
EFFECTS OF STORM-RELATED PARAMETERS ON THE ACCURACY OF THE NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL(U) NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY CA B J WILLIAMS MAR 86 AD-R167 889 1/2 UNCLASSIFIED F/G 4/2 NL



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1965 A





NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL Monterey, California





THESIS

EFFECTS OF STORM-RELATED PARAMETERS ON THE ACCURACY OF THE NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL by

Brian J. Williams

March 1986

Thesis Advisor: Co-advisor: R. L. Elsberry J. C.-L. Chan

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

15. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION 15. SETREUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT 15. DECLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY 15. DECLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY 15. DECLASSIFICATION TOWNIGARADING SCHEDULE 16. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBERIS) 16. MOINTORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBERIS) 17. ADDRESS (CIP), State, and ZIP Code) 18. MOINTORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBERIS) 18. ADDRESS (CIP), State, and ZIP Code) 19. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 10. SOURCE OF FUNDING, NUMBERS 11. SUBJECT TERMS (Commune on reverse of more and information of the NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL 15. SUBJECT (TERMS (Commune on reverse of more and information of the NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL 16. SUBJECT (TERMS (Commune on reverse of more and information of the NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL 17. ADDRESS (CIP), STATE, and ZIP FAGE (COUNT 1986 March 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Commune on reverse of more and information of the NESTED Tropical Cyclone forecasting, forecast error statistics, CHIPPER, typhonost, recurvature, tropical cyclones, cross-cross	REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE								
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited Approved for public release; distribution Approved for public release in unlimited Bandaria in approved for public release in unlimited Approved for	1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION			16. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS					
Separaming Organization Report Number(s) Separation	2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY				3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT				
68. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Naval Postgraduate School 62. ADDRESS (Cry. State. and ZIP Code) Montercy, California 93943-5000 83. NAME OF FUNDING ISPONSORING ONGANIZATION Montercy, California 93943-5000 84. ADDRESS (Cry. State. and ZIP Code) 85. ADDRESS (Cry. State. and ZIP Code) 85. ADDRESS (Cry. State. and ZIP Code) 86. ADDRESS (Cry. State. and ZIP Code) 87. ADDRESS (Cry. State. and ZIP Code) 88. ADDRESS (Cry. State. and ZIP Code) 89. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER PROGRAM PROJECT TASK NO 10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS PROGRAM PROJECT TASK NO 11. ITTE (Include Security, Classification) EFFECTS OF STORM-RELATED PARAMETERS ON THE ACCURACY OF THE NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL 12. SESSONA, AUTHORS) Williams, Brian J. 130. TIME COVERED TO 14. DATE OF REPORT (Vear. Month, Day) 15. PAGE (OUNT 1986 March 10. GROUP 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. GROUP 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. GROUP 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. The performance of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model (NTCM) for 542 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1985 is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters: intensity, 12-h change in intensity, latitude, longitude and size. This study is intended to aid the operational forecaster in deciding when to use the NTCM based on storm-related parameters at the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecasts revealuated in terms of the mean forecast error, median forecasts error, median forecasts in incorrect terciles is used to compare the accuracy of the NTCM and CLIPER forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12-through 36-h forecasts periods. It also performs better for storms wit	2b. DECLASSI	FICATION / DOV	VNGRADING SCHEDU	LE .		for public relea	se; distri	bution	
Naval Postgraduate School 63 Naval Postgraduate School 63 Naval Postgraduate School 63 Naval Postgraduate School 63 Naval Postgraduate School 75 ADDRESS (City, State, and ZiP Code) Monterey, California 93943-5000 85 Name Of Funding/Sponsoring 86 87 87 87 88 ADDRESS (City, State, and ZiP Code) 88 88 ADDRESS (City, State, and ZiP Code) 89 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	4 PERFORMIN	IG ORGANIZAT	TON REPORT NUMBE	R(S)	5. MONITORING	ORGANIZATION RE	PORT NUM	BÉR(S)	
Naval Postgraduate School 63 Naval Postgraduate School 64 ADDRESS (City, State, and ZiP Code) Monterey, California 93943-5000 85 Naval C of EUNDING (SPONSORING) 86 ADDRESS (City, State, and ZiP Code) 87 Naval Postgraduate School 88 Naval Postgraduate School 89 Monterey, California 93943-5000 80 OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) 80 OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) 80 OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) 81 O SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS 82 NADDRESS (City, State, and ZiP Code) 84 DORESS (City, State, and ZiP Code) 85 PROGRAM PROJECT TASK MORE UNIT ACCESSION NO PROGRAM ELEMENT NO NUMBER OF FUNDING NUMBERS 86 PROGRAM PROJECT TASK MORE UNIT ACCESSION NO NO NUMBER OF FUNDING NUMBERS 87 DEFICE TO GE STORM-RELATED PARAMETERS ON THE ACCURACY OF THE NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL 88 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 1986 March 10 GROUP SUB-GROUP Tropical cyclone forecasting, forecast error; slong-track error; NTCM recurvature; tropical cyclones; cross-track error; along-track error; NTCM for S42 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1985 is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters intensity, 12-h change in intensity, latitude, longitude and size. This study is intended to aid the operational forecaster in deciding when to use the NTCM based on storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecasts are evaluated in terms of the mean forecast error, median forecast error and systematic (zonal and meridional) error. Cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components are computed relative to a CLIPER forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12-through 36-h forecast periods. It also performs better for storms with initial latitudes south of 13 N and initial longitudes west of 129 E. For					7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION				
Monterey, California 93943-5000 Ba NAME OF FUNDING (SPONSORING (If applicable)) Ba NAME OF FUNDING (STATE (IT ASK (MORK JUNT) (ACCESSION NO IT ACCESSION NO IT ACCESSI	Naval	Postgradua	te School		Naval Postgraduate School				
Bb. OFFICE SYMBOL ORGANIZATION 8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS PROGRAM ELMENT NO PROJECT NO ACCESSION NO 11. ITTLE (Include Security Classification) EFFECTS OF STORM-RELATED PARAMETERS ON THE ACCURACY OF THE NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL 12. PERSONAL AUTHORIS) Williams, Brian J. 13. TOPE OF REPORT Master's Thesis 13b. TIME COVERED 14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 15 PAGE COUNT 10.8 16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10.8 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10.8 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 11. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 12. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	6c. ADDRESS	(City, State, an	d ZIP Code)		7b. ADDRESS (Cit	y, State, and ZIP C	ode)		
RGANIZATION 8c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS PROGRAM ELEMENT NO PROJECT TASK NO ACCESSION NO 11 STITE (Include Security Classification) EFFECTS OF STORM-RELATED PARAMETERS ON THE ACCURACY OF THE NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL 13 TYPE OF REPORT STORM TO 1986 March 14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 15 PAGE COUNT Master's Thesis FROM 10 1986 March 15 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) 19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The performance of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model (NTCM) for 542 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1985—is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters: intensity, 12-h change in intensity, latitude, longitude and size. This study is intended to aid the operational forecaster in deciding when to use the NTCM based on storm-related parameters at the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecaster are evaluated in terms of the mean forecast error, median forecast error and systematic (zonal and meridional) error. Cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components are computed relative to a CLImatology and PERsistence (CLIPER) track. A scoring system (M) that assesses penalty points for forecasts in incorrect terciles is used to compare the accuracy of the NTCM and CLIPER forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12- through 36-h forecast periods. It also performs better for storms with initial latitudes south of 13 N and initial longitudes west of 129 E. For	Monte	rey, Califor	mia 93943-5000		Monterey,	California 939	43-5000		
The performance of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model (NTCM) for 542 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1985—is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters at the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecasts are evaluated in terms of the mean forecast error and systematic (zonal and meridional) error. Cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components are computed relative to a CLimatology and PERsistence (CLIPER) track. A scoring system (M) that a sasesse penalty points for forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12- through 36-h forecast periods. It also performs better for storms with initial latitudes south of 13 N and initial longitudes and source consisted.			PNSORING		9. PROCUREMENT	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER			
EFFECTS OF STORM-RELATED PARAMETERS ON THE ACCURACY OF THE NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL PERSONAL AUTHORISE) Williams, Brian J. 13 TYPE OF REPORT TROPICAL TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL PERSONAL AUTHORISE) Williams, Brian J. 13 TYPE OF REPORT TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL 13 TYPE OF REPORT TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL 14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 15 PAGE COUNT 1986 March 15 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Tropical cyclone forecasting, forecast error statistics, C-LIPER, typhoons, recurvature, tropical cyclones, cross-track error, along-track error, NTCM ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The performance of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model (NTCM) for 542 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1985—is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters: intensity, 12-h change in intensity, latitude, longitude and size. This study is intended to aid the operational forecaster in deciding when to use the NTCM based on storm-related parameters at the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecasts are evaluated in terms of the mean forecast error, median forecast error and systematic (zonal and meridional) error. Cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components are computed relative to a CLImatology and PERsistence (CLIPER) track. A scoring system (M) that assesses penalty points for forecasts in incorrect terciles is used to compare the accuracy of the NTCM and CLIPER forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12- through 36-h forecast periods. It also performs better for storms with initial latitudes south of 13 N and initial longitudes west of 129 E. For	8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and	ZIP Code)		10 SOURCE OF F				
EFFECTS OF STORM-RELATED PARAMETERS ON THE ACCURACY OF THE NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Williams, Brian J. 13									
13b TIME COVERED 13b TIME COVERED 14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 15 PAGE COUNT 108	EFFEC TROPIC	TS OF STO	RM-RELATED	PARAMETERS C	ON THE ACCU	JRACY OF TH	IE NEST	ED	
Master's Thesis FROM 10 1986 March 108			125 TIME CO	NVERED. T	A DATE OF PERO	RT /Year Month D	1au) 15 0.	AGE COUNT	
Tropical cyclone forecasting; forecast error; statistics; CLIPER, typhoons; recurvature; tropical cyclones, cross-track error; along-track error; NTCM ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The performance of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model (NTCM) for 542 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1985 is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters: intensity, 12-h change in intensity, latitude, longitude and size. This study is intended to aid the operational forecaster in deciding when to use the NTCM based on storm-related parameters at the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecasts are evaluated in terms of the mean forecast error, median forecast error and systematic (zonal and meridional) error. Cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components are computed relative to a CLImatology and PERsistence (CLIPER) track. A scoring system (M) that assesses penalty points for forecasts in incorrect terciles is used to compare the accuracy of the NTCM and CLIPER forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12- through 36-h forecast periods. It also performs better for storms with initial latitudes south of 13 N and initial longitudes west of 129 E. For									
Tropical cyclone forecasting; forecast error statistics; CLIPER, typhoons; recurvature; tropical cyclones, cross-track error; along-track error; NTCM The performance of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model (NTCM) for 542 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1985 is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters: intensity, 12-h change in intensity, latitude, longitude and size. This study is intended to aid the operational forecaster in deciding when to use the NTCM based on storm-related parameters at the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecasts are evaluated in terms of the mean forecast error, median forecast error and systematic (zonal and meridional) error. Cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components are computed relative to a CLImatology and PERsistence (CLIPER) track. A scoring system (M) that assesses penalty points for forecasts in incorrect terciles is used to compare the accuracy of the NTCM and CLIPER forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12- through 36-h forecast periods. It also performs better for storms with initial latitudes south of 13° N and initial longitudes west of 129° E. For	'6 SUPPLEME	NTARY NOTA	TION			-			
The performance of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model (NTCM) for 542 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1985 is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters: intensity, 12-h change in intensity, latitude, longitude and size. This study is intended to aid the operational forecaster in deciding when to use the NTCM based on storm-related parameters at the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecasts are evaluated in terms of the mean forecast error, median forecast error and systematic (zonal and meridional) error. Cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components are computed relative to a CLImatology and PERsistence (CLIPER) track. A scoring system (M) that assesses penalty points for forecasts in incorrect terciles is used to compare the accuracy of the NTCM and CLIPER forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12- through 36-h forecast periods. It also performs better for storms with initial latitudes south of 13° N and initial longitudes west of 129° E. For									
The performance of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model (NTCM) for 542 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1989 is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters: intensity, 12-h change in intensity, latitude, longitude and size. This study is intended to aid the operational forecaster in deciding when to use the NTCM based on storm-related parameters at the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecasts are evaluated in terms of the mean forecast error, median forecast error and systematic (zonal and meridional) error. Cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components are computed relative to a CLImatology and PERsistence (CLIPER) track. A scoring system (M) that assesses penalty points for forecasts in incorrect terciles is used to compare the accuracy of the NTCM and CLIPER forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12- through 36-h forecast periods. It also performs better for storms with initial latitudes south of 13° N and initial longitudes west of 129° E. For									
The performance of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model (NTCM) for 542 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1985 is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters: intensity, 12-h change in intensity, latitude, longitude and size. This study is intended to aid the operational forecaster in deciding when to use the NTCM based on storm-related parameters at the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecasts are evaluated in terms of the mean forecast error, median forecast error and systematic (zonal and meridional) error. Cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components are computed relative to a CLImatology and PERsistence (CLIPER) track. A scoring system (M) that assesses penalty points for forecasts in incorrect terciles is used to compare the accuracy of the NTCM and CLIPER forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12- through 36-h forecast periods. It also performs better for storms with initial latitudes south of 13° N and initial longitudes west of 129° E. For				•				* •	
Prof. R. L. Elsberry 408-646-2373 63Es									

DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR

83 APR edition may be used until exhausted All other editions are obsolete

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

Block 19 (continued)

very large storms, the NTCM forecasts have both left-of-track and westward biases which indicate problems of the NTCM in predicting recurvature of such systems. The NTCM (which has a 60-kt bogus) forecasts for storms with initial intensities between 50 and 75 kt have much lower CT/AT M scores and smaller forecast errors than the subsamples with initial intensities less than 50 kt or greater than 75 kt.

N 0122- =F-214-2621

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Effects of Storm-related Parameters on the Accuracy of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model

by

Brian J. Williams Lieutenant, United States Navy B.A., University of Washington, 1979

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL March 1986

Author:	Buan f Williams Brian J. Williams	
Approved by:	Russell L. Elsberry, Thesis Advisor J. CK. Chan, Co-Advisor	
	Robert J. Renard, Chairman, Department of Meteorology	20.
	John N. Dyer, Dean of Science and Engineering	Accession for PT18 OFFICE TO THE TOTAL TOT
	3 QUALITY INSPECTED	By

ABSTRACT

CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR

The performance of the Nested Tropical Cyclone Model (NTCM) for 542 track forecasts in the western North Pacific during 1981-1983 is evaluated with respect to five storm-related parameters: intensity, 12-h change in intensity, latitude, longitude and size. This study is intended to aid the operational forecaster in deciding when to use the NTCM based on storm-related parameters at the forecast time. The storm-related parameters are divided into three subsamples (about 180 in each) and the forecasts are evaluated in terms of the mean forecast error, median forecast error and systematic (zonal and meridional) error. Cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components are computed relative to a CLImatology and PERsistence (CLIPER) track. A scoring system (M) that assesses penalty points for forecasts in incorrect terciles is used to compare the accuracy of the NTCM and CLIPER forecasts within the subsamples. For the entire sample, the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 12- through 36-h forecast periods. It also performs better for storms with initial latitudes south of 13° N and initial longitudes west of 129° E. For very large storms, the NTCM forecasts have both left-of-track and westward biases which indicate problems of the NTCM in predicting recurvature of such systems. The NTCM (which has a 60-kt bogus) forecasts for storms with initial intensities between 50 and 75 kt have much lower CT/AT M scores and smaller forecast errors than the subsamples with initial intensities less than 50 kt or greater than 75 kt.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	10
II.	THE NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL	13
III.	THE DATA SET	15
	A. NTCM, CLIPER AND BEST TRACK POSITIONS	15
	B. STORM-RELATED PARAMETERS	16
IV	ERROR STATISTICS	23
	A. MEAN AND MEDIAN FORECAST ERRORS	23
	B. SYSTEMATIC ERRORS	24
	C. CROSS-TRACK AND ALONG-TRACK ERROR COMPONENTS	24
	D. CONTINGENCY TABLES, CLASS ERRORS AND M SCORES	34
V.	RESULTS	39
	A. TOTAL SAMPLE STATISTICS	39
	B. LATITUDE EFFECTS	41
	C. LONGITUDE EFFECTS	47
	D. INTENSITY EFFECTS	52
	E. PAST 12-HOUR INTENSITY CHANGE EFFECTS	.58
	F. SIZE EFFECTS	63
VI.	CONCLUSIONS	70
AP	PENDIX: CONTINGENCY TABLES AND PERCENTAGE OF CLASS ERROR TABLES	73
LI	ST OF REFERENCES	. 10
IN	ITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	10

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Means and standard deviations of 24, 48 and 72 h CT and AT error components for a sample of best track positions	26
2a.	Cross-track contingency tables, percentage of class errors and M scores	35
2b.	As in Table 2a, except for along track	36
3.	NTCM total sample (n=542) percent class errors, M scores, systematic, mean and median forecast errors	39
4.	CLIPER systematic, mean and median forecast errors for the total sample	
5.	Cross-track and along-track percent class errors and M scores for NTCM stratified by latitude	43
6.	Mean, median and systematic errors for NTCM stratified by latitude	44
7.	As in Table 6 except for CLIPER	45
8.	Cross-track and along-track percent class errors and M scores for NTCM stratified by longitude	48
9.	Mean median, and systematic errors for NTCM stratified by longitude	49
10.	As in Table 9 except for CLIPER	50
11.	Cross-track and along-track percent class errors and M scores for NTCM stratified by intensity.	53
12.	Mean median, and systematic errors for NTCM stratified by intensity	. 54
13.	As in Table 12 except for CLIPER	55
14.	Cross-track and along-track percent class errors and M scores for NTCM stratified by past 12-h intensity change	59
15.	Mean median, and systematic errors for NTCM stratified by past 12-h intensity change	60
16.	As in Table 15 except for CLIPER	6
17.	Cross-track and along-track percent class errors and M scores for NTCM stratified by size	64
18.	Mean median, and systematic errors for NTCM stratified by size	6:
19.	As in Table 18 except for CLIPER	6

A-1.	Cross-track contingency tables, percent class error tables, and	~ 4
	M scores for 24-h NTCM forecasts stratified by latitude	
A-2.	As in A-1, except for 48 h	
A-3.	As in A-1, except for 72 h	76
A-4.	As in A-1, except for along-track 24 h	77
A-5.	As in A-4, except for 48 h	78
A-6.	As in A-4, except for 72 h	79
A-7.	As in A-1, except for cross-track 24 h stratified by longitude	80
A-8.	As in A-7, except for 48 h	. 81
A-9.	As in A-7, except for 72 h	. 82
A-10.	As in A-7, except for along-track 24 h	83
A-11.	As in A-10, except for 48 h	. 84
A-12.	As in A-10, except for 72 h	. 85
A-13.	As in A-1, except for cross-track 24 h stratified by intensity	86
A-14.	As in A-13, except for 48 h	. 87
A-15.	As in A-13, except for 72 h	. 88
A-16.	As in A-13, except for along track 24 h	. 89
A-17.	As in A-16, except for 48 h	. 90
A-18.	As in A-16, except for 72 h	. 91
A-19.	As in A-1, except for stratified by past 12-h intensity change	92
A-20.	As in A-19, except for 48 h	. 93
A-21.	As in A-19, except for 72 h	
A-22.	As in A-19, except for along-track 24 h	. 95
A-23.	As in A-22, except for 48 h	
A-24.	As in A-22, except for 72 h	. 97
A-25.	As in A-1, except for cross track 24 h stratified by size	. 98
A-26.	As in A-25, except for 48 h	. 99
A-27.	As in A-25, except for 72 h	. 100
A-28.	As in A-25, except for along-track 24 h	
A-29.	As in A-28, except for 48 h	
A-30	As in A-28 except for 72 h	

LIST OF FIGURES

1a.	Distribution of initial latitudes with tercile cutpoints	18
1b.	As in Fig. 1a, except for initial longitudes	19
1c.	As in Fig. 1a, except for initial intensities (kt)	20
1d.	As in Fig. 1a, except for previous 12-h intensity change (kt)	21
1e.	As in Fig. 1a, except for radii of 30-kt winds (n.mi)	22
2.	Definition of forecast and systematic error components	23
3.	Definition of cross-track and along-track error components	25
4a.	Distribution of best track 24 h CT error components	27
4b.	Distribution of best track 48 h CT error components	28
4c.	Distribution of best track 72 h CT error components	29
5a.	Distribution of best track 24 h AT error components	31
5b.	Distribution of best track 48 h AT error components	32
5c.	Distribution of best track 72 h AT error components	33
6.	Locations of latitude and longitude cutpoints in the western North Pacific.	42

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation to the following people who provided encouragement, guidance and assistance throughout this study. My wife Linda, whose love and patience were uplifting influences that dampened the frustrations and setbacks that are inevitable in such a project. Professor Russell Elsberry, who conceived the project and gave outstanding guidance, counseling and assistance essential to its completion. Dr. Johnny Chan, who reviewed the manuscript and provided sage advice on both the content and form of my writing. Mr. Jim Peak, who assisted in the writing of the computer code required to compile the error statistics. I also wish to thank Dr. Ted Tsui and Mr. Michael Fiorino who provided the CLIPER and NTCM forecast data, and Mr. Charles Leonard who manually entered the radius of 30-kt winds into the computer data base from the JTWC warnings. Without the help of these people, this study would never have been completed. It has been my distinct pleasure learning from them.

catalogical processing processes straightful

I. INTRODUCTION

The enormous destructive potential of intense tropical cyclones is well known. The high winds, heavy seas and torrential rain that accompany these systems have caused great loss of life and damage to property at sea and ashore. Thus, it is not surprising that accurately forecasting the movement of tropical cyclones is of primary importance to civilian and military organizations in affected regions. Recognizing this, the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command has given an improved forecast capability the highest priority for tropical cyclone research objectives within the Department of Defense (DOD) (COMNAVOCEANCOM,1984). Especially important are long-range (48- to 72-h) forecasts, which are required by operational commanders who must consider movement of ships and aircraft to avoid damage to DOD assets. Civilian authorities also need advance warning to implement public disaster preparedness measures. Noting this requirement for increased accuracy in track forecasting, the United States Seventh Fleet Commander has levied a requirement on the Joint Typhoon Warning Center (JTWC) in Guam to achieve maximum forecast errors of 50, 100, and 150 nautical miles (n.mi.) for 24, 48, and 72 h respectively.

