



A dynamical downscaling approach for the improved representation of sub-annual coastal sea level variability: the importance of shelf and slope ocean dynamics

Jacob Steinberg¹, John Krasting¹, and Andrew Ross¹

¹NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, Princeton, NJ

Correspondence: Jacob Steinberg (jacob.steinberg@noaa.gov)

Abstract. Using a recently developed dynamical downscaling framework, we build and assess an ensemble of year-long sea level hindcasts for the western North Atlantic. Downscaled high-resolution regional ocean model (NWA12) output of U.S. East Coast sea level at long established tide gauge stations is compared to parent coarse-resolution global ocean model (SPEAR) output to quantify varied impacts of downscaling in a forecasting framework, particularly from an extremes perspective. Comparisons of modeled coastal sea level distributions and observations at tide gauge stations reveal downscaling enhances variability by nearly an order of magnitude across all resolved frequencies. As the downscaled simulations are forced at the surface with the same atmosphere felt by the SPEAR ocean, we attribute this enhanced variability to the improved representation of shelf and slope ocean dynamics. The magnitude of this enhancement, however, appears a strong function of latitude and suggests added value of downscaling to vary geographically. Together, these results demonstrate how dynamical downscaling can offer practical time varying statistics of higher frequency coastal sea level variability developed with an improved understanding of the links between model resolution and the processes driving coastal sea level changes.

1 Introduction

Coastal sea level variability across hourly to monthly timescales comprises predictable contributions from the tides and seasonal cycle, but also contributions from a less predictable combination of atmospheric and ocean dynamics (e.g., wind-driven transport, boundary current variability, coastally trapped waves, inverted barometer effects). Potential predictability of these contributions can be distilled from a dynamical understanding of circulation along ocean margins, long observational records at coastal tide gauge stations, and simulations of continental shelf dynamics. Different approaches have sought predictive skill through the use of data assimilation (Rose et al., 2024), statistical (Long et al., 2023), and damped persistence (Dusek et al., 2022) tools that reduce system complexity or isolate specific processes. These efforts all reflect a desire and need to characterize, understand, and predict coastal variability, especially extreme event occurrences associated with flooding (Thompson et al., 2021). What is often absent in these approaches, however, is adequate representation or consideration of continental shelf and slope ocean processes that determine connectivity between the coast and larger-scale or remote ocean and atmosphere dynamics. Resolving this coast-to-open-ocean transition is necessary to gain both process-level understanding of the drivers of coastal sea level change and meaningful forecast skill.



25 At a process level, coastal sea level variability can be considered from local and remote perspectives. Locally, atmospheric
pressure and wind forcings primarily drive variability moderated by shelf circulation and boundary currents (Lentz, 2024;
Camargo et al., 2025). This variability is then influenced by remote forcings communicated through either the coastal wave
guide (Hughes and Williams, 2010; Wise et al., 2020) or Rossby waves impinging along a western boundary (Calafat et al.,
2018). Ocean model representation of both local and remote drivers of higher frequency coastal variability is fundamentally
30 linked to horizontal model resolution of the ocean, atmosphere, and bathymetry (Li et al., 2022; Little et al., 2026). The
importance of bathymetric resolution, however, is not universal and depends on continental shelf width and local deformation
radii. Where the shelf is narrow, enhanced connectivity between the coast and open ocean implies that more realistic simulations
and accurate forecasts may be achieved to the extent that larger-scale dynamics and coastal waves are well resolved (Jacox et al.,
2023; Little et al., 2024; Alexander et al., 2025). Where the shelf is relatively wide, realistic simulations of coastal sea level
35 depend on the resolution-dependent representation of near-coast dynamics and smaller-scale processes.

Along the U.S. East and Gulf coasts, continental shelf width varies greatly, from ~ 10 km to ~ 200 km, thus variably linking
the coast and open ocean. Much previous work has explored relationships among U.S. East Coast sea level and flooding
events (Volkov et al., 2023), winds (Wang et al., 2022), coastal waves (Wise et al., 2020), bathymetry (Wise et al., 2018),
the Gulf Stream (Donatelli et al., 2025; Wu and He, 2025), and the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC)
40 (Ezer and Atkinson, 2014; Little et al., 2019). While spatial patterns of coastal variability strongly depend on timescale,
distinct regimes are found to the north and south of Cape Hatteras, North Carolina. This region corresponds geographically
to a significant narrowing of continental shelf width and is the location where the Gulf Stream separates from the coast and
turns eastward. Partly as a result of this geography, sea level and along-shore winds are more tightly linked north of Cape
Hatteras (Wang et al., 2022), while Gulf Stream strength and positioning modulate coastal sea level south of Cape Hatteras,
45 also influenced by equator-ward propagating coastal waves Wang et al. (2024a). These two regimes can be understood to reflect
differing contributions of offshore, wind-driven, and coastal wave dynamics (Wise et al., 2018), but also continental shelf width
(Minobe et al., 2017). From a modeling perspective, accurate simulation of ocean behavior in this region is centrally linked to
the representation of the shelf and slope transition.

In the construction and configuration of ocean models used to explore and forecast coastal sea level variability, tradeoffs
50 must be made between computational cost, domain size, horizontal and vertical resolution, and process representation that
together leverage knowledge of coastal margin hypsometry. Dynamical downscaling enables a more realistic representation
of coastal sea level variability, influenced by both local and remote processes and across the coastal to open-ocean transition.
Relatively coarse horizontal resolution parent global climate model output can be used as boundary forcings driving a higher
horizontal resolution ocean model. This results in enhanced resolution of local shelf/slope dynamics that feel larger scale and
55 remote weather and climate forcings (Ross et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2016; Hermans et al., 2020; Apecechea et al., 2025).

