A simple design criterion for residual energy on embankment dam stepped spillways.
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Abstract: The stepped spillway design is associated with significant flow resistance and associated energy dissipation on the steps, yielding smaller, more economical downstream dissipation structures. A number of design guidelines were developed for steep stepped spillways typical of concrete gravity dams. Herein the focus of the study is on embankment stepped spillways. A large set of air-water flow data is compared with re-analyzed data sets to provide a simple unifying design approach for the residual energy at the stepped chute’s downstream end and to highlight the uncertainties involved. The results provided some simple design criteria in terms of the dimensionless residual energy of stepped chutes with flat steps. It is believed that a stepped design with a 1V:2.5H slope (θ = 21.8°) might be optimum in terms of energy dissipation performances. The Darcy-Weisbach friction factors were close for all stepped data ranging between 0.1 ≤ f ≤ 0.4.
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Introduction

The stepped chute is a typical spillway design for gravity and embankment dams (Chanson 2001) (Fig. 1). The steps act as rough elements increasing the amount of entrained air and enhancing the rate of energy dissipation along the staircase chute, compared to smooth-invert spillway designs. The strong energy dissipation performances allow a reduction of the downstream stilling structure, hence a reduction in construction costs. The flows above stepped spillways are three dimensional. Downstream of the inception point of air-entrainment, the flow appears even more complex with strong air-water flow interactions. Several dissipative processes take place, including cavity recirculations within the step niches driven by momentum transfer from the main stream flow, droplet ejections above the air-water flows and strong turbulent energetic processes within the bulk of the two phase flow (Matos 2001, Chanson et al. 2002, Ohtsu et al. 2004). The investigation of the energetic processes is closely linked with the air-water flows and the energy dissipation rate should be measured directly in the two-phase flow section at the downstream end of the stepped chute.

While the energy dissipation processes on steeply sloped stepped spillways have been studied in great details, the focus shifted during the last decade to the study of spillways with typical embankment dam
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A number of design guidelines for embankment chute were developed based upon air-water flow experiments, including Ohtsu et al. (2004) for $5.7^\circ < \theta < 19^\circ$, Gonzalez and Chanson (2007) for $\theta = 15.9^\circ$ and $21.8^\circ$ and Bung (2011) on stepped chutes with $\theta = 18.4^\circ$ and $26.6^\circ$. Recently Hunt et al. (2014) provided guidelines for stepped chutes with slopes of $14^\circ \leq \theta \leq 26.6^\circ$ based upon experiments with mono-phase flow and air-water flow devices. Each set of design guidelines is based upon the respective experimental data, collected in stepped chutes with various slopes, channel geometries, inflow conditions, flow rates and instrumentation. Interestingly the resulting guidelines are fairly similar, often with slight differences in empirical factors in same or similar equation format. These differences are the consequence of different experimental results sometimes even for the same channel slope. There is a need to provide clarity on the uncertainty of the design guidelines.

Herein the present work is an approach to use the available air-water flow data to provide a simple unifying design approach for the residual energy at the chute’s downstream end and to highlight the uncertainties involved. Basis of the present paper are extensive measurements by Felder (2013) of the air-water flow properties on several stepped configurations with typical embankment dam slopes of $\theta = 26.6^\circ$ and $\theta = 8.9^\circ$ (Figure 2). These results are complemented with the re-analyses of a number of detailed air-water stepped spillway data on flat slopes of $3.4^\circ \leq \theta \leq 26.6^\circ$, providing a new design criterion for the residual energy at the downstream end of the stepped section.

**Experimental data set and configurations**

Physical experiments were conducted in three large sizes stepped spillway models encompassing a range of stepped geometries, i.e. flat uniform steps, flat non-uniform steps, pooled steps, porous pooled steps, and combination of flat and pooled steps (Table 1). Figure 2 illustrates the investigated configurations with vertical step heights $h = 0.05$ m and $h = 0.10$ m, and vertical drop in elevation between upstream broad-crested weir and last step edge $\Delta z_o = 0.9$ m and 1 m. For all stepped configurations, the uncontrolled broad-crested weir provided a smooth inflow into the stepped test section with widths of $W = 0.5$ m, 0.52 m and 1.0 m respectively. On the spillway with $\theta = 8.9^\circ$, the pooled stepped configurations consisted of weirs at the step edge of height $w = 5$ cm. On the steeper sloped spillway with $\theta = 26.6^\circ$, the pooled weirs had $w = 3.1$ cm to satisfy the same ratio $w/l$ of pool weir height to step length between the pooled configurations. For two pooled designs, a pool weir porosity was added ($P_o = 5\%$ and $P_o = 31\%$) to simulate pooled designs with low flow drainage and gabion permeability respectively (Figure 2). Details about the configuration with step pool porosity can be found in Felder and Chanson (2014b). The experimental flow conditions are summarised in
Table 1 including the discharge per unit width between $0.003 \leq q_w \leq 0.267$ m$^2$/s and the dimensionless discharge $d_c/h$ where $d_c$ is the critical flow depth. The discharges corresponded to Reynolds numbers within two orders of magnitude: $1.5 \times 10^4 \leq Re \leq 1.1 \times 10^6$. The Reynolds number was defined in terms of the hydraulic diameter. The flow patterns of all stepped chutes were investigated including the inception point of free-surface aeration and the air-water flow characteristics (Felder 2013).

