

Geophysical Research Letters

RESEARCH LETTER

10.1029/2019GL085565

Special Section:

Atmospheric Rivers:
Intersection of Weather and Climate

Key Points:

- Heat transport during landfalling atmospheric rivers is explicitly computed for western North America and Europe
- Under global warming, latent heat transport increases across all regions in the mid-latitudes where sensible heat decreases (increases) for western North America (Europe)
- Upper-level meridional wind component dominates changes in heat transport

Supporting Information:

- Supporting Information S1
- Figure S1
- Figure S2
- Figure S3
- Figure S4
- Figure S5
- Figure S6
- Figure S7
- Figure S8
- Figure S9
- Figure S10

Correspondence to:

C. A. Shields,
shields@ucar.edu

Citation:

Shields, C. A., Rosenbloom, N., Bates, S., Hannay, C., Hu, A., Payne, A. E., et al. (2019). Meridional heat transport during atmospheric rivers in high-resolution CESM climate projections. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46, 14,702–14,712. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085565>

Received 25 SEP 2019

Accepted 6 DEC 2019

Accepted article online 10 DEC 2019

Published online 19 DEC 2019

©2019. American Geophysical Union.
All Rights Reserved.

Meridional Heat Transport During Atmospheric Rivers in High-Resolution CESM Climate Projections

Christine A. Shields¹, Nan Rosenbloom¹, Susan Bates¹, Cecile Hannay¹, Aixue Hu¹, Ashley E. Payne², Jonathan J. Rutz³, and John Truesdale¹

¹National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA, ²University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, ³National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Salt Lake City, UT, USA

Abstract Meridional sensible and latent heat transport is evaluated for regions with landfalling atmospheric rivers using both MERRA-2 reanalysis and fully coupled CESM1.3 high-resolution climate projections. Western North America, the United Kingdom, and the Iberian Peninsula are chosen to represent the regions significantly impacted by atmospheric rivers (ARs). CESM1.3 historical simulations can accurately represent both sensible and latent regional meridional heat transports compared to MERRA-2 both for the total period analyzed (1980–2016) and for days with atmospheric rivers only. Uncertainty in these calculations due to AR identification is assessed by applying available Tier 1 AR-catalogs from Atmospheric Tracking Method Intercomparison Project (ARTMIP) to the MERRA-2 analysis. CESM1.3 climate projections suggest that under global warming, latent heat transport increases across all regions in the mid-latitudes where sensible heat decreases (increases) for western North America (Europe). Generally, changes to the meridional heat transport are forced by the upper-level meridional wind component.

Plain Language Summary Atmospheric rivers (ARs) are long, filamentary structures in the atmosphere that transport significant amounts of water and energy from lower latitudes to higher latitudes. They can be considered a subset of an extratropical storm and are commonly found in the mid-latitudes. To date, the majority of research has focused on water transport simply because ARs are an important part of Earth's hydrological cycle and can act as either drought-busters or mechanisms for catastrophic floods, particularly in regions such as western North America and western Europe. Here, rather than focusing on water transport, we analyze two key contributors to total energy transport in the atmosphere: (1) heat produced by the phase changes of water (latent heat) and (2) heat produced by a change in temperature (sensible heat). With global warming, for days with landfalling atmospheric rivers, we find that sensible heat transport decreases for western North America but increases for western Europe. Latent heat transport, however, increases across all regions.

1. Introduction

Atmospheric rivers (ARs) are typically known for their ability to transport large amounts of moisture from tropical and subtropical locations into the mid and high latitudes (Bonne et al., 2015; Dettinger, 2011; Dettinger et al., 2011; Gorodetskaya et al., 2014; Ralph et al., 2004, 2005, 2011, 2013). They provide relief to drought-stricken communities (Dettinger, 2013), or they can inundate coastal locations, causing floods and natural disasters, such as the Oroville Dam Crisis in northern California in the winter of 2017 (Vahedifard et al., 2017). Much of the research to date has focused on the hydrological cycle aspects of ARs with examples from identifying moisture sources and impacts of aerosols (Dacre et al., 2015; Ralph, Iacobellis, et al., 2017; Ramos et al., 2016) to evaluating extreme precipitation and its impacts on the water table, snowpack, and local communities (Guan et al., 2012; Lavers et al., 2012; Lavers & Villarini, 2013; Lavers & Villarini, 2015; Neiman et al., 2008; Neiman et al., 2011). Research has also been conducted on widely different climate regimes from paleoclimate (e.g., Last Glacial Maximum, Lora et al., 2017, and Eocene, Kiehl et al., 2018) to future climates under global warming (Chang et al., 2012; Espinoza et al., 2018; Hagos et al., 2016; Lavers et al., 2013; Lavers et al., 2015; Mizuta, 2012; Payne & Magnusdottir, 2015; Shields & Kiehl, 2016a, 2016b; Warner et al., 2015). However, other than quantifying the thermodynamical contributions of moisture transport under climate change (Gao et al., 2015, 2016; Sousa et al., 2019) and investigating air temperature within the ARs themselves (Gonzales et al., 2019), little research has

been devoted to investigating the energy transport explicitly by atmospheric rivers. Understanding energy changes within ARs is an important new direction identified by the scientific community (Ralph, Dettinger, et al., 2017).

