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Abstract: Some types of barriers are designed with a clearance between the bottom of the barrier and the channel bed. This feature allows small discharges to pass, thereby reducing the maintenance required over the service life of the barrier. Aside from the practical function of a clearance, it influences the impact force, jump height, and discharge. In this paper, a series of physical experiments was conducted using a 6 m long flume to model the interaction between dry granular flow and rigid barrier with a basal clearance. The ratio between the clearance and particle diameter $H_d/D$ was varied from 0 to 10. The channel inclination was varied from $15^\circ$ to $35^\circ$ to achieve different Froude numbers before impact. A new impact model for predicting impact force exerted on the barrier with a basal clearance is presented and evaluated. Results reveal that $H_d/3D$ is capable of reducing the impact force and overflow. Findings from this study highlight the importance of considering the effects of basal clearance on the design of multiple-barrier systems.
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Introduction

Structural countermeasures such as rigid and flexible barriers are commonly constructed to mitigate the steep creek hazards (Kwan 2012; Sun and Law 2015; Moase et al. 2017). To minimize maintenance for barriers, a clearance (Fig. 1) is often prescribed between the base of the barrier and the channel bed (Volkwein 2014; Wieser 2014; Gems et al. 2014; Piton and Recking 2015; Chiari et al. 2016; Nagl et al. 2016a, 2016b). Sze and Lam (2017) reported a summary of overseas guidelines on the design of flexible barriers spanning the entire width of the stream courses. Findings recommended that barriers need a suitably sized basal clearance to prevent the accumulation of stream loads so as to reduce the maintenance required. Some proprietary products were reported to allow basal clearances that range from 0.5 to 1.5 m (Sze and Lam 2017). However, the recommendations remain based on an empirical criterion.

Wendeler and Volkwein (2015) carried out a series of laboratory tests to study the influence of both the mesh size opening and basal clearance on the retention volume of a net barrier. Findings revealed that the net barrier achieved an optimal retention volume by sizing both the mesh size opening and basal clearance based on $d_{50}$, representing particle size larger than 90% of the debris material. Their study laid a strong foundation for designing net barriers based on volume retention. However, the effects of a basal clearance on the impact load and jump height remain a topic of practical and scientific interest in the mitigation of steep creek hazards.

Discharge through a basal clearance is expected to affect the deposited material at the base of the barrier, referred to as dead zone herein (Faug et al. 2002; Gray et al. 2003). The dead zone plays an important role in exerting static load (Caccamo et al. 2011) and altering the flow kinematics and the resulting force on the barrier as debris rides overtop the dead zone (Faug et al. 2012).
Understanding the effects of a basal clearance is particularly important when designing multiple-barrier systems (WSL 2008; Wendeler et al. 2008; Kwan et al. 2015) in steep creeks. A basal clearance can directly influence the volume of material retained and the volume of material allowed to discharge downstream. The material that discharges downstream can pass through the basal clearance or overflow the barrier (Hákonardóttir et al. 2003a, 2003b; Naaim-Bouvet et al. 2004; Choi et al. 2015; Speerli et al. 2010; Glassey 2013; Kwan et al. 2015; Ng et al. 2018) once the retention capacity of the barrier is reached. More importantly, overflow has been recognized as a key mechanism that is responsible for scouring of the channel bed that is just downstream of the barrier (Comiti et al. 2013; Chen et al. 2016). This process compromises the geotechnical stability of barrier foundations (Hübl et al. 2005). With these considerations in mind, it is evident that a basal clearance plays a critical role in flow–barrier interaction and warrants further attention in the design of barriers.

