

# Impact of wave-dependent stress on storm surge simulations in the North Sea: Ocean model evaluation against in situ and satellite observations

Lucia Pineau-Guillou, Marie-Noëlle Bouin, Fabrice Ardhuin, Florent Lyard, Jean-Raymond Bidlot, Bertrand Chapron

### ▶ To cite this version:

Lucia Pineau-Guillou, Marie-Noëlle Bouin, Fabrice Ardhuin, Florent Lyard, Jean-Raymond Bidlot, et al.. Impact of wave-dependent stress on storm surge simulations in the North Sea: Ocean model evaluation against in situ and satellite observations. Ocean Modelling, 2020, 154, pp.101694 -. 10.1016/j.ocemod.2020.101694 . hal-03492327

## HAL Id: hal-03492327 https://hal.science/hal-03492327v1

Submitted on 14 Sep 2022

**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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

# Impact of wave-dependent stress on storm surge simulations in the North Sea: ocean model evaluation against in situ and satellite observations

4 Lucia Pineau-Guillou<sup>a,\*</sup>, Marie-Noëlle Bouin<sup>a,b</sup>, Fabrice Ardhuin<sup>a</sup>, Florent Lyard<sup>c</sup>, Jean5 Raymond Bidlot<sup>d</sup>, Bertrand Chapron<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> IFREMER, CNRS, IRD, UBO, Laboratoire d'Océanographie Physique et Spatiale, UMR 6523, IUEM, Brest, France

<sup>b</sup> CNRM, UMR 3589, Météo-France et CNRS, Toulouse, France <sup>c</sup> Laboratoire d'Etudes en Géophysique et Océanographie Spatiales, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Toulouse, France

<sup>d</sup> European Centre for Medium-range Weather Forecasts, Reading, UK

#### 14 Abstract

3

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

15 We investigate the impact of wave-dependent stress on surge modelling, from case studies in 16 17 the North Sea, using a global ocean model forced with a wave-atmosphere coupled model. We select the storms with the largest surges and a range of sea state development from young to 18 mature seas. The modelled surges are compared to tide gauges and altimeter data. The ocean 19 model is able to accurately predict storm surges in coastal areas. The consistency of the model 20 outputs, the altimeter, and the tide gauge data confirms the accuracy of altimeters for storm 21 surge measurements. We show that using a wave-dependent rather than a wind-dependent only 22 stress formulation gives more accurate surge simulations when the sea state is young and the 23 24 sea rougher. Taking into account the waves in the stress formulation has a significant impact 25 on the surges (up to 20 cm).

26

*Keywords*: air-sea exchanges, storm surges, wind stress, drag coefficient, wind-wave coupling,
North Sea

#### 30 **1. Introduction**

31

29

Storm surges are generated by atmospheric pressure gradient and wind stress. In coastal areas, 32 the wind stress contribution is more effective due to shallow waters, water pileup along the 33 coast, and resonant effects (Moon et al., 2009; Bertin et al., 2012). In addition, in nearshore 34 areas, the radiation stress, which is the momentum flux carried by the waves, generates 35 36 nearshore currents and wave setup (i.e. additional surge) when the waves dissipate (Bunya et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2010; Brown et al., 2010; Idier et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2013; Bertin et al., 37 2015; Thuy et al., 2017; Choi et al., 2018). Here, we focus on the impact of the wind stress on 38 the surges. This study tackles the question 'which impact has the sea state on the wind stress?'. 39 To answer this, we determine if simulated surges are closer to observations when wind stress 40 parameterization is wave-dependent. 41

42

The wind stress is usually parameterized using bulk formulae that express it as a function of the
wind speed at a given height, generally 10 m above sea surface, and of a drag coefficient

45

$$\tau = \rho_a u_*^2 = \rho_a \mathcal{C}_d U_{10}^2 \tag{1}$$

48 where  $u_*$ ,  $C_d$ , and  $U_{10}$  are the friction velocity, the drag coefficient, and the wind speed at 10 49 m above the surface, respectively. Most formulations of the drag depend only on the wind speed 50 (e.g. Moon et al., 2007; Edson et al., 2013; Peng and Li, 2015), whereas others include sea state

\*Corresponding author *Email address:* lucia.pineau.guillou@ifremer.fr (Lucia Pineau-Guillou)

Preprint submitted to Ocean Modelling

@ 2020 published by Elsevier. This manuscript is made available under the CC BY NC user license https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

parameters (e.g. Janssen, 1991; Moon et al., 2009). Despite years of research, the impact of sea
state on drag remains inconclusive. Recently, Edson et al. (2013) concluded that the "COARE
3.5 wind speed-dependent formulation matches the observations well without any wave
information," whereas earlier works insisted on the importance of wave-enhanced drag for
young waves (Mastenbroek et al., 1993).

56

These contrasted results can be explained by the complexity of the problem. There are major 57 issues that prevent a simple answer to the question 'what is the wave impact on the wind stress, 58 if any?': (1) Wind stress measurements - and drag estimations - are difficult to perform, 59 particularly at high winds. Uncertainties in observations could explain the variability of the drag 60 at a given wind speed. Estimations from several recent field experiments based on direct in situ 61 measurements (e.g. Black et al., 2007; Edson et al., 2013) or indirect ones (Powell et al., 2003; 62 Jarosz et al., 2007; Holthuijsen et al., 2012), as well as laboratory tank measurements (e.g. 63 Donelan et al., 2004; Takagaki et al., 2012) show differences in the drag up to a factor 2 at 30 64 65 m/s (Pineau-Guillou et al., 2018). It is not known if these differences are due to measurement uncertainties or various environmental conditions (fetch, turning wind, bathymetry...). (2) Wind 66 stress measurements are scarce. They generally come from short dedicated campaigns, with 67 moderate winds often being lower than 20 m/s. There is clearly a lack of measurements at very 68 high winds. (3) All the variables used to explain the drag variability are interdependent. 69 Consequently, good correlations between the drag and variables such as wave age may mainly 70 be due to self-correlation (Andreas, 2009). This contributes to a lack of confidence in these 71 72 relationships in a part of the scientific community.

73

74 The objective of this article is to investigate the impact of a wave-dependent stress on the surges. 75 Here, we focus on the North Sea. The main idea is to simulate storms with various sea states (i.e. young and old) to estimate the sensitivity of surges to the sea state development (i.e. the 76 wave age). Selected storms are simulated using wind-dependent only and wave-dependent 77 78 stress parameterizations. The simulated surges are evaluated against observations (i.e. tide 79 gauges and altimeters). The first part of the article describes the methods to compute the surges 80 in models and observations. In the following part, we describe the case studies-namely, the storms selection, the numerical setup, and the validation data. Then, we analyze the results to 81 estimate the impact of the wave-dependent stress on the storm surges. Finally, we discuss 82 different points; among them is the difficulty of comparing the model with observations, as 83 various processes contribute to the surges, particularly in coastal areas. 84

85

87

92

#### 86 2. Surges in models and observations

The surges are the differences between the water level and the tide prediction. Here, we describe the methods to compute the surges from the model and observations.

90 91 2.1. Modelled surges

Surges are simulated with an ocean model forced with output from an atmosphere model. The
ocean model resolves the classical Saint-Venant shallow water continuity and momentum
equations in barotropic mode, formulated similarly as in Bertin et al. (2012)

96 97

$$\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot \int_{-h}^{\eta} \vec{u} dz = 0, \qquad (2)$$

98 
$$\frac{D\vec{u}}{Dt} = -f\vec{k} \times \vec{u} + \alpha g \vec{\nabla} \hat{\psi} - \frac{\vec{\nabla} P_a}{\rho} - g \vec{\nabla} \eta + \frac{\vec{\tau}_s - \vec{\tau}_b}{\rho(\eta + h)}$$
(3)

99

100 where  $\eta$  is the surface elevation,  $\vec{u}$  is the horizontal velocity, h is the bathymetry, f is the 101 Coriolis parameter,  $\alpha$  is the earth-elasticity factor, g is the mean gravitational acceleration,  $\hat{\psi}$ 102 is the earth tidal potential,  $P_a$  is the sea level atmospheric pressure,  $\rho$  is the water density,  $\tau_s$  is 103 the surface stress, and  $\tau_b$  is the bottom stress. The bottom stress is expressed as

- 104
- 105

$$\overline{\tau_b} = \frac{c}{H} \parallel \vec{u} \parallel \vec{u}$$
(4)

106

where *H* is the mean local depth, and *C* is a dimensionless friction coefficient set as 2.5  $10^{-3}$  (Lyard et al., 2006).

