

ANALYSING FLOW CHARACTERISTIC OF BREACHING EMBANKMENT
USING LINEAR HYDRODYNAMIC POROUS MODEL

ZAINAB MOHAMED YUSOF

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

School of Civil Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JULY 2021

DEDICATION

*Knowledge is that which benefits not that which is
memorised*

Quoted by Imam Al-Shafié

Patience is a pillar of faith

Quoted by Umar ibn al-Khattab (RA)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I owe my sincere gratitude and utmost thanks to my supervisors, Professor Ts. Dr. Ahmad Khairi Abd. Wahab and Associate Professor Dr. Zulhilmi Ismail for their encouragement, supervision and support that enables me to develop an understanding of the subject throughout the entire period of my study. This thesis could not be presented in its current form without their guidance.

My gratitude extends to Dr. David Hargreaves and Dr. Herve Morvan at the University of Nottingham, United Kingdom, for giving me the opportunity and providing me knowledge in Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD). Also, to my employer at the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia and the Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia, for the financial grant, laboratory equipment, and moral support during my study time.

I dedicate my deepest gratitude and love to my beloved husband, Shahabuddin Amerudin, and sons, Hariz Izzuddin and Haziq Izzamuddin for their sacrifices, patience, and understanding at all times.

Finally, I offer my regards and blessings to everyone who has supported me in any way during the whole course of my study, including my colleagues at School of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.

ABSTRACT

The study of the overtopping flow associated with breaching embankments is an essential part of water management, particularly for emergency planning. One of the mechanisms that triggers embankment collapse is overtopping. Therefore, it is crucial to identify the zones at risk where the overtopping failure is likely to occur and where the breach might form. The nature of the failure would significantly impact the breach discharge, the variation of reservoir water levels, and the resulting water levels in the downstream valley or floodplain. This thesis presents the characteristics of flow due to an embankment breaching caused by flow overtopping. Laboratory works were carried out to observe the embankment failure, how the erosion is triggered, and factors contributing to the failure. A dimensional analysis was performed to identify the variables involved to analyse the mechanism of the embankment failure. The development of an embankment breach model using Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) was carried out to model the failure patterns of a breaching embankment. This required specification of the breach formation and breach widening, and prediction of the resulting breach hydrograph. In this study, the embankment was modelled as a porous medium governed by a generalised form of Darcy's Law. The erosion is prescribed by systematically decreasing the porous embankment resistance in those areas where erosion is likely to occur linearly. Model validations were performed by comparing CFD simulations with measured data from experimental work in the laboratory for a 2D model. The Eroding models developed were conducted in 2D and 3D, using the Realizable $k - \varepsilon$ model and the Volume of Fluid (VOF) multiphase model to identify the free elevation surface. The 2D model results have shown good agreement with experimental data for free water surface and velocity profiles over a rigid embankment. For a porous embankment, the profiles displayed reasonable accuracy with that of a Rigid Model. The validations on the 2D porous embankment models gave reasonably good agreement on temporal breach patterns and free surface flow over the breached embankment. The results showed that the overflow volume predicted was close to the theoretical value. The percentage difference was around 13%. The study considered the mesh adaption technique using a grid refinement method. The results indicated that a 10% rule of refining and coarsening produced a difference of 6% (in peak flow of the hydrograph) compared to 10% rule of refining only technique. The 3D Eroding Models allow for the inclusion of lateral breach formation to predict flow features over a breached embankment and predict a breach discharge hydrograph. Three breach shape cases were simulated, namely the side-, trapezoidal, and triangle breach shapes. As a result, parameters such as velocity vectors at the breach area, free water surface profiles, and embankment volume lost during the breaching event were produced. The Eroding Model predicted that the initially triangular shaped beach produced 24% higher peak breach discharge compared with the trapezoidal shape. Comparisons of a maximum velocity at the breached area between the 3D Eroding Models and FLOW-3D simulation ranged from 11% to 52%. Meanwhile, the FLOW-3D simulation predicted more volume lost and peak discharge compared with observed data (Case Study E1) with a percentage difference of 42.7% and 30.2%, respectively.

ABSTRAK

Kajian aliran limpahan berkaitan pemecahan benteng amat penting dalam pengurusan air, terutamanya dalam menyediakan plan tindakan kecemasan. Salah satu mekanisma yang menyebabkan pemecahan benteng adalah limpahan air melalui struktur benteng. Oleh itu, adalah penting untuk mengenalpasti zon-zon yang berisiko di mana pemecahan benteng mungkin berlaku disebabkan limpahan ini dan lokasi pembentukan pemecahannya. Sifat perpecahan benteng ini akan memberi kesan yang signifikan ke atas aliran air limpahan yang dihasilkan, perubahan aras air takungan dan menyebabkan kenaikan paras air di bahagian hilir. Tesis ini mengkaji ciri-ciri aliran akibat pemecahan benteng tanah yang disebabkan oleh aliran limpahan air. Penyasatan di makmal telah mengkaji ciri-ciri aliran yang menyebabkan perpecahan benteng; bagaimana hakisan berlaku dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi pemecahan benteng. Analisis tidak berdimensi telah dilakukan untuk mengenal pasti pemboleh ubah yang berkaitan yang menyebabkan perpecahan benteng. Pembangunan model perpecahan benteng dibangunkan menggunakan kaedah 'Computational Fluid Dynamics' (CFD) untuk memodelkan corak perpecahan pembentukan punca pemecahan benteng. Kaedah ini memerlukan spesifikasi pembentukan punca pemecahan dan kelebaran kawasan pemecahan dan meramalkan hidrograf aliran limpahan yang dihasilkan. Dalam kajian ini, benteng dimodelkan sebagai media berongga (berliang) yang alirannya dianalisis menggunakan Hukum Darcy dalam bentuk umum. Hakisan dibentuk dengan mengurangkan daya rintangan di bahagian benteng yang berkemungkinan terhakis secara linear. Pengesahan model dilakukan dengan membuat perbandingan keputusan model simulasi CFD untuk pemodelan 2D dengan data yang dicerap di makmal. Benteng dimodelkan secara 2D dan 3D menggunakan model berbilang fasa, iaitu menggunakan kaedah 'Volume of Fluid' (VOF) dan model aliran gelora 'Realizable Model' $k - \epsilon$ untuk mengkaji ciri-ciri pembentukan air disebabkan pemecahan benteng. Hasil simulasi secara 2D bagi profil permukaan air dan kelajuan air bagi Model Benteng Tegar menunjukkan perbandingan yang baik dengan data yang dicerap di makmal. Bagi pemodelan benteng berliang, profil aliran menunjukkan persetujuan yang baik dengan Model Benteng Tegar yang tidak berlaku pemecahan. Pengesahan yang telah dilakukan bagi model 2D Benteng Berliang telah menunjukkan perbandingan yang baik, dari segi corak masa pemecahan dan aliran permukaan. Hasil kajian menunjukkan jumlah lebih air menghampiri nilai teori dengan perbezaan peratusan sekitar 13%. Kajian telah menggunakan teknik pembentukan grid dengan kaedah penghalusan grid. Teknik penghalusan dan pembesaran grid sebanyak 10% menghasilkan perbezaan peratusan aliran puncak hidrograf sebanyak 6% berbanding dengan kaedah 10% penghalusan grid sahaja. Model Hakisan 3D mengambilkira pembentukan perpecahan benteng bagi simulasi aliran melalui benteng yang pecah dan seterusnya menghasilkan hidrograf aliran limpah. Tiga jenis bentuk perpecahan yang disiasat adalah jenis perpecahan sisi, trapezoid dan segitiga. Parameter yang dihasilkan adalah vektor halaju, permukaan air bebas dan isipadu kehilangan semasa perpecahan benteng berlaku. Hasil simulasi model 3D menunjukkan bentuk perpecahan awal jenis segitiga menghasilkan aliran limpahan 24% lebih tinggi daripada bentuk trapezoid. Perbandingan halaju maksimum di kawasan perpecahan benteng bagi semua Model Hakisan 3D dibandingkan dengan FLOW-3D adalah di antara 11% - 52%. Manakala, simulasi FLOW-3D menghasilkan lebih kehilangan isipadu benteng dan kadar alir puncak berbanding data cerapan (Kajian kes E1) dengan perbezaan peratusan 42.7% dan 30.2%.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	iii
	DEDICATION	iv
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
	ABSTRACT	vi
	ABSTRAK	vii
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
	LIST OF TABLES	xiii
	LIST OF FIGURES	xv
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxvii
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xxix
CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Background Study	1
	1.2 Problem Statement	4
	1.3 Aim and Objective of the Study	7
	1.4 Scopes of Study	8
	1.5 Research Questions	9
	1.6 Significance of Study	9
	1.7 Model Limitations	10
	1.8 Terminology	11
	1.9 Thesis Outline	12
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE REVIEW	15
	2.1 Failures of an Embankment Dam	15
	2.2 Failure due to Overtopping	18
	2.3 Breach Widening	27
	2.4 Sidewall Effect	39
	2.5 Models of Embankment Failure	42

2.6	Porous Media and Their Limitations	57
2.7	Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) Technique	61
2.7.1	The Darcy Model for Porous Medium	61
2.7.2	Multiphase Flow and VOF Model	63
2.7.3	Turbulence Models	65
2.7.4	Numerical Techniques	68
2.7.5	Numerical Accuracy	69
2.7.6	Mesh Types	71
2.7.7	Time Steps	72
2.8	Summary	73
CHAPTER 3	METHODOLOGY	75
3.1	Introduction	75
3.2	Phase 1 – Literature Review and Laboratory Experiments	77
3.2.1	Experimental Model Setup	77
3.2.2	Discharge Measurement	79
3.2.3	Soil Compaction	81
3.2.4	Repeatability Test	83
3.3	Phase 2 - Hydraulic Flow Characteristics and CFD	84
3.4	Phase 3 – Development of Eroding Models	86
3.4.1	2D Eroding Model	86
3.4.1.1	Delimiter Lines Equation	88
3.4.2	3D Eroding Model	94
3.4.2.1	Delimiter Plane Equations	96
3.5	Computational Model of a Porous Eroding Embankment	98
3.5.1	Realizable $k - \varepsilon$ Turbulence Model in Porous Media	102
3.5.2	The User-Defined Function (UDF) in FLUENT	102
3.5.3	The Initial and Boundary Conditions	104
3.5.4	Mesh Adaptions	106
3.6	Summary	106

CHAPTER 4	PHYSICAL MODELS AND POROUS MODEL'S SENSITIVITY	111
4.1	Results on Physical Models of Breaching Embankment	111
4.1.1	Effect of Selected Test Parameters on Breach Process	111
4.1.1.1	Effect of Embankment Slope, S_o	114
4.1.1.2	Effect of Inflow Rate, Q	118
4.1.1.3	Effect of Sediment Grainsize, d	121
4.1.1.4	Effect of Breach Widening	125
4.1.2	Soil Properties	135
4.1.3	Dimensional Analysis on a Breaching Embankment	137
4.1.4	Embankment Volume Lost and Deposition – Case Study E1	139
4.1.4.1	MATLAB Analysis – Remaining Embankment and Sediment Deposition	142
4.1.4.2	SURFER 8 – Embankment Volume Lost	144
4.1.5	Breach Progression and Soil Displacement – Case Study E2	145
4.1.5.1	Temporal Breach of Case Study E2	146
4.1.5.2	Soil Displacement using PIV	149
4.1.5.3	Breached Velocity for Case Study E2	151
4.1.6	FLOW-3D Validation for Case Study E1	153
4.2	Validation and Sensitivity Analysis of Intact Models	161
4.2.1	Validation 1: Fritz and Hager's Experimental Works	162
4.2.1.1	Validation 1: Sensitivity Analysis of Flow over a Rigid Model	164
4.2.2	Validation 2: Sensitivity Analysis of Flow over an Intact Model	175
4.2.2.1	Shear stress above a Rigid Model versus an Intact Model	181
4.2.3	Validation 3: Sensitivity analysis of Mesh Resolution of Intact Model (1-domain approach)	186
4.3	Summary	189

