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## FOREWORD

The Annual Tropical Cyclone Report is prepared by the staff of the Joint Typhoon Warning Center (JTWC), a combined Air Force/Navy organization operating under the command of the Commanding Officer, U.S. Naval Oceanography Command Center/Joint Typhoon Warning Center, Guam. JTWC was established 1 May 1959 when USCINCPAC directed USCINCPACFLT to provide a single tropical cyclone warning center for the western North Pacific region. The operations of JTWC are guided by CINCPACINST 3140.1T.

The mission of the Joint Typhoon Warning Center is multi-faceted and includes:

1. Continuous monitoring of all tropical weather activity in the Northem and Southem Hemispheres, from 180 degrees longitude westward to the east coast of Africa, and the prompt issuance of appropriate advisories and alerts when tropical cyclone development is anticipated.
2. Issuing warnings on all significant tropical cyclones in the above area of responsibility.
3. Determination of requirements for tropical cyclone reconnaissance and assignment of appropriate priorities.
4. Post-storm analysis of all significant tropical cyclones occurring within the westem North Pacific and North Indian Oceans, which includes an in-depth analysis of tropical cyclones of note and all typhoons.
5. Cooperation with the Naval Oceanographic and Atmopheric Research Laboratory (NOARL), Monterey, Califomia, on the operational evaluation of tropical cyclone models and forecast aids, and the development of new techniques to support operational forecast scenarios.

Satellite imagery used throughout this report represents data obtained by the DMSP network. The personnel of Detachment 1, 1WW, collocated with JTWC at Nimitz Hill, Guam, coordinate the satellite acquisitions and tropical cyclone reconnaissance with the following units:

Det 4, 20WS, Hickam AFB, Hawaii
Det 5, 20WS, Clark AB, Republic of the Philippines
Det 8, 20WS, Kadena AB, Japan
Det 15, 30WS, Osan AB, Korea

Air Force Global Weather Central, Offutt AFB, Nebraska

In addition, the Naval Oceanography Command Detachment, Diego Garcia, and Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP) equipped U.S. Navy ships have been instrumental in providing vital fixes of tropical cyclones in the Indian Ocean from satellite data.

Should JTWC become incapacitated, the Alternate Joint Typhoon Warning Center (AJTWC) located at the U.S. Naval Western Oceanography Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, assumes warning responsibilities. Assistance in determining satellite reconnaissance requirements, and in obtaining the resultant data, is provided by the PACAF Weather Support Unit, Hickam AFB, Hawaii.

Changes in this year's publication include: a new list of tropical cyclone names was implemented after Typhoon Wayne (25W); old Annex A now appears under the heading Tropical Cyclone Warning Statistics, Track and Fix Data; the Satellite Reconnaissance section was expanded to include technique development efforts and fuoure developments; and the numbering of the sections was modified to make indexing the material easier.

Special thanks to: Lieutenant Colonel Daniel J. McMorrow for his significant contributions and support; the men and women of the 27 th Communications Squadron, Operating Location Charlie and the Operations and Equipment Support departments of the Naval Oceanography Command Center, Guam for their continuing support by providing high quality real-time satellite imagery; Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Japan for sharing their satellite imagery of tropical cyclones; the Pacific Fleet Audio-Visual Center, Guam for their assistance in the reproduction of satellite data for this report; to the Navy Publications and Printing Service Branch Office, Guam; Dr. Bob Abbey and the Office of Naval Research for their technical support to this publication and support to the University of Hawaii for the Post Doctorate Fellow at JTWC; Dr. Mark Lander for his training efforts and suggestions; the Australian Meteorological Service for the coastal radar reports on tropical cyclones via the AFTN to JTWC; National Weather Service Pacific Region for their able assistance installing the AMOS equipment at Ujae and Enewetak, and AFTN hardware at JTWC; and the Republic of the Marshall Islands for endorsing the AMOS installations at Ujae and Enewetak; Mr John Brown and Mr. David Saltzberger of the Naval Oceanographic Office for their efforts regarding buoys and the Local User's Terminal data.

Note: Appendix A contains definitions, Appendix B names of tropical cyclones, Appendix $C$ references and Appendix $D$ information on how to obtain past issues of the Annual Tropical Cyclone Report (itiled Annual Typhoon Report prior to 1980).
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| AFB | Air Force Base |  |  |  |  |
| AFGWC | Air Force Global Weather Central | COSM or COSMOS | Cyclops Objective Steering Model Output Statistics | INIT | Initial |
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| AIREP | Aircraft (Weather) Report (Commercial and Military) | CPA | Closest Point of Approach | IR | Infrared |
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|  |  |  |  | KT | Knot(s) |
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| APT | Automatic Picture | CSUM | Colorado State University |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  | LUT | Local User's Terminal |
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|  |  | DMSP | Defense Meteorological Satellite Program | MET | Meteorological |
| AWDS | Automated Weather Distribution System |  | Satelite Program |  | Meteorological |
|  |  | DSAT | Digital Satellite Acquitition | MIN | Minimum |
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|  |  | GMT | Greenwich Mean Time | NEDN | Naval Environmental Data Network |
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| NM | Nautical Mile(s) | POS ER | (Initial) Position Error | TYMNET | Time-Sharing Network: Commercial wide area network connecting microand mainframe computers |
| NOAA | National Oceanic and Atmospheric | RADOB | Radar Observation |  |  |
|  | Administration | RECON | Reconnaissance | ULAC | Upper-Level Anticyclone |
| NOARL | Naval Oceanographic and Atmospheric Research Laboratory | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RRDB } \\ & \text { RSDB } \end{aligned}$ | Reference Roster Data Base | ULCC | Upper-Level Circulation Center |
|  |  |  | Raw Satellite Data Base | USAF |  |
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| NWOC | Naval Western Oceanography Center | TAPT | Typhoon Acceleration Prediction Technique | 24 WE | 24-Hour Wind (Waming) Error |
| NWS | National Weather Service | TC | Tropical Cyclone | 48 WE | 48-Hour Wind (Waming) Error |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NR | Number | TCFA | Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert |  |  |
| NRL | Naval Research Laboratory | TD | Tropical Depression | 72 WE | 72-Hour Wind (Waming) Error |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| OTCM | One Way (Interactive) Tropical Cyclone Model | TIROS | Television Infrared Observational Satellite |  |  |
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## 1. OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

### 1.1 GENERAL

The Joint Typhoon Warning Center (JTWC) provides a variety of routine products and services to the organizations within its area of responsibility, including:

### 1.1.1 SIGNIFICANT TROPICAL WEATHER

 ADVISORIES - Issued daily, to describe all tropical disturbances and their potential for further development during the advisory period.
### 1.1.2 TROPICAL CYCLONE FORMATION

 ALERTS - Issued when synoptic or satellite data indicate the development of a tropical cyclone is likely within 24 hours in a specified area.1.1.3 TROPICAL CYCLONE/ TROPICAL DEPRESSION WARNINGS - Issued periodically throughout each day to provide forecasts of position, intensity, and wind distribution for tropical cyclones in JTWC's area of responsibility (AOR).
1.1.4 PROGNOSTIC REASONING MESSAGES - Issued with each warning for tropical depressions, tropical storms, typhoons and super typhoons in the western North Pacific to discuss the rationale for JTWC's warnings.
1.1.5 PRODUCT CHANGES - The contents and availability of the above JTWC products are stipulated in USCINCPACINST 3140.1 (series). Changes to USCINCPACINST 3140.1T and JTWC products and services are proposed and discussed at the Annual Tropical Cyclone Conference. Significant changes this year to the warning system include: a new list of tropical cyclone names for the western North Pacific, Tropical Depression Warnings, inclusion of 30kt wind radii at 48- and 72 -hour forecast periods, and changing the message identifiers for the Prognostic Reasoning Messages and the Significant Tropical Weather Advisories.

### 1.2 DATA SOURCES

1.2.1 COMPUTER PRODUCTS - Numerical and statistical guidance are available from the USN Fleet Numerical Oceanography Center (FNOC) at Monterey, California. These products along with selected ones from the National Meteorological Center (NMC) are received through the Naval Environmental Data Network (NEDN), the Naval Environmental Satellite Network (NESN), and by microcomputer dial-up connections using military and commercial telephone lines. Numerical guidance is also received from Air Force Global Weather Center (AFGWC) at Omaha, Nebraska via the Pacific Digital Information Graphics System (PACDIGS), and from indigenous sources within our AOR.
1.2.2 CONVENTIONAL DATA - These data sets are comprised of land and shipboard surface observations, and enroute meteorological observations from commercial and military aircraft (AIREPS) recorded within six hours of synoptic times, and cloud-motion winds derived from satellite data . The conventional data is hand- and computerplotted, and hand-analyzed in the tropics for the surface/gradient and 200 mb levels. These analyses are prepared twice daily from 0000 Z and 1200 Z synoptic data. Also, FNOC supplies JTWC with computer generated analyses and prognoses, from 0000 Z and 1200 Z synoptic data, at the surface, $850 \mathrm{mb}, 700 \mathrm{mb}, 500 \mathrm{mb}$, $400 \mathrm{mb}, 200 \mathrm{mb}$ levels, and deep layer mean winds.

### 1.2.3 SATELLITE RECONNAISSANCE -

 Meteorological satellite imagery recorded at USAF/USN ground sites and USN ships supply day and night coverage in JTWC's area of responsibility. Interpretation of these satellite data provides tropical cyclone positions and estimates of current and forecast intensities (Dvorak, 1984). A USAF tactical satellite siteand Air Force Global Weather Central currently receive and analyze special sensor microwave/imager (SSM/I) data to provide estimates of $30-\mathrm{knot}$ wind radii near tropical cyclones. Use of satellite reconnaissance is discussed further in section 2. Reconnaissance and Fixes.
1.2.4 RADAR RECONNAISSANCE - Landbased radar observations are used to position tropical cyclones. Once a well-defined tropical cyclone moves within the range of land-based radar sites, their reports are invaluable for determination of movement. Use of radar reports during 1989 is discussed in section 2. Reconnaissance and Fixes.

### 1.2.5 DRIFTING METEOROLOGICAL

 BUOYS - In 1989, no drifting meteorological buoys were specifically deployed in the western North Pacific for tropical cyclone warning support. Five of the nine buoys from the 1988 deployment and one from the 1987 deployment continued operations into 1989. Buoys provided data as Tropical Storm Winona (01W) and Typhoon Brenda (03W) crossed the Philippine Sea, but by late May the last buoy ceased operation. In 1989 Commander, Naval Oceanography Command put into action the NAVOCEANCOM Integrated Drifting Buoy Plan 1989-1994 to provide mini-drifter buoys to meet USCINCPACFLT requirements including tropical cyclone warning support.JTWC acquires drifting buoy data directly through its Local User Terminal (LUT). The buoys transmit data to the TIROS-N polar orbiting satellites, which in turn relay the data to JTWC's LUT. Additionally, the data stored aboard the satellite are recovered via Service ARGOS and NOAA/NESDIS. NOAA/NESDIS processes and distributes the meteorological data to users via the National Meteorological Center (NMC) and the Automated Weather Network (AWN).
1.2.6 AUTOMATIC WEATHER OBSERVING STATIONS-Through a cooperative effort between Naval Oceanography Command and NOAA, the first of two HANDAR stations in the Mariana Islands was installed on Saipan in 1986. The second installation followed the next year on Rota. HANDAR data are received at JTWC through the Airfield Fixed Telecommunications Network (AFTN) and the AWN. Now, with the cooperation of NOAA, the Department of the Interior, and the Naval Oceanography Command, a network of 20 Automated Meteorological Observing Stations (AMOS) is planned to be completed throughout Micronesia by 1993. In 1988, the first AMOS site was installed at Faraulep Island (WMO 52005) in the central Carolines. In 1989, two more AMOS started operations at Ujae and Enewetak in the Marshall Islands. JTWC receives AMOS data from all sites via the AWN. In addition, data from the Faraulep site

Table 1-1. AUTOMATIC WEATHER OBSERVING STATIONS SUMMARY

| Site | Location | Callsign | Type | System | Installed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Saipan | $\left(15.2^{\circ} \mathrm{N}, 145.7^{\circ} \mathrm{E}\right)$ | 15D151D2 | HANDAR | ARC** | 1986 |
| Rota | $\left(14.4^{\circ} \mathrm{N}, 145.2^{\circ} \mathrm{E}\right)$ | 15D16448 | HANDAR | ARC | 1987 |
| Faraulep | $\left(8.6^{\circ} \mathrm{N}, 144.6^{\circ} \mathrm{E}\right)$ | FARP2/52005 | AMOS | C-MAN/ARGOS* | 1988 |
| Ujae | $\left(8.9^{\circ} \mathrm{N}, 165.8^{\circ} \mathrm{E}\right)$ | UJAP2 | AMOS | C-MAN*** | 1989 |
| Enewetak | $\left(11.4^{\circ} \mathrm{N}, 162.3^{\circ} \mathrm{E}\right)$ | ENIP2 | AMOS | C-MAN | 1989 |

[^0]can be received real time via service ARGOS. Summary of current AMOS appears in Table 1.1.

### 1.3 COMMUNICATIONS

Primary communications support is provided by the Naval Telecommunications Center (NTCC), Nimitz Hill, a component of the Naval Communications Area Master Station, Western Pacific (NAVCAMS WESTPAC). JTWC uses the following communications systems:
1.3.1 AUTOMATED DIGITAL NETWORK (AUTODIN) - AUTODIN is used for dissemination of warnings, alerts and other related bulletins to DOD and other US Government installations. These messages are relayed for further transmission over Navy Fleet Broadcasts, and Coast Guard CW (continuous wave Morse Code) and voice broadcasts. AUTODIN messages can be relayed to commercial telecommunications for delivery to non-DOD users. Inbound message traffic for JTWC is received via AUTODIN addressed to NAVOCEANCOMCEN GQ//JTWC// or DET 1 1WW NIMITZ HILL GQ//CC//.
1.3.2 AUTOMATED WEATHER NETWORK (AWN) - The AWN provides weather data over the Pacific Meteorological Data System (PACMEDS). Operational at JTWC since April 1988, the PACMEDS allows Pacific-Theater agencies to receive weather information at 1200 baud. Early in 1989, JTWC also became the first Pacific unit to use the AWNCOM/WINDS software and a microcomputer to send and receive data via the PACMEDS. The system will eventually provide effective storage and manipulation of the large volume of meteorological reports available from throughout JTWC's vast AOR. Through the AWN, JTWC has limited access to data available on the Global Telecommunications System (GTS).

### 1.3.3 DEFENSE SWITCHED NETWORK (DSN) - DSN, formerly AUTOVON, is a

world-wide general purpose switched telecommunications network for the Department of Defense. The network provides a rapid and vital voice link for JTWC to communicate tropical cyclone information to DOD installations. The DSN telephone numbers for JTWC are 344-4224 or 321-2345.
1.3.4 NAVAL ENVIRONMENTAL DATA NETWORK (NEDN) - The NEDN is the primary link to FNOC to obtain computer generated analyses and prognoses. It is also a backup communication line for requesting and receiving the objective tropical cyclone forecast aids from FNOC's mainframe computers. The NEDN allows JTWC to communicate directly to the other Naval Oceanography Command Centers around the world.
1.3.5 PUBLIC DATA NETWORK (PDN) A commercial packet switching network that provides low-speed interactive transmission to users of FNOC products. The PDN is now the primary method for JTWC to request and receive FNOC produced objective tropical cyclone forecast aids. The PDN allows direct access of FNOC products via the Automated Tropical Cyclone Forecast (ATCF) system. The PDN also serves as an alternate method of obtaining FNOC analyses and forecast fields. TYMNET is the contractor providing PDN services to FNOC .
1.3.6 DEFENSE DATA NETWORK (DDN) -The DDN is a DOD computer communications network utilized to exchange data files. Because the DDN has links, or gateways, to non-military information networks, it is primarily used to exchange data with the research community.

### 1.3.7 TELEPHONE FACSIMILE (TELEFAX)

 - TELEFAX provides the capability to rapidly scan and transmit, or receive, documents over commercial telephone lines or DSN. TELEFAX is used to disseminate tropical cyclone advisories and warnings to key agencies on Guam and, in special situations, the other Micronesian Islands. Inbound documentsfor JTWC are received via commercial telephone at (671) 477-6186. If inbound through DSN, the Guam DSN operator 3221110 can transfer the call to the commercial number 477-6186.
1.3.8 NAVAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE NETWORK (NESN) - The NESN's primary function is to pass satellite data from the satellite global data base at FNOC to regional centers. Similarly, it can pass satellite data from NOCC/JTWC to FNOC or other regional centers. Also, it provides a limited back-up for the NEDN.

### 1.3.9 AIRFIELD FIXED TELECOMMUN-

 ICATIONS NETWORK (AFTN) - AFTN was installed at JTWC in January 1990. Though AFTN is primarily for the exchange of aviation information; weather information and warnings are also distributed via this network. AFTN also provides point-to-point communication with other warning agencies. JTWC's AFTN identifier is PGUMYMYT.1.3.10 LOCAL USER'S TERMINAL (LUT) JTWC uses a LUT, provided by the Naval Oceanographic Office, as the primary means of receiving real-time data from drifting meteorological buoys and some of the Micronesia AMOS via the polar orbiting NOAA satellites.

### 1.4 DATA DISPLAYS

Equipment maintenance is provided by the Equipment Support Department of the Naval Oceanography Command Center, Guam.
1.4.1 NAVAL ENVIRONMENTAL DISPLAY STATION (NEDS) - The NEDS receives, processes, stores, displays and prints copies of FNOC environmental products. It drives the fleet facsimile broadcast and can also be used to generate the requests for objective tropical cyclone forecast techniques.
1.4.2 AUTOMATED TROPICAL CYCLONE FORECAST SYSTEM (ATCF) - The ATCF has decreased message preparation time and reduced the number of corrections to JTWC's alerts and warnings. In 1989 for the first time, the ATCF automatically computed the myriad of statistics calculated by JTWC. Links were established through a Local Area Network (LAN) to the NOCC Operations watch team to facilitate the generation of Tropical Cyclone Warning graphics for the Fleet Facsimile Broadcasts and their local metwatch and warning products for Micronesia. A module permits satellite reconnaissance fixes to be input from Det 1, 1WW into the LAN. Several other modules are still under development including: direct links to NTCC, the LUT, and AWNCOM.

### 1.4.3 PACIFIC DIGITAL INFORMATION GRAPHICS SYSTEM (PACDIGS) - The

 PACDIGS is a communications circuit that was expanded to include JTWC in 1988. Air Force Global Weather Central (AFGWC) at Omaha, Nebraska provides a standard set of numerical products to the PACDIGS circuit which can be used for additional evaluation in the development of tropical cyclone warnings.1.4.4 NAVAL SATELLITE DISPLAY SYSTEM (NSDS) - The NSDS functions as a display of FNOC stored Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP) imagery and low resolution geostationary imagery. It is the primary means for JTWC to observe the Indian Ocean.

### 1.4.5 NAVAL SATELLITE DISPLAY SYSTEM-GEOSTATIONARY(NSDS-G) The NSDS-G is the primary system used to process high resolution geostationary imagery for tropical cyclone positioning and intensity estimates for the western Pacific Ocean. Its built-in sectorizer allows monitoring of numerous cyclones or suspect areas on a small enough scale to expand and evaluate the data effectively.

### 1.5 ANALYSES

The JTWC Typhoon Duty Officer (TDO) routinely does manual streamline analyses of composite surface/gradient-level ( $3000 \mathrm{ft}(914 \mathrm{~m}$ )) and Upper-tropospheric (centered on the 200 mb level) data for 0000 Z and 1200 Z each day. Manual sea-level pressure analyses concentrating on the mid-latitudes are available from the NOCC Operations watch team. Computer analyses of the surface, 850, $700,500,400$, and 200 mb levels, deep layer mean winds, and frontal boundaries are available from the 0000 Z and 1200 Z FNOC data bases. Additional sectional charts at intermediate synoptic times and auxiliary charts, such as station-time plot diagrams and pressure-change charts, are analyzed during periods of significant tropical cyclone activity.

### 1.6 FORECAST PROCEDURES

1.6.1 INITIAL POSITIONING - The warning position is the best estimate of the center of the surface circulation at synoptic time. It is estimated from an analysis of all fix information received from one hour before to one and onehalf hours after synoptic time. The analysis is aided by a computer-generated objective best track scheme that weights fix information based on its statistical accuracy. The TDO includes synoptic observations and other information to adjust the position, testing consistency with the past direction, speed of movement and the influence of the different scales of motions. If the fix data are not available due to reconnaissance platform malfunction or communication problems, or are considered unrepresentative, synoptic data and/or extrapolation from previous fixes are used.
1.6.2 TRACK FORECASTING - A preliminary forecast track is developed based on an evaluation of the rationale behind the previous warning and the guidance given by the most recent set of objective techniques (see 5.2), numerical prognoses, recent movement, satellite animation, and other objective and empirical
techniques. This preliminary track is then subjectively modified based on the following considerations:
1.6.2.1 The prospects for recurvature or erratic movement are evaluated. This determination is based primarily on the present and forecast positions and amplitudes of the middletropospheric, mid-latitude troughs and ridges as depicted on the latest upper-air analyses and numerical forecasts.
1.6.2.2 Determination of the best steering level is partly influenced by the maturity and vertical extent of the tropical cyclone. Shallow or sheared systems would be steered by the lower tropospheric flow, whereas deep or mature cyclones would be affected by mid-level or deep-layer steering. For mature tropical cyclones located south of the subtropical ridge axis, forecast changes in speed of movement are closely correlated with anticipated changes in the intensity or relative position of the ridge. When steering currents are relatively weak, the tendency for tropical cyclones to move northward due to internal forces are considered. North of the subtropical ridge the polar westerlies and shortwaves greatly affect tropical cyclone steering and intensity.
1.6.2.3 Over the 12 - to 72 -hour ( 12 - to 48 -hour in the Southern Hemisphere) forecast period, speed of movement during the early forecast period is usually biased towards persistence, while the later forecast periods are biased towards objective techniques. When a tropical cyclone moves poleward, and toward the midlatitude steering currents, speed of movement becomes increasingly more biased toward a selective group of objective techniques capable of estimating acceleration.
1.6.2.4 The proximity of the tropical cyclone to other tropical cyclones is closely evaluated to determine if there is a possibility of interaction. If the proximity is less than $900 \mathrm{~nm}(1665 \mathrm{~km})$, binary interaction tracking techniques are considered.

A final check is made against climatology to determine if the forecast track is reasonable. If the forecast deviates greatly from one of the climatological tracks, the forecast rationale is reevaluated.
1.6.3 INTENSITY FORECASTING - Heavy reliance is placed on the empirically derived Dvorak (1984) technique for forecasting tropical cyclone intensity. Other techniques used for forecasting intensity are extrapolation of synoptic wind and pressure data and climatology. An evaluation of the entire synoptic situation is made, including the location of major troughs and ridges, the position and intensity of the Tropical UpperTropospheric Trough (TUTT), if present. The vertical and horizontal extent of the tropical cyclone's cyclonic circulation, and the extent of the associated upper-level outflow patterns are considered. Animated satellite data plays a key role in the evaluation of intensification potential. Each intensity forecast is affected by the accompanying forecast track and environmental influences along that track; such as, terrain, vertical wind shear and extratropical weather features. JTWC also incorporates a new interactive climatology scheme to help determine intensity forecasts.

### 1.6.4 WIND-RADII FORECASTING -

 JTWC uses a wind profile and steering diagnostic developed by Major J. Martin and Dr. G. J. Holland (Office of Naval Research contractor). The technique adapts an earlier work (Holland, 1980) and specifically addresses the need for realistic $30-, 50$ - and $100-\mathrm{kt}$ wind radii around tropical cyclones. It solves equations for basic gradient wind relations within the tropical cyclone area, using input parameters obtained from enhanced infrared satellite imagery. The diagnosis also addresses asymmetric areas of winds caused by tropical cyclone movement. Size and intensity parameters are used to diagnose internal steering components of tropical cyclone motion known collectively as "beta-drift".
### 1.6.5 EXTRATROPICAL TRANSITION -

 When a tropical cyclone is forecast to become an extratropical system, JTWC coordinates the transfer of warning responsibility with the appropriate Naval Oceanography Command Regional Center, which assumes warning responsibilities for the extratropical system.
### 1.6.6 TRANSFER OF WARNING RESPON-

 SIBILITIES - JTWC coordinates the transfer of tropical warning responsibility for tropical cyclones entering or exiting its AOR. For tropical cyclones crossing the dateline in the North Pacific Ocean, JTWC coordinates with the Central Pacific Hurricane Center (CPHC), Honolulu via the Naval Western Oceanography Center (NWOC), Pearl Harbor. For the South Pacific Ocean, JTWC coordinates with NWOC.In the event JTWC should become incapacitated, the Alternate Joint Typhoon Warning Center (AJTWC), co-located with NWOC, assumes JTWC's functions.

### 1.7 WARNINGS

JTWC issues two types of warnings: Tropical Cyclone Warnings and Tropical Depression Warnings.

Tropical Cyclone Warnings are issued when a closed circulation is evident and maximum sustained winds are forecast to reach $34 \mathrm{kt}(18 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ within 48 hours, or when the tropical cyclone is in such a position that life or property may be endangered within 72 hours.

Each Tropical Cyclone Warning is numbered sequentially and includes the following information: the current position of the surface center; estimate of the position accuracy and the supporting reconnaissance (fix) platforms; the direction and speed of movement during the past six hours (past 12 hours in the Southern Hemisphere); and the intensity and radial extent of over $30-, 50$, and $100-\mathrm{kt}$ surface winds, when applicable. At
forecast intervals of $12,24,48$, and 72 hours ( 12,24 , and 48 hours in the Southern Hemisphere), information on the tropical cyclone's anticipated position, intensity and wind radii is provided. In addition, vectors indicating the mean direction and mean speed between forecast positions are included in all warnings.

Warnings in the western North Pacific and North Indian Oceans are issued every six hours valid at standard times: 0000Z, 0600Z, 1200 Z and 1800 Z (every 12 hours: 0000Z, 1200 Z or $0600 \mathrm{Z}, 1800 \mathrm{Z}$ in the Southern Hemisphere). All warnings are released to the communications network no earlier than synoptic time and no later than synoptic time plus two and one-half hours, so that recipients are assured of having all warnings in hand by synoptic time plus three hours (0300Z, 0900Z, 1500 Z and 2100 Z ).

Tropical Depression Warnings are issued only for western North Pacific tropical depressions that are not expected to reach the criteria for Tropical Cyclone Warnings, as mentioned above. The depression warning contains the same information as a Tropical Cyclone Warning except the Tropical Depression Warning is issued every 12 hours at standard synoptic times and extends only to the 36-hour forecast period.

Both Tropical Cyclone and Tropical Depression Warning forecast positions are later verified against the corresponding best track positions (obtained during detailed post-storm analyses) to determine the most probable path and intensity of the cyclone. A summary of the verification results for 1989 is presented in section 5 . Summary of Forecast Verification.

### 1.8 PROGNOSTIC REASONING MESSAGES

These plain language messages provide meteorologists with the rationale for the forecasts for tropical cyclones in the western North Pacific Ocean. It also discusses alternate forecast scenarios. Prognostic reasoning
messages are prepared to complement each warning. In addition to this message, prognostic reasoning information is provided in the remarks section of warnings when significant forecast changes are made or when deemed appropriate by the TDO.

### 1.9 TROPICAL CYCLONE FORMATION ALERTS

Tropical Cyclone Formation Alerts are issued whenever interpretation of satellite imagery and other meteorological data indicates that the formation of a significant tropical cyclone is likely. These alerts will specify a valid period not to exceed 24 hours and must either be canceled, reissued, or superseded by a warning prior to expiration.

### 1.10 SIGNIFICANT TROPICAL WEATHER ADVISORIES

This product contains a description of all tropical disturbances in JTWC's area of responsibility (AOR) and their potential for further (tropical cyclone) development. In addition, all tropical cyclones in warning status are briefly discussed.

Two separate messages are issued daily and each is valid for a 24 -hour period. The Significant Tropical Weather Advisory for the Western Pacific Ocean (ABPW10 PGTW) covers the area east of $100^{\circ}$ east longitude to the dateline and is issued by 0600 Z . The Significant Tropical Weather Advisory for the Indian Ocean (ABIO10 PGTW) covers the area west of $100^{\circ}$ east longitude to the coast of Africa and is issued by 1800 Z . These are reissued whenever the situation warrants. For each suspect area, the words "poor", "fair", or "good" are used to describe the potential for development. "Poor" will be used to describe a tropical disturbance in which the meteorological conditions are currently unfavorable for development. "Fair" will be used to describe a tropical disturbance in which the meteorological conditions are favorable for development, but significant development has not commenced.
"Good" will be used to describe the potential for development of a disturbance covered by an alert.

## 2. RECONNAISSANCE AND FIXES

### 2.1 GENERAL

The Joint Typhoon Warning Center depends on reconnaissance to provide necessary, accurate, and timely meteorological information in support of advisories, alerts and warnings. JTWC relies primarily on two reconnaissance platforms: satellite and radar. In data rich areas, synoptic data are also used to supplement the above. As in past years, the optimum use of all available reconnaissance resources to support JTWC's products remains a primary concern. The weighing of the specific capabilities and limitations of each reconnaissance platform, and the tropical cyclone's threat to life and property both afloat and ashore, continue to be an important part of careful product preparation.

### 2.2 RECONNAISSANCE AVAILABILITY

2.2.1 SATELLITE - Fixes from Air Force/Navy ground sites and Navy ships provide day and night coverage in JTWC's area of responsibility. Interpretation of this satellite imagery yields tropical cyclone positions and estimates of current and forecast intensities through the Dvorak technique. A new capability provided by the Special Sensor Microwave/Imager (SSM/I) data is used to determine the extent of the $30-\mathrm{kt}$ winds around the tropical cyclone and to aid in tropical cyclone positioning.
2.2.2 RADAR - Land-based radar remotely senses and maps precipitation within tropical cyclones in the proximity (usually within 175 nm ( 325 km ) of radar sites in the Republic of the Philippines, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea, Kwajalein and Guam. The next radar upgrade will be the arrival of the next generation Doppler radars in the early 1990's.
2.2.3 SYNOPTIC - JTWC also determines tropical cyclone positions based on the analysis
of the surface/gradient-level synoptic data. These positions are an important supplement to fixes provided by remote sensing platforms and become invaluable in situations where neither satellite nor radar fixes are available.

### 2.3 SATELLITE <br> RECONNAISSANCE SUMMARY

The Air Force provides satellite reconnaissance support to JTWC through the DMSP Tropical Cyclone Reporting Network (DMSP Network), which consists of tactical sites and a centralized facility. Tactical DMSP sites monitoring DMSP, NOAA and geostationary satellite data are located at Nimitz Hill, Guam; Clark AB, Republic of the Philippines; Kadena AB, Okinawa, Japan; Osan AB, Republic of Korea; and Hickam AFB, Hawaii. These sites provide a combined coverage that includes most of JTWC's area of responsibility in the western North Pacific, from near the date line westward to the Malay Peninsula. For the remainder of its AOR, JTWC relies on the AFGWC to provide coverage using stored satellite data. The Naval Oceanography Command Detachment, Diego Garcia, furnishes interpretation of NOAA polar orbiting coverage in the central Indian Ocean and USN ships equipped for direct satellite readout contribute supplementary support. Additionally, civilian contractors with the U.S. Army at Kwajalein Atoll provide satellite and radar information on tropical cyclones that develop in the Marshall Islands to supplement Det 1, 1WW's satellite coverage. An additional source of satellite data is DMSP satellite mosaics available from the Fleet Numerical Oceanography Center via the NEDN and NESN lines. This valuable data is used to metwatch the areas not in the DMSP tactical site satellite coverage and provides forecasters the capability to monitor tropical cyclones that AFGWC satellite analysts are fixing.

In addition to polar orbiter imagery, Det 1,1 WW uses geostationary imagery to support the reconnaissance mission. Low resolution imagery is received through animation loopers at the DMSP tactical sites. The animation of these images is invaluable in depicting systems in their formative stages and determining coarse motion vectors. Animation is also valuable in assessing environmental changes affecting tropical cyclone behavior. In addition to this capability, Det 1, 1WW is able to receive high resolution digital geostationary data through the Naval Satellite Dissemination SystemGeostationary (NSDS-G) which is the primary source of geostationary data used for positioning and intensity analyses.

AFGWC is the centralized member of the DMSP network. In support of JTWC, AFGWC processes stored imagery from DMSP and NOAA spacecraft. Stored imagery is recorded onboard the spacecraft as they pass over the earth and is later down-linked to AFGWC via a network of command readout sites and communication satellites. This enables AFGWC to obtain the coverage necessary to fix all tropical cyclones within JTWC's AOR. AFGWC has the primary responsibility to provide tropical cyclone reconnaissance over the entire Indian Ocean, southwest Pacific, and the area near the dateline in the western North Pacific Ocean. Additionally, AFGWC can be tasked to provide tropical cyclone support in the western North Pacific as backup to coverage routinely available in that region.

The hub of the DMSP network is Det 1 , 1WW, colocated with JTWC at Nimitz Hill, Guam. Based on available satellite coverage, Det 1, 1WW is responsible for coordinating satellite reconnaissance requirements with JTWC and tasking the individual network sites for the necessary tropical cyclone fixes, current intensity estimates and forecast intensities. When a particular satellite pass is selected to support the development of JTWC's next tropical cyclone warning, two sites are tasked to fix the tropical cyclone from the same pass.

This "dual-site" concept provides the necessary redundancy that virtually guarantees JTWC a satellite fix to support each warning.

The network provides JTWC with several products and services. The main service is one of monitoring the AOR for indications of tropical cyclone development. If development is detected, JTWC is notified. Once JTWC issues either a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert or warning, the network provides three products: tropical cyclone positions, current intensity estimates and forecast intensities. Each satellite tropical cyclone position is assigned a Position Code Number (PCN), which is a measure of positioning confidence. The PCN is determined by the combination of availability of visible landmarks in the image that can be used as references for precise gridding and the degree of organization of the tropical cyclone's cloud system (Table 2-1).

Det 1, 1 WW provides two estimates of the tropical cyclone's current intensity per day once JTWC is in alert status and four estimates when in warning status. Current intensity estimates and 24 -hour intensity forecasts are made using the Dvorak technique (NOAA Technical Report NESDIS 11) for both visual and enhanced infrared imagery (Figure 2-1). The enhanced infrared technique is preferred due to its increased objectivity and accuracy, however, the visual technique is used to supplement this information during the daylight hours. For subtropical cyclones, intensity estimates are made using the Hebert and Poteat technique (NOAA Technical Memorandum NWS SR-83, 1975).

[^1]2.3.1 SATELLLITE PLATFORM SUMMARY Figure 2-2 shows the status of operational polar orbiting spacecraft. Two DMSP spacecraft were operational during 1989. Spacecraft 19543 (F8), which carries the Special Sensor Microwave/Imager (SSM/I), was operational throughout the year. Spacecraft 20542 (F9) was operational throughout the year, despite some thermal channel degradation problems which were corrected in early 1989. The NOAA 10 and NOAA 11 spacecraft performed well throughout the year.
2.3.2 STATISTICAL SUMMARY - During 1989, the DMSP network was the primary input to JTWC for operational warnings and post analysis best tracks in the entire 53 million square mile area of responsibility for the warning center. Almost all the warnings were based on satellite reconnaissance. JTWC received a total of 3133 satellite fixes from the DMSP network on 35 tropical cyclones in the western North Pacific Ocean. Of this, 49 percent were from polar orbiters, while 51 percent were from geostationary. With the increased emphasis this year on the early detection of tropical depressions, the DMSP network began fixing storms earlier in their lifecycle and continued fixing them until they weakened below 25 kt or became extratropical. This emphasis contributed significantly to the 50 percent increase in the total number of fixes this year as compared to 1988. In addition, 124 fixes were made on tropical cyclones in the North Indian Ocean and 1625 on cyclones in the Southern Hemisphere. A comparison of those fixes with their corresponding best track positions is shown in Tables 2-2A and 2-2B. For the western North Pacific, the total mean error was comparable to the multi-year average and has essentially remained constant. In addition to the mean errors verses JTWC best track, Figure 2-3 depicts the 90 th percentile values, i.e. 90 percent of the fixes fall within these limits, stratified by current intensity. This figure shows that errors decrease as a system becomes more intense. The greatest errors are found in the formative stages, with maximum sustained winds less than 25 kt . In general,


Figure 2-1. Dvorak code for communicating estimates of current and forecast intensity derived from satellite data. In the example, the current "T-number" is 3.5 , but the current intensity is 4.5 . The cloud system has weakened by 1.5 "T-numbers" since the previous evaluation conducted 24 -hours earlier. The plus ( + ) symbol indicates an expected reversal of the weakening trend or very little further weakening of the tropical cyclone during the next 24 -hour period.


Figure 2-2. Polar orbitters for 1989.


Figure 2-3. A stratification of western North Pacific satellite fix errors (90th percentile) and current intensities (Dvorak Tnumbers). For example: for a tropical cyclone with a current intensity of T1.0, $90 \%$ of the fixes fell within $105 \mathrm{~nm}(195 \mathrm{~km})$ of the final best track position.

TABLE 2-2A MEAN DEVIATICN (NM) OF ATL SAYMTTITE DERIVED TROPICAL CYCLONE
POSITIONS FROM JIWC BEST TRACK POSITIONS IN THE WESTERN NORTH PACITIC AND NORTH INDIAN OCEANS (NUMBIER OF CASES IN PARGNTHSSES)

WESTERN NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN
NORTH INDIAN OCEAN

| RCN | 1979-1988 AVERAGE |  | 1989 AVERAGE |  | 1980-1988 AVERAGE |  | 1989 AVERAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 14.0 | (1698) | 11.4 | (150) | 16.5 | (44) | 10.7 | (20) |
| 2 | 14.9 | (3070) | 11.8 | (583) | 15.2 | (13) | 12.0 | (20) |
| 3 | 21.0 | (2275) | 19.2 | (140) | 24.7 | (42) | 17.4 | (5) |
| 4 | 21.7 | (2441) | 19.6 | (550) | 41.3 | (26) | 18.4 | (13) |
| 5 | 36.8 | (3932) | 26.4 | (209) | 38.2 | (343) | 28.9 | (32) |
| 6 | 36.1 | (6120) | 31.7 | (1467) | 40.3 | (481) | 31.1 | (15) |
| 1\&2 | 14.6 | (4768) | 11.7 | (733) | 16.2 | (57) | 11.3 | (40) |
| 344 | 21.3 | (4716) | 19.6 | (690) | 31.1 | (68) | 18.1 | (18) |
| 5\&6 | 36.4 | (10052) | 31.1 | (1676) | 39.4 | (824) | 29.6 | (47) |
| 1,3\&5 | 27.4 | (7905) | 19.9 | (499) | 34.7 | (429) | 21.5 | (57) |
| 2,486 | 27.4 | (11631) | 24.7 | (2600) | 39.7 | (520) | 19.7 | (48) |
| TOTALS: | 27.4 | (19536) | 23.9 | (3099) | 37.4 | (949) | 20.7 | (105) |

TABLE 2-2B
MEAN DEVIATION (NM) ON AL工 SATMNLITE DERIVED TROPICAL CYCLONE
POSITIOAS ITRM JIHC BEST TRACK POSITIONS IN THR WESTKRN SOOTH PACIEIC AND SOUFH INDIAN OCRANS (NOMBHR OR CASES IN PARWNHESES)

| PCN | 1985-1988 AVERAGE |  | 1989 AVERAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 16.3 | (103) | 15.3 | (108) |
| 2 | 16.5 | (564) | 15.3 | (240) |
| 3 | 34.8 | (125) | 20.3 | (45) |
| 4 | 27.0 | (538) | 23.7 | (93) |
| 5 | 40.6 | (548) | 30.9 | (210) |
| 6 | 37.1 | (3651) | 33.7 | (735) |
| $1 \& 2$ | 16.5 | (667) | 15.3 | (348) |
| $3 \& 4$ | 28.5 | (663) | 22.6 | (138) |
| $5 \& 6$ | 37.6 | (4199) | 33.1 | (945) |
| 1. $3 \& 5$ | 36.4 | (776) | 24.9 | (363) |
| 2,466 | 33.5 | (4753) | 28.7 | (1068) |
| TOTALS: | 33.9 | (5529) | 27.7 | (1431) |


| TABLE 2-3 | MAXINTM SUSTATNED WIND SPEED (TET) AS A FUNCTION OT DVORAR CURRENT AND FORECAST INTENSITTY NCNRER AND 3 MIMMOM SEA-LEVEL PRESSURE (MSLP) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TROPICAL CYCLONE INTENSITY NUMBER | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WIND } \\ & \text { SPEED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MSIP } \\ \text { (NW PACIFIC) } \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 0.0 | $<25$ | - - - - |
|  | 0.5 | 25 | - - - |
|  | 1.0 | 25 | - - - - |
|  | 1.5 | 25 | - - - |
|  | 2.0 | 30 | 1000 |
|  | 2.5 | 35 | 997 |
|  | 3.0 | 45 | 991 |
|  | 3.5 | 55 | 984 |
|  | 4.0 | 65 | 976 |
|  | 4.5 | 77 | 966 |
|  | 5.0 | 90 | 954 |
|  | 5.5 | 102 | 941 |
|  | 6.0 | 115 | 927 |
|  | 6.5 | 127 | 914 |
|  | 7.0 | 140 | 898 |
|  | 7.5 | 155 | 879 |
|  | 8.0 | 170 | 858 |

errors become smaller with increasing intensity. The network also provided an additional 345 fixes on tropical disturbances which did not develop into significant tropical cyclones. The standard relationship between tropical cyclone "T-number", maximum sustained surface wind speed (Dvorak, 1984) and minimum sea-level pressure (Atkinson and Holliday, 1977) for the Pacific is shown in Table 2-3.
2.3.3 NEW TECHNIQUES - In the past, one of the biggest challenges in providing satellite reconnaissance to JTWC has been in detecting and tracking low-level circulation centers and low level clouds lines at night. When available, the satellite analyst used the low light visual capability of the DMSP spacecraft. However, during 1989, DMSP network satellite forecasters developed an infrared enhancement for the NOAA spacecraft 3.7 micrometer channel which significantly improves the capability to identify and track exposed or partially exposed low-level circulations and low level cloud lines through the nighttime hours when mid or high cloud do not obscure the low clouds. This enhancement also accentuates the land-sea contrast, highlighting geography which
can be used for more precise gridding. This enhancement is now routinely applied to images of tropical cyclones where shearing is either suspected or in progress.

