Impact of North Atlantic – GIN Sea exchange on deglaciation evolution of the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation
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Abstract. In a transient simulation of the last deglaciation with a fully coupled model (TraCE-21000), an overshoot of the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC) is simulated and proposed as a key factor for the onset of the Bølling-Allerød (BA) warming event. There is collaborating evidence for an AMOC overshoot at the BA in various proxy reconstructions although the mechanism governing its behavior is not well understood. Here, we present two new sensitivity experiments to explicitly illustrate the impact of North Atlantic – GIN Sea exchange on the AMOC’s deglacial evolution. Results show that this oceanic exchange dominates the convection restarting in the GIN Sea, the occurrence of the AMOC overshoot, and the full BA warming.

1 Introduction

The last deglacial period (Termination I) harbored several abrupt climatic shifts, including the Bølling-Allerød interstadial (BA, ~14.7–12.9 kyr before present [ka]), with similar timing to the Antarctic Cold Reversal in the south. This is the initial warm phase during the Weichselian late glacial that followed the Older Dryas cold period (18 to 14.7 ka), including Heinrich Event 1, and is followed by the Younger Dryas stadial (12.9–11.6 ka) (Alley et al., 1999).

In a transient simulation of the last deglaciation with a fully-coupled model (TraCE-21000), an AMOC overshoot during the BA event was simulated and proposed as a key factor for the onset of the BA warming (Liu et al., 2009, hereafter L09). For example, the AMOC peaks at nearly 20 Sv (1 Sverdrup = 10⁶ m³ s⁻¹) at the onset of the BA compared with 13 Sv at the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM). In addition to the TraCE-21000 simulation, several water-hosing experiments with different models show an AMOC overshoot during their recovery stage (Manabe and Stouffer, 1997; Stouffer et al., 2006; Mignot et al., 2007; Weber and Drijfhout, 2007). Qualitatively, the occurrence of the AMOC overshoot is robust to different models although the magnitudes of the AMOC overshoot in these water-hosing experiments are usually weaker than that in TraCE-21000.

Evidence for the AMOC overshoot in proxy records is equivocal, with some studies corroborating the overshoot hypothesis (Barker et al., 2010; Thornalley et al., 2011) while others do not provide evidence for an overshoot (e.g., McManus et al., 2004).

The mechanism governing the occurrence of AMOC overshoot at the BA is still not completely clear. L09 point out that the occurrence of the AMOC overshoot at the BA is closely associated with the convection restarting in the GIN Sea; Cheng et al. (2011) agrees with L09, and elaborates on more detailed processes. As a result, two questions concerning the AMOC overshoot at the BA are raised: (1) What is the relative role of oceanic and atmospheric processes for the restoration of convection in the GIN Sea? (2) Could the AMOC achieve an overshoot at the BA without the participation of the GIN Sea?

The oceanic exchange between North Atlantic (NA) and GIN Sea is thought to be an important factor to the
deep-water formation and its variation in the Labrador Sea and GIN Sea. This oceanic exchange impacts the evolution of deep-water formation in these two regions during the Holocene (de Vernal and Hillaire-Marcel, 2006; Hillaire-Marcel et al., 2007), in modeling experiments during a global warming scenario (Hu et al., 2004), and also impacts the AMOC oscillation at both inter-decadal (e.g. Dong and Sutton, 2005; Oka et al., 2006) and centennial-to-millennial timescales (Schulz et al., 2007). In some studies of the water-hosing experiments, the significant importance of this oceanic exchange on the AMOC recovery is also identified (e.g., Vellinga and Wood, 2002; Krebs et al., 2007).

Here, we present two new additional sensitivity experiments to address the questions mentioned above.

2 Model and experiment setup

The climate model used in this study is the low-resolution version of the Community Climate System Model, Version 3 (CCSM3 T31_lg3xv5) with a dynamic global vegetation module. CCSM3 is a global, coupled ocean-atmosphere-sea ice-land surface climate model without flux adjustment (Yeager et al., 2006; Collins et al., 2006a). The atmospheric model is the Community Atmosphere Model Version 3 (CAM3) with horizontal resolution of about 3.75° × 3.75° and 26 vertical hybrid coordinate levels (Collins et al., 2006b). The land model is the Community Land Model Version 3 (CLM3) with same resolution as the atmosphere (Dickinson et al., 2006). The ocean model is the NCAR implementation of the Parallel Ocean Program (POP) with vertical z-coordinate and 25 levels (Smith and Gent, 2002). The longitudinal resolution is 3.6 degrees and the latitudinal resolution is variable, with finer resolution in the tropics and NA. The sea ice model is the Community Sea Ice Model (CSIM) with the same resolution as the ocean model (Briegleb et al., 2004).