With the aim of improving simulations and forecasts of sub-annual coastal sea levels, we leverage a recently developed
dynamical downscaling framework to explore ocean and atmospheric influences along the U.S. East Coast as they depend
on model horizontal resolution. We focus particularly on the representation of daily extremes and their seasonal evolution, as
well as the impact of model-resolved bathymetry along the continental shelf and slope margin. Our central focus is realized




Figure 1. a-c) GLORYS, SPEAR, and NWA12 annual mean sea surface height (SSH) (for GLORYS we show dynamic sea level, such that the zero value corresponds to the global mean. This is used to initialize NWA12 SSH referenced to the model ellipsoid). The 150 m isobath is contoured in black. d-f) GLORYS, SPEAR, and NWA12 annual mean sea surface height variance (note log colorscale).

60 through comparison between coastal sea level in a parent global atmosphere-ocean forecast model, the Seamless System for Prediction and Earth System Research (SPEAR) model (Delworth et al., 2020), and a higher horizontal resolution regional ocean model of the Northwest Atlantic (NWA12, Ross et al. (2023)) forced at the boundaries by SPEAR. NWA12 realizes improved representation of shelf and slope circulation features (Fig. 1) and was developed as part of NOAA's Changing Ecosystem and Fisheries Initiative to drive a biogeochemical and ecosystem forecast model (Ross et al., 2024). We employ
65 this downscaling framework for three purposes: to improve understanding of the processes that influence coastal sea level at sub-annual timescales, to determine ocean model horizontal resolution controls coastal sea level variability, and to develop a framework for diagnosing time evolving coastal sea level distributions. We refrain from hindcast/forecast evaluation in terms of skill or error with respect to observed sea level at a given time, but rather consider model-dependent predictability associated with changing distributions (e.g. Sweet et al. (2022, 2024); Volkov et al. (2023)) and focus on extremes that can
70 adversely impact the built environment and put human lives at risk. If the time-varying nature of these distributions can be better understood and modeled, a more meaningful, useful, and accurate forecasting framework can be leveraged to save lives and property.

2 Configuration and Methods

2.1 Parent Model and Downscaling Configuration

75 We use the dynamical ocean downscaling framework developed in Ross et al. (2024) to downscale a suite of retrospective forecasts from the global coupled SPEAR model. 1-year retrospective seasonal forecasts from SPEAR, running in the medium



resolution configuration with 0.5° atmosphere and 1° ocean resolution (Lu et al., 2020; Adcroft et al., 2019), were used as surface and ocean boundary conditions for 1-year simulations of the NWA12 regional ocean model. With $1/12^\circ$ ocean model resolution, NWA12 simulations have enhanced continental shelf and slope bathymetric resolution (Fig. 2), more realistic Gulf Stream representation (Fig. 1), and include tides (Ross et al., 2023, 2024).

For each initialization year, 1999–2018, five NWA12 ensemble member runs were carried out, with each member using a different ensemble member of the SPEAR retrospective forecast as forcing. SPEAR ocean temperature, salinity, velocity, and sea surface height anomalies from each ensemble member were added to GLORYS12 reanalysis seasonal climatologies (Lellouche et al., 2021) to build ocean boundary forcings. This choice was made to permit ocean anomalies to cross NWA12 ocean domain boundaries and to ensure a smooth transition to interior NWA12 fields initially nudged using GLORYS12. As in Rose et al. (2024), daily-averaged SPEAR atmospheric fields of pressure, temperature, and humidity are used as surface boundary conditions to the NWA12 regional model, except for surface winds, which are updated at 6-hourly resolution. Retrospective forecasts were initialized on December 1 of each initialization year. Initial NWA12 ocean states were extracted from a 1993–2022 NWA12 run forced by ERA5 at the ocean surface (Hersbach et al., 2020) and GLORYS12 reanalysis climatology along ocean boundaries. In this 30-year run, interior temperatures and salinities were nudged toward concurrent GLORYS12 reanalysis monthly means. The December 1 initialization time was selected as SPEAR’s large-scale seasonal predictions show the largest skill at this time due to enhanced predictive skill from the timing of the climatological ENSO cycles. December 1 also allows the simulations to capture the winter-spring transition, although the sensitivity of results to this choice was found to be low (excluding start times spanning the spring barrier). The resulting ensemble comprises five retrospective forecast ensemble members initialized at the beginning of every December between 1999 and 2018 and run for one year, a total of 100 year-long simulations.

We acknowledge a missing feedback in the NWA12 ocean-only configuration in which the ocean currents and temperature in the regional model do not feed back onto the wind field in the forcing model. As a result, heat fluxes in NWA12 and SPEAR differ due to different ocean temperatures, but configurations and bulk formulae for the two are the same. For qualitative comparison to observations, it is also worth noting that SPEAR, along with many of the current seasonal prediction systems, exhibits bias in the magnitude and direction of near-surface winds (Delworth et al., 2020). Even so, and despite the decreased frequency at which the ocean-only model is forced by the atmosphere, we find an enhanced NWA12 response to the winds attributable to increased horizontal resolution of the ocean. This derives from the expectation that an enhanced response to the wind field should arise as ocean model resolution equals then exceeds atmospheric resolution.

2.2 Analysis Approach

Interrogation of these hindcasts focuses along the U.S. East and Gulf Coast continental shelf, at fifteen long-established tide gauge stations with records generally greater than 75 years, and throughout the NWA12 domain at the surface. We quantify sea level variance: as a function of frequency using the discrete Fourier transform with a 12-hour boxcar smoothing, within daily to monthly frequency bands using non-overlapping Butterworth filters, and at tide gauge stations through a thorough characterization of monthly distributions of daily sea level anomalies. Hourly coastal sea levels at tide gauge stations were also saved to




Figure 2. a) SPEAR and b) NWA12 continental shelf and slope bathymetry [0 - 350 m] colored at respective ocean model grid resolution. Black contours correspond to 25, 50, 100, and 150 m isobaths. Red dots locate the 15 tide gauge stations whose data are used in this analysis.

enable comparison to hourly observations from the Global Extreme Sea Level Analysis (GESLA) dataset (Woodworth et al., 2016). Primary analyses focus on NWA12 comparison to SPEAR at daily and longer timescales. As SPEAR atmosphere and ocean fields were saved at daily resolution, this focus also enables offline assessment of inverted barometer (IB) effect contributions. For output extracted at tide gauge stations, preprocessing began with removal of NWA12 prescribed tidal constituents using the utide Python library (Codiga, 2011). To enable appropriate comparison to SPEAR daily averages, hourly non-tidal residuals (NTRs) were then uniformly averaged across 24-hour periods and centered at each mid-day time to generate daily timeseries (Fig. 3). A 1999-2018 mean seasonal cycle, calculated as the daily mean across all years and ensemble members for each day of the year was also removed.

