

## **UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

## FLOOD MODELING OF DAM BREAK WITH CONSIDERATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE

# SAAD SHAUKET SAMMEN

FK 2018 31



## FLOOD MODELING OF DAM BREAK WITH CONSIDERATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE

By

SAAD SHAUKET SAMMEN

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

December 2017

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



# DEDICATION



Abstract of the thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

#### FLOOD MODELING OF DAM BREAK WITH CONSIDERATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE

By

#### SAAD SHAUKET SAMMEN

December 2017

# Chairman: Professor Thamer Ahmad Mohammed Ali, PhDFaculty: Engineering

In this study, the failure of cascade dams in a tropical region is simulated using mathematical models. The simulation is considering the climate change impact. Three cascade dams for hydropower generation on the Perak River were taken as case studies. The three dams are of different designs, ages and heights which make a unique complex dam system. The proposed models were categorized as dam breach parameters model, hydrological model and hydrodynamic models. The dam breach parameters model is based on generalized regression neural network, GRNN while the hydrological model and hydrodynamic models are Mike 11 (NAM sub-model), 1-D Mike 11 and 2-D Mike 21.

The GRNN was used to estimate the dam breach parameters. Dam breach parameters such as breach width, breach height and breach formation time are the key variables to estimate the peak discharge during dam break. Because of the high nonlinear relationships in dam breach parameters and their variation with time, the estimation of these parameters is considered very complex. The training and testing of GRNN models were conducted using records of more than 140 failed dams around the world in order to estimate dam breach parameters. The results obtained from GRNN models for dam breach parameters were compared with the results obtained from the existing methods. The computed value of Mean Relative Error, MRE for GRNN models were found to be ranged from 0.11 to 0.17 while values of MRE for the existing methods were founded to be ranged from 0.15 to 0.33 for dam breach width estimation. For dam failure time estimation, the values of MRE were found to be ranged from 0.08 to 0.16 for GRNN model results and from 0.34 to 0.57 for the existing methods' results.



In this study, the hydrological model was developed using Mike 11 (NAM submodel). The Mike 11 (NAM sub-model) is a lumped conceptual model which forms part of the rainfall-runoff (RR) module of the MIKE 11 river modeling system. Time series of rainfall, evaporation and streamflow data for the Temenggor catchment were used to calibrate and validate the hydrological model for the Temenggor dam (the largest dam in the studied dam system). The developed model was applied to predict the probable maximum flood, PMF. Also, the impact of climate change on value of PMF was considered by estimation the PMF value for two future period which include future 1 period (2031 - 2045) and future 2 period (2061 - 2075). The values of PMF were found to be 2887.53 m<sup>3</sup>/s, 4299.43 m<sup>3</sup>/s and 6427.89 m<sup>3</sup>/s for periods (2001 - 2015), (2031 - 2045) and (2061 - 2075) respectively.

The 1-D Mike 11 hydrodynamic model was calibrated and validated using recorded water levels and streamflow for Perak river. Then the model was applied to determine simulated maximum peak outflow from Temenggor, Bersia and Kenering dams for four scenarios. By using the PMF for the period from 2061 to 2075, the maximum peak outflow for the above dams was found to be 272602.59 m3/s, 217984.96 m<sup>3</sup>/s and 184922.01 m<sup>3</sup>/s respectively. Also, flood routing for Perak river, flood hydrograph and water level hydrograph at different sections were simulated.

The 2 - D Mike 21 hydrodynamic model was used to routing the flood that will result from the simulated maximum peak outflow from Temenggor, Bersia and Kenering dam failures for four scenarios. Flood arrival time, maximum water depth and time to maximum water depth were estimated for different selected villages downstream of the three dams above. Additional, the flood inundation maps were found for different scenarios. Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

#### PEMODELAN BANJIR DISEBABKAN EMPANGAN PECAH DENGAN MENGAMBIL KIRA IMPAK PERUBAHAN IKLIM

Oleh

#### SAAD AHAUKET SAMMEN

Disember 2017

#### Pengerusi : Profesor Thamer Ahamed Mohammed Ali, PhD Fakulti : Kejuruteraan

Dalam kajian ini, kegagalan empangan lata di sebuah kawasan tropika disimulasi menggunakan model matematik. Simulasi tersebut mempertimbangkan impak perubahan iklim. Tiga empangan lata untuk penjanaan kuasa hidro di Sungai Perak telah diambil sebagai kajian kes. Ketiga-tiga empangan tersebut yang berbeza reka bentuk, umur dan ketinggian menjadikan ini suatu sistem empangan kompleks yang unik. Model yang dicadangkan dikategorikan sebagai model parameter empangan pecah, model hidrologi dan model hidrodinamik. Model parameter empangan pecah adalah berdasarkan kepada rangkaian neural regresi umum, GRNN manakala model hidrologi dan model hidrodinamik ialah Mike 11 (sub-model NAM ), 1-D Mike 11 dan 2-D Mike 21.

GRNN telah digunakan untuk menganggarkan parameter pecahan empangan. Parameter pecahan empangan seperti lebar pecahan, ketinggian pecahan dan masa pembentukan pecahan adalah pembolehubah utama untuk menganggarkan pelepasan puncak semasa pecahan empangan. Kerana hubungan tak lurus yang tinggi bagi parameter pecahan empangan dan variasinya dengan masa, anggaran parameter-parameter ini dianggap sebagai sangat rumit. Latihan dan ujian model GRNN telah dijalankan menggunakan rekod lebih daripada 140 empangan yang gagal di seluruh dunia untuk menganggarkan parameter pecahan empangan. Keputusan yang diperolehi daripada model GRNN untuk parameter pecahan empangan dibandingkan dengan keputusan yang diperolehi daripada kaedah-kaedah sedia ada. Nilai dikira Ralat Relatif Mean, MRE untuk model GRNN telah didapati berjulat antara 0.11-0.17 manakala nilai MRE untuk kaedah-kaedah yang sedia ada didapati berjulat antara 0.15-0.33 untuk anggaran lebar pecahan empangan. Untuk anggaran masa kegagalan empangan, nilai MRE telah didapati antara 0.08-0.16 untuk keputusan model-model GRNN dan 0.34-0.57 untuk keputusan kaedah sedia ada.

 $\bigcirc$ 

Dalam kajian ini, model hidrologi dibangunkan menggunakan Mike 11 (sub-model NAM ). Mike 11 (sub-model NAM) ialah model konseptual tergumpal yang merupakan sebahagian daripada modul larian air hujan (RR) daripada sistem pemodelan sungai MIKE 11. Siri masa hujan, penyejatan dan data aliran sungai untuk kawasan tadahan Temenggor digunakan untuk menentukur dan mengesahkan model hidrologi untuk empangan Temenggor (empangan terbesar di sistem empangan yang dikaji). Model yang dibangunkan telah digunakan untuk meramalkan banjir maksimum yang mungkin, PMF untuk senario yang berbeza termasuk impak perubahan iklim. Nilai-nilai PMF didapati 2887.53 m<sup>3</sup>/s, 4299.43 m<sup>3</sup>/s dan 6427.89 m<sup>3</sup>/s untuk tempoh (2001 - 2015), (2031 - 2045) dan (2061 - 2075) masing-masing. Model hidrodinamik 1-D Mike 11 telah ditentukur dan disahkan menggunakan paras air dan aliran sungai yang direkodkan untuk sungai Perak. Kemudian model tersebut telah digunakan untuk menentukan aliran keluar puncak maksimum yang disimulasi dari empangan Temenggor, Bersia dan Keering untuk empat senario. Dengan menggunakan PMF bagi tempoh 2061 ke 2075, aliran keluar puncak maksimum bagi empangan-empangan di atas didapati ialah 272602.59 m<sup>3</sup>/s, 217984.96 m<sup>3</sup>/s dan 184922,01 m<sup>3</sup>/s masing-masing. Juga, penghalaan banjir sungai Perak, hidrograf banjir dan hidrograf paras air di bahagian-bahagian yang berbeza telah disimulasi.

Model hidrodinamik 2 - D Mike 21 digunakan untuk penghalaan banjir yang akan terhasil daripada aliran keluar puncak maksimum yang disimulasi dari kegagalan empangan Temenggor, Bersia dan Kenering untuk empat senario. Masa Banjir tiba, kedalaman air maksimum dan masa untuk kedalaman air maksimum dianggarkan untuk kampung terpilih yang berbeza di hiliran daripada tiga empangan di atas. Selain itu, peta banjir telah didapatkan untuk senario yang berbeza.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, all praises due to the Lord of the worlds, Allah (SWA), for giving me the strength and providing me with the opportunity to see this research appear in its current form. I wish also to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Thamer Ahamed Mohammed for his invaluable help and guidance throughout all of the thesis stages, which have contributed to the success of this research. I would like also to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to Associate Professor Dr. Abdul Halim Ghazali Professor Dr. Lariyah Mohammed Sideq and Ir. Azlan Abdul Aziz, my supervisory committee members, for their constructive comments and suggestions, which enriched this research.

This research work was supported by a Putra grant (GP-IPS/2016/9453100) provided by Universiti Putra Malaysia. The great assistance provided to the author during his research.

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

#### Thamer Ahmad Mohammad Ali, PhD

Professor Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

#### Abdul Halim Ghazali, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

#### Ir. Azlan Abdul Aziz, PhD

Senior Lecturer Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

#### Lariyah Mohammed Sideq, PhD

Professor, Ir University Tenaga Nasional Malaysia (Member)

#### **ROBIAH BINTI YUNUS, PhD**

Professor and Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

#### **Declaration by graduate student**

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature:

\_Date:

Name and Matric No: Saad Shauket Sammen, GS41659

## **Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee**

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) were adhered to.

