

Climate change and the impact of extreme temperatures on aviation

Coffel, E.^{1*}; Horton, R.²

Abstract

Temperature and airport elevation significantly influence the maximum allowable takeoff weight of an aircraft by changing the surface air density and thus the lift produced at a given speed [1]. For a given runway length, airport elevation, and aircraft type there is a temperature threshold above which the airplane cannot take off at its maximum weight and thus must be weight restricted. The number of summer days necessitating weight restriction has increased since 1980 along with the observed increase in surface temperature. Climate change is projected to increase mean temperatures at all airports and significantly increase the frequency and severity of extreme heat events at some [22, 7, 13]. These changes will negatively affect aircraft performance, leading to increased weight restrictions especially at airports with short runways and little room to expand. For a Boeing 737-800 aircraft, we find that the number of weight restriction days between May and September will increase by 50-200% at four major airports in the United States by 2050-2070 under the RCP8.5 emissions scenario [18]. These perfor-

mance reductions may have a negative economic effect on the airline industry. Increased weight restrictions have previously been identified as potential impacts of climate change [19, 26], but this study is the first to quantify the effect of higher temperatures on commercial aviation. Planning for changes in extreme heat events will help the aviation industry to reduce its vulnerability to this aspect of climate change.

1 Introduction

Surface temperatures over the United States have increased by approximately 0.8°C since the start of the 20th century, with most of that change occurring after 1980 [27, 14]. Temperature increases exhibit spatial variation [20], with the most significant changes occurring in the central and eastern US [27]. Extreme temperature events have been observed to increase more rapidly than the mean, with changes of 1-1.5°C over much of the continental US [3, 11]. As climate change progresses, temperatures are projected to increase with approximately 4-5°C of mean warming expected by 2100 under the RCP8.5 emissions scenario [12, 18] with potentially larger changes in the magnitude of extreme events [10, 7, 8].

Weather is the most significant factor affecting aircraft

¹Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA.

*Email: ec2959@columbia.edu. Phone: (319) 400-0807.

²Center for Climate Systems Research, Columbia University, New York, NY, 10025, USA. Email: rh142@columbia.edu. Phone: (212) 678-5649.

operations, accounting for 70-80% of passenger delays [21] and costing airlines hundreds of millions of dollars per year in lost revenue [15]. Thus far, few studies have investigated the effects of climate change on aviation-relevant weather parameters [28]. Here we quantify the expected impact of increasing mean and extreme temperatures on aircraft performance. As air warms at constant pressure it becomes less dense, and an airplane wing traveling through this thinner air will produce less lift at a given speed than in cooler, thicker air. As a result, on warm summer days commercial airplanes have higher takeoff speeds [1]. Barometric pressure variations are used in day-to-day flight planning, but since weather-related pressure changes are usually less than 30 hPa at all airports worldwide this is a much smaller factor than temperature and is not considered here; all performance data assumes a standard pressure of 1013 hPa. For each airport and aircraft type, there is a temperature threshold above which the airplane's minimum flying speed at its maximum takeoff weight is too high to reach on the available runway, and the airplane must be weight restricted. Airlines respond by removing either passengers or cargo to decrease the aircraft's weight and thus lower its takeoff speed. Here we investigate how the number of days per summer (May-September) on which a Boeing 737-800 must be weight restricted may change during the 21st century as a result of climate change. We use the period May-September rather than the standard June-August in order to capture the vast majority of weight restriction events in the future. The 737-800 is one of the

most common short to medium range aircraft, operating 426,789 flights in 2013 [4]. The trends we find here hold with some variation for other commercial aircraft types.

2 Methods

We conduct a detailed analysis of four airports in the United States which may be particularly susceptible to increasing temperatures: Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport (PHX), Denver International Airport (DEN), New York's LaGuardia Airport (LGA), and Washington, DC's Reagan National Airport (DCA). PHX was chosen due to its frequent extremely high summer temperatures, DEN due to its relatively high elevation, and LGA and DCA due to their short runways, limited space for expansion, and high traffic loads. The maximum runway lengths and elevations for these four airports are shown in Table 1.

