

NUMERICAL SIMULATION OF SUPERCRITICAL FLOW IN OPEN  
CHANNEL

NG BOON CHONG

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Master of Engineering (Civil- Hydraulic)

Faculty of Civil Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

MAY 2006

To every single life that I care  
ant, seed, farmer and stone  
ng5207@yahoo.com

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Within this one and half years, I have conducted this research which include literature review, experimental works and numerical model testing. I was slowly guided by my supervisor, Dr Noor Baharim bin Hashim. Here I wish to express my sincere appreciation to him for the guidance, advices, motivation and critics. In fact, I am very thankful to his friendship during my research.

My sincere appreciation also extends to Professor R. Narayanan. He was one of my panels during proposal presentation and his ideas are very much appreciated. His opinions and tips are very useful indeed for my experimental works.

Besides, all technicians especially Mr Mohd Ismail and Mr Shahrin from hydraulic laboratory, research officers (Miss Anie and Maznah) and my friends (Mr Ling, Mr Abdullah, Mr Yusof and Mr Arresh) should also be recognised for their support. I am also indebted to University Technology Malaysia (UTM) for the financial support for my master research. The financial support for this research come through Research Management Center (RMC), UTM on Fundamental Research grant vot : 71840. Without them, this thesis would never be completed.

Finally, I wish to express my special thanks to all of my family members, including panda. Because of them, I never feel lonely.

## ABSTRACT

The presence of disturbances such as bends, contraction, expansion, junction, bridge piers in a drainage system is very common in Malaysia. These hydraulic structures often cause the channel flow to choke and form standing waves. The challenges for this numerical model lie in representing supercritical transition and capturing shocks. For this purpose, an unstructured two-dimensional finite-element model is used to solve the governing shallow water equations. This numerical model utilizes a characteristic based Petrov-Galerkin method implemented with shock-detection mechanism. The model testing demonstrates the ability of this numerical model to reproduce the speed and height of flow with the presence of hydraulic structure under different flow conditions. Four experiments, which consist of weir, contraction and 90° expansion, hydraulic jump and bridge pier, were conducted in laboratory Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM). The Reynolds number for these experiments is within the range of 30000 to 47000. The numerical model results are compared quantitatively with experimental results, published numerical simulation and analytical solution. In general, the energy in the model is dissipated too fast and the short wave in the model tends to travel faster. The present model is not suitable for any surface flow that has steep gradients. Overall results show that the numerical model satisfactorily computed the water-surface profiles of the experiments data and exact solutions. The results demonstrate that the numerical model provides an alternative tool in validating theoretical finding and evaluating flow performance.

## ABSTRAK

Kehadiran struktur-struktur dalam sistem saluran seperti bengkokan saluran, pengecilan dan pengembangan lebar, simpang saluran, dan tiang jambatan adalah amat umum di Malaysia. Struktur hidraulik ini sering mengakibatkan aliran dalam saluran bergelora dan mewujudkan gelombang tegak. Cabaran-cabaran yang dihadapi oleh model ini termasuklah memapar semula aliran genting lampau dan juga kejutan gelombang dalam model. Untuk tujuan ini, satu model berunsur terhingga dalam dua dimensi telah digunakan untuk menyelesaikan persamaan '*shallow water equation*'. Model ini mempergunakan ciri berdasarkan kaedah *Petrov-Galerkin* beserta dengan mekanisme pengesanan kejutan gelombang. Ujian-ujian model mempamerkan kebolehan model berangka ini dalam menghasilkan semula kelajuan dan kedalaman aliran dalam saluran yang berstruktur hidraulik di bawah keadaan aliran yang berbeza-beza. Empat eksperimen yang terdiri daripada empangan dasar, pengecilan dan 90° pengembangan, lompatan hidraulik dan tiang jambatan telah dijalankan di makmal Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM). Dalam eksperimen-eksperimen tersebut, nombor *Reynolds* didapati berada dalam lingkungan 30000 hingga 47000. Keputusan daripada model berangka ini dibandingkan secara kuantitatif dengan keputusan eksperimen dan penyelesaian analitikal. Secara umumnya, tenaga aliran dalam model dilepaskan terlalu cepat dan gelombang pendek dalam model bergerak dengan lebih cepat. Model ini tidak sesuai untuk sebarang permukaan aliran yang berkecuraman. Secara keseluruhannya, model berangka ini berjaya menghasilkan profil permukaan air daripada eksperimen dan penyelesaian tepat. Keputusan menunjukkan bahawa model berangka ini telah memperkenalkan kaedah alternatif dalam pengesanan sesuatu penemuan teori dan penilaian prestasi aliran.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CHAPTER</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
	<b>TITLE PAGE</b>	<b>i</b>
	<b>DECLARATION PAGE</b>	<b>ii</b>
	<b>DEDICATION PAGE</b>	<b>iii</b>
	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>iv</b>
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>v</b>
	<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>vi</b>
	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>vii</b>
	<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xi</b>
	<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xiii</b>
	<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	<b>xviii</b>
	<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	<b>xxi</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
	1.1 Introduction	1
	1.2 Problem Statement	2
	1.3 Objective of the Study	3
	1.4 Scope of the Study	4
	1.5 Significance of Research	5

