Wind Gust Parameterization Methods: A Review and Implementation Analysis

Carlos Peralta

2025-09-06

Introduction

Wind gust forecasting is critical for wind energy applications, aviation safety, and structural engineering. Traditional parameterization methods were developed for the standard 10-meter reference height, but for example in wind energy modern wind turbines operate at hub heights of 100+ meters, necessitating new approaches that account for height-dependent effects, atmospheric stability, and surface roughness variations.

This documents outlines different methods to answer the technical question:

```
How would you calculate wind gusts based on the weather model output?
Outline your approach to deriving gusts (e.g. using 10 m wind, boundary layer turbulence
diagnostics), including any assumptions or approximations.
```

Most numerical weather models provide a post-processed wind gust estimate. The data downloaded in the data pipeline developed in this repository includes wind gust from a global (GFS) and a high resolution regional model (MET).

The kind of parametrization used for estimating wind gust at the surface varies with the numerical model. They range from using a simple (empirical) multiplicative factor to more sophisticated formulas that consider atmospheric stability. Below we review wind gust parameterization methods discussed in Suomi et al. (2013) and analyzes their implementation. The analysis covers three main parameterization approaches: Wieringa (1973), Woetman Nielsen and Petersen (2001), and the more recent Suomi method.

A python script that implements the simplest of the approaches can also be found in `data_processing/calculate_wind_gust.py`.

Wind Gust Parameterization Methods Review

Power Law Method

Theoretical Foundation

The power law method represents the simplest approach to wind gust parameterization, based on the classical wind profile relationship:

$$u(z) = u_{ref} \left(\frac{z}{z_{ref}}\right)^{\alpha}$$

Where:

- $u(z)$ = wind speed at height z
- u_{ref} = reference wind speed at reference height z_{ref}
- α = power law exponent (typically 0.1-0.4)

For gust calculations, the method applies the same scaling to both mean wind and gust components:

$$G(z) = G_{ref} \left(\frac{z}{z_{ref}}\right)^{\alpha}$$

Power Law Exponent Determination

The exponent α varies with:

Surface roughness:

- Smooth surfaces (water, ice): $\alpha \approx 0.1$
- Open terrain (grassland): $\alpha \approx 0.15$
- Suburban areas: $\alpha \approx 0.25$
- Urban/forest: $\alpha \approx 0.3 - 0.4$

Atmospheric stability:

- Unstable conditions: α decreases (enhanced mixing)
- Stable conditions: α increases (reduced mixing)
- Neutral conditions: Standard values apply

Implementation Approach

The power law gust parameterization follows these steps:

1. **Reference gust calculation** at standard height (typically 10m)
2. **Height extrapolation** using appropriate power law exponent
3. **Roughness adjustment** based on local surface characteristics
4. **Optional stability correction** for improved accuracy

Key Characteristics

Strengths:

- **Computational simplicity** - minimal processing requirements
- **Widely understood** - established meteorological practice
- **Baseline reference** - useful for method comparison
- **Data requirements minimal** - only reference wind speed needed

Limitations:

- **Systematic underestimation** of gust wind speeds at higher elevations
- **No stability effects** - assumes neutral atmospheric conditions
- **Limited height range** - accuracy decreases significantly above 50-100m
- **Oversimplified physics** - ignores turbulence generation mechanisms
- **Site-specific bias** - requires local calibration for accuracy

Performance Characteristics

Observational studies have shown that the power law method:

- **Underestimates gusts** by 10-30% at wind energy heights (80-150m)
- **Shows largest errors** in stable atmospheric conditions
- **Performs reasonably** in neutral conditions over simple terrain
- **Requires bias correction** for operational applications

Wieringa (1973) Method

Theoretical Foundation

The W73 method represents one of the earliest systematic approaches to gust parameterization, based on the fundamental relationship:

$$G_{t,T} = 1 + \frac{g_{t,T} \cdot u_* \cdot t}{u_T \cdot \ln(z/z_0)}$$

Where:

- $G_{t,T}$ = gust factor (ratio of gust to mean wind speed)
- $g_{t,T}$ = normalized gust coefficient
- u_* = friction velocity
- t = gust duration
- u_T = mean wind speed over period T
- z = height above surface
- z_0 = aerodynamic roughness length

Key Characteristics

Strengths:

- **Computational simplicity** - minimal processing requirements and easy implementation
- **Well-established empirical basis** - extensively validated across multiple sites
- **Direct roughness incorporation** - explicitly accounts for surface roughness effects
- **Robust performance** - reliable in near-neutral conditions up to ~50m height
- **Minimal data requirements** - only needs basic meteorological parameters
- **Historical validation** - proven track record in operational applications

Limitations:

- **Neutral stability assumption** - ignores important atmospheric stability effects
- **Limited height range** - accuracy decreases significantly above 50m elevation
- **No stability dependence** - cannot capture stability-driven gust variations
- **Single-station derivation** - limited geographical representativeness
- **Overestimation in complex terrain** - tends to overpredict gusts over forests
- **Low wind speed issues** - poor performance in weak wind conditions

Woetman Nielsen and Petersen (2001) Method

Theoretical Foundation

The WNP01 method introduced atmospheric stability effects through the formulation:

$$G_{t,T} = 1 + g_{t,T}\left[\gamma_0 \frac{c_N u_{*0}}{u_T} + (1-\gamma_0)\frac{c_B w_*}{u_T}\right]$$

Where:

- $\gamma_0 = 1 - \gamma_s$ (stability parameter)
- $\gamma_s = 1$ for stable, $\gamma_s = 0$ for unstable conditions
- u_{*0} = surface friction velocity
- $w_* = (B_p h)^{1/3}$ = convective velocity scale
- c_N, c_B = empirical constants
- h = boundary layer height

Key Characteristics

Strengths:

- Explicit stability dependence
- Accounts for both mechanical and thermal turbulence
- Physically-based approach using similarity theory
- Applicable to various atmospheric conditions

Limitations:

- Complex parameter determination
- Requires boundary layer height information
- Overestimates stability effects in some conditions
- Limited validation at wind energy heights

Suomi et al. (2013) Method

Theoretical Foundation

The Suomi method represents a significant advancement in gust parameterization, combining turbulence intensity concepts with stability-dependent formulations specifically designed for wind energy heights:

$$G_{t,T} = 1 + g_{t,T}\frac{\sigma_U}{u_T}$$

Where the standard deviation of horizontal wind speed σ_U is parameterized using modified Gryning et al. (1987) formulations:

For unstable conditions:

$$\sigma_U = u_*\sqrt{c_1^2 + c_2^2\left(\frac{z}{h}\right)^{2/3}\left(-\frac{h}{L}\right)^{2/3}}$$

For stable conditions:

$$\sigma_U = u_*\sqrt{c_3^2 + c_4^2\frac{z}{L}}$$

Where: - $g_{t,T}$ = normalized gust factor (observationally derived) - u_* = friction velocity - h = boundary layer height
- L = Obukhov length - z = height above surface - c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 = empirical constants

Key Characteristics

Strengths:

- **Superior performance** - outperformed W73 and WNP01 methods in validation studies
- **Height-explicit formulation** - applicable from 30-143m, suitable for modern wind turbines
- **Realistic stability effects** - avoids overestimation issues of WNP01 method
- **Unified approach** - single framework for all stability conditions
- **Observational basis** - derived from extensive mast observations in different environments
- **Physical insight** - based on turbulence intensity concepts
- **Flexible parameterization** - adaptable to various surface roughness conditions

Limitations:

- **Complex implementation** - requires multiple meteorological parameters (u*, h, L)

- **Boundary layer height dependency** - sensitive to BL height accuracy in model applications
- **Limited extreme conditions** - validation focused on moderate to strong winds (>3-5 m/s)
- **Site-specific coefficients** - normalized gust factors may vary between locations
- **Computational requirements** - more demanding than simpler methods like W73
- **Parameter uncertainty** - performance depends on accurate estimation of stability parameters

Practical implementation

All the methods describe above require site specific parameters

In order to test them in different situations one would need:

1. **Historical data window**: 1-2 months of measurements and weather model data
2. **Parameter fitting**: Site-specific coefficient adjustment
3. **Stability classification**: Separate parameters for different atmospheric conditions
4. **Seasonal variation**: Accounting for annual cycles would require several months of data

Additionally, since all model data has biases for different variables a simple bias correction approach could be included:

Use a **lead-time dependent bias correction**:

$$u_{gust,corrected} = a \cdot u_{gust,forecast} + b$$

Where coefficients a and b vary with forecast lead time.

This method can be effective for systematically biased predictions.

