Impact of surface heterogeneity on the boundary-layer flow and nearsurface turbulent exchanges LES analysis

R Fernandes, F Couvreux

Context

 Need to explore L-A interactions (improve knowledge on involved processes + performance of the models).

- Already quite some work on the impact of surface heterogeneities but usually very idealized set up and in particular fixed fluxes (Rochetin et al 2017) or surface temperatures (Patton et al 2005) => go one step further with coupled LSM-LES

Until what level/scale the surface discontinuities influence the BL ?

What complexity of the surface heterogeneities do we need to represent ?

- Surface parameterization in LES uses bulk formulas based on the Monin Obukhov Similarity Theory (MOST) : Same formulas from climate to LES models.

Only few LSM-LES but rather good results (Patton et al., 2005; Lohou et al., 2014b; Brilouet et al., 2020).

=> propose some work to highlight the sensitivity to this kind of setup

Method



Inspired by the case of Darbieu et al (BLLAST, 20/06/11)
But initial conditions from AROME (more complex profiles)
Sensitivity to domain size (5, 10, 25 km)

- Sensitivity to first level (5, 10, 25, 50 m) and grid size (strecthed, 25m , 50m) -Sensitivity to humidity and temperature soil initialization

Method

LES with surface-atmosphere coupled configuration (Meso-NH+SURFEX)
3 surfaces : grass, maize and forest + ECOCLIMAP database

- Homogeneous or Heterogeneous surfaces

- Same initial conditions and simulation set-up : Lx=10 km, Dx=50m, Lz=4km, Dz1=5m+stretched grid

	Simulation	Grass cover %	Maize cover %	Forest cover %	z_0 (m)
	GP	90	0	0	0.067
	MP	0	65	0	0.24
	FP	0	0	70	0.67
	GM4P	45	32.5	0	0.127
- 100	GM16P	45	32.5	0	0.136
	GM64P	45	32.5	0	0.140
	GMF64P1	27	19.5	28	0.39
	GMF64P2	27	19.5	28	0.38
	GMF3P	27	19.5	28	0.44

On the influence of near-surface atmospheric variances on surface fluxes

Surface Flux Parameterization= bulk formula based on M-O similarity for climate → LES models Pertinence for the LES simulations ? (∆t~1s, ∆x~10m) In LES simulations, large spatial variability of surface fluxes ? What drive such variability ? Is it key ?

Tests on 3 types of surface (CMO Brilouet et al 2021, continental cases derived from BLLAST over Grass and Forest)

 $\overline{w'\theta'} = -C_H \|\overline{\underline{U}}(z_l)\| (\overline{\theta}(z_l) - \overline{\theta}_s)$ $\overline{w'q'} = -C_Q \|\overline{\underline{U}}(z_l)\| (\overline{q}(z_l) - \overline{q}_s)$ $\overline{u'w'} = -C_D \|\overline{\underline{U}}(z_l)\| \overline{u}(z_l)$ $\overline{v'w'} = -C_D \|\overline{\underline{U}}(z_l)\| \overline{v}(z_l)$ $\|\overline{\underline{U}}(z_l)\| = \sqrt{\overline{u'}(z_l) + \overline{v'}(z_l)}$

Spatial Homogeneization of 1st atmospheric level fields before computation of surface fluxes

Experiment 1 (REF) Experiment 2 Experiment 3 Experiment 4 $H = -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot U \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot U \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{a}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot C_{H} \cdot \overline{U} \cdot (\theta_{s} - \theta_{s}) \sim -\rho \cdot C_{pa} \cdot$

On the influence of near-surface atmospheric variances on surface fluxes



Spatial variability of surface fluxes controlled by the wind at first order

However no impact on the main characteristics of the BL except very close to the surface

Large-eddy simulations with homogeneous or heterogeneous surface



Interactive surface 10 km² x 4 km dx = dy = 50m dz1 = 5m, stretched grid









First results





First results



Heterogeneities slightly increase mean flux

However no impact on the main characteristics of the BL except very close to the surface

First results



Conclusion

Coupled LES simulation with surface heterogeneities from very idealised to more realistic : Following Emilie work => need to redo the simulations with improved albedo and root depth

The realistic LES has to be completely analysed=> EMI stage proposed next year

LMD postdoc=> development of a simplified surface scheme and test for this ensemble of cases

After the SOP at Lannemezan, possibility to do a LES and use the work of Myrtille and Sylvain Dupont to evaluate the resolution close to the surface at the border of the forest ?

Initial conditions and forcing (=0) Simulations disponibles sous hendrix. fernandesr/MESONH/



Origine de ces profils initiaux => un radiosondage Mais bcp de fluctuations ? On peut envisager De refaire les simus LES avec des profils initiaux plus idéalisés. Ca ne devrait pas chger bcp les résultats mais plus facile a présenter pour un papier E