

REDU **Overview of WRF-ARW FDDA Capabilities** and Future Research and Development

Aijun Deng, David Stauffer, Brian Gaudet, Brian Reen, Lili Lei, and Raphael Rogers Penn State University

Jimy Dudhia, Francois Vandenberghe, Cindy Bruyere, Al Bourgeois, Joe Grim, Wanli Wu, and Yubao Liu NCAR

11th Annual WRF Users' Workshop

June 21-25, 2010, Boulder, CO







1855

PENNSTATE

- Part I
 - Current status of the nudging FDDA capabilities in WRF-ARW, and status of the end-to-end FDDA system.
 - Test results of WRF nudging FDDA in a multiscale FDDA framework with several case studies.
 - Comparisons using NO FDDA, obs FDDA, analysis FDDA and multiscale FDDA

Comparison between MM5 and WRF

- Part II
 - Ongoing work with hybrid nudging-ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF). (Lili Lei's Ph.D research, advisor Dave Stauffer)
- Future Plans







- Regime-dependent vertical influence functions for surface observations (e.g. obs_nudgezfullr1_t, obs_nudgezrampr1_t).
- Switch to exclude obs nudging from within the PBL (e.g. obs_no_pbl_nudge_t).
- Option to reduce time window (obs_sfcfact) and radius of influence for surface observations (obs_sfcfacr).
- Parameter to adjust nudging strength based on terrain difference between the obs site and grid point where the innovation is applied (obs_dpsmx).
- Improved diagnostic prints.



• CAPTEX-83 Case

48-h model simulation, 36-km/12-km/4-km domains, 32 vertical layers with the first half layer at ~30 m

Starting: 1200 UTC, 18 Sept. 1983 Ending: 1200 UTC, 20 Sept. 1983 (IC/LBC/FDDA inputs based on MM5 RAWINS) Physics: MYJ PBL, KF CPS (on 36- and 12-km grids), Dudhia SW and RRTM LW, etc



Experimental Design for Multi-scale FDDA PENNSTATE





CAPTEX-83 (36/12/4-km grids)

Exp. name	36-km		12-km		4-km	
	Analysis Nudging	Obs Nudging	Analysis Nudging	Obs Nudging	Analysis Nudging	Obs Nudging
NOFDDA	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
OFDDA	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
GFDDA/S	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
MFDDA/S	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES

FDDA Experimental Design and Parameters

CAPTEX-83 (36/12/4-km grids)

	3D and Surface Analysis Nudging			Obs Nudging		
	36-km	12-km	4-km	36-km	12-km	4-km
G (1/sec)	3*10-4	1*10 ⁻⁴	N/A	4*10 ⁻⁴	4*10 ⁻⁴	4*10 ⁻⁴
3D Wind field	3D Nudging all layers	3D Nudging all layers	N/A	Nudging all layers	Nudging all layers	Nudging all layers
3D Mass field	3D Nudging above PBL	3D Nudging above PBL	N/A	Nudging above PBL	Nudging above PBL	Nudging above PBL
Sfc wind field	Used within PBL	Used within PBL	Used within PBL	Used within PBL	Used within PBL	Used within PBL
Sfc mass field	Used within PBL	Used within PBL	Used within PBL	Not used	Not used	Not used
RINXY (km)	N/A	N/A	N/A	150 [*]	100*	100*
TWINDO (hr)	N/A	N/A	N/A	2**	2**	2**

* 0.67 factor for surface, 2.0 factor at 500 hPa and above

** 0.5 factor for surface

8

MAE of WRF-Simulated Surface Layer

MAE of Surface-Layer Vector Wind Difference





MAE of Surface -Layer Temperature







MAE of WRF-Simulated Fields Averaged NSTATE Over 48-h Time Period And All Model

Layers

MAE of Vector Wind Difference













4-km Grid





Experimental Design

Exp. Name	36 km		12 km		4 km	
	Analysis Nudging	OBS Nudging	Analysis Nudging	OBS Nudging	Analysis Nudging	OBS Nudging
BASELINE2_PX or BASELINE3	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
GFDDA2	YES (3D)	NO	YES (3D)	NO	NO	NO
OFDDA2	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
MFDDA2	YES (3D)	YES	YES (3D)	YES	NO	YES
MFDDA_SFC2	YES (3D+Sfc+Soil)	YES	YES (3D+Sfc+Soil)	YES	NO	YES
MFDDA_SFC2_no soil	YES (3D+Sfc)	YES	YES (3D+Sfc)	YES	NO	YES