Table 1. Configuration of sensitivity experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting time</th>
<th>Restoring</th>
<th>Restoring time scale</th>
<th>Restoring depth range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB_PreBA 14.77 ka PreBA 90 days 50 m – bottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB_REC 14.5 ka REC 90 days 50 m – bottom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, two sensitivity experiments are initiated from and compared to the DGL-A run of TraCE-21000. The forcing in the DGL-A run includes the transient variations in orbital parameters, greenhouse gas (GHG; including CO\textsubscript{2}, CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O) concentrations (Joos and Spahni, 2008), continental ice sheets (Peltier, 2004), and the meltwater input in L09. In addition, fixed coastlines under the LGM state (Peltier, 2004) have been used. The DGL-A run starts from 22 ka and successfully reproduces several major climatic features of the last deglacial evolution (L09).

The configuration of these two sensitivity experiments are almost the same as the DGL-A run, except employing a “Partially Blocking (PB)” scheme at the oceanic edge of the NA and GIN Sea during the BA event (Fig. 1). The PB scheme involves prescribing a thin “sponge wall” of salinity and temperature in the ocean, and is developed and used to diagnose the oceanic feedbacks (Liu et al., 2002; Wu and Liu 2002, 2003; Zhong et al., 2008). In the PB zone, the salinity and temperature at each grid cell are restored to the prescribed annual cycle of the specific condition; other variables in the ocean and atmosphere adjust freely during the model integration. The restoring applies for depths below 50 m to avoid any influence of the PB scheme on the local air-sea interaction. As a consequence of this, the oceanic exchange of heat and salt through the PB zone, as well as the wave propagation, are mostly inhibited.

Table 1 shows the details of the PB configuration in the two sensitivity experiments. They’re very similar, except that the starting times and restoring state in the PB zone are different. The first sensitivity experiment (PB_PreBA) starts from 14.77 ka. At this time, the AMOC is under the collapsed state and deep-water formation in both the Labrador Sea and GIN Sea are suppressed. In this run, the salinity and temperature of the PB zone are restored to the PreBA state (14.67 ka, start time of the BA onset in L09). Its initial 100 yr integration (14.77–14.67 ka) shows that the PB scheme doesn’t induce significant shift of the AMOC strength. The second sensitivity experiment (PB_REC) restarts from 14.5 ka (REC). At this time, the AMOC strength has recovered to its LGM level, and the deep-water formation in the Labrador Sea has been recovered and enhanced, but is suppressed in the GIN Sea. In this run, the salinity and temperature of the PB zone are restored to the REC state. The restoring time scale in both sensitivity experiments is 90 days. The integration length of the PB_PreBA and PB_REC are 600 and 300 yr, respectively.
3 Results

When implementing the PB scheme at the different stages of the BA onset, the deep-water formation in the GIN Sea barely restarts in either sensitivity experiment (red solid line in Fig. 2a and b). Comparing with the DGL-A run, the recovering magnitude of the deep-water formation in the GIN Sea are reduced by nearly 100 % and 80 % for the PB PreBA and PB REC run, respectively. The evolution of the deep-water formation in the Labrador Sea is also affected slightly by the PB scheme. In the PB PreBA run, the recovery magnitude is lower by about 2 Sv than the DGL-A run (blue solid and dash line in Fig. 2a). In the PB REC run, the latter rate of that is slightly higher than that in the DGL-A run (blue solid and dash line in Fig. 2b).

As stated in Cheng et al. (2011), the enhanced deep-water formation in the Labrador Sea and GIN Sea during the BA onset is related to their previous intense full-depth freshening. During the AMOC recovery over this period, the accompanying resumption of salinity first occurs in the upper layers and then propagates downward through the restarted convection. The salinity’s recovery in the deep layers lags that in the upper layers, which leads to a weak stratification and in turn an enhanced deep-water formation in these two regions. After that, the enhanced deep-water formation in the Labrador Sea has been removed by the reorganized stratification (14.5–14.11 ka, blue dash line in Fig. 2), but has been hold on in the GIN Sea due to increased GHG forcing and the associated sea ice retreat (14.32–14.11 ka, red dash line in Fig. 2).

This transient enhanced deep-water formation in the Labrador Sea is not simulated in the PB PreBA run (blue solid line in Fig. 2a). The implementation of the PB scheme is thought to be mostly responsible for its absence. The PB zone locates partially at the northeast edge of the Subpolar Gyre of the NA (Fig. 1). Along with the salinity recovery in the Labrador Sea, the PB zone becomes a freshwater source to the region of the Subpolar Gyre due to its restored low salinity. The induced negative salinity anomaly in deep layers is transported upward through the Ekman pumping of Subpolar Gyre, which weakens the strengthening trend of the local stratification. As a result, the resumption of deep-water formation in the Labrador Sea is limited and no enhanced phenomenon is generated in this PB run. Compared to the GIN Sea, the impact of PB scheme on the Labrador Sea is relatively minor, and its impact on the AMOC evolution is minor too (Fig. 2a).

