

Atmospheric Dynamics Presentation (10/25/24)

Clara Orbe, Natasha Trencham, Molly Menzel, David Rind,
Jeffrey Jonas, Tiehan Zhou, Larissa Nazarenko, Gary Russell


Outline

- New higher vertical resolution E2.2 runs (E2.2X) (APAM Postdoc Natasha Trencham) (12 minutes)
- Ozone feedback on the Brewer-Dobson Circulation (NPP Molly Menzel) (2 minutes)
- Sensitivities of E2.2 to Increased Mountain Drag (David Rind, Jeffrey Jonas) (8 minutes)
- Comparisons of E2.2 vs. E3 with ERA-5 (Tiehan Zhou, David Rind) (3 minutes)

Stratospheric Circulation Biases in E2.2

Problems with stratospheric dynamics in E2.2-AP (hereafter L102)
as we know it:

- Strong northern hemisphere polar night jet/vortex (right)
 - Suppresses sudden stratospheric warmings (SSWs).
- Quasi-biennial oscillation (QBO) direct signal in the equatorial (lower) stratosphere is too weak
 - May be partly why we fail to see many QBO teleconnections, e.g. impact on NH polar vortex strength/SSWs in boreal winter (Holton-Tan Effect), impact on deep convection (Madden Julian Oscillation) in tropics in boreal winter.
- All of these are important, because of their impacts upon surface climate (SSTs, SLP, TSURF, etc.), mainly in the Northern Hemisphere during boreal winter.




E2.2X Increased Vertical Resolution Experiments

- In an aim to decrease these biases, experiments with increased vertical resolution, mainly in the upper troposphere/lower troposphere (UTLS), were performed, as well as control simulation (**L102**):

Experiment Label	Region of increased resolution	Magnitude of resolution increase
L109	50-150hPa	2x
L114	50-90hPa	3x
L128	50-150hPa	3x
L130	20-90hPa	3x
L135	50-300hPa	2x
L156	50-150hPa	4x
L166	50-300hPa	3x


- Focus is on (100 years' worth of) coupled picontrol simulations using E2.2X (historical control simulation showed similar biases relative to MERRA2).
- Boldfaced experiment are highlighted because: (a) they all have same magnitude of resolution increase (3x) so comparison is easier, and (b) did not change resolution below UTLS region, as doing so might complicate interpretation of changes in tropospheric dynamics.

Results: Climatological Zonal Wind Changes (NH, NDJFM)





- Higher resolution simulations help to reduce climatological NDJFM biases of zonal winds, managing to:
 - Reduce polar vortex strength (all);
 - Reduced midlatitude jet strength (L130, L128);
 - Increased strength of subtropical jet around core (L130, L128).
 - Strongest response in L128, which had resolution changes extending into upper troposphere.

Results: Climatological Zonal Wind Changes (SH, JJA)




- Left: SH vortex shows almost opposite bias in L102 relative to MERRA2, showing a weakening and equatorward-shift. Similar weak, downward-shifted subtropical jet bias. Midlatitude tropospheric bias as big.
- L130 and, especially L128, help to reduce this bias in vortex. Explanation seems similar to NH winter (i.e. stronger wave midlatitude convergences, stratosphere + troposphere).

Results: Drivers of NH Vortex Strength Changes




- Changes appears driven by stronger planetary waves (measured by Eliassen Palm (EP) flux convergence) around the vortex (left), extending down into the troposphere (right), driving easterly anomalies in midlatitudes.
 - Wave convergence is stronger in models with vertical resolution changes extending into the troposphere (L128, L135, L156, L166).
- Eddy-mean flow feedbacks then drive anomalous westerlies in subtropics to compensate/preserve angular momentum.

Results: Climatological SSW Frequencies & Timings




- F102 vs MERRA2 (green vs black dots): Due to strong NH vortex, SSWs much less frequent and later in season;
- HR models: Reduced vortex strengths cause more frequent, earlier SSWs. Greatest changes in F128/F156 (enhanced resolution in UTLS region).
 - Note: this is in spite of these models showing *reductions* in midlatitude eddy activity.

Results: Tropospheric Impacts – Mass Streamfunction (NH, NDJFM)




- Left panel: relative to MERRA2, L102 features an anomalously strong NH Hadley cell in boreal winter, and poleward-shifted and weakened Ferrel cell, in-line with poleward-shifted and weakened midlatitude jet.
- L114 shows no change, in line with lack of tropospheric zonal wind response.
- L130/L128 both show reduced bias in Ferrel cell, in-line with reduced bias in midlatitude jet.
- Different responses in Hadley cell, with L130 showing weakening of poleward flank (better), L128 a strengthening (worse). Correlate with different zonal wind anomalies in tropics.

