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Abstract

Lo studio dell’evaporazione da parte di specchi d’acqua in ambiente urbano può contribuire alla comprensione dei fenomeni micrometeorologici e allo sviluppo di soluzioni per migliorare il comfort delle città. Questo problema è stato affrontato usando una simulazione fluidodinamica di un canyon urbano al cui centro è stato posto un canale d’acqua. Per le simulazioni è stato usato un modello di fluidodinamica computazionale sviluppato usando OpenFOAM. Come approccio numerico è stata usata una large-eddy simulation. Tale approccio ha permesso di simulare l’evoluzione del sistema e di analizzarne le variabili medie e turbolente. Il modello è basato su un solutore fluidodinamico in approssimazione di Boussinesq a cui sono state aggiunte le equazioni di avvezione diffusione del vapore e lo scambio termico provocato dall’evaporazione. Inoltre sono state implementate delle condizioni al contorno che potessero modellizzare l’evaporazione d’acqua dal canale. Il modello è stato validato simulando un canale piano usando diversi modelli di turbolenza. Sono state eseguite due simulazioni del canyon urbano, una prima in cui il canale ha una temperatura maggiore dell’aria circostante, e una seconda in cui la temperatura del canale è inferiore all’aria. In entrambe le simulazioni la presenza del canale ha influenzato fortemente sia le variabili medie che turbolente. L’evaporazione d’acqua dal canale e il conseguente galleggiamento ha portato un aumento dell’intensità della velocità all’interno del canyon. Si è assistito inoltre ad un abbassamento delle temperature su tutto il dominio, in particolare nel caso del canale freddo, all’interno del canyon, si è raggiunto un raffreddamento del 10-20% rispetto alla differenza di temperatura tra il canale e la temperatura ambientale iniziale. Si è inoltre osservato un aumento dell’energia cinetica turbolenta in tutto il dominio, e un aumento di flussi turbolenti di quantità di moto soprattutto all’interfaccia tra il canyon e l’aria esterna.
Abstract

The study on waterbodies evaporation in an urban environment can contribute to the understanding of micrometeorological phenomena and the development of solutions to improve the urban comfort. This problem was addressed using a fluid dynamics simulation of an urban canyon with a water channel in the middle. A computational fluid dynamics (CFD) model developed using OpenFOAM was used for the simulations. For the numerical approach, a large-eddy simulation (LES) was used. This approach made it possible to simulate the evolution of the system and to analyse its mean and turbulent variables. The model is based on a fluid dynamics solver in the Boussinesq approximation, to which the equations of vapor advection-diffusion and heat transfer caused by evaporation have been implemented. In addition, boundary conditions were implemented to model the evaporation of water from the channel. The model was validated by simulating a flat channel using different turbulence models. Two simulations of the urban canyon were performed, a first one in which the channel has a higher temperature than the surrounding air, and a second one in which the temperature of the channel is lower than the air. In both simulations the presence of the channel strongly influenced both the mean and turbulent variables. The evaporation of water from the channel and the resulting buoyancy led to an increase in the velocity intensity within the canyon. There was also a lowering of temperatures over the entire domain, in particular in the case of the cold channel, inside the canyon, a 10-20% cooling was achieved regarding the temperature difference between the channel and the initial ambient temperature. An increase in turbulent kinetic energy was also observed throughout the domain, and an increase in turbulent momentum fluxes was observed especially at the interface between the canyon and the outside air.
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Introduction

Nowadays, more than half of the human population lives in urban areas and the percentage is estimated to rise to 68% by 2050, according to the world urbanization prospect of the United Nations [3]. It is well known that urban temperature is usually warmer than surrounding rural areas, this phenomenon is called urban heat island (UHI). The causes of UHI are several from the street geometry, to the presence of artificial surface with high emissivity, and the presence of anthropogenic heat source. Climate change is expected to worsen the situation with higher temperatures and more frequent and intense heatwaves.

There is a wide literature on possible solutions to improve urban comfort [25] to reduce morbidity and mortality in urban settlements. An important ensemble of strategies to mitigate the UHI are the natural-based solutions (NBS) that are inspired by, supported by or copied from nature, including for example trees and water basins in the urban texture. To insert water bodies may reduce the temperature due to the evaporation, but may also increase the urban humidity and changes the dynamics producing a buoyancy effect. Understanding the behaviour of evaporation in urban areas and the dynamics of moisture is important to gain knowledge about the impact of the existing water bodies and to predict the consequences of the implementation of water basins in the urban planning of the new neighbourhood.

Some articles were published, which address the problem from different points of view, using numerical modelling, field measures, laboratory experiments and scale models. Hathway et al. [10] have studied the impact of an urban river in England using field measures and showing a cooling effect of 1.5°C during the spring period. This effect is smaller during the summer season due to the high water temperature. Theeuwes et al. [23] have studied a simulation of a circular city surrounded by a rural area performed with the weather research and forecasting (WRF) model. Inside the city they have set some water basins of different sizes and forms. They found that greater lakes produce greater impact but only near the edge and in the downwind area, instead of many small lakes producing smaller impact but involving greater areas. They also noticed that during the night the water temperature may be higher than the air temperature heating the environment. Tominaga et al. [24] used a model which combine a Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes equations (RANS) simulation and a radiative model. After the validation of the model using a model of buildings array and a river in a wind tunnel, they have
simulated a residential area in Japan that contain a pound, and they compared the simulation with the field measurements. They found a maximum temperature decrease of 2°C at the pedestrian level, with an extension of 100 m with a wind of 10 m/s at 3 m high. Montazeri et al. [15] studied the effect of a water spray used in a courtyard in the Netherlands during a heatwave in 2006, using a RANS simulation comparing it with fields and satellite measurements, obtaining a temperature reduction of about 7 and 5°C at pedestrian level. Since the 1970s one of the most important research topics in the context of urban micrometeorology is the study of street canyons [18, 17].Pearlmutter et al. [19] have created a scale model of an array of street canyons with evaporation pans that simulate vegetative areas to study the evapotranspiration impact. Syafii et al. [11] have created a scale model of buildings array with some water pounds in different positions and of different forms. They found better thermal environments in presence of the pounds, but also an increase in absolute humidity which may worsen the pedestrian comfort. They also found a more efficient cooling effect with pounds oriented parallel to prevailing winds. Kubilay et al. [13] worked on a RANS simulation of a street canyon in which water evaporates from the surfaces of buildings which are wet from the rain. They found that the increase in the rainfall intensity does not change the reduction in surface temperature, but extends the duration of the cooling effect. They also have studied the impact of materials founding that the moisture permeability, moisture capacity and thermal diffusivity, affected the thermal comfort. Zhao et al. [27] in their review point out that, for the study of street canyon dynamics, it would be better to use models that take into account the temporal evolution such as large-eddy simulations (LES) and unsteady RANS (URANS) simulations instead of the more used RANS. However, dealing with the phase change of water in a fluid dynamic simulation is not a simple thing because turbulent flows with a high Reynolds number, are complex nonlinear systems. Today no a LES is treating the evaporation and the moisture role in a street canyon.

Cintolesi et al. [6] proposed a model to simulate the evaporation from a water film in a turbulent flow using a LES. In the present work, such an evaporation model is applied to an urban street canyon with an evaporating waterbody. This allows the investigation of effects of evaporation and vapour concentration in the air circulation. Two different simulation are performed with different temperature of the water to simulate a diurnal configuration with the waterbody colder than the air, and a nocturnal configuration with the waterbody warmer than the air. The model is implemented using the software toolbox OpenFOAM [26, 2, 1], which is a computational fluid dynamic open source software written in C++. It is used the OpenFOAM solver buoyantBoussinesqPimpleFoam, which simulate the motion of a fluid in Boussinesq approximation with buoyancy due to temperature and humidity change. That solver is changed to simulate the evaporation from the waterbody and to take into account the vapour concentration diffusion and buoyancy contribution.

The first chapter will show the mathematical models used to model the dynamic of
the system and the evaporation, and the numerical approaches used to model turbulence. In the second chapter, the numerical implementation of the mathematical models will be shown with particular attention to the boundary conditions used to simulate the evaporation of the water film. In the third chapter, the model will be validated using the archetype case of channel flow which is well known and studied in depth [16]. Three different turbulence models have been used the Smagorinsky, the wall adapting local eddy-viscosity model (WALE) [9] and the dynamic Lagrangian [14]. Wall functions proposed by desoutter et al. [8] will be used to validate the evaporation model. The fourth chapter will be shown the analysis of the simulations made on the street canyon and the results obtained. Finally, in the fifth chapter, the conclusions drawn from this work are reported.
Chapter 1

Theoretical models

1.1 Mathematical models

1.1.1 Navier-Stokes equations

The motion of a fluid is described by the Navier-Stokes equations, which is a system of equations including the conservation of mass and the conservation of momentum. According to the Boussinesque approximation, the variation of density will be neglected except in the gravitational term.

For an incompressible fluid, the equation of mass conservation is:

\[ \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i} = 0 \]  

(1.1)

where \( u \) is the fluid velocity, and \( x \) is the cartesian coordinate.

The momentum conservation equation is:

\[ \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial t} + u_j \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} = - \frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} - \frac{\rho}{\rho_0} g \delta_{i3} \]  

(1.2)

where \( t \) is the time, \( \rho_0 \) is the reference density, \( p \) is the pressure, \( \nu \) is the kinematic viscosity, \( \rho \) is the density and \( g \) is the gravitational acceleration.

The vapour concentration \( \omega \) is defined as the ratio between the mass of vapour \( m_v \) and the sum of the masses of vapour and dry air \( m_a \):

\[ \omega = \frac{m_v}{m_a + m_v} \]  

(1.3)

The density \( \rho \) is supposed to be a linear function of the temperature \( T \) and the vapour concentration:

\[ \frac{\rho}{\rho_0} = 1 - \beta_T (T - T_0) - \beta_\omega (\omega - \omega_0) \]  

(1.4)
\[ \beta_T \text{ and } \beta_\omega \text{ are respectively the expansion coefficients for the temperature and vapour concentration.} \]

The density depends on both \( T \) and \( \omega \) which are active scalar, and are diffused and transported following the advection-diffusion equation:

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + u_j \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_j} = \alpha_T \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} + S \tag{1.5}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t} + u_j \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x_j} = \alpha_\omega \frac{\partial^2 \omega}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} \tag{1.6}
\]

where \( \alpha_T \) and \( \alpha_\omega \) are the coefficients of diffusion for \( T \) and \( \omega \), and \( S \) is a source term due to the energy exchange produced by evaporation as explained in the next section.