<b>2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Numerical Model Review	6
2.2	Published Experimental Work	18
2.2.1	Hydraulic Jump (Gharangik and Chaudhry, 1991)	18
2.2.2	90° Channel Junction (Weber et al, 2001)	19
2.2.3	Both Side Contraction (Ippen and Dawson, 1951)	20
2.3	Basic Equations and Hypotheses	22
2.4	Governing Equations	24
2.5	Finite-element Model	25
2.6	Shock Detecting	27
2.7	Numerical Approach	28
<b>3</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>30</b>
3.1	Introduction	30
3.2	Experimental Work	32
3.2.1	Preliminary Work	32
3.2.2	Control Test	36
3.2.3	Experiment 1 : Weir	37
3.2.4	Experiment 2 : Contraction and 90° Expansion	39
3.2.5	Experiment 3 : Hydraulic Jump	42
3.2.6	Experiment 4 : Bridge Pier	43
3.3	Analytical Solution	48
3.3.1	Weir	48
3.3.2	One Side and Both Contraction	50
3.3.3	Expansion	53
3.3.4	Gradual Contraction	54

3.3.5	Bend	54
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Numerical Model Application</b>	<b>56</b>
3.4.1	Data Collection for Model Input	
	Parameters	56
3.4.2	Model Geometry	56
3.4.3	Mesh Grid Generation	57
3.4.4	Initial Condition	59
3.4.5	Boundary Conditions	59
3.4.6	Model Control	60
3.4.7	Model Run	62
3.4.8	Results Examination	62
<b>4</b>	<b>RESULTS AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>63</b>
4.1	Introduction	63
4.2	Control Test	64
	4.2.1 Normal Depth	68
4.3	Test Cases	72
	4.3.1 Weir	72
	4.3.2 Expansion	85
	4.3.3 Contraction	89
	4.3.3.1 One Side Contraction	89
	4.3.3.2 Both Sides Contraction	93
	4.3.3.3 One Side Contraction and 90° Expansion	97
	4.3.4 Junction	107
	4.3.5 Hydraulic Jump	112
	4.3.6 Bridge Pier	121
	4.3.7 Gradual Contraction	134
	4.3.8 Bend	136



<b>5</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>139</b>
5.1	Model Performance	139
5.2	Modelling	
	141	
5.3	Experimental Work	143
<b>6</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>144</b>
6.1	Conclusion and Recommendation	144
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>146</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>150</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Experiment results (hydraulic jump)	19
2.2	Flow parameters (junction)	20
2.3	Flow parameters for three assumptions	21
3.1	Results comparison among three discharge measurement methods	35
3.2	Flow parameters for weir experiment	37
3.3	Flow parameters for contraction & 90° expansion test case	41
3.4	Flow parameters for aluminium pier test cases	46
3.5	Flow parameters for wood pier test cases	47
4.1	Measured flow rate, $Q$ (m <sup>3</sup> /s)	64
4.2	Measured normal depth (unit cm) from experiment	64
4.3	Manning's $n$ for flume	65
4.4	Normal depth for small flow rate, $Q = 0.0155$ m <sup>3</sup> /s	70
4.5	Normal depth for large flow rate, $Q = 10.0$ m <sup>3</sup> /s	70
4.6	Flow parameters for subcritical flow without back water (weir)	72
4.7	Flow parameters for supercritical flow without back water (weir)	74
4.8	Results comparison for weir test case with analytical solution	76
4.9	Input parameters for numerical model (weir experiment)	79

