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What is an extratropical cyclone?

From Personal Experience:
Wintertime storms in the Northeast.
Characteristics:
- low pressure center
- warm and cold front
- abundance of rain and/or snow

From Theory:
Circulation response to baroclinic instability (Meridional Temperature Gradient).

hence: baroclinic life cycles.

http://www.hpc.ncep.noaa.gov/noaa/noaa_archive.php
Introduction: Extratropical Cyclones and Climate

Climatological Storms Tracks, i.e., Baroclinic Wave Activity

Variance of time-filtered 250 hPa Geopotential Height
(time filtered to isolate synoptic variability)

Storm Track Analysis examines the cumulative affect of storms.

Today I will focus on the individual storms.
What will happen to midlatitude storms in a warmer world?
How will components of the atmosphere that influence storms change with global warming?

(1) $dT_{\text{SURF}}/dy$ decreases :: less low-level baroclinicity.
   *Wu et al., 2011: upper-level baroclinicity increases.

(2) Low-level atmospheric water vapor increases.
Using PV thinking to understand the influence of moisture

\begin{equation}
(1) \quad PV = -g(\zeta_{\theta} + f)\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial p}\right)
\end{equation}

Potential Vorticity = (local rotation + global rotation)*(vertical stability)

\begin{equation}
(2) \quad \frac{d(PV)}{dt} \approx -g(\zeta_{\theta} + f)\frac{\partial \dot{\theta}}{\partial p}
\end{equation}

\[ \dot{\theta} = \text{diabatic heating rate} \]

Potential Vorticity Tendency \approx (rotation)*(vertical derivative of diabatic heating rate)

---

PV inversion offers a useful estimation of midlatitude storm dynamics.

A positive PV anomaly generates \textit{cyclonic circulation} at all points (lat, lon, p).
The strength of the circulation induced decreases radially away from the PV anomaly.
Dynamics of midlatitude storms

Classic Dry Schematic:

**STEP 1:** upper-level trough induces a circulation: warm air poleward and cold air equatorward.

**orange:** circulation associated with upper level PV

**black lines:** surface isotherms

**STEP 2:** upper-level and surface PV anomalies interact

**green:** circulation related to surface PV created by poleward advection of warm air.

Adapted from Hoskins et al. 1985
**Dynamics of midlatitude storms**

**Classic Dry Schematic + MOISTURE:**

**STEP 1:** upper-level trough induces a circulation: warm air poleward and cold air equatorward.

**orange:** circulation associated with upper level PV

**black lines:** surface isotherms

**STEP 2:** upper-level and surface PV anomalies interact

Circulation strengthened by moist +PV.

**green:** circulation related to surface PV created by poleward advection of warm air.

**purple:** PV created by condensational heating and its circulation

*Kleinschmidt 1957*

*Stoelinga 1996*
Moisture forcing of midlatitude storms

Emanuel et al. 1987
moist processes $\rightarrow$ faster development, scale collapse in semigeostrophic system.

Kuo et al. 1992
numerical weather model case studies: moisture strengthens storms
• Filaments of vertical and horizontal transport within storms e.g. Browning 1971.

• Strengthens storm circulation.

Boutle et al. 2011
Changing initial relative humidity in idealized model
→ changes in WCB ventilation
→ changes in storm strength

3-D Schematic of Warm Conveyor Belt

• SLP: black
• Temperature Fronts: blue, red
• Blue/White: Warm Conveyor Belt
• Purple: +PV from diabatic heating
**How will components of the atmosphere that influence storms change with global warming?**

(1) $\text{d}T_{\text{SURF}}/\text{dy}$ decreases :: less low-level baroclinicity.

(2) **Low-level atmospheric water vapor increases.**

*Changes in atmospheric stability might also affect storms*
Midlatitude Storm Results from the CMIP3 GCM Projections

(GCM: Global Circulation Model)

(1) Total number of NH storms decreases – Lambert and Fyfe (2006)

(2) Frequency of most violent midlatitude wind storms increases.
    -Gastineau and Soden (2009)

(3) Amplitude of 99.9%tile of heavy precipitation events per latitude increases in midlatitudes.
    -O’Gorman and Schneider (2009)
What will happen to midlatitude storms in a warmer world?

Results from higher resolution GCM forecasts

**Bengtsson et al., 2009**
No increase in occurrence of strongest storms
(850 hPa relative vorticity)

- *Used GCM with ~60km resolution, ECCHAM*
- *CMIP3 models resolutions range: 80-200km*

**Catto et al. 2011, Champion et al. 2012:**

Same results as Bengtsson.
(using ~60km resolution Hadley Center model)
Results from higher resolution GCM forecasts

**Bengtsson et al., 2009**
No increase in occurrence of strongest storms
(850 hPa relative vorticity)

- Used GCM with ~60km resolution, ECCHAM
- CMIP3 models resolutions range: 80-200km

**Catto et al. 2011, Champion et al. 2012:**
Same results as Bengtsson.
(using ~60km resolution Hadley Center model)

**Their logic:**

dereduced \(dT_{\text{SURF}}/dy\)

balances

strength increase associated with increase moisture.

