

BOUNDARY SHEAR STRESS DISTRIBUTION IN COMPOUND OPEN CHANNEL FLOW

Mr. Kishanjit Kumar Khatua¹

Prof. Kanhu Charan Patra²

ABSTRACT: *Reliable prediction of boundary shear distribution in open channel flow is crucial in many critical engineering problems such as channel design, calculation of energy losses, and sedimentation. During floods, part of the discharge of a river is carried by the simple main channel and the rest are carried by the floodplains located to its sides. For such compound channels, the flow structure becomes complicated due to the transfer of momentum between the deep main channel and the adjoining floodplains which magnificently affects the shear stress distribution in floodplain and main channel sub sections. Knowledge of momentum transfer across the assumed interfaces starting from the junction between main channel and flood plain can be acquired from the distribution of boundary shear in the sub sections. An investigation concerning the distribution of shear stress in the main channel and floodplain of meandering and straight compound channels are presented. Based on the experimental results of boundary shear, this paper predicts the distribution of boundary shear carried by main channel and floodplain sub-sections of meandering and straight compound channels. Five dimensionless parameters are used to form equations representing the total shear force percentage carried by floodplains. A set of smooth and rough sections is studied with aspect ratio varying from 2 to 5. The model is also validated using the data of other investigators.*

Key words: Boundary shear, Interface plane, Compound channel, Flood Plain, Meandering channels, Over-bank flow, apparent shear,

¹Sr. Lecturer, Department of Civil Engineering, N.I.T.Rourkela, Orissa, India email: kkkhatua@yahoo.com / kkkhatua@nitrl.ac.in

²Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, N.I.T.Rourkela, Orissa, India email: prof_kcpatra@yahoo.com / kcpatra@nitrl.ac.in

INTRODUCTION

Information regarding the nature of boundary shear stress distribution in a flowing simple and compound channel is needed to solve a variety of river hydraulics and engineering problems such as, to give a basic understanding of the resistance relationship, to understand the mechanism of sediment transport, to design stable channels, revetments (Ghosh and Jena, 1971). The boundary shear stress distribution, velocity distribution and flow resistance in compound cross section channels have been investigated by many authors (Wright and Carstens 1970, Myers, and Elsayy 1975, Knight 1981, Rhodos and Lamb 1991, Rhodos and Knight 1994, Knight and Cao 1994, Patra and Kar 2000, Patra and Kar 2004). Most of hydraulic formulae assume that the boundary shear stress distribution is uniform over the wetted perimeter. Distribution of boundary shear stress mainly depends upon the shape of the cross section and the structure of the secondary flow cells. However, for meander channel - floodplain geometry, there is wide variation in the local shear stress distribution from point to point in the wetted perimeter. Therefore, there is a need to evaluate the boundary shear stress carried by the main channel and floodplain walls at various locations of meander path. The aim of this study is to describe the effect of the interaction mechanism on the basis of shear stress distribution in meandering and straight compound channel sections.




Fig.1(a) Schematic Diagram showing Experimental Setup (Plan View)




FIG. 1(b) Plan Forms of Meandering Experimental Channels with Floodplains

EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Experimental data from three types of channels are presented in this paper. Schematic diagram showing experimental set up along with the plan forms of the meandering channels with floodplains are shown in Fig.1. The summary of experimental runs for the meandering compound channel geometries are given in Table 1. Series-A channel is asymmetrical with two unequal floodplains attached to both sides of the main channel. The Series C, D, F and G channels are asymmetrical with only floodplain attached to one side of the main channel. The surfaces of both main channel and floodplain of channels Series A, C, D and I are smooth but the surfaces (both main channel and floodplain) of the channel series F and G are roughened with rubber beads of 4 mm diameter at 12 mm centre to centre. Series I channel is symmetrical with two equal floodplains attached to both sides of the main channel.

A recirculating system of water supply is established with pumping of water from an underground sump to an overhead tank from where water could flow under gravity through a sharp-crested V-notch measuring device to a stilling tank. From the stilling tank water is led to the experimental channel through a baffle wall, and a transition zone helped reduce turbulence of the water flow. An adjustable tailgate at the downstream end of the flume is used to achieve uniform flow over the test reach in the channel for a given discharge. Water from the channel is collected in a tank from where it is pumped back to the system. The measuring devices consist of a point gauge mounted on a traversing mechanism to measure depths having a least count of 0.1 mm, a Preston micro-Pitot tube in conjunction with a water manometer is used to measure dynamic pressures for the evaluation of boundary shear stress and velocity. The tube is fabricated locally according to the design used by Ippen and Drinker (1962).