### 1.1.2 Evaporation model

To describe the evaporation of water, is used a mathematical model yet used in other research [6, 7, 20]. The waterbody is modelled as an evaporating film with constant physical properties. The only property of the water film that changes in time is the height. The model considers only the evaporation and condensation which take place in the boundary in contact with the water film.

Using the molar masses \( M \) and the number of moles \( n \) for vapour (subscript \( v \)) and dry air (subscript \( a \)), it is possible to express omega as a function of atmospheric pressure \( p_{atm} \) and vapour pressure \( e \)

\[
\omega = \frac{m_v}{m_a + m_v} = \frac{M_vn_v}{M_an_a + M_vn_v} = \frac{M_vn_v}{M_an_a} \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{M_v}{M_a}e} \right) 
\]

\[
= \frac{M_v}{M_a} \left( \frac{e}{p_{atm} - e} \right) \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{M_v}{M_a}e} \right) = \frac{M_v}{M_a} \left( \frac{e}{(p_{atm} - e) + \frac{M_v}{M_a}e} \right). \tag{1.7}
\]

The vapour pressure may be replaced by the vapour pressure at saturation multiplied for the relative humidity. Assuming that in contact with the water film the water is saturated is possible to compute the value of the concentration of vapour at the interface

\[
\omega_{\Gamma} = \frac{M_v}{M_a} \left( \frac{e_s}{p_{atm} - (1 - \frac{M_v}{M_a})e_s} \right). \tag{1.8}
\]

The saturation pressure \( (e_s) \) is computed using the Buck’s equation

\[
e_s(T_{\Gamma}) = 611.85 \exp \left( \frac{17.502T_{\Gamma}}{240.9 + T_{\Gamma}} \right). \tag{1.9}
\]
The velocity of evaporation may be estimated by Fick’s law for the diffusion of vapour. Since \( \omega \) includes both the mass of vapour and air it is necessary to divide the diffusion flow of omega by the mass of dry air \((1 - \omega_T)\)

\[
U_\omega = -\frac{\alpha_\omega}{1 - \omega_T} \left( \frac{d\omega}{dn} \right) \hat{n}.
\] (1.10)

From \( U_\omega \) is computed the heat flux vector:

\[
q = \rho^* L_h U_\omega.
\] (1.11)

where \( \rho^* \) is the sum of the density of air and water, and \( L_h \) is the latent heat of vaporization, both are considered constant. The divergence of \( q \) represents the energy stored in an air particle near the water film, dividing it by heat capacity is possible to compute the source term in the temperature equation (1.5):

\[
S = -\frac{1}{\rho C_p} \nabla \cdot q.
\] (1.12)

Evaporation, therefore, behaves like a temperature sink that acts on the cells adjacent to the boundary with the water film.

The evolution of the height (H) of the water film is computing using \( U_\omega \)

\[
\frac{\partial H}{\partial t} = \frac{\rho_a}{\rho_w} U_\omega
\] (1.13)

where \( \rho_a \) is the density of the air and \( \rho_w \) is the density of water, while \( \rho_a/\rho_w = 0.001 \), following Ref. [20].

1.2 Large-eddy simulation

In order to resolve the Navier-Stokes equation, in a finite computational grid, a spatial filter has been apply. The spatial filter is defined by a filtering operation:

\[
\overline{u}(x,t) = \int G(r,x)u(x-r,t)dr
\]

where \( G \) is a filter function.

The momentum conservation equation becomes:

\[
\frac{\partial \overline{u}_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \overline{u}_j u_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 \overline{u}_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_j}.
\] (1.14)
The equation depends both on $u_i$ and $u_j$ so the system is not closed. Introducing the residual stress tensor:

$$\tau_{ij}^R = u_i u_j - \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j$$

which may be divided into an anisotropic and an isotropic part:

$$\tau_{ij}^R = \tau_{ij}^r + \frac{2}{3} k_r \delta_{ij}.$$  

The isotropic part may be included in the pressure term, so the equation (1.14) becomes

$$\frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \bar{u}_j \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \tau_{ij}^r}{\partial x_i}.$$  

Than modelling $\tau_{ij}^r$ the problem may be closed. Different modelization of $\tau_{ij}^r$ exist, in this work there will be used the Smagorinsky, the WALE and the dynamic Lagrangian. These three turbulence models will be explained in the next section.

1.3 Turbulence models

1.3.1 Smagorinsky model

The Smagorinsky model is based on the hypothesis that the subgrid-scale (sgs) shear stress is linearly related to the resolved rate of the strain tensor.

$$\tau_{ij}^{sgs} = -2 \nu_{sgs} \bar{S}_{ij}$$

This hypothesis is known as the linear eddy-viscosity model and treats the effect of turbulence in the subgrid-scale as a viscosity acting on the grater scale motion. The eddy viscosity of the residual motion $\nu_{sgs}$ is computed using the mixing length hypothesis

$$\nu_{sgs} = l_s^2 |\bar{S}|$$

where $l_s$ is the Smagorinsky mixing-length

$$l_s = (C_s \Delta)$$

where $\Delta$ is the linear dimension of the cell, and $C_s$ is the Smagorinsky constant. So $\nu_{sgs}$ becomes

$$\nu_{sgs} = (C_s \Delta)^2 |\bar{S}|$$

The OpenFOAM implementation of the Smagorinsky model, used in this work, is a bit more complex and will be explained in the following. It starts dividing the SGS stress tensor ($\tau_{ij}$) into an isotropic and an anisotropic part

$$\tau_{ij} = \frac{1}{3} \tau_{kk} \delta_{ij} + \left( \tau_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \tau_{kk} \delta_{ij} \right)$$
The isotropic part is proportional to the SGS kinetic energy \( k_{sgs} \) while the anisotropic part is assumed to behave as a viscosity proportional to the resolved rate of strain tensor \( \mathbf{D}_{ij} \) following the eddy viscosity approximation.

\[
\tau_{ij} = \frac{2}{3} k_{sgs} \delta_{ij} - 2 \nu_{sgs} \text{ dev } \left( \overline{\mathbf{S}} \right)_{ij}
\]  

(1.20)

where \( \nu_{sgs} \) is the SGS viscosity, computed as

\[
\nu_{sgs} = C_k \Delta \sqrt{k_{sgs}}
\]  

(1.21)

where \( C_k \) is a constant. \( k_{sgs} \) is computed assuming that the subgrid-scale are in local equilibrium so the energy production is in balance with the dissipation

\[
\overline{\mathbf{S}}_{ij} \tau_{ij} + C_\epsilon \frac{k_{sgs}^{1.5}}{\Delta} = 0
\]  

(1.22)

Solving that equation using the definition of \( \nu_{sgs} \)

\[
\overline{\mathbf{S}}_{ij} \left( \frac{2}{3} k_{sgs} I - 2 \nu_{sgs} \text{ dev } \left( \overline{\mathbf{S}} \right) \right)_{ij} + C_\epsilon \frac{k_{sgs}^{3/2}}{\Delta} = 0
\]

\[
\overline{\mathbf{S}}_{ij} \left( \frac{2}{3} k_{sgs} I - 2 C_k \Delta \sqrt{k_{sgs}} \text{ dev } \left( \overline{\mathbf{S}} \right) \right)_{ij} + C_\epsilon \frac{k_{sgs}^{3/2}}{\Delta} = 0
\]

\[
\sqrt{k_{sgs}} \left( \frac{C_\epsilon}{\Delta} k_{sgs} + \frac{2}{3} \text{ tr } \left( \overline{\mathbf{S}} \right) \sqrt{k_{sgs}} - 2 C_k \Delta \text{ dev } \left( \overline{\mathbf{S}} \right)_{ij} \overline{\mathbf{S}}_{ij} \right) = 0
\]  

(1.23)

The last equation may be rewritten as

\[
ak_{sgs} + b \sqrt{k_{sgs}} - c = 0
\]  

(1.24)

where \( a, b \) and \( c \) are defined as

\[
a = \frac{C_\epsilon}{\Delta}
\]

\[
b = \frac{2}{3} \text{ tr } \left( \overline{\mathbf{S}} \right)
\]  

(1.25)

\[
c = 2 C_k \Delta \left( \text{ dev } \left( \overline{\mathbf{S}} \right)_{ij} \overline{\mathbf{S}}_{ij} \right)
\]

So the equation (1.24) has the solution

\[
k_{sgs} = \left( -b + \sqrt{b^2 + 4ac} \right)^2
\]  

(1.26)
for an incompressible fluid, \( \mathbf{S} \) is traceless so \( \text{dev}(\mathbf{S}) = \mathbf{S} \) and

\[
\begin{align*}
    b &= 0 \\
    c &= C_k \Delta |\mathbf{S}|^2
\end{align*}
\] (1.27)

so \( k_{sgs} \) and \( \nu_{sgs} \) become

\[
\begin{align*}
    k_{sgs} &= \frac{C_k \Delta^2 |\mathbf{S}|^2}{C_\epsilon} \\
    \nu_{sgs} &= C_k \sqrt{\frac{C_k}{C_\epsilon}} \Delta^2 |\mathbf{S}|
\end{align*}
\] (1.28)

which is equal to the equation (1.18) where

\[
C_s^2 = C_k \sqrt{\frac{C_k}{C_\epsilon}}.
\] (1.29)

Using cells of different shapes and sizes, the linear dimension \( \Delta \) of each cell is computed as the cube root of the volume.

In real turbulent flows, near a wall, a viscous sublayer forms. In this sublayer, the viscous forces dominate over the inertial ones producing a laminar boundary layer, and the turbulence viscosity should go to zero near the wall. But in the Smagorinsky model, the large velocity gradients produce a value of \( S_{ij} \) and therefore of \( \nu_{sgs} \) different from zero. It is, therefore, necessary to introduce a correction to \( l_s \) so that it goes to zero as it approaches the wall:

\[
l_s = C_s \Delta f(z^+) \quad \text{(1.30)}
\]

where \( z^+ \) is the non-dimensional wall-normal coordinate, defined as

\[
z^+ = \frac{u^* z}{\nu}
\] (1.31)

with \( \nu \) viscosity, \( u^* \) friction velocity and \( z \) wall-normal direction. In this work is used a Van Driest dumping function

\[
f(z^+) = \sqrt{(1 - e^{-z^+/A})^3}
\] (1.32)

where \( A \) is an empirical constant set to 25.

