# Next Generation HWRF

# **HYCOM** coupling

Hyun-Sook Kim, HWRF & HYCOM modeling team

Environmental Modeling Center National Centers for Environmental Prediction US National Weather Service



HWRF tutorial 1

### **Overview**

- 1. Introduction to HYCOM coupling & Background
- 2. HYCOM Hurricane Domains
- **3.** Initial and Boundary Conditions
- Forecast Comparisons between Non-coupled and Coupled runs: Western North Pacific Typhoons 2012-2013
- 5. TC Forecasting: Sensitivity of SST
- 6. Importance of Initial Conditions: Seasonal and Spatial Variability
- 7. Importance of Realistic Ocean Simulations
- 8. Lessons Learned Recommendations
- 9. Future Plans for Improvement of TC forecasting

# **1. HYCOM coupling**

#### An experimental model proposed for next generation HWRF

- One of ocean models chosen for ocean model impact study as a Hurricane Forecast Improvement Project (HFIP) initiative.
- Forecast skills have been demonstrated
  - for the North Atlantic and Eastern North Pacific hurricanes (Kim et al., 2014), since 2009; and
  - for the Western North Pacific Typhoons (Kim et al. 2015), since 2012.
- Realistic and idealized configurations, along with diagnostic and graphic codes, exist in DTC SVN, but currently HYCOM coupling framework is not supported by DTC yet.

# **1. HYCOM coupling**

#### Ocean model components of HWRF

|                            | POM   | НҮСОМ   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Dynamics & Numerics        | Hydrostatic, free-surface, primitive equations on C grid                      |   |
|                            | 1/12-degree   |   |
|                            | 23 hybrid sigma & Z   | 32 hybrid isopycnal & Z                             |
| <b>Mixing Physics</b>      | Mellor-Yamada 2.5 closure   | KPP   |
| Initialization             | Monthly GDEM3 Climatology +<br>daily GDAS SST assimilation +<br>Feature Model | 6 hourly NCODA-HYCOM<br>analysis                    |
| Lateral Boundary<br>Values | Adjusted T/S fields   | 3 hourly 2D and 6 hourly 3D global RTOFS* forecasts |

\*: RTOFS = Real-Time Ocean Forecast System producing 2-day nowcasts and 8-day forecasts each day

HYCOM is the community model (but not HYCOM coupling), having NRL as the primary developer. *Reference at https://hycom.org* 

# 2. HYCOM Hurricane Domains

#### Domains vs. All TC storms 1851-2006

#### Tracks and Intensity of All Tropical Storms



www.meted.ucar.edu, edited by Hyun-Sook Kim

**NHC**: North Atlantic (blue), Eastern North Pacific (red), Central North Pacific (not shown).

**JTWC**: Western North Pacific (green), Eastern South Indian/Western South Pacific (grey), North Indian (black), and South Indian (pink).

# 2. HYCOM Hurricane Domains

Domains vs. Boundary Currents



www.rapid.ac.uk/background.php, edited by Hyun-Sook Kim

#### Major thermal fronts in each basin:

#### meandering and shedding eddies in meso scales by baroclinic instabilities

- 1. North Atlantic (blue): North Equatorial Current, Loop Current, Gulf Stream, Canary Current
- 2. Eastern North Pacific (red): Equatorial Countercurrent, California Current
- 3. Western North Pacific (green): Kuroshio Current, the North & Equatorial Current
- 4. North Indian Ocean (black): North Equatorial Current, Somali Current, coastal upwelling
- 5. South Indian Ocean (pink): South Equatorial Current, Agulhas Current
- 6. Western South Indian/Eastern South Pacific (grey): East Australian Current &

West Australian Current

# 3. Initial and Boundary Conditions

#### **Components and Data Flow**



DA = data assimilation

GFS = Global Forecast System

GSI = Gridpoint Statistical Interpolation

- 2. Atmospheric pressure
- 3. Heat fluxes Sensible, latent, total radiation, and net shortwave radiation
- 4. Wind stress

### 3. Initial and Boundary Conditions

HYCOM for 2-way coupling to HWRF

- 1) IC/BC from real-time global RTOFS (Real-Time Ocean Forecast System) . RTOFS uses the same eddy-resolving HYCOM dynamics and physics solutions on 1/12-degree horizontal and 36 vertical layers.
- 2) IC uses NCODA\*-HYCOM analysis and available for 321any cycle.
- 3) BC uses 5.25 day forecasts from daily RTOFS products.
- 4) Earth System Modeling Framework (ESMF) compliance: ready for coupling in NOAA Environmental Modeling System (NEMS) framework.

