#### Testing and Evaluation of the GSI-Hybrid Data Assimilation and it Applications for High-resolution Tropical Storm Forecasts

Chunhua Zhou<sup>1,3</sup>, Hui Shao<sup>1,3</sup> and Ligia Bernardet<sup>2,3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR)
<sup>2</sup> NOAA/ESRL/GSD
<sup>3</sup> Developmental Testbed Center (DTC)
<sup>4</sup> University of Colorado/Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences (CIRES)



15<sup>th</sup> WRF Users' Workshop - June 26, 2014

# **SI-Hybrid 3DVAR** $J(x,\alpha) = \beta_1 J_b + \beta_2 J_e + J_o$ ensembles $J(x,\alpha) = \beta_1 J_b + \beta_2 J_e + J_o$ $g_1 \frac{1}{2} (x - x_b)^T B^{-1} (x - x_b) + \beta_2 \frac{1}{2} \alpha^T A^{-1} \alpha + \frac{1}{2} [y - H(x + x_e)]^T R^{-1} [y - H(x + x_e)]$

Specific humidity analysis increments for single obs test q@ 700mb (Isaac) (HWRF 2012 Basin)



Even with 75% ens. contributions, the 3DVAR contribution is still overwhelmingly dominant.

- Tune the variance of static background errors (BE)
- Improve ensemble representation -
  - Ensemble selection: HWRF ensemble versus GFS ensemble

## **Ensemble Selection: HWRF vs GFS**

• HWRF ensemble:

Generated by DTC using EMC 2013 code & configuration (provided by Zhan Zhang)

-- Model physics perturbation with stochastic convective trigger

-- 20 member GEFS (Ensemble Transform with Rescaling (ETR) based) for IC/ BC perturbations



# **Experimental design**

- Generated HWRF regional ensemble (20 members)
  - Analysis time
  - 6-hr forecasts
- Generated ensemble for ghost\_d03 domain
  - Merging HWRF ensemble for outer domain & HWRF ensemble for inner nest, using prior 6-h forecasts (domains move following TC)

• Conducted 2 sets of experiments for Isaac (2012):

- GLBL: GSI-hybrid & HWRF runs using GFS ensemble (80 members, 0.46 deg) for both outer (0.18 deg, 27km) and ghost domains (0.02 deg, 3km). Only conventional data and TDR (when available) were assimilated. -- similar to 2013 HWRF operational configuration
- **RGNL**: Similar to GLBL, except DA for ghost\_d03 used merged ensemble from step 2.



2013 HWRF operational domains

#### How does the ensemble merging work for ghost\_d03?



u perturbation on ghost\_d03 -- d1 ensemble member 001

### Analysis results

 RGNL analyses provides better flow-dependent and finer scale structures.

 Similar results were found for other analysis times and fields.



Column precipitable water at analysis time

58W

57W 56W

69W

65W 64W 63W

62W 61W

60W 59W 58W

57W 56W

**Developmental Testbed Center** 

69W 68W 67W 66W 65W 64W

#### **Forecast verification**

RGNL (using HWRF ensemble for inner domain DA) gives more realistic hurricane structure than GLBL







- Improvements on track forecasts
- Neutral or negative impact on intensity forecasts

#### Impacts of vortex initialization vs DA

#### V (m/s) at level 11 - 2012082300



• For this case study (with TDR data and using HWRF ensemble), the vortex initialization counter-acts with the DA analysis increments in the inner domain.

DTC

#### Impact of vortex initialization

• RNVI: similar to RGNL, but without vortex initialization (Isaac 2012)

✓ Since there is no vortex initialization involved, the total adjustment to the background is through GSI, or, GSI analysis increment.

Track Errors (nm)

Lead Time (h)

[K\_ERR (nm)

RGNL

RNVI



#### Impact of vortex initialization



#### Impact of vortex initialization



#### RWRM: new experiment with HWRF background for the inner domain DA

Cases: Isaac and Sandy for 2012 season



Experiment	Outer domain DA	Inner domain (ghost_d03) DA
RNVI (no vortex init.)	GDAS 6hr fcst background, GFS ensemble	GDAS 3hr,6hr and 9hr fcst background (FGAT), HWRF ensemble
RWRM (no vortex init.)	GDAS 6hr fcst background, GFS ensemble	HWRF 3hr,6hr and 9hr fcst background (FGAT), HWRF ensemble



Column precipitable water 108-h forecasts initialized at 06Z Aug 24, 2012



### Summary

- HWRF regional ensemble provides
  - Larger ensemble spread around TC areas (inner domain)
  - More realistic analysis increments with better flow-dependent features
- Minimal impacts on TC track and intensity forecasts were found by using HWRF ensemble vs GFS ensemble
  - Vortex initialization and DA not working well together
  - Removing vortex initialization gives better intensity forecast in this case study, when TDR assimilated for the inner domain
- Using HWRF background for the inner domain DA gives some improvements on the track and intensity forecasts, compared to GDAS background for the inner domain DA
- Ongoing/future work
  - Further investigations on the the roles of vortex initialization and data assimilation, in the framework of 2014 HWRF
  - Extensive testing for one or more seasons, for both strong and weak storms
  - Data impacts for the inner domain DA
  - Two-way Hybrid Ensemble DA

