



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/185677/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Tolladay, J and Chemel, C (2021) Numerical Modelling of Neutral Boundary-layer Flow Across a Forested Ridge. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 180 (3). pp. 457-476. ISSN: 0006-8314

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-021-00628-y>

© 2021, The Author(s). This is an author produced version of an article published in *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 Numerical Modelling of Neutral Boundary-Layer Flow across 2 a Forested Ridge

3 John Tolladay · Charles Chemel

4
5 Submitted: R0 29 May 2020 / Revised: R1 11 January 2021 / Revised: R2 30 March 2021

6 **Abstract** Forest canopies have been shown to alter the dynamics of flows over complex
7 terrain. Deficiencies have been found when tall canopies are represented in numerical sim-
8 ulations by an increase in roughness length at the surface. Methods of explicitly modelling
9 a forest canopy are not commonly available in community numerical weather prediction
10 models. In this work, such a method is applied to the community Weather Research and
11 Forecasting model. Simulations are carried out to replicate a wind-tunnel experiment of
12 neutral boundary-layer flow across a forested ridge. It is shown that features of the flow,
13 such as the separated region on the lee slope of the ridge, are reproduced by the roughness
14 length or canopy model methods. Shear at the top of the ridge generates turbulence that
15 spreads vertically as the flow moves downstream in both cases, but is elevated to canopy
16 top where a canopy model is used. The roughness-length approach is shown to suffer sev-
17 eral deficiencies, such as an over-prediction of mean wind-speeds, a lack of turbulence over
18 flat forested ground and an insufficient vertical extent of turbulence at all locations of the
19 domain studied. Sensitivity to the horizontal resolution of the simulation is explored. It is
20 found that higher resolution simulations improve reproduction of the mean flow when mod-
21 elling the canopy explicitly. However, higher resolutions do not provide improvements for
22 the roughness-length case and lead to a reduction in the horizontal extent of the separated
23 region of flow on the lee slope of the ridge.

24 **Keywords** Complex terrain · Forest canopy · Numerical simulation

25 1 Introduction

26 Interactions with surface elements such as buildings and forested areas have a significant
27 effect on the flows present in complex (uneven) terrain (Fernando 2010). It is thereby impor-
28 tant to understand the contributing factors to these flows, so as to evaluate their impacts on
29 pooling of cold air and air pollution in valleys or to predict mean wind speed and turbulence

J. Tolladay
University of Hertfordshire, College Lane, Hatfield, AL10 9AB, UK
E-mail: j.tolladay@herts.ac.uk

C. Chemel
National Centre for Atmospheric Science (NCAS), University of Hertfordshire, UK

30 statistics for wind farm applications. Bastin et al. (2019) estimated that 2.8 of the 15 billion
 31 hectares (that is 18.7%) of the Earth's land surface are covered in a forest canopy with a
 32 tree cover greater than 10%. Given the difficulty of building on ridge or valley sides and in
 33 mountainous areas, these areas are often left untouched and so likely to be covered in shrubs
 34 and trees at mid-latitudes. Therefore, a significant fraction of complex terrain is likely to be
 35 covered in a forest canopy of some sort.

36 Finnigan (2000) reviewed the bulk of the work done to date to understand flow in ho-
 37 mogeneous forest canopies over flat ground. Belcher et al. (2012) built on this review to il-
 38 lustrate how canopy flows respond to complex terrain. More recently, Finnigan et al. (2020)
 39 reviewed the subject of boundary layer flows in complex terrain. A section of this review
 40 focused on theory, analytical and numerical models of flow over canopy covered hills, and
 41 considered the effects of stability and scalar transport. There is a reasonably good mech-
 42 anistic understanding of the dynamics of canopy flows, the adjustment of flows at canopy
 43 edges, the ability to use 'simple' turbulence closures due to the inviscid nature of the dy-
 44 namics, effects of forested terrain on scalar transport, the generation of reversed flows within
 45 canopies downstream of ridge-tops and the significant reduction of turbulence and momen-
 46 tum within a canopy. However, woodland canopies are often not modelled explicitly in nu-
 47 merical weather prediction (NWP) models and relatively little attention has been paid to the
 48 evaluation of the effects of forest cover in complex terrain in these models.

49 Due to the broad range of scales of canopy elements (e.g. leaves, twigs and branches),
 50 it is currently computationally impractical to model explicitly the processes involved in the
 51 canopy flow dynamics on the scale of canopy elements in NWP models. Recognising the
 52 increased friction caused by canopy elements, the most common approach to parametrise
 53 the effects of the canopy on the flow is to increase the roughness z_0 of the underlying surface
 54 and displace the height of the ground. As is customary in micrometeorology, let us align the
 55 x -direction with that of the mean horizontal flow (i.e. the stream-wise direction) of veloc-
 56 ity $\langle u \rangle$ such that there is no variation of the mean span-wise component of velocity $\langle v \rangle$
 57 in the y -direction. Parametrising the turbulent kinematic flux of stream-wise momentum in the
 58 vertical direction z (referred to as stream-wise momentum flux thereafter), $\langle u'w' \rangle$, using a
 59 first-order flux–gradient relationship yields

$$60 \quad u_*^2 \equiv -\langle u'w' \rangle = K_m \frac{\partial \langle u \rangle}{\partial z}, \quad (1)$$

61 where $u_* \equiv \sqrt{|\langle u'w' \rangle|}$ is the (stream-wise) friction velocity and K_m is the eddy diffusivity of
 62 momentum. Using a mixing-length model, K_m is modelled, for neutral stability, as

$$63 \quad K_m = \ell u_* = \ell^2 \frac{\partial \langle u \rangle}{\partial z}, \quad (2)$$

64 where the mixing-length $\ell = \kappa (z - d)$, $\kappa = 0.4$ is the von Kármán constant and d is the zero-
 65 plane displacement height, where $\langle u \rangle = 0$. Assuming that $\langle u'w' \rangle$ is constant in the surface
 66 layer (that is u_* is constant in this 'constant-flux' layer), an integration of Equation (1) with
 67 the boundary condition $\langle u \rangle (z = d + z_0) = 0$ gives the logarithmic law

$$68 \quad \langle u \rangle = \frac{u_{*0}}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{z - d}{z_0} \right), \quad (3)$$

69 where $u_{*0} = u_* (z = 0)$. Since the wind speed is reduced to zero at the displacement height,
 70 this formulation cannot represent the flow or turbulence below the displacement height.
 71 When canopy elements are small in scale relative to the extent of the atmosphere being

72 modelled above, flows within the canopy have little impact on the dynamics of the flow
 73 well above the canopy. A change in roughness length at the surface is, thereby, a reasonable
 74 option to be used in NWP models for flows over short canopies. However, when dealing
 75 with taller canopy elements on the scales of mature trees, in the range 10–50 m in height,
 76 turbulence and drag within the canopy can have a profound effect on the flow above canopy
 77 (e.g. Ross 2012), which is not accounted for over a bare surface with increased roughness.
 78 Furthermore, the mixing length ℓ as defined above is not the most appropriate to use as a
 79 length scale for turbulent motions within a forest canopy (Wilson et al. 1998).

80 Several studies using the roughness-length approach to simulate the flow over forested
 81 ridges have shown that various features of the flow are not recreated accurately (e.g. Finni-
 82 gan and Brunet 1995; Ross and Vosper 2005). In particular, the region of separated flow,
 83 where the wind downstream of a forested ridge reverses close to the ground, is often not
 84 as substantial in simulations using a roughness-length parametrisation when compared to
 85 observations. The roughness-length approach also tends to over-predict the turbulence ki-
 86 netic energy (TKE) within close proximity to ridge-tops. Finnigan and Belcher (2004) and
 87 Harman and Finnigan (2007) examined canopy flows with an analytical model and found evi-
 88 dence that canopies do not tend to a constant roughness length while flowing over hills. This
 89 suggests that using a constant roughness length across a forested section of a hill is unlikely
 90 to properly recreate the flows over forested, complex terrain. A study by Allen (2006), on the
 91 effects of roughness lengths on flows over ridges, found that flow separation is encouraged if
 92 the roughness length is largest at the top of ridges. If the surface roughness length is largest
 93 at the base of ridges then flow separation is reduced.