109

The water level variations are due to tide through the tidal potential ( $\hat{\psi}$  in Eq. 3), wind through 110 the wind stress ( $\tau_s$  in Eq. 3), and atmospheric pressure through the pressure gradient ( $\vec{\nabla} P_a$  in 111 Eq. 3). Note that the wind stress effect is modulated with the bottom stress effect ( $\tau_b$  in Eq. 3), 112 whose influence is not studied here. We investigated the relative contribution of the wind stress 113 and pressure gradient terms in Eq. 3 as  $\vec{\tau_s}/\rho(\eta + h)$  and  $\vec{\nabla}P_a/\rho$ , respectively. In this case, the 114 wind stress contribution increases in shallow waters, as it is divided by the water height. 115 Comparison of the two terms shows that the wind stress term is largely dominant in the North 116 Sea, that is, more than 90% of the sum of the two terms (Pineau-Guillou, 2018). This suggests 117 that the currents are mainly driven by the wind, whereas the effect of the atmospheric pressure 118 is negligible. 119

120

In the following, the surges are computed from simulations without tide (no tidal potential  $\hat{\psi}$  in Eq. 3) and with atmospheric forcing only. As a consequence, the modelled surges correspond only to atmospheric surges; the surges due to wave breaking (i.e. wave setup) are not modelled here (see discussion in section 5). To compute the surges, we used the TUGO shallow water global ocean model, developed by LEGOS (Lyard et al., 2006). This model in barotropic mode resolves the classical shallow water continuity and momentum equations (Eqs 2 and 3). Following Lynch and Gray (1979), the model solves the generalized wave equation

128 129

$$\frac{\partial(CE)}{\partial t} + c_0 CE = 0 \tag{5}$$

(6)

130

133

where CE = 0 is the continuity equation (Eq. 2), and  $c_0$  is a relaxation coefficient towards the continuity equation. This gives more explicitly

134 
$$\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial t^2} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot \frac{\partial H\vec{u}}{\partial t} + c_0 \left( \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot H\vec{u} \right) = 0$$

135

where  $H = \eta + H$  is the water height, and  $\frac{\partial H\vec{u}}{\partial t}$  is formally replaced by using the momentum 136 equations. This allows to make the elevation solver implicit, hence relaxing the CFL condition 137 for time step. Actually, TUGO can use different solvers and discretization for the dynamical 138 equations, but the most efficient so far in tides or storm surges modelling is the LGP1xLGP1 139 140 (elevations and currents discretized at element vertices) generalized wave equations solver (hence being used in our study). TUGO is a reference model; it allowed the development of the 141 tidal model FES2014 (Carrère et al., 2015), a worldwide reference model for tides, which is 142 widely used in the scientific community. It also produces Dynamic Atmospheric Corrections to 143 correct altimeter data from atmospheric effects (Carrère and Lyard, 2003). This correction is 144 officially used by CNES and NASA for altimeter data processing. 145 146

147 2.2. Observed surges

149 Tide gauges measure the sea level. The surges are computed as the differences between the 150 observed and predicted sea level (Simon, 2007):

151 152

148

 $Surge_{TideGauge} = Observed sea level - Tide prediction$  (7)

153 154

155

156

We used 101 tide gauges in the North Sea (Figure 1), obtained thanks to Copernicus Marine Environment Monitoring Service (CMEMS). Data temporal resolution is generally of 10 minutes (88% of the tide gauges) and sometimes 1 hour (12% of the tide gauges). We used the

Tidal ToolBox developed by LEGOS (Allain, 2013) to process the data and estimate the surges.
The method is the following; (1) a harmonic analysis is performed on the sea level observations
to estimate the harmonic constants (amplitude and phase) of the tidal constituents; (2) from
these harmonic constants, a prediction is computed over the same period as the observations;
(3) the surges are the differences between the observed and predicted sea levels (Eq. 7). Note
that this residual also includes the error associated with the prediction.

163

In addition to tide gauges, radar altimeters onboard satellites also measure the sea level—that 164 is, the instantaneous Sea Surface Height (SSH) above the ellipsoid. Data are processed by 165 providers to compute the Mean Sea Surface (MSS) and the Sea Level Anomaly (SLA). The 166 MSS corresponds to the mean of several years of SSH, eventually using several satellites. The 167 SLA is the difference between the instantaneous SSH and the MSS. Many geophysical and 168 environmental corrections are made to estimate SLA, and one among them is Dynamic 169 Atmospheric Correction (DAC) (Antony et al., 2014). This correction corresponds to the ocean 170 response to atmospheric forcing (atmospheric pressure and winds) and generally comes from 171 an ocean model elevations for high frequency part (e.g. TUGO, Carrère and Lyard (2003)) and 172 inverted barometer law for low-frequency part (e.g. using ECMWF atmospheric pressure 173 products). To be consistent with the model and the tide gauges, the surges from altimeters are 174 computed as the summation of the SLA and the DAC: 175

176

$$Surge_{Altimeter} = SLA + DAC.$$
 (8)

179 To compute the altimetric surges, we used the SLA and DAC from the JASON-2 1Hz X-TRACK coastal product (Birol et al., 2016), developed by the Center of Topography of the 180 Ocean and Hydrosphere (CTOH/LEGOS, Toulouse). Along-track data have a temporal 181 182 resolution of 1 s, which corresponds to a spatial interval of about 6-7 km between points. X-TRACK is a post-processing software which increases the SSH information derived from 183 satellite altimetry in the coastal ocean areas. Retrieved information along tracks come closer to 184 land, up to 5 km, against 10 km with the standard AVISO (Archiving, Validation and 185 Interpretation of Satellite Oceanographic data) product. 186

187 188

#### 3. Case studies and modelling

189

Here, we describe the storms selection, the numerical setup, and the validation data.

192 3.1. Storms selection

193

The storms were selected according to the following criteria: 1) availability of good-quality data at tide gauges as well as along tracks, 2) occurrence of maximum surges in the North Sea, and 3) presence of various sea states. The objective was to select two storms with young sea

states, and two with old sea states. A common way to characterize the sea state is to consider 197 the wave age, following the expression  $\xi = C_p/U_{10}$ , where  $C_p$  is the phase velocity at the peak 198 of the wave spectrum, and  $U_{10}$  is the wind speed at 10 meters. When the wind has just started 199 blowing, the waves are short-period, steep, and short-crested. At this stage, the wind speed is 200 201 higher than the wave phase velocity, and the waves are growing. It is commonly considered that the value of 1.2 separates the young and the old sea. In the North Sea during the storms, 202 the wave age is generally around 0.8 (Pineau-Guillou, 2018). In the following, sea state is 203 204 considered as "young" when the wave age is close to 0.8 and "old" when the wave age is greater than 1.2 (swell). Note that the sea state quickly evolves spatially and temporally during the 205 storm; the reference to a "young" or "old" sea state for each storm characterizes the sea state 206 207 along the altimeter track during a short period of several minutes and is not representative of the whole storm. 208

209

To select the storms, we analyzed tide gauges and JASON-2 altimeter data (Figure 1). The tide gauge database consists of 101 tide gauges in the North Sea, from January 2012 to October 2017 (date of the extraction). The duration of observations depends on sites, and ranges from less than 3 years to more than 5 years. Surges at tide gauges were computed following Eq. 7. The altimeter database covers 8 years (2008-2015) of JASON-2 data along tracks. Surges along tracks were computed following Eq. 8. Analysis of data led to select following storms: ex-Gonzalo, Friedhelm, Felix, and Gunter (Table 1).

