

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ecss

Highlights

Improved modeling of the role of mangroves in storm surge	Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science xxx (xxxx) xxx
attenuation	
Qiang Chen, Yuepeng Li [*] , David M. Kelly, Keqi Zhang, Brian Zachry, Jamie Rhome	
• Mangrove effects on storm surge modeled by a porosity plus drag force (PDB) method.	
• Both small scale and landscape scale mangrove tree characteristics are important.	
• The PDB method outperforms the conventional Manning coefficient method (MBF).	
 Mangroves cause 18 to 24 cm/km decay rate of storm surge peaks. 	
• Short mangroves (height less than 4 m) may attenuate storm surges better than tall one	s.
· · · ·	
 Both small scale and landscape scale mangrove tree characteristics are important. The PDB method outperforms the conventional Manning coefficient method (MBF). Mangroves cause 18 to 24 cm/km decay rate of storm surge peaks. Short mangroves (height less than 4 m) may attenuate storm surges better than tall one 	s.

Graphical abstract and Research highlights will be displayed in online search result lists, the online contents list and the online article, but will not appear in the article PDF file or print unless it is mentioned in the journal specific style requirement. They are displayed in the proof pdf for review purpose only.



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science



21

22

23

24

25

26

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ecss

Improved modeling of the role of mangroves in storm surge attenuation

Qiang Chen^a, Yuepeng Li^{a,*}, David M. Kelly^b, Keqi Zhang^a, Brian Zachry^c, Jamie Rhome^c

^a Coastal Research Lab., International Hurricane Research Center, Florida International University, Miami, FL, 33199, USA

^b Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (CEFAS), Lowestoft, NR33 OHT, UK

^c National Hurricane Center, National Weather Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Miami, FL, 33165, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Storm surge Mangrove Nature-based infrastructure Hurricane Wilma (2005) Manning coefficient Drag force

ABSTRACT

Mangroves have been proven to be effective in storm surge attenuation but it remains an important challenge to accurately quantify such bio-shielding effects using numerical simulations, as it is very difficult to comprehensively represent the ecological characteristics of mangroves at both large and small scales. In this study, a numerical method is developed and implemented in the Coastal and Estuarine Storm Tide (CEST) model in order to investigate the attenuation effect of mangroves on storm surge. This numerical method employs an improved drag force formula, which involves the development of new abstract tree models and use of a landscape scale data map of mean mangrove tree height for the study area. The storm surge observed in the South Florida mangrove zone caused by Hurricane Wilma (2005) is used to verify the numerical model. The numerical results indicate a maximum surge of approximately 4.3 m, and a decay rate of peak storm surge height of approximately 18 cm/km across the areas with a mixture of mangrove islands and open water, and nearly 24 cm/km through areas with dense mangrove forest. Results also show that short mangroves (< 4 m) can outperform tall mangroves on surge attenuation when the water depth is low (< 4 m). Extensive comparisons are also made with the conventional Manning coefficient based method that incorporates the mangrove drag force into bed friction; it is found that the current method predicts better inundation extents for Wilma (2005), hence a more accurate quantification of the attenuation of storm surge due to mangroves.

1. Introduction

1

7

q

11

14

17

2 Mangrove forests, as a sustainable and ecological alternative to 3 conventional coastal engineering defenses, protect human lives and in-4 frastructures from not only the damaging winds induced by hurricanes 5 but also currents and waves such as storm surge and tsunami (Tanaka et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2012; Tanaka, 2009; Teh et al., 2009; Xu 6 et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2013; Temmerman et al., 2013; Rodríguez 8 et al., 2017; Sheng and Zou, 2017; Iimura and Tanaka, 2012). Mangroves can significantly dissipate wind-generated short-period waves in 10 a few hundred meters into the forest (Horstman et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2020), but need much longer distance (in kilometers) to re-12 duce long-period waves such as storm surge (Xu et al., 2010; Zhang 13 et al., 2012). Currently, accurate quantification of mangrove effects on storm surge propagation still remains a challenging topic of practical 15 interests. Research efforts on this include field survey (Smith et al., 16 2009; Krauss et al., 2009), physical modeling (Iimura and Tanaka, 2012; Tomiczek et al., 2020), and numerical modeling (Xu et al., 2010; 18 Zhang et al., 2012). While field survey and physical modeling are 19 very expensive, time-consuming and site-limited, numerical modeling 20 as a cost-effective and reliable solution has become more and more popular (Wu et al., 2001; Zhang et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2013; Iimura and Tanaka, 2012; Wu and Marsooli, 2012; Rodríguez et al., 2017; Sheng and Zou, 2017; Teh et al., 2009; Xu et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2013). Numerical models that resolve atmosphere-ocean-coast interactions would provide a powerful, low-cost, and flexible tool for the designing and management of mangrove zones against real-world storm surges.

For numerical modeling, typical approaches for handling mangrove-27 fluid interactions fall into two categories: (1) estimate the drag force 28 by mangroves to the flows via the Manning coefficient based bed 29 friction force (Liu et al., 2013; Rodríguez et al., 2017; Xu et al., 2010; 30 Zhang et al., 2012, 2013), and (2) treat mangroves as vertical cylinders 31 (or similar assumptions) informed by mangrove characteristics, and 32 consider the volume exclusion term (owing to partial occupation of 33 the flow space by mangroves) and mangrove hydrodynamic impact 34 based on the Morison's equation (or its variants) (Mazda et al., 1997; 35 Wu et al., 2001; Teh et al., 2009; Wu and Marsooli, 2012; Iimura 36 and Tanaka, 2012). Despite being physically unjustified, the Manning 37 coefficient based method is feasible and easy to implement, and has 38 achieved reasonable performance since both the drag force and the 39 bed friction force share the same quadratic relationship with flow 40

Corresponding author. E-mail addresses: qchen@fiu.edu (Q. Chen), yuepli@fiu.edu (Y. Li).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2021.107515

Received 22 February 2021; Received in revised form 15 July 2021; Accepted 20 July 2021



Fig. 1. The study area, with the basin for the numerical model and the measurement locations for Hurricane Wilma (2005).

velocity. In particular, Zhang et al. (2012) suggested using an enhanced Manning coefficient map to account for the effects of different land covers on storm surges, where a Manning coefficient of 0.14 was used for the mangrove forest. Nevertheless, the Manning coefficient based method ignores the mangrove physical characteristics such as stem size, tree height, and tree density. In contrast, the approaches in the second category are able to take into consideration the mangrove characteristics but often requires development of sophisticated tree architecture models (for computing local mangrove hydrodynamic forces) and incorporation of the data of mangrove characteristics at large scales (for computing regional mangrove hydrodynamic impact). However, designing an informative and computationally suitable abstract tree model is not straightforward, due to the complexity nature of mangrove tree structure. The abstraction of mangrove trees to uniform cylinders represents a significant simplification in estimating the effect of mangrove tree shape on water flows, especially for red mangroves which are famous for their tangled roots called "prop-roots". Nevertheless, for the black mangroves, identified by their pencil roots, the abstract tree model used by Teh et al. (2009) that includes root, stem and leaf, formed by vertical cylinders of different diameters and heights determined by field measurements, appears to represent the tree structure well.

23 In addition to designing appropriate tree architecture models, an-24 other difficulty of the above-mentioned second category approach is 25 the employment of large scale data maps of mangrove characteristics, 26 such as spatial variations of tree height, stem size and density. Previous 27 numerical studies in this category are usually based on estimations or 28 field measurements in small plots for the mangrove characteristics, and 29 few researches have exploited the landscape scale data until recently. 30 For example, Zhang et al. (2020) investigated the short-period wave 31 attenuation by mangroves at the Daguansha of Beihai city, China, 32 through solving a power-dissipation based wave attenuation equation 33 that makes use of the remote sensing and field measurement data of 34 landscape mangrove characteristics, such as mangrove species, crown 35 breadth and tree height. In fact, with the advancement of remote sens-36 ing technology, surveys of mangrove forests, particularly tree heights 37 and extents, at the landscape scale have become feasible (Simard et al.,

2006; Feliciano et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2016; Ruiz et al., 2017, 2018). As an example, Simard et al. (2006) used the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission elevation data to produce a map of mean tree height for the mangrove forest at the Gulf Coast of South Florida, USA. With this tree height data map, it is possible to obtain the data maps of mangrove stem size and density that are required by the aforementioned mangrove-fluid interaction approaches, as many ecological studies on mangroves have indicated that there are strong allometric relationships between stem size and tree height (Tamai et al., 1986; Hirata et al., 2014; Mugasha et al., 2019), between stem size and stem density (Ward et al., 2006), and between stem size and biomass (Ross et al., 2001; Smith and Whelan, 2006).

