### 1.4.3   A LOOK AT PROFILER PERFORMANCE

Edwin Kessler, Michael Eilts

National Severe Storms Laboratory, NOAA
Norman, OK 73069

Kevin Thomas

Cooperative Institute for Mesoscale Meteorological Studies
Norman, OK 73019

## INTRODUCTION

Since about 1974, Doppler radars operating in UHF and VHF ranges have been used increasingly to study atmospheric winds.  Historically, large systems capable of obtaining data from high altitudes have focused attention on the mesosphere and stratosphere, rather than on the troposphere (MST) wherein abides most of the weather considered by most meteorologists.  Excellent histories and exposition of the technology involved have been given by GAGE and BALSLEY (1978) and BALSLEY and GAGE (1982).  Perhaps the most recent comprehensive collection of MST studies is the HANDBOOK FOR MAP (Middle Atmosphere Program) Volume 9 (BOWHILL and EDWARDS, 1983).

Refinement of smaller systems with down-to-earth capabilities has stimulated investigation of their application to meteorological problems as evidenced by the existence of the session on forecasting applications at this Workshop.  The prospect that vertical profiling radars would provide accurate wind information frequently and automatically is very intriguing to meteorologists at a time when data processing and communicating capabilities are advancing rapidly with commensurate development of numerical meteorological models.  One scenario, for example, envisages that a network of wind profiling radars, substantially denser than the present day rawinsonde system but no more expensive, would transmit wind data as often as hourly to a central station, where a grand numerical model would fuse kinematic details with thermodynamic data gathered from weather satellites and perhaps a few ground-based thermodynamic profilers, and produce a weather outlook updated hourly.  No weather system 100 km in size or larger would escape detection with this network; incipient storm triggers would be incorporated into the forecasts, and we would only very rarely be much surprised by weather developments.

Since this session includes papers by experts who indicate practical approaches to this meteorological utopia (see especially the outline of mathematical synthesis of diverse data given by Gal-Chen, this volume), we do not dwell on this further here. Rather, we address some questions the meteorologist must logically ask first, viz., what is the actual performance capability of these systems, how accurate is the wind data of interest to meteorologists, and from what altitudes in the troposphere are the data reliably obtained?

## LITERATURE ON ACCURACY OF WIND FINDING BY PROFILING RADARS IN THE TROPOSPHERE

CLARK et al. (1985) cite 11 references that present some analysis of the accuracy with which wind profiling radars measure the winds. The findings of these studies are summarized in Table 1 and our list of references includes their sources.  From these papers we have drawn the following conclusions:
   a.  There is a remarkable paucity of solid tests.  Most tests involve one or more of the following limitations:  check data unfortunately distant in time and/or space; too few cases to be definitive; winds too light to be definitive; test conducted in region where winds are quite variable.

Table 1. Profiler winds compared with winds by rawinsonde and other means.

| Radar Location | Frequency | Beam-Width | Author | Date | Rawinsonde site & distance | Radar Method | Results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Sunset, Colo. | 40 MHz | 7.1° E-W 14.2° N-S | Green et al. | 1975 | Denver, 55 km | 2 beams, 30° from vert. | About 65 wind measurements but unclear how many soundings involved. E-W radar wind and rawinsonde winds correlated 0.84. stand. dev. of diff ~5 ms$^{-1}$. |
| 2. Sunset, Colo. | 40 MHz | Presumably as in (1). | Warnock et al. | 1978 | Tabernash 33 km | 2 beam method; compare winds with soundings whose balloons pass within 25 km. | Five cases; correlation 0.96 with winds above 4 km MSL. Some differences up to 5 ms$^{-1}$. Could be due to spatial separation. |
| 3. Sunset, Colo. | 40 MHz | Presumably as in (1). | Green et al. | 1980 | - | Winds by radar and NCAR aircraft compared. | On a day with Queenair, winds less than 5 m/sec; some differences were about as large, but reasonable agreement in profile shapes. On windy Feb. day with Sabreliner, almost all data (dis)agreed within 5-10 ms$^{-1}$. Data 4-6 km MSL only. |
| 4. Sunset, Colo. Platteville | 40 MHz 50 MHz | 4.8° 2.5° | Clark et al. | 1985 | - | 5 beams: one vertical, 2 E-W, 2 N-S | More consistent data on horizontal winds follow correction for vertical winds. Vertical winds more a problem in mountainous areas than on plains. |
| 5. Chatanika, Alaska | 1290 MHz | 0.6° | Balsley et al. | 1977 | Fairbanks 5 km | VAD | Agreement to within 1-2 ms$^{-1}$. |
| 6. Poker Flat, Alaska | 50 MHz | 2.0° az 4.0° el | Ecklund et al. | 1977 | 2 km | 143° component measured at different heights with beam fixed in elevation. | Two weather balloons, one was two hours different in time. Soundings and radar winds agreed to ~2 m/sec. Winds ranged from 1-14 m/sec. |