217

218 The tracks of the 4 selected storms are shown in Figure 2, and the surface winds during the storms are shown in Figure 3. These storms were moving at a speed of around 15 to 20 km/h. 219 220 In December 2011, Friedhelm crossed the North East Atlantic. Its track is the southernmost one. In the North Sea, the winds are very strong (up to 27 m/s), and the sea state is old, with 221 wave age larger than 1.2 along the altimeter track. In October 2014, ex-Gonzalo reached the 222 223 Northern part of the British Islands. This storm corresponds to the remnants of Category 4 224 Atlantic Hurricane Gonzalo. It is the strongest storm in terms of surges, but not in terms of winds (no more than 22.7 m/s). The sea state is young with wave age around 0.9 along the 225 226 altimeter track. One of the characteristics of this storm is that the strong winds moved from the west to the east as a nearly North-South front of around 1,000 km long (Figure 3 (b)). This 227 228 explains the discontinuity in the Mean Sea Level Pressure observed in the ex-Gonzalo track 229 over the North Sea, as the minimum moves along this front (red curve on Figure 2). In January 2015, Felix and Gunter crossed the North Atlantic. In fact, three storms succeeded: first Elon, 230 then Felix which crossed the North Sea on the 10<sup>th</sup> of January, and finally Gunter on the 12<sup>th</sup> of 231 232 January 2015. The winds were strong and reached 26.8 m/s (Table 1). For Felix, the sea state was young with wave age close to 0.8 along the altimeter track, whereas for Gunter it was old 233 with wave age larger than 1.2. The old sea for Gunter can be easily explained by the succession 234 of three storms in a short period (few days). The Gunter track was farther north than the Felix 235 one, which may explain why the storm had less impact in term of surges. 236

- 237
- 238 *3.2. Numerical setup*
- 239

The ocean model is forced with output from a coupled wave-atmosphere model (Figure 4).Here, we describe the ocean model, the atmosphere model, and the experiments.

242243 *3.2.1. Ocean model* 

We used the default configuration of the TUGO shallow water global ocean model (Lyard et al., 2006), with FES2014 spatial grid (Figure 5). The unstructured space discretization allows the increasing of the resolution in shallow waters, as well as along strong topographic gradient areas. In the North Sea, the resolution varies from 10-15 km offshore to 4 km along the French
and English coasts, and 2 km along the north of the Norwegian coasts. Note that the resolution
is not refined in the southeast of the North Sea, due to a lack of detailed bathymetric information
in this area (not enough available data).

251

The ocean model is forced with (1) 10-m wind or (2) surface wind stress from the coupled wave atmosphere model (Figure 4). In the first case (1), the wind stress is computed from the ocean model bulk formula. The drag coefficient is expressed following Hellerman and Rosenstein (1983), which is a wind-only dependent formulation:

- 256
- 257 258

259

$$\begin{split} 10^3 C_d &= 0.934 + 0.788 \times 10^{-1} U_{10} + 0.868 \times 10^{-1} \Delta T - 0.616 \times 10^{-3} U_{10}^2 - 0.12 \times \\ & 10^{-2} \Delta T^2 - 0.214 \times 10^{-2} U_{10} (\Delta T) \end{split}$$

where  $U_{10}$  is the wind at 10 m, and  $\Delta T$  is the air-sea temperature difference to take into account 260 the stability effect. In the second case (2), the wind stress comes directly from the ECMWF-261 coupled wave-atmosphere model. Figure 6 shows the TUGO drag for  $\Delta T = 0$  and the ECMWF 262 263 drag, computed over the North Sea during two days for each storm: Fridhelm, ex-Gonzalo, Felix, and Gunter. For winds lower than 15 m/s, the TUGO drag is guite similar to the ECMWF 264 one, but with no variability. For winds stronger than 15 m/s, the TUGO drag is generally lower 265 than the ECMWF one. For a given wind speed, the variability of the ECMWF drag depends on 266 the wave age (Figure 7), even if this dependency is not explicit (see section 3.2.2). Note that 267 the TUGO drag is quite close to the ECMWF drag for old sea state, but lower for young sea 268 state. 269

270

#### 271 *3.2.2. Atmosphere model*

We used the ECMWF-coupled wave-atmosphere model - IFS (Integrated Forecasting System) 272 - to generate atmospheric forcing (Figure 4). We conducted the simulations without data 273 assimilation. The IFS CY41R1 cycle (ECMWF, 2015a) has a spatial resolution of around 16 274 km (TL1279) and 137 vertical levels. It has been coupled with the spectral wave model 275 ECWAM (ECMWF Wave Model, ECMWF (2015b)) since 1998. ECWAM uses a coarser 276 horizontal resolution than IFS at around 28 km, with 36 directions and 36 frequencies 277 278 exponentially spaced, with starting frequency 0.035 Hz and an increment of 1.1. In ECWAM, the source terms are  $S = S_{in} + S_{nl} + S_{ds} + S_{bot}$ , where  $S_{in}$  represents the wind input,  $S_{nl}$ 279 represents the nonlinear wave-wave interactions,  $S_{ds}$  represents the dissipation due to 280 whitecapping, and  $S_{bot}$  represents the bottom friction. The parameterizations of these source 281 terms are discussed in ECMWF (2015b). 282

The wind stress is represented by classical bulk formulae (Eq. 1). We assume that the wind stress is in the wind direction—that is, the effects of wind-wave misalignment are not accounted here. The drag coefficient is expressed following Janssen (1991), which is a wave-dependent formulation. In neutral conditions, the drag coefficient can be expressed as

288

$$C_d = \frac{\kappa^2}{\left[\log\left(\frac{10}{Z_0}\right)\right]^2} \tag{10}$$

289

where  $z_0$  is the roughness length, and  $\kappa$  is von Kármán's constant (0.4). The roughness length is expressed as

292

293 
$$z_0 = \frac{0.11\nu}{u_*} + \alpha \frac{u_*^2}{g}$$
(11)

294

where  $\nu$  is the kinematic viscosity, and  $\alpha$  is the Charnock's parameter (Charnock, 1955). Note 295 296 that the ECWAM wave model uses Eqs 10 and 11, but Eq. 11 is reduced to the second term, that is, roughness associated with an overall form drag of the wave field; the first term, that is, 297 roughness associated to the viscous properties of the flow, is computed in the IFS atmosphere 298 model. The modification of the roughness length  $z_0$  impacts the drag coefficient and the wind 299 stress (Eqs 10 and 1), then the sea level (Eqs 2 and 3), but also the wind profile. Indeed, when 300 301 roughness increases, friction also increases, and this slows down the wind (Pineau-Guillou et al., 2018). Janssen (1991) parameterized the quasi-linear wave growth effect as an effective 302 larger Charnock parameter, expressed as a function of the wave-induced stress  $\tau_w$ 303

304 305

$$\alpha = \frac{\alpha_0}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{\tau_W}{\tau}}} \tag{12}$$

306

with  $\alpha_0 = 0.006$ . The wave-induced stress  $\tau_w$  is the momentum flux transferred from the atmosphere to the waves. It can be related to the wind-wave growth parameter  $\beta$  and the directional wave spectrum  $E(f, \theta)$ 

$$\tau_w = \rho g \int_0^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} \beta(f,\theta) E(f,\theta) / (c(f)) \, df \, d\theta \qquad (13)$$

311 312

where  $\theta$  is the direction, f is the relative wave frequency, and c(f) is the phase speed, which 313 is a function of frequency (Janssen, 2004). The wave-growth parameter is expressed as  $\beta =$ 314  $(\beta_m/\kappa^2) \mu \ln^4(\mu), \mu \le 1$ , where  $\beta_m$  is a constant (1.2), and  $\mu$  is the dimensionless critical 315 height (ECMWF, 2015b). In Eq. 13, the frequency f is integrated from 0 to a high-frequency 316 limit  $f_c$  (prognostic part of the wave spectrum) using the discretized spectrum. Beyond  $f_c$ 317 (diagnostic part of the wave spectrum), the shape of the spectrum is assumed, and the resulting 318 integral can be evaluated using a simple integration scheme (ECMWF, 2015b). It is assumed 319 that the diagnostic part of the wave spectrum is given as  $E(f,\theta) = E(f_c,\theta)(f/f_c)^{-5}$  for  $f > f_c$ . The high frequency limit  $f_c$  is set as  $f_c = \min(f_{max}, 2.5f_{windsea})$ , where  $f_{max}$  is the 320 321 maximum discretized frequency, and  $f_{windsea}$  is the mean frequency of the modelled wind sea 322 323 (ECMWF, 2015b).