---

*Given the CMIP3 results & idealized models & weather case-studies*

*Perhaps moisture forcing of storm strength deserves further study?*
What will happen to midlatitude storms in a warmer world?

Can we approach the original question, in a simpler manner?

Idealized life cycle experiments!

• Changing moisture in initial conditions leads to:
  • weak change in storm (Pavan et al. 1999)
  • strong change in storm (Boutle et al. 2011)

Our question:

What is the response of idealized midlatitude storms to changes in moisture?
Experiment and Methods

**Method:** integrations of a baroclinic wave in a channel.

**Model:** WRF: Weather Research and Forecasting Model

- **Domain:** 80° of latitude centered at 45° N
  50° of longitude, periodic in zonal direction
- f-plane
- Horizontal grid spacing: 50 km.

**Parameterizations:**
- convection
- turbulent mixing within the planetary boundary layer
- bulk microphysics
  *No radiation in the integrations*

Surface Boundary: $\text{SST} = T_{\text{SURF}}^- .5 \text{ C}$

i.e., there is a moisture source at the surface.
Initial Conditions

Zonal Wind (shading) and Potential Temperature (contours)

Relative Humidity (shading) and Specific Humidity (contours)

\( T \text{ at } 45^\circ = 280\text{K} \)

Analytic, balanced initial conditions for T,U from Polvani and Esler 2007
Results of the Integration: A Midlatitude Storm

Snapshots of Storm Evolution for Control Integration

(a) EKE ¼ max, Day 6.5
(b) EKE ½ max, Day 8
(c) EKE max, Day 9.5

SLP contours (Thickest: 1000hPa. contour interval: 10 hPa)
Precipitation Rates (mm/day), yellow-red: resolved, blue-purple: cumulus
Experiment #1: DRY-TO-OBSERVED Initial conditions of Relative Humidity (RH)

*Replicating Boutle et al. (2011)*

\[
RH = RH_0 \times \begin{cases} 
(1 - 0.85 \times \frac{Z}{Z_T})^{1.25} & \text{for } Z \leq Z_T \\
0.12 & \text{for } Z > Z_T
\end{cases}
\]

- Six integrations with 6 different values of RH0: 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 0.95

RH0 = 0.8 creates conditions closest to observations

Surface Boundary: SST = T_{SURF} - .5 C

i.e., there is a moisture source at the surface.
Results: RH₀ Set of Experiments

Eddy Kinetic Energy:: EKE

\[ EKE = \int_{VOL} \rho \ast 1/2 \left( (u^\ast)^2 + (v^\ast)^2 \right) \]

\[ u^\ast = u - \left\langle u \right\rangle \]

\[ \left\langle \cdot \right\rangle \equiv \text{zonal mean} \]

- The storm eddy kinetic energy increases monotonically with RH₀.
- Storm growth rate increases.
- EKE increase for RH₀ = 0.0 vs. 0.8 : ~ 100%.
- The increase for RH₀ = 0.8 to 1 is the smallest.
Alternate Storm Strength Metrics

**Storm Central Pressure Minimum ::**  
\( \text{CTR-PRES}_{\text{MIN}} \)

-objectively identify minimum SLP at each time step

**Strongest winds::**  \( \text{WIND99} \)

-strongest 99\(^{th}\) percentile for surface wind speed.

\( \text{CTR-PRES}_{\text{MIN}} \) and \( \text{WIND99} \) response:  
larger initial RH creates a stronger storm

---

**Results: RH\(_0\) Set of Experiments**

![CTR-PRES\(_{MIN}\) for RH\(_0\) Experiment](chart)

![WIND99 for RH\(_0\) Experiment](chart)
Storm Precipitation Extremes

(a) Strongest 99th percentile precipitation rate for precipitation created at the resolved scale (mm/hour).

(b) Strongest 99th percentile precipitation rate precipitation rate for precipitation created by the cumulus* scheme (mm/hour).

Extreme Rain rates respond to changes in RH₀ in the same manner as EKE.

*What is cumulus precipitation?: rain formed by the vertical mixing parameterized by the cumulus scheme.
Increase in strength with RH0 is robust across various horizontal grid-spacing.

Results for RH0 experiments using:
25 km (red), 50 km (green), 100 km (black) and 200 km (blue).