The ratio α between overall width B and main channel width b of the meandering compound channels could be varied from 2.13 to 5.25 for the three types of channels. The channel sections are made from Perspex sheets for which the roughness of floodplain and main channel are identical. The observations are made at the section of maximum curvatures (bend apex) of the meandering channel geometries. Experiments are conducted utilizing the facilities available at the Water Resources and Hydraulic Engineering Laboratory of the Civil Engineering Department of the Indian Institute of

Technology, Kharagpur India. For each channel, boundary shear stress measurements at three locations in the meander path covering a number of points in the wetted perimeter for each location have been obtained from the dynamic pressure drop measured by Preston tube - micro manometer system and also from the semi log plot of velocity distribution. Estimation of boundary shear stress by Preston tube technique provides a simple, reliable and quicker alternative involving the recording of the dynamic pressure drop along the flow boundary. The diameter of the Preston tube used is such that it lies in the region of dynamic similarity, which is about one-fifth of the boundary layer thickness. In other words, the diameter of the tube has great influence on the shear measurement at the channel bed. While dealing with the flow over rough boundaries care has been taken to locate the tube from zero datum such that the roughness distribution does not influence the recording of the dynamic pressure drop. In view of the complexities involved in converting the dynamic pressure drop to shear stress, the computed mean shear by both the approaches are compared with the energy gradient approach and the closest values of shear distribution are considered for the study. While calculating the shear stress, the value of Von Karman's constant k is taken as 0.40 for both smooth and rough boundary. Though the general pattern of distribution of shear stress by both the methods is somewhat similar, there exist some local variations in the approaches. One reason for the disagreement of local shear stress can be the error in computing the local shear velocities from velocity profiles at these locations.

Table 1. Summary of Experimental Runs for Meandering Channel with Floodplains

Experi-ment series/ Run No	Nature of Channel surface	Bed slope	Top width B (cm)	Main channel width b (cm)	Total depth of Flow H (cm)	Depth of lower main channel h (cm)	Sinuo-sity S_r	Amplitude/ Width ratio (R)	Observed Discharge (cm^3/sc)	%age of flood plain shear ($\% S_{fp}$)	Shape of the compound channel section
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
A.1	smooth	0.0061	52.5	10	11.6	10	1.22	0.178	3960	64.1	
A.2	smooth	0.0061	52.5	10	14.9	10	1.22	0.178	14000	67.0	
A.3	smooth	0.0061	52.5	10	16.8	10	1.22	0.178	19500	67.4	
C.4	smooth	0.004	21.3	10	12.19	10	1.21	(-)0.481	5800	29.0	
C.5	smooth	0.004	21.3	10	13.81	10	1.21	(-)0.481	8450	34.8	
C.6	smooth	0.004	21.3	10	15.24	10	1.21	(-)0.481	11200	38.0	
D.7	smooth	0.004	41.8	10	12.19	10	1.21	0.245	5800	59.2	
D.8	smooth	0.004	41.8	10	14.08	10	1.21	0.245	8450	59.9	
F.9	rough	0.004	21.3	10	12.22	10	1.21	(-)0.481	5500	27.1	
F.10	rough	0.004	21.3	10	13.71	10	1.21	(-)0.481	8200	34.4	
F.11	rough	0.004	21.3	10	15.24	10	1.21	(-)0.481	10900	36.1	
G.12	rough	0.004	41.8	10	12.49	10	1.21	0.245	5500	55.9	
G.13	rough	0.004	41.8	10	14.23	10	1.21	0.245	8200	56.0	
G.14	rough	0.004	41.8	10	15.84	10	1.21	0.245	10900	60.0	
I.15	smooth	0.00278	138	44	29.5	25	1.043	0.072	94535	37.1	
I.16	smooth	0.00278	138	44	30.7	25	1.043	0.072	103537	42.8	
I.17	smooth	0.00278	138	44	31.6	25	1.043	0.072	108583	46.1	

