Advertisement: ESD Special Issue on Ensemble Design/Implementation in Climate Science



Earth System Dynamics

Articles & PREPRINTS • SUBMISSION POLICIES • PEER REVIEW • EDITORIAL BOARD & BOUT • EGU PUBLICATIONS • 20
Special issue
Articles / Special issue

Theoretical and computational aspects of ensemble design, implementation, and interpretation in climate science (ESD/GMD/NPG inter-journal SI)

Editor(s): Francisco de Melo Viríssimo, Irina Tezaur, Eviatar Bach, David Stainforth, and Christian Franzke Special issue jointly organized between Earth System Dynamics, Geoscientific Model Development, and Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics

The purpose of this special issue is to review and report on recent advances in the design, implementation, and interpretation of ensembles in climate science. This includes theoretical, mathematical, and computational aspects, therefore bringing together contributions from mathematicians, computational scientists, model users and developers, and climate scientists alike.

Climate science, in particular climate prediction and projection, are heavily dependent on the use of Earth system models (ESMs), which are nonlinear, complex, and chaotic representations of the Earth's spheres. As such, ESMs are susceptible to various sources of uncertainty. These include uncertainty in the initial state, parameter values, model formulation, structure, and external forcing. Ensembles have become a key tool to quantify these uncertainties and improve predictions. However, challenging questions remain regarding how to design and interpret such ensembles within the constraints of limited computational power and the lack of a rigorous framework for their design. Therefore, this special issue will be a valuable resource to climate scientists working on both theoretical and practical aspects of prediction ahead of Phase 7 of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP7) and future assessments.

This issue arises from the minisymposium "Theoretical and Computational Aspects of Ensemble Design and Interpretation in Climate Science and Modelling" hosted during the SIAM Conference on Mathematical & Computational Issues in Geosciences in Bergen, Norway (19-22 June 2023). It will feature works by participants as well as external contributions.

- Earth System Dynamics (ESD)/ Geoscientific Model Development (GMD)/ Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics (NPG) inter-journal special issue
- Editors: Francisco de Melo Virissimo, Irina Tezaur, Eviatar Bach, David Stainforth, Christian Franzke
- Papers due July 31, 2024
- More info found here: <u>https://esd.copernicus.org/articles/special</u> <u>issue1278.html</u>
- **Contact:** <u>ikalash@sandia.gov</u>



Exceptional service in the national interest





Development and Calibration of the Arctic Coastal Erosion (ACE) Model, Towards UQ of Climate Change-Induced Arctic Permafrost Degradation Jenn Frederick, Alejandro Mota, <u>Irina Tezaur</u>, Charles Choens, Diana Bull, Elyce Bayat Sandia National Laboratories, USA



Sandia National Laboratories is a multi-mission laboratory managed and operated by National Technology and Engineering Solutions of Sandia, LLC., a wholly owned subsidiary of Honeywell International, Inc., for the U.S. Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under contract DE-NA0003525. SAND2019-7899 C

SAND2024-01744C

Outline

Sandia National Laboratories

- Motivation and background
- The Arctic Coastal Erosion (ACE) model
 - Birds-eye-view of ACE



- Thermo-mechanical terrestrial component of ACE
- Numerical results
 - Sensitivity study for 3D elastic mechanics-only simulation
 - Calibration/validation of thermo-mechanical coupling for pseudorealistic 2.5D slice problem
- Summary
- Current and future work

Motivation

The Arctic is warming at **4 times** the rate of the global average resulting in **accelerated rates of coastal erosion**!

- Primary culprit is loss of Arctic sea ice: since 1979 sea ice has lost 51% in area and 75% in volume
 - Increasing ice-free season
 - Increasing wave energy and storm surge
 - Increasing sea water temperatures

Erosion is threatening:

- **Coastal communities**: threatened with displacement
- **Coastal infrastructure**: active DoD sites, including toxic waste sites, in northern Alaska
- **Global carbon balance**: permafrost stores greenhouse gases (CO₂, CH₄, NO₂).



