Dynamical coupling between the stratosphere and troposphere

Tiffany A. Shaw Columbia University SPARC DynVar



Special thanks to J. Perlwitz, CIRES/NOAA & T. Birner, CSU

Motivation: Coupling across timescales



See also Limpasuvan et al. (2004, 2005), Sigmond et al. (2013)



See also Greatbatch et al. (2012), Scaife et al (2005)

• Importance of stratospheric dynamics in North Atlantic response to climate change (Scaife et al. 2012, Karpechko & Manzini 2012)



Adapted from Plumb (2002)

Mechanisms of vertical coupling: Mean meridional circulation

- Non-local balanced response to a given stratospheric torque
 - Eliassen adjustment (Eliassen 1951)
 - Downward control (Haynes et al. 1991)
 - PV inversion (Hartley et al. 1998, Black 2002, Ambaum & Hoskins 2002)

$$\overline{w}^* = \mathcal{L}^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Q}}\mathcal{Q})$$

 $\partial_t \overline{u} = \mathcal{L}_1^{-1} (\mathcal{L}_{1\mathcal{F}} + \mathcal{L}_{1\mathcal{Q}})$

See Andrews et al. (1987)



Mechanisms of vertical coupling: Planetary-scale waves

- Wave behavior determined by given zonal-mean flow via index of refraction (e.g. Charney & Drazin 1961, Matsuno 1970)
 - Dissipation at critical layer (e.g. McIntyre & Palmer 1983) $n_{ref}^2 \rightarrow \infty$
 - Reflection (e.g. Perlwitz & Harnik 2003, Shaw et al. 2010) $n_{ref}^2 \rightarrow 0$
 - Resonance (e.g. Tung & Lindzen 1979, Plumb 1981, Esler & Scott 2005)

$$m^{2} + \frac{N^{2}}{f_{0}^{2}}\ell^{2} = \frac{N^{2}}{f_{0}^{2}} \left[\frac{\overline{q}_{y}}{\overline{u} - c} - k^{2} + F(N^{2}) \right] \equiv n_{ref}^{2}$$

$$\partial_t \mathcal{A} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F} = \mathcal{S} \qquad \mathbf{F} = \left(-\overline{u'v'}, \frac{gf}{T_0 N^2}\overline{v'T'}\right)$$

Role of synoptic-scale eddies



Lorenz & Hartmann (2003)

- In the troposphere variability dominated by annular modes, which are sustained by synoptic eddy feedbacks (Lorenz and Hartmann 2001, 2003)
 - Mean flow conditions in the vicinity of the tropopause affect synoptic eddies via changes in
 - Lower stratospheric shear (Wittman et al. 2007)
 - Index of refraction (Simpson et al. 2009)
 - Isentropic slope (Thompson & Birner 2012)
 - Eddy length scale (Kidston & Vallis 2010)
 - Eddy phase speed (Chen & Held 2007)
- Synoptic eddies can serve as an "amplifier" of stratospheric forcing

Importance of transiently evolving extreme stratospheric events (ESEs)



- Are extreme vortex events the only ESEs of interest?
- What quantities should be monitored in order to forecast ESEs?

- How do waves become extreme e.g., blocking?
- How important are wave resonance and reflection in tropospheric coupling?

- On average ESEs couple to troposphere but what is coupling probability for given event?
 - Is vertical coupling via planetarywaves & mean meridional
 - circulation sufficient to explain tropospheric response?
 - How does vertical coupling impact synoptic eddies?

Importance of planetary-scale wave coupling

- Extreme vortex events are preceded by anomalous wave activity entering the stratosphere (Polvani & Waugh 2004)
- Extreme positive heat flux events have been linked to
 - Blocking (e.g. Martius et al. 2009, Woolings et al. 2010)
 - ENSO, MJO, snow anomalies via constructive linear wave interference (e.g. Garfinkel & Hartmann 2010, Smith et al. 2010)
 - Wave resonance (Tung & Lindzen 1979, Plumb 1981, Esler & Scott 2005)
- Extreme negative heat flux events have been linked to
 - Downward wave coupling involving transient dynamical cooling (analogous to dynamical warming events)
 - Poleward jet shift in the Atlantic basin (Shaw & Perlwitz 2013a,b)
- Idealized model studies support role of planetary waves in tropospheric coupling (Plumb & Semeniuk 2003, Song & Robinson 2004, Sun et al. 2011)

