Modelling thermal and hydrologic regime of the permafrost

M.M. Arzhanov, P.F. Demchenko, A.V. Eliseev, I.I. Mokhov

A.M. Obukhov Institute of Atmospheric Physics RAS, 3 Pyzhevsky, 119017, Moscow, Russia, e-mail: arzhanov@ifaran.ru

The model for thermal and hydrological regime of the soils, which is suitable for the climate model of intermediate complexity, is developed. The soil model numerics is based on the method of "phase boundary catching" [1]. The soil hydrology is computed, based on [2], but with the runoff, parameterized in accordance to [3].

Here, this model is applied to the computation of the active layer thickness (ALT) in the Northern Hemisphere. The model has been forced by the monthly NCEP/NCAR reanalysis climatology for 1979-1995. For simplicity, the soil heterogeneity is neglected and everywhere the soil thermo/hydrophysical parameters, corresponding to loam, are prescribed. The computed ALT is shown in Fig.1.

The total area, covered by permafrost in the model, is about 21 mln.sq.km. This is quite close to the observationally based estimate \sim 23 mln.sq.km [4]. This value is also agree with the continious potential permafrost area 20 mln sq.km, estimated, using the severity index [5] (with the surface air temperature, again taken from the NCEP/NCAR reanalysis dataset). Moreover, the geographical boundaries of the regions, where the permafrost is simulated by the model, are in the good agreement with the severity index isoline, bounding the continious potential permafrost.



Fig.1: Simulated active layer thickness (color shades) together with the severity index isolines -1 and -2 (bounding sporadic and continious potential permafrost, respectively).

The computed ALT can be compared with the results of the direct measurements, performed in the limited number of experimental sites. Here, this comparison is performed for the site near Yakutsk (62N 129E). The modeled value is 1.3 m, while the measurements embed the range 1.4-1.7 m with the mean value 1.5 m [6]. This underestimation can be due to cold bias in the NCEP/NCAR reanalysis (note that the area, covered by the continious potential permafrost in this reanalysis, is close to the observationally estimated area, covered by the all types of permafrost).

References:

1. Anisimov, O.A., 1989: On estimation of the permafrost sensitivity to the global thermal regime of the Earth's surface. Sov. Meteorol. Hydrol., (5), 79-84.

2. Pachepsky, Ya.A., L.B. Pachepskaya, E.V. Mironenko, and A.S. Komarov, 1976: Modelling the water-salt regime of soils using computer. Nauka Publ. House, Moscow [in Russian].

 Volodin, E. M. and V. N. Lykosov, 1998: Parametrization of Heat and Moisture Transfer in the Soil–Vegetation System for Use in Atmospheric General Circulation Models:
Formulation and Simulations Based on Local Observational Data. Izvestia, Atmos. Oceanic Phys., 34 (4), 405-416.

4. Zhang, T., R.G. Barry, K. Knowles, J.A. Heginbottom, and J. Brown, 1999: Statistics and characteristics of permafrost and ground-ice distribution in the Northern Hemisphere. Polar Geogr., 23(2), 132-154

5. Demchenko, P.F., A.A. Velichko, A.V. Eliseev, I.I. Mokhov, and V.P.Nechaev, 2002: Dependence of permafrost conditions on global warming: Comparison of models, scenarios, and paleoclimatic reconstructions. Izvestia, Atmos. Oceanic Phys., 38 (2), 143-151

6. Pavlov, A.V., 2003: Permafrost and climate changes on the north of Russia: Observation and forecast. Izvestiya, Geogr., (6), 39-50 [in Russian]