AMERICAN METEOROLOGICAL SOCIETY

Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society

EARLY ONLINE RELEASE

This is a preliminary PDF of the author-produced manuscript that has been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. Since it is being posted so soon after acceptance, it has not yet been copyedited, formatted, or processed by AMS Publications. This preliminary version of the manuscript may be downloaded, distributed, and cited, but please be aware that there will be visual differences and possibly some content differences between this version and the final published version.

The DOI for this manuscript is doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00108.1

The final published version of this manuscript will replace the preliminary version at the above DOI once it is available.

Meteorology For Coastal/Offshore Wind Energy In The United States:

Recommendations And Research Needs For The Next 10 Years

Cristina L. Archer (corresponding author)
University of Delaware
College of Earth, Ocean, and Environment
Newark, DE 19716
carcher@udel.edu

Brian A. Colle
Stony Brook University/SUNY, Stony Brook, New York

Luca Delle Monache
National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado

Michael J. Dvorak
Sailor's Energy, Berkeley, California

Julie Lundquist
University of Colorado at Boulder, and
National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, Colorado

Bruce H. Bailey and Philippe Beaucage
AWS Truepower, LLC, Albany, New York

Matthew J. Churchfield
National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, Colorado

Anna C. Fitch and Branko Kosovic
National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado

Sang Lee and Patrick J. Moriarty
National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, Colorado

Hugo Simao
Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

Richard J. A. M. Stevens
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, and
University of Twente, Enschede (The Netherlands)

Dana Veron
University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware

John Zack
AWS Truepower, LLC, Albany, New York

Offshore wind energy is just starting in the United States, with imminent offshore wind farms in Massachusetts, Maryland, and Rhode Island waters and with an ambitious goal of 10 GW of installed offshore capacity by 2020 set by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), which has recently funded seven “Advanced Technology Demonstration” offshore wind projects to help achieve that goal. Although new in the U.S., offshore wind energy began over 20 years ago in Europe and has now reached over 5.5 GW of installed capacity worldwide, predominantly in Denmark and the United Kingdom. Given the unfortunate coincidence of introducing a new industry during challenging economic times, it is essential that public and private financial resources be effectively and optimally directed towards those meteorological research needs that are emerging today and that will be critical in the next decade. Identifying these research needs for wind energy along the U.S. East Coast, both coastal and offshore, was the goal of a two-day symposium held at the University of Delaware on 27–28 February 2013. Over 40 participants gathered from academia, national laboratories, wind industry, and funding agencies.

During the symposium, three main topics were explored: 1) wind resource assessment, 2) wind power forecasting, and 3) turbulent wake losses. Overviews of the latest findings in the three topics were given on the first day in the form of presentations, which were open to students and the general public. On the second day, the experts gathered in a workshop to identify research needs and provide recommendations for urgent action items. Whereas specific research needs were identified for each of the three main topics, two emerged as cross-cutting and urgent: 1) continuous, publicly available, multilevel measurements of winds and temperature over U.S. offshore waters, and 2) quantification and reduction of

uncertainty. These two research needs and relevant recommendations (in italics) are described first.

Research need #1: More offshore observations

Offshore meteorological measurements are challenging and expensive. Ideal measurements would quantify the wind resource at several vertical levels spanning the height of the turbine rotor disk to understand the rotor equivalent wind speed and possible impacts on turbine power production. In European waters, designated research platforms (e.g., FINO1 in Germany) have been established for characterization of offshore flow as well as validation of new measurement technologies such as light detection and ranging (lidar) and modeling approaches. The few long-term meteorological observations off the East Coast are typically buoy-based, thereby restricting the altitude of wind measurements to a few meters above the surface. A sparse network of nine towers, with an elevation of ≤ 50 m, extends along the coast from Florida to Maine, but fails to provide multilevel information and measurements at turbine hub-height or above.

Periodically, detailed measurements of wind and temperature have been conducted offshore in short-term field campaigns, but the consistent long-term measurements required for resource assessment are generally not available off the East Coast (with the only exception being the Cape Wind tower in Nantucket Sound, Massachusetts). The standard approach considered buoy measurements and then extrapolated them to higher altitudes with assumptions of the shape of the wind profile (log-law or power-law). By extrapolating surface or near-surface measurements with such smooth profiles, important wind structures such as low-level jets are ignored.

94 *The first recommendation is the deployment of a more dense network of*
95 *meteorological towers, which will enable traditional resource assessment measurements*
96 *such as wind speed, wind direction, and turbulence at several levels from the surface to*
97 *the rotor disk top, and temperature profiles for quantifying atmospheric stratification and*
98 *stability. Ideally, such towers could also provide a platform for validating remote sensing*
99 *measurements. The U.S. DOE has proposed the Reference Facility for Offshore*
100 *Renewable Energy (RFORE) to be located at the Chesapeake Light Tower,*
101 *approximately 13 miles off the Virginia Coast. The facility provides a first step towards*
102 *addressing the shortage of offshore wind data.*

103 Beyond meteorological towers, *remote sensing technology mounted either on fixed*
104 *towers or on floating platforms could provide data over broader regions.* Scanning
105 Doppler lidar, wind-profiling lidar, and sodar can provide valuable wind speed and
106 direction measurements throughout the turbine rotor disk and beyond. Radiometers can
107 quantify temperature and humidity profiles to determine atmospheric stability.

