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Verification of WRF with Systematically Varying Parameterizations

The systematic variation of all combinations results in >100 configurations
Verification of WRF with Systematically Varying Parameterizations

55 Stations with Hourly Observations:

- BC Hydro Stations
- Environment Canada Stations
## Verification of the Individual Configurations

### Metrics for Continuous Forecasts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Absolute Error (MAE)</th>
<th>BIAS</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (STD)</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Mean Squared Difference (MSD)</th>
<th>MSD random/total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>N PBL</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM5</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.0901</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF</td>
<td>ACM2</td>
<td>NM P</td>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.0975</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBM</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM5</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Metrics calculated from 6-hourly precipitation on the 9-km grids (time and location-averaged)*

### Overall best performing models:

- WSM5|KF|YSU|NoahMP
- WSM5|KF|GBM|NoahMP

### Thom|KF|ACM2|NoahMP

### Thom|GF|YSU|NoahMP

### Thom|GF|YSU|NoahMP

However, the ‘best-performing’ model is unique to the user, based on which verification metric(s) are most important to their application.

White colors indicate average values of the ensemble; values better than the average are highlighted in green; values worse than the average are highlighted in red.

---

* Metrics calculated from 6-hourly precipitation on the 9-km grids (time and location-averaged)
Verification Across the Region

Relative bias (WRF-Obs / Obs) of 6-hourly precipitation by location as ensemble and seasonal average:

- The bias in the cold/wet season is larger in relative magnitude than in the warm/dry season. Some stations have a very strong wet bias especially at the coarser grid.
- In the cold season central Vancouver Island verifies too dry, the Coast Range verifies too wet, highly populated areas (e.g. metro Vancouver, Fraser Valley, Victoria) have small errors in comparison – Suggests overdone orographic influences.
➢ GF models perform better in the warm and drier season (reduced wet bias compared to KF)
➢ KF models perform better in the cold and wet season, which contributes the majority of the total precipitation in BC
Resolution dependent Performance

MAEs are worse for finer grids. GF models show a surprisingly large grid dependency.

Pearson Correlation Coefficients decrease with finer grid spacings. The change with resolution is more significant than the spread between the models.

The relative Standard Deviation (STD) is larger for finer grids on average (as fine grids can represent more detail and are prone to double penalty), where STDs are more sensitive to model configurations than grid spacings.

The relative Biases are larger for coarser grids.

Error metrics for 6-hourly precipitation
The temporal resolution has a larger impact on the forecast performance than the spatial resolution.

The total number of correct forecasts (where correct negatives are often the majority) improves with finer grids and shorter accumulation windows.

The hit rate decreases significantly for more difficult forecasts (extreme events and shorter time).

The best hit rate is achieved by the coarsest grid for events > 0.25mm, whereas 75\textsuperscript{th}- and 95\textsuperscript{th}-percentile events have the highest hit rate at the mid-size domain.

The ETS for 75\textsuperscript{th} and 95\textsuperscript{th} percentiles are best at the 9-km grid, followed by 3-km grid; it is worst at the 27-km grid.

The false-alarm rate often exceeds the miss rate: WRF overpredicts precipitation frequencies.
Ensemble-mean MAE’s and correlation coefficients improve asymptotically with extended accumulation windows. The improvement is rapid within the first day and levels out after about 2 or 3 days of accumulation.

Correlation coefficients are only best at the coarsest grid for accumulation periods up to 1 day, then the finer grids become better.

Longer accumulation windows are more likely to capture the entirety of a rain event and compensate for potential temporal offsets between forecasted and observed rainfall. On the other hand, important information about variable precipitation rates at time scales shorter than a given accumulation window are averaged out and poorly represented.
➢ All models are highly correlated with one another (27-km more than 3-km due to dynamical downscaling).
➢ The cumulus scheme is most important for precipitation at coarser resolutions (especially models that use KF produce very similar precipitation); the combination of cumulus with microphysics becomes more important as resolution increases.
➢ PBL schemes have a minor, and the choice of land surface scheme has the lowest impact on precipitation forecasts.
1 year of numerical weather prediction data from over 100 WRF configurations reveals:

- Cumulus and microphysics together are most important for total model precipitation.

- **WSM5** yields competitive verification scores when compared to more sophisticated and computationally expensive microphysics. (Model runs with Thom and Morr take on average ~20% longer than with WSM5.)

- In contradiction to what one might expect for a scale-aware cumulus scheme, GF did not outperform the conventional KF scheme at finer resolutions. Although GF performed better for convective precipitation in summer, KF was better across all scales for cold-season frontal precipitation, which contributes the majority of the annual rainfall in southwest BC.

- Using **Noah MP** yields slight yet consistent improvements (compared to the older Noah land surface model).

- Coarser grids had smaller random errors, smaller MAEs, and higher correlation coefficients compared to finer grids. Categorical forecasts on finer grids resulted in better frequency biases, ETS’s, and accuracies, which means that they had the largest fraction of correct forecasts (although most of the total correct forecasts are correct rejections). The midsize domain (9-km) had the highest hit rate and ETS for 75th and 95th-percentile precipitation.

- Extended accumulation windows can greatly improve precipitation verification scores. Temporal resolution has shown a larger impact on the forecast performance than the spatial model resolution.
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Thank you!
Stay healthy!