As both SPEAR and NWA12 oceans were forced by the same surface wind field, we take particular focus on the ocean's near-coast response to onshore/offshore wind-driven transport. Daily surface wind stresses from SPEAR hindcasts were interpolated to the 150 m isobath and rotated and decomposed into local along and across isobath components. Connectivity between coastal sea level at tide gauge stations and along-shore winds was then considered at multiple coastal stations and across frequencies to reveal local and/or remote forcing and implied equatorward coastal wave propagation. The role played by the atmosphere, through wind and surface pressure forcing, is thus generally considered from variance contribution and regression perspectives, with model differences largely attributed to the representation of continental shelf dynamics and its areal extent over which wind stresses can act. We acknowledge that shelf sea level changes reflect both local mass and density changes, but avoid decomposition into components as our primary focus is at the coast where the density contribution vanishes. The role of wind- or circulation- driven cross-shore mass transport over the shelf across daily to monthly timescales will depend on shelf




Figure 3. SPEAR (red) and NWA12 (blue) coastal sea level at Boston, MA (a), Charleston, SC (b), and Pensacola, FL (c) tide gauge stations for the 2015-12-01 – 2016-06-30 period. Tides and a twenty-year mean season cycle have been removed. Hourly non-tidal residuals are in light blue. Solid and dashed lines are daily averages without and with the diagnosed IB contribution.

representation, but as shelf depths are very shallow compared to those offshore, we expect little density contribution differences
 130 between the two models.

In focusing on horizontal resolution importance for coastal extreme representation, we lastly consider SPEAR, NWA12, and observation-derived monthly distributions of deseasonalized daily sea level anomalies. 5th and 95th percentile values are calculated for each month at each tide gauge station. The role of the IB effect in shaping these distributions is separately considered in comparison to observed timeseries, spectra, and daily distributions. While both SPEAR and NWA12 oceans
 135 do not feel atmospheric pressure variations, the IB effect is calculated offline and added to simulated coastal sea level for comparison to observations that include pressure effects. Comparisons between SPEAR and NWA12 isolate the effect of improved shelf and slope process representation and response to surface forcings.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Frequency Spectra at tide gauge stations

140 Initial comparison between SPEAR and NWA12 at tide gauge stations reveals a SPEAR-NWA12 difference in variance across daily to monthly frequencies that is a strong function of latitude (Figs. 3, 4 - red vs. blue curves). At the Boston tide gauge station, SPEAR and NWA12 have comparable energy across resolved frequencies, similar to the observed spectrum, but moving



south along the coast through the Mid-Atlantic and South-Atlantic bights (MAB and SAB, respectively), SPEAR variance reduces by nearly an order of magnitude compared to both NWA12 and observations. The IB contribution to sea level variability is greatest at higher latitudes ($\sim 33\%$, Piecuch and Ponte (2015)) and decreases to the south (Figs. 3, 4 dashed lines). This pattern reveals a modest contribution of extratropical storms on sea level variability that diminishes at stations located further away from the climatological position of the mid-latitude storm track, a feature generally well resolved by SPEAR (Lee et al., 2025). Across hourly to daily frequencies, NWA12 spectra compare favorably with observations at all stations. This suggests tides are well resolved and lends support to the argument that this dynamical downscaling framework improves the representation of coastal and shelf dynamics.

The SPEAR decrease of energy with decreasing latitude is apparent in all 1-year simulations and across all ensemble members (Fig. 5). While the full NWA12 ensemble mean is still less energetic than GESLA at most sites, NWA12 variability across daily and lower frequencies is much closer to observations than SPEAR, especially within and south of the MAB. These differences between SPEAR and NWA12 span a range of frequencies that includes those which SPEAR is expected to resolve, $\sim > 1$ week, as well as those unexpected to be resolved due to a relatively coarse SPEAR shelf resolution. These include higher frequency motions like coastal trapped waves that require a wide shelf and well-resolved cross-shelf bathymetric gradient. Absence of these bathymetric features (Fig. 2) suggests a limited pathway for along-coast signal propagation, especially across the narrowest point near Cape Hatteras.

3.2 Band-passed Variance

To assess sea level variability as a function of frequency throughout the model domain, deseasonalized daily sea level anomalies were band-pass filtered to partition variance into four bins: 5-day to 2-week, 2-week to 5-week, 5-week to 8-week, and greater than 10 weeks. These bands we selected to partition variance across weather to seasonal timescales, the full span of resolved frequencies from these 1-year simulations. Importantly, this separation includes frequencies expected to be well resolved by both SPEAR and NWA12 ($\sim > 2$ week) and frequencies that only NWA12 can resolve associated with tides and dynamics permitted due to higher horizontal resolution. Resulting variance at each NWA12 grid point and within each frequency bin was then averaged across adjacent grid points to smooth NWA12's $1/12^\circ$ degree horizontal resolution to the SPEAR 1° resolution and enable difference maps to be generated (Fig. 6). These maps reveal geographically a difference in dominant timescales of variability along the coast and offshore. Along the MAB, SAB, and Gulf coasts, variability in the 5-day to 2-week band is over one order of magnitude greater in NWA12 than in SPEAR. Along the northeast coast within the Gulf of Maine, however, the SPEAR model's variance in this bin is slightly greater than NWA12. Within all lower frequency bins, NWA12 sea level variance is over an order of magnitude greater than SPEAR away from the coast and within the Gulf Stream and Loop Current. This added energy can be partly attributed to NWA12's finer horizontal resolution that enables a more realistic representation of mesoscale eddy turbulence.




