

## WESTERN REGION TECHNICAL ATTACHMENT NO. 87-38 September 29, 1987

## AN OBVIOUS CASE OF POOR INITIALIZATION

It is 14Z. You are seated at the forecast desk in the Cheyenne, WY forecast office. The morning LFM run is starting to come in. You look at the initial 500 mb height and vorticity analyses (Figure 1). They appear to fit the plotted upper air observations quite well. No significant dynamics are upstream under northeasterly flow. You move on, calling up the initial mean-layer relative humidity analysis (Figure 2). It shows an area in southwestern South Dakota of greater than 70% RH and a tongue of relatively high RH which extends east to west across the South Dakota/Nebraska border. You are surprised to see so much moisture upstream and decide to investigate further.

Visible satellite imagery at 1331Z (Figure 3) shows clouds extending across southwestern Minnesota toward Sioux Falls, SD, but no low clouds across South Dakota or Nebraska. Could it be that the satellite pictures deceive you, and that moisture across southern South Dakota is all vapor? The Rapid City surface observations indicate clear skies with a temperature near  $60^{\circ}F$  and a dew point near  $35^{\circ}F$ . You think that seems rather dry considering the mean-layer RH, so you wonder what the raob looks like (Figure 4). You notice that, aside from the surface dew point depression, no depressions exist aloft in the observation. You ask how the model can put a relative humidity maximum over Rapid City with no dew point depression observations there, seriously question the analysis, and check to see if there were any prior indications of this feature. You ultimately (correctly) decide to throw out the upstream RH analysis.

As it turns out, the 12-hour LFM RH field decreased the maximum RH associated with this erroneous analysis to less than 50% (Figure 5), due to the strongly subsident synoptic regime where the misanalysis occurred. The model took care of the analysis problem by itself in this case. (The NGM initial analysis and model run was very similar with respect to this feature). It was apparently so obvious to the forecasters that the analysis was bad that not one SFD mentioned the problem (or else no one noticed it because it "dried out" so fast).

What if, however, the synoptics were such that the localized atmosphere was not so stable, with synoptic scale upward motion and higher relative humidities in general around the bad raob? In such a case, heavy precipitation and strong cyclone development would be possible as a result of the bad observation. An example of such a case was described in WRTA 86-31. In that case, like this one, there was a problem with the radiosonde hygristor. But why should there be such a high RH in this case when no depressions existed on the sounding? The reason was that the Figure 4 data were corrections. The original observation sent around the AFOS circuit was nearly saturated (Figure 6). Apparently, this was the observation that was ingested in the NMC analyses; they did not input the correction (as they may not have received it in time). Note the remarkably similar structure of this raob to the case in WRTA 86-31, with near-saturation aloft, decreasing only slightly with altitude. This is the typical response that is received when the hypristor electrical contacts remain open, whether due to a damaged or misplaced hygristor.

WESTERN REGION TECHNICAL ATTACHMENT NO. 87-38 September 29, 1987

While this attachment describes a situation in the NWS Central Region, it has application at all sites. Western Region forecasters should be well aware of the problems associated with analyses over the data-void eastern Pacific. Likewise, a forecaster should not assume that model initial analyses are always "good enough" over land, since they can be problematic to the forecaster, whether it is due to poor analysis of vorticity centers or axes, bad or missing raobs, or too much smoothing of significant small-scale features. The point of this attachment should be clear - it is <u>always</u> important to <u>diagnose</u> the situation before looking at the model output. In so doing, errors which may crop up in the model runs will become more obvious and cause less problems for the forecaster.

2





Figure 3. GOES-East visible satellite image 1331Z 22 Sept 1987.

 FSDSGLRAP

 W0US00 KRAP
 221201 COR

 72662 TTBB
 7212/ 72662 00913 05650 11080 154// 22778 090//

 33700 072// 44500 079// 55250 463// 66172 635// 77139 685//

 08100 641// 51515 10168 09125 10101=

 PPBB 72120 72662 90046 15003 26508 29508 90709 31508 33507

 35505 91246 36012 01015 00518 919// 02520 92014 02519 03018

 01529 925// 01531 93057 03533 04551 05556 94369 04566 06545

 04035 9503/ 04033 04026=

 FSDMANRAP

 WOUS00 KRAP 221201 CDR

 72662 TTAA 72121 72662 99913 05650 15003 00194 ///// ////

 05557 136// 29009 70175 072// 02507 50587 079// 02520 40756

 217// 01531 30961 371// 04038 25005 463// 04553 20229 575//

 05859 15407 663// 06043 10653 641// 03523 08139 685// 05037

 77178 04566 41128 51515 10168 09125 10101 10164 00092 10194

 25007 33007=

J

Figure 4. Rapid City, SD sounding data 12Z 22 Sept 1987.



Figure 5. 12-hour LFM mean-layer RH forecast valid 00Z 23 Sept 1987.