| Radar Location | Frequency | Beam-Width | Author | Date | Rawinsonde site & distance | Radar Method | Results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Max Planck Inst. for Aeronomy | 53.5 MHz | 3.5° | Rottger et al. | 1978 | Hannover 90 km | Measurements at vertical incidence and 12.5° off zenith. | Fair agreement (3 ms$^{-1}$) between radar and rawinsonde winds in one case. No winds below 1 km from radar. But max. rawinsonde wind only 6 ms$^{-1}$. |
| 8. Arecibo | 430 MHz | 0.17° | Farley et al. | 1979 | San Juan 75 km | VAD scanning 22.5° intervals | Agreement w/San Juan generally to 3 ms$^{-1}$. Large variations in both ff and dd faithfully mirrored. Measurement above 5 km MSL; strong zero shift returns at low altitudes. Data scaled by hand; reference to need to develop criteria to deal with clutter echoes and complex atmos. echoes with multiple spectral peaks. |
| 9. Arecibo | 430 MHz | 0.17° | Fukao et al. | 1982 | San Juan 75 km | Wind components measured along beam directed 15° from zenith, in meridional and azimuthal directions, each for 30 minutes. | Standard deviation of differences between radar and rawinsonde components was under 5 m/sec, ascribed to rawinsonde errors & temporal and spatial variability of winds. Rather faithful match vertical irregularities in Arecibo and San Juan profilers. Winds up to 30 ms$^{-1}$. |
| 10. Platteville, Colo. | 50 MHz | 2° | Ecklund et al. | 1979 | Denver | 2 beams, 15° from vertical | 2 comparisons. Differences generally <5 ms$^{-1}$ except one at 8 km >20 ms$^{-1}$. Only heights above 4 km agl. |
| 11. Kwajalein | 410 MHz | 1.06° | Crane | 1980 | - | Compared with Jimsphere tracked with same radar. | Agreement to ~1 ms$^{-1}$. |
| 12. Jicamarca | 50 MHz | 0.5° | Fukao et al. | 1981 | Lima 30 km | 2 beams, 3.45° from vertical | Four cases; radar data offset 10-15 ms$^{-1}$ from Lima data 20 km away. Reason for discrepancies unclear. Note that any systematic error must be greatly amplified in calculations because of small zenith angle. |

b. In a few cases (5, 8, 9, 11) with radar beams quite narrow ($\sim 1°$ or less), results are excellent, differences with other reported winds being indisputably within the range of uncertainty attributable to the other wind-finding method.

c. Almost all of the test data concern VHF. There are only three papers treating results in the 400-MHz region, and these apply to unusual and markedly superior equipment, not of the economical type being recommended for development and deployment in a meteorological network.

d. The typical deviation of radar-measured and comparison winds is near 5 m $s^{-1}$. This is not small enough to give ease but not so large that it cannot be largely explained by spatial and temporal separations in the data acquired.