4.10	Input parameters for numerical model (expansion experiment)	85
4.11	Analytical solution results (expansion experiment)	85
4.12	Input parameters and analytical solution results (one side contraction)	89
4.13	Analytical solution results (one side contraction)	90
4.14	Input parameters and analytical solution results (test2 and test3)	92
4.15	Constant ratio of water depth	93
4.16	Flow parameters used by Berger and Stockstill (1995)	95
4.17	Flow parameters used by Chaudhry (1993)	96
4.18	Input flow parameters for numerical model (contraction & 90° expansion)	101
4.19	Results comparison for contraction & 90° expansion	101
4.20	Input flow parameters for numerical model (90° junction)	109
4.21	Input flow parameters for numerical model (hydraulic jump)	112
4.22	Input flow parameters for numerical model (experiment hydraulic jump)	118
4.23	Input flow parameters for numerical model (aluminium pier)	125
4.24	Relationship between run up with other parameters (aluminium pier)	127
4.25	Input flow parameters for numerical model (wood pier)	131
4.26	Relationship between run up with other parameters (wood pier)	132
4.27	Input flow parameters for numerical model (gradual contraction)	134
4.28	Input flow parameters for numerical model (bend)	136

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Water depth increased four times within a short distance	8
2.2	(a) Spatial grids, (b) Geometry of flume	9
2.3	Comparison results reported by Katapodes (1984)	10
2.4	“S” shape open channel (Ghamry and Steffler, 2002)	13
2.5	“U” shape of rectangular flume(Ghamry and Steffler, 2002)	13
2.6	270° curved rectangular flume(Ghamry and Steffler, 2002)	14
2.7	Test facility for hydraulic jump	18
2.8	Test facility for 90° junction	19
2.9	Test facility for contraction, reported by Ippen and Dawson (1995)	21
2.10	Example error case in Newton-Raphson iterative method	29
3.1	Methodology Flow Chart	31
3.2	Rectangular flume in UTM laboratory	32
3.3	Point gauge and grid paper	33
3.4	Valve in front of flume	34
3.5	Checking slope	35
3.6	Concrete weir	37
3.7	Slope checking in weir test case	38
3.8	Contraction & 90° expansion test case	39
3.9	Slope checking for contraction & 90° expansion test case	40

3.10	Plan view for contraction & 90° expansion test case	41
3.11	Hydraulic jump test case with steep slope	42
3.12	Plastic gate at the end of flume	42
3.13	Triangular nose and tail for aluminium bridge pier	44
3.14	Plan view (1 <sup>st</sup> test case)	44
3.15	Side view (1 <sup>st</sup> test case)	45
3.16	Side view (2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> test case)	45
3.17	Rectangular nose and tail for wood bridge pier	46
3.18	Plan view (wood pier)	47
3.19	3D view (wood pier)	47
3.20	Side view of weir test case	49
3.21	Inward deflection in boundary	50
3.22	Channel design for contraction	52
3.23	Expansion	53
3.24	Gradual contraction	54
3.25	Maximum difference depth in bend	55
3.26	Example geometry shown in model	57
3.27	Example meshing grid shown in model	58
3.28	Input for boundary conditions	60
3.29	Input for Manning's n	61
4.1	Bed surface of flume (mild slope)	65
4.2	Bed surface of flume (steep slope)	66
4.3	Comparison water depths for different flow rate with $S = 1/500$	66
4.4	Comparison water profiles for different n and $\beta$ with $S = 1/1500$	67
4.5(a)	Water depth contours from numerical model at $t = 300s$	68
4.5(b)	Water depth contours from numerical model at $t = 300s$	69
4.6	Velocity distribution for steady state	71
4.7	Mesh grids (weir)	73
4.8	Numerical result for subcritical flow without back water (weir)	73