Permafrost thaw & erosion

What is permafrost?

- Ground that remains frozen for 2+ consecutive years.
- 24% of ice-free land area in Northern Hemisphere and 85% of Alaska, Greenland, Canada and Siberia contains permafrost.
- 34% of global coastline is permafrost.



Left: schematic illustrating formation of ice wedges and ice-wedge polygon landscapes. *Right:* map of permafrost distribution in Arctic



Brown et al. 1998.



Unique coastal permafrost erosion process in Arctic:

- Predominant geomorphology: ice-wedge polygons
 - > Ice acts to **bind** unconsolidated soils in permafrost.
 - > Ice wedges **grow/expand** up to 10s meters wide and deep.
 - Permafrost thaw can cause subsidence, slumping, weakening.

Coastal permafrost failure mechanisms



- **Retrogressive thaw slumping**: a slope failure characterized by thaw of exposed ground ice and slumping of thawed soil, typically caused by thermo-denudation¹.
- Active layer detachment: failures are translational landslides that occur in summer in thawing soil overlying permafrost, typically caused by thermo-denudation¹.
- Block failure: a niche (recess at bluff base) progresses landward until the overhanging material fails in a shearing or toppling mode known as block failure, caused by thermo-abrasion².
 - > Fallen blocks can disintegrate in the near-shore environment within 1-2 weeks!



Retrogressive thaw slumping



Active layer detachment



Block failure

Coastal permafrost failure mechanisms



This study

- Retrogressive thaw slumping: a slope failure characterized by thaw of exposed ground ice and slumping of thawed soil, typically caused by thermo-denundation¹.
- Active layer detachment: failures are translational landslides that occur in summer in thawing soil overlying permafrost, typically caused by thermo-denundation¹.
- Block failure: a niche (recess at bluff base) progresses landward until the overhanging material fails in a shearing or toppling mode known as block failure, caused by thermo-abrasion².
 - > Fallen blocks can disintegrate in the near-shore environment within 1-2 weeks!



Retrogressive thaw slumping



Active layer detachment

Dominant failure mechanism in northern Alaska



Block failure

Example of bluff erosion during 2019 UAV surveys*





State-of-the-art in permafrost modeling

Most **existing permafrost models*** (including Earth System Model-, or ESM-, coupled models) are fairly **primitive**!

- Most models were based on trend projection and/or empirical relationships
- Limited PDE-based models: primarily thermal models, e.g., 1D steady state heat flow (no mechanics/deformation)
- Most models assumed a particular type of erosion (e.g., block failure)
- Models did not include realistic boundary conditions and did not account for permafrost geomorphologies or geophysics.

<u>Premise behind ACE</u>: an accurate, predictive Arctic coastal erosion model must couple the influences of evolving wave dynamics, thermodynamics and mechanics.





Arctic Coastal Erosion (ACE) model







Colors distinguish terrain units



LOCATION SPECIFIC DATA

BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

Reanalysis (ASR & ERA) (Historic)

HYCOM (Historic)

SNAP Downscaled RCP 8.5 Earth System Models (*Projections*)

TERRESTRIAL \ TERRESTRIAL

coupled wave & circulation



IND SPEED / DIRECTION • ATMOSPHERIC TEMP • PERMAFROST TEMP • OCEAN ICE EXTENT • OCEAN CURRENTS • OCEAN TEMP



Arctic Coastal Erosion (ACE) model





Colors distinguish terrain units

Finite element implementation in Albany-LCM

The *thermo-mechanical Arctic Coastal Erosion (ACE)* model is implemented within the *LCM project* in Sandia's open-source parallel, C++, multi-physics, finite element code, *Albany*.

- Component-based design for rapid development.
- Contains a wide variety of *constitutive models*.
- Extensive use of libraries from the open-source *Trilinos* project.
 - Use of the *Phalanx* package to decompose complex problem into simpler problems with managed dependencies.
 - Use of the Sacado package for automatic differentiation.
- All software available on *GitHub*.

https://github.com/trilinos/ trilinos

https://github.com/ sandialabs/LCM







Anatomy of a canonical computational domain





* Layer of unfrozen ground that is perennially cryotic (forming part of the permafrost) in which freezing is prevented.

