

T. J. Rhone

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROGRESS REPORT IV

RESEARCH STUDY ON STILLING BASINS, ENERGY
DISSIPATORS, AND ASSOCIATED APPURTENANCES

SECTION 8

STILLING BASIN FOR HIGH HEAD OUTLET WORKS UTILIZING
HOLLOW-JET VALVE CONTROL (BASIN VIII)

Hydraulic Laboratory Report No. Hyd-446

DIVISION OF ENGINEERING LABORATORIES



COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE
DENVER, COLORADO

April 18, 1960

Hyd 446

Hollow Jet Valve Stilling Basins

FOREWORD

This report, Progress Report IV, is the fourth in a series on research subjects included under the title of this report. Progress Report I was superseded by Progress Report II, Hyd-399, which contains the first six sections listed below. Progress Report III, Hyd-415, contains Section 7.

Section 8 is contained in this report and covers Item 10 given in the "Scope" of the research program as originally planned and given in Progress Report II, page 3. Other items in the "Scope" will be completed and reported in future progress reports as time and funds permit. Completed sections are listed below.

Section 1--General Investigation of the Hydraulic Jump on a Horizontal Apron (Basin I)

Section 2--Stilling Basin for High Dam and Earth Dam Spillways and Large Canal Structures (Basin II)

Section 3--Short Stilling Basin for Canal Structures, Small Outlet Works, and Small Spillways (Basin III)

Section 4--Stilling Basin and Wave Suppressors for Canal Structures, Outlet Works, and Diversion Dams (Basin IV)

Section 5--Stilling Basin With Sloping Apron (Basin V)

Section 6--Stilling Basin for Pipe or Open Channel Outlets--No Tail Water Required (Basin VI)

Section 7--Slotted and Solid Buckets for High, Medium, and Low Dam Spillways (Basin VII)

Section 8--Stilling Basin for High Head Outlet Works Utilizing Hollow-jet Valve Control (Basin VIII)

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Summary	
Introduction	1
Development of Basin Features	2
Boysen Dam	2
Falcon Dam	3
Yellowtail Dam	3
Trinity Dam	4
Navajo Dam	4
Recapitulation	4
Generalization Test Procedures	5
Test Equipment	5
Preliminary Procedures	5
Preliminary Tests	6
Generalization Test Results	8
Final Tests	8
Basin Length and Depth	8
Basin Width	9
Basin Performance	9
Riprap Size	9
Center Dividing Wall	10
Valve Placement	11
Application of Results	11
Problems	11
One-valve Stilling Basin Design (a)	11
Two-valve Stilling Basin Design (b)	13
Prototype Performance	15
Boysen Dam	15
Falcon Dam	16
Acknowledgment	18
Bibliography	19


Table

Comparison of Basin Dimensions	1
--	---

SUMMARY

This report describes hydraulic model and prototype tests made to generalize and prove the hydraulic design of a new type of stilling basin which utilizes the hollow-jet valve for discharge control. Dimensionless curves are derived from model data and are used to define the important dimensions of the basin for the usual combinations of valve size, operating head, and discharge. Sample problems are presented to illustrate the use of the design curves and the general hydraulic design procedures. Prototype tests on the Boysen and Falcon Dam stilling basins are described and analyzed to help establish the reliability of the recommended basins. Basin dimensions obtained from individual model tests on six stilling basins are shown to compare favorably with the dimensions obtained from the dimensionless curves and methods given in this report.

The schematic drawing below shows the developed basin and the relationships between important dimensions.



A brief description of the seven steps required to design a stilling basin is given below:

1. Using the design discharge Q , the total head at the valve H , and the hollow-jet valve discharge coefficient C from Figure 3, solve the equation $Q = CA \sqrt{2gH}$ for the valve inlet area A and compute the corresponding diameter d which is also the nominal valve size.
2. Use H/d in Figure 12 to find D/d and thus D , the ideal depth of tail water in the basin. Determine the elevation of the basin floor, tail water elevation minus D . It is permissible to increase or decrease D by as much as $\frac{\sqrt{d} \text{ (in feet)}}{2.5}$.
3. Use H/d in Figure 14 to find L/d and thus L , the length of the horizontal apron.
4. Use H/d in Figure 15 to find W/d and thus W , the width of the basin for one valve.
5. Use H/d in Figure 13 to find D_s/d and thus D_s , the tail water depth at which the action is swept out of the basin. D minus D_s gives the margin of safety against sweep out.
6. Complete the hydraulic design of the basin from the relationships given in Figure 11.
7. Use the H/d ratio to select the proper photograph in Figures 16 and 17 to see the model and help visualize the prototype performance of the design. The water surface profile may be scaled from the photograph using the scale on the photograph. To convert to prototype dimensions, multiply the scaled values by the ratio $\frac{\sqrt{d} \text{ (inches)}}{3}$.

These are the main considerations in the hydraulic design of a hollow-jet valve stilling basin. The text which follows contains additional information which may be of value in indicating tolerances in basin dimensions when unusual conditions prevail.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Commissioner's Office--Denver	Laboratory Report No. Hyd-446
Division of Engineering Laboratories	Prepared by: G. L. Beichley
Hydraulic Laboratory Branch	A. J. Peterka
Hydraulic Structures and Equipment Section	Reviewed by: J. W. Ball
Denver, Colorado	Submitted by: H. M. Martin
April 18, 1960	

SECTION 8

STILLING BASIN FOR HIGH HEAD OUTLET WORKS UTILIZING
HOLLOW-JET VALVE CONTROL (BASIN VIII)

INTRODUCTION

The hollow-jet valve stilling basin described in this report is of a new type and is used to dissipate hydraulic energy at the downstream end of an outlet works control structure. To reduce cost and save space, the stilling basin is usually constructed within or adjacent to the powerhouse structure as shown in Figures 1 and 2. The hollow-jet valve, Figure 3, controls and regulates the flow. Regardless of the valve opening or head, the outflow has the same pattern, an annular or hollow jet of water of practically uniform diameter throughout its length, Figure 4. The stilling basin is designed to take advantage of the hollow-jet shape; solid jets cannot be used in this basin.

