

Clim Dyn manuscript No. (will be inserted by the editor)
--

1 **Declining summer snowfall in the Arctic: causes,**
2 **impacts and feedbacks**

3 **James A. Screen · Ian Simmonds**

4

5 Received: date / Accepted: date

6 **Abstract** Recent changes in the Arctic hydrological cycle are explored using in
7 situ observations and an improved atmospheric reanalysis data set, ERA-Interim.
8 We document a pronounced decline in summer snowfall over the Arctic Ocean
9 and Canadian Archipelago. The snowfall decline is diagnosed as being almost en-
10 tirely caused by changes in precipitation form (snow turning to rain) with very
11 little influence of changes in total precipitation. The proportion of precipitation
12 falling as snow has decreased as a result of lower-atmospheric warming. Statisti-
13 cally, over 99% of the summer snowfall decline is linked to Arctic warming over
14 the past two decades. Based on the reanalysis snowfall data over the ice-covered
15 Arctic Ocean, we derive an estimate for the amount of snow-covered ice. It is es-

J.A Screen

School of Earth Sciences, University of Melbourne,

Melbourne, Victoria, 3010, Australia

E-mail: screenj@unimelb.com.au

I. Simmonds

School of Earth Sciences, University of Melbourne,

Melbourne, Victoria, 3010, Australia

1 timated that the area of snow-covered ice, and the proportion of sea ice covered
2 by snow, have decreased significantly. We perform a series of sensitivity experi-
3 ments in which inter-annual changes in snow-covered ice are either unaccounted
4 for, or are parameterized. In the parameterized case, the loss of snow-on-ice re-
5 sults in a substantial decrease in the surface albedo over the Arctic Ocean, that
6 is of comparable magnitude to the decrease in albedo due to the decline in sea
7 ice cover. Accordingly, the solar input to the Arctic Ocean is increased, causing
8 additional surface ice melt. We conclude that the decline in summer snowfall has
9 likely contributed to the thinning of sea ice over recent decades. The results pre-
10 sented provide support for the existence of a positive feedback in association with
11 warming-induced reductions in summer snowfall.

12 **Keywords** Arctic · Precipitation · Snow · Sea ice · Albedo feedback · Climate
13 change

14 1 Introduction

15 Recent climate change has been especially pronounced in the Arctic region, with
16 surface temperatures rising two to four times faster than the global average (Solomon
17 et al, 2007; Bekryaev et al, 2010; Miller et al, 2010) and an accompanying rapid
18 decline of sea ice (Serreze et al, 2007; Stroeve et al, 2007). Both the Arctic warming
19 and sea ice loss in the past few decades are unprecedented over at least the last
20 few thousand years (Kaufmann et al, 2009; Polyak et al, 2010). A multitude of
21 climate feedbacks have been proposed that amplify the Arctic surface air temper-
22 ature response to climate forcing (either natural or anthropogenic). Whilst some
23 remain poorly understood and their existence unconfirmed (Francis et al, 2009),

1 others, for example the ice-albedo feedback, are already believed to be active and
2 contributing significantly to recent Arctic change (Serreze et al, 2009; Screen and
3 Simmonds, 2010a).

4 In its simplest form the ice-albedo feedback can be understood as decreases in
5 sea ice cover, that expose open water with a lower albedo than ice and increase the
6 solar energy absorbed by the coupled ocean-ice-atmosphere system. As the system
7 warms, the sea ice cover further declines reinforcing the warming. The decline in
8 sea ice extent over recent decades and its associated positive feedback have been
9 widely documented (e.g., Serreze and Francis, 2006; Perovich et al, 2007; Screen
10 and Simmonds, 2010a). However, changes in sea ice cover are not the only driver
11 of the ice-albedo feedback. Changes occurring within the ice pack, for example to
12 its snow cover or melt pond fraction, also contribute (Curry et al, 1995). Such
13 changes have received less attention than the pronounced decline of sea ice extent.

14 The characteristics of the Arctic sea ice cover and its albedo change through
15 the annual cycle. The winter ice cover is overlaid by a relatively thick layer of snow
16 with a high albedo (note that during the polar night the albedo is irrelevant to
17 the energy budget as there is no incoming sunlight). As sunlight returns to the
18 Arctic in spring, the snow cover begins to melt. The albedo decreases, first as dry
19 snow turns to wet snow, and then further as bare ice is exposed (Perovich et al,
20 2002). By mid-summer, the seasonal snow cover has largely disappeared (Warren
21 et al, 1999). Arctic storms, most prevalent in summer (Serreze and Barrett, 2008;
22 Simmonds et al, 2008), produce snowfall and an ephemeral summer snow cover.
23 The formation and development of melt ponds during the summer further lower
24 the ice albedo (Perovich et al, 2002). In autumn, as surface temperatures decrease,
25 the melt ponds refreeze and the snow cover returns, raising the albedo.

1 Rising air temperatures over recent decades have likely led to an earlier on-
2 set and lengthening of the melt season (Markus et al, 2009). Warming may also
3 be influencing Arctic precipitation patterns with associated impacts on the snow
4 cover. Evaluations of Arctic precipitation changes are largely based on gauge mea-
5 surements at meteorological stations on land. They suggest an increase in Arctic
6 precipitation over recent decades (White et al, 2007; Min et al, 2008). Support-
7 ing evidence comes from the monitoring of discharge from the major Eurasian
8 rivers that drain into the Arctic Basin. These rivers have predominantly shown
9 increases in discharge (e.g., Peterson et al, 2002; McClelland et al, 2006), likely
10 in part due to increased continental precipitation (Wu et al, 2005), but also other
11 factors such as earlier snow melt, thawing permafrost, land use change, shifting
12 fire regimes and changing river management (e.g., dams) (McClelland et al, 2004).
13 Changes in precipitation over the Arctic Ocean are more uncertain, in most part
14 due to spatially and temporally sparse observations. Peterson et al (2006) report
15 an increase in maritime precipitation over the last half-century based on the Euro-
16 pean Centre for Medium-range Weather Forecasts' (ECMWF) ERA-40 reanalysis.
17 However, this data set has known weaknesses in its representation of the Arctic
18 moisture budget (Cullather et al, 2000; Serreze and Hurst, 2000). Data from raw-
19 insondes and satellites suggest no coherent large-scale change in net precipitation
20 (precipitation minus evaporation) over the Arctic Ocean (see review of White et al,
21 2007).

22 Continental snow cover has decreased in March associated with warmer win-
23 ters, greater snow melt and a decrease in the fraction of precipitation that occurs
24 as snow (e.g., McCabe and Wolock, 2010). Again, changes over the ice-covered
25 Arctic Ocean are harder to ascertain. Warren et al (1999) analyzed snow depths

1 from the Russian North Pole drifting stations and reported a decline in snow depth
2 in all months over the period 1954-1991, with the largest decline in May. These au-
3 thors found no evidence of earlier onset of melt and concluded that the reduction
4 in May snow depth was likely related to reduced snowfall. Here we provide the
5 first Arctic-wide estimates of the recent evolution of summer snow cover over the
6 ice-covered Arctic Ocean. We document a significant decline in summer snowfall
7 and examine its causes. Then, in a series of sensitivity experiments, we go on to
8 explore the importance of these changes for the ice-albedo feedback.