4.9	Numerical result for subcritical flow with back water (weir)	74
4.10(a)	Water profile for supercritical flow without back water (weir)	75
4.10(b)	Numerical Result for supercritical flow without back water (weir)	75
4.11(a)	Water profile for supercritical flow with back water (weir)	75
4.11(b)	Numerical result for supercritical flow without back water (weir)	76
4.12	Front view of mortal weir	77
4.13	Side view of water profile on the weir	78
4.14	Flow pattern on the weir	79
4.15	Initial condition (weir experiment)	80
4.16	Mesh grids (weir experiment)	80
4.17(a)	Water depth (weir experiment)	81
4.17(b)	Water depth (downstream just after weir)	82
4.18	Back water in front of weir	83
4.19	Back water in front of weir (numerical model)	84
4.20	Geometry and mesh grid for expansion	85
4.21	Water depth (expansion)	86
4.22	Velocity distribution (expansion)	86
4.23	Velocity distribution (frictionless expansion)	88
4.24	Water depth (frictionless expansion)	88
4.25	Parameters in one side contraction	89
4.26	Mesh grid in one side contraction	90
4.27	Water depth (one side contraction)	90
4.28	Water depth (frictionless one side contraction)	91
4.29	Water depths (test2 one side contraction)	92
4.30	Water depths (test3 one side contraction)	92
4.31	Water depth (both side contraction from Ippen and Dawson, 1951)	94
4.32	Water depth (both side contraction from Berger and Stockstill, 1995)	94
4.33	Mesh grid (both side contraction)	95

4.34	Simulated Water depth (Berger and Stockstill, 1995)	96
4.35	Simulated Water depth (Chaudhry, 1993)	96
4.36	Simulated Water depth (new assumption)	97
4.37	Shock wave in experiment	98
4.38	Wavefront angles in experiment	98
4.39	90° expansion	99
4.40	Flow pattern after 90° expansion	99
4.41	Increasing water depth (point A)	100
4.42	Mesh grid (contraction and 90° expansion)	100
4.43	Plan view for contraction & 90° expansion test case	101
4.44(a)	Water depth (contraction & 90° expansion)	102
4.44(b)	Water depth (contraction & 90° expansion)	103
4.44(c)	Water depths (contraction & 90° expansion)	104
4.45	Comparison between simulated water depths and measured water depths (contraction & 90° expansion)	105
4.46	$h^*$ contours for $q^* = 0.250$ and $0.750$ (experiment 90° junction)	107
4.47	$u^*-v^*$ vector field for $q^* = 0.250$ (experiment 90° junction)	108
4.48	Schematic of flow structure for $q^* = 0.250$	109
4.49	Mesh grid (90° junction)	110
4.50(a)	$h^*$ contours for $q^* = 0.250$ from model (90° junction)	110
4.50(b)	$h^*$ contours for $q^* = 0.750$ from model (90° junction)	111
4.51(a)	$u^*-v^*$ vector field for $q^* = 0.250$ from model (90° junction)	111
4.51(b)	$u^*-v^*$ vector field for $q^* = 0.750$ from model (90° junction)	112
4.52	Analysis of grid resolution in hydraulic jump	113
4.53(a)	$Fr_1 = 6.71$	114
4.53(b)	$Fr_1 = 5.71$	114
4.53(c)	$Fr_1 = 4.21$	115