BOUNDARY SHEAR FORCE RESULTS

The shear stress distribution at the bend apex of two typical channels (Table 1) A-3 and C-6 are shown in Fig.2 (a) and Fig.2 (b) respectively. Various boundary elements of the compound channels are labeled

from 1– 4 in Fig.3. Label (1) denotes the vertical wall(s) of floodplain with length $[2(\bar{H}- h)]$ and label (2) denotes floodplain bed(s) with length $(\bar{B}-b)$. Label (3) denotes the two main channel walls and the bed of the main channel is represented by label (4). The measured shear stresses are integrated over the respective lengths of each boundary elements to obtain the boundary shear force per unit length for the elements. The total shear force carried by the floodplain beds and walls are very important because the apparent shear force acting on the assumed interfaces originating from the junction between floodplain and main channel can be determined once this quantity is known. The sum of the boundary shear forces for all beds and walls of the compound channel is used as a divisor to calculate the shear force percentages carried by the boundary elements. The shear force percentage carried by the floodplains is represented as $\%S_{fp}$, and for the main channel it is represented as $\%S_{mc}$. The shear force percentages carried by the floodplain ($\%S_{fp}$) with depth ratio $(H-h)/H$ for all of the compound channels for varying geometries ($\alpha = 2.13-5.25$) are given in Col.11 of Table 1. It can be seen from Table 1 that the value of flood plain shear increases with depth of flow in the compound channel. This follows the established theory.




Fig. 2(a) Isovel and Boundary shear stress distribution Of Meandering Channel with both side Flood plain




Fig. 2(b) Isovel and Boundary shear stress distribution Of Meandering Channel with one side Flood plain

For the channels, the variation of shear force in floodplains with relative depth β are shown in Fig.4. Clearly the figure indicates that the percentage of total shear force carried by the floodplain beds and walls $\%S_{fp}$ increases with relative depth $\beta [= (H-h)/H]$. Floodplain shear increases with increasing the channel width ratio $\alpha [=B/b]$ and decreases with increase in sinuosity Sr (the ratio of valley slope to channel slope) and R (amplitude by width ratio).




Fig. 3 Notations

APPARENT SHEAR FORCE ON VARIOUS INTERFACES

The apparent shear force at the assumed interface plane gives an insight into the magnitude of flow interaction between the main channel and the adjacent floodplains basing on which the merits of the

selection of the interface plains for discharge estimation are decided. The conventional method of calculation of discharge in compound sections divides the channel into hydraulically homogeneous regions by plane originating from the junction of the floodplain and main channel, so that the floodplain region can be considered as moving separately from the main channel. The assumed plane may be: (1) vertical interface aa_1 ; (2) horizontal interface aa or (3) diagonal interface aa_2 (Fig.3). Once the shear force carried by the floodplain is known, the apparent shear force acting on the imaginary interface of the compound section can be calculated. These apparent shear forces may then be used to get an idea of the momentum transfer between the different subsections of the compound channel. For any regular prismatic channel under uniform flow conditions the sum of boundary shear forces acting on the main channel wall and bed together with an ‘‘apparent shear force’’ acting on the interface plane between main channel and floodplain must be equal to the resolved weight force along the main channel and is written as

$$\rho g A_{mc} S = \int_{mc} \tau dp + ASF_{ip} \quad (1)$$




FIG. 4 Variation % of Flood plain shear with relative depth

in which g = gravitational acceleration, ρ = density of flowing fluid, S = slope of the energy line, A_{mc} = area of the main channel defined by the interface plane, $\int_{mc} \tau dp$ = shear force on the surfaces of the main channel consisting of two vertical walls and bed, and ASF_{ip} = apparent shear force of the imaginary interface plane. Because the boundary shear stress carried by the compound section ($\rho g AS$) is equal to 100%, where A is the total cross section of the compound channel, the percentage shear force carried by the main channel surfaces can be calculated as

$$\% S_{mc} = 100 \frac{\int_{mc} \tau dp}{\rho g AS} = 100 \frac{\rho g A_{mc} S}{\rho g AS} - 100 \frac{ASF_{ip}}{\rho g AS} \quad (2)$$

