

Modelling Extreme Flood Events and Associated Processes

Professor Roger A. Falconer FREng Professor of Water Management and

Past President of IAHR (2011-15)

Hydro-environmental Research Centre School of Engineering, Cardiff University







General

- Flooding essentially a natural process ⇒ we need to live with rivers, climate change and increasing storm events
- Flooding not only be caused by high rainfall ⇒ also poor drainage, groundwater saturation, debris flows etc.
- Flooding usually also leads to water pollution ⇒ large loss of life in many countries due to epidemiological outbreaks
- Flooding damage extent often exacerbated by:
 - Inadequate data, poor warning systems and planning
 - Inadequate defences and insufficient upstream storage
 - Use of crude modelling tools and inexperienced operators





• Floods are on the Rise







• Floods Cause Loss of Life







• Floods Bring Misery and Stress







• Floods Bring Contamination







• Cumbria Floods 2016 – Short Steep River Basin







• Somerset Levels 2014 – Mild Slope River Basin







• Overview of Research for Steep Catchments

- Increasing concern of flooding along steep river basins and levee breeches – particularly in Wales
- Traditional 2-D and 1-D models not ideal for such flows and need refining for trans- and supercritical flows
- Full shallow water equations solved using a finite volume scheme on a collocated grid
- Model also refined to include surface and sub-surface flow interactions and extended to include floodplain flows in urban regions





• DIVAST-ADI vs. DIVAST-TVD

Dam-Break Problem







• DIVAST-ADI vs. DIVAST-TVD



DIVAST-ADI

DIVAST-TVD





• Dyke Break Experiment (TU Delft)







• Dyke Break Experiment







• Dyke Break Experiment







• Refined Treatment of Buildings

- Three modelling approaches considered:
 - Modelling buildings as solid blocks making buildings impervious
 - Remove buildings and increase local roughness => not ideal for water quality predictions
 - ➢ Remove buildings and treat as porous media ⇒ better for predicting water quality in buildings





• Flood Building Interaction







Flood Building Interaction 1 – Solid Building







Flood Building Interaction 2 – High Roughness







Flood Building Interaction 3 – Porous Media







• Flood Building Interaction – Water Levels







• Flood Inundation of Glasgow

City in Scotland prone to urban flooding



Without buildings

With buildings





• Flood Inundation of Glasgow

Porous media and solid block methods



Without buildings

With buildings





• Interaction Between Flood and Buildings







• Boscastle Flood 2004

- Small picturesque town in South West of UK
- Short river basin with steep valley terrain ⇒ similar to many river basins in Wales and Northern England
- Up to 200 mm rainfall fell in 5 hr and predicted to have 1 in 400 yr return period event
- Extensive damage to properties, bridges, highways and other infrastructure
- One of best recorded extreme flood events in UK with trans- and super-critical flows



























Model Study Objectives

- Determine type of model scheme most appropriate for predicting key parameters for extreme flood events
- Three different schemes compared:
 - ➤ Simplified DIVAST (i.e. NI No Inertia)
 - > Standard DIVAST (i.e. ADI Alternating Direction Implicit)
 - > DIVAST TVD (i.e. Total Variation Diminishing)
- Case studied: 2004 Boscastle flash flood
- Predicted main flood parameters (i.e. water elevations and flood inundation extent) compared with observed data





Boscastle Study Domain









Predicted Flood Simulation (TVD Scheme)







Flood Inundation Extent Predictions







• Predicted and Measured Water Levels





• Summary

- Models can be extended to include treatment of buildings on floodplains using surface/subsurface models ⇒ offering attractive options for flood modelling (e.g. health impact)
- For rivers with trans- or supercritical flows, or levee breeches, then need to use more complex models and replicate hydrodynamic processes more accurately
- Computational models with shock capturing algorithms provide more accurate predictions of flood elevations
- Debris and vehicles can increase flood risk by blocking bridges and culverts to reduce local discharges















• Incipient Velocity for Vehicles in Floodwaters

- Study first undertaken to determine incipient velocity for fully submerged vehicles
- Subsequent studies undertaken for partially submerged vehicles based on:
 - Based on physics derived formulae
 - Flume experiments based on similarity laws
 - Parameter determination and formulae validation
 - > Based on incipient velocity for prototype vehicles





• Formula Derivation

Different forces acting on a partially submerged vehicle





1

$$F_{D} = F_{R}$$

$$C_{d}[a_{d}(h_{f}b_{c})]\gamma_{f}\frac{u_{b}^{2}}{2g} = \mu[a_{c}l_{c}b_{c}(h_{c}\gamma_{c} - R_{f}h_{f}\gamma_{f})]$$

$$u = (1 + \beta)(\frac{y}{h_{f}})^{\beta}U$$

$$u_{b} = \sqrt{\frac{\mu a_{c}}{a_{d}C_{d}}}\sqrt{2gl_{c}\left(\frac{h_{c}\rho_{c}}{h_{f}\rho_{f}} - R_{f}\right)}$$

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{1 + \beta a_{b}^{\beta}}\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{C_{d}}\frac{a_{c}}{a_{d}}}$$

$$U_{c} = \alpha\left(\frac{h_{f}}{h_{c}}\right)^{\beta}\sqrt{2gl_{c}\left(\frac{\rho_{c}}{\rho_{f}}\frac{h_{c}}{h_{f}} - R_{f}\right)}$$

 α , β = Parameters, to be calibrated using flume experiments; U_c = Incipient velocity for a partially submerged vehicle.