108 In addition to long-term measurements of winds, temperature, and moisture profiles,
109 *short-term intensive measurement campaigns with a broader deployment of instruments*
110 *would also be of value, especially for model validation.*

111 These recommendations for more intensive observations extend a prior call for more
112 onshore meteorological observations and focused field campaigns made by DOE in 2008.
113 Since then, new types of remote sensing instruments have become more widely available
114 and more accepted in the wind energy industry for wind resource characterization.

115
116 **Research need #2: Uncertainty characterization**
117

Deterministic wind power forecasts based on numerical weather prediction (NWP) can provide useful information for decision-making. However, by design, a single plausible future state of the atmosphere starting from a single initial state is generated. Imperfect initial and boundary conditions and model deficiencies inevitably lead to nonlinear error growth during model integration. Accurate knowledge of the continuum of plausible future states, the forecast probability density function (PDF), is considerably more useful for decision-making because it allows for a quantification of the uncertainty associated with a forecast.

“Ensembles” are used today to generate a set of plausible future atmospheric states and to estimate the forecast PDF of atmospheric variables relevant to wind power.

Ensembles are created from the outputs of NWP models using any of the following: various initial conditions, different parameterizations within a single model, stochastic approaches with diverse numerical schemes, different models, and coupled ocean-atmosphere schemes. For wind energy, one important additional source of uncertainty comes from the challenging step of wind-to-power conversion.

Ensembles are affected by biases in the ensemble mean and by lack of diversity among the ensemble members, particularly in the planetary boundary layer (PBL). Therefore, *post-processing is an important component of the wind forecasting process and should be explored further*, preferably including methods and techniques developed by the wind industry. Since the wind industry benefits from the findings published by the research community and the public sector, *it is recommended that a regular two-way exchange of know-how between academia, public sector, and industry be established* to help advance the science and prevent the duplication of efforts. A promising post-processing technique is the analog approach, in which past observations that correspond

to past predictions that best match selected features of the current forecast, such as time series of wind speed and direction, are used to correct the current forecast. Other promising techniques are advanced model output statistics (e.g., neural networks, support vector machines, and random forests).

Recently, operational centers have generated multiyear reforecast datasets to support successful calibration of both deterministic and probabilistic forecasts. It is expected that in the next few years new calibration techniques, possibly combining statistical and dynamical approaches, will lead to large improvements in the accuracy of wind power predictions and in the reliable characterization of their uncertainty.

Next, the three main topics and their specific research needs are described.

Topic #1: Resource assessment

Initial maps of the U.S. offshore wind resource from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) and others by Stanford University have identified gross characteristics of the hub-height offshore wind resource, which have been generally useful to policy makers and researchers and for early-stage project development. Using mesoscale modeling techniques, these maps provide estimates of wind speed and direction, diurnal and seasonal patterns, wind shear, and air density at horizontal grid scales of approximately 1-5 km. This information, although essentially unverified due to the lack of hub-height measurements described in Research Need #1, has enabled numerous project siting studies, wind farm layout and energy production simulations, and estimates of development potential as a factor of water depth, distance from shore, wind

resource, and other factors. However, *there is a need to accurately capture dynamic coastal processes*, such as sea breezes, low-level jets, and other land-air-ocean interactions, as they represent a significant source of variability in the available wind.

Data representing assessment periods of 20–25 years (i.e., project lifetimes) are typically required for bankable offshore projects; interannual speed variability of 4%–6% is not uncommon. The probability and magnitude of extreme events, particularly peak winds and waves and hurricanes, and the effects of more common events, such as winter storms, icing from sea spray, and salt corrosion, need to be better known to properly design turbines and foundations and meet industry standards. *In a changing climate, more studies are needed to reduce the uncertainty of a changing wind resource* as ocean, offshore, and coastal temperatures change. Changes in the local wind environment over time may also be caused by the increasing presence of other wind farms within a given region, as described in Topic #3.

Recent studies have explored strategic temporal, climatological, and spatial aspects of the offshore resource, including large-scale wind farm interconnection scenarios. U.S. East Coast offshore wind has been found to be particularly coincident with peak-electricity demand. Similar studies should be performed to identify resource attributes that can add value to generally higher offshore costs and evaluate the sensitivity of project location, including distance from the shore, to load coincidence.

Significant offshore resource assessment uncertainties exist. Most of the aforementioned studies relied on mesoscale modeling that was validated with generally sparse in-situ data. Perhaps the largest uncertainty is extrapolating surface observations, generally 5-m buoy anemometer measurements to heights across the turbine rotor. As such, *there is an urgent need for multilevel wind and temperature observations at*

platforms offshore (as in Research Need #1), equipped with either meteorological towers that are as tall or taller than hub height, or lidars. In the coastal region, transport processes (advection of either maritime air inland or continental air offshore) during sea and land breeze events often cause the PBL to deviate from classic well-mixed, neutrally-stable conditions. Existing PBL parameterizations struggle to perform well in these conditions. *Research effort is needed to improve such PBL parameterizations in coastal regions.*

Long-term wind climatologies require publicly available historic reanalysis data and future climate data generated by models forced under different anthropogenic emission scenarios. Most of the existing publicly available data are at a relatively coarse spatial scale (>20 km) compared to the size of a typical wind farm. Dynamical downscaling methods typically employ a regional climate model to generate higher spatio-temporal wind climatologies but at a high computational expense for long climate records. Stochastic downscaling methods are computationally cheaper and have been shown to accurately downscale low-resolution reanalysis data with acceptable accuracy, as compared to in-situ validation data.

