Synoptic Development during the ACLOUD/PASCAL Field Campaign near Svalbard in Spring 2017

E.M. Knudsen¹*, B. Heinold², S. Dahlke^{3,4} and the ACLOUD/PASCAL team^{5,6,7}

¹ University of Cologne (Germany), ² Leibniz Institute for Tropospheric Research (Germany), ³ Alfred Wegener Institute (Germany), ⁴ University of Potsdam (Germany), ⁵ Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz (Germany), ⁶ University of Bremen (Germany), ⁷ University of Leipzig (Germany)



Research Question

In the sparsely observed Arctic (Fig. 1), is the Arctic amplification



Conclusions

- Short-term variability in atmospheric circulation dominated over the long-term forcing of the Arctic amplification during the campaign.
- Three key periods during the campaign:
 - 1. The cold period (CP; May 23–29, 2017), characterized by cold and dry Arctic air from the north

dominating the synoptic situation?

Fig. 1: Tracks of PASCAL's *RV Polarsternⁱ* and previous shipbased Arctic field campaigns^{ii,iii,iv}.

- associated with widely covering low-level clouds.
- The warm period (WP; May 30 June 12, 2017), characterized by warm and moist maritime air 2. from the south and east associated with less covering and mainly mid-level clouds.
- The normal period (NP; June 13–26, 2017), characterized by close-to-average temperate and 3. moist air from a mixture of regions associated with a mix of earlier cloud conditions.

Objectives

- ACLOUD (Fig. 2 top) aimed to improve the understanding of what role clouds play in the rapidly changing Arctic climate.
- PASCAL (Fig. 2 bottom) aimed to improve the understanding of the Arctic energy



Time Series Variability

Temperature

Ny-Åles





Specific Humidity





Marine cold air outbreak (MCAO) index^{vi} = $\theta_{SKT} - \theta_{850hPa}^{xiv}$ for the central ACLOUD/PASCAL region. | and | separate the three key periods 2^{-12} the cold period (CP), the warm period (WP), and the normal period (NP).





Cold and dry air with thick ABL (Fig. 3),

during the first week, including an anomalous MCAO (Figs. 4 and 5) \rightarrow CP.

budget and its interaction with clouds and aerosols.

Polar 5 and Polar 6 flights, with later dates in brighter colors^v. [Bottom] Tracks of PASCAL's *RV Polarstern* ocean-crossing (PSo) and ice-attached (PSi) position^v. LYR = Longyearbyen, NYA = Ny-Ålesund.

- Warm and moist air with thin ABL (Fig. 3) during the next two weeks, including two moderate warm air advections (Figs. 4 and 5) \rightarrow WP.
- Close-to-average air the remaining two weeks (Figs. 3 and 4) \rightarrow NP.

Data

Time period:

May 23 – June 26, 2017.

Data sets:

- Near-surface meteorological and \bullet radiosonde data from Ny-Ålesund (AWIPEV^{vi,vii}) and *RV Polarstern*^{viii} (Figs. 2 and 3).
- Atmospheric temperature, humidity, \bullet and circulation data from the European Re-Analysis Interim^{ix} (ERA-I; Figs. 4, 5 and 6).

Key Period Characteristics



Cloud cover



- Cloud data from the Infrared \bullet Atmospheric Sounding Interferometer^x (IASI; Fig. 7).
- Sea ice and snow data from more lacksquaresatellite products^{xi,xii,xiii} in manuscriptⁱ.

Fig. 6: Climatologies (1979–2016; contours) and anomalies relative to climatologies (2017 minus 1979–2016; shading) of 700-hPa [left] geopotential height with median wind (vectors) and [right] virtual potential temperature for key periods [top] CP, [middle] WP, and [bottom] NP.

Normal period (NP): Zonal divide (Fig. 6 left). Ο Mixed, average air Ο

Cold period (CP):

• Cyclonic circulation

Cold and dry Arctic air

Highest cloud coverage

Anticyclonic circulation

maritime air (Fig. 6 right).

Lowest cloud coverage

Warm period (WP):

Warm and moist

(Fig. 6 left).

(Fig. 6 right).

(Fig. 6 left).

(Fig. 7).

(Fig. 7).

(Fig. 7).

(Fig. 6 right).

Ο

Ο

 \bigcirc

Ο

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the German Research Foundation through the Transregional Collaborative Research Centre TR 172 – "Arctic Amplification: Climate Relevant Atmospheric and Surface Processes, and Feedback Mechanisms (AC)³".



Fig. A: Set-up of the ACLOUD/PASCAL campaign. From v.

References

ⁱKnudsen et al. Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss. **2018**. ⁱⁱVihma et al. Geophys. Res. Lett. 2008, 35, L18706. iiiTjernström et al. Atmos. Chem. Phys. 2012, 12, 6863-6889.

^{iv}Cohen et al. J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos. **2017**, 122, 7235-7259.

Wed_3_AC-2_337

^vWendisch et al. B. Am. Meteorol. Soc. submt. ^{vi}Maturilli et al. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, **2013**, *5*, 155. ^{vii}Maturilli. *PANGEA*, **2017a** & **2017b**. viiiSchmithüsen. PANGEA, **2017a** & **2017b**. ^{ix}Dee et al. Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc. **2011**, 137, 553–597. *EUMETSAT. *EUM/OPS-EPS/MAN/04/0033*, **2017**.

^{xi}Spreen et al.

Medium cloud coverage

seaice.uni-bremen.de/sea-ice-concentration/, 2017. ^{xii}Fetterer et al. <u>nsidc.org/data/G02135/versions/3</u>, **2018**. xiiiLavergne et al. J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans, 2010, 115, C10032. ^{xiv}Papritz et al. *J. Climate*, **2015**, *28*, 342–364. ^{xv}Etling. *Springer-Verlag*, **2008**.

*Correspondence to eknudsen@uni-koeln.de

POLAR2018, 19-23 June 2018, Davos, Switzerland