Results: Tropospheric Impacts – Mass Streamfunction (NH, JJA)




- Left panel: in NH Hadley cell appears anomalously strong and equatorward-contracted relative to MERRA2.
- L130/128 appear to help poleward-expand summer Hadley cell. Don't really help with bias in Hadley cell strength.

Results: Climatological Surface Impacts – Sea Surface Temperatures (NDJFM)



- Left: L102 exhibits cold biases in midlatitudes, maximizing around boundary currents, where $dSST/dx$ large. Warm/Cold bias in tropical East/West pacific.
- Higher resolution runs improve extratropical cold biases (largest in L130). No detectable improvement in tropical east/west bias.
- Annual mean picture similar.


Results: Climatological Surface Impacts – Sea Level Pressures (NDJFM)



- Left: L102 shows a weakened Aleutian low/Siberian + Arctic high, and weakened zonal SLP gradient in East/West Pacific. All in agreement with SST biases.
- Similar to SST biases, higher resolution runs do reduce the NH extratropical SLP biases, probably greatest improvement in L130. Slight further degradation of tropical pacific East/West SLP gradient bias.
- Annual mean shows similar picture with weakened anomalies in NH extratropics.


Changes in QBO structure

- F102 vs MERRA2 (black dashed vs solid lines): underrepresents zonal wind anomalies 20-50hPa, and temperature and dT/dz anomalies throughout stratosphere;
- HR models:
 - Improve zonal wind anomalies, mainly 20-50hPa;
 - Struggle to impact T and dT/dz anomalies in lower stratosphere.
 - Interactive ozone configurations (OMA, LINOZ) are more effective at this (DallaSanta et al. (2021)).
 - This may partly explain apparent lack of QBO modulation of tropical convection (e.g. MJO) in these models.








Result: QBO Impacts – Zonal Winds

- MERRA2: NH **polar vortex** strengthened and **subtropical jet** (STJ) equatorward-shifted during QBOW vs QBOE;
- F102: STJ slightly stronger, but not the vortex, during QBOW;
- HR models:
 - F114: No change
 - F130: Vortex stronger, slightly improved STJ equatorward-shift;
 - F128: Vortex even stronger BUT STJ now weaker.



Drivers of Holton-Tan Changes


- MERRA2: During QBOW, upward wave propagation into subtropical stratosphere is suppressed, leading downstream to less convergence around polar vortex so net acceleration;
- F102: both anomalies appear weak;
- F114: some improvement;
- F130: greater improvement;
- F128: even better, but now also excess wave convergence in subtropical upper troposphere, driving STJ weakening, plus other tropospheric changes.




Results: QBO Impacts - SSW frequencies & Timings

- MERRA2: more frequent and earlier SSWs on average during QBOE vs QBOW;
- F102: No real difference in SSW frequencies, earlier onset during QBOW;

SSW frequencies



SSW onset dates



- HR models: Most (all but F135) show enhanced frequency during QBOE vs QBOW; no real difference in timings.
 - QBOI nudging experiments found similar results;
 - Frequencies often greatly amplified during QBOE/ENINO, so even greater improvement in frequencies vs. QBOW/ENINO.

Key Points: Higher Vertical Resolution (HR) Experiments


- HR runs help to improve the following model biases/discrepancies in E2.2:
 - Too strong/weak polar vortex in NH/SH wintertime;
 - Too infrequent, late SSWs in NH;
 - Poleward-displaced NH midlatitude jet and circulation during wintertime;
 - Cold extratropical SSTs;
 - Weak sea level pressure anomalies in NH extratropics;
 - QBO zonal wind anomalies down to $\sim 50\text{hPa}$;
 - Lacking QBO modulation of NH polar vortex strength and SSW frequencies.
- Some HR runs do help with the following model biases:
 - Insufficient QBO modulation of NH subtropical jet position (F130).
- HR runs do not generally help with the following model biases:
 - A Hadley circulation which is too strong/weak in boreal wintertime/summertime;
 - Weak QBO anomalies in temperature, dT/dz and vertical velocity in UTLS region;
 - QBO modulation of SSW timings.

Decomposing the Coupled Response to 4xCO₂


Idealized simulations isolate the impact of warming and composition responses to 4xCO₂.

