

Statistical modeling of turbulent wind velocity at canopy top: application to forest wind damage

Sylvain Dupont

To cite this version:

Sylvain Dupont. Statistical modeling of turbulent wind velocity at canopy top: application to forest wind damage. Mathematical Modelling of Wind Damage Risk to Forests, Oct 2015, Arcachon, France. hal-02738612

HAL Id: hal-02738612 <https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02738612v1>

Submitted on 2 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

STATISTICAL MODELING OF TURBULENT WIND VELOCITY AT CANOPY TOP: APPLICATION TO FOREST WIND DAMAGE

SYLVAIN DUPONT

UMR ISPA

A L I M E N T A T I O N A G R I C U L T U R E E N V I R O N N E M E N T

Recent findings **Dupont et al., Agric. For. Meteorol.** (2015)

- ‒ damage propagation involves two stages
- 1st stage: randomness nature of damages, damages induced by sweeps
- 2nd stage: wind increases inside damaged areas
- ‒ storm duration plays a major role for predicting the final level of damage
- ‒ tree dynamics has to be considered in evaluating the critical bending moment
- Give clues to develop a new generation of mechanistic wind risk model

A new generation of wind risk model

- use a probabilistic approach
- ‒ account for the gustiness of the flow
- account for damage propagation
- ‒ account for windstorm duration and its intensity variation (ideally measured at a nearby meteorological station)
- ‒ allow to easily compare damage prediction between different stands or different storms as well as to investigate the impact of silvicultural practices

Proposition

Tree: flexible cantilever beams, perfectly clamped in the ground (Pivato et al. 2014)

Wind: statistical modeling of wind velocity time series at canopy top

Wind time series from *Uh*, *h* and PAI

\Box 1st step: autocorrelated Gaussian time series m_i :

1st way: stochastic approach

- Integral scale of turbulence (Λ_i)
- No correlation between u and w at this stage

2nd way: inv. Fourier transform

- Energy spectra of m_i (S_i)
- ‒ Correlation between u and w done through phase dependence (S_{max})

2nd step: transformation from Gaussian to real PDF

$$
m_i = \text{normalized } u_i^*
$$
 (= $[u_i - U_h \delta_{i1}]/\sigma_i$)

Fi : CDF of *ui **

($1st$ way: correlation between velocity components done through F_i)

\Box 3rd step: denormalization

$$
\sigma_i = \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{U}_h \qquad \qquad u_i(t) = \sigma_i (u_i^*(t) + U_h \delta_{i1})
$$

Main hypothesis

Unknown variables of the model:

- β_N : "extinction coefficient" of the mean wind velocity within the canopy
- Λ_{i} integral scale of turbulence for the wind velocity u_i (1st way)
- S_i, S_{uw}: analytical wind spectra and cospectrum (2nd way)
- e_i ratio between u_i standard deviations and U_h
- F_i . : CDF of the wind velocity u_i^*

Hypothesis: *Above variables are independent of the wind intensity and canopy morphology*

Supporting reasons:

- β_{N} usually around 0.30 (Harman & Finnigan 2007)
- Constancy of $Λ$ _i over a large range of canopies (Kaimal & Finnigan 1994)
- ‒ Observations and simulations showed small variabilities of normalized wind statistics at canopy top (e.g., Raupach et al. 1996, Dupont & Brunet 2008)

Limits:

- ‒ Hypothesis only valid at canopy top (inflection point position)
- ‒ Hypothesis not valid over very sparse canopies
- \blacktriangleright Following this hypothesis, β_N , Λ_i , e_i and F_i deduced from LES over a Maritime pine forest

Illustration of simulated time series of wind speed and tree motion

Velocity of damage propagation:

Deduced from the number of damaging periods

Hypothesis:

Impact of damaged areas on the wind neglected

Limits:

 \triangleright Only valid for short or weak windstorm

But allows comparison of stand vulnerability following stand morphology

Two different canopy species:

- $-$ 3 Mature Maritime pine forests, $h = 22$ m and PAI=1.25, 2.50, 5.00
- $-$ Walnut orchard, $h = 10$ m and PAI=2.50

Evaluation against measurements:

- ‒ Maritime pine forest (PAI=2.50): Le Bray experiment (Dupont et al. 2011, 2012)
- ‒ Walnut orchard: CHATS experiment (Patton et al. 2011)

