HYDRAULIC MODELLING OF A SHARP CRESTED LABYRINTH WEIR



ADOLF TOMMY SITOMPUL







National Library of Canada Bibliothèque nationale du Canada Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Weilington Street Ottawa, Ontario K 1A 0N4 395, rue Wellington Ottawa (Ontano) K1A 0N4

harte Automierse

state Accesses

NOTICE

AVIS

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments. La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canadä

ŝ

HYDRAULIC MODELLING OF A SHARP CRESTED LABYRINTH WEIR

By

OADOLF TOMMY SITOMPUL

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Engineering

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCE

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

DECEMBER, 1993

ST JOHN'S NEWFOUNDLAND CANADA



Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch

Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street Ottawa, Ontano K1A 0N4 395, rue Wellington Ottawa (Ontario) K 1A 0N4

harter lotesteene

On the Automations of

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons. L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

Canadä

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-91601-X

Abstract

A labyrinth weir is an attractive alternative for water level control in flat land where the head is usually limited. It is also useful in a river where the weir width is confined by the topography. The advantages occur because the crest length of a labyrinth weir is significantly longer than the width of the river. This is achieved by having a plan form which consist of repeating geometric cycles, typically trapezoidal in form. As a result large flows can be released at relatively low heads. Trapezoidal and triangular forms have become the favoured geometric cycles for designers.

This study on a labyrinth weir was undertaken to confirm the operating parameters as well as to investigate different plan shapes including roctangular, rectangular with a semi-circular connection and reverse trapezoidal. Experimental and theoretical results confirmed that the trapezoidal shape with the side wall angle, $\alpha = 0.68 \alpha_{max}$, and the length magnification, l/w = 2.65 gave the best hydraulic performance among other labyrinth weir plan forms which were tested in this study. The effect of varying the crest width was also investigated in this study. This part of the study focused on the trapezoidal shape. It was shown that increasing the width of the crest up to 10 mm (in this case 10% of weir height, P) was not significant in decreasing the flow despite some frictional losses on the crest. Such a crest is useful when a river has a large quantity of debris.

The economic advantages of labyrinth weirs were also studied with reference to the Ciwadas trapezoidal labyrinth weir which was constructed in Indonesia in 1988. This labyrinth weir was designed to handle the flood flows of 200 m³/s and control water depths between 1.6 m and 2.35 m. Comparison with a typical weir with gate shows that this labyrinth weir was more than 25% less expensive.

A computer code for analytical studies was also established. It was shown that for trapezoidal plan forms, a good agreement between theoretical results and experimental data could be achieved. This also confirms the previous theoretical solution proposed by Hay and Taylor although there is a little difference (0.1) in defining the value of the energy loss coefficient (contraction) at the entry to the weir.

Acknowledgements

It is my very pleasant duty to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Professor DR. J.J. Sharp, for his continual reinforcement, patience, very valuable advice and comment, and guidance in preparing this thesis and conducting the laboratory experiment.

I am also thankful to DR. L.M. Lye, for his very useful advice in preparing the Chapter 2 of my thesis.

The writer wish to express his thanks to DR. N. Hay of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Nottingham for sending me the details of computer program of the theoretical solution of DR. Taylor's thesis.

The writer would like to acknowledge the financial support of the Government of Canada which is administired by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). A part of the model test facility was financed by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) to DR. J.J. Sharp. This assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

I gratefully acknowledge to the M=nistry of Public Works of the Republic of Indonesia and to the Memorial University of Newfoundland for providing the opportunity to study in Canada. The author wish to thank Mr. J. Andrews, Mr. S. Foster, and technical services staff of Faculty of Engineering for their help in the construction of the experimental apparatus. I am also indebted to Mr. D. Sparks of the Hydraulic Laboratory of Faculty of Engineering for his assistance during the experimental works in the laboratory.

Finally, I am much indebted to my wife, Evalina S.M. Pasaribu, and my parents, Mr. & Mrs. A.M. Sitompul, and Mr. & Mrs. A.S. Pasaribu for their patience and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xiv
List of Symbols	xx
Chapter 1 Introduction	
1.1. Weirs as control structures	1
1.2. The sharp crested labyrinth weir	2
1.3. The use of labyrinth weir in Indonesia	4
1.4. The objective of this study	6
Chapter 2 Economic Analysis of a Labyrinth Weir	
2.1. Introduction	10
2.2. The Ciwadas labyrinth weir and barrage description	
2.2.1. Labyrinth Weir	13
2.2.2. Barrage	13
2.3. Cost comparison of barrage and labyrinth weir	
2.3.1. Construction Cost	16
2.3.2. Operation and Maintenance Cost	22
2.4. The prospect of applying the labyrinth weir	26
Chapter 3 Literature Review	
3.1. Labyrinth weirs which have been constructed	29
3.2. N.Hay and G.Taylor experimental and theoretical works	30
3.3. Discussion by Louis A.Darvas	40

3.4. USBR Hydraulic Model Study of Ute Dam Labyrinth	
Spillway	43
3.5. USBR Hydraulic Model Study of Hyrum Dam Auxiliary	
Labyrinth Spillway	47
3.6. J.Cassidy et al. on Hydraulic Model Study of Carty Dam	
Labyrinth Spillway	49
3.7. A.P. Magalhães	50
3.8. Frederick Lux III and David L. Hinchliff	52
3.9. A.Afshar	55
3.10.Indonesian Institute of Hydraulic Engineering (IIHE),	
Bandung-Indonesia experimental works	56
3.11. Tacail et al. on hydraulic model study of South Heart	
Dam Labyrinth Spillway	59
3.12. Discussion	60
Chapter 4 Theoretical Background and Computer Modelling	
4.1. Theoretical background	
4.1.1. The general weir equation	64
4.1.2. Theoretical solution	65
4.2. Dimensional Analysis	73
4.3. Computer Modelling Programme	
4.3.1. An attempt to develop a computer model	79
4.3.2. Spreadsheet work	79
4.3.3. Flow charts	88
4.3.4. QuickBASIC Program	91
4.3.5. Comment on Spreadsheet vs QuickBASIC	93
Chapter 5 Experimental Procedures	
5.1. Weir models	96
5.2. Range of flows required	101
5.3. Size and design of flume	105

5.4. Provision of flow	111
5.5. Flow measurement and depth measurement	
5.5.1. Flow measurement	114
5.5.2. Depth measurement	114
5.6. Calibration works	
5.6.1. Calibration and check on accuracy of the point-gauges	117
5.6.2. Calibration of rotameter	119
5.6.3. Calibration of the V-notch weir	120
5.7. Experiments	
5.7.1. A typical experiment	123
5.7.2. Model test data	125
5.7.3. The range of the Froude and Reynolds number in the	
model test	126
Chapter 6 Results and Discussion	
6.1. The linear weir (model no.6)	128
6.2. The trapezoidal labyrinth weirs (model no.1, 1a, 2, and 3)	
6.2.1. Coefficient of discharge	130
6.2.2. Scale errors	132
6.2.3. Effect of changing the side wall angle (α)	133
6.2.4. Effect of varying the crest height (P)	134
6.2.5. Discussion	135
6.3. The rectangular labyrinth weir (model no.4, Figure 5-1)	
6.3.1. The discharge coefficient (Cd)	135
6.3.2. The flow magnification	136
6.3.3. The water surface profile	137
6.4. The rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection	
(model no.5, Figure 5-1)	
6.4.1. The discharge coefficient, C _d	138
6.4.2. Tue flow magnification	139

6.4.3.	The water surface profile	140
6.5. The rev	verse trapezoidal shapes (model no.7 and no.8,	
Figure	5-2)	
6.5.1.	The discharge coefficient	143
6.5.2.	The flow magnification	144
6.5.3.	Water surface profile	144
6.6. Compar	rison between model no.1, 4, and 5	148
6.7. The tra	pezoidal shapes with different crest widths	
(model	no.1b, 1c, 1d, and 1e)	
6.7.1.	The discharge coefficient	150
6.7.2.	The flow magnification	150
6.7.3. 1	Discussion	151
6.8. General	discussion	152
Chapter 7 Con	clusions and Recommendation	
7.1. Conclus	sions	154
7.2. Recomm	nendation	156
References		157
Appendix A	Input and output of spreadsheet	162
Appendix B	Listing of QuickBASIC program	171
Appendix C	Input and output of QuickBASIC	
	program	177
Appendix D	Experimental data of all weir models	179
Appendix E		211

List of Tables

2.1.	Table of actual construction cost of the labyrinth weir (based on	
	1988 prices and exchange rate of Rp.1650/US \$)	17
2.2.	Table of estimated construction cost of the barrage (based on	
	1988 prices and an exchange rate of Rp.1650/US \$)	18
2.3.	Table of annual cost of the barrage and the labyrinth weir (based	
	on 1988 prices and exchange rate of Rp.1650/US \$)	19
2.4.	Table of estimated annual operation and maintenance cost of the	
	labyr'nth weir (based on 1988 prices and an exchange rate of	
	Rp.1650/US \$)	21
2.5.	Table of estimated annual operation and maintenance cost of the	
	barrage (based on 1988 prices and an exchange rate of	
	Rp.1650/US \$)	22
2.6.	Table of total annual cost of the barrage and the labyrinth weir	
	(based on 1988 prices and an exchange rate of Rp.1650/US \$)	23
3.1.	Existing trapezoidal shape labyrinth weir installations	30
4.1.	Table of computation for the determination of discharge of each	
	section $(Q_L/Q_N = 2.56, H/P = 0.03)$	81
5.1.	Range of flows, Q required in the experiment	104
5.2.	Range of flows for each weir model in the experiment	126
A.1.	Table of computation for the determination of discharge of each	
	section $(Q_L/Q_N = 2.56, H/P = 0.03)$	163

A.2.	Table of computation for the determination of discharge of each	
	section (0 /0 $= 2.53$ H/P $= 0.12$)	164
4.7	Section $(Q_{L}/Q_{N} = 2.55, 117 = 0.12)$	104
A.J.	Table of computation for the determination of discharge of each	
	section $(Q_L/Q_N = 2.49, H/P = 0.19)$	165
A.4.	Table of computation for the determination of discharge of each	
	section $(Q_1/Q_N = 2.45, H/P = 0.26)$	166
A.5.	Table of computation for the determination of discharge of each	
	section $(Q_L/Q_N = 2.40, H/P = 0.33)$	167
A.6.	Table of computation for the determination of discharge of each	
	section $(Q_L/Q_N = 2.34, H/P = 0.42)$	168
A.7.	Table of computation for the determination of discharge of each	
	section $(Q_L/Q_N = 2.27, H/P = 0.53)$	169
A.8.	Table of computation for the determination of discharge of each	
	section ($Q_L/Q_N = 2.24$, H/P = 0.58)	170
D.1.	Experimental data of model no.1 (see Figure 5-1)	183
D.2.	Experimental data of model no.2 (see Figure 5-1)	184
D.3.	Experimental data of model no.3 (see Figure 5-1)	185
D.4.	Experimental data of model no.4 (see Figure 5-1)	186
D.5.	Experimental data of model no.5 (see Figure 5-1)	187
D.6.	Experimental data of model no.6 (see Figure 5-2)	188
D.7.	Experimental data of model no.7 (see Figure 5-2)	189
D.8.	Experimental data of model no.8 (see Figure 5-2)	190
D.9.	Experimental data of model no.1a (see Figure 5-2)	191
D.10.	Experimental data of model no.1b (see Figure 5-3)	192
D.11.	Experimental data of model no.1c (see Figure 5-3)	193
D.12.	Experimental data of model no.1d (see Figure 5-3)	194
D.13.	Experimental data of model no.1e (see Figure 5-3)	195
D 14	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	

	rectangular plan form, mode! no.4 (see Figure 5-1), H/P = 0.41	
	$Q_L/Q_N = 2.64$	196
D.15.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	rectangular plan form, model no.4 (see Figure 5-1), $H/P = 0.48$	
	$Q_L/Q_N = 2.48$	197
D.16.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	rectangular plan form, model no.4 (see Figure 5-1), $H/P = 0.56$	
	$Q_L/Q_N = 2.33$	198
D.17.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection, model	
	no.5 (see Figure 5-1), H/P = 0.48, Q_L/Q_N = 2.52	199
D.18.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection, model	
	no.5 (see Figure 5-1), H/P = 0.51, $Q_L/Q_N = 2.46$	200
D.19.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection, model	
	no.5 (see Figure 5-1), H/P = 0.59, $Q_L/Q_N = 2.34$	201
D.20.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.7 (see Figure 5-2),	
	$H/P = 0.43, Q_L/Q_N = 1.76$	202
D.21.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.7 (see Figure 5-2),	
	$H/P = 0.50, Q_L/Q_N = 1.69$	203
D.22.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.7 (see Figure 5-2),	
	$H/P = 0.57, Q_L/Q_N = 1.58$	204
D.23.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.8 (see Figure 5-2),	
	$H/P = 0.43, Q_L/Q_N = 1.79$	205

D.24.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.8 (see Figure 5-2),	
	$H/P = 0.50, Q_L/Q_N = 1.69$	206
D.25.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.8 (see Figure 5-2),	
	$H/P = 0.57, Q_t/Q_N = 1.59$	207
D.26.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line between two	
	cycles on rectangular plan form, model no.4 (see Figure 5-1),	
	$H/P = 0.41, Q_L/Q_N = 2.64$	208
D.27.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line between two	
	cycles on reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.7 (see Figure	
	5-2), H/P = 0.57, Q _L /Q _N = 1.58	209
D.28.	Depth profile data taken along the centre line between two	
	cycles on reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.8 (see Figure	
	5-2), H/P = 0.57, $Q_t/Q_N = 1.59$	210

٩

List of Figures

1-1.	A straight weir	3
1-2.	A barrage	3
1-3.	A typical 4 cycle trapezoidal shape labyrinth weir	5
1-4.	A stage-discharge (Q-H) relationship of the weirs	5
1-5.	Location of the labyrinth weirs	6
1-6.	A combination of rectangular and half circle plan form	7
1-7.	Flow description over the rectangular shape labyrinth weir at	
	high flows	8
1-8.	A reverse trapezoidal plan form	9
2-1.	A description of two alternatives, barrage and labyrinth weir	12
2-2.	A situation of Ciwadas labyrinth weir	14
2-3.	A plan of Ciwadas labyrinth weir	15
2-4.	A close up of Ciwadas labyrinth weir	28
2-5.	An upstream view of Ciwadas labyrinth weir	28
3-1.	Diagram indicating the notation used in Hay and Taylor	
	experimental and theoretical works	31
3-2.	Hay and Taylor design chart for triangular plan form labyrinth	
	weirs constructed without aprons, w/P≥2.5, with downstream	
	interference (zero change in bed elevation), side wall angle,	
	$\alpha = \alpha_{\max}$	34
3-3.	Hay and Taylor design chart for trapezoidal plan form labyrinth	
	weirs constructed without aprons, w/P≥2.0, with downstream	
	interference (zero change in bed elevation), side wall angle.	

	$\alpha = 0.75 \alpha_{max}$	34
3-4.	Sketch illustrating the presence of aprons in both upstream and	
	downstream channel	37
3-5.	Sketch illustrating a decrease in channel bed elevation	38
3-6.	Model crest sections tested in Taylor's experimental work	38
3-7.	A comparison of experimental and theoretical results with	
	energy loss due to contraction of the flow at entry to the upstream	
	channel equal to 0.2 V2/2g in which V is velocity, for triangular	
	plan form labyrinth weirs and no downstream interference	39
3-8.	Darvas design chart for quarter-round crest trapezoidal plan form	
	labyrinth weirs constructed without aprons, $w/P \ge 2$, and side	
	wall angle, $\alpha \ge 0.8 \alpha_{max}$	42
3-9.	Sketch illustrating sharp crest section and quarter-round crest	
	section	43
3-10.	A comparison of USBR and Hay & Taylor design curves for	
	triangular plan form weir, $w/P = 2.5$, side wall angle,	
	$\alpha = \alpha_{max}$, with downstream interference (zero change in bed	
	elevation)	45
3-11.	Splitter pier location and dimensions	46
3-12.	Schematic of the spillway approach condition and labyrinth weir	
	orientation tested in the hydraulic model studies	48
3-13.	Discharge coefficient for quarter-round crest trapezoidal shape	
	labyrinth weirs, constructed without aprons, $w/P \ge 2$, and side	
	angle, $\alpha \ge 0.8 \alpha_{max}$	51
3-14.	Design curves for sharp crest trapezoidal labyrinth weirs	54
3-15.	A comparison of discharge coefficient, CLH between quarter-	
	round crest and sharp crest trapezoidal plan labyrinth weir	55
3-16.	A most suitable geometry of the labyrinth weir	58
3-17.	IIHE design chart for trapezoidal shape labyrinth weirs,	

	$l/w = 2.56$, side wall angle, $\alpha = 14.04^{\circ}$	58
4-1.	Sketch illustrating the notation used in Nimmo's equation	67
4-2.	Flow description over the trapezoidal shape labyrinth weir	68
4-3.	Sketch to illustrate the theoretical analysis of flow over the	
	labyrinth weir	80
4-4.	Flow charts for QuickBASIC program	90
4-5.	A comparison of the output obtained from spreadsheet and Quick	
	BASIC	94
4-6.	Comparison between Hay and Taylor theoretical results and	
	author theoretical results for 3 trapezoidal planform labyrinth	
	weirs with downstream interference (zero change in bed	
	elevation)	95
5-1.	Schematic of the sharp crested labyrinth weir plan forms tested	
	in the flume	97
5-2.	Schematic of the sharp crested weir geometries tested in the	
	flume	100
5-3.	Schematic of the trapezoidal labyrinth weirs with different top	
	width tested in the flume	102
5-4.	Photograph of all weir models	103
5-5.	Initial test in progress	103
5-6.	Photograph of initial testing facility (side view)	100
5-7.	Photograph of initial testing facility (downstream view)	10
5-8.	Photograph of the new testing facility (upstream view)	10
5-9.	Photograph of the new testing facility (downstream view)	10
5-10.	Layout experimental setup	10
5-11.	Side view of experimental setup	10
5-12.	Front view of experimental setup	110

5-13.	Photograph of the flow straightener system	112
5-14.	Photograph of a thin layer of duxseal along the bottom and sides	112
5-15.	Photograph shows the location of depth measuring section	113
5-16.	Photograph of the V-notch weir	113
5-17.	Detail of V-notch weir	115
5-18.	Flow depth measurement at the V-notch weir in progress	116
5-19.	Depth measurement at the weir model in progress	116
5-20.	Sketch to illustrate a calibration of point gauge	118
5-21.	Sketch to illustrate a check on accuracy of point gauge using	
	manometer	118
5-22.	The discharge-depth (Q-H) relationship at the V-notch weir	
	measured by point gauge and vertical manometer	119
5-23.	The calibration test result of rotameter	120
5-24.	Calibration of the rotameter in progress	121
5-25.	Calibration of the V-notch weir in progress	121
5-26.	The discharge-depth (Q-H) relationship at the V-notch weir, a	
	comparison of measured and predicted by Q = 15.21 $H^{1.5}$	122
5-27.	Measurement sections of depth, H	124
5-28.	Measurement sections to obtain the water surface profile	125
6-1.	Comparison of theoretical and experimental results of discharge	
	coefficient, C4 vs H/P of the straight weir (model no.6)	130
6-2.	Comparison of theoretical and experimental results of discharge	
	coefficient, C_d vs H/P of models no.1, 2, and 3 (Figure 5-1)	
	and model no.1a (Figure 5-2)	131
6-3.	Comparison of flow magnification between model no.1 and	
	model no.2 which have different sizes	132
6-4.	Comparison of flow magnification between model no.1 and	
	model no.3 with different value of the side wall angle (α) and	

	the length magnification (L/W)	133
6-5.	Comparison of flow magnification between model no.1 and	
	model no.1a with different value of the weir height (P)	134
6-6.	Comparison of theoretical and experimental results of discharge	
	coefficient, C _d vs H/P of model no.4 (rectangular shaped	
	labyrinth weir, two-cycle)	136
6-7.	The flow magnification at rectangular shape labyrinth weir	
	(model no.4, Figure 5-1), both experimental and theoretical	
	values	137
6-8.	Water surface profile along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	rectangular plan form labyrinth weir (model no.4, Figure 5-1)	138
6-9.	Comparison of theoretical and experimental results of discharge	
	coefficient, $C_{\rm d}$ vs H/P of model no.5 (rectangular geometry with	
	a semi-circular connection, two-cycle labyrinth weir)	139
6-10.	The flow magnification data at rectangular geometry with a	
	semi-circular connection, two-cycle labyrinth weir (model no.5,	
	Figure 5-1), both experimental and computed results	140
6-11.	Water surface profile along the centre line of one-cycle on	
	rectangular plan form with a semi-circular connection, two-cycle	
	labyrinth weir (model no.5, Figure 5-1)	141
6-12.	Water surface profiles at model no.4 and model no.5	142
6-13.	Water surface profiles at model no.4 and model no.5	142
6-14.	Comparison of discharge coefficient, C_d , between model no.7	
	and model no.8	143
6-15.	Comparison of flow magnification-depth to crest height ratio	
	relationship between model no.7 and model no.8	144
6-16.	Water surface profile at model no.7	145
6-17.	Water surface profile at model no.8	145
6-18.	A comparison of water surface profile at models no.4, 7, and 8	

	along the centre line of one-cycle (most on upstream channel)	147
6-19.	A comparison of water surface profile at models no.4, 7, and 8	
	along the centre line between two cycles (most on downstream	
	channel)	147
6-20.	Comparison of stage-discharge relationship at models no.1,	
	no.4, and no.5	148
6-21.	Comparison of flow magnification-depth to crest height ratio	
	relationship at models no.1, no.4, and no.5	149
6-22.	Comparison of discharge coefficient amongst model no.1b, 1c,	
	1d, and 1e with 7 mm, 10 mm, 15 mm, and 20 mm top width	
	respectively	151
6-23.	Comparison of the flow magnification amongst model no.1b, 1c,	
	1d, and 1e with 7 mm, 10 mm, 15 mm, and 20 mm top width	
	respectively	152
E-1.	A comparison of the flow magnification values plotting with H/P	
	and H _o /P for model no.1 (trapezoidal shape, two-cycle-see	
	Figure 5-1)	212
E-2.	A comparison of the flow magnification values plotting with H/P	
	and H./P for model no.4 (rectangular shape, two-cycle-see	
	Figure 5-1)	213
E-3.	A comparison of the flow magnification values plotting with H/P	
	and H./P for model no.5 (rectangular shape with a semi-circular	
	connection, two-cycle-see Figure 5-1)	214
	, ,	

List of Symbols

Description	Dimensions
a half length of tip sections of labyrinth weir normal	
to the main flow direction	L
the area of the cross section of flow	L ²
the length of one side wall of labyrinth weir	L
discharge coefficient of a weir	-
discharge coefficient of a labyrinth weir proposed by	
Lux and Hinchliff	-
the coefficient of energy loss due to sudden contraction	10
discharge coefficient of a labyrinth weir proposed by	
Darvas	-
water surface elevation relative to crest	L
the acceleration due to gravity	LT ⁻²
the flow depth	L
the velocity head, V2/2g	L
the total head, H + H _v	L
the ratio of the flow depth over the weir crest to the	
height of the weir	-
the ratio of the total head over the weir crest to the	
height of the weir	
the developed crest length of one-cycle labyrinth weir	L
the length magnification, a ratio of length of one-cycle	
labyrinth weir to the length of corresponding presumptiv	/e
	Description a half length of tip sections of labyrinth weir normal to the main flow direction the area of the cross section of flow the length of one side wall of labyrinth weir discharge coefficient of a weir discharge coefficient of a labyrinth weir proposed by Lux and Hinchliff the coefficient of energy loss due to sudden contraction discharge coefficient of a labyrinth weir proposed by Darvas water surface elevation relative to crest the acceleration due to gravity the flow depth the velocity head, $\sqrt{t}/2g$ the total head, $H + H_{c}$ the ratio of the flow depth over the weir crest to the height of the weir the developed crest length of one-cycle labyrinth weir the length magnification, a ratio of length of one-cycle labyrinth weir to the length of one-cycle

	straight weir	-
L	the total developed crest length of a labyrinth weir	
	regardless the number of cycle	L
L/W	the length magnification, a ratio of length of the labyrint	h
	weir to the length of corresponding presumptive straight	
	weir regardless the number of weir cycle	-
n	the number of labyrinth weir cycles in plan	-
Р	the height of the weir	L
Q _L	the total flow over one-cycle labyrinth weir	L3T-1
QTL	the experimental total flowrate at the labyrinth weir	
	regardless of the number of cycles	L3T-1
Q _{TN}	the theoretical flowrate at the presumptive straight	
	weir, calculated on the basis of full channel width	L3T-1
Q_N	the total flow over a straight weir with a crest length	
	equal to the channel width of one-cycle	$L^{3}T^{-1}$
Q_L/Q_N	the flow magnification, a ratio of discharge over a sharp	
	crested labyrinth weir to the discharge over a sharp	
	crested presumptive straight weir	-
O+M	operation and maintenance	÷
Sch	the slope of the channel bed between the sections	-
Saw	the slope of side wall	
Sr	the friction slope between the sections	
S.	the slope of the river bed	-
w	the width of one-cycle of labyrinth weir	L
w/P	the vertical aspect ratio, a ratio of the width of one-cycle	1
	of the labyrinth weir to the height of the labyrinth weir	
W	the total width of a labyrinth weir regardless the number	
	of cycle	L
х	the transverse distance along the channel	L
α	the angle of the side wall of the labyrinth weir to the	

main direction of the flow	-
the energy coefficient	-
discharge coefficient of a labyrinth weir proposed by	
Magalhães	-
viscosity	L2T1
density of water	ML-
surface tension	MT ⁻²
	main direction of the flow the energy coefficient discharge coefficient of a labyrinth weir proposed by Magalhäes viscosity density of water surface iension

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Weirs as control structures

Weirs are constructed to increase water levels by the effect of the backwater They can also be used to change the distribution of a river's discharge through its branches, and to provide suitable conditions for recreation and fisheries, etc. In addition to this, weirs are also utilized to pass the flood flows by allowing water to overtop. Raising the water level of a river allows water to enter the intake of an irrigation system, as well as the intake of a domestic or industrial water supply.

Straight weirs and barrages are two types of control structures which have wide application in irrigation systems. Although the purpose of both is to increase water levels, straight weirs differ from barrages in structure. A straight weir is built to maintain satisfactory water levels behind the weir. When the flood occurs, the water is allowed to flow over the crest and a gate is not provided (Figure 1-1). A barrage, consisting of a weir with an undershot gate, is usually built on the flatland area of a river where the ratio of maximum flow to minimum flow is quite high. A small, unrestricted, weir is provided to pass the maximum flow without excessive increase in depth. However water elevations are likely to be too low with the unrestricted weir at low flows and a gate is therefore provided (Figure 1-2). This can be closed as the flow reduces to ensure satisfactory water levels at all flows between minimum and maximum.

1.2. The sharp crested labyrinth weir

The sharp created labyrinth weir performs the same function as a barrage in the sense that an acceptable minimum elevation is maintained at low flows without having excessively high elevations at large flows. However no gate is required and, unlike a straight weir, a labyrinth weir is distinguished by the plan shape. The geometric design is not linear. Rather it is varied by using a repeating plan form (see Figure 1-3). As a result, the weir will consist of a number of cycles. Hence, the water flow is presented with a greater length of crest as compared with a straight weir occupying the same space. Because the crest length of a labyrinth weir is significantly longer than that of a straight weir, the discharge for a given operating head is significantly increased.

The development of labyrinth weirs has been supported by these following advantages :

a). Due to the increase in the crest length, it provides a lower operating head than a conventional weir. Thus, the inundation area can be decreased.

b). In case of a sudden change in the flow magnitude the fluctuation of water surface elevations can be reduced since this weir is suited for use where the ratio of flow



Figure 1-1 A straight weir After Slagter (1975).



Figure 1-2 A barrage After Slagter (1975).

maximum to minimum is quite high (see Figure 1-4).

c). The energy of the flow is partially dissipated by the interaction of the flows from adjacent cycles (see Figure 1-3). Therefore a simpler stilling basin floor can be designed. As a result, the costs of the stilling basin are reduced.

d). If the labyrinth weir is made of reinforced concrete, it will be a lighter structure than a conventional weir which is usually a massive structure. Consequently, a simpler foundation of the structure can be designed even though the bottom soils are poor.
e). Finally, it can be shown (see Chapter 2) that the labyrinth weir is more economical than a barrage.

1.3. The use of labyrinth weir in Indonesia

The Ciwadas labyrinth weir was the first, and is currently the only, labyrinth weir constructed in Indonesia. It is situated at Karawang, West Jawa, 300 km east of Jakarta, capital city of Indonesia, an area known for its shrimp products. Construction on the labyrinth weir began on November 27, 1987, and was completed on October 6, 1988, before the contract completion date on March 3, 1989. The contractor was P.T. Hutama Karya of Jakarta, Indonesia. The primary purpose of the weir is to provide 12 m¹/s freshwater for a shrimp pond area. For that purpose 1.6 m elevation of water is required by the intake. This reinforced concrete weir is able to pass the 50 year return period design flood of 200 m¹/s at a water surface elevation of 2.35 m.

Besides the Ciwadas weir, five other weirs have been designed but construction is currently on hold. These are, the Maloso Weir in South Sulawesi, Batanghari Weir in



Figure 1-3 A typical 4 cycle trapezoidal shape labyrinth weir



Figure 1-4 A stage-discharge (Q-H) relationship of the weirs

West Sumatra, Tami Weir in Irian Jaya, Ubrug Weir ,and Karedok Weir in West Jawa. Figure 1-5 shows the location of these labyrinth weirs. This study was designed to enhance the understanding, and therefore the further development, of labyrinth weirs in Indonesia.



FIGURE 1-5 Location of the labyrinth weirs

1.4. The objective of this study

There are several objectives of the present study. The first is to check previous experimental data of the hydraulic model studies of labyrinth weirs which have been done by other researchers. The second is to consider and examine the combination of rectangular and half circle plan form as an alternative geometry (see Figure 1-6). A third is to study the effect of variation in crest width for the trapezoidal plan form. All of these were based on experimental work. A further objective was to develop a spreadsheet analysis to provide an analytical solution of the flow over the labyrinth weir crest.

These original objectives were modified during the experimental work because of some initial findings. When a rectangular plan form was investigated at high flows, an undular jump was found to occurr over the crest (see Figure 1-7). This was thought to be due to blocking of the downstream flow. Therefore, a reverse trapezoidal plan form which increased the blocking was used to study this phenomenon (see Figure 1-8). It was also found that the spreadsheet analytical solution was cumbersome and time consuming and a computer program model was then developed in QuickBASIC to rectify the spreadsheet one.



Figure 1-6 A combination of rectangular and half circle plan form



Figure 1-7 Flow description over the rectangular shape labyrinth weir at high flows


Figure 1-8 A reverse trapezoidal plan form

Chapter 2

Economic Analysis of a Labyrinth Weir

2.1. Introduction

Indonesia, the fifth most populous country in the world, has a population which is estimated to rise to not less than 196 million people by the end of 1995 (World Bank, 1990). According to a ministerial report (Indonesian Ministry of Transmigration, 1988), more than 80 percent of the people are dependent on agriculture. Water resources development and irrigation programmes therefore play an important role in improving the quality of life through a better income distribution and by helping the poor farmer. The important role of irrigation in increasing rice production is undoubted and was proved by the achievement of self sufficiency in rice production in 1984.

In 1985 the Ciwadas project was launched in accordance with planning and programming of water resources development to promote fish and shrimp cultivation through irrigation programmes. The project is situated at the Ciwadas River, Karawang, West Java, in the lowlands of Java, where the bulk of the rice is grown. Total annual rainfall varies from about 1500 mm up to about 2500 mm (Water Resources Development, 1988). The rainy season, during which 70 percent of the rainfall occurs, extends from September to March (West monsoon) and the dry season from April to August (East monsoon) (Water Resources Development, 1988). This amount of rainfall is usually insufficient to grow a wet season crop. The onset of rains is sometimes delayed and much of the rainfall occurs in high intensity storms.

The Ciwadas River is situated on a flatland area with an average river bed slope of 4.84x10⁴. Fifty years of flow records on the Ciwadas River show that the maximum discharge was 196.25 m³/s whereas the minimum was 4.15 m³/s. Thus, the ratio of maximum to minimum flow is high (47.30). This is a typical value in most rivers in Indonesia (average value is in excess of 40). Based on those situations, it was decided that a barrage was the best structure to offer maximum water level control in these topographical and hydrological conditions. With a barrage, the water level behind the weir could be controlled at both low flows and high flows (Hutama Karya, 1985). However due to expensive construction costs, this alternative was not approved by the project steering committee.