Signature: Name of Chairman of	
Committee:	Thamer Ahmad Mohammad Ali
Signature: Name of Member of Supervisory	
Committee:	Abdul Halim Ghazali
Signature: Name of Member of Supervisory Committee:	Azlan Abdul Aziz
Signature: Name of Member of Supervisory Committee:	Lariyah Mohammed Sideq

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

A A A I I I I I I I I I I	ABSTRACT ABSTRAK ACKNOWLI APPROVAL DECLARAT LIST OF TAL LIST OF FIG LIST OF AB	EDGEMENTS ION BLES GURES BREVIATIONS	i iii v vi viii xiii xv xxi
•	CHAPTER		
1	I INTR	ODUCTION	1
-	1.1	History of Dams Failure	1
	1.2	Problem Statement	2
	1.3	Research Objectives	4
	1.4	Significance of the Study	4
	1.5	Scope and Limitations	5
	1.6	Thesis Layout	6
,			7
4		Statistics of Dom Eailurg	7
	2.1	Machanisms of Dam Failure	10
	2.2	2.2.1 Overtenning	10
		2.2.1 Overtopping	10
		2.2.2 Tipling 2.2.3 Foundation Defects	12
	23	Dam Break Modelling	16
	2.5	2.3.1 Mathematical Modelling	10
		2 3 1 1 Empirical model	17
		2.3.1.2 Parametric and Dimensionless Models	18
		2.3.1.3 Physically-Based Numerical Models	18
		2.3.2 Experimental work	19
	2.4	Artificial Neural Network (ANN)	19
		2.4.1 The Biological Model of Neural Network	20
		2.4.2 The Mathematical Model of Neural Network	21
		2.4.3 General Regression Neural Network (GRNN)	22
		2.4.4 Application of Artificial Neural Network in Water	
		Resources	24
	2.5	Impacts of Climate Change on Water Resources	31
	2.6	Previous Works of Hydrological Modelling	32
		2.6.1 Description of MIKE NAM Model	33
		2.6.2 Parameters of Mike NAM Model	35
		2.6.3 Previous Works using Mike 11 (NAM – Submodel)	36
	2.7	Hydrodynamic Modelling of Dam Break	39

		2.7.1	One-dimensional Model	40
			2.7.1.1 Mike 11 Model	40
			2.7.1.2 Governing Equations for Mike 11 Model	40
			2.7.1.3 Components of Mike 11 Model	42
		2.7.2	Two-dimensional numerical model	42
			2.7.2.1 Mike 21 Model	43
			2.7.2.2 Governing Equations for Mike 21 Model	43
		2.7.3	Previous works on hydrodynamic dam break	44
	2.8	Summ	ary	48
3	METH	ODOI	LOGY	50
	3.1	Introdu	action	50
	3.2	Descri	otion of the Study Area	50
	3.3	Data A	cauisition	52
		3.3.1	Data for Dam Breach Parameters Modelling	55
		3.3.2	Hydrological Data	57
		3.3.3	Hydrodynamic Data	58
		0.0.0	3 3 3 1 River Geometry Data	58
			3 3 3 2 Riverbed and Flood Plain Resistance Data	60
			3 3 3 3 Boundary Conditions	60
			3 3 3 4 Topographical Data	61
	3.4	Metho	dology of Dam Breach Parameters Modelling	62
		3.4.1	Data Pre- and Post-Processing	62
		3.4.2	Model Development, Training and Testing	64
		3.4.3	Models Performance Evaluation	66
	3.5	Metho	dology of Hydrological Modelling	68
		3.5.1	Catchment Area Delineation	68
		3.5.2	Estimation of Probable Maximum Precipitation	75
			3.5.2.1 Rainfall Analysis	77
			3.5.2.2 Design Rainfall Temporal Patterns	78
			3 5 2 3 Hershfield Method	79
		3.5.3	Model Development	81
		3.5.4	Mike 11 (NAM – Submodel) Calibration, Validation and	
			Application	84
		3.5.5	Assessment of the Hydrological Model	85
	3.6	Metho	dology of Hydrodynamic Modelling	87
		3.6.1	One Dimensional Model (Mike 11)	88
			3.6.1.1 Generation of Network	88
			3.6.1.2 Generation of Cross Section Database	88
			3.6.1.3 Generation of Boundary Conditions	89
			3.6.1.4 Simulation Set-up	91
		3.6.2	Two Dimensional Model Mike 21	91
			3.6.2.1 Generation of Bathymetry Database	92
			3.6.2.2 Time Step	92
			3.6.2.3 Flooding and Drying	93
			3.6.2.4 Eddy Viscosity	93
			3.6.2.5 Resistance Coefficient	94
	3.7	Dam F	ailure Scenarios	94

4	RESU	ULTS AND DISCUSSION	96
	4.1	Dam Breach Parameters Estimation	96
		4.1.1 Breach Width Estimation	96
		4.1.2 Time Failure Estimation	107
		4.1.3 Breach Parameters for the Selected Dams in Malaysia	116
	4.2	Hydrological Modelling	116
		4.2.1 Calibration of Hydrological Model Mile 11 (NAM –	
		Submodel)	119
		4.2.2 Validation of Hydrological Model Mike 11 (NAM – Sub	-
		model)	128
		4.2.3 Model Application	132
		4.2.3.1 Rainfall Intensity Duration Frequency (IDF)	
		Curves	132
		4.2.3.2 Estimation of Probable Maximum Precipitation	134
		4.2.3.3 PMP Hyetograph	134
		4.2.3.4 Climate Change Impact	135
		4.2.3.5 Estimation of Probable Maximum Flood	136
	4.3	Hydrodynamic Modelling	136
		4.3.1 One Dimensional Model	138
		4.3.1.1 Calibration and Validation of Mike 11 Model	138
		4.3.1.2 Simulation of Scenarios Using Mike 11	142
		4.3.2 Two Dimensional (Mike 21) Model Development	160
5	CON	ICLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	169
	5.1	Conclusions	169
	5.2	Recommendations for Future Studies	170
REF	ERENC	CES	172
APP	ENDIC	ES	186
BIO	DATA (	OF STUDENT	205
LIST	Г OF PU	UBLICATIONS	206

 $\mathbb{G}$ 

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Classification of Failed Dams	8
2.2	Empirical Equations for Breach Parameters Estimation	18
2.3	Statistical Evolution of ANN and MLR Models (Awchi, 2014)	28
2.4	Statistical Performance Indices (Abu El-Nasr et al., 2000)	36
2.5	Statistical Performance Indices (Anh et al., 2008)	37
2.6	Performance of Developed Model for Calibration and Validation (Loliyana and Patel 2014)	38
2.7	Results of sensitive analysis (Loliyana and Patel, 2015)	39
2.8	Rehabilitation cost of villages (Kulkarni and Jagtap, 2017)	48
3.1	Details Dams of Perak Hydropower	53
3.2	Descriptive Statistics for Dam Failure Database	56
3.3	Rainfall Stations Details for Temengor Catchment	57
3.4	Manning (n) Values for Different Channels (Chow 1959)	60
3.5	GRNN Models Developed in This Study	64
3.6	The weight of Rainfall Stations to Compute Main Rainfall for the Temengor Catchment	82
3.7	Parameters of Mike 11 (NAM – Submodel)	84
4.1	Results of GRNN Models and Existing Empirical Methods for Dam Breach Width Estimation	106
4.2	Results of GRNN Models and Existing Empirical Methods for Dam Failure Time Estimation	115
4.3	Breach Parameters for Selected Dams in Malaysia	118
4.4	Values of Mike NAM Parameters	119

4.5	Hydrological Model Performance during Calibration Period	126
4.6	Rainfall Depth for Different Return Period	134
4.7	PMF Hydrograph Simulation Results in (m <sup>3</sup> /s)	136
4.8	Statistical Evaluation of Mike 11 model	142
4.9	Breach Parameters for First Scenario	145
4.10	Breach Parameters for Second Scenario	155
4.11	Breach Parameters for the Third Scenario	158
4.12	Flood Wave Details for First Scenario	161
4.13	Flood Wave Details for Second Scenario	163
4.14	Flood Wave Details for the Third Scenario	165
4.15	Flood Wave Details for the Fourth Scenario	167
A1	Details of Failed Dam	186

C

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Malpasset dam break in France (FMSD, 2009)	9
2.2	Tenton dam break in Idaho, USA (USBR, 2000)	10
2.3	Overtopping breach failure (Siri, 2013)	11
2.4	Models of breach development (Froehlich, 2008)	12
2.5	Overtopping breach failure processes (Morris 2009)	13
2.6	Schematic of piping hole (State of Colorado department of natural resources division of water resources 2010)	14
2.7	Piping breach failure processes (Morris, 2009)	15
2.8	Neuron cells (Saumya et al., 2011)	21
2.9	Mathematical model of neuron (saumya et al., 2011)	22
2.10	Structure of GRNN model	23
2.11	Performance of GRNN and ARX models for residual chlorine estimation (May et al., 2004)	25
2.12	Results of Cl <sub>2</sub> consumption and residual (Gibbs et al. 2006)	26
2.13	Comparison of water consumption between T.S and T.S GRNN models	29
2.14	Comparison between backbropogation and output weight optimization and hidden weight optimization performances (Jaime et al. 2016)	30
2.15	Structure of the NAM model (source: DHI 2009)	34
2.16	Model performance during the validation period (Ahmed, 2012)	37
2.17	MIKE 11 flood model scheme (DHI, 2009)	42
3.1	General flow chart of methodology	51
3.2	Locations of studied dams	54

