

ADVANCING OCEAN PREDICTION SCIENCE FOR SOCIETAL BENEFITS

Theme 5.4

Assimilation of Surface Residual Currents from HF Radar in the Jeju Strait

Kyungman Kwon¹, Sung-Gwan Myoung¹, Byoung-Ju Choi²

¹Korea Institute of Ocean Science and Technology, Republic of Korea ²Chonnam National University, Republic of Korea

Introduction

High frequency (HF) radar is an instrument that measures surface currents by emitting short waves from antennas to the sea surface and analyzing the phase difference of the reflected waves from the sea surface. The Jeju Strait, the study area, is heavily influenced by tides, predominantly the M2 semi-diurnal tide, which plays a crucial role in vertical and horizontal mixing due to its seasonal and spatial variability. For effective data assimilation of HF radar currents into an ocean circulation numerical model, the tidal characteristics simulated by the numerical model must be similar to those observed by the HF radar. This study proposes a method to assimilate residual currents, derived by removing tidal components from HF radar surface current data, into the numerical ocean circulation model.

Results

Comparison of Surface Currents



Data and Methods



Fig. 1. (a) Numerical model domain, outlined by a red dashed box, are enclosed by the Yellow and East China Sea, (b) contour lines represent bathymetry within the model domain and black rectangle indicates the area of interest, Jeju Strait, for further analysis



- Data Assimilation

- O Method: Ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF)
- O Data: HF-Radar **Total Vector**

Fig. 4. Comparison of model surface currents with observations from ocean buoys for both u- and vcomponents in FR (a, c) and DA (b, d)

Fig. 5. Comparison with surface currents from drifters. Root mean square error (RMSE) and correlation coefficient (R) were used for assessment

- u-component improved: Buoy R 0.83 \rightarrow 0.85, Drifter R 0.88 \rightarrow 0.89
- v-component improved: Buoy R 0.42 \rightarrow 0.52, Drifter R 0.75 \rightarrow 0.82

RMSE reductions indicate improved accuracy in surface current predictions



- O Depth: Surface
- O Period: July 2020 (1 month)
- O Assimilation Cycle: 3 hour
 - O Number of Ensemble member: 30
- Independent Data for validation

O 2 buoys, 3 ADCPs, 7 Drifters

Fig. 2. Distribution of HF radar total vector data coverage (%) for July 2020 at Sites 1 and 2. The black contour line represents the 80% data coverage threshold. Green circles indicate the locations of ocean buoy observations, blue circles denote ADCP observation sites, and the orange circle marks the positions of seven drifter observations

$$\overrightarrow{X_{m}} = \widetilde{X_{m}} + X_{m}' - (1)$$

$$\overrightarrow{X_{o}} = \widetilde{X_{o}} - X_{o}' + X_{m}' - (2)$$

 $\overline{X_m}$: Model surface current $\overrightarrow{X_o}$: HF Radar surface current $\widetilde{X_m}$: Model residual current $\widetilde{X_o}$: HF Radar residual current X_m' : Model tidal current X_o' : HF Radar tidal current





Fig. 6. Comparison of model surface currents with ADCP observations at locations T1, T2, and T4 for the u-component (left) and v-component (right), with FR (upper panels) and DA (lower panels). Each panel provides the linear regression equation, RMSE, and R for both FR and DA results

Table 1. Comparison of the slope,	Cto	C om -	FR	DA	FR	DA	FR	DA
RMSE, and R values between the	Sta.	Comp.	Slope		RMSE		R	
FR and DA results at the T1, T2, and	T1	u	0.74	0.59 (20%)	0.25	0.32 (28%)	0.74	0.60 (19%)
T4 ADCP stations. The percentage		V	0.45	0.32 (29%)	0.10	0.11 (10%)	0.45	0.32 (29%)
values represent the relative	т2 5 5 т4	u	0.85	0.89 (4.7%)	0.21	0.18 (14%)	0.83	0.88 (6.0%)
ER to DA with blue indicating		V	0.45	0.48 (6.7%)	0.09	0.08 (11%)	0.50	0.54 (8.0%)
improvement and red indicating		u	0.71	0.75 (5.6%)	0.31	0.29 (6.5%)	0.69	0.74 (7.2%)
deterioration	14	V	0.09	0.22 (144%)	0.12	0.10 (16.7%)	0.13	0.32 (146%)

Effects on Surface Temperature and Currents



Fig. 7. (a) Horizontal distribution of surface temperature and currents in the DA. (b) Difference in surface temperature and currents between DA and FR. (c) Surface u-component difference and (d) surface vcomponent difference between DA and FR, with (c) and (d) showing the enlarged view of the blue box region in (a)

After data assimilation, increased turbulent inflow results in elevated sea

Fig. 3. The process of obtaining HF radar residual currents by performing harmonic analysis on raw HF radar data to fill gaps and applying harmonic analysis three times. The residual current from HF radar is then combined with the tidal current from the numerical model to be used in data assimilation

해양을 고

KIOST

Ocean Specialist KIOST

Conclusions



- surface temperature within the Jeju Strait, likely due to the strengthened representation of turbulent inflow in the assimilated fields
- Intensified warm current inflow is thought to enhance the northeastward flow and increase current speeds to the north of Jeju Island, whereas the northeastward currents to the southeast of Jeju Island were weakened

A method for assimilating residual currents was developed to address discrepancies between numerical model and HF radar tidal currents in regions with strong tidal influence. Assimilative model results demonstrated improvements in surface current accuracy, with the influence on both surface currents and vertical current profiles. The assimilation further intensified warm current inflow, raising surface temperatures in the Jeju Strait. This process is thought to strengthen the northeastward flow in the northern region of Jeju, while relatively weakening the northeastward flow in the southern region.





ntergovernmental Oceanographic



2021 United Nations Decade of Ocean Science **2030** for Sustainable Development