An optimization cost analysis was carried out using a labyrinth weir as a second alternative because this weir results in a lower maximum water level than that of a conventional weir. From the analysis, it was estimated that the labyrinth weir could reduce the construction costs by 50 percent (Hutama Karya, 1985) and the labyrinth weir was therefore adopted in this project. As shown in Table 2.6, this estimate was, perhaps, too optimistic. The two alternative descriptions are displayed in Figure 2-1.



ALTERNATIVE 1 : A BARRAGE



Figure 2-1 A description of two alternatives, barrage and labyrinth weir

A detailed economic analysis of a labyrinth weir is presented here to demonstrate the benefits of using this type of weir. Due to the availability of the Ciwadas project data, the Ciwadas labyrinth weir was selected as a study case.

2.2. The Ciwadas labyrinth weir and barrage description

2.2.1. Labyrinth Weir

The Ciwadas Labyrinth Weir was completed in 1988. As constructed the weir consists of seven cycles with a total crest length of 176.60 m within a river width of 61.00 m and has repeated, symmetrical trapezoidal shapes (Figure 2-2 and Figure 2-3). It is constructed of reinforced concrete with a crest width of 0.30 m and a crest height of 1.60 m. After the completion of this project, it became possible to provide freshwater for 600 ha of shrimp ponds by gravitational irrigation. The freshwater is conveyed by the primary freshwater channel and is distributed to two secondary channels through a distribution structure. Then, the freshwater is conveyed to several ponds where freshwater and seawater are mixed.

2.2.2. Barrage

Based on a 50 year return period, a design flood of 200 m³/s and 1.6 m minimum water elevation required by the intake, were used to design the dimensions of the alternative system. Design calculations (Hutama Karya, 1985) showed that a 1.00 m height of unrestricted weir and 10 radial gates were required. Each gate would be 5.00 m wide and 1.00 m high (Figure 2-1).



Figure 2-2 A situation of Ciwadas labyrinth weir After Hutama Karya (1989).



Figure 2-3 A plan of Ciwadas labyrinth weir After Hutama Karya (1989).

15

.....

2.3. Cost comparison of barrage and labyrinth weir

In this analysis, costs are defined in two ways. The first is in terms of construction costs while the second is in terms of operation and maintenance costs.

2.3.1. Construction Cost

The analysis of construction costs is broken into two parts. The first is for the labyrinth weir, and the second is for the barrage. The costs of two sluice gates (2.36 m x 1.75 m and 2.36 m x 2.35 m) for sediment flushing, removal of the existing weir, trash racks, an access road, lighting for works, a diversion channel, a cofferdam, dewatering, and a bridge for works were excluded from each analysis, because all of these were required both by a labyrinth weir and by a barrage. The contractor's report (Hutama Karya, 1989) showed that the actual construction costs for those works was US \$ 377,094 (based on 1988 prices and an exchange rate of Rp. 1650/US \$).

Both designs would require dykes to be constructed upstream. These would be located on either side of the river and would protect the surrounding land against flooding at the higher water levels. However both alternatives were designed for the same maximum water level. The dykes required by the labyrinth weir and the barrage would therefore be of the same size. Design calculations (Hutama Karya, 1985) showed that a 3.00 m height and 2500 m length of dykes were required. The cross section of the dykes was trapezoidal with 2.00 m top width and 6.00 m base width for both alternatives. Costs would therefore be the same and dyke costs are therefore not given in this analysis. The contractor's report (Hutama Karya, 1989) showed that the actual construction costs for a dyke was US \$ 88,712 (based on 1988 prices and an exchange rate of Rp.1650/US \$).

The labyrinth weir

Details of actual construction costs incurred by the labyrinth weir are listed in Table 2.1. The unit, number of units, unit price, and total costs were all taken from the contractor's final report (Hutama Karya, 1989). 'Extras', given in row 15 Table 2.1, refers to the costs discussed above. As shown in Table 2.1 the total specific cost of a labyrinth weir was US \$ 659,432.36. When the extra costs noted above are added the real total cost of a labyrinth weir becomes US \$ 1,036,527. Dyke costs would be in addition to this amount.

The barrage

The initial design report (Hutama Karya, 1985) which compared capital costs of a barrage with a labyrinth weir did not give detailed costs of the barrage. Total costs of a barrage were estimated without detailing the number of units and unit prices of each item of works. Instead of accepting these total costs, it was decided to attempt a more accurate estimate of unit numbers and unit prices. Therefore the design of the New Rentang barrage in Cimanuk River, West Java (Puslitbang Pengairan, 1973) was used as a reference to estimate the number of unit costs and some of the unit prices of a barrage. The numbers of units of each item of work were estimated by adjusting according to the dimensions of the Ciwadas barrage relative to that of the New Rentang barrage. These are shown as items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15 and 16 in Table 2.2. Some of the unit prices were taken from the final report of contractor (Hutama Karya, 1989) since some of the barrage works were also required for the labyrinth weir works, such as items 1, 6, 8, 14 and 15 in Table 2.2. The remaining unit prices, for items 2, 3, 5, 7, 13 and 16, were taken from the design of the New Rentang barrage (Puslitbang Pengairan, 1973) with an adjustment made to transfer from 1972 prices to 1988 prices.

The number of units and unit prices of items 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12 in Table 2.2 were estimated in consultation with the staff of P.T. Barata, an Indonesian metal works company (Wibowo, personal communication, 1993).

Estimated construction costs are displayed in Table 2.2. 'Extras', given in row 17 Table 2.2 again refer to the costs discussed in Section 2.3.1. As can be seen from Table 2.2 the total estimated cost required only by a barrage is US \$ 826,827.68. If the extra costs detailed earlier are added the total estimated cost of a barrage becomes US \$ 1,203,922. Dyke costs are again additional to this amount. The design calculation (Hutama Karya, 1985) estimated the total construction costs of a barrage at US \$ 1,607,818 which is about 34 percent higher than author's estimation. Presumably this difference is because the contractor over-estimated the number of units in some works. It is considered that the estimate given here is more accurate since it is based on actual construction costs at another barrage which has been constructed in a similar area.

Discussion

As can be seen from Table 2.1 and Table 2.2 the capital costs of a labyrinth weir and a barrage are US \$ 1,036,527 and US \$ 1,203,922 respectively. Thus the capital cost of the barrage is about 20 percent higher than that of the labyrinth weir. This assumes that both alternatives have the same life time. However, as shown in Table 2.2, one of the major costs relating to the construction is the cost of the gate and its facilities (items 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12) which amounts to US \$ 362,341. This is approximately 30 percent of the cost of the barrage. These items are not required for the labyrinth weir. Whereas the labyrinth weir is comprised entirely of civil works (with the assumption of a life time of 50 years), part of the barrage (the gates and power equipment) is mechanical works with a life time of only 25 years (Lye, 1992). Therefore, the different life time should be taken into account, by reducing both capital costs to an annual cost of debt repayments.

The annual capital cost

In this calculation the capital costs of the barrage will be broken into two parts. Part one deals with the civil works, and part two deals with mechanical works. The total cost of these mechanical works, items 9, 11, and 12 in Table 2.2 is US \$ 293,347. If the total costs for mechanical works are subtracted from the total then the estimated cost of the civil works of the barrage becomes US \$ 910,575. The annual cost of both alternatives at different interest rates has been obtained and displayed in Table 2.3. As shown in Table 2.3, the cost ratio tends to decrease as the interest rate increases. It is likely that the difference of annual capital cost between both alternatives is significant at lower interest rates (<8%).

TABLE 2.1
Table of actual construction cost of the labyrinth weir
(Based on 1988 prices and exchange rate of Rp. 1650/US \$)

				_				
No.	Item.	Unit	No. of units	Unit Price	Total (US\$)			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(US \$) (5)	(6)			
THE LABYRINTH WEIR								
	L = 176.6 m, W = 61 m, P = 1.6 m							
1.	Structure excavation works	m³	23,892.00	5.43	129,733.56			
2.	Soil improvement	m	3,764.00	13.19	49,647.16			
3.	Wooden sheetpile works, constructing from circular piles 8 cm diameter and 5 m long.	no.	46,446.00	1.87	86,854.02			
4.	Concrete works, 1:3:5 cement/sand/gravel mix	m3	654.00	40.98	26,800.92			
5.	Concrete works, 1:2:1 cement/sand/gravel mix	m3	1,632.00	85.13	138,932.16			
6.	Steel used as reinforcement	kg	237,755.00	0.39	92,724.45			
7.	Wooden sheetpile for foundation, constructing from circular piles 10 cm diameter and 5 m long.	no.	2,875.00	2.85	8,193.75			
8.	Masonary works for the flank walls, with 1:4 cement/sand mix as a filler material; stone 30 cm in diameter	m3	596.00	31.72	18,905.12			
9.	Finishing mortar, -1:2 cement/sand mix	m²	831.00	1.31	1088.61			
10.	Finishing mortar, -1:3 cement/sand mix	m²	174.00	1.40	243.60			
11.	Rip-rap; stone, diameter = 30 cm	m3	686.00	30.15	20,682.90			
12.	Backfill without compaction	m3	5,910.00	1.43	8,451.30			
13.	Bamboo weave wall	m	49.00	1.53	74.97			
14.	Excavation of mud	m³	16,096.00	4.79	77,099.84			
			Sub Total		659,432.36			
15.	Extra costs	-		-	377,094.00			
			Total		1,036,527			

Note : L = crest length; W = river's width; P = crest height Source : Hutama Karya, 1989.

No.	Item	Unit	No. of units	Unit Price (US \$)	Total (US\$)		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		
	THE BARRAGE						
	W = 61.00 m, P = 1.00 m						
1.	Main structure excavation	m ³	26285.00	5.43	142727.55		
2.	Steel sheetpile cut-off	m ²	1220.00	53.24	64952.80		
3.	Concrete in the stilling basin floor, 1:2:3 cement/sand/gravel mix	m,	762.50	55.66	42440.75		
4.	Concrete in the piers, and the slabs -1:2:2 cement/sand/gravel mix	m3	536.25	70.85	37993.31		
5.	Concrete in the main weir, -1:2:2 cement/sand/gravel mix	m3	468.75	70.85	33210.94		
6.	Concrete in the bridge docks, 1:2:1 cement/sand/gravel mix,(61x8x0.3)m ³	m3	146.40	85.13	12463.03		
7.	Backfill & Compaction	m	4920.00	1.95	9594.00		
8.	Masonary works	m³	1260.00	31.72	39967.20		
9.	The equipment to operate the 10 radial gates	no.	10.00	12130.0	121300.00		
10.	Housing for control and operation of 10 radial gates	по.	10.00	3100.00	31000.00		
11.	(a) 10 radial gates: 5 m x 1 m	kg	22530.00	4.55	102511.50		
	(b) 10 gate hoists	kg	11265.00	6.09	68603.85		
12.	Synthetic rubber waterstop	m	75.00	12.42	931.50		
13.	Handrails	m	226.00	28.93	6538.18		
14.	Excavation of mud	m³	17705.60	4.79	84809.82		
15.	Rip-rap; stone, diameter = 30 cm	m³	823.50	30.15	24828.55		
16.	Filter-materials	an ³	381.25	7.75	2954.70		
	Sub Total						
17.	Extra costs			-	377094.00		
			Total		1,203,922		

TABLE 2.2 Table of estimated construction cost of the barrage (Based on 1988 prices and an exchange rate of Rp.1650/US \$)

TABLE 2.2 (continued)

Note : W = crest length; P = crest height

: Unit prices were taken from Hutama Karya, 1989 & Puslitbang Pengairan, 1973, and No. of units were calculated as indicated in text.

TABLE 2.3

Table of annual cost of the barrage and the labyrinth weir (Based on 1988 prices and exchange rate of Rp.1650/US \$)

Inte-	Capital	Annual Cost of	Capital	Annual Cort of	Annual	Annual	Cost
rate	Factor	Mechani-	Factor	Civil	of	of	Ratio
	n = 25	cal	n = 50	Works		a	(b/lw)
(%)	years (Riggs et al., 1986).	Works a barrage (US \$)	years (Riggs et al., 1986).	a barrage (US \$)	a barrage (US \$) (3)+(5)	labyrinth weir (US \$)	(6):(7)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
3	0.05743	16846.92	0.03887	35394.05	52240.97	40289.80	1.30
5	0.07095	20812.97	0.05478	49881.30	70694.27	56780.95	1.25
7	0.08581	25172.11	0.07246	65980.26	91152.37	75106.75	1.21
8	0.09368	27480.75	0.08174	74430.40	101911.15	84725.72	1.20
9	0.10181	29865.66	0.09123	83071.76	112937.42	94562.36	1.19
10	0.11017	32318.04	0.10086	91840.59	124158.63	104544.11	1.19
11	0.11874	34832.02	0.11060	100709.60	135541.62	114639.89	1.18
12	0.12750	37401.74	0.12042	109651.44	147053.18	124818.58	1.18
13	0.13643	40021.33	0.13029	118638.82	158660.15	135049.10	1.17
15	0.15470	45380.78	0.15014	136713.73	182094.51	155624.16	1.17

Note : (3) = (2) * total cost mechanical works of a barrage.

(5) = (4) * total cost civil works of a barrage.

(7) = (4) * total cost of a labyrinth weir.

2.3.2. Operation and Maintenance Cost

Due to the absence of detailed actual costs for operation and maintenance of both

alternatives, it was decided to use the costs for operation and maintenance of a labyrinth

weir given in the contractor's final report (Hutama Karya, 1989). These gave costs for the labyrinth weir directly but needed some interpretation to be used for the barrage.

Labyrinth Weir

Two people are required to operate and maintain the sluice gate (Hutama Karya, 1989). As displayed in Table 2.3, the estimated operation and maintenance costs for the labyrinth weir is only US \$ 5,321. Most of this is for painting, grass cutting and salaries. All of the maintenance works (items 3 to 8) are usually contracted out since these works require many people and are part time in nature.

Barrage

An estimation of annual operation and maintenance costs of a barrage was not prepared by the contractor. All of the estimated unit prices in this analysis were then made with reference to the contractor's final report (Hutama Karya, 1989). This was decided because in general the operation and maintenance works required by a barrage are similar to those for the labyrinth weir except for operating the radial gates.

The number of units required in each item was considered to be the same as those calculated for the labyrinth weir except that it was considered that at least four people would be required to operate 10 radial gates as well as to maintain the sluice gate. In addition, the annual operation cost of the gate and hoist was estimated as 1.5% of the capital cost of gate and hoist (Lye, 1992). As shown in Table 2.4, the estimated cost is US \$ 8,977, which about twice that of the annual costs of operation and maintenance for the labyrinth weir. Most of this is for operation and maintenance of 10 radial gates, salaries, painting and grass cutting.

All of the maintenance works (items 4 to 9) are usually contracted out since these work require many people, and are again part time.

TABLE 2.4

Table of estimated annual operation and maintenance cost of the labyrinth weir (Based on 1988 prices and an exchange rate of Rp.1650/US \$)

No.	Item	Unit	No. of units	Unit Price	Total (US\$)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	THE LABYRINTH WEIR				
	Operation Cost				
1.	Lubrication oil	kg	20.00	3.03	60.60
2.	Personnel cost	no	2.00	544.50	1089.00
	Maintenance Cost				
3.	Painting works	m ²	200.00	9.08	1816.00
4.	Grass cutting	m²	10000.00	0.16	1600.00
5.	Repair of masonary works	m³	5.00	30.25	151.25
6.	Repair of soil works	m	100.00	1.51	151.00
7.	Sediment excavation	m	50.00	3.02	151.00
8.	Debris cleaning	m	100.00	3.02	302.00
			Total		5,320.85

Source : Hutama Karya, 1989.

TABLE 2.5 Table of estimated annual operation and maintenance cost of the barrage (Based on 1988 prices and an exchange rate of Rp.1650/US \$)

No.	Item	Unit	No. of units	Unit Price	Total (US \$)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	THE BARRAGE				
	Operation Cost				
1.	Lubrication oil	kg	20.00	3.03	60.60
2.	Personnel cost	80	4.00 (author's estimation)	544.50	2178.00
3.	Gate & Hoist				2567.00 (Lye, '92)
	Maintenance Cost				
4.	Painting works	m ²	200.00	9.08	1816.00
5.	Grass cutting	m²	10000.00	0.16	1600.00
6.	Repair of masonary works	m ³	5.00	30.25	151.25
7.	Repair of soil works	m ³	100.00	1.51	151.00
8.	Sediment excavation	m)	50.00	3.02	151.00
9.	Debris cleaning	m ³	100.00	3.02	302.00
			Total		8,976.85

Source : Hutama Karya, 1989 except as noted.

Total Annual Cost

Since the annual operation and maintenance cost of each alternative is different, this difference should be taken into account by adding the annual cost to the annual operation and maintenance costs as shown in Table 2.6. Then the cost ratio of each alternative can be computed. As can be seen in Table 2.6, the cost ratio of the barrage to the labyrinth weir varies from 1.19 to 1.34. Again, the labyrinth weir would be a more attractive alternative than the barrage, especially when the interest rate is low. For example, in Indonesia, the interest rate for water resources projects is usually about 7% (Water Resources Development, 1984). At that interest rate the total annual cost of the barrage is US \$ 100,129 and that of the labyrinth weir is US \$ 80,428 (Table 2.6.). The cost ratio of the barrage to the labyrinth weir is thus 1.24.

Interest rate (%) (1)	Annual capital cost of a barrage (US \$) (2)	Total annual cost of a barrage (US \$) (3)	Annual capital cost of a labyrinth weir (US \$) (4)	Total annual cost of a labyrinth weir (US \$) (5)	Cost ratio (b/lw) (3):(5) (6)
3	52240.97	61217.82	40289.80	45610.65	1.34
5	70694.27	79671.12	56780.95	62101.80	1.28
7	91152.37	100129.22	75106.75	80427.60	1.24
8	101911.15	110888.00	84725.72	90046.57	1.23
9	112937.42	121914.27	94562.36	99883.21	1.22
10	124158.63	133135.48	104544.11	109864.96	1.21
11	135541.62	144518.47	114639.89	119960.74	1.20
12	147053.18	156030.03	124818.58	130139.43	1.20
13	158660.15	167637.00	135049.10	140369.95	1.19
15	182094.51	191071.36	155624.16	160945.01	1.19

TABLE 2.6 Table of total annual cost of the barrage and the labyrinth weir (Based on 1988 prices and an exchange rate of Rp.1650/US \$)

Note : (3) = (2) + annual O+M cost of the barrage.

(5) = (4) + annual O+M cost of the labyrinth weir.

2.4. The prospect of applying the labyrinth weir

Table 2.6 showed that the total annual cost of debt repayments ratio of the barrage to a labyrinth weir is between 1.19 and 1.34. On average the labyrinth weir annual cost is about 25 percent lower than that of a barrage. This is less than the 50 percent difference estimated by P.T. Hutama Karya as discussed in Section 2.1. Reasons for the difference were suggested in Section 2.3.1. Thus, it can be said that in situations where funding is the only consideration, the labyrinth weir is a better alternative because it requires a lower cost than a barrage. However, a barrage may be a better political alternative since it can help to develop and support the development of a metal works industry.

As a comparison, on a large project such as the Ute Dam in the United States of America, the United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) estimated the cost for the labyrinth spillway (1984 prices) at US \$ 10 million compared to a gated spillway costed at US \$ 34 million (Hinchliff and Houston, 1984).

In conclusion, the benefits of using a labyrinth weir in a small project such as Ciwadas and in a large project such as Ute Dam are significant and it is likely that the benefits exist over a range of sizes.

Finally, it also can be concluded that a labyrinth weir is the best alternative for Indonesia, and its use should be encouraged in Indonesia due to a number of reasons. These include :

a). It requires a low technology of operation and maintenance.

b). It is easier to build than the barrage.

c). All materials and labour required by a labyrinth weir are available locally.

d). It requires a lower capital cost than that of a barrage as shown in Table 2.6. This capital cost in developing countries such as Indonesia is the main consideration since the funding is usually borrowed.



Figure 2-4 A close up of Ciwadas labyrinth weir



Figure 2-5 An upstream view of Ciwadas labyrinth weir

Chapter 3

Literature Review

The major papers, reports or investigations directly pertaining to labyrinth weirs which have been carried out prior to the current study will be reviewed separately in this chapter. Experimental work is emphasized in this chapter, and details of theoretical work are provided in chapter 4. Before the review of prior works is discussed, it is useful to describe briefly the existing labyrinth weirs which have been installed up to now. At the end of this chapter, a discussion is provided to summarize previous work.

3.1. Labyrinth weirs which have been constructed

Among the geometries of labyrinth weirs, the symmetrical triangular and trapezoidal plan form have been developing since the 1940s. However, the trapezoidal plan is the form most used in many countries, because it is easiest to construct. Table 3.1 presents some trapezoidal planform labyrinth weirs which have been built to date.

No. (1)	Name of Location (2)	Year of completion (3)	n (4)	P (m) (5)	w (m) (6)	1 (m) (7)	Reference (8)
1.	Avon Dam, Sydney New South Wales Australia	1970	10	3.00	13.54	26.46	Darvas, (1971)
2.	Hyrum Dam Hyrum, Utah USA		2	3.66	9.14	45.72	Houston, (1983)
3.	Mercer Dam Dallas, Oregon USA	1972	4	4.57	5.49	17.60	Lux III, and Hinchliff, (1985)
4.	Ute Dam Logan, New Mexico USA	1984	14	9.14	18.29	73.16	Houston, (1982)
5.	Ciwadas Weir Karawang, Jawa Barat Indonesia	1988	7	1.60	7.70	25.00	Hutama Karya, (1989)
6.	South Heart Dam Northern Alberta, Alberta-Canada	1988	2	4.00	11.75	60.20	Tacail et al., (1990)

TABLE 3.1 Existing trapezoidal shape labyrinth weir installations

Note : n = number of cycles; P = crest height; w = width of one-cycle; I = developed crest length.

3.2. N. Hay and G. Taylor experimental and theoretical works

Taylor (1968) performed a series of experiments using various labyrinth weir geometries : trapezoidal, triangular, and rectangular plan forms. Parameters which influenced the labyrinth weir flow and would be examined in the experimental study were determined before the model test was started (see Figure 3-1). These include :

 The flow magnification, Q_L/Q_N, which is the ratio of discharge over a sharp crested labyrinth weir, Q_L, to the discharge over a sharp crested straight weir, Q_N. The flow Q_N was calculated from a standard weir equation (Eq. 4.1) using the experimental values of



Figure 3-1 Diagram indicating the notation used in Hay and Taylor experimental and theoretical works. Modified from Taylor (1968).

H and P corresponding to the value of Q₄. Q₄ was the experimental value of labyrinth weir discharge. This flow magnification will here be used to represent the performance of a labyrinth weir.

 The length magnification, L/W. This is the ratio of length of the labyrinth weir to the length of presumptive straight weir. Alternatively W may be considered as the width of the channel containing the labyrinth weir.

 The flow depth to weir height ratio, H/P, which is the ratio of the flow depth over the weir crest to the height of the labyrinth weir.

 The vertical aspect ratio, w/P, is the ratio of the width of one-cycle of the labyrinth weir to the height of the labyrinth weir.

• The side wall angle, α is the angle of the side wall of the labyrinth weir to the main direction of the flow. Rectangular geometry will result if $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$.

· The number of weir cycles in plan, n.

The domain of Taylor's experiment is briefly described below :

a). The flow depth to crest height ratio (H/P) varied from 0 to 0.5.

b). The length magnification (L/W) ranged from 2 to 8.

c). The vertical aspect ratio (w/P) presented values between 2 and 4.5.

d). The side wall angle (α) tested varied from 0° to 20°.

e). The crest height (P) varied from 12.88 cm to 18.03 cm.

f). The number of weir cycles (n) observed varied from one to three.

They compared the flow over the labyrinth weir with the flow over a presumptive straight weir of a length equal to the total width of the labyrinth weir channel. Values of Q_c/Q_N must always be in excess of 1.0. Half inch thick perspex sheet weir models were set in a test channel 4.9 m long, 0.91 m wide, and 0.36 m high. Developments to the models, such as change in channel bed elevation, presence of aprons, nappe interference, and alternative crest sections were noted.

The results of all model tests were plotted in the form of flow magnification (Q_t/Q_t) against depth to crest height ratio (H/P) for each value of the length magnification (L/W), vertical aspect ratio (w/P), side wall angle (α), and number of weir cycles (n).

From the experimental work, the following general conclusions can be drawn. a). Generally, the flow magnification, Q_L/Q_{st} of all labyrinth weirs tends to decrease as the value of flow depth to crest height ratio increases (Figure 3-2 and Figure 3-3). This is as expected, since at low flow depth the interaction between flow from adjacent cycles is not significant. On the other hand, as the flow depth increases, the interference of the flow from adjacent cycles is serious. As a result the flow capacity of each cycle reduces. Hence the flow magnification decreases. However, in the rectangular plan form, it was found that a small increase in flow magnification value occured at particular points on the curves.

b). As the length magnification increases, the effectiveness of the weir's performance declines. Also, it was observed that the weir behaves best when the value of the length magnification, L/W = 2. This is because at L/W = 2, the labyrinth weir acts almost as a straight or linear weir for which L/W = 1.

c). The effect of the vertical aspect ratio, w/P is not significant in changing the labyrinth



Figure 3-2 Hay and Taylor design chart for triangular plan form labyrinth weirs constructed without aprons, $w/P \ge 2.5$, with downstream interference (zero change in bed elevation), side wall angle, $\alpha = \alpha_{max}$. After Hay and Taylor (1970).



Figure 3-3 Hay and Taylor design chart for trapezoidal plan form labyrinth weirs constructed without aprons, w/P \geq 2.0, with downstream interference (zero change in bed elevation), side wall angle, $\alpha = 0.75 \alpha_{max}$. After Hay and Taylor (1970).

weir's performance if the value of $w/P \ge 2.5$ for a triangular plan form, and if the value of $w/P \ge 2.0$ for trapezoidal geometry.

d). The flow magnification value improves with a rise in the value of α for a given L/W. It was recommended, for maximum performance, that the side wall angle, α should be as large as possible. The maximum value, α_{max} , is the angle produced by a triangular shape.

e). The number of weir cycles, n does not effect the value of QL/QN.

f). The presence of aprons in both upstream and downstream channels (Figure 3-4) decreases the magnitude of the flow magnification.

g). A decrease in channel bed elevation downstream (Figure 3-5) causes a small improvement in performance.

h). An alteration in crest section shape from sharp to semi-circular (Figure 3-6) improves the performance by up to 20 percent compared to that of a sharp crest. This increase occurred under conditions of full aeration when the flow springs free over the total length of the labyrinth weir crest (Tacail *et al.*, 1990).

In addition, Hay and Taylor (1969) developed a computer program to predict the performance of labyrinth weirs. Results from the computation agreed with the results from the model tests with a difference between theoretical and experimental around 4 percent except for a rectangular geometry. One of these comparisons is given in Figure 3-7. The computer model analysis was based on a momentum approach given by Nimmo (Taylor, 1968), and was coded in ALGOL. This computer model was proposed to help designers in pre-design of the labyrinth weir. Details are given in Chapter 4.



on downstream channel bed

Figure 3-4 Sketch illustrating the presence of aprons in both upstream and downstream channel. Modified from Taylor (1968).



(no downstream interference)

Figure 3-5 Sketch illustrating a decrease in channel bed elevation. Modified from Taylor (1968).



Sharp crest section

Semi-circular creat section

Figure 3-6 Model crest sections tested in Taylor's experimental work. Modified from Taylor (1968).



Figure 3-7 A comparison of experimental and theoretical results with energy loss due to contraction of the flow at entry to the upstream channel equal to 0.2 V/2g in which V is velocity, for triangular plan form labyrinth weirs and no downstream interference. After Hay and Taylor (1969).

Due to the better performance of triangular and trapezoidal plan forms compared to rectangular geometry and a close agreement between theoretical and experimental results for both geometries, Taylor recommended the use of triangular and trapezoidal plan forms for the design of a labyrinth weir. Two design charts were provided for triangular ($\alpha = \alpha_{max}$) and trapezoidal ($\alpha = 0.75 \alpha_{max}$) plan form sharp crested labyrinth weirs constructed without aprons as shown previously in Figure 3-2 and 3-3.

3.3. Discussion by Louis A. Darvas

To some extent Darvas (1971) agreed with Hay and Taylor's analysis that parameters L/W, w/P, α , and H/P determined the flow capacity of the labyrinth wcir. However, he criticized the method of presentation which was proposed by Hay and Taylor as an indirect presentation of the performance of the labyrinth weir. In particular he criticized the use of a presumptive linear weir to calculate the flow magnification values. Thus he proposed to simplify the method of calculation by excluding the presumptive linear weir.

As an alternative he promoted a more direct design chart in which a labyrinth weir discharge coefficient, C_w is plotted against the length magnification, L/W for a series of constant values of the flow depth to crest height ratio, H/P. In other words, he preferred to express the efficiency of a labyrinth weir in terms of the discharge coefficient, C_w rather than by flow magnification, Q_t/Q_{rt} as can be seen in Figure 3-8. Then, the labyrinth weir discharge was obtained using (Darvas, 1971) :

$$Q_L = C_V W H^{1.5}$$
(3.1)

where Q_L is the discharge over the labyrinth weir crest in ft³/s, C_w is Darvas⁴ discharge coefficient, W is the total width of the labyrinth weir in ft, and H is the flow depth over the crest of the labyrinth weir in ft.

This design chart was based on three dimensional hydraulic model studies of Avon and Woronora labyrinth weir spillways. These were conducted at the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board (MWS&DB) Hydraulic Laboratory, Sydney, Australia. Darvas showed that the results of these model tests were in close agreement with the results given by Hay and Taylor.

Darvas' tests were carried out under the following conditions :

a). The length magnification (L/W) ranged from 1 to 8.

b). The flow depth to crest height ratio (H/P) covered was from 0.2 to 0.6.

c). The side wall angle (α) was greater than 0.80 times α_{max} .

d). The vertical aspect ratio (w/P) was greater than 2.0.

e). There was free flow over the weir.

f). The shape tested was a trapezoidal plan form with a horizontal channel bed and a quarter of a circle crest (see Figure 3-9).

Darvas only proposed an alternative way of presentating the labyrinth weir's performance rather than further improvement of the labyrinth weir design. Darvas' design chart however can be used in a straightforward manner without knowledge of the flow over the linear weir.



Figure 3-8 Darvas design chart for quarter-round crest trapezoidal plan form labyrinth weirs constructed without aprons, w/P \geq 2, and side wall angle, $\alpha \geq 0.8 \alpha_{max}$. After Darvas (1971).



Figure 3-9 Sketch illustrating sharp crest section and quarter-round crest section. Modified from Houston (1982 and 1983).

3.4. USBR Hydraulic Model Study of Ute Dam Labyrinth Spillway

Along with a hydraulic model study of the Ute Dam Labyrinth Spillway, the United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) reviewed the Hay and Taylor design curve (Houston, 1982). Two points regarding the previous design curve were criticised by them. The first was the use of only 1 depth measurement (H) without consideration of the velocity head ($H_{i} = V^{2}/2g$) when the design curves were developed. The second was the limitation in using these design curves, since they only covered H/P values from 0 to 0.5 (Figure 3-2 and Figure 3-3).

Because of these artiticisms half inch thick and 0.1524 m high aluminum labyrinth weir models were tested in a flume 10.97 m long, 0.76 m wide, and 0.61 m high. The model tests were run for trapezoidal and triangular planform sharp crested labyrinth weirs. The results of all model tests were also plotted in the same way as Hay and Taylor's design curves. Modified design curves were then developed for the value of w/P = 2.5. The Q_t/Q_r and L/W values ranged from 2 to 5, and the H/P values where H, = (H + H_s) were between 0 and 1.0 as shown in Figure 3-10. Because there was a different concept in determining the head values, the bureau design curves have a lower discharge magnification, Q_t/Q_s than Hay and Taylor's design curves at the same value of L/W and H/P. Houston attributed this difference entirely to the difference used in defining the value of H. In Hay and Taylor's work H was taken as the depth of flow above the crest whereas Houston used depth plus velocity head (H_a). These two head concepts were investigated in the present work (see Appendix E) and there was little difference in results.