Topic #2: Wind Power Forecasting

Wind power forecasting is challenging because the relationship between wind speed and power production for a single wind turbine or a wind farm is nonlinear; for some wind speed ranges, the sensitivity of power production forecasts to wind speed forecast error is quite high. For example, a modest 1.5 m s^{-1} error in a wind speed forecast can, in some cases, result in a power production forecast error of over 20% of a wind farm's capacity.

A diverse set of prediction tools and input data have been applied to the wind power forecast problem for a range of time scales. Intra-hour forecasts (0–60 minutes ahead) are needed for regulation and real-time dispatch decisions. At this scale, the effects of small eddies and turbulent mixing are important but cannot be resolved by operational models. Therefore, mainly statistical methods are used, which are based on near real-time observations. This has driven the deployment of meteorological sensors and lidars for intra-hour forecasting.

The 1-6 hour-ahead forecast for load-following and next-operating hour commitment has to account for various mesoscale weather phenomena (e.g., sea breezes, convective systems, and local topography). The rapid-update NWP approach most likely offers the best potential for improvement in this time frame. This is a tool with increasing capability, largely because of improvements in data assimilation techniques (e.g., the hybrid ensemble Kalman filter approach), the formulations of physics-based submodels, and the amount and quality of data available for assimilation. The state of the art in rapid-update systems is the High-Resolution Rapid Refresh (HRRR) model, currently undergoing experimental operation at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which assimilates the latest data and generates a 15-hour forecast on a 3-km grid every hour.

The day-ahead forecast is important for unit commitment, scheduling, and market trading, which require knowledge of the evolving synoptic storm systems using NWP models and ensembles. The seasonal predictions for resource planning and contingency analysis require knowledge of global teleconnections (such as El Niño). These predictions are based largely on the analysis of cyclical patterns and climate forecast system models.

It is also recommended that more offshore observations be collected using towers, lidars, and buoys, to better validate models, help with data assimilation and uncertainty characterization, and improve the model physics, because many of the PBL schemes were originally developed over land. These efforts will require a close collaboration between operational forecast centers, industry, and academia.

Lastly, future efforts should focus on improving the models' ability to represent the PBL and the interactions of fine-scale processes with larger scale flows, both inland and offshore. Such improvements will be possible only with investments that focus on improving our understanding of these key processes using real observations. Several workshops over the past twenty years have noted the need for improved PBL modeling, but no concerted effort at making such improvements has been made.

Topic #3: Turbulent Wake Losses

Wind turbines generate wakes downstream, which are generally characterized by a wind speed deficit and higher turbulence than the upwind environment. Because wakes can reduce power production and increase structural fatigue in downstream turbines, understanding wake properties, quantifying resulting power losses, and optimizing wind turbine layouts to minimize such losses is especially important to the wind energy industry. Accurately modeling turbine wakes is also important for other atmospheric applications that span a wide range of spatial scales, such as the impacts of wind energy deployment on the global climate, local meteorology, crop production, and the wind resource itself.

Because atmospheric flows are characterized by high Reynolds numbers ($\sim 10^7$ - 10^8), the number of grid points required to explicitly resolve such flows with operating wind turbines via direct numerical simulation is $\sim 10^{18}$, which is prohibitive in the foreseeable future. As such, the wind industry has traditionally relied on computationally efficient wake models to simulate wind turbine wakes. In order of increasing complexities, these earlier wake models include: analytical representations of the wake deficit (e.g., the PARK model); parabolized forms of the Reynolds-Averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) equations (e.g., the Ainslie model, also called the eddy viscosity model; UPMPARK, which uses a k - ϵ turbulence closure); hybrid models based on an internal boundary layer growth parameterization and coupled with a parabolized RANS or an analytical model (e.g., Deep-Array Wake Model and Large Array Wind Farm model); and nonlinear RANS models (e.g., WindModeller, Ellipsys, and FUGA). Although these models are attractive for their quick runtime, they have limited ability to capture the detailed wake characteristics because they are not suitable for simulations of unsteady, anisotropic turbulent flows.

To overcome these limitations, the research community has been using large-eddy simulation (LES), in which large-scale flow structures are resolved while the effects of smaller eddies are represented with a subgrid model (Smagorinsky or dynamical). In addition, the wind turbine is represented by either an actuator disk (with or without rotation features) or by actuator lines (one per blade) that exert a force on the flow and act as a momentum sink, or by the vortex method. Arrays of multiple wind turbines, in which multiple wakes interact with one another, have also been successfully simulated with LES. However, because of the high CPU-hours required, LES can be conducted for only a few hours or at equilibrium-state using periodic boundary conditions.

Because LES models for turbine wakes were traditionally developed in-house by research centers or universities without any funds for distributing, maintaining, or testing the codes, they are generally not available to the public. The only exception is the open-source Simulator for Offshore/Onshore Wind Farm Applications (SOWFA) from NREL, which includes a finite-volume scheme, actuator disks/lines, and options for periodic or nonperiodic boundary conditions. Although developing numerous in-house LES codes is of value because researchers can obtain independent verification of results, *it is recommended that more effort and funds be devoted to maintaining LES codes for turbine wakes and making them available to the public.*

To avoid the steep computational costs of simulating real wind farms with high numbers of turbines via LES, parameterizations of the effects of large wind farms on regional meteorology and global climate have been developed for mesoscale NWP and large-scale climate models, which are less computationally demanding. These parameterizations represent wind farms as either an elevated momentum sink (often with an added source of turbulent kinetic energy (TKE), increased surface roughness, or an increased surface drag coefficient. *Because surface-based parameterizations incorrectly extract momentum near the surface, as opposed to around hub height, they are not recommended for turbine wake impact studies.* Although the global-scale impacts of even high penetrations of wind energy have been proven negligible, local wakes extending tens of kilometers downwind of individual large wind farms have been generated by some wind farm parameterizations. However, to date, few observations are available to verify these model results.

