# Towards GOT5 Miscellaneous Points on Polar Tides, Coastal Tides, and Minor Tides

# **Richard Ray**

**NASA Goddard Space Flight Center** 

**OSTST meeting** 







# Towards GOT5 Miscellaneous Points on <del>Polar Tides, Coastal</del> <del>Tides, and</del> Minor Tides

# **Richard Ray**

**NASA Goddard Space Flight Center** 

**OSTST meeting** 







## Degree-3 M<sub>1</sub> Tide

P. L. Woodworth (2019), "The global distribution of the M1 ocean tide," Ocean Sciences, 15, 431-442.

## Ocean response to Y<sub>3,1</sub> spherical harmonic of astronomical potential







# Degree-3 M<sub>1</sub> Tide

P. L. Woodworth (2019), "The global distribution of the M1 ocean tide," Ocean Sciences, 15, 431-442.





#### GOT5





#### (via inference) GOT5

Frequency separation = 1 cycle / 8.8 years



## **Degree-3 Terdiurnal** M<sub>3</sub> Tide

## **Ocean response to Y**<sub>3,3</sub> spherical harmonic of astronomical potential





#### GOT5 (preliminary)

# **Terdiurnal M**<sub>3</sub>

## Amplitude of GRACE residuals at M<sub>3</sub> frequency

![](_page_6_Figure_2.jpeg)

## **Terdiurnal M**<sub>3</sub>

#### **Amplitude of GRACE residuals at M<sub>3</sub> frequency**

![](_page_7_Figure_2.jpeg)

## **Terdiurnal M**<sub>3</sub>

#### **Amplitude of GRACE residuals at M3 frequency**

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_3.jpeg)

Red dot – Thevenard tide gauge

![](_page_8_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_6.jpeg)

# Astronomical Tidal Potential (deg 2)

#### **Diurnal band**

![](_page_9_Figure_2.jpeg)

GOT4.x was distributed with 4 major diurnals, 4 major semidiurnals (plus M4) FES2004 was distributed with same + 2N2. FES2014 was distributed with more, but many not data-constrained

### **Semidiurnal band**

![](_page_9_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

## DART station 46419 (North Pacific)

![](_page_10_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_2.jpeg)

## **Semidiurnal Tidal Admittance**

#### **DART station 46419 (North Pacific)**

# Minor Tides in Diurnal & Semidiurnal Bands Infer them or estimate directly?

- Inference 

   admittance interpolation vs extrapolation.
  - Extrapolation is risky for  $2Q_1$ ,  $J_1$ ,  $OO_1$ ,  $\varepsilon_2$

![](_page_12_Figure_5.jpeg)

•When altimeter time series was short, we had to infer; poor SNR. •As time series lengthens, more tides can be estimated directly.

![](_page_12_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_9.jpeg)

#### **GRACE** Range-Acceleration Residuals by Tidal Constituent: Diurnal Band

#### **Prior model = GOT4.7, based on extrapolation of admittances**

![](_page_13_Figure_2.jpeg)

Note: OO1 is a smaller tide than J1, but is higher frequency at edge of band, implying farther extrapolation of diurnal admittance, implying larger errors

![](_page_13_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### GOT5

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### GOT5 minus (inferred) GOT4.7

![](_page_14_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### GOT4.7 Acceleration Residuals wrt GOT4.7 admittance extrapolation

![](_page_14_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **GRACE** Range-Acceleration Residuals by Tidal Constituent: Semidiurnal Band

#### **Prior model = GOT4.7, based on extrapolation of admittances**

![](_page_15_Figure_2.jpeg)

Larger mu2 residuals show presence on nonlinear 2MS2

In general, mu2 is 20% larger than 2N2, so color table adjusted accordingly

## Can we map the nonlinear $2MS_2$ coinciding with $\mu_2$ ?

## GOT5 minus (inferred) GOT5 = $2MS_2$ ?

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

## **RMS differences (mm) with ~150 bottom-pressure stations**

	2Q1 Direct	2Q1 Infer	P1 Direct	P1 Infer	J1 Direct	J1 Infer	001 Direct	001 Infer	mu2 Direct	mu2 Infer	nu2 Direct	nu2 Infe
GOT4.7			2.34	2.02								
GOT4.10c			2.45	1.91								
GOT5 β	0.63	0.84	1.48	1.79	0.97	1.74	0.93	2.53	0.79	2.50	0.89	0.7
HAM12			1.99	1.91								
FES2014*			1.38	1.74	4.50	1.71			0.96	2.59	0.90	0.70

\* Warning: FES2014 may have assimilated some test stations

hydrodynamic only

![](_page_17_Picture_7.jpeg)

## **Recommendations for Handling Minor Tides**

#### **M1** nu2

Tides affected by nonlinearity must be directly estimated (but not everywhere?) mu2 (2MS<sub>2</sub>) L2 (2MN<sub>2</sub>) tau1 (MP<sub>1</sub>)

Tides at edges of bands can now be directly estimated (depending on SNR). **2Q1** J1 001 sigma1

![](_page_18_Figure_4.jpeg)

Tides in middle of bands can still be inferred (admittances interpolated, not extrapolated).

![](_page_18_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

## A little nonlinear at mu2

![](_page_19_Figure_4.jpeg)

## Valparaiso, Chile

![](_page_19_Figure_6.jpeg)

## **TOPEX + Jason along-track estimates of M3** 27 years of altimeter measurements

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

## **TOPEX + Jason along-track estimates of M3** 27 years of altimeter measurements

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

## **Discrepancies between Tide Models and Along-Track Altimetry**

![](_page_22_Figure_2.jpeg)

## **Discrepancies between Tide Models and Along-Track Altimetry**

![](_page_23_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### M2 Residuals

25 cm

## (Noisy) Tide Residual Amplitudes from Altimetry

Envisat only

SARAL only

![](_page_24_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### Prior = FES2014

Cryosat-2 only

![](_page_24_Figure_8.jpeg)