

Arctic Working Group Telecon – October 1st, 2015

## Review of existing modeling studies on Arcticmidlatitudes linkages

Yannick Peings and Gudrun Magnusdottir

### Outline

- Robust results, agreement across different studies
- Uncertain results that need to be reconciled or reproduced
- Suggestions for direction and coordination in future modeling studies

Thanks to Clara Deser, James Screen and Timo Vihma for their contributions !



#### Different types of numerical experiments that have been performed in the literature

# - **AGCM perturbation experiments with repeating sea ice forcing**, from observations or projections, hemispheric or regional

(e.g., Alexander et al. 2004, Balsameda et al. 2010, Bhatt et al. 2008, Blüthgen et al. 2012, Cassano et al. 2013, Deser et al. 2010, Grassi et al. 2013, Honda et al. 1999, 2009, Kim et al. 2014, Kumar et al. 2007, Liptak and Strong 2014, Liu et al. 2012, Magnusdottir et al. 2004, Mori et al. 2014, Peings and Magnusdottir 2014, Pethoukov and Semenov 2010, Screen 2013, Screen et al. 2015a-b, Seierstad and Bader 2009, Semenov and Latif 2015, Strey et al. 2010, Sun et al. 2014, Sun et al. 2015)

- **AMIP-type experiments** with prescribed chronology of SIC and/or SST anomalies (e.g., Kug et al. 2015, Perlwitz et al. 2015, Screen et al. 2013, 2014, Singarayer et al. 2005, Wu et al. 2015)

- **Coupled ocean-atmosphere** experiments (e.g., Deser et al. 2015, Orsolini et al. 2012, Rinke et al. 2013)

- **Simplified GCMs** idealized experiments (e.g., Butler et al. 2010, Hassanzadeh et al. 2014)

US CLIVAR

Many processes are involved ... (Vihma 2014, Cohen et al. 2014)





"Higher-confidence" results (good agreement between numerical studies)

1) Local response to sea ice loss and causes for Arctic Amplification (AA)

2) Late winter negative NAO/NAM response to projected (large) Arctic sea ice loss

3) Teleconnection between Barents-Kara Seas and Siberia



#### "Higher-confidence" results (good agreement between numerical studies)

### 1) Local response to sea ice loss and causes for Arctic Amplification (AA)

2) Late winter negative NAO/NAM response to projected (large) Arctic sea ice loss

3) Teleconnection between Barents-Kara Seas and Siberia



#### 1) Local response to sea ice loss and causes for Arctic Amplification

Response of autumn (SON) surface temperature to observed sea ice loss



Increase in surface temperature (decrease of the surface temperature inversion)

Increase in cloud cover, moisture, precipitation

Warming and increase in thickness of the lower troposphere

#### 1) Local response to sea ice loss and causes for Arctic Amplification





### Sea ice loss is not the only contributor to AA



#### "Higher-confidence" results (good agreement between numerical studies)

1) Local response to sea ice loss and causes for Arctic Amplification (AA)

# 2) Late winter negative NAO/NAM response to projected (large) Arctic sea ice loss

3) Teleconnection between Barents-Kara Seas and Siberia



#### 2) Late winter negative NAO/NAM response to projected large Arctic sea ice loss



Z500 response in Jan-Feb (Deser et al. 2010)



NAO- pattern (equatorial jet shift)

Supported by, e. g., Deser et al. 2010, Peings and Magnusdottir 2014, Seierstad and Bader 2009



#### "Higher-confidence" results (good agreement between numerical studies)

1) Local response to sea ice loss and causes for Arctic Amplification (AA)

2) Late winter negative NAO/NAM response to projected (large) Arctic sea ice loss

#### 3) Teleconnection between Barents-Kara Seas and Siberia



#### 3) Teleconnection between Barents-Kara Seas and Siberia

Response of February air surface temperature to Barents-Kara sea ice anomalies



Honda et al. 2009

# Less sea ice, warming in the Barents-Kara Seas induce a cooling over Siberia/central Asia

Supported by, e.g., Kim et al. 2014, Kug et al. 2015, Liu et al. 2012, Mori et al. 2014, Pethoukov and Semenov 2010



#### "Lower-confidence" results : conflicting findings or based on a single study

1) Remote dynamical response to AA (e.g., signal vs internal atmospheric variability; role of the stratosphere; role of ocean dynamics)

2) Competing influence of regional sea ice anomalies

3) Response in terms of cold winter extremes over Europe and North America

4) Competition between the response to Arctic Amplification and other factors (global warming, oceanic decadal oscillations, etc ...)



