The use of WRF-DART analyses for 3 km explicit convective forecasts in support of the 2012 DC3 Field Program
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13th WRF Workshop – Boulder, CO – 25-29 June 2012
Morris is in Salina, KS providing forecast support for DC3 (Deep Convective Clouds and Chemistry) Field Program. So – no attacks on DART this year!
Forecast challenge – Accurate prediction of convective development, character and evolution in the 0-36h time frame, suspect initial conditions (ICs) play a key role

Analysis quality metric – Forecasts precipitation systems of the right intensity at approximately the right time and location. Assume better forecast = better analysis

Goal – Use a continuously cycled WRF-DART system (with inferior observation set) and generate an analysis with similar or better forecast skill to external analyses available in realtime (leverage Torn’s realtime system for hurricanes to get started)

Various methods for radar assimilation shown to work well in 0-3h time frame, but often fail when mesoscale background is poor. So – get mesoscale accurate first. Inaugural 2011 system left room for improvement!

Sensitivity test – how do physics configurations in the continuously cycled DA system impact analysis quality?
Continuously cycled WRFDART analysis

ARW WRF with varying physics configurations 15 km horiz.

Forecast model with added 3 km resolution convection permitting nest

Spring 2011 we ran the KAF config. in realtime
Continuously cycled wrf-dart ensemble from 27 Apr – 13 June 2011

Daily hi-res forecasts from single member analysis 00 UTC

WRF – CONUS 15 km dh, 35 levels
- Kain-Fritsch (Tiedtke), RRTM LW, Goddard SW, MYJ (YSU) PBL, Thompson (Morrison), Noah LSM

DART – 50 members, 6-hr cycling, adaptive inflation & localization, sampling error correction, ~ 510(6.5) km half-width H(V) localization

Soil states ran free for each member
- TSLB, SMOIS, SH2O, TSK

Realtime forecasts were noted to have some quality issues, so we looked for clues in the ICs
Example: 24h forecasts from different analyses

The convective system in the Southern Great Plains is too far west, poorly matching observations.

‘Bonus’ convection over Ohio.
Typical 24h realtime forecast errors:

Large scale similarities with observed rainfall patterns where strongly forced – however frequently lagged further west than observed

Too much forecast precip NW of low pressure systems

Are these initial condition errors?

If so, could model bias in the ensemble data assimilation system be playing a role?
  
  e.g. Torn and Davis 2012 found KF scheme caused storm track bias
Forecasts use identical forecast model. ICs differ from analysis system physics. More similarity where large scale forcing was strong. All forecasts have + bias (too much rain) and orientation errors with the main precipitation event for this case.
Bias in 6 h forecasts (Priors) against radiosonde obs

Bias for continuously cycled wrf-dart priors – fit to assimilated radiosonde mandatory level observations

Model state (bkgd) generally too warm, too wet and wind speeds too slow relative to radiosonde obs for all tested physics sets,

Some physics sets appear to have worse fit than others
Hovmöller diagrams for period 18-27 May 2011

Stage IV

WRF ARW (TIE) f12-36h

Discontinuities in sequential WRF 12-36 h forecasts, some displaced missing, or bonus precip
Meridionally averaged accumulated precipitation (mm)

- Model >= 0.15 mm
- Stage IV >= 0.15 mm
- Both >= 0.15 mm

Legend:
- Model >= 0.15 mm: Blue
- Stage IV >= 0.15 mm: Red
- Both >= 0.15 mm: Grey

Dates in May 2011 (DD UTC): 18 12, 19 12, 20 12, 21 12, 22 12, 23 12, 24 12, 25 12, 26 12, 27 12

Longitudes: -105, -100, -95, -90, -85

Meridionally averaged accumulated precipitation (mm):
0 0.02 0.04 0.08 0.14 0.2 0.35 1 2 3 5
• More, shorter, ‘swaths’ than observed in the WRF forecasts (microphysics?)
• Clear wet bias in WRF in 2nd day all longitudes
• Exaggerated diurnal cycle
• Spin-up period 1-3 hrs
Gross similarities, but differences in details
+precip bias in model forecasts with a wider latitudinal band of heavy precipitation.
Fractions Skill Score and Areal Coverage for varied ICs

