

UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

EFFECTS OF NAPIER AND CATTAIL GRASSES ON OPEN CHANNEL FLOW CHARACTERISTICS

MANAL M. ABOOD

FK 2005 128

EFFECTS OF NAPIER AND CATTAIL GRASSES ON OPEN CHANNEL FLOW CHARACTERISTICS



MANAL M. ABOOD

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Partial Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

October 2005

DEDICATION



G

I dedicate this work

To My Country Iraq,

Abstract of the thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the partial requirement for the degree of Master of Science

EFFECTS OF NAPIER AND CATTAIL GRASSES ON OPEN CHANNEL FLOW CHARACTERISTICS

By MANAL M. ABOOD October 2005

Chairman : Badronnisa Yusuf

Faculty : Engineering

Laboratory study has been conducted to analyze the effects of two types of vegetations namely Napier grass and Cattail grass on the characteristics of flow in an open channel. The main objectives of this study are to determine the effects of vegetations on Manning's roughness coefficient and velocity distribution, and to develop relationships between the characteristics of vegetation (density, degree of submergence and distribution) with the properties of flow (Manning roughness coefficient, velocity and Reynolds number).

The resistance properties for each of vegetation were examined in the flume which is rectangular in cross section and has dimensions of 12m length, 0.32m width and 0.32m height.

The results show that the presence of vegetations increases the values of Manning's roughness coefficient, n, and affected significantly the vertical velocity profiles. The effects depend on factors such as flow depth, degree of submergence, density and arrangement of plant.

The Manning's roughness coefficient, n, for flows with Napier grass increased with the increased in flow depth for both submerged and unsubmerged situations, and this increments varied from 0.017 to 0.065 with flow depth for high vegetation density (100 veg/m^2) and from 0.0058 to 0.0427 for low vegetation density (20 veg/m^2). In the presence of Cattail grass, the effects were reversed. The increased in flow depth leads to reduction in the roughness coefficient, and this decrements varied from 0.031 to 0.022 for the high density and from 0.024 to 0.0157 for the low density. This may be due to the physical characteristics of the cattail, which has no branching stems and leaves.

Manning's n in the case of low density (20 veg/m^2) of Napier grass decreased with the increase of Reynolds number, Re for both submerged and unsubmerged vegetations. However, for higher density (100 veg/m²), this phenomenon only occurred for submerged vegetation. In the case of unsubmerged vegetation the n values increased with the increased of Re. For cattail, the n values decreased with Re for all densities of vegetation. The dependence of n on density of vegetation was found to be represented by a linear relationship (R^2 =0.93-0.96) for both submerged and unsubmerged vegetations. The results indicate a tendency for n to increase with increasing values of density for the same value of flow depth. Napier grass increased the Manning's, n with the increased of density by 35%, while the Cattail grass increased the value of n with the increased of density by 25%. Increment in Manning's, n with the density of vegetation is not only with the flow depth but also with the different types of vegetation. The Manning roughness coefficient, n was also found to be affected by the vegetation arrangement. The results show that the arrangement where the vegetations were at both sides of the channel gave the highest values of n followed by the vegetations at the channel center and then the vegetations were randomly distributed. The n value increased almost linearly with the depth of flow in three types of arrangements.

The effects of vegetations in the vertical velocity distribution of flow were examined, the results showed that the present of vegetation change the shape of velocity distribution and reduced the velocity by 61.5% inside the canopy and 36% above the canopy.

Abstrak tesis dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi sebahagian keperluan Ijazah Master Sains

KESAN TUMBUHAN (RUMPUT *NAPIER* DAN *CATTAIL*) KE ATAS CIRI ALIRAN DALAM SALURAN TERBUKA

Oleh

MANAL M. ABOOD October 2005

Pengerusi : Badronnisa Yusuf

Fakulti : Kejuruteraan

Kajian makmal telah dilakukan untuk menganalisis kesan dua jenis tumbuhan yang berbeza, iaitu rumput Napier dan Cattail, ke atas ciri-ciri aliran dalam saluran terbuka. Objektif utama kajian ialah untuk mendapatkan kesan tumbuhan ke atas pekali kekasaran Manning dan profil halaju, dan untuk membangunkan hubungan antara ciriciri tumbuhan (ketumpatan, tahap ketenggelaman dan agihan/susunan) dengan sifatsifat aliran (pekali kekasaran Manning, dan nombor Reynolds).

Sifat rintangan untuk setiap tumbuhan kepada aliran telah kaji di dalam flum terbuka segiempat yang berdimensi 12 m panjang, 0.32 m lebar dan 0.32 m tinggi.