"Lower-confidence" results : conflicting findings or based on a single study

1) Remote dynamical response to AA (e.g., signal vs internal atmospheric variability; role of the stratosphere; role of ocean dynamics)

2) Competing influence of regional sea ice anomalies

3) Response in terms of cold winter extremes over Europe and North America

4) Competition between the response to Arctic Amplification and other factors (global warming, oceanic decadal oscillations, etc ...)



#### 1) Remote dynamical response (signal vs noise, model uncertainties ?)





#### 1) Remote dynamical response (signal vs noise, model uncertainties ?)

Diversity in the response of winter SLP



Thanks to J. Screen



#### 1) Remote dynamical response (role of the stratosphere ?)

Response of the polar cap geopotential (NAM anomalies) as a function of pressure and time







Response of the DJF zonal wind to RCP8.5 sea ice loss

d)  $\Delta ICE_coupled$ U(z) 100 150 200 250 300 400 500 700 850 1000 60S 30S 90S 0 30N 60N 90N e)  $\Delta ICE_atm$ U(z)100 150 200 250 300 400 500 700 Deser et al. (2015) 850 1000 30S 30N 90N 90S 60S 0 60N

**Response in OAGCM** 

**Response in AGCM** 

Using an interactive ocean reinforces the NH response and induces SH anomalies



#### "Lower-confidence" results : conflicting findings or based on a single study

1) Remote dynamical response to AA (e.g., signal vs internal atmospheric variability; role of the stratosphere; role of ocean dynamics)

#### 2) Competing influence of regional sea ice anomalies

3) Response in terms of cold winter extremes over Europe and North America

4) Competition between the response to Arctic Amplification and other factors (global warming, oceanic decadal oscillations, etc ...)



#### 2) Competing influence of regional sea ice anomalies

Response of the zonal wind : opposite effect of Atlantic vs Pacific RCP8.5 sea ice anomalies



Sun et al. 2015



#### "Lower-confidence" results : conflicting findings or based on a single study

1) Remote dynamical response to AA (e.g., signal vs internal atmospheric variability; role of the stratosphere; role of ocean dynamics)

2) Competing influence of regional sea ice anomalies

#### 3) Response in terms of cold winter extremes over Europe and North America

4) Competition between the response to Arctic Amplification and other factors (global warming, oceanic decadal oscillations, etc ...)



Arctic Working Group Telecon – October 1st, 2015

#### 3) Response in terms of wintertime cold extremes over Europe and North America

Response of cold extreme temperature (10th percentile) to projected RCP8.5 2080-2099 sea ice anomalies in CAM5



Peings and Magnusdottir 2014

Larger NAO/NAMresponse in February

Response in terms of cold extremes over Europe/North America is less clear than over Asia as it is more dependent on the large-scale dynamical response (NAO/NAM)



#### "Lower-confidence" results : conflicting findings or based on a single study

1) Remote dynamical response to AA (e.g., signal vs internal atmospheric variability; role of the stratosphere; role of ocean dynamics)

2) Competing influence of regional sea ice anomalies

3) Response in terms of cold winter extremes over Europe and North America

4) Competition between the response to Arctic Amplification and other factors (global warming, oceanic decadal oscillations, etc ...)



4) Competition between Arctic Amplification and other factors

ex : Arctic amplification vs anthropogenic radiative forcing

Response of the 700 hPa zonal wind in RCP85 : role of sea ice loss



The response to AA explains the asymmetry between the NH and SH annular mode responses to GHG (competing mechanisms in the NH)

CMIP5

2004)

#### 4) Competition between Arctic Amplification and other factors



Barnes and Polvani 2015



• . . .

## Which questions do we want to address ?

• Attribution of past trends or future projections ? Response to long-term sea ice loss or seasonal prediction ?

- Physical mechanisms (role of stratosphere, of ocean dynamics ?)
- Local role of regional sea ice anomalies or large-scale response to global Arctic anomalies ?
- Role of AA vs GHG in future projections of mid-latitudes climate ?



## What types of experiments ?

• Multi-model AGCM experiments with identical SST/SIC anomalies to assess model dependencies

- large ensemble required to get rid of internal variability, >100 members (Screen et al. 2014)

- AMIP vs fixed sea-ice forcing

- regional vs hemispheric sea ice anomalies to assess local influences (Kug et al. 2015)

- high-top models to assess the role of the stratosphere in communicating the response (Peings and Magnusdottir 2014)

- high vertical resolution in the boundary layer (impact on vertical distribution of heat released by the open sea and on the resulting large-scale response ?)

- additional contributors to Arctic Amplification, other than sea ice loss (e.g., snow cover decrease)

- daily outputs to investigate the response of subseasonal processes such as cold/warm spells, atmospheric blocking, sudden stratospheric warming, ...