Thermal model



 Transient heat conduction in a non-homogeneous porous media with water-ice phase change:

$$(\overline{\rho c_p} + \widetilde{\Theta})\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{K} \cdot \nabla T)$$

where $\widetilde{\Theta} \coloneqq \rho_f L_f \frac{\partial f}{\partial T}$ incorporates phase changes through soil freezing curve, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial T}$.

Computes temperature T and ice saturation f





- **Boundary conditions** (from wave model/data)
 - Local geothermal heat flux from below
 - Air temp* from above
 - Air/ocean temp at bluff face
 - Ocean salinity at bluff face**







Mechanical model

 Finite deformation *time-dependent* variational formulation for *solid mechanics problem* obtained by minimizing the energy functional:

$$\Phi[\boldsymbol{\varphi}] \coloneqq \int_{\Omega} A(\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{Z}) \, dV - \int_{\Omega} \rho \boldsymbol{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, dV - \int_{\partial_{\boldsymbol{T}} \Omega} \boldsymbol{T} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, dS$$

- Computes displacements and new computational geometry (following erosion)
- J₂ plasticity extended to large-deformation regime constitutive model for ice and permafrost
 - Incorporates all mechanisms that lead to deformation and plastic flow of polycrystalline materials like ice; minimal calibration parameters; simplest material model w/ plastic behavior
 - > Constitutive model is a function of f, the *ice saturation*, which comes from the *thermal problem*
- Boundary conditions:
 - Symmetry BCs on lateral sides
 - Wave pressure Neumann BC on bluff face* (from wave model)
 - Damage variable on bluff face in contact with ocean (introduces softening due to dissolution by lowering elastic modulus E)







Erosion failure criteria

- <u>Stress criterion</u>: when material reaches a critical value of the stress in tension or compression.
- Strain criterion: when material reaches a critical strain limit defined as a function of peat content (distortion).
- <u>Kinematic criterion</u>: when material has tilted excessively, or exceeded a maximum physical displacement, it is assumed to have fallen as part of block erosion.



When any of the **failure criteria** are reached for all integration points within an element, "failed" elements are **removed** from mesh.



Coupled thermo-mechanical formulation

Eroded geometry



Potential key advantages:

- Failure modes develop from constitutive relationships in FEM model (no empirical relationships!)
- 3D unsteady heat flow can include chemistry
- Thermal and mechanical problems can be advanced using different time-steppers (e.g., implicit-explicit coupling)
- **Coupled** mechanical + thermal states

Unique characteristic of coupled model: coupling happens at the level of material model

Thermal: *Inputs:* geometry, sediment type, porosity, salinity **Outputs:** temperature field, ice saturation

Mechanical:

Inputs: ice saturation, mechanical parameter relationships as function of sediment type and ice saturation
 Outputs: displacements, eroded geometry

Parameters & inputs

Parameters estimated from core lab experiments:

- Elastic modulus, Poisson's ratio, yield strength
- Sand/silt/clay/peat fractions with depth
- Porosity with depth
- Salinity with depth

Parameters from literature:

- Ice/water/sediment densities, thermal conductivities, heat capacities
- Freezing curve/width as function of sediment type

Parameters estimated from observational data at Drew Point, AK:

- Air temp w/ time, initial bluff temp (USGS weather station data)
- Geothermal heat flux (borehole at Barrow, AK)
- Polygon dimension, ice wedge thickness and depth, bluff height, organic layer (peat) thickness (Aug. 2019 field campaign)

Parameters from wave model (WW3+SWAN+Delft3D):

 Ocean temperature, salinity and sea-level w/ time (for thermal and wave pressure mechanical BCs)



integral





Material model calibration to experimental data





ice saturation

1.0

0.0

0

porosity



Experimental results on permafrost core samples used to create fits for *E*, K, σ as a function of **ice** saturation and porosity.

