Atmospheric Sciences Section of AGU Newsletter

Interview with Thomas Knutson

Hans von Storch

What would you consider the most two significant achievements in your career?

I think the two most significant achievements have been the cumulative works done in two areas: the modeling of hurricanes and climate and the climate change detection problem, combining models and observations. This work has been very much a collaborative effort involving a number of colleagues, especially at GFDL, and I am very grateful to have been able to work with these colleagues to achieve much more than I could have done on my own.

In modeling of hurricanes and climate we have shown that it is possible to dynamically downscale the year to year changes in Atlantic hurricane activity surprising well using large scale climate forcings together with a dynamical model. We've worked to leverage the GFDL hurricane model—an operational model used for short-term (1-5 day) weather prediction – to simulate how storms may become more intense in a greenhouse warmed climate. My work in climate change detection has focused on several areas. Gabe Vecchi and I worked to assess the reliability of past Atlantic hurricane counts based on the evolving density of observing ship traffic since the late 1800s,

and we find an effect large enough to change a highly significant increasing trend into a non-significant trend. Suki Manabe and I documented the presence of substantial multi-decadal modulations of El Nino amplitude in the GFDL climate models. If such modulation also occurs in the real world, then there is a great need for caution in interpreting changes of El Nino amplitude as trends as opposed to background internal variability. We've assessed the consistency between historical climate simulations and past observed trends in regional surface temperature using methods that are fairly accessible to non-specialists. This latter work supports IPCC's general conclusion that there is already a detectable human influence on regional surface temperatures due to increasing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases.

When you look back in time, what were

the most significant, exciting or surprising developments in atmospheric science?

First of all, it was exciting to be a part of the science research effort as the global warming issue emerged over time. Not only has it been fascinating to watch the observational evidence mount over time, it was striking to witness the progress being made in climate modeling and analysis, which led to increasingly strong evidence that humans were responsible for much of the observed global climate warming. Moreover, it has been interesting to watch as this problem expanded into other disciplines in the social and natural sciences, and to see the growing interaction of climate science with the policy/political/private sector realms. I think these trends will only continue over the coming decades due to the long time scales and continued growth of the problem as well as its international dimensions. Among the more surprising developments have been the many innovative and clever methods that the community has developed to tease information out of models and out of available data of all kinds to learn more about the climate system. For example, it's amazing to see how scientists can use even

AGU FALL MEETING 2011
San Francisco, California, USA | 5-9 December

Join us at the Atmospheric Sciences Banquet, 6 December 2011. Be sure to sign up for the banquet when you register for the Fall Meeting.

Section News
Atmospheric Science Section Member Awarded Climate Communication Prize

Morgan B. Yarker

Photo curtsey of Bruce Gilbert

The Atmospheric Science section is proud to announce Dr. Gavin Schmidt as the winner of the first annual Climate Communication Prize. This prize is funded by a donation from Nature's Own and is aimed at honoring scientists for the communication of climate science. According to the AGU website, the prize "highlights the importance of promoting scientific literacy, clarity of message, and efforts to foster respect and understanding of science-based values as they relate to the implications of climate change."

The prize committee selected Schmidt for his work as co-founder and editor of the RealClimate.org blog, book-writing and media outreach. According to Schmidt, the idea for RealClimate was based on a desire to respond to public interest in climate change issues portrayed in the media and in motion pictures, like The Day After Tomorrow (2004). He explained, "There was very little response from the science community to the movie [The Day After Tomorrow], partially because there was no venue for discussion or to answer questions. So I started thinking about ways to interactively explain these concepts to the public and a blog seemed to fit."

Schmidt says that the goal of RealClimate is to share with the public what climate scientists actually think about climate science and why - in ways that do not generally get media coverage. More importantly, visitors to the website can interact directly with the scientists, something that doesn't often occur elsewhere. The site discusses a range of climate science issues, including data measurements, natural variation, anthropogenic change, the scientific process, and climate models and over the years has built up a large archive of discussions.