94 More success has been found in recreating flow dynamics within and above canopies
 95 where the effects of these canopies are modelled explicitly and with a proper vertical extent.
 96 Such models consider the canopy as a horizontally homogeneous but vertically resolved
 97 volume, wherein the total kinematic drag generated by the canopy, \mathbf{F}_c , is expressed as the
 98 product of a drag coefficient C_d , a one-sided plant area density a and the square of the
 99 resolved velocity \mathbf{u} (see Wilson and Shaw 1977; Raupach and Thom 1981; Raupach and
 100 Shaw 1982; Finnigan 1985; Raupach et al. 1986), namely

$$101 \quad \mathbf{F}_c = -C_d a |\mathbf{u}| \mathbf{u}. \quad (4)$$

102 This term represents the momentum per unit mass that is lost per unit time through inter-
 103 action between the air and the trunks, branches and leaves that make up a forest canopy.
 104 Numerous studies added \mathbf{F}_c as an additional sink of momentum to the momentum equation
 105 within the canopy in bespoke numerical models to study (i) observed properties of the flow
 106 within the canopy over flat ground, e.g. sweeps and ejections that govern turbulent transport
 107 (e.g. Shaw and Schumann 1992; Dupont et al. 2008; Finnigan et al. 2009; Ouwersloot et al.
 108 2017), effects of forest edges (e.g. Cassiani et al. 2008; Dupont et al. 2011), variability in
 109 plant-area density in the horizontal (e.g. Bohrer et al. 2009) and in the vertical (e.g. Dupont
 110 and Brunet 2008), and (ii) the associated biosphere–atmosphere exchange of trace-gas and
 111 other scalars (e.g. Patton et al. 2001, 2003). In the study by Ouwersloot et al. (2017), some
 112 work was done to assess the sensitivity of model results to changes in grid resolution, but
 113 this related only to the influence of resolution on the production of unphysical velocity fluc-
 114 tuations caused by the sharp transition in plant area density at canopy top.

115 Less attention was given to deep canopies over hilly and mountainous terrain. Numerical
 116 modelling studies of flow across forested hills and ridges were conducted to challenge the
 117 model results with experimental measurements or analytical predictions (Ross and Vosper
 118 2005; Tamura et al. 2007; Dupont et al. 2008; Ross 2008; Grant et al. 2016). Patton and
 119 Katul (2009) investigated phase relationships between mean flow variables and turbulence

120 statistics and their sensitivity to a change in leaf area density. The separation region was
 121 found to be ambiguous for sparse canopies while being well-defined within the canopy on
 122 the lee side of the ridge for dense canopies. [Ross \(2011\)](#) and [Chen et al. \(2019\)](#) examined
 123 how topography-induced changes in the flow translate to scalar transport within the canopy.
 124 Scalars emitted near the ground exhibited larger spatial variability than those emitted in the
 125 upper canopy (see also [Ross and Harman 2015](#)). Transport out of the canopy was enhanced
 126 compared to that over flat terrain, with a preferential route out of the canopy located over the
 127 region of separated flow. [Ross and Baker \(2013\)](#) considered the effects of a forest canopy
 128 covering partially hilly terrain. Flow separation was essentially limited to the forested region
 129 over the lee slope where an adverse pressure gradient is induced by the terrain. The differ-
 130 ences in flow separation for different positionings of the forest were found to have a large
 131 impact of scalar transport out of the canopy.

132 In the present work, a simple canopy model is implemented in the Weather Research and
 133 Forecasting model. Large-eddy simulations using the standard roughness length approach
 134 and using the canopy model are evaluated using the ‘Furry Hill’ data ([Finnigan and Brunet
 135 1995](#)) for a neutral boundary-layer flow across a forested ridge. Simulations are carried out
 136 using a range of horizontal and vertical grid spacings in order to assess the impact that this
 137 has on the response of the flow to the canopy covered hill, hereafter referred to as a ridge to
 138 clarify the two dimensional profile. The modelling system is presented briefly in Sect. 2. The
 139 set-up of the modelling system and the design of the numerical experiments are described in
 140 Sect. 3. Numerical results and sensitivities to the horizontal grid spacing are analysed in
 141 Sect. 4. Conclusions are given in Sect. 5.

142 2 Modelling System

143 Numerical simulations were performed with the community Weather Research and Forecast-
 144 ing (WRF) modelling system, version 3.9.1, and using its Advanced Research WRF (ARW)
 145 dynamical core. The ARW dynamical core integrates the fully compressible, non-hydrostatic
 146 equations of motion in flux form. The equations are discretised using a terrain-following
 147 mass-based coordinate system and a staggered grid of type Arakawa-C. Time integration
 148 was performed using a third-order Runge-Kutta scheme and a time-splitting technique with
 149 semi-implicit sound waves. A fifth-order Weighted Essentially Non-Oscillatory (WENO)
 150 scheme with a positive definite filter was selected for advection of momentum and scalar
 151 variables. The Coriolis force was excluded as the effects of the Earth’s rotation on the flow
 152 are negligible at the scales of motion that are considered in the present work (see Sect. 3).

153 Canopy models have been developed and implemented in WRF by, for example, [Ma
 154 and Liu \(2019\)](#) and [Arthur et al. \(2018\)](#). However, these were not finalised until consider-
 155 able work had already been done for this study. The term F_c , defined by Equation (4), as an
 156 additional sink of momentum to the momentum equation within the canopy was therefore
 157 implemented by the authors. The 1.5-order turbulence closure scheme developed by [Dear-
 158 dorff \(1980\)](#) with a prognostic equation for sub-grid-scale (SGS) TKE, denoted by k_{SGS} , was
 159 used to determine the SGS fluxes from the resolved fields and the SGS TKE. In this scheme,
 160 the eddy viscosity of momentum K_m is modelled as

$$161 \quad K_m = C_k \lambda \sqrt{k_{SGS}}, \quad (5)$$

162 where the diffusion coefficient $C_k = 0.10$ and the SGS mixing length scale λ was set equal
 163 to the cube root of the grid-cell volume $\Delta s = (\Delta x \Delta y \Delta z)^{1/3}$.




Fig. 1 Terrain height z_g , normalised by the height of the canopy h_c , along the stream-wise direction x . The distance along x is normalised by the half-height width L of the ridge. The terrain is symmetric about $x = 0$ and uniform in the span-wise direction y (into the page). The vertical dotted lines indicate the positions where experimental data is available

In the turbulence closure scheme proposed by [Deardorff \(1980\)](#) the SGS TKE dissipation is given by

$$\varepsilon_v = C_\varepsilon k_{SGS}^{3/2} / \lambda, \quad (6)$$

where the dissipation coefficient $C_\varepsilon = 0.93$, except in the first grid cell immediately above the surface, where C_ε is increased to 3.9 to mimic a ‘wall effect’ so as to prevent k_{SGS} from becoming unduly large there. Following [Shaw and Schumann \(1992\)](#), the standard viscous dissipation ε_v was augmented by an additional dissipation term,

$$\varepsilon_c = 2C_d a |\mathbf{u}| k_{SGS}, \quad (7)$$

to represent the dissipation caused by the interactions between the air and the canopy.

3 Design of The Numerical Experiments

The ‘Furry Hill’ wind-tunnel experiment carried out by [Finnigan and Brunet \(1995\)](#) is used to evaluate the different methods of parametrising the canopy presented in the previous sections. In this experiment, a neutral atmosphere with a uniform background wind $U_b = 12 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ interacts with a forested ridge with a two dimensional profile of a ‘witch of Agnesi’ centred about $x = 0$ (see [Fig. 1](#)). Ground level z_g is defined as $z_g = H_e / [1 + (x/L_e)^2]$, where the height of the ridge $H_e = 0.15 \text{ m}$ and its half-height width $L_e = 0.42 \text{ m}$. For the artificial canopy used in the experiment, the height of the canopy was $h_{c,e} = 0.047 \text{ m}$, the plant area density $a_e = 10 \text{ m}^{-1}$ and the drag coefficient $C_{d,e} = 0.68$, leading to a canopy-drag length scale $L_{c,e} = (C_{d,e} a_e)^{-1} = 0.147 \text{ m}$. This artificial canopy was then surrounded by a rough surface of gravel with a diameter of 0.014 m ($\approx h_{c,e}/3.36$).