9 **2 Data**

10 We draw on data from two primary sources: atmospheric reanalyses from ERA-
11 Interim (ERA-I) and station observations from northern Canada.

12 2.1 ERA-Interim

13 ERA-I is the latest global atmospheric reanalysis produced by the ECMWF, cover-
14 ing the data-rich period since 1989 (Simmons et al, 2006). The ECMWF, applying
15 lessons learned from earlier reanalysis efforts and well-documented weaknesses in
16 older reanalyses, have implemented a number of improvements in ERA-I. These
17 include an assimilating model with higher spectral resolution, improved model
18 physics, a more sophisticated hydrological cycle, and data assimilation based on a
19 12-hourly four-dimensional variational analysis (4D-var) (Dee and Uppala, 2009).
20 ERA-I only became available to the scientific community in 2009 and consequently
21 the validation and evaluation of the output is in its infancy. However, early indica-
22 tions suggest that there have been significant improvements in the representation

1 of Arctic temperature trends (Screen and Simmonds, 2010a, in press), and in the
 2 global hydrological cycle (Simmons et al, 2006; Uppala et al, 2008; Simmons et al,
 3 2010) in ERA-I versus older reanalyses. These improvements were in the fore-
 4 front of our mind when choosing the most appropriate data set from a number of
 5 available products. That said, the accuracy of long-term precipitation changes in
 6 ERA-I remain unclear due to differences in the various reference data sets used
 7 for validation purposes (Simmons et al, 2010). This uncertainty in ERA-I precipi-
 8 tation trends, and its implications for our conclusions, is discussed further in later
 9 sections.

10 Snowfall, precipitation, surface albedo and net solar radiation data are archived
 11 as daily or monthly means for midday and midnight, and at time steps of 3-, 6-, 9-
 12 or 12-hours. For precipitation and snowfall, we summed the 12-hour accumulated
 13 totals for midday and midnight to give daily accumulated precipitation (mm d^{-1})
 14 and snowfall (mm-we d^{-1}). For non-accumulated fields (albedo, solar radiation)
 15 we averaged the values at the same time-steps to give a daily-mean. Sea ice fraction
 16 and air temperature are archived as daily means. Where monthly or seasonal data
 17 are used these are monthly or seasonal means of the daily data.

18 For oceanic grid-boxes, the albedo in ERA-I, a_{era} , is given by:

$$a_{era} = c(1 - a_i) + (1 - c)(1 - a_w), \quad (1)$$

19 where a_i is the albedo of sea ice, a_w is the albedo of water and c is the sea ice
 20 fraction. In ERA-I, a_i has a crude seasonal cycle that is held constant from year-
 21 to-year (Fig. 1). These values have been interpolated from seasonal mean albedo
 22 values in Ebert and Curry (1993), with the value for summer (0.51) representative

1 of bare sea ice and the value in winter (0.77) representing dry snow. This partially
2 mimics the observed seasonal evolution of a_i : a_i is high during winter as the ice is
3 covered by dry snow, begins to decrease in early summer as the snow cover starts
4 to melt, reaches its lowest values in mid-summer due to melt pond formation and
5 rises rapidly in early fall as melt ponds refreeze and the snow cover returns (Curry
6 et al, 2001; Perovich et al, 2002). In comparison to observations during the Surface
7 Heat Budget of the Arctic (SHEBA) field campaign (Curry et al, 2001; Perovich
8 et al, 2002), the ERA-I a_i is slightly too low in the cold season and too high in
9 mid-to-late summer. The lower a_i observed in summer is due to the presence of
10 melt ponds that are not accounted for in ERA-I.

11 In contrast to a_i , a_w does not vary with season and is fixed at 0.06. Thus, a_{era}
12 over ocean varies only according to the climatological annual cycle of a_i and the
13 time-varying c . In Section 6, we modify this albedo parameterization so that the
14 albedo also varies according to time-varying changes in estimated snow cover.

15 2.2 Canadian observations

16 We obtained monthly total precipitation, rainfall, snowfall and mean surface tem-
17 perature for twelve meteorological stations in northern Canada from Environment
18 Canada (<http://www.climate.weatheroffice.gc.ca/index.html>). The stations used
19 were (from north to south) Eureka, Resolute, Cambridge Bay, Kugluktuk, Baker
20 Lake, Coral Harbour, Mayo, Rankin Inlet, Fort Simpson, Hay River, Watson Lake
21 and Fort Smith. These stations were chosen based on their high-latitude locations
22 (north of 60°N) and because they had data spanning the whole period 1989-2009.
23 On occasion, these stations were separated into two categories: Arctic (north of

1 70°N; Eureka and Resolute) and sub-Arctic (60-70°N; other ten stations). In ad-
 2 dition to the monthly data, we have examined daily data for the Arctic stations.
 3 These meteorological data have been independently processed and quality con-
 4 trol checks undertaken by Environment Canada. Missing data are flagged and we
 5 make no effort to infill these. Data are also flagged when “incomplete” or “es-
 6 timated”. In both cases, we treat these data points as missing data. Days with
 7 small amounts (less than about 0.1mm or 0.1mm-we) of a precipitation type are
 8 flagged as “trace”. At the Canadian Arctic stations, up to 50% of the observations
 9 have snowfall reported as trace amounts. Inclusion of the trace events is therefore
 10 important. Here we consider a trace amount to be equal to 0.05mm or 0.05mm-we.
 11 Note, the results were not sensitive to small changes in these values.

12 **3 Snowfall-to-Precipitation ratio**

13 The proportion of precipitation occurring as snow can be expressed by the snowfall-
 14 to-precipitation ratio (SPR):

$$SPR = \frac{S_{we}}{P}, \quad (2)$$

15 where S_{we} is the daily total snowfall water equivalent (mm-we d^{-1}) and P is the
 16 daily total precipitation (mm d^{-1}). Days with no precipitation are not considered.
 17 Therefore, an SPR of zero indicates a day when all precipitation fell in liquid form
 18 rather than a day with no precipitation.

19 Fig. 2 (top left) shows the daily SPR as a function of daily mean surface tem-
 20 perature, observed at Resolute in Arctic Canada. A clear, but highly non-linear,
 21 relationship exists between the proportion of precipitation falling as snow and sur-

1 face temperature. Precipitation falls almost entirely as snow on days with mean
2 temperatures below around 260K. Conversely, precipitation falls almost entirely
3 as rain on days with mean temperatures above around 278K. On days with mean
4 temperatures between 260-278K, precipitation can exist in both liquid and solid
5 forms. However, as temperatures approach melting point there is a rapid tran-
6 sition from predominantly snowfall to rainfall. (The cluster of points at SPR of
7 0.5 is partly an artifact of the observing precision: a large number of days had
8 “trace” amounts of rainfall and snowfall, hence a SPR of 0.5). A nearly identical
9 relationship between SPR and temperature is found in ERA-I sub-sampled at the
10 grid-box containing Resolute (Fig. 2, top right). Similar plots were obtained for
11 other stations (not shown) and have been shown by other authors (e.g., Ledley,
12 1985).

13 SPR is influenced by changes in both snowfall and total precipitation, but
14 neither of these variables display a simple relationship with daily mean temper-
15 ature (Fig. 2 middle & bottom). Very little snowfall is observed, or depicted by
16 ERA-I, when the daily mean temperature exceeds 275K. The upper limits of both
17 daily snowfall and total precipitation decrease with decreasing temperature (below
18 about 275K) in a quasi-exponential manner, because changes in precipitable water
19 are tied to changes in temperature. However, changes in temperature do not lead
20 to a consistent change in total snowfall or precipitation.

21 The dependence of SPR on temperature can be further seen in Fig. 3, which
22 shows the mean annual cycles of SPR and surface temperature averaged over the
23 Arctic from ERA-I. Here and in what follows, the Arctic-mean SPR was calculated
24 as:

$$SPR_{arctic} = \frac{\overline{S_{we}}}{\overline{P}}, \quad (3)$$

1 where the overbars denote area-averages north of 70°N. Through a large portion
 2 of the year, the Arctic-mean temperature is well below freezing point and the vast
 3 majority of precipitation falls as snow. In winter (December-February), precipita-
 4 tion falls entirely as snow over most of the Arctic and rain normally only occurs
 5 in the Norwegian, Greenland and Barents Seas. The largest regional contribution
 6 to the Arctic-mean winter rainfall comes from the Norwegian Sea area where as
 7 much as 60% of precipitation falls as rain even in winter. With the exception of
 8 this region, atmospheric warming at this time of year is unlikely to result in a large
 9 change in SPR because it is too cold for rain. However, in summer (June-August)
 10 the Arctic-mean temperature is near to melting point and even small changes in
 11 temperature have the potential to cause changes in precipitation form, as SPR is
 12 highly sensitive to changes in temperature within this mean temperature range
 13 (Fig. 2, top). We hypothesize that in a warming Arctic (warming is observed in
 14 all months, see Screen and Simmonds (2010b)), the proportion of summer pre-
 15 cipitation falling as snow will decrease as a direct result of atmospheric warming.
 16 In the next section, we test this hypothesis based on Canadian meteorological
 17 observations and ERA-I reanalyses.

18 An often reported problem with precipitation observations is the underestima-
 19 tion of the *real* precipitation due to gauge undercatch (e.g., Forland and Hanssen-
 20 Bauer, 2000). The wet-day mean precipitation at Resolute is 0.62 mm d⁻¹ com-
 21 pared to 0.91 mm d⁻¹ in ERA-I sub-sampled at the grid-box containing Resolute.
 22 Part of this difference may be related to precipitation undercatch. Forland and

1 Hanssen-Bauer (2000) estimated that the true annual precipitation may be up
2 to 50% greater than the recorded precipitation at sites in the Norwegian Arctic.
3 Undercatch of solid precipitation may be greater than liquid precipitation (For-
4 land and Hanssen-Bauer, 2000). However, the SPR is highly consistent between
5 observations and ERA-I, with both having a mean SPR at Resolute of 0.84 over all
6 wet-days. Looking only at wet-days when the mean surface temperature was above
7 260K (i.e. the temperature range when solid and liquid precipitation both occur),
8 the mean SPR is 0.61 and 0.69 for the observations and ERA-I, respectively. Thus,
9 the observed SPR may be slightly underestimated in the warm season, although
10 bias in ERA-I cannot be ruled out as a cause of the difference. Importantly for
11 the trend analyses that follow, we found no obvious tendencies or discontinuities
12 in the SPR difference between observations and ERA-I as a function of time.

13 **4 Arctic hydrological changes**

14 Fig. 4 shows the linear change in SPR, snowfall, rainfall and total precipitation over
15 the period 1989-2009, in each season and at each of the Canadian meteorological
16 stations (gray crosses). The stations show a wide range of observed change, both in
17 the sign and magnitude of the trends. In order to simplify this spatially variability,
18 we also plot multi-station means for the Arctic (north of 70°N) and the sub-
19 Arctic (60-70°N). A large SPR decrease is found in summer for the Arctic stations,
20 associated with a pronounced decrease in summer snowfall and an increase in
21 summer rainfall. In the sub-Arctic, summer precipitation has increased, almost
22 exclusively in liquid form. Outside of summer, noteworthy decreases in spring and
23 autumn precipitation and snowfall have occurred at the Arctic stations.

1 In ERA-I, the largest seasonal-mean Arctic-mean changes in SPR are in sum-
2 mer, when the proportion of precipitation falling as snow has significantly de-
3 creased (Fig. 5), consistent with the Canadian observations. A smaller, but still
4 statistically significant (at the 90% level), decrease in SPR is depicted by ERA-
5 I in autumn. However, these two seasons show contrasting changes in snowfall
6 and total precipitation. In summer, there has been a decrease in ERA-I snowfall
7 and total precipitation, again in agreement with observations at the Arctic sta-
8 tions. The decline of snowfall exceeds the total precipitation decrease resulting in
9 the decrease in SPR. Given that the majority of precipitation in summer falls as
10 rain (Fig. 3), one would expect a decrease in total precipitation to be associated
11 with a decrease in rainfall. That rainfall has increased and not decreased (Fig. 5),
12 when the total precipitation has decreased, reflects the changes in SPR. Had SPR
13 remained constant, rainfall would have decreased in line with decreasing precipi-
14 tation. In autumn, ERA-I shows a large increase in total precipitation and only a
15 small increase in snowfall. This increase in snowfall cannot be related to changes
16 in precipitation form as SPR has decreased and must be related to the increase in
17 total precipitation. This additional precipitation has disproportionately fallen as
18 rain rather than snow, as reflected by the decrease in SPR and the large increase
19 in rainfall. In contrast, autumn precipitation decreased at the Arctic stations (Fig.
20 4). Spring total precipitation, snowfall and rainfall have all decreased in ERA-I,
21 resulting in negligible change in SPR (Fig. 5). Lastly, in winter, there has been
22 little change in any of these hydrological indicators in ERA-I or observations. It is
23 worth noting that the Arctic-mean changes in ERA-I are broadly consistent with
24 the observed changes at the Arctic stations in summer, spring and winter, but
25 discrepancies exist during autumn.

1 Since the atmosphere has warmed in all seasons over the past two decades
2 (Screen and Simmonds, 2010a,b) and that there is a general expectation of greater
3 Arctic precipitation in a warming climate (Finnis et al, 2007; Holland et al, 2007;
4 Kattsov et al, 2007), it is worth considering briefly why we don't find a consistent
5 picture of precipitation increases in ERA-I (Fig. 5) or observations (Fig 4). In the
6 observations, the only pronounced precipitation increases are found in summer at
7 the sub-Arctic stations. Autumn is the only season that displays an Arctic-mean
8 precipitation increase in ERA-I, although we reiterate this is not supported by
9 single-point observations from Eureka or Resolute. Despite increases in air temper-
10 ature and humidity in ERA-I (Screen and Simmonds, 2010a), it depicts substantial
11 decreases in total precipitation in spring and summer. A possible explanation for
12 this discrepancy may be that a decrease in storm activity has counter-acted the
13 increase in precipitable water. To explore this possibility, we applied the University
14 of Melbourne cyclone tracking algorithm (Simmonds et al, 2008; Simmonds and
15 Keay, 2009) to ERA-I mean sea level pressure fields. Fig. 6 shows the seasonal-
16 mean Arctic-mean changes in two important cyclone statistics: cyclone number
17 and mean cyclone depth that provide information on the number of cyclones and
18 their average intensity, respectively. (For more details of these statistics and their
19 derivation, the reader is directed to Simmonds et al (2008) and references therein.)
20 ERA-I depicts significant decreases in both cyclone variables in spring, giving cre-
21 dence to the explanation of reduced spring precipitation due to reduced cyclone
22 activity. In summer, there is a shift toward weaker Arctic cyclones over the study
23 period that may partly explain the decrease in summer precipitation. We note that
24 these cyclone changes are a robust feature in three alternative reanalyses over the
25 last two decades (not shown).