Due to the changed evolution of the deep-water formation in these two regions, the AMOC does not exhibit the overshoot phenomenon in these two sensitivity experiments (black solid line in Fig. 2). In the PB PreBA run, the lack of recovery of the deep-water formation in the GIN Sea prevents the AMOC strength from recovering to its glacial state, and leads to an overall weakening of about 3 Sv (black solid line in Fig. 2a). In the PB REC run, the AMOC strength remains near its initial level through the comparable and opposite evolution of deep-water formation in the Labrador Sea and GIN Sea (solid lines in Fig. 2b). Compared with the DGL-A run, the reduced recovery magnitudes of the AMOC strength are about 11 Sv and 6 Sv in the PB PreBA and PB REC run, respectively.

The PB scheme inhibits the salt and heat input to the GIN Sea within the upper layers in both sensitivity experiments (Fig. 3a and b). Compared with the DGL-A run, the recovery ratios of the salt input are ~27 % and 60 % in the PB PreBA and PB REC runs, respectively. Meanwhile, the heat input exhibits virtually no recovery in either sensitivity experiment. Because the sea ice concentration over the GIN Sea is closely connected with the amount of the heat input within upper layers, the reduced recovery of heat input in both sensitivity experiments leads to sustained extensive sea ice covering this region (Fig. 3c). The meltback of the sea
Fig. 3. Time series evolution of upper layer (0–800 m) salt (a) and heat (b) input to the GIN Sea, sea ice concentration (AICE, c), surface heat flux (SHF, d) and maximum mixed layer depth (XMXL, e) area means in the GIN Sea. Variables in DGL-A, PB_PreBA, and PB_REC runs are shown in black, red and green, respectively.

Fig. 4. SAT difference of PB_PreBA (a) and PB_REC (b) to DGL-A run at the time of 14.32 ka (maximum AMOC overshoot, seen in Fig. 2).

L09 proposed that the AMOC overshoot is a key factor in the BA warming, contributing to approximately 6°C of the total 15°C warming over the Greenland during the BA onset. In these two sensitivity experiments, we can explicitly validate L09’s hypothesis and provide insight into the detailed spatial distribution of the AMOC overshoot impact on the BA warming. Fig. 4 shows the climatic impact with no overshoot on the surface air temperature (SAT) in these two sensitivity experiments. Greenland SAT warming is reduced by ~5°C with no overshoot in both sensitivity experiments, and is nearly identical to the proposed value from L09. The spatial distribution of the reduced warming in the North Hemisphere and the weak enhanced warming in the South Hemisphere (the positive magnitude is less than 0.5°C in the PB_REC run) indicate that the AMOC overshoot can impact the global SAT change during the BA event. This hemispheric “see-saw” pattern in the SAT closely mimics the climatic response to the AMOC strength change in other model studies (Stocker, 1998; Vellinga and Wood, 2002). The center of the reduced warming in the North Hemisphere locates over the GIN Sea, where the reduced magnitudes of BA warming are more than 15°C.

4 Conclusions

With two additional sensitivity experiments to the DGL-A run, we explicitly found that the NA – GIN Sea oceanic exchange is critical to convection restarting in the GIN Sea, the occurrence of the AMOC overshoot, and the full magnitude of the BA warming. Compared with the atmospheric process, oceanic processes are the dominant factor to the AMOC evolution during the BA event. In the original DGL-A run, the atmospheric process indeed contributes to convection restarting in the GIN Sea. The heat input, sea ice
covering, and SHF all exhibit an intense recovery (black lines in Fig. 3b-d); consequently, this series of recovery is beneficial to the local restart in convection (black lines in Fig. 3e). In the sensitivity experiments presented here, we explicitly point out that the atmospheric processes are not the dominant factor, and act as a slave to oceanic processes.

We found that the GIN Sea is a key region responsible for the occurrence of the AMOC overshoot at the BA. This is consistent with previous work that also point out the fundamental importance of the GIN Sea to the AMOC changes under the possible climate change in the model simulations (e.g., Stouffer et al., 2006).

In these two sensitivity experiments, we also validate L09’s hypothesis concerning the AMOC overshoot impact to the Greenland SAT change during the BA onset. Furthermore, we found that the AMOC overshoot can significantly impact the BA warming in the North Hemisphere far away from the high-latitude NA.

One point that should be noticed is that the term “overshoot” used here is somewhat different from that shown in the water-hosing experiments. Actually, the simulated BA overshoot in the DGL-A run is a combination of a “pure overshoot” and a mean-state transition of the AMOC from a glacial to an interglacial state. The peak value of the AMOC strength during the BA event reaches about 20 Sv (black dash line in Fig. 2). It’s higher than that of 13 Sv at the LGM, and is also higher than that of 18 Sv during the later stage of the BA event. Therefore, there’s a significant AMOC overshoot during the BA event, either when compared with the value at LGM or later BA. The stable AMOC strength during the later BA is similar with that in the modern simulation with the same CCSM3 model (Yeager et al., 2006), and observations (Roemmich and Wunsch, 1985; Talley et al., 2003; Cunningham et al., 2007). Accordingly, there’s also a glacial-to-interglacial mean state transition of the AMOC during the BA onset. Even combined with a mean state transition, the recovery processes of the AMOC during the BA onset are similar to that in an idealized water-hosing experiment under the glacial state (not shown).
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