In this study, a series of small-scale physical experiments have been carried out to study the interaction between dry granular flow and rigid barrier with a basal clearance. The influences of the size of the basal clearance on discharge, jump height, and the size of the basal clearance on discharge, jump height, and the density ratio can be expressed as functions of Fr and λ. These functions were derived by Iverson et al. (2016) and given as follows:

\[
Fr = \frac{v_i}{\sqrt{gh_i \cos \theta}}
\]

where \(v_i\) is the flow velocity, \(g\) is the gravitational acceleration (\(g = 9.81 \text{ m/s}^2\) in this study), and \(\theta\) is the channel inclination.

Faug (2015a) and Albaba et al. (2018) further solved eq. (1) with Cardano’s method (Cardano and Spon 1968), assuming \(k = 1\), for the jump height \(h_j\), which is given as follows:

\[
\xi = \frac{h_j}{h_i} = 2^{\alpha/3} \cos \left(\frac{\theta_0}{3}\right) + \frac{1}{3\lambda_\phi}
\]

where \(\xi\) is the jump height ratio, \(\lambda_\phi\) is the density ratio and can be expressed as \(\lambda_\phi = \rho_j/\rho_i \cdot r\) and \(\theta_0\) are expressed as follows:

\[
r = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{q^2 - \Delta}
\]

\[
\theta_0 = \arccos \left( -\frac{q}{2r} \right)
\]

where \(\Delta = q^2 + 4p^3/27\); \(q\) and \(p\) are functions of \(Fr\) and \(\lambda_\phi\).

Assuming that the density of the flow remains unchanged, \(\lambda_\phi\) is unity in eq. (3). \(\xi\), \(r\), and \(\theta_0\) can be rewritten as follows:
(8) \[ \xi = 2R_j^3 \cos \left( \frac{\theta_b}{3} \right) + \frac{1}{3} \]

(9) \[ r = \sqrt{\frac{1}{27} \left( 2R_j^3 + 4 \frac{v_i^2}{3} \right) \] 

(10) \[ \theta_0 = \arccos \left[ \frac{\left( 2R_j^3 - \frac{8}{9} \right)}{\sqrt{3 \left( 2R_j^3 + \frac{4}{3} \right)}} \right] \]

Although assuming a constant density simplifies the impact process by treating the flow as incompressible, it provides a more conservative prediction of larger jump height as reported by Faug et al. (2015). The jump height ratio \( \xi \) can thus be solved using only one unknown parameter, which is the Froude number of the incoming flow.

**Newly proposed impact model for barriers with basal clearance**

A simplified approach based on the conservations of mass and momentum (Hüb & et al. 2009; Scheidl et al. 2012, 2013; Ng et al. 2017) is commonly recommended in design guidelines (VanDine 1996; MLR 2006; NILIM 2007; Kwan 2012) to predict the impact force on barriers. This hydrodynamic approach explicitly considers dynamic loading and the equation is given as follows:

(11) \[ F_{dy} = \alpha \rho j^2 v_j w \]

where \( \alpha \) is dynamic pressure coefficient and \( w \) is the channel width. Recently, Wendeler et al. (2019) reported a load model that combines both the hydrostatic and hydrodynamic components for a steel net barrier with basal clearance. The hydrodynamic model in eq. (11) and the model proposed by Wendeler et al. (2019) are ideal for design because only a small number of parameters, which can be obtained with ease, are required. However, neither of the two load models considers the effects of barrier opening and may lead to an overestimation of the impact force.

In this study, a new impact model considering the basal clearance in a rigid barrier is proposed. Figure 2 shows that when granular flow impacts a rigid barrier with a basal clearance, a jump forms just upstream of the barrier and a steady discharge passes downstream through the basal clearance. Variable \( Q \) represents the flow rate and subscript “d” indicates discharge proper-

(12) \[ \rho_j v_j - \rho_a v_a = 0 \]