During the past decade, the rate of improvement in tropical cyclone track forecasting has not been as rapid as hoped. It is generally accepted that a "plateau" has been reached in the annual 24-h forecast error statistics (Elsberry, 1984). Improvements in 72-h forecasts have been realized, but only in some tropical cyclone regions (Thompson, et al., 1981). Furthermore, while some components of the tropical cyclone warning system have been improved, others have been degraded. For example, the introduction and advancement of

satellite surveillance techniques have not compensated for the loss of data due to the reduction in conventional observations and in reconnaissance flights (Elsberry, 1984).

The most important recent development has been the implementation of new dynamic forecast models to predict tropical cyclone tracks (Elsberry, 1983). The U.S. Navy two-way interactive nested tropical cyclone model (NTCM) was originally developed by Harrison (1973). It has been tested with operational data by Harrison (1981), Harrison and Fiorino (1982), Fiorino et al. (1982) and Peak and Elsberry (1984). These tests with a large number of cases indicate that the NTCM has high potential for good performance at 48 and 72 h (Fiorino, 1985). However, problems with consistency in the NTCM tracks have limited its value as an operational forecast tool. JTWC recently evaluated NTCM track predictions in the western North Pacific during the 1984 tropical cyclone season and found that the NTCM-predicted cyclone movement averaged 40 percent less than that observed (Sandgathe, 1985). This slow bias significantly hampers the decision-making process of the typhoon duty officer (TDO) because the "decision points" in the forecast track (recurvature, etc.) are forecast too late.

The primary objective of this thesis is to determine how storm-related parameters affect the NTCM-predicted track. This knowledge may provide valuable information to the forecaster concerning the veracity of a particular NTCM forecast based on certain storm-related conditions observed at the time the tropical cyclone warning is issued. An example in which such knowledge may have been useful is Supertyphoon Abby in 1983. Fiorino (1985) suggests that the NTCM and virtually all of the other forecast aids were incorrect because Abby was such a large storm (radius of 30-kt winds greater than 300 n.mi.). By contrast, Typhoon Ike (1984), a very small storm (radius of 30-kt winds less than 100 n.mi.), was also incorrectly forecast by NTCM. In addition to size, the storm-related parameters of intensity, past 12-h intensity change, and position are studied

to determine what relationships exist between these parameters and the respective NTCM forecasts. The intensity and intensity change parameters are chosen because the NTCM includes a time-independent bogus storm of 60-kt intensity in the initial conditions.

and managem cecess such that have been according

A TOTAL COMPRESENTATION OF THE PARTY OF THE

Knowledge of the NTCM performance characteristics is essential in making the correct decision to accept or reject a particular NTCM forecast. Such performance characteristics of the NTCM, based on certain storm-related parameters, are described herein. In addition, the methodology used in this study, while developed specifically for the NTCM, can (and should) be applied to other objective tropical cyclone forecast aids. Similar studies will be useful to compile "rules of thumb" for each aid under various storm-related conditions. Given a set of such rules and the initial storm-related parameters, a forecaster should be able to make a better and quicker evaluation of the relative merit of the track forecasts from each objective aid. In a broader context, the methodology of this study may be used to provide the objective measures of storm-related or synopticity factors to build a "decision-tree" algorithm. The "decision-tree" algorithm suggested by Peak and Elsberry (1985) selects the objective aid that is most appropriate to each forecast situation, based on a large number of synopticity and storm-related factors. The tree-structured approach to forecasting is expected to reduce forecast errors, improve training and guidance for inexperienced TDO's, and provide a detailed record of the decision process for post-storm analysis. Because of the myriad of possible storm-related and synopticity factors, and the numerous existing objective aids to be evaluated, much more work must be done before the "decision-tree" concept becomes an operational reality.

II. THE NESTED TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL

The NTCM was originally developed by Harrison (1973) to demonstrate the concept of grid-nesting with two-way interactive boundaries. After early tests of the model had shown considerable promise (see Harrison, 1981), its forecasts have been received on a regular basis by the JTWC since 1979. Different versions of the NTCM were used in subsequent seasons as modifications were made to decrease the model forecast errors (Fiorino, 1985). The forecasts analyzed in this study are from the operational model during 1983. The 1981 and 1982 storms were re-run by M. Fiorino using this version to provide a homogeneous data set.

The NTCM is a three-layer model with a nested, moving grid that provides high resolution in the vicinity of the cyclone circulation. The inner grid remains centered on the storm position as it moves within the 6600 km x 4900 km outer region. The inner grid has a 1230 km x 1230 km domain with 41 km resolution. The coarse grid resolution is 205 km, which gives a five to one reduction at the interface. The NTCM does not include topographic effects. A simple analytic heating function centered on the surface cyclone is used to maintain the cyclonic circulation. The north-south boundaries of the outer grid consist of free-slip walls while cyclic continuity is assumed in the east-west direction. The inner grid has two-way interactive boundaries which allows cyclone circulation in the inner grid to influence the environmental flow and vice versa. The model uses centered time and space differencing techniques.

The NTCM is initialized from the global band tropical analysis fields generated by the Fleet Numerical Oceanography Center (FNOC). Because of the channel boundary conditions, the NTCM can be integrated independently of other models or inputs following

initialization from the analysis fields. This feature is particularly desirable from the standpoint of operational timeliness (Elsberry, 1979).

The NTCM uses a reverse balance initialization technique for wind and geopotential fields (Harrison and Fiorino, 1982). The tropical cyclone is simulated by a bogus circulation imposed on the fine grid at the observed location of the storm. The initial intensity of the storm is always 60 kt. The streamfunction field is calculated from the vorticity which is obtained from the analyzed wind field. Divergence is allowed in the solution of the nonlinear balance equation for the geopotential height field. The balanced geopotential values are then interpolated from the coarse grid to the edge of the fine grid, and similar balancing is performed on the fine grid. Values at the coincident points on the fine grid are then substituted for the interior of the coarse grid solution. The entire initialization process is repeated two or three times to ensure that both grids have converged to approximately the same balanced initial fields. Initialization of the coarse grid and treatment of the input data were modified for the 1983 season (Fiorino, 1985) to improve the consistency between the mass and wind fields, especially near the channel boundaries.

THE PERSONAL REPORTS STANDARD PRODUCT CONTROLS

PROBLEM INCOME.

The basic philosophy of the model is to provide good, long range track predictions in a timely manner for use by an operational forecaster. This study is an attempt to analyze and understand the performance characteristics of the NTCM as a function of storm-related parameters using a large data set. It will be shown that the performance of the model can be related to the values of these parameters so that an operational forecaster can use this information to help decide whether or not to use the NTCM.

III. THE DATA SET

A. NTCM, CLIPER AND BEST-TRACK POSITIONS

The position data set consists of 542 tropical cyclone cases from the western North Pacific during 1981, 1982 and 1983 in which track forecasts are available up to 72 h. These data include the NTCM and the western North Pacific CLImatology and PER-sistence model (CLIPER) forecasts as well as the verifying best-track positions in 12-h increments for all 542 cases. The data set, kindly provided by Mr. Michael Fiorino of the Naval Environmental Prediction and Research Facility (NEPRF), represents the largest homogeneous data set used to analyze the performance of the NTCM. Even so, the 542 cases represent only about one-fourth of the approximately 2200 tropical cyclone warnings issued in this region from 1981 through 1983. The reason for this is twofold:

- 1. The NTCM was run only once every 12 h for seasons 1981 and 1982 (every 6h for 1983), whereas the JTWC issues warnings every 6h; and
- 2. All NTCM forecasts without verifying positions to 72 h were excluded.

The 72-h CLIPER forecasts, also provided by M. Fiorino, were run for the same cases as the NTCM. The resultant data set is homogeneous since the NTCM and CLIPER models have track predictions to 72 h for each of the 542 cases and verifying data (best track) are available for each forecast position.

The western North Pacific CLIPER, which was developed by Xu and Neumann (1985), uses regression equations to relate future storm positions to initial position, past 12- and 24-h positions, initial intensity, and Julian date. The equations were derived for storms south of 35°N and west of 150°E which occurred during the months of May through December. The forecasts to 24 h rely heavily on persistence, and more on

climatology at the 48- and 72-h forecast periods. The CLIPER track is selected as a reference in calculating the cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) error components for both the NTCM and best-track positions (see chapter IV). The reason for using CLIPER is that it is a statistical forecast scheme that should be free of any significant bias with respect to the actual storm track.

B. STORM-RELATED PARAMETERS

CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR

PROCEED SANDANA CONFINE UNITED A PARTICIONAL

The storm latitude, longitude, intensity, previous 12-h change in intensity and radius of 30-kt winds are selected as the storm-related parameters to be used as predictors. The data are taken from the JTWC warnings and correspond to the initial times of the 542 NTCM and CLIPER forecasts. These five parameters are chosen for two reasons. First, when taken from the JTWC warnings, they represent the real-time data that are available to the TDO at the time the NTCM is run. Second, these storm-related parameters are expected to have some degree of influence on the future storm track (Elsberry, 1984).

The samples of each of the five storm-related parameters are partitioned into equal-sized terciles. The cutpoints between the terciles are then used to segregate the corresponding sample of NTCM and CLIPER forecasts into three subsamples. Various error statistics (see chapter IV) are computed for each subsample of forecasts and examined to determine differences in NTCM forecast performance. The histograms for each of these parameters (with the locations of the tercile cut points) are provided in Figs. 1a-1e.

The distribution of initial latitudes for the sample (Fig. 1a) is slightly skewed with maximum frequencies near the lower cutpoint (between 12°N and 13°N) and the mean latitude (15.5°N) near the upper cutpoint (between 16°N and 17°N). There are 183, 177 and 182 cases for the "southern", "central" and "northern" areas. In the histogram of initial longitude (Fig. 1b), the lower cutpoint is between 128°E and 129°E and the upper

cutpoint between 139°E and 140°E. The distribution of initial longitudes also appears slightly skewed, with the maximum frequency near the lower cutpoint. There are 169, 186 and 187 cases in the "western", "middle" and "eastern" areas.

The histogram of initial intensities (Fig. 1c) is skewed toward the lower intensities. The width of the cells in the histogram is 5 kt because intensities on the JTWC warnings are issued in 5-kt increments. The cutpoints, which are located between 45 and 50 kt and between 75 and 80 kt, divide the data into subsamples which shall be referred to as "weak", "moderate" and "intense" tropical cyclones. The number of cases in each subsample is 182, 182 and 178 respectively. The histogram of the previous 12-h intensity change can be separated into "weakening", "developing" and "rapidly developing" subsamples using the cutpoints between 0 and 5 kt and between 10 and 15 kt (Fig. 1d). The number of cases in these subsamples are 190, 169 and 99, respectively. The sample can not be partitioned equally because the majority of the cases falls into just a few of the cells, and the cells can not be smaller than 5 kt of 12-h intensity change. The size of the sample is consequently reduced to 458 because the intensity differences can not be computed for the first warning of a tropical cyclone.

Noticeable "spikes" in the histogram of the radii of 30-kt winds (Fig. 1e) occur at 30, 100, 150 and 300 n.mi. When a warning gives two semicircles of wind radii, the larger of the two is used. In addition, tropical cyclones ≤ 30 kt are assigned a radius of 30 n.mi. The radius of 30-kt winds is often rather subjective as peripheral data from aircraft reconnaissance may not be available. These data were manually extracted by Mr. Charles Leonard of the Department of Meteorology at NPS from over 2200 warning messages issued by JTWC. The cutpoints are located between 105 and 110 n.mi. and between 205 and 210 n.mi., which separates the sample into "small", "medium" and "large" tropical cyclones. The number of cases in the three subsamples are 186, 181 and 175 respectively.




Figure 1a. Distribution of initial latitudes during 1981-83. Dashes indicate tercile cutpoints.

est herein leaveness reseasons province le





Figure 1b. Similar to Fig. 1a except for initial longitudes.



PARTIE STATES STATES STATES STATES STATES

Figure 1c. Similar to Fig. 1a except for initial intensity (kts).




Figure 1d. Similar to Fig. 1a except for previous 12-h intensity change (kts).




Figure 1e. Similar to Fig. 1a except for radius (n.mi) of 30-kt winds.

IV. ERROR STATISTICS

A. MEAN AND MEDIAN FORECAST ERRORS

A measure of accuracy commonly used for tropical cyclone track forecasts is the "forecast error", which is defined as the great circle distance between the forecast and verifying position (Fig. 2). The mean forecast error is simply the sum of the errors divided by the number in the sample.




Figure 2. Definition of forecast and systematic error components (ΔX and ΔY). In this example, both ΔX and ΔY are negative.

Because the distribution of the forecast errors in a sample is bounded on one side by zero and unbounded on the other, many studies use the "median forecast error" which is the value of the 50th percentile in the distribution.

The mean and median forecast errors at 12, 24, 36, 48, 60 and 72 h for the NTCM and CLIPER (verified relative to best-track positions) are computed for the total sample (542 cases) and for each subsample stratified by different values of storm-related parameters. The unit used for these and all other error components is kilometer (km).

B. SYSTEMATIC ERRORS

Another measure of error for tropical storm track forecasts is the systematic error. The systematic error components, ΣX and ΣY , are simply the zonal (ΔX) and meridional (ΔY) errors averaged over the sample of forecasts (Fig. 2). The error components are calculated for each 12-h forecast period to 72 h. The systematic error components are useful in determining the presence (or absence) of an error bias in the sample. For example, a monotonic increase or decrease throughout the forecast period indicates a systematic error which might be statistically removed (Peak and Elsberry, 1982). The sign convention for this study is positive if the forecast position is north ($+\Sigma Y$) or east ($+\Sigma X$) of the best-track position. The results of the systematic, mean and median error statistics for the NTCM and CLIPER samples are discussed in chapter V (Tables 3 and 4).

C. CROSS-TRACK AND ALONG-TRACK ERROR COMPONENTS RELATIVE TO EXTRAPOLATED CLIPER FORECASTS

Forecast errors are also presented as cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components. The objective of the CT/AT system is to provide information to the forecaster about the movement and direction of the storm relative to a standard forecast aid such as persistence or climatology (Elsberry and Peak, 1986). The mean and median forecast errors give only the magnitude of the error relative to the actual position and the systematic error gives the average of the zonal and meridional error components. On the other hand, the CT/AT errors also provide information about the direction of the forecast in a storm-oriented reference frame. Elsberry and Peak (1986) evaluated tropical cyclone aids based on CT and AT components relative to an extrapolated track based on warning positions at the initial (00) and past 12-h time periods. They interpreted the CT components as turning motion and the AT components as acceleration or deceleration. This directionality aspect gives important information to the forecaster that is not available from the other error measures.

The CT/AT scheme used in this study differs from that of Elsberry and Peak (1986) in that the CT and AT components for the NTCM or best-track positions for each forecast period (24, 48, 72 h) are calculated relative to the CLIPER forecast at the corresponding time. For example, the CT/AT at 72 h is calculated relative to a line connecting the 72 and 60 h CLIPER positions (Fig. 3).




Figure 3. Definition of cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) components at 72 h relative to an extrapolated track based on CLIPER positions at 72 and 60 h. In this example, CT is positive (right) and AT is negative (slow) with respect to the CLIPER track.

The perpendicular distance from the NTCM or best-track position to the extrapolated track is the cross-track component, with positive values to the right of the track and negative to the left. The distance along the extrapolated track from the CLIPER position to the perpendicular from the NTCM or best-track position is the along-track component. Positive (negative) AT values occur if the perpendicular meets the track ahead (behind) the corresponding CLIPER position.

The CT/AT components of the best track are computed for the entire best-track sample at 24-, 48- and 72-h forecast periods. The means and standard deviations of the distributions for each forecast period are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Means (x) and standard deviations (σ) of the 24-, 48- and 72-h CT and AT components (km) for the total sample of best-track positions (relative to CLIPER forecasts).

1	24	h	48	h j	72 h	
	x	σ	X	σ	x	σ
СТ	-22	164	-29	340	-41	574
AT	-66	165	-179	377	-276	594

Notice that the mean values of the 24-, 48-hand 72-h CT errors are all very close to zero, which indicates that the best-track CT components are not biased with respect to the CLIPER track. This result is not surprising because a statistical scheme such as CLIPER should have no bias relative to the overall mean position. It can also be seen that the standard deviation increases with time. The symmetric properties of the CT sample are evident in the histograms for the samples of the three time periods (Figs. 4a-c). The tercile cutpoints are indicated on the histograms by dashed lines. The cutpoints of the 24-h CT distribution (Fig. 4a) are at -75 km and 50 km, which is almost exactly centered about the mean (-22 km). The 48-h CT (Fig. 4b) cutpoints are at -125 km and 125 km, and are also symmetric about the mean. The same properties can be seen in the 72-h sample (Fig. 4c), which has cutpoints at -200 km and 200 km. The nearly symmetric distribution of best-track CT error components around the mean CLIPER track supports the use of CLIPER as a referencing system because it is more likely to provide an orientation with respect to the mean track of the tropical cyclone. The terciles have been labeled left (L),





Figure 4a. Distribution of best-track 24-h cross-track (CT) error components (km). Each point on abscissa indicates of the respective histogram cell. Dashes indicate approximate locations of tercile cutpoints.



Second Second

CONTRACTOR DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE

Figure 4b. Similar to Fig. 4a except for 48-h CT error components.




Figure 4c. Similar to Fig. 4a except for 72-h CT error components.

center (C) and right (R) according to the distributions of the best-track CT error components for the 24-, 48- and 72-h distributions. These three (L, C and R) categories are used to compare NTCM forecasts to the best-track positions.

The AT distributions exhibit characteristics similar to those of the CT distributions discussed above. The values of the standard deviation for the AT distributions (Table 1) are very close to those of the CT for all three time periods. The AT histograms (Figs. 5a-c) resemble the CT histograms (Figs. 4a-c) in that they are also very symmetric about the mean. As with the CT error components, the terciles are marked on Figs. 5a-c and have been named to indicate the position with respect to the extrapolated CLIPER track: slow (S), center (C) and fast (F). However, the negative mean (x) values (Table 1) of -66, -179, and -276 km indicate that best-track positions are consistently "slow" with respect to the extrapolated CLIPER track (or, that CLIPER is "fast" compared to the best-track). This results from the fact that given the same initial position and identical speed of movement, any deviation in direction of movement from the reference (past 12 h extrapolated CLIPER) track will produce an apparent "slow" AT error component. This is one of the shortcomings of attempting to define a storm-oriented coordinate system (Neumann and Pelissier, 1981).

The primary advantage in using the CLIPER forecast rather than an extrapolated track from warning and -12 h positions (as was done in Elsberry and Peak, 1986) as the reference for CT/AT components is that it appears to be an excellent storm-oriented coordinate system. This is especially true at the 48-h and 72-h forecast periods. A track extrapolated from warning and 12-h old positions is very representative of storm movement for the early (12- to 24-h) forecast periods, but not so of the later (48- to 72-h) forecast periods. Compared to simple extrapolation, the inclusion of climatology in the method described above provides a better CT/AT frame of reference at all forecast periods because it is evidently more representative of the true storm track at all time periods.

percent andrew letteristic passion assisting bythesis assisting





Figure 5a. Distribution of best-track 24-h along-track (AT) error components (km). Each point on abscissa indicates lowest value of the respective histogram cell. Dashes indicate approximate locations of tercile cutpoints.



