



Forecasting near term thunderstorm potential has proven challenging among forecasters because both convection-allowing and parameterized models struggle to pinpoint where and when activity will occur. The suite of parameterized models and MOS guidance sources currently used to generate the near-term forecast often underestimate convective coverage. On the other hand, convection-allowing model Probability of Precipitation (PoP) forecast grids often exhibit extremely high values that are usually displaced slightly in time and space from the observed convection.



Flight paths being disrupted in Atlanta airspace (left), lightning strikes near busy airfield (center), flights deviating around thunderstorms in Denver airspace (right).

Development

Developed in Greenville-Spartanburg, SC forecast office, the tool quickly became a strong utility for forecasts to assess convection potential. For example, CamPoP was used by WFO GSP to support NASA's IPHEx (Intergrated Precipitation and Hydrology Experiment) in 2014 and received very positive feedback from the NASA team and supported their daily flight planning.



CamPoP image from GSP office (left) versus storm total precipitation for the same period (Center). NASA's **IPHEx experiment logo**.

CamPoP has since been implemented in the Mojave Desert region and is being run out of the NWS Las Vegas office. The CamPoP grids are generated hourly in GFE and are then converted to web-based images so that meteorologists in Los Angeles CWSU can use them as an extra tool for short term thunderstorm forecasting and daily flight planning.





Los Angeles CWSU webpage with CamPoP link (left) and the CamPoP webpage (right).

Assessing the CamPoP tool in LAS Tracon Airspace James Oh, Los Angeles CWSU & Chris Outler, NWS Las Vegas

Purpose



The CamPoP ("convection-allowing model PoP") smart tool was developed to aid forecasters in determining where and when thunderstorms will occur by using a consensus approach. The tool generates PoP forecast grids showing the percentage of convectionallowing models with non-zero Quantitative Precipitation Forecasts (QPF) in any particular grid box at any particular time. For example, 100% would mean all 8 models and 3 time lagged HRRR runs agree on QPF of 0.01" or greater at a given time and location.

This allows forecasters to zero in on areas of maximum threat for daily convection, and anticipate trends and uncertainty that exist within the forecast using a probabilistic approach. Therefore, CWSU forecasters can express greater confidence in thunderstorm potential to FAA customers for safer and more efficient flight planning.



CamPoP Components

The CamPoP tool is generated by using 8 different convection allowing models and three time lagged HRRR runs to create a consensus of precipitation probability.



	<mark>a eko yo ako a</mark> ko
0 CamPoP	10
indicates none	indicates
are forecasting	n
	foreca

Grid Vertical CAM Levels Spacing Frequ HRRR 3km 50 60 6 h 3km NAMNEST 12 ł 40 3.6km HIRESWnmm 40 12 ł 3km HIRESWarw VEFARWNAM¹ 50 12 1 3.5km 45 12 ł VEFNMMNAM¹ 4km 45 VEFNMMGFS¹ 12 4km 45 **VEFARWGFS*** 9km 12

> *Non-convective allowing multiscale parameter ¹Model only included in CamPoP through 2017.

100%) CamPoP all of the odels are sting QPF.



un encies	Forecast Length	
urly	18 hours	
ourly	84 hours	
ourly	48 hours	
ourly	48 hours	
ourly	60 hours	
ourly	60 hours	
ourly	60 hours	
ourly	204 hours	
ized model.		

Case Examples

August 2nd, 2018







CamPoP accurately forecast the areas of greatest storm concentration (shaded areas), while also suggesting more isolated activity (dotted areas).

1900Z run of CamPoP valid for 2200Z July 11th, 2018. (3 hour lead time).



1700Z run of CamPoP valid for 2200Z May 9th, 2017. (5 hour lead time).



Limitations & Additional Work

Some limitations of the CamPoP tool include lack of differentiation between nonconvective and convective precipitation. Therefore some additional interrogation on the meteorologists part is required to assess the thunderstorm threat. Additionally, the number of available models decreases further in time, so the accuracy can become degraded at longer lead times.

Being an experimental forecasting tool, additional case reviews are required to further assess the CamPoP's performance.

Verification CamPoP depicted an area of thunderstorms

Southern NV and NW Arizona (shaded areas).





0218Z Radar Composite on August 3rd



2208Z Radar Composite on July 11th

CamPoP accurately forecast the precipitation band across NW Arizona (shaded areas), along with the terrain driven activity further north (dotted areas).



2157Z radar image depicting good agreement with the CamPoP forecast.