But since $\% S_{mc} = 100 - \% Sf$; and $100(ASF_{ip}/\rho g AS)$ = percentage of shear force on the assumed interface, substituting the values the apparent shear force on the interface plane is calculated as

$$\% ASF_{ip} = 100 \frac{A_{mc}}{A} - \{100 - \% Sf\} \quad (3)$$

in which $\% ASF_{ip}$ = percentage of shear force in the interface plane. By substituting the value of A_{mc} and A in terms of α and β , the apparent shear forces can be expressed as percentages of the total channel shear force in the form of following relations:

$$\% ASF_V = \frac{50}{[(\alpha - 1)\beta + 1]} - \frac{1}{2}\{100 - \% Sf\} \quad (4a)$$

$$\% ASF_D = \frac{25(2 - \beta)}{[(\alpha - 1)\beta + 1]} - \frac{1}{2}\{100 - \% Sf\} \quad (4b)$$

$$\% ASF_H = \frac{100(1 - \beta)}{[(\alpha - 1)\beta + 1]} - \{100 - \% Sf\} \quad (4c)$$

Where $\%ASF_V$, $\%ASF_D$, $\%ASF_H$ are the percentage of apparent shears in the assumed vertical, diagonal and horizontal interfaces respectively. For example, for vertical interface between the boundary of the floodplain and main channel shown as the lines aa_1 in Fig.3 the value of A_{mc} is the area marked by a_1abbaa_1 , which when substituted in (4a), yields $\%ASF_V$. Similarly, for horizontal or diagonal interfaces, A_{mc} can be estimated from the areas marked as $aabb$ or $a_2aabb aa_2$ respectively.

Selection of suitable interfaces for calculating conveyance by divided channel method becomes easier once we know the apparent shear in different assumed interfaces. Percentages of apparent shear force for the assumed vertical, horizontal, and diagonal interface planes may be calculated using the equation 4. Toebe and Sooky (1967) carried out laboratory experiments on two stage composite channel section and showed that a nearly horizontal fluid boundary located at the junction between the main channel and flood plain would be more realistic than other interfaces. Wormleaton, et al. (1980, 1982) proposed an apparent shear stress ratio by which suitability of interface plain for calculation of discharge can be predicted. Holden (1986), Stephenson and Kolovpoulos (1990) proposed the area method for discharge calculation in compound channel by selecting a curved interface by assuming the apparent shear along the interface length as zero. Patra and Kar (2000) proposed the variable interface method of discharge calculation for meandering and straight compound channel. Percentage of apparent shear force for the assumed vertical, horizontal and diagonal interface planes can be calculated using the equation 4. For the assumed vertical interface plane, the shear force is always positive for the ranges of α and β tested. A positive value indicates transfer of momentum from the main channel to the floodplain at the assumed plane indicating the floodplain flow retarding the main channel flow. This apparent shear is higher than the bed-shear stress at low floodplain depths and reduces gradually as β increases. For example, for channel series A.1 the apparent shear stress is 4.2% per unit length of the vertical interface plane while the bed shear stress of the main channel per unit length of wetted perimeter is 1.2% of the total shear stress. A similar trend is noticed for all other channels and for all the runs. For the diagonal and horizontal interface planes it is observed that the apparent shear force is positive at low depths and changes sign as depth increases indicating that at higher depths over floodplain there is transfer of momentum from the floodplain to the main channel. A smaller value of apparent shear stress renders the interface plane more suitable, but a large negative value of apparent shear stress at higher depths makes the interface plane unsuitable for separating the channel into hydraulically homogeneous zones for calculating discharge of compound channels by the divided channel method.