In the total energy budget, meridional features are the primary mechanism that carries energy poleward (Barry et al., 2002). There have been numerous studies looking at the changes in the storm track under global warming (e.g., O’Gorman, 2010; Tamarin-Brodsky & Kaspi, 2017) as well as theoretical and modeling studies from the lens of energy transport (Armour et al., 2019; Colman et al., 1994; Siler et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2010). For our study, we specifically focus on atmospheric rivers (a subset of mid-latitude storms) and evaluate meridional heat transport over three regions commonly impacted by landfalling ARs: (1) western North American, (2) the United Kingdom, and (3) the Iberian Peninsula. As a first step toward understanding the contribution of ARs to the meridional heat transport, we focus on the sensible and latent heat transports (SHT and LHT, respectively). This work is organized as follows: In section 2, we present details and methodology for both MERRA-2 and CESM1.3 data sets. Catalogs from Tier 1 Atmospheric River Tracking Method Intercomparison Project (ARTMIP) are applied to address uncertainty due to AR detection methodology (Shields et al., 2018, 2019; Rutz et al., 2019). In section 3, we evaluate heat transport by atmospheric rivers using (a) the MERRA-2/ARTMIP analysis, (b) the CESM1.3 historical simulations compared to the MERRA-2, and (c) the CESM1.3 climate change simulations. Section 4 discusses the primary mechanism behind the meridional heat transport climate response, and section 5 summarizes our work.

2. Data and Methods

2.1. MERRA-2 Reanalysis and ARTMIP

Modern Era Retrospective-Analysis for Research and Applications (MERRA-2) (Gelaro et al., 2017, data doi number: 10.5067/QBZ6MG944HW0) reanalysis data are used for this work to approximate observations. The period, 1980–2016, was chosen to encompass ARTMIP data so a systematic comparison between methodologies could be accomplished as well as quantifying uncertainties in the heat transport quantities simply due to the detection algorithm. ARTMIP is a grassroots effort designed to provide the community with a means of quantifying uncertainties in AR science due to the many detection algorithms currently used and found in the literature (Shields et al., 2018, also see ARTMIP website: <http://www.cgd.ucar.edu/projects/artmip/>). Drawing on catalogs available through ARTMIP, heat transport is computed for ARTMIP MERRA-2 catalogs to determine the spread among the methodologies (supporting information Table S1; Brands et al., 2016; Gershunov et al., 2017; Goldenson et al., 2018; Guan & Waliser, 2015; Hagos et al., 2016; Lavers et al., 2012; Lora et al., 2017; Mundhenk et al., 2016; Muszynski et al., 2018; Payne & Magnusdottir, 2014, 2015; Ramos et al., 2016; Rutz et al., 2014; Sellars et al., 2015; Shields & Kiehl, 2016a, 2016b). Heat transport equations (1) and (2) are shown in section 3 and employ full 3D-field daily reanalysis fields for wind, temperature, and specific humidity. AR tracking is done at 3-hourly intervals, as per ARTMIP design.

2.2. CESM1.3 Model Description and Simulations

CESM1.3 is the high-resolution version of the standard Community Earth System Model (version 1.3) but with several modifications documented in Meehl et al. (2019). The atmosphere component is CAM5 (Neale et al., 2010; Park et al., 2014) and employs the spectral element dynamical core (Dennis et al., 2012; Taylor & Fournier, 2010) at 0.25° resolution (ne120) unlike other standard 1° CESM1 simulations (Hurrell et al., 2013). The land component is CLM4 (Lawrence et al., 2011) at 0.25° resolution, and the river transport model is RTM at 0.5° resolution. The ocean component is POP2 (Smith et al., 2010; Danabasoglu et al., 2011), and the ice component is CICE4 (Hunke & Lipscomb, 2008), where both the ocean and ice are integrated at a nominal 1° resolution. The high-resolution version of CESM is the preferred configuration because increasing horizontal resolution has been shown to better represent the regional hydrological cycle and ARs in particular (Hagos et al., 2015; Shields et al., 2016).

Ensemble simulations for both historical and Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP8.5) experiments were analyzed, although due to some data loss, parts of this analysis did not use all members (Table S2). The years 1960–2005 (historical simulations, three ensemble members) and 2070–2099 (RCP8.5 simulations, two ensemble members) were included for all AR tracking and statistics, at 6-hourly intervals (see Figures S1 and S2 for AR tracking statistics compared to MERRA-2). Heat transport terms were taken from mean 3-hourly data and averaged to daily frequency to match the MERRA-2 data. High-temporal frequency output is

available for heat transport calculations (full field wind, moisture, and temperature) for model years 1991–2005 (historical, one ensemble member) and 2070–2099 (RCP8.5, one ensemble member), although only annual data representing the mean states are presented here. Seasonal cycle climatologies were computed using monthly data, the years 1960–2005 and 2070–2099, respectively.