e. There are not enough data for us to be confident about possible systematic differences between true winds and data gathered with VHF radars of the type proposed for meteorological use. It appears, however, that bias, if it exists, is not greater than about 2 m $s^{-1}$.

f. Study (4) in Table 1 is persuasive in its indication that vertical velocity contaminates the indications of horizontal winds at the Sunset site and in its suggestions of means to reduce such contamination greatly with multibeam systems. This paper, in a milieu of other meteorological inputs, is also persuasive in its evidence for a substantially smaller magnitude and persistence of vertical velocities in the plains than in the Rocky Mountains.

g. Data collected by the 50-MHz systems deployed for weather studies are in the layer between about 2 km AGL and 17 km.

As we interpret these data to reach our conclusions, we should refer to studies of wind variability and of rawinsonde accuracy; rawinsondes represent usual means for measuring and studying winds. During 1968, during the NSSL spring program of observations, paired soundings were released within five minutes of each other at two sites and tracked with independent tracking systems within a few hundred feet of each other on the ground. Seven pairs at each site produced comparative wind data. The standard deviation of wind speed differences near Fort Sill, Oklahoma, was 1.43 m $s^{-1}$, and near the television antenna for WKY north of Oklahoma City it was 2.55 m $s^{-1}$; standard deviations of directional differences were 6.00 and 7.68 degrees, respectively. Since the balloons were launched in fair weather, it is estimated that practically all the differences are attributable to properties of the procedures and equipment used to gather the data. In particular, the larger value given for the WKY site probably reflects some difficulties there that were especially noticeable (BARNES et al., 1971). Also in 1968, at 10-station rawinsonde network near the National Severe Storms Laboratory in Norman, with station spacing ranging from 25 to 132 km and average spacing of 39 km, provided 573 soundings appropriate for study of wind structure, of which 104 soundings were made during periods devoid of local storms (BARNES and LILLY, 1975). The rms vector wind difference measured at the 46 km distance significant for the current study was less than 3 m $s^{-1}$ at each of the altitudes examined -- 1500, 3000, and 5700 m MSL.

Finally, there is the study of HOEHNE (1980) who found 3.1 m $s^{-1}$ to be the standard deviation of the difference between wind speeds measured with separate tracking systems that tracked pairs of sondes suspended from single balloons. Hoehne's value seems large in view of the results from the NSSL data described above.

Clearly, work remains to define both the wind-profiling performance envelope of the 50-MHz and 405-MHz systems proposed for meteorological use, and the spatial variability of actual winds.

50-MHz PROFILER IN OKLAHOMA

In a project involving cooperation between the Wave Propagation Laboratory in Boulder, Colorado, and the National Severe Storms Laboratory, a 2-beam 50-MHz profiler was installed during Spring 1985 at Great Plains Apiaries, 34°58'N x 97°31'W. This is in Section 21, Township 6 North, Range 3 West, McClain County, Oklahoma, 46 km south of the Oklahoma City Weather Service Forecast Office, where rawinsonde data are obtained twice daily. It is a region of rolling hills with slopes averaging near 2°; and valley bottoms are about 35 meters below hilltops about 2 km apart. The radar is at an elevation of 330 meters MSL and surrounding hilltops are typically 355 meters MSL. In order to minimize displacement of earth during installation and subsequent erosion problems, the 50-m-square dipole arrays were oriented along azimuths 11.3° and 101.3°, referenced to true north, with Earth's surface at the site tilted upward 2.1° toward azimuth 11.3°. The dipoles oriented toward 11.3° project a beam toward azimuth 109.4° and elevation angle 75.4°; and the dipoles oriented toward 101.3° project a beam toward 191.3° and elevation angle 73.4°. The two-way beamwidths are about 5° to half power. The radar was placed "on the air" about May 10th with software applicable to installations on a level surface; software properly accounting for the tilted terrain and beam angles given above was installed on July 15th. Data collected before the revised software was installed can be corrected.