As was mentioned earlier, the SSM/I, mounted on the F8 DMSP spacecraft, was operational most of 1989. Through the majority of the 1989 season, SSM/I technique development support was provided exclusively by analysts in the AFGWC Tropical Section. This support included bulletins describing the extent of $30-\mathrm{kt}$ winds surrounding the tropical cyclone for all systems with maximum sustained winds of 50 kt or greater. Winds can only be obtained in rain-free areas and areas free of deep moisture. If the cloud system center was rain free, analysts provided center/eye positions based on the 85 gigahertz ( GHz ) microwave channel display. These positions provided a comparison with those made using visual and infrared spectral windows. Multispectral imaging, particularly with the 85 GHz channel which is able to "see through" the cirrus canopy, offers a rich area for development. In October 1989, Det 1, 1 WW obtained a prototype capability to ingest,

| TABLE 2-4A |  | $1989$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OEPR HEMA } \\ & \text { TTORM SOM } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WESTERN NORTH PACIEIC |  | SATELLITE | RADAB | SYNOPTIC | TOTAL |
| TS WINONA STY ANDY | (01W) | 78 | 11 | 1 | 90 |
|  | (02W) | 129 | 50 | 0 | 180* |
| TY BRENDA | (03W) | 96 | 24 | 0 | 120 |
| TY CECIL | (04W) | 53 | 6 | 0 | 59 |
| TY DOT | (05W) | 116 | 17 | 0 | 133 |
| TS EluIS - 0 | (06W) | 39 | 2 | 1 | 42 |
| TS FAYE (0) | (07W) | 102 | 9 | 1 | 111 |
| STY GORDON (O) | (08W) | 160 | 24 | 0 | 184 |
| TS HOPE (O) | (09W) | 109 | 69 | 0 | 178 |
| TS IRVING | (10W) | - 48 | 16 | 0 | 64 |
| TY Jody (1 | (11W) | 132 | 93 | 0 | 225 |
| TD 12W (1 | (12W) | 23 | 6 | 0 | 29 |
| TS KEN-LOLA (1 | (13W-14W) | 94 | 112 | 4 | 210 |
| TY MAC (1 | (15W) | 123 | 61 | 1 | 185 |
| TY OWEN (1 | (16W) | 104 | 1 | 7 | 112 |
| TY NANCY (1 | (17W) | 65 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| ts pegay (1) | (18W) | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| TD 19W (10 | (19W) | 43 | 9 | 2 | 54 |
| TS ROGER (20 | (20W) | 61 | 98 | 2 | 161 |
| TD 21W (2 | (21W) | 37 | 0 | 1 | 38 |
| TY SARAH | (22W) | 140 | 73 | 0 | 213 |
| TS TIP (2 | (23W) | 60 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| TS VERA | (24W) | 70 | 62 | 0 | 132 |
| TY Wayne | (25W) | 54 | 160 | 0 | 214 |
| Sty angela | (26W) | 182 | 31 | 0 | 213 |
| TY BRIAN | (27W) | 57 | 6 | 0 | 63 |
| TY COLILEEN (2 | (28W) | 108 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| TY DAN (2 | (29W) | 81 | 21 | 1 | 103 |
| STY ELSIE (3 | (30W) | 153 | 15 | 0 | 168 |
| TY FORREST (31W) |  | 141 | 7 | 0 | 148 |
| TY GAY (32W) |  | 38 | 14 | 0 | 52 |
| TY HUNT (33W) |  | 127 | 18 | 3 | 148 |
| TY IRMA (34W) |  | 146 | 0 | 0 | 146 |
| TD 35W (35W) |  | 30 | 0 | 3 | 33 |
| TY JACK (36W) |  | 97 | 63 | 0 | 160 |
| TOTALS NWP: |  | 3133 | 1068 | 27 | 4238* |
| PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL: |  | 73.9\% | 25.48 | $0.7 \%$ | 100\% |
| NORTH INDIAN OCEAN |  | SATEIUITE | RADAR | SYNOPTIC | TOTAL |
| TC 01B (01B) |  | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| TC 02A (02A) |  | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| TC 32W (32W) |  | 73 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| TOTALS NIO: |  | 124 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL: |  | 100\% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 100\% |
| * ONE AIRBORNE RADAR FIX Was received |  |  |  |  |  |


| TABIE | $2-4 B$ | 1989 SOUTH | PACIPIC <br> EIX ELATE | OUIH INDIAN UNMARY | EANS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TROPICAI | CYCLONES S | SATELILIE | SYNOPTIC | RADAR | TOTAL |
|  | Tc 01s | ADELININA | 35 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
|  | TC 02S | BARISAONA | 125 | 0 | 0 | 125 |
|  | TC 03S | ILONA | 55 | 0 | 5 | 60 |
|  | TC 04P | DILILAH | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
|  | TC 05P | GINA | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
|  | TC 06S | - - - - | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
|  | TC 07S | EDME | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
|  | TC 085 | FIRINGA | 61 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
|  | TC 095 | KIRRILY | 68 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
|  | TC 10P | HARRY | 156 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
|  | TC 11S | HANITRA | 91 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
|  | TC 12S | GIZEIA | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
|  | TC 13P | IVY | 85 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
|  | TC 14P | - - - | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
|  | TC 15P | JUDY | 29 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
|  | TC 165 | - - - | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
|  | TC 175 | MARCIA | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
|  | TC 185 | - - - | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
|  | TC 195 | JINABO | 66 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
|  | TC 205 | NED | 88 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
|  | TC 21s | KRISSY | 80 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
|  | TC 22P | KERRY | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
|  | TC 23P | AIVO | 57 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
|  | TC 245 | LEZISSY | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
|  | TC 25P | LILI | 68 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
|  | TC 265 | ORSON | 91 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
|  | TC 27P | MEENA | 112 | 0 | 0 | 112 |
|  | TC 28P | ERNIE | 71 | 0 | 0 | 71 |
|  | TOTAL NUMBER OF FIXES: |  | 1625 | 0 | 5 | 1630 |

process and display the SSM/I data realtime. Current plans are for the prototype system to be upgraded with improved hardware and software. Installation of these new systems is projected for Det 1, 1 WW and for DMSP sites at Clark AB, Kadena AB and Hickam AFB during the summer of 1990 .

### 2.3.4 FUTURE OF SATELLITE RECON-

 NAISSANCE - The future of satellite reconnaissance provides many unique challenges. As the SSM/I imagery becomes available throughout the DMSP network, training must be accomplished quickly to maximize the benefit. At this time, the majority of the emphasis has been placed on the 85 GHz and surface wind information. However, a great deal of unrealized information may lie in the other channels. Several Air Force investigators are examining this potential.Det $1,1 \mathrm{WW}$ expects to receive an automated satellite imagery processing and display system designed specifically for the tropical cyclone reconnaissance mission during the 1991-1992 timeframe. The system will process and display polar orbiter and geostationary satellite data. It will have a broad spectrum of satellite data manipulation applications which will significantly enhance Det $1,1 \mathrm{WW}$ support to the reconnaissance mission. In the meantime, Det $1,1 \mathrm{WW}$ is developing its capabilities using a MacIntosh IIx ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ computer system which has been programmed to ingest and display polar orbiter and geostationary satellite data.

In addition to SSM/I, the Mark III and Mark IV DMSP ground systems located at the Pacific DMSP sites should be upgraded with the Mark IVB state-of-the-art satellite imagery
ingest and display system during the 1992-93 timeframe. The near future of satellite reconnaissance is becoming more and more dependent on this upgrade, as the current systems become more difficult to support.

### 2.4 RADAR RECONNAISSANCE SUMMARY

Twenty-eight of the thirty-five significant tropical cyclones in the western North Pacific during 1989 passed within range of land-based radar with sufficient cloud pattern organization to be fixed. The land-based radar fixes that were obtained and transmitted to JTWC totaled 1068 for the Northern Hemisphere and 5 for the Southern Hemisphere. One radar fix was obtained by an aircraft of opportunity.

The WMO radar code defines three categories of accuracy: good (within 10 km (5 nm ), fair (within $10-30 \mathrm{~km}(5-16 \mathrm{~nm}$ ), and poor (within $30-50 \mathrm{~km}(16-27 \mathrm{~nm})$ ). Of the 1073 radar fixes encoded in this manner; 314 were good, 341 were fair, and 418 were poor. Compared to JTWC's best track, the mean
vector deviation for land-based radar sites was 20 nm ( 37 km ). Excellent support from the radar network through timely and accurate radar fix positioning allowed JTWC to track and forecast tropical cyclone movement through even the most difficult erratic tracks.

Five radar reports were received on Southern Hemisphere tropical cyclones; however, as in previous years, no radar reports were received on North Indian Ocean tropical cyclones.

### 2.5 TROPICAL CYCLONE FIX DATA

A total of 4238 fixes on thirty-five western North Pacific tropical cyclones and 124 fixes on three North Indian Ocean tropical cyclones were received at JTWC. Table 2-4A delineates the number of fixes per platform for each individual tropical cyclone for the western North Pacific and North Indian Oceans. Season totals and percentages are also indicated. Table 2-4B provides similar information for the South Pacific and South Indian Oceans.

## 3. SUMMARY OF WESTERN NORTH PACIFIC AND NORTH INDIAN OCEAN TROPICAL CYCLONES

### 3.1 GENERAL

The calendar year 1989 was a very busy year. JTWC issued warnings on a total of 35 tropical depressions, tropical storms and typhoons in the western North Pacific - 5 super typhoons, 16 less intense typhoons, 10 tropical storms and 4 tropical depressions - the most tropical cyclones since 1974 and the most typhoons since 1972. An extensive post analysis indicated that dissipating Ken (13W) and developing Lola (14W) merged into a single system, thus the total of 36 numbered cyclones was revised to 35 (Table 3-1). In any case, this is more than the climatological mean of 31 tropical cyclones in the western North Pacific (Table 3-2). The North Indian Ocean was fairly inactive with only 3 tropical cyclones occurring there - below the 5 per year average. During 1989, warnings were issued on a total of 37* Northern Hemisphere tropical cyclones. A chronology of western North Pacific and North Indian Ocean tropical cyclones is provided in Figure 3-1.

For the year, JTWC was in warning status 154 days compared to 114 in 1988. Again, considering only the western North Pacific, there were 46 days when the Center issued warnings on two cyclones and 9 days

[^2]when it warned on three cyclones (Table 3-3). When the North Indian Ocean is included, there were a total of 167 days with warnings on one cyclone, 49 days with warnings on two cyclones, and 9 days with warnings on three. There were no days when warnings were issued on four or five tropical cyclones at once. Thus, JTWC was in Northern Hemisphere warning status $40 \%$ of the year, it was warning on two or more tropical cyclones during 58 days or $16 \%$ of the year.

JTWC issued 710 warnings on 35 western North Pacific tropical cyclones, 147 more than in 1987 and 239 more than last year. In addition, the Center put out 44 warnings on North Indian Ocean tropical cyclones, for a grand total of 754 Northern Hemisphere warnings. There were 51 initial Tropical Cyclone Formation Alerts issued on western North Pacific tropical disturbances (Table 3-4) and 8 on disturbances in the North Indian Ocean. Three out of the 35 significant tropical cyclones that developed in the western North Pacific did so without Formation Alerts. Alerts were issued on all tropical cyclones that formed in the North Indian Ocean. Tropical Cyclone 32W (Gay) was already in warning status when it entered the Bay of Bengal from the Gulf of Thailand.


TABLE 3-2 WESTERN NORTH PACIFIC TROPICAL CYCIONE DISTRIBUTION




### 3.2 WESTERN NORTH PACIFIC TROPICAL CYCLONES

1989 was unique in many regards. The monsoon trough was very active, even into November. Because the trough was extremely broad and because of the abnormally large diurnal fluctuations in convection, disturbances were slow to develop to intensities above 30 to 40 kt ( 15 to $20 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). As a result, JTWC used the new 36-hour Tropical Depression Warning on systems not expected to reach tropical storm intensity within 48 hours. The mid-tropospheric ridge was narrow - averaging less than 250 nm ( 465 km ). This made forecasts, even for straight running tropical cyclones difficult. There were a large number of erratically moving cyclones with tracks containing several bifurcation points where difficult forecast decisions had to be made as to significant changes in direction of motion. Several tropical cyclones stalled for prolonged periods of time. Some examples are Typhoons Gay (32W), Irma (34W), Mac (15W) and Jack (36W), among others. In fact, Jack (36W) sat 175 nm ( 325 km ) directly east of Guam for nearly two days. JTWC experienced several occasions where tropical cyclones engaged in binary interaction with each other or with other circulations in the environment. Most notable was the interaction between Typhoons Owen (16W), Nancy (17W) and towards the end Tropical Storm Peggy (18W). The Tropical Upper-Tropospheric Trough (TUTT) was extremely active and played a major role in the development, intensification and movement of numerous tropical cyclones. Of particular interest was Typhoon Gordon (08W) which actually developed explosively from a thunderstorm that built beneath, and directly up into a cold-cored TUTT low aloft. And finally, 1989 had a large number of very compact, yet very intense typhoons. The presence of Tropical Cyclone 32W (Gay) with super typhoon intensity in the Bay of Bengal was a rare occurance. The variety of synoptic influences on the 1989 tropical cyclone season made it one of the most unique and challenging in JTWC's 30-year history.

## JANUARY THROUGH JUNE

The first western North Pacific tropical cyclone of 1989, Winona (01W), quietly began in the eastern North Pacific southeast of the Hawaiian Islands. The system was unusual because of its compact size and persistence. In two weeks it traveled over $5500 \mathrm{~nm}(10,185$ km ) before finally dissipating in the Philippine Islands. Following Tropical Storm Winona ( 01 W ), there was a long break in activity until mid-April when Andy (02W) developed. Super Typhoon Andy ( 02 W ) was the second typhoon in the past nine years to form in April, the first super typhoon of 1989, and the first typhoon of the year to seriously threaten Guam. It developed very slowly, and after recurving at the extremely low latitude of $10^{\circ}$ north, passed $70 \mathrm{~nm}(130 \mathrm{~km})$ southeast of Guam. A month later Brenda ( 03 W ), the first of two typhoons to form in May, generated in the western Caroline Islands, moved northwestward across the central Philippine Islands, and then made landfall in China. It was the second of eleven tropical cyclones to cross the Philippines during the year. An extensive monsoon trough spread across the Bay of Bengal into the South China Sea. Typhoon Brenda (03W) formed at the end of the trough. As Brenda (03W) moved northwestward and dissipated over southern China, it left behind an area of enhanced low-level southwesterly flow. Typhoon Cecil (04W) developed in the South China Sea in the wake of the enhanced flow from Typhoon Brenda (03W). After Cecil (04W) churned across the South China Sea and into Vietnam during the last week of May, the tropics were relatively quiet for two weeks. Then came Typhoon Dot ( 05 W ), the first of two significant tropical cyclones in June. Dot (05W) formed in low latitudes south of the central Caroline islands, moved steadily west-northwestward and crossed the Philippine Islands. It reached typhoon intensity in the South China Sea and eventually dissipated over northern Vietnam. The second tropical cyclone to form in June, Tropical Storm Ellis (06W) interrupted the series of "straight runners" that occurred from Brenda (03W) through Dot (05W). The asymmetric displace-
ment of a broad area of gale force winds away and to the east of the low-level circulation center accompanied Ellis (06W). After five days as a poorly defined system, Ellis (06W) briefly peaked at tropical storm intensity before becoming extratropical and making landfall in Japan.

## JULY

After another two-week break in activity, a surge in the southwest monsoon caused widespread convective activity in the area west of the Mariana Islands, culminating in the genesis of Faye ( 07 W ), the first of seven tropical cyclones to form in July. Faye (07W) intensified at a normal rate as it tracked westnorthwestward towards the Philippines. The cyclone weakened as it crossed north-central Luzon and reintensified slightly in the South China Sea. It weakened again in the central South China Sea, and crossed the island of Hainan before making landfall on the coast of northern Vietnam. At the start of the second week of July, while Tropical Storm Faye (07W) was affecting the Philippine Islands and the Tropical Upper-Tropospheric Trough (TUTT) was influencing weather near Wake Island, the second super typhoon of the year, Gordon ( $08 \mathbf{W}$ ), developed. It was unique in that it developed from a single cumulonimbus directly beneath a cyclonic cell in the TUTT. The cumulonimbus was initially small, but underwent a dramatic rapid, almost explosive, deepening phase. Hope (09W) generated in the wake of Gordon (08W) in a broad area of convection enhanced by divergence aloft associated with a TUTT cell. Hope (09W) failed to develop to typhoon intensity as a result of the upper-level shear caused by the outflow from Super Typhoon Gordon (08W). During its life, Hope (09W) moved generally northwestward, occasionally "stair stepping" in response to the passage of a series of mid-latitude shortwave troughs. Although no binary interaction was apparent, the tropical cyclone tracked along the periphery of Gordon's (08W) low-level circulation for most of its lifetime. As Super Typhoon Gordon (08W) was about to make
landfall on the coast of China and Tropical Storm Hope (09W) was reaching peak intensity, Irving (10W) formed in the monsoon trough near the southwestern Caroline Islands. Tropical Storm Irving (10W) was the fourth tropical cyclone of 1989 to cross the South China Sea and the last to enter the South China Sea until Typhoon Brian (27W) late in September. Irving was short-lived and actually reached its maximum intensity as it made landfall on the coast of northern Vietnam. The day after Irving (10W) developed in the western Caroline Islands, Judy (11W) developed in the monsoon trough just west of Guam. The second of two typhoons to develop during the month of July, Judy (11W), followed a north-oriented track with a critical turn to the northwest, just to the south of Honshu. It brushed by the southern coast of Kyushu, made landfall on the south coast of the Korean Peninsula and dissipated rapidly. After a major track change on 26 July, it took JTWC a day to get the forecast back on track to the northwest. This situation highlighted the value of the alternate scenario and rapid telephone commurications between the customer and the forecaster when forecast difficulties arise. While Typhoon Judy (11W) was tracking northwestward towards Korea, an associated area of deep convection became persistent to the south-southeast in the monsoon trough that had already proven itself the most active since July 1973. The disturbance became Ken-Lola (13W-14W) and took an elongated cycloidal track, passing close to Okinawa before making landfall on the coast of eastern China. While in warning status, JTWC considered the system as two separate tropical cyclones. A detailed post-analysis, even though not absolutely conclusive, strongly suggested that Tropical Storms Ken (13W) and Lola (14W) were most probably the same system. Tropical Storm Ken-Lola (13W-14W) underscored the limitations of remote sensing for locating some poorly organized systems. Synoptic data proved invaluable in identifying and classifying the system while in warning status and in postanalysis. A much larger mid-level cy-clone in which the tropical cyclone was embedded appeared to be the major influence on Ken-

Lola's (13W-14W) track.

## AUGUST

As the most active July since 1973 came to a close, Typhoon Judy (11W) was dissipating over Korea and Tropical Storm Ken-Lola (13W14W) was threatening Okinawa. During this time, Mac (15W) developed northeast of Saipan in an extremely active monsoon trough that extended as far east as Wake Island. Typhoon Mac (15W) also developed at a higher than normal latitude. In addition, its track and intensity were influenced by a complex midlatitude synoptic regime and complicated by a multi-storm environment. The typhoon had a general northwest track, interrupted by 48 hours of westward movement before it resumed an accelerated north orientated track, and made landfall east of Tokyo. Mac (15W) weakened rapidly as it moved into and across the Sea of Japan and dissipated over southern Sakhalin Island. Soon thereafter, Typhoon Owen (16W) slowly spun up in the monsoon trough while moving on a general northwestward to northward track. Due to the proximity of Nancy (17W), which developed at the extreme eastern end of the monsoon trough and was intensifying to the east, Owen (16W) took more than a week to reach tropical storm intensity. Later, Owen's (16W) three days of binary interaction with Typhoon Nancy (17W) resulted in an unusual southeasterly track during its developing stage. Then, the tropical cyclone followed Nancy (17W) through recurvature, extratropical transition and into high latitudes. The third tropical cyclone to develop in the monsoon trough, was Peggy (18W). After a brief interaction with Owen (16W), Peggy (18W) was short-lived and only reached minimal tropical storm intensity. Then came Tropical Depression 19W with its unusual curved track to the north, west, and then south which appeared to coincide with the overall motion displayed by a larger, mid-level low. As the mid-level low began to fill, the tropical depression escaped its influence, and the track of the cyclone straightened out, moving westward within the easterly steering flow.

Forming just north of Taiwan, Roger (20W) moved south-eastward into the southern Ryukyu's, abruptly turned northeastward, and made landfall on Honshu. At the start, the forecast problem for this tropical cyclone was exacerbated by the difficulty in locating the system's complex center during its formative stages and the immediate threat it posed to DOD assets on Okinawa. The eighth and final tropical cyclone of August, Tropical Depression 21W, developed on the eastern end of the monsoon trough which was located to the northeast of the Mariana Islands. Because JTWC recognized that intensification would be inhibited by strong vertical wind shear, only Tropical Depression Warnings were issued.

## SEPTEMBER

The first of the September tropical cyclones, Sarah (22W) proved to be a bona fide challenge to forecasters. The cyclone apparently underwent a binary interaction with a secondary low east of Luzon and later, when it stalled east of Luzon, was involved with the development of a sympathetic low on the lee side of Luzon. From genesis involving two distinct cloud masses to accelerating toward the Philippines, stalling just east of Luzon, moving north and rapidly reintensifying, then looping over eastern Taiwan, Sarah (22W) was one of the most difficult storms of the year to forecast. Sarah (22W) finally moved northwestward across northern Taiwan and dissipated in China. Generating in early September at the eastern end of the monsoon trough, Tip (23W) executed an unusual track to the northeast, then recurved after moving northwestward around the subtropical ridge, and finally tracked eastward with the polar westerlies. Tropical Storm Tip (23W) reached its peak intensity at $37^{\circ}$ north latitude, two days after recurvature. Developing in the monsoon trough north of Guam, Tropical Storm Vera (24W), after some initial erratic motion, moved on a westnorthwestward track, threatened Okinawa, and made a devastating landfall just south of Shanghai. About 24 hours after Tropical Storm Vera (24W) had dissipated over eastern China,
the first warning on Wayne ( 25 W ) was issued. The last of four tropical cyclones to mature in September, Typhoon Wayne (25W) was also the last tropical cyclone of 1989 to affect Japan. It was unique in that it intensified after recurvature, partly as a result of its rapid acceleration. Wayne ( 25 W ) caused considerable destruction, mudslides and some deaths in Japan.

## OCTOBER

During late September, the monsoon trough, located near $10^{\circ}$ north latitude, became very active after a week of little convective activity. The first tropical cyclone of a threecyclone outbreak in the monsoon trough during a three-day period, Angela (26W) had the unique distinction of being in warning status longer than any other tropical cyclone in the western North Pacific this year - 12 days. JTWC issued a total of 46 warnings on this typhoon. Angela (26W) was also one of five tropical cyclones to reach super typhoon intensity in 1989. Developing south of Guam, Angela (26W) tracked slowly westward and struck northern Luzon with super typhoon intensity causing a large number of casualties and widespread destruction. It then continued into the South China Sea, where it reintensified, and finally made landfall in central Vietnam. As Angela (26W) developed over the Philippine Sea, the monsoon trough became active across the South China Sea from western Luzon to Vietnam and spawned typhoon Brian (27W). Typhoon Cecil (04W) in May and Brian (27W) in late September and early October were the only tropical cyclones of the year to develop and spend their entire lifetimes within the confines of the South China Sea. Nearly 4000 nm ( 7400 km ) to the east, a deep trough penetrated into the tropical western North Pacific near the dateline and Colleen (28W) formed at the base of the trough. Colleen (28W) passed through the northern Mariana Islands before recurving south of Japan. The tropical cyclone maintained
typhoon intensity until it completed extratropical transition, threatening PACEX 89 - the largest US Navy exercise conducted in the Pacific since the Korean War. Colleen ( 28 W ) highlighted the difficulty of tracking poorly organized systems with only nighttime infrared satellite imagery, but also showed the value of data from the microwave imager as a tool to help locate these systems. Forming from a disturbance in the monsoon trough near Truk in the central Caroline Islands, Dan (29W) followed a steady west-northwestward track and crossed the central Philippine Islands. Coming just days after Typhoon Angela's (26W) destructive passage across northern Luzon, Dan ( 29 W ) added to the misery heaped on the Philippines by its predecessor. The cyclone reintensified in the South China Sea and made landfall on the coast of central Vietnam where it caused more destruction. In the wake of Super Typhoon Angela (26W) and Typhoon Dan (29W), Super Typhoon Elsie (30W) became the third tropical cyclone to hit the Philippine Islands within 12 days. Elsie (30W) developed from a TUTT-induced wave in the easterlies and tracked westward throughout its life. In the Philippine Sea, Elsie (30W) rapidly intensified and struck central Luzon with an intensity of 140 kt ( $72 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). It was cited as the most intense cyclone to strike the Philippine Islands this year. Because of its small size, Elsie (30W) weakened dramatically as it moved across the Philippines, and did not reintensify as it traversed the South China Sea. The cyclone dissipated after making landfall in central Vietnam. The last of six tropical cyclones in October and the 17 th cyclone of at least typhoon intensity for the year, Forrest (31W) was slow and erratic in its development. Throughout its early life, Forrest (31W) was a sloppy, broad system. After passing Guam, Forrest (31W) finally intensified and ultimately became a respectable $95-\mathrm{kt}$ ( $49-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) typhoon. Soon thereafter, it recurved and accelerated rapidly to the northeast becoming one of the year's strongest extratropical cyclones.

## NOVEMBER THROUGH DECEMBER

The first tropical cyclone of November turned out to be the worst tropical cyclone to affect the Malay Peninsula in 35 years. Gay (32W) generated in the Gulf of Thailand, sank numerous ships, crossed the Malay Peninsula into the Bay of Bengal and slammed into India with peak sustained winds of $140 \mathrm{kt}(70 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. Unique because of its small size, great intensity, and point of origin, Gay (32W) challenged forecasters by crossing two different tropical cyclone basins and almost entering a third. Except for Typhoon Gay (32W), early November was relatively inactive in the western North Pacific. In mid-November, Hunt (33W) initially appeared as a weak tropical disturbance in the monsoon trough. Hunt (33W) was the fourth typhoon, following Angela (26W), Dan (29W) and Elsie (30W), to strike the Philippine Islands within six weeks. Generally a westward moving system, Hunt (33W) was slow to develop, but intensified rapidly in the western Philippine Sea. As it approached the Philippines, the cyclone underwent a "stair step" before resuming a westward course into central Luzon. Unlike its predecessors, Hunt (33W) dissipated in the South China Sea after crossing Luzon. Irma (34W) was the third and final tropical cyclone to form in November. It's
development and track were dictated by complex mid-latitude and monsoonal regimes. Initially, Irma (34W) was slow to develop, however, rapid intensification followed once it entered in the Philippine Sea. Irma (34W) lasted 17 days and required a total of 39 warnings - only Super Typhoon Angela (26W) exceeded this longevity with its 46 wamings. As Super Typhoon Irma (34W) weakened in the Philippine Sea, Tropical Depression 35W was detected on the first day of December in the western Marshall Islands. The depression lasted more than a week as a discrete system, although it was in warning status only 48 hours. The second tropical cyclone to form in December, Jack ( 36 W ) was the twenty-first tropical cyclone of the year to attain at least typhoon intensity, and was the final tropical cyclone of the year. Typhoon Jack (36W) was noteworthy for the unusually long period it remained stationary. Not surprisingly, the unusual motion of Typhoon Jack (36W) was accompanied by an equally unusual intensification and dissipation pattern. The cyclone rapidly intensified from 30 to 125 kt ( 15 to $64 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) in three and a half days, then fell apart completely. In this remarkable dissipation, Jack's (36W) maximum winds dropped from 105 to 30 kt ( 54 to $15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) in 24 hours.
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## TROPICAL STORM WINONA (01W)

The first western North Pacific tropical cyclone of 1989, Winona quietly began in the eastern North Pacific southeast of the Hawaiian Islands. The system was unusual because of its compact size and persistence. In two weeks it traveled over $5500 \mathrm{~nm}(10,185 \mathrm{~km})$ before finally dissipating in the Philippine Islands.

At the start of the second week of January, $40-\mathrm{kt}(21-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) upper-level westerly winds funneled through a trough located just east of the Hawaiian Islands and created a broad area of divergence aloft to the southeast. In response, an area of deep convection persisted under the divergence and over the eastsoutheasterly winter trades. As the upper-level trough relocated eastward at 091200 Z , a swirl of low-level cloudiness (Figure 3-01-1) became exposed, leaving behind its convective cloudiness, and moved to the west-northwest as a wave until 11 January. Then the supporting convection flared up (Figure 3-01-2), triggering flash floods on Kauai. As the system assumed a
more westward track on 12 January, it again passed under another upper-level trough. This time, however, the central convection persisted. Sparse surface data indicated a small area of light westerly winds to the south of the circulation center and a minimum sea-level pressure center of 1010 mb .

On 16 January, the compact system still retained its deep convection. It had traversed the Central Pacific in the dead of winter at $20^{\circ}$ north latitude and persisted, which is extremely unusual. In fact, Winona was so unique that the analog and climatological forecast guidance was not available, or very limited, for most of the tropical cyclone's lifetime. It had crossed the international dateline the day before and was now approaching Wake Island. At 160600 Z , the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory mentioned its persistent circulation and central convection. Later, at 161800 Z , it was 75 nm ( 140 km ) south of Wake Island (WMO 91245),


Figure 3-01-1. The low-level cloud system is passing south of the island of Hawaii. The area of bright cloudiness near point A is located east of the upper-level trough ( $102316 Z$ January GOES West visual imagery courtesy of the National Weather Service Forecast Office, Honolulu, Hawaii).
which experienced maximum sustained surface winds of $25 \mathrm{kt}(13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ and gradient-level winds (Figure 3-01-3) of $30 \mathrm{kt}(15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ).

After Winona passed Wake Island, a satellite intensity estimate of 25 kt ( $13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) coupled with the system's translational speed of more than $20 \mathrm{kt}(37 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) prompted a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 170030Z. The subject of the Alert was upgraded to Tropical Storm Winona at 180000 Z based on persistent central convection, the satellite intensity analysis and the cyclones rapid translational speed to the west, which would cause higher winds to the north of the circulation center. Since the tropical cyclone was embedded in broad easterly flow, a "straight runner" was forecast.

Just at the end of 18 January invaluable insight came from the ship MV Williams as follows, "Believe to have passed through center at 180700 Z ........Barometer pressure 991 (mb) max sustained winds 045 (gusts to) $65-70 \mathrm{kts}$, combined sea-swell 35 (ft)." This ship observation resulted in a waming and final best track intensity* increase (Figure 3-01-4). Without any additional direct measurements, satellite remote sensing tracked the cold cloud tops throughout the night. First light visual satellite data and later initial radar reports from Andersen AFB, Guam (WMO 91218) found Winona south and west of the expected track (Figure 3-01-5). The tropical storm (Figure 3-$01-6)$ with peak winds of $55 \mathrm{kt}(28 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$, passed just to the north of Saipan at 190000Z. The International Airport (91232) reported


Figure 3-01-2. As the low-level vortex enters an area more favorable for development, the convection flares up ( 112346 Z January GOES West visual imagery courtesy of the National Weather Service Forecast Office, Honolulu, Hawaii).
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Figure 3-01-3. The gradient winds at Wake Island (91245) peak at $30 \mathrm{kt}(15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) and undergo a directional change between 161200 Z and 170000 Z , as Winona passes to the south. Note the gradual speed increase from two days before Winona's passage and decrease for two days afterward.
winds of 25 kt ( $13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) with gusts to 35 kt ( $18 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). No loss of life was reported Saipan.

Winona continued accelerating to the west-southwest along the southern edge of a shallow modifying polar air mass until the deep supporting convection was lost. A final warning was issued at 191800 Z . However, the central convection flared up again and a regenerated warning followed at 200600 Z . Just prior to landfall in the central Philippine Islands, Winona's deep central convection fell apart and the system was finalled at 210600 Z .


Figure 3-01-4. Impact of the ship MV Williams' 180700 Z report on the warning and final best track intensities for Winona.


Figure 3-01-5. Comparison of expected track, raw fix data and final best track for Winona. The first daylight visual satellite fixes (A and B) were key elements in establishing Winona's continued movement to the west-southwest.


Figure 3-01-6. Tropical Storm Winona approaches Saipan. Note the compact size of the system (182321Z January DMSP visual imagery).
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## SUPER TYPHOON ANDY (02W)

For the western North Pacific, Andy was the second typhoon in the past nine years to form in April, the first super typhoon of 1989 and the first typhoon of the year to seriously threaten Guam.

The weather pattern the second week of April mirrored climatology with brisk, eastnortheast trade winds dominating the low latitudes and only token deep convection. However, by the close of the week, the trade winds became lighter and equatorial westerlies replaced the cross-equatorial flow, or buffer, as Tropical Cyclone 26S (Orson) developed south of the equator in the Arafura Sea. North of the equator increased convection persisted near

Truk Atoll in the eastern Caroline Islands. This increased convection was first mentioned in the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory at 130600Z. Continued cloud development prompted the first Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 151430 Z . Intensification of the system (Figure 3-02-1) was slow, however, and followon Alerts were issued at 161430 Z and 171430 Z .

As this area slowly moved westward and gradually intensified, it was finally upgraded at 171800Z to Tropical Depression 02W. Data from the Automated Meteorological Observing Station (AMOS) installed in 1988 on Faraulep Island (WMO 52005) in the central Carolines became very important as it monitored the


Figure 3-02-1. Satellite global data base display from the Air Force Global Weather Central captures the two tropical cyclones - Andy near Truk and Orson (26S) in the Arafura Sea (170000Z April DMSP infrared imagery).
approach of the tropical cyclone (Figure 3-022 ). In this normally data sparse area the Faraulep AMOS provided needed observations of surface pressure, wind speed and direction which provided the ground truth for the satellite data. These AMOS data (Figure 3-02-3) reflected the change of Andy's track from the west to northwest at 171800 Z . After the
passage of a mid-latitude trough to the north of the system, the track returned to westward at 181200Z.

Following Andy's passage to the north of Faraulep and south of Guam, satellite fixes from 190530Z through 191730 Z indicated it had ceased its westward movement and had


Figure 3-02-2. Andy bears down on Faraulep Island. Guam is just under the leading edge of the cirrus ( 172219 Z April DMSP visual imagery).


Figure 3-02-3. Faraulep AMOS reports showing: (a) time series of pressure, (b) wind speed and (c) wind direction. Andy's closest point of approach was at $181800 Z$. Note the major shift of wind direction and increase of wind speed preceded the lowest pressure.
begun to move to the north. Continued intensification (Figure 3-02-4) further aggravated the forecaster's dilemma. With recurvature possible as another mid-latitude trough moved eastward from Asia, there was an increasing threat to life and property in the Marianas. Until 200000Z, it appeared that the track would return to the west-northwest after a mid-latitude trough to the north progressed eastward and the lower tropospheric high pressure reestablished itself north of the
cyclone. OTCM supported this synoptic assessment (Figure 3-02-5) in contrast to the climatological techniques, primarily CLIPER, which indicated a track to the north and just to the west of Guam. But Andy's continued slow northward movement required a reassessment of the synoptic situation. The track forecast was changed from west-northwestward to north, just west of Guam, followed by recurvature. The alternate forecast scenario became an early recurvature with passage southeast of Guam.
 an imminent threat to the Marianas ( 210816 Z April DMSP visual imagery).

The primary forecast held until 201700Z at which time it became apparent that recurvature had already taken place. A special tropical cyclone warning was issued with the updated forecast reflecting that Andy (Figure 3-02-6) would pass 45 nm ( 70 km ) southeast of Guam.

Andy's closest point of approach (CPA) to Guam occurred at 202100Z 70 nm ( 130 km ) to the southeast. The island was spared the intense maximum sustained winds near the center estimated to be 135-140 kt (69-72 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). Sustained surface winds recorded on the island were $35-45 \mathrm{kt}$ ( $18-23 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) with peak gusts to $68 \mathrm{kt}(35 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. These resulted
in crop damage, power outages and minor property damage, primarily due to fallen trees. In addition, torrential downpours caused localized flooding. At sea, the combat stores ship, USS San Jose came to the aid of a disabled fishing vessel in the path of the super typhoon.

After CPA, Andy continued to track northeastward and weaken as the vertical shear from the westerly winds aloft increased. Three days later, at 240000 Z , when the central convection completely separated from the dissipating low-level circulation center (Figure 3-02-7), the final warning was issued.


Figure 3-02-5. Comparison of OTCM guidance tracks from 191800 Z through 211800 Z with the final best track. After the start time for OTCM, the dots embedded in the dashed line indicate the location of the 24,48 and 72 hour guidance.


As a point of interest, Figure 3-02-8 is included to deomonstrate the value of multispectral imaging. In the visual image the low-
level eye is completely obscured; however, a part of it can be seen in the enhanced infrared image.

Figure 3-02-7. Remnants of Andy's low-level circulation (242322Z April DMSP visual imagery).


Figure 3-02-8. As Andy moves away from Guam, this picture pair shows the importance of multispectral since the eye is located at the extreme lower right edge of the polar orbiter image. Note a small portion of the low-level eye shows on the enhanced infrared (to the left). On the visual (to the right) the low-level eye is completely masked by the bright sunlight reflected from the eastern side of wall cloud (210434Z April NOAA visual and infrared imagery).


## TYPHOON BRENDA (03W)

The first of two typhoons to form in May, Brenda generated in the western Caroline Islands, moved northwestward across the central Philippine Islands, and then made landfall in China. It was the second of eleven tropical cyclones to cross the Philippines during the year.

After spawning Super Typhoon Andy in April, the tropics remained relatively quiet for two weeks. Then, on 14 May, the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory mentioned an area of broad convection with weak turning in the monsoon trough south of Yap. Continued organization of clouds and winds prompted the issuance of a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert
at 150730 Z and the first warning at 151800 Z . The system was upgraded to tropical storm at 160000Z.

Brenda (Figure 3-03-1) tracked across Samar and southern Luzon, exiting at the tip of the Bataan Peninsula. Closest point of approach to both NAS Cubi Point and Manila was 18 nm ( 35 km ). Cubi Point's barograph recorded a minimum sea level pressure of 989 mb at 171800 Z. To the north, Clark AB (WMO 98327) experienced maximum gusts of 38 kt ( $20 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) and received minor damage. News reports indicated at least four water craft sank, and that more than 50 people were killed or missing in the Philippine Islands. In addition,


Figure 3-03-1. Brenda slams into the southem Luzon (170025Z May DMSP visual imagery).
thousands were left homeless, and communications and power were significantly disrupted.

Once in the South China Sea and again over warm water, Brenda (Figure 3-03-2) continued northwestward and intensified, reaching typhoon status at 191200 Z . Meanwhile, the NOGAPs prognostic series forecast a mid-latitude short wave to move north of the tropical cyclone, indicating potential for recurvature. JTWC did forecast recurvature at 181200 Z , based on an apparent
northward motion of the circulation center on the nighttime infrared satellite imagery. Low confidence radar signatures also indicated a northward motion. Subsequent fixes based on visual imagery returned the cyclone's track to a northwestward direction. In turn, JTWC returned forecasts to a northwest motion and into the coast of China, west of Hong Kong.

Typhoon Brenda reached a maximum intensity of $75 \mathrm{kt}(39 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ at 191800 Z before passing within 81 nm ( 150 km ) of Hong Kong at 201200Z. The Royal Observatory at Hong


Figure 3-03-2. Moving over water, Brenda regains organization and reintensifies (180146Z May DMSP visual imagery).