	3.3	Dam failure cases according to dam height (Singh, 1996)	55
	3.4	Frequency distribution of dam failure cases according reservoir capacity (Singh, 1996)	56
	3.5	Location of rainfall stations Temengor reservoir catchment area	59
	3.6	Digital elevation model (DEM) for the studied area	63
	3.7	GRNN structure for dam breach parameters estimation	64
	3.8	Flow chart of GANN model development process	65
	3.9	The methodology of hydrological modelling	69
	3.10	DEM before and after filling the sinks	70
	3.11	Flow direction and flow accumulation of the study area	70
	3.12	Streams of the study area	71
	3.13	The catchments in the whole study area	72
	3.14	The catchment polygons of the study area	73
	3.15	Drainage lines of the study area	73
	3.16	The adjoint catchments of the study area	74
	3.17	The drainage points of the study area	75
	3.18	The catchment area of Temengor reservoir	76
	3.19	Temporal pattern Perak region for 1-day duration	80
	3.20	Thiessen polygons derived for the study area	83
	3.21	The methodology of one dimensional Mike 11 model	90
	3.22	The methodology of two dimensional Mike 21 model	92
	4.1	Models of dam breach width estimation	97
	4.2	Variation of MRE with smoothing factor $B_{avg}$ estimation models	99
	4.3	GRNN performance of (Hw) model for $B_{avg}$ estimation	100

4.4	GRNN performance of (Vw) model for $B_{avg}$ estimation	101
4.5	GRNN performance of (Vw and Hw) model for $B_{avg}$ estimation	102
4.6	GRNN performance of (Vw and Hb) model for $B_{avg}$ estimation	103
4.7	GRNN performance of (dam factor) model for $B_{avg}$ estimation	104
4.8	Performance of GRNN model and existing empirical equation for $B_{avg}$ estimation	105
4.9	Models of dam failure time estimation	107
4.10	Variation of MRE with smoothing factor Tf estimation models	109
4.11	GRNN performance of (Hw) model for Tf estimation	110
4.12	GRNN performance of (Vw and Hw) model for Tf estimation	111
4.13	GRNN performance of (Vw and Hb) model for Tf estimation	112
4.14	GRNN performance of (Vw, Hw and Hd) Mmdel for Tf estimation	113
4.15	Performance of GRNN model and Eeisting empirical equation for Tf estimation	114
4.16	Daily flow at Temengor catchment during calibration period	121
4.17	Peak daily flow at Temengor catchment during Nov. 2009	122
4.18	Low daily flow at Temengor catchment from Mar. to Jun 2010	123
4.19	Scatter plot of daily inflow during calibration period (normal scale)	125
4.20	Scatter plot of daily inflow during calibration period (log scale)	125
4.21	Relative residual plot of daily inflow during calibration period	126
4.22	Monthly inflow during calibration period	127
4.23	Daily flow at Temengor catchment during validation period	129
4.24	Peak daily flow at Temengor catchment (Dec. 2012 – Apr. 2013)	130

4.25	Scatter plot of daily inflow during validation period (log scale)	131
4.26	Scatter plot of daily inflow during validation period (log scale)	131
4.27	Relative residual plot of daily inflow during validation period	132
4.28	Monthly runoff during validation period	133
4.29	PMP Temporal pattern for historical period (2001 – 2015)	135
4.30	PMF hydrographs for Temengor catchment for historical period (2001 – 2015)	137
4.31	PMF hydrographs for Temenggor catchment for future 1 period $(2031 - 2045)$	137
4.32	PMF hydrographs for Temengor catchment for future 2 period (2061 – 2075)	138
4.33	Comparison between simulated and observed W.L during calibration period	140
4.34	Comparison between simulated and observed W.L during vlidation period	141
4.35	Peak outflow hydrographs from Temenggor, Bersia and Kenering dams for the first scenario	144
4.36	Flood hydrographs at 390, 9697.89 and 15494.5 km downstream of Temengor dam for the first scenario	146
4.37	Flood hydrographs at 123, 12560 and 24025 km downstream of Bersia dam for the first scenario	147
4.38	Flood hydrographs at 9000, 15750, 23750, 31750 km downstream of Kenering dam for the first scenario	148
4.39	Water level hydrographs at 6500, 10500 and 16000 km downstream of Temengor dam for first scenario	150
4.40	Water level at hydrographs at 5750, 10750, 14500, 16750 and 21000 km downstream of Bersia dam for the first scenario	151
4.41	Water level at hydrographs at 6750, 15250, 26000, 33000, 38000 km downstream of Kenering dam for first scenario	152

	4.42	Peak outflow hydrographs from Temenggor, Bersia and Kenering dams for the second scenario	154
	4.43	Peak outflow hydrographs from Temenggor, Bersia and Kenering dams for third scenario	157
	4.44	Peak outflow hydrographs from Temenggor, Bersia and Kenering dams for the fourth scenario	159
	4.45	Flood inundation maps for the first scenario	162
	4.46	Flood inundation maps for the second scenario	164
	4.47	Flood inundation maps for the third scenario	166
	4.48	Flood inundation maps for the fourth scenario	168
	B1	Cross section downstream Temengor dam at chainage 4500 m	189
	B2	Cross section downstream Temengor dam at chainage 12500 m	190
	B3	Cross section downstream Bersia dam at chainage 10750 m	191
	B4	Cross section downstream Bersia dam at chainage 16750 m	192
	B5	Cross section downstream Kenering dam at chainage 2500 m	193
	B6	Cross section downstream Kenering dam at chainage 30500 m	194
	C1	Flood hydrographs at 500, 9500 and 15500 km downstream of Temengor dam for second scenario	195
	C2	Flood hydrograph at 1250, 12500 and 24000 km downstream of Bersia dam for second scenario	196
	C3	Flood hydrographs at 9000, 15750, 23750, 31750 km downstream of Kenering dam for second scenario	196
	C4	Water level hydrographs at 6500, 10500 and 16000 km downstream of Temengor dam for second scenario	197
	C5	Water level hydrograph at 5750, 10750, 14500, 16750 and 21000 km downstream of Bersia dam for second scenario	197
	C6	Water level hydrographs at 6750, 15250, 26000, 33000, 38000 km downstream of Kenering dam for second scenario	198

C7	Flood hydrographs at 500, 9500 and 15500 km downstream of Temengor dam for the third scenario	198
C8	Flood hydrographs at 1250, 12500 and 24000 km downstream of Bersia dam for the third scenario	199
C9	Flood hydrograph at 9000, 15750, 23750, 31750 km downstream of Kenering dam for the third scenario	199
C10	Water level hydrographs at 6500, 10500 and 16000 km downstream of Temengor dam for the third scenario	200
C11	Water level hydrographs at 5750, 10750, 14500, 16750 and 21000 km downstream of Bersia dam for the third scenario	200
C12	Water level hydrographs at 6750, 15250, 26000, 33000, 38000 km downstream of Kenering dam for the third scenario	201
C13	Flood hydrographs at 500, 9500 and 15500 km downstream of Temengor dam for the fourth scenario	201
C14	Flood hydrographs at 1250, 12500 and 24000 km downstream of Bersia dam for the fourth scenario	202
C15	Flood hydrographs at 9000, 15750, 23750, 31750 km downstream of Kenering dam for the fourth scenario	202
C16	Water level hydrographs at 6500, 10500 and 16000 km downstream of Temengor dam for the fourth scenario	203
C17	Water level hydrographs at 5750, 10750, 14500, 16750 and 21000 km downstream of Bersia dam for the fourth scenario	203
C18	Water level hydrographs at 6750, 15250, 26000, 33000, 38000 km downstream of Kenering dam for the fourth scenario	204

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

	H <sub>d</sub>	Dam height
	Bavg	Average breach width
	$H_{\rm w}$	Depth of water above the bottom of the breach
	$V_{\rm w}$	Reservoir volume at the time of failure
	V <sub>er</sub>	Volume of material eroded from the dam embankment
	B* <sub>avg</sub>	Dimensionless average breach width
	S*	Dimensionless reservoir storage
	C <sub>b</sub>	Reservoir volume coefficient
	В	Breach width
	Ko	Coefficient related to dam failure mode
	g	Gravitational acceleration
	H <sub>b</sub>	Breach hight
	di	The computed distance
	σ	Spreading factor or smoothing factor
	Q	Discharge
	h	Water depth
	α	Velocity distribution coefficient
	t	Time
	Х	Stationing
	A	Area of wet cross-section
	C	Chezy number
	К	Hydraulic radius

E	Reservoir's water surface elevation
Es	Water surface elevation in the breach,
$\mathbf{v}_1$	Reservoir's flow velocity
ζin	Head loss factor for inflow contraction
As	Flow area in the breach
$A_1$	Reservoir flow area.
ys	Breach's water depth
U, V	Depth-averaged Cartesian velocity components,
K <sub>xx</sub> , K <sub>yy</sub>	eddy viscosities
Us, Vs	Velocities at the source
Х	Standardized value of X <sub>i</sub>
$\mathbf{X}_{\min}$	Minimum value of data
X <sub>max</sub>	Maximum value of data
$\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{o}}$	Observed values
Xp	Predicated values
X <sub>o</sub> _	The average of observed predicted values
X p	The average of predicted values
Xo	Observed values
Xp	Predicated values
X <sub>o</sub>	Mean value of the recorded rainfall
$\sigma_X$	Standard deviation of the recorded rainfall
Р	Occurrence probability
У	Dimensionless variable

Т	Return period	
X <sub>T</sub>	Estimated event magnitude	
Qsimi	The simulated discharge during time i	
Qobsi	The observed discharge during time i	
$\overline{Q}_{Obs}$	The average observed discharge,	
$\overline{Q}_{Sim}$	The average simulated discharge	
C <sub>R</sub>	Courant number	
c	Wave celerity or maximum velocity (m/s)	
Δt	Time step (sec)	
Δx	Grid spacing (m)	
$ au_{o}$	The wall shear stress	
η	The eddy viscosity	
∂u⁻/∂z	The changes in mean horizontal velocity along the depth	

6

#### **CHAPTER 1**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 History of Dams Failure**

Water is the vital liquid to support all forms of life on the earth. It is an essential element of the environment. Although 70% of the Earth is covered with water, a significant portion of the world population suffers water shortage. This is because 96.5% of the water resources are salt water found in oceans (Gleick, 1993). On the other hand, 98.8% of the earth's freshwater is in the forms of ice and groundwater and only a small portion is in rivers and lakes. As a result of the expanding world population and economic growth, the demand for water has increased the importance of freshwater resources. Therefore, it is essential to collect and store the available freshwater water resources on the earth. Dams are built for storing freshwater in large quantities to overcome the water shortage.