A key characteristic of stepped spillways is the large rate of energy dissipation along the stepped chute associated with a strong air entrainment downstream of the inception point of free-surface aeration. Hence, experiments on stepped spillways must describe the air-water flow properties and the energy dissipation characteristics in the two-phase flow region. In the present study, detailed air-water flow measurements were performed with dual-tip phase-detection probes with probe sensor sizes $\Omega = 0.13$ mm and 0.25 mm for a range of discharges corresponding to the transition and skimming flow regimes ($0.69 \leq d_c/h \leq 3.55$). The conductivity probes were sampled at 20 kHz per sensor for 45 s at all step edges downstream of the inception point of free-surface aeration. The air-water data processing followed the method of Chanson (2002) and Felder (2013).

The present data used for the design criterion comprised a smaller range of flow rates of $0.035 \leq q_w \leq 0.234$ m$^2$/s for flat uniform steps on the stepped spillway with $\theta = 8.9^\circ$ and for $0.02 \leq q_w \leq 0.186$ m$^2$/s for flat steps with $\theta = 26.6^\circ$ because the last step edge had to be at least three step edges downstream of the inception point of air entrainment. The present data were compared with several stepped spillway data sets with slopes between $3.4^\circ \leq \theta \leq 26.6^\circ$ (Table 2). These studies were also conducted with phase-detection probes to document the air-water flow properties and the energy dissipation performances. Table 2 lists the relevant studies including the channel slope, the stepped configuration, the step heights, the height between upstream end and last step edge, and the probe sensor size. The comparative analyses provided a comprehensive experimental data set to assess the energy dissipation performances for embankment stepped spillways, leading to a simple design criterion for the residual energy at the spillway toe. At the downstream end of the spillways the air-water flows were fully developed, but no uniform equilibrium flow conditions were observed. Please note that the data of Hunt et al. (2014) are not included since it was not possible to differentiate between air-water flow data and mono-phase flow data, as well as the data corresponding to the spillway toe.

Air-water flow patterns

For all present stepped configurations, the flow patterns were observed for a range of discharges comprising nappe (NA), transition (TRA) and skimming flow (SK) regimes (Table 1). In the nappe flow regime for small discharges, the water discharged from one step to the next in a series of free-falling nappes. For intermediate flow rates, a transition flow regime existed which consisted of slight instabilities visible in strong droplet splashing and irregular cavity recirculation for the flat stepped spillways. For the pooled stepped design, stronger instabilities were observed within the transition flows consisting of jump waves and flow instabilities (Felder and Chanson 2013). In particular for the pooled stepped design with $\theta = 8.9^\circ$, a safe
operation of the spillway might not be possible due to strong instationary flow patterns including jump waves propagating downstream (Figure 3A). For the largest flow rates, typically the design discharge, a skimming flow regime was observed (Figure 3B and C). At the upstream end, a clear water region existed and when the turbulence fluctuations within the flow were large enough to overcome the surface tension and buoyancy forces, the air entrainment process started. Downstream a highly-complex three-dimensional air-water flow mixture was observed (Figure 3B and C).