### 1.3.2 Wall adapting local eddy-viscosity model

The wall adapting local eddy-viscosity model (WALE) was proposed by Nicoud and Ducros in 1999 [9] in order to improve the Smagorinsky model. It includes the contribution of the rotation rate to the subgrid-scale stress tensor, and the turbulent viscosity
goes to zero approaching the wall. As the Smagorinsky, the WALE model assumes that the SGS turbulent viscosity is proportional to the square root of the SGS turbulent kinetic energy:

\[ \nu_{sgs} = C_k \Delta \sqrt{k_{sgs}} \]  

(1.33)

but as invariable to compute the subgrid turbulent kinetic energy is used the traceless symmetric part of the square of the velocity gradient

\[ S_{ij}^d = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{u}_k}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_j}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial \bar{u}_k}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_k} \right) - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_k}{\partial x_l} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_l}{\partial x_k} \]  

(1.34)

\( k_{sgs} \) is then computed from \( S_{ij}^d \) and \( S_{ij} \) as

\[ k_{sgs} = \left( \frac{C_w \Delta}{C_k} \right)^2 \frac{(S_{ij}^d S_{ij}^d)^{3/2}}{(S_{ij} S_{ij})^{5/2} + (S_{ij}^d S_{ij}^d)^{5/4}}. \]  

(1.35)

Finally, the subgrid turbulent viscosity becomes

\[ \nu_{sgs} = (C_w \Delta)^2 \frac{(S_{ij}^d S_{ij}^d)^{3/2}}{(S_{ij} S_{ij})^{5/2} + (S_{ij}^d S_{ij}^d)^{5/4}}. \]  

(1.36)

It is possible to show [9] that approaching a wall, \( (S_{ij}^d S_{ij}^d)^{3/2} \) behaves like \( d^3 \) (where \( d \) is the distance from the wall) and therefore approaches zero. This means that this model does not need a damping function near the walls.

**1.3.3 Dynamic Lagrangian model**

Another turbulence model for large-eddy simulations was proposed by Meneveau et al. in 1994 [14]. It is called dynamic Lagrangian and is based on the Smagorinsky model with the difference that \( C_s \) is non an empirical parameter but is computed during the simulation using information from the resolved scales. Taking into account a grid with cells size double than that used in the simulation, \( \hat{\Delta} = 2\Delta \) is possible to apply a spatial filter based on this grid. It is introduced \( L_{ij} \) which is the difference between the stress tensor of the two scales

\[ T_{ij} - \hat{T}_{ij} = \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j - \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j \equiv L_{ij}. \]  

(1.37)

That difference may be estimated using the Smagorinsky model

\[ T_{ij} - \hat{T}_{ij} \simeq C_s 2\Delta^2 \left( \hat{|S| S}_{ij} - 4\hat{|S| S}_{ij} \right) \equiv C_s M_{ij} \]  

(1.38)

The error between the two previous approaches is

\[ e_{ij} = L_{ij} - C_s M_{ij} \]  

(1.39)
The error in function of $C_s$ is minimised in a last-square sense, along the particle trajectories covered in a time $T$:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial C_s} \int_{-\infty}^{t} e_{ij}(x, t')e_{ij}(x, t') \frac{1}{T} e^{-\frac{(t-t')}{T}} dt' = 0. \quad (1.40)$$

Replacing $e_{ij}$ with equation (1.39), and resolving in $C_s$ it becomes

$$C_s = \frac{I_{LM}}{I_{MM}} \quad (1.41)$$

where $I_{LM}$ and $I_{MM}$ are defined as

$$I_{LM} = \int_{-\infty}^{t} L_{ij} M_{ij} \frac{1}{T} e^{-\frac{(t-t')}{T}} dt', \quad (1.42)$$

$$I_{MM} = \int_{-\infty}^{t} M_{ij} M_{ij} \frac{1}{T} e^{-\frac{(t-t')}{T}} dt'. \quad (1.43)$$

It is possible to show that $I_{LM}$ and $I_{MM}$ are solutions of the following equations

$$\frac{\partial I_{LM}}{\partial t} + \bar{u} \nabla I_{LM} = \frac{1}{T} (L_{ij} M_{ij} - I_{LM}), \quad (1.44)$$

$$\frac{\partial I_{MM}}{\partial t} + \bar{u} \nabla I_{MM} = \frac{1}{T} (M_{ij} M_{ij} - I_{MM}), \quad (1.45)$$

using as characteristic time

$$T = 1.5 \Delta (I_{LM} I_{MM})^{-1/8}. \quad (1.46)$$

This is, generally, a more accurate model than the Smagorinsky but need more computational time because it resolves two auxiliary fields $I_{LM}$ and $I_{MM}$.
Chapter 2
Numerical implementation

2.1 Solver description

The mathematical models described in the previous chapter, are implemented using the software toolbox OpenFOAM 6 from The OpenFOAM Foundation [26, 2, 1]. The OpenFOAM’s solver buoyantBoussinesqPimpleFoam is used to resolve the equations of motion. It uses the Boussinesq approximation, taking into account the contribution of buoyancy due to the thermal variation.

The solver has been modified to take into account the $\omega$ equation (1.6), its contribution in the buoyancy, and the evaporation model. The evaporation model was previously [6, 7, 20] written for a different solver (coupledHeatVapourFoam) on a different OpenFOAM version (v2.1). The files which described the evaporation model are rewritten in order to be compatible with the solver used and implemented in it.

The solver thus obtained was called humidityBuoyantBoussinesquePimpleFoam.

2.1.1 PISO algorithm

The pressure implicit with splitting of operators (PISO) algorithm proposed by Issa [12] is used in this work. From the discretization of equation (1.2) is computed the predicted values of velocity $u^*$ from the values of velocity, pressure and density at the previous time steps ($u^n, p^n, \rho^n$). The general form of this equation is:

$$Cu^* = r - \nabla p^n + \rho^ng$$

where $r$ is an explicit source term excluding pressure and buoyancy.

Then the first corrected velocity ($u^{**}$) is computed from the following equation:

$$Au^{**} + H'U^* = r - \nabla p^* + \rho^ng$$

where $A$ and $H'$ are the diagonal and the off-diagonal parts of the matrix $C$ ($C = A + H'$), and $p^*$ is the first corrected pressure which is still unknown. Since $A$ is diagonal it
is simply invertible and the equation becomes
\[ u^{**} = A^{-1}H - A^{-1}\nabla p^* + A^{-1}\rho^n g \] (2.3)

where \( H \) is \( r - H'u^* \). Knowing that for the continuity equation the velocity field must be solenoidal, is possible to find \( p^* \) imposing \( \nabla u^{**} = 0 \).

\[ \nabla^2 (A^{-1}p^*) = \nabla (A^{-1}H + A^{-1}\rho^n g) \] (2.4)

from \( p^* \) is found \( u^{**} \) and using the same \( A \) and \( H \) is possible to repeat the last two equations to find the second and following corrector steps.

### 2.1.2 Solver structure

The main structure of the solver is the same as buoyantBoussinesqPimpleFoam with some additions because the original solver does not take into account the temperature source, the \( \omega \) equation and the boundary condition to describe the evaporation.

For each cell, at each time step is defined the Courant number as:

\[ Co = \frac{u\Delta t}{\Delta x} \] (2.5)

where \( u \) is the magnitude of the velocity, \( \Delta t \) is the time interval, and \( \Delta x \) is the cell linear dimension. Following the Courant convergence condition, there is a maximum value \( Co_{max} \) that can be reached to preserve system stability. At each time step, the solver computes \( \Delta t \) to have a max courant number \( Co_{max} \) of 0.5 using the scripts CourantNo.H and setDeltaT.H.

```cpp
while (runTime.run())
{
    #include "readTimeControls.H"
    #include "CourantNo.H"
    #include "setDeltaT.H"

    runTime++;

    Info<< "Time = " << runTime.timeName() << nl << endl;

    #include "TEqn.H"
    #include "omegaEqn.H"
```

Then the temperature (1.5) and humidity (1.6) equations and the evaporation model are resolved using the scripts TEqn.h and omegaEqn.H. TEqn.h and omegaEqn.H will be explained in detail in the following sections.

```cpp
#include "TEqn.H"
#include "omegaEqn.H"
```

The PISO algorithm described in section 2.1.1 is implemented with the scripts UEqn.H and pEqn.H. The solver may be used with different turbulence models. After each step of the PISO loop, the turbulence parameters are updated.
// --- Pressure-velocity PIMPLE corrector loop
while (pimple.loop())
{
    #include "UEqn.H"

    // --- Pressure corrector loop
    while (pimple.correct())
    {
        #include "pEqn.H"
    }

    if (pimple.turbCorr())
    {
        laminarTransport.correct();
        turbulence->correct();
    }
}

// At the end of the PISO loop, the temperature and humidity equations are recomputed to improve the coupling with the velocity and pressure equations.
#include "TEqn.H"
#include "omegEqn.H"

runTime.write();
Info<< "ExecutionTime = " << runTime.elapsedCpuTime() << " s"
<< " ClockTime = " << runTime.elapsedClockTime() << " s"
<< nl << endl;

In the next sections will be described TEqn.H and omegaEqn.H in detail. UEqn.h and pEqn.H will not be treated in this work as they have not undergone significant changes compared to the original solver.

2.1.3 Temperature equation

At the start of the TEqn.H script, before resolving the temperature equation, the boundary fields are updated. The evaporation model are implemented through the function updateCoeffs(), the details of the function for each boundary are shown in subsequent sections.

forAll(omega.boundaryField(),b)
{
    omega.boundaryFieldRef()[b].updateCoeffs();
}

forAll(Uomega.boundaryField(),b)
{
    Uomega.boundaryFieldRef()[b].updateCoeffs();
}
following the Reynold analogy, the turbulent thermal diffusivity ($\alpha_t$) is proportional to the turbulent viscosity ($\nu_t$), and the proportional constant is the inverse of the turbulent Prandtl number ($P_r_t$).

$$\alpha_t = \frac{\nu_t}{\rho C_p}$$

The thermal diffusivity is computed using the Prandtl number and is summed to the turbulent thermal diffusivity to obtain the efficient thermal diffusivity ($\alpha_{Eff}$).

$$\alpha_{Eff} = \frac{\nu_t}{\rho C_p} + \alpha_t$$

The source term in eq. (1.5) is computed using the eq. (1.12) where the norm of $\mathbf{q}$ is implemented as a scalar field named EvCoHF. The computation of EvCoHF is described in detail in the section about his boundary condition.

$$\text{surfaceScalarField EvCoSource} \left( \text{fvc::interpolate}(\text{EvCoHF}/\rho C_p) \cdot \text{mesh.magSf()} \right)$$

Finally, the equation (1.5) is resolved using the function solve() of the object TEqn.
2.1.4 Vapour concentration equation