The hollow-jet valve was developed by the Bureau of Reclamation in the early 1940's and is patented with rights reserved for use by the Federal Government without payment of royalties. The hollow-jet design was accomplished with the aid of a complete 6-inch-diameter hydraulic model and a sectional 12-inch-diameter air model. These models were tested in the Bureau of Reclamation Hydraulic Laboratory.^{1/} To evaluate the valve characteristics at greater than scale heads, a 24-inch-diameter valve was tested at Hoover Dam under heads ranging from 197 to 349 feet (depending upon the valve opening).^{2/}

Piezometer pressure measurements, thrust determinations on the valve needle, and rates of discharge were studied in both field and laboratory tests. It was found that the hydraulic characteristics of the larger valves could be predicted from the performance of the smaller model valves.^{3/}

^{1/} Numbers refer to Bibliography at end of this report.

From these tests and investigations of prototype valves up to 96 inches in diameter, the valve has been proved to be a satisfactory control device.^{4/}

Cavitation damage, found on a few of the many prototype valves in use, was minor in nature and was caused by local irregularities in the body casting and by misalignment of the valve with the pipe. These difficulties have been eliminated by more careful foundry and installation practices. On one installation, damage which occurred on the cast iron valve support vanes may have been caused by abrasive sediment in the water. The design itself is cavitation free.

Because a large valve operating at high heads can discharge flows having an energy content of up to 150,000 horsepower, a stilling basin is usually constructed downstream from the valve. In the early stilling basin designs, the valve was discharged horizontally onto a trajectory curved floor which was sufficiently long to provide a uniformly distributed jet entering the hydraulic jump stilling pool. This resulted in an extremely long structure, twice or more the length of the basin recommended in this report. When two valves were used side by side, a long, costly dividing wall was also required. Hydraulic model tests showed that the basin length could be reduced more than 50 percent by turning the hollow-jet valves downward and using a different energy dissipating principle in the stilling basin. The first stilling basin of this type was developed for use at Boysen Dam ^{5/} and later was modified by further tests on individual hydraulic models of the outlet works at Falcon,^{6/} Yellowtail,^{7/} Trinity,^{8/} and Navajo Dams.^{9/} The tests made to generalize the basin design were made later. A brief description of the individual model tests made to develop the basin type is given in the following section. Table 1 gives a summary of basin dimensions, valve sizes, test heads, and discharges for these structures.

DEVELOPMENT OF BASIN FEATURES

Boysen Dam

In the Boysen Dam model studies, a series of basic tests was made to determine the optimum angle of entry of a hollow jet into the tail water. For flat angles of entry, the jet did not penetrate the pool but skipped along the tail water surface. For steep angles, the jet penetrated the pool but rose almost vertically to form an objectionable boil on the water surface. When the valves were depressed 24° from the horizontal, Figure 1, and a 30° sloping floor was placed downstream from the valve to protect the underside of the jet from turbulent eddies, optimum performance resulted. The submerged path of the valve jet was then sufficiently long that only a minimum boil rose to the surface. The

size and intensity of the boil were further reduced when converging walls were placed on the 30° sloping floor to protect the sides of the jet until it was fully submerged. The converging walls have another function, however, they compress the hollow jet between them to give the resulting thin jet greater ability to penetrate the tail water pool. Sudden expansion of the jet as it leaves the converging walls plus the creation of fine grain turbulence in the basin account for most of the energy losses in the flow. Thorough breaking up of the valve jet within the basin and good distribution of the velocities over the entire flow cross section account for the low velocities leaving the basin. Figure 5 shows the performance of a hollow-jet basin both with and without the converging walls.

Pressures on the inside face and downstream end of the converging walls were measured to determine whether low pressures which might induce cavitation were present. The lowest pressure, measured on the end of the wall, was 3 feet of water above atmospheric; therefore, cavitation should not occur. Pressures measured on the sloping floor and under and near the impinging jet were all above atmospheric. Maximum pressures did not exceed the static pressure produced by the tail water depth.

Scour downstream from the end sill was mild and wave heights were only 0.5 foot in the river channel. A vertical traverse taken near the end sill showed surface velocities to be about 5 feet per second and uniformly decreasing to about 2 feet per second near the floor.

Falcon Dam

In the Falcon Dam tests, two separate basins were developed, one for the United States outlet works and one for the Mexican outlet works, Figures 6 and 7. In these tests, the basic concepts of the Boysen design were proved to be satisfactory for greater discharges. In addition, it was confirmed that dentils on the end sill were not necessary and that the center dividing wall need not extend the full length of the basin. A low 2:1 sloping end sill was sufficient to provide minimum scour and wave heights. Maximum pressures beneath the impinging jet were found to be about one-third of the total head at the valve, somewhat greater than found in the Boysen tests, but still not excessive.

Yellowtail Dam

In the Yellowtail Dam model studies, the head and discharge were both considerably higher than in the Boysen and Falcon tests. Because of the high-velocity flow from the valves, it was found necessary to extend the converging walls to the downstream end of the sloping floor, Figure 2, and to reduce the wall gap to about one-quarter of the basin width. These refinements improved the stilling action within the basin,

Figure 5c, and made it possible to reduce the basin length further. Scour was not excessive, and the water surface in the downstream channel was relatively smooth. Pressures on the converging walls and other critical areas in the basin were found to be above atmospheric.

Trinity Dam

The Trinity Dam outlet works utilized a head almost 4 times greater and a discharge 5 times greater than at Boysen Dam. In the development tests, it was found that the performance of this type of basin would be satisfactory for extremely high heads and discharges. Although several variations in the basin arrangement were investigated, no new features were incorporated in the design. Figure 8 shows the developed design.

Navajo Dam

The experimental work on the Navajo outlet works was complicated by the fact that the hollow-jet valve basin, Figure 9, had to first serve as a temporary diversion works stilling basin. Since the diversion works basin was larger than required for the outlet works basin, it was possible to insert the proper appurtenances in the temporary basin to convert it to a permanent outlet works basin. The development tests indicated that a larger than necessary basin does not in itself guarantee satisfactory performance of the hollow-jet valve basin. Best outlet works performance was obtained when the temporary basin was reduced in size to conform to the optimum size required for the permanent structure. Since the Navajo Dam outlet works model was available both during and after the generalization tests, the model was used both to aid in obtaining the generalized data and to prove that the design curves obtained were correct.