Figure 4. Power spectral density at nine tide gauge stations. Black denotes observed and yellow NWA12 hourly spectra for the 2018-12-01 simulation start time. Solid red (SPEAR) and blue (NWA12) are daily spectra with the blue dashed line adding the IB contribution. Moving left to right, light gray vertical dashed lines correspond to 2-month, 1-month, 2-week, and 5-day periods.

3.3 Connections to Relevant Dynamics: wind stress and boundary currents

175 Sea level variability along continental shelves can be significantly influenced by along-shore winds driving an across-shore Ekman transport (Wang et al., 2024b). Along the U.S. East Coast, winds are predominantly northwesterly and typically strongest in the winter, becoming light and variable in the summer. After removing a seasonal climatology to highlight a coastal sea level response to wind anomalies across daily to weekly timescales, daily SPEAR along-shore wind stress anomalies are regressed onto coastal sea level anomalies at Atlantic City, NJ, and Charleston, SC. As these wind stress anomalies are felt by both the
 180 SPEAR and NWA12 oceans, comparisons reveal differing coastal sea level response patterns to wind stress anomalies over the shelf that, while dependent on timescale, suggest the importance of continental shelf resolution.

This connectivity is assessed first at Atlantic City. North of Cape Hatteras, NWA12 regression coefficient magnitudes are larger than those in SPEAR by nearly a factor of two (Fig. 7, correlations also approximately double - not shown). This increase can be at least partly attributed to the improved representation of the Mid-Atlantic and New England continental shelf
 185 bathymetry (Fig. 2). Regression values are greatest between Georges Bank and New Jersey, suggesting this region to be a runway for along-shore wave generation/propagation and the setup of an along-shore pressure gradient. Lentz (2024) discusses




Figure 5. SPEAR (red) and NWA12 (blue) daily-mean power spectral density curves at nine tide gauge stations. Averages across twenty initialization years and ensemble members are added as thicker red and blue curves. Twenty-year mean spectra computed from hourly observations is added in black.

these factors in detail and shows that a simple wind-driven depth-average model configured for this section of continental shelf can well reproduce coastal variability. Regression coefficient magnitudes in this region are elevated within all frequency bands. Magnitudes south of Cape Hatteras, however, marginally increase only within the lowest frequency band, suggesting the large-scale wind field, which varies at these multi-month timescales, imprints on this metric, as there is no poleward signal propagation pathway. This inference is consistent with a comparison of correlation coefficients between along-shore wind stress values offshore of Charleston and Atlantic City. Correlations are weak, but increase at timescales greater than ~ 2 weeks.

South of Cape Hatteras, at the Charleston tide gauge, wind stress anomaly regression coefficients are also elevated in NWA12 compared to SPEAR (Fig. 8). The extent of these elevated coefficient magnitudes is generally confined to the SAB, increasing poleward with decreasing frequency. This agrees with the expectation of equator-ward propagation of coastal waves, but also the increasing spatial scale of lower frequency wind variability. As at Atlantic City, these increased regression coefficient magnitudes in NWA12 suggest increased sensitivity to along-shore wind stress that is linked to continental shelf representation.

Along the western boundary of the major ocean basins, coastal sea level is also influenced by the position and strength of western boundary currents. The poleward-flowing Gulf Stream and subsurface intensified equator-ward flowing slope current exert both local and remote effects on US East Coast sea level (Ezer, 2016; Camargo et al., 2025). Together, this western




Figure 6. a-b) Deseasonalized total SPEAR and NWA12 sea surface height variance. Variance is partitioned into four frequency bands [5 day - 2 week (c,d), 2 week - 5 week (f,g), 5 week - 8 week (i,j), and greater than 10 weeks. e,h,k,n) Differences in variance (NWA12 - SPEAR) at SPEAR horizontal resolution.]




Figure 7. Regression of along-150 m isobath winds with SPEAR total SSH at Atlantic City, NJ (open-circle) (a) and as a function of frequency band (b-e). f-j) Same as a-e but for NWA12.




Figure 8. Regression of along-150 m isobath winds with SPEAR total SSH at Charleston, SC (open-circle) (a) and as a function of frequency band (b-e). f-j) Same as a-e but for NWA12.




Figure 9. SPEAR (a-e) and NWA12 (f-j) SSH correlation with SSH at the Charleston, SC tide gauge station. Black contour is the 150 m isobath.

boundary current variability reflects changes in the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation and lower frequency coastal sea level variations (Yin et al., 2009; Little et al., 2019). At higher frequencies, flooding events have been linked to the AMOC state (Volkov et al., 2023), but more locally, the Gulf Stream extension position and along-coast jet strength (Donatelli et al., 2025). Connectivity, or lack thereof, between slope or offshore variability and the coast also depends strongly on the bathymetric resolution of the shelf and slope. A significant difference between NWA12 and SPEAR to this effect appears in the pattern of correlation of coastal sea level at Charleston and sea surface height throughout the region (Fig. 9). Within the lowest frequency band considered, at timescales of Gulf Stream position changes, SPEAR correlations are broadly elevated offshore of the shelf-slope transition, while elevated NWA12 correlations are confined to the inner shelf (Fig. 9e,j). This suggests potentially undesired elevated Charleston sea level sensitivity in SPEAR linked to offshore Gulf Stream behavior. In NWA12, elevated correlations appear more tightly confined to the SAB shelf, along the slope, and at the point of Gulf Stream detachment from the coast.

3.4 Seasonality of Daily Distributions and Extreme Events

These different process representations and responses to surfaces forcings also impact the magnitude and occurrence of daily extremes. Ensemble-mean NWA12 and SPEAR distributions of daily coastal sea levels, binned by simulation lead month and with a climatological seasonal cycle removed, are considered at all tide gauge stations. Distribution shape and width



are first evaluated at two tide gauge stations, Boston, MA (Fig. 10) and Charleston, SC (Fig. 11). At Boston, distribution evolution reveals a seasonal cycle, decreasing in width through the summer and widening throughout the winter. With the IB effect added to facilitate NWA12 and SPEAR comparison to observations, this seasonal cycle is realized as a two-fold change in distribution standard deviation. At Charleston, this seasonal cycle in distribution width is muted, with SPEAR over-
220 representing a narrowing throughout the summer. NWA12 distributions remain wider throughout the year, a pattern more similar to observations and likely linked to coastal wave and Gulf Stream variability.