One of the benefits to contributing to RealClimate, Schmidt feels, is that it strengthened his ability to write clearly and cohesively for the general public. One big test came about in 2009 when climate scientists' emails were stolen from the Climatic Research Unit in the UK and allegations of misconduct were flying. RealClimate was the main source able to convey the context of the emails. "It was a unique moment," Schmidt said.

Schmidt works as a Climate Scientist at the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York where he leads development of the climate modeling group. He is the co-author with photographer Joshua Wolfe of "Climate Change: Picturing the Science" (published by W. W. Norton 2009).

AGU Fall Meeting 2011 Highlights:

The 2012 AGU Fellows for Atmospheric Science Section will be honored at the AGU Fall Meeting 2011 in San Francisco. Join us to celebrate them. Honors Ceremony and Reception will take place Wednesday, 7 December, Moscone North, Hall E. Honors Banquet will take place Thursday, 8 December (tickets required: U.S. $65.00).

Join us at the Atmospheric Sciences Banquet, 6 December 2011, to honor Atmospheric Sciences Section Award Winners:
Tiffany Shaw, 2011 winner of the James R. Holton Award
Alex Guenther, 2011 winner of the Yoram J. Kaufman Award
Be sure to sign up for the banquet when you register for the Fall Meeting (students tickets $15).

Plan to attend the Atmospheric Sciences Sections special lectures on Tuesday, 6 December 2011:
the Jacob Bjerknes Lecturer, Paul Newman (NASA/GSFC) and the Jule Charney Lecturer Graeme Stephens (NASA/JPL).

* Don't forget to support AGU by volunteering as a judge for the Outstanding Student Paper Awards (OSPA). help with student Travel Grant selection, or serving as Editors and on Editorial Advisory boards. Contact Anne Thompson at amt16@psu.edu, or Peter Webster at pjw@eas.gatech.edu to volunteer.

tiny bits of geologic "proxy" evidence to piece together a history of past climates; how satellite data, ocean measurements, ground-based measurement, balloon based measurements, etc. are used together to build a coherent picture of the climate system; how statistical and numerical methods are used to analyze data, initialize models, confront models with data, improve model performance, uncover problems with observed records, probe mechanisms behind observed phenomena and much more.

Is there a politicization of atmospheric science?

Yes, I would say so, with a familiar specific example being the greenhouse warming problem. As climate science began to have stronger and more immediate policy implications, and as a more earnest policy debate began about whether to attempt to control greenhouse gas emissions through governmental actions, the science community in turn began to experience increased interaction with the public, policy arena, and vested interest groups (e.g., private industry). Not surprisingly, these interactions have become more vigorous, politically charged, and at times confrontational—perhaps more confrontational than many climate scientists were expecting. Humans are still in the relatively early stages of experiencing the greenhouse gas-induced changes, and of reducing or quantifying the uncertainties about what future climate changes may occur. We're still in the very early stages in terms of adaptation responses and mitigation. Therefore, I expect these interactions between scientists and society will grow and evolve over the coming decades in even more interesting ways. That is, climate science will continue to interact strongly with the political sphere for a long time to come due to the very nature of the problems that we face and their linkage to society in terms of both impacts and mitigation efforts. The days where climate scientists could work in relative isolation from the political implications of their work have now come and gone, especially for those scientists who either take on problems of great interest to policymakers or who take a special interest in communication between climate scientists and the society at large.

What constitutes "good" science?

Knutson at Shenandoah in 1978.

Good science truly advances understanding, perhaps not by providing proof, but by providing evidence and objective assessment of the evidence that allows for more informed understanding of a particular issue or physical phenomenon. Good science can be done in pursuit of problems that either may or may not have strong implications for society (i.e., knowledge for knowledge sake vs more practical problem areas). I prefer working on those areas which I see as having strong societal implications, such as future climate change and understanding and predicting the anthropogenic and natural influences on climate. For these areas, the importance of the communication of science to the broader science, policymaking, and public arenas should be recognized. In addition to conducting and reporting on science activity leading to improved understanding, it is the responsibility of scientists working in these more societally focused areas to communicate in such a way that the main points and uncertainties are understood, but without stretching statements (in either direction) beyond what is scientifically justified.

