

Numerical Simulation of Open Return Wind Tunnel and its Application in
Wind-bridge Deck Interaction Study

By

Kokob Zeremariam Woldeyesus

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Civil Engineering

Under the Supervision of Professor Junke Guo

Lincoln, Nebraska

May, 2016

ProQuest Number: 10102766

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10102766

Published by ProQuest LLC (2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Numerical Simulation of Open Return Wind Tunnel and its Application in
Wind-bridge Deck Interaction Study

Kokob Woldeyesus, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 2016

Advisor: Junke Guo

The tug-of-war between Computational Fluid Dynamics and wind tunnel is sometimes taken as a zero-sum game with time as wind tunnel will be replaced by CFD, which is far from reality. Effectively, symbiotic use of both tools edges the competition. The development in computational power elevated the synergy between CFD and experiments. This dissertation presents the CFD works done by the author in Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center laboratory. The works include wind flow characterization in a test section of the TFHRC wind tunnel, simplification of an existing complex wind tunnel model, and study of wind-generic bridge deck interaction. Wind flow characteristics were assessed by velocity distributions in the test area of the empty full scale wind tunnel. The complexity in the computational domain was eliminated by reducing the size of the tunnel, greatly reducing the computational time and cost. The realizable $k-\epsilon$ turbulence model was used as a closure for the Reynolds Averaged Navier-Stokes Equations (RANS) and Unsteady Reynolds Averaged Navier-Stokes Equations (URANS) equations. For all the simulations, commercial numerical code, Star-ccm+, was used.

Simulations with and without screens were analyzed. The presence of the screens produced a fairly uniform velocity distribution across the test section, and patterned

pressure distribution was also observed compared to screenless wind tunnel. A good agreement was obtained between the measured and calculated velocities. The open return wind tunnel was able to yield fairly uniform velocity distributions throughout the width of the test section. Ensuring removal of obstacles that can interfere the circulation of wind around the wind tunnel should not be undermined.

Floating number errors and geometry complexity were targeted during the simplification of the wind tunnel model. The computational size and time were reduced 45% and 40% respectively. Mesh sensitivity study was done to choose the correct discretized model. The computed velocity was found to be close to measured velocity.

Wind-bridge deck interaction was studied in the Reynolds number range of 4.25×10^4 - 4.29×10^4 for seven angles of attack ranging from -15° to 15° in an interval of 5° . The aerodynamic response of the deck was numerically computed. URANS with implicit unsteady time steps was implemented. The calculated mean drag and lift coefficients were found to be close to the measured values. However, further work is recommended for the pitching moment coefficients, which aberrated from the wind tunnel testing results. The k- ϵ turbulence model was able to provide engineering results. The developed open circuit wind tunnel model lays the platform to studies such as the effect of aspect ratio of bridge decks and Reynolds number on aerodynamic performance.

Dedication

This dissertation is lovingly dedicated to my mother, Tsghereda Abraha. Her support, encouragement, and constant love have sustained me throughout my life.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Faculty, family and colleagues have contributed in completing the dissertation even though only my name appears on the cover. I owe my gratitude to all the people who helped me walked all the long road to the dissertation destination, and I am sure that my graduate experience will be one that I will cherish forever. My deepest gratitude goes to my advisor, Dr. Junke Guo for his guidance, understanding, and patience throughout the course of my study. I am so deeply grateful for his financial support and help me stand as an independent thinker.

I would like to thank my committee members—Dr. John Stansbury, Dr. Tian Zhang, Dr. Yusong Li and Dr. Yaoqing Yang—for feeding me knowledge and support throughout my study. I am thankful for Dr. John Stansbury, Dr. Daniel Linzell and Dr. Eva Bachman for their institutional support and making sure that my study does not interrupt due to financial constraint, and I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Arlys Blakey for her continuous support. My stay at the TFHRC would not have been possible without the help of Dr. Jerry Shen, Dr. Harold Bosch and Dr. Kornel Kerenyi. I extend my gratitude to the members of the TFHRC aerodynamics lab personnel specially Michael Uhrig and Timon Meyer. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Steven Lottes and Dr. Cezary Bojanowski for their technical supports.