We define three levels of weight restriction: 1,000 lbs (454 kg), 10,000 lbs (4,536 kg), and 15,000 lbs (6,804 kg). Each level indicates how much the aircraft's maximum takeoff weight must be reduced as compared to a day with no restriction. At each airport, 737-800 performance charts from Boeing [2] are used to calculate the temperature that will result in each level of weight restriction. These temperature thresholds are shown in Table 2. The required temperatures vary significantly due to runway length and airport elevation, and at DEN, LGA, and DCA, "N/A" indicates that a 1k lbs weight restriction is always in effect. At LGA and DCA a 737-800 cannot take off at its maximum weight at any temperature due

to the relatively short runways, and at DEN the runways are sufficiently long but the required takeoff speed would exceed the maximum tire speed of 225 mph [2].

We use 17 general circulation models from the CMIP5 multi-model ensemble [25] (see Table 3) to project future temperatures under the RCP8.5 high emissions scenario [18]. We use daily maximum temperature observations from the National Climatic Data Center, recorded on the airport grounds, for historical verification. Historical weight restriction trends are examined during the period 1981-2005. However, the Denver International Airport opened in 1995 and thus only ten years of observational data is available at that site. The other three airports – PHX, LGA, and DCA – have observational data for the entire historical period. It should be noted that while the particular variant of 737 analyzed here was not in operation in 1981, aircraft with similar weights and flight characteristics were.

The CMIP5 ensemble has been shown to represent extreme temperature events relatively well [23, 13], but significant biases are still present in CMIP5 daily maximum temperature. We use a bias-correction procedure to reduce the spread between the CMIP5 daily maximum temperature distributions and the observed distributions. We separate the observed and modeled temperature distributions at each airport into twenty 5-percentile bins, and the mean bias between the modeled and observed temperatures in each bin is subtracted from the model data. This correction is performed for each of the 17 CMIP5 models, and the corrected model data is then averaged to

form a multi-model mean. The bias-correction and averaging procedure is seen to significantly improve both the shape and range of the distributions at all airport sites (see Figure 4).

Each bias-corrected CMIP5 model is used to project future temperatures at the airport sites during the period 2021-2069 under the RCP8.5 scenario, and a multi-model mean is calculated by averaging the mean and extreme daily maximum temperatures across the models. During this period, significant mean temperature increases of 2.5-3.5°C are projected across the US as shown in Figure 1a. However, as found by other studies [6, 17, 24], the projected change in temperature extremes is larger with average increases of 3-5°C in the annual maximum temperature as shown in Figure 1b. All four airports are projected to see significant increases in temperature by mid-century. Figure 2 shows generalized extreme value distributions for the historical period (1981-2005) and each decade between 2021 and 2069. The weight restriction temperature thresholds at each airport are shown by vertical dashed and dotted lines. Changes in yearly maximum temperatures of 3-4°C are seen at all four airports with smaller changes of 3-3.5°C in the summertime mean daily maximum.

3 Results

We define a weight restriction day as any day when the daily maximum temperature matches or exceeds the weight restriction temperature threshold. Determining the amount of time that the threshold is exceeded is not

possible with the CMIP5 model data. The number of weight restriction days per year is calculated using the observed temperatures, bias-corrected historical CMIP5 data, and bias-corrected future CMIP5 data. Our results are shown in Figure 3. We find that the number of weight restriction days increases significantly at each airport, with the number of 10k lbs restriction days going from near zero to approximately 20 at PHX, and doubling at LGA. Large increases in the number of 15k lbs restriction days are seen at DEN, LGA, and DCA, although they remain a rare event at PHX. Due to the short runway lengths at LGA and DCA, and the high elevation at DEN, the 1k weight restriction level is met every day in the current climate (and is therefore not shown).