CESSES 1077/0/10

CONTRACTOR STANDARDS CONTRACTOR STANDARDS

Figure 5b. Similar to Fig. 5a except for 48-h AT error components.




Figure 5c. Similar to Fig. 5a except for 72-h AT error components.

D. CONTINGENCY TABLES, CLASS ERRORS AND M SCORES

PROTEIN TRESPOSA INST

After division of the best-track CT and AT components into terciles, a scoring system that assesses penalty points for forecasts that fall into the incorrect tercile is used to rank the NTCM. The NTCM forecasts are also divided into terciles and each forecast compared to the tercile for the best track. A forecast is defined as having a zero-class error if it falls into the same tercile as the best track, a one-class error if it is in a tercile adjacent to that of the best track and a two-class error if it is two terciles away from the best track. Contingency tables for the CT and AT components are then formed at each of the forecast intervals (24, 48 and 72 h) as shown in Tables 2a and 2b.

The upper portion of Table 2a gives the contingency tables for the NTCM for all three time periods. The cutpoints that define the tercile boundaries (see also Figs. 4a-c) are indicated just below the contingency tables. The zero-class errors are arranged in the bins located along the upper-left to lower-right diagonal. The two-class errors are located in the upper-right and lower-left bins and the remaining bins contain the one-class errors. A higher number in the zero-class diagonal relative to the one- and two-class error bins indicates a greater skill level. For example, the total number of zero-class CT errors for the 48-h time period is 280, or slightly more "hits" than at either 24 h (236) or 72 h (265). The totals column on the right side of each contingency table indicates the number in each best-track tercile (L, C and R). Similarly, the totals along the bottom row of each contingency table show the number of NTCM forecasts that fall into the best-track L, C and R categories. Notice that fewer NTCM forecasts fall into the "R" category at 48 and 72 h (123 and 130) than the best-track (178 and 189), but the number of NTCM forecasts in the "R" category at 24 h (171) is very close to the best track (186). This indicates the NTCM has a left bias in the later forecast periods, but none at the 24-h period.

TABLE 2a Cross-track contingency tables, percentage of class error summaries and M scores

	Totals	180	173	189	265	ï.						
	R	19	33	78	130	km; to 200 k km	%2	10.6		22.7	11.2	62.1
72 h	NTCM C	58	84	89	210	Cut Points: L < -200 km; C = -200 to 200 km; R ≥ 200 km	%1	33.2	51.4	36.0	39.9	Score =
	ו	103	56	43	202	Points: 1	0%	57.2	48.6	41.3	48.9	M Sc
24 h 48 h 72 h		J	Ö	~	Totals 202	C RE		7	၁	æ	Totals	
010	Totals	188	176	178	280	ä;	1					***************************************
0.1433	R T	19	31	73	123	km; to 125 k km	%2	10.1		18.5	9.5	58.0
48 h	NTC!A C	56	94	72	222	L < -125 km; C=-125 to 125 km; R ≥ 125 km	9%1	29.8	46.6	40.5	38.9	Score =
3	L Z	113	51	33	\vdash		0%	60.1	53.4	41.0	51.6	M Sc
raoles,	1	L	ر ت	~	Totals 197	Cut Points:	,	1	၁	K	Totals	4
(VIII.7)	ls		•	9					Service Secreticism	nu valuudustataa vaa	occessor	endands no
	Totals	177	179	186	236	Ë						_
nach c	8	35	53	83	171	L < -75 km; C = -75 to 50 km; R ≥ 50 km	%2	19.7		15.6	11.8	68.3
						27- 27- 2, 3	_	3	0	8	1	II
24 h	NTCM C	99	11	74	217	7 U K	%1	37.3	57.0	39.8	44.	ore
24 h	NTCM L C	99 92	49 77	29 74	154 217	:	% 0%	42.9 37.	43.0 57.	44.6 39.	43.5 44.7	M Score
24 h	NTCM L C			 	Totals 154 217			6	0.	9	.5	

TABLE 2b Same as 2a, except for along-track.

	Totals	183	177	182	286 n;						
	H T	13	45	88	146 km; to -50 km	%2	7.1	:	25.3	10.8	58.1
72 h	NTCM C	59	87	48	194 14 S < -400 km C = -400 to - F ≥ -50 km	%1	32.2	50.8	26.4	36.5	M Score = 58.1
72 h	S	111	45	46		0%	60.7	49.2	48.4	52.8	
		S	S	댼	Totals 202 Cut Points:		Ø	ပ	μ,	Totals	
	Totals	178	180	184	89	ſ					
	ТT	11	41	79	131 km; to -25 km	%2	6.2	- !	26.6	10.9	61.4
48 h	NTCM C	51	73	56	180 < -275 = -275 > -25	%1	28.1	59.4	30.4	39.5	M Score = 61.4
,	ς Z	116	99	49	B.	0%	65.2	40.6	42.9	49.5	M S
В											
		S 1	S	ţ <u>r</u> ,	Totals 2 Cut Po		S	ນ	ഥ	Totals	
	otals		187 C	180 F	240 To		S	ບ		Totals	********
	F Totals	S	energe en		240 To	%2	8.0 S	C			70.7
24 h	F	175 S	187	180	240 To	%1 %2	8.0		37.8	15.3	ore = 70.7
24 h	M F	14 175 S	25 187	51 180	171 90 240 To : S < -125 km; C = -125 to 15 km F ≥ 15 km						M Score = 70.7
24 h	NTCM C F	41 14 175 S	69 25 187	61 51 180	240 To	%1	23.4 8.0	63.1	33.9 37.8	Totals 44.3 40.1 15.3	M Score = 70.7

The lower half of Table 2a contains the percentages of NTCM zero-, one- and two-class errors for each (L,C,R) best-track tercile and the totals. The percentages provide information about the general distribution of errors. For example, notice that at 72 h, a higher percentage of two-class errors occur when the best track is in the "R" tercile (22.7) than in the "L" tercile (10.6). This indicates that at 72 h, the NTCM is more than twice as likely to be left of the best track when there is a two-class error.

Table 2b is similar to 2a, but contains the AT contingency tables (S, C, and F categories). The highest number of zero-class errors is in the 72-h period (286). Notice that the number of NTCM forecasts that fell into the slow (S) categories for all three time periods is very high. This agrees with the observation by Sandgathe (1985) that the NTCM movement is on the average 40% less than the observed cyclone movement.

A primary motivation for the tercile pattern separation into contingency tables is to determine if the NTCM correctly distinguishes between left-turning and right-turning as well as slow and fast storms (Elsberry and Peak, 1986). The lower portions of Tables 2a and 2b summarize the percentage of class errors for each category (L, C and R or S, C and F) of the sample. For example, in the 72-h portion of Table 2a, 180 of the storms moved to the left of the CLIPER track (total of first row). Of these, 103 (57.2%) are forecast correctly by the NTCM, 58 (33.2%) are forecast to be in the center tercile (one-class error) and 19 (10.6%) in the right-turning tercile (two-class error). The percent of each class of errors for the best-track terciles (L, C, R or S, C, F) and the total sample are tabulated below the contingency tables. In the above example for 72 h, the "totals" row shows that the 48.9%, 39.9% and 11.2% of the NTCM forecasts for CT were in the zero-, one- and two-class error categories, respectively. For comparison purposes, a purely random selection would have percentages of 33.3%, 44.4% and 22.2%, respectively. Thus, the NTCM is more skillful than a random forecast for this sample.

A further distillation of the information contained in the contingency tables is made as an aid to compare quantitatively the performance of forecasts. Preisendorfer and Mobley (1982) devised a scoring system to represent the level of skill in a forecast as a single number (M) defined as

$$M = V + 2W, (1)$$

where (U,V,W) are the percentages of (zero-, one-, two-class) errors such that

$$U + V + W = 100. \tag{2}$$

The quantity M is simply a linear penalty score according to the error class; the lower the M score, the higher the degree of skill. In the example used above (Table 2a), the M score for the NTCM at 72 h for the CT component is 62.1. A random tercile selection would have an M score of 88.9. Therefore, the M score also indicates that the NTCM is more skillful than a random forecast.

An M score for the CLIPER is suggested as another standard of comparison. Because the terciles are defined relative to CLIPER, the CLIPER forecast track will always be in the center tercile. Thus, there can never be more than a one-class error. However, the terciles are constructed so that for both the CT and the AT distributions 66.7% of the cases are not in the center tercile. The CLIPER forecast will always fail by one class in these cases. Thus, the M score is simply 66.7 for both the CT and the AT components. For the total sample (see Tables 2a and 2b), the CT/AT M scores for the NTCM at 48 h (58.0/61.4) and 72 h (62.1/58.1) indicate that the NTCM is more skillful than CLIPER at the later forecast periods. However, the 24-h CT/AT M scores (68.3/70.7) indicate that the NTCM is essentially a no-skill forecast at this time period.

V. RESULTS

A. TOTAL SAMPLE STATISTICS

The CT and AT percentages of class errors, M scores, mean and median errors and systematic errors for the total NTCM sample are summarized in Table 3. The CT M scores (68.3, 58.0 and 62.1 at 24, 48 and 72 h) suggest that overall, the NTCM forecasts are more skillful at 48 and 72 h than at 24 h. The AT M scores (70.7, 61.4 and 58.1 at 24, 48 and 72 h) also indicate a similar result. Also, the NTCM performs better than the CLIPER (M=66.7) at these time periods. However, the 24-h M scores of the CT and AT

TABLE 3

NTCM total sample (542 cases) percent class errors and M scores (left).

Systematic, mean and median forecast errors (right).

	% 0	% 1	%2	M	·		ΣΧ	ΣΥ	Mn	Md
СТ	43.5	44.7	11.8	68.3		12 h	47	2	137	127
24 h AT	44.3	40.6	15.1	70.8		24 h	60	-2	225	194
СТ	51.7	38.7	9.6	57.9		36 h	45	4	301	263
48 h AT	49.4	39.5	11.1	61.7		48 h	17	-16	397	355
СТ	48.9	39.7	11.4	62.5		60 h	9	-3	508	453
72 h AT	52.8	36.3	10.9	58.1		72 h	-7	-9	626	565

components (68.3 and 70.8) indicate that the NTCM represents the storm movement no better than CLIPER. Notice that the relatively high percentage of AT two-class errors at 24 h (15.1%). Referring back to the contingency table (Table 2b) for this forecast period,

it can be seen that this high percentage is due to a large number of two-class errors in the lower-left corner of the table (68). This indicates that the NTCM has a slow bias, especially at the 24-h period.

AND THE CONTRACTOR

The mean (Mn) and median (Md) forecast errors for the overall sample of NTCM forecasts (Table 3) and the CLIPER (Table 4) suggest that the NTCM performance is generally no better than CLIPER at the early (12- and 24-h) time periods. However, the NTCM consistently has lower forecast errors at the later (36-through 72-h) periods. For this sample of forecasts, the CT/AT error statistics, which measure forecasting skill based on "storm-motion" coordinates, are in good agreement with the forecast error statistics, which account only for the distance between the forecast and the best-track position.

TABLE 4

CLIPER systematic (∑X and∑Y), mean (Mn) and median (Md) forecast errors (km) for the total sample (542 cases).

	ΣΧ	ΣΥ	Mn	Md
12 h	-6	21	107	90
24 h	3	47	206	172
36 h	22	73	329	278
48 h	41	96	457	373
60 h	48	115	592	480
72 h	56	121	730	590

The slow bias of the NTCM is also evident in the zonal (ΣX) and meridional (ΣY) errors (Table 3). The 12-, 24- and 36-h ΣX averages are 47, 60 and 45 km, which indicates that the NTCM is initially east of the best-track position. For westward-moving

storms, these positive values suggest that the NTCM is "slow" during the early forecast periods. Most of the storms in this sample will have a component toward the west because of the requirement that a complete 72-h track be included. This will tend to reduce the number of the eastward-moving storms that tend to undergo extratropical transition prior to 72 h. Notice that in the 48- to 72-h time period, the values of ΣX decrease from 17 to -7, which indicates that the average NTCM position becomes slightly west of the best-track position at 72 h. However, this error is very small compared with the mean and median forecast errors. The meridional (ΣY) components of the systematic error of the NTCM are also negligible. In fact, the largest deviation from zero at 48 h is only 16 km south of best-track latitude (Table 3), which is well within the "noise".


The CLIPER systematic errors (Table 4) indicate that the average forecast positions are generally east and north of the best track. although these systematic errors are not large, near zero values had been expected. This seems to suggest that this sample from 1981-3 had somewhat different characteristics than the sample used to create the CLIPER algorithm.

B. LATITUDE EFFECTS

The second of th

As indicated in Fig. 1a, the sample of NTCM forecasts is divided into southern (latitudes < 13° N), central (between 13° and 17° N) and northern (> 17° N) samples. The locations of the latitude and longitude (section C) tercile cutpoints are shown in Fig. 6.

Two obvious points arise from an inspection of the M scores of the latitude-stratified subsample (Table 5). First, the M scores of the 48- and 72-h CT components for the southern area are much lower than those for the central and northern areas. This suggest that the NTCM is more skillful in forecasting the direction of storm movement for systems with initial positions south of 13° N. Second, both CT and AT M scores indicate that the NTCM has less skill in forecasting direction and speed at 24 h than at 48 h and 72 h for all



ted sections becomeded from the contract herebyes and particless particles contract here

Figure 6. Locations of latitude and longitude tercile cutpoints in the western North Pacific (thick lines).

では、100mmので

TABLE 5

Code Sold and Section of March 1988

process percessing

Cross-track and along-track percent class errors and M scores for NTCM forecasts stratified by latitude.

	×	70.3	56.0	70.3	55.4	75.8	58.2	182
. 17.	%2	11.0	7.1	11.0	6.0	15.4	9.3	ple =
Latitude ≥ 17°	961	48.3	41.8	45.6		45.0	9.6	Subsam
Lati	6 0%	40.7	51.1	43.4	50.6 43.4	39.6	51.0 39.6	No. in Subsample = 182
	8	,		4		3	,	N
7.	M	70.6	81.3	55.3	71.8	9.19	60.5	177
Latitude 13° to 17°	%2	42.4 44.6 13.0 70.6	18.6	9.0 55.3	16.4	13.0	53.1 33.3 13.6 60.5	mple =
tude 1	1%	44.6	44.1	53.7 37.3	39.0	51.4 35.6	33.3	Subsa
Lati	0%	42.4	37.3 44.1	53.7	44.6 39.0	51.4	53.1	No. in Subsample = 177
•					•			Z
7	M	64.0	75.4	50.8	57.9	50.3	55.7	= 183
Latitude < 13° N	%2	47.5 41.0 11.5 64.0	19.7	8.8	10.9	6.0	9.8 55.7	mple
titude	%1	41.0	36.0	34.3	33.3	38.3	36.1	Subsa
7	0%	47.5	44.3	57.9	. 53.0 33.3	55.7	54.1	No. in Subsample = 183
		CT	24 h AT	CT	48 h AT	CT	72 h AT	

TABLE 6

Mean (Mn), median (Md), and systematic errors (km) for NTCM forecasts stratified by latitude.

•	=			10	\Q.			۱.,
7	. Md	106	165	246	346	441	578	= 182
× 17° I	Mn	116	188	264	366	489	-4 644	mple :
Latitude $\geq 17^{\circ}$ N	ΣY	-1	-19	-5	6-	12	-4	Subsa
Lat	Σχ	33	4	-38	-94	-136	-210	No. in Subsample = 182
								Ň
	Md	124	198	263	345	462	80	111
Z		L i	52			4	580	-
to 17	Mn	137	228	298	392	507	-3 616	mple
de 13°	ΣY	2	-10	3	-17	4-	. 6-	Subsa
Latitude 13° to 17° N	Σχ	62	109	119	135	164	200	No. in Subsample = 177
•								Z
						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	
77	Md	148	235	301	368	457	543	183
< 13° N	Mn	158	261	341	433	527	617	mple
Latitude < 13° N	ΣY	5	23	14	-23	-16	-21	Subsa
Lat	$\Sigma X \mid \Sigma Y$	45	92 -	58	14	2	9-	No. in Subsample = 183
		12 h	24 h 76	36 h	48 h	4 09	72 h	

TABLE 7

nessel expresses toposposi leaguesper Inscreases stabilisms

Mean (Mn), median (Md), and systematic errors (km) for CLIPER forecasts stratified by latitude.

	ਚ	T	T	T				7 ~
z	Md	8	162	264	342	439	537	= 18%
≥ 17	Mn	2	193	295	400	514	633	ample
Latitude ≥ 17° N	2x	29	63	103	132	136	102	Subs
<u>.</u> "	ΣX	4	Ģ	4	-3	-20	-57	No. in Subsample = 182
z	PW	88	161	269	376	496	909	12
Latitude 13° to 17° N	Mn	96	192	309	432	995	714	mple .
ude 13	ΣY	20	49	84	117	149	178	Subsa
Latit	ΣΧ	-10	-2	24	.69	117	185	No. in Subsample = 177
7	Md	101	195	302	415	525	619	= 183
Latitude < 13° N	Mn	119	233	382	539	694	841	in Subsample = 183
titude	ΣY	15	29	31	41	19	86	Subsa
La	Σх	4-	16	46	59	48	43	No. in
		12 h	24 h	36 h	48 h	4 09	72 h	Z

three subsamples. This result can also be seen in the forecast error statistics (Table 6), which indicate that the NTCM has higher mean and median 24-h forecast errors in the southern and central areas than CLIPER (Table 7).

THE RESERVE CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF TH

PROPERTY INCOMES TO A CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY

Although the CT and AT M scores generally decrease with increasing forecast period, the AT M scores for the northern subsample are an exception. The 24-h score is very low (56.0) with respect to that for the total sample (70.8), and the M score increases slightly to 58.2 at 72 h. This seems to indicate that the slow bias of the NTCM (mentioned above) is less pronounced for storms with initial latitudes north of 17°N. Inspection of the contingency table (Table A-4, appendix) indicates that the number of two-class errors in the slow category for the northern subsample (11) is much less than those for the southern (28) and central (29) subsamples. In addition, the NTCM median 24 h forecast error (Table 6) for the northern area is much smaller than those for the southern and central areas (165 km versus 235 and 198 km, respectively). This 24-h median forecast error is even slightly smaller than that of CLIPER (175 km, see Table 4) for the total sample. Therefore, the slow bias of the NTCM at 24 h is largely due to the storms initially south of 17° N. This initial slow bias probably contributes to increased forecast errors at 48 and 72 h because it leads to an incorrect timing of recurvature (Sandgathe, 1985). Missing the time of recurvature can produce large forecast errors. Although the AT errors for the northern area are quite small, the large CT errors seem to offset them at the 48 and 72 h time periods.

Notice that the NTCM mean and median forecast errors at 72 h (Table 6) for the northern subsample (644 and 578 km) are greater than those of the CLIPER (Table 7) for this subsample (633 and 537 km), which is consistent with the NTCM CT M score at 72 h (75.3) being much higher than that of the CLIPER (66.7). Therefore, the NTCM is no more skillful than CLIPER for storms north of 17° N, even at the 48- and 72-h periods. Only in the southern subsample does the NTCM clearly outperform CLIPER at 48 and

72 h with respect to all of the error statistics; CT, AT and mean and median forecast errors (see Tables 6 and 7).

One explanation of the apparently good performance for NTCM in terms of the CT errors (especially at 48 and 72 h) in the southern area may be that the synoptic features that cause recurvature are less likely to extend into this region (south of 13° N). Therefore, the lack of recurvature influences on the storm tracks probably contribute to the low CT M scores at 72 h (50.3 for the southern area versus 61.6 and 75.8 for the central and northern areas).

The systematic errors of the NTCM (Table 6) indicate that the meridional (ΣY) averages for all three areas are very close to zero and show no systematic change with increasing forecast period. However, the central area exhibits an increase in zonal (ΣX) error from 62 km to 200 km from 12 to 72 h, which indicates that the NTCM forecasts are east of the best track. Conversely, the northern area zonal error decreases from 33 km to -210 km throughout the period, with the NTCM becoming farther west of the best track. The absence of such large systematic errors in the southern area is consistent with the other error statistics, which suggests that the NTCM performs best for storms initially south of 13° N.