Spatial Validation Analysis

- Do a multi-Site Performance
- Include both inland and coastal locations
- Consider complex and flat terrains

Methodological Improvements

- **Machine learning integration** for parameter optimization
- **High-resolution model** for complex terrain
- **Uncertainty quantification** using ensemble forecast data

Summary

Different methods can be used to estimate wind gust based on model output data. All the parametrizations listed above require site specific parameters and some bias correction of model output.

Power Law Method: Simple but systematically underestimates gusts at wind energy heights. Best suited as a baseline reference method.

Wieringa (1973): Although very simple, performs reasonably well in near-neutral conditions up to ~50m height. However, it tends to overestimate gust factors in complex or forested terrain and lacks stability dependence.

Woetman Nielsen and Petersen (2001): Introduces important stability effects but tends to overestimate the effects of atmospheric stability, particularly in unstable conditions over rough surfaces. Complex parameter determination limits practical application.

Suomi et al. (2013): Demonstrates superior performance across different stability conditions and surface types. The method successfully captures height dependence, stability effects, and surface roughness impacts without the overestimation issues of WNP01. Recommended for wind energy applications despite higher computational requirements.

Python implementation

The script under `data_processing/calculate_wind_ gust.py` implements simplified versions of the formulas listed above

- Multiplicative Factor Method: The script's multiplicative approach (gust = U10 m × gust_factor) is an empirical baseline akin to the Power Law Method and the general use of a gust factor described in both operational practice. The gust factor is commonly used in structural engineering and forecast practice, and its values (e.g., 1.5) originate from statistical studies of wind speed records, including recommendations by the World Meteorological Organization and model parameterizations.

- Friction Velocity Method: The script uses friction velocity (gust = U10m + $\;$ u∗), which is related to the Wieringa (1973) Method as described above. The method stems from boundary-layer similarity theory and is implemented in meteorological models (e.g., HIRLAM, WRF postprocessing routines). The relation between the friction velocity and gusts is a diagnostic, physically motivated approach, with typical coefficients (, e.g., 3.0) chosen based on model calibration and observational fit.
- Turbulent Kinetic Energy (TKE) Method: The TKE-based formula (gust = U10m + $\;$ TKE) from the script is most similar to advanced methods such as the Suomi et al. (2013) Method and other turbulence-based approaches reviewed in your document. These rely on turbulence intensity (often parameterized by TKE or related metrics) and standard deviation of wind components, matching the rationale for using TKE in gust calculations. The formula is widely cited in the literature (e.g., ECMWF, WRF, and several peer-reviewed studies). The approach relates wind gusts to fluctuations in the wind field, quantified by the square root of TKE (the standard deviation of turbulent wind components), and typically uses empirically-derived multipliers (, often 2.0–3.0). This method reflects the physical process that wind gusts are generated by turbulent eddies, with TKE providing a statistical measure of gustiness.

References

Suomi, I., Vihma, T., Gryning, S. E., & Fortelius, C. (2013). Wind-gust parametrizations at heights relevant for wind energy: a study based on mast observations. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 139(674), 1298-1310. https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2039

Wieringa, J. (1973). Gust factors over open water and built-up country. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 3(4), 424-441. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01034986

Woetmann Nielsen, N., & Petersen, C. (2001). Calculation of wind gusts in DMI-HIRLAM. *Danish Meteorological Institute Scientific Report*, 01-03.

Brasseur, O. (2001). Development and application of a physical approach to estimating wind gusts. *Monthly Weather Review*, 129(1), 5-25. https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2001)129<0005:DAAOAP>2.0.CO;2

Panofsky, H. A., & Dutton, J. A. (1984). *Atmospheric Turbulence: Models and Methods for Engineering Applications*. John Wiley & Sons.

Stull, R. B. (1988). *An Introduction to Boundary Layer Meteorology*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kaimal, J. C., & Finnigan, J. J. (1994). *Atmospheric Boundary Layer Flows: Their Structure and Measurement*. Oxford University Press.

Holtslag, A. A. M., & Nieuwstadt, F. T. M. (1986). Scaling the atmospheric boundary layer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 36(3), 201-209. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00118662

Gryning, S. E., Batchvarova, E., Brümmer, B., Jørgensen, H., & Larsen, S. (2007). On the extension of the wind profile over homogeneous terrain beyond the surface boundary layer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 124(2), 251-268. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-007-9166-9

Floors, R., Peña, A., & Gryning, S. E. (2015). The effect of baroclinicity on the wind in the planetary boundary layer. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 141(687), 619-630. https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2386