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

The objective of this paper is thus to investigate the effect of mangroves on storm surge attenuation via an improved numerical modeling approach, which incorporates a new tree architecture model for red mangroves, that is designed based on the field measurements of the individual components of biomass (e.g., roots, stems, branches and leaves), and landscape scale mangrove characteristics developed based on remote sensing data of mangrove tree height and mangrove allometric equations. The numerical simulations are based on the Coastal and Estuarine Storm Tide (CEST) model (Zhang et al., 2012), which is well verified for tide and storm surge simulation through historical hurricane events, such as Wilma (2005) (Zhang et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2013), Andrew (1992) (Zhang et al., 2013), and Hugo (1989) and Camille (1969) (Zhang et al., 2008). In these papers, however, CEST employed the Manning coefficient based method to account for mangrove effects. Therefore, this study also aims to provide an in-depth comparison between the newly developed mangrove characteristics based method and the existing Manning coefficient based method.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the study area, the landscape scale data map of mangrove mean tree height, and the allometric equations for mangrove characteristics; Section 3 gives an overview of the CEST model as well as the detailed implementation of the mangrove tree component; Section 4 examines the numerical model using an idealized test case and compares the fundamentals of the current method for mangrove modeling with the Manning coefficient method; Section 5 describes the simulation of Hurricane Wilma (2005)

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21



Fig. 2. Tracks of relevant hurricanes that have impacted the mangrove zone at the Southwest Florida USA.

using both the current method and the Manning coefficient method for mangroves; Section 6 is for discussions; Section 7 draws conclusions.

2. Study area and data

2.1. Study area

1

2

3

4

5 The mangrove forest distributed along the Gulf coast of South Florida, USA, provides an ideal site for investigating mangrove atten-6 7 uation effect on storm surge (see Fig. 1). South Florida suffers from 8 frequent tropical storm impact during hurricane season, and the gently-9 sloped topography makes it vulnerable to inundation induced by storm 10 surges. The mangrove zone as indicated in Fig. 1 covers a coastline of 200 km stretching from Naples to the north coast of Florida Bay. 11 12 The mangrove species dominating this area are the red mangrove 13 (Rhizophora mangle), black mangrove (Avicennia germinans), and white 14 mangrove (Laguncularia racemosa) (Ruiz et al., 2017, 2018), with tall 15 trees (> 4 m) living along the coast area while short scrubs distributed 16 further inland (Fig. 3). Recent hurricanes that have struck this mangrove zone include Andrew (1992), Wilma (2005) and Irma (2017) 17 (Fig. 2). Particularly, this study focuses on the numerical simulation of 18 19 Hurricane Wilma (2005). Wilma approached the South Florida from the 20 southwest and made landfall as a Category 3 hurricane around 10:30 21 coordinated universal time (UTC) on 24 October 2005 near Cape Ro-22 mano. Wilma was moving at a forward speed of approximately 37 km/h 23 when the landfall of the center occurred, with the maximum sustained 24 winds estimated to be near 194 km/h (Pasch et al., 2006). Despite 25 being weaker at landfall (Category 3), Wilma had an extraordinarily 26 wide eye of 89-105 km in diameter and a track at the upper part of 27 the mangrove zone, leading to significant storm surge (approximately 5 m at maximum (Smith et al., 2009)) and extensive coastal inundation. 28 29 According to the field survey by Smith et al. (2009), Wilma completely 30 destroyed the Lostmans Ranger Station (located at the north shore of 31 the Lostmans River mouth) that survived the passage of the Labor Day 32 Storm (1935), Hurricane Donna (1960), and the leading and trailing 33 eyewalls of Hurricane Andrew (1992) (Fig. 2).

Extensive storm surge measurements during and after Wilma (2005)
were made by a variety of institutions and many individual researchers.
In particular, the data collected for verifying the current numerical
simulations include: (1) high water marks (HWMs) and time series
of water levels collected at the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) stations (Soderqvist and Byrne, 2007; Telis, 2006), U.S. National Park

Service (NPS) stations (Telis, 2006), South Florida Water Manage-40 ment District (SFWMD) stations (Telis, 2006) and from field survey 41 by individual researchers (Smith et al., 2009; Krauss et al., 2009); 42 (2) time series of water elevations measured at National Oceanic and 43 Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) tide gauges. Fig. 1 shows the 44 locations of these measurements. For other data sources of Hurricane 45 Wilma (2005) (e.g. HWMs collected by Federal Emergency Manage-46 ment Agency (FEMA) along the Florida Keys), the reader is referred 47 to the previous work of Zhang et al. (2012). 48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

94

95

96

97

98

100

2.2. Landscape scale mangrove data map

The structural data of mangroves such as tree height, stem size and density plays an important role in quantifying the effect of mangroves on storm surge attenuation. For the current numerical simulations, a landscape scale data map of mean mangrove tree height for the study area (see Fig. 1) was obtained with the following procedure using airborne Light Detection And Ranging (LiDAR) data collected by the Florida Department of Emergency management in 2007 (Fig. 3). First, the LiDAR data in binary LAS format was downloaded from the coastal data website of NOAA (https://coast.noaa.gov/dataviewer/#/ lidar/search/, accessed 28 December 2019). Second, the Digital Surface Model (DSM) and Digital Terrain Model (DTM) with a pixel spacing of 15 m reference to State Plan HARN NAD83 horizontal datum and NAVD88 vertical datum in units of meters were generated for the mangrove zone by interpolating the LiDAR points. The first return and ground LiDAR measurements were used to produce DSM and DTM, respectively, by using the inverse distance weighted interpolation in ArcGIS (www.esri.com). Third, the Digital Canopy Model (DCM) was generated by subtracting the DTM from DSM. The values of DCM could be negative in the areas without many trees because of the difference in LiDAR points used for DSM and DTM interpolations and the negative values in DCM were set to be zero. The mangrove zone (Fig. 3) for the calculation of DCM was the same as that used by Zhang et al. (2012). Finally, the mean tree height for each model grid cell were computed using the DCM pixels falling within the cell. The mean tree heights were calculated only for the model grid cells where the mangrove areas were larger than the half sizes of the cells, and these cells were marked as mangrove cells. It can be seen that tall mangrove trees are mainly distributed along the shoreline, particularly around the mouths of Harney River and Shark River (see Figs. 1 and 3).

In addition to tree heights, other mangrove characteristics such as stem size and stem density were obtained through allometric equations. For the stem size, while direct allometric relations between tree height and stem diameter are available for mangroves (Tamai et al., 1986; Hirata et al., 2014; Mugasha et al., 2019), they are not specifically targeted at the mangroves in the study area. We therefore derived such equations based on the work of Smith and Whelan (2006) who focused their studies on the mangroves in the study area. Smith and Whelan (2006) suggested the allometric equations between dry biomass and diameter at breast height (DBH) *D*, and between dry biomass and stem height *T* for red, black and white mangroves. Thus, the allometric equation between the DBH *D* and the tree height *T* can be inferred by eliminating the dry biomass. For the red mangrove (*Rhizophora mangle*) for example, this is expressed as (total variance explained $r^2 \approx 0.93$):

$$D = 10^{\frac{2.357\log_{10}T - 0.657}{1.731}}$$
(1) 93

where the tree height *T* is in meter (m) and the DBH *D* is in centimeter (cm). Once the DBH data is available, it is straightforward to calculate the tree density, *n*, using the equation proposed by Ward et al. (2006) whose data are also based on the South Florida mangrove zone ($r^2 = 0.91$):

$$n = 6.3765 D^{-1.52} \tag{2} 99$$

where n is the number of trees per square meters and D is in cm.



Fig. 3. Map of mean mangrove tree height in the mangrove zone.

Species composition is also one of the important characteristics of 2 mangrove tree structures in terms of numerical modeling. Unfortunately, a map of mangrove species composition is yet not available for the study area. A comprehensive vegetation mapping project for the south part of the mangrove zone shows that there are hundreds of unique vegetation classes within this region, although most of them (around 85%) account for less than 1% of the map (Ruiz et al., 2017, 2018). The most common classes are mangrove forest, mangrove scrub and marsh; these classes together with water account for at least 60% of the region (Ruiz et al., 2017, 2018). It appears that red mangroves, including red mangrove forest, shrubland and scrub, are the dominant vegetation in the southwest part of the mangrove zone where most of the tall trees live (Ruiz et al., 2018), and the red mangrove scrub accounts for a considerably larger portion than any other vegetation in the southeast part (Ruiz et al., 2017). Hence, from the numerical simulation point of view an assumption was made that the characteristics of the trees in the mangrove zone are represented by those of red mangroves; further discussions regarding this assumption are given in Section 6.

3. Incorporation of red mangrove in the CEST storm surge model

3.1. Characterization of red mangroves

22 Mangrove trees are complex structures from the perspective of 23 numerical simulation of fluid-structure interaction. Particularly, this 24 paper focuses on the investigation of the attenuation effect of red man-25 grove on storm surge, which is well known for its tangled prop-roots. It 26 is thus impractical to represent every individual tree with details in the 27 numerical model. An abstract tree model that characterizes the major 28 structural features of red mangrove has to be established in order to 29 enable numerical simulations.

30 In this study, the red mangrove is characterized into three parts: 31 a leaf-bearing part, a trunk (stem) part and a root part, which are 32 represented by two cylinders and a truncated cone, respectively (see 33 Fig. 4). In addition, based on field observation, the mangroves have 34 been divided into three groups according to the tree height, and each 35 group has different height ratios of the leaf-bearing part and the root

part to the trunk part (see Fig. 5). For comparison purpose, photographs taken during a field survey are also displayed in Fig. 5.