2.3. AR Detection for Climate Change

For CESM1.3 data, the Shields and Kiehl (2016a, 2016b) algorithm, henceforth called SK2016, is specifically chosen to detect ARs for CESM1.3 data because it was uniquely developed to detect ARs for high-resolution climate change projections. Three regions are targeted for landfalling ARs: (1) western North America (32°–52°N, henceforth called WNAM), (2) the United Kingdom (49°–60°N, UK), and (3) the Iberian Peninsula (35°–49°N, Ib). ARs are required to be longer than they are wide (requiring a 2:1 grid point ratio and a length of at least 200 km), the 850 hPa wind direction must be from the southwest (180–270°) for western North America and have a westerly aspect (180–360°) for western European regions. The 85th percentile of the magnitude of the 850 hPa wind vector is computed to impose a minimum wind strength threshold. It is computed self-consistently from the data set where ARs are being detected. The primary control is the moisture anomaly field where total column water (i.e., integrated water vapor, IWV) is computed using an empirical formula provided in Zhu and Newell (1998), tested in Newman et al. (2012), and also used by Gorodetskaya et al. (2014). Moisture thresholds are based on spatial anomalies and are calculated for each latitudinal band using both the zonal mean and maximum values for IWV. The moisture threshold reference value is then used at each grid point along the coastline to determine if AR conditions exist for each 3-hr interval. The SK2016 detection algorithm is designed to extract stronger storms and ignore weak ones and, thus, is one of the most restrictive algorithms in the ARTMIP suite (Rutz et al., 2019). Comparing the SK2016 to the ARTMIP spread allows the reader to understand how this method varies from others regarding meridional heat transport calculations.

3. Heat Transport in Landfalling Atmospheric Rivers

Similar to Colman et al. (1994), we define sensible and latent heat energy transports as follows:

$$SHT = \int_{P_{\text{bot}}}^{P_{\text{top}}} \frac{1}{g} (c_p v T) dp, \quad (1)$$

$$LHT = \int_{P_{\text{bot}}}^{P_{\text{top}}} \frac{1}{g} (L v q) dp, \quad (2)$$

where *SHT* signifies sensible heat transport, *LHT* is latent heat transport, *c_p* is the specific heat constant, *L* is the latent heat of vaporization, *g* is gravity, *T* is temperature, *q* is specific humidity, and *v* represents the meridional wind. *P_{top}* and *P_{bot}* represent the top and bottom pressure layers and the integral limits (for model or reanalysis data, *P_{top}* is represented by the pressure at the tropopause). Total atmospheric energy transport also includes potential energy; however, we do not consider potential energy here because our focus is climate change, and mechanical energies have been shown to have a small or negligible effect (Pan et al., 2017). Only landfalling ARs are evaluated and isolated over the targeted regions so that heat transport data can be explicitly calculated without influence from other AR-like structures and/or significant moisture transports such as monsoonal flows and tropical cyclones.

Heat transport data are computed daily for the full period (i.e., equations (1) and (2) are solved for each day from 1991 to 2005). We refer to the daily heat transport for the full period as “All-days.” Within this data set, a subset of days with atmospheric rivers are referred to as “AR-days.” These “AR-days” are days where catalogs register AR conditions at any interval during that calendar day. All-days and AR-days are composited into annual means, and transport is computed across the regional boundary. Annual composites of MERRA-2 SHT (left panels, red) and LHT (right panels, green) are shown in Figure 1 for All-days (heavy, black lines), the ARTMIP spread (shaded), and ARTMIP median values (color dashed). MERRA-2 AR-days identified by the SK2016 algorithm are superimposed as a black dashed line. Longitudinal bounds are noted in the above each panel on the right and scaled by the great circle distance to produce the conventional unit of PW. The broad longitudinal swaths shown incorporate not only the coastal regions where ARs make landfall but also upwind oceanic regions impacted during the AR life cycle.




Figure 1. ARTMIP spread for MERRA-2 (1980–2016) heat transport via atmospheric river (AR) for sensible heat (left panels, red) and latent heat (right panels, green). ARTMIP median values are dashed with the maximum and minimum highlighted with shading. Black dashed lines indicate where the Shields and Kiehl algorithm lies relative to the ARTMIP spread. Dark solid lines indicate full heat transport for All-days. WNAM (Western North America, top panels), UK (United Kingdom, middle panels), and Ib (Iberian Peninsula, bottom panels) are plotted (longitude range included in mean is given in parentheses). Transport is computed as an annual mean and the units are in PW.

Each row of Figure 1 shows a different region; WNAM is shown in the upper panels, the UK in the middle panels, and the Ib in the lower panels. Note that although the UK and Ib domains are computed across the same longitudinal bounds and plotted from 20°N to 60°N, the difference between these panels highlights the difference between synoptic-scale ARs making landfall over the UK, and those making landfall over the Iberian Peninsula. Although they are broadly similar, there are some differences between the European regions, especially for LHT where there is a larger ARTMIP spread and broader transport across the mid-latitudes for the Iberian Peninsula. This spread could, in small part, be due to different number of algorithms that specifically target the Iberian Peninsula (see Table S1). The ARTMIP spread illustrates the general agreement in heat transport across different algorithms. The SK2016 algorithm tends to be closer to the maximum value for SHT and closer to the median in the mid-latitudes (40°–60°N) for LHT. Given the SK2016 is designed to detect stronger storms, it is not surprising that this algorithm appears closer to the maximum for SHT values. Also worthy of note is that for most cases, AR-days (median and maximum) tend to exceed All-days in the mid-latitude bands where ARs are most active.

Figure 2 shows a comparison of heat transport quantities in CESM1.3, a sophisticated fully coupled earth system model, against the MERRA-2 reanalysis. Both AR-days (dashed lines) and All-days (solid lines) are shown for the same regions as in Figure 1. Relative to MERRA-2, the model estimates both the latitudinal




Figure 2. Similar to Figure 1 except MERRA-2 Shields-Kiehl AR catalog (SK2016; black dashed line, years 1980–2016) is compared to CESM1.3 historical simulations (red lines for sensible heat and green lines for latent heat, years 1991–2005). AR-days (dashed) are compared to All-days (solid).

distribution of heat transport and its absolute value (shown as PW) reasonably well. AR-days (dashed) for both MERRA-2 and CESM1.3 clearly transport more sensible heat for WNAM in the mid-latitudes compared to All-days, although this relationship is less pronounced for European ARs, which is also seen in Figure 1. For all regions, LHT AR-days (dashed) exceeds All-days for most latitudes with general agreement between CESM1.3 and MERRA-2. The exception to this relationship is seen for WNAM and the Iberian Peninsula, where in the upper-mid-latitudes, LHT All-days (solid) exceed AR-days.

