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**Motivation**

- **Currently:**
  - “Mountain wave and other turbulent lee event forecasting methodologies need considerable attention.” – Air Force Weather Turbulence Forecasting Summary
  - Panofsky Turbulence Index for near-surface turbulence forecasting is quite good for synoptic wind shear events, but struggles in certain situations, such as with dry thermal convection and mesoscale waves
  - Current trapped lee wave forecasting methods can be cumbersome, and the nature of the process does not account for all regions or for propagation
  - Little has been done in the way of forecasting conditions favorable for other types of trapped waves (such as gravity waves, currents, etc.)
Currently

Box Forecasting Method
(Mountain Waves)

Terrain-Induced Wave:
SE Oklahoma
21 May 2011
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Approach

- Review research pertaining to simulations and observations of trapped waves
- Study trapped wave cases to find meteorological conditions likely most responsible for wave-trapping
- Use operational models to find clues that will aid in the forecasting of trapped waves – regions of enhanced turbulence probability, as well as enhanced turbulence severity
15 KM WRF Information

- Version 3.2
- Nested within 45 KM Domain
- 3DVAR Data Assimilation
- Resolution
  - Horizontal: 15 KM
  - Vertical: 56 levels
  - Grid Size: 343 x 211
- Physics Package
  - Longwave radiation: RRTM scheme
  - Shortwave radiation: Dudhia scheme
  - Cumulus Parameter Scheme: Kain-Fritsch scheme
  - Explicit scheme: WRF Single-Moment 5-class scheme
  - Planetary Boundary Layers: Yonsei University Scheme
  - Soil Model: Noah Land Surface Model
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Challenges: Verification

- Nature of pilot reports
- If area is known to be turbulent, flights avoid the region
- Product-specific challenges:
  - Nocturnal wave identification
  - “Other” cloud cover can obscure evidence of trapped waves
  - Specific cause of turbulence
  - Specific level at which wave exists
  - Waves in dry atmosphere (below LCL)?
Challenges: NWP

- Limited resolution of operational models
  - Traditional measures of turbulence, such as the Richardson number, can be difficult to forecast at necessary thresholds due to vertical resolution
  - Thickness differences in upper levels
- Not every wave can be simulated in operational models–
  - Want to focus on environments favorable for waves
  - Mesoscale processes may affect local environments
“Under ordinary conditions, an upward-propagating gravity wave may encounter a level where background flow characteristics such as N or u change quickly with height. When this happens, wave reflection can occur (Nappo 2002).”

“$M^2 < 0$ implies that either stability is small or negative, or there is significant curvature in the wave-normal wind profile (Coleman et al 2009).”
Use vertical velocities within the WRF data to attempt to identify wave motions.

Contoured WRF vertical velocity
6 June 2011: Northern Nevada.
06Z 15 KM WRF valid 18Z.

Upper limit of negative vertical velocities: near 1500 meters AGL.

Wind curvature near 650 mb (~1450 m AGL)
Vertical Velocity Cross Sections: W-E Horizontal Display

Vertical Velocity (m/s)

10-Sigma layer vertical velocity plot: 06Z WRF data valid 18Z, NV

Vertical Velocity (m/s)

17-sigma layer vertical velocity plot: 06Z WRF data valid 18Z, NV
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Forecast Product

- Single Layer:
  - Compute changes in wind components for each sigma layer
    - EX: $DU(5120) = UCOMP(5425) - UCOMP(4760)$
    - Layer product that will be represented by median level
    - Square DU and DV terms
  - Early Formula:
    - Add $DU^2$ and $DV^2$ terms, minimum 10 for each term
  - Updated Formula:
    - Multiply $DU^2$ term by $DV^2$ term
    - Emphasize significant changes
    - Minimum 6 for each term
    - If either term is less than 0, set entire product to 0
  - Caveat: Coarse vertical resolution in upper levels
Graphical Display:
13 June 2011 – Early Formula

“Early” formula:
7745 sigma level

Visible satellite:  
1815Z

Panofsky Turbulence Index:
Valid 18Z

Pilot reports in NW Missouri:  
Moderate turbulence  
1806Z  
1906Z
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Graphical Display
19 July 2011 – Updated Formula
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Vertical Profile:
$DU^2*DV^2$ Term

DU$^2$DV$^2$ Term
06 Z WRF data: Valid 18Z
21 July 2011
NE of Seattle, Washington

12 Z UIL sounding

17Z visible satellite image
**Data Display:**

8 July 2011 - Utah

Visible satellite: 1530Z

WRF data: Valid 15Z
DU^2*DV^2 terms:
5475-4760 layer: 147.0
5120-4405 layer: 244.3

Visible satellite: 1830Z

WRF data: Valid 18Z
DU^2*DV^2 Terms
5475 – 4760 layer: 4.5
5120 – 4405 layer: 6.7
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Maximum WRF data calculated DU2*DV2 term : 11.3
12Z TOP sounding calculated DU2*DV2 term: 73.7

Most favored region for reflecting layer on 12Z
Topeka sounding
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Identified 24 trapped waves using visible satellite imagery

Reviewed WRF data: found evidence of reflecting layer meeting our criteria within WRF data in 21 cases

For missed cases: found evidence of reflecting layer meeting our criteria within nearby sounding data

“Missed” cases primarily tended to appear on imagery for short periods of time (< 1 hour) and over smaller geographical areas

“Missed” waves more likely the result of mesoscale influences
Summary/Conclusions

- 15 KM WRF shows ability to accurately and operationally forecast specific areas where reflecting layers are preferred.
- A combination of u-component change and v-component change can be used to display a likelihood that a reflecting layer will be present.
- Not all reflecting layers are large-scale features in the atmosphere, particularly within the mountains.
- Mesoscale features may alter a wind profile in favor of reflection when large scale conditions are unfavorable. Operational models may continue to struggle in these cases.
Future Work

- **Product Development:**
  - Multi-layer maps: Ease for user
  - Any “clues” available where events appear to be missed?
  - Account for thickness of upper sigma layers
  - Probabilistic and ensemble forecasting methodology

- **Climatology Studies**
  - Frequency of conditions favorable for reflecting layers

- **Weather Forecasting:**
  - Wave formation
  - Wave breaking
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