Finally I must express my profound gratitude for my family whose continuous support, encouragement, patience and unwavering love were undeniably the bedrock upon which my success have been built. It was under their watchful eye that I gained so much drive and courage to tackle challenges head on. My sincere thanks to friends for their generous moral support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xviii
LIST OF SYMBOLS.....	xx
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Overview.....	1
1.2 Motivation of Work	3
1.3 Objectives	7
1.4 Dissertation Structure	9
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 Computational Fluid Dynamics and Its Applications.....	10
2.2 Effect of Reynolds Number	11
2.3 Bluff Body Aerodynamics	15
CHAPTER 3 NUMERICAL MODELS, COMPUTATIONAL AND WIND TUNNEL FACILITIES	21
3.1 Navier-Stokes Equation	21
3.2 Discretization and Numerical Methods	24
3.3 Turbulence Models	26
3.3.1 Overview of Turbulence Models	26
3.3.2 Eddy Viscosity Turbulence Models	27
3.3.3 Space Filtering Turbulence Models.....	34

3.4	Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center Boundary Layer Wind Tunnel Facility.....	41
3.5	Transportation Research and Analysis Computer Center.....	45
3.6	Holland Computing Center.....	47
3.7	Flow Quality and Pressure-Drop Coefficients of Screen	48
3.8	Measurement of Velocity and Pressure in Test Section	49
CHAPTER 4	RANS FULL SCALE WIND TUNNEL SIMULATION	51
4.1	Introduction.....	51
4.2	Numerical Methodology	53
4.3	Baffle wall model	57
4.4	Mesh Generation.....	58
4.5	Mesh Convergence Test	61
4.6	Results and Discussion	65
4.7	Comparison of Experimental and CFD Results.....	80
CHAPTER 5	SIMPLIFIED WIND TUNNEL MODEL	87
5.1	Introduction.....	87
5.2	Numerical Methodology	87
5.3	Geometry and Computational Domain.....	90
5.4	Mesh Generation.....	91
5.5	Boundary Conditions	93
5.6	Computational Simulation	93
5.7	Grid Sensitivity Study.....	94
5.8	Results and Discussion	98

5.9	Comparison of Full Scale and Simplified Wind Tunnel Models	103
5.10	Comparison of Measured and Computed Velocity	106
CHAPTER 6 URANS SIMULATION OF WIND-BRIDGE DECK		
	INTERACTION	110
6.1	Introduction.....	110
6.2	Wind Tunnel Testing and Simulation Setups	111
6.3	Numerical Methodology	115
6.3.1	Drag and Lift Coefficients	120
6.3.2	Axial and Normal Force Coefficients.....	121
6.3.3	Aerodynamic Moments	122
6.3.4	Pressure Coefficients	124
6.4	Spatial and Temporal Discretization	126
6.5	Application of Flow Physics.....	129
6.6	Results and Discussion	131
6.7	Implications	148
CHAPTER 7 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS		
7.1	Numerical Characterization of Velocity in Wind Tunnel.....	150
7.2	Simplification of Wind Tunnel Model	152
7.3	CFD Investigation of Wind-Generic Bridge Deck Interaction.....	153
7.4	Recommendations.....	155
REFERENCES		157
Appendix A	Velocity Distribution in the Full Scale Wind Tunnel.....	167
Appendix B	Velocity Distribution in Sections inside the Wind Tunnel.....	169
Appendix C	5° Angle of Attack	172

Appendix D	10° Angle of Attack	177
Appendix E	15° Angle of Attack	182
Appendix F	-5° Angle of Attack.....	187
Appendix G	-10° Angle of Attack.....	192
Appendix H	-15° Angle of Attack.....	197

