

Some Benchmark Simulations for Flash Flood Modelling

Ekkehard Holzbecher, Ahmed Hadidi

German Univ. of Technology in Oman (GUtech)

E-mail: ekkehard.holzbecher@gutech.edu.om

Flash Floods



COMSOL Conference 2017 Rotterdam

Rapid flooding due to

- heavy rain in a watershed
- meltwater of snow and ice
- failure of a protection structure

Time scale: few hours maximum

www.pinterest.com

Flood Warning

- Early Warning
- Flood Routing





Photoblog.nbcnews.com

Flood Modelling



COMSOL Conference 2017 Rotterdam

- Urban Planning
- Identification of flood risk zones
- Flood risk maps
- Improve hazard mitigation actions
- Enhance emerency planning
- Flood prediction.
- Communication of flood risk to the public

Houston, Texas, Sep. 2, 2017

Shallow Water Equations

SWE

Saint-Venant Equations

Volume Conservation

$$\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (H\mathbf{u}) = 0$$

Momentum Conservation

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} + g\nabla H - \mathbf{F} = 0$$

with with total water depth H, water height above reference height η , velocity vector \mathbf{u} , acceleration and due to gravity g and vector of outer forces \mathbf{F}

-

Extension

Hydraulics with friction on the walls

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} + g \nabla H + g \eta n^2 \frac{|\mathbf{u}|}{\eta^{4/3}} \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{F} = 0$$

with Manning coefficient n

(Brufau & García-Navarro 2000, Duran 2015)

Implemented in COMSOL Multiphysics as physics mode by Schlegel (2012)

Benchmarking

- against analytical solutions
- against numerical results from other codes, accepted by the scientific community



Initial condition: dam at position x_0

high water level upstream (left), low water level downstream (right) at simulation time zero the dam disappears



Straight Forward Model



100 Elements, without stabilization

Effects of Stabilization

Inconsistent

• artificial viscosity

Consistent

• shock wave capturing



100 Elements, comparison of

- consistent (with markers) and
- inconsistent (gray) stabilization

Effect of Element Order



100 Elements, comparison of

- linear (with markers)
- quadratic (gray) element

Effect of backwater height



Effect of Adaptive Meshing



2D Dambreak Problem Set-up

COMSOL Conference 2017 Rotterdam



Left: initial state Right: water table change after dam break

Straight Forward Model



Front propagation after dam break (2D) along the main diagonal at selected time instances , no stabilization

Effects of Stabilization



Comparison of

- consistent (with markers) and
- inconsistent (gray) stabilization

Effect of Mesh Refinement



comparison of results with consistent stabilization with two mesh refinements:

- reference mesh (gray),
- refined mesh (spacing 0.01 m (black)
- double refined mesh (spacing 0.005 m)

2D Dambreak with Obstacle Problem Set-up



It is a 2D problem with a rectangular obstacle located in the backwater. The model was treated experimentally and modelled numerically by several groups within the IMPACT project. The experiment is documented by Soares Fração *et al.* (2004) and Soares Fração *et al.* (2011).



COMSOL Model

- Model set-up: There is a no-flow no-slip condition along walls. The Manning friction coefficient is n = 0.01.
- Elements: 2. order
- Stabilization: consistent
- Adaptive meshing: max. 4 refinements



Front, Early Time



Front propagation after dam break (2D) with obstacle after 0.66 s

Front, Intermediate Time



Front propagation after dam break (2D) with obstacle after 2 s

Front, Long Time



Front propagation after dam break (2D) with obstacle after 3 s

Summary & Conclusions

 For the 1D and 2D classical benchmarks we checked numerically computed shock waves using the analytical solution. Straight forward discretization leads to spurious oscillations. Inconsistent stabilization supresses the oscillations, but introduces a numerical viscosity error. Quadratic elements produce more accurate solutions than linear elements.

Summary & Conclusions

- 2. For the usual parameter range, both in 1D and 2D, **adaptive meshing** techniques lead to accurate solutions utilizing much less computational resources than simulations on fixed meshes. We observed reduction by factors:
 - model size: 8 times smaller
 - execution time: 20 times faster

References

- Brufau P., García-Navarro P. (2000) Two-dimensional dam break flow simulation, Int. J. Numer. Meth. in Fluids 33, 35–57
- Duran A. (2015) A robust and well balanced scheme for the 2D Saint-Venant system on unstructured meshes with friction source term, Int. J. for Numer. Meth. in Fluids 78(2), 89-121
- Holzbecher E. (2016) Flash floods in Oman, 2nd Intern. Symp. on Flash Floods in Wadi Systems (ISFF2), Al-Gouna, Egypt
- IMPACT (2001), http://www.impact-project.net/ impact_project_overview.htm
- Schlegel F., (2012) Shallow water physics (shweq). COMSOL internal paper
- Soares Frazão S., Noël B., Zech Y., (2004) Experiments of dam-break flow in the presence of obstacles. Proceedings of River Flow 2004, Naples, Italy

Acknowledgements

TRC



مجلس البحث العلمي The Research Council

COMSOL Multiphysics

ICOMSOL

German Univ. of Technology in Oman



Outlook



ISFF3

December 5-7, 2017

Muscat, Sultanate of Oman

German University of Technology in Oman

