Losch et al. (2014)

solution method: EVP variants

 $\sigma_{ij} = \frac{P}{2\Lambda} \left\{ 2\dot{\epsilon}_{ij} e^{-2} + \left[(1 + 1) \right] \right\}$ $\frac{\Delta e^2}{P} \sigma_{ij} + \left| \frac{\Delta(1-1)^2}{2} \frac{\Delta(1-1)^2}{P} \right|^2$ \Leftrightarrow

- Hunke and Dukowicz (1997)
- Danilov 2012)
- adding inertial term to momentum equations fixes convergence (Lemieux et al. 2012, Bouillon et al 2013)
- m(odified)EVP, a(daptive)EVP (Kimmritz et al 2015, 2016, 2017)



$$\frac{(1 - e^{-2})(\dot{\epsilon}_{11} + \dot{\epsilon}_{22}) - \Delta}{(1 - e^{2})} \left(\sigma_{11} + \sigma_{22}\right) + \frac{\Delta}{2} \delta_{ij} = \dot{\epsilon}_{ij}$$

does not converge (definitely not to VP, Lemieux et al. 2012, Losch and



issues with conventional EVP

reference

EVP, 120 sub-cycles

EVP, 1980 sub-cycles

(a) (b)

Lemieux et al. (2012), shear and divergence (per day)





New EVP equations

to momentum equations

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{p} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \Big(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}^{p}) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{p} \Big),$$
$$\mathbf{u}^{p+1} - \mathbf{u}^{p} = \frac{1}{\beta} \Big(\frac{\Delta t}{m} \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{p+1} + \frac{\Delta t}{m} \mathbf{R}^{p+1/2} - \mathbf{u}^{p+1/2} - \mathbf$$



based on Lemieux et al. (2012), Bouillon et al. (2013), add "inertial-like" term





New EVP equations

New momentum equations

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{p} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \Big(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}^{p}) - \mathbf{u}^{p+1} - \mathbf{u}^{p} \Big) = \frac{1}{\beta} \Big(\frac{\Delta t}{m} \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \Big)$$

with

modified EVP: α, β = constant, order(300) adaptive EVP: $\alpha = \beta = (4\gamma)^{1/2}$



high resolution simulations



EVP "convergence" (in FESOM)

 $N_{EVP} = 50$

 $N_{EVP} = 150$



$$N_{EVP} = 550$$

 $N_{EVP} = 750$







 $N_{EVP} = 350$

 $N_{EVP} = 1050$

Koldunov et al. (2019), JAMES ~ 4 km



EVP "convergence" (in FESOM)



Koldunov et al. (2019), JAMES, grid resolution ~ 4 km





Convergence to VP solution: ice thickness (m) at 4.5 km grid spacing

 $\alpha\beta \gg \gamma = \zeta \frac{(c\pi)^2}{A_c} \frac{\Delta t}{m}$

stability parameter depends on grid spacing and local ice viscosity

sea ice dynamics from optical satellite images





Sea Ice

Concentration (Opacity) and Thickness (Shadowing)



2012/05/25







20 Jul 2012 12:00

NEC





20 Jul 2012 12



MultiSync LCD20900X

NEC 1.9 1.43 0.952 0.476 Slheff, effective ice thickness Scalar = Slheff Depth = 0 (surface) Row = 7 Col = 7

Menemenlis, pers. comm



Maxwell Elasto-Brittle rheology

- VP has been criticized for low intermittency and heterogeneity (Girard et al 2009, but Hutter et al 2018/2019 show opposite)
- $1 \partial \sigma$ • Dansereau et al (2016):

 $E \ \partial t$

- new model variable: damage (actually integrity of sea ice), affects ice strength
- Mohr-Coulomb law for failure (increases damage) ($\tau = \mu \sigma + c$)
- VP-viscosities are re-interpreted as constant coefficients; leads to a linear problem
- unclear: optimal solution strategy, computational cost (probably very) high), stability, coupling to thermodynamics



$$+\frac{1}{\lambda}\sigma = K:\dot{\epsilon}$$





0001/01/08 09:00

not sure if I should show



time (5s)