Recapitulation

Since development work on individual basins had reached a point where the general arrangement of the basin features was consistent, and since the basin had been proved satisfactory for a wide range of operating conditions, a testing program was inaugurated to provide data for use in generalizing the basin design. The purpose of these tests was to provide basin dimensions and hydraulic design procedures for any usual combinations of valve size, discharge, and operating head. The main purpose of this report, therefore, is to describe these tests, to explain the dimensionless curves which are derived from the test data, and to show by means of sample problems the procedures which may be used to hydraulically design a hollow-jet valve stilling basin. Prototype tests on the Boysen and Falcon basins are included to demonstrate that the hollow-jet valve basin will perform as well in the field as predicted from the model tests.

GENERALIZATION TEST PROCEDURES

Test Equipment

The outlet works stilling basin model shown in Figure 10 was used for the generalization tests. The glass-walled testing flume contained two stilling basins separated by a dividing wall. The right-hand basin having the glass panel as one wall was operated singly to determine the basin length, width, and depth requirements; both basins were used to study the performance with and without flow in an adjacent basin.

The glass panel permitted observation of the stilling action and the flow currents within and downstream from the basin. The length, width, and depth of the basin were varied by inserting false walls or by moving the basin within the test box. The tail box contained an erodible sand bed to represent the discharge channel bed.

The model valves were exact duplicates of a prototype valve in that the flow surfaces were exactly reproduced, and they could be opened and closed to any partial opening. The models were 3-inch valves machined from bronze castings.

The pressure head at each model valve was measured using a piezometer located in the 3-inch supply pipe 1 diameter upstream from the valve. Discharges were measured using calibrated venturi meters permanently installed in the laboratory. The tail water elevation in the discharge channel was controlled with a hinged tailgate in the tail box. Tail water elevations were determined visually from a staff gage on the tail box wall located approximately 62 valve diameters downstream from the valves.

Preliminary Procedures

The investigation was begun by tabulating the important dimensions of the Boysen, Falcon, Yellowtail, and Trinity outlet works basins in dimensionless form, as shown in Table 1. Based on these dimensions, a model was constructed as shown in Figure 11, using the valve diameter $d = 3$ inches as a guide to determine the absolute model size. In determining the model dimensions, more weight was given to the Yellowtail and Trinity model studies because they were the most recent studies and contained refinements in the converging wall design which improved the basin performance at high heads. Also, the latter basins had been subjected to a greater operating range than were the earlier low head basins.

To provide practical discharge limits for the tests, the 3-inch model was assumed to represent an 84-inch prototype valve, making the model scale 1:28. Discharges of 2,000 to 4,000 second-feet with one valve open

100 percent were considered to be the usual design discharges for a valve of this size. The corresponding heads ranged between about 100 and 345 feet of water at the valve.

Initial tests were made with the stilling basin apron longer than necessary and with no end sill in place. For a given discharge, the ideal depth of tail water was determined from visual inspection of the stilling action as it occurred over a range of tail water elevations. For each ideal tail water determination, the minimum length of apron was determined by inspection of the flow currents. Confirming tests were then conducted successively on a representative group of basins constructed to the lengths previously determined and having an end sill at the end of the apron. Adjustments were then made as necessary to the preliminary values to obtain final ideal tail water depths and apron lengths. In the latter tests, the height of the valve above the maximum tail water elevation was adjusted to simulate a typical prototype installation. Similar tests were then made with the valve open 75 and 50 percent. Finally, a series of tests was made to determine the ideal width of stilling basin and the range of widths over which satisfactory performance could be expected.

Preliminary Tests

In a typical test, the desired discharge was set by means of the laboratory venturi meter and passed through the outlet works valve or valves opened 100 percent. The tail water elevation was adjusted to provide the best energy dissipating action in the basin. The optimum value, tail water depth D in Figure 11, was judged by the appearance of the stilling action in the basin and on the smoothness of the tail water surface.

For discharges of 2,000 to 4,000 second-feet, it was found that the tail water could be raised or lowered about 3 feet (0.1 foot in model) from the ideal tail water elevation without adversely affecting the basin performance. Increasing the tail water depth beyond this margin reduced the efficiency of the stilling action and allowed the jet to run along the bottom of the basin for a greater distance before being dissipated. This also produced surges in the basin and increased the wave heights in the discharge channel. Decreasing the tail water depth below the 3-foot margin moved the stilling action downstream in the basin and uncovered the valve jets at the end of the converging walls. This increased the flow velocity entering the discharge channel and increased the tendency to produce bed scour. Uncovering of the stilling action also produced objectional splashing at the upstream end of the basin. If the tail water was decreased further, the flow swept through the basin with no stilling action having occurred. The latter tail water depth was measured and recorded as the sweep-out depth D_s . Tests were made with the dividing

wall extended to the end of the basin since this provided the least factor of safety against jump sweep out. With a shorter dividing wall, sweep out occurs at a tail water elevation slightly less than D_s .

With the ideal tail water depth set for a desired flow, the action in the basin was observed to determine the ideal length, L , of the basin apron, Figure 11. The apron length was taken to the point where the bottom flow currents began to rise from the basin floor of their own accord, without assistance from an end sill, Figure 5c. The water surface directly above and downstream from this point was fairly smooth, indicating that the stilling action had been completed and that the paved apron and training walls need not extend farther. In preceding studies, 5, 6, 7, 8 it had been found that when the basin was appreciably longer than ideal, the ground roller at the end sill carried bed material from the discharge channel over the end sill and into the basin. In the prototype, deposited material would swirl around in the downstream end of the basin and cause abrasive damage to the concrete apron and end sill. The preceding studies also showed that scour tendencies in the discharge channel were materially increased if the basin was appreciably shorter than ideal. Therefore, the point at which the currents turned upward from the apron, plus the additional length required for an end sill, was determined to be the optimum length of apron. At this point, the scouring velocities were a minimum and any scouring tendencies would be reduced by the sloping end sill to be added later.

Practical difficulties were experienced in determining the exact length of apron required, however. Surges in the currents flowing along the basin floor caused the point of upturn to move upstream and downstream a distance of $1/4$ to $1/2 D$ in a period of 15 to 20 seconds in the model. An average apron length was therefore selected in the preliminary tests. For this reason, too, the end sill would help to neutralize the scouring tendencies which increased as the bottom currents surged downstream.