36

37

59

Given a tree height T and trunk size D (related by Eq. (1)), the 38 characteristic diameters of the leaf-baring part (D_L) and the root part 39 (D_R) shown in Fig. 4 were determined according to two factors: (1) 40 the height ratios (i.e. T_I/T and T_R/T) as shown in Fig. 5; (2) the 41 biomass ratios of the leafing-bearing part to the trunk part, and the root 42 part to the trunk part, respectively. The biomass ratios were obtained 43 from Smith and Whelan (2006); Fig. 6 shows the ratios of the biomasses 44 of different tree components to the total biomass as a function of 45 tree height. Note that for the current study, the branch and the leaf 46 biomasses were combined together as the biomass of the leaf-bearing 47 part. Assuming a constant material density, these biomass ratios can 48 be reinterpreted as volume ratios between the tree parts, which, with 49 the height ratios mentioned above, were used to calculate the values 50 of D_L/D and D_R/D . It is noted that D_L/D and D_R/D determines the 51 shape of the abstract tree model (Fig. 4) and will be seen to be the key 52 parameters in the numerical simulation. Table 1 presents the calculated 53 D_L/D and D_R/D based on a typical tree height in each group. It is 54 found from Table 1 that D_L/D and D_R/D remain almost unchanged 55 as the tree height varies from 1.5 m to 9 m. Hence, in the numerical 56 simulation, D_L/D and D_R/D were fixed at 1.85 and 1.64, respectively, 57 which are the averaged values of those given in Table 1. 58

3.2. Hydrodynamic model

The CEST model, in a depth-integrated, two dimensional (2D) form 60 on an orthogonal curvilinear grid was modified to include the man-61 grove tree component for storm surge modeling. In particular, the 62 mangrove effect is parameterized into a porosity (volume exclusion) 63 coefficient (Wu et al., 2001) and a drag force term (Nepf, 1999); both 64 of these are functions of water depth and the mangrove characteristics. 65 The 2D depth-integrated continuity equation and momentum equations 66 in an *x*, *y*, and *z* coordinate system with *z* axis perpendicular to the still 67 water level are (Zhang et al., 2012): 68 2011 201111 201112

$$\frac{\partial\theta H}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial\theta H U}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial\theta H V}{\partial y} = 0$$
(3) 69

Table 1

1

2

2

5

6

7

8 9

Ratios of D_L/D and D_R/D for typical mangroves in the groups presented in Fig. 5.

Tree height	Leaf-bearing part			Root part		
	Biomass ratio to the trunk part	Height ratio to the trunk part	D_L/D	Biomass ratio to the trunk part	Height ratio to the trunk part	D_R/D
T = 1.5 m	1.024	0.4	1.887	0.323	0.4	1.660
(in $T \leq 3$ m)						
T = 4.5 m	0.648	0.3	1.778	0.211	0.3	1.590
(in 3 m < $T \le 6$ m)						
T = 9.0 m	0.513	0.2	1.888	0.161	0.2	1.661
(in T > 6 m)						



Fig. 4. Sketch showing the simplified structure for red mangrove. The trunk part is represented by a cylinder with diameter *D* and height *T* that extends through the whole tree model. The leaf-bearing part and the root part are represented by a cylinder with diameter D_L and height T_L , and a truncated cone with bottom diameter D_R and height T_R , respectively.

$$\frac{\partial\theta HU}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial\theta HU^2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial\theta HUV}{\partial y} = f\theta HV - g\theta H \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\zeta + \frac{\Delta P_a}{\rho g}\right) - \frac{F_x}{\rho} \\ -\theta \frac{\tau_b^x}{\rho} + \theta \frac{\tau_s^x}{\rho} + A_h \left(\frac{\partial^2 \theta HU}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \theta HU}{\partial y^2}\right)$$
(4)

$$\frac{\partial\theta HV}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial\theta HUV}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial\theta HV^2}{\partial y} = -f\theta HU - g\theta H \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\zeta + \frac{\Delta P_a}{\rho g}\right) - \frac{F_y}{\rho} \\ -\theta \frac{\tau_b^y}{\rho} + \theta \frac{\tau_s^y}{\rho} + A_h \left(\frac{\partial^2 \theta HV}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \theta HV}{\partial y^2}\right)$$
(5)

where θ is the porosity coefficient that is defined as the ratio of the water volume versus the total volume of water and mangrove trees on the same area. $H = \zeta + h$ is the overall water depth, *h* is the

water depth from the still water level to the bottom, ζ is the water surface elevation reference to the still water level, U and V are depthintegrated velocities along *x*- and *y*- directions respectively, *f* is Coriolis parameter, *g* is the gravitational acceleration, ΔP_a is air pressure drop, ρ is the water density, A_h is the horizontal eddy diffusivity, τ_b^x and τ_b^y are the bottom friction forces in *x*- and *y*- directions respectively, τ_s^x and τ_s^y are the surface wind stresses in *x*- and *y*- directions respectively, and F_x and F_y are the newly added drag forces due to mangroves in *x*- and *y*- directions, respectively.

The momentum equations, Eqs. (4) and (5), are further simplified to obtain their non-conservative forms using the continuity equation and the chain rule, and can be written as follows by dividing with θH at both sides:

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + U \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} = fV - g \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\zeta + \frac{\Delta P_a}{\rho g}\right) - \frac{F_x}{\rho \theta H}$$
²³

$$-\frac{\tau_b^x}{\rho H} + \frac{\tau_s^x}{\rho H} + A_h \left(\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial y^2}\right)$$
(6) 24
25

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + U\frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + V\frac{\partial V}{\partial y} = -fU - g\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(\zeta + \frac{\Delta P_a}{\rho g}\right) - \frac{F_y}{\rho\theta H}$$
 26

$$-\frac{\tau_b^y}{\rho H} + \frac{\tau_s^y}{\rho H} + A_h \left(\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial y^2}\right) \tag{7}$$

Note that the full diffusion terms, $\frac{A_h}{\partial H} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \theta H U}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \theta H U}{\partial y^2} \right)$ and 28 $\frac{A_h}{\partial H} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \theta H V}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \theta H V}{\partial y^2} \right)$, are simplified to $A_h \left(\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial y^2} \right)$ and 29 $A_h \left(\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial y^2} \right)$ following Hervouet et al. (2000). Eq. (3), Eqs. (6) 30 and (7) are the governing equations solved in CEST on an orthogonal 31 curvilinear grid, for which more details can be found in Blumberg and 32 Herring (1987). The equations for τ_s^x , τ_s^y , τ_b^x and τ_b^y , and the handling 33 of wetting and drying process and boundary conditions were given 34 in Zhang et al. (2012). 35

3.3. Drag force

36 37

38

39

40

41

43

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In the previous CEST versions (Zhang et al., 2012), the drag force due to land covers was included into the bottom friction term through modifying the Manning coefficient, as both drag force and bottom friction share the same quadratic relationship with flow velocity. The bed friction in CEST is expressed as:

$$\tau_b^x = C_b \rho \sqrt{U^2 + V^2 U}$$
(8) 42

$$C_{b}^{y} = C_{b}\rho\sqrt{U^{2} + V^{2}}V$$
 (9) 44

45

47

$$C_b = \frac{gm^2}{H^{1/3}}$$
(10) 46

where m is the Manning coefficient.

In the current version, the drag forces F_x and F_y due to mangroves 48 are calculated directly, based on the abstract tree models described 49 in Section 3.1 and the landscape scale mangrove data map discussed 50



Fig. 5. Sketch showing the grouping of the red mangrove based on the tree height, in contrast with photos taken from field survey.

in Section 2.2. The equations for F_x and F_y are modified from those 1 2 proposed in Tanaka et al. (2007) and are expressed as:

3
$$F_{x} = n \times \int \frac{1}{2} C_{di} \rho u_{i} \left| u_{i} \right| dA_{i} = \frac{n}{2} \times \alpha \times \overline{C_{d}} DL \rho U_{m} \left| U_{m} \right|$$
(11)

5
$$F_{y} = n \times \int \frac{1}{2} C_{di} \rho v_{i} \left| v_{i} \right| dA_{i} = \frac{n}{2} \times \alpha \times \overline{C_{d}} DL \rho V_{m} \left| V_{m} \right|$$
(12)

where

6

7

$$L = \begin{cases} H & \text{if } H \le T \\ T & \text{if } H > T \end{cases}$$
(13)

8 where *n* is the number of trees per square meters, C_{di} , u_i , v_i , dA_i are the 9 drag coefficient, the velocity in x-direction, the velocity in y-direction 10 and the projected tree area in the *i*th layer when dividing the tree model 11 (see Fig. 4) vertically into k layers with the same layer height l, D is the DBH, H is the overall water depth, T is the tree height, $\overline{C_d}$ is a 12 bulk drag coefficient representing the mangrove tree array and is set to 13 14 a constant value of 1.17 according to Nepf (1999), $U_m = (U_m, V_m)$ is the 15 flow velocity acting on the mangrove and is determined following Stone 16 and Shen (2002):

17
$$\mathbf{U}_m \approx (L/H)^{1/2} \mathbf{U}$$
(14)

18 where $\mathbf{U} = (U, V)$ is the depth-averaged flow velocity, and α represents 19 the integrated effect of tree structure to the drag force along the water 20 depth.