(13) \[ \int_0^{h_i} \sigma_i dy - \int_0^{h_a} \sigma_a dy = F = \rho_j w_j (v_a - v_j) \]

where \( \sigma_i \) and \( \sigma_a \) are the longitudinal normal stresses of the flow and can be simplified as \( \sigma_i = k_j (\rho_j h_i - y) \cos \theta \) and \( \sigma_a = k_a (\rho_a h_a - y) \cos \theta \) and \( F \) is the impact force from the flow. The internal energy dissipation during the discharge is ignored to provide a first-order approximation of the impact force. Therefore, the assumption for solving eqs. (12) and (13) requires the energy at flow surfaces of the granular jump and discharge remains constant. This condition can be further expressed by Bernoulli’s equation as follows:

(14) \[ \frac{\rho_j^2 v_j^2 - \rho_a^2 v_a^2}{2g \cos \theta} + \rho_j h_1 = \frac{\rho_j^2 v_a^2}{2g \cos \theta} + \rho_a h_a \]

In this study, the density of the discharge flow is also assumed unchanged to achieve a first-order approximation of the impact force, i.e., \( \rho_a = \rho_b = \rho_c \). Moreover, we assume that the surface of the open-channel flow is only subjected to atmospheric pressure, and thus the pressure terms in eq. (14) are eliminated. The impact force \( F \) can therefore be expressed as follows:

(15) \[ F = \frac{\rho_g (h_1 - h_a) w \cos \theta}{2(h_j + h_a)} \]

Substituting \( h_1 \) with eq. (3), \( F \) can be rewritten as follows:

(16) \[ F = \frac{\rho_g (h_1 \xi - h_a)^3 w \cos \theta}{2(h_\xi + h_a)} \]

The discharge flow depth \( h_a \) is governed by the basal clearance height and is assumed equal to the height of the basal clearance in this study. The impact force \( F \) can then be calculated using upstream flow parameters, which include the density, velocity, depth and width of the flow, and by knowing the basal clearance height and channel inclination. For a closed barrier with \( h_a = 0 \), eq. (16) can be written as follows:

(17) \[ F_i = \frac{\rho_g h_i^2 \xi^2 w \cos \theta}{2} \]

that is, in essence, the hydrostatic force of the retained flow. A similar approach to eq. (17) for calculating the impact force on a closed rigid barrier has been proposed by Zanuttigh and Lambert (2006) by adopting an approximate solution of the jump height ratio \( \xi \) based on the condition that an incoming Froude number is much larger than unity. Equation (11) can be written as a function of Froude number, \( F_r \), as follows:

(18) \[ F_{dy} = \alpha \rho j^2 \rho g h_i^2 w \]

If we divide eq. (18) by eq. (17), a relationship between the hydrodynamic equation and eq. (17) is given as follows:

(19) \[ \frac{F_{dy}}{F_i} = \frac{2 \alpha R_j^2}{\xi^2 \cos \theta} \]

where \( \xi \) is a function of the Froude number, \( F_r \), of incoming flow as expressed in eqs. (8)–(10). When \( F_r \gg 1 \), it can be calculated from eqs. (8)–(10) that \( 2R_j^3 \xi^3 = 1 \), and therefore \( F_{dy}/F_i = \alpha/cos \theta \).

**Flume modelling**

The experiments in this study were conducted using a 6 m long flume model with a rectangular channel. The width and depth of the channel were 200 and 500 mm, respectively. At the upstream end of the flume, a container with a maximum volume of 0.1 m³ was used to store the granular material, which was retained by a
gate. The gate was controlled using a magnetic lock at the base of the channel. Upon deactivation of the magnetic lock, the pneumatic gate was lifted vertically to release the granular material down the channel.

Flow characterization
Characterization of the flow before impact is important for correlating the dynamics of a flow and the resulting load. The Froude number, \( Fr \), governs the dynamics of open-channel flow and is closely correlated with the impact behaviour on structures (Hübl et al. 2009; Armanini et al. 2011; Choi et al. 2015; Ng et al. 2017).