The depth D , sweep-out depth D_s , and length L were then determined for the range of discharges possible with the hollow-jet valve open 75 percent, and finally 50 percent, using the testing methods described in the preceding paragraphs. Partial openings were investigated because the valve size is often selected on the basis that the valve pass the maximum or design discharge at a head less than maximum. If the same discharge is then passed at higher heads, the valve opening must be reduced. The relation between velocity and discharge at the valve is therefore changed, and the minimum basin dimensions may be affected. The data obtained using the partially opened valves are also useful in indicating the basin size requirements for discharges greater or less than the design flow conditions.

GENERALIZATION TEST RESULTS

Final Tests

The final tests were made to correct or verify the dimensions obtained in the preliminary tests and to investigate the effect of varying the basin width. Scour tendencies were also observed to help evaluate the basin performance.

D , D_s , and L for the three valve openings are functions of the energy in the flow at the valve. The energy may be represented by the total head, H , at the valve, Figure 11. Therefore, to provide dimensionless data which may be used to design a basin for any larger hollow-jet valve, D , D_s , and L values from the preliminary tests were divided by the valve diameter d and each variable was plotted against H/d . The resulting curves were used to obtain dimensions for a group of model basins which were tested with the end sill at the end of the apron and with the valves placed to give the proper vertical distance between the valve and the tail water. For each model basin, a 3:1 upward sloping erodible bed, composed of fine sand, was installed downstream from the end sill. The bed was kept sufficiently low that it did not interfere with tail water manipulation, even when the tail water was lowered for the sweep-out tests. Test procedure was essentially as described for the preliminary tests.

Basin Length and Depth

In general, it was found that the preliminary basin lengths were too long for the high heads and too short for the lower heads, although both adjustments were relatively minor. The depth curves for both the ideal tail water depths and the sweep-out depths needed but little adjustment. It was observed that a longer apron was necessary when the tail water depth was greater than ideal. As the stilling action became drowned, the action in the basin changed from fine-grain turbulence to larger and slower moving vertical eddies. The bottom flow currents were not dissipated as thoroughly or as quickly and were visible on the apron for a greater distance, thereby increasing the necessary length of basin. The action is similar to that observed in hydraulic jumps which are drowned by excessive tail water depths. A moderate amount of drowning is tolerable, but it is important that the ideal tail water depth be maintained within the stated limits if the best performance is desired. The recommended design curves are shown in Figures 12, 13, and 14. These curves provide the minimum structure for best hydraulic performance. Satisfactory performance occurs over a range of tail water, $0.1/\sqrt{d}$ inches/foot greater or less than D shown in Figure 12. In cases where $\frac{0.1/\sqrt{d}}{3}$ very high tail water is encountered and the stilling action is well drowned, a model study is recommended.

Basin Width

To determine the effect of basin width, tests on several basins were made in which only the basin width was varied. It was found that the width could be increased to 3.0 times the valve diameter before the action became unstable as a result of the stilling action not occupying the full width of basin. The width could be decreased to 2.5 times the valve diameter before the stilling action extended beyond the ideal length of basin. These tests also demonstrated that extra width of basin cannot be substituted for some of the required length or depth of the basin, or vice-versa. Since increasing the basin width does not improve the hydraulic performance, and decreasing the basin width does not materially alter the hydraulic performance or increase the depth and length requirements, it may be concluded that basin width is not a critical dimension and that the basin width may be selected, within the limits stated, to fit a particular space requirement. The recommended basin width may be determined from the curves in Figure 15 for 100 percent, 75 percent, and 50 percent valve openings.

Basin Performance

The six model basins shown operating in Figures 16 and 17 illustrate the performance to be expected from the recommended structures. Figure 16 shows the operation for 100 percent valve opening; Figure 17 shows the operation for 50 percent opening. The photographs may be used to determine the model appearance of the prototype basin and may help to provide a visual appraisal of the prototype structure. Wave heights, boil heights, or other visible dimensions may be scaled from the photographs (using the scale shown in the photographs) and converted to prototype dimensions by multiplying the scaled distances by the model scale. To determine the model scale, divide the prototype valve diameter in inches by 3 (the model valve diameter). To determine which of the six photographs represent the prototype in question, use the H/d ratio to select the photograph which most nearly represents the design problem. It is permissible to interpolate between photographs when necessary.

Riprap Size

A prototype basin is usually designed for maximum discharge, but will often be used for lesser flows at partial and full valve openings. For these lesser discharges, the basin will be larger than necessary, and in most respects, the hydraulic performance will be improved. However, at less than design discharge, particularly those close to the design discharge, the ground roller will tend to carry some bed material upstream and over the end sill into the basin. The intensity of this action is relatively mild over most of the discharge range, and movement of material may be prevented by placing riprap downstream from the end sill. Riprap, having 50 percent or more of the individual stones 24 to

30 inches or larger in diameter, should provide a stable channel downstream from the end sill. The riprap should extend a distance D, or more, from the end sill. If the channel is excavated and slopes upward to the natural river channel, the riprap should extend from the end sill to the top of the slope, or more. The riprap should not be terminated on the slope.

The justification for choosing riprap as described is as follows: Because of the fixed relationships between depth and width of basin, the average velocity leaving the basin will seldom exceed 5 feet per second, regardless of structure size. Surface velocities will therefore seldom exceed 7 to 8 feet per second and bottom velocities 3 to 4 feet per second. To protect against these velocities, stones 10-12 inches in diameter would be ample. However, the critical velocity for riprap stability is the upstream velocity of the ground roller which has a curved path and tends to lift the stones out of place. Model tests showed that graded riprap up to 24 to 30 inches in diameter was sufficient to provide bed stability.

Center Dividing Wall

Prototype stilling basins usually have two valves placed a minimum distance apart, and aligned to discharge parallel jets. It is necessary, without exception, to provide dividing walls between the valves for satisfactory hydraulic performance. When both valves are discharging without a dividing wall, the flow in the double basin sways from side to side to produce longitudinal surges in the tail water pool. This action occurs because the surging downstream from each valve has a different period and the resulting harmonic motion becomes intense. When only one valve is discharging, conditions are worse. The depressed water surface downstream from the operating valve induces flow from the higher water level on the nonoperating side. Violent eddies carry bed material from the discharge channel into the basin and swirl it around. This action in the prototype would damage the basin as well as the discharge channel. In addition, the stilling action on the operating side is impaired.