Finally, SHT and LHT are computed for both the historical and RCP8.5 simulations (Figure 3) for the same regions and domains as in Figures 1 and 2. The historical simulation is shown in red for SHT and green for LHT, whereas the RCP8.5 is purple for the respective panels. Dashed lines are AR-days and solid lines are All-days. As one might expect, for WNAM, a region dominated by ARs originating deeper into the tropical and subtropical bands, SHT is reduced for both AR-days and All-days for the mid-latitudes, although ARs are still carrying more heat, on average, than All-days. The European regions are projected by CESM1.3 to receive a modest increase in heat transport for the mid-latitudes, an area that is dominated by the eddy-driven jet and where heat and moisture are sometimes sourced from both lower mid-latitude and subtropical bands. LHT is projected to increase for all the regions northward of 40°N, regardless of AR subsetting. AR-days (dashed), however, are offset equatorward compared to All-days (solid), consistent with ARs dominating moisture transport at these latitudes. Although all areas experience an increase in LHT (purple lines), it is only across WNAM under global warming that AR-days shift poleward by ~2° of latitude (green dashed versus purple dashed).




Figure 3. Similar to Figure 2 CESM1.3 historical simulations (red lines for sensible heat and green lines for latent heat, years 1991–2005) are compared to RCP8.5 simulations (purple lines, years 2070–2099). AR-days (dashed) are compared to All-days (solid).

Figures 1–3 have focused on the broader AR life cycle regions; however, examining the spatial fingerprint for each region is important when looking at climate change mechanisms as discussed in section 4. At the coastlines (Figures S3 and S4), ARs tend to carry more heat compared to All-days (not shown) but are very similar to Figure 3. The exception is WNAM, where the climate change due to global warming is different for the coastline domain compared to the life cycle region. For the greater domain, SHT is projected to decrease, and along the coastline and over the continent, the SHT signal is weak and slightly positive. Therefore, for the mechanism discussion, we will show both coastal and broader domains.

4. Mechanism

The driving force behind how and why frequency metrics change, regionally, in a warming world (i.e., more or less ARs) can be tied to their response to jets and the zonal wind (Payne & Magnusdottir, 2015; Shields and Kiehl, 2016a and 2016b). As seen from equations (1) and (2), however, heat transport is driven by the meridional wind. Therefore, the response of the meridional wind to climate change needs to be considered. Climate change meridional wind (300 and 850 hPa) climatologies for WNAM and UK domains (180°W–90°W and 50°W–30°E, respectively) and coastlines (130°W–110°W and 30°W–0°E) are illustrated via Hovmöller diagram in Figures 4 (WNAM) and 5 (UK) left and center-left panels. For points of reference and a holistic view of the components of heat transport, historical and RCP8.5 climatologies are plotted with variance values in Figures S5–S8 along with temperature and specific humidity changes (Figures S9 and S10). Monthly climatologies start in July and progress through June to emphasize the cool season months




Figure 4. Western North American climate change (RCP8.5–historical) mean annual cycle for 300 hPa meridional wind (left panels), 850 mb meridional wind (left-center panels), sensible heat term (right-center panels), and latent heat term (right panels). Energy terms are computed using AR-days for events making landfall over coastal regions where ARs make landfall (upper panels, averaged from 110°W–130°W) and the broad Pacific Ocean region upwind to landfalling ARs (lower panels, averaged from 180°W–90°W). Units for wind and energy terms are m/s and $\text{kg/m}^3 \times 10^9$, respectively. Meridional wind differences significant at the 95% level are stippled, whereas the energy terms are stippled at 90%. Meridional wind data are computed from monthly mean data, years 2070–2099 (RCP8.5) and 1960–2005 (historical).




Figure 5. Same as Figure 4, except for European coastlines (averaged from 30°W–0°E) and the upwind Atlantic Ocean region (50°W–30°E).

and peak AR activity (Lavers et al., 2012; Neiman et al., 2008; Ramos et al., 2015). Statistical significance, shown with stippling at the 95% level, shows broad areas of significant change for the meridional wind at both 300 and 850 hPa for all domains. Transport terms for sensible heat (center-right panels) and latent heat (right panels) are also plotted in the same style to compare spatial patterns with significance testing relaxed to the 90% level. For simplicity we only show transport terms from landfalling UK ARs, which have a signature similar to Iberian ARs. The coastal domain patterns in Figures 4 and 5 primarily peak between 30° and 60°N for both SHT and LHT consistent with the location of peak ARs frequency. Climate change in meridional heat transport is clearly well correlated to the meridional wind although SHT is far stronger than LHT. Key winter months and the seasonal progression from boreal winter into spring from lower to mid-latitudes align very well with upper-level wind. (Note that, as in Figures 1–3, the absolute values of LHT are approximately an order of magnitude less than SHT.) The emphasis on late summer and early fall for WNAM LHT is likely, in part, due to background moisture availability in a warmer world, under the Clausius-Clapeyron relationship, compared to the historical period. For the broader “life cycle” domain, reductions in WNAM SHT reflect elements of both upper and lower meridional wind response, as do LHT, but with less significance. The broad pattern of reductions in LHT is consistent with weaker winds in the lower-mid-latitudes and stronger winds in the upper-mid-latitudes. For the larger UK domain, the pattern approximates the coastal pattern with the highest significance in the LHT term and peak changes occurring in the shoulder seasons, a finding consistent with projected changes in AR frequency (Shields et al., 2016; Warner et al., 2015).