4.3.1	Progression of Failure and Volume Lost	190
4.3.2	Breach Discharge Hydrograph	191
4.3.3	Breaching Patterns and Widening	191
CHAPTER 5	NUMERICAL MODEL RESULTS	195
5.1	Introduction	195
5.2	Analysis of 2D Eroding Models	195
5.2.1	2D Non-deposited Eroding Model	196
5.2.1.1	2D Non-deposited Eroding Model Validation: Sub-Domain Approach	197
5.2.1.2	Analysis of Results	201
5.2.2	2D Deposited Eroding Model: 1-Domain Approach	206
5.2.2.1	Method of Rotating Lines	207
5.2.2.2	Progression of Collapse	213
5.2.2.3	Eroding Model Validation Results	215
5.2.2.4	Eroding Model with Grid Refinement Method	218
5.3	Analysis of 3D Eroding Models	229
5.3.1	Model Setup of 3D Eroding Models	231
5.3.2	3D Eroding Model 1: Side-Breach Shape	233
5.3.2.1	Results and Analysis of the 3D Eroding Model 1 (Side-Breach)	234
5.3.3	3D Eroding Model 2: Trapezoidal Breach Shape	239
5.3.3.1	Results and Analysis of the 3D Eroding Model 2 (Trapezoidal Breach)	242
5.3.4	3D Eroding Model 3: Triangular Breach Shape	252
5.3.4.1	Results and Analysis of the 3D Eroding Model 3 (Triangular Breach)	253
5.4	FLOW-3D Model Validations for a 3D Eroding Model	263
5.5	Summary	272
CHAPTER 6	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	277
6.1	Conclusions	277

6.1.1	Physical Model Outputs of Breach Parameters (Objective 1)	277
6.1.2	2D Intact Model (Objective 2)	278
6.1.3	2D Eroding Model (Objective 3)	279
6.1.4	3D Eroding Model (Objective 4)	280
6.1.5	Validation of Eroding Model	281
6.2	Recommendations	282
	REFERENCES	285
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	297

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Table 2.1	Definition of dam Hazard Rating (DID, 2017)	21
Table 2.2	List of embankment dams and its hazard classification in Malaysia (DID, 2017)	22
Table 2.3	Breach parameter relations based on dam failure case studies (Wahl, 1998)	42
Table 2.4	Summary of breach numerical models due to overtopping	43
Table 2.5	Estimated breach erosion rate parameter values for dam failure (Walder and O'Connor, 1997)	47
Table 3.1	Physical model versus prototype properties of the study	79
Table 4.1	Experimental cases of embankment description	112
Table 4.2	Summary of the experimental setup and parameters testing in the laboratory	113
Table 4.3	Summary of soil properties tested in the laboratory	137
Table 4.4	Variables and its dimension of breaching mechanisms	138
Table 4.5	Controlling parameters in embankment erosion based on Category	139
Table 4.6	Velocities of a breached embankment – Case Study E2	151
Table 4.7	Experimental data of velocity sediment for Case Study E2	153
Table 4.8	Comparison results of Volume Lost between FLOW-3D and experimental for Case Study E1	159
Table 4.9	A summary of data for 2D model validation	164
Table 4.10	Mesh resolution for Rigid Models	165
Table 4.11	Summary of the experimental results on breach parameters	192
Table 5.1	Breach description for 2D Non-deposited Eroding Model in replicating Lüthi's result	201
Table 5.2	Phases of erosion for Deposited Eroding Model, in replicating Lüthi's breach pattern results	209
Table 5.3	Progression of embankment collapses by rotation	213

Table 5.4	Comparison results on different threshold values on mesh adaption	223
Table 5.5	Logic statements of a trapezoidal breach model	241
Table 5.6	Summary of volume lost comparison between 3D Eroding Models and FLOW-3D	267
Table 5.7	The comparison of a maximum velocity magnitude between 3D Eroding Models and FLOW-3D	270
Table 5.8	Summary of the 2D Eroding Models	273

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Figure 1.1	Dramatic historical embankment failures due to overtopping flow	5
Figure 2.1	Overtopping leading to washout due to less cohesive material	18
Figure 2.2	Shearing Stress over a channel bed	19
Figure 2.3	A breaching embankment (Everington, 2020)	20
Figure 2.4	The impact of embankment overtopping: (a) during and (b) after (ASDSO, 2020)	20
Figure 2.5	Flow regimes of overtopping (Powledge et al., 1989)	23
Figure 2.6	The erosion of the crest and its evolution (Chinnarasri et al., 2003)	23
Figure 2.7	Rotation of downstream embankment face around Pivot point in the first stage after overtopping; (a) antidunes formation; (b) Crest lowering due sliding of the downstream slope (Dupont et al., 2007)	24
Figure 2.8	Free surface computation (CFD) and comparison against experimental works (Physical Model) by Fritz and Hager (1998) (Zelmar, 2005)	25
Figure 2.9	Evolution Shear Stress on the top and outward slope face of a 1:2 embankment (Zelmar, 2005)	26
Figure 2.10	Pressure Coefficient, C_p , at the foot of a 1:2 embankment (Zelmar, 2005)	26
Figure 2.11	Erosion rate categories for selected soil types (after Briaud et al., 2008)	29
Figure 2.12	Breach Growth: (a) at initiation and (b) after breach formation (FLOODsite, 2019)	30
Figure 2.13	Experimental results of a coarse-sand embankment breaching; (a) after 44 s, (b) after 113 s, (c) after 217 s and (d) after 269 s (Coleman et al., 2002)	31
Figure 2.14	A part of the IMPACT project showing the unstable part of non-cohesive soil embankment (Wang and Bowles, 2006)	32

Figure 2.15	Schematic diagrams of ‘two-helix flow’ erosion (Zhang et al., 2009)	33
Figure 2.16	HERU’s temporal breaching observation due to overtopping (Hahn et al., 2000)	34
Figure 2.17	Growth of breach width, observed in Zwin’94 experiment (Visser, 1998)	35
Figure 2.18	Erosion rates for Zwin’94 experiment (Bisschop et al., 2011)	36
Figure 2.19	Breach phases for all three breach types (Orendoff, 2009)	37
Figure 2.20	Breach widening for different inflow rates; (a) $Q_1 = 0.6 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$, (b) $Q_2 = 0.9 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$, and (c) $Q_3 = 1.2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ for medium sand embankment and slope of 1V:2H (Lazin, 2014)	37
Figure 2.21	Flow and detailed 3D morphodynamic data from laboratory experiments of fluvial dike breaching (Rifai et al., 2019)	39
Figure 2.22	Experimental setup of an embankment breach model (a) streamwise section, and (b) plan view (Schmocker and Hager, 2009)	40
Figure 2.23	Model embankment for scale family tests (Schmocker and Hager, 2009)	40
Figure 2.24	Sidewall effect on embankment surface profiles at various time, t for Tests 28, 29 and 30 (Schmocker and Hager, 2009)	41
Figure 2.25	Prescribed breach lines used by Cristofano erosion model (Fread, 1988)	45
Figure 2.26	Setup of Model Reach I and Model Reach II, and its flow regime according to the ID model (Tingsanchali and Chinnarasri, 2001)	49
Figure 2.27	Modified evolution of breach formation studied by Temple et al. (2005)	51
Figure 2.28	Illustration of velocity profiles through impervious wall and porous media	58
Figure 2.29	Boundary layer (after NASA, 2008)	59
Figure 2.30	Comparison of laminar and turbulent boundary layers (after NASA, 2008)	59
Figure 3.1	The research methodology	76
Figure 3.2	The long flume used for the laboratory experiment	77

Figure 3.3	A schematic diagram of the channel setup; (a) plan view, (b) side view	78
Figure 3.4	Schematic diagram of an embankment size	79
Figure 3.5	A v-notch weir setup at the channel outlet: (a) actual model and (b) weir dimensions with $\theta = 90^0$	80
Figure 3.6	Vibratory table set up for determining the dry density of soil	82
Figure 3.7	Physical model setup; (a) Grids for the embankment construction, (b) Bubble level (c) Embankment compaction, and (d) Notch (a black dashed circle) as a weak area of the embankment, located at the centre of the embankment	83
Figure 3.8	A local bank failure method (IMPACT, 2005)	85
Figure 3.9	Intractability of finite volume approach to tackle a problem dealing with porous regions: (a) cell 1 is completely filled with porous region and (b) cell 2 is partially filled with porous region	89
Figure 3.10	The conceptualisation of delimiter lines based on cell by cell approach using finite volume method (embankment side view): (a) cells lie completely below the delimiter lines, and (b) cells lie completely and partially below the limiter lines	89
Figure 3.11	The normal distance, D_i , from a series of nodes to a delimiter line of $ax + by + c = 0$	90
Figure 3.12	Fluent snapshot of R_i values	91
Figure 3.13	Resistance value in logarithmic scale for interpolation	92
Figure 3.14	Resistance value in linear scale for interpolation	93
Figure 3.15	Conceptualisation of overtopping failure in 2D dimensions	94
Figure 3.16	3D plane equations for Eroding Models	95
Figure 3.17	A plane equation to model a 3D Porous medium	96
Figure 3.18	Modified Fluent Solver. Step involved in a flow solution (FLUENT, 2009).	99
Figure 3.19	A schematic diagram of conceptual porous model	100
Figure 3.20	Flow chart of the Eroding Model development	101
Figure 3.21	Example of 3D and 2D block-structured grid which matches at interfaces, as used to model embankment breach (a) 3D grid – a finer mesh near the edge and (b) 2D grids	104

Figure 4.1	Comparison of breached hydrograph on 1V:2H and 1V:3H embankment slopes with coarse sand for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 , and (c) Q_3	115
Figure 4.2	Comparison of breached hydrograph on 1V:2H and 1V:3H embankment slopes with medium sand for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 , and (c) Q_3	116
Figure 4.3	Breach discharge hydrographs of different inflow rates for Case L1 (Coarse, 1V:2H)	118
Figure 4.4	Breach discharge hydrograph of different inflows for Case L2 (Coarse, 1V:3H)	119
Figure 4.5	Breach discharge hydrograph for different inflows for Case L3	120
Figure 4.6	Breach discharge hydrographs for different inflows for Case L4 (Medium, 1V:3H)	120
Figure 4.7	Flow enters the notch at $t = 0$ s; (a) Coarse sand, Case L1 and (b) Medium sand, Case L3	121
Figure 4.8	Breach discharge hydrograph comparison between coarse and medium sand, with a similar embankment slope for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 , and (c) Q_3	123
Figure 4.9	Breach discharge hydrograph comparison between coarse and medium sand with different embankment slope for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 , and (c) Q_3	124
Figure 4.10	Breach widening of three different inflow rates for Case L1 (Coarse, 1V:2H) and a final breached shape at a specific time for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 and (c) Q_3	126
Figure 4.11	Breach widening of three different inflow rates for Case L2 (Coarse, 1V:3H) and a final breached shape at a specific time for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 and (c) Q_3	127
Figure 4.12	Breach widening of three different inflow rates for Case L3 (Medium, 1V:2H) and a final breached shape at a specific time for Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3	128
Figure 4.13	Breach widening of three different inflow rates for Case L4 (Coarse, 1V:3H) and a final breached shape at a specific time for Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3	129
Figure 4.14	Breach width comparisons between coarse and medium embankment with different embankment slope for Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3	130
Figure 4.15	A summary of the breach width phases for Case L2 (Coarse, 1V:3H)	132