Validation of Decomposition

Coupled =
Direct CO₂ Radiative
+ Surface Warming
+ Interactive Ozone



Isolated Perturbation Simulations




Decomposing the Coupled Response to 4xCO₂

Idealized simulations isolate the impact of warming and composition responses to 4xCO₂.

Validation of Decomposition

Coupled =
Direct CO₂ Radiative
+ Surface Warming
+ Interactive Ozone




Decomposing the Coupled Response to 4xCO₂

Idealized simulations isolate the impact of warming and composition responses to 4xCO₂.

Validation of Decomposition

Coupled =
Direct CO₂ Radiative
+ Surface Warming
+ Interactive Ozone




Menzel et al. *in preparation*

Strat Warmings and Tropospheric Response


Also (eventually) Change with Climate

- Goal is to assess how SSWs influence the troposphere, i.e., ‘cold air outbreaks in winter, and how it changes as climate changes.
- First requirement is that one gets the proper number of SSWs, and also that they propagate downward sufficiently in the stratosphere to influence the troposphere.
- Number of SSWs, defined as occurrence of east winds at 10 hPa and 60°N during November through March, depends on the strength of the polar vortex; if it is too strong westerly, harder to get winds reduced to east.
- Comparison to ERA5 shows model west winds too strong by ~12 m/s




WHY ARE THE ZONAL WINDS TOO STRONG?

- One possibility is that the planetary longwave amplitudes, particularly wave #s 1 and 2, are too weak.
- Comparison with ERA5 shows they are not too small in the region above 100 hPa





WAVE #1





WAVE #2

- Andrews and McIntyre (1976) Non-interaction theorem suggests that for waves to affect the mean flow there needs to be dissipation or transience. Maybe there is not enough dissipation.
- The mountain drag was increased to 'optimum' levels (by increasing their frequency and strengthening their drag coefficient), to produce a weaker polar vortex. It does this by acting directly on zonal winds and by allowing planetary waves to act on them also.
- It did reduce zonal winds, although they are still a little too strong (~ 5 m/s) as is the polar vortex strength



AMIP




COUPLED

Other experiments, particularly removing the UV filter on the winds, seems to help further, as seen in the 50 hPa polar vortex

COUPLED


CONTROL

Height at 50mb 20 DJF Avgs Control (PI) – ERA5 (Modern)
(Control is Coupled)



OPTIMIZED


Height at 50mb 20 DJF Avgs Optimized (PI) – ERA5 (Modern)
(Optimized = Coupled w/ Mtn C=.4 F=55)




OPTIMIZED + NO UV FILTER

AMIP


Height at 50mb DJF Avgs Control (PI) – ERA5 (Modern)



Height at 50mb DJF Avgs No Wind Filters (PI) – ERA5 (Modern)




Height at 50mb DJF Avgs Optimized w/ No Wind Filters (PI) – ERA5 (Modern)
(Optimized w/ No Wind Filter with prescribed SSTs)



CONTROL

E2.2AP
E06F102oQ40


Zonal U Wind
Daily DJFM at 61°N



OPTIMIZED



E2.2AP
E06F102oQ40
Mtn Drag C=.4 F=55%

Zonal U Wind
Daily DJFM at 61°N



HAVE WE MADE ANY PROGRESS?

- Standard model is deficient in number of SSWs
Observed: 62% of winters; Model: 32%
- There is some increase in the Optimized run but it seems to vary depending on the number of years run, since there are some 'dry spells'. Longer runs are needed.
- Optimized Model does seem to have more downward propagating events, as can be seen in zonal wind record and by using Polar Cap Height anomalies
- Greater mountain drag does reduce planetary wave amplitudes, especially wave #2 (wave #1 was too large before so now is actually better).



Now 20% below
observations


CONTROL

Control

Polar Cap Height Anomalies

E2.2AP

Daily DJFM



OPTIMIZED


Mtn Drag

C=.4 F=55%

Polar Cap Height Anomalies


E2.2AP

Daily DJFM




Both Standard and Optimized produce the proper Surface Air Temperature and SLP responses

Figure 1: Surface climate response to SSWs




Sigmond et al., 2013
Contours show SLP
Colors show SAT

SURF AIR TEMPERATURE




E2.2SP

Following
15-60 day
anomalies
from
climatology






E2.2AP



OPTIMIZED


SEA LEVEL PRESSURE



SH issues for Optimized run...


