A Case Study of Nearshore Drag Coefficient Behavior during Hurricane Ike (2008)
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ABSTRACT

Over the past decade, numerous field campaigns and laboratory experiments have examined air–sea momentum exchange in the deep ocean. These studies have changed the understanding of drag coefficient behavior in hurricane force winds, with a general consensus that a limiting value is reached. Near the shore, wave conditions are markedly different than in deep water because of wave shoaling and breaking processes, but only very limited data exist to assess drag coefficient behavior. Yet, knowledge of the wind stress in this region is critical for storm surge forecasting, evaluating the low-level wind field across the coastal transition zone, and informing the wind load standard along the hurricane-prone coastline. During Hurricane Ike (2008), a Texas Tech University StickNet platform obtained wind measurements in marine exposure with a fetch across the Houston ship channel. These data were used to estimate drag coefficient dependence on wind speed. Wave conditions in the ship channel and surge level at the StickNet location were simulated using the Simulating Waves Nearshore Model coupled to the Advanced Circulation Model. The simulated waves were indicative of a fetch-limited condition with maximum significant wave heights reaching 1.5 m and peak periods of 4 s. A maximum surge depth of 0.6 m inundated the StickNet. Similar to deep water studies, findings indicate that the drag coefficient reaches a limiting value at wind speeds near hurricane force. However, at wind speeds below hurricane force, the drag coefficient is higher than that of deep water datasets, particularly at the slowest wind speeds.

1. Introduction

Over 37 million people currently live in hurricane-prone coastal regions stretching from Texas to North Carolina and a continued increase in population is inevitable. As a result, there is an urgent need for nearshore observations of surface layer quantities to improve hurricane storm surge forecasting and to accurately define wind-loading provisions in the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) standard for this critical region. Over the past decade, numerous field and laboratory experiments have examined air–sea momentum exchange in the deep ocean during hurricane conditions, but there is a significant gap in our understanding in shallow water and near the coast.

The transfer of momentum from the air to the sea is described in terms of a 10-m drag coefficient \( C_D \) defined as

\[
C_D = \frac{\tau_o}{\rho_a U_{10}^2} = \frac{u_*^2}{U_{10}^2},
\]

where \( \rho_a \) is the density of air, \( \tau_o \) is the surface wind stress, \( u_* \) is the shear velocity, and \( U_{10} \) is the mean wind speed.
measured at 10 m. Powell et al. (2003) and Donelan et al. (2004) found that $C_D$ increases with increasing wind speed and reaches a limiting value of around 0.0025 near hurricane force. Black et al. (2007) found that $C_D$ saturates to a value of 0.0018 at wind speeds of 22–23 m s$^{-1}$. The limiting nature of the drag coefficient has been attributed to the effects of spray droplets acting to limit turbulent mixing along with surface tension effects associated with a surface emulsion consisting of a deep layer of foam, and in short-fetch conditions, saturation is likely a result of airflow separation from the dominant waves (e.g., Powell et al. 2003; Kudryavtsev and Makin 2007).

Near the shore, wave interaction with the local bathymetry causes wave conditions to be markedly different from those in deep water due to wave shoaling and breaking transformation processes. At present, nearshore wind stress is not completely understood and only a few studies exist on this topic. Anctil and Donelan (1996) observed increased drag over shoaling waves compared to both deep water and breaking waves in Lake Ontario. For wind speeds of around 14 m s$^{-1}$, they estimated the shoaling wave drag to be 0.0028, which is higher than deep water values at similar wind speeds. Data reported in Powell (2008) also suggest increased drag in the nearshore region. Based on these studies and the wave condition differences stated above, it is believed that deep water wind stress parameterizations do not allow for reliable estimation of the nearshore wind setup and are a potential culprit for the inaccurate predictions of storm surge.

The work presented here aims to advance our understanding of momentum exchange at the coast and in complex wave conditions. Rare measurements of hurricane winds in marine exposure were obtained by a Texas Tech University rapidly deployable surface weather observing station, termed StickNet (Weiss and Schroeder 2008), during the passage of Hurricane Ike in 2008. The StickNet platform was inundated by surge during the peak of the storm with a predominant wind direction arriving from the 3-km-wide Houston ship channel. The surge at the station and wave conditions in the channel were estimated using a coupled wave and circulation approach via Simulating Waves Nearshore (SWAN) and the Advanced Circulation Model (ADCIRC), denoted SWAN+ADCIRC (Dietrich et al. 2011a,b). This work examines coastal drag coefficient behavior for wind speeds reaching hurricane force.