324

The ocean model is forced by the atmospheric stress  $\tau$ . However, a part of the atmospheric stress is going into the waves. The momentum flux going into the ocean  $\tau_{oc}$  is the sum of two contributions (Figure 8): the part of the atmospheric flux which was not used to generate the waves  $\tau_o = \tau - \tau_w$ , and the momentum flux transferred from the waves to the ocean by dissipation  $\tau_{diss}$  (ECMWF, 2015b)

- 330
- 331 332

$$\tau_{oc} = \tau_o + \tau_{diss} = \tau - \tau_w + \tau_{diss}.$$
 (14)

A more correct approach would be to force the ocean model with  $\tau_{oc}$  rather than  $\tau$ . The 333 normalized stress going into the ocean corresponds to the ratio  $\tau_{oc}/\tau$  (output parameter of the 334 ECMWF operational version, but not available in the research version of IFS we used). The 335 normalized stress is lower than 1 when the waves are growing, and greater than 1 when they 336 are dissipating. It is globally close to 1 but can reach values as high as 1.5 under extreme 337 conditions, such as with a passing front (Janssen, 2012). In the ex-Gonzalo case study, it could 338 locally be greater than 2 when the front was passing (Pineau-Guillou, 2018). The strong 339 gradients suggest a potential impact on the ocean model. Curcic (2015) also investigated the 340 ratio between the oceanic and atmospheric stress in tropical cyclones; he found typical values 341 between 0.85 and 1 depending on the wave state. 342

343

#### 344 *3.2.3. Experiments*

345 We simulated the 4 selected storms (ex-Gonzalo, Friedhelm, Felix, and Gunter) with two stress parameterizations—that is, the wind-dependent and the wave-dependent parametrizations. Note 346 that Felix and Gunter are in the same simulation as they follow each other. For each storm, the 347 348 model was initialized for at least 15 days, with winds and atmospheric pressure coming from the ECMWF operational 1 h forecasts (i.e. combining hourly operational forecasts computed 349 twice a day at 00:00 and at 12:00). Once initialized, each storm simulation lasted 5 days and 350 was forced by (1) the 10 m-wind or (2) directly by the wind stress, and the atmospheric pressure, 351 with a 1h temporal resolution. In this case, the wind stress comes from the atmosphere model. 352 When forced by the 10 m-wind (1), the drag is a wind-dependent formulation, computed by 353 TUGO (Eq. 9 with  $\Delta T = 0$ , Hellerman and Rosenstein (1983)), whereas when forced by the 354 wind stress (2), the drag is a wave-dependent formulation, which has seen the waves through 355 IFS/WAM coupling (Eqs 10, 11, 12 and 13, Janssen (1991)). 356

357

358 *3.3. Validation data* 

359

Among the 101 tide gauges, 22 tide gauges were selected for comparison with the model (Figure 360 361 1). The following were the criteria: 1) the tide gauges must have data available during the storms, 2) the tide gauges must open up to the ocean, rather than at the end of a bay, 3) a 362 maximum number of the tide gauges must be offshore, where processes are different from 363 364 harbors, and 4) a maximum number of tide gauges must be located along the tracks. The JASON-2 tracks with the maximum surges are tracks 170 for Friedhelm, 61 for ex-Gonzalo, 94 365 for Felix, and 170 for Gunter (Figure 1). All the data (tide gauges and JASON-2) were processed 366 367 as described in section 2.

- 369 **4. Results**
- 370

368

To investigate the impact of the waves, we compared the surges with wind-dependent (Hellerman and Rosenstein, 1983) and wave-dependent (Janssen, 1991) parameterization during four storms—two with a young sea state (ex-Gonzalo and Felix) and two with an old sea state (Friedhelm and Gunter). Note that Felix and Gunter followed each other, and correspond to the same simulation. We compared the simulated surges with observations, namely tide gauges and JASON-2 altimetric data.

377

378 Figure 9 shows the surge comparison between the model and 3 tide gauges (representative of the whole) for ex-Gonzalo, Felix, and Gunter (no data were available for Friedhelm in 2011, as 379 the CMEMS tide gauge database starts only in 2012); Table 2 summarizes the corresponding 380 errors between the model and the tides gauges: bias, Root Mean Square Error (RMSE), and 381 Peak Error (defined as the difference between the maximum observed and modelled surge). 382 Finally, Figures 10 and 11 show the surge comparison between the model and JASON-2 383 altimetric data, for ex-Gonzalo and Friedhelm. Note that the grey shaded area corresponds to 384 deep waters, where the wind stress effect is lower. 385

386

Analysis of ex-Gonzalo (young sea) and Friedhelm (old sea) gives the following results.

The first result is that globally, the model matches very well with the observations. For the wave-dependent parameterization, on average, the bias between the model and all the tide gauges is close to zero, the RMSE is 0.12 m, and the Peak Error is -0.09 m (Table 2). The errors between the model and JASON-2 are lower than the errors between the model and the tide

gauges: the bias is close to zero, and the RMSE is 0.08 m, whereas the surge ranges up to 1.40 393 m (Figure 10). Note also the very good agreement between the model, JASON-2 data, and the 394 tide gauge situated along the track (D151TG, see Figure 1 for the tide gauges location). 395 Unfortunately, the tide gauge Cromer located on the northeast coast of England at the end of 396 the track did not record data during this storm. For Friedhelm, the model also matches the 397 398 altimeter quite well, but not as well as for ex-Gonzalo. For the wave-dependent parameterization, the bias and RMSE reach -0.12 m and 0.08 m, respectively (Figure 11). The 399 differences could be due to uncertainties in altimeter corrections, such as geophysical 400 corrections (for example tide). However, note that the agreement between the model and the 401 altimeter is very good in shallow waters, where the wind stress effect is the most significant 402 (Figure 11 (b)). To conclude, the errors between the model and the observations (tide gauges 403 and altimeter data) for these two storms are small enough to confirm the capability of a global 404 model to accurately predict storm surges, even in the coastal areas, when its spatial resolution 405 is fine enough to catch the storm size. These results also confirm the capability of altimeters to 406 407 accurately measure surges (Antony et al., 2014).

408

The second result is that the wave-dependent parameterization yields higher surges only when 409 410 the sea state is young (ex-Gonzalo, Figures 9 (a) and 10 (b)). Otherwise, the surges are similar, regardless of the parameterization (Friedhlem, Figure 11 (b)). Physically, this is not surprising 411 as old sea corresponds to a situation where waves are no longer rapidly growing resulting in 412 sharp reduction of the momentum flux from the atmosphere to the waves. When the sea state is 413 old, the drag coefficients from the two parameterizations are close to each other (Figure 7), and 414 the surges are then similar. However, in the presence of young and steep waves, the drag 415 increases with Janssen's parameterization due to higher values of the Charnock parameter 416 417 (Figure 12 (c) and (d)). This yields higher drag than the wind-dependent formulation, and later higher wind stress (Figure 12 (e) and (f)) and higher surges. The differences between these two 418 parameterizations corresponds to the effect of the waves on the surges. This difference reaches 419 420 25 cm at Lowestoft (Figure 9 (a)) and 20 cm along Jason-2 track (Figure 10 (b)). We note the 421 very good agreement in terms of Significant Wave Height (SWH) between the ECMWF coupled wave-atmosphere model and JASON-2 altimeter (Piolle et al., 2019) for ex-Gonzalo 422 423 (Figure 12 (b) and 13 (b)), and for Gunter (Figure 13 (d)). The very strong SWH gradient along the track for ex-Gonzalo corresponds to the passage of the front (Figure 13 (b)). 424

425

The third result is that the wave-dependent parameterization is closer to the observations than the wind dependent one. These results are consistent with those previously obtained by Mastenbroek et al. (1993), Nicolle et al. (2009), and Bertin et al. (2015). Along the JASON-2 track, the RMSE is reduced from 0.13 m to 0.08 m (Figure 10 (b)). On average, in the 21 tide gauges, the Peak Error is reduced from -0.21 m to -0.09 m (Table 2). However, in some tide gauges, the surges are still underestimated. The tides gauges can be separated into three groups:

432 433 434

435

436

• Group 1: a first group of 11 tide gauges (in blue in Figure 1), where the surges with the wave-dependent stress match well with observations, such as Lowestoft and EuroplatformTG in Figure 9 (a). This corresponds to the 4 offshore tide gauges (F3platformTG, D151TG, EuroplatformTG, VlakteVdRaanTG) as well as 7 other tide gauges onshore.

Group 2: a second group of 5 tide gauges (in green in Figure 1), where the surges with the wave-dependent stress are still underestimated, such as Whitby in Figure 9 (a).