CONTROL

Height at 50mb 20 JJA Avgs Control (PI) – ERA5 (Modern)
(Control is Coupled)



OPTIMIZED

Height at 50mb 20 JJA Avgs Optimized (PI) – ERA5 (Modern)
(Optimized = Coupled w/ Mtn C=.4 F=55)



CONTINUING WORK

- Continue experiments to reduce polar vortex strength a little more
- See if 'Optimized' version run with higher vertical resolution produces changes in SSWs and their downward propagation
- Investigate impact of transient EKE in stratosphere – in the model, there is more energy in transient waves than in the standing waves
- Produce daily vertical energy flows (EP fluxes) to discriminate between energy propagation up vs. down between troposphere and stratosphere
- See if warmer model (currently being run) can impact polar vortex
- Ultimately see how the events which influence the troposphere change with a warming climate

COMPARISON E3, E2.2 OBS

Part 1: Protocol

E3: $1^{\circ} \times 1.25^{\circ}$

E2.2: $2^{\circ} \times 2.5^{\circ}$

OBS: ERA5, NOAA

P101

ERA 5
MODEL
MODEL-ERA5

P102

ERA 5
MODEL
MODEL-ERA5

(GENERAL FORMAT)

VARIABLE

ANN OR SEASON

P103

ERA 5
MODEL
MODEL-ERA5

E2.2AP











ERA 5
MODEL
MODEL-ERA5

FIVE TAKEAWAYS FROM MODEL E3 COMPARISONS

Areas for Improvement

1. ENSO : Period too long, extends too far west
2. Tropical Moisture/Circulations: Indian Ocean & Indonesia
3. Atmospheric Planetary Waves (Deficient longwave energy #s 1-3)
4. Regions of Importance for Stratospheric Ozone (Too warm – JJA BD too weak)
5. QBO (Too weak, reduced variability); Semi-annual Oscillation too weak


OBSERVED




#1
ENSO

AMP and PERIOD






OBSERVED



ENSO SSTs




OBSERVED






EASTWARD SURFACE WIND
STRESS DURING ENSO

OBSERVED





TOP OF ATM. LONG WAVE RADIATION DURING ENSO









#2 TROPICAL MOISTURE/CIRCULATIONS

SPECIFIC HUMIDITY
DEC-FEB





Anomalies $O(15\%)$

*





RELATIVE HUMIDITY
DEC-FEB



Anomalies 5-15% absolute



SPECIFIC HUMIDITY 300 hPa
DEC-FEB







Anomalies O(20%)





STREAMFUNCTION
DEC-FEB

Anomalies 20-100%







U 850 hPa
DEC-FEB





Anomalies O(20%)







#3 PLANETARY WAVES

ZONAL WIND
DEC-FEB















Anomalies 10-15 m/s

★









WAVE #1
AMPLITUDE
DEC-FEB

Anomalies O(40%)









WAVE #2
AMPLITUDE
DEC - FEB













Anomalies O(40%)



WAVE #3 AMPLITUDE
DEC - FEB







Anomalies 20-30%



U 300 hPa
DEC-FEB

Anomalies 10 m/s







#4
STRATOSPHERIC OZONE
REGIONS OF
IMPORTANCE



TEMPERATUR
E
SEPT-NOV

Anomalies 5-
10°C



*



WATER VAPOR TAPE
RECORDER




E2.2AP magnitude ‘corrected’




★


r1i1p101f1




r1i1p103f1




r1i1p102f1



E2.2AP



ERA5



#5
QBO


NOTE: 1 hPa scales differ

Semiannual wind anomaly 50-100%

★

Extra Slides


Results: Tropospheric Impacts – Mass Streamfunction (SH, JJA)




- Left panel: in contrast to NH wintertime, SH winter Hadley cell appears too weak and equatorward-contracted in F102. Slight equatorward-contraction of Ferrel cell in upper-tropospheric midlatitudes, in-line with lower-stratospheric zonal wind anomalies.
- L114/L130 show no change/slight worsening of Hadley and Ferrel cell anomalies. L128 also slightly exacerbates Ferrel cell anomalies, although upper branch of Hadley cell shows slight improvement.

Results: Climatological Biases – E2.2 vs E3

E2.2-L102 - MERRA2




E3 - MERRA2



Regional Hadley Cell Response to 4xCO₂

Regionally, the Hadley Cell expands where it strengthens (and vice versa), opposing the well-known and robust zonal-mean response of Hadley Cell expansion and weakening.



Hadley Cell Response to 4xCO₂

While the upper tropospheric response largely reflects a zonally uniform upward extension of the troposphere, the mid-to-lower tropospheric response features strong regional variations.