The maximum takeoff weight of a 737-800 is 174.2k lbs. However, the empty weight (no payload or fuel) is 91.3k lbs, leaving 82.9k lbs available for both fuel and payload of passengers and cargo [2]. On a cross-country route, the aircraft will need nearly 100% of its 46k lbs fuel capacity [2]. In this situation, a 15k lbs weight restriction represents approximately 30% of the payload capacity of the aircraft. Thus, the weight restriction directly translates into less cargo or fewer passengers that can be carried. A 737-800 in a typical two-class configuration seats 177 passengers, and in a high-density one-class configuration seats 189 passengers [2]. Using the current FAA average summertime passenger weight of 190 lbs (including carry-on baggage) [9], the 1k lbs, 10k lbs, and 15k lbs restrictions translate into 5, 52, and 79 passengers, respectively, that cannot be carried. In 2013, 163,883

flights departed from LGA, 137,262 from DCA, 180,044 from PHX, and 267,649 from DEN [4]. Thus the projected increase in weight restrictions presented here will affect a significant number of flights. In real-world operations cargo will likely be displaced before passengers, but a loss of cargo capacity will also reduce per-flight revenue and may be economically significant given the low profit margins on some routes [16].

4 Conclusions

Our results highlight weight restriction as an important factor in planning future flight operations. Airlines may need to allocate summertime cross-country flights to aircraft with better takeoff performance, such as the 757 today or perhaps a new aircraft in the future, and heavily loaded flights may need to be rescheduled out of the hottest parts of the day. Airports may need to extend existing runways or build new, longer runways. At urban airports like LGA and DCA, runway extension is likely to be difficult leading to more constrained summertime operations and potentially the loss of longer flights to nearby airports with longer runways, such as JFK and Newark in New York and Dulles in Washington. However, such decisions would require advanced planning especially since these airports operate at near 100% capacity today.

The temperature thresholds used in this study assume that maximum takeoff power (as opposed to a 10-20% derated thrust level which is often used when possible to reduce fuel burn and engine wear). Thus, for the 737-800, increasing takeoff thrust is not feasible with the cur-

rent generation of engines – and since aircraft and engines must be designed together, a new generation of engines cannot be installed on existing aircraft without significant effort. Aircraft design changes are unlikely to significantly mitigate the weight-restriction problem. The wings of commercial aircraft are designed to be most efficient at high speeds, since the vast majority of flight time is spent in cruise. There is a trade-off between high speed efficiency and low speed lift generation, and both cannot generally be increased together [1].

The aircraft analyzed here, the 737-800, is still in production and individual airframes will likely be in operation for several decades. The effects of climate change on weight restriction are already detectable and are projected to become increasingly significant within the lifetime of these aircraft. All other commercial aircraft will also experience the effect of increasing temperatures to varying degrees, making the results presented here highly relevant for current and future airline operations. Changes in technology will no doubt revolutionize the aviation industry in the next 50 years. Carbon fiber structures will make aircraft lighter and new engines will produce more thrust with less fuel. However, these changes do not inherently result in better takeoff performance – aircraft manufacturers may need to prioritize this in the future.

Internal variability in the climate system [5] as well as human decisions concerning greenhouse gas emissions [18] may alter the time frame on which temperature changes occur. However, even under lower emissions scenarios,

significant changes in temperature – and thus weight restriction days – are projected [12]. It is also possible that changes in extreme heat events will be different than currently projected by climate models due to potential changes in the general atmospheric circulation, urban heat island effects, and soil moisture feedbacks, among other mechanisms. This study demonstrates one potential effect of climate change on aircraft operations. However, more work is needed to analyze the effect of heat on ground personnel safety and performance, airport infrastructure, and airline on-time performance. In addition, other potential climate impacts could affect aviation: sea level rise could threaten some airports (LGA is especially vulnerable) and changes in the frequency and magnitude of summer, winter, and tropical storms could have a major impact on airline activity. Of course climate is only one factor influencing the industry; changes in passenger behavior and weight, general economic conditions, and technology will have large and unknown effects. However, the aviation industry should begin to consider the effects of climate change on aircraft operations sooner rather than later in order to construct loss-reducing adaptation plans.

5 Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the World Climate Research Programme’s Working Group on Coupled Modelling, which is responsible for CMIP, and we thank the climate modeling groups (listed in Table 3 of this paper) for producing and making available their model output. For CMIP the U.S.

Department of Energy’s Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison provides coordinating support and led development of software infrastructure in partnership with the Global Organization for Earth System Science Portals.