4.53(d)	$Fr_1 = 2.30$	115
4.54	Hydraulic jump test case with steep slope	116
4.55(a)	Undular jump (front view)	116
4.55(b)	Undular jump (side view)	117
4.56	Oscillations	117
4.57	Mesh grid (Hydraulic jump)	118
4.58(a)	Water depth (Hydraulic jump)	119
4.58(b)	Water depth (Hydraulic jump)	120
4.59	Sluice gate	121
4.60(a)	3D view (1 <sup>st</sup> test case in aluminium pier)	122
4.60(b)	3D view (2 <sup>nd</sup> test case in aluminium pier)	123
4.60(c)	3D view (3 <sup>rd</sup> test case in aluminium pier)	123
4.61	Plan views for test case 1 (top), 2 (middle) and 3 (bottom)	124
4.62	Mesh grid (triangular nose and tail)	125
4.63(a)	Comparison water depth between experiment and numerical model (1 <sup>st</sup> test case)	126
4.63(b)	Comparison water depth between experiment and numerical model (2 <sup>nd</sup> test case)	128
4.63(c)	Comparison water depth between experiment and numerical model (3 <sup>rd</sup> test case)	129
4.64	Run up at rectangular nose of wood pier	130
4.65	Mesh grid (rectangular nose and tail)	131
4.66	Comparison water depth between experiment and numerical model (1 <sup>st</sup> test case for wood pier)	133
4.67	Mesh grid (gradual contraction)	134
4.68	Water depth for $Fr = 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0$ and $6.0$ (gradual contraction)	135
4.69	Mesh grid (bend)	136
4.70(a)	Water depth for $Fr = 0.25$ (bend)	137
4.70(b)	Water depth for $Fr = 1.20$ (bend)	137
5.1	Wave (side view)	139



## LIST OF SYMBOLS

$\bar{E}$	-	Average element energy over the entire grid
$\bar{E}_i$	-	Average energy of element $i$
$\psi_i$	-	Equal to $\phi_i I + \varphi_i$
$\phi_i$	-	Galerkin part of the test function
$\varphi_i$	-	Non-Galerkin part of the test function
$\Delta l$	-	Element length
$\Delta t$	-	Time step size
$a_i$	-	Area of element $i$
$B$	-	Width
B.C.	-	Boundary Condition
$C_0$	-	Conversion coefficient ( $C_0=1$ for SI units and 2.208 for non-SI units);
CFL	-	Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy
$d_i$	-	Water depth at section $i$
$E$	-	Mechanical energy distribution within the element
$E'$	-	Error = $Lu_{\text{approx}} - f(x_j)$
$ED_i$	-	Element $i$ energy deviation
$f(x_j)$	-	Function in $x$ variable, it can be a constant
$F_1\theta$	-	Shock number
$Fi$	-	Froude number at section $i$
$Fr$	-	Froude number
$g$	-	Acceleration due to gravity;
$h$	-	Depth;
$h^*$	-	$h/B$
$H_{\min}$	-	Minimum head energy
$I$	-	Identity Matrix

$L$	-	Differential operator in finite-element model
$L$	-	Length for a object in experiment
$n$	-	Manning's coefficient
$N_r$	-	Weighting functions of depth-averaged velocity;
$p$	-	uh, x-direction discharge per unit width where u being x-component of depth-averaged velocity;
$Q$	-	Discharge rate
$q$	-	vh, y-direction discharge per unit width where v being y-component
$q^*$	-	Ratio of $Q_m/Q_t$
$Q_b$	-	Branch channel flow
$Q_m$	-	Main channel flow
$Q_t$	-	Total flow
$R$	-	Radius of curvature of the centreline of the channel
$S$	-	Slope
$SD$	-	Standard deviation of all $ED_i$
Sub	-	Subcritical flow
Super	-	Supercritical flow
$t$	-	Time
$u^*$	-	Dimensionless velocity along y-axis
$u_{approx}$	-	Approximate of dependent variable
$u_i$	-	Longitudinal velocity
$V$	-	Flow velocity
$v^*$	-	Dimensionless velocity along x-axis
$x$	-	Longitudinal direction
$x^*$	-	$x/B$
$y$	-	Lateral direction
$y$	-	Vertical water depth
$y^*$	-	$y/B$
$y_o$	-	Normal depth
$z$	-	Vertical direction
$z^*$	-	$z/B$
$Z_0$	-	Channel bed elevation;
$\beta$	-	Dissipation coefficient

- $\beta_1, \beta_2$  - Wavefront angles
- $\theta$  - Angle of deflection
- $\rho$  - Fluid density;
- $\sigma$  - Reynolds stresses due to turbulence

**LIST OF APPENDIX**

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>A</b>	Example laboratory data	150

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.6 Introduction

The design of structures to control waterways in Malaysia is a major concern for engineers. The options for flood control in urban areas, however, are limited. A large fraction of the ground surfaces is paved causing concentrated flood flow peaks. One of the practical methods of routing the water through the urban areas is via the use of high-velocity channels.

