

CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
香港城市大學

**Multi-model Statistical-Dynamical Seasonal
Forecast of Landfalling Tropical Cyclones
in the United States**
登陸美國熱帶氣旋的
多模式統計動力季節預報

Submitted to
Department of Physics and Materials Science
物理及材料科學系
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Philosophy
哲學碩士學位

by

Chiu Kwok Shing
趙國誠

July 2009
二零零九年七月

Abstract

In past studies, seasonal prediction of tropical cyclones (TCs) has been made by statistically relating historical observations and the TC activities. In statistical relationship between past data and future condition, it is implicitly assumed the future would behave in the same way as in the past, which is not necessarily correct. To solve such an inherent problem, the statistical-dynamical technique is used in this study. Instead of relating the TC activities with historical data such as El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO), stratospheric Quasi-Biennial Oscillation (QBO), North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) and other atmospheric indices, the predictors are derived from dynamical-model-predicted fields. Dynamical and thermodynamical fields related to the formation and movement of TCs, such as sea-surface temperature, environmental steering flow patterns and geopotential fields are chosen as predictors.

In this study, forecasts of seven coupled global atmospheric general circulation models (GCMs) from the DEMETER (Development of a European multimodel ensemble system for seasonal to interannual prediction) project are related to the number of landfalling TCs over a particular coastal region of the United States of America. As a result, seven individual prediction equations are formulated from predictors of one of the seven models. A multi-model prediction equation is then formulated as a linear combination of the individual equations.

To analyze the relationships between the number of landfalling TCs and model-predicted fields, the model-predicted fields are represented by the empirical orthogonal functions (EOFs) as potential predictors. To predict the

number of future landfalling TCs, an equation relating the each of the predictors and the TC number is needed. The Poisson regression is used for the purpose, as the normality assumption failed in small number of landfalling TCs. Replacing the simple linear prediction equation, a non-linear prediction equation is used with the Poisson regression. Multivariate stepwise procedures are used to select the “best” sets of predictors in the forecast equation. With the U.S. Atlantic coast divided into three regions (East Coast, Florida and Gulf Coast) according to the geophysical location, the predictions for the regional number of landfalling TCs are skillful. The prediction for the Florida region gives about 17% skills over the climatology, which is defined as the ratio between the root-mean-square errors of the prediction scheme and that of the climatological mean, while the predictions for the East Coast and Gulf Coast regions give skills of about 30% and 40%, respectively. It is therefore shown that the statistical-dynamical technique is feasible in seasonal forecast of TC activities. It is hoped that a more accurate seasonal forecast will be made using the technique in the near future.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgment	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	x
List of Abbreviations	xv
List of Symbols	xvi
<u>Chapter 1 Introduction</u>	<u>1</u>
1.1 Objectives	2
1.2 Overview of chapters	3
<u>Chapter 2 Literature review</u>	<u>4</u>
2.1 Overview of tropical cyclones (TCs)	4
2.1.1 Mature structure	4
2.1.2 Genesis	6
2.1.3 Movement	7
2.1.4 Summary	10
2.2 Variability of TC activities and seasonal forecast of TCs	11
2.2.1 Interannual to multi-decadal variation of TC activities	11
2.2.2 Statistical seasonal forecast of TC activities	13
2.2.3 Statistical-dynamical forecast	15
2.2.4 Summary	15
<u>Chapter 3 Data</u>	<u>17</u>
3.1 Landfalling tropical cyclone dataset	17

3.2	Climatological characteristics of U.S. landfalling TCs	18
3.3	Global atmospheric general circulation model forecast	22
3.4	Summary	24
<u>Chapter 4 Methodology</u>		26
4.1	Analysis of potential predictors	26
4.1.1	North et al. rule of thumb	27
4.1.2	Summary	28
4.2	Derivation of a forecast equation	29
4.2.1	Poisson regression	29
4.2.2	Screening potential predictors	31
4.2.3	Stepwise selection of potential predictors	32
4.2.4	Multi-model prediction	33
4.3	Cross-validation	33
<u>Chapter 5 Factors affecting landfalling TCs</u>		36
5.1	An example of single-predictor prediction	36
5.2	Physics behind the significant predictors	39
5.2.1	Predictors from model-CERFACS for EC region	40
5.2.2	Predictors from model-LODYC for GC region	49
5.2.3	Predictors from model-LODYC for both GC and FL region	57
5.2.4	Predictors from model-LODYC for FL region	63
5.3	Summary	67
<u>Chapter 6 Prediction equations and performance</u>		69
6.1	Single-model prediction	69
6.1.1	Prediction for East Coast region	69
6.1.2	Prediction for Gulf Coast region	71