DEVELOPMENT OF SHEAR FORCE MODEL

Knight and Hamed (1984) investigated smooth compound channels having a bank full depth of 76 mm that can be considered close to the present channels for which most of data are presented and proposed equation for the percentage of total shear force carried by the floodplain as

$$\%S_{fp} = 48(\alpha - 0.8)^{0.289}(2\beta)^m \quad (5a)$$

where the exponent m can be calculated from the relation $m = 1 / [0.75 e^{0.38\alpha}]$. These equations apply to the straight compound channels having symmetry with respect to the main channel centerline. Patra and Kar (2000) extended (5a) and proposed equation for the percentage of total shear force carried by the floodplain for the meandering compound channels as

$$\% S_{fp} = 48(\alpha - 0.8)^{0.289} (2\beta)^m [1 + \alpha \text{Re}^{-13.25\beta\delta}] \quad (5b)$$

where the exponent m can be calculated from the relation $m = 1 / [0.75 e^{0.38(\alpha - R)}]$.

in which R = ratio of the amplitude of the meandering channel to the top width B of the compound section, the values of which are given in col. 9 of Table 1, and δ = aspect ratio of the main channel b/h , b = width of main channel and d = bank full depth of main channel. The equation is valid for the meandering compound sections having smooth boundaries or with equal roughness in the floodplain and in the main channel. For the compound channel with different roughness Patra and Kar (2000) further proposed the following general equation for the percentage of floodplain shear as

$$\% S_{fp} = 48(\alpha - 0.8)^{0.289} (2\beta)^m [1 + \alpha \text{Re}^{-13.25\beta\delta}] \{1 + 1.02\sqrt{\beta} \log \gamma\} \quad (5c)$$

where γ = the ratio of Manning's roughness n of the floodplain to that for the main channel. For straight channel the value of R is zero. A zero value of R reduces (5b) & (5c) to the form of Knight and Hamed (1984) and for channels with equal surface roughness in the floodplain and main channel for $\gamma=1$, the equation further reduces to the form proposed by Knight and Hamed (1984).

Due to complexity of the empirical equations proposed by the previous investigators a regression analysis is made to obtain a simple but more reliable equation to predict the percentage of floodplain shear. To best understand the variation of floodplain shear with α and β , plots between percentage of floodplain shear ($\%S_{fp}$) with β for various compound channel geometry ($\alpha = 2, \alpha = 3, \alpha = 4$) for straight compound channels of Knight and Demetrious (1983) are shown in Fig 5 (a). From these plots the best fitted power function between ($\%S_{fp}$) with β is selected as

$$\% S_{fp} = F [A (\beta)^B] \quad (6)$$

Similarly in Fig. 5 (b) plot between ($\%S_{fp}$) with α for various relative depth β have been made and the best fitted logarithmic function has been chosen as

$$\% S_{fp} = F [A + B \text{Log}(\alpha)] \quad (7)$$




Fig 5(a)




Fig. 5 (b)

Fig. 5 Variation of Flood plain shear with Depth Ratio β and Width Ratio α

Therefore for a straight compound channel the equation for percentage of shear carried by floodplain can be modeled as

$$\%S_{fp} = A(\beta)^B [B + C \text{Log}(\alpha)] \quad (8a)$$

or

$$\%S_{fp} = 1.451 \beta^{0.1833} (38.269 \text{Ln} \alpha + 3.6262) \quad (8b)$$

Equation (8) is for straight compound channel with smooth surfaces only. For different roughness in main channel and flood plain surface it is further modified as.

$$\%S_{fp} = 1.451 \beta^{0.1833} (38.269 \text{Ln} \alpha + 3.6262) \{1 + 1.02 \sqrt{\beta} \log \gamma\} \quad (9)$$

where γ = the ratio of Manning's roughness n of the floodplain and that for the main channel. For meandering channel with floodplain the distribution is further complicated and modified due to meandering effect. It has been observed from the experimental result that the percentage of boundary shear is inversely proportional to Sinuosity (S_r) and exponentially on amplitude(ϵ)/width ratio(B) = R . Finally a general equation for meandering compound channel is modeled as

$$\%S_{fp} = 1.451 \beta^{0.1833} (38.269 \text{Ln} \alpha + 3.6262) \left[\frac{(1 + \alpha \text{Re}^{-13.25\beta\delta})}{S_r} \right] \{1 + 1.02 \sqrt{\beta} \log \gamma\} \quad (10)$$