The physical properties of the ridge and canopy are scaled up as proposed by [Dupont et al. \(2008\)](#), so that the experiment represents atmospheric scales. This provides a ridge height $H = 30 \text{ m}$, half-height width $L = 84 \text{ m}$, canopy height $h_c = 10 \text{ m}$, plant area density $a = 0.165 \text{ m}^{-1}$ and drag parameter $C_d = 0.2$, leading to a canopy-drag length scale $L_c = (C_d a)^{-1} = 30.3 \text{ m}$. Geometric similarity is achieved ($H/L = H_e/L_e = 0.36$), but a was increased slightly in comparison to the value of 0.16 m^{-1} used by [Dupont et al. \(2008\)](#). This was done to achieve marginally closer values to the ‘Furry Hill’ experiment for the conditions $L_{c,e}/L_e = 0.35$ and $h_{c,e}/L_{c,e} = 0.32$, where these are $L_c/L = 0.36$ and $h_c/L_c = 0.33$ for the values used here. The canopy extends from $x/L = -9.35$ to 3.39 to match the location of the artificial canopy used in the experiment. For all simulations, the surrounding gravel surface is simulated using a roughness length of $z_0 = 0.0025 h_c = 0.025 \text{ m}$, approximately one tenth of the diameter of the scaled up gravel.

Simulations are performed with two nested domains and feedback was enabled, such that the lateral boundaries of the inner domain are set by the outer domain solution and the

198 solution at the boundaries of the inner domain are fed back to the outer domain. The outer
 199 domain extends horizontally between $x/L = \pm 36$ and $y/L = \pm 10.6$. The inner domain, centred
 200 on $(x, y) = (0, 0)$, covers one third of this extent, between $x/L = \pm 12$ and $y/L = \pm 3.53$.
 201 It should be noted that the ridge and canopy are present in the inner and outer domains
 202 and both domains are run in large-eddy simulation (LES) mode. In the vertical, a terrain-
 203 following coordinate is used with 85 points from the surface to the top of the two domains
 204 at approximately $z/h_c = 20$ above the sections of flat ground. A hyperbolic tangent function
 205 is applied to the vertical grid spacings to compact the grid close to the ground, with
 206 grid spacings barely increasing above. The grid is stretched such that the lowest level has a
 207 height of approximately $h/h_c = 0.1$, providing 10 levels within the canopy. A lowest grid
 208 level height of $h/h_c = 0.2$ was also considered but the results are not shown because the
 209 difference between the two cases was negligible. The top of the two domains is frictionless
 210 and includes a 50 m deep Rayleigh damping layer to reduce numerical instabilities in the
 211 simulation (Klemp et al. 2008). Periodic boundary conditions are used at the lateral bound-
 212 aries of the outer domain, which is given a sufficient extent in the stream-wise direction for
 213 the forested ridge to have no noticeable effect on the incoming flow at the inner domain.
 214 Horizontal grid spacings $\Delta x = \Delta y$ of 0.024, 0.048 and 0.071 L (2, 4 and 6 m) are considered
 215 for the inner domain and 0.071, 0.143 and 0.214 L (6, 12 and 18 m) for the outer domain,
 216 respectively. At the surface, no-slip conditions are imposed, the heat flux is set to zero and
 217 the momentum flux is calculated from wind velocity at the first grid point above the surface,
 218 using the logarithmic profile of Eq. (3) with a prescribed surface roughness length z_0 .

219 The simulations are initialised with a wind speed of 17 m s^{-1} in the positive x -direction at
 220 all positions. The initial wind speed is larger than that of the upstream flow in the wind-tunnel
 221 experiment (12 m s^{-1}) so that the flow speed achieved after the spin-up period corresponds
 222 to that approaching the canopy in the experiment. After approximately 30 to 40 minutes of
 223 simulation time, the solution reaches a quasi-steady state, as shown in Fig. 2 by the relatively
 224 constant wind speed after this time. While no forcing is applied to drive the flow, the 5 minute
 225 moving average of wind speed at the locations shown vary by no more than 3% in the outer
 226 domain and 6% in the inner domain for the time period after the first 45 minutes for all
 227 the simulations that were performed. To obtain numerically stable results, the vertical grid
 228 resolution and maximum flow speed demanded a model time-step $\Delta t = 0.025 \text{ s}$, with data
 229 being exported at 20 s intervals. The 90 data points between minute 45 and minute 75 of the
 230 simulation are then used to calculate the mean velocity components $\langle u \rangle_{yt}$, $\langle v \rangle_{yt}$, $\langle w \rangle_{yt}$ and
 231 their variances $\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yt}$, $\langle v'^2 \rangle_{yt}$, $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ in the x -, y -, z -directions, respectively, the momentum
 232 flux per unit mass $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ and TKE per unit mass $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$, where $\langle \square \rangle_{yt}$ denotes an average
 233 in both time and the span-wise direction y and $'$ represents a fluctuation from this averaged
 234 value. The velocity components and turbulence statistics collected by Finnigan and Brunet
 235 (1995) were normalised with the friction velocity u_* at canopy top at $x/L = -3$. In this work
 236 the results are presented in SI units and the normalisation of the measurements was reversed
 237 using $u_* = 0.911 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ calculated from their results.

238 In the following, the WRF simulations that use the canopy model introduced in Sect. 2
 239 are given the reference WRF-C. The surface roughness length at the location of the canopy
 240 is set to $z_0 = 0.001 h_c = 0.01 \text{ m}$ (as in Shaw and Schumann 1992) for these simulations. An-
 241 other set of WRF simulations with reference WRF-R use only a change in surface roughness
 242 length to represent the artificial canopy, rather than modelling it explicitly. For WRF-R the
 243 roughness length used at the location of the canopy is $z_0 = 0.085 h_c = 0.85 \text{ m}$, determined
 244 to provide the closest agreement with the profile above the flat section of canopy in WRF-C
 245 when used in Equation (3). When discussing a specific simulation, the references WRF-C
 246 and WRF-R are followed by a number representing the horizontal grid spacing of the inner




Fig. 2 Wind speed $|u|$ averaged in the y -direction for WRF-C6 (a) outer and (b) inner domains and for WRF-R6 (c) outer and (d) inner domains for positions around the ridge at $4h_c$ above ground level. The points show instantaneous wind speeds, while the solid lines show a 5 min moving average

247 domain. For example, with horizontal grid spacing of 2 m ($0.024L$) for a simulation using
 248 the explicit canopy model, the reference would be WRF-C2. The height of the lowest grid
 249 level is below the displacement height of the canopy and WRF is designed to only apply the
 250 effects of a roughness length in the bottom grid level. The results for WRF-R were elevated
 251 upwards by $z/h_c = 0.6$ such that the displacement height $d = 0.7h_c$ is within the lowest grid
 252 level. To keep notation simple in the following, height above ground level $h = z - z_g$ for
 253 WRF-R refers to that for WRF-C. Note that the ground is elevated at all positions, as this
 254 change in displacement height can not be properly applied at the leading and trailing edge
 255 of the canopy-covered region.

256 To ascertain that the model does resolve the most energetic scales of motion, the ratio
 257 of SGS to resolved TKE is shown in Fig. 3 for WRF-C. The SGS component of $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ is
 258 negligible at all positions away from the canopy regardless of the horizontal grid spacing
 259 considered. In all cases, SGS TKE is up to 4 times greater in magnitude than resolved TKE
 260 at the lowest levels of the domain, outside of the canopy. While it is not shown here, the same is
 261 true for all cases of WRF-R at the lowest grid levels but with a more significant contribution
 262 where the surface roughness increases to represent the canopy, especially around the peak of
 263 the ridge between $x/L = -1$ to 1. For WRF-C6 [see Fig. 3(a)], above the lowest grid levels,
 264 SGS TKE is most substantial (up to 3 times resolved TKE) at the top of the leading edge of
 265 the canopy ($x/L = -9$ to -8) and at canopy top near the peak of the ridge ($x/L = 0$ to 1). As
 266 the horizontal grid spacing is reduced, more of the turbulence generated in these locations
 267 within the canopy is resolved. Almost all TKE is resolved for WRF-C2 [see Fig. 3(c)]. It
 268 is therefore expected that the results for WRF-C2 will be closer to the measurements made in
 269 the ‘Furry Hill’ experiment than the other cases of WRF-C.