For practical applications, knowledge of both the velocity and depth of the flow is convenient for characterizing the dynamics of steady open-channel flows and correlating the dynamics with the impact behaviour. A diminishing \( Fr (< 1) \) indicates that the effects of gravity and therefore static loading is significant. By contrast, \( Fr >> 1 \) suggests that the existing state of inertia in the flow and therefore the dynamic loading is very much significant (Faug 2015; Sovilla et al. 2016). In this study, different \( Fr \) were achieved by varying the channel inclination.

Instrumentation
Figure 3 shows a side schematic of the flume and the instrumentation used in this study. A high-speed camera (Fig. 3a; model No.: Mikrotron, EoSens mini2) was installed at the side of the channel to capture the impact kinematics and to approximate both the flow depth and flow velocity for each test. Images were sampled at 300 frames per second at a resolution of 1660 pixels × 970 pixels.

The rigid barrier (Fig. 3b) adopted in this study consisted of four 10 mm thick acrylic plates. Each plate was instrumented with a load cell to measure the impact load along different locations of the barrier. The height of each acrylic plate near the bottom of the barrier was 50 mm and the acrylic plate near the top of the barrier had a height of 100 mm. A wooden plate was installed at the upper portion of the barrier and lined with plastic film to ensure a flush surface with the rest of the barrier. The instrumented barrier was 500 mm in height and mounted 1100 mm from the gate of the storage container.

Test programme
Before conducting tests to study the interaction between dry granular flows and a rigid barrier with different basal clearances, control tests were carried out to characterize the Froude number of the flows without installing any barrier. The flow velocity and flow depth used to deduce the Froude number were measured based on high-speed camera images. The maximum flow depth at the barrier location was used to calculate the Froude number in eq. (2). Figure 4 shows a side schematic of the control test for determining the frontal velocity of the flow. The dilute flow front usually had a much higher velocity that was not representative of the flow. Correspondingly, the frontal velocity for each test was calculated using the thicker part of the flow front, which was ± 50 mm from the barrier location.

To discern the differences between fine and coarse granular flows, monodisperse glass spheres with diameters \( D \) of 3 and 10 mm were selected. The ratios between the flume width and the particle diameters, \( w/D \), for the 3 and 10 mm spheres are 67 and 20, respectively. The initial bulk densities for the 3 and 10 mm glass spheres were 1620 and 1611 kg/m³, respectively. The measured dynamic friction angles for the 3 and 10 mm glass spheres were 17.8° and 16.6°, respectively (Ng et al. 2017a).
The channel inclination $\theta$ was varied from 15° to 35° to achieve different $Fr$. The height of basal clearance was varied from 0 to 30 mm. The normalized basal clearance $H_c/D$, which is also regarded as the relative opening of the clearance, ranged from 0 to 10 in this study. A summary of the test programme and measured $Fr$ at the location of the rigid barrier is given in Table 1.

For each test a mass of 30 kg of glass spheres was prepared into the storage container with a horizontal free surface. Afterwards, the flume was inclined using a crane. When the channel inclination exceeded the repose angle of the granular material, the free surface of the granular material was modelled between the gate and the barrier. The increasing shear resistance provided from overlying particles eventually charged of material through the clearance (Fig. 6b). At this instant, a drastic reduction in discharge underneath the barrier occurred. Any additional discharge through the clearance was from the disintegration of the dead zone. Furthermore, the dead zone acted as a cushion against subsequent dynamic load exerted on the barrier. This is analogous to a series of force chains that redistribute stress in a granular assembly (Tordesillas et al. 2014).

Figure 5c shows discharge was passing through the basal clearance without an upstream supply of granular material. Eventually, the discharge behaved like hopper flow (Ketterhagen et al. 2009), which was predominantly gravity driven.