• Flume Experiments for Vehicle Instability

- Experiments conducted in HRC flume Cardiff University. Flume: 15 m long, 1.20 m wide and 1.00 m deep, plastic bed and glass sides
- To estimate critical conditions for prototype vehicles scaled model vehicles used, with 3 similarity laws used to design flume experiments



Experimental test flume

Partially submerged vehicle test





• Design of Flume Experiments

Prototype can be analysed from experiments if similarity occurs with: form (geometric), motion (kinematic) and force (dynamic).

Similarity Scale		Symbol	Design scale
Geometric similarity	Horizontal or vertical scale	$\lambda_{\!_L} = \lambda_{\!_H}$	18
Kinematic similarity	Velocity scale	$\lambda_{_U} = \sqrt{\lambda_{_L}}$	$\sqrt{18}$
Dynamic similarity	Force scale	$\begin{split} \lambda_{_{\!$	18 ³

Scale ratios of model experiments

Flow and dimensions used typical for Taff





Depth-incipient velocity relationships for partially submerged vehicles





Incipient Velocity for Prototype Vehicles

Incipient velocities for partially submerged vehicles in floodwaters estimated using two methods: (i) using model scale ratios, (ii) computations based on derived formulae



Comparison between estimated incipient velocities using two different approaches





• Assessment of People Safety

Previous studies carried out using two approaches:

- Empirical or semi-quantitative criteria
- Stability analysis validated by experimental data





Keller and Mitsch (1992) established balanced forces acting on a flooded person:- buoyancy, weight, frictional resistance and drag due to flow:-

$$U_{c} = 2 \left(\frac{F_{r}}{\rho_{f} C_{d} A} \right)^{0.5}$$

- F_r = restoring force due to friction;
- A = submerged area normal to flow;
- $C_d = drag \ coefficient$.



Instability curves for child and adult in floodwaters





Incipient Velocity for People in Floodwaters

- Similar approach adopted to previous study on incipient velocity for vehicles
- Current study for partially submerged people
 - Formula derivation
 - Flume experiments following similarity laws
 - Parameter determination and formula validation
 - Estimation of incipient velocity for prototype people



• Formula Derivation

- 186 tests undertaken in China using 1:5.54 scale models
- Different forces acting on partially submerged person



- F_G : Effective weight
- F_D: Drag force
- F_b: Buoyancy force
- F_N : Normal force
- F_R: Frictional force



Critical condition for toppling instability, given by moment around pivot point O :

$$F_{Gy}L_{gy} + F_{Gx}L_{gx} - F_DL_d = 0$$

Giving for velocity v. depth:-:

$$U = \alpha \left(\frac{h_f}{h_p}\right)^{\beta} \sqrt{\frac{m_p}{h_f^2 \rho_f}} \left(\cos\theta + \gamma \sin\theta\right) - \left(\frac{a_1}{h_p^2} + \frac{b_1}{h_f h_p}\right) \left(a_2 m_p + b_2\right)$$

where: $\alpha, \gamma = \text{coefficients}$ (see paper), $m_p = \text{body mass}$, $h_p = \text{body height}$, $h_f = \text{flow depth}$, $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 = \text{body shape coefficients}$





Scaled Incipient Velocity vs. Depth



Empirical or Semi-quantitative Criteria

Defra (2003) in UK use simple method to assess flood hazard based on velocity, depth and debris:

$$HR = h \times (U + 1.5) + DF$$

- HR = flood hazard rating;
- H = depth of flooding (m);
- U = velocity of floodwaters (m/s);
- DF = debris factor (= 0, 1, 2 varies with probability that debris will lead to greater hazard)

• Determination of Hazard Degree

Incipient velocity formula from our studies used to assess vehicle and people safety

Expression used to determine degree of hazard:-

HD=Min(1.0, U/Uc)

- U = depth-averaged velocity in a cell (m/s);
- h = flow depth in a cell (m);
- Uc = critical velocity for depth (h) \Rightarrow for vehicle or people(m/s);
- HD = Hazard degree for vehicle or people in floodwaters

Safe if HD=0, Dangerous if HD =1.0

Comparison of Hazard Formulae

- Model Application
 - 1. Glasgow flood in the UK
 - 2. Boscastle flood in the UK

Map of a small urban area in Glasgow

Maximum water depth (m)

Predicted maximum water depth distribution

Predicted maximum velocity distribution

Distributions of hazard degree for vehicles: (a) Pajero; (b) MiniCooper

Distributions of hazard degree for people: (a) Children; (b) Adults

• Boscastle Flood

- Water depths on streets over 2 m, with high velocities transporting debris and cars
- Over 100 vehicles washed away, but no fatalities

Domain showing upstream and downstream boundaries

Distribution of water depth and velocity at Q_{pk}

Maximum water depth

Maximum velocity

FRMRC flood risk management research consortium

Comparison between predicted peak levels and flood tracks

Hazard degree for vehicles: (a) Pajero; (b) MiniCooper

Hazard degree for people: (a) Children; (b) Adults

Conclusions

- Accurate modelling of flooding in steep catchments and levee breaches requires shock capturing models and DIVAST-TVD provides engine for Flood Modeller Pro
- Novel treatment of buildings using high roughness or low porosity and Darcy flow attractive for modelling floods
- New formulae developed for critical velocity of vehicles and people under flood conditions
- New formulae developed for flood hazard risk ⇒ based on fundamental physics vis-à-vis empirical formulae
- Models tested successfully for two sites predicting hazard levels for people and vehicles ⇒ new algorithms provided

Professor Roger A. Falconer Email: FalconerRA@cf.ac.uk