

Three different models were tested for the computation of the near-bank shear stress: the empirical distribution from Simon and Senturk (1977), the computing scheme of the River2D hydrodynamic model, and the analytical model from Kean and Smith (2006a).



A comparison between riverbank erosion models with an evaluation of the risk

Laura Nardi, Lorenzo Campo

Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile, University of Florence, E-mail: *lcampo1 @dicea.unifi.it*,

STEP 1: DATA COLLECTION	GPS, Grain size distribution, CSM, Bank roughness					
STEP 2: HYDRODYNAMIC MODELLING Q: $5 \Rightarrow 671.2 \text{m}^3/\text{s}$	- 1D Model → 2D. Mode					
STEP 3: NUMERICAL IMPLEMENTATION	Near-bank shear stress (KEAN AND SMITH, 2006)					
STEP 4: NEAR-BANK SHEAR STRESS ANALYSIS AND ERODIBILITY PARAMETERS CALIBRATION	→ Comparison of results from models and calibration of erodibility parameters					
STEP 5: COUPLING FLUVIAL EROSION AND BANK STABILITY ANALYSIS (at 2 representative banks)	River2D-K&S + BSTEM					
STEP 6: FRAMEWORK FOR FLUVIAL	Excess shear stress (Partheniades 1963)					

INPL

Sectior
M1
M1
M1
M1
V1
V1
V1
V1





3. Calibration of erodibility parameters

A calibration of the models was performed basing on observations from aerial photos on the region in a period of ten years (1994-2004) and the results of the different combination of the models are discussed and compared.

JT	DATA	

1. Measured bank retreat (GIS on aerial photos)

2. Flow events between 1994-2004

Step Hydrograph

Shear stresses along the bank for each discharge in the hydrograph and for each hydr. model

 $\varepsilon = k_d (\tau - \tau_c)^a$ (Partheniades, 1963)



1994-2004						1994-2000						2000-2004							
Hydr.	Shear Stress	t _{c_g}	K _{d–c}	K _{d—g}	Error		Hydr.	Shear	t _{c_g}	K _{d–c}	K _{d–g}	Error	Section	Hydr.	Shear Stress	t _{c_g}	K _{d-c}	K_{d-g}	Error
Mod.	Mod.	[Pa]	[m ³ Ns ⁻¹]	[m ³ Ns ⁻¹]	[m]	Section	Mod.	Stress Mod.	[Pa]	[m ³ Ns ⁻¹]	[m ³ Ns ⁻¹]	[m]	Section	Mod.	Mod.	[Pa]	[m ³ Ns ⁻¹]	[m ³ Ns ⁻¹]	[m]
HR	SS	5.61	5.07E-07	1.07E-06	< 0.5	M1	HR	SS	5.56	7.25E-07	1.15E-06	< 0.5	M1	HR	SS	5.74	4.05E-08	1.08E-06	< 0.5
HR	KS	5.59	5.24E-07	1.38E-06	< 0.5	M1	HR	KS	5.41	6.70E-07	1.54E-06	< 0.5	M1	HR	KS	5.71	9.71E-07	1.33E-06	< 0.5
R2D	R2D	5.67	2.42E-07	6.85E-06	< 0.5	M1	R2D	R2D	5.64	1.41E-07	9.41E-06	< 0.5	M1	R2D	R2D	5.67	7.54E-07	5.92E-06	< 0.5
R2D	KS	5.65	4.04E-07	2.75E-05	< 0.5	M1	R2D	KS	5.61	1.01E-08	4.59E-05	< 0.5	M1	R2D	KS	5.64	3.02E-07	2.17E-05	< 0.5
HR	SS	-	-	-	-	V1	HR	SS	4.96	6.78E-08	3.54E-07	< 0.5	V1	HR	SS	29.13	2.89E-07	3.53E-07	< 0.5
HR	KS	4.39	2.89E-08	6.47E-07	< 0.5	V1	HR	KS	4.56	2.92E-07	2.25E-06	< 0.5	V1	HR	KS	8.01	7.36E-08	1.26E-07	< 0.5
R2D	R2D	-	-	-	-	V1	R2D	R2D	2.72	7.22E-07	2.57E-04	< 0.5	V1	R2D	R2D	4.5	1.12E-07	3.72E-06	1.06
R2D	KS	4.09	2.58E-07	7.06E-05	< 0.5	V1	R2D	KS	4.23	5.03E-07	2.93E-04	< 0.5	V1	R2D	KS	4.28	4.28E-07	9.03E-06	< 0.5
	HR=HEC-RAS; R2D=River2D; SS=Simon and Senturk (1977); KS= Kean and Smith (2006a)																		

4. Evaluation of the risk

A framework was developed for risk analysis of land loss due to bank erosion, and an application to the study case is provided by using the results of fluvial erosion modeling.



Location of bank M1 at the study reach

I. Computation of Flow duration curve $\varepsilon = k_d (\tau - \tau_c)^a$ IV. Computation of *local loss duration curve* r 1 year $\boldsymbol{R} =$ Ldt





Riverbank retreat									
Frame-Time	M1 [m]	V1 [m]							
1994-2000	11 ± 2.1	12.5 ± 2.1							
2000-2004	19.5 ± 1.5	1 ± 1.5							
1994-2004	$\textbf{30.5} \pm \textbf{1.3}$	13.5 ± 1.3							



II. Estimation of near-bank shear stress for each value of discharge

III. Application of fluvial erosion model for each value of bank shear stress

L (LOSS)= Bank retreat x Price of land [€/m·day]