Fig. 3 Ratio of sub-grid scale to resolved turbulence kinetic energy per unit mass, $\langle k_{SGS} \rangle_{yt} / \langle k \rangle_{yt}$ for (a) WRF-C6, (b) WRF-C4 and (c) WRF-C2. The top of the simulated artificial canopy is indicated by a black dashed line

270 4 Results and Analysis

271 4.1 Model Evaluation

272 Pressure perturbations $\langle \Delta p \rangle_{yt}$ as a difference from the values at corresponding altitude z
 273 further upstream, taken here at $x/L = -3$, result from interaction with the forested ridge.
 274 The pressure perturbations induced by the canopy, Δp_c , and by the ridge, Δp_h , scale as
 275 $\Delta p_c \approx \rho U_b^2 h_c / L_c$ and $\Delta p_h \approx \rho U_b^2 H / L$, respectively, where ρ is density and U_b is the
 276 stream-wise velocity at corresponding altitude upstream of the ridge, taken here at $x/L = -5$
 277 (Belcher et al. 2003). Simulated near-surface pressure perturbation for WRF-C and WRF-R
 278 is compared with measurements from the wind-tunnel experiment in Fig. 4(a) and (b), re-
 279 spectively. Recall that the simulated fields for WRF-R are valid from height $z = d$ and so
 280 pressure is compared at this height. The simulations capture reasonably well the measured
 281 decrease in pressure across the top of the ridge, although both over-predict the drop in pressure
 282 over the windward slope of the ridge. Immediately after the ridge-top the near-surface
 283 pressure for WRF-R follows the measurements closely, with the exception of WRF-R2
 284 where the near-surface pressure increases over a shorter distance than for the other WRF-R
 285 simulations. For WRF-C, the distribution of near-surface pressure is similar to that measured
 286 but of a larger magnitude at all positions where measurements are available. This shows, as
 287 pointed out for instance by Ross and Vosper (2005), that the effective width of the ridge is
 288 increased for WRF-C when compared to WRF-R.




Fig. 4 Simulated mean near-surface normalised pressure $\langle \Delta p / \Delta p_h \rangle_{yt}$ for (a) WRF-C and (b) WRF-R compared with the wind-tunnel measurements over the ‘Furry Hill’ from Finnigan and Brunet (1995) (see text for details). The pressure perturbation Δp is calculated relative to the value at $x/L = -3$

Table 1 Domain-wide root-mean-squared-error γ for the time and y-direction averaged stream-wise velocity $\langle u \rangle_{yt}$ (in m s^{-1}), vertical momentum flux per unit mass $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ (in $\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-2}$), stream-wise velocity variance $\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ (in $\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-2}$), vertical velocity variance $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ (in $\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-2}$) and turbulence kinetic energy per unit mass $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ (in $\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-2}$), for all cases considered for WRF-C and WRF-R

Simulation	$\gamma(\langle u \rangle_{yt})$	$\gamma(\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt})$	$\gamma(\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yt})$	$\gamma(\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt})$	$\gamma(\langle k \rangle_{yt})$
WRF-C2	0.90	0.70	1.03	0.58	1.20
WRF-C4	0.96	0.67	1.19	0.64	1.24
WRF-C6	1.03	0.56	1.26	0.75	1.13
WRF-R2	2.50	0.68	1.88	1.05	2.08
WRF-R4	1.92	0.62	1.67	0.98	1.69
WRF-R6	1.53	0.57	1.62	1.08	1.45

289 Simulated vertical profiles of the time and y-direction averaged stream-wise velocity and
 290 turbulence statistics to the counterpart measured profiles are presented in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6
 291 for a selected subset of positions across the ridge. A quantitative evaluation in terms of root-
 292 mean-square error (RMSE), denoted by γ herein, for all measurement positions (x, h) , illus-
 293 trated in Fig. 1, is presented in Table 1. Vertical profiles of the time and y-direction averaged
 294 stream-wise velocity $\langle u \rangle_{yt}$ for WRF-C and WRF-R are shown respectively in Fig. 5(a) and
 295 Fig. 6(a). For WRF-C, these profiles are relatively close to those of the measurements, with
 296 similar $\gamma(\langle u \rangle_{yt})$ of 0.9 to 1.3 m s^{-1} over the range of horizontal grid spacings. For WRF-R
 297 the profiles of $\langle u \rangle_{yt}$ are similar to the measurements upstream of the ridge but, as a result
 298 of the weaker separation on the lee side of the ridge, there is an excess of $\langle u \rangle_{yt}$ from ap-
 299 proximately $z/h_c = 2$ to 6. This indicates that using a passive roughness is appropriate to
 300 represent the mean boundary-layer flow over flat ground for the case considered, but per-
 301 formance degrades significantly when the boundary-layer flow crosses over the ridge. When
 302 evaluated across all measurement positions (x, h) , $\gamma(\langle u \rangle_{yt})$ is 49 to 178% larger for WRF-R
 303 than for WRF-C (see Table 1). The canopy model therefore performs better overall at repro-
 304 ducing the mean flow over a ridge covered in a forest canopy. Although the canopy model in
 305 WRF-C was implemented with the *sharp transition* of Ouwensloot et al. (2017), erroneous
 306 fluctuations in stream-wise velocity above the canopy were not seen.




Fig. 5 Vertical profiles of time and y-direction averaged (from the top to bottom panels) stream-wise velocity $\langle u \rangle_{yT}$, vertical momentum flux per unit mass $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yT}$, stream-wise velocity variance $\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yT}$, vertical velocity variance $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yT}$ and turbulence kinetic energy per unit mass $\langle k \rangle_{yT}$ for WRF-C, compared with the wind-tunnel measurements over the ‘Furry Hill’ from [Finnigan and Brunet \(1995\)](#) (see text for details). A graphical representation of the slope in the terrain present around each profile is displayed at the top of the figure

307 The simulated $\langle u \rangle_{yT}$ on the lee side of the ridge is negative within the canopy for WRF-C
 308 and WRF-R, which is not the case for the measurements. However, the measurements of
 309 velocity must be interpreted with caution in the region of separated flow, since the crossed
 310 hot-wire probes that were used are not appropriate for measuring a reversed flow. Using
 311 flow visualisation techniques, [Finnigan and Brunet \(1995\)](#) were able to identify a separation
 312 region $5.2L$ in length. This will be explored in Sect. 4.2 using cross-sections that show the
 313 full extent of the simulated separation region more clearly. WRF-C performs better than
 314 WRF-R not only for the mean flow but also for the majority of the turbulence statistics (see
 315 rows (b) to (e) in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 and the second to fifth columns of Table 1). The RMSE




Fig. 6 Vertical profiles of time and y-direction averaged (from the top to bottom panels) stream-wise velocity $\langle u \rangle_{yt}$, vertical momentum flux per unit mass $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$, stream-wise velocity variance $\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yt}$, vertical velocity variance $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ and turbulence kinetic energy per unit mass $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ for WRF-R, compared with the wind-tunnel measurements over the ‘Furry Hill’ from Finnigan and Brunet (1995) (see text for details). A graphical representation of the slope in the terrain present around each profile is displayed at the top of the figure

316 γ for WRF-R are 29 to 83%, 44 to 81% and 28 to 73% larger than that for WRF-C for the
 317 stream-wise velocity variance $\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yt}$, vertical velocity variance $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ and TKE per unit
 318 mass $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$, respectively.

319 In the region upstream of the ridge, the stream-wise velocity variance $\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ takes a
 320 similar form to the measured profiles for both WRF-C and WRF-R, with WRF-C closer to
 321 the measured values than WRF-R and WRF-R2 performing particularly poorly above the
 322 canopy. The vertical velocity variance $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ and vertical momentum flux per unit mass
 323 $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ below $z/h_c = 5$ in the upstream region are minimal for all cases for WRF-R in
 324 comparison to the corresponding measurements. This is a clear indication that the roughness-

length approach to modelling the effects of a canopy does not generate the level of turbulence seen in the wind-tunnel measurements, at least over flat ground. Conversely, WRF-C is able to reproduce most turbulence statistics accurately, with $\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ and $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ agreeing well with the measured profiles. The magnitude of the peak in $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ is reproduced well by WRF-C2; it is between 4 and 16% of the measured peak value in the upstream region. However, the simulations with larger horizontal grid spacings under-predict $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$, with peak values in this region 22 to 37% smaller for WRF-C4 and 40 to 69% smaller for WRF-C6. The WRF-C simulations tend to over-predict the magnitude of $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ above the canopy, with WRF-C6 performing slightly better than WRF-C4 and WRF-C2 in the upstream region.