Comparing model results with wind tunnel experiments, with either a single turbine or multiple turbines, is useful because the constant and controllable environment in a wind

tunnel can be reproduced well. However, wind tunnel conditions are different from real atmospheric conditions and therefore *field measurements are also recommended both at individual turbines and at offshore wind farms*. Short-term field campaigns, as well as routine measurements (especially offshore) are needed to validate results under a large umbrella of atmospheric conditions. *It is recommended that inflow, near-wake, and far-wake vertical wind profiles and atmospheric stability be measured, as well as wake properties, such as TKE and turbulent fluxes* (preferably with scanning lidars or arrays of sonic anemometers).

More information on offshore observations (Research need #1)

Cañadillas, B., A. Westerhellweg, and T. Neumann, 2011: Testing the performance of a ground-based wind LiDAR system: One year intercomparison at the offshore platform FINO1, *DEWI Mag.*, **38**, 58-64.

Chen, S. S., W. Zhao, M. A. Donelan, J. F. Price, and E. J. Walsh, 2007: The CBLAST-Hurricane Program and the Next-Generation Fully Coupled Atmosphere-Wave-Ocean Models for Hurricane Research and Prediction. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **88**, 311–317. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-88-3-311>.

Clifton, A., S. Schreck, D. Jager, N. Kelley, and J. K. Lundquist, 2013: Meteorological tower observations at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. *Journal of Solar Energy Engineering*. **135**(3), 031017, doi:10.1115/1.4024068

Edson, J., and coauthors, 2007: The Coupled Boundary Layers and Air-Sea Transfer Experiment in Low Winds. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **88**, 341–356. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-88-3-341>.

333 Friedrich, K. J., K. Lundquist, E. Kalina, M. Aitken, and R. Marshall, 2012: Stability and
 334 Turbulence in the Atmospheric Boundary Layer: An Intercomparison of Remote
 335 Sensing and Tower Observations. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, Vol. 39, No. 3, L03801,
 336 doi:10.1029/2011GL050413.

337 Knupp, K., R. Ware, D. Cimini, F. Vandenberghe, J. Vivekanandan, E. Westwater, and
 338 T. Coleman, 2009: Ground-Based Passive Microwave Profiling during Dynamic
 339 Weather Conditions. *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*, **26**, 1057-1073.

340 Muñoz-Esparza, D., B. Cañadillas, T. Neumann, and J. van Beeck, 2012: Turbulent
 341 fluxes, stability and shear in the offshore environment: Mesoscale modelling and field
 342 observations at FINO1. *J. Renewable Sustainable Energy*, **4**, 063136, doi:
 343 10.1063/1.4769201.

344 Neumann, T., K. Nollopp, and K. Herklotz, 2004: First operating experience with the
 345 FINO1 research platform in the North Sea, *DEWI Mag.*, **24**, 27-34.

346 Nunalee, C. G., S. and Basu, 2013: Mesoscale modeling of coastal low-level jets:
 347 implications for offshore wind resource estimation. *Wind Energy*,
 348 doi: 10.1002/we.1628

349 Pichugina, Y. L., R. M. Banta, W. A. Brewer, S. P. Sandberg, and R. M. Hardesty, 2012:
 350 Doppler Lidar-Based Wind-Profile Measurement System for Offshore Wind-Energy
 351 and Other Marine Boundary Layer Applications. *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.*, **51**, 327–
 352 349.

353 Schreck, S., J. K. Lundquist, W. Shaw, 2008: DOE Workshop Report: Research Needs
 354 for Wind Resource Characterization. NREL Technical Report NREL/TP-500-43521.

- Shaw, W. J., J. K. Lundquist, S. Schreck, 2009: Workshop on Research Needs for Wind Resource Characterization. *Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc.*, **90**, 535-538, doi: 10.1175/2008BAMS2729.1
- Wagner, R., I. Antoniou, S. M. Pedersen, M. S. Courtney, and H. E. Jørgensen, 2009: The influence of the wind speed profile on wind turbine performance measurements. *Wind Energy*, **12**, 348–62.
- Wharton, S., and J. K. Lundquist, 2012: Atmospheric stability affects wind turbine power collection. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **7**, 014005, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/1/014005.
- More information on uncertainty characterization (Research need #2) and wind power forecasting (Topic #2)**
- AMS, 2008: Enhancing weather information with probability forecasts: An information statement of the American Meteorological Society. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **89**, 1049–1053.
- ANL, 2009: Wind power forecasting: State-of-the-art 2009. Decision and Information Sciences Division Document ANL-DIS-10-1, 216 pp., available online at www.dis.anl.gov/pubs/65613.pdf.
- Berner, J., G. J. Shutts, M. Leutbecher, and T. N. Palmer, 2009: A spectral stochastic kinetic energy backscatter scheme and its impact on flow-dependent predictability in the ECMWF ensemble prediction system. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **66**, 603–626.
- Bishop, C. H., and Z. Toth, 1999: Ensemble transformation and adaptive observations. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **56**, 1748–1765.

378 Bowler, N. E., A. Arribas, K. R. Mylne, K. B. Robertson, and S. E. Beare, 2008: The
379 MOGREPS short-range ensemble prediction system. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **134**,
380 703–722.