Acknowledgments

There are many institutions, programs, and people to thank for the enormous undertaking of high-resolution simulations. They include Regional and Global Model Analysis (RGMA) component of EESMP of the U.S. DOE's BER via National Science Foundation (NSF) IA 1947282; National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), sponsored by NSF under Cooperative Agreement 1852977; CESM is supported primarily by NSF; Climate Simulation Laboratory within NCAR's Computational and Information Systems Laboratory (doi: 10.5065/D6RX99HX), sponsored by NSF and other agencies; Innovative and Novel Computational Impact on Theory and Experiment (INCITE) program and Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, Contract DE-AC02-06CH11357; Blue Waters sustained-petascale computing project, supported by NSF (Awards OCI-0725070 and ACI-1238993) and the state of Illinois (a joint effort of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and its National Center for Supercomputing Applications, “High Resolution Earth System Modeling Using Blue Waters Capabilities” PRAC NSF Award ACI-1516624). ARTMIP includes international researchers from universities, laboratories, and agencies. Co-chairs and committee members are Jonathan Rutz, Christine Shields, Ruby Leung, Marty Ralph, Ashley Payne, Travis O'Brien, and Michael Wehner. Details on catalogs developers can be found on the ARTMIP website. ARTMIP has received support from the US DOE (BER) as part of the RGCM and the Center for Western Weather and Water Extremes (CW3E) at Scripps Institute for Oceanography at the University of California, San Diego. Finally, we thank Brian Medeiros and James Benedict for sharing their MERRA-2 daily data and Jeff Kiehl for insight on heat transport.

5. Discussion and Summary

We diagnose meridional heat transport by atmospheric rivers for three regions commonly affected by landfalling ARs, using both MERRA-2 and high-resolution CESM1.3 model data. We explicitly compute both meridional SHT and LHT for landfalling ARs impacting western North America, the UK, and the Iberian Peninsula using MERRA-2, ARTMIP Tier 1 catalogs, and CESM1.3 data. We show that there is general agreement in both transport quantities and latitudinal distribution for these terms across ARTMIP members for the MERRA-2 data, as well as across MERRA-2 reanalysis data and CESM1.3 historical model output. Under global warming, using the SK2016 algorithm and high-resolution CESM1.3 climate change model output, we show that latent heat transport increases across all regions in the mid-latitudes although there is a different latitudinal signature for AR-days compared to the All-days across the full record. For a sensible heat transport, western North America (Europe) is projected to experience less (more) heat transport by ARs. The mechanism driving the changes in meridional heat transport by ARs can be primarily tied to upper-level meridional winds, although regional differences exist. Coastal domains provide a focused view of heat transport by landfalling ARs, while the broader domains inform the larger-scale response. Mechanistic differences between regional ARs in the context of heat transport are evident, in particular for LHT, and illustrate the importance of evaluating ARs from a regional perspective where the climate change response depends on the flavor of AR.

Data Availability Statements

ARTMIP data are available from the Climate Data Gateway, doi: 10.5065/D6R78D1M (ARTMIP Tier 1 catalogs) and doi: 10.5065/D62R3QFS (MERRA-2 source data). Data from all analysis presented here are available through the Climate Data Gateway. High-resolution CESM1.3 simulations are available on NCAR's long-term archiving facility.

References

- Armour, K. C., Siler, N., Donohoe, A., & Roe, G. H. (2019). Meridional atmospheric heat transport constrained by energetics and mediated by large-scale diffusion. *Journal of Climate*, 32, 3655–3680. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0563.1>
- Barry, L., Craig, G. C., & Thuburn, J. (2002). Poleward heat transport by the atmospheric heat engine. *Nature*, 415(6873), 774–777. <https://doi.org/10.1038/415774a>
- Bonne, J., Steen-Larsen, H. C., Risi, C., Werner, M., Sodemann, H., Lacour, J., et al. (2015). The summer 2012 Greenland heat wave: In situ and remote sensing observations of water vapor isotopic composition during an atmospheric river event. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 120, 2970–2989. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD022602>
- Brands, S., Gutiérrez, J. M., & San-Martín, D. (2016). Twentieth-century atmospheric river activity along the west coasts of Europe and North America: Algorithm formulation, reanalysis uncertainty and links to atmospheric circulation patterns. *Climate Dynamics*, 48(9–10), 2771–2795. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3095-6>