From the experimental results, Houston also found that the triangular planform was the best geometry and recommended the use of this plan in the design of the labyrinth weir. The reason for this is that the triangular plan gave a slightly higher flow than the trapezoidal geometry under the same total head and length magnification.

The other interesting result from the model tests was the use of a splitter pier on the crest of each cycle of the labyrinth weir (Figure 3-11). The benefit of using this pier was to provide aeration along the full length of each side wall, so the negative pressure which usually occurs at a low discharge could be reduced.

A modified design curve then was used to design the 14-cycle Ute Dam labyrinth spillway. This labyrinth spillway was tested in a 1:80 scale model. The result of the
experimental study showed that this 14-cycle labyrinth spillway was able to pass the desired maximum discharge. The first 10-cycle labyrinth spillway designed using Hay and Tavlor's (1970) design curves could not pass this maximum discharge.



Figure 3-10 A comparison of USBR and Hay & Taylor design curves for triangular plan form weir, w/P = 2.5, side wall angle, $\alpha = \alpha_{max}$, with downstream interference (zero change in bed elevation). After Houston (1982), Hay and Taylor (1970).





Figure 3-11 Splitter pier location and dimensions. After Houston (1982).

3.5. USBR Hydraulic Model Study of Hyrum Dam Auxiliary Labyrinth Spillway

The United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) also performed 1:30 scale model tests on a two-cycle Hyrum Dam labyrinth spillway with a trapezoidal plan form of a crest height, P, equal to 3.66 m and length magnification, L/W equal to 5 (Houston, 1983). The study was initially focused on determining the effect of the direction of the labyrinth spillway, ie to locate one apex downstream and two apexes upstream or vice versa. The effect of approach conditions on the spillway orientation was also studied (Figure 3-12).

From the results of the investigation, it was shown that the labyrinth weir, which had a length magnification of five and two apexes located upstream, was less efficient hydraulically than the labyrinth weir with two apexes located downstream. Nevertheless, based on a study of the effect of approach conditions, it was concluded that the use of a good entrance condition had more significant effects on the efficiency of the spillway than the orientation of spillway. A good entrance condition is a curved approach as indicated in Figure 3-12. Thus the labyrinth spillway entrance conditions are more meaningful than the labyrinth spillway orientation.



Figure 3-12 Schematic of the spillway approach condition and labyrinth weir orientation tested in the hydraulic model studies. (Flow direction from top to bottom). After Houston (1983).

3.6. J. Cassidy et al. on Hydraulic Model Study of Carty Dam Labyrinth Spillway

The main objective of this hydraulic model study was to verify the labyrinth spillway design for Carty Dam. This was based mainly on Hay and Taylor's work (Cassidy et al., 1983). A triangular plan form with a semi-circular crest was chosen for the design of the Carty dam labyrinth spillway. Model tests were carried out by the Albrook Hydraulics Laboratory at Washington State University.

The results of the model test were plotted in the form of flow rate over the labyrinth spillway against the reservoir water surface elevation. The experimental results indicated that, at the higher flow depths, the flow capacity of the labyrinth spillway proved to be 20 percent to 25 percent lower than values extrapolated from the Hay and Taylor design curve. It was pointed out that the chute width of the labyrinth spillway depend on the developed length of labyrinth spillway. Increase in the developed length of the labyrinth spillway without increasing the chute width of the spillway reduced the effectiveness of the labyrinth spillway, particularly at higher flow. The model tests also agreed with the results of the hydraulic model study of Hyrum Dam (Houston, 1983) that the use of a curved approach channel is significant in increasing the weir's effectiveness, especially at higher flow rates.

3.7. A.P. Magalhães

In his paper, Magalhães (1985) reported the results of hydraulic model studies of Harrezza Dam, Dungo Dam, and Keddara Dam Labyrinth Spillways which were carried out at the Portuguese National Laboratory of Civil Engineering (LNEC) in 1980, 1981, and 1984 respectively (Magalhães, 1985). In the case of the Harrezza Dam Labyrinth Spillway, for $H/P \ge 0.54$, the actual discharge was 17 percent lower than the predicted discharge from the Hay and Taylor, and the Darvas design curves. This difference underlined the necessity of hydraulic model tests to verify the design of labyrinth weirs.

Furthermore, Darvas' design chart was revised by Magalhäes by presenting a dimensionless coefficient of discharge, μ_{ψ} as shown in Figure 3-13. Then, the discharge over the labyrinth weir was calculated using (Magalhäes, 1985) :

$$Q_L = \mu_w W \sqrt{2 g} H^{1.5}$$
 (3.2)

Note that :

$$C_{\mu} = \sqrt{2 g} \mu_{\mu}$$
 (3.3)

in which C_w is Darvas' discharge coefficient, g is the acceleration due to gravity = 32.2 ft/s², (both Darvas and Magalhäes presented their data in FPS units), and μ_w is Magalhäes' discharge coefficient.



Figure 3-13 Discharge coefficient for quarter-round crest trapezoidal shape labyrinth weirs, constructed without aprons, w/P \geq 2, and side wall angle, $\alpha \geq 0.8 \alpha_{max}$. After Magalhães (1985).

3.8. Frederick Lux III and David L. Hinchliff

In this paper (Lux and Hinchliff, 1985) the design and construction of labyrinth spillways was discussed. The work was based on the hydraulic model studies conducted by the USBR and tests by other investigators such as Taylor and Darvas. They pointed out that, in general, the main factors which influence the performance of the labyrinth weir are the plan form, the maximum discharge, and the design head. Usually, in the design stage, the maximum discharge and the design head are already settled. Therefore, the choice of the labyrinth geometry becomes important in order to obtain the best performance.

Normally, the flow pattern over a labyrinth weir passes through four basic stages as the upstream head increases. These stages were defined as : fully aerated, partially aerated, transitional, and suppressed (Figure 3-14). It was observed that the labyrinth weir behaves ideally in fully aerated stages when the flow falls freely over the total length of the labyrinth crest.

The general considerations for hydraulic design of a labyrinth spillway were summarized. These included spillway approach conditions and placement, upstream and downstream flow conditions, number of labyrinth cycles and nappe interference, and labyrinth low flow conditions.

In the design chart (Figure 3-14), C_{LH} was plotted against the total head to crest height ratio, H/P for a series of constant values of the length magnification, L/W. The value of C_{LH} , H/P and L/W were obtained from the hydraulic flume studies conducted by USBR (Houston, 1982) and Taylor (1968). Data were also obtained from site-specific hydraulic models at Hyrum dam labyrinth spillway (Houston, 1983). Then, the discharge over the labyrinth weir could be estimated (for w/P ≥ 2) using (Lux & Hinchliff, 1985):

$$Q_L = C_{LH} \frac{(W/P)}{(W/P + K)} \le H_o \sqrt{g H_o}$$
(3.4)

where k has the value of 0.18 for triangular and 0.10 for trapezoidal (with a/w = 0.0765) plan forms. It was shown that the use of a quarter-round crest increased the discharge coefficient, C_{LK} above that of a sharp crest. This is shown in Figure 3-15. An increase of discharge coefficient, C_{LK} occurred under conditions of full aeration when the flow springs free over the total length of the weir crest (Tacail *et al.*, 1990).

Lux and Hinchliff presented this result using a discharge coefficient as indicated in equation 3.4. This is somewhat similar to Darvas' approach. However Lux and Hinchliff's discharge coefficient, C_{LH} differed from Darvas' discharge coefficient, C_w according to :

$$C_{LH} = \frac{(w/P + k)}{(w/P)\sqrt{g}} C_w$$
(3.5)

In addition the method of presentation was similar to that of Hay and Taylor except that the head term included the velocity head, H_v (see Figures 3-14 and 3-15).

Finally, the structural design and construction considerations for a labyrinth spillway were discussed on the basis of the USBR's experience with Ute Dam. For structural design, the stability analysis of a labyrinth cycle should be investigated. This includes overtuning, sliding, and foundation bearing pressures subject to normal load at normal water surface level and extreme load at maximum water surface level.



Figure 3-14 Design curves for sharp crest trapezoidal labyrinth weirs. After Lux & Hinchliff (1985).



Figure 3-15 A comparison of discharge coefficient, C_{LH} between quarter-round crest and sharp crest trapezoidal plan labyrinth weir. After Lux and Hinchliff (1985).

3.9. A. Afshar

In his paper entitled "The development of labyrinth spillway designs", Afshar (1988) discussed the development and the benefits of using a labyrinth spillway mainly by reviewing the Lux and Hinchliff paper (Lux & Hinchliff, 1985). The Hay and Taylor works (Hay & Taylor, 1970) and Darvas discussion paper (Darvas, 1971) were also discussed in this paper.

Moreover, some examples of the main characteristics of some labyrinth spillways which have been constructed to date were stated briefly. Afshar emphasized the economic value of labyrinth spillways. He also recommended the use of this spillway in situations where the head is limited or the spillway width is confined by the topography.

3.10. Indonesian Institute of Hydraulic Engineering (IIHE), Bandung-Indonesia experimental works

The aim of this study was to find the most suitable geometry of labyrinth weir for use in Indonesia (Memed and Sadeli, 1990; Puslitbang Pengairan, 1991). This took into account the need for a low cost design giving good flow capacity with a small length magnification. The range of the experimental work is described below :

- a). The flow rates ranged from 0.1 m3/s to 1 m3/s.
- b). The labyrinth weirs were tested for one, two, four, and eight cycles.
- c). Triangular and trapezoidal shapes were observed.

A mahogany labyrinth weir, with a crest height of 0.20 m was used on the model tests. Modifications to the models, such as change in the crest sections, alteration of the different crest heights, and the effects of sedimentation downstream of the weirs were also examined.

The results of all model tests were as follows :

a). The most suitable geometry was established as shown in Figure 3-16.

b). Alteration in crest sections from 2.0 cm to 3.0 cm top width, and 3.0 cm to 4.0 cm top width slightly decreases the flow over the labyrinth weir. They recommended that a crest section with 1.0 cm top width gives the maximum flow capacity under the same operating depth.

c). As the number of weir cycles increases while the value of L/W held constant, the flow over the labyrinth weir falls (Figure 3-17).

d). Change in crest height is not significant in changing the flow capacity of the labyrinth weir.

e). Effects of sedimentation with an increased depth of sediment of 5 cm up to 10 cm in the upstream channel, do not influence the flow capacity of labyrinth weir.

In the end of the study, a design chart was established for practical use in the field. This is reproduced in Figure 3-17. The design chart was developed for the most suitable geometry which proved to be a trapezoidal plan form with α =0.68 α _{max} as indicated in Figure 3-16. The discharge over the weir crest, Q was plotted against the total head of the approaching flow, H for various values of the number of cycles as shown in Figure 3-17.



Figure 3-16 A most suitable geometry of the labyrinth weir. Modified from Puslitbang Pengairan (1991).



Figure 3-17 IIHE design chart for trapezoidal shape labyrinth weirs, l/w=2.56, side wall angle, $\alpha = 14.04^{\circ}$. After Puslitbang Pengairan (1991).

3.11. Tacail et al. on hydraulic model study of South Heart Dam Labyrinth Spillway

This paper (Tacail et al., 1990) reported experience in the design and hydraulic model study of South Heart Dam Labyrinth Spillway in northern Alberta, Canada. The objective of the laboratory experiment was to investigate different weir cycles including two cycles and three cycles. Experiments were also done to study the effects of changing the crest height and shape.

From their experiments, they summarized some important factors relating to the labyrinth weir performance. These include :

a). An increase of vertical aspect ratio, w/P was able to eliminate the effect of downstream interference and submergence. Thus, the labyrinth weir capacity increased. This was proved by reducing the number of weir cycles from three to two, thus increasing the w/P value. The increase in discharge occured because increasing the value of w/P provides a larger space in the downstream channel.

b). An increase in weir height, P while keeping the head constant was significant in increasing the labyrinth weir discharge. This increase occurred when the value of H/P ranged from 0.25 to 0.33.

c). An increase in the side wall angle, α was significant in increasing the labyrinth weir flow capacity. This was shown by reducing the number of cycles and therefore increasing the value of α . It was emphasized then that the side wall angle is an important factor in influencing the flow capacity of labyrinth weir. Also, the model study corroborated Hay and Taylor's recommendation to udopt the side wall angle, $\alpha \ge 0.75 \alpha_{max}$. d). The effect of changing the crest shape increased the discharge 23 percent above that of a sharp crested labyrinth weir. It was observed that the labyrinth weir flow capacity is sensitive to a change in crest shape and height only under free-flow conditions.

It was concluded that for the same spillway width, the two-cycle was better than the three-cycle labyrinth weir. Thus the two-cycle was adopted in the South Heart Dam labyrinth spillway. The study also underlined the importance of hydraulic model studies in confirming the parameters influencing the flow capacity of a labyrinth weir.

3.12. Discussion

In general it has been shown that the discharge over the labyrinth weir is not determined only by the crest shape and depth or total head to weir height ratio (H/P or H_s/P) as at straight weir. Other parameters are also important. These include the length magnification (L/W), and the side wall angle (α) which depends on the labyrinth weir shape (Hay and Taylor, 1970; Darvas, 1971; Houston ,1982 and 1983; Lux and Hinchliff, 1985; and Magalhäes, 1985).

Hay and Taylor (1970) observed that for a value of the length magnification, L/W < 2 the performance of the weir was relatively unaffected by changes in the value of H/P. Memed and Sadeli (1990) found similar results for the trapezoidal shape shown in Figure 3-16 with a length magnification, L/W < 2.56.

Lux & Hinchliff (1985) insisted that the choice of the labyrinth weir shape was an important step in the design of the weir. Most authors recommended the use of a triangular or trapezoidal shape in the design of labyrinth weir plan form. Hay and Taylor (1970) suggested the use of a triangular shape with $\alpha = \alpha_{max}$. or a trapezoidal geometry with $\alpha \ge 0.75\alpha_{max}$. The USBR also suggested the use of a triangular shape (Houston, 1982) and Darvas (1971) recommended the use of trapezoidal geometry with $\alpha \ge 0.8\alpha_{max}$. The Indonesian Institute of Hydraulic Engineering (IIHE) Bandung, Indonesia also proposed the use of a trapezoidal shape (Figure 3-16). A trapezoidal plan form with $\alpha = 0.68\alpha_{max}$. was established and recommended in the design of the weir geometry (Memed & Sadeli, 1990; Puslithang Pengairan, 1991). These studies showed that the flow capacity of the specified triangular and trapezoidal plan forms increases in direct proportion to an increase in crest length.

It was shown that, in general, the flow capacity of a labyrinth weir decreases as the depth or total head over the crest increases. This was thought to be due to the limitation of space either in the approach channel at the upstream side or in the receiving channel downstream. Hydraulic model studies have been carried out to improve these conditions. Taylor (1968) showed that a decrease of channel bed elevation downstream slightly increases the flow over the labyrinth weir. The USBR (Houston, 1983) also showed that the use of a curved approach in the spillway entrance, upstream channel (Figure 3-12) was significant in improving the labyrinth spillway's flow capacity. Cassidy *et al.* (1983) agree that the use of this curved approach in the spillway entrance increases the discharge over the labyrinth spillway as discussed in Section 3.6.

Some authors added that the choice of the number of weir cycles (n) will affect the quantity of the flow over the labyrinth weir. Two hydraulic model studies (sections 3.10 and 3.11) showed that an increase in the number of weir cycles decreases the flow capacity of each cycle. Thus the overall performance of labyrinth weir with a smaller number of cycles would be better than a greater one. This did not confirm the result obtained earlier by Taylor (1968) that the behaviour of the labyrinth weir is independent of the number of weir cycles (Section 3.2.).

Among the previous works, only Hay & Taylor developed a theoretical solution to predict the flow capacity of a labyrinth weir. Other workers relied on the results of hydraulic model studies. However Taylor's model was based on ALGOL which is now seldorn used. Thus in this thesis an attempt is made to develop the theoretical solution as done by Hay and Taylor but using different code and revised theory. When no funding is available for hydraulic model testing, this theoretical solution will be very useful for designers.

The importance of hydraulic model studies was also emphasized by some authors (Magalhäes, 1985; Lux and Hinchliff, 1985; and Tacail *et al.*, 1990). Hydraulic model studies will confirm the important parameters influencing the labyrinth weir flow capacity and will confirm design estimates of discharge.

The economic value of labyrinth weirs was discussed by some authors (Hay and Taylor, 1970; Hinchliff and Houston, 1984; and Afshar, 1988). However none of them provided an economic analysis for a labyrinth weir. This thesis has shown the economic advantages by giving the case of one labyrinth weir which has already been constructed in Indonesia (see Chapter 2).

Finally, a number of generalized design curves for pre-design purposes were proposed. Hay and Taylor's (1970) design curves express the flow magnification as a function of the length magnification and the flow depth to crest height ratio (Figure 3-2 and 3-3). On the other hand Darvas' (1971) design chart describes a discharge coefficient as a function of the length magnification and the flow depth to weir height ratio (Figure 3-8). Magalhäes (1985) revised Darvas' design chart by presenting a dimensionless coefficient of discharge as indicated in Figure 3-13. The USBR (Houston, 1982) also promoted design curves in which the velocity head (H₄) was taken into account as shown in Figure 3-10. Using the experimental data from Taylor (1968), Darvas (1970), and Houston (1982), Lux and Hinchliff presented design curves expressing the relationship between the discharge coefficient and the total head (H_e = H + H₄) to crest height ratio for a constant value of the length magnification. This design curve was completed for the four basic stages of the flow over a labyrinth weir (Figure 3-14). Finally, IIHE Bandung, Indonesia advanced the design chart for a particular size of trapezoidal geometry (Figure 3-17).

Chapter 4

Theoretical Background and Computer Modelling

4.1. Theoretical background

4.1.1. The general weir equation

To best understand how much water can flow over a sharp crested weir, normal and labyrinth, one must be aware of the following equation used in calculating water flow (Daily and Harleman, 1973; Vennard and Street, 1975; Daugherty and Franzini, 1977; and Chadwick and Morfett, 1986) :

$$Q = C_d \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 g} L H^{1.5}$$
 (4.1)

in which Q is the discharge over the weir crest in m³/s, L is the net crest length in m, C_4 is the weir discharge coefficient, H is the depth of the approaching flow in m, and g is the acceleration due to gravity = 9.81 m/s³. Many textbooks suggest that C_4 should be predicted by the Rehbock equation (Daugherty and Ingersoll, 1954; Vennard and Street, 1975; Daugherty and Franzini, 1977) as shown below :

$$C_d = 0.605 + 0.08 \frac{H}{P} + \frac{1}{305 H}$$
 (4.2)

where H is in feet. In order to use the S.I. system, equation (4.2) should be modified to become :

$$C_d = 0.605 + 0.08 \frac{H}{P} + \frac{1}{1000.7 H}$$
(4.3)

From equation (4.1), the total discharge overtopping the weir is proportional to the length of crest. Therefore, the flood flows which pass the weir can be increased without increasing the depth by extending the length of the crest. However, on a narrowwidth river, it is impossible to make the crest longer. In periods of high discharge, the raised water level may cause unwanted inundations in the flood plain, and require local protective action by raising the crest of a levee. These problems could not be prevented through the use of a normal weir where the crest length cannot be increased. Those problems however can be solved by the use of a labyrinth weir in which the crest length can be increased. This weir is particularly suited for use at sites where the depth over the crest is limited or the weir width is restricted by the topography.

4.1.2. Theoretical solution

Hay and Taylors' (1969) theoretical solution.

Nimmo's momentum equation (Nimmo, 1928) was applied by Hay and Taylor (1969) in their theoretical solution. They chose this equation because it described the general case of side weir flow. A sloping channel with the channel width and side wall slope varying from section to section (Figure 4-1) was considered in Nimmo's equation (Taylor, 1968). The equation was based on consideration of momentum principles and is given below :

$$\frac{Q^2}{g A} + \frac{Q}{g A} \frac{\Delta Q}{g A} - \frac{(Q + \Delta Q)^2}{g (A + \Delta A)} = \frac{(W + \Delta W)(H^2 + 2 H \Delta h)}{2}$$

$$+ (s_{rer} + \Delta s_{re}) \frac{(H^3 + 3 H^2 \Delta h)}{3} - \frac{W H^2}{2} - \frac{s_{rer}}{3} \frac{H^2}{3} - \frac{\Delta W H^2}{2}$$

$$- \frac{\Delta S_{rer}}{3} \frac{H^2}{3} - \Delta x (S_f - s_{ab}) (W H - s_{rer} H^2) \qquad (4.4)$$

where : Q is the flow past a downstream section across the channel; ΔQ is the overflow between the sections; A is the area of cross section of flow at downstream section; ΔA is the difference in area of cross section of flow between the sections; g is the acceleration due to gravity; W is the width of channel bed at downstream section; ΔW is the difference in channel width between the sections; H is the flow depth at downstream section; Δh is the difference in depth between the sections; S_w is the slope of side wall at downstream section; Δs_{w} is the difference in slope of side wall between the sections; S_r is the friction slope between the sections; and s_w is the slope of the channel bed between the sections.

Since this original equation was general, Taylor simplified it in order to be used in the case of labyrinth weir flow (Figure 4-2). The final equation is expressed by :

$$\frac{\Delta h}{\Delta x} = \frac{2Q (H+P)}{w} \frac{(Q \tan \alpha - \frac{w C_d H^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(w^2 (H+P)^3 g - Q^3)})}{(w^2 (H+P)^3 g - Q^3)}$$
(4.5)

where : Δh is the predicted difference in depth between 2 sections; Δx is a transverse element of channel length; Q is the discharge over the weir crest downstream of the section; H is the depth downstream of the section; P is the crest height; w is the average channel width between two sections; α is the side wall angle; C₄ is the coefficient of discharge between two sections; and g is the acceleration due to gravity.



Figure 4-1 Sketch illustrating the notation used in Nimmo's equation. After Taylor (1968).

67





Figure 4-2 Flow description over the trapezoidal shape labyrinth weir. (modified from Hay and Taylor, 1969).

(4.5). This solution was obtained by a marching method using finite differences as described below.

(1) Consider the flow over the labyrinth weir shown in Figure 4-2. The channel is divided into a number of sections each separated by Δx .

(2) Assume that the flow depth, H₁ at section 1 is known. Therefore, Q₁ can be calculated from the standard weir equation (equation 4.1) using the local depth at section 1 and the crest length downstream of section 1, ie 1,.

(3) Calculate the slope of the water surface at section 1 using equation (4.5). Then, Δh_{12} can be determined by defining the value of Δx . Then $H_2 = H_1 + \Delta h_{12}$.

(4) The average depth between two sections = $(H_1 + H_2)/2$, and the overflow between sections 1 and 2 is given by :

$$\Delta Q_{12} = \frac{2 C_d \Delta x}{\cos \alpha} \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 g} \left(\frac{H_1 + H_2}{2}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}$$
(4.6)

then, $Q_2 = Q_1 + \Delta Q_{12}$.

(5) Using geometrical considerations,

$$\frac{\Delta W}{\Delta x} = \frac{w_2 - w_1}{\Delta x} = 2 \tan \alpha$$
 (4.7)

or

$$w_2 = w_1 + 2 \Delta x \tan \alpha \tag{4.8}$$

The flow conditions are then known at section 2. The procedure is repeated in a similar

way to determine the flow and depth at the next section (section 3, Figure 4-2) and so on for the entire length of labyrinth weir crest or until the end of the upstream channel entry section (section 4, Figure 4-2).

Finally, energy conditions are satisfied between sections 4 and 5. Therefore,

$$H_{s} = H_{4} + C_{sc} \frac{V_{4}^{2}}{2 g}$$
(4.9)

where C_{w} is a cor-ificient of energy loss due to sudden contraction of the flow at entry to the upstream channel, and V_4 is the flow velocity at section 4, Figure 4-2. From Hay and Taylors' (1969) investigation C_w was found to be equal to 0.2. The theoretical values agree very well with experimental results as discussed previously in Chapter 3.

Author's theoretical solution.

Basically, the flow over the labyrinth weir is a typical case of flow over a side channel spillway since the discharge along the labyrinth crest changes in the direction of the flow. In determining the side channel spillway flow characteristics, the theory of spatially varied flow with decreasing discharge has been applied by many experimenters. Therefore, in this theoretical works, the momentum equation for spatially varied flow with decreasing discharge will be adopted to predict the water surface profile. Figure 4-2 shows the flow description over a labyrinth weir. The momentum equation (Chow, 1959) for the control volume between sections 1 and 2 Figure 4-2 can be written as follows :

$$\Delta h = \frac{\beta Q_1 (V_1 + V_2) \Delta V}{g (Q_1 + Q_2)} (1 - \frac{\Delta Q}{2Q_1}) + S_f \Delta x$$
(4.10)

where Δh is the predicted difference in depth between sections 1 and 2; β is the energy coefficient; Q_1 is the total discharge over the labyrinth weir crest downstream of section 1; $\Delta Q/2$ is the discharge over one side of the labyrinth weir per unit length of the crest between sections 1 and 2; Q_2 is the total discharge over the labyrinth weir crest downstream of section 2 (equal to $Q_1 + \Delta Q$); g is the acceleration due to gravity; V_1 is the velocity at section 1; V_2 is the velocity at section 2; ΔV is the difference between velocities at sections 1 and 2; S_r is the friction slope; and Δx is the distance between sections 1 and 2 measured along the center line of the channel (Figure 4-2).

Some assumptions are made in this solution. These include :

1). The flow is uniform and steady.

2). The energy coefficient, β in equation (4.10) is taken equal to one. For greater accuracy the value of β must be obtained experimentally from the velocity distribution in the channel cross section.

3). At any section, the water surface across the section is horizontal.

4). Frictional forces are negligible provided Δx is small. Then the friction slope, S_r in equation 4.10 can be neglected.

5). The overflow per unit of crest length at any section may be calculated from the standard weir equation using the local depth at that section.

Equation (4.10) can then be simplified to :

$$\Delta h = \frac{Q_1 (V_1 + V_2) \Delta V}{g (Q_1 + Q_2)} (1 - \frac{\Delta Q}{2Q_1})$$
(4.11)

The solution is started by defining the local depth at a particular section. Section 1 in Figure 4-2 was chosen as a starting point of this solution. Let the local depth at section 1 be H_1 , and the crest length up to section 1 be I_1 . The total flow up to section 1, Q_1 thus can be determined using :

$$Q_1 = C_{d_1} \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 g} l_1 H_1^{1.5}$$
(4.12)

in which :

$$C_{d_i} = 0.605 + 0.08 \frac{H_1}{P} + \frac{1}{1000.7 H_i}$$
 (4.13)

and :

$$l_1 = 2 \ a + 2 \ \frac{\Delta x}{\cos \alpha} \tag{4.14}$$

Then the flow velocity V1 at section 1, can be calculated using :

$$V_1 = \frac{Q_1}{A_1}$$
 (4.15)

where A1 is the area of the cross section of flow at section 1 and is given by :

$$A_1 = (H_1 + P) (2 \ a + 2 \ \Delta x \ \tan \alpha)$$
 (4.16)

Let, the overflow between sections 1 and 2 be ΔQ_{12} . Then $\Delta Q_{12}/2$ is the flow over one side of the weir and can be calculated from the standard weir equation using the average local depth between sections 1 and 2 as expressed by :

$$\frac{\Delta Q_{12}}{2} = C_{d_{11}} \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 g} \frac{\Delta x}{\cos \alpha} \left(\frac{H_1 + H_2}{2}\right)^{1.5}$$
(4.17)

The flow depth H_2 at section 2 is unknown but can be obtained by assuming a value of Δh and adding this to the value of H_1 . The difference in flow, ΔQ_1 between sections 1 and 2 can then be obtained from equation 4.17, thus giving the total flow Q_2 at section 2. From H_2 , Q_2 and the known geometry it is then possible to calculate V_2 . Equation 4.11 can then be used to calculate Δh which can be compared to the assumed value. If the calculated value differs from the assumed value a new estimate must be made and the procedure must be repeated until the calculated value agrees with the assumed value. The calculation can then move as to obtain conditions between sections 2 and 3, and so on. This procedure is repeated in a similar way until the channel upstream entry section is reached (section 4 in Figure 4-2). To obtain the flow depth at section 5, Figure 4-2, the energy condition must be satisfied between sections 4 and 5. In this solution, Hay and Taylor's approach was adopted. However, the value of the coefficient of energy loss due to sudden contraction, C_{sc} was found to be equal to 0.1. This value is lower than the value of 0.2 determined by Hay and Taylor (1969).

4.2. Dimensional Analysis

Dimensional analysis is used to provide guidance to experiments and presentation of experimental results by incorporating all of the relevant variables into a dimensionless equation (Sharp, 1981). The experimental investigation presents either the design charts or the numerical constants, and assists in checking the correctness of the analysis. The total discharge per cycle, QL (Figure 4-2) can be expressed by the function:

$$Q_{l} = \phi(l, a, w, P, H, \rho, g, \mu, \sigma)$$
 (4.18)

where :

- Q₁ = total flow over one-cycle of the labyrinth weir
- 1 = developed crest length of one-cycle
- a = half length of tip section normal to the flow
- w = cycle width
- P = crest height
- H = upstream depth above the crest
- ρ = density of water
- g = gravitational acceleration
- $\mu = viscosity$
- σ = surface tension

Since the flow in nature is turbulent, and occurs at a relatively large head, it can be assumed that viscosity μ , and surface tension σ are insignificant variables (Sharp, 1981). Therefore, they can be dropped from equation (4.18). Thus, equation (4.18) becomes :

$$Q_{L} = \phi (l, a, w, P, H, \rho, g)$$
(4.19)

In order to make the equation dimensionally homogenous, the density should be eliminated since it is the only variable which has a mass dimension. Then, equation (4.19) becomes :

$$Q_L = \phi(l, a, w, P, H, g)$$
 (4.20)

Using the Indicial Approach or Rayleigh's Method, several combinations of dimensionless numbers can be obtained from equation (4.20), so that equation (4.20) can be written in terms of the dimensions to give :

$$Q_L = k l^a a^b w^c P^d H^c g^f$$
(4.21)

where k, a, b, c, d, e, and f are undefined constants. Rewriting the equation (4.21) in terms of the length [L] and time [T] dimensions gives :

$$\frac{[L]^3}{[T]} = k \ [L]^a \ [L]^b \ [L]^c \ [L]^d \ [L]^c \ (\frac{[L]}{[T]^2})^2$$

Equating exponents of [L], and [T] :

- $[L] \quad 3 = a + b + c + d + e + f$
- [T] $-1 = -2f \rightarrow f = \frac{1}{2}$
 - $e = 2\frac{1}{2} a b c d$

Substituting in equation (4.21), these values lead to :

$$\frac{Q_L}{\frac{1}{g^2H^2}} = \phi \left(\frac{l}{H}, \frac{a}{H}, \frac{w}{H}, \frac{P}{H}\right)$$
(4.22)

Compounding equation (4.22), in order to have a convenient solution, gives :

$$\frac{Q_l}{g^2 H^2} * \frac{H}{l} = \phi \left(\frac{l}{H} * \frac{H}{w}, \frac{a}{H} * \frac{H}{w}, \frac{w}{H} * \frac{H}{P}, \frac{H}{P} \right) \quad (4.23)$$

Therefore, equation (4.22) can be rewritten as :

$$Q_L = C_d \ l \ H \ \sqrt{g \ H} \tag{4.24}$$

where

$$C_d = f\left(\frac{l}{w}, \frac{a}{w}, \frac{w}{P}, \frac{H}{P}\right)$$
(4.25)

Equation (4.24) is the general weir equation. This equation uses the crest length per cycle, I, as the characteristic length for the labyrinth weir. In equation (4.25), all dimensionless ratios except the last one are fixed for a given labyrinth weir. Thus, C_4 in this case is known as the coefficient of discharge of the labyrinth weir. In other words, the labyrinth weir discharge coefficient, C_4 is given as a function of dimensionless parameters I/w, a/w, w/P, and H/P. If the values of I/w, a/w, and w/P are already fixed, then, equation (4.25) could be expressed by the function :

$$C_d = \phi \left(\frac{H}{P} \right) \tag{4.26}$$

Equation (4.26) is the Rehbock equation (see equations 4.2 and 4.3).