The script which resolves the $\omega$ equation (1.6) is omegaEq.H. It is similar to TEq.H but there is no update of the boundary conditions of the evaporation model and the computing of the source term, which is absent in eq (1.6). As the first thing, it is computed the turbulent diffusion, dividing the eddy viscosity to the turbulent Schmidt number. In the program the Schmidt number is called PrOmega for the formal similarity with the Prandtl number in the temperature diffusivity, as the other variable which as the name of the analogous in the TEqn.H adding Omega at the end.

\[
\text{alphaOmegat} = \frac{\text{turbulence->nut()}}{\text{PrOmegat}};
\]

\[
\text{alphaOmegat.correctBoundaryConditions();}
\]

\[
\text{alphaOmegaEff} = \frac{\text{turbulence->nu()}}{\text{PrOmega}} + \text{alphaOmegat};
\]

Is creating the object omegaEqn which is a matrix created using the discretization schemes for the differential operators. The equation is resolved using the method of omegaEqn solve().

\[
\text{fvScalarMatrix omegaEqn}
\]

\[
\text{(}
\]

\[
\text{fvm::ddt(omega)}
\]

\[
\text{+ fvm::div(phi, omega)}
\]

\[
\text{- fvm::laplacian(alphaOmegaEff, omega)}
\]

\[
\text{)};
\]

\[
\text{omegaEqn.relax();}
\]

\[
\text{fvOptions.constrain(omegaEqn);}\]

\[
\text{omegaEqn.solve();}
\]

At the end of the scripts the density is updated taking into account the temperature and humidity contributions using the equation (1.4).

\[
\text{rhok} = 1.0 - \beta(T - TRef) - \betaOmega \cdot (\omega - \omegaRef);
\]

2.2 Evaporation boundary condition

2.2.1 Vapour concentration

The value of vapour concentration at the interface ($\omega_{T}$) described in eq (1.8) is computed using the boundary condition of $\omega$. The boundary condition is implemented in OpenFoam using the mixedFvPatchScalarField which is a boundary condition obtained from a combination of a constant value (refValue) and a constant gradient (refGrad), weighted by the fraction (valueFraction). When the function updateCoeffs() is called for the $\omega$ boundary conditions the necessary parameters and variables ($M_{v}/M_{a}$, $H$, $T$ and $P_{sat}$) are initialized.
void Foam::vaporConcentrationFvPatchScalarField::updateCoeffs()
{
  if (updated())
  {
    return;
  }
  Info << "*** updating omega " << patch().name() << endl;
  fixesValue_ = true;
  scalar Mfrac=Mv()/Ma();
  scalarField _Height = Height();
  scalarField Tred = Temperature() - 273.15;
  scalarField _ps = (611.85 * exp ( 17.502 * Tred / (240.9 + Tred) ));

  forAll(patch_.faceCells(),fi){
    if(_Height[fi] > 0){
      (*this)[fi]=((Mfrac * _ps[fi]) /
        ( Patm_ - ((1.0-Mfrac) * _ps[fi]) )
      );
      if(*this)[fi]<0 (*this)[fi] = 0;
    }else{
      this->refValue()[fi] = 0.0;
      this->refGrad()[fi] = 0.0;
      this->valueFraction()[fi] = 0.0;
      fixesValue_ = false;
    }
  }

  when refValue, refGrad and valueFraction are set for both the conditions on H, the boundary is updated using the OpenFoam class mixedFvPatchScalarField
}

mixedFvPatchScalarField::updateCoeffs();
When valueFraction is set to 1 the function sets the value of the face cells at the value refValue, and when valueFraction is 0 the function sets the gradient on the boundary at the value refValue.

### 2.2.2 Evaporation/condensation velocity

The velocity of evaporation $U_\omega$ is defined as a vector field which is 0 in all the domain except in the boundaries where it may assume different values. When the boundaries are updated all the variables needed for the computation of $U_\omega$ are initialized

246 void Foam::velocityEvaporationCondensationFvPatchVectorField::updateCoeffs()
247 {
248 Info << "*** updating Uomega " << patch().name() << endl;
249 scalarField _omega (omega());
250 scalarField _Domega (Domega());
251 scalarField _omegaGrad (omegaGrad());
252 scalarField _H (H());

The value of $U_\omega$ is computed using eq. (1.10)

255 scalarField evaporationVelocity = -( _Domega/(1.0-_omega))*_omegaGrad;

In each face cell in which $H$ is 0 or less, $U_\omega$ is set to 0

257 forAll(patch_.faceCells(),c){
258 if (_H[c] <= 0){
259 evaporationVelocity[c] = 0;
260 }
261 }

$U_\omega$ is set to be a vector normal to the surface

263 const vectorField n(patch_.nf());
264 vectorField::operator=(evaporationVelocity * n);

The boundary is updated using the OpenFoam class fixedValueFvPatchVectorField which sets the value of $U_\omega$ equal to the variables evaporationVelocity.

266 fixedValueFvPatchVectorField::updateCoeffs();
267 }

### 2.2.3 Evaporation/condensation heating flux

As shown in the explanation of TEqn.H, the source term is implemented using a scalar field EvCoHF which corresponds to the norm of $q$. Before updating the EvCoHF, the $U_\omega$ and $H$ variables are initialized. Only the component of $U_\omega$ normal to the boundary is used.

309 scalarField ha (H());
310 tmp<scalarField> UomegaNormal (Uomega() & patch().nf());
newGradient is a scalar field defined as the product of $L_\rho$ and $U_\omega$.

```cpp
scalarField newGradient (Lrho_ * UomegaNormal());
```

If $H$ is not greater than 0 there can not be evaporation so newGradient is set to 0 (SMALL is a OpenFoam’s constant defined as 1e-6).

```cpp
forAll(newGradient,fi)
{
    if( ha[fi] < SMALL)
    {
        newGradient[fi] = 0;
    }
}
```

At the end, the boundary of EvCoHF is updated as a fixed value boundary condition, using the value of newGradient.

```cpp
fvPatchScalarField::operator=(newGradient);
fixedValueFvPatchScalarField::updateCoeffs();
```

### 2.2.4 Film thickness

The field $H$, which described the film thickness, is used to define in which boundary cells evaporation is possible. This field is null in all the domain except in the boundary with the water film, where evaporation takes place. Here $H$ has the value of the height of the water film. The value of the boundaries of $H$ is updated using the function updateCoeffs(). If the value of $H$ is greater than 0 the evaporation and condensation may occur so the function read the value of $U_\omega$ and the value of $dt$ and with that compute the value of $dh$ using the formula

$$dH = U_\omega \cdot \hat{n} \cdot \frac{\rho_{air}}{\rho_{water}} dt.$$ (2.6)

```cpp
void filmThicknessFvPatchScalarField::updateCoeffs()
{
    Info << "*** updating H " << patch().name()<<endl;

    const fvPatch& p = patch();
    const label & thispatch = p.index();
    vectorField n = p.nf();
    const fvPatchVectorField& U_interface = db().lookupObject<volVectorField>(UName_).boundaryField()[thispatch];
    const fvMesh& mesh = internalField().mesh();
    scalar ratio = 0.001; // rho_air/rho_water
    scalarField dh (this->size());
    forAll(*this,c){
        if ((*this)[c] <= 0) dh[c]=0;
        else dh[c] = (U_interface[c] & n[c])*ratio*mesh.time().deltaT().value();
    }
}
```

Then it updates the value of $H$.

```cpp
scalarField::operator += (dh);
```
Chapter 3

Validation of the simulation approach

3.1 Channel flow settings

For the validation of the model is used the data from a DNS of a turbulent channel flow with a $Re_\tau = 395$, reported by Moser et al.[16]. $Re_\tau$ is the friction Reynolds number, defined as

$$Re_\tau = \frac{u_\tau \delta}{\nu}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

where $u_\tau$ is the friction velocity, defined in in term of wall shear stress $\tau$

$$u_\tau = \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{\rho}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

The DNS is done on a channel flow with dry air without evaporation, to compare that with the simulation done with humidity.

$BuoyantBoussinesquePimpleFoam$ is set to 0 so that there is no buoyancy effect.

In this way, it is possible to validate the dynamical part of the solver, for the validation of the evaporation model were used the wall function proposed by Desouter et al. [8].

The case is an infinite channel between two walls on the top and bottom, perpendicular to the $y$-direction, and a body force along the $x$-direction. The simulation is made in a domain of $2\pi \times 2 \times \pi$, divided in a grid of 50 cells along the $x$ coordinate, 90 along the $y$ and 70 along the $z$.

The coordinate of the $\xi$th cell follows the equation:

$$\vec{x} = \vec{x}(\vec{s}(\xi)).$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.3)

The $s(\xi)$ function change for each direction, along the $x$ and $z$ coordinates the distribution of points is linear:

$$s(\xi) = \frac{\xi}{I}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.4)
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Table 3.1: Parameters used in the simulation of the channel flow for the validation of the model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>3.3e-3 [1/K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{ref}$</td>
<td>297.5 [K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>114.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Pr_t$</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>1.165 [kg/m$^3$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_\tau$</td>
<td>1 [m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>2.53165e-03 [m$^2$/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Sc_t$</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_p$</td>
<td>1.00510$^3$ [J/(kg K)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{ref}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega$</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{ref}$</td>
<td>297.5 [K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>0 [g/s$^2$]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{\omega}$</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{ref}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where $I$ is the number of points along the direction.

In the $y$ coordinate (which is the direction perpendicular to the walls) is used a double-sided hyperbolic stretch, and the $s(\xi)$ function becomes:

$$s(\xi) = 1/2 \left( 1 + \frac{\tanh(\delta (\xi/I - 1/2))}{\tanh(\delta/2)} \right) \quad (3.5)$$

where $\delta$ is a parameter set to 5.

The choice of the grid parameters is so that the first point along the $y$ coordinate is within $y^+ = 1$ and there are 9 points within $y^+ = 10$, where $y^+$ is defined as

$$y^+ = \frac{y u_\tau}{\nu} = y \cdot Re_\tau. \quad (3.6)$$

The distance from two adjacent points in the plus coordinates parallel to the wall (defined analogously to $y^+$) is $\Delta x^+ = 49.6372$, $\Delta z^+ = 17.7276$.

The parameters used for the simulation are shown in table 4.1.5. $u_\tau$ is set to 1 m/s introducing a body force of 1 m/s$^2$. This is possible because the wall shear stress is proportional to the pressure gradient,

$$- \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = \frac{\tau_w}{H}. \quad (3.7)$$

In this case $H = 1 m$, so for the definition of $u_\tau$, (3.2), the value of the body force (F) is equal to the value of $u_\tau^2$:

$$F = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{u_\tau^2 \rho}{H}. \quad (3.8)$$

The initial conditions of velocity, pressure, turbulent viscosity and vapour concentration are set to 0. The temperature on the top wall is set to 285 K and the bottom wall is set to 310 K, while the points inside the domain start from 297.5 K.