• OAGCM experiments since ocean-atmosphere coupling seems to play a crucial role in the response to Arctic sea ice loss (Deser et al. 2015)

- feasibility of a common protocol ?

- availability of computing resources ?

• Importance of AA relative to the full response to GHG changes (Deser et al. 2015, Screen et al. 2015b)

- AMIP-type experiments with projected sea ice loss from RCP scenarios

• ... open to discussion !



Arctic Working Group Telecon – October 1st, 2015

## **Coordination of the project**

• What are the relevant funding opportunities ? (e.g., EU Horizon 2020 "Impact of Arctic changes on the weather and climate of the Northern Hemisphere", Year of Polar Prediction, ...)

• Do we want to suggest a "formal" MIP (Model Intercomparison Project; ArcMIP?)

• Do we want to coordinate with other programs such as CliC (Climate and Cryosphere) that can help with coordination etc ... ?

#### References

Alexander M., U. Bhatt, J. Walsh, M. Timlin, J. Miller and J. Scott (2004) The atmospheric response to realistic Arctic sea ice anomalies in an AGCM during winter. J. Climate, 17, 890–905

Balmaseda M.A., L. Ferranti, F. Molteni and T.N. Palmer (2010) Impact of 2007 and 2008 Arctic ice anomalies on the atmospheric circulation: Implications for long-range predictions. Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., 136: 1655–1664. DOI:10.1002/qj.661.

Bhatt U., M. Alexander, C. Deser, J. Walsh, J. Miller, M. Timlin, J. Scott and R. Tomas (2008) The atmospheric response to realistic reduced summer Arctic sea ice anomalies. Arctic Sea Ice Decline: Observations, Projections, Mechanisms, and Implications, Geophys. Monogr., Vol. 180, Amer. Geophys. Union, 91–110.

Bluthgen J., R. Gerdes and M. Werner (2012) Atmospheric response to the extreme arctic sea ice conditions in 2007. Geophys. Res. Lett., 39, L02707, doi:10.1029/2011GL050486.

Butler A. H., D. W. Thompson and R. Heikes (2010), The steady-state atmospheric circulation response to climate change-like thermal forcings in a simple general circulation model, J. Clim., 23(13), 3474–3496, doi:10.1175/2010JCLI3228.1.

Cassano E.N., J.J. Cassano, M.E. Higgins and M.C. Serreze (2013) Atmospheric impacts of an Arctic sea ice minimum as seen in the Community Atmosphere Model. Int. J. Clim., in press, DOI: 10.1002/joc.3723

Cohen J., and co-authors (2014) Recent Arctic amplification and extreme mid-latitude weather. Nature Geoscience, doi:10.1038/ngeo2234.

Deser C., R. Tomas, M. Alexander and D. Lawrence (2010) The seasonal atmospheric response to projected Arctic sea ice loss in the late 21st century. J. Climate, 23, 333-351, 10.1175/2009JCLI3053.1

Deser C., R. A. Tomas and L. Sun (2015) The role of ocean-atmosphere coupling in the zonal-mean atmospheric response to Arctic sea ice loss. J. Climate, 28, 2168-2186, doi: 10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00325.1.

Grassi B., G. Redaelli and G. Visconti (2013) Arctic Sea Ice Reduction and Extreme Climate Events over the Mediterranean Region. J. Climate, 26, 10101–10110. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00697.1

Hassanzadeh P., Z. Kuang and B. F. Farrell (2014) Responses of midlatitude blocks and wave amplitude to changes in the meridional temperature gradient in an idealized dry GCM, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41,doi:10.1002/2014GL060764.

Honda M., K. Yamazaki, H. Nakamura and K. Takeuchi (1999) Dynamic and Thermodynamic Characteristics of Atmospheric Response to Anomalous sea ice Extent in the Sea of Okhotsk. J. Climate, 12, 3347–3358.

Honda M., J. Inoue and S. Yamane (2009) Influence of low Arctic sea ice minima on anomalously cold Eurasian winters. Geophys. Res. Lett., 36, L08707, doi:10.1029/2008GL037079.

Kim B.-M., S.-W. Son, S.-K. Min, J.-H. Jeong, S.-J. Kim, X. Zhang, T. Shim and J.-H. Yoon (2014) Weakening of the stratospheric polar vortex by arctic sea-ice loss. Nature Communications, 5, doi: 10.1038/ncomms5646.



