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“Uncertainty is an uncomfortable position. But certainty is an absurd one.”

-Voltaire
Revealing the uncertainties

- Emissions Scenario(s)
- Global Climate Model(s)
- Natural Variability
- Downscaling method(s)
- Hydrologic Model Structure(s)
- Combined uncertainty
- Hydrologic Model Parameter(s)
Revealing the uncertainties

Emissions Scenario(s) → Global Climate Model(s) → Natural Variability
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What will the future look like?

Warmer Air Temperature (mostly)

Wetter And Drier... (Sometimes?)
Representation of Climate Change

- Problems with historical fidelity aside...
- How do different methods represent climate change.
- Statistical methods are almost identical.
- Dynamical simulation is very different.
A dichotomy of downscaling options

False

- Statistical downscaling based on rescaling GCM outputs
  - BCSD, BCCA, AR

- Statistical downscaling based on GCM dynamics (water vapor, wind, convective potential, etc.)
  - Regression-based methods
  - Analog methods

- Sophisticated circulation methods to relate the space-time variability of downscaled fields to synoptic scale atmospheric predictors (self-organized maps, etc.), possibly enhanced stochastically

- Dynamical downscaling using simple weather models

- Dynamical downscaling using state-of-the-art RCMs
The CESM Large Ensemble Variability in the Climate Signal

• CESM-LE simulates tremendous variability in precipitation changes

• Will this variability increase or decrease with a more sophisticated treatment of the physics?

• Initially selected two end members for WRF downscaling
  – Increasing Precipitation (Ens 2)
  – Decreasing Precipitation (Ens 30)

• Now adding 4 more
  – dashed lines + 2 not shown 6, 15, 34, and 35
  – 34 & 35 are new and stored hourly precip from CESM
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Uncertainty within Physics parameterizations
## Uncertainty in Microphysics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ntc:</td>
<td>Droplet number concentration</td>
<td>50 cm$^{-3}$ – 1000 cm$^{-3}$ Clean air - Polluted</td>
<td>Related to Aerosol concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNO:</td>
<td>Cloud ice number concentration parameterization</td>
<td>0.5 to 50</td>
<td>Vary deposition ice nucleation with a factor of 100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_v$, $b_v$, $f_v$:</td>
<td>Snow fall speed parameters</td>
<td>Original Mitchell and Heymsfield (2005). <strong>Test:</strong> Locatelli and Hobbs (1974) used in other microphysical schemes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_v$:</td>
<td>Cloud ice fall speed</td>
<td>Original: 1847 (Ferrier, 1994) <strong>Test:</strong> 700 (Ikawa and Saito, 1991 ).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{cube}$:</td>
<td>Capacitance (ice, graupel and snow)</td>
<td>Original: 0.5 <strong>Test:</strong> 0.25 (Lin 2008)</td>
<td>Deposition and sublimation dependent on capacitance. Reduced $c_{cube}$ based on Lin (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigg:</td>
<td>Droplet freezing</td>
<td>0: Some aerosol types(?) -5: Default (most aerosol types) -10: Relatively clean air (some aerosol types)</td>
<td>Change the temperature for where droplet freezing occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ef_sw_l</td>
<td>Snow collecting cloud water.</td>
<td>Original: efficiency &lt; 1 <strong>Test:</strong> efficiency = 1 (used in many microphysical schemes)</td>
<td>Variable collection efficiency based on median volume diameter of snow and cloud water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ideal Hill Case

- Varying all microphysical parameters results in large changes in precipitation
- (Some of these may be unrealistic...)

![Graph showing precipitation (mm/hr) vs. distance (km)]
• These changes affect a climate change signal strongly as well (2°C warming)
Parameter space

- Mapping these changes back to parameter space can suggest sensitive parameters for further evaluation.
- Most important parameters are related to conversion efficiency:
  - conversion of cloud ice to snow flakes.
Summary

- Uncertainty in GCM and Internal variability
- Uncertainties in downscaling scheme are significant
- Uncertainty in physics parameters may be large