Hydraulic engineers often use the term “high-velocity channel” when referring to a control flood channel which was designed to discharge water as fast as possible to discharge point such as river or sea (Berger and Stockstill, 1995). High-velocity channels are often used for drainage purposes in urban regions where real estate is expensive. This kind of channels are normally constructed at a sufficient slope so that the flow is supercritical, thus reducing the flow area and concentration time.

The designer of these high-velocity channels is faced with many problems that cannot be solved easily. At the design level, two main concerns are the water depth and velocities of the flow. The depth must be known to determine sidewall heights and minimum bridge span elevations. Normally, a designer simply applies an

empirical equation such as the Manning's equation to obtain water depth with known discharge rate. However, determining the depth of flow is complicated by side inflows and boundary features such as contractions, expansions, curves, and obstructions. These boundary features in a supercritical channel cause flow disturbances that can result in a significant oscillation in flow.

Besides water depth, consideration should be given to flow velocity when designing a channel section. According to MASMA (Urban Stormwater Management Manual for Malaysia), flow velocity should be controlled within range 0.6 – 4.0 m/s to prevent sediments and to protect channel from bank corrosion.

For these design purposes, many methods have been used such as empirical equations, physical models and numerical model. A numerical model in handling shock capturing will be tested through this study.

## **1.7 Problem Statement**

Open channel especially high-velocity channels are used for drainage in urban regions, since urban sprawl increase rainfall runoff due to altered land use. Flood control channels are designed and built to safely manage the anticipated hydrologic load. The desire is to minimize the water's time of residence in the urban area. The channels are designed to carry supercritical flow to reduce the water depths and the required route. Structures, such as bends and transitions cause flow to choke and form jumps. These hydraulic conditions generally necessitate higher walls, bridges and other costly containment structures. A poorly designed channel can cause bank erosion, damaged equipment, increased operating expense, and reduced efficiency (Berger and Stockstill, 1995). Furthermore, crossings may be washed out, and the town may be flooded.

Predicting the potential location of shocks and determining the elevation of water surface in channel are necessary to evaluate and decide the required sidewall heights. Normally empirical equations are often used in the channel design due to its

simple application. However, the presence of bends, contractions, transitions, confluences, bridge piers and access ramps can cause the flow to choke or to produce a series of standing waves and these all will complicate channel design.

In the past, applications of physical models are common for this water profile evaluation. Although physical model can reproduce a channel if properly conducted, but great care must be taken in model dimension and scale. A major drawback of physical models is the problem of scaling down a field situation to the dimensions of a laboratory model. Phenomena measured at the scale of a physical model are often different from conditions observed in the field. For example, the Reynolds number of the flow in site will not be the same as Reynolds number in the physical model.

Changes to the physical model require a “cut and try” technique that involves tearing down sections of the channel and rebuilding them with the new desired design. Due to the time and cost constraints of physical models, it is not practical to examine a wide range of designs. This could result in hydraulic performance that is only acceptable over a limited range.

Mathematical models have been developed to overcome the problem mentioned above. A mathematical model consists of a set of differential equations that are known to govern the flow of surface water. The reliability of predictions of models depends on how well the model approximates the field situation. Inevitably, simplifying assumptions must be made because the equations such as differential continuity equation and momentum equation are too complex to be solved. Usually, the assumptions necessary to solve a mathematical model analytically are fairly restrictive. To deal with more realistic situations, it is usually necessary to solve the mathematical model approximately using numerical techniques. Therefore, an inexpensive and a readily available model is needed. A numerical model is a logical approach.

An area of engineering design that can benefit the use of numerical model is the design and modification of high-velocity channels essential for the routing of floodwater through urban areas. The proper design of new channels and re-design of existing channels is required to avoid such things as bank erosion, damaged

equipment, increased operating expenses, flooding, and higher construction costs. By using numerical model, a better channel design can be produced with minimum cost and time.