As can be witnessed in the historical record, dam building is as old as man's civilization. Elsewhere, India, Mesopotamia and Egypt are old civilization were dams existed. On record, the old dam in the world is Egyptian Saddle-Kafara dam which was built around 2600 BC as a diversion dam for flood control, but it was destroyed by heavy rain during construction or shortly afterward (Kok, 1987).

Dams can usually be classified into two different groups: concrete and earthen/rock. Concrete dams can usually be classified into gravity, arch, or buttress. Almost 80% of the world's major dams are constructed from natural erodible earthen materials (US Committee on Large Dams, 1975). In the United States, about 11,000 dams were constructed in the mid-twentieth century (Caldwell, 2009). Given the cheaper cost often associated with earth dam construction in developing countries, this percentage is likely higher on a global scale.

Despite the efforts to promote dam safety, but the huge water volume that is retained in the reservoir can produce a serious flood and threat the properties and population in the downstream if a sudden released of the stored water may occur (Razad et al., 2013). There are many factors that may increase the potential of dam failure by overtopping and piping such as changes in the patterns of global climatic, the insufficient discharge capacity of the spillway and lack of maintenance of the embankment dams. Therefore, the study of dam break is considered significantly necessary in order to determine the peak outflow to assess economic, social and environmental impacts downstream and to prepare the emergency response plan. Over the past years, the need to predict, model and understand the characteristics of dam break has become an important subject. Therefore, many physically and numerically techniques have been developed for dam break analysis.



In the latter half of the twentieth century, several major embankment dams failed. In the Netherlands, in February 1953, a high-tide storm caused the highest water levels observed up to date and breached the dikes in more than 450 places, causing the death of nearly 1,900 people as well as enormous economic damage (Gerritsen, 2005). The Baldwin Hills Reservoir near Los Angeles failed in 1964, destroying 277 homes and killing 5 people after discharging 1 million m<sup>3</sup> of water from the reservoir and causing an additional 73 million CAD (12M USD in 1971) in property damage (Hamilton and Meehan, 1971). The Teton Dam in Idaho failed in 1976 and is considered one of the most well-known dam failures in the world; 14 people were killed and over \$1 billion in damages were caused (Solava and Delatte, 2003). But the world's worst dam disaster occurred in Henan province in China, in August 1975, when the Banqiao Dam and the Shimantan Dam failed catastrophically due to the overtopping caused by torrential rains. Approximately 85,000 people died from flooding and much more died during subsequent epidemics and starvation; millions of residents lost their homes (Qing, 1997). This catastrophic event is comparable to what Cherno and Bhopa represent for the nuclear and chemical industries (McCully, 1996). Additionally, between 1985 and 1994, there have been more than 400 dam failures in the United States alone. The amount of life loss will depend on a number of different factors including: the water depth, geographical distribution of the population, warning time to reach the population, and how easy it is to warn them. Therefore, if advanced warning messages are delivered to the population, lives can be saved.

Dam failures do not always result in loss of life, however, as many have been constructed far away from populated centers. Massive ecological damage is also possible. When the Aznalcollar tailings pond dam in Spain failed in 1998, a great quantity of toxic material spilled out into the river system, causing devastating ecological damage which threatened a nearby national park (Coleman et al., 2002). Similarly, when the Opuha Dam in New Zealand failed in 1997 while it was under construction, it caused significant economic and environmental damage (Coleman et al., 2002).

#### **1.2 Problem Statement**

Malaysia has not experienced any dam break incident. As the dams in Malaysia get older, the scenario of dam break should be considered in order to take relevant safety measures. Flooding due to dam break leads to greater peak discharge magnitudes compared to any flood that resulting from rainfall. Moreover, it will often have catastrophic consequences if there are human developments found downstream of the dam. To evaluate the flood damage resulting from a dam break, one has to predict not only the mode and possibility of a dam break but also the flood waves' propagation and the volume of floodwater that the dam breach will release.

The most important factors in the dam break analysis are hydrological parameters (peak outflow and time failure) and dam breach geometry (breach width and breach height). Therefore, the development of simple and precise approaches to deal with

 $\bigcirc$ 

estimation of these parameters has been the focus of many contributions published in the last decades (Wahl 2010; Bentaher 2013; Froehlich 1995; Xu and Zhang 2010). The statistical approaches that use regression analysis are considered as traditional approaches for predicting dam breach parameters. In this approaches, reservoir characteristics such as depth and volume of water were taken as the dependent variables to obtain the best-fit equations for estimation of peak outflow and dam breach parameters (USBR 1988; Von Yhun and Gillette 1990; Froehlich 1995a, 2004, 2008; Xu and Zhang 2010). More accurate equations can be obtained when the database of dam failure cases are well documented (Xu and Zhang 2010).

Wahl (2004) and Pierce (2010) criticized the quality of the data for the case studies that were used in the formulation of regression analysis methods and the accuracy of predictions from these methods. Black-box models is an alternative approach if the suitable database exists. In the black-box models, the inputs and targets are mapped directly inside the model without detailed consideration of the internal structure of the physical process (Hakimzadeh et al., 2014). Artificial Neural Network (ANN) is considered as a black-box model which have usefulness exceed traditional statistical models such as free-pattern of forecasting model, toleration to data inaccuracy and their data-driven nature (Azmatullah et al., 2005). In addition to its simplicity, capability and accuracy. Artificial Neural Network (ANN) has been adopted and commonly used to model various problems in the field of water resources engineering. Forever, it has not been used specifically for estimating dam breach parameters.

Climate change is an important issue that has gained increasing attention in recent years. Climate change may involve changes in the length and time of weather variation or changes in mean weather conditions (Carnesale & Chameides, 2011). Most of the dams in Malaysia are designed for estimated life more than 100 years. However, Malaysia is affected by climate change and the period included climate change studies, particularly for dam break analysis, should consider the dam life. Despite the climatic changes that are expected in Malaysia, there have been no studies that carried out on the effect of climatic changes on dam break analysis. Therefore, analysis of flow depth, peak outflow and inundation maps that results from dam failure with different scenario under current and future climatic changes is considered very important and necessary for dam safety in Malaysia.

Dam failure can lead to significant downstream disaster. This is especially true for a valley that has cascade reservoirs, which would intensify the extent of the disaster. Numerous experimental and computational studies concerning dam-break flows have been conducted over the past decades. However, the focus of majority of these research studies is on flood that results from the failure of a single dam due to overtopping failure mode only (Bellos et al. 1991; Gracia-Navarro, 1999; Zhou et al. 2005; Al-Taiee and Rasheed, 2009; Dewals et al. 2010; Xiong, 2011; Cao et al., 2011; Mungkasi et al. 2013; Ehsan and Marx 2014; Sun et al. 2014; George and Nair, 2015; Wang et al., 2016; Andrew, 2016). There is scarce quantitative research about cascading dam-break flows despite the fact that cascading dam-break floods are significantly more disastrous since they can progressively destroy a series of dams.

 $\bigcirc$ 

The present study includes a more accurate technique for estimation of dam breach parameters. Also, the hydrological modeling for estimation of maximum probable flood considering climate change impact. While the hydrodynamic modeling for dam break modeling will consider different dam failure mode including overtopping and piping for a selected cascade dams in Malaysia.

#### **1.3** Research Objectives

The main objective of the present study is to model the dam break for a cascade dams which include (Temenggor, Bersia and Kenering) dams located in the state of Perak, Malaysia with consideration of climate change impact. The specific objectives of this study are:

- 1. To propose the generalized regression neural network (GRNN) as a new method that can accurately estimate the dam breach parameters.
- 2. To estimate the maximum probable inflow hydrograph into Temengor reservoir using MIKE 11 (NAM Submodel) hydrological model with consideration of climate change impact.
- 3. To investigate the possible scenarios of dam failure such as overtopping and piping for cascade dams using 1D and 2D hydrodynamic models.
- 4. To produced predicated inundation maps at the Temenggor, Bersia, and Kenering catchment due to dam break with consideration of climate change impact.

#### **1.4** Significance of the Study

This study is concerning the simulation of dam break for cascade dams (Temenggor, Bersia and Kenering) located at Perak state, Malaysia with consideration of climate change impact.

Data related to failed dams around the world were used to build Generalized Regression Neural Network (GRNN) models for accurately estimating dam breach parameters (dam breach width and dam failure time). The available methods used for estimation of dam breach parameters are based on regression analysis and suffer from uncertainty in their predictions.

 $\bigcirc$ 

In this study, the dam break modeling was conducted by considering the impact of climate change on the probable maximum flood (PMF). The impact of climate change was not considered before in dam break studies in Malaysia. Also, a different mode of failure including overtopping and piping were considered in this study. However, most of the dam break studies were considered the overtopping failure mode only.