The positions of the inception point of free-surface aeration were observed for all flow conditions and stepped configurations. The smooth stepped chute data were in close agreement and well fitted by existing correlation functions from the literature (Felder and Chanson 2013) such as the the simple -correlation by Chanson (1994,2001):

$$\frac{L_i}{h \times \cos \theta} = 9.719 \times (\sin \theta)^{0.0796} \times F^*^{0.713}$$

(1)

where $L_i$ is the distance from the first step edge to the inception point of free-surface aeration and $F^*$ is a Froude number expressed in terms of the step roughness:

$$F^* = \frac{q_w}{\sqrt{g \times \sin \theta \times k_s^3}}$$

(2)

where $g$ is the gravity acceleration and $k_s$ is the step cavity height normal to the mainstream flow: $k_s = h \times \cos \theta$ for flat stepped spillways and $k_s = (h+w) \times \cos \theta$ for pooled stepped spillways. For the pooled stepped data a slightly different correlation proposed by Thorwarth (2008) matched the pooled data well. The agreement between equations and experimental data is not shown since it has been presented previously (Felder and Chanson 2013). Felder and Chanson (2013) compared their correlation and data set (Eq. (1)) with several other formulas including Meireles and Matos (2009) and one by Hunt et al. (2014). It must be emphasized that there is close agreement between the formulas and experimental data available.

Similarly several empirical formulas describe the flow depth in the clear-water flow region $d_w$ above the inception point (e.g. Meireles and Matos 2009, Hunt et al. 2014). Chanson (2001) developed a semi-empirical equation for the flow depth based upon boundary layer development thickness $\delta_{BL}$:

$$d_w = \frac{q_w}{\sqrt{2 \times g \times (H_{\text{max}} - d_w \times \cos \theta)}} + \frac{\delta_{BL}}{N}$$

(3)

Equation (3) was successfully tested by Chanson (2001) and Felder and Chanson (2014a). Due to its semi-empirical nature, Eq. (3) should receive preference above solely empirical equations.

**Air-water flow properties**

The air-water flow properties were measured for all stepped configurations at all step edges downstream of the inception point. Characteristic results of several air-water flow properties are presented in this section
comprising the vertical distributions of void fraction $C$ and interfacial velocity $V$ (Figure 4) as well as the longitudinal development of characteristic air-water flow parameter (Figure 5). Typical skimming flow distributions of local time-averaged void fraction $C$ above the stepped chute are illustrated in Figure 4A and 4B for two channel slopes and different discharges. In the figure legend, the depth-average air concentration $C_{\text{mean}}$ is added:

$$C_{\text{mean}} = \frac{1}{Y_{90}} \int_{y=0}^{y=Y_{90}} C \times dy$$

(4)

where $y$ is the distance perpendicular to the mainstream flow direction and $Y_{90}$ is the characteristic distance where $C = 0.9$. $C_{\text{mean}}$ is the key parameter for the theoretical solution of the void fraction distributions, i.e. the advective diffusion equation for air bubbles in air-water skimming flows:

$$C = 1 - \tanh^2 \left( K' \frac{y}{Y_{90}} + \frac{y}{Y_{90}} - \frac{1}{3} \right)$$

(5)

where $K'$ and $D_o$ are dimensionless functions of $C_{\text{mean}}$ only (Chanson and Toombes 2002a). In Figures 4A and 4B, Equation (5) compares favorably with the experimental void fraction data. Close agreement between the advective diffusion equation (Eq. (5)) and experimental data has been also confirmed in many other air-water flow studies of embankment dam sloped stepped spillways while void fraction profiles in less stable transition flows are well correlated by a different solution of the same advective diffusion equation (Chanson and Toombes 2004). In the uniform equilibrium flow region, the mean air concentration $C_{\text{mean}}$ can be estimated with an empirical equation by Ohtsu et al. (2004):

$$C_{\text{mean}} = D - 0.3 \exp \left( -5 \left( \frac{h}{d_c} \right)^2 - 4 \frac{h}{d_c} \right)$$

(6)

with $D = 0.3$ for $5.7^\circ \leq \theta \leq 19^\circ$ and $D = -0.00024 \theta^2 + 0.0214 \theta - 0.0357$ for $\theta \geq 19^\circ$. Again various other empirical formulas exist.

Typical time-averaged interfacial velocity distributions are also illustrated in Figures 4A and 4B for the same flow conditions. The dimensionless interfacial velocity distributions $V/V_{90}$ compared well with a power law

$$\frac{V}{V_{90}} = \left( \frac{y}{Y_{90}} \right)^{1/N}$$

(7)