To provide acceptable operation with one valve operating, the dividing wall should extend to three-fourths of the basin length or more. However, if the two adjacent valves discharge equal quantities of flow at all times, the length of the center dividing wall may be reduced to one-half of the basin length. The margin against sweep out is increased, but the stability of the flow pattern is decreased as the dividing wall is shortened. However, a short dividing wall may not need to be considered in some installations since a full-length wall may be desirable to help support the upper levels of a powerplant, Figure 1. If other arrangements of the center wall are required, a model study is recommended.

Valve Placement

A hollow-jet valve should not operate submerged; however, the valve may be set with the valve top at maximum tail water elevation, and the valve will not be underwater at maximum discharge. The valve jet sweeps the tail water away from the downstream face of the valve sufficiently to allow usual ventilation of the valve. However, as a general rule, it is recommended that the valve be placed with its center (downstream end) no lower than tail water elevation.

APPLICATION OF RESULTS

Problems

Design a stilling basin for (a) 1 hollow-jet valve discharging 1,300 cfs, and (b) a double basin for 2 valves discharging 650 cfs each. In both problems, the reservoir is 108 feet above maximum tail water elevation.

One-valve Stilling Basin Design (a)

Place the valve center (downstream end) at maximum tail water elevation. If the hydraulic losses upstream from the valve are 20 percent of the total head (108 feet), or say 22 feet, there will be 86 feet of usable head at the valve for the maximum discharge. Determine the valve size from the equation: $Q = CA \sqrt{2gH}$. . . (1)
in which Q is the design discharge, C is the coefficient of discharge, A is the inlet area to the valve, g is the acceleration of gravity, and H is the usable or total head at the valve.

From Figure 3, for 100 percent valve opening:

$$C = 0.7$$

Then

$$A = 25 \text{ square feet}$$

And

$$d = 5.67 \text{ feet or about 68 inches}$$

where d is the inlet diameter of the valve and also the nominal valve size.

Since nominal valve sizes are usually graduated in 6-inch increments, a 72-inch valve would be required. Because the valve is larger than required, it would not be necessary to open the valve fully to pass the design flow at the maximum head.

Having determined the valve size and therefore the diameter of the supply conduit, the probable head losses in the system from reservoir to valve may be computed. In this example, the computed losses are said to be 20 feet, which leaves 88 feet of head at the valve. Using Equation (1), C is computed to be 0.61; from Figure 3, the valve opening necessary to pass the design discharge at the design head is found to be 83 percent.

The basin depth, length, and width may be determined from Figures 12, 13, 14, and 15 using the head ratio

$$\begin{aligned} H/d &= \frac{88}{6} \\ &= 14.67 \end{aligned}$$

For 83 percent valve opening, Figure 12 shows the depth ratio

$$D/d = 3.4$$

The depth of the basin is

$$D = 20.4 \text{ feet}$$

Therefore, the apron is placed 20.4 feet below the maximum tail water elevation.

For 83 percent valve opening, Figure 14 shows the length ratio

$$L/d = 11.2$$

The length of the basin is

$$L = 67 \text{ feet}$$

For 83 percent valve opening, Figure 15 shows the width ratio

$$W/d = 2.5$$

The width of the basin is

$$W = 15 \text{ feet}$$

The dimensions of other components of the basin may be determined from Figure 11.

The tail water depth at which the flow will sweep from the basin may be determined from Figure 13. For 83 percent valve opening, the depth sweep-out ratio

$$D_s/d = 2.5$$

The sweep out depth is

$$D_s = 15.6 \text{ feet}$$

Since 20.4 feet of depth is provided, the basin has a safety factor against sweep out of 4.8 feet of tail water depth. In most installations this is sufficient, but if a greater margin of safety is desired, the apron elevation may be lowered

$$0.1 \text{ foot } (72/3) = 2.4 \text{ feet}$$

The value, 0.1 foot, is the amount the tail water depth in the test models could be increased or decreased from the ideal depth without sacrificing excellent hydraulic performance. The value (72/3) is the ratio of the prototype to model valve size, and, therefore, the scale to which this sample problem is represented by the test models. If greater economy and less margin of safety are desired, the basin floor may be placed 2.4 feet higher to provide only 18 feet of depth.

If the tail water depth from Figure 12 is adopted, the water surface profile will be similar to that shown in Figure 16a, since the H/d value of 16 in Figure 16a is comparable to 14.67 in this example. If tail water depth 2 feet greater or less than the ideal is adopted for the prototype, the water surface profile will be moved up or down accordingly. Water surfaces may be estimated by multiplying the variations shown in Figure 16a by the model scale as determined above. Wave heights in the downstream channel will be considerably less as indicated in other photographs showing downstream conditions.

Two-valve Stilling Basin Design (b)

If two valves are to be used to discharge the design flow of 1,300 second-feet, a double basin with a dividing wall is required. The discharge per valve is 650 cfs, and at 100 percent valve opening the valve coefficient is 0.7, Figure 3. The head on the valve is estimated to be 86 feet as in the first example. From Equation (1), the inlet area of the valve is found to be 12.48 square feet. A 48-inch valve provides practically the exact area required.

For this example, it is assumed that the calculations to determine head losses have been made and that the assumed head of 86 feet at the valves is correct. Therefore, 100 percent valve opening will be necessary to pass the design flow.

Using the methods given in detail in the first example:

$$H/d = 21.5$$

$$D/d = 4.06, \text{ from Figure 12}$$

and

$$D = 16.2 \text{ feet}$$

$$D_s/d = 3/3, \text{ from Figure 13}$$

Then

$$D_s = 13.2 \text{ feet}$$

The tail water depth for sweep out is therefore 3.0 feet below the ideal tail water depth. If more or less insurance against the possibility of sweep out is desired, the apron may be set lower or higher by the amount

$$0.1 \text{ foot } (48/3) = 1.6 \text{ feet}$$

To aid in determining the apron elevation, the effect of spillway, turbine, or other discharges on the tail water range may need to be considered.

$$L/d = 14.4, \text{ from Figure 14}$$

Then

$$L = 58 \text{ feet}$$

$$W/d = 2.6, \text{ from Figure 12}$$

Then

$$W = 10.4 \text{ feet}$$

Since two valves are to be used, the total width of the basin will be $2(W)$ plus the thickness of the center dividing wall. The length of the center dividing wall should be three-fourths of the apron length or 43.5 feet long, Figure 11. If it is certain that both valves will always discharge equally, the wall need be only one-half the apron length or 29 feet long. The hydraulic design of the basin may be completed using Figure 11.