21 It is somewhat complicated to calculate α accurately, as it requires 22 the exact details of individual mangrove tree structure. Here, a simpli-23 fied method is developed based on the abstract tree models (see Fig. 4). 24 As a depth-integrated value, in general, α can be expressed as follows, 25 by dividing the abstract tree model vertically into a number of layers 26 of the same height:

27
$$\alpha = \frac{1}{L} \int_0^L b(z) dz \approx \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p b_i$$
(15)

28 where p is the number of layers under water, b_i is an amplification 29 factor of the projected tree area at the *i*th layer to that at the DBH layer,



Fig. 6. Biomass ratio of each component to the total biomass as a function of tree height for the red mangrove in the South Florida mangrove zone (data reorganized from Smith and Whelan (2006)).

which accounts for an increase of the drag force due to mangrove roots, 30 branches or leafs, in addition to that provided by the mangrove trunk. To calculate b_i , here an assumption is made that at each layer in the root part, the abstract tree model can be further divided into a number of small cylinders representing the prop-roots of red mangrove, plus a cylinder representing the trunk; the prop-root cylinders are assigned with an identical diameter equal to X and a height equal to the layer height, and the trunk cylinder has the same diameter as DBH and also a height equal to the layer height (see Fig. 7). As such, b_i can be computed as:

$$b_i = \frac{\left(D + q_i X\right)l}{Dl} \tag{16}$$

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1



Fig. 7. Schematic showing the idea of further dividing one layer (the *i*th layer) of the abstract tree model into one trunk cylinder and q_i prop-root cylinders in a volume conservative manner

where q_i is the number of the prop-root cylinders at the *i*th layer, D is the DBH, and *l* is the layer height. To calculate q_i , the shape of the *i*th layer abstract tree model is also simplified into a cylinder (see Fig. 7), given a very small layer height (namely a large number of layers). Thus, q_i can be expressed as:

$$q_i = \frac{D_i^2 - D^2}{X^2}$$
(17)

where D_i is the diameter of the abstract tree model at the *i*th layer, which based on Fig. 4 is calculated as:

$$\Theta \qquad D_{i} = \begin{cases} D_{R} - (D_{R} - D)L/T_{R} & \text{if } L \leq T_{R} \\ D & \text{if } T_{R} < L \leq T - T_{L} \\ D_{L} & \text{if } T - T_{L} < L \leq T \end{cases}$$
(18)

10 where T_R and T_L are the heights of the root part and the leaf-bearing part of the abstract tree model, respectively. Finally, by inserting 11 12 Eq. (17) into Eq. (16), b_i is obtained as:

3
$$b_i = 1 + \frac{D_i^2 - D^2}{XD}$$
 (19)

14 It is clear from Eq. (19) that a larger X will give a smaller b_i . As 15 an estimation, in the current study X is given half the trunk diameter, i.e. D/2. However, statistical data for X from field study by ecological 16 17 researchers would improve the accuracy of the current model. Note that 18 Eq. (19) is also used at the leaf-bearing part of the abstract tree model in 19 the same manner, approximating the effect of tree branches and leaves 20 on the drag force. Finally, in the current study a total number of 100 21 layers are used to vertically divide the abstract tree models, and Fig. 8 22 shows the calculated value of α for the three group of mangrove trees 23 listed in Fig. 5.



Fig. 8. Value of α as a function of water depth, accounting for a depth-averaged increase of the drag force due to the root, branch and leaf of red mangrove

3.4. Porosity coefficient

and

In the literature, very few papers have presented relevant data in terms of mangrove porosity as a function of water depth. For example, Mazda et al. (1997) suggested such data for Rhizophora stylosa (red mangrove) and Bruguiera gymnorhiza (black mangrove) located in islands in Japan and Australia up to a water depth of only 0.5 m. However, strong storms could cause water of several meters high (Zhang et al., 2012). The tree model proposed in this paper (see Fig. 4) provides an easy access to the calculation of the porosity coefficient. The idea is a simple one: the volume of mangrove tree, V_M , at different water depths can be calculated by:

$$V_M = \gamma V_C \tag{20}$$

$$V_C = \frac{\pi L D^2}{4} \tag{21}$$

where V_C is the trunk part cylinder volume at depth L, which makes γ an amplification coefficient due to the additional root, branch and leaf of mangroves. Similar to Eq. (15), it is trivial to obtain the expression for γ :

$$y = \frac{1}{L} \int_0^L c(z) dz \approx \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p c_i = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{dV_i}{dV_{\text{DBH}}} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{D_i}{D}\right)^2$$
(22)

where c_i is the volume amplification coefficient for the *i*th layer, dV_i and dV_{DBH} are the volume of mangrove tree model at the *i*th layer and at the DBH layer, respectively, D_i is the diameter of the abstract tree model at the *i*th layer (see Eq. (18)). Fig. 9 presents the calculated value of γ used in the numerical simulations.

Finally, the porosity coefficient θ considering the structural characteristics of red mangrove and the water depth is expressed by:

$$\theta = 1 - \frac{(n\Delta x \Delta y)V_M}{H \Delta x \Delta y} = 1 - n\frac{\pi D^2 L}{4H} \gamma_L$$
(23)

where γ_L is the γ value at the water depth of *L*. According to the above 52 equation, it was found that the porosity coefficient is in general close 53 to 1, implying that the volume ratio of mangrove to the total volume 54 on the same area is very low. As an example, assuming that the water 55 depth is very low such that L = H (see Eq. (13)) and γ_L is equal to 56 the maximum value of γ as seen in Fig. 9, the value of θ is found to 57 decrease from 0.9986 to 0.9948 when the tree height varies from 2 m to 15 m.

26

27

28

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

58

Table 2

Parameters for the SLOSH wind model. MWS Central pressure (hPa) Time RMW Location (hours) (km) (km/h) Hurricane 1 Hurricane 2 Hurricane 3 #1 144.0 963 963 963 0 64.4 #2 12 77.2 157.7 963 933 903 #3 18 119.1 125.2 960 930 900 123.5 962 #4 21 121.8 932 902





Fig. 9. Value of γ as a function of water depth, accounting for a depth-averaged increase of the volume of red mangrove due to its root, branch and leaf.

4. An idealized test case

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

In this section, an idealized test case, concerning the simulation of storm surge onto an idealized coastal plain planted with red mangroves, is designed to examine the characteristics of the proposed method. These mainly include the importance of the porosity term at different scenarios and the difference between the current method and the Manning coefficient based method in terms of modeling mangrove resistance to water flows during storm surge impact.

4.1. Setup of the test case

10 Fig. 10 shows the computational basin for the idealized test case. The ground elevation is set to be similar to natural bathymetry ranging 11 12 from very deep water in the ocean basin to very shallow water in the 13 continental shelf. The ground elevation for the entire coastal plain, 14 i.e. the land area shown in Fig. 10, is fixed at the still water level, which 15 is attempted to minimize the effect of topography on storm surge. The 16 land area is designated as the mangrove zone, where the mangrove tree 17 data for the current method are set following the allometric equations 18 as needed. The hurricane for the idealized test case is designed based 19 on Hurricane Wilma (2005). All of the features of Wilma's track were 20 employed and a similar landfall location was maintained (see Figs. 1 21 and 10), except that the atmosphere pressure is slightly modified 22 to generate three hurricanes that will lead to different storm surge 23 severities. In other words, the three hurricanes, named as Hurricane 24 1, 2 and 3, share the same track shown in Fig. 10 but have different 25 central pressure values close to landfall. The wind field was computed 26 by using the parametric wind model employed by the SLOSH (Sea, 27 Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes) model (Jelesnianski et al., 28 1992). Table 2 gives the input parameters of the SLOSH wind model

Fig. 10. The computational basin for the idealized test case. (b) shows the detailed ground elevation for profile A-B depicted using the dashed line in (a). The value of ground elevation is referenced to the still water level. The hurricane travels from the south to the north.

at the locations marked in Fig. 10, including the radius of maximum 29 wind (RMW), maximum wind speed (MWS), and central pressure. As 30 an example, Fig. 11 shows the computed peak surge heights for the three hurricanes, where the mangrove tree characteristics are set to T= 6.5 m, D = 0.053 m and n = 0.5 according to Eqs. (1) and (2). As expected, Hurricane 1 leads to the smallest storm surge and Hurricane 3 results in the largest one. Finally, the grid size is set to approximately 1700 m \times 1700 m in the deep ocean area and 350 m \times 350 m near the shoreline, with the total number of grid cells being nearly 470,000. The simulated time is 2 days with a time step of 10 s for each of the simulations presented in this section.