6 Methods

6.1 Data Sources

Daily maximum temperature (tasmax) data are obtained from one ensemble member taken from each of the 17 chosen CMIP5 [25] models (see Table 3). Each model is regridded to a resolution of 0.94° in latitude and 1.25° in longitude. The regridded model data is bias-corrected by calculating the mean bias in each of twenty 5-percentile bins. This mean bias is then subtracted from each bin in the historical and future model data. The number of weight restriction days is calculated for each model and then averaged to form a multi-model mean. The changes in mean daily maximum and yearly maximum temperature are computed for each model and then averaged in Figure 1. The generalized extreme value distribution parameters are calculated for each model individually and then averaged in Figure 2. Observational temperature data from each airport site is obtained from the National Climatic Data Center. Weight restriction temperatures are obtained from the 737-800 performance charts [2] for sea-level temperatures of 30°C , 40°C , and 50°C . These charts take airport elevation into account and assume a standard pressure of 1013 hPa. Linear interpolation

was used to find exact temperature thresholds as is allowed by the document guidelines. Runway lengths and airport elevations are obtained from official Federal Aviation Administration airport maps. Weight restriction days are calculated as the number of days between May and September with a daily high temperature above the temperature threshold for each restriction category.

6.2 Bias Correction

The bias-correction procedure used on the CMIP5 model data is seen to improve the model temperature distributions in the historical period. Figure 4 shows the temperature distributions for the uncorrected CMIP5 (left), corrected CMIP5 (middle), and observations (right) at each airport (rows). The corrected distributions are seen to match the observed distributions well, especially at the high end which is what this study is concerned with.

Figure 5 shows the correction applied to each temperature percentile, averaged across the 17 models. The bias-correction is performed by dividing the temperature distribution of each model at each site into twenty 5-percentile bins and calculating the mean bias for each bin using observed temperatures from the airport sites. These mean biases are then subtracted from the percentile bins from which they were calculated. This method allows for a correction of the mean bias as well as some correction of the distribution variance and range.

References

- [1] John D Anderson. *Introduction to Flight*. McGraw-Hill Science/Engineering/Math, 1999.
- [2] Boeing. *737 airplane characteristics for airport planning*, September 2013.
- [3] SJ Brown, J. Caesar, and CAT Ferro. Global changes in extreme daily temperature since 1950. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 113(D5):D05115, 2008.
- [4] Bureau of Transportation Statistics, May 2014.
- [5] Clara Deser, Adam Phillips, Vincent Bourdette, and Haiyan Teng. Uncertainty in climate change projections: the role of internal variability. *Climate Dynamics*, 38(3-4):527–546, 2010.
- [6] Noah S. Diffenbaugh and Moetasim Ashfaq. Intensification of hot extremes in the United States. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 37(15), 2010.
- [7] M. G. Donat, L. V. Alexander, H. Yang, I. Durre, R. Vose, R. J. H. Dunn, K. M. Willett, E. Aguilar, M. Brunet, J. Caesar, B. Hewitson, C. Jack, a. M. G. Klein Tank, a. C. Kruger, J. Marengo, T. C. Peterson, M. Renom, C. Oria Rojas, M. Rusticucci, J. Salinger, a. S. Elayah, S. S. Sekele, a. K. Srivastava, B. Trewin, C. Villarroel, L. a. Vincent, P. Zhai, X. Zhang, and S. Kitching. Updated analyses of temperature and precipitation extreme indices since the beginning of the twentieth century: The HadEX2 dataset. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118(5):2098–2118, 2013.
- [8] D. R. Easterling, G. A. Meehl, C. Parmesan, S. A. Changnon, T. R. Karl, and L. O. Mearns. Climate Extremes: Observations, Modeling, and Impacts. *Science*, 289(5487):2068–2074, 2000.
- [9] Federal Aviation Administration. *Aircraft weight and balance control*, August 2004.
- [10] E. M. Fischer, U. Beyerle, and R. Knutti. Robust spatially aggregated projections of climate extremes. *Nature Climate Change*, 3(11):1–6, 2013.
- [11] P Frich, LV Alexander, and P Della-Marta. Observed coherent changes in climatic extremes during the second half of the twentieth century. *Climate Research*, 19:193–212, 2002.
- [12] Hartmann, D.L., A.M.G. Klein Tank, M. Rusticucci, L.V. Alexander, S. Brönnimann, Y. Charabi, F.J. Dentener, E.J. Dlugokencky, D.R. Easterling, A. Kaplan, B.J. Soden, P.W. Thorne, M. Wild, and P.M. Zhai. Observations: Atmosphere and Surface. In V. Bex Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia and P.M. Midgley, editors, *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2013.