Group 3: a third group of 5 tide gauges (in black in Figure 1), where the effect of the parameterization is not significant; this corresponds to tide gauges located in the northern part of the North Sea, where surges are smaller than 0.50 m. In this part, the bathymetry ranges from 50 to 200 m, and the effect of wind stress is smaller than in the

southern part, with shallow waters. That may explain the non-significant differencesbetween the two parameterizations.

445 Note that in the second group where surges are still underestimated, there are no tide gauges offshore. This underestimation is probably partly due to processes taking place in the very 446 nearshore, and not modelled by TUGO (e.g. wave setup, see the discussion in section 5). This 447 448 could suggest that comparisons with the altimeter are better, as the tracks offshore are not 449 contaminated by coastal processes such as wave setup. Another reason that could explain this negative bias is the lack of spatial resolution near the coast (only 2 km). Experiments show that 450 atmospheric surges may increase from 0.1 to 0.3 between 10 m isobath and the shoreline 451 (personal communication from X. Bertin); here, the spatial resolution is not fine enough to 452 correctly represent this increase. 453

454

After the analysis of ex-Gonzalo (young sea) and Friedhelm (old sea), analysis of Felix (young 455 sea) and Gunter (old sea) give partly similar results. (1) The model still matches quite well with 456 the tide gauges (bias, RMSE, and Peak Error are respectively 0 cm, 19 cm, and -10 cm for the 457 wave-dependent parameterization; see Table 2). (2) The wave-dependent parameterization still 458 yields to higher surges when the sea state is young. The impact of the waves on the surges 459 reaches around 11 cm at Europlatform and around 20 cm along Jason-2 track (not shown). (3) 460 We find also that the wave-dependent parameterization is closer to the tide gauge observations, 461 reducing on average the Peak Error from -0.14 m to -0.10 m. However, comparison between 462 the model and the altimeter is not as good as for ex-Gonzalo and Friedhelm (not shown), and it 463 464 is difficult to conclude which parameterization is the most appropriate. This suggests that the number of case studies should be increased, to give more confidence in our conclusions. 465 466

- 467 **5.** Discussion
- 468

469 Here, we discuss the influence of the wind direction, the processes contributing to the surges,470 and the impact on the altimetric corrections.

- 471 472
- 473 5.1. Impact of the wind direction
- 474

Analysis of tide gauge and altimeter data revealed that ex-Gonzalo was the storm with the highest surge, whereas it was the one with the weakest winds (only 23 m/s in the North Sea, against 27 m/s for Friedhelm, see Table 1). This is mainly due to the wind direction. Figure 14 shows wind roses in the middle of the North Sea (4°E 56°N), during the 5-day simulations of the storms. For ex-Gonzalo (Figure 14 (a)), strong winds were mainly from the northwest direction, pushing the waters along the southern coast of the North Sea, whereas for other storms, strong winds came mainly from the west (see also Figure 3).

This is probably not the only explanation for ex-Gonzalo high surges. The track of this storm
is the southernmost one; the storm crosses the south of the North Sea, and the shallow waters
may enhance the wind stress contribution.

485

487

486 5.2. Processes contributing to the surges

Even if the wave-dependent parameterization yields higher surges, the modelled surges are still underestimated compared with some tide gauges (5 over 21 for ex-Gonzalo storm). The comparison between modelled and observed surges is complicated by the different processes that contribute to the surge and that are not always modelled (see Table 3). Generally, the dominant effect is the atmospheric forcing (Mean Sea Level Pressure and winds). This 493 contribution is commonly of the order of 50 cm, but can exceed 1 m in severe storms and
494 hurricanes, as in the case of Xynthia in February 2010 at La Rochelle (Pineau-Guillou et al.,
495 2012; Bertin et al., 2012). In case of progression in very shallow waters, as for example in the
496 South of the North Sea, the surges can reach up to 2 or 3 m. This atmospheric contribution is
497 taken into account in the ocean model through the atmospheric forcing.

498

Another important contribution to the total surge - which is here not taken into account - is the 499 wave setup, that is, the surge due to wave dissipation (mainly by wave breaking) in the 500 nearshore areas (Bunya et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2010; Brown et al., 2010; Idier et al., 2012; Lee 501 et al., 2013; Bertin et al., 2015; Thuy et al., 2017; Choi et al., 2018). To model the wave setup, 502 the radiation stress has to be introduced. The radiation stress is the momentum flux carried by 503 the waves. When the waves dissipate, such as by wave breaking or strong bottom friction, this 504 generates nearshore currents and an additional surge, the wave setup. Its contribution to the 505 total surge may be significant. For instance, values of 0.5 to 1.5 m were reported in Liverpool 506 Bay (Brown et al., 2010), more than 0.5 m (i.e. 50% or more of the total surge) in the southern 507 part of the Bay of Biscay (Idier et al., 2012), and 10 to 20 cm in the central part of the Bay of 508 Biscay (Bertin et al., 2015). In coastal areas, it can contribute up to 80% of the total storm surge 509 (Pedreros et al., 2018). During typhoons, it can contribute up to 15% following Thuy et al. 510 (2017) and even 40% following Kim et al. (2010). In the North Sea, Choi et al. (2018) reported 511 contributions of around 20 cm and 10% of the total surge during 1953 Big Flood. To capture 512 the wave setup well, (1) the ocean model has to be coupled one-way or two-way with a wave 513 model to take into account the radiation stress, and (2) the grid spatial resolution has to be high 514 enough, that is, around 10 m. As a consequence, due to a too coarse grid (3 to 15 km in the 515 North Sea), the wave setup is not modelled in this study (as is generally done in global and 516 517 regional models). This is a limitation for comparison with coastal tide gauges, but not with altimeter, as wave setup is close to zero far from the coast. Note that the present study would 518 benefit from more tide gauge observations offshore (where wave setup is negligible). 519

520

521 Other contributions are the waves whose signature may be significant at the surface when 522 propagating in coastal areas, such as meteo-tsunami, infragravity waves - only few cm in deep 523 ocean (Aucan and Ardhuin, 2013) but can reach more than 1 m in coastal areas (Sheremet et 524 al., 2014), internal solitary waves (can reach 20 cm in coastal areas) as well as internal waves, 525 rogue waves, and tsunamis - surge due to an earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption. Finally, 526 seiches - resonance phenomena in closed or semi-closed basins - also contribute to the surges. 527 Their amplitude can be significant in harbors and sometimes reach several tens of centimeters.

528 529

#### 5.3. Impact on the altimetric corrections

530

The accuracy of the simulated storm surges is essential, as it directly impacts the accuracy of 531 Sea Level Anomaly products through the Dynamic Atmospheric Correction (Eq. 8). Figure 15 532 shows the differences between the default SLA from CTOH (blue curve) and the new 533 reconstructed one (red curve) with the DAC taking into account the waves, that is, from the 534 TUGO simulation forced with the ECMWF wind stress. The new reconstructed SLA is on 535 536 average closer to zero. The SLA has been improved by removing some surge residual due to atmospheric effect. The difference between the two SLA (the native and the reconstructed one) 537 reaches 40 cm near the coast. Note that in this 40 cm, around 20 cm may be attributed to the 538 539 waves impact, and the other 20 cm are probably due to a better ocean model resolution and a 540 better temporal atmospheric forcing (1h versus 6h in the DAC product from CTOH).

- 541
- 542 **6.** Conclusions

- We investigated the impact of a wave-dependent stress on surge modelling. During ex-Gonzalo
  and Friedhelm storms, which are characterized respectively by young and old sea states, we
  compared simulated surges with wind-dependent and wave-dependent stress (Hellerman and
  Rosenstein, 1983; Janssen, 1991). We compared the results with tide gauges and altimetric data.
- 548

549 We showed that the global ocean model accurately predicts storm surges in coastal areas 550 (RMSE of 0.12 m). This can be attributed partly to the unstructured grid, which allows 551 increasing the resolution in the shallow waters. The consistency between the model, the 552 altimeter, and the tide gauges also confirms the capability of altimeters to accurately measure 553 surges (RMSE of 0.08 m along the track).