The radar operates automatically, with data transmissions hourly to computers at the Wave Propagation Laboratory in Boulder, Colorado, and at the University of Oklahoma in Norman. The archival data are represented in Table 2. The winds are drived from a composite of up to 12 determinations during the previous hour; the computer selects contributions to the composite on the basis of a sufficiently large signal-to-noise ratio; processing details and other information have been presented by STRAUCH et al. (1985). Details on the Doppler spectra are available but must be requested specifically. A dedicated line will facilitate more comprehensive recording and in-depth study of the Oklahoma data.

SOME COMPARISONS INVOLVING DATA FROM THE OKLAHOMA 50-MHz PROFILER

We have compared rawinsonde data acquired at Oklahoma City on 39 occasions from August 8 to September 8, 1985, and on 11 occasions from October 1 to October 8, 1985, with profiler data acquired at the same times (within one hour of 00 Z and 12 Z). (Obviously erroneous data in both sets, such as the point indicated in Table 2 were excluded.) A majority of the soundings in the first set are characterized by light winds and weak shear throughout the troposphere. The second set is marked by substantially stronger winds and vertical shear.

Vertical interpolation is necessary for comparison of the rawinsonde data with profiler data. Data from one sensor were linearly interpolated to the height of the data from the other sensor. This interpolation is a source of error in the comparison; its magnitude is surely small because of the small vertical separation between data (290 m for the short pulse and 870 m for the long pulse). At the higher heights the long pulse data are sometimes sparse, with larger interpolation errors.

The root-mean-square (rms) average difference for the 39 comparisons of the first set, for both the u (positive to the east) and the v (positive to the north) wind components are listed in Table 3a. The average rms differences of the components are about 2.5 m s$^{-1}$ for the rawinsonde/short pulse comparison, 3.5 m s$^{-1}$ for the rawinsonde/long pulse comparison, and 1.5 m s$^{-1}$ for the long pulse/short pulse comparison. The rms vector differences are the square roots of the sum of squares of the average rms differences.

C-2

Table 2.

```
SITE: OKLAHOMA
DATE: 85  5 23
TIME: 23  0  0
NPRO:  12  NTDA:  350  NOSP:  13  PULU:  3.67  PRPR:  238.00
MAX HOR VEL:        62.87
FIRST HT (AGL):      1.64
NUMBER OF HEIGHTS:    24
DELTA HEIGHT (KM):   .29
POWER ANTENNA:        EW
```

| GATE | SPEED | DIRECT | HEIGHT | #E | #N | POWER |
|------|-------|--------|--------|----|----|-------|
| 1 | -999.00 | -999.0 | 1.97 | 2 | 12 | -999.0 |
| 2 | 5.37 | 301.5 | 2.26 | 9 | 12 | 48.3 |
| 3 | 7.57 | 297.5 | 2.54 | 12 | 12 | 58.9 |
| 4 | 7.88 | 303.6 | 2.83 | 12 | 12 | 69.4 |
| 5 | 7.42 | 307.2 | 3.12 | 12 | 12 | 72.0 |
| 6 | 7.84 | 322.9 | 3.41 | 12 | 12 | 65.6 |
| 7 | 6.17 | 338.4 | 3.70 | 12 | 12 | 57.2 |
| 8 | 5.45 | 343.3 | 3.99 | 12 | 12 | 52.3 |
| 9 | 4.88 | 323.7 | 4.28 | 12 | 12 | 49.1 |
| 10 | 6.80 | 304.3 | 4.57 | 12 | 12 | 46.5 |
| 11 | 8.12 | 299.9 | 4.86 | 12 | 12 | 45.5 |
| 12 | 5.65 | 300.4 | 5.14 | 12 | 11 | 48.5 |
| 13 | 4.60 | 294.8 | 5.43 | 12 | 11 | 48.2 |
| 14 | 3.89 | 294.3 | 5.72 | 12 | 11 | 42.7 |
| 15 | 3.27 | 293.4 | 6.01 | 11 | 10 | 36.1 |
| 16 | 5.46 | 302.1 | 6.30 | 11 | 9 | 35.2 |
| 17 | 9.74 | 302.0 | 6.59 | 11 | 10 | 38.0 |
| 18 | 10.34 | 299.2 | 6.88 | 12 | 11 | 38.0 |
| 19 | 10.84 | 294.2 | 7.17 | 12 | 10 | 35.7 |
| 20 | 11.43 | 293.2 | 7.46 | 10 | 9 | 31.3 |
| 21 | 11.22 | 292.2 | 7.74 | 9 | 7 | 29.2 |
| 22 | 13.54 | 287.7 | 8.03 | 8 | 6 | 25.0 |
| 23 | 13.61 | 288.7 | 8.32 | 8 | 5 | 23.6 |
| 24 | 2.25 | 314.5 | 8.61 | 5 | 5 | 34.8 |

```
SITE: OKLAHOMA
DATE: 85  5 23
TIME: 23  0  0
NPRO:  12  NTDA:  124  NOSP:  22  PULU:  9.67  PRPR:  672.00
MAX HOR VEL:        62.85
FIRST HT (AGL):      2.65
NUMBER OF HEIGHTS:    18
DELTA HEIGHT (KM):   .87
POWER ANTENNA:        EW
```