If the tail water depth determined from Figure 12 is adopted, the water surface profile for determining wall heights may be estimated by interpolating between Figures 16a and b. Water surface variations may be predicted by multiplying values scaled from the photographs by the ratio 48:3.

PROTOTYPE PERFORMANCE

The Boysen Dam and Falcon Dam outlet works stilling basins, Figures 1, 6, and 7, have been field tested and found to perform in an excellent manner. 7/8/ Table 1 shows the important dimensions of these basins and indicates that the values calculated from the design curves of this report are in good agreement with those obtained from the individual model tests (and also used to construct the prototypes).

Boysen Dam

The outlet works basin at Boysen Dam is designed for 1,320 cfs from two 48-inch hollow-jet valves 100 percent open at reservoir elevation 4725.00. Design tail water elevation at the basin is 4616.00. The model performance of this basin is shown in Figures 18 and 19.

The prototype tests, Figures 20, 21, and 22 were conducted with the reservoir at elevation 4723.5 and with the powerplant both operating and shut down. The spillway was not operating. The outlet works discharge was measured at a temporary gaging station located about 1/2 mile downstream from the dam using a current meter to determine the discharge. Tail water elevations were read on the gage located in the powerhouse.

The prototype performed as well as predicted by the model and was considered satisfactory in all respects. However, the field structure entrained more air within the flow than did the model. This caused the prototype flow to appear more bulky and "white water" extended farther into the downstream channel than was indicated in the model. A comparison of the model and prototype photographs, Figures 19 and 22, illustrates this difference. Greater air entrainment in the prototype is the usual conclusion when making model prototype comparisons, particularly when the difference between model and prototype velocities is appreciable. In other respects, however, the prototype basin was as good or better than predicted from the model tests.

For the initial prototype test, only the left outlet valve was operated; the powerhouse was not operating. At the gaging station, the discharge was measured to be 732 cfs* after the tail water stabilized at elevation 4614.5. It was possible to descend the steel ladder, Figure 1, to closely observe and photograph the flow in the stilling basin, Figures 20 and 21. The basin was remarkably free of surges and spray;

*This is a greater discharge than can be accounted for by calculations. It is presumed that the valve overtravel caused the valve opening to exceed 100 percent, even though the valve opening indicator showed 100 percent open.

the energy-dissipating action was excellent. There was no noticeable vibration at the valves or in the basin. The flow leaving the structure caused only slightly more disturbance in the tailrace than the flow from the draft tubes when the turbines were operating at normal load.

Operation of the prototype provided an opportunity to check the air requirements of the structure, which could not be done on the model. With the inspection cover removed, Figure 1, the basin was open to the rooms above. Air movements through the inspection opening and in the powerplant structure were negligible, which indicated that ample air could circulate from the partially open end of the stilling basin, Figure 21.

When both valves were discharging fully open, the tail water stabilized at elevation 4615. A discharge measurement at the gaging station disclosed that both valves were discharging 1,344 cfs. Since the left valve had been found to discharge 732 cfs, the right valve was discharging 612 cfs.

The reason for the difference in discharge is that the 57-inch-inside-diameter outlet pipe to the left valve is short and is connected to the 15-foot-diameter header which supplies water to the turbines, Figure 1. The right valve is supplied by a separate 66-inch-diameter pipe extending to the reservoir. Therefore, greater hydraulic head losses occur in the right valve supply line, which accounts for the lesser discharge through the right valve. Although it was apparent by visual observation that the left valve was discharging more than the right valve, Figure 22, no adverse effect on the performance of the outlet works stilling basin or on flow conditions in the powerhouse tailrace could be found.

The outlet works basin performance was also observed with the turbines operating and the tail water at about elevation 4617. No adverse effects of the outlet works discharge on powerplant performance could be detected. Flow conditions in the tailrace area were entirely satisfactory, Figure 22. Since the tests were made at normal reservoir level and maximum discharge, the stilling basin was subjected to a severe test.

Falcon Dam

The outlet works basin on the Mexico side at Falcon Dam is designed to accommodate 4,570 cfs from two 90-inch valves or 2,400 cfs from one valve, with the valves 100 percent open and the reservoir at elevation 300. The tail water elevation is 181.2 when the powerplant is discharging 5,400 cfs in conjunction with both valves. The model performance of this basin is shown in Figures 23 and 24.

The outlet works basin on the United States side at Falcon Dam is designed to discharge 2,920 cfs from two 72-inch valves, or 1,600 cfs

from one valve, with the valves 100 percent open and reservoir at elevation 310. Tail water is at elevation 180.8 when two valves are operating and 180.5 when one valve is operating. The model performance of this basin is shown in Figures 25, 26, and 27.

The prototype tests at Falcon, Figures 28, 29, and 30, were conducted at near maximum conditions; the reservoir was at elevation 301.83, and the valves were 100 percent open. In each outlet works, the valves were operated together and individually. Single-valve operation represents an emergency condition and subjects the stilling basin to the severest test, Figures 28 and 29. All turbines at both powerplants were operating at 72 percent gate and 100 percent load during all tests. The prototype valve discharges were determined from discharge curves based on model test data.

Here, too, more white water was evident in the prototype than in the model. The greater amount of air entrainment in the prototype, evident in the photographs, caused bulking of the flow at the end of the stilling basin and a higher water surface than was observed in the model. However, the prototype tail water is 3 to 4 feet higher than shown in the model photograph and this probably helps to produce a higher water surface boil at the downstream end of the basin by reducing the efficiency of the stilling action. In other respects, the prototype basin performed as predicted by the model.