Review of the literature show that investigators propose alternatives interface planes to calculate the total discharge carried by a compound channel section. Either including or excluding the interface length in the wetted perimeter does not make sufficient allowance for discharge calculation for all depths of flow over floodplain. It results either overestimate or underestimate of the discharge results because of not taking care of momentum transfer in terms of apparent shear at the respective interfaces. Having computed $\%S_{fp}$ through (10), it is easy to evaluate (4) for the assumed interface plane. For example, for vertical interface between the boundary of the floodplain and main channel shown as the lines aa_1 in Fig.4 the value of A_{mc} is the area marked by a_1abba_1 , which when substituted in (5), yields $\%ASF_v$. Similarly, for horizontal or diagonal interfaces, A_{mc} can be estimated from the areas marked as $aabb$ or $a_2aabb a_2$, respectively, in Fig.4. After finding out apparent shear in the assumed interface of a compound channel, it becomes easier for selection of suitable interfaces for discharge calculation. If the apparent shear is negligible for any interfaces (generally diagonal interfaces) in the divided channel method, than in sub section perimeter calculation the interface length is not included in sub section discharge calculation. After finding the sub section discharges the total corrected discharge is obtained by adding the sub section discharges. For any depth of flow in a compound channel if apparent shear is equal to boundary shear of main channel or flood plain than the interface lengths are added subsection perimeter of main channel to obtain the correct discharge. If apparent shear is very large for any over bank depth of flow compared to boundary shear of the subsection perimeter than the selection of respective interface plain gives erroneous discharge result for the compound channel.

Using (10), the variation of computed percentage of shear force for floodplain wetted perimeter with the observed value of the straight compound channels of Knight and Demetrious (1983) is shown in Fig. 6(a). The variation of computed percentage of shear force of flood plain wetted perimeter with the observed value for meandering compound channels of Patra and Kar (2000) is plotted in Fig. 6(b). Fig. 6 shows that the present model gives less error as compared to the previous models.




Fig. 6(a)




Fig. 6(b)

Fig. 6 Variation of Observed Value and Modeled Value of Flood plain shear

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are drawn:

1. Distribution of shear stress along the boundary of straight and meandering compound channels are observed and examined. New empirical relationships to predict the percentage of boundary shear in the floodplain of compound sections for the types of geometry investigated are presented. Equation (10) is found to be quite adequate to predict the percentage of boundary shear in the floodplain.
2. For the straight compound channels the important parameters effecting the boundary shear distribution are relative depth (β), the width ratio (α), and the ratio of Manning's roughness n of the floodplain to that for the main channel (γ). These three dimensionless parameters are used to form equation representing the total shear force percentage carried by floodplains.
3. For the meandering compound channels the additional important parameters effecting the boundary shear distribution are sinuosity (S_r), the amplitude (ϵ) and the aspect ratio (δ) in addition to the other three parameters of straight compound channels. These six dimensionless parameters are used to form general equations representing the total shear force percentage carried by floodplains of meandering compound channels.
4. The proposed equations give good result with the observed data. The models are also validated using the data of Knight and Demetriou (1983).
5. Once the percentage of boundary shear in the floodplain of a compound section is determined, the apparent shear at the assumed vertical, horizontal or diagonal interface planes of separation of compound sections can easily evaluated using equation (4). This further helps in identifying the best alternative interface plane in calculating the section discharge of the compound section using "divided channel method". The question of including the length of interface plane with the wetter perimeter or excluding the length depends on the magnitude of the shear at the interface.

It is recommended that further investigation be focused on extending the present analysis to the compound channel of different cross sections (trapezoidal sections).

NOTATIONS

The following symbols are used in this paper

A = total cross-sectional area of compound channel;

B = top width of compound channel;

b = width of main channel;

g = gravitational acceleration;

H = depth of flow in main channel;

h = height of main channel up to floodplain bed;

k = Von Karman constant;

m = exponent used in Eq. (5a);

n = Manning's roughness factor;

R = ratio of amplitude of compound channel to top width B ;

S_r = sinuosity of meander channel

α = width ratio = B/b ;

β = relative depth = $(\bar{H} - h)/H$;

γ = ratio of floodplain roughness to main channel roughness;

δ = ratio between main channel width to its depth (b/h);

ε = the amplitude

ρ = density of flowing liquid;

τ = boundary shear stress;

$\int_{mc} \tau dp$ = shear force on surfaces of main channel;

% ASF = percentage of total channel shear force carried by assumed interface planes;

% ASF_H = ASF on horizontal interface (aa) as percentage of total shear force;

% ASF_{ip} = ASF on an interface plane as percentage of total shear force;

% ASF_V = ASF on vertical interface (aa1) as percentage of total shear force;

% ASF_D = ASF on diagonal interface (aa2) as percentage of total shear force;

A_{mc} = area of main channel

A_{fp} = flood plain subsections respectively,

S = the longitudinal slope of the channel.