The consideration of cascade dams in dam break modeling is one of the main significance of the present study. Perak dam system which consists of three dams (Temenggor dam, Bersia dam and Kenering dam) was taken as a case study. Almost all the studies on dam break in Malaysia was focused on a single dam only.

The inundation depth maps are the main output of the present study. These maps will help to prepare the emergency action plan for the affected areas in order to reduce human and economic losses.

Also, the flood due to single dam break has a catastrophic consequences if the human development was found downstream of the dam. But this consequence will be more sever when more than one dam founded on the same river (cascade dam). Therefore, this study was conducted in order to investigate the flood due to the failure of the series dam. While most of the previous dam break studies were focused on modeling of dam break due to the single dam.

#### 1.5 Scope and Limitations

This study was conducted to model dam failure by taking (Temenggor, Bersia and Kenering) located at Perak State, Malaysia as a case study. The simulation includes estimation of dam breach parameters using Generalized Regression Neural Network technique and data of 140 failed dam around the world. Due to a limitation in data, 85% of the data is used for training while the remaining 15% is used for testing.

The study also includes the hydrological modeling to forecast the inflow hydrograph for the catchment of Temengor dam. Mike 11 (NAM – Submodel) is used for this purpose. The data was acquired from respective Government authorities in Malaysia. Data on streamflow is derived using water balance concept. Also, there is no meteorological station found in the catchment of the study area, so the evaporation is taken from the nearest station.

The hydrodynamic modeling include the simulation of flood wave resulted from a dam break. Mike 11, Mike 21 are used to simulate flood wave at (Temenggor, Bersia and Kenering) catchment. Limited data is available to be used in the modeling process. The available data for streamflow and water level are from January 1980 to June 1983 and these data were used for calibration and validation for Mike 11. For Mike 21 model, existing values for the Manning coefficient of roughness for the floodplain are used in the model application. These values are ranging from 0.045 to 0.10 and taken from (TNB).



## 1.6 Thesis Layout

This thesis is organized into five chapters. Chapter one focuses on the introduction while Chapter two summarizes the published literature. The methodology and description of the study area are presented in Chapter three. Chapter four present the results that obtained from the study and their discussion. Finally, Chapter five present the main conclusions and the recommendations for the future research.



#### REFERENCES

Abbott, M. B. (1979). Computational Hydraulics. Pitman, London.

- Abu El-Nasr, A., Patrick W., Luis T., Karen Ch., & Jan F. (2000). Comparative Analysis of the Runoff-Generation Using Lumped and Distributed Approaches, with Application to the Jeker Catchment in Belgium. *International Water Technology Conference*, Egypt.
- Ahmed F. (2012). A Hydrologic Model of Kemptville Basin—Calibration and Extended Validation. Water *Resource Management*, 26, 2583–2604, DOI 10.1007/s11269-012-0034-0
- Alcrudo, F., & Garcia-Navarro P. (1993). A High-Resolution Godunov-Type Scheme in Finite Volumes for the 2D Shallow-Water Equations. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, 16(6), 489–505.
- Alcrudo, F., Garcia-Navarro, P., & Saviron, J-M. (1992). Flux Difference Splitting for 1D Open Channel Flow Equations. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, 14(9):1009–1018.
- Al-Taiee, T. M. & Rasheed, A.M. (2009). Simulation Tigris River Flood Wave in Mosul City Due to a Hypothetical Mosul Dam Break. *Thirteenth International Water Technology Conference, IWTC*, Hurghada, Egypt, 283-299.
- Al-Zahrani, M. A., & Amin A. (2015). Urban Residential Water Demand Prediction Based on Artificial Neural Networks and Time Series Models. *Water Resource Management*, 29, 3651–3662, DOI 10.1007/s11269-015-1021-z.
- Anastasiou, K. & Chan CT (1997). A solution of the 2D shallow water equations using finite volume method on unstructured triangular meshes. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, 24(11), 1225–1245.
- Andrew, D. C. (2016). Modelling potential impacts of a breach for a high hazard dam, Elizabethtown, Kentucky, USA, *Applied Geography*, 71, 1 – 8, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.12016/j.apgeog.2016.04.002</u>
- Anh, L. N.T., Willems, P., Boxall1, J.B., & Saul, A.J. (2008). An Evaluation of Three Lumped Conceptual Rainfall-Runoff Models at Catchment Scale, *The 13th World Water Congress, Montpellier, France.*
- Anila, C., Georgea, B., & Thulasidharan N. (2015). Dam Break Analysis Using BOSS DAMBRK, International Conference on Water Resources, Coastal and Ocean Engineering (ICWRCOE 2015), Aquatic Procedia, 4, 853 – 860
- Antanasijevic, D., Pocajt V., Povrenovic D., Peric-Grujic A., & Rictic M. (2013). Modelling of Dissolved Oxygen Content using Artificial Neural Networks:

Danube River, North Serbia, Case Study, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 20, 9006-9013, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11356-013-1876-6</u>.

- Araghinejad, S. (2014). Data-Driven Modeling: Using MATLAB in Water Resources and Environmental Engineering, *Water Science and Technology Library*, 67, DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7506-0\_5,
- Awchi. T.A. (2014). River Discharges Forecasting in Northern Iraq Using Different ANN Techniques, Water Resource Management, 28, 801–814, DOI 10.1007/s11269-014-0516-3
- Azmatullah, H. Md., Deo, M.C., & Deolalikar, P.B. (2005). Neural Networks for Estimation of Scour Downstream of a Ski-jump Bucket. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 131(10), 898–908.
- Bajpai, S., Jain K., & Jain N. (2011). Artificial Neural Networks. International Journal of Soft Computing and Engineering (IJSCE), 1, 2231-2307,
- Bates, P.D. De, A.P.J. Roo, A. (2000). Simple Raster-Based Model for Flood Inundation Simulation. *Journal of Hydrology*, 236(1-2), 54-77,
- Beiios, C. V., Soulis, J. V. & Sakkas, J. G. (1991). Computation of Two Dimensional dam-break induced flows, *Advance Water Resources*, 14 (1), 31-41.
- Bellos, C.V. & Sakkas, J.G. (1987). 1-D Dam-break Flood Wave Propagation on Dry Bed. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* ASCE, 113(12), 1510–1524.
- Bentaher, L. S. & Elmazoghi, H. G. (2013). Estimation of Dam Breach Width Using a Neuro-Fuzzy Computing Technique. *Seventeenth International Water Technology Conference (IWTC17)*, Istanbul, Turkey.

Beven, K. J. (2001). Rainfall-runoff modeling: the primer Wiley.

- Bourdes, V., Bonnevay, S., Lisboa, P., Defrance, R., Perol, D., Chabaud, S., Bachelot, T., Gargi, T., & Negrier, S. (2010). Comparison of Artificial Neural Network with Logistic Regression as Classification Models for Variable Selection for Prediction of Breast Cancer Patient Outcomes. *Advances in Artificial Neural Systems*, Vol. 2010, DOI: 10.1155/2010/309841.
- Bozkus, Z. & Ali K. (1998). Comparison of Physical and Numerical Dam-Break Simulations. *Turkish Journal of Engineering and Environmental Science*, 22, 429–443.
- Brekke, L. D., Kiang, J. E., Olsen, J. R, Pulwarty, R. S., Raff, D. A., Turnipseed, D. P., Webb, R. S., & White, K. D. (2009). Climate Change and Water Resources Management, A Federal Perspective, Publications of the US Geological Survey, <u>http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usgspubs/44</u>

- Bruce, J. P. & Clark, R. H. (1966). Introduction to Hydrometeorology. New York, Pergamon.
- Brufau, P., & Garcia-Navarro, P. (2000). Two Dimensional Dam Break Flow Simulation. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, 33, 35–37.
- Cacuci, D. G., Ionescu-Bujor, M., & Navon, I. M. (2005). Sensitivity and uncertainty analysis: Applications to large-scale systems. CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton.
- Cai, H. (2010). Flood forecasting on the Humber River using an Artificial Neural Network Approach, Master Thesis, Faculty of Engineering and the Applied Science Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Caldwell, L. W. (2009). Rehabilitating our Nation's Aging Small Watershed Projects. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Association of State Dam Safety Officials.* Hollywood, Florida, USA
- Caleffi, V., Valiani, A. & Zanni A (2003). Finite Volume Method for Simulating Extreme Flood Events in Natural Channels. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering ASCE*, 41(2), 167–177.
- Cao, Z., Yue, Z. & Pender, G. (2011), Flood Hydraulics due to Cascade Landslide Dam Failure. Journal of Flood Risk Management, 4, 104–114. doi:10.1111/j.1753-318X.2011.01098.x
- Carnesale, A., & Chameides, W. (2011). America's Climate Choices. *The National Academies Press*, Washington, DC, USA.
- Chow V. T., Maidment D.R., & Mays L.W. (1988). Applied Hydrology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 332, 96-108, (Second Edition).
- Chow, V. T. (1951). A General Formula for Hydrologic Frequency Analysis. *Trans. Am. Geophys. Union*, 32, 231-237.
- Chow, V.T. (1959). Open Channel Hydraulics. McGraw-Hill Book Company, NY.
- Christensen, J. H., Hewitson, B., Busuioc, A., Chen, A., Gao, X. & co-authors. (2007). Regional Climate Projections. In: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. The contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- Cigizoglu, HK. (2002). Suspended Sediment Estimation for Rivers using Artificial Neural Networks and Sediment Rating Curves. *Turkish Journal of Engineering and Environmental Sciences*, 26(1), 27-36.