C. LONGITUDE EFFECTS

DANIERS RECEIVED TOTAL

The cutpoints for dividing the sample of forecasts into western, middle and eastern areas are 129° E and 140° E (Figs. 1b Fig. 6). The lowest CT M scores for the NTCM are found in the western area (Table 8). This is due to a low percentage of two-class errors in the western area for all three time periods (3.5, 2.4 and 5.3% for 24, 48 and 72 h). The contingency tables (Tables A-7, A-8 and A-9) also do not indicate any left or right bias of the NTCM in the western area. Although the CT M scores at 24 and 48 h are very low (50.8 and 43.8) for the western area, the corresponding AT M scores are higher

TABLE 8

seems recovers respects assessed assessed likely

respective produced by the produced begins

Cross-track and along-track percent class errors and M scores for NTCM forecasts stratified by longitude.

ь П	Σ	74.8	66.3	61.5	57.8	54.5	56.6	
Longitude ≥ 140° E	%2	17.1	17.1 66.3	12.3 61.5	10.7	12.3		
gitude	%1	40.6	32.1	36.9	36.4	29.9	31.0 12.8	
Lor	0%	42.3	50.8	50.8	52.9	8.7.8	56.2	
140° E	Σ	77.4	66.6	67.1	60.1	74.7	7.0 57.0	
Longitude 129° to 140° E	%2	14.0	14.5	13.4	8.0	16.1		
tude İ	%1	49.4	44.6 40.9	40.3	47.8 44.1	42.5	50.0 43.0	
Longi	0%	36.6	44.6	46.2	47.8	41.4	50.0	
, E	M	50.8	76.9	43.8	67.4	5.3 57.9	6.09	
Longitude < 129° E	962	3.5 50.8	13.6	2.4	14.8 67.4		13.0 60.9	
ngitude	%1	52.7 43.8	49.7	39.0	37.9	47.3	34.9	
Lo	0%	52.7	36.7	58.6	47.3	47.3	52.1	
		CT	24 h AT	ָל	48 h AT	CT	72 h AT	

2002-2004 | 100-2007 | 100-200-2004 | KEEEOON | FEEEOON | FEEEOON | 100-2004 | 100-2004 | 100-2004 |

WALL PROGRESS TO TOTAL SEE THE

No. in Subsample = 187

in Subsample = 186

Š.

No. in Subsample = 169

TABLE 9

AND TOTAL BUTTONIAN TOTAL STATES OF THE STAT

Mean (Mn), median (Md), and systematic errors (km) for NTCM forecasts stratified by longitude.

ETJ .	Md	134	198	273	368	481	574	187
Longitude ≥ 140° E		151	248	341	439 3	553	673	mple =
tude ≥	ΣY Min	27 1	49	. 26	48	62 5	57 6	Subsa
Longi	Σx	55	72	58	37	55 (52	No. in Subsample = 187
		1						Ž
								9
40° E	Md	122	224	292	367	486	582	= 18
° to 1		133	231	305	400	516	637	ample
de 129	ΣY Mn	-16	-40	-28	-42	-34	-:41	Subs
Longitude 129° to 140° E	Σx	28	61	29	6-	-33	-74	No. in Subsample = 186
1	_							
								6
。 田	Md	120.	173	232	322	417	520	# 16
< 129	Mn	126	194	251	348	449	562	ample
Longitude < 129° E	Σх	9-	-16	-19	09-	-40	-49	Subs
Long	ΣΧ	25	45	50	24	3	-	No. in Subsample = 169
		12 h	24 h	36 h	48 h	ч 09	72 h	

. Table 10

Mean (Mn), median (Md), and systematic errors (km) for CLIPER forecasts stratified by longitude.

凹	Md	108	212	324	446	581	705	=187
Longitude ≥ 140° E	Mn	124	242	385	522	629	794	No. in Subsample =187
itude	ΣY	35	80	121	160	861	222	Subsa
Long	ΣΧ	15					175 2	in
	Σ	-1	43	88	127	147	17	Š
								9
140° E	Md	79	158	262	353	452	552	= 18
9° to	Mn	98	191	297	408	523	650	sample
nde 12	\(\Sigma\) Mu	10	27	49	99	73	65	Sub
Longitude 129° to 140° E	ΣΧ	8-	-10	∞-	89	-18	-39	No. in Subsample = 186
) , E	Md	84	152	246	362	465	579	in Subsample = 169
Longitude < 129° E	Mn	96	183	302	441	593	746	ample
ngitude	ΣΧ	19	32	45	09	71	73	Subs
Loi	ΣX	-26	-28	-11	-1	11	28	No.
		12 h	24 h	36 h	48 h	4 09	72 h	

(76.9 and 67.4) than those in the middle and eastern areas. This offsetting effect degrades the overall performance of the NTCM. Research is required to improve the NTCM so that it has low M scores in both components.

The eastern area has the next lowest CT M scores, which decrease from 74.8 to 61.5 to 54.5 at 24, 48 and 72 h. The 72-h value is even slightly lower than the corresponding western area CT M score. The highest CT M scores are found in the middle area (77.4, 67.1 and 74.7 at 24, 48 and 72 h). The CT performance for this longitude band is less skillful than CLIPER (M = 66.7) at all forecast periods.

Except for the very poor AT performance in the western area mentioned above, the AT M scores do not show major variations between longitude bands. The AT M scores at all three time periods for the middle and eastern areas are similar to the those of the total NTCM sample (Table 3).

The systematic error measures of the NTCM (Table 9) also show no major departures from those of the overall sample statistics in Table 3. The ΣX and ΣY for all three subsamples are generally less than 70 km. In the eastern area the NTCM has small and nearly constant eastward zonal ($\Sigma X \approx 50$ km) and northward meridional ($\Sigma Y \approx 50$ km) errors throughout the forecast period. In the middle area, the errors are fairly constant throughout the forecast period with a slight southward meridional displacement ($\Sigma Y \approx -30$ km) and a monotonic variation from an eastward ($\Sigma X = 58$ km) to a westward zonal displacement ($\Sigma X = -74$ km). For a westward-moving storm, this may be interpreted as the NTCM track starting out "slow" or east of the best track and "passing" or moving west of the best-track longitude over the 72-h time period. Very small variations of the systematic errors with forecast period (< 50 km) are observed in the western area. This is consistent with the earlier finding that the CT/AT M scores are generally lower and indicates again that the NTCM is highly skillful in the western area.

The mean and median forecast errors (Table 9) are also consistent with the CT/AT and systematic error statistics. That is, the smallest mean and median forecast errors for all forecast periods are found in the western area and the highest are in the eastern area. Although the NTCM is nearly as skillful as the CLIPER at 24 h in the eastern area, the CLIPER generally outperforms the NTCM at 12 and 24 h. In addition, the CLIPER forecast errors are almost as low or lower than the NTCM at all forecast periods in the middle area. The NTCM outperforms CLIPER by about 40 to 100 km (both mean and median errors) at 36 through 72 h in the western and eastern areas. In the western area, the 48- and 72-h NTCM median forecast errors are 93 and 184 km lower than those of the CLIPER.

In summary, the NTCM performs better in terms of all of the error statistics for storms with initial longitudes west of 129° E. One explanation may be that the western area storms are closer to the relatively data-rich continental areas (Fig. 6) compared to the data-sparse eastern regions. Thus, the initial wind fields in the NTCM are more likely to be representative of the true wind fields. The frequency of storm fix positions also increases in this area because of the proximity to land-based radar and synoptic data, which provides a better initial position for the NTCM.

D. INTENSITY EFFECTS

As indicated in Fig. 1c, the sample of NTCM forecasts is divided into storms with initial intensity < 50 kt, between 50 and 75 kt and $\ge 80 \text{ kt}$. These groups will be referred to as the weak, moderate and intense subsamples, respectively. Recall that the initial intensity of the bogus storm in the NTCM is always 60 kt, which is near the mean of the moderate subsample.

The M scores for both CT and AT errors are relatively low for the moderate subsample (Table 11). In fact, the M scores for both CT and AT at every forecast period (24, 48 and 72 h) are considerably smaller for the moderate subsample than those for the other two

TABLE 11

Cross-track and along-track percent class errors and M scores for NTCM forecasts stratified by intensity.

	Inten	Intensity ≤ 45 knots	45 kno	st	Intens	sity 50	Intensity 50 to 75 knots	knots	Inte	Intensity ≥ 80 knots	2 80 km	ots
	0%	%1	%2	Σ	%0 %1		%2	Σ	0%	1%1	%2	Σ
CT	40.7		41.7 17.6	76.9	48.9	41.8	8.3	58.4	41.0	49.4	9.6	9.89
24 h AT		39.6 37.3 23.1	23.1	83.5	49.5	38.4	12.1	62.6	43.8	46.1	10.1	66.3
CT	46.7	40.1 13.2	13.2	66.5	61.0	61.0 33.0	6.0	45.0	47.2	43.2	9.6	62.4
48 h AT	44.0	44.0 41.2	14.8	70.8	58.8	31.9	9.3	50.5	45.5	45.5	9.0	63.5
CT	48.9	40.1	11.0	62.1	56.6	56.6 36.8	9.9	50.0	41.0	42.1	16.9	75.9
72 h AT	AT 50.5 35.7 13.8	35.7	13.8	63.3	56.6	33.0	56.6 33.0 10.4 53.8	53.8	51.1	40.5	8.4	57.3
	Š.	in Sub	sample	No. in Subsample = 182	No. in	Subs	ample	No. in Subsample = 182	No. ir	Subs	ample	No. in Subsample = 178

TABLE 12

Mean (Mn), median (Md), and systematic errors (km) for NTCM forecasts stratified by intensity.

					—			00
oots	PW	100	162	234	323	417	558	= 178
2 80 kr	Mn	112	187	261	356	477	614	ample
Intensity ≥ 80 knots	2x	8-	% -	9	13	55	41	Subs
Inte	Σx	16	-3	-20	-73	-105	-150	No. in Subsample = 178
nots	Md	120	194	772	356	448	557	No. in Subsample = 182
Intensity 50 to 75 knots	Mn	125	213	282	374	480	592	ample
ity 50	ΣΧ	1	-2	6-	-44	-37	-32	Subs
Intens	ΣΧ	50	73	61	54	44	43	No. in
ots	Md	158	240	289	369	491	591	= 182
45 km	Mn	173	275	358	461	566	671	ample
Intensity ≤ 45 knots	ΣΥ	13	4	15	-18	-25	-37	n Subs
Inte	Σx	73	108	94	69	84	82	No. in Subsample = 182
		12 h	24 h	36 h	48 h	4 O9	72 h	

TABLE 13

Mean (Mn), median (Md), and systematic errors (km) for CLIPER forecasts stratified by intensity.

Intensity ≤ 45 knots Ir 12 h -15 21 134 111 24 h -15 48 234 210 36 h -9 60 346 291	SY Mn Md 21 134 111 48 234 210 60 346 291				Intens 7 7 7 71 71	23 23 38 55 55 55	Intensity 50 to 75 knots ΣΧ ΣΥ Mn Md 7 23 103 84 31 38 215 166 71 55 361 281	Md 84 166 281	Inte ΣX -10 -9	ΣΥ 20 54 54 103	Intensity ≥ 80 knots EX ΣΥ Mn M 10 20 81 7 -9 54 168 15 5 103 279 25	Md 73 155 254
48 h	-9	89	461	389	107	71	517	389	24	152	393	350
60 h	-31	76	574	483	134	84	089	534	40	187	520	455
72 h	-34	83	694	575	157	89	835	652	44	194	999	552
	No. in Subsample = 182	n Subs	ample	= 182	No.	Subs	ample	No. in Subsample = 182	No. in	Subs	No. in Subsample = 178	= 178

subsamples. Nearly all of the M scores in the moderate subsample are at least ten points better than the M scores from the total sample (Table 3). An exception is the 72-h AT M score, which is 53.8 for the moderate subsample and 58.1 for the total sample. The M scores of the weak subsample are generally the highest of the three subsamples. A possible explanation is that the deep tropospheric bogus storm in the NTCM is not a good representation of these weak storms. The M scores for the intense subsample are closer to the total sample scores (Table 3), but higher than the 48- and 72-h CT cases.

16060605 versional residences recorded bibliotes (record

The contingency tables for intensity stratifications (Tables A-13 to A-18) provide further explanation of the M scores. Notice that for all three forecast periods, the NTCM CT errors are biased to the right of the best track for the weak group, are fairly evenly distributed about the best track for the moderate subsample, and are typically to the left of the best track for the intense subsample. These results suggest that the NTCM may predict recurvature too quickly for the less intense storms and may be slow in recurving storms with intensity ≥ 80 kt. The 60-kt bogus storm may result in excessive poleward deflecting of the weak storms that are expected to be traveling from east to west. By contrast, the poleward deflection may be underestimated by the bogus storm in the NTCM when the storm is actually more intense. This is especially true for right-moving storms (relative to CLIPER) at 72 h, when the NTCM tends to forecast a left-moving path (two-class error) in 49.6% of the cases.

The AT M scores (Table 11) are also lower for the moderate subsample, although at 72 h, they are not much lower than that of the intense subsample (53.8 versus 57.3, respectively). The high percentage of two-class errors in the fast category of the 24-, 48- and 72-h AT contingency tables (Tables A-16, A-17 and A-18) indicate a slow bias in each subsample. For the weak subsample, a high percentage of two-class errors occurs at all the three forecast intervals, especially at 24 h (50%). Although this slow bias is less prevalent in the intense subsample, the AT M scores are higher than those of the moderate group at

each time interval. The lower M scores in the moderate subsample are due to the lower number of one-class errors, even though at 72 h there is a high percentage (31.1%) of two-class errors in which the NTCM is slower than the best track (Table A-18).

The systematic errors for the NTCM (Table 12) indicate that there is little or no systematic growth in longitudinal (ΣX) errors in the moderate and weak subsamples. The NTCM position in both cases is east (73 km and 50 km for the weak and moderate subsamples, respectively) of the average best-track position at 12 h and remains almost constant with increasing time. However, a large systematic growth in longitudinal error occurs in the intense subsample. The zonal error (ΣX) increases from 16 to -150 km monotonically with time, which indicates that the average NTCM position becomes farther west of the best track with increasing forecast period for those intense storms. Only a small meridional error (ΣY) is found for the different storm intensities. The 72-h NTCM forecasts are slightly to the south of the best track for the weak and moderate subsamples and slightly to the north in the moderate subsample.

Forecast errors of the NTCM in the moderate subsample are much smaller than those of CLIPER beyond 12 h (Tables 12 and 13). The NTCM mean and median forecast errors in the intense subsample are about the same as in the moderate subsample, even though the CT and AT results seem to indicate much lower directional and speed errors for the moderate subsample. A possible explanation for this result is that the accuracy of the initial position from fixes by any platform (aircraft, satellite or radar) is much greater for cyclones that have developed an eye (or at least a well-defined circulation center). Since initial position errors are propagated along the forecast track, the NTCM mean and median forecast errors for the intense subsample should be smaller than those of the weak or moderate subsamples by virtue of better initial position inputs. The CLIPER (which should be unbiased with respect to storm-related parameters) mean and median forecast errors also decrease markedly from weak to intense subsamples (Table 13), which

supports this argument. In addition, the CT and AT M scores indicate that the NTCM predicts the storm direction and speed much more accurately for moderate storms than for either weak or intense storms. Finally, the weak subsample has much larger mean and median forecast errors (as well as higher CT and AT M scores) than the other subsamples throughout the entire forecast period. Thus, the 60-kt specification of the NTCM storm bogus may be inappropriate for weak storms.

E. PAST 12-HOUR INTENSITY CHANGE EFFECTS

The three subsamples of NTCM forecasts are classified as weakening (past 12-h intensity change, or " Δ intensity" ≤ 0 kt), intensifying (Δ intensity 5 and 10 kt) and rapidly intensifying (Δ intensity ≥ 15 kt). As indicated earlier, the number of forecasts (Table 14) is not equally distributed among the three categories due to the small range of possible Δ -intensity values.

The NTCM CT M scores are the lowest for the rapidly intensifying storms (Table 14) at all forecast periods, although the intensifying storms had CT M scores almost as low at 72 h. The AT M scores for the rapid intensifiers were much lower (more than 10 points at all three forecast periods) than those of the weakening storms. These results indicate that the NTCM forecasts direction and speed more accurately for storms that are intensifying (slowly or rapidly) than for weakening storms.

The NTCM mean and median forecast errors (Table 15) follow the same pattern as the CT and AT M scores. That is, the errors for the rapidly intensifying storms are much smaller than those of the weakening storms (more than 100 km smaller mean and median errors at 72 h). The trend of decreasing mean and median forecast errors from weakening to intensifying to rapidly intensifying subsamples holds for all forecast periods except between 12 and 36 h. For these periods, the median forecast errors increase slightly for the intensifying storms, and then decrease for the rapid intensifiers (Table 15).

TABLE 14

Cross-track and along-track percent class errors and M scores for NTCM forecasts stratified by past 12-h intensity change.

	ΔIr	Δ Intensity \leq 0 knots	y ≤ 0 k	nots	Δ Inte	Δ Intensity 5 to 10 knots	to 10	knots	∆ Int	ensity	Δ Intensity \geq 15 knots	nots
	0%	%1	%2	M	%0 %1		%2	Σ	0%	%1	%2	Z
5	46.3	46.3 41.6 12.1	12.1	65.8	42.0		42.0 16.0	74.0	43.4	51.5	5.1	61.7
24 h AT		39.5 40.5	20.0	80.5	49.1	37.3	13.6 64.5	64.5	42.4	46.5	11.1	68.7
ָל	50.5	39.5	10.0	59.5	51.5	38.5	38.5 10.0	58.5	55.6	37.4	7.1	51.6
48 h AT	44.7	40.0	15.3	70.6	52.7	37.3	10.0 57.3	57.3	53.5	40.4	6.1	52.6
ָל	44.2	44.2 42.1 13.7	13.7	69.5	53.3	34.9	34.9 11.8	58.5	55.6	35.3	9.1	53.5
72 h AT	48.4	36.3	15.3	6.99	54.4	37.9	7.7	53.3	9.99	56.6 35.3	8.1	51.5
	No.	Subs	ample	No. in Subsample = 190	No.	Subs	ample	No. in Subsample = 169	No.	n Sub	No. in Subsample = 99	66 =

TABLE 15

Mean (Mn), median (Md), and systematic errors (km) for NTCM forecasts stratified by past 12-h intensity change.

	∆ In	tensity	Δ Intensity ≤ 0 knots	nots	Δ Intensity 5 to 10 knots	sity 5	to 10 k	nots	∆ Int	ensity	Δ Intensity ≥ 15 knots	cnots
X		27	Mn	Md	ΣΧ	ΣΥ	Mn	М	Σχ	ΣX	Mn	Md
34	l	4	138	121	43	3	146	130	61	9-	114	106
53		∞	239	202	46	-3	225	193	92	-13	195	183
65		14	313	266	21	0	303	277	62	-7	267	239
24	4	4	413 357	357	3	-22	396	348	48	-20	348	326
-	19	11	535	510	-34	8	503	439	38	-3	448	379
<u> </u>	7	6-	662	633	-54	17	17 613	537	34	2	553	489
ģ] .5	Subs	No. in Subsample = 190] 81 82	No. in Subsample = 169	Subs	ample	= 169	No.	n Sut	sampl	No. in Subsample = 99

TABLE 16

Mean (Mn), median (Md), and systematic errors (km) for CLIPER forecasts stratified by past 12-h intensity change.

ā —	Mn Md	89 70	187 144	309 266	425 349	557 473	695 616	No. in Subsample = 99
1 7.1.3	7 7 7 7 7	17	36 1	62 3	87	115	135 (Subsar
	X	∞-	-12	-7	4	14	29	No. in
	Md	97	182	281	396	508	595	= 169
	Μ'n	118	217	337	469	605	735	ample
t the second	7	23	48	74	100	129	142	Subs
	X	∞-	-5	7	24	25	28	No. in Subsample = 169
	Md	83	162	249	363	480	909	= 19
	Ψu	96	199	334	474	622	782	sample
	ΣΧ ΣΥ	25	99	06	611	133	135	in Subsample = 190
	X	0	29	77	119	144		No.
_		12 h	24 h	36 h	48 h	ч 09	72 h 168	

The meridional (ΣY) errors (Table 15) for all three categories had small values, which indicates that no north-south systematic errors exist in the three subsamples. As the zonal (ΣX) errors for the intensifying storms decrease nearly linearly from 24 h (46 km) to 72 h (-54 km), the NTCM position is initially east of the best-track longitude ("slow" for east to west-moving storms), and becomes west of the best track by 72 h. This may be a function of the initial slow bias of the NTCM, which would cause the point of recurvature to be forecast too late (Sandgathe, 1985). By contrast, the rapidly intensifying storms have a small and nearly constant (from 61 to 34 km) zonal bias. In this case, the initial slow bias in the NTCM forecasts is carried throughout the forecast period. A statistical scheme to remove the initial slow bias of the NTCM should result in a reduction in errors.