4.2. Importance of the porosity (volume exclusion) term θ

The porosity term represents the fact that mangroves occupy part of 41 the water volume during storm surge. Theoretically, when the poros-42 ity approaches zero (i.e. there is no water), the mangroves will act 43 like a 'wall', and when the porosity approaches one (i.e. there is no 44 mangrove), the effect of the porosity term will vanish. It is therefore in-45 teresting to investigate the effect of the porosity term for the mangroves 46 abstracted under the current numerical framework. 47

As demonstrated in Section 3.4, the ratio of mangrove volume to the total volume of water and mangrove on the same area is, in general,

48



Fig. 11. Computed peak surge heights for the three hurricanes using the current porosity plus drag force method. The mangrove tree data are T = 6.5 m, D = 0.053 m and n = 0.5.

Table 3Parameters for testing the effect of the porosity term.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

g

10

11

Group	Hurricane	Mangrove			
		Height T (m)	Diameter D (m)	Density $n (m^{-2})$	
1	1, 2, 3	3.0	0.019	2.5	
2	1, 2, 3	4.5	0.032	1.1	
3	1, 2, 3	6.5	0.053	0.5	

very low. In the literature, some researchers have argued that the effect of the porosity is negligible when the volume of vegetation is low (Wu et al., 2001; Wu and Marsooli, 2012); however, their work was not undertaken within the context of storm surge, nor were the mangrove tree characteristics considered. Here, three group of tests were conducted; their parameters are given in Table 3. In each group, the tree height was first selected and then the trunk diameter and the density were calculated using Eqs. (1) and (2). Note that the tree height setup for each group leads to the use of the different tree models listed in Fig. 5. The effect of the porosity term is assessed by comparing the maximum storm surge heights along profile A-B (see Fig. 10).

12 Fig. 12 shows the computed peak surge profiles with and without 13 the porosity effect (by enforcing $\theta = 1$ in every wet cell). It is obvious 14 that for all of the tree sizes and the hurricane intensities, the results run 15 with and without the porosity effect are indistinguishable. Thus, in the current study the effect of the porosity term on mangrove resistance 16 17 to storm surge is negligible, which is due likely to that in general, the porosity term θ is close to 1.0 as seen from the calculations in 18 19 Section 3.4. Meanwhile, it is interesting to notice that the relatively 20 short tree (T = 3.0 m) appears to generate shorter inundation distances 21 when compared with the tall tree (T = 6.5 m) at the same hurricane 22 conditions; the reason for this is discussed in the following section.

4.3. Comparison between the current method and the Manning coefficient 23 method 24

The Manning coefficient method has been successfully employed for modeling mangrove effect on storm surge attenuation (Zhang et al., 2012; Xu et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2013). It typically requires an empirical value of the Manning coefficient to account for the mangrove effect. In contrast, in the current method the mangrove tree characteristics are considered in a more physical manner. This section gives more in-depth comparisons between the two methods. Hereafter, the current method is referred to as the Porosity plus Drag Force (PDF) method in contrast to the Manning coefficient based Bottom Friction force (MBF) method.

Since it has been shown that the porosity term is insignificant in the previous section, the drag force term due to the PDF method and the bed friction term owing to the MBF method are the key factors in determining the difference between the two methods. Recalling the drag force term and the bed friction term in the *x*-direction momentum equation (Eq. (6)) for example, we have:

$$\frac{F_x}{\rho\theta H} = \frac{n\alpha \overline{C_d} DL}{2\theta H} U_m |U_m| \approx \frac{n\alpha \overline{C_d} D}{2\theta} \left(\frac{L}{H}\right)^2 U |U|$$
(24) 40

$$\frac{\tau_b^x}{\rho H} = \frac{gm^2}{H^{4/3}}\sqrt{U^2 + V^2}U$$
(25) 42

Ignoring the velocity quadratic term, the difference between the 43 two methods is in fact down to the coefficients $\frac{n\alpha \overline{C_d D}}{2\theta} \left(\frac{L}{H}\right)^2$ and $\frac{gm^2}{H^{4/3}}$, 44 where θ can be further set to 1. Let the Manning coefficient *m* be 1.4 45 for the mangroves following Zhang et al. (2012), Fig. 13 plots the two 46 coefficients as a function of water depth for comparison. It is seen from 47 Fig. 13 that the coefficient for the MBF method decreases monotonically 48 as the water depth increases, while the curves for the PDF method 49 show a consistent pattern of decreasing, increasing, and decreasing. For 50 the MBF method, this trend is due to the coefficient being inversely 51 proportional to the water depth. For the PDF method, however, the co-52 efficient is also a function of mangrove tree characteristics; in general, 53

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38



Fig. 12. Comparison for the computed peak surge heights along profile A-B (see the profile location in Fig. 10) between results run with and without the porosity effect. Three typical tree sizes are tested and each of them is impacted by the three hurricanes: (a) T = 3.0 m, D = 0.019 m, n = 2.5, (b) T = 4.5 m, D = 0.032 m, n = 1.1, and (c) T = 6.5 m, D = 0.053 m, n = 0.5.

as the water depth increases, the initial high drag force due to the root part of the red mangrove decreases, then it increases back when the water depth reaches the leaf-bearing part, and finally when the tree is submerged, the drag force decreases again as the water depth continues to rise. For the PDF method, at least two conclusions can be drawn: (1) when the water depth is less than 2 m, shorter trees cause a larger coefficient, and when the water depth increases, this trend is slowly altered to the opposite; (2) the coefficients for different tree heights converge to a small value as the water depth becomes very large (> 8 m). Comparing the two coefficients, in general, the MBF method related coefficient is significantly larger than that related to the PDF method when the water depth is smaller than 1 m, regardless of the tree height. When the water depth is larger than 1 m, the PDF method related coefficient starts to exceed that of the MBF method at a critical water depth that varies and is in general larger for taller trees. However, it is noted that the MBF method coefficient should be larger than any of the PDF method coefficient at extremely large water depth, because the former is proportional to $H^{-4/3}$ while the latter is proportional to H^{-2} (see e.g. T = 2 m in Fig. 13).

Fig. 14 presents comparison for the computed peak surge profiles between the results run using the MBF and the PDF methods, where the tree height T = 6 m is selected for simulation. For the case selected, when the water depth is less than 4 m, the MBF method coefficient is larger than the PDF method coefficient (see Fig. 13), which means the MBF method predicts a higher mangrove resistance to the water flow, and the situation transposes when the water depth is larger than 4 m. This trend is clearly reflected in the computed profiles. For example, at Profile 2 where Hurricane 3 leads to a maximum surge of approximately 6 m, the decay rate of the computed peak surge profile by the PDF method is larger than that by the MBF method within 7 km extend to the shoreline, where the water depth is in general larger than 4 m during the passing of the storm surge peak. On the contrary,



Fig. 13. Comparison between the key coefficients of the drag force term (the PDF method) and the bed friction term (the MBF method).

at Profile 4, where the maximum surges due to the three hurricanes are all less than 4 m, the MBF method predicts in all cases a higher decay rate when compared to the PDF method.

Similarly, according to Fig. 13, the drag force related coefficient for T = 6.5 m can be expected to be smaller than that for T = 3.0 m in the water depth range of 0 to 6 m; this explains the point raised in the previous section that the short mangrove trees outperform the

39

1

2

3

4



Fig. 14. Comparison for the computed peak surge heights along the four profiles depicted in Fig. 11(c) between results run by the MDF method (Manning coefficient set to 1.4) and the PDF method (T = 6.0 m, D = 0.048 m and n = 0.6).

tall mangrove trees on reducing the inundation extend of storm surge,
 despite some short-period submergence of the short trees.

3 5. Storm Surge of Hurricane Wilma (2005)

To verify the PDF method, this section focuses on the numerical modeling of the real-world storm surge due to Hurricane Wilma (2005).

5.1. Model setup

4

5

6

7 This test case was previously investigated by Zhang et al. (2012) 8 and Liu et al. (2013) using the CEST model. In their work, the effect of 9 land cover was accounted for via bottom friction, which was calculated 10 using an enhanced Manning coefficient map. The Manning coefficient changes spatially according to the type of the land cover. In particular, 11 12 the Manning coefficient for mangroves was set to a constant value of 13 0.14. In this work, in addition to the drag force, a background Manning 14 coefficient of 0.02 is used in the calculation of the bed friction on the 15 ground in the mangrove zone where computational cells are marked as 16 containing mangroves. When the mangroves are submerged, the extra 17 bed friction on the top of the mangroves is ignored in comparison 18 with the drag force exerted by the mangroves. For model grid cells 19 that are not marked as mangrove cells, no drag force or mangrove 20 porosity is considered, and only bottom frictions (due to other land 21 covers) are applied based on the enhanced Manning coefficients (Zhang 22 et al., 2012). Simulation results based on these setups are again referred 23 to as the PDF method results. For comparison purpose, simulations 24 employing the same Manning coefficient method as that by Zhang 25 et al. (2012) for modeling mangroves are also conducted, and those 26 are referred to as the MBF method cases as previous. Each simulation

continued for 8 days with a time step of 10 s, starting at 18:00 UTC on 20th October 2005 and ending at 18:00 UTC on 28th October.