### Jamming at basal clearance

Jamming at the basal clearance was observed in the experiments with a relative opening $H_c/D = 1.5$. Figure 6 shows the captured kinematics for test C15-I25-D10. In this test, 10 mm particles were used to impact the rigid barrier that had a basal clearance of $H_c/D = 1.5$. The channel was inclined at 25°. As the flow front arrived at the barrier (Fig. 6d), only dispersed material at the flow front passed through the basal clearance. The retained material (Fig. 6b) provided additional confining stress to resist the discharge of material through the clearance (Fig. 6c). The increasing shear resistance provided from overlying particles eventually jammed the flow and the impact process reached a static state (Fig. 6c), which is similar to that reported by Janda et al. (2008).

When $H_c/D = 1.5$, the barrier retained more than 98% of the initial flow volume. Compared with results reported by Wendeler and Volkwein (2015), the result in this study indicates that for dry monodisperse flow, a height that is 1.5 times that of the particle size for the basal clearance can provide quite a high retention volume. For a barrier with a basal clearance that had a relative opening $H_c/D \geq 3$, jamming was not observed in this study. By

### Interpretation of test results

#### Observed kinematics of flow impacting barrier with basal clearance

Figure 5 shows a comparison between the observed kinematics captured using the high-speed camera and the velocity fields analysed using particle image velocimetry (White et al. 2003) for test C30-I25-D10. In this test, the channel was inclined at 35°, and the rigid barrier had a basal clearance with a relative opening $H_c/D = 3.0$.

The thin flow front passed through the basal clearance freely because the flow depth was smaller than the height of the basal clearance. As the tapered flow front became thicker, the flow started to interact with the barrier. From image analysis (Fig. 5a), the velocity vectors of the resisted flow near the base of the barrier changed direction from a predominantly slope parallel direction to a barrier parallel direction. At this stage of the impact process, the flux entering the system was larger than that passing underneath the barrier. The confining stress from the accretion of granular material just upstream of the barrier resisted the subsequent discharge of material underneath the barrier. Eventually, a distinct dead zone developed at the toe of the barrier (Fig. 5b). At this instant, a drastic reduction in discharge underneath the barrier occurred. Any additional discharge through the clearance was from the disintegration of the dead zone. Furthermore, the dead zone acted as a cushion against subsequent dynamic load exerted on the barrier. This is analogous to a series of force chains that redistribute stress in a granular assembly (Tordesillas et al. 2014).

### Table 1. Summary of test programme and results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test ID</th>
<th>Basal clearance, $H_c$ (mm)</th>
<th>Flume inclination, $\theta$</th>
<th>Particle diameter, $D$ (mm)</th>
<th>$H_c/D$</th>
<th>Frontal velocity, $v$ (m/s)</th>
<th>Flow depth, $h$ (mm)</th>
<th>Froude number, $Fr$</th>
<th>Peak total force (N)</th>
<th>Reduction proportion of peak total force (%)</th>
<th>Jamming at basal clearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I15-D3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I25-D3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I35-D3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I15-D10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I25-D10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I35-D10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0-I15-D3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0-I25-D3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0-I35-D3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0-I15-D10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0-I25-D10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0-I35-D10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15-I15-D3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15-I25-D3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15-I35-D3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15-I15-D10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>−11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15-I25-D10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15-I35-D10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>154.3</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30-I15-D3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30-I25-D3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30-I35-D3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30-I15-D10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30-I25-D10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30-I35-D10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>132.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Flow depth is the maximum flow depth at the barrier location from control tests.*
allowing the material to freely discharge to downstream through the basal clearance, overflow volume can potentially be reduced. This implies that a basal clearance can indirectly minimize the threat posed by scouring from overflow.