What is the subjective element in scientific practice? Does culture matter? What is the role of instinct?

I do see there being a subjective element with

instinct playing a role. For instance, consider that a typical scientist will live ~80 yr and spend ~40 yr working during a typical scientific career. This means that your time is a limited resource. Deciding how to spend this limited resource requires choices to be made: What problem should one undertake? What is the best approach to the problem? Are there some approaches that, while intellectually more satisfying, are likely to be either too difficult or time-consuming to realistically pursue, given one's access to resources. How should one divide one's time between research and other related activities such as teaching/mentoring/communicating/service to the community, etc.? When choosing science problems to work on, there may be naturally a tension between exploring 'off-beat' hypotheses in pursuit of a big breakthrough vs maintaining focus and discipline that can lead to incremental increases in knowledge. In these and other areas, I think instinct and subjective judgment are very useful for guiding one's choices.

How did you come into the field of atmospheric sciences?

I was intrigued by the possibility of studying global climate change and greenhouse warming for quite a few years before I actually took the plunge into atmospheric sciences. For me studying atmospheric sciences was in fact mainly a vehicle I would use to study the global warming problem. I first became aware of the greenhouse warming issue as a teenager growing up in the mountains of Virginia, as I recall, reading a newspaper article in The Washington Post on one of Suki Manabe's early CO_2 sensitivity studies. The thought of working on something as important as global climate change--something that could affect the entire planet--was really exciting. Growing up the son of a geologist, I already had a keen interest in the natural world and some conception of what a dramatic role climate change could play in shaping the world through ice ages and the like.

Although I wasn't prepared to take the plunge into climate science right at that moment, this remained in the back of my mind as I began my undergraduate studies in computer science at

Announcement

STUDENTS: At the Atmospheric Sciences and Global Environmental Change banquet, Tuesday night, December 6, we will show slides featuring student presentations at the Fall Meeting. For all the students attending, please download this PowerPoint slide, http://www.agu.org/sections/atmos/YourNameAGUbanquet2011.ppt , fill in your information, change the file name to add your name, and email it to Alan Robock at robock@envsci.rutgers.edu by the end of the day on Friday, December 2, and we will show your slide during the banquet. Even if you will have already given your talk or poster by Tuesday night, please send a slide so we can tell people about your work. We look forward to seeing you all then.

the University of Virginia. There I had an opportunity to elect a minor course of study, and after looking through the course catalog, I settled on Environmental Sciences. One particularly influential course I took was Bruce Hayden's Holocene Climates course, which was fun and just fascinating to me. Bruce covered greenhouse warming briefly in the course as well as all sorts of interesting paleoclimate topics. I told Bruce I wanted to pursue the topic of climate change in graduate school and he gave me a list of programs to consider. Among those, I eventually chose the University of Wisconsin and John Kutzbach's group, where climate change was studied within an atmospheric sciences department. That's actually how I actually ended up in the field of atmospheric sciences. Although I started out doing my graduate research and an initial stint at GFDL working on the Madden-Julian Oscillations-- and even had a brief period away from science research, where I pursued graduate studies in management-- eventually I settled back on the greenhouse warming problem as my main career focus. As it turned out, I was fortunate enough to secure a position in Suki Manabe's group in 1990 and enjoyed several years of work with Suki before he retired from GFDL.

What would your advice be for young scientists coming now and the coming years into the field of atmospheric sciences?