- Extreme planetary-wave coupling events defined using highlatitude (60-90N) wave-1 heat flux
 - Significantly violate non-acceleration conditions
 - Importance of wave focusing (McIntyre 1982)



Transient EP flux convergence = dynamical warming Reversal of zonal-mean zonal wind Transient EP flux divergence = dynamical cooling Reversal of residual circulation

> Figures courtesy of E. Dunn-Sigouin See poster by Shaw & Perlwitz





- Stratospheric variability linked to NAO-like variability (Shaw et al. 2014)
- Importance of wave-induced cavity (cf. Matsuno 1970, McIntyre 1982), self-tuning (Plumb 1981)



 Planetary wave signal amplified by synoptic eddies (not reversible, dominate zonal mean)

- Extreme heat flux events linked to tendency of mean flow
 - Transient dynamical (adiabatic) warming and cooling events via vertical advection (see poster by Shaw & Perlwitz)
 - Circulation coupled to wave source/sink in troposphere (Shaw & Perlwitz 2013b)
- Extreme heat flux events occur during vortex events (Dunn-Sigouin & Shaw 2014)
- Transient change dominate long time averages
- Stratospheric radiative timescales are also important (Charlton and O'Neil 2010, Hitchcock et al. 2010, 2013)
 - Coupling to chemistry during ESEs needs to be explored

troposphere

Importance of feedbacks from synopticscale eddies

- During extreme vortex events synoptic scale eddies organize and feedback onto anomalies near the tropopause (Limpasuvan et al. 2004, 2005, Kunz & Greatbatch 2013)
- Eddies may feedback onto mean meridional circulation anomalies
 - Song & Robinson (2004) showed that "downward control with synoptic eddy feedbacks" (DCWEF) is not sufficient to explain tropospheric response in idealized model simulations (see also Charlton et al. 2005)
- Feedbacks onto planetary-scale wave modulated basic state have also been suggested (DeWeaver & Nigam 2000)
- Strong synoptic eddy feedbacks make it difficult to determine cause of original anomaly (Garfinkel et al. 2013)
 - Must focus on transient evolution

Impacts of a degraded stratosphere: Insights from CMIP5



Impacts of a degraded stratosphere: Insights from CMIP5



CMIP5 models exhibit large differences in their representation of stratospheric heat flux extremes

Small = dominantly high-top models Large = low-top models

Biased stratospheric heat flux extremes linked to biased N. Atlantic jet stream in the troposphere



Shaw et al. (2014)

 $c.i. = 1 m s^{-1}$

Stratospheric biased linked to biased distribution of tropospheric variability



What have we learned?

- Key ingredients for dynamical stratosphere-troposphere coupling are mean meridional circulation, planetary and synoptic scale waves
 - Mechanisms span all time scales
- Understanding transient dynamical coupling via extreme events is key
 - Time-integrated evolution relates to longer time scales (e.g. interannual variability, response to 2 x CO2) due to irreversibility
- Planetary-scale waves exhibit rich behavior in high latitudes
 - Transient dynamical warming & cooling events (role of 'self-tuning'?)
 - Coupled to equatorward and poleward jet shifts in the Atlantic basin
- Synoptic-scale eddies exhibit strong positive feedbacks that amplify anomalies (tropospheric response not reversible)
- In general low-top models underestimate stratospheric variability
 - Biased stratospheric variability impacts climatology and variability of Atlantic jet stream in the troposphere
 - Model lid height is not sufficient condition for assessing tropospheric impacts (effect of tuning parameterizations)

Where should we go from here?

- Is it time to declare victory on high top/low top? (Shepherd)
 - What are the necessary criteria for a stratosphere-resolving model?
- Outstanding questions regarding mechanisms should be targeted with idealized and comprehensive model experiments
- In order to test mechanisms models must represent relevant dynamics
 - Extreme vortex and planetary wave coupling events, synoptic eddies
- Role for mechanism denial experiments with idealized GCMs
 - Used in studies of the MJO (Kim et al. 2011)
 - Suppress (Domeisen & Plumb 2012) or prescribe (Domeisen et al. 2013) synoptic wave fluxes
 - Transient experiments (e.g. Hardiman & Haynes 2008)
 - Not trivial to control eddy feedbacks