2. Field instrumentation and surge hindcast

A total of 24 StickNet weather stations were deployed during Hurricane Ike. One of the StickNet platforms (denoted StickNet 110A) was deployed in an open grassy area in Fort Travis Seashore Park on the Bolivar Peninsula, Texas, during Hurricane Ike (2008). The photograph was taken by the Galveston County Office of Emergency Management during retrieval of StickNet 110A facing southwest toward the Houston ship channel.
which included Hurricanes Gustav and Ike and a spinup time of 18 days to allow the tidal signal to be replicated with constituents K1, O1, M2, S2, N2, K2, Q1, and P1. Surface stresses were calculated using an Ocean Weather, Inc., representation of the wind field (Powell et al. 1996, 1998, 2010; Powell and Houston 1996) and a drag coefficient formulation following Garratt (1977) with the radial dependence of Powell (2008). The drag coefficient formulation found herein was not applied in the hindcast due to the circular nature of this result and to the fact that a sensitivity study will be provided in a following paper. Initial water levels were raised by 0.280 m to adjust for seasonal expansion and the vertical datum adjustment, and the river flux in the Mississippi was set to 12 318 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$. Wave- and water-level properties were saved at hourly intervals for the analysis. A complete validation of the SWAN+ADCIRC hindcast is provided in Hope et al. (2013) in which they found the coefficient of determination to be 0.91 between the observed and modeled high-water marks.

The bathymetry of the channel is not representative of a typical shoreline, where waves propagate toward the shore from oceanic deep water. Near the edges the channel is shallow, but drops off quickly to approximately 14 m deep with a slope of 2.5:1. In the center of the channel (29.350$^\circ$N, 94.771$^\circ$W), the simulated waves were indicative of a fetch-limited condition with maximum significant wave heights reaching 1.5 m and peak periods of 4 s (Fig. 4). A maximum water level of 4.17-m NAVD88 was hindcast in the channel. At the StickNet, the simulated surge reached a height of 4.3 m NAVD88 or roughly 0.6 m above local ground, which is

![Fig. 2. Raw 1-min wind speed (black solid line) and wind direction (gray circles) time records (at 2.25 m) obtained from StickNet 110A during Hurricane Ike (2008). Landfall is denoted by the vertical dashed line.](image)

![Fig. 3. The observed path of Hurricane Ike (2008), the wind fetch (wind directions of 190$^\circ$–230$^\circ$) used in the analysis, modeled wave heights in the ship channel using SWAN+ADCIRC, and observed waves offshore in the Gulf of Mexico.](image)
in agreement with a high-water mark of 0.6 m measured on the StickNet. In other words, roughly 1.65 m of StickNet 110A was above the water surface during the peak of the surge and hence the anemometer height was 1.65 m at this time.

3. Methodology

a. StickNet 110A wind measurements

StickNet 110A measured tropical cyclone winds with a fetch across numerous changes in land and marine exposures. Wind flow interaction with these varying surface roughness regimes leads to complex internal boundary layer (IBL) interaction and transition. Based on numerous relationships for IBL growth (e.g., Peterson 1969; Wood 1982; Arya 1988; Stull 1988; Kaimal and Finnigan 1994; Powell et al. 1996; Simiu and Scanlan 1986; Holmes 2001; Saveljev and Taylor 2005), and assuming the lowest 10% of the IBL depth is fully adjusted, StickNet 110A measured marine-type winds associated with the wave conditions (marine roughness) in the Houston ship channel. Many of the IBL growth equations provided in the literature are based on measurements for specific roughness transitions, and the authors are not generally aware of any literature that directly applies to the fetch scenario and wind speeds analyzed herein. Although unlikely, a minimal impact of the upstream roughness on the sampled IBL cannot be completely ruled out because of the complex IBL transition analyzed (e.g., Schmid and Oke 1990).

