Including PWS gauge data in radar merging ^{II} improves real-time precipitation estimates *Methodology and 1-year evaluation for the Netherlands*

Jiří Svatoš¹, Aart Overeem², Nathalie Rombeek³, Claudia Brauer¹

1 - Hydrology and Environmental Hydraulics Group, Wageningen University & Research;
2 - R&D Observations and Data Technology, Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute;
3 - Department of Water Management, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology

Motivation

- Accuracy of real-time precipitation monitoring limited by low number of rain gauges
- Merging radar with both official and crowdsourced rain gauges has the largest potential to improve quantitative precipitation estimates (QPEs)
- Need to account for different quality of rain gauge observations through:
 - PWS quality control filter out observation errors
 - PWS quality weighting not to overwhelm official (high-quality) observations

Methodology

• For the period February 2023 – January 2024 in the Netherlands (Fig. 1):







UNIVERSITY & RESEARCH

Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Manaaement

Jeitt

- 32 KNMI automatic weather stations (AWSs)
- 4281 Netatmo personal weather stations (PWSs)
- 319 manual network gauges (only 24-h accumulations, used for evaluation)
- Using operational KNMI merging algorithm (see poster presentation by Aart Overeem, ID: 9)
- Compare to current real-time (AWS-radar) and final reanalysis (RFCOR) products

Merging setup

Only a simple PWS quality control needed Netatmo Unadjusted **PWSs** radar PWSQC • Simple PWS-radar thresholds (5-min) (1-h) (de Vos et al., 2019) make computationally expensive Faulty zeroes (FZ) PWSQC filters redundant High influx (HI) Station outlier (SO) Dynamic bias correction (dynBC) Merging algorithm itself supplements Default bias correction 1.15 quality control (interpolating adjustment Radar QC factors, lower PWS quality weight) (Overeem et al., 2024) Aggregate to 1-h accumulations if ≥ 10 out of 12 timesteps available • Bias correction is useful, but dynamic BC is not Radar & PWS > 0.25mm $PWS \le 150 mm$ **Table 1:** Performance of the PWS-AWS-radar merged with different PWS/radar < 12

Figure 1: Locations of available A) radars and KNMI rain gauges B) Netatmo PWSs.

Quality weight of PWSs should be decreased

- Optimal PWS weight around 0.1 (one tenth of the weight of AWSs)
- Same optimum value when using 4281 or only 500 random PWSs



PWS quality control filters applied, evaluated at manual gauges for 24-h gauge rainfall accumulations ≥ 0 mm and ≥ 20 mm.



Quality control	Rel. bias [%]		CV		ρ ²	
For gauge [mm]	≥0	≥20	≥0	≥20	≥0	≥20
Radar QC, HI, FZ, SO, dynBC	-7.25	-10.09	0.478	0.174	0.924	0.638
Radar QC, HI, FZ, SO	-7.20	-9.93	0.476	0.173	0.925	0.643
Radar QC only	-7.42	-10.65	0.478	0.171	0.924	0.645
0.25 mm threshold only	-6.54	-9.39	0.490	0.188	0.920	0.598
AWS-radar reference	-10.29	-12.95	0.558	0.223	0.896	0.482

Figure 2: Performance of the PWS-AWS-radar merged product based on the assigned PWS quality weight, evaluated for 24-h precipitation accumulations at manual network gauges. The RFCOR product is evaluated with leave-one-out cross validation.

Evaluation

Adding PWSs improves QPEs, especially during heavy rainfall

• PWSs help capture local convective storms





Improvement also at lower PWS network densities

• Diminishing benefit of adding extra PWSs



Figure 3: Scatter density plots of 1-h precipitation accumulations of the **A)** AWS-radar and **B)** PWS-AWS-radar merged products against the AWS reference provided through leave-one-out cross validation

Figure 4: Performance of the merged radar products as a function of the number of used PWSs for 24-h accumulations at manual gauges (with leave-one-out cross validation for RFCOR).

Conclusions

- Merged PWS-AWS-radar product can match the performance of the final reanalysis product in real time
- Methodology is potentially suitable for operational rainfall monitoring in the Netherlands as well as countries with less dense PWS networks



https://edepot.wur.nl/693405

References

de Vos et al. (2019). Quality control for crowdsourced personal weather stations to enable operational rainfall monitoring. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *4*6(15), 8820-8829.

Overeem et al. (2024). Merging with crowdsourced rain gauge data improves pan-European radar precipitation estimates. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 28(3), 649-668.