



Long-Term Drag Coefficients Measurements in the Coastal Zone

Harry Friebel US Army Corps of Engineers - NAP

Alexander Benilov Stevens Institute of Technology - CMS

Jeff Hanson and Chuck Long US Army Corps of Engineers - FRF

Donald Resio US Army Corps of Engineers - ERDC



11th International Workshop on Wave Hindcasting and Forecasting & 2nd Coastal Hazards Symposium Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada October 18-23, 2009





Remarks

Primary: Improve the transfer of momentum in nearshore numerical modeling.



Secondary: Identify corrupted incident wind directions.

Motivation

Methodology

Conclusions





Remarks

Friction velocity, heat and humidity fluxes considered constants with height

Eddy correlation (direct) method to calculate Reynolds stresses

Paulson (1970) method for stratification corrections

Nearshore waves at the USACE-FRF experience:

- Shoaling
- Breaking
- Limited phase speed (governed by the local water depth)
- Asymmetric shear stresses

Motivation

Methodology

Conclusions



Motivation



Remarks

- 1. High-quality momentum flux data have been collected at the USACE-FRF pier in Duck, NC from October 2005 through December 2007.
- 2. Drag coefficients are calculated for winds greater than 10 m/s.
- 3. Corrupted measurements are identified.

Methodology

- 4. Onshore drag coefficients calculated at the USACE-FRF are less than historical open ocean parameterizations.
- 5. Measured drag coefficients do increase if the underlying surface current is taken into account; however, measurements are still less than historical parameterizations.

Conclusions

Details of Study

6. The largest onshore drag coefficients are measured between 340 - 10° north.



Instrumentation



Remarks



Pier extends 560-m into the Atlantic Ocean

Pier directed 70° north

Tower positioned above 7.5-m water depth

Onshore winds: 340° - 160° north clockwise

Gill R3A sonic anemometer

LI-COR LI-7500 CO2/H2O gas analyzer

Positioned 16.7-m above MSL

Sampling rate: 10 Hz

Instrumentation directed 40° north

Data acquisition system: PC in NOAA shed



Motivation

Methodology

Conclusions

What Direction Did the Winds Originate From?

US Army Engineer Research and Development Center







Onshore vs. Offshore Data







Identify Corrupted Incident Wind Directions



Remarks

Inspect the following parameters:

1.Mean vertical (W) wind speed

2. Friction velocity

3. Drag Coefficient

4. Auto Spectra

Motivation

Methodology

Conclusions



Vertical Wind





Motivation

Methodology

Conclusions

Details of Study



Motivation



Remarks

Details of Study

1. Limited data record

Methodology

- 2. Boundary layer horizontal, non-uniformity in the coastal zone
- 3. Formation of inner boundary layer
- 4. Misalignment or "tilt" of the anemometer
- 5. Instrumentation/supporting structures distorting measurements

Conclusions

Friction Velocity





Motivation

US Army Engineer Research and Development Center

Methodology

Conclusions

Details of Study



Drag Coefficients





Motivation

Methodology

Conclusions

Details of Study



Spectra and Universal Spectra







Check Stability of Universal Spectra Approximations







Standard Deviation of Universal Spectra Approximations





Motivation

Methodology

Conclusions

Details of Study





Motivation

Methodology

Conclusions

Details of Study



Underlying Surface (Current) Corrections





Motivation

Methodology

Conclusions

Details of Study



"Updated" Drag Coefficient



Remarks



Motivation

Methodology

Conclusions

Additional Duck, NC Drag Coefficients

US Army Engineer Research and Development Center











A special thanks to:

Kent Hathaway (USACE), Cliff Baron (USACE), Gerrit de Leeuw (FMI), Marcel Moerman (TNO) and Chris Zappa (Columbia)

