



Cairo University

THREE-DIMENSIONAL NUMERICAL STUDY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLES

By

Eng. Heba Tarek Ahmed Essawy

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Irrigation and Hydraulics Engineering

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA – EGYPT
2018

**THREE-DIMENSIONAL NUMERICAL STUDY OF
STACKED DROP MANHOLES**

By

Eng. Heba Tarek Ahmed Essawy

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Irrigation and Hydraulics Engineering

Under The supervision of

Dr. Ahmad Wagdy Abdeldayem
Prof. of Hydrology
Head of Department
IHD, Faculty of Engineering
Cairo University

Dr. Ahmed Mohamed Helmi
Assistant Prof.
IHD, Faculty of Engineering
Cairo University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA – EGYPT
2018

DISCLAIMER

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own original work and that no part of it has been submitted for a degree qualification at any other university or institute.

I further declare that I have appropriately acknowledged all sources used and have cited them in the references section.

Name: Heba Tarek Ahmed Essawy

Date: 1/11/2018

Signature:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I am Grateful to The Mighty Allah for giving me the strength to finish this work.

I wish to express my deepest thanks to my supervisors, Prof. Dr. Ahmed Wagdy, for his extraordinary help and endless patience without which this work would not have been possible, and for providing me with all the necessary facilities. I thank him for his enthusiasm, inspiration, and persistence. Without his common-sense, knowledge and perceptiveness, I would have never finished this work. He has made a deep impression on me and I owe him lots of gratitude.

I would also like to express my thankful recognition to Ass.Prof. Dr. Ahmed Helmy. I really appreciated the liberties he gave me in developing my ideas. He was a valuable supervisor sharing his experience, good advice and countless ideas. He kept an eye on the progress of my work, and was always available when I needed his advice, as there are no words can express my deepest respect to him for helping me throughout this study. I could not have imagined having a better co-advisor and mentor for my master study.

I also would like to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Hossam Abdel Wahab, who really helped me a lot, and giving me a spare time to finish my thesis, as he was supportive and eager that I could finish my thesis as soon as possible.

I cannot forget to thank my colleagues in the Khatib and Alamy company, for their continuous support throughout the research time.

I cannot end without thanking my family on their continuous encouragement and the love they had for me throughout my life. I feel a deep sense of gratitude to my father, Prof. Dr. Tarik Essawy, and my mother, Dr. Nemat Eid. I will always be proud of you. I hope that I made you proud of me too, as I really owe you a lot. This dissertation is entirely dedicated to them. I also would like to thank my sisters, Dr. Basma Tarik and Dr. Bakinam Tarik, for their love, support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DISCLAIMER	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF FIGURES	vi
LIST OF SYMBOLS	x
ABSTRACT	xii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Problem Definition.....	1
1.3 Study Objective	1
1.4 Approach	2
1.5 Thesis Overview.....	2
CHAPTER 2	3
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1 Introduction	3
2.2 Types of Manholes.....	3
2.3 Application of Different Manhole Types	4
2.4 Hydraulics of Drop Shaft	5
2.5 Hydraulics of Stacked Drop Manhole	11
2.6 Computational fluid dynamics (CFD).....	15
2.6.1 General description of FLOW-3D.	16
2.6.2 Flow governing equations.....	17
2.6.3 Volume of Fluid (VOF) Free surface determination	18
2.6.4 Turbulence models.....	18
CHAPTER 3	21
METHODOLOGY OF NUMERICAL MODEL	21
3.1 Introduction.	21
3.2 Model description.....	22
3.3 Procedure of FLOW-3D simulation	22