# 4. Non-coupled vs. coupled (HYCOM) Typhoon Forecasts for 2012-2013

#### **Two Seasons Combined**



- Track: Little difference
- Intensity:
  2 kt/3 hPa
- Bias in V<sub>max</sub> and P<sub>min</sub> is worse by coupling than control.
- Similar negative bias observed in other studies, e.g., Wada (2010).

# 4. Non-coupled vs. coupled (HYCOM) Typhoon Forecasts for 2012-2013

#### **Seasonal Variations**



- MAE: HYCOM coupling (cpl) has smaller MAE (<16 kt), compared to noncoupled (ctl).
  - Bias: HYCOM coupling shows a consistent bias.
- Seasonal variability in forecast is probably related to the large scale variations.

# 4. SST cooling comparison

#### Comparison against daily TMI & AMSRE OI SST



#### statistics @day 5 for Jelawat 18W: cycle=2012092200



#### **HYCOM SST**

- Similar cold wake (~26°C) at a similar degree of cooling (~3°C)
- Mesoscale variability **GFS SST**
- No change in GFS SST
- No cold wake and no cooling
- No Mesoscale variability

#### **HYCOM SST**

- Similar magnitude of mean
- Higher correlation coefficient (0.899)
- Lower RMSD (0.6) and STD (0.5).

### 4. Non-coupled vs. Coupled

- SST feedback: Ocean Coupling changes the TC thermodynam dynamics loop.
- > SST cooling is real, and important to TC intensity

# **Maximum Potential Intensity and SST**

Maximum Potential Intensity (Emanuel 2003)

$$V_{\rm max}^2 \propto \frac{(T_1 - T_2)}{C_d T_2} F_h$$

 $T_{1} = SST;$   $T_{2} = \text{outflow temperature};$   $C_{d} = \text{drag coefficient};$ and  $F_{h} = (LHT+SHT) \text{ the surface flux of enthalpy.}$ 

T1, LHT, SHT, Cd and (Ch) are either explicitly or implicitly related with SST.

# 5. Sensitivity of SST – Edouard (2014)

#### using non-coupled HWRF

### for Initial SST and location, size and strength of a warm pool

1010

1000



#### Sources:

- NCODA SST from 2010-2014
- GDEM September climatology



90

For example, at 96 h, wrt BT ΔPmin = 4 hPa (2014/2012) vs. 28 hPa ∆Vmin = -15 kt (2014/2012) vs. -30 kt

- Best Forecast was achieved with NCODA 2014 dataset.
- Better Intensity Forecast with
  - a. Larger and warmer beneath the storm
  - b. Stronger temperature gradient along the track

#### East North Pacific 2015 Season

#### *El Nino* Early season – NiNo index 1-2 Mid and Late season – NiNo index 3-4



Also, body of warm water residing at 20N, expanding southwestward over time  $\rightarrow$  set up unseasonally warm SST in the tropics.



Further extends favorable conditions for TCs in later season.

#### **Blanca: Intensity Forecast Verification**

- 2015 HYCOM coupling (H5Y2) performed the best, showing small MAE (< 18 kt) and small bias, followed by H214 (2014 operational HWRF was run before the 2015 season).
- 2. GFDL performed the worst.
- 2015 HWRF (HCTL=H215) performed worse, especially for early lead hours (< 48 h), than 2014 HWRF.
- COAMPS-TC (COTC) performance was between HWRF and GFDL for Vmax. But, Vmax bias, and Pmin MAE and bias were quite different.



#### Blanca: 2015 HYCOM coupling vs. POM coupling

- Intensity: Between HYCOM (red) and POM coupling (blue), the former performs better at higher winds or lower pressure (dashed ovals).
- U<sub>T</sub> (storm translation speed): Over-estimate for slow and underestimate for fast moving storm (more so for HYCOM).



HWRF-HYCOM Wind-Pressure-U<sub>T</sub> for BLANCA 2015

SST Cooling & Intensity using HWRF and HWRF-HYCOM

Track Forecasts







SST cooling over 24 h (entire cycle) in the storm field:

- POM 9.1 (3.6-17.6)°C for 62 kt/975 hPa
- HYCOM 11.0 (3.6-13.1)°C for 77 kt/964 hPa

#### SST cooling in environment:

• POM – uniform cooling (-0.5°C)

HYCOM – large variation of cooling and warming responsible for primarily advection

#### Kim et al. 17

# 6. Importance of oceanic initial conditions: Seasonal and Spatial variations Subsurface Temperature Structure



POM: Shallower and colder upper layer, with 23.3°C of maximum temperature at 80 m.

- > HYCOM: Deeper and warmer upper layer, with 28.8°C of maximum temperature at 80 m.
  - Higher Ekman pumping.
  - Features of warm core are more intensive and expansive in horizontal.
  - Depth of 26°C (Z26) is 20-25 m deeper  $\rightarrow$  higher Ocean Heat Content.

# 7. Importance of Realistic Ocean Simulations

# Example for upwelling and interactions with the Kuroshio Current



# **Better physics should result in better models**

But, there are more subtle reasons too:

Coupling forces you to take a closer look at details of the constituent models, in ways that are often complementary to the way the models are conventionally validated.

This often leads to systematic improvement of the constituent models. That often has a positive impact on the component models, even if the impact on the actual coupling is found to be minimal.

#### 8. Lessons Learned - Recommendations

- 1. Focus on best possible description of physical states for all models.
  - Better physics makes for a better model. However, better physics in a well tuned model will almost always detune the model in a coupled framework.
- 2. Deal with de-tuning of model due to "improved" physics in two ways, which makes most sense.
  - > Deal with this as bias treatment in coupler (quick and dirty).
  - Retune as possible, particularly when individual processes are documented to describe nature better (long term systematic approach).
- 3. We need to have a set of metrics for HWRF that reflects these mentioned above: Track and intensity verification alone will never work.
- 4. Coupled model makes further development of modeling system a little more complicated.
  - > This is an unavoidable side effect of doing things physically better.

5. The key for coupled modeling is in the fluxes.

A weather model with a fixed or climatological SST is constrained in terms of systematic seasonal and climate shifts. But, in a coupled model, there is no constraint to the ocean state and also to the weather model. Hence, spurious drifts of the SST and mixed layer in general in the ocean will result in spurious drifts in the weather model, with a strong possibility of (nonlinear) feedback.

- 6. Developing a coupled model is a cyclic process:
  - First emphasis on getting the ocean right.
  - > In the process, many issues with HWRF were revealed.
    - Not necessarily major issues, but critical for realistic coupling with a realistic ocean model.
    - Climatology based ocean model component appears less sensitive to these errors as ocean responses are suppressed to gain a more robust system.
  - > Fixes and updates require a revisit to make sure that all ocean responses are realistic.
  - > ... and this will never stop...

### 9. Future Plans for Improvement of TC forecastings

#### Processes in the Air-Sea Interface



http://www.whoi.edu/science/AOPE/dept/CBLASTmain.html

This is a simplified version of reality!

Kim et al. 23

# 9. Future Plans for Improvement of TC forecastings

#### 3-way coupling HWRF-HYCOM-WW3

- 1. HWRF:
  - a) Surface stress modified by effects of sea state, directionality of wind and wave, and surface currents

#### 2. WAVEWATCH III (WW3):

a) Forced by sea-state dependent wind stress, including effects of ocean currents

#### 3. HYCOM:

- a) Forced by sea-state dependent wind stress, modified by growing/ decaying waves and Coriolis-Stokes forcing
- b) Turbulent mixing modulated by the Stokes drift (Langmuir turbulence)

#### Data Assimilation in a coupled framework Currently GSI for HWRF, and NCODA for HYCOM, in separate.