Figure 4.16	Comparisons of breach discharge hydrograph and breach width for different material with a similar embankment slope, for Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3 ; (a) coarse and (b) medium embankment	133
Figure 4.17	Comparisons of breach discharge hydrograph and breach width for coarse embankment with different embankment slope, for Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3 ; (a) 1V:2H and (b) 1V:3H	134
Figure 4.18	Comparisons of breach discharge hydrograph and breach width for medium sand with different embankment slope, for Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3 ; (a) 1V:2H and (b) 1V:3H	135
Figure 4.19	Analysis of soil particles sample distribution in the present study, as referred to BS 1377 procedures	136
Figure 4.20	Experimental morphology of an embankment failure; (a) flow entering the notch, and (b) after completely breached for Case Study E1	140
Figure 4.21	Sediment deposition (a) final breached shape, and (b) Sediment deposition pattern (ripples) at downstream for Case Study E1	140
Figure 4.22	A breached hydrograph of the embankment failure of Case Study E1	141
Figure 4.23	A plan view of grids created as an intersection point to measure the sediment bed level (x and z axes).	142
Figure 4.24	Surface embankment structure using MATLAB before breaching for Case Study E1	143
Figure 4.25	Surface morphology of breached embankment using MATLAB for Case Study E1.	143
Figure 4.26	A 3D surface morphology using SURFER 8 of an embankment failure; (a) before and (b) after. The legend (in colours) represents the elevation in cm.	145
Figure 4.27	A notch; acting as a weak point of the embankment dam, is located in the middle of the embankment fill, marked as a white circle	146
Figure 4.28	Experimental results of temporal vertical breaching for Q_3 : (a) $t = 10$ s, (b) $t = 30$ s, (c) $t = 60$ s, and (d) $t = 90$ s for Case Study E2	147
Figure 4.29	Experimental results of temporal lateral breaching for Q_3 : (e) $t = 120$ s, (f) $t = 160$ s, and (g) $t = 260$ s for Case Study E2	148
Figure 4.30	Breached hydrograph for Case Study E2	149

Figure 4.31	Soil displacement patterns during the embankment failure of Case Study E2 for Q_2 ; (a) $t= 30$ s, $t= 50$ s, (c) $t= 90$ s and (d) $t= 160$ s. Arrows represent the movement of soil. Curve lines represents the area of breach	150
Figure 4.32	Locations of velocity measured after the embankment is completely breached	151
Figure 4.33	Flow velocity after embankment breached, for inflow rate, $Q_3 = 1.2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ (Case Study E2)	152
Figure 4.34	Velocity of sediment travelled for Case Study E2	153
Figure 4.35	Initial and boundary conditions of Case Study E1 model' setup; S- symmetry, Q – Discharge (inlet), O – Outflow (outlet) and P-Specified Pressure. The dark blue represents the embankment, and the light blue area represents the initial flow depth for Case Study E1	154
Figure 4.36	Embankment breach growth; (a) $t = 0$ s, (b) $t = 57$ s, (c) $t = 60$ s, (d) $t = 78$ s, and (d) $t = 250$ s for Case Study E1	155
Figure 4.37	The breach discharge hydrograph and embankment volume during the breaching for Case Study E1	156
Figure 4.38	Temporal progression of free surface flow over the breached area; (a) $t = 40$ s, (b) $t = 60$ s, (c) $t = 78$ s, and (d) $t = 250$ s for Case Study E1	157
Figure 4.39	Profiles of velocity magnitude of a breaching progression (plan view); (a) $t = 16$ s, (b) $t = 57$ s, (c) $t = 78$ s, and (d) $t = 250$ s for Case Study E1	158
Figure 4.40	Breach velocities of the embankment failure for Case Study E1	160
Figure 4.41	A linear relationship between breached discharge and wetted area of a breaching embankment for Case Study E1	160
Figure 4.42	Experimental result of free surface profiles for upstream flow depth, $H_o = 0.05$ m (\triangle), 0.1 m (\circ), 0.15 m (∇) and 0.2 m (\square) (after Fritz and Hager, 1998).	162
Figure 4.43	Experimental setup of Fritz and Hager (1998). Dimensions; (a) plan view, (b) side view, and (c) v-notch weir to measure the discharge at the end of channel	163
Figure 4.44	Rigid Model setup for initial and boundary conditions (Fritz and Hager's validation model) using FLUENT	165
Figure 4.45	Schematic diagram of mesh resolution used to model a Rigid Model for Case R3	166

Figure 4.46	Comparison results of free water surface profiles between a Rigid Model and Fritz and Hager's experimental results; (a) Case R1, (b) Case R2, (d) Case R3, and (d) Case R4	168
Figure 4.47	Snapshot of recirculation water of the Rigid Model due to turbulent flow for Case R1. Red and blue colours represent the volume fraction of water and air	169
Figure 4.48	Snapshots of velocity contours above a Rigid Model; (a) Case R1, and (b) Case R4	170
Figure 4.49	x -velocity profiles above a rigid embankment crest – Case R1	172
Figure 4.50	Pressure distribution along the Rigid Model for (a) Case R1 (b) Case R2 (c) Case R3 and (d) Case R4. Blue colour represents the embankment location	174
Figure 4.51	Wall Shear Stress distribution along the Rigid Model for (a) Case R1, (b) Case R2, (c) Case R3 and (d) Case R4. Blue colour represents the embankment location	175
Figure 4.52	Schematic diagram of an Intact Model for Case R4	176
Figure 4.53	Snapshots of free surface profile; (a) over a Rigid Model, (b) over an Intact Model for Case R4	177
Figure 4.54	Snapshots of velocity contours; (a) Rigid Model, and (b) Intact Model for Case R4	178
Figure 4.55	Comparison profiles of free surface water of Rigid Model, Intact Model and experimental data of Fritz and Hager (1998) for Case R4	179
Figure 4.56	Comparison result of velocity profiles at the middle of embankment crest for Case R4	179
Figure 4.57	Relation of shear stress and y^+ value above wall	181
Figure 4.58	Comparison results of strain rate along Rigid and Intact Model	182
Figure 4.59	Comparison results of velocity gradient along rigid and Intact Model	183
Figure 4.60	Correlation factor of velocity gradients between rigid wall and porous medium	184
Figure 4.61	Corrected velocity gradient of Intact Model in comparison to Rigid Model	184
Figure 4.62	Locations of free water surface and embankment; (a) Intact Eroding Model (coarse mesh), and (b) Intact Sub-domain Model (finer mesh)	187

Figure 4.63	Locations of expected free water surface and embankment of Intact Eroding Model without tailwater effect – the water is freely flowing towards the downstream.	188
Figure 4.64	Comparison of free water surface profiles between Intact Model with and without tailwater effect with Fritz and Hager’s data	188
Figure 5.1	Schematic diagram of the Non-deposited Eroding Model using a sub-domain approach for Lüthi (2005) comparison	198
Figure 5.2	Mesh structures used for 2D Non-deposited Eroding Model (sub-domain). A line with white colour represents the embankment boundaries	198
Figure 5.3	Free water surface profiles of Intact Model in comparison to Rigid Model	199
Figure 5.4	x -velocity profiles over crest of Intact Model in comparison to Rigid Model at upstream, middle and downstream of the embankment crest	199
Figure 5.5	Conceptualised of 2D Non-deposited Eroding Model failure, based on Lüthi’s experiment. Line (1) and (2) represent the former lines before shifting to a line (1’) and (2’), indicating the breaching takes place.	200
Figure 5.6	Comparison of breach patterns between; (a) Non-deposited Eroding Model, CFD simulations (b) the experiments of Lüthi (2005)	202
Figure 5.7	Temporal breached embankment of Non-deposited Eroding Model	202
Figure 5.8	Variation of water levels at upstream and downstream of the channel	203
Figure 5.9	Predicted breach discharge hydrograph of Non-deposited Eroding Model	204
Figure 5.10	Final state of embankment after 150 s	205
Figure 5.11	A schematic diagram of deposition of breached embankment for 2D Deposited Eroding Model	206
Figure 5.12	Schematic diagram of a rotating line	207
Figure 5.13	A snapshot of Lüthi’s deposited breaching experimental result (after Hager and Unger, 2006) and locations of pivot	208
Figure 5.14	Locations of rotation lines and pivot points to match Lüthi’s results	208
Figure 5.15	Creation of rotating line 1	210

Figure 5.16	Creation of rotating line 2	211
Figure 5.17	Creation of rotating line 3	212
Figure 5.18	A schematic diagram of extended downstream of eroding model	215
Figure 5.19	Snapshot of grids structure where the embankment is placed in the Deposited Eroding Model's setup	216
Figure 5.20	Free water surface profiles of Deposited Eroding Model in comparison to a Rigid Model and Non-deposited Eroding Model	217
Figure 5.21	Temporal breach progression of a Deposited Eroding Model from CFD (line) simulation in comparison with Lüthi (2005) (marker)	217
Figure 5.22	Breach discharge of Deposited Eroding Model	218
Figure 5.23	Snapshot of finer mesh on 10% mesh rule	220
Figure 5.24	Snapshot of finer and coarsen mesh on 20% mesh rule	220
Figure 5.25	Comparison of free water surface profiles of 20% mesh rule adaption for Deposited Eroding Model (with and without adaption) and Non-deposited Eroding Model	221
Figure 5.26	The complete result of breach discharge hydrograph using mesh rules, based on erosion stages for Deposited Eroding Model	222
Figure 5.27	Close-up on comparison of breach discharge hydrographs using mesh rules during the early part of the simulation for Deposited Eroding Model	222
Figure 5.28	Velocity magnitude as a result of temporal progression of breached embankment with 10% (refine and coarsen) mesh adaptive method	224
Figure 5.29	CFD simulation snapshots of the temporal progression of breach profile with a free water surface using a rotation line for Deposited Eroding Model. The red and blue colour represent the sediment deposited and free water surface.	226
Figure 5.30	Experimental results on embankment erosion by Schmocker (2011)	227
Figure 5.31	Relationship of upstream water depth between breach discharge and volume remaining during reservoir drawdown for Deposited Eroding Model	228
Figure 5.32	Breach control section for 3D Eroding Model	230
Figure 5.33	A 3D geometry domain of Eroding Models	231

