Comparison of WTLMA Lightning Climatology to GLM Climatology for the West Texas Region

STEPHANIE A. WEISS ERIC C. BRUNING, TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

KATRINA VIRTS, NASA/UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA HUNTSVILLE

WTLMA Climatology: Data Availability

- West Texas LMA 2012-present
- Flash-sorted data
- Gridded data
 - Flash extent density
 - Flash initiations
 - Flash footprints
 - Sources
- Vanna Chmielewski & Vicente Salinas



Climatology Comparison: WTLMA & GLM

- Rudlosky and Virts (2020)
- Grid of flash km⁻² yr⁻¹
 - GLM: flash centroid
 - WTLMA: flash initiation
- GLM 16, 17, and 18
- December 2018-May 2020 and May 2021-August 2023 (46 months)



Seasonal Climatology Comparison: WTLMA & GLM

GLM16 flash density (flash/km²/month)



WTLMA flash density (flash/km²/month)



Climatology Comparison: WTLMA & GLM



December 2018-May 2020 and May 2021-August 2023 (46 months)

Detection Efficiency Considerations

- Apply approximate DE rules from recent studies
 - Energy threshold: 5 fJ = 40% of TRMM LIS DE. Min energy: 10% per fJ (Cummins 2020, personal comm.)
 - 2.5 fJ threshold for GLM-16 implies 80% DE relative to LIS
 - GLM-17 threshold is 1.5 fJ higher than GLM-16. Implies 15% worse for GLM-17.
 - For LMA flashes with 0.3 s duration, 10 km flash width, detection efficiency is reduced by **50% for medium-small flashes** (Zhang and Cummins, 2020, JGR)
 - 10x ice water path implies 10-30% drop in flash DE. Anvil: 0.05 kg m⁻², largest values in Colorado 50 kg m⁻². (Rutledge et al., 2020, JGR)
 - Let's assume we have a 20% drop from optical depth.



Conclusions

- Reasonable agreement between GLM and WTLMA for seasonal plots
- Long-time-scale plots highlight the WTLMA's DE change with distance
- Previously-derived DE of GLM for a single case seems to work well with this larger WTLMA dataset
- GLM provides helpful sanity check
- Future Work
 - DE range correction on WTLMA data
 - WTLMA:GLM comparison to estimate DE at different locations across the domain