381 Buizza, R., M. J. Miller, and T. N. Palmer, 1999: Stochastic simulation of model
382 uncertainties in the ECMWF ensemble prediction system. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*,
383 **125**, 2887–2908.

384 Clifton, A., L. Kilcher, J. K. Lundquist, and P. Fleming, 2013: Using machine-learning to
385 predict wind turbine power output. *Env. Res. Lett.* 8 024009 doi:10.1088/1748-
386 9326/8/2/024009.

387 Eckel, F. A., and C. F. Mass, 2005: Aspects of effective mesoscale, short-range ensemble
388 forecasting. *Wea. Forecasting*, **20**, 328–350.

389 Erickson, M. E., B. A. Colle, and J. Charney, 2012: Impact of bias correction type and
390 conditional training on Bayesian model averaging over the northeast United States.
391 *Wea. Forecasting*, **27**, 1449–1469.

392 European Wind Energy Association, 2013: The European offshore wind industry - Key
393 trends and statistics. European Wind Energy Association, Brussels, Belgium, 31 pp.

394 Hacker, J., S.-Y. Ha, C. Snyder, J. Berner, F. Eckel, E. Kuchera, M. Pocerich, S. Rugg,
395 J. Schramm, and X. Wang, 2011: The U.S. Air Force Weather Agency’s mesoscale
396 ensemble: Scientific description and performance results. *Tellus A*, **63**, 625–641.

397 Hagedorn, R., T. M. Hamill, and J. S. Whitaker, 2008: Probabilistic forecast calibration
398 using ECMWF and GFS ensemble reforecasts. Part I: two-meter temperatures. *Mon.*
399 *Wea. Rev.*, **136**, 2608–2619.

400 Hamill, T. M., J. S. Whitaker, and X. Wei, 2004: Ensemble reforecasting: improving
401 medium-range forecast skill using retrospective forecasts. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **132**, 1434–
402 1447.

403 Hamill, T. M., and J. S. Whitaker, 2006: Probabilistic quantitative forecasts based on
404 reforecast analogs: theory and application. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **134**, 3209–3229.

405 Hamill, T. M., J. S. Whitaker, and S. L. Mullen, 2006: Reforecasting: improving skill
406 using retrospective forecasts. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **27**, 33–46.

407 Hamill, T. M., and J. S. Whitaker, 2007: Ensemble calibration of 500-hPa geopotential
408 height and 850-hPa and 2-m temperatures using reforecasts. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **135**,
409 3273–3280.

410 Hamill, T. M., R. Hagedorn, and J. S. Whitaker, 2008: Probabilistic forecast calibration
411 using ECMWF and GFS ensemble forecasts. Part II: Precipitation. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*,
412 **136**, 2620–2632.

413 Hamill, T. M., G. T. Bates, J. S. Whitaker, D. R. Murray, M. Fiorino, T. J. Galarneau, Jr.,
414 Y. Zhu, and W. Lapenta, 2012: NOAA’s second-generation global medium-range
415 ensemble

416 Hirschberg, P. A., E. Abrams, A. Bleistein, W. Bua, L. Delle Monache, T. W. Dulong, J.
417 E. Gaynor, B. Glahn, T. M. Hamill, J. A. Hansen, D. C. Hilderbrand, R. N. Hoffman,
418 B. H. Morrow, B. Philips, J. Sokich, and N. Stuart, 2011: A weather and climate
419 enterprise strategic implementation plan for generating and communicating forecast
420 uncertainty information. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **12**, 1651–1666.

421 Holt, T., J. Pullen, and C. H. Bishop, 2009: Urban and ocean ensembles for improved
422 meteorological and dispersion modelling of the coastal zone. *Tellus A*, **61**, 232–249.

423 Hou, D., E. Kalnay, and K. K. Droegemeier, 2001: Objective verification of the
 424 SAMEX'98 ensemble forecasts. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **129**, 73–91.

425 Houtekamer, P. L., L. Lefaivre, J. Derome, H. Ritchie, and H. L. Mitchell, 1996: A
 426 system simulation approach to ensemble prediction. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **124**, 1225–1242.

427 Houtekamer, P. L., H. L. Mitchell, G. Pellerin, M. Buehner, M. Charron, L. Spacek, and
 428 B. Hansen, 2005: Atmospheric data assimilation with an ensemble Kalman filter:
 429 Results with real observations. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **133**, 604–620.

430 Houtekamer, P. L., H. L. Mitchell, and X. Deng, 2009: Model error representation in an
 431 operational Ensemble Kalman Filter. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **137**, 2126–2143.

432 Jones, M., B. A. Colle, and J. Tongue, 2007: Evaluation of a short-range ensemble
 433 forecast system over the Northeast U.S., *Wea. Forecasting*, **22**, 36–55.

434 Krishnamurti, T. N., C. M. Kishtawal, Z. Zhang, T. Larow, D. Bachiochi, E. Williford, S.
 435 Gadgil, and S. Surendran, 2000: Multimodel ensemble forecasts for weather and
 436 seasonal climate. *Journal of Climate*, **13**, 4196–4216.

437 Kuhl, D., I. Szunyogh, E. J. Kostelich, G. Gyarmati, D. J. Patil, M. Oczkowski, B. R.
 438 Hunt, E. Kalnay, E. Ott, and J. A. Yorke, 2007: Assessing predictability with a local
 439 ensemble Kalman filter. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **64**, 1116–1140.

440 Lorenz, E. N., 1963: Deterministic non-periodic flow. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **20**, 130–141.