- Chang, E. K. M., Guo, Y., & Xia, X. (2012). CMIP5 multimodel ensemble projection of storm track change under global warming. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *117*, D23118. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JD018578>
- Colman, R. A., McAvaney, B. J., Fraser, J. R., & Power, S. B. (1994). Climate dynamics, annual mean meridional energy transport modeled by a general circulation model for present and $2 \times \text{CO}_2$ equilibrium climates. *Climate Dynamics*, *10*(4-5), 221–229. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00208989>
- Dacre, H. F., Clark, P. A., Martinez-Alvarado, O., Stringer, M. A., & Lavers, D. A. (2015). How do atmospheric rivers form? *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, *96*(8), 1243–1255.
- Danabasoglu, G., Bates, S. C., Briegleb, B. P., Jayne, S. R., Jochum, M., Large, W. G., et al. (2011). The CCSM4 ocean component. *Journal of Climate*, *25*, 1361–1389.
- Dennis, J. M., Edwards, J., Evans, K. J., Guba, O., Lauritzen, P. H., Mirin, A. A., et al. (2012). CAM-SE: A scalable spectral element dynamical core for the community atmosphere model. *International Journal for High Performance Computing Applications*, *26*(1), 74–89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094342011428142>
- Dettinger, M. D. (2011). Climate change, atmospheric rivers, and floods in California—A multimodel analysis of storm frequency and magnitude changes. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, *47*(3), 514–523.
- Dettinger, M. D. (2013). Atmospheric rivers as drought busters on the U.S. West Coast. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *14*(6), 1721–1732.
- Dettinger, M. D., Ralph, F. M., Das, T., Neiman, P. J., & Cayan, D. (2011). Atmospheric rivers, floods, and the water resources of California. *Water*, *3*, 455–478.
- Espinoza, V., Waliser, D. E., Guan, B., Lavers, D. A., & Ralph, F. M. (2018). Global analysis of climate change projection effects on atmospheric rivers. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *45*, 4299–4308. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017GL076968>
- Gao, Y., Lu, J., & Leung, L. R. (2016). Uncertainties in projecting future changes in atmospheric rivers and their impacts on heavy precipitation over Europe. *Journal of Climate*, *29*(18), 6711–6726. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0088.1>
- Gao, Y., Lu, J., Leung, L. R., Yang, Q., Hagos, S., & Qian, Y. (2015). Dynamical and thermodynamical modulations on future changes of landfalling atmospheric rivers over western North America. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *42*, 7179–7186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL065435>
- Gelaro, R., McCarty, W., Suárez, M. J., Todling, R., Molod, A., Takacs, L., et al. (2017). The modern-era retrospective analysis for research and applications, Version 2 (MERRA-2). *Journal of Climate*, *30*, 5419–5454. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli-d-16-0758.1>
- Gershunov, A., Shulgina, T., Ralph, F. M., Lavers, D. A., & Rutz, J. J. (2017). Assessing the climate-scale variability of atmospheric rivers affecting western North America. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *44*, 7900–7908. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL074175>
- Goldenson, N., Leung, L. R., Bitz, C. M., & Blanchard-Wrigglesworth, E. (2018). Influence of atmospheric rivers on mountain snowpack in the western United States. *Journal of Climate*, *31*, 9921–9940. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0268.1>
- Gonzales, K. R., Swain, D. L., Nardi, K. M., Barnes, E. A., & Diffenbaugh, N. S. (2019). Recent warming of landfalling atmospheric rivers along the west coast of the United States. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *124*, 6810–6826. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD029860>
- Gorodetskaya, I. V., Tsukernik, M., Claes, K., Ralph, M. F., Neff, W. D., & Van Lipzig, N. (2014). The role of atmospheric rivers in anomalous snow accumulation in East Antarctica. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *41*, 6199–6206. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL060881>
- Guan, B., & Waliser, D. E. (2015). Detection of atmospheric rivers: Evaluation and application of an algorithm for global studies. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *120*, 12,514–12,535. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD024257>
- Guan, B., Waliser, D. E., Molotch, N. P., Fetzner, E. J., & Neiman, P. J. (2012). Does the Madden–Julian oscillation influence wintertime atmospheric rivers and snowpack in the Sierra Nevada? *Monthly Weather Review*, *140*, 325–342. <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-11-00087.1>
- Hagos, S. M., Leung, L. R., Yoon, J.-H., Lu, J., & Gao, Y. (2016). A projection of changes in landfalling atmospheric river frequency and extreme precipitation over western North America from the large ensemble CESM simulations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *43*, 1357–1363. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL067392>
- Hagos, S. M., Ruby Leung, L., Yang, Q., Zhao, C., & Lu, J. (2015). Resolution and dynamical core dependence of atmospheric river frequency in global model simulations. *Journal of Climate*, *28*(7), 2764–2776.
- Hunke, E. C., & Lipscomb, W. H. (2008). CICE: The Los Alamos sea ice model user's manual, version 4. Los Alamos National Laboratory Tech. Rep. LA-CC-06-012, 76pp.
- Hurrell, J. W., Holland, M. M., Gent, P. R., Ghan, S., Kay, J. E., Kushner, P. J., et al. (2013). The Community Earth System Model: A framework for collaborative research. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, *94*(9), 1339–1360. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00121.1>
- Kiehl, J. T., Shields, C. A., Snyder, M. A., Zachos, J. C., & Rothstein, M. (2018). Greenhouse- and orbital-forced climate extremes during the early Eocene. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *376*(2130). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2017.0085>
- Lavers, D. A., Allan, R. P., Villarini, G., Lloyd-Hughes, B., Brayshaw, D. J., & Wade, A. J. (2013). Future changes in atmospheric rivers and their implications for winter flooding in Britain. *Environmental Research Letters*, *8*, 034010. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/8/3/034010>
- Lavers, D. A., Ralkph, F. M., Waliser, D. E., Gershunov, A., & Dettinger, M. D. (2015). Climate change intensification of horizontal water vapor transport in CMIP5. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *42*, 5617–5625. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064672>
- Lavers, D. A., & Villarini, G. (2013). The nexus between atmospheric rivers and extreme precipitation across Europe. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *40*, 3259–3264. <https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.50636>
- Lavers, D. A., & Villarini, G. (2015). The contribution of atmospheric rivers to precipitation in Europe and the United States. *Journal of Hydrology*, *522*, 382–390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.12.010>
- Lavers, D. A., Villarini, G., Allan, R. P., Wood, E. F., & Wade, A. J. (2012). The detection of atmospheric rivers in atmospheric reanalyses and their links to British winter floods and the large-scale climatic circulation. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *117*, D20106. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JD018027>
- Lawrence, D. M., Oleson, K. W., Flanner, M. G., Thornton, P. E., Swenson, S. C., Lawrence, P. J., et al. (2011). Parameterization improvements and functional and structural advances in version 4 of the community land model. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, *3*, M03001. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011MS000045>
- Lora, J. M., Mitchell, J. L., Risi, C., & Tripathi, A. E. (2017). North Pacific atmospheric rivers and 15 their influence on western North America at the last glacial maximum. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *44*, 1051–1059. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL071541>