PREVIEW

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1-1: The sinking of the pontoon bridge over the Hood Canal near peninsula in Washington State (Fredict 2014).....	2
Figure 2.2-1: Variations of the base pressure coefficient (C_{pb}), drag coefficient (C_d), Strouhal number (S_t), moment coefficient (C_m), and lift coefficient (C_l) depending on the Reynolds number and angles of attack (Schewe 2013) ...	14
Figure 2.3-1: The spanwise streamlines time averaged (above) and scheme of the recognized mean flow structures (below) (Bruno et al. 2010)	16
Figure 2.3-2: The time-averaged mean base pressure coefficient (C_{pb}) with respect to the aspect ratio (B/D) (Tian et al. 2013).....	19
Figure 2.3-3: The time averaged drag coefficient (CD) with aspect ratio (R) (Najjar and Vanka 1995b; Tian et al. 2013)	19
Figure 2.3-4: The r.m.s. lift coefficient (C_{Lrms}) against the aspect ratio (Najjar and Vanka 1995b, Tian et al. 2013).....	20
Figure 3.1-1: Cascading of energy from largest scale to the dissipation scale (Anderson et al. 2012).....	22
Figure 3.1-2: Fluctuation of velocity with time.....	23
Figure 3.3-1: Turbulence models and computational limitations (not to scale).....	27
Figure 3.3-2: Impingement causes the over-production of turbulent energy k by the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model (Murakami 1998).....	31
Figure 3.3-3 : A schematic overview of turbulence models (Anderson et al. 2012).....	40
Figure 3.4-1: Tacoma Narrow Bridge collapsed on November 7, 1940, caused by aeroelastic flutter	41

Figure 3.4-2: The front and side of the boundary layer wind tunnel.....	42
Figure 3.4-3: The open wind tunnel, turbulence generator and the surrounding walls at the TFHRC aerodynamic laboratory (FH Aachen)	42
Figure 3.4-4: Schematic cross sections of different honeycombs (Kulkarni et al. 2011)	44
Figure 3.5-1: Cluster computer and client-server connection (Argonne).....	47
Figure 3.8-1: Pitot-Prandtl probe with a hemispherical probe nose (Ristić et al. 2004).	50
Figure 4.1-1: Model of the fan: the new updated fan (left) and the previous fan (right)	52
Figure 4.1-2: Model of the inlet parts of the wind tunnel fan	53
Figure 4.2-1: Location of probe sections and lines selected in the areas of interest	54
Figure 4.2-2: Longitudinal profile of the wind tunnel. 1 to 8 are the screens, and the inside derived sections are shown between the screens	55
Figure 4.2-3: Flow diagram for the simulations of the wind tunnel with new fan model....	56
Figure 4.4-1: Computational domain of the full scale wind tunnel model.....	60
Figure 4.4-2: Discretized wind tunnel model	61
Figure 4.5-1: Comparison of velocities at 2 ft line for different mesh sizes	63
Figure 4.5-2: Comparison of velocities at 3 ft line for different mesh sizes	63
Figure 4.5-3: Comparison of velocities at 4 ft line for different mesh sizes	64
Figure 4.5-4: Comparison of velocities at 5 ft line for different mesh sizes	64
Figure 4.6-1: Velocity distributions across the vertical (top) and horizontal (bottom) planes. RS and LS are the right and left sides of the entrance to the fan	66
Figure 4.6-2: Velocity in a vertical cross section passing through the test section center ...	66
Figure 4.6-3: Velocity distribution in the line probes placed across the room lab.....	67

Figure 4.6-4: Surface-averaged velocity measured and the standard deviation at different sections inside the wind tunnel and the test section	68
Figure 4.6-5: The velocity profile along a line passing through the center of the WT and the test section	69
Figure 4.6-6: Pressure spectrum created due to the presence of the screens.....	70
Figure 4.6-7: Pressure variation inside wind tunnel and the test section	70
Figure 4.6-8: Surface-averaged pressure calculated on screens	71
Figure 4.6-9: TKE distribution along the wind tunnel and the test section.....	72
Figure 4.6-10: TDK distribution inside the WT and the test section	73
Figure 4.6-11: Velocity at the test section of the wind tunnel.....	74
Figure 4.6-12: Velocity across the vertical section of the screenless WT.....	75
Figure 4.6-13: The velocity profile along center of the screenless wind tunnel and the test section.....	76
Figure 4.6-14: Surface average velocity across sections along the WT and the test region	77
Figure 4.6-15: Pressure distribution across the wind tunnel without screens	77
Figure 4.6-16: Pressure along the center line of the screenless wind tunnel.....	78
Figure 4.6-17: Pressure computed on both sides of the interfaces	79
Figure 4.6-18: TKE distribution along the screenless wind tunnel and the test section	80
Figure 4.7-1: Points of velocity measurement (not to scale).....	81
Figure 4.7-2: Location of axes of calculated velocity: top and side views respectively.	82
Figure 4.7-3: The measured and simulated velocity comparison along the a-a axis.....	83
Figure 4.7-4: The measured and simulated velocity comparison along the b-b axis	83
Figure 4.7-5: The measured and simulated velocity comparison along the c-c axis	84