$$y/Y_{90} \leq 1$$

where $V_{90}$ is the velocity with $C = 0.90$ and $N$ is the power law coefficient, typically $N = 10$ for stepped chutes. Variations in parameters of $N$ have been observed by several researchers (e.g. Bung 2011; Takahashi and Ohtsu 2012; Hunt et al. 2014). As seen in Figures 4A and 4B, there are small deviations from the $1/10^{th}$ power law linked to variations between adjacent step edges, with distance downstream of the inception point, with variation in step configuration as well as discharges. The factor $N = 10$ reflected an average power law
coefficient for the observations by Felder (2013) for the full range of stepped configurations and discharges for the present data sets (Fig. 2). Differences in factor $N$ might be also explained with different experimental facilities, measurement devices and sampling parameters, but reflect most importantly the complexity and fluctuations of the three dimensional flow. For $y/Y_{90} > 1$, the interfacial velocities followed a quasi-uniform profile for all flow conditions, but for some flow rates, uniform velocities were seen for $y/Y_{90} > 0.7$ (Fig. 4A and 4B). In the legend of Figure 4, the values of $V_{90}$ are also presented for completeness. Similar distributions of void fractions and interfacial velocities were recorded for all stepped configurations confirming such features as characteristic for air-water skimming flows independently of step height, embankment dam slope and downstream distance from the inception point of air entrainment.

Characteristic air-water flow parameters were also estimated for all step edges downstream of the inception point of free-surface aeration. These parameters comprised the maximum bubble count rate $F_{\text{max}}$, i.e. the maximum number of air bubbles in a cross-section, the mean void fraction in a cross-section $C_{\text{mean}}$ and the characteristic flow depth $Y_{90}$. The flow parameters are illustrated in dimensionless terms in Figure 5 as a function of the dimensionless distance from the inception point $(x - L_0)/d_c$, where $x$ is the distance along the spillway. The longitudinal distributions of the air-water flow properties highlighted the rapidly varying flow region immediately downstream of the inception point of air entrainment. Further downstream the flow parameters vary gradually and no uniform flow conditions were observed on the present spillway facilities. In particular the dimensionless maximum bubble count rate $F_{\text{max}} V_c/d_c$ did increase gradually along the spillway (Figure 5) where $V_c$ is the critical flow velocity. Furthermore all air-water flow parameters showed a seesaw patterns which may be typical for stepped spillway flows as shown by Felder and Chanson (2009). Figure 5 confirms that no uniform equilibrium conditions were achieved at the downstream end of the stepped chute and that the flow was fully developed air-water flows which varied gradually for all configurations. Because of the rapidly varied flow in the region just downstream of the inception point, the design criterion of the present study is only valid for positions at least three step edges downstream of the inception point of air entrainment. Data which did not fulfill this three step rule were not considered for the calculation of the median dimensional residual energy. For several flow conditions, residual energies were observed for consecutive step edges showing very similar residual energy levels independent of the height of the step edge to the weir crest. While the residual energy at consecutive steps would have provided additional experimental data, only the residual energy at the downstream end of the chutes were considered for the design criterion. This was done for consistency with flow configurations where only the residual energy at the downstream end was available.

Energy dissipation and flow resistance

Residual energy for flat sloped stepped spillways

The present air-water flow data were used to calculate some key design parameters, namely the residual energy at the last step edge at the chute's downstream end and the average friction factor in the fully developed air-water flow region. The residual energy at the chute’s downstream end is an important design
parameter for the downstream energy dissipator, typically a stilling basin. The size of this stilling basin must be designed to allow the dissipation of the remaining energy to avoid damage and erosion of the river further downstream. The present data were compared with the re-analysis of existing air-water flow data for embankment dam slopes to provide guidance for a large range of channel slopes and configurations and to combine data from different facilities (Table 2). The residual head at the downstream end is calculated based upon air-water flow data as:

\[ H_{res} = d \times \cos \theta + \frac{U_w^2}{2 \times g} + w = \frac{w}{q_{w}} \left( 1 - C \right) \times \cos \theta \times dy + \frac{q_{w}^2}{2 \times g} \left( \int_0^{\frac{w}{q_{w}}} \left( 1 - C \right) \times dy \right)^2 \]

where \( d \) is the equivalent clear water flow depth, \( U_w \) is the depth average velocity, \( g \) is the gravity acceleration and \( w \) the pool weir height (for pooled and porous pooled stepped spillways only). For the staggered and in-line configurations of flat and pooled stepped spillways a cross-sectional averaging was used following Guenther et al. (2013). Figure 6 presents the dimensionless residual energy \( H_{res}/d_c \) data as functions of the dimensionless discharge \( d_c/h \). The present data are highlighted with filled symbols and the re-analyzed data are shown as hollow symbols. The data are presented in four graphs, regrouping stepped spillway data with similar channel slopes (Fig. 6A-D). The comparative analysis identified four stepped spillway slopes exhibiting similar dimensionless residual energy results: i.e., \( 3.4^\circ \leq \theta \leq 11.3^\circ \), \( 14.6^\circ \leq \theta \leq 19^\circ \), \( \theta = 21.8^\circ \) and \( \theta = 26.6^\circ \). For each group, the median values and the standard deviation of data are included with solid and dashed lines respectively (Fig. 6).