Keputusan menunjukkan tumbuhan meningkatkan nilai pekali kekasaran Manning dan memberi kesan yang ketara terhadap profil tegak aliran. Kesan ini bergantung kepada faktor seperti kedalaman aliran, tahap ketenggelaman, kepadatan serta agihan dan susunan tumbuhan.

Pekali kekasaran Manning, untuk aliran dengan rumput Napier didapati meningkat dengan peningkatan kedalaman aliran dalam keadaan tenggelam dan juga separa tenggelam. Peningkatan ini berubah dari 0.017 ke 0.065 untuk kepadatan tumbuhan tinggi (100veg/m²) dan dari 0.0058 ke 0.0427 untuk kepadatan tumbuhan rendah (20 veg/m²). Manakala rumput Cattail memberi kesan yang berbeza. Peningkatan kedalaman aliran menyebabkan penurunan pekali kekasaran. Penurunan ini berubah dari 0.031 ke 0.022 untuk kepadatan tumbuhan tinggi dan dari 0.024 ke 0.0157 untuk kepadatan rendah. Ini berlaku mungkin kerana ciri-ciri fizikal rumput Cattail yang tiada batang dan daun bercabang.

Manning n, untuk aliran dengan rumput Napier berkepadatan rendah didapati menurun dengan peningkatan nombor Reynolds, Re, di dalam kedua-dua keadaan, iaitu tenggelam dan separa tenggelam. Walaubagaimanapun, pada kepadatan tinggi pemerhatian ini hanya benar dalam kes tumbuhan tenggelam. Dalam kes tumbuhan separa tenggelam, nilai n meningkat dengan peningkatan Re. Untuk aliran dengan rumput Cattail, nilai n menurun dengan Re pada semua kepadatan tumbuhan. Kebergantungan nilai n kepada kepadatan tumbuhan, didapati mempunyai hubungan linear (R²=0.93-0.96) untuk kedua-dua keadaan, tenggelam dan separa tenggelam. Rumput Napier meningkatkan nilai n dengan peningkatan kepadatan tumbuhan. Keputusan menunjukkan pada kedalaman aliran yang sama nilai kekasaran meningkat sebanyak 35% dengan peningkatan kepadatan tumbuhan sebanyak 33.3%... Manakala rumput Cattail dengan peningkatan kepadatan tumbuhan yang sama telah meningkatkan nilai n sebanyak 25%. Peningkatan nilai Manning n, dengan kepadatan tumbuhan tidak hanya dengan bergantung kepada kedalaman aliran tetapi juga dengan jenis tumbuhan. Pekali kekasaran Manning's juga didapati dipengaruhi oleh agihan tumbuhan. Keputusan menunjukkan agihan tumbuhan pada kedua-dua sisi saluran memberi rintangan tertinggi, diikuti dengan agihan tumbuhan ditengah saluran dan kemudian agihan tumbuhan rawak. Nilai n meningkat hampir linear dengan kedalaman aliran untuk semua jenis agihan tumbuhan.

Kesan tumbuhan kepada profil menegak juga di kaji. Keputusan menunjukkan kehadiran tumbuhan telah merubah bentuk profil halaju dan menurunkan halaju sebanyak 61.5% di dalam tumbuhan dan 36% di aliran di atas tumbuhan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praise to supreme almighty Allah swt. The only creator, cherisher, sustainer and efficient assembler of the world and galaxies whose blessings and kindness have enabled the author to accomplish this work successfully.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Puan Badronnisa Yusuf, for her kind supervision and for accepting me as her thesis student. Her cheery nature and her unfailing patience has been a great motivation for me to excel in my work. Without her guidance, this thesis would not have been completed successfully. Sincere appreciation is also due to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Abdul Halim Ghazali and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Thamer Ahmed Mohammed for their constructive suggestions and guidance during the execution of this project, as well as for critical reviewing of the manuscript.

The gratitude also goes to the Department of Agriculture and Biological and Engineering for providing the facilities to accomplish this project. Not forgetting to the technician En. Muhamed Hafiz Ramli for lent me his helping hands.

I would never forget my mother's continuous sacrifice, advice and prays for my success.

I would like to thank my wonderful husband Mohamad A. Hussain for his unbelievable support and understanding during the work of this thesis; his encouragement to me during that time was invaluable. I would like also to thank my daughter Marwa and my son Mustafa for their support, encouragement, immense help and cooperation during the whole period of study.