**Effects of basal clearance on granular jump process**

Figure 7 shows a comparison of the measured jump height $h_j$ normalized by flow depth $h_i$ with different basal clearance heights, $H_c/D$, at different Froude conditions. The basal clearance height, $H_c/D$, and Froude number were selected as the horizontal axes of Figs. 7a and 7b, respectively, to discern the effects of these two parameters. Figure 7a shows that larger basal clearances reduced jump height for finer granular material ($D = 3$ mm, $H_c/D \geq 5.0$) by up to 34%. By contrast, for coarser granular flow ($D = 10$ mm, $H_c/D \geq 1.5$), the jump height increased less than 10% in this study compared to that of a barrier without basal clearance. An exception to this trend was observed when $Fr = 3.2$ and $H_c/D = 3.0$. Under such conditions, a 15% decrease in the jump height was observed. The decrease of jump height was because more material passed through the clearance and therefore less material was available for the granular jump. Moreover, due to the reduced lateral earth pressure at the basal clearance, the momentum of the flow would be much easier to transfer downstream instead of...
transferring upwards. The increase of jump height was due to the less material discharged to downstream and the intensive shearing induced during the discharge process.

More specifically, one would expect enhanced shearing between grains of the deposited material and the discharge passing through the clearance. Such shear-induced stresses between grains of the deposited material and the discharge passing through the clearance. As the granular assembly is sheared, a velocity gradient $\delta v$ develops and particles interact between the two layers. There are two types of grain interaction, one type results in dispersive stress $P_d$ in the normal direction of the flow, while the other type results in grain shear stress $P_s$ along the direction of flow. These stresses are given as follows:

\begin{align}
(20) & \quad P = \rho_s \gamma^2 D^2 \\
(21) & \quad P_s = \frac{P}{\sin \alpha_c} = \frac{P}{\cos \alpha_c}
\end{align}

Equation (20) shows that the grain collisional stress $P$ is proportional to grain density $\rho_s$, square of the shear rate $\gamma^2$, and particle diameter square $D^2$. The grain collisional stress $P$ can be divided into grain shear stress $P_s$ and grain dispersive stress $P_d$, and is expressed in eq. (21). Here, $\alpha_c$ is an angle, which is dependent on the direction of collision and whether the rotation of grains occurs (Bagnold 1954). Equations (20) and (21) suggest that as flow discharges through the basal clearance (Fig. 8b), collisions between the arrested material, and discharging flow may increase both the grain dispersive and grain shear stresses. Larger particles and higher $Fr$ lead to higher dispersive stresses $P_d$, which is reflected in the increase of jump height.

The dashed line in Fig. 7b is the estimated jump height based on eq. (1) with $k = 1$ and $\rho_s = \rho$. The result from Fig. 7b shows that the analytical solution of eq. (1) can overestimate the jump height when $Fr = 3.2$ to 3.4. The jump height can be overestimated by up to twice the measured values. In addition, eq. (1) underestimates the jump height by up to 15% when $Fr = 4.5$ to 5.7. A reason for the underestimation is that eq. (1) is meant for predicting the jump height of granular flows with an internal friction angle larger than channel inclination (Hákonardóttir et al. 2003b). When the internal friction angle is smaller than the slope angle, the elevated surface will be unstable and need to readjust to the repose angle thereby causing an increase in the jump height. Alba et al. (2018) proposed an alternative approach to estimate the increased jump height by calculating the length of the granular jump along the flow direction. As this method requires the input of the incoming flow velocity and flow depth, predicting the jump in a practical sense can be challenging. Notwithstanding, the 15% underestimation of the jump height in this study is not unacceptable and eq. (1) is suitable for estimating the jump height of granular flow impacting a barrier with basal clearance.

In summary, results show that a closed barrier is not the most conservative scenario for calculating the jump height. A basal clearance that has a relative opening $H_c/D \leq 3$ may induce an increase of jump height of up to 8%. A basal clearance that has relative openings of $H_c/D = 5$ and 10 may result in a reduction of jump heights by up to 11% and 34%, respectively. Even for $H_c/D = 5$, the reduction of the granular jump was only up to 11% compared to that of a closed barrier. Therefore, a barrier with a basal clearance with an $H_c/D \geq 10$ is recommended for mitigating granular jumps.