Biogeochemistry in sea ice models

- BGC through "seeding" with biologically active material
- simple models for simple sea ice models, e.g. SIMBA (Castellani et al. 2017)
- with positive definite vertical transport schemes, see documentation of "icepack" (column physics and biogeochemistry of CICE)
- numerous feedbacks need to be taken into account



 ice BGC affects attenuation (uptake) of shortwave raditiation (albedo; modifies melt rate and availability to ocean), ocean

• multilayer models require more sophisticated sea ice models

What's missing and where to go from here

- dynamics
 - explore continuity assumption at high resolution
 - new rheological approaches, anisotropy (EAP)
 - discrete element models for climate research?
 - surface and bottom stress (skin drag, form drag, ice roughness length, etc.)
 - porosity in ridges => ice strength parameterisations (Roberts et al. 2019)
- thermodynamics (most of this is in CICE/ICEPACK: https://github.com/CICE-Consortium)
 - multiple layers, vertical advection
 - melt pond parameterisations
 - snow parameterisations
 - biogeochemistry
- coupling to ocean and atmosphere

. . .





Literature about sea ice modelling

- Reviews:
 - https://www.igsoc.org/journal/56/200/j10j186.pdf
 - -10.1017/9781108277600. URL www.cambridge.org/9781108417426.
 - doi.org/10.1080/07055900.1993.9649465
 - Feltham, D. (2008) Sea Ice Rheology, Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech. 2008. 40:91–112, doi:10.1146/annurev.fluid.40.111406.102151 _
- Bitz, C.M., Lipscomb, W.H., 1999. An energy-conserving thermodynamic model of sea ice. J. Geophys. Res. 104, 15,669–15,677.
- Coon MD, Maykut GA, Pritchard RS, Rothrock DA, Thorndike AS. 1974. Modeling the pack ice as an elastic-plastic material. AIDJEX Bull. 24:1–105
- 10.5194/tc-10-1339-2016, 2016.
- Flocco, D. and D.L. Feltham. 2007. A continuum model of melt pond evolution on Arctic sea ice. J. Geophys. Res., 112(C8), C08016. (10.1029/2006JC003836.) \bullet
- Hibler WD III. 1977. A viscous sea ice law as a stochastic average of plasticity. J. Geophys. Res. 82:3932–38
- Hibler WD III. 1979. A dynamic thermodynamic sea ice model. J. Phys. Oceanogr. 9:815–46 \bullet
- Rothrock DA. 1975. The energetics of the plastic deformation of pack ice by ridging. J. Geophys. Res. 80:4514–19
- Semtner, A.J., Jr. 1976. A model for the thermodynamic growth of sea ice in numerical investigations of climate. J. Phys. Ocean- ogr., 6(5), 379–389.
- Semtner, A.J., Jr. 1984. On modelling the seasonal thermodynamic cycle of sea ice in studies of climatic change. Climatic Change, 6(1), 27–37.
- Thorndike AS, Rothrock DA, Maykut GA, Colony R. 1975. The thickness distribution of sea ice. J. Geophys. Res. 80:4501–13
- Winton, M (2000) A Reformulated Three-Layer Sea Ice Model, J. Atmos, Ocean Techn. 17(4), 525–531



- Hunke, E. C., W. H. Lipscomb, A. K. Turner (2010) Sea-ice models for climate study: retrospective and new directions. Journal of Glaciology, Vol. 56, No. 200,

Lemieux, J.-F., S. Bouillon, F. Dupont, G. Flato, M. Losch, P. Rampal, B. Tremblay, M. Vancoppenolle, and T. Williams (2017). Sea ice physics and modelling. In T. Carrieres, M. Buehner, J.-F. Lemieux, and L. T. Pedersen, eds., Sea Ice Analysis and Forecasting, Towards an Increased Reliance on Automated Prediction Systems, pages 51–108. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom; New York, NY, October 2017. ISBN 978-1-108-41742-6. doi:

Leppäranta, M. (1993) A review of analytical models of sea-ice growth. Atmosphere-Ocean, 31:1, 123-138, DOI: 10.1080/07055900.1993.9649465, https://

Dansereau, V., Weiss, J., Saramito, P., and Lattes, P.: A Maxwell elasto-brittle rheology for sea ice modelling, The Cryosphere, 10, 1339–1359, https://doi.org/