Last but not least, special appreciation goes to my friend, Mr. Sivanesan Nadaraja who helps me a lot in providing information related to this study.



I certify that an Examination Committee met on 7th October 2005 to conduct the final examination of Manal M. Abood on her Master thesis entitled "effects of Napier and Cattail grasses on open channel flow characteristics" in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulation 1981. The Committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows:

Mohd Amin Mohd Soom, PhD,Ir Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

Lee Teang Shui, PhD Associate Professor

Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

Katayon Saed, PhD

Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

Othman A. Karim, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Engineering Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (External Examiner)

HASANAH MOHD.GHAZALI, PhD

Professor/Deputy Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

This thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science. The members of the Supervisory Committee are as follows:

Badronnisa Yusuf, Msc Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

Abdul Halim Ghazali, PhD AssociateProfessor Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

Thamer Ahmed Mohammed, PhD AssociateProfessor Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

> AINI IDERIS, PhD Professor/Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations, which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institution.



TABLE OF CONTENT

			Page
DEDICA	TION		ii
ABSTRA	СТ		iii
ABSTRA	K		vi
ACKNOV	WLEDGN	MENTS	ix
APPROV	AL		xi
DECLAR	ATION I	FORM	xiii
LIST OF	TABLES		xvi
LIST OF	FIGURE	S	xvii
LIST OF	SYMBO		xix
СНАРТЕ	R		
1	INTE	RODUCTION	1.1
	1.1	General	1.1
	1.2	Effect of Vegetation	1.2
	1.3	Statement of Problem	1.3
	1.4	Objective	1.4
	1.5	Scope of Study	1.5
2	LITE	CRATURE REVIEW	2.1
	2.1	Uniform Flow in Open Channel	2.1
	2.2	Empirical Formula for Uniform Flow Computation	2.2
	2.3	Resistance Coefficient in Vegetated Channel Prediction	2.4
	2.4	of Flow Resistance for Vegetated Channel	
		2.4.1 Theoretical Analysis to Predict Resistance Coefficient	2.9
		2.4.2 Field study to Predict Resistance Coefficient	2.12
		Laboratory Experiments to predict Resistance	
		2.4.3 Coefficient	2.14
	2.5	Vertical Velocity Distribution in Vegetated Channel	2.21
3	MET	HODOLOGY	3.1
	3.1	Introduction	3.1
	3.2	Material and Equipments	3.1
		3.2.1 Open Channel	3.1
		3.2.2 Vegetation	3.3
		3.2.2.1 Napier Grass	3.3
		3.2.2.2 Cattail Grass	3.4
		3.2.3 Velocity meter	3.6
	3.3	Experimental Design	3.9

3.3.1 Investigation the Relationship Between Flow 3.10

	Depth and Manning's, n	
	3.3.2 Investigation the Effects of Vegetation Density	3.11
	on the Manning's, n	
	3.3.3 Investigation the Effects of Vegetation	3.11
	Arrangement on the Manning's, n	
	3.3.4 Investigation the Effects of Vegetation in the	3.12
	Velocity Distribution	
3.4	Velocity Measurement	3.13
	3.4.1 Points of Measurement	3.13
	3.4.2 Determination of the average velocity	3.14
	3.4.3 Determination of vertical velocity	3.14
3.5	Calculation of Roughness Coefficient	3.14
	3.5.1 Roughness Coefficient with vegetation	3.14
	3.5.2 Roughness coefficient Contributed by the	3.16
	Vegetation –	
3.6	State of flow and Reynolds Number	3.17
3.7	Analysis of data	3.17
DEG		
RES	ULTS AND DISCUSSION	4.1
4.1	Introduction	4.1
4.2	Mean Velocity and Roughness Coefficient, n	4.1
1.0	(with vegetation)	
4.3	Vegetation Roughness coefficient, n veg	4.4
4.4	Roughness Coefficient for Different Arrangement of	4.6
4 5	Vegetation	4 7
4.5	Vertical velocity Distribution	4./
4.6	Effects of Napier and Cattail grass on hydraulic	4.7
	A C 1 Leftware of Degree of Submarganes (V/II) of	47
	4.6.1 Influence of Degree of Submergence (Y/H) of	4./
	vegetation on Manning Roughness coefficient, n	
	4.6.2 Influence of Vegetation Density on Manning	4.12
	Roughness Coefficient, n,	
	4.6.3 Influence of Vegetation Arrangement on	4.14
	Manning Roughness Coefficient, n	
4.7	Variation Of Roughness Coefficient, n, With Reynolds	4.16
	Number, Re	
4.8	Influence of Vegetation on the Velocity Distribution	4.18
CON	ICLUSION	51
REF	ERENCES	5.1
BIO	DATA OF THE AUTHOR	