**Effects of basal clearance on impact force**

Figure 9 shows the measured peak impact force exerted on barriers with different basal clearances for fine (Fig. 9a) and coarse (Fig. 9b) granular flows. The impact forces calculated from eqs. (11) and (16) are shown for reference. Furthermore, loadings under different $Fr$ are compared. Using eq. (11) with a theoretical dynamic pressure coefficient $\alpha = 1.0$, the flow is assumed to be incompressible, and $v_i$ and $h_i$ were measured from the open channel tests.

Figure 9 shows that the measured peak force for fine-grained flows decreased with an increasing basal clearance height. By contrast, the measured peak force for coarse particles when $H_c/D = 1.5$ increased by up to 6% compared to a barrier without a basal clearance. The peak force decreased by 13% to 40% when $H_c/D = 3.0$. The increase of peak impact force suggests that the impact force on a barrier with smaller basal clearance, $H_c/D \leq 1.5$, cannot be effectively reduced compared with a barrier without a basal clearance. The reason that a barrier with $H_c/D = 1.5$ did not attenuate the impact force was because only up to 2% of the flow volume discharged to downstream. This small discharge volume had a negligible effect on the decrease of the overall impact load. By contrast, when $H_c/D \geq 3.0$, a more obvious reduction in the peak impact force can be found. When $H_c/D \geq 3.0$, the reduction in the peak impact force ranged from 11% to 18%, compared to barrier without basal clearances, for $Fr$ from 5.3 to 5.7. When $H_c/D$ ranged from 3 to 5, the reduction of peak impact force was from 20% to 29% and 35% to 40% for flows with $Fr$ from 4.5 to 4.6, and from 3.2 to 3.4, respectively. Larger reductions in impact force, from 43% to 77%, were observed for $Fr$ from 3.4 to 4.6 with a clearance of $H_c/D = 10$. Results show that $Fr$ governed the reduction of impact force exerted on barriers with basal clearances, and the basal clearance had less effect on more inertial flows. Details of the reduction of peak force on the barrier and the jamming condition in each test are summarized in Table 1. The result in Table 1 reveals that for barrier configurations where jamming did not occur at the basal clearance, the discharge of the flow led to smaller static force on the barrier, which in turn reduced the peak impact force on the barrier.
Fig. 9. Comparison of measured peak impact load at different basal clearance heights and Froude conditions: (a) flow with particle diameter 3 mm; (b) flow with particle diameter 10 mm. [Colour online.]

Performance of newly proposed analytical model for barrier with basal clearance

Results show that the proposed impact model in this study can reliably predict the decreasing trend of the impact force with an increasing basal clearance height at different Froude conditions (Figs. 9a and 9b). However, the impact force was underestimated for finer granular flows (D = 3 mm) (Fig. 9a) with Froude numbers of 4.6 and 5.7. The lower than expected impact loads may be attributed to the smaller jump heights as shown in Fig. 7b. The finding demonstrates the importance of a reliable momentum jump model for predicting the impact force. Figure 9b shows that the proposed model in this study overestimates the impact force exerted by coarse granular flow (D = 10 mm). However, the proposed model still provides a reasonable upper bound compared with the constant theoretical impact forces predicted by using eq. (11) without considering the effects of basal clearance.

Attention should also be placed on the observation that the theoretical impact force for fine granular flow with \( H_0/D > 10 \) and for coarse granular flow with \( H_0/D > 3 \) may not be valid using the proposed impact model because the barriers with a basal clearance can lose its regulatory function once the basal clearance exceeds a critical height. This critical basal height can be determined using the maximum flow depth.

A comparison of results from the proposed impact model and the measured results shows reasonable agreement. However, the proposed analytical model was only evaluated against idealized monodisperse dry granular flows in this study. For debris flow, the fluid phase plays an integral role in regulating the flow dynamics (Iverson 1997; McArdell et al. 2007). More specifically, excess pore-water pressures are generated as a granular assembly is sheared. Correspondingly, contact stresses are reduced. This implies that less material is expected to be retained by barriers with basal clearances for wet flows compared to that of dry granular flows.