6.1.3	Prediction for Florida region	73
6.2	Multi-model prediction	75
6.3	Summary	79
<u>Chapter 7 Summary</u>		81
7.1	Discussion and summary	81
7.2	Limitations and suggestions on future work	83
	References	85

List of Tables

<p>Table 3.1. List of TCs with intensity of tropical storm or above during 1980-2001 August-September. Reg. represents the region where the TC makes landfall. A TC may make landfall over more than one region. TS and HR represent the highest intensity of a TC is tropical storm and hurricane (maximum 1-minute sustained surface wind speed is higher than 118 km h⁻¹), respectively.</p>	20
<p>Table 3.2. The resolutions and initialization strategies of the DEMETER coupled models. (Adopted from Palmer et al. 2004).</p>	23
<p>Table 5.1. Residual deviance of the significant single-predictor Poisson regression, with predictand of EC landfalling TCs and predictors from the model-CERFACS derived EOF time series. The null deviance is 18.20. Insignificant predictors are indicated by a hyphen.</p>	40
<p>Table 5.2. Explained variances (var), eigenvalues, single-predictor Poisson regression coefficient (coef) and residual deviance (D_{res}) of the significant predictors as in Table 5.1. Separation denotes whether the significant EOFs from the same atmospheric field are well-separated as defined by North et al. (1982) rule of thumb. U, V, Z, SST and SLP represent zonal</p>	

wind, meridional wind, geopotential, sea-surface temperature
and sea-level pressure, respectively. 43

Table 5.3. As in Table 5.2, except for Gulf Coast region and the null
residual deviance is 29.60. 50

Table 5.4. Explained variances (var), eigenvalues, single-predictor
Poisson regression coefficient (coef) and residual deviance
(Dres) of the significant predictors as in Table 5.3. Separation
denotes whether the significant EOFs from the same
atmospheric field are well-separated as defined by North et al.
(1982) rule of thumb. U, V, Z, SST and SLP represent zonal
wind, meridional wind, geopotential, sea-surface temperature
and sea-level pressure, respectively. Bolded are significant
predictors shared with the FL region. 51

Table 5.5. As in Table 5.2, except for Florida region and the null
residual deviance is 24.77. 57

Table 5.6. Explained variances (var), eigenvalues, single-predictor
Poisson regression coefficient (coef) and residual deviance
(Dres) of the significant predictors as in Table 5.5. Separation
denotes whether the significant EOFs from the same
atmospheric field are well-separated as defined by North et al.
(1982) rule of thumb. U, V, Z, SST and SLP represent zonal
wind, meridional wind, geopotential, sea-surface temperature

and sea-level pressure, respectively. Bolded are significant predictors shared with the GC region.

58

Table 6.1. Agreement coefficients of the regional prediction equations derived from the significant predictors.

76

List of Figures

- Fig. 2.1. Schematic of the structure of a mature TC (adopted from Aguado and Burt 1999). 5
- Fig. 2.2. Vertical cross-section illustration of the types of vertical wind shear and cloudiness associated with Atlantic tropical cyclones that extend through the tropopause (TROP) into the stratosphere. Right are the typical west QBO period, left are typical east phase of QBO. (Adopted from Gray et al. 1992). 12
- Fig. 3.1. Map of the United States, with the geophysical separation of the 3 regions: East Coast, Florida and Gulf Coast. 18
- Fig. 3.2. Monthly number of U.S. landfalling TCs in the 3 regions during the period 1980 - 2001. 19
- Fig. 3.3. Best tracks of landfalling TCs over (a) EC, (b) FL and (c) GC region in August and September during the period 1980 – 2001. 21
- Fig. 5.1. Time series plot of EOF coefficients of the model CERFACS predicted 200-hPa zonal wind EOF 1, observed and single-predictor regression equation predicted number of landfalling TCs. 38
- Fig. 5.2. Scatterplot of model-CERFACS predicted 200-hPa zonal wind EOF 1 prediction equation predicted against observed number of EC landfalling TCs. The solid and dashed lines

represent perfect prediction and the linear relationship
between the observed and predicted values, respectively. 39