441 Marquis, M., J. Wilczak, M. Ahlstrom, J. Sharp, A. Stern, J. C. Smith, and S. Calvert,
 442 2011: Forecasting the wind to reach significant penetration levels of wind energy.
 443 *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **92**, 1159–1171.

444 Molteni, F., R. Buizza, T. N. Palmer, and T. Petroliaxis, 1996: The new ECMWF
 445 ensemble prediction system: Methodology and validation. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*,
 446 **122**, 73–119.

447 NRC, 2006: *Completing the Forecast: Characterizing and Communicating Uncertainty*
 448 *for Better Decisions Using Weather and Climate Forecasts*. National Academies
 449 Press, 124 pp.

450 NREL, 2011: Wind energy forecasting: A collaboration of the National Center for
 451 Atmospheric Research (NCAR) and Xcel Energy, available online at
 452 <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy12osti/52233.pdf>.

453 Perlin, N., E.D. Skyllingstad, R.M. Samelson, and P.L. Barbour, 2007: Numerical
 454 simulation of air–sea coupling during coastal upwelling. *Journal of Physical*
 455 *Oceanography*, **37**, 2081–2093.

456 Stensrud, D. J., J. W. Bao, and T. T. Warner, 2000: Using initial condition and model
 457 physics perturbations in short-range ensemble simulations of mesoscale convective
 458 systems. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **128**, 2077–2107.

459 Teixeira, J., and C. A. Reynolds, 2008: Stochastic nature of physical parameterizations in
 460 ensemble prediction: A stochastic convection approach. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **136**, 483–
 461 496.

462 Thomas, S. J., J. P. Hacker, M. Desgagné, and R. Stull, 2002: An ensemble analysis of
 463 forecast errors related to floating point performance. *Wea. Forecasting*, **17**, 898–906.

464 Toth, Z., and E. Kalnay, 1993: Ensemble forecasting at NMC: The generation of
 465 perturbations. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, **74**, 2317–2330.

466 Toth, Z., and E. Kalnay, 1997: Ensemble forecasting at NCEP: The breeding method.
 467 *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **125**, 3297–3319.

468 Wandishin, M. S., S. L. Mullen, D. J. Stensrud, and H. E. Brooks, 2001: Evaluation of a
 469 short-range multi-model ensemble system. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **129**, 729–747.

WMO, 2008: Guidelines on communicating forecast uncertainty. WMO Tech. Document 4122, 25 pp, available online at www.wmo.int/pages/prog/amp/pwsp/documents/TD-1422.pdf.

Wilks, D. S., and T. M. Hamill, 2007: Comparison of ensemble-MOS methods using GFS reforecasts. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **135**, 2379–2390.

Wilks, D. S., 2009: Extended logistic regression to provide full-probability-distribution MOS forecasts. *Meteorol. Appl.*, **16**, 361–368.

More information on resource assessment (Topic #1)

Brower, M., 2012: Wind resource assessment: a practical guide to developing a wind project. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken (New Jersey), 280 pp.

Delle Monache, L., T. Nipen, Y. Liu, G. Roux, and R. Stull, 2011: Kalman filter and analog schemes to post-process numerical weather predictions. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **139**, 3554–3570.

Dvorak, M. J., E. D. Stoutenburg, C. L. Archer, W. Kempton, and M. Z. Jacobson, 2012: Where is the ideal location for a US East Coast offshore grid? *Geophysical Research Letters*, **39**, L06804, 6 pp., doi:10.1029/2011GL050659.

Dvorak, M. J., B. A. Corcoran, J. E. Ten Hoeve, N. G. McIntyre, M. Z. Jacobson, 2013: US East Coast offshore wind energy resources and their relationship to peak-time electricity demand. *Wind Energy*, in press.

Kempton, W., C. L. Archer, A. Dhanju, R. W. Garvine, and M. Z. Jacobson, 2007: Large CO₂ reductions via offshore wind power matched to inherent storage in energy end-uses. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **34**, L02817, doi:10.1029/2006GL028016.

Kempton, W., F. Pimenta, D. E. Veron, and B. A. Colle, 2010: Electric power from offshore wind via synoptic-scale interconnection. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **107**,7240.

More information on wake characteristics and losses (Topic #3)

Adams, A. S., and D. W. Keith, 2013: Are global wind power resource estimates overstated? *Environ. Res. Lett.* **8**, 015021.

Ainslie, J. F., 1988: Calculating the flowfield in the wake of wind turbines. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod.*, **27**, 213-224.

American Meteorological Society Offshore Wind Energy Committee, 2013: The need for expanded meteorological and oceanographic data to support resource characterization and design condition definition for offshore wind power projects in the United States. Available at: <http://www.ametsoc.org/boardpges/cwce/docs/BEP/Offshore-Wind/2013-05-Offshore-Wind-APT-Final-Report.pdf>

Baidya Roy, S., S. W. Pacala, and R. L. Walko, 2004: Can large wind farms affect local meteorology? *J. Geophys. Res.*, **109**, D19101.

Baidya Roy S, 2011: Simulating impacts of wind farms on local hydrometeorology. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* doi:10.1016.

Barrie D., and D. B. Kirk-Davidoff, 2010: Weather response to a large wind turbine array. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, **10**, 769-775.

