

Evaluation of different erosion models for debris flow modeling

Seungjun Lee¹, Hyunuk An¹, Minseok Kim²

¹Dept. of Agriculture and rural engineering, Chungnam National University, Korea, ²Geological Environment Disaster Research Center, Korea Institute of Geoscience and Mineral Resources, Korea





METHODOLOGY

- ✓ The Deb2D is two-dimensional debris flow simulation software based on quadtree-grid.
- It used a vertically integrated shallow-water governing equation and implemented a finite-volume method(FVM) for discretization.
- In the Deb2D, Voellmy, Takahashi, Bingham, and Coulomb-vi models can be selected as <u>rheological models</u>. In this study, Voellmy model was used.
- ✓ For the erosion model, Sovilla, McDougall & Hungr and Frank were applied and compared.
- ✓ The parameters were calibrated against the observed data(Aerial LiDAR DEM).
- ✓ The parameters were calibrated against the observed data in the Raemian apartment basin.
- The parameter of each erosion model calibrated in the Raemian was applied equally to the Sindong-A apartment basin, and the generality of the parameters and model was observed.



Discussion

- •The total debris-flow volume, maximum velocity, and inundated depth resulted from several erosion models were compared to the field survey data.
- The shape of the erosion depth that **Frank** model was most similar to the observation.
- •However, the Frank model showed the worst accuracy in volume of entrainment
- •The Sovilla model with one parameter showed the most stable results.
- Particularly, the flow velocity of the debris analyzed through the Deb2D model was found to be very low compared to the overall entrainment(erosion) model.
- •Also, the observed flow velocity in the field are 28m/s and 18m/s, which is very large compared to the past debris flow events in the world.
- •This was confirmed to be very large due to the continuous rainfall caused by the torrential rainfall in Mt. Umyeon in 2011, and it was difficult to implement it in the model.

STUDY EVENT

In July 2011, a landslide occurred due to torrential rain in Mt. Umyeon in Seoul, Republic of Korea.





In the series of landslides that occurred, we studied the watersheds of Raemian and Sindong-A.

UebZl

McDougall & Hungr Sovilla **Observation** Frank Conclusion 1. H_{max}= 5.7m 1. H_{max}= 4.6m 1. H_{max}=5.6m Depth (m) **Field survey** Raemian 2. $v_{max} = 10.2 \text{m/s}$ 2. $v_{max} = 10.6 \text{m/s}$ 2. $v_{max} = 13.9 \text{ m/s}$ 1. $H_{max} \approx 8 \sim 10 m$ 3. $V = 42,014m^3$ • We analyzed the results by 2. $v_{max} \approx 28 \text{m/s}$ 3. $V \approx 42,500 \text{m}^3$ 3. V= 43,497m³ 3. $V = 42,547 \text{m}^3$ applying various erosion models to one rheological 1. Inundated depth model using the Deb2D model. estimated at this area µ=0.060 In future studies, various ξ=2,000m/s² erosion models will be dz/dt=0.033m/s µ=0.060 $\tau_c = 1.00 \text{kPa}$ µ=0.060 applied to various dz/dt=0.50m/kPa ξ=2,000m/s² ξ=2,000m/s² rheological models, and ρ=1,900kg/m³ κ=0.0030 e=9.93 quantitative combinations as well as qualitative 1. H_{max}= 3.5m 1. H_{max}= 5.3m 1. $H_{max} = 4.5m$ Sindonga Field survey 2. $v_{max} = 9.2 m/s$ 2. $v_{max} = 10.6 \text{m/s}$ 2. v_{max}= 11.0m/s comparisons will be made to $H_{max} \approx 6 \sim 8 m$ 3. $V = 87,069 \text{m}^3$ 3. V = 40,473m³ 2. $v_{max} \approx 18.6 \text{m/s}$ 3. $V \approx 44,500 \text{m}^3$ 3. V= 68,431m³ determine the best combination and 2. Max. velocity parameters for the study estimate at this area area.

3. Entrainment volume









• Also, in the above process, we

want to understand the

features, advantages, and

disadvantages of each model.