An Historical Analysis of the California Current Circulation Using ROMS 4D-Var. Part I: System Configuration and Diagnostics

Emilie Neveu¹, Andrew M. Moore^{2*}, Christopher A. Edwards², Jérôme Fiechter²,
Patrick Drake², William J. Crawford², Michael G. Jacox^{3,4} and Emma Nuss⁵

1 INRIA, Rhône Alpes Research Center, Grenoble, France.

2 Department of Ocean Sciences, 1156 High Street
University of California, Santa Cruz CA 95062.

3 Institute of Marine Sciences, 1156 High Street
University of California, Santa Cruz CA 95062.

4 Environmental Research Division, Southwest Fisheries Science Center
NOAA, Monterey, California.

5 Department of Oceanography,
University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu HI 96822.

* Corresponding author: ammoore@ucsc.edu

November 9, 2015

Abstract

The Regional Ocean Modeling System (ROMS) 4-dimensional variational (4D-Var) data assimilation tool has been used to compute two sequences of circulation analyses for the U.S. west coast. One sequence of analyses spans the period 1980-2010 and is subject to surface forcing derived from relatively low resolution atmospheric products from the Cross-Calibrated Multi-Platform wind product (CCMP) and the European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) reanalysis project. The second sequence spans the shorter period 1999-2012 and is subject to forcing derived from a high resolution product from the Naval Research Laboratory Coupled Ocean Atmosphere Mesoscale Prediction System (COAMPS). The two analyses periods are divided into eight day windows, and all available satellite observations of sea surface temperature and sea surface height, as well as *in situ* hydrographic profiles are assimilated into ROMS using 4D-Var. The performance of the system is monitored in terms of the cost function and the statistics of the innovations, and the impact of data assimilated on the circulation is assessed by comparing the posterior circulation estimates with the prior circulation and the circulation from a run of the model without data assimilation, with particular emphasis on eddy kinetic energy. This is part I of a two part series, and the circulation variability of the 4D-Var analyses is documented in part II.

Keywords: California Current; data assimilation; 4D-Var.

1 Introduction

The California Current System (CCS) is the dominant circulation feature along the west coast of North America where equatorward winds drive coastal upwelling, leading to high levels of primary productivity. The CCS is the eastern boundary current of the North Pacific subtropical gyre, and the dynamics of this region are of interest because of the associated energetic mesoscale circulation and pronounced seasonal cycle of upwelling, especially important in central California from April to July (Hickey, 1979, 1998; Checkley and Barth 2009). The CCS and associated ecosystems are influenced by known modes of climate variability, such as the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) (e.g. Lynn and Bograd, 2002), the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) (Mantua et al., 1997), and the North Pacific Gyre Oscillation (NPGO) (Di Lorenzo et al., 2009).

This paper is the first of a two part series that describes a sequence of retrospective analyses of the CCS circulation computed using a high resolution configuration of the Regional Ocean Modeling System (ROMS) in conjunction with 4-dimensional variational (4D-Var) data assimilation, spanning the period Jan. 1980 to Dec. 2012. In contrast to most previous analyses of the CCS that are available from global data assimilation products (such as those available through the Global Ocean Data Assimilation Experiment (GODAE)), the analyses described here were performed at a resolution that largely captures the mesoscale circulation and the influence of complex coastal geometry and bathymetry. Furthermore, other analyses of the CCS are more limited in time and do not adequately resolve low-frequency variability. Another and original feature of our analyses is that they utilize some of the best high resolution atmospheric forcing products that are available from regional atmospheric

models and regional reanalyses, which resolve many important features of the surface forcing such as wind intensification in the vicinity of capes (Castelao and Barth 2006) and local topographically enhanced wind stress curl (Enriquez and Friehe 1995; Doyle et al, 2009), although excessive wind stress curl near the coast can be detrimental to model circulation estimates as well (Capet et al, 2004).

While regional circulation models, such as ROMS, have been developed for modeling the complex coastal circulation environment, they provide accurate analyses of the physical circulation only if the initial conditions, boundary conditions and model parameters are accurately specified. Data assimilation methods can be used to estimate these inputs to the model by identifying the best linear unbiased estimate (BLUE) of the circulation, which in the case of linear dynamics and Gaussian errors, is equivalent to the maximum likelihood estimate.

Data assimilation can also be formally related to Bayes' theorem. The circulation obtained from a model is uniquely determined by the initial conditions, boundary conditions, and model parameters, which are referred to collectively as the control variables. We will denote by $\mathbf{z}$ the vector of control variables, and by $\mathbf{y}^o$ the vector of ocean observations. Treating both $\mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{y}^o$ as random variables, Bayes' theorem relates the conditional probability distribution of the unknown control variables given the observations, denoted $P(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^o)$, to the prior distribution $P(\mathbf{z})$ of the unknowns $\mathbf{z}$ and the data distribution $P(\mathbf{y}^o|\mathbf{z})$ which quantifies the distribution of the measurement errors in relation to the unknowns $\mathbf{z}$. Formally Bayes' theorem can be expressed as:

$$P(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^o) = P(\mathbf{y}^o|\mathbf{z})P(\mathbf{z})/P(\mathbf{y}^o) \quad (1)$$

where $P(\mathbf{y}^o)$ is the marginal probability distribution and acts a normalizing coefficient to ensure that the integral of $P(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^o)$ is one. It is usual to express the observations as $\mathbf{y}^o = H(\mathbf{z}_t) + \epsilon$ where H is called the observation operator and $\mathbf{z}_t$ represents the true control vector. The vector of observation errors ϵ has a covariance given by $\mathbf{R}$, and the observation operator H may include the model equations. For Gaussian distributed errors in $\mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{y}^o$, then $P(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^o) \propto \exp(-\mathcal{J}_{NL})$, where:

$$\mathcal{J}_{NL} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^b)^T \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^b) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{y}^o - H(\mathbf{z}))^T \mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{y}^o - H(\mathbf{z})). \quad (2)$$

In (2) $\mathbf{z}^b$ is the prior control vector and $\mathbf{D}$ is the covariance of the errors in the prior. Data assimilation can then be viewed as identification of the control vector $\mathbf{z}$ that maximizes the conditional probability $P(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^o)$ (Wikle and Berliner, 2007). According to (2), $P(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^o)$ will be a maximum when $\mathcal{J}_{NL}$ has its minimum value. In control theory, $\mathcal{J}_{NL}$ is usually referred to as the cost function or penalty function.

Variational approaches are often used to identify the $\mathbf{z}$ that minimizes $\mathcal{J}_{NL}$, and were first introduced in meteorological applications by Lewis and Derber (1985), Le Dimet and Talagrand (1986), and Talagrand and Courtier (1987). During 4D-Var, the model is used to dynamically interpolate in space and time (via H) all of the information gathered by the irregular sampling of the observations, resulting in a 4D picture of the ocean circulation that represents the BLUE during the period spanned by the observations. Two approaches are generally used: one in which the minimization of $\mathcal{J}_{NL}$ is performed in the space spanned by the control vector, referred to as the primal approach, and one in which the minimization of $\mathcal{J}_{NL}$ is performed in the space spanned by the observations, referred to as the dual approach.

Since the control vector is usually much larger than the number of ocean observations, the dual approach is potentially more amenable in high resolution models. Only a handful of ocean models use the 4D-Var approach, including MITgcm (Wunsch and Heimbach, 2007), the Ocean Parallélisé (OPA) model (Weaver et al., 2003), the Nucleus for European Modelling of the Ocean (NEMO; Mogensen et al., 2012), the Navy Coastal Ocean Model (NCOM; Ngodock and Carrier, 2013) and ROMS (Moore et al., 2011a; Kurapov et al., 2009). However, ROMS is somewhat unique in terms of the tools that are available in support of both the primal or dual approaches. Moore et al., (2011a,b,c) describe in detail all of the features currently available for the ROMS 4D-Var systems.

The current application of ROMS 4D-Var to the CCS was preceded by the studies of Broquet et al. (2009, 2011) which were important in demonstrating the 4D-Var approach and methodology that is used here. In the present study, we have extended this previous work and compute historical analyses of the CCS spanning two different periods: the 31 year period 1980-2010 (hereafter referred to as WCRA31), and the 14 year period 1999-2012 (hereafter WCRA14). During WCRA31, the model surface forcing was derived from a combination of atmospheric products with horizontal resolutions ranging from 25-200 km. While these products capture well the large-scale components of the atmospheric circulation, as noted earlier, the coastal orography can significantly influence the near-shore atmospheric circulation. Therefore during WCRA14 the model was forced by a higher resolution product with a resolution ranging from 3-9km. As such, during the overlapping period 1999-2010, WCRA14 and WCRA31 demonstrate the impact of high resolution forcing on the ocean circulation estimates. The companion paper by Crawford et al. (2014), hereafter referred to as Part II, explores the circulation variability within WCRA31 and its relation to ENSO,

the NPGO and the PDO.

It should also be mentioned that there have been other significant data assimilation efforts in the context of the CCS. Li et al (2008, 2009) and Chao et al (2009) describe a 3D-Var data assimilation system for ROMS which is also currently used to compute nowcasts and forecasts for the CCS. Pan et al (2011) and Ngodock and Carrier (2013) have also used 3D-Var and 4D-Var respectively in conjunction with the Navy Coastal Ocean Model (NCOM), although this was mainly a study of the Monterey Bay. 4D-Var circulation estimates of the CCS off the Oregon coast have been computed by Kurapov et al (2009, 2011) and Yu et al (2012) using the Advanced Variational Regional Ocean Representer Analyzer (AVRORA), also applied in ROMS. Circulation estimates of the CCS have also been computed using a non-incremental formulation of 4D-Var in the MITgcm by Todd et al (2011). A more detailed review of these and other efforts can be found in Edwards et al (2015).

An outline of the paper is as follows. In section 2, we describe ROMS-CCS and discuss the prior information and observations that are critical for identifying the BLUE using equations (1) and (2). Section 3 introduces the 4D-Var set-up, discusses quality control of the observations, the minimization procedure, and the prior error statistics. In section 4, the performance of the minimization algorithm is discussed, along with a diagnostic analysis of the innovation statistics. Differences between the posterior and prior estimates are examined in section 5, and the analyses are validated by comparing them to a run of the model without assimilation. Comparisons with the assimilated data set are also presented. We conclude with a summary and discussion in section 6 where limitations of the current analyses are discussed.

2 ROMS CCS: Model Set-up, Priors, and Observations

In this section, we present the configuration of ROMS for the CCS, and motivate our choice of prior information for the surface forcing and boundary conditions used to compute WCRA31 and WCRA14. A description of the observations assimilated into the model is also presented along with details of observation pre-processing.

2.1 The ROMS configuration

ROMS is a Boussinesq, hydrostatic, primitive equations ocean model, and is well suited for modeling coastal regions characterized by complex topography and bathymetry because of its advanced numerics (Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2004). ROMS possesses an extensive suite of numerical algorithms for advection and diffusion of momentum and tracers, as well as a variety of parameterizations for horizontal and vertical mixing and open boundary conditions. A full description of ROMS can be found at <http://www.myroms.org>. Following Veneziani et al. (2009a) and Broquet (2009), the CCS domain spans the region $30^{\circ}N$ - $48^{\circ}N$, $134^{\circ}W$ - $115.5^{\circ}W$ and is shown along with the bathymetry in Fig. 1.

The horizontal resolution is $1/10^{\circ}$, while in the vertical 42 terrain-following σ -levels were used that vary in thickness between 0.3-8m over the continental shelf and 7-100m in the deep ocean. A prerequisite for data assimilation is a model capable of generating a good prior estimate of the circulation. Veneziani et al. (2009a) have demonstrated that the current configuration of ROMS CCS captures very well many aspects of the observed circulation, and Broquet et al. (2009, 2011) have shown that it performs well in 4D-Var experiments.

148 While Marchesiello et al (2003) find that a resolution of at least $\sim 1/20^\circ$ is required to
 149 represent coastal upwelling and the circulation energetics in this region, the choice of $1/10^\circ$
 150 resolution used here represents a trade-off between resolution of the smaller scale features
 151 of the circulation and the computational cost of the 4D-Var approach. Nevertheless, the
 152 resolution used here is adequate to capture much of the variability associated with mesoscale
 153 eddies which vary in size between 40 and 350 km, with a mean size of ~ 165 km (Stegmann
 154 and Schwing, 2007).

155 Following Moore et al. (2011a), the ROMS state-vector of grid-point prognostic variables
 156 will be referred to as $\mathbf{x}$ and comprises the potential temperature T , the salinity S , horizontal
 157 velocities $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$, and sea surface displacement (ζ):

$$\mathbf{x} = (T, S, \zeta, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})^T \quad (3)$$

158 where superscript T denotes the vector transpose. For ease of notation, the non-linear ROMS
 159 will be denoted in sequel by $M(t_i, t_{i-1})$, so that:

$$\mathbf{x}(t_i) = M(t_i, t_{i-1})(\mathbf{x}(t_{i-1}), \mathbf{f}(t_{i-1}, t_i), \mathbf{b}(t_{i-1}, t_i)). \quad (4)$$

160 The vector $\mathbf{x}(t_i)$ represents the propagation in time by the discretized model subject to
 161 surface forcing, $\mathbf{f}(t_{i-1}, t_i)$, and lateral open boundary conditions, $\mathbf{b}(t_{i-1}, t_i)$, during the time
 162 interval $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$. In the ROMS data assimilation system and in keeping with Bayes' theorem,
 163 the surface forcing and boundary conditions are regarded as prior information, and are
 164 actually control variables in that they are adjusted during the data assimilation procedure.
 165 In sequel, the prior vectors of surface forcing and boundary conditions are denoted $\mathbf{f}^b$ and

166 $\mathbf{b}^b$ respectively.

