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## Part 1: Introduction

## SRH-2D Stands for:

## Sedimentation and River Hydraulics -2D

## Major Capabilities

- Two Dimensional (2D) Depth-Averaged Modeling for Open Channel Flows
- Dynamic Wave Solver
- Steady or Unsteady Flows
- Sub-, Super-, and Trans-Critical Flows
- Unstructured or Structured Arbitrarily-Shaped Meshes


## Why SRH-2D?

- Commercial Codes
- Not convenient for occasional use
- Expensive to own
- Too many inputs \& turning parameters
- Not suitable for advanced use
- Black-box style: garbage-in garbage-out
- Research Codes
- Availability issue
- Hard wired
- User unfriendly
- Error prone


## SRH-2D Development Philosophy

- Easy to Learn
- A tutorial case exercise + Occasional references to the User's Manual
- An interactive preprocessor to guide input setup
- Easy to Apply
- Flexible mesh: less restrictive on the requirements of mesh
- Very few input parameters for model tuning
- Dynamic run-time execution control
- Interface with SMS or GIS for result post-processing
- Easy to Solve
- Robust and stable numerical algorithm for field applications


## Current Limitations

- Flow Only:

Erosion and sediment transport will be added in future versions.

- Solver Module Only:

Mesh generation: SMS
Post-Processing: SMS, GIS, or TECPLOT

## Why 2D Modeling?

- Flows with in-stream structures such as weirs, diversion dams, release gates, cofferdams, etc.



## Why 2D Modeling?

- Flows through meander bends



## Why 2D Modeling?

- Perched channel system
- Flows with multiple channel systems.



## Why 2D Modeling?

- Interested in local flow velocities, eddy patterns, and flow recirculation



## Why 2D Modeling?

- Interested in lateral variations
- Flow spills over banks and levees



## Why 2D Modeling?

- Flow over vegetated areas and interaction with main channel flows



## Zonal Modeling

- Roughness Zone



## RECLAMATION

## Zonal Modeling



RECLAMATION

## Modeling Feature: Flexible Mesh



## Model Output Variables:

- Inundation Map
- Water Surface Elevation
- Water Depth
- Velocity Vector and Magnitude
- Froude Number
- Bed Shear Stress
- Sediment Transport Capacity
- Critical Sediment Diameter


## Output for Geomorphic Assessment: Critical Diameter



## SRH-2D Structure

## What's Needed?

Three Steps $\rightarrow$ Three Modules

- Mesh Generation
- SMS (Map Mesh Scatter)
- Numerical Solution
- SRH-2D program
- Post Processing
- SMS, TECPLOT, or GIS


## About SRH-2D

SRH-2D consists of two modules

- Preprocessor
- srhpre
- Solver
- srh2d


## SRH-PRE:

## Interactive Q\&A session

- Prepare an Input File for SRH-2D:
- named as case.dat
- Script Output File (SOF):
- case_SOF.dat
- Script Input File (SIP):
- case_SIF.dat
- See Chapter 4 of the Manual for all inputs


## SRH-2D: Flow Solver Module

- Read Input File
- case.dat
- Run Time Monitoring
- Output Results for Post Processing
- case_SMSi.dat


## Part 2: Governing Equations and Boundary Conditions

## Governing Equations

- Dynamic Wave Equations (St Venant Equations)

$$
\frac{\partial h}{\partial t}+\frac{\partial h U}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial h V}{\partial y}=e
$$

$$
\frac{\partial h U}{\partial t}+\frac{\partial h U U}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial h V U}{\partial y}=\frac{\partial h T_{x x}}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial h T_{x y}}{\partial y}-g h \frac{\partial z}{\partial x}-\frac{\tau_{b x}}{\rho}+D_{x x}+D_{x y}
$$

$$
\frac{\partial h V}{\partial t}+\frac{\partial h U V}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial h V V}{\partial y}=\frac{\partial h T_{x y}}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial h T_{y y}}{\partial y}-g h \frac{\partial z}{\partial y}-\frac{\tau_{b y}}{\rho}+D_{y x}+D_{y y}
$$

