Seasonal response of the jet-stream to tropospheric warming

Elizabeth A. Barnes Colorado State University

with input from collaborator Lorenzo Polvani, Columbia U./LDEO



CMIP5 multi-model mean temperature response under RCP8.5

CESM Climate Variability and Paleoclimate WGs

March 10, 2014

Seasonal response of the jet-stream to tropospheric warming

Elizabeth A. Barnes Colorado State University

with input from collaborator Lorenzo Polvani, Columbia U./LDEO

preliminary work



CMIP5 multi-model mean temperature response under RCP8.5

CESM Climate Variability and Paleoclimate WGs

March 10, 2014

ERA-Interim temp. trends: 1989-2008

- Arctic has been warming substantially compared to other latitudes in recent years
- Some work suggested that the warming Arctic is influencing midlatitude weather by modifying the large-scale nearsurface temperature gradient e.g. Francis & Vavrus (2012)



Screen & Simmonds (2010); NAT

CMIP5: temperature response by 2100



CSU

- By 2100, models project that the near-surface temperature gradient will decrease in the cool months with Arctic amplification (DJF)
- The near-surface story in summer (||A) is not as clear
- Note that the largest uncertainty among models is in DJF as well

Change in zonal-mean temperature in ¹⁰25 CMIP5 models under RCP8.5

Large seasonality in CMIP5 future jet shift response



- jet shift has a rich seasonality
- could be due to a few factors
 - (I) seasonality of forcing (e.g. sea ice loss and Arctic amplification)

(2) seasonality of the circulation (even for constant forcing)

Large seasonality in CMIP5 future jet shift response



- jet shift has a rich seasonality
- could be due to a few factors

(1) seasonality of forcing (e.g. sea ice loss and Arctic amplification)

(2) seasonality of the circulation (even for constant forcing)

Response to GHG independent of season?

Delayed Southern Hemisphere Climate Change Induced by Stratospheric Ozone Recovery, as Projected by the CMIP5 Models

ELIZABETH A. BARNES

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, New York

NICHOLAS W. BARNES

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Minneapolis, Minnesota

LORENZO M. POLVANI

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, and Department of Applied Physics and Applied Math, Columbia University, New York, New York

FUTR: (2089-2099) - (2040-2050)

(Manuscript received 20 April 2013, in final form 5 August 2013)





Elizabeth A. Barnes

Response to GHG independent of season?

Delayed Southern Hemisphere Climate Change Induced by Stratospheric Ozone Recovery, as Projected by the CMIP5 Models

ELIZABETH A. BARNES

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, New York

NICHOLAS W. BARNES

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Minneapolis, Minnesota

LORENZO M. POLVANI

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, and Department of Applied Physics and Applied Math, Columbia University, New York, New York

FUTR: (2089-2099) - (2040-2050)

(Manuscript received 20 April 2013, in final form 5 August 2013)





Elizabeth A. Barnes

Southern Hemisphere Atmospheric Circulation Response to Global Warming

PAUL J. KUSHNER, ISAAC M. HELD, AND THOMAS L. DELWORTH

NOAA/Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, Princeton, New Jersey

(Manuscript received 24 February 2000, in final form 1 August 2000)

ABSTRACT

The response of the Southern Hemisphere (SH), extratropical, atmospheric general circulation to transient, anthropogenic, greenhouse warming is investigated in a coupled climate model. The extratropical circulation response consists of a SH summer half-year poleward shift of the westerly jet and a year-round positive wind anomaly in the stratosphere and the tropical upper troposphere. Along with the poleward shift of the jet, there is a poleward shift of several related fields, including the belt of eddy momentum-flux convergence and the mean meridional overturning in the atmosphere and in the ocean. The tropospheric wind response projects strongly onto the model's "Southern Annular Mode" (also known as the "Antarctic oscillation"), which is the leading pattern of variability of the extratropical zonal winds.



FIG. 4. The seasonal cycle of the climatological surface zonal-mean zonal wind for (a) the 800-yr time mean of the control integration, and (b) the ensemble mean response, years 2065–89. (c), (d) As in (a) and (b), but at 250 mb. Shading and dashed contours indicate negative values. Contour interval: (a) 2 m s⁻¹; (b) 0.25 m s⁻¹; (c) 5 m s⁻¹; (d): 0.5 m s⁻¹.

- forced GCM with increased greenhouse gases
- found largest SH response zonal winds in summer (DJFM)

The model: dry dynamical core

A Proposal for the Intercomparison of the Dynamical Cores of Atmospheric General Circulation Models





equilibrium





- Driven by Newtonian relaxation to equilibrium temperature profile

Isaac M. Held*

and Max J. Suarez**

- Lin-Rood semi-Lagrangian scheme for horizontal advection & finite volume parabolic scheme for vertical advection
- No well-resolved stratosphere
- No moisture
- Add seasonal cycle (360 day year) by varying the equilibrium temperature profile following Polvani & Kushner 2002

Held & Suarez (1994)

The Steady-State Atmospheric Circulation Response to Climate Change–like Thermal Forcings in a Simple General Circulation Model

AMY H. BUTLER, DAVID W. J. THOMPSON, AND ROSS HEIKES Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado







follow a similar setup to earlier idealized studies

- I. near-surface warming at pole
- 2. upper-tropospheric warming at equator
- See how the circulation responds to forcing at different times of the year

Butler et al. (2010)

Experimental setup

- <u>Control</u>:

- spin-up for 3 years, 6 years for climatology

- <u>Heating runs:</u>

- 9 branching runs each of length 540 days
- branches are 10 days apart in a month, so 3 per month per year
- heating is held constant throughout the 540 days (initialized in specific month)
- all quantities are first averaged over ensembles before any analysis