As the flow reaches the top of the ridge, at $x/L = 0$, a peak forms in the measured vertical momentum flux per unit mass $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ within close proximity of the top of the canopy. This is reproduced well by WRF-C2, but WRF-C4 and WRF-C6 under-predict this peak value respectively by 36 and 56%. For WRF-R this peak is not present for any of the horizontal grid spacings used. A similar peak in TKE per unit mass $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ is also seen in the measurements at this location. In carrying out simulations similar to those discussed here, Dupont et al. (2008) and Ross and Vosper (2005) reported large peaks in $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ near the displacement height of the canopy at ridge-top when using a change in roughness length at the surface to represent the canopy. While this was not seen in the results shown here, such an excess was present in the results of preliminary simulations carried out by the authors when considering non-neutral conditions. The peaks in $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ for WRF-R at this location are approximately 50% smaller than the measured values, with WRF-R6 and WRF-R4 11 to 12% closer to the measured peak value than WRF-R2. The peak values of $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ for WRF-C are within 12 and 23% of the measured peak values, with smaller horizontal grid spacings providing the closest agreement. The differences between the ridge-top profiles for the different grid-spacings are minimal at most locations, but while WRF-C2 provides the best result for the canopy model simulations, WRF-R6 provides the best result for the simulations using only a change in roughness length at the surface.

As the flow proceeds downstream, all turbulence statistics begin to respond more strongly to the presence of the forested ridge. For the simulations and measurements, the momentum flux $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ displays a single peak, the location of which increases in height above ground level between $x/L = 0$ and 2.5 (see Fig. 5(b) and Fig. 6(b)). It should be noted that these figures show height above ground level. Thus, while a peak in a profile appears to be displaced upwards, it actually remains at a fairly constant altitude, as will be shown in the cross-sections of Sect. 4.2.

For WRF-C, the peak in $\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ increases in height downstream over a similar range of x/L to that seen in the measurements. However, for $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ the peak rises initially but then remains between $h/h_c = 1.5$ to 2.5 over $x/L = 0.7$ to 2.5. $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ and $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ correspondingly increase more rapidly at low levels than higher above the ground. This leads to the peak value occurring lower than that measured in the wind tunnel and to closer agreement with the measurements above the peak than below. For WRF-R the peak value of $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ occurs slightly closer to the ground, between $h/h_c = 1$ to 2. The magnitude of this peak is not reproduced well by any of the WRF-R simulations at $x/L = 0.7$. For $x/L = 1$ to 1.4, WRF-R6 and WRF-R4 remain close to the measured profiles of $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ until $h/h_c = 1.5$ but under-predict above this height until $h/h_c = 6$. This is also true for the peak in $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ for WRF-R2, except by $x/L = 1.4$ the peak value is over-predicted by 32% while still 1.5 h_c lower than the height of the peak in the measurements. The peaks in the downstream profiles of $\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ for WRF-R rise over a range of x/L more in line with the measurements and WRF-C than those for $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$. However, by $x/L = 1.4$ these peaks are 0.5 to 1 h_c lower than those in the measurements, with this discrepancy most acute in the case of WRF-R2. This

374 leads to the peak in $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ for WRF-R occurring up to $1.5h_c$ lower than the peak in the
375 measurements, compared to $1h_c$ lower for WRF-C. As WRF-R reproduces $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ more
376 accurately downstream of the ridge and less accurately before the ridge and *vice versa* for
377 WRF-C, the corresponding γ for this quantity are within 2 to 8% when comparing the two
378 methods of parametrising the canopy.

379 The results produced by WRF-C are very similar to those that were produced in the
380 simulations carried out by Dupont et al. (2008). The peak in $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ immediately down-
381 stream of the ridge also occurs at a position in the vertical that is different from that of the
382 measurements and is over-predicted by a similar amount, but by $x/L = 3.5$ the profile is
383 more similar to the measurements than WRF-C. The simulations from both works follow
384 the profiles of $\langle u'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ and $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ closely. Similar but small over-predictions in these quantities
385 below $z/h_c = 3$ are present in both cases, but larger for WRF-C. While WRF-C2 performs
386 considerably better in reproducing $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ upstream of the ridge, the results by Dupont et al.
387 (2008) are closer to the measurements downstream of the ridge. The vertical position of the
388 peak in $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ is also lower than in the measurements at $x/L = 2$ but follows the measure-
389 ments better than any of the WRF-C simulations. It is worth noting that Dupont et al. (2008)
390 do not provide the value for u_* used for normalisation and this could lead to differences
391 in the magnitudes of the various statistics between those results and the results of WRF-C.
392 The similarity between the height of the wake seen in the WRF-C simulations and those of
393 Dupont et al. (2008) would suggest that the difference to the measurements is a result of the
394 experiment being scaled up. It is therefore possible that further similarity conditions are re-
395 quired when scaling up experiments studying flows over ridges covered with a canopy. The
396 'Furry Hill' experiment was studied by Ross and Vosper (2005) using numerical simulations
397 of the same scale as that of the wind tunnel with a canopy model and using only a change
398 in roughness length at the surface to parametrise the artificial canopy. However, it is difficult
399 to compare WRF-C and WRF-R to those results due to the reduced vertical extent of the
400 plotted data and the small size of the plots themselves.

401 There are some considerable differences between the profiles of turbulence statistics for
402 the equivalent simulations with different horizontal grid spacings. Upstream of the ridge,
403 WRF-C2 provides the closest agreement with the measurements but, as the flow proceeds
404 past the ridge, WRF-C6 tends to produce better results. The finest grid appears to be repro-
405 ducing the fine scales of turbulence above the flat section of canopy upstream of the ridge
406 well, but is not performing so well in the wake, where turbulence is generated by the com-
407 bination of the canopy and the ridge. The profiles of turbulence statistics for WRF-R6 and
408 WRF-R4 are very similar across most positions, although with considerable differences to
409 the measured values. However, there are large differences between the profiles for WRF-R2
410 and those with a more coarse grid spacing. The TKE $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ and vertical momentum flux
411 $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ are over-predicted to varying degrees in all of the simulations below $h/h_c = 5$ to
412 6 in the downstream region. While this is still true at $x/L = 3.5$, the differences between
413 equivalent simulations of different horizontal grid spacings are greatly reduced, with pro-
414 files of $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ much closer to the measured profiles. The horizontal grid resolution resolution
415 of the simulations has a strong influence on the properties of the flow in close proximity to
416 the forested ridge, but does not make a large difference to the properties of the flow further
417 downstream.

418 While the magnitude of the turbulence statistics generated from WRF-R and WRF-C
419 both differ from the measurements in some positions, the forms of the vertical profiles are
420 more closely reproduced by WRF-C. The response to the forested ridge for WRF-R gener-
421 ally lies between what would be expected for a ridge with negligible roughness and that
422 for WRF-C. The roughness-length approach to modelling the effects of a canopy does mod-




Fig. 7 Simulated mean normalised pressure perturbation $\langle \Delta p \rangle_{yt}$ for (a) WRF-C4 and (b) WRF-R4. The pressure perturbation is calculated relative to the value at the corresponding height at $x/L = -3$. The top of the simulated artificial canopy is indicated by a black dashed line. The light grey lines show mean flow streamlines originating at regular height intervals above the flat ground at $x/L = -12$. The dashed white line in (b) represents the effective ground level of the vertically displaced WRF-R4 simulation (see Sect. 3 for details)

423 if the dynamics correctly but not sufficiently for the extensive, tall canopy considered in
 424 the present work. In sum, the comparison of model results with the ‘Furry Hill’ data shows
 425 that the implementation of the canopy model in WRF is a significant improvement over the
 426 roughness-length approach for both the mean flow and the turbulence statistics when con-
 427 sidering a ridge covered by a tall canopy for the range of horizontal grid spacings considered
 428 herein. While WRF-C provides better results than WRF-R immediately downstream of the
 429 ridge, there are still clearly deficiencies in the model’s ability to reproduce the magnitude
 430 and height of the wake.

431 4.2 Flow Features

432 Using the scaling arguments presented at the beginning of Sect. 4.1, since $h_c/L_c \sim H/L$
 433 in the present work, there ought to be an interplay between the canopy and the ridge on the
 434 generation of drag on the ridge surface. The mean pressure perturbation field $\langle \Delta p \rangle_{yt}(x, z)$
 435 across the finer-resolved domain is shown in Fig. 7 for WRF-C4 and WRF-R4. Significant
 436 differences can be noticed between the two simulations, most notably the presence of a
 437 local maximum and minimum in pressure respectively before and after the leading edge of
 438 the canopy at $x/L = -9.35$ for WRF-C (see Fig. 7a). The local minimum at $x/L = -7.5$,
 439 induces an adverse pressure gradient, thereby decelerating the flow (see Belcher et al. 2003,
 440 for a detailed description of the adjustment of a turbulent boundary layer to a canopy of
 441 roughness elements). In contrast, pressure is essentially horizontally uniform upstream of
 442 the ridge for WRF-R with only a slight decrease caused by the change in roughness length at
 443 $x/L = -9.35$. The flow is assumed to adjust to the canopy at the location where $\langle w \rangle_{yt}/u_{\text{ref}} =$
 444 0.01 , with u_{ref} taken as $\langle u \rangle_{yt}$ at height $h/h_c = 2$ over the flat section of terrain with no canopy
 445 present at $x/L = -10.5$. For all cases of WRF-C this adjustment length $L_a \approx 3.8 L_c$, which is
 446 smaller than the range $4.5\text{--}6 L_c$ predicted by Belcher et al. (2012). However, it is in line with
 447 the values of $3 L_c$ and $4 L_c$ found in the analytical and numerical studies of Belcher et al.