The boundary conditions are set cyclic for the lateral boundaries. On the walls, the boundary conditions are set: no slip for the velocity; constant values for the temperature; for the field which described the evaporation are used the boundary condition
Figure 3.1: Computational domain, from top to bottom: the entire domain; the yz face; the xy face; the xz face.
Table 3.2: Parameter used in the turbulence models

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smagorinsky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_k$</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_\epsilon$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_s$</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_w$</td>
<td>0.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

described in Chapter 2; and for the other fields are set to zero gradient.

The case was run with three different turbulence models Smagorinsky, WALE and dynamic Lagrangian, in Table 3.1, are reported the values of the parameters used in the turbulence models.

### 3.2 Validation of turbulence models

The channel flow is a well-known case study for the analysis of turbulent flows near a wall. As shown by Piomelli [21] near the wall the flux is divided into three different layers. For $y^+ < 5$ there is the viscous sublayer, where $U^+$ (which is the mean velocity divided by the friction velocity) have a linear profile. Above the viscous layer, up to about 30 $y^+$, is the buffer layer, where the peak of the kinetic energy is located. Over 30 $y^+$ there is the logarithmic layer where $U^+$ follow a logarithmic profile.

Figure 3.2 shows the profile of $U^+$ of the simulation with the three different turbulence models.

All the data produced by the simulations are averaged over all the domain in the $x$ and $z$ direction, and over 150 time steps of 0.1 s each.

For $y^+ < 5$, the profile is fitted with a linear function:

$$U^+(y^+) = a + by^+$$

with $a = 0.019$ and $b = 0.97$.

For $60 < y^+ < 110$, the profile is fitted with a logarithmic function:

$$U^+(y^+) = c + d \log(y^+)$$

with $c = 5.2$ and $d = 2.5$.

In the viscous layer, the profile of the DNS is well reproduced by the simulations. In the logarithmic layer, where the grid points are further away from each other, there is a greater difference between the simulations profile and the DNS. In the centre of the channel the velocity of the simulations is greater than the DNS, so the turbulent viscosity is underestimated. There could be several causes of the underestimation of
Figure 3.2: Profiles of $U^+$ in function of $y^+$ for the three turbulence models and the DNS, the x-axis is on a logarithmic scale, the fitted lines are plotted in black.
turbulent viscosity, as turbulence plays a fundamental role in channel flow dynamics. Nevertheless, the qualitative behaviour of $u$ is reproduced by the simulations, where the three different layers (viscous, buffer and logarithmic) can be clearly seen.

Figure 3.3 shows the profile along $y$ of the Reynolds stresses diagonal component, $\langle u'^2 \rangle$, comparing the three different turbulence models to the DNS. In the streamwise direction, the Reynolds stresses are an order of magnitude greater than in the other direction, and the turbulence models produce greater Reynolds stresses than the DNS, this is probably due to the underestimation of the turbulent viscosity which produces faster motion with greater fluctuation. In the other directions, there is an underestimate of the Reynolds stresses. The turbulence model which better reproduce the profile is the Smagorinsky which is known to be a high dissipative model so it compensates for the underestimation of viscosity better.

### 3.3 Validation of the evaporation model

In order to test the evaporation model in the running case, the two walls of the channel flow have different temperatures (310K e 285K) and are covered with a film of water in which may occur evaporation and condensation. In the simulation is ignored the buoyancy contribution so $g = 0$. In Figure 3.4 are shown the profile of $\omega$ and $T$, obtained with the Smagorinsky turbulent model, which is the one that better reproduces the dynamic inside the channel. For a turbulent flow over a boundary with an evaporating liquid film, Desouter [8] proposed wall function of the type:

$$y^+ < y_T^+ : \zeta = a_\zeta + b_\zeta y^+ \quad (3.11)$$

$$y^+ > y_T^+ : \zeta = c_\zeta + d_\zeta \log(y^+) \quad (3.12)$$

where $\zeta$ is the concentration of the evaporating fluid (in this case $\omega$) and $y_T^+$ is a threshold value that divides the linear and logarithmic regions.

For $y^+ < 5$ the profile is fitted with a linear function, eq. 3.11, obtaining $a_\zeta = 0.39$ and $b_\zeta = -95 \cdot 10^4$.

For $60 < y^+ < 110$ the profile is fitted with a logarithmic function, eq. 3.12, obtaining $c_\zeta = 0.031$ and $d_\zeta = -0.001$.

Figure 3.4 show the profile of $\omega$ with the two fitting line, in function of $y^+$, the vertical axis is inverted because it is the profile near the bottom wall where the water is evaporating from the hot wall, so $\omega$ decrease with height.

In the same article, Desouter [8] proposed also a wall function for the temperature ($T$) of the type:

$$y^+ < y_T^+ : T = a_T + b_T y^+ \quad (3.13)$$

$$y^+ > y_T^+ : T = c_T + d_T \log(y^+) \quad (3.14)$$
Figure 3.3: Profile along $y$ of the diagonal term of the reynolds stress, for the DNS and the three turbulence models: top $\langle u'u' \rangle$; middle $\langle v'v' \rangle$; bottom $\langle w'w' \rangle$. 
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Figure 3.4: Profile of $T$ (top) and $\omega$ (bottom) in function of $y^+$, the x axis is in logarithmic scale, the fitted lines are plotted in black.
Figure 3.4 shows the profile of the temperature near the bottom wall (the vertical axis is inverted).

The temperature profile is fitted with a linear function, eq. 3.13, for \( y^+ < 5 \) obtaining 
\[
  a_T = 309, \quad b_T = -0.80.
\]
For \( 60 < y^+ < 110 \), the temperature profile is fitted with a logarithmic function, eq 3.14, obtaining 
\[
  c_T = 303 \quad \text{and} \quad d_T = -0.78.
\]
Both the temperature and vapour concentration follow a linear profile in the viscous sublayer, and a logarithmic profile in the logarithmic sublayer.

The model has been validated using the wall functions due to the lack of experimental data or DNS evaporation model. The model correctly reproduced the temperature and vapour behaviour near the wall, so it has correctly reproduced the evaporation from a water film in a turbulent flow.
Chapter 4

Street canyon simulations and results

4.1 Case study description

The case study is an infinite array of urban street canyons. Each canyon consists of two square buildings delimit a road of infinite length, at the center of the road there is an urban channel. Above the canyon, a wind current is imposed perpendicular to it. This simplified setting is intended to reproduce an urban area crossed by a waterbody. The presence of the evaporating waterbody can change the temperature and vapour concentration of the air. Both temperature and vapour concentration are treated as active scalars, which can therefore influence the dynamics of the system.

Two different configurations have been studied: one in which the water temperature is higher than that of the air, and another in which the water is colder than air. The first could represent a nocturnal situation in which the air undergoes rapid cooling due to the cessation of solar radiation while the thermal inertia of the water causes it to remain at a higher temperature. The second could represent a diurnal situation in which rapid heating due to solar radiation causes the air to have higher temperatures than water.

4.1.1 Geometry

Figure 4.1 outlines the geometry of the case. The road and the buildings wide is $W = 1m$ and the buildings high is $H = 1m$. The aspect ratio, which is the ratio between $W$ and $H$, of the canyon is $a = 1$. The streamwise direction, perpendicular to the street, is $x$, the spanwise direction is $y$ and the vertical direction is $z$. $z = 0$ is the plan of the street and $x = 0$ is a plan that cuts one of the two buildings in half along the streamwise direction. The system is symmetrical along the $y$ direction. The computational domain is a parallelepiped starting from the origin $(x = 0, y = 0, z = 0)$ long $2H$ in the streamwise direction, deep $2H$ in the spanwise direction and high $3H$ in the vertical direction. The
Figure 4.1:

The street is located at $0.5 < x/H < 1.5$ and $z/H = 0$. The channel is $0.7m$ wide, located in the middle of the street at $0.65 < x/H < 1.35$ and $z/H = 0$. The boundary conditions on the front plane $y/H = 0$ and the back plane $y/H = 2$ are set cyclic to simulate a system of infinite depth in the spanwise direction. The boundary conditions on the inflow plan $x/H = 0$ and outflow plan $x/H = 2$ are set cyclic to simulate an infinite array of canyons. The top boundary is located at $z/H = 3$.

### 4.1.2 Computational grid

The computational domain is discretised using a grid with 1,592,562 cells. Figure 4.2 shows the computational mesh used. Near the solid surfaces the mesh is denser so that the first cell center is at $y^+ < 1$ (where $y^+$ is computed in the direction normal to the surface).

### 4.1.3 Boundary conditions

The boundary conditions of the velocity field are: no slip for the street, the channel, the buildings surfaces, and fixed at the value $U_0 = (0.2, 0, 0)m/s$ at the top boundary. The boundary conditions of the pressure field are set to zero gradient for the street, the channel, the buildings surfaces and the top boundary. The boundary conditions of the subgrid-scale eddy viscosity are set zero gradient for the street, the channel, the
buildings surfaces and the top boundary. The boundary conditions of the temperature field are set fixed to the value \( T_0 = 25^\circ C \) for the street, the buildings surfaces and the top boundary. For the channel the temperature boundary condition is different for the two configuration: in the hot channel case the temperature is fixed at \( T_{\text{hot}} = 27.5^\circ C \) while in the cold channel case the temperature is fixed at \( T_{\text{cold}} = 22.5^\circ C \). In both configurations, there is an absolute difference of temperature \( \Delta T = 2.5^\circ C \). The boundary conditions of vapour concentration are set at zero gradient for the street and the buildings surfaces, while in the top boundary is fixed at the constant value \( \omega_0 = 0 \). For the channel boundary condition of the vapour concentration is used the boundary condition described in section 2.2.1. The field used for simulate the evaporation: film height, evaporation velocity and evaporation heating flux; are defined only on the channel boundary and the boundary conditions used are described in sections 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4.