27

28

The Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) model 29 grid (Jelesnianski et al., 1992), covering about 400,000 km² area of 30 ocean and land in South Florida (Fig. 1), is converted into a CEST grid 31 for storm surge simulation following the procedure developed by Zhang 32 et al. (2013). The CEST model can run on the conformal SLOSH grid 33 without changing the geometries of the model domain and grid cells. 34 The SLOSH grid was developed by National Hurricane Center of NOAA 35 for modeling storm surges and establishing evacuation zones in South 36 Florida. The SLOSH grid consists of about 640,000 cells and the grid 37 size is approximately 450×450 m along the coastal area in the study 38 site and 1500 \times 1500 m in the open ocean. The water depths and 39 elevations of SLOSH grid cells were computed using most recent ETOP1 40 global bathymetric data set, coastal relief data sets, and LiDAR data 41 sets for Florida. The major river channels and topographic barriers 42 which affect inland inundation of storm surges were incorporated into 43 the model domain through sub-grid features such as flows, cuts, and 44 barriers (Jelesnianski et al., 1992). 45

The water levels at the open boundary are generated using seven 46 tidal constituents M2, S2, N2, K1, O1, K2, and Q1, which are obtained 47 from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) East Coast 2001 48 database of tidal constituents (Mukai et al., 2002). The wind field 49 computation employs the H*Wind data, generated by NOAA based on 50 field measurements (Powell et al., 1998), and when H*Wind data are 51 not available, the parametric wind model used by SLOSH is used. For 52 details of the wind field computation in CEST, including terrain effect 53 on the wind, the reader is referred to Zhang et al. (2012). 54



Fig. 15. Computed peak surge heights using the PDF method (a) and the MBF method (b). The location of the four profiles in Fig. 16 is also depicted in (a). The red dots represent the measurement stations shown in Fig. 1.

Fig. 15 shows the distribution of the computed peak surge heights within the whole computational domain using the PDF method (Fig. 15a) and the MBF method (Fig. 15b), respectively. The maximum surge heights are around 4.3 m from both methods and occur at the center of the mangrove zone between Chatham River and Shark River (see Figs. 1 and 15), which are consistent with the field survey measurements from Smith et al. (2009). However, the PDF method generates a larger inundation area (approximately 350 km² more) across the

mangrove zone when compared with that obtained by the MBF method, 10 and more measurement stations, located further inland and experienced 11 the storm surge caused by Wilma (2005), are covered by or closer 12 to the edge of the simulated storm surge from the PDF method. It is 13 worth noting that the water level recorder from Krauss et al. (2009) 14 (see Fig. 15) was deployed inland 50 to 80 m from the river's edge 15 and located at 18.2 km upstream of the Shark River; the MBF method 16 produces storm surges only inside the rivers at such long distance, while 17 the PDF method predicts an inundation area covering Krauss et al.'s 18 inland station (see Fig. 15). Based on these observations, it appears that 19

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

27

31



Fig. 16. Comparisons for the computed peak surge profiles along the four profiles across the mangrove zone (see Fig. 15a for the profile location).

the PDF method produces an improved result for the surge inundation extent compared with the MBF method (further confirmed by the HWM comparison in Fig. 17).

The difference between the computed peak surge heights by the two methods is shown clearly along four profiles in Fig. 16 (profile location is given in Fig. 15a). Results run without the mangrove effect (i.e. $F_x =$ $F_{y} = 0$) are also plotted for comparison. The PDF method predicts inundation extents 1.5 km to 3.0 km longer than those obtained by the MBF method. However, the maximum surge heights at the front of the mangrove zone are similar for both methods, and increased by 15%-30% compared to those computed without the mangrove effect. The PDF method derives, on average, a decay rate of the peak surge heights of approximately 18 cm/km across the areas with a mixture of mangrove islands and open water (Profiles 1 and 2) and nearly 24 cm/km through dense mangrove forest areas (Profiles 3 and 4). The corresponding rate predicted by the MBF method are 22 cm/km and 29 cm/km, respectively. Note that the decay rate was calculated using the peak surge heights at the front and the back of the mangrove zone (or the inland end of the inundation if the surge remains inside the mangrove zone), and the effect that the surge amplitude decreases as it moves inland even without mangroves was not excluded.

Figs. 17 and 18 present the comparisons between the simulated 23 and the observed results for the HWMs and the time series of water levels at both river stations and NOAA tide gauges (see Fig. 1 for 25 station location), respectively. The computed HWMs from both the 26 PDF method and the MBF method match well with the observations (Fig. 17). The root mean square errors (RMSEs) of the simulated results 28 against the observation data for the PDF and the MBF methods are 29 0.43 and 0.45, respectively, which confirms the better performance of 30 the PDF method. Nevertheless, the comparison not only verifies the PDF method but also hints that the Manning coefficient of 0.14 for 32 mangroves as suggested by Zhang et al. (2012) works well in the coastal 33 areas experiencing high storm surges. The time series comparisons

(Fig. 18) also show acceptable results of the simulations in both the ocean areas (NOAA tide gauges at the left panels) and the river channels (USGS stations at the right panels). It is noticeable that there are slight phase errors for the occurring time of the water elevation peaks at the river stations. This is most likely due to the fact that the current grid size is much wider than the river width in reality, and the river channels are approximated by stair-like grid cells, which leads to longer distance for water to propagate upstream in the numerical model, hence the delay of arriving time. The wider grid size also results in more water than could, in reality, moving upstream in the rivers, which may be responsible for the over-estimation of the water elevation peaks in Broad River and Chatham River (Fig. 18).

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

6. Discussion

This study made the assumption that the characteristics of man-47 grove trees within the South Florida mangrove zone are represented 48 by those of the red mangrove, because red mangroves including for-49 est, shrubland and scrub are the dominant species within this region 50 according to the comprehensive vegetation map for the Everglades 51 National Park (Ruiz et al., 2017, 2018). The vegetation characteristics 52 of other major species in this region, including black mangrove, white 53 mangrove and marsh, were not considered, because it is very difficult to 54 find a consistent numerical method to represent a variety of mangrove 55 species, and landscape scale data map of species compositions is not 56 available. The use of an enhanced Manning coefficient map based on 57 the land cover may provide an alternative solution to these difficul-58 ties; however, the determination of the Manning coefficient is often 59 empirical and requires more efforts on calibration when circumstances 60 changes. The current assumption nevertheless allows the implementa-61 tion of the proposed numerical method that represents mangroves more 62 justifiably and with more physical detail; moreover, the results shown 63 in Section 5, imply that such assumption is an acceptable simplification. 64



Fig. 17. Comparison between the observed peak surge heights and the computed peak surge heights (NAVD88) at the measurement locations listed in Fig. 1. The dashed lines represent the perfect simulation line ± 0.5 m.

42

1

2

The proposed PDF method in general predicted reasonably good results regarding the storm surge induced by Hurricane Wilma (2005) in the South Florida mangrove area. This is aided by the development of an advanced abstract tree model to capture major structural characteristics of mangroves as well as the use of a landscape scale data map of mean mangrove tree height. From the perspective of numerical simulation, remote sensing technology, such as radar and LiDAR, has made ecological data on mangroves available at a large scale, which encourages characterizing detailed mangrove tree structures at a small scale. Efficient combination of such small and large scale data with sophisticated numerical models could provide effective estimation of the attenuation effect of mangrove zones, and suggest the appropriate management of such zones for protecting the communities that lie behind these zones. Furthermore, to give suitable solutions for targeted areas, development based on the current tree model for red mangroves, or other mangrove species, as well as the utilization of associated allometric equations, may be necessary to better reflect local mangrove tree characteristics. This is because the characteristics of mangrove trees, even those of the same species, vary significantly both spatially and temporally (see data in Mazda et al. (1997)). In addition to this, local storm surge behavior is also affected by many other factors such as ground elevation, rainfall and hurricane characteristics (Zhang et al., 2012).

Throughout the current study, extensive comparisons between the results obtained by the PDF method and the MBF method have been made. As demonstrated in Section 4.3, the fundamental difference between the two methods lies in the coefficients associated with the velocity quadratic term in the drag force and the bed friction force terms, respectively. The coefficient in the PDF method incorporates both mangrove tree structural and ecological details, hence it exhibits more variation in its relation to the water depth than the one does for the MBF method. In the test case of Hurricane Wilma (2005), the PDF method in general predicts larger inundation extents when compared with the MBF method, while both methods give similar peak water elevations at the front of the mangrove zone. Hence, the PDF method predicts a smaller decay rate of storm surge attributable to the mangroves than the MBF method does. This is largely because that as the water propagates further inland, the water depth becomes smaller and smaller, where the MBF method coefficient becomes significantly larger than that of the PDF method. While the MBF method may predict overly large mangrove resistance to the water flows when the water depth is small, the PDF method could underestimate the resistance due

to the highly simplified parameterization of turbulence within the 2D CEST model. Nevertheless, comparisons against field observations show that the use of a Manning coefficient of 1.4, as suggested by Zhang et al. (2012), worked well for the mangrove zone in the study area. Importantly, the proposed PDF method achieved better results when simulating the storm surge inundation area and also a more accurate quantification of the attenuation of storm surge due to mangroves.

