Tables (1-5) ${ }^{1}$ give various micrometeorological statistics observed (22 May 2003) at Ellerslie (Alberta), during a windbreak experiment ${ }^{2}$. Cup anemometers and shielded, ventilated thermocouples measured the vertical profiles of mean cup windspeed ("S") and mean temperature ${ }^{3}$ on a mast standing in the (by assumption, horizontally-homogeneous) flow upwind of its disturbance by a windbreak. The mean profile data (Tables 1,2 ) suffice to determine the MOST scaling parameters for each interval, however in addition a 3 -dimensional sonic anemometer at $z=2 \mathrm{~m}$ on the mast provides an independent and direct estimate of the MOST scales, by manipulation of the statistics it provides (Tables 4, 5). A wind vane on the mast provided the mean wind direction (" $\theta$ ") in the compass convention.

The porous plastic windbreak, whose height and resistance coefficient were $h=1.25 \mathrm{~m}$, $k_{r}=2.4$, was erected in a straight line oriented N-S. A perpendicular (W-E) transect of cup anemometers standing at $z / h=0.5$ measured the effect of the windbreak on the mean flow, at streamwise locations $x / h=(-15,-1,2,4,6,10,20)$, with the lowest cup anemometer on the mast providing the reference windspeed $S_{0} \equiv S(x=-15 h, z=h / 2)$.

## Task 1: Surface-layer parameters from mean profiles

For each 15 min interval, analyse the mean profile data on the mast to provide the friction velocity $u_{*}$, the temperature scale $T_{*}$, the Monin-Obukhov length $L$, and the sensible heat flux density ${ }^{4} Q_{H}$ (you will need to write a computer program to do this: the general outline of a method is given below). Plot at least two of the given mean profiles alongside your corresponding theoretical profiles (i.e. those implied by your derived $u_{*}, T_{*}$ ). Also plot (on one graph) the complete set of mean wind profiles, normalizing each profile using the "reference velocity" $S_{0}$ provided by the lowest cup anemometer on the mast. Deduce the surface roughness length $z_{0}$.

[^0]
## Task 2: Surface-layer parameters from the sonic anemometer

From the sonic data compute alternative estimates $u_{*}^{s}, T_{*}^{s}, L^{s}$ and mean wind direction $\beta_{s}=$ $\arctan (V / U)$ (correct for the orientation of the sonic frame, ie. add $90^{\circ}$ ). Comment on the measured values of $\sigma_{u} / u_{*}, \sigma_{v} / u_{*}, \sigma_{w} / u_{*}$ in the context of MO similarity theory.

## Task 3: Analysis of shelter effectiveness

Plot the raw transects (Table 3) of windspeed $S(x)$ across the windbreak, and also normalized transects $S(x) / S_{0}$. Estimate for each interval the fractional wind reduction $\Delta S / S_{0} \equiv 1-S / S_{0}$ at the location of minimum mean windspeed, and plot this parameter against mean wind direction and against the stability parameter $h / L$. Compare with the value $k_{r} /\left(1+2 k_{r}\right)^{0.8}$ expected in neutral, perpendicular flow.

## Appendix: Profile Fitting Method

Create the set of measured differences $\Delta S_{z}{ }^{m}=S_{z}-S_{r e f}, \Delta T_{z}{ }^{m}=T_{z}-T_{\text {ref }}$ (etc.) where $S_{r e f}$ is the windspeed at a reference height, such as $z=0.62 \mathrm{~m}$. To each of these differences there correspond (for any guess of the scales $u_{*}, T_{*}$ ) theoretical differences $\Delta S_{z}{ }^{t}=\left(S_{z}-S_{\text {ref }}\right)^{t}$ (etc.) that may be calculated from the Monin-Obukhov similarity profiles. Your scales should be optimal in the sense that they minimize the dimensionless residual:

$$
\begin{aligned}
R & =\frac{\sum_{1}^{N_{S}}\left(\Delta S^{m}-\Delta S^{t}\right)^{2}}{\delta S^{2}} \\
& +\frac{\sum_{1}^{N_{T}}\left(\Delta T^{m}-\Delta T^{t}\right)^{2}}{\delta T^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Here $\delta S, \delta T$ are the estimated characteristic uncertainties in windspeed and temperature difference; assume values $\delta_{S}=0.05 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}, \delta_{T}=0.1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. In the present case the number of velocity differences is $N_{S}=3$ and $N_{T}=2$. The simplest computational approach is to use a nested loop: scan through all combinations of $u_{*}, T_{*}$ covering a physically reasonable range, say, $0.05 \leq u_{*} \leq 0.5 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ (with interval 0.01 ) and $-5 \mathrm{~K} \leq T_{*} \leq 0$ (with interval 0.01 ).