3.4 Domain description	24
3.5 Geometric presentations and grid type.....	26
3.6 Turbulence model.....	27
3.7 Boundary conditions	27
3.8 Time Step Adjustment.....	28
3.9 Numerical Convergence limitations.....	28
3.10 Energy dissipation efficiency calculations.....	29
3.11 Grid Sensitivity Analysis	30
3.12 Selection of turbulence model, and model calibration.....	30
CHAPTER 4.....	33
RESULTS OF NUMERICAL MODELS	33
4.1 Introduction	33
4.2 Model Output	33
4.4 Energy Dissipation efficiency of staked drop manhole vs. single drop shaft	40
4.5 Energy dissipation efficiency of stacked drop manhole for different flow rates (Q*)	42
4.6 Energy dissipation efficiency of stacked drop manhole of different total drop heights (H).....	45
4.7 Optimum Stacked Drop Manhole Drop Configuration.....	48
4.8 Energy dissipation efficiency of stacked drop manhole for different cross-section geometries	49
4.9 Efficiency and Cost Comparisons of stacked drop manholes and Single drop shaft	52
CHAPTER 5.....	54
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	54
5.1 Introduction	54
5.2 Summary	54
5.3 Conclusions	55
5.4 Recommendations	55
REFERENCES	56

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: Summary for Camino et al. 2011 Experimental Setup	14
Table 3-1: Summary of the simulated runs by FLOW-3D	25
Table 3-2: Relative error comparison for the whole flow spectrum.....	32
Table 4-1: Efficiency and Cost Comparison between alternatives 1, 2, 3.....	53

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 2-1: TYPICAL URBAN DROP STRUCTURES: A) VORTEX DROP SHAFT OF HELICAL; B) PLUNGING DROP SHAFT OF ELBOW ENTRANCE; AND, C) SANITARY DROP MANHOLE (ADOPTED FROM WILLIAMSON, 2001).	4
FIGURE 2-2: DIRECT-DROP AIR ENTRAINING DROP SHAFT (ADOPTED FROM U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS 1997).	5
FIGURE 2-3: RELATIVE ENERGY LOSS VARIATION IN SUPERCRITICAL FLOW	6
FIGURE 2-4: FLOW REGIME FOR DROPSHAFT, (DE MARINIS ET AL. 2007).....	7
FIGURE 2-5: GRANATA ET AL. 2009 AND 2011 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP (ADOPTED FROM GRANATA ET AL. 2009 AD 2011)	7
FIGURE 2-6: RELATIVE TOTAL ENERGY LOSS WITH RESPECT TO IMPACT NUMBER (I) (ADOPTED FROM GRANATA ET AL. 2011).....	8
FIGURE 2-7: A) TOTAL ENERGY DISSIPATION WITH RESPECT TO SEVERAL DISCHARGES B) ENERGY DISSIPATION DUE TO DIFFERENT DROPS WITH RESPECT TO SEVERAL DISCHARGES (Q)(ADOPTED FROM CARVALHO AND LEANDRO 2012).....	9
FIGURE 2-8: ZHENG ET AL 2017 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP (ADOPTED FROM ZHENG ET AL 2017).	10
FIGURE 2-9: ENERGY LOSSES EFFICIENCY WITH RESPECT TO DIFFERENT DROPS AND DISCHARGES (ADOPTED FROM ZHENG ET AL 2017)	10
FIGURE 2-10: CAMINO ET AL. 2009 PROPOSED STACKED DROP MANHOLES IN WINDERMERE SUBDIVISION IN EDMONTON, ALBERTA (ADOPTED FROM CAMINO ET AL. 2009).....	11
FIGURE 2-11: FLOW REGIMES IN STAKED DROP MANHOLES (SDM) (ADOPTED FROM CAMINO ET AL. 2009).....	12
FIGURE 2-12: CAMINO ET AL. 2011 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP (ADOPTED FROM CAMINO, ZHU, AND RAJARATNAM 2011) (A) SECTIONAL VIEW; (B) PLAN VIEW OF ASYMMETRIC SDM; (C) PLAN VIEW OF AN OFFSET SDM	13