Fig. 5.3. Spatial pattern of positive phase of the model CERFACS
predicted 200hPa zonal wind EOF 1. Shaded are the
negative-valued regions. This explained variance of the EOF
is 53.91% as indicated at the top-right hand corner. The
eigenvalue corresponds to the EOF is indicated at the top of
the figure. 42

Fig. 5.4. Divergence due to the positive phase of the model-
CERFACS predicted 200-hPa zonal wind EOF 1. Shaded are
the negative-valued regions. 42

Fig. 5.5. As in Fig. 5.3, except for 200-hPa zonal wind EOF 3. 44

Fig. 5.6. As in Fig. 5.4, except for 200-hPa zonal wind EOF 3. 44

Fig. 5.7. As in Fig. 5.3, except for 200-hPa geopotential EOF 1. 46

Fig. 5.8. As in Fig. 5.3, except for 500-hPa geopotential EOF 4. 46

Fig. 5.9. As in Fig. 5.3, except for 500-hPa zonal wind EOF 1. 47

Fig. 5.10. As in Fig. 5.3, except for 500-hPa geopotential EOF 1. 47

Fig. 5.11. As in Fig. 5.3, except for 850-hPa meridional wind EOF 1. 48

Fig. 5.12. As in Fig. 5.3, except for sea-surface temperature EOF 1. 48

Fig. 5.13. As in Fig. 5.3, except for sea-level-pressure EOF 1. 49

Fig. 5.14. Spatial pattern of positive phase of the model LODYC
predicted 500hPa meridional wind EOF 2. Shaded are the

negative-valued regions. This explained variance of the EOF is 14.51% as indicated at the top-right hand corner. The eigenvalue corresponds to the EOF is indicated at the top of the figure.	52
Fig. 5.15. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 850-hPa meridional wind EOF 1.	53
Fig. 5.16. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 500-hPa geopotential EOF 4.	54
Fig. 5.17. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 850-hPa geopotential EOF 4.	54
Fig. 5.18. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 850-hPa meridional wind EOF 3.	55
Fig. 5.19. Divergence due to the model-LODYC predicted 850-hPa meridional wind EOF 3. Shaded are the negative-valued regions.	55
Fig. 5.20. Relative vorticity due to the model-LODYC predicted 850-hPa meridional wind EOF 3. Shaded are the negative-valued regions.	56
Fig. 5.21. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 200-hPa geopotential EOF 2.	59
Fig. 5.22. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 850-hPa geopotential EOF 2.	59
Fig. 5.23. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 200-hPa zonal wind EOF 1.	60
Fig. 5.24. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 500-hPa zonal wind EOF 2.	61
Fig. 5.25. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 850-hPa zonal wind EOF 1.	61
Fig. 5.26. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 200-hPa meridional wind EOF 2.	62
Fig. 5.27. As in Fig. 5.14, except for sea-surface temperature EOF 1.	63

Fig. 5.28. As in Fig. 5.14, except for sea-level pressure EOF 2.	63
Fig. 5.29. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 200-hPa meridional EOF 4.	64
Fig. 5.30. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 500-hPa meridional EOF 3.	65
Fig. 5.31. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 850-hPa zonal wind EOF 2.	65
Fig. 5.32. As in Fig. 5.14, except for 850-hPa geopotential EOF 3.	66
Fig. 5.33. As in Fig. 5.14, except for sea-surface temperature EOF 3.	67
Fig. 6.1. Scatterplot of model-CERFACS prediction equation predicted and cross-validation predicted against observed number of EC landfalling TCs. Solid line represents the perfect prediction, dashed line represents the linear relationship between the cross-validation predicted and the observation.	70
Fig. 6.2. As in Fig. 6.1, except for model LODYC and Gulf Coast region.	73
Fig. 6.3. As in Fig. 6.1, except for model LODYC and Florida region.	74
Fig. 6.4. Scatterplot of simple-average and agreement-coefficient-weighted average multi-model prediction for EC landfalling TCs. The solid line represents the perfect prediction and the dashed line represents the linear relationship between the weighted-average prediction and the observation.	77
Fig. 6.5. As in Fig. 6.4, except for Gulf Coast region.	78
Fig. 6.6. As in Fig. 6.4, except for Florida region.	79