Barthelmie, R. J., G. C. Larsen, S. T. Frandsen, L. Folkerts, K. Rados, S. C. Pryor, B. Lange, G. Schepers, 2006: Comparison of Wake Model Simulations with

517 Offshore Wind Turbine Wake Profiles Measured by Sodar. *J. Atmos. Oceanic*
518 *Technol.*, **23**, 888–901.

519 Barthelmie, R. J., K. Hansen, S.T. Frandsen, O. Rathmann, J. G. Schepers, W.
520 Schlez, J. Phillips, K. Rados, A. Zervos, E.S. Politis, and P. Chaviaropoulos,
521 2009: Modelling and Measuring Flow and Wind Turbine Wakes in Large
522 Wind Farms Offshore, *Wind Energy* **12**, 431.

523 Beaucage, P., N. Robinson, M. Brower, and C. Alonge, 2012: Overview of six
524 commercial and research wake models for large offshore wind farms.
525 Proceeding, *EWEA conference*, Copenhagen.

526 Cal, R. B., J. Lebrón, L. Castillo, H. S. Kang, and C. Meneveau, 2010:
527 Experimental study of the horizontally averaged flow structure in a model
528 wind-turbine array boundary layer. *J. Renewable Sustainable Energy*, **2**,
529 013106.

530 Calaf, M., C. Meneveau, and J. Meyers, 2010: Large eddy simulation study of
531 fully developed wind-turbine array boundary layers. *Phys. Fluids*, **22**, 015110.

532 Calaf, M., M. B. Parlange, and C. Meneveau, 2011: Large eddy simulation study
533 of scalar transport in fully developed wind-turbine array boundary layers. *Phys.*
534 *Fluids*, **23**, 126603.

535 Chamorro, L.P., and F. Porté-Agel, 2009: A wind-tunnel investigation of wind-
536 turbine wakes: boundary-layer turbulence effects. *Bound.-Lay. Meteor.*, **132**,
537 129–149.

538 Churchfield, M. J., S. Lee, S., J. Michalakes, and P. Moriarty, 2012: A numerical
539 study of the effects of atmospheric and wake turbulence on wind turbine
540 dynamics. *J. Turbulence*, **13**(14), 1-32.

541 Churchfield, M. J., S. Lee, P. Moriarty, L. A. Martinez, S. Leonardi, G.
 542 Vijayakumar, and J. G. Brasseur, 2012: A large-eddy simulation of wind-plant
 543 aerodynamics, *50th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting including the New*
 544 *Horizons Forum and Aerospace Exposition*, Nashville, Tennessee, 9–12
 545 January 2012.

546 Crespo, A., L. Chacón, J. Hernández, F. Manuel, and J. Grau, 1994: UPMPARK:
 547 A Parabolic 3D Code to Model Wind Farms, Proceeding, *European Wind*
 548 *Energy Conference 1994*, Thessalonica, Greece, 10-14 October 1994, 454-
 549 459.

550 Fitch, A. C., J. B. Olson, J. K. Lundquist, J. Dudhia, A. K. Gupta, J. Michalakes,
 551 and I. Barstad, 2012: Local and mesoscale impacts of wind farms as
 552 parameterized in a mesoscale NWP model. *Mon. Weather Rev.*, **140**, 3017-
 553 3038.

554 Fitch, A. C., J. B. Olson, and J. K. Lundquist, 2013: Mesoscale influences of wind
 555 farms throughout a diurnal cycle. *Mon. Weather Rev.*, **141**, 2173-2198.
 556 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-12-00185.1>.

557 Fitch, A. C., J. B. Olson, and J. K. Lundquist, 2013: Parameterization of wind
 558 farms in climate models. *J. Climate*. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00376.1)
 559 [00376.1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00376.1).

560 Ivanell, S. S. A., 2009: Numerical computations of wind turbine wakes, PhD
 561 Thesis, Gotland University, Stockholm, Sweden.

562 Ivanell, S. S. A., R. Mikklesen, J. Sorensen, and D. Henningson, 2008: Validation
 563 of methods using EllipSys3D. Technical report, KTH, TRITA-MEK 2008:12.

564 Garza, J., A. Blatt, R. Gandoin, and S.-Y. Hui, 2011: Evaluation of two novel
 565 wake models in offshore wind farms. Proceeding, EWEA Offshore 2011,
 566 Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 29 November–1 December 2011.

567 Jacobson, M. Z., and C. L. Archer, 2012: Saturation wind power potential and its
 568 implications for wind energy. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **109**(39), 15681.

569 Jensen, N. O., 1983: A Note on Wind Generator Interaction, Risø National
 570 Laboratory, Risø-M-2411

571 Jimenez, A., A. Crespo, E. Migoya, and J. Garcia, 2007: Advances in large-eddy
 572 simulation of a wind turbine wake. *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.*, **75**, 012041.

573 Jimenez, A., A. Crespo, E. Migoya, and J. Garcia, J., 2008: Large-eddy simulation
 574 of spectral coherence in a wind turbine wake, *Environ. Res.* **3**, 015004.

575 Jimenez, A., A. Crespo, and E. Migoya, 2010: Application of a LES technique to
 576 characterize the wake deflection of a wind turbine in yaw, *Wind Energy*, **13**,
 577 559-572.

578 Katic, I., J. Højstrup, and N. O. Jensen, 1987: A simple model for cluster
 579 efficiency, proceeding, European Wind Energy Conference 1986, Rome, **1**,
 580 407-410.

581 Keith, D. W., J. F. DeCarolis, D. C. Denkenberger, D. H. Lenschow, S. L.
 582 Malyshev, S. Pacala, and P. J. Rasch, 2004: The influence of large-scale wind
 583 power on global climate. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **101**(46), 16115–16120.