Distributions are further characterized by constructing a climatology of ensemble-mean 5th and 95th percentiles (Fig. 12). As suggested by differences between Boston and Charleston, this characterization reveals a latitudinal dependence of the seasonal cycle of distribution width and extreme occurrences. Along the New England and mid-Atlantic coasts, 5th and 95th percentile
225 values increase through the winter and decrease during the summer. This seasonal cycle is well represented in NWA12 and SPEAR at the northernmost tide gauges, but moving south, into the MAB, SPEAR extreme amplitudes notably decrease. South of Cape Hatteras, distributions exhibit a damped seasonal cycle, but NWA12 consistently resolves larger 5th and 95th percentile values, especially in the SAB.

Together, these characterizations of daily distributions of coastal sea level reveal a latitudinal dependence on the strength
230 and representation of a seasonal cycle in daily extremes. At higher latitudes, the SPEAR and NWA12 distribution shapes and seasonal evolutions align with observations. Here, distribution width increases in the winter, associated with increased extratropical storm activity, and extremes become larger in magnitude. Moving south into the MAB, SPEAR distributions narrow and exhibit a relatively weaker seasonal change in width as compared to NWA12 and observations. As winds in NWA12 and SPEAR are identical, we attribute this decreased variability to the limited resolution of the Mid-Atlantic and New England
235 continental shelves. Without a well-resolved shelf, with depths increasing with distance offshore, equator-ward propagating waves are poorly resolved. Further south, along the SAB and Gulf Coasts, the seasonal cycle weakens in both models and observations, but extreme magnitudes are over 50% greater in NWA12 at most stations.

4 Conclusions

In this analysis, we leverage a recently developed dynamical downscaling framework to generate high-resolution year-long
240 hindcasts of U.S. East Coast sea level. A 100-member ensemble is built to explore patterns of variability and assess the structure and evolution of daily coastal sea level distributions. Downscaled (NWA12) and parent (SPEAR) model hindcast differences are considered throughout the downscaled domain and high-frequency model output is compared to coastal sea levels at tide gauge stations. Differences between NWA12 and SPEAR are contrasted considering different continental shelf and slope representations. From a coastal sea level perspective, these results highlight the importance of resolving coastal and
245 ocean basin margin dynamics, including western boundary currents.

Monthly distributions of daily coastal sea levels differ significantly in downscaled and parent model output. Distributions across all months are wider in NWA12, reflecting the enhanced representation of short-term extremes. While these distributions are determined after removal a monthly seasonal climatology from coastal station time series, they exhibit a seasonal cycle




Figure 10. left) Distributions of daily SPEAR (red) and NWA12 (blue) sea level anomalies (SLA) at the Boston, MA tide gauge station as a function of lead month. Horizontal bands denote 5,10,25,75,90,95 percentiles. Red and blue text are 5th and 95th percentile values for SPEAR and NWA12. right) Distributions of daily SPEAR (red), NWA12 (blue), and observations (black) with the IB effect included. Solid vertical lines denote corresponding standard deviations.




Figure 11. left) Distributions of daily SPEAR (red) and NWA12 (blue) sea level anomalies (SLA) at the Charleston, SC tide gauge station as a function of lead month. Horizontal bands denote 5,10,25,75,90,95 percentiles. Red and blue text are 5th and 95th percentile values for SPEAR and NWA12. right) Distributions of daily SPEAR (red), NWA12 (blue), and observations (black) with the IB effect included. Solid vertical lines denote corresponding standard deviations.




Figure 12. 5th and 9th percentiles of daily sea level anomaly distributions as a function of simulation lead time (days since model initialization). SPEAR is in red, NWA12 in blue, and observations (GESLA) in black.

with location dependent amplitudes. At northern tide gauge stations, NWA12, SPEAR, and observed distributions are similar across all months, but moving south, SPEAR distributions become excessively narrow, especially in summer months. These differences also manifest away from the coast. Throughout the NWA12 domain, the relationship between model horizontal resolution and sea level variability appears influenced by continental shelf and slope structure as well as adjacent boundary current representation. As in Li et al. (2022), Volkov et al. (2023), Zhang et al. (2025), and (Little et al., 2026), we link horizontal resolution increases with the improved representation of shelf and slope dynamics.

In a general sense, near-coast and open-ocean co-variability depends on continental shelf hypsometry and width. Where the shelf relatively wide and shelf-break sharp, strong cross-shore potential vorticity and bathymetry gradients act to insulate the coast. A model's ability to well simulate coastal sea level is then closely tied to the representation of this open-ocean to coastal dynamical transition. In this work, we find NWA12-SPEAR differences to vary significantly with latitude. As both model oceans feel the same surface forcing, with wind strength generally increasing with latitude, these differences are attributed to the differing resolution-dependent ability of along-shore winds to excite cross-shore transport and along-shore wave propagation.



As in Little et al. (2026), shelf bathymetric resolution is recognized here as a central component of the realistic simulation of coastal sea level. Little et al. (2026) identify Cape Hatteras, NC as an important ‘choke point’ where continental shelf width decreases substantially. If model resolution cannot resolve this segment along the coastal wave guide, downstream coastal sea level variability will be muted. Compared to NWA12 and observations, we find such decreased SAB variability in SPEAR that is further associated with limited representation of the Gulf Stream and its imprint along the coast (Donatelli et al., 2025).

