Influence of Types of Steel Poles on Measurements by Wind Speed Sensors along High-Speed Railways
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ABSTRACT

To find the influence of different types of steel poles on measurements by wind speed sensors along high-speed railways, the three-dimensional Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes equations, combined with the $k-\varepsilon$ turbulence model, were solved on an unstructured grid with a boundary layer using the finite volume method. The grid-independent validation was firstly conducted, and the accuracy of the present numerical simulation method was validated by experiments and simulations carried out by previous researchers. To ascertain angles of influence at different distances between the sensor and the virtual one, the flow field around a sensor was investigated with the method of altering the relative coordinates between the two sensors. After that, the flow fields and velocity distributions around steel poles were studied. It can be stated that behind the sensor, the closer the distance from the sensor center line, the larger the angle of influence. However, as the distance is varied from 0.3 to 1.0 m, the most adverse angles are not in excess of ±20°. In addition, the steel poles have a certain influence on the measurement results of sensors. A “two-sided petal acceleration region” with a “central pistil deceleration zone” comes into being. From the perspective of regions of influence in different wind directions, the influence region of the annulus pole is basically the same. For the square and H types, when the angle is 45°, the region of effect is the largest. For the same distance between the sensor and the pole, the space required between two sensors for the single H type is larger than that required by the annulus type. Thus, it is suggested that the distance between sensors and the pole should be 1.0 m with the anemometer located on the upstream side, and the distance between two anemometers should be 0.8 m.
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NOMENCLATURE

- $d$: distance between the centre line of sensors and the centre of the steel pole
- $D$: wind speed sensor
- $h$: distance between two sensors
- $L$: characteristic length, which is the width of the steel pole
- $l$: length of the wind speed sensor
- $R_u$: velocity ratio
- $U$: incoming flow speed
- $U_{XY}$: wind speed of the point in the XY horizontal plane
- $\alpha$: wind direction relative to the railway line
- $\beta$: wind direction relative to the sensors
- $\beta_e$: angle of influence
- $R_h$: height ratio, which is the ratio of the height of the adverse point from the bottom of the sensor to the height of the sensor

1. INTRODUCTION

In order to prevent train accidents due to strong winds, some countries with developed railway traffic and transportation have carried out lots of research and made large effective and practical achievements (Suzuki et al. 2003, Diedrichs et al. 2007, Bocciolone et al. 2008, Baker 2010, Liu and Zhang 2013, Rezvani and Mohebbi 2014, Hemida et al. 2014). All these can be summarized as three types of measures, as follows: (1) optimization of train aerodynamic shape (Cheli 2010, Hemida and Krajnovic 2010, Zhang et al. 2011), (2) construction of efficient windbreak facilities (Fujii et al. 1999, Zhang et al. 2013, Zhang and Liu 2012), and (3) regulation of train operation (Fujii et al. 1999, Gong and Wang 2012, Liu et al. 2008). They greatly improve the running safety of the train under crosswinds. During this investigative process, these countries have built Strong Winds Early Warning Systems (SWEWSs) one after another.
In France, wind speed sensors are installed on two independent dismountable masts which are 5 m high. Each one has two sensors that are 4 m above the rail level and at a distance of 4 m from the centre line of the near track (SNCF I / SYSTRA 2004). In Germany, every monitoring point has two 3-D ultrasonic anemometers which are also 4 m above the rail level and at a distance of 4 m from the centre line of the nearer track. In China, the system is mainly built along the Lanzhou–Xinjiang railway, the Qinghai–Tibet railway, and some high-speed railways that are easily affected by strong winds and monsoons (Ye et al. 2001, Liu et al. 2009, Gong and Wang 2012). At present, along the Lanzhou–Xinjiang and Qinghai–Tibet railways, the anemology stations are generally located upstream of the railway line, where the wind speed can respond to the incoming flow. However, along high-speed railways, the wind speed sensors are located 4 m above the rail level in horizontal holders which are fixed on steel poles. They are outwards and perpendicular to the line, and every monitoring point has two sensors as in some other countries. If this layout is chosen for the regulation of operation, when the wind speed sensors are in the upstream side, the measurement data will be influenced by the steel pole; when the sensors are near the pole, the effect tends to be higher; when the sensors are in the downstream side, however, due to the shielding effect of the steel pole, the sensors may be in an acceleration or deceleration zone, and thus the measurements will be unreliable and may be incorrect. In this wind environment, how to install the sensors around the pole will be particularly important. According to their research, Fujii et al. (1999) proposed that wind directions be judged and train operations be controlled according to wind velocities observed with windward anemometers on the bridge which connects the Kansai district with Kansai International Airport on the Kansai airport line, so in this study, the upstream layout method is also chosen for setting up wind monitoring points.