Let me answer this question rephrased as "into the field of global climate change". I think that climate scientists have a special role to play in society now and going forward. The role is to use the power of the scientific method to inform decision-making and promote good stewardship of the planet. If climate science, over the long term, is to maintain credibility as a scientific endeavor and be a trusted source to inform decisions, this means above all that we must present highest quality science in as fair and clear a manner as possible, neither shying away from presenting findings that may make some in our audience (i.e., the world) uncomfortable, nor "stretching the truth" to attain some objective. Perhaps the advice of Bertrand Russell, from a 1959 BBC interview, suits the question best:

"When you are studying any matter, or considering any philosophy, ask yourself only: what are the facts and what is the truth that the facts bear out. Never let yourself be diverted, either by what you wish to believe or by what you think would have beneficent social effects if it were believed. But look only and solely at what are the facts."

Source:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g3jnEqXhDNI&feature=player_embedded#!

Extreme rainfall frequency in the Atlanta metropolitan area: An analysis of September 2009

Laura Belanger

National Weather Service, Peachtree City, Georgia

Extreme rainfall across north Georgia during

Atlanta Floods (September 2009): Downtown Flooding of I85/75 Connector (top, photo from Glenn Dyke, top). Six Flags Over Georgia (bottom, photo from MSNBC).

September 18-23, 2009 resulted in historic, catastrophic flooding. The most intense rainfall occurred in a 24-period from September 20-21, with amounts exceeding 10 inches in a large area of the western Atlanta metropolitan. Ten people perished in Georgia as a direct result of the flooding, and damage amounted to more than $300 million. To capture the statistical significance of this extreme rainfall event, a regional frequency analysis was performed using observed rainfall data from more than 30 state-wide locations to develop theoretical extreme value distributions via L-moments. This analysis supports the initial post-event conclusion that the 24-hour rainfall amounts during September 20-21, 2009 were in excess of a 10,000-year rainfall event.

Event Background

The September 20-21, 2009 extreme rainfall event fell within a prolonged rainy period for the Southeastern United States. Moisture from both the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico contributed to a saturated atmosphere as a stalled upper-level low pressure system over

the lower Mississippi River Valley began to lift out on September 20, 2009. A series of mid and upper-level disturbances moved over the area, providing a focus for shower and thunderstorm development (NOAA 2010). Precipitable Water (PW) values exceeded 2 inches at the peak of the event – more than two standard deviations above normal.[1] The combination of anomalous moisture and a strong low-level jet provided the ingredients for torrential downpours and training of storm cells over a particular area. In a 24-hour period, the western Atlanta Metropolitan area saw widespread 10-20 inches of rain, with isolated larger amounts. The maximum 24-hour rainfall total of 21.03 inches was reported at the Douglas County Water and Sewer Authority just west of Atlanta in Douglasville, Georgia (NOAA 2010).

Initial Frequency Analysis

The floods resulting from the extreme precipitation amounts were unprecedented in some cases, with historic and catastrophic impacts. Eleven people perished as a direct result of the event – ten of those in Georgia. In total, more than $300 million in property damage was reported (NOAA 2010). Following the event, a demand for the statistical significance of the event arose from Emergency Management Agencies, media, and citizens. A quick analysis was performed using a gamma distribution fit to the top 30, 24-hour rainfall events for the Hartsfield Jackson Atlanta International Airport observation site (KATL).[2]

The gamma distribution method achieved an unreasonably low return frequency for the 21.03 inch maximum observation, so the process was reproduced using 10 and 12 inches as a guideline. As a result, the Public Information Statement published by National Weather Service, Peachtree City stated that the chances of this event occurring "are less than one hundredth of one percent, or a 10,000-year event."

The National Service Assessment conducted by the National Weather Service highlighted the necessity for a more robust analysis of the September 2009 event in order to convey more statistically sound information. Rather than analyzing a single point using a limited data set, a regional frequency analysis was preferred in which data from several sites are used to estimate the frequency distribution at each site (Hosking 1990).