Since the StickNet stations only collect single-level $u-v$ wind data, the turbulence intensity (TI) method was utilized to estimate the roughness length (Beljaars 1987). Turbulence intensity is a measure of the fluctuating component of the wind. In general terms, TI characterizes the intensity of gusts in the flow, and is defined as the ratio of the standard deviation of the fluctuating component of the wind to the mean wind speed. By substituting TI into the log law, $z_o$ and $C_D$ are computed as follows:

$$z_o = z_a \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\text{T}I}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad C_D = k^2 \left[\ln \left(\frac{z_o}{z_a}\right)\right]^{-2},$$

where $z_a = 2.25$ m is the anemometer height (on dry land) and $k = 0.4$ is the von Kármán constant. The TI method can be applied to wind data based on two main assumptions. First, this method assumes that a logarithmic wind profile exists. Overwater dropsonde data from Powell et al. (2003) and Powell (2008) show that a logarithmic wind profile exists in tropical cyclones. Second, the method assumes that the ratio of the standard deviation of the wind to the friction velocity is 2.5 (e.g., Counihan 1975; Beljaars 1987). Conceptually, this ratio simply states that boundary layer turbulence is purely driven mechanically with no contribution from buoyant processes. Although this ratio is well established in the published literature (e.g., Barthelmie et al. 1993, Letchford et al. 2001; Paulsen and Schroeder 2005), there is uncertainty around its value and future research projects aimed at establishing this are greatly needed. Regardless of the uncertainty in the 2.5 assumption, this ratio has provided comparable results to other methodologies (e.g., Barthelmie et al. 1993).

The TI varies based on averaging time (Schroeder et al. 1998). To determine where TI stabilizes, the wind speed record was windowed into various averaging times, and mean, maximum, and minimum values were computed (Fig. 5). An averaging time of 2 min was
utilized for this work (computed from the 5-Hz instantaneous measurements), as this window length captures variations in the smaller scales of motion, which are driven by surface roughness. Because of the sampling rate, wind gusts with frequencies greater than the Nyquist frequency of 2.5 Hz are inherently aliased. In addition, mechanical anemometers are not able to resolve all scales of motion, as the rotating components tend to filter the amplitudes of the highest-frequency gusts. Not resolving the highest-frequency gusts likely yields a marginal reduction in the standard deviation of the fluctuating component and, hence, a smaller $z_o$ value. This is a concern for all high-frequency wind measurements and is not unique to this work. Regardless of this limitation, TI becomes fairly stable by 2 min with only a modest increase of 6.0% from 2 to 10 min. Non-stationarities lead to anomalous TI values, and hence only stationary wind speed segments (in both the mean and variance), as evaluated using the reverse arrangement test at a significance level of $\alpha = 0.01$ (Bendat and Piersol 1986), were used in the analysis.

4. Analysis and discussion

The drag coefficient was analyzed for three different time durations (Fig. 6). Over these time periods, the wind direction remained relatively stable with a fetch across the channel. Mean wind speed data obtained at 2.25 m (or a lower height based on the simulated water depth at the StickNet) were referenced to 10 m using the neutral-stability log law (Stull 1988), as follows:

$$C_D(10) = C_D(2.25) \left( \frac{U_{2.25}}{U_{10}} \right)^{2.5}.$$  (3)

Durations of 12 and 22 h were used to determine the dependence of the drag coefficient with wind speed. The longer record is provided to show differences at lower wind speeds, as the highest wind speeds occurred in the first few hours and the slowest near the end of the record. For the lower wind speed values in the 22-h duration, the wave heights and water levels had decreased in the ship channel, and more land was exposed on both the Bolivar Peninsula and Galveston Island based on the simulation. Surface layer quantities were also determined for the duration in which the StickNet was inundated by surge. Based on the hindcast, the StickNet was inundated for 1.03 h of the analysis length. The standard way to assess $C_D$ versus $U_{10}$ is to partition the wind speed data and corresponding $C_D$ values into bins with equal ranges. Six wind speed bins of 5 m s$^{-1}$ were chosen ranging from 5 to 35 m s$^{-1}$. It is assumed that if the number of data points in each bin is greater than 10, then a reasonable sample size has been achieved. Statistics for the different wind records binned into six wind speed groups are shown in Table 1. Wind
directions are very similar for the strongest wind speeds (within 20°), showing that a very similar fetch existed throughout the records. At slower speeds the winds have a greater southerly component. This result is due to the winds turning counterclockwise as the hurricane moved north of the region late in the record.

Binned drag coefficients are plotted against wind speed in Fig. 7. For the 12- and 22-h durations without correction for water levels at the StickNet, the drag coefficient increases with wind speed initially, reaches a limiting value of 0.0022 at a wind speed near 28 m s⁻¹, and decreases for wind speeds above 28 m s⁻¹. Compared to the 12-h record, the drag coefficient is higher at lower wind speeds for the 22-h record. For the 5–10 m s⁻¹ wind speed bin, this result could be due to small sample size or increased land exposure and hence roughness near the end of the record as the water receded from the Bolivar. When the correction for water level is taken into account, only the highest two wind speeds bins are affected. In the 30–35 m s⁻¹ wind speed bin, the drag coefficient increase minimally from the noncorrected analysis and in the 25–30 m s⁻¹ bin the values decrease more significantly. Regardless, a limiting value has been reached, but data at higher wind speeds would be necessary to confirm any trends beyond the threshold of hurricane force winds.