- [13] IPCC. In C.B. Field, V. Barros, T.F. Stocker, D. Qin, D.J. Dokken, K.L. Ebi, M.D. Mastrandrea, K.J. Mach, G.K. Plattner, S.K. Allen, M. Tignor, and P.M. Midgley, editors, *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, and New York, NY, USA, 582 pp., 2012.
- [14] TR Karl, JM Melillo, and TC Peterson. *Global climate change impacts in the United States*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [15] Shan Lan, John-Paul Clarke, and Cynthia Barnhart. Planning for Robust Airline Operations: Optimizing Aircraft Routings and Flight Departure Times to Minimize Passenger Disruptions. *Transportation Science*, 40(1):15–28, 2006.
- [16] SM Leon, JG Szmerkovsky, and DD Tolliver. A Portfolio Approach to Allocating Airline Seats. *Transportation Journal*, 52(4):441–462, 2013.
- [17] Gerald a Meehl and Claudia Tebaldi. More intense, more frequent, and longer lasting heat waves in the 21st century. *Science*, 305(5686):994–7, 2004.
- [18] RH Moss, JA Edmonds, and KA Hibbard. The next generation of scenarios for climate change research and assessment. *Nature*, 463(7282):747–756, 2010.
- [19] National Research Council. *Potential Impacts of Climate Change on U.S. Transportation: Special Report 290*. The National Academies Press, 2008.
- [20] Robert W Portmann, Susan Solomon, and Gabriele C Hegerl. Spatial and seasonal patterns in climate change, temperatures, and precipitation across the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106(18):7324–9, 2009.
- [21] Jay M Rosenberger, Andrew J Schaefer, David Goldsman, Ellis L Johnson, J Anton, George L Nemhauser, Jay M Rosenberger, Andrew J Schaefer, David Goldsman, Ellis L Johnson, Anton J Kleywegt, George L Nemhauser, Jay M Rosenberger, Andrew J Schaefer, David Goldsman, Ellis L Johnson, Anton J Kleywegt, and George L Nemhauser. A Stochastic Model of Airline Operations. *Transportation Science*, 36(Nov 2002), 2002.
- [22] Martin Scherer and NS Diffenbaugh. Transient twenty-first century changes in daily-scale temperature extremes in the United States. *Climate Dynamics*, 2013.
- [23] J. Sillmann, V. V. Kharin, X. Zhang, F. W. Zwiers, and D. Bronaugh. Climate extremes indices in the CMIP5 multimodel ensemble: Part 1. Model evaluation in the present climate. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118(4):1716–1733, 2013.
- [24] J. Sillmann, V. V. Kharin, F. W. Zwiers, X. Zhang, and D. Bronaugh. Climate extremes indices in the

CMIP5 multimodel ensemble: Part 2. Future climate projections. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118(6):2473–2493, 2013.

[25] Karl E. Taylor, Ronald J. Stouffer, and Gerald a. Meehl. An Overview of CMIP5 and the Experiment Design. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93(4):485–498, 2012.

[26] US Global Change Research Program. In T. R. Karl, J. M. Melillo, and T. C. Peterson, editors, *Climate Change Impacts in the United States: The Second National Climate Assessment*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[27] US Global Change Research Program. Ch. 2: Our Changing Climate. In Melillo, Jerry M. and Terese (T.C.) Richmond and Gary W. Yohe, editor, *Climate Change Impacts in the United States: The Third National Climate Assessment*. U.S. Global Change Research Program, 2014.

[28] Paul D. Williams and Manoj M. Joshi. Intensification of winter transatlantic aviation turbulence in response to climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, 3(7):644–648, 2013.