584 Kirk-Davidoff, D. B., and D. W. Keith, 2008: On the climate impact of surface
 585 roughness anomalies. *J. Atmos. Sci.* **85**, 2215-2234.

586 Kosovic, B., and J. D. Mirocha, 2012: “Toward High-resolution Multiscale
 587 Simulations of Flows in Heterogeneous Atmospheric Boundary Layers.” 20th

588 Symposium on Boundary Layers and Turbulence, Boston, MA, 9-13 July,
589 2012.

590 Lee, S., Churchfield, M., P. Moriarty, J. Jonkman, and J. Michalakes, 2013: A
591 numerical study of atmospheric and wake turbulence impacts on wind turbine
592 fatigue loadings. *J Solar Energy Engineering*, **135**(3), 031001.

593 Madsen, H. Aa., G. C. Larsen, T. J. Larsen, N. Troldborg, and R. Mikkelsen,
594 2010: Calibration and validation of the dynamic wake meandering model
595 implemented in the aeroelastic code HAWC2. *J. Solar Energy Engineering*,
596 **132**(4), 041014.

597 Mann, J., 1994: The spatial structure of neutral atmospheric surface-layer
598 turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **273**, 141–168.

599 Martinez, L. A., S. Leonardi, M. Churchfield, and P. Moriarty, 2012: A
600 comparison of actuator disk and actuator line wind turbine models and best
601 practices for their use, *50th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting including the*
602 *New Horizons Forum and Aerospace Exposition*, Nashville, Tennessee, 9–12
603 January 2012.

604 Marvel K., B. Kravitz, and K. Caldeira, 2012: Geophysical limits to global wind
605 power. *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 118–121.

606 Meyers J., and C. Meneveau, 2011: Optimal turbine spacing in fully developed
607 wind farm boundary layers. *Wind Energy*, **15**, 305-317.

608 Mikkelsen, R., 2003: Actuator disk methods applied to wind turbines. Ph. D.
609 Thesis, Technical University of Denmark.

610 Mikkelsen, R., J. N. Sørensen, J. A. Michelsen, and N. Troldborg, 2005:
611 Aeroelastic actuator line modeling, proceeding, 18th IEA Symposium on
612 Aerodynamics of Wind Turbines, Pamplona, Spain, 2005.

613 National Renewable Energy Laboratory, “SOWFA: Simulator for On/Offshore
614 Wind Farm Applications,”
615 <http://wind.nrel.gov/designcodes/simulators/sowfa/>.

616 Rajewski, D., and coauthors, 2013: Crop Wind Energy Experiment (CWEX):
617 Observations of Surface-Layer, Boundary Layer, and Mesoscale Interactions
618 with a Wind Farm. *Bull Amer Meteor Soc* **94**: 655–672.

619 Rhodes, M. E., and J. K. Lundquist, 2013: The Effect of Wind Turbine Wakes on
620 Summertime Midwest Atmospheric Wind Profiles. In press at *Boundary-*
621 *Layer Meteorology*. doi:10.1007/s10546-013-9834-x

622 Sanderse, B., S. P. van der Pijl, and B. Koren, 2011: Review of computational
623 fluid dynamics for wind turbine wake aerodynamics. *Wind Energy*, **14**, 799-
624 819.

625 Sørensen, N. N., 2003: General Purpose Flow Solver Applied to Flow over Hills,
626 Ph.D. Thesis, Risø-R-827(EN), Risø National Laboratory, Roskilde, Denmark.

627 Sørensen, J. N., and W. Z. Shen, 2002: Numerical modeling of wind turbine
628 wakes. *J. Fluids Engineering*, **124**(2), 393-399.

629 Thomsen, K., 2001: Aeroelastic load simulations, FLEX5 sample, Abstract from
630 C-WET expert training RISO, Risø, Denmark.

631 Troldborg, N., G. C. Larsen, H. A. Madsen, K. S. Hansen, J. N. Sørensen, and R.
632 Mikkelsen, 2010: Numerical simulations of wake interactions between two
633 wind turbines at various inflow conditions. *Wind Energy*, **14**, 859-876.

- Vermeer, L. J., J. N. Sørensen, and A. Crespo, A., 2003: Wind turbine wake aerodynamics. *Prog. Aerosp. Sci.*, **39**, 467–510.
- Wagner, R., M. Courtney, J. Gottschall, and P. Lindell-Marsden, 2011; Accounting for the speed shear in wind turbine power performance measurement. *Wind Energy*, **14**(8), 993-1004, doi:10.1002/we.509.
- Wang, C., and R. J. Prinn, 2010: Potential climatic impacts and reliability of very large-scale wind farms. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **10**, 2053-2061.
- Wu, Y.-T., and F. Porté-Agel, 2011: Large-eddy simulation of wind-turbine wakes: evaluation of turbine parameterizations. *Bound.-Lay. Meteor.*, **138**, 345–366.
- Wu, Y.-T., and F. Porté-Agel, 2013: Simulation of turbulent flow inside and above wind farms: model validation and layout effects. *Bound.-Lay. Meteor.*, **146**, 181-205.
- Yang, X., S. Kang, and F. Sotiropoulos F., 2012: Computational study and modeling of turbine spacing effects in infinite aligned wind farms. *Phys. Fluids*, **24**, 115107.
- Zhou, L., Y. Tian, S. Baidya Roy, C. Thorncroft, L. F. Bosart, and Y. Hu, 2012: Impacts of wind farms on land surface temperature. *Nature Climate Change*, **2**, 539–543, doi:10.1038.