- Cigizoglu, K.H. & Alp, M. (2006). Generalized Regression Neural Network in Modelling River Sediment Yield. *Advances in Engineering Software*, 37(2), 63-68.
- Cleary, P.W., Prakash, M., Mead, S., Tang, X., Wang, H. & Ouyang, S. (2012). Dynamic Simulation of Dam-Break Scenarios for Risk Analysis and Disaster Management. *International Journal of Image and Data Fusion*, 3(4), 333–363
- Coleman, S., Andrews, D. & Webby, M. (2002). Overtopping Breaching of Non-Cohesive Homogeneous Embankments. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 128(9), 829–838.
- Costa J. E. (1985). Floods from Dam Failures. Open-File Report 85-560, Secretary, p. 59.
- Cowan, W.L. (1956). Estimating Hydraulic Roughness Coefficients, Agricultural Engineering, 121, 473-475.
- Cunge, J. A., Holly, F. M. & Verwey, A. (1980). Practical Aspects of Computational River Hydraulics. London: Pitman Publishing Limited,
- Dawson, C.W. & Wilby, R. (1998). An Artificial Neural Network Approach to Rainfall-Runoff Modelling. *Hydrological Science Journal*, 43(1), 47-66.
- Demuth, H., Beale, M. & Hagan, M. (2009). Neural Network Toolbox 6, User's Guide. Mathworks Inc.: Natick, MA, USA.
- Department of Irrigation and Drainage Malaysia (DID, 2009a). DID Manual Volume 9 – Dam Safety, Inspections and Monitoring.
- Desa, M, M. N., Noria, A. B. & Rekhecha, P. R. (2001). Probable Maximum Precipitation for 24 – h Duration over Southeast Asia Monsoon Region – Selangor, Malaysia. Atmospheric Research, 58(1), 41 – 54.
- Desa, M, M.N., Sharifuddin, S & Rekhecha, P. R. (2003). To Estimate 24 hour Probable Maximum Precipitation for 24 – h for the Malaysian State of Kelantan. *International Water Power and Dam Construction*. 35 – 39.
- Desa, M. N.; Rekhecha, P. R. (2007). Probable Maximum Precipitation for 24 h Duration over an Equatorial Region: Part 2 – Johor, Malaysia. *Atmospheric Research*, 84(1), 84 – 90.
- Dewals, B. J., Erpicum, S., Detrembleur, S., Archambeau, P., & Pirotton, M. (2010). Failure of Dams Arranged in Series or in Complex, *Natural Hazards*, 56(3), 917–939, DOI 10.1007/s11069-010-9600-z.
- Dhar, O. N., Kulkarni, A. K., Rakhecha, P. R. (1981) Probable Maximum Point Rainfall Estimation for the Southern Half of the Indian Peninsula. Proceedings

of the Indian Academy of Sciences - Earth and Planetary Sciences, 90(1), 39-46.

- DHI. (2004). A modeling system for rivers and channels: Reference manual. DHI Water and Environment, Denmark.
- DHI. (2005). MIKE11\_User Manual and Reference book. DHI Water and Environment, Denmark.
- DHI. (2014a). MIKE 21 User manual. DHI Water and Environment, Denmark.
- DHI, (2014b). MIKE URBAN User manual. DHI Water and Environment, Denmark.
- DHI. (2015a). MIKE 21 [Online]. Available: http://www.mikepoweredbydhi.com/products/mike-21
- Dorf, R. C. (1997). The Electrical Engineering Handbook. CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton.
- Dressler R. F. (1954). Comparison of Theories and Experiments for the Hydraulic Dam-Break Wave. International Association for Scientific Hydrology, 3 (38), 319–328.
- Ehsan, S. & Marx, W. (2014). Dam Break Modelling for Large Earth and Rock-fill Dams. Journal of River Engineering, 2(6).
- Engineers Australia (2012). Two Dimensional Modelling in Urban and Rural Floodplains, Stage 1 & 2 Report, Australian Rainfall and Runoff Revision Projects, Project 15, P15/S1/009, November.
- Erpicum, S., Dewals, B. J., Archambeau, P. & Pirotton, M. (2010) Dam-Break Flow Computation Based on an Efficient Flux-Vector Splitting. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 234(7), 2143-2151.
- Fennema, RJ, & Chaudhry, H. (1990). Explicit methods for 2-D transient free surface flows. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering – ASCE*, 116(8), 1013–1034.
- Ahmed, F. (2012). A Hydrologic Model of Kemptville Basin—Calibration and Extended Validation, *Water Resource Management*, 26(9), 2583–2604, DOI 10.1007/s11269-012-0034-0.
- Filipova, V. (2012). Urban Flooding in Gothenburg A MIKE 21 Study. Master's thesis. Available from: LUP Student Papers.
- Fleming, K.M., Tregoning, P., Kuhn, M., Purcell, A. & McQueen, H. (2012) Effect of Melting Land-Based Ice Masses on Sea-Level around the Australian Coastline. *Australian Journal of Earth Science*, 59 (4), 457–467.

- Fread, D. L. (1984). DAMBRK: the NWS Dam Break Flood Forecasting Model. National Weather Service (NWS) Report, Silver Spring.
- French Ministry of Sustainable Development (FMSD). (2009). Burst of Dam: Malpasset 2 December 1959 in France by French Ministry of Sustainable Development (FMSD) - DGPR / SRT / BARPI. http:// www.aria.developpement- durable.gouv.fr/resources/
- Froehlich D.C. (1995a). Peak Outflow from Breached Embankment Dams. Journal of Water Resource Planning Management, 121(1), 90–97.
- Froehlich, D. (2004). Two-Dimensional Model for Embankment Dam Breach Formation and Flood Wave Generation. *Proceedings of the 21st annual conf. of the Association of State Dam Safety Officials*, Lexington, Ky.
- Froehlich, D. C. (2008). Embankment Dam Breach Parameters and Their Uncertainties. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering – ASCE, 134(12), 1708– 1721.
- Garcia-Navarro P, Fras A, &Villanueva, I. (1999). Dam-Break Flow Simulation: Some Results for One – Dimensional Models of Real Cases. *Journal of Hydrology*, 216(3-4), 227–247.
- Gerritsen, H. (2005). What happened in 1953? The Big Flood in the Netherlands in retrospect, Philosophical Transactions: *Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 363(1831), 1271–1291.
- Giang, N. T. & Phuong T.A. (2010). Calibration and Verification of a Hydrological Model Using Event Data, VNU Journal of Science, Earth Sciences 26(2), 64-74.
- Gibbs, M. S., Morgan, N., Maier, H. R., Dandy, G.C., Nixon, J.B. & Holmes, M. (2006). Investigation into the Relationship between Chlorine Decay and Water Distribution Parameters using Data Driven methods Mathematical and Computer Modelling, 44(5-6), 485–498
- Glaister, P. (1988). Approximate Riemann Solutions of the Shallow Water Equations. Journal of Hydraulic Research, 26(3), 293–300.
- Gleick, P. H. (1993). Water in crisis: A Guide to the World's Freshwater Resources. Oxford University Press, pp 13.
- Gourrion, J. (2000). Ku-band wind speed model functions via neural network methods. Technical report DOS, French Research Institute for Exploitation of the Sea, vol. -02
- Govindaraju, R. S. (2000). Artificial Neural Networks in Hydrology I: preliminary concepts, *Journal of Hydrologic* Engineering ASCE, 5(2), 115-123.

- Graham, W. J. (1998). Estimation of Loss of Life Due to Dam Failure. *United States Bureau of Reclamation*, Washington, D.C.
- Hafezparast, M., Araghinejad, S. & Fatemi SE. (2013). A Conceptual Rainfall-Runoff Model Using the Auto Calibrated NAM Models in the Sarisoo River. *Hydrology Current Research*, 4(1), 1-6, doi:10.4172/2157-7587.1000148.
- Hagen, V. K. (1982). Re-evaluation of Design Flood and Dam Safety. Proceedings, 14th International Congress on Large Dams, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1, 475 – 491.
- Hakimzadeh, H., Nourani, V. & Babaeyan, A. A. (2014). Genetic Programming simulation of Dam Breach Hydrograph and Peak Outflow Discharge. *Journal Hydrology Engineering*, 19(4), 757 – 768.
- Hamilton, D., & Meehan, R. (1971). Ground Rupture in the Baldwin Hills. Science, 172(3981), 333-344.
- Hassan, S. (2002). Dam Safety Surveillance DID Perspective. Paper presented at National Training Course on Use of Isotopes as Alternative Techniques in Dam Safety and Dam Sustainability.
- Hastie, T., Tibishrani, R., & Freidman, J. (2001). The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference and 1Prediction, Springer, NewYork.
- Heddam, S. (2014). Generalized Regression Neural Network (GRNN) Based Approach for Colored Dissolved Organic Matter (CDOM) Retrieval: Case Study of Connecticut River at Middle Haddam Station, USA. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 186(11),7837–7848, DOI 10.1007/s10661-014-3971-7.
- Henan Water Resources Authority (2005). The August 1975 Catastrophic Flood Disaster in Henan, Yellow River Water Conservancy, Zhenzhou, China.
- Hershfield, D. M. (1961). Estimating the Probable Maximum Precipitation. *Journal Hydraulic Deviation – ASCE*, 87(5), 99-116.
- Hershfield, D.M. (1965) Method for Estimating Probable Maximum Precipitation. Journal of American Water Works Associated, 57(8), 965-972.
- Hirabayashi, Y., Kanae, S., Emori, S., Oki, T. & Kimoto M (2008). Global Projections of Changing Risks of Floods and Droughts in a Changing Climate. *Hydrological Science Journal*, 53(4), 754–772
- Hodouin, D., Thibault, J., & Flamemt, F. (1991). Artificial Neural Networks: An Emerging Technique to Model and Control Mineral Processing Plants. *120th Annual Meeting of the Society of Mining*, Metallurgy and Exploration Inc.