167 **2.2 Prior surface forcing**

168 The prior surface forcing $\mathbf{f}^b$ comprises surface fluxes of momentum, heat and freshwater
169 estimated from different sources of atmospheric data. For WCRA14 daily-averaged atmo-
170 spheric variables at standard heights from the Naval Research Laboratory’s Coupled Ocean-
171 Atmosphere Mesoscale Prediction System (COAMPS) were used. The COAMPS forcing is
172 derived from a series of nested grids (Doyle et al., 2009) and the combined product used here
173 has a resolution of $\sim 3-9$ km. Since COAMPS data is available only since January 1999, the
174 surface forcing for WCRA31 (starting in 1980) was derived from a combination of sources.
175 Specifically, the 40 year reanalysis from ECMWF (ERA40; Källberg et al., 2004) with a
176 resolution of 2.5° was used for the period 1980-2001 and the more recent ECMWF interim
177 reanalysis (ERA Interim; Dee et al., 2011) with a resolution of 0.7° for the period 2002-2010,
178 along with the Cross-Calibrated, Multi-Platform (CCMP) ocean wind product of Atlas et al.
179 (2011) with a resolution of 25 km that spans the period 1988-2010. In both WCRA14 and
180 WCRA31, the ocean surface fluxes were computed using the bulk formulations of Liu et al.
181 (1979) and Fairall et al. (1996a,b). As described by Atlas et al. (2011), CCMP is an analysis
182 of surface winds computed using a 2D-Var procedure in which ERA40 was used as the 2D-
183 Var prior estimate. Therefore, to ensure consistency between the CCMP-derived wind stress
184 and surface heat and freshwater fluxes used to force ROMS, we chose to use the ERA40
185 fields at 2.5° resolution as the 4D-Var prior in ROMS during the period spanned by CCMP,
186 rather than the higher resolution (75 km) ERA Interim product, sacrificing resolution for
187 consistency between the various components of the surface forcing.

2.3 Prior open boundary conditions

Clamped time varying boundary conditions were used for tracers and momentum at all open boundaries for both WCRA31 and WCRA14. The prior open boundary conditions $\mathbf{b}^b$ were taken from the global Simple Ocean Data Assimilation Product (SODA; version SODA POP 2.2.4) of Carton and Giese (2008). The Chapman (1985) boundary conditions were applied to sea surface height, while the vertically integrated flow was subject to the Flather (1976) condition. To damp boundary waves, a 100 km wide sponge layer was also used adjacent to the open boundaries, in which viscosity increased linearly from $4 \text{ m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$ in the interior to $400 \text{ m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$ at the boundary.

2.4 Observations

During both WCRA31 and WCRA14, all available observations from in-situ instruments and satellite platforms were assimilated into the model. An important first step in reducing data redundancy is the pre-processing of observations that combines all observations of the same state variable within each model grid cell over a 6 hour time window to form super-observations. During 4D-Var, the contribution of each observation to the posterior control vector is weighted according to the sum of the variance of measurement error and the error of representativeness. Observation errors and errors of representativeness are assumed to be mutually uncorrelated in space and time resulting in a diagonal observation error covariance matrix $\mathbf{R}$ in (2). While this is unlikely to be true in general, especially for gridded satellite data, specification of correlated observation error is non-trivial, and greatly complicates the 4D-Var procedure. This is discussed further in section 3.

209 A summary of the different observation platforms and the nominal error standard de-
 210 viations assigned to each platform are shown in Table 1. After the computation of super
 211 observations, the variance entries in $\mathbf{R}$ were replaced by the sum of the variance of the in-
 212 dividual observations about the value of the super observation (taken as an estimate of the
 213 error of representativeness) and the nominal error variance in Table 1. The super observa-
 214 tions procedure affects nearly every observation since satellite observations are averaged in
 215 the horizontal and in situ observations in the vertical to match the model resolution.

216 Figure 2 shows a time series of $\log_{10}$ of the total number of super observations from
 217 each observing platform that fall within the ROMS CCS model domain during each month
 218 of the year spanning the full period of WCRA31. Figure 2 indicates that the bulk of the
 219 observations available for assimilation are in the form of satellite measurements of SST. As
 220 indicated in Table 1, SST observations are available from several different platforms. The
 221 along track data from each platform were used, and when multiple platforms are concurrently
 222 available, the super observations from each platform were combined via the super observation
 223 process. Only the number of super observations for each individual platform are shown in
 224 Fig. 2. The individual super observations from each platform were combined, if necessary,
 225 by computing a standard minimum variance estimate using the nominal errors in Table 1
 226 to compute the weights. While it can be argued that the formation of super observations
 227 effectively reduces the uncertainty in the assimilated data, no effort was made here to reduce
 228 the error entries in $\mathbf{R}$ associated with super observations.

229 The SSH data used here were from the multi-mission $1/4^\circ$ global SSH fields created by
 230 the Archiving Validation and Interpretation of Satellite Oceanographic data center (AVISO),
 231 specifically their Data Unification and Altimeter Combination System (DUACS) version DT-

232 2010. These SSH data are produced by objective mapping of multi-mission altimeter data
 233 (Dibarboure et al. 2011), and the data assimilated into the model was a 1 day gridded
 234 composite. Prior to assimilating the data, the mean dynamic topography of the AVISO
 235 data averaged over the ROMS CCS domain was corrected to match that of the model. A
 236 steric height correction was also applied using the data of Willis et al. (2004). Rather than
 237 using along-track data, gridded data were used because the version of 4D-Var employed to
 238 compute the analyses does not allow for prior errors or observation errors that are correlated
 239 in time. As a result, information from individual along track observations can be quickly
 240 lost due to geostrophic adjustment and becomes ineffective for constraining the model unless
 241 it persists over time. This issue can be alleviated using the gridded products, which allows
 242 the large-scale gyre circulation and eddy field to geostrophically adjust to the SSH field.
 243 However, this is not an ideal solution because of the limitations of the objective mapping
 244 technique used to map the altimeter observations onto a regular grid. Furthermore, since
 245 satellite SSH observations near the coast are known to be unreliable (Saraceno et al., 2008),
 246 only observations more than 50 km from the coast were assimilated.

247 The in-situ hydrographic profiles of T and S assimilated into the model were taken from
 248 the quality controlled EN3 data archive maintained by the UK Met Office as part of the
 249 European Union ENSEMBLES project (Ingleby and Huddleston, 2007). These observa-
 250 tions are available from a variety of different observing platforms that include: expendable
 251 bathythermographs (XBTs), mechanical bathythermographs (MBTs), conductivity temper-
 252 ature depth devices (CTDs), free drifting Argo profiling floats, and autonomous pinneped
 253 bathythermographs (APBs) in the form of tagged marine mammals. The version of EN3
 254 used here is version 2a which includes the XBT and MBT temperature error corrections of

255 Levitus et al. (2009). No velocity observations were assimilated into the model. However,
 256 work is underway to augment the observations assimilated into the ROMS system described
 257 here with coastal HF radar observations of surface current that cover the entire U.S. West
 258 Coast out to approximately 100 km offshore (Oke et al., 2015).

259 **3 The incremental 4D-Var system**

260 As noted in Section 1, the circulation of an ocean model is uniquely determined by the
 261 initial conditions, surface forcing and boundary conditions. In (2) these were identified
 262 as the control variables, $\mathbf{z}$, which we can now write as $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x}(t_0)^T, \mathbf{f}^T, \mathbf{b}^T)^T$ where $\mathbf{x}(t_0)$
 263 represents the initial state vector, while $\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are vectors of surface forcing and open
 264 boundary conditions at all time steps within the data assimilation window. Similarly, the
 265 vector of prior control variables is denoted by $\mathbf{z}^b = (\mathbf{x}^b(t_0)^T, \mathbf{f}^{bT}, \mathbf{b}^{bT})^T$. The prior control
 266 vector yields an estimate that may differ significantly from the observations which, following
 267 (2), are denoted by $\mathbf{y}^o$. Variational data assimilation seeks to identify the control vector $\mathbf{z}^a$
 268 that minimizes the cost function in (2) which is a measure of the distance, in a Mahalanobis
 269 sense, between $\mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{z}^b$ as well as $\mathbf{y}^o$ and the projection of $\mathbf{z}$ into observation space. The
 270 weighting functions used are the inverse prior error covariance matrix and inverse observation
 271 error covariance respectively.

272 The 4D-Var data assimilation method employed here is iterative, starting from the prior
 273 $\mathbf{z}^b$, and it searches for a sequence of new $\mathbf{z}$ iterates that yield successively smaller values of
 274 $\mathcal{J}_{NL}$. The minimum of $\mathcal{J}_{NL}$ identifies $\mathbf{z}^a$, the desired posterior estimate of $\mathbf{z}$ that maximizes
 275 the conditional probability $P(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{y}^o)$ in (1). Since H is generally non-linear, the cost function

276 $\mathcal{J}_{NL}$ will be non-quadratic, and being non-convex may possess more than one minimum
 277 solution. Therefore, it is more usual to employ a Gauss-Newton approach to minimize $\mathcal{J}_{NL}$.
 278 In this case a sequence of quadratic cost functions are minimized by linearizing the model
 279 and the observation operator (Lawless et al. 2005). This approach developed in numerical
 280 weather prediction (NWP) is referred to as the incremental method (Courtier et al., 1994),
 281 and proceeds by assuming that each estimate of $\mathbf{z}_k$ is a small departure $\delta\mathbf{z}$ from the *prior*,
 282 so that $\mathbf{z}_k = \mathbf{z}^b + \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \delta\mathbf{z}_l$, where k refers to the k^{th} outer-loop iterate, and $\delta\mathbf{z}_l$ are the
 283 increments from all previous outer-loops given by:

$$\delta\mathbf{z}_l = (\delta\mathbf{x}(t_0)_l^T, \delta\mathbf{f}_l^T, \delta\mathbf{b}_l^T)^T \quad (5)$$

284 where $\delta\mathbf{x}(t_0)_l$, $\delta\mathbf{f}_l$ and $\delta\mathbf{b}_l$ denote the increments in the initial conditions, surface forcing and
 285 open boundary conditions. In the calculations described here, only a single outer-loop was
 286 considered, so the subscript k will be dropped in subsequent expressions.

287 The state-vector increment $\delta\mathbf{x}$ is a solution of the tangent linearization of the model M
 288 in (4) linearized about the prior state $\mathbf{x}^b$, $\mathbf{f}^b$ and $\mathbf{b}^b$, and subject to the increments $\delta\mathbf{f}$ and
 289 $\delta\mathbf{b}$, namely:

$$\delta\mathbf{x}(t_i) = \mathbf{M}(t_i, t_0)\delta\mathbf{z} \quad (6)$$

290 where $\mathbf{M}(t_i, t_0)$ is the tangent linear model. The quadratic cost function $\mathcal{J}$ in terms of the
 291 control vector increment $\delta\mathbf{z}$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{J} = \frac{1}{2}\delta\mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{D}^{-1}\delta\mathbf{z} + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{G}\delta\mathbf{z})^T \mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{G}\delta\mathbf{z}) \quad (7)$$

292 which is the weighted sum of the squared increments $\delta\mathbf{z}$ and the squared departures of the
 293 time evolved increments from the innovation vector $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{y}^o - H(\mathbf{x}^b)$. The operator $\mathbf{G}$,
 294 referred to as the generalized observation operator, is a convolution in time of $\mathbf{M}$ with $\mathbf{H}$,
 295 where $\mathbf{H}$ is the tangent linearization of the observation operator H , so that $\mathbf{G}$ represents the
 296 tangent linear model sampled at the observation points. Each $\delta\mathbf{z}_l$ in (5) corresponds to the
 297 minimization of $\mathcal{J}$ in (7) where $\mathbf{G}$ is linearized about $\mathbf{z}_{l-1}$ and is identified by a sequence
 298 of inner-loops iterations. In the case a single outer-loop the final control vector is given by
 299 $\mathbf{z}^a = \mathbf{z}^b + \delta\mathbf{z}$.

300 **3.1 The 4D-Var set-up**

301 As noted earlier, two analyses were performed, referred to as WCRA31 and WCRA14. The
 302 entire time interval in each case was divided into 8-day windows that are referred to as
 303 assimilation cycles. Each cycle overlaps the previous cycle and the next cycle by 4 days as
 304 illustrated in Fig. 3. In this way, the prior initial condition for each cycle is the posterior
 305 circulation estimate computed at the mid-point of the previous cycle. Overlapping cycles
 306 were used because each 4D-Var analysis cycle is equivalent to a Kalman smoother, for which
 307 the expected errors in the posterior analysis are a minimum at the mid-point of the cycle.
 308 Therefore the next cycle starts from the best possible prior initial state. While errors in the
 309 observations collected during the first half of a cycle will be correlated with errors in the
 310 prior circulation estimate, no account was taken of these correlations during the analyses
 311 presented here. The choice of an 8-day assimilation window was a trade-off between choosing
 312 an interval that includes a significant number of observations, and that does not seriously
 313 violate the tangent linear assumption which is invoked during 4D-Var.

During each cycle, the cost function (7) was minimized using an iterative minimization algorithm based on a truncated Gauss-Newton method. Each member of the sequence was computed using 1 outer-loop and 15 inner-loop iterations, following Broquet et al. (2009), Moore et al. (2011b) and Gürol et al. (2013), who have demonstrated that this choice of parameters yields adequate convergence of $\mathcal{J}$ toward its minimum value.

In the calculations described here, the dual 4D-Var algorithm was used where the gain matrix is expressed as $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^T(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^T + \mathbf{R})^{-1}$. The inverse of the stabilized representer matrix $\mathbf{S} = (\mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^T + \mathbf{R})$ (Bennett, 2002) was computed by solving an equivalent system of linear equations $\mathbf{S}\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{d}$ using a conjugate gradient (CG) algorithm. Following Gürol et al. (2013), $\mathbf{S}$ is preconditioned by $\mathbf{R}$ and a Lanczos formulation of CG was used in conjunction with a $\mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^T$ inner-product to yield the Lanczos equivalent of the restricted $\mathbf{D}$ -preconditioned conjugate algorithm of Gratton and Tshimanga (2009). After the last outer-loop, the final increment was computed according to $\delta\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^T\mathbf{w} \equiv \mathbf{K}\mathbf{d}$.