An alternative equation can be obtained to describe the performance of a sharp crested labyrinth weir of constant geometry in terms of flow magnification. The total discharge per cycle, Q, (Figure 4-2) may be expressed by the function :

77

$$Q_L = \phi \left(Q_N, H, P, I, w \right) \tag{4.27}$$

where :

Q_N = total flow over a sharp crested normal or linear weir

H = upstream depth above the crest

P = crest height

1 = crest length of labyrinth weir

w = crest length of linear or normal weir

Rearranging equation (4.27) as before gives :

$$Q_L = k \ Q_N^a \ H^b \ P^c \ l^d \ w^c \tag{4.28}$$

where k is a constant. Equation (4.28) in dimensional form can be rewritten as :

$$\frac{[L]^3}{[T]} = \left(\frac{[L]^3}{[T]}\right)^4 [L]^6 [L]^c [L]^4 [L]^4$$
(4.29)

Equating exponents of [L] and [T] :

$$[T] -1 = -a$$

 $a = 1$

$$[L] 3 = 3a + b + c + d + e$$

 $0 = b + c + d + e$
 $b = -c - d - e$

Substitute these values into equation (4.28) gives :

$$\frac{Q_{t}}{Q_{N}} = \phi \left(\frac{P}{H}, \frac{l}{H}, \frac{w}{H} \right)$$
(4.30)

Compounding, in order to have a convenient solution, gives :

$$\frac{Q_L}{Q_N} = \phi \left(\frac{H}{P}, \frac{l}{H} * \frac{H}{w}, \frac{w}{H} * \frac{H}{P} \right)$$
(4.31)

Thus, equation (4.30) can be rewritten as :

$$\frac{Q_L}{Q_N} = \phi \left(\frac{H}{P}, \frac{l}{w}, \frac{w}{P} \right)$$
(4.32)

From equation (4.32), the comparison of the labyrinth weir flow, Q_{kx} , with the corresponding straight weir flow, Q_k is expressed directly. Hay and Taylor (1970) used equation (4.32) to present the results of their model test. On the other hand, Darvas (1971) expressed the results of his experiment by equation (4.25). In the present experiments, the results of the model test will be plotted in terms of flow magnification (Q_L/Q_n) against flow depth to weir height ratio (H/P) for a constant value of the length magnification (I/w) and vertical aspect ratio (w/P). This is similar to the way in which Hay and Taylor presented the results of their model tests.

4.3. Computer Modelling Programme

The momentum equation (eq. 4.11) describes one-dimensional steady, spatially varied flow. It can be used to compute the flow profile of a spatially varied flow with decreasing discharge based on a method of numerical integration. Because the numerical solution is repetitive, it was decided to develop a computer program to increase the speed of the process. Then, numerical predictions of labyrinth weir performance could be made directly without model tests.

4.3.1. An attempt to develop a computer model

As discussed in the previous chapter, Hay and Taylor (1969) established a computer model to predict the performance of a labyrinth weir and compared their solution with experimental work.

Hay and Taylor's computer program in ALGOL is relatively complex and difficult to understand. Also, ALGOL has largely been replaced by other programming languages. Therefore, an alternative formulation was developed using equation (4.11). Initially, it was thought that the use of a spreadsheet, or tabular method, to compute the water surface profile would be easier than the use of computer program. Using a spreadsheet, the analysis could be developed easily by a trial and error procedure.

However following this development it was found that the use of spreadsheet was cumbersome and time consuming. A computer program in QuickBASIC was then set up based on the spreadsheet procedures.

4.3.2. Spreadsheet work

The computational procedures to get one value of H/P corresponding to one value of Q_t/Q_t are described below (see Figure 4-3 and Table 4.1) :

 Specify the length of one-cycle, l; the width of one-cycle, w; half length of tip section normal to the flow, a; weir height, P; acceleration due to gravity, g; and number of



Figure 4-3 Sketch to illustrate the theoretical analysis of flow over the labyrinth weir. (modified from Hay and Taylor, 1969).
						at its of ensering	these for man data	TABLE 4.1	desire of each se						
- ;	71.9600 cm				00001190	mis ~ 2	defail =	2.4138 0	E	= d	10 0000	5	* x	28.1002 0	E
	35125 cm			defa x	2.3417	E	- 4	7.0250 0		8	28 9650	5	= wipha	14 0062	
Sec. No	x (cm)	r (Eg)	8	- (tua)	(stc_us)	(cm ~ 3/s)	01 + 02 (cm ~ 3/5)	(cm)	k K	(cm/s)	(VI + VZ) (cm/h)	deita O (cm ^ 3/s)	deta V (cm/s)	(cm)	Sec. No
6	8	10	[9]	8	to)	e	(8)	8	(01)	613	22	(13)	(543	(51)	(14)
0	0 0000														0
-	23417	0,3048	0,9353	11.8525	55.0955	22,4366		8.1958	64.4564	0 6522		T	-	00001	-
2	4 0834	0.3040	0.6352		77,5260		132.6125	0.3667	PCCS DB	0 8022	1,4554	22 4306	0 1509	00001	~
~	4 0034	0.3040	0.6352		0925.11	22.4506		0 3667	00275 00	0 6032			-	00001	~
1	10000	00000	19100		10/0/0	1097 00	111202111	10 50/5	100 5000	0 0007	BC2/1	0061-72	artt D	10000	-
-	100000	0.3051	-		122,4358		222 4124	11.7083	120 6556	10148	1 0054	22.4591	0 00411	00001	-
	1996.9	0 3051	0 0350		122 4350	22.4676		11 7063	120 6556	1,0140				00001	
	11 7064	0 3052			144.0033		267 3301	12.8702	132.7224	1.0018	21065	22 4076	00110	10000	•
9	11,70641	0 3052	0 9349		144 8033	22.4761		12.6792	122 7224	1,0918		-		00001	•
	14.0501	0 3053			167.3794		312 2527	14.0500	144 7805	1 1560	2247B	22.4781	0 0042	00001	
	14.0501	0 3053	0 0348		167.3784	22,4845		M.0600	144 7005	1.1560				0000	
	0100.01	10000	2000		1000 000	1000 Mar	2512152	13.2206	150 000	1.2104	10002	SP0+ 77	1000	10000	ļ
	10 73 76	10000	1 ACR D		V101 010	1000 122	100 000	1100 81	00000001	1001	0 4876	WOX CO	D DAMP	10000	-
	10.7325	0.3055	0 8346		212 3570	22.4000		10 2017	168 8243	12571				00000	
0	21.0751	0 3055			234 65,00		447.2100	17 5625	180.0004	1 2976	25547	22 4900	0 0406	000000	•
0	21,0751	0 3055	0,946		234, 8530	22 4960		17,5625	160 9004	1,2974			-	0 0000	
10	23.4108	0 30555			257,3400		492 2020	10.7333	103 00041	1.3300	2 6008	22 4600	0 0354	0 00000	10
10	23 41 666	0 3065	0 8346		2812,2480	22,4900		10 7333	103 0004	1,3330				000000	10
11	おため	0 3055			279 8450		S37 1940	19 8042	206.1224	1 3043	2 6973	22 4400	0 (213)	00000	11
11	201200	0 3055	0 8040		279 6450	22.4000		18 8042	506 1224	1.3043			-	000000	-
12	20,1002	0.3056	0 8340		302.3410	32 7303	562 1859	21.0750	217.1864	13001	27504	22 4060	0 0278	00000	15
12	2001 82	0 3055			10200				-						12
Turner of the					- URD	0.1000	0.000		2 1010				9	A DROMOMO	
Poutputte.	-				-	0 2000	0 3500	- d(m	2 6100 (1	cycle).					
Check.		-	ABLE 4.1 H	continued,		0 2500				-				-	
- C1X	and choice and	-	Sec. No	×	H+ H+	Con Con	8	20	NOTO	HP		INDI		OUTPUT	
				[(cm)	feet and									
- 211	64 9650 cm		5	(18)	(61)	8	(12)	8	(62)	(14)	- (cu) -	71 5600	24	2 5515	
w12 =	21.0750 cm	-	T		9900 0		0 9345	130 9639	2 5580	0 0300	- (wa) -	35125	-1070	2,5560	
					0 3066		0 0344	131 0183	2 5675	0 0306	= (ma) =	10 0000	- 07	0.0008	
Defa H (col.	umn 15) a Quy	Date	2	30 4410	0 3067	C170 200	0 0344	131 9427	2 5570	0 0000 0	(cm/det 2) -	0000 195			
Trom Coen-	Crunnel Hydr	anica.	-		10000		CHCEO	1200 121	2 2000	0000	-				
	Non-	340			00000		2 MAN	0100 101	10001 2		-				
) - H man	(1A + 2N-10)	JULY MOD	10 + 201	2)-11-6	((10.2.0 met						C + GPUD KUN	Deficient due lo suble	0 6487 M 50G		

2). Then, I/w; w/P; y; b; X; α ; Δx ; and ΔI are calculated. These notations are illustrated in Figure 4-3.

y is obtained by :

$$y = (\frac{w}{2} - 2 a)$$
 (4.33)

b is expressed by :

$$b = \frac{(l-4 a)}{2}$$
(4.34)

X is given by :

$$X = \sqrt{(b^2 - y^2)}$$
 (4.35)

 α is calculated by :

$$\alpha = \arctan\left(\frac{y}{X}\right) \tag{4.36}$$

 Δx and Δl are estimated by :

$$\Delta x = \frac{X}{n} \quad : \quad \Delta l = \frac{\Delta x}{\cos \alpha} \tag{4.37}$$

3). The solution is started from section 1 (column 1, row 1). The transverse distance of section 1 from the tip section at the downstream end of the labyrinth weir, X_1 is obtained by setting n = 1 in the general equation :

$$X_{n} = (n - 1) \Delta r + \Delta r$$
 (4.38)

The value of X1 (equal to 2.3417 cm) is shown in column 2, row 1.

4). The flow depth H_1 at section 1, is specified. In this example H_1 was set equal to 0.3048 cm (column 3, row 1).

5). The coefficient of discharge, C₄ is then predicted using the Rehbock equation with the depth = H_t. Experimental work will later (Chapter 6) be described regarding the use of the Rehbock equation to predict the theoretical discharge coefficient of the labyrinth weir. This is estimated by :

$$C_{d_a} = 0.605 + 0.08 \frac{H_s}{P} + \frac{1}{10.006562 H_s}$$
 (4.39)

Here $C_{d(n=1)} = 0.9353$ (column 4, row 1).

6). The length of weir crest l1 downstream of section 1, is then calculated from :

$$l_{1} = (2 a + \frac{2 x}{\cos \alpha})$$
(4.40)

In column 5, row 1, l1 is shown equal to 11.8525 cm.

7). The flow Q₁ at section 1, is then estimated using the standard weir equation applied to the length of weir crest downstream of section 1, 1, This is given by :

$$Q_1 = C_{d_1} l_1 H_1^{1.5} \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 g}$$
 (4.41)

From this equation $Q_1 = 55.0865 \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ (column 6, row 1).

8). Next the channel width w₁ at section 1 is calculated with n = 1 in the equation :

$$w_a = (2 a + 2 X_a \tan \alpha)$$
 (4.42)

Then, W_{n=1} = 8.1958 cm (column 9, row 1).

9). The area A1 of the cross section of flow at section 1, is calculated from :

$$A_{a} = (H_{a} + P) w_{a}$$
 (4.43)

giving An=1 = 84.4564 cm² (column 10, row 1).

10). Then the velocity V1 at section 1, can be calculated by .

$$V_n = \frac{Q_n}{A_n} \tag{4.44}$$

Then $V_{n=1} = 0.6522$ cm/s as shown in column 11, row 1.

11). The solution of the momentum equation requires a trial and error procedure and it is necessary to estimate Δh . This assumption is specified at column 15, row 1. Once $\Delta h_{numption}$ (0.0001 cm) was entered in column 15, row 1, $\Delta Q_{1 w 2}$ (ie from n = 1 to n = 2) can be calculated using the standard weir equation given by :

$$\Delta Q_{(n)-(n+1)} = 2 \quad C_{d_{m+n-1}} \quad \frac{\Delta x}{\cos \alpha} \quad \left(\frac{H_n + H_{n+1}}{2}\right)^{1.5} \quad \frac{2}{3} \quad \sqrt{2 \ g} \tag{4.45}$$

in which :

$$C_{l_{u+n}} = 0.605 + 0.08 \frac{(\frac{H_n + H_{n+1}}{2})}{P} + \frac{1}{10.006562} \frac{(H_n + H_{n+1})}{2}$$
(4.46)

and n = 1

This gave $\Delta Q_{1,2} = 22.4396 \text{ cm}^3/\text{sec}$ (column 7, row 1).

12). Calculate $X_2 = X_1 + \Delta x$ (It is obtained by setting n = 2 in equation (4.38)). The value of X_2 (equal to 4.6834 cm) is shown in column 2, row 2.

13). Calculate the flow depth H2 at section 2. This is estimated by :

$$H_{n+1} = H_n + \Delta h_{(n)-(n+1)}$$
(4.47)

in which Δh above is the assumed value of Δh given in column 15, row 1. Thus H₂ = 0.3049 cm (column 3, row 2).

14). The discharge Q2 at section 2, is estimated (n=1) from :

$$Q_{n+1} = Q_n + \Delta Q_{(n)-(n+1)} \tag{4.48}$$

Then $Q_2 = 77.5260 \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$ (column 6, row 2).

15). Sum $Q_1 + Q_2$. This is needed to simplify the calculation of Δh using the momentum equation (see step 22). Q_1 is the total flow at the downstream section 1 and Q_2 is the total flow at the upstream section 2. In column 8, row 2, $Q_1 + Q_2$ is shown equal to 132.6125 cm³/sec.

16). Calculate the width w2 at section 2 (see step 8).

17). Calculate the area A2 of the cross section of flow at section 2 (see step 9).

18). Calculate the velocity V2 at section 2 (see step 10).

19). Sum $V_1 + V_2$ (see step 15). V_1 is the velocity at the downstream section 1 and V_2 is the velocity at the upstream section 2.

20). Calculate the difference in flow ΔQ between the two sections. $\Delta Q = Q_2 - Q_1$ (column 13). Actually this equals to ΔQ at step 11 for all sections except the last row (see step). 21). Calculate the difference in velocity ΔV between sections 1 and 2. $\Delta V = V_2 - V_1$ (column 14).

22). Compute ∆h using the momentum equation. This is calculated, with n=1, from :

$$\Delta h_{(n)-(n+1)} = \frac{Q_n (V_n + V_{n+1}) \Delta V_{(n)-(n+1)}}{g (Q_n + Q_{n+1})} (1 - \frac{\Delta Q_{(n)-(n+1)}}{2 Q_n})$$
(4.49)

This equation gives $\Delta h_{computed}$ between sections 1 and 2, $\Delta h_{1,2}$ and is entered automatically in column 15, row 2. The value calculated is 0.0001 and matches the assumed value of step 11 entered in column 15, row 1. Because of the match, the trial and error calculation is finished between sections 1 and 2. If $\Delta h_{computed}$ did not match $\Delta h_{termspicen}$, it is necessary to return to step 11 and substitute $\Delta h_{termspicen}$ by $\Delta h_{computed}$. Then step 11 would be repeated. This process continues until the calculated value of Δh printed in column 15, row 2 is equal to the assumed value entered in column 15, row 1.

The whole process is then repeated from section 2 to 3 and is started by entering the assumed value of Δh_{23} in column 15, row 3. The spreadsheet goes through the calculation and prints the calculated value of Δh in column 15, row 4. The operator checks and reenters as necessary. This is repeated for each section up to section 12 (shown as section n in Figure 4-3).

23). The total flow Q_{12} at section 12, is the total flow without including the flow over the two tip sections, each of length a, at the upstream end of labyrinth weir crest. Thus the total flow Q_{12} at section 12, becomes :

$$Q_{12'} = Q_{12} + C_{d_{11}} (2 a) (H_{12})^{1.5} \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 g}$$
 (4.50)

This gives Q₁₂ = 335.0773 (column 6, row 12' and column 20, row 13).

24). Calculate $X_{13} = X_{12} + \Delta x$ (It is obtained by setting n = 13 in the equation (4.38)). This gave $X_{13} = 30.4419$ cm (column 18, row 13). It is necessary to satisfy energy conditions between sections 12 and 13 to obtain the depth H_{13} at section 13. This is given by :

$$H_{13} = H_{12} + C_{re} \frac{V_{12}^2}{2 g}$$
(4.51)

where C_{sc} is the energy loss coefficient due to sudden contraction. A number of C_{c} values were investigated. This was required in order to match the author's theoretical results with the Hay and Taylor's theoretical results. The author assumed that Hay and Taylor's theoretical solution was the correct one. However author's theoretical solution will also be compared to author's experimental results. As shown in Table 4.1, C_{sc} values equal to 0.1, 0.15, 0.2 and 0.25 were tried and gave depths H₁₃ at section 13 as shown in column 19. These depths (column 19) were then used (step 5) to calculate the discharge coefficients shown in column 21.

25). The total flow over the normal or straight weir applying the local depth H_{13} at section 13, and the width of one-cycle labyrinth weir, w is given by :

$$Q_N = C_{d_{11}} \approx \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 g} (H_{13})^{1.5}$$
 (4.52)

These results are given in column 22.

26). Finally, the flow magnification, Q_L/Q_N was calculated along with the depth to weir height ratio, H/P. These results are given in columns 23 and 24 respectively. Note that the whole procedure only provides one value of Q_L/Q_N and one corresponding value of H/P depending on the value specified for C_w . To get another value of Q_L/Q_N and H/Pfor the same dimension of labyrinth weir, steps 4 to 26 except step 6 must be repeated. If the dimensions are changed, then the solution must be started from step 1.

A comparison of results with Hay and Taylor's theoretical solution showed that a value of C_{sc} equal to 0.1, gave the best fit. Details of the comparison are given in section 4.3.5.

Table 4.1 provides only one example of the spreadsheet calculation and gives data for H/P = 0.0306. Other examples are provided in Appendix A where Tables C.1 to C.8 give data for eight different values of H/P with values varying from 0.03 to 0.58. In each case the dimensions of the labyrinth weir are given by 1 = 71.98 cm, w = 28.1 cm, a = 3.51 cm, and α = 14.04°.

4.3.3. Flow charts

A flow chart to illustrate the operations which must be carried out by the computer was developed for the QuickBASIC program. This is shown in Figure 4-4. This flow chart is designed to obtain a series of values of Q_L/Q_H and a series of corresponding values of H/P for particular design dimensions. The range of H/P values is set from 0 to 0.6. The flow charts consist of three nested loops. The inner loop represents the iteration of flow depth at a section. The middle loop repeats this calculation over the length of the labyrinth weir to provide one value of H/P and one corresponding value of Q_c/Q_8 . The outer loop repeats the entire calculation for a range of specified values of H/P.

The flow chart starts with the specification of the design dimensions of the labyrinth weir. These include : the developed length of one-cycle (I), the width of one cycle (w), the half length of tip section (a), and the weir height (P). It is then necessary to specify the number of sections (n), gravitational acceleration (g), and energy loss coefficient due to sudden contraction (C_{w}) . Next the labyrinth weir parameters are calculated. These include : the length magnification (I/w), width to weir height ratio (w/P), and side wall angle (a). The geometrical dimensions which will be required for the next calculation are also calculated.

The flow chart then comes to the outer loop which calculates the different values of H/P and corresponding values of Q_i/Q_{tr} . This starts by defining the depth at the initial section (H_i), the initial assumption of difference of depth between the two sections ($\Delta h_{temperson}$), the level of acceptable error (E), and the amount by which this initial depth is increased for each repetition of the entire calculation. This outer loop will be reexecuted automatically with different values of H_i and will stop automatically when the value of H/P is greater than or equal to 0.6.

After that, flow chart comes to the middle loop which computes the different values of depth at each adjacent section. This middle loop will be re-executed automatically once Ah is established in the inner loop. The number of repetitions in this second loop depends on the number of sections, n, which were defined. Once the last



Figure 4-4 Flow charts for QuickBASIC program

section is reached, the computation goes back automatically to the outer loop.

Next, the flow chart comes to the inner loop. This loop repeats the calculation of the depth difference between two sections (Δh) until the computed value agrees with the assumed value. The calculation uses the momentum equation. If the error between $\Delta h_{tempeten}$ and $\Delta h_{tempeted}$ is greater than the level of acceptable error (E), then this inner loop will be re-executed. This is done automatically by modifying the next estimation of Δh by setting the assumed value equal to the computed value. Once the value of $\Delta h_{assumption}$ agrees with $\Delta h_{tempeted}$ this inner loop will jump back automatically to the middle loop.

Finally, the output of the program is printed. This includes the flow magnification (Q_t/Q_t) and depth to weir height ratio (H/P) of one design dimension of labyrinth weir with one-cycle. A typical output of the QuickBASIC program is shown in Appendix C.

4.3.4. QuickBASIC Program

The computer program was designed for practical use in the design of labyrinth weirs and to compute the relationship between flow magnification values, Q_t/Q_t and depth to weir height ratios, H/P. These values are computed for one-cycle of the labyrinth weir. As shown in Appendix B, the program consisted of 142 lines. These include :

(1) Lines 10-90 clear screen, and give the program title.

(2) Line 100 is a dimension statement.

(3) Lines 110-210 print the heading.

(4) Lines 220-310 input data. This includes the developed length of labyrinth weir, width of one-cycle, half length of tip section, gravitational acceleration, weir height, number of increments, and energy loss coefficient due to sudden contraction.

(5) Lines 320-390 print the labyrinth weir geometry.

(6) Lines 400-510 calculate the length magnification, depth to weir height ratio, side wall angle, and other geometrical dimensions of labyrinth weir.

(7) Lines 520-600 print the labyrinth weir design parameters.

(8) Lines 610-720 print the heading of output.

(9) Lines 730-780 specify the initial value of the depth Δh difference between two sections, the level of acceptable error (E), the minimum value of initial depth (H_i), the maximum value of initial depth (H_i), and the desired increment of initial depth.

(10) Line 790 starts the calculation in loop 1 for different initial depths.

(11) Lines 800-920 calculate the total flow at the initial section.

(12) Line 930 starts the calculation in loop 2 for different adjacent depths until to the last section.

(13) Lines 940-960 stores Δhinput data and calculates the width.

(14) Lines 970-1110 give the calculation in loop 3 to match Δhinput due with Δhomouted-

(15) Line 1120 stores the adjacent depth after getting the matched Δh.

(16) Line 1130 is the end of loop 2.

(17) Lines 1140-1170 stores the depth, flow, discharge coefficient, and velocity at the last section.

(18) Line 1180 calculates the flow over two tip sections at the upstream end of the

labyrinth weir

- (19) Line 1190 calculates the total flow of a labyrinth weir for one initial depth value.
- (20) Lines 1200-1210 calculate the total depth in the approach channel.
- (21) Lines 1220-1230 calculate the total flow over the normal weir.
- (22) Lines 1240-1250 calculate the flow magnification and depth to weir height ratio.
- (23) Lines 1260-1420 print output and stop the program.

4.3.5. Comment on Spreadsheet vs QuickBASIC

In the author's experience, five minutes was required to obtain one value of Q_L/Q_N and the corresponding value of H/P using the spreadsheet. This duration was largely because a trial and error method was applied. Thus, to get a series of values (0, 1 \leq H/P \leq 0.6) would require, on average, half an hour.

Unlike the spreadsheet, QuickBASIC only requires a few seconds to obtain a series of values of Q_t/Q_N and H/P. Thus, QuickBASIC is more advantageous than the spreadsheet with respect to time.

The outputs of the spreadsheet and the QuickBASIC program are shown in Figure 4-5 and are very close. Further details of spreadsheet output are given in Appendix A. The output of the QuickBASIC program is shown in Appendix C. The QuickBASIC program is to be preferred as the method of obtaining a theoretical solution.

The author's results were compared with those of Hay and Taylor (1969). Three models in Taylor's work were reproduced in the author's theoretical solution. These were considered to be representative of Hay and Taylor's results and were considered to be sufficient for comparison. The comparison is illustrated in Figure 4-6. This showed satisfactory agreement with the condition that the energy loss coefficient, C_{sc} was equal to 0.1 rather than 0.2 which was obtained earlier by Taylor (1968).



Figure 4-5 A comparison of the output obtained from spreadsheet and QuickBASIC.



Figure 4-6 Comparison between Hay and Taylor theoretical results and author theoretical results for 3 trapezoidal planform labyrinth weirs with downstream interference (zero change in bed elevation). (modified from Hay and Taylor, 1969).

Chapter 5

Experimental Procedures

5.1. Weir models

The trapezoidal geometry (Figure 3-16) which was proposed by IIHE, Bandung-Indonesia, would be retested in this present experiment. Experiments were required to confirm previous experimental data obtained in hydraulic model studies of this weir. Based on the dimensions of the testing flume facility at the Hydraulics Laboratory, Memorial University of Newfoundland, the size of the trapezoidal geometry was designed. The resulting two-cycle trapezoidal plan form labyrinth weir had dimensions : w = 281 mm, 1 = 720 mm, a = 35 mm, α = 14.04°, and P = 100 mm as indicated in Figure 5-1 and noted as model no.1.

Based on the dimensions of this trapezoidal geometry, a rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection between the two-cycles was developed by the author as an alternative geometry. It was thought that this might give a better performance than the trapezoidal plan form because the rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection





Legend :



- L/W = length magnification

 $-\alpha$ = side wall angle

- P = crest height

Figure 5-1 Schematic of the sharp crested abyrinth weir plan forms tested in the flume. (Flow direction from bottom to top). provides a longer crest than the trapezoidal shape. Thus it might give a larger flow than the trapezoidal shape at the same operating depth. The re tangular geometry with a semicircular connection was designed with : w = 281 mm, l = 752 mm, a = 70 mm, R =70 mm, $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$, and P = 100 mm as shown in Figure 5-1 and noted as model no.5. It was also considered necessary to retest the rectangular geometry in order to compare the performance of a rectangular geometry with that of a rectangular geometry with a semicircular connection. This two-cycle rectangular geometry was designed with : w = 281nm, l = 843 mm, a = 70 mm, $\alpha = 0^{\circ}$, and P = 100 mm as displayed in Figure 5-1 and noted as model no.4.

To avoid the possibility of scale errors a trapezoidal geometry similar to model no.1 was developed but with four-cycles. The shape was exactly the same as that of model no.1 but the size were reduced by a factor of 2.0. This is shown in Figure 5-1 and noted as model no.2.

A decrease in the side wall angle, α for a trapezoidal geometry also was examined by developing another trapezoidal shape with two-cycles. The dimensions were, w = 281mm, 1 = 757 mm, a = 47 mm, $\alpha = 9.42^{\circ}$, and P = 100 mm as illustrated in Figure 5-1 and noted as model no.3. This model would confirm whether a decrease in the side wall angle, α for a trapezoidal geometry would also significantly reduce the flow capacity at the same operating depth conditions.

As discussed in section 4.2 the results of the model test would be presented in terms of flow magnification (Q_{e}/Q_{o}) against flow depth to weir height ratio (H/P) for a constant value of the length magnification (L/W) and vertical aspect ratio (W/P). Therefore, to produce the correlation between them, the experiment should be conducted with a variation in the value of I, w, and P. Variation in I was obtained by developing models no.3, 4, and 5. A variation in w also was noted by developing model no.2. Variation in P was considered by developing model no.1a (see Figure 5-2). The dimensions were similar to model no.1 except that the crest height, P was reduced to 50 mm.

It was decided to use 2 mm thick aluminum to construct the labyrinth weir models in this experimental study. This was chosen because aluminum is easy to fabricate and there is no warping problem. Also, since the thickness of the aluminum is 2 mm, it is not necessary to chamfer the downstream edges of the crest. Such material has already been considered as a sharp crested weir (Kraatz, 1975).

After initial tests (model no. 1) were run, it was observed that the value of Q_i/Q_N exceeded the value of L/W. This was peculiar, because the maximum Q_i/Q_N value of a labyrinth weir should be equal to the value of L/W (see section 3.2). It was thought that this might due to under estimation of the discharge coefficient using the Rehbock equation in calculating the total flow of a straight weir, Q_m , from the standard weir equation. This could have resulted in a lower value of Q_m than was expected and therefore a higher value of Q_L/Q_m than was expected. Consequently, it was necessary to evaluate the use of the Rehbock equation to predict the discharge coefficient in calculating Q_m . A straight weir (model no.6, Figure 5-2) then was established with crest length, L = 562 mm and P = 100 mm.

Further developments of weir shape were done again during the experimental







- L/W = length magnification

- α = side wall angle

- P = crest height

Figure 5-2 Schematic of the sharp crested weir geometries tested in the flume. (Flow direction from bottom to top).

work because of some initial findings. When a rectangular geometry (model no.4) was investigated at high flows, a small undular jump was found to occur over the crest. This was thought to be due to blocking of the downstream flow due to insufficient cross sectional area in the downstream flow passages. Thus, a reverse trapezoidal shape (model no.7, Figure 5-2) which increased the blocking by further restricting the downstream width was used to study this phenomenon. After model no.7 was run, it was shown that the jump did indeed occur due to blocking of the downstream flow. Then, efforts were made to increase the area of the downstream receiving channel by developing another reverse trapezoidal shape (model no.8, Figure 5-2) and examining whether it would decrease the size of the jump or perhaps eliminate the jump altogether.

From past experience in the field, sharp crests are sensitive to large quantities of debris. Sometime this could damage the sharp crest and as a result, reduce the effectiveness of the weir to pass the flow. For this reason, it was thought necessary to study the effect of varying the crest thickness. Among the four models of labyrinth weirs (model no.1, 3, 4, and 5), model no.1 proved to be the model which gave the largest flowrate per unit of crest length. Therefore, model no.1 was retested with different values of the crest thickness. These are shown as models no. 1B, 1C, 1D, and 1E in Figure 5-3. A photograph of all weirs model is given in Figure 5-4.

5.2. Range of flows required

Based on the dimensions of the labyrinth weir models, the range of flows required could be determined by specifying the range of depths, H, which would be tested in this







- L/W = length magnification

- α = side wall angle
- P = crest height

Figure 5-3 Schematic of the trapezoidal labyrinth weirs with different top width tested in the flume. (Flow direction from bottom to top).



Figure 5-4 Photograph of all weir models



Figure 5-5 Initial test in progress

experiment. Initial tests (Figure 5-5) proved that the minimum depth which could be measured in the model was 10 mm. When a lower depth than 10 mm was run, it was found to be difficult to take the measurement since in this condition the depth fluctuated. In addition, it was also shown that the maximum depth which could be measured was 60 mm. When a higher depth than 60 mm was run, it was observed that a submerged flow occurred.

Therefore, the range of depth to weir height ratio, H/P which would be investiged in this experiment was between 0.1 and 0.6. Then the maximum depth, H_{max} , which would be observed for all models was 60 mm except for model no.1a (P = 50 mm) H_{max} . = 30 mm. The minimum depth, H_{mix} which would be covered for all models was 10 mm. The range range of flows was estimated from the standard weir equation (equation 4.1) and is summarized in Table 5.1 below.

Model No.	Total crest length,L (cm)	H (cm)	H (cm)	Minimum flow, (l/s)	Maximum flow, Q (l/s)
1	143.96	1.0	6.0	3.03	41.84
2	143.95	1.0	6.0	3.03	41.84
3	151.49	1.0	6.0	3.19	44.03
4	168.60	1.0	6.0	3.55	49.00
5	150.51	1.0	6.0	3.17	43.74
6	56.20	1.0	6.0	1.18	16.33
7	200.16	1.0	6.0	4.21	58.17
8	143.96	1.0	6.0	3.03	41.84
1A	143.96	1.0	3.0	3.06	15.16

TABLE 5.1 Range of flows O required in the experiment

1B	143.96	1.0	6.0	3.03	41.84
1C	143.96	1.0	6	3.03	41.84
ID	143.96	1.0	6	3.03	41.84
1E	143.96	1.0	6	3.03	41.84

Note : Flow is estimated from standard weir equation (equation (4.1)).

5.3. Size and design of flume

The initial experimental arrangement attempted to make use of an existing facility. This facility was a recirculating sand flume and a new channel was constructed of wood to hold the model weirs. The intention was to place this new channel on top of the existing flume so as to make use of the pump, flow measurement device and recirculating pipework. The new channel was constructed to be 4.12 m long, 0.32 m deep and 0.56 m wide. Photographs are shown in Figures 5-6 and 5-7.

The initial experiments showed however that the maximum flow rate of the pump was not sufficient to cover the maximum flow rate required by this experiment. Therefore, the old wooden flume was modified and removed. A completely new flume was designed as shown in Figures 5-8 to 5-12. In this new set up, it was intended that water would be supplied to the flume from an underground tank by a constant speed centrifugal pump connected to the flume through an 203 mm diameter pipe with appropriate control valves. The exit flow from the flume was discharged into a tail flume fitted with a calibrated V-notch weir, from where it discharged into the main sump.