Drag coefficients in this complex environment are compared with previous studies in Fig. 7. The present work is consistent with the deep water studies in that $C_D$ reaches a limiting value and either decreases or remains relatively constant for higher wind speeds. In regard to the wind speed that $C_D$ saturates, the coastal drag coefficient reached a limiting value at slower wind speeds than Powell et al. (2003) and Donelan et al. (2004) and at faster wind speeds than Black et al. (2007). There are not sufficient data to compare the limiting values to the nearshore values presented in Powell (2008).

Examination of Fig. 7 also reveals that coastal $C_D$ values are significantly higher for wind speeds of less than 25 m s⁻¹. Powell et al. (2003) and Powell (2008) indicate that deep and shallow water values decrease rapidly for wind speeds below hurricane force. Crudely extrapolating their results to slower winds, the drag coefficient would be markedly less than those obtained here during Hurricane Ike. Laboratory observations from Donelan et al. (2004) also indicate lower drags for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 h</td>
<td>No. of 2-min segments</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean wind speed (m s⁻¹)</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev wind speed (m s⁻¹)</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean wind direction (°)</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev wind direction (°)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean roughness length (mm)</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev roughness length (mm)</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean drag coefficient × 10³</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev drag coefficient × 10³</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 h</td>
<td>No. of 2-min segments</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean wind speed (m s⁻¹)</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev wind speed (m s⁻¹)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean wind direction (°)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev wind direction (°)</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean roughness length (mm)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev roughness length (mm)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean drag coefficient × 10³</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev drag coefficient × 10³</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.03 h</td>
<td>No. of 2-min segments</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean wind speed (m s⁻¹)</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev wind speed (m s⁻¹)</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>————</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean wind direction (°)</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev wind direction (°)</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>————</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean roughness length (mm)</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>————</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev roughness length (mm)</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>————</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean drag coefficient × 10³</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>————</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std dev drag coefficient × 10³</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>————</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>————</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lighter winds and that the trend in $C_D$ with increasing wind speed is much steeper than the present study. This result is likely a consequence of the fetch-limited and complex wave conditions in the ship channel generating a rough wave surface even under light-wind conditions.

5. Concluding remarks

Field observations of coastal wind measurements were obtained during the passage of Hurricane Ike. It was found that aerodynamic drag increased with wind speed up to 28 m s$^{-1}$, where a limiting value of 0.0022 is reached. When wind speeds are corrected based on the SWAN+ADCIRC hindcast water levels at the StickNet, the drag coefficient levels off at slower wind speeds of 22 m s$^{-1}$. These results are similar to deep water studies. Saturation of $C_D$ is likely a result of sea spray and skimming flow as the waves are fetch limited and very steep. At slower wind speeds, the drag coefficient values are higher than those reported in any of the comparison deep water studies. This result could be a consequence of the complex wave conditions in the channel creating a “rougher than normal” surface under light to moderate winds. Similar relationships may also exist in regions that exhibit complex bathymetry, coastal formations that interfere with the local waves, or other types of fetch-limited conditions. Based on this analysis, storm surge models using a deep water wind speed–dependent drag coefficient may be slightly underestimating hurricane storm surge, and additional forcing parameterizations are needed in such complex roughness situations.

Based on recent air–sea interaction research, structures built on the hurricane-prone coast are currently being designed to withstand wind loads specified by Exposure D in ASCE 7-10 (i.e., flat, unobstructed areas and water surfaces with associated roughness lengths of 5 mm). The previous standard, ASCE 7-05, was set at Exposure C (i.e., open terrain with scattered obstructions having heights generally less than 9.1 m with associated roughness lengths of 20 mm). In other words, the hurricane-prone coast is now smoother from a roughness perspective and structures must be designed for higher wind loads (faster winds speeds). Data obtained during Hurricane Ike in complex nearshore conditions are in agreement with the shift to Exposure D in this region, as mean $z_o$ values are on the order of 2 mm. These findings suggest that similar wave environments may also exhibit roughness values according to Exposure D. This work also adds to the literature base for ensuring reliable design standards in hurricane-prone regions for all wave conditions.
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