Fig. 8 Simulated mean stream-wise velocity $\langle u \rangle_{yt}$ for (a) WRF-C4 and (b) WRF-R4. The top of the simulated artificial canopy is indicated by a black dashed line. The light grey lines show mean flow streamlines originating at regular height intervals above the flat ground at $x/L = -12$. The dashed white line in (b) represents the effective ground level of the vertically displaced WRF-R4 simulation (see Sect. 3 for details)

448 (2008) and Dupont and Brunet (2009), respectively. It should be noted that the analytical
 449 methods use the location where the vertical velocity has dropped to the friction velocity u_* ;
 450 however for WRF-C the vertical velocity is always less than the friction velocity at canopy
 451 top.

452 Pressure decreases and hence the wind speed increases as the flow approaches the top
 453 of the ridge. In the case of a ridge with no canopy and negligible surface roughness, the
 454 pressure minimum is located directly above the ridge. When a canopy is present on the ridge
 455 this pressure minimum is displaced to a position downstream from the ridge-top (see Fig. 7).
 456 For WRF-C the area of lowest pressure extends over the majority of the slope on the lee
 457 side of the ridge for all horizontal grid spacings. A pressure minimum occurs immediately
 458 downstream of the ridge-top just above the canopy at $x/L = 0.95$, $h/h_c = 1.7$ for WRF-C4.
 459 Changing the horizontal grid spacing does not modify the height of this minimum by more
 460 than $0.1 h_c$. However larger grid spacings result in a more significant displacement of this
 461 minimum in the stream-wise direction, $x/L = 0.67$ for WRF-C2 and $x/L = 1.14$ for WRF-C6
 462 (not shown). While there is an area of reduced pressure over a similar extent for WRF-R,
 463 the location of minimum pressure is at the top of the ridge at the lowest modelled level at
 464 $x/L = 0$, $h/h_c = 0.6$ for all horizontal grid spacings considered.

465 On the lee side of the ridge the adverse pressure gradient leads to flow separation which,
 466 in turn, causes the adverse pressure gradient to extend further downstream as if the ridge
 467 has been extended in the downstream direction. This effect is more significant for WRF-C
 468 than for WRF-R, although the pressure field for WRF-R is much closer to that for WRF-C
 469 than to that which would be expected for a ridge with negligible roughness. The pressure
 470 close to the ground readjusts downstream of the ridge over a shorter distance for WRF-R
 471 than for WRF-C (cf. Fig. 4). Coupling between the out-of-phase flows within and above
 472 the canopy results in a reduced pressure gradient (reduced over-speeding) over the ridge for
 473 WRF-C compared with that for WRF-R. The separation region extends over $4L$ in length
 474 over the ground surface for all cases for WRF-C, in line with the experimental data of Finni-
 475 gan and Brunet (1995) and numerical data of Ross and Vosper (2005) and Dupont et al.
 476 (2008), compared with $3L$ for WRF-R4 (see Fig. 8). However, the horizontal extent of the




Fig. 9 Simulated turbulence kinetic energy per unit mass $\langle k \rangle_{yr}$ for (a) WRF-C4 and (b) WRF-R4. The top of the simulated artificial canopy is indicated by a black dashed line. The light grey lines show mean flow streamlines originating at regular height intervals above the flat ground at $x/L = -12$. The dashed white line in (b) represents the effective ground level of the vertically displaced WRF-R4 simulation (see Sect. 3 for details)

477 separation region at the surface for WRF-R would be of comparable extent if the flow could
 478 be visualised below the displacement height d . The horizontal grid spacing does not modify
 479 the length of the separation region significantly for WRF-C. For WRF-R the horizontal extent
 480 of the separation region increases with horizontal grid spacing, from $2.2L$ in length for
 481 WRF-R2 to $3.5L$ for WRF-R6.

482 A wake is created on the lee side of the ridge, centred vertically on the region of maxi-
 483 mum wind shear above the separation region as shown in Fig. 9 for $\langle k \rangle_{yr}$ (although a similar
 484 structure is visible in all other turbulence statistics). The vertical differential in wind speed
 485 at the top of the ridge is smaller for WRF-R than that at canopy height at the top of the ridge
 486 for WRF-C. Therefore, the wake angle and the intensity of turbulence within the wake are
 487 larger for WRF-C than for WRF-R. There is evidence of Kelvin-Helmholtz billows forming
 488 in the wake for both simulations. Turbulence is suppressed in the canopy for WRF-C while
 489 fluctuations are clearly visible near the surface for WRF-R. The vertical spread or depth D
 490 of the turbulent wake region follows a power law of the form $D = A(x - x_0)^\alpha$, as presented by
 491 Kaimal and Finnigan (1994) in reference to Taylor (1988). In this formulation x_0 is a virtual
 492 origin situated before the ridge and A is a constant. Kaimal and Finnigan (1994) pointed out
 493 that theory, wind-tunnel and field experiments have not decided whether α should be equal
 494 to 0.5 or 1. The power α that best fit the wakes in the simulations presented here is in the
 495 range 0.6 – 0.7 with x_0 taken as $x/L = -3$.

496 5 Conclusions and Discussion

497 Results from numerical model simulations of neutral boundary-layer flow across a forested
 498 ridge using a canopy model (WRF-C) or a bare surface with an increased roughness z_0 at the
 499 location of the canopy (WRF-R) using a range of resolutions were analysed and compared.
 500 The main conclusions, along with some discussion, are given below.

- 501 • The speed of the flow in the stream-wise direction is closer to the counterpart wind-
502 tunnel measurements for WRF-C than for WRF-R. As is expected, the reduced canopy
503 drag for WRF-R leads to an over-estimation of the wind speed above the canopy, which
504 becomes larger as the flow proceeds downstream.
- 505 • WRF-C captures the measured turbulence statistics significantly better than WRF-R.
506 The boundary layer has very little turbulence upstream of the ridge for WRF-R with a
507 particular deficiency in the vertical velocity variance $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$.
- 508 • While the forested ridge in WRF-R generates turbulence close to the ground, the vertical
509 extent of these turbulent structures does not reach as far above the ground as those seen
510 in the measurements or in WRF-C.
- 511 • For WRF-R the horizontal extent of the separation region increases as the horizontal
512 grid spacing is increased. This is not seen in WRF-C, where the separation region was
513 of comparable extent for each horizontal grid spacing considered.
- 514 • The discrepancies between the experimental measurements and simulated values of
515 stream-wise velocity and the various turbulence statistics are reduced by reducing the
516 horizontal grid spacing for WRF-C.
- 517 • While it might be expected for a finer horizontal resolution to improve the results of
518 WRF-R, the discrepancy with the measurements is actually increased, as is discussed
519 below.

520 The RMSE γ between the measured and modelled profiles at the positions shown in
521 Fig. 1 varies between the different turbulence statistics and mean stream-wise velocity for
522 different horizontal grid spacings for WRF-C and WRF-R. In general, WRF-C provides
523 closer results to the measurements when a smaller horizontal grid spacing is used, while
524 the WRF-R simulations provide closer results at larger grid spacings for the case considered
525 here. The RMSE for vertical momentum flux $\gamma(\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt})$ and TKE $\gamma(\langle k \rangle_{yt})$ do not follow this
526 trend for WRF-C, with the largest grid spacing providing the best result in the reproduction
527 of both statistics. However, this discrepancy is predominantly due to the turbulence occur-
528 ring directly after the peak of the ridge at the profiles between $x/L = 0.7$ and 1.4. In this
529 region there is a large over-prediction in $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ at low levels and the closest simulated pro-
530 files to the measurements shift from WRF-C2 to WRF-C6 as the flow moves downstream.
531 The stronger response to the ridge at low levels when smaller horizontal grid spacings are
532 used leads to an even greater over-prediction in $\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt}$ and, as the difference to the mea-
533 surements is large here, $\gamma(\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt})$ is heavily influenced by these profiles. The smaller grid
534 spacings also lead to an over-prediction of $\langle k \rangle_{yt}$ in this region, but the difference this makes
535 to $\gamma(\langle k \rangle_{yt})$ is reduced by the smaller difference in magnitude to the measured profiles. The
536 fact that WRF-C2 is closer to the measurements before and after the ridge leads to $\gamma(\langle k \rangle_{yt})$
537 for WRF-C2 being only 6% larger than for WRF-C6, while for $\gamma(\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt})$ WRF-C2 is 25%
538 larger. For WRF-R, $\gamma(\langle u'w' \rangle_{yt})$ and $\gamma(\langle k \rangle_{yt})$ reduce with increasing horizontal grid spacing
539 in line with the other statistics. However, $\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt}$ is reproduced poorly for all grid spacings,
540 with $\gamma(\langle w'^2 \rangle_{yt})$ remaining at approximately $1 \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-2}$.