Figure 6A shows the residual energy for flat and pooled stepped spillways with \( 3.4^\circ \leq \theta \leq 11.3^\circ \) as well as the median values for the flat stepped data \( (H_{res}/d_c = 3.31) \) for all channel slopes and the median values for the pooled stepped spillway data with \( \theta = 8.9^\circ \) \( (H_{res}/d_c = 2.28) \). While the pooled design might be better in terms of energy dissipation performances, its safe operation is not advised because of instationary free-surface jump waves (Takahashi et al. 2008, Felder and Chanson 2013). Figure 6B illustrates the residual energy for \( 14.6^\circ \leq \theta \leq 19^\circ \) as well as the median dimensionless residual energy \( H_{res}/d_c = 3.96 \) and the standard deviation of the data. In Figure 6C, the residual head data for flat steps with \( 21.8^\circ \) are shown together with the median residual energy \( H_{res}/d_c = 3.37 \). The data showed some scatter, most notably for the data with \( h = 0.10 \) m and the large standard deviation reflect the scatter. The data set comprised experimental results from three different studies (Table 2) conducted with different probe sensor sizes and variations in sampling parameters. It is conceivable that the smallest sensors yielded larger residual energy values. A more detailed study could provide insights upon any effect of sensor sizes upon air-water flow properties and energy dissipation rates. It must be also noted that the largest values of residual energy were observed for transition flow discharges, i.e. discharges below the design skimming flow discharge, which are characterized by instabilities. The fourth group of data \( (\theta = 26.6^\circ) \) is shown in Figure 6D comprising data for flat uniform, flat non-uniform, pooled steps, porous pooled steps as well as configurations of in-line and staggered configurations of flat and

pooled steps. The median residual energy and the standard deviation are also shown for the flat stepped data (both uniform and non-uniform configurations) \( (H_{\text{res}}/d_c = 3.94) \). The pooled and porous pooled stepped spillway configurations showed the largest residual energy levels and the design might not be beneficial in terms of energy dissipation performances since the rate of energy dissipation is closely linked with the residual energy at the downstream end. Again, the largest residual energies were observed for unstable transition flows.

Figure 7 summarizes the median residual energy values as functions of the spillway slope for all data presented in Figure 6. The standard deviation of experimental data is added to the figure with error bars. The results demonstrate a similar order of magnitude in terms of median residual energies for all four stepped spillway groups. Further they indicated a slight increase of residual energy with increasing channel slope, but the data for \( \theta = 21.8^\circ \) indicated a drop in residual energy for that particular slope. Such a stepped spillway slope might be best in terms of energy dissipation performances for embankment stepped chute slopes within the range of \( 14.6^\circ \leq \theta \leq 26.6^\circ \) (Fig. 7). The finding was close to the results of Ohtsu et al. (2004) and Gonzalez and Chanson (2006). Very flat slopes might yield smaller residual energy levels at the chute toe, but the design would yield long and uneconomical designs.

A relatively close agreement was obtained between all experimental data, with a majority within the range \( 2 \leq H_{\text{res}}/d_c \leq 5 \). The median residual energies for four groups with similar slopes were calculated, highlighting typical residual energies usable as simple design criterion. Table 3 summarizes the design criteria for embankment stepped spillways with slopes within \( 3.4^\circ \leq \theta \leq 26.6^\circ \) incorporating the present data (Table 1) as well as previous air-water flow studies on stepped spillways (Table 2). The guidelines are valid for uniform flat steps within a range of step heights and discharges in both transition and skimming flow regimes. No uniform equilibrium conditions were observed at the downstream end and the design guidelines are valid for fully developed air-water flows with non-uniform flow conditions. A benefit of such design guidelines is the simplicity for application to the full range of flat sloped spillways.