FIGURE 2-13: CAMINO ET AL. 2011 RELATIVE ENERGY LOSSES RESULTS INSIDE SDM OF DIVERSE CONFIGURATIONS WITH RESPECT TO Q*.....	14
FIGURE 2-14: VOLUME OF FLUID (VOF) FREE SURFACE ASSESSMENT	18
FIGURE 3-1: GENERAL APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY STAGES.....	21
FIGURE 3-2: FLOW-3D SOFTWARE BASIC STRUCTURE	23
FIGURE 3-3: SETUP OF THE SIMULATED STACKED DROP MANHOLE DOMAIN A) SIDE VIEW, B) PLAN VIEW.....	24
FIGURE 3-4: DOMAIN GEOMETRY FILE	26
FIGURE 3-5: FLOW-3D GENERATED ORTHOGONAL MESH ASSOCIATED WITH STL	26
FIGURE 3-6: DOMAIN BOUNDARY CONDITIONS.....	28
FIGURE 3-7: CONVECTIVE VOLUME ERROR	29
FIGURE 3-7: TOTAL HYDRAULIC HEAD (CM.).....	29
FIGURE 3-7: THE GENERATED 3-D GRID.....	30
FIGURE 3-7: COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CALCULATED, AND SIMULATED ENERGY DISSIPATION EFFICIENCY	32
FIGURE 4-1: STACKED DROP MANHOLE DOMAIN.....	33
FIGURE 4-2: SIDE VIEW FOR STACKED DROP MANHOLE VELOCITY VARIATIONS.....	34
FIGURE 4-3: PLAN VIEW FOR STACKED DROP MANHOLE VELOCITY VARIATIONS.....	34
FIGURE 4-4: SIDE VIEW FOR STACKED DROP MANHOLE PRESSURE VARIATIONS.....	35
FIGURE 4-5: PLAN VIEW FOR STACKED DROP MANHOLE PRESSURE VARIATIONS.....	35
FIGURE 4-6: SIDE VIEW FOR STACKED DROP MANHOLE FLOW DEPTH VARIATIONS.....	36
FIGURE 4-7: PLAN VIEW FOR STACKED DROP MANHOLE FLOW DEPTH VARIATIONS.....	36
FIGURE 4-8: SIDE VIEW FOR STACKED DROP MANHOLE HYDRAULIC ENERGY VARIATIONS.....	37
FIGURE 4-9: PLAN VIEW FOR STACKED DROP MANHOLE HYDRAULIC ENERGY VARIATIONS.....	37

FIGURE 4-9: STACKED DROP MANHOLE FREE OVERFALL FLOW REGIME (B)	38
FIGURE 4-11: STACKED DROP MANHOLE SURFACE JET FLOW REGIME (B)	38
FIGURE 4-12: STACKED DROP MANHOLE SUBMERGED OPENING FROM DOWNSTREAM (C)	39
FIGURE 4-13: STACKED DROP MANHOLE FULLY SUBMERGED JET FLOW REGIME (D)	39
FIGURE 4-14: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE VS. SINGLE DROP SHAFT FOR TOTAL DROP HEIGHT $H=20D$	40
FIGURE 4-15: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE VS. SINGLE DROP SHAFT FOR TOTAL DROP HEIGHT $H=15D$	40
FIGURE 4-16: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE VS. SINGLE DROP SHAFT FOR TOTAL DROP HEIGHT $H=10D$	41
FIGURE 4-17: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE VS. SINGLE DROP SHAFT FOR TOTAL DROP HEIGHT $H=5D$	41
FIGURE 4-18: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR $Q^*=0.2$ FOR DIFFERENT DROP CONFIGURATIONS	42
FIGURE 4-19: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR $Q^*=0.4$ FOR DIFFERENT DROP CONFIGURATIONS	43
FIGURE 4-20: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR $Q^*=0.6$ FOR DIFFERENT DROP CONFIGURATIONS	43
FIGURE 4-21: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR $Q^*=0.8$ FOR DIFFERENT DROP CONFIGURATIONS	44
FIGURE 4-22: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR $Q^*=1.0$ FOR DIFFERENT DROP CONFIGURATIONS	44
FIGURE 4-23: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR $H_1/H=0.25$ FOR DIFFERENT FLOW REGIME	45
FIGURE 4-24: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR $H_1/H=0.40$ FOR DIFFERENT FLOW REGIME	46
FIGURE 4-25: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR $H_1/H=0.50$ FOR DIFFERENT FLOW REGIME	46
FIGURE 4-26: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR $H_1/H=0.60$ FOR DIFFERENT FLOW REGIME	47