554

555 We showed that when the sea state is old, the wind-dependent formulation Hellerman and Rosenstein (1983) is appropriate. However, when the sea becomes younger and rougher, the 556 557 wind stress increases, and a wave-dependent formulation (here, Janssen (1991)) is more appropriate. This reduces the Peak Error significantly (e.g. from 0.21 m to 0.09 m). The waves 558 effect on the surge can reach 20 to 25 cm. This result is consistent with previous studies 559 (Mastenbroek et al., 1993; Nicolle et al., 2009; Bertin et al., 2015). However, the number of 560 case studies should be increased to confirm these conclusions. Indeed, taking into the waves 561 allows to obtain surges closer to observations, but could be a way to compensate other errors. 562 For example, Moon et al. (2009) concluded that Mastenbroek et al. (1993) obtained good 563 564 simulated surges with overestimated drag by compensating surge error due to a too coarse grid. 565

This work underlines the lack of consistency of the drag between the wave, atmosphere, and ocean models (van Nieuwkoop et al., 2015). One recommendation could be to force the ocean model with the wind stress from a coupled wave-atmosphere model, which has seen the waves (e.g. ECMWF model). This would yield to (1) more consistency between the drag from the ocean and the atmosphere models and (2) improvement of the storm surges taking into account the wave effect. To go even further, we would recommend forcing the ocean model with the stress going into the ocean  $\tau_{oc}$  rather than the atmospheric stress  $\tau$ .

573

In this study, we showed that the ocean model better matches with tide gauges offshore (compared with onshore) and altimeter tracks. This is probably due to coastal effects in tide gauges (e.g. wave setup) that are not modelled in the TUGO ocean model and that are not seen with the altimeters (as the tracks are offshore). This suggests that tide gauges should not always be considered as a reference, and that what we generally call "errors" between model/tide gauges or altimeter/tide gauges also includes local coastal processes. Consequently, we should not always want the model (or altimeter) to match perfectly with tide gauges.

581

Finally, we should mention several limitations in this study. (1) Results are specific to the 582 ECMWF and TUGO parameterizations used here (Janssen, 1991; Hellerman and Rosenstein, 583 1983). (2) The wind stress is mainly supported by the capillary and short gravity waves, that is, 584 the tail of the spectrum, which is crudely represented in wave models today (Kudryavtsev et 585 586 al., 2014; Peureux and Ardhuin, 2016). Dedicated efforts are being made to improve wave breaking parameterization, in order to also improve the tail of the spectrum. There are also 587 many uncertainties of the wave growth parameter  $\beta$ . (3) We assume that the wind stress is in 588 the wind direction, as it is mainly supported by high-frequency waves which respond quickly 589 to changes in the wind direction (Janssen, 2004). Possible wind-wave misalignment is not 590 591 accounted here. (4) The ocean model is forced by the atmospheric stress  $\tau$ , whereas a more correct approach would be to force it with the stress going into the ocean  $\tau_{oc}$ . (5) The wave 592

setup, that is, the surge generated by the wave dissipation (e.g. wave breaking), is not accounted 593 here. It may reach up to 20 cm in the North Sea (Choi et al., 2018). (6) We have investigated 594 the wind stress sensitivity on the surges, but other factors impact the surges, such as grid spatial 595 resolution, bottom friction, bathymetry, and coastal geometry (Mao and Xia, 2017). Despite we 596 obtain modelled surges closer to the observations, there are still some possible compensation 597 598 of errors due to uncertainties on other modelling terms. Note that we did not go further in investigating how these other factors may impact the surge dynamics, as this is not within the 599 scope of the present paper. (7) The ocean model is here forced by the atmosphere model. Two-600 way ocean-atmosphere coupling would probably affect the resulting water levels, as both the 601 wind  $U_{10}$  and the atmospheric stress  $\tau$  will be modified to account for the moving ocean surface 602 (Hersbach and Bidlot, 2009). 603

604 605

#### 606 Acknowledgment

607

608 Acknowledgement is made for the use of ECMWF's computing and archive facilities in this research. We thank all ECMWF staff for the warm welcome and excellent support provided. 609 We thank CMEMS for providing tide gauges data. We also thank CTOH/LEGOS for providing 610 611 JASON-2 1Hz X-track coastal product, LEGOS for providing TUGO ocean model, and ESA Sea State Climate Change Initiative and Ifremer for providing JASON-2 Significant Wave 612 Height. We also warmly thank Xavier Bertin and Michel Benoit for their constructive 613 614 comments and suggestions. Finally, the authors would like to thank the reviewers for their careful reading and their constructive comments, which allowed us to improve this article. 615 616

- Figure 1: Tide gauges and JASON-2 tracks. The tracks numbered 094, 170, and 061 are the ones with maximum
  surges for storms Felix, Friedhelm/Gunter, and ex-Gonzalo (see Table 1). The 4 groups of tide gauges correspond
  to the 22 tide gauges used for this study. For ex-Gonzalo storm, group 1 matches quite well with observations,
  group 2 shows an underestimation, group 3 is not sensitive to the parameterization (deep waters), and group 4 has
  no data during this storm.
- Figure 2: Tracks of the minimum of the Mean Sea Level Pressure for the selected storms (from ECMWF simulations). The asterisk on the figure corresponds to the time for the wind plot (Figure 3).
- Figure 3: 10 m winds during the storms (a) Friedhelm, 8 December 2011, 22:00 (b) ex-Gonzalo, 21 October 2014,
  17:00 (c) Felix, 10 January 2015, 10:00 (d) Gunter, 12 January 2015, 17:00 (from ECMWF simulations).
- 628

630

632

622

625

- 629 Figure 4: Ocean model forced with a coupled wave-atmosphere model.
- **631** Figure 5: FES2014 grid over the North East Atlantic.
- Figure 6: Comparison of drag coefficient for the TUGO parameterization (Hellerman and Rosenstein, 1983) and
  the ECMWF (CY41R1) parameterization. For the ECMWF model, computation is made over the North Sea over
  two days.
- Figure 7: Comparison of drag coefficient for the TUGO parameterization (Hellerman and Rosenstein, 1983) and
  the ECMWF (CY41R1) parameterization. Vertical bars correspond to one standard deviation. For the ECMWF
  model, computation is made over the North Sea over two days.
- 640
- 641 Figure 8: Schematic representation of momentum fluxes at the air-sea interface (adapted from Janssen et al. 642 (2013)). The momentum flux going into the ocean  $\tau_{oc}$  is the sum of  $\tau_o$  and  $\tau_{diss}$ .
- 643
- Figure 9: Observed and modelled surges with two parameterizations (wind- and wave-dependent) at tide gaugesLowestoft, EuroplatformTG, and Whitby during (a) ex-Gonzalo, (b) Felix, and (c) Gunter storms.
- Figure 10: Surges from TUGO model, JASON-2 altimeter, and tide gauges during ex-Gonzalo (young sea) (a)
  over the North Sea (b) along Jason-2 track. The grey shaded area corresponds to deep waters (>100 m), where
  wind stress effect is lower.
- Figure 11: Surges from TUGO model and JASON-2 altimeter during Friedhelm (old sea) (a) over the North Sea
  (b) along Jason-2 track. The grey shaded area corresponds to deep waters (>100 m), where wind stress effect is lower.
- Figure 12: (a) Wind, (b) Significant Wave Height (SWH), (c) Wave age, (d) Charnock parameter, (e) wind stress
  from the ECMWF coupled wave-atmosphere model, and (f) wind stress from TUGO ocean model, during exGonzalo storm (young sea), October 21 2014, 23:00. The colored dots on (b) correspond to the observed
  Significant Wave Height from JASON-2 altimeter.
- 659

654

- Figure 13: Significant Wave Height from JASON-2 altimeter and the ECMWF model during (a) Friedhlem, (b)
  ex-Gonzalo, (c) Felix, and (d) Gunter storms.
- Figure 14: Wind roses (m/s) in the middle of the North Sea (4°E 56°N) during the 5-day simulations of storms (a)
  Friedhelm (b) ex-Gonzalo (c) Felix/Gunter. The color corresponds to the wind speed (in m/s), and the bar size corresponds to the distribution (in %).
- Figure 15: Comparison of default SLA (blue curve) and reconstructed SLA (red curve) taking into account thewaves for track 061 during ex-Gonzalo.