Experiments are very challenging to perform and provide limited data!



<u>Goal:</u> assess *impact* of *bluff geometry* and *material variability* on stress states leading up to bluff failure, and use results to *inform thermo-mechanical* analyses

- Geometric parameters varied: niche height (N_H) , niche depth (N_D) , bluff height (B_H) , permafrost block size (B_S) , ice wedge thickness (I_W) , ice wedge depth (I_D)
- Mechanical properties varied: bulk density (ρ_b), Young's modulus (E), Poisson's ratio (v)
- Parameter ranges: informed by field observations, visual inspection of UAV-based aerial photography and mechanical testing of permafrost samples (see Thomas *et al.*, 2020)
- **Output QOIs**: location (indicated by star) and magnitude of simulated maximum tensile stress ($\sigma_{T_{max}}$)



ORIGINAL RESEARCH published: 12 May 2020 doi: 10.3389/feart.2020.00143

Sandia

National

aboratories

Geometric and Material Variability Influences Stress States Relevant to Coastal Permafrost Bluff Failure

Matthew A. Thomas¹⁺¹, Alejandro Mota², Benjamin M. Jones³, R. Charles Choens², Jennifer M. Frederick² and Diana L. Bull²

¹U.S. Geological Survey, Geologic Hazards Science Center, Golden, CO, United States, ³ Sandia National Laboratories, Abuquerque, NM, United States, ³ Institute of Northern Engineering, College of Engineering and Mines, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK, United States



| | Location $\sigma_{T_{\max}}$ | Magnitude $\sigma_{T_{\max}}$ | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Erosional niche - | | H | Parameter | Unit | Min | Max | Base |
| Permafrost blocks - | | н <mark>ш</mark> н | N_H | m | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Ice wedges - | | н <mark>н</mark> | N_D | m | 2 | 6 | 4 |
| Bulk density - | I | | B_H | m | 2.5 | 7.5 | 5 |
| Young's Modulus - | I | н <mark>П</mark> н | B_S | m | 10 | 20 | 15 |
| Poisson's Ratio - | | 0 | I_W | m | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 3 4 5 6 | 7 0 50 100 150 200 250 300 | I_D | m | 50% <i>B_H</i> | $100\% B_{H}$ | 75%B _H |
| | Distance inland from bluff face Magnitude of σ_{Tmax} [kPa] to location of σ_{Tmax} [m] | | $ ho_b$ permafrost | kg/m ³ | 1000 | 1500 | 1250 |
| | Erosional niche properties: $N_H \& N_D$ Permafrost blocks: $B_H \& B_S$, Ice wedges: $I_W \& I_D$ | | E permafrost | Ра | 1e8 | 1e9 | 5e8 |
| F | | | v permafrost | — | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.25 |
| - Niche characteristics exert the largest impact on the location and magnitude of $\sigma_{T_{\rm max}}$ | | | $ ho_b$ ice | kg/m ³ | 871 | 963 | 917 |
| | | | E ice | Ра | 5e8 | 1e9 | 7.5e8 |
| | | | | | | | |

v ice

0.1

0.4

• Variability in *material properties* influences *magnitude* of $\sigma_{T_{\max}}$ but not its *location*

0.25





Niche dimension affects location and magnitude of simulated max tensile stress ($\sigma_{T_{max}}$) more than the bluff height, ice wedge polygon size, ice wedge geometry, bulk density and Poisson's ratio



- **Taller** and **narrower** erosional **niches** promote **smaller failure masses** compared to those with **shorter** and **deeper niches**. Orange/green shading highlights potential **failure areas** (left figure).
- As niche advances into the block, an overhanging section in the block acts as *cantilever* (right figure).
- Highest *tensile stresses* develop on top surface where cantilever meets rest of block (right figure).

- Observations have shown that failure can occur along tension cracks in ice wedge polygon centers
- Additional sensitivity study: introduce vertical fractures having fracture depth F_D from 0 to 25% B_H



Left figure: highest F_D produces ~40% more displacement than lowest F_D , suggesting that the presence of a tension crack prior to failure can induce localized displacement

Takeaway: even relatively shallow vertical cracks can concentrate strain within ice-bonded permafrost bluffs.