THE PROPERTY AND ASSAULT TO THE PROPERTY AND ASSAULT

The CLIPER mean, and especially the median forecast errors (Table 16) have smaller differences among the three categories. For example, the median forecast errors at 72 h are 605, 595 and 616 km for the weakening, intensifying and rapidly intensifying storms. The relatively small differences in forecast errors between categories is seen at the 12-through 60-h forecast periods as well. In addition, the mean and median forecast errors for each category are within 35 km of the total error statistics (Table 4) at every time period except 72 h, when the mean forecast error for the weakening category is 52 km larger than the total sample mean. This result indicates that the CLIPER forecasts are not affected by changes in the past 12-h intensity trend.

Compared to the CLIPER errors, the NTCM error statistics all indicate that the NTCM has much more skill at the 36- to 72-h periods for both intensifying and rapidly intensifying categories. For example, the NTCM median and mean forecast errors at 72 h are 142 and 127 km lower than the CLIPER in the rapidly intensifying category. On the other hand, the median 72-h forecast error for the NTCM is 28 km higher than the CLIPER for the weakening category. Since the NTCM mean forecast error at 72 h for weakening storms is 120 km smaller than the CLIPER error, the NTCM evidently has

fewer very large errors in its forecasts compared to CLIPER, which has a slightly lower median forecast error at 72 h.

In summary, each of the error measures suggests that the NTCM is much more skillful in forecasting intensifying storms (both slow and rapid) than weakening storms. The marked difference between rapid intensifiers and weakening storms in both CT/AT M scores and mean/median forecast errors suggest that the performance of the NTCM is significantly affected by the past 12-h intensity trend as well as the initial intensity.

F. SIZE EFFECTS

The sample of NTCM forecasts is divided by the initial size (radius of 30-kt winds) into categories of "small" (size ≤ 100 n.mi), "medium" (size 105 to 205 n.mi) and "large" (size ≥ 210 n.mi). Although the AT M scores (Table 17) do not vary much between categories, they are the lowest in the large category. In fact, these scores among the three categories vary by only four points at 72 h and 10 points at the 48 h. This suggests that the initial size parameter has a diminishing effect with time on the speed forecast (AT component) of the NTCM.

The lowest CT M scores for the NTCM are found in the small category, where the 72-h M score is more than 10 points lower than either the medium or large categories (Table 17). Notice that the largest percentages of two-class CT errors at the 48 and 72 h time periods occur in the large subsample. Inspection of the 48- and 72-h CT contingency tables (Tables A-26 and A-27) reveals that a very large number of one- and two-class errors are located in the lower left bins of the large (size > 210 n.mi) subsample. A majority of the forecasts in the lower left bin of the contingency table indicates that the NTCM forecast track falls far to the left of the best track more frequently than it does to the right of the track (68 left versus 28 right at 48 h, and 71 left versus 24 right at 72 h). Therefore, the larger the storm, the more often the NTCM forecasts the track to be to the

TABLE 17

Cross-track and along-track percent class errors and M scores for NTCM forecasts stratified by size (radius of 30-kt winds in n. mi).

	Sï	ze ≤ 10	Size ≤ 105 n. mi	•==	Size	110 to	Size 110 to 205 n. mi	, m.	S	ze ≥ 2]	Size ≥ 210 n. mi	· =
	0%	%1	2%	X	0%	%1	%2	M	0%	1%	%2	M
CT		46.2 39.3	14.5	68.3	40.9	48.6	10.5	9.69	43.4	46.3	10.3	6.99
24 h AT	42.5	38.1	19.4	76.9	43.1		42.0 14.9	71.8	47.4	41.7	10.9	63.5
CT	54.8	37.1	∞ —	53.3	54.7	35.4	6.6	55.2	45.1	44.0	10.9	65.8
48 h AT	47.8	36.6	15.6	67.8	50.8	39.8	9.4	58.6	49.7	42.3	8.0	58.3
CT	J	54.8 36.6	8.6	53.8	46.4	41.4	12.2	65.8	45.1	41.2	13.7	68.6
72 h AT	AT 53.8 32.8	32.8	13.4	59.6	50.8	39.3	6.6	59.1	53.7	37.2	9.1	55.4
	No.	n Sub	sample	No. in Subsample = 186	No.	n Sub	sample	No. in Subsample = 181	No.	Subs	No. in Subsample = 17.	= 17.

TABLE 18

aspendent continued property is aspected by

Mean (Mn), median (Md), and systematic errors (km) for NTCM forecasts stratified by size (radius of 30-kt winds in n. mi).

	╗		162	[2	33	9	498	175
Ξ	PW	107		232	323	406	46	Н
10 n.	Mn	119	188	260	351	468	597	ample
Size ≥ 210 n. mi	ΣX	φ,	6-	-2	4	26	2	No. in Subsample = 175
S	Σx	24	9	7-	-59	-85	-121	No. in
. mi	Md	117	198	273	353	457	575	= 181
205 n	Mn	132	225	300	397	512	618	No. in Subsample = 181
Size 110 to 205 n. mi	ΣY	5	-3	2	-17	4	13	Subs
	ΣΧ	49	64	4	34	25	18	No.
· :	Md	147	239	291	368	496	582	= 186
Size ≤ 105 n. mi	Mn	159	260	340	441	541	199	ample
ze ≤ 1(ΣΥ	8	9	12	-27	-37	-41	Subs
Si	Σx	59	106	96	72	81	22	No. in Subsample = 186
		12 h	24 h	36 h	48 h	4 09	72 h	

TABLE 19

anders sociated sociation specialist indicated

Mean (Mn), medan (Md), and systematic errors (km) for CLIPER forecasts stratified by size (radius of 30-kt winds in n. mi).

•					1		1	5
n.	Md	77	154	238	334	411	480	= 17
Size ≥ 210 n. mi	Mn	91	179	283	380	484	592	No. in Subsample = 175
ize≥2	ΣΥ	18	44	83	119	138	123	Subs
S	ΣΧ	9-	-2	15	34	45	38	do. in
ı. mi	Md	84	168	280	389	523	673	No. in Subsample = 181
э 205 п	Mn	86	198	331	478	634	792	ample
Size 110 to 205 n. mi	ΣΥ	21	43	67	88	103	115	Subs
Size	ΣΧ	-15	-23	-22	-21	-32	-28	No.
••								
zi	Md	102	215	293	414	525	644	= 186
05 n. n	Mn	130	240	370	510	652	799	ample
Size ≤ 105 n. mi	ΣY	25	53	89	83	105	126	n Subs
Si	ΣX	4	32	72	108	128	154	No. in Subsample = 186
		12 h	24 h	36 h	48 h	4 09	72 h	

left of the best track. A possible explanation of this bias to the left of the best track is that the NTCM tends to forecast straight tracks for large (probably recurving) storms. As a westward-moving storm begins to turn to the northwest, a straight forecast would produce large negative (left) CT components. In addition, a forecast that recurves the storm too late will also produce negative CT components. This was observed in the case of Typhoon Abby during 1983, which began to recurve around the western periphery of the subtropical ridge soon after it formed. Although the NTCM (as well as the other objective aids) continually forecast Abby to move west-northwest, this storm produced some of the largest forecast errors in this data set and many of the left of track one- and two-class CT errors in the large category (Tables A-25 through A-27).

であっているとは国際のではなる。まで、これのもの自己というなどを対し

The mean and median forecast errors of the NTCM (Table 18) seem to contradict the above findings. That is, the mean and median forecast errors are largest for the small category and decrease from the small to large categories (this applies to CLIPER as well). However, the mean and median forecast errors do not vary much among the three categories (90 km or less at all time periods) compared to the differences found between categories of the other storm-related parameters. The lower forecast errors for the large category may be due to more accurate initial positions and working-best-tracks for the large storms. This reasoning assumes that the fix accuracy for very large (or intense) tropical cyclones is higher than for small systems due to better-defined central features. While there are cases of intense storms that have very small radii of 30-kt winds, it is generally held that the size of tropical cyclones generally increases with intensity. Thus, smaller errors in initial position result in smaller errors propagated along the forecast track. In addition, the frequency of fixes is higher for very large or intense storms because the JTWC places higher priority on tasking satellite coverage and aircraft reconnaissance for such potentially destructive systems. Because of resource limitations less threatening storms often receive less coverage in terms of fix data during multiple-storm situations.

Only the zonal (ΣX) errors in the large category (Table 18) show a systematic change with forecast period from 24 km east of the best track to 121 km west of best track. As described above, this increase in the zonal error is interpreted as a NTCM forecast track continuing westward while the storm is tending to recurve to the north. The zonal errors for the small and medium sizes tend to be large from the initial time and do not systematically grow, which suggests difficulties with initializing the NTCM. The meridional (ΣY) errors for the small storms (Table 18) have a very small systematic trend from north (8 km) to south (-41 km) of the best track position, but no systematic change for the medium and large storms.

The CLIPER mean and median forecast errors (Table 19) also indicate distinctly smaller forecast errors for the large category. The mean and median CLIPER errors at 72 h for the large storms are 200 and 164 km smaller than those for the medium storms. This sensitivity of the CLIPER to the size parameter may also be traced in part to smaller initial positioning errors. Notice that the NTCM forecast errors at 72 h are slightly larger than the CLIPER errors for the large category. By contrast, the NTCM mean and median forecast errors at 72 h for the small and medium categories are smaller than the CLIPER errors by at least 98 km (Tables 18 and 19) at all forecast intervals. This suggests that the NTCM shows a higher skill level for small and medium storms than for large storms relative to CLIPER, even though the actual error magnitudes are smaller for the large storms.

In summary, the CT M scores and contingency tables indicate that the NTCM forecast tracks for large storms are left of the best track much more often than they are to the right. In addition, the NTCM has slightly higher forecast errors at 72 h for large storms than the CLIPER, which indicates that the NTCM has little skill in this category. Although the forecast errors are slightly larger for the small and medium storms, they are much smaller than the CLIPER errors, which indicates a higher level of skill. In addition, there is a large

systematic decrease in the zonal (ΣX) component for large storms, so that the NTCM forecast becomes farther west of the best track with forecast period.

It should be noted that the radius of 30-kt winds may not be an accurate representation of the size. The infrequency of wind field measurements make this storm-related parameter the most subjective of the five. In many cases, aircraft peripheral data or synoptic data from ships or islands close to the storm are not available, and the TDO must extrapolate the size from the most recent data available, or estimate the size from satellite imagery. An objective method for determining storm size would be desirable to facilitate the use of such data in future studies.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Various error statistics for evaluating the effects of storm-related parameters on the NTCM are applied to a sample of 542 NTCM forecasts during 1981-1983. A new technique for computing the cross-track (CT) and along-track (AT) error components relative to CLIPER forecast positions is found to be very effective for evaluating the errors in a storm-oriented frame of reference. The best-track CT components at each forecast period are distributed normally about the respective extrapolated CLIPER tracks. The NTCM CT and AT errors are related to true storm movement (left or right, and slow or fast) by comparison in contingency tables with the verifying best-track positions. An M score is used to distill the information from each contingency table into a single penalty score. The mean and median forecast errors and the systematic errors are also calculated. The statistics of the total sample (1981 through 1983) for the western North Pacific indicate a slow bias in the NTCM forecasts, especially at the early (12 to 36 h) forecast periods.

The NTCM forecasts are evaluated within terciles for five initial storm-related parameters (latitude, longitude, intensity, intensity trend and size). For storms with initial latitudes south of 13° N, the NTCM predicts the direction and speed of storms much better than for storms north of 13° N. The forecast errors are lower for the southern storms as well. By contrast, the NTCM performs relatively poorly at 72 h for storms with initial latitudes north of 17° N. The CT errors for the northern storms were especially large at 48 and 72 h. The systematic errors and contingency tables indicate that the NTCM has a large westward and left-of-track bias, which suggests that the NTCM is slow in forecasting recurvature for storms in the northern area. The NTCM performs better for storms with initial longitudes west of 129° E. Low CT M scores (only 43.8 at 48 h) and forecast errors

for the NTCM in this region are thought to be a function of the data availability of the western area relative to the areas farther east.

NTCM forecasts of storms with initial intensities between 50 and 75 kt (moderate category) are found to have much better CT/AT performance characteristics than weak or intense categories of storms. The CT contingency tables indicate the NTCM has no bias left or right of the best track in the moderate category, whereas the weak storms are more often forecast to the right of best track and intense storms to the left. In agreement with the CT/AT statistics, the forecast errors for the moderate category are also relatively small. The results support the expectation that the NTCM would perform better on storms with initial intensities more closely resembling that of the fixed-intensity bogus storm. It is therefore recommended that a variable intensity storm bogus to agree with the actual intensity be evaluated as an upgrade to the NTCM. The NTCM has lower CT and AT M scores, and lower forecast errors, for intensifying storms than for weakening storms. An initial slow bias in the NTCM forecasts tends to be carried throughout the forecast period for storms in the rapidly intensifying category.

a section of the course of the

COLUMN COLONIA NOSSIBATE REPORTER CO

The radius of 30-kt winds from the JTWC warnings, which is used as a measure of storm size, is a relatively subjective measure because no objective technique exists for estimating the radius in the absence of peripheral data. The NTCM forecasts for very large storms are to the left of the best track much more often than to the right. A large systematic decrease with increasing forecast period of the zonal (ΣX) error component also suggests that the NTCM does not show a high degree of skill in forecasting the recurvature of large systems. The NTCM shows no improvement in the mean and median forecasts errors relative to the CLIPER for the large category, despite having slightly lower errors than the small and medium categories.

These results provide the Typhoon Duty Officer valuable information about the NTCM performance with respect to various storm-related parameters. It is recommend that similar studies be conducted to provide the same information about the One-way Tropical Cyclone Model (OTCM) and other dynamic forecast aids. These results should also be used to construct of a decision tree that will provide the TDO with a real-time evaluation of each forecast aid. Such a tool might contribute to reductions in track forecast errors of these destructive cyclones.

THE PERSON OF TH

APPENDIX:

CROSS-TRACK (CT) AND ALONG-TRACK (AT) CONTINGENCY TABLES

AND

PERCENTAGE OF ONE-, TWO- AND THREE-CLASS ERROR TABLES

Each table in the appendix contains three columns which correspond to different values of a storm-related parameter. Each column contains a three-by-three contingency table of CT or AT errors on the top row and a table of the percentage of one-, two- and three-class errors on the bottom row. The contingency tables can be likened to a box with nine bins which contain the CT or AT error components of the NTCM forecasts compared with the best track positions. The forecasts and best-track positions are first referenced to a CLIPER track (either left, right, center or slow, fast, center) and then compared to each other in the contingency table. If, for example, an NTCM forecast is left of the CLIPER track and the best track is also left, the number of cases in the upper left bin of the CT contingency table is increased by one. This bin represents a number of zero-class errors, as do the other bins on the upper-left to lower-right diagonal. The upper-right and lower-left bins represent the number of two-class errors, and the remaining bins the one-class errors. The percentage of the class errors (with respect to the subsample in that column) are tabulated below the contingency tables. They show the percentage of CT (AT) class errors that occur left (slow), center, or right (fast) of the best track as well as the total percentage of class errors for the subsample.

The tables are organized in the following order:

- I. Storm-related parameter
 - A. Cross-track error components
 - 1. 24-h NTCM forecasts
 - 2. 48-h NTCM forecasts
 - 3. 72-h NTCM forecasts
 - B. Along-track error components
 - 1. 24-h NTCM forecasts
 - 2. 48-h NTCM forecasts
 - 3. 72-h NTCM forecasts

TABLE A-1 Cross-track contingencies, percent class errors, and M scores for 24-h NTCM forecasts stratified by latitude

execution bedesigns, especially properties eccessist besome

		als		<u> </u>		74						
7		Totals	47	99	69	ı	182					_
, 17° N	_	~	5	15	30	50	le = %2	10.6	-	21.7	11.0	70.3
ıde 2	NTCM	C	21	23	24	89	Subsamp %1	44.7	65.2	34.8	48.3	Score =
Latitude		Г	21	28	15	64	Number in Subsample	44.7	34.9	43.5	40.7	M S
			7	C		Totals 64	Ž	7	C	×	Totals	
z		Totals	63	53	61	75	7					
0 17*		R	16	19	30	65	e = 177 %2	25.4	-	11.5	13.0	70.6
13° t	NTCM	C	26	24	24	74	ubsampl %1	41.3	54.7	39.3	44.6	M Score =
	***	7	21	01	7	38	Number in Subsample %0 %1	33.3	45.3	49.2	42.4	M S
			Γ	Ö	~	Totals	Nun	L	Ç	~	Totals	
		Totals	29	09	26	87	e tea <u>e</u> e distribuir e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	<u> </u>	essana <u>e</u> din novembro	50.4.2. • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	00.00	
ude < 13° N	NTCM	R	14	19	23	56	. = 183 %2	20.9	:	12.5	11.5	64.0
ode <	NTCM	၁	19	30	26	7.5	ubsample % 1	28.4	50.0	46.4	41.0	ore =
Latitu		1	34	11	7	52	Number in Subsample	50.8	50.0	41.1	47.5	M Sc
		·	1	ပ	~	Totals	Z E	J	ပ	æ	Totals	<u> </u>
-			Bes	t Tra	ck			В	est T	rack		

(Best Track relative to CLIPER) R > 50 kmC = -75 to 50 km; L < -75 km;Cut Points:

responded to the control of the cont

			als	~ .		~	6		· NOCOCIO · NOCOCIO	and the same the same	en e	*************	********	
			Totals	53	57	72	- 62	15 =		1	9	0	9	_
	S.		~	3	6	28	40	le = 1 %2	5.7	-	23.6	11.0	67.6	IPER
	Latitude ≥ 17° N	NTCM	၁	18	19	27	49	Subsamp %1	34.0	66.7	37.5	45.6	M Score =	e to CL
	Latitu		ı	32	29	17	78	Number in Subsample = 182 %0 %1 %2	60.4	33.3	38.9	43.4	M S	relative
				٦	၁	~	Totals	Ž	L	C	æ	Totals		(Best Track relative to CLIPER)
× ×	7		Totals	65	67	45	95	7						
Same as A-1, except for 48 h	Latitude 13° to 17° N		R	6	14	25	48	Number in Subsample = 177 %0 %1 %2	13.9	-	15.6	0.6	55.3	R > 125 km
-I, exce	e 13° t	NTCM	၁	27	41	13	18	Subsamp %1	41.5	38.8	28.9	37.3	M Score =	
ne as A	atitud		Г	29	12	7	48	nber in S	44.6	61.2	55.6	53.7	M	C = -125 to 125 km;
Ze.	1			7	ပ	24	Totals 48	in N	٦	D D	R	Totals		C = -12
			Totals	70	52	61	106							L < -125 km;
	3° N		RT	7	∞	20	35	: = 183 %2	10.0		14.8	8.8	50.8	L
	ude < 13° N	NTCM	င	11	34	32	11	Subsample %1	15.7	34.6	52.5	33.3	Score =	Cut Points:
	Latitu		Г	52	01	6	17	Number in S %0	74.3	65.4	32.8	57.9	M S	Cut
	_		•	-1	၁	~	Totals	un N	1	ວ	~	Totals		
	700	on market of the second	<u> </u>	Bes	t Trac	ck	**********	and a state of the	Ве	st Ti	ack	and the second second	000/00000000000000000000000000000000000	

(Best Track relative to CLIPER) R > 125 km C = -125 to 125 km; L < -125 km;

TABLE A-3 Same as A-1, except for 72-h.

THE PROPERTY OF THE CASE

		S	tata atau a mining atau atau atau atau atau atau	e ete ete ete atetakane kanada k	and the second second						100.00 e	Maria de Caración de la composición del composición de la composic	
		Totals	4	62	9/	72	= 182	_			<u> </u>		_
Z°N	Į	~	2	7	56	35	nple =	%2	4.6		34.2	15.4	75.8
Latitude ≥ 17° N	NTCM	၁	21	25	24	92	Number in Subsample	%1	47.7	59.7	31.6	45.0	M Score = 75.8
Latit		Г	21	30	26	11	lumber i	0%	47.7	40.3	34.2	39.6	M Sc
17° N Latitude ≥ 17			H	C	æ	Totals 77	Z		L	ິ	R	Totals	
7		Totals	<i>L</i> 9		54	91	77	ſ					7
o 17° l	38	R	12	14	28	54)le = 1	%2	17.9		20.4	13.0	61.6
e 13° te	NTCM	C	20	28	15	63	Subsam	%1	29.9	50.0	27.8	35.6	M Score = 61.6
Latitude 13° to 17° N		L	35	14	11	09	Number in Subsample = 177	0%	52.2	50.0	51.9	51.4	X
		Į.	T	ပ	~	Totals 60	Ž		7	ပ	~	Totals	-
						_		•				ĭ	
		Fotals	69	55	₈₈	102	33					Ţ	••••••
		R Totals	5 69	12 55	24 59	····	le = 183	%2	7.3		10.2	6.0	50.3
ide < 13° N	VTCM	1			 	102	H	%1 %2	24.6 7.3	43.6	49.2 10.2	6.0	ore = 50.3
nde < 13° N		~	5	12	24	65 77 41 102	H				49.2	38.3 6.0	M Score = 50.3
ide < 13° N	VTCM	~	17 5	31 12	29 24	77 41 102		%1	1 24.6	43.6	9.2	6.0	M Score = 50.3

(Best Track relative to CLIPER) R > 200 km C = -200 to 200 km; Cut Points:

TABLE A-4
Same as A-1, except for along-track 24-h.