541 The larger discrepancies between the measurements and the counterpart numerical re-
542 sults, when smaller horizontal grid spacings are used, is also likely due to a compounding
543 of errors. The dynamics of the flow in and around the canopy is not properly modelled
544 when the canopy is represented only by a change in roughness length at the surface, as for
545 WRF-R. When the horizontal grid spacing is reduced there are a larger number of grid cells
546 over which errors can accumulate. For WRF-C the flow is more accurately reproduced over
547 the flat terrain for which the canopy model used was devised. However, immediately down-
548 stream of the ridge, the smallest grid spacing is not providing a significant improvement to

549 the reproduction of turbulence in the wake region. This may indicate that the canopy model
550 used for WRF-C requires improvement to properly reproduce canopy dynamics in complex
551 terrain. However, this canopy model is representing an evenly spaced array of cylindrical
552 stalks as a homogeneous, porous block and so inconsistencies are always likely to be present.

553 For each of the simulations performed here, with a vertical resolution at the surface
554 of $0.1h_c$, a corresponding simulation was carried out with a vertical resolution of $0.2h_c$.
555 These have not been shown here as the differences between these two sets of simulations
556 were negligible at all positions, other than a shift of approximately $z/h_c = 0.1$ in the height
557 of peak values at canopy top due to the larger vertical extent of the grid cells. When a
558 forest canopy is represented using an increase in roughness length at the surface and vertical
559 resolution smaller than that of canopy elements, it is necessary to elevate the ground to
560 the displacement height of the canopy. As this is not practical in numerical simulations, it is
561 difficult to accurately reproduce the modification to the flow by the leading or trailing edge of
562 the canopy using such a method. An additional simulation was performed with a bottom grid
563 cell height of $h/h_c = 1.2$, using the roughness length approach but without displacing the
564 ground. Results were found to have the same deficiencies as the other WRF-R simulations,
565 with little to no response to the canopy visible in the turbulence statistics (not shown). Hence,
566 a change in roughness length cannot replicate the effects of a relatively tall canopy in the
567 modulation of the flow speed over a ridge. An explicit treatment of the canopy represents a
568 significant improvement over the roughness-length approach. However, it does require a fine
569 spatial resolution in the vertical and the horizontal to include model layers within the canopy
570 and to model turbulence in a large-eddy simulation mode. The high spatial resolution of the
571 simulation leads to steeper slopes in the orography, which set constraints on the time-step
572 (Connolly et al. 2020). Further research will be required to determine the effectiveness of
573 this canopy model if coarser spatial resolutions are required.

574 While the results presented herein are for a fairly idealised terrain geometry and set
575 of initial and boundary conditions, the results have important practical implications for the
576 assessment and management of wind and pollution in the atmosphere within complex terrain.
577 In the interest of comparing to the measurements of Finnigan and Brunet (1995), the current
578 study was limited to geometry of the hill and canopy in their experiment with $L_c/L = 0.36$
579 and $h_c/H = 0.33$. For this case it appears that a horizontal resolution of $0.024L$ ($0.066L_c$)
580 and a vertical resolution of 0.1 to $0.2h_c$ was appropriate to reproduce the flow over a forested
581 ridge using a canopy model with vertical extent. Further work is required to explore a wider
582 range of hill geometries and canopy properties and extents at different resolutions, as well as
583 real-case studies that are likely to demand coarser grid resolutions. However, this will require
584 considerably more experimental data on canopy flows in complex terrain to be collected.

585 **Acknowledgements** The authors thank Dr. Sylvain Dupont for the provision of data from the paper by
586 Dupont et al. (2008). Numerical model simulations were performed using the University of Hertfordshire
587 high-performance computing facility.

588 References

- 589 Allen T (2006) Flow over ridges with variable roughness. *Boundary Layer Meteorology* 121:475–490, DOI
590 [10.1007/s10546-006-9086-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-006-9086-0)
- 591 Arthur R, Mirocha J, Lundquist K, Street R (2018) Using a Canopy Model Framework to Improve Large-
592 Eddy Simulations of the Neutral Atmospheric Boundary Layer in the Weather Research and Forecasting
593 Model. *Monthly Weather Review* 147, DOI [10.1175/MWR-D-18-0204.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-18-0204.1)
- 594 Ayotte KW, Finnigan JJ, Raupach MR (1999) A second-order closure for neutrally stratified vegetative canopy
595 flows. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 90:189–216, DOI [10.1023/A:1001722609229](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1001722609229)