Degradatio

Sandia

National

Sandia National Laboratories

- Computational domain is 2.5D cross-section of archetypal 3D
 bluff geometry discretized using a uniform hex grid
 - Pseudo-realistic problem with realistic oceanic and atmospheric forcing BC data occurring at Drew Point, AK in summer 2018
 - Initial temperature field obtained from vertical thermistor string placed into DP1-1 ice core at Drew Point





2.5D slice thermo-mechanical sensitivity study



Increasing E Weakening Factor Higher stiffness, less deformable material Residual Elastic Modulus = 1.5e+04 g factor = 1000. - CAM 7 - CAM - CAM 7 - CAM z = 5.0 m z = 5.0 m $z = 5.0 \, m$ $z = 5.0 \, m$ 5 - z = 4.5 m z = 4.5 m z = 4.5 mz = 4.5 mz = 4.0 m z = 4.0 r z = 4.0 r z = 4.0 m Too slow = z = 3.0 r z = 3.0 m = z = 2.0 r = z = 2.0 m z = 2.0 m z = 2.0 m z = 0.5 r $z = 0.5 \, m$ $z = 0.5 \, \pi$ 7 = 0.25 7 = 0.25 7 = 0.25 : 7 = 0.25= z = 0.0 r - Aug.25 Aug 08 Aug 15 Aug 22 10 lu(10 lu(11 08 Aug (In In In 크 크 In Dny Residual Elastic Modulus Residual Elastic Modulus = 8.25e+03 Residual Elastic Modulus = 8.25e+03 Residual Elastic Modulus = 8.25e+03 - CAM - - 50 Decreasing z = 4.5 n 7 = 4.5 rz = 4.0 m z = 4.0 rz = 4.0 mz = 2.0 rz = 1.0 m z = 1.0 r z = 1.0 rz = 0.5 n z = 0.5 r z = 0.25 r z = 0.25 r z = 0.25 r - 7 - 0.0 0 $7 = 0.0 \, \text{m}$ 7 - 0.0 m Aug.25 Aug 01 -Aug 08 -Aug 15 -Aug 22 jul 08 jul 15 Jul 22 Aug 15 Residual Elastic Modulus = 1.5e+03 Residual Elastic Modulus = 1.5e+03 sidual Elastic Modulus = 1.5e+03 E Weake - CAM - CAM - thermist thermist z = 5.0 m z = 5.0 m $z = 5.0 \, m$ Too fast z = 4.5 r z = 4.5 r Good fit in this range z = 4.0 m z = 4.0 m z = 4.0 r z = 3.0 m = z = 3.0 m z = 2.0 r z = 2.0 r z = 2.0 r z = 1.0 m z = 0.5 m z = 0.5 m z = 0.5 r z = 0.25 ____ z = 0.0 m z = 0.0 m = z = 0.0 m Lower stiffness, 15 80 15 15 08 15 15 80 22 ul 22 Aug (Aug 1 E Ξ Ξ more deformable material

E weakening factor and redidual *E* parameters *hand-calibrated* through sensitivity studies s.t. *niche growth* and *day/time of collapse* match *observations*

Residual Elastic Modulus: lowest value the elastic modulus, $E = f(ice \ saturation, \ porosity)$, can take

- Increasing value → less deformation/unit stress
- **Decreasing value** → more deformation/unit stress → material more likely to fail in strain
- Plays strong role in **rate of denudation**

E Weakening Factor: factor by which the residual elastic modulus is divided at locations where the ocean is in contact with the bluff

- Reflects **localized adjustment** in material properties from material dissolution due to ocean-bluff contact
- Increasing value → more deformation/unit stress → material more likely to fail in strain
 - Plays strong role in niche formation



3.1m

6.8m



Bluff face

Time: 0.000000 days since 01JUL2018





28 August 2018

Sandia

National

aboratories

Calibrated ACE model *capable of simulating* Sept. 1, 2018 *block collapse event* observed at Drew Point, AK!