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

94

The attenuation rate of mangroves on storm surge is an important 50 parameter for quantifying mangrove effects and was investigated at 51 various sites globally through field observation (Krauss et al., 2009; 52 Montgomery et al., 2018), numerical modeling (Zhang et al., 2012; 53 Dasgupta et al., 2019) and theoretical analysis (Montgomery et al., 54 2019). However, there exists no consistent conclusion with regard to 55 such attenuation rates, that ranges from some 4 to 50 cm/km (Krauss 56 et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2012; Montgomery et al., 2018; Vafeidis 57 et al., 2019). One of the reasons is that it is very difficult to separate 58 the contributions of mangroves over many other factors that could also 59 affect the peak water level of storm surge. For example, the storm surge 60 is affected by the geometry of the coastline (e.g. funnel-shaped estu-61 ary could increase surge level) and topography characteristics inland 62 (e.g. channel networks can reduce mangrove influence (Montgomery 63 et al., 2018)) even without any vegetation cover. It could be problem-64 atic to directly apply the attenuation rates from one site to another. For 65 the mangrove zone along the coast of Southwest Florida, Krauss et al. 66 (2009) estimated mangrove attenuation rates of 4.2 to 9.4 cm/km based 67 on Hurricane Charley (2004) and Wilma (2005). Their estimations, 68 however, are based on sparse gauge measurements referenced to the 69 ground level, which increase uncertainty of the records being affected 70 by local topography (Zhang et al., 2012). Also pointed out by Zhang 71 et al. (2012), the calculations by Krauss et al. (2009) do not consider the 72 high water level at the front of the mangrove zone (see the comparison 73 of peak water levels with and without the mangroves in Fig. 16). 74 Observations by Montgomery et al. (2018) show that much of the surge 75 dissipation occurred at the seaward fringe of the mangrove forest, as 76 also seen in Fig. 16. Therefore, the averaged mangrove attenuation 77 rates could be significantly underestimated by Krauss et al. (2009). On 78 the other hand, Zhang et al. (2012), through numerical modeling on the 79 same mangrove area, suggested mangrove attenuation rates of up to 48 80 cm/km. However, their numerical simulations do not include the tidal 81 effects, which also add uncertainty as the water level change attributed 82 to the tidal effects would influence mangrove resistances to the flows. 83 In addition, in the simulations of Zhang et al. (2012), the drag force 84 due to mangroves is estimated by using the Manning coefficient based 85 friction force, which completely ignores the ecological characteristics 86 of mangroves at both small and large scales. In the current numerical 87 study, both of the above-mentioned aspects have been accounted for, 88 and the results indicate mangrove attenuation rates of approximately 89 18 to 24 cm/km from mixed mangrove islands and open water to dense 90 mangrove forests, which agrees with the attenuation rate of 24 cm/km 91 for unchannelized mangrove forests suggested by Montgomery et al. 92 (2018).93

7. Conclusions

The CEST model, incorporating the porosity plus drag force method 95 for modeling the mangrove effect on attenuating storm surges, gen-96 erated good results for simulating the storm surge across the South 97 Florida mangrove zone caused by Hurricane Wilma (2005). These 98 include good agreements with field measurements or observations for 99 the maximum surge height, inundation extend, HWMs and time series 100 of surface elevations at tidal gauges and river stations. The numerical 101 model predicted a maximum surge height of approximately 4.3 m be-102 tween Chatham River and Shark River. The computed decay rate of the 103 peak storm surge height was approximately 18 cm/km across the areas 104 with a mixture of mangrove islands and open water and 24 cm/km 105 through dense mangrove forest areas. Results show that short mangrove 106

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21



Fig. 18. Comparison for the time series of water surface elevations (NAVD88) at various stations during Hurricane Wilma (2005). The location of the stations is marked in Fig. 1.

trees (T < 4 m) can be more effective than tall mangrove trees on storm surge attenuation when the water depth is relatively low (H < 4 m). The porosity (volume exclusion) term played a negligible role and can be ignored, because the volume ratio of mangrove to the total volume of mangrove and water on the same area is very low within the study area.

Compared to the Manning coefficient method, the porosity plus drag force method predicted better results of the inundation extents of the storm surge across the mangrove zone caused by Hurricane Wilma (2005). Particularly, the porosity plus drag force method produced approximately 1.5 km to 3 km larger inundation distance to the shoreline than the Manning coefficient method did, resulting in roughly 350 km² more inundation area. Both methods generated very similar maximum surge heights at the front of the mangrove zone, and consequently, the porosity plus drag force method suggested approximately 4 cm/km to 5 cm/km smaller decay rates of storm surge than that obtained by the Manning coefficient method. Based on the current study, a plot showing the fundamental difference between the drag force due to the porosity plus drag force method and the bed friction force owing to the Manning coefficient method was produced (Fig. 13). In general, the variation of the drag force depends on the flow velocity, water depth and the mangrove ecological characteristics at both large and small scales. The porosity plus drag force method would benefit from the inclusion of a species composition map, and more diverse tree models representing various mangrove species.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Qiang Chen: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Software, Data curation, Validation, Formal analysis, Visualization, Writing - original draft. Yuepeng Li: Conceptualization, Investigation, Resources, Writing - review & editing, Supervision. David M. Kelly: Writing - review & editing, Supervision. Keqi Zhang: Conceptualization, Resources, Data curation, Writing - review & editing, Supervision. Brian Zachry: Conceptualization, Resources, Writing - review & editing. Jamie Rhome: Conceptualization, Resources, Writing - review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper. 39

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

Acknowledgments

We thank the reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions on improving the quality of this paper. This work is supported by the USA National Science Foundation under Award Number 1801244, and Florida Office of Insurance Regulation under the Florida Public Hurricane Loss Model (FPHLM) project.

References

- Blumberg, A.F., Herring, H.J., 1987. Circulation modelling using orthogonal curvilinear coordinates. In: Nihoul, J.C.J., Jamart, B.M. (Eds.), Three-Dimensional Models of Marine and Estuarine Dynamics. In: Elsevier Oceanography Series, vol. 45, Elsevier, pp. 55–88. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0422-9894(08)70442-2, URL http: //www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0422989408704422.
- Dasgupta, S., Islam, M.S., Huq, M., Huque Khan, Z., Hasib, M.R., 2019. Quantifying the protective capacity of mangroves from storm surges in coastal Bangladesh. PLOS ONE 14 (3), 1–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214079.
- Feliciano, E.A., Wdowinski, S., Potts, M.D., Lee, S.-K., Fatoyinbo, T.E., 2017. Estimating mangrove canopy height and above-ground biomass in the everglades national park with airborne LiDAR and TanDEM-X data. Remote Sens. 9 (7), http://dx.doi.org/ 10.3390/rs9070702, URL https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/9/7/702.
- Hervouet, J.-M., Samie, R., Moreau, B., 2000. Modelling urban areas in dam-break flood-wave numerical simulations. In: Proceedings of the International Seminar and Workshop on Rescue Actions Based on Dambreak Flow Analysis. Seinajoki, Finland.
- Hirata, Y., Tabuchi, R., Patanaponpaiboon, P., Poungparn, S., Yoneda, R., Fujioka, Y., 2014. Estimation of aboveground biomass in mangrove forests using high-resolution satellite data. J. Forest Res. 19 (1), 34–41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10310-013-0402-5.
- Horstman, E.M., Dohmen-Janssen, C.M., Narra, P.M.F., van den Berg, N.J.F., Siemerink, M., Hulscher, S.J.M.H., 2014. Wave attenuation in mangroves: A quantitative approach to field observations. Coast. Eng. 94, 47–62. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2014.08.005, URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/ science/article/pii/S0378383914001574.
- Iimura, K., Tanaka, N., 2012. Numerical simulation estimating effects of tree density distribution in coastal forest on tsunami mitigation. Ocean Eng. 54, 223–232. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2012.07.025, URL http://www.sciencedirect. com/science/article/pii/S0029801812002806.
- Jelesnianski, C.P., Chen, J., Shaffer, W.A., 1992. SLOSH: Sea, Lake, and Overland Surges from Hurricanes. NOAA technical report NWS, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Weather Service, URL https://books.google.com/books?id = Wdg8mQfzkVcC.
- Krauss, K.W., Doyle, T.W., Doyle, T.J., Swarzenski, C.M., From, A.S., Day, R.H., Conner, W.H., 2009. Water level observations in mangrove swamps during two hurricanes in Florida. Wetlands 29 (1), 142–149.
- Liu, H., Zhang, K., Li, Y., Xie, L., 2013. Numerical study of the sensitivity of mangroves in reducing storm surge and flooding to hurricane characteristics in southern Florida. Cont. Shelf Res. 64, 51–65. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2013.05.015, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0278434313001994.
- Mazda, Y., Wolanski, E., King, B., Sase, A., Ohtsuka, D., Magi, M., 1997. Drag force due to vegetation in mangrove swamps. Mangroves Salt Marshes 1 (3), 193–199.
- Montgomery, J.M., Bryan, K.R., Horstman, E.M., Mullarney, J.C., 2018. Attenuation of tides and surges by mangroves: Contrasting case studies from New Zealand. Water 10 (9), http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/w10091119, URL https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/10/9/1119.
- Montgomery, J.M., Bryan, K.R., Mullarney, J.C., Horstman, E.M., 2019. Attenuation of storm surges by coastal mangroves. Geophys. Res. Lett. 46 (5), 2680–2689. http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2018GL081636.
- Mugasha, W.A., Mauya, E.W., Njana, A.M., Karlsson, K., Malimbwi, R.E., Ernest, S., 2019. Height-diameter allometry for tree species in Tanzania Mainland. Int. J. For. Res. 2019, 1–17.
- Mukai, A.Y., Westerink, J.J., Luettich, J., Mark, D., 2002. Eastcoast 2001, a tidal constituent database for western north atlantic, gulf of Mexico, and Caribbean Sea. In: ERDC/CHL TR-02-24. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, DC.
- Nepf, H.M., 1999. Drag, turbulence, and diffusion in flow through emergent vegetation. Water Resour. Res. 35 (2), 479–489. http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/1998WR900069.
- Pasch, R.J., Blake, E.S., Cobb III, H.D., Roberts, D.P., 2006. Tropical cyclone report hurricane wilma 15-25 october 2005. National Hurricane Center, NOAA, USA, Miami, Florida, URL https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/data/tcr/AL252005_Wilma.pdf.
- Powell, M.D., Houston, S.H., Amat, L.R., Morisseau-Leroy, N., 1998. The HRD real-time hurricane wind analysis system. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn. 77–78, 53–64. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6105(98)00131-7, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/ science/article/pii/S0167610598001317.
- Rodríguez, J.F., Saco, P.M., Sandi, S., Saintilan, N., Riccardi, G., 2017. Potential increase in coastal wetland vulnerability to sea-level rise suggested by considering hydrodynamic attenuation effects. Nature Commun. 8 (1), 1–12.
- Ross, M.S., Ruiz, P.L., Telesnicki, G.J., Meeder, J.F., 2001. Estimating above-ground biomass and production in mangrove communities of Biscayne National Park, Florida (USA). Wetl. Ecol. Manag. 9 (1), 27–37.