3.2 Observation error and prior error covariances

In the observation error covariance matrix $\mathbf{R}$, it was assumed that the observation errors are not correlated in time or space in which case $\mathbf{R}$ is diagonal. The prior error covariance matrix, $\mathbf{D}$, is assumed to be block diagonal so that:

$$\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{f}}, \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{b}}) \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{x}}$, $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{f}}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{b}}$ are the full multivariate prior error covariance matrices of the initial conditions, surface forcing and open boundary conditions respectively. Here we neglect

333 the influence of model errors during the 4D-Var procedure (the so-called strong constraint),
 334 although some specific types of errors in terrain following coordinate models, such as ROMS,
 335 have been documented (e.g. Marchesiello et al, 2009). Accounting for model error during
 336 4D-Var (the so-called weak constraint) is currently an active area of research, and will be
 337 the subject of a future study in ROMS. In addition, we assume that errors in the priors are
 338 neither correlated in time or flow-dependent, which renders $\mathbf{D}$ time invariant.

339 Each block of $\mathbf{D}$ in (8) was modeled using the diffusion operator approach introduced
 340 by Derber and Rosati (1989). In ROMS 4D-Var the approach developed by Weaver and
 341 Courtier (2001) was used in which the initial condition increment $\delta\mathbf{x}(t_0)$ is expressed as
 342 the sum of a balanced and unbalanced component of the circulation. The state variables
 343 of the unbalanced component of $\delta\mathbf{x}(t_0)$ are assumed to be uncorrelated with a covariance
 344 $\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{\Sigma}^T$, where $\mathbf{C}$ is a univariate correlation matrix, and $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is a diagonal matrix of standard
 345 deviations.

346 The initial condition prior error covariance matrix in ROMS, $\mathbf{B}_x$ is factorized as:

$$\mathbf{B}_x = \mathbf{K}_b \mathbf{\Sigma}_x \mathbf{C} \mathbf{\Sigma}_x^T \mathbf{K}_b^T \quad (9)$$

347 where $\mathbf{K}_b$ is a multivariate balance operator. The implementation of $\mathbf{K}_b$ used in ROMS par-
 348 allels that of Weaver et al. (2005), Balmaseda et al. (2008) and Mogensen et al. (2013). All
 349 of the analyses described here were computed with the balance operator disabled. Nonethe-
 350 less, the linearized dynamics embodied in the tangent linear and adjoint of ROMS effectively
 351 allows the transfer of information between variables during the assimilation procedure so the
 352 lack of $\mathbf{K}_b$ during WCRA14 and WCRA31 is not considered to be detrimental to the re-

353 sulting 4D-Var analysis. The prior error covariances for the surface forcing ($\mathbf{B}_f$) and open
 354 boundary conditions ($\mathbf{B}_b$) do not include a balance operator and are simply factorized as
 355 $\Sigma_f \mathbf{C}_f \Sigma_f^T$ and $\Sigma_b \mathbf{C}_b \Sigma_b^T$ respectively.

356 The standard deviations that comprise the diagonal elements of Σ_x were chosen to be
 357 the climatological variance of a long run of the model subject only to surface forcing and
 358 boundary conditions (i.e. no data assimilation). However, in the case of salinity, past
 359 experience (Moore et al., 2013) has revealed that the background errors computed using this
 360 method are too large, so the standard deviations for S were capped at 0.1 psu. In a similar
 361 vein, the temporal variability of the surface forcing fields for the appropriate period was
 362 used to compute the diagonal elements of Σ_f , and the elements of Σ_b were chosen to be the
 363 standard deviations of the open boundary data. While the climatological variance is a useful
 364 proxy for the prior error variance during the initial 4D-var cycles, the prior error variance will
 365 naturally decrease over time as the model solution moves closer to the observations (see Fig.
 366 7). Therefore the use of static climatological variances is inappropriate during later cycles,
 367 and the variances should evolve with the circulation. Flow-dependent covariance modeling is
 368 very challenging and is currently an active area of research. While no attempt was made here
 369 to refine the error covariance model parameters, we acknowledge that this places a limitation
 370 on the ensuing circulation analyses. Some of these limitations are explored in section 4.2.

371 Following Weaver and Courtier (2001), the univariate correlation matrix $\mathbf{C}$ is assumed
 372 to be separable in the horizontal and vertical, and the horizontal (vertical) correlation func-
 373 tions are modeled as the solution of a 2-dimensional (1-dimensional) pseudo-heat diffusion
 374 equation. The horizontal and vertical correlation lengths were held constant over the entire
 375 domain. The decorrelation length scales used to model the *prior* error covariances of each

376 control variable are summarized in Table 2.

377 While no explicit account is taken of temporal correlations in any of the background
378 errors in the current version of ROMS 4D-Var, the surface forcing and boundary condition
379 increments were computed daily and interpolated to each intervening model time step. This
380 procedure effectively imposes a temporal correlation on the errors. The correlation lengths for
381 the prior errors must be specified *a priori*, and are typically estimated using semi-variogram
382 techniques (e.g. Banerjee et al., 2004; Milliff et al., 2003; Matthews et al., 2011). However,
383 some level of subjective tuning of the correlation lengths is also typically required to optimize
384 the performance of the 4D-Var algorithm. A discussion of the choice of the aforementioned
385 background error covariance parameters for the CCS in Table 2 can be found in Broquet et
386 al. (2009 , 2011) and Moore et al., (2011b).

387 3.3 Background quality control

388 A background quality control check was applied to the observations as a means of identi-
389 fying data that cannot be well represented by the model because of measurement errors or
390 inadequacies in the model (Hollingsworth et al., 1986, Lorenc and Hammon, 1988), and such
391 data were rejected from the data assimilation system. Following Järvinen and Undén (1997)
392 and Andersson and Järvinen (1999), the elements of the innovation vector $\mathbf{d}$ were com-
393 pared with their expected error (assuming uncorrelated observation and background errors).
394 Specifically, observations were rejected from the analysis based on the following criterion:

$$\frac{(y_i^o - y_i^b)^2}{\sigma_b^2} > \alpha \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_o^2}{\sigma_b^2} \right) \quad (10)$$

395 where y_i^o is the i^{th} observation and y_i^b the i^{th} element of the vector $H(\mathbf{x}_b)$, the background
 396 evaluated at the observation locations. The standard deviations of the observation and
 397 background errors at the observation points are σ_o and σ_b respectively. While no attempt
 398 was made to propagate prior information about σ_b to the appropriate observation times
 399 using the generalized observation operator $\mathbf{G}$, section 4.2 demonstrates that this is not
 400 a severe limitation. The threshold parameter α is dependent of the type of observation,
 401 and can be estimated from the frequency distribution of the elements of $\mathbf{d}$ computed from
 402 historical analyses (Andersson and Järvinen, 1999). Since historical analyses are not available
 403 in the present case, we considered instead the innovations from a randomly chosen year
 404 (1999) during which all observations were assimilated into the model. Based on the analysis
 405 described by Moore et al. (2013), the background quality control parameter $\alpha = 16$ was
 406 found to be appropriate for the 4D-Var system described here. In other words, an observation
 407 that produces a misfit greater than $4(\sigma_b^2 + \sigma_o^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is rejected. For this choice of α , it was found
 408 that on average less than 1% of the observations were rejected during the 4D-Var assimilation.
 409 A time series of the total number of observations rejected from the analysis each month is
 410 shown in Fig. 2. During most months $\sim 0.1\%$ of the observations were rejected, although
 411 there are a few cycles, especially at the beginning of the analysis period, where the fraction
 412 of observations rejected was significantly higher (although still typically less than 2%) due
 413 to the spin-up effects of the first few years.

4 Monitoring of 4D-Var

4.1 Minimization

The 4D-Var cost function is a useful indicator of the performance of the minimization algorithm. Figure 4 shows time series of the prior and posterior cost function $\mathcal{J}$ in (7) for each data assimilation cycle, for both WCRA31 and WCRA14. The posterior cost function is always less than the prior cost function, typically by a factor of $\sim 2 - 5$, indicating that the minimization algorithm is behaving correctly. Also shown in Fig. 4 are the values of the non-linear cost function $\mathcal{J}_{\text{NL}}$ from (2), which recall is a measure of the misfit between the non-linear model and the observations and between the non-linear model and the prior. During the majority of cycles of WCRA31, $\mathcal{J}_{\text{NL}} \sim \mathcal{J}$ indicating that the tangent linear assumption of the incremental approach is generally valid. Discrepancies between $\mathcal{J}_{\text{NL}}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are generally larger during WCRA14, and during a few cycles the posterior $\mathcal{J}_{\text{NL}}$ is larger than the prior value. This behavior is associated with non-linearity and may be due to the higher resolution of the forcing used in WCRA14 which enhances non-linear circulation effects in the model. Nonetheless, even though the discrepancies between $\mathcal{J}_{\text{NL}}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are larger for WCRA14 than for WCRA31, on the whole WCRA14 is well behaved also.

The time series of $\mathcal{J}$ also reflect changes in the observing network as different instrument platforms come online in accordance with Fig. 2. For example, in 1981 $\mathcal{J}$ increases due to the introduction of SST observations from the Pathfinder AVHRR satellite, and then again in 2000 due to the introduction of SST observations from MODIS.

4.2 Innovation statistics

The statistics of the innovation vectors $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{y}^o - H(\mathbf{x}^b)$ provide valuable insight into the performance of the 4D-Var algorithm, and the choice of the prior error and observation error covariances. Figure 5 shows the probability density function (PDF) of the innovations from all cycles from WCRA31 for observations of temperature, salinity and sea surface height. The means for temperature, salinity and SSH are -0.06°C , -0.03 psu and -0.003 m, respectively, and close to zero. The tails of the distributions indicate that the innovations sometimes have quite large values (e.g. in excess of 10°C for temperature; not shown). However, these occur very infrequently, and there is no particular preferred geographical location associated with the values in the tails (not shown). Also shown in Fig. 5 are normal distributions with the same mean and standard deviation as the PDFs. Clearly each PDF departs significantly from a normal distribution which indicates a violation of the hypotheses that underlie the 4D-Var system since the innovations should be normally distributed with zero mean and an error covariance of $(\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^T)$.

The consistency of the prior error and observation error covariances prescribed in Section 3.2 with the 4D-Var estimates can be further examined following Desroziers et al. (2005). As noted above, the theoretical covariance of the innovations is given by $E\{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{d}^T\} = (\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^T)$ where E denotes the expectation operator. Following Desroziers et al. (2005), the innovation vector can also be expressed as $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{y}^o - H(\mathbf{x}^a) + H(\mathbf{x}^a) - H(\mathbf{x}^b) = \mathbf{d}_a^o + \mathbf{d}_b^a$, where $\mathbf{d}_a^o = \mathbf{y}^o - H(\mathbf{x}^a)$ and $\mathbf{d}_b^a = H(\mathbf{x}^a) - H(\mathbf{x}^b)$, in which case $E\{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{d}^T\} = E\{\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{d}_a^o)^T\} + E\{\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{d}_b^a)^T\}$. As shown by Desroziers et al. (2005), the theoretical expectation $E\{\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{d}_a^o)^T\} = \mathbf{R}$ while $E\{\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{d}_b^a)^T\} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^T$. Therefore, the vectors $\mathbf{d}_a^o$ and $\mathbf{d}_b^a$ provide information about the

consistency of the statistics of the observation error covariance matrix and the prior error covariance in observation space (i.e. the representer matrix). As Desroziers et al. (2005) point out, the statistics of $E\{\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{d}_a^o)^T\}$ and $E\{\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{d}_b^a)^T\}$ will only match those specified *a priori* for $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{GDG}^T$ if the observation error and prior error statistics are chosen correctly.

Unfortunately, a direct measure of $\mathbf{GDG}^T$ is not readily available because it involves a mapping of $\mathbf{D}$ into observation space by the time evolving prior circulation. However, an estimate of the trace of $\mathbf{GDG}^T$ can be obtained using a randomization method (Andersson et al., 2000) which can be directly compared with the inner-product $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{d}_b^a$. Specifically, $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{GDG}^T) \simeq 1/M \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{q}_i^T \mathbf{q}_i$, where $\mathbf{q}_i = \mathbf{D}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{v}_i$ and $\mathbf{v}_i$ is a random vector sampled from a normal distribution with zero mean and unit standard deviation. The standard deviation of the sequence of estimates for $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{GDG}^T)$ varies approximately as $1/(2M)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, so a sample size of $M = 50$ yields an uncertainty $\sim 10\%$ in the randomized estimate of the trace (Weaver and Courtier, 2001). Because the evaluation of each vector $\mathbf{q}_i$ requires an integration of the tangent linear and adjoint of ROMS over the length of each assimilation cycle, it is not feasible to compute an estimate of $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{GDG}^T)$ for each assimilation cycle. However, a reduced rank approximation of the preconditioned stabilized representer matrix $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{GDG}^T + \mathbf{I})$ can be computed following Gürol et al. (2013) who show that $(\mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{GDG}^T + \mathbf{I}) \simeq \mathbf{V}_m \mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}_m^T \mathbf{GDG}^T$ where $\mathbf{V}_m$ is the matrix of m Lanczos vectors ($m = 15$ is the number of inner-loops) and $\mathbf{T}$ is the $m \times m$ tridiagonal matrix of Lanczos coefficients. In this case $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{GDG}^T + \mathbf{I}) \simeq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{V}_m \mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}_m^T \mathbf{GDG}^T) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{T} \mathbf{V}_m^T \mathbf{GDG}^T \mathbf{V}_m) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{T})$, where the last equality is a consequence of the orthonormal property of the Lanczos vectors, $\mathbf{V}_m^T \mathbf{GDG}^T \mathbf{V}_m = \mathbf{I}$. While $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{T})$ will be a significant underestimate of $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{GDG}^T + \mathbf{I})$, they are highly correlated ($r = 0.92$) as shown in Fig. 6a which compares randomized trace

estimates of $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{GDG}^T + \mathbf{I})$ (using $M = 50$) with $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{T})$ for a selection of 4D-Var cycles during 1991 (prior to AVISO) and 2004 (post AVISO, MODIS and AMSR-E). The best least-squares straightline fit is given by $s = 9.60\text{Tr}(\mathbf{T}) + 4.83 \times 10^4$ which can be used to estimate $s = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{GDG}^T + \mathbf{I})$ for all cycles. Figure 6b shows time series of s and $\mathbf{d}^T\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{d}$. If the *a priori* choice of parameters for $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ are correct, then $E\{\mathbf{d}^T\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{d}\} = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{GDG}^T + \mathbf{I})$ and the two time series would be identical. Figure 6b shows that this is clearly not the case, which is a further indication that the prior choices for $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ are not correct.