Figure 5.34	Close-up of snapshot grids in x - y - z directions for 3D Eroding Model	232
Figure 5.35	The initial headcut of side-shaped breach	233
Figure 5.36	Comparison of flow characteristics accelerating over downstream slope of breaching area (symmetrical plane) and non-breaching area (Plane X1 and Plane X2) for 3D Eroding Model 1	235
Figure 5.37	Velocity magnitude of flow overtopped over side-breach embankment at $t = 0$ s, $t = 20$ s and $t = 50$ s for 3D Eroding Model 1	236
Figure 5.38	Variation of velocity vectors along the downstream slope of Plane Y1, Plane Y2, Plane Y3, Plane Y4 and Plane Y5 at $t = 0$ s, $t = 20$ s and $t = 50$ s for 3D Eroding Model 1	237
Figure 5.39	Breach discharge and embankment volume remaining for 3D Eroding Model 1	238
Figure 5.40	Variation of water levels at upstream and outlet for 3D Eroding Model	239
Figure 5.41	Development of initial Trapezoidal shaped breach. Plane 1 and Plane 2 indicate the extent of top and bottom width of the cut. The arrow shows the side view of the plane	240
Figure 5.42	Point locations to define the resistance in the embankment using a trapezoidal breach shape. The position of points (1) to (6) is based on the logic statements coded with respect to the embankment breach	241
Figure 5.43	Temporal trapezoidal breach growth, 3D Eroding Model 2; (a) $t = 0$ s, (b) $t = 12$ s, (c) $t = 35$ s, (d) $t = 55$ s and (e) $t = 70$ s	243
Figure 5.44	Locations of monitoring planes X0, X1, X2, X3, X4, and Plane AA. Plan AA is located at a symmetrical plan at the embankment centreline	244
Figure 5.45	Simulated flow field in the vicinity of the trapezoidal breach at $t = 70$ s. Red contours represent water volume at Plane X0, X1, X2, X3 and X4	245
Figure 5.46	Time series of velocity vectors on a vertical plane cross the trapezoidal breach at Plane BB	246
Figure 5.47	Velocity vectors of flow passing through in the middle of the trapezoidal breach section at Plane AA	248
Figure 5.48	Flow field over the trapezoidal breach; velocity vectors of overtopping flow at Plane AA	249

Figure 5.49	Front-view of velocity vectors through a trapezoidal beach shape for different breaching time	250
Figure 5.50	Breach discharge and embankment volume remaining for a trapezoidal breach model	251
Figure 5.51	Variation of water level at outlet for a trapezoidal breach model	252
Figure 5.52	Initial triangular shaped of breach for 3D Eroding Model 3	253
Figure 5.53	Temporal progression of breached embankment for a triangular breach shape	255
Figure 5.54	Evolution of a triangular breach shape	255
Figure 5.55	Close-up of water velocity contours through a vicinity of a triangular breach	256
Figure 5.56	Velocity vectors at upstream and downstream flow over a triangular breach	257
Figure 5.57	Water volume fraction of flow overtops a triangular breach at several locations, at $t = 70$ s	258
Figure 5.58	Free surface profile over a triangular breach, at $t = 70$ s	259
Figure 5.59	Velocity vectors over a final triangular breach, at $t = 70$ s	260
Figure 5.60	Front view of velocity magnitude through a triangular breach; (a) 3D Eroding Model 3 at $t = 70$ s and (b) site project in Norway (CADAM Project) (Morris, 2001)	261
Figure 5.61	Breach discharge hydrograph and embankment remaining for a triangular breach shape	262
Figure 5.62	Variation of water level at outlet for a triangular breach model	263
Figure 5.63	FLOW-3D model setup. Initial and boundary conditions; S– symmetry, Q – Discharge (inlet), O – Outflow (outlet) and P-Specified Pressure. The light blue area represents the initial flow depth.	264
Figure 5.64	Embankment breach growth (half embankment); (a) $t = 0$ s, (b) $t = 10$ s, (c) $t = 30$ s, (d) $t = 50$ s, (e) $t = 70$ s, and (f) $t = 300$ s	265
Figure 5.65	Hydrograph and embankment volume during the breaching time from FLOW-3D	266
Figure 5.66	Profiles of free surface flow over the breached area (full scale); (a) $t = 3$ s, (b) $t = 24$ s, (c) $t = 48$ s, (d) $t = 70$ s, and (e) $t = 300$ s (completely breached)	268

Figure 5.67	Profiles of velocity magnitude of a breaching progression; (a) $t = 3$ s, (b) $t = 24$ s, (c) $t = 48$ s, (d) $t = 70$ s and (e) $t = 300$ s (completely breached)	269
Figure 5.68	Progression of breach velocity over the breached embankment	271
Figure 5.69	A linear relationship between discharge and wetted area of a breached embankment. A line represents a linear equation of the data obtained	272
Figure 5.70	Outputs of the breach model development	275

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANSYS	-	Fluid Dynamics (CFD) Software Program Solutions
ASTM	-	American Standard Testing Manual
BEM	-	Boundary Element Method
BEED	-	Breach Erosion of Earthfill Dams
BREACH	-	An Erosion Model for Earthen Dam Failures
CAD	-	Computer-aided Design
CADAM	-	Concerted Action on Dambreak Modelling
CFD	-	Computational Fluid Dynamics
DAMBRK	-	Dam Break Forecasting Model
MyDAMS		Malaysian Safety Management Guidelines
UDF	-	User-Defined-Function
UDM	-	User-Defined-Memory
FDM	-	Finite Difference Model
FEM	-	Finite Element Model
FLOODsite	-	Integrated Flood Risk Analysis and Management Methodologies
FLOW-3D	-	CFD Software
FLUENT	-	Fluid Simulation Software
FVM	-	Finite Volume Model
HERU	-	Hydraulic Engineering Research Unit
HPC	-	High Performance Computer
IGES	-	Internal Graphics Exchange Specification
IMPACT	-	Investigation of Extreme Flood Processes and Uncertainty
N-S	-	Navier-Stokes
PDEs	-	Partial Differential Equations
PIV	-	Photogrammetric and Particle Images Velocity
QUICK	-	Quadratic Upwind Interpolation for Convective Kinetics
RANS	-	Reynolds Average Navier Stokes
RNG	-	Re-Normalised Group

SIMBA	-	SIMplified Breach Analysis (Computer Model)
SG	-	Specific Gravity
SST	-	Shear Stess Transport
STEP	-	STandard for Exchange of Product
VOF	-	Volume of Fluid
WinDAM	-	Windows Dam Analysis Modules

LIST OF SYMBOLS

B	-	Breach Width (m)
B_0	-	Initial Rectangular-shape Width (m)
C	-	Material Dependent Constant
C_a	-	Empirical Coefficient
C_d	-	Discharge Coefficient
C_p	-	Pressure Coefficient
C_R	-	Embankment Resistance (kgms^{-2})
C_{R0}	-	Embankment Initial Resistance (kgms^{-2})
C_r	-	Courant Number
C_μ	-	Turbulence Model Constant
$C_{\varepsilon 1}, C_{\varepsilon 2}$	-	Model Constants
D_a	-	Darcy Number
D_i	-	Displacement Distance (m)
F_r	-	Froude Number
H	-	Headcut Overfall Height (m)
H_e	-	Embankment Height (m)
H_T	-	Total Energy Head (m)
H_t	-	Porous Media Thickness (m)
H_o	-	Overflow Energy Head (m)
I	-	Incoming Flow Rate (m^3s^{-1})
K	-	Porous Media Permeability (m^2)
O	-	Outflow Rate (m^3s^{-1})
P	-	Hydrostatic Pressure (Nm^{-2})
P_e	-	Peclet Number
P_k	-	Rate of Turbulence Production
Q	-	Discharge (m^3s^{-1})
Q'	-	Non-Dimensional Discharge
Q_o	-	Initial Discharge (m^3s^{-1})
Q_p	-	Peak Discharge (m^3s^{-1})
Q_{out}	-	Outflow Discharge (m^3s^{-1})

Q_L	-	Lateral Discharge (m^3s^{-1})
Q_B	-	Breach Discharge (m^3s^{-1})
R_e	-	Reynolds Number
R	-	Volume of Reducing Reservoir (m^3)
S_M	-	Source of Internal Energy
U_e	-	Erosion Rate (ms^{-1})
V_L	-	Volume Lost (m^3)
$\mathbf{U}(u, v, w)$	-	Velocity Vectors
b	-	Channel Width (m)
d	-	Particle Diameter (mm)
dt	-	Change in Time (s)
g	-	Gravitational Acceleration (ms^{-2})
h	-	Local Head Above The Dam Crest (m)
k_d	-	Detachment Coefficient ($\text{ms}^{-1}\text{Pa}^{-1}$)
q	-	Discharge per Unit Width ($\text{m}^3\text{s}^{-1}\text{m}^{-1}$)
q_c	-	Darcy Flux
t	-	Time (s)
u_b	-	Breach Velocity (ms^{-1})
v	-	Flow Velocity (ms^{-1})
y	-	Water Depth (m)
y_1	-	Water Depth Before The Hydraulic Jump (m)
y_2	-	Water Depth After The Hydraulic Jump (m)
y_o	-	Height of Free Surface Above The Embankment (m)
y_t	-	Tailwater Depth (m)
(x, y)	-	Coordinates x And y
τ	-	Local Bed Shear Stress (Nm^{-2})
τ_c	-	Critical Shear Stress (Nm^{-2})
τ_e	-	Effective Hydraulic Stress (Nm^{-2})
\bar{v}	-	Mean Velocity (m/s)
\vec{u}	-	Velocity Vector
ω_e	-	Angular Erosion Rate
ρ	-	Fluid Density (kgm^{-3})

θ	-	Channel Slope
γ_w	-	Unit Weight of Water (Nm^{-3})
γ_s	-	Particle Specific Weight (Nm^{-3})
Δt	-	Time Step Size (s)
Δx	-	Cell Size (m)
∇p	-	Pressure Gradient ($\text{Nm}^{-2}\text{m}^{-1}$)
α_a	-	Volume Fraction of Air
α_w	-	Volume Fraction of Water
μ	-	Water Viscosity ($\text{kgm}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$)
η	-	Porosity
$\sigma_k, \sigma_\varepsilon$	-	Turbulent Prandtl Numbers for k and ε
μ_t	-	Turbulence Viscosity ($\text{kgm}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background Study

Earthen embankment is a type of hydraulic structures or effective infrastructures constructed to retain water. This structure is always related with the risk of its failure due to aging, lack maintenance and extreme hydrological events resulted in a disastrous flooding downstream. In general, the causes of fatal embankment failures are due to loss of embankment material stability (shearing failure in the dam body or sub-base), overtopping due to insufficient spillway capacity, internal erosion and surface erosion caused by an instability embankment structure during the intensive rainfall. In practice, the above-mentioned types of failures are interrelated and statistics have shown that failure due to overtopping represents approximately 40% for all embankment dam failures (Saluja et al., 2018).

According to The British Dam Society (2007), there are over 3,000 embankment dams in the United Kingdom, some of which dated from the 9th Century. It is estimated that the average age of embankment dams in Britain is over 100 years. Meanwhile, in the United States, there are more than 90,000 regulated dams. According to the National Dam Inventory (USACE, 2016), about 85% are earthen dams and many of these dams have been built for the purposes of flood control, tourism, hydroelectric generation and irrigation (Sasanakul et al., 2019). These dams have an average age of more than 50 years, and some are older than 150 years (USACE, 2016). Aging and deterioration affect the stability and reliability of the dams to operate properly during extreme weather events, which may in turn endanger the health and safety of residents and property downstream. It has been reported that hundreds of them have suffered failures throughout history. The main purpose of an embankment dam is to retain water like other types of dam, but the structure relies on its compaction strength and weight to resist the flow of water, in the same way as a

concrete gravity dam. Because of its age and earthen-filled material, an embankment dam needs to have regular maintenance to ensure strength, stability and safety.

Embankment breaching is a complex process affected by many factors such as the embankment height, slope, material, and flow. There is a strong coupling between flow hydraulics and the changing geometry of the breached structure (Hager and Unger, 2006; Hahn et al., 2000; Hanson et al., 2005; Hassan et al., 2004; Mohamed et al., 1999; Powledge et al., 1989). The process involves the sediment-deposition at the downstream due to water pressure behind the dam that causes the instability of the dam structure leading to collapse. The result of breach opening and sediment transport towards the downstream valley is a crucial aspect to consider when dealing with an embankment failure to prevent damages and deaths. An embankment erosion happens when shear stress by fluid flow on its surface is high and sufficient enough to overcome the force that holds the particles together. The rate of erosion, so-called erodibility differs from cohesive to non-cohesive soil. Factors such as grain size portion, density and grain shape influenced the erodibility for non-cohesive soil. Mechanism of erosion of the embankment failure is due to the flow of the water through the embankment material. For example, the failure due to overtopping is due to high stresses at the downstream embankment face near the toe, leading to high potential for erosion.