Regional Frequency Analysis

Previous studies indicate that for a regional frequency analysis, it is common and appropriate to comprise an Annual Maximum Series (AMS) and a Partial Duration Series (PDS) from the selection observed data for each site in the defined region. The AMS consists of the largest 24-hour rainfall total of each year for the length of the observed record. The PDS uses the highest N events where N is

the number of years in the observed record (Chow et al. 1988). The most significant objection to using an AMS is that it highlights only the largest event in each individual year, regardless of whether other events during the same year exceed the largest event of other years. Given a fairly long and reliable PDS record, the use of this distribution should yield more accurate estimates of extreme quantiles than the corresponding AMS frequencies (Maidment 1993).

L-Moments

To create the theoretical distributions from the AMS and PDS data, an alternative approach to the long-established moment-based methods is to use L-moments. L-moments are estimated by linear combinations of order statistics and are analogous to ordinary moments, defining the shape of an observational distribution. (Hosking 1993). Specifically, the first moment is the mean, second is the variance, third is the skewness, and fourth is the kurtosis. As L-moments employ actual observational data, when compared with unconventional moments, the results are unbiased and more effective (Gubareva et al. 2010). Additionally, L-moments provide simple, reasonably efficient estimators of the observational data characteristics, especially with respect to rainfall and hydrologic data (Maidment 1993). In regional frequency analysis, to obtain a normalized frequency distribution, a regional weighted average of the L-moments is used to generate theoretical distributions, such that a site with a longer period of record does not have undue influence.

Data Selection

For this analysis, 35 Georgia observation sites with at least a 50-year period of record were obtained from the National Climatic Data Center (NCDC). The archived daily rainfall data is a 24-hour accumulation ending at 7 AM. As the highest 24-hour rainfall totals are usually not confined to this specific time frame, we apply an adjustment factor of 1.13 to the daily observations to convert them to 24-hour observations, consistent with NOAA Atlas 14 (2004) and Technical Paper 40 (1961). The AMS and PDS distributions were


Figure 1. AMS (red) and PDS (blue) data distribution overlaid on the precipitation record for Hartsfield Jackson Atlanta International Airport (1930-2009).


Figure 2. L-kurtosis v. L-Skewness of the AMS (red) and PDS (blue) data sets for each of the 33 locations (dots) and the regional weighted average L-moments (stars). The GEV (red line) and the GPD (blue line) were subjectively selected as having the minimum deviation.


Figure 3. Observed vs. Theoretical distribution for the AMS (left) and PDS (right) for all sites.

generated for each of the 35 site locations in North Georgia. Figure 1 shows the KATL observational time series overlaid with the AMS and PDS data. As typical with the AMS, it includes lower rainfall amounts relative to the PDS dataset. Common with the PDS, all values are generally above a particular threshold. It is important to note that the PDS data series appear homogenous through the period of record, with no apparent bias during any period. Thus, it can be inferred, that regardless of changes in the background climate, there appears to be no major impact to the occurrence of extreme rainfall events in Atlanta.

Results

Goodness of Fit

A qualitative goodness of fit test determined

Figure 4. Ratio of the theoretical distribution fits of the PDS and AMS datasets. Values equivalent to one imply perfect agreement for the recurrence interval of the extreme distributions.

the candidate distributions that were most appropriate for each of the observational data sets by accenting the minimum deviation from the theoretical distribution. Figure 2 shows the L-kurtosis and L-skewness relationship for the AMS and PDS datasets for each of the 33 sites along with the regionally-weighted average. Although many candidate distributions were considered, including the log-normal shown in Figure 2, the goodness of fit test concluded that the GEV and GPD were appropriate for the AMS and PDS, respectively, and for simplicity the others are not discussed here.

For extreme value probabilities, the fit of the theoretical distribution to the tails, or the observed extreme rainfall totals is important. Figures 3 shows the comparison of the theoretical distribution to the observational data for the AMS and PDS datasets, for each quantile. Ideally, a perfectly linear relationship is desired with the probability of a particular rainfall amount in the theoretical distribution matching that of the observational data set. Note the high correlation between the theoretical and observed data for both AMS and PDS, with r^2 near 0.98 in both cases. This figure also emphasizes the need for the theoretical distribution, as the highest value in the observational data set is near 12 inches.