Discussion

Although the design criterion for embankment sloped stepped spillways is straightforward, the presented data highlight also a weakness of today’s research in air-water stepped spillway flows. A large scatter of experimentally observed data was shown in Figures 6 and 7 which result in large uncertainties of the actual residual energy at the downstream end. In the present paper, the effort was to include as many air-water flow data as possible for the analyses to find a design criterion which is valid independently of the experimental facility as well as the instrumentation used for data collection. The use of a median value as the representative residual head at the downstream end represents a typical value for the available limited number of data sets. The median values should be used in conjunction with the standard deviation enabling a sensitivity analysis of the stepped chute design. The large scatter of data might be explained by these differences, but could also result from the complexity of air-water flows more generally. As pointed out, transition flows lead to larger flow instabilities which may result in larger measurement uncertainties, but
also larger residual energies at the channel end. Interestingly most engineering designs are based upon design discharges and not on the lower discharges which might have instabilities resulting in larger energies to be dissipated in the stilling structure at the downstream end. These instabilities might not just be linked with increased average energy, but the energy might be incorporated in sudden energy bursts as has been found on pooled stepped spillways with $\theta = 8.9^\circ$ (Felder and Chanson 2013). Even so the average residual energy on the pooled stepped chute for instationary discharges was comparable to the design discharge (Figure 6A), the use of a simple design guideline for such flows must underestimate the energy to be dissipated in the stilling structure. While the present design guideline provided a simple median value and information about the data scatter, the use of physical modelling is essential to conduct systematic testing of design and non-design flow conditions. Further, it is important to identify any uncertainties. Existing data sets could be provided easily online (e.g. Felder 2013) to allow a more systematic comparison of experimental studies including air-water flow properties and further design parameters.

Flow resistance for flat sloped stepped spillways

On stepped spillways, significant form losses take place along the steps. The flow resistance is commonly expressed in terms of the Darcy-Weisbach friction factor $f_e$ (Chanson 2001). The friction factor characterizes a dimensionless shear stress between main stream skimming flow and cavity flow in the air-water flow region downstream of the inception point of free-surface aeration. In the present study, no uniform equilibrium flow was achieved along the stepped chutes, and the average equivalent Darcy-Weisbach friction factor was calculated in the gradually-varied flow for flat, pooled and porous pooled stepped chutes (e.g. Chanson 2001)

$$f_e = \frac{8 \times g \times S_f \times \left( \int_0^{y_o} (1 - C) \times dy \right)^3}{q_w^2}$$

(9)

where the friction slope equals $S_f = - \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}$, $H$ is the total head and $x$ is the distance in flow direction. All the data were herein calculated based upon the air-water flow measurements. The results are summarized in Figure 8. The friction factor is presented as a function of the dimensionless step roughness height $k_s/D_H$ with $k_s$ the step cavity height and $D_H$ the hydraulic diameter or equivalent pipe diameter. Figure 8 includes all skimming flow data for the flat sloped stepped spillways. A key finding is the close agreement of all data independent of the channel slope and discharge (Fig. 8). Apart from a few discrepancies for the spillway with the combination of flat and pooled steps and very low friction factors for the stepped chute with 3.4º, all values were in the range $f_e = 0.1$ to 0.4. The data compared well with the simplified solution of a Prandtl mixing length model (Chanson et al. 2002) expressing the pseudo-boundary shear stress:

$$f_d = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi} \times K}$$

(10)
where $f_d$ is an equivalent Darcy friction factor estimate of the form drag and $1/K$ is the dimensionless rate of expansion of the shear layer. Equation (10) is shown in Figure 8 for $K = 6$.

The present findings (Fig. 8) highlighted the significant flow resistance of stepped spillways independently of channel slopes and discharges. While a similar results was derived for gravity dam stepped chutes (Chanson et al. 2002), the present results extend the findings to typical embankment dam spillways.

**Conclusion**

The focus of this work was to develop a simple design criterion for residual energy for stepped chutes, with slopes typical of embankment dams, including the effects of free-surface aeration. Detailed air-water flow experiments were performed on several stepped spillway geometries with slopes between $\theta = 8.9^\circ$ and $26.6^\circ$ comprising flat uniform and non-uniform configurations as well as flat, pooled, porous pooled steps and a combination of flat and pooled steps. The data analyses were complemented by the re-analyses of existing air-water flow data sets, thus resulting in a comprehensive data set typical of embankment dams $3.4^\circ \leq \theta \leq 26.6^\circ$.