Please note that in unstable stratification the temperature profile can be represented as

$$
\bar{T}(z)-\bar{T}\left(z_{0}\right)=\frac{T_{*}}{k_{v}}\left[\ln \frac{z}{z_{0}}-\psi_{h}\left(\frac{z}{L}\right)+\psi_{h}\left(\frac{z_{0}}{L}\right)\right]
$$

where $\psi_{h}=2 \ln \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(1+\phi_{h}{ }^{-1}\right)\right]$. Dyer and Bradley (1982; BLM Vol. 22, 3-19) recommended $\phi_{h}(z / L)=(1-14 z / L)^{-1 / 2}$.

Table 1: Profiles of (uncorrected) 15 min mean cup windspeed $\left[\mathrm{m} \mathrm{s}^{-1}\right.$ ] in an undisturbed ASL, Ellerslie (AB), 22 May, 2003 (on all tables, end times are given in Local Standard Time). Measurements have been rounded to nearest $0.01 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$. The cup anemometers should be assumed to have overestimated the mean speed by $8 \%$, and each value should be corrected accordingly.

|  |  | HEIGHT |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $t_{\text {end }}$ | 0.62 m | 1.57 m | 3.07 m | 5.02 m |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1600 | 3.33 | 4.04 | 4.49 | 4.84 |
| 1615 | 3.24 | 3.98 | 4.47 | 4.83 |
| 1630 | 2.83 | 3.43 | 3.80 | 4.10 |
| 1645 | 3.31 | 4.09 | 4.66 | 5.07 |
| 1700 | 2.52 | 3.11 | 3.46 | 3.73 |
| 1715 | 3.48 | 4.37 | 4.95 | 5.38 |
| 1730 | 2.28 | 2.82 | 3.16 | 3.43 |
| 1745 | 2.94 | 3.62 | 4.07 | 4.43 |
| 1800 | 3.17 | 3.92 | 4.46 | 4.84 |
| 1815 | 2.71 | 3.40 | 3.88 | 4.26 |
| 1830 | 2.29 | 2.90 | 3.30 | 3.62 |
| 1845 | 2.36 | 2.94 | 3.35 | 3.67 |

Table 2: Profiles of 15 min mean temperature difference $[\mathrm{K}]$ in an undisturbed ASL, Ellerslie (AB), 22 May, 2003. Negative entries imply the upper level is cooler than the lower (reference) level, implying unstable stratification.

| $t_{\text {end }}$ | $1.31 \mathrm{~m}(-) 0.34 \mathrm{~m}$ | $4.25 \mathrm{~m}(-) 0.34 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| 1600 | -0.84 | -1.40 |
| 1615 | -0.92 | -1.53 |
| 1630 | -0.85 | -1.34 |
| 1645 | -0.67 | -1.14 |
| 1700 | -0.80 | -1.18 |
| 1715 | -0.57 | -0.92 |
| 1730 | -0.23 | -0.33 |
| 1745 | -0.22 | -0.34 |
| 1800 | -0.15 | -0.20 |
| 1815 | -0.0074 | 0.017 |
| 1830 | 0.24 | 0.42 |
| 1845 | 0.31 | 0.52 |

Table 3: Transects of mean cup windspeed (rounded to nearest $0.01 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ ) at $z=0.62 \mathrm{~m}$ $(z / h=0.5)$ along a perpendicular to the windbreak, spanning $-15 \leq x / h \leq 20$. The mean wind direction $(\theta)$ was measured in the upwind, undisturbed flow (a westerly, exactly normal to the windbreak, has $\theta=270^{\circ}$ ). Measurements made at Ellerslie (AB), 22 May, 2003. Note: the cup anemometers should be assumed to have overestimated the mean speed by $8 \%$, and each value should be corrected accordingly.