Overall, this analysis demonstrates that dynamically downscaled forecasts yield more realistic simulations of U.S. East Coast sea level variability across daily to monthly timescales. While the nature and magnitude of this enhanced variability varies geographically, with enhancements generally greater at lower latitudes, daily distributions of downscaled output exhibit temporal variability, width, and extremes that more closely align with observations at all tide gauge stations. With these improvements, contextualized alongside recent results that explore distribution shape evolution (Hovenga et al., 2025), datum re-assessment (Piecuch et al., 2025; Gregory et al., 2019), and extreme events as they impact the built environment (Maghsoodifar et al., 2025), this framework can be further leveraged and applied in a true forecasting sense to generate more locally relevant information built on mechanistic understanding. Together, these continued efforts aim to improve preparedness for realized and future higher frequency flooding hazard risk changes (Qu et al., 2026).

In comparing downscaled and parent ocean model output forced by the same atmosphere, we highlight the link between representation of shelf and slope ocean dynamics and coastal sea level variability. We explore this link in terms of ocean model sensitivity to along-shore wind stress and the representation of ocean boundary currents. Our results highlight the importance of resolving shelf bathymetry, but also help develop interpretability of larger scale forecasts of climate variability in their application to local coastal changes and their physical drivers. As the occurrence and intensity of extreme events changes at monthly and longer timescales (Xu et al., 2026), the distributional characterization and linkage to model resolution discussed here further connect forecast output to process representation. In this context and with this tool, sub-annual coastal sea level variability can be better understood and predicted to mitigate risks to life and property.

Code and data availability. Analysis notebooks are archived on GitHub at <https://github.com/jakesteinberg/NWA12-seasonal-forecasts>. Model output for the purpose of reproducing analyses and figures can be found on Zenodo at <https://zenodo.org/records/20415501>. Observed coastal sea levels derive from the Global Extreme Sea Level Analysis (GESLA) dataset (Woodworth et al., 2016) and can be downloaded at <https://gesla787883612.wordpress.com/downloads/>. GLORYS12 reanalysis (Lellouche et al., 2021) can be downloaded from the Copernicus Marine Service Information Marine Data Store at <https://doi.org/10.48670/moi-00021>.

Author contributions. Jacob Steinberg: building and running simulations, analysis, synthesis, and writing. John Krasting: analysis plan and interpretation of results. Andrew Ross: model configuration and experimental design.

Competing interests. We declare no competing interests are present.



Acknowledgements. Funding for this project was provided by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). We would like to thank GFDL's Seasonal-to-Decadal Variability and Prediction Division and GFDL's Marine Ecosystem and Downscaling Division for access to their downscaling and seasonal forecasting framework as well as their time helping configure it for sea level applications. We would also like to thank the Seasonal-to-Decadal Variability and Prediction Division to for access SPEAR seasonal hindcasts. We appreciate the time spent
295 by internal reviewers L. Jia, G. Negrete Garcia, and L. Zhang and thank them for their comments/suggestions. We acknowledge C. Piecuch for providing interpretation of results and meaningful suggestions for improvement of analyses.



References

- Adcroft, A., Anderson, W., Balaji, V., Blanton, C., Bushuk, M., Dufour, C., Dunne, J., Griffies, S., Hallberg, R., Harrison, M., Held, I., Jansen, M., John, J., Krasting, J., Langenhorst, A., Legg, S., Liang, Z., McHugh, C., Radhakrishnan, A., Reichl, B., Rosati, A., Samuels, B., Shao, A., Stouffer, R., Winton, M., Wittenberg, A., Xiang, B., Zadeh, N., and Zhang, R.: The GFDL Global Ocean and Sea Ice Model OM4.0: Model Description and Simulation Features, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001726>, 2019.
- Alexander, M., Scott, J., Jacox, M., Amaya, D., and Wilczynski, L.: Processes That Influence Bottom Temperatures in the California Current System, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 130, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024JC021886>, 2025.
- Apecechea, M., Melet, A., Reffray, G., and Thieblemont, R.: Impact of dynamical downscaling on sea level projections in the north-east Atlantic ocean and regional seas, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 130, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2025JC022737>, 2025.
- Calafat, F., Wahl, T., Lindsten, F., Williams, J., and Frajka-Williams, E.: Coherent modulation of the sea-level annual cycle in the United States by Atlantic Rossby waves, *Nature Communications*, 9, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04898-y>, 2018.
- Camargo, C., Piecuch, C., and Raubenheimer, B.: Do Ocean Dynamics Contribute to Coastal Floods? A Case Study of the Shelfbreak Jet and Coastal Sea Level Along Southern New England (US), *Earth's Future*, 13, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2025EF006708>, 2025.
- Codiga, D.: Unified Tidal Analysis and Prediction Using the UTide Matlab Functions., Technical Report, <https://www.po.gso.uri.edu/~codiga/utide/2011Codiga-UTide-Report.pdf>, 2011.
- Delworth, T., Cooke, W., Adcroft, A., Bushuk, M., Chen, J., Dunne, K., Ginoux, P., Gudgel, R., Hallberg, R., Harris, L., Harrison, M., Johnson, N., Kapnick, S., Lin, S., Lu, F., Malyshev, S., Milly, P., Murakami, H., Naik, V., Pascale, S., Paynter, D., Rosati, A., Schwarzkopf, M., Shevliakova, E., Underwood, S., Wittenberg, A., Xiang, B., Yang, X., Zeng, F., Zhang, F., Zhang, L., and Zhao, M.: SPEAR: The Next Generation GFDL Modeling System for Seasonal to Multidecadal Prediction and Projection, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 12, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001895>, 2020.
- Donatelli, C., Little, C., Ponte, R., and Yeager, S.: Spatiotemporal properties of intrinsic sea level variability along the southeastern United States coastline, *Ocean Science*, 21, <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-21-2367-2025>, 2025.
- Dusek, G., Sweet, W., Widlansky, M., Thompson, P., and Marra, J.: A novel statistical approach to predict seasonal high tide flooding, *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 9, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.1073792>, 2022.
- Ezer, T.: Can the Gulf Stream induce short-term fluctuations in sea level along the US East Coast? A modeling study, *Ocean Dynamics*, 66, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-016-0928-0>, 2016.
- Ezer, T. and Atkinson, L.: Accelerated flooding along the U.S. East Coast: On the impact of sea-level rise, tides, storms, the Gulf Stream, and the North Atlantic Oscillations, *Earth's Future*, 2, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014EF000252>, 2014.
- Gregory, J., Griffies, S., Hughes, C., Lowe, J., Church, J., Fukimori, I., Gomez, N., Kopp, R., Landerer, F., Cozannet, G., Ponte, R., Stammer, D., Tamisiea, M., and van de Wal, R.: Concepts and terminology for sea level: mean, variability and change, both local and global, *Surveys in Geophysics*, 40, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10712-019-09525-z>, 2019.
- Hermans, T., Tinker, J., Palmer, M., Katsman, C., Vermeersen, B., and Slangen, A.: Improving sea-level projections on the Northwestern European shelf using dynamical downscaling, *Climate Dynamics*, 54, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-019-05104-5>, 2020.
- Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Hirahara, S., Horányi, A., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Schepers, D., Simmons, A., Soci, C., Abdalla, S., Abellan, X., Balsamo, G., Bechtold, P., Biavati, G., Bidlot, J., Bonavita, M., De Chiara, G., Dahlgren, P., Dee, D., Diamantakis, M., Dragani, R., Flemming, J., Forbes, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A., Haimberger, L., Healy, S., Hogan, R. J., Hólm, E.,