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Summary of previous studies	2.6
2.2	Summary of previous studies	2.7
2.3	Summary of previous studies	2.8
2.4	Different Methods To Modify Prandtl's Log Law (Stephan and Guthnecht, 2002)	2.26
3.1	Napier and Cattail grasses details	3.3
3.2	Details Of Experiments (Napier grass)	3.9
3.3	Details Of Experiments (Cattail grass)	3.10
4.1	Average Velocity and Roughness Coefficient, n for channel with Cattail Grass	4.2
4.2	Average Velocity and Roughness Coefficient, n for channel with Napier Grass	4.3
4.3	Vegetation Roughness Coefficient (Cattail Grass)	4.4
4.4	Vegetation Roughness Coefficient (Napier Grass)	4.5
4.5	Roughness Coefficient Of The Channel With Different Arrangement Of Napier Grass	4.6
4.6	Vertical Velocity Distribution With And Without Vegetation	4.7
4.7	Increment Of Manning Roughness For Napier Grass	4.10

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Flow Resistance Model (Petryk, and Bosmajian, 1975)	2.9
2.2	Vertical velocity profile above aquatic vegetation (Stephan and Guthnecht, 2002)	2.24
3.1	Open channel flume	3.2
3.2	Schematic Diagram of Experimental Setup (Not to scale)	3.2
3.3	Napier grass in the flume	3.4
3.4	Cattail grass in the field	3.5
3.5	Cattail grass in the flume	3.5
3.6	View of Area-velocity flow meter (ISCO 4250,USA)	3.7
3.7	Current Meter (BRAYSTOKE, BFM001, UK)	3.7
3.8	Vegetation arrangement; Vegetations at the (a) center of the channel, (b) both sides of the channel, (c) staggeredly distributed across the	3.12
3.9	Locations of mean velocity measurement points	3.13
4.1	Relation of degree of submergence, Y/H and Manning's n for Napier grass	4.8
4.2	Relation of degree of submergence, Y/H and Manning's n for Napier grass: Comparisons with Jarvela, 2002 and Maghdam, 1997	4.9
4.3	Relation of degree of submergence, Y/H and Manning's n for Cattailgrass: Comparisons with Wu et al (1999) and Reza Mahbub (1998)	4.11
4.4	Roughness coefficients, n vs. density of plant for Napier grass	4.13

4.5	Roughness coefficients, n vs. density of plant for Cattail grass	4.13
4.6	Roughness coefficient vs vegetation density for both submerged and unsubmerged vegetation (Napier grass)	4.14
4.7	Roughness coefficient vs Y/H for three different vegetation arrangements (Napier grass)	4.15
4.8	Roughness coefficient vs Re for different densities, Dv for Napier grass	4.17
4.9	Roughness coefficient vs Re for Napier grass: Comparison with Wu et al (1999) and Jarvela (2002)	4.17
4.10	Roughness coefficient vs. Re for different densities, Dv for Cattail grass	4.18
4.11	Velocity distribution to describe flow in three zones (El Hakim and Salama, 1992)	4.19
4.12	Comparison of velocity inside and above submerged Napier (staggered distribution) with El Hakim and Salama (1992) and Kouwen et al (1969)	4.20
4.13	Velocity distribution inside and above Cattail grass (staggered distribution)	4.21

C

LIST OF SYMBOLS

	А	Flow cross- sectional area normal to direction of flow.
	A _i	Projected area of ith plant in upstream direction
	С	Chezy coefficient
	C _d	Drag coefficient vegetation
	C _d ΣAi/AL	Density of vegetation
	D	Mean water depth (assumed as R for wide channel)
	D _i	Drag force on ith plants
	Dv	Density of plant (veg/m ²)
	Е	Modulus of elasticity
	F_x	Force in x direction
	G	Gravitational constant
	h	Roughness height
	I	Second moment of area
	k	Roughness height (deflected)
	L	Length of channel
	m	Number of roughness elements

n	Manning roughness coefficient including boundary and vegetation effect
n (ave)	Equivalent Manning's roughness coefficient
n _b	Manning boundary roughness coefficient which excludes influence of vegetation
n _{veg}	Vegetative roughness coefficient
Р	Wetted perimeter
R	Hydraulic radius defined as a ratio of cross- sectional area of flow to the wetted perimeter
Re	Reynolds number
S	Bed slope of channel
S_{w}	Water surface slope (cm/cm)
So	Bed slope
U*	Shear velocity
V	Mean velocity
Vi	Average approach velocity to ith plant
γ	Specific weight of liquid
τ _w	Shear force per unit area on channel boundary