- Ibne Amir, Md. Sh., Mohammad, M. K., Mohammad, G. R., Raj, H. S., & Fatema A. (2013). Automatic Multi-Objective Calibration of a Rainfall-Runoff Model for the Fitzroy Basin, Queensland, Australia, *International Journal of Environmental Science and Development*, 4(3), 311-315, DOI: 10.7763/IJESD.2013.V4.361
- Ilias, A., Hatzispiroglou J., Baltas, E. & Anastasiadou-Partheniou, E. (2006). Application of the NAM Model to the Ali-Efenti Basin, WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment, Vol. 91, doi:10.2495/RISK060271.
- Innovyze. (2012). Infoworks RS 13 Model Description and User Manual. Innovyze Inc.
- Jaime, V., Felipe, C., Pablo, V. (2016). Artificial Neural Networks applied to flow prediction: A use case for the Tomebamba river. Procedia Engineering, 162, 153 – 161, doi: 10.1016/j.proeng.2016.11.031.
- Joshi, M., M., Shahapure, S. S. (2017). Study of Two Dimensional Dam Break Analysis Using HECRAS for Vir Dam. International Journal of Engineering Technology Science and Research (IJETSR), 4(8), 2394 – 3386.
- Kisi, Q. (2011). A Combined Generalized Regression Neural Network Wavelet Model for Monthly Streamflow Prediction, *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering*, 15(8), 1469-1479, DOI 10.1007/s12205-011-1004-4.
- Kok, C.G., (1987). The Planning and Design Factors in Dam Safety. Paper presented at the Seminar on Dam Safety, Kuala Lumpur.
- Krzyk, M., Klasinc, R. & Cetina, M. (2012). Two-Dimensional Mathematical Modelling of a Dam-Break Wave in a Narrow Steep Stream, *Journal of Mechanical Engineering*, 58(4), 255-262, DOI:10.5545/sv-jme.2010.216.
- Kulkarni, S. R., Jagtap, S. A. (2017) Dam break analysis for Pawana dam. International Journal of Recent Advances in Engineering & Technology (IJRAET), 5(1), 2347–2812.
- Linsley, R.K. (1982). Rainfall-Runoff Models an Overview. *Proceeding of International Symposium of Rainfall-Runoff Modelling*, Mississippi State University, Mississippi, USA, 3-22.
- Loliyana, V. D. & Patel, P. L. (2014). Calibration and Validation of Hydrologic Model for Yerli Sub-Catchment (Maharashtra, India), a 19th International Conference on Hydraulics, Water Resources, Coastal and Environmental Engineering, 18 – 20 Dec., India.
- Lolyana, V. D. & Patel, P. L. (2015). Lumped conceptual hydrological model for Purna river basin, India. Sadhana, 40(8), 2411–2428.

- Louaked, M. & Hanich, L. (1998) TVD scheme for the shallow water equations. Journal of Hydraulic Research, 36(3), 363–378.
- Madsen, P.A., Rugbjerg, M. & Warren, I.R. Subgrid (1988). Modelling in Depth Integrated Flows, *Coastal Engineering Conference*, 1, 505-511, Malaga, Spain.
- May, R. J., Maier, H. R., Dandy, G. C. & Nixon, J. B. (2004). General Regression Neural Networks for Modelling Disinfection Residual in Water Distribution Systems, 4<sup>th</sup> World Water Congress, Marrakech, Morocco.
- McCulloch, W. S. & Pitts, W. (1943). A Logical Calculus of the Ideas Imminent in Nervous Activity. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics*, 5(4), 115–133.
- McCully, P. (1996). Silenced Rivers: The Ecology and Politics of Large Dams, Zed Books, London & New Jersey.
- Menzel, L., Niehoff, D., Burger, G., & Bronstert, A. (2002). Climate Change Impacts on River Flooding: a Modelling Study of Three Meso-scale Catchments. In: Beniston, M. (Ed.), *Climatic Change: Implications for the Hydrological Cycle* and for Water Management, 10 Springer, Netherlands, 249–269.
- Mingham, C. G. & Causon, D. M. (1998). High-Resolution Finite Volume Method for Shallow Water Flows. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering – ASCE*, 124(6), 605–614.
- Mohammadi, K., Eslami, H. R., & Dardashti, Sh. D. (2005). Comparison of Regression, ARIMA and ANN Models for Reservoir Inflow Forecasting Using Snowmelt Equivalent (a Case study of Karaj). *Journal of Agriculture Science* and Technology. 7(3), 17-30.
- Mohammed, T.A & Huat, B.K, (2004). Groundwater Engineering and Geotechnique. University Putra Malaysia Press: 160 -163
- Moriasi, D., Arnold, J., Van Liew, M., Bingner, R., Harmel, R., & Veith, T. (2007). Model Evaluation Guidelines for Systematic Quantification of Accuracy in Watershed Simulations. *Transactions of the ASABE*, 50(3), 885-900. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.13031/2013.23153</u>.
- Morris, M. (2009). Breach Initiation & Growth: Physical Processes Analysis of Impact Project Breach Field Tests March for Sixth Framework Programme for European Research and Technological Development (2002-2006)
- Mungkasi, S., Drie, R. & Roberts S. G. (2013). Predictions on Arrival Times of Water of the St. Francis Dam Break Flood using ANUGA, 20th International Congress on Modelling and Simulation, Adelaide, Australia.

- Myers, V.A. (1967) Meteorological Estimation of Extreme Precipitation for Spillway Design Floods. U.S. Department of Commerce Environmental Science Service Administration Weather Bureau, Office of Hydrology, 1-29.
- National1 Hydraulic Research Institute of Malaysia (NAHRIM) (2008). Derivation of Probable Maximum Precipitation for Design Flood in Malaysia. Technical Research Publication No. 1.
- Nicola, R., Stéphane, H., Sumana, B., Murthy B., Satya, P. Dhore, K. Farhat, R., Mathur, P., Nicolas, N., Fanny, H., Celine, H., Sanjib, P. & Jan C. (2011). An assessment of the potential impact of climate change on flood risk in Mumbai. Climatic Change, 104(1), 139–167, DOI 10.1007/s10584-010-9979-2.
- Nielsen, S.A. & Hansen, E. (1973). Numerical Simulation of the Rainfall-Runoff Process on a Daily Basis. *Hydrology Research*, 4(3), 171–190.
- Othman, Z.A. (2006). Overview of Dam Safety in Malaysia. Jurutera. January 2009. Institute of Engineers Malaysia.
- Panagoulia, D. & Dimou, G. (1997). The sensitivity of Flood Events to Global Climate Change. Journal of Hydrology. 191 (1–4), 208–222.
- Pierce, M. W., Thornton, C. I. & Abt, S. R. (2010). Predicting Peak Outflow from Breached Embankment Dams. *Journal Hydrology Engineering*, 15(5), 338– 349.
- Ponce, V.M. (1989). Engineering Hydrology Principles and Practices. Prentice Hall Company.
- Priddy, K.L. & Keller, P.E. (2005). Artificial Neural Networks: an Introduction; SPIE Press: Bellingham, WA, USA.
- Prudhomme, C., Crooks, S., Kay, A.L. & Reynard, N. (2013). Climate Change and River Flooding: Part 1 Classifying the Sensitivity of British Catchments. *Climate Change*, 119(3-4), 933–948.
- Pushkar S., Sanskriti M. (2017) Dam break analysis using HEC-RAS and HEC-GeoRAS a case Study of Ajwa reservoir. Journal of Water Resources and Ocean Science, 5(6), 108-113, doi: 10.11648/j.wros.20160506.15.
- Qing, D. (1997). The River Dragon has come to Three Gorges Dam and the Fate of China's Yangtze River and its People, ME Sharpe.
- Razad, A.Z.A., Muda, R. S., Sidek, L. M., Azia, S. A., Mansor, F. H. & Yalit, R. (2013). Simulation of Breach Outflow for Earthfill Dam. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, doi:10.1088/1755-1315/16/1/012030.

- Rientjes, T. H. M. & Boekelman, R. H. (2001). Hydrological Models, Lecture Notes (CThe4431), Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences - Section of Hydrology and Ecology.
- Robert E. S., David, B., & Dean, O. (1998). A Framework of Characterization of Extreme Floods for Dam Safety Risk Assessments. *Proceeding USCOLD Annual Lecture*, Buffalo, New York.
- Romesburg, H. C. (1984). Cluster Analysis for Researches. Lifetime Learning Publications, Belmont.
- Ross, D. Z., David, G. J. & Richard, D. C. (2005). Comparison of HEC RAS with FLDWAV and DAMBRK Models for Dam Break Analysis, *CDA 2005 Annual Conference*, Alberta, Canada.
- Sari1, V., Nilza, M. R. C. & O, C. P. (2017). Estimate of Suspended Sediment Concentration from Monitored Data of Turbidity and Water Level Using Artificial Neural Networks. Water Resources Management, 15(31), 4909– 4923, DOI 10.1007/s11269-017-1785-4.
- Saumya, B., Kreeti, J. & Neeti, J. (2011). Artificial Neural Networks. International Journal of Soft Computing and Engineering (IJSCE), 7, 27-31.
- Savelieva, E. (2004). Automatic Spatial Prediction with General Regression Neural Network (GRNN). Nuclear Safety Institute (IBRAE) of Russian Academy of Science. 1(2).
- Sachin (2014) Dam Break Analysis using Mike 11 for Lower Nagavali Dam and Rukura Dam, Master Thesis. National Institute of Technology, Rourkela.
- Schwanenberg, D. & Harms, M. (2004). Discontinuous Galerkin Finite Element Method for Transcritical Two – dimensional Shallow Water Flows. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering – ASCE*, 130(5), 412–421.
- Shrestha, S. (2014). Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation in Water Resources and Water Use Sectors. Springer Water, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-09746-6\_4.
- Sillmann, J. & Roeckner, E. (2008). Indices for Extreme Events in Projections of Anthropogenic Climate Change. *Climate Change*, 86(1-2), 83–104.
- Sim, L.K. (1 990). Manual on Watershed Research. A publication of ASEAN-US Watershed Project, Philippine.
- Singh, V.P. (1996). Dam Breach Modelling Technology. *Kluwer Academic Pub*.
- Singh, V.P. (1996). Dam Breach Modelling Technology. *Water Science and Technology Library*. Vol.17. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston.