The flow entering the flume was led into the bottom of a vertical box with a trapezoidal cross section. Aluminum honeycomb was placed in this box to minimise



Figure 5-6 Photograph of initial testing facility (side view)



Figure 5-7 Photograph of initial testing facility (downstream view)



Figure 5-8 Photograph of the new testing facility (upstream view)



Figure 5-9 Photograph of the new testing facility (downstream view)











eddies as the water rose and to provide a smooth flow at the upstream end of the flume. This system later proved to be unsatisfactory, particularly at high flow, for it produced waves in the flume. Then, some sheets of wire mesh were placed beyond the honeycomb, and this new flow straightener resulted in a smooth ripple free surface (Figure 5-13).

The weir model was placed 915 mm from the downstream end of the main flume. To avoid leakage between the bottom and edges of the weir and the flume walls, the very small gaps between weir model and the channel bed were secured by a thin layer of du.seal along the bottom and sides (Figure 5-14). This did not affect the flow capacity of labyrinth weir.

Finally, depth measuring sections were determined (Figure 5-15), 25 cm $(\geq 4 \text{xH}_{\text{max}})$ from the weir model (Albertson *et al.*, 1960; Kraatz, 1975). This depth, H would then be used in equation (4.1) and would be plotted as the value of H/P. Also a survey was conducted of the channel bed to ensure that the flume had been set up with a horizontal bed.

5.4. Provision of flow

When the second run of the model test was being carried out, it was observed that the lowest flow rate of the centrifugal pump was too large to supply the minimum flow rate required by this experiment. Therefore, it was decided to use the centrifugal pump only for high flows. Under these conditions the flow rate would be adjusted by valve and the flow magnitude would be measured by the V-notch weir (Figure 5-16). Model tests showed that the range of these high flows varied from 8.20 l/s to 39.15 l/s.



Figure 5-13 Photograph of the flow straightener system



Figure 5-14 Photograph of a thin layer of duxseal along the bottom and sides



Figure 5-15 Photograph shows the location of depth measuring section



Figure 5-16 Photograph of the V-notch weir

Following this it was decided to supply low flows using the laboratory freshwater supply. The flow rate could be adjusted by valve and the flow magnitude could be controlled by the rotameter. Flows from this rotameter were delivered to the flume through a 102 mm diameter pipe. Experiment showed that the range of the low flow was between 2.43 l/s to 8.1 l/s.

5.5. Flow measurement and depth measurement

5.5.1. Flow measurement

A sharp sided 90° V-notch weir (Figure 5-17) was designed to measure the discharge. This was chosen for ease of construction and for accuracy over the design range of flows (8.2 l/s to 39.15 l/s). The flow depths at the downstream end were measured 900 mm upstream from the weir crest by a fixed point gauge (Figure 5-18). A wooden board 20 mm thick, 400 mm high together with aluminum honeycomb approximately 100 mm thick, 445 mm high was set at 1.31 m from the downstream end to provide the necessary stilling.

5.5.2. Depth measurement

Water surface profiles over the model were measured by a movable point gauge to the nearest 0.001 ft (0.305 mm). This avoided the need for more than one pointgauge, since the measurement point varied along the length and width of the channel (Figure 5-19).

The flow depth upstream of the V-notch weir was measured by a fixed point



DETAIL OF V-NOTCH WEIR



Figure 5-18 Flow depth measurement at the V-notch weir in progress



Figure 5-19 Depth measurement at the weir model in progress
gauge to the nearest 0.001 ft (0.305 mm). This fixed point gauge was placed 0.9 m upstream of the weir crest.

5.6. Calibration works

Because the flow and depth measurements were the main data that would be collected in the model tests, it was very important to ensure accurate calibration of the point gauge, the rotameter, and the standard 90° V-notch weir.

5.6.1. Calibration and check on accuracy of the point-gauges

A calibration of point-gauges (see Figure 5-20) showed that 328 counts on the counter was equivalent to 100 mm. Alternatively each count measured 0.001 ft. Although a calibration of point-gauges was done, it is necessary to check the accuracy of the pointgauges. This was done by taking the flow depth measurement using the point-gauges and a vertical manometer connected to the tail flume (see Figure 5-21).

Several readings of the flow depth over the sharp sided 90° V-notch weir were taken 0.90 m upstream of the V-notch weir crest, together with readings of the vertical manometer. Comparisons showed that the maximum variation in the determination of the flow depth was 4.18 percent as displayed in Figure 5-22. Also, it can be seen that the error decreases with increasing discharge, Q.







Figure 5-21 Sketch to illustrate a check an accuracy of point gauge using manometer



Figure 5-22 The discharge-depth (Q-H) relationship at the v-notch weir measured by point gauge and vertical manometer.

5.6.2. Calibration of rotameter

A number of flow rates were run and measured using the rotameter. These were compared with a volumetric measurement. This is a simple way to check the accuracy of the rotameter by discharging a measured volume of water within a particular time. This was done by discharging water into a tank of known cross sectional area and measuring the increase in depth over a measured time.

The test result is shown in Figure 5-23. It was observed that the maximum error of the rotameter was only 1.56 percent. A photograph to show the calibration of rotameter is given in Figure 5-24. 1

119



Figure 5-23 The calibration test result of rotameter

5.6.3. Calibration of the V-notch weir

A total of six flows were run to calibrate the V-notch weir using the rotameter (Figure 5-25). Four readings for each flow were taken using the fixed point gauge to measure the flow depth over the V-notch weir. Flowrates were measured using the rotameter. The results are presented in Figure 5-26 which shows the plot of flowrate, measured by rotameter, against head over the V-notch weir. This correlation gives the relationship for the V-notch weir as :

$$O = 15.21 H^{2.5}$$
 (5.1)

where Q is discharge in 1/s; and H is the depth over the crest in cm.

Equation (5.1) may be rewritten as :



Figure 5-24 Calibration of the rotameter in progress



Figure 5-25 Calibration of the V-notch weir in progress

$$Q = \frac{8}{15} \sqrt{2g} C_d \tan \theta H^{2.5}$$
 (5.2)

where C_e is a discharge coefficient = 0.64 and θ is the angle of each side of the V-notch to the vertical = 45°. Usually C_e = 0.58-0.61 (Novak,1990)

Although equations 5.1 and 5.2 were obtained under the low flowrate condition, it was considered that they can be used also for the high flow condition, because of the known accuracy of V-notch weirs. Operational problems did not permit direct calibration of the higher flows.



Figure 5-26 The discharge-depth (Q-H) relationship at the v-notch weir, a comparison of measured and predicted by $Q = 15.21 \text{ H}^{1.5}$.

5.7. Experiments

The general procedures used are described in this section which also includes some details of the model tests.

5.7.1. A typical experiment

Methods of collecting the experimental data will be discussed in two sections according to the magnitude of the flow (see section 5.4).

(1) Low flows

First, the valve at the freshwater supply was opened. Then, the flowrate Q_r at rotameter was set. The valve was adjusted until the flowrate at the rotameter was stable at the desired flowrate, Q_r . It was then necessary to wait until the water surface on the flume was stable. Usually, ten minutes was enough to get this condition. Then, the depths were measured using the point gauge 250 mm upstream from the weir model (discussed previously in section 5.3 and see Figure 5-27). Three depths were measured across the channel. The mean depth, H, was taken as the average value of these depth measurements. One value of Q_r and one value of H were obtained from each test.

(2) High flows

First, the valve downstream of the centrifugal pump was opened. Then, the depth over the weir crest was set. This was done by adjusting the valve until the depth over the crest was established at the desired flow depth. As before it was then necessary to wait about ten minutes until the water surface on the flume and tail flume were stable. Then, the flow depths were measured using the point gauge 250 mm upstream from the weir model (discussed previously in section 5.3 and see Figure 5-27). Last, the flow depth was measured 900 mm upstream of the V-notch weir in order to obtain the flowrate, Q_{T} , which was calculated using equation 5.1. As before one value of Q_{T} and one value of H were obtained from each test.

The water surface profiles for low and high flows were obtained from depth measurements along the lines 1 and 2 shown in Figure 5-28. Typically, ten depth measurements were made along the line at 50 mm intervals. This was varied as necessary to give sufficient detail. Measured data are given in Appendix D.



Points 1,2, and 3 are the location of depth measurements

Figure 5-27 Measurement sections of depth, H



Figure 5-28 Measurement sections to obtain the water surface profile

5.7.2. Model test data

The number of flow runs and the flow ranges for each of the weir models is summarized in Table 5.2. As shown in Table 5.2 the maximum flow in these experiments was 39.15 l/s and the minimum flow was 2.43 l/s. Details of the flow and depth for each weir model are given in Appendix D which also summarises the calculations. A total of 205 experiments were run using the 8 basic models and the 5 modifications of model no.1.

Model No. (1)	Number of tests (2)	Flow range (litre/second) (3)	
1	21	3.53 - 37.92	
2	15	3.86 - 29.31	
3	11	4.73 - 35.27	
4	24	4.24 - 37.00	
5	24	3.37 - 36.87	
6	15	2.43 - 17.66	
7	14	5.07 - 23.80	-
8	14	4.73 - 24.19	
la	12	2.90 - 13.52	
16	13	4.84 - 38.00	
1c	14	4.95 - 39.15	
1d	14	4.92 - 38.89	
le	14	4.92 - 35.76	

TABLE 5.2 Range of flows for each weir model in the experiment

5.7.3. The range of the Froude and Reynolds number in the model test

Since the flow in open channels results under the action of gravitational forces which influence the resistance it is useful to check the values of the Froude, F, and Reynolds number, R₄ (Sharp, 1981). However, it is not necessary to check the Froude and Reynolds number for each flow rate in all experiments. Rather it is possible to use minimum and maximum flow rates in order to obtain a range of values for F and R₄. In the experiments reported here the maximum flow was 39.15 1/s at a total flow depth equal to 158 mm. The minimum flow was 2.43 l/s at a total flow depth equal to 115 mm. The Froude number, F is expressed by :

$$F = \frac{V}{\sqrt{g H}}$$
(5.3)

in which F is the Froude number; V is velocity; g is gravitational acceleration; and H is the flow depth. Using equation (5.3) the maximum Froude number is 0.35 while the minimum Froude number is 0.035.

The Reynolds number, Re can be estimated from :

$$R_e = \frac{V H}{v}$$
(5.4)

where R_e is Reynolds number; V is velocity; H is the flow depth; and ν is kinematic viscosity assumed to be 10⁴ m²s⁴. Using equation (5.4) the maximum value of R_e was 6966 and the minimum value was 433. Thus it can be concluded that the model flows were rough turbulent since rough turbulent flow occurs when $R_e > 400$ to 800 (de Vries, 1971 quoted in Sharp, 1981).

Chapter 6 Results and Discussion

The results of the tests on each model will be given separately. A discussion to compare these results will also be provided in this chapter. As discussed in the previous chapter (4.2) the experimental results were plotted in terms of flow magnification, $Q_{\rm L}/Q_{\rm N}$ and flow depth to weir height ratio, H/P. This will represent the performance of each labyrinth weir model. The results of the investigation however will also be plotted in terms of a relationship between the discharge coefficient, $C_{\rm a}$ and the flow depth to weir height ratio, H/P. This is to confirm the assumption made in the theoretical solution that the discharge coefficient could be predicted by the Rehbock equation (see section 4.1).

6.1. The linear weir (model no.6)

After fifteen flow runs (see Appendix D for experimental data in Table D.6) the results of the test were plotted in terms of discharge coefficient, C_4 against depth to crest height ratio, H/P as shown in Figure 6-1. Three theoretical formulas to predict the C_4 values were compared to experimental values of C4. These include :

 The Rehbock equation (modified from Daugherty and Ingersoll, 1954; and quoted in Vennard and Street, 1975; and Daugherty and Franzini, 1977).

$$C_d = 0.605 + 0.08 \frac{H}{P} + \frac{1}{10.007 H}$$
 (6.1)

in which H is in cm.

(2) The Rouse equation (quoted in Daily and Harleman, 1973).

$$C_{d} = 0.61 + 0.08 \frac{H}{P}$$
 (6.2)

(3) The Kindsvater and Carter formula (modified from Albertson et al., 1960).

$$C_{q} = 0.6019 + 0.0748 \frac{H}{P}$$
 (6.3)

As shown in Figure 6-1, among those equations, the Rehbock formula showed the best agreement with the author's C_a experimental values, although the experimental discharge coefficients were slightly higher than theoretical values predicted by the Rehbock formula. This difference however was observed to be not more than 10% on average (see Table D.6). Thus the experimental values were considered to be still predicted reasonably well using the Rehbock equation. This confirms the previous assumption made in section 4.1. and this equation (6.1) was used to predict the value of C_a for a linear weir. This value of C_a was also required to estimate the theoretical flowrate over the straight weir (Q_w) using equation (4.1).



Figure 6-1 Comparison of theoretical and experimental results of discharge coefficient, C_d vs H/P of the straight weir (model no.6).

6.2. The trapezoidal labyrinth weirs (model no.1, 1a, 2, and 3)

6.2.1. Coefficient of discharge

The results of all the trapezoidal labyrinth weir model tests were plotted in terms of discharge coefficient, C_4 against depth to crest height ratio, H/P as shown in Figures 6-2 (model no.1-data in Table D.1, model no.1a-data in Table D.9, model no.2-data in Table D.2, and model no.3-data in Table D.3). It can be seen that C_4 results are scattered but still may be predicted reasonably well using the Rehbock equation. However, when the value of H/P > 0.4 the experimental values of C_d decreased and could not be predicted by Rehbock formula. This was as expected. At higher values of H/P there is more interference in the flows leaving each cycle and as a result the discharge coefficient decreases.

The good agreement between theory and experiment for discharge coefficient values at H/P < 0.4 suggests that, provided L/W is also less than about 2.7, the discharge can be predicted by equation 4.1, the standard weir equation. At values of L/W > 2.7 and H/P > 0.4 the QuickBASIC program would give a more accurate solution.



Figure 6-2 Comparison of theoretical and experimental results of discharge coefficient, C_d vs H/P of models no. 1, 2, and 3 (Figure 5-1) and model no.1a (Figure 5-2)

6.2.2. Scale errors

Scale effects were checked by comparing the values of flow magnification between model no.1 (data in Table D.1) and model no.2 (data in Table D.2). These weirs were geometrically identical (see Figure 5-1) but model no.2 was half the size of model no.1. As illustrated in Figure 6-3, scale effects or errors were insignificant and both models gave the same results. This suggested that the models were large enough to be used for prediction purposes.



Figure 6-3 Comparison of flow magnification between model no.1 and model no.2 which have different sizes

The effect of changing the side wall angle (α) was observed by comparing the values of flow magnification of model no.1 (data in Table D.1) and model no.3 (data in Table D.3). Model no.1 had a side wall angle of 14.04° while the side wall angle in model no.2 was 9.42° (see Figure 5-1). As indicated in Figure 6-4, this change did not affect the flow magnification magnitudes significantly. Note however that there is a slight theoretical difference. This difference was smaller than the experimental scatter.



Figure 6-4 Comparison of flow magnification between model no.1 and model no.3 with different value of the side wall angle (α) and the length magnification (L/W).

6.2.4. Effect of varying the crest height (P)

Models no.1 (data in Table D.1) and no.1a (data in Table D.9) were identical geometrically except that the crest height of model no.1a (50 mm) was half that (100 mm) of model no.1 (see Figures 5-1 and 5-2). These models were used to investigate the effect of varying the crest height. As can be seen in Figure 6-5, it was obvious that the change of this parameter was not significant and there was no change in labyrinth weir performance either theoretically or experimentally.



Figure 6-5 Comparison of flow magnification between model no.1 and model no.1a with different value of the weir height (P).

6.2.5. Discussion

In all trapezoidal labyrinth weir models, the coefficient of discharge, C_{as} , could be predicted reasonably well using the Rehbock equation except for H/P > 0.4 (see Figure 6-2). This confirmed the previous assumption that the Rehbock equation could be used to predict the theoretical values of C_a in a theoretical solution. It was also observed that the experimental values of flow magnification agreed very well with the theoretical values predicted by the QuickBASIC program.

In addition, the curve of Q_{L}/Q_{N} against H/P tends to be relatively flat at the low values of Q_{L}/Q_{N} studied in these experiments. This is as expected and confirms the results obtained by previous experimenters.

6.3. The rectangular labyrinth weir (model no.4, Figure 5-1)

6.3.1. The discharge coefficient (C_)

As can be seen in Figure 6-6 (data in Table D.4), the experimental discharge coefficient for the rectangular geometry labyrinth weir decreased rapidly as the depth to crest height ratio, H/P, increased. Thus, the theoretical value of C_4 could not be predicted very well either using the Rehbock, the Rouse or the Kindsvater & Carter formulas. This decrease in discharge coefficient is thought to be due to the weir's geometry. Because the sidewalls of the rectangular shape are parallel to the flow direction the flow over the side wall crests has a velocity component parallet to the crests and therefore the flow may be reduced.

6.3.2. The flow magnification

As displayed in Figure 6-7 (data in Table D.4), the experimental values of the flow magnification at this type of weir were satisfactorily predicted by the theoretical computer solution although the experimental values were slightly higher. This did not confirm Taylor's work (1968) which showed a significant discrepancy between theoretical and experimental results. However, the author's experiments were based on a lower length magnification value (l/w = 3) than Taylor's model (l/w = 6 and l/w = 8) and this may be the reason for the better agreement.

The trend of both theoretical and experimental values showed that the flow magnification decreases as the depth to crest height increases. This corroborated Taylor's experiment for a rectangular shape labyrinth weir.



Figure 6-6 Comparison of theoretical and experimental results of discharge coefficient, C_d vs H/P of model no. 4 (rectangular shaped labyrinth weir, two-cycle).



Figure 6-7 The flow magnification at rectangular shape labyrinth weir (model no.4, Figure 5-1), both experimental and theoretical values.

6.3.3. The water surface profile

The water surface profile along the centre line of one cycle is shown in Figure 6-8 (data in Tables D.14, D.15, and D.16). As can be seen from Figure 6-8, an undular jump occurred in this rectangular shape. The phenomenon was particularly noticable at high flows ($H/P \ge 0.40$). Also the height of the jump rises as the flow increases. In addition the jump location moves in the downstream direction as the flow increases.



Figure 6-8 Water surface profile along the centre line of one-cycle on rectangular plan form labyrinth weir (model no.4, Figure 5-1).

6.4. The rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection (model no.5, Figure 5-1)

6.4.1. The discharge coefficient, C_d

The relationship between the discharge coefficient, C_{4} , and the depth to crest height ratio, H/P, is shown in Figure 6-9. This indicates that the experimental values are in good agreement with the theoretical values predicted the by Rehbock equation except at higher flows (H/P \ge 0.4) where there is a discrepancy.



Figure 6-9 Comparison of theoretical and experimental results of discharge coefficient, C_a , vs H/P of model no.5 (rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection, twocycle labyrinth weir).

6.4.2. The flow magnification

The experimental data and computed results of the QuickBASIC program were plotted and displayed in Figure 6-10. As shown in Figure 6-10 (data in Table D.5), the computed results compared well with the experimental data. Note however that there is a discrepancy between the experimental and theoretical curves. This was not considered to be significant since the difference was smaller than 10 percent.



Figure 6-10 The flow magnification data at rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection, two-cycle labyrinth weir (model no.5), both experimental and computed results.

6.4.3. The water surface profile

The water surface profile is shown in Figure 6-11. As can be seen from Figure 6-11 (data in Tables D.17, D.18, and D.19), an undular jump also occurred at this geometry especially at higher flows. Also the height of the jump rises as the flow increases and the jump location moves downstream as the flow increases. Although this model behaved similarly to model no.4 (Figure 5-1) with respect to the jump, the height of the jump which occurred with this model was lower than that of a rectangular shaped labyrinth weir. A comparison is shown in Figures 6-12 (data in Tables D.15 and D.17) and 6-13 (data in Tables D.16 and D.19). Notice in Figure 6-13, that although model no.5 had a higher value of H/P and Q than model no.4, the height of the jump on model no.5 was slightly lower than that of model no.4. This suggests that the semi-circular connections help to increase the effectiveness of the sidewalls to pass the flow. As a result the height of the jump decreases.



Figure 6-11 Water surface profile along the centre line of one-cycle on rectangular plan form with a semi-circular connection, two-cycle labyrinth weir (model no.5, Figure 5-1).



Figure 6-13 Water surface profiles on model no.4 and model no.5

6.5. The reverse trapezoidal shapes (model no.7 and no.8, Figure 5-2)

The primary purpose of these experiments was to study the undular jump. Also, this study investigated whether the undular jump occurred because of the blocking in the downstream channel or because of the angle of the side walls to the main flow direction. As in other experiments, flows and flow magnifications were also measured.

6.5.1. The discharge coefficient

As can be seen in Figure 6-14 (data in Tables D.7 and D.8), the effect of reversing the trapezoidal shape decreased the discharge coefficient rapidly and none of the proposed theoretical equations could predict this value. However, reducing the length of the side wall crest by constructing model no.8 was significant in increasing the discharge coefficient to some degree.



Figure 6-14 Comparison of discharge coefficient, C_d , between model no.7 and model no.8.

As shown in Figure 6-15 (data in Tables D.7 and D.8), the reverse trapezoidal effect changed the trend of flow magnification. The labyrinth weir behaves ideally at low flow and as height increases the flow magnification decreases rapidly. This is because the effectiveness of the side walls to pass the flow decreased, especially at high flow.



Figure 6-15 Comparison of flow magnification-depth to crest height ratio relationship between model no.7 and model no.8.

6.5.3. Water surface profile

The water surface profile at model no.7 is shown in Figure 6-16 (data in Tables D.20, D.21, and D.22). Similarly, the water surface profile at model no.8 is shown in Figure 6-17 (data in Tables D.23, D.24, and D.25).



Figure 6-17 Water surface profile at model no.8

Model no.7 was designed to increase the blocking in the downstream flow by decreasing the size of the openings in the downstream channel (ie 70 mm in Figure 6-16). It was expected that this would increase the size of the jump. Model no.8 was similar in shape but had larger openings (125 mm in Figure 6-17). This was expected to decrease the jump size below that of model no.7. A comparison of the jumps on upstream channel for these shapes and for model no.4 (the rectangular planform) is shown in Figure 6-18 (data in Tables D.23, D.24, and D.25).

Jumps formed with all three models. There is little difference between the jumps which formed at models no.4 and no.7 but the jump which formed at model no.8 was much shorter. All jumps were of approximately the same height. This makes it difficult to draw any definite conclusion but the reduction in jump length when the downstream openings were increased (ie model no.8) does suggest that blocking was important. However a comparison of the jumps on downstream channel (see Figure 6-19-data in Tables D.26, D.27, and D.28) showed obviously that blocking was also important. Model no.7 which had openings 70 mm in the downstream channel had the highest and the longest jump, while model no.8 which had larger openings (125 mm) had a lower and a shorter jump than model no.7. The widest downstream opening occurs for the normal trapezoidal plan form in which jumps were never observed. It was concluded again that this shape (model no.1-see Figure 5-1) was the ideal shape for a labyrinth weir.



Figure 6-18 A comparison of watersurface profile at models no.4, 7 and 8 along the centre line of one-cycle (most on upstream channel).



Figure 6-19 A comparison of watersurface profile at models no.4, 7 along the centre line between two cycles (most on dowmstream channel)

6.6. Comparison between model no.1, 4 and 5

A comparison between trapezoidal (model no.1), rectangular (model no.4) and rectangular with a semi-circular connection (model no.5) plan forms was made to evaluate those models in terms of total flowrate and flow magnification. In this comparison, model no.1 was chosen to represent the trapezoidal geometries.

As shown previously in Figure 5-1, model no.4 was 17% longer than model no.1, while model no.5 was 4% longer than model no.1. As can be seen from Figures 6-20 and 6-21 (data in Tables D.1, D.4, D.5 and D.6), the increase of the crest length at model no.4 and model no.5 was not significant in increasing the flow capacity over the labyrinth weir (see equation 4.1).



Figure 6-20 Comparison of stage-discharge relationship at models no.1, no.4, and no.5.

9 Model 4 Model 1 Model 5 8 Theory 4 Theory 1 Theory 5 7 Model P W/P I./W N n 6 10 cm 2.56 5.62 14.04 2 1 dr/dN 3.00 10 cm 5.62 0.00 2 5 10 cm 2.68 5.62 0.00 2 4 3 000 2 1 0.4 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.5 0.6 H/P

Figure 6-21 Comparison of flow magnification-depth to crest height ratio relationship at models no.1, no.4 and no.5.

As shown in Figure 6-21, the theoretical results from the QuickBASIC program show a small difference in values of the flow magnification, especially at low values of H/P. Similarly, the experimental results showed that the difference in the magnitude of flow magnification among the three models was small except at low values of H/P. These differences were not considered to be significant from a practical viewpoint. Again, it can be concluded that the trapezoidal shape (model no.1-see Figure 5-1) is the most suitable shape from a hydraulic point of view. Also it is easier and cheaper to build than rectangular shapes or rectangular shapes with semi-circular connection (models no.4 and no.5-see Figure 5-1).

6.7. The trapezoidal shapes with different crest widths (Model No.1b, 1c,1d, and 1e)

6.7.1. The discharge coefficient

As indicated in Figure 6-22, the increase of the crest width from 7 mm (model no.1b, data in Table D.10) to 10 mm (model no.1c, data in Table D.11) did not change the discharge coefficient significantly. The experimentally determined values were still predicted reasonably well using the Rehbock equation. However when the crest width was expanded to 15 mm (model no.1d, data in Table D.12) and 20 mm (model no.1e, data in Table D.13), the discharge coefficient decreased. In this case, models no.1d and le did not act as a sharp crested weir. The frictional losses over the crest were significant and hence the discharge coefficient decreased.

6.7.2. The flow magnification

The flow magnification values were not affected by increasing the crest width when the width was smaller than 10 mm. However, as shown in Figure 6-23, for model no. Id and no. Ie with crest width 15 mm and 20 mm respectively, the value of the flow magnification was likely to decrease at low flow.



Figure 6-22 Comparison of discharge coefficient amongst model no.1b, 1c, 1d, and 1e with 7 mm, 10 mm, 15 mm, and 20 mm top width respectively.

6.7.3. Discussion

As indicated in Figure 6-22 and 6-23, it can be concluded that model no.1b and le with crest widths of 7 mm and 10 mm respectively still behave reasonably similar to model no.1 which had a crest width of 2 mm. In practice, a really sharp crest is seldom used since this would make the crest sensitive to damage by floating debris.



Figure 6-23 Comparison of the flow magnification amongst model no.1b, 1c, 1d, and 1e with 7 mm, 10 mm, 15 mm, and 20 mm top width respectively.

6.8. General discussion

The experimental results showed that the value of the discharge coefficient, C_d depends on the geometry of the labyrinth weir and the crest width of the labyrinth weir. It was shown that for all trapezoidal geometries (models no.1, 1a, 2, and 3) the experimental data were fitted reasonably well by the Rehbock equation, except for higher values of H/P (see Figure 6-2). The discharge coefficient for a rectangular geometry could not predicted by the Rehbock equation (see Figure 6-6). This was thought to be
because the sidewalls of the rectangular shape are parallel to the flow direction. The flow over the side wall crests then has a velocity component parallel to the crests and the discharge coefficient may therefore be reduced. However, for a rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection (model no.5-see Figure 5-1), the experimental discharge coefficient was still predicted well by the Rehbock equation, except at higher values of H/P (see Figure 6-9). This was thought to be because the semi-circular connection helps to increase the discharge coefficient, C_p.

In addition, increasing the crest width from 2 mm (model no.1, data in Table D.1) to 10 mm (model no.1c, data in Table D.11), had little effect on the relationship between the experimentally measured values of the discharge coefficient and those given by the Rehbock equation. However the expansion of the crest width from 10 mm to 15 mm (model no.1d, data in Table D.12) and from 10 mm to 20 mm (model no.1e, data in Table D.13), showed that the experimental discharge coefficient did not fit the Rehbock equation for these crest widths.

It was also shown that the experimental flow magnification values generally have a good agreement with the theoretical results from the QuickBASIC program (see Figures 6-3, 6-4, 6-5, 6-15, 6-23). However at the rectangular geometry (model no.4) and the rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection (model no.5), it was shown that the experimental flow magnification values are always slightly higher than the theoretical results obtained from the QuickBASIC program (see Figures 6-7, 6-10). Nevertheless both experimental and theoretical results show the same trend, namely that the flow magnification tends to decrease as the head over the weir increases.

Chapter 7

Conclusions and Recommendation

7.1. Conclusions

Within the limitations of this experimental work, the following conclusions can be advanced.

• The use of a labyrinth weir with a rectangular and semi-circular connection geometry (model no.5, see Figure 5-1) does not significantly increase the performance of a labyrinth weir relative to that with a trapezoidal plan form. Although theoretically the performance should be improved because the crest length of this labyrinth weir is 4% longer than the trapezoidal shape (model no.1, see Figure 5-1), the experiments showed that there were no significant differences between the two shapes.

 It was found that the trapezoidal geometry with the side wall angle, α = 0.68 α_{max}. (model no.1 or model no.2, see Figure 5-1) gave the best hydraulic performance among other labyrinth weir geometries which were tested in this study. This confirms the result obtained by IIHE, Bandung, Indonesia (Memed and Sadeli, 1990; Puslitbang Pengairan, 1991).

• The reverse trapezoidal geometries (models no.7 and no.8, see Figure 5-2) were used to show that the existence of the jump obtained with model no.4 (rectangular shape) and model no.5 (rectangular with a semi-circular connection geometry) was probably due to blocking of the flow in the downstream channel. Also it was shown that allowing a larger space in the downstream channel (model no.8) decreased the dimensions of the jump.

• The experimental discharge coefficient at weir models no.4 (rectangular geometry, L/W = 3.00), no.7 (reverse trapezoidal, L/W = 3.56), no.8 (reverse trapezoidal, L/W = 2.56), no.1D (trapezoidal geometry with crest width = 15 mm, L/W = 2.56), and no.1E (trapezoidal geometry with crest width = 20 mm, L/W = 2.56) could not be predicted well using Rehbock equation. Thus the QuickBASIC program would give a more accurate solution in predicting the performance of those models.

• However at weir models no.1 (trapezoidal geometry, L/W = 2.56), no.1a, no.2, no.3 (trapezoidal geometry, L/W = 2.69), and no.5 (rectangular plan form with a semicircular connection, L/W = 2.68) when the value of H/P < 0.4, the discharge coefficient could be predicted well by the Rehbock equation. Thus when the value of the length magnification, L/W < 2.7 and the value of H/P < 0.4, the theoretical flowrate over the labyrinth weir can be estimated using the standard weir formula (equation 4.1) by applying the Rehbock equation (6.1) to predict the heoretical discharge coefficient. While the QuickBASIC program should be used to predict the performance of the labyrinth weir when the value of H/P > 0.4.

· The ability of the computer program to predict the performance of the labyrinth weir

has been demonstrated in this thesis. The results showed that in all cases the theoretical flow magnifications have close agreement with the experimental data. Also, the theoretical values showed a good agreement with the ones obtained earlier by Hay and Taylor (1969). This condition was achieved with the energy loss coefficient (due to a sudden contraction) equal to 0.1. This value differs from the value (0.2) obtained by Hay and Taylor.

 The economic advantages of labyrinth weirs have also been demonstrated in this thesis. It has been shown that the Ciwadas trapezoidal labyrinth weir, which was constructed in Indonesia, was more than 25% less expensive compared to the alternative of a straight weir with gate.

7.2. Recommendation

Based on the experimental results, it is possible to encourage the use of a trapezoidal geometry with : $\alpha = 0.68 \alpha_{max}$, length magnification 1/w equal to 2.65, and the crest width approximately 10% of weir height P (see model no.1c, Figure 5-3). The increased width of the crest is not significant in decreasing the discharge coefficient despite some frictional losses on the crest. Such a crest is useful when a river has a large quantity of debris.

Since the QuickBASIC program was capable of predicting the performance of the labyrinth weir, especially for use with the trapezoidal geometry in this study, it is recommended that this QuickBASIC program is used in the preliminary design of labyrinth weirs in Indonesia.

References

- Albertson, M.L., Barton, J.R., and Simons, D.B. (1960). Fluid Mechanics for Engineers, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 9th Ed., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Ackers, P., White, W.R., Perkins, J.A., and Harrison, A.J.M. (1978). Weirs and Flumes for flow measurement, John Wiley & Sons
- Afshar, A. (1988). "The development of labyrinth spillway designs," Water Power Dam and Construction, pp.36-39
- Cassidy, J., Gardner, C., and Peacock, R. (1983). "Labyrinth-Crest Spillway Planning, Design, and Construction," *International Conference on the Hydraulic Aspects* of Floods & Flood Control, London, England, pp.59-80.
- Chadwick, A., and Morfett, J. (1986). Hydraulics in Civil Engineering, Allen & Unwin, London, 492 p.
- Chow, Y.T. (1959). Open channel hydraulics, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., 680 p.
- Daily, J.W., and Harleman, D.R.F. (1973). Fluid Dynamics, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. Reading, Massachusetts, USA
- Darvas, L.A. (1971). "Discussion of Performance and Design of Labyrinth Weirs, by N.Hay, and G. Taylor," *Journal of the Hydraulics Division, Proceedings of the* ASCE, No. H78, pp. 1246-1251.
- Daugherty, R.L., and Ingersoll, A.C. (1954). Fluid Mechanics, McGraw Hill, 5th Ed., NY, 472 p.
- Daugherty, R.L., and Franzini, J.B. (1977). Fluid Mechanics with Engineering Applications, McGraw-Hill, 7th Ed., 564 p.
- Ellis, D.S. (1947). Elements of Hydraulic Engineering, Van Nostrand, NY, 277 p.
- Hay, N., and Taylor, G. (1969). "A Computer Model for the Determination of the Performance of Labyrinth Weirs," 13th Congress of the International Association of Hydraulic Research, Science Council of Japan, Kyoto, Japan, pp.361-378

- Hay, N., and Taylor, G. (1970). "Performance and Design of Labyrinth Weirs," Journal of the Hydraulics Division, Proceedings of the ASCE, Vol.96, No. HY11, pp. 2337-2357
- Henderson, F.M. (1966). Open Channel Flow, MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., 522 p.
- Hinchliff, D.L., and Houston, K.L. (1984). "Hydraulic Design and Application of Labyrinth Spillways," Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colorado, 24 p.
- Houston, K.L. (1982). "Hydraulic Model Study of Ute Dam Labyrinth Spillway," Report No. GR-82-7, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colorado, 41p.
- Houston, K.L. (1983). "Hydraulic Model Study of Hyrum Dam Auxiliary Labyrinth Spillway," Report No.GR-82-13, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colorado, 29p.
- Hutama Karya, P.T. (1985). Studi Perencanaan Proyek Pandu Tambak Udang Inti Rakyat (TIR) Ciwadas, Jakarta, Indonesia
- Hutama Karya, P.T. (1989). Laporan Akhir Pelaksanaan Proyek Pandu Tambak Udang Inti Rakyat (TIR) Ciwadas, Jakarta, Indonesia
- Jaeger, C. (1956). Engineering Fluid Mechanics, Blackie & Son Ltd., London, United Kingdom, 529 p.
- Kraatz, D.B. (1975). "Small Hydraulic Structures," Irrigation and Drainage Paper FAO, pp. 182-187
- Lux III, F., and Hinchliff, D.L. (1985). "Design and Construction of Labyrinth Spillways," 15th Congress of ICOLD, Lausanne, Switzerland, Q.59-R.15, pp.249-274
- Lye, L.M. (1992). Engineering Economic Analysis, ENGR 9310, Course Notes, Fall Term, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science, Memorial University of NewFoundland, SLiohn's, NewFoundland, Canada.
- Magalhães, A.P. (1985). "Labyrinth-Weir Spillways," 15th Congress of ICOLD, Lausanne, Switzerland, Q.59-R.24, pp.395-407
- Memed, M., and Sadeli, L. (1990). "Optimasi Dimensi Hidrolis Bendung dan Spillway Tipe Gergaji, "Seminar on Theory and Application on Hydraulic Phenomena of Hydraulic Structures, Bandung, Indonesia, 20p.

- Novak, P., Moffat, A.I.B., Nalluri, C., and Narayanan, R. (1990). Hydraulic Structures, Unwin Hyman, Ltd., London, United Kingdom, 546 p.
- Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan (Puslitbang) Pengairan, Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pekerjaan Umum, Departemen Pekerjaan Umum, Republik Indonesia (1973). New Rentang Barrage, Rentang, Jatibarang, West Java, Bandung, Indonesia, 74 p.
- Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan (Puslitbang) Pengairan, Badan Penciitian dan Pengembangan Pekerjaan Umun, Departemen Pekerjaan Umum, Republik Indonesia (1986). Aturan Operasi Pintu Bendung Gerak Rentang Baru, Rentang, Jatibarang, Jawa Barat, No. PA. 1308-HAU, Bandung, Indonesia. 18 p.
- Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan (Puslitbang) Pengairan, Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pekerjaan Umum, Departemen Pekerjaan Umum (1991). "Bendung dan Pelimpah Tipe Gergaji," *Balai Penyelidikan Hidrolika*, Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia, 8 p.
- Quasney, J.S. (1992). Programming in QuickBASIC, Boyd & Fraser Publishing Company, Boston, M.A., 120 p.
- Riggs, J.L., Rentz, W.F., Kahl, A.L., and West, T.M. (1986). Engineering Economics, McGraw-Hill Ryerson, Toronto, ON, Canada, 746 p.
- Samuels, P.G. (1989). "Backwater lengths in rivers," Proc. Instn Civ. Engrs., Part 2, 87, pp. 571-582
- Sharp, J.J. (1976). "Discussion of A dimensionless number for the study of open channel flow, by O.N. Wakhlu," Proc. Instn Civ. Engrs., Part 2, 61, pp.233-245
- Sharp, J.J. (1981). Hydraulic Modelling, Butterworths, London, England, United Kingdom, 242 p.
- Sharp, J.J. (1988). BASIC fluid mechanics, Butterworths, London, England, United Kingdom, 139 p.
- Sharp, J.J. (1992). Similarity and Model Tecniques, ENGR 9710, Course Notes, Fall Term, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science. Memorial University of Newfoundland, St.John's, Newfoundland, Canada
- Sinha, C.P., and Singh, D.P. (1984). "Barrages on Alluvial Rivers," Channels and Channel Control Structures, Proceedings of the 1st International Conference, Southampton, England, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York-Tokyo, ed. K.V.H. Smith, A Computational Mechanics Centre Publication, pp. 119-1.32

- Sitompul, A.T. (1992). "An application of dimensional analysis on hydraulic modelling of a sharp orested labyrinth weir," *Similarity and Model Tecniques, ENGR 9710*, Term Paper, Fall Term, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St.John's, Newfoundland, Canada, 15 p.
- Sitompul, A.T. (1992). "A cost-benefit analysis of the Wonorejo Dam and Irrigation Project Tulungagung II, Brantas River Basin Development in Est Jawa, Indonesia ," Engineering Economic Analysis, ENGR 9310, Project Report, Fall Term, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science, Memorial University of NewFoundand, St.John's, NewFoundland, Canada, 19 p.
- Slagter, J.C. (1975) Weirs, International Course in Hydraulic Engineering, Part 1textbook, Delft, Netherlands
- Smith, C.D. (1985). Hydraulic Structures, University of Saskatchewan Printing Services, 364 p.
- Tacail, F.G., Evans, B., and Babb, A. (1990). "Case study of a labyrinth weir spillway," *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, National Research Council Canada, Vol. 17, pp. 1-7.
- Taylor, G. (1968). "The Performance of Labyrinth Weirs," PhD. thesis, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, England, U.K., 362 p.
- Transmigration, Indonesian Ministry of. (1988). Indonesia, Our People, Our Land, Our Future, an official booklet publication
- United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. (1987). Design of Small Dams, A Water Resources Technical Publication, 860 p.
- Venit, S.M. (1991). Programming in QuickBASIC:Problem Solving with Structure and Style, West Publishing Company, St. Paul, M.N., 418 p.
- Vennard, J.K., and Street, R.L. (1975). Elementary Fluid Mechanics, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Toronto, Canada, 740 p.
- Vittal, N., and Rastogi, N.K. (1984). "Comparative Discharge Ferformance of Side and Normal Weirs," *Channels and Channel Control Structures, Proceedings of the 1st International Conference*, Southampton, England, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York-Tokyo, ed. K.V.H. Smith, A Computational Mechanics Centre Publication, pp. 133-1.44
- Wakhlu, O.N. (1975). "A dimensionless number for the study of open channel flow," Proc. Instn Civ. Engrs., Part 2, 59, pp. 515-522.

- Water Resources Development, Directorate General of., Ministry of Public Works. (1988). Water Resources and its Development in Indonesia, an official booklet publication, Jakarta, Indonesia, 47 p.
- Water Resources Development, Directorate General of, Sub Directorate of Planning and Programming, Ministry of Public Works, Republic of Indonesia. (1984). Guideline BP 12, The economic analysis of DORND Projects, Jakarta, Indonesia
- Wibowo, S. (1993). Personal communication, a long-distance call, St.John's, Canada -Jakarta, Indonesia

World Bank. (1990). World Development Report 1990, Washington D.C.

APPENDIX A

Input and output of spreadsheet

5	0	Sec. No.	(14)	0	-	~	2	-			8	-			-	0		•		10	10	-	-	2	S.M.								
28,1002	14,0382	defa H (cm)	613		0 0001	00001	00000	00000	0 0001	00001	0 0001	10000	1000	0 0001	00001	00001	00000	0 0000	00000	00000	0 0000	00000	00000		THOMAS	-	Indino	25016	25560	00000			
• ×	alpha -	(cm/s)	(14)			0.1509	10000	0110	10000		00170	C. Contract	Number of the second	00544	-	19900		00400		0 0354		00313	0 0000	0,000	8	1	1		- NONO	- dH			
E	Ę	deits ((cm ~ 3/s)	(61)			22.4300	100	1000 22	22 4501		22,4678	1047 60	1010 22	22 4045		22 4030		22,4060		22 4900		22,4900	1000	22.900		- Andrew -	INAN	71 5000	35125	10 0000	0000 196	21 0000	
10.0000 c	28 8650 4	(shin) (cm/s)	81)			1.4564	-	1.14.00	1 0354		2.1055	and a	6.64/0	2 2004		2 4675		2 5547		2 6006		2 0973	1 March 1	10017		1	1	- (mo) -	a forth	P (cm) -	- (2 - MO(MO)		-
scton P =	•	(cmis)	(11)		0.6522	0 8032	0 9030	0.0001	1,0148	10140	1.0018	BLOOT .	Contra t	12104	12104	1221	12871	1,2976	129761	1 3330	1 3330	13643	13061	13961	inclu		er.	(524)	0.0306	0 0308	90000	00000	00000
harpa of each su	F	A (5~m2)	(01)		1051-10	90.5220	00 1220	106 4660	120 0550	120 0556	132.7224	132 7224		150 BSGG	150 0.500	168 9243	168 0243	180.9004	160 0004	193 0564	193 0564	206 1224	200.1224	11/1004	25015		8	52	25560	2 5575	2 5570	20002	10022
TABLE A.1 mination of disc 2.4138 ci	7,0250 0	(cm)	8		8.1058	1990.0	0.3607	10 5775	11.7063	11.7063	12.6702	12.6/02	0000101	16 2208	15 2206	10 2017	18 2017	17,5625	17.5625	16 7333	18.7333	10 0042	10 0042	00/07/2	39	and the second division of the second divisio	(em _ un)	620	120 0020	C810 161	121.0427	131 0671	121 00121
tion for the deter defail =	:	C1 + C2 (cm ⁻ 3/b)	(11)			132 6125	A DE RACE	1111-111	222.4124		1000.705	ALC ALC	314 4041	347 2433		402 2208		447.2100		492 2020		537.1940	1000 1000	200 1000	0.000		8	(12)	0 6045	0 8344	0 8344	0000	ZNONO
able of computer	undan m	defta O (cm ^ 3/s)	E		22,4396		22 4506	22.4501		22 4070		22 4/01	and a		22 4930		22.4060		22 4060		22.4980		22 4900	36.130	0.1000 0.1500 0.2000	05-00	(cm 24s)	8	Ī	~	335 0773	I	
100000186	0.2450 a	(str ma)	(12)		55,0665	77.5260	11.5200	00 0101	122,4266	122 4358	144.6033	144 200	TUAN AND	ANG MAND	100 0030	212 3570	212 3570	234 8530	234 6530	257,3490	267.3480	279 8450	279.9450	315 0773	- 290	Supervised in the local division of the loca	SC-V-22-0	(ac)	0 3056	99000	0 3057	10000	and a
	defta x =	[cm]	19		11.8525		T	T	T							-	t			-				T		(continued)	×	(91)	t		101++ 00	T	
		8	(+)		0.8053	0,9352	0,0002	0 6351		0 9350	-	C BOAR	0.0248		0 8347		0 9346		0 0346		0.945		0 8346	Diversion of		ABLEALL	Sec No	6.0	ſ		13	1	
W	55	(cm)	5		0.3048	0.3040	0.3040	0 3050	0.3451	0 3051	0 3052	None o	0.000	0.3244	0.3054	0 3055	0 3055	0.3055	0 3055	0 3055	0.3055	0 3055	0.000	0 3055		- 8	5	£	6			2	2010
71,8800	32125	(cm)	8	0 0000	23417	4.6834	4 0034	7.0250	0 3667	9 2007	11 7084	1000	1000	10.0010	10,3010	2007.01	18 7335	21.0751	21.0751	23.4168	23 4166	28 7565	1921-10	2001 82	fr		28,1002 6	64.9550	21.0750 0		note perior	Inter Hydrau	. PhO. P
0	;;;	Sec. No	8	0	1	~	~	-			-			-	4					10	10	11	11	21	Townson P.	1000	×12 -	- 211	w12 -		O SH MARO.	Com-Char	Ven 1e Cho

1 1	1000 cm 5125 cm 12 H Cd		0000 L 0000 C	able of comput.	aton for the deter	ZA138 CI	harpe of each se	- d	0000 01	E	*	2001 82	F
Image Image <th< th=""><th>8</th><th>abha - x abha</th><th>23417 0</th><th>uan a</th><th>•</th><th>7.0250 0</th><th></th><th>•</th><th>28 9850</th><th>E</th><th>= wicks</th><th>14 0002</th><th></th></th<>	8	abha - x abha	23417 0	uan a	•	7.0250 0		•	28 9850	E	= wicks	14 0002	
	(m) (cm)	- (uc)	(cm ^ 3/s)	dotta () (cm ~ 3/s)	(91 + CS	# (iug)	4 (5	(snus)	(s/us) (ZA + LA)	delta () (cm ^ 3/s)	detta V (cm/s)	(cm)	Sec. No
	2) (2) (4)	6	6	E	g	8	(01)	(11)	(21)	(61)	(11)	(51)	(10)
	0000												0
	3417 1 2192 0 6967	11.8525	2012 022	133.0623		8 1056	81,6607	3.570:				0.0022	-
	6634 1 2214 0.6966		402 1365		790.4147	0 3667	105.1071	4.3068	7.9870	133 8623	0.8267	2200 0	~
	0000 1 2214 0 0000		1001701	1242.461	1000 1000	1000 0	100.10/1	1.000	10110	4000 701	0.000	12000	-
	0.000 1 2237 0 6965		1112 005	CT12 MC1	INVECTION I	10 5275	110 2007	2005	2022.0	100001	0000	0 0002	-
1 1	1 2259		130 9494		1327.3166	11.7003	131.4300	5 5612	10.6037	134.5772	0 5184	0 0022	-
	3067 1 2250 0 6063		730.9484	134 6008		11.7063	131.4360	5,5012				0 0021	•
	7084 1.2280		805 6551		1500.0031	12 8792	144 6073	5 6676	11,5400	134.9008	0.4264	0 0021	5
	7084 1 2280 0 5962		005.0551	135 2129	to us us to	12.8792	141 6073	5 0076	10 2110	0010 241	A 4644	0.0019	
	1000 0 000 1000		1001001	126.4000	100-20 7000	14.0600	167 7601	TAME O	A DOWN	100.00	1 100 0	0000	-
	12317		1130,5640		2137 6330	15,2208	170.6550	6.6483	12,0000	135.4060	0.3036	0.0010	r
	3918 1 2317 0 6060		1136.5640	136.7573		15 2208	170.9550	0.0403				0.0018	-
	7335 1 2333		1272 3223		2408 8872	10 3017	184.1325	0.0000	1000 01	135.7573	0 2615	0 0016	
	7335 12333 0 6950		1212 322	120.0004	Anna Cana	10.001	100.1325	91019	1000	110 0001	1000	0 0015	
11.1 11.1 <th< td=""><td>0751 12348 0.6068</td><td></td><td>1408.3177</td><td>136 2100</td><td>1000/0002</td><td>17 5005</td><td>2115.701</td><td>2761.7</td><td>14/04/4</td><td>NOW OF L</td><td>11770</td><td>1000</td><td>-</td></th<>	0751 12348 0.6068		1408.3177	136 2100	1000/0002	17 5005	2115.701	2761.7	14/04/4	NOW OF L	11770	1000	-
Dial Dial <thdial< th=""> Dial Dial <thd< td=""><td>4168 1.2361</td><td></td><td>1544 5277</td><td></td><td>2052.0454</td><td>10.7333</td><td>210 4696</td><td>7,3376</td><td>14.4753</td><td>1362100</td><td>0 2002</td><td>0.0013</td><td>9</td></thd<></thdial<>	4168 1.2361		1544 5277		2052.0454	10.7333	210 4696	7,3376	14.4753	1362100	0 2002	0.0013	9
10.10 10.10 <th< td=""><td>1000 12361 0.6057</td><td></td><td>1544.5277</td><td>130.4021</td><td></td><td>18.7303</td><td>210.4896</td><td>87CC 7</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0.0012</td><td>9</td></th<>	1000 12361 0.6057		1544.5277	130.4021		18.7303	210.4896	87CC 7				0.0012	9
13.00 13.00 <th< td=""><td>7565 1.2373</td><td></td><td>1660 9296</td><td></td><td>3225, 4575</td><td>19.9042</td><td>223 6691</td><td>7,5153</td><td>14 6530</td><td>136 4021</td><td>0.1775</td><td>0.0012</td><td>=</td></th<>	7565 1.2373		1660 9296		3225, 4575	19.9042	223 6691	7,5153	14 6530	136 4021	0.1775	0.0012	=
Note: 1 Note:	7565 1.2373 0.6957		1660 9296	136 5789		19.9042	223 0001	7,5153				0.0011	=
Million Control Control <t< td=""><td>1002 1.2384 0.6666</td><td>1</td><td>1005 1101</td><td>100.0047</td><td>34001.4300</td><td>21.070</td><td>C0191002</td><td>1.8/3/</td><td>15.1000</td><td>120121001</td><td>0.1564</td><td>11000</td><td></td></t<>	1002 1.2384 0.6666	1	1005 1101	100.0047	34001.4300	21.070	C0191002	1.8/3/	15.1000	120121001	0.1564	11000	
Math CC- 1300 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000	10001 12:001		SEVE BLOC	A 1000		-							1
Math Task L4 interference 5.000 5.000 5.000 5.000 4.000			- 080	0.1500	0 3000	- ~1	2,5618				ş	COMMODEL.	2
Ref LA / Company				0.2000	0.3500	- din	2.8100 (1	cycle).					
281002cm 386.NG K (2011) 2011	TABLE A.2 (o	continued	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR OFTA CONT	020	adamatica and	Actual Second	the second se	A STATE OF THE OWNER		- and	L	Contraction of	
04,8550 cm (17) (18) (19) (20) (21) (22) (23) (24) (cm) = 71,950	1002 cm	(cm)	CSC+V-22*0	(cm ~ 3/s)	3	(em - 34)		2			1	- In In	
	8850 cm (17)	(18)	(Lug)	6363	(12)	122	(C2)	(54)	= (ucu) =	21.6800		2.5616	
20102 # (up) # 1751.0 CH2.2 CH		T	11111		D and a	THE LEGAL	10.01	1244	- Cuola	2001.02		2018.2	
Z10/700 CTT 1.24719 0.00013 1.20010 0.00013 1.2011 0.0011 0.0011 0.0011	monoru		1 2420		Contra C	Too son	2 6220	0 1243	P (cm)	000001	- 61	0.1241	
ucted from 13 30.4419 1.2444 2018.3735 0.0653 60.0564 2.5178 0.1244 g(cm/b41^2)- 801.000	10m 13	30.4419	1.2444	2018.3735	0.6053	800.8564	2.5178	0.1244	-(2 teb/moj0	00007195			
nnel Hydraulica. 12459 0.08042 0.02.2077 2.5135 0.1245 n= 1	tydnulics.		12450		0.6952	802 2017	2.5135	0.1240	-	12			
W. Ph.D., page 340 0.104 10.000 0.000 0.000 0.104 0.000 0.104 0.000 0.104 0.000 0.104 0.0000 0.0000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.	D., page 348		12474		100000	0002.500	Canc.2	0.1641		0.100			-

000 Cm		a pha	0.2450	adan z	dena i =	2,4138.0	e	a.	10 0000 0	E	×	28.1002 0	F
5		de'ta x -	23417	5	- *	7.0250 0	E	= 9	28.9650 c	E	alpha =	14.0062	
(cm)	3	(cm)	(cm ~ 2/s)	detta O (cm * 3/s)	01 + 02 (cm ⁻ 3/s)	(um)	A (cm 2)	V (cm/s)	(cm/s)	delta O (cm ^ 3/s)	detta V (cm/s)	defa H (cm)	Sec. No
8	(9)	12	8	6	100	60	(10)	(11)	121	(61)	(14)	(51)	(16)
													0
7 1.62	56 0.674.	11,0525	563.6530	230.2607		0.1058	08.0460	8,0203				0.0003	-
4 1.63	51 0.674		1000128		1405 5027	10000 8	110.8554	7.4145	13.4348	230 2007	1.3042	0.0003	~
1.01	51 0.674		621.0307	2015 002		10000	110.8554	2.4145				0 00000	~
1.64	17		1001.4859	-	1662 4250	10.5375	124 7819	8.5067	15 0212	239.5402	1.0922	0 0000	-
104	17 0674		1061.4856	240.7670	-	10 5375	124.7619	8,5067		- and -		0 0001	-
184	10		1302 252		2363.7368	11 7083	138 7215	51370	17.8943	240 7870	0.6606	0000	-
1.04	0013		REN DO	241.9328	Tata Line	11.7003	212/ 021	10187.0	A SAMA	111 0110	A THE P	00000	-
1 10	CATAO IN		TALL VOIL	OFTI LEE	C0+0-007	10 0 000	100,070	10110	NWO AL	100001112	01200	North C	ŀ
201	2000		1707 0001	B10002	111 1000	14 COTOS	100/0.001	10.100	CUT B LOO	OF LO LAD	11100	10000	
1 1 45	ALL DATA		1702 2011	244 0143		10000	100 001	10 7967	10000	at in the		00001	-
1 1 10	2000		AATE ICC	PLINE A	2018.4150	and at	NOO COL	11 2476	11010	244 0143	0.6310	19000	-
8 100	67 0.8735		2031.2146	244 9 394		15 2208	180.560	11.2476				0 0047	-
1.00	X		2278 1541		4307,3687	16 3017	194 5503	11 00001	22.9460	244.0304	0.4514	0 0047	-
1 00	M 06734		2278.1541	245.7901		14.3017	104 5503	11,0990				0 0043	
1 1.87	22		2521 0442		4798.0982	17.5025	208.5310	12 0836	23,7026	245 7001	0.3948	0 0043	•
19.1 1.67.	37 06731		2500.0002	248.5757		17.5625	206 5319	12.0038				010010	•
187	-		2708 5100		5290.4640	18.7333	222 5060	12.4420	24 5361	240.5757	SINCO	0 0040	10
187.	17 0 6730		2706.5100	247.2954		18 7333	222 5069	12 423				90000	10
5 168	10		3015 8153		5784.3352	18 8042	236.4874	12 7525	25 1948	247,2064	0 2100	0 0000	=
1 64	13 0.6735		3015 6153	247.0568		10 6042	238.4874	12 7525				0 0034	11
2 1.65	1 0 6731		3263 7749	361.2639	6279 5002	21 0750	250 4701	13 0006	25.7831	247,9500	0 2761	0 0004	12
1 68	11		3625 0568				-	-				-	2
			- 000	0 1000							5	Cumonal a	
			-	0.2000	0 3500	- 614	2.8100 (1	cycle)					ĺ.
	TAPLE A 3	(continued)		02,00									
	Sec No.	×	+1		3	3	NONO	He		INdAI	L	OUTPUT	
en o		(cm)	CSC-V-22-0	(cm , 34)		(cm 2/s)		-	1		1		
	-	-	(cm)	1	-	1	-		- territ			A 1010	
E C B	50	(au)	60	1	(12)	8	12	-	- former	0001 80		2 8100	
0 Cm			1 0034	-	06720	1454 7264	2.49191	0 1663	. (cm) -	3.5125	- NONO	2 4910	
			1.0077		0 6728	1450 5303	2 4837	0.1848	P (cm) =	10 0000	· dH	0 1803	
	51	30 4410	1 9000	2025, 0568	0 6726	1464 3300	2.4756	0.1602	= [2 m/det 2] =	0000 195			
nuice.			1 0000		0 6727	1469 1548	2.4674	0 1000		12			
page 345			1 0107	Γ	0 6726	1473 9755	2 4504	1181 0	- 050	0 1000			
			. 0.60		0.6726	ATA ATA	P 454.9	0 1016				-	

The set of	8	71.0600 cm				1 0000 198	able of computations	ton for the deter	BLE A.4 minaton of disc 2 4138 or	harge of each se	eton p	10 0000 01		- ×	20100	E
Mer Int Control Contro Contro Contro	;::	25 1000 CF			alpha -	02450 0	uan a	- *	7 (0250 cr			26 9050 0	Ę	alota -	14 0302	lan.
	Sec. No	(cm)	ri	8	- 1	(cm 25)	(str _ ma)	(sre_ wa)	* (i	Re-mail	(cm/s)	(vi + vz)	0000 C	defa V (cm/s)	(cm)	Sec No
	ε	8	8	£	6	8	ε	(8)	8	(01)	61)	12	(13)	(14)	(51)	(10)
	0	0 0000								-						
	-	2.3417	2 4384	0 6655	11.8525	806 8656	202 0317		8 1958	101,9431	8 0000				0 0132	-
	2	4 6834	2.4510	0 6054		1249.5175		2136.4033	1990.9	118 6300	10.7135	19 4133	362.0017	2 0137	00132	~
1 1	2	1 00.14	DICY 2	0 0034		1249.5175	365 6383	-	10000	118.6300	10.7135				00100	2
	-	7.0250	2.4654	A 80.00		1615 1568	000 0000	2864.6743	10.5375	131 3542	12 2002	23 0097	2003.0300	1 5827	00138	
		CONC. 0	2.4700	200		1003.7698	200000	350A 0257	11 2003	1001 011	13 5778	25.87.64	A00 0122	THE L	1000	-
1 1		1092.8	2 47 06	0.0651		1083 7080	371.4723		11.7083	146.1060	13 5778				00127	
	5	11.7084	2 4915			2356 2412		4339 0102	12 8782	150.8901	14 8397	28.2173	371.4723	1,0621	00127	5
	•	11.7084	2 4015	0 6650		2355 2412	374.1630		12.0702	10090.001	14 6307				00118	5
1 1		11 0501	2500		T	2720.4051	-	5084 5484	14.0600	175 8714	15 53701	30.1767	374.1630	0 6975	00118	
	-	14 0501	2.2003	0 0000	I	2720.4001	376 5650	1141 1412	14.050	175.071	0/55 51	01010	ATA GATA	0.000	00100	
Image: 1	-	10.0010	25142	0 0040		2100100000	378.8706	14/4 0000	15 2200	100.4760	BUCC BI	000010	2/10 0000	0.1000	00100	F
		18,7335	25242			3485 0396		6691.1068	10 3017	205.2925	10 97001	33 2828	378.8708	0 6501	00100	-
	8	18.7335	2,5242	0.6648		3485.0366	381.1060	-	16.3617	206 2925	16.9760				0 0003	0
Image: constraint of the	0	21.0751	2 5335			3866.1458		7351,1855	17,5025	220.1198	17 5636	34,5336	361,1000	0,56791	00000	•
		21.0751	2 5005	0.0547		3806.1458	1000 535		17.5625	220.1198	17.5608				0 0000	•
	2	B019 52	Z PAZI	-		ROST ROZA		0102 0119	18./.20	24.000	Ren Bi	INNOR	1000.050	0 5214	00000	0
1 1 2	0	23.4168	12452	0.0046	I	4249.2358	British		10.725	Kon wz	ISBO BL				00000	0
Image: constraint of the second sec	-	20.000	10002			4024.1084		6460 4000	2 MONTRI	Neg/ 942	0100001	20 0009	0000919000	0 4060	00000	
I All Basel State		29:1560	2 5501	0.6646		4834.1864	300 0450	-	19.0042	248.7993	18.5518		-	-	0.0074	11
Manual contract CC- COOR	-	20.1000	2422	CHOD'N	T	NAM ANY	1/20100	YOUN HOM	1.0000	1010	01/001	1000.10	10000	0.000	1000	2
Obset: Mark A monthment 11.1 Control	Trapendal po	i g				- 28	0.1000 0.1500 0.2000	03500	1.4	2.6100 (1	cycle).			Ŷ	DOMMODEL	
713 B1000 Ref Ref Ref Ref Correr Pair Other Mail Correr Corr	Check:		-1	FABLE A.4.	(continued)		02200					1				
ID: HANDOR (7) (16) (10) <th< td=""><td>×12 =</td><td>28.1002 cm</td><td></td><td>Sec. No.</td><td>× (Eg)</td><td>CSC-V^ 22'0</td><td>(stc., 3))</td><td>8</td><td>(en . 3%)</td><td>NOTO</td><td>d.H</td><td></td><td>Indu</td><td></td><td>OUTPUT</td><td></td></th<>	×12 =	28.1002 cm		Sec. No.	× (Eg)	CSC-V^ 22'0	(stc., 3))	8	(en . 3%)	NOTO	d.H		Indu		OUTPUT	
U. TOTAL TO	- 211	BH.1550 Cm		E	81	12	8	(12)	8	(22)	[92]	- leal A	71,9800	- MA	2 5010	
Cherric mentioner 13 Autril 2 2000 Exerct on 2 2000 <th< td=""><td>- 21M</td><td>21.0750 cm</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>2.5750</td><td></td><td>0 6944</td><td>2279.1661</td><td>2.4500</td><td>0.2578</td><td>a (cm) -</td><td>3.5125</td><td>- NOTO</td><td>2.4503</td><td></td></th<>	- 21M	21.0750 cm				2.5750		0 6944	2279.1661	2.4500	0.2578	a (cm) -	3.5125	- NOTO	2.4503	
Own of the figure (a) 1						05027		20000	0021-1022	1000	00000	- fund -		-	BICTO O	
Vier (#CDex,PhD), page 348 22172 20125 22008 2207.1555 22008 2207.1555 22008 2207.1555 22008 22012 255 4 1000 4 101 255 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1	Conn-Char	poted nom		2		2.6034	2000000	0.6942	2315.1227	24122	0.2600	- U ventuale	12			
4 G 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Ven le Cho	w. Ph.D., pape	0 348			2.6125		0 6642	2327.1535	2.3008	0.2613	- OSO	0.1000			
				-	-	26217	-	0 0001	23,09 2008	2 3674	0 2022				•	