2000			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	en e	and and analysis and and	and the second		e e de consecutado do de consecutado	an analasa erra	•		ana aya -
		Totals	4	72	46	93	. 82					
N.		F T	2	11	12	25	ple = 1 %2	3.1	å 8 1	23.9	7.1	56.0
Latitude ≥ 17° N	NTCM	ວ	13	32	23	89	Subsam %1	20.3	55.6	50.0	41.8	core =
Latitu		S	49	29	11	Totals 89	Number in Subsample = 182 %0 %1 %2	76.6	44.4	26.1	51.1	M Score = 56.
			S	၁	Ţ,	Total	Z	S	၁	ŢŢ,	Totals	
7		Totals	48	61	89	99		············		*************		
0.17° N		. H	4	4	41	22 6	e · = 17	8.3		42.6	9.81	81.3
Latitude 13° to 17° N	NTCM	၁	12	20	25	57	Number in Subsample = 177 %0 %1 %2	25.0	67.2	36.8	44.1	ore =
atitud	Z	S	32	37	29	86	nber in St %0	2.99	32.8	20.6	37.3	M Score
			. ω	Ö	Į.	Totals 98	Z	S	၁	Ĭ.	Totals	-
		Totals	63	54	99	81	8	***********				one canno serve
itude < 13° N		F	8	10	25	43	Subsample = 183 %1 . %2	12.7		42.4	19.7	= 75.4
itude <	NTCM	၁	16	17	13	46	Subsampl %1	25.4	68.5	19.7	36.0] <u>s</u>
Lati		S	39	27	28	94	Number in \$	61.9	31.5	37.9	44.3	M Sc
			တ	ပ	ᄄ	Totals 94	Ž	S	ဎ	ĸ	Totals	J
17.370	e englese es	***************************************	Bes	t Tra	ck	(n. j. n. p. j. n.	a en en en transportuetario	Be	st Tr	ack	volumentary was	The second second

(Best Track relative to CLIPER) F > 15 km C = -125 to 15 km; S < -125 km; Cut Points:

ore acceptant sources of the sources acceptant to the sources acceptant inducated acceptant increases.

			S					···,"····,•··					and the second	
			Totals	52	92	54	92	82	٢	<u>~</u>	Т			
•	7° N		Ľ.	3	19	24	46		7%	5.8		14.8	0.9	= 55.4
	Latitude ≥ 17° N	NTCM	ပ	14	33	22	69	Subsampl	- - - -	26.9	56.6	40.7	43.4	Score =
	Latitu		S	35	24	8	19	Number in Subsample	0%	67.3	43.4	44.4	9.09	W :
				S	၁	μ,	Totals	Nun		S	ပ	Ţ,	Totals	
8 F.			Totals	56	4	72	79		F			************		······································
ot for 48	17° N		FT	5	∞	32	3	= 177	%2	8.9		31.2	16.4	71.8
Same as A-4, except for 48 h.	Latitude 13° to 17° N	NTCM	C	20	91	21	57	Number in Subsample = 177	1%	35.7	63.6	27.3	39.0	Score =
as A-4	itude	NTCM	S	31	20	24	75	ır in Sul	0%	55.4	36.4	41.6	44.6	M
Same	Lai		İ	S	U O	Ţ,	Totals	Numbe	•	S	ບ	ഥ	Totals	
			د. د	····	***************************************	····	**********	~~~~	200000V	***********	*************			0000000
			Totals	92	l g	53	97	_			 +			
	3° N		F	3	14	23	\$	= 183	%2	4.3	:	32.1	10.9	57.9.
	ude < 13° N	NTCM	C	17	24	13	22	ıbsample	% 1	24.3	60.0	24.5	36.1	Score =
	Latitu	Z	S	50	22	17	68	Number in Subsample	0%	71.4	40.0	43.4	53.0	M Sc
				S	ပ	נגן	Totals	N N		S	၁	Ľ,	Totals	
	*****	***********	*********	Bes	t Tra	ck	*************	e constant	*******	В	est T	rack	Maria de Caracidas	teres on an

F > -25 km C = -275 to -25 km; S < -275 km;

Cut Points:

TABLE A-6 Same as A-4, except for 72 h.

Same as A-4, except for $1/2$ h. Latitude 13° to 17° N Latitude ≥ 17 ° N		NTCM	stals S C F Totals S C F Totals	80 S 36 22 4 62 S 19 19 3 41	61 C 10 29 7 46 C 18 35 17 70	42 F 20 20 29 69 F 14 18 39 71	99 Totals 66 71 40 94 Totals 51 72 59 93	Number in Subsample = 177 Number in Subsample = 182	%0 %1 %2 %0 %1 %2	S 58.1 35.5 6.5 S 46.3 46.3 7.3	C 63.0 37.0 C 50.0 50.0	F 42.0 29.0 F 54.9 25.4 19.7	Totals 53.1 33.3 13.6 Totals 51.1 39.6 9.3	M Score = 60 5 M Score = 58.2
2 2 2 °						<u> </u>	ī	177	62	6.5	-	0.	9.	ا ا
cept fc		7			, ,	29	4		}.					11
۸-4, ex ام 13°		NTC	ن	22	29	20	71	Subsam	1				-	Score
ne as A	Adulta		S	36	10	20	99	nber in	88				53.1	Z
				Š	Ö	Ţ,	Totals	Z		S)	Ľ	Totals	
	&x.@xx	******	Totals	08	61	42	66		ologo o o o o			······································		
nde / 13° N	N CI		- -	9	21	20	47	le = 183	%2	7.5		28.6	8.6	55.7
itude /	\ appli	NTCM	ပ	18	23	10	51	Number in Subsample	%1	22.5	62.3	23.8	36.1	M Score =
Latit	Late		S	56	17	12	85	mber in !	0%	70.0	37.7	47.6	54.1	Σ
			•	S	၁	11.	Totals	N		S	ပ	Ľ.	Totals	-

S < -400 km; C = -400 to -50 km; F > -50 km (Best Track relative to CLIPER) Cut Points:

TABLE A-7 Same as A-1, except for cross-track 24 h stratified by longitude.

	800000000000000000000000000000000000000		9,000000000000000000000000000000000000	***********	ngaronomen.	.00000000000000000000000000000000000000	en viven en en	agus emisses	an inggrander,	ana, yestekki	0000
(T)	Totals	85	54	48	79	; ;					
≥ 140° E	8	25	20	25	07	[2]	29.4		14.6	17.1	74.8
de ≥	NTCM C	24	18	16	58 Subsamp	%1	28.2	66.7	33.3	40.6	Score =
Longitude ≥ 140° E	L	36	16	7	als 59 58	0%	42.3	33.3	52.1	42.3	Σ
		٦	ပ	×	Totals 59		ר	ပ	R	Fotals	
	Totals	50	20	98	89	? r					
Longitude 129° to 140° E	R	7	14	31	25	%2	14.0	- ;	22.1	14.0	77.4
129° t	NTCM C	24	18	36	s 56 78 5	%1	48.0	64.0	41.9	49.4	M Score = 77.4
tude	L Z	61	18	19	9	0%	38.0	36.0	36.0	36.6	S Z
. <u></u>		_	-	-	56	i l	<u> </u>	Ř	3	3(_
			S S	<u>۳</u>	Totals 5			<u>ကို</u> ပ	R 3	Totals 30	
Longi		1	Ü	~	9 Total	eren en				muni.	
	R Totals	1		<u> </u>	49 89 Total	= 103					enegoni.
ıde < 129° E	R Totals	42 L	75 C	52 R	49 89 Total	= 103	2.9 7.1 L		R	3.8 3.5 Totals	= 50.8
ıde < 129° E	M R Totals	3 42 L	19 75 C	27 52 R	81 49 89 Total	= 103	42.9 7.1 L	45.3 C	42.3 5.8 R	43.8 3.5 Totals	50.8
	R Totals	18 3 42 L	41 19 75 C	22 27 S2 R	49 89 Total	%1 %2	2.9 7.1 L	S	5.8 R	3.8 3.5 Totals	= 50.8

TABLE A-8 Same as A-7, except for 48 h.

		als	- 5	2	. «	ابر -	90000 <u>0</u> 100000000000000	received and in	reconstruction of	esta esta esta esta esta esta esta esta	ere ere ere ere ere ere ere ere ere ere	vieres :
ம		Totals	92	42	53	95	187					1,,
40° 1		R	12	7	18	37	e = 187 %2	13.0		20.8	12.3	61.5 ER)
de ≥ 1	NTCM	C	21	18	24	63	ubsample % 1	22.8	57.1	45.3	36.9	core =
Longitude≥140° E		Г	59	17	11	87	Number in Subsample %0 %1	64.1	42.9	34.0	50.8	M Score
T			1	၁	×	Totals	N E	ı	၁	×	Totals	M Score = 61. (Best Track relative to CLIPER)
ы		Totals	51	09	 75	86	Y 1 2 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	distriction of process	18.00 p. 10.00 p. 10	andre in spirit		(Bes
Longitude 129° to 140° E		R To	4	6	30	43	= 186 %2	7.8		28.0	13.4	= 67.1 R > 125 km
129° to	NTCM	၁	17	26	24	19	bsample %1	33.3	56.7	32.0	40.3	ဥ
gitude	Z	L	30	25	21	_	Number in Subsample %0 %1	58.8	43.3	40.0	46.2	M Sc to 125 kg
Longitude 129° to 140° E Longitude ≥ 140° E		•	L	၁	~	Totals 76	Numb	T	ပ .	24	Totals	M Sco C = -125 to 125 km;
		Totals	45	74	50	66	en en en en en en en en en en en en en e	***************************************	<u> en venous mans</u>	****************	nani i governo	06.44002.
Longitude < 129° E		R	3	15	25	43	= 169	6.7		2.0	2.4	43.8 L < -125 km;
tude <	NTCM	၁	18	50	24	92	Subsample % 1	40.0	32.4	48.0	39.0	I II
Longi		r	24	6	1	34	Number in St %0	53.3	67.7	50.0	58.6	M Score Cut Points
		····	7	S	R	Totals	Z S	٦	၁	~	Totals	
							***************************************		**********		Contract Contract	entitle control

TABLE A-9 Same as A-7, except for 72 h.

		Totals	80	50	57	108			*	eracarage e e d <mark>esco</mark>	**************************************		ocuse um
40° E		R To	10	6	26 5	45	le = 187	%2	12.5	!	22.8	12.3	54.5 ER)
Longitude ≥ 140° E	NTCM	၁	13	25	18	56	Number in Subsample	%1	16.3	50.0	31.6	29.9	" =
ongitu		Г	57	16	13	98	ımber in	0%	71.3	50.0	45.6	57.8	M Score
-			T	၁	×	Totals 86	Ź		ı	C	~	Totals	Track
ы		Totals	48	2	1 4	77	٠,		and the same				(Besi
0 140		R To	. 4	13	27	4	= 186	%2	8.3		35.1	16.1	= 74.7 R > 200 km
Longitude 129° to 140° E	NTCM	C	18	24	21	63	Number in Subsample	%1	37.5	62.5	28.4	42.5	2
itude	E	L	26	27	26	-	er in Su	0%	54.2	37.5	36.5	41.4	M Score 200 km; F
Long			L 2	C 7	- X	Totals 79	Numb	l	د .	ט	~	Totals	M Sco C = -200 to 200 km;
		******	enennenen.		<u></u>	T _o	~~~~		·	*********		F	Ü "
田		Totals	52	59	58	80	6						0 km;
gitude < 129° E	7	X	5	11	25	4	le = 169	%2	9.6	1 1	6.9	5.3	57.9 L < -200 km;
itude	NTCM	၁	27	35	29	16	Subsample	%1	6.13	40.7	50.0	47.3	Score =
Long		Γ	20	13	4	37	Number in	0%	38.5	59.3	43.1	47.4	Cut P
			L	C	X	Totals 37	N N		Γ	၁	×	Totals	•
[****			Bes	st Tra	ck	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	200 0244.20	*********	Ве	est T	rack	XXXXXX XXXXXX XXX	eto:mane

TABLE A-10 Same as A-7, except for along-track 24 h.

DESCRIPTION DESCRIPTION PRODUCTION

-	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	electric contraction of the probability of the prob	***************************************		000000000000000000000000000000000000000	annoceocos	bendangana	riconcommence page	ngan managpan anga	virriodoronomendoro	or recommended and	
		Totals	64	52	71	95	1.	ſ		1			
40° E		F.	12	9	32	50	c = 187	%2	18.8		28.2	17.1	66.3
te ≥ 1,	NTCM	C	14	25	19	58	ıbsampl	%1	21.9	51.9	26.8	32.1	Score =
Longitude ≥ 140° E	NTCM	S	38	21	20	62	Number in Subsample	0%	59.4	48.1	45.1	50.8	M Sc
3		Į	<u>~</u>	.: ၁	<u> </u>	Totals 79	Numb	L	S	ပ	<u></u>	Totals	,
				<u>. </u>		Tot			_		_	Tot	
EЛ		Totals	53	99	7	~~	the Notice town	******		Adaption and the Control		tal e e ta e e este al talen	
40°.		ů I	0 5	9 9	67	33 	= 186	%2	0.0	:	40.3	14.5	6.69
to 1		ഥ			10	16		ł	3				11
129°	NTCM	၁	6	26	30	62	bsamp	%1	11.3	9.09	44.8	40.9	M Score
Longitude 129° to 140° E	Z	S				_	Number in Subsample	0%	88.7	39.4	14.9	44.6	Σ
ngi			47	34	27	=	ber	L					l
a l				· · · · · · ·		ر س	E		S	C	[1	al s	
Lo			S	၁	ŢĽ	Totals 108	N		S 3	O	IL ,	Totals	
Lo		stats	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Service and the service of	notes and a second	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Num	<u>~~</u>	· ·	O	<u>r.</u>	Totals	
		Totals	2 58 S	69	9 42 F	62 I		25	3.5	:			6.9
	J	F Totals	28	Service and the service of	42	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	= 169	%2	3.5	•	20.0	13.6	= 76.9
ude < 129° E	NTCM		28	69	42	62 I	ubsample = 169	%1 %2		:			Ħ
ude < 129° E	NTCM	Œ,	2 58	13 69	9 42	24 62	ubsample = 169		3.5	•	20.0	13.6	
	NTCM	C F	21 2 58	18 13 69	12 9 42	94 51 24 62	= 169	% 1	36.2 3.5	73.9	28.6 50.0	49.2 13.6	Score =
ude < 129° E	NTCM	C F	35 21 2 58	C 38 18 13 69	F 21 12 9 42	51 24 62	ubsample = 169	% 1	60.3 36.2 3.5	C 26.1 73.9	21.4 28.6 50.0	36.7 49.2 13.6	Score =

(Best Track relative to CLIPER) F > 15 km C = -125 to 15 km; S < -125 km; Cut Points:

TABLE A-11 Same as A-10 except for 48 h.

ecoeses assessed becauses assessed basesses

E		etitiste<u>tin</u> e esseetia	**********	<u> </u>	e de l'abbate de la colonie de	Protokolok <mark>k</mark> an	anainga	vasa savar sassa	good of congression	en er en er er er er er er er er er er er er er	<u>de en romania de la com</u>	eserci essenza	sociolism.
	Totals	99	9	84	73	8	87						_
140° E	Œ	۱	•	15	41	61	plc = 1	%2	7.6		20.6	10.7	= 57.8 CLIPER)
ide ≥	NTCM	25		22	17	64	Subsam	%1	37.9	54.2	23.3	36.4	core = e to CL
Longitude ≥ 140° E	ď	36		11	15	s 62	Number in Subsample = 187	0%	54.6	45.8	56.2	52.9	M Score
	<u>.</u>	S		၁	Ħ.	Totals 62	ź 		S	၁	ſĽ,	Totals	M Score = 57.8 (Best Track relative to CLIPER)
田		5.5		7.5	56	68	::coox600	too-tootoopy;				ecessores esteres.	
Longitude 129° to 140° E	F Totals	~		16	22	41	= 186	%2	5.5	-	21.4	8.0	= 60.1 F > -25 km
129° t	NTCM	1 7	:	29	22	65	Number in Subsample	%1	25.5	61.3	39.3	44.1	1 "
gitude	z z	× ×	3	30	12	80	lber in S	0%	69.1	38.7	39.3	47.9	M Score C = -275 to -25 km;
Lon				၁	Ţ,	Totals	Neg	•	S	၁	ΙΤ.,	Totals	C = -27
						Ĕ						_	
	*** *********************************	e de como de de	an an an an an an an an an an an an an a	enneuve		Ë	**************************************	*********			<u></u>	_	Ë.
<i>~</i> ~~	ale.	e de como de de	/6	57	55	80 Te	6.9	weijan			***************************************	Τ	-275 km;
<i>~</i> ~~	ale.	<u> </u>		10 57	16 55	XXXXXXX	le = 169	%2	5.3		40.0	14.8	67.4 S < -275 km;
<i>~</i> ~~	F Totals		<u> </u>			08 	Subsample = 169	%1 %2	21.1 5.3	61.4	30.9 40.0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	= 67 ints:
	ale.	,	3 3/	10	16	29 80	Subsample = 16					14.8	67
<i>~</i> ~~	NTCM C F Totals	,	42 12 3 5/	22 10	17 16	51 29 80	in Subsample = 16	961	21.1	61.4	30.9	37.9 14.8	= 67 ints:

TABLE A-12 Same as A-10 except for 72 h

	annon in lee.	S .				~	en en en en en en en en en en en en en e	eren en eren eren eren er	erenen ingenere	construction of		errien err	2
30		Totals	67	19	29	105	87						
140° I		Ľ	6	23	36	89	le = 1 %2	13.4		25.4	12.8	= 56.6	IPER)
ude ≥	NTCM	၁	15	26	8	49	Subsamp %1	22.4	57.4	13.6	31.0	Score =	to CL
Longitude ≥ 140° E		S	43	12	15	70	Number in Subsample = 187 %0 %1 %2	64.2	42.6	61.0	56.2	M	relative
			S		Ľ	Totals 70	ž	S	Ö	ſĽ	Totals		(Best Track relative to CLIPER)
		2						.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		************			. Be
0. E		Totals	57	99	63	- 93	2 86	5.3	· ·	6.	7.0		km
0 14		压	3	2	37	20	= 186	2		15.9	7	57.0	F > -50 km
Longitude 129° to 140° E	NTCM	င	32	34	16	82	Number in Subsample %0 %1	56.1	48.5	25.4	43.0	Score =	
itude	Z	S	22	22	10	54	er in Su %0	38.6	51.5	58.7	50.0	W Sc	C = -400 to -50 km;
guo				<u> </u>		<u> </u>	אַ נ פּ	S	ြ ၁	[I,	Totals	l	400
Lon		•	S	C	Ľ,	Totals	_		·		Tol		
		Totals	<u>م</u>	50	I 8	8			oren er er er er er er er er er er er er er	ocerere e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e		. operate total	S < -400 km;
ப		Tol	59	5	9	1	691				_	1 _	404
129°		Œ	1	12	15	28	le = 169 %2	1.7		35.0	13.0	60.9	
tude < 129° E	NTCM	ပ	12	27	24	63	ubsampl %1	20.3	46.0	40.0	34.9	core =	Points:
Longit		S	46	11	21	78	Number in Subsample %0 %1	78.0	54.0	25.0	52.1	M Score	Cnt
			S	Ü	<u> </u>	Totals 78	Z	S	ິບ	Ĭ.	Totals	-3	
2000	e comme	en en en en	Bes	t Tra	ck	enserver e	New York Control of the Control of t	В	est T	rack	*Batananananav.ed	nes ment	33