Desroziers et al. (2005) also demonstrate how the contributions of individual observations, observation types, or observing platforms to the aforementioned statistics can also be diagnosed by considering appropriate subsets of the dot-products for $\mathbf{d}^T\mathbf{d}$, $\mathbf{d}^T\mathbf{d}_a^o$ and $\mathbf{d}^T\mathbf{d}_b^a$. The corresponding contributions of individual or subsets of observations to $\mathbf{GDG}^T$ could also be estimated using the randomization method described above, although this would be very costly. Instead, we have used $\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{FDF}^T$ as an estimate for $\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{GDG}^T$ where $\mathbf{F}$ ignores the influence of the ocean dynamics and simply maps $\mathbf{D}$ to the observation points in space each time an observation is available. Figure 6c shows that $\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{FDF}^T$ and $\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{GDG}^T$ are highly correlated ($r = 0.98$) for the same sample of randomized trace estimates shown in Fig. 6a, although $\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{FDF}^T$ generally underestimates $\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{GDG}^T$ by $\sim 20\%$. Assuming that this correlation holds for all cycles and for the sub-traces of $\mathbf{GDG}^T$ associated with different observation types, we can use the sub-traces of $\mathbf{FDF}^T$ as an approximate surrogate for those of $\mathbf{GDG}^T$ as shown in Figs. 6d-6f for temperature, salinity and sea surface height observations. Even allowing for the underestimate of $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{FDF}^T\}$ compared to $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{GDG}^T\}$, Figs. 6d and 6f suggest that the prior error variances chosen *a priori* for temperature and sea surface displacement are generally too high. Conversely, the *a priori*

502 choices of error variance for salinity are too low. However, it must be remembered that $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{d}_b^a$
 503 does not represent the sum of the true values of the prior error in observation space since $\mathbf{d}$
 504 and $\mathbf{d}_b^a$ depend on the *a priori* choice of $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{R}$. Thus any attempts to modify $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{R}$
 505 will result in new estimates of $\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{d}_b^a$ as well. Figure 6e shows that for salinity, $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{d}_b^a$ is
 506 negative during some cycles which further highlights the sub-optimal nature of the *a priori*
 507 choices of the prior errors for this variable. ¹ An interesting feature of Figs. 6d and 6e is
 508 the overall general decline in $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{d}_b^a$ as the model fit to the observations of temperature and
 509 salinity improves over time.

510 Figures 6g-6i show time series of the sub-trace of $\mathbf{R}$ and the corresponding contributions
 511 to $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{d}_a^o$ for observations of temperature, salinity and sea surface height. For temperature
 512 and salinity the *a priori* combination of measurement error and error of representativeness
 513 is generally too low, while for sea surface displacement it is too high.

514 **5 The Influence of Data Assimilation on the Circula-** 515 **tion**

516 To examine the efficacy of the fit of the model to the observations, in this section the impact of
 517 4D-Var on various aspects of the circulation is examined, namely: Sea Surface Temperature
 518 (SST), Sea Surface Salinity (SSS), Sea Surface Height (SSH), and Eddy Kinetic Energy
 519 (EKE). A forward run of the model subject to the prior forcing and prior open boundary
 520 conditions and without data assimilation is used as a benchmark. To gauge geographical

---

¹While $\mathbf{d} \mathbf{d}^T = \mathbf{d}_a^o \mathbf{d}^T + \mathbf{d}_b^a \mathbf{d}^T$ is by necessity a positive-definite matrix, there is no such requirement for $\mathbf{d}_a^o \mathbf{d}^T$ and $\mathbf{d}_b^a \mathbf{d}^T$, except when $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{G}^T$ are specified correctly.

521 variations in the impact of 4D-Var on the system, the model domain was subdivided into
 522 the four regions illustrated in Fig. 1. The four regions are labelled R1 through R4, and
 523 characterize different circulation environments. Regions R1-R3 delineate the different coastal
 524 wind regimes identified by Dorman and Winant (1995). R1 spans the Oregon, Washington
 525 and Northern California coastal region where the continental shelf is typically narrow and
 526 where there is a pronounced seasonal reversal in the alongshore winds leading to upwelling
 527 in the summer and downwelling in winter. R2 spans the central California coast where
 528 the alongshore winds are generally upwelling favorable year round. Furthermore, R1 and
 529 R2 encompass the main features of the CCS surface circulation, such as the equatorward
 530 California Current ~ 500 km offshore and the near-shore coastal jet, as well as the transition
 531 zone that separates the circulation over the shelf from that in the deep ocean (Marchesiello
 532 et al., 2003). R3 encompasses the Southern California Bight typically characterized by less
 533 seasonal upwelling and by a cyclonic circulation for part of the year (Di Lorenzo, 2003),
 534 while R4 encompasses the deep open ocean environment. In each of the four regions the
 535 spatial average of SST, SSS, SSH and EKE were computed during each data assimilation
 536 cycle for the time varying prior, posterior, and forward run circulation estimates. We will
 537 consider first the differences between the 4D-Var posterior and prior circulation estimates for
 538 WCRA31, then examine the differences between the WCRA31 4D-Var posterior and forward
 539 solutions. Finally the impact of 4D-Var on the EKE and eddy statistics is quantified. In
 540 general, the mean adjustments to the open boundary conditions by 4D-Var are small for all
 541 variables, therefore the open boundary increments will not be considered further.

5.1 Posterior minus prior differences

Figure 7 shows the mean and standard deviation of the initial condition increments of SST and SSS for all assimilation cycles during WCRA31. Since the posterior and prior estimates are time evolving during 4D-Var, the differences between the time evolving posterior and prior circulation estimates in the four regions of Fig. 1 are summarized in Table 3 for WCRA31. The mean difference between the time evolving posterior and the prior SST is small and slightly negative in all regions indicating that the posterior is $O(0.1^\circ\text{C})$ cooler than the prior (Table 3). Figure 7a shows that it generally takes the form of a cold bias which is most pronounced equatorward of Cape Mendocino. The standard deviation of the time evolving differences is approximately 0.25°C over the whole domain, although near the coast it is larger (Fig. 7c). There is an apparent change in the character of the SST posterior minus prior differences around 2002 when the prior atmospheric forcing changes to ERA Interim. This is illustrated in Fig. 8a for region R2. An erroneous 6 hours shift in the ERA net radiation flux was inadvertently introduced at this time. However, the 4D-Var analysis procedure was able to compensate for this inconsistency by adjusting the surface heat fluxes, which recall are part of the control vector, leading to a minimal overall impact on the analyses.

The impact of the AVISO SSH observations on the 4D-Var estimates is very obvious in the time evolving posterior minus prior time series as shown in Fig. 8b for region R2. Table 3 shows that the mean difference is close to zero, with the posterior mean sea-level on average $O(0.1\text{ cm})$ lower than the prior. The standard deviation of the differences over the entire 30 yr period is approx 1.5 cm, although the differences after 1992 (when the AVISO

product came online) are significantly larger than this and in the range ± 5 cm (Fig. 8b).

The mean time evolving posterior minus prior SSS differences are small and indicate that the posterior is slightly fresher, on average, than the prior, and the standard deviation is $O(0.01)$ or less over the entire domain. The spatial structure of the mean initial condition increments in Fig. 7b confirms this, and shows that the posterior is typically fresher than the prior near the coast. In region R2, the corrections made by 4D-Var to the time evolving prior are generally smaller during the last 20 years of the analysis as shown in Fig. 8c. Figure 7d indicates that the largest increments in salinity are confined to nearshore within the upwelling/downwelling regions poleward of Point Conception.

The differences between the posterior and prior EKE are generally more pronounced during the latter half of the analysis period in regions R1 and R4, as illustrated in Fig. 8d for region R1. Along the coast (regions R1-R3), Table 3 shows that the posterior is generally more energetic than the prior, while off-shore in deep water (region R4) the opposite is true.

5.2 Posterior minus forward model differences

The forward model solution is generally warmer than the posterior in all regions, as illustrated in Fig. 9a for region R2. The posterior SST is representative of the observed SST since SST observations are assimilated into the model. The seasonal cycle is very obvious in Fig. 9a, and low frequency variability is also apparent in the time series and will be discussed in more detail in Part II.

Prior to the introduction of AVISO in 1992, the average posterior and forward SSH fields are very similar as shown in Fig. 9b for region R1. The differences, however, become larger after the introduction of AVISO SSH observations into the assimilation system, and the

amplitude variations of the posterior SSH estimates are generally lower than those in the forward model. The low frequency variations in SSH will be discussed in Part II.

The posterior estimates are on average fresher than those of the forward model as shown in Fig. 9c for region R4. The number of salinity observations that are assimilated into the model is relatively small compared to the number of temperature measurements (cf Fig. 2), so the lower salinity in the posterior is being driven mainly by adjustments to freshwater fluxes made by 4D-Var. The difference between the net freshwater flux of the posterior and the forward run (not shown) indicates that except for a few areas along the coast, the posterior fluxes are everywhere smaller than those in the forward run (i.e. less posterior evaporation in the subtropics and more posterior precipitation at middle latitudes).

The near-surface EKE time series reveal that the EKE of the posterior is significantly higher than that of the forward model, indicating that the posterior is more energetic as a result of data assimilation. The seasonal amplitude of the EKE variations of the posterior is also significantly larger than that of the forward model as illustrated in Fig. 9d for region R1. This is consistent with the findings of Marchesiello et al (2003) who examined in detail the circulation of the CCS in forward runs of ROMS with different horizontal resolutions. They found that a minimum resolution of approximately $1/20^\circ$ is required to reliably reproduce the observed EKE and SSH variability. Much of the EKE in their solutions is non-seasonal and geostrophic, and model solutions lower than $1/20^\circ$ tend to be less energetic. In order to recover the sub-mesoscale variability, much higher resolutions are required (Capet et al, 2008) but this is not the focus of the present study. In the case considered here, however, 4D-Var is able to re-energize the circulation by reconstructing the ocean eddy field from the observations. The impact of 4D-Var on this aspect of the circulation is explored further in

609 section 5.4.

610 **5.3 Posterior minus prior surface flux adjustments**

611 The mean posterior zonal and meridional surface wind stress components from the two
612 sequences of analyses are shown in Figs. 10a-d, and in general the two are very similar.
613 Figures 10e-h show the adjustments that are made to the surface wind stress by 4D-Var (i.e.
614 the difference between the posterior and prior estimates) averaged over all assimilation cycles
615 for WCRA31 and WCRA14. By and large, the patterns of adjustment made to the zonal and
616 meridional components are qualitatively similar during the two sequences of analyses. For
617 example, in both cases the equatorward posterior alongshore wind stress is weaker than in
618 the prior. This is consistent with the findings of Broquet et al. (2011) using the same model
619 with COAMPS forcing but for a shorter time interval (2002-2004) and different satellite
620 observations. Broquet et al. (2011) concluded that the tendency of 4D-Var to weaken the
621 alongshore upwelling favorable winds is most likely associated with systematic model error.
622 Recall that in both WCRA31 and WCRA14, 4D-Var was applied subject to the strong
623 constraint. In general, the meridional wind stress differences between the posterior and the
624 prior are largest during WCRA14 (Fig. 10h), with 4D-Var making the largest corrections
625 near 128°W , 38°N , a feature also present during WCRA31 but weaker (Fig. 10f). A region
626 of positive zonal wind stress adjustments between 35°N and 45°N within 300-400 km of the
627 coast is present in both sequences of analyses (Figs. 10e and 10g) with largest values near the
628 coast between Cape Mendocino and San Francisco Bay, although it covers a geographically
629 broader area in WCRA31 extending all the way to the southern boundary. In general, the
630 adjustments made to the surface wind stress by the 4D-Var procedure are $\sim 5 - 10\%$ of the

mean.

The mean posterior total surface heat fluxes for WCRA31 and WCRA14 are shown in Fig. 11 averaged over all cycles. Near the coast the mean heat fluxes are similar, however offshore the fluxes from WCRA14 are significantly lower than in WCRA31. This is also reflected in the posterior minus prior heat flux differences. Near the coast and in the upwelling region, 4D-Var makes similar adjustments to the total heat flux in both sequences of analyses. However, offshore the 4D-Var heat flux corrections are predominantly negative (positive) in WCRA31 (WCRA14). Near the coast the 4D-Var flux adjustments are 10% of the mean, while offshore the adjustments are the same order of magnitude as the mean.

The root mean square (rms) wind stress and heat flux differences between the posterior and the prior averaged over the whole model domain for all years are summarized in Table 4. While the true winds and heat fluxes are not known, Table 4 compares the rms of the 4D-Var surface flux adjustments to the rms difference between various other commonly used ocean forcing products for this region, including an estimate of surface wind stress based on QuikScat. Table 4 shows that the rms of the 4D-Var adjustments in both WCRA31 and WCRA14 are generally small compared to the rms differences between different atmospheric products, indicating that the 4D-Var adjustments are not unreasonable.

The mean posterior total surface freshwater fluxes (evaporation minus precipitation) for the two sequences of analyses are shown in Fig. 12, along with the posterior minus prior flux differences, averaged over all assimilation cycles in each case. In general the mean freshwater fluxes and 4D-Var flux adjustments are qualitatively and quantitatively similar, although the adjustments in WCRA14 contain more small scale features than those in WCRA31 in the central part of the domain, which is associated with the higher resolution of the freshwater

flux prior used in WCRA14 from the inner-most grid of the COAMPS nested configuration (Doyle et al., 2009). The freshwater flux adjustments made by 4D-Var are $\sim 5 - 10\%$ of the mean. Estimates of the rms differences in surface freshwater fluxes are not shown in Table 4 since they are highly uncertain regardless of the source of the estimate.