1 Whilst the cyclone changes identified in Fig 6 help reconcile the precipitation
2 changes over the same time period, they must be viewed with caution in the con-
3 text of longer-term Arctic trends. Over the longer period, 1979-2008, the cyclone
4 statistics show few significant trends across the seasons and a number of reanaly-
5 ses (updated from Simmonds et al, 2008). By extension, the precipitation changes
6 in ERA-I over the last two decades may not be representative of multi-decadal
7 Arctic precipitation trends. Indeed, land-based observations suggest increases in
8 Arctic precipitation since 1950 (Min et al, 2008). Over this longer period, it may
9 be that long-term warming and the associated increases in precipitable water have
10 had greater influence on precipitation trends than have changes in Arctic cyclones.
11 Whilst further work is required to confirm this, it would not be surprising if longer-
12 and shorter-term precipitation changes were predominately driven by different pro-
13 cesses. We do, however, expect the changes in SPR over the last two decades to be
14 broadly consistent with longer-term changes, as they are very strongly related to
15 atmospheric warming and Arctic air temperatures have risen in each decade since
16 1970 (Gillett et al, 2008). Further discussion on the accuracy of the precipitation,
17 snowfall and SPR changes in ERA-I is provided in Section 5.

18 Fig. 7 shows the spatial extent of SPR changes in the summer months. We pay
19 particular attention to SPR changes in northern Canada, where stations observa-
20 tions are used to validate ERA-I. Decreases in SPR are found over much of the
21 Arctic Ocean and in all three summer months. There are some differences in the
22 patterns, most notably, the largest SPR decreases are found in the Beaufort Sea
23 region during June and at higher latitudes in July. This latitudinal shift is also
24 apparent in the observations. During June, the Arctic stations of Resolute and
25 Eureka display strong decreases in SPR. SPR decreases at these stations are less

1 in July, when the largest changes have occurred at higher latitudes. In northern
2 Canada, ERA-I and station observations show broadly the same SPR changes. In
3 June, large SPR decreases have occurred at the most northerly stations (Resolute
4 and Eureka) and are well-captured by ERA-I. The north-east coastal regions of
5 mainland Canada exhibit modest increases in SPR, which are also seen in ERA-I,
6 albeit with some minor differences in regional extent. The inland stations show
7 little change in SPR and nor does ERA-I over inland northern Canada. In July
8 and August, the most pronounced SPR changes have occurred at the far-northern
9 stations with only small changes at the other stations. This north-south gradient
10 is well-represented in ERA-I.

11 The spatial pattern of observed SPR change is related to temperature change.
12 Stations and months that display SPR decreases (the far-northern stations) have
13 generally warmed whilst stations that display SPR increases (north-east main-
14 land) have generally cooled (Fig. 8). However, the temperature changes alone are
15 insufficient to explain the lack of SPR change at many stations and months. This
16 insensitivity of SPR to temperature change can be understood when the mean
17 temperature is also taken into account. All the stations without a change in SPR
18 have mean monthly surface temperatures above roughly 280K (Fig. 8) and as a
19 consequence the vast majority of precipitation falls as rain (Fig. 3). Thus, atmo-
20 spheric warming at these stations has had little effect on SPR. Cooling could have
21 caused an increase in SPR, but none of these stations have cooled sufficiently for
22 this to happen.

5 Causes of the snowfall decline

The summer snowfall decline has occurred in unison with decreases in SPR and total precipitation (Fig. 5). It is possible to quantitatively estimate the proportion of the snowfall decline that is associated with changes in precipitation form and that associated with changes in total precipitation. To separate the component of the snowfall decline due to changes in precipitation form, S_{form} , we held the total precipitation constant at the 1989 value (as given by the y-intercept of the linear trend) and estimated the snowfall from the time-varying SPR by:

$$S_{form} = P_{1989} * S/P \quad (4)$$

Conversely, to estimate the snowfall variability due to changes in total precipitation, S_{amount} , we held SPR constant at the 1989 value and estimated the snowfall from the time-varying total precipitation:

$$S_{amount} = S_{1989}/P_{1989} * P \quad (5)$$

In Fig. 9 (upper panel) the solid line denotes the summer-mean Arctic-mean snowfall in ERA-I, with S_{form} and S_{amount} shown by the dotted and dashed lines, respectively. The changes in total precipitation have a weak influence on the snowfall variability. Instead, the snowfall variability is almost entirely explained by changes in SPR, hence, changes in precipitation form. As discussed earlier, we expect this component of the snowfall change to be strongly dependent on temperature. The lower panel in Fig. 9 shows the summer-mean Arctic-mean 900hPa air temperature. Snowfall and air temperature are very highly correlated ($r =$

1 -0.92) and both display significant trends. Statistically, the trend in 900hPa air
2 temperature explains over 99% of the snowfall trend.

3 Previous studies have demonstrated that the temperature trends in ERA-I are
4 realistic (Screen and Simmonds, 2010a,b, in press) and Fig. 2 suggests that the
5 temperature-snowfall relationships in ERA-I are also valid. Accordingly, we ar-
6 gue that snowfall changes related to changes in precipitation form (temperature
7 changes) will be accurate in ERA-I. The accuracy of the component of snowfall
8 change due to change in total precipitation, which is less dependent on temper-
9 ature, is more uncertain. With this in mind, let us consider that possibility that
10 ERA-I is incorrect and that Arctic precipitation has increased rather than de-
11 creased over the period 1989-2009. Given that snow represents a small fraction
12 of the total precipitation in summer (approximately 15% on average, Fig. 3), it
13 would take a relatively large increase in total precipitation to ameliorate the loss
14 of snowfall due to changes in SPR. For example, ERA-I depicts a $0.1\text{mm}\cdot\text{we}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$
15 decrease in snowfall over the period 1989-2009 due to changes in precipitation
16 form. To balance out this loss, the Arctic-mean summer precipitation would have
17 had to have increased by around $6.6\text{mm}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$. To put this estimate into context,
18 Arctic-mean summer precipitation would have had to have increased ten-fold in
19 ERA-I between 1989 and 2009 to counter the loss of snowfall driven by changes in
20 SPR. Observations suggest a large-scale precipitation increase of around 8% over
21 the past century (Symon et al, 2004), although substantial uncertainties remain
22 owing to lack of observations, particularly over the Arctic Ocean.

23 Therefore, we assume that the impact of changes in total precipitation on
24 summer snowfall have been small and are negligible in comparison to the impacts
25 of changes in SPR. In other words, we argue that the critical factor driving the

1 summer snowfall decline is lower-tropospheric warming, which is reasonably well-
2 represented in ERA-I, and not precipitation changes that may not be accurate in
3 reanalyses. This assumption is unlikely to hold for other seasons, hence, our focus
4 on summer. Summer is also of especial interest because the radiative impacts of
5 changes in surface albedo are greatest in this season.