## **1.8 Objective of the Study**

The primary purpose of the research is to develop a methodology and ascertain the effectiveness of using a numerical model for open channel modeling. The challenges for this numerical model lie in representing supercritical transitions and, capturing the potential location and movement of the shocks. The specific objectives of the study are listed as the following:

1. to assess the practicality of using a two-dimensional numerical model to aid in the design of a realistic open channel, and
2. to evaluate the performance of the numerical model in handling shock capturing in various test cases through comparison with published results, laboratory tests and analytical solutions.

## **1.9 Scope of the Study**

The purpose of this research is to describe the numerical flow model and to illustrate typical open flow fields that the model is capable of simulating. Only rectangular channel is focused in this research. A few test cases are conducted in laboratory using simple geometries. Numerical results are used for comparison with published laboratory results. Model parameters are tested to determine the model sensitivities. This reduces the number of parameters to only those that have major impact on the design. The model verification consists of comparing results computed using the numerical model with laboratory results and analytical solutions. However, studies will only focus on steady state flow. Model limitations will also be discussed.



The results can be used to determine the appropriate parameters to be optimized in the future.

### **1.5 Significance of Research**

In surface water modelling, the most challenging part is to detect the location and water elevation of hydraulic jump or shock. The height of the jump is critical to the design of channel walls and bridges within high-velocity channel. And through this prediction, we can also define easily the critical location within the existing channel so that improvement can be done quickly before flood happens in that location. A lot of flow models used recently are not able to perform this task accurately. Some flow models have been developed specially for this shock capture purpose but most of them in one-dimensional (1D) mode.

There were some concerns to the adequacy of one-dimensional (1D) analysis of the flow conditions such as contractions, expansions, bends, hydraulic jumps and bridge piers which are commonly found in high-velocity channels. There was a question as to whether computing cross-sectional averaged flow variables provided a sufficiently accurate estimate of flow depths and velocities within these boundary features. Thus, a two-dimensional (2D) analysis was deemed necessary to evaluate these flow conditions.

A numerical model HIVEL2D is used to assess the design computationally before the construction of the physical model begins. Using a numerical model would accelerate this design process and lead to an improved initial physical model thus reducing the time spent on the physical model. This would allow for exploration of more design alternatives in a shorter length of time resulting in a more cost-effective solution.

## REFERENCES

- Abbett, M. (1971). *Boundary Conditions in Computational Procedures for Inviscid, Supersonic Steady Flow Field Calculations*. Aerotherm Report 41-71. Aerotherm Corp., Mt. View, Calif.
- Bellos, C.V., Soulis, J.V., and Sakkas, J.G. (1992). *Experimental Investigation of Two-dimensional Dam-break Induced Flow*. *Int. J. Hydr. Res.*, Delft, The Netherlands, 40(1), 47-63.
- Berger, R.C., and Howington, S.E. (2002). *Discrete Fluxes and Mass Balance in Finite Elements*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 128(1), 87-92.
- Berger, R.C., and Stockstill, R.L. (1995). *Finite Element for High-Velocity Channels*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 121(10), 710-716.
- Bhallamudi, S.M., and Chaudhry, M.H.(1992). *Computation of Flows in Open-channel Transitions*, *J. Hydraulic Research, Inter. Assoc. Hyd. Research*, no. 1:77-93.
- Borghei S. M., Jalili, M. R., and Ghodsian, M. (1999). *Discharge Coefficient for Sharp-crested Side Weir in Subcritical Flow*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 125(10), 1051-1056.
- Chaudhry M. H. (1993). *Open-Channel Flow*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:Prentice-Hall.