Heating profiles



maximum heating of 0.5 K/day (similar to Butler et al. 2010)

Temperature response in first month of Jan. heating



POLAR: zonal wind response to January heating

Feb, Yr. 1

40

40

40

latitude

Nov, Yr. 1

 \bigcirc

40

latitude

latitude

Aug, Yr. 1

latitude

May, Yr. 1

60

60

60

60







- response is a decrease in zonal winds
- response is an equatorward shift of the jet
- response to January heating is largest in spring

POLAR: seasonality of the response of u



POLAR: seasonality of the response of u

Apr, Yr. 1 50 500 500 850 0 20 40 60 80



POLAR: seasonality of the response of the jet position



CSU

jet shift is generally largest in **spring,** although not as much agreement

TROP: zonal wind response to January heating





0

CSU

20

40

latitude

60

80

0



- response is an increase in zonal winds
- response is a *poleward* shift of the jet
- response to January heating is largest in autumn



TROP: seasonality of the response of the jet position



TROP: seasonality of the response of the jet position



CSU

Elizabeth A. Barnes

Hadley cell edge and midlatitude jet location



<u>Ceppi & Hartmann (2013)</u>

the strongest correlations between the Hadley cell edge and the jet will occur when the meridional gradient of the upper-tropospheric zonal winds is weakest (i.e. in summer when the winds are weakest)

Summer Winter

Kang & Polvani (2011)



TROP: wind response at 300 hPa

- response of u is largest for tropical heating in the summer/ autumn when the zonal winds are weakest
- further work is needed to confirm that this is due to the Hadley circulation response being coupled to the midlatitude wind response in that season



Barnes & Polvani (in prep)

CSU

POLAR: Explaining CMIP5 model spread with AA

- Results for the North Atlantic only
- Arctic warming explains the most model spread in the zonal wind response in spring
- This is not a measure of the model's climate sensitivity (green lines)





850mb air (C) Composite Mean

POLAR: Explaining CMIP5 model spread with AA

- Results for the North Atlantic only
- Arctic warming explains the most model spread in the zonal wind response in spring
- This is not a measure of the model's climate sensitivity (green lines)





Barnes & Polvani (in prep)

Final thoughts...

- Preliminary results suggest that certain seasons may be "primed" for a larger jet response

- this result is independent of the timing of the initial heating

- These results aren't necessarily surprising

- many studies have shown different sensitivities of the circulation to mean-state (e.g. jet latitude or subtropical jet proximity)
- However, a thorough understanding of the circulation seasonality to a fixed forcing is likely required to understand circulation changes over the 21st Century

- Much more work to be done...

- e.g. determine robustness to model setup, mean state, magnitude of forcing, sign of forcing
- experiment with both polar and tropical upper-tropospheric heating imposed at the same time

EXTRA SLIDES

CSU

Elizabeth A. Barnes

CMIP5 seasonality of historical jet-stream position





CMIP5 seasonality of jet-stream position response



CSU

Elizabeth A. Barnes

Title here

Stratospheric Ozone Depletion: The Main Driver of Twentieth-Century Atmospheric Circulation Changes in the Southern Hemisphere

LORENZO M. POLVANI

Department of Applied Physics and Applied Mathematics, and Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Columbia University, New York, New York

DARRYN W. WAUGH

Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland

GUSTAVO J. P. CORREA

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, New York

SEOK-WOO SON

Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada



Elizabeth A. Barnes

setting the seasonal cycle in the dry GCM

GEOPHYSICAL RESEARCH LETTERS, VOL. 29, NO. 7, 10.1029/2001GL014284, 2002

Tropospheric response to stratospheric perturbations in a relatively simple general circulation model

Lorenzo M. Polvani¹ Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences Program, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, USA

Paul J. Kushner NOAA/Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, Princeton, New Jersey, USA

[23] The tropospheric relaxation temperature is given by

$$T_{eq}^{trop}(p,\phi) = \max[T_T, (T_0 - \delta T)(p/p_0)^{\kappa}],$$
 (A3)

where $T_0 = 315$ K, $p_0 = 1000$ mb, and $\kappa = 2/7$, with

$$\delta T = \delta_y \sin^2 \phi + \epsilon \sin \phi + \delta_z \log(p/p_0) \cos^2 \phi \qquad (A4)$$

where $\delta_y = 60$ K, $\delta_z = 10$ K, and $\epsilon = 10$ K. The nonzero value of ϵ provides a simple asymmetry between the winter and summer hemispheres. Continuity of T_{eq} at $p = p_T$ results from the choice $T_T = T_{US}(p_T)$.



Elizabeth A. Barnes

Model name	Monthly u	Daily u, v
BCC-CSM1.1	Х	х
BNU-ESM	x	х
CanESM2	x	х
CCSM4	х	
CMCC-CM	x	х
CNRM-CM5	x	х
CSIRO-Mk3-6–0	x	х
FGOALS-g2	x	х
FGOALS-s2	x	х
GFDL-CM3	x	х
GFDL-ESM2G	x	х
GFDL-ESM2M	x	х
GISS-E2-H	x	
GISS-E2-R	x	
HadGEM2-CC	x	х
HadGEM2-ES	x	х
INMCM4	x	х
IPSL-CM5A-LR	x	х
IPSL-CM5A-MR	x	х
IPSL-CM5B-LR	x	
MIROC-ESM	x	х
MIROC-ESM-CHEM	х	х
MIROC5	х	х
MPI-ESM-LR	x	х
MPI-ESM-MR	x	х
MRI-CGCM3	X	Х
NorESM1-M	x	х

Table S1. Data availability of CMIP5 model output