| GATE | SPEED | DIRECT | HEIGHT | #E | #N | POWER |
|------|-------|--------|--------|----|----|-------|
| 1 | 7.22 | 310.7 | 2.98 | 12 | 12 | 65.8 |
| 2 | 7.35 | 317.8 | 3.84 | 12 | 12 | 66.9 |
| 3 | 6.70 | 314.4 | 4.71 | 12 | 11 | 61.8 |
| 4 | 5.85 | 305.8 | 5.58 | 11 | 10 | 54.1 |
| 5 | 6.20 | 309.1 | 6.44 | 11 | 12 | 46.2 |
| 6 | 7.59 | 301.9 | 7.31 | 11 | 12 | 42.3 |
| 7 | 7.83 | 294.1 | 8.18 | 10 | 12 | 37.8 |
| 8 | 8.82 | 287.3 | 9.05 | 9 | 9 | 32.0 |
| 9 | 6.36 | 291.2 | 9.91 | 9 | 8 | 28.6 |
| 10 | 11.75 | 294.6 | 10.78 | 8 | 10 | 25.9 |
| 11 | 20.44 | 289.1 | 11.65 | 8 | 10 | 24.6 |
| 12 | 19.53 | 292.0 | 12.51 | 8 | 10 | 24.8 |
| 13 | 19.65 | 287.5 | 13.38 | 7 | 7 | 23.4 |
| 14 | 18.03 | 285.5 | 14.25 | 5 | 7 | 20.6 |
| 15 | 10.49 | 291.9 | 15.11 | 6 | 8 | 23.2 |
| 16 | 11.79 | 303.7 | 15.98 | 7 | 4 | 21.7 |
| 17 | 10.82 | 279.2 | 16.85 | 5 | 5 | 19.9 |
| 18 | -999.00 | -999.0 | 17.71 | 5 | 3 | 27.4 |

Table 3a. Average RMS difference of the u and v wind components for 39
comparisons during August 8 - September 8, 1985.

| Comparison | Average RMS difference | | RMS vector wind difference ms$^{-1}$ |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | u | v | |
| Rawinsonde/short pulse | 2.55 | 2.44 | 3.5 |
| Rawinsonde/long pulse | 4.15 | 2.93 | 5.1 |
| Long pulse/short pulse | 1.73 | 1.17 | 2.1 |

Table 3b. Average RMS difference of the u and v wind components for 11
cases during October 1-8, 1985.