*Solid lines show RH0 = 0.8*
*Dashed lines show RH0 = 0.*

**Eddy Kinetic Energy**

**WIND99**

**KEY:** Increase in storm strength with DX is primarily caused by a decrease in the numerical diffusion.
Increase in strength with RH0 is robust across various horizontal grid-spacing.

**The storm response to RH\textsubscript{0} is also robust to changes in the cumulus and microphysics parameterizations schemes.**
Are the RH$_0$ experiments the best method for understanding moisture changes with global warming?

- With global warming, changes in RH are expected to be small, e.g. Sherwood et al. 2010.
- Changing temperature would increase moisture, but where should we warm?
Are the RH$_0$ experiments the best method for understanding moisture changes with global warming?

- With global warming, changes in RH are expected to be small, e.g. Sherwood et al. 2010.
- Changing temperature would increase moisture, but where should we warm?

**Method 2** for changing moisture, add a coefficient into Clausius-Clapeyron Equation

*inspired by Frierson et al. 2008*

$$q_{SAT} = C_{SVP} \times 6.11 \times e^{\left(\frac{L_v}{R_v} \times \left(\frac{1}{273} - \frac{1}{T}\right)\right)}$$

$C_{SVP} ::$ coefficient of saturation vapor pressure

$C_{SVP} = 1$ creates observed initial conditions
Experiment #2: DRY-TO-OBSERVED by changing saturation vapor pressure.

We start with an analog to the RH\(^0\) experiment.

Run 6 integrations, with \(C_{SVP}\) ranging from 0 \(\rightarrow\) 1 with intervals of 0.2

\[
q_{SAT} = C_{SVP} \times 6.11 \times e^{\left(\frac{L_v}{R_v} \times \left(\frac{1}{273} - \frac{1}{T}\right)\right)}
\]
**Results:** $\Delta C_{SVP}$ DRY-TO-OBSERVED

**Eddy Kinetic Energy :: EKE**

\[
EKE = \int_V \rho \frac{1}{2} \left( (u^*)^2 + (v^*)^2 \right)
\]

**Storm Central Pressure Minimum :: CTR-PRES\textsubscript{MIN}**

**Strongest winds :: WIND99**

-value of the strongest 99th percentile for surface wind speed.

Storm strength increases with increasing moisture content: consistent with the RH\textsubscript{0} experiment.
Experiment #3: OBSERVED-TO-2X-OBS by changing saturation vapor pressure.

\[ q_{SAT} = C_{SVP} \times 6.11 \times e^{\left(\frac{L_v}{R_v} \times \left(\frac{1}{273} - \frac{1}{T}\right)\right)} \]

- \( C_{SVP} \): coefficient of saturation vapor pressure
- \( C_{SVP} = 1 \) creates observed initial conditions

**Run 6 integrations, with \( C_{SVP} \) ranging from 1 \( \rightarrow \) 2 with intervals of 0.2

i.e., synthetically increase moisture content beyond observed values.
Results: Moisture content greater than observed

Eddy Kinetic Energy :: $EKE$

$$EKE = \int_{VOL} \rho \cdot \frac{1}{2} \left( (u^*)^2 + (v^*)^2 \right)$$

Storm Central Pressure Minimum :: $CTR\text{-}PRES_{\text{MIN}}$
-objectively identify minimum in sea level pressure following the storm.

Strongest winds:: $WIND99$
-value of the strongest 99th percentile for surface wind speed.

EKE: -maximum changes non-monotonically.

Growth rate increases with moisture.

CTR-PRES$_{\text{MIN}}$ deepens with increased moisture.

$WIND99$ increases.
Results: Moisture content greater than observed.

Eddy Kinetic Energy ::
EKE

\[ \text{EKE} = \int_{VOL} \rho \frac{1}{2} \left( (u^*)^2 + (v^*)^2 \right) \]

Storm Central Pressure Minimum ::
CTR-PRES_{\text{MIN}}
-objectively identify minimum in sea level pressure following the storm.

Strongest winds::
WIND99
-value of the strongest 99th percentile for surface wind speed.

Results:

PURPLE CURVE
\( C_{\text{SVP}} = 1.2 \)
corresponds to a moisture increase with the magnitude predicted by GCMs for 2100.

For all 3 metrics:

\( C_{\text{SVP}} = 1.2 \) does not create a substantial change.
(a) PRCP99\textsubscript{RES} :: Strongest 99\textsuperscript{th} percentile precipitation rate for precipitation created at the resolved scale (mm/hour).

(b) PRCP99\textsubscript{CU} :: Strongest 99\textsuperscript{th} percentile precipitation rate for precipitation created by the cumulus\textsuperscript{*} scheme (mm/hour).

