

### INTRODUCTION

Currently, fire weather forecasters, fire planners, and decision makers do not have easy access to information needed to verify the accuracy of, or communicate the level of confidence in, fire weather forecasts and fire prediction products that depend on fire weather forecasts. The Joint Fire Science Program (JFSP) funded us to develop a produces intuitive, easily that system understandable meteorological model performance assessments and provides end-users with real-time information about meteorological model bias, model reliability, and overall performance of fire weather forecasts used in predictions of ignition risk potential.

The system is extensible to parameters important for emissions, dispersion and transport, dry and wet deposition, chemical reactions, and air pollutant concentrations.



The forecast performance evaluation system described here provides information on fire weather predictions and uncertainty important to fire ignition risk. It routinely acquires observed and forecast meteorological data, and provides real-time evaluation/verification and uncertainty estimates of the model-predicted fire weather variables (both surface and aloft) that will be used in the fire ignition risk predictions.

Spatially and temporally integrated results of the real-time comparison of predicted and observed fire weather parameters will be used as an indicator of model performance.



The DAS underwent an initial testing phase with data from MADIS<sup>1</sup> (ASOS and RAWS) surface data) and NCEP<sup>2</sup> (NAM 12-km 0000 UTC and 1200 UTC 3-hourly forecasts; and GFS 1.0 degree 0000 UTC and 1200 UTC 3-hourly forecasts). The data, including temperature, relative humidity, wind speed, wind direction, solar radiation, fuel moisture, and precipitation, were ingested by the MDMS. Queries were developed to retrieve data from the MDMS for initial investigation of model performance evaluation analyses.



# **Real-Time Analysis of Weather Prediction Accuracy**

Neil J. M. Wheeler<sup>1</sup>, Kenneth J. Craig<sup>1</sup>, Stacy A. Drury<sup>1</sup>, Miriam L. Rorig<sup>2</sup>, Eric A. Gray<sup>1</sup>, Garnet B. Erdakos<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> Sonoma Technology, Inc., Petaluma, California, USA <sup>2</sup> USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Seattle, Washington, USA

## **DATA ACQUISITION AND FORECAST EVALUATION SYSTEM**

#### **Data Acquisition System**

A data acquisition system (DAS) was developed to provide a single program for managing and coordinating continuous remote file transfer protocol (FTP) and local data transfers from multiple sources. This system offers:

- Customizable data transfer jobs
- Integrated job scheduling
- Logging capability for tracking system failures
- Command-line options for manually spawning one-time transfers
- modules from the Python standard library

Data Sources												
Data Sources <sup>1</sup>	T <sub>sfc</sub>	<b>RH</b> <sub>sfc</sub>	E Prec.		u <sub>sfc</sub>	T <sub>aloft</sub>	T <sub>dp,aloft</sub>					
	Taise Sourcesa trces1T SfcRHsfcEPrec.u usfcT 											
ASOS	~	$\checkmark$		~	~							
RAWS	~	~	~	~	~							
RTMA	~	$\checkmark$		~	~							
RAOB						~	~					
			Fored	ast								
UW WRF	~	~	~	~	~	~	~					
NDFD	~	~		~	~							
NAM	~	~	~	~	~	~	~					
GFS	~	~	~	~	~	~	~					
1 Data cour	coop for co	van mata	aralagiaa	Ingramat	arat aurfa	oo air						

Data sources for seven meteorological parameters: surface air temperature (T<sub>sfc</sub>); surface relative humidity (RH<sub>sfc</sub>); solar radiation (E); precipitation (Prec.); surface wind velocity (u<sub>sfc</sub>); aloft temperature (T<sub>aloft</sub>); and aloft dew point temperature (T<sub>dp aloft</sub>)

ASOS: Automated Surface Observing System RAWS: Remote Automated Weather Station RTMA: Real Time Mesoscale Analysis RAOB: Radiosonde Observation

UW WRF: University of Washington—Weather Research and Forecasting model



The above examples are for NAM and GFS forecasts for Boise, Idaho, over an 11-day time period. They demonstrate the performance of the model by comparison of the observed temperature (green bars) to the one-day (open circles), two-day (orange squares) and three-day (yellow triangles) forecasts on 8/19/2011 and the previous seven days. They also show the performance of forecasts (solid black circles) for the next three days. The error bars on the three "future" day forecasts indicate the mean error for the forecast based on the model performance over the previous seven days.

## **EXAMPLE RESULTS**

## • Python (version 2.6); leverages queue and threading

NDFD: National Digital Forecast Database NAM: North American Model

GFS: Global Forecast System



#### **Database Platform**

The Model Data Management System (MDMS) was developed in **PostgreSQL** to

- facilitate efficient storage and retrieval of modeled and observed meteorological data; • store site-specific data using a minimized data table for optimal storage and retrieval; and • accommodate the unique challenges posed by model data sets with multiple daily cycles.

real time as they are acquired and processed.

#### **Forecast Analysis and Evaluation**

Various analysis methods to establish confidence levels for the meteorological models considered are being investigated, including inter-comparison and evaluation methods such as time-series analysis, standard model performance metrics, and skill scores. A retrospective evaluation of the meteorological predictions provides a basis for quantifying the reliability of meteorological forecasts for fire weather purposes. Currently underway, this evaluation will complement the daily real-time comparisons.

- Continue testing the DAS, including additional observation and model data sources.
- Continue investigating forecast performance analysis methods. • Develop prototype analysis tools and products, which will be integrated into a web-based information
- display system. • Implement the full sustained ignition probability forecasting system.
- Investigate how uncertainties in the weather predictions propagate through to the sustained fire ignition predictions.
- Develop spatial plots of the resulting sustained ignition probability.
- Develop a "dashboard" type summary of confidence in the predictions suitable for use by land managers.



#### **Example Spatial Plot**



The system described here is being developed by the USDA Forest Service AirFire Team and Sonoma Technology, Inc., with funding from the JFSP. The JFSP was created by Congress in 1998 as an interagency research, development, and applications partnership between the U.S. Department of the Interior and U.S. Department of Agriculture.

> Presented at the 10<sup>th</sup> Annual CMAS Conference, Chapel Hill, NC, October 24-26, 2011 (STI-4238). For more information, contact Neil Wheeler via email at neil@sonomatech.com.



A Java-based automated ingest system was built into the MDMS to import modeled and observed data in

## **FUTURE WORK**



Forecast Source	Forecast Length (days)							
Forecast Source	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
UW-WRF								
NAM								
GFS								
NDFD								
Persistence								
No Forecast Available								
High Confidence								
Medium Confidence								
Low Confidence								
No Confidence								

#### **Example Confidence Dashboard**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Meteorological Assimilation Data Ingest System <sup>2</sup> National Centers for Environmental Prediction