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Preamble

• Not a review talk
• Title is meant to be a paradox
• Simple models for understanding?
  Hydrometeorology is too complex
• Climate interactions of water
  [phase changes and radiation interactions] are central to climate
• Let us confront the challenge
A little New England nostalgia..

• As I was writing this, after 40cm of fluffy snow have just fallen, the sun glistened off the frozen fields and the dripping icicles outside my window, but the bare forested hills are dark. Water is everywhere, the rivers are in flood, but the sky is clear. Beneath the melting snow and a mulch of leaves, the ground is barely frozen, and my brussel sprouts are still good to eat.

• All these things (except my brussel sprouts) matter to the hydrometeorology and seasonal climate of New England…….
Climate is both global and local

• Need coupled earth system models
• Need them locally to warn us of the first frost
  [local diurnal cycle in September]
• Improving our global models is central
• Global models can be used as tools to understand interacting processes
• Contrast our model world, which we dimly understand, and the real world, where we only understand fragments of a complex, living system.
What controls evapotranspiration?

• “Equilibrium evaporation”.  
  *Raupach (BLM, 2000, QJRMS 2001)*

• Models for the *growing daytime* “dry BL”

• Fascinating but simplified by ignoring some key real-world physics, which control evaporation for climate equilibrium.
What is this ignored physics?

• Cloud fields control cloud base, the surface net radiation, and dominate the cooling rate of the CBL

  [It is not the dry BL solutions that are relevant]

• Climate problem is a 24-hr mean problem, with a superimposed diurnal cycle

  [It is not just a growing daytime BL problem]

• First-order atmospheric constraints on evaporation. Global models with coupled cloud fields include these processes, so they can help us understand the coupling
a) Global scale feedbacks – seasonal forecasts

Idealized global soil moisture simulations and evaporation-precipitation feedback over continents

b) Land-surface coupling at daily timescale – 30 years of ERA40 river basin time-series

Coupling of soil moisture, cloud-base, cloud cover, radiation fields, sensible and latent heat fluxes and diurnal cycle
a) Global scale feedbacks - Idealized soil moisture simulations and evaporation-precipitation feedback

- Serendipity, and great flood on the Mississippi of July 1993
- Parallel ECMWF suite with a 4-layer soil model to better represent soil moisture memory
- Soil moisture sensitivity experiments for July, 1993
July 1993: wet-dry soil initialization

- Increase of monthly forecast precipitation: peaking at over 4 mm/day or >125 mm/month [Beljaars et al. 1996]
Seasonal forecasts with idealized soil moisture

• ERA40 model: 120-day forecasts at T-95 L60 from May 1, 1987 (DOY=121)
• Identical except
  a) Soil moisture initialized at 100% field capacity for vegetated areas
  b) Soil moisture initialized at 25%

  -- Soil Moisture Index
  0 < SMI < 1 as PWP < SM < FC
P, E, P-E and SMI for Eastern US

- Reduction of SMI reduces precipitation, evaporation
- Has little impact on P-E which averages to small values over summer
- Memory of soil moisture lasts all summer
Europe

Amazon
Canada

N. Asia
Only in monsoon regions where P-E is large is memory of SMI reduced.
Evaporation over land determines precipitation: [away from monsoons]

- So what controls evaporation?
- Not classic “equilibrium evaporation”
- Recast equilibrium evaporation as as a diurnally averaged problem, linked to cloud-base and cloud fields

[Betts, JHM 2000; Betts et al., 2003; JGR, submitted]
Surface energy balance, and ML “equilibrium”

- 3 Americas regions
- 5-day means: of wet and dry simulations

- Latent heat $\lambda E$ against SMI: weak relation: sensitive to $R_{net}$
- Sensible heat $H$ against SMI: tight relation
- linked to dependence of depth to cloud-base on SMI
Sensible heat flux: $H$

- $H$ against $P_{LCL}$: linear with slope related to cooling processes in ML
- $H$ is constrained by ML cooling, constrained by cloud-base
- Net long-wave has similar behavior: coupled to $P_{LCL}$
Amazon basin in more detail

- $H, 8E$ quasi-linear with $P_{LCL}$; $2$-m $Q$ and $T$ quasi-linear with $P_{LCL}$
- Over wetter soils, $E$ increases; $T$ decreases and $Q$ increases in ML
- New coupled state has lower LCL, with cooler, moister ML; reduced $H$ and larger $E$
Radiation balance

- LW and SW feedbacks
- Wet soil: more cloud and water vapor
- $SW_{\text{net}}$ down; $-LW_{\text{net}}$ down; with smaller effect on $R_{\text{net}}$
- In dry season, both $SW_{\text{net}}$ and $-LW_{\text{net}}$ increase (regime shift in June) and longwave feedback dominates
b) ERA40 river basin budgets

- Basin averages: hourly archive
- Daily averages: 1972-2002 [11000 days]

- Madeira : Amazon
  Arkansas-Red : Mississippi
  Athabasca : Mackenzie

- [ERA40 biases: see Betts et al. 2003a,b]
ERA40 for Madeira River basin compared with LBA Rondonia pasture site: 1999

- Large seasonal change of diurnal amplitude
- ERA-40 basin ranges smaller than at pasture site
ERA-40 radiation fluxes

- Large seasonal cycle in $LW_{\text{net}}$, linked to the seasonal cycle of cloud cover and transition from the rainy season to a deep dry ML in August.