Kong reported maximum gusts of 54 kt ( 28 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ), a minimum sea-level pressure of 995 mb and 17 inches ( 441 mm ) of rain during the six days that Brenda and its enhanced southwest flow affected the area.

Brenda (Figure 3-03-3) made landfall on the south coast of China at 201400 Z and dissipated over land in the Guangdong

Province. Preliminary reports indicated that at least 84 people perished in southern China, and that widespread flooding due to the heavy rains damaged about 3.5 million acres ( 1.4 million hectares) of land. In Hong Kong six people were killed, one was missing, and the heavy rains resulted in landslides, floods and large losses in livestock and fish farming.


Figure 3-03-3. This brightly lit low sun angle photo shows Brenda's convective spirals as the typhoon approaches the coast. The sun is low to the west, and its rays scatter forward, through the aerosols, and out to space. The gray, milky-looking areas around the periphery of Brenda reveal the piesence of aerosols in the lower layer of the atmosphere that are being trapped, and concentrated, as a the result of subsidence (201021Z DMSP visual imagery).


The second of two typhoons during the month of May, Cecil developed in the South China Sea in the wake of Typhoon Brenda (03W).

On 20 May, an extensive monsoon trough spread across the Bay of Bengal into the South China Sea where it terminated in Typhoon Brenda (03W). As Brenda moved northwestward and dissipated over southern China, it left behind an area of enhanced lowlevel southwesterly flow. Additionally, the dissipation of Brenda ( 03 W ) reduced the vertical wind shear from the north over the genesis area for Cecil. Cecil was first detected on 21 May as a low-level cyclonic circulation associated with the enhanced southwesterly flow. The Significant Tropical Weather Advisory was reissued at 212000 Z to cover this circulation and its persistent cloudiness. When surface synoptic reports and additional satellite data indicated that the system was becoming better organized, a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert was issued at 220230 Z .

Initially, the deep convection was only located in the southern semicircle, but on 22 May the convection wrapped around the circulation center. This event, along with falling central pressures precipitated the first
warning on Tropical Depression 04W at 221800 Z . The warning was then amended based on subsequent synoptic reports, and the system upgraded to a tropical storm.

At the start, Cecil was forecast to track northward through the weakness in the subtropical ridge created by Brenda (03W). This forecast was supported by guidance from the dynamic aid, OTCM, and HPAC, an aid which blends one half persistence with one half climatology. But, the tropical cyclone turned towards the west on 23 May and tracked into central Vietnam in response to ridging to the north over China.

With inflow from the extensive lowlevel southwest monsoonal flow, divergence aloft and weak vertical wind shear, Cecil reached typhoon intensity at 240000 Z (Figure 3-04-1). The typhoon tracked across the coast of Vietnam at 241800 Z with maximum sustained surface winds estimated at 70 kt ( 35 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). News agencies reported that at least 52 people perished, 37 were injured, over 100,000 were left homeless and 700 water craft were destroyed. Persistent convection associated with Cecil produced heavy rains inland which resulted in flooding and crop damage in Laos and northeastern Thailand.


Figure 3-04-1. Cecil with a large ragged $40 \mathrm{~nm}(75 \mathrm{~km})$ diameter eye approaches the coast of Vietnam ( 240539 Z May NOAA visual imagery.)


## TYPHOON DOT (05W)

Dot, the first of two significant tropical cyclones in June, formed in low latitudes south of the central Caroline islands, moved steadily west-northwestward and crossed the Philippine Islands. It reached typhoon intensity in the South China Sea and eventually dissipated over northern Vietnam.

After Cecil (04W) tracked across the South China Sea and into Vietnam the last week of May, the tropics were relatively quiet. Then light westerly surface winds appeared in the southern Philippine Sea and cloudiness increased. In this zone of maximum cloudiness on 2 June Dot, as a tropical disturbance, was
identified and noted in the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory as having fair potential for development. On 4 June the disturbance passed north of the island of Palau in the western Carolines and became better organized, which prompted a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 041230Z. A further increase in convection and organization led to the first warning at 050000 Z when the system was approximately 300 nm ( 555 km ) southwest of the island of Samar in the Republic of the Philippines.

Tropical Depression 05W was upgraded to Tropical Storm Dot (Figure 3-05-1) at 051200 Z , twelve hours before making


Figure 3-05-1. As Dot reaches tropical storm intensity, it's central dense overcast and surrounding band of convection blanket a large portion of the Philippine Sea ( 051801 Z June NOAA infrared imagery).
landfall on Samar. Dot accelerated slightly while crossing the central Philippine Islands which was in agreement with the results of Sikora's (1976) movement study. The open waters of the Sibuyan Sea and the relatively low relief of the adjacent islands allowed the circulation aloft to intensify slowly, but the rugged topography limited the surface effects. Clark Air Base's radar (WMO 98327) located the circulation center at 061835 Z over south central Mindoro. As suspected from the previous satellite imagery, the analysis of surface pressure reports from land stations revealed the system's large size (Figure 3-05-2).

Upon entering the South China Sea, Dot initially took a more northward track. This increase in northward component, coupled with


Figure 3-05-2. Based on the surface wind and pressure plots for 061200 Z , the isobaric analysis shows the large size of the circulation.
the approaching frontal system and the guidance of most of JTWC's objective aids, led JTWC to forecast Dot's track to the east and north of Hainan Island (Figure 3-05-3). However, the tropical cyclone never linked up with the approaching frontal system and continued westnorthwestward. Weak vertical wind shear and the warm waters of the South China Sea allowed Dot to reach typhoon intensity. Peaking at an intensity of $100 \mathrm{kt}(51 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ on 9 June (Figure 3-05-4), the typhoon then weakened as it approached and crossed southern Hainan Island. Dot crossed the Gulf of Tonkin as a tropical storm and made landfall near Haiphong, Vietnam at 110600Z. It dissipated six hours later in the mountains northwest of Hanoi.


Figure 3-05-3. Objective guidance and the forecast from 071800 Z through 24, 48 and 72 hours. Note: the displacement of the 071800 Z starting point to the north of the best track. This is the result of adjustment to the best track caused by later data.


Figure 3-05-4. Nearing peak intensity, Typhoon Dot tracks towards Hainan Island (082225Z June DMSP visual imagery).


## TROPICAL STORM ELLIS (06W)

The second of two tropical cyclones to form in June, Ellis interrupted the series of "straight runners" that occurred from Typhoon Brenda (03W) through Typhoon Dot (05W). After five days as a poorly defined system, Ellis briefly peaked at tropical storm intensity before becoming extratropical and making landfall in Japan. (This tropical cyclone provided the first opportunity for JTWC to use the newly instituted Tropical Depression Warning format as stated in a change to USCINCPACINST 3140.1 T . This change addressed warnings when the depression was not expected to reach tropical storm intensity. These warnings were to be issued every twelve hours instead of every six hours as is the case for Tropical Cyclone Warnings.)

On 18 June, a disturbance formed in the Philippine Sea $210 \mathrm{~nm}(390 \mathrm{~km})$ northwest of Guam and was mentioned on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory. The disturbance was classified as having poor potential for further development, due to the lack of favorable upper-level support. It appeared that the proximity of the TUTT to the north through northeast restricted the outflow from the convection. However, the next Advisory was reissued at 192100 Z to upgrade the potential for further development to fair after the central convection flared at the morning convective maximum and synoptic data revealed the development of the low level cyclonic circulation. A Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert followed at 200430 Z when the deep convection had persisted. Within ninety minutes, the first Tropical Depression Warning was issued. The application of the Tropical Depression Warning was appropriate since this depression (Figure 3-06-1) appeared deeply embedded in the monsoon trough and further development was unlikely. At 201800Z, the second, and final, Tropical Depression Warning followed as the poorly defined cloud system weakened 450 nm ( 835 km ) east of Luzon.

As the disturbance moved westward toward Luzon, the 200 mb pattern underwent a substantial change. On 18 June, a narrow ridge aloft with an east to west orientation extended through the Bonin Islands (south of Japan). Simultaneously, a weak trough existed across Korea and western Honshu. Short waves exiting China deepened this trough until it extended southward from the Yellow Sea to Taiwan. The rawinsonde data from Okinawa (WMO 47936) showed 60 -meter height falls at 200 mb from 19 to 20 June. This adjustment of the upper-level pattern favorably positioned divergence over the remnants of the tropical depression.

With synoptic data indicating minimum sea-level pressures near 1001 mb , the next convective flare up prompted a second Alert at 211900 Z. Then, with the synoptic situation unchanged, a third Alert followed 24 hours later. This Alert addressed the fact that the maximum winds were displaced 180 nm ( 335 km ) east of the system's center. This asymmetric displacement of a broad area of gales away and to the east of the low-level circulation center was unusual and accompanied Ellis for the remainder of its lifetime. At 222100 Z , JTWC issued the first Tropical Cyclone Warning on Tropical Depression 06W (Figure 3-06-2). The system was forecast to move slowly toward the northeast, steered by the southwesterly flow ahead of the trough. Further, it would only reach minimal tropical storm intensity before encountering increased vertical wind shear and cooler air behind a stationary front. The front had pushed south of Okinawa during the preceding three days.

While the intensity was correctly forecast, Tropical Storm Ellis led JTWC on a high speed chase, doubling its forward speed from 12 to 24 kt ( 6 to $12 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) as it sped toward Okinawa. By the fourth warning at 231200 Z, Ellis was becoming extratropical, having linked with the previously mentioned stationary front; but it was not weakening. The
system passed 90 nm ( 165 km ) east of Kadena AB. Kadena (WMO 97931) provided two radar fixes on Ellis, as it passed by, and reported peak gusts to 22 kt ( $11 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). The system passed over Kyushu and extreme western Honshu
before dissipating over the Sea of Japan on 24 June. Although gales persisted as Ellis continued northward, no reports of major damage or fatalities were received.


Figure 3-06-1. Nighttime visual picture of the disorganized cloud signature of the tropical depression after the first waming. Bright moonlight makes the image look like daytime. Note the city lights of Taiwan (201327Z June DMSP visual imagery).


Figure 3-06-2. Ellis starts moving northward towards Okinawa (222106Z June DMSP visual imagery).


## TROPICAL STORM FAYE (07W)

After a two-week break in activity, Faye was the first of seven tropical cyclones to form in July. It formed in the monsoon trough and intensified at a normal rate as it tracked westnorthwestward towards the Philippines. Faye weakened as it crossed north-central Luzon and reintensified slightly in the South China Sea. It weakened again in the central South China Sea, and crossed the island of Hainan before making landfall on the coast of northern Vietnam.

On 4 July, a surge in the southwest monsoon caused a widespread increase of convective activity in an area west of the Mariana Islands. This convection was shortlived - peaking at 050000 Z and dissipating for the most part by 051200 Z . Out of the remnants of this convection arose a small area of deep convection near $15^{\circ}$ north latitude and $130^{\circ}$ east longitude. This deep convection continued to
develop after the early morning convective maximum, and at 060200 Z a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert was issued on the disturbance. The first tropical cyclone warning on Tropical Depression 07W followed at 060600 Z . At that time, the depression had a partially exposed low-level circulation to the north of the deep convection with restricted upper-level outflow in the northern semicircle. This displacement of convection introduced some uncertainty in the location of the low-level circulation center (Figure 3-07-1) until first light the next day.

A short wave trough passing to the north induced a small northward shift in track during the first 24 hours in warning. As the short wave trough moved eastward, the subtropical ridge strengthened to its west and the depression began moving to the west. Continued development resulted in an upgrade to tropical


Figure 3-07-1. After the last visual fix at 060730Z (point A), plots of satellite fixes (encircled) through the night show that cold cloud top targets on the infrared imagery can be misleading. The visual data the next day at 062330 Z (point B) enabled the forecaster to get the weak circulation back on track.
storm intensity at 070600 Z . Throughout the next 24 hours, the subtropical ridge remained unchanged and Faye tracked westward and intensified.

Tropical Storm Faye reached its peak intensity of $60 \mathrm{kt}(31 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ at 081200 Z , just prior to making landfall in north-central Luzon. Remarks from the radar site at Baguio (WMO 98321) about the change of wind direction from northwest to southwest and $35 \mathrm{kt}(18 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ gusts proved invaluable in tracking Faye as it accelerated over Luzon and retained tropical storm intensity as it entered the warm waters of the South China Sea late on 8 July. Moving out into open waters, it began to reintensify. In the central South China Sea, Faye moved into an
environment of strong upper-level northeasterlies which began to shear the system. Despite this strong shear, Faye (Figure 3-07-2) retained much of its convective organization and its tropical storm intensity until it reached the island of Hainan.

Late on the 10 July, Faye crossed northern Hainan causing telecommunication interruptions and the destruction of pepper, sugar cane and coffee crops. It was downgraded to a tropical depression as it entered the Gulf of Tonkin. The low-level circulation, which was displaced $45 \mathrm{~nm}(85 \mathrm{~km})$ from the deep convection, made landfall near Haiphong, Vietnam at 110600 Z and quickly dissipated.


Figure 3-07-2. The exposed low-level circulation center is evidence of a shearing regime in the South China Sea (090607Z July NOAA visual imagery).
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## SUPER TYPHOON GORDON (08W)

The second super typhoon in the western North Pacific for 1989, Gordon was also the second of seven significant tropical cyclones to form in July. The system was unique in that it developed from a single cumulonimbus directly beneath a cyclonic cell in the Tropical UpperTropospheric Trough (TUTT). The cumulo-
nimbus was initially small, but underwent a dramatic rapid, almost explosive, deepening phase.

At the start of the second week of July, Tropical Storm Faye (07W) was affecting the Philippine Islands. Aloft, the TUTT, which


Figure 3-08-1. Typhoon Gordon four hours before reaching super typhoon intensity. The eye diameter is $20 \mathrm{~nm}(37 \mathrm{~km})$ ( 142304 Z July DMSP visual imagery).
extended eastward, was the major uppertropospheric feature. It overlaid an extensive cloud minimum area that extended eastward to the date line. Just to the west of Wake Island on 9 July, a discrete cloud system became associated with a deep TUTT low.

On 11 July after the early morning convective maximum, a very small, ragged central dense overcast persisted, and the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory was reissued at 110200 Z to include the system. Subsequent satellite imagery indicated the system's vigorous central convection was expanding rapidly, too rapidly to enable JTWC to issue a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert. As a result, an abbreviated warning was issued on Tropical Depression 08W at 110400Z, followed by the first 72 -hour warning at 110600 Z . This development was unusual. Gordon appeared to blossom directly beneath the upper cold low. This was in contrast to the normal sympathetic development of convection to the south and east of the upper low (Sadler, 1976). To our knowledge such a distal development has never been documented. Sadler (1974) does discuss a similar development where convection wraps around the TUTT cell, finally converting the cold-core cyclone to a warm-core one. This is generally a slow process. He also alludes to occasional cumulonimbus near the center of TUTT cells as a clue to locating their centers, but does not discuss the development of tropical cyclones from the thunderstorms.

The system's track was west-southwest to westward for two days, becoming westnorthwestward as Gordon approached the Philippine Islands. The guidance from the NOGAPS fields correctly foretold that no break in the subtropical ridge would occur, and that Gordon's westward movement would be uninterrupted.

Initially, forecasters expected slow to normal intensification as the TUTT restricted the system's upper-level outflow. However, the depression was quickly upgraded to Tropical


Figure 3-08-2. Gordon's rapid intensification after 140000Z compared with an increase of one " $T$ " number per day.

Storm Gordon 24 hours after the initial warning, to typhoon after 48 hours, and to super typhoon after 96 hours (Figure 3-08-1). In only 30 hours from 140000 Z to 150600 Z , Gordon intensified rapidly - two-and-one-half "T" numbers (Figure $3-08-2$ ). This represents an estimated $70-\mathrm{mb}$ fall in central pressure over this period, or a deepening rate of $2.3 \mathrm{mb} / \mathrm{hr}$, just short of the 2.5 $\mathrm{mb} / \mathrm{hr}$ required for explosive deepening (Dunnavan, 1981).

Super Typhoon Gordon slammed into the rice-producing region of northern Luzon with maximum sustained winds of 140 kt ( 72 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). News reports indicated that 27 people died, 15 were missing, at least 120,000 were evacuated and thousands were left homeless in its wake. To the south, the peak winds reported from US military installations in the Philippines were 68 knots ( $35 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) at Wallace AS, 54
knots ( $28 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) at John Hay AB, 40 kt ( 21 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) at Cubi Point NAS (WMO 98426), and $18 \mathrm{kt}(9 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ at Clark AB (WMO 98327). John Hay AB also recorded a total of 29.8 inches ( 747 mm ) of rain. The SS OVERSEAS VIVIAN reported 35 kt ( $18 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) sustained winds as it approached Subic Bay late on 15 July when Gordon was more than 200 nm ( 370 km) away.

After exiting northern Luzon, the
typhoon moved west-northwestward across the South China Sea and passed $100 \mathrm{~nm}(185 \mathrm{~km})$ to the southwest of Hong Kong at 171800 Z (Figure 3-08-3). U.S. Navy ships in port at Hong Kong had sortied 24 hours earlier. Though the system was weakening as it made landfall near the coastal city of Zhanjiang, 215 nm ( 398 km ) west-southwest of Hong Kong, where Gordon inflicted more fatalities and property loss. The final waming was issued at 181200 Z , as Gordon left the Leizhou peninsula.


Figure 3-08-3. The large ragged eye is visible as Tropical Storm Gordon moves southwest of Hong Kong (180126Z July DMSP visual imagery).

During the next three hours, Gordon's area of convection (Figure 3-08-4) expanded nearly three times in size as it moved across the shallow, warm waters of the Gulf of Tonkin. Synoptic data indicated continued weakening
during the convective expansion. The remnants of Gordon were identifiable on satellite imagery for the next 24 hours as the dissipating system moved into the mountains of northern Vietnam.


Figure 3-08-4. Tropical Storm Gordon (above) enters northern Gulf of Tonkin (181115Z July DMSP enhanced infrared imagery) and (below) Gordon's area of convection expands rapidly (181407Z July DMSP enhanced infrared imagery).
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The third of seven tropical cyclones to form in July, Hope was a TUTT-induced tropical cyclone that failed to develop to typhoon intensity as a result of the upper-level shear from outflow from Super Typhoon Gordon (08W). During its life, Hope moved generally northwestward , occasionally "stairstepping" in response to the passage of a series of mid-latitude short-wave troughs. Although no binary interaction was apparent, the tropical cyclone tracked along the periphery of Gordon's low-level inflow for most of its lifetime.

Hope generated in the wake of Gordon (08W) in a broad area of convection enhanced by the divergence aloft associated with a TUTT cell. When the convection persisted for more than 18 hours, it was included as a suspect area on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory at 130600 Z . Synoptic data indicated a low-level cyclonic circulation embedded in the convection. Surface winds were estimated to be 10 to 20 kt ( 5 to $10 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) and the MSLP 1007 mb. During the next 48 hours, the convection became disorganized due to increased vertical wind shear aloft from Super Typhoon Gordon ( 08 W ), which was intensifying to the west. A weak surface circulation persisted in the synoptic data.

At 151740 Z JTWC issued a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert when Hope's central convection increased after the combined
restrictive effects of the passage of a midlatitude trough to the north and outflow from Gordon (08W) to the west decreased. Winds in the area were estimated to be 20 to 30 kt ( 10 to $15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). The first warning followed at 160000Z. Tropical Depression 09W tracked westward for the next 18 hours under the influence of the building mid-tropospheric subtropical ridge to the north. The low-level circulation center remained partially exposed until 161800 Z, when a central dense overcast formed. In response, Hope intensified to 35 kt ( $17 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) and was upgraded to a tropical storm.

Late on 16 July, Hope's track returned to the northwest in contrast to the guidance provided by the NOGAPS forecast fields, which indicated the subtropical ridge would remain intact despite the approach of a series of shortwave troughs. The NOGAPS guidance was reinforced by the statistical-dynamic aid CSUM. As a result, JTWC adjusted the forecast track southward with each succeeding warning until, by 171800 Z , Hope was forecast to pass near Taiwan. However, the tropical cyclone remained north of the forecast track and slowly intensified. Kadena AB (WMO 47931) on Okinawa, approximately 100 nm ( 185 km ) northeast of the tropical storm, measured a peak gust of $31 \mathrm{kt}(16 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ at 180411 Z .

From 180000 Z through 191800 Z the
synoptic situation was complex (Figure 3-09-1). Hope responded to another short-wave trough and tracked north-northwestward. Once again JTWC abandoned the westward track into China and changed the forecast track to take Hope through a possible break in the subtropical ridge into the East China Sea and then on to Korea. The change in track was prompted by several factors: (1) the failure of the expected westward movement to develop, (2) the
possibility that NOGAPS was overforecasting the strength in the ridge to the north, (3) the expectation that Hope would remain a shallow system and be influenced by the more southerly low- to mid-level steering flow rather than the weak easterly mid- to upper-level flow, and (4) guidance from the dynamic aid OTCM. However, after the passage of another shortwave trough, the ridge strengthened north of Hope. At 200000 Z , the tropical storm (Figure


Figure 3-09-1. Complex synoptic situation with Gordon (08W) to the west, and the mid-latitude trough to the north. The island of Okinawa is nearby ( 172338 Z July NOAA visual image:- $;$ ).

3-09-2) executed an abrupt turn to the west and moved into mainland China.

While Hope was over warm ocean waters, it intensified slowly, reaching its peak intensity of $55 \mathrm{kt}(27 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ at 181800 Z . However, the northeasterly upper-level flow restricted Hope's outflow and prevented further development into a typhoon. Hope was down-
graded to a tropical depression at landfall. The tropical cyclone weakened rapidly as it moved over land, and the final warning was issued at 210000Z. News reports indicated that at least 24 people died and more than 1000 were injured in eastern China. In addition, landslides and widespread flooding resulted from locally heavy rains. Totals up to 7.5 inches ( 109 mm ) in 24 hours were recorded in some areas.


Figure 3-09-2. Hope near landfall. The low-level anticyclonic flow (indicated by the curved arrow) in the subtropical ridge is defined by the cumulus streets across southern Korea, coastal China, and the brightness pattern in the lee of Kyushu. Frontal cloudiness associated with the passing trough trails across central Korea and the Yellow Sea ( 200046Z July DMSP


Tropical Storm Irving was the fourth tropical cyclone of 1989 to cross the South China Sea and the last to enter the South China Sea until Typhoon Brian (27W) late in September. In August and September the tropical cyclone tracks shifted northward. Irving was short-lived and actually reached its maximum intensity as it made landfall on the coast of northern Vietnam.

As Super Typhoon Gordon (08W) was about to make landfall on the coast of China and Tropical Storm Hope (09W) was reaching peak intensity, the disturbance that would eventually develop into Irving formed on 18 July in the monsoon trough near the southwestern Caroline Islands. The disturbance moved slowly northwestward across the Philippine Sea. Synoptic data at 190000 Z July indicated a surface circulation, and the disturbance was
considered a suspect area on that day's Significant Tropical Weather Advisory.

The disturbance crossed the Philippine Sea from southeast of Palau to over the Philippine Islands in three days. The lowest observed minimum sea-level pressure was 1004 mb. Once in the South China Sea, the disturbance became better organized and JTWC issued a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 202000Z. The first warning on Tropical Depression 10W was issued four hours later. The depression was upgraded to tropical storm intensity at 210600 Z .

The tropical easterly jet was weakly established across the Southeast Asia; still, the vertical wind shear over the South China Sea due to the northerly flow aloft was sufficient to prevent Tropical Storm Irving (Figure 3-10-1)


Figure 3-10-1. Vertical wind shear is responsible for the separation between the lowlevel circulation center and the bright cloud tops to the southwest. The area of cloudiness at the top right of the picture is the remnants of Tropical Storm Hope (09W) over eastern China (NOAA visual imagery 220533 Z July).
from reaching typhoon intensity. Throughout Irving's lifetime, the upper-level cloud circulation center was located southwest of the low-level center. As a result, the nighttime infrared satellite fixes of the upper-level cloud features were displaced to the southwest of the low-level circulation center. This tilt to the system also resulted in differences between the radar and corresponding satellite fixes.

Based on satellite imagery, Irving was downgraded to a tropical depression on the 230600 Z warning. However, a reanalysis of the imagery indicated Irving actually continued to intensify as it entered the warm waters of the

Gulf of Tonkin. In addition, the Gulf of Tonkin is a natural region of forced low-level convergence due to the surrounding topography. The 240000 Z warning upgraded the system again to tropical storm intensity. Irving was downgraded for a second time to a tropical depression on the final warning when it moved into northern Vietnam at 240600 Z .

The remnants of Irving moved across the mountains and dissipated over Laos. News reports estimated that at least 102 people died and another 488 were injured in Vietnam. In addition, more than 80,000 houses and 160,000 acres of crops were destroyed.
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## TYPHOON JUDY (11W)

The second of two typhoons to develop during the month of July, Judy formed just west of Guam in the monsoon trough and followed a north oriented track with a critical turn to the northwest, just to the south of Honshu. It crossed the southern coast of Kyushu, made landfall on the south coast of the Korean Peninsula and dissipated rapidly.

As Tropical Storm Hope (09W) weakened over China, two tropical cyclones developed in the monsoon trough which was located near $10^{\circ}$ north latitude. First, on July 20, Tropical Storm Irving (10W) developed in the South China Sea. The following day Judy developed 300 nm ( 555 km ) west of Guam. The disturbance that was to become Judy was first mentioned on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory at 200600 Z as a slowly moving tropical disturbance with a poor potential for further development. The potential was upgraded to fair the following day. At 212000Z, JTWC issued a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert based on synoptic data that
indicated a low-level cyclonic circulation beneath an upper-level anticyclone and satellite imagery that showed increased convection and organization.

As the disturbance's organization and upper-level outflow continued to improve, the first warning followed for Tropical Depression 11 W at 220600 Z when satellite intensity analysis indicated surface winds of 25 kt (13 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). A cyclonic circulation in the Tropical Upper Tropospheric Trough (TUTT)(Sadler, 1976) to the northwest of the depression provided a source of upper-level divergence needed for further intensification. At 230000Z, the depression was upgraded to tropical storm intensity when satellite analysts estimated $35-\mathrm{kt}$ ( $18-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) surface winds were present. Judy continued to intensify as the system stayed southeast of the TUTT low, a favorable position for development. At 250600 Z , it was again upgraded - this time to a typhoon (Figure 3-11-1). Although most ships avoided Judy's dangerous winds, the moored buoy (WMO

Figure 3-11-1. Judy approaching peak intensity (250945Z July DMSP enhanced infrared imagery).

21004) at $29^{\circ}$ north latitude and $135^{\circ}$ east longitude provided valuable data to track Judy. Fifty-seven-knot ( $29 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) winds and a minimum sea-level pressure of 974 mb were recorded as the typhoon passed close by.

Using NOGAPS and satellite data as a guide, JTWC forecast Judy to track northward to Japan and then recurve to the northeast. In contrast, OTCM guidance suggested a northwestward track from the start. When the subtropical ridge did finally build in from the east, OTCM was discounted since all the previous model guidance (Figure 3-11-2)
indicated a northwest track while July tracked north. By comparison, Figure 3-11-3 shows JTWC's initial success with the track forecasts. However, after the direction change on 26 July, it took a day for the forecasts to get back on track to the northwest. This situation highlighted the value of the alternate scenario and rapid communications between the customer and the forecaster when forecast difficulties arise.

Judy's interaction with the southern coast of Kyushu at 271800 Z resulted in rapid weakening. This trend continued until the


Figure 3-11-2. Comparison of OTCM guidance with the best track. After 251800 Z July (point A), the guidance proved correct.


Figure 3-11-3. JTWC forecasts compared with the best track. The major track change to the northwest on 26 July was not reflected in the forecasts until the next day.
tropical cyclone (Figure 3-11-4) made landfall approximately $110 \mathrm{~nm}(205 \mathrm{~km})$ southwest of Pusan, Korea. By the time Judy reached Osan AB near Seoul, it had weakened significantly. Osan $A B$ (WMO 47122) reported maximum
winds of $22 \mathrm{kt}(11 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. At 290000Z, the final warning was issued as the remnants of the system moved towards the Sea of Japan. No reports of damage were received.


Figure 3-11-4. In the Korea Straits, Judy is about to be downgraded to a tropical storm (280430Z July DMSP visual imagery).
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## TROPICAL DEPRESSION 12W

While Typhoon Judy (11W) was tracking northwestward towards Korea, an area of deep convection became persistent to the south-southeast of Judy. This persistent convection, first mentioned in the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory for 27 July, looped around in the monsoon trough and headed west, passing $50 \mathrm{~nm}(80 \mathrm{~km})$ south of Okinawa at 281200 Z . The discovery of a well-developed low-level circulation and falling pressures
prompted the issuance of a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 290630Z, followed by the first Tropical Depression Warning at 291200Z. Because of strong vertical wind shear, the depression was not forecast to intensify to a minimal tropical storm. After the last warning at 300000 Z , the deep convection sheared away and continued westward into China while the dissipating low-level circulation tracked southward into the Taiwan Strait.


Figure 3-12-1. TD 12W shortly after the first waming (291131Z July DMSP infrared imagery).


## TROPICAL STORM KEN-LOLA (13W-14W)

Tropical Storm Ken-Lola underscored the limitations of remote sensing for locating poorly organized systems. Synoptic data proved invaluable in identifying and classifying the system while in warning status and in the post-analysis. While in warning status, JTWC considered the system as two separate tropical cyclones. A detailed post-analysis, even though not absolutely conclusive, strongly suggested that Tropical Storms Ken and Lola were probably the same system. The system generated in the monsoon trough that had already proven itself the most active since July 1973. The system then took an elongated cycloidal track, passing close to Okinawa before making landfall on the coast of eastern China.

In the last week of July, as Tropical Depression 12W tracked through the southern Ryukyu's and Typhoon Judy (11W) dissipated in the Sea of Japan, an active monsoon trough with several small embedded circulation centers extended across Taiwan, eastward to $140^{\circ}$ east longitude. A pool of warmer than normal sea surface temperatures engulfed the southern Ryukyu's and extended southeastward to $130^{\circ}$ east longitude. On 29 July, synoptic data indicated that a circulation center in the lowlevel wind field formed over the warm pool about 300 nm ( 555 km ) southeast of Okinawa. While the circulation had a central pressure of 995 mb and winds near the center of only 15 kt ( $8 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ), a broad area of southwesterly monsoonal gales extended 100 to 300 nm ( 185 to 555 km ) south of the center. The first mention of the disturbance appeared on that
day's Significant Tropical Weather Advisory as a suspect area having fair potential for development.

Further evaluation of the 290600 Z synoptic data and subsequent satellite imagery led to issuance of a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 290930 Z even though the low-level cyclonic circulation center was displaced to the north of the associated convection. Improving organization during the subsequent 18 hours prompted the first warning on Tropical Depression 13W at 300400Z. The depression was forecast to move northward, along the periphery of the monsoon gale area, and loop cyclonically around a mid- to upper-level low located between the depression and Okinawa. This low aloft would restrict the depression's outflow and result in slow development and peaking below typhoon intensity. JTWC correctly forecast the overall character of the track and the limited intensity.

At 300900 Z , the second warning valid at 300600 Z , was amended to upgrade the depression to Tropical Storm Ken, when synoptic data showed the maximum sustained winds were $45 \mathrm{kt}(23 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. For the next 18 hours fixes from (mostly nighttime) satellite imagery indicated continued northeast movement until the final warning was issued at $310000 Z$. JTWC expected Ken to shear apart and follow the monsoon surge around the northern periphery of an exposed low-level circulation that later would be called Lola. Post-analysis suggests that the 310000 Z
position was most likely 250 nm ( 465 km ) northwest of the warning position (Figure 3-131) and that the low-level system had moved northwestward since 301200 Z .

At 310600 Z , JTWC issued a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert for a disturbance located about 300 nm ( 555 km ) northeast of Okinawa. The satellite imagery (Figure 3-13-2) indicated an exposed low-level center with increasing convection to the south. This system now had gales extending several hundred miles north of the center. At 311030Z, an abbreviated
warning on Tropical Storm Lola was issued after the USS Dubuque (LPD8) reported sustained winds of $50 \mathrm{kt}(26 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) at 310300 Z followed by $40 \mathrm{kt}(21 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ and falling surface pressure three hours later. Also, at 0600Z, another ship (call sign 9MTS) reported westerly winds approximately 90 nm ( 165 km ) south of the USS Dubuque. These data demonstrated that the winds reported by the Dubuque were associated with a circulation center and not the tight pressure gradient near Japan (Figure 3-133 ), as initially thought.


Figure 3-13-1. Ken's expected track verses the best track.


Figure 3-13-2. Imagery supporting the final waming on Tropical Storm Ken and formation of Lola. Note remnants of TD12W in the Taiwan Strait ( $310025 Z$ July DMSP visual imagery).


Figure 3-13-3. Wind and pressure reports from the USS Dubuque (LPD8) from 300000Z through 311200Z July with a report from ship 9MTS at 310600 Z help define the circulation center. Tropical storm symbols represent six-hourly best track positions for Tropical Storm Ken-Lola.

The first 72-hour forecast for Lola followed at 311200 Z . The problems that aggravated this initial warning were the inconsistencies between fix platforms. Radar fixes were displaced to the west of the satellite fixes and suggested the system was moving rapidly southwestward. In contrast, the satellite fixes, based on cold cloud tops on infrared imagery, implied slow westward movement. Based on the prevailing northeasterly steering flow, the system was forecast to track westsouthwestward and pass about 100 nm ( 185 km ) northwest of Okinawa.

In a short time an understanding of the track became clearer. The radars were tracking a band of convection that was spiraling around the mid-level low. Also, the pressure at Kadena AB (WMO 47931) on Okinawa was not falling
rapidly indicating Lola probably was not tracking rapidly to the southwest as had been suggested by the radar fixes. As a consequence, JTWC slowed the forecast speed of movement and angled the track towards Taiwan.

The mid-level cyclone appears to have been the major influence on Ken-Lola's track (Figure 3-13-4). In fact Ken-Lola's path described a elongated cycloid with the storm representing a point on the rotating "rim" of the westward moving 500 mb "wheel". The track made a cusp near Okinawa as the 500 mb center passed to the west of the system. The mid-level low pulled Ken-Lola northward and then westward into the East China Sea.

Kadena AB (WMO 47931) recorded peak winds of $30 \mathrm{kt}(15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ as the system


Figure 3-13-4. Spatial relationship between the tropical cyclone and accompanying 500 mb circulation center. Minimum 500 mb heights are in meters. Positions are for 0000Z from 29 July through 4 August.
passed within 80 nm ( 150 km ) between 011800 Z and 020000 Z (Figure 3-13-5). The USS Dubuque (LPD 8), which remained near Okinawa, reported $35-\mathrm{kt}$ ( $18-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) winds at 020600 Z that decreased to $24 \mathrm{kt}(12 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ by 021200Z.

On 3 August, a building ridge over Manchuria caused Ken-Lola to take a more westward track toward Shanghai. Due to
concern that a trough, approaching eastern China could reverse the tropical cyclone's track and take it northeastward into the Yellow Sea and Korea, the warnings continued until 041800 Z when it was more than 250 nm (465 km ) inland. The low relief and wetlands of the Yangtze River Valley allowed the weak circulation to maintain itself inland for several days. No reports of damage were received.


Figure 3-13-5. Ken-Lola nears Okinawa. Typhoon Mac (15W) is at the lower right ( $012344 Z$ August DMSP visual imagery).


## TYPHOON MAC (15W)

The first typhoon of August, Mac developed at a higher than average latitude. Its track and intensity were influenced by a complex mid-latitude synoptic regime and complicated by a multi-storm environment. JTWC and NOGAPS had considerable difficulty distinguishing between short-term and long-term trends. Developing northeast of the Mariana Islands, Mac began with a general northwest track, moved westward 48 hours, then accelerated on a northwestward track and made landfall northeast of Tokyo. Mac weakened rapidly as it moved into and across the Sea of Japan, and finally dissipated over southern Sakhalin Island.

As the most active July since 1973 came to a close, Typhoon Judy (11W) was dissipating over Korea and Tropical Storm Ken-Lola (13W) was threatening Okinawa. At the same time, an
area of convection developed approximately 600 nm ( 1111 km ) northeast of Saipan in an extremely active monsoon trough that extended as far east as Wake Island. The 300000Z July surface analysis indicated that a low-level cyclonic circulation with a 1008 mb pressure was associated with an area of disturbed weather. JTWC classified the disturbance as having poor potential for further development on the 300600 Z Significant Tropical Weather Advisory. Subsequent synoptic reports indicated that the central pressure had decreased to 1006 mb and surface winds had increased. Thus, JTWC reissued the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory at 301000 Z to upgrade the disturbance's potential to fair.

The disturbance's central convection increased and additional synoptic reports indicated that the central pressure had fallen to


Figure 3-15-1. Mac's cirrus outflow (at left) is impressive compared to Ken-Lola (13W-14W) (012344Z August DMSP visual imagery).

1000 mb . The surface winds north of the system were 20 to 25 kt ( 10 to $13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) and monsoon gales were present to the south. JTWC issued a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 310400 Z with the disturbance moving to the southeast. Subsequent fix information indicated that the disturbance had actually made a cyclonic loop and was moving northwestward out of the Alert area. In response, JTWC reissued the Alert at 311700 Z .

While the first warning on Tropical Storm Mac was issued at 010000Z August, post-analysis indicated that the system did not reach tropical storm intensity until 12 hours
later. The first series of forecasts called for Mac to track northward along the $150^{\circ}$ east meridian. Due to the mid-tropospheric subtropical high weakening, the early stages of the forecasts verified well - as Mac tracked north-northwestward for the next 36 hours.

While Tropical Storm Ken-Lola (13W14W) was in the vicinity of Okinawa on 2 August, JTWC changed its forecast outlook on Mac (Figure 3-15-1). The 020600Z warning had Mac moving westward along $30^{\circ}$ north latitude in the 48- to 72 -hour period as a complex series of events began to unfold. At the same time as a long-wave trough moved


Figure 3-15-2. At peak intensity, Mac is surrounded by a ring of subsidence (032304Z August DMSP visual imagery).
eastward into the Sea of Japan, a large TUTT cyclone began to tumble rapidly westward from the date line. While the TUTT cell moved northwest of Mac, the mid-tropospheric subtropical ridge strengthened, placing Mac under the influence of easterly flow. This was similar to events that had recently forced Typhoon Judy (11W) to move westward. JTWC would remain with the westward track along $30^{\circ}$ north latitude for the next nine warnings.

The westward movement began much earlier than forecast, in fact, along $27^{\circ}$ instead of $30^{\circ}$ north latitude and within 12 hours instead of 48 hours. Mac continued the westward movement for the next 48 hours reaching typhoon intensity at 030300 Z . JTWC had high confidence in its forecast as NOGAPS built a high over the Sea of Japan and most of the objective techniques supported slow westward movement. Confidence was further heightened when Mac began tracking west-southwestward at 030000 Z . JTWC forecasters recognized the unfavorable upper-level regime and displayed great success with the intensity forecasts. Mac reached its peak intensity of $80 \mathrm{kt}(41 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ at 031800Z (Figure 3-15-2).

During its westward track, an ominous slowing of Mac's forward speed occurred. At 040600 Z Mac was moving very slowly westsouthwestward. The 040000 Z analysis indicated that a jet maximum approaching the trough axis which could deepen the trough. The Prognostic Reasoning accompanying the 040600 Z warning did mention recurvature as a low-probability alternate scenario. JTWC's westward scenario was reinforced by the movement of a high from Mongolia to coastal Manchuria. Forecasters thought the continued eastward movement of that high and Mac's westward movement would allow the typhoon to escape the influence of the digging trough as ridging reestablished itself to Mac's north.

In the meantime, the TUTT cell that had tumbled westward slowed down and linked up with the mid-latitude trough in the Sea of Japan. This blocked significant eastward movement of the high over Manchuria and changed Mac's steering flow from westward to northward around the east side of the the TUTT cell. JTWC added northward movement to the Prognostic Reasoning accompanying that 041200 Z warning as a moderate probability alternate scenario. At 041800Z, the westward forecast was abandoned as Mac made a slow move northward and the new 041200 Z NOGAPS no longer showed the high building over the Sea of Japan. JTWC swung the forecast track to the northwest toward Osaka near the 72 -hour point. JTWC remained with that forecast for the next two warnings.

Meanwhile Mac had accelerated from 3 $\mathrm{kt}(6 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$ at 041200 Z to $13 \mathrm{kt}(24 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$ toward the north-northwest at 050600 Z as it ran along the east side of the TUTT cell. The TUTT cell was expected to resume its normal southwestward movement causing Mac to resume a northwestward track toward Osaka. This reasoning was reinforced by height falls occurring west of Tokyo.

By 051200Z, Mac had accelerated to 17 $\mathrm{kt}(32 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$. At this time, JTWC shifted the forecast track to pass 180 nm ( 335 km ) east of Tokyo within 24 hours. Satellite fixes indicated a northward movement and subsequent radar observations from Tori-Shima (WMO 47639) confirmed the north-northwestward track. In addition, the TUTT cell and an upper-level low over the northern Sea of Japan linked producing an extended trough. Mac would now maintain a forward speed of $17 \mathrm{kt}(32 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$, or more, during the next 30 hours.

After 051800Z, Mac shifted from a north-northwestward course to a more northwestward course, as the tough in the Sea of

Japan began to weaken. Mac finally passed east of Tokyo at 060700 Z , but only by 60 nm ( 111 km ) with an intensity of $45 \mathrm{kt}(23 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ (Figure 3-15-3). The tropical cyclone made landfall at 061000 Z . At 061200 Z , Mac was downgraded to tropical storm intensity, however, post-analysis indicates Mac was a tropical storm at least six hours earlier.

Mac weakened while crossing Japan, but without the benefit of satellite intensity analysis and availability of continuous observations, JTWC conservatively maintained Mac at tropical storm intensity until 070600Z. MAC actually entered the Sea of Japan, near Sakata, as a tropical depression at 061700Z. The final warning on Tropical Depression 15W was issued at 071800 Z . The remnants turned northeastward and dissipated over southern Sakhalin island on 8 August.


Figure 3-15-3. Mac approaches Japan (060438Z August NOAA visual imagery).
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## TYPHOON OWEN (16W)

Typhoon Owen generated in the monsoon trough and intensified slowly while moving on a general northwest to northward track. Due to the proximity* of Typhoon Nancy (17W) to the east, Owen took more than a week to reach tropical storm intensity. Later, its binary interaction with Typhoon Nancy (17W) resulted in an unusual southeastward track during its developing stage. Then, the tropical cyclone followed Nancy (17W) through recurvature, extratropical transition and into high latitudes.

The initial disturbance that spawned Typhoon Owen began as an area of convection in the monsoon trough south of Pohnpei in the eastern Caroline Islands. After the convection persisted for 24 hours, JTWC included the disturbance as a suspect area on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory at 040600Z. Synoptic data indicated a weak low-level circulation under easterly flow aloft. During the next six days, the amount and organization of the convection associated with the disturbance fluctuated as the monsoon trough repositioned further north. Finally convection consolidated beneath an upper-level anticyclone, prompting JTWC to issue a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 100600Z.

* If formative tropical cyclones are separated by distances of less than fifteen degrees, interaction (at the expense of one, or the other) between the two circulations is often observed.

During the next 18 hours, the system continued to organize, although its upper-level outflow was restricted by a TUTT cell centered four to five degrees latitude to the northnorthwest. At 110000 Z , JTWC issued a 36 hour tropical depression warning on Tropical Depression 16W and forecast no intensification because of its proximity to the TUTT cell. The tropical cyclone tracked northeastward along the monsoon trough axis and through the northern Mariana Islands for the next 18 hours, influenced both by the TUTT cell and by Tropical Depression 17W. By 120000 Z , a well-defined upper-level anticyclone had established itself over Owen, and the system improved its organization and convection. Anticipating further intensification, JTWC transitioned to a regular 72 -hour warning. At 121200Z, the depression reached tropical storm intensity based on satellite intensity estimates. By this time, a binary interaction with Nancy (17W) was beginning to influence Owen's track and resulting in a slow southeastward movement until 131200Z. (For specific diagrams of this binary interaction, please see the following article on Typhoon Nancy (17W). Owen became a typhoon at 131800 Z and reached its peak intensity of $75 \mathrm{kt}(38 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ at 141200Z.

As Owen followed Nancy (17W) to the north-northwest, the recently formed eye began to fill (Figure 3-16-1). With the subtropical ridge close by, at 161500 Z , Owen weakened to tropical storm intensity and began to be buffeted by upper-level westerly flow. Twelve hours later Owen recurved around the ridge and
accelerated to the northeast. At 180000 Z , JTWC issued its final warning on Owen as it crossed $40^{\circ}$ north latitude and was becoming extratropical. During its lifetime, Owen was a threat primarily to maritime interests. No reports of damage or loss of life were received.


Figure 3-16-1. Typhoon Owen with a cloud filled eye follows Nancy (17W) northnorthwestward (142243Z August DMSP visual imagery).
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## TYPHOON NANCY (17W)

Of the eight August tropical cyclones, Nancy was the third typhoon. It underwent a prolonged binary interaction with Typhoon Owen (16W), tracked rapidly toward Japan, then abruptly turned northward, and finally became extratropical.

The disturbance that eventually became Typhoon Nancy appeared as an area of persistent convection in the monsoon trough. It was first considered as a suspect area on the 9 August Significant Tropical Weather Advisory. The disturbance tracked northeastward in response to surging monsoon southwesterlies. At 110100 Z , JTWC issued a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert based on increased curvature in
the convective bands and a cyclonic tumbling motion of the convection on animated satellite imagery. The first warning for Tropical Depression 17 W followed at 110600 Z when satellite imagery revealed a developing central dense overcast. At first, JTWC forecast Tropical Depression 17W to make a curve to the north and then track northwestward, as it separated from the monsoon trough and interacted with the subtropical ridge which was building westward. The system did, indeed, follow the forecast, however, only after an unforecast 18 -hour jog to the southeast. During this early stage, both Tropical Depressions 17W and 16 W competed for low-level inflow and favorable upper-level outflow channels, causing


Figure 3-17-1. Typhoons Nancy and Owen (16W) at peak intensity (140313Z August NOAA infrared imagery).
a high degree of uncertainty as to which system would dominate.

As Tropical Depression 17W turned to the north, it was upgraded to Tropical Storm Nancy at 120600 Z. Six hours later, Tropical Depression 16W also would become a tropical storm. Then, Nancy broke free of the monsoon trough and began rapid intensification, reaching typhoon intensity within 24 hours of its upgrade to a tropical storm.

JTWC anticipated the possibility of binary interaction with Tropical Depression 16W as soon as Nancy formed. While Tropical Depression 16W intensified, the two systems closed to within $600 \mathrm{~nm}(1110 \mathrm{~km})$ of each other, and binary interaction became evident when Nancy turned northward. Nancy and Owen (16W) rotated around each other from 120000 Z until 150000 Z (Figure $3-17-1$ ), an exceptionally long period. The rotation between the two systems about a common
center point totaled 105 degrees. During this time, Nancy accelerated from $6 \mathrm{kt}(11 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$ on 12 August to $24 \mathrm{kt}(44 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$ on 14 August in response to the combined effects of increased steering flow and the interaction with Owen (16W). A comparison of both typhoon tracks referenced to the center of motion, or centroid, is shown in Figure 3-17-2. The centroid's track (Figure 3-17-3) during the binary interaction moved east and then turned to the northwest. JTWC used this as a forecast aid for both cyclones, with good results. JTWC propagated the centroid northward, however, results would have been even better had JTWC steered the centroid with the north-northwestward steering flow. At 131800Z, Nancy reached a peak intensity of 75 kt ( $39 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) and started accelerating towards Tokyo, a track that would reach the metropolis in 24 hours. Based on the expected behavior from the binary interaction, JTWC forecasters projected the cyclone to slow down and veer to the north. Twelve hours later, the forecast motion away from Japan


Figure 3-17-2. Tracks of Typhoons Nancy and Owen (16W) relative to their common center. Binary interaction lasted for 72 hours and through 105 degrees of rotation.
materialized. On 15 August, the binary interaction between Nancy and Owen (16W) ended abruptly. There is, to our knowledge, no research that indicates when a binary interaction will cease and the storms will resume independent tracks.

In retrospect, and in light of a similar north-orientated track of Typhoon Mac (15W) two weeks before, there was concern whether Nancy would cross over Japan. But, the NOGAPS prognostic series were quite consistent in moving a trough, which could
induce recurvature, to the east of Japan. The series also built a mid-tropospheric ridge that would stop any further northwest movement over the northern Sea of Japan. At 160000 Z , Nancy was moving north of the midtropospheric subtropical ridge. It had weakened to tropical storm intensity, and began extratropical transition. Without deep convection to maintain the warm core, the cyclone completed its extratropical transition. The final warning was issued at 161200 Z as the low-level circulation center tracked north-northeastward just east of Hokkaido.


Figure 3-17-3. Path of mid-points between Typhoons Nancy and Owen (16W).


## TROPICAL STORM PEGGY (18W)

The third tropical cyclone to develop in the monsoon trough between 11 and 16 August, Peggy was short-lived and only reached minimal tropical storm intensity.

While tropical cyclones Owen (16W) and Nancy (17W) were completing their binary interaction and moving northward, the disturbance that would eventually become Peggy formed in the monsoon trough roughly 200 nm ( 370 km ) north of Guam. Late on 14 August, satellite imagery displayed a new area of convection associated with a low-level circulation center. After sparse synoptic data indicated falling pressures and wind shifts

reflected the circulation's development, JTWC issued a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 150000Z.

Initially, the disturbance moved northeastward and a small ragged area of central convection persisted. This persistent, but small, central dense overcast led JTWC to issue the first warning on Tropical Depression 18W at 160000 Z . The depression then turned north to follow Owen's (16W) track. Increased convection resulted in an upgrade to tropical storm intensity on the 161200 Z warning. The outflow from Owen (16W) restricted Peggy's outflow aloft. This increased vertical shear, in combination with the subsidence associated with a Tropical Upper Tropospheric Trough (TUTT) cell to the northeast, kept Peggy from developing further. Minor flare-ups of convection were, however, sufficient to allow Peggy to maintain its $35-\mathrm{kt}$ ( $18 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) intensity despite the shear. Meanwhile, lower tropospheric ridging northeast of Peggy caused the cyclone to turn to the west. At 180000 Z , the final warning was issued when satellite imagery (Figure 3-18-1) indicated the separation of the low-level circulation from its convection and that the low-level center would remain in an area of strong subsidence. The residual lowlevel vorticity center drifted west-northwestward and dissipated on 19 August near Iwo Jima.

Figure 3-18-1. Vertical wind shear from the northwest exposes the lowlevel circulation center as a TUTT cell to the northeast of Peggy is becomes the dominant feature ( 172206 Z August NOAA visual imagery).


## TROPICAL DEPRESSION 19W

Developing from a large area of low pressure and disturbed weather, this system was first detected on satellite imagery approximately 180 nm ( 335 km ) northwest of Okinawa on 16 August. Initially, there was just a large cloud minimum area that was caused by subsidence beneath a mid-level low. Based on the expected movement of upper-level divergence into this area, JTWC forecast the development of Tropical Depression 19W. When strong upperlevel divergence did move into this area, convection began to rapidly develop. This cloudiness began to coil beneath the mid-level low, and estimates of $20-$ to $25-\mathrm{kt}$ (10- to $13-$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) surface winds from satellite data prompted the issuance of a Tropical Cyclone

Formation Alert at 160230Z. The first warning, at 170000 Z , addressed further development of the tropical cyclone.

Tropical Depression 19W's unusual curved track to the north, west, and then south appears to coincide with the overall motion displayed by the larger, mid-level low. On 18 August, the mid-level low began to fill, weakening its influence on the tropical depression (Figure 3-19-1). The track of the cyclone straightened out, moving westward with the easterly steering flow. JTWC issued the final warning at 191200 Z as the tropical depression approached the coast of China. No reports of damage were received.


Figure 3-19-1. A tight spiral of low cloudiness is associated with the exposed low-level circulation of Tropical Depression 19W (172346Z August NOAA visual imagery).


## TROPICAL STORM ROGER (20W)

Forming just north of Taiwan, Roger moved southeastward into the southern Ryukyu Islands, abruptly turned northeastward, and made landfall on Honshu. At the start, the forecast problem for this tropical cyclone was exacerbated by the difficulty in locating the system's complex center during its formative stages and the immediate threat it posed to DOD assets on Okinawa.

On 23 August, a tropical disturbance rapidly consolidated just north of Taiwan. Because of the developed cloud signature, JTWC opted to issue a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 230500Z instead of reissuing the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory. When further development did not occur as rapidly as anticipated, the Alert was reissued the following day. Satellite data detected multiple vortices near the main convection mass and there was uncertainty about just where the system was going to consolidate. The fairly dense network of ship and land observations in the southern Ryukyu Islands began to show significant 12 -hour pressure falls, and winds near the center of the disturbance increased to $25 \mathrm{kt}(13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. In response, JTWC issued a 36-hour Tropical Depression Warning at

241200Z. Pressures continued to drop during the following 12 hours, and satellite and synoptic fixes appeared to converge. Finally, when it became apparent that one circulation center was going to emerge and intensify, JTWC issued a 72 -hour Tropical Cyclone Warning at 250000 Z .

On 25 August, in response to a short wave trough approaching from the north-northwest, the depression turned northeastward. The reason for the abrupt track change to the northeast was not immediately apparent because two vortices were involved. The low-level circulation center, in the southern portion of the cloud system, weakened, and another center in the northern portion strengthened. This switch in circulation centers initially made it appear as if Roger had executed a sharper turn and had accelerated faster than it actually did.

In addition to the major track change on 25 August, Roger also intensified to a tropical storm. Synoptic data revealed that gale force winds extended out from the circulation center more than 300 nm ( 555 km ) into the southeastern semicircle. This large asymmetrical pattern of gales would accompany

Roger during the remainder of its lifetime. As the tropical cyclone (Figure 3-20-1) moved steadily northeastward, it gradually intensified. Roger reached a peak intensity of 50 kt ( 26 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) early on 27 August, just prior to making landfall on Shikoku at Cape Muroto, which is located $100 \mathrm{~nm}(185 \mathrm{~km})$ southwest of the city of Osaka.

At landfall, Roger's convection became more centralized and upper-level outflow remained good. In addition, the cyclone accelerated, increasing winds in the southeastern semicircle. As a consequence, Roger's track across central Honshu created considerable havoc. Two people drowned in swollen rivers and a third was killed in one of many landslides. Some areas in Roger's path recorded over 19 inches ( 485 mm ) of rain.

Widespread disruption of air traffic and railway service stranded over 37,000 travelers. Also, due to high winds, the new Seto Ohashi Bridge across the Inland Sea between Honshu and Shikoku was closed for the first time since it opened in April 1988.

At 271200 Z, Tropical Storm Roger moved into the Sea of Japan and continued to accelerate under the influence of stronger westerly winds aloft. Even though the circulation center was over water, the combined effects of surface friction from the rugged topography of northern Honshu and increased westerly winds aloft weakened the tropical cyclone. At 280000 Z , the final warning was issued as the extratropical remnants of Roger sped northeastward across Hokkaido.


Figure 3-20-1. Near peak intensity, Roger approaches central Honshu (262343Z August DMSP visual imagery).
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## TROPICAL DEPRESSION 21W

The eighth and final tropical cyclone of August, Tropical Depression 21W developed northeast of the Mariana Islands. Because JTWC recognized that intensification would be inhibited by strong vertical wind shear, only Tropical Depression Warnings were issued.

As Tropical Storm Roger (20W) passed through the southern Ryukyu Islands on 23 August, a disturbance formed on the eastern end of the monsoon trough which extended
eastward across the northern-most Mariana Islands. The 24 August Significant Tropical Weather Advisory mentioned the disturbance and its poor potential for development. During the night, the disturbance became better organized and its potential for development was upgraded to fair. A Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert was issued at 241200 Z , after the disturbance continued to develop during the normal diurnal convective minimum. Further development (Figure 3-21-1) led to the first

Figure 3-21-1. Convective organization continues to increase after the Alert was issued (242242Z August DMSP visual imagery).

warning at 250600 Z . A Tropical Depression Warning was issued rather than a tropical cyclone warning since the low-level circulation was displaced to the west of the deep convection and the system was not expected to be long-lived because of strong westerly wind shear aloft.

While the upper-level winds restricted the tropical cyclone's outflow, the deep southwesterly monsoonal flow carried the lowlevel circulation center on an unusually long track to the northeast. Late on 25 August, Tropical Depression 21W slowed abruptly as it moved into an area of weaker vertical shear. Coincidentally, the low-level circulation center moved beneath the central cloud mass, and the intensity increased to 30 kt ( $15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ).

On 26 August, the depression accelerated in response to a surge in the southwest
monsoon. Shortly thereafter it started interacting with a shear zone that trailed from a weak cold front. Tropical Depression 21W appeared to be on the verge of transitioning to an extratropical system; however, on 27 August, mid-level steering weakened, the system stalled, and central convection reappeared.

Within a day, unfavorable conditions returned aloft, as northwesterlies moved over the system and began once more to strip away the central convection. As a consequence, the amount of convection decreased and the lowlevel circulation center became exposed. A weakening Tropical Depression 21W suddenly started tracking northwestward. At 280600 Z , with the low-level circulation center separated more than one degree to the west of the convection, the final warning was issued. JTWC did not receive any reports of damage caused by the tropical cyclone.
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## TYPHOON SARAH (22W)

The first of the September tropical cyclones, Sarah proved to be a bona fide challenge to forecasters. The cyclone apparently underwent a binary interaction with a secondary low east of Luzon and later, when it stalled, was involved with the development of a sympathetic low* on the lee side of Luzon. From genesis involving two distinct cloud masses to accelerating toward the Philippines, stalling just east of Luzon, moving north and rapidly reintensifying, then looping over eastern Taiwan, Sarah was one of the most difficult storms of the year to forecast.

The first day of September, the monsoon trough stretched across the western Pacific in a southwest to northeast orientation between $10^{\circ}$ to $20^{\circ}$ north latitude, and supported several discrete convective cloud masses. Near Minami Tori-shima, a distinct TUTT cell was evident in satellite imagery. About $600 \mathrm{~nm}(1110 \mathrm{~km})$ to the southeast, a disturbed area of weather persisted in the monsoon trough. There was little convection associated with the TUTT cell, however, the convection associated with the

[^4]disturbance was listed on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory. Two Tropical Cyclone Formation Alerts were issued before the first warning. Complex interactions between the TUTT cell, the disturbance and a second disturbance resulted in conditions favorable for development, and the first warning on Tropical Depression 22W was issued at 060000Z.

The Depression tracked as forecast to the west and was upgraded to Tropical Storm Sarah on the 061800 Z warning. By midday on 7 September, Sarah started to accelerate to the northwest towards Okinawa and the tropical storm was relocated on the 071800 Z to reflect the acceleration.

Forecasters at JTWC expected the northwestward motion to be short-lived and predicted a turn back to the west. However, on 8 September, the tropical storm turned westsouthwest, then south-southwest, and nearly stalled east of Luzon on 9 September. Binary interaction with a secondary low appeared to be


Figure 3-22-1. Matched pair of visual (above) and enhanced infrared (below) images showing two centers of convection. Point $A$ is the mass of persistent convection that appears to have undergone binary interaction with Sarah which is at point $\mathbf{B}$ (080043Z September DMSP infrared imagery).

the cause for Sarah's unusual movement. While there was a persistent convective mass (Figure 3-22-1) on the satellite images, there was no firm evidence of this secondary low at the surface on 8 September.

Upgraded to typhoon intensity at 081800 Z , Sarah drifted south slowly and then abruptly headed north. During this time, a sympathetic lee-side low (Figure 3-22-2) formed along the northwest side of Luzon. As Sarah moved north, the cloud mass associated with this lee-side low crossed Basco Island north of Luzon and tracked rapidly around the east side of Sarah and to the northeast. Since Basco Island (WMO 98135) reports did not indicate a wind shift as the convective mass
passed by, no Alert on this secondary convective area was issued. Sarah's prolonged stay just east of Luzon, coupled with the enhanced southwesterly monsoon flow being drawn over the Philippine Islands resulted in at least 31 fatalities, and extensive property and crop damage on Luzon. In addition, rare tornadoes touched down on 10 September. One caused approximately $\$ 150,000$ of damage to the San Miguel Naval Communications Station located $38 \mathrm{~nm}(70 \mathrm{~km}$ ) northwest of Manila. No other U. S. military installations reported major damage. Camp John Hay located near Baguio reported the strongest winds observed at a U.S. military installation of 42 - 48 kt (22-25 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) during the period from 091500 Z to 110430Z.


Figure 3-22-2. 101220Z surface/gradient wind analyses shows the sympathetic low along the northwest coast of Luzon.

Moving north into an area of efficient multiple outflow channels, Sarah (Figures 3-223 and 3-22-4) explosively deepened. The typhoon peaked at $125 \mathrm{kt}(64 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ before interaction with the rugged mountains of Taiwan caused it to weaken. On 10 September, the typhoon was forecast to track north, passing approximately 60 nm ( 110 km ) east of Taiwan on 11 September. It was expected to merge with an approaching mid-latitude front and recurve to the northeast into Kyushu, Japan. Although this was the overall track taken by the secondary cloud maximum that had formed on
the lee-side of Luzon and looped around the east side of Sarah as both systems moved north, Sarah did not follow suit. Sarah moved onshore Taiwan with maximum winds near 90 kt ( $46 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). It then tracked south a short distance along the eastern edge of the mountain range and finally completed a counterclockwise loop off the coast. Approximately 12 hours later, Sarah reentered the coast farther north, weakened and was downgraded to a tropical storm Sarah at 121200 Z as it crossed the rugged mountains of Taiwan. The cyclone did not regain its organization as it crossed the Taiwan


Figure 3-22-3. Radar display of Sarah from Hualien (WMO 46699) at 110500Z. Comparison with Figure 3-22-4, which is close in time, shows the contrast between the remotely sensed precipitation echoes from radar and the cloud top topography as viewed from space (photograph courtesy of the Central Weather Bureau, Taipei, Taiwan).


Figure 3-22-4. Matched visual (above) and enhanced infrared (below) pair of images showing Sarah near peak intensity ( 100517 Z September DMSP visual and infrared imagery).


Straits and was downgraded to a tropical depression after it entered the eastern coast of China at 130600Z (Figure 3-22-5). The last warning was issued at 140000 Z as the system dissipated over eastern China. Press reports
indicated that 13 people died on Taiwan, and that the 12000 -ton freighter Lung Hao (Figure 3-22-6) broke in half off Hualien, Taiwan. No reports of damage were received from China.


Figure 3-22-5. Sarah weakens over the coast of China (130006Z NOAA visual imagery).


Figure 3-22-6. The wreck of the freighter Lung Hao, which was broken in half on the coast of Taiwan by Typhoon Sarah (photo courtesy Pacific Daily News, Agana, Guam).


Generating in early September at the eastern end of the monsoon trough, Tip executed an unusual track to the northeast, then recurved after moving northwestward around the subtropical ridge, and finally tracked eastward with the polar westerlies. Tip reached its peak intensity at $37^{\circ}$ north latitude two days after recurvature.

Tip developed east of the Mariana Islands in an area of enhanced convection at the eastern-most extension of the southwest monsoon. At 080600Z, JTWC mentioned the area on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory as having fair potential for further development. Increases in the amount, depth, and organization of the convection caused JTWC to issue a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 082300 Z . With synoptic data
supporting a closed low-level circulation and indicating 25 kt ( $13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) sustained surface winds, JTWC issued the first warning on Tropical Depression 23W.

During the time that the depression moved rapidly northeastward, and then northwestward, the "spin-up" of the system was slow, partially due to the large size of the vortex. By the time Tip reached the axis of the subtropical ridge and slowed late on 10 September, the bulk of the supporting convection from the monsoonal flow had moved away to the east and north, and had dissipated, leaving only a small ragged patch of dense overcast near the partially exposed lowlevel circulation center.

At 110600Z, Tip (Figure 3-23-1) began


Figure 3-23-1. Tip accelerates to the northeast and begins recurving 400 nm ( 640 km ) north-northeast of Minami Tori-shima (110324Z September NOAA visual imagery).
to accelerate to the north-northeast. During the next 18 hours, Tip appeared to be undergoing extratropical transition, but, at 120000 Z , the tropical cyclone regained enough of its central convection to maintain its warm core. This additional translational effect from the acceleration assisted Tip in reaching its peak intensity of $50 \mathrm{kt}(26 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ at 130000 Z .

During the early morning hours of the 13 September, Tip's convection tracked southsoutheastward with the upper-level flow. Daylight satellite imagery revealed that the lowlevel circulation was well to the north of the convection. At 131800 Z, JTWC issued the final warning on Tropical Storm Tip and passed warning responsibility for the extratropical gales to the Naval Western Oceanography Center at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.
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## TROPICAL STORM VERA (24W)

The third tropical cyclone in September, Vera generated north of Guam. After some initial erratic motion, the cyclone moved on a west-northwestward track, threatened Okinawa, and made a devastating landfall just south of Shanghai.

Vera generated in an area of low-level convergent flow in the monsoon trough approximately 250 nm ( 465 km ) north of Guam. Persistent convection had not been observed with this system prior to 101200 Z . By then, however, the combination of persistent convection, a preexisting low-level circulation center, and sea-level pressures below 1004 mb triggered JTWC to issue the first Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 110430Z. Both satellite imagery and synoptic data indicated efficient outflow over the low-level circulation center suggesting good potential for further
development. JTWC reissued the Alert at 111500 Z as the disturbance moved to the southeast, and out of the original Alert box.

After the initial erratic motion, the convection organized around the circulation center, and the cyclone settled into a track to the west-northwest. JTWC issued the first warning on Tropical Depression 24W at 120600Z. Moving into increased steering flow along the southern side of the subtropical ridge, the tropical cyclone increased its translational speed and continued to intensify. At 121200 Z , JTWC upgraded the depression to Tropical Storm Vera.

Due to two impinging TUTT cells, which constricted the efficiency of its upperlevel outflow, one to the northwest and one to the northeast, Vera (Figure 3-24-1) intensified


Figure 3-24-1. Convection flares shortly before Vera reaches it peak intensity (130042Z September DMSP visual imagery).
slowly, reaching only a peak intensity of 50 kt ( $26 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) at 130600 Z . On 14 and 15 September, as the tropical cyclone accelerated to a forward speed of $20 \mathrm{kt}(10 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$, it started to weakened due to strong vertical wind shear. Vera passed $100 \mathrm{~nm}(185 \mathrm{~km}$ ) southwest of Okinawa and maintained tropical storm intensity until after it made landfall approximately $150 \mathrm{~nm}(240 \mathrm{~km})$ south of Shanghai. At 151800 Z , the cyclone was downgraded to a tropical depression. JTWC
issued the final warning at 160000 Z , and the system dissipated over land 18 hours later. No damage reports were noted from Okinawa, however, press releases from China cited Vera as the most powerful cyclone to hit the lowlying Zhejiang province in southeastern China in decades. Estimates ran as high as 500 fatalities, 700 injured and hundreds missing. Heavy rains reportedly caused extensive flooding and crop damage.
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## TYPHOON WAYNE (25W)

The last of four tropical cyclones to develop in September, Wayne was also the last tropical cyclone of 1989 to affect Japan. It was unique in that it intensified after recurvature. Wayne caused considerable destruction, mudslides and some deaths in Japan.

About 24 hours after Tropical Storm Vera (24W) had dissipated over eastern China, the first warning on Tropical Depression 25W was issued at 170600 Z indicating maximum sustained winds of $25 \mathrm{kt}(13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. The depression formed approximately 300 nm ( 555 km ) southwest of Okinawa and was expected to continue on a northwestward track into China before it could reach tropical storm intensity. JTWC issued a second Tropical Depression Warning at 171800 Z . At that time, the six-hour
movement was thought to have been to the west; however, detailed post-analysis indicated that the system had, in fact, turned northward. The turn to the north as well as further intensification became evident by 180000 Z . The depression was upgraded to Tropical Storm Wayne and was forecast to track northeast through central Honshu and dissipate near Tokyo.

JTWC forecasters maintained that forecast scenario until 181200Z, when they took the track more northward into the Sea of Japan. This change in thinking was based on the persistent northward movement and the NOGAPS prognostic series that indicated a deepening low in the Sea of Japan would attract the system. JTWC's prognostic reasoning


Figure 3-25-1. Typhoon Wayne along the southern coast of Japan (190932Z September DMSP enhanced infrared imagery).
discussed the possibility of the system being caught by the approaching frontal system and remaining south of Japan. The strong vertical wind shear present east of Korea was expected to prevent Wayne from exceeding tropical storm intensity.

Surprisingly, satellite imagery at 181800 Z indicated Wayne had apparently developed an eye. The warning was amended four hours later as subsequent satellite imagery confirmed the presence of an eye and further intensification. At 190000 Z , Wayne was upgraded to a typhoon. While not a common occurrence, intensification after recurvature can occur when a tropical cyclone recurves at relatively low latitudes; and the jet stream provides an efficient outflow channel. A favored time for such intensification (Guard, 1983) is during the fall when warm sea surface temperatures extend into higher latitudes.

Significant acceleration started at 190000Z, and Wayne (Figure 3-25-1) was downgraded to a tropical storm at 191800 Z .

Fortunately for Japan, as Wayne accelerated, the translational speed diminished the maximum sustained wind speeds in the northwest quadrant, which was over land. Yokota AB, Japan (WMO 47642), experienced maximum sustained winds of $14 \mathrm{kt}(7 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ with a peak gust to 19 knots ( $10 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ), even though Wayne passed only $45 \mathrm{~nm}(85 \mathrm{~km}$ ) to the southeast. Tateyama (WMO 47672), southeast of Yokosuka at the mouth of Sagami Bay, took a direct hit from Tropical Storm Wayne, and after the storm passed, the station recorded 60 kt ( 31 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) sustained winds with gusts to 84 kt ( 43 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). Heavy rains caused flooding and mudslides. News reports indicated at least seven people died and over 4000 homes were flooded.

By 191800Z, Wayne's translational speed had increased to $40 \mathrm{kt}(74 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) and the system began to transition into an extratropical low. JTWC issued the final warning on Wayne at 200600 Z as it underwent a compound transition (Brand and Guard, 1978) and merged with a cold-core low east of Hokkaido.
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## SUPER TYPHOON ANGELA (26W)

Angela was the first of three tropical cyclones to form in the monsoon trough during the three-day period 29 September to 2 October. It had the unique distinction of being in warning status longer than any other tropical cyclone in the western North Pacific this year - 12 days. From 29 September to 10 October, JTWC issued a total of 46 warnings on Angela. Angela also was one of five tropical cyclones to reach super typhoon intensity in 1989. Developing south of Guam, Angela tracked slowly westward and struck northern Luzon with super typhoon intensity causing a large number of casualties and wide spread destruction. It then continued into the South China Sea, where it reintensified, finally making landfall in central Vietnam.

During late September, the monsoon trough, located near $10^{\circ}$ north latitude, became very active after a week of little convective activity. On 26 September an area of convection developed in the western Caroline Islands. The disturbed weather persisted for two more days, and was added as a suspect area to the 280600 Z Significant Tropical Weather Advisory. As the disturbance moved to the southeast side of a Tropical Upper Tropospheric Trough (TUTT) cyclone, it organized rapidly. This resulted in the issuance of a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 281730Z. The enhanced upper-level outflow from the TUTT low aided further development, and the first warning on Tropical Depression 34W (Figure 3-26-1) was issued at 290600 Z .

Figure 3-26-1. Angela just after the initial warning was issued. The TUTT low northwest of Angela is enhancing upperlevel outflow and divergence (290904Z September DMSP enhanced infrared imagery).


The depression was upgraded to Tropical Storm Angela at 291800Z. Angela initially tracked northwestward, as it developed, influenced by a mid-latitude short wave to the northwest. At 010600Z, the short wave had moved to the east, and Angela started tracking westward along the south side of the subtropical ridge. In the meantime as the short wave approached, Angela developed dual outflow channels and rapid intensification occurred. Angela intensified from $45 \mathrm{kt}(23 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ to 90
$\mathrm{kt}(46 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ during the period 301200 Z to 010000 Z , reaching typhoon intensity at 301800 Z . After 010000 Z , intensification was slower as Angela lost the outflow channel to the north. It wasn't until four days later, at 050600 Z , that Angela (Figure 3-26-2) was upgraded to a super typhoon.

Between 051500 Z and 060300 Z , Angela skirted along the northern coast of Luzon and was downgraded to a typhoon at


Figure 3-26-2. Super Typhoon Angela at peak intensity just prior to hitting northem Luzon ( $050558 Z$ October NOAA visual imagery). Note: The spot in the eye is a blemish on the original transparency.

060600 Z as it moved into the South China Sea. News reports from the Philippines indicated that the death toll from Angela was 62, mostly drowning victims, with 50 others missing and 21 injured. The high winds and heavy rains triggered flooding and caused heavy damage to crops and infrastructure. Angela destroyed more than 22,000 houses and sent 118,000 people fleeing to evacuation centers.

In the South China Sea, the typhoon started to track west-southwestward with high pressure building over China. As vertical wind shear weakened, Angela reintensified reaching $95 \mathrm{kt}(49 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ at 090600 Z . Interacting with the topography of Hainan, the typhoon weakened before it moved inland in central Vietnam. At 100600 Z , Angela made landfall approximately 30 nm ( 55 km ) north of Hue, Vietnam and the last warning followed at 101200Z.


## TYPHOON BRIAN (27W)

Typhoon Cecil (04W) in May and Typhoon Brian in late September and early October were the only tropical cyclones of the year to develop and spend their entire lifetimes within the confines of the South China Sea.

As Super Typhoon Angela (26W) developed over the Philippine Sea, the monsoon trough became active across the South China Sea from western Luzon to Vietnam. A broad area of moderate convection developed in the trough and was first mentioned on the 280600 Z September Significant Tropical Weather Advisory as a fair suspect area about 390 nm ( 720 km ) southeast of Hong Kong. The satellite
signature indicated a well defined upper-level anticyclone, but a weak surface circulation with very little deep convection.

The strong upper-level anticyclone persisted for the next 24 hours and synoptic data indicated that the low-level cyclonic circulation had intensified, prompting the issuance of a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 290830Z. The circulation moved slowly westward along the southern side of the mid-tropospheric subtropical ridge. At 300000 Z , the ridge weakened and the disturbance became quasistationary $195 \mathrm{~nm}(360 \mathrm{~km}$ ) southeast of Hong Kong.


Figure 3-27-1. Tropical Storm Brian tracks toward Hainan (010641Z October NOAA visual imagery).

Over the next six hours, the disturbance drifted northward in an area of weak mid-level steering flow. As JTWC did not expect the depression to intensify during the next 48 hours, a 36 -hour Tropical Depression Warning was issued for Tropical Depression 27 W at 300600Z. Shortly thereafter, the subtropical ridge strengthened to the north and the depression moved west-southwestward and intensified. Brian (Figure 3-27-1) was upgraded to tropical storm intensity at 301800 Z and to typhoon status 24 hours later when it was 240 $\mathrm{nm}(445 \mathrm{~km})$ southwest of Hong Kong.

On 2 October at 0000Z, Brian (Figure 3-27-2) settled on a westward course and increased its forward speed to 9 kt ( $17 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). At 021200 Z , the typhoon reached a peak
intensity of $80 \mathrm{kt}(41 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) approximately 20 nm ( 35 km ) off the southeast coast of Hainan Island. Three hours later the cyclone crossed the extreme southern coast of Hainan and weakened to $75 \mathrm{kt}(39 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. News releases from the area reported that at least 31 people perished and 500 were injured. In addition, Brian damaged an estimated 190,000 acres (77,000 hectares) of rice.

After mauling Hainan, the typhoon maintained its westward course and 75-kt (39$\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) intensity until it made landfall near Vinh, Vietnam. JTWC issued its last warning on Brian at 031200 Z . The convection continued westward into the mountains of Vietnam and dissipated the next day.


Figure 3-27-2. Typhoons Angela (26W) and Brian. Angela's intensity of $115 \mathrm{kt}(59 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) is almost twice that of Brian's (020100Z October DMSP visual imagery).
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## TYPHOON COLLEEN (28W)

Forming just north of the Marshall Islands, Colleen passed through the northern Mariana Islands before recurving south of Japan. The tropical cyclone maintained typhoon intensity until it completed extratropical transition. Also, Colleen threatened PACEX 89 - the largest US Navy exercise conducted in the Pacific since the Korean War. Colleen underscored the difficulty of tracking poorly organized systems with only nighttime infrared satellite imagery, but also showed the value of 'the microwave imager data as a tool to help locate these systems.

In the last week of September, Super Typhoon Angela (26W) was forming in the Philippine Sea and Typhoon Brian (27W) in the South China Sea. A deep trough penetrated into the tropical northwestern Pacific near the dateline. An area of cloudiness formed at the base of the trough on 23 September and moved slowly southwestward toward the Marshall Islands. In the data sparse area there were no
indications of a surface circulation until 271200 Z when pressure falls and wind shifts throughout the northern Marshall Islands reflected the passage of a surface circulation or a tropical wave. JTWC first identified the disturbance as a suspect area on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory at 280600 Z . The disturbance was tracked on the Advisories for the next three days until a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert was issued at 010030 Z October. At that time, based on satellite imagery, the disturbance was analyzed as moving west-northwestward at 15 kt (28 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). Forecasters noted that gradient-level winds at Guam (WMO 91217) had slowly veered from the south-southeast to the westnorthwest from 290000Z September until 010000 Z October despite the presence of Tropical Storm Angela (26W) to the west of Guam.

The Alert was reissued at 011400 Z when satellite analysts determined that the disturbance was moving westward at 9 kt (17


Figure 3-28-1. Tropical Storm Colleen approaching Guam (021159Z October DMSP enhanced infrared imagery).
$\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). The first warning on Tropical Depression 28W followed at 011800 Z after satellite imagery indicated the development of a central dense overcast. The depression was upgraded to Tropical Storm Colleen with the second warning at 020000 Z . The forecasts for the initial five warnings called for the system to track south of Guam, however, the accompanying Prognostic Reasoning Messages discussed the possibility of a "stair step" in response to the passage of a short wave trough indicated by the NOGAPS prognostic series.

Tracking Colleen (Figure 3-28-1) became a problem during the night of 2 October. Earlier in the evening, a USAF contractor was installing a computer at Detachment $1,1 \mathrm{WW}$ to process and display DMSP microwave imager information. Between 020800Z and 020900Z, microwave imager data from the 85 -gigahertz channel was acquired and processed. These data were able to "see through" the high overcast clouds and the analyst could locate the center of the tropical storm and verify the positions obtained from the infrared channel. Subsequent nighttime infrared positions, without the benefit of the microwave data,
indicated that the system was moving westnorthwestward in excess of 12 kt ( $22 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). The 021200 Z satellite fix placed the position of the storm within $100 \mathrm{~nm}(185 \mathrm{~km})$ of Guam, but neither the weather radar at Andersen AFB nor the Air Traffic Control radar operated by the Federal Aviation Administration on Guam could confidently locate the center. Because of the contradictory information presented by the satellite fixes, the lack of central or banding features on radar, and the absence of falling pressures that should accompany a rapidly approaching system, the 021200 Z warning position was based only partly on the satellitederived position. In the post-analysis, the 021200 Z satellite position was $96 \mathrm{~nm}(178 \mathrm{~km})$ west of the final best track position. The average error of the eight infrared satellite fixes made during the night of 2 October was 68 nm ( 126 km ) compared to the $20-\mathrm{nm}(37-\mathrm{km}$ ) average error for the visual fixes on the 2 and 3 October. Warning number five, valid at 021800 Z , was amended at 022300 Z and relocated the position of the system to the north based on the first available visual satellite imagery. Also, at that time, 24 -hour surface pressure falls at Saipan (WMO 91232) in-

## 24 HOUR PRESSURE FALLS

 020300Z - 030000Z

TIME
Figure 3-28-2. Twenty-four hour pressure falls at Guam, Saipan, and Faraulep from 020300Z, through 030000Z.
creased while Guam (WMO 91212) and the Faraulep AMOS station (WMO 52005) indicated slowing trends (Figure 3-28-2). The relocated position indicated the system had tracked northwestward during the night and was moving towards a weakness in the subtropical ridge. JTWC's amended warning took the system near Saipan in 36 hours. Colleen would eventually pass $120 \mathrm{~nm}(220 \mathrm{~km})$ to the east of Guam and 30 nm ( 55 km ) to the northeast of Saipan. Colleen tracked northwestward through the northern Marianas (Figure 3-28-3) passing within $60 \mathrm{~nm}(110 \mathrm{~km})$ of the islands of Pagan and Farallon de Pajaros -- both proposed sites for future Automated Meteorological Observing Stations (AMOS). Heavy rains during Colleen's passage caused widespread flooding on Guam.

Warning number 6, valid at 030000 Z , called for the start of recurvature in the vicinity
of Iwo Jima near the 72 -hour point. However, Colleen slowed to $5 \mathrm{kt}(9 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$ on 5 October and recurvature was delayed until 061800Z. Subsequent warnings retained the recurvature scenario well south of Japan with significant acceleration to the northeast.

At 040600 Z , satellite imagery indicated a partial eyewall, and Colleen was upgraded to a typhoon. The system reached peak intensity at $051200 \mathrm{Z}-210 \mathrm{~nm}(390 \mathrm{~km})$ southeast of Iwo Jima -- and weakened only slightly as it headed for its recurvature point. Ships involved in PACEX 89 altered course to avoid any encounter with Colleen. After 061800Z, the tropical cyclone moved northeastward and weakened to $70 \mathrm{kt}(36 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. Colleen maintained its intensity but doubled its speed of movement to 21 kt ( $39 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) during the next 18 hours, and almost doubled it again to 40 kt


Figure 3-28-3. Typhoon Colleen leaving the northern Marianas. The cloud mass on the left is Typhoon Angela (26W) ( 042358 Z October DMSP visual imagery).
( $74 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) during the following 12 hours.
JTWC issued its final warning at 080600 Z (Figure 3-28-4) when Colleen was approximately $660 \mathrm{~nm}(1220 \mathrm{~km})$ east of northern Honshu moving at $54 \mathrm{kt}(100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$ to
the northeast and still packing sustained winds of $70 \mathrm{kt}(36 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. It became one of the most intense extratropical cyclones of the year. In satellite imagery at 081200 Z the extratropical remnants of Colleen were discernible near $46^{\circ}$ north latitude.


Figure 3-28-4. Typhoon Colleen undergoing extratropical transition ( 080344 Z October NOAA visual imagery).
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## TYPHOON DAN (29W)

Forming in October in the Caroline Islands near Truk, Dan followed a steady westnorthwestward track and crossed the central Philippine Islands. Coming just days after Typhoon Angela's (26W) destructive passage through northern Luzon, Dan had a devastating effect on southern Luzon. The cyclone reintensified in the South China Sea and made landfall on the coast of central Vietnam where it caused more destruction.

On 6 October a disturbance formed in the monsoon trough near Truk in the central Caroline Islands. JTWC evaluated the weak low-level circulation center and its divergent flow aloft. On the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory at 060600 Z , in light of strong vertical wind shear affecting the disturbance, JTWC classified it as having poor potential for development. After the disturbance persisted for another day, the potential was upgraded to fair. On 8 October, weaker vertical wind shear and the presence of a well-developed band of convection near the low-level circulation center led to the issuance of a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 0330Z.

At 081200 Z , JTWC issued the first warning on Tropical Depression 29W which was located $60 \mathrm{~nm}(110 \mathrm{~km})$ northeast of Yap in the western Caroline Islands. Eighteen hours
later, the depression was upgraded to Tropical Storm Dan. The moderate flow south of the mid-level subtropical ridge axis kept the system on a 15 - to $20-\mathrm{kt}$ ( $28-$ to $37-\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) west-northwestward course toward the central Philippine Islands. Deep convection continued to improve with upper-level outflow efficient in all but the northwest quadrant, where it was restricted by the outflow from Typhoon Angela (26W). After outflow in the northwest improved and the eye become visible, Dan was upgraded to a typhoon at 100600 Z .

At 101300Z, Typhoon Dan made landfall on the extreme southeastern coast of Luzon and later passed 20 nm ( 37 km ) south of Manila's Ninoy Aquino International Airport (WMO 98429). The weather station reported sustained winds of 45 kt ( $23 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) with gusts to $65 \mathrm{kt}(33 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. The strong winds rearranged some of the aircraft parked on the tarmac, blowing an Omani Boeing 707 and a Bangladesh presidential DC-10 into each other. Forty-eight $\mathrm{nm}(90 \mathrm{~km}$ ) north of Manila, Clark AB (WMO 98327) received winds of 30 kt ( 15 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) with gusts to 50 kt ( $26 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) from 110100 Z to 110400 Z . Cubi Point NAS (WMO 98426), $40 \mathrm{~nm}(75 \mathrm{~km})$ northwest of Manila, reported sustained winds of $40 \mathrm{kt}(21 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ with gusts to 75 kt ( $39 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). From 100000 Z to 120000 Z Cubi Point reported 5 inches ( 125
mm) of rain, while Clark AB measured 3.5 inches ( 90 mm ).

As Dan moved into the South China Sea, it lost its eye feature and weakened to tropical storm intensity at 110300Z (Figure 3-29-1). Tracking west-northwestward over the warm sea, the cyclone regained its convection, reformed its eye, and was again upgraded to a typhoon at 120000 Z . Dan reached a peak intensity of $70 \mathrm{kt}(36 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ six hours later. The typhoon weakened slightly as it approached and passed $60 \mathrm{~nm}(110 \mathrm{~km})$ to the south of Hainan Island. As Dan approached the coast of central Vietnam, increased mid- to upper-level shear elongated the cloud shield and weakened the system. Dan made landfall on the central coast of Vietnam at 131200Z, and at that time

JTWC issued a final warning. The circulation dissipated in the mountains and the disorganized convection continued westward into Laos.

Dan, despite being only a minimal typhoon, proved to be a very destructive one. In the Philippines the Department of Social Welfare reported at least 41 people killed; 16,185 houses damaged; and, 232,555 left homeless or without livelihoods. Electrical power was lost to $95 \%$ of Metropolitan Manila because of downed power lines; "brown-outs" continued for weeks afterward. In Vietnam, Dan ripped the roofs off buildings, downed communication lines, and flooded over 320,000 acres.


Figure 3-29-1. Moonlit photo of Typhoon Dan as it enters the South China Sea and the eye reforms ( $111348 Z$ October DMSP visual imagery).
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In the wake of Super Typhoon Angela (26W) and Typhoon Dan (29W), Super Typhoon Elsie became the third tropical cyclone to hit the Philippine Islands within 12 days. Elsie developed from a TUTT-induced wave in the easterlies and tracked westward throughout its life. In the Philippine Sea, Elsie rapidly intensified and struck central Luzon with an intensity of $140 \mathrm{kt}(72 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. In news reports it was cited as the most intense cyclone to strike the Philippine Islands this year. Elsie weakened dramatically as it moved across the Philippines, and did not reintensity as it traversed the South China Sea. The cyclone dissipated after making landfall in central Vietnam.

In the middle of October the Tropical Upper Tropospheric Trough (TUTT) was well established in a east-west orientation across the western North Pacific. As Typhoon Dan (29W) made landfall in central Vietnam, a tropical disturbance developed approximately 670 nm $(1240 \mathrm{~km})$ east-northeast of Manila and started tracking west-northwestward. The system, first

mentioned on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory at 130600Z, was located between two small TUTT lows -- one located to the southwest and one located to the northeast of the disturbance. These TUTT lows enhanced the disturbance's upper-level outflow, and at 132330Z a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert was issued. As the disturbance intensified, the first warning was issued on Tropical Depression 30 W at 140000 Z , followed by an upgrade to Tropical Storm Elsie at 141200 Z. At that time, Elsie stalled as it moved into an area of weak steering flow between two subtropical highs.

Late on 15 October, Elsie began a "stair step" northwestward, as a mid-latitude short wave passed to the north. This short wave enhanced the outflow, and Elsie rapidly intensified from $60 \mathrm{kt}(31 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ to $110 \mathrm{kt}(57$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) in 24 hours. At 160600 Z , Elsie was upgraded to a typhoon and became a super typhoon at 180600 Z. Super Typhoon Elsie (Figure 3-30-1) reached its maximum intensity of 140 knots ( $72 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) at 181800 Z and then


Figure 3-30-1. A matched pair of enhanced infrared (left) and visual (right) data show Elsie's classic cloud-free eye and surrounding central dense overcast ( 190000 Z October NOAA visual and infrared imagery).
made landfall in central Luzon at 190300 Z .
As it crossed Luzon, Elsie weakened rapidly due to frictional effects and the loss of oceanic sensible and latent heat sources . The system was downgraded to a typhoon at 190600Z, and then to a tropical storm at 191200Z. The tropical cyclone tracked westward along the south side of a northeast monsoonal surge. Vertical wind shear associated with the surge prevented Elsie from reintensifying in the South China Sea (Figure 3-

30-2). The final warning was issued at 220600 Z as Tropical Storm Elsie made landfall in central Vietnam. The remnants remained identifiable until they reached the mountainous terrain of Laos.

In the Philippines Super Typhoon Elsie left at least 17 dead, 50,000 homeless, and damage in the millions of dollars. John Hay Air Station and Wallace Air Station sustained a total of $\$ 30,000$ damage, including damaged roofs, uprooted trees and destroyed sheds.


Figure 3-30-2. Elsie spins westward across the South China Sea and never regains typhoon intensity ( 192233 Z October DMSP visual imagery).

Intentionally left blank.


## TYPHOON FORREST (31W)

The last of six tropical cyclones in October and the 17th typhoon of the year, Forrest was slow and erratic in its development. In fact, JTWC issued and reissued three Tropical Cyclone Formation Alerts before finally disseminating the first warning on Tropical Depression 31W. Throughout its early life, Forrest was a sloppy, broad system with large diurnal variations in its convection. After passing Guam, Forrest finally intensified and ultimately became a $95-\mathrm{kt}(49-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec})$ typhoon. Soon thereafter, it recurved and accelerated rapidly to the northeast, becoming one of the year's strongest extra-tropical cyclones in the Pacific. Forrest's track was striking in its similarity to the track of Typhoon Colleen (28W).

As Super Typhoon Elsie (30W) approached the northern Philippines on 17 October, the near-equatorial trough reestab-
lished itself through the Marshall and eastern Caroline Islands and generated a tropical disturbance. JTWC initially discussed the disturbance located about 100 nm ( 185 km ) south of Pohnpei on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory on 18 October. During the next two days, the disturbance moved toward the west-southwest. Then on the morning of 20 October, it took a turn to the northwest approximately 180 nm ( 335 km ) southeast of Truk. At 200200Z, JTWC issued the first of three Tropical Cyclone Formation Alerts, when the apparent cloud rotation on animated cloud imagery changed from anticyclonic to cyclonic, indicating the development of organized deep convection. From 20 to 22 October, the disturbance (Figure 3-31-1) underwent extremely large diurnal fluctuations in convection creating a broad circulation center and slowing intensification. The disturbance passed about 45 nm ( 85 km ) west of Truk in the evening of 21


Figure 3-31-1. Forrest prior to the first warning shows a large, poorly defined circulation center (212315Z October DMSP visual imagery).


Figure 3-31-2. (a) 230000 Z October 200 mb composite streamline analysis showing unrestricted outflow channels to the north and south. (b) 231200 Z October 200 mb composite analysis showing the large anticyclone southeast of Forrest's main upper-level circulation center.


October. From 212100 Z to 230900 Z , Truk experienced sustained 20 to 25 kt ( 10 to 13 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) surface winds from the monsoon surge associated with the disturbance. At 222000Z, the first warning was issued on Tropical Depression 31W as it reached $30 \mathrm{kt}(15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ and developed efficient outflow channels to the north and south. Twelve hours later, the depression was upgraded to a tropical storm. Forrest moved toward the northwest and
intensified at a rate of $5 \mathrm{kt}(3 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ every 6 hours. Forecasters at JTWC expected Forrest to reach typhoon intensity as it approached Guam and to rapidly intensify 24 hours later. However, on 23 October the southern outflow channel was completely severed as a large upper-level anticyclone developed to the south of the cyclone (Figure 3-31-2) as a result of the vigorous convection in the rainband to the southeast (Figure 3-31-3). This, coupled with


Figure 3-31-3. As Forrest nears Guam, a wide ribbon of deep convection to the southeast of the center contrasts with small area of central convection (232207Z October NOAA visual imagery).
the normal tendency for suppressed daytime convection, resulted in a convectively inactive, broad circulation center. Without the organized convection, winds remained relatively strong aloft, but weak at the surface, especially over land. At 240800 Z , Forrest passed within 75 nm ( 140 km ) of the International Airfield on Guam. The weather station (WMO 91212) recorded gusts to $34 \mathrm{kt}(18 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) and a minimum sea level pressure of 998 mb . Strong vertical wind
shear the following day did ground aircraft on Guam and Saipan. During the day, convection remained disorganized, but about 8 hours after passing Guam, convection rapidly increased and Forrest, which was close to Saipan, intensified and formed a banding type eye. Even though the typhoon was moving away from Saipan, it buffeted the island with moderately strong winds, downing tree limbs and power lines. The airport at Saipan (WMO 91232) recorded a


Figure 3-31-4. Enhanced infrared image of Typhoon Forrest at peak intensity (271632Z October NOAA infrared imagery).
minimum pressure of 991 mb at 250400 Z , several hours after Forrest had passed. Capitol Hill at an elevation of 1000 ft ( 305 m ) above sea level unofficially recorded wind gusts to 50 kt ( $26 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). Reports stated that Forrest left most of the island without power, stopped air travel, closed schools, and flooded low-lying areas.

The typhoon continued its northwestward track at an average speed of 10 kt ( 19 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). Twelve hours prior to recurvature, Forrest attained its peak intensity of 95 kt ( 49 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) as it crossed the axis of the midtropospheric sub-tropical ridge (Figure 3-31-4). Following recurvature at 271200 Z , the cyclone began to accelerate to the northeast. On the evening of 26 October, a typhoon acceleration prediction technique (Weir, 1982) used to help determine the timing of recurvature and acceleration indicated that Forrest was about to recurve, and that it would rapidly accelerate. In response, JTWC altered its forecast considerably to reflect the anticipated changes. This caused the USS Carl Vinson battle group to alter its course from one passing across the storm's expected track to one that kept it
northwest of that track off the coast of Japan. While recurvature and acceleration were delayed 12 to 18 hours making and the speed of JTWC's forecast too fast, the direction forecast was correct. Remaining over relatively warm water and maintaining an efficient outflow channel into the mid- latitude westerlies, Forrest did not rapidly weaken. At 281200 Z , the typhoon had accelerated to nearly 30 kt ( 56 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ), and still packed $75-\mathrm{kt}(39-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec})$ winds, partly as a result of its rapid motion along track. At this time, Forrest passed within 175 nm ( 325 km ) to the northwest of Chichijima (WMO 47971) where 850 mb winds were recorded at 230 degrees at 65 kt ( 33 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). Interacting with the mid-latitude westerlies, Forrest's convective heat engine finally gave way to baroclinic energy-producing processes and the storm became extratropical while moving northeastward at nearly 50 kt (93 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). The final warning on Typhoon Forrest was issued at 290600Z. Like Colleen, the resulting extratropical system became one of the strongest winter storms in the Pacific during 1989, packing storm force winds in excess of 60 $\mathrm{kt}(31 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$.


The first tropical cyclone of November turned out to be the worst tropical cyclone to affect the Malay Peninsula in 35 years. Gay developed in the Gulf of Thailand, crossed the Malay Peninsula into the Bay of Bengal and slammed into India with peak sustained winds of $140 \mathrm{kt}(70 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. Unique because of its small size, intensity, and point of origin, Gay challenged forecasters by crossing two different tropical cyclone basins and almost entering a third.

From a climatological point of view, an occasional tropical cyclone may move into the Gulf of Thailand from the South China Sea, but it is rare for genesis and intensification to occur in the Gulf - a relatively small body of water surrounded by land on three sides. However, on the first of November, satellite imagery detected the presence of a concentrated area of convection with a well-organized upper-level anticyclone. At the same time, sparse ship reports in the Gulf showed that sea-level pressures were relatively high - near 1008 mb . The continued increase in the amount and organization of convection prompted JTWC to mention it on the 010600Z Significant Tropical Weather Advisory, noting that a low-level circulation was evident in the monsoon trough. Maximum sustained surface winds were estimated to be 10 to 15 kt ( 5 to $8 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). During the next 15 hours, the disturbance continued to consolidate and estimated winds increased to $25 \mathrm{kt}(13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. At 012100Z, JTWC issued a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert.

Aided by its small size, dual outflow channels to the north and south, and the warm Gulf waters, the tropical cyclone spun up rapidly, and at 020000 Z JTWC issued a 36 -hour Tropical Depression Warning on Tropical Depression 32W. It became apparent that the cyclone would continue intensification, and six hours later, JTWC issued the first 72-hour Tropical Cyclone Warning on the system, upgrading it to tropical storm intensity. As Gay intensified, it presented a paradox to forecasters. While the satellite intensity estimates correctly diagnosed intensification, the synoptic data in Malaysia and Thailand indicated weakening winds and higher pressures. The synoptic data were correctly interpreted as indicators of increased subsidence produced by the intensifying midget system. Subsequent JTWC warnings thus reflected that Gay would reach typhoon intensity.

At 021800 Z , Gay began to intensify more rapidly than anticipated reaching typhoon intensity at 030000 Z . The eye apparently passed directly over the Seacrest, a commercial oil drilling ship moored in the Gulf. Confused seas with estimated heights of 35 to 45 feet ( 11 to 14 m ) caused the ship to capsize shortly after eye passage. Gay's intensification continued, reaching $100 \mathrm{kt}(51 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s})$ at 040600 Z just before it crashed into Champhun, Thailand which is located 210 nm ( 390 km ) south-southwest of Bangkok. The radar at Champhun (WMO 48517) had tracked Gay for 18 hours, before its reports abruptly ceased shortly before the
typhoon (Figure 3-32-1) came inshore. At least four hundred and fifty-eight people were died and over 600 fishermen were reported missing at sea. In addition, two hundred fishing vessels were lost or missing.

As Gay moved slowly to the northwest in the Gulf, JTWC forecasters anticipated that a ridge would build to the north, and correctly forecast the cyclone to make a left turn and move across the Malay Peninsula. Gay weakened briefly as it crossed the Peninsula, entering the Bay of Bengal with maximum winds of $65 \mathrm{kt}(33 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s})$ at 041200 Z . Situated south of the mid-level ridge, Gay continued to track west-northwestward across the Bay of Bengal at an average speed of $10 \mathrm{kt}(19 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$.

Gay intensified slowly in an area of weak vertical wind shear and warm sea surface temperatures, reaching an intensity of 95 kt (49 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) by 051200 Z . Restrictions to the upperlevel outflow inhibited further development for the next 36 hours.

At 070000Z, Gay attained an intensity of 100 kt ( $51 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ), and took a more westward course as the mid-level ridge strengthened to the north. Without any significant restrictions to its outflow, the cyclone intensified for the next 42 hours until it reached the coast of India. Gay (Figure 3-32-2) reached super typhoon intensity at 080600 Z , with winds of $130 \mathrm{kt}(67 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. Gay (Figure 3-32-3) made landfall in a sparsely populated area of India approximately 120 nm


Figure 3-32-1. Typhoon Gay as it makes landfall on the Malay Peninsula. More than 1000 people were reported dead or missing in Gay's aftermath ( 040042 Z November NOAA visual imagery).
( 220 km ) north of Madras at 081800 Z , with maximum sustained winds estimated at 140 kt ( $72 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). While there was concern that the Dvorak intensity estimation technique might have overestimated Gay's intensity, photos of destruction showed that Gay was a very intense, but very small, cyclone. In-country analyses of Indian synoptic data indicated that the $30-\mathrm{kt}(15-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec})$ wind radii did not extend much beyond $50 \mathrm{~nm}(95 \mathrm{~km}$ ) - (personal communication with Dr. G. S. Mandal, Indian Meteorological Service).

Twelve hours after making landfall, Gay had weakened to $45 \mathrm{kt}(23 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s})$. Because of the possibility of its reemergence into the

Arabian Sea, JTWC continued to issue warnings on the system as it moved across India at 13 kt ( $24 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). After 090600 Z , Gay took a more northwestward overland track. At 100600 Z , JTWC issued its final warning as the system dissipated in the Western Ghats approximately 75 nm ( 140 km ) southeast of Bombay. Gay weakened much faster than anticipated as it moved across India. This was a result of its small size and small over-water fetch. Once inland the small fetch, which supplied Gay's latent heat source, was rapidly cut off. Because Gay was so small and went inshore in a rural area, it caused only 39 deaths. However, over 20,000 homes were destroyed or damaged.


Figure 3-32-2. Gay approaches super typhoon intensity. The small eye appears in a small, compact central dense overcast ( $080340 Z$ November DMSP visual imagery).


Figure 3-32-3. Enhanced infrared (above) and low-light visual (below) satellite picture pair of Gay at the coast of India. The city lights, the moonlit coast line and Gay's cloudiness show on the visual image. The enhanced infrared reveals the small eye and cold surrounding overcast ( 081612 Z November DMSP visual and infrared imagery).
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## TYPHOON HUNT (33W)

Typhoon Hunt was the fourth typhoon, following Angela (26W), Dan (29W) and Elsie (30W), to strike the Philippine Islands within six weeks. Generally a westward moving system, it was slow to develop, but finally intensified rapidly in the western Philippine Sea. As it intensified and approached the Philippines, it underwent a northwestward "stair step" before resuming a westward course into central Luzon. Unlike Angela (26W), Dan (29W) and Elsie (30W) which reintensified after crossing Luzon, Hunt weakened dramatically and dissipated in the South China Sea.

Except for Typhoon Gay (32W), early November was relatively inactive in the westem North Pacific. The cloud cluster that became Typhoon Hunt was first identified on the 10 November Significant Tropical Weather Advisory. This system was a weak tropical disturbance embedded in the monsoon trough north of the island of Truk in the central Caroline Islands. The cloud cluster remained poorly defined and drifted slowly westward for two days. After synoptic data indicated falling surface pressures, JTWC issued a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 121000Z. The disturbance was located 270 nm ( 500 km ) southeast of Guam. As the passage of a midlatitude trough to the northeast of Guam weakened the mid-level subtropical ridge. On 13 November, the disturbance executed an abrupt track change to the north towards Guam. The Alert was reissued at 131000 Z , approximately 220 nm ( 405 km ) southsoutheast of Guam.

The system moved northward for a day, then turned sharply westward, passing 90 nm ( 165 km ) south of Guam. Increasing vertical shear weakened the convection significantly, and the Alert was canceled at 140400 Z . On 16 November, the organization of the disturbance improved, as southwesterly winds of 20 to 30 kt ( 10 to $15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) were reported by ships and land stations. JTWC issued its third Alert on
the system at 160730 Z .
Continued organization led to the first warning on Tropical Depression 33W at 161200 Z . In response to a mid-latitude trough passage to the north, the depression appeared to slow and then dip southward for six hours. As the trough moved out to the northeast, the 500 mb ridge remained very narrow but split into two cells, one to the northwest of the tropical cyclone and another to the northeast. A broad col area remained north of the tropical depression which then moved northwestward towards this weakness.

At 180000 Z , the depression was upgraded to Tropical Storm Hunt with maximum sustained winds of 35 kt ( $18 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). Hunt intensified rapidly while moving northwestward and was upgraded to a typhoon at 181800 Z . JTWC continued to forecast movement over Luzon and predict the system would enter the South China Sea just south of Manila Bay. This was based on NOGAPS prognostic fields which indicated that the narrow 500 mb ridge would reestablish and maintain itself to the north of the system, thus forcing a westward track. At the same time, a strong 850 mb ridge of continental polar air associated with the winter monsoon extended eastward from southern China. This was also expected to block Hunt's northward progression. However, the NOGAPS forecast series proved to be too fast at reestablishing the ridge and Hunt turned northward toward the weakness in the ridge.

At this time, the typhoon also slowed to $4 \mathrm{kt}(7 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$. Now JTWC and U.S. forces from the Philippines to Okinawa faced the dilemma of having a destructive system either affect forces in the Philippines should Hunt make only a "stair step," or in Okinawa, should it recurve. Because weak mid-latitude troughs, embedded in the predominantly zonal flow, continued to pass north of the tropical cyclone, and the prognostic series continued to build the
narrow 500 mb ridge as a barrier to Hunt's continued northward movement, JTWC persisted with its forecast of westward movement.

At 091500 Z Typhoon Hunt, with its 90 -$\mathrm{kt}(46-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) maximum sustained winds, turned sharply to the west toward central Luzon as the 500 mb ridge to the system's northeast built westward and strengthened. Hunt remarkably maintained its $90-\mathrm{kt}(46-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec})$ intensity for 66 continuous hours before moving ashore in central Luzon at 212000Z (Figure 3-33-1). Army personnel involved in the joint-combined U.S.-Philippine exercise, BALIKATAN 89 , were deployed to Fort Magsaysay near Clark AB. The Weather Support Force for the exercise reported peak winds of 52 kt ( 27 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) at 212200 Z when Hunt was 40 nm ( 75
km ) northeast of its location. As the typhoon crossed Luzon, it killed at least seven Filipino people. Damage to military installations was slight.

Hunt was downgraded to a tropical storm at 220600 Z as it entered the Lingayen Gulf. The northeast monsoon was of moderate strength in the South China Sea, and Hunt, despite moving over warm water, continued to weaken due to strong vertical wind shear. Deep convection had completely subsided by 230000 Z when Hunt was downgraded to a tropical depression and the final warning was issued. The remains of the low-level circulation, although not visible on satellite imagery, were last discernible on synoptic charts at 240000 Z drifting southward in the monsoonal flow.


Figure 3-33-1. Typhoon Hunt approximately nine hours before landfall on central Luzon. Maximum sustained winds are estimated at $90 \mathrm{kt}(46 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})(211130 \mathrm{Z}$ November DMSP visual imagery).


## SUPER TYPHOON IRMA (34W)

Irma was the third and final tropical cyclone to form in November. It's development and track were dictated by complex mid-latitude and monsoonal regimes. Initially, Irma was slow to develop, however, rapid intensification followed once it was in the Philippine Sea. Irma lasted 17 days and required a total of 39 warnings -- only Super Typhoon Angela (26W) exceeded this longevity with a total of 46 warnings.

In the middle of November, disturbed weather associated with a TUTT low developed $580 \mathrm{~nm}(1075 \mathrm{~km})$ northeast of Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. The disturbance was first mentioned on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory at 182300 Z . Because of significant vertical wind shear affecting the system, JTWC opted for a 36-hour Tropical

Depression Warning at 210600 Z instead of a 72 -hour Tropical Cyclone Warning. Increasing upper-level flow around the TUTT low led to increasing shear above the depression, and a final Tropical Depression Warning followed at 220600Z. However, JTWC continued to mention the poorly defined remnants each day on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory.

From 22 to 27 November, the system moved a record-breaking five days to the southwest, traveling from $20^{\circ}$ to $10^{\circ}$ north latitude. During this period from 22 to 24 November, the system tracked southwestward along the edge of a shear zone and continued to exhibit partially tropical characteristics. Eventually the southwestward track carried the system into an area of less vertical wind shear, where a flare up in convective activity led to a


Figure 3-34-1. An extensive field of closed cell stratocumulus appear to the north through west of Super Typhoon Irma (300431Z November NOAA visual imagery).

Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 240600Z. This development continued and at 250000 Z a Tropical Depression Warning was issued. As the polar air mass along the shear line became well-modified in the tropics and anticyclonic outflow became more symmetric aloft, conditions improved for development. At 261200 Z , JTWC issued the first Tropical Cyclone Warning on Tropical Depression 34W.

As the track became more westerly at 261800Z, Tropical Depression 34W was upgraded to Tropical Storm Irma. As a midlatitude short wave trough approached from the northwest, enhancing Irma's outflow, rapid intensification occurred and JTWC upgraded
the tropical cyclone to a typhoon at 280600 Z . As a second short wave approached, Irma (Figure 3-34-1) attained super typhoon intensity at 300000 Z . This increase in intensity was short lived, however. With the passage to the east of the shortwave also came stronger westerly winds aloft and an accompanying surge in the low-level northeast monsoon. These factors, plus the entrainment of cold air, weakened Irma (Figure 3-34-2) below super typhoon intensity at 010000 Z .

Since 27 November the track to the west-northwest brought Irma closer to the polar westerlies aloft. Irma's forward motion slowed gradually as the cyclone approached the western


Figure 3-34-2. Irma's central dense overcast is elongated and asymmetrical. The eye is filling with clouds and the super typhoon is weakening ( $302151 Z$ November DMSP visual imagery).
periphery of the subtropical ridge. The entire fall of 1989 had be characterized by zonal westerly mid-tropospheric flow and a very narrow subtropical ridge in the extreme western Pacific. Because of the $250 \mathrm{~nm}(465 \mathrm{~km})$ wide ridge, even straight moving cyclones were very close to becoming recurvature ones. JTWC expected the flow to remain zonal, and for Irma to resume westward movement into the Philippine Islands. However, on 2 December, another short wave moved eastward from the
coast of Asia. This trough deepening further equatorward than the previous short waves and Irma recurved 630 nm ( 1165 km ) east of Manila. The typhoon accelerated in response to the stronger westerly flow aloft and weakened in the strong shearing environment. The final warning was issued at 041200 Z . The remnants of Irma were no longer visible on the satellite imagery on 5 December. JTWC received no reports of damage caused by Irma.


## TROPICAL DEPRESSION 35W

Detected on the first day of December, Tropical Depression 35W lasted more than a week as a discrete system, although it was in warning status only 48 hours.

As Super Typhoon Irma (34W) was weakening in the Philippine Sea, a weak surface circulation and an associated area of convection were detected in the western Marshall Islands. The tropical disturbance was mentioned on the 010600Z Significant Tropical Weather Advisory as a poor suspect area. Over the next five days this tropical disturbance moved generally westnorthwestward and continued to organize very slowly. The presence of strong vertical wind shear arrested development and eventually
weakened the system. After the disturbance passed to the south of Guam, the convection flared and at 050500Z the first Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert was issued. The Alert was reissued at 060500 Z . Then, based on a satellite intensity estimate of $30-\mathrm{kt}(15-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec})$ surface winds (Figure 3-35-1), a Tropical Cyclone Warning was issued at 070000 Z . At 080000 Z , the approach of a mid-level short wave trough from the northwest resulted in the depression abruptly changing track and recurving northeastward. Increased vertical wind shear from the west-southwest was responsible for further weakening the system. The final warning was issued at 090000 Z as the cyclone dissipated over water.


Figure 3-35-1. Tropical Depression 35W with $30-\mathrm{kt}(15-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) maximum sustained surface winds ( 070457 Z December NOAA visual imagery).


## TYPHOON JACK (36W)

The second tropical cyclone to form in December, Jack was the twenty-first typhoon and final tropical cyclone of the year. Typhoon Jack was noteworthy for the unusually long period it remained quasi-stationary and the extremely rapid dissipation that followed.

A broad area of poorly organized convection located approximately 240 nm (445 km ) southeast of Truk was first noted on the 210600Z Significant Tropical Weather Advisory. The disturbed area of weather continued to organize slowly and a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert was issued at 221900Z. At that time, the disturbance was 150 $\mathrm{nm}(275 \mathrm{~km})$ northeast of Truk, moving westnorthwestward at $8 \mathrm{kt}(15 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$ with surface winds of 20 to 30 kt ( 10 to $15 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). Over the next 8 hours, the upper-level anticyclonic circulation and the spiral bands of the disturbance increased significantly in organization, however, the low-level circulation
remained weak. The combination of the rather tentative intensification of the disturbance and its movement in the general direction of Guam prompted the issuance of a Tropical Depression Warning at 230000 Z . At that time Tropical Depression 36W was approximately 400 nm ( 740 km ) southeast of Guam and forecast to move northwestward at $11 \mathrm{kt}(20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr})$.

The low-level organization of Tropical Depression 36W appeared to improve markedly on satellite imagery resulting in the issuance of a Tropical Cyclone Warning at 230600Z. The motion forecast for the next four days called for continued northwestward movement toward a weakness in the subtropical ridge near Guam, followed by recurvature due to an approaching short-wave trough. The system did reach a weak area at the axis of the subtropical ridge in about two days. However, the broad nature of the ridge blocked Jack's movement in all directions. This caused the cyclone to stall in a


Figure 3-36-1. Jack near super typhoon intensity ( 252148 Z December NOAA visual imagery).
large area of weak mid-level steering at a latitude too far south to permit the passing short-wave trough to initiate recur-vature. Jack had closed to within $185 \mathrm{~nm}(345 \mathrm{~km})$ of Guam before stalling. The proximity to Guam allowed surveillance to be conducted by the weather radar at Andersen AFB (WMO 91218). In what is almost certainly a record for almost no motion, radar surveillance doc-umented that Jack moved only about 60 nm ( 110 km ) from 250710 Z to 270335 Z , and moved less than 20 $\mathrm{nm}(35 \mathrm{~km})$ from 251210 Z to 261210 Z . Jack's eye, with a diameter of 20 to $30 \mathrm{~nm}(37 \mathrm{~km}$ to 55 km ), made an ideal target for remote sensing. The typhoon was essentially stationary in a nonshearing environment for nearly 48 hours.

Not surprisingly, the unusual motion of Typhoon Jack was accompanied by an equally unusual intensification and dissipation pattern. From a maximum wind speed of 30 kt ( 15
$\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) at 222330 , Jack rapidly deepened to a maximum wind speed of $115 \mathrm{kt}(57 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ at 250530 Z , which corresponds to nearly two Tnumbers per day using the Dvorak intensity estimation technique. It reached a peak intensity of 125 kt ( $67 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$; Dvorak T6.5) during the period 251800 Z to 261200 Z (Figure 3-36-1). Such an intensification pattern was unusual since Jack appeared to have only one well-defined outflow channel to the northeast. Normally, rapid deepening and the attainment of super-typhoon intensity are associated with the development of two efficient outflow channels.

As Jack began to show signs of prolonged quasi-stationary behavior, JTWC anticipated on the 260000 Z warning that the upwelling of cold water at the cyclone's center, normally associated with the wind stress on the ocean's surface, might initiate a rapid weakening of the system due to its slow movement. Although


Figure 3-36-2. Jack as an intense typhoon only 24 hours before dissipation (262126Z December NOAA visual imagery).
such weakening did indeed occur, the extreme nature of the ensuing dissipation was surprising. At 270000 Z , JTWC assessed the intensity of Jack (Figure 3-36-2) to be about 105 kt ( 54 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). Figure 3-36-3 shows the remnants of Jack 24 hours later. All that remained was a 30-$\mathrm{kt}(15-\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) exposed low-level circulation located $120 \mathrm{~nm}(220 \mathrm{~km})$ northeast of Guam. This remarkable weakening rate exceeded 15 kt ( $8 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) per 6 hour forecast period. The
remnants of the associated convective cloud mass were about 300 nm ( 555 km ) to the south of the low-level circulation center. The vorticity associated with the cloud mass actually developed a secondary low-level circulation center that moved south of Guam on 28 December. Of interest, NOAA imagery on 29 December detected a cold water cyclonic eddy in the ocean where Jack had been quasistationary for nearly two days.


Figure 3-36-3. The remnants of Jack: an exposed low-level circulation center northenst of Guam, and the last vestige of the convection cloud mass to the south (272357Z December DMSP visual imagery).

### 3.3 NORTH INDIAN OCEAN TROPICAL CYCLONES

Spring and fall in the North Indian Ocean are periods of transition between major climatic controls and the most favorable seasons for tropical cyclone activity (Tables 3-5 and 36). Two significant tropical cyclones developed in the North Indian Ocean in the spring, however, no tropical cyclones developed in the fall transition season. The most interesting
event was the passage of Tropical Cyclone 32W (Gay) into the Bay of Bengal from the Gulf of Thailand. It maintained typhoon intensity while crossing the Malay Peninsula and reached super typhoon intensity which is rare in the Bay of Bengal.

In summary, 1989 tropical cyclone activity was below the 1988 and 15-year average of five (Table 3-6).

| TABLE 3-5. | 1989 SIEATPICNNT TRORICAL CYCLONBS MORIM ITDIAN OCERAN |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PERIOD OF WARNING |  | NUMBER OF | MAXIM | MUM | ESTIMATEDMSLP_(MB) |
| TROPICAL CYCLONE |  |  | WARNINGS | SURFA | CE |  |
|  |  |  | ISSUED | WINDS-KT | (M/SEC) |  |
| TC 01B | 23 MAY - | 26 MAY | 14 |  | (28) | 984 |
| TC 02A | 12 JUN - | 13 JUN | 5 |  | (18) | 996* |
| TC 32W | 04 NOV - | 10 NOV | 25 | 140 | (72) | 898 |
|  |  | TOTAL: | 44 |  |  |  |
| * BASED | ON SYNOPTIC | DATA |  |  |  |  |





## TROPICAL CYCLONE 01B

Tropical Cyclone 01B was the first of two cyclones to affect the Bay of Bengal and the only one to form in the Bay this year.

In mid-May, the monsoon trough was well-established throughout the Bay of Bengal between $8^{\circ}$ to $10^{\circ}$ north latitude with the heaviest convection persisting over the southwestern portion of the Bay. On 20 May, there was a broad area of poorly organized convection formed in the eastern half of the Bay and sparse synoptic data suggested a circulation center. But it wasn't until late on 22 May that the organization improved and convection increased dramatically. This development prompted JTWC to issue a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 230330 Z and the first
warning followed at 231500 Z . The basic track to the north-northwest was interrupted on 24 and 25 May when weak mid-level steering resulted in an erratic and very slow movement.

Even though the system's development was slowed by northeast winds aloft, Tropical Cyclone 01B (Figure 3-01B-1) did attain a intensity of $55 \mathrm{kt}(28 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) at 261200 Z , just before making landfall. After landfall the cyclone passed $60 \mathrm{~nm}(110 \mathrm{~km})$ west of Calcutta, which recorded $25 \mathrm{kt}(13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) sustained surface winds and a minimum sealevel pressure of 988 mb . Then, the dissipating circulation tracked northward into the heat low. No reports of damage were received.


Figure 3-01B-1. Digitized mosaic from the satellite global data base at AFGWC shows Tropical Cyclone 01B moving towards landfall and Calcutta (240300Z-240400Z May DMSP visual data).


## TROPICAL CYCLONE 02A

The only significant tropical cyclone to develop in the Arabian Sea this year, Tropical Cyclone 02A, generated from a pre-existing low-level circulation beneath an area of weak upper-level divergence. The disturbance was first mentioned at 071800 Z June on the Significant Tropical Weather Advisory. Subsequent satellite imagery indicated the convection was organizing as it tracked toward the northwestern coast of India. The first satellite fix was made at 090148 Z , and it estimated the intensity to be $25 \mathrm{kt}(13 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$. This prompted JTWC to issue a Tropical Cyclone Formation Alert at 090600Z. Although a day later the circulation was technically overland, the presence of enhanced convection overwater resulted in reissuance of the Alert at 100600 Z . This Alert was later canceled as satellite and synoptic data showed that the circulation had remained overland for more than 24 hours.

At 111629Z, satellite imagery (Figure 3$02 \mathrm{~A}-1$ ) revealed that the deep convection had moved rapidly westward into the Arabian Sea as an upper-level anticyclone advanced from the Arabian peninsula into Afghanistan and increased the eastern flow aloft over the Arabian Sea. A third Alert followed at 111800 Z . Late arriving 110600 Z ship observations reported $35 \mathrm{kt}(18 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec})$ and a 998 mb pressure near the circulation center. Rapidly increasing convection and low-level organization led to an Abbreviated Warning at 120600 Z . Mid-level flow around the subtropical ridge over Iran and Afghanistan carried the cyclone westward, but the strong northeasterly upper-level flow from the anticyclone aloft restricted its outflow and suppressed further development. The last warning was issued at 130600Z when satellite imagery indicated that the convection had separated more than 60 nm $(110 \mathrm{~km})$ to the west of the low-level circulation.


Figure 3-02A-1. A digitized mosaic of satellite data shows Tropical Cyclone 02A over the Arabian Sea ( 111600 Z to 111800 Z June DMSP infrared imagery).
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## 4. SUMMARY OF SOUTH PACIFIC AND SOUTH INDIAN OCEAN TROPICAL CYCLONES

### 4.1 GENERAL

On 1 October 1980 JTWC's area of responsibility (AOR) was expanded to include the Southern Hemisphere from $180^{\circ}$ longitude westward to the coast of Africa. Details on Southern Hemisphere tropical cyclones and JTWC warnings from July 1980 through June 1982 are contained in Diercks et al. (1982) and from July 1982 through June 1984, in Wirfel and Sandgathe (1986). Information on Southern Hemisphere tropical cyclones after June 1984 can be found in the applicable Annual Tropical Cyclone Report.

The Naval Western Oceanography Center (NWOC) Pearl Harbor, HI issues warnings on tropical cyclones in the South Pacific east of $180^{\circ}$ longitude. Tropical cyclones in NWOC's AOR are included in this and previous Annual Tropical Cyclone Reports.

In accordance with USCINCPACINST 3140.1 (series), Southern Hemisphere tropical cyclones are numbered sequentially from 1 July through 30 June. This convention is established to encompass the Southern Hemisphere tropical cyclone season, which normally occurs from January through April. There are two ocean basins for warning purposes - the South Indian (west of $135^{\circ}$ east longitude) and the South Pacific (east of $135^{\circ}$ east longitude) - which are identified by appending the suffixes " S " and " P " respectively to the tropical cyclone number.

Caveat: Intensity estimates for Southern Hemisphere tropical cyclones are derived from the evaluation of satellite imagery (Dvorak, 1984) and in rare instances by surface observations. Estimates for minimum sea-level pressure are derived by applying the Atkinson and Holliday (1977) relationship between maximum sustained one-minute average surface wind and minimum sea-level pressure (Table 4-1) to the intensity estimates derived from satellite imagery. Note: This relationship was based on data from the western North

Pacific. A modified relationship has been adopted for the Atlantic basin.

### 4.2 SOUTH PACIFIC AND INDIAN OCEAN TROPICAL CYCLONES

After a below average number of tropical cyclones in 1988, 1989 (Table 4-2) activity rose to the near climatological mean of 27 storms (Table 4-3). A comparison of tropical cyclone activity for these two years shows that both started in the beginning of November and ended by mid-May. Although December 1989 proved to be below average with only one tropical cyclone in a month which normally has three, the multiple outbreaks (Figure 4-1) in late February and in the late March/early April timeframe resulted in the total being near normal. During the year, two tropical cyclones achieved super typhoon intensity-Harry (10P) and Orson (26S). Harry (10P) also shared the

distinction of requiring warnings for almost two weeks with Barisaona (02S) and Hanitra (11S). A comparison of activity by basin appears in

Table 4-4. Plots of the tropical cyclone best tracks are provided in Figures 4-2 and 4-3.

| TABLE 4-2 | SOUTH PACIFIC AND SOUTH INDIAN OCEANS 1989 SIGNIFICANT TROPICAL CYCLONES (1 July 1988 - 30 June 1989) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PERIOD OF WARNING | NUMBER WARNINGS ISSUED | $\begin{array}{r} \text { MAX } \\ \text { SUR } \\ \text { WINDS-K } \end{array}$ | IMUM <br> FACE <br> T (M/SEC) | ESTIMATED <br> MSLP (MB) |
| 015 ADELININA | 01 NOV - 04 NOV | 9 |  | (39) | 968*** |
| 025 BARISAONA | 08 NOV - 20 NOV | 2.6 | 100 | (51) | 944*** |
| 035 ILONA | 13 DEC - 18 DEC | 10 |  | (44) | 958 |
| 04P DELILAH | 01 JAN - 03 JAN | 4 |  | (31) | 980 |
| 05P GINA | 07 JAN - 09 JAN | 6** |  | (23) | 991 |
| 06S - - - - | 10 JAN - 14 JAN | 9 |  | (39) | 968*** |
| 07 S EDME | 20 JAN - 25 JAN | 11 | 115 | (59) | 927 |
| 08 S FIRINGA | 26 JAN - 01 FEB | 14 |  | (46) | 954 |
| 09 S KIRRILY | 06 FEB - 10 FEB | 9 |  | (39) | 967 |
| 10P HARRY | 08 FEB - 19 FEB | 24 | 130 | (67) | 910 |
| 11 S HANITRA | 17 FEB - 28 FEB | 23 | 125 | (64) | 916 |
| 12 S GIRELA | 18 FEB - 22 FEB | 9 |  | (33) | 976 |
| 13P IVY | 23 FEB - 01 MAR | 13 | 100 | (51) | 944*** |
| 14P - - - | 24 FEB - 01 MAR | 10** |  | (46) | 954 |
| 15P JUDY | 24 FEB - 28 FEB | 9** |  | (46) | 954 |
| 16 S - - - | 24 FEB - 25 FEB | 3 |  | (23) | 991 |
| 17 S MARCIA | 03 MAR - 04 MAR | 3 |  | (18) | 987*** |
| 18S - - - | 09 MAR - 10 MAR | 4 |  | (18) | 997 |
| 19 S JINARO | 25 MAR - 30 MAR | 13 |  | (33) | 976 |
| 20 S NED | 26 MAR - 31 MAR | 19 | 100 | (51) | 943 |
| 21 S KRISSY | 30 MAR - 07 APR | 18 | 105 | (54) | 938 |
| 22P KERRY | $31 \mathrm{MAR} \mathrm{-} 02 \mathrm{APR}$ | 5 |  | (26) | 987 |
| 23P AIVU | 01 APR - 04 APR | 8 | 120 | (62) | 922 |
| 24S LEZISSY | 06 APR - 09 APR | 6 |  | (23) | 991 |
| 25P LILI | 07 APR - 11 APR | 10 | 110 | (57) | 933 |
| 26S ORSON | 18 APR - 23 APR | 12 | 140 | (72) | 898 |
| 27P MEENA | 03 MAY - 10 MAY | 16 |  | (26) | 987 |
| 28P ERNIE | 07 MAY - 09 MAY | 5 |  | (18) | 997 |
| 28P ERNIE* | 10 MAY - 12 MAY | 4 | 30 | (15) | 1000 |
| TOTAL 312 |  |  |  |  |  |
| * REGENERATED <br> ** ISSUED BY NWO <br> *** BASED ON SYNO | TIC DATA |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: NAMES OF SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE TROPICAL CYCLONES ARE GIVEN BY THE REGIONAL WARNING CENTERS (NADI, BRISBANE, DARWIN, PERTH, REUNION AND MAURITIUS) AND ARE APPENDED TO JTWC WARNINGS, WHEN AVAILABLE. |  |  |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Figure 4-1. Chronology of South Pacific and South Indian } \\
& \text { Ocean tropical cyclones for } 1989 .
\end{aligned}
$$



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAB | J0U | ADG | STP | OCT | NOY | DEC | TAN | EEB | MAR | APB | MAY | JUN | TOTAL |
| (1959-1978) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVERAGE* | - | - | - | 0.4 | 1.5 | 3.6 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 2.1 | 0.5 | - | 24.7 |
| 1981 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 24 |
| 1982 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 25 |
| 1983 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 1984 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 1985 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 1986 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 33 |
| 1987 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 28 |
| 1988 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 21 |
| 1989 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 28 |
| TOTAL CASES: | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 28 | 59 | 64 | 36 | 29 | 9 | 1 | 249 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { (1981-1989) } \\ \text { AVERAGE: } \end{gathered}$ | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 6.6 | 7.1 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 27.7 |
| * (GRAY, 1979) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## 5. SUMMARY OF FORECAST VERIFICATION

### 5.1 ANNUAL FORECAST VERIFICATION

### 5.1.1 WESTERN NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

 - Verification of warnings at initial, 24-, 48and 72-hour forecast positions was made against the final best track. The (scalar) forecast, along-track and cross-track errors (illustrated in Figure 5-1) were then calculated for each tropical cyclone and are presented in Tables $5-1 \mathrm{~A}, 5-1 \mathrm{~B}, 5-1 \mathrm{C}$ and $5-1 \mathrm{D}$, as appropriate. Table 5-2 includes mean alongtrack and cross-track forecast errors for 19781989. The frequency distributions of errors for warning positions, and 24-, 48-, and 72-hour forecasts are in Figures 5-2A through 5-2D, respectively. A comparison of the annual mean forecast errors for all tropical cyclones as compared to those tropical cyclones that reached typhoon intensity can be seen in Table $5-3$. The mean forecast errors for 1989 as compared to the twenty previous years are graphed in Figure 5-3.
### 5.1.2 NORTH INDIAN OCEAN - The

 positions given for warning times and those atthe 24-, 48-, and 72 -hour valid times were verified for tropical cyclones in the North Indian Ocean by the same methods used for the western North Pacific. Table 5-4 is the initial and forecast along-track and cross-track error summary for the North Indian Ocean. Forecast errors are plotted in Figure 5-4 (72-hour forecast errors were evaluated for the first time in 1979). There were no verifying 72 -hour forecasts in 1983 and 1985. Table 5-5 contains a summary of the annual mean forecast errors for each year.

### 5.1.3 SOUTH PACIFIC AND SOUTH

 INDIAN OCEANS - The positions given for warning times and those at the $24-, 48$-, and $72-$ hour valid times were verified for tropical cyclones in the Southern Hemisphere by the same methods used for the western North Pacific. Table 5-6A is the initial, forecast along-track and cross-track error summary for the Southern Hemisphere. Table 5-6B has the number of warnings verified at each forecast period. Forecast errors are plotted in Figure 55. Table $5-7$ contains a summary of the annual mean forecast errors.Figure 5-1. Definition of cross-track error (XTE), along-track error (ATE) and forecast track error (FTE). In this example, the XTE is positive (to the right of the best track) and the ATE is negative (behind or slower than the best track).


| TABLE 5-1A <br> INITIAL POSITIOQ ERRORS (NAD <br> HISTIARN MCRTH PACITIC OCTEAN <br> 1989 SIGEITICAMT TROPICAL CYCLO: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TROPICAL CYCLONE |  | ERROR (NM | NUMBER OF WARNINGS |
| (01w) | TS WINONA | 25 | 13 |
| (02W) | STY ANDY | 12 | 26 |
| (03W) | TY BRENDA | 31 | 20 |
| (04W) | TY CECIL | 19 | 9 |
| (05\%) | TY DOT | 16 | 25 |
| (06\%) | TS ETLIS | 33 | 6 |
| (07\%) | TS FAYE | 25 | 21 |
| (08W) | STY GORDON | 13 | 30 |
| (09W) | TS HOPE | 21 | 21 |
| (10W) | TS IRVING | 21 | 14 |
| (11w) | TY JUDY | 15 | 28 |
| (12W) | TD 12W | 14 | 3 |
| (13W-14W) | TS KEN-LOLA | 38 | 23 |
| (15\%) | TY MAC | 17 | 28 |
| (16\%) | TY OWEN | 21 | 28 |
| (17\%) | TY NANCY | 19 | 22 |
| (18W) | TS PEGGY | 24 | 9 |
| (19W) | TD 19W | 19 | 6 |
| (20W) | TS ROGER | 32 | 14 |
| \{21w | TD 21W | 23 | 7 |
| (22W) | TY SARAH | 28 | 33 |
| (23W) | TS TIP | 23 | 20 |
| (24W) | TS VERA | 25 | 16 |
| (25W) | TY WAYNE | 19 | 12 |
| (26W) | STY ANGELA | 8 | 46 |
| (27W) | TY BRIAN | 16 | 13 |
| (28W) | TY COLLEEN | 18 | 27 |
| (29W) | TY DAN | 16 | 21 |
| (30W) | STY ELSIE | 12 | 34 |
| (31w) | TY FORREST | 22 | 30 |
| (32W) | TY GAY | 6 | 9 |
| (33W) | TY HONT | 14 | 27 |
| (34W) | STY IRMA | 18 | 39 |
| (35W) | TD 35W | 73 | 9 |
| (36W) | TY JACK | 28 | 21 |
|  |  | meas: 20 | TOINL: 710 |



| TABLE 5-1C <br> 48-HOUR FORECAST ERRORS (NM) WISSTERN HORTH PACIFIC OCTRAN 1989 SIGNIFICANI TROPICAL CYCLONL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TRORICAL CYCLONE |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FORECAST } \\ & \text { ERROR_(NMI) } \end{aligned}$ | ALONG-TRACK ERROR |  | CROSS-TRACK ERROR |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SAMPLE } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | MEAN* | MEDIAN | MEAN* | MEDIAN |  |
| (01W) | ) TS WINONA |  | 346 | 322 | ** | 118 | ** | 6 |
| (02W) | STY ANDY | 290 | 205 | -167 | 174 | -74 | 22 |
| (03W) | ) TY BRENDA | 227 | 178 | -180 | 104 | 48 | 12 |
| (04W) | ) TY CECIL | 330 | 80 | ** | 318 | ** | 6 |
| (05W | TY DOT | 148 | 113 | -8 | 80 | 73 | 17 |
| (06\% | ) TS ELLIS | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | 0 |
| (07\% | ) TS FAYE | 124 | 106 | -106 | 54 | -12 | 12 |
| (08W | ) STY GORDON | 118 | 65 | 30 | 85 | 23 | 24 |
| (09W | ) TS HOPE | 224 | 111 | 82 | 172 | -57 | 14 |
| (10W) | ) TS IRVING | 152 | 133 | ** | 44 | ** | 4 |
| (11W | TY JUDY | 195 | 98 | -92 | 144 | 107 | 20 |
| (12W) | ) TD 12W | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | 0 |
| (13W-14 | TS KEN-LOLA | 313 | 180 | -106 | 225 | -194 | 14 |
| (15W) | ) TY MAC | 335 | 244 | -146 | 198 | -132 | 23 |
| $(1$ | ) TY OWEN | 239 | 189 | -151 | 108 | 37 | 23 |
|  | TY NANCY | 348 | 294 | -266 | 110 | 12 | 19 |
| (18W) | ts peggy | 335 | 147 | ** | 281 | ** | 6 |
| (19W) | TD 19W | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | 0 |
| (20W) | ts Roger | 474 | 459 | ** | 94 | ** | 7 |
| (21W) | TD 21W | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | 0 |
| (22W) | TY SARAH | 302 | 140 | 5 | 240 | -18 | 25 |
| (23W) | TS TIP | 374 | 206 | -193 | 270 | -190 | 11 |
| (24W) | TS VERA | 381 | 373 | ** | 69 | ** | 10 |
| (25W) | TY WAYNE | 623 | 564 | ** | 253 | ** | 4 |
| (26W | STY ANGELA | 165 | 112 | -51 | 96 | 73 | 39 |
| (27W | TY BRIAN | 135 | 79 | ** | 93 | ** | 5 |
| (28W) | TY COLLEEN | 207 | 132 | -25 | 135 | -75 | 20 |
| (29W | TY DAN | 222 | 202 | -206 | 55 | -29 | 13 |
| (30W | STY ELSIE | 145 | 115 | -90 | 66 | -39 | 27 |
| (31W | TY FORREST | 169 | 122 | -16 | 85 | -81 | 23 |
| (32W) | TY GAY | 101 | 87 | ** | 39 | ** | 8 |
| (33W) TY HONT |  | 173 | 123 | 41 | 103 | -64 | 23 |
| (34W) STY IRMA |  | 226 | 188 | -179 | 104 | -74 | 25 |
| (35W) TD 35W |  | 440 | 30 | ** | 439 | ** |  |
| (36W) TY JACK |  | 167 | 135 | -14 | 83 | -25 | 18 |
| Mman : 231 |  |  | 162 |  | 127 TOTAL: 481 |  |  |
| MBDIAN: 227 |  |  | -1 |  | -19 |  |  |
| Standard deviatiow: 145 |  |  | 190 |  |  |  |  |  |
| * the mean was computed from absolute values. <br> ** the median was not computed for instances of ten cases or less. *** FORECASTS WERE NOT ISSUED OR DID NOT VERIFY. <br> SEE TABLE 5-1b FOR EXPLANATIONS OF THE TERMS MEAN, MEDIAN, ALONG-TRACK ERROR AND CROSS-TRACK ERROR. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | warninas position | 24-HOUR |  |  |  | 48-HOUA |  |  |  | 72-HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FORECASTS | track | ALONG | Cross | FORECASTS | TRACK | ALONG | Cross | FORECASTS | track | Along | CROSS |
| $1978$ | 69821 | 558 | 126 | 87 | 71 | 420 | 274 | 194 | 151 | 295 | 411 | 296 | 218 |
| 1979 | 695 | 589 | 125 | 81 | 76 | 469 | 227 | 146 | 138 | 368 | 316 | 214 | 182 |
| 1980 | $590 \quad 28$ | 491 | 127 | 88 | 76 | 369 | 244 | 165 | 147 | 267 | 391 | 268 | 230 |
| 1981 | $584 \quad 25$ | 468 | 124 | 80 | 77 | 348 | 221 | 146 | 131 | 246 | 334 | 208 | 219 |
| 1982 | 786 | 686 | 113 | 74 | 70 | 532 | 238 | 162 | 142 | 425 | 342 | 223 | 211 |
| 1983 | 44516 | 342 | 117 | 76 | 73 | 253 | 260 | 169 | 184 | 184 | 407 | 259 | 263 |
| 1984 | 61122 | 492 | 117 | 84 | 64 | 378 | 232 | 163 | 131 | 288 | 363 | 238 | 216 |
| 1985 | 59218 | 477 | 117 | 80 | 68 | 336 | 231 | 153 | 138 | 241 | 367 | 230 | 227 |
| 1986 | 74321 | 845 | 126 | 85 | 70 | 535 | 261 | 183 | 151 | 412 | 394 | 278 | 227 |
| 1987 | 65718 | 583 | 107 | 71 | 64 | 465 | 204 | 134 | 127 | 389 | 303 | 198 | 186 |
| 1988 | 485 | 373 | 114 | 85 | 58 | 262 | 216 | 170 | 103 | 183 | 315 | 244 | 159 |
| TOTALS: | 6884 | 5660 |  |  |  | 4367 |  |  |  | 3294 |  |  |  |
| AVERAGE 7-48: | 62421 | 515 | 120 | 81 | 70 | 397 | 238 | 162 | 139 | 299 | 356 | 239 | 211 |
| 1989 | 71020 | 625 | 120 | 83 | 68 | 481 | 231 | 162 | 127 | 363 | 350 | 265 | 177 |
| TOTALS: <br> AVERAGE TB-89: | $\begin{array}{cc}7574 \\ 831 & 21\end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6285 \\ 524 \end{gathered}$ | 120 | 81 | 70 | 4848 404 | 237 | 162 | 138 | 3657 305 | 355 | 242 | 208 |
| 8ources: | 1979-85 24, 48- $\mathbf{7 2}$-hour arrors from Teul and Milter (1986) Inital Position $1986-89$ arrors from ATCR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 5-2A. Frequency distribution of initial position errors ( 15 nm increments) for the western North Pacific in 1989.


Figure 5-2B. Frequency distribution of 24 -hour forecast errors ( 30 nm increments) for the western North Pacific in 1989.


Figure 5-2C. Frequency distribution of 48 -hour forecast errors ( 60 nm increments) for the western North Pacific in 1989.


Figure 5-2D. Frequency distribution of 72 -hour forecast errors ( 90 nm increments) for the western North Pacific in 1989.

MEAN:
MEDIAN:
STANDARD DEVIATION: 206

CASES: 363

The median is the middle value obtained by sorting, and differs from median computed for Tables 5-1B, 5-1C,5-1D, 5-4 and 5-6A.



Figure 5-3. Annual mean forecast errors (nm) for all significant tropical cyclones in the westem North Pacific.



Figure 5-4. Annual mean forecast errors (nm) for all significant tropical cyclones in the North Indian Ocean.
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\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
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\end{tabular}} \& \multicolumn{11}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
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\hline TC 01S \& 83 \& 235 \& 209 \& ** \& 80 \& ** \& 384 \& 349 \& ** \& 134 \& ** \\
\hline TC 02S \& 25 \& 98 \& 75 \& -21 \& 45 \& -4 \& 169 \& 127 \& -59 \& 79 \& -43 \\
\hline TC 03S \& 14 \& 106 \& 54 \& ** \& 67 \& ** \& 203 \& 122 \& ** \& 125 \& ** \\
\hline TC 04P \& 20 \& 74 \& 27 \& ** \& 66 \& ** \& 110 \& 80 \& ** \& 76 \& ** \\
\hline TC 05P \& 30 \& 130 \& 94 \& ** \& 83 \& ** \& 464 \& 408 \& ** \& 222 \& ** \\
\hline TC 06S \& 18 \& 100 \& 87 \& ** \& 39 \& ** \& 156 \& 113 \& ** \& 99 \& ** \\
\hline TC 07S \& 29 \& 141 \& 64 \& ** \& 102 \& ** \& 322 \& 170 \& ** \& 244 \& ** \\
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\hline TC 13P \& 50 \& 120 \& 89 \& -53 \& 59 \& 51 \& 207 \& 174 \& ** \& 88 \& ** \\
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\hline TC 15P \& 22 \& 160 \& 123 \& ** \& 87 \& ** \& 390 \& 191 \& ** \& 321 \& ** \\
\hline TC 16S \& 35 \& 229 \& 219 \& ** \& 69 \& ** \& *** \& *** \& *** \& *** \& *** \\
\hline TC 17S \& 13 \& 92 \& 32 \& ** \& 86 \& ** \& 332 \& 286 \& ** \& 169 \& ** \\
\hline TC 18S \& 40 \& 220 \& 182 \& ** \& 55 \& ** \& 400 \& 355 \& ** \& 184 \& ** \\
\hline TC 19S \& 25 \& 113 \& 58 \& -6 \& 89 \& 55 \& 184 \& 81 \& ** \& 151 \& ** \\
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Figure 5-5. Annual mean forecast errors ( nm ) for all significant tropical cyclones in the South Pacific and South Indian Oceans.

| TABLE 5-7 | AMANOAL MCEAN FORECAST ERRTCRS (NM) SOOTH PACIFIC AND SOUTH INDIAN OCTANS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 24-HOUR |  | 48-HOUR |  |
|  | FORECAST | BIGHT-ANGIE | EORECAS | RIGHT-ANGLE |
| 1981 | 165 | 119 | 315 | 216 |
| 1982 | 144 | 91 | 274 | 174 |
| 1983 | 154 | 84 | 288 | 150 |
| 1984 | 133 | 73 | 231 | 124 |
| 1985 | 138 | 78 | 242 | 133 |
| 1986 | 133 | ** | 268 | ** |
| 1987 | 145 | ** | 280 | ** |
| 1988 | 146 | ** | 290 | ** |
| 1989 | 125 | ** | 242 | ** |
| ** IN 1986, RIGHT-ANGLE ERROR WAS REPLACED BY CROSS-TRACK ERROR. SEE TABLE 5-1B FOR AN EXPLANATION OF CROSS-TRACK ERROR. |  |  |  |  |

### 5.2 COMPARISON OF OBJECTIVE TECHNIQUES

5.2.1 GENERAL - JTWC uses a variety of objective techniques as guidance in the warning development process. A variety of techniques are required because each technique has particular strengths and weaknesses which vary by basin, time of year, synoptic situation, and forecast period. The techniques can be divided into six general categories: extrapolation, climatology and analogs, statistical, dynamic, empirical and analytical, and blends of the previous categories.

Since September 1981, JTWC has initialized its objective forecast techniques from the six-hour old preliminary best track position (interpolated) rather than the forecast (extrapolated) warning position, e.g. the 0600 Z warning is supported by objective techniques developed from the 0000 Z preliminary best track position. This ensures the techniques are in-hand for a longer evaluation time and has resulted in lower 24 -hour forecast errors because of more accurate direction and speed of movement.

### 5.2.2 DESCRIPTION OF OBJECTIVE TECHNIQUES

5.2.2.1 EXTRAPOLATION (XTRP) - Forecast positions for 24,48 , and 72 hours are derived from the extension of a straight line that connects the most recent and 12 -hour old preliminary best track positions.
5.2.2.2 CLIMATOLOGY (CLIM) - A climatological aid providing 24 -, 48 -, and 72 -hour tropical cyclone forecast positions (and intensities in the western North Pacific) based upon the position of the tropical cyclone. The output is based upon data records from 1945 to 1978 for the western North Pacific Ocean and 1900 to 1981 for the North Indian Ocean and Southern Hemisphere.
5.2.2.3 HALF PERSISTENCE AND CLIMATOLOGY (HPAC) - Forecast positions are generated from the blend of equally weighted persistence (XTRP) and climatology (CLIM) forecast positions.
5.2.2.4 ANALOGS - The program scans the climatology for tropical cyclones with a similar history (within specified spatial and temporal windows) to the current tropical cyclone. For the western North Pacific Ocean, two forecasts of position and intensity are provided at 24,48 , and 72 hours: RECR - a weighted mean of all tropical cyclones that were categorized as "recurving" during their best track period; TOTL - a weighted mean of all accepted tropical cyclones. In addition the program produces a list of the five tropical cyclones with the least variance from the current storm. For the North Indian Ocean and Southern Hemisphere, a single (total) forecast track is provided for the 24 -hour intervals to 72 hours.

### 5.2.2.5 CLIMATOLOGY / PERSISTENCE

 (CLIPER) - A statistical regression technique, adapted from Xu and Neuman (1985), based on climatology, current intensity and position, and past movement. This technique is used as a crude measure of real forecast skill when verifying forecast accuracy.
### 5.2.2.6 CYCLOPS OBJECTIVE STEERING

 MODEL OUTPUT STATISTICS (COSMOS) - A Model Output Statistics (MOS) (Allen, 1982) routine based on the geostrophic steering at the $850-, 700-$, and $500-\mathrm{mb}$ levels. The steering is derived from the HATTRACK point advection model run using NOGAPS forecast fields. The MOS forecast is then blended with the six-hour past movement to generate the forecast track.
### 5.2.2.7 COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

 MODEL (CSUM) - A statistical-synoptic method developed by Matsumoto (1984). Tropical cyclones are stratified in the basins North Indian Ocean, South China Sea, and western North Pacific - based on the tropical cyclones position relative to the 500 mb ridgeaxis (determined from the direction of recent movement). A separate set of multiple regression equations using synoptic parameters are used depending on whether the tropical cyclone is south, on, or north of the ridge axis.
5.2.2.8 ONE-WAY INTERACTIVE TROPICAL CYCLONE MODEL (OTCM) - A coarse-mesh, three-layer, primitive equation model with a 205 km grid spacing over a 6400 x 4700 km domain. The model's fields are computed around a bogused, digitized cyclone vortex using FNOC analyses. The past motion of the tropical cyclone is compared to initial steering fields and a bias correction is computed and applied to the model. The resultant forecast positions are derived by locating the 850 mb vortex at six-hour intervals to 72 hours. Forecast boundary conditions are updated from NOGAPS.


#### Abstract

5.2.2.9 TYPHOON ACCELERATION PREDICTION TECHNIQUE (TAPT) - An empirical technique (Weir, 1982) that utilizes upper-tropospheric and surface wind fields to estimate acceleration associated with the tropical cyclone's interaction with the midlatitude westerlies. It includes guidelines for the duration of acceleration, upper-limits, and probable path of the cyclone.


### 5.2.2.10 COMBINED CONFIDENCE

 WEIGHTED FORECASTS (CCWF) - An optimal blend of objective techniques produced by the ATCF. The ATCF blends the selected techniques by using the inverse of the covariance matrices computed from historical and real-time cross-track and along-track errors as the weighting function.5.2.2.11 DVORAK - An estimation of tropical cyclone's current and 24-hour forecast intensity is made from the interpretation of satellite imagery (Dvorak, 1984) . These intensity estimates are used with other intensity related data and trends to forecast tropical cyclone intensity.
5.2.2.12 HOLLAND/MARTIN - The technique adapts an earlier work (Holland, 1980) and specifically addresses the need for realistic $30-, 50$ and $100-\mathrm{kt}$ wind radii around tropical cyclones. It solves equations for basic gradient wind relations within the tropical cyclone area, using input parameters obtained from enhanced infrared satellite imagery. For the first time, diagnosis also includes an asymmetric area of winds caused by tropical cyclone movement. Size and intensity parameters are also used to diagnose internal steering components of tropical cyclone motion known collectively as "beta-drift".

### 5.2.2.13 FNOC BETA AND ADVECTION

 MODEL (FBAM) - FNOC's implementation of NMC's Beta and Advection Model. The model uses the output from NOGAPS, current observations, and an analytic description of the tropical cyclone.
### 5.2.2.14 NAVY OPERATIONAL REGIONAL

 PREDICTION SYSTEM (NRPS) - The Advanced Tropical Cyclone Model (ATCM) produced from NORAPS fields.
### 5.3 TESTING AND RESULTS

A comparison of selected techniques is included in Tables 5-8A, 5-8B, and 5-8C for all western North Pacific tropical cyclones; Table 5-9 for all North Indian Ocean tropical cyclones and Table 5-10 for the Southern Hemisphere. In these tables, " x -axis " refers to techniques listed vertically. For example (Table 5-8A) in the 629 cases available for a (homogeneous) comparison, the average forecast error at 24 hours was 131 nm ( 243 km ) for HPAC and 130 nm ( 241 km ) for COSM. The difference of $1 \mathrm{~nm}(2$ km ) is shown in the lower right. (Differences are not always exact, due to computational round-off which occurs for each of the cases available for comparison).
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## 6. NOARL TROPICAL CYCLONE SUPPORT SUMMARY

# Tropical Cyclone Forecaster's Reference Guide 


#### Abstract

R. J. Miller and J-H. Chu

Development of a Tropical Cyclone Forecaster's Reference Guide has started at Naval Oceanographic and Atmospheric Research Laboratory (NOARL). The reference guide will be a computer-based information management system for JTWC forecasters. Using a mouse/menu interface, the user will have access to general tropical cyclone information, as well as current research results, thumb rules, definitions, case studies, etc. Since the guide will be computer-based, one can easily add new information to the system, or modify existing information.


## Automated Tropical Cyclone Forecasting System (ATCF) Upgrade

D. M. Roesser, C. R. Sampson, and R. J. Miller

The ATCF has been operational at JTWC since August, 1988. The system runs on an IBM-AT compatible machine using the MSDOS operation system. This current configuration limits the capabilities of the ATCF. For this reason, work is underway to adapt the ATCF software to a UNIX environment. The UNIX operating system runs more powerful applications and is capable of multitasking (running more than one program at once). Additionally, software developed for UNIX is portable to a wide variety of computer systems (personal computers, workstations, or mainframes).

## Tropical Cyclone Expert System

C. R. Sampson and J-H. Chu

NOARL is developing an expert system for tropical cyclone forecasting. Using
forecasting thumb rules and research results such as objective technique error statistics, the expert system will objectively weigh the information based upon the current forecast situation and assist the forecaster in making decisions. More importantly, the expert system may alert the forecaster to possibilities not previously considered.

## Personal Computer-Based Track Climatology <br> C. R. Sampson and R. J. Miller

Currently the Fleet Numerical Oceanography Center (FNOC) in Monterey, CA runs all of JTWC's computer objective forecast techniques on the mainframe computers. With the increased power and use of personal computers, it is now feasible to run some of these forecast techniques locally at JTWC. NOARL is adapting the tropical cyclone track climatology forecast technique to run on a PC. The global data base contains best tracks since 1945 to present. At the end of each tropical cyclone season, new best tracks can easily be added to the data base.

## NORAPS/ATCM Development

## C-S. Liou

Since the Advanced Tropical Cyclone Model (ATCM) is a special application of the Navy Operational Regional Atmospheric Prediction System (NORAPS), any changes made to NORAPS will also affect ATCM performance. In 1989-1990, NORAPS development efforts are focused on improving lateral boundary conditions, radiation calculation, and initialization procedures. The improvements are aimed at reducing forecast errors due to ill-posed lateral boundary conditions, to reduce large bias errors, and to reduce errors due to vertical interpolation between sigma and pressure levels.

Intentionally left blank.

## 7. TROPICAL CYCLONE WARNING STATISTICS, TRACK AND FIX DATA

### 7.1 GENERAL

Due to the rapid growth of microcomputers in the meteorological community and to save publishing costs, tropical cyclone track data (with best track, initial warning, 24-, 48and 72-hour JTWC forecasts) and fix data (satellite, aircraft, radar and synoptic) are now available separately upon request. The data will be in ASCII format on 5.25 inch floppy diskettes. The data sets are available on two diskettes. These include the western North Pacific Ocean (1 January - 31 December 1989) on one and North Indian Ocean (1 January - 31 December), South Indian and western South Pacific Oceans (1 July 1988-30 June 1989) on the other. Agencies or individuals desiring these data sets should send the appropriate number of floppy diskettes (two if both data sets
are desired) to NAVOCEANCOMCEN/JTWC Guam with their request. When the request is received, the data will be copied onto your diskettes and returned with the explanation of the data formats. The use of floppy diskettes should facilitate the transfer of these rather large data files to your computer.

### 7.2 WARNING VERIFICATION STATISTICS

### 7.2.1 WESTERN NORTH PACIFIC

This section includes verification statistics for each warning in the western North Pacific Ocean during 1989. Pre- and postwarning best track positions are not printed, but are available on floppy diskettes by request.

JIMC FORECAST TRACK AND INIENSITY ERRORS BY WARNING

| Tropical | m | ona (01w |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DTG | W | BT Iat |
| 89011800 | 1 | 16.5 N |
| 89011806 | 2 | 16.4 N |
| 89011812 | 3 | 16.2 N |
| 89011818 | 4 | 15.8 N |
| 89011900 | 5 | 15.2 N |
| 89011906 | 6 | 14.6 N |
| 89011912 | 7 | 14.0 N |
| 89011918 | 8 | 13.8N |
| 89012006* | 9 | 13.5N |
| 89012012 | 10 | 13.5N |
| 89012018 | 11 | 13.3 N |
| 89012100 | 12 | 13.1N |
| 89012106 | 13 | 12.3N |
| * Regenerated |  |  |

Average

* Cases

| Supar Typhoon Mndy (02W) (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DTG | W ${ }^{\text {\# }}$ | BT IAT | ET ION | ROS ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72ER | BT WN | HW_ER | 24_EB | 48_ER | 72.E8 |
| 89041812 | 4 | 9.6 N | 145.3 E | 8 | 126 | 291 | 664 | 45 | 5 | -5 | -45 | -75 |
| 89041818 | 5 | 9.7N | 144.5 E | 11 | 164 | 463 | 872 | 50 | -5 | -20 | -70 | -60 |
| 89041900 | 6 | 9.7N | 143.9E | 13 | 65 | 317 | 692 | 55 | 0 | -10 | -50 | -65 |
| 89041906 | 7 | 9.7N | 143.5 E | 21 | 165 | 475 | 857 | 60 | -15 | -45 | -80 | -60 |
| 89041912 | 8 | 9.9N | 143.3 E | 8 | 181 | 559 | 960 | 70 | -5 | -45 | -50 | -20 |
| 89041918 | 9 | 10.1N | 143.3 E | 0 | 89 | 357 | 617 | 75 | 0 | -45 | -45 | -15 |
| 89042000 | 10 | 10.5N | 143.5 E | 21 | 148 | 372 | 533 | 85 | -5 | -50 | -45 | -5 |
| 89042006 | 11 | 10.9N | 143.8 E | 11 | 196 | 473 | 653 | 100 | -5 | -25 | -5 | 35 |
| 89042012 | 12 | 11.5N | 144.1 E | 6 | 242 | 479 | 614 | 120 | 5 | 5 | 35 | 85 |
| 89042018 | 13 | 12.0N | 145. OE | 0 | 125 | 267 | 343 | 135 | -5 | -25 | 0 | 55 |
| 89042100 | 14 | 12.6 N | 145.9E | 5 | 162 | 307 | 384 | 140 | -5 | 10 | 45 | 70 |
| 89042106 | 15 | 13.4N | 146.9E | 5 | 84 | 192 | 402 | 140 | -5 | -5 | 25 | 35 |
| 89042112 | 16 | 14.2N | 148.2 E | 0 | 121 | 245 | 449 | 140 | -10 | 0 | 40 | 30 |
| 89042118 | 17 | 15.4N | 149.4 E | 18 | 66 | 280 | 509 | 135 | -5 | 0 | 50 | 30 |
| 89042200 | 18 | 16.4N | 150.5E | 5 | 62 | 164 | 330 | 130 | -10 | 15 | 35 | 10 |
| 89042206 | 19 | 17.4N | 151.5 E | 8 | 41 | 168 | N/A | 120 | -10 | 10 | 25 | N/A |
| 89042212 | 20 | 18.5N | 152.5 E | 6 | 90 | 175 | N/A | 110 | 0 | 40 | 35 | N/A |
| 89042218 | 21 | 19.6N | 153.4E | 18 | 85 | 128 | N/A | 100 | 0 | 40 | 25 | N/A |
| 89042300 | 22 | 20.8N | 154.3E | 16 | 100 | 96 | N/A | 85 | 5 | 25 | 15 | N/A |
| 89042306 | 23 | 21.6 N | 155.1 E | 12 | 17 | N/A | N/A | 65 | 10 | 15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89042312 | 24 | 22.5N | 155.6E | 12 | 44 | N/A | N/A | 45 | 15 | 15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89042318 | 25 | 23.4N | 156.1E | 17 | 128 | N/A | N/A | 35 | 15 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89042400 | 26 | 24.4N | 156.7E | 16 | 95 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 5 | 5 | N/A | N/ $/$ |




Typhoon Cocil (04W) (continued)

| DTG | H1 | BT IAT | BT ION | PQS ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72 ER | BT WN | WW ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72.ER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89052312 | 4 | 15.2 N | 111.5 E | 21 | 154 | 338 | N/A | 55 | 0 | -5 | 20 | N/A |
| 89052318 | 5 | 15.5 N | 111.0 E | 21 | 190 | 374 | N/A | 60 | -5 | 0 | 20 | N/A |
| 89052400 | 6 | 15.7N | 110.4 E | 13 | 120 | N/A | N/A | 65 | -10 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89052406 | 7 | 15.7 N | 109.7E | 11 | 30 | N/A | N/A | 70 | -5 | 30 | N/A | N/A |
| 89052412 | 8 | 15.8 N | 109.2 E | 18 | 58 | N/A | N/A | 75 | 0 | 35 | N/A | N/A |
| 89052418 | 9 | 15.8 N | 108.6E | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 70 | -5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |



| Tropical Storm Ellis (06\%) |  |  | Average - Cases | $\begin{array}{r} \frac{00 h}{33} \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \mathrm{~h} \\ 347 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 48 \mathrm{~h} \\ \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 72 \mathrm{~h} \\ \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A} \\ 0 \end{array}$ | BT WN | HN ER | 24.EB | 48 ER | 72 ER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drg | Hit | Bt Iat | BT LON | POS ER | 24_ER | 48.ER | 72 ER |  |  |  |  |  |
| $89062006 \dagger$ | 1 | 16.4 N | 128.9 E | 24 | 240 | N/A | N/A | 25 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| $89062018 \dagger$ | 2 | 17.3N | 127.4 E | 65 | 266 | N/A | N/A | 25 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89062218* | 3 | 20.0 N | 126.1E | 11 | 463 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89062300 | 4 | 21.0 N | 126.8 E | 42 | 653 | N/A | N/A | 35 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89062306 | 5 | 23.2N | 127.9 E | 36 | 336 | N/A | N/A | 35 | 0 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89062312 | 6 | 25.4 N | 128.8 E | 18 | 125 | N/A | N/A | 35 | -5 | -10 | N/A | N/A |
| $\dagger$ | opic gene | Depressi <br> d | on Warni |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Tropical Storm Faye (07\%) |  |  |  | O0h | 24b | 48h | 72h |  | WW ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72 ER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average <br> \# Cases | 25 | 72 | 124 | 220 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 21 | 18 | 12 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | W ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | BT LAT |  | BT LON | POS ER | 24ER | 48 ER | 72 ER |  |  |  |  | BT WN |
| 89070606 | 1 | 15.4 N | 129.6 E | 13 | 72 | 33 | 114 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 10 | -10 |
| 89070612 | 2 | 15.9 N | 129.2E | 43 | 75 | 42 | 150 | 25 | 5 | -5 | -5 | -5 |
| 89070618 | 3 | 16.3 N | 128.7E | 74 | 90 | 83 | 194 | 25 | 0 | -10 | 10 | 0 |
| 89070700 | 4 | 16.7N | 128.1E | 60 | 59 | 185 | 310 | 30 | 0 | -5 | 5 | 10 |
| 89070706 | 5 | 16.9 N | 127.4E | 18 | 53 | 207 | 280 | 35 | 0 | -5 | 0 | 20 |
| 89070712 | 6 | 17.0 N | 126.5E | 24 | 81 | 169 | 248 | 35 | 0 | -5 | 10 | 40 |
| 89070718 | 7 | 17.0 N | 125.7E | 16 | 74 | 124 | 160 | 40 | -5 | 15 | 25 | 40 |
| 89070800 | 8 | 16.7N | 124.6E | 11 | 77 | 183 | 257 | 45 | 0 | 10 | 35 | 60 |
| 89070806 | 9 | 16.7 N | 123.5 E | 24 | 55 | 124 | 230 | 55 | 0 | 20 | 40 | 50 |
| 89070812 | 10 | 16.9 N | 122.4E | 30 | 82 | 166 | 257 | 60 | 0 | 20 | 40 | 45 |
| 89070818 | 11 | 17.2 N | 120.8E | 62 | 69 | 135 | N/A | 40 | 0 | 25 | 45 | N/A |
| 89070900 | 12 | 17.3N | 119.1E | 11 | 41 | 32 | N/A | 45 | 0 | 35 | 30 | N/A |
| 89070906 | 13 | 17.5N | 117.6E | 17 | 62 | N/A | N/A | 45 | 0 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89070912 | 14 | 17.7N | 116.5E | 29 | 146 | N/A | N/A | 45 | -5 | -5 | N/A | N/R |
| 89070918 | 15 | 18.2 N | 115.4E | 43 | 135 | N/A | N/A | 40 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89071000 | 16 | 18.7N | 114.0E | 13 | 17 | N/A | N/A | 40 | 0 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89071006 | 17 | 19.1 N | 112.7 E | 5 | 88 | N/A | N/A | 35 | 0 | -10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89071012 | 18 | 19.5N | 111.4 E | 8 | 25 | N/A | N/A | 35 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89071018 | 19 | 20.0N | 110.3E | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89071100 | 20 | 20.5N | 109.1E | 17 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89071106 | 21 | 21.2 N | 107.7E | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A. | N/A |


| Super Typhoan Gordon (08W) |  |  |  | Average* Cases | $\begin{array}{r} 00 \mathrm{~h} \\ 13 \\ 30 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \mathrm{~h} \\ 68 \\ 26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \frac{48 \mathrm{~h}}{118} \\ 24 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 72 h \\ 146 \\ 18 \end{array}$ | BT. WN | Wher | 24-ER | 48 EB | 72.ER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | 且 |  | BT LAT | ET ION | POS ER | 24_ER | 48 ER | 72 ER |  |  |  |  |  |
| 89071106 | 1 |  | 18.6N | 147.3 E | 72 | 33 | 80 | 120 | 30 | 0 | -10 | -15 | -35 |
| 89071112 | 2 |  | 18.5 N | 145.3E | 13 | 30 | 70 | 138 | 30 | 0 | -5 | -10 | -35 |
| 89071118 | 3 |  | 18.3N | 144.0E | 24 | 23 | 93 | 121 | 30 | 0 | -10 | -15 | -50 |
| 89071200 | 4 |  | 18.1N | 142.6 E | 22 | 8 | 90 | 96 | 35 | -5 | -10 | -20 | -65 |
| 89071206 | 5 |  | 18.0 N | 141.3 E | 12 | 53 | 123 | 105 | 40 | 5 | 5 | -15 | -50 |
| 89071212 | 6 |  | 17.9N | 139.9E | 0 | 62 | 98 | 55 | 45 | 0 | 0 | -25 | -50 |
| 89071218 | 7 |  | 17.9 N | 138.3E | 8 | 72 | 96 | 47 | 50 | -5 | -5 | -40 | -55 |
| 89071300 | 8 |  | 17.8 N | 136.7 E | 12 | 124 | 179 | 214 | 55 | 0 | -10 | -50 | -35 |
| 89071306 | 9 |  | 17.6N | 135.1 E | 8 | 117 | 149 | 192 | 60 | 5 | 0 | -40 | -20 |
| 89071312 | 10 |  | 17.0N | 133.8 E | 12 | 85 | 183 | 284 | 65 | 5 | -5 | -65 | -10 |
| 89071318 | 11 |  | 16.5N | 132.6 E | 5 | 25 | 116 | 165 | 70 | -5 | -40 | -75 | -15 |
| 89071400 | 12 |  | 16.4 N | 131.4 E | 6 | 5 | 67 | 142 | 75 | 0 | -35 | -55 | 0 |
| 89071406 | 13 |  | 16.3N | 130.2 E | 8 | 49 | 157 | 188 | 90 | -5 | -30 | -35 | 10 |
| 89071412 | 14 |  | 16.3 N | 128.8 E | 5 | 104 | 136 | 172 | 100 | 10 | -15 | -15 | 15 |
| 89071418 | 15 |  | 16.4 N | 127.4 E | 13 | 119 | 112 | 152 | 115 | -5 | -60 | -5 | 20 |
| 89071500 | 16 |  | 16.6 N | 126.2E | 12 | 132 | 151 | 185 | 125 | 0 | -40 | 10 | 25 |
| 89071506 | 17 |  | 17.0 N | 125.1 E | 13 | 116 | 130 | 110 | 140 | -5 | -30 | 15 | -5 |
| 89071512 | 18 |  | 17.5 N | 124.0E | 12 | 30 | 20 | 143 | 140 | -5 | -5 | 30 | -5 |
| 89071518 | 19 |  | 17.9N | 122.6 E | 13 | 97 | 98 | N/A | 140 | -5 | 20 | 25 | N/A |
| 89071600 | 20 |  | 18.2N | 121.3E | 13 | 111 | 94 | N/A | 120 | -25 | 10 | 15 | N/A |
| 89071606 | 21 |  | 18.3 N | 120.1 E | 5 | 34 | 98 | N/A | 110 | -30 | 20 | -25 | N/A |
| 89071612 | 22 |  | 18.5N | 118.8 E | 6 | 33 | 116 | N/A | 100 | -15 | 30 | -20 | N/A |
| 89071618 | 23 |  | 18.6 N | 117.6E | 12 | 83 | 250 | N/A | 90 | 0 | 35 | -10 | N/A |
| 89071700 | 24 |  | 19.1N | 116.6E | 16 | 26 | 126 | N/A | 80 | 0 | 30 | 5 | N/A |
| 89071706 | 25 |  | 19.7 N | 115.6 E | 8 | 81 | N/A | N/A | 75 | 0 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89071712 | 26 |  | 20.4N | 114.7 E | 6 | 115 | N/A | N/A | 70 | 0 | -20 | N/A | N/A |
| 89071718 | 27 |  | 20.8N | 113.6 E | 12 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 65 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89071800 | 28 |  | 21.1N | 112.5 E | 18 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 60 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89071806 | 29 |  | 21.4N | 111.3 E | 16 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 55 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/R |
| 89071812 | 30 |  | 21.7N | 110.0E | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 50 | -5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |



| Tropical Storm Irving (10w |  |  |  | 00h | 24h | 48h | 72h | BT WN | MW EB | 24.ER | $48 . \mathrm{ER}$ | 72 ER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average * Cases | 21 | 90 | 152 | 232 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 14 | 9 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | W迷 | BT LAT |  | BT ION | ROS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER |  |  |  |  |  | 72 ER |
| 89072100 | 1 | 15.0 N | 116.7E | 21 | 174 | 264 | 389 | 30 | -5 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 89072106 | 2 | 15.1N | 115.0E | 17 | 8 | 29 | 74 | 35 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 5 |
| 89072112 | 3 | 15.0N | 113.4E | 30 | 163 | 254 | N/A | 40 | 0 | 20 | -20 | N/A |
| 89072118 | 4 | 15.0N | 112.2E | 29 | 166 | N/A | N/A | 40 | 5 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89072200 | 5 | 15.5 N | 111.3 E | 8 | 56 | N/A | N/A | 40 | 5 | -10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89072206 | 6 | 16.4N | 110.7E | 40 | 49 | 62 | N/A | 40 | -5 | -10 | -10 | N/A |
| 89072212 | 7 | 16.7 N | 110.2 E | 20 | 49 | N/A | N/A | 40 | -5 | -10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89072218 | 8 | 16.8 N | 109.5E | 24 | 47 | N/A | N/A | 40 | -5 | -20 | N/A | N/A |
| 89072300 | 9 | 17.1N | 108.6E | 25 | 101 | N/A | N/A | 45 | -10 | -30 | N/A | N/A |
| 89072306 | 10 | 17.5N | 107.7E | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 45 | -15 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89072312 | 11 | 18.1N | 107.0E | 16 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 45 | -15 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89072318 | 12 | 18.6N | 106.3E | 36 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 55 | -30 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89072400 | 13 | 19.2N | 105.7E | 18 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 55 | -20 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89072406 | 14 | 19.7N | 104.9E | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 40 | -10 | N/A | N/A | N/A |


| Typhoon Judy (11\%) |  |  | Average <br> * Cases | $\begin{array}{r} \frac{00 h}{15} \\ 28 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 h \\ \hline 85 \\ 24 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \frac{48 h}{195} \\ 20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 72 h \\ 323 \\ 16 \end{array}$ | BT WN | Wh ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | 72 EB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | W | BT IAT | BT_ION | POS ER | 24.58 | 48 ER | 72 ER |  |  |  |  |  |
| 89072206 | 1 | 14.8N | 138.8E | 18 | 119 | 290 | 446 | 25 | 0 | 5 | 0 | -20 |
| 89072212 | 2 | 15.4 N | 138.3E | 52 | 67 | 39 | 106 | 25 | 0 | 0 | -10 | -40 |
| 89072218 | 3 | 16.1N | 138.0E | 31 | 23 | 24 | 136 | 30 | -5 | -5 | -25 | -45 |
| 89072300 | 4 | 16.5 N | 138.0E | 26 | 60 | 43 | 85 | 35 | 0 | 0 | -25 | -35 |
| 89072306 | 5 | 17.0N | 138.0E | 32 | 30 | 24 | 139 | 35 | 0 | -5 | -35 | -30 |
| 89072312 | 6 | 17.5N | 138.0E | 13 | 90 | 174 | 277 | 35 | 0 | -5 | -35 | -15 |
| 89072318 | 7 | 18.2N | 138.1E | 30 | 87 | 180 | 296 | 35 | 5 | -10 | -30 | -15 |
| 89072400 | 8 | 18.9N | 138.2E | 6 | 84 | 95 | 241 | 50 | 0 | -10 | 0 | 25 |


| Typhoon Judy (11w) |  | (contimsed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DTG | 迷 | BT LAT | BTION | ROS ER | 24_ER | 48 ER | 72.ER | BT WN | HW EB | 24.EB | 48 ER | 72.ER |
| 89072406 | 9 | 19.6 N | 138.3E | 13 | 42 | 125 | 308 | 55 | 0 | -15 | 10 | 25 |
| 89072412 | 10 | 20.2N | 138.4E | 11 | 48 | 103 | 272 | 55 | 0 | -20 | 10 | 0 |
| 89072418 | 11 | 20.9N | 138.4E | 11 | 55 | 111 | 316 | 65 | 0 | -10 | 10 | 0 |
| 89072500 | 12 | 21.8 N | 138.4E | 11 | 41 | 146 | 389 | 80 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 30 |
| 89072506 | 13 | 22.8N | 138.3 E | 8 | 69 | 274 | 485 | 90 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 40 |
| 89072512 | 14 | 23.9N | 138.0 E | 10 | 87 | 376 | 652 | 95 | 0 | 25 | 30 | 40 |
| 89072518 | 15 | 24.9N | 137.9E | 5 | 123 | 383 | 578 | 95 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 25 |
| 89072600 | 16 | 26.0 N | 137.5 E | 8 | 150 | 388 | 437 | 90 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 30 |
| 89072606 | 17 | 26.8N | 136.9 E | 0 | 155 | 375 | N/A | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| 89072612 | 18 | 27.6N | 136.3 E | 8 | 227 | 398 | N/A | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| 89072618 | 19 | 28.4N | 135.2 E | 6 | 195 | 328 | N/A | 85 | 0 | -5 | 10 | N/A |
| 89072700 | 20 | 29.2N | 134.15 | 5 | 27 | 30 | N/A | 85 | 0 | 0 | 5 | N/A |
| 89072706 | 21 | 30.1N | 132.8 E | 0 | 74 | N/A | N/A | 90 | -5 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89072712 | 22 | 30.8 N | 131.2 E | 7 | 81 | N/A | N/A | 90 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89072718 | 23 | 31.8 N | 130.0E | 20 | 43 | N/A | N/A | 90 | -15 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89072800 | 24 | 32.7 N | 129.2 E | 7 | 52 | N/A | N/A | 65 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89072806 | 25 | 33.5 N | 128.4 E | 15 | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | N/A | N/A | 60 | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89072812 | 26 | 34.6 N | 127.6E | 20 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 50 | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89072818 | 27 | 36.4 N | 127.3E | 30 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 40 | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/R |
| 89072900 | 28 | 38.0N | 128.0E | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Tropical D | Depreasion | 212W |  | 00 h | 24 h | 48h | 72h |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Average | 14 | 61 | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | * Cases | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | W | BT LAT | BT ION | ROS ER | 24_EB | 48 FR | 72.ER | BT WN | Hix ER | 24_ER | 48 ER | 72 EB |
| 89072912 | 1 | 24.8N | 124.0E | 0 | 12 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89072918 | 2 | 25.0 N | 122.8 E | 0 | 110 | N/R | N/A | 30 | 0 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89073000 | 3 | 25.2N | 122.0E | 43 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | -5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Tropical | Storm Ken | -rola | (13W-14W) Average - Cases | O0h | 24h | 48h | 72h |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 38 | 193 | 313 | 382 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 23 | 18 | 14 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | H2 | BT LAET | BT LON | POS ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72 ER | BT WN | Wh ER | 24_ER | 48ER | 72.EB |
| 89073000 | 1 | $24.3 N$ | 136.0E | 20 | 221 | 509 | 519 | 30 | 0 | -5 | 5 | 10 |
| 89073006 | 2 | 25.1N | 137.3E | 43 | 199 | 450 | 546 | 45 | 0 | 5 | 0 | -10 |
| 89073012 | 3 | 26.5 N | 138.5 E | 31 | 397 | 449 | 306 | 45 | 0 | 5 | 5 | -10 |
| 89073018 | 4 | 27.7N | 136.7E | 141 | 409 | 414 | 241 | 45 | 0 | 5 | 10 | -10 |
| 89073100 | 5 | 28.5N | 135.0E | 246 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 45 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89073112* | 6 | 29.1N | 130.9 E | 59 | 425 | N/A | N/A | 50 | 0 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89073118 | 7 | 28.2N | 129.9E | 16 | 187 | 363 | N/A | 50 | 0 | 15 | 5 | N/A |
| 89080100 | 8 | 27.5N | 129.5 E | 10 | 173 | 290 | 335 | 50 | 0 | 15 | 5 | -10 |
| 89080106 | 9 | 27.0 N | 129.3 E | 26 | 151 | 285 | 378 | 50 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 5 |
| 89080112 | 10 | 26.8N | 129.2 E | 43 | 221 | 362 | 386 | 45 | 0 | 10 | -5 | 0 |
| 89080118 | 11 | 26.8N | 129.0E | 32 | 242 | 346 | 345 | 40 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| 89080200 | 12 | 27.0 N | 128.9E | 0 | 259 | 403 | 438 | 40 | 0 | -5 | 10 | 15 |
| 89080206 | 13 | 27.7N | 128.4E | 18 | 171 | 311 | 324 | 45 | 0 | 10 | 40 | 30 |
| 89080212 | 14 | 28.5N | 127.7 E | 7 | 30 | 39 | N/A | 45 | 0 | 15 | 5 | N/A |
| 89080218 | 15 | 29.5 N | 126.9E | 37 | 92 | 76 | N/A | 45 | -5 | 15 | 10 | N/A |
| 89080300 | 16 | 30.0 N | 126.0E | 12 | 51 | 83 | N/A | 50 | -10 | 0 | 5 | N/A |
| 89080306 | 17 | 30.4 N | 125.0E | 18 | 106 | N/A | N/A | 50 | -10 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89080312 | 18 | 30.7N | 123.8 E | 36 | 85 | N/A | N/A | 50 | -10 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89080318 | 19 | 31.1 N | 122.6 E | 11 | 51 | N/A | N/A | 45 | -5 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89080400 | 20 | 31.3N | 121.3E | 21 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 40 | -5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89080406 | 21 | 31.8 N | 120.0E | 43 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89080412 | 22 | 32.0 N | 119.0 E | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89080418 | 23 | 32.1N | 118.0 E | 11 |  | N/A | N/A | 25 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| * Post analysis indicates 13 W and 14W were the same storm. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Typhoon | (15 |  | Average <br> * Cases | $\begin{array}{r} 00 \mathrm{~h} \\ \hline 17 \\ 28 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \mathrm{~h} \\ 167 \\ 26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 48 \mathrm{~h} \\ \hline 335 \\ 23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 72 \mathrm{~h} \\ \hline 520 \\ 19 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DTG | W\% | BT LAT | BT ION | POS ER | 24 ER | 48_ER | 12 ER | BT WN | WW ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | 72.ER |
| 89080100 | 1 | 21.2N | 151.0E | 36 | 120 | 230 | 279 | 30 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 10 |
| 89080106 | 2 | 21.8 N | 151.0E | 21 | 73 | 221 | 299 | 30 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 10 |
| 89080112 | 3 | 22.5N | 150.9 E | 12 | 141 | 244 | 426 | 35 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 10 |
| 89080118 | 4 | 23.2 N | 150.7 E | 12 | 137 | 352 | 551 | 40 | 5 | 15 | -5 | 10 |
| 89080200 | 5 | 24.0N | 150.2 E | 13 | 112 | 320 | 447 | 45 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| 89080206 | 6 | 25.0 N | 149.8 E | 0 | 153 | 274 | 150 | 45 | 0 | -5 | 0 | 10 |
| 89080212 | 7 | 26.1N | 149.2 E | 16 | 227 | 325 | 283 | 45 | 5 | -10 | 0 | 10 |
| 89080218 | 8 | 26.8 N | 148.2 E | 26 | 235 | 411 | 555 | 50 | -5 | -15 | 0 | 15 |
| 89080300 | 9 | 27.0N | 147.1 E | 12 | 142 | 276 | 438 | 60 | -5 | 0 | 10 | 25 |
| 89080306 | 10 | 26.9N | 146.1 E | 6 | 119 | 264 | 465 | 70 | 5 | 20 | 15 | 30 |
| 89080312 | 11 | 26.7N | 145.4 E | 0 | 110 | 347 | 622 | 75 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 50 |
| 89080318 | 12 | 26.5N | 145.0E | 10 | 139 | 435 | 725 | 80 | -5 | 5 | 15 | 60 |
| 89080400 | 13 | 26.3N | 144.6E | 24 | 167 | 520 | 792 | 75 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 60 |
| 89080406 | 14 | 26.3N | 144.3 E | 16 | 232 | 560 | 803 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 50 |
| 89080412 | 15 | 26.6 N | 144.15 | 24 | 292 | 622 | 839 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 50 |
| 89080418 | 16 | 27.1N | 144. OE | 13 | 229 | 490 | 624 | 75 | 0 | 5 | 45 | 50 |
| 89080500 | 17 | 27.9N | 143.9 E | 28 | 290 | 544 | 686 | 75 | 0 | 10 | 40 | 45 |
| 89080506 | 18 | 29.2N | 143.7 E | 15 | 272 | 475 | 660 | 75 | 0 | 20 | 40 | 20 |
| 89080512 | 19 | 30.8 N | 143.2 E | 16 | 122 | 251 | 226 | 75 | -5 | 20 | 20 | 15 |
| 89080518 | 20 | 32.6 N | 142.6 E | 19 | 46 | 212 | N/A | 70 | 5 | 30 | 5 | N/A |
| 89080600 | 21 | 34.2N | 141.8 E | 19 | 34 | 169 | N/A | 65 | 5 | 10 | 10 | N/A |
| 89080606 | 22 | 35.8 N | 140.9 E | 12 | 98 | 35 | N/A | 50 | 15 | 5 | 5 | N/A |
| 89080612 | 23 | 37.4N | 140.0 E | 11 | 136 | 125 | N/A | 40 | 5 | 5 | 5 | N/A |
| 89080618 | 24 | 39.1 N | 139.3 E | 24 | 274 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 5 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89080700 | 25 | 40.4N | 138.6E | 36 | 230 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 10 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89080706 | 26 | 41.2 N | 137.7 E | 21 | 224 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 5 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89080712 | 27 | 42.7N | 136.6E | 27 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89080718 | 28 | 43.6 N | 137.0E | 11 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 25 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |






| Tropical Depraseion 19W |  | 00 h | 24 h | 48 h | 72 h |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Average | 19 | 95 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
|  | \# Cases | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 |


| DTG |  | BT Lat | BT LON | POS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | 72 ER | BT WN | Wh ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72 ER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $89081700 \dagger$ | 1 | 29.3N | 124.2E | 27 | 105 | N/A | N/A | 25 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| $89081712 \dagger$ | 2 | 28.1N | 123.7E | 40 | 160 | N/A | N/A | 25 | 5 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| $89081800 \dagger$ | 3 | 27.3N | 123.2E | 17 | 68 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89081812† | 4 | 27.2N | 122.5E | 12 | 47 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| $89081900 \dagger$ | 5 | 27.0N | 121.8E | 12 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| $89081912 \dagger$ | 6 | 26.8N | 120.4E | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 25 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |

$\dagger$ Tropical Depresion Warning

| Tropical Storm Roger (20W) |  | 00 h | 24 h | 48 h | 72 h |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Average | 32 | 223 | 473 | 949 |
|  | \# Cases | 14 | 12 | 7 | 3 |


| DTG | W* | BT IAT | BT LON | POS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | 72 ER | BT WN | WW ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72 ER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $89082412 \dagger$ | 1 | 25.3N | 124.0E | 94 | 266 | N/A | N/A | 30 | -5 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89082500 | 2 | 25.1N | 124.7E | 24 | 172 | 422 | 823 | 35 | -5 | 0 | -5 | 15 |
| 89082506 | 3 | 24.8 N | 125.6 E | 26 | 254 | 543 | 937 | 35 | -5 | 0 | 5 | 15 |
| 89082512 | 4 | 24.5 N | 126.8E | 28 | 345 | 708 | 1087 | 35 | -5 | 0 | 5 | 15 |
| 89082518 | 5 | 24.4N | 128.0 E | 33 | 412 | 816 | N/A | 35 | -5 | -15 | 0 | N/A |
| 89082600 | 6 | 26.1N | 130.0 E | 17 | 165 | 406 | N/A | 40 | -10 | -20 | -15 | N/A |
| 89082606 | 7 | 28.2N | 131.2 E | 60 | 236 | 107 | N/A | 40 | 5 | -10 | -15 | N/A |
| 89082612 | 8 | 30.2N | 131.9 E | 23 | 213 | 312 | N/A | 40 | 5 | -10 | -15 | N/A |
| 89082618 | 9 | 31.7 N | 133.0E | 31 | 211 | N/A | N/A | 45 | 0 | -10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89082700 | 10 | 33.3 N | 134.1 E | 12 | 208 | N/A | N/A | 50 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89082706 | 11 | 35.2N | 135.7E | 18 | 105 | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 40 | 5 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89082712 | 12 | 37.0 N | 137.3E | 33 | 92 | N/A | N/A | 40 | 5 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89082718 | 13 | 39.2 N | 139.3E | 54 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 40 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89082800 | 14 | 41.6 N | 140.9E | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 40 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |


| Tropical Depression 21W |  | 00 h | 24 h | 48 h | 72 h |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Average | 23 | 135 | N/A | N/A |
|  | $\#$ Cases | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 |


| DTG | W\% | Bt Lat | BT LON | POS ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72 ER | BT WN | WW ER | 24EE | 48 ER | 72.ER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $89082506 \dagger$ | 1 | 28.5N | 151.6 E | 47 | 109 | N/A | N/A | 25 | 5 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89082518 t | 2 | 30.1 N | 153.9 E | 13 | 143 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| $89082606 \dagger$ | 3 | 31.4 N | 155.7E | 15 | 62 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| $89082618 \dagger$ | 4 | 31.4N | 158.8E | 33 | 81 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89082706 t | 5 | 32.0 N | 161.0 E | 28 | 111 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| $89082718 \dagger$ | 6 | 32.2N | 161.7 E | 11 | 303 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| $89082806 \dagger$ | 7 | 32.7N | 161. OE | 16 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 25 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |



| Typhoon Sarah (22W) (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DTG | 迷 | BT IAT | BT ION | POS ER | 24ER | 48 EB | 72 ER | BT WN | HW ER | 24.ER | 48_ER | 72 ER |
| 89090706 | 6 | 20.1N | 134.6E | 24 | 220 | 136 | 145 | 45 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 30 |
| 89090712 | 7 | 20.5N | 133.2E | 16 | 231 | 220 | 124 | 50 | -5 | 5 | 15 | 20 |
| 89090718 | 8 | 21.1N | 131.4 E | 47 | 234 | 303 | 484 | 55 | 0 | 10 | -5 | -40 |
| 89090800 | 9 | 21.4N | 129.1 E | 44 | 265 | 310 | 474 | 55 | 0 | 10 | -5 | -55 |
| 89090806 | 10 | 20.8 N | 126.9E | 42 | 301 | 497 | 688 | 55 | 0 | 5 | 25 | -35 |
| 89090812 | 11 | 19.7N | 125.3 E | 34 | 321 | 586 | 726 | 60 | -5 | 10 | 15 | -75 |
| 89090818 | 12 | 18.5N | 124.6 E | 61 | 90 | 354 | 507 | 65 | 0 | 20 | 5 | -10 |
| 89090900 | 13 | 17.9N | 124.3E | 6 | 162 | 387 | 511 | 65 | 0 | 5 | -55 | -10 |
| 89090906 | 14 | 17.7N | 123.9E | 36 | 238 | 430 | 574 | 65 | 0 | 0 | -60 | 5 |
| 89090912 | 15 | 17.9 N | 123.6 E | 39 | 253 | 419 | 517 | 60 | 5 | -20 | -65 | 10 |
| 89090918 | 16 | 18.4N | 123.6E | 78 | 281 | 386 | 542 | 55 | 10 | -30 | -30 | 25 |
| 89091000 | 17 | 19.1 N | 123.8E | 17 | 91 | 83 | 360 | 55 | 10 | -45 | -5 | 40 |
| 89091006 | 18 | 19.9 N | 123.8E | 18 | 68 | 148 | 406 | 55 | 10 | -45 | 15 | 45 |
| 89091012 | 19 | 20.6N | 123.6 E | 13 | 97 | 240 | 467 | 65 | 0 | -40 | 30 | 60 |
| 89091018 | 20 | 21.1 N | 123.2E | 6 | 78 | 224 | 483 | 75 | 0 | -5 | 45 | 65 |
| 89091100 | 21 | 21.8 N | 123.1E | 0 | 191 | 422 | 640 | 115 | 0 | 50 | 85 | 95 |
| 89091106 | 22 | 22.8 N | 122.7E | 12 | 167 | 384 | N/A | 120 | 0 | 55 | 70 | N/A |
| 89091112 | 23 | 23.3N | 122.0E | 12 | 225 | 443 | N/A | 125 | 0 | 60 | 75 | N/A |
| 89091118 | 24 | 23.0 N | 121.2 E | 45 | 71 | 292 | N/A | 90 | 0 | 45 | 50 | N/A |
| 89091200 | 25 | 23.0 N | 121.6 E | 13 | 146 | 269 | N/A | 80 | 0 | 40 | 55 | N/A |
| 89091206 | 26 | 24.1N | 122. OE | 18 | 190 | N/A | N/A | 65 | 0 | 25 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091212 | 27 | 24.5N | 121.3 E | 20 | 154 | N/A | N/A | 60 | 0 | 25 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091218 | 28 | 25.1 N | 120.9 E | 39 | 137 | N/A | N/A | 45 | 10 | 30 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091300 | 29 | 25.7N | 120.3E | 32 | 27 | N/A | N/A | 40 | 5 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091306 | 30 | 26.3N | 119.8 E | 56 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 35 | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89091312 | 31 | 27.1N | 119.6 E | 41 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89091318 | 32 | 27.9N | 119.8 E | 48 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 25 | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89091400 | 33 | 28.7N | 120.0E | 50 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 20 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |


| Tropical | ram | (23W) | Average \# Cases | $\begin{array}{r} \frac{00 \mathrm{~h}}{23} \\ 20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \mathrm{~h} \\ \hline 204 \\ 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 48 \mathrm{~h} \\ \hline 374 \\ 11 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 72 h \\ 502 \\ 8 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DTG | H13 | BT IAT | BT Lon | POS ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72 ER | BT WN | WW ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | 72.58 |
| 89090900 | 1 | 20.3N | 153.9E | 71 | 369 | 318 | 385 | 25 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 |
| 89090906 | 2 | 22.1N | 154.9 E | 37 | 298 | 226 | 375 | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89090912 | 3 | 24.5N | 155.0E | 0 | 78 | 183 | 418 | 30 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 20 |
| 89090918 | 4 | 26.7N | 154.0E | 0 | 113 | 258 | 392 | 30 | 0 | 15 | 25 | 20 |
| 89091000 | 5 | 28.2N | 152.3 E | 0 | 207 | 315 | 490 | 35 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 20 |
| 89091006 | 6 | 28.9N | 151.0E | 32 | 281 | 335 | 582 | 35 | 0 | 20 | 25 | 20 |
| 89091012 | 7 | 29.3N | 150.2E | 78 | 172 | 323 | 575 | 35 | 0 | 20 | 5 | -10 |
| 89091018 | 8 | 29.8N | 150.0E | 20 | 213 | 477 | 800 | 35 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| 89091100 | 9 | 30.4 N | 150.4 E | 6 | 24 | N/A | N/A | 35 | 0 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091106 | 10 | 31.6 N | 151.0E | 5 | 120 | 474 | N/A | 35 | 5 | 0 | -10 | N/A |
| 89091112 | 11 | 33.0N | 151.1E | 7 | 268 | 648 | N/A | 35 | 5 | -10 | -20 | N/A |
| 89091118 | 12 | 34.0 N | 151.1E | 11 | 256 | 565 | N/A | 35 | 0 | -15 | -15 | N/A |
| 89091200 | 13 | 35.0N | 151.8E | 7 | 327 | N/A | N/A | 35 | 5 | -15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091206 | 14 | 35.6N | 152.7E | 18 | 249 | N/A | N/A | 40 | 10 | -15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091212 | 15 | 36.0N | 154.5 E | 4 | 174 | N/A | N/A | 45 | 0 | -10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091218 | 16 | 36.6 N | 156.6 E | 9 | 214 | N/A | N/A | 45 | 0 | -10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091300 | 17 | 36.6 N | 159.0E | 15 | 143 | N/A | N/A | 50 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091306 | 18 | 36.5 N | 161.1E | 20 | 163 | N/A | N/A | 50 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091312 | 19 | 36.6 N | 163.1E | 15 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 45 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89091318 | 20 | 36.6 N | 165.1 E | 108 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 45 | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |



| Typhoon Waype |  | (25w) | 00h |  | 24h | $\frac{48 b}{623}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72 h \\ & N / A \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average | 19 | 231 |  |  |  | HW EB | 24EB | 48.ER | 72.E8 |
|  |  | 4 Cases | 12 | 10 | 4 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | 泩 |  | Bt Iat | Bt Lon | POS ER | $24 . E R$ | 48 ER |  |  |  |  | $72 . E B$ | BI WN |
| $89091706 \dagger$ | 1 |  | 23.7N | 124.9E | 5 | 115 | N/A | N/A | 25 | - | -10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091718 | 2 | 24.1N | 125.1E | 87 | 348 | N/A | N/A | 30 | -5 | -25 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091800 | 3 | 25.3N | 125.2 E | 5 | 424 | N/A | N/A | 35 | 0 | -20 | -20 | N/A |
| 89091806 | 4 | 26.6 N | 125.3 E | 16 | 144 | 593 | N/A | 40 | -5 | -20 | -20 | N/A |
| 89091812 | 5 | 27.7N | 125.8E | 12 | 292 | 753 | N/A | 45 | 0 | -15 | -20 | N/A |
| 89091818 | 6 | 29.0 N | 127.1E | 16 | 344 | 720 | N/A | 55 | 0 | -10 | -5 | N/A |
| 89091900 | 7 | 30.3N | 128.6 E | 15 | 309 | N/A | N/A | 65 | 0 | -15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091906 | 8 | 31.5N | 131.4 E | 6 | 157 | N/A | N/A | 65 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091912 | 9 | 32.9N | 134.6 E | 0 | 290 | N/A | N/A | 65 | 0 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89091918 | 10 | 34.4N | 138.6 E | 23 | 284 | N/A | N/A | 60 | -5 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89092000 | 11 | 36.3N | 143.0 E | 20 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 55 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89092006 | 12 | 38.4N | 147.8E | 26 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 50 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| + T | pica | Depressi | O Warnin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Supar Typhoon Angela (26W) (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DTG | W | BTILAT | BT ION | ROS_ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | 72 ER | BT WN | FWT ER | 24 ER | 48_ER | 72.E8 |
| 89100218 | 15 | 18.0 N | 132.7E | 0 | 81 | 218 | 436 | 120 | 0 | 15 | -15 | -35 |
| 89100300 | 16 | 18.1N | 131.9 E | 5 | 85 | 115 | 92 | 120 | 0 | 0 | -20 | -35 |
| 89100306 | 17 | 18.2N | 131.2 E | 6 | 32 | 126 | 216 | 120 | -5 | 0 | -25 | -25 |
| 89100312 | 18 | 18.2N | 130.7E | 8 | 63 | 156 | 204 | 120 | -5 | 0 | -25 | 20 |
| 89100318 | 19 | 18.2N | 130.1 E | 8 | 97 | 188 | 227 | 115 | 0 | -15 | -30 | 15 |
| 89100400 | 20 | 18.2N | 129.4 E | 5 | 125 | 263 | 388 | 115 | -5 | -30 | -45 | 5 |
| 89100406 | 21 | 18.2N | 128.5 E | 0 | 39 | 72 | 54 | 115 | 0 | -15 | -50 | 5 |
| 89100412 | 22 | 18.2N | 127.3E | 17 | 41 | 68 | 87 | 115 | 0 | -20 | -10 | 10 |
| 89100418 | 23 | 18.2N | 126.0E | 0 | 53 | 87 | 132 | 125 | 0 | -35 | -5 | 15 |
| 89100500 | 24 | 18.1N | 125.0 E | 6 | 74 | 118 | 193 | 125 | 0 | -60 | -20 | -25 |
| 89100506 | 25 | 18.1N | 123.9 E | 8 | 75 | 121 | 180 | 130 | 0 | -40 | -5 | -40 |
| 89100512 | 26 | 18.2N | 122.9E | 20 | 71 | 114 | 173 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -45 |
| 89100518 | 27 | 18.4 N | 122.0E | 0 | 47 | 188 | 298 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -45 |
| 89100600 | 28 | 18.6 N | 121.1 E | 13 | 49 | 108 | 125 | 125 | 0 | 35 | 15 | -30 |
| 89100606 | 29 | 18.7 N | 120.1 E | 12 | 75 | 141 | 126 | 115 | 0 | 20 | -20 | -50 |
| 89100612 | 30 | 18.7 N | 119.3 E | 5 | 75 | 128 | 101 | 75 | -10 | -10 | -45 | -60 |
| 89100618 | 31 | 18.6 N | 118.6 E | 13 | 30 | 47 | 33 | 75 | 0 | -10 | -45 | -55 |
| 89100700 | 32 | 18.5 N | 117.9 E | 8 | 16 | 68 | 146 | 75 | 0 | -15 | -50 | -60 |
| 89100706 | 33 | 18.3N | 117.2E | 12 | 25 | 94 | 177 | 70 | 0 | -35 | -60 | -60 |
| 89100712 | 34 | 18.2N | 116.5 E | 8 | 13 | 86 | 144 | 65 | 0 | -45 | -55 | -35 |
| 89100718 | 35 | 18.2N | 115.8 E | 12 | 78 | 149 | 213 | 65 | 0 | -45 | -50 | -5 |
| 89100800 | 36 | 18.2N | 115.1 E | 8 | 51 | 114 | N/A | 70 | 0 | -10 | -10 | N/A |
| 89100806 | 37 | 18.1 N | 114.4 E | 12 | 80 | 160 | N/A | 85 | 0 | -5 | 0 | N/A |
| 89100812 | 38 | 17.9N | 113.5 E | 12 | 86 | 154 | N/A | 90 | 0 | -5 | 15 | N/A |
| 89100818 | 39 | 17.7N | 112.5 E | 5 | 12 | 58 | N/A | 90 | 0 | -10 | 0 | N/A |
| 89100900 | 40 | 17.6 N | 111.6 E | 6 | 17 | N/A | N/A | 90 | 0 | -15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89100906 | 41 | 17.5N | 110.7 E | 8 | 38 | N/A | N/A | 95 | 0 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89100912 | 42 | 17.5N | 109.6E | 8 | 29 | N/A | N/A | 90 | 0 | -15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89100918 | 43 | 17.4N | 108.6E | 6 | 12 | N/A | N/A | 85 | 0 | 20 | N/A | N/A |
| 89101000 | 44 | 17.4 N | 107.8 E | 11 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 85 | -10 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89101006 | 45 | 17.4N | 106.9E | 20 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 80 | -5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89101012 | 46 | 17.4N | 106.0E | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 60 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |




Typhoon Dan (29W)

| DTG | WI |
| :--- | ---: |
| 89100812 | 1 |
| 89100818 | 2 |
| 89100900 | 3 |
| 89100906 | 4 |
| 89100912 | 5 |
| 89100918 | 6 |
| 89101000 | 7 |
| 89101006 | 8 |
| 89101012 | 9 |
| 89101018 | 10 |
| 89101100 | 11 |
| 89101106 | 12 |
| 89101112 | 13 |
| 89101118 | 14 |
| 89101200 | 15 |
| 89101206 | 16 |
| 89101212 | 17 |
| 89101218 | 18 |
| 89101300 | 19 |
| 89101306 | 20 |
| 89101312 | 21 |


| Super IYyhoon Elsie (30w) |  |  | 00 h |  | 24 h |  | $\frac{72 h}{231}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average | 12 | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | * Cases | 34 | 31 | 27 | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | Wil | BT LAT | BT LON | POS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | 72 ER | BT WN | Wh ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | 72.E8 |
| 89101400 | 1 | 16.4 N | 132.2 E | 0 | 138 | 288 | 392 | 30 | 0 | 0 | -15 | -55 |
| 89101406 | 2 | 16.3 N | 131.8 E | 8 | 121 | 272 | 353 | 30 | 5 | 0 | -15 | -50 |
| 89101412 | 3 | 16.2 N | 131.6 E | 13 | 24 | 54 | 44 | 35 | 0 | -10 | -40 | -65 |
| 89101418 | 4 | 16.2N | 131.4 E | 11 | 29 | 75 | 46 | 35 | 0 | -10 | -45 | -60 |
| 89101500 | 5 | 16.1 N | 131.2E | 17 | 46 | 62 | 40 | 40 | -5 | -10 | -50 | -55 |
| 89101506 | 6 | 16.1N | 130.9 E | 12 | 54 | 56 | 12 | 45 | -5 | -20 | -55 | -60 |
| 89101512 | 7 | 16.1 N | 130.8 E | 21 | 67 | 54 | 42 | 50 | -5 | -35 | -60 | -55 |
| 89101518 | 8 | 16.1N | 130.7E | 11 | 48 | 29 | 71 | 55 | 0 | -30 | -35 | -40 |
| 89101600 | 9 | 16.2 N | 130.6E | 8 | 66 | 63 | 135 | 60 | -5 | -35 | -35 | -40 |
| 89101606 | 10 | 16.5N | 130.3 E | 12 | 65 | 98 | 201 | 70 | -5 | -35 | -40 | 20 |
| 89101612 | 11 | 16.7 N | 130.0E | 5 | 69 | 109 | 226 | 90 | 0 | -10 | -10 | 60 |
| 89101618 | 12 | 16.9N | 129.4 E | 5 | 66 | 77 | 242 | 100 | 0 | 0 | -10 | 75 |
| 89101700 | 13 | 16.9 N | 128.8E | 12 | 74 | 114 | 311 | 110 | 0 | -40 | -65 | 25 |
| 89101706 | 14 | 16.9N | 128.1E | 13 | 74 | 71 | 261 | 115 | -5 | -30 | -5 | 20 |
| 89101712 | 15 | 16.7 N | 127.5E | 26 | 79 | 119 | 243 | 125 | -15 | -30 | 15 | 35 |
| 89101718 | 16 | 16.4 N | 126.9E | 26 | 52 | 93 | 175 | 125 | -5 | -30 | 25 | 45 |
| 89101800 | 17 | 16.1N | 126.4E | 8 | 42 | 173 | 252 | 125 | -5 | -40 | 25 | 45 |
| 89101806 | 18 | 16.1N | 125.7 E | 13 | 137 | 260 | 348 | 130 | 0 | 40 | 15 | 50 |
| 89101812 | 19 | 16.2N | 124.9E | 21 | 176 | 289 | 395 | 130 | 0 | 60 | 20 | 55 |
| 89101818 | 20 | 16.4N | 124.1E | 5 | 142 | 254 | 374 | 140 | -5 | 20 | 30 | 65 |
| 89101900 | 21 | 16.6 N | 122.9E | 8 | 111 | 220 | 387 | 140 | -5 | 30 | 40 | 65 |
| 89101906 | 22 | 16.7N | 121.5E | 23 | 123 | 236 | 398 | 80 | 40 | 35 | 45 | 65 |
| 89101912 | 23 | 16.8 N | 119.9 E | 13 | 62 | 217 | 374 | 60 | 20 | 40 | 55 | 80 |
| 89101918 | 24 | 16.8 N | 118.4 E | 11 | 65 | 222 | N/A | 55 | 30 | 40 | 65 | N/A |
| 89102000 | 25 | 16.9 N | 117.1E | 6 | 36 | 156 | N/A | 55 | 35 | 45 | 70 | N/A |
| 89102006 | 26 | 16.9N | 116.0E | 8 | 42 | 152 | N/A | 55 | 15 | 10 | 15 | N/A |
| 89102012 | 27 | 17.0N | 114.8 E | 11 | 60 | 104 | N/A | 55 | 5 | 10 | 5 | N/R |
| 89102018 | 28 | 17.2N | 113.7 E | 13 | 87 | N/A | N/A | 55 | 0 | 15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89102100 | 29 | 17.5N | 112.5E | 8 | 45 | N/A | N/A | 55 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89102106 | 30 | 17.8 N | 111.4E | 6 | 70 | N/A | N/A | 50 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89102112 | 31 | 18.2N | 109.9E | 11 | 54 | N/A | N/A | 40 | 0 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89102118 | 32 | 18.3N | 108.5E | 13 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 35 | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89102200 | 33 | 18.3N | 107.2E | 12 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 35 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89102206 | 34 | 18.3N | 105.9E | 29 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 35 | -5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |



Typhoon Forrest (31M) (continued)

| DTG | Hin | BT IAT | BTION | POS ER | 24.ER | 48.ER | 72 ER | BT WN | HiNEE | 24-ER | 48 ER | 72 ER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89102606 | 18 | 20.4N | 139.1 E | 12 | 34 | 31 | 558 | 90 |  | 5 | 20 | 20 |
| 89102612 | 19 | 21.1N | 138.5E | 24 | 247 | 679 | N/A | 90 | -5 | -30 | -30 | N/A |
| 89102618 | 20 | 21.9 N | 138.1 E | 20 | 116 | 261 | N/A | 90 | -5 | -15 | -20 | N/A |
| 89102700 | 21 | 22.7N | 137.7E | 0 | 70 | 139 | N/A | 95 | 0 | -5 | 0 | N/A |
| 89102706 | 22 | 23.6 N | 137.5E | 18 | 33 | 96 | N/A | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| 89102712 | 23 | 24.6N | 137.4E | 12 | 99 | 33 | N/A | 95 | 0 | -10 | -5 | N/A |
| 89102718 | 24 | 25.8N | 137.5E | 20 | 106 | N/A | N/A | 90 | 0 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89102800 | 25 | 27.1N | 138.1 E | 41 | 94 | N/A | N/A | 90 | 0 | 5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89102806 | 26 | 28.4N | 139.4 E | 33 | 155 | N/A | N/A | 80 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 89102812 | 27 | 29.9N | 141.4E | 43 | 180 | N/A | N/A | 75 | 0 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89102818 | 28 | 31.7 N | 144.3 E | 70 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 70 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89102900 | 29 | 33.9N | 148.3 E | 50 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 60 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89102906 | 30 | 36.8 N | 153. OE | 48 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 60 | -10 | N/A | N/A | N/A |




| Super TYph | n Ima | (34W) | Average \# Cases | $\begin{array}{r} 00 \mathrm{~h} \\ \hline 18 \\ 39 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \mathrm{~h} \\ 112 \\ 37 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 48 \mathrm{~h} \\ 212 \\ 27 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 72 \mathrm{~h} \\ 394 \\ 23 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DTG | W\# | BT LAT | BT LON | POS ER | $24 . E R$ | 48 ER | 72 ER | BT WN | WW ER | 24_ER | 48_ER | 72 EB |
| $89112106 \dagger$ | 1 | 17.7 N | 164.8 E | 11 | 181 | N/A | N/A | 25 | -5 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| $89112118 \dagger$ | 2 | 19.2 N | 163.0 E | 30 | 120 | N/A | N/A | 25 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| $89112206 t$ | 3 | 19.7N | 162.3 E | 12 | 160 | N/A | N/A | 25 | -5 | -10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89112500* | 4 | 13.7 N | 150.6E | 26 | 55 | N/A | N/A | 30 | -5 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| $89112512 \dagger$ | 5 | 12.8 N | 148.4E | 26 | 205 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | -5 | N/A | N/A |
| 89112600 t | 6 | 11.7 N | 147.0E | 17 | 110 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | -15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89112612 | 7 | 10.7 N | 145.9 E | 16 | 94 | 144 | 213 | 35 | -5 | -15 | -25 | -45 |
| 89112618 | 8 | 10.4N | 145.2E | 24 | 117 | 168 | 249 | 35 | 0 | -10 | -20 | -60 |
| 89112700 | 9 | 10.1N | 144.5 E | 8 | 32 | 125 | 163 | 45 | 0 | 5 | -10 | -25 |
| 89112706 | 10 | 10.0 N | 144.0E | 0 | 64 | 172 | 186 | 45 | 0 | 0 | -15 | -25 |
| 89112712 | 11 | 10.0N | 143.4 E | 41 | 143 | 236 | 251 | 50 | 0 | 0 | -15 | -30 |
| 89112718 | 12 | 10.1N | 142.7E | 18 | 74 | 152 | 174 | 55 | 0 | 0 | -30 | -25 |
| 89112800 | 13 | 10.2 N | 141.9 E | 8 | 130 | 181 | 186 | 60 | 0 | -20 | -40 | -5 |
| 89112806 | 14 | 10.4 N | 141.0E | 8 | 135 | 177 | 142 | 65 | 0 | -20 | -40 | 5 |
| 89112812 | 15 | 10.8 N | 140.0 E | 6 | 71 | 100 | 92 | 70 | 0 | -15 | -30 | 10 |
| 89112818 | 16 | 11.3 N | 138.9 E | 11 | 26 | 84 | 105 | 75 | 0 | -35 | -45 | -15 |
| 89112900 | 17 | 11.8 N | 137.8E | 0 | 32 | 34 | 107 | 100 | 0 | -15 | -5 | -5 |
| 89112906 | 18 | 12.3 N | 136.7E | 5 | 37 | 36 | 125 | 105 | 0 | -15 | -5 | -5 |
| 89112912 | 19 | 12.6 N | 135.7 E | 13 | 48 | 115 | 256 | 105 | 0 | -50 | -40 | -25 |
| 89112918 | 20 | 12.9N | 135.0E | 5 | 40 | 77 | 250 | 125 | -20 | -40 | -30 | -25 |
| 89113000 | 21 | 13.2 N | 134.2 E | 8 | 36 | 112 | 358 | 140 | -20 | -5 | 0 | 5 |
| 89113006 | 22 | 13.5N | 133.4 E | 11 | 63 | 206 | 481 | 140 | 0 | -5 | 0 | 5 |
| $\dagger$ Tropical Depression Warning <br> * Regenerated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Super Ty | yphoon Izma | (34W) | (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DTG | Wi | BT IAT | BT LON | POS ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72 ER | BT WN | 4W ER | 24.ER | 48 ER | 72 ER |
| 89113012 | 23 | 13.8 N | 132.5E | 5 | 100 | 235 | 546 | 140 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 10 |
| 89113018 | 84 | 14.1 N | 132.0E | 12 | 54 | 238 | 590 | 135 | 0 | 10 | 0 | -10 |
| 89120100 | - 25 | 14.3 N | 131.6 E | 8 | 105 | 343 | 782 | 120 | 5 | 0 | -5 | 0 |
| 89120106 | - 26 | 14.5N | 131.2E | 32 | 123 | 428 | 906 | 115 | 0 | -5 | 0 | 10 |
| 89120112 | 27 | 14.7 N | 131.0E | 5 | 132 | 481 | 933 | 110 | 0 | -5 | -5 | 15 |
| 89120118 | - 28 | 14.9 N | 130.7 E | 11 | 135 | 498 | 946 | 105 | 0 | -10 | -5 | 25 |
| 89120200 | - 29 | 15.2 N | 130.6 E | 11 | 195 | 614 | 1027 | 100 | 0 | -10 | 0 | 30 |
| 89120206 | - 30 | 15.6 N | 130.7E | 23 | 196 | 516 | N/A | 95 | -5 | -15 | 0 | N/A |
| 89120212 | 231 | 16.1 N | 130.9E | 8 | 13 | 31 | N/A | 90 | 0 | 5 | 15 | N/A |
| 89120218 | -32 | 16.7 N | 131.3 E | 21 | 43 | 117 | N/A | 90 | 0 | 0 | 25 | N/A |
| 89120300 | 33 | 17.2N | 131.9E | 16 | 78 | 108 | N/A | 85 | 0 | 5 | 35 | N/A |
| 89120306 | - 34 | 18.1N | 132.8 E | 11 | 30 | N/A | N/A | 80 | 0 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89120312 | - 35 | 19.1N | 133.7 E | 8 | 94 | N/A | N/A | 75 | 0 | 15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89120318 | - 36 | 20.1N | 134.5E | 21 | 189 | N/A | N/A | 75 | 0 | 15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89120400 | - 37 | 21.0 N | 136.1 E | 21 | 694 | N/A | N/A | 65 | 0 | 20 | N/A | N/A |
| 89120406 | - 38 | 21.7N | 137.4E | 43 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 55 | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89120412 | 239 | 22.5N | 138.8E | 131 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 45 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Tropical Deprassion |  | 35W |  | OOh | 24h | 48h | 72h |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Average | 73 | 212 | 439 | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | * Cases | 9 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | W者 | BT IAT | BT LON | POS ER | 24-ER | 48 ER | 72 EB | BT WN | WW ER | $24 . E B$ | 48 ER | 72 ER |
| 89120700 | 1 | 11.0 N | 139.1 E | 106 | 232 | 439 | N/A | 30 | -5 | 5 | 25 | N/A |
| 89120706 | - 2 | 10.9 N | 138.7 E | 40 | 46 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89120712 | 3 | 10.9 N | 138.4 E | 79 | 129 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89120718 | - 4 | 11.0 N | 138.2 E | 97 | 272 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89120800 | 5 | 11.1 N | 138.0E | 144 | 381 | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | 15 | N/A | N/A |
| 89120806 | 6 | 11.5 N | 138.0E | 64 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89120812 | 7 | 12.2 N | 138.3 E | 61 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89120818 | 8 | 12.8 N | 138.7 E | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 89120900 | - 9 | 13.5 N | 139.0E | 61 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 25 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| TYphoon Jack (36W) |  |  |  | 00h | 24h | 48h | 72h |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Average | 28 | 95 | 167 | 317 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | * Cases | 21 | 20 | 18 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | Hel | BT LAT | BT LON | POS EB | 24 ER | 48 EB | 72 ER | BT WN | W W EB | 24-EB | 48 ER | 72 ER |
| 89122300 | 1 | 10.2 N | 152.7E | 6 | 98 | N/A | N/A | 30 | -5 | -35 | N/A | N/A |
| 89122306 | - 2 | 10.9N | 151.9E | 0 | 108 | 191 | 338 | 35 | 0 | -20 | -50 | -55 |
| 89122312 | 3 | 11.5 N | 151.2 E | 13 | 133 | 258 | 458 | 45 | 0 | -25 | -50 | -60 |
| 89122318 | 4 | 11.9 N | 150.9 E | 47 | 6 | 58 | 215 | 55 | 0 | -15 | -40 | -55 |
| 89122400 | 5 | 12.2N | 150.5 E | 13 | 48 | 105 | 304 | 65 | 0 | -15 | -35 | -25 |
| 89122406 | - 6 | 12.5 N | 150.1 E | 8 | 26 | 138 | 336 | 70 | -5 | -25 | -35 | -10 |
| 89122412 | 7 | 12.7N | 149.6 E | 18 | 37 | 168 | 355 | 80 | -5 | -20 | -20 | 25 |
| 89122418 | 8 | 12.8 N | 149.2 E | 8 | 102 | 217 | 352 | 90 | 0 | -25 | -15 | 45 |
| 89122500 | - 9 | 12.9 N | 148.8 E | 0 | 94 | 222 | 234 | 100 | -5 | -10 | 15 | 75 |
| 89122506 | 10 | 13.4 N | 148.5 E | 18 | 87 | 212 | 168 | 110 | -5 | -5 | 30 | 80 |
| 89122512 | 11 | 13.6 N | 148.3 E | 8 | 88 | 198 | 193 | 120 | -10 | -5 | 60 | 85 |
| 89122518 | 12 | 13.7 N | 148.2 E | 11 | 81 | 159 | 303 | 125 | -5 | 5 | 75 | 80 |
| 89122600 | 13 | 13.8 N | 148.1 E | 8 | 75 | 56 | 303 | 125 | 0 | 20 | 85 | 75 |
| 89122606 | 14 | 13.8 N | 148.0E | 5 | 56 | 36 | 371 | 125 | -5 | 30 | 85 | 75 |
| 89122612 | 15 | 13.8 N | 148. OE | 5 | 51 | 139 | 511 | 125 | -5 | 50 | 85 | 80 |
| 89122618 | 16 | 13.7N | 147.9 E | 13 | 44 | 200 | N/A | 120 | -5 | 65 | 75 | N/A |
| 89122700 | 17 | 13.5 N | 147.7E | 11 | 67 | 198 | N/A | 105 | 0 | 60 | 65 | N/A |
| 89122706 | 18 | 13.4 N | 147.4E | 0 | 165 | 194 | N/A | 90 | 0 | 40 | 40 | N/A |
| 89122712 | 19 | 13.5N | 147.0E | 46 | 209 | 259 | N/A | 65 | 10 | 20 | 25 | N/A |
| 89122718 | 20 | 14.0N | 146.5 E | 120 | 328 | N/A | N/A | 45 | 10 | 10 | N/A | N/A |
| 89122800 | 21 | 14.8 N | 145.7E | 237 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |

### 7.2.2 NORTH INDIAN OCEAN

This section includes verification statistics for each warning in the North Indian

Ocean during 1989. Pre- and post- warning best track positions are not printed, but are available on floppy diskettes by request.

JIAC FORECAST TRACK AND INTENSITY ERRORS BY WARNILK


Tropical Cyclone 32N (Gay): Please see page 237 for data.

### 7.2.3 SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE

This section includes verification statistics for each warning in the South Indian and western South Pacific Oceans from 1 July

1988 to 30 June 1989. Pre- and post- warning best track positions are not printed, but are available on floppy diskettes by request.

JTWC FORECAST TRACK AND INTEENSITY ERRORS BY KARNING

| Tropical Cyclose 01S (Adelinina) | 00 h | $\frac{24 \mathrm{~h}}{}$ | $\frac{48 \mathrm{~h}}{}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Average | 83 | 235 | 384 |
| \# Cases | 9 | 8 | 6 |


| DTG | W\% | bt Iat | BT ION | POS ER | 24_EB | 48 ER | BT WN | HW ER | 24_ER | 48 ER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88110100 | 1 | 8.75 | 76.7E | 29 | 48 | 281 | 50 | -5 | 0 | -10 |
| 88110112 | 2 | 9.15 | 76.6 E | 62 | 133 | 407 | 55 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 88110200 | 3 | 9.85 | 76.7E | 13 | 264 | 562 | 55 | 0 | -10 | -5 |
| 88110212 | 4 | 11.08 | 77.6 E | 21 | 146 | 175 | 65 | 0 | 10 | 25 |
| 88110300 | 5 | 12.75 | 79.0E | 35 | 131 | 300 | 75 | 0 | 10 | 45 |
| 88110312 | 6 | 14.05 | 80.4 E | 16 | 210 | 576 | 75 | 0 | -10 | -10 |
| 88110400 | 7 | 14.65 | 81.7E | 87 | 367 | N/A | 75 | -10 | -5 | N/A |
| 88110412 | 8 | 14.35 | 82.7 E | 211 | 579 | N/A | 65 | -20 | -15 | N/A |
| 88110418 | 9 | 14.05 | 83.2 E | 275 | N/A | N/A | 55 | -30 | N/A | N/A |



| Tropical Cyclone 03S (Ilona) | $\frac{00 \mathrm{~h}}{}$ | $\frac{24 \mathrm{~h}}{}$ | $\frac{48 \mathrm{~h}}{}$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Average | 14 | 106 | 203 |
| Hases | 11 | 8 | 6 |


| DTG | W2 | BT lat | BT ION | POS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | BT WN | WW EB | 24 WE | 48 WE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88121312 | 1 | 16.55 | 120.0 E | 54 | 197 | 299 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 88121400 | 2 | 16.05 | 117.9 E | 8 | 12 | 71 | 45 | -5 | -10 | -15 |
| 88121412 | 3 | 16.15 | 116.4 E | 12 | 132 | 269 | 50 |  | 0 | -5 |
| 88121500 | 4 | 16.25 | 115.8 E | 5 | 38 | 191 | 55 |  | -5 | -10 |
| 88121512 | 5 | 16.45 | 115.4 E | 24 | 55 | 45 | 60 | 0 | -15 | -30 |
| 88121600 | 6 | 16.75 | 115.1E | 29 | 120 | 346 | 70 | -5 | -10 | 35 |
| 88121612 | 7 | 17.25 | 115.1E | 5 | 106 | N/A | 75 | 0 | -10 | N/A |
| 88121700 | 8 | 18.35 | 115.3 E | 16 | 183 | N/A | 85 | 0 | 35 | N/A |
| 88121706* | 9 | 19.15 | 115.7E | 5 | N/A | N/A | 85 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 88121712 | 10 | 20.2 s | 116.0E | 0 | N/A | N/A | 85 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 88121800 | 11 | 22.75 | 117.0E | 0 | N/A | N/A | 40 | 0 | N/A | N/A |

* Intermediate Update

| Tropical Cyclone 04P | (Delilah) | 00 h | 24 h | 48 h |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Average | 20 | 74 | 110 |  |
| ( Cases | 4 | 3 | 1 |  |


| DTG | WI | BT LAT | BT LON | R |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 89010118 | 1 | $18.7 S$ | 161.2 E |  |
| 89010206 | 2 | 20.2 S | 165.0 E |  |
| 89010218 | 3 | 22.3 S | 167.8 E |  |
| 89010300 | 4 | 23.4 S | 168.8 E |  |


| ROS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 38 | 106 | 110 |
| 16 | 34 | N/A |
| 5 | 83 | $N / A$ |
| 18 | $N / A$ | $N / A$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $\frac{00 h}{30}$ | 24 h | 48 h |
| 6 | 4 | 464 |
|  | 2 |  |


| DTG | W\% | BT IAT | BT LON | POS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | BT WN | HW ER | 24.WE | 48 WE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89010706 | 1 | 15.35 | 172.1W | 18 | 131 | 445 | 35 | 0 | -10 | 0 |
| 89010718 | 2 | 16.45 | 171.7W | 29 | 131 | 483 | 40 | 0 | 5 | 20 |
| 89010806 | 3 | 17.6 S | 171.4W | 8 | 112 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | 45 | -5 | 0 | $N \backslash A$ |
| 89010818 | 4 | 18.95 | 171.1W | 33 | 146 | $N \backslash A$ | 40 | 0 | 10 | $\mathbf{N} \backslash$ A |
| 89010906 | 5 | 19.75 | 172.8W | 8 | $N \backslash A$ | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | 35 | 0 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathbf{N} \backslash$ A |
| 89010918 | 6 | 20.5 s | 175.1W | 82 | $\mathbf{N} \backslash$ A | $N \backslash A$ | 25 | 10 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathbf{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ |


| Tropical | Cyclona 06S |  |  | 00h | 24h | 48h |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average * Cases | 18 | 100 | 156 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 975 |
| DTG | Wil | BT IAT |  | BT ION | POS ER | 24.ER | $48 . E R$ | BT WN | WW EB | 24 WE | 48 WE |
| 89011018 | 1 | 16.45 | 40.9E | 13 | 38 | 106 | 45 | 0 | -10 | -25 |
| 89011106 | 2 | 16.95 | 41.2 E | 20 | 204 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | 55 | -10 | -25 | $N \backslash A$ |
| 89011118 | 3 | 17.25 | 41.6 E | 21 | 132 | 271 | 65 | -10 | -20 | -45 |
| 89011206 | 4 | 17.35 | 41.9E | 12 | 69 | 111 | 65 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| 89011218 | 5 | 17.55 | 42.2E | 26 | 38 | 156 | 75 | -10 | 0 | 5 |
| 89011306 | 6 | 17.75 | 42.6E | 20 | 80 | 135 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 89011318 | 7 | 17.95 | 42.8 E | 11 | 135 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | 75 | 0 | 5 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ |
| 89011406 | 8 | 18.95 | 43.8E | 6 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | $N \backslash A$ | 75 | 0 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | $N \backslash A$ |
| 89011418 | 9 | 20.35 | 44.6E | 29 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathbf{N} \backslash \mathbf{A}$ | 65 | -10 | $N \backslash A$ | $\mathrm{N} \backslash$ A |



| Tropical | clon | ( Parry ) |  | Q0h | 24h | $\frac{48 \mathrm{~h}}{269}$ |  | WW ER | 24.WE | 48 WE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average |  | 23 | 111 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 24 | 23 | 21 |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | W\# | BT LAT | BT ION | POS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | BT WN |  |  |  |
| 89020800 | 1 | 17.35 | 161.4E | 24 | 157 | 281 | 30 | 5 | -5 | -15 |
| 89020812 | 2 | 18.35 | 162.3 E | 28 | 198 | 307 | 45 | 0 | -10 | -55 |
| 89020900 | 3 | 18.2 S | 163.7 E | 66 | 156 | 283 | 55 | -10 | -30 | -65 |
| 89020912 | 4 | 18.35 | 165.0E | 12 | 100 | 308 | 60 |  | -35 | -30 |
| 89021000 | 5 | 18.75 | 165.6 E | 18 | 192 | 450 | 80 | -5 | -10 | -5 |
| 89021012 | 6 | 19.35 | 165.5E | 13 | 155 | 348 | 110 | 0 | 20 | 45 |
| 89021100 | 7 | 20.15 | 164.9 E | 5 | 112 | 306 | 115 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 89021106* | 8 | 20.55 | 164.4 E | 25 | 143 | 338 | 110 | 0 | 0 | -20 |
| 89021112 | 9 | 20.9 S | 163.6 E | 5 | 145 | 352 | 105 | -5 | -10 | -55 |
| 89021200 | 10 | 20.95 | 162.5 E | 0 | 74 | 214 | 95 | 5 | -5 | -60 |
| 89021212 | 11 | 20.6 S | 161.5E | 6 | 55 | 99 | 80 | 0 | -30 | -65 |
| 89021300 | 12 | 20.05 | 160.6 E | 18 | 79 | 104 | 80 | 0 | -40 | -55 |
| 89021312 | 13 | 19.45 | 159.7E | 13 | 57 | 145 | 95 | -5 | -40 | -5 |
| 89021400 | 14 | 19.2 S | 158.8E | 24 | 74 | 221 | 115 | 0 | 20 | 30 |
| 89021412 | 15 | 19.05 | 157.9 E | 5 | 92 | 248 | 130 | 0 | 25 | 35 |
| 89021500 | 16 | 19.35 | 157.4E | 11 | 152 | 376 | 120 | -5 | -10 | 10 |
| 89021512 | 17 | 19.55 | 157.5E | 24 | 158 | 426 | 115 | -5 | 0 | 10 |
| 89021600 | 18 | 19.75 | 157.7E | 28 | 140 | 375 | 110 | 5 | 10 | -5 |
| 89021612 | 19 | 19.85 | 158.2E | 11 | 96 | 237 | 95 | 0 | -5 | 35 |
| 89021700 | 20 | 20.35 | 159.5E | 17 | 21 | 111 | 80 | 0 | 10 | 55 |
| 89021712 | 21 | 21.25 | 160.9 E | 21 | 37 | 120 | 80 | 10 | 45 | 45 |
| 89021800 | 22 | 22.35 | 162.6 E | 48 | 76 | $N \backslash A$ | 70 | 0 | 10 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ |
| 89021812 | 23 | 23.95 | 163.9 E | 47 | 80 | $N \backslash A$ | 55 | 0 | 0 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash$ A |
| 89021900 | 24 | 25.85 | 165.4 E | 88 | $N \backslash A$ | $N \backslash A$ | 35 | 0 | $N \backslash \mathrm{~A}$ | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ |
| * | em | te Upda |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Tropical | Cyclona 13P (Ivy) |  |  | O0h | 24h | 48h |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Average <br> * Cases | 50 | 120 | 207 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 13 | 11 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| DTG | W早 | BT IAT |  | BT LON | PQS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | BT WN | WW EB | 24.NE | 48 WIE |
| 89022318 | 1 | 17.55 | 166.8 E | 57 | 196 | 367 | 30 | 5 | 15 | 10 |
| 89022406 | 2 | 18.05 | 166.OE | 29 | 199 | 400 | 35 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 89022418 | 3 | 18.95 | 166.7E | 17 | 127 | 98 | 40 | 5 | -15 | -45 |
| 89022506 | 4 | 19.5 S | 167.2E | 0 | 82 | 212 | 50 | -5 | -15 | -45 |
| 89022518 | 5 | 19.9 S | 167.6E | 8 | 84 | 183 | 60 | -5 | -25 | -15 |
| 89022606 | 6 | 20.25 | 168.7E | 18 | 74 | 88 | 70 | 20 | 25 | 15 |
| 89022618 | 7 | 20.95 | 170.1E | 16 | 87 | 176 | 90 | 5 | 25 | 35 |
| 89022706 | 8 | 21.55 | 171.2E | 6 | 21 | 157 | 90 | 0 | -10 | 15 |
| 89022718 | 9 | 22.35 | 171.9E | 21 | 30 | 179 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 89022806 | 10 | 22.95 | 172.7E | 24 | 151 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | 85 | 0 | 25 | N\A |
| 89022818 | 11 | 23.85 | 172.8 E | 12 | 268 | $N \backslash A$ | 70 | 5 | 25 | $N \backslash A$ |
| 89030106 | 12 | 23.55 | 171.4 E | 138 | $\mathbf{N} \backslash \boldsymbol{A}$ | $\mathbf{N} \backslash$ A | 45 | 10 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathbf{N} \backslash \mathbf{A}$ |
| 89030118 | 13 | 22.5 S | 170.4E | 310 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | $N \backslash A$ | 30 | 5 | N\A | $\mathbf{N} \backslash \mathbf{A}$ |




## Tropical Cyclone $15 P$（Judy）continued

| DTG | W年 | BT IAT | BT LON | POS ER | 24．EB | 48 ER | BT WN | WIN ER | 24 WE | 48 ME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89022500 | 3 | 23.05 | 155．2W | 13 | 268 | 626 | 70 | －5 | －25 | $-20$ |
| 89022512 | 4 | 22.75 | 156．2W | 21 | 89 | 148 | 80 | －15 | －10 | 25 |
| 89022600 | 5 | 22.45 | 157．2W | 28 | 47 | $N \backslash A$ | 90 | －10 | 5 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ |
| 89022612 | 6 | 22.45 | 158．3W | 28 | 152 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | 80 | －10 | 30 | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ |
| 89022700 | 7 | 22.85 | 159．6W | 16 | $N \backslash A$ | $N \backslash A$ | 75 | －5 | $N \backslash A$ | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ |
| 89022712 | 8 | 24.75 | 160.4 W | 32 | $N \backslash A$ | $\mathrm{N} \backslash \mathrm{A}$ | 45 | 15 | $N \backslash A$ | $N \backslash A$ |



| Tropical Cyclone 17s（Maraia） | 00 h | 24 h | 48 h |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Average | 13 | 92 | 332 |
| \＃Cases | 3 | 2 | 1 |


| DTG | W ${ }^{\text {W }}$ | BT LAT | BT LON | POS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | BT WN | Wh ER | 24．WE | 48 ME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89030300 | 1 | 17.15 | 100．1E | 0 | 80 | 332 | 30 | 0 | 15 | 30 |
| 89030312 | 2 | 18.5 S | 98．7E | 18 | 104 | N／A | 35 | －5 | 20 | N／A |
| 89030400 | 3 | 19.75 | 97．6E | 23 | N／A | N／A | 30 | 0 | $N / A$ | N／A |


|  |  | 00 h | $\frac{24 \mathrm{~h}}{}$ | $\frac{48 \mathrm{~h}}{185}$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Average | 40 | 220 | 185 |
|  | \＃Cases | 4 | 3 | 1 |


| DTG | 近美 | BT LAT | BT LON | POS ER | 24 ER | 48 ER | BT WN | WW EB | 24 WE | 48 WE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89030906 | 1 | 23.95 | 42．2E | 63 | 163 | 185 | 35 | 0 | 5 | 10 |
| 89030918 | 2 | 26.45 | 43．3E | 30 | 228 | N／A | 35 | 0 | 0 | N／A |
| 89031006 | 3 | 28.95 | 43．7E | 37 | 270 | $N / A$ | 35 | 0 | 0 | N／A |
| 89031018 | 4 | 30.45 | 44．7E | 31 | N／A | N／A | 30 | 0 | N／A | $N / A$ |





| Tropical Cyclone 22P (Kerry) | O0h | 24 h | 48 h |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Average | 56 | 158 | 386 |
| \# Cases | 5 | 4 | 3 |


| DTG | WH | BT LAT | BT LON | POSER | 24_ER | 48 ER | BT WN | WW ER | $24 \_$WE | 48 WE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 89033100 | 1 | $19.3 S$ | 179.8 W | 57 | 131 | 303 | 30 | 5 | 0 | -5 |
| 89033112 | 2 | $21.0 S$ | 177.5 E | 75 | 147 | 513 | 45 | 0 | 5 | 15 |
| 89040100 | 3 | 22.1 S | 177.4 E | 24 | 116 | 342 | 45 | 0 | -10 | -15 |
| 89040112 | 4 | $21.7 S$ | 177.6 E | 115 | 240 | N/A | 50 | -5 | -15 | N/A |
| 89040200 | 5 | $21.3 S$ | 177.6 E | 8 | N/A | N/A | 50 | -20 | N/A | N/A |




## APPENDIX A DEFINITIONS

BEST TRACK - A subjectively smoothed path, versus a precise and very erratic fix-to-fix path, used to represent tropical cyclone movement.

CENTER - The vertical axis or core of a tropical cyclone. Usually determined by cloud vorticity patterns, wind and/or pressure distribution.
EPHEMERIS - Position of a body (satellite) in space as a function of time; used for gridding satellite imagery. Since ephemeris gridding is based solely on the predicted position of the satellite, it is susceptible to errors from vehicle wobble, orbital eccentricity and the oblateness of the Earth.

EXPLOSIVE DEEPENING - A decrease in the minimum sea-level pressure of a tropical cyclone of 2.5 $\mathrm{mb} / \mathrm{hr}$ for 12 hours or $5.0 \mathrm{mb} / \mathrm{hr}$ for six hours (Dunnavun, 1981).

EXTRATROPICAL - A term used in warnings and tropical summaries to indicate that a cyclone has lost its "tropical" characteristics. The term implies both poleward displacement from the tropics and the conversion of the cyclone's primary energy source from the release of latent heat of condensation to baroclinic processes. It is important to note that cyclones can become extratropical and still maintain winds of typhoon or storm force.

EYE - The central area of a tropical eyclone when it is more than half surrounded by wall cloud.

FUJIWHARA EFFECT - A binary interaction where tropical cyclones within about $750 \mathrm{~nm}(1390 \mathrm{~km}$ ) of each other begin to rotate about one another. When tropical cyclones are within about $400 \mathrm{~nm}(740 \mathrm{~km})$ of each other, they may also begin to be drawn closer to one another (Brand, 1970) (Dong and Neumann, 1983).
INTENSITY - The maximum sustained 1-minute mean surface wind speed, typically within one degree of the center of a tropical cyclone.

MAXIMUM SUSTAINED WIND - The highest surface wind speed averaged over a one-minute period of time. (Peak gusts over water average 20 to 25 percent higher than sustained winds.)

RAPID DEEPENING - A decrease in the minimum sea-level pressure of a tropical cyclone of $1.25 \mathrm{mb} / \mathrm{hr}$ for 24 -hours (Holliday and Thompson, 1979).

RECURVATURE - The tuming of a tropical cyclone from an initial path toward the west and poleward to east and poleward.

SIGNIFICANT TROPICAL CYCLONE - A tropical cyclone becomes "significant" with the issuance of the first numbered warning by the responsible warning agency.

SIZE - The areal extent of a tropical cyclone, usually measured radially outward from the center to the outermost closed isobar.

STRENGTH - The average wind speed of the surrounding low-level wind flow, usually measured within one to three degrees of the center of a tropical cyclone.
SUBTROPICAL CYCLONE - a low pressure system that forms over the ocean in the subtropics and has some characteristics of a tropical circulation, but not a central dense overcast. Although of upper cold low or low-level baroclinic origins, the system can transition to a tropical cyclone.

SUPER TYPHOON - A typhoon with maximum sustained 1 -minute mean surface winds of 130 kt ( 67 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) or greater.

TROPICAL CYCLONE - A non-frontal, migratory low-pressure system, usually of synoptic scale, originating over tropical or subtropical waters and having a definite organized circulation.

TROPICAL DEPRESSION - A tropical cyclone with maximum sustained 1-minute mean surface winds of 33 kt ( $17 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) or less.

TROPICAL DISTURBANCE - A discrete system of apparently organized convection, generally 100 to 300 nm ( 185 to 555 km ) in diameter, originating in the tropics or subtropics, having a non-frontal, migratory character and having maintained its identity for 12 - to 24 -hours. It may or may not be associated with a detectable perturbation of the wind field. It is the basic generic designation which, in successive stages of development, may be classified as a tropical depression, tropical storm, typhoon or super typhoon.

TROPICAL STORM - A tropical cyclone with maximum sustained surface winds in the range of 34 to 63 kt ( 17 to $32 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) inclusive.

TROPICAL UPPER-TROPOSPHERIC TROUGH (TUTT) - A dominant climatological system and a daily upper-level synoptic feature of the summer season, over the tropical North Atlantic, North Pacific and South Pacific Oceans (Sadler, 1979).

TYPHOON (HURRICANE) - A tropical cyclone with maximum sustained 1 -minute mean surface winds of 64 to 129 kt ( 33 to $66 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ). West of 180 degrees longitude they are called typhoons and east of 180 degrees longitude hurricanes.

WALL CLOUD - An organized band of cumuliform clouds that immediately surrounds the central area of a tropical cyclone. The wall cloud may entirely enclose or partially surround the center.

| Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANGELA | ABE | AMY | AXEL |
| BRIAN | BECKY | BRENDAN | BOBBIE |
| COLLEEN | CECIL | CAITLIN | CHUCK |
| DAN | DOT | DOUG | DEANNA |
| ELSIE | ED | ELLIE | ELI |
| FORREST | FLO | FRED | FAYE |
| GAY | GENE | GLADYS | GARY |
| HUNT | HATTIE | HARRY | HELEN |
| IRMA | IRA | IVY | IRVING |
| JACK | JEANA | JOEL | JANIS |
| KORYN | KYLE | KINNA | KENT |
| LEWIS | LOLA | LUKE | LOIS |
| MARIAN | MIKE | MIREILLE | MARK |
| NATHAN | NELL | NAT | NINA |
| OFELIA | OWEN | ORCHID | OMAR |
| PERCY | PAGE | PAT | POLLY |
| ROBYN | RUSS | RUTH | RYAN |
| STEVE | SHARON | SETH | SIBYL |
| TASHA | TIM | THELMA | TED |
| VERNON | VANESSA | VERNE | VAL |
| WINONA | WALT | WILDA | WARD |
| YANCY | YUNYA | YURI | YVETTE |
| ZOLA | ZEKE | ZELDA | ZACK |

NOTE: Names are assigned in rotation and alphabetically. When the last name in Column 4 (ZACK) has been used, the sequence will begin again with the first name in Column 1 (ANGELA).

SOURCE: CINCPACINST 3140.1T

NAMES FOR TROPICAL CYCLONES (PRIOR TO TY ANGELA (26W) 1989)

| Column 1 | Column 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| ANDY | ABRY |
| BRENDA | BEN |
| CECIL | CARMEN |
| DOT | DOM |
| ELLIS | ELLEN |
| FAYE | FORREST |
| GORDON | GEORGIA |
| HOPE | HERBERT |
| IRVING | IDA |
| JUDY | JOE |
| KEN | KIM |
| LOLA | LEX |
| MAC | MARGE |
| NANCY | NORRIS |
| OWEN | ORCHID |
| PEGGY | PERCY |
| ROGER | RUTH |
| SARAH | SPERRY |
| TIP | THELMA |
| VERA | VERNON |
| WAYNE | WYNNE |


| Column 3 |  | Column 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ALEX |  | AGNES |
| BETTY | BILL |  |
| CARY | CLARA |  |
| DNNAH | DOYLE |  |
| ED | ELSIE |  |
| FREDA | FABIAN |  |
| GERALD | GAY |  |
| HOLLY | HAL |  |
| IAN | IRMA |  |
| JUNE | JEFF |  |
| KELLY | KIT |  |
| LYNN | LEE |  |
| MAURY | MAMIE |  |
| NINA | NELSON |  |
| OGDEN | ODESSA |  |
| PHYYLIS | PAT |  |
| ROY | RUBY |  |
| SUSAN | SKIP |  |
| THAD | TESS |  |
| VANESSA | VAL |  |
| WARREN | WINONA |  |
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## APPENDIX D

## PAST ANNUAL TROPICAL CYCLONE REPORTS

Copies of the past<br>Annual Tropical Cyclone Reports<br>can be obtained through:<br>National Technical Information Service<br>5285 Port Royal Road<br>Springfield, Virginia 22161

Refer to the following acquisition numbers when ordering:

YEAR
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988

ACQUISITION NUMBER
AD 786147
AD 786148
AD 786149
AD 786128
AD 786208
AD 786209
AD 786210
AD 785891
AD 785344
AD 785251
AD 785178
AD 785252
AD 768333
AD 768334
AD 777093
AD 010271
AD A023601
AD A038484
AD A055512
AD A070904
AD A082071
AD A094668
AD A112002
AD A124860
AD A137836
AD A153395
AD A168284
AD A184082
AD A191883
AD A207206

Intentionally left blank.

## report documentation page

form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

| 1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED |  | 1b. RESTRICTIVE MARXINGS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY |  | 3. DISTRIBUTION /AVAILABILITY OF REPORT AS IT APPEARS IN THE REPORT/ DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED |  |  |  |
| 4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) |  | 5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) |  |  |  |
| 6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAVOCEANCOMCEN/JTHC | 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) | 7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION NAVOCEANCOMCEN/JTWC |  |  |  |
| 6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) <br> COMNAVMAR BOX 12 <br> FPO SAN FRANCISCO, CA 96630-2926 |  | 7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and 2IP Code) <br> COINAVMAR BOX 12 <br> FPO SAI FRAIJCISCO, CA 96630-2926 |  |  |  |
| 8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION NAVOCEANCOMCEN / JTWC | Bb. OFFICE SYMBOL (If app/lcab/e) | 9. PROCUREME | INSTRUME | ENTIFICA | MBER |
| 8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) COMNAVMAR BOX 12 FPO SAN FRANCISCO, CA 96630-2926 |  | 10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS |  |  |  |
|  |  | PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TASK } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & W O F \\ & A C C \end{aligned}$ |

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)

1989 ANNUAL TROPICAL CYCLONE REPORT
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(5)

| 13a. TYPE OF REPORT ANNUAL | 13b. TIME COVERED FROM JAN 89 TO DEC 89 | 14. DATE OF REPORT (Yeas, MOnth, Day) 1989 | 15. PAGE COUNT 253 PLUS i- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

| 17. | COSATI CODES |  | 18. SUBIECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) TROPICAL CYCLONES <br> TRODICAL STOPMS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FIELD | GROUP | SU8-GROUP |  |  |
| 04 | 02 |  | TROPICAL DEPRESSIONS | TYPHOONS/SUPER TYPHOONS |
|  |  |  | TROPICAL CYCLONE RESEARCM | METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITES |

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

ANNUAL PUBLICATION SUMMARIZING TROPICAL CYCLONE ACTIVITY IN THE lVESTERN NORTH PACIFIC, BAY OF BENGAL, ARABIAN SEA, WESTERN SOUTF PACIFIC AND SOUTH INDIAN OCEANS. A BEST TRACK IS PROVIDED FOR EACH SIGNIEICANT TROPICAL CYCLONE. A BRIEF NARRATIVE IS GIVER FOR ALL TRORICAL CYCLONES IN THE WESTERN JJORTH PACIFIC AND HORTH INDIAN OCEANS. ALL RECONNAISSANCE AND FIX DATA USED TO CONSTRUCT THE DEST TRACKS ARE PROVIDED, UPON REQUEST, ON FLOPPY DISKETTES. FORECAST VERIFICATION DATA AMD STATISTICS FOR THE JOINT TYPHOON WARNING CENTER (JTWC) ARE SUBMITTED.
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT $\square$ UNCLASSIFIEDIUNLIMITED [ $\square$ SAME AS RPT. $\square$ DTIC USERS
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL FRANK H. WELLS
21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 22c. OFFICE SYMBOL
671-344-5240
NOCC/JTWC

## UNCLASSIFIED

BLOCK 18 CONTINUED
RADAR
aUTOMATIC WEATHER OBSERVING STATIONS SYNOPTIC DATA
TROPICAL CYCLONE INTENSITY TROPICAL CYCLONE BEST TRACK DATA TROPICAL CYCLONE FORECASTING TROPICAL CYCLONE RECONNAISSANCE TROPICAL CYCLONE STEERING MODELS OBJECTIVE FORECASTING TECHNIQUES TROPICAL CYCLONE FIX DATA
MICROWAVE IMAGERY
DRIFTING BUOYS


[^0]:    * System ARGOS data collection (via TIROS-N)
    ** Automated Remote Collection system (via GOES West)
    *** Coastal-Marine Automated Network (via GOES West)

[^1]:    TABLE 2-1 POSITION CODB NOABERS (PCN)

    PCN METHOD FOR CENTER DETERMINATION/GRIDDING

    EYE/GEOGRAPHY
    EYE/EPHEMERIS
    WELL DEFINED CIRCULATION CENTER/GEOGRAPHY
    WELL DEFINED CIRCULATION CENTER/ERHENERIS
    POORLY DEFINED CIRCULATION CENTER/GEOGRAPHY POORLY DEFINED CIRCULATION CENTER/EPHEMERIS

[^2]:    * TC-32W (Gay) counted only once.

[^3]:    *This underscores a limitation of the Dvorak technique (1984), when applied to tropical cyclones that are moving along track at speeds greater than the climatic mean. Tropical cyclone forecasters should consider excess translational speed in addition to the intensity estimate, that is derived from the cloud signature, to better approximate maximum sustained surface winds.

[^4]:    * The formation of a sympathetic low is documented in relation to systems approaching Taiwan (Brand and Blelloch, 1973), but not for systems off the Philippine Islands