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General

Vegetations present in many rivers, streams, and man made channels throughout the country. Vegetations can be found growing naturally on the bed of the channel or on the riverbanks or have been purposely planted. They are often classified by their shape and the locations where they grow. Vegetations that grow on the river floodplains typically comprises of various combination of trees, herbs, shrubs, hedges, bushes and grasses. The in-channel vegetations usually consist of aquatic plants and these may be divided into four categories: emergent, submerged, floating-leaf, and free-floating.

Emergent plants are rooted in the soil close to or below the water level but stems, flowers and most of the mature leaves are protruding above the water surface. They are generally found by the banks of the river. Submerged aquatic plants have flexible stems and leaves, are rooted in the soil, and are completely covered by water. The floatingleaf plants are rooted in the submerged soil with many of their leaves floating on the water surface. These are usually seen along the margin of river that is not fast flowing. The last group is free-floating plants, most of their leaf and stem tissue are at or above the water surface. They obtain their nutrients directly from the water, since they are not rooted to the soil.

The presence of vegetations in river channel provides both benefits and problems. From environmental point of view, aquatic plants are essential parts of natural aquatic systems and form the basis of a waterbody's health and productivity. From engineering point of view, vegetation can improve the strength of bank materials through buttressing and root reinforcement. However, invariably aquatic plants become over abundant or unsightly and require control. The obvious problem related to excessive growth are flow retardment , flow capacity reduction and causing flood. Although the flow capacity can be increased by complete or partial removal of vegetation, this is a costly procedure. A complete removal of the vegetation in channels can lead to erosion of the banks and turbidity of the water. Unrestricted growth of such vegetation can lead to a nearly complete loss of capacity to convey water. Therefore, it is essential that the balance between risk and benefit of having vegetation in the channel is weighed and proper engineering judgement be made.

1.2 Effects of Vegetation

The vegetations in a channel influence the flow across the channel and the degree of influence depends on vegetations characteristics such as vegetations species,

distribution, flexibility, degree of submergence and density as well as flow characteristics, including flow area, depth and boundary characteristics (Jarvela, 2002).

The effect of vegetation in the channel is mainly on the velocity of flow. The average water velocity at a cross section tends to decrease, because of roughness presented by the stems and leaves of the plants. Vegetation generally increases roughness or flow resistance (Frschenich, 2000). Increases in roughness due to vegetation can be as much as higher than that due to channels particle size alone (Chow, 1959). According to Thompson and Roberson (1976), the growth of thick vegetation in channel can reduce capacity by up to 50% in less than a year. Righetti and Armanini (2002) reported that the vegetations effect varies seasonally. Vegetations in wet season give less resistance to flow compared with vegetations that are partially submerged during dry season. Shih and Rahi (1982) discovered that during the growing season the value of Manning roughness coefficient, n increased by 300%.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

An understanding of flow resistance is the most fundamental and essential to hydraulics engineers and the effects of vegetations on overall flow resistance are significant and cause difficulties in many hydraulic designs (Jarvela, 2004). The planning, design and operation of water resources projects often require knowledge of discharge in a given channel as a function of flow depth. In area where flow occurs through vegetation, the flow depth may be largely determined by the roughness and resistance provided by the vegetation.

Well-established flow resistance formulas, such as the Manning, Darcy– Weisbach, and Chezy equations, have long been used to analyze river flows but yet the accounts on the effect of vegetation on the resistance are still widely studied. Research on vegetative resistance in open-channel flows has been motivated by an increase in awareness of the importance of the ecological and environmental effects of vegetation in a river system.

Advances in understanding the behavior of flow over vegetation will improve both the knowledge of flow-velocity profiles and flow resistance. This will lead to the development of better way in estimating resistance or roughness due to vegetations.

In Malaysia, there are many kinds of tropical vegetation and aquatic plants and their effects on the channel flow yet to be studied. Research in this area played important role in determining the flow capacity and water surface elevation in vegetated channel or wetland.

1.4 Objectives

The general objective of this study is to determine the effect of vegetations on the characteristic of flow in an open channel. The specific objectives are to analyze the effects of Napier and Cattail grasses on hydraulic roughness and velocity distributions

as well as to develop empirical relationship between characteristics of vegetation and flow.