Breach parameters are obtained from simple regression equations based on dam and reservoir properties for embankment dams that fail by progressive erosion in most cases. Because real erosion processes are not modelled, the uncertainty of breach predictions is high. Inherent variation in the erodibility of embankment materials as a function of soil type and compaction and moisture conditions, and the effects of variability of embankment design, configuration, and geometry are factors increasing the uncertainty for embankment dams. The significant uncertainties associated with the simulation of breaches make it difficult to prevent the effects of dam failure accurately and to prepare for dam break flooding emergencies effectively.

Embankment breaches have been studied either using physical experiments, numerical model simulations, and field observations. Most publications focus on embankment breaching, but studies on the mechanism of overtopping failure are very

limited due to the complexity of the erosion process (Freed, 1991; Singh, 1996 and Wahl, 2004). This include the determination of basic parameters that characterise the progress of the embankment failure such as time to failure, shape and size of the breach, progress of the failure and maximum breach discharge. The data can be obtained either based on historical observation or from the laboratory works. Without understanding the breaching process, one may overestimate the breached flood discharges. In this study, a numerical model is developed to simulate embankment breaching to understand and predict the consequences of what will happen when breaching occurred. Considering the complexity of the breaching process to resulting flooding, an approach of porous embankment is introduced to model the hydrodynamic of breach discharge in two-dimensional (2D) and three-dimensional (3D) flow model. This approach allows for a reliable dam break process model that would have the potential for the best outcomes.

This study is to analyse flow characteristics of a porous embankment breaching due to overtopping. Several studies on porous media to characterise flow in open channels have been carried out, particularly on the behaviour of flow through the porous region, an application widely used in groundwater research. However, only a few of them comprehensively studied flow characteristics above the porous region, which is of interest. In other words, relevant literature on rigid porous regions was very difficult to obtain. This study therefore takes one step further to investigate quantitatively the characterisation of overtopping flow by the presence of porous media, as one of the new methods in modelling breaching embankments. The numerical approach undertaken is to model porous eroding embankment using ANSYS-FLUENT (hereafter FLUENT). In doing so, the embankment is assumed to be filled with porous material to allow sinks of momentum and turbulence to be specified. This study is also made to validate the capability of FLUENT in tackling the behaviour of overtopping flow over porous structures, particularly flow interaction at the interface of the fluid/porous region, which needs further investigation.

Indeed, modelling a breaching dam due to overtopping using a porous medium approach leads to a new approach in dam break analysis. A physical-based numerical simulation of breach model was replicated to propose a dynamic simulation of

breached embankments using a porous medium approach. Therefore, the 2D and 3D Eroding Models are developed to model the patterns of breach embankment by lowering the embankment based on observation made from the experiments. The failure mode resulted exclusively from overtopping and it was governed by predefined lines and planes acting as surfaces of the embankment. Moreover, the porous eroding model has the capability to react instantly to the embankment surface failure to produce breach discharge.

1.2 Problem Statement

In practice, any dam or embankment that was designed and built to prevent flood, is in fact, acting as a boundary for an inundation area. When water has reached the embankment boundary, up to a maximum limit, the surplus capacity of water from the reservoir that spills over its banks may cause a collapse of the embankment. This is known as a breached embankment. The embankment is breached when part of it actually breaks away, creates a brink, and then allows a large opening for water to pass through it to flood the downstream valleys. The failure mode, whether sudden or gradual depends on the mechanism of the breach i.e. surface erosion or subsurface failure. For overtopping failure, the embankment surface has a potential to be eroded first rather than sudden breach i.e. due to piping, resulting the stored water washing out to downstream, thus causing catastrophic flooding. Indeed, with the urban and the increased frequency of extreme flood events, the behaviour of flood defences under these extreme conditions need to be investigated.

The historical local event of embankment breach happened in Malaysia was in 1883. The failure of the Kuala Kubu Dam destroyed the Kuala Kubu city in Selangor. The original Kuala Kubu Dam was established in 1780s to reduce the depth of the river for tin mining activities. The dam was about 1.6 kilometres long and over 91.4 meters wide. In 29 August 1883, a heavy downpour caused the dam to burst, which resulted in massive amounts of water flooding into Sungai Kubu. The embankment failed and as a result, the water flooded onto Kuala Kubu town and its surrounding area. The event killed 33 people and destroyed 38 houses. After 1883 event, there is no

embankment or dam failure occurred but there are some incidents happened. The latest dam breach happened in October 2013 where 4 people deaths due to excess water released from the Sultan Abu Bakar Dam in Pahang during the Monsoon (DID, 2017). Meanwhile, the most dramatic examples of embankment breach were happened in South Fork Dam (1889) in Pennsylvania (USA), the breaching of Nanak Sagar Dam (1967) in India and the worst failure in history was the breaching of Banqiao Dam (1975) in China (Zhu, 2006). The failure caused enormous losses to both human lives and economic properties. Figure 1.1 shows the images of the dramatic historical embankment failures due to overtopping flow.



(a) Banqiao Dam (1975)



(b) South Fork Dam (1889)



(c) Nanak Sagar Dam (1967)

Figure 1.1 Dramatic historical embankment failures due to overtopping flow

Since the 1980s, computational methods have been in widespread use for routing floods caused by dam failure, and advanced 2D modelling capabilities are now popular. Most of these instruments are still focused on basic parametric representations of the flood wave-initiating breach occurrence. A user specifies the ultimate distance, depth and shape of the breach and the time needed for the development of the breach,

and the model simulates the flow at the defined rate through the breach as it enlarges. For examples in BREACH, DAMBRK, BEED, etc. (Singh, 1996). The BEED model has been developed for earthfill dams to simulate the breach erosion. It incorporates the processes of surface erosion and slope sloughing to simulate breach enlargement (Singh et al., 1988). Moreover, efforts have been carried out by USDA and HR Wallingford in the United Kingdom, leading to advances in the field via two large projects: CADAM and IMPACT. Even though the projects were started years ago there is still poor understanding of erosion mechanism and a need for re-evaluation (Wahl, 2009).

The use of numerical modelling of free surface flows associated with breaching phenomenon is a fairly recent development in the field of river engineering. An analysis that includes fluid mechanics and embankment erosion is a complex problem, especially when defining boundary conditions to be coupled between flow and soil for hydrodynamic interaction. Aware of this concern, researchers have developed models to study breach problems and to produce the breach discharge hydrographs, leading to an extensive study of characteristics of breach models up to date. However, the available data on the numerous historical earth dam failures from the literature were limited and uncertainties, and sometimes contradictory to the source data of the same dam failure cases due to unreliable eye-witness reports (Wahl, 2004; 2009).

The knowledge of breaching processes in embankments is still in need of exploration, even though many scholars have come out with analytical, mathematical and experimental works. It is still uncertain which method could provide the best solution to describe the breaching process experimentally and numerically, in particular to predict breach discharge hydrographs, in view of the complex breach processes involved. The first version of the sandy embankment breach model studied by Visser (1998) gave a reasonable agreement with field data at the first stage of the breaching process, but it overestimated the breach growth at the end of the process. The results, however, provide improvement of breach models such as SIMBA, WinDAM and many other commercial models that have been developed by European and United State consortia (Hanson et al., 2005; Hassan et al., 2004; Temple et al.,

2006). None of the models developed were able to model the breach hydrodynamics of the breach progression.

Thus, in 3D breach models, the headcut is constructed as an initiation to the breach so that the breach widening can be simulated laterally. As it was subject to flow, the headcut advances upstream along the embankment crest and at the same time vertically erodes the embankment. The growth process is modelled exclusively to investigate a process of surface erosion through a combination of vertical, lateral and headcut advance. This is not well understood at present because of the dynamic flow of the breach that triggers the erosion.

1.3 Aim and Objective of the Study

This study is aimed at understanding and analysing the flow characteristics associated with breach formation of a porous medium. The porous breach model to known later as an Eroding Model is developed to evaluate the ability of a CFD code, FLUENT, to model breach embankments and predict the breach discharge hydrograph and volume lost during the failure. To achieve the aim, several objectives are outlined as follows:

- 1) To investigate the processes involved in earth embankment breach through laboratory experiments including the effects of embankment slope, inflow rate, sediment gran sizes and breach widening. The experimental result is compared with FLOW-3D model.
- 2) To analyse and validate flow characteristics of overtopped embankments described by a Rigid Model compared to Intact Model to get a relationship of velocity profile, pressure distribution and shear stress profile at the interface of a porous and a rigid embankment.
- 3) To develop a two-dimensional computational model of an eroding embankment with specific feature of analysing free surface flow, breach patterns and breached outflow hydrograph during embankment drawdown.

- 4) To develop a three-dimensional computational model to simulate and study the breach characteristics from various type of headcuts.

1.4 Scopes of Study

Computational methods have been in widespread use for routing floods triggered by embankment failure. In the present study, the terminology used for each model development may refer to Section 1.8. The scopes of the study are:

- (a) The physical model is conducted using a straight channel with a dimension of 12 m length, 0.5 m deep and 0.6 m width at the Hydraulics and Hydrology Laboratory, School of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- (b) The Eroding Model is developed to model a breach of a homogenous embankment dam. In the proposed model, it has been assumed that the embankment is not covered with grass on the downstream surface to allow water to flow freely at the embankment crest.
- (c) The storage capacity of the reservoir is determined by input velocity at the inlet where the water is pumped from that point. This setup will keep the velocity rate at the inlet the same, resulting in a reduction of the reservoir water level as breaching takes place. This approach, however, is useful to predict the breach discharge hydrograph, especially with data of reservoir water surface which sometimes is inconsistent with the reported outflow hydrograph.
- (d) ANSYS-FLUENT is used to model the eroding porous embankment and validated with FLOW-3D software.
- (e) The initial width, depth and shape of the breach and the time required for breach development are defined by the user.

1.5 Research Questions

In dealing with a fluid-structure interface, there is still a gap to model the breach embankment using a porous media approach accurately due to shearing stress and flow infiltration effect between the interface layer of porous medium and water. There are a few research questions need to be addressed;

- (a) What are the parameters that influence the breaching embankment?
- (b) What is the method to be adapted to model an Eroding Porous Embankment to analyse the breach flow characteristics?
- (c) What is the correlation factor to model the erosion using a porous embankment due to slip boundary at water-soil interface?
- (d) What are the outputs of different types of headcuts to initial breach for Eroding Model developed?
- (e) Does the Eroding Model able to visualise breach patterns, breach flow characteristics and quantify the amount of breach discharges in 2D and 3D applications?

1.6 Significance of Study

Many scholars understand the important mechanisms that may trigger the collapse of an embankment dam. Dynamic interaction between the soil properties and the hydraulic behaviour of overtopping that causes instability of the soil is one of the main factor that warrants great attention to avoid the embankment collapses. One has to keep in mind that the failure of high-water defences has been an immediate cause of many inundations. The rate of inundation is theoretically governed by the discharge rate through the breach, which depends on the process of breach erosion. The breach discharge rate is the most important parameter for any modellers and policy makers when investigating the failure of an embankment. In any failure observations, it is crucial to be able to produce observed breach discharge hydrographs, not only to investigate the mechanisms that trigger the breach, but also to identify detailed breach patterns and predict the breach discharge.