Figure 4.7-6: The measured and simulated velocity comparison along the d-d axis.....	84
Figure 5.3-1: Full scale wind tunnel model displaying the regions	90
Figure 5.3-2: The simplified wind tunnel model	91
Figure 5.4-1: Generated mesh in a vertical cross section in the computational domain....	91
Figure 5.4-2: Trimmer mesh for the simplified wind tunnel	92
Figure 5.7-1: Mesh independent study at 3 ft line from the WTE	96
Figure 5.7-2: Mesh independent study at 4 ft line from the WTE	97
Figure 5.7-3: Mesh independent study at 5 ft line fr om the WTE.....	97
Figure 5.8-1: Horizontal (top) and vertical distribution (bottom) of velocity in the simplified wind tunnel.....	100
Figure 5.8-2: Velocity distribution in the line probes of the simplified model.	101
Figure 5.8-3: Vertical velocity distribution in the test section of the simplified WT	102
Figure 5.9-1: Simplified and full scale WT velocities comparison at axis a-a	103
Figure 5.9-2: Simplified and full scale WT velocities comparison at axis b-b.....	104
Figure 5.9-3: Simplified and full scale WT velocities comparison at axis c-c	104
Figure 5.9-4: Simplified and full scale WT velocities comparison at axis d-d.....	105
Figure 5.10-1: Measured and computed velocity comparison along the a-a axis.....	106
Figure 5.10-2: Measured and computed velocity comparison along the b-b axis	107
Figure 5.10-3: Measured and computed velocity comparison along the c-c axis.....	107
Figure 5.10-4: Measured and computed velocity comparison along the d-d axis	108
Figure 6.2-1: Bridge model is placed infront of the exit of the wind tunnel extension (FH Aachen).....	112

Figure 6.2-2: Bridge deck geometry with (right) and without the attached adaptors at both ends (left).....	113
Figure 6.2-3: Wind tunnel testing set up showing the Pitot tubes, force balances and data acquisition instrument (Bosch).....	113
Figure 6.2-4: Bridge deck model placed between the dual force balances (FH Aachen)	114
Figure 6.2-5: The placement of the force balance on each side in an inclined bridge model (FH Aachen)	115
Figure 6.3-1: Locations of the pitot tubes upstream and downstream of the bridge deck	117
Figure 6.3-2: Locations of the line probes in the area of interest	117
Figure 6.3-3: Locations of the probe sections selected around the bridge deck	118
Figure 6.3-4: Flow chart for the simulations in the numerical aerodynamic investigation of deck-wind interaction	119
Figure 6.3-5: Orientation of the different forces on the bridge deck	122
Figure 6.3-6: Orientation of the moments and forces on the bridge deck	123
Figure 6.4-1: Discretized model of the wind tunnel and the bridge deck	126
Figure 6.4-2: Bridge deck mesh refined with small cell size.....	127
Figure 6.4-3: A refined 2-D vertical mesh around the model	127
Figure 6.4-4: Prism layer around the deck	128
Figure 6.4-5: Residuals of the simulation for 0° angle of attack with a time step of 0.025 second	129
Figure 6.5-1: Y^+ value for the simulation of the 0° angle of attack	130
Figure 6.6-1: Linear relationship between the inlet boundary velocity (IV) and velocity at the location of pitot tube-center (V_{center}).....	132