Scale effects are governed by the interaction between the solid and fluid phases (Iverson 2015). However, the proposed impact model in this study treats the flow as an incompressible equivalent fluid, which neglects the particle–particle and particle–fluid interactions. Correspondingly, the simple impact model can be used for any scenario by treating the flow as an equivalent fluid (Hungr 1995). Test results (Fig. 9) also show that the current model does not explicitly consider the effects of a small basal clearance that cannot have an impact force reduction compared to barrier without basal clearance when \( H_0/D = 1.5 \).

More importantly, findings from this study provide a basis for evaluating existing recommendations for basal clearances in the literature. For example, the basal clearance heights of some proprietary steel net barriers in the field range from 0.5 to 1.5 m based on that reported by Sze and Lam (2017). However, their report does not specify whether the recommended range of clearance is for reducing the frontal impact force, minimizing the jump height, reducing the serviceability required by the barrier or maximizing the volume retained. Results from this study reveal that the optimum clearance is different depending on its intended function. For example, this study recommends an optimum clearance of \( H_0/h_0 \geq 0.6 \) for reducing the impact force and an optimum clearance of \( H_0/h_0 \geq 0.9 \) for reducing the jump height. Although the scope of this study was limited to idealized dry granular flows, results suggest that even for more complex flows, the basal clearance is different depending on its intended function.

Load distribution along barrier

Figure 10 compares the load distribution along the height of barriers with different basal clearances at a channel inclination of 35°. Peak loads from the four load cells are shown. Results show increases in peak load near the base of the barrier, compared to that of a closed barrier by 13% and 27% for the fine particles (\( Fr = 5.7, H_0/D = 10.0 \)) and the coarse particles (\( Fr = 5.3, H_0/D = 3.0 \)), respectively. The higher peak loads were attributed to the disruption of the dead zone near the basal clearance. A dead zone can attenuate the dynamic impact of the subsequent flow on the barrier by redirecting the flow (Ng et al. 2017b).

In summary, the newly proposed model is suitable for predicting the impact force on barriers with basal clearance. When \( H_0/D \geq 3.0 \), the peak force shows a consistent decrease with increasing basal clearance. The delay in the formation of the dead zone for barriers with clearances during the impact process can result in an increase of impact force near the base of the barrier. However, this local increase will not affect the total force exerted on the barrier.

Conclusions

A series of flume experiments were conducted to investigate the interaction between dry granular flows and a rigid barrier with a basal clearance. The effects of the basal clearance \( H_0/D \) on discharge, jump height, and impact force were examined. Findings from this study are drawn as follows:
Fig. 10. Measured distributed impact force along barrier for different basal clearance heights: (a) flow with particle diameter 3 mm at Fr = 5.7; (b) flow with particle diameter 10 mm at Fr = 5.3. [Colour online.]

1. A closed barrier is not the most conservative design scenario and the effects of a basal clearance cannot be ignored. Both the Froude numbers and normalized basal clearance $H_c/D$ are key design considerations when assessing the discharge, jump height, and impact force.

2. Both the momentum-based jump model and a newly proposed impact model, with consideration of a basal clearance, were evaluated. Both models reasonably predict the jump and impact force for dry granular flows with Froude condition ranging from 3.2 to 5.7.

3. For dry monodisperse granular flows, a basal clearance of $H_c \geq 3D$ reduces the impact force by up to 77%. The jump height on the barrier can be reduced by up to 34% when $H_c = 10D$. A basal clearance height $H_c \geq 3D$ is suggested to reduce the impact force and overflow volume in multiple-barrier systems.

4. For dry monodisperse granular flows, a basal clearance $H_c \leq 1.5D$ can achieve a retention volume by more than 98% of the total volume. However, neither the jump height nor the impact force is suppressed.
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