- Solava, S., & Delatte, N. (2003). Lesson of the Failure of the Teton Dam. *Proceedings* of the Third Congress, San Diego, CA, 178-189.
- Sreedaran R. (2013). Batu Dam Break Analysis and Two Dimensional Flood Modelling. Master Thesis, University Putra Malaysia.
- State of Colorado Department of Natural Resources Division of Water Resources (2010). GUIDELINES FOR DAM BREACH ANALYSIS. Report. <u>http://water.state.co.us</u>
- Sudheer, K. P., Gosain, A. K. & Ramasastri K. S. (2002). A Data-Driven Algorithm for Constructing Artificial Neural Network Rainfall-Runoff Models. *Hydrology Process*, 16(6), 1325–1330
- Sun, R., Wang, X., Zhou, Z., Ao, X. & Sun Song, X. M. (2014). Study of the Comprehensive Risk Analysis of Dam-Break Flooding Based on the Numerical Simulation of Flood Routing, *Natural Hazards*, 72(2), 675–700, DOI 10.1007/s11069-013-1029-8.
- Surina Binti Othman, (2011). Adaptation to Climate Change and Reducing Natural Disaster Risk: A Study on Country Practices and Lesson between Malaysia and Japan. (Final Research Report).
- Task Committee on Dam/Levee Break Fluvial Processes, (2010). Earthen Embankment Breaching. *Environment and Water Resources Institute*, American Society of Civil Engineers.
- Tenaga Malaysia Berhad (TNB) (2013). Climate Change Impact on Dam Safety Modelling and Lake Ecosystem at Chapter 3 Sungai Perak Power Station, Report, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Tokar, A., Sezin J. & Peggy A. (1999). Rainfall-Runoff Modelling using Artificial Neural Networks, *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering ASCE*, 4(3), 232-239.
- Tronto, I. F. B., Da Silva, J. D. S., & Sant' Anna, N. (2006). Comparison of Artificial Neural Network and Regression Models in Software Effort Estimation. NPE ePrint: <u>sid.inpe.br/ePrint@80/2006/12.08.12.47 v 2006-12-09</u>.
- Tseng, M. H. & Chu, C. R. (2000). Two Dimensional Shallow Water Flows Simulation using TVD-MacCormack Scheme. *Journal Hydraulic Research*, 38(2), 123–131.
- Tushar, A., Rajeshwar, M., Ashish S., Manish K., & Subashisa D. (2015). Impact of Climate Change on Floods in the Brahmaputr Basin using CMIP5 Decadal. Predictions, *Journal of Hydrology*, 527, 281–291, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.04.056</u>

- United States Bureau of Reclamation (1988). Downstream Hazard Classification Guidelines. ACER Technical Memorandum No. 11, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colorado.
- United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), (2000). The Failure of Teton Dam: Final Report by United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). http://www.usbr.gov/pn/about/Teton.html
- Vahid, N. (2016). An Emotional ANN (EANN) approach to modeling rainfall-runoff process. Journal of Hydrology, 544(2017), 267–277, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.11.033
- Valentin, A., Stefan L., Tobias, V., Samuel, F., Jafet C.M. A., Sandro C., Frank H.A., Fred, F. H. & Eva, P. N. (2016). Flood Projections within the Niger River Basin under Future Land Use and Climate Change, Science of the Total Environment, 562, 666–677, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.04.021.
- Vassilis, Z. A., Athanasios, V. A. (2017). Daily reference evapotranspiration estimates by artificial neural networks technique and empirical equations using limited input climate variables. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 132, 86– 96, doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2016.11.011
- Vischer, D.L. & Hager, W.H. (1998). Dam Hydraulics. John Wiley and Sons, 272-276.
- Visser, P.J. (1995). Application of Sediment Transport Formulae to Sand-Dike Breach erosion, Communications on Hydraulic and Geotechnical Engineering, Report 94-7, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Delft University of Technology (TU Delft), Delft, The Netherlands.
- Visser, P.J. (1998). Breach growth in sand-dikes, Ph.D. Thesis, Delft University of Technology, Delft, and The Netherlands.
- Von Thun, J. L. & Gillette, A. M. (1990). Guidance on breach parameters. The unpublished internal document, *U.S.Bureau of Reclamation*. Accessed March 13, Denver, Colorado
- Wahl T. L. (2010). Dam breach modeling an overview of analysis methods. 2<sup>nd</sup> Joint *Federal Interagency Conference*, Las Vegas.
- Wahl TL (2004). The uncertainty of predictions of embankment dam breach parameters. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering ASCE*, 130(5):389–397.
- Walder, J.S. & O'Connor, J.E. (1997). Methods for predicting peak discharge of floods caused by the failure of natural and constructed earth dams. *Water Resources Research*, 33(10): 2337-2348.

- Wang, J., Liang, D., Zhang, J. & Yang, X. (2016). Comparison between shallow water and Boussinesq models for predicting cascading dam-break flows. *Natural Hazards*, 83(1), 327–343, DOI 10.1007/s11069-016-2317-x.
- Wang, J.D. (1990). Numerical Modelling of Bay Circulation, The Sea, Ocean Engineering Science, 9, Part B, Chapter 32, 1033-1067.
- World Meteorological Organisation (1969). Estimation of maximum floods, Tech. Note No. 98, WMO No. 233, TP-126.
- World Meteorological Organisation (1970). Guide to hydro- meteorological practices, WMO No. 168, TP-82.
- World Meteorological Organisation (1986). Manual for estimation of probable maximum precipitation. Operational Hydrology Report No.l, WMO.
- Xu, Y. & Zhang L.M. (2010). Breaching parameters for earth and Rockfill dams. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 135(12), 1957– 1970.
- Yi, F. & Xiong (2011). A Dam Break Analysis Using HEC-RAS, Journal of Water Resource and Protection, 2011, 3(6), 370-379, doi:10.4236/jwarp.2011.36047.
- Zhang, L. M. Y. X. & J. S. Jia. (2007). Analysis of earth dam failures A database approach. *First International Symposium on Geotechnical Safety & Risk*, Shanghai Tongji University, China.



## **UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

## STATUS CONFIRMATION FOR THESIS / PROJECT REPORT AND COPYRIGHT

## ACADEMIC SESSION :

## TITLE OF THESIS / PROJECT REPORT :

## FLOOD MODELING OF DAM BREAK WITH CONSIDERATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE

#### NAME OF STUDENT: SAAD SHAUKET SAMMEN

I acknowledge that the copyright and other intellectual property in the thesis/project report belonged to Universiti Putra Malaysia and I agree to allow this thesis/project report to be placed at the library under the following terms:

- 1. This thesis/project report is the property of Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- 2. The library of Universiti Putra Malaysia has the right to make copies for educational purposes only.
- 3. The library of Universiti Putra Malaysia is allowed to make copies of this thesis for academic exchange.

I declare that this thesis is classified as :



[Note : If the thesis is CONFIDENTIAL or RESTRICTED, please attach with the letter from the organization/institution with period and reasons for confidentially or restricted.]

#### LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

#### **Published Paper**

- Saad Sh. Sammen, T. A. Mohamed, A. H. Ghazali, A. El-Shafie & L. M. Sidek (2016) Generalized Regression Neural Network for Prediction of Peak Outflow from Dam Breach, Journal of Water Resources Management (2017) 31:549–562 DOI 10.1007/s11269-016-1547-8.
- Saad Sh. Sammen, T. A. Mohamed, A. H. Ghazali, L. M. Sidek & A. El-Shafie (2017) An evaluation of existent methods for estimation of embankment dam breach parameters, Journal of Natural Hazards, Nat Hazards (2017) 87:545–566. DOI 10.1007/s11069-017-2764-z.

#### **Conference Paper**

- Saad Sh. Sammen, T. A. Mohamed, A. H. Ghazali, L. M. Sidek & Azlan Abdul Aziz (2016) Generalized Regression Neural Network for Predication of Dam Breach Width, World Research and Innovation Convention on Engineering and Technology Cong. 24 -25, Langkawi, Kedah, Malaysia.
- Saad Sh. Sammen, T. A. Mohamed, A. H. Ghazali, L. M. Sidek & Azlan Abdul Aziz (2017) Estimation of Failure Time for Embankment Dams, 37<sup>th</sup> IAHR World Congress, Managing Water for Sustainable Development, 13 – 18 Augest, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Saad Sh. Sammen, T. A. Mohamed, A. H. Ghazali, L. M. Sidek & Azlan Estimation of Probable Maximum Precipitation for Tropical Catchment, Accepted to Third International Conference on Buildings, Construction and 33Environmental Engineering (BCEE3) which will be held Egypt from 23-25 October 2017.

#### **Other Papers**

Muhammad Rizal Razali, Saad Sh. Sammen, Azzlia Mohammed Unaini, Thamer Ahamed Mohammed (2017) 37<sup>th</sup> IAHR World Congress, Managing Water for Sustainable Development, 13 – 18 Augest, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia