Airborne Doppler Radar Observations of Tropical Cyclone Boundary Layer Kinematic Structure and Evolution During Landfall

Robert Rogers¹ and Jun A $\rm Zhang^2$

 $^{1}\mathrm{AOML/HRD}$ $^{2}\mathrm{Hurricane}$ Research Division, AOML, NOAA

August 4, 2023

Abstract

Airborne Doppler radar observations of the wind field in the tropical cyclone boundary layer (TCBL) during the landfall of Hurricane Ida (2021) are examined here. Asymmetries in tangential and radial flow are governed by TC motion and vertical wind shear prior to landfall, while frictional effects dominate the asymmetry location during landfall. Strong TCBL inflow on the offshore-flow side of Ida occurs during landfall, while the location of the peak tangential wind at the top of the TCBL during this period is located on the onshore-flow side. A comparison of these observations with a numerical simulation of TC landfall shows many consistencies with the modeling study, though there are some notable differences that may be related to differences in the characteristics of the land surface between the simulation and the observations here.

Hosted file

969076_0_art_file_11202205_ry0gjj.docx available at https://authorea.com/users/641213/ articles/655689-airborne-doppler-radar-observations-of-tropical-cyclone-boundary-layerkinematic-structure-and-evolution-during-landfall

1	
2	
3	
4	Airborne Doppler Radar Observations of Tropical Cyclone Boundary Layer Kinematic
5	Structure and Evolution During Landfall
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	Robert F. Rogers ¹ and Jun A. Zhang ^{1,2}
12	¹ NOAA/OAR/Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratory/Hurricane Research
13	Division
14	Miami, FL
15	² University of Miami/Cooperative Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Studies
16	Miami, FL
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	To be submitted to Geophysical Research Letters
22	
23	July 2023

24 Key Points

25	•	Wind asymmetries in tropical cyclone boundary layer are governed by TC motion,
26		vertical shear over open water; frictional effects at landfall
27	•	Boundary layer radial inflow peaks in the offshore-flow side at landfall, peak in
28		tangential winds at top of boundary layer occurs on the onshore-flow side
29	•	These observations are largely consistent with recent numerical modeling studies of
30		tropical cyclone landfall

31

32 Abstract

Airborne Doppler radar observations of the wind field in the tropical cyclone boundary 33 layer (TCBL) during the landfall of Hurricane Ida (2021) are examined here. Asymmetries in 34 tangential and radial flow are governed by TC motion and vertical wind shear prior to landfall, 35 while frictional effects dominate the asymmetry location during landfall. Strong TCBL inflow on 36 the offshore-flow side of Ida occurs during landfall, while the location of the peak tangential 37 wind at the top of the TCBL during this period is located on the onshore-flow side. A 38 comparison of these observations with a numerical simulation of TC landfall shows many 39 consistencies with the modeling study, though there are some notable differences that may be 40 related to differences in the characteristics of the land surface between the simulation and the 41 observations. 42

43

44 Plain Language Summary

The structure of the wind field in the lowest levels of a hurricane when it makes landfallplays a significant role in determining damage. This study uses aircraft observations to document

47 the changes that occur in the winds in the lowest levels of a hurricane prior to and as it makes landfall. The location of the strongest inflow into the storm center and winds around the center 48 are determined by characteristics like storm motion and environmental winds when the storm is 49 50 over open water, but at landfall these wind peaks are dominated by the differences in friction between the land surface and water. At landfall, the inflow near the surface is strongest on the 51 side of the hurricane experiencing offshore flow, while winds moving around the storm center a 52 few thousand feet above the surface are strongest on the side experiencing onshore flow. These 53 results are mostly consistent with computer modeling studies, allowing for studies on physical 54 55 processes to be conducted using these models.

- 56
- 57 Key words
- 58 Hurricane landfall
- 59 Boundary layer winds
- 60 Aircraft observations

62 **1. Introduction**

The wind field in the tropical cyclone (TC) boundary layer (BL) determines the 63 magnitude and distribution of surface enthalpy and momentum fluxes, which is critical in 64 determining whether a TC will intensify (Ooyama 1969; Emanuel 1986, 1995, 1999; Shay et al. 65 2000; Cione et al. 2013; Jaimes et al. 2015; Zhang et al. 2017; Wadler et al. 2021). Decomposing 66 67 the TCBL wind field into tangential and radial components also yields important insights into other intensity change processes, such as the radial advection of angular momentum and radial 68 mass flux within and above the frictional inflow layer, as well as factors affecting the wind 69 70 structure in the TCBL, such as the azimuthal distribution of supergradient flow and the presence of TCBL jets (Smith and Montgomery 2015, Smith et al. 2009, 2021). Additionally, TCBL 71 winds govern storm surge and rainfall fields at landfall. Understanding the physical processes 72 that govern the structure and evolution of TCBL winds is therefore critical to predict TC 73 structure and intensity as well as impacts at landfall. 74

Past observational and modeling studies have characterized the symmetric structures of 75 TCBL flow over the open ocean (Kepert 2001; Kepert and Wang 2001; Bell and Montgomery 76 2008; Zhang et al. 2011, 2015, 2023; Bryan 2012; Rogers et al. 2012; Sanger et al. 2014; 77 Montgomery et al. 2014; Ming et al. 2015; Ahern et al. 2019), finding that inflow is maximized 78 in the lowest 200 m, with a region of weaker inflow at the top of and above the TCBL. The depth 79 of the inflow layer increases with increasing radial distance from the TC center. Peak tangential 80 81 wind occurs in the inflow layer, and there is a region of supergradient flow at and inside the region of strongest inflow. 82

The dominant drivers of azimuthal asymmetries in TCBL winds over the open ocean are
TC motion (Shapiro et al. 1983, Ueno et al. 2009, 2011; Zhang and Uhlhorn 2012; Uhlhorn et al.

2014) and vertical wind shear (Rogers and Uhlhorn 2007; Zhang et al. 2013; Reasor et al. 2013;
Uhlhorn et al. 2014; Klotz and Jiang 2017; Sun et al. 2019; Ming et al. 2022). TC motion
establishes a region of strong TCBL tangential flow to the right of storm motion and maxima in
radial inflow and convergence in the TCBL in the front and front-right quadrants (Shapiro 1983).
Vertical shear establishes peak tangential wind speed, inflow, and convergence in the downshear
and downshear-left quadrants (Zhang et al. 2013; Reasor et al. 2013; Uhlhorn et al. 2014).

Several observational studies have examined the variation of the TCBL wind field and 91 features at and after landfall. The kinematic boundary layer height is reduced with decreases in 92 93 distance from the TC center, and maximum BL wind is larger in an offshore regime in the eyewall region compared to an onshore regime (Giammanco et al. 2013). Roll-like features were 94 documented during TC landfalls using Doppler radar and tower data (e.g., Wurman and Winslow 95 1998; Kosiba and Wurman 2014; Lorsolo et al. 2008; Zhu et al. 2010). Ming et al. (2014) 96 observed enhancement of turbulence kinetic energy by convective downdrafts in the BL of 97 Typhoon Morakot (2009) near rainbands, while the strongest surface winds during the landfall of 98 Hurricane Harvey (2017) were found to be associated with convective perturbations in the 99 eyewall (Alford et al. 2019; Fernadez-Caban et al. 2019). Alford et al. (2020) investigated the 100 101 coastal transition of vertical wind profiles in the BL of Hurricane Irene (2011) and found that the tangential wind maximum was within the inflow layer over water but was above the inflow layer 102 onshore. The tangential wind maximum was within the inflow layer from the coastline up to 5 103 104 km inland, which is the transition zone between ocean and land exposure. The height of the maximum radial wind increases from water to land in response to the growth of the internal 105 boundary layer that forms in the transition zone due to flow adjustment to the surface roughness 106 107 change (Hirth et al. 2004; Alford et al. 2020).

108 Clearly, as a TC approaches land, variations in surface roughness dominate the creation 109 of asymmetries. It is important to understand how these asymmetries affect the wind field in the 110 TCBL at landfall, as these structures are what determine the hazards driven by wind, storm 111 surge, and rainfall. Many of the landfall papers described above, however, focus on TCBL 112 structure and evolution at specific ground-relative locations, because that is where the 113 instruments are located. They focus less on the evolution of the flow field in a storm-relative 114 framework, and they say little about the flow field when the TC is > 100 km offshore.

A recent paper by Hlywiak and Nolan (2022, hereafter HN22) examined the structure and 115 evolution of asymmetries in the TCBL wind field in a storm-relative framework prior to and 116 during landfall using an idealized model. In their simulation they found an increase in the 117 strength of the radial inflow on the offshore flow side of the TC, beginning when the TC was 118 about 200 km offshore. They attributed the increase in radial inflow to the decrease in frictional 119 stress once the agradient offshore flow crossed the coastline and reached water. An enhanced 120 advection of angular momentum by the secondary circulation, tied to the strengthened radial 121 inflow in the TCBL on the offshore flow side, additionally forced a strengthening of a 122 supergradient jet near the top of the TCBL, resulting in a maximum in wind speed downstream; 123 124 i.e., on the onshore flow side at the top of the TCBL. They compared some of their modeling results to a set of buoy observations of near-surface inflow angle from three landfalling TCs and 125 found general agreement with their results. 126

127 The comparisons with observations from HN22 were limited, however, to a relatively 128 small number of point observations at the surface, with no information on the variation of the 129 tangential and radial flow with height and as a function of distance from the storm center. A 130 comparison of the three-dimensional structure of the flow field in the TCBL, and its variation

between when a TC is well offshore and when it is making landfall, would provide a more robust evaluation of HN22's results. Ground-based radar could provide such a comparison, but the elevation of the beam and curvature of the Earth would prevent observations of the wind field in the lowest 1-2 km, except when the TC is close (< 100 km) to the radar site.</p>

Airborne Doppler radar data, by contrast, can provide a comprehensive depiction of the 135 structure and evolution of the flow field by sampling the TC at many different periods during its 136 approach to landfall. In this study, profile analyses (e.g., Rogers et al. 2012; Zhang et al. 2023) 137 from airborne Doppler radar onboard the NOAA WP-3D aircraft (hereafter P-3) are used to 138 139 produce analyses of tangential and radial wind in a narrow (~10-km wide) swath under the aircraft with 150 m spacing in the vertical and down to altitudes as low as 150 m above the 140 surface. Three-dimensional radar analyses that provide winds and reflectivity in a swath 141 extending approximately 50 km in either direction normal to the flight track, with 500 m spacing 142 in the vertical, will also be used. Together, these radar analyses will be used to examine the 143 structure of TCBL tangential and radial flow in Hurricane Ida as it made landfall along the 144 coastline of Louisiana in August 2021. The analysis shown here will provide an opportunity to 145 evaluate results from HN22 in a more comprehensive and robust manner than what was shown in 146 147 their study. It will also provide the opportunity to assess the evolution of TCBL flow fields as Ida transitioned from an over-water exposure to one associated with landfall. 148

149

150 **2.** Case description

Ida formed from a tropical wave that moved into the southwest Caribbean (Beven et al. 2022), tracked northwest and was declared a tropical depression on August 26, and became a hurricane prior to its first landfall in western Cuba on August 27. Once Ida emerged into the

southeastern Gulf of Mexico, a favorable environment and inner-core structure allowed Ida to
strengthen rapidly, intensifying from 70 to 130 kt in the 24-h period from 1200 UTC 28 August
to 1200 UTC 29 August. By the end of this period of rapid intensification, Ida was southwest of
the mouth of the Mississippi River. A continued northwest motion brought Ida inland near Port
Fouchon, Louisiana, at 1655 UTC 29 August.

NOAA P-3 aircraft N42RF sampled Ida during its track across the Gulf of Mexico up to 159 landfall. The focus of the analysis in this study will be on the final two missions of N42RF into 160 Ida. Flight tracks for these missions are shown in Fig. 1. The first mission, with mission ID 161 20210828H (hereafter 28H), occurred from 1955 UTC 28 to 0156 UTC 29 August, when Ida 162 was in the eastern Gulf of Mexico and ~300 km prior to landfall. During this time Ida was 163 tracking toward the northwest at 14 kt and was experiencing 850-200 hPa vertical shear of ~5 kt 164 with a shear heading nearly due east. The mission consisted of a set of radial passes through the 165 center of Ida at different azimuthal locations, beginning and ending in the northeast quadrant. 166 The second mission, 20210829H (hereafter 29H), occurred during landfall from 1703 UTC to 167 2304 UTC 29 August. This mission began with a flight leg paralleling the southeast coast of 168 Louisiana, flying inbound to the center from the east-northeast, through the center as Ida was 169 170 making landfall, and outbound from the center toward the west-southwest. This leg, extending from points 1 to 2 from 29H in Fig. 1, is termed a "coastal run", and it will be used to examine 171 variations in offshore and onshore flow structures later. The aircraft then flew away from the 172 173 coast and flew an inbound leg toward the center in the southwest quadrant and an outbound leg in the southeast quadrant before finishing its pattern well-removed to the southeast of the TC 174 175 center. During the landfall mission



176

Figure 1. Radar reflectivity (shaded, dBZ) at 4-km altitude obtained from merged analyses of
tail Doppler radar on the P-3 aircraft during the 28H and 29H missions (labeled). Flight
tracks for each mission are overlain, with dashed (solid) lines denoting the flight track for
28H (29H). Numbers on each flight track denote initial point, key turn points, and final point
for each pattern.

182

Ida was tracking toward the north-northwest at a slower translation speed (9 kt), and the vertical
shear had increased slightly to ~8 kt with a heading toward the east-southeast.

185

186 **3. Results**

Plots of radar reflectivity from 28H and 29H (cf. Fig. 1) show the well-developed inner core of Ida during the two missions. Ida's eye during the 28H mission was large, with a radardefined diameter of ~60 km and broad swaths of high reflectivity and heavy rainfall in all quadrants of the TC. For the 29H mission, Ida's eye had contracted to ~30 km diameter. There was also an indication of an outer eyewall in the reflectivity field at ~60 km radius from the TC center. Additional rainband activity was apparent further outward on the east side of the TC. Onthe west and southwest side, reflectivity outside the inner core was less widespread.

Plots of earth-relative tangential wind at 0.5 km and 2 km altitude from the three-194 dimensional radar analyses are shown in Fig. 2. The increase in tangential winds associated with 195 Ida's intensification up to landfall is clearly seen here. Of particular interest is the azimuthal 196 197 location of peak tangential winds at each altitude. For 28H, when Ida was over water, the peak wind speeds are located in the eyewall north-northeast of the TC center within the TCBL (i.e., 198 0.5 km). The peak winds at the top of the TCBL (i.e., 2 km) are rotated upwind, northeast of the 199 200 TC center at this time. During 29H, when Ida was making landfall, there is a significant change in the azimuthal location of the peak tangential winds. Within the TCBL the strongest winds are 201 to the south and southeast of the TC center, with an azimuthal shift of >90 degrees clockwise 202 from 28H. The direction of the storm motion heading (vertical shear) changed by ~10 (30) 203 degrees between 28H and 29H, so the shift in the azimuthal location of the peak tangential winds 204 does not appear to be driven, at least primarily, by changes in storm motion or vertical shear 205 direction. Rather, the change in the azimuthal location of TCBL tangential winds at landfall is 206 likely due to the adjustment of the winds as they exit the higher roughness values over land to the 207 208 lower roughness over water on the offshore-flow (i.e., west) side of the TC, similar to that shown in HN22. At the top of the TCBL, the strongest winds remain to the northeast of the TC center, 209 extending from the coast to locations well inland. 210

Characteristics of the radial flow within the TCBL are shown in the Doppler profile analyses in Fig. 3. Figure 3a shows vertical cross sections in the lowest 2 km for radial flow along a southwest/northeast-oriented radial pass during 28H. The maximum inflow on this pass $(> 15 \text{ m s}^{-1})$ is seen in the leg in the northeast quadrant. This location is to the right of the storm 215 motion heading and to the left of the vertical shear heading, an orientation consistent with previous studies relating boundary-layer inflow and storm motion/vertical shear. Figure 3b 216 shows a similar profile, but along the coastline (during the "coastal run" leg, from point 1-2 217 shown in Fig. 1) during 29H. Now the radial inflow has shifted and is maximized on the west 218 (offshore-flow) side of the TC, located ~40-50 km from the TC center, where values of peak 219 inflow are ~20 m s⁻¹. On the east (onshore-flow) side, inflow magnitude is about half of that seen 220 on the offshore-flow side at similar radii, though there is a weaker local maximum of inflow at 221 222 about 80 km, likely associated with the outer eyewall seen in Fig. 1. This relationship between 223 the peak radial inflow in the offshore vs. onshore-flow sides of the TC is consistent with HN22, who argued that the increase in the radial inflow in the offshore flow is attributed to the sudden 224 decrease in frictional stress once the highly agradient flow crosses the coastline. 225

A depiction of the azimuthal variation of TCBL inflow strength, and how it varies from 226 28H to 29H, is shown in Figs. 3c and 3d. Here the radial inflow is averaged within predefined 227 boxes that include the radius of maximum wind (RMW) and the lowest 150 km of the profile 228 analysis for each radial pass through the TC center for both missions. These values are then 229 plotted as a function of azimuth, with the TC motion and vertical shear heading vectors included 230 231 for reference. During 28H the peak radial inflow in the lowest 150-300 m layer is in the northeast portion of the TC, to the east (right) of the storm motion vector and to the west (left) of the 232 vertical shear vector. Such an orientation of inflow with respect to the TC motion and shear 233 234 vectors over open water is consistent with the studies mentioned earlier and shown in Fig. 3a. For 29H, the orientation of radial inflow changes significantly. The strongest inflow now is on 235 236 the west side of the storm. In terms of its orientation relative to the motion and shear vectors, the 237 peak inflow in



238

242

Figure 2. Earth-relative tangential wind (shaded, m s⁻¹) at 2 km altitude (top of TCBL) for (a)
28H and (b) 29H missions. Tangential winds at 0.5 km altitude (within TCBL) also shown
for (c) 28H and (d) 29H missions.

the TCBL is nearly opposite the shear vector and located about 90 degrees to the left of the motion vector – orientations at odds with the expected azimuthal location over open water based on motion and shear considerations alone. The peak inflow is located on the offshore- flow side of the TC. Such an orientation is consistent with HN22's results, and suggests that landfall impacts, resulting from changes in the roughness length as air moves from over-land to overwater exposures, take on a greater significance in governing inflow structure than with TC motion and shear. The increase in inflow between 28H and 29H on the west and southwest sides of the storm – from about 5 m s-1 during 28H to 8-10 m s-1 during 29H – provide a potential explanation for the azimuthal location of the peak tangential winds in the southeast quadrant during 29H. The greater inward advection of angular momentum in the stronger inflow within the TCBL on the west and southwest sides during 29H lead to an enhancement in the tangential wind at the top of the TCBL





Figure 3. (a) Earth-relative tangential wind (contour, m s⁻¹) and radial wind (shaded, m s⁻¹) from southwest/northeast-oriented profile analysis from tail Doppler radar during 28H. (b) As in (a), but for the coastal run during 29H. (c) Azimuthal variation of areally-averaged near-surface radial inflow (see text for calculation details; positive values denote inflow) for radial passes during 28H. Storm motion and vertical shear heading denoted. (d) as in (c), but for 29H.

downwind; i.e., in the southeast quadrant. Such an explanation is consistent with that described
in HN22. The variation of tangential and radial flow with height and azimuth for 28H and 29H is
shown in azimuth-height transects ("curtain plots" in HN22) in Fig. 4 using the threedimensional Doppler radar analyses. Here the tangential and radial wind is averaged in a curtain
of 30 km radial width around the TC center, with the inner radius corresponding to the 2-km
RMW that thus



269

Figure 4. Azimuth-height plots (see text for calculation details) of earth-relative tangential winds (shaded, m s⁻¹) for (a) 28H and (b) 29H. (c) As in (a), but for earth-relative radial winds (shaded, m s⁻¹, negative values denote inflow). (d) As in (c), but for 29H. Triangles in (b) and (d) denote locations of coastline, with filled (unfilled) triangles denoting offshore (onshore) flow.

includes flow features at and outside the RMW, similar to Fig. 8 in HN22. Over open water, the
tangential wind shows a clear wavenumber-1 pattern, with the peak values uniformly located in
the northeast quadrant, from 0.5 to 3.5 km altitude. The radial flow shows a similar
wavenumber-1 type pattern, with strongest inflow above the TCBL located south of the TC

center and within the TCBL located east-northeast of the TC center. At landfall, the tangential 280 281 and radial inflow maxima generally remain at the same location above the TCBL altitude as 28H. However, the locations of the maxima within the TCBL have both shifted significantly, with the 282 tangential wind maximum shifting from the northeast quadrant in 28H to the southeast quadrant 283 in 29H, and the radial inflow maximum shifting from the east side in 28H to the southwest 284 quadrant in 29H. The depth of the changes in tangential and radial flow are ~1-1.5 km, 285 suggesting this is the depth over which the frictional effects on radial and tangential flow 286 described above are dominant. 287

288

289 4. Discussion

The results shown here present an opportunity to use observations to explore the structure 290 and evolution of the TCBL during landfall, while also providing the ability to assess the results 291 of HN22. Many of the structures seen from airborne Doppler radar during Ida's landfall are 292 similar to those shown in their paper. The strongest tangential flow is located on the onshore-293 flow side within and above the TCBL for both HN22 and Ida (cf. Figs. 2, 4). Peak radial inflow 294 during landfall in the TCBL is located at and just downwind of the offshore-flow (cf. Figs. 3, 4), 295 similar to that shown in HN22, and the location of peak inflow shifts downwind, further 296 297 offshore, with height above the TCBL in both HN22 and Ida (cf. Fig. 4).

The relationship between the tangential and radial inflow peaks during Ida's landfall suggests a similar set of processes as that described in HN22. The peak in radial inflow in the offshore flow is likely related to the sudden decrease in frictional stress when the agradient flow crosses the coastline. Enhanced advection of angular momentum by this inflow forces a strengthening of the supergradient jet near the top of the TCBL, downwind of the peak inflow. Such a relationship is seen by the downwind rotation of the azimuthal location of peak inflow and tangential wind shown in Figs. 4b, d.

An important result shown here is the comparison of the vertical structure of the wind asymmetries in Fig. 4, which showed the depth over which these wind field modifications occur. Prior to landfall, the inflow peak extends up to ~ 1.5 km altitude on the east-northeast side of the storm. During landfall, the inflow peak shifts to the west (offshore) side of the TC. This shift extends up to about 1-1.5 km altitude. The depth over which this shift occurs is generally consistent with the TCBL depth as defined by the turbulent kinetic energy field found in HN22.

311 While many of the results shown here support the results from HN22, there are some ways that the results differ. For example, the location of peak tangential wind in Ida at the top of 312 the TCBL is in the northeast quadrant at landfall (cf. Figs. 2, 4). This location is inland, and it 313 314 contrasts with the results from HN22, who showed that the tangential wind peak at the top of the TCBL is located in the right-rear quadrant relative to landfall; i.e., offshore. It is not clear what 315 the reason is for this difference. The TC in HN22 was ~140 kt, while Ida was 125 kt at landfall, 316 317 so it does not appear that storm intensity played a significant role in explaining the difference. The roughness length of the swampy marshlands of the Louisiana coast is ~ 0.05 cm, while the 318 roughness lengths used in HN22 ranged between 5 and 50 cm. The sensitivity tests shown in 319 320 HN22 showed that increasing the inland roughness length led to stronger inflow in the offshore

flow, stronger inward advection of angular momentum, and more supergradient flow at the top of the TCBL in the offshore quadrants of their simulated TCs. It is possible that, with a much smaller roughness length for Ida, the inward advection of angular momentum and supergradient flow was weaker than HN22, though that still does not explain why the maximum in tangential wind was seen further downstream (in fact inland) compared with HN22's results. Further analysis and additional sensitivity tests could shed more light on these differences.

The analysis shown here extends upon that shown in HN22 by highlighting the changing 327 importance of various physical processes in governing the structure of surface wind asymmetries 328 329 prior to and during landfall. The location of the peak tangential wind and inflow is on the northeast side of Ida prior to landfall – to the right of the storm motion vector and to the left of 330 the vertical shear vector, consistent with past studies examining the relationship between storm 331 motion, vertical shear, and surface wind asymmetries. As Ida makes landfall, the location of the 332 asymmetries shifts significantly, indicating the dominant effect of frictional differences in 333 governing the structure of asymmetries in the wind field within and at the top of the TCBL at 334 landfall. 335

By providing observations of the three-dimensional structure of the wind field and its variation in time, the results shown here extend upon those comparisons shown in HN22. HN22 uses buoy observations to compare inflow angles with their simulations. These buoys are fixed points in space, though they do provide time continuity. By contrast, the radar observations shown here show a fully three-dimensional field (subject to presence of scatterers), but these fields are essentially snapshots in time. Ideally, a combination of these types of observing systems would provide both spatial coverage and temporal continuity.

Additional cases, including more aircraft missions sampling TCs with a similar "coastal 343 run" pattern during landfall, are needed to assess the robustness of the results shown here. An 344 incorporation of land-based observational systems, similar to those studies described above, 345 could fill in gaps in coverage from the aircraft (see, e.g., the lack of TCBL observations on the 346 north and northwest sides of Ida in 29H) and provide observations of roll vortices, eye-eyewall 347 mesovortices, and convective downdrafts and associated gusts to provide an unprecedented 348 picture of the structure and evolution of the TCBL wind field and turbulent kinetic energy prior 349 to, during, and after landfall. Such an analysis is crucial to assessing damage potential for 350 351 landfalling TCs, from both wind and surge. 352 Acknowledgements 353 This work was supported by NOAA Base Funds, ONR TCRI Award N00014-20-1-2071, 354 NOAA Grants NA21OAR4590370, NA22OAR4590178, and NA22OAR4050669D, and 355 National Science Foundation (NSF) Awards 2228299 and 2211308. 356 357 Data availability statement 358 be 359 The observational data used in this paper can accessed through https://www.aoml.noaa.gov/hrd/data sub/hurr.html. 360 361 362 References Ahern, K., M.A. Bourassa, R.E. Hart, J.A. Zhang, and R.F. Rogers, 2019: Observed Kinematic 363 and Thermodynamic Structure in the Hurricane Boundary Layer during Intensity Change. 364 365 Mon. Wea. Rev., 147, 2765–2785, https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-18-0380.1.

- 366 Alford, A. A., M. I. Biggerstaff, G. D. Carrie, J. L. Schroeder, B. D. Hirth, and S. M. Waugh,
- 367 2019: Near-surface maximum winds during the landfall of Hurricane Harvey. *Geophys. Res.* 368 *Lett.*, 46, doi:10.1029/2018GL080013.
- Alford, A. A., Zhang, J. A., Biggerstaff, M. I., Dodge, P., & Bodine, D. J., 2020. Transition of
- the hurricane boundary layer during the landfall of hurricane irene (2011). *Journal of the*
- 371 *Atmospheric Sciences*, 77(10), 3509-3531.
- Bell, M. M., and M. T. Montgomery, 2008: Observed Structure, Evolution, and Potential
- Intensity of Category 5 Hurricane Isabel (2003) from 12 to 14 September. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*,
- **136**, 2023–2046, https://doi.org/10.1175/2007MWR1858.1.
- Beven, J.L., A. Hagen, and R. Berg, 2022: National Hurricane Center Tropical Cyclone Report:

Hurricane Ida (26 August - 1 September 2021). Report AL092021, 163 pp,

- 377 https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/data/tcr/AL092021_Ida.pdf
- Bryan, G. H., (2012). Effects of surface exchange coefficients and turbulence length scales on
- the intensity and structure of numerically simulated hurricanes. *Monthly Weather Review*,

380 *140*, 1125–1143.

- 381 Cione, J.J., E.A. Kalina, J.A. Zhang, and E.W. Uhlhorn, 2013: Observations of Air–Sea
- Interaction and Intensity Change in Hurricanes. Mon. Wea. Rev., 141, 2368–2382.
- 383 Emanuel, K.A., 1986: An Air-Sea Interaction Theory for Tropical Cyclones. Part I: Steady-State
- 384 Maintenance. J. Atmos. Sci., 43, 585–605.
- Emanuel, K. A. (1995). Sensitivity of tropical cyclones to surface exchange coefficients and a
- revised steady-state model incorporating eye dynamics. *Journal of the Atmospheric Science*,
 52, 3969–3976.
- Emanuel, K. A., 1999: Thermodynamic control of hurricane intensity. *Nature*, **401**, 665–669.

- Fernandez-Caban, P. L., and Coauthors, 2019: Observing Hurricane Harvey's eyewall at
 landfall. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-17-0237.1.
- 391 Giammanco, I. M., J. L. Schroeder, and M. D. Powell, 2012: GPS Dropwindsonde and WSR-
- 392 88D Observations of Tropical Cyclone Vertical Wind Profiles and Their Characteristics.
- 393 *Weather Forecast.*, **28**, 77–99, doi:10.1175/waf-d-11-00155.1.
- Hirth, B. D., J. L. Schroeder, C. C. Weiss, D. a. Smith, and M. I. Biggerstaff, 2012: Research
- Radar Analyses of the Internal Boundary Layer over Cape Canaveral, Florida, during the
- Landfall of Hurricane Frances (2004). *Weather Forecast.*, **27**, 1349–1372,
- 397 http://doi:10.1175/WAF-D-12-00014.1.
- 398 Hlywiak, J., and D. S. Nolan, 2022: The Evolution of Asymmetries in the Tropical Cyclone
- Boundary Layer Wind Field during Landfall. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **150**, 529–549,
- 400 <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-21-0191.1</u>.
- 401 Jaimes, B., L.K. Shay, and E.W. Uhlhorn, 2015: Enthalpy and Momentum Fluxes during
- 402 Hurricane Earl Relative to Underlying Ocean Features. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **143**, 111–131,
- 403 <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-13-00277.1</u>
- 404 Kepert, J., 2001: The Dynamics of Boundary Layer Jets within the Tropical Cyclone Core . Part
- 405 I: Linear Theory. J. Atmos. Sci., 58, 2469–2484, doi:10.1175/1520-
- 406 0469(2001)058<2469:TDOBLJ>2.0.CO;2.
- 407 Kepert, J., and Y. Wang, 2001: The Dynamics of Boundary Layer Jets within the Tropical
- 408 Cyclone Core. Part II: Nonlinear Enhancement. J. Atmospheric Sci., 58, 2485–2501,
- 409 <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(2001)058</u><2485:TDOBLJ>2.0.CO;2.

- 410 Klotz, B. W., and H. Jiang, 2017: Examination of Surface Wind Asymmetries in Tropical
- 411 Cyclones. Part I: General Structure and Wind Shear Impacts. Mon. Wea. Rev., 145, 3989–
- 412 4009, <u>https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-17-0019.1</u>.
- 413 Kosiba, K. A., and J. Wurman, 2014: Finescale dual-Doppler analysis of hurricane boundary
- 414 layer structures in hurricane Frances (2004) at landfall. *Mon. Weather Rev.*, **142**, 1874–1891,
- 415 doi:10.1175/MWR-D-13-00178.1.
- 416 Lorsolo, S., J. L. Schroeder, P. Dodge, and F. Marks, 2008: An Observational Study of
- 417 Hurricane Boundary Layer Small-Scale Coherent Structures. Mon. Weather Rev., 136, 2871–
- 418 2893, http://doi:10.1175/2008MWR2273.1.
- 419 Ming, J., J. A. Zhang, R.F. Rogers, F. D. Marks, Y. Wang, and N. Cai, 2014: Multiplatform
- 420 observations of boundary layer structure in the outer rainbands of landfalling typhoons. J.
- 421 *Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, **119**, 7799-7814, https://doi: 10.1002/2014JD021637.
- 422 Ming, J., J.A. Zhang, and R.F. Rogers, 2015: Typhoon boundary layer structure from dropsonde
- 423 composites. J. Geophys. Res., **120**(8):3158-3172, https://doi:10.1002/2014JD022640.
- 424 Ming, J., R. Liu, J.A. Zhang, and R.F. Rogers, 2022: The shear-relative variation of inflow angle
- 425 and its relationship to tropical cyclone intensification. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 127,
- 426 https://doi.org/10.1029/2022JD037280.
- 427 Montgomery, M. T., J. A. Zhang, and R. K. Smith, 2014: An analysis of the observed low-level
- 428 structure of rapidly intensifying and mature hurricane Earl (2010). Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.,
- 429 **140**, 2132–2146, doi:10.1002/qj.2283.
- 430 Ooyama, K. V., 1969: Numerical simulation of the life cycle of tropical cyclones. *J. Atmos. Sci.*,
 431 26, 3–40.

432	Reasor, P., R.F. Rogers, and S. Lorsolo, 2013: Environmental flow impacts on tropical cyclone
433	structure diagnosed from airborne Doppler radar composites. Mon. Wea. Rev., 141, 2949-
434	2969.

- 435 Rogers R.F., and E. Uhlhorn, 2008: Observations of the structure and evolution of surface and
- 436 flight-level wind asymmetries in Hurricane Rita (2005). *Geophysical Research Letters*, **35**,
- 437 L22811, doi:10.1029/2008GL034774.
- 438 Rogers, R.F., S. Lorsolo, P. Reasor, J. Gamache, F.D. Marks, Jr., 2012: Multiscale analysis of
- 439 tropical cyclone kinematic structure from airborne Doppler radar composites. *Monthly*
- 440 *Weather Review*, **140**, 77-99.
- 441 Sanger, N. T., M. T. Montgomery, R. K. Smith, and M. M. Bell, 2014: An observational study of
- tropical cyclone spinup in Supertyphoon Jangmi (2008) from 24 to 27 September. *Mon. Wea.*

443 *Rev.*, **142**, 3–28, doi:10.1175/MWR-D-12-00306.1.

- Shapiro, L. J., and H. E. Willoughby, 1982: The response of balanced hurricanes to local sources
 of heat and momentum. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **39**, 378–394.
- 446 Shay, L.K., G.J. Goni, and P.G. Black, 2000: Effects of a Warm Oceanic Feature on Hurricane
- 447 Opal. Mon. Wea. Rev., 128, 1366–1383, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-
- 448 0493(2000)128<1366:EOAWOF>2.0.CO;2
- 449 Smith, R. K., and M. T. Montgomery, 2015: Towards clarity on understanding tropical cyclone
- 450 intensification. J. Atmos. Sci., **72**, 3020-3031.
- 451 Smith, R. K., and M. T. Montgomery, 2016: The efficiency of diabatic heating and tropical
- 452 cyclone intensification. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **142**, 2081–2086.
- 453 Smith, R. K., M. T. Montgomery, and N. Van Sang, 2009: Tropical cyclone spin-up revisited.
- 454 *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **135**, 1321–1335, https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.428.

455	Smith, R. K., G. Kilroy and M. T. Montgomery, 2021: Tropical cyclone life cycle in a three-
456	dimensional numerical simulation. Quart. J. Royal Meteorol. Soc, 147, 3373-3393.
457	Sun Z, Zhang B, Zhang JA, Perrie W. Examination of Surface Wind Asymmetry in Tropical
458	Cyclones over the Northwest Pacific Ocean Using SMAP Observations. Remote Sensing.
459	2019; 11(22):2604. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11222604
460	Ueno, M., and M. Kunii, 2009: Some aspects of azimuthal wavenumber-one structure of
461	typhoons represented in the JMA operational mesoscale analyses. J. Meteor. Soc. Japan, 87,
462	615–633.
463	Ueno, M., and K. Bessho, 2011: A statistical analysis of near-core surface wind asymmetries in
464	typhoons obtained from QuikSCAT data. J. Meteor. Soc. Japan, 89, 225-241.
465	Uhlhorn, E. W., B. W. Klotz, T. Vukicevic, P. D. Reasor, and R. F. Rogers, 2014: Observed
466	Hurricane Wind Speed Asymmetries and Relationships to Motion and Environmental Shear.
467	Mon. Wea. Rev., 142, 1290-1311, https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-13-00249.1
468	Wadler, J. B., J. A. Zhang, R. F. Rogers, B. Jaimes, and L. K. Shay, 2021: The Rapid
469	Intensification of Hurricane Michael (2018): Storm Structure and the Relationship to
470	Environmental and Air-Sea Interactions. Mon. Wea. Rev., 149, 245-267.
471	Wurman, J., and J. Winslow, 1998: Intense sub-kilometer-scale boundary layer rolls observed in
472	hurricane Fran. Science (80)., 280, 555–557, doi:10.1126/science.280.5363.555.
473	Wurman, J., & Kosiba, K., 2018. The role of small-scale vortices in enhancing surface winds and
474	damage in Hurricane Harvey (2017). Monthly Weather Review, 146(3), 713-722.
475	https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-17-0327.1

Zhang, J. A., & Uhlhorn, E. W., 2012. Hurricane Sea Surface Inflow Angle and an ObservationBased Parametric Model. *Monthly Weather Review*, 140(11), 3587-3605.

478 https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-11-00339.1

- 479 Zhang, J.A., R.F. Rogers, D.S. Nolan, and F.D. Marks, Jr., 2011: On the characteristic height
- 480 scales of the hurricane boundary layer. *Monthly Weather Review*, **139**, 2523-2535.1
- Zhang, J.A., R.F. Rogers, P. Reasor, E. Uhlhorn, and F.D. Marks, Jr., 2013: Asymmetric
- 482 hurricane boundary layer structure from dropsonde composites in relation to the
- 483 environmental wind shear. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 141, 3968–3984.
- 484 Zhang, J.A., D.S. Nolan, R.F. Rogers, and V. Tallapragada, 2015: Evaluating the Impact of
- Improvements in the Boundary Layer Parameterization on Hurricane Intensity and Structure
 Forecasts in HWRF. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 143, 3136-3155.
- 487 Zhang, J.A., R.F. Rogers, and V. Tallapragada, 2017: Impact of Parameterized Boundary Layer
- 488 Structure on Tropical Cyclone Rapid Intensification Forecasts in HWRF. Mon. Wea. Rev.,
- 489 **145**, 1413–1426, doi: 10.1175/MWR-D-16-0129.1.
- 490 Zhang, J.A. R.F. Rogers, P.D. Reasor, and J.F. Gamache, 2023: The Mean Kinematic Structure
- 491 of the Tropical Cyclone Boundary Layer and Its Relationship to Intensity Change. *Mon. Wea.*
- 492 *Rev.*, **151**, 63-84, https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-21-0335.1.
- Zhu, P., J.A. Zhang, and F.J. Masters, 2010: Wavelet analyses of turbulence in the hurricane
 surface layer during landfalls. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 67(12):3793-3805,
- 495 https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JAS3437.1