- Ruiz, P., Giannini, H., Prats, M., Perry, C., Foguer, M., Garcia, A., Shamblin, B., Whelan, K., Hernandez, M.-J., 2017. The everglades national park and big cypress national preserve vegetation mapping project interim report-southeast saline everglades (region 2), Everglades National Park. (Natural Resource Report NPS/SFCN/NRR—2017/1494), National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Ruiz, P., Prats, M., Perry, C., Garcia, A., Foguer, M., Ingram, J., Shamblin, R., Guichardot, M., Whelan, K., 2018. The everglades national park and big cypress national preserve vegetation mapping project interim report-Southwest Coastal everglades (region 3), everglades national park. (Natural Resource Report NPS/SFCN/NRR–1776), National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Sheng, Y.P., Zou, R., 2017. Assessing the role of mangrove forest in reducing coastal inundation during major hurricanes. Hydrobiologia 803 (1), 87–103.
- Simard, M., Zhang, K., Rivera-Monroy, V.H., Ross, M.S., Ruiz, P.L., Castañeda Moya, E., Twilley, R.R., Rodriguez, E., 2006. Mapping height and biomass of mangrove forests in Everglades National Park with SRTM elevation data. Photogramm. Eng. Remote Sens. 72 (3), 299–311.
- Smith, T.J., Anderson, G.H., Balentine, K., Tiling, G., Ward, G.A., Whelan, K.R.T., 2009. Cumulative impacts of hurricanes on Florida mangrove ecosystems: sediment deposition, storm surges and vegetation. Wetlands 29 (1), 24–34.
- Smith, T.J., Whelan, K.R.T., 2006. Development of allometric relations for three mangrove species in South Florida for use in the Greater Everglades Ecosystem restoration. Wetl. Ecol. Manag. 14 (5), 409–419.
- Soderqvist, L.E., Byrne, M.J., 2007. Monitoring the Storm Tide of Hurricane Wilma in Southwestern Florida, October 2005. US Geological Survey Reston, VA, USA, http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ds294, URL http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/ds294.
- Stone, B.M., Shen, H.T., 2002. Hydraulic resistance of flow in channels with cylindrical roughness. J. Hydraul. Eng. 128 (5), 500–506. http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE) 0733-9429(2002)128:5(500).
- Tamai, S., Nakasuga, T., Tabuchi, R., Ogino, K., 1986. Standing biomass of mangrove forests in southern thailand. J. Jpn. For. Soc. 68 (9), 384–388. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.11519/jjfs1953.68.9_384.
- Tanaka, N., 2009. Vegetation bioshields for tsunami mitigation: review of effectiveness, limitations, construction, and sustainable management. Landsc. Ecol. Eng. 5 (1), 71–79.
- Tanaka, N., Sasaki, Y., Mowjood, M.I.M., Jinadasa, S., 2007. Coastal vegetation structures and their functions in tsunami protection: experience of the recent Indian Ocean tsunami. Landsc. Ecol. Eng. 3 (1), 33–45.
- Teh, S.Y., Koh, H.L., Liu, P.L.-F., Ismail, A.I.M., Lee, H.L., 2009. Analytical and numerical simulation of tsunami mitigation by mangroves in Penang, Malaysia. J. Asian Earth Sci. 36 (1), 38–46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jseaes.2008.09. 007, Tsunamis in Asia. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/ S1367912008001557.
- Telis, P.A., 2006. The Everglades Depth Estimation Network (EDEN) for support of Ecological and Biological Assessments. (2006–3087), Geological Survey (U.S.).
- Temmerman, S., Meire, P., Bouma, T.J., Herman, P.M.J., Ysebaert, T., De Vriend, H.J., 2013. Ecosystem-based coastal defence in the face of global change. Nature 504 (7478), 79–83.
- Tomiczek, T., Wargula, A., Lomónaco, P., Goodwin, S., Cox, D., Kennedy, A., Lynett, P., 2020. Physical model investigation of mid-scale mangrove effects on flow hydrodynamics and pressures and loads in the built environment. Coast. Eng. 162, 103791. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2020.103791, URL https://www. sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378383920304774.
- Vafeidis, A.T., Schuerch, M., Wolff, C., Spencer, T., Merkens, J.L., Hinkel, J., Lincke, D., Brown, S., Nicholls, R.J., 2019. Water-level attenuation in global-scale assessments of exposure to coastal flooding: a sensitivity analysis. Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. 19 (5), 973–984. http://dx.doi.org/10.5194/nhess-19-973-2019, URL https: //nhess.copernicus.org/articles/19/973/2019/.
- Ward, G.A., Smith, T.J., Whelan, K.R.T., Doyle, T.W., 2006. Regional processes in mangrove ecosystems: spatial scaling relationships, biomass, and turnover rates following catastrophic disturbance. Hydrobiologia 569 (1), 517–527.
- Wu, Y., Falconer, R., Struve, J., 2001. Mathematical modelling of tidal currents in mangrove forests. Environ. Model. Softw. 16 (1), 19–29. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ S1364-8152(00)00059-1, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/ S1364815200000591.
- Wu, W., Marsooli, R., 2012. A depth-averaged 2D shallow water model for breaking and non-breaking long waves affected by rigid vegetation. J. Hydraul. Res. 50 (6), 558–575. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00221686.2012.734534.
- Xu, H., Zhang, K., Shen, J., Li, Y., 2010. Storm surge simulation along the US East and Gulf Coasts using a multi-scale numerical model approach. Ocean Dyn. 60 (6), 1597–1619.
- Zhang, K., Li, Y., Liu, H., Rhome, J., Forbes, C., 2013. Transition of the coastal and estuarine storm tide model to an operational storm surge forecast model: A case study of the Florida coast. Weather Forecast. 28 (4), 1019–1037. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-12-00076.1, URL https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/ journals/wefo/28/4/waf-d-12-00076_1.xml.
- Zhang, K., Liu, H., Li, Y., Xu, H., Shen, J., Rhome, J., Smith, T.J., 2012. The role of mangroves in attenuating storm surges. Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 102–103, 11–23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2012.02.021, URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/ science/article/pii/S0272771412000674.

150

151

152

153

154

155

6 7

1

2

3

4

5

8

a

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72 73

74 75

- Zhang, K., Thapa, B., Ross, M., Gann, D., 2016. Remote sensing of seasonal changes and disturbances in mangrove forest: a case study from South Florida. Ecosphere 7 (6), e01366. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.1366.
- Zhang, K., Xiao, C., Shen, J., 2008. Comparison of the CEST and SLOSH models for storm surge flooding. J. Coast. Res. 24 (2 (242)), 489–499.
- Zhang, Y., Yang, Y., Yang, K., Tan, X., Sun, X., Leng, B., Zhou, C., Zhu, B., 2020. Non-linear wave attenuation quantification model improves the estimation of wave attenuation efficiency of mangroves. Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. 245, 106927. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2020.106927, URL https://www. sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0272771420306582.