% S_{fp} = the percentage of shear force carried by the floodplains

% S_{mc} = the percentage of shear force carried by the floodplains

REFERENCES

- Ghosh, S. and Jena, S.B. (1971): Boundary Shear Stress Distribution in Open Channel Compound, Proceedings of the Institute of Civil Engineers, vol.49, pp.417-430.
- Holden (1986): Shear Stress and Discharge in Compound Channels. Thesis presented to the University of the Witwatersrand at Johannesburg, South Africa for partial fulfillment of the requirement of the degree of Master of Science.
- Ippen, A.T. and Drinker, P.A. (1962): Boundary Shear Stress in Curved Trapezoidal Channels, *Jr of Hyd. Engrg.* ASCE Vo.88, No.Hy5, September.
- Knight, D.W. (1981): Boundary Shear in Smooth and Rough Channels, *Jr of Hydr. Div., ASCE*, 107(7), pp. 839-851.
- Knight, D.W. and Demetriou, J.D. (1983): Floodplain and Main Channel Flow Interaction, *Jr of Hyd. Engrg.* ASCE Vo.109, No.8, pp-1073-1092.
- Knight, D.W. and Hamed, M.E. (1984): Boundary Shear in Symmetrical Compound Channels, *Jr of Hyd. Engrg., ASCE*, Vol.110, No. HY 10, pp.1412-1430.

- Knight, D.W. and Cao, S. (1994): Boundary Shear in the Vicinity of River Banks, *Proc. Nat. Conf. Hydraulic Engrg., ASCE, Buffalo, USA.*
- Myers, W.R.C. and Elsayy, E. M. (1975): Boundary Shear in Channel With Floodplain, *Jr. of Hydr. Division, ASCE, Vol.101, HY7, pp. 933-946.*
- Patra, K. C. and Kar, S.K. (2000): Flow Interaction of Meandering River with Floodplains, *Jr. of Hydr. Engrg, ASCE, Vol., 126, No.8, pp.593-603.*
- Patra, K. C. et.al. (2004): Flow and Velocity Distribution in Meandering Compound Channels, *Jr. of Hyd. Engr, Vol. 130, No. 5, May 1.*
- Rhodes, D.G. et. al (1991): Automatic Measurement of Boundary Shear Stress and Velocity Distributions in Duct Flow, *J. Hydr. Research, IAHR, 29(2): pp.189-197.*
- Rhodes, D.G. and Knight, D.W. (1994): Distribution of Shear Force on the Boundary of a Smooth Rectangular Duct". *Jr. Hydr. Engrg., ASCE 120(7): pp.787-807.*
- Stephenson, D. and Kolovopoulos, P. (1990): Effects of Momentum Transfer in Compound Channel, *Jr. of Hyd. Engrg, ASCE, Vol.116, No.HY12, pp.1512-1522.*
- Toebe, G. H. and Sooky, A. A. (1967): Hydraulics of Meandering Rivers with Floodplains, *Jr. of Wtrwy. and Harbor Div., ASCE, 93(2), pp.213-236.*
- Wright, R.R and Carstens, M. R. (1970): Linear Momentum Flux to Over Bank Sections, *Jr. of Hydr. Divn., ASCE, Vol.96, NoHY9, pp.1781-1793.*
- Wormleaton, P. R. Allen, J. and Hadjipanos, P. (1980): Apparent Shear Stresses in Compound Channel Flow, *Symp. of River Engrg., IAHR, Delft, The Netherlands.*
- Wormleaton, et al. (1982): Discharge Assessment in Compound Channel Flow, *Jr. of the Hydr. Divn., ASCE, Vol.108, No.HY9, pp.975-994.*
- Yen, C.L. and Overton, D.E.(1973): Shape Effects on Resistance in Floodplain Channels, *Jr. of Hydr. Divn., ASCE, Vol.99, No.1, pp.219-238.*