-							1	ABLE A.S							
-	71.9800 ст				00000100	able of comput	ation for the dete defail =	2.4138 c	manage of each s	ector P =	10.0000		- ×	28,1002 6	e
3	3 5125 cm			defta x -	23417	uadan m		7,0250 0	Ę		28.0050	E	- anda	14.0362	•
Sec. No.	x (cm)	(cm)	8	(cm)	(cm ^ 2/h)	della Q (cm ~ 3/s)	O1 + C2 (cm ~ 3/s)	(tem)	A (cm ~ 2)	V (cmb)	(V1 + V2) (cm/s)	(cm ~ 3m)	Ceetta V (cm/s)	defta H (cm)	Sec. No
B	8	6	(1)	Ø	(a)	3	g	E	(10)	611	(12)	(61)	(+1)	(51)	(16)
•	0 0000														•
-	23417	3.0460	0.6622	11,0525	1233 2773	1221 508		8,1956	106 8342	11.5325				102010	-
8	4 6634	3.0711	0.6621		1738 3094		2971.6767	1905.0	122,4326	14,1966	25.7313	505.1221	2 1003	16200	2
~	4.0634	3 07 11	0 6621		1728.3094	511.0027		0.3067	122.4320	14 1988	1			0 0243	~
-	7.0250	1000	A 4000	I	2248.4021		3087,8015	10.5375	137.9228	00001	2 30.4 7	511.0027	2.1000	0 0042	-
	1970	1011 0	2000		2760 3310	in and	KTET 2102	11 7001	BCTR FAI	18 0007	NOICHE	510 9331	1 7090	10000	
	0 3667	3 1101	0 6620		2766 3352	522 6643		11 7063	1623 620	18 0007				0 0025	
	11.7084	3.1418			3250 0004		6065.3346	12.0702	100 2520	10 4325	37 4421	522 0043	1 4228	0 0025	
	11 7084	3.1416	0 0010		3280 9094	0100 825		12 8762	100 2529	194325			-	0 0210	-
9	14 0601	3,1626			3617 0610	-	7106.0805	14 0500	184,93461	201002	40 0726	526,0016	1 2077	0 0210	
	14.0501	3.1626	0 0019		3617.0610	533.1437		14 0600	184 9348	20 6402			-	00100	
-	16,3918	1281 6		I	4360 2247		8167 3057	15 2208	200 6428	21 0615	42 3210	200.1437	10413	00100	-
	0162.01	1981 5	0.0018	T	4300 2247	NUSP/IS	0010 0100	10.22 CI	200.0426	C10012	10101	AV7 MAA	U GOOM	10100	-
	187.235	1 2000	0.0010		464B CM2	542 2503		10.2017	EE76 815	22 5910			-	00100	
•	21 0751	32170			5420 3345		10318.4106	17 5625	232 1236	2166 02	45 9851	542,2500	0 8002	0.0166	•
•	21 0751	32170	0 6618		SHOC DONS	546 35121		17.6625	2321236	23 3942				00157	•
10	23 4108	3 2327			5970 0050		11407.0001	CCC7 81	247 8028	24.1100	47,5041	540 3512	0.715.6	00157	10
10	23.4166	3 2227	0 0010		5476 6656	SS0.1847	1000 0000	CXE7.01	247 0326	24 1100	10 1000	10101 101	0.000	00100	0
	1000102	12.01	0.000	I	10000		10000 00001	2 MARINE	00/0102	Co./201	700 84	1401 000	2000	1000	
	000/02	01420	0.0010		2000 0002	2921 2920	12007 6161	1011010	270 4740	24.7164	60 C600	00.00	0 401	20100	0
121	2001 022	0192 0			14100 0011		10.00						-		12
Treposite pr	5				- 080	0 1000 0 1500 0 2000	00000	29	2 6100	cycle)			Ş	TEDOWINO	
Check :		-	ABEAS	(continued		0 2500				-		-			
×12 -	28 1002 cm		Sec No	x (ima)	CSC-V-22-0	(cm 2/3)	8	(em _ ma)	80	e He		INDI		OUTPUT	
-211	64 9550 cm		6	81	101	8	63	8	102	(54)	- (ma) +	71 6600	10	2 5616	
- 21×	21.0750 cm				3.2937	-	0 0617	3292 0770	2 4007	0 3294	- (ua) u	2150	- NOTO	2 4007	
Contrast.	and have			0111 M	1010 C	And Press	11800	1201 0000	in the second	DINCAL D	- (un) -		-	A HOLE	
0-000	The Promition	,	2		RACE		0.619	125. 122	2 3511	ENCE O		2			
Ven Te Cho	PhD. page	976		ſ	1986 6		0 6616	3360 0166	2 3040	6900 0	- 280	0 1000		3	
					3 3755		0 6615	0400 0010	23171	0 3376				0	88
	1A + ZN.10	L'A READ (10+20	13-13-0	(1D-20 me					2	SC - the piece of	NUMBER OF IS INCOME.	3 6 940 m 200.		16

3	71 8600 cr			- Child	0000 198	cmis 2	defta I =	2 4130 4	E	å	10 0000 01	E O	- ×	28 1002 0	ε.
	35125 0			detax	23417	em m		7.0250 c	e		28 8650	cm	- artcha	2000.11	
ec. No.	(cm)	(cm)	8	(cm)	(cm ^ 3/5)	(cm ~ 3/s)	O1 + 02 [cm * 3/s]	(cm)	15 mol	V (s/ms)	(VI + VZ) (cm/s)	deta O (cm ^ 3/s)	detta V (cm/k)	(cm)	Sec. No.
ε	6	5	(7)	Ē	6	E	60	6	(01)	(11)	(12)	(E1)	(\$4)	615	61
	00000														0
-	23417	4 5720	0 6634	11.6525	2260.9966	634 3024		8 1958	110.4297	19 0070				0 0622	-
~	4 0034	4.6342	0.0000		1962 1020		5474 2657	0 3067	157 0737	23 3765	42,3634	14206.1468	4 3005	0 0622	~
~	4 (804	4 6042	0.0036		3204 2001	NS3 8554	A144 4444	0.0007	137.0737	213765	1000	1000	1000	0 0000	~
	2 0240	4,7000	0.6030		41591545	A74.27.M	10001-0001	10 5175	100101	CO DATA	10000	HOCE FOR	1.04 C	DODO D	-
	1990 0	4.7646			5132.4281		0000 5425	11.7083	172.8712	20 6603	56 5332	074.2736	2 8454	0.0948	-
	10000 0	4 7648	0 6641		5132.4281	004 2763		11 7063	172.8712	0000.02				10000	
	11.7064	4 6259			6126.7044		11259.1324	12.8792	180 9581	32,0640	61.7733	00M 2763	2 3947	0.0021	
	11,7064	4.6208	0 6043		01267044	1013 4604		12.8732	190 9561	32,0640				0.0568	
	14 0501	4 6057			71401348		13206 6601	14.0500	200.1441	34 1400	06 22 40	1013.4604	2 0560	0.0568	
	14 0501	4 8657	0 6045		7140.1848	1031.7510		14.0500	209.1441	34 1400		Contraction of the local division of the loc		00554	
-	10.3010	1001	0.004		8171 8356	ALL CLOB	15012 1205	10 22 01	227.4100	35 8339	20 0739	10157.1001	00011	00000	+
	1010101	10001	-		10000110000	Bronau	11100 0011	1117 DI	C1.100	000000	343646	ALL DOUD	1 6464	0 DK 00	-
	10.7.7.01	1000	O BUSIC		000101000	1000 6110	P 204 900 1	10.017	ALE 7003	17 6100			-	00000	
	21.0751	50425	ſ		10286 5304		10607 5400	17.5625	264 1639	36 9370	76.4500	1005 5130	14374	0.0492	
	21,0751	S WZ	0 6652		10288.5304	1081.0974		17 5005	264.1630	38.9370				0.0464	•
10	23 4168	5 0669			11367.6276		21654.1562	16.7330	282 6654	40.2158	70 1526	1081.0974	1 2766	0.0464	10
10	23 4168	5 0889	0 0053		11367.6278	1005 8069		100001-101	282.6654	40 2158				00430	01
=	25 7565	5.1326			12463 5247		23831.1525	19 80421	301,2058	41.3768	81 5946	1005 6060	1 1620	00430	=
=	25,7565	5,1328	0.0056		12403 52471	1109 9813		19.9042	301,2068	41.3768				00418	=
21	201000	5 1744	0 0057		12573 5000	1625 4066	20037 0307	21 0750	319 8000	1000.50	10228 128	1100 6011	1 0640	00416	2 0
						0 1000			and the second se				The second s		
Personal Con	fs				- 200	0 1500	0 3000	29	2 5618	-			ç	W.TECOMONO	2
Check:		1	ABLE A7 (continued		0 2500									
×12 -	- COUT NC		Sec. No	X	H+ CSC-V-979-A	Con Con	3	No.	NOTO	8'1	-	INPUT	U	ourput	
				[(cm)		-	free and							
- 24	64 9650 CF		E	10	(10)	62	(21)	(22)	(62)	(*5)	- (act)	21 0000	- 25	25616	
			1		1000	1					-	28 1000	-	28100	
* 21M	21 0/50 CF	-			2002 6		10000	9090 6/00	22754	00000		Chen .	- 200	A STOR	
NO IN HIGH	mont thom	-		30 4110	CONST S	1510a 0747	D PANEL	AND NAME	101100	and a state	alemidan 21-	(m) 0000			
man-O-m	Ne hyonut	,			5 4039		0 6667	6040 8765	2 1660	0 5404		12			
1. To Chose	PhD. pag	9.346 e		ſ	0 4400		0 6666	7040 6629	2 1567	02450	- 280	00001 0			
	-				2 4936		0 5672	7122 X057	2 1310	05450				~	8

E		Sec. No.	-	(14)	0	-	2	~	-	1	-	6			8	-	-	-	0		10	2	-	2	12	ą										5
28 1002 0	14,0062	defta H	(cm)	(12)		0 0752	0 0752	00100	00100	00100	00rds	00.35	21200	11200	0 00576	0 0020	11000	0000	0.0000	0.0574	0 0674	00044	0.0517	00017		A-TEICOMONO		Turpur		2 5616	2 8100	22425				*0
• x	- eucle	deta V	(cm/s)	6+13			4 8017		3 8135	21972		2 6471		2.2767		1 0005	tana t	2001	1 58401		1.4330	-	1 XON	1 2000		Ş		L	j		= d/*	- NOTO	-			
		deta O	(cin 3/s)	(13)			1057.0533	-	1001.7394	CIVE AVI-	101 1011	1133 22511		1157 6274		1181 3328	TANK TANK	100010001	1225 0490		1245 3566		1021 1921	1250,2078				THOM		21 9950	0001 92	3.5125	0000	22	0 1000	
10 0000 e	23 0650 c	EA + 11	(cm/s)	613			46.0509		55.2701	mark ma	10000	CB 0140		12 0201		77 2110	10000		64 3237		87.3407		60 0807	NTA SATA				L	1	- (ma) I	- (uc) -	+ (cm) +	- Contraction		- 980	
ection P =	2	-	(cm/s)	ŝ		20 8286	25 7303	25,7303	20 5450	800.00	20 0001	15,2006	SOLL SE	37.6092	37.6002	39 6027	1209 66	1 1000	42 0530	42 0530	44 3000	11, 3000	45 0008	45 CKUB			clapsic	07		1920		0 5002		02950	0 6026	0 6090
htrige of each si		×	(cm ~2)	[101]		122 5523	140.7641	140.7641	150.1065	1281.801	0100 111	100 2001	1005001	2154705	2154365	234 4216	234.4218	100 CAL	272 6765	272 6765	201.9302	20008162	311 2500	11 2003 112		25010	28100 (1	XX		1231		2242		21412	21149	2 DALLA
BLE A.B Tination of disc 2.4138 cr	7.0250 cr		(cm)	69		8.1958	1996.0	10000	10 5375	CIPC DI	1000/ 11	12 8792	12 6782	14.0500	14.0500	15 2208	15 2206	ALVE DI	17 606	17.50251	18.7333	18.73331	10 8042	210750	-	- MI		· ····	(cm ~ 3/5)	12		2022 5511	0101 0001		8221 0293	0110 0020
Tr or for the deteri deta I =	;	20+10	(sitc _ uo)	(8)		-	6186.7544		1285 5520	ALL TANK	1/06 1001	10755 0146		15048.9677		17306.1279		10/10/10/10/	22100 00102		24870.3721		27180 4556	OTAL MOTOS		0 3000	0 3500	i iv	3	121		0.0000	0000	Second C	0 6696	NOTA O
table of computat	un e	detta O	(cm ~ 3/s)	ε		1057.0533		1081.7304		2107.7011	1 200 1211	INS SHI	1157.8274	-	1181.3325		12021 7287	COLO MAL	1000	1245 3506		1264.7237		1002 0221	-	0 1000	0 2000	and a	(cm ~ 3/s)	100	-		and solar	1000 00071	[
10000188	2.3417 cl	0	(cm ^ 3/s)	19		2564,8506	3621 0036	3621.9038	4703 6432	2010.014	1110 1100	COLO NUCH	6944.5702	8102.3078	8102 3976	8283.7304	8283.730M	1764.78401	1972 51711	11712 5061	12367.8659	12357 6650	14222 5606	14222 (400)	17300 0368	- 280		1.0	CSC-V-22-0	100		5 8018	1000	terra c	90009	8 Pater 8
5	alpha - deha x -	-	(uus)	8		11,8525		-		T	I								T						Ī			Time and	(cm)	Sec.		-				
		8		(•)		0.6648	0.6651	0 0051	-	0.0034	Canto	20000	0.0001	-	0 0004		0 6667	A POTO	0,000	0 6673		0.0076		0.6678						20			1	2	the second	
E C	55	×	(cm)	8		4 9530	5 0082	5 0202	5.1078	5.1078	tool o	0.001	5 2819	63336	9000 9	5 4014	\$ 4014	3 4000	INCX S	55261	55635	55835	50079	56370	5 6906	the second s			ŧ	B		w	1	-	010 010	
71,9800	3.512	*	(ms)	8	0 0000	2341	4.663	4.663	7 0274	1.0255	and a	10.00	11.7064	14 050	14 050	16 391	16 3014	217.01	210751	21.075	23.410	23410	25 750	25.758	28 1000	-	-		2001 82	04 BCGC	-	21 075		TOTAL DATION	Dug -	
a -	3 8 6	Sec. No		ε	0	-	2	2	•	-		1	5	8	5	~	~				10	10		=	12	reviewed to	andno	1000	×12 -	- 211		- 21M	the second second	Contraction of the second	an Te Cho	

APPENDIX B

Listing of QuickBASIC program

.

10 CLS

40 'to crest height ratio (H/P) of one cycle labyrinth weir. 50 'The program is modified from Hay and Taylor computer program, pp.214-221, 60 'October 1968, Faculty of Applied Science, University of Nottingham. 70 'Modification is made by Adolf Tommy Sitompul, Faculty of Engineering and 80 'Applied Science, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 90 100 DIM H(200), X(200), w(200), A(200), V(200), CD(200), Q(200), delh(200), delha(200), delO(200), delOa(200), delV(200) 110 LPRINT 120 LPRINT 130 LPRINT 140 LPRINT " DESIGN DATA " 150 LPRINT " 160 LPRINT 170 T1\$ = " - Length Magnification l/w = ##.#### " 180 T2\$ = " - Vertical aspect ratiow/P = ##.#### " 190 T3S = "- Angle of side wallsalpha = ##.#### " 200 T4\$ = " OL/ON = ##.#### " 210 T5\$ = " H/P = #.#### " 220 *********** 230 'DATA INPUT 240 ************ 250 INPUT "Length of labyrinth weir, l(cm) = "; l 260 INPUT "Width of labyrinth weir, w(cm) = "; w 270 INPUT "Half length of tip section of labyrinth weir, a(cm) = "; a 280 INPUT "Gravitational acceleration, g(cm/det2) = "; g 290 INPUT "Crest height of labyrinth weir, P(cm) = "; P 300 INPUT "Number of sections, n = "; n 310 INPUT "Energy loss coefficient, CSC = ": CSC 320 LPRINT " o Labyrinth weir geometry : " 330 LPRINT " 340 LPRINT 350 LPRINT " Length of labyrinth weir1 (cm) ="; 1 360 LPRINT " - Width of labyrinth weir w (cm) ="; w 370 LPRINT " - Crest height of labyrinth weir P (cm) ="; P

380 LPRINT " - Half length of tip section of labyrinth weir a (cm) ="; a 390 LPRINT 410 'CALCULATION OF PARAMETERS 430 LWR = 1/w440 WPR = w/P450 y = (w / 2) - (2 * a)460 b = (1 - (4 * a)) / 2470 X = $((b)^2 - (y)^2)^5$.5 480 ALPHA = ATN(y / X)490 delX = X / n 500 delL = delX / COS(ALPHA)510 ALPHA1 = ALPHA * 57.29577951308232# 520 LPRINT 530 LPRINT " o Design Parameter : " 540 LPRINT " 550 LPRINT 560 LPRINT USING T1\$; LWR 570 LPRINT USING T2S: WPR 580 LPRINT USING T3\$; ALPHA1 590 LPRINT " - Energy loss coefficient CSC =": CSC 600 LPRINT " - Gravitational acceleration g (cm/s^2) ="; g 610 LPRINT 620 LPRINT 630 LPRINT " HYDRAULIC CALCULATION - RESULTS " 640 LPRINT " 650 LPRINT 660 LPRINT " QL/QN vs H/P Relationship " 670 LPRINT " 680 LPRINT 690 LPRINT " HI QL/QN H/P 700 LPRINT " 710 LPRINT 720 LPRINT 730 INPUT "Initial delta h, delh = "; delh 740 INPUT "The level of acceptable error, E = "; E

750 INPUT "The minimum value of initial depth, Hminimum = "; HMIN

760 INPUT "The maximum value of initial depth, Hmaximum = "; HMAX 770 IF HMAX < P THEN 810 ELSE PRINT "Sorry, the value exceeds the maximum value allowed. Please Try again ": GOTO 790 780 INPUT "The increment of desired initial depth, Increment = "; INC 790 FOR H1 = HMIN TO HMAX STEP INC 810 'CALCULATION OF INITIAL DISCHARGE 830 H(1) = H1840 X1 = delX 850 X(1) = X1 860 11 = (2 * a + 2 * delL)870 w1 = (2 * a + 2 * X1 * TAN(ALPHA))880 w(1) = w1890 CD1 = .605 + .08 * (H1 / P) + 1 / (10.006562# * H1) 900 CD(1) = CD1910 Q1 = CD1 * 11 * (H1 $^{1.5}$) * (2 / 3) * ((2 * g) $^{1.5}$) 920 Q(1) = Q1930 FOR I = 2 TO n 940 delh(I - 1) = delh950 X(I) = X(I - I) + delX960 w(I) = (2 * a + 2 * X(I) * TAN(ALPHA))970 WHILE ABS(delh(I - 1) - delha(I - 1)) > E980 delh(I - 1) = delha(I - 1)990 H(I) = H(I - 1) + delh(I - 1)1000 CD(I) = .605 + .08 * (((H(I - 1) + H(I)) / 2) / P)+ 1 / (10.006562# * ((H(I - 1) + H(I)) / 2))

1010 $delO(I - 1) = CD(I) * delL * (((H(I - 1) + H(I)) / 2)^{1.5} * (2 / 3))$ * ((2 * g) ^ .5) 1020 Q(I) = Q(I - 1) + 2 * delQ(I - 1)1030 A(I - 1) = (H(I - 1) + P) * w(I - 1)1040 A(I) = (H(I) + P) * w(I)1050 V(I - 1) = Q(I - 1) / A(I - 1)1060 V(I) = O(I) / A(I)1070 delV(I - 1) = V(I) - V(I - 1)1080 delQa(I - 1) = Q(I) - Q(I - 1)1090 delha(I - 1) = ((O(I - 1) * (V(I - 1) + V(I)) * delV(I - 1)))/(g * (O(I - 1) + O(I))) * (1 - (delOa(I - 1) / (2 * O(I - 1))))1100 delhfix = delha(I - 1)1110 WEND 1120 H(I) = H(I - 1) + delhfix1130 NEXT I 1140 HL = H(n)1150 QLWL = Q(n)1160 CDLWLS = CD(n) 1170 VLWLS = V(n)1180 delQtip = CDLWLS * a * (HL ^ 1.5) * (2 / 3) * ((2 * g) ^ .5) 1190 QL = QLWL + 2 * delQtip 1200 ELOSS = CSC * ((VLWLS ^ 2) / (2 * g)) 1210 HTOT = HL + ELOSS 1220 CDNW = .605 + .08 * (HTOT / P) + 1 / (10.006562# * HTOT)

1230 QN = CDNW * W * (HTOT $^{1.5}$) * (2 / 3) * ((2 * g) $^{.5}$)

##.#### ##.#### ##.#### "; H1; OLONR; HPR

Filename . COMPUTEL BAS .

The level of acceptable error :": E

End of Results "

1370 IF ALPHA1 = 0 THEN LPRINT " Rectangular Shape " ELSE LPRINT

.

1310 NEXT H1 1320 LPRINT 1330 LPRINT "

1340 LPRINT 1350 LPRINT "

1360 LPRINT

1400 LPRINT 1410 LPRINT "

1420 END

Trapezoidal Shape " 1380 LPRINT 1390 LPRINT "

APPENDIX C

Input and output of QuickBASIC program

DESIGN DATA

o Labyrinth weir geometry :

-	Length of labyrinth weir	1	(cm)	-	71.98
-	Width of labyrinth weir	w	(cm)	-	28.1
-	Crest height of labyrinth weir	P	(cm)	=	10
-	Half length of tip section of labyrinth weir	а	(Cm)	=	3.51

o Design Parameter :

-	Length Magnification	l/w	12	2.5616
-	Vertical aspect ratio	N/P	=	2.8100
-	Angle of side walls	alpha	-	14.0439
-	Energy loss coefficient	CSC	-	.1
-	Gravitational acceleration g (cr	n/s^2)	=	981

HYDRAULIC CALCULATION - RESULTS

QL/QN vs H/P Relationship

Hl	QL/QN	H/P
0.4000	2.5557	0.0401
0.7500	2.5457	0.0756
1.1000	2.5317	0.1117
1.4500	2.5141	0.1485
1.8000	2.4937	0.1862
2.1500	2.4708	0.2249
2.5000	2.4459	0.2646
2.8500	2.4193	0.3056
3.2000	2.3915	0.3479
3.5500	2.3627	0.3914
3,9000	2.3332	0.4364
4.2500	2.3033	0.4827
4.6000	2.2732	0.5305
4.9500	2.2431	0.5797

The level of acceptable error : .00005

Trapezoidal Shape

Filename : COMPUTE1.BAS

End of Results

APPENDIX D

Experimental data of

all weir models

Remarks

(for Table D.1 to Table D.13)

1). Column 1 indicates the number of the test.

2). Column 2, Q_{TL} is the experimental total flowrate at the labyrinth weir regardless of the number of cycles. (Note that Q_L is the flowrate over one cycle. At low flow rates (less than 8.1 l/s) Q_{TL} was measured directly by rotameter. At higher flows Q_{TL} was estimated from equation 5.1 whic is :

where H is the experimental average flow depth over the V-notch weir crest in cm.

3). Column 3, H is the experimental mean depth over the weir model crest. Three depth measurements were taken 250 mm upstream of weir model (see Figure 5-27). The mean depth, H₄ is the average.

4). Column 4 indicates the experimental value of C₄. This is calculated by rearranging the standard weir equation (equation 4.1) to give :

$$C_d = \frac{Q_{\pi} \times 1000}{\frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 \ g} \ L \ H^{1.5}}$$

where Q_{TL} is the experimental total flowrate at labyrinth weir (column 2) in *l/s*; L is the total developed length of labyrinth weir in cm ; g is the acceleration due to gravity = 981 cm/sec³; and H is the experimental mean depth over the weir model crest (column 3) in cm.

 Column 5 indicates the theoretical value of C₄. This is estimated from the Rehbock equation (equation 4.3) ie :

$$C_d = 0.605 + 0.08 \frac{H}{P} + \frac{1}{10.007 E}$$

where H is the experimental mean depth over the weir crest (column 3) in cm; and P is the weir height in cm.

6). Column 6 indicates the difference between experimental and theoretical values of C_d. This value, ΔC_a, is obtained from the equation :

7). Column 7 indicates the theoretical flowrate Q_{TN} a straight weir constructed across the channel width (sometimes called the presumptive linear weir). This is estimated from the standard weir equation (equation 4.1) using the total channel width, W, and the theoretical value of C_p. This gives by :

$$Q_{TN} = \frac{C_4 \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 \ g} \ W \ H^{1.5}}{1000}$$

where Q_{TN} is the theoretical flowrate at the straight weir (column 7) in *I*/s; C_4 is the theoretical discharge coefficient (column 5) and H is the experimental mean depth over the weir crest (column 3) in cm.

Note that Q_{TN} is the flowrate calculated on the basis of full channel width, the value of Q_{N} , used previously, refers to a straight weir with a crest length equal to the channel width for one cycle only.

8). Column 8 indicates the flow magnification, Q_{TL}/Q_{TN} . This, of course, is equal to Q_L/Q_{N} . This is calculated from column (2) divided by column (7).

9). Column 9 indicates the depth to weir height ratio, H/P. This is calculated from column (3) divided by weir height, P.

Table D.6 refers to a straight weir and therefore does not have values for flow magnification $(Q_{TL}/Q_{TN} \text{ or } Q_L/Q_N)$ and theoretical Q_{TN} .

	Trapezo	idal		two-cycl	e			
	P = 10.0	0 cm	v	V = 56.20) cm	g =	981 cm/s	sec ²
1	L = 143.9	96 cm		L/W = 2	.56	a	= 14.04	3
Test no.	Q _{rL} (l/s)	H (cm)	Experi- mental C _e	Theore- tical C ₄	Diffe- rence in C ₆ (%)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (1/s)	Q _{TL} /Q _{TN} or Q _L /Q _N	H/P
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
L	3.53	1.14	0.68	0.70	-2.67	1.42	2.49	0.11
2.	4.19	1.27	0.69	0.69	-0.37	1.64	2.55	0.13
3.	4.94	1.41	0.69	0.69	0.86	1.91	2.58	0.14
4.	5.57	1.68	0.60	0.68	-11.11	2.44	2.28	0.17
5.	5.63	1.57	0.67	0.68	-0.95	2.22	2.54	0.16
6.	6.39	1.68	0.69	0.68	1.73	2.45	2.61	0.17
7.	7.16	1.84	0.68	0.67	0.23	2.79	2.57	0.18
8.	7.61	1.93	0.67	0.67	-0.75	2.99	2.54	0.19
9.	8.61	2.20	0.62	0.67	-7.09	3.62	2.38	0.22
10.	11.01	2.37	0.71	0.67	6.77	4.03	2.73	0.24
11.	11.89	2.51	0.70	0.66	5.83	4.39	2.71	0.25
12.	12.98	2.67	0.70	0.66	5.28	4.81	2.70	0.27
13.	14.54	3.00	0.66	0.66	-0.47	5.70	2.55	0.30
14.	15.13	3.00	0.68	0.66	3.36	5.71	2.65	0.30
15.	16.80	3.14	0.71	0.66	7.05	6.13	2.74	0.31
16.	19.31	3.49	0.70	0.66	5.35	7.16	2.70	0.35
17.	21.38	3.80	0.68	0.66	2.64	8.13	2.63	0.38
18.	27.18	4.74	0.62	0.66	-6.79	11.38	2.39	0.47
19.	27.94	4.77	0.63	0.66	-5.02	11.48	2.43	0.48
20.	30.00	4.98	0.64	0.66	-4.45	12.26	2.45	0.50
21.	37.92	6.04	0.60	0.67	-10.38	16.52	2.30	0.60

TABLE D.1 Experimental data of model no.1 (see Figure 5-1)

	Trapezo	idal		four-cyc	le					
P = 10.00 cm			V	W = 56.20 cm			$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$			
L = 143.95 cm				L/W = 2.56			$\alpha = 14.04^{\circ}$			
Test no.	Q _{TL} (l/s)	H (cm)	Experi- mental C ₆	Theore- tical C _d	Diffe- rence in C _d (%)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (l/s)	Q _{TL} /Q _{TN} or Q _L /Q _N	Н/Р		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)		
1.	3.86	1.28	0.63	0.69	-9.74	1.67	2.31	0.13		
2.	4.59	1.42	0.64	0.69	-7.03	1.93	2.38	0.14		
3.	5.22	1.54	0.64	0.68	-5.50	2.16	2.42	0.15		
4.	5.96	1.68	0.64	0.68	-5.29	2.46	2.43	0.17		
5.	7.36	1.78	0.73	0.68	7.97	2.66	2.77	0.18		
6.	8.14	1.91	0.73	0.67	8.13	2.94	2.77	0.19		
7.	9.62	2.18	0.70	0.67	5.16	3.57	2.69	0.22		
8.	12.91	2.65	0.70	0.66	6.12	4.75	2.72	0.26		
9.	15.50	3.09	0.67	0.66	1.64	5.96	2.60	0.31		
10.	19.81	3.65	0.67	0.66	1.05	7.65	2.59	0.36		
11.	22.76	4.15	0.63	0.66	-4.45	9.30	2.45	0.42		
12.	24.87	4.50	0.61	0.66	-7.53	10.50	2.37	0.45		
13.	26.16	4.77	0.59	0.66	-10.96	11.47	2.28	0.48		
14.	27.19	4.98	0.58	0.66	-13.46	12.27	2.22	0.50		
15.	29.31	5.34	0.56	0.67	-16.07	13.63	2.15	0.53		

TABLE D.2 Experimental data of model no.2 (see Figure 5-1)

	Trapezo	idal		two-cycl	e				
P = 10.00 cm			1	W = 56.20 cm			$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$		
	L = 151.49 cm			L/W = 2.69			$\alpha = 9.42^{\circ}$		
Test no.	Qn. (l/s) (2)	H (cm) (3)	Experi- mental C ₄ (4)	Theore- tical C ₄ (5)	Diffe- rence in C _d (%) (6)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (l/s) (7)	Q _{TL} /Q _{TN} or Q _L /Q _N (8)	H/P (9)	
1.	4.73	1.34	0.68	0.69	-1.30	1.78	2.66	0.13	
2.	6.24	1.59	0.70	0.68	2.62	2.25	2.77	0.16	
3.	7.60	1.84	0.68	0.67	1.08	2.79	2.72	0.18	
4.	9.46	2.14	0.67	0.67	0.89	3.48	2.72	0.21	
5.	11.69	2.51	0.66	0.66	-1.45	4.40	2.66	0.25	
6.	16.87	3.10	0.69	0.66	4.17	6.01	2.81	0.31	
7.	21.39	3.56	0.71	0.66	7.56	7.38	2.90	0.36	
8.	23.90	3.85	0.71	0.66	6.83	8.30	2.88	0.39	
9.	29.09	4.60	0.66	0.66	-0.74	10.87	2.68	0.46	
10.	31.75	4.99	0.64	0.66	-4.20	12.30	2.58	0.50	
п.	35.27	5.51	0.61	0.67	-8.68	14.33	2.46	0.55	

TABLE D.3 Experimental data of model no.3 (see Figure 5-1)

P = 10.00 cm			W = 56.20 cm			$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$		
	L = 168.60) cm		L/W = 3.00	>	$\alpha = 0^{\circ}$		
Test no. (1)	Q _{TL} (i/s) (2)	H (cm) (3)	Experi- mental C _d (4)	Theore- tical C ₄ (5)	Diffe- rence in C ₄ (%) (6)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (1/s) (7)	Q _{TL} /Q _{TN} or Q _L /Q _N (8)	H/P (9)
1.	4.24	1.16	0.68	0.70	-3.04	1.46	2.91	0.12
2.	4.88	1.28	0.68	0.69	-2.40	1.67	2.93	0.13
3.	5.49	1.39	0.68	0.69	-1.83	1.87	2.94	0.14
4.	6.28	1.50	0.69	0.68	0.30	2.09	3.01	0.15
5.	6.94	1.61	0.68	0.68	0.37	2.31	3.01	0.16
6.	7.70	1.74	0.67	0.68	-0.60	2.58	2.98	0.17
7.	9.05	1.98	0.65	0.67	-2.53	3.10	2.92	0.20
8.	10.71	2.27	0.63	0.67	-5.74	3.79	2.83	0.23
9.	11.88	2.50	0.60	0.66	-9.49	4.37	2.72	0.25
10.	13.72	2.74	0.61	0.66	-8.57	5.00	2.74	0.27
11.	16.03	3.01	0.62	0.66	-6.80	5.73	2.80	0.30
12.	17.90	3.27	0.61	0.66	-7.97	6.48	2.76	0.33
13.	19.05	3.45	0.60	0.66	-9.72	7.03	2.71	0.34
14.	21.75	3.77	0.60	0.66	-9.77	8.04	2.71	0.38
15.	22.58	3.98	0.57	0.66	-13.65	8.72	2.59	0.40
16.	23.99	4.08	0.58	0.66	-11.83	9.07	2.65	0.4
17.	24.97	4.20	0.58	0.66	-11.93	9.45	2.64	0.4
18.	27.19	4.52	0.57	0.66	-14.36	10.58	2.57	0.4
19.	28.66	4.77	0.55	0.66	-16.66	11.46	2.50	0.4
20.	29.09	4.84	0.55	0.66	-17.30	11.73	2.48	0.4
21.	31.19	5.08	0.55	0.67	-17.65	12.62	2.47	0.5
22.	34.43	5.63	0.52	0.67	-22.45	14.80	2.33	0.5
23.	35.03	5.68	0.52	0.67	-22.29	15.03	2.33	0.5
24.	37.00	5.96	0.51	0.67	-23.80	16.18	2.29	0.6

TABLE D.4 Experimental data of model no.4 (see Figure 5-1), rectangular-two cycle

.