Since the 1980s, models that simulate real erosion processes have also been available to predict breach growth in embankment dams, but have not seen widespread use. Most of these models were focused on primitive simplifications of erosion and breaching processes that, in case studies and experimental experiments, have proven to be inconsistent with subsequent findings of breach mechanics. A lack of ability to calculate the erodibility of embankment materials and a deficiency of models that efficiently integrate accurate erodibility measures has limited the implementation of the models. The need for enhanced modelling of embankment dam erosion and breach procedures is now motivated by many factors. Risk populations in areas directly below large dams continue to grow, the significant effect of warning time on flood effectiveness has been recognised. Also, the procedures for risk assessment are increasingly being used to cost of preventing in dam protection. Therefore, breaching process and breach phase modelling helps to address both of these needs by enhancing ability to predict the breach discharge hydrograph and timing of the dam breach discharge.

Thus, fundamental studies on breach discharge characteristics using a porous medium approach is an alternative to investigate how overflow may affect the embankment structure leading to lowering of the embankment and then visualise them in 3D applications. The proposed approach is a new method to analyse breaching embankments, particularly in analysing hydrodynamic flow over the breaching area and producing breach discharge hydrographs. It benefits to policy makers and government authorities in hazard mapping planning guidance for emergency evacuation.

1.7 Model Limitations

The present study consists of laboratory works and a numerical model development. The physical model is tested based on the erosion mechanism that causes the embankment to fail. However, due to the large complexity in driving the erosion process into the model development, the Eroding Porous Model only focuses on constant erosion rate for each time of breaching specified. In order to develop a linear

erosion model of a lowering embankment, understanding the possible effects of using a variable erosion rate and time to breach are tested.

1.8 Terminology

The following terminology is to be used throughout the text.

- (a) Zone – is a grouping of nodes, faces and cells, for examples the wall boundary zone and fluid cell zone.
- (b) Domain – is a grouping of cell zones.
- (c) Rigid Model – where the embankment is modelled using walls boundary condition without the embankment (the shape of the embankment is defined as rigid walls).
- (d) Intact Model – where the embankment is modelled using a porous embankment. The model can be modelled either using a sub-domain or 1-domain approach.
- (e) Porous embankment – where the embankment is present as a porous media, which has a porosity and resistance.
- (f) Sub-domain approach – where the embankment domain is fixed and modelled using a porous medium. Breach patterns does not allow for the deposition process.
- (g) 1-domain approach – where the embankment domain can be placed everywhere in the domain. Breach patterns does allow for the deposition effect.
- (h) Eroding Model – where the embankment is modelled using a porous embankment, the extent of which is defined by a number of lines or planes. The line or planes can be moved with time.
- (i) Non-deposited Eroding Model – where the breached embankment does not consider the sediment deposited. The model uses the sub-domain approach.
- (j) Deposited Eroding Model – where the breaching embankment considers the sediment deposited downstream using 1-domain approach.

1.9 Thesis Outline

This chapter provides an overview of the study, consisting of the aims and objectives to be achieved. These include the importance of the study, the problems underlined throughout the study to be addressed and improved, and the methodology used to model a breaching embankment using the new porous medium approach. Chapter 2 presents a general theory of flow over hydraulic structures in open channels and reviews some studies of breaching embankments due to overtopping both in experimental work and numerical modelling. Most of the breaching embankment literature identify erosion as the main mechanism of collapse and a few papers discuss breach patterns. Reviews on the evolution of breach progression are less widely discussed. Also, it describes the numerical modelling techniques using the CFD package, FLUENT. The choice of mesh resolution, initial and boundary conditions, turbulence models, and multiphase models are discussed.

Chapter 3 explains the methodology to model an eroding porous embankment using a delimiter line approach in lowering the embankment in 2D model. A description of delimiter lines (predefined lines) and their movement via translation and rotation are presented step-by-step. A similar approach is used to determine a lateral breaching for a 3D Eroding Model. In contrast to the 2D model which uses lines to define the extent of the embankment, the 3D model uses planes to describe the embankment surfaces.

Chapter 4 discusses the results of breaching mechanisms in a laboratory. Parameters such as the effects of embankment geometries, hydraulic characteristics and soil grain sizes leading to the breaching are analysed. Breaching outputs such as embankment volume lost, breached patterns, breached hydrograph and breached velocity are also analysed and compared with FLOW-3D. Sensitivity analysis on CFD techniques to simulate a Rigid Model and Intact Models (sub-domain and 1-domain approach) are carried out. These are: using walls to model the embankment and using a porous region by predefined three delimiter lines to model the porous embankment. The results such as free surface profiles, velocity, pressure and wall shear stress are

discussed and compared with Fritz and Hager (1998), that investigated flow over a rigid embankment.

Chapter 5 presents the results of Eroding Models using the delimiter line method to model eroding embankments in 2D. The results of eroding models including breached outflow hydrographs are then discussed and model validations are made against data of two series of experimental work: non-deposited and deposited models of Lüthi (2005) to replicate a pattern of breached embankments. In the 3D Eroding Model results, breach flow characteristics in terms of free surface, velocity profile at breach, embankment volume lost, breach discharge hydrographs and breach shape are presented and validated with FLOW-3D.

Chapter 6 presents a conclusion of the study and highlights a few recommendations of model improvement for future research.

REFERENCES

- Al-Riffai, M. (2014) *Experimental study of breach mechanics in overtopped noncohesive earthen embankments*. Ph.D dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Andrews, D. P. (1998) *Embankment Failure Due to Overtopping Flow*. Master thesis, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Andrews, D. P., Coleman, S. E., Webby, M. G. and Melville, B. W. (1999) Noncohesive Embankment Failure Due to Overtopping Flow, in *Proceeding - 28th Congress of the International Association for Hydraulic Research (IAHR)*, Graz, pp. 7.
- ASDSO (Association of State Dam Safety Officials) (2020) *Lessons learned: From Dam Incidents and Failure*. <https://damfailures.org/lessons-learned/high-and-significant-hazard-dams-should-be-design-to-pass-an-appropriate-design-flood-dams-constructed-prior-to-the-availability-of-extreme-rainfall-data-should-be-assessed-to-make-sure-they-have-ad/>, retrieved date 15th July 2020.
- ASTM (American Standard Testing Manual) D4253 (2006) *Standard Test Methods for Maximum Index Density and Unit Weight of Soils Using a Vibratory Table*. ASTM International., Unites States.
- Berger, J., Garparin, S., Dutykh, D. and Mendes, N. (2017) 'Accurate Numerical Simulation of Moisture Front in Porous Material', *Building and Environment*, Volume 118, pp. 211-224.
- Bisschop, R., Visser, P. J., Rhee, C. V. and Verhagen, H. J. (2011) 'Erosion due to High Flow Velocities: A Description of Relevant Processes', *Coastal Engineering Proceedings*, 1(32), pp. sediment.24.
- Brinkman, H. C. (1948) 'A Calculation of The Viscous Force Exerted By A Flowing Fluid on A Dense Swarm of Particles', *Appl. Sci. Res*, Vol A1, pp 27-34.
- Beavers, G. S. and Joseph, D. (1967) 'Boundary Conditions at a Naturally Permeable Wall', *Journal Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 30, pp. 197-207.
- Berkowitz, B. (1989) 'Boundary Conditions Along Permeable Fracture Walls; Influence on Flow and Conductivity', *Water Resource Research*, Vol. 25, pp. 1919-1922.

- Braim, K. S., Ahmad, S. N. A. S., Rashid, A. S. A. and Mohamad, H. (2016) 'Strip footing settlement on sandy soil due to eccentricity load', *International Journal of GEOMATE*, 11(5), pp. 2741-2746.
- British Dam Society (2007) *Learning from Experience: Post-incident reporting for UK Dams 2007 Annual Report*. Environmental Agency, Bristol, United Kingdom.
- Breugem, W. P. (2007) 'The Effective Viscosity of a Channel-Type Porous Medium', *Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 19. Issue 10, pp 103103-1- 103104-8.
- Briaud, J. L., Chen, H. C., Govindasamy, V. and Storesund, R. (2008) 'Levee Erosion by Overtopping in New Orleans During the Katrina Hurricane', *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, Vol. 134, pp. 618-632.
- BSI (1990) *BS 1377: 1990 - Methods of Test for Soils for Civil Engineering Purposes*, British Standards Institute, Milton Keynes.
- Chan, E. C. and Lien, F. S. (2005) 'Permeability Effects of Turbulent Flow through a Porous Insert in a Backward-Facing-Step Channel', *Transport in Porous Media*, 59(1), pp. 47-71.
- Chan, H. C., Huang, W. C., Leu, J. M. and Lai, C. J. (2007) 'Macroscopic Modeling of Turbulent Flow over a Porous Medium', *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, Vol. 28, pp. 1157-1166.
- Cheng, N. S., and Chiew, Y. M. (1998) 'Pick-up probability for sediment entrainment', *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, ASCE, 124(2), pp. 232-235.
- Chinnarasri, C., Ingsanchali, T., Weesakul, T. and Wonwises, S. (2003) 'Flow Patterns and Damage of Dike Overtopping', *International Journal of Sediment Research*, pp. 301-309.
- Chinnarasri, C., Jirakitlerd, S. and Wonwises, S. (2004) 'Embankment Dam Breach and Its Outflow Characteristics', *Civil Engineering Systems*, Volume 21(4), pp. 247-264.
- Choi, C. Y. and Waller, P. M. (1997) 'Momentum Transport Mechanism for Water Flow over Porous Media', *Journal of Environmental Engineering*, Vol. 123, pp. 792-799.
- Coleman, S.E. and Andrews, D. (1998) *Embankment Failure Due to Overtopping Flow*. Foundation for Research, Science and Technology.

- Coleman, S. E., Andrews, D. P. and Webby, G. M. (2002) 'Overtopping Breaching of Noncohesive Homogeneous Embankments', *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 128 (9), pp. 829-838.
- Cristofano, E. A. (1965) *Method of Computing Erosion Rate for Failure of Earthfill Dams*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colorado.
- de Lemos, M. J. S. (2006) *Turbulence in Porous Media: Modelling and Applications*. 1st edition, Oxford, United Kingdom: Elsevier Ltd.
- de Lemos, M. J. S. and Pedras, M. H. J. (2001). "Recent Mathematical Models for Turbulent Flow in Saturated Rigid Porous Media," *Journal of Fluids Engineering*, Vol. 123, pp. 935-940.
- Department of Irrigation and Drainage (DID) (2017) *Malaysia Dam Safety Management Guidelines (MyDAMS)*. Government of Malaysia copyrights, ISBN 978-983-41328-5-9.
- Dupont, E., Dewals, B.J., Archambeau, P., Erpicum, S., Piroton, M. (2007) 'Experimental And Numerical Study of The Breaching of Embankment Dam'. *Proc. 32nd Congress of IAHR Venice*, 1(178), IAHR, Madrid, pp. 1-10.
- Emelen, S. V., Swartenbroekx, C., Zech, Y. and Soares-Fraza, S. (2011) 'Numerical Modelling of the Breaching Process in an Earthen Dike', *presented at the Fifth International Conference on Advanced Computational Methods in Engineering*, Liege, Belgium.
- Everington, K. (2020) Chinese Authorities Blow up Dam to Release Floodwaters. *Taiwan News*, <https://www.taiwannews.com.tw/en/news/3970298>, retrieved date 20th August 2020.
- Fergizer, J. H. and Peric, M. (2002) *Computational Methods for Fluid Dynamics*. London: Springer.
- FLOODsite (2019) Breach Modelling - Breach Initiation and Growth. http://www.floodsite.net/html/taskinfo/addinfo_task6.htm, retrieved date 10th December 2019.
- FLUENT (2009) *User's Guide*. Version 6.3 ed.: Fluent Inc. Software.
- FLOW-3D® Version 12.0 (2019) *Users Manual*. Santa Fe, NM: Flow Science, Inc. <https://www.flow3d.com>, retrieved date 15th November 2019.