### 4.1.4 Initial conditions

Velocity and subgrid-scale eddy viscosity fields fully developed in the same geometry without the presence of the channel and evaporation, are used as initial conditions of that fields. The temperature field initial condition is \( T_0 \) in the entire domain. The vapour concentration field initial condition is \( \omega_0 \) in the entire domain.
4.1.5 Physical parameters

The parameters used in the simulations are shown in Table 4.1.5. From the parameters

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\beta_T & 3.3 \times 10^{-3} & [1/K] & \beta_\omega & 0.63 & - \\
T_0 & 298.15 & [K] & \omega_0 & 0 & - \\
Pr & 2.220 \times 10^{-5} & - & Sc & 3.29 \times 10^{-5} & - \\
Pr_t & 0.7 & - & Sc_t & 0.7 & - \\
\rho & 1.165 & [kg/m^3] & c_p & 1.005 \times 10^3 & [J/(kg K)] \\
g & 9.81 & [m/s^2] & \nu & 1.568 \times 10^{-5} & [m^2/s] \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Table 4.1: Parameters used in the simulation of the street canyon

used is possible to define some non-dimensional numbers in order to describe the dynamical and thermal regimes of the simulations. The turbulent state of the air is described by the Reynolds number, which is computed using the air viscosity, the wind velocity at the top of the domain and the building height (H):

\[
Re = \frac{U_0 H}{\nu}.
\]  

In that simulations, the \( Re = 2.0 \times 10^4 \) which is smaller than the normal atmospheric value (it is used smaller building and velocity), however, as Lup Wai et al. [4] have shown, the canyons with aspect ratio \( a = 1 \) are independent of \( Re \) for \( Re > 12,000 \).

The Reynolds number does not take into account the thermal effect and the natural convection produced by the buoyancy due to the temperature and moisture. To describe the thermal contribution in the natural convection is used the Grashof number:

\[
Gr_T = \frac{g \beta_T \Delta T H^3}{\nu^2}.
\]  

That definition of \( Gr_T \) takes into account only the thermal contribution to the natural convection. In that simulations also \( \omega \) contributes to the buoyancy. The \( \omega \) difference (\( \Delta \omega \)) in the system is estimated using the difference between \( \omega \) value at saturation at \( T_0 \), \( \omega_s = 0.02 \), and \( \omega_0 \). Than the Grashof number for the vapour concentration contribution may be defined as:

\[
Gr_\omega = \frac{g \beta_\omega \Delta \omega H^3}{\nu^2}.
\]  

From the Reynolds and the Grashof numbers is possible to compute the Richardson number, which describes the ratio of the buoyancy and inertial terms:

\[
Ri = \frac{g \left( \beta_T \Delta T + \beta_\omega \omega_0 \right) H}{U_0^2} = \frac{Gr_T + Gr_\omega}{Re^2}.
\]
Three different convection regimes are defined by the Richardson number: for $Ri \ll 1$ there is the forced convection regime, where the flow is driven by the inertial force, and natural convection is suppressed; for $Ri \gg 1$ there is the free convection regime, where dominates the buoyancy force; for $Ri \sim 1$ there is the mixed convection regime, where both buoyance and inertial therm are significant.

In that simulations $Gr_T = 8.2 \cdot 10^8$ and $Gr_\omega = 5.5 \cdot 10^8$, so the $Ri = 3.4$ so the contribution from inertial and buoyancy therm are both important to determine the evolution of the flow.

4.1.6 Numerical

The simulations are performed using the program humidityBuoyantBoussinesquePimpleFoam which is described in chapter 2. As turbulence model is used the Smagorinsky, which has produced better results in the validation reported in chapter 3. The maximum Courant number used is $C_{o,\max} = 0.5$. For the time derivative is used the OpenFOAM scheme backward which is a second order implicit scheme. For the spatial derivatives (gradients, divergences and laplacians) is used the OpenFOAM scheme Gauss linear, wich is a finite volume discretisation scheme which use a linear interpolation to compute the values at the faces centres from the cells centres.

4.2 First order statistic

In the following section are reported the results of the simulations for the two different configurations: the hot channel case, where the channel has a temperature of 27.5°C; and the cold channel case where the channel has a temperature of 22.5°C. The data of a simulation made by Cintolesi et al. [5], computed using the same geometry and parameters but in isothermal condition and withot the evaporating channel are also reported. This last case without the channel is used as referrence to investigate the impact of the channel.

All the data are averaged on all the cells in the spanwise direction along which the dynamic system is invariant. The time average is computed on 300 time steps of 1 s each.

The cases are described divinding it into four regions: the pedestrian region for $z/H < 0.2$; the internal region for $0.2 < z/H < 0.8$; the interface region for $0.8 < z/H < 1$; and the external region for $z/H > 1$.

4.2.1 Velocity field

For each case, the magnitude of the velocity field will be shown on a vertical section perpendicular to the spanwise direction, and the profiles of velocity components along
three vertical lines. Each velocity is divided by the velocity at the top of the domain $U_0$ and the each length is divided by the height of the buildings $H$, to make that non-dimensional. Figure 4.3 shows the streamlines of the velocity field and the magnitude of the velocity in the canyon, for the three cases: hot channel, cold channel and without channel. In the case without the channel, the dynamic inside the canyon is dominated by the main vortex with three smaller vortices at the bottom-right, bottom-left and top-left, which rotate in the opposite direction to the main vortex. This configuration is typical of the urban canyons with an aspect ratio of 1 and the forcing of the upper wind [18]. In the two cases with the channel, the general dynamics is similar to the case without channel, with higher horizontal velocity in the pedestrian and interface regions for $0.8 < x/H < 1.2$, and higher vertical velocity in the interface region near the walls, $x/H < 0.7$ and $x/H > 1.3$. This show that the contribution of vapour concentration to the buoyancy (that will be shown is following sections) increase the intensity of the main vortex. In the cold channel case, the corner vortex at the top left does not develop.

Figure 4.4 displays the vertical profiles of the mean adimensional horizontal velocity for three different values of $x$, the first is halfway between the left wall and the channel at $x/H = 0.575$, the second is at the centre of the canyon at $x/H = 1$, the third is halfway the channel and the right wall at $x/H = 1.425$. The second profile is over the channel, while the others two are outside it. Overall, in the lower part of the canyon $z/H < 0.5$, all the cases exhibit horizontal motion in an opposite direction than the outside stream. In the higher part of the canyon, $0.5 < z/H < 1$, there are horizontal motion streamward, which become more intense in the external regions $z/H > 1$. In the hot channel case, are developed more intense velocities than the other cases, in particular in the pedestrian and the interface regions. In the left and right profiles over the floor at $x/H < 0.05$, the hot channel case, shows areas of positive velocity related to the presence of secondary vortex. In the right profile at $0.7 < z/H < 1$, the hot channel case shows values that tend to zero, this is due to the right side of the top left vortex which is intersected from the line $x/H = 0.575$. In the cold channel case, in the pedestrian and interface regions, the velocities are more intense than the case without the channel but lesser than the hot channel case. In the right profile under $x/H = 0.1$ there are positive values due to the bottom right vortex. Outside the canyon, the velocity of the hot channel and the cold channel cases are similar and are both greater than the case without the channel, so the vapour concentration increases the horizontal velocity also in the region outside the canyon.

Figure 4.5 shows the profiles of the vertical velocity, for the same lines of the previous figure. All the cases exhibit the same qualitative behaviour, with high velocity in the internal region near the wall, and almost zero velocity in the middle of the canyon ($x = 1$) and outside the canyon. This is due to the main vortex, which has an upstream along the left wall, and a downstream along the right wall. The hot and cold channel cases have greater velocity near the lateral walls than the case without the channel due to the buoyancy produced by $\omega$ which will be shown in following sections. So higher value of
Figure 4.3: Stream lines (black lines), and magnitude values (background color) of the velocity fields, from top to bottom: the case without the channel; the hot channel case; the cold channel case.
Figure 4.4: Vertical profiles of orizzontal mean adimensional velocity for the three cases: hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines), without channel (green lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
Figure 4.5: Vertical profiles of vertical mean adimensional velocity for the three cases: hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines), without channel (green lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).

Vapour concentration increase the upstream current and then the circulation of the main vortex producing higher velocity inside the canyon.
4.2.2 Temperature field

The temperature field is made non-dimensional subtracting the initial environment temperature, $T_0$, and dividing for the absolute value of the difference between the channel temperature and $T_0$.

$$ T^* = \frac{(T - T_0)}{\Delta T} \quad (4.5) $$

Figure 4.6 shows the values of the temperature inside the canyons for the hot and cold channel cases. In both cases there is a strong gradient immediately over the channel, due to the cooling effect of the evaporation, then the cold air is transported along the left wall by the upstream and diffused over the whole domain, where have uniform values. There is no positive value, so in both cases the presence of the channel produce a cooling effect on the environmental temperature. In all the domain, the cold channel case shows lower values than the hot channel case.

Figure 4.7 displays the profiles of T for the two cases with the channel at the same values of $x/H$ used in the previous section. In the central profile, over the channel $z/H \simeq 0$, both cases show temperature colder than the initial temperature $T_0$. This means that also in the case with the hot channel the temperature sink in equation (1.5) due to the evaporation, dominates over the diffusive term. This produces a discontinuity with the boundary, where the temperature is set constant at the channel temperature, and the first computational cell, where the sink therm produces colder temperatures. That discontinuity is not physical and it is due to the model hypothesis used. In the rest of the domain, the impact of this effect should be reduced by the coupling of temperature and momentum equations. In the hot channel case the cooling effect of the evaporation in opposed to the heating effect of the channel temperature. This produce difference between 2-3% of $\Delta T$ from the starting temperature $T_0$. In the central profile, the cold channel case shows values $T^* < -1$ near the water surface. This is due to the evaporation which cooled the air below the channel temperature $T_{cold}^* = -1$. In the left profile the cold channel case shows lower temperatures than the right profile, this is due to the main vortex which transport cold air from over the channel to the updraft near the left wall. Inside the canyon, the cold channel case shows a difference between 10-20% of $\Delta T$ from the starting temperature $T_0$. Outside the canyon, the cold channel case shows a uniform difference of 7.5% of $\Delta T$ from the starting temperature $T_0$, so the presence of the cannel impact also the temperature outside the canyon.
Figure 4.6: Values of the temperature fields of the hot channel case (top), and the cold channel case (bottom).
Figure 4.7: Vertical profiles of adimensional temperature for the two cases: hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.2.3 Vapour concentration

The values of the vapour concentration field are divided to the vapour concentration at saturation $\omega_s$ at the temperature $T_0$, to made it non-dimensional.

$$\omega^* = \frac{\langle \omega \rangle}{\omega_s}$$ (4.6)

Figure 4.8 shows the vapour concentration distribution in the domain for the two cases with the channel. Overall, all the cases exhibit the highest values near the water surface, where the air is at saturation. On the rest of the domain the fields shows a rapid decrease, with higher values along the upstream near the left wall. The spatial distribution of the vapour concentration is qualitatively similar to the distribution of temperature, except in contact with the street and buildings surfaces, where the different boundary conditions show different behaviour.