5.4 EKE and a census of eddies

Eddies are an important component of the circulation in the CCS since they form a bridge between the shelf and deep ocean, and they are known to be important for primary production (Falkowski et al, 1991; McGillicuddy et al, 1998). As discussed in sections 5.1 and 5.2, data assimilation increases the EKE of the 4D-Var circulation estimates over much of the model domain. This is further illustrated in Fig. 13 which shows the difference between the 30 year mean surface eddy kinetic energy (EKE) computed from WCRA31 and the forward model without data assimilation. Figure 13 shows that there is a region of elevated EKE offshore and downstream of Cape Mendicino in the same general area as that identified in satellite altimeter observations (Kelly et al, 1998; Strub and James, 2000; Stegmann and Schwing, 2007). This suggests that 4D-Var is able to recover the surface EKE signature from the satellite observations, despite the relatively low model resolution. EKE is elevated in the same region in WCRA14 compared to a forward model run forced with COAMPS (not shown).

It is instructive to compare the model surface EKE with estimates derived from observations. With this in mind, the space-time average surface EKE was computed in the region $36^{\circ}\text{N}-40^{\circ}\text{N}$, $124^{\circ}\text{W}-130^{\circ}\text{W}$, indicated in Fig. 13, which encompasses the region of maximum EKE in both the model and observational estimates. Two observational estimates were

676 computed: one from AVISO SSH based on surface geostrophic velocities (1992-2010), and a
 677 second from surface drifter observations (1987-2014). The surface drifter observations from
 678 www.aoml.noaa.gov/envids were sorted in to $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ bins, and processed as described by
 679 Veneziani et al. (2009a). The mean surface EKE in WCRA31 (WCRA14) is $95 \pm 35 \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-2}$
 680 ($96 \pm 34 \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-2}$) compared to $85 \pm 23 \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-2}$ ($86 \pm 27 \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-2}$) in the forward model without
 681 data assimilation. The mean EKE estimated from AVISO is $113 \pm 47 \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-2}$ while that from
 682 the drifters is $235 \pm 178 \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-2}$. 4D-Var increases the surface EKE by $\sim 10\%$ compared
 683 to the forward model without data assimilation, although both analyses are lower than the
 684 AVISO estimates, and less than half that from drifters. However, the model EKE signature
 685 in the 4D-Var estimates extends well below the surface indicating that the vertical structure
 686 of the eddies is also recovered. For example, data assimilation increases the depth averaged
 687 EKE over the upper 500 m by $\sim 50\%$ compared to the forward model, indicating that 4D-Var
 688 is effective at propagating or projecting energy down through the water column.

689 To further illustrate, Fig. 14 shows Hovmoller diagrams of the difference in depth av-
 690 eraged EKE over the upper 500 m between WCRA31 and the forward model (no data
 691 assimilation), and averaged between Cape Blanco (43°N) and Point Conception (34°N) as
 692 a function of offshore distance. Adjacent to the coast, depth averaged EKE in WCRA31
 693 and the forward model are similar (recall that SSH observations are not assimilated within
 694 50 km of the coast), while 50 – 500 km offshore the depth averaged EKE of WCRA31 is
 695 elevated compared to the forward model. Elevated westward propagation of the EKE is
 696 apparent in WCRA31 in agreement with observation (Kelly et al, 1998; Strub and James,
 697 2000; Stegmann and Schwing, 2007), and consistent with the generally accepted idea of eddy
 698 formation via baroclinic instability within the CCS and westward propagation of eddies as

699 Rossby waves (Barth, 1994; Marchesiello et al., 2003). Figure 14 suggests that the 4D-Var
700 analyses are able to more successfully capture this process.

701 To shed more light on the nature of the elevated EKE in the 4D-Var analyses, individual
702 eddies present in the circulation estimates were identified using the Okubo-Weiss param-
703 eter W (Weiss, 1991) which is defined as $W = (u_x - v_y)^2 + (v_x + u_y)^2 - (v_x - u_y)^2$, where
704 subscripts denote partial derivatives with respect to the indicated independent variable. As
705 discussed by Chelton et al. (2007), eddy cores are characterized by regions where $W < 0$.
706 The Okubo-Weiss parameter was computed here using the 8-day average velocity compo-
707 nents corresponding to each assimilation cycle ensuring that the circulations are in dynamic
708 balance. Each field of W was smoothed using eight applications of a 2nd order Shapiro
709 filter, and values of W within three grid points of the coast were disgarded to minimize the
710 possibility of miss-identifying eddy cores associated with the computation of derivatives on
711 the ROMS staggered grid near land-sea boundaries. In addition, W was not computed in the
712 sponge layers adjacent to each open boundary. Eddy cores were identified as regions where
713 W was less than twice the mean of all *negative* values of W over the model domain, which
714 has the effect of isolating the most intense regions of $W < 0$ which are most likely associated
715 with eddy cores, although false alarms are possible (Chaigneau et al, 2009; Kurian et al,
716 2011; Davis and Di Lorenzo, 2015). The eddies identified in this way were then counted,
717 and the number of eddies found during each 8-day cycle recorded.

718 Figure 15a shows a time series of the total number of eddies identified in both WCRA31
719 and the forward model without data assimilation. Figure 15a shows that on average there
720 are $\sim 50\%$ more eddies present in WCRA31 than in the forward model, consistent with the
721 elevated levels EKE in the former. In both cases, the number of eddies varies considerably

722 from year to year (in agreement with other studies, such as Stegmann and Schwing, 2007;
723 Davis and Di Lorenzo, 2015), and exhibits a pronounced seasonal cycle, with the maximum
724 eddy count occurring during spring at the start of the upwelling season. Similar results
725 were obtained for WCRA14 (not shown). In WCRA31, Fig. 15a shows that the difference
726 in the number of eddies is particularly pronounced during the period when AVISO SSH
727 observations were assimilated into the model beginning in 1992.

728 The influence of 4D-Var on energizing the circulation via eddy generation was further
729 illustrated by performing a second run of the forward model initialized from the 4D-Var
730 analysis on 17 Feb. 1995, then integrated forward in time without data assimilation. A time
731 series of the total eddy count for this case is also shown in Fig. 15a. Following the abrupt
732 end of data assimilation, the number of eddies decreases within 40-60 days to the same level
733 as the original forward model run, showing that the spin-down of the eddies in the model is
734 quite rapid if they are not maintained by 4D-Var. A time series of the EKE from the same
735 spin-down calculation displays a similar behaviour (not shown).

736 The total eddy counts in regions R1 and R4 exhibit a pronounced seasonal cycle which
737 is less well defined in R2 and R3. A further analysis of the vorticity field associated with
738 each eddy core reveals regional variations in the number of cyclonic and anticyclonic eddies.
739 In regions R1, R3 and R4, there are generally more cyclonic eddies than anticyclonic eddies
740 (not shown), particularly in the forward model, in general agreement with observations
741 (Stegmann and Schwing, 2007).

742 The eddies can be further classified as geostrophic or ageostrophic. Geostrophic eddies
743 were identified using SSH ζ to compute the geostrophic approximation of $W = 4(u_{gx}^2 + v_{gx}u_{gy})$
744 following Chelton et al. (2007), where $u_g = -(g/f)\zeta_y$ and $v_g = (g/f)\zeta_x$. Eddies with

745 a significant ageostrophic component were identified as those which have no discernable
 746 geostrophic signature. These are typically eddies that have a weak geostrophic core which
 747 falls below the detection threshold for the spatially smoothed W , but surrounded by an
 748 ageostrophic halo. The nature of the dynamical balance within the halo region is not known
 749 at this time, and is beyond the scope of this study, but could include advection of momentum
 750 (e.g. Penven et al., 2014) and wind influences (e.g. Sudre et al., 2013). Figure 15b shows
 751 time series of the ratio of the number ageostrophic eddies to the number of geostrophic
 752 eddies identified in WCRA31 and the forward model, and indicates that in WCRA31 $\sim 40\%$
 753 of the eddies are dominated by ageostrophic circulations compared to $\sim 28\%$ in the forward
 754 model. Similar ratios are present in WCRA14 (not shown). Kelly et al. (1998) argued that
 755 the level of EKE based on SSH observations may be lower than that derived from drifter
 756 data because of the contribution of ageostrophic circulations which are undetectable in the
 757 altimeter observations, an idea confirmed in other regions (e.g. Penven et al., 2014). In the
 758 forward runs, 73% of the eddies with significant ageostrophic circulations are located near
 759 the coast in regions R1-R3 compared to 56% in the 4D-Var analyses. This is consistent with
 760 the elevated ageostrophic EKE documented by Marchesiello et al. (2003) near shore in other
 761 non-data assimilative configurations of ROMS for the CCS.

762 Figure 15c shows the probability density function (PDF) of the diameter of the eddy
 763 cores based on estimates of the circumference of each eddy. This calculation assumes that
 764 each eddy is circular, which of course is not the case, but nevertheless the equivalent eddy
 765 core diameter serves as a useful reference. Figure 15c shows that the mode of the eddy core
 766 diameter is ~ 60 km in agreement with the study by Kurian et al. (2011), although on the
 767 whole WCRA31 (and WCRA14, not shown) tends to favor somewhat smaller eddy cores

768 than the forward model. Figure 15d shows the PDF of eddy core diameter for geostrophic
 769 and ageostrophic eddies for WCRA31, and that from the forward run is qualitatively similar
 770 (not shown). The mode of the eddy core diameter for both the geostrophic and ageostrophic
 771 eddies is also ~ 60 km. However, in the case of the geostrophic eddies, the PDF is also
 772 clearly elevated at scales of the first baroclinic mode Rossby radius of deformation which is
 773 $\sim 20 - 35$ km in the CCS (Chelton et al., 1998). It is important to recall that the fields
 774 of W were filtered prior to identifying the eddies. This smoothing removes any features in
 775 W with a scale of twice the model grid spacing. In addition, the diameters in Fig. 15d
 776 relate only the eddy cores, meaning that the eddies themselves will have diameters larger
 777 than this. Therefore, the elevated probability density of the geostrophic eddies at diameters
 778 $\sim 20 - 35$ km compared to the ageostrophic eddies is a real effect. The PDF of eddy diameter
 779 for WCRA14 is similar to that for WCRA31.

780 The dominant eddy diameters identified here are somewhat smaller than the mean eddy
 781 size ~ 165 km identified in SSH observations by Stegmann and Sshwing (2007). However,
 782 their study was limited to circular, geostrophic eddies on a $1/3^\circ$ grid with life spans longer
 783 than 35 days, so their analysis will exclude smaller short-lived eddies as well as eddies with
 784 significant ageostrophic circulations.

785 **5.5 Departures from the observations**

786 To explore the veracity of the subsurface circulation, the 4D-Var posterior circulation esti-
 787 mates were compared to vertical temperature and salinity profiles collected as part of the
 788 California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigation (CalCOFI). The data used here are
 789 from the period March 1990 to July 2007. There are typically cruises four times a year,

790 mainly off southern California as shown in Fig. 1. It is traditional to compare posterior
791 estimates to independent observations that have not been assimilated into the model. How-
792 ever, some of the CalCOFI cruise data used here are included in the EN3 data set, so the
793 4D-Var and CalCOFI data set comparisons are not truly independent. However, Schroeder
794 et al. (2014) present a comparison of the WCRA31 analyses with independent observations
795 of the CCS off the central California coast collected at a mooring near Monterey Bay and by
796 the NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, and conclude that the 4D-Var analyses yield
797 reliable estimates of temperature and salinity despite the presence of some overall biases.

798 A comparison was made at each CalCOFI station between the in situ observations and
799 the corresponding profiles of salinity and potential temperature from the 4D-Var posterior
800 circulation estimates. Figure 16a summarizes the statistics of the posterior minus observation
801 differences for temperature and salinity averaged over all of the CalCOFI survey locations
802 for the period Jan. 1990 - July 2007 for WCRA31. The results for WCRA14 are similar and
803 are not shown. The corresponding analysis for the forward run without data assimilation is
804 summarized in Fig. 16b.

805 Figure 16b shows that in the absence of data assimilation, the model exhibits a warm
806 temperature bias $\sim 0.7^{\circ}\text{C}$ above 150 m and a cold bias $\sim -0.2^{\circ}\text{C}$ between 150 and 450 m.
807 Following data assimilation, the bias is close to zero in the upper 50 m, and the warm bias
808 between 50 and 150 m has been reduced to $\sim 0.2^{\circ}\text{C}$. Below 150 m 4D-Var has reduced
809 the cold bias slightly. The forward model has a positive salinity bias between ~ 50 and
810 150 m but matches the mean of the observations very well below this (Fig. 16b). In the
811 upper 50 m or so of the water column the forward model salinity agrees quite well with the
812 observations. Data assimilation substantially reduces the subsurface positive salinity bias

(Fig. 16a), although it introduces a negative bias in the upper 75 m of the water column.

In terms of the variability, Fig. 16b reveals that the forward model under-estimates the observed subsurface temperature variability above ~ 175 m, while the agreement between the 4D-Var estimates and the observations in Fig. 16a is generally very good. Both the forward model and the 4D-Var circulation estimates significantly over estimate the variability in salinity in the upper 125 m.

6 Summary and Discussion

Two sequences of historical analyses of the California Current circulation have been computed using ROMS 4D-Var. One sequence spans the period 1980-2010 while the second sequence spans the shorter period 1999-2012. The two sequences differ only in the prior ocean surface forcing fields used during the 4D-Var analysis cycles. On the whole, the 4D-Var system performs well as evidenced by the significant decrease in the cost function during each data assimilation cycle. The tangent linear assumption employed by 4D-Var is generally valid throughout the two periods considered as indicated by the generally good agreement between $\mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{NL}$ although nonlinearity seems to play more of a role during WCRA14, perhaps due to the higher resolution surface forcing. Further evidence for the well behaved nature of the 4D-Var cycles is the very small percentage of observations that were rejected by the background quality control check. An examination of the statistics of the innovations reveals that there is scope for improvement in the *a priori* choice of parameters for the prior error and observation error covariance matrices. This is not unexpected since the correct specification of a time evolving multivariate covariance matrix is a tall order. Nonetheless,

834 the innovation statistics point to ways in which specification of the covariance model vari-
835 ances can be improved by tuning the error variances following the iterative process outlined
836 in Desroziers et al. (2005) and Desroziers and Ivanov (2001).