- Meehl, G. A., Yang, D., Arblaster, J. M., Bates, S. C., Rosenbloom, N., Neale, R., et al. (2019). Effects of model resolution, physics, and coupling on Southern Hemisphere storm tracks in CESM1.3. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *46*, 12408–12416. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL084057>
- Mizuta, R. (2012). Intensification of extratropical cyclones associated with the polar jet change in the CMIP5 global warming projections. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *39*, L19707. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL053032>
- Mundhenk, B. D., Barnes, E. A., & Maloney, E. D. (2016). All-season climatology and variability of atmospheric river frequencies over the North Pacific. *Journal of Climate*, *29*, 4885–4903. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0655.1>
- Muszynski, G., Kashinath, K., Kurlin, V., Wehner, M., & Prabhat, K. (2018). Topological data analysis and machine learning for recognizing atmospheric river patterns in large climate datasets. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *12*(2), 613–628. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2018-53>
- Neale, R. B., Chen, C. C., Gettelman, A., Lauritzen, P. H., Park, S., Williamson, D. L., et al. 2010: Description of the NCAR community atmosphere model (CAM5.0). NCAR Tech. Rep. NCAR/TN-486+STR, 268 pp.
- Neiman, P. J., Ralph, F. M., Wick, G. A., Lundquist, J. D., & Dettinger, M. D. (2008). Meteorological characteristics and overland precipitation impacts of atmospheric rivers affecting the West Coast of North America based on eight years of SSM/I satellite observations. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *9*, 22–47.
- Neiman, P. J., Schick, L. J., Ralph, F. M., Hughes, M., & Wick, G. A. (2011). Flooding in Western Washington: The connection to atmospheric rivers. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *12*(6), 1337–1358.
- Newman, M., Kiladis, G. N., Weickmann, K. M., Ralph, F. M., & Sardeshmukh, P. D. (2012). Relative contributions of synoptic and low-frequency eddies to time-mean atmospheric moisture transport, including the role of atmospheric rivers. *Journal of Climate*, *25*, 7341–7361.
- O’Gorman, P. A. (2010). Understanding the varied response of the extratropical storm tracks to climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *107*(45), 19,176–19,180. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011547107>
- Pan, Y., Li, L., Jiang, X., Li, G., Zhang, W., Wang, X., & Ingersoll, A. P. (2017). Earth’s changing global atmospheric energy cycle in response to climate change. *Nature Communications*, *8*, 14,367. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms14367>
- Park, S., Bretherton, C. S., & Rasch, P. J. (2014). Integrating cloud processes in the community atmosphere model, Version 5. *Journal of Climate*, *27*, 6821–6856.
- Payne, A. E., & Magnusdottir, G. (2014). Dynamics of landfalling atmospheric rivers over the North Pacific in 30 years of MERRA reanalysis. *Journal of Climate*, *27*, 7133–7150. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00034.1>
- Payne, A. E., & Magnusdottir, G. (2015). An evaluation of atmospheric rivers over the North Pacific in CMIP5 and their response to warming under RCP 8.5. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *120*, 11,173–11,190. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD023586>
- Ralph, F. M., Coleman, T., Neiman, P. J., Zamora, J., & Dettinger, M. D. (2013). Observed impacts of duration and seasonality of atmospheric-river landfalls on soil moisture and runoff in coastal northern California. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *14*(2), 443–459. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-12-076.1>
- Ralph, F. M., Dettinger, M., Lavers, D., Gorodetskaya, I. V., Martin, A., Viale, M., et al. (2017). Atmospheric rivers emerge as a global science and applications focus. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, *98*, 1969–1973. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-16-0262.1>
- Ralph, F. M., Iacobellis, S. F., Neiman, P. J., Cordeira, J. M., Spackman, J. R., Waliser, D. E., et al. (2017). Dropsonde observations of total integrated water vapor transport within North Pacific atmospheric rivers. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *18*, 2577–2596. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-17-0036.1>
- Ralph, F. M., Neiman, P. J., Kiladis, G. N., Weickmann, K., & Reynolds, D. W. (2011). A multiscale observational case study of a Pacific atmospheric river exhibiting tropical extratropical connections and a mesoscale frontal wave. *Monthly Weather Review*, *139*(4), 1169–1189. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010MWR3596.1>
- Ralph, F. M., Neiman, P. J., & Rotunno, R. (2005). Dropsonde observations in low-level jets over the Northeastern Pacific Ocean from CALJET-1998 and PACJET-2001: Mean vertical-profile and atmospheric-river characteristics. *Monthly Weather Review*, *133*(4), 889–910. <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR2896.1>
- Ralph, F. M., Neiman, P. J., & Wick, G. A. (2004). Satellite and CALJET aircraft observations of atmospheric rivers over the eastern North-Pacific Ocean during the El Niño winter of 1997/98. *Monthly Weather Review*, *132*, 1721–1745.
- Ramos, A. M., Nieto, R., Tomé, R., Gimeno, L., Trigo, R. M., Liberato, M. L. R., & Lavers, D. A. (2016). Atmospheric rivers moisture sources from a Lagrangian perspective. *Earth System Dynamics*, *7*(2), 371–384. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-7-371-2016>
- Ramos, A. M., Trigo, R. M., Liberato, M. L. R., & Tomé, R. (2015). Daily precipitation extreme events in the Iberian Peninsula and its association with atmospheric rivers*. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *16*(2), 579–597. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jhm-d-14-0103.1>
- Rutz, J. J., Shields, C. A., Lora, J. M., Payne, A. E., Guan, B., Ullrich, P., et al. (2019). The Atmospheric River Tracking Method Intercomparison Project (ARTMIP): Quantifying Uncertainties in Atmospheric River Climatology. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD030936>
- Rutz, J. J., Steenburgh, W. J., & Ralph, F. M. (2014). Climatological characteristics of atmospheric rivers and their inland penetration over the western United States. *Monthly Weather Review*, *142*, 905–921. <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-13-00168.1>
- Sellers, S. L., Gao, X., & Sorooshian, S. (2015). An object-oriented approach to investigate impacts of climate oscillations on precipitation: A western United States case study. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *16*, 830–842. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-14-0101.1>
- Shields, C. A., & Kiehl, J. T. (2016a). Simulating the pineapple express in the half degree community climate system model, CCSM4. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *43*, 7767–7773. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL069476>
- Shields, C. A., & Kiehl, J. T. (2016b). Atmospheric river landfall-latitude changes in future climate simulations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *43*, 8775–8782. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL070470>
- Shields, C. A., Kiehl, J. T., & Meehl, G. A. (2016). Future changes in regional precipitation simulated by a half-degree coupled climate model: Sensitivity to horizontal resolution. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, *8*, 863–884. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015MS000584>
- Shields, C. A., Rutz, J., Leung, L.-Y., Ralph, F. M., Wehner, M., Kawzenuk, B., et al. (2018). Atmospheric River Tracking Method Intercomparison Project (ARTMIP): Project goals and experimental design. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *11*, 2455–2474. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-2455-2018>
- Shields, C. A., Rutz, J. J., Leung, L. R., Ralph, F. M., Wehner, M., O’Brien, T., & Pierce, R. (2019). Defining Uncertainties Through Comparison of Atmospheric River Tracking Methods. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-18-0200.1>