669

Name	Track date	Track	Type of	Rank from	Rank from	Max. wind
		number	sea state	JASON-2	TGs	(m/s)
				analysis	analysis	
Friedhelm	2011-12-10 02:43	170	old sea	5	/	27.0
ex-Gonzalo	2014-10-21 22:39	061	young sea	2	1	22.7
Felix	2015-01-10 12:44	94	young sea	6	5	26.8
Gunter	2015-01-13 11:55	170	old sea	20	/	25.5

Table 1: Storms selected for this study. The type of sea state (column 4) indicates if the sea state is young or old along the track. The rank (columns 5 and 6) corresponds to maximum surges. Maximum winds (column 7) are

673 computed over the North Sea ( $4^{\circ}E \ 10^{\circ}W \ 50^{\circ}N \ 65^{\circ}N$ ) during two days from the ECMWF simulations.

-	_	-
6	7	6
n	1	n
~		~

Tide Gauge	Bias (m)	Bias (m)	RMSE (m)	RMSE (m)	Peak Err. (m)	Peak Err. (m)
	Wind-dep.	Wave-dep.	Wind-dep.	Wave-dep.	Wind-dep.	Wave-dep.
EX-GONZALO						
Group 1	0.007	0.000	0.004	0.070	0.104	0.024
DISITG	0.007	0.002	0.084	0.070	-0.124	-0.024
EuroplatformTG	0.016	0.024	0.130	0.120	-0.165	0.061
F3platformTG	0.007	0.000	0.084	0.061	-0.129	-0.005
Harwich	-0.068	-0.045	0.161	0.155	-0.169	0.106
IjmuidenTG	0.022	-0.001	0.192	0.162	-0.336	-0.175
Leith	-0.018	-0.012	0.119	0.114	-0.141	-0.080
Lowestoft	-0.029	-0.028	0.126	0.111	-0.307	-0.077
StavangerTG	0.018	-0.003	0.095	0.072	-0.103	-0.024
TregdeTG	0.011	-0.005	0.126	0.106	-0.248	-0.146
VlakteVdRaanTG	-0.012	-0.015	0.160	0.163	-0.161	0.047
Whitby	-0.005	-0.021	0.106	0.095	-0.234	-0.147
Group 2						
DunkerqueTG	-0.020	-0.041	0.189	0.181	-0.473	-0.319
HelgolandTG	0.083	0.072	0.202	0.173	-0.433	-0.207
HoernumTG	0.103	0.071	0.230	0.184	-0.437	-0.219
NorderneyTG	0.029	-0.000	0.261	0.218	-0.539	-0.328
VlielandHavenTG	0.014	-0.009	0.201	0.174	-0.374	-0.224
Group 3						
Aberdeen	0.026	0.011	0.084	0.074	-0.026	-0.003
Lerwick	0.010	0.015	0.038	0.038	-0.007	-0.004
MaloyTG	0.031	0.009	0.064	0.052	-0.065	-0.041
NorthCormorantTG	0.039	0.036	0.052	0.048	0.028	0.026
Wick	0.030	0.003	0.078	0.065	0.014	-0.026
Group 4						
Cromer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	0.014	0.003	0.132	0.116	-0.211	-0.086
FELIX/GUNTER						
Mean	0.011	0.001	0.198	0.190	-0.138	-0.104

Table 2: Bias, RMSE, and Peak Error for wind- and wave-dependent parameterization during the 5-day simulation
 for ex-Gonzalo and Felix/Gunter storms. For ex-Gonzalo, Group 1 matches quite well with observations (see the

last column for the Peak Error), Group 2 shows an underestimation (see also the last column for the Peak Error),

682 Group 3 is not sensitive to the parameterization (deep waters), and Group 4 has no data during this storm. See

Figure 1 for the location of the 4 groups.

Process	Location	Computed in hydrodynamic models
Atmospheric surge due to wind and atm. pressure	Everywhere	Yes, if atmospheric forcing is introduced
Wave setup, i.e. surge due to wave breaking	In nearshore areas	Yes, if resolution is fine enough, and if radiation stress is introduced
Tide surge interaction	Significant in very shallow waters	Yes, if meteorological and tide forcing are introduced
Meteo-tsunami		Yes, if the space resolution is fine enough
Infragravity waves		Yes, if the hydrodynamic model is coupled with a wave model
Internal waves	Everywhere	Yes, in a baroclinic model
Rogue waves		No
Tsunamis i.e. surge due to an earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption		No
Seiches i.e. resonance phenomena in closed or semi-closed basins	Mainly in harbors or bays	Yes, if the spatial resolution is fine enough; this is rarely the case in global or regional models

686 Table 3: Various processes contributing to the surge

#### 689 **References**

- 690
- Allain, D. J., 2013. TUGOm tidal toolbox. Tech. rep., LEGOS Documentation.
- Andreas, E. L., 2009. Relating the drag coefficient and the roughness length over the sea to thewavelength of the peak waves. J. Phys. Oceanogr. 39, 3011-3020.
- Antony, C., Testut, 470 L., Unnikrishnan, A., 2014. Observing storm surges in the Bay of
   Bengal from satellite altimetry. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 151, 131-140.
- Aucan, J., Ardhuin, F., 2013. Infragravity waves in the deep ocean: An upward revision.Geophys. Res. Lett. 40, 3435-3439.
- Bertin, X., Bruneau, N., Breilh, J.-F., Fortunato, A. B., Karpytchev, M., 2012. Importance of
- wave age and resonance in storm surges: The case Xynthia, Bay of Biscay. Ocean Modelling42, 16-30.
- Bertin, X., Li, K., Roland, A., Bidlot, J.-R., 2015. The contribution of short-waves in storm
   surges: Two case studies in the Bay of Biscay. Continental Shelf Research 96, 1-15.
- Birol, F., Fuller, N., Lyard, F., Cancet, M., Niño, F., Delebecque, C., Fleury, S., Toublanc, F.,
- Melet, A., Saraceno, M., Léger, F., 2016. Coastal applications from nadir altimetry: Example
   of the X-TRACK regional products. Advances in Space Research 59 (4), 936-953.
- Black, P. G., D'Asaro, E. A., Drennan, W. M., French, J. R., Niller, P. P., Sanford, T. B., Terrill,
- E. J., Walsh, E. J., Zhang, J. A., 2007. Air-sea exchange in hurricanes: Synthesis of observations
   from the coupled boundary layer airsea transfer experiment. Bull. Amer. Meterol. Soc. 88,
- 709 359374.
  710 Brown I M Souza A I Wolf I 2010 An investigation of recent decadal-scale storm even
- Brown, J. M., Souza, A. J., Wolf, J., 2010. An investigation of recent decadal-scale storm events
  in the eastern Irish Sea. J. Geophys. Res. 115, C05018.
- Bunya, S., Dietrich, J., Westerink, J., Ebersole, B., Smith, J., Atkinson, J., Jensen, R., Resio,
- D., Luettich, R., Dawson, C., Cardone, V., Cox, A., Powell, M., Westerink, H., Roberts, H.,
- 714 2010. A high resolution coupled riverine, tide, wind, wind wave, and storm surge model for
- southern Louisiana and Mississippi: Part I model development and validation. Mon. WeatherRev. 138, 345-377.
- Carrère, L., Lyard, F., 2003. Modeling the barotropic response of the global ocean to
  atmospheric wind and pressure forcing comparisons with observations. Geophys. Res. Lett.
  30 (6), 1275.
- 720 Carrère, L., Lyard, F., Cancet, M., Guillot, A., Apr. 2015. FES 2014, a new tidal model on the
- global ocean with enhanced accuracy in shallow seas and in the Arctic region. In: EGU General
- Assembly Conference Abstracts. Vol. 17 of EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts. p.
- 723 5481.
- Charnock, H., 1955. Wind stress on a water surface. Quart. Journ. Roy. Meteorol. Soc. 81, 639-640.
- Choi, B. H., Kim, K. O., Yuk, J.-H., Lee, H. S., 2018. Simulation of the 1953 storm surge inthe North Sea. Ocean Dynamics 6, 1759-1777.
- 728 Curcic, M., 2015. Explicit Air-Sea Momentum Exchange in Coupled Atmosphere-Wave-Ocean
- Modeling of Tropical Cyclones. Open Access Dissertations. 1512. PhD manuscript. 196 p.
- 730 Donelan, M. A., Haus, B. K., Reul, N., Plant, W. J., Stiassnie, M., Graber, H. C., Brown, O. B.,
- 731 Saltzman, E. S., 2004. On the limiting aerodynamic roughness of the ocean in very strong
- 732 winds. Geophys. Res. Lett. 31, L18306.
- ECMWF, 2015a. IFS Documentation CY41R1. ECMWF Book.
- ECMWF, 2015b. IFS Documentation CY41R1. Part VII: ECMWF Wave Model. ECMWFBook Chapter.
- 736 Edson, J. B., Jampana, V., Weller, R. A., Bigorre, S. P., Plueddemann, A. J., Fairall, C. W.,
- Miller, S. D., Mahrt, L., Vickers, D., Hersbach, H., 2013. On the exchange of momentum over the open ocean L Phys. Oceanogr 43, 1589, 1610
- the open ocean. J. Phys. Oceanogr. 43, 1589-1610.

