WOODS HOLE OCEANOGRAPHIC INSTITUTION



Atmospheric weather patterns and their contributions to the fall stratification breakdown on the Southern New England shelf

L. Lobert^{1,2}, G. Gawarkiewicz¹, A. Plueddemann¹

- ¹ Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA
- ² Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA

i) Why we all should care about stratification (N^2) variability at shelfbreak fronts:

- N^2 constraints vertical motions and the nutrient upwelling in a highly productive coastal region.
- N^2 facilitates frontal instability and surface layer exchange between the coastal and the open ocean.

ii) The goal: We aim to identify the pathways of wind-driven destratification close to a shelfbreak front under varying forcing and frontal state characteristics.

iii) Why this region?

- Impact: The US East Coast warms rapidly.
- <u>Generalizability:</u> A wide variety of forcing processes meets a 'textbook'-shelfbreak with smooth bathymetry. Opportunity: A multi-year observational dataset [1].

Clustering revealed that these two downwelling-favorable high-wind patterns destratify the shelf the most:



Fig. 1: Mean characteristics of impactful downwelling-favorable high-wind event patterns. Upper row: Mean sea level pressure fields. Lower row: Composite timeseries observed by mooring array (white diamond).

The steadiness of a synoptic highwind forcing pattern determines whether coastal destratification is caused rather locally or advectively.

This claim is backed by the following 2 observations: i] Hydrography vs. impact



Fig. 2: Salinity (S)/ Temperature (T) contributions to shelf destratification for individual events point to advection vs. surface cooling as 'source' of destratification.

The attempt of a unifying framework in 2D:

 Q_{s} MLD≺ പ noclin

Fig. 4: Sketch of downwelling-favorable wind forcing processes affecting the shelfbreak ocean stratification in a 2D framework. Left: Forcing characteristics of rotating cyclones. Right: Forcing characteristics of steady high-pressure systems. Along-shelf gradients are neglected.

Check out our preprint on the categorization of high-wind

ii] Dynamical forcing regime vs. impact



Fig.3: Scalar estimates of 1D local TKE-input $\propto \int |u|^3 dt$ and 2D cross-shelf Ekman transport $\propto \int au_x dt$. The Ekmancell is more effective in terms of required wind forcing strength.



foot of the front

In addition: Shelfbreak frontal instability

The Southern New England Shelfbreak front is inherently unstable in both models [2] and observations [3]. In an idealized model [4] ...

- ... finite-amplitude frontal meander scales are set by the length scales of present barotropic (BTI) and baroclinic (BCI) instability.
- ... symmetric instability (SI) can facilitate the development of other instability with larger growth rate in the vicinity of the front.

Hypothesis: The steadiness of the forcing event determines the mix of instability mechanisms favored.

Preliminary test: Check cross-shelf glider sections for dynamical conditions that allow flow instability.

<u>BCI</u>: Richardson-Number: $Ri = \frac{N^2}{|\partial u/\partial z|^2}$

assumptions to allow computation from glider transects [5]

<u>SI:</u> Ertel PV: $q = \omega_a \cdot \nabla b \approx -\frac{|\nabla_h b|^2}{f} + N^2 (f + \zeta)$ $\frac{|b_y|}{f} + N^2(f - u_y)$



Fig. 4: Occurrence frequency necessary for instability conditions as a function of depth and averaged across the shelfbreak (from 39.85-40.35°N). a) Ri < 1 as a condition for BCI; b) Ertel Potential vorticity q < 0 as a condition for SI [6]. All data from gridded glider transects.

Some preliminary observations:

- The obvious one: Instabilities are more prominent when winds are strong.
- **BCI-conditions:** most typically at the surface and MLD
- **SI-conditions:** most often in ML; monotonous decrease below.

So, what's next then?

- 1) Explore how far data availability allows to differentiate between different forcing regimes (e.g., forcing steadiness) and ocean state (e.g., frontal state).
- 2) Add the missing components to the picture/framework, i.e.,
 - the Ekman Buoyancy Flux (EBF) and its sub-surface structure,
 - Barotropic Instability (BTI)
 - along-shelf variations and frontal meander scales.

References

- [1] OOI Coastal Pioneer Array: ooinet.oceanobservatories.org
- [2] Flagg and Beardsley (1976). J. Geophys. Res., 83(C9)
- [3] Fratantoni and Pickart (2003). J. Geophys. Res., 108(C5)
- [4] Zhang and Gawarkiewicz (2015). J. Phys. Oceanog., 45(10)
- [5] Thompson et al. (2016). J. Phys. Oceanog., 46(4)



Contact: llobert(*a*)**whoi.edu**