In China, according to the document "Steel Pole for Overhead Contact System of Electrified Railway (GB/T 25020-2010)", the types of steel poles along high-speed railways are always of the square, annulus, or H type, and the velocity distributions around these types of steel poles are different. If we use one method to install the sensors on poles, the measurement data may be inaccurate. Meanwhile, the detail of velocity distributions around them has not been studied deeply. Therefore, in order to find the influence of different types of steel poles on the measurements by wind speed sensors along high-speed railways, grid-independent validation and program validation are firstly conducted to find a suitable mesh resolution and a simulation method for the follow-up research. Then the disturbance of the flow field due to the sensors themselves is studied, and the proposed distance between two anemometers is found. After that, the flow field around different types of steel poles is analysed. Finally, the velocity distributions of the poles are analysed to find a reasonable distance between them and the wind speed sensors.

2. Mathematical Model

According to Article 170 of the "Interim Measures for the Management of Beijing–Tianjin Intercity Railway (TG-QT106-2008)", when the wind speed reaches above 30 m/s, high-speed trains are not allowed to run into gale regions, and so the wind speed in the current paper is chosen as 30 m/s. Through the calculations, the Mach number of the resultant wind is 0.09, so the air can be considered to be incompressible. Previous publications (Bouris and Bergeles 1999; Dutta et al. 2008) indicate that the upstream flow is regular and the velocity distributions are almost the same under different viscous models. Therefore, taking this flow case into account, the Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) equations combined with the eddy viscosity hypothesis (Fluent Inc. 2006) represent the most extensive method in engineering applications. (Zhang et al. 2011; Asgharzadeh et al. 2012; Rezvani et al. 2013; Zhang et al. 2013, Wang et al. 2014, Zhang and Liu 2012) for computing the flow field around the steel pole. In this simulation, the SIMPLEC algorithm was used in the computational method to couple the pressure and velocity fields. The second-order upwind formulations were chosen for solving the Navier–Stokes equations. The convergence criterion was based on the residual value of the continuity equation being imposed to $10^{-7}$ with little fluctuation. And it was also monitored by plotting the aerodynamic force coefficients on the steel poles until they become steady with iterations.

3. Computational Details

In the paper, the types of steel poles chosen are the square, annulus, and H types, with cross-sections of 300 mm × 300 mm (Φ 300 mm), as shown in Fig. 1. Meanwhile, H types include the single-H and the double-H. Along China’s high-speed railways, the types of sensors are mainly the Lambrecht hot-zone from Germany and the Vaisala ultrasonic from Finland. These two kinds of sensors are similar in their dimensions. Therefore, the Lambrecht hot-zone wind sensor is chosen for the research on the disturbance of the flow field due to the sensors themselves. Its maximal diameter $D$ is 105 mm with a length $l$ of 311 mm. Its exterior surface is very regular and simple, but the interior is a hole with some complex structures, so we just smooth the hole to retain its whole shape, as shown in Fig. 1(e).
In numerical simulations, the wind direction is taken into consideration, which is illustrated in Fig. 2. Then it is set as 0°, 15°, 30°, 45°, 60°, 75°, and 90°, respectively. When $\alpha = 0^\circ$, it means that the incoming flow is parallel with the railway line, and its orientation is along the positive direction of the Y axis. Meanwhile, when $\alpha$ is equal to 90°, it means that the incoming flow is perpendicular to the railway line. Due to the symmetry of the steel pole, as the direction varies from 90° to 180°, we can refer to velocity distributions between 0° and 90°. In addition, the distance between the two sensors is defined as $h$, and $d$ is the distance of their centre line from the centre of the pole cross-section.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Grid-independent Validation and Program Validation