Figure 4 shows the ratio of the theoretical PDS and AMS distributions. Although initially the theoretical PDS values are higher than the AMS, with larger probabilities (or smaller recurrence intervals), the ratio converges to 1. Thus, using the L-moments method on the PDS and AMS dataset with the appropriate theoretical distribution results in very similar estimates for the average recurrence interval for extreme rainfall events.

Theoretical Estimate of Recurrence Interval

Using the theoretical distributions resulting from the regional frequency analysis, the 24-hour rainfall amount associated with a 0.01% probability is 13.8 inches. Using a Monte Carlo simulation with 1,000 synthetic distributions for each site and focusing on the second L-moment, the 95% confidence interval ranges between 13.5 and 15.6 inches

for a 0.01% probability. However, the September 2009 highest rainfall total is 21.03 inches, which occurred in Douglasville, Georgia. From the theoretical distributions based on the AMS and PDS datasets, this amount is associated with a 0.00025% probability, or a 600,000-year event. Using the 95% confidence interval, this probability can vary from 18.3 to 31.1 inches. Thus, this analysis of the September 20-21, 2009 extreme rainfall event supports the initial finding that the observed 21.03 inches was in excess of a 10,000-year event.

Conclusion

The motivation for this analysis was to perform a more robust statistical analysis on the extreme rainfall observed September 20-21, 2009 in the western Metropolitan Atlanta area. The initial, post-event calculations determined that this anomalous event had a probability of 0.01% of occurring in a given year, or a 10,000-year event. In this analysis, L-moments were used to derive extreme theoretical distributions based on Annual Maximum Series and Partial Duration Series datasets for 33 different sites across Georgia. Upon evaluating the goodness of fit for a set of extreme value distributions (Generalized Pareto and Generalized Extreme

Value), we show that at high rainfall totals, the two methods result in similar estimated recurrence intervals. Based on the theoretical extreme value distributions, it is seen that a 24-hr rainfall total of 21.03 inches is associated with a 0.00025% probability, which is in excess of a 10,000-year event. In addition to the analysis shown here, further computations have updated the rainfall amounts for major recurrence intervals ranging from 1 to 100 years. As a result, in-office rainfall frequency forecaster resources at the National Weather Service in Peachtree City have been updated to reflect these values.

[1]http://www.crh.noaa.gov/unr/include/pw.php?sid=ffc
[2]http://climate.met.psu.edu/features/other/rainextreme.php

References

Bonnin, G., D. Martin, T. Parzybok, B. Lin, D. Riley, and M. Yekta, 2006: Precipitation frequency atlas of the United States. NOAA Atlas 14 Volume 2, Version 3.0, National Weather Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

Chow, V.T., D.R. Maidment, and L.W. Mays, 1988: Applied Hydrology. McGraw-Hill International Editions, 572 pp.

Hosking, J.R.M., and J.R. Wallis, 1991: Some statistics useful in regional frequency analysis. Research Report RC 17096 (#75863) 8/12/1991, Mathematics, IBM Research Division, T.J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, New York.

Hosking, J.R.M. and J.R.Wallis, 1993: Some statistics useful in regional frequency analysis. Water Resources, 29, no. 2, 271-281.

Hosking, J.R.M. and J.R. Wallis, 1997: Regional frequency analysis, an approach based on L-moments. Cambridge University Press, 224 pp.

Gubareva, T.S., and B.I. Gartsman, 2010: Estimating distribution parameters of extreme hydrometeorological characteristics by L-moments method. Water Resources, 37, no. 4, 437-445.

Jaiswal, R.K., N.K. Goel, P. Singh, T. Thomas, 2003: L-Moment based flood frequency modelling. Journal of the Institution of Engineers, 84, 6-10.

Maidment, D. R., 1993: Handbook of Hydrology. McGraw-Hill Publishing, 29.47 pp.