TABLE A-13
Same as A-1, except for cross-track 24 h stratified by intensity

. 🗖	<u>v</u>	er inderendendenset	entrene to to records	2000 timber of the second	ggilgete teatra e e	rentra entra	errenanisht	andrew and	Leave to the thirty	organiza e	estima.
	Totals	84	64	99	- 73 178	ļ	~			<u></u>	1
0 kts.	~	4	12	28		%2	8.3		19.7	9.6	68.6
ity≥8	NTCM	22	23	25	70 Subsam	961	45.8	64.1	37.9	49.4	Score =
Intensity ≥ 80 kts.	L N	22	29	13	ls 64 70 44 Number in Subsample =	0%	45.8	35.9	42.4	41.0	M Sc
	1	T	၁	×	Totals 64 Number	•	Г	၁	~	Totals	M Score = 6
		***************************************	***************************************	*************	on or a second	5000000000000	***********	***************			
s;	Totals	9	65	57	89	ı				-	;
75 kt	R,	6	23	26	58 = 18	%2	15.0		10.5	8.3	58.4
50 to	NTCM C	21	33	25	79 Toursday	1%	35.0	49.2	43.9	41.8	ore =
Intensity 50 to 75 kts.	NTCM L C R To	30	6	9	s a	0%	50.0	50.8	45.6	48.9	M Score = 58.4
In			<u> </u>	<u></u> _	Totals 45 Number	ļ		\Box	~	Totals	. 1
		7	C	~	Tota					Tot	
	Totals	69	50	63	74	a despues a section of		er grannenden gu	and the second second	and the second	
ts	ı,			 	ı ≌	~				<u> </u>	ا ما
45 k	R	22	18	29	_	%2	31.9		15.9	17.6	= 76.9
nsity ≤ 45 kts	NTCM C R	23	21	24	68 Subsample	%1	33.3	58.0	38.1	41.7	Score = 76.9
Inten	L	24		01	ls 45 Number in	0%	34.8	42.0	46.0	40.7	M S
		L	U	~	Totals Nun			ပ	24	Totals	•
ana	eranica, menerica	Bes	t Tra	ck		2000-20	Ве	st Ti	ack	esercion cons	***********

TABLE A-14 Same as A-13, except for 48 h

			Totals	56		62	84	~						
	0 kts		≃ٍ [3	2	21	29	le = 17	%2	5.4	1	22.6	9.6	62.4
	Intensity ≥ 80 kts	NTCM	၁	19	29	27	75	Subsamp	%1	33.9	51.7	43.5	43.2	M Score =
	Intensity ≥	Z	L	34	26	14	74	Number in Subsample = 178	0%	60.7	48.3	33.9	47.2	W Sc
				7	Ö	24	Totals 74	Ž		1	၁	8	Totals	
48 h			Totals	99	62	54	111	2	*****					•
Same as A-13, except for 48 h	Intensity 50 to 75 kts		R	2	13	27	42	Number in Subsample = 182	%2	3.0	•••	16.7	0.9	45.0
·13, exc	50 to	NTCM	င	16	36	81	8	bsample	%1	24.2	41.9	33.3	33.0	ore =
e as A	ensity	Z	Г.	48	13	6	2	er in Si	0%	72.7	58.1	50.0	61.0	M Score
San	Int		ļ	_1	ပ ပ	~	Totals 70	N. B.			ပ	24	Totals	4
			Totals	99	54	62	85	erenege Live	onen ega e o			and property of the second	and the second second	december
	5 kts		R T	14	13	12	52	Subsample = 182	%2	21.2		16.1	13.2	66.5
	ensity ≤ 45 kts	NTCM	၁	21	29	27	11	ubsample	. 1%	31.8	46.3	43.5	40.1	Score =
	Inten	~		31	12	10	53	.9	0%	47.0	53.7	40.3	46.7	M Sc
				<u> </u>	C	~	Totals 53	N			C	~	Totals	_
	oute	74 ************************************	umar)	Ве	st Tr	ack	real control of the c	engel of	·····	Ве	st T	rack		oottoottooto

(Best Track relative to CLIPER) R > 125 km C = -125 to 125 km; Cut Points:

TABLE A-15 Same as A-13, except for 72 h

CONTRACTOR DESIGNATION OF SECURITIES OF SECU

-0000	operation of the second	onges greek	ntrastrutorens e statisti	or magnetical	es angohoteorooga	ere ere ere ere	er journ	wyw.com	ego ego escado.		anna a a manna	series errecen	
		Totals	45	64	69	73	∞						
30 kts		~	2	∞	20	30	le = 178	%2	4.4		40.6	16.9	75.9
Intensity ≥ 80 kts	NTCM	ပ	19	29	21	69	Subsamp	%1	42.2	54.7	30.4	42.1	Score =
Inten		l L	24	27	28	79	Number in Subsample	0%	53.3	45.3	29.0	41.0	M Sc
			L	၁	X	Totals	Z Z		1	S	X	Totals	M Score = 75.9
S		Totals	78	48	 56	103	2						
, 75 kt		×	5	11	29	55	e = 182	%2	6.4		12.5	9.9	= 50.0
y 50 to	NTCM	ی	23	24	20	19	ubsampl	%1	29.5	50.0	35.7	36.8	4)
Intensity 50 to 75 kts	~	1	50	13	7	70	Number in Subsample	0%	64.1	50.0	51.8	56.6	M S
I			. 1	C	~	Totals 70	Num		L	C	×	Totals	M Score
		Totals	57	61	64	89	***********	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	<u> (a i te</u> aceacetaece	e character de l'escale d	ecocies peres		recoorer.
45 kts		~	12	14	29	55	: = 182	%2	21.1		12.5	11.0	62.1
Intensity ≤ 45 kts	NTCM	၁	16	31	27	74	ubsample	%1	28.1	49.2	42.2	40.1	Score =
Inten		L	29	16	∞	53	Number in Subsample	0%	50.9	50.8	45.3	48.9	M S
		•	J	၁	×	Totals	Z	,	T	C	R	Totals	
التفعيد			Bes	t Tra	ck				В	est T	`rack	and southern to the se	and made to

(Best Track relative to CLIPER) C = -200 to 200 km;Cut Points:

TABLE A-16 Same as A-13, except for along-track 24 h

		*		and a service of the service of	agadas da a estre de est					and a second	er, and a region of the effect.	e de la persona de como	de service de la company
		Totals	56	79	43	78	178	_,	<u> </u>				٦
) kts		Ľ,	7	10	12	29	n <u>e</u>	%2	12.5		25.6	10.1	66.3
Intensity ≥ 80 kts	NTCM	C	15	32	20	29	Number in Subsample = 178	%1	26.8	59.5	46.5	46.1	M Score = 66.
nsity	Z		1	<u> </u>	2	Ľ	in Su	0%					M Score
Inte		S	34	37	11	82	umber	88	60.7	40.5	27.9	43.8	≥
Int			S	၁	Ľ	Ţotals 82	Z		S	ວ	<u>r</u>	Totals	E
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	M COMPANIES CONTRACTOR	MARKAGO (NA PARA)	·		******	Nordon de Nordon	***********	***************************************		
~		Totals	59	62	61	96	182		1.	,	1	-	Ì.
'5 kts		F	3	7	24	8	II	%2	5.1	-	31.1	12.1	= 62.6
) to 7	4					<u> </u>	Number in Subsample	%1	23.7	61.3	29.5	38.4	
ity 5(NTCM	၁	14	24	<u>∞</u>	26	n Sub	0%	71.2	38.7	39.3	49.5	Sco
.22		S	2		5	2	eri	6	71	38	39	6	Z .
ten			42	31	-	9	튙						J – 3
Intensity 50 to 75 kts			S A	C 3	T.	tals 9	Numb	!	S	Ü	<u>r</u> ,		,
Inten			<u></u>	<u>L</u>	<u> </u>	Totals 92	Numb	************				Totals	
Intens		otals	<u></u>	<u>L</u>	<u> </u>	eren en	****						
		F Totals		L O	76 F	22	= 182	%2		C	<u>.</u>	Totals	:
		F Totals	S 09	46 C	ĬŢ,	eren en = 182		S 7.9	C	50.0 F	23.1 Totals	= 83.5	
			S 09	46 C	76 F	22	182	%1 %2	S	C	<u>.</u>	Totals	= 83.5
45 kts		ഥ	4 60 S	8 46 C	15 76 F	48 27 72	Subsample = 182		S 7.9	C	50.0 F	23.1 Totals	3.5
		C F	4 60 S	13 8 46 C	23 15 76 F	72 72	= 182	%1	20.0 6.7 S	71.7 C	30.3 50.0 F	39.6 40.7 23.1 Totals	Score = 83.5
		C F	44 12 4 60 S	C 25 13 8 46 C	38 23 15 76 F	48 27 72	Subsample = 182	%1	73.3 20.0 6.7 S	C 28.3 71.7 C	19.7 30.3 50.0 F	40.7 23.1 Totals	Score = 83.5

TABLE A-17 Same as A-16, except for 48 h

7777777

seesessi vaaraara haddaask aaaaaaa leesesess

		eza avan	one, in terms of the	orace de caracteria que	on from a server	ooraa aasaa	energia s		n - engleytte en senge	garaga ang pagangangan		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	and the state of
		Totals	58	78	42	81	178						•
30 kts		Ľ.	9	19	61	4) = old	%2	10.3	:	23.8	9.0	63.5
Intensity ≥ 80 kts	NTCM	၁	21	31	13	65	Subsam	%1	36.2	60.3	31.0	45.5	M Score =
Inten		S	31	28	10	69	Number in Subsample = 178	0%	53.4	39.7	45.2	45.5	M Sc
			S	ນ	ΪŢ	Totals 69	Ź		S	C	!L	Totals	
		Totals	64	52	99	107	2			or recommended their			
75 kts		F		10	31	42	3 = 182	%2	1.6	:	24.2	9.3	50.5
50 to	NTCM	C	=	24	19	54	nbsample	%1	17.2	53.8	28.8	31.9	M Score = 50.5
Intensity 50 to 75 kts	Ż	S	52	18	16	 98	Number in Subsample	0%	81.3	46.2	47.0	58.8	M
In			S	ິບ.	Ţ	Totals	Nem	•	S	ပ	ſĽ,	Totals	,
		Totals	56	50	92		eren en e	Access of the poor	an ann an	a santanen jaran	version i versione	***************************************	**********
kts			4	12 5	29 7	ŀ	= 182	7	7.1		30.3	14.8	œ.
nsity ≤ 45 kts	Σ	<u>ت</u>			2	45	Subsample =	%2					= 70.8
nsity	NTCM	ပ	-61	18	24	19	Subsa	%1	33.9	64.0	31.6	41.2	Score =
Inten	,	S	33	20	23	9/	Number in	0%	58.9	36.0	38.2	44.0	M
		~	S	ပ	[I.	Totals 76	ž	·	S	၁	Ľ	Totals	
<u> تفامعون</u>			Best	Trac	ck				Ве	st Tr	ack	entere agencia e	Acres (

(Best Track relative to CLIPER) C = -275 to -25 km; F > -25 km S < -275 km; Cut Points:

A STANDARD BY SOME WAS A STANDARD BY SOME OF S

TABLE A-18 Same as A-16, except for 72 h

(** ***		Sis			etylapan mikaya	, in a septiment of the	e e ja .	on our orași	entrene - regita	jus syskiadalaina	. The section seed	knotore in boene	5000000
		Totals	28	65	55	91	178	2	8.6	-	18.2	8.4	6
0 kts		Ľ	5	14	27	46	# 2	%2					= 57.3
ity≥8	NTCM	ပ	25	36	18	162	ubsampl	%1	43.1	44.6	32.7	40.5	M Score =
Intensity ≥ 80 kts		S	28	15	10	53	Number in Subsample = 178	0%	48.3	55.4	49.1	51.1	Z
			S	ပ	ഥ	Totals 53	Z	_	S	ນ 	<u>. </u>	Totals	
		Totals	61	56	65	103	ed postor	1000 maren	niusnuona Jaskua				3
kts			1	19 5	34 6	S4	= 182	%2	. 1.6	:	27.7	10.4	53.8
10 75	7	H		-	3			%1	.2	55.4	20.0	33.0	
, 50 1	NTCM	ပ	16	25	13	54	ubsam		26.2				M Score =
Intensity 50 to 75 kts		S	44	12	18	74	Number in Subsample	0%	72.1	44.6	52.3	56.6	Σ
			S	၁	ir.	Totals 74	Num		S	၁	Г	Totals	
		Totals	64	56	— 62	92			in Churchige code		Accidentation of the second of		ex::::::::
5 kts		F	7	12	27	46	= 182	9,62	10.9	-	29.0	13.8	63.3
≥ 4	NTCM	C	18	26	17	61	bsample	%1	28.1	53.6	27.4	35.7	core =
ity	1 5	-			 		S.	0%	60.9	46.4	.5	50.5	M S
Intensity ≤ 45 kts	Z	S	39	18	18	75	žer į	9	9	46	43.5	20	
Intensity	Z	S	S 39	C 18	F 18	Totals 75	Number in Subsample	6)9 S	C 46	F 43	Fotals 50] ~

(Best Track relative to CLIPER) F > -50 km C = -400 to -50 km;S < -400 km;Cut Points:

TABLE A-19 Same as A-1, except for stratified by past 12-h intensity change (Δ Intensity).

	A STATE OF THE STA	s.	<u></u>								****	ga es meneros y el com		
	e E	Totals	8	37	32	43	•	_,[3		3.1	5.1	7	
5 kt	~	۱	4	14	17	35	66 =	%2	13.3		(,,	\$	61.7	ER)
Δ Intensity ≥ 15 kt	NTCM	Ţ	15	15	14	44	Number in Subsample	%1	50.0	59.5	43.8	51.5	Score =	CLIP
ensit	IN	1				4	n Sub	. 0%	36.7	40.5	53.1	43.4	M Sc	ve to
Δ Intensity ≥	-	1	=	∞	1	20	mber i	6	L	C	R		~	relati
7			L	C	R	Totals 20	ž					Totals		(Best Track relative to CLIPER)
		s S	eranis que que recedence					e service de	***************************************		and the second s	energy and a	anana .	(Best
k	į	Totals	47	55	67	71	69	7	25.5		22.4	16.0	0:	E
10	۵	4	12	20	29	61	÷ 169	%2	25		22	91	= 74	R > 50 km
Δ Intensity 5 to 10 kt	CM				3		ample	%1	29.8	61.8	34.3	42.0	Score = 74.0	
Δ Intensity 5	NTCM	ٔ	14	21	23	58	Number in Subsample	0%	44.7	38.2	43.3	42.0	M Sc	C = -75 to 50 km;
/ Inte	-	۱ ۲	21	14	15	50	ıber in		L 4	C 3	R 4] ~	75 to 2
7		-		C	×	Totals	Nun					Totals) = J
		9	<u></u>	***************************************			*********	o-concern		**********	Hater taxonomon	******	*****	km;
	ſ	Totals	9	64	57	. 8	0	1	8	<u> </u>	8		ł	L < -75 km;
0 kt	۵	۷ ا	14	15	25	54	= 19	%2	20.3		15.8	12.1	65.8	
nsity ≤ 0	NTCM		- 6		23	69	mple	%1	27.5	57.8	40.4	41.6	9	Cut Points:
ensi	Į,	1		27	2	9	Subsa						Score	Cut
Δ Intensity ≤ 0 kt	-	1	36	22	6	29	Number in Subsample = 190	0%	52.2	42.2	43.9	46.3	M S	
-		ı.	1	C	~	Totals 67	Num		L	S	×	Totals		
ani.	assument.	veries.	Bes	t Tra	ck	gasa arannan	Mary Andrews	20000000	В	est T	rack	nga (Angarasana) anda	. mgpa	

TABLE A-20 Same as A-19, except for 48 h

THE THE PERSON AND PROPERTY OF THE PERSON OF


	Totals		32	32	35	55								
15 kt	R To		2	4	14	20	66 =	%2	6.3		14.3	7.1	51.6	PER)
sity ≥		-	ᆰ	21	16	47		%1	31.3	34.4	45.7	37.4	Score =	to CLII
Δ Intensity \geq 15 kt	\ \(\overline{\chi}\)		2 2	7	5	 	Number in Subsample	0%	62.5	65.6	40.0	55.6	M Sc	relative
7			 	<u></u>	~	Totals 32	Numbe	•	Γ	ပ	24	Totals	•	(Best Track relative to CLIPER)
	a is		51	57	01	87	ner one	wiki co			No the same of the first			
) kt	Totals		5	12	27 (44	= 169	%2	9.8		19.7	10.0	58.5	R > 125 km
5 to 1(M R		14	28	22	19		%1	27.5	50.9	36.1	38.5	= ezc	
ısity	NTCM	\vdash				-	Subsa	0%	62.7	49.1	44.3	51.5	M Score	125 kn
₩ 1	a .		32	17	12	l 5	.크		9	4	4	3	~	2
Inte	7		۵,]	per			ິບ	8		1	25
Δ Intensity 5 to 10 kt	1	<u>L</u>	1 1	Ü	~	Totals 61	Number in Subsample		L	ນ	~	Totals		C = -125 to 125 km;
674660					<u> </u>	96 Totals	Number		7	ט	~	Totals	~~~~	
	RQ OOKS CONTRACTOR		7	υ	~	(conservation)		%2	11.8	C	17.9 R	10.0 Totals	59.5	L < -125 km; C = -125
	RQ OOKS CONTRACTOR		76 L	58 C	56 R	چ 1	= 190	61 %2	3.7 11.8	T			ore = 59.5	L < -125 km;
ntensity ≤ 0 kt	NTCM R Tatale		9 76 L	11 58 C	20 56 R	71 40 96	ubsample = 190	%1	1.5 23.7 11.8		17.9	10.01		
ntensity ≤ 0 kt	NTCM R Totals		18 9 76 L	27 11 58 C	20 56 R	40 %	ubsample = 190		1.5 23.7 11.8	.6 53.4	46.4 17.9	.5 39.5 10.0	Score =	L < -125 km;


TABLE A-21 Same as A-19, except for 72 H

	~					anga e remanda e			annesyness.	ranna seera ee	general/en	
	Totals	31	33	35	55						•	
15 kt	×	1	5	17	23	e = 99 %2	3.2		22.9	9.1	53.5	EK)
ısity ≥	NTCM C	11	19	10	40	ubsample %1	35.5	42.4	28.6	35.3	ore =	S CLIF
Δ Intensity ≥ 15 kt	د ا	19	6	8	36	Number in Subsample %0 %1	61.3	57.6	48.6	55.6	M Score	elative
7			C	×	Totals	Z Z	L	ပ	×	Totals		(Best Track relative to CLIPER)
	slı				~~~	**************************************						(Best
tt	Totals	53	46	9	98	6	4		4]	E
101	~	~	6	32	46	= 169 %2	9.4		21.4	11.8	58.5	R > 200 km
Δ Intensity 5 to 10 kt	NTCM C	41	24	23	19	Number in Subsample %0 %1	26.4	47.8	32.9	34.9	၂ ည	
Intensi	L Z	34	13	15	62	er in Su %0	64.2	52.2	45.7	53.3	M Sc	o 200 kr
Δ Intensity 5 to 10 kt			Ü	껕	Totals	Numb	Τ	C	×	Totals		C = -200 to 200 km;
					•							_
	ls	errenen errene	::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::				***************************************	*************************		***************************************	*******	ı,
	a —	73	[9]	56	***	0					*******	00 km;
	R	12 73	14 61	18 56	******	; = 190 %2	16.4		25.0		69.5	L < -200 km;
	R				84			59.0		13.7	= 69.5	
Δ Intensity ≤ 0 kt	a —	12	14	18	69 44 84		27.4		32.1 42.9 25.0	42.1 13.7	core = 69.5	Cut Points: L < -200 km;
	R	20 12	25 14	18	44 84	Subsample	27.4	59.0	42.9	13.7	= 69.5	Points:

TABLE A-22 Same as A-19, except for along-track 24 h

		Totals	27	45	27	42							
15 kt	1	<u>.</u>	3	∞	10	21	66 = 1	%2	11.1	1	29.6	11.1	68.7 (R)
Δ Intensity \geq 15 kt	NTCM	ပ	4	12	6	25	Number in Subsample	% 1	14.8	73.3	33.3	46.5	o clipe
Δ Intensity ≥		S	20	25	8	53	ıber in S	0%	74.1	26.7	37.0	42.4	M Score
7			S	ى ت	Ľ	Totals 53	Z		S	ນ	Œ	Totals	M Score = 68 (Best Track relative to CLIPER)
1		Totals	09	57	52	83	<u></u>						(Best
o 10 k		<u>_</u>	S	5	14	2	= 169	%2	8.3		34.6	13.6	t = 64.5 F > 15 km
Δ Intensity 5 to 10 kt	NTCM	၂	12	26	20	58	bsample	%1	20.0	54.4	38.5	37.3	פו
Inten	Ż	တ	43	26	81	87	Number in Subsample	0%	7.1.7	45.6	26.9	49.1	M S to 15 k
V		ı	S	Ü	<u>u</u>	Totals 87	Numb		S	C	ĹŢ.	Totals 49.1	M Scor C = -125 to 15 km;
****		Totals	- 95		<u></u>	75						***********	0.5 S < -125 km;
≤ 0 kt	NTCM	FT	5	10	16	31	= 190	%2	8.9	1	49.3	20.0	80.5°
ntensity ≤ 0 kt	NTCM	၁	17	25	18	99	Subsample	%1	30.4	62.7	26.9	40.5	Score = Cut Points:
∆ Inte		S	34	32	33	Totals 99	Number in Su	0%		37.3	23.9	39.5	M Sc Cut
	400	1		ာ	ĹĽ,	als	lum!		S	C	ഥ	s	-
			~			Tot						Totals	