6 We now explore the implications of the summer snowfall decline and its role
7 in recent Arctic climate change.

8 **6 Impacts on surface albedo**

9 It is well known that snow has a higher albedo than ice and that snow-covered ice
10 has a higher albedo than bare ice. The surface albedo is also sensitive to charac-
11 teristics of the snow cover, for instance whether the snow is wet or dry, and to the
12 presence of surface melt ponds. Neither of these effects are directly considered here.
13 ERA-I includes 6-hourly output of the surface albedo. The modeled albedo over
14 ocean in ERA-I is dependent only on the sea ice concentration and the seasonally
15 varying a_i . The model does not accumulate snowfall on ice. By mid-summer, all
16 sea ice is considered to be bare ice with no snow cover or melt ponds. Thus, trends
17 in the ERA-I albedo only relate to changes in sea ice cover. To assess the radia-
18 tive impacts of changes in snowfall over the Arctic Ocean, we have performed a
19 series of “nudging” experiments using ERA-I output. The premise of these experi-
20 ments is to represent changes in snow-covered ice and their impacts on albedo and
21 surface solar radiation using simple, but physically reasonable, parameterizations.
22 The outputs from these “nudged” experiments are compared to the unmodified

1 ERA-I output to quantify the relative importance of changes in snowfall on the
2 surface radiation budget, in comparison to changes in sea ice concentration.

3 Using daily output from ERA-I, grid-boxes were identified that had snowfall.
4 In these grid-boxes the albedo was nudged according to the following parameteri-
5 zation:

$$a_{nud} = a_{era} + c(a_s - a_i), \quad (6)$$

6 where a_{nud} is the nudged albedo, a_{era} is the model albedo from ERA-I (from Eq.
7 1), and a_i is the seasonally-varying albedo of sea ice (Fig. 1). The albedo of snow-
8 covered ice, a_s , was set as 0.75, in line with the observed albedo of wet (melting)
9 snow (Curry et al, 2001; Perovich et al, 2002). Snowfall over open water, which has
10 no direct impact on the surface albedo, was accounted for by scaling the nudge
11 factor by the ice cover fraction, c . The nudging was only applied to grid-boxes
12 with snowfall on that day and the albedo returns to the ERA-I value the day after
13 snowfall ceases. This is consistent with observations in summer, which suggest that
14 the snow cover rapidly melts following a snowfall event (Perovich et al, 2002). We
15 assume that all ice within a grid-box is snow-covered when snowfall occurs in that
16 grid-box and on that day. Note, the nudged albedo does not consider snow depth,
17 with the grid-box being considered snow-covered or not depending on whether
18 there was snowfall on that day or not.

19 Fig. 10 illustrates the effect of the parameterization during June and July 1989
20 at a grid-box in the Barents Sea. As the ice cover decreased during June and early
21 July, the ERA-I albedo also decreased. By mid-July, the grid-box was ice free and
22 the albedo was 0.06 (a_w). Superimposed on this variability due to ice cover, is

1 a small decline in albedo during June due to prescribed seasonal cycle of a_i (see
2 Fig. 1). The nudged albedo includes the effects of sea ice cover, but additionally
3 it increases relative to the ERA-I albedo on days with snowfall (if there is sea ice
4 present). The nudge factor (the difference between the ERA-I and nudged albedo)
5 on snowy days is dependent on c , reflecting the increased likelihood of snow falling
6 over open water rather than sea ice as c decreases, and on the difference between
7 a_i and a_s . When c is zero, snowfall events result in no change in albedo (as seen
8 on 30 July in Fig. 10).

9 The sea ice area has significantly declined in summer over the last 21 years (Fig.
10 11). The area of ice assumed to be snow-covered has also decreased significantly.
11 The latter decline has occurred at a faster rate, resulting in a decrease in the
12 fraction of ice covered by snow. Thus, not only has the ice cover declined exposing
13 open water, the snow cover on top of the ice has declined exposing more bare ice.
14 Both of these changes will have an effect on the surface albedo. The questions we
15 address now are how large are these effects and how important is the decline in
16 snow-covered ice relative to the more widely documented effects of reduced sea ice
17 cover.

18 Fig. 12 (top) shows time-series of the Arctic-mean summer albedo from ERA-
19 I and our nudged experiment. The former varies according to the sea ice cover
20 (compare with Fig. 11, top) and shows a significant decline over the period 1989-
21 2009 (Fig. 12, bottom). Relative to the ERA-I albedo, the nudged albedo is higher
22 throughout the period reflecting the allowance for the presence of snow-covered
23 ice. The difference between the ERA-I and nudged albedo decreases as a function
24 of time because the fraction of ice covered by snow decreases. As a result, the
25 nudged albedo shows a larger decline than the ERA-I albedo over the 21 years.

1 The difference between the linear change in the ERA-I and nudged albedo, reflects
 2 the albedo change due solely to changes in the fraction of ice covered by snow.
 3 The parameterised changes in snow-on-ice lead to an albedo decrease of 0.03. This
 4 change is comparable in magnitude to the albedo decrease in ERA-I, that is solely
 5 due to changes in sea ice cover.

6 We now assess the impact of these albedo changes on the surface radiation
 7 budget. In ERA-I, the net surface solar radiation, q_{era} , can be written as:

$$q_{era} = q_{in} [(c(1 - a_i) + (1 - c)(1 - a_w))], \quad (7)$$

8 where q_{in} is the surface incoming solar radiation. For grid-boxes where the ice is
 9 assumed to be snow-covered, the net surface solar radiation response to the nudged
 10 albedo, q_{nud} , becomes:

$$q_{nud} = q_{era} + q_{in} [c(a_i - a_s)], \quad (8)$$

11 The nudging only occurs over the ice-covered portion of the grid-box, so (7) reduces
 12 to:

$$q_{era} = q_{in}(1 - a_i), \quad (9)$$

13 Rearranging (9) and substituting into (8) gives:

$$q_{nud} = q_{era} + \frac{q_{era}}{1 - a_i} [c(a_i - a_s)] = q_{era} [1 + \frac{c(a_i - a_s)}{1 - a_i}], \quad (10)$$

14 Fig. 13 shows time-series of the Arctic-mean summer net surface solar radiation
 15 under clear-sky conditions, in ERA-I and our nudged experiment. Here we use the
 16 clear-sky radiation rather than the all-sky radiation in order to remove the effects

1 of cloud cover and changes in cloudiness. This isolates the solar radiation response
2 to changes in albedo. Furthermore, it circumvents concerns about the reliability
3 of cloud cover and its trends in reanalysis products. Of course, changes in albedo
4 have a greater influence on the surface solar radiation under clear skies than under
5 cloudy skies. Thus, by using the clear-sky radiation we are clearly overestimating
6 the surface solar radiation response and our estimates must be viewed as an up-
7 per boundary of the radiation change due to the changing albedo over the Arctic
8 Ocean. However, our primary concern here is not the absolute magnitude of the
9 solar radiation change but the relative magnitudes of the response due to changes
10 in sea ice cover and the response due to changes in snow-covered ice. Consistent
11 with the decrease in albedo (Fig. 12), ERA-I depicts a significant increase in the
12 net surface solar radiation over the period 1989-2009 (Fig. 13). Including the ef-
13 fects of changing snow-covered ice results in reduced solar energy input throughout
14 the period, in line with the higher albedo versus the case with no representation
15 of snow-covered ice. The difference between the ERA-I and nudged radiation de-
16 creases with time as the proportion of ice covered by snow decreases. The solar
17 radiation change due to the decline in snow-covered ice is slightly larger than that
18 associated with the change in sea ice cover, again pointing to the importance of
19 changes in snow-covered ice for the ice-albedo feedback.