In order to obtain grid-independent results, numerical simulations of poles were performed on three different meshes with different numbers of cells: coarse, medium, and fine, consisting of $3.25 \times 10^6$, $4.26 \times 10^6$ and $5.29 \times 10^6$ cells, respectively. The pole type is double-H, and the wind direction is 90° with a speed of 30 m/s. Compared with the calculated results, the velocity ratio $R_U$ of the horizontal plane at $x = -1.0$ m is studied on three different meshes, illustrated in Fig. 4. The velocity ratio $R_U$ is defined as follows:

$$R_U = \frac{U_{XY}}{U}$$

where $U_{XY}$ is the wind speed of this point in the XY horizontal plane, $U$ is the incoming flow speed.

It is discovered that the contact ratio of curves is very good. Therefore, to save computational resources, the coarse mesh is chosen for the
calculation of cases. Figure 5 shows the coarse mesh of the cross-section of the pole.

The next step is to validate the accuracy of the present numerical method. Figure 6 shows the validation result obtained using this program with the centre line velocity in front of the square. The experimental data are from Durao et al. (1988). We also found that Bouris and Bergeles (1999) carried out a numerical simulation on the flow field of a square cylinder, but it was a 2-D model and the research only investigated its vortex shedding. Based on Bouris and Bergeles’ numerical simulation model, a depth with four characteristic lengths along the height direction is taken into account the 3-D effect of the flow field. Compared with the recorded values, the figure presents reasonable agreement with the experimental and simulation results.

4.2 Flow Disturbance Due to the Sensors Themselves

In order to guarantee the accuracy of the measured data, two wind speed sensors are always installed at a monitoring point. Therefore, it is necessary to study the flow disturbance due to the sensors themselves to obtain a reasonable layout. In numerical simulations, only one sensor is located in the computational zone, while the other is a virtual sensor instead. (According to the principle of measurement by the hot-zone wind speed sensor, the data obtained are relative to their constant coefficients, convective heat transfer coefficient, passing electric current value, and so on. When these parameters are unknown, the velocity around the sensor in the simulation cannot be used to reflect the speed of the far-field airflow, so in order to eliminate the flow disturbance due to the sensors themselves, the method of setting up a virtual point and reading its speed value is chosen.)

The resultant wind velocity is 30 m/s. And the direction angle attacked is made by altering the relative coordinates between the sensor and the virtual one, as demonstrated in Fig. 7. The distance between the two sensors is defined as $H$ and is chosen as 0.3, 0.5, 0.8, and 1.0 m. Because the sensors are symmetrical in relation to the steel pole, the angle $\beta$ is only varied from 0° to 90° to achieve a comprehensive analysis of disturbance of the flow field.

When angle $\beta$ is 0°, it means that the virtual sensor lies at the centre line of the pole and behind it, which indicates that the measurement of the virtual sensor will be mainly affected by the pole. Because the sensor is not a regular cylinder, the velocity...
ratios $R_U$ of lines along the Z axis at distances of 0.3, 0.5, 0.8, and 1.0 m from the sensor center line, respectively, are studied to find the lowest value of $R_U$ along the vertical height, which is the most adverse point, as shown in Fig. 8 (a).

![Fig. 8. Distribution of $R_U$: (a) $R_U$ along the vertical height, (b) $R_U$ under different angles.](image-url)

Through detailed analysis, it is found that the height ratios $R_U$ of the adverse points are 0.22, 0.25, 0.33, and 0.35, corresponding to the $R_U$ values of 0.47, 0.65, 0.76, and 0.79 under these different distances. All velocity ratios are all less than 1. Here, $R_U$ is equal to the height of the adverse point from the bottom of the sensor to the height of the sensor. Even though the allowable measured deviation of ±10% is taken into consideration, according to the wind measurement criterion of China’s railways, $R_U$ at adverse points do not yet reach the lowest requirements. Therefore, it is necessary to obtain the range of influence behind the wind speed sensor, named angle $\beta_e$. Figure 8 (b) shows the variations of $R_U$ under different angles with different distances on the planes which are based on the height of the most adverse points and are parallel to the XY plane.