Field tests on the Yellowtail, Trinity, and Navajo outlet works have not been made because at the time of this report they had not been completed. Table 1 shows, however, that the comparison of dimensions made for the Boysen and Falcon Dams' outlet works is generally true for the latter structures as well. Since the dimensions obtained from the individual model tests agree with the calculated values, and since the Boysen and Falcon Dams' outlet works field structures performed satisfactorily, it is believed that satisfactory hydraulic designs on future projects may be derived from the information given in this report.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Data and material used in this report were obtained through the cooperation of individuals too numerous to acknowledge singly, yet their wholehearted interest aided materially in providing a complete analysis of the problem. Their assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

The hollow-jet valve stilling basin, Basin VIII, was developed in the Hydraulic Laboratory, Division of Engineering Laboratories, through close coordination with the Mechanical Branch and the Dams Branch of the Division of Design, all of the Bureau of Reclamation, Assistant Commissioner and Chief Engineer's Office, Denver, Colorado.

The prototype tests at Boysen Dam were made with the cooperation of the Bureau's Region 6 Office in Billings, Montana, and the Yellowstone-Bighorn Projects Office, Cody, Wyoming. Bureau personnel at Boysen Dam operated the hydraulic structures and assisted in obtaining data. United States Geological Survey personnel at Riverton, Wyoming, made the river gagings and State of Wyoming personnel made downstream river adjustments to permit above-normal discharges.

The prototype tests at Falcon Dam, which included tests on both the United States and Mexico outlet works and powerplants, were conducted by personnel at Falcon Dam through arrangements with the International Boundary and Water Commission, El Paso, Texas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following Hydraulic Laboratory reports describe in more detail the background material summarized in this report. The titles are consistent with the subjects covered.

1. "Model Studies for the Development of the Hollow-jet Valve," Hydraulic Laboratory Report No. 148.
2. "Tests on Hollow-jet Valve at Boulder Dam," Hydraulic Laboratory Report No. 189.
3. "The Hydraulics of Hollow-jet Valves as Determined by Field and Laboratory Tests," Journal of the Hydraulics Division, October 1959.
4. "The Development of High Head Outlet Valves," Hydraulic Laboratory Report No. Hyd-240.
5. "Hydraulic Model Studies of the Outlet Works--Boysen Dam--Missouri River Basin Project," Hydraulic Laboratory Report No. Hyd-283.
6. "Hydraulic Model Studies of Falcon Dam," Hydraulic Laboratory Report No. Hyd-276.
7. "Hydraulic Model Studies of Yellowtail Dam Spillway and Outlet Works," Hydraulic Laboratory Report No. Hyd-414.
8. "Hydraulic Model Studies of Trinity Dam Outlet Works," Hydraulic Laboratory Report No. Hyd-439.
9. "Hydraulic Model Studies of Navajo Dam Outlet Works and Diversion Structure," Hydraulic Laboratory Report No. Hyd-457.
10. Bureau of Reclamation field trip report "Performance of Outlet Works and Spillway--Boysen Dam--Boysen Unit--Missouri River Basin Project," dated August 1, 1956, by A. J. Peterka and R. W. Whinnerah.
11. "Flow Tests of Hollow-jet Valves at Falcon Dam," December 19, 1958, by N. H. Scoggins, Project Superintendent, letter report to Assistant Commissioner and Chief Engineer from International Boundary and Water Commission, El Paso, Texas, L. H. Hewitt, Commissioner.

Table 1

COMPARISON OF BASIN DIMENSIONS

Upper values in each box were calculated from Figures 11 through 15;
lower values in each box were developed from individual model studies.

	: Boysen :	: Falcon : U. S.	: Falcon : Mexico	: Yellowtail :	: Trinity :	: Navajo :
Valve diameter, ft:	4	6	7.5	7	7	6
Head at valve, ft :	86	81.5	81.9	380	315	217
Design Q, cfs	660	1,460	2,285	2,500	3,835	2,340
Coefficient C	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.41	0.70	0.70
Percent valve open:	100	100	100	52	100	100
Depth D, ft	16.2 19	21.0 22.5	24.7 25.2	31.5 32.6	38.5 38	30.0 ***35
Depth D _s , ft	13.6 14	17.4 17.5	20.2 19.5	25.9 25.6	31.5 31.8	24.6 24
Length L, ft	60.4 58	74.4 73.9	86.2 94	104 102.8	129 123	103 ****110
Width W, ft	10.2 12	14.7 16.2	18 16.2	19.2 18.7	19.6 18.8	16.2 ****18.0
End sill height	3 4	3 3	3.1 3	3.9 3	4.8 5	* *
End sill slope	**2:7	2:1	2:1	2:1	2:1	*
Valve center above T.W. ft	1.8	3.0	3.0	1.0	3	
Converg wall height	3.0d	4.5d	3.9d	3.1d	3.5d	
Converg wall gap	0.50W:	0.52W:	0.65W:	0.25W:	0.23W:	
Center wall length:	****L	0.5L	0.4L	0.7L	0.3L	
Channel slope	10:1	4:1	4:1	25:1	2:1	


*Special case, dentated sill used for diversion flow requirements.

**Sill slope 2:1 recommended for all basins.

***See explanation on page 4.


****Required for structural reasons.

Valve tilt 24 degrees; inclined floor 30 degrees in all cases.




HORIZONTAL SECTION THROUGH POWERHOUSE

Reservoir normal w. s. El. 4725.00
Outlet Works discharge 1320 cfs
with valves 100 percent open.



POWERHOUSE SECTION-THROUGH OUTLET STILLING BASIN




PIPE LAYOUT-PLAN


BOYSEN DAM
OUTLET WORKS STILLING BASIN AND POWERPLANT

RESERVOIR NORMAL W.S. EL.4725.00
OUTLET WORKS DISCHARGE 5,000 CFS
WITH VALVES 52 PERCENT OPEN






NOTE : All dimensions in terms of diameter



HOLLOW-JET VALVE DIMENSIONS AND DISCHARGE COEFFICIENTS




Valve fully open



Valve 50 percent open

SIX-INCH HOLLOW-JET VALVE DISCHARGING



(a) Stilling action without converging walls




(b) Stilling action with short converging walls




(c) Stilling action with recommended converging walls

HOLLOW-JET VALVE STILLING BASIN
WITH AND WITHOUT CONVERGING WALLS




SECTIONAL PLAN-EL. 195.00




SECTION A-A

FALCON DAM
HYDRAULIC MODEL STUDIES
UNITED STATES OUTLET WORKS
RECOMMENDED DESIGN
MODEL SCALE 1:24





SECTIONAL PLAN—EL. 195.00




SECTION A-A


FALCON DAM
 HYDRAULIC MODEL STUDIES
 MEXICAN OUTLET WORKS
 RECOMMENDED DESIGN
 MODEL SCALE 1:30






HOLLOW-JET VALVE STILLING BASIN
MODEL USED FOR GENERALIZATION TESTS





NOTE: Best hydraulic performance is for ideal depths shown.
 Good performance occurs over range of depths $0.1 \left[\frac{d(\text{inches})}{3} \right]$ ft.
 greater or less than D .
 D , H , and d are defined in Figure 11.
 "•" Represent data points shown in Figures 16 and 17.