Figure 4.9 shows the profiles of $\omega$ for three different values of $x/H$ used also in the previous sections. In the central profile, immediately over the channel, both the cases shows values $\omega^* \approx 1$ because in contact with the water the air is at saturation, then the profiles rapidly decrease due to the advection and turbulent diffusion. In the internal region and in the interface region, the values of $\omega^*$, are uniform along the vertical, and higher in the left profiles than the right ones. Outside the canyon, both the cases shows uniform values smaller than that inside the canyon. In the left profile, where the values of $\omega^*$ inside the canyon are greater, the difference with values of the external region is greater than the other profile than the other two profiles. In all the profiles, the hot channel case show greater values of vapour concentration than the cold channel case. The warmer temperature of the channel produces more evaporation, than the vapour concentration is diffused from the motion producing higher values on the entire domain.
Figure 4.8: Values of the vapour concentration fields of the hot channel case (top), and the cold channel case (bottom).
Figure 4.9: Vertical profiles of vapour concentration for the two cases: hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.2.4 Buoyancy force

The buoyancy force \((\rho/\rho_0)g\) is divided by \(g\) to made it non-dimensional. As show in equations (1.2) and (1.4), the buoyancy force depends on both temperature and vapour concentration. Only the vertical component of the buoyancy force is not zero, so only that component will be discussed in this section. Figure 4.10 displays the values of the buoyancy force in the two cases with the channel. As shown in section 4.2.2, the difference between the hot channel case temperatures and the initial temperature \(T_0\) are of the order of 2-3\% \(\Delta T\). Section 4.2.3 show that the hot channel case have high values of vapour concentration. The high vapour concentration and low temperature values means that the buoyancy force, in the hot channel case, is possibly dominated by the \(\omega\) contribution. The cold channel case show lower values of the buoyancy force, than the hot channel case. That case show high buoyancy values in contact with the left wall. This effect is probably due to the different idealized boundary conditions used for the temperature and vapour concentration fields. Indeed the temperature on the left building surface is set constant to \(T_0\), while vapour concentration field has a zero gradient boundary condition. These high buoyancy values concentrated in a small region in contact with the wall \(0.50 < x < 0.52/H\), could be the cause of the absence of the top left corner vortex in the cold channel case in Figure 4.3.

Figure 4.11 shows the vertical profiles of the buoyancy for the two cases with the channel at the values of \(x/H\) used in the previous sections. All the profiles shows uniform values in the internal and external region, in according with the profile of \(T\) and \(\omega\) reported in Figure 4.7 and 4.9. The hot channel case show higher values in the left profile than the right profile. So in the left side, the buoyancy reduce the gravitational acceleration increasing the intensity of the updraft and the whole main vortex, as shown in section 4.2.1. The cold channel case, in the internal region, does not shows difference from left and right profiles. As shown previously in Figure 4.10, in that case the high values of buoyancy wich may contribute to the main vortex dynamics, are confined in a small region. That region does not intersect the line along which the profile are computed \(x/H = 0.575\), except at \(z/H = 1\) where the high buoyancy regions is deviated rightward by the external stream. At this height the left profile shows a peak of buoyancy.
Figure 4.10: Values of the buoyancy force fields of the hot channel case (top), and the cold channel case (bottom).
Figure 4.11: Vertical profiles of buoyancy force for the two cases: hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.3 Second order statistic

4.3.1 Streamwise velocity variance

The streamwise velocity variance fields will be discussed in this section. For all the cases, the averaged field will be shown on a vertical section perpendicular to $y$, and the profiles of variances along three vertical lines. Each value is made non-dimensional dividing by $U_0^2$.

Figure 4.12 displays the values of the variances of streamwise components of the normalized velocity. In all the cases there are high values of variance immediately over the interface region, $1 < z/H < 1.1$. In the hot channel case, there are also high values in the pedestrian level at the left side of the channel, $0.6 < x/H < 0.8$. In the cold channel case, the peak over the interface region is shifted towards the right side of the canyon, $x/H > 1$.

Figure 4.13 shows the profile of $\langle u'u' \rangle /U_0^2$ for three different values of $x/H$ for the three cases with hot and cold channel and without channel. All the profiles show their maximums over the interface region at $1 < z/H < 1.1$. In the hot channel case, the profile near the left wall shows a secondary peak in the pedestrian region, this peak is evident also in the other profiles of the same case, but with lower intensity. In the cold channel case, the variances are lesser intense than the hot channel case except the peak over the interface in the middle and right profiles, that shows higher values then the hot channel case. In both cases with the channel, the variances are greater than the case without the channel, so the increase of vapour concentration and buoyancy produce more fluctuations in the streamwise velocity.
Figure 4.12: Values of the fields of variances of streamwise velocities, from top to bottom: the case without the channel; the hot channel case; the cold channel case.
Figure 4.13: Vertical profiles of streamwise velocity variance for the three cases: without the channel (green lines), hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.3.2 Spanwise velocity variance

The spanwise velocity variance fields has divided by $U_0^2$ to made it non-dimensional. Figure 4.14 shows the values of the spanwise normalized velocity variance, for the three cases.

In all the cases there is a maximum variance in the interface region near the right wall. In the cases with the channel, there is a secondary peak of variance, more evident in the hot channel case, immediately over the right side of the channel at $1.2 < x/H < 1.4$.

Figure 4.15 displays the profiles of the normalized spanwise velocity variance, for three different values of $x/H$. The profiles show two main peaks, one over the interface region, which is greater in the left profile, and one in the pedestrian region which have higher values in the right profile. The vertical line along the profile are plotted does not intersect the peak in the interface region near the right wall, which cannot be seen in the graphs.

The hot channel case shows higher values of the variance than the cold channel case, which have greater values than the case without channel, this suggest the contribution of vapour concentration and so of buoyancy force in the increase of velocity variance.
Figure 4.14: Values of the fields of variances of spnawise velocities, from top to bottom: the case without the channel; the hot channel case; the cold channel case.
Figure 4.15: Vertical profiles of spanwise velocity variance for the three cases: without the channel (green lines), hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.3.3 Vertical velocity variance

The vertical velocity variance fields has divided by $U_0^2$ to made it non-dimensional. Figure 4.16 displays the value of normalized vertical velocity variance. In all the cases there are high values on the left side of the canyon at $x/H < 1.3$.

In the case without the channel, the peak on the right side is located between the interface and internal regions at $0.7 < z/H < 0.9$, where the horizontal motion are deflected inside the canyon.

In the hot channel case, the peak near the right wall is shifted down between internal and pedestrian regions at $0.05 < z/H < 0.45$. There are also high values of variance on the left side of the interface region. That difference may be due to the higher vertical velocity which produces more variances where the updraft and downdraft change the direction of motion.

In the cold channel case, the right peak of variances is located in the internal and pedestrian region near the right wall at $0.1 < z/H < 0.8$, which is at a greater height than the hot channel case, where the vertical motions are stronger, and a lower height than the case without channel where the vertical motions are weaker.

Figure 4.17 shows the vertical profiles of the variances of the vertical velocity for three different points along the x axis.

In the hot channel case, there is the main peak near the right wall in the pedestrian region, and a secondary peak near the left wall in the interface region.

In the cold channel case, there is only one peak at the bottom of the internal region ($z/H < 0.3$) of less intensity than the hot channel case.

In both the cases with the channel, the values are greater than the case without the channel, also in the region outside the channel, showing the contribution of buoyancy in the production of variances of vertical velocity.
Figure 4.16: Values of the fields of variances of vertical velocities, from top to bottom: the case without the channel; the hot channel case; the cold channel case.
Figure 4.17: Vertical profiles of vertical velocity variance for the three cases: without the channel (green lines), hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.3.4 Turbulent kinetic energy

In this section, the turbulent kinetic energy field will be discussed. The turbulent kinetic energy is defined as the sum of the variances of the three velocity component divided by 2, in this analysis the TKE will be divided by $U_0^2$ to make it non-dimensional:

$$TKE = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle u'^2 \rangle + \langle v'^2 \rangle + \langle w'^2 \rangle}{U_0^2}. \quad (4.7)$$

Figure 4.18 shows the vertical sections of the mean TKE spatial distribution, for the three cases: without the channel, with the hot channel and with the cold channel. All the cases show high values over the canyon at $1 < z/H < 1.1$. In the case without the channel, there are high-values in the top right corner of the canyon, until a height of $z/H > 0.8$. In the cold channel case values are higher than the previous, and the high value region near the right wall extends along the entire internal region, $z/H > 0.2$. In the hot channel case, the values are higher than the other cases, and the regions of high values extend on all the left side and continue leftward in the pedestrian region following the main vortex. The presence of the channel produces so higher turbulent motion, more intense in the hot channel case where buoyancy is stronger.

Figure 4.19 displays the profiles of the normalized turbulent kinetic energy, for three different values of $x/H$. The profiles in the different parts of the domain show similar behaviour, with high value in the pedestrian region and immediately over the interface. In the pedestrian region, the hot and cold channel cases show a peak that is greater near the right wall. Over the interface at $1 < z/H < 1.1$, all the cases have peaks in all the profiles, showing that in this region, the interaction between the main vortex and the external current produce turbulent motions. In all three profiles, the hot channel case have greater turbulent kinetic energy than the cold channel case which is greater than the case without channel. This show a strong contribution of buoyancy produced by vapour concentration in the production of turbulent motion in all the domain, also in the regions where the increasing of the medium velocity is not evident or absent.
Figure 4.18: Values of the fields of turbulent kinetic energy, from top to bottom: the case without the channel; the hot channel case; the cold channel case.
Figure 4.19: Vertical profiles of turbulent kinetic energy for the three cases: without the channel (green lines), hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.3.5 Covariance of horizontal and vertical velocity

Following the turbulent-viscosity hypotheses (for reference see [22]) the covariance of vertical and horizontal velocity may be interpreted as turbulent fluxes of momentum that may be modelled by the gradients of the mean velocity:

\[
\langle u'v' \rangle \simeq -\nu_t \left( \frac{\partial \langle u \rangle}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \langle v \rangle}{\partial x} \right)
\]  

(4.8)

For all the cases, the averaged field will be shown on a vertical section perpendicular to \( y \), and the profiles of temperature along three vertical lines. Each value is adimensionalized dividing by \( U_0^2 \).

Figure 4.20 shows the values of covariance of horizontal and vertical velocity. In all the case immediately over the interface, there are high negative values, in these regions the vertical motion are weak so using eq. (4.8), it may be interpreted as a transmission of horizontal momentum upward, from the main vortex to the region outside the canyon. In the cases with the channel, where the vertical motion is stronger, the peak in the right side is shifted downward at \( z/H = 0.1 \). The peaks in the bottom right corner and the peak that the hot channel case show in the top left corner are difficult to interpret due to the complex dynamics in that region characterized by a strong gradient in both vertical and horizontal direction and the presence of secondary vortex that affect the motion.