| Comparison | Average RMS difference | | RMS vector wind difference ms$^{-1}$ |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | u | v | |
| Rawinsonde/short pulse | 2.8 | 2.3 | 3.6 |
| Rawinsonde/long pulse | 4.3 | 3.3 | 5.4 |
| Long pulse/short pulse | 3.1 | 1.5 | 3.4 |

In order to learn if the average rms differences include a systematic
bias, we also computed the mean wind speed at all the points for which
comparative data existed (approximately 400 from each sensor). These mean
winds for the first set of data are listed in Table 4a. Note that the average
profiler winds, both with long pulse and short pulse, are smaller than the mean
winds estimated by rawinsonde. In the rawinsonde/short pulse comparison the
difference between the mean wind estimates is 1.9 m s$^{-1}$; the speed of the
short pulse winds averages 74.3% of the rawinsonde winds. Similarly, the long
pulse winds average 71.9% of the rawinsonde winds or 2.5 m s$^{-1}$ less than
corresponding rawinsonde winds.

The findings from the August 8 - September 8 period are reinforced in the
October data, represented in Tables 3a and 4a. The October period was one of
substantially stronger winds, as shown by the u component listed in Table 4a.

All in all, these comparisons of rawinsonde and profiler data indicate a
bias toward zero in the profiler winds. More comparisons with other sensors
as well as in-depth analysis of Doppler spectral data with collocated profiler
and rawinsonde should be informative. It will be particularly important to
determine whether the rawinsonde/profiler differences represent a constant
offset or a percentage bias.

It should be noted that the average differences discussed here are
compounded of rather widely different situations. Thus, Figure 1a shows a case
with marked systematic differences between wind speeds at the rawinsonde and

Table 4a. Mean wind speeds for the three comparisons in Table 3a.

| Sensor | Mean Wind | Sensor | Mean Wind | Difference |
|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|------------|
| Rawinsonde | 7.24 m s$^{-1}$ | short pulse | 5.38 m s$^{-1}$ | 1.86 m s$^{-1}$ |
| Rawinsonde | 8.94 | long pulse | 6.43 | 2.51 |
| Long pulse | 5.22 | short pulse | 5.11 | 0.11 |

Table 4b. Mean wind speeds for the three comparisons in Table 3b.

| Sensor | Mean Wind (u comp.) | Sensor | Mean Wind (u comp.) | Difference of means |
|--------|---------------------|--------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Rawinsonde | 14.2 | short pulse | 12.8 | 1.4 |
| Rawinsonde | 18.1 | long pulse | 15.2 | 2.9 |
| Long pulse | 15.5 | short pulse | 13.4 | 2.1 |

profiler sites, but 1b shows that wind directions reported on the same occasion agree quite well. On another date, shown in Figure 2a and 2b, rawinsonde and profiler wind speeds are in remarkable agreement except in the layer from 7.5 to 11 km, where differences are up to about 15 m s$^{-1}$, while directions are in close agreement except differences up to about 60° in the layer from 3 to 6 km! We certainly must identify the reason(s) for such features since they represent very large deviations in implied kinetic energy and are correspondingly significant for forecasting; such interesting characteristics are present in practically every sounding pair.

POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS FOR DISCREPANCIES IN OKLAHOMA DATA

The following possible sources of differences noted above are: ground clutter contamination; interference from stray electromagnetic transmissions during oil field operations, rawinsonde errors, spatial and temporal variability of the wind, hardware and software discrepancies in the profiler radar; backscatter from edges of the main beam and from sidelobes, and contamination by vertical velocities associated with standing and/or migratory waves. At this writing we are just beginning to investigate these possibilities and to look for others.

The authors believe that the differences presented are significantly larger than can be explained by spatial variability of the wind. We plan to evaluate this definitively during Spring 1986 with aid of a rawinsonde unit at the radar site.

The sometime differences between profiler indications on long and short pulse illustrated in Figure 3 may be relatable to nonlinear vertical distributions of wind shear interactive with the different pulse lengths.