FIGURE 4-27: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR $H_1/H=0.75$ FOR DIFFERENT FLOW REGIME	47
FIGURE 4-28: OPTIMUM STACKED DROP MANHOLE CONFIGURATION FOR TOTAL DROP HEIGHT $H=10D$	48
FIGURE 4-29: OPTIMUM STACKED DROP MANHOLE CONFIGURATION FOR TOTAL DROP HEIGHT $H=5D$	48
FIGURE 4-30: 1DX1D STACKED DROP MANHOLE CROSS-SECTION GEOMETRY FREE OVERFALL FLOW REGIME	49
FIGURE 4-31: 2DX2D STACKED DROP MANHOLE CROSS-SECTION GEOMETRY FREE OVERFALL FLOW REGIME	50
FIGURE 4-32: 3DX3D STACKED DROP MANHOLE CROSS-SECTION GEOMETRY FREE OVERFALL FLOW REGIME	50
FIGURE 4-33: 4DX4D STACKED DROP MANHOLE CROSS-SECTION GEOMETRY FREE OVERFALL FLOW REGIME	51
FIGURE 4-34: EFFICIENCY OF STACKED DROP MANHOLE FOR DIFFERENT CROSS SECTION GEOMETRY	51
FIGURE 4-35: SINGLE DROP MANHOLE AND STACKED DROP MANHOLE ALTERNATIVES	52
FIGURE 4-36: EFFICIENCY OF SINGLE DROP MANHOLE AND STACKED DROP MANHOLE ALTERNATIVES	53

LIST OF SYMBOLS

- (A_x, A_y, A_z) : Area fraction open to flow in (x, y, and z) directions.
- Diff: Diffusion
- f_x, f_y, f_z : The viscous acceleration in (x, y, and z) directions.
- G_x, G_y, G_z : The acceleration in (x, y, and z) directions.
- i, j, k : Unit vector in x, y, and z directions.
- k : Kinetic energy of turbulent fluctuation per unit mass.
- l : Turbulence length scale; a characteristic of eddy size.
- P : The pressure.
- P_t : The turbulence kinetic energy production
- t : Time.
- U_i : Mean velocity in tensor notation.
- U, V, W : Instantaneous velocity components in x, y, and z directions.
- U', V', W' : Fluctuating velocity components in x, y, and z directions.
- V_f : The opened fraction volume to flow.
- w_{sx}, w_{sy}, w_{sz} : The wall shear stress in (x, y, and z) directions.
- x_i : Position tensor in tensor notation.
- x, y, z : Rectangular Cartesian coordinates.
- ϵ : Dissipation per unit mass.
- ω : Specific dissipation rate.
- μ : The dynamic viscosity.
- S_{ij} : Mean strain rate tensor.
- δ_{ij} : Kronecker delta tensor.
- δ_t : Time Step.
- Ω_{ij} : Mean rotation tensor.
- $\beta, \sigma, C_\epsilon$: Closure Coefficient.
- ν : Kinematic molecular viscosity.
- ν_t : Kinematic eddy viscosity.
- ν_k : Kinetic energy diffusion coefficient.
- ν_ϵ : ϵ diffusion coefficient.
- ν_ω : ω diffusion coefficient.
- τ_{ij} : Specific Reynolds stress tensor, $-\overline{U'_i U'_j}$
- λ : Taylor microscale in RNG K-e model.

ρ : The fluid density.

H_0 : Inlet Hydraulic head of the experimental setup.

D: Diameter of the inlet and outlet pipes.

h: Total drop height of the experimental setup.

h_1 : Height of the first chamber of the experimental setup.

h_2 : Height of the second chamber of the experimental setup.

h_w : Height of the internal opening of the experimental setup.

y_0 : Water depth at the inlet pipe of the experimental setup.

y_1 : Water depth in the first chamber of the experimental setup.

y_w : Water depth at the internal opening of the experimental setup.

y_p : Water depth behind the water jet in the second chamber of the experimental setup.

y_2 : Water depth in the second chamber of the experimental setup.

y_3 : Water depth in the outlet pipe of the experimental setup.

E: Hydraulic Energy Head.

Z: Invert elevation above the datum.

V: Mean water velocity.

g: Gravity acceleration.

P: Pressure.

γ : Specific weight.

E_{in} : Hydraulic energy head at the inlet pipe.

E_{out} : Hydraulic energy head at the outlet pipe.

Q^* : Dimensionless discharge parameter.

η : Energy dissipation efficiency.

H: Total drop height.

H_1 : Height of first chamber.

ABSTRACT

Drop shaft manholes are usually used in steep slope urban areas in order to reduce the slope of outlet pipes when one or more of the inlet pipes have an invert elevation significantly higher than that of the outlet pipe. Usually the invert elevation of the inlet pipe is designed to be equal to the invert elevation of the manhole but in case of using drop manhole the inlet pipe invert elevation is set to be significantly higher than that of the manhole. Despite the wide usage of drop manholes structures there are no systematical studies that restrict the height of the drop manholes except for the concern of excessive aeration and corrosion in the drainage system as this may lead to poor hydraulic conditions if the manhole energy dissipation rate is inadequate. The dominant hydraulic features of the drop manholes depend on the manhole geometry, the tail water feature and the flow regimes. Depending on the flow regimes, the energy dissipation can vary within large limits, affecting thereby the downstream flow features.

This research will present a three dimensional numerical study of square stacked drop manhole (SDM). The objectives of this numerical simulation are: (I) to study the hydraulic performance of stacked drop manhole under several flow regimes with different drops combinations, (II) to conduct a comparative analysis between stacked drop manhole and single drop shaft manhole to assess the performance of both structures in terms of energy dissipation efficiency, (III) to define the criteria of choosing stacked drop manhole over single drop shaft, and (IV) to recommend the optimum stacked drop manhole geometric combinations that give the best energy dissipation efficiency.

In order to achieve the above mentioned objectives, a three dimensional numerical simulation for the stacked drop manhole structure will be carried out using a three dimensional CFD software (FLOW 3D). The model will be calibrated using available laboratory results in previously published experimental studies. Guidelines and recommendations will be developed for the design of square stacked drop manhole under different approach of flow regime.

Numerical models are constructed using the CFD- FLOW 3D program to solve the three-dimensional Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes equations with realizable K-epsilon turbulent model. The Numerical models are calibrated by the calculated energy losses efficiency with the efficiency results of the pervious experimental physical model done at the University of Alberta.

The results of the numerical simulations include energy head variation, velocity variation and manhole water depths. The present study finding suggests that stacked drop manhole structure is recommended for total drop height $<10D$ where D is the diameter of the inlet pipe. Based on the flow regime, the best energy dissipation efficiency of this structure is achieved when the first chamber drop height (H_1) ranges between 60-75% of the total manhole drop height (H) (i.e. $H_1/H=0.6-0.75$). The optimum manhole geometry used in this study is (3DX3D), and it is recommended to add 2D free board above the inlet pipe to accommodate for the jetting splashes that occur in supercritical inflow. Exceeding these limits didn't add any significant benefits to the energy dissipation rates. The energy dissipation efficiency was calculated based on the overall energy losses inside the stacked drop manhole relative to the total drop height.