Figure 6.6-2: Linear relationship between the inlet boundary velocity (V) and velocity at the location of pitot tube-1 (V_1).....	132
Figure 6.6-3: Velocity in the horizontal (top) and vertical (bottom) sections of the computational domain	134
Figure 6.6-4: Converged lift and drag coefficients in 0° angle of attack simulation	135
Figure 6.6-5: Calculated normal and axial force coefficients in 0° angle of attack	136
Figure 6.6-6: Pressure coefficients for the horizontal bridge deck (a) top and front and (b) the bottom sides of the deck	137
Figure 6.6-7: Converged velocity results at the three positions of the pitot tube	138
Figure 6.6-8: Velocity distributions around the bridge deck	139
Figure 6.6-9: TKE distributions around the horizontal deck	140
Figure 6.6-10: TDR distributions around the horizontal deck	141
Figure 6.6-11: Mass flow rates in the wind tunnel model	141
Figure 6.6-12: The aerodynamic moment coefficients of the bridge deck	142
Figure 6.6-13: Drag coefficient comparison between the experimental and CFD results	143
Figure 6.6-14: Lift coefficients comparison between the measured and CFD results	144
Figure 6.6-15: CFD and wind tunnel test data comparison for the axial force coefficients	145
Figure 6.6-16: Comparison of CFD and measured normal force coefficients	146
Figure 6.6-17: Comparison of CFD and measured moment coefficients	147
Figure A-1: Velocity distributions in vertical sections in the WTE and the test section .	167
Figure B-1: Velocity distributions across vertical sections inside the WT	170
Figure C-1: Drag and lift coefficients for 5° angle of attack.....	172

Figure C-2: Normal and axial force coefficients for 5° angle of attack	172
Figure C-3: Pitching, rolling and yawing moment coefficients for 5° angle of attack	173
Figure C-4: Velocity flow around the bridge deck for 5° angle of attack.....	174
Figure C-5: Velocity distributions around the deck with 5° angle of attack.....	174
Figure C-6: Pressure coefficients for 5° angle of attack (a) bottom, (b) the top of the bridge deck.....	175
Figure C-7: TKE distributions around the deck for 5° angle of attack	176
Figure C-8: TDR distributions around the bridge deck for 5° angle of attack.....	176
Figure D-1: Converged drag and lift coefficients for 10° angle of attack.....	177
Figure D-2: Normal and axial force coefficients for 10° angle of attack.....	177
Figure D-3: Moment coefficients for 10° angle of attack	178
Figure D-4: Velocity flow around the bridge deck for 10° angle of attack.....	178
Figure D-5 : Velocity distributions around the bridge deck with 10° angle of attack	179
Figure D-6: Pressure coefficients for 10° angle of attack (a) bottom, (b) the top and side of the bridge deck	180
Figure D-7: TKE distributions around the bridge deck with 10° angle of attack	181
Figure D-8: TDR distributions around the bridge deck with 10° angle of attack	181
Figure E-1: Drag and lift coefficients for 15° angle of attack.....	182
Figure E-2: Normal and axial force coefficients for 15° angle of attack	182
Figure E-3 : Moment coefficients for 15° angle of attack.....	183
Figure E-4: Velocity distributions around the bridge deck for 15° angle of attack	184
Figure E-5: Velocity distributions around the deck with an angle of attack of 15°	184

Figure E-6: Pressure coefficients for 15° angle of attack (a) bottom, (b) the top and side of the bridge deck	185
Figure E-7: TKE distributions around the deck with 15° angle of attack	186
Figure E-8: TDR distributions for angle of attack of 15°	186
Figure F-1: Drag and lift coefficients for -5° angle of attack.....	187
Figure F-2: Normal and Axial force coefficients for -5° angle of attack.....	187
Figure F-3: Moment coefficients for -5° angle of attack.....	188
Figure F-4: Velocity flow pattern around the bridge deck for -5° angle of attack.....	188
Figure F-5: Velocity distributions in the test section for -5° angle of attack	189
Figure F-6: Pressure coefficients for -5° angle of attack (a) bottom, (b) the top and side of the bridge deck	190
Figure F-7 : TKE distributions for -5° angle of attack.....	191
Figure F-8: TDR distributions for -5° angle of attack.....	191
Figure G-1: Drag and lift coefficients for -10° angle of attack	192
Figure G-2: Normal and Axial force coefficients for -10° angle of attack	192
Figure G-3: Moment coefficients for -10° angle of attack.....	193
Figure G-4: Velocity flow around the bridge deck for -10° angle of attack	194
Figure G-5: Velocities at positions of the pitot tubes	194
Figure G-6: Velocity distributions for -10° angle of attack	195
Figure G-7: Pressure coefficients for -10° angle of attack (a) bottom, (b) the top and side of the bridge deck	195
Figure G-8: TKE distributions for -10° angle of attack	196
Figure G-9: TDR distributions for -10° angle of attack.....	196