It is discovered that as the distance is varied from 0.3 to 1.0 m, the most adverse angles are not in excess of 20°. The closer the distance, the larger the angle of influence. Based on this investigation, the angles are obtained for different intervals as listed in Table 1. At the distance of 0.3 m, with an allowable deviation of 5%, the largest angle of impact is 19.7°. For the symmetrical location, the angle $\beta_e$ is 39.4°. While at the distance of 1.0 m, it is 14.8°. If we increase the deviation to 10%, the angle decreases to 37.0° at the distance of 0.3 m and to 9.2° at the distance of 1.0 m. So an angle of $\beta \geq 20°$ is suggested to avoid the disturbance of sensors themselves and the distance $H \geq 0.8$ m.

**Table 1 Angle of influence $\beta_e$**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowable deviation</th>
<th>$\beta_e/°$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤5%</td>
<td>$\beta_e$/°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x=0.3$ m</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x=0.5$ m</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x=0.8$ m</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x=1.0$ m</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**≤10%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowable deviation</th>
<th>$\beta_e/°$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x=0.3$ m</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x=0.5$ m</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x=0.8$ m</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x=1.0$ m</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3 Flow Fields**

To understand the flow field around different steel poles, the calculated flow fields in the cross-section at 0 L (in the middle of the pole) along the Z axis are depicted in Fig. 9 in terms of the velocity. Due to the effect of the blockage and the shielding influence of the steel pole, in the upstream direction, the deceleration zone occurs separately in front of and behind the steel pole. The shorter the distance between the steel pole and the monitoring point, the lower the speed in that zone. However, behind the pole, the velocity at the monitoring point is much lower. As a result, a “two-sided petal acceleration region” with a “central pistil deceleration zone” comes into being, as shown in Fig. 9.

Due to an arc structure, the effect on the flow around the annulus is the same at different wind direction; therefore, the region of influence is basically the same. However, for the square and H types, due to their right-angled structures, the blockage effects can be clearly seen. When the wind direction is at 45°, the effect zone is the largest, while the smallest effect zone occurs for wind directions of 0° and 90°. In the same direction, the area of influence of the annulus is the lowest, and those of the square and H types have little difference from one another, while at 45°, the H type’s area of influence is slightly larger.

**4.4 Velocity Distributions**

The definition of the wind direction is illustrated in Fig. 2. The model of the wind speed sensor is not located in the computational zone, but instead of a virtual point. To better ascertain the influence of the pole, on the $z=0$ m plane, the velocity at the monitoring point is investigated. The positions of the lines are shown in Fig. 10 (a). The analysis in Section 3.2 indicates that the leeward flow field is affected more by the pole, and those of the square and H types are basically the same. Therefore, in this section, mainly the velocities at the windward flow field of the annulus and single-H types are investigated. The distribution of the velocity ratio $R_U$ is illustrated in Figs. 10(b)–10(d) for angles of 0°, 45°, and 90°, respectively, and the range of allowable deviation of wind speed measurement in engineering applications is marked.

It is clear that the shorter the distance from the pole, the greater the impact on the monitoring point. In addition, a shorter distance from the pole causes the peak variation of velocity ratio $R_U$ to be larger. At
the same wind direction and distance, the areas under the single-H type bounded by the curve of the velocity ratio $R_U$ and line of $R_U = 1$ are greater than the one under the annulus type. At a direction of 0°, the region of influence is small and has a non-symmetrical distribution. At 45°, the zone is the largest and also has a non-symmetrical distribution. However, at 90°, although the area is nearly the same as that at 0°, the curve has a symmetric distribution with respect to the line at $y/L = 0$. In different directions, the values of the velocity ratio $R_U$ along the lines range from 0.5 to 1.0 m within the allowable deviation of ±10% for the annulus type. For the single-H type, the situation is bad. The shorter the distance, the larger the part beyond the allowable deviation, because the possibility of receiving inaccurate data is much greater. Thus, to obtain a reasonable distance between poles and wind speed sensors, based on Figs. 10(b)–10(d), the results are listed in Table 2. (The flow fields around the square and H types are basically the same, so only that of the single-H type is analysed.)