20 We estimate an upper-bound for the solar radiation change due to the decline
21 in snow-covered ice of 21.4 W m^{-2} (Fig. 13). We have repeated the analyses
22 using the ERA-I all-sky solar radiation (not shown). In this case, the changes in
23 snow-covered ice result in a 11.8 W m^{-2} increase in solar heating over the period
24 1989-2009, approximately half of the increase under clear-sky condition. Finally,

1 we estimate the amount of surface melt that could be sustained by these increases
 2 in solar energy input to the ice cover:

$$\Delta I = \frac{\Delta Q * t}{L_f * \rho_{ice}}, \quad (11)$$

3 where ΔI is the depth of surface ice melted (m), ΔQ is the change in net solar
 4 radiation (W m^{-2}), t is the elapsed time, L_f is the latent heat of fusion (334000 J
 5 kg^{-1}) and ρ_{ice} is the density of ice (917 kg m^{-3}). If sustained over the summer (t
 6 = 3 months) over the ice-covered ocean (recall the parameterized solar radiation
 7 change is explicitly over ice), ΔQ would result in surface melt of 0.56m or 0.31m,
 8 for the clear-sky and all-sky estimates, respectively. Whilst these rough estimates
 9 mask a large degree of spatial variability, they nonetheless represent a sizable
 10 fraction of the ice thickness in summer. Thus, the decline in summer snowfall may
 11 have significantly contributed to the thinning of sea ice over recent decades.

12 The experiments presented highlight the sensitivity of Arctic climate to the
 13 estimated recent changes in summer snowfall. Whilst they are not expected to fully
 14 represent reality due to the omission of a number of other factors that influence
 15 the ice albedo, such as melt ponds and ice thickness, our aim was to estimate and
 16 isolate the effects of changing snow-on-ice. It is important to note, that although
 17 ERA-I has no allowance for time-varying changes in snow-on-ice, this need not
 18 imply that its output is erroneous because of this. ERA-I output is a combination
 19 of observations and model-estimated fields. If the observational constraint is high,
 20 the biases or errors in the model physics will have little effect. A case in point
 21 may be the ERA-I surface temperature trends. Based on the discussion above, one
 22 could reasonably hypothesize that because ERA-I does not account for changes in

1 snow-cover, it may underestimate the warming over recent decades. However, this
2 does not appear to be the case (Screen and Simmonds, 2010a,b, in press). This may
3 reflect the fact that surface temperatures (and sea ice concentrations) are relatively
4 highly constrained by satellite observations over the period considered. Problems
5 are more likely to arise in variables with weak (or no) observational constraint,
6 for example the radiative heat fluxes, but this is hard to confirm. Finally, we note
7 that the errors in surface albedo are likely to be one of many sources of error in
8 the ERA-I model physics, and the net effect of all these errors will likely be wholly
9 different to those we have isolated here.

10 **7 Feedbacks**

11 The results suggest that increasing Arctic temperatures have led to decreased
12 snow-on-ice (Fig. 11), that has decreased the surface albedo (Fig. 12) and increased
13 energy gain by the ocean-ice-atmosphere system (Fig. 13). A logical next question
14 to ask is: do these changes constitute a positive feedback on Arctic warming?
15 This question is harder to answer than it may first appear. Increased energy gain
16 by the Arctic Ocean during summer, as a result a lower albedo, is associated
17 with increased energy transfer from the ocean to the atmosphere in autumn and
18 winter (Screen and Simmonds, 2010b). Some of this energy will be lost to space as
19 longwave radiation, but a proportion will warm the atmosphere. So, in isolation the
20 aforementioned changes represent a positive feedback on Arctic warming. However,
21 it has been previously noted that the interpretation of a feedback depends on the
22 temporal scale of the changes under consideration, and it is essential to consider
23 how the feedback mechanism operates when integrated through at least a full

1 annual cycle (Curry et al, 1995). This view recognizes the fact that linkages that
2 constitute a positive feedback in one season may not constitute a feedback, or
3 represent a negative feedback loop, at another time of the year. Two of the linkages
4 in the temperature-snowfall-ice feedback are characterized by competing effects
5 (Francis et al, 2009) and their relative importance vary by season.

6 Snowfall, or more precisely snow cover, has competing effects on the sea ice. On
7 one hand, the snow cover increases the surface albedo, reducing energy absorption
8 and decreasing ice melt. Since some snow gets converted to ice, more snow also
9 increases ice formation rates. On the other hand, the snow cover insulates the
10 ocean from the atmosphere. In the colder seasons, this reduces oceanic heat loss
11 and ice growth (Ledley, 1991, 1993). The albedo effect is greatest in summer when
12 insolation is greatest, whereas the insulation effect is largest in the ice-growth
13 season.

14 The linkage between changes in air temperature and snowfall can also operate
15 in both senses. Warmer air temperatures may be associated with increases or de-
16 creases in snowfall. Here we have shown that in summer, warming leads to reduced
17 snowfall due to changes in SPR. Considering the cold season, increasing temper-
18 atures are expected to lead to more precipitation because higher air temperatures
19 can hold more water vapor. Since most precipitation in cold season falls as snow,
20 this would translate to an increase in snowfall. However, total precipitation is in-
21 fluenced by the complex interplay of numerous factors in addition to atmospheric
22 warming, for example, changes in cyclone activity (Figs. 5 and 6).

23 In summer, the albedo effect dominates over the insulation effect (Ledley, 1991,
24 1993) and warming is likely associated with decreased snowfall (Fig. 9) - a posi-
25 tive feedback. If snowfall was to increase due to autumn warming, the thicker snow

1 cover may reduce ice growth and led to a thinner sea ice cover - again, a positive
2 feedback. If autumn snowfall was to decrease, due to warming-induced changes in
3 SPR, the feedback could be negative in this season. Another consideration is that
4 increased winter or spring snowfall could result in the delayed melt of the snow
5 cover, a higher albedo in spring and reduced ice melt - a negative feedback. This
6 effect could be countered by spring warming that would promote earlier snow melt.
7 In short, the net climatic effect of the temperature-snowfall-ice feedback is depen-
8 dent on the sign, magnitude and timing of warming-induced snowfall changes, and
9 their interactions with other aspects of Arctic change. Whilst the results presented
10 here provide support for the existence of a positive feedback in association with the
11 summer snowfall decline, the net climatic effect of past (and projected) snowfall
12 changes in all seasons remains uncertain.