- Hellerman, S., Rosenstein, M., 1983. Normal monthly wind stress over the world ocean with
  error estimates. J. Phys. Oceanogr. 13 (7), 1093-1104.
- 741 Hersbach, H., Bidlot, J.-R., 2009. The relevance of ocean surface current in the ECMWF
- analysis and forecast system. In: ECMWF Workshop on Ocean-Atmosphere Interactions, 10-
- 12 November 2008. ECMWF, pp. 61-73. URL https://www.ecmwf.int/node/9866
- Holthuijsen, L. H., Powell, M. D., Pietrzak, J. D., 2012. Wind and waves in extreme hurricanes.
- 745 J. Geophys. Res. 117, C09003.
- 746 Idier, D., Muller, H., Pedreros, R., Thiebot, J., Yates, M., Creach, R., Voineson, G., Dumas, F.,
- 747 Lecornu, F., Pineau-Guillou, L., Ohl, P., Paradis, D., 2012. Système de prévision de surcotes
- en Manche/Atlantique et Méditerranée : Amélioration du système existant sur la façade
  Manche/Gascogne [D4] . Tech. rep., BRGM/RP-61019-FR.
- Janssen, P., 2004. The interaction of ocean waves and wind. Cambridge University Press,Cambridge, UK.
- Janssen, P., 2012. Ocean wave effects on the daily cycle in SST. J. Geophys. Res. 117, C00J32.
- Janssen, P. A., Breivik, O., Mogensen, K., Vitart, F., Balmaseda, M., Bidlot, J.-R., Keeley, S.,
- Leutbecher, M., Magnusson, L., Molteni., F., 2013. Air-sea interaction and surface waves.
- 755 Tech. rep., ECMWF Technical Memorandum 712.
- Janssen, P. A. E. M., 1991. Quasi-linear theory of wind wave generation applied to wave
- 757 forecasting. J. Phys. Oceanogr. 21, 1631-1642.
- Jarosz, E., Mitchell, D. A., Wang, D. W., Teague, W. J., 2007. Bottom-up determination of airsea momentum exchange under a major tropical cyclone. Science 315, 1707-1709.
- Kim, S. Y., Yasuda, T., Mase, H., 2010. Wave set-up in the storm surge along open coastsduring Typhoon Anita. Coastal Eng. 57, 631-642.
- Kudryavtsev, V., Chapron, B., Makin, V., 2014. Impact of wind waves on the airsea fluxes: Acoupled model. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans 119, 1217-1236.
- Lee, H. S., Yamashita, T., Hsu, J. R.-C., Ding, F., 2013. Integrated modeling of the dynamic
- 765 meteorological and sea surface conditions during the passage of Typhoon Morakot. Dynamics766 of Atmospheres and Oceans 59, 1-23.
- Lyard, F., Lefevre, F., Letellier, T., Francis, O., 2006. Modelling the global ocean tides: modern
  insights from FES2004. Ocean Dynamics 56, 394-415.
- Lynch, D., Gray, W., 1979. A wave equation model for finite element tidal computations.Computers and Fluids 7, 207-228.
- 771 Mao, M., Xia, M., 2017. Dynamics of wave-current-surge interactions in Lake Michigan: A
- model comparison. Ocean Modelling 110, 1-20.
- 773 Mastenbroek, C., Burgers, G., Janssen, P. A. E. M., 1993. The dynamical coupling of a wave
- model and a storm surge model through the atmospheric boundary layer. J. Phys. Oceanogr. 23,1856-1867.
- Moon, I.-J., Ginis, I., Hara, T., Thomas, B., 2007. A physics-based parameterization of airsea
- momentum flux at high wind speeds and its impact on hurricane intensity predictions. Mon.
- 778 Weather Rev. 135 (8), 2869-2878.
- 779 Moon, I.-J., Kwon, J.-I., Lee, J.-C., Shim, J.-S., Kang, S. K., Oh, I. S., Kwon, S. J., 2009. Effect
- of the surface wind stress parameterization on the storm surge modeling. Ocean Modelling 29,115127.
- Nicolle, A., Karpytchev, M., Benoit, M., 2009. Amplification of the storm surges in shallow
  waters of the Pertuis Charentais (Bay of Biscay, France). Ocean Dynamics 59, 921-935.
- 784 Pedreros, R., Idier, D., Muller, H., Lecacheux, S., Paris, F., Yates-Michelin, M., Dumas, F.,
- 785 Pineau-Guillou, L., Sénéchal, N., 2018. Relative contribution of wave setup to the storm surge:
- 786 Observations and modeling based analysis in open and protected environments (Truc Vert
- beach and Tubuai island). Journal of Coastal Research 85, 1046-1050.

- Peng, S., Li, Y., 2015. A parabolic model of drag coefficient for storm surge simulation in the
  South China Sea. Nature Scientific Reports 5, 15496.
- Peureux, C., Ardhuin, F., 2016. Ocean bottom pressure records from the Cascadia array andshort surface gravity waves. J. Geophys. Res. 121, 28622873.
- Pineau-Guillou, L., 2018. Ocean-Atmosphere interaction: improvement of wind stress forcoastal physical modelling. PhD manuscript. 140 p.
- Pineau-Guillou, L., Ardhuin, F., Bouin, M.-N., Redelsperger, J.-L., Chapron, B., Bidlot, J.-R.,
- 795 Quilfen, Y., 2018. Strong winds in a coupled wave-atmosphere model during a North Atlantic
- storm event: evaluation against observations. Quart. Journ. Roy. Meteorol. Soc. 144, 317-332.
- Pineau-Guillou, L., Lathuiliere, C., Magne, R., Louazel, S., Corman, D., Perherin, C., 2012.
- Sea levels analysis and surge modelling during storm Xynthia. European Journal ofEnvironmental and Civil Engineering 16 (8), 943-952.
- Piolle, J.-F., Dodet, G., Ash, E., Ardhuin, F., 2019. Sea State CCI Product User Guide Version
  1.0. Tech. rep., ESA Climate Change Initiative Sea State project.
- Powell, M. D., Vickery, P. J., Reinhold, T. A., 2003. Reduced drag coefficient for high wind
  speeds in tropical cyclones. Nature 422, 279-283.
- 804 Sheremet, A., Staples, T., Ardhuin, F., Suanez, S., Fichaut, B., 2014. Observations of large
- infragravity wave runup at Banneg Island, France. Geophys. Res. Lett. 41 (3), 976-982.
- 806 Simon, B., 2007. La marée océanique côtière. Institut Océanographique Editeur, Paris, France.
- Takagaki, N., Komori, S., Suzuki, N., Iwano, K., Kuramoto, T., Shimada, S., Kurose, R.,
  Takahashi, K., 2012. Strong correlation between the drag coefficient and the shape of the wind
- sea spectrum over a broad range of wind speeds. Geophys. Res. Lett. 39, L23604.
- 810 Thuy, N. B., Kim, S., Chien, D. D., Dang, V. H., Cuong, H. D., Wettre, C., Hole, L. R., 2017.
- Assessment of storm surge along the coast of central Vietnam. Journal of Coastal Research 33(3), 518-530.
- van Nieuwkoop, J., Baas, P., Caires, S., Groeneweg, J., 2015. On the consistency of the drag
- between air and water in meteorological, hydrodynamic and wave models. Ocean Dynamics 65
- 815 (7), 989-1000.
- 816





![](_page_22_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

-

60°N

58°N

56°N

54°N

52°N

50°N

4°W

(b)

![](_page_29_Figure_2.jpeg)

(a)

(b)

Friedhelm 2011-12-10 03:00 60°N 58°N 56°N lason-2 54°N

![](_page_30_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_0.jpeg)

(b) ex-Gonzalo

![](_page_33_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_3.jpeg)

(c) Felix/Gunter

Е

![](_page_34_Figure_0.jpeg)