## Manning's Roughness Equations

- Equation:

$$
\binom{\tau_{b x}}{\tau_{b y}}=\rho C_{f}\binom{U}{V} \sqrt{U^{2}+V^{2}} ; \quad C_{f}=\frac{g n^{2}}{h^{1 / 3}}
$$

- About Manning's Coefficient:
- Does not change with flow
- Spatially distributed depending on bed types.
- Conversion from equivalent roughness height using the Strickler's formula:

$$
n=\frac{k_{s}^{1 / 6}}{A}
$$

## Turbulence Stress Equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
& T_{x x}=2\left(v+v_{t}\right) \frac{\partial U}{\partial x}-\frac{2}{3} k \\
& T_{x y}=\left(v+v_{t}\right)\left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial y}+\frac{\partial V}{\partial x}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
T_{y y}=2\left(v+v_{t}\right) \frac{\partial V}{\partial y}-\frac{2}{3} k
$$

## Turbulence Models

- Parabolic Equation:

$$
v_{t}=C_{t} U_{*} h
$$

- Two-Equation $k$-e Model:

$$
\frac{\partial h k}{\partial t}+\frac{\partial h U k}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial h V k}{\partial y}=\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{h v_{t}}{\sigma_{k}} \frac{\partial k}{\partial x}\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(\frac{h v_{t}}{\sigma_{k}} \frac{\partial k}{\partial y}\right)+P_{h}+P_{k b}-h \varepsilon
$$

$$
\frac{\partial h \varepsilon}{\partial t}+\frac{\partial h U \varepsilon}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial h V \varepsilon}{\partial y}=\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{h v_{t}}{\sigma_{\varepsilon}} \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial x}\right)+\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(\frac{h v_{t}}{\sigma_{\varepsilon}} \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial y}\right)+C_{\varepsilon 1} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} P_{h}+P_{s b}-C_{\varepsilon 2} h \frac{\varepsilon^{2}}{k}
$$

## Initial Conditions

- Steady Simulation
- U, V, WSE are needed in theory
- Only water surface elevation is critical
- U and V are setup automatically by SRH-2D
- Options for initial WSE:
- Dry bed
- From another SRH-2D solution
- Unsteady Simulation
- Use a steady-state solution from SRH-2D


## Boundary Condition: Inlet

- Inlet: water is to flow into the domain
- Portion of the boundary may be dry!
- Multiple inlets may be used
- Information needed at an inlet:
- Flow Discharge (steady or time-series hydrograph)
- Lateral Velocity Distribution:
- Constant-v Setup: uniform velocity across the inlet
- Constant-q Setup: uniform q=vh across the inlet
- Sub-critical or Super-critical?
- Additional Information at a Supercritical Inlet:
- Water Surface Elevation


## Boundary Condition: Exit

- Exit: water is to flow out of the domain
- Portion of the boundary may be dry!
- Multiple exits may be used
- Information needed at an exit:
- Sub-critical or Super-critical?
- Water Surface Elevation if a Sub-critical Exit
- Constant WSE
- Time series WSE
- Normal Depth
- None if Super-critical Exit


## Additional Boundary Conditions

- Solid Wall: No User Definition is Needed
- no water is flowing through
- represent banks and islands
- No-slip condition; the boundary exerts a frictional force
- Symmetry: User Definition is Needed
- no water is flowing through
- the boundary is frictionless, slip condition
- Derivatives of all main variables are zero except the normal velocity (zero normal velocity)


## Part 3: Selected Verification Studies: a presentation

## 2D Diversion Flow in a Channel

## Shetta and Murthy (1996)

## Case Description

- Solution Domain:
- a main channel: 6.0 m in length and 0.3 m in width
- a side channel: 3.0 m in a length and 0.3 m in and width
- Mesh:
- main channel: 120-by-30 elements
- side channel: 40-by- $\mathbf{3 0}$ elements



## Flow Condition

- Main channel flow discharge:
$0.00567 \mathrm{~m} 3 / \mathrm{s}$
- Water surface elevation at main channel exit: 0.0555 m
- Water surface elevation at side channel exit: 0.0465 m
- The Manning's roughness coefficient: 0.012
- The parabolic or k-e turbulence model