Evaluation against LES:

‒ Maritime pine forest (PAI=1.25, 2.50, 5.00)

Wind model evaluation: probability density functions

Wind model evaluation: wind spectra

- ‒ The wind model retrieves the main characteristics of canopy-top turbulence
- Results obtained by only describing the canopy from its cumulative PAI and its height
- ‒ The main hypothesis on the weak dependence of canopy-top normalized wind statistics on wind intensity and canopy morphology is well verified

 \triangleright With increasing wind speed, the tree natural vibration frequency moves upward along the inertial subrange region of the wind spectrum

Damage prediction on a Maritime pine stand

Damage prediction on a Maritime pine stand

Number of storm $0¹$ 50 100 150 10 20 30 \geq $\mathbf \omega$ $\boldsymbol{\varpi}$ \mathbf{r} $\mathbf \circ$ ⋽ Ξ ulativ $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ $\bf \nabla$ $\bm{\varpi}$ Ξ $\boldsymbol{\varpi}$ g $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ Ω r o b. (%) Number of storm 60 50 100 150 80 100 \geq $\bm{\mathsf{\omega}}$ $\boldsymbol{\varpi}$ \mathbf{r} $\mathbf \circ$ ⋽ Ξ ulativ $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ ರ $\bm{\varpi}$ $\mathsf E$ $\bm{\varpi}$ g $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ Ω r o b. (%) 10% 72% Time (h) $\mathsf{\Omega}$ $\bm{\varpi}$ Ξ $\bm{\varpi}$ g $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ Ω r o b. (%) 0.4 -0.2 0 0.2 0.4 50 100 Time (h) \Box $\bm{\varpi}$ Ξ $\bm{\varpi}$ ರಾ $\mathbf \omega$ Ω r o b. (%) 0.4 -0.2 0 0.2 0.4 50 100 10% 72%

Low windstorm High windstorm

Without considering the 2^{nd} damage stage

2nd damage stage starts when damaged areas reach 10% of the stand (Dupont et al. 2015)

 $v_{\text{prop2}} = 4.30 \text{ U}_{h}$ -42.71 (% of damaged trees/min)

Damage prediction on a Maritime pine stand

Number of storm $0¹$ 50 100 150 10 20 30 \geq $\mathbf \omega$ $\boldsymbol{\varpi}$ \mathbf{r} $\mathbf \circ$ ⋽ Ξ ulativ $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ $\bf \nabla$ $\bm{\varpi}$ Ξ $\boldsymbol{\varpi}$ g $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ Ω r o b. (%) Number of storm 60 50 100 150 80 100 \geq $\bm{\mathsf{\omega}}$ $\boldsymbol{\varpi}$ \mathbf{r} $\mathbf \circ$ ⋽ Ξ ulativ $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ ರ $\bm{\varpi}$ $\mathsf E$ $\bm{\varpi}$ g $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ Ω r o b. (%) Time (h) \Box $\bm{\varpi}$ Ξ $\bm{\varpi}$ ರಾ $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ Ω r o b. (%) 0.4 -0.2 0 0.2 0.4 50 100 Time (h) \Box $\bm{\varpi}$ $\mathsf E$ $\bm{\varpi}$ g $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ Ω r o b. (%) 0.4 -0.2 0 0.2 0.4 50 100 considering the second propagation
damage stage 10% 10% 72% 72% 100%

Without considering the 2^{nd} damage stage

2nd damage stage starts when damaged areas reach 10% of the stand (Dupont et al. 2015)

 $v_{\text{prop2}} = 4.30 \text{ U}_{h}$ -42.71 (% of damaged trees/min)

Conclusion

Simple wind-tree model:

- ► allowing to easily compare damage prediction between different stands or different storms as well as to investigate the impact of silvicultural practices
- \blacktriangleright answering to several weaknesses of existing wind risk models

More works need to be done to reach a complete wind risk model:

- (1) stand heterogeneities: not considered in the present model and poorly accounted for in existing wind risk models (Dupont et al. 2015, *Can. J. For. Res.*)
- (2) accentuation of damage propagation when damaged areas become significant enough to modify the wind flow
- (3) tree failure due to tree uprooting, not yet considered in the tree swaying model
- (4) evaluation of the model against reported damage after windstorms

THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTION

Financial support from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR): FORWIND and TWIST projects