Growth in the seasonal cycle of CO₂ in the Northern upper troposphere between the IGY and HIPPO

Heather Graven

Scripps Institution of Oceanography

S. C. Piper, R. F. Keeling, Scripps Institution of Oceanography P. K. Patra, Frontier Research Center for Global Change
B. B. Stephens, National Center for Atmospheric Research
C. Sweeney, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
S. C. Wofsy, Harvard University

Seasonal amplitudes at Northern Hemisphere flask sites have grown by 20-40%



Keeling et al. 1996; Cleveland et al. 1983; Randerson et al. 1997, 1999

Comparison of seasonal cycles between the IGY and HIPPO eras at flask sites



Uncertainties based on biweekly standard error in 3-harmonic fits

Proposed causes of larger CO₂ cycle:

- Plant activity
 - $-CO_2$ fertilization
 - N fertilization
 - Warming-induced spring uptake
 - Warming-induced autumn respiration
- Atmospheric transport
- Fossil fuel emissions
- Disturbance

e.g. Cleveland et al. 1983; Bacastow et al. 1985; Kohlmaier et al. 1989; Keeling et al. 1996; Chapin et al. 1996; Randerson et al. 1997; Piao et al. 2008 Similar observations of a growing cycle in upper air have not yet been possible, but they might:

- Demonstrate that changes are occurring at large scales
- Demonstrate that changes are not a result of varying vertical transport
- Help to identify responsible causes and source regions

Flights over

International Geophysical Year CO₂ observations

Conducted 1958-61 by US Air Force, weather reconnaissance flights

Flying at 500 or 700mb

Flights occurred during all seasons

12 flasks sampled each flight, analyzed at SIO

Data updated to current SIO x08A scale



Keeling et al. 1968

Sampling locations in each era



Comparison at 500 mb, 15-25°N



- Bin data by 10° zonal bands
- Assume shape of seasonal cycle using NOAA data
- Optimize gain in seasonal amplitude

Comparison at 500 mb, 15-25°N



Comparison at 500 mb, 25-35°N



Comparison at 500 mb, 35-45°N



Comparison at 500 mb, 45-55°N



Comparison at 500 mb, 55-65°N



Comparison at 500 mb, 65-75°N



Comparison at 500 mb, 75-90°N



Observed change in amplitude, by latitude and altitude

in percer	nt						
500 n	וש 0%	0%	0%	+50%	+30%	+50%	+60%
700 n	1 b +20% MLO					+30%	+50%
1000 n	nb			+30% STP		+40% PTB	
	15-25°N	25-35°N	35-45°N	45-55°N	55-65°N	65-75°N	75-90°N

Observed change in amplitude, by latitude and altitude

in percent							
500 mb	0%	0%	0%	+50%	+30%	+50%	+60%
700 mb	+20% MLO					+30%	+50%
1000 mb				+30% STP		+40% PTB	
	15-25°N	25-35°N	35-45°N	45-55°N	55-65°N	65-75°N	75-90°N
in ppm							
500 mb	0 ppm	0 ppm	0 ppm	+4 ppm	+4 ppm	+5 ppm	+7 ppm
700 mb	+1 ppm					+4 ppm	+7 ppm
1000 mb				+4 ppm		+6 ppm	
	15-25°N	25-35°N	35-45°N	45-55°N	55-65°N	65-75°N	75-90°N

Boreal land fluxes are the main influence on Northern Hemisphere seasonal cycles

Boreal Asia, Boreal N. America and Europe



Temperate Asia and Temperate N. America





45-90°N

Average contributions to seasonal cycle in 5 Transcom3 models at 140°W, using Transcom3 pre-subtraction fluxes for fossil, ocean and land (CASA) to define total amplitude

Observations suggest a large-scale change in boreal fluxes occurred between the IGY and HIPPO

Is this change predicted by the land models participating in CMIP5 for the IPCC AR5?

Do any of the CMIP5 models predict the observed change in the CO₂ cycle at Point Barrow?



Do any of the CMIP5 models predict the observed change in the CO₂ cycle at Point Barrow?



Is the fractional change in CO₂ amplitude in HadGEM2 + ACTM consistent with observations aloft?

Observed							
500 mb	0%	0%	0%	+50%	+30%	+50%	+60%
700 mb	+20% MLO					+30%	+50%
1000 mb				+30% STP		+40% PTB	
	15-25°N	25-35°N	35-45°N	45-55°N	55-65°N	65-75°N	75-90°N
HadGEM2-ES + ACTM		More intense				Less intense	
500 mb	+20%	+20%	+25%	+30%	+30%	+30%	+30%
700 mb	+20%	+20%	+30%	+30%	+30%	+30%	+30%
1000 mb	+35%	+30%	+35%	+40%	+40%	+40%	+40%

Spatial pattern of the change in NEE amplitude



How is the boreal NEE cycle impacted by climate change vs. CO₂ fertilization in CMIP5 models?

HadGEM2-TRIFFID



Significant change already by IGY Mainly influenced by CO₂ fertilization, not climate

Good deal of nonlinearity and/or internal variability

HadGEM2-TRIFFID



IPSL also mainly influenced by CO₂ fertilization, not climate

Fertilization seems to have a stronger effect on amplitude

Climate seems to have a stronger effect on phase

Uncertainties in carbon-climate feedbacks, based on C⁴MIP models, IPCC AR4



Uncertainties in Carbon Cycle Feedbacks

Impact on Airborne Fraction of Total Emissions

Denman et al. 2007

Conclusions

- Large-scale growth in seasonal CO₂ cycle throughout northern high latitude troposphere between IGY and HIPPO
- Likely caused by changing boreal fluxes
- Most CMIP5 models underestimate growth in CO₂ cycle at high latitudes
- Growth in CO₂ cycle could provide a metric for evaluating and improving carbon-climate feedbacks in models

Next Steps

- Test effect of atmospheric transport and synoptic variations on observed and modeled cycles
- Test sensitivity of CO₂ cycles in upper air to amplitude vs. phase of boreal NEE cycle
- IGY-era inversion using available airborne and surface-based CO₂ data