Figure 4.21 displays the covariance of horizontal and vertical velocity for three different value of \( x/H \). The negative peak over the interface is evident in all the profiles. The hot channel case show two positive peaks one in the right profile in the pedestrian region, and the other in the left profile in the interface region. All the features of the profile are stronger in the cases with the channel than the case without it, showing the contribution of vapour concentration in increasing the turbulent fluxes of momentum.
Figure 4.20: Values of the fields of covariances of streamwise and vertical velocities, from top to bottom: the case without the channel; the hot channel case; the cold channel case.
Figure 4.21: Vertical profiles of covariance of streamwise and vertical velocity for the three cases: without the channel (green lines), hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.3.6 Horizontal temperature turbulent fluxes

Following the gradient-diffusion hypothesis (for reference see [22]) the covariance of velocity and a general scalar $\phi$ may be interpreted as turbulent fluxes of that scalar that may be modelled by the gradients of the mean quantity:

$$\langle u'_i \phi' \rangle \simeq -\alpha_t \left( \frac{\partial \langle \phi \rangle}{\partial x_i} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.9)

This may be used to interpret the temperature fluxes, using $T$ instead of $\phi$. Each value is adimensionalized dividing by $U_0 \Delta T$. Figure 4.22 shows the values of the covariance of horizontal velocity and temperature. The hot channel case does not show any feature except immediately over the channel and immediately over the floor at the left side of the channel. In the cold channel case, the regions of negative and positive fluxes over the channel and the floor are more evident. There are also highly positive values over the canyon at $0.6 < x/H < 1.3$.

Figure 4.23 displays the profiles of the covariance of horizontal velocity and temperature. Over the channel, in the central profile, in both cases the fluxes are negative and of similar intensity, which means cold air is transported leftward. In the internal region, the profiles are almost uniform. In the hot channel case near the bottom boundary in the left plot, the profile rapidly changes from negative to positive values, it is difficult to say if it is due to the secondary vortex or to the change in the boundary condition from the channel to the floor. In the cold channel case over the interface, there is a peak of positive value, more intense in central and right profiles, which means that the turbulent fluxes are cooling the region outside the canyon.
Figure 4.22: Values of the fields of covariances of streamwise velocities and temperatures, of the hot channel case (top), and cold channel case (bottom).
Figure 4.23: Vertical profiles of covariance of streamwise velocity and temperature for the two cases: hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.3.7 Vertical temperature fluxes

The covariance of vertical velocity and temperature will be discussed in this section. Using the eq. (4.9) the vertical turbulent fluxes may be interpreted as a diffusion of temperature along the vertical direction. Each value is adimensionalized dividing by $U_0 \Delta T$.

Figure 4.24 shows the values of covariance of vertical velocity and temperature. In the hot channel case the main gradients are located over the bottom boundary on the left side of the channel, $0.6 < x/H < 0.8$. In the cold channel case, there are negative values over the canyon at $z/H = 1$, so the turbulent fluxes are cooling the outside regions. In the pedestrian region, there are negative values due to the cooling effect of the channel which produces turbulent fluxes that cool the upper air. In the pedestrian region at the corners, $x/H < 0.6$ and $x/H > 1.5$, there are small regions of positive values, in which the air is cooled downward, possibly related to the corner vortex.

Figure 4.25 shows the profiles of adimensional turbulent vertical thermal fluxes, for three different points of $x/H$. In the hot channel case, in the central profile, there is a negative peak over the channel at $z/H < 0.1$, that describes the cooling of the upper air from the channel, in the internal regions the fluxes are not appreciable, at $z/H = 1$ there are negative values meaning the turbulent fluxes are cooling upward. In the left profile in the lower pedestrian region, at $z/H < 0.1$ there are high positive values which describe the turbulent fluxes are cooling downward and it is possibly due to the bottom left vortex. In the cold channel case, all the profiles show negative values at $z/H = 1$, meaning that the turbulent fluxes are cooling upward the air outside the canyon. In the internal region, there are negative values in the left and right profiles, so the turbulent fluxes are cooling the air upward. In the pedestrian region in the central profile, there are negative values showing the cooling effect of the channel on the upper air.
Figure 4.24: Values of the fields of covariances of vertical velocities and temperatures, of the hot channel case (top), and cold channel case (bottom).
Figure 4.25: Vertical profiles of covariance of vertical velocity and temperature for the two cases: hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.3.8 Horizontal vapour concentration fluxes

Using the eq. (4.9) the horizontal turbulent fluxes may be interpreted as a diffusion of the vapour concentration along the $x$ direction. For all the cases, the averaged field will be shown on a vertical section perpendicular to $y$, and the profiles of covariance along three vertical lines. Covariance of horizontal velocity and $\omega$ is made non-dimensional dividing it by $U_0\omega_s$.

Figure 4.26 shows the values of turbulent adimensionalized horizontal fluxes. Over the interface, in both cases, there is a region with high negative values, which shows a streamwise transport of humidity into the external region due to the turbulent motions. In both cases, over the channel, there are positive values of turbulent fluxes, which means that humidity is transported leftward. In both bottom corners, in the cold channel case, and the left bottom corners, in the hot channel case, there are small regions of negative values, that may be related to the secondary vortex, in the velocity field.

Figure 4.27 displays the profiles of turbulent adimensional horizontal fluxes of $\omega$ for three different values of $x/H$. In all the profiles are evident the negative peak over the interface, in both cases. In the central profile, there is a positive peak immediately over the channel, which is more intense in the hot channel case due to the higher evaporation. In both cases, in the lateral profiles, at the bottom of the pedestrian region, there are small negative profiles. In the hot channel case, the left bottom peak is greater than the right one.
Figure 4.26: Values of the fields of covariances of streamwise velocities and vapour concentrations, of the hot channel case (top), and cold channel case (bottom).
Figure 4.27: Vertical profiles of covariance of streamwise velocity and vapour concentration for the two cases: hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
4.3.9 Vertical vapour concentration fluxes

The covariance of the vertical velocity component and $\omega$ has divided by $U_0\omega_s$ to make it non-dimensional. Using the eq. (4.9) the vertical turbulent fluxes may be interpreted as a diffusion of the vapour concentration along the $z$ direction.

Figure 4.28 shows the values of adimensional turbulent vertical fluxes of $\omega$. In the hot channel case, there are two regions of high positive flux, one over the interface, and the other over the channel spreading along the updraft. In the cold channel case, the regions with the higher fluxes are the region over the interface, and the internal region near the right wall spreading leftward on the downdraft. The positive values are one order of magnitude greater than the negative values, showing that upward diffusion of moisture dominates the entire system.

Figure 4.29 shows the profiles of adimensional turbulent vertical humidity fluxes for three different values of $x/H$. Near the left wall, both the profiles have positive values all along the canyon, which are greater in the hot channel case. In the central profile, there are two peaks, one at $z/H = 1$ where the humidity is transported to the drier external air, the other over the channel where water evaporates upward. The profiles near the right wall show different behaviour, in the hot channel case, the peak is over the interface, while in the cold channel case the peak is between the internal and pedestrian region.
Figure 4.28: Values of the fields of covariances of vertical velocities and vapour concentrations, of the hot channel case (top), and cold channel case (bottom).
Figure 4.29: Vertical profiles of covariance of vertical velocity and vapour concentration for the two cases: hot channel (red lines), cold channel (blue lines); for three different position: near the left wall (left plot), centre of the canyon (middle plot), near the right wall (right plot).
Chapter 5

Conclusions

The present work has shown the impact of an evaporating waterbody in an urban canyon. This phenomenon has been investigated through numerical simulation using a computational fluid dynamic (CFD) model. A large-eddy simulation (LES) has been chosen as numerical approach, to resolve the evolution of the system by modeling the small scale motions. The model resolves the equations of motion in Boussinesq approximation and the equations of advection and diffusion of temperature and vapour concentration. An evaporation model which describes the evaporation from a water film has been chosen and implemented in the fluid dynamic model. Due to the lack of experimental data to validate the model, it has been tested on a turbulent channel flow with $Re_{\tau} = 395$, with different turbulence models. The Smagorinsky model gave the best results and is used in the subsequent simulations. The model is then used in the simulation of an urban street canyon of aspect ratio $H/W = 1$, with $H$ height of the buildings and $W$ width of the street. In the centre of the canyon, an evaporating channel has been placed. Two simulations are performed, with two different channel temperature, one higher than the air temperature and the other lower. The large-eddy simulation approach has permitted to observe the spatial distributions of the mean and turbulent variables.

The results of the simulations show strong interaction between the mechanical and thermodynamical variables. The main vortex developed inside the canyon diffuses the temperature and vapour concentration inside the canyon, and the buoyancy due to the vapour concentration increases the intensity of the vortex. In the hot channel case, the high water temperature has produced high evaporation and so high vapour concentration values in the system. This caused an increase of up to 375% in the horizontal velocity values and up to 300% in the vertical velocity values, these percentages have been computed comparing the maximum velocity values in various regions to the values of the case without the channel. In the cold channel case the colder temperature values and lower vapour concentrations have produced weaker effect on the buoyancy, than the previous case, reaching a maximum increase of 130% on the horizontal velocities and of 160% in the vertical velocities. In both cases the presence of the channel has reduced the tem-
perature in the whole domain. In the hot channel case, where the cooling effect of the evaporation opposes the warming effect of thermal diffusion, the temperature reduction was 2-3% of the difference between the channel temperature and the initial air temperature. In the cold channel case, where the cooling effect was greater, the temperature reduction was 10-20% inside the canyon and 7.5% outside. Also the turbulence variables have been changed by the presence of the evaporation. The turbulent kinetic energy in both cases shows higher values than the case without the channel. Turbulent fluxes of momentum show higher values than the case without channel, in particular near the interface between the canyon and the external air, vertical turbulent fluxes of vapour show high values on the left side of the interface. This is particularly interesting because usually, in street canyons, that is a region with high pollutant concentration. So, high turbulence fluxes could contribute to diffuse the pollutant to outside the canyon and reduce the internal concentration.

This work has some limitation due to the model hypothesis used and the simplified setting. The temperature discontinuity on the channel surface may be resolved implementing a model which couples the temperature of the channel to the air temperature. The cold channel case shows the dependence of the buoyancy fields from the boundary conditions of the left building wall, further simulation may study that dependence using different boundary condition and taking in account other physical property of the building facades. The model could be validated using laboratory or scale model data, simulating more complex geometry.
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