Figure 1. Wind speed (top) and direction (bottom) measured by
rawinsonde (O) and Oklahoma profiler (other symbols) on
13 August 1985, 00 GMT. Abscissae show wind speed in
increments of 5 m s$^{-1}$ and direction in increments of 50°,
respectively. Ordinates show heights MSL in km.


Concerning variations of reflectivity with elevation angle, it has been
noted that since VHF reflectivity declines with increasing zenith angle, the
measured velocities are biased low by the more reflective patches that have
smaller radial velocities in the more elevated portions of the beam. Although
formulations by DOVIAK and ZRNIC' (1984) show this effect to be negligible at
zenith angles larger than about 8° (Figure 4), consideration of sidelobes may
alter first impressions. A useful experiment in this regard would involve
addition of switchable phase shifters to the profiler antenna system and
study of backscattered power from a beam scanned in elevation.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Highly accurate wind finding is confirmed for radars with narrow beams,
especially when VAD scanning is employed. Systematic differences up to 2 m

Figure 2.  Same as Figure 1, except 19 August 1985, 00 GMT.

$s^{-1}$ between wind data from rawinsondes and profilers of the inexpensive type recommended for widespread use, average random variations up to 5 m $s^{-1}$ between wind data from these sensors, and occasional differences up to 15 m $s^{-1}$, are not well explained in much of the data reported so far. This is not reason to be discouraged, however, because confidence in the basic profiler method is well founded (KOSCIELNY et al., 1984), and the studies that leave us with concerns, including this one, are insufficiently definitive. We are stimulated to concentrate our efforts toward quantifying the differences in observations by profilers and other sensors, and then seeking their causes, so that large variances can be understood and data of known and acceptable accuracy can be produced routinely.  We can be confident that a much better situation will develop as we direct our resources strongly to this problem.

SUMMARY

The Workshop provided a valuable exchange of information among meteorologists and engineers. Clearly, advances in communicating, data processing, and

Figure 3. Vertical variations of reflectivity in a layer
with vertical wind shear produce differences between
the winds measured with short pulse and long pulse.
Ordinates show heights in kilometers. Abscissae left
to right are relative power, wind speed, and wind
direction measured by the 50-kHz profiler in Oklahoma.



Figure 4. Reflectivity vs zenith angle based on data
gathered by Rottger and a model by DOVIAK and ZRNIC'
(1984).

mathematical modeling of meteorological phenomena have brought the meteorol-
ogical community to the threshold of effective use of kinematic and thermo-
dynamic data gathered more frequently and on a finer grid than heretofore.
Such additional data provided routinely should lead to improved models and to
improved forecasts of precipitation and other weather variables.

Conference papers demonstrate a wide range of interesting studies ongoing
with profilers, but the performance envelope of wind profiling radars needs
better definition. In particular, further address is needed toward questions
concerning possible bias in profiler wind data, measurement of winds in the
planetary boundary layer, and the accuracy of wind estimates in relation to the
time period over which averages are calculated.

In view of great interest in boundary layer parameters and their
importance to interpretation of individual profiler data, as well as to
forecasting with network data, it is urged that profiler programs identify and
implement means for providing boundary layer data, especially on wind and
precipitation, at profiler radar sites.

The meteorological community is interested in prospects for studying
lightning and precipitation processes with VHF and UHF profiler radars because
Doppler signatures of meteors and of the air motion itself may be apparent
simultaneously.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