For all configurations, the residual energy was estimated at the stepped chute's downstream end in the fully-developed air-water flow region. The results provided some simple design criteria in terms of the dimensionless residual energy of stepped chutes with flat steps. For a slope of $3.4^\circ \leq \theta \leq 11.3^\circ$, the median remaining energy can be estimated at $H_{res}/d_c = 3.31$, for $14.6^\circ \leq \theta \leq 19^\circ$ as $H_{res}/d_c = 3.96$, for $\theta = 21.8^\circ$ as $H_{res}/d_c = 3.37$ and for $\theta = 26.6^\circ$ as $H_{res}/d_c = 3.94$. The guidelines are valid for a range of flow conditions comprising both transition and skimming flow regimes independently of the height of the spillway and for non-uniform gradually-varied air-water flows. Overall it is believed that a stepped design with a $1V:2.5H$ slope ($\theta = 21.8^\circ$) might be optimum in terms of residual energy to be dissipated in the downstream stilling structure. The Darcy-Weisbach friction factors were close for all stepped data ranging between $0.1 \leq f_d \leq 0.4$, with Equation (10) providing some simple design criterion. In practice, and until further major scientific breakthrough, a sensible design approach should be favored, combining both a reasonable economical design supported by sound scientific calculations and physical observations. Namely (a) the use of the median value, (b) with a clear statement about data scatter to enable some sensitivity analyses, and (c) the compulsory use of physical modelling for a wide range of design and non-design flow conditions.
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**Notations**

$C$ 
void fraction defined as the volume of air per unit volume of air and water;