- 596 Bastin J, Finegold Y, Garcia C, Mollicone D, Rezende M, Routh D, Zohner CM, Crowther TW (2019) The
597 global tree restoration potential. *Science* 365:76–79, DOI [10.1126/science.aax0848](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax0848)
- 598 Belcher S, Harman I, Finnigan J (2012) The wind in the willows: flows in forest canopies in complex terrain.
599 *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 44:479–504, DOI [10.1146/annurev-fluid-120710-101036](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-fluid-120710-101036)
- 600 Belcher SE, Jerram N, Hunt JCR (2003) Adjustment of a turbulent boundary layer to a canopy of roughness
601 elements. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 488:369–398, DOI [10.1017/S0022112003005019](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022112003005019)
- 602 Belcher SE, Finnigan JJ, Harman IN (2008) Flows through forest canopies in complex terrain. *Ecological*
603 *Applications* 18:1436–1453, DOI [10.1890/06-1894.1](https://doi.org/10.1890/06-1894.1)
- 604 Bohrer G, Katul GG, Walko RL, Avissar R (2009) Exploring the effects of microscale structural heterogeneity
605 of forest canopies using large-eddy simulations. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 132:351–382, DOI
606 [10.1007/s10546-009-9404-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-009-9404-4)
- 607 Cassiani M, Katul GG, Albertson JD (2008) The effects of canopy leaf area index on airflow across forest
608 edges: large-eddy simulation and analytical results. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 126:433–460, DOI
609 [10.1007/s10546-007-9242-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-007-9242-1)
- 610 Chen B, Chamecki M, Katul GG (2019) Effects of topography on in-canopy transport of gases emitted
611 within dense forests. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 145:2101–2114, DOI
612 [10.1002/qj.3546](https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3546)
- 613 Connolly A, Chow FK, Hoch SW (2020) Nested large-eddy simulations of the displacement of cold air pool
614 by lee vortices. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* (In press)
- 615 Deardorff JW (1980) Stratocumulus-capped mixed layers derived from a three-dimensional model. *Boundary-*
616 *Layer Meteorology* 18:495–527, DOI [10.1007/BF00119502](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00119502)
- 617 Dupont S, Brunet Y (2008) Influence of foliar density profile on canopy flow: a large-eddy simulation study.
618 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 148:976–990, DOI [10.1016/j.agrformet.2008.01.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2008.01.014)
- 619 Dupont S, Brunet Y, Finnigan J (2008) Large-eddy simulation of turbulent flow over a forested ridge: val-
620 idation and coherent structure identification. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*
621 134:1911–1929, DOI [10.1002/qj.328](https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.328)
- 622 Dupont S, Brunet Y (2009) Coherent structure in canopy edge flow: a large-eddy simulation study. *Journal of*
623 *Fluid Mechanics* 630:93–128, DOI [10.1017/S0022112009006739](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022112009006739)
- 624 Dupont S, Bonnefond JM, Irvine MR, Lamaud E, Brunet Y (2011) Long-distance edge effects in a pine
625 forest with a deep and sparse trunk space: in situ and numerical experiments. *Agricultural and Forest*
626 *Meteorology* 151:328–344, DOI [10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.11.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.11.007)
- 627 Fernando H (2010) Fluid dynamics of urban atmospheres in complex terrain. *Annual Review of Fluid Me-*
628 *chanics* 42:365–389, DOI [10.1146/annurev-fluid-121108-145459](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-fluid-121108-145459)
- 629 Finnigan J (2000) Turbulence in plant canopies. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 32:519–571, DOI
630 [10.1146/annurev.fluid.32.1.519](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.fluid.32.1.519)
- 631 Finnigan J, Belcher S (2004) Flow over a ridge covered with a plant canopy. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal*
632 *Meteorological Society* 130:1–29, DOI [10.1256/qj.02.177](https://doi.org/10.1256/qj.02.177)
- 633 Finnigan J, Brunet Y (1995) Turbulent airflow in forests on flat and hilly terrain. In: Coutts MP, Grace
634 J (eds) *Wind and Trees*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, chap 1, pp 3–40, DOI
635 [10.1017/CBO9780511600425.002](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511600425.002)
- 636 Finnigan JJ (1985) Turbulence transport in flexible plant canopies. In: Hutchison BA, Hicks BB (eds) *The*
637 *Forest-Atmosphere Interaction*, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp 443–480, DOI [10.1007/978-94-009-5305-5_28](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-5305-5_28)
- 638 Finnigan JJ, Shaw RH, Patton EG (2009) Turbulence structure above a vegetation canopy. *Journal of Fluid*
640 *Mechanics* 637:387–424, DOI [10.1017/S0022112009990589](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022112009990589)
- 641 Finnigan J, Ayotte K, Harman I, Katul G, Oldroyd H, Patton E, Poggi D, Ross A, Taylor P (2020) Boundary-
642 layer flow over complex topography. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 177:247–313, DOI [10.1007/s10546-020-00564-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-020-00564-3)
- 643 Grant ER, Ross AN, Gardiner BA (2016) Modelling canopy flows over complex terrain. *Boundary-Layer*
645 *Meteorology* 161:417–437, DOI [10.1007/s10546-016-0176-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-016-0176-3)
- 646 Harman IN, Finnigan JJ (2007) A simple unified theory for flow in the canopy and roughness sublayer.
647 *Boundary Layer Meteorology* 123:339–363, DOI [10.1007/s10546-006-9145-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-006-9145-6)
- 648 Hunt JCR, Leibovich S, Richards KJ (1988) Turbulent shear flow over low ridges. *Quarterly Journal of the*
649 *Royal Meteorological Society* 114:1435–1470, DOI [10.1002/qj.49711448405](https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49711448405)
- 650 Kaimal JC, Finnigan JJ (1994) *Atmospheric Boundary Layer Flows. Their Structure and Measurements*.
651 Oxford University Press, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 289 pp, ISBN-13 978-0-19-506239-7
- 652 Katul G, Mahrt L, Poggi D, Sanz C (2004) One- and two-equation models for canopy turbulence. *Boundary-*
653 *Layer Meteorology* 113:81–109, DOI [10.1023/B:BOUN.0000037333.48760.e5](https://doi.org/10.1023/B:BOUN.0000037333.48760.e5)
- 654 J.B.Klemp, J.Dudhia and A.D.Hassiotis (2008) An Upper Gravity-Wave Absorbing Layer for NWP Applica-
655 tions. *Monthly Weather Review* 136: 3987–4004, DOI [10.1175/2008MWR2596.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/2008MWR2596.1)

- 656 Ma Y, Liu H (2019) An advanced multiple-layer canopy model in the WRF model with large-eddy
657 simulations to simulate canopy flows and scalar transport under different stability conditions. *Journal of*
658 *Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* 11:2330–2351, DOI [10.1029/2018MS001347](https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001347)
- 659 Ouwersloot HG, Moene AF, Attema JJ, Vil'a-Guerau de Arellano C (2017) Large-eddy simulation compar-
660 ison of neutral flow over a canopy: sensitivities to physical and numerical conditions, and similarity to
661 other representations. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 162:71–89, DOI [10.1007/s10546-016-0182-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-016-0182-5)
- 662 Patton EG, Katul GG (2009) Turbulent pressure and velocity perturbations induced by gentle ridges covered
663 with sparse and dense canopies. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 133:189–217, DOI [10.1007/s10546-009-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-009-9427-x)
664 [9427-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-009-9427-x)
- 665 Patton EG, Davis KJ, Barth MC, Sullivan PP (2001) Decaying scalars emitted by a forest canopy: a numerical
666 study. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 100:91–129, DOI [10.1023/A:1019223515444](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019223515444)
- 667 Patton EG, Sullivan PP, Davis KJ (2003) The influence of a forest canopy on top-down and bottom-up dif-
668 fusion in the planetary boundary layer. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 129:1415–
669 1434, DOI [10.1256/qj.01.175](https://doi.org/10.1256/qj.01.175)
- 670 Pinard J, Wilson J (2001) First- and second-order closure models for wind in a plant canopy. *Journal of*
671 *Applied Meteorology* 40:1762–1768, DOI [10.1175/1520-0450\(2001\)040<1762:FASOCM>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(2001)040<1762:FASOCM>2.0.CO;2)
- 672 Raupach MR, Shaw RH (1982) Averaging procedures for flow within vegetation canopies. *Boundary-Layer*
673 *Meteorology* 22:79–90, DOI [10.1007/BF00128057](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00128057)
- 674 Raupach MR, Thom AS (1981) Turbulence in and above plant canopies. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*
675 13:97–129, DOI [10.1146/annurev.fl.13.010181.000525](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.fl.13.010181.000525)
- 676 Raupach MR, Coppin PA, Legg BJ (1986) Experiments on scalar dispersion within a model plant canopy.
677 Part I: The turbulence structure. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 35:21–52, DOI [10.1007/BF00117300](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117300)
- 678 Ross A (2008) Large-eddy simulations of flow over forested ridges. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 128:59–76,
679 DOI [10.1007/s10546-008-9278-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-008-9278-x)
- 680 Ross A (2011) Scalar transport over forested ridges. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 141:179–199, DOI
681 [10.1007/s10546-011-9628-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-011-9628-y)
- 682 Ross A (2012) Boundary-layer flow within and above a forest canopy of variable density. *Quarterly Journal*
683 *of the Royal Meteorological Society* 138:1259–1272, DOI [10.1002/qj.989](https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.989)
- 684 Ross A, Vosper S (2005) Neutral turbulent flow over forested ridges. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Metro-*
685 *logical Society* 131:1841–1862, DOI [10.1256/qj.04.129](https://doi.org/10.1256/qj.04.129)
- 686 Ross AN, Baker TP (2013) Flow over partially forested ridges. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 146:375–392,
687 DOI [10.1007/s10546-012-9766-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-012-9766-x)
- 688 Ross AN, Harman IN (2015) The impact of source distribution on scalar transport over forested ridges.
689 *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 156:211–230, DOI [10.1007/s10546-015-0029-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-015-0029-5)
- 690 Shaw RH, Schumann U (1992) Large-eddy simulation of turbulent flow above and within a forest. *Boundary-*
691 *Layer Meteorology* 61:47–64, DOI [10.1007/BF02033994](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02033994)
- 692 Skamarock WC, Klemp JB, Dudhia J, Gill DO, Barker DM, Duda MG, Huang XY, Wang W, Powers JG
693 (2008) A Description of the Advanced Research WRF Version 3. NCAR Technical Note NCAR/TN-
694 475+STR, NCAR, Boulder, CO, USA, 125 pp
- 695 Tamura T, Okuno A, Sugio Y (2007) LES analysis of turbulent boundary layer over 3D steep ridge cov-
696 ered with vegetation. *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics* 95:1463–1475, DOI
697 [10.1016/j.jweia.2007.02.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2007.02.014)
- 698 Taylor PA (1988) Turbulent wakes in the atmospheric boundary layer. In: Steffen WL, Denmead OT (eds)
699 *Flow and Transport in the Natural Environment: Advances and Applications*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin,
700 Germany, pp 270–292, ISBN-13 978-3-642-73845-6
- 701 Wilson J, Finnigan J, Raupach M (1998) A first-order closure for disturbed plant-canopy flows, and its applica-
702 tion to winds in a canopy on a ridge. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 124:705–732,
703 DOI [10.1002/qj.49712454704](https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49712454704)
- 704 Wilson NR, Shaw RH (1977) A high order closure model for canopy flows. *Journal of Applied Meteorology*
705 16:1197–1205, DOI [10.1175/1520-0450\(1977\)016<1197:AHOCMF>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(1977)016<1197:AHOCMF>2.0.CO;2)