Lead Times Between In-Cloud and Cloud-to-Ground Lightning Flashes in the South Texas Sea Breeze Regime

> Joshua J. Schroeder, Matthew J. Brady, and Brian A. Mejia

NOAA/National Weather Service, Brownsville/Rio Grande Valley, TX

oshua.schroeder@noaa.gov



National Weather Service Brownsville/Rio Grande Valley



**Building a Ready Weather Nation** 

# "When thunder roars, go indoors" is great for the general public...

## ...but other users have different needs:

"OK, I'm hearing thunder. Call me back when you detect a cloud-to-ground strike, because that's what my safety regs are written to."

- Paraphrased from many conversations with test officers building missiles in the field at WSMR.



# Wouldn't it be great to tell an EM or Safety Officer...

"OK, you've probably heard thunder, since we've detected in-cloud lightning. You've got 'X' minutes before a cloudto-ground strike is likely. Take any final precautions NOW."



But what is X??

# There is little published work on what values of 'X' are.

Consider  $\Delta t$ , the lag time between first In-Cloud (IG) lightning activity and first Cloud-to-Ground (CG) flash in a particular storm.

#### MacGorman, et al. (2011) in MWR

- Found *∆t* to be in the range of 3-31 min (at 50<sup>th</sup> percentile).
- Wide variability across three geographical regions (OK, N. Texas, High Plains of CO/KS/NE).
- Used VHF 3-D Lightning Mapping Networks vs. NLDN.

Initial, limited analysis of orographic thunderstorms at @ WSMR generally showed 5-15m lead time from IC to CG activity.

# Who Might Want to Know This Number for South Texas?







#### Liquified Natural Gas export plants coming on-line at Port of Brownsville

#### Need Two Datasets to Determine Δt

#### National Lightning Detection Network (NLDN)

- Primarily detects CG flashes
- Magnetic/ToA sensors
- Detection efficiency ~95%.
- Operated by Vaisala; download available to NWS users via NCEI.

## Earth Networks Total Lightning Detection Network (ENTLN)

- Detects lightning electric field waveforms at ~700 sites in CONUS.
- Processes "pulses".
- Can discriminate between IC and CG flashes.
- Data available upon request to NWS users.

#### Focused on Warm-Season Sea-Breeze Thunderstorms

## Relatively easy to isolate individual storms around sea-breeze initiation time.

- Analysis was all done "manually".
- Look at first storms of the day, usually around 1500-1800 UTC, for months Jun-Sep 2018.
  - Convection pattern usually gets "messy" quickly.
  - Looked at storms within range of KBRO NEXRAD.
  - Did not consider widespread convection forced by upper-level lows, tropical waves, etc.
- Goal was to identify at least 30 storms where ∆t could be determined to allow for semi-robust statistics.

### Start with the CG Data and Work Backward

1. Find the first CG strike occurring around the time of sea-breeze initiation (will often follow a significant break in lightning activity):

2018	/	0	13	13	40.390	25.053	-90.980	13	IN	38.4	L
2018	7	6	13	33	15.749	25.087	-96.98	12	N	118.8	2
2018	7	6	13	33	50.012	25.078	-96.995	12	N	39.6	2
2018	7	6	13	34	59.059	25.074	-96.994	11	N	73	2
2018	7	6	13	41	5.956	25.133	-97.032	4	N	18.4	1
2018	7	6	13	56	33.544	25.322	-98.144	3	P	11.2	1
2018	7	6	14	49	34.625	26.146	-97.25	6	P	11.2	1
2018	7	6	14	53	17.763	26.149	-97.22	6	P	27.5	3
2018	7	6	15	42	21.091	25.623	-97.293	10	N	22.2	1
2018	7	6	15	57	18.497	25.667	-97.396	12	N	22.8	2

- 2. Use Weather and Climate Toolkit or GR2Analyst to review the radar reflectivity imagery from previous 60 min.
  - Look for signs of sea-breeze storm development around the time of the CG strike identified.

### Look for a Prior IC Pulse

- 3. Export the radar data to a *kmz* file for use in Google Earth.
  - Plot the lat./lon. of CG strike.
- 4. Try to find a corresponding IC source that occurred nearby and in prior 60 min.

										£
1	2018-07-06T13:34:59.089827299	25.07111	-96.971	6102	18534	18	0.74	0.63	4.4	
0	2018-07-06T13:34:59.130824804	25.09564	-96.972	29263	0	19	0.27	0.1	4.2	
1	2018-07-06T14:49:34.491731882	26.12556	-97.2564	-8485	14316	13	0.57	0.56	11.1	
1	2018-07-06T14:49:34.644515991	26.13103	-97.2388	3231	7640	9	0.6	0.38	28.8	
1	2018-07-06T14:49:34.679929972	26.12876	-97.2364	5266	17971	11	0.25	0.1	7.9	
1	2018-07-06T15:28:11.252523661	25.75568	-97.2557	-8906	10728	16	0.38	0.21	49.6	
1	2018-07-06T15:31:18.040844202	25.67185	-97.2278	-2847	10552	5	2.13	0.2	8.8	

- 5. Plot location of first IC source. Determine spatial separation between the IC and CG strikes.
- 6. If possible, analyze other cells on same day; else, back to Step 1...



IC source must have occurred within **10 miles** of CG strike and be visually associated with the same storm cell.

#### What Did We Learn?



Note: "Null" cases not considered.

#### What Did We Learn?



Note: "Null" cases not considered.

#### There was some variability in LT's.



Measures of central tendency, especially median, fairly consistent month-to-month from Jun-Sep.

### "You Can't Always Get What You Want..."

- At least for South Texas sea-breeze storms
  - IC lightning does *not* precede CG strikes reliably enough or early enough to aid with provision of IDSS.
  - Not nearly enough safety margin, especially when considering latency in networks, time for communication, etc.



resume activities.

### **Concluding Thoughts**

Clearly there are climatological differences in IC/CG lead times; concurs with MacGorman, et al. (2011).

Different storm electrification processes/timeframes.

How would the distribution in LT's differ in other environments, e. g. desert/mountain?

- In more synoptically forced situations?
- Need to <u>automate</u> to really expand the sample size.

#### At what value *does* **\Lambda t** become useful??

Would calculated Δt be any different using GLM sources?

Do other thresholds/predictors (e.g., reflectivity at isotherms) provide more value?



National Weather Service Brownsville/Rio Grande Valley



**Building a Ready Weather Nation**