|  |  |  | $\mathrm{x} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $t_{\text {end }}$ | $\theta$ | -15 | -1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 20 |  |
| 1600 | 305 | 3.33 | 2.79 | 1.86 | 1.89 | 2.17 | 2.52 | 2.98 |  |
| 1615 | 299 | 3.24 | 2.77 | 1.89 | 1.73 | 1.95 | 2.42 | 2.83 |  |
| 1630 | 280 | 2.83 | 2.40 | 1.53 | 1.49 | 1.65 | 2.07 | 2.48 |  |
| 1645 | 283 | 3.31 | 2.82 | 1.83 | 1.66 | 1.86 | 2.35 | 2.94 |  |
| 1700 | 269 | 2.52 | 2.09 | 1.31 | 1.20 | 1.38 | 1.83 | 2.27 |  |
| 1715 | 281 | 3.48 | 3.00 | 1.88 | 1.67 | 1.91 | 2.55 | 3.34 |  |
| 1730 | 307 | 2.28 | 2.00 | 1.30 | 1.30 | 1.49 | 1.87 | 2.16 |  |
| 1745 | 302 | 2.94 | 2.45 | 1.59 | 1.55 | 1.69 | 2.14 | 2.56 |  |
| 1800 | 288 | 3.17 | 2.60 | 1.59 | 1.43 | 1.59 | 2.14 | 2.69 |  |
| 1815 | 278 | 2.71 | 2.20 | 1.31 | 1.17 | 1.31 | 1.75 | 2.35 |  |
| 1830 | 287 | 2.29 | 1.89 | 1.22 | 1.18 | 1.36 | 1.66 | 2.15 |  |
| 1845 | 313 | 2.36 | 2.06 | 1.36 | 1.31 | 1.55 | 1.89 | 2.13 |  |

Table 4: Velocity statistics (MKS units) from the sonic anemometer at $z=2.00 \mathrm{~m}$ on the upwind mast. The sonic was 'facing' west, thus when $v=0$ wind direction is $270^{\circ}$. In principle, the statistics should be rotated into a frame for which $\bar{w}=0$, but we shall neglect this step. All components of the Reynolds stress tensor $R_{i j} \equiv \overline{u_{i}^{\prime} u_{j}^{\prime}}$ can be computed from the given data.
$\overline{v w}$ $\begin{array}{ll}0.00715 & 0.00728 \\ -0.00238 & -0.00505 \\ -0.02209 & -0.0007 \\ 0.00212 & -0.00099 \\ 0.00265 & -0.00165 \\ 0.18194 & 0.05048 \\ -0.03078 & -0.00674 \\ -0.00306 & -0.03642 \\ -0.0565 & -0.01844 \\ -0.04546 & 0.0385 \\ -0.04173 & -0.02076 \\ -0.03112 & -0.04291\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}0.13858 & 5.0236 \\ 0.13379 & 5.9387\end{array}$

 N
N.
N.
O.

|  |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Table 5: Temperature and heat flux statistics (MKS units) from the sonic anemometer at $z=2.00 \mathrm{~m}$ on the upwind mast. From these data the eddy heat fluxes can formed as, for example, $\overline{u^{\prime} T^{\prime}}=\overline{u T}-\bar{u} \bar{T}$.

| $t_{\text {end }}$ | $\bar{T}$ | $\overline{T T}$ | $\overline{u T}$ | $\overline{v T}$ | $\overline{w T}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1600 | 20.023 | 401.4 | 60.634 | 36.547 | 0.66429 |
| 1615 | 19.97 | 399.2 | 63.45 | 33.994 | 0.42466 |
| 1630 | 19.837 | 393.96 | 56.439 | 17.35 | 0.054 |
| 1645 | 20.231 | 409.62 | 70.755 | 16.312 | 0.49237 |
| 1700 | 20.062 | 402.79 | 57.626 | -5.0379 | 0.31351 |
| 1715 | 20.499 | 420.5 | 81.243 | 18.17 | 1.7131 |
| 1730 | 19.9 | 396.24 | 44.506 | 31.641 | 0.12985 |
| 1745 | 20.043 | 401.8 | 57.865 | 31.548 | 0.19873 |
| 1800 | 20.189 | 407.65 | 71.591 | 21.223 | 0.12048 |
| 1815 | 20.132 | 405.33 | 63.711 | 3.424 | 0.03931 |
| 1830 | 19.917 | 396.71 | 49.127 | 18.883 | -0.1858 |
| 1845 | 19.849 | 394 | 40.716 | 36.55 | -0.11142 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ These data are also available in electronic form by downloading a file from the class web site.
    ${ }^{2}$ For details, see Wilson (2004; J. Applied Meteorol. Vol. 43, 1149-1167)
    ${ }^{3}$ Or more precisely, mean temperature differences (" $\bar{T}-\bar{T}_{r e f}$ ") relative to a reference temperature at $z=0.34 \mathrm{~m}$.
    ${ }^{4}$ The mean temperature $T_{0}$ during this period was about $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and for the purpose of calculating the density $\rho_{0}$ you may assume the atmospheric pressure $p=93 \mathrm{kPa}$.