NOAA, 2010: Southeast United States Floods, September 18-23, 2009. Service Assessment, 71 pp.

Conferences Opportunities

// AGU Fall Meeting 2011 //

San Francisco, CA, USA 1317

December 2011.

// AGU Chapman Conference on Remote Sensing of the Terrestrial Water Cycle//

http://www.agu.org/meetings/chapman/2012/acall/

19–22 February 2012, Kona, Hawaii, USA

// Ocean Sciences 2012 Ocean Sciences Meeting//

http://www.sgmeet.com/osm2012/

20–24 February 2012, Salt Lake City,

Utah, USA

Announcement

The AGU Council Leadership Team and Board have decided to align terms of office for AGU (executive officers and Council) to the calendar year, rather than the present July 1 rotation. This will take effect 1 January 2013. As a result, the current Council and Section committees have been asked to serve an additional 6 months, from 1 July to 31 December 2012. The nomination calendar for new officers will be announced early in 2012.

DISCCRS VII
Interdisciplinary Climate Change Research Symposium
http://disccrs.org/disccrsposter.pdf
October 13-20, 2012
La Foret Conference and Retreat Center
Colorado Springs, CO
Application Deadline: February 29, 2012
Participation limited to 30 early-career Ph.D. scholars
Airfare and on-site expenses are supported through grants from NSF and NASA
http://disccrs.org

It is imperative for climate change researchers to form strong collaborative bonds that reach across disciplines and other boundaries. Every year the DISsertations initiative for the advancement of Climate Change ReSearch (DISCCRS, pronounced discourse) hosts a symposium for early-career climate change researchers. Our goal is to catalyze international, interdisciplinary collaboration while laying the foundation for dynamic, communicative collegial networks that are better-equipped to understand and respond to the myriad challenges posed by climate change.

During the week-long symposium, 30 invited DISCCRS Scholars will have the opportunity to present their research, hone interdisciplinary communication and teambuilding skills, and discuss emerging research and trends. Scholars will also have the opportunity to discuss societal and professional challenges involved in climate change research, with each other and with established researchers invited to serve as mentors.

Applications will be reviewed by an interdisciplinary collection of climate researchers. The selection committee will favor applicants who plan to engage in interdisciplinary research careers in any subject relevant to the study of climate change, its impacts or its solutions. We encourage applicants from the natural and social sciences, mathematics, engineering, and other fields, so long as their current research relates to climate change, its impacts or its solutions. While the emphasis is on the U.S. research system, we welcome applicants from all countries who are interested in connecting with U.S. researchers.

Symposium application instructions: http://disccrs.org/application_instructions

ELECTRONIC RESOURCES

In addition to our annual symposia, DISCCRS provides online tools for
catalyzing interdisciplinary discussion and collaboration:

http://disccrs.org/disccrsposter.pdf

Please display and distribute the poster as widely as possible!

1. Online Ph.D. Dissertation Registry: Join over 2500 climate change researchers by registering your Ph.D. dissertation and adding your abstract to our fully searchable database. You can also browse the registry to see what other climate change researchers have been doing recently. http://disccrs.org/register

2. Electronic newsletter: With timely climate change job listings, news stories, funding opportunities and more, our weekly e-newsletter is automatically provided to anyone who registers their Ph.D.

You can also subscribe online. http://disccrs.org/subscribe

3. Career Resources: In addition to the registry, our website includes a wealth of valuable resources for finding a job, developing your professional skills, locating funding opportunities, crafting grant proposals and more. http://disccrs.org/career

DISCCRS Sponsors:

AAG, AERE, AGU, AMS, ASLO, ESA, ESS-ISA, STEP-APSA, TOS, USSEE

DISCCRS Funding:

U.S. National Science Foundation

Collaborative Grant Numbers: SES-0931402 to the University of Oregon

and SES-0932916 to Whitman College

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Grant number NNX10AJ53G to Whitman College

Contact: info@disccrs.org

Organizers: Ronald B. Mitchell and C. Susan Weiler