837 Data assimilation has a significant influence on the time evolving circulation as evidenced
838 by the differences between the posterior estimates and those from a model without data
839 assimilation, as well as the differences between the prior and posterior fields. One notable
840 characteristic of the posterior circulation estimates is that they are more energetic than the
841 model run without data assimilation, as evidenced by the EKE.

842 Further investigation reveals that both sequences of analyses more faithfully capture the
843 region of elevated EKE observed offshore and downstream of Cape Mendocino, with offshore
844 propagation of EKE by eddies consistent with baroclinic instability of the California Current
845 and Rossby wave propagation. However, both analyses consistently under estimate the level
846 of EKE based on observational estimates, most likely because of the relatively low model
847 resolution used here. Nevertheless, 4D-Var energizes the circulation, and there are generally
848 more eddies present during the 4D-Var analyses than in runs of the model without data as-
849 simulation. However, the number of eddies decreases within a month or so if data assimilation
850 is not maintained. In addition, the 4D-Var analyses capture a higher fraction of eddies with
851 a significant ageostrophic component, often in the form of an ageostrophic halo surrounding
852 a very weak geostrophic core. The nature of the ageostrophic circulations and halos, with
853 diameters that peak near 60 km, is unclear and deserves further attention, although they are
854 unlikely to be an artifact of 4D-Var since they are present in the forward model runs also.
855 The PDF of eddy core diameter during 4D-Var indicates that geostrophic eddy energy has
856 a tendency to accumulate at scales of the first baroclinic radius of deformation. As noted

earlier, the elevated levels of EKE and number of eddies in the 4D-Var analyses compared to forward model runs is likely to have important implications for primary productivity in ecosystem models driven by the analysis circulation fields.

Data assimilation was found to significantly improve some aspects of the subsurface circulation when compared to a subset of the CalCOFI hydrographic observations. In particular the temperature and salinity biases were reduced, and the 4D-Var analyses more faithfully capture the subsurface temperature variability. However, data assimilation is unable to correct for the over estimation of upper ocean salinity variance in the forward model.

The version of ROMS 4D-Var that was used for the calculations described here has a number of shortcomings and limitations which are likely to impact the circulation estimates to some degree. However, the latest release of the 4D-Var code has more utility and a second sequence of calculations are planned using the improved system. Specific changes and improvements to the calculations will include: (1) inhomogeneous covariance models that allow the *a priori* correlation lengths scales to vary spatially across the domain. This is expected to have a significant impact near the coast where the covariance functions are likely to be particularly inhomogeneous; (2) the use of temporal correlation functions for the prior error. It is anticipated that this will allow a more efficient use of along-track satellite altimeter observations in place of the gridded products that are currently used; and (3) the use of a multivariate balance operator which includes an improved method for estimating the depth of the surface mixed layer where the balancing of temperature and salinity is disabled. Additional changes that will be made during the second sequence of 4D-Var analyses will include: (a) explicitly allowing for the correlation between errors in the prior and observations during the period of overlap between the current cycle and the

previous cycle; (b) refinements to the background error covariance and observation error covariance model parameters based on the analyses of the innovations in section 4.2; and (c) correction of the 6 hour offset in the specification of the ERA Interim net surface radiation fields. As experience in NWP has shown, it is anticipated that further improvements in the CCS circulation analyses can be expected by future iterative refinements of the analysis system resulting from rigorous quantitative analysis of the 4D-Var circulation estimates by the oceanographic community.

Both sequences of analyses are available to the oceanographic community from <http://oceanmodeling.ucsc.edu/> and represent a valuable community resource that can be used for a wide range of applications. Some recent applications by NOAA include modeling the population of juvenile Salmon (Schroeder et al., 2014), larval transport studies (Bjorkstedt, personal communication), and understanding whale migration patterns along the U.S. west coast (Forney and Becker, personal communication). Analysis of the circulation variability captured by the 4D-Var analyses is ongoing (e.g. Jacox et al., 2014, 2015), and Part II by Crawford et al. (2015) is dedicated to analysis of the CCS circulation variability on interannual-to-decadal timescales.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation (OCE 1061434). The altimeter products were produced by Ssalto/Duacs and distributed by AVISO, with support from CNES (<http://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/duacs/>). We are also grateful to the three anonymous reviewers who helped to improve the manuscript content.

References

- Andersson, E. and H. Järvinen, 1999: Variational quality control. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, **125**, 679-722.
- Andersson, E., M. Fisher, R. Munro and A. McNally, 2000: Diagnosis of background errors for radiances and other observable quantities in a variational data assimilation scheme and the explanation of a case of poor convergence. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, **126**, 1455-1472.
- Atlas, R., R. N. Hoffman, J. Ardizzone, S. M. Leidner, J. C. Jusem, D. K. Smith, D. Gombos, 2011: A cross-calibrated, multiplatform ocean surface wind velocity product for meteorological and oceanographic applications. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **92**, 157-174. doi: 10.1175/2010BAMS2946.1.
- Balmaseda, M. A., A. Vidard and D.L.T. Anderson, 2008: The ECMWF Ocean Analysis System: ORA-S3. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **136**, 3018-3034.
- Bannerjee, S., Carlin, B.P. and A.E. Gelfand, 2004: Hierarchical Modeling and Analysis for Spatial Data. *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*, **101**, Chapman Hall/CRC Press.
- Barth, J.A., 1994: Short-wavelength instabilities on coastal jets and fronts. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **99**, 16,095-16,115.
- Broquet, G., C.A. Edwards, A.M. Moore, B.S. Powell, M. Veneziani and J.D. Doyle, 2009: Application of 4D-variational data assimilation to the California Current System. *Dyn. Atmos. Oceans*, **48**, 69-91.
- Broquet, G., A.M. Moore, H.G. Arango, and C.A. Edwards, 2011: Corrections to ocean

surface forcing in the California Current System using 4D-variational data assimilation.

Ocean Modelling, **36**, 116-132.

Capet, X., P. Marchesiello and J.C. McWilliams, 2004: Upwelling response to coastal wind profiles. *Geophys. Res. Letts.*, **31**, L13311, doi:10.1029/2004GL020123.

Capet, X., J.C. McWilliams, M.J. Molemaker and A.F. Shchepetkin, 2008: Mesoscale to submesoscale transition in the California Current System. Part I: Flow, structure, eddy flux and observational tests. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **38**, 29-43.

Carton, J.A. and B.S. Giese, 2008: A reanalysis of ocean climate using simple ocean data assimilation (SODA). *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **136**, 2999-3017.

Castelao, R.M. and J.A. Barth, 2006: The relative importance of wind strength and along-shelf bathymetric variations on the separation of a coastal upwelling jet. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **36**, 412-425.

Chaigneau, A., G. Eldin and B. Dewitte, 2009: Eddy activity in the four major upwelling systems from satellite altimetry (1992-2007). *Progress in Oceanography*, **83**, 117-123.

Chao, Y., Z. Li, J. Farrara, J.C. McWilliams, J. Bellingham, X. Capet, F. Chavez, J.-K. Choi, R. Davis, J. Doyle, D.M. Fratantoni, P. Li, P. Marchesiello, M.A. Moline, J. Paduan and S. Ramp, 2009: Development, implementation and evaluation of a data assimilative ocean forecasting system off the central California coast. *Deep Sea Res.*, **56**, 100-126.

Chapman, D.C., 1985: Numerical treatment of cross-shelf open boundaries in a barotropic coastal ocean model. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **15**, 1060-1075.

Checkley, D.M. and J.A. Barth, 2009: Patterns and process in the California Current system. *Prog. Oceanogr.*, **83**, 49-64.

946 Courtier, P., J.-N. Thépaut and A. Hollingsworth, 1994: A strategy for operational imple-
947 menation of 4D-Var using an incremental approach. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, **120**,
948 1367-1388.

949 Chelton, D.B., R.A. DeSzoeke, M.G. Schlax, K. El Naggar and N. Siwertz, 1998: Geographi-
950 cal variability of the first baroclinic Rossby radius of deformation. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*,
951 **28**, 433-460.

952 Crawford, W., A.M. Moore, M.G. Jacox, E. Neveu, J. Fiechter and C.A. Edwards, 2015:
953 An Historical analysis of the California Current using ROMS 4D-Var. Part II: Climate
954 Variability. Submitted.

955 Davis, A. and E. Di Lorenzo, 2015: Interannual forcing mechanisms of California Current
956 transports II: Mesoscale eddies. *Deep Sea Res. II*, **112**, 31-41.

957 Dee, D.P., S. M. Uppala, A. J. Simmons, P. Berrisford, P. Poli, S. Kobayashi, U. Andrae, M.
958 A. Balmaseda, G. Balsamo, P. Bauer, P. Bechtold, A. C. M. Beljaars, L. van de Berg, J.
959 Bidlot, N. Bormann, C. Delsol, R. Dragani, M. Fuentes, A. J. Geer, L. Haimberger, S.
960 B. Healy, H. Hersbach, E. V. Hólm, L. Isaksen, P. Källberg, M. Köhler, M. Matricardi,
961 A. P. McNally, B. M. Monge-Sanz, J.-J. Morcrette, B.-K. Park, C. Peubey, P. de
962 Rosnay, C. Tavolato, J.-N. Thépaut and F. Vitart, 2011: The ERA-Interim reanalysis:
963 configuration and performance of the data assimilation system, *Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc.*,
964 **137**, 553-597, doi: 10.1002/qj.828.

965 Derber, J. and A. Rosati, 1989: A global oceanic data assimilation system. *J. Phys.*
966 *Oceanogr.*, **19**, 1333-1347.

967 Desroziers, G., L. Berre, B. Chapnik and P. Poli, 2005: Diagnosis of observation, background
968 and analysis-error statistics in observation space. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, **131**, 3385-

3396.

Desroziers, G. and S. Ivanov, 2001: Diagnosis and adaptive tuning of observation error covariance parameters in a variational assimilation/ *Q. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.*, **127**, 1433-1452.

Dibarboure, G., M.-I. Pujol, F. Briol, P. Y. Le Traon, G. Larnicol, N. Picot, F. Mertz, and M. Ablain, 2011: Jason-2 in DUACS: Updated system description, first tandem results and impact on processing and products. *Mar. Geod.*, **34**, (3-4), 214-241.

DiLorenzo, E., 2003: Seasonal dynamics of the surface circulation in the Southern California Current system. *Deep Sea Res. II*, **50**, 2371-2388.

DiLorenzo, E., J. Fiechter, N. Schneider, A. Bracco, A.J. Miller, P.J.. Franks, S. Brograd, A.M. Moore, A.C. Thomas, W. Crawford, A. Peña and A. Hermann, 2009: Nutrient and salinity decadal variations in the central and eastern North Pacific. *Geophys. Res. Letts.*, **36**, L14601, doi:10.1029/2009GL038261.

Dorman, C.E. and C.D. Winant, 1995: Buoy observations of the atmosphere along the west coast of the United States, 1981-1990. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **100**, 16,029-16,044.

Doyle, J.D., Q. Jiang, Y. Chao and J. Farrara, 2009: High-resolution atmospheric modeling over the Monterey Bay during AOSN II. *Deep Sea Res. II*, **56**, 87-99.

Edwards, C.A., A.M. Moore, I. Hoteit and B.D. Cornuelle, 2015: Regional ocean data assimilation. *Ann. Rev. Mar. Sci.*, **7**, 6.1-6.22.

Enriquez, A.G. and C.A. Friehe, 1995: Effects of wind stress and wind stress curl variability on coastal upwelling. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **25**, 1651-1671.

Fairall, C.W., E.F. Bradley, J.S. Godfrey, G.A. Wick, J.B. Edson and G.S. Young, 1996a: Cool-skin and warm layer effects on the sea surface temperature. *J. Geophys. Res.*,

992 **101**, 1295-1308.

993 Fairall, C.W., E.F. Bradley, D.P. Rogers, J.B. Edson and G.S. Young, 1996b: Bulk pa-
994 rameterization of air-sea fluxes for tropical ocean global atmosphere Coupled-Ocean
995 Atmosphere Response Experiment. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **101**, 3747-3764.

996 Falkowski, P., D. Ziemann, Z. Kolber and P.Bienfang, 1991: Role of eddy pumping in
997 enhancing primary productivity production in the ocean. *Nature*, **352**, 55-58.

998 Flather, R.A., 1976: A tidal model of the northwest European continental shelf. *Memoires*
999 *de la Societe Royale des Sciences de Liege* 6 (10), 141-164.

1000 Gratton, S., and J.Tshimanga, 2009: An observation-space formulation of variational as-
1001 simulation using a restricted preconditioned conjugate gradient algorithm. *Q. J. R.*
1002 *Meteorol. Soc.*, **135**, 1573-1585.

1003 Gürol, S., A.T. Weaver, A.M. Moore, A. Piacentini, H.G. Arango and S. Gratton, 2013:
1004 B-preconditioned minimization algorithms for variational data assimilation with the
1005 dual formulation. *Q. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.*, doi:10.1002/qj.2150.

1006 Hickey, B.M., 1979: The California Current System: hypotheses and facts. *Progress in*
1007 *Oceanography*, **8**, 191-279.

1008 Hickey, B.M., 1998: Coastal oceanography of western North America from the tip of Baja,
1009 California to Vancouver Island. *The Sea*, **11**, 345-393, Eds. A.R. Robinson and K.H.
1010 Brink, John Wiley and Sons.

1011 Hollingsworth, A., D.B. Shaw, P. Lnnberg, L. Illari, K. Arpe, K. and A Simmons, 1986:
1012 Monitoring of observation and analysis quality by data assimilation systems. *Mon*
1013 *Wea. Rev.*, **114**, 861-879.

1014 Ingleby, B. and M. Huddleston, 2007: Quality control of ocean temperature and salinity

1015 profiles - historical and real-time data. *J. Mar. Systems*, **65**, 158-175.

