Evaluation of quantitative precipitation forecasts by HWRF model

Mrinal K Biswas¹

In collaboration with

John Gotway¹, Tara Jensen¹, Barbara Brown¹, Ligia Bernardet², Louisa Nance¹ and Vijay Tallapragada³ ¹DTC/NCAR, ²DTC/ESRL/CIRES, ³EMC

2015 WRF Workshop, Boulder, CO



Acknowledgment to EMC HWRF Team for providing the HWRF datasets

Developmental Testbed Center

Introduction

- Rainfall flooding during TCs is the second deadliest cause next to storm surge (Rappaport 2014).
- TC precipitation forecast verification for HWRF has

been limit
Objec
How does
Does HW
Interview of the provided state o



Storms for Verification



3

Data

Observations

• CMORPH

- Satellite based precipitation estimate from CPC
- 3-h on 0.25°x0.25° grid from 60°S-60°N
- NCEP Stage IV
 - Precipitation from rain gauge and radar data
 - 1, 6 and 24-h on 4km grid covering CONUS
- Model
 - HWRF
 - 2014 pre-implementation & realtime 27/9/3 km (EMC)
 - Post processed using UPP from ~ 27 km to 0.25°
 - 0.05° storm total precipitation mostly from d03 domain
 - GFS

DTC

- Operational model output Mixed model version
- 0.5° data available to users







Verification regions



24 h Acc precipitation climatology





Most of the large scale patterns are well captured like ITCZ, orographic rainfall

Developmental Testbed Center-

DTC

Frequency Bias/ETS(Thresholds: 0.1",1",2",3")



Track errors and impact on QPF

- Track errors increase with lead time – wrong storm position impacts QPF
- Shifted domain based on difference between forecasted & best track location at 24 h acc precip valid time
- Verification over 600 km circle centered on observed storm
- Implemented in MET by DTC verification team

ETS shown before and after shifting



Shifted (solid) No shift (dashed) Thresholds 0.1", 1", 2", 3"



Developmental Testbed Center

Verification of hi-res HWRF swath

6

52

\$

\$

35

- Re-gridded CMORPH, Stage IV data to 0.05°
- Drew bands of 50 km width around the storm track extending out to 400 km.
- Drawn bands relative to BT for obs and fcst location for HWRF
- Used CMORPH when storm over water and Stage IV when storm over land



Due to coarse resolution, CMORPH does not truly represent finer scale precipitation

Distribution of acc precip for different bands and 0-400 km



Summary

- Both HWRF and GFS capture overall precipitation pattern, e.g. ITCZ, orographic rainfall.
- Generally HWRF QPF over-estimates compared to observations, whereas, GFS QPF under-estimates precipitation.
- At 5-day lead time ETS is reduced substantially due to track error.
- HWRF produces too much rainfall near the storm center, but too little away from it.