P = 10.00 cm			W == 56.20 cm			g = 981 cm/sec ²		
L = 150.51 cm			L/W = 2.68			$\alpha = 0^{\circ}$		
Test no. (1)	Q _{TL} (1/s) (2)	H (cm) (3)	Experi- mental C _d (4)	Theore- tical C ₄ (5)	Diffe- rence in C ₄ (%) (6)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (1/s) (7)	Q_{TL}/Q_{TN} or Q_L/Q_N (8)	H/P (9)
1.	3.37	1.06	0.70	0.71	-1.48	1.28	2.64	0.11
2.	4.28	1.22	0.71	0.70	1.97	1.57	2.73	0.12
3.	4.86	1.36	0.69	0.69	0.42	1.81	2.69	0.14
4.	6.28	1.63	0.68	0.68	-0.29	2.35	2.67	0.16
5.	7.58	1.88	0.66	0.67	-2.12	2.89	2.62	0.19
6.	9.79	2.21	0.67	0.67	0.68	3.63	2.70	0.22
7.	11.13	2.37	0.68	0.67	2.82	4.04	2.75	0.24
8.	12.45	2.59	0.67	0.66	1.42	4.58	2.72	0.26
9.	13.45	2.75	0.66	0.66	-0.17	5.03	2.67	0.28
10.	15.58	3.00	0.67	0.66	1.75	5.72	2.72	0.30
11.	17.38	3.26	0.66	0.66	0.41	6.46	2.69	0.33
12.	19.51	3.54	0.66	0.66	-0.39	7.32	2.67	0.35
13.	20.86	3.74	0.65	0.66	-2.10	7.95	2.62	0.37
14.	23.04	4.00	0.65	0.66	-2.10	8.79	2.62	0.40
15.	25.16	4.29	0.64	0.66	-3.87	9.77	2.57	0.43
16.	26.98	4.52	0.63	0.66	-4.63	10.56	2.55	0.45
17.	28.61	4.72	0.63	0.66	-5.54	11.31	2.53	0.47
18.	29.09	4.79	0.63	0.66	-5.86	11.54	2.52	0.48
19.	30.07	5.00	0.61	0.66	-9.01	12.34	2.44	0.50
20.	31.75	5.15	0.61	0.67	-8.06	12.90	2.46	0.51
21.	32.50	5.26	0.61	0.67	-9.13	13.35	2.43	0.53
22.	34.19	5.50	0.60	0.67	-10.56	14.28	2.40	0.55
23.	35.52	5.68	0.59	0.67	-11.74	15.03	2.36	0.57
24.	36.87	5.86	0.58	0.67	-12.64	15.76	2.34	0.59

TABLE D.5

Experimental data of model no.5 (see Figure 5-1), rectangular with a semi-circular connections, 2 cycle

	Straight Weir									
P =	10.00 cm	v	V = 56.20 c	m	$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$					
L =	56.20 cm		L/W = 1.00	0	$\alpha = 90^{\circ}$					
Test no.	Q _{TL} (I/s)	H (cm)	Experi- mental C _d	Theore- tical C _d	Diffe- rence in C ₄ (%)	H/P				
1	2.43	1.52	0.78	0.68	14.11	0.15				
2.	2.71	1.76	0.70	0.68	3.28	0.18				
3.	3.77	2.08	0.75	0.67	12.72	0.21				
4.	4.13	2.32	0.71	0.67	5.83	0.23				
5.	4.30	2.51	0.65	0.66	-2.22	0.25				
6.	4.87	2.56	0.71	0.66	7.57	0.26				
7.	5.46	2.77	0.71	0.66	7.73	0.28				
8.	6.21	3.01	0.72	0.66	8.16	0.30				
9.	6.22	3.13	0.68	0.66	2.29	0.31				
10.	6.94	3.23	0.72	0.66	9.12	0.32				
11.	7.63	3.44	0.72	0.66	8.83	0.34				
12.	9.43	3.87	0.75	0.66	12.69	0.39				
13.	13.55	5.03	0.72	0.67	8.95	0.50				
14.	16.69	5.82	0.72	0.67	7.07	0.58				
15.	17.66	5.95	0.73	0.67	9.45	0.60				

TABLE D.6 Experimental data of model no.6 (see Figure 5-2)
	Reverse		trap	trapezoidal shape			vo-cycle		
1	P = 10.00	cm	w	W = 56.20 cm L/W = 3.56			$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$ $\alpha = 14.04^\circ$		
L	. = 200.10	5 cm	I						
Test no.	Qn. (1/s)	H (cm)	Experi- mental C ₄	Theore- tical C _d	Diffe- rence in C ₄ (%)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (I/s)	Q _{TL} /Q _{IN} or Q _L /Q _N	H/P	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
1.	5.07	1.38	0.53	0.69	-23.33	1.86	2.73	0.14	
2.	6.41	1.65	0.51	0.68	-24.37	2.38	2.69	0.16	
3.	7.89	2.00	0.47	0.67	-29.45	3.14	2.51	0.20	
4.	8.92	2.26	0.45	0.67	-33.26	3.75	2.38	0.23	
5.	10.07	2.57	0.41	0.66	-37.76	4.54	2.22	0.26	
6.	12.19	3.07	0.38	0.66	-42.17	5.92	2.06	0.31	
7.	12.26	3.16	0.37	0.66	-44.22	6.17	1.99	0.32	
8.	14.78	3.75	0.34	0.66	-47.96	7.97	1.85	0.37	
9.	16.03	3.99	0.34	0.66	-48.66	8.77	1.83	0.40	
10.	17.18	4.28	0.33	0.66	-50.49	9.75	1.76	0.43	
11.	18.80	4.57	0.33	0.66	-50.96	10.76	1.75	0.46	
12.	20.95	5.01	0.32	0.67	-52.47	12.37	1.69	0.50	
13.	22.67	5.44	0.30	0.67	-54.68	14.05	1.61	0.54	
14.	23.80	5.69	0.30	0.67	-55.59	15.05	1.58	0.57	

TABLE D.7 Experimental data of model no.7 (see Figure 5-2)

Reverse		trap	ezoidal sha	ape	tv	wo-cycle			
1	P = 10.00 cm		W	W = 56.20 cm			$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$		
L	, = 143.9	6 cm	L	L/W = 2.56			$\alpha = 14.04^{\circ}$		
Test no.	Q _{rL} (l/s)	H (cm)	Experi- mental C _d	Theore- tical C _é	Diffe- rence in C ₂ (%)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (l/s)	Q _{TL} /Q _{TN} or Q _L /Q _N	H/P	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
L.	4.73	1.47	0.62	0.68	-9.05	2.03	2.33	0.15	
2.	6.24	1.82	0.60	0.67	-11.69	2.76	2.26	0.18	
3.	7.65	2.19	0.56	0.67	-16.88	3.59	2.13	0.22	
4.	8.65	2.48	0.52	0.67	-21.58	4.31	2.01	0.25	
5.	10.95	2.97	0.50	0.66	-24.08	5.63	1.94	0.30	
6.	12.45	3.32	0.48	0.66	-26.73	6.63	1.88	0.33	
7.	14.49	3.64	0.49	0.66	-25.89	7.63	1.90	0.36	
8.	15.73	3.93	0.48	0.66	-28.17	8.55	1.84	0.39	
9.	17.42	4.28	0.46	0.66	-30.09	9.73	1.79	0.43	
10.	19.64	4.75	0.45	0.66	-32.79	11.41	1.72	0.48	
п.	20.77	4.98	0.44	0.66	-33.96	12.28	1.69	0.50	
12.	22.39	5.25	0.44	0.67	-34.31	13.31	1.68	0.53	
13.	23.14	5.47	0.43	0.67	-36.15	14.15	1.64	0.55	
14.	24.19	5.73	0.42	0.67	-37.85	15.19	1.59	0.57	

TABLE D.8 Experimental data of model no.8 (see Figure 5-2)

	Trapezoidal			two-cycle					
P = 5.00 cm		V	W = 56.20 cm			$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$			
1	= 143.9	96 cm		L/W = 2.56			$\alpha = 14.04^{\circ}$		
Test no.	Q _{TL} (I/s)	H (cm)	Experi- mental C _d	Theore- tical C ₆	Diffe- rence in C ₄ (%)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (l/s)	Qrt/Qrn or Qt/Qn	H/P	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
1.	2.90	1.04	0.64	0.72	-10.33	1.26	2.30	0.21	
2.	3.44	1.18	0.63	0.71	-11.06	1.51	2.28	0.24	
3.	4.24	1.32	0.65	0.70	-6.68	1.77	2.39	0.26	
4.	4.92	1.46	0.66	0.70	-5.56	2.03	2.42	0.29	
5.	5.59	1.59	0.66	0.69	-5.21	2.30	2.43	0.32	
6.	6.37	1.75	0.65	0.69	-6.36	2.65	2.40	0.35	
7.	7.08	1.84	0.67	0.69	-2.76	2.84	2.49	0.37	
8.	7.84	1.98	0.66	0.69	-3.71	3.18	2.47	0.40	
9.	9.85	2.39	0.63	0.69	-8.74	4.21	2.34	0.48	
10.	10.42	2.49	0.62	0.68	-8.88	4.46	2.33	0.50	
11.	11.69	2.74	0.61	0.69	-11.70	5.17	2.26	0.55	
12.	13.52	3.02	0.61	0.69	-11.71	5.98	2.26	0.60	

TABLE D.9 Experimental data of model no. la (see Figure 5-2)

Trapezoidal				two-cycle						
	P = 10.00 cm			W = 56.20 cm			$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$			
I	. = 143.9	6 cm		L/W = 2	.56		a = 14.04	0		
	Top width $= 0.7 \mathrm{cm}$									
Test no.	Q _{rt.} (1/s)	H (cm)	Experi- mental C ₄	Theore- tical C ₄	Diffe- rence in C ₄ (%)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (l/s)	Q _{TL} /Q _{TN} or Q _L /Q _N	H/P		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)		
1.	4.84	1.40	0.69	0.69	0.35	1.88	2.57	0.14		
2.	6.45	1.64	0.72	0.68	6.38	2.37	2.72	0.16		
3.	7.99	1.93	0.70	0.67	4.72	2.98	2.68	0.19		
4.	9.96	2.20	0.72	0.67	7.57	3.62	2.76	0.22		
5.	12.26	2.53	0.72	0.66	7.87	4.44	2.76	0.25		
6.	17.82	3.14	0.75	0.66	13.92	6.11	2.92	0.31		
7.	19.47	3.49	0.70	0.66	6.17	7.16	2.72	0.34		
8.	21.21	3./2	0.69	0.66	5.05	7.88	2.69	0.37		
9.	24.48	4.14	0.68	0.66	3.21	9.26	2.64	0.41		
10.	27.71	4.52	0.68	0.66	2.33	10.57	2.62	0.44		
11.	32.21	5.09	0.66	0.66	-0.73	12.67	2.54	0.50		
12.	35.40	5.43	0.66	0.67	-1.21	13.99	2.53	0.53		
13.	38.00	5.74	0.65	0.67	-2.49	15.21	2.50	0.56		

TABLE D.10 Experimental data of model no.1b (see Figure 5-3)

	Trapezo	idal		two-cyc	le					
	P = 10.0	0 cm	V	V = 56.20) cm	g	$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$			
I	. = 143.9	96 cm		L/W = 2.56			$\alpha = 14.04$	0		
	Top width $= 1 \text{ cm}$									
Test no. (1)	Q _{11.} (1/s)	H (cm)	Experi- mental C _d	Theore- tical C4	Diffe- rence in C _d (%)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (1/s)	Qrl/Qtn or QL/Qn	H/P		
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)		
1.	4.95	1.50	0.64	0.68	-7.06	2.08	2.38	0.15		
2.	6.39	1.73	0.66	0.68	-2.56	2.56	2.50	0.17		
3.	7.99	1.97	0.68	0.67	1.23	3.08	2.59	0.19		
4.	10.42	2.32	0.69	0.67	4.01	3.91	2.66	0.23		
5.	12.98	2.62	0.72	0.66	8.37	4.67	2.78	0.26		
6.	17.58	3.26	0.70	0.66	6.18	6.46	2.72	0.32		
7.	22.58	3.85	0.70	0.66	6.30	8.29	2.72	0.38		
8.	24.97	4.12	0.70	0.66	6.35	9.16	2.72	0.40		
9.	28.34	4.48	0.70	0.66	6.12	10.43	2.72	0.44		
10.	30.52	4.72	0.70	0.66	5.40	11.30	2.70	0.46		
11.	34.67	5.27	0.67	0.67	1.24	13.37	2.59	0.52		
12.	34.67	5.27	0.67	0.67	1.24	13.37	2.59	0.52		
13.	38.13	5.64	0.67	0.67	0.42	14.82	2.57	0.55		
14.	39.15	5.82	0.66	0.67	-1.83	15.57	2.51	0.57		

 TABLE D.11

 Experimental data of model no.1c (see Figure 5-3)

Trapezoidal			two-cycle						
1	P = 10.00) cm	v	/ = 56.20) cm	g =	$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$		
L = 143.96 cm			L/W = 2.56			$\alpha = 14.04^{\circ}$			
			Тор	width = 1	.50 cm				
Test no.	Q _{TL} (I/s)	H (cm)	Experi- mental C _d	Theore- tical C ₄	Diffe- rence in C _d (%)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (l/s)	Q _{TL} /Q _{TN} or Q _L /Q _N	H/P	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
1.	4.92	1.52	0.62	0.68	-9.50	2.12	2.32	0.15	
2.	6.50	1.75	0.66	0.68	-2.55	2.60	2.50	0.17	
3.	8.04	2.01	0.66	0.67	-1.11	3.17	2.53	0.20	
4.	9.02	2.22	0.64	0.67	-3.84	3.66	2.46	0.22	
5.	10.48	2.47	0.64	0.66	-4.43	4.28	2.45	0.24	
6.	15.06	3.02	0.68	0.66	2.15	5.76	2.62	0.30	
7.	16.95	3.26	0.68	0.66	2.37	6.46	2.62	0.32	
8.	19.22	3.50	0.69	0.66	4.67	7.17	2.68	0.34	
9.	22.67	3.95	0.68	0.66	2.83	8.61	2.63	0.39	
10.	24.77	4.23	0.67	0.66	1.32	9.54	2.60	0.4	
11.	26.78	4.48	0.67	0.66	0.42	10.41	2.57	0.44	
12.	31.98	4.99	0.68	0.66	1.65	12.28	2.60	0.4	
13.	35.76	5.46	0.66	0.67	-1.05	14.11	2.53	0.5	
14.	38.89	5.81	0.65	0.67	-2.08	15.51	2.51	0.5	

TABLE D.12 Experimental data of model no.1d (see Figure 5-3)

	Trapezoi	idal		two-cycle					
P = 10.00 cm			V	W = 56.20 cm			$g = 981 \text{ cm/sec}^2$		
I	L = 143.96 cm			L/W = 2	.56		$\alpha = 14.04$	•	
			Тор	width $= 2$.00 cm				
Test no.	Q _{rt.} (I/s)	H (cm)	Experi- mental C ₆	Theore- tical C ₄	Diffe- rence in C ₄ (%)	Theore- tical Q _{TN} (1/s)	Q _{TL} /Q _{TN} or Q _L /Q _N	H/P	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
1.	4.92	1.62	0.56	0.68	-17.10	2.32	2.12	0.16	
2.	6.54	1.92	0.58	0.67	-13.98	2.97	2.20	0.19	
3.	7.89	2.13	0.60	0.67	-10.89	3.46	2.28	0.21	
4.	8.60	2.29	0.59	0.67	-12.18	3.82	2.25	0.22	
5.	10.25	2.53	0.60	0.66	-9.83	4.44	2.31	0.25	
6.	12.91	2.96	0.60	0.66	-9.76	5.59	2.31	0.29	
7.	15.50	3.27	0.62	0.66	-6.79	6.49	2.39	0.32	
8.	17.50	3.49	0.63	0.66	-4.48	7.15	2.45	0.34	
9.	21.21	3.99	0.63	0.66	-5.26	8.74	2.43	0.39	
10.	23.14	4.22	0.63	0.66	-5.18	9.53	2.43	0.41	
11.	24.67	4.38	0.63	0.66	-4.35	10.07	2.45	0.43	
12.	29.42	5.00	0.62	0.66	-6.78	12.32	2.39	0.49	
13.	33.37	5.44	0.62	0.67	-7.14	14.03	2.38	0.53	
14.	35.76	5.66	0.62	0.67	-6.46	14.92	2.40	0.56	

TABLE D.13 Experimental data of model no.1e (see Figure 5-3)

TABLE D.14 Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on rectangular plan form, model no.4 (see Figure 5-1)

H/P =	0.41	QL/QN =	2.64
	QTL =	23.99 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	3.00	

No.	X (cm)	E (cm)	X/P	E/P
1	0.00	3.50	0.00	0.35
2	-3.00	3.13	-0.30	0.31
3	-6.00	2.73	-0.60	0.27
4	-9.00	2.52	~0.90	0.25
5	-12.00	2.70	-1.20	0.27
6	-15.00	3.77	-1.50	0.38
7	-16.30	4.26	-1.63	0.43
8	-18.00	4.26	-1.80	0.43
9	-20.00	3.62	-2.00	0.36
10	-23.00	3.65	-2.30	0.36
11	-26.00	3.71	-2.60	0.37
12	-28.10	3.34	-2.81	0.33
13	-32.00	1.12	-3.20	0.11
14	-35.00	-2.75	-3.50	-0.28
15	-37.00	-5.50	-3.70	-0.55

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

TABLE D.15 Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one – cycle on rectangular plan form, model no.4 (see Figure 5–1)

H/P =	0.48	QL/QN =	2.48
	QTL =	29.09 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	3.00	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
1	0.00	4.17	0.00	0.42
2	-3.00	3.77	-0.30	0.38
3	-6.00	3.25	-0.60	0.33
4	-9.00	2.79	-0.90	0.28
5	-12.00	2.67	-1.20	0.27
6	-15.00	3.04	-1.50	0.30
7	-18.30	4.74	-1.83	0.47
8	-20.00	5.05	-2.00	0.50
9	-23.00	4.56	-2.30	0.46
10	-25.00	4.26	-2.50	0.43
11	-28.10	3.74	-2.81	0.37
12	-30.00	3.10	-3.00	0.31
13	-32.00	1.67	-3.20	0.17
14	-36.20	-4.43	-3.62	-0.44

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

TABLE D.16 Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on rectangular plan form, model no.4 (see Figure 5-1)

H/P =	0.56	QL/QN =	2.33
	QTL =	34.43 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	3.00	

No.	X (cm)	E (cm)	X/P	E/P
1	0.00	4.84	0.00	0.48
2	-3.00	4.35	-0.30	0.43
3	-6.00	3.77	-0.60	0.38
41	-9.00	3.25	-0.90	0.33
5	-12.00	2.95	-1.20	0.29
6	-15.00	3.04	-1.50	0.30
7	-18.00	3.65	-1.80	0.36
8	-21.00	4.71	-2.10	0.47
9	-23.70	5.81	-2.37	0.58
10	-25.00	5.90	-2.50	0.59
11	-27.00	5.32	-2.70	0.53
12	-28.10	4.68	-2.81	0.47
13	-30.00	3.83	-3.00	0.38
14	-33.00	1.76	-3.30	0.18
15	-35.00	-0.99	-3.50	-0.10
16	- 37.50	-3.79	-3.75	-0.38

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection, model no.5 (see Figure 5-1)

H/P =	0.48	QL/QN =	2.52
	QTL =	29.09 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	2.68	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
1	0.00	4.26	0.00	0.43
2	-3.00	3.95	-0.30	0.40
3	-6.00	3.65	-0.60	0.36
4	-9.00	3.40	-0.90	0.34
5	-12.00	3.43	-1.20	0.34
6	-15.00	3.80	-1.50	0.38
7	-18.00	4.56	-1.80	0.46
8	-21.00	4.87	-2.10	0.49
9	-24.00	4.32	-2.40	0.43
10	-27.00	3.86	-2.70	0.39
11	-28.10	3.65	-2.81	0.36
12	-32.00	1.54	-3.20	0.15
13	-35.00	-1.44	-3.50	-0.14
14	-38.00	-2.97	-3.80	-0.30
15	-41.00	-4.09	-4.10	-0.41
16	-44.00	-4.77	-4.40	-0.48
17	3.00	4.47	0.30	0.45
18	6.00	4.62	0.60	0.46
19	9.00	4.65	0.90	0.47
20	12.00	4.68	1.20	0.47
21	15.00	4.74	1.50	0.47
22	18.00	4.78	1.80	0.48

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

TABLE D.18 Depth profile data taken along the centre line

of one-cycle on rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection, model no.5 (see Figure 5-1)

H/P =	0.51	QL/QN =	2.46
	QTL =	31.75 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	2.68	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
1	0.00	4.62	0.00	0.46
2	-3.00	4.35	-0.30	0.43
3	-6.00	3.95	-0.60	0.40
4	-9.00	3.65	-0.90	0.36
5	-12.00	3.56	-1.20	0.36
6	-15.00	3.83	-1.50	0.38
7	-18.00	4.50	-1.80	0.45
8	-21.00	5.20	-2.10	0.52
9	-24.00	4.96	-2.40	0.50
10	-27.00	4.35	-2.70	0.43
11	-28.10	4.04	-2.81	0.40
12	-32.00	2.12	-3.20	0.21
13	-35.00	-0.28	-3.50	-0.03
14	-38.00	-2.11	-3.80	-0.21
15	-41.00	-3.30	-4.10	-0.33
16	-44.00	-3.97	-4.40	-0.40
17	5.00	4.93	0.50	0.49
18	10.00	5.05	1.00	0.50
19	15.00	5.08	1.50	0.51
20	20.00	5.11	2.00	0.51
	and the second se			

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on rectangular geometry with a semi-circular connection, model no.5 (see Figure 5-1)

H/P =	0.59	QL/QN =	2.34
	QTL =	36.87 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	2.68	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
1	0.00	5.20	0.00	0.52
2	-3.00	4.93	-0.30	0.49
3	-6.00	4.56	-0.60	0.46
4	-9.00	4.17	-0.90	0.42
5	-12.00	3.98	-1.20	0.40
6	-15.00	3.95	-1.50	0.40
7	-18.00	4.50	-1.80	0.45
8	-21.00	5.32	-2.10	0.53
9	-24.00	5.87	-2.40	0.59
10	-27.00	5.42	-2.70	0.54
11	-28.10	5.08	-2.81	0.51
12	-32.00	3.19	-3.20	0.32
13	-35.00	1.09	-3.50	0.11
14	-38.00	-0.80	-3.80	-0.08
15	-41.00	-2.02	-4.10	-0.20
16	5.00	5.54	0.50	0.55
17	10.00	5.72	1.00	0.57
18	15.00	5.78	1.50	0.58
19	20.00	5.87	2.00	0.59
1000				

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

TABLE D.20 Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.7 (see Figure 5-2)

H/P =	0.43	QL/QN =	1.76
	QTL =	17.18 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	3.56	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
1	-45.00	-5.55	-4.50	-0.55
2	-40.00	-6.37	-4.00	-0.64
3	-37.00	-7.38	-3.70	-0.74
4	-32.00	0.49	-3.20	0.05
5	-31.00	1.62	-3.10	0.16
6	-30.00	1.77	-3.00	0.18
7	-28.10	2.50	-2.81	0.25
8	-25.00	2.44	-2.50	0.24
9	-20.00	2.74	-2.00	0.27
10	-15.00	2.56	-1.50	0.26
11	-10.00	1.28	-1.00	0.13
12	-5.00	2.41	-0.50	0.24
13	0.00	3.57	0.00	0.36
14	5.00	4.02	0.50	0.40
15	10.00	4.15	1.00	0.41
16	15.00	4.21	1.50	0.42
17	20.00	4.24	2.00	0.42

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

TABLE D.21 Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.7 (see Figure 5-2)

H/P =	0.50	QL/QN =	1.69
	QTL =	20.95 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	3.56	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
1	-45.00	-7.68	-4.50	-0.77
2	-40.00	-7.22	-4.00	-0.72
3	-38.00	-6.89	-3.80	-0.69
4	-32.00	1.74	-3.20	0.17
5	-31.00	2.10	-3.10	0.21
6	-30.00	2.65	-3.00	0.27
7	-28.10	3.23	-2.81	0.32
8	-25.00	3.29	-2.50	0.33
9	-20.00	3.75	-2.00	0.37
10	-15.00	2.07	-1.50	0.21
11	-10.00	1.77	-1.00	0.18
12	-5.00	3.14	-0.50	0.31
13	0.00	4.33	0.00	0.43
14	5.00	4.79	0.50	0.48
15	10.00	4.82	1.00	0.48
16	15.00	5.00	1.50	0.50
17	20.00	5.03	2.00	0.50

*E = water surface elevation rolative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.7 (see Figure 5-2)

H/P =	0.57	QL/QN =	1.58
	QTL =	23.80 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	3.56	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
	45.00			
1 1	-45.00	-5.79	-4.50	-0.58
2	-40.00	-7.68	-4.00	-0.77
3	-38.00	-5.97	-3.80	-0.60
4	-32.00	1.98	-3.20	0.20
5	-31.00	2.80	-3.10	0.28
6	-30.00	2.99	-3.00	0.30
7	-28.10	3.47	-2.81	0.35
8	-25.00	4.18	-2.50	0.42
9	-20.00	4.11	-2.00	0.41
10	-15.00	1.95	-1.50	0.20
11	-10.00	2.19	-1.00	0.22
12	-5.00	3.57	-0.50	0.36
13	0.00	4.85	0.00	0.48
14	5.00	5.33	0.50	0.53
15	10.00	5.46	1.00	0.55
16	15.00	5.55	1.50	0.55
17	20.00	5.70	2.00	0.57

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.8 (see Figure 5-2)

H/P =	0.43	QL/QN =	1.79
	QTL =	17.42 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	2.56	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
1	-40.00	-6.24	-4.00	-0.62
2	-35.00	-6.76	-3.50	-0.68
3	-28.00	-7.64	-2.80	-0.76
4	-27.00	-6.33	-2.70	-0.63
5	-24.50	-2.18	-2.45	-0.22
6	-21.00	1.47	-2.10	0.15
7	-20.00	2.20	-2.00	0.22
8	-19.00	2.51	-1.90	0.25
9	-17.20	3.21	-1.72	0.32
10	-15.00	3.33	-1.50	0.33
11	-10.00	2.30	-1.00	0.23
12	-5.00	2.60	-0.50	0.26
13	0.00	3.58	0.00	0.36
14	5.00	4.03	0.50	0.40
15	10.00	4.16	1.00	0.42
16	15.00	4.19	1.50	0.42
17	20.00	4.22	2.00	0.42

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.8 (see Figure 5-2)

H/P =	0.50	QL/QN =	1.69
	QTL =	20.77 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	2.56	

No.	X (cm)	E (cm)	X/P	E/P
1	-40.00	-5.99	-4.00	-0.60
2	-35.00	-7.21	-3.50	-0.72
3	-29.00	-7.24	-2.90	-0.72
4	-27.00	-4.07	-2.70	-0.41
5	-24.50	-0.48	-2.45	-0.05
6	-21.00	2.42	-2.10	0.24
7	-20.00	2.91	-2.00	0.29
8	-19.00	3.39	-1.90	0.34
9	-17.20	3.88	-1.72	0.39
10	-15.00	3.70	-1.50	0.37
11	-10.00	2.24	-1.00	0.22
12	-5.00	3.18	-0.50	0.32
13	0.00	4.19	0.00	0.42
14	5.00	4.67	0.50	0.47
15	10.00	4.77	1.00	0.48
16	15.00	4.92	1.50	0.49
17	20.00	4.92	2.00	0.49

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

Depth profile data taken along the centre line of one-cycle on reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.8 (see Figure 5-2)

H/P =	0.57	QL/QN =	1.59
	QTL =	24.19 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	2.56	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
1	-40.00	-6.27	-4.00	-0.63
2	-33.00	-7.46	-3.30	-0.75
3	-30.00	-5.75	-3.00	-0.58
4	-27.00	-1.39	-2.70	-0.14
5	-24.50	0.62	-2.45	0.06
6	-21.00	3.21	-2.10	0.32
7	-20.00	3.82	-2.00	0.38
8	- 19.00	4.09	-1.90	0.41
9	-17.20	4.06	-1.72	0.41
10	-15.00	2.78	-1.50	0.28
11	-10.00	2.88	-1.00	0.29
12	-5.00	3.70	-0.50	0.37
13	0.00	4.89	0.00	0.49
14	5.00	5.41	0.50	0.54
15	10.00	5.47	1.00	0.55
16	15.00	5.56	1.50	0.56
17	20.00	5.59	2.00	0.56

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

Depth profile data taken along the centre line between two cycles on rectangular plan form, model no.4 (see Figure 5–1)

H/P =	0.41	QL/QN =	2.64	
	QTL = P = L/W =	23.99 / 10.00 cl 3.00	s m	
No.	X (cm)	E (cm)	X/P	E/P
1	0.00	3.53	0.00	0.35
2	-3.00	2.37	-0.30	0.24
3	-6.00	0.14	-0.60	0.01
4	-9.00	-1.90	-0.90	-0.19
5	-18.50	0.11	-1.85	0.01
6	-24.60	-0.56	-2.46	-0.06
7	-28.10	-1.29	-2.81	-0.13
8	-32.50	-4.06	-3.25	-0.41
9	-35.00	-5.47	-3.50	-0.55

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

Depth profile data taken along the centre line between two cycles on reverse trapezoidal plan form, model no.7 (see Figure 5-2)

H/P =	0.57	QL/QN =	1.58
	QTL =	23.80 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	3.56	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
1	-40.00	-6.16	-4.00	-0.62
2	-35.00	-1.77	-3.50	-0.18
3	-30.00	1.92	-3.00	0.19
4	-28.10	3.60	-2.81	0.36
5	-25.00	3.78	-2.50	0.38
6	-15.00	1.43	-1.50	0.14
7	-9.50	1.16	-0.95	0.12
8	-6.00	2.59	-0.60	0.26
9	-4.00	3.60	-0.40	0.36
10	-2.00	4.36	-0.20	0.44
11	0.00	4.94	0.00	0.49
12	5.00	5.46	0.50	0.55
13	10.00	5.55	1.00	0.55
14	15.00	5.61	1.50	0.56
15	20.00	5.64	2.00	0.56
and the second	and the second s		Constant Constant of Constant	

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

TABLE D.28 Depth profile data taken along the centre line between two cycles on reverse trapezoidal plan form,

model no.8 (see Figure 5-2)

H/P =	0.57	QL/QN =	1.59
	QTL =	24.19 l/s	
	P =	10.00 cm	
	L/W =	2.56	

No.	X	E	X/P	E/P
	(cm)	(cm)		
1	-35.00	-5.93	-3.50	-0.59
2	-28.00	-5.26	-2.80	-0.53
3	-21.00	-1.12	-2.10	-0.11
4	-17.20	0.83	-1.72	0.08
5	-15.00	1.02	-1.50	0.10
6	-12.50	-2.76	-1.25	-0.28
7	-9.00	-1.15	-0.90	-0.11
8	-7.00	0.68	-0.70	0.07
9	-5.20	2.30	-0.52	0.23
10	-3.00	3.76	-0.30	0.38
11	-2.00	4.09	-0.20	0.41
12	-1.00	4.49	-0.10	0.45
13	0.00	4.70	0.00	0.47
14	5.00	5.44	0.50	0.54
15	10.00	5.50	1.00	0.55
16	15.00	5.56	1.50	0.56
17	20.00	5.62	2.00	0.56

*E = water surface elevation relative to crest.

*X = distance.

*P = weir height.

Appendix E

This appendix contains a number of graphs which showed a different plotting of the relationship between flow magnification, Q_L/Q_N and depth to crest ratio, H/P; and the relationship between flow magnification, Q_L/Q_N and total head to crest ratio, H_J/P (see section 3.4).



Figure E-1 A comparison of the flow magnification values plotting with H/P and H_/P for model no.1 (trapezoidal shape, two-cycle-see Figure 5-1).



Figure E-2 A comparison of the flow magnification values plotting with H/P and H₂/P for model no.4 (rectangular shape, two-cycle-see Figure 5-1).



Figure E-3 A comparison of the flow magnification values plotting with H/P and H/P for model no.5 (rectangular shape with a semi-circular connection, two-cycle-see Figure 5-1).