- $C_{\text{mean}}$: depth-averaged void fraction;
- $D$: empirical factor;
- $D_o$: dimensionless constant;
- $d$: equivalent clear water flow depth in air-water flows (m);
- $d_c$: critical flow depth (m);
- $d_w$: flow depth in the clear-water flow region above the inception point (m);
- $F$: air bubble count rate or bubble frequency (Hz);
- $F_{\text{max}}$: maximum air bubble count rate in a cross-section (Hz);
- $F^*$: Froude number expressed in terms of the step roughness;
- $f_d$: equivalent Darcy-Weisbach friction factor estimate of the form drag;
- $f_e$: equivalent Darcy-Weisbach friction factor in air-water flows;
- $g$: gravity constant: $g = 9.80$ m/s$^2$ in Brisbane, Australia;
- $H$: total head (m);
- $H_{\text{max}}$: maximum upstream head (m) above chute toe;
- $H_{\text{res}}$: residual energy (m);
- $h$: vertical step height (m);
- $K$: constant inversely proportional to the rate of expansion of the mixing layer;
- $K'$: dimensionless integration constant;
- $k_s$: step cavity roughness height (m);
- $L_1$: longitudinal distance (m) measured from the weir crest to the inception point of free-surface aeration;
- $l$: horizontal step length (m);
- $N$: power law exponent;
- $q_w$: water discharge per unit width (m$^3$/s);
- $P_o$: porosity of pooled stepped spillway;
- $Re$: Reynolds number defined in terms of the hydraulic diameter;
- $S_f$: friction slope;
- $U_w$: mean flow velocity (m/s);
- $V$: interfacial velocity (m/s);
- $V_c$: critical flow velocity (m/s);
- $V_{90}$: characteristic interfacial velocity (m/s) where the void fraction is 90%;
- $W$: channel width (m);
- $w$: weir height in pooled stepped spillway configuration (m);
- $x$: distance along the channel bottom (m);
- $Y_{90}$: characteristic depth (m) where the void fraction is 90%;
- $y$: distance (m) measured normal to the invert (or channel bed);
- $\Delta z_o$: height (m) from the calculated step edge at the downstream end to the weir crest;
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Table 1: Summary of experimental flow conditions of stepped spillway configurations in present study (Fig. 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Stepped configuration</th>
<th>( \Delta z_0 ) [m]</th>
<th>Conductivity probe</th>
<th>( q_w ) [m²/s]</th>
<th>( d_c/h ) [-]</th>
<th>( d_c/h ) [-]</th>
<th>( d_c/h ) [-]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.9º</td>
<td>( h = 5 ) cm (flat)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.13 mm)</td>
<td>0.004-0.234</td>
<td>0.24-3.54</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( h = w = 5 ) cm (pooled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.009-0.233</td>
<td>0.39-3.54</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( h = w = 5 ) cm (flat/pooled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.007-0.233</td>
<td>0.52-3.54</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.6º</td>
<td>( h = 10 ) cm (flat)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.25 mm)</td>
<td>0.008-0.262</td>
<td>0.18-1.91</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( h = 5 ) cm (flat)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005-0.230</td>
<td>0.27-3.51</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( h = 5 ) &amp; 10 cm (non-uniform)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005-0.241</td>
<td>0.13-1.81</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.97 (1.7 for 5 cm dominating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( h = 10 ) cm, ( w = 3.1 ) cm (pooled)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004-0.267</td>
<td>0.11-1.94</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( h = 10 ) cm, ( w = 3.1 ) cm, ( Po = 31% ) (porous pooled)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003-0.282</td>
<td>0.10-2.01</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( h = 10 ) cm, ( w = 3.1 ) cm, ( Po = 5% ) (porous pooled)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003-0.282</td>
<td>0.10-2.01</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Summary of previous air-water flow studies on stepped spillways with embankment dam slopes which are compared with the present stepped spillway configurations (Fig. 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Stepped configuration</th>
<th>Spillway height</th>
<th>Conductivity probe</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4°</td>
<td>h = 7.15 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 1.14 m</td>
<td>Single-tip (Ø = 0.35 mm)</td>
<td>Chanson and Toombes (2002b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h = 14.3 cm (flat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7°</td>
<td>h = 0.63 – 5 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.3 – 0.7 m</td>
<td>Single-tip (Ø = 0.1 mm)</td>
<td>Ohtsu et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9°</td>
<td>h = 5 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 1 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.13 mm)</td>
<td>Thorwarth (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h = w = 5 cm (pooled)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.95 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3°</td>
<td>h = 0.63 – 5 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.3 – 0.7 m</td>
<td>Single-tip (Ø = 0.1 mm)</td>
<td>Ohtsu et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6°</td>
<td>h = 5 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 1 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.13 mm)</td>
<td>Thorwarth (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h = 10 cm (flat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h = w = 5 cm (pooled)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.95 m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.9°</td>
<td>h = 5 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.8 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.025 mm)</td>
<td>Gonzalez (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h = 10 cm (flat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4°</td>
<td>h = 3 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 2.34 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.13 mm)</td>
<td>Bung (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h = 6 cm (flat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19°</td>
<td>h = 0.63 – 5 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.85 – 2.4 m</td>
<td>Single-tip (Ø = 0.1 mm)</td>
<td>Ohtsu et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.8°</td>
<td>h = 5 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.95 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.25 mm)</td>
<td>Felder and Chanson (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h = 10 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.9 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.25 mm)</td>
<td>Carosi and Chanson (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.8 m</td>
<td>Single-tip (Ø = 0.35 mm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.7 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.025 mm)</td>
<td>Gonzalez (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.6°</td>
<td>h = 3 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 2.34 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.13 mm)</td>
<td>Bung (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h = 6 cm (flat)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.9 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.13 mm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h = 10 cm, w = 3.1 cm (in-line flat/pooled steps)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.9 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.25 mm)</td>
<td>Guenther et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h = 10 cm, w = 3.1 cm (staggered flat/pooled steps)</td>
<td>Δz₀ = 0.9 m</td>
<td>Double-tip (Ø = 0.25 mm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Design guidelines for stepped spillways with embankment slopes $3.4^\circ \leq \theta \leq 26.6^\circ$ and flat steps comprising the present data (Table 1) and previous air-water flow studies (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Step characteristics</th>
<th>Dimensionless residual energy</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Flow regime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4° - 11.3°</td>
<td>0.05 ≤ h ≤ 0.143 m</td>
<td>$H_{res}/d_c = 3.31$</td>
<td>0.61 ≤ d_c/h ≤ 4</td>
<td>TRA &amp; SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6° - 19°</td>
<td>0.03 ≤ h ≤ 0.1 m</td>
<td>$H_{res}/d_c = 3.96$</td>
<td>1.06 ≤ d_c/h ≤ 4</td>
<td>SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.8°</td>
<td>0.05 ≤ h ≤ 0.1 m</td>
<td>$H_{res}/d_c = 3.37$</td>
<td>0.7 ≤ d_c/h ≤ 2.9</td>
<td>TRA &amp; SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.6°</td>
<td>0.03 ≤ h ≤ 0.1 m</td>
<td>$H_{res}/d_c = 3.94$</td>
<td>0.69 ≤ d_c/h ≤ 3.6</td>
<td>TRA &amp; SK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. 6. Dimensionless residual energy at the downstream end of stepped spillways with embankment dam slopes (Filled symbols = present data, Table 1; Hollow symbols = Table 2) – Solid line = median values for design guidelines – Dashed lines = standard deviation of data
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Fig. 7. Median residual energy for flat steps - four slope groups with similar behaviour (black circles) – error bars showing standard deviation of samples

Fig. 8. Equivalent Darcy friction factors of stepped spillways with embankment dam slopes (Filled symbols – data present study, Table 1; Hollow symbols - references for data in Table 2)
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