- 335 Janisková, M., Keeley, S., Laloyaux, P., Lopez, P., Lupu, C., Radnoti, G. and de Rosnay, P., Rozum, I., Vamborg, F., Villaume, S., and
Thépaut, J.-N.: ERA5 Global Reanalysis, *Q.J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803>, 2020.
- Hovenga, P., Newman, M., Albers, J., Sweet, W., Dusek, G., Xu, T., Callahan, J., Shin, S., and Compo, G.: Using stochastically generated
skewed distributions to represent hourly nontidal residual water levels at United States tide gauges, *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 12,
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2025.1618367>, 2025.
- Hughes, C. and Williams, S.: The color of sea level: Importance of spatial variations in spectral shape for assessing the significance of trends,
340 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 115, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JC006102>, 2010.
- Jacox, M., Buil, M., Brodie, S., Alexander, M., Amaya, D., Bograd, S., Edwards, C., Fiechter, J., Hazen, E., Hervieux, G., and Tommasi, D.:
Downscaled seasonal forecasts for the California Current System: Skill assessment and prospects for living marine resource applications,
PLOS Climate, 2, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000245>, 2023.
- Lee, J., Yang, X., Chang, E., Murakami, H., and Cooke, W.: Sensitivity of Northern Hemisphere Extratropical Cyclone Properties to Atmo-
345 spheric Resolution in the GFDL SPEAR Model, *Journal of Climate*, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-24-0770.1>, 2025.
- Lellouche, J.-M., Greiner, E., Bourdalle-Badie, R., Garric, G., Melet, A., Drevilon, M., Bricaud, C., Hamon, M., Le Galloudec, O., Regnier,
C., Candela, T., Testut, C.-E., Gasparin, F., Ruggerio, G., Benkiran, M., Drillet, Y., and Le Traon, P.-Y.: The Copernicus Global 1/12°
Oceanic and Sea Ice GLORYS12 Reanalysis, *Frontiers in Earth Science*, <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2021.698876>, 2021.
- Lentz, S.: Wind-Driven Along-Coast Pressure Gradients in the Middle Atlantic Bight, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 129,
350 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024JC021271>, 2024.
- Li, D., Chang, P., Yeager, S., Danabasoglu, G., Castruccio, F., Small, J., Wang, H., Zhang, Q., and Gopal, A.: The Impact of Horizontal
Resolution on Projected Sea-Level Rise Along US East Continental Shelf With the Community Earth System Model, *Journal of Advances
in Modeling Earth Systems*, 14, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021MS002868>, 2022.
- Little, C., Hu, A., Hughes, C., McCarthy, G., Piecuch, C., Ponte, R., and Thomas, M.: The relationship between U.S. east
355 coast sea level and the Atlantic meridional overturning circulation: a review, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 124,
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015152>, 2019.
- Little, C., Yeager, S., Ponte, R., Chang, P., and Kim, W.: Influence of Ocean Model Horizontal Resolution on the Rep-
resentation of Global Annual-To-Multidecadal Coastal Sea Level Variability, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 129,
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2024JC021679>, 2024.
- 360 Little, C., Yeager, S., Ponte, R., and Donatelli, C.: Blocked coastal propagation inhibits model representation of southeast United States
coastal sea level variability, *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 53, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2025GL118781>, 2026.
- Liu, Z., Minobe, S., Sasaki, Y., and Terada, M.: Dynamical downscaling of future sea level change in the western north Pacific using ROMS,
Journal of Oceanography, 72, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10872-016-0390-0>, 2016.
- Long, X., Shin, S., and Newman, M.: Statistical Downscaling of Seasonal Forecasts of Sea Level Anomalies for U.S. Coasts, *Geophysical
365 Research Letters*, 50, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL100271>, 2023.
- Lu, F., Harrison, M., Rosati, A., Delworth, T., Yang, X., Cooke, W., Jia, L., McHugh, C., Johnson, N., Bushuk, M., Zhang, Y., and Adcroft,
A.: GFDL's SPEAR Seasonal Prediction System: Initialization and Ocean Tendency Adjustment (OTA) for Coupled Model Predictions,
Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 12, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020MS002149>, 2020.
- Maghsoodifar, F., Radfar, S., Moftakhari, H., and Moradkhani, H.: Establishing closure criteria for coastal roadways under flooding condi-
370 tions, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 130, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2025.105805>, 2025.