1.5 Scope of the Study

The study involved collecting data through experimental works. Two types of vegetation (Napier and Cattail grass) were tested. The effects of the vegetation on the velocity profile and hydraulic roughness were analysed and empirical equations that relate these parameters with the various characteristics of vegetation were developed.



REFERENCES

- Abdelsalam, M.W, Khatab, A. F, Khalifa, A.A and Bakry, M. F. (1992). Flow capacity through wide and submerged vegetation channels. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage ASCE, Vol. 118. pp 25-44.
- Backry, M. A. (1992). Field measured hydraulic resistance characteristics in vegetation invested canals. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineer. ASCE. Vol 118. No2. pp 256-273.
- Chanson, H. (1999). The Hydraulic of Open Channel Flow. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Chow, V.T. (1959). Open Channel Hydraulics. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Christensen, B.A.(1985). Open Channel and sheet flow over flexible roughness, proceedings of the 1st IAHR congress in Melbourne, Australia, 462-467.
- Copeland, R.R.(2000).Determination of flow resistance coefficient due to shrubs and woody vegetation. Technical Notes, US Army Engineer Research and Development Centre, Vicksburg, MS.
- El Hakim, O. and Salama, M.M (1992). Velocity distribution inside and above branched flexible roughness. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage. ASCE. Vol.118. No. 6. pp 914-927.
- Frschenich G. (2000). Resistance due to vegetation. EMRRP Technical Notes Collection(ERDC TN-EMRRP-SR-07),U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.
- French, R. H. (1985). Open Channel Hydraulic. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Hwang, N.H.C. and Hita, C.E. (1987). Fundamental of Hydraulic Engineering System. Second Edition, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Jarvela, J. (2002). Flow resistance of flexible vegetation, a flume study with natural plants. Journal of Hydrology. 269. pp 44-54.
- Jarvela, J. (2004). Flow resistance due to lateral momentum transfer in partially vegetated rivers. Water Resources Research. Vol. 40, W05206.
- Kao D.T.Y. and Barfield B.J. (1978). Properties of flow hydraulics for vegetated channels. Transaction of the ASAE, pp 489-494.
- Kouwen, N., Unny, M. and Hary M. H. (1969). Flow retardance in vegetated channel. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Division. ASCE. Vol.95, No.1, pp 329-343.

- Kouwen, N and Unny, T. E.(1973). Flexible roughness in open channels. Journal of Hydraulic Division. ASCE. Vol. 99. No. 5. pp 713-729.
- Maghdam, F. and Kouwen, N. (1997). Nonrigid, nonsubmerged vegetation roughnes on flood plains. Journal of Hydraulics Engineering. ASCE. Vol.123. No.1. pp 51-56.
- Nnaji,S. and Wu, I. (1973) Flow resistance from cylindrical roughness. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Division. 99 (IRI), 15-26.
- Petryk, S. and Bosmajian, G. (1975). Analysis of flow through vegetation. Journal of Hydraulic Division, ASCE. Vol.101. No.7. pp 871-884.
- Righetii, M. and Armanini, A. (2002). Flow resistance in open channel flows with sparsely distribution bushes. Journal of Hydrology. No.269. pp 55-64.
- Raju, G. Ranga (1993). Flow Through Open Channel. 2nd Edition. New Delhi: Tata Mc Graw –Hill.
- Reza Mahbub, A.K.M. and Suzuki, S. (1998) Flow retardance in open channel due to artificial flexible vegetation. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering. No.13 pp5-7
- Sellin Robert H. J., (1969). Flow in Channels. London, Macmillan.
- Shih, S.F. and Rahi, G.S. (1982). Seasonal variations of Manning's roughness coefficient in subtropical marsh, Transaction of ASAE, pp116-119.
- Stephan, U. and Guthnecht, D. (2002). Hydraulic resistance of submerged flexible vegetation. Journal of Hydrology. No. 269. pp 27-43.
- Thompson, G.T. and Roberson, J.A. (1976). Theory of flow resistance for vegetated channels. Transaction of the ASAE. pp 288-293.
- Templet, D. (1986). Velocity distribution coefficient for grass lined channel. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering. 112(3). 193-205.
- Wu, F.C., Shen, H.W. and Chou, Y.J (1999). Variation of roughness coefficient for unsubmerged and submerged vegetation. Journal of Hydraulics Engineering. ASCE. Vol.125. No.9, pp 934-942.