Without considering the case of disturbance between the sensors themselves, when the distance $d$ of their centre line from the centre of the pole cross-section is equal to 0.5 m around the annulus type, the proper interval between two virtual sensors is $h \geq 0.32$ m. (For the symmetrical installment of the sensors, two times space is selected for the final result.) Meanwhile, when $d$ is chosen as 0.8 and 1.0 m, respectively, as long as the virtual sensors are located on the upstream side, the measurement requirements will be met. Furthermore, for the single-H type, under the condition of $d = 0.5$ m, an interval $h \geq 5.44$ m (2 times interval) is required to meet the requirements for all wind directions; for $d = 0.8$ m, an interval of $h \geq 4.94$ m is required, and for $d = 1.0$ m, intervals of $0.88 \geq h \geq 0$ m and $h \geq 4.48$ m are required. At the same $d$, the $h$ is larger for the single-H type than for the annulus type. Therefore, the installation of the wind speed sensors on the steel pole needs to meet the requirements for the H type (there is little difference between it and the square type); that is $d = 1.0$ m on the upstream side and $0.88 \geq h \geq 0.32$ m. Given the flow disturbance of the flow field due
to the sensors themselves based on the analysis in Section 3.2, it is suggested that \( h \) is 0.8 m.

5. CONCLUSION

The wind speed sensors installed along high-speed railways are always influenced by the steel pole. When the wind goes across it, due to its blockage effect, the wind speed at the sensor point will change. In this paper, RANS combined with the eddy viscosity hypothesis turbulence model has been used to investigate the velocity distribution around the sensor and different types of steel poles. The simulation method was compared with an experiment conducted by Durao (1988) and a simulation done by Bouris and Bergeles (1999), and these present reasonable agreements. Through analysis, the following conclusions could be drawn:

1. Along the incoming flow direction, there are two deceleration zones around the steel pole. The shorter the distance, the lower the velocity around the pole, especially behind the pole. Meanwhile, a “two-sided petal acceleration region” with a “central pistil deceleration zone” comes into being.

2. From the perspective of the region of influence under different wind directions, the region of influence of the annulus pole is basically the same under different wind directions. For the square and H-types, when the angle is 45°, the region of effect is the largest, while the smallest effect zone occurs for wind directions of 0° and 90°. In the same direction, the area of influence of the annulus is the lowest, and those of the square and H types have little difference from one another, while at 45°, the H type’s area of influence is slightly larger.

3. When the sensor is close to the pole, the space between two sensors tends to increase. For the same the distance \( d \) between the sensor and pole, the space \( h \) under the single H-type is larger than that of the annulus.

Thus, to install the wind speed sensors on the steel pole, it is necessary to meet the requirements of the H type, and it is suggested that the distance between
Table 2 Reasonable distance between wind speed sensors and steel poles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steel pole</th>
<th>Wind direction/°</th>
<th>Reasonable distance between steel poles and wind speed sensors/m</th>
<th>Sensor-1</th>
<th>Sensor-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x = -0.5 m</td>
<td>x = -0.8 m</td>
<td>x = -1.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annulus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>y ≤ 0.16</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>y ≥ 0.10</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>y ≤ 0.99</td>
<td>y ≥ 1.09</td>
<td>0.44 ≤ y ≤ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>y ≥ 1.69</td>
<td>0.21 ≤ y ≤ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.20 ≤ y ≤ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 2.72</td>
<td>0.43 ≤ y ≤ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.41 ≤ y ≤ 0</td>
<td>y ≥ 2.65</td>
<td>0.72 ≤ y ≤ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.82 ≤ y ≤ 0.16</td>
<td>y ≥ 1.56</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>y ≥ 0.28</td>
<td>y ≥ 0.07</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>y ≥ 0.31</td>
<td>y ≥ 0.10</td>
<td>y ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the anemometer and the pole should be chosen as \( d = 1.0 \) m with the anemometer located on the upstream side, and the distance between two anemometers should be specified as \( h = 0.8 \) m.
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