## Flow Streamlines



## Comparison of WSE

- Along both walls of the main channel

- Along both walls of the side channel



## Comparison of Velocity




n Channel






## Comparison of Velocity








## Verification \& Validation Cases: Savage Rapids Dam (SW Oregon)



## Plainview and Contours



RECLAMATION

## Mesh: 20,468 Points; Flow: 2,800cfs



## Comparison of Water Surface Elevation (Q=2,800 cfs)



## Measurement Points for Velocity Comparison



## Velocity Comparison at XS 1 to 4 Dynamic Solver




## Velocity Comparison at XS 5 to 8 Dynamic Solver



## Velocity Comparison downstream of Dam Dynamic Solver Diffusive Wave Solver




# Verification \& Validation Cases: Elwha Surface Diversion Project (WA) 



RECLAMATION

## Mesh: ~ 10,000 Points; Low Flow: 1,025 cfs High Flow: 28,500cfs (2002 Flood)



RECLAMATION

## Comparison of Water Surface Elevation

|  |  | Measured Elevation 2001, 1025 cfs Measured/Estim ated High Water Mark 20 GSTAR-W Diffusive 1025 ofs GSTAR-W Dynamic 1025 cfs GSTAR-W Diffusive 28500 cfs |  | ${ }^{28500 c f s}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Collins <br> House East <br> Bank | West Bank upstream Bridge | Rainney Well | Intake at <br> Diversion <br> Dam | High Voltage Area |
| Surveyed /Estimated(ft) | 83.0 | 80.2 | 79.4 | 75.7 | 63.0 |
| Model <br> Predicted(ft) | 84.1 | 78.9 | 78.5 | 75.6 | 62.8 |

River Mile

## Verification \& Validation Cases: Sandy River Delta (Oregon)



## Domain: 9.5 mi of Columbia River 1.2 mi of Sandy River ~ 40,000 points



## Topography \& Landuse Zones



## Comparison of Water Surface Elevation

(Q_sandy=377cfs; Q_columbia=123,000cfs)


## Comparison of Velocity Magnitude



## Comparison of Velocity Vector



# Part 4: Sample Practical Applications 

## Sample Applications

- Dam Removal:

Savage Rapids Dam

- Temporary Diversion: Elwha River
- Levee Setback:

Lower Dungeness River

## Savage Rapids Dam Removal Study



RECLAMATION

## Intake Location Selection



## Intake Location Selection



## Intake Cofferdam



## Right Cofferdam Design

Right Coffer Dam Design Simulation
Savage Rapids Dam, Oregon


## Left Cofferdam Design



## After Dam Removal Inundation 900cfs 8,390cfs



## Elwha Surface Diversion Project



## Topography by Mesh



## Cofferdam Design \& Inundation at $\mathrm{Q}=5,000 \mathrm{cfs}$



## Flood Inundation 10,000cfs

## 25,000 cfs



## Velocity 10,000cfs

## 25,000 cfs



## Intake Cofferdam Design 5,000cfs <br> 25,000cfs



## Lower Dungeness Levee Setback Study



RECLAMATION







## Mesh: ~ 50,000 points



## Topography by Mesh



## 2002 Flood Simulation (6,280cfs)



## Comparison of Inundation



RECLAMATION

## Comparison of Inundation



## Comparison of Inundation



## Existing Conditions 100-Year Flood



## 100-Year Flood Inundation Conclusions

- The Sequim-Dungeness and Ward Road setback options provide the closest match to the pre-levee inundation condition

100-year flood depths and velocity vectors for Existing Conditions
Water Surface Elevation (ft)

| $\begin{aligned} & 99 \\ & 90 \\ & 81 \\ & 72 \\ & 63 \\ & 54 \\ & 45 \\ & 36 \\ & 27 \\ & 18 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Channel Zalweg

## 100-year flood depths and velocity vectors for ACOE levee-setback alternatives



## 100-year flood depths and velocity vectors for ACOE levee-setback alternatives



## 100-year flood depths and velocity vectors for ACOE levee-setback alternatives