13 **8 Conclusions**

14 Our main conclusions can be summarized as:

- 15 1. The fraction of Arctic summer precipitation occurring as snow has declined
16 over the last two decades.
- 17 2. As a result of (1), summer Arctic snowfall has declined by 40% over the period
18 1989-2009.
- 19 3. (1) and (2) are primarily due to lower-atmospheric warming.
- 20 4. (1) and (2) have significantly reduced the area of snow-covered ice during
21 summer.
- 22 5. (4) has led to a substantial decrease in the Arctic-mean surface albedo.
- 23 6. (5) has likely contributed to the recent thinning of Arctic sea ice.

1 **Acknowledgements** We thank Environment Canada and the ECMWF for making their re-
2 spective datasets readily available on-line. Insightful comments from Steve Warren and two
3 anonymous reviewers improved the clarity of the manuscript. Parts of this research were sup-
4 ported by funding from the Australian Research Council.

5 **References**

- 6 Bekryaev R, Polyakov I, Alexeev V (2010) Role of polar amplification in long-
7 term surface air temperature variations and modern Arctic warming. *J Climate*
8 23:3888–3906
- 9 Cullather R, Bromwich D, Serreze M (2000) The atmospheric hydrologic cycle
10 over the Arctic Basin from reanalyses. Part I: Comparison with observations
11 and previous studies. *J Climate* 13:923–937
- 12 Curry J, Schramm J, Ebert E (1995) Sea ice-albedo climate feedback mechanism.
13 *J Climate* 8:240–247
- 14 Curry J, Schramm J, Perovich D, Pinto J (2001) Applications of SHEBA/FIRE
15 data to evaluation of snow/ice albedo parameterizations. *J Geophys Res*
16 106:15,345–15,355
- 17 Dee D, Uppala S (2009) Variational bias correction of satellite radiance data in
18 the ERA-Interim reanalysis. *Q J R Meteorol Soc* 135:1830–1841
- 19 Ebert E, Curry J (1993) An intermediate one-dimensional thermodynamic sea ice
20 model for investigating ice-atmosphere interactions. *J Geophys Res* 98:10,085–
21 10,109
- 22 Finnis J, Holland M, Serreze M, Cassano J (2007) Response of the Northern Hemi-
23 sphere extratropical cyclone activity and associated precipitation to climate

-
- 1 change, as represented by the Community Climate System Model. *J Geophys*
2 *Res* 112, G04S42, doi:10.1029/2006JG000286
- 3 Forland E, Hanssen-Bauer I (2000) Increased precipitation in the Norwegian Arc-
4 tic: true or false? *Climatic Change* 46:485–509
- 5 Francis J, White D, Cassano J, Gutowski W, Hinzman L, Holland M, Steele M,
6 Vorosmarty C (2009) An Arctic hydrological system in transition: Feedbacks
7 and impacts on terrestrial, marine, and human life. *J Geophys Res* 114, G04019,
8 doi:10.1029/2008JG000902
- 9 Gillett N, Stone D, Stott P, Nozawa T, Karpecho A, Hegerl G, Wehner M, Jones P
10 (2008) Attribution of polar warming to human influence. *Nature Geosci* 1:750–
11 754
- 12 Holland M, Finnis J, Barrett A, Serreze M (2007) Projected changes
13 in Arctic Ocean freshwater budgets. *J Geophys Res* 112, G04S55,
14 doi:10.1029/2006JG000354
- 15 Kattsov V, Walsh J, Chapman W, Govorkova V, Pavlova T, Zhang X (2007)
16 Simulation and projection of Arctic freshwater budget components by the IPCC
17 AR4 global climate models. *J Hydrometeor* 8:571–589
- 18 Kaufmann D, Schneider D, McKay N, Ammann C, Bradley R, Briffa K, Miller G,
19 Otto-Bliesner B, Overpeck J, Vinther B, 2k Project Members AL (2009) Recent
20 warming reverses long-term Arctic cooling. *Science* 325:1236–1239
- 21 Ledley T (1985) The sensitivity of a thermodynamic sea ice model with leads to
22 time step size. *J Geophys Res* 90:2251–2260
- 23 Ledley T (1991) Snow on sea ice: competing effects in shaping climate. *J Geophys*
24 *Res* 96:17,195–17,208

- 1 Ledley T (1993) Variations in snow on sea ice: a mechanism for producing climate
2 variations. *J Geophys Res* 98:10,401–10,410
- 3 Markus T, Stroeve J, Miller J (2009) Recent changes in Arctic sea ice
4 melt onset, freezeup and melt season length. *J Geophys Res* 114, C12024,
5 doi:10.1029/2009GJC005436
- 6 McCabe G, Wolock D (2010) Long-term variability in northern hemisphere snow
7 cover and association with warmer winters. *Climatic Change* 99:141–153
- 8 McClelland J, Holmes R, Peterson B, Stieglitz M (2004) Increasing river discharge
9 in the Eurasian Arctic: Consideration of dams, permafrost thaw, and fires as po-
10 tential agents of change. *J Geophys Res* 109, D18102, doi:10.1029/2004JD004583
- 11 McClelland J, Dery S, Peterson B, Holmes R, Wood E (2006) A pan-Arctic eval-
12 uation of changes in river discharge during the latter half of the 20th century.
13 *Geophys Res Letts* 33, L06715, doi:10.1029/2006GL025753
- 14 Miller G, Alley R, Brigham-Grette J, Fitzpatrick J, Polyak L, Serreze M, White
15 J (2010) Arctic amplification: can the past constrain the future? *Quat Sci Rev*
16 29:1779–1790
- 17 Min SK, Zhang X, Zweirs F (2008) Human-induced Arctic moistening. *Science*
18 320:518–520
- 19 Perovich D, Grenfell T, Light B, Hobbs P (2002) Seasonal evolution of the albedo
20 of multiyear Arctic sea ice. *J Geophys Res* 107, 8044, doi:10.1029/2000JC000438
- 21 Perovich D, Light B, Eicken H, Jones K, Runciman K, Nghiem S (2007) In-
22 creased solar heating of the Arctic Ocean and adjacent seas, 1979-2005: at-
23 tribution and role in the ice-albedo feedback. *Geophys Res Letts* 34, L19505,
24 doi:10.1029/2007GL031480

-
- 1 Peterson B, Holmes R, McClelland J, Vorosmarty C, Lammers R, Shiklomanov
2 I, Rahmstorf S (2002) Increasing river discharge to the Arctic Ocean. *Science*
3 298:2171–2173
- 4 Peterson B, McClelland J, Curry R, Holmes R, Walsh J, Aagaard K (2006) Trajec-
5 tory shifts in the Arctic and sub-Arctic freshwater cycle. *Science* 313:1061–1066
- 6 Polyak L, Alley R, Andrews J, Brigham-Grette J, Cronin T, Darby D, Dyke A,
7 Fitzpatrick J, Funder S, Holland M, Jennings A, Miller G, O’Regan M, Savelle
8 J, Serreze M, John K, White J, Wolff E (2010) History of sea ice in the Arctic.
9 *Quat Sci Rev* 29:1757–1778
- 10 Screen J, Simmonds I (2010a) The central role of diminishing sea ice in recent
11 Arctic temperature amplification. *Nature* 464:1334–1337
- 12 Screen J, Simmonds I (2010b) Increasing fall-winter energy loss from the Arctic
13 Ocean and its role in Arctic temperature amplification. *Geophys Res Letts* 37,
14 L16707, doi:10.1029/2010GL044136
- 15 Screen J, Simmonds I (in press) Erroneous Arctic temperature trends in the ERA-
16 40 reanalysis: a closer look. *J Climate*
- 17 Serreze M, Barrett A (2008) The summer cyclone maximum over the central Arctic
18 Ocean. *J Climate* 21:1048–1065
- 19 Serreze M, Francis J (2006) The Arctic amplification debate. *Climatic Change*
20 76:241–264
- 21 Serreze M, Hurst C (2000) Representation of mean Arctic precipitation from
22 NCEP-NCAR and ERA reanalyses. *J Climate* 13:182–201
- 23 Serreze M, Holland M, Stroeve J (2007) Perspectives on the Arctic’s shrinking
24 sea-ice cover. *Science* 315:1533–1536