Airport	Maximum runway length (ft)	Elevation (ft)
PHX	11,500	1,135
DEN	16,000	5,433
LGA	7,003	21
DCA	7,169	15

Table 1: Airport characteristics. Runway lengths are for the longest runway at the airport – weather or other operating conditions may require a different and potentially shorter runway to be used for departures. Data obtained from Federal Aviation Administration airport charts.

Airport	1k lbs (454 kg) reduction (degrees C)	10k lbs (4,536 kg) reduction (degrees C)	15k lbs (6,804 kg) reduction (degrees C)
PHX	38	47	53
DEN	N/A	30	37
LGA	N/A	31	33
DCA	N/A	31	33

Table 2: Boeing 737-800 temperature thresholds for three chosen levels of weight restriction. “N/A” indicates a restriction that is always in effect due to airport characteristics, regardless of temperature. Data obtained from Boeing’s “Airplane Characteristics for Airport Planning” [2].

Modeling center	Institute ID	Model name
College of Global Change and Earth System Science, Beijing Normal University	GCESS	BNU-ESM
Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis	CCCMA	CanESM2
National Center for Atmospheric Research	NCAR	CCSM4
Community Earth System Model Contributors	NSF-DOE-NCAR	CESM1(BGC)
Community Earth System Model Contributors	NSF-DOE-NCAR	CESM1(CAM5)
Centro Euro-Mediterraneo per I Cambiamenti Climatici	CMCC	CMCC-CM
Centro Euro-Mediterraneo per I Cambiamenti Climatici	CMCC	CMCC-CMS
Centre National de Recherches Meteorologiques / Centre Europeen de Recherche et Formation Avancee en Calcul Scientifique	CNRM-CERFACS	CNRM-CM5
NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory	NOAA GFDL	GFDL-CM3
NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory	NOAA GFDL	GFDL-ESM2G
NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory	NOAA GFDL	GFDL-ESM2M
Met Office Hadley Centre (additional HadGEM2-ES realizations contributed by Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais)	MOHC (additional realizations by INPE)	HadGEM2-ES
Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace	IPSL	IPSL-CM5A-MR
Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology, Atmosphere and Ocean Research Institute (The University of Tokyo), and National Institute for Environmental Studies	MIROC	MIROC-ESM
Max Planck Institute for Meteorology	MPI-M	MPI-ESM-MR
Meteorological Research Institute	MRI	MRI-CGCM3
Norwegian Climate Centre	NCC	NorESM1-M

Table 3: CMIP5 models used




Figure 1: Change in summer temperatures in the CMIP5 multi-model mean in 2050-2069 relative to 1981-2005. (a) Mean summer daily maximum temperature, (b) annual summer maximum temperature.




Figure 2: Generalized extreme value distributions at selected airports. (a) PHX, (b) DEN, (c) LGA, and (d) DCA. Distributions shown for the base period (1981-2005) and each decade between 2021 and 2069. Dashed and dotted black lines indicate the temperature thresholds for the three weight restriction levels: 1k lbs, 10k lbs, and 15k lbs.




Figure 3: Number of weight restriction days per year in the past and future. (a-b) PHX, (c-d) DEN, (e-f) LGA, and (g-h) DCA. Left column: 10k lbs restriction. Right column: 15k lbs restriction. The black line is calculated from observations and the red line is the observed trend. The gray error bars represent the standard deviation of the number of weight restriction days per year between the 17 CMIP5 models. Note: the historical CMIP5 data ends in 2005.




Figure 4: Temperature distributions at PHX (top row), DEN (2nd row), LGA (3rd row), and DCA (4th row) from uncorrected CMIP5 multi-model mean (left), bias-corrected CMIP5 (middle), and ground observations (right).




Figure 5: Bias correction applied to each 5% temperature percentile bin at (a) PHX, (b) DEN, (c) LGA, and (d) DCA. Results are shown for the CMIP5 multi-model mean. Significantly different biases are seen in different parts of the temperature distributions. A horizontal line would indicate that the model bias is equal in all parts of the distribution. The deviation from horizontal indicates the degree to which bias changes at the upper and lower extremes. At all four airports, the bias correction acts to increase the range of the distribution, especially at the upper end. The correction at PHX indicates a large cool bias of 10-15°C across the distribution, likely due to the effect of terrain and the relatively large model grid-box size.