HOLLOW-JET VALVE STILLING BASIN
 IDEAL TAIL WATER DEPTH



NOTE: D_s is the depth of tailwater above the basin apron when the flow from the valve first begins to sweep out of the basin.
 H and d are defined in Figure 11.

HOLLOW-JET VALVE STILLING BASIN TAIL WATER SWEEPOUT DEPTH


FIGURE 14
REPORT HYD 446



NOTE: H , L , and d are defined in Figure 11.


"•" Represent data points shown in Figures 16 and 17.

HOLLOW-JET VALVE STILLING BASIN
STILLING BASIN LENGTH




NOTE: Best hydraulic performance is widths shown.
Good performance occurs over range of width $2.5d$ to $3.5d$.
 W , H , and d are defined in Figure 11.
"•" Represent data points shown in Figures 16 and 17.


HOLLOW-JET VALVE STILLING BASIN WIDTH PER VALVE



A. $H/d=16$, $D/d=3.7$, $L/d=12.9$, $W/d=2.5$




B. $H/d=40$, $D/d=5.2$, $L/d=17.8$, $W/d=2.7$




C. $H/d=63$, $D/d=6.2$, $L/d=20.3$, $W/d=3.0$

These operating conditions correspond to points shown in Figures 12, 14 and 15


HOLLOW-JET VALVE STILLING BASIN PERFORMANCE
VALVE 100 PERCENT OPEN



$H/d=22$, $D/d=3.3$, $L/d=10.0$, $W/d=2.5$




$H/d=56$, $D/d=4.5$, $L/d=15.0$, $W/d=2.7$



$H/d=91$, $D/d=5.3$, $L/d=17.8$, $W/d=3.0$


These operating conditions correspond to points shown in Figures 12, 14 and 15

HOLLOW-JET VALVE STILLING BASIN PERFORMANCE
VALVE 50 PERCENT OPEN



Both valves 100 percent open. Reservoir elevation 4725. Tailwater elevation 4616.

BOYSEN DAM
LEFT VALVE OF OUTLET WORKS BASIN
DISCHARGING 660 CFS 1:16 SCALE MODEL



Both valves 100 percent open. Reservoir elevation 4725. Tailwater elevation 4616

BOYSEN DAM
OUTLET WORKS DISCHARGING 1320 CFS 1:16 SCALE MODEL

Figure 20
Report HYD 446



Both valves fully open. Reservoir elevation 4723.5. Dashed lines show the outline of converging walls located beneath spray.
Compare with Figure 19

BOYSEN DAM
LEFT VALVE OF OUTLET WORKS BASIN DISCHARGING
732 CFS LOOKING UPSTREAM

Figure 21
Report HYD 446



Both valves fully open. Reservoir elevation 4723.5
Compare with Figure 19

BOYSEN DAM
LEFT VALVE OF OUTLET WORKS BASIN DISCHARGING
732 CFS--LOOKING DOWNSTREAM



Both valves fully open and both turbines operating at normal load. Reservoir elevation 4723.5. Tailwater elevation 4617. Compare with Figure 19.


BOYSEN DAM
OUTLET WORKS DISCHARGING 1344 CFS



MEXICAN OUTLET WORKS - FALCON DAM
90-INCH VALVES 100 PERCENT OPEN
4,570 CFS - RES. ELEV. 300 APPROX. - T. W. ELEV. 181.2
1:30 SCALE MODEL




MEXICAN OUTLET WORKS - FALCON DAM
90-INCH LEFT VALVE DISCHARGING 100 PERCENT OPEN
2,400 CFS - RES. ELEV. 300 APPROX. - T. W. ELEV. 181.2
1:30 SCALE MODEL



UNITED STATES OUTLET WORKS - FALCON DAM
72-INCH VALVES OPEN 100 PERCENT
2920 CFS - RES. ELEV. 310 APPROX. - T. W. ELEV. 180.8
1:24 SCALE MODEL



UNITED STATES OUTLET WORKS - FALCON DAM
72-INCH RIGHT VALVE DISCHARGING 100 PERCENT OPEN
1600 CFS - RES. ELEV. 310 APPROX. - T. W. ELEV. 180.5
1:24 SCALE MODEL



UNITED STATES OUTLET WORKS - FALCON DAM
72-INCH VALVES OPEN 100 PERCENT
2920 CFS - RES. ELEV. 310 APPROX. - T. W. ELEV. 180.8

Figure 28
Report HYD 446



Note: Compare with Figure 24

MEXICAN OUTLET WORKS - FALCON DAM
90-INCH LEFT VALVE DISCHARGING - 100 PERCENT OPEN
2,300 CFS APPROX. - RES. ELEV. 301.83. - T. W. ELEV. 183.0



Note: Compare with Figures 26 & 27

UNITED STATES OUTLET WORKS - FALCON DAM
72-INCH LEFT VALVE DISCHARGING 100 PERCENT OPEN
1,750 CFS APPROX. - RES. ELEV. 301.83 - T. W. ELEV. 182.7

Figure 30
Report HYD 446



90-inch outlet works valves open 100 percent discharging
4,500 cfs approx. - T. W. elev. 183.6.
Turbine gates 72 percent open - 100 percent load.



72-inch outlet works valves open 100 percent discharging
3,000 cfs approx. - T. W. elev. 184.1.
Turbine gates 72 percent open - 100 percent load.

FALCON DAM
MEXICAN & UNITED STATES POWERPLANTS & OUTLET WORKS
DISCHARGING AT RESERVOIR ELEVATION 301.83