- Minobe, S., Terada, M., Qiu, B., and Schneider, N.: Western Boundary Sea Level: A Theory, Rule of Thumb, and Application to Climate Models, *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 47, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-16-0144.1>, 2017.
- Piecuch, C. and Ponte, R.: Inverted barometer contributions to recent sea level changes along the northeast coast of America, *Ocean Science*, 42, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064580>, 2015.
- 375 Piecuch, C., Das, S., Gorrell, L., Dangendorf, S., Hamlington, B., Thompson, P., and Wahl, T.: Impact-Based Thresholds for Investigation of High-Tide Flooding in the United States, *Earth's Future*, 13, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024EF005850>, 2025.
- Qu, Y., Jevrejeva, S., Fang, J., and Wang, S.: Projected changes in sea level seasonal cycle alter global coastal flood hazards, *Environmental Research Letters*, 21, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ae3b57>, 2026.
- Rose, L., Widlansky, M., Feng, X., Thompson, P., Asher, T., Dusek, G., Blanton, B., Luettich, R., Callahan, J., Brooks, W., Keeney, A., Haddad, J., Sweet, W., Genz, A., Hovenga, P., Marra, J., and Tilson, J.: Assessment of water levels from 43 years of
380 NOAA's Coastal Ocean Reanalysis (CORA) for the Gulf Coast of Mexico and East Coasts, *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 11, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2024.1381228>, 2024.
- Ross, A., Stock, C., Adcroft, A., Curchitser, E., R., H., Harrison, M., Hedstrom, K., Zadeh, N., Alexander, M., Chen, W., Drenkard, E., duPontavice, H., Dussin, R., Gomez, F., John, J., Kang, D., Lavoie, D., Resplandy, L., Roobaert, A., Saba, V., Shin, S.-I., Siedlecki, S.,
385 and Simkins, J.: A high-resolution physical–biogeochemical model for marine resource applications in the northwest Atlantic (MOM6-COBALT-NWA12 v1.0), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 16, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-16-6943-2023>, 2023.
- Ross, A., Stock, C., Koul, V., Delworth, T., Lu, F., Wittenberg, A., and Alexander, M.: Dynamically downscaled seasonal ocean forecasts for North American east coast ecosystems, *Ocean Science*, 20, <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-20-1631-2024>, 2024.
- Sweet, W. V., Hamlington, B. D., Kopp, R. E., Weaver, C. P., Barnard, P. L., Bekaert, D., Brooks, W., Craghan, M., Dusek, G., Frederikse, T., Garner, G., Genz, A. S., Krasting, J. P., Larour, E., Marcy, D., Marra, J. J., Obeysekera, J., Osler, M., Pendleton, M., Roman, D.,
390 Schmied, L., Veatch, W., White, K. D., and Zuzak, C.: Global and Regional Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States: Up-dated Mean Projections and Extreme Water Level Probabilities Along U.S. Coastlines, NOAA Technical Report NOS 01, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Ocean Service, Silver Spring, MD, 2022.
- Sweet, W. V., Genz, A., Menendez, M., Marra, J., and Obeysekera, J.: Implications of Variability and Trends in Coastal Extreme Water
395 Levels, *Geophysical Research Letters*, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2024GL108864>, 2024.
- Thompson, P., Widlansky, M., Hamlington, B., Merrifield, M., Marra, J., Mitchum, G., and Sweet, W.: Rapid increases and extreme months in projections of United States high-tide flooding, *Nature Climate Change*, 11, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01077-8>, 2021.
- Volkov, D., Zhang, K., Johns, W., Willis, J., Hobbs, W., Goes, M., Zhang, H., and Menemenlis, D.: Atlantic meridional overturning circulation increases flood risk along the United States southeast coast, *Nature Communications*, 14, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-40848-z>,
400 2023.
- Wang, O., Lee, T., Piecuch, C., Fukumori, I., Fenty, I., Frederikse, T., Menemenlis, D., Ponte, R., and Zhang, H.: Local and Remote Forcing of Interannual Sea-Level Variability at Nantucket Island, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 127, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JC018275>, 2022.
- Wang, O., Lee, T., Frederikse, T., Ponte, R., Fenty, I., and Fukumori, I.: What Forcing Mechanisms Affect the Interannual Sea Level
405 Covariability Between the Northeast and Southeast Coasts of the United States?, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 129, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023JC019873>, 2024a.



- Wang, O., Lee, T., Piecuch, C., Fukumori, I., Fenty, I., Fredrickse, T., Menemenlis, D., Ponte, R., and Zhang, H.: Local and Remote Forcing of Interannual Sea-Level Variability at Nantucket Island, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 127, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JC018275>, 2024b.
- 410 Wise, A., Hughes, C., and Polton, J.: Bathymetric Influence on the Coastal Sea Level Response to Ocean Gyres at Western Boundaries, *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 48, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-18-0007.1>, 2018.
- Wise, A., Polton, J., Hughes, C., and Huthnance, J.: Idealised modelling of oddshore-forced sea leve hot spots and boundary waves along the North American East Coast, *Ocean Modelling*, 155, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2020.101706>, 2020.
- Woodworth, P., Hunter, J., Marcos, M., Caldwell, P., Menendez, M., and Haigh, I.: Towards a global higher-frequency sea level dataset, *Geoscientific Data*, 3, <https://doi.org/10.1002/gdj3.42>, 2016.
- 415 Wu, T. and He, R.: Gulf Stream Near Cape Hatteras Modulates Sea Level Variability Along the Southeastern Coast of North America, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 52, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024GL112776>, 2025.
- Xu, G., Chang, P., Danabasoglu, G., Castruccio, F., Yeager, S., Zhang, Q., Kurian, J., Small, J., Bates, S., and Shepard, C.: Storm-permitting climate modeling highlights storm frequency's role in future extreme sea level changes along US East and Gulf Coasts, *npj: climate and atmospheric science*, 9, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-025-01274-8>, 2026.
- 420 Yin, J., Schlesinger, M., and Stouffer, R.: Model projections of rapid sea-level rise on the northeast coast of the United States, *Nature Geoscience*, 2, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo462>, 2009.
- Zhang, L., Delworth, T., Koul, V., Ross, A., Stock, C., Yang, X., Zeng, F., Wittenberg, A., Zhao, J., Gu, Q., and Li, S.: Skillful multiyear prediction of flood frequency along the US Northeast Coast using a high-resolution modeling system, *Science Advances*, 11, <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.ads4419>, 2025.
- 425