-
- 1 Serreze M, Barrett A, Stroeve J, Kindig D, Holland M (2009) The emergence of
2 surface-based Arctic amplification. *Cryosphere* 3:11–19
- 3 Simmonds I, Keay K (2009) Extraordinary September Arctic sea ice reductions
4 and their relationships with storm behavior over 1979–2008. *Geophys Res Letts*
5 36, L19715, doi:10.1029/2009GL039810
- 6 Simmonds I, Burke C, Keay K (2008) Arctic climate change as manifest in cyclone
7 behavior. *J Climate* 21:5777–5796
- 8 Simmons A, Uppala S, Dee D, Kobayashi S (2006) ERA-Interim: new ECMWF
9 reanalysis products from 1989 onwards. *ECMWF Newsletter* 110:25–35
- 10 Simmons A, Willett K, Jones P, Thorne P, Dee D (2010) Low-frequency variations
11 in surface atmospheric humidity, temperature, and precipitation: inferences from
12 reanalyses and monthly gridded observational data sets. *J Geophys Res* 115,
13 D01110, doi:10.1029/2009JD012442
- 14 Solomon S, Qin D, Manning M, Chen Z, Marquis M, Averyt K, Tignot M, Miller H
15 (2007) *Climate Change 2007: the Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge University
16 Press
- 17 Stroeve J, Holland M, Meier W, Scambos T, Serreze M (2007) Arc-
18 tic sea ice decline: faster than forecast. *Geophys Res Letts* 34, L09501,
19 doi:10.1029/2007GL029703
- 20 Symon C, Arris L, Heal B (2004) *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*. Cambridge
21 University Press
- 22 Uppala S, Dee D, Kobayashi S, Berrisford P, Simmons A (2008) Towards a climate
23 data assimilation system: status update of ERA-Interim. *ECMWF Newsletter*
24 115:12–18

-
- 1 Warren S, Rigor I, Untersteiner N, Radionov V, Bryazgin N, Aleksandrov Y,
2 Colony R (1999) Snow depth on Arctic sea ice. *J Climate* 12:1814–1829
- 3 White D, Hinzman L, Alessa L, Cassano J, Chambers M, Falkner K, Francis J,
4 Gutowski W, Holland M, Holmes R, Huntington H, Kane D, Kliskey A, Lee C,
5 McClelland J, Petersen B, Rupp T, Straneo F, Steele M, Woodgate R, Yang
6 D, Yoshokawa K, Zhang T (2007) The Arctic freshwater system: Changes and
7 impacts. *J Geophys Res* 112, G02S54, doi:10.1029/2006JG000353
- 8 Wu P, Wood R, Stott P (2005) Human influence on increasing Arctic river dis-
9 charges. *Geophys Res Letts* 32, L02703, doi:10.1029/2004GL021570




Fig. 1 Seasonally varying ice albedo in ERA-I.




Fig. 2 (top left) Daily snowfall-to-precipitation ratio (SPR) as a function of mean surface air temperature at Resolute and (top right) in ERA-I sub-sampled at the grid-box containing Resolute. Each cross denotes a day in the period 1989-2009. Days with no precipitation are not plotted; 81% of the days considered were “wet” at Resolute and 74% in the ERA-I grid-box. The black line shows the mean SPR calculated for 1K bins and smoothed with a boxcar average of 5-bin-width. (middle) As top, but for daily snowfall and (bottom) for daily total precipitation




Fig. 3 Monthly climatologies of the Arctic-mean (north of 70°N) SPR (solid) and surface air temperature (dashed) in ERA-I, 1989-2009.




Fig. 4 Linear changes from 1989 to 2009 in seasonal-mean SPR, daily snowfall (mm-we d^{-1}), daily rainfall (mm d^{-1}) and daily total precipitation (mm d^{-1}) at the Canadian meteorological stations. Each gray cross represents the 21-year change at one station. Multi-station means for the Arctic (north of 70°N) and sub-Arctic ($60\text{-}70^\circ\text{N}$) are shown by the squares and triangles, respectively. Note that in summer, two sub-Arctic stations have large rainfall and precipitation increases that fall outside the upper bound of the vertical scale and are not plotted, but are included in the sub-Arctic mean.




Fig. 5 Linear changes from 1989 to 2009 in seasonal-mean Arctic-mean SPR, daily snowfall (mm-we d^{-1}), daily rainfall (mm d^{-1}) and daily total precipitation (mm d^{-1}) in ERA-I. Darker bars denote linear changes that are statistically significant at the 90% level or better.




Fig. 6 Linear changes from 1989 to 2009 in seasonal-mean Arctic-mean cyclone number and mean cyclone depth in ERA-I. Darker bars denote linear changes that are statistically significant at the 90% level or better. For ease of plotting on the same vertical scale, both cyclone variables have been normalized by their standard deviation.




Fig. 7 Linear changes from 1989 to 2009 in (left) June-, (middle) July- and (right) August-mean SPR in ERA-I.. The colored dots denote SPR changes from Canadian meteorological stations. There is a change in map projection from satellite-view in the upper maps to polar stereographic in the lower maps.




Fig. 8 Monthly-mean SPR change from 1989 to 2009 as a function of (top) mean surface temperature change and (bottom) mean surface temperature at the Canadian meteorological stations during the summer months (diamonds, triangles and squares denote June, July and August, respectively).




Fig. 9 (top) Time series of Arctic-mean summer-mean daily snowfall (solid). The dashed and dotted lines denote the estimated snowfall due to changes in precipitation or changes in SPR, respectively. (bottom) Time series of Arctic-mean summer 900hPa air temperature (note the inverted scale).




Fig. 10 Daily mean snowfall during June-July 1989 from an ERA-I grid-box in the Barents Sea. The dashed line denotes the daily sea ice fraction. The solid and dotted lines denote the albedo from ERA-I and the nudged experiment, respectively.




Fig. 11 Time series of summer (top) sea ice area, (middle) snow-covered ice area and (bottom) the fraction of ice covered by snow.




Fig. 12 (top) Time series of Arctic-mean summer albedo from (solid) ERA-I and (dashed) the nudged experiment. (bottom) Linear change from 1989 to 2009 in the Arctic-mean summer albedo in ERA-I and the nudged experiment, and their difference.




Fig. 13 top) Time series of Arctic-mean summer net surface clear-sky solar radiation (W m^{-2}) from (solid) ERA-I and (dashed) the nudged experiment. (bottom) Linear change from 1989 to 2009 in the Arctic-mean summer albedo in ERA-I and the nudged experiment, and their difference.