#### References

Kug J.-S., J.-H. Jeong, Y.-S. Jang, B.-M. Kim, C. K. Folland, S.-K. Min and S.-W. Son (2015) Two distinct influences of Arctic warming on cold winters over North America and East Asia. Nature Geoscience, DOI: 10.1038/NGEO2517.

Kumar A. and Coauthors (2010) Contribution of sea ice loss to Arctic amplification. Geophys. Res. Lett., 37, L21701, doi:10.1029/2010GL045022.

Liptak J. and C. Strong (2014) The winter atmospheric response to sea ice anomalies in the Barents Sea. Journal of Climate, 27, 914-924,

Liu J., J.A. Curry, H. Wang, M. Song and R.M. Horton (2012) Impact of declining Arctic sea ice on winter snowfall. PNAS, doi:10.1073/pnas.1118734109

Magnusdottir G., C. Deser and R. Saravanan (2004) The effects of North Atlantic SST and sea ice anomalies on the winter circulation in CCM3, Part I: Main features and storm-track characteristics of the response. J. Climate, 17, 857-876.

Mori M., M. Watanabe, H. Shiogama, J. Inoue, and M. Kimoto (2014) Robust Arctic sea-ice influence on the frequent Eurasian cold winters in past decades, Nature Geoscience, doi:10.1038/ngeo2277

Orsolini Y., R. Senan, R. Benestad and A. Melsom (2012) Autumn atmospheric response to the 2007 low Arctic sea ice extent in coupled ocean-atmosphere hindcasts. Climate Dyn., 38, 2437–2448.

Peings Y. and G. Magnusdottir (2014) Response of the wintertime Northern Hemisphere atmospheric circulation to current and projected Arctic sea ice decline: a numerical study with CAM5. J. climate, 27, 244–264.

Perlwitz J., M. Hoerling and R. Dole (2015) Arctic Tropospheric Warming: Causes and Linkages to Lower Latitudes. Journal of Climate 28 (6), 2154-2167

Petoukhov V. and V. Semenov (2010) A link between reduced Barent-Kara sea ice and cold winter extremes over northern continents. J. Geophys. Res., 115, D21111, doi:10.1029/2009JD013568.

Rinke A., K. Dethloff, W. Dorn, D. Handorf and J. C. Moore (2013) Simulated Arctic atmospheric feedbacks associated with late summer sea ice anomalies, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 118, 7698–7714, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50584.

Screen J.A. (2013) Influence of Arctic sea ice on European summer precipitation, Environ. Res. Lett., 8, 044015.

Screen J.A., I. Simmonds, C. Deser and R. Tomas (2013) The atmospheric response to three decades of observed Arctic sea ice loss. J. Climate, 10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00063.1.

Screen J.A., C. Deser, I. Simmonds & R. Tomas (2014) Atmospheric impacts of Arctic sea-ice loss, 1979-2009: Separating forced change from atmospheric internal variability, Clim. Dyn., 43, 333-344

Screen J. A., C. Deser and L. Sun (2015a) Projected changes in regional climate extremes arising from Arctic sea ice loss. Environ. Res. Lett., 10, 084006 doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/8/084006

Screen J. A., C. Deser and L. Sun (2015b) Reduced risk of North American cold extremes due to continued Arctic sea ice loss. BAMS, http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00185.1



#### References

Seierstad I. and J. Bader (2009) Impact of a projected future Arctic sea ice reduction on extratropical storminess and the NAO. Climate Dyn., 33, 937–943.

Semenov V. A. and M. Latif (2015) Nonlinear winter atmospheric circulation response to Arctic sea ice concentration anomalies for different periods during 1966–2012 Environmental Research Letters, 10 (5). 054020. DOI 10.1088/1748-9326/10/5/054020.

Singarayer J., J. Bamber and P. Valdes (2006) Twenty-first-century climate impacts from a declining Arctic sea ice cover. J. Climate, 19, 1109–1125.

Strey S., W. Chapman and J. Walsh (2010) The 2007 sea ice minimum: Impacts on the Northern Hemisphere atmosphere in late autumn and early winter. J. Geophys. Res., 115, D23103, doi:10.1029/2009JD013294.

Sun L., C. Deser, L. Polvani and R. Tomas (2014) Influence of projected Arctic sea ice loss on polar stratospheric ozone and circulation in spring. Environ. Res. Lett., 9, 084016, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/9/8/084016.

Sun L., C. Deser and R. A. Tomas (2015) Mechanisms of stratospheric and tropospheric circulation response to projected Arctic sea ice loss. J. Climate, accepted.

Wu B., J. Su and R. D'Arrigo (2015) Patterns of Asian Winter Climate Variability and Links to Arctic Sea Ice. J. Climate, 28, 6841–6858. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00274.1