## REFERENCES

Balsley, B. B., N. Cianos, D. T. Farley, and M. J. Baron (1977), Winds derived
    from radar measurements in the arctic troposphere and stratosphere, _J._
    _Appl. Meteorol._, _16_, 1235-1239.
Balsley, B. B., and K. S. Gage (1982), On the use of radars for operational
    wind profiling, _Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc._, _63_, 1009-1018.
Barnes, S. L., J. H. Henderson, and R. J. Ketchum (1971), Rawinsonde
    observation and processing techniques at the National Severe Storms Labora-
    tory, NOAA Tech. Memo. _ERL NSSL-53_, 244-246.
Barnes, S. L., and D. K. Lilly (1975), Covariance analysis of severe storm
    environments, Preprints, Ninth Conf. on Severe Local Storms, Oct. 21-23,
    1975, Am. Meteorol. Soc., Boston, MA, 301-306.
Bowhill, S. A., and B. Edwards (1983), Middle Atmosphere Program, _Handbook for_
    _MAP_, Vol. 9, SCOSTEP Secretariat, Univ. Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
Clark, W. L., J. L. Green, and J. M. Warnock (1985), Estimating meteorological
    wind vector components from monostatic Doppler radar measurements: A case
    study, _Radio Sci._ (in press).
Crane, R. K. (1980), Radar measurements of wind at Kwajalein, _Radio Sci._,
    _15_, 383-394.
Doviak, R. J., and D. S. Zrnic' (1984), Reflection and scatter formula for
    anisotropically turbulent air, _Radio Sci._, _19_, 325-326.
Ecklund, W. L., D. A. Carter, and K. S. Gage (1977), Sounding of the lower
    atmosphere with a portable 50 MHz coherent radar, _J. Geophys. Res._, _82_,
    4969-4971.

Ecklund, W. L., D. L. Carter, and B. B. Balsley (1979), Continuous measurements of upper atmospheric winds and turbulence using a VHF Doppler radar: Preliminary results, J. Atmos. Terr. Phys., 41, 983-944.

Farley, D. T., B. B. Balsley, W. E. Swartz, and C. LaHoz (1979), Tropical winds measured by the Arecibo radar, J. Appl. Meteorol., 18, 227-230.

Fukao, S., A. Aoki, K. Wakasugi, T. Tsuda, S. Kato, and D. A. Fleisch (1981), Some further results on the lower stratospheric winds and waves over Jicamarca, J. Atmos. Terr. Phys., 43, 649-661.

Fukao, S., T. Sato, N. Yamasaki, R. M. Harper, and S. Kato (1982), Winds measured by a UHF Doppler radar and rawinsondes: Comparisons made on twenty-six days (August-September 1977) at Arecibo, Puerto Rico, J. Appl. Meteorol., 21, 1357-1363.

Gage, K. S., and B. B. Balsley (1978), Doppler radar probing of the clear atmosphere, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 59, 1074-1093.

Green, J. L., J. M. Warnock, R. M. Winkler, and T. E. VanZandt (1975), Studies of winds in the upper troposphere with a sensitive VHF radar, Geophys. Res. Lett., 2, 19-21.

Green, J. L., K. S. Gage, W. L. Clark, T. E. VanZandt, and P. H. Hildebrand (1980), Joint instrumented aircraft and VHF Doppler radar measurements of wind near Boulder, Colorado, Preprints, 19th Conf. on Radar Meteorology, April 15-18, Miami Beach, FL, 624-628.

Hoehne, W. E. (1980), Precision of National Weather Service upper air measurements, NOAA Tech. Memo NWS, T&DE-16.

Koscielny, A. J., R. J. Doviak, and D. S. Zrnic' (1984), An evaluation of the accuracy of some radar wind profiling techniques, J. Atmos. and Oceanic Tech., 1, 309-320.

Rottger, J., J. Klostermeyer, P. Czechowsky, R. Ruster, and G. Schmidt (1978), Remote sensing of the atmosphere by VHF radar experiments, Naturwiss., 65, 285-296.

Strauch, R. G., D. A. Merritt, and K. P. Moran (1985), Radar wind profilers in the Colorado network, NOAA Tech. Memo., ERL WPL-120.

Warnock, J. M., T. E. VanZandt, J. L. Green, and R. H. Winkler (1978), Comparisons between wind profiles measured by Doppler radar and by rawinsonde balloons, Geophys. Res. Lett., 5, 109-112.