1016 Jacox, M.G., A.M. Moore, C.A. Edwards and J. Fiechter, 2014: Spatially resolved upwelling
1017 in the California Current system and its connections to climate variability. *Geophys.*
1018 *Res. Letts.*, **41**, 3189-3196, doi:10.1002/2014GL059589.

1019 Jacox, M.G., J. Fiechter, A.M. Moore and C.A. Edwards, 2015: El Niño and the California
1020 Current Coastal Upwelling Response. *J. Geophys. Res.*, In press.

1021 Järvinen, H. and P. Undén, 1997: Observation screening and first guess quality control in
1022 the ECMWF 3D-Var data assimilation system. *ECMWF Tech. Memo*, **236**, EMCWF,
1023 Shinfield Park, Reading, U.K.

1024 Källberg, P., A. Simmons, S. Uppala and M. Fuentes, 2004: The ERA-40 Archive. ERA-40
1025 Project Report Series No. 17.

1026 Kelly, K.A., R.C. Beardsley, R. Limeburner, K.H. Brink, J.D Paduan and T.K. Chereskin,
1027 1998: Variability of the near-surface eddy kinetic energy in California Current based
1028 on altimetric, drifter, and moored current data. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **103**, 13,067-13,083.

1029 Kurian, J., F. Colas, X. Capet, J.C. McWilliams and D.B. Chelton, 2011: Eddy properties in
1030 the California Current System. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **16**, C08027, doi:10.1029/2010JC006895.

1031 Kurapov, A.L., G.D. Egbert, J.S. Allen and R.N. Miller, 2009: Representer-based analyses
1032 in the coastal upwelling system. *Dyn. Atmos. Ocean.*, **48**, 198-218.

1033 Kurapov A.L., D. Foley, P.T. Strub, G.D. Egbert, and J.S. Allen, 2011: Variational assimilation of satellite observations in a coastal ocean model off Oregon. *J. Geophys. Res.*,
1034 **116**, C05006.
1035

1036 Lawless, A.S., S. Gratton, and N.K. Nichols, 2005: Approximate iterative methods for variational data assimilation. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Fl.*, **1**, 1-6.
1037

1038 Le Dimet, F.-X. and O. Talagrand, 1986: Variational algorithms for analysis and assimilation
1039 of meteorological observations. *Tellus*, **38A**, 97-110.

1040 Levitus, S., J.I. Antonov, T.P. Boyer, R.A. Locarnini, H.E. Garcia, and A.V. Mishonov,
1041 2009: Global ocean heat content 1955-2008 in light of recently revealed instrumentation
1042 problems. *Geophys. Res. Letts.*, **36**, L07608, doi:10.1029/2008GL037155.

1043 Lewis, J. and Derber, J., 1985: The use of adjoint equations to solve a variational adjustment
1044 problem with advective constraints. *Tellus*, **37**, 309-327.

1045 Li, Z., Y. Chao, J.C. McWilliams and K. Ide, 2008: A three-dimensional variational data
1046 assimilation scheme for the regional ocean modeling system. *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*,
1047 **25**, 2074-2090.

1048 Liu, W.T., K.B. Katsaros and J.A. Businger, 1979: Bulk parameterization of the air-sea
1049 exchange of heat and water vapor including the molecular constraints at the interface.
1050 *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **36**, 1722-1735.

1051 Lorenc, A.C., and P. Hammon, 1988: Objective quality control of observations using Bayesian
1052 methods. Theory, and a practical implementation. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, **114**, 515-
1053 543.

1054 Lynn, R.J. and S.J. Bograd, 2002: Dynamic evolution of the 1997-1999 El Niño-La Niña
1055 cycle in the southern California Current System. *Prog. Oceanogr.*, **54**, 59-75.

1056 Mantua, N.J., S.R. Hare, Y. Zhang, J.M. Wallace and R.C. Francis, 1997: A Pacific in-
1057 terdecadal climate oscillation with impacts on salmon production. *Bull. Amer. Met.*
1058 *Soc.*, **78**, 1069-1079.

1059 Marchesiello, P., J.C. McWilliams and A. Shchepetkin, 2003: Equilibrium structure and
1060 dynamics of the California Current System. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **33**, 753-783.

1061 Marchesiello, P., L. Debreu and X. Couvelard, 2009: Spurious diapycnal mixing in terrain-
 1062 following coordinate models: The problem and a solution. *Ocean Modelling*, **26**, 156-
 1063 169.

1064 Matthews, D., B. Powell, and R.F. Milliff, 2011: Dominant spatial variability scales from
 1065 observations around the Hawaiian Island. *Deep Sea Res. I*, **58**, 979-987.

1066 McGillicuddy, D. J., Jr., A. R. Robinson, D. A. Siegel, H. W. Jannasch, R. Johnson, T. D.
 1067 Dickey, J. McNeil, A. F. Michaels, and A. H. Knap 1998: Influence of mesoscale eddies
 1068 on new production in the Sargasso Sea, *Nature*, **394**, 263-266.

1069 Milliff, R.F., P. Niiler, J. Morzel, A. Sybrandy, D. Nychka, and W. Large, 2033.: Mesoscale
 1070 correlation length scales from NSCAT and Minimet surface wind retrievals in the
 1071 Labrador Sea. *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*, **20**, 513-533.

1072 Mogensen, K., M.A. Balmaseda and A.T. Weaver, 2012: The NEMOVAR ocean data assim-
 1073 ilation system as implemented in the ECMWF ocean analysis for system 4. *ECMWF*
 1074 *Technical Memo.*, **668**, 61pp.

1075 Moore, A.M., H.G. Arango, G. Broquet, B.S. Powell, J. Zavala-Garay and A.T. Weaver,
 1076 2011a: The Regional Ocean Modeling System (ROMS) 4-dimensional variational data
 1077 assimilation systems. Part I: System overview and formulation. *Progress in Oceanog-*
 1078 *raphy*, **91**, 34-49.

1079 Moore, A.M., H.G. Arango, G. Broquet, C. Edwards, M. Veneziani, B. Powell. D. Foley,
 1080 J. Doyle, D. Costa and P. Robinson, 2011b: The Regional Ocean Modeling System
 1081 (ROMS) 4-dimensional variational data assimilation systems. Part II: Performance
 1082 and application to the California Current System. *Progress in Oceanography*, **91**, 50-
 1083 73.

1084 Moore, A.M., H.G. Arango, G. Broquet, C. Edwards, M. Veneziani, B. Powell. D. Fo-
 1085 ley, J. Doyle, D. Costa and P. Robinson, 2011c: The Regional Ocean Modeling Sys-
 1086 tem (ROMS) 4-dimensional variational data assimilation systems. Part III: Observa-
 1087 tion impact and observation sensitivity in the California Current System. *Progress in*
 1088 *Oceanography*, **91**, 74-94.

1089 Moore, A.M., C. Edwards, J. Fiechter, P. Drake, H.G. Arango, E. Neveu, S. Gürol and A.T.
 1090 Weaver, 2013: A Prototype for an Operational Regional Ocean Data Assimilation
 1091 System. Chapter 14 In “Data Assimilation for Atmospheric, Oceanic and Hydrological
 1092 Applications, Vol II”, Liang Xu and Seon Park, Eds. Springer, pp345-366.

1093 Ngodock, H. and M.. Carrier, 2013:A weak constraint 4D-Var assimilation system for the
 1094 Navy Coastal Ocean Model using the representer method. Chapter 15 In “Data As-
 1095 similation for Atmospheric, Oceanic and Hydrological Applications, Vol II”, Liang Xu
 1096 and Seon Park, Eds. Springer, pp367-390.

1097 Oke, P.R., G. Larnicol, E. M. Jones, V. Kourafalou, A. Sperrevik, F. Carse, C. A. S. Tana-
 1098 jura, B. Moure, M. Tonani, G. B. Brassington, M. Le Henaff, G. R. Halliwell, R. Atlas,
 1099 A. M. Moore, C. A. Edwards, M. J. Martin, A. A. Stellar, A. Alvarez, P. De Mey, and
 1100 M. Iskandarani, 2015: Assessing the impact of observations on ocean forecasts and
 1101 reanalyses: Part 2: Regional applications. *J. Operational Oceanography*, In press.

1102 Pan C., M. Yaremchuk, D. Nechaev and H. Ngodock, 2011: Variational assimilation of glider
 1103 data in Monterey Bay. *J. Mar. Res.*, **69**, 331-346.

1104 Penven, P., I. Halo, S. Pous and L. Marie, 2014: Cyclogeostrophic balance in the Mozambique
 1105 Channel. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **119**, 1054-1067.

1106 Rio, M.H., P. Schaeffer and J.M. Lemoine, 2005: The estimation of the ocean mean synam-

ics topography through the combination of altimetric data, in-situ measurements and
GRACE geoid: From global to regional studies. *Proc. GOCINA Int. workshop*, Lux-
embourg. Centre Européen de Géodynamique et de Séismologie.

Saraceno, M., P.T. Strub and P.M. Kosro, 2008. Estimates of sea surface height and near
surface alongshore coastal currents from combinations of altimeters and tide gauges.
J. Geophys. Res., **113**, C11013, doi:10.1029/2008JC004756.

Schroeder, I. D., J. A. Santora, A. M. Moore, C. A. Edwards, J. Fiechter, E. L. Hazen,
S. J. Bograd, J. C. Field, and B. K. Wells (2014), Application of a data-assimilative
regional ocean modeling system for assessing California Current System ocean con-
ditions, drill, and juvenile rockfish interannual variability, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **41**,
5942-5950, doi:10.1002/2014GL061045.

Shchepetkin, A.F. and J.C. McWilliams, 2004: The regional oceanic modeling system (ROMS):
a split explicit, free-surface, topography-following-coordinate oceanic model. *Ocean*
Modeling, **9**, 347-404.

Stegmann, P.M., and F. Schwing, 2007: Demographics of mesoscale eddies in the California
Current. *Geophys. Res. Letts.*, **34**, L14602, doi:10.1029/2007GL029504.

Strub, P.T. and C. James, 2000: Altimeter-derived variability of surface velocities in the
California Current System: 2. Seasonal circulation and eddy statistics. *Deep Sea Res.*,
Part II, **47**, 831-870.

Sudre, J., C. Maes and V. Garçon, 2013: On the global estimates of geostrophic and Ekman
surface currents. *Limnology and Oceanography: Fluids and Environment*, **3**, 1-20.

Talagrand, O. and P. Courtier, 1987: Variational assimilation of meteorological observations
with the adjoint vorticity equation. I: Theory. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, **113**, 1321-1328.

1130 Todd R.E., D.L. Rudnick, M.R. Mazloff, R.E. Davis and B.D. Cornuelle, 2011: Poleward
1131 flows in the southern California Current System: glider observations and numerical
1132 simulation. *J. Geophys. Res.* **116**, C02026.

1133 Veneziani, M., C.A. Edwards, J.D. Doyle and D. Foley, 2009a: A central California coastal
1134 ocean modeling study: 1. Forward model and the influence of realistic versus climato-
1135 logical forcing. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **114**, C04015, doi:10.1029/2008JC004774.

1136 Veneziani, M., C.A. Edwards and A.M. Moore, 2009b: A central California coastal ocean
1137 modeling study: 2. Adjoint sensitivities to local and remote forcing mechanisms. *J.*
1138 *Geophys. Res.*, **114**, C04020, doi:10.1029/2008JC004775.

1139 Weaver, A.T. and P. Courtier, 2001: Correlation modelling on the sphere using a generalized
1140 diffusion equation. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, **127**, 1815-1846.

1141 Weaver, A.T., C. Deltel, E. Machu, S. Ricci and N. Daget, 2005: A multivariate balance
1142 operator for variational ocean data assimilation. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, **131**, 3605-
1143 3625.

1144 Weaver, A.T., J. Vialard and D.L.T. Anderson, 2003: Three- and four-dimensional varia-
1145 tional assimilation with a general circulation model of the tropical Pacific Ocean. Part
1146 I: Formulation, internal diagnostics and consistency checks. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **131**,
1147 1360-1378.

1148 Weiss, J., 1991: The dynamics of enstrophy transfer in two-dimensional hydrodynamics.
1149 *Physica D*, **48**, 273-294.

1150 Wikle, C.K. and L.M. Berliner, 2007: A Bayesian tutorial for data assimilation. *Physica D*,
1151 **230**, 1-16.

1152 Willis, J.K., D. Roemmich and B.D. Cornuelle, 2004: Interannual variability in upper ocean

1153 heat content, temperature, and thermosteric expansion on global scales. *J. of Geophys.*
1154 *Res.*, **109**, C12036, doi:10.1029/2003JC002260.

1155 Wunsch, C. and P. Heimbach, 2007: Practical global ocean state estimation. *Physica D*,
1156 **230**, 197-208.

1157 Yu P., A.L. Kurapov, G.D. Egbert, J.S. Allen and P.M. Kosro, 2012: Variational assimilation
1158 of HnF radar surface currents in a coastal ocean model off Oregon. *Ocean Modelling*,
1159 **49**, 86-104.

Table Captions

Table 1: A summary of the observation types, observing platforms, data sources, the nominal measurement errors, and the period covered.

Table 2: A summary of the correlation length scales used for the background errors for the different components of $\mathbf{B}$. For the surface forcing, (τ_x, τ_y) denotes the zonal and meridional components of the surface wind stress, Q_H is the surface heat flux, and Q_W is the net surface freshwater flux. In the case of the background errors in the open boundary conditions and initial conditions, the first number represents the horizontal correlation length while the second number is the vertical correlation length. The state variables listed are the two horizontal components of velocity (u, v) , temperature (T) , salinity (S) and sea surface height (ζ) .

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation of the posterior minus prior fields for WCRA31.

Table 4: The root mean square (rms) difference between surface wind stress in N m^{-2} (surface heat flux in W m^{-2}) between the data sets indicated. The numbers highlighted in red correspond to the rms differences between the 4D-Var posterior and prior estimates. CCMP/ERA = the combination of CCMP and ERA products used in WCRA31; WCRA31 = WCRA31 posterior estimates; WCRA14 = WCRA14 posterior estimates; NARR = North American Regional Reanalysis from NCEP; CaRD10 = California Reanalysis Downscaling to 10km from Scripps Institute of Oceanography; Qscat = QuikSCAT wind product from NOAA Coastwatch.