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARUS-1963-4

TABLE A-23 Same as A-22, except for 48 h

personal property sections

		Totals	29	42	28	53							
15 kt		F	0	12	14	28	66 = :	%2	0.0		21.4	6.1	52.6
△ Intensity ≥ 15 kt	NTCM	S	7	11	∞	32	Number in Subsample = 99	- 8	24.1	59.5	28.6	40.4	ore =
∆ Inten	_	S	22	13 ·	9	4	ber in S	0%	75.9	40.5	50.0	53.5	M Score
7			S	ပ	ĬŢ.	Totals 41	Z		S	C	[II.	Totals	
		Totals	09	53	56	89			Y				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
- 10 kg	200000000000000000000000000000000000000	H	4	6	25	38		%2	6.7		23.2	10.0	57.3
z, cacc ity 5 to	NTCM	٥	16	24	81	88	sample	1%	26.7	54.7	32.1	37.3	11
Δ Intensity 5 to 10 kt	Z	S	40	20	13	73	Number in Subsample	0%	66.7	45.3	44.6	52.7	M Score
		Ļ	S	Ö	[Z4	Totals 73	Nemb		S	ນ	Ĭ.	Totals	-
		Totals	61	64	8	85							
≤ 0 kt	TCM	r.	5	13	21	39	190	%2	8.2		36.9	15.3	70.6
Δ Intensity ≤ 0 kt	TCM	၁	19	27	70	%	bsample	281	31.2	57.8	30.8	40.0	n
Δ Inte	Z	S	37	24	24	88	Number in Sub	0%	60.7	42.2	32.3	44.7	M Score
		•	S	ပ	ĬĨ.	Totals	Numb	_	S	ပ	Ľ,	Totals	
	<u> </u>												

(Best Track relative to CLIPER) C = -275 to -25 km; S < -275 km; Cut Points:

TABLE A-24 Same as A-22, except for 72 h

	12	<u> </u>										
	Totals	36	28	35	. 56	_	Γ					
15 kt	댐	1	8	18	27	66 6	7%	2.8		20.0	8.1	51.5 ER)
Δ Intensity ≥ 15 kt	NTCM C	13	16	10	39	Number in Subsample = 99	, ,	36.1	42.9	28.6	35.3	M Score = 51.5
∆ Inter	S	22	4	7	33	ber in S	0%	61.1	57.1	51.4	Totals 56.6	M So
	ļ	S	ပ	Ľ	Totals 33	Nem		S	Ö	IL	Totals	M Score = 51. (Best Track relative to CLIPER)
	218				~						and the con-	(Bess
kt	Totals	- 5	- 29	\$	2 2	691	آج	8.2		16.3	7.7	.3 km
to 10	ഥ	5	20	28	53		82					= 53.3 F > -50 km
Δ Intensity 5 to 10 kt	NTCM C	19	27	13	59	چ	26	31.1	54.2	26.5	37.9	၂ ပ
Intens	z z	37	12	∞	57	er in Su	8	60.7	45.8	57.1	54.4	M S,
Δ		8	U U	IT.	Totals 57	Zen Ans		S	C	Ľ	Totals	M Scor C = 400 to -50 km;
-00000	<u></u>	at a design of the con-	The state of the same of			Mary and the second		o escolar	er i consecuence	oode serviçõ	anders and the	asyra -
	Totals	8	99	2	- 26	_	•					56.9. S < -400 km;
≤ 0 kt	[14	5	10	24	39		%2			37.5	15.3	66.9 S < -4
Δ Intensity ≤ 0 kt	NTCM	22	35	16	2	ıbsample	1%	36.7	47.0	25.0	36.3	M Score = Cut Points:
Δ Inte	S	33	21	24	28	Number in Subsample	0%	55.0	53.0	37.5	48.4	M Sc Cut
		S	Ü	[I]	Totals 78	Z		S	ပ	Ľ.	Totals	_
	enantania i esperanta	Ве	st Tra	ick	, populati programa de la composição de la composição de la composição de la composição de la composição de la	no niga kabas	orani ca	В	est T	rack	tona se ande in trate	

TABLE A-25 Same as A-1, except for cross-track 24 h stratified by size (radius of 30-kt winds in n.mi).

Course and the second s

	sla	S	a	· ~	٠,						
	Totals	46	56	73	92	- 175 %2	6	·	∞	3	6
Ē	~	5	10	34	\$	न । ह	10.9		17.8	10.3	66.9 PER)
210 n.	NTCM C	20	21	26	29	Subsamp 96.1	43.5	62.5	35.6	46.3	M Score = 66.9
Size≥210 n.mi	7	21	25	13	59	Number in Subsample = 175 %0 %1 %2	45.7	37.5	46.6	43.4	M So
			၁	×	Totals 59	Ž	1	Ö	~	Totals	M Score = 66 (Best Track relative to CLIPER)
	21	10	1 00		_						(Be
m.	Totals	<u></u>	89	58	74	- 181 %2	25.5		8.6	10.5	69.6 50 km
05 n.	~	4	24	24	62	- 9%					c = 69.6 $R > 50 km$
) to 2(NTCM	20	29	29	78	ubsamp %1	36.4	57.4	50.0	48.6	1 2
Size 110 to 205 n.mi	Ž Ž	21	15	2	=	Number in Subsample = 181 %0 %1 %2	38.2	42.6	41.4	40.9	M Scot
Si	j		J	~	Totals 41	Z 2 2	1	ວ	~	Totals	27-
					To				_		
	Totals	76	55	53	98	<u>~ ~~~</u>		- Commission Commissio	and the second	erenere comme	3. L < -75 km;
ı.mi	R	16	19	25	ક	- 186 %2	21.1		20.0	14.5	۱۰ ۵۵
≤ 105 n.mi	NTCM C	26	27	61	22	Subsample % 1	34.2	50.9	34.5	39.3	Score = 68
Size <	Z	34	6	=	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\		44.7	49.1	45.5	46.2	M Scc
			<u></u>	~	Totals 54	Number in 9%()	<u></u>	U V	R	<u> </u>] _
_					Tota					Totals	
2000	entre en en en en en en en en en en en en en	Ве	st Tra	ıck	er og sødende som	Maria de españo por escar	В	est T	rack	***************************************	ogenous.

TABLE A-26 Same as A-25, except for 48 h

good secons as economical beautiful (bosoner) controled for these and access to the property

≤ 105 n.mi Size 110 to 205 n.mi Size ≥ 210 n.mi	NTCM NTCM NTCM	C R Totals L C R Totals L C R Totals	20 6 70 L 34 16 10 60 L 35 20 3 58	33 15 60 C 14 41 11 66 C 25 20 5 50	22 25 56 R 8 23 24 55 R 16 27 24 67	75 46 102 Totals 56 80 45 99 Totals 76 67 32 79	ubsample = 186 Number in Subsample = 181 Number in Subsample = 175	%1 %2 %0 %1 %2 %0 %1 %2	28.6 8.6 L 56.7 26.7 16.7 L 60.3 34.5 5.2	45.0 C 62.1 37.9 C 40.0 60.0	39.3 16.1 R 43.6 41.8 14.5 R 35.8 40.3 23.9	37.1 8.1 Totals 54.7 35.4 9.9 Totals 45.1 44.0 10.9	1,
n.mi		•			 	1		%2	8.6		16.1	8.1	53.3
	NTCM	ပ	20	33	22	75	Subsample	%1					S.C.S.
Size		7	L 44	C 12	R 9	Totals 65	Number in Subsample	%0	L 62.9	C 55.0	R 44.6	Totals 54.8]3

household escentist similarities resource escentist

			Totals		6 1	5	6			-			
	[֓֞֞֟֟֟֟֟	4	8	- 65	79	. 175	2.4		35.4	13.7	و ا
	n.m		~		7	22	30	2 8					= 68.6
	Size ≥ 210 n.mi	NTCM	ပ	16	33	20	69	ubsamp %1	39.0	52.2	30.8	41.2	Score
	Size	Z	긔	24	59	23	1 9/	Number in Subsample = 175 %0 %1 %2	58.5	47.8	33.8	45.1	M
	***************************************		Į		<u> </u>	X	Totals 76	N N	L	ິນ	R	Totals	-
			•	·	· · · · · · · ·		<u></u>					····· weekee	
	ni		Totals	67	52	62	84		4		0	2] _∞
ı	5 n.r	i	≃ [9	17	26	52	- 181	13.4		21.0	12.2	65.8
	0 20	M.	ŀ					mple %1	35.8	53.8	37.1	41.4	= =
	9	NTCM	ပ	24	24	23	71	n Subsa %0					M Score
	Size 110 to 205 n.mi		-1	34	11	13	58	Number in Subsample = 18 %0 %1 %2	50.7	46.2	41.9	46.4	Σ
			L		C	~	Totals 58	Z B	1	၁	~	Totals	
	- 1											i	
		area esercices	or and the				To	and the same	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		tota en esperanta a prima en		erecerry.
	Women .	and the second	otals	12	52	62	102 To				to an exercise and the second		
		ere energy	R Totals		9 52	30 62		. 186	12.5		11.3	9.8	53.8
		Σ	R Totals	9 72	6	30	48 102	*	0 12.5		3 11.3	9.8	= 53.8
		NTCM		72		_	102		25.0 12.5	48.1	40.3 11.3		1 11
	Size ≤ 105 n.mi	NTCM	~	9 72	6	30	48 102	Subsample 98.1				54.8 36.6 8.6	
		NTCM	~	18 9 72	27 9	30	68 70 48 102	ubsample % 1	25.0	48.1	40.3	36.6 8.6	Score =
		NTCM	~	45 18 9 72	C 16 27 9	7 25 30	70 48 102	Subsample 98.1	L 62.5 25.0	C 51.9 48.1	48.4 40.3	54.8 36.6 8.6	Score =

TABLE A-28
Same as A-25, except for along-track 24 h

٦	=	10			~							
	Totals	6 55	10 71	13 49	29 8 3	= 175	%2	10.9		26.5	10.9	63.5 PER)
i.mi	7 T		1	-1	7							= 6. CLIPE
2101	NTCM	14	35	23	22	Subsan	. %1	25.5	50.7	46.9	41.7	M Score =
Size ≥ 210 n.mi	ြ	35	26	13	45	Number in Subsample	0%	63.6	49.3	26.5	47.4	M N
S		S	Ü	Ι.	Totals 74	Nan		S	υ	Ľ	Totals	M Score = 63
	Totals	59	88	57	78							
n.mi	F T	3	9	17	28	**************************************	%2	5.4	:	42.1	14.9	= 71.8 F > 15 km
Size 110 to 205 n.mi	NTCM	4	22	16	 - -	Number in Subsample = 181	%1	25.0	67.6	28.1	42.0	
110 t		<u> </u>	7	_	3 52	is Set	0%	9.69	32.4	29.8	43.1	M Score C = -125 to 15 km;
ize	S	39	9	24	100	mper		S 6	C 3	F 29		-125
		S	C	Ľ,	Totals 103	Ź				_	Totals	
	Totals	64	48	74	79				•			9 S < -125 km;
.m.	F	5	6	21	33	- 186	%2	7.8		41.9	19.4	76.9 . S .
105 n	NTCM	13	12	22	47	ubsample = 186	9%1	20.3	75.0	29.7	38.1	Sore = 7
Size ≤ 105 n.mi	ν Z	46	27	31	—	Number in Su	0%		25.0	28.4	42.5	M Score = 76.9 Cut Points: S
		S	Ü	Į.	Totals 104	Nem		S	ပ	ĬĽ,	Totals	ı
- R		В	est Tr	ack	la faire			В	est T	rack	sa kira ini ma	word war

TABLE A-29 Same as A-28, except for 48 h

7						_			100			
	Totals	51	72	52	87	75	1	00	· . 1	4]
ie.	F	9	20	28	54	; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ;	9%	11.8		15.4	8.0	58.3
Size ≥ 210 n.mi	NTCM	12	792	91	22	Number in Subsample = 175	%1	23.5	63.9	30.8	42.3	Score =
ze ≥ 2	N S	33	26	∞	-	r in Su	0%	64.7	36.1	53.8	49.7	M Sc
Si		3	7	ļ	l °	E PCC	į		لــــــا			1
		S	ပ	Ĭ	Totals 67	Ž		S	Ü	[_	Totals	M Score = 58
	Totals	63	62	56	92							_
Size 110 to 205 n.mi	F T	-	11	20	32	- 181	%2	1.6		28.6	9.4	58.6
o 205	CM	-			 	Number in Subsample - 181	1%	30.2	53.2	35.7	39.8	
110 t	NTCM C	19	29	8	8	Subs	0%	68.3	46.8	35.7.	8.09	M Score
Size	S	43	22	16	8	nber in		S 6	C 46	F 33]
_		S	Ü	Ţ	Totals 81	Z		- -			Totals	M Scor
	Totals	2	46	76	68							67.8
.m.	F 7	4	01	31	₩	Subsample - 186	% 2	6.3		32.9	15.6	67.8
e ≤ 105 n.mi	NTCM C	70	<u>∞</u>	20	58	ample	%1	31.3	6.09	26.3	36.6	1 u
ze ≤				"	 "		1					A Score
Size	S	40	18	25	83	Number in	90	62.5	39.	40.8	47.8	, צ
		S	၁	Ĭ.	Totals	Z		S	S	<u></u>	Totals	
		Bes	t Trac	k				Ве	st Ti	ack		

TABLE A-30 Same as A-28, except for 72 h.

					_							
	Totals	£	2	89	94	175.						
Ē	L.	4	17	9	19		962	9.3		17.6	9.1	55.4
: ≥ 210 n. NTCM	ı	4	29	16	59	ubsampl	%1	32.6	54.7	23.5	37.2	M Score = 55.
Size ≥ 210 n.mi NTCM	S	25	18	12	—	Number in Subsample -	0%	58.1	45.3	58.8	53.7	M Sc
S	ı	S	Ü	IT.	Totals 55	Z	ļ	S	ပ	Ľ,	Totals	1
	=											
Bi	Totals	73	52	52	23 	181	7	2.7		29.6	9.9	59.1
05 n.	Œ	7	13	19	34		%2					= 5
10 to 2 NTCM		28	30	19	77	bsampl	%i	38.4	44.4	35.2	39.3	M Score =
Size 110 to 205 n.mi NTCM	S	43	=	91	2	Number in Subsample = 181	0%	58.9	55.6	35.2	50.8	Σ
Si		S	U	<u>t.</u>	Totals 70	Numb		S	၁	Ţ	Totals	-
	Totals	29	59	8	100							
n.mi	F	7	15	53	51	- 186	%2	10.4		30.0	13.4	59.6
≤ 105 n.mi	၁	17	28	13	88	bsample	%1	25.4	52.5	21.7	32.8	ore =
Size	S	43	16	81	77	Number in Subsample = 186	0%	64.2	47.5	48.3	53.8	M Score
		S	၁	ĬĽ,	Totals 77	Z Z		S	၁	Ľ,	Totals	
- management		Ве	st Tra	ack	e de			В	est T	rack		

LIST OF REFERENCES

COMNAVOCEANCOM, 1984: Letter, Ser. 3/387, 20 July 1984 to CINCPACFLT re. tropical cyclone track forecast accuracy.

Elsberry, R. L., 1979: Applications of tropical cyclone models. <u>Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society</u>, 60, 750-762.

Elsberry, R. L., 1983: Recent developments in tropical cyclone track forecasting. Proceedings of the CCNA-AIT Joint Seminar on Monsoon and Tropical Meteorology. Sponsored by the Coordination Council for North American Affairs - The American Institute in Taiwan, pp. 89-98.

Elsberry, R. L., 1984: A proposal for an improved tropical cyclone warning system. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Meteorology, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, April, 41 pp.

Elsberry, R. L., and J. E. Peak, 1986: An evaluation of tropical cyclone forecast aids based on cross-track and along-track components. <u>Monthly Weather Review. 114.</u> 156-164.

Fiorino, M., 1985: A review of the dynamic tropical cyclone forecast models developed by the U. S. Navy. Appendix F of Elsberry, R. L., and M. Fiorino, NAVENVPREDRSHFAC Technical Report TR 85-03, 152 pp.

Fiorino, M. E., J. Harrison and D. G. Marks, 1982: A comparison of the performance of two operational dynamic tropical cyclone models. <u>Monthly Weather Review</u>, 110, 651-656.

responde actioner responde personel economic libraries, especies,

Harrison, E. J., Jr., 1973: Three-dimensional numerical simulations of tropical systems utilizing nested finite grids. <u>Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences</u>, 30, 1528-1543.

Harrison, E. J., Jr., 1981: Initial results from the Navy two-way interactive nested tropical cyclone model. Monthly Weather Review, 109, 173-177.

Harrison, E. J., Jr. and M. E. Fiorino, 1982: A comprehensive test of the Navy nested tropical cyclone model. Monthly Weather Review, 110, 645-650.

Neumann, C. J., and J. M. Pelissier, 1981: Models for the prediction of tropical cyclone motions over the North Atlantic: An operational evaluation. <u>Monthly Weather Review</u>, 109, 522-538.

- Peak, J. E. and R. L. Elsberry, 1982: A simplified statistical post-processing technique for adjusting tropical cyclone tracks. <u>Papers in Meteorological Research</u>, 5, 1-14.
- Peak, J. E. and R. L. Elsberry, 1984: Dynamical-statistical model forecasts of southern hemisphere tropical cyclones. Monthly Weather Review, 112, 717-724.
- Peak, J. E. and R. L. Elsberry, 1985: Objective selection of optimum tropical cyclone guidance using a decision-tree methodology. Preprints, the Technical Conference on Hurricanes and Tropical Meteorology, American Meteorological Society, Boston, 97-98.
- Preisendorfer, R. W., and C. D. Mobley, 1982: Data intercomparison theory, II. PMEL/NOAA Technical Memorandum, 91 pp.
- Sandgathe, S. A., 1985: Operational considerations for the design of the advanced tropical cyclone model. Appendix A of Elsberry, R. L., and M. Fiorino, NAVENVPREDRSHFAC Technical Report TR 85-03, 152 pp.
- Thompson, W. J., R. L. Elsberry and R. G. Read, 1980: An analysis of eastern North Pacific tropical cyclone forecast errors. Monthly Weather Review. 109, 1930-1938.
- Xu, Y., and C.J. Neumann, 1985: A statistical model for the prediction of western North Pacific tropical cyclone motion (WPCLPR). NOAA Technical Memorandum, NWS-NHC 28, National Hurricane Center, Miami, Fl, 30 pp.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

		No. Copies
1.	Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station, Alexandria, Virginia 22304-6145	2
2.	Library Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943	2
3.	Chairman, Code 63Rd Department of Meteorology Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5000	1
4.	Professor R.L. Elsberry, Code 63Es Department of Meteorology Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5000	5
5.	Professor J.CL. Chan Royal Observatory Nathan Road Kowloon, Hong Kong	1
6.	Mr. James E. Peak, Code 63 Pj Department of Meteorology Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5000	
7.	Chairman, Code 68Mr Department of Oceanography Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5000	1
8.	Commanding Officer Naval Oceanography Command Center Box 17 COMNAVMARIANAS FPO San Francisco, CA 96630	1
9.	Director Joint Typhoon Warning Center Box 17 COMNAVMARIANAS FPO San Francisco, CA 96630	1

10.	Commanding Officer Naval Environmental Prediction Research Facility Monterey, CA 93943-5000	1
11.	Brian J. Williams, LT, USN 82 Golden Showers Lane FPO San Francisco, CA 96630	2
12.	Director Naval Oceanography Division Naval Observatory 34th and Massachusetts Avenue Washington, DC 20390	1
13.	Commanding Officer Fleet Numerical Oceanography Center Monterey, CA 93943-5000	1
14.	Chairman, Oceanography Department U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, MD 21402	1
15.	Commanding Officer Naval Western Oceanography Center Box 113 Pearl Harbor, HI 96818	1
16.	Dr. Ted Tsui Naval Environmental Prediction Research Facility Monterey, CA 93943-5000	1
17.	Professor William M. Gray Department of Atmospheric Sciences Colorado State University Fort Collins, CO 80523	1
18.	Commander Naval Oceanography Command NSTL Station Bay St. Louis, MS 3852	1
19.	Chief of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217	1
20.	Henry Jones, LT, USN, Code 63 Department of Meteorology Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5000	1

6-86