3-hourly Surface Wind Speed MAE scores 12Z 12/16/2000 -- 12Z 12/21/2000

3-hourly Surface Temp MAE scores 12Z 12/16/2000 -- 12Z 12/21/2000





3-hourly Surface Wind Dir MAE scores 12Z 12/16/2000 -- 12Z 12/21/2000





12-hourly Upper-Air Wind Speed MAE scores 12Z 12/16/2000 -- 12Z 12/21/2000





12-hourly Upper-Air Wind Dir MAE scores 12Z 12/16/2000 -- 12Z 12/21/2000







Obs nudging on all three grids

- MM5NOFDDA: MM5 without FDDA
- MM5FDDA: MM5 with Obs nudging only
- NOFDDA: WRF without FDDA
- OFDDA: WRF with Obs nudging only
- OFDDAD: WRF with Obs nudging only, with improved vertical spreading for regime 4 as in surface analysis nudging

Note: Both MM5 and WRF use identical configurations, same inputs, same physics, same obs nudging parameters (e.g. same SFCFACT, SFCFACR, and same vertical spreading except OFDDAD)

PENNSTATE



MAE of WRF- and MM5-Simulated Surface Layer Fields Averaged Over 48-h Time Period

MAE of Surface-Layer Vector Wind Difference











PENNSTATE 1 8 5 5

PENNSTATE MAE of WRF- and MM5-Simulated Fields Averaged Over 48-h Time Period And All Model Layers

MAE of Vector Wind Difference







1855

MNOFDDA

WNOFDDA

MOFDDA

WOFDDA

WOFDDAD



Part I: Summary WRF Multiscale FDDA



- 3D/Sfc analysis-nudging only and obs-nudging only significantly reduce model error.
- Analysis nudging (with surface analysis nudging) shows closer fit to obs on the coarser 36-km grid, and obs nudging better fits the obs on the 12-km grid, as expected due to weaker analysis nudging strength.
- Multiscale FDDA (combined analysis and obs nudging) with surface analysis nudging has the best performance.
- PX soil nudging is done independently from the PSU surface analysis nudging, except for the on/off switch (user caution is needed when changing the surface analysis nudging coefficients).





- Surface (wind only, no mass fields nudged):
 - MM5 and WRF have similar error reduction due to use of obs nudging.
 - MM5 (with and without FDDA) has slightly smaller error in surface-layer VWD field. WRF with FDDA has slightly smaller error in surface-layer wind direction on 12- and 4-km grids.
 - The new default vertical spreading option for regime 4 in surface wind nudging in WRF appears to further improve both surface wind stats.

PENNSTATE



Part I: Summary WRF VS MM5 obs nudging

Upper Air:

- MM5 has smaller error in mass field (both with and without FDDA).
- MM5 and WRF have similar error reduction due to use of obs nudging.

PENNSTATE



- WRF IC / LBC: NCEP/NCAR Global Reanalysis Products enhanced by observations via OBSGRID
- 3DVAR is used to perturb the IC and LBC.
- Ensemble size is 24. Currently only IC and LBC perturbations are applied. Different model physics will be used to create additional ensemble members.
- Three-hourly WMO surface observations and twelve-hourly rawinsondes are used for assimilation and fit-to-observations statistics.
- The observation error variances of wind and temperature are adapted from 3DVAR. The observation error variance of relative humidity is set to 10% of the saturated specific humidity.





PENNSTATE

1 8 5 5

Exp. name	Exp. description
NOFDDA	Assimilate no observations
NOEnKF	Assimilate no observations in ensemble
EnKF	Assimilate observations by ensemble adjustment Kalman filter (EAKF)
FDDA	Assimilate observations by traditional observation nudging with nudging coefficients of 4*10 ⁻⁴ s ⁻¹
Hybrid	Assimilate observations by hybrid EnKF (in progress)
Hybrid2	Same as Hybrid except doubling of hybrid nudging coefficients



UNCLASSIFIED



MAE Wind Speed Profile

MAE Wind Direction Profile







MAE Temperature Profile



MAE Mixing Ratio Profile







- Part II: Conclusions EnKF
- The EnKF, hybrid EnKF and FDDA experiments produce better analyses than the corresponding NOFDDA and NOEnKF simulations based on fit statistics.
- FDDA produces better analyses than the EnKF, especially for assimilation of surface observations partially due to the fact that EnKF is not using all surface obs used in FDDA.
- The hypothesis here is that the hybrid EnKF combining the advantages of both nudging (continuous small corrections) and EnKF (flow-dependent error covariances) will produce a better WRF dynamic analysis than either nudging or EnKF applied separately.