(a) 0.2 mm/hr
(b) 1.0 mm/hr
(c) 10.0 mm/hr

GFS was killing us Beyond 12 h

All have +bias!
Growing our own analysis system for initializing convection permitting forecasts is feasible

Much more work to become competitive with current operational Mesoscale analysis systems (expected, our team has extremely limited resources)

Model, and perhaps even observation bias needs to be minimized or corrected in a continuously cycled analysis system used to generate initial conditions for forecasts:
- only showing for WRF-DART
- small changes in background bias impact forecast skill
- reduced background bias generally leads to better forecasts
- intuitive, but we believe this is first attempt to quantify in LAM
Cont.
Continuously cycled DA system enables identification of model and observation system weaknesses

Some remaining issues:
Forecast model here held fixed – better to have same model in forecast as is used in the cycled analysis system?

Would prefer to be running ensemble forecasts instead of deterministic
Operations period: 30 April to 30 June 2012

WRF model changes from 2011:
- Additional 5 vertical levels, now 40
- Raise Ptop to 50 mb (from 65 mb)
- Version 3.3.1 (3.2.1)
- Tiedtke CP, RRTMG +aerosol and ozone climatology for LW&SW radiation, Morrison microphysics

DART changes from 2011:
- Development branch (mainly for obs processing updates)
- Localization H(V) to 640 (8) km, adaptive localization threshold to 2k
- Initial inflation SD = 0.80
• **New:**
  – Profiler U, V wind component (MADIS)
  – Significant level radiosonde observations (just T & Td)

• **Modified:**
  – ACARS superobs larger Horz. kernel (60 km)
  – SAT winds larger Horz. kernel (90 km)

• **Ob errors:**
  – ACARS temp error increased
  – SAT winds error increased, see related problem in Torn poster
  – Stretched radiosonde error profiles toward lower pressure for ‘spring’
  – Tweaked down surface ob errors (T 1.75 K, U/V 1.75 m/s)
  – Dewpoint rh_error 0.05; rh_min = 0.15
2012 Realtime – Aggregate performance 30 Apr-26 Jun

- Little evidence of model bias relative to radiosonde temperature obs below 300 mb
- Still a slow wind speed bias
Meridionally averaged accumulated precipitation (mm)

Both >= 0.15 mm
Model >= 0.15 mm
Stage IV >= 0.15 mm

a) KAF
b) TIE
c) YSU
d) MOR
e) GFS
f) ST4

f12-36 h forecast 0.15 mm accumulated precip. against Stage IV from 1 May – 15 June 2012

2012 Realtime – Forecast verification 1 May-15 June
2012 Realtime – Accumulated precip 2 May-15 June

Good spatial agreement in rainfall climatology, but clearly biased
The +bias is dominated by excess rainfall at most intense rain rates, less so in areal coverage.
Average daily accumulated precipitation Hovmöller May 1 – June 22 2012

Obvious bias, exaggerated diurnal cycle, spike in development in first 3h (spinup problem?)
Diurnal moisture bias (+bias during afternoon and evening) evident against surface METAR stations.
Subjective assessments suggest current analysis and forecast system performing much better than last season (low bar), with greater reliability (less forecast skill variance from day-to-day)

Significant positive bias in ‘high end’ rain events

Need to examine skill in 12 UTC initialized runs, and compare against control runs and forecasts from other analysis and forecast systems

Have a look for yourself:
Analysis:
http://www.image.ucar.edu/wrfdart/rt2012/index.htm

Deterministic forecasts:
http://wrf-model.org/plots/realtime_3kmconv.php

Next season on our agenda: Ensemble forecasts from the ensemble analysis!!!

Thanks for your attention!