- Both $SW_{\text{net}}$ and $R_{\text{net}}$ have a minimum in June; maximum in October
Coupling of soil moisture index, cloud-base height and Evaporative fraction

• Mean cloud-base height increases over drier soils and with larger surface $R_{\text{net}}$

• Evaporative fraction increases with soil moisture, and decreases with $R_{\text{net}}$

• 3 basins similar: with additional dependence on unstressed resistance
Madeira basin for July and November

- July: dry season
- Nov: wet season

- Surface fluxes as function of cloud-base and cloud cover
$LW_{\text{net}}$ dependencies

- Soil moisture index
- Cloud-base
- Total cloud cover
- Diurnal range: $T_s$

- 2 months merge to single quasi-linear distribution
$SW_{\text{net}}$ dependencies

- Tight coupling to $LW_{\text{net}}$
- Cloud-base
- Total cloud cover
- Sensible heat flux $H$

- Distinct distributions except for $H$
Sensible heat flux $H$

- Diurnal range: $T_s$
- Maximum $T_s$
- Cloud-base
- $SW_{\text{net}}$
- Distinct distributions except where coupled to $SW_{\text{net}}$
- Subcloud heating rates
- 3K/day in July
- 6K/day in November
Latent heat flux $\lambda E$ and $H$

- Coupling of $H$ to SMI through $P_{LCL}$ stronger than coupling of $\lambda E$
- $\lambda E$ has more variation with $R_{net}$ in rainy season
- $H$ splits into 2 branches as function of $R_{net}$ [contrast SW$_{net}$]
Priestley-Taylor ratio

- \( PT = \frac{EF(1+g)}{g} \)  
  \[ EF = \frac{8E}{R_{net}-G}; \quad g = \left(\frac{8}{C_p}\right)\frac{dQ_s}{dT} \]

- Separate branches for July and November with upper limit near 1.26
LW coupling for other basins

- $LW_{\text{net}}$ tightly coupled to cloud cover and cloud-base
- Madeira has 50hPa lower cloud-base
- Red-Arkansas has 0.25 lower cloud cover
Diurnal Cycle: Madeira

- $LW_{\text{net}}$ coupled to diurnal range of $T_S$
- $SW_{\text{net}}$ more closely related to $T_{\text{smax}}$
Diurnal range of 2-m T and RH

\[ T_{\text{Planck}} = - \frac{LW_{\text{net}}}{4F T^3} \] gives diurnal range of T

Diurnal range of RH and T coupled: Q variation small
Conclusions-1

• Climate and climate change over land depends critically on getting evaporation-precipitation feedback right

• ERA-40 model has large E, P feedback over continents  
  [Is it right?]

• The change in surface energy budget over dry and wet soils is consistent with a shift of the mean sub-cloud layer equilibrium
Conclusions-2

• Model data such as reanalyses can be used to understand coupling of processes.

• Coupling of surface processes in ERA-40, though complex, is comprehensible.

• Soil moisture, cloud-base, cloud cover, the radiation fields and evaporative fraction are coupled quite tightly [sub-seasonally].

• Evaporation of precipitation below cloud-base and off wet canopies plays opposite roles in the surface energy balance.
Conclusions-3

• Evaporation is controlled somewhat indirectly by the controls on net radiation and sensible heat flux

• The long-wave flux control by cloud-base height and cloud cover is particularly tight across all basins

• The sensible heat flux is coupled to cloud-base height, cooling processes in the sub-cloud layer, as well as directly to the shortwave flux [the BL is not in exact equilibrium on the daily timescale]
Conclusions-4

• Diurnal cycle of temperature is tightly coupled to the net long-wave flux
  [which in turn is controlled by mean cloud-base height and cloud cover]

• [Fundamental importance to NBL]
Conclusions-5

• Proposing a framework for analyzing model data for land-surface feedbacks

• Proposing analysis framework for comparing global models and climate observations

• RH, cloud-base and cloud cover need to be measured with the radiation fields as *climate variables*

• Climate modeling with interchangeable plug-in modules is fraught with peril, as the feedbacks change
Thank-you!