Figure H-1: Drag and lift coefficients for -15° angle of attack	197
Figure H-2: Normal and axial force coefficients for -15° angle of attack	198
Figure H-3: Moment coefficients for -15° angle of attack.....	198
Figure H-4: Velocity flow around the bridge deck for -15° angle of attack	199
Figure H-5: Velocity distributions around the deck for -15° angle of attack.....	199
Figure H-6: Pressure coefficients around the deck region for -15° angle of attack	200
Figure H-7: TKE distributions for -15° angle of attack	200
Figure H-8: TDR distributions for -15° angle of attack	201

PREVIEW

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1: Composition of the TRACC super-computers (Argonne)	46
Table 4-1: Mesh characteristics of the wind tunnel discretized model.....	60
Table 4-2: Computational size of the different meshes	62
Table 4-3: Pressure drops across the screens	72
Table 4-4: The alpha (α) values for the screens.....	72
Table 4-5: Comparison of velocities at different positions of the test section.....	75
Table 4-6: Wind tunnel test data locations	81
Table 4-7: Statistical comparison of measured and calculated velocities in the full scale WT	86
Table 5-1: Mesh properties for the mesh independent study	94
Table 5-2: Base sizes provided for the regions of the simplified WT simulations.....	95
Table 5-3: Estimation of the velocity differences between the medium and fine mesh simulations.....	96
Table 5-4: Mesh parameters.....	98
Table 5-5: Physical parameters for the computational domain	99
Table 5-6: Statistical comparison between full scale and simplified WT models.....	106
Table 5-7: Statistical comparison of measured and computed velocities in the simplified WT model.....	109
Table 6-1: Input for calculating the aerodynamic coefficient.....	121
Table 6-2: Pitching moment input values	124
Table 6-3: Pressure coefficient input values	125
Table 6-4: Mesh and face sizes of the simulations	128

Table 6-5: Drag, lift and pitching moment coefficients.....	143
Table 6-6: Statistical comparison of measured and computed aerodynamic parameters	148

PREVIEW

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ASM	Algebraic Stress Model
CFD	Computational Fluid Dynamics
CPU	Central Processing Unit
DES	Detached Eddy Simulation
DNS	Direct Numerical Simulation
EARSM	Explicit Algebraic Reynolds Stress Model
FDM	Finite Difference Method
FEM	Finite Element Method
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FVM	Finite Volume Method
HCC	Holland Computing Center
LEA	Linearised Explicit Algebraic (model)
LES	Large Eddy Simulation
LFD	Load Factor Design
NS	Navier-Stokes (Equation)
RANS	Reynolds Averaged Navier-Stokes

RNG	Renormalization Group (Method)
RSM	Reynolds Stress Model
SAE	Spalart Allmaras Equation
SGS	Subgrid Scale
SST	Shear Stress Transport
TDR	Turbulent Dissipation Rate
TFHRC	Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center
TKE	Turbulent Kinetic Energy
TRACC	Transportation Research and Analysis Computing Center
URANS	Unsteady Reynolds Averaged Navier-Stokes
WSD	Working Stress Design
WSDOT	Washington State Department of Transportation
WT	Wind Tunnel
WTE	Wind Tunnel Extension

LIST OF SYMBOLS

Re	Reynolds number
C_d	Drag coefficient
C_l	Lift coefficient
F_d	Drag force
F_l	Lift force
a_{ref}	Plan projected area of the generic bridge deck
ρ	Density of air
B	Characteristic length, width of the generic bridge model
L	Length of the generic bridge model
V	Velocity of wind
α	Angle of attack
C_p	Pressure coefficient
V_{ref}	Reference velocity
P	Pressure
p	Time averaged pressure
P_∞	Reference pressure
K_{drop}	Pressure drop coefficient