- Foster, M.A. and Fell, R. (2001) 'Assessing Embankment Dam Filters that do not satisfy Design Criteria', *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering ASCE*, Vol. 127, no. 4, May, pp. 398-407.
- Foster, M. A., Fell, R., and Spannagle, M. (2000) 'The statistics of embankment dam failures and accidents', *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 37(5), pp. 1000-1024.
- Fread, D.L., (1984) *DAMBRK: The NWS Dam-Break Flood Forecasting Model*. National Weather Service, Office of Hydrology, Maryland: Silver Spring.
- Fread, D. L. (1988) *Breach: An Erosion Model for Earthen Dam Failures*. Hydrologic Research Laboratory, National Weather Service, NOAA.
- French, R. H. (1994) *Open-Channel Hydraulics*. Singapore: International Edition – McGrawHill Book Company.
- Frenette, R. and Pestov, I. (2005) 'Flow and Erosive Stresses at the Base of a Headcut', *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, Vol. 131 (2), pp. 139-141.
- Fritz, H. M. and Hager, W. H. (1998) 'Hydraulic of Embankment Weirs', *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, Vol. 131, pp. 963-971.
- Fujisawa, K., Aoyama, O. and Kobayashi, A. (2009) 'Theoretical Description of Embankment Erosion owing to Overflow', *Geotechnique*, Vol 58 (9), pp 661-671.
- Garcia, E. and Uchimura, T. (2007) 'Study of Failure Mechanism in Embankments Induced by Rainfall Infiltration by Monitoring Pore Water Pressures and Water Contents', *DYNA*, Vol 74, No. 152, pp 125 - 135.
- Getachew, D., Minkowycz, W. J. and J. L. Lage (2000) 'A Modified Form of K-Epsilon Model for Turbulent Flows of an Incompressible Fluid in Porous Media', *International Journal Heat and Mass Transfer*, Vol. 43, pp. 2909-2915.
- Guo, C., Li, Y., Nian, X., Xu, M., Liu, H. and Wang, Y. (2020) 'Experimental Study on The Slip Velocity of Turbulent Flow over and Within Porous Media', *Physics of Fluids*, Volume 32, Issue 1, pp. 015111.
- Goharzadeh, A., Khalili, A. and Jorgensen, B. B. (2005) 'Transition Layer Thickness at a Fluid-Porous Interface', *Journal of Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 17, pp. 1-10.
- Hager, W. H. and Schwalt, M. (1994) 'Broad-Crested Weir', *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering*, Vol. 120 p. 4385.
- Hager, W. H. and Unger, J. (2006) 'Dike Erosion - a Preliminary Outlook', in *River Flow 2006*, Lisbon, Portugal, pp. 1511-1519.

- Hahn, W., Hanson, G. J. and Cook, K. R. (2000) Breach Morphology Observations of Embankment Overtopping Tests. *American Society of Civil Engineers Water Resources Conference Proceedings*, Minneapolis, MN, Publication #113078.
- Hanson, G. J. (1990) 'Surface Erodibility of Earthen Channels at High Stresses Part 1 - Open Channel Testing', *Transactions of the ASAE*, Vol. 33, pp. 127-131.
- Hanson, G. J. Cook, K. R. and Hunt, S. L. (2005) 'Physical Modeling of Overtopping Erosion and Breach Formation of Cohesive Embankments', *Transactions of the ASAE*, Vol. 48, pp. 1783-1794.
- Hanson, G., Morris, M., Vaskinn, K., Temple, D., Hunt, S. and Hassan, M. (2005a) 'Research Activities on the Erosion Mechanics of Overtopped Embankment Dams', *The Journal of Dam Safety*, Vol. Spring 2005, pp. 4-16.
- Hanson, G. J., Robinson, K. M., Cook, K. R. and Temple, D. M. (2005b) 'Modeling of Erosion from Headcut Development in Channelized Flow', *Advances in Hydro-Science and Engineering*, Vol. VI, pp. 1-12.
- Hanson, G. J. Cook, K. R. and Britton, S. L. (2003) 'Observed Erosion Processes During Embankment Overtopping Tests', *ASAE*, Paper No. 032066, St. Joseph, Michigan: ASAE.
- Hargreaves, D. M., Morvan, H. P. and Wright, N. G. (2007) 'Validation of the Volume of Fluid Method for Free Surface Calculation: The Broad-Crested Weir', *Engineering Applications of Computational Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 1, pp. 136-146.
- Harris, C. K. (2003) *Sediment Transport Processes in Coastal Environments*. Lecture Notes, http://www.vims.edu/~ckharris/MS698_03/lecturenotes.html, Retrieved date 20th April 2019.
- Hassan, M., Morris, M., Hanson, G. and Lakhali K. (2004) "Breach Formation: Laboratory and Numerical Modeling of Breach Formation", *In Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Assoc. of State Dam Safety Officials*, USA.
- Hassan, M. A., and Ismail, M. A. M. (2017) 'Literature Review For The Development of Dikes' Breach Channel Mechanism Caused by Erosion Processes During Overtopping Failure', *Engineering Heritage Journal / Galeri Warisan Kejuruteraan*, 1(2), pg 23.-30.
- HERU (USDA-ARS Hydraulic Engineering Research Unit) (2019) *Embankment Dam Breaching Processes*. HERU Project, <https://www.ars.usda.gov/plains->

area/stillwater-ok/hydraulic-engineering-research/docs/embankment-dam-breach-processes/, Retrieved date 30th January 2019.

- Hirt, C. W. and Nichols, B. D. (1981) 'Volume of Fluid (VOF) Method for the Dynamics of Free Boundaries', *Journal of Computational Physics*, Vol. 39, pp. 201-225.
- Hirt, C.W. and Sicilian, J.M. (1985) 'A Porosity Technique for the Definition of Obstacles in Rectangular Cell Meshes', *4th International Conference on Numerical Ship Hydrodynamics*, Washington, D.C.
- IMPACT (Investigation of Extreme Flood Processes and Uncertainty) (2005) *Final Technical Report*. January, pp. 27.
- Jack, R. (1996) *The Mechanics of Embankment Failure Due to Overtopping Flow*. Master thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Jiang, X. (2019) 'Laboratory Experiments on Breaching Characteristics of Natural Dams on Sloping Beds,' *Advances in Civil Engineering*, Volume 2019, Article ID 5064093, Hindawi Publisher.
- Johnson, F. A. and Illes, P. (1976) 'Classification of Dam Failures', *International Water Power and Dam Construction*, Vol. 28, pp. 43-45.
- Lage, J. L. and Antohe, B. V. (1997) 'A General Two-Equations Macroscopic Turbulence Model for Incompressible Flow in Porous Media', *International Journal Heat and Mass Transfer*, Vol. 40, pp. 3013-3024.
- Lazin, M. N. A. (2014) *Erodable Dam Breaching Patterns Due to Overtopping*. Master thesis, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor, Malaysia.
- Lauder, B. E. and Spalding, D. B. (1974) 'The Numerical Computation of Turbulent Flows', *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, Vol. 3, pp. 269-289.
- Lecoite, G. (1998). Breaching Mechanisms of Embankments: An Overview of Previous Studies and the Models Produced. *Proceeding of the 2nd CADAM workshop*, Munich.
- Loukola, E. and Huokuna, M. (1998) A Numerical Erosion Model for Embankment Dams Failure and Its Use For Risk Assessment. *CADAM Proceedings*, Munich Meeting, pp. 8-9 October.
- Lüthi, N. (2005) *Deicherosion (Dike Erosion)*. Diploma Thesis (In German), VAW, ETH Zürich.

- Macchione, F. and Rino, A. (2008) 'Model for Predicting Floods Due to Earthen Dam Breaching. Ii: Comparison with Other Methods and Predictive Use', *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, Vol. 134 (12), pp. 1697-1707.
- MacDonald, T. C. and Langridge-Monopolis (1984) 'Breaching Characteristics of Dam Failures', *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, American Society of Civil Engineering, Vol. 110, No. 5, pp. 567-586.
- Meyer-Peter, E. and Müller, R. (1948) Formulas for bed-load transport. *Proceedings of the 2nd Meeting of the International Association for Hydraulic Structures Research*, pp. 39–64.
- Mohamed, M. A. A., Samuels, P. G. and Morris, M. W. (2002) Improving the Accuracy of Prediction of Breach Formation through Dam and Flood Embankments. *Presented at the Flow 2002 Conference*.
- Mohamed, M. A. A., Samuels, P. G., Ghataora, G. S. and Morris, M. W. (1999) A New Methodology to Model the Breaching of Non-Cohesive Homogeneous Embankments. *Presented at the Proceedings of the Zaragoza Meeting-CADAM*, November, pp. 289 -308.
- Morris, M. W. (2001) CADAM and Impact: European Research Project Investigating Dambreak Modelling and Extreme Flood Process. *Proceedings FEMA Workshop – Issues, Resolutions, and Research Needs Related to Embankment Dam Failure Analysis*. Oklahoma City.
- Mott, R. L. (2006) *Applied Fluid Mechanics*. 6th ed., Singapore: Prentice Hall, Pearson Education South Asia Pte Ltd,
- NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) (2008) *Boundary Layer*. Glenn Research Center, Washington DC.
- Novak, P., Moffat, A. I. B., Nalluri, C. and Narayanan, C. (1996) *Hydraulic Structures*. London, United Kingdom: E & FN Spon Publisher.
- Nielsen, P. (1992) 'Coastal bottom boundary layers and sediment transport', *Advanced Series on Ocean Engineering*, Volume 4, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd, Singapore.
- Ochoa-Tapia, J. A. and Whitaker, S. (1995) 'Momentum Transfer at the Boundary between a Porous Medium and a Homogenous Fluid - I. Theoretical Development', *International Journal Heat Mass Transfer*, Vol. 38, pp. 2635-2646.