Summary

- We have developed a *thermo-mechanical* coupled FEM model, *ACE*, that can simulate *transient niche development* and *permafrost erosion* within Albany-LCM.
- The model was *calibrated* using data from a series of *experiments* on frozen soil samples from Drew Point, Alaska that were performed at Sandia's Geomechanics Laboratory, as well as *observational data* collected at the same location.
- The model incorporates *boundary conditions* from the *WW3+SWAN+Delft3D* wave models and observational data from field campaigns at Drew Point, Alaska.
- Sensitivity studies can provide insight into which parameters are most important to permafrost demise, and assist with model calibration.







Current and future work

Interface project: upscale ACE terrestrial model to meso/macro scales for integration into E3SM

24 July 2018

Meso-scale model

10s of km, monthly duration

Upscaling will be performed from "catalog" of 6-7 ACE runs for different terrestrial configurations/locations in northern Alaska

- Arctic Critical Infrastructure (ACI) project: aims to develop a computational model capable of analyzing various permafrost-infrastructure scenarios, failure modes, and risk-mitigation strategies
 - > UQ is critical to this project/problem!

Permafros

Micro-scale (ACE) model

10s of m, storm duration

Initial exemplar: Paulatuk airstrip in northern Canada (right).



Macro-scale model

Prudhoe Ba

Kaktovik

Beaufort Sea

Macro-scale model 100s of km, annual+ duration



Jtaiaavik (Barrow)



References Drew Point calibration/validation paper in preparation!



[1] J. Frederick, M. Thomas, D. Bull, C. Jones, J. Roberts. "The Arctic Coastal Erosion Problem". Sandia National Laboratories Report, SAND2016-9762, 2016.

[2] A. Gibbs, B. Richmond. "National assessment of shoreline change – historical shoreline change along the north coast of Alaska, U.S.-Canadian border to Icy Cape". U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report, 2015-1048, 2015.

[3] P. Martin *et al.* "Wildlife response to environmental Arctic change: predicting future habitats of Arctic Alaska". Report to WildREACH: Predicting Future Habitats of Arctic Alaska Workshop, Farbanks, Alaska, 2008.

[4] J. Brown and O. Ferrians and J. Heginbottom, E. Melnikov. "Circum-Arctic map of permafrost and ground conditions. Boulder, CO: National Snow and Ice Data Center, Digital Media, 1998.

[5] H. Lantuit, W. Pollard. Fifty years of coastal erosion and retrogressive thaw slump activity on Herschel Island, southern Beaufort Sea, Yukon Territory, Canada. Geomorphology, 95, 84-102, 2008.

[6] T. Ravens, B. Jones, J. Zhang, C. Arp, J. Schmutz. "Process-based coastal erosion modeling for Drew Point, North Slope, Alaska". Journal of Waterway, Port, Coastal, and Ocean Engineering, 138, 2, 122-130, 2012.

[7] C. Koven, J. Riley, A. Stern. "Analysis of permafrost thermal dynamics and response to climate change in the CMPI5 Earth system models". J Climate, 26, 1877-2900, 2009.

[8] M. Thomas, A. Mota, B. Jones, C. Choens, J. Frederick, D. Bull. "Bluff geometry and material properties influence stress rates relevant to coastal permafrost block failure". Frontiers in Earth Science 8, 2020.

[9] J. Frederick, A. Mota, D. Bull, I. Tezaur. "Thermo-chemo-mechanical coupling for Arctic Coastal Erosion", J. Comput. Appl. Math. 397 113533, 2021.

[10] D. Bull, C. Flanary, C. Jones, J. Frederick, A. Mota, I. Tezaur, J. Kasper, E. Brown, B. Jones, M. Jones, E. Bristol, C. Choens, C. Connoly, J. McClelland. "Arctic Coastal Erosion: Modeling and Experimentation". Sandia National Laboratories report, SAND2020-10223, 2020.