Southern Ocean Winds, Diapycnal Diffusion and the Atlantic Meridional Overturning

Markus Jochum Niels Bohr Institute, Copenhagen Carsten Eden University of Hamburg



Cunningham et al 2013

Overview

- diapycnal diffusivity
- Southern Ocean winds & eddies
- a theory for everything
- ... and GCM against all
- Conclusions



Tropensonne, Nolde

A pragmatic approach

A belief is true, if in the long run it works for all of us, and guides us expeditiously through our semihospitable world.

(William James)



Sandstroem (1908): heating and cooling on same geopotential

Jeffrey (1925): turbulence mixes heat downward

Munk (1966): downward diffusion is balanced by abyssal upwelling

Munk and Wunsch (1998): Where does all the energy come from?

Davies (1994ab): You will never figure it out!

Some Background



observed temperature at 20W (Levitus)

How do we constrain the diffusivity (k)?

- inverse modelling or water mass budget (Munk, Walin, Gordon)
- microstructure measurements (Gregg, Polzin, Toole, Alford)
- tracer release (Ledwell, Watson & Law)
- adjoint techniques (Wunsch, Stammer)
- energy sources/sinks (Munk, Wunsch)

Large scatter, but models show that for MOC or stratification the details don't seem to matter. (Bryan, McWilliams et al., Marotzke)



The North Atlantic Response

difference in temperature on the 1.028 isopycnal

vectors: velocity in control on the same surface



difference in salinity on the 1.028 isopycnal

Ledwell & PSI - control

Toggweiler and Samuels, 1995: a fresh start



Radiocarbon along 28W (Key et al. 2004, based on WOCE)



Real Oceanographers, Real Eddies: Munday, Johnson and Marshall, 2013





NADW production – SO upwelling = mixing driven upwelling

Gnanadesikan 1999, Shakespeare and Hogg 2012, Nikurashin and Vallis, 2012



The GCM: CCSM4 in its T31x3 configuration:

3.75 x 3.75 degree, 26 levels in the atmosphere 0.6 - 3 degree, 60 levels in the ocean

Danabasoglu & Marshall the Elder (2007) version of stratification dependent isopycnal and thickness diffusion

zonally averaged wind stress



NULL, HALF, CONT, TWO

AMOC at equator NULL, HALF, CONT, TWO



Exp.	$taux_{max}$	$AMOC_{eq}$	$Up_{Pacific}$	SO_{Euler}	SO_{eddy}	$SO_{resid.}$	κ_{GM}
NULL	0.00	13	9	5	-7	4	500
HALF	0.09	12	7	20	-11	15	570
CONT	0.14	12	3	35	-15	26	610
TWO	0.25	14	1	60	-22	42	700

Residual Overturning in the various basins



Blue: sigma27; Red: 34.3 psu; Green: 3 C



ACC Transport







CONT

22 -

14 -

10 -

6 · 2 ·

Exp.	$taux_{max}$	$taux_{dp}$	$taux_{ave}$	ACC_{Drake}	κ_{GM}
NULL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	500
HALF	0.09	0.06	0.02	110	570
CONT	0.14	0.06	0.03	100	610
TWO	0.25	0.14	0.05	180	700

HALF

TWO

Total Energy used for diabatic mixing:

NULL: 0.31 TW

CONT: 0.26 TW

depth(m)

TWO: 0.29 TW



Conclusions

- Within realistic parameter ranges the AMOC is mostly independent from ocean turbulence or Southern Ocean winds
- This result has to be corroborated with an eddy resolving GCM, and with a more physical parameterization of diapycnal mixing, or maybe just repeating Munday et al. with a Pacific basin
- ... and, of course, we still have to figure out what the AMOC depends on



(H. Pratt)