- Orendorff, B. D. E. (2009) *An experimental study of embankment dam breaching*. Master thesis, Univ. of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada.
- Pantakar, S. V. (1980) *Numerical Heat Transfer and Fluid Flow: Hemisphere*. New York.: Publishing Corporation - Taylor and Francis Group.
- Pedras, M. H. J. and de Lemos, M. J. S. (2001) 'Macroscopic Turbulence Modeling for Incompressible Flow through Underformable Porous Media', *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, Vol. 44, pp. 1081-1093.
- Pham-Van, S., Hinkelmann, R., Nehrig, M. and Martinez, I. (2011) 'A Comparison of Model Concepts and Experiments for Seepage Processes through a Dike with a Fault Zone', *Engineering Applications of Computational Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 5, pp. 149-158.
- Pickert G., Jirka G.H., Bieberstein A. and Brauns J. (2004) Soil/water interaction during the breaching process of overtopped embankments. *Conference proceedings: River Flow 2004*. June 2004, Naples, Italy, London: Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 23–25.
- Pickert., G., Weitbrecht, V. and Bieberstein, A. (2011) 'Breaching of Overtopped River Embankments Controlled by Apparent Cohesion', *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, Vol. 49, pp. 143-156.
- Powledge, G. R., Ralston, D. C., Miller, P. , Chen, Y. H., Clopper, P. E. and Temple, D. M. (1989) 'Mechanics of Overflow Erosion on Embankments. I: Research Activities', *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, Vol. 115, p. Paper No. 23762.
- Rahman, A., Nistor, I. and Infante, J-A. (2019) 'The effect of the non-cohesive homogenous embankment geometry on the breach outflow and erosion rates during overtopping', CSCE Annual Conference (June), pp. HYD005-1 - HYD005-10.
- Rashid, A.S.A., Black, J.A., Mohamad, H. and Noor, N.M. (2015a) 'Behavior of weak soils reinforced with end-bearing soil-cement columns formed by the deep mixing method', *Marine Georesources and Geotechnology*, 33(6), pp. 473-486.
- Rashid, A. A. S., Black, J. A., Kueh, A. B. H. and Md Noor, N. (2015b) 'Behaviour of weak soils reinforced with soil cement columns formed by the deep mixing method: Rigid and flexible footings Measurement', *Journal of the International Measurement Confederation*, 68, pp. 262-279.
- Rifai, I., Abderrezzak, K. E. K., Dewals, B. Hager, W. H., Violeau, D., Erpicum, S., Archambeau, P. and Piroton, M. (2019) Fluvial Dike Breaching Induced by

- Overtopping: Lessons From Experimental and Numerical Studies. *E-proceeding of the 38th IAHR World Congress*. September 1-6, Panama City, pp. 1353 - 1363
- Rodi, W. (2000) *Turbulence Models and Their Application in Hydraulics*. London: Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780203734896>. Retrieved date 15 January 2018.
- Saluja, I. S., Athar, M. and Ansari, S. A. (2018) 'Causes of Failure of Earthen Dams and Suggested Remedial Measures', *International Journal of Engineering Technology Science and Research*, Volume 5, Issue 3, pp. 177 - 185.
- Sasanakul, I., Gassman, S.L., Ovalle-Villamil, W., Starcher, R., Gheibi, E. and Rahman, M. (2019) 'Geotechnical Observations of Dams Failed During the 2015 Historic Flooding in South Carolina', *ISSMGE International Journal of Geoengineering Case Histories*, Vol.5, Issue 2, pp. 93 - 117.
- Schmocker, L. and Hager, W. H. (2009) 'Modelling Dike Breaching Due to Overtopping', *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, Vol. 47, pp. 585-597.
- Schmocker, L. (2011) *Hydraulics of Dike Breaching*. Ph.D Disertation, Hydrology, and Glaciology (VAW), Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH), Zurich.
- Schmocker, L. and Hager, W. H. (2012) 'Effect of Sediment Diameter on Plane Dike Breach Shape and on Breach Discharge, *River flow 2012: Proceedings of the International Conference on Fluvial Hydraulics*. San Jose, costa Rica, pp. 1065-1075.
- Singh, V. P. (1996) *Dam Breach Modelling Technology*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Singh, V. P., Scarlatos, P. D., Collins, J. G. and Jourdan, M. R. (1988) 'Breach Erosion of Earthfill Dams (BEED) Model', *Natural Hazards*, Volume 1, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 161-180.
- Singh, V. P., and Scarlatos, C. A. (1985) *Breach erosion of earthfill dams and flood routing: BEED model*. Res. Rep., Army Research Office, Battelle, Research Triangle Park, NC.
- Soulsby, R. (1997) *Dynamics of Marine Sands*. London: Thomas Telford Publications.
- Sturm, T. W. (2010) *Open Channel Hydraulics*. London: McGraw-Hill International Edition.
- Tabrizi, A. A. (2016) *Modeling Embankment Breaching Due to Overtopping*. Ph.D Thesis, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, United States.

- Temple, D. M. and Hanson, G. J. (2001) Limited Overtopping, Embankment Breach and Discharge. *Proceedings FEMA Workshop – Issues, Resolutions, and Research Needs Related to Embankment Dam Failure Analysis*. Oklahoma City, OK.
- Temple, D. M., Hanson, G. J. and Britton, S. L. (2004) 'Practical Considerations in Modelling Earth Dam Overtopping and Breach', *Advances in Hydro-Science and Engineering Vol. VI*, pp. 135-136.
- Temple, D. M., Hanson, G. J., Neilsen, M. L. and Cook, K. R. (2005) SIMplified Breach Analysis Model for Homogeneous Embankments: Part1 - Background and Model Components. *USSD Proceedings: Technologies to Enhance Dam Safety and the Environment*. Salt Lake City, Utah, pp. June 6-10.
- Temple, D. M., Hanson, G. J. and Neilsen, M. L. (2006) WinDAM – Analysis of Overtopped Earth Embankment Dams. *Proceeding of the ASABE Annual Conference*. Paper number 062105, Oregon.
- Tingsanchali, T. and Chinnarasri, C. (2001) 'Numerical Modelling of Dam Failure Due to Flow Overtopping', *Journal of Hydrological Sciences*, Vol. 46, pp. 113 - 130.
- USACE (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) (2016) *Corps Map: National Inventory of Dams*. <https://nid.sec.usace.army.mil/>, Retrieved date 30th September 2020.
- Van Driest, E. R. (1956) 'On turbulent flow near a wall', *J. Aeronaut. Sci.*, 23, No. 11, pp. 1007-1011.
- Van Rijn, L. C. (1984) 'Sediment Transport, Part I: Bed load transport', *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 110(10), pp. 1431-1456.
- Vesteeg, H. K. and Malalasekera, W. (2009) *Computational Fluid Dynamic- the Finite Volume Method*. 2nd Edition, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Visser, P.J. (1998) '*Breach Erosion in Sand-Dikes*'. PhD thesis. Delft University of Technology.
- Visser, P. J. and Vrijling, J. K. (2004) *Review on Embankment dam breach modeling*. In book: *New Developments in Dam Engineering*, pp 1189-1196.
- Walder, J. S., and O'Connor, J. E. (1997) 'Methods for Predicting Peak Discharge of Floods Caused by Failure of Natural and Constructed Earth Dams', *Water Resources Research*, Vol. 33, No. 10, October 1997, pp 2337-2348

- Wahl, T. L. (1998) *Prediction of embankment dam breaching parameters a literature review and needs assessment*. Water Resources Research Laboratory, Dam Safety Research Report, U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation.
- Wahl, T. L. (2004) 'Uncertainty of Predictions of Embankment Dam Breach Parameters', *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, Vol. 130, pp. 389-397.
- Wahl, T. L. (2009) Evaluation of New Models for Simulating Embankment Dam Breach. *presented at the ASDSO Dam Safety '09*. Florida.
- Wahl, T. L., Hanson, G. J. and Regazzoni, P. (2009b) Quantifying Erodibility of Embankment Materials for the Modelling of Dam Breach Processes. *Presented at the ASDSO Dam Safety '09*, Hollywood, Florida.
- Wan, C. F. and Fell, R. (2004) 'Investigation of Rate of Erosion of Soils in Embankment Dams', *Journal of Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Engineering*, Vol. 130, pp. 373-380.
- Wang, Z. (2005) *A Numerical Three-Dimensional Non-Cohesive Earthen Dam Breach Model*. PhD Thesis, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.
- Wang, Z. and Bowles, D. S. (2006) 'Dam Breach Simulations with Multiple Breach Locations under Wind and Wave Action', *Advances in Water Resources*, Vol. 29, pp. 1222-1237.
- Wei, G., Brethour, J.M., Grünzner M., and Burnham, J. (2014) *The Sediment Scour Model in FLOW-3D*. Technical Note FSI-14-TN-99, Flow Science, Inc.
- White, D. J., Take, W. A. and Bolton, M. D. (2003) 'Soil deformation measurement using particle image velocimetry (PIV) and photogrammetry', *Géotechnique*, 53(7), pp.619-631.
- Winterwerp, J.C., Bakker, W.T., Mastbergen, D.R. and Van Rossum, H. (1992) 'Hyperconcentrated sand-water mixture flows over erodible bed', *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 118(11), pp. 1508–1525.
- Zelmar, A. (2005) *Modelling of an Overtopped Embankment Using Computational Fluid Dynamics Techniques*. Master Thesis, The University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom.
- Zhang, L. M., Xiao, T., He, J. and Chen, C. (2019) 'Erosion-based analysis of breaching of Baige landslide dams on the Jinsha River, China,' *Landslides*, Vol. 16, no. 10, pp. 1965–1979.

- Zhang, J., Xuan, G., Wang, X. and Li, J. (2009) 'Overtopping Breaching of Cohesive Homogenous Earth Dam with Different Cohesive Strength', *Science in China Series E: Technological Sciences*, Vol. 50, pp. 3024-3029.
- Zhao, G., Visser, P. J., Ren, Y. and Uijttewaal, S.J. (2015a) 'Flow Hydrodynamics in Embankment Breach', *Journal of Hydrodynamics*, Volume 27, Issue 6, pp. 835-844.
- Zhao, G., Visser, P.J., Peeters, P. and Vrijling, J.K (2015b) 'Hydrodynamic erosion in cohesive embankment breach', *Scour and Erosion*, Cheng, Draper & An (Eds), Taylor & Francis Group, London, pp. 441 – 445.
- Zhu, Y. (2006) *Breach Growth in Clay-Dikes*. PhD thesis, TU Delft University.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

List of Indexed Journals

1. **Zainab Mohamed Yusof**, Ahmad Khairi Abd. Wahab, Zulhilmi Ismail and Shahabuddin Amerudin (2020) Soil Erosion Morphology of an Embankment Failure. *In IOP Conference Series Proceeding publication: Material and Science Engineering, 5th International Conference and Advance Technology & Applied Science in Conjunction with 6th Malaysia-Japan Joint International Conference (ICaTAS 2020)*, Issue 1051, Paper No. 012045, pp 294 - 302 (Indexed by Scopus).
2. **ZM Yusof**, AKA Wahab, Z Ismail, and S Amerudin (2018) ‘Characteristics of Non-Cohesive Embankment Failure’, *In IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, Vol (140), pp 12044 (Indexed by Scopus).
3. **Zainab Mohamed Yusof**, Ahmad Khairi Abd. Wahab, Zulhilmi Ismail and Shahabuddin Amerudin (2021) ‘Erosion Morphology of a Breached Embankment Due To Overtopping Flow’, *International Journal of Integrated Engineering (IJIE) - Special Issue 2020: Micropollutant Research Centre (MPRC)*, Penerbit UTHM (In Press – Indexed by Scopus).
4. **Z. Mohamed Yusof**, M. F. Mohd Mokhtar, A. K. Abd. Wahab, Z. Ismail and S. Amerudin (2021) *Breached Hydrograph Analysis of Kaolin Embankment Failures*. In Community, Environmental and Disaster Risk Management (CEDRM) Book Series: Sustainability and Water Quality Assessment Techniques – An Insight in Asia, through 4th International Conference of Water Resources (ICWR 2018), Vol (25), Emerald Publisher (Accepted for Correction – Indexed by Scopus).

List of Conference Proceedings

1. **Zainab Mohamed Yusof**, Ahmad Khairi Abd. Wahab, Zulhilmi Ismail and Shahabuddin Amerudin (2020) Soil Erosion Morphology of an Embankment Failure. *5th International Conference and Advance Technology & Applied Science in Conjunction with 6th Malaysia-Japan Joint International Conference (ICaTAS 2020)*, September, Kuala Lumpur.
2. **Z. Mohamed Yusof**, M. F. Mohd Mokhtar, A. K. Abd. Wahab, Z. Ismail and S. Amerudin (2019). *Breached Hydrograph Analysis of Kaolin Embankment Failures*. In IHP-VIII Technical Documents in Hydrology (UNESCO), through 4th International Conference of Water Resources (ICWR 2018).