- Fagherazzi, S., Rasetarinera, P., Hussaini, M. Y., and Furbish, D. J. (2004). *Numerical Solution of the Dam-break Problem with a Discontinuous Galerkin Method*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 130(6), 532-539.
- Fennema, R.J., and Chaudhry, M.H. (1990). *Explicit Methods for 2-D Transient Free Surface Flows*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 116(8), 1013-1034.
- Ghamry, H. K., and Steffler, P. M. (2002). *Effect of Applying Different Distribution Shapes for Velocities and Pressure on Simulation of Curved Open Channels*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 128(11), 969-982.
- Gharangik, A. M., and Chaudhry, M. H. (1991). *Numerical Simulation of Hydraulic Jump*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 117(9), 1195-1211.
- Henderson, F. M. (1966). *Open Channel Flow*, MacMillian, New York, NY.
- Herbert, F.W., and Mary P. Anderson (1982). *Introduction to Ground Water Modelling: Finite Difference and Finite Element Methods.*: San Francisco. Academic Press Limited.
- Hicks, F. E., and Steffler, P. M. (1992). *Characteristic Dissipative Galerkin Scheme for Open-Channel Flow*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 118(2), 337-352.
- Hicks, F. E., Steffler, P. M. and Yasmin, N. (1997). *One-dimensional Dam-break Solutions for Variable Width Channels*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 123(5), 464-468.
- Hunt, J., Brunner, G. W., and Larock, B. E. (1999). *Flow Transitions in Bridge Backwater Analysis*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 125(9), 981-983.
- Ippen, A. T., and Dawson, J. H. (1951). "Design of Channel Contraction." High-velocity Flow In Open Channel: A Symposium, Trans., 116, ASCE, New York, N.Y., 326-346.

- Jain, S.C. (2001). *Open Channel Flow*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY.
- Jimenez, O., and Chaudhry, M. H. (1988). *Computation of Supercritical Free-surface Flows*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 114(4), 377-395.
- Katapodes, N. D. (1984). *A Dissipative Galerkin Scheme for Open-channel Flow*, *Jour. Hydraulic Engineering*, ASCE, 110, no. 4 (April):450-66.
- Katopodes N. D. (1984). *Two-dimensional Surges and Shocks in Open Channels*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 110(6), 794-812
- Lai Y.G., Weber, L.J., and Patal, V.C. (2003). *Nonhydrostatic three-dimensional method for hydraulic flow simulation. I: Formulation and verification*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 129(3), 196-205.
- Liu, M., Rajaratnam, N., and Zhu, D. Z. (2004). *Turbulence Structure of Hydraulic Jumps of Low Froude Numbers*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 130(69), 511-520.
- Molinas, A., Kheireldin, K., and Wu, B. (1998). *Shear Stress Around Vertical Wall Abutments*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 124(8), 822-830.
- Reinauer, R., and Hager, W. H. (1998). *Supercritical Flow in Chute Contraction*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 124(1), 55-64.
- Salaheldin T.M., Imran J., and Chaudhry, M. H. (2004). *Numerical Modelling of Three-Dimensional Flow Field Around Circular Piers*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 130(2), 91-100.
- Schwanenberg, D., and Harms, M. (2004). *Discontinuous Galerkin Finite-Element Method for Transcritical Two-Dimensional Shallow Water Flows*. *J. Hydr. Engrg.*, ASCE, 130(5), 412-421.

- Seckin, G., Yurtal, R., and Haktanir, T. (1998). *Contraction and Expansion Losses Through Bridge Constrictions*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 124(5), 546-549.
- Stockstill, R.L. (1994), Application of a Two-Dimensional Model of Hydrodynamics to San Timoteo Creek Flood-Control Channel, California. Miscellaneous Paper HL-94-7, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS, October.
- Stockstill, R.L., Berger, R.C., and Nece R.E. (1997). *Two-Dimensional Flow Model for Trapezoidal High-Velocity Channels*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 123(10), 844-852.
- Stockstill, R.L., Berger, R.C., and Nece R.E. (2001). *Simulating Barge Drawdown and Currents in Channel and Backwater Areas*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 127(5), 290-298.
- Unami, K., Kawachi, T., Munir Babar, M., and Itagaki, H. (1999). *Two-dimensional Numerical Model of Spillway Flow*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 125(4), 369-375.
- Von Neumann, J., and Richtmyer, R. D. (1950). *A Method for the Numerical Calculation of Hydrodynamics Shocks*. J. Appl. Phys., 21(3), 232-237.
- Weber, L. J., Schumate, E. D., and Mawer, N. (2001). *Experiments on Flow at a 90° Open-channel Junction*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 127(5), 340-350.
- Wu, B., and Molinas, A. (2001). *Choked Flows Through Short Contractions*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 127(8), 657-662.
- Wu, S., Rajaratnam, N. (1996). *Transition from Hydraulic Jump to Open Channel Flow*. J. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE, 122(9), 526-528.