Extreme Rain rates:
- no change in maxima at resolved scale.
- increase in maxima for cumulus.

Total amount of rainfall increased monotonically.

$C_{\text{SVP}} = 1.2$ does not create a large change.
Can we explain the EKE behavior for $C_{SVP} > 1$?

Experiment 3: Increasing CSVP from 1 $\rightarrow$ 2.

Response of TKE a monotonic increase with moisture; i.e, the same as SLP$_{MIN}$ and WIND99.
The meridional extent of the storm decreases as moisture increases.
Experiment #3: Explanation for storm response

Mechanism affecting both storms:

Increase in conditional instability → increased verticality of warm conveyor belt.

Wind speed versus height also shows the increased verticality of the storms.

Interesting?:
- Horizontal scale decreases with moisture increase, consistent Emanuel et al. 1987.
- Vertical scale increases with moisture increase
Summary & Conclusions

① Increasing moisture from dry to observed:
   Strengthens the storm EKE, CTR-PRES$_{\text{MIN}}$, WIND99 and precipitation

   Cause: positive-PV anomaly generated by latent heat release within warm conveyor belt (WCB).

   Storm develops faster.

② For moisture increased above observed values:
   Increased vertical motion within the WCB affects storm response: EKE decreases, while strongest surface winds and precipitation increase.

   Storm develops faster.

IMPLICATIONS
   Moisture increase will not lead to stronger magnitude of extreme storms. However:
   - storm growth rates could increase
   - the number of moderate storms could increase.

Booth et al. Climate Dynamics (early online release)
Can we explain the increase in strength?
Snapshots of Storm Evolution for Control Integration

(a) EKE $\frac{1}{4}$ max, Day 6.5  
(b) EKE $\frac{1}{2}$ max, Day 8  
(c) EKE max, Day 9.5

SLP contours (Thickest: 1000 hPa, contour interval: 10 hPa)  
Precipitation Rates (mm/day), yellow-red: resolved, blue-purple: cumulus
Can we explain the increase in strength?

Cross section of 2PVU at midpoint of storm shows: warm conveyor belt has is more upright and larger for higher RH$_0$.

(1 PVU = 10$^{-6}$ K kg$^{-1}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$)

At full EKE, height maximum of warm conveyor belt is larger for larger RH$_0$.
Final RH conditions help to show the warm conveyor belt.

**Cross Sections of RH at time of EKE_{max}**

**INITIAL CONDITIONS**

**DAY 9.5 (EKE = max)**
Two ways to think about the impact of latent heat release during stable moist ascent:

**the external approach:**
latent heat release is regarded as an external forcing mechanism that ... drives or helps to drive the vertical circulation (fits with potential vorticity view).

**the stratification approach:**
the latent heat release ... is manifested as a modification to the stratification in the vertical advection term of the thermodynamic equation:

\[
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + u \nabla H \theta + \omega \left[ \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial p} - \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial p} \right]_{\theta_{esat}} = 0
\]

Nielson-Gammon and Keyser, MWR, 2000
NEXT: zonal mean @ green line + 5° of latitude.

**Precipitation and SLP versus $C_{SV}$**

(a) $C_{SV} = 1.0$

(b) $C_{SV} = 2.0$
Mechanism affecting storms:

- Increase in moisture
  - more latent release and increase in conditional instability.
  - increased verticality and decrease in meridional extent of warm conveyor belt.

Explanation of storm response

2PVU Cross-section at time of EKE max

Green: $C_{SVP} = 1.00$, Red: $C_{SVP} = 2.00$

3-D Schematic of Warm Conveyor Belt
Explanation of storm response

Mechanism affecting storms:

Increase in moisture

→ more latent release and increase in conditional instability.

→ increased verticality and decrease in meridional extent of warm conveyor belt.

2PVU Cross-section at time of EKE max

green: $C_{SVP} = 1$, red: $C_{SVP} = 2$

3-D Schematic of Warm Conveyor Belt
T at 45°=275K

T at 45°=285K
T at $45^\circ$=275K

T at $45^\circ$=285K
REVISIT: Dry ($C_{SVP}=0$) vs. Moist ($C_{SVP}=1$)

700 hPa Vertical Velocity

COLORS: $\omega$ (Pa/sec)
SHADING: sea level pressure

Adding moisture leads to scale collapse at the fronts (~Emanuel et al. 1987)
Scale changes for storm as a whole? Needs more work.
\[ \lambda \equiv \frac{\omega' \omega^{\uparrow}}{\omega'^2} \]

Relates to asymmetry of impact that moisture has on vertical motion.

Distribution of all vertical velocities at 1 – 8 km range from init. until EKE_{MAX}.