- Siler, N., Roe, G. H., & Armour, K. C. (2018). Insights into the zonal-mean response of the hydrologic cycle to global warming from a diffusive energy balance model. *Journal of Climate*, *31*, 7481–7493. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0081.1>
- Smith, R. D., Jones, P., Briegleb, B., Bryan, F., Danabasoglu, G., Dennis, J., et al. (2010). The Parallel Ocean Program (POP) reference manual, Tech. Rep. LAUR-10-01853, Los Alamos Natl. Lab., Los Alamos. [Available <http://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/cesm1.0/pop2/doc/sci/POPRefManual.pdf>.]
- Sousa, P. M., Ramos, A. M., Raible, C. C., Messmer, M., Tomé, R., Pinto, J. G., & Trigo, R. M. (2019). North Atlantic Integrated Water Vapor Transport—from 850–2100 CE: Impacts on Western European rainfall. *Journal of Climate*, *33*(1), 263–279. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0348.1>
- Tamarin-Brodsky, T., & Kaspi, Y. (2017). Enhanced poleward propagation of storms under climate change. *Nature Geoscience*, *10*(12), 908–913. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-017-0001-8>
- Taylor, M. A., & Fournier, A. (2010). A compatible and conservative spectral element method on unstructured grids. *Journal of Computational Physics*, *229*, 5879–5895. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2010.04.008>
- Vahedifard, F., AghaKouchak, A., Ragno, E., Shahrokhbadi, S., & Mallakpour, I. (2017). Lessons from the Oroville dam. *Science*, *355*(6330), 1139–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan0171>
- Warner, M. D., Mass, C. F., & Salathe, E. P. (2015). Changes in winter atmospheric rivers along the North American west coast in CMIP5 climate models. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *16*(1), 118–128. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-14-0080.1>
- Wu, Y., Ting, M., Seager, R., Huang, H.-P., & Cane, M. A. (2010). Changes in storm tracks and energy transports in a warmer climate simulated by the GFDL CM2.1 model. *Climate Dynamics*, *37*(1–2), 53–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-010-0776-4>
- Zhu, Y., & Newell, R. E. (1998). A proposed algorithm for moisture fluxes from atmospheric rivers. *Monthly Weather Review*, *126*(3), 725–735. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1998\)126<0725:APAFMF>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1998)126<0725:APAFMF>2.0.CO;2)