1. INTRODUCTION

Atmospheric turbulence can significantly degrade the quality of optical communications systems. It is therefore essential to characterize expected turbulence before using such a system. Unfortunately it can be very difficult and expensive to instrument regions for measuring relevant atmospheric conditions. A more economical alternative is to employ numerical weather prediction to estimate turbulence climatology.

The key variable of interest is the refractive index structure-function parameter ($C_n^2$). When turbulence is locally homogeneous and isotropic, $C_n^2$ is related to changes in the refractive index $\delta n$ over distance $r$ (Tatarskii 1971):

$$\overline{(\delta n)^2} = C_n^2 r^{2/3}$$

where the overbar indicates an ensemble average, and $r$ lies within the inertial subrange of turbulence. Larger values of $C_n^2$ correspond to increasing changes in the refractive index. Closely related is the Fried parameter ($r_0$):

$$r_0 = \left[ 0.423 \left( \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \right)^2 \int_0^\infty C_n^2(z) dz \right]^{-3/5}$$

where $\lambda$ is the optical wavelength. Fried (1965) introduced $r_0$ to measure the magnitude of the phase distortion of an optical wavefront by turbulence. Smaller values of $r_0$ indicate more severe turbulence, and increasingly degraded atmospheric seeing conditions.

In this paper we describe using the WRF-ARW to estimate seeing climatologies over different geographical areas in the United States. Our work is complementary to that of Cherubini et al. (2008) and of Masciadri and coworkers (Masciadri and Enger 2006; Masciadri and Jabouille 2001; Masciadri et al. 2001). Section 2 describes the model configuration, modifications to the WRF Mellor-Yamada-Janjić (MYJ) turbulence closure, and calculation of seeing parameters. Example results for a region in New Mexico are given in section 3. Section 4 provides a summary and discusses future work.

2. TECHNIQUE

a. Domain Configuration

We have used WRF-ARW Version 2.2 to simulate daily weather conditions at several locations in the United States for 2006–2007. In each case the model is configured at 1-km horizontal resolution with dimensions $67 \times 63$. The number of vertical grid points varies from 135 to 140, with the sigma levels set to approximate 50 m resolution below 2 km above ground level (AGL), 125 m for 2-12 km AGL, and 500 m up to 50 mb. (These exact resolutions would require flat terrain and conditions matching the U.S. Standard Atmosphere.) Simulations are initialized at 1200 UTC directly from the 12-km (Grid 218) North American Mesoscale (NAM) analysis produced by the National Weather Service. Lateral boundary conditions are provided out to 27 hours by three-hourly NAM forecasts. This allows us to filter out model “spin-up” by excluding the first 3 simulation hours from our studies, while still capturing the full 24-hour diurnal cycle. Selected physics and diffusion options are summarized in Table 1.

b. Modifications to WRF

We found it necessary to modify the minimum turbulence kinetic energy (TKE) permitted in the MYJ scheme. The default setting of parameter epsq2 in MODULE_MODEL_CONSTANTS.F gives TKE values $\geq 0.01$ m$^2$ s$^{-2}$, resulting in unrealistically large values of $C_n^2$ in the free atmosphere. Following Gerrity et al. (1994), we changed the minimum TKE limit to 0.00001 m$^2$ s$^{-2}$.

The second modification involves the eddy diffusivities of heat and momentum ($K_H$ and $K_M$, respectively). In the original MYJ scheme, these vari-
Table 1: WRF physics and diffusion settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time integration</th>
<th>RK3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time step</td>
<td>2 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal advection</td>
<td>Fifth order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical advection</td>
<td>Third order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit diffusion</td>
<td>Physical space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary layer</td>
<td>MYJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface layer</td>
<td>Janji Eta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land surface</td>
<td>Noah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortwave radiation</td>
<td>Dudhia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwave radiation</td>
<td>RRTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microphysics</td>
<td>WSM6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulus parameterization</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ables are given by:

\[ K_H = \ell q S_H, \quad K_M = \ell q S_M, \]

where \( \ell \) is the mixing length, \( q = \sqrt{2 \text{TKE}} \), and \( S_H \) and \( S_M \) are functions of TKE, mixing length, buoyancy and vertical wind shear (Mellor and Yamada 1982). In our modified version we keep these relations unchanged for neutral and unstable conditions. However, when the gradient Richardson number (\( Ri \)) > 0.01 we follow Walters and Miller (1999) and adjust \( K_M \) so that:

\[ \frac{K_H}{K_M} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\text{TKE}}, & \text{for } \text{Ri} \geq 1, \\ 1, & 0.01 < \text{Ri} \leq 1. \end{cases} \]

This equation for \( K_H/K_M \) was first proposed by Kondo et al. (1978). The Kondo equation decreases \( K_H/K_M \) with increasing \( \text{Ri} \), effectively increasing TKE production by vertical wind shear. Walters and Miller (1999) found this necessary to generate free atmosphere turbulence associated with jet streaks, and we employ this change in all simulations.

c. Estimating Seeing

Tatarskii (1971) derived an alternative expression for the structure-function parameter applicable for optical wavelengths:

\[ C_n^2 = \left( \frac{79 \times 10^{-8} P}{T^2} \right)^2 C_T^2 \]

where \( P \) is atmospheric pressure (Pa), \( T \) is air temperature (K), and \( C_T^2 \) is the structure-function parameter for temperature. \( C_T^2 \) in turn is related to:

\[ C_T^2 = a^2 \left( \frac{K_H}{K_M} \right) L_o^{4/3} \left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z} \right)^2 \]

where \( a^2 \) is an empirical constant, \( L_o \) is the outer length scale of turbulence (i.e., the upper bound of the inertial subrange), and \( \partial \theta/\partial z \) is the vertical gradient of potential temperature. Following Walters and Miller (1999), we set \( a^2 \) to 2.8 and calculate \( L_o \) in thermally stable conditions using an approximation from Deardorff (1980):

\[ L_o = 0.76 \sqrt{TKE/N} \]

where \( N \) is the Brunt-Väisälä frequency. In thermally unstable conditions, \( L_o \) is related to the depth of the unstable layer, similar to Masciadri et al. (2001). With these input variables, we then calculate \( C_n^2 \) in 3D and \( r_0 \) in 2D.

3. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

A sample springtime climatology of \( r_0 \) from WRF is shown in Figure 1. For comparison, we also show observed climatological information measured from a differential image motion monitor (DIMM). The comparison shows general success in simulating the diurnal cycle of \( r_0 \) with WRF. Figure 2 shows the cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) of both datasets for the daytime. It is apparent that WRF does not produce the very lowest values of \( r_0 \) during the day—perhaps due to inadequate grid resolution. Figure 3 shows the corresponding CDF plots for nighttime. Here, WRF (in blue) shows lower \( r_0 \) values at night that are not measured by the DIMM. One partial explanation is that the DIMM was shut down whenever surface winds exceeded 30 mph. Better agreement is reached when WRF cases exceeding this wind threshold are thrown out (in green).

4. SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK

We have generated daily simulations of atmospheric conditions for several locations with WRF, in an attempt to characterize the distribution of \( C_n^2 \) and related optical turbulence parameters. Comparisons with observations suggest some skill in capturing optical turbulence, but discrepancies are also noted. Future work will include:

- additional comparisons with observed data;
- increasing the resolution of the model domains (we are attempting to run WRF version 3.0 at 0.5 km resolution at the time of this writing);
- improving the model initialization (e.g., with 3DVAR); and
- testing other physics packages to more accurately simulate turbulence.
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