Figure Captions

Figure 1: The ROMS domain and bathymetry (depth in m) used in WCRA31 and WCRA14. Also shown are the regions considered in section 5.1 and the CalCOFI lines considered in section 5.5 (white dashed lines).

Figure 2: A time series of $\log_{10}$ of the total number of super observations available from EN3 and each satellite observing platform within the ROMS CCS model domain during each month of the year during the period spanned by WCRA31. Dark blue: In situ observations from EN3; Red: SST from AVHRR/PathFinder; Black: SST from AMSR-E; Green: MODIS-Terra; Magenta: SSH from AVISO; Light blue: observations rejected.

Figure 3: A schematic illustrating the overlapping 8 day data assimilation cycles used in WCRA14 and WCRA31. The starting time for cycle j is denoted as t_0^j and the mid-point as $t_0^j + 4$. As indicated, the ending time of 4D-Var analysis cycle j corresponds to the mid-point of cycle $j + 1$ and the starting time of cycle $j + 2$. The *prior* circulation initial condition for cycle $j + 1$ is taken as the *posterior* circulation estimate at the mid-point of cycle j .

Figure 4: Time series of the initial (blue curve) and final (red curve) cost function (7) for each 4D-Var cycle for (a) WCRA31 and (b) WCRA31. Also shown are the values of the nonlinear cost function (2) (green crosses).

Figure 5: Probability density functions of the innovations for observations of (a) SSH, (b) temperature, and (c) salinity. The red line in each case shows the probability density function of a normal distribution with the same mean and standard deviation.

Figure 6: (a) A scatter plot of $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{T}\}$ vs randomized estimates of $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^T\}$ for a selection of 4D-Var cycles during 1991 and 2000. The best least-squares straight line fit is

1202 indicated by the dashed line. (b) Time series from WCRA31 of s (red line) and $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{d}$
1203 (black line). (c) A scatter plot of $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{F} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{F}^T\}$ vs $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{G}^T\}$. The 1-to-1 line is
1204 also shown. Time series from WCRA31 of $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{F} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{F}^T\}$ (red line) and $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{d}_b^a$ (black line) for
1205 observations of (d) temperature, (e) salinity and (f) SSH. Time series from WCRA31 of
1206 $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{R}\}$ (red line) and $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{d}_a^a$ (black line) for observations of (g) temperature, (h) salinity and
1207 (i) SSH.

1208 Figure 7: The mean increments for (a) SST and (b) SSS computed from all 4D-Var analysis
1209 cycles of WCRA31. The standard deviations of the increments are shown in (c) for SST and
1210 (d) for SSS.

1211 Figure 8: Time series of the posterior minus prior fields of WCRA31 averaged over the
1212 different regions in Fig. 8 for: (a) R1 SST, (b) R2 SSH, (c) R2 SSS and (d) R1 EKE.

1213 Figure 9: Time series of the WCRA31 posterior (red) and forward (blue) fields averaged over
1214 the different regions in Fig. 8 for: (a) R2 SST, (b) R1 SSH, (c) R4 SSS and (d) R1 EKE.

1215 Figure 10: The mean posterior zonal and meridional surface wind stress averaged over all
1216 assimilation cycles for (a,b) WCRA31, and (c,d) WCRA14. Also shown are the differences
1217 between the posterior and prior zonal and meridional surface wind stress components for
1218 (e,f) WCRA31, and (g,h) WCRA14.

1219 Figure 11: The mean posterior total surface heat flux averaged over all assimilation cycles
1220 for (a) WCRA31, and (c) WCRA14. Also shown are the differences between the posterior
1221 and prior surface heat flux averaged over all assimilation cycles for (b) WCRA31, and (d)
1222 WCRA14.

1223 Figure 12: The mean posterior total surface freshwater flux (mm day⁻¹) averaged over all

assimilation cycles for (a) WCRA31, and (c) WCRA14. A positive flux is out of the ocean (i.e. excess evaporation over precipitation). Also shown are the differences between the posterior and prior surface freshwater flux for (b) WCRA31, and (d) WCRA14.

Figure 13: The time mean surface EKE difference between WCRA31 and the forward model run without data assimilation (TJoules). The region indicated by the black box is referred to in section 5.4.

Figure 14: The difference in depth averaged EKE over the upper 500 m between WCRA31 and the forward model run without data assimilation and averaged between Point Conception (34°N) and Cape Blanco (43°N) as a function of offshore distance from the coast (TJoules).

Figure 15: (a) Time series of the three month running mean of the total number of eddies in WCRA31 (red) and the forward model without data assimilation (blue). (b) Time series of the ratio of the three month running mean of the number of ageostrophic eddies to geostrophic eddies in WCRA31 (red) and the forward run (blue). The number of eddies from a run of the model where data assimilation ceases on 17 Feb. 1995 is also shown (green). (c) Probability density functions (PDFs) of eddy diameter in WCRA31 (red) and the forward model (blue). (d) The PDF for geostrophic eddies (red) and ageostrophic eddies (blue) in WCRA31.

Figure 16: Vertical profiles of the comparison between the model and the CalCOFI observations for (a) WCRA31 and (b) the forward model run for the period Mar. 1990 - Jul. 2007. The statistics for temperature (salinity) are shown in the left (right) of each panel. The black line is the mean of the differences between the model (M) and the observational

1246 data (D). The standard deviation of the difference M-D is shown in blue. The standard
1247 deviations of the model and the data are shown in red and green, respectively.

Observation Type	Observing Platform	Source	Instrument Error	Period Covered
SSH	Altimeter	Aviso, 1 day average	0.04 m	1993-2012
SST	AVHRR/Pathfinder	NOAA Coast Watch	0.6°C	1981-2012
SST	AMSR-E	NOAA Coast Watch	0.7°C	2002-2010
SST	MODIS-Terra	NASA JPL	0.3°C	2000-2012
Hydrographic data	Various	UK Meteorological Office	0.5°C for T 0.1 for S	1950-2012

Table 1: A summary of the observation types, observing platforms, data sources, the nominal measurement errors, and the period covered.

Prior					
Forcing	τ_x 300 km	τ_y 300 km	Q_H 100 km	Q_W 100 km	
Open boundaries	u 100km, 30 m	v 100km, 30 m	T 100km, 30 m	S 100km, 30 m	ζ 100km
Initial conditions	u 50km, 30 m	v 50km, 30 m	T 50km, 30 m	S 50km, 30 m	ζ 50km

Table 2: A summary of the correlation length scales used for the background errors for the different components of **D**. For the surface forcing, (τ_x, τ_y) denotes the zonal and meridional components of the surface wind stress, Q_H is the surface heat flux, and Q_W is the net surface freshwater flux. In the case of the background errors in the open boundary conditions and initial conditions, the first number represents the horizontal correlation length while the second number is the vertical correlation length. The state variables listed are the two horizontal components of velocity (u,v), temperature (T), salinity (S) and sea surface height (ζ).

Variable	R1 (mean, std)	R2 (mean, std)	R3 (mean, std)	R4 (mean, std)
ΔSST ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	-6×10^{-2} , 0.24	-7×10^{-2} , 0.24	-6×10^{-3} , 0.25	-8×10^{-2} , 0.21
ΔSSH (m)	-2×10^{-3} , 1.6×10^{-2}	-2×10^{-3} , 1.6×10^{-2}	-1×10^{-3} , 1.5×10^{-2}	-1×10^{-3} , 1.6×10^{-2}
ΔSSS	-3×10^{-3} , 1.1×10^{-2}	-4×10^{-3} , 1.2×10^{-2}	-4×10^{-3} , 9×10^{-3}	-2×10^{-3} , 4×10^{-3}
ΔKE (TJoules)	9.2, 23	1.5, 22	3.4, 17	-37,110

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation of the posterior minus prior fields for WCRA31.

Model	WCRA31	COAMPS	WCRA14	NARR	CaRD10	Qscat
CCMP/ERA	0.038 (40)	0.091 (147)		0.117 (148)	0.273 (121)	0.061
WCRA31			0.098 (151)			0.070
COAMPS			0.037 (73)	0.057 (67)	0.262 (78)	0.059
WCRA14						0.067
NARR					0.239 (62)	0.059
CaRD10						0.248

Table 4: The root mean square (rms) difference between surface wind stress in Nm^{-2} (surface heat flux in Wm^{-2}) between the data sets indicated. The numbers highlighted in red correspond to the rms differences between the 4D-Var posterior and prior estimates. CCMP/ERA = the combination of CCMP and ERA products used in WCRA31; WCRA31 = WCRA31 posterior estimates; WCRA14 = WCRA14 posterior estimates; NARR = North American Regional Reanalysis from NCEP; CaRD10 = California Reanalysis Downscaling to 10km from Scripps Institute of Oceanography; Qscat = QuikSCAT wind product from NOAA Coastwatch.

Figure 1: The ROMS domain and bathymetry (depth in m) used in WCRA31 and WCRA14. Also shown are the regions considered in section 5.1 and the CalCOFI lines considered in section 5.5 (white dashed lines).

Figure 2: A time series of $\log_{10}$ of the total number of super observations available from EN3 and each satellite observing platform within the ROMS CCS model domain during each month of the year for the period spanned by WCRA31. Dark blue: In situ observations from EN3; Red: SST from AVHRR/PathFinder; Black: SST from AMSR-E; Green: SST from MODIS-Terra; Magenta: SSH from Aviso; Light blue: observations rejected.

Figure 3: A schematic illustrating the overlapping 8 day data assimilation cycles used in WCRA14 and WCRA31. The starting time for cycle j is denoted as t_0^j and the mid-point as $t_0^j + 4$. As indicated, the ending time of 4D-Var analysis cycle j corresponds to the mid-point of cycle $j+1$ and the starting time of cycle $j+2$. The prior circulation initial condition for cycle $j+1$ is taken as the posterior circulation estimate at the mid-point of cycle j .

Figure 4: Time series of the initial (blue curve) and final (red curve) cost function (7) for each 4D-Var cycle for (a) WCRA31 and (b) WCRA14. Also shown are the values of the nonlinear cost function (2) (green crosses).

Figure 5: Probability density functions of the WCRA31 innovations for observations of (a) SSH, (b) temperature, and (c) salinity. The red line in each case shows the probability density function of a normal distribution with the same mean and standard deviation.

Figure 6: (a) A scatter plot of $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{T}\}$ vs randomized estimates of $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{GDG}^T\}$ for a selection of 4D-Var cycles during 1991 and 2000. The best least-squares straight line fit is indicated by the dashed line. (b) Time series from WCRA31 of s (red line) and $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{d}$ (black line). (c) A scatter plot of $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{FDF}^T\}$ vs $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{GDG}^T\}$. The 1-to-1 line is also shown. Time series from WCRA31 of $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{FDF}^T\}$ (red line) and $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{d}_b^a$ (black line) for observations of (d) temperature, (e) salinity and (f) SSH. Time series from WCRA31 of $\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{R}\}$ (red line) and $\mathbf{d}^T \mathbf{d}_a^o$ (black line) for observations of (g) temperature, (h) salinity and (i) SSH.

Figure 7: The mean increments for (a) SST and (b) SSS computed from all 4D-Var analysis cycles of WCRA31. The standard deviations of the increments are shown in (c) for SST and (d) for SSS.

Figure 8: Time series of the posterior minus prior fields of WCRA31 averaged over the different regions in Fig. 8 for: (a) R2 SST, (b) R2 SSH, (c) R2 SSS and (d) R1 EKE.

Figure 9: Time series of the WCRA31 posterior (red) and forward (blue) fields averaged over the different regions in Fig. 8 for: (a) R2 SST, (b) R1 SSH, (c) R4 SSS and (d) R1 EKE.

Figure 10: The mean posterior zonal and meridional surface wind stress averaged over all assimilation cycles for (a,b) WCRA31, and (c,d) WCRA14. Also shown are the differences between the posterior and prior zonal and meridional surface wind stress components for (e,f) WCRA31, and (g,h) WCRA14.

Figure 11: The mean posterior total surface heat flux averaged over all assimilation cycles for (a) WCRA31, and (c) WCRA14. Also shown are the differences between the posterior and prior surface heat flux averaged over all assimilation cycles for (b) WCRA31, and (d) WCRA14.

Figure 12: The mean posterior total surface freshwater flux (mm day⁻¹) averaged over all assimilation cycles for (a) WCRA31, and (c) WCRA14. A positive flux is out of the ocean (i.e. excess evaporation over precipitation). Also shown are the differences between the posterior and prior surface freshwater flux for (b) WCRA31, and (d) WCRA14.

Figure 13: The time mean surface EKE difference between WCRA31 and the forward model run without data assimilation (TJoules). The region indicated by the black box is referred to in section 5.4.

Figure 14: The difference in depth averaged EKE over the upper 500 m between WCRA31 and the forward model run without data assimilation and averaged between Point Conception (34°N) and Cape Blanco (43°N) as a function of offshore distance from the coast (TJsoules).

Figure 15: (a) Time series of the 3 month running mean of the total number of eddies in WCRA31 (red) and the forward model without data assimilation (blue). The number of eddies from a run of the model where data assimilation ceases on 17 Feb. 1995 is also shown (green). (b) Times series of the ratio of the 3 month running mean of the number of ageostrophic eddies to geostrophic eddies in WCRA31 (red) and the forward run (blue). (c) Probability density functions (PDFs) of eddy diameter in WCRA31 (red) and the forward model (blue). (d) The PDF for geostrophic eddies (red) and ageostrophic eddies (blue) in WCRA31.

Figure 16: Vertical profiles of the comparison between the model and the CalCOFI observations for (a) WCRA31 and (b) the forward model run for the period Mar. 1990-Jul. 2007. The statistics for temperature (salinity) are shown in the left (right) of each panel. The black line is the mean of the differences between the model (M) and the observational data (D). The